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Albrecht Dürer’s “Oblong Passion”: The Impact of the Reformation and Netherlandish Art on the Artist’s Late Drawings

Abstract

by

DANA E. COWEN

Albrecht Dürer’s Oblong Passion drawings of the early 1520s, previously considered as preparatory studies for an unfinished woodcut Passion series, are here conceived as independent works. When examined formally and within their historical context, they yield fresh insights into Dürer’s late artistic and intellectual interpretation of Christ’s Passion, his spiritual engagement in the early Reformation, and his creative response to Netherlandish art. Representing four episodes from the Passion narrative and one from Christ’s infancy, the eleven drawings reveal Dürer’s appropriation of Netherlandish compositional devices in order to depict a new conceptual and iconographical representation of the Passion narrative, one that specifically featured theological principles set forth by Martin Luther.

For the first time, in this dissertation the Oblong Passion drawings are interpreted through the lens of Luther’s Sermon von der Betrachtung des heiligen Leidens Christi of 1519, a popular tract that emphasized complete faith in Jesus’ atoning sacrifice instead of the prevailing belief that acts of affective piety and good works resulted in salvation. Dürer’s de-emphasis of Jesus’ suffering and that of his followers, as well as the artist’s overall attention to the temporality of the narrative, diverge from his previous renditions of the subject and demonstrate the artist’s evangelical reconsideration of Christ’s Passion.
In addition to the widened format of the drawings, Dürer’s treatment of space, figural arrangement, and dramaturgical pathos reflect his adoption of Netherlandish artistic principles, particularly those of his contemporary Lucas van Leyden. Although early scholars have noted the overall Netherlandish impression of the drawings, I provide specific and conclusive comparative examples to affirm Dürer’s receptivity to foreign artistic stimuli during this late phase in his career. This critical interpretation of the Oblong Passion drawings brings much needed attention to an understudied aspect of Dürer’s religious output and furthers our understanding of Dürer’s late creative process, his application of evangelical principles to his works, and the explicit ways in which he engaged with Netherlandish art.
Introduction

While on his year-long stay in the Netherlands from the summer of 1520 to 1521, Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528) began a group of Passion drawings, known today as the Oblong Passion. The drawings—unique in their landscape format—stand apart from his many other Passion images. Eleven drawings associated with this series survive and represent four events from the Passion narrative: one Last Supper in the Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna (Fig. 1); four of the Agony in the Garden in the Staatliche Kunsthalle, Karlsruhe, the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, and two in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt (Figs. 2-5); two of Christ Carrying the Cross, both in the Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence (Figs. 6, 7), and three of the Bearing of the Body or Entombment, one each in the Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence, the Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg, and the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt (Figs. 8-10).¹ A 1524 drawing in the Graphische Sammlung Albertina of the Adoration of the Magi (Fig. 11), a theme not usually included in cycles of Christ’s Passion, is often designated as the preface to the entire series, while one drawing of the Bearing of the Body is considered a copy after a

¹ Dürer’s drawings will be referenced according to the catalogue numbers provided in Friedrich Winkler, Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers, (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1936-1939). The Oblong Passion drawings are held in the following museum collections in alphabetical order by city: Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett: The Agony in the Garden, KdZ 17 (W. 803), acquired 1877; Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi: Christ Carrying the Cross, 1077 E (W. 794), Medici Fund Collection, Christ Carrying the Cross, 1078 E. (W. 793), Medici Fund Collection, The Bearing of the Body, 1069 E (W. 795), Medici Fund Collection, all acquired before 1918; Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut: The Agony in the Garden, Inv. Nr. 695 (W. 798), acquired 1850, The Agony in the Garden, Inv. Nr. 694 (W. 891), acquired before 1862, The Bearing of the Body, Inv. Nr. 716 (W. 799), acquired before 1862; Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle: The Agony in the Garden, Inv. Nr. 1978-11 (W. 797); Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum: The Bearing of the Body, St. Nbg. 12589 (W. 796), acquired around 1890-95; Vienna, Albertina: The Last Supper, Inv. 3178 (W. 889), acquired 1920, The Adoration of the Magi, Inv. 4837, acquired after 1822.
lost original or a workshop study (Fig. 10). The dating of the drawings begin in 1520 and ends in 1524, meaning that Dürer likely started the series while he was traveling in the Netherlands and continued to produce parts of it after his return home to Nuremberg.

The drawings are significant in Dürer’s oeuvre since he never composed his narrative scenes, particularly of Christ’s Passion, in landscape format. They are also the only narrative works Dürer completed while on his journey in the Netherlands. As a devout Christian and as an artist, Dürer engaged with the story of the Passion over most of his career. He produced four finished Passion series, apart from the *Oblong Passion* drawings, which demonstrate the progression of his artistic skills and his ongoing creative capacities. The distinct format of the later drawings, as well as Dürer’s comprehensive treatment of space and restrained dramatic emotion, differs significantly from his earlier renditions of the story and suggests that the appearance of his new Passion imagery was informed by both the circumstances surrounding religious reform in northern Europe and the exposure to earlier and contemporary works of art he viewed in the Netherlands.

As the most comprehensive study of the *Oblong Passion* to date, my research explores the function and meaning of the drawings for Dürer, deduces in what specific ways he incorporated contemporaneous evangelical ideologies into the works, and establishes how Dürer’s extended stay in the Netherlands, with its concomitant intense exposure to Netherlandish art, informed his late creative process. I address a number of...

---

fundamental questions regarding the drawings and their interpretation over time. Namely, why might Dürer have returned to the theme of Christ’s Passion with such intensity after an interval of seven years since his previous renderings of the theme? Under what circumstances were the drawings created and how did these circumstances inform their appearance? Why did Dürer use an oblong format for the drawings when all of his previous Passion scenes were designed for a vertical orientation? How can a fresh reading of the *Oblong Passion* contribute to our larger understanding of Dürer as an artist, including the relationship of his work to religious matters during this period, and his visual response to Netherlandish art?

My investigation is based on both the objects themselves and the historical contexts within which they were made. It addresses the formal and pictorial choices Dürer applied for the execution of the drawings and how religious and social events directly experienced by Dürer might have shaped their making. By examining Dürer’s recurrent engagement with Christ’s Passion and analyzing his earlier interpretations of the subject, I establish that the *Oblong Passion* demonstrated a break from Dürer’s earlier, canonical depictions of the story. As the creation of the drawings took place during the formative stages of the Protestant Reformation and since Dürer was among many lay people captivated by Luther’s teachings, I consider whether the drawings were intended to reflect traditional devotional themes or rather to engage with the theological ideas espoused by Martin Luther.

Although scholars have noted that the *Oblong Passion* bears resemblance to Netherlandish history painting, there has been a tendency to disregard the implications of this phenomenon as well as the identification of specific comparative examples for
clarification. By considering celebrated early Netherlandish paintings and the contemporaneous popular prints of Lucas van Leyden, I fill this lacuna of scholarship in Dürer’s late drawing production by providing particular instances in which Dürer adapted Netherlandish motifs and compositional arrangement. This study therefore demonstrates that the broadened pictorial format and the understated expressiveness of the *Oblong Passion* resulted from both Dürer’s interest in Luther’s writings, particularly on the proper method of meditation on Christ’s Passion, and the circumstances of the Netherlandish journey.

**A Brief Overview of the *Oblong Passion***

On 12 July 1520 Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528) set out from his hometown of Nuremberg with his wife Agnes and her maidservant Susannah to travel north to the Low Countries. The artist chose Antwerp, the most prosperous trading center in the Netherlands, as his temporary residence and the headquarters from which he traveled to various towns and cities in the region. The fundamental purpose of the journey was to secure the annual imperial pension awarded to Dürer by Emperor Maximilian I (1459-1519) in 1515. When Maximilian’s death in January of 1519 jeopardized the continuation of this annuity, Dürer decided to petition for its renewal from Maximilian’s

---

3 The most significant source of information regarding Dürer’s trip is his own diary. It has survived in two copies and has since been transcribed into several languages. For transcriptions in German and English, see Hans Rupprich, ed., *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1956-1969), 1: 148-178 and William Martin Conway, *The Literary Remains of Albrecht Dürer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1889), 92-125, and later *The Writings of Albrecht Dürer* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1958).

4 Dürer’s pension was distributed from the Nuremberg municipal budget but was evidently rarely paid by the City Council. Jane Campbell Hutchison, *Albrecht Dürer: A Biography* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 115.
successor and grandson Charles V (1500-1558) personally at the new monarch’s
coronation ceremony in Aachen in October 1520. Rather than simply travel to Aachen at
the time of this event and return home at its conclusion, Dürer embarked for the
Netherlands three months prior and stayed in the Low Countries almost a full calendar
year. Dürer likely left several months early for the coronation to secure a
recommendation from Charles’ aunt, Margaret of Austria, at her court in Mechelen, just
southeast of Antwerp. However, since Dürer received confirmation of the renewal of his
pension in early November, he must have had other motives for staying in the
Netherlands for another seven months.5

Some of these reasons can be ascertained from the extensive diary Dürer kept
while traveling. Included in the entries were notations of monies spent, works gifted and
sold, new acquaintances made, objects viewed and admired, and localities visited. Dürer
also recorded much of this information, particularly the people he met and the towns he
saw, in the work he produced while there, including silverpoint, charcoal, and pen and
ink drawings as well as paintings. Of the extant artworks, many can be matched with
Dürer’s inscriptions. For instance, toward the end of his Netherlandish journey, Dürer
noted in a late May 1521 entry “Jch hab 3 ausführung und 2 ölberg auff 5 halb pogen
gerissen (I drew 3 Leadings-forth [possibly Christ Carrying the Cross] and 2 Mounts of
Olives on 5 half-sheets).”6 Scholars agree that the artist was referring to part of a series of

5 Charles V granted Dürer the renewal of his pension on 4 November 1520. For a transcription of the letter
see Conway, Literary Remains, 91; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 90-91. Dürer received
notification on 12 November 1520, stating in his diary “My confirmation from the Emperor came to my
Lords of Nürnberg for me on Monday after Martin’s in the year 1520 after great trouble and labour.”
Conway, Literary Remains, 108; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 160.

drawings in landscape format that depict a number of episodes from Christ’s Passion, aptly referred to today as the *Oblong Passion*. For Dürer, the subject of Christ’s Passion was significant not only for his own religious devotion, but also as a means of profit. Apart from independent drawings, paintings, and prints, over the course of his career Dürer created four finished series of the subject, three of which were published. These include the *Large Passion* (woodcut, 1497-1500, 1510-1511), the *Green Passion* (pen and ink with white heightening on green prepared paper, 1504), the *Small Passion* (woodcut, c. 1509-1511), and the *Engraved Passion* (1507-1513). It was not until 1520, seven years after Dürer completed the final print of the *Engraved Passion*, that he re-engaged with the subject of Christ’s Passion with as much dedication and extended consideration as he had with his previous series.

Many scholars have argued that the *Oblong Passion* drawings were preparatory for a final woodcut Passion series that never came to fruition. The only evidence for this assumption is the publication of his 1523 *Last Supper* woodcut in landscape format, a subject that appears among the late oblong drawings (Fig. 12). However, the *Last Supper* drawing of 1523 is markedly different in composition and narrative emphasis from the analogous woodcut (Fig. 1). This discrepancy may indicate that the function of the drawings shifted from independent works to preparatory drawings, or vice versa, during
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7 Four woodcuts known as the *Albertina Passion* that date to around the mid 1490s are occasionally added as the sixth of Dürer’s Passion series, including the *Oblong Passion*. The group includes the Flagellation (M. 73), the Crowning of Thorns (M. 327), the Bearing of the Cross (M. 153), and the Crucifixion (M. 112b). I have not included these works in my discussion since their authorship is provisional. See Angela Hass, “Two Devotional Manuals by Albrecht Dürer: The Small Passion and the Engraved Passion. Iconography, Context and Spirituality,” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 63, no. 2 (2000): 169.

the span of their creation. Several reasons have been set forth for why Dürer might have abandoned this proposed project, including the artist’s age and declining health, his preoccupation with finishing his theoretical writings, and his assumed reluctance to publish devotional material at a time when the relationship of religious imagery to salvation was being questioned.⁹

Commonalities exist between Dürer’s early graphic work on the Passion and his late oblong drawings in the subject matter and poses of significant figures, such as Christ’s stance while carrying the cross or his kneeling position on the Mount of Olives. However, the shift from a vertical to horizontal compositional arrangement altered not only the space and movement of the narrative, but also the expressive intensity. Unlike the immediately familiar and confrontational plots of the compact and energetic renditions found in the Large, Small, Green and Engraved Passions, the landscape format of the Oblong Passion allowed the narrative of Jesus’ suffering to unfold gradually over a wide surface. The slow movement of the design encourages unhurried contemplation by progressing visually horizontally and diagonally through the figures, anecdotal details, and settings. Conversely, the earlier, more restrictive vertical compositions typically confined movement to the foreground, promoting instant recognition of the narrative and an increased sense of immediacy. Significantly, the emphasis of the earlier Passion series

---

⁹ Panofsky believed Dürer abandoned the project for religious reasons, Panofsky, Life and Art, 222; Peter Strieder thought Dürer was undergoing a “crisis in religion” and that spiritual confusion accounted for the series’ incompletion. See Peter Strieder, Albrecht Dürer: Paintings, Prints, Drawings, trans. Nancy M. Gordon and Walter L. Strauss (New York: Abaris Books, 1982), 129; Jordan Kantor thought Dürer’s concern over the reception of devotional imagery in the midst of iconoclastic debates caused him to refrain from finishing the series. See Jordan Kantor, Dürer’s Passions, exh. cat. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Art Museums, 2000), 34-41; Donald McColl considered the artist’s old age and anxiety accounted for the incompletion. See Donald McColl, “Agony in the Garden: Dürer’s ‘Crisis of the Image,’” in The Essential Dürer, ed. Larry Silver and Jeffrey Chipps Smith (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 166-184.
on the suffering of Jesus and his followers is mitigated in the late oblong drawings wherein the suffering experienced by all becomes more introspective and personalized.

The drawings have yet to receive proper critical analysis although the contrasts between Dürer’s earlier renditions of Christ’s Passion and his late oblong drawings are immediately perceivable. For the most part discussions of the drawings have been relegated to terse entries in accounts of Dürer’s drawings or in collection catalogues. In monographs devoted to the artist the *Oblong Passion* is discussed briefly as part of Dürer’s late religious output and of drawings he produced during his trip to the Netherlands. Although the unique format and pictorial arrangement of the drawings within Dürer’s oeuvre is duly noted, it has remained underexplored in all but a few publications. Erwin Panofsky, one of the foremost past authorities on the artist’s life and work, perhaps expressed the reasons for this underrepresentation in the literature best when he stated, “The implications of this sudden change from a vertical to a horizontal form of composition are easier to apprehend intuitively than to define in words.”

Certainly, the lack of sustained and critical attention to the series, particularly among early Dürer scholars, has effectively minimized their significance within Dürer’s oeuvre, specifically in the ways in which the drawings can inform us about the artist’s late creative process and his evolving relationship to the Passion narrative.

---

10 See *supra* note 1 for collection information.


Dürer’s Drawing Praxis and the Potential Function of the *Oblong Passion*

The importance of drawing to Dürer's artistry is clear from the significant body of his surviving drawings, which amount to approximately one thousand single-leaf sheets. As a draughtsman, Dürer expanded the function of drawings as well as the methods with which they were made. He believed that drawing could communicate “...the spiritual essence of an artist’s creative impulse...,” and signed and dated his drawings as a record of his authorship. His drawings encompass a wide range of subject matter, including landscapes, animals, costume studies, as well as preparatory studies for paintings, prints, and stained glass. Principal among the drawings are those devoted to the human form, which Dürer presented in a wide array of themes, including anatomical studies, portraits, and both religious and mythological compositions. He also mastered all materials then available for the creation of drawings, including silverpoint, pen and ink, brush, charcoal, and chalk. His technique varied from highly finished compositions to rapidly sketched ideas.

Prior to the sixteenth century, most northern European drawings did not demonstrate the individuality of the artist or serve as spontaneous representations of artistic ideas, but rather functioned as model drawings that were kept in the workshop as either single sheets or placed together in a compendium of drawings similar to the

---


tradition of medieval pattern books.\textsuperscript{15} Although the functions of drawing in the early
sixteenth century largely had much the same purpose as those in the previous century,
additional uses for drawings developed as new art forms were introduced, like
printmaking, and as new artistic aims, such as the study of the natural world, evolved.\textsuperscript{16}
As the examination of nature and its realistic representation developed to a greater extent,
so too did the naturalistic rendering of the human figure. Artists, who were increasingly
becoming more aware of their own individuality and creativity, also began signing their
drawings with greater frequency. This practice is no more apparent than in the work of
Dürer, who even signed and dated his preparatory drawings for panel paintings.\textsuperscript{17}

In addition to their ongoing preparatory function, drawings became a tool with
which to work out the challenges of design, a means of self-expression, and a mode of
creating independent works that served no initial preparatory function. For instance,
Dürer’s German contemporaries like Albrecht Altdorfer (c. 1480-1538) and other artists
active around the Danube region (and referred to today as the Danube School) created
independent drawings that were inspired by the rich wooded atmosphere within which
they worked. Primarily concerned with integrating the landscape into their designs, this
group also included Erhard Altdorfer (c. 1485-1561/62), Lucas Cranach the Elder (1472-
1553), and Wolfgang Huber (c. 1485-1553). Many independent drawings by Albrecht

\textsuperscript{15} According to Maryan Ainsworth, Netherlandish sketchbooks of the late fifteenth century were not as

\textsuperscript{16} John Rowlands, \textit{The Age of Dürer and Holbein: German Drawings 1400-1550}, exh. cat. (London:

\textsuperscript{17} National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung Basel, Kupferstichkabinett,
Altdorfer on colored paper exist that feature complex landscape designs as well as those with ambiguous subject matter, such as his *Wild Man* drawing of 1508 (Fig. 13), which depicts a man carrying an uprooted tree over his shoulder in an isolated wooded forest. Various drawings by Swiss draughtsman Urs Graf (c. 1485-1527-9) exemplify the creation of drawings as independent works with no ostensible preparatory function. Highly personal and often dealing with military themes, they were likely kept by the artist.  

Hans Baldung also produced drawings that were not conventional, and which at times even overstepped the bounds of contemporary norms of propriety, as seen in his 1513 red chalk drawing, *Defecating Woman* (Fig. 14), which likely served no preparatory function. These drawings, which were not meant as models for works in a different medium, demonstrate that early sixteenth-century German artists began to consider drawings and their function in alternate ways from artists active a generation earlier.

From an early stage in his career, Dürer used drawing to construct ideas and design concepts that went beyond a utilitarian purpose. He also understood how the choice of one media over another furthered his artistic aims, for instance charcoal versus pen and ink. The vast number of extant Dürer drawings and the breadth of their function has been the subject of much scholarship. Numerous catalogues have been devoted to his corpus, including two from the late nineteenth century, as well as Friedrich Winkler’s four-volume catalogue *Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers* of 1936-1939, and Walter Strauss’s six-volume *The Complete Drawings of Albrecht Dürer* of 1974.  
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museum holdings of Dürer’s drawings have also been compiled separately, including Walter Koschatzky and Alice Strobl’s 1971 *Die Dürerzeichnungen der Albertina* and Fedja Anzelewsky’s 1984 critical catalogue from the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin.20 Christopher White’s monograph, *Dürer: the Artist and his Drawings* was published in 1971, while a myriad of articles and exhibitions have also featured aspects of his drawn oeuvre.21

Independent drawings in Dürer’s body of work are especially difficult to identify since his drawings could serve several functions and because he often returned to earlier drawings for his later projects.22 A recent essay by Stephanie Porras written for the 2012 *Early Dürer* exhibition catalogue entitled “‘ein freie hant:’ Autonomy, Drawing and the Young Dürer,” examined the role of drawing in Dürer’s early career as well as the complexity of defining some of Dürer’s drawings as autonomous, or independent works.23 She referenced Dürer’s 1503 charcoal drawing the *Head of the Dead Christ* as a prime example of a drawing that should be considered independent but that also served multiple purposes (Fig. 15). For instance, the drawing depicts Jesus’ countenance in death and states in an inscription along the bottom edge that Dürer made the drawing while sick. Porras believed the drawing served no preparatory function, but was both a

---


22 For his *Saint Anthony* engraving of 1519, Dürer used a cityscape from his *Pupila Augusta* drawing of circa 1495 (W. 153), which was created 24 years earlier during his first trip to Italy. The cityscape can also be seen in his *Feast of the Rose Garlands* of 1506.

record of Dürer’s artistic inventiveness and one of his modes of self-documentation. According to her, “For Dürer, drawing is an autonomous practice, a subjective method of thinking, making and commenting.”24 Further, “…the young Dürer understood drawing as both a practice for the pursuit of artistic and intellectual ambition and as an object of material use for future projects…”25 Porras’s essay is important because it reflects the recent trends in the scholarship of northern European drawings in attempting to understand artists’ creative processes, methods of production, and their drawings’ functions.26 Her interpretations about Dürer’s early drawing praxis are significant for understanding Dürer’s creative process for his late drawings as well, in particular the intellectual and creative aspects of the Oblong Passion.

The majority of scholars who have discussed the Oblong drawings view the works solely as preparatory drawings for a new Passion series of prints. While an acceptable and suitable hypothesis regarding their function, it is useful to consider their potential as independent works in and of themselves or as objects that Dürer thought could have been used later as models for future projects.27 This use for drawing is likely the case for the other three unrelated drawings Dürer created of Christ’s Passion during this period. In 1521 Dürer completed a Lamentation that reflected the compositions of his earlier Small

24 Ibid., 258.

25 Ibid., 245.

26 See appendix 3 for a discussion of Northern European drawing scholarship from the late nineteenth century to the present.

27 Of the scholars who have written extensively about Dürer’s drawings, Christopher White is alone in considering the Oblong Passion drawings as independent works. He asserted that “…the artist made more than one drawing of each subject, but now there was no question of one being a development of the other, and in that respect they cannot be categorized as working drawings. Each version is a finished work of art, offering a different interpretation of the story expressed through a different arrangement.” White, Dürer: The Artist and His Drawings, 32.
and *Engraved Passion* renditions and a simple *Crucifixion* scene, each in vertical format, as well as a second *Lamentation* in 1522 (Figs. 16-18). These other drawings show that Dürer was actively experimenting with multiple modes of representing Christ’s Passion during this period and that he may not have initially regarded any of them as anything other than creative and intellectual re-workings of the Passion narrative. Considering the *Oblong Passion* drawings in this light is significant. It allows for further discussions of the drawings in terms of their religious meaning for Dürer, the ways in which he applied new methods of representation to creatively re-envision the Passion story, and more generally, to gain further insight into Dürer’s late drawing practice.

**The Impact of the Reformation and Netherlandish Art on the *Oblong Passion***

At the time of Dürer’s trip to the Netherlands, the early stages of the Protestant Reformation were well underway. Dürer’s interest in evangelical writings and his involvement with the current state of religious disputation are well documented in the literature.28 Extant letters from contemporaries, Dürer’s own diary entries, and interactions between Dürer and his Lutheran-minded circle of friends and acquaintances attest to his pursuit of information regarding the intensely polemic movement. However, unlike his contemporary Lucas Cranach the Elder, who created propagandistic pamphlets for Martin Luther and altarpieces based on evangelical principles, Dürer’s art is less conclusive in demonstrating his stance on the Roman Catholic Church.29 Apart from


29 Cranach was a supporter of Luther and a close friend. He produced significant polemical and evangelically centered paintings and prints, including his *Passional Christi und Antichristi*, published in
commonly agreed upon Protestant interpretations of his 1523 *Last Supper* woodcut and his 1526 *The Four Holy Men* panels (Fig. 19), Dürer’s religious imagery from this time period appears to be neutral overall and can be interpreted from both Roman Catholic and evangelical Protestant viewpoints.

For instance, it is possible to read Dürer’s 1521 Frankfurt *Agony in the Garden* and his 1521 engravings of *Saint Christopher Facing Left* and *Saint Christopher Facing Right* as devotional imagery in the traditional Catholic sense, yet Larry Silver has interpreted these works as bearing Lutheran connotations (Figs. 3, 20-21). To him, Jesus’ prostrate position in Dürer’s *Agony* models submission to God’s will in accordance with Luther’s teachings while Saint Christopher’s pivoted pose represents the decisive moment of his religious conversion as it relates to contemporaneous Lutheranism.

Likewise, Dürer’s late depictions of the Virgin and Child, for example his *Virgin with the Swaddled Child* engraving of 1520, can at once be viewed as a customary devotional print, or as Donald McColl has pointed out, as a Lutheran model of humility and faith (Fig. 22). These fresh interpretations of Dürer’s artistic choices, ascertained through formal, biographical and religious readings of the objects, provides visual polysemy, additional layers of meaning to Dürer’s late religious compositions that have yet to be fully applied to the *Oblong Passion* drawings.

1521 and his 1529 panel *The Law and the Gospel* (National Gallery of Prague). It should be noted that Cranach continued to produce artworks for his Roman Catholic patrons as well, including Albrecht von Brandenburg, archbishop of Mainz. See Joseph Leo Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2004).


31 McColl, “Through a Glass Darkly,” 87. The author noted that Mary was a primary example of justification through faith because of her unwavering belief in God’s plan for her child.
As noted earlier, Dürer’s arrangement of the Passion narrative in a horizontal orientation was a novel approach for the artist. Of his roughly 105 intaglio prints, only three feature this oblong format. Earlier drawings in this orientation include watercolor landscapes and object studies, demonstrating that Dürer generally preferred a vertical format for narrative compositions. Given the paucity of the horizontal orientation in Dürer’s narrative works, it is significant that he began using this format while traveling and viewing artworks in the Netherlands. Nonetheless the possibility that Dürer shifted his working method for the drawings in response to foreign stimuli remains underexplored in the literature. While authorities on Dürer’s drawings have recognized characteristics of Netherlandish art in the *Oblong Passion*, scholars have rarely expounded on probable sources, instead referring to the ways Dürer’s graphic work affected that of his Netherlandish contemporaries, particularly among Antwerp Mannerists.

Those who have noted the correlation between his late artworks from the trip and Netherlandish art tend to generalize their assessments. In his 1980 monograph on Dürer,
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32 The figure of 105 intaglio prints is derived from Strauss, *The Complete Drawings of Albrecht Dürer*, 4: 2030. Identified by Panofsky, Dürer’s three prints in oblong format are the *Sudarium Displayed by Two Angels*, engraving, 1513 (B.25), the *Landscape with Cannon*, etching, 1518 (B.99), and *Saint Anthony*, engraving, 1519 (B. 58). Panofsky, *Life and Art*, 219. Strauss lists four—the same as above, with the addition of the *Five Lansquenets and an Oriental on Horseback*, engraving, around 1495 (B.88), which is squarer in dimension.

33 I have counted approximately 170 extant oblong drawings by Dürer from Strauss’s 1974 catalogue, some of which have contested attributions. Strauss, *The Complete Drawings of Albrecht Dürer*. Approximately one thousand single-leaf sheets by Dürer have survived, illustrating the small percentage of drawings completed in a landscape format. Andersson and Silver, “Dürer’s Drawings,” 12.

34 References to the Netherlandish appearance of the *Oblong Passion* drawings are perfunctory and underdeveloped in the literature and will be discussed further in the following chapter. For the brief instances, see Herman Knackfuss, *Dürer* (Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klasing, 1900), 138; Friedrich Winkler, *Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers*, 4:23 and idem, *Albrecht Dürer: Leben und Werk*, 308; Christopher White, *Dürer: The Artist and His Drawings*, 32; Anzelewsky, *Dürer: His Art and Life*, 212; Strieder, *Albrecht Dürer*, 132.
Fedja Anzelewsky suggested that “The growing emphasis on epic elements and the choice of a landscape format reflect the influence of Netherlandish art...” and subsequently suggested the work of Dürer’s contemporary Lucas van Leyden as a possible model. However, he gave no specific instances of Lucas’s works that might have been a source of interest for Dürer and only referenced the similar use of trees by both artists to emphasize important figural groupings.\textsuperscript{35} Walter Koschatzky and Alice Strobl’s discussion of Dürer’s 1521 drawing \textit{The Temptation of Saint Anthony}, also executed in the Netherlands, is similarly ambiguous (Fig. 23). They claimed “These figures are more majestic and dignified than any done before Dürer's journey to the Netherlands, and clearly show the great influence of Flemish masterpieces in his art."\textsuperscript{36} The authors’ statements remain unclear since no comparisons are made and descriptive terms such as “majestic” and “dignified” do little to showcase the parallel between Dürer’s figures and those customary to Netherlandish painters.

Among the \textit{Oblong Passion} drawings, Dürer’s two renditions of \textit{Christ Carrying the Cross}, both of 1520, have elicited the most commentary for their likeness to Netherlandish models (Figs. 6, 7). For instance Panofsky, in his discussion of figure 6, maintained that “...it cannot be questioned that he, like Massys and Gossart, paid homage to the great tradition of Early Netherlandish painting.”\textsuperscript{37} Similarly, Winkler suggested that Dürer was apparently inspired to create a multi-figured scene in the tradition of old Netherlandish paintings, but only went on to reiterate Heinrich Wölfflin’s earlier cryptic

\textsuperscript{35} Anzelewsky, \textit{Dürer, His Art and Life}, 212.

\textsuperscript{36} Koschatzky and Strobl, \textit{Dürer Drawings in the Albertina}, 314.

\textsuperscript{37} Panofsky, \textit{Life and Art}, 221.
assessment that “Such pictures taught the north for the first time what it meant to narrate a story well.”\textsuperscript{38} Mischaracterized and unsatisfactorily explained, Dürer’s incorporation of aspects of Netherlandish art into a number of his late \textit{Oblong Passion} drawings is overshadowed in the literature by the notion that Dürer improved upon the models he followed instead of identifying the specific merits Dürer recognized in Netherlandish art. Further, any discussion of Dürer’s assimilation of foreign artistic forms and models has typically prioritized his interest in Italian art and theory.

Recently, scholars have recognized that Netherlandish art has played a more significant role in artistic exchange with such areas as Italy, Germany, and surrounding regions in Central Europe than had been previously acknowledged. Over the last ten years monographs such as Paula Nuttall’s \textit{From Flanders to Florence: The Impact of Netherlandish Painting, 1400-1500} (2004) and Till-Holger Borchert’s exhibition catalogues \textit{The Age of Van Eyck: The Mediterranean World and Early Netherlandish Painting 1430-1530} (2002) and \textit{Van Eyck to Dürer: The Influence of Early Netherlandish Painting on European Art, 1430-1530} (2011) have explored in greater depth the popularity and impact of Netherlandish art through travel by artists, the commissioning or purchase of works by donors and collectors, and the appropriation of Netherlandish style,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{38} Winkler, \textit{Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers}, 4: 27, cat. 793; Wölfflin, \textit{The Art of Albrecht Dürer}, 261. Wölfflin qualified his statement about the superiority of the narrative of \textit{Christ Carrying the Cross} (W. 793) by explaining, “The plot is developed perfectly clearly and is yet as abundant as reality and pervaded with the charm of the seemingly arbitrary.” I believe this statement could also be applied to works found in Netherlandish art, particularly the prints of Lucas van Leyden, whose \textit{Ecce Homo} of 1510 in particular clearly depicts Jesus on a platform presented to a crowd of divergent bystanders, including distracted children, set within a credibly realistic city square and expressing a narrative that is perfectly clear and engaging. For a succinct discussion of Lucas’s \textit{Ecce Homo} and his use of narrative, see Peter Parshall, “Lucas van Leyden’s Narrative Style,” \textit{Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek}, 29 (1978): 185-237, esp. 214-218.
\end{itemize}
technique, and form by other master artists and their workshops.39 The reevaluation of the flow of artistic exchange, which until the end of the twentieth century favored a one-way path from Italy to the North, encourages further examination into pictorial appropriation between artists and their works, and for this study in particular, Dürer’s response to early and contemporary Netherlandish works of art.

Chapter Summaries

The first chapter introduces the circumstances of Dürer’s Netherlandish journey in order to provide the context within which the Oblong Passion drawings were conceived. It begins with an analysis of past scholarship related to Dürer’s trip as well as the literature concerning his accompanying diary. As Dürer’s Netherlandish diary is the primary source of information regarding the journey, a significant portion of the chapter is devoted to the information it provides, specifically Dürer’s travel destinations in the Netherlands, his acquaintances, his commercial affairs, the cultural events he witnessed, and the works of art he admired. In order to emphasize the singularity of the Oblong Passion drawings among the other works of art he created during this time, a succinct evaluation of Dürer’s "Silverpoint Sketchbook," pen and ink drawings, and charcoal and painted portraits is provided.

The purpose of chapter two is to establish the ways in which the Oblong Passion drawings diverge in appearance and narrative scope from Dürer’s
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previous Passion series. It begins with an overview and comparison of the
defining characteristics, function, and prospective audiences of each of Dürer’s
Passion series, specifically the Large, Green, Small, and Engraved Passions.
Comprehensive formal and iconographic analysis of the oblong drawings
illustrate Dürer’s alternative depiction of space, dramatic moment, figural
arrangement, and emotional expression from his earlier renditions of the subject
and provides a basis for the subsequent discussions regarding the Oblong Passion
within the framework of the Reformation and Dürer’s pictorial adaptations from
Netherlandish art.

Chapter three explores the religious meaning of the Oblong Passion
through the lens of Dürer’s relationship to Christianity prior to and during the
eyearly stages of the Reformation, how he engaged with the teachings of Martin
Luther, and how the artist incorporated elements of the reformer’s ideas into his
works from the early 1520s, including his distinct Oblong Passion drawings.
Luther’s precepts on the proper meditation on Christ’s Passion, published as his
Sermon von der Betrachtung des heiligen Leidens Christi (A Sermon on
Meditating on the Holy Passion of Christ) in 1519, provides a better sense of
Dürer’s perspective on the Passion during this period. This sermon, which is listed
among the reformer’s writings that Dürer either owned or looked to acquire, was
most certainly known by the artist because of its immense popularity.

Although recent scholars have noted wider evangelical concepts in a
number of the Oblong Passion drawings, such as the role of a good Christian and
the complete submission to God’s will for salvation, an examination of Luther’s
Passion sermon in relation to Dürer’s late drawings has not been undertaken before now. The parallels between them show Dürer’s application of Luther’s teachings to his drawings and demonstrate the ways in which the artist reconsidered the Passion narrative.

Dürer’s incorporation of Luther’s teachings into a number of his Oblong Passion drawings necessitated a compositional and dramaturgical transformation of the narrative that diverged from his previously more intimate, immediate, and devotional renditions of the theme. The fourth chapter therefore examines Dürer’s altered mode of representation and its relationship to Netherlandish art. Given the paucity of the horizontal format for his narrative compositions, it is notable that he began using this orientation while traveling and viewing artworks in the Netherlands. Nonetheless, the possibility that Dürer shifted his working method in response to foreign stimuli remains under-explored in the literature.

Although past scholars have widely noted the overall Netherlandish impression of his oblong drawings, they did not provide specific examples of how the works reflected Netherlandish art or which elements Dürer might have considered inspiring enough to include in his own works. To better understand Dürer’s engagement with Netherlandish visual culture, this chapter provides specific examples of Dürer’s appropriation of aspects of Netherlandish art with particular emphasis on the works of his contemporary Lucas van Leyden. Since Dürer never copied the Netherlandish works he viewed, my assessments of the drawings are based on his treatment of space, figural arrangement, pathos, and the inclusion of visual cues adapted from his northern counterparts. By blending
evangelical concepts regarding Christ’s Passion with Netherlandish artistic conventions, Dürer progressed to a new type of Passion imagery that departed in several ways from his previous representations of the subject.
Chapter One

*Albrecht Dürer in the Netherlands, 1520 to 1521: The Diary and Works of Art*

While second-hand accounts of Dürer’s journey to the Netherlands are found as early as the seventeenth century in the works of Karl van Mander and Joachim van Sandrart, the most important account of Dürer’s trip is his own written record.¹ Although the original manuscript has not survived, two copies, both likely based on the original, are extant and date from the mid-sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.² Dürer’s entries from the diary describe personal reflections, financial transactions, and travel destinations among other details, offering a rare glimpse into the day-to-day concerns of an artist traveling through foreign regions. From the first publication of the diary by Christoph Gottlieb von Murr in 1779, Dürer’s extensive chronicle of the trip has been published frequently in the original German and translated into several languages, including English, French, Dutch, Russian and Spanish.³ Dürer’s concurrently produced silverpoint, charcoal, and pen and ink drawings as well as several panel paintings augment the diary and inform us of the people, costumes, animals, architecture, and vistas he considered worth recording. Works of art from the trip are routinely considered

---


travel documents and are reproduced in the literature as they pertain to Dürer’s biography and to the cultural atmosphere of the Netherlands during the early sixteenth century.

Several *Oblong Passion* drawings are among the works Dürer mentioned completing on the trip, however they are distinct from the rest of his Netherlandish body of work. The Passion drawings depict narrative episodes from both the life and death of Jesus and are at a variance with the typical portrait, costume, and topographic studies Dürer created with regularity abroad. In order to provide the context within which the *Oblong Passion* was conceived and to distinguish it from Dürer’s other extant works from the period, this chapter discusses significant events noted in the diary and highlights a selection of the drawings and paintings Dürer completed from 1520 to 1521.

The chapter begins with a profile of the most pertinent scholarship from the late eighteenth century to the present regarding Dürer’s journey and is followed by a succinct discussion of the trip as documented in the diary. Highlights from the entries to be summarized include significant travel destinations, local and foreign acquaintances, commercial dealings, and Dürer’s commentary on artworks and various cultural events. The discussion concludes with an overview of Dürer’s “Silverpoint Sketchbook,” pen and ink drawings, charcoal portraits and paintings.

---

A Review of Past and Current Scholarship Regarding Dürer’s Trip to the Netherlands

As early as 1604 Karel van Mander discussed Dürer’s presence in the Netherlands as part of the artist’s biography in his *Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters*. In addition to highlighting the meeting between Dürer and Lucas van Leyden, Van Mander noted the German artist’s appreciation for the artwork he saw in the Netherlands, stating that Dürer viewed it “...with great pleasure and admiration.”

Joachim van Sandrart also mentioned Dürer’s trip as part of his discussion of the artist’s life in his *Teutsche Academie der Bau-, Bild- un Mahlerey-Künste* of 1675. Both Van Mander and Sandrart’s accounts must have been gleaned from sources other than the diary since portions of it were not published for the first time until 1779 when Christoph Gottlieb von Murr included an extensive excerpt of it in his article, “Reisejournal Albrecht Dürers von seiner niederländischen Reise.”

After Friedrich Campe published the first complete edition of the diary in 1828, a steady stream of scholars from the early nineteenth century to the late 1930s featured the
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6 Ibid. Various scholars have suggested Dürer spent some time in the Netherlands during his Wanderjahre based on Karel van Mander’s additional commentary that Dürer had been to Haarlem and admired the work of Geertgen tot Sint Jans. See Ibid., 1: 82-93, 96-97. See also Albert Châtelet, “Dürer und die nördlichen Niederlande,” *Anzeiger des Germanischen Nationalmuseums* (1975): 52-64. Hans Gerhard Evers has also argued that Dürer spent time in Hans Memling’s workshop during this period. See Hans Gerhard Evers, *Dürer bei Memling* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1972). Whether Dürer traveled to the Netherlands during this time remains speculative and is a theory not widely supported among current Dürer scholars.


8 Murr, “Reisejournal Albrecht Dürers.” Murr’s transcription was from the copy known as Manuscript A in the Staatsbibliothek, Bamberg, 246, J.H. Msc. Art.I, III.18.
diary regularly in their Dürer monographs or produced their own translations of it. In 1840, Frederic Verachter translated both Dürer’s *Family Chronicle* and his Netherlandish diary for the first time into Dutch and added supplemental footnotes to Dürer’s text. The nearly simultaneous publications of William B. Scott and Mary Margaret Heaton’s monographs in 1869 and 1870 feature the first translations of the diary into English. While several other authors such as Moritz Thausing (1872), Friedrich Leitschuh (1884), William Martin Conway (1889), and Konrad von Lange and Franz Louis Fuhse (1893) published the diary as part of Dürer’s literary remains, the most extensive treatment of it and of the Netherlandish trip overall was Jan Veth’s and Samuel Muller’s *Albrecht Dürers Niederländische Reise*, published in 1918. This sizeable two-volume work featured a discussion of the two extant copies of the diary with illustrations of the script for each, a translation of the diary with notes, and a narrative of Dürer’s time in the Netherlands. The authors provided the art historical and cultural circumstances of the journey and were also the first to reproduce the artworks from the trip and to provide useful catalogue entries for each.

9 Friedrich Campe, *Reliquien von Albrecht Dürer: seinen verehrern geweiht* (Nürnberg: Druck und Verlag von Campeschen Handlung, 1828), 71-145. Campe’s publication of the diary was part of a larger tome devoted to Dürer’s literary remains, including his Family Chronicle, letters to Willibald Pirckheimer and Jakob Heller, and a selection of Dürer’s poetry, among other items.


It was not until Julius Held’s 1930 doctoral dissertation *Dürers Wirkung auf die niederländische Kunst seiner Zeit* (published in 1931) that a critical examination of the diary was undertaken to pinpoint Dürer’s artistic impact on the Netherlands. In addition to analyzing Dürer’s entries and discussing the works Dürer sold and presented as gifts, Held evaluated the impact of Dürer’s graphic work on his Netherlandish counterparts, listing specific instances in which Netherlandish artists derived motifs or specific details from Dürer’s work for their own. Extremely useful for establishing Dürer’s widespread influence in Northern Europe, this publication also showcases the early trend among scholars to characterize Dürer’s presence in the Low Countries as a creative impetus for the Netherlandish art scene while understating any reciprocal artistic exchange from northern artists.

During the early 1940s and 1950s two publications, while not specifically focused on Dürer’s Netherlandish journey, featured important art historical discussions of this period in the artist’s life. Erwin Panofsky’s *The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer* (1943) was a pivotal monograph of the artist in which Panofsky, in contrast with the popular tendency among art historians to exalt Dürer as the quintessential German artist, demonstrated Dürer’s international significance rather than simply his Germanic origin.
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13 Julius Held, “Dürers Wirkung auf die Niederländische Kunst seiner Zeit” (PhD diss., University of Freiburg, 1930) and idem, *Dürers Wirkung auf die Niederländische Kunst seiner Zeit* (Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1931).


15 Erwin Panofsky, *The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer*, 1st ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943). The first edition consisted of two volumes, the second of which was devoted to an extensive “Handlist of Works,” concordances, and illustrations. Due to its popularity, subsequent editions were published in 1945, 1948, and 1955. This fourth edition was condensed into one volume by omitting the handlist. For a succinct overview of the scholarly emphasis on Dürer’s “Germanness” from the nineteenth
In the fourteen pages that he devoted to Dürer’s trip to the Netherlands, Panofsky discussed the significant events and acquaintances listed in the diary and Dürer’s art production, making several significant critical evaluations about Dürer’s silverpoint drawings, his by then retardataire painted portrait technique, and various artistic precedents for the *Oblong Passion*.16 In 1956 Hans Rupprich published *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, the first of three volumes establishing the definitive German edition of Dürer’s literary remains as well as the documents of various contemporary sixteenth-century writings that made reference to the artist. In addition to transcribing the artist’s records from the original German, Rupprich annotated important names and references from the Netherlands diary, providing useful identifications and his own interpretive commentary.17

Dürer’s Quincentennial celebration of 1971 prompted additional publications of the diary and artwork as well as the first exhibition to explore Dürer’s influence on his Netherlands contemporaries.18 Staged at the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam, the exhibition featured Dürer’s graphic work and was accompanied by a small catalogue.19

---


17 Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*.


19 Dieuke de Hoop Scheffer, *The Graphic Art of Albrecht Dürer and Its Influence in the Netherlands*, exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1971). The text of the short, eight page catalogue, is heavy on biographical
The focus of the exhibition rested on the integration of motifs from Dürer’s prints among painters in the Southern Netherlands, such as Bernard van Orley, Jan Gossaert, and Jan Wellens de Cock, and in the Northern Netherlands on printmakers and book illustrators such as Lucas van Leyden, Jacob Cornelisz. van Oostanen, and Cornelis Anthonisz.

A more extensive exhibition about Dürer’s trip was held in Brussels at the Palais des Beaux-Arts in 1977 as part of a celebration of German culture at the Europalia 77 festival. In an attempt to recreate Dürer’s foreign experiences by displaying shells, large bones, model ships, musical instruments, ivory spoons, and a stuffed monkey among other items, the exhibition also brought together works by Dürer and his Netherlandish contemporaries to illustrate Dürer’s artistic production while abroad and his direct influence on contemporary northern artists. This ambitious show was the last dedicated to Dürer’s trip to the Netherlands.

Since 1993 Dürer’s diary has been reprinted in several languages while Gerd Unverfehrt’s *Da sah ich viel köstliche Dinge. Albrecht Dürers Reise in die Niederlande* of 2007 is the latest publication to survey Dürer’s trip extensively. Unverfehrt’s volume description, Dürer’s interests in humanism as reflected in his graphic work, and on various collectors of his prints in the Netherlands, including Abraham Ortelius and Rembrandt. The only discussion of Dürer’s influence on Netherlandish artists is relegated to the last few paragraphs.
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21 Keith Roberts, review of the exhibition *Albrecht Dürer aux Pays-Bas, son voyage 1520-21, son Influence*, Palais des Beaux-Arts, Brussels, *The Burlington Magazine* 119, no. 896 (1977): 797-795. There were 433 objects in the exhibition that ranged from works Dürer would have seen on his trip, artwork that he produced, and works by his Netherlandish contemporaries. According to Roberts’ review, the exhibition was “something of a disaster” as the presentation lacked clarity, objects were included that had little relevance to the theme, and works that should have been compared together were displayed in separate rooms.

22 See Muriel Hewak and Stan Hugue, *Journal de Voyage aux Pays-Bas: pendant les années 1520 & 1521* (Paris: Dédale Maisonneuve et Larose, 1993) for a recent French translation of the diary with a useful appendix detailing currency exchanges as well as Dürer’s purchases and sales.
aimed to update Ernst Ullmann’s 1993 transcription of the diary, to correct various errors from earlier editions, and to intersperse commentary with the diary. Each chapter focused on a portion of the journey and a discussion of the significant entries. Unverfehrt’s useful appendix provided a concordance of Dürer’s works by media and the appropriate catalogue numbers in corresponding texts. The author also documented the cost of various items, the recipients of gifts and what Dürer specifically gave them, and provided short essays on Dürer’s collecting practices of both objects and written documents.

In addition to the more extensive treatments of Dürer’s trip and diary described above, recent authors have also included information about the journey in their biographies, such as in Jane Campbell Hutchison’s comprehensive *Albrecht Dürer: A Biography* (1990) and Jeffrey Chipps Smith’s *Dürer* (2012). Shorter essays have also been included in catalogues and edited volumes, for instance Fritz Koreny’s 2008 essay “Albrecht Dürer und die Niederlande,” in which the author focused primarily on Dürer’s painted portraiture and its influence in the Netherlands and Dagmar Eichberger’s “Dürer and the Netherlands: Patterns of Exchange and Mutual Admiration,” in which she emphasized Dürer’s fame and his impact on contemporary northern art, particularly through the popularity of his *Saint Jerome* painting of 1521.


Two conferences in 2012 suggest that interest in Dürer’s journey continues, primarily regarding his production of portraits for his acquaintances and the social and financial practice of exchange. Dagmar Hirschfelder’s paper “Dürers Bildniszeichnungen als biographische Zeugnisse: Zur Netwerkbildung auf der niederlänischen Reise,” presented at the Congress of the International Committee of the History of Art in Nuremberg in 2012 considered the ways in which Dürer’s portrait drawings were appreciated and kept by their recipients and how they ultimately increased his already widespread recognition.26 At the 2012 Netherlandish Culture of the Sixteenth Century conference held in Toronto, Jessica Stewart also discussed Dürer’s portraiture as a medium of exchange and looked to Dürer’s diary to extrapolate the relative value of objects found in the general Antwerp marketplace.27 At the same conference, Jeffrey Chipps Smith presented a paper on Dürer’s journey entitled “An Outsider’s View: Dürer’s Thoughts on Netherlandish Art, Artists, and Culture,” information of which was largely explored in his chapter on the subject in his 2012 monograph on Dürer.28


By applying social and economic methodologies to their research, current scholars are now examining the trip with more interpretive scrutiny and are moving away from the tendency to view the resulting works of art as simply records of Dürer’s travels. However, further critical examination of the objects and their relationship to Dürer’s oeuvre is still needed since readings of the diary and the artworks, particularly the portraits, are still largely biographical and the discussion of artistic exchange remains largely a one-way path from Dürer to his northern contemporaries.

**Albrecht Dürer’s Journey to the Netherlands**

*The Diary*

The best source of information regarding Dürer’s journey is his extensive diary. In addition to chronicling events and meetings, the notebook also served as a detailed ledger for business transactions, purchases, and as a record for gifts given and received. It begins with the commencement of the Dürers’ long journey on 12 July 1520 and ends just as the family set out toward Cologne for their return voyage home a little over a year later on 15 July 1521. After Dürer’s death, the original diary was in the possession of Willibald Pirckheimer (1470-1530) and subsequently bequeathed to the Imhoff family, Pirckheimer’s heirs. Willibald Imhoff (1519-1580), Pirckheimer’s grandson, still had the original in his possession in Nuremberg at the time of his death while the last mention of it was in 1620.29 Imhoff’s widow and his later descendants sold much of his collection, including his library, the latter of which was purchased by Thomas Howard (1585-1646),
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the second Earl of Arundel in 1636.\textsuperscript{30} The diary was likely among the items in the sale, but probably perished when the Earl’s residence, located south of London, England, and much of his collection burned in 1642.\textsuperscript{31}

\textbf{Travel Destinations}

While the two surviving handwritten copies are not identical, they share the same fundamental elements and provide a detailed account of the trip.\textsuperscript{32} After departing from Nuremberg, Dürer and his companions traveled north for three weeks toward the cosmopolitan city of Antwerp, his main destination and the point from which he would travel to other cities in the Netherlands. The Dürers stopped at many cities and small towns between the two destinations, including Bamberg. There Dürer received a travel pass and written letters of introduction from Bishop Georg III Schenck zu Limberg (r. 1505-1522), which exempted him from paying tolls at several points along the Main.\textsuperscript{33} Two weeks after their departure, the Dürers reached Cologne on 25 July where they visited with the artist’s cousin Niklas and his family for several days. After arriving in


\textsuperscript{31} Additionally, because the diary was not among the documents discovered in the Imhoff house in 1758 that featured letters written from Dürer to Pirckheimer, it is assumed that it became part of the Earl of Arundel’s collection. Unverfehrt, \textit{Da sah ich viel köstliche Dinge}, 20.

\textsuperscript{32} Hutchison, \textit{Albrecht Dürer}, 130. Dates for various entries can be gleaned from Dürer’s references to feast days and historical events, however there are wide calendar gaps where it is unclear if Dürer’s entries referenced many activities for one specific day, or if he performed certain actions over a more extensive period of time. For instance, from 15 December 1520 to 10 February 1521, one can only approximate the particular days of his entries.

\textsuperscript{33} As Dürer traveled further away from Bamberg, he had to pay (or promise to pay) the tolls at several locations. Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 95; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 148. “Then we came to Ehrenfels, and there I showed my pass but had to pay 2 fl. in gold. If however within two months I would bring them a free pass the toll-taker would give me back the 2 fl. in gold.” Later in the same entry, Dürer stated, “We came next to Kaub and I showed my pass, but it would carry me no further, and I had to promise in writing as before.”
Antwerp, Dürer secured accommodations at Jobst Planckfelt’s Inn known as the
Engelenbroch, located on Wolstraat between the main market and the harbor.34

After nearly a month in Antwerp, during which time Dürer became acquainted
with the city and its inhabitants, he traveled to Mechelen and Brussels at the end of
August 1520. Tomasin Bombelli, a Genoese silk merchant and accountant to Margaret of
Austria (1480-1530), accompanied Dürer on the eight-day excursion.35 The primary
purpose of this short trip was to secure the favor of Margaret of Austria, the Regent of the
Netherlands and Charles V’s aunt, in his petition to renew his imperial annuity.

According to Dürer, she “...sent after me to Brussels and promised to speak for me to
King Karl, and she has shown herself quite exceptionally kind to me.”36 Dürer also sought
the support from various members of the Nuremberg City Council who were staying in
Brussels and who would later serve as representatives at the coronation ceremony in
Aachen.37 In addition to meeting several artists and viewing significant works of art,

34 Chipps Smith, Dürer, 289.

35 Margaret of Austria, daughter of Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I, served as Regent of the
Netherlands from 1507 to 1515 and from 1518 to 1530. During her Regency she established court at
Mechelen where she accumulated an impressive collection of artworks and naturalia. See Dagmar
Eichberger, “A Cultural Centre in the southern Netherlands: the Court of Archduchess Margaret of Austria
(1480-1530) in Mechelen,” in Princes and Princely Culture (c. 1450-1650), ed. M. Gosman, A. Vanderjagt

36 Conway, Literary Remains, 102; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 155. Later in the diary,
Dürer expressed frustration with the Regent. In June 1521, Dürer showed Margaret a portrait of her father
Maximilian, but she did not like it. “And I went to Lady Margaret’s and showed her my Emperor, and
would have presented it to her, but she so disliked it that I took it away with me.” Conway, Literary
Remains, 121; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 173. Later in July that same year, Dürer noted
with some disappointment that “…Lady Margaret in particular gave me nothing for what I made and
presented to her,” which had been a set of Dürer’s entire works and two drawings on parchment that Dürer
had created “…with the greatest pains and care.” Conway, Literary Remains, 123, 105; Rupprich, Dürer.
Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 176; 158.

37 Conway, Literary Remains, 101; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 155; Hutchison, Albrecht
Dürer, 140.
Dürer visited the Town Hall, the Royal Palace and its zoo, and the Count of Nassau’s house, which the artist found “splendidly built and beautifully adorned.”

Dürer stayed in Antwerp for a month after his return from Brussels and subsequently traveled to Aachen at the beginning of October 1520. The members of the Nuremberg City Council, with whom Dürer had already spent time in Brussels, accompanied him to the city and paid for many of his expenses. As the coronation ceremony did not take place until 23 October, Dürer was able to spend leisure time with his companions and to visit the city’s attractions, including the Cathedral, which he documented in his silverpoint sketchbook (Fig. 24). During the coronation itself, Dürer “...saw all manner of lordly splendor, more magnificent than anything that those who live in our parts have seen....”

Departing from Aachen, Dürer and his Nuremberg companions traveled to Cologne where they stayed for two weeks. In addition to visiting with his cousin Niklas and his family again, Dürer attended the Emperor’s coronation banquet and visited several sights including the City Hall and the church of Saint Ursula. On 12 November Dürer received notification that his pension had been renewed, stating, “My confirmation from the Emperor came to my Lords of Nürnberg for me on Monday after Martin’s in the year 1520 after great trouble and labour.”

---


39 Dürer seems to have enjoyed the company of his Nuremberg companions as gambling is mentioned several times during his time in Aachen. Five separate notations indicate that Dürer lost approximately 17 stuivers “at play.” Conway, *Literary Remains*, 106; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 159.


On his return trip to Antwerp, Dürer traveled north, passing through Nijmen and s’Hertogenbosch, stopping at many small villages along the way, and arrived at his destination on 22 November 1520.\footnote{Surprisingly, Dürer made no mention of any works by Hieronymus Bosch even though he recorded a visit to the church in s’Hertogenbosch, which displayed works by the artist. “Bosch is a fine town and has a most beautiful church.” Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 109; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 162. In 1610, traveler Jan Baptiste de Gramaye saw Bosch’s \textit{The Creation of the World} altarpiece on the main altar of the Church of Saint Jan as well as his \textit{Adoration of the Magi} located in the Chapel of Our Lady in Saint Jan. Unfortunately, these paintings are no longer extant, however it is likely that when de Gramaye saw them in 1610 they were in their original locations since Bosch carried out several commissions for the church and the lay confraternity in which he belonged, the Brotherhood of Our Lady. See Laurinda S. Dixon, \textit{Bosch} (London: Phaidon, 2003), 33.} In December, Dürer left Antwerp again, this time for Bergen op Zoom and the islands of Zeeland, and visited several towns including Goes, Middleburg, and Veere. In Zierikzee, Dürer sought out the grounded whale he had learned of while still in Antwerp:

At Zierikzee in Zeeland a whale has been stranded by a high tide and a gale of wind. It is much more than 100 fathoms long and no man living in Zeeland has seen one even a third as long as this is. The fish cannot get off the land; the people would gladly see it gone, as they fear the great stink, for it is so large that they say it could not be cut in pieces and the blubber boiled down in half a year.\footnote{Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 109; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 162.}

Unfortunately, by the time Dürer reached the site “...the tide had carried him off again.”\footnote{Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 111; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 163.} During this expedition the artist contracted malaria, or a similar illness, that would cause him to suffer until his death in 1528. Several months after this excursion, Dürer commented in his diary that “…when I was in Zeeland, a wondrous sickness overcame me, such as I never heard from any man, and this sickness remains with me.”\footnote{Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 118; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 169.}

After returning from Zeeland in mid-December, Dürer remained in Antwerp for several months until his visit to Bruges and Ghent at the beginning of April 1521. Later
that June, Dürer went on a second trip to Mechelen, this time visiting with Margaret of Austria personally.46 Before his return home to Nuremberg, Dürer traveled to Brussels again, on this occasion to paint the portrait of Christian II of Denmark (1481-1559).47 The last few entries in the diary relate the family’s departure from Brussels on 12 July 1521 (the exact day they left Nuremberg a year earlier) and conclude with their arrival in Cologne three days later. From there, it likely took the Dürers about three weeks to reach their home in Nuremberg.48

**Significant Acquaintances**

In addition to meeting Christian II, king of Denmark, toward the end of his journey in July 1521 and producing both drawn and painted portraits for the monarch, Dürer met several distinguished people while abroad. He associated with foreign dignitaries, local noblemen, humanists, and scientists, as well as with several successful Netherlandish artists.

Upon his arrival in Antwerp, Dürer dined with Bernhard Stecher, the local head of the Fugger’s banking branch, a prosperous merchant and banking family based in
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46 Conway, *Literary Remains*, 121; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 173. During this visit, Margaret showed Dürer her art collection. “And on Friday Lady Margaret showed me all her beautiful things; amongst them I saw about 40 small oil pictures, the like of which for precision and excellence I have never beheld. There also I saw more good works by Jan and Jacob Walch. I asked my Lady for Jacob’s little book, but she said she had already promised it to her painter. Then I saw many other costly things and a precious library.” The little book Dürer referred to was a book of drawings by Jacopo de’ Barbari that she had promised to her court painter Bernard van Orley.

47 When Dürer was about ready to leave Antwerp for Nuremberg in June 1521, Christian II, King of Denmark, summoned Dürer to make his portrait, which Dürer did in charcoal. The artist also dined with the monarch. The following day, Dürer and his family travelled to Brussels at the King’s behest to paint his portrait, for which Dürer was given 30 florins. Dürer also attended the banquet given by Charles V and Margaret of Austria in Christian II’s honor and later the banquet given by the King of Denmark. Conway, *Literary Remains*, 124-125; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 176-177.

Augsburg. They dined together on several occasions and exchanged gifts, including a set of prints from Dürer and a tortoise shell from Stecher. Dürer also developed a close friendship with Tomasin Bombelli. He dined with Bombelli on numerous occasions and drew portraits of Tomasin and his children as well as his brothers Vincentius and Gerhard. Dürer also exchanged many gifts with him (including various items Bombelli presented to Agnes) and traveled with him to Mechelen.

Dürer was also a frequent guest of the members of the Portuguese Consul in Antwerp, including Joaõ Brandao (act. 1514-1521) and the First Secretary to the Portuguese Consul Rodrigo Fernandez d’Almada, with whom he also exchanged gifts. A drawing housed in the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, is often considered the portrait of Rodrigo that Dürer mentioned creating in his diary (Fig. 25). Lazarus Ravensburger, a manager of a German trading company conducting business with Portugal and whom Dürer referred to as a “great man,” exchanged many gifts with Dürer on a regular basis.

In December, Dürer gave Ravensburger “...an engraved Jerome and three Large books,”

---

49 Conway, Literary Remains, 96; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 151.

50 “I have changed 1 fl. for expenses, and given Bernhard Stecher a whole set of prints.” Conway, Literary Remains, 112; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 164. “...and Bernhard Stecher gave me a tortoise-shell.” Conway, Literary Remains, 122; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 175.

51 For various instances where Bombelli is mentioned, see Conway, Literary Remains, 98-101, 105-106, 109-110, 112-115, 119-121, and 123-124; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 152, 154, 156, 158, 161-162, 164-166, 169, 173, 175, 176.

52 Azevedo Cruz and Maria do Rosário de Sampaio Themuso de Barata first suggested that Dürer may have previously met d’Almada while the Portuguese diplomat traveled in Germany from 1519-1520. Azevedo Cruz and Maria do Rosário de Sampaio Themuso de Barata, “Um português na Alemanha no temp de Dürer: Rui Fernandes de Almanda,” Revista da Faculdade de Letras de Lisboa 15, no. III, (1973): 85-123.

53 Chipps Smith, Dürer, 303. This figure has been identified as Rodrigo d’Almada because it is the only extant drawing completed in pencil that was listed in the diary. “I drew with a metal-point a portrait of his Moorish woman, and one of Rodrigo with the pencil in black and white on a large piece of paper.” Conway, Literary Remains, 116; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 167.

54 Conway, Literary Remains, 110; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 162.
and in return Dürer received “...a great fish-scale, 5 snail-shells, 4 medals of silver, 5 of copper, 2 little dried fishes, a white coral, 4 cane-arrows, and another white coral.”55 He also depicted Ravensburger in his silverpoint sketchbook in 1520 next to a drawing of the pinnacle of the tower on the Van Liere residence (Fig. 26).56

In addition to the many businessmen Dürer associated with, he also met with learned men, including Nicholas Kratzer (1486/87-1550) and Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466?-1536). During August 1520 in Antwerp, Dürer limned Kratzer’s portrait, noting in his diary that Kratzer was an astronomer and that “He lives with the King of England, and has been very helpful and useful to me in many matters.”57 The two would subsequently share correspondence in late 1524.58 The Dutch humanist Erasmus of Rotterdam was traveling in the Low Countries during the time of Dürer’s journey and was portrayed by the artist on at least two occasions (Fig. 27). In Brussels at the beginning of September 1520, Dürer mentioned in his diary that he had “...once more

55 Conway, Literary Remains, 112; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 163-164.

56 Chipps Smith, Dürer, 292.

57 Conway, Literary Remains, 98-99; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 52.

58 For a transcription of their correspondence see Conway, Literary Remains, 28, 130-131; Rupprich, 111-113. In a letter from Kratzer to Dürer, dated 24 October 1524, the author expressed his support of the city of Nurenberg towards Protestantism and provided Dürer with words of encouragement: “Now that you are all evangelical in Nürnberg I must write to you. God grant you grace to persevere; the adversaries indeed are strong, but God is stronger and is wont to help the sick who call upon him and acknowledge him.” Conway, Literary Remains, 28; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 111-112. Among other statements and inquiries in the letter, Kratzer commissioned an illustration of a scientific instrument in Pirckheimer’s possession and asked for any recent developments regarding astronomy coming forth from Nuremberg. After responding to various items from Kratzer’s letter, Dürer’s December 1524 reply addressed the religious tension within his city: “We have to stand in disgrace and danger for the sake of the Christian faith, for they abuse us as heretics; but may God grant us his grace and strengthen us in his word, for we must obey Him rather than men. It is better to lose life and goods than that God should cast us, body and soul, into hell-fire. Therefore may He confirm us in that which is good, and enlighten our adversaries, poor, miserable, blind creatures, that they may not perish in their errors.” Ibid. At the end of 1524 in Nuremberg, tensions were high as the city experienced a schism between supporters of Catholicism and of Luther, as well as the increasing disapproval of the city by the ruling Emperor Charles V, who was staunchly Catholic. See David Price, Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance: Humanism, Reformation, and the Art of Faith (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), 228-229.
taken Erasmus of Rotterdam’s portrait.”59 The two also exchanged gifts. Erasmus gave Dürer “...a small Spanish mantilla and three men’s portraits...” in August 1520, while Dürer presented the humanist with an Engraved Passion in Brussels.60

Dürer also met with numerous artists during his travels. Almost immediately after his arrival in Antwerp, the family was invited to the city painters’ guildhall where Dürer was honored as their esteemed guest. He related in his diary “...as I was being led to the table the company stood on both sides as if they were leading some great lord. And there were amongst them men of very high position, who all behaved most respectfully towards me with deep courtesy, and promised to do everything in their power agreeable to me that they knew of.”61 As both artists and city officials were in attendance, the banquet provided Dürer an excellent introduction to the city’s artistic and administrative inhabitants.

Dürer soon established several relationships with his fellow Netherlandish artists, in particular Joachim Patinir (c.1480-1524), whom Dürer referred to in his diary as “the good landscape painter.”62 In addition to dining with Patinir, Dürer obtained art supplies from the artist and received the assistance of Patinir’s apprentice. In return Dürer gave the artist a number of his prints.63 In April 1521, Dürer drew “...with the metal-point the

---

59 Conway, Literary Remains, 102; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 156. Dürer’s engraving of Erasmus dated 1526 may have been based on this second portrait.

60 Conway, Literary Remains, 98, 102; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 152, 156.

61 Conway, Literary Remains, 96; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 151.

62 Conway, Literary Remains, 119; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 169. From documentary evidence, Dürer was among the first artists to categorize paintings composed primarily of the landscape as a specific genre.

63 Conway, Literary Remains, 98; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 152. Chipps Smith has suggested the possibility that Patinir allowed Dürer to work in his studio. Chipps Smith, Dürer, 304.
portrait of Master Joachim and made him besides another likeness with the metal-point,” and also produced several drawings of Saint Christopher for him.\textsuperscript{64} In May 1521, Patinir honored Dürer with an invitation to his wedding.\textsuperscript{65}

In addition to becoming familiar with a number of goldsmiths in the city, Dürer met the glass painter Dirck Vellert (c.1484/5-after 1549) and gave a set of the \textit{Apocalypse} and six knot woodcuts.\textsuperscript{66} During the latter half of his journey, in April 1521, Dürer accompanied the Flemish painter Jan Provost (c. 1465-1529) along the Scheldt to Bruges, drew his likeness in metalpoint as appreciation for his hospitality, and then subsequently traveled with Provost on to Ghent, where he met the Dean of the painter’s guild and other artists from the city.\textsuperscript{67}

Dürer spent time with and particularly admired two artists who were in the service of Margaret of Austria—her sculptor Conrad Meit (1470/85-1550/1) and her painter Bernard van Orley (c.1488-1541). Prior to traveling to Brussels in August 1520, Dürer sent ahead a number of gifts to Meit. “Herr Ægidius, King Karl’s Porter, has taken for me

\textsuperscript{64} “For Master Joachim have I drawn 4 small S. Christophers on grey paper.” Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 120; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 172. It is widely believed that Dürer’s 1521 sketch of nine versions of Saint Christopher, now in Berlin, was preparatory for the drawings he gave Patinir (Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, KdZ 4477, W. 800).


\textsuperscript{67} For the diary entries regarding Dürer’s journey with Jan Provost, see Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 116-117; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 167-168. In addition to the metalpoint portrait Dürer made of Provost in April, he also drew one with charcoal in October 1520 prior to their trip to Bruges and Ghent. See Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 104; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 157. Dürer related that when he and Provost arrived in Ghent “…the Dean of the Painters came to me and brought with him the first masters in painting; they showed me great honor, received me most courteously, offered me their goodwill and service, and supped with me.” Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 117; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 168.
from Antwerp the *St Jerome in the Cell*, the *Melancholy*, the three new *Marys*, the *Anthony*, and the *Veronica* as a present for Master Konrad Meyt the good sculptor, whose like I have not seen.” According to Chipps Smith, Dürer may have already been acquainted with Meit when the sculptor was in the service of Friedrich the Wise between 1505 and 1509 in Wittenberg. In addition to dining with Meit on several occasions, Dürer portrayed him twice—once “at night by candlelight” in August 1520 and once with metalpoint in June 1521.

Dürer met Bernard van Orley during his first visit to Brussels and remarked that the painter, “...invited me and prepared so costly a meal that I do not think 10 fl. will pay for it.” Dürer completed Van Orley’s likeness in charcoal during the same visit and later painted his portrait. In the diary, Dürer also mentioned meeting a number of other artists, such as the sculptor Jean Mone (c. 1485/90-1549?), the illuminator Susanna Horenbout (fl. 1520-50), from whom he purchased a “Salvator on a little sheet,” and Lucas van Leyden (c. 1494-1533). Regrettably, Dürer did not meet Antwerp’s leading painter, Quinten Massys (1466-1530), whose house he visited shortly after his arrival to the city, or Jan Gossaert (1478-1532) who was living in Wijk bij Duurstede as a court...

---


69 Chipps Smith, *Dürer*, 307. The author also pointed out that Dürer was likely sending Meit gifts so that he would mention Dürer to his employer Margaret of Austria, Charles V’s aunt.


73 Conway suggested Jean Mone as the artist Dürer referred to as Master Jean “the good marble sculptor.” Conway, *Literary Remains*, 114n1.
painter to Philip of Burgundy, the Bishop of Utrecht.\textsuperscript{74} If Dürer did meet Joos van Cleve (d. 1540/41), a successful master of a large workshop in Antwerp, he did not mention it in his diary.

\textit{Commerce}

In addition to the personal entries discussed above, the diary served as a detailed ledger of monies earned and spent. To finance the trip Dürer brought a large stock of his prints and various paintings to be sold or exchanged as gifts and for services. Chipps Smith deduced that in order for Dürer to sell the large quantity of prints mentioned in the diary, he would have had to send a shipment ahead to Antwerp, most likely through representatives of Hans Imhoff the Elder.\textsuperscript{75} This supposition is confirmed by a passage in the diary in which Dürer had to guarantee that he was not conveying merchandise at a toll stop in Trier. He wrote, “...I had to certify in short writing under my seal that I had with me no common merchandise, and then the man willingly let me go.”\textsuperscript{76} It is uncertain how many prints Dürer had during his trip, if any additional works were sent from Nuremberg, or how many he actually sold or gave away as he often disposed of them in batches and likely overlooked entering some of the transactions in the diary.\textsuperscript{77} The diary is filled with

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{74} Hutchison, \textit{Albrecht Dürer}, 155; Maryan Ainsworth, ed., \textit{Man, Myth, and Sensual Pleasures: Jan Gossart’s Renaissance; the Complete Works}, exh.cat. (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010), 160. It is unknown if the two artists met or if Massys was travelling at the time of Dürer’s visit. Massys’s house was well known in Antwerp and was called “the Ape.” See Larry Silver, \textit{The Paintings of Quinten Massys with Catalogue Raisonné}, (Montclair, NJ: Allanheld & Schram, 1984), 4.

\textsuperscript{75} Chipps Smith, \textit{Dürer}, 288.

\textsuperscript{76} Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 95; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 150

\textsuperscript{77} Chipps Smith, \textit{Dürer}, 293.
\end{footnotesize}
instances of print sales of both a large and small scale, although the latter occurred with more frequency.78

While Dürer profited from the sale of his work and saved money by bartering for various services, he also spent a good deal for items ranging from essentials such as food, lodging, and transport, to miscellaneous items such as exotica imported from Asia and Africa, animals such as monkeys, birds and tortoises as well as art supplies, medical services, and medicinal remedies.79 By comparing the prices Dürer spent on fare from the commercial marketplace, one can deduce the relative worth of Dürer’s prints sold in the Netherlands. For instance, Dürer paid 2 stuivers each for a little glass jar, varnish, gloves, a screwknife, a small cage, and a haircut.80 The total sum of these items at 12 stuivers equals the amount he earned for one Small Passion woodcut series sold in Antwerp.81 In addition to spending his money on essentials and curio, Dürer also gambled frequently. Although he lost seventeen times “at play” out of eighteen, it appears that he broke even. For example, he generally lost between 1 stuiver and 8 stuivers at each game, totaling a combined loss of 48.5 stuivers. However, he won 2 florins on the one instance he was

78 Among Dürer’s larger transactions was a sale to the German merchant Sebald Fischer. According to the diary, “Sebald Fischer bought of me at Antwerp 16 small Passions for 4 fl., 32 of the Large Books of 8 fl., 6 engraved Passions for 3 fl., half-sheets—20 of all kinds taken together at 1 fl.—of these he took 3 fl.—of these he took 3 fl. worth and again 5¼ fl. worth, quarter-sheets—45 of all kinds at 1 fl.— for 5¼ fl., and of whole-sheets 8 of all kinds taken together for 1 fl. It is paid.” Conway, Literary Remains, 97; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 152.

79 For a discussion of Dürer’s collecting practices throughout his career, as well as an extensive examination of Dürer’s purchases and gifts while in the Netherlands, see Jeffrey Chipps Smith, “The 2010 Josephine Waters Bennett Lecture: Albrecht Dürer as Collector,” Renaissance Quarterly 64, no. 1 (2011): 1-49.

80 For the items Dürer purchased listed above see Conway, Literary Remains, 125, 106, 116, 122, 123, 97; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 177, 158, 167, 174, 175, 152.

81 Chipps Smith, Dürer, 293. Chipps Smith provided a similar comparison to illustrate relative costs. For a listing of exchange rates see Hutchison, Albrecht Dürer, 131; Unverfehrt, Da sah ich viel köstliche Dinge, 226.
victorious, which when converted, equals 48 stuivers.\textsuperscript{82} After winning, Dürer noted that he “took the portrait in charcoal of Bernhard von Castell, the man from whom I won the money.”\textsuperscript{83}

Regardless of his art sales, by the end of his trip Dürer thought that he had lost money. He lamented, “In all my doings, spendings, sales, and other dealings, in all my connexions with high and low, I have suffered a loss in the Netherlands; and Lady Margaret in particular gave me nothing for what I made and presented her.”\textsuperscript{84} However, a tally of the works sold and objects given to him as gifts suggest that the monies Dürer spent were likely offset by his total gains.\textsuperscript{85}

**Commentary on Art and Various Cultural Events**

Throughout his journey Dürer had the opportunity to view important artworks in a number of cities across the Netherlands and made comments on what he saw in his diary. While some observations provide Dürer’s personal judgments on quality, many of the entries simply list what he viewed. In Brussels Dürer visited the Town Hall and stated that, “In the golden chamber in the Townhall at Brussels I saw the four paintings which the great Master Roger van der Weyden made.”\textsuperscript{86} Dürer was referring to Rogier’s *Justice* panels, which the artist created while acting as the official city painter. Destroyed during a French attack on the city in 1695, the compositions are now known only through


\textsuperscript{85} Chipps Smith, *Dürer*, 318.

\textsuperscript{86} Conway, *Literary Remains*, 101; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 155
tapestry copies. Dürer saw several other works by Rogier, including a chapel in Bruges painted by him.87

Dürer also commented on a painting by Hugo van der Goes, located in the count of Nassau’s house chapel in Brussels, which he thought a “good picture.”88 In Bruges, Dürer related that his guides took him “…to S. Jacob’s and showed me the precious pictures by Roger and Hugo, who were both great masters.”89 After viewing Michelangelo’s alabaster Madonna in the Church of Our Lady in Bruges, Dürer’s companions brought him to other institutions in the city and showed him “…all the good pictures, of which there is an abundance there; and when I had seen the Jan van Eyck and

87 Conway, Literary Remains, 117; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 168. Chipps Smith has suggested that Dürer paid to see Rogier’s Saint Luke Painting the Virgin in the chapel of the Brussels painters’ guild. Chipps Smith, Dürer, 310. This observation seems to be based on a passage in Dürer’s diary where he stated, “I gave 2 st. for a buffalo ring, also 2 st. for opening Saint Luke’s picture.” Conway, Literary Remains, 102; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 155.

88 Conway, Literary Remains, 102; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 155.

89 Conway, Literary Remains, 117n2; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 168. Conway believed that the painting by Hugo van der Goes was his Entombment. Maximiliaan P.J. Martens identified the painting as a lost Deposition (likely the same painting identified by Conway), which was considered a significant part of Hugo’s oeuvre and was likely placed on the high altar in Saint James (Sint Jacobskerk), as noted by several later descriptions. See Maximiliaan P.J. Martens, “Artistic Patronage in Bruges Institutions, ca. 1440-1482” (PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1992), 267-274. Martens also suggested Dürer saw a later workshop version of Rogier van der Weyden’s well-known Saint John the Baptist Altarpiece, which was donated to Saint James’s by an Italian merchant from Pisa, Joannes Baptista Agnelli between 1477 and 1486. Martens excluded the possibility that Agnelli’s painting was either Rogier’s Saint John Altarpiece now in Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, or the copy from Rogier’s studio now in Frankfurt, Städelches Kunstinstitut, but concluded that there was another version. As the altarpiece was removed from the church in the 1790s, Martens suggested it might still be extant, some panels of which could reside in private collections. Maximiliaan P.J. Martens, “A Puzzling Footnote to Rogier van der Weyden’s Saint John the Baptist Altarpiece,” in Onverwacht Bijeengebracht: Opstellen voor Ed Taverne en Lyckle de Vries ter gelegenheid van hun 25-jarig jubileum in dienst van de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, ed. J.L. de Jong and E.A. Koster (Groningen: Instituut voor Kunst- en Architectuurgeschiedenis, 1996), 89-90. The author also noted that Hans Memling’s Moreel Triptych (Triptych with Saints Christopher, Giles and Mauritius), now in the Groeningemuseum, Bruges, would have been installed in Saint James’s during Dürer’s visit although the artist neglected to mention the work in his diary. Martens, “Artistic Patronage in Bruges Institutions,” 268.
all the other works, we came at last to the painters’ chapel, in which there are good
things.”

While in Ghent in April 1521, Dürer viewed Jan and Hubert van Eyck’s *Ghent
Altarpiece*, stating, “Then I saw Jan’s picture; it is a most precious painting, full of
thought, and the Eve, Mary, and God the Father are specially good.” During his second
visit to Cologne, Dürer paid to have an altarpiece opened, which “Master Stephan
made.” This work has been identified as the *Altarpiece of the Three Magi (Dombild)*,
located in Cologne Cathedral and generally attributed to Stephan Lochner. While in
Middelburg, Dürer saw a painting by Jan Gossaert, and provided the only negative
critique of an artwork found in his diary. “There, in the Abbey, is a great picture painted
by Jan de Mabuse—not so good in the modeling as in the colouring.” Unfortunately,
this *Deposition* was destroyed by fire in 1568.


91 Ibid.

92 “I paid 2 white pf. for opening the picture at Köln which Master Stephan made.” Conway, *Literary

93 Brigitte Corley, *Painting and Patronage in Cologne: 1300-1500* (Turnhout: Harvey Miller Publishers,
2000), 134. Corley, however, was not convinced that this was the painting Dürer paid to have opened in
October 1520. She posited the altarpiece would have been opened during this time for the Feast of Saint
Ursula, one of the city’s patron saints. She also questioned whether Stephan Lochner was the author of the
*Dombild*, and provided an alternate attribution to the Dombild Master. Julien Chapuis challenged Corley’s
argument, stating that the Feast of Saint Ursula fell on 21 October, 7 days before Dürer arrived in Cologne.
Thus the altarpiece would have been closed at the time of his visit. Chapuis also asserted that the municipal
council of Cologne had required curtains be placed on the altarpiece in 1501 to protect it from light. Julien
28n160.

Dürer*, 155. Gossaert’s altarpiece was painted in 1518-1520.

95 Chipps Smith, *Dürer*, 311.
Perhaps the greatest praise to be found in the diary for art objects is a reference to the many treasures sent from conquistador Hernán Cortés (1485-1547) to Charles V from Mexico in 1519, which Dürer saw in Brussels at the Coudenberg palace in August of 1520. Among the works were a golden sun and silver moon, weapons such as shields and darts, and armor and textiles. Dürer devoted many lines in his diary to his impressions of the objects:

These things were all so precious that they are valued at 100,000 florins. All the days of my life I have seen nothing that rejoiced my heart so much as these things, for I saw amongst them wonderful works of art, and I marveled at the subtle *Ingenia* of men in foreign lands. Indeed, I cannot express all that I thought there.

In addition to the coronation of Charles V in Aachen, Dürer noted several other important cultural events. Shortly after his arrival in the Low Countries, Dürer described the preparations he witnessed for Charles V’s Triumphal Entry into Antwerp, which took place on 23 September 1520. “My host took me to the workshop in the Painters’ warehouse at Antwerp, where they are making the Triumphal structure through which King Karl is to make his entry. It is four hundred arches long, and each arch is 40 feet wide. They are to be set up along both sides of the street, handsomely ordered and two storeys high.” He later purchased a printed “Entry into Antwerp” that described the

---


97 Conway, *Literary Remains*, 101-102; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 155. Unfortunately, there are no extant drawings of these objects by Dürer.

98 Chipps Smith, *Dürer*, 290.

event in full.\textsuperscript{100} Dürer also noted the splendor of a procession for the Assumption of the Virgin hosted by the Church of Our Lady in Antwerp and described that “...when the whole town of every craft and rank was assembled, each dressed in his best according to his rank. And all the ranks and guilds had their signs, by which they might be known. In the intervals great costly pole-candles were borne, and their long old Frankish trumpets of silver.”\textsuperscript{101} The procession involved the entire city, including guild members, shopkeepers, merchants, widows, religious orders, and the clergy of Our Lady’s Church, who paraded through the streets accompanied by instruments that “...were loudly and noisily blown and beaten.”\textsuperscript{102} According to Dürer, the event lasted for more than two hours, with far too many spectacles to be recorded in the diary.\textsuperscript{103} Later in May 1521 Dürer commented on two other religious processions in Antwerp, one for the feast of the Holy Trinity and one for the Corpus Christi, the latter of which was “very splendid.”\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{100} Published after the event, the “Entry into Antwerp” was produced by Peter Gillis (Petrus Ægidius) and Cornelius Grapheus. Hutchison, \textit{Albrecht Dürer}, 144. “I have paid 1 st. for the printed “Entry into Antwerp” telling how the King was received with a splendid triumph—the gates very costly adorned—and with plays, great joy, and graceful maidens whose like I have seldom seen.” Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 104; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 157.

\textsuperscript{101} Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 99; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 153

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{103} Dürer’s description of the procession is quite extensive. Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 99-100; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 155

\textsuperscript{104} Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 120; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 173. Rupprich argued that the horizontal format of the \textit{Oblong Passion}, particularly in regards to the two \textit{Christ Carrying the Cross} compositions, was a direct result of the various processions Dürer witnessed in the Netherlands. His assessment that Dürer may have been influenced by the spectacles he observed against the civic backdrop of the city, while speculative, cannot be ruled out, especially since Dürer spent a good deal of text describing the Triumphal Entry in his diary and purchased the accompanying pamphlet as a memento. Ibid., 1: 199.
**Drawings and Paintings Produced Abroad**

In addition to the works he brought with him from Nuremberg, Dürer also created new work to be sold or bestowed as gifts and for his own personal records, as in the case of quick likenesses. While there is no evidence that Dürer created any woodcuts or engravings during the trip, he did produce a multitude of drawings and several paintings.

**Drawings**

On several occasions in his diary, Dürer referred to a sketchbook ("**mein Buchlein**"), which he had taken with him on his journey.\(^\text{105}\) Fifteen sheets have survived from what is known today as Dürer’s “Silverpoint Sketchbook,” and twelve have drawings on both the *recto* and the *verso*.\(^\text{106}\) Executed on light rose-tinted prepared paper and carried out with a metalpoint or silverpoint, the sheets are oriented in an oblong format and measure approximately 5 x 7 inches.\(^\text{107}\) The sketchbook contains a variety of subjects, including views of the northern countryside as well as a number of towns and

---

\(^\text{105}\) Mention of the sketchbook can be found in the entry for 7 October, which stated “I have drawn the portraits of Paulus Topler and Martin Pfinzing in my sketch-book,” while the entry for 3 December noted “I took the portraits in charcoal of Jan de Has, his wife, and his two daughters, and I drew the maid and the old woman with the metal-point in my sketch-book.” Conway, *Literary Remains*, 106, 110; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 159, 162.

\(^\text{106}\) Giulia Bartrum, *Albrecht Dürer and his Legacy: The Graphic Work of a Renaissance Artist* (London: British Museum, 2002), 205. See Winkler, *Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers* (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1936-1939), 4: cat. nos. 761-786. The sketchbook has since been unbound and leaves can be found in a number of European institutions including the British Museum, London, the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, and the Musée Condé, Chantilly.

\(^\text{107}\) A. Berger, A. Duval, I. Reiche, et. al., “Non-destructive investigations of Dürer’s silver point drawings by SR-XRF and PIXE,” *art* (2002): 1-8. Published in association with the Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Non-destructive Testing and Microanalysis for the Diagnostics of the Cultural and Environment Heritage, the authors of this essay analyzed six silverpoint drawings preserved in the Musée Condé, Chantilly and seven silverpoint drawings housed at the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin using Proton Induced X-ray Emission (PIXE) and Spatially resolved synchrotron radiation induced X-ray fluorescence (SR-XRF). The researchers concluded that Dürer completed all of the analyzed drawings, save one (the drawing *Sitting Bishop* and *Portrait of a Man with a Fur Cap* from Berlin, KdZ 34r), with the same silverpoint stylus, or at least with silverpoints having the same chemical composition.
cityscapes, a good example of which is the drawing of Bergen op Zoom (Fig. 28), a town which Dürer considered “...a pleasant place in the summer....”\textsuperscript{108} Portraits of both men and women of various ages are also included as are depictions of horses, dogs, and the lions he viewed in Ghent in April 1521.\textsuperscript{109} Other sketches show inanimate objects such as floor tiles, a trunk, a table and jugs, and a large mortar.\textsuperscript{110}

The sketchbook is fascinating not only for its variety, but also for the way in which Dürer has arranged the images. He used skillful economy of space, pairing several of his drawings on one sheet. For instance, his drawings \textit{Caspar Sturm, The Imperial Herald}, and \textit{Landscape} of 1520 occupy the same sheet (Fig. 29). Walter L. Strauss suggested that the landscape was added at a later date, revealing Dürer’s ability to integrate both images into one well-constructed composition and thus making it appear as though the landscape was the actual background to his portrait drawing.\textsuperscript{111} Indeed, nearly all the leaves in which images are combined share this same sense of pictorial unity.

Dürer notably used a silverpoint sketchbook to record his observations. Leonardo, in his \textit{Treatise on Painting}, suggested the use of silverpoint sketchbooks for their convenience at recording impressions from nature. For that reason the medium would have appealed to Dürer while traveling.\textsuperscript{112} Conversely, silverpoint is exacting and difficult


\textsuperscript{109} “Next I saw the lions and drew one with the metal-point.” Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 117-118; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 168.

\textsuperscript{110} For a facsimile of the Silverpoint Sketchbook see Edmund Schilling, \textit{Sketchbook of the Journey to the Netherlands} (1520-1521) (London: Lund Humphries, 1968).


\textsuperscript{112} Leonardo stated, “...be sure to take with you a little book with pages prepared with bone meal, and with a silverpoint briefly note the movements and actions of the bystanders and their grouping...When your book is full, put it aside and keep it for your later use, then take another book and continue as before.” This quote
to correct, and while Dürer had shown an aptitude for the technique at an early age and used the medium sporadically throughout his career, it was not his preferred method for drawing. Erwin Panofsky suggested that the early Flemish masters who favored the technique, such as Jan van Eyck and Rogier van der Weyden, might have influenced Dürer during this period.\textsuperscript{113}

In addition to the Silverpoint Sketchbook, Dürer created multiple single sheet pen and ink drawings of two main sizes. Some measure approximately 6 x 4 inches while the larger drawings measure approximately 10½ x 8 inches. The pen and ink drawings of the smaller dimensions may have formed an additional separate sketchbook.\textsuperscript{114} Compared to the silverpoint drawings, which depict a range of subjects, the small pen and ink drawings are primarily portraits and sketches of physiognomy and costume. The larger drawings include topographic studies, such as the \textit{Harbor of Antwerp Near the Scheldt Gate} (Fig. 30) and \textit{The Royal Gardens at Brussels} (Fig. 31) as well as a full-length portrait \textit{Captain Felix von Hengersperg, Kneeling} (Fig. 32), which according to an entry in the diary was given in exchange for 100 oysters.\textsuperscript{115} While the Silverpoint Sketchbook was likely for Dürer’s own use, the pen and ink drawings were produced as both personal studies and as gifts, thus varying in their function.

\textsuperscript{113} Panofsky, \textit{Life and Art}, 215.

\textsuperscript{114} In his catalogue, Strauss labeled the drawings from Dürer’s Silverpoint Sketchbook and the drawings considered part of the pen sketchbook in parentheses after the catalogue number and title of the work. Strauss, \textit{The Complete Drawings of Albrecht Dürer}, 1974.

\textsuperscript{115} “I made a pen-and-ink portrait in his book of Felix kneeling. He gave me 100 oysters.” Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 110; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 162. The size of the larger pen-and-ink drawings measure approximately 270 x 210 mm (approx. 10 ½ x 8 ¼ in.). Precise measurements of each can be found in Winkler, \textit{Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers}; Strauss, \textit{The Complete Drawings of Albrecht Dürer}.
Dürer also created numerous portraits of his acquaintances with charcoal. While several survive in silverpoint, pen and ink, and oils, approximately forty-five references are made in the diary to Dürer’s use of charcoal for likenesses, although he may have produced more than were recorded. For the surviving portraits, only a few of the sitters can be identified. The 1521 *Portrait of Christian II of Denmark* (Fig. 33), while not inscribed with the sitter’s name, can be securely identified as the monarch through comparison with other portraits. The composition of Christian II’s portrait, in which the sitter is shown in bust length three-quarter view before a shaded background, reflects most of the charcoal likenesses Dürer completed on the journey. Dürer paid more attention to physiognomy than costume and a blank horizontal band along the top of the sheet was reserved for the artist’s monogram and the date.

Dürer traded these portraits for merchandise, produced them on commission, or gave them in gratitude for hospitality rendered. On several occasions Dürer expected payment that he did not receive for his work. For instance, after his visit to Brussels, during which time he visited with members of Margaret of Austria’s court, Dürer stated, “Six people whose portraits I drew at Brussels have given me nothing.”

---

116 Chipps Smith counted at least 120 portraits recorded in the diary, eight of which were painted with oils. Chipps Smith, *Dürer*, 295. Chipps Smith also listed thirty-eight charcoal drawings mentioned by Dürer. Ibid., 296. Dürer noted producing at least seven portraits in black chalk as well.

117 Bartrum, *Albrecht Dürer and His Legacy*, 210. Both Lucas Cranach the Elder (Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg; Museum der bildenden Künste, Leipzig) and Michael Sittow (Statens Museum for Kunst, Denmark) painted portraits of Christian II.

118 Although they share a general appearance, there are some variations among the charcoal portraits. For instance, the drawing of Erasmus of Rotterdam displays an overall sketchiness as well as a blank background without an upper band for the date. Chipps Smith posited that the drawing remained unfinished because the portrait session was interrupted. The author’s assertion is supported by Erasmus’ account of the event written in a 1525 letter to Pirckheimer. Chipps Smith, *Dürer*, 300.

Paintings

After Dürer had been in the Netherlands for approximately four months, he began mentioning the oil paintings he created. These works generally fall into two groups—portraits and saints.\(^{120}\) He mentioned four paintings of Saint Veronica, three of which he seems to have created in the Netherlands. The first, which he may have brought with him from Nuremberg, was given to Jacob Bannisis, while two others were given to members of the Portuguese faction, and the last to “Jan the goldsmith.”\(^ {121}\) His *Saint Jerome*, which subsequently inspired many Netherlandish variations, was created in March of 1521 and given to his Portuguese acquaintance Rodrigo d’Almada (Fig. 34).\(^ {122}\) Dürer noted producing painted likenesses of two dukes, painter Bernard van Orley, and the Treasurer Lorenz Sterk (fl.1514-1525), as well as a portrait each of his Antwerp hosts Jobst Planckfeldt and his wife, and finally one of King Christian II of Denmark.\(^ {123}\) Of the works

---

\(^ {120}\) Dürer also mentioned painting a coat of arms for an Englishman. “I painted for the Englishman his coat of arms and he gave me 1 fl.” Conway, *Literary Remains*, 120; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 172.

\(^ {121}\) “I gave Herr Jacob Bannisis a good painting of a Veronica face....” Conway, *Literary Remains*, 103; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 156. Since Dürer does not explicitly state that he painted this Veronica, it may have been a work that he brought with him to Nuremberg or one done by another artist. “I painted a good Veronica Face in oils; it is worth 12 fl. I gave it to Francisco, Factor of Portugal. Then I painted another Veronica Face in oils, a better one than the former, and I gave it to Factor Brandan of Portugal.” Conway, *Literary Remains*, 113; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 165. “I gave the Veronica, which I painted in oils … to Jan the goldsmith....” Conway, *Literary Remains*, 120; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 172. Conway speculated that Jan the goldsmith was perhaps Jan van den Perre who later acted as goldsmith to Charles V. Conway, *Literary Remains*, 120n3.

\(^ {122}\) “I painted a Jerome carefully in oils and gave it to Rodrigo of Portugal.” Conway, *Literary Remains*, 115; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 166. This painting may have also been commissioned, although it is not specified in the diary. Lucas van Leyden, Joos van Cleve, and Marinus Reymerwaele created variations based on this painting.

mentioned by Dürer only a small percentage have survived, and they mostly have tentative identifications and cautious attributions. According to Fedja Anzelewsky, only the Portrait of Bernhard von Reesen can be securely identified (Fig. 35).124

Other extant portraits include one formerly considered a likeness of Rodrigo d’Almada (Fig. 36); a Portrait of a Man, once thought to be Lorenz Sterck (Fig. 37); and a portrait of a woman identified as Jobst Planckfelt’s wife (Fig. 38).125 According to Panofsky, during this trip Dürer returned to an older form of portrait painting, namely in his depiction of the sitters in a three-quarter view with hands portrayed at the base of the canvas, a style that Panofsky asserted was still popular within the Netherlands.126 Dürer’s

---

124 Fedja Anzelewsky, Albrecht Dürer: das malerische Werk, rev. ed. (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1991), 1: 265, cat. no. 163. Once considered a portrait of the painter Bernard van Orley, it has since been identified as the merchant Bernhard von Reesen. The letter held by the sitter is inscribed with the words “Dem p [b?] ernh...” which may correspond to the name Bernhard. Till-Holger Borchert, Van Eyck to Dürer, 428, cat. 239. According to Conway’s translation of the diary, Dürer wrote that he had “…made the portraits of little Bernard of Brussels, George Kötzler, and the Frenchman from Kamrich.” Conway, Literary Remains, 111. However, according to Rupprich’s transcription of the diary, Dürer referred to Bernard as Bernhart von Breßlen, not Brussel. Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 163. Rupprich also noted that in copy A of Dürer’s diary the person was clearly called “Resten.” Ibid., 194n538.

125 Fedja Anzelewsky, Albrecht Dürer, 1: 265. The Tietzes identified the Isabella Stewart Gardner portrait of a man as Lazarus Ravensburger based on a likeness from Dürer’s Silverpoint Sketchbook (W. 774) and an entry from Dürer’s diary. See Conway, Literary Remains, 112; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 164. However, Anzelewsky suggested that the likeness could also be of Rodrigo d’ Almada or Lorenz Sterck. Overpainting of various areas, such as the sleeves also raised questions as to its status as an original or copy. See Anzelewsky, Albrecht Dürer, 1: 265-267. The Madrid portrait has also had various identifications, including Jobst Planckfelt, Lorenz Sterck, Hans Imhoff, Sebastian Schedel, and Pirckheimer. The wide range of identifications is a result of the varied interpretation of the inscribed date as either 1521 or 1524. However, because of the Netherlandish format and the compositional similarity to the Portrait of Bernhard von Reesen (Dresden) the date is more likely 1521. See Ibid., 267; Holger-Borchert, Van Eyck to Dürer, 427, cat. 238. Winkler and Anzelewsky thought the condition of the Toledo portrait of a woman impeded an accurate assessment of the attribution. See Friedrich Winkler, Albrecht Dürer: Leben und Werk (Berlin: Verlag Gebr. Mann, 1957), 302n1; Anzelewsky, Albrecht Dürer, 1: 269-270.

126 Erwin Panofsky, The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer, 4th ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 211. Panofsky noted that Lucas van Leyden and Jan Gossaert continued to produce portraits in the style of the early Netherlandish masters, however Joos van Cleve should be added to his list. Several of Van Cleve’s portraits dating from the 1520s showcase tightly framed bust-length quarter view figures with depictions of hands along the lower edge of the panel. See John Oliver Hand, Joos Van Cleve: The
portraiture thus represents an important instance in which he altered his style to emulate Netherlandish painting.

**Conclusion**

Dürer was forty-nine when he embarked for the Netherlands and had already achieved widespread fame through the dissemination of his woodcuts and engravings. It is clear from the diary that Dürer was well received by the artists, local citizens, and foreign dignitaries whom he met.\(^{127}\) Although Dürer contracted an illness while abroad that plagued him for the remainder of his life, his journey north otherwise had favorable social, economic, and artistic outcomes.\(^{128}\)

The detailed information Dürer reported in his diary is extremely rare, particularly among the extant documents of early sixteenth-century northern European artists. The frequency with which the diary has been published attests to its importance for both historians of art and of the Netherlands. Dürer’s surviving works from the period remain invaluable for the evidence they provide regarding likenesses, Netherlandish costume, and the appearance of various towns, residences, and churches. However, because Dürer’s works do not demonstrate a drastic change in style or show his interests in theory

---

\(^{127}\) In a letter written to the Nuremberg Town Council after his return from the Netherlands, Dürer noted that the city of Antwerp had offered him an attractive deal to stay in the Netherlands and work there. Conway, *Literary Remains*, 132; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 109-110.

\(^{128}\) Additionally, Dürer’s time in the Netherlands afforded him new experiences, for instance the opportunity to view animals that he had never seen like lions and a walrus, but he also had the chance to be a hero. While on his trip to Arnemuiden, the boat he was in was struck by another ship in the harbor. According to Dürer he helped almost everyone safely disembark before the ship was swept out to sea, at which point Dürer calmed the captain and helped bring the boat ashore. For Dürer’s full account see Conway, *Literary Remains*, 111; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 163.
as those did after his trips to Italy, his reception of Netherlandish artwork, both past and contemporary, has received less attention in the literature. Instances in which he modeled his portraits after earlier Netherlandish conventions or added Netherlandish dress to his figures have been noted but not satisfactorily discussed.

In order to situate the *Oblong Passion* drawings in the literature pertaining to the trip and within the context of the journey itself, this chapter has presented a general overview of the scholarly focus of Dürer’s journey, the significant biographical and historical information recorded in the diary, and on the various artworks Dürer produced abroad. This information provides the foundation from which to examine the *Oblong Passion* drawings in subsequent chapters, particularly in terms of the social and religious circumstances surrounding their creation as well as the ways in which Netherlandish art informed their unique appearance. The following chapter therefore continues with an analysis of the formal aspects of the individual drawings and examines how they reflect a shift in Dürer’s creative process.
Chapter 2

*Dürer and the Passion: The “Oblong Passion” and its Predecessors*

When Panofsky described the distinct character of the *Oblong Passion* drawings in his *Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer*, he emphasized the altered viewing experience of the oblong drawings from Dürer’s vertically oriented works:

An oblong format is more congenial with an epic than with a dramatic or lyrical form of presentation. We do not feel ourselves drawn with a rush into the picture, but tend rather to absorb the spectacle as though watching a stream flowing by, or the waves of the ocean rolling on, or a distant mountain range spread out before us. The oblong format creates, or at least corresponds to, a mood of objectivizing receptivity rather than a subjectivizing activity, and it makes for an experience of space wherein depth is not apprehended by breaking through the picture plane but by a quiet, gradual advance on the whole front. It is therefore more suitable for “relief-space” and panoramic space than for a space full of dynamic tensions or dissolving in visionary unreality.\(^1\)

Panofsky’s observations identify several important aspects that he believed represented the contrast between the *Oblong Passion* and Dürer’s earlier depictions of the theme. He noted that the artist’s “epic” rather than “lyrical” approach to the pictorial arrangement afforded a grand and widespread expanse over which to explore the scenes. Panofsky used metaphorical imagery to describe the calm viewing process of the drawings, such as “watching a stream flowing by” or “the waves of the ocean rolling on” to invoke a slow and rhythmic sense of movement through the compositions. Panofsky also chose strong and pointed language to express the divergent dramatic emphasis between a horizontal and vertical orientation. Terms and phrases such as “dramatic,” “subjectivizing,” “breaking through the picture plane,” “dynamic tensions,” and “unreality” are juxtaposed

---

with descriptions such as “objectivizing,” “quiet,” and “gradual,” all of which suggest a dichotomy between an active and a passive viewing approach to the images.²

While some of Panofsky’s assertions are debatable, in particular that the “objectivizing receptivity” of the epic presentation supersedes an active reading of the objects, the author was successful in demonstrating that Dürer’s late depictions of the Passion underwent a significant transformation from his previous representations. With Panofsky’s point in mind, the aim of this chapter is to discuss the Oblong Passion drawings in relationship to Dürer’s early engagement with Christ’s Passion, in particular his numerous Passion series, and to demonstrate the ways in which the Oblong Passion drawings deviate from his earlier treatments of the theme.

The first section presents an overview of Dürer’s printed and drawn Passion series in which I evaluate the defining characteristics, function, and prospective audiences of his works. An analysis of ten of the extant Oblong Passion drawings follows, presented in chronological order by date and by subject, rather than in the customary sequential order of the Passion narrative.³ For instance, I will be discussing the two Christ Carrying the Cross drawings of 1520 before the 1523 Last Supper. This approach demonstrates the progression of Dürer’s creative process, particularly for the episodes in which he depicted more than one variation. This concentrated discussion of the Oblong Passion drawings

² Larry Silver disagreed with much of Panofsky’s description, stating, “...I take issue with his characterization of the effects of the horizontal format of the Gospel events as “epic” rather than “dramatic or lyrical,” or still less as “a mood of objectivizing receptivity rather than subjectivizing activity.” The relief-space effect perceived here by Panofsky may well dominate the sensation of depth, but it is precisely the effects he sees denied here, viz., “a space full of dynamic tensions or dissolving in visionary unreality” that highlight at least the Mount of Olives drawings....” Larry Silver, “The Influence of Anxiety: The Agony in the Garden as Artistic Theme in the Era of Dürer,” Umení 45 (1997): 428n19.

³ I do not include the 1524 Adoration of the Magi in this chapter since the event is not a part of the Passion narrative, however a discussion of the drawing can be found in the appendix to this dissertation.
also illustrates the specific ways in which Dürer’s late renditions of the theme differed from his earlier versions, an important determination in characterizing both the evangelical elements within the drawings and the ways in which Dürer looked to Netherlandish art for pictorial structure.

**Dürer and the Subject of Christ’s Passion**

Dürer repeatedly returned to the theme of Christ’s Passion over the course of his career. Apart from independent drawings, paintings, and prints, Dürer created five narrative versions of the story. In addition to demonstrating the broader devotional significance of the Passion narrative among late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century European Christians, Dürer's extensive engagement with the subject illustrates his own preoccupation with Jesus’ suffering and redemption. Dürer's Passion imagery also reveals his development as an artist over many years as well as his varied interpretations of the subject in both prints and drawings. His frequent attention to the story allowed Dürer to develop his style and execution with each design and to reconsider Jesus’ final days both conceptually and visually.

---

4 These series include the Large Passion, Green Passion, Small Passion, Engraved Passion, and the Oblong Passion. Four woodcuts known as the Albertina Passion that date to the mid 1490s are occasionally added as the sixth of Dürer’s Passion series. The Albertina Passion woodcuts include the Flagellation (M. 73), the Crowning of Thorns (M. 327), the Bearing of the Cross (M. 153), and the Crucifixion (M. 112b).

5 Dürer's stylistic and thematic interpretations of Christ's Passion over the course of his career was the subject of Jordan Kantor's exhibition, Dürer's Passions, in which the curator traced Dürer's understanding of the events through his representations of Jesus’ physical presence and the viewer’s perspective. For Kantor, Dürer’s perception of Jesus evolved from a man resistant to his Passion to one who became resigned to the destiny set forth by his father. Dürer's early depictions place the viewer as a participant in the scene while the late drawings of the Oblong Passion distance the viewer by means of a high perspective and oblique viewpoints. Jordan Kantor, Dürer’s Passions, exh. cat. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Art Museums, 2000).
Dürer’s various Passion series are different from one another in number of episodes included and events depicted. His first extensive engagement with the subject began around 1497 with the commencement of his woodcut *Large Passion* series. By 1499, he had completed and published seven woodcuts as separate sheets. In 1510 Dürer created four additional episodes. When he published the series in book format in 1511, Dürer added a frontispiece featuring the Man of Sorrows. Each leaf is approximately 15 x 11 inches, vertically oriented, and accompanied by Latin text by Benedictus Chelidonius, a Benedictine monk, the canon of the church of Saint Aegidius in Nuremberg, and a close friend of both Willibald Pirckheimer and Dürer. The set, partly modeled on Martin Schongauer’s engraved Passion series of around 1480, features events from the Last Supper to the Resurrection. Dürer likely rounded out the series with an

---

6 Dürer’s early woodcuts for the *Large Passion* included the *Agony in the Garden*, the *Flagellation*, the *Ecce Homo*, the *Bearing of the Cross*, the *Crucifixion*, the *Lamentation*, and the *Deposition.*

7 The late narrative additions to the series included the *Last Supper*, the *Betrayal*, the *Harrowing of Hell*, and the *Resurrection.*

8 Artists such as Martin Schongauer and Israhel van Mechenem popularized the practice of producing printed devotional imagery in cycles or small series. These sheets were often pasted into small religious books as aids to the texts or were bound together and sold as small booklets. David Landau and Peter Parshall, *The Renaissance Print: 1470-1550* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), 58.


additional four prints in 1510 to be similar in number to the other two publications included in his *Drei Große Bücher* in 1511—the *Apocalypse* and the *Life of the Virgin*.¹¹

Dürer’s creation of four of the woodcuts after his second journey to Italy from 1505 to 1507— the *Last Supper*, *Betrayal*, *Harrowing of Hell*, and *Resurrection*— resulted in a series noticeably inconsistent in style and execution. The compositions created prior to 1500 feature ornate line work and crosshatching, acute contrasts between light and shadow, busy landscape detail, and crowded figural arrangements. In contrast, the later woodcuts of 1510 and 1511 demonstrate Dürer’s interest in Renaissance artistic principles of classical anatomy, compositional symmetry, and unity. Clear examples of these differences are evident in a comparison between Dürer’s 1497-1498 *Crucifixion* and his 1510 *Resurrection* woodcuts, wherein the latter shows uniform hatching and cross-hatching juxtaposed against lighter areas of negative space (Figs. 39, 40). This combination of line and unmarked space suggested plasticity and depth by generating a middle tone from which the extreme lights and darks of the image were offset. Described by Panofsky as a *clair-obscur* effect, Dürer’s familiarity with the technique stemmed from drawing with pen and ink with white highlights on colored paper.¹²

In 1504, Dürer applied the *clair-obscur* technique to the design of his *Green Passion*, which he completed in the interim between the publications of his early and late *Large Passion* woodcuts. Executed with pen and ink on green prepared paper with accents of white gouache, the cycle consists of eleven vertically oriented drawings.

¹¹ Holger-Borchert, *Van Eyck to Dürer*, 422.

¹² Panofsky, *Life and Art*, 133-134.
(originally twelve), each approximately 11 x 7 inches. Questions regarding the attribution of the drawings, their status as originals or copies, and their overall function continue to be debated. Issues related to their quality, particularly in reference to areas of weak draughtsmanship and maladroit gouache application, have led to the supposition that a member of Dürer’s workshop, likely Hans Baldung Grien, Hans Schäufelein, and/or Hans von Kulmbach, executed the Green Passion from Dürer’s original designs. Several related drawings in pen and ink on white paper that appear to be either preliminary drawings or transfer drawings from lost preparatory studies have also contributed to the questionable nature of the series.

The fundamental purpose of the Green Passion, particularly whether the drawings were independent works of art or preparatory for objects in other media, has been an ongoing debate. Panofsky suggested that Friedrich the Wise of Saxony commissioned the drawings as models for a never-completed relief cycle of the Stations of the Cross meant for the Schlosskirche in Wittenberg. Koschatzky and Strobl believed a collector

---

13 As with all of Dürer’s Passion series, the episodes vary slightly from version to version. The Green Passion includes the Betrayal of Christ, Christ before Caiaphas, Christ before Pilate, the Flagellation, Crowning with Thorns, Ecce Homo, Bearing of the Cross, Nailing to the Cross, Crucifixion, Descent from the Cross, and Entombment. A stylistically similar drawing of the Agony in the Garden on white paper was likely preparatory for the lost green version and is kept in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan (W. 298). Walter Koschatzky and Alice Strobl, Dürer Drawings in the Albertina, trans. Heide and Alastair Grieve (Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, 1972), 112.

14 J. Springer was the first to question the attribution of the Green Passion to Dürer because of what he considered poor draughtsmanship. See J. Springer, “Dürers Zeichnungen in neuen Publikationen,” Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft 29, 1906, 553 ff. See also Koschatzky and Strobl, Dürer Drawings in the Albertina, 112, for a summary of the authenticity debates. The poor condition of the drawings, particularly in the amount of abrasion, makes it difficult to judge the quality of the draughtsmanship and application of gouache.


16 Panofsky, Life and Art, 105.
commissioned the series while most recently Heinz Widauer has suggested that Dürer completed the preparatory drawings, but his workshop executed the finished *Green Passion* on the event of the artist’s departure for Italy. Dürer’s later visual references to various compositions from the *Green Passion* make it clear that the artist valued his designs for the series whether he completed all of the finished works or not. For instance, several episodes from his subsequent *Engraved Passion* are derivative of several episodes found in the *Green Passion*, specifically the extant preparatory drawing of the *Agony in the Garden* and the finished drawings of the *Betrayal of Christ* and *Christ before Pilate*.18

Around 1509, five years after the completion of the *Green Passion* and while still at work on the final scenes of the *Large Passion*, Dürer began his most ambitious Passion cycle, known as the *Small Passion*. This series includes thirty-seven woodcuts beginning with the Fall of Man and ending with the Last Judgment.19 Each image is approximately 5 x 3 ½ inches, vertically oriented and accompanied by Latin verses written again by Chelidonius. Like the *Large Passion*, the *Small Passion* was published as a book in 1511.

17 Koschatzky and Strobl, *Dürer Drawings in the Albertina*, 112; Widauer in Robison and Schröder, *Albrecht Dürer*, 156.


19 Talbot, ed., *Dürer in America*, 184. The episodes depicted in the *Small Passion* include the *Man of Sorrows, Fall of Man, Expulsion from Paradise, Annunciation, Nativity, Christ Taking Leave of his Mother, Christ’s Entry into Jerusalem, Christ Driving the Money Changers from the Temple, The Last Supper*, *Christ Washing the Feet of Saint Peter, Agony in the Garden, Betrayal of Christ, Christ before Annas, Christ before Caïthphas, Mocking of Christ, Christ before Pilate, Christ before Herod, Flagellation, Christ Crowned with Thorns, Ecce Homo, Pilate Washing his Hands, Bearing of the Cross, Veronica Displaying the Sudarium with Saints Peter and Paul, Christ Nailed to the Cross, Crucifixion, Harrowing of Hell, Deposition, Lamentation, Entombment, Resurrection, Christ Appearing to his Mother, Noli me tangere, Supper at Emmaus, Christ Appearing to his Disciples, Ascension, Pentecost*, and *The Last Judgment*. Dürer made a different woodcut of the *Agony in the Garden* that featured Jesus in a prostrate position, but which was not used in the final series as it may have been damaged in the cutting process. See Heinrich Wölfflin, *The Art of Albrecht Durer*, trans. Alastair and Heide Grieve, 3rd ed. (New York: Phaidon, 1971), 260.
and features a frontispiece of the Man of Sorrows.\textsuperscript{20} However, unlike the \textit{Large Passion}, the series was completed within two years of its inception and thus displays a greater degree of pictorial and stylistic unity.

Concurrently, Dürer was also busy with the creation of his \textit{Engraved Passion}, which he had started in 1507 and finished in 1513, two years after the publications of his \textit{Large} and \textit{Small Passion} series. Measuring approximately 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 3 inches, the engravings are slightly smaller and narrower in dimension than the \textit{Small Passion} woodcuts. The sixteen scenes include the \textit{Man of Sorrows} and \textit{Saint Peter and Saint John Healing a Cripple}, the latter not traditionally part of the Passion narrative.\textsuperscript{21} The \textit{Small} and \textit{Engraved Passion} series are often discussed together in the Dürer literature both because of their contemporaneity and because of the contrasts they provide through differences in media and number of episodes.

Dürer used a clear diagrammatic approach and clarity of line for the compact dimensions and woodcut medium of the \textit{Small Passion}. He reduced each scene to its fundamental narrative emphasis by eliminating unnecessary detail and by placing the main action of the scenes within a consistent central viewpoint in the immediate

\textsuperscript{20} The series was printed four images to a sheet, which were then folded to accommodate binding. Giulia Bartrum, \textit{Albrecht Dürer and His Legacy: The Graphic Work of a Renaissance Artist}, exh. cat. (London: British Museum, 2002), 173.

\textsuperscript{21} Panofsky believed the inclusion of this episode was possibly for two reasons: either Dürer wanted to make the number of engravings even for printing purposes or he was planning on extending the cycle to include the Acts of the Apostles. Evidently, the print was excluded from privately bound copies of the \textit{Engraved Passion} as early as the sixteenth century. Panofsky, \textit{Life and Art}, 141. Hass believed that when all of the prints were viewed simultaneously, they could be interpretively read in corresponding pairs, beginning with the two outermost (the first and last) and ending with the two interior scenes. When viewed in this way, episodes such as the \textit{Agony} and the \textit{Resurrection} could be juxtaposed for intellectual ruminition. Since the \textit{Saint Peter and Saint John Healing a Cripple} and the \textit{Man of Sorrows} are themes not part of the passion narrative they become foils for one another. Hass, “Two Devotional Manuals,” 218.
foreground. He also attained deep contrasts of light and shade by juxtaposing rich areas of dense crosshatching against areas of untouched paper.

The distinguishing characteristic of the series is movement. Jordan Kantor called the Small Passion a “visual page-turner” for its kinetic pictorial appearance. For instance, Adam and Eve are ushered out of the frame in the Expulsion of Paradise (Fig. 41); Jesus presses onward in Christ Taking Leave of his Mother (Fig. 42), just as Christ’s Entry into Jerusalem is one of forward motion (Fig. 43). Even after Jesus’ death, his body is never settled. In the Deposition he is taken down from the Cross (Fig. 44), then lifted by the shoulders in the Lamentation (Fig. 45), and lowered into the sarcophagus in the Entombment (Fig. 46).

There is a marked contrast between the active scenes of the Small Passion and the contained and contemplative episodes of the Engraved Passion. Comparable in size to the Small Passion, the engraved series also features clearly constructed compositional arrangements for readability. However, because of the nature of engraving, Dürer achieved a higher degree of detail and finish not possible with woodcutting. Dürer’s varied and precise burin work produced rich textural details and wide-ranging levels of tonal gradation, allowing for more visually intricate scenes. Soft fabrics of figures’ garments are juxtaposed against cold stony architecture while shadowy figures emerge from the darkness. Take for instance Dürer’s 1512 Pilate Washing his Hands where the texture of the clothing and headpieces of the three foreground figures include silky, rough, and wooly materials (Fig. 47). The hard surface of the architecture is achieved with consistent and methodical shading, while the background setting traverses through

22 Kantor, Dürer’s Passions, 31.
Jerusalem, up to Golgotha and out into the sea. This kind of descriptive representation encourages the act of close looking and could only have been achieved through engraving.

Panofsky believed the divergences between the Small and Engraved Passion demonstrated Dürer’s intention to sell to separate audiences. A wider, more devotionally oriented viewership would have purchased the woodcut cycle while a more intellectual and art-minded collector would have acquired the engravings. Like the Large Passion, the Small Passion was accompanied by edifying text in the form of Latin poems. First published as a book, Dürer meant for the text printed on the verso of each print to reference the recto of the following page. Although it is likely that not everyone who purchased a Small Passion was literate, the imagery itself would have been sufficient for devotional purposes. Angela Hass argued that Dürer specifically depicted episodes of the Small Passion that resembled canonical northern iconography so as to remain familiar and accessible to a wider religious-minded audience.

In contrast with the Small Passion, Dürer seems to have never intended the Engraved Passion to include text or to be published in book format, although later owners of the series bound it in such a way. Images could be viewed and contemplated separately in narrative chronological order or simultaneously as a larger group. Hass

---

23 Panofsky, Life and Art, 140.
24 Bartrum concluded that Dürer’s Small Passion was the most widely recognized of his series based on the large amount of woodcuts printed without text after 1511. Bartrum, Albrecht Dürer and his legacy, 171.
25 Hass’s examples include Lenten cloths with Passion imagery, passion plays, and popular Northern print cycles such as the fifteenth-century metalcut sequence of Christ’s Passion, the greatest number of impressions of which are in the British Museum, London. Hass, “Two Devotional Manuals.”
26 Friedrich the Wise of Saxony bound his version of the Engraved Passion and included prayers that were pasted to the backs of the impressions. It is now in the Princeton University Art Museum. See Talbot, Dürer in America, 138.
suggested that the engravings should be viewed in pairs beginning at the extreme ends followed by progressive inward movement toward the center. Considered in this way, images could be juxtaposed to produce intellectual and thought-provoking matches. For instance, viewers could compare the *Agony in the Garden* against the *Resurrection* and contemplate such theological matters as Jesus’ transcendence above the human condition and death. This kind of intellectual and theological rumination over corresponding early and late episodes from those depicted in Dürer’s *Engraved Passion*, although plausible, was not likely performed among less erudite viewers of the series.

Unlike the *Small Passion*, where viewers were encouraged to model their devotions after Jesus’ suffering and his followers’ extreme grief, the *Engraved Passion* is much more restrained in terms of drama and emotional pathos; it is a “passion of the mind.” Like Panofsky, Hass believed the intended audience of the *Engraved Passion* was much like Dürer himself, “...a vivacious, intellectually and culturally demanding minority, devout and personally involved in the religious debates leading up to the Reformation.” Buyers and recipients of Dürer’s various Passion series documented in his Netherlandish diary show a broad spectrum representing various social levels. For instance, Dürer sold an *Engraved Passion* to a fellow artist and gave the series to Margaret of Austria, various artists, and to his acquaintances’ family members.

---


28 Ibid.

29 Kantor, *Dürer’s Passions*, 44. See also Hass, “Two Devotional Manuals,” 230.

30 Hass, “Two Devotional Manuals,” 228.

several occasions Dürer gave and sold both the *Small* and *Engraved Passions* together, for example to members of the Portuguese faction in Antwerp, the prior of the Antwerp Augustinians, and to Felix Hungersperg, an accomplished lute player. Dürer also sold all three of his *Passions* to Sebald Fischer, a merchant or art dealer.\(^{32}\) Even from this evidence, it is difficult to determine the wider audience for each series, particularly since prints that were given as sets are not listed by their contents and various other customers who bought the Passions were not named. Nonetheless, the documented instances from the diary illustrates that the differences between the series, particularly the breadth of the religious narrative and the aesthetic variations, were of interest for both those people who bought them and for Dürer who gave them.

The *Small* and *Engraved Passion* series fundamentally demonstrate Dürer’s capacity for creativity and design. The challenge of undertaking two markedly different series of the same subject, created nearly at the same time, required Dürer to vary the settings, costumes, figural arrangement, anecdotal details, and background elements of the corresponding episodes in order to avoid repetition. The appearance of the *Engraved Passion* reveals Dürer’s aim to provide an alternative Passion series in size, content, and viewer interaction from both his *Large* and *Small Passions*. In order to do so, Dürer worked in a different medium, omitted accompanying text, and elected against binding the episodes into book form. Although the *Small* and *Engraved Passions* share thirteen of the same episodes, not including the title pages, Dürer avoided replication by slightly altering the arrangement and expressive mood of each corresponding scene to reveal

another layer of meaning for Jesus’ earthly sufferings and his triumphant conquest over death.

Just as Dürer challenged himself with alternative methods of media, pictorial arrangement, execution of line, and the expression of emotional pathos within the vertical constructs of each of his Passion series, he later applied these same creative impulses to his designs of the Oblong Passion drawings with the result that they notably diverge from his earlier examples.

**The Oblong Passion**

Dürer’s production of Passion imagery was minimal in the years between the completion of his Engraved Passion in 1513 and his departure for the Netherlands. He suffered a number of personal losses including the deaths of Anton Koberger (1440-1513), Dürer’s godfather; his mother Barbara, née Holper (1451-1514); Michael Wolgemut (1434/7-1519), his early teacher; and his patron Maximilian I (1459-1519). Dürer was also immersed in various important projects such as his three Master Engravings—Knight, Death, and the Devil, Saint Jerome in his Study, and Melencolia I— from 1513 to 1514 and was among the many artists working on graphic projects for Emperor Maximilian I, including the Triumphal Arch, Triumphal Procession, and his Prayerbook. In addition to a small number of engravings, Dürer experimented with etching in this period, though he produced just six prints in the medium.33

33 The six etchings include The Desperate Man (B. 70), Man of Sorrows, Seated, 1515 (B. 22), Agony in the Garden, 1515 (B. 19), Sudarium Spread out by an Angel, 1516 (B. 26), Abduction of Proserpine on a Unicorn, 1516 (B. 72), Landscape with Cannon, 1518 (B. 99).
Circumstances such as the events from his personal life, the demands of a number of ongoing projects, and the recent publication of his *Large, Small, and Engraved Passion* series prevented Dürer from devoting extensive time to the subject of Christ’s Passion. Of the few Passion subjects he depicted in this period, he was most preoccupied with the theme of the Agony in the Garden, which he sketched four times and etched once (Figs. 48-52). Although Dürer drew a scene of the Lamentation in 1519 that resembled a combination of his *Small* and *Engraved Passion* versions, it was not until he commenced work on the *Oblong Passion* drawings that he returned to the larger theme of the Passion with concentrated attention (Fig. 53).

The following analysis considers each of the drawings associated with the *Oblong Passion* dating from 1520 to 1524. The drawings are presented in chronological order and by subject matter. Information regarding the 1524 drawing of the *Adoration of the Magi* is located in the appendix. The discussion of the drawings focuses on their design and pictorial arrangement in order to identify specific divergences from Dürer’s earlier renditions of the scenes. This extensive examination of the drawings acts as the foundation for the following chapters wherein I discuss Dürer’s late artistic choices as they pertain to the votive and Netherlandish characteristics of the works.

**Christ Carrying the Cross**

The two versions of *Christ Carrying the Cross* that Dürer depicted in the *Oblong Passion* are considered Dürer’s earliest drawings among the group and are both monogrammed and dated 1520 (Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence, Figs. 6, 7). Although an integral episode in visual representations of the Passion narrative, Jesus’ burden of
carrying his own cross to Golgotha is a rather sparsely described event in the Gospels.\textsuperscript{34} According to the Evangelists, after having scourged and mocked Jesus, the Roman soldiers “...led him away to crucify him (Mt 27: 31).”\textsuperscript{35} Matthew, Mark, and Luke related that as the procession moved, the soldiers took Simon, a man from Cyrene, Africa, from the crowd and forced him to carry Jesus’ cross while John specifically noted that Jesus bore his own.\textsuperscript{36} Luke referred to two criminals in the procession as well as a large group of people who followed behind, particularly the Daughters of Jerusalem, whom Jesus bid to “weep not over me; but weep for yourselves, and your children (Luke 23: 28, 32).”\textsuperscript{37}

Because the details of Jesus’ passage to Golgotha are limited, artists added to and intensified the visual representation of the event over time. In his study of passion iconography of Northern European art from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, James H. Marrow concluded that “...by the late Middle Ages the Bearing of the Cross had become one of the most richly elaborated events of the passion, crowded with figures and replete with anecdotal incident.”\textsuperscript{38} As an artist working within this devotional tradition, Dürer’s two drawings of the scene associated with the \textit{Oblong Passion} also elaborate upon the basic elements found in the Gospels. They depict the same narrative moment

\textsuperscript{34} The biblical quotations are derived from the Douay-Rheims Bible. The corresponding Gospel passages for Jesus carrying his cross are Mt 27: 31-33; Mk 15: 20-22; Lk 23: 26-32; Jn 19: 16-17.

\textsuperscript{35} Mk 15: 20, “...they led him out to crucify him.” Lk 23: 26, “And as they led him away...” Jn 19: 16, “And they took Jesus, and led him forth.”

\textsuperscript{36} The corresponding Gospel passages regarding Simon are Mt 27: 32; Mk 15: 21; Lk 23: 26; Jn 19: 17.

\textsuperscript{37} All four evangelists mentioned the presence of two thieves to either side of Jesus during the crucifixion, while only Luke noted that they formed part of the procession. Mt 27: 38; Mk 15: 27; Lk 23: 32-33; Jn 19: 18.

from Christ’s Passion; however, Dürer interpreted the episode differently in each by modifying the degree of Jesus’ suffering, his persecution, and the reactions of the crowd.

Dürer’s drawing in which Jesus stands is generally considered the first of the two versions (Fig. 6).39 The highly structured design shows a procession of over twenty-five figures that advance leftward on foot and by horseback before the city walls of Jerusalem. Portrayed slightly left of center, Jesus has paused momentarily to glance back toward the kneeling figure of Veronica.40 While presenting the cloth on which Jesus will ultimately imprint his features, Veronica also draws attention from two other figures, the soldier behind Jesus who pushes him onward and a man in the left foreground who twists away from the viewer to look at her. Jesus’ and the two soldiers’ brief awareness of Veronica’s gesture halts the forward progression of the group and aids in directing the viewer’s focus back to Jesus.41 The two thieves, both unclad and bound, lead the group to the left and one turns his head back to look at the condition of their fellow prisoner. To the right, a small group of women follow behind Veronica in her wake and are likely those

39 Wölfflin, Winkler, Tietze, Panofsky, and Strauss considered this drawing the first, while only Knackfuss and Anzelewsky thought it was completed after figure 7, Uffizi 1077. Herman Knackfuss, Dürer (Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klasing, 1900), 138; Heinrich Wölfflin, The Art of Albrecht Dürer, trans. Alastair and Heide Grieve, 3rd ed. (New York: Phaidon, 1971), 261; Friedrich Winkler, Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1936-1939), 4: 27, cat. 793; Hans Tietze and Erika Tietze-Conrat, Kritisches Verzeichnis der Werke Albrecht Dürers (Augsburg: Filser, 1928) 2: 17, cat. 787; Panofsky, Life and Art, 220; Walter L. Strauss, The Complete Drawings of Albrecht Dürer (New York: Abaris Books, 1974), 4: 1976, cat. 1520/37; Fedja Anzelewsky, Dürer, His Art and Life (New York: Alpine Fine Arts Collection, 1980), 210. The apparent quickness of the other sketch (Fig. 7) led Anzelewsky to conclude that that drawing was designed prior to figure 6. “It seems reasonable to suppose that the rougher drawings, in which the figures’ gestures are more agitated and their facial expressions more dramatic, are the earlier attempts, while the more developed and tranquil compositions represent the second stage of the artist’s thoughts on the subject.”

40 Veronica is not mentioned in the four canonical Gospels. Her first appearance is in the apocryphal gospel of Nicodemus 5:26.

41 Wölfflin believed that Jesus’ momentary glance with Veronica would have gone unnoticed had it not been for Dürer’s inclusion of this second man who looks back at Veronica while pushing Jesus forward. Wölfflin, The Art of Albrecht Dürer, 261.
mentioned in Luke’s Gospel.\textsuperscript{42} The movement of the procession is slow and orderly while the interaction of the participants is limited.

The entire frieze of figures is depicted close to the picture plane and little space is provided between the cavalcade and the stone walls of the city. Directly behind the band of figures, a Gothic arched portal to the right of the central axis provides a distant view to the metropolis, imparting a sense of depth to an otherwise shallow and congested composition. Additionally, in order to break the uniformly horizontal composition, vertical and diagonal instruments rise up from the crowd, for instance various weapons, a ladder, and the nearly perpendicular cross held by Jesus. Assiduously executed, Dürer’s tight and controlled pen strokes define the pictorial elements through various uniform hatchings and cross-hatchings. Areas of rich shadow disperse evenly among the interstices of the crowd while broad areas of highlighting are distinguished through the absence of line, particularly within the figures’ clothing.

Jesus’ suffering and abuse at the hands of his captors is relatively restrained here in favor of underscoring the brief moment of mutual recognition between Jesus and Veronica. In contrast, Dürer’s other oblong \textit{Christ Bearing the Cross} emphasizes Jesus’ struggle as well as the brutality of the Roman soldiers (Fig. 7). As in figure 6, Dürer composed a frieze of figures progressing to the left along the exterior walls of a large city. Soldiers, civilian men and women, the two thieves, and officials on horseback surround the central figure of Jesus who falls to the ground under the weight of the cross in the center. Supporting his body with his right hand on a stone slab, he grasps the horizontal beam of the cross with his left hand and spreads his knees across the dirt for

\textsuperscript{42} Lk 23: 27-28.
balance. The ‘x’ shape of the body, the diagonal placement of the cross along his shoulders, and the small, unoccupied area in which he has fallen establish Jesus as the focal point of the drawing. Two soldiers behind Jesus lash and kick him, while Simon of Cyrene grasps the lower edge of the horizontal cross beam to alleviate some of his burden.

Similarly to figure 6, Veronica is present in the lower right foreground, but now stands and is at a farther distance from Jesus. The Virgin and John the Evangelist follow closely behind Veronica and avert their eyes from the gruesome spectacle. In addition to the two thieves in the left middle ground, now barely discernable, women and men stand opposite from one another in order to clear a path through which Jesus can proceed. The crowd’s interest in the event, conveyed through varied hand gesticulations and exaggerated body and head movements, increases the momentum of the procession and intensifies the dramatic impact. The viewer’s attention is forced to remain on the main spectacle of Jesus’ suffering since Dürer did not include the distant vista of the city seen through the central portal as in figure 6.

The execution of the drawing is also less controlled and finished than in figure 6. Crosshatching is primarily used in the garments of the figures and less so in the architecture. The lower right foreground, where the figures emerge from the city gate, features the heaviest chiaroscuro while Jesus’ body, which displays little variation in shading, is the most hastily sketched and loosely defined. The quickness with which the

---

43 Panofsky noted that Dürer revised the pose he had used in his The Death of Orpheus drawing of 1494, now in the Kunsthalle, Hamburg, for the pose of Jesus fallen beneath the cross. Panofsky, Life and Art, 221.

44 When I viewed the drawing in the Galleria degli Uffizi in July of 2012, I noticed that it had some areas of indentation, specifically an orthogonal extending from the top of the battlement to the gate and among other
drawing appears to have been rendered complements the action and motion of the scene. In addition to Jesus’ suffering, the emphasis of the drawing is centered on the naturalistic reactions of the bystanders, including those of the soldiers, officials, devastated supporters, and the throng of people who have come to witness an execution—a clear departure from the previous drawing in which the figures are more reserved and withdrawn.

The identification of the *Christ Carrying the Cross* drawings as those mentioned in Dürer’s diary entry in which he succinctly noted, “Ich hab 3 ausführung und 2 ölberg auff 5 halb pogen gerissen (I drew 3 Leading-forth and 2 Mounts of Olives on 5 half-sheets)” has been variously debated. Although the entry is dated to May 1521, several scholars considered Dürer’s use of the term “Ausführung” to refer to his 1520 *Christ Carrying the Cross* drawings (if this were the case one drawing would now be lost), while others believed he meant the *Bearing of the Body* compositions. The word derives from the verb *ausführen*, which has a number of connotations, including to walk or stroll areas of the architecture. There is also some very basic indenting in the figures that does not follow the contour lines exactly. It is difficult to determine to what extent the indentations were used for later copying.

Three extant paintings of a lost 1527 original attributed to Dürer depict the main scene of this drawing with further elaboration toward the front of the procession. The copy in the best condition belongs to the Accademia Carrara, Bergamo. The other two are located in Richmond, England and Dresden, Germany. See Fedja Anzelewsky, *Albrecht Dürer: das malerische Werk* (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1971), 281-285. See also Ceil Parks Bare, “Albrecht Dürer’s Bearing of the Cross,” *Athanor* 18 (2000): 25-32. Bare’s paper focused on the iconographic significance of the standard flown at the beginning of the procession that depicted a large single-headed eagle.

---


and to carry out or execute an order, command, or plan. In his translation of the diary, Rupprich understood the word to mean “Leadings Out,” specifically toward execution. He ascertained that the term was derived from Martin Luther’s Septembertestament in the passages relating to the moment Jesus was “led forth” to Golgotha in the Gospels of Mark (15: 20) and John (19:16). However, Flechsig argued against the identification of the two 1520 Christ Carrying the Cross drawings as those mentioned in the diary and asserted it was unlikely that Dürer would have added an entry listing the drawings five months later in 1521. Panofsky explained the discrepancy between the dating of the Christ Carrying the Cross drawings and the later diary entry by suggesting:

In all likelihood, then, Dürer had originally failed to mention in his Diary the drawings of 1520 and listed them subsequently together with the similar ones produced the following year, thereby giving a complete list of large, oblong drawings of Passion scenes [...] extant at the time of his writing.

While Panofsky’s explanation is possible, I agree with Flechsig that the Christ Carrying the Cross drawings are not those mentioned in the 1521 entry, for the direct

---


49 Ibid. This interpretation was reiterated by Walter L. Strauss, *The Complete Drawings of Albrecht Dürer*, 1976n2. Luther used the verb “ausführen” in the simple past tense to describe the event. “Und da sie ihn verspottet hatten, zogen sie ihm den Purpur aus und zogen seine eigenen Kleider an und führten ihn aus, daß sie ihn kreuzigten.” Lucas Cranach and Martin Luther, *Das Newe Testament Deutsch* (Vuittemberg: Melchior Lotther, 1522), Mk 15: 20.


reason that Dürer recorded daily and weekly details in the diary with meticulous care.\textsuperscript{52} It is possible that the term “Ausführhung” could also be applied to the act of carrying out, or leading forth Jesus’ lifeless body to the tomb by his followers and so refer to the \textit{Bearing of the Body} compositions. This extended exercise in determining the various meanings of “Ausführhung” is just one specific example of the divergent scholarly discourse related to the \textit{Oblong Passion}, in this instance the dating of the two \textit{Christ Carrying the Cross} drawings, Dürer’s treatment of time in his diary entries, and the intended meaning for the term in Dürer’s lexicon.

Dürer’s two \textit{Christ Carrying the Cross} drawings show Dürer experimenting with both of the figure types he had used for Jesus previously in his Passion scenes, including each of his Passion series and one independent drawing (Figs. 54-58).\textsuperscript{53} With the exception of the 1511 drawing, all of Dürer’s earlier renditions feature a similar pictorial structure. Jesus is depicted in the immediate foreground carrying the cross, the crowd behind him emerges from a city gate to the left, and distant landscape elements in the upper right background denote the setting. Space is compressed by densely overlapped figures representing soldiers, Jewish officials, Jesus’ followers, and typically two figures set above the crowd on horseback.\textsuperscript{54} Each episode shows the same moment of the

\textsuperscript{52} My agreement with Flechsig rests largely on the inscribed dates of the drawings. If these were later proven to be written with another hand (although I know of no current doubts to their authenticity) it would be necessary to reassess the identification as those drawings Dürer mentioned in his diary.

\textsuperscript{53} All designed for a vertical format, these include the corresponding scenes from the \textit{Large Passion} (B. 10), \textit{Green Passion} (W. 310), \textit{Small Passion} (B. 37), \textit{Engraved Passion} (B. 12), and a sketch dated to 1511 now in the Albertina, Vienna (W. 580). A preparatory drawing or trace of the \textit{Green Passion} design on white paper is located in Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett (W. 309).

\textsuperscript{54} The \textit{Engraved Passion} scene of \textit{Christ Carrying the Cross} is the only one of Dürer’s not to depict at least two figures on horseback.
narrative wherein Veronica offers to wipe Jesus’ brow with her cloth, but differ in Jesus’ position and apparent degree of suffering.\footnote{Veronica is absent from the 1511 drawing (W. 580).} 

Dürer’s \textit{Large, Green,} and \textit{Small Passion} depictions feature Jesus fallen beneath the weight of the cross with his head turned back to make eye contact with Veronica (Figs. 54-56). In each, a soldier holding a rope tied around Jesus’ waist stands to his right while a figure behind Jesus prepares to whip, or prod him. All share a sense of drama and immediacy as the movement behind Jesus’ fallen body presses forward despite his momentary collapse. Jesus’ suffering is the clear emphasis of these depictions and his close proximity to the picture plane allows the viewer direct access with him.

Dürer altered Jesus’ position to one in which he stands with the cross in both the 1511 sketch of the episode and his 1512 \textit{Engraved Passion} print (Figs. 58, 57). In the drawing, Jesus is depicted at the head of a procession that emerges from a large Italian Renaissance building as opposed to the medieval fortified portals of the previous renditions. The drawing is hastily executed and areas in which figures and architectural elements overlap, particularly in the left and central foreground, indicate that Dürer altered the composition several times during the drawing process.\footnote{Whether the function of the drawing was preparatory or independent remains unknown. See the catalogue entry in Koschatzky and Strobl, \textit{Dürer Drawings in the Albertina}, 202, cat. 78.}

In contrast with the sketch, Dürer’s 1512 engraving demonstrates a high degree of finish and detail (Fig. 57). Jesus stands in the central foreground with the cross resting on his shoulder and turns to bless Veronica who kneels by his side at the left. A man with his back turned to the viewer pulls Jesus forward by his cloak to the right. Instead of a distant vista, Dürer used the stone fortification of the city walls as the main backdrop so as to
sustain the viewer’s gaze on the figural triad in the foreground. As opposed to the fatigued Jesus of the \textit{Small Passion}, Dürer’s standing Jesus of the \textit{Engraved Passion} exhibits a dignified and resolute attitude toward his persecution.

Similarities between the early works and late drawings of \textit{Christ Carrying the Cross} include the moment depicted, in which Veronica plays a central role, the crowd emerging from the city gates, and the various riders on horseback. The oblong version wherein Jesus stands is most akin to Dürer’s engraved scene of 1512 while the oblong version of Jesus fallen corresponds most with the \textit{Green} and \textit{Large Passion} versions.

Despite these similarities, the pictorial arrangement of the \textit{Oblong Passion} drawings is distinct from Dürer’s earlier works. The processional character of the subject itself is better suited to a horizontal format in which the figures have more space to walk and interact. Dürer accomplished this by shifting the movement of the crowd and the locations of the city portals from which they emerged. In his earlier versions, the abbreviated cavalcade quickly moved diagonally from the middle ground into the foreground. Figure 6 of the \textit{Oblong Passion} shows the procession coming forth from the background gate and turning leftward to walk along the city walls. Figure 7 is less complicated in that the crowd simply emerges from the stone gate at the left and proceeds along a relatively straight path towards the right.

Dürer has encouraged a slow contemplative viewing process by allowing more space to depict the crowd. The multiple participants of the scene and the individual demeanor and motivations of each character demonstrate how they relate to the theme of Jesus’ suffering. While Jesus is still the focal point of the drawings, one is no longer abruptly confronted with the event or even placed on the same level as him. By shifting
the viewpoint to a slightly higher level, Dürer altered the viewer’s direct contact with Jesus and moved away from the intimacy encouraged in his earlier Passion scenes. Set above the scene, the viewer has now become an observer rather than a participant.57

The Agony in the Garden

Between 1520 and 1524 Dürer created four drawings associated with the Oblong Passion depicting the Agony in the Garden. Two drawings inscribed with his monogram and dated 1520 (Fig. 2) and 1521 (Fig. 3) are considered works that Dürer completed during his travels in the Netherlands, while a closely related but undated drawing without a monogram is also thought to be from this period (Fig. 4). The fourth drawing of the Agony in the Garden, monogrammed and dated 1524 (Fig. 5), was completed in Nuremberg.

We recall that Dürer noted his completion of two Agony in the Garden drawings in his diary entry of May 1521.58 Opinions vary among scholars as to which extant versions Dürer referenced in this entry. With the 1524 Frankfurt drawing excluded, some art historians believed Dürer meant his 1520 Karlsruhe (Fig. 2) and 1521 Frankfurt drawings (Fig. 3), while others thought he referred to his 1521 Frankfurt drawing and the undated Berlin work (Fig. 4).59 Several also considered that of the two drawings mentioned in the diary only the 1521 Frankfurt version survived.60

57 Jordan Kantor previously noted that Dürer shifted the point of view for his Oblong Passion Christ Carrying the Cross. Kantor, Dürer’s Passions, 34–35.

58 “Ich hab 3 ausführung und 2 ölberg auff 5 halb pogen gerissen (I drew 3 Leadings-forth and 2 Mounts of Olives on 5 half-sheets).” Conway, Literary Remains, 120; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass: 1:172.

59 Flechsig and Strauss considered the 1521 Frankfurt and undated Berlin drawings to be those referenced in the diary. Flechsig, Albrecht Dürer, 2: 233; Strauss, The Complete Drawings of Albrecht Dürer, 4: 2034,
In order for the 1520 Karlsruhe drawing to be considered one of the *Agony* drawings mentioned in the diary, the same reasoning applied by Panofsky for the identification of the *Christ Carrying the Cross* drawings would have to be applied in this instance—that Dürer completed the drawing in 1520 and only mentioned that he had made it five months later in the diary. This discrepancy in the dating of the drawings would mean that three out of the five drawings Dürer noted in the diary were actually created in 1520 and not in May 1521. While possible, the second *Agony* drawing has more likely been lost.

Dürer’s late drawings of Jesus’ *Agony* incorporate the accounts of the four Evangelists.61 According to the Gospels, after their final meal together Jesus and his disciples walked to the Garden of Gethsemane.62 Leaving the others behind, Jesus took Peter, James, and John to the Mount of Olives and told them to wait while he prayed. After he was “...withdrawn away from them a stone’s cast...,” Jesus beseeched God that he might renounce his imminent sacrifice and ease his suffering, bidding “Father, if thou wilt, remove this chalice from me; but yet not my will, but thine be done.”63 In his despair...
Jesus prayed for guidance so intensely “...his sweat became like great drops of blood falling down to the ground.” It was in this time of need that, “...there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening him.” Matthew and Mark related that Jesus returned to Peter, James, and John on three occasions between his prayers to find them asleep, though not from fatigue, but rather from sorrow. Resolved to his fate, Jesus awoke his followers for the final time stating, “It is enough: the hour is come: behold the Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of sinners. Rise up, let us go. Behold, he that will betray me is at hand.”

While each of Dürer’s Agony drawings include these basic elements from the episode related by the Evangelists (with the exception of the undated Berlin drawing, which does not include the sleeping disciples or the distant group of incoming soldiers), the arrangement of the disciples and Jesus’ position as he prays differs among them. According to Mark, Jesus “...fell flat on the ground; and he prayed...,” while Matthew was more specific, relating that Jesus “...fell upon his face, praying....” Luke simply stated that Jesus “...knelt down and prayed.” Dürer was careful to depict the distinctive poses mentioned by the Evangelists among the four late Agony drawings. The 1520 and 1524 renditions (Figs. 2, 5) show Jesus kneeling with arms upraised, while the 1521 and undated versions depict Jesus prostrate, face down with arms extended to either side (Figs. 3, 4).

---

64 Lk 22: 44.
65 Lk 22: 43. Luke is the only Evangelist to include the angel.
66 Mt 26: 40-46; Mk 14: 37-41; Lk 22: 45.
67 Mk 14: 41-42.
68 Mk 14: 35; Mt 26: 39.
Dürer’s *Agony in the Garden* drawings demonstrate a clear progression of style and execution over a four year period, indicating that the artist continued to rework the scenes with greater conscientiousness. From the first to the last, Dürer developed a greater uniformity of line and compositional balance, shifting elements of the narrative to better fit the horizontal orientation of the paper. In the 1520 Karlsruhe drawing (Fig. 2), Dürer depicted Jesus in the upper left corner of the composition kneeling on a flat stone surface before a jagged hillock with his body turned away from the viewer. With arms raised overhead, Jesus faces a diminutive angel who bears a crucifix and floats above a small cloud formation. To his right, three disciples rest within a sunken recess in the immediate foreground. Large rocks, plants, and a substantial tree trunk frame the sleeping figures while soldiers enter the garden through a fenced entryway in the central background. With tight, evenly spaced horizontal pen strokes, Dürer portrayed the night sky, while a large circular area above the soldiers, devoid of line, may represent a full moon, torchlight, or unfinished foliage.\(^{69}\)

Dürer’s use of crosshatching here to indicate deep shadows, particularly in the clothing of the disciples, recalls the execution of the 1520 *Christ Carrying the Cross* drawings in Florence (Figs. 6, 7), a stylistic element that is applied with less frequency in the subsequent versions. Jesus’ profile and hands are drawn plainly without modeling, while his garment, particularly the length and the folds of the lower half, are overly elaborate and disproportionate with his figure. The monumentality of the disciples in the

\(^{69}\) Dürer portrayed a crescent moon in his *Green Passion* rendition of the *Betrayal of Christ*, Vienna, Albertina (W. 300) of 1504, but no other of his depictions of the *Agony in the Garden* feature a moon, or such a large empty element. I have not yet viewed this drawing in person and so cannot determine whether the drawing has sustained abrasion in this area. Based on the reproductions, this does not appear to be the case.
foreground is also out of scale when compared to their relative size and distance from Jesus, leading to an incongruous suggestion of space and depth. Winkler considered the large scale of Jesus’ companions a compositional weakness in the construction of the drawing, compelling Dürer to draw another rendition the following year to resolve this formal issue.

Dürer adjusted the relative size of Jesus to his disciples in the 1521 Frankfurt Agony in the Garden (Fig. 3) by moving Jesus’ attendants further into the middle ground, decreasing their size, and arranging them in a compact semi-circle. This effectively deemphasized their presence and thus allowed Jesus’ figure to have greater prominence in the composition. Jesus’ pose also changed dramatically. Lying prostrate and face down with arms outstretched to either side, Jesus is positioned at a diagonal angle on a smooth rock platform at the apex of a series of ascending graduated outcroppings. Above Jesus’ head, in the upper left corner, an angel floats atop swirling clouds and holds a chalice while looking down with tilted head toward Jesus’ recumbent figure. Mist emanates from the cloud in which the angel appears, which both obscures the landscape along the upper

---


71 Winkler, *Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers*, 4: 28, cat. 797.

72 The iconography of Jesus lying prostrate is developed out of the Byzantine tradition and occurred with some frequency during the Middle Ages. A drawing from the workshop of Michael Wolgemut by the so-called Master of 1483 is comparable to Dürer’s first rendition of the scene in a 1508–1509 woodcut. The rarity of the motif combined with the similarity between Dürer’s work and this drawing suggests that Dürer may have known of it from Wolgemut’s shop. See Rainer Schoch, *100 Meisterzeichnungen aus der Graphischen Sammlung der Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg*, exh. cat. (Nuremberg: Verlag des Germanischen Nationalmuseums, 2008), 100–101, cat. 33; Hans Dickel, *Zeichnen vor Dürer die Zeichnungen des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts in der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen*, (Petersberg: Imhof, 2009), 230–232, cat. 79.
left background and adds an otherworldly element to the atmosphere.\textsuperscript{73} The center of the drawing, left open on the Karlsruhe sheet to indicate recession into space (Fig. 2), is now filled with elements from nature, while Judas and the soldiers approach from the upper right background.

Dürer reduced his crosshatching to a minimum in this work, relying instead on uniform parallel pen strokes to indicate the dark atmosphere, the form and details of the landscape, and the shading within the figures’ garments.\textsuperscript{74} The consistent use of line departs from his 1520 Karlsruhe work and corresponds to his other Passion drawings from 1521 onward.

The Berlin Agony (Fig. 4) is drawn on a square sheet and is without date or monogram. It features the same motif of Jesus praying in a prostrate position, but shares the stylistic attributes of Dürer’s 1520 oblong drawings and may be considered either an unfinished drawing or a preparatory study for the 1521 Frankfurt drawing. Dürer focused solely on Jesus and the emergence of the angel at the upper left, omitting the three

\textsuperscript{73} Stephanie Buck made the observation that Dürer’s extensive application of this mist was a newly invented motif, emphasizing the duality of the spiritual and earthly realm represented by the ephemeral haze and the apostles, but which also served to convey Jesus’ dual nature as both human and divine. Stephanie Buck, \textit{Wendepunkte deutscher Zeichenkunst: Spätgotik und Renaissance im Städel}, exh. cat. (Frankfurt am Main: Städelisches Kunstinstitut, 2003), 110.

\textsuperscript{74} From my own observations, Dürer completed this drawing with light grey ink, which appears rather aqueous in areas. Elements such as the toes of Jesus’ left foot have been reworked with the ink, likely by Dürer. The monogram and date to the left of Jesus’ legs appear to be in the same ink as the rest of the drawing, while a small faded monogram in the lower right corner is from a later hand. Buck, \textit{Wendepunkte deutscher Zeichenkunst}, 108. The verso of this drawing features a sketch for a coat of arms with accompanying color notations. For instance, “der rock ist plo (blau) und do e(r) tzerschnitt is mit golt gefutert” while other areas were to be “gell, weis, Schwartz, rot.” See Edmund Schilling, \textit{Katalog der deutschen Zeichnungen: alte Meister} (München: Prestel, 1973), 1: 29, cat. 101. Shortly after the entry in his diary in which he noted the completion of the \textit{Oblong Passion} drawings, Dürer wrote that he “painted for the Englishman his coat of arms and he gave me 1 fl.” Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 120; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 172. The verso of the 1521 Frankfurt drawing has been identified as the preparatory sketch for this painting that Dürer mentioned. The Englishman to whom Dürer referred has been identified as a member of the Abarrow family of North Charford, Hampshire by S. Michael Levey. Schilling, \textit{Katalog der deutschen Zeichnungen}, 1: 30, cat. 101.
Apostles, the advancing soldiers, and the extensive vista. The isolated surroundings are predominately constructed of various rock formations, while the upper and lower halves of the drawing are left empty. Along the bottom edge, an inscription by a later hand reads, “albert Dürer hant selw.”

Past authors have questioned the authenticity and quality of the Berlin Agony, mainly as a result of the drawing’s incompleteness. Bock considered the work of poor merit and thought it was an unfinished version of the 1521 Frankfurt drawing. Bock’s critical assessment led the Tietzes to doubt Dürer’s authorship. In their opinion, the drawing displayed incongruities between the design concept and the fragmentary execution and was therefore imitative. In contrast, Winkler considered the Berlin drawing to be an unfinished preparatory work for the 1521 Frankfurt version and dated it to around 1520, based on stylistic similarities with drawings datable to the same year. Panofsky thought the drawing was of this period as well and identified it as preparatory, but also had questions regarding its authenticity. In the most extensive discussion of the drawing to date, Hans Mielke noted the hesitancy of line in some areas, specifically Jesus’ garment, but suggested that the overall structure of the drawing was Düreresque. He believed that the articulation of Jesus’ head and hands as well as the representation of

---

75 Anzelewsky and Mielke, *Albrecht Dürer*, 105, cat. 101. No direct translation is provided in the Berlin catalogue, but roughly means that Dürer’s hand created the work.

76 Ibid.


the angel and the setting, particularly the use of crosshatching to provide structure to the rocks, pointed to the drawing’s authenticity.\textsuperscript{80}

While preliminary sketches like the Berlin Agony do not survive for the other extant Oblong Passion drawings, it would not have been incongruous for Dürer to create a preliminary drawing of this motif as he had only designed Jesus in a prostrate position for the Agony once before, approximately 13 years earlier (Figs. 59).\textsuperscript{81} His return to this design in the late Oblong Passion drawings may signify two possible objectives. First, that Dürer sought to depict an alternative aspect of Jesus’ suffering or a shift in dramatic emphasis, as he did in the two oblong 1520 drawings of Christ Carrying the Cross, and second, that Dürer perhaps considered Jesus lying prostrate more suitable to the landscape format.

Jesus’ prostrate pose not only echoed the horizontal orientation of the drawing, but also provided a solution to the somewhat awkward scale and spatial depth of the 1520 Agony, which was manifest in the monumentality of the disciples. In the 1521 Frankfurt drawing, Jesus’ figure and the steep stone incline he occupies assumes substantial

\textsuperscript{80} Anzelewsky and Mielke, Albrecht Dürer, 105, cat. 101. Mielke also noted that the fragment of a watermark under Jesus’ feet of a star atop a rod was derived from northern Italy. With this in mind, he tentatively remarked that the drawing could have been made in Nuremberg before the trip, however, the close relationship in style and iconography of the drawing to the 1521 Frankfurt version suggests they are contemporaneous. Also, it is likely that Dürer brought his own stock of paper with him to the Netherlands, which he replenished while there. For instance, in the diary Dürer recorded that he spent 6 pf. for paper while in Aachen in 1520. Conway, Literary Remains, 107; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 159. An alternative would be that paper Dürer purchased while in the Netherlands had been imported from areas in northern Italy. Even though paper mills were established in the Netherlands in Huy an der Maas in 1405 and Nijmegen in 1428, the Netherlands continued to import paper well into the sixteenth century. See Fritz Koreny, Early Netherlandish Drawing from Jan van Eyck to Hieronymus Bosch, exh. cat. (Antwerp: Rubenshuis, 2002), 11; Guido Messling, “Drawing in Germany: From Van Eyck to Dürer,” in Van Eyck to Dürer: The Influence of Early Netherlandish Painting on European Art, 1430-1530, by Till-Holger Borchert, exh. cat. Bruges, Groeningemuseum (London: Thames & Hudson, 2011), 96.

\textsuperscript{81} Around 1508 or 1509, Dürer produced a woodcut of the scene for an Agony in the Garden that may have been intended for his Small Passion series, but which was replaced by a design of Jesus kneeling. Dürer likely did not use this woodcut in the final series, “...presumably because it was spoilt in the cutting.” Wölfflin, The Art of Albrecht Dürer, 260.
pictorial space, covering roughly two-thirds of the drawing. His voluminous and elevated presence, combined with the reduction in scale of the disciples and their recessed position into the middle ground resulted in a more realistic sense of space and depth.\textsuperscript{82} Although Dürer revised the relative scale of the figures, he continued to modify the scene. In 1524 he designed another oblong rendition of the Agony in which he returned to the motif of Jesus kneeling before the angel with the disciples once again placed in the foreground (Fig. 5).

As in the earliest \textit{Agony in the Garden} in Karlsruhe, this last version depicts Jesus kneeling before the angel with arms upraised. However in contrast with all of the previous oblong \textit{Agony} drawings, Dürer positioned Jesus frontally in three-quarter view, thereby allowing his countenance to be seen by the viewer.\textsuperscript{83} Floating on a small cloud at the left, the angel presents a chalice surmounted by a diminutive crucifix and is level with Jesus, rather than above. The disciples rest to his right and are stacked vertically along the edge of the drawing. This differs from previous works that feature a more semi-circular formation. The design of the sheet is framed by a series of large trees, one to the left and two at the right, while a distant vista is visible in the central background. A clear and unobstructed path through the center of the drawing leads to Jesus’ powerful figure. Dürer added a long cloak to Jesus’ attire that stretches at a distance behind him, which combined with his upraised arms, forms the shape of a triangle.

\textsuperscript{82} Stephanie Buck suggested that Jesus’ oblique position made it appear as though he were floating and that the apostles appear paradoxically closer to the viewer even though they are depicted further back and are of a smaller scale than Jesus. Buck, \textit{Wendepunkte deutscher Zeichenkunst}, 110.

\textsuperscript{83} Dürer previously depicted Jesus’ face in three-quarter view in the \textit{Agony in the Garden} depictions for his \textit{Large Passion}, \textit{Engraved Passion}, and for an undated figure study in Vienna, Albertina (W. 598).
These formal elements, combined with the marginalization of the disciples at the right, assert Jesus as the main focal point of the narrative. Dürer’s economical use of line is consistent with his other late Oblong Passion drawings as very little crosshatching is used in favor of uniformly spaced parallel pen strokes. Dürer’s balance of light and shadow, the coherence of design, and clarity of line demonstrate Dürer’s steady progression from the complex and varied execution of the 1520 Agony to one that has attained order and uniformity.

Dürer depicted the Agony in the Garden on numerous other occasions throughout his career in both printed and drawn formats. Each of his Passion series included the scene, although the drawing for the Green Passion has since been lost (Figs. 60-62). Dürer also made an etching of the subject in 1515 (Fig. 63), for which two contemporaneous drawings were likely made in preparation (Figs. 64-65). In all but his 1508-1509 woodcut of Jesus in a prone position (Fig. 59), Dürer depicted him kneeling, but varied the positions of his arms and hands. Typically, Jesus’ figure is turned toward the left (except for the etching) and faces a rock formation and angel who bears either a chalice (Large Passion), or a crucifix (Engraved and Small Passion). In contrast, a chalice surmounted by a cross sits on top of a jagged rock before Jesus as if on an altar in the 1515 etching and the corresponding preparatory drawings. As a result of the vertical orientation, the positions of Jesus, the apostles, and the angel are limited. Dürer’s method

84 A 1504 drawing of the Agony in which Jesus kneels with arms upraised was linked to Dürer and associated with the Green Passion (W. 298). Winkler and Koschatzky and Strobl considered it autograph, while most others consider it a copy or a drawing by Hans von Kulmbach. Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana. See also Widauer in Robison and Schröder, Albrecht Dürer, 149n1.

85 Other drawings include an undated study of Jesus kneeling, dated to around 1515, Vienna, Albertina (W. 598) and a 1518 sketch of the scene, Paris, Louvre (W. 586).

86 Dürer’s 1518 drawing of the Agony also features a chalice surmounted by a cross.
was to stack the figures, typically with the apostles along the lower edge of the frame with Jesus in the center.\textsuperscript{87} This strategy left little space within which to visually separate Jesus from his sleeping companions.

Dürer’s 1515 etching shows the most divergence among the early group of \textit{Agony} depictions (Fig. 63). Jesus’ figure is monumental; the disciples have moved to the middle ground behind Jesus, the angel’s large-scale head and wings appear disarticulated from its body, while the chalice now rests on a stone. The compositional orientation of the etching faces to the right as a result of the printing process. Compared to engraving, which requires the forceful application of a burin to inscribe the plate, etching is less arduous because acid bites the artist’s design into the surface. Dürer used the medium to apply calligraphic lines similar to drawing and his employment of variable line thickness and ample crosshatching produced significant contrast between shadow and light.

Perhaps it was the new medium or the new compositional framework that sparked Dürer’s creativity. His experimentation with the placement of Jesus and the apostles and the execution of line in the 1515 etching continued in the \textit{Oblong Passion} drawings. By exploiting the horizontal orientation, Dürer avoided stacking his figures and physically separated Jesus from his apostles to a greater degree. This spatial distance suits the narrative of the Gospel story better in that Jesus could actually be “...withdrawn away from them a stone’s cast...,” and could return to wake them three times.\textsuperscript{88} In this way, the widened framework supports the passage of time in the Biblical accounts more so than

\textsuperscript{87} The exception to this is the 1515 etching wherein the apostles rest in the middle ground.

\textsuperscript{88} Lk 22: 41.
the vertically oriented works. Further, by positioning Jesus at a diagonal away from his apostles, Dürer could place more emphasis on the solitary nature of his suffering.

Dürer also capitalized on the oblong format by treating the landscape as integral to the narrative. Previously, Dürer typically depicted a rocky hillock and foliage along the left edge, while a distant vista appeared in the right background. As Dürer made little use of the middle ground, the succession to the background was quick in all of his depictions. In contrast, Dürer’s *Oblong Passion Agony* drawings feature more panoramic views with movement undulating through the landscape. The viewpoint has also been shifted higher. Much like the late *Christ Carrying the Cross* drawings, the viewer is not suddenly confronted by the episode, but can “...absorb the spectacle as though watching a stream flowing by...” and can contemplate Jesus’ isolation, both physical and mental.89

**The Bearing of the Body**

Dürer’s three *Oblong Passion* drawings depict Jesus’ body being carried to the tomb by his followers, a transitional moment between Jesus’ removal from the cross and his internment. This rarely represented episode differs the most from Dürer’s previous Passion scenes in narrative moment, emotional tenor, and setting (Fig. 8-10). The drawings are most often referred to in the literature as either Depositions or Entombments, although they depict neither event.90 While foreign designations, such as

89 This excerpt is from Panofsky’s observation on the *Oblong Passion* quoted at the beginning of the chapter.

90 White refers to the drawings as Entombments as do the English translations of Knackfuss, Wölflin, and Anzelewsky. Panofsky and Strauss call the drawings Depositions. The Tietzes and Winkler used the term *Grabtragung* while Flechsig referred to the drawings as *Grablegung*, meaning Entombment. In French, they are referred to as *Mise au tombeau* (Entombment). See Fedja Anzelewsky, Matthias Mende, and Paul Eeckhout, eds., *Albert Dürer aux Pays-Bas: son voyage (1520-21), son influence* (Brussels: Palais des
Grabtragung (grave bearing) and Cristo al Sepolcro (Christ brought to the tomb) are more applicable referents, I have chosen to discuss Dürer’s drawings using a title more common among Byzantine scholars, the Bearing of the Body. This connotes the liminal quality of the event to a greater extent than the canonical labels for the drawings as well as Dürer’s emphasis on Jesus’ corporeality and the multiple participants involved in the procession.

The Gospels do not mention the moment during which Jesus is wrapped within or placed atop a large shroud and physically carried to the sepulcher. In the timeline of the Passion narrative, this event would have occurred between the Lamentation—when Jesus’ body was laid on the ground while the Virgin, John the Evangelist, Mary Magdalen, and other followers mourned his death—and the Entombment, the moment when Jesus’ body was placed within the tomb or lowered into a sarcophagus.

Beaux-Arts, 1977), 78, cat. 91. In Italian they are called Cristo Portato al Sepolcro. See Keith Andrews, Disegni tedeschi da Schongauer a Liebermann, exh. cat. (Florence: Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi, 1988), 24, cat. 19. I have outlined the differences here to illustrate that there is no canonical way in which to refer to the drawings as even the foreign terms have various connotations.

91 Mt. 27: 57-61, Mk 15: 42-47, Lk 23: 50-56, Jn 19: 38-42. For the full Gospel entries see below, notes 93 and 94.

92 From the tenth century in western tradition onward, the interment was more commonly depicted as the lowering of Jesus’ body into a sarcophagus rather than the rock-cut tomb, which remained popular in Byzantine iconography and is in keeping with the Gospel accounts (Mt 27:60; Mk 15: 46; Lk 23:53). See Anne Derbes, “Byzantine Art and the Dugento: Iconographic Sources of the Passion Scenes in Italian Painted Crosses” (diss., University of Virginia, 1980), 288. Derbes noted the Entombment of the Egbert Codex, c. 890, Trier, Stadbibliothek, Ms. 24, fol. 84 (Schiller, II, fig. 544) as an early western example wherein Jesus is lowered into a sarcophagus. For a further discussion of the proposed reasons for a change in the motif between the East and the West, see Derbes, “Byzantine Art and the Dugento,” 289-290. It was suggested by Mary Ann Graeve in her essay, “The Stone of Unction in Caravaggio’s Painting for the Chiesa Nuova,” The Art Bulletin, 40 (1958): 230, and later by William Forsyth that crusaders in Constantinople who were aware of the stone of unction (the relic on which Jesus’ body was anointed) had influenced the switch in iconography from the rock-cut tomb to the sarcophagus in Western art. William H. Forsyth, The Entombment of Christ: French Sculptures of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), 8.
According to the Gospels, after Jesus’ death Joseph of Arimathea appealed to Pontius Pilate for the release of his body to inter Jesus’ remains before sundown and the beginning of the Jewish Sabbath. Other witnesses included Mary Magdalen and Mary the mother of Joseph, both mentioned by Matthew and Mark (although Matthew referred to the latter as “the other Mary”), while Luke mentioned the witnesses in general terms as the women whom had followed Jesus from Galilee. John’s more elaborate narration included Nicodemus, a member of the Sanhedrin and follower of Jesus, who aided Joseph of Arimathea’s endeavor to inter Jesus’ body and, in accordance with Jewish custom, contributed a large quantity of spices for the burial. John also noted that the tomb was in a garden near Golgotha, an ideal location for its close proximity to the crucifixion site.

---

93 “And when it was evening, there came a certain rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was a disciple of Jesus. He went to Pilate, and asked the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded that the body be delivered. And Joseph taking the body, wrapped it up in a clean linen cloth. And laid it in his own new monument, which he had hewed out in a rock. And he rolled a great stone to the door of the monument, and went his way. And there was there Mary Magdalen, and the other Mary sitting over against the sepulchre (Mt. 27: 57-61);”

94 “And after these things, Joseph of Arimathea (because he was a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews) besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus. And Pilate gave leave. He came therefore, and took away the body of Jesus. And Nicodemus came, (he who at the first came to Jesus by night,) bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. They took therefore the body of Jesus, and bound it in linen cloths, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now there was in the place where he was crucified, a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein no man yet had been laid. There, therefore, because of the parasceve of the Jews, they laid Jesus, because the sepulchre was nigh at hand (Jn 19: 38-42).”
Since the Evangelists did not describe the bodily act of conveying Jesus’ corpse to the tomb, Dürer’s drawings of the event build upon their brief accounts by illustrating how Jesus’ body was carried and by whom, as well as how many additional people might have accompanied the cortège and how the surrounding landscape might have appeared.

The three extant drawings of the Bearing of the Body from the Oblong Passion, each monogrammed and dated, vary considerably in terms of viewpoint, scale, and level of finish. While the Nuremberg and Florence drawings are considered autograph (Figs. 8, 9), the Frankfurt rendition, a compositional mélange of the other two, is usually deemed a copy or a variation done by a close follower for reasons of execution, compositional arrangement, and style (Fig. 10). Generally considered the first of the three, the Nuremberg drawing depicts a procession of approximately twelve figures arranged in a frieze along the picture plane. Left of the center of the composition, three figures carry the elongated body of Jesus on top of a large shroud in the direction of the tomb entrance located in the lower left foreground. Just inside the sepulcher a figure greets them, while the remaining mourners follow behind Jesus’ body. Identifiable participants of the

---


96 Hans Hoff believed the Nuremberg drawing was the last of the three extant drawings. Hans Hoff, Die Passionsdarstellungen Albrecht Dürers (Heidelberg: Emerling, 1898), 87. Winkler thought the Frankfurt copy to be an intermediary drawing between the Nuremberg and Florence renditions as the composition of the Florence version is more developed and the figures smaller in scale. Friedrich Winkler, Albrecht Dürer, Leben und Werk (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1957), 309. This view was reiterated in the catalogue edited by Anzelewsky, Mende and Eeckhout, Albert Dürer aux Pays-Bas: son voyage (1520-1521), son influence, 78, cat. 91, where the authors suggested that because the Nuremberg drawing was close in composition to Mantegna’s Entombment engraving that this was the first of the drawings to be completed, since the subsequent renditions were more freely rendered.
procession include Joseph of Arimathea, who holds the shroud at Jesus’ feet, Nicodemus, who carries a large container of unguents, Mary Magdalene, who holds an ointment jar, the Virgin, whose face is partially covered, and following behind her, John the Evangelist. A vast landscape featuring a vineyard, shrubbery, and trees dashed sporadically in the open pasture indicate the topography through which the procession advanced from the hill of Golgotha, pictured in the distance. A large, lone tree bisects the composition down the center, while a smooth rock surface representing the exterior of the tomb serves as the backdrop for both the corpse bearers and Jesus’ lifeless body.

Dürer greatly modified the composition of the subsequent Florence Bearing of the Body drawing by including monumental architectural components, increasing the size of the tomb, adding figures, decreasing their scale, and shifting the viewpoint to a higher level (Fig. 9). Rather than compose the entire procession into a strict frieze, Dürer arranged the foremost participants at an oblique angle to the picture plane. Four bearers cradle Jesus’ foreshortened body in the shroud, which shifts Jesus’ torso into an upright position, angled toward the viewer. A woman with arms upraised in lamentation supplants the tree as the central axis of the composition and visually links the two figural groups together. The limited gestures and closeness of the mourners following behind this central figure suggest the reserved and slow progress with which the second group advances. In contrast with the Nuremberg version, there is a large arched portal along the right edge through which the mourners pass. From this structure, a long arcade extends.

---

97 I believe the presence of a vineyard has Eucharistic undertones and the lifting of Jesus’ body is akin to the priest elevating the host during mass. See Barbara G. Lane, “‘Depositio et Elevatio’: The Symbolism of the Seilern Triptych,” The Art Bulletin 57, no. 1 (1975): 21–30. In her essay, Lane discussed Robert Campin’s Seilern Triptych, which depicts an Entombment as the central panel, an empty cross on the left wing and a Resurrection on the right. In the center panel Christ appears above a sarcophagus. Since the Middle Ages the sarcophagus has been linked to the altar on which Mass is performed, while the gold pattern of grapevines is a reference to the Eucharistic wine also used during Mass.
diagonally toward the middle ground, where it intersects with a distant building. These additional architectural elements, including the prominence of the rock-cut tomb to the left, frame the composition and provide convincing spatial depth. While the Florence Bearing of the Body is executed more loosely than its Nuremberg counterpart, the arrangement of the figures, landscape, and architectural features are more visually complex and well-structured.

The third drawing amalgamates the Nuremberg and Florence versions (Fig. 10). Like the Nuremberg drawing, Jesus’ body is carried by three figures and a large tree is prominently placed left of the central axis. The smooth surface of a large boulder that rests adjacent to the tomb entrance provides a backdrop for two of the bearers. In a similar manner to the Florence rendition, a group of mourners that follow Jesus’ body emerge from a manmade structure, now a wooden gate from which a high picket fence extends into the distance.

At first glance, this drawing appears to be a quick intermediary sketch done by the artist because it incorporates a pastiche of motifs from Dürer’s autograph Nuremberg and Frankfurt drawings. However, on closer inspection, several problematic instances point to a less-skilled artist as its creator. For instance, the figures of Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus depicted in the right corner of the Florence drawing have been transposed and placed in reverse in the lower left corner of the Frankfurt drawing. Also, the poses of Mary Magdalene and the Virgin in the Nuremberg drawing have been similarly repurposed for the Virgin and John the Evangelist in the Frankfurt rendition. Small inclusions such as the shrubbery growing from above the tomb and trees dotting the landscape also appear to be derivative.
The ineffective use of landscape elements to achieve the illusion of depth also points away from Dürer’s hand. Additionally, while the execution of line mimics quick rendering, the application is quite tentative in areas, for instance in the garment of John the Evangelist. This handling indicates the artist was actually working much slower than the sketchy quality of the drawing might suggest. While it is clear that the Frankfurt drawing is related compositionally to the Nuremberg and Florence versions, the drawing’s composite appearance suggests it is more likely a pastiche of the two extant drawings by a close follower rather than a copy of a lost original by Dürer.

Dürer’s choice to depict the Bearing of the Body is curious since the theme was less common during the sixteenth century compared to representations of the Deposition, Lamentation, and Entombment and was generally rare, particularly among painters and printers working before Dürer in Germany. The earliest known renditions of this

98 Martin Sonnabend, the Head of Prints and Drawings before 1750 at the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt, discussed this drawing with me and pointed out the tentative nature of the artist’s use of line and the awkward quality of the landscape. He likened the drawing style to Hans Schäufelein, however he noted this identification was unlikely, as Schäufelein had already left Dürer’s studio by 1521. Martin Sonnabend, interview by author, Frankfurt, Germany, July 23, 2012.

99 The monogram and date are considered spurious, but the ink appears to be the same used for the drawing. While the ink has not been scientifically examined, this consistency suggests that the same artist who drew the composition also signed the work with Dürer’s monogram. Areas of the design where shadow lines overlap figures and objects, such as the Virgin’s cast shadow over the small child, suggests that the drawing was built up in stages rather than copied and may indicate that this drawing is a pastiche done by a student or follower. This building up of the composition could also account for the lack of clearly articulated spatial depth between the foreground and background.

100 In Germany, the tradition of the Holy Graves—monumental sculpture representing Christ’s effigy placed atop a centrally located sarcophagus surrounded by women, angels, and sleeping soldiers—was more prevalent than representations of the Bearing of the Body. The theme grew in popularity during the fourteenth century and in some cases the sculpture was portable. These arrangements cannot be considered representations of the Bearing of the Body, or as William Forsyth has noted, strictly Entombments, but rather a conflation of elements from the liturgy, including the Depositio, the Elevatio, and the Visitatio Sepulchri. For a further discussion see William H. Forsyth, The Entombment of Christ, 13-21. Variations of the theme can also be found in France, where scenes of the Entombment were popularized in monumental sculpture during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Often commissioned by patrons to be placed in private chapels where masses could be said posthumously in their honor, the theme of the Entombment was in its highest demand in the years surrounding the turn of the sixteenth century, but waned in popularity later into the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. See Ibid., 4. While many of the sculptural programs
episode are found in Byzantine manuscript illumination from Constantinople dating to the end of the ninth century, such as the Chludov Psalter and the *Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus* (Figs. 66, 67). Each portrays the two principal figures of Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus from John’s Gospel bearing Jesus’ tightly wound body before a rock-cut tomb. The absence of other participants indicates that the focus of these early works is largely on the isolated act of conveying the body. As the visual iconography of the Bearing of the Body developed, the involvement of mourners, as well as the presentation of Jesus’ body before his entombment, particularly without wrappings, became especially significant for devotional purposes.

101 The representation of the *Bearing of the Body* from the Chludov Psalter depicts Psalm 88:6, “Thou hast laid me in the lowest pit, in darkness, in the deeps.” The episode of the Bearing of the Body is also often combined with representations of the Lamentation and Entombment, where Jesus is shown in the process of either being laid down by his bearers to allow for a final moment of mourning, or shown being lifted to proceed into the tomb. This kind of ambiguity in classifying the appropriate moment of either stasis or motion makes an overview of the subject difficult. To date, no comprehensive treatment of the subject has been explored. For brief overviews of the theme, see the entries in Louis Réau, *Iconographie de L’art Chrétien*, (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1956), 2: 525; Curt Schweicher, “Grablegung Christi,” in *Lexicon Der Christlichen Ikonographie* (Rom: Herder, 1970), 2: 191; Gertrud Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art* (London: Lund Humphries, 1972), 2: 168.

102 While both renditions restrict the event to two bearers, the miniature from the *Homilies of Gregory* incorporates the scene within a larger narrative depiction of Christ’s Passion and also subtly shifts the emphasis of the action from the moment of entry into the tomb to a pause before the ingress. According to Kurt Weitzmann, this slight variation served to present Jesus “…for the sake of the beholder’s devotion in order to permit him a last glance at the dead Christ.” Kurt Weitzmann, “The Origin of the Threnos,” *De Artibus Opuscula XL, Essays in Honor of Erwin Panofsky*, ed. Millard Meiss (New York, 1961), 479. See Weitzmann also for the gradual development of the Lamentation as independent from scenes of the Entombment in Byzantine art.
In Italy, depictions of the theme were adapted from Byzantine models and occasionally found on the apron panels of thirteenth-century painted crosses (Fig. 68).\textsuperscript{103} In these instances, the addition of a procession with several figures added a tenor of grief to the event that was previously lacking in the earlier models.\textsuperscript{104} Mantegna and Raphael’s later representations of the episode built on these funerary characteristics, adding overt displays of mourning among the participants (Figs. 69, 70).

According to Isolde Lübbeke, Dürer was the first German artist to represent the Bearing of the Body in his \textit{Oblong Passion} drawings, but noted that Hans Burgkmair was working on a \textit{predella} of the subject simultaneously for an altarpiece that has since been lost (Fig. 71).\textsuperscript{105} In her catalogue of early German paintings held in the Thyssen-Bornemisza collection, she suggested an Italian source for Dürer’s drawings that likely

\textsuperscript{103} For examples, see Evelyn Sandberg Vavalà, \textit{La croce dipinta Italiana e l'iconografia della passione} (Verona, Casa editrice Apollo, 1929), 298; Erwin Panofsky, \textit{Early Netherlandish Painting: Its Origins and Character} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953, 1: Pl. 10, fig. 24; Derbes, “Byzantine Art and the Dugento.” Derbes noted that the scenes associated with Jesus’ burial were particularly popular as part of the program for Dugento crosses with full narratives. Ibid., 275.

\textsuperscript{104} Derbes noted that scenes of the Entombment became increasingly more emotional and links the events of the Crusades, particularly the threats to the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, to the episodes’ increasing popularity within narrative scenes of the Passion. Derbes, “Byzantine Art and the Dugento,” 288. See also Anne Derbes, \textit{Picturing the Passion in Late Medieval Italy: Narrative Painting, Franciscan Ideologies, and the Levant} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

\textsuperscript{105} Isolde Lübbeke and Margaret Thomas Will, \textit{Early German Painting, 1350-1550. The Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection} (London: Sotheby’s Publications, 1991), 177. Winkler had earlier concluded that this similarity was likely coincidental and Lübbeke noted that Dürer was not influenced by Burgkmair’s composition. See Winkler, \textit{Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers}, no. 796, 28. Karl Feuchtmayr suggested that the \textit{predella} panel belonged to Burgkmair’s \textit{Altarpiece of the Crucifixion} of 1519 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), however the scale of the figures, the treatment of the haloes, and the disparate scale of the two works suggests otherwise. A drawing in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, of the Resurrection for an altarpiece without wings features a \textit{predella} of the \textit{Bearing of the Body}, however, Jesus’ body is depicted as already half-way into the rock-cut tomb and so is more of an Entombment. See Per Bjurström, ed., \textit{Drawings in Swedish Public Collections: German Drawings} (Stockholm: Allmaenna Foerlaget, 1972), 1: no. 29. Lübbeke believed that the presence of this drawing, and the corresponding painted \textit{predella} panel in the Staatsgalerie, Augsburg, indicated that Burgkmair’s 1521 \textit{Christ Carried to the Tomb} was for a similar, now lost, altarpiece. Burgkmair’s panel is quite similar to Dürer’s Nuremberg drawing, particularly in the positioning of the figures in a frieze, Jesus’ elongated body, the central tree that bisects the composition, and in the postures of the three bearers. However, in contrast, Burgkmair placed the entry to the rock-cut tomb behind the procession and included the cityscape of Jerusalem.
would have been available in the Netherlands by means of the art trade, while a similar Italian variation of the theme must have been available in Augsburg for Burgkmair. Likewise, Lübbeke believed that the same source must have also been accessible to Hans Holbein the Younger, who featured the scene around the same period on the outer panel of his Passion Altarpiece of about 1524 (Fig. 72).

Dürer’s decision to depict the Bearing of the Body instead of the Lamentation or Entombment was in contrast with the choice of episodes he featured in his previous Passion series. The closest rendition of the theme in Dürer’s oeuvre prior to the 1521 drawings is his 1497 woodcut Entombment from the Large Passion (Fig. 73). There, Jesus is carried by three bearers to an open sarcophagus situated within a rock-cut tomb in the right middle ground. A group of mourners behind Jesus advance from the upper left middle ground toward the right foreground where the Virgin has fallen. While staring agape at Jesus’ face, John the Evangelist stands behind the Virgin and supports her rounded back. The densely populated scene features elaborate landscape details that obscure and overwhelm the main subject. For instance, the complex arrangements of the

106 Lübbeke, Early German Painting, 177.

107 Ibid. Hans Holbein the Younger, Exterior of a Winged Altarpiece with Eight Images of Christ’s Passion, Basel, Kunstmuseum. The circumstances of the altarpiece’s commission and where it was originally kept are unknown. It was a gift to the Öffentliche Kunstsammlung Basel in 1770 from the city of Basel. See, Christian Müller, Hans Holbein the Younger: the Basel Years, 1515-1532 (Munich: Prestel, 2006), 324-327. The last of eight scenes and located in the lower right corner of the right closed panel, Holbein presents a frontal view of Jesus’ limp body as the three bearers struggle to bring him toward the cave entrance, directly behind. Only the Virgin and John the Evangelist are recognizable among the mourners to the left of the tomb. While the large jagged rock and reduction of figures is reminiscent of Byzantine examples, scholars have noted the influence of Mantegna’s Entombment engraving, more directly Giovanni Antonio da Brescia’s engraved copy after Mantegna printed in reverse, and Dürer’s woodcut Entombment from the Small Passion. Bätschmann and Griener noted the difficulties in dating the altarpiece as a signature and date are lacking and no documentary evidence is linked to the work. It has been suggested that Holbein completed it prior to 1520 or after his journey to France in 1524. See Oskar Bätschmann and Pascal Griener, Hans Holbein (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 52; Jochen Sander, Hans Holbein D.J.: Tafelmaler in Basel 1515-1532 (Munich: Hirmer, 2005), 239-240.
overlapping figures that carry Jesus nearly cover the entire lower half of his body. The
dramatic focus of the print is less about the viewer’s access to Jesus’ corporeality and
more about the grief of his followers, particularly the Virgin’s. By mirroring Jesus’
concave torso and lifeless arms with the limp pose of his adjacent mother, Dürer alerts
the viewer to the key devotional element of the image.108

Dürer’s late Oblong Passion drawings of the Bearing of the Body do not encourage the viewer to relate to or linger on the Virgin’s grief, but rather to focus on the
ceremonial aspect of the scene in its entirety. Dürer’s arrangement of the figures
emphasizes the physical act of conveying Jesus’ body to the tomb and the slow
movement of the procession that follows. By depicting the event within a wide landscape
setting that clearly describes the long passage the figures traversed to reach the tomb,
Dürer communicates the progress of time, an element of the narrative that was less
significant for his 1497 woodcut depiction.

The Last Supper

Two years after his return to Nuremberg from the Netherlands, Dürer made a
drawing of the Last Supper that is associated with the Oblong Passion, monogrammed
and dated 1523 (Fig. 1). In this same year Dürer published a Last Supper woodcut in

108 Compared with the later 1521 renditions, a more Italianate influence is present in this woodcut. For
instance, the swooning Madonna of Dürer’s early print is similar to the motif found in Mantegna’s
Entombment engraving of around 1465-70. In addition, Dürer appears to have modeled the face of John the
Evangelist on Mantegna’s figure, particularly in the strict profile view and the open-mouthed gape. Dürer’s
interest in Mantegna’s work during this period is evident by the extant drawn copies he completed around
1494-5 after the Italian artist’s Battle of the Sea Gods and Bacchanal with Silenus engravings. See
Panofsky, Life and Art, 31-32. There is no extant documentary evidence to indicate that Dürer also knew of
Mantegna’s Entombment during this early stage, but can be surmised by the associations just discussed.
Dürer’s quotation from Mantegna’s Entombment for the full-length figure of John the Evangelist in his
Crucifixion engraving of 1508 does however show that he was aware of the engraving by at least that date.
horizontal format (Fig. 74). Since the drawing and woodcut bear the same date, subject, and orientation, scholars typically consider the drawing a preparatory design for the woodcut. Further, given their thematic relationship and contemporaneous production, scholars have interpreted the works as evidence for Dürer’s formation of an entirely new woodcut Passion series in oblong format. In this interpretation, the Last Supper drawing was the only one from the Oblong Passion translated into a printed image.

The drawing and the woodcut represent two separate episodes from Jesus’ last meal with his disciples. While his followers believed they had gathered to celebrate the Passover Feast, Jesus recognized that it was the final moment of communion with his disciples before the events of his Passion. As such, Jesus performed three significant deeds during the meal, including the institution of the sacrament of the Eucharist through the consecration of the bread and wine. According to Mark, “...whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread; and blessing, broke, and gave to them, and said: Take ye. This is my body. And having taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them. And they all drank of it. And he said to them: This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many (Mk 14: 22-24).”

Jesus’ second act during the meal was the unexpected revelation that a once-trusted member of the group was a traitor. Jesus said, “Amen, amen I say to you, one of you shall betray me (Jn 13:21),” at which point the apostles “began to inquire among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing (Lk 22: 23).” Jesus’ third
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109 Among the scholars who have suggested the drawings were preparatory for a printed series are Wölfflin, The Art of Albrecht Dürer, 257–262; Tietze and Tietze-Conrat, Kritisches Verzeichnis der Werke Albrecht Dürers, 2: 26, cat. 820; Panofsky, Life and Art, 218; Friedrich Winkler, Albrecht Dürer, Leben und Werk, 326; Fedja Anzelewsky, Dürer, His Art and Life, 212–214.

action, which took place after the betrayer Judas had departed, was the bestowal of a new commandment to his disciples. As related only in John’s Gospel, Jesus declared, “A new commandment I give unto you: That you love another, as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another (Jn 13: 34-35).” Dürer’s oblong drawing of the subject depicts the dramatic announcement of Jesus’ betrayal, but his 1523 woodcut represents Jesus’ third act—the proclamation of the new commandment, a theme never before depicted in art and the meaning of which is discussed fully in the following chapter.\footnote{111 According to Panofsky, “Now—and so far as we know for the first and last time in the history of art—the scene is depicted after the crisis has passed.” He also noted “It is the giving of this ‘New Commandment’ which forms the principal content of Dürer’s woodcut and after which it should be named. For a human tragedy and the establishment of a sacred ritual it substitutes the institution of the Evangelical community.” Panofsky, Life and Art, 223.}

The 1523 Last Supper drawing shows the disciples arranged around a long rectangular table within a narrow and shallow room. Jesus is seated to the left at the head of the table, while John the Evangelist, “…whom Jesus loved (Jn 13: 23),” lies against his chest. The position of Jesus’ upraised left hand and the dynamic attitudes and gesticulations of the apostles indicate that Jesus has just announced the presence of his betrayer. While some disciples confer with each other and others react with despondency, Judas (seated alone and closest to the viewer) gazes toward Jesus and holds the payment for his duplicity clearly under his left arm. The accoutrements of the meal are on the table, including cursorily inscribed plates and a drinking glass, while placed before Jesus are the sacramental chalice and bread. A small window at the right provides the light source that illuminates the small room while a cabinet along the back wall adds to the space’s domesticity.
Dürer’s Last Supper drawing has a clear stylistic and compositional layout much like his late oblong Agony in the Garden of 1524 (Fig. 5). Crosshatching is reduced to a minimum and is primarily used for the folds of various figures’ garments, while closely placed parallel pen strokes indicate spatial boundaries, such as the walls, floor and ceiling.112 A pentimento reveals that the width of the table has been reduced, while overlapping horizontal lines over the feet of the disciples and through the cabinet and window suggest Dürer added design elements as he developed the composition.113

Jesus’ position at the head of the table rather than in the center, while uncommon during the sixteenth century, is represented in both Early Christian and Byzantine art.114 Among the earliest examples is a mosaic from Sant’Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna, dating to the early sixth century (Fig. 75). Jesus reclines at left, while the disciples sit along the posterior edge of a semi-circular table. Directly across from Jesus, Judas twists backward, his face in profile, to view Jesus as he blessed the meal. Giotto later employed the same

112 While the stark setting and simplified composition align more closely with his oblong drawings of 1524, the Last Supper appears much more casually sketched when viewed in person. The date, monogram, and composition were completed with black ink, however Gustav Waagen believed the inscription to be by a different hand. Gustav Friedrich Waagen, Die vornehmsten Kunstdenkmäler in Wien (Vienna: Braumüller, 1867), 2: 166. Likewise, Panofsky implied that the monogram and date were not completed contemporaneously with the drawing. He stated, “The inscribed date, though probably arrived at by inference from the woodcut, may be correct.” Panofsky, Albrecht Dürer, 2: 67, cat. 554. No conclusive tests have been conducted to determine the homogeneity of the inks. It is possible that this drawing was produced earlier, perhaps even while Dürer was still in the Netherlands, and a date was added later to correspond with the woodcut. No watermark has been documented in the literature of the drawing and unfortunately when I viewed the work in July 2012, it was matted and framed. In addition, the placement of the monogram, specifically above the figures, is the only drawing from the Oblong Passion to be placed at such a high level. All other monograms and dates are in the foreground, either in the center or to the left of center.

113 The top right and the bottom corners of the drawing have been cut down. The paper shows some damage, particularly on the lower half of Judas’ robe and on the hand of the figure to his right holding the knife.

114 Louis Réau, Iconographie, 2: 410.
motif for two frescoes, one of which was featured in the cycle of Christ's life in the Capella degli Scrovegni nell'Arena in Padua, Italy, of around 1302-1305 (Fig. 76).115

Because of Dürer’s distinct placement of Jesus to the left, Panofsky considered both the artist’s knowledge of the outdated compositional arrangement and the reasons for his use of it in the 1523 Oblong Passion drawing. While Panofsky gave no suggestion as to Dürer’s artistic source, he proposed that the artist’s departure from contemporary portrayals of the scene reflected Dürer’s attempt to establish his inventiveness at a time when depictions of the Last Supper by Leonardo and Raphael circulated widely in Europe in the form of reproductive prints (Figs. 77-79).116 This explanation only considers the formal characteristics of the composition and overlooks the possible spiritual or devotional significance of Jesus’ less hierarchical placement to the left.

Prior to 1523, Dürer depicted the Last Supper in both his Small and Large Passion series in which Jesus exposes the betrayal (Figs. 80, 81). Both woodcuts show a flurry of crowded activity, dominated by the commanding presence of Jesus’ haloed figure at the center. In the Small Passion woodcut of around 1508-1509, Dürer shows the disciples crowded around a small round table. Sitting before a tapestry that resembles a cloth of honor, Jesus calls for his disciples’ attention with an oratorical gesture while holding a sleeping John the Evangelist against his chest. The disciples talk animatedly among themselves while only Judas, seated in the foreground with his back turned to the viewer, looks toward Jesus. The table is littered with items from the meal, including a

115 Giotto’s other fresco, dated to the late 13th to early 14th century is now in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich. In both of Giotto’s renditions, he placed several apostles on a bench with their backs turned toward the viewer along the anterior of the table closest to the picture plane.

116 Panofsky, Life and Art, 221. The first reproductive print after Leonardo’s Last Supper of around 1500 is attributed to Giovanni Pietro da Birago. The Raphael drawing, after which Raimondi made his print, is now badly damaged and is located in Windsor.
charger on which the Paschal lamb rests in the center while a pitcher of wine sits on the floor in the right foreground.

Dürer's *Large Passion* rendition features a much more open setting, characterized by blank walls and a tall vaulted ceiling. The apostles sit and stand around a rectangular table, while Jesus and John the Evangelist assume a similar position to the *Small Passion Last Supper* in the center. The symmetry of the composition comes not only through the centrality of Jesus and John, but also by their alignment with the converging arches of the ceiling, the large oculus window above them, the charger on the table, the central crease in the tablecloth, and the table leg below. Judas assumes the same position in the right foreground with his back to the viewer, this time looking away from Jesus. Once again the tabletop features the various accessories of the meal. In the left foreground an apostle pours wine from a pitcher while a larger jug rests on the floor in front of him.

Dürer’s 1523 oblong drawing significantly departs from his earlier treatments of the theme. While depicting the same narrative moment, wherein Jesus announces his betrayer, the communal tenor is less formal and ceremonial than Dürer’s other versions. Placing Jesus at the head of the table, rather than in the center, diminishes the traditional hierarchy of the scene while still denoting Jesus as the disciples’ teacher and mentor. By keeping Jesus on an equal plane with his followers and by eliminating his halo, Dürer has depicted Jesus as a more homogenous participant of the group. Less about his divinity, Dürer’s drawing focuses on Jesus’ humanity in this difficult moment and the family he chose to be with during his final hours as a free man.
Conclusion

Dürer repeatedly returned to the theme of Christ’s Passion throughout his career and used a variety of media to describe the story. With each new published series or individual drawing Dürer exhibited his capacity for creativity, his intellect, and his skillful accomplishments as an artist. His Large, Green, Small, and Engraved Passions each demonstrate his expressive aims through his choice of paper size, medium, number of episodes, accompanying text, and the degree of dramatic intensity of every narrative moment depicted. After an extended period during which Dürer only made a handful of graphic works depicting the Passion, he revisited the subject with renewed earnestness while traveling in the Netherlands and immediately thereafter in Nuremberg. As Dürer was not accustomed to drawing narrative scenes in a horizontal format, the Oblong Passion drawings demonstrate not only a shift in Dürer’s creative process, but also his rethinking of the narrative into a new idiom.

The prolonged time span during which Dürer created the Oblong Passion and the modifications he made within each group illustrates the progress of Dürer’s drawing style and his variable design choices. He created at least two versions of every scene, including the Last Supper if one considers the analogous woodcut as part of the group. The earliest works feature extensive cross-hatching and chiaroscuro to define forms and atmosphere while the later works demonstrate Dürer’s simple, methodical, and orderly use of line. Distinct amendments in the compositions, such as Jesus’ poses in the Christ Carrying the Cross and the Agony in the Garden drawings, altered the arrangement of the pictorial elements and transformed the emotional tenor of the narrative.
The *Oblong Passion* drawings also evoke an altered viewing experience from his previous renditions. Whereas Dürer’s early works invite intimacy by placing the viewer on the same level as the scene, the higher viewpoint of his late drawings impose distance and limit involvement with the unfolding events. The sense of immediacy is mitigated as one is able to look at the composition over a wider surface area and at a deliberate pace.

The specific episodes Dürer chose to depict further suited the oblong format. The landscape orientation allowed the broad and slow moving processions to convey the psychologically taxing physical and mental routes Jesus and his followers traversed to the crucifixion and his tomb. The format also enabled Dürer to convey both Jesus’ physical and emotional separation from his followers at the Garden of Gethsemane and to provide space for the disciples’ reactions when Jesus announced his betrayer at the Last Supper.

Several reasons have been given for why Dürer never published a new Passion series in this oblong format, such as his declining health and the uncertain religious climate of the period. Others considered that Dürer drew multiple versions of the same episodes because he was discontented with his results. For instance, Knackfuss concluded that “The numerous repetitions of one and the same subject suggest that he did not find it easy to determine, among all these compositions, which to regard satisfactory; and it was, perhaps, on that account that he gave up the whole project, feeling that it would be impossible for him to do the work to his complete satisfaction.”\(^{117}\) Christopher White later suggested that “It seems more likely that he was fundamentally uncertain how to illustrate the theme of the Passion within this new format.”\(^{118}\) These assessments assume
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\(^{117}\) Knackfuss, *Dürer*, 136.

\(^{118}\) White, *Dürer: The Artist and His Drawings*, 193.
only the preparatory function of the drawings instead of considering Dürer’s varied
designs as intellectual and artistic ruminations independent from utilitarian function.

While the previous chapter situated the *Oblong Passion* within the context of
Dürer’s Netherlandish journey, this chapter has established the ways in which Dürer’s
late Passion drawings differ from his earlier works by analyzing the artistic methods he
used to construct the narrative for an oblong format. To better understand Dürer’s re-
imagining of Christ’s Passion in this altered format, the following chapter examines the
circumstances under which the drawings were created, particularly how the emerging
Reformation and Martin Luther’s teachings acted as a catalyst for Dürer’s conceptual and
artistic creativity.
Chapter 3

_Dürer, Luther, and the Reformation: The Meaning of the “Oblong Passion”_

By the time Dürer embarked for the Netherlands in the summer of 1520, religious reform was already well under way as theologians, humanists and members of the clergy actively challenged fundamental doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, traditional religious practices, and the legitimacy of papal authority. Through mass publications and widespread public preaching, Martin Luther’s outspoken criticisms of abuses committed by the Church reached an extensive audience throughout northern Europe and England. Documentary evidence culled from Dürer’s letters and those of his contemporaries, as well as from the artist’s Netherlandish diary, illustrates that Dürer was among the laity who were drawn to Luther’s dynamic evangelical teachings.¹ Significantly, during his stay in Antwerp, Dürer acquired a number of Luther’s informational pamphlets and engaged with humanists and religious figures that were supportive of the reform effort. It was also during this time that Dürer reimagined the depiction of Christ’s Passion in landscape format, a full seven years after the publication of the _Engraved Passion_.

Considering Dürer’s extensive engagement with the theme of Christ’s Passion throughout his career, it is not surprising that he would have revisited the subject during his later years. However, the circumstances under which Dürer created his late Passion drawings were different from those of his earlier works and are significant to the meaning of the _Oblong Passion_, specifically their inception in 1520 during the early stages of the

Reformation. Documentary evidence already points to Dürer’s interest in Luther, but can a closer examination of the drawings reveal anything more about Dürer’s attitude towards religious matters of the early 1520s?

In order to provide a plausible answer to this question, this chapter examines the social and religious conditions under which the *Oblong Passion* drawings were made as well as how Dürer’s creative process can inform their various meanings. The first section of the chapter will establish the role of contemporary Christianity in Dürer’s life and the various ways he related to Christ’s Passion, artistically through his prints, spiritually through his writings, and personally through his identification with Jesus’ suffering by means of self-portraiture. The second section will outline Dürer’s relationship to the state of Christianity at the time he created the *Oblong Passion* drawings, particularly his interest in Luther’s writings and his involvement with evangelical reformers in the Netherlands.

The third section features a discussion of Luther’s 1519 *A Sermon on Meditating on the Holy Passion of Christ* in which he discussed the proper way to thoroughly contemplate Christ’s Passion. As this work was listed among Dürer’s possible belongings, it will provide the basis from which to assess how his views on the Passion might have changed during this time. This analysis is the first time Luther’s sermon has been used as an interpretive tool to understand Dürer’s application of Lutheran theology to his work of the 1520s.

This evaluation is followed by an examination of a number of Dürer’s works that have been read from a Lutheran perspective, including Dürer’s 1521 Frankfurt *Agony in the Garden* (Fig. 3). The chapter concludes with an analysis of Dürer’s *Oblong Passion*
drawings, particularly how differences in pictorial arrangement and Dürer’s modifications of Jesus’ suffering display both devotional and evangelical readings. Discerning Dürer’s religious stance through his work of the early 1520s is difficult because his images are not overtly Lutheran. However, this discussion of Dürer’s late Oblong Passion will show that they are among the first of his drawings to demonstrate associations with Luther’s teachings.

**Dürer, Christ’s Passion, and the Church**

Prior to the Reformation, common late-medieval Christianity and its temporal and spiritual applications permeated European life from birth to death. The movement of time, both daily and monthly, was directed by the Church. Hourly bells alerted local citizens to the hours of prayer while feast days for important biblical events and saints were celebrated throughout the year. Additionally, significant milestones were marked by the conferral of religious sacraments as a means of preparing for the Last Judgment at the time of birth (Baptism), the transition into adulthood (Confirmation), marriage (Holy Matrimony), and death (Extreme Unction). As a Christian one was also obligated to demonstrate contrition for one’s sins through the sacrament of Reconciliation and to partake in the sacrament of the Eucharist at least once annually. At the beginning of the sixteenth century in Germany, earlier medieval customs such as mass pilgrimage to
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2 The seven Roman Catholic sacraments are Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Holy Matrimony, Reconciliation, Extreme Unction, and Holy Ordinance.

religious sites, veneration of the saints, and the reverence of holy relics remained popular devotional undertakings.\(^4\)

In addition to the spiritual guidance of the Church, religious movements such as the *Devotio Moderna* emphasized a deepening of faith through intense meditation on Jesus’ life, particularly his suffering during the Passion.\(^5\) Prayer, meditation, and reading passages from such texts as Ludolph of Saxony’s popular *Vita Christi* and Thomas à Kempis’s *Imitation of Christ*, as well as contemplating images of the Passion in the form of manuscript illumination, altarpieces, sculptural programs, and prints aided the devout in their pursuit of virtue.\(^6\)

---


\(^5\) The *Devotio Moderna*, or Modern Devotion, was a small religious movement that started around 1380 when Master Geert Grote of Deventer began preaching about the necessity of conducting a more intense religious life. The movement quickly spread from the Netherlands through much of Europe, including Germany, France, and Italy. According to John van Engen, adherents of the Modern Devotion emphasized “...an individual and affective identification with particular moments in Christ’s life, chiefly his passion, the result or purpose of which was ideally fourfold: to “relive” with Christ his virtuous life and saving passion, to have him ever present before one’s eyes, to manifest his presence to others, and to orchestrate, as it were, all of one’s mental and emotional faculties around devotion to him. This emphasis was entirely positive: to have the New Devout live in Christ and Christ in them.” See John H. Van Engen, *Sisters and Brothers of the Common Life: The Devotio Moderna and the World of the Later Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 1 and idem, *Devotio Moderna: Basic Writings* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 12.

\(^6\) Moeller, “Piety in Germany around 1500,” 56. The *Vita Christi* and *Imitation of Christ* were distributed widely among lay groups and eventually were incorporated into sermons and religious advice from local churches. Written around 1348, the *Vita Christi* consisted of 181 chapters that included both a biography of Jesus and a series of long Christocentric meditations that were meant to be contemplated daily and to serve as a model for the reader. It was first printed in Strasbourg and Cologne in 1474 and in Nuremberg in 1478. More editions followed in 1483, 1493, 1494, 1499 and 1522, which attests to its popularity. See Ludolphus de Saxonia, *Praying the Life of Christ: First English translation of the prayers concluding the 181 chapters of the Vita Christi of Ludolphus the Carthusian, the quintessence of his devout meditations on the Life of Christ* (Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur Universität Salzburg, 1973), 2; Peter Parshall, *Origins of European Printmaking: Fifteenth-Century Woodcuts and their Public*, exh. cat. (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 2005), 234, cat. 68; Angela Hass, “Two Devotional Manuals by Albrecht Dürer: The Small Passion and the Engraved Passion. Iconography, Context and Spirituality,” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 63, no. 2 (2000), 206n78.
Beginning in the late fourteenth century, small devotional woodcuts were inexpensive, produced in large numbers and were widely available to people of varying social positions and intellect. Although some prints were accompanied by text, as with Dürer’s *Large* and *Small Passion*, literacy was not required. Lay people were instructed by their religious leaders on the ways in which to interact with such images. For instance preacher Johann Geiler von Kaiserberg (1445-1510), active in Strassburg, told his parishioners that:

If you cannot read, then take one of those paper images on which the meeting of Mary and Elizabeth is painted. You can buy one for a penny. Look at it, and think of how happy they were and full of hope, and come to know that in your faith! Then show your extreme reverence for them; kiss the picture on the piece of paper, bow down before it, kneel in front of it! Call upon the Virgin, give alms to a poor person for her sake!7

This short passage identifies the ways in which the devout were encouraged to empathize with the figures depicted in such inexpensive imagery by placing themselves within that particular moment, in this case a joyous one. Affection in the form of kissing, reverence through the act of bowing, and supplication by kneeling were promoted. Devotees were also urged to petition for mercy, redemption, and favor through the intercession of the portrayed saint and to perform good works by giving charity in their name.

For those who could read or be read to, texts accompanying sorrowful images were meant to intensify penitential feelings from the viewer. For instance, the frontispieces of both Dürer’s *Large* and *Small Passions* show the Man of Sorrows together with admonishing poetry (Figs. 82, 83). The *Small Passion* text is as follows:

O Cause of such great sorrows to me who am just;  
O Bloody Cause of the cross and of my death;  
O Man, is it not enough that I have suffered these things once for you?  
O cease crucifying me with new sins.8

In this instance, the linking of image with text connected the thoughts and words of Jesus with a depiction of what Panofsky referred to as his “Perpetual Passion,” a state wherein Jesus, who has already suffered crucifixion, is still tortured by human weakness and sin.9 The language of the verse combined with Jesus’ dispirited pose incites a desire for penance, redemption, and salvation from a pious viewer.

By clearly visualizing Christ’s Passion, each series by Dürer would have aided the devotional and religious interests of late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Northern European Christians. For devout beholders, religious prints were critical instruments for contemplating Jesus’ sacrifice for the redemption of humankind. At the turn of the century it was through one’s spiritual connection with Christ, facilitated at times through religious imagery, and adherence to the guidelines of the Roman Church that salvation was believed to be achieved.10

Naturally, there were different degrees of religious devotion among the laity around 1500 just as there was a wide range in the quality and expense of religious

8 Quoted from Charles W. Talbot, ed., Dürer in America, exh. cat. (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1971), 184. The frontispiece text for the Large Passion is more extensive and colorful. “These cruel wounds I bear for thee, O man/ And cure thy mortal sickness with my blood/ I take away thy sores with mine, thy death/ With mine—a God Who changed to man for thee/ But though ingrate, still stabb’st my wounds with sins /I still take floggings for thy guilty acts/ It should have been enough to suffer once/ From hostile Jews; now friend, let there be peace!” Ibid, 176. The Benedictine monk Benedictus Chelidonius composed the text for Dürer’s Large Passion, Small Passion, and Life of the Virgin.

9 Erwin Panofsky, The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer, 4th ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955), 138. The image of the Man of Sorrows is outside of the Passion narrative since it does not represent a specific instance in Jesus’ biography, but rather shows the wounds and tortures inflicted on Christ even after he had risen.

10 Bern Moeller called the “...later fifteenth century in Germany one of the most churchly-minded and devout periods of the Middle Ages.” Moeller, “Piety in Germany around 1500,” 51.
imagery. Reasons for purchasing a Passion series by Dürer and how the viewer would have interacted with the imagery could vary considerably depending on one’s level of faith and appreciation of his work. It is clear from the nearly simultaneous creation of and many differences between Dürer’s Small and Engraved Passions that they were likely intended for different clientele and were sold at different price points. Questions remain among scholars as to whether Dürer was strictly financially driven to create his Passion series or if his personal beliefs were instrumental in their conception. In fact, since none were commissioned, save perhaps the Green Passion, and because Dürer was a shrewd businessman, publishing was surely in part commercially motivated.

Dürer was certainly aware of the profitability of selling prints compared to commissioned paintings. In a 1509 letter to Jacob Heller regarding the completion of an arduous commission, now referred to as the Heller Altarpiece, Dürer wrote, “Of ordinary pictures, I will in a year paint a pile which no one would believe it possible for one man to do in the time. With such things one can earn something. But very careful nicety does

11 The state of religious life in the years approaching the Reformation is a heavily researched subject with various interpretations that approach the topic from theological, social, and economic perspectives. Reformation scholar Robert Scribner examined the field through a popular religious and social lens, concluding that there were four distinct categories regarding religious thought prior to the Reformation. These included religious discontent and despondency, strong religious piety and devotion to the Church, religious overload resulting in anxiety, and a fundamental lack of religion. See Robert Scribner and C. Scott Dixon, The German Reformation, 2nd ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003) and Robert Scribner and Trevor Johnson, Popular Religion in Germany and Central Europe, 1400-1800 (New York: Saint Martin’s Press, 1996).

12 In the Netherlandish diary, Dürer noted that he sold Sebald Fischer a large number of prints in Antwerp, listing 16 Small Passions at ¼ florin each and 6 Engraved Passions at a ½ florin each, indicating that the Engraved Passion cost twice as much as the Small Passion. However, these prices were likely not set in stone, as Dürer noted later in the diary that he sold the Small Passion for much higher, at a cost of 3 florins. William Martin Conway, The Literary Remains of Albrecht Dürer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1889), 97, 114; Hans Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1956-1969), 1: 152, 165.

not pay. Therefore I shall stick to my engraving, and if I had done so before I should today have been a richer man by 1000 florins.”

While it is evident from the sales quoted in Dürer’s Netherlandish diary that his Passion series continued to earn him money, Dürer’s unprecedented number of series on the subject could not have been entirely motivated by financial gain but surely also reflected the artistic and personal significance of the Passion for Dürer. With each series, Dürer evolved as an artist, both technically and intellectually, as he progressively incorporated innovative graphic techniques, increasingly realistic space, and stronger compositional designs. By repeating episodes he improved upon his previous depictions, conceived of new ways to pictorially structure the events of Jesus’ final days, and gained a deeper understanding of Jesus’ tribulations.

As a spiritual man and one who identified with Jesus’ suffering, Dürer’s multiple versions of the Passion demonstrate his commitment to the subject. Artistic and documentary evidence in the form of self-portraiture, his family chronicle, poetry, and his diary from the Netherlands suggests that Dürer attached great importance to both Jesus’ holy example and to religious observances, such as the sacraments. According to David

---


15 According to the Netherlandish diary, Dürer sold thirteen *Small Passions* and eight *Engraved Passions* and 32 Large Books, of which the *Large Passion* was included. See Conway, *Literary Remains*, 97, 103, 104, 109, 114; Rupprich. *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 152, 154, 156, 157, 162, 165. These numbers only represent documented instances, as it is likely that Dürer did not record every sale in his diary. Dürer also gifted and bartered twelve *Engraved Passions*, three *Small Passions* and two *Large Passions*. Conway, *Literary Remains*, 100, 102, 104, 109, 112, 115, 122, 123, 125; Rupprich. *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 164, 166, 174, 176, 177.
Price, “Dürer is, in fact, an outstanding example of the vitality of religious culture before the Reformation.”

Dürer’s unique identification with Christ is evident in both painted and drawn self-portraiture. The best-known example is his Self-Portrait of 1500 (Fig. 84). Although not a scene from the Passion, Dürer depicted himself in the same iconographic tradition as both Christ as the Salvator Mundi and Jesus’ imprinted countenance on Veronica’s sudarium. Roland Bainton first suggested that this self-portrait reflected both the doctrines of imitatio Christi and conformitas Christi, whereby the pious strive to emulate Christ and God bestows Christ’s likeness upon them. By depicting himself in such a way, Dürer credited God with providing him the artistic ability to complete such gifted work.

Dürer’s emulation of Christ is also apparent in two drawings in which he depicts himself in the manner of Christ as the Man of Sorrows. The earlier of the two portrays a self-portrait of around 1512-1513 in which the artist looks directly toward the viewer and points to his side (Fig. 85, Bremen, Kunsthalle). Likely drawn for a medical consultation, the drawing illustrates a source of Dürer’s pain and was inscribed by the artist. “There where the yellow spot is and the finger points, there it hurts me.”

---


17 Much has been written about this self-portrait. For a more thorough discussion see Erwin Panofsky, Life and Art; Joseph Leo Koerner, The Moment of Self-Portraiture in German Renaissance Art (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); Jeffrey Chipps Smith, Dürer (London: Phaidon, 2012), 144-149.

18 Roland Bainton, “Dürer and Luther as the Man of Sorrows,” Art Bulletin 29, no. 4 (1947): 269. An example of the conformitas Christi is the stigmata conferred to Saint Francis of Assisi.

19 Chipps Smith, Dürer, 147.

20 Quoted from Joseph Leo Koerner, The Moment of Self-Portraiture, 179.
recognized that Dürer appropriated the iconography of the Man of Sorrows, wherein Christ displays his lance-wound to the viewer, and suggested that Dürer did this in order to “...relate his own illness to the Passion, thereby assuming the pious attitude of conformitas Christi and invoking, for his aid, the healing powers of Christ’s wounds.”\(^{21}\) Dürer again assumed the deportment of Christ as the Man of Sorrows in his *Self-Portrait* of 1522 (Fig. 86, currently held by the Russian Federation in Moscow).\(^{22}\) Here, he is seated and nude to the waist, slouched forward and holding the scourge and whip of Christ’s Passion on his lap. As in the previous drawing, Dürer was ill at the time of its creation, having contracted a malaria-like disease in 1521 while traveling in the Netherlands. By conflating his physical distress with Jesus’ pain, Dürer may have been attempting to assuage his own.

In addition to graphic self-representations linking him with Christ’s Passion, Dürer also assembled a manuscript of religious poetry. The documents, which were created during his most productive period for Passion imagery between 1509 and 1510, survive today in a seventeenth-century copy.\(^{23}\) The first poem was a prayer to Christ:

\[
\begin{align*}
    \text{Du aller enngel spiegel vnnd erlöser der welldt,} \\
    \text{Dein große marter seý für mein sünt ein widergelt.}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{21}\) Ibid. According to Koerner, the area to which Dürer points is his spleen, an organ thought to be the source of melancholy. The self-portrait then not only alludes to Dürer’s physical ills but also to his character. Ibid, 177.

\(^{22}\) This drawing was once housed in the Kunsthalle in Bremen and was thought to be lost after WWII. Shortly thereafter it was found in the Soviet Union and is now kept in Moscow. As Chipps Smith pointed out it is “...a pawn in the cultural patrimony disputes between Russia and Germany.” Jeffrey Chipps Smith, “Dürer's Losses and the Dilemmas of Being,” in *Enduring Loss in Early Modern Germany: Cross Disciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Lynne Tatlock (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 86n40.

As a short meditation on Jesus’ suffering, and thereby Christ’s Passion, Dürer’s poem reflects the popular penitential notion that through Jesus’ torments and death, his sins would be redeemed.25

While Dürer physically and spiritually identified with Christ through self-portraiture and poetry, he also seems to have faithfully followed religious duties required by the Church. In his Gedenkbuch (Memorial Book) and Familienchronik (Family Chronicle), Dürer’s entries regarding the death of his parents note that they died in good Christian standing, having received the final sacraments.26 When his father died in 1502, Dürer’s contemporaneous account inscribed in his Gedenkbuch noted that his father had passed too quickly for him to be present. He wrote that his mother had recited Saint Bernard’s prayer to him, a petition to protect one from the torments of hell, and he asked that future readers “…remember his soul with an Our Father and Ave Maria.”27 This

24 Dürer’s friend Willibald Pirckheimer criticized this poem because he felt Dürer used an excessive amount of syllables. Ibid., 111.

25 Dürer’s poetry also accompanied images, particularly broadsides, some of which included his own woodcuts. Ibid., 113.

26 Only one sheet, written on the recto and verso, of the Gedenkbuch survives (Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett). There were likely many more pages to the book since this sheet was labeled folio 59 at some point in its history. The page includes descriptions dating from 1502 to 1513 of Dürer’s father’s death, a miracle he witnessed in which crosses fell from the sky, financial records regarding his trip to Italy, and his discussion of his mother’s death. The Familienchronik only survives in a 1625 copy by Nuremberg citizen Georg Wilhelm Kress von Kressenstein and reports significant genealogical information regarding Dürer’s family (Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett). See Daniel Hess and Thomas Eser, The Early Dürer, exh. cat. (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2012, in association with the Germanisches Museum), 262-263.

27 The full entry of Dürer’s father’s death in the Gedenkbuch is as follows: “…So the old woman helped him up, and the nightcap on his head became suddenly wet with great drops of sweat. Then he asked to drink, and she gave him a little Reinfell. He took a very little of it and then wanted to get into bed again, and thanked her; and when he had gotten into bed again he fell at once into his last agony. At once his old wife lit the candle and repeated Saint Bernhard’s Prayer to him: [Lighten mine eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death; Lest mine enemy say, I have prevailed against him; Into thine hand I commend my spirit: Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of Truth. Then spake I with my tongue: Lord, make me know mine end, And
account suggests that Dürer the Elder may have died before he could receive the sacraments of the Eucharist and Extreme Unction. However, later in his *Familienchronik*, written in 1524, Dürer noted that his father “…received the Holy Sacraments and passed away in a Christian manner….” Since Dürer’s first entry is quite detailed, he may have amended the second record in his *Familienchronik* to include the conferral of the sacraments so as to assert his father’s absolution from sin for the benefit of posterity. This later revision demonstrates that even in 1524 Dürer likely considered the bestowal of Extreme Unction significant before death.

Dürer also elaborately recorded the events surrounding his mother’s death in the *Gedenkbuch* in a passage from 1514 noting that she received the sacraments for the remission of sin as well as papal absolution. He described how his mother had fallen ill a year earlier and was given the last sacraments in case she was to pass quickly. “So we carried her into a room downstairs, and she was given the sacraments [Communion and Extreme Unction], for everyone thought that she would die.” Later in the passage he continued, “From that day, on the aforementioned date when she was taken ill, more than

---

28 The entry in Dürer’s *Familienchronik* regarding his father’s death is much shorter. “Some time later, my father fell ill with dysentery that nothing could cure it. And when he saw death approaching, he gave himself to it willingly and with great patience. He commended my mother to me, and exhorted me to live in a manner pleasing to God. He received the Holy Sacraments and passed away in a Christian manner in the year 1502, after midnight before Saint Matthew’s as I have described in another book.” Quoted from Hutchison, *Albrecht Dürer*, 75.

29 Martin Luther believed Extreme Unction was unnecessary and outlined his views in his *Babylonian Captivity* of 1520.

30 Hutchison, *Albrecht Dürer*, 121.
a year later, in 1514, as they reckon it, on a Tuesday, the 17[th] day of May, two hours before nightfall, my mother, Barbara Dürer died a Christian death with all the sacraments, absolved by Papal power from pain and sin.”31 From the possible amending of his father’s death rites and the precise recording of his mother’s, it shows that Dürer believed that acquiring the last sacraments before death was an important step in the attainment of salvation.

While there is no record of Dürer’s own final hours and whether he received last rites, Dürer appears to have continued to partake in the sacrament of Reconciliation at least until 1521. While in the Netherlands, Dürer noted going to confession twice, once in mid-March 1521 and again in early April of the same year. He wrote, “I changed 1 Philips florin for expenses and gave 10 stuivers to my father-confessor,” and later “...4 stuivers to the father-confessor.”32 At the beginning of June 1521, Agnes also took the sacrament of Reconciliation, which was paid for by her husband. “To the monk who confessed my wife I gave 8 stuivers.”33

Dürer visited many churches and viewed many celebrated relics during his travels, however he never explicitly said that he attended Mass or paid any indulgences to view “…the great relics of the holy maid and others...” in Cologne or “…the shift and

31 Ibid., 122. According to Price, the papal absolution meant that Barbara Dürer received a plenary indulgence. Price, Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance, 232. Dürer also wrote an account of his mother’s death in his Familienchronik of 1524. Helmut Puff pointed out that the later account of Dürer’s mother’s death written in the Familienchronik differs from that of his account of his earlier Gedenkbuch in that Barbara Dürer only received one sacrament as opposed to “all the sacraments.” He suggested this might relate to Luther’s reduction of acceptable sacraments, in this case extreme unction. Helmut Puff, “Memento Mori, Memento Mei: Albrecht Dürer and the Art of Dying.” In Enduring Loss in Early Modern Germany: Cross Disciplinary Perspectives, ed. Lynne Tatlock (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 103-132.


33 Conway, Literary Remains, 121; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 173.
girdle of our Lady, and other relics” in Aachen.\textsuperscript{34} Dürer’s failure to mention going to Mass and paying for indulgences at relic sites during his time in the Netherlands corresponds with his growing interest in Martin Luther’s teachings. Whether Dürer converted to Lutheranism toward the end of his life or remained devoted to the Roman Catholic Church is a continually debated subject among Dürer scholars.\textsuperscript{35} Jane Campbell Hutchison has suggested that this question is anachronistic since Dürer could not have been a “Protestant in the modern sense” as Protestantism was not officially sanctioned until the Augsburg Confession of 1530, two years after Dürer’s death.\textsuperscript{36} While the nascent phases of the Reformation might not have suggested an eventual schism from the Catholic Church, the complex religious, social, and political circumstances of the movement show a notable transformation of religious attitudes among individuals and municipalities more generally. Dürer’s hometown of Nuremberg was an early supporter of Luther in 1518 and adopted the evangelist movement by March of 1525.\textsuperscript{37}

The question of whether Dürer “converted” to Protestantism is less important than understanding how he interpreted and applied Luther’s teachings in his life and art. Dürer’s awareness of Luther’s criticisms of the Church, including the selling of

\textsuperscript{34} Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 106; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 159.


\textsuperscript{36} Hutchison, \textit{Albrecht Dürer}, 178. Price noted that Nuremberg supported the evangelist movement from 1525. See also Price, \textit{Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance}, 285n8.

indulgences, the efficacy of relics and saints, and the limited spiritual authority of the pope is clear from documentary evidence written by him and points to a shift in his religious concerns. The following sections will identify the relevant documentary evidence for Dürer’s interest in Luther and will discuss Luther’s attitudes on the correct way to meditate on Christ’s Passion and how his instructions may be reflected in Dürer’s *Oblong Passion*.

**Dürer and the Reformation**

The earliest documentary evidence relating Dürer’s interest in Luther is from a March 1518 letter written by Luther to Dürer’s friend, the Nuremberg civic leader Christoph Scheurl: “I received both your German and Latin letter, good and learned Scheurl, together with the distinguished Albert Dürer’s gift, and my Theses in the original and the vernacular.” Likely a set of prints, Dürer’s gesture illustrates how quickly knowledge of Luther’s criticisms of the Church spread throughout Germany, particularly since the publication of Luther’s 95 Theses was published only four months earlier in November of 1518. In the 1604 *Het Schilder-boeck*, Karel van Mander mentioned that when Dutch artist Jan van Scorel (1495-1562) arrived in Nuremberg in

---

38 Dürer’s diary entry about Luther’s alleged kidnap clearly shows his poor opinion for the papacy, which he referred to as the “unchristian Papacy,” which he believed “...strives with its heavy load of human laws against the redemption of Christ.” Conway, *Literary Remains*, 158; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 170.


late 1518 or early 1519 to study with Dürer, he thought the German artist too engaged with the evangelist movement and decided to travel elsewhere.\footnote{Karel van Mander, \textit{The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters from\nthe First Edition of the Schilder-boeck (1603-1604)}, edited by Hessel Miedema. 6 Vols. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1994, fol. 235r; Panofsky, \textit{Life and Art}, 198; Jeffrey Chipps Smith, \textit{“Netherlandish artists and art \nin Renaissance Nuremberg.” Simiolus}, 20, no. 2/3 (1990-1991): 153.}

In a 1520 letter to George Spalatin, secretary to Friedrich the Wise, Dürer noted receiving one of Luther's publications from the Saxon prince.\footnote{A transcription of the letter can be found in Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 89-90; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 86-87.} He asked Spalatin to convey thanks to Friedrich the Wise and urged his friend to “...beg him humbly that he will protect the praiseworthy Dr. Martin Luther for the sake of Christian truth. It matters more than all the riches and power of this world, for with time everything passes away; only truth is eternal.”\footnote{Quoted from Hutchison, \textit{Albrecht Dürer}, 124.} Dürer went on to say that “...if God helps me to come to Dr. Martinus Luther, then I will carefully draw his portrait and engrave it in copper for a lasting remembrance of this Christian man who has helped me out of great distress.”\footnote{Ibid., 124-125. From surviving artwork, it appears that Dürer never had the opportunity to depict Luther’s portrait. However, scholars have suggested that the two met while Luther visited the \textit{Sodalitas Staupitziana}, a humanist confraternity in Nuremberg in which Dürer was a member. See Hutchison, \textit{Albrecht Dürer}, 125; Price, \textit{Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance}, 19; Jeffrey Chipps Smith, review of Albrecht Dürer’s \textit{Renaissance: Humanism, Reformation, and the Art of Faith} by David Hotchkiss Price, \textit{H-Net Reviews} (January 2005): 3, \url{http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=10123} (accessed January 5, 2010). The distress Dürer mentioned has been understood to mean Dürer’s spiritual distress. Panofsky, \textit{Life and Art}, 198.} In the letter, Dürer also requested additional writings by the evangelist. “And I beg your worthiness to send me for my money anything new that Dr. Martin may write in German.”\footnote{Quoted from Hutchison, \textit{Albrecht Dürer}, 125. In the same letter to Spalatin, Dürer made reference to Lazarus Spengler’s “Apology for Luther” that Dürer had intended to send with his letter, but which was being reprinted in Augsburg. He mentioned that although the book had been published in Nuremberg, “...it is condemned in the pulpit as heretical and [meant] to be burnt and the man who published it anonymously}
Luther’s publications, as is evident from a one-page document written by Dürer dated to around 1520 or 1521 that lists sixteen of Luther’s titles that Dürer either already owned or intended to buy, or both.\footnote{Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 156-157; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}: 221. The sheet is now in the British Museum, London.}

Various entries in Dürer’s Netherlandish diary mention the purchase of Luther’s writings or receipt of them as gifts from evangelical-minded acquaintances. For instance, in late September 1520 Dürer “...gave 2 st. for the \textit{Condemnation} and the \textit{Dialogus} and 3 st. to the messenger.”\footnote{Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 105; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 158. It is interesting that Dürer paid more for the delivery of Luther’s two tracts than he actually paid for the writings. This exchange may indicate that Luther’s writings were considered contraband in the Netherlands and that a more cautious attitude about the sale of Luther’s works was necessary.} While in Cologne in late October of the same year, Dürer “...bought a tract of Luther’s for 5 white pf. and the \textit{Condemnation of Luther, the pious man}, for 1 white pf.”\footnote{Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 107; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 160. Dürer entered on several occasions that he had purchased “little tracts” for relatively cheap prices. See Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 105, 107, 108, 112; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 158, 160, 164. As far as I have been able to discern, no one has commented on what these tracts may have been. I speculate that they were \textit{Flugschriften}—short, easily concealable pamphlets that were published to elucidate the basic controversies regarding the Church. More widespread in Germany (about 10,000 were printed in Germany between 1499 and 1530), presses in Antwerp also produced them, the most inexpensive of which cost around 1 \textit{stuiver}. See Thomas A. Brady Jr., \textit{German Histories in the Age of Reformations, 1400-1650} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 165; Alastair Duke, \textit{Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries} (London: Hambledon and London, 2003), 102, 113.} In June 1521 Cornelius Grapheus, the secretary of Antwerp, gave Dürer Luther’s \textit{Babylonian Captivity} and in return Dürer gave him a copy of his \textit{Drei Große Bücher}.\footnote{Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 123; Rupprich, \textit{Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass}, 1: 175.}

is abused and defamed. It is reported that Dr. Eck wanted to burn it in public at Ingolstadt, as was done to Dr. Reuchlin’s book.” Conway, \textit{Literary Remains}, 89. Johannes Eck was a professor of theology in Ingolstadt and was a staunch opponent of Luther. For a general discussion of religious exchanges between Eck and Luther, see C. Scott Dixon, \textit{The Reformation in Germany} (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002).
Cornelius Grapheus was among the enthusiastic humanist citizens of Antwerp who welcomed Luther’s many ideas for reform, particularly his position on the supremacy of the Gospels over papal authority.\textsuperscript{50} In the same year that he gave Dürer Luther’s \textit{Babylonian Captivity}, Grapheus wrote how pleased he was that ‘...everywhere polite letters are being restored, the gospel of Christ has been re-born and Paul lives again.’\textsuperscript{51} He judged that this revival was ‘...thanks to the writings of Luther and others.’\textsuperscript{52} In 1521, an associate of the early Reformist Thomas Müntzer sent a letter to him from Braunschweig, Germany, relating that ‘...there [Antwerp] the common folk are a thousand times more attached to the teachings of Christ and Martin [Luther] than they are here.’\textsuperscript{53}

Two main factors aided the spread of reform in Antwerp: its position as a trade and printing center and the concentrated efforts of the Augustinians there. Luther’s publications and numerous translations of the Gospels were imported to the city and printed in the vernacular by various printing houses.\textsuperscript{54} According to Alastair Duke, “In a little over four months during the winter of 1520/21 one press there published five works

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50} Duke, \textit{Reformation and Revolt}, 55.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 13.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 55. See also idem, “The Netherlands,” in \textit{The Early Reformation in Europe}, ed. Andrew Pettegree (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 144n7. Grapheus’s quotes above are from two separate sixteenth-century documents.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Quoted from Alastair Duke, \textit{Reformation and Revolt}, 16.
\item \textsuperscript{54} There was a market for Luther’s writings in the Netherlands during this early stage of the Reformation, however as the movement became more perilous fewer publishers were willing to take chances. Duke noted that “Of the seven printers responsible for more than half of the Dutch evangelical pamphlets and Bibles produced between 1520 and 1565, two and possibly three, were put to death; one other was imprisoned and yet another decided to move his business from Antwerp to London and thence to Emden.” Duke, \textit{Reformation and Revolt}, 103-104.
\end{itemize}
by Luther, probably translated into Dutch by the local Augustinians.” In addition to translating Luther’s writings, the Netherlandish Augustinians, who between 1516 and 1521 traveled to Wittenberg to study under Luther, also preached Luther’s message publically and were instrumental to the movement’s dissemination. From his diary we know that Dürer was well acquainted with the Antwerp group of Augustinians. He mentioned dining with them on a number of occasions and gifted a *Life of the Virgin* series to the supervisor of the monastery.

Although the Augustinians openly championed Luther’s doctrines, the evangelical movement itself did not gain the same public foothold in the Netherlands at this time as it did in Germany. Like their German neighbors, Netherlandish Christians were dissatisfied with the lack of transparency of the Church and supported the right of the laity to interpret Scripture from the vernacular. But there were no dominant figureheads to follow, like Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531) in Zurich or Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt (1486-1541) in Wittenberg, while early opposition from Emperor Charles V, who decreed numerous anti-heresy edicts and ousted questionable clergy, contributed to widespread anxiety. In December of 1521, just four months after Dürer’s return home to Nuremberg, the prior of the Antwerp Augustinians Jacobus Praepositus was taken to Brussels, where in February of 1522 he was eventually compelled to recant his

---

55 Ibid., 16.

56 Ibid., 15-16. These Augustinians were part of the Saxon Congregation.

57 Conway, *Literary Remains*, 122; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 174. “I have dined twice with the Augustines.” “I gave the Steward of the Augustinian convent at Antwerp a Life of Our Lady, and 4 st. to his servant.” “I have dined again with the Augustinians.”

evangelical beliefs. In April of that year, Cornelius Grapheus was forced to do the same. Matters escalated when in the summer of 1523 two Augustinian monks from the Low Countries were burnt at the stake in Brussels for heresy.

During the precise time of Dürer’s trip from 1520 to 1521 support for the reform movement was at its first height in the Netherlands. According to Duke, in both Germany and the Netherlands, “Disorder, excitement and experimentation were the hallmarks of the 1520s as evangelicals, swept along by the wave of support for Luther, found themselves in uncharted waters bound for unknown destinations.” While in his diary Dürer mentions acquiring a number of Luther’s important writings and dining with evangelically supportive Augustinians, perhaps his most significant entry regarding the movement is his spirited and distressed reaction to Luther’s “kidnapping” after the reformer attended the Imperial Diet of Worms in April of 1521 at the behest of Charles

---


60 Duke, Reformation and Revolt, 13-14. In a letter to Dürer dated 23 February 1524, Grapheus related that “...great events were happening...” and that “…there is a great and daily increasing persecution on the account of the Gospel.” He neglected to go into detail, leaving that task to the bearers of the letter. At this point, Grapheus had already been discredited and discharged from his position as town secretary in Antwerp. For the full contents of the letter, see Conway, Literary Remains, 130; Ruprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 108-109. For Grapheus’s troubles after his abjuration in 1522, see Duke, “The Netherlands,” 144.

61 Luther wrote a song describing the martyrdom of the monks Henricus Vos and Johannes van den Esschen and announcements of their deaths were published in pamphlets. See, Dick Akerboom and Marcel Gielis, "'A New Song Shall Begin Here...’ The Martyrdom of Luther's Followers among Antwerp's Augustinians on July 1, 1523 and Luther's Response," in Johan Leemans, More Than a Memory: the Discourse of Martyrdom and the Construction of Christian Identity in the History of Christianity (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 243-248.

62 Duke, Reformation and Revolt, 17.
V. 63 Not aware of Friedrich the Wise of Saxony’s plan to protect Luther at Wartburg Castle, Dürer assumed Luther had been arrested and possibly murdered. 64

In addition to lamenting Luther’s possible loss, Dürer’s long entry of 17 May 1521 is in part a diatribe against the papacy for incorrectly interpreting the Gospels and impeding the Bible’s unobstructed use by the laity:

And whether he yet lives I know not, or whether they have put him to death, if so, he has suffered for the truth of Christ because he rebuked the unchristian Papacy, which strives with its heavy load of human laws against the redemption of Christ. But this is above all most grievous to me, that, may be, God will suffer us to remain still longer under their false, blind doctrine, invented and drawn up by the men whom they call Fathers, by whom also the precious Word of God is in many places wrongly expounded or utterly ignored. 65

In light of Luther’s apparent absence and because of his extensive knowledge regarding the philology of the Gospels, Dürer called on Erasmus to adopt the evangelist cause:

And if we have lost this man, who has written more clearly than any that has lived for 140 years, and to whom Thou hast given such a spirit of the Gospel, we pray Thee, oh heavenly Father, that Thou wouldst give Thy Holy Spirit to one, that he may gather anew everywhere together Thy Holy Christian Church, that we may again live free and in Christian manner...Oh God, if Luther be dead, who will henceforth expound to us the holy Gospel with such clearness? What, oh God, might he not have written for us in ten or twenty years?...Oh Erasmus of Rotterdam, where wilt thou stop? Behold how the wicked tyranny of worldly

63 On 15 June 1520, the papal bull Exsurge Domine was issued, which denounced many of Luther’s ideas and gave him 60 days to recant his beliefs. In December of that year, Luther publically burnt the bull in Wittenberg along with other books of ecclesiastical law laid down by the pope. He was summoned to the Diet of Worms on 6 March 1521, refused to recant in April, and left Worms on the 26th of that month. On 4 May, under the authority of Friedrich the Wise of Saxony, Luther was taken to the Wartburg Castle for protection, where he stayed for a year, until March 1522. Shortly after leaving the Diet, on 26 May Charles V issued the Edict of Worms, which condemned Luther as a heretic. See Dixon, The Reformation in Germany, xxiii-xxvi.

64 For a full translation of Dürer’s extensive entry on Luther, see Conway, Literary Remains, 158-159; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 170-172.

65 Conway, Literary Remains, 158; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 170.
power, the might of darkness, prevails. Hear, thou knight of Christ. Ride on the side of the Lord Jesus. Guard the truth.”

Dürer’s last extant mention of Luther by name is from the Netherlandish diary, although it appears that Dürer continued to support the evangelistic cause until at least 1524. In a letter written to Nicolas Kratzer on 5 December 1524, Dürer reminded Kratzer that they both had to “…stand in disgrace and danger for the sake of the Christian faith, for they abuse us as heretics, but may God grant us his grace and strengthen us in his word, for we must obey Him rather than men.” Whether Dürer continued to be so passionate about the evangelical movement until his death is unknown.

Luther’s Passion

An evangelical interpretation of Dürer’s Oblong Passion drawings necessarily begins with Luther’s thoughts on Christ’s Passion and how one should understand it through proper meditation. This approach will place Dürer’s Passion drawings within the religious context in which they were created and serve as a framework to discuss Lutheran undertones in the Oblong Passion.

---


67 Price, Albrecht Dürener’s Renaissance, 226. Dürer’s last mention of Luther is on the receipt of the Babylonian Captivity from Grapheus in June of 1521. In a footnote, Price mistakenly listed the date of this entry as 6 August 1521. Dürer’s last inscription in the diary was 15 July 1521 made in reference to his trip to Cologne from Brussels on the return journey to Nuremberg. See Conway, Literary Remains, 123; Rupprich, Dürener Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 175.

68 For the full transcription of the letter see Conway, Literary Remains, 131; Rupprich, Dürener Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 111.

69 There is some speculation that Dürer may have returned to Catholicism late in life. This hypothesis comes from a letter written by Pirckheimer, written to Johann Tschertte on 1530 soon before his death in which he stated that during the early stages of the Reformation he was a “a good Lutheran, just like our late Albrecht….” Pirckheimer may have been alluding to their joint disillusionment, or just his. The statement is too ambiguous to draw any solid conclusions. See Price, Albrecht Dürener’s Renaissance, 229.
In his first significant public sermon in April of 1518, known as the Heidelberg Disputation, Luther explained his early assertion that the focus of Christianity should be on Jesus’ sacrifice on the cross for the atonement of mankind’s sins and through that sacrifice, God’s interaction with humanity. Shortly thereafter, in a number of early sermons in 1518 and 1519 Luther preached further on the significance of Christ’s Passion to salvation. His *Sermon von der Betrachtung des heiligen Leidens Christi* (*A Sermon on Meditating on the Holy Passion of Christ*) of 1519, which was published the same year and reprinted in at least twenty-five editions over two years, was a series of instructions on the appropriate and inappropriate motivations behind meditating on Christ’s Passion and one’s redemption through it. According to Robert Guy Erwin, the printed sermon “...could be considered an evangelical substitute for older forms of passion meditation; perhaps this characteristic accounts in part for its great popularity.” The sermon was listed among Dürer’s presumed holdings of Luther’s writings and given its widespread popularity and Dürer’s established relationship to the Passion, it is likely that Dürer knew its contents well.

---


71 Prior to his March 1519 *Sermon von der Betrachtung des heiligen Leidens Christi* (*A Sermon on Meditating on the Holy Passion of Christ*), which was published and reprinted at least six times before 1520, Luther had given four sermons for the clergy (in Latin) and the laity (in German) on the significance of meditating on Christ’s Passion. The German sermons in which Luther discussed the subject are called the “Zwei deutsche Fastenpredigten,” and were given in the spring of 1518. See Robert Guy Erwin, “The Passion and Death of Christ,” 258-259, 282-283.

72 Ibid., 4, 258.

73 Ibid., 260.

Luther considered that many devotees of Christ’s Passion misdirected their emotions or misunderstood the point of Jesus’ sacrifice and death. To guide believers to perform their contemplation of the Passion correctly, Luther provided fifteen directives. The initial three illustrate the improper approach to meditation. The misguided first method is one done out of indignation, for it is not rumination on Jesus’ suffering at all, but rather on the people who betrayed and opposed Jesus, such as Judas and the Jews. This kind of contemplation elicits anger towards the agents of Jesus’ pain and death, rather than focusing on his atoning actions.75 The second incorrect way to approach meditation of the Passion is to see it as *ex opera operato*, or a means in and of itself to salvation. In other words, it is wrong simply to go through the motions of contemplation without inducing a change within oneself. Further, it is also misguided to view the Passion as a talisman against evil and suffering, for instance in the practice of carrying “...little paintings, prayer books, letters of indulgence, and crosses...” as some people go “...so far as to claim that these things protect them from drowning, attack, fire, and all sorts of danger.”76 Those following the third path are believers who, even though they may feel Christ’s Passion deeply, waste their time because they focus on the wrong aspects of the narrative instead of the larger significance—they linger on the hows of Jesus’ suffering and not on the whys. Luther used as an example the devotees “.... who tear the passion story apart, and elaborate a great deal on things like the farewell scene at Bethany and the sorrows of the Virgin Mary, and as a result never get anywhere.”77


76 Ibid., article 2, 411.

77 Ibid., article 3, 412.
Luther instead stressed that in order to understand the Passion and thereby its significance to salvation, one must recognize the depravity of one’s own sinful nature and view it “...in such a way that their hearts shrink back in terror and their consciences despair.” Doing so leads to the realization that God, in his mercy, sent his only son to bear the responsibility of one’s personal sins and as a result, suffer and die for them. Luther said, “…the whole benefit of the passion of Christ for us depends on this: that one should come to an understanding of oneself, and be frightened and overcome for its own sake. For whatever person this does not come to pass, for that person the sufferings of Christ have been for naught.” In other words, believers must recognize their sins in Jesus’ suffering and understand that he destroys them, and that “through his resurrection he makes us righteous and free from all those sins, however much we believe the contrary.” The most significant element is “however much we believe the contrary” for devotees must fully have faith that their sins are forgiven through Jesus’ death in order to reject the misguided notion that they can overcome sin by their own efforts through contrition, penance, and good works. By believing in merit-based reward, a believer confirms to God that they do not trust in Jesus’ atoning act as possessing fundamental redemptive power. If one does not have this faith, it is essential to pray for God’s grace to help in understanding Jesus’ powerful act of sacrifice. Luther explains for those struggling to:

... encourage yourself to do this: first, no longer look at the suffering of Christ (until that has done its proper work and frightened you) but look through it and

78 Ibid., article 4, 413.
79 Ibid., article 8, 415.
80 Ibid., article 13, 419.
see his kindly heart, how much it is filled with love for you, until it forces you to see that it carries the weight of your conscience and your sin. Then your heart will become sweet toward him, and the confidence of your faith will be strengthened. Thereafter climb further, through Christ’s heart to God’s, and see that Christ would never have shown you all this love, but that God wanted you to have his eternal love—God to whom Christ has been obedient out of love for you.\textsuperscript{81}

Luther’s notion of finding God’s love in the Passion opposes both the Roman Catholic Church’s and early devotional writers’ understanding that believers, because of their role in Christ’s suffering, should fear God’s judgment and do everything in their power to earn his forgiveness. According to Erwin, this fear was a typical response among Christians prior to the Reformation. He noted that an additional way in which Luther’s theology differed from that of his predecessors concerned their belief that “through one’s suffering, then, the believer could in a sense participate vicariously in Jesus’ suffering, and through this sharing (more or less explicitly, depending on the interpreter) in Christ’s merit and reward.”\textsuperscript{82} To Luther, this would have been a misunderstanding of Christ’s Passion and God’s grace because this kind of meditation has little to do with faith. Instead of appropriating Jesus’ suffering for themselves, Luther asserted that the believer should model their lives and deaths on Christ’s example and draw strength from his actions to overcome sin in one’s daily life. By doing so one becomes an enemy of sin “...through love, not out of fear of pain.”\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., article 14, 420.

\textsuperscript{82} Erwin, “The Passion and Death of Christ,” 302.

\textsuperscript{83} Luther, \textit{A Sermon on Meditating}, article 15, as transcribed in Robert Guy Erwin, “The Passion and Death of Christ,” 421. Rittger’s review of Luther’s concept of meditation on the Passion is summarized well. He stated that, “Luther’s point here is that Christians must receive Christ’s Passion as a means of grace before they can regard it as a model to imitate. Christians cannot suffer with Christ before they have embraced the full benefits of Christ’s suffering for them; they cannot act like Christ until Christ has acted upon (and in) them. Luther still urges imitation of Christ and participation in his sufferings, but he thinks that the ability to do so depends on the indwelling Christ himself; there is no thought of human merit here, as in late medieval Passion piety.” Rittgers, \textit{The Reformation of Suffering}, 115.
To review, Luther believed that the foundation of Christianity was Jesus’ death on the cross, which resulted in absolute salvation for all believing Christians. Through Christ’s atonement, God’s grace was freely given to those that had faith in Jesus’ sacrifice and thereby God’s love. Luther’s message eschewed the Roman Catholic Church’s emphasis on performing good works, buying indulgences, and viewing relics. These practices, which could do nothing to earn God’s favor, were a source of anxiety among dedicated early modern Christians because of the uncertainty of their efficacy and because, as noted by Rittgers, “...they could never know if they had done enough to render themselves pleasing to God.” Steven Ozment has argued that many Christians in the early sixteenth century embraced Luther’s message of salvation because it dismissed such fears.

Like his contemporaries, Dürer may have also felt uneasy and unsure about the efficacy of attaining salvation through merit-based actions. In the letter to Spalatin referenced above, Dürer wrote that Luther was a “...Christian man who has helped me out of great distress.” Panofsky believed that Dürer was referring to spiritual distress in this instance. In a passage written on the back of a drawing, likely dating to 1520, Dürer summarized much of what Luther stressed in his *Sermon von der Betrachtung des heiligen Leidens Christi*. Dürer’s statement reads in full:

---


Seeing that through disobedience of sin we have fallen into everlasting Death, no help could have reached us save through the incarnation of the Son of God, whereby He through His innocent suffering might abundantly pay the Father all our guilt, so that the Justice of God might be satisfied. For He has repented of and made atonement for the sins of the whole world, and has obtained of the Father Everlasting Life. Therefore Christ Jesus is the Son of God, the highest power, which can do all things, and He is the Eternal Life. Into whomsoever Christ comes he lives, and himself lives in Christ. Therefore all things are in Christ good things. There is nothing good in us except it becomes good in Christ. Whosoever therefore will altogether justify himself is unjust. If we will what is good, Christ wills it in us. No human repentance is enough to equalize deadly sin and be fruitful.88

With this short passage, Dürer has laid out the fundamentals of Christianity without the need for good works. He stressed in the first sentence that only Christ’s atonement could save humankind from “everlasting Death.” One cannot will themselves into salvation, because to “justify himself is unjust.” It is because Christ lives in mankind, through one’s obedience to his will, that one is good and no amount of “human repentance,” through the laws of man, could earn God’s grace. Luther made it explicitly clear in his Meditations to “…take care that you do not act like those erring persons who, in their sins, bit and gnaw at their own hearts, and strive after good works and satisfactions, and run here and there, or buy indulgences to work off their sins and be free of them—this is impossible.”89 It is

88 Conway, Literary Remains, 155, 161; Rupprich, Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 216-217. Conway noted that the recto of the drawing depicts the outline of a human figure. The sheet is located in the British Museum, London, Add. 5228, fol. 23r. Rupprich’s transcription, 217: Item als wyr durch dy vngehorsam der sünd jn den ewigen thot gefallen sind, hat vns durch kein weg geholfen mügen warden, dan das der sun gotes mensch wurd, awff das er durch sein vnschuldig leiden dem vater all vnser schuld vberflüssig betzalett, domit das dy gerechtikeit gottes erfült würd. Dan er hat aller awsser welten sünd berewt, gepüst vnd pey dem fater das ewig leben erlangt. Dorum Jesus Christus ist der sun gottes, dy höchst kraft, der alle ding vermag, vnd er ist das ewyg leben. In wen Christus kumpt, der ist lebendig, vnd der selb lebt jn Christo. Dorum alle ding gute ding sind Christi. Nichtz gutz ist jn vns, es werd dan jn Christo gut. Dorum welcher sich gantz gerecht will machen, der ist vngerecht. Wir können gutz wollen, Christus wöls dan jn vns. Kein menschlich rew ist so gros, das sy gnug sien müg, ein totsünd zw...das sie frucht pring.”

89 Luther, A Sermon on Meditating, article 12, as transcribed in Robert Guy Erwin, “The Passion and Death of Christ,” 418.
evident through both entries in the diary and this concise notation that Dürer absorbed and understood Luther’s message.

**Dürer’s Works from the Early 1520s: A Lutheran Perspective**

While the documentary evidence explicitly shows Dürer’s support for Luther during this tumultuous period, definitive proof of Dürer’s position in regards to the Roman Catholic Church in his artwork of the time is less obvious.90 Scholarship on this subject generally focuses on Dürer’s 1523 *Last Supper* woodcut and 1526 *Four Holy Men* panels, while a limited number of studies have recognized the impact of the early Reformation and Luther’s teachings on some of Dürer’s other prints and drawings.91

In 1983, Larry Silver argued that as a result of Dürer’s preoccupation with Lutheran theology, the artist incorporated the concept of religious conversion into his 1521 engravings of Saint Christopher (Figs. 87, 88).92 During the early 1520s, Dürer completed a number of studies of the saint for Joachim Patinir while in the Netherlands and finished two engravings of Saint Christopher, which showed two distinctive moments

---

90 Dürer was not sectarian in regards to patronage. He continued to produce works for Cardinal Albrecht of Brandenburg and, based on preparatory drawings from the early 1520s, was in the process of completing a large altarpiece of a sacra conversazione. Numerous head and costume studies as well as models for the entire composition have survived. Panofsky mistakenly believed that the final painting was intended as the central panel for the *Four Holy Men* paintings, which Panofsky thought were the wings. For a full discussion of the drawings, see Panofsky, *Life and Art*, 225-229.

91 As Dürer’s *Four Holy Men* panels were not completed until 1526, I will not go into any discussion of them. The 1523 *Last Supper* woodcut is discussed in more depth later in the chapter.

in the saint’s legend, after his return to Nuremberg. According to Silver, Saint Christopher looking back to view Jesus symbolized the moment he realized whom he carried across the river and the pagan’s religious conversion (Fig. 87). The other engraving in which Christopher looks forward and bears his burden stoically is “...emblematic of the life of a good Christian, who willingly assumes the burden of Christ during his journey through life...(Fig. 88).” Silver saw the prominent church in the background as the “emerging Lutheran Church.”

It seems that Dürer’s high level of engagement with the subject during a period when the devotion to saints was questioned would be at odds with Luther’s writings. For instance, in early 1518 Luther criticized the adoration of saints in the Sermons on the Ten Commandments, particularly Saint Christopher, who was a heavily indulgenced figure and revered by many to the point of idolatry. However, Silver asserted that, “Regarding St. Christopher veneration and superstition, Dürer could only use this theme as a subject if he found it suitable to the new, Lutheran outlook. Like old wine in new, Lutheran bottles, the St. Christopher legend could certainly be used as an emblem of conversion....” Within this context, Silver considered the two engravings analogous

---

93 Conway, Literary Remains, 120; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 172. “For Master Joachim have I drawn 4 small S. Christophers on grey paper.” A page with nine drawings of Saint Christopher survives and is kept at the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin and may be a preparatory study for the drawings commissioned by Patinir (W. 800). A drawing of Saint Christopher on grey paper with white heightening in the British Museum is also linked to this entry from Dürer’s diary (W. 801).


95 Ibid., 242.

96 Christensen, Art and the Reformation, 45.

97 Silver, “Christ-Bearer,” 242. Price concurred with Silver’s assessment that Dürer was preoccupied with the subject of Saint Christopher during this period and thought his discussion of religious conversion a useful one. However, he did not agree with Silver’s use of later discussions by Luther as supporting
transformation stories—Christopher’s conversion to Christianity and Dürer’s conversion to Lutheranism. While Dürer’s depictions of the saint of travelers could also be read in connection with his own journey during this time, Silver’s discussion illustrates both the challenges and the possibilities of interpreting subjects of a conventionally devotional nature through a reformatory lens.

In 1997, Silver also proposed that Dürer’s drawings of Christ’s Agony in the Garden from the early 1520s bore “...a new aura of ‘Lutheran relevance,’” particularly Dürer’s 1521 Frankfurt Agony in the Garden (Fig. 3). He supported Fritz Saxl’s assessment that the positioning of Jesus lying prostrate on the ground reflected both Luther’s doctrine and Dürer’s contemporaneous attitude that “...salvation lies in complete submission to faith.”98 This assessment is valid since Luther claimed that the only way to know God’s grace was not through the believer’s own efforts, since Jesus had already atoned for the sins of man, but through faith in God’s redemptive power. Together with Dürer’s Saint Christopher engravings, Silver believed that the artist was involved in “...a spiritual ‘recycling’ of highly charged, traditional Catholic images...”99

Silver also addressed Dürer’s Christ Bearing the Cross drawings from the Oblong Passion and suggested that Dürer’s depiction of Simon of Cyrene assisting Jesus in carrying the cross illustrated the concept of a good Christian: he bore Christ’s burdens (Fig. 7). According to Silver, “This subject was more than appropriate as a new kind of evidence, which reflected the reformer’s more progressive views of the usefulness of Saint Christopher’s legend for lay devotion. See Price, Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance, 306n34.


99 Larry Silver, "The Influence of Anxiety,”: 420-29, 424.
Lutheran *Andachstbild*, symbolizing, like the concept of Christopher as “Christ-Bearer,” the proper emotion and theology of the Passion.” Silver’s reading of this motif is original in associating Lutheran concepts with Simon’s action in this drawing. However Dürer depicted this scene in all of his previous Passion series, except for the *Engraved Passion*. Silver neither accounts for how this representation is different from previous versions, nor how it is particularly Lutheran in concept. He may not have considered the drawing’s dramatic penitential emphasis as a whole, which I believe to be more devotional and less evangelical in its emphasis on Jesus’ suffering. Further, the notion of identifying oneself with Jesus and those around him was a common form of devotion throughout the medieval period, particularly among monastic orders and the adherents of the modern devotion. Luther was himself influenced by writers of popular devotion literature who were active a century and more before him, such as the works ascribed to Bonaventure and Ludolph of Saxony, and whose ideas are featured in much of Luther’s early writings. In this instance, it is thus difficult to separate old models of devotion from the new. As Dürer typically depicted Simon’s gesture in other versions of the scene, further interpretation of the remaining elements in the drawing is necessary to discern any evangelical links.

---

100 Silver, “The Influence of Anxiety,” 424-425. Only one of Dürer’s *Christ Bearing the Cross* drawings from the *Oblong Passion* depicts Simon, the more dramatic instance where Jesus has fallen under the weight of the cross (Fig. 7).

101 Erwin, “The Passion and Death of Christ,” 6. The basis of Erwin’s dissertation was to determine which early devotional writings were influential to Luther in understanding Christ’s Passion and how he in turn applied and criticized them. He emphasized that Luther was building on a long tradition of devotion literature in his concept of the theology of the cross, or *theological cruces*.

102 An example from Bonaventure’s interpretation of Luke’s Gospel of around 1257 shows that Simon’s presence at the road to Calvary could reflect the concept of a Christian following the call to take up the cross, or it could have several negative connotations depending on one’s outlook. Luke’s verse on the episode states, “And as they led him away, they laid hold of a certain Simon of Cyrene, coming from the country, and they laid the cross upon him to carry after Jesus (Lk 23:26).” Bonaventure noted the
While Silver is among the small group of scholars to read Protestant undertones in specific drawings from the *Oblong Passion*, Jordan Kantor has seen the impact of the early Reformation on the entire series, particularly Dürer’s possible anxiety regarding the use of images for devotional purposes. In his 2000 exhibition *Dürer’s Passions*, Kantor evaluated Dürer’s attitude towards Christ’s Passion through the artist’s emphasis on the corporeality of Jesus’ body and the way in which Dürer intended the viewer to interact devotionally with the imagery. To Kantor, the artist’s multiple Passions series demonstrated Dürer’s “...developing understanding of Christ’s response to his fate. As a young artist, Dürer imagined Christ as highly emotional, resisting his inevitable suffering and death. Late in his career, Dürer pictured his protagonist as calmer and more resigned to his fate.”

Kantor also believed Dürer purposely minimized Jesus’ suffering to a “calmer and more resigned” figure to reflect the notion of faithful submission to God’s will, similar to Saxl and Silver’s assessment of the 1521 Frankfurt *Agony* drawing. He argued that Dürer’s use of high and oblique viewpoints reflected Dürer’s attempt to minimize the devotional aspects of the works in response to evangelical concerns about the idolatrous significance of Luke’s identification of Simon from another country as it “...designates the obedience of the Gentile peoples to take up the cross after Christ.” But he goes on to say that according to Mark’s account, Simon was forced to carry Jesus’ burden (Mk 15:21). Bonaventure argued that this shift in nomenclature suggested that, “…by reason of compulsion Simon designates hypocrites who carry the cross for the sake of human praise.” He said that Simon could also signify people who carry Jesus’ cross in the spirit of punishment that is imposed upon them. It is clear just from Bonaventure’s reading of the event that Simon’s act of carrying Jesus’ cross could evoke at least two different spiritual attitudes, the embrace of Jesus’ suffering and the rejection of it. Robert J. Karris, *Saint Bonaventure’s Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, (Saint Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2004), 3: 2136-2137.

---


104 Ibid., 18.

105 Ibid., 35. See also *supra* text in note 98.
abuse of images. This factor may contribute to the noticeable difference of the style and format of the *Oblong Passion*. However it does not take into consideration the function of the drawings in Dürer’s ouvre or other artistic circumstances that may have influenced his compositions. If the purpose of the drawings was not primarily as preparatory woodcut designs, then they were for the benefit of the artist only. As such Dürer would not have been concerned that his images might inspire idolatry among devout viewers. More plausibly, the appearance of the *Oblong Passion* was an outcome of Dürer’s shifting religious understanding of Christ’s Passion combined with his awareness of contemporary Netherlandish modes of depicting panoramic landscape views and religious scenes.

Although Silver and Kantor related Luther’s religious concepts to Dürer’s work from the early 1520s, both provided only limited detail from Luther’s writings from that time period, referring more generally to Lutheran concepts and in the case of Silver, making reference to Luther’s writings that postdate Dürer’s death as evidence. For instance, Silver’s argument that Dürer’s 1521 *Saint Christopher* engravings depict a spiritual conversion as well as a model for evangelical Christians to become Christ-bearers is predicated on a sermon Luther gave in April of 1530. Noting that this sermon could not of been a source for Dürer’s drawings, Silver additionally referred to an early instance wherein Luther spoke of Saint Christopher as a Christ-bearer in an emblematic

---

106 Ibid., 35. Craig Harbison has also suggested that Dürer was concerned about the status of religious imagery, citing Dürer’s supposed re-dating of his engraving of *Saint Philip* (B. 46) and the postponement of its publication from 1523 to 1526. See Craig Harbison, “Dürer and the Reformation: The Problem of the Re-dating of the Saint Philip Engraving,” *The Art Bulletin*, 58, no. 3 (1976): 368-373.


way, a much less developed idea at the time. While making anachronistic use of sources can be at times problematic, Silver’s overall interpretation of the engravings should not be disregarded for the principal reason that, “...the artist, so preoccupied with both Luther and St. Christopher during the year 1521, would surely have taken note of the current discussion by Luther on the subject of St. Christopher.” As I have shown, this is also the case with Dürer’s preoccupation with the Passion.

Of Dürer’s late graphic work, his Last Supper 1523 woodcut has been interpreted with the most frequency as reflecting evangelical concepts (Fig. 89). Like Dürer’s earlier Last Supper renditions from his Small and Large Passion woodcuts, Jesus is featured as the central figure with a luminous halo (Fig. 90, 91). However, the animated gestures of the figures and the distinctive settings were replaced in favor of a simple, stark, and sober atmosphere. Jesus and John the Evangelist assume a similar position to the earlier renditions while the apostles listen intently to Jesus’ announcement. In a prominent departure from his earlier works, Dürer removed Judas from the scene, thus establishing a separate moment of the narrative. Dürer depicted an episode told only in John’s Gospel in which Jesus delivers the new commandment to his followers that they love one another as Jesus has loved them.

109 Here, Silver made reference to Luther’s 1521 text, the Decem praecepta, which may or may not have been on Dürer’s list of works by Luther. Ibid., 243.

110 Ibid., 244.


112 According to Panofsky, “Now—and so far as we know for the first and last time in the history of art—the scene is depicted after the crisis has passed.” He also noted “It is the giving of this “New Commandment” which forms the principal content of Dürer’s woodcut and after which it should be named. For a human tragedy and the establishment of a sacred ritual it substitutes the institution of the Evangelical community.” Panofsky, Life and Art, 223. For the Gospel entry, see (Jn 13: 34-35). “A new commandment
Other departures from Dürer’s previous renditions include the structure of the composition and the placement of the Eucharistic elements. First, although Jesus and John the Evangelist are in a similar position to his other Last Supper depictions and maintain the focal point of the woodcut, the composition is noticeably asymmetrical. Additionally, nothing remains on the table except for the isolated chalice, while the empty charger, bread, and wine pitcher rest on the floor in the foreground. Scholars have argued that the drastic change in narrative moment and the emphasis on the chalice of the 1523 woodcut signify evangelical ideologies that deal with the theology of the Eucharist and the concept of Christian love, each topics of discussion in Martin Luther’s writings.

I give unto you: That you love another, as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another.” John is also the only Evangelist who does not describe the establishment of the Eucharist at the Last Supper. According to David Price, “This absence has so disturbed Biblical exegetes over the years that a tradition arose—and is still used—for finding a Eucharistic statement in John’s Gospel at 6,53ff.” David Price, “Albrecht Durer’s ‘Last Supper’ (1523) and the ‘Septembertestament’,” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 59, no. 4 (1996): 581. This passage tells of Jesus’ feeding of the multitudes when he described himself as the “living bread which came down from heaven,” and “If any man eat this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world (Jn 6: 52-53).” “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day (Jn 6: 55).”

114 The empty charger has been identified as the basin used by Jesus during the episode of the washing of the feet, also only found in John’s Gospel (Jn 13: 4-16), however, this identification has lost support in favor of an Eucharistic interpretation. See Tietze and Tietze-Conrat, Kritisches Verzeichnis der Werke, 2: 49, cat. 915; Panofsky, Life and Art, 222; Price, “Albrecht Durer’s ‘Last Supper’ (1523) and the ‘Septembertestament’,” 580n11.

115 See Panofsky, Life and Art, 221–223; Price, “Albrecht Durer’s ‘Last Supper’ (1523) and the ‘Septembertestament’”; Price, Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance, 250–258. One of the only scholars to deny that Dürer’s 1523 Last Supper woodcut has a Protestant message is Jane Hutchison who viewed the print as an image meant for Catholic consumption, particularly within clerical circles of convents and monasteries. She suggested that the main focal point of the print is “the venerable medieval mystic theme of the Johannesminne, in which John the Evangelist ‘reclines on the Lord’s bosom’—that is, falls asleep at the table, leaning on Christ.” Hutchison, Albrecht Dürer, 179. This assertion does not take into account that much of Luther’s new theological concepts came out of the devotional tradition; therefore the Johannesminne could still apply to more evangelical-minded representations. Further, John the Evangelist models complete faith in Jesus, something that Luther stressed as a key to one’s salvation. Hutchison also did not consider that Dürer used this figural grouping for all of his renditions of the Last Supper, an arrangement he clearly valued for its powerful message.
Several scholars have suggested that the unprecedented spatial distance Dürer placed between the sacramental elements, specifically the representation of the chalice on the table and the wine and bread on the floor, refer to a contemporary debate known as the “Chalice Controversy” regarding utraquism, the notion that the laity should be given the right to partake in the full sacrament, both the bread and the wine. In 1523, Wolfgang Volprecht extended the Eucharist in both forms to those who wanted it in Nuremberg, an act that was unauthorized at the time. Two years later this would become standard practice. Panofsky believed that “It may have been the doctrinal significance of the Last Supper which induced him [Dürer] to develop this one composition into a woodcut for immediate publication while he postponed and ultimately abandoned the execution of his other Passion drawings.” However, the distinctive moment depicted is also significant to the emerging concepts of the period.

Price has argued that Luther’s Septembertestament, the first edition of his translation of the New Testament published in September of 1522, should be considered Dürer’s source for this woodcut. In the forward, Luther presented the reader with the concept of Christian love according to John’s Gospel. He asserted, “This is what Christ means when at the last he gave no other commandment than love, by which men were to

---

116 For example, Panofsky, Life and Art, 222; Price, Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance, 253. The drinking of the wine was the most controversial element to the debate, as it was not offered to the laity in the Catholic mass. In Latin, it is sub utraque forma, utraque meaning ‘both.’

117 Price, Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance, 253. In 1521, Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt dedicated his pamphlet Von anbetung vnd eer erbeittung der zeychen des neüwen Testaments (On the Adoration and Veneration of the Symbols of the New Testament) to his “dear protector Albrecht Dürer,...in order to pay homage to you...” Quoted from Hutchison, Albrecht Dürer, 179. The tract discussed the concept of utraquism, but as noted by Price, the real emphasis of the work was on the “proper veneration of the sacrament.” Price, Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance, 253.

118 Panofsky, Life and Art, 222.

119 Price, Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance, 255.
know who were his disciples and true believers.” Price added that Luther’s concept of Christian love had also been laid out earlier in his *The Freedom of a Christian* of 1520 and that the Eucharistic symbolism emphasized among other scholars may be less relevant to the print than previously thought.

The significance of the Eucharist is also secondary in the 1523 *Oblong Passion Last Supper* drawing, which is considered by many to be the preparatory drawing for the woodcut (Fig. 1). As noted in the discussion of the drawing in the previous chapter, Dürer’s composition represents the moment Jesus announced there was a traitor amongst them. However, Panofsky remarked that Dürer’s placement of the ceremonial chalice directly in front of Jesus was a change from his earlier Passion woodcuts and therefore was a clear reference to the utraquism debate. Panofsky also noted the absence of a sacrificial lamb on the table and suggested that Dürer was depicting Luther’s view of Christ’s symbolic presence within the Eucharist rather than the moment of transubstantiation.

I argue that a significant aspect of this drawing rests in Jesus’ placement to the side. By placing him at the head of the table on the same plane as his disciples, rather than slightly above them, and by eliminating his halo, Dürer emphasized Jesus’ humanity.

---

120 Quoted from Ibid., 256.

121 Ibid., 255. Panofsky suggested that the absence of the Pascal lamb on the charger indicated Dürer’s support of Luther’s claim that the mass is not sacrificial. In contrast, Price asserted that “However oft-repeated this point has become, it is merely speculation, for there is no trace of an iconographic tradition for associating the Passover lamb on the charger at the Last Supper as a symbol for the Mass. There is also no occurrence in Protestant polemics of using such an image to criticize the Catholic definition of the Mass. Although I incline toward seeing the round object on the floor as a serving platter, we should also not rule out the possibility that it is the basin used for washing the disciples’ feet.” David Price, *Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance*, 253.

122 See the discussion of the drawing in chapter two.

123 Panofsky, *Life and Art*, 222.
and the affinity he had with his followers. According to the Gospels, Jesus had just told them that this would be the last moment that he was to eat with them before his imminent suffering, which was followed by the announcement of a traitor among them (Lk 22:15-16; 22: 21). Dürer’s composition shows that Jesus’ announcement and the meaning of his impending agony was lost on his disciples as they question Jesus and each other, feel saddened by the possibility of treachery in their midst, and finally ask who the greatest was among them (Lk 22: 23-24). Although Judas was the true betrayer, to whom Jesus even extended a final warning and a chance for redemption, the other disciples also exhibited true selfishness. They worried more about themselves and argued over who had the greatest merit, a testament to the sinfulness of humanity and the purpose for Jesus’ incarnation. Some of Jesus’ followers also continued to have doubts in him as the savior because of his humanity. After the meal, Philip asked Jesus, “Lord, shew us the Father, and it is enough for us (Jn 14: 8).” The drawing is thus a representation of confusion, doubt, and the sinfulness of humanity, the remedy for which, according to Luther, was faith.

The gravity of Jesus’ suffering continued to go unrecognized by his disciples in the Garden of Gethsemane. In his 1520 Karlsruhe depiction of the Agony in the Garden, Dürer emphasized Peter, James, and John in the lower right foreground (Fig. 2). Jesus’ presence is diminished in comparison and his countenance is turned away from the viewer toward the diminutive angel above. The disciples represent humanity and all of the sins Jesus must assume for his atonement. While Winkler considered the oversized scale of the disciples an error in draughtsmanship, Silver considered their significance in the drawing to mean that the viewer had to encounter the weakness of humanity first
before reaching the greatness of the spirit. For Silver, the space and scale differences between Jesus and his followers represented the dichotomy between mankind and divinity.

This observation has merit; however, it is clear from Jesus’ upraised arms and the angel’s cross, a prefiguration of the crucifixion, that he is tormented by the thought of his suffering to come and has yet to accept his fate. He pleaded, “My Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass from me (Mt 26: 39). This request to God for mercy is when Jesus is at his most human. For those who contemplated the Passion, Luther proposed Jesus’ agony as a source of strength in his Meditations: “If troubles or any kind of adversity of body or soul weigh you down, gird up your heart and say: “Hey, why can I not endure even a small adversity, when my Lord’s troubles and fear caused him to sweat blood in the garden. What kind of lazy, shameful knave will lie in bed, when his master struggles with in the cords of death?” By praying with such earnestness, Jesus in his agony demonstrates the perfect example of prayer and how Christians should live their lives in his image.

Dürer’s 1521 Frankfurt Agony in the Garden shows Jesus’ subsequent acceptance of his fate (Fig. 3). As has been noted by Saxl and Silver, the position of Jesus prostrate on the ground in the form of a cross represents Luther’s doctrine that “...salvation lies in

---


125 Ibid.

complete submission to faith.”127 Luther asserted in a lecture of the Psalms in 1519 that, “The CROSS alone is our theology.”128 As a monk within the Augustinian order, Luther had practiced a form of devotion that was heavily cross-centered. A scapular was to be worn constantly, as a reminder of Jesus’ burden of carrying the cross, while initiates entering into the brotherhood were required to lay before the head of the order and extend their arms into a cross position, much like in Dürer’s depiction.129 Donald McColl noted that this was a penitential pose for prayer even into the 1530s, as Thomas More suggested it in his *Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation* of 1534.130

In the oblong drawing, an angel floating in the clouds above Jesus holds the chalice, which signifies his acceptance of what is to come. Jesus prayed, “My Father, if

---

127 See Fritz Saxl, *Lectures*, 1: 273. Silver also quoted Saxl in his discussion of the 1521 Frankfurt *Agony*. See Silver, “The Influence of Anxiety,” 424. According to Panofsky, “The figure has both the pathos of a human being in agony and the grandeur of a fallen statue, with arms outstretched in the form of the Cross.” Panofsky, *Life and Art*, 220. White later noted that through the depiction of the misty atmosphere, the crestfallen pose of Jesus, and the tranquility of the sleeping disciples, “Dürer the rationalist achieves a mystic and poetic quality that he never surpassed in any other work.” Christopher White, *Dürer: The Artist and His Drawings* (New York: Watson-Guptill, 1971), 196, cats., 91, 92. The first scholars to note Jesus’ position as if already on the cross were Posonyi and Thausing. For the specific references for these authors, see Fedja Anzelewsky and Hans Mielke, *Albrecht Dürer: Kritischer Katalog der Zeichnungen, die Zeichnungen alter Meister im Berliner Kupferstichkabinett* (Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, 1984), 106, cat. 101. Jordan Kantor did not see the same emotive quality of the drawing as Panofsky but rather viewed it as a clear departure from Dürer’s emphasis on Jesus’ corporeality and presence in his earlier *Agony* depictions. He asserted that Dürer intended to “completely dematerialize Christ,” and that his face-down posture relinquishes “the possibility of an intimate encounter with him.” His interpretation supposes that Dürer intended to create distance between Jesus and the viewer in the face of criticism surrounding devotional imagery during the early years of the Reformation. Kantor also suggested that because Dürer was older and ill that he was less “interested in staging Christ in an argument with God over his fate.” This observation discounts Dürer’s other *Agony* drawings of the period. Jordan Kantor, *Dürer’s Passions* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Art Museums, 2000), 40.

128 “CRUX sola est nostra theologica,” from Luther’s *Operationes in psalmos* (Psalm 5:12), quoted from Erwin, “The Passion and Death of Christ,” 10n9.

129 Ibid., 254.

130 Donald McColl, “Agony in the Garden: Dürer’s ‘Crisis of the Image,’” in *The Essential Dürer*, ed. Larry Silver and Jeffrey Chippens Smith (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 166. The excerpt from Thomas More’s passage stated, “Then let him before an altar or some pitiful image of Christ’s bitter passion...kneel down or fall prostrate as at the feet of almighty God, verily believing him to be there invisibly present as without any doubt he is. There let him open his heart to God, and confess his faults such as he can call to mind, and pray God forgiveness.”
this chalice may not pass away, but I must drink it, thy will be done (Mt. 26: 42).” Dürer depicted Jesus’ prostrate body as if weightless and floating above the ground, signifying his dual nature as man and divine. He has made the decision to be with his Father and to redeem mankind’s sins, no matter the sacrifice.\textsuperscript{131} By showing Jesus’ acceptance of his fate, Dürer visualized Luther’s assertion that one should have absolute faith in God’s plan for them.

Dürer’s depictions of \textit{Christ Carrying the Cross} also show two related yet distinct instances from the episode (Figs. 6, 7). In the more traditional version, Dürer has shown Jesus fallen beneath the weight of the cross (Fig. 7). As noted above, Silver has argued that Simon’s act of assisting Jesus with his burden reflects a Lutheran concept of how to be a good Christian by taking up Christ’s cross.\textsuperscript{132} I believe that figure 7, because of its dramatic emphasis on suffering, reflects the common devotional aspects found in Dürer’s previous works, only with a wider breadth of vision. Jesus is shown beaten by his numerous captors while the crowd, ignorant to the significance of his death, carves out a path for the procession. John the Evangelist and the Virgin are depicted closely behind Jesus just as they are in Dürer’s earlier renditions of the scene, save for the \textit{Engraved Passion} version.

Dürer’s other drawing of the episode is less intense in terms of drama and suffering (Fig. 6). Jesus’ distress is deemphasized, as is the abuse of the guards. Likewise, the procession has stopped, allowing contemplation of not just Jesus at the

\textsuperscript{131} Stephanie Buck noted that Jesus looked as though he were floating. Stephanie Buck, \textit{Wendepunkte deutscher Zeichenkunst: Spägotik und Renaissance im Städel}, exh. cat. (Frankfurt am Main: Städelisches Kunstinstut, 2003), 110.

\textsuperscript{132} Silver, “The Influence of Anxiety”, 424-425.
center, but two other figural groups at the extreme edges of the drawing. The fellow prisoners and the women of Jerusalem represent a number of Luther’s concepts, including the way to Christian salvation, the unrighteous path, and misconstrued devotion. In the right foreground, instead of depicting John the Evangelist and the Virgin, Dürer included the women Luke mentioned as those who “...bewailed and lamented him [Jesus] (Lk 23: 27).” According to his account, Jesus saw how these women wept and “...turning to them said: Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not over me; but weep for yourselves, and for your children (Lk 23: 28).” Luther, in his Meditations, made these women an example of those who lament over Jesus’ innocence, but do not grasp its meaning. Here, Jesus reprimands the women, not because they are weeping, but rather because they miss the significance of his suffering to their salvation. As Jesus is made to suffer for their transgressions and not his own, they would be better off weeping over their own sinfulness.

Dürer’s depiction of the thieves is unique among his other renditions of this event prior to 1520. They are only slightly visible in the analogous Christ Carrying the Cross drawing discussed above (Fig. 7). Dürer has plainly established Jesus’ fellow criminals in the lower left foreground by their near nakedness and their ligatures. The thief whose face and torso are bathed in light will eventually be the “good thief” while the other, left in shadow, will remain the “bad thief” at the time of their deaths. Turning back to look at Jesus, the good thief demonstrates his acknowledgment that Jesus holds the key to his fate. As the bad thief hung from the cross he taunted Jesus saying, “If thou be Christ, save

---

133 Dürer depicted two women directly behind Jesus in his Engraved Passion Christ Carrying the Cross, but did not feature them in any other version of the episode.

134 Luther, A Sermon on Meditating on the Holy Passion of Christ, 1519, article 3, as transcribed in Robert Guy Erwin, “The Passion and Death of Christ,” 412; Ibid., 269-270.
thynself and us (Lk 23:39).” The good thief intervened reproachfully, “Neither dost thou fear God, seeing thou art under the same condemnation (Lk 23:40)?” This criminal also knew they deserved to die for what they had done, but that Jesus was innocent (Lk 23:41). The good thief asked Jesus to “…remember me when thou shalt come into thy kingdom” to which Jesus replied, “Amen I say to thee, this day thou shalt be with me in paradise (Lk 23:42-43).”

By depicting the thieves so distinctly at the head of the procession, Dürer illustrated the difference between pride and humility before the face of God. Until the end, the bad thief could not recognize Jesus’ saving grace, trusting only himself. In contrast, the good thief accepted his sins and asked for God’s mercy. Because he had faith that his sins would be forgiven, even just moments before his death, the good thief was given redemption and was the first to be with Christ in paradise. Jesus’ mercy in this moment shows that there is nothing one can do of one’s own accord to earn salvation; it can only be given in the spirit of complete faith through grace. Compared to Dürer’s corresponding depiction of Christ Carrying the Cross, this work is rich with meaning and shows Dürer’s contemplation of salvation as forwarded by Luther.

The doctrinal significance of Dürer’s Bearing of the Body drawings from the Oblong Passion is more challenging to discern. They are unique within Dürer’s oeuvre and are neither scenes of Jesus’ descent from the cross nor the highly devotional lamentation of the Virgin over her dead son’s body, as discussed in chapter two. The gospel accounts are also limited regarding the proceedings after Jesus’ death and vary in the details of who was active during Jesus’ burial. Joseph of Arimathea is the only figure found in all four accounts, while among the Synoptic Gospels Nicodemus appears, as do
Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of Joseph, and a group of women from Galilee. All of the additional figures depicted in the scene, such as the people who bear Jesus, John the Evangelist, and the Virgin are additions to the biblical narrative.

The 1521 Nuremberg drawing (Fig. 8) represents the scene at eye level. The viewer is directly confronted by Jesus’ languid corpse, which Dürer has elongated for emphasis. The Virgin’s typical emotional response to Jesus’ death is underplayed here and no one appears to look directly at his body. The last of Jesus’ humanity is gone and through his death he has atoned for mankind. Jesus’ body is lifted up just as a priest lifts up the host, while behind the procession a vineyard of grapes grows, both references to the Eucharist.

In his other *Bearing of the Body* drawing of 1521, Dürer places less emphasis on Jesus’ body, as the viewpoint is much higher while the scale of the figures is minimized (Fig. 9). The focus rests on the group of mourners who follow in the wake of Jesus’ corpse. There is little display of emotion, save for the central figure that raises her arms in consternation. When compared to the rest of the procession, she appears out of place, almost indecorous. The high vantage, the panoramic landscape, and the slowness of the cortège relates the gravitas of the situation without the affective grief typically depicted in scenes involving Jesus’ remains. There is no climactic event and if it were not for Jesus’ exposed body and the significance of his sacrifice, the drawing might depict an ordinary secular funeral procession. Dürer’s more restrained depiction of Jesus and his followers demonstrates the artist’s reflections on the nature and significance of Christ’s
Passion itself, and to that end, the larger importance of faith as a requisite for salvation in contrast to the usefulness of affective piety.\textsuperscript{135}

\textbf{Conclusion}

Dürer’s character and identity as a man and as an artist was shaped by the religious and cultural climate in Germany during the years leading up to and during the early stages of the Reformation. As a devoted Christian, Dürer engaged with Christ’s Passion both artistically and spiritually for the majority of his career. Dürer’s \textit{Large, Green, Small}, and \textit{Engraved Passion} series were all conceived for both monetary ends and devotional purposes and were aimed at both the discerning art lover and the pious believer. With each series, Dürer reconsidered how best to represent the narrative, both creatively and stylistically. While the series differ to varying degrees from one another, Dürer’s late \textit{Oblong Passion} drawings show a distinct departure from his earlier works.

At the time of Dürer’s creation of the \textit{Oblong Passion}, the Reformation was rapidly unfolding in northern Europe. Documentary evidence indicates that Dürer was a supporter of Luther’s ideas and the artist’s reflections on Luther’s possible loss in his Netherlandish diary further attest to Dürer’s preoccupation with the reformer’s welfare. Artistically, Dürer refrained from producing polemical or didactic imagery that overtly supported the movement, causing later debate among scholars regarding the degree of Dürer’s religious inclinations towards Lutheranism. Dürer’s 1523 \textit{Last Supper} woodcut

\textsuperscript{135} Susan C. Karant-Nunn observed that, “Protestant piety, guided by the Word of God, was explicitly and semiotically defined as quiet submission to the workings of faith within the individual Christian and, externally, as gentle, less emotive (however feeling), non-flaunting submission to authority and the service of one’s neighbor.” See Susan C. Karant-Nunn, \textit{The Reformation of Feeling: Shaping the Religious Emotions in Early Modern Germany} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 65. This notion can certainly be applied to Dürer’s \textit{Oblong Passion} drawings.
and his 1526 *Four Holy Men* panels have garnered the most attention for their possible references to Luther’s teachings. Instances of evangelical meaning in Dürer’s other works of the period are more difficult to determine. However, because of Dürer’s interest in Luther’s writings, several authors have attempted to identify specific occurrences of reformatory doctrinal principles in his late religious artwork. A number of Dürer’s *Oblong Passion* drawings have been assessed in this light, but to a surprisingly limited degree. Dürer’s 1521 Frankfurt *Agony in the Garden* has received the most consideration because of the unique way Dürer depicted Jesus prostrated in the shape of the cross, a clear allusion to his impending crucifixion while also a Lutheran reference to the importance of complete submission to God’s will.

Among those scholars that have noted evangelical principles in some of Dürer’s *Oblong Passion* drawings, Luther’s *Sermon von der Betrachtung des heiligen Leidens Christi* has been surprisingly overlooked as a source that helps to explain the divergence of Dürer’s late Passion scenes from his earlier works. Luther’s sermon was printed in at least twenty-five editions with varying translations within two years of its initial publication and quickly achieved widespread popularity. The work was listed among those that Dürer either had in his possession or was looking to acquire. Based on the language of Dürer’s passage on Luther in his diary and a notation located on the back of a drawing, it is clear that Dürer was aware of Luther’s main assertions about the significance of Christ’s Passion—that Jesus’ atonement for the sins of mankind was the foundation of Christianity and that one’s true faith in God’s grace was the key to redemption. This theological stance was diametrically opposed to the merit-based prescriptions imposed by the precepts of the earthly Church.
Elements of Dürer’s *Oblong Passion* drawings reflect Luther’s models for good Christian behavior and how to meditate on Christ’s Passion properly. Whether preparatory for a new Passion series or independent meditations on the subject, they demonstrate Dürer’s re-envisioning of the theme from, what Silver appositely called it, “...old wine in new, Lutheran bottles.”136 However, this interpretation does not explain why Dürer chose to depict the episodes in an oblong format, an orientation that was uncommon for Dürer’s narrative subjects. I contend that in order for Dürer to truly re-conceptualize the Passion he had to diverge radically from his canonical depictions of the scene. To do so, Dürer chose a different format, alternative pictorial arrangements, and more elaborate narrative descriptions. As Dürer was traveling within the Netherlands at the time he commenced work on the drawings, he likely sought artistic stimulation from the copious amount of artworks he viewed. Several scholars have noted a relationship between the *Oblong Passion* and Netherlandish art, but have never fully delved into the sources Dürer might have been interested in adapting.

While this chapter has explored the ways in which the Reformation and Luther’s teachings directly affected Dürer’s conception of Christ’s Passion and how he altered his depictions of the theme to suit current religious thought, the following chapter examines how the oblong format and the subjects of the drawings are in various ways informed by Dürer’s early Netherlandish predecessors, whom he admired, as well as his contemporaries, whose novel approaches to religious imagery also likely served as inspiration. Dürer’s evangelical reconceptualization of Christ’s Passion combined with pictorial elements derived from Netherlandish art resulted in Dürer’s construction of a

---

new visual language that departed significantly from his earlier representations of the subject.
Chapter 4

The “Oblong Passion” Drawings and their Relationship to Netherlandish Art

When Dürer traveled north to the Netherlands in 1520, he chose Antwerp as his headquarters from which to visit nearby towns and cities in the region. This decision was a calculated one, for at the time of his trip Antwerp was the commercial trading hub of Northern Europe.\(^1\) The market was filled with an abundance of goods including Indian spices from Portugal, Spanish silver, English textiles, German metals and Canary Island sugar, all imported by way of the harbor along the river Scheldt and by overland trade routes throughout Europe.\(^2\) In addition to the foreign merchants and bankers who flocked to the city to conduct business, artists like Joachim Patinir (c. 1480- c. 1524) and Quinten Massys (1466-1530) relocated from other regions of the Low Countries to live in Antwerp and reap the benefits of the burgeoning art market.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Antwerp’s rise as a competitive trading center was linked to the economic decline of the once successful late fifteenth-century market in nearby Bruges, which resulted from adverse politics as well as the silting of the Zwin, the city’s main waterway to the North Sea. Maximilian I, in response to Bruges’ rebellion and his imprisonment there in 1488, ordered all foreign merchants to leave the city, and suggested Antwerp specifically as a suitable replacement. See J.A. van Houtte, “The Rise and Decline of the Market in Bruges,” *The Economic History Review, New Series* 19, no. 1 (1966): 29-47. According to Herman van der Wee, Antwerp experienced its first initial period of intense growth from 1490 to 1520. For the standard source regarding the market in Antwerp, see Herman van der Wee, *The Growth of the Antwerp Market and the European Economy* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1963). For a more recent analysis, see Filip Vermeylen, *Painting for the Market: Commercialization of Art in Antwerp's Golden Age* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003).


An analysis of the registered painters in Antwerp’s Guild of Saint Luke (Liggeren) shows that from 1460 to 1520 the number of masters and apprentices working in the city grew from 45 to 321, not including itinerant journeymen. The art market’s success in Antwerp was due in part to the serialization of popular pictorial types and the increasing specialization of subjects. Variations of images like David’s *Virgin and Child with Milk Soup* were reproduced multiple times while Patinir’s innovative “hybrid” history paintings, wherein panoramic landscapes were the main feature of the picture and the figures were secondary, found their specific niche within the Antwerp art market (Figs. 92, 93). Dürer even referred to Patinir in his diary as the “good landscape painter,” indicating that he was a specialist in the emerging genre.

This kind of innovative art production was an integral part to the city’s success. Indeed, the city council of Antwerp was aware of the importance of the arts to the market

---


economy and encouraged artists from foreign regions to settle there. In a letter written to the Nuremberg city council regarding the receipt of monies owed him, Dürer noted that he had been approached by the rival city and was offered attractive incentives to work there permanently. He stated, “...only a short time ago when I was in the Netherlands, the Council of Antwerp would have given me 300 Philipsgulden a year, kept me there free of taxes, and honoured me with a well-built house, and besides I should have been paid in addition [...] for all the work I might have done for the gentry.”8 The city’s generous offer to Dürer demonstrates how integral the arts had become to the economy in the early 1520s and how accommodating Antwerp could be to successful artists.

Dürer resided in the city for almost a full calendar year amidst this modern and exciting atmosphere enjoying the time he spent visiting with members of the Guild of Saint Luke and their workshops.9 In addition to the contemporary art he would have seen on the market, Dürer visited many churches and houses in Antwerp, Brussels, Mechelen, and Ghent to view masterpieces by earlier Netherlandish painters.10 Dürer’s interest in the culture and artwork is evident from the diary in which he listed the elaborate processions he attended and the many paintings he viewed, including Rogier van der Weyden’s Justice Panels in Brussels, Jan and Hubert van Eyck’s Ghent Altarpiece, and paintings by

---

8 Conway, Literary Remains, 131-132; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 109-110. Part of the reason for Dürer’s decline was likely the uncertain religious climate in the city at the time of his visit as well as his firm establishment in the cultural atmosphere of Nuremberg.

9 As discussed in chapter one, Dürer was invited to the painters’ guildhall upon arriving in the city and participated in a magnificent feast. Soon thereafter Dürer visited the “Painters’ warehouse” where he saw the work underway in preparation for Charles V’s Triumphal Procession. See Conway, Literary Remains, 96-97; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 151.

10 See chapter one for a description of some of his commentary on the works he viewed.
Hugo van der Goes.\textsuperscript{11} He also recorded the sights and townspeople he found interesting in his “Silverpoint Sketchbook” and in various pen and ink drawings. Surrounded by such visual stimuli, it is conceivable that Dürer would have drawn on this great Netherlandish tradition for inspiration in his own works.

According to Heinrich Wölfflin, Dürer’s “…greatest period began with his journey to the Netherlands.”\textsuperscript{12} He believed that, “In his fifties he experienced a revitalization of his perception...” and that “...new and deeper springs were opened to him.”\textsuperscript{13} Further, it was the scholar’s judgment that the novelty of a foreign country prompted the “new germs [that] suddenly stirred in him.”\textsuperscript{14} However, to Wölfflin, the Netherlands was just a catalyst that revived the creativity Dürer had experienced in Italy. He thus, “...needed the impressions of Antwerp with her refinement and opulent living to release the memory of Venice.”\textsuperscript{15} This commentary from an early authoritative voice on the artist illustrates the pervasive notion that while Netherlandish art and culture may have been praiseworthy in Dürer’s mind, Italy still held most significant sway over him.

Such is the case with observations regarding the *Oblong Passion*. In their discussions of the drawings, scholars such as the Tietzes, Winkler, and Panofsky compared them to Italian paintings and prints that might have influenced Dürer’s drawings, while only marginally considering any role Netherlandish art might have


\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 248.
played in their appearance.16 For instance, passages that refer to the drawings with such
generalities as “The growing emphasis on epic elements and the choice of a landscape
format reflect the influence of Netherlandish art,”17 and “These figures [...] clearly show
the great influence of Flemish masterpieces in his art,”18 and finally, that the oblong
drawings depicted “...a new Passion series [...] designed under the influence of
Netherlandish art,”19 are repetitive and provide little to no explication on what appears
Netherlandish about the drawings beyond their format, or why Dürer developed the
drawings in a manner different from his previous Passion imagery. This leaves the
Netherlandish aspects of these works ambiguous and perplexing at best.

Therefore, the aim of this chapter is to assess the *Oblong Passion* drawings within
the context of Netherlandish art in a way that previous scholars have overlooked. I will
identify which Netherlandish subjects and pictorial devices Dürer might have found
compelling and inspiring enough to incorporate into his own work and how he
implemented them in his drawings to make a new visual mode of expression for the
Passion to reflect current religious discourse.

The chapter will be arranged much the like the second chapter in that the
drawings will be discussed chronologically according to subject. Within each group I
evaluate the past scholarly viewpoints on possible influences for the drawings’ designs,
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which in many cases have been typically Italian. It should be noted that since Dürer never
directly copied the Netherlandish works he viewed, my assessments are based on Dürer’s
treatment of space and figural arrangement as well as the borrowing of certain visual cues
intended to guide the viewer. This discussion will demonstrate that Dürer found various
modes of representation that were practiced by Netherlandish artists worth developing in
his unique Oblong Passion drawings so as to reimagine Christ’s Passion within a
Lutheran framework.20

The Oblong Passion Drawings

Christ Carrying the Cross

Among Dürer’s extant Oblong Passion drawings, his two versions of Christ
Carrying the Cross have most frequently been associated with Netherlandish art by past

20 It is germane to this study to briefly note that Dürer had experienced Netherlandish art early in his career
indirectly by way of Michael Wolgemut’s workshop and through the prints of Martin Schongauer.
Wolgemut was in turn impacted by his predecessor Hans Pleydenwurff (c. 1425-1472), who incorporated
Netherlandish conventions into his altarpieces and portraiture. See Pleydenwurff’s portrait Count George of
Löwenstein, c. 1456, Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, no. Gm 128. Early on, Dürer painted
portraits of his parents in the style of the Netherlandish masters. Both half-length three-quarter views with
hands visible along the bottom edge of the frame, Dürer paid particular attention to the naturalistic texture
of skin and clothing. See Dürer’s Mother, Barbara Dürer, c. 1490, Nuremberg, Germanisches
Nationalmuseum, no Gm 1160 and Dürer’s Father, Albrecht Dürer the Elder, 1490, Florence, Galleria
degli Uffizi, no. 1086. Later in his career, Dürer returned to this portrait style while traveling in the
Netherlands. See for example, Portrait of Bernhard von Reesen, 1521, Dresden, Staatliche
Kunstsammlungen, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, inv. 871. This was a style of portraiture that had been
popular in the Netherlands during the mid-fifteenth century and which experienced a revival during the first
three decades of the sixteenth century among artists such as Joos van Cleve, Lucas van Leyden, and
Bernard van Orley. Dürer also painted a Saint Jerome in 1521 that is related to Netherlandish painting. It
depicts the saint in half-length, close to the picture plane, with books and skull on the desk in front of him,
painted with naturalistic detail and jewel toned colors. See Saint Jerome, 1521, Lisbon, Museu Nacional de
Arte Antiga, inv. 828 Pint. For more on the impact of Netherlandish art in Germany, see Till-Holger
Borchert, Van Eyck to Dürer: The Influence of Early Netherlandish Painting on European Art, 1430-1530,
Familienchronik that his father had moved to Nuremberg in 1455 after “...he had been a long time in the
Netherlands with great artists...” See Jane Campbell Hutchison, Albrecht Dürer: A Biography (Princeton,
scholars (Figs. 6, 7). Knackfuss noted that here “We perceive clearly the influence of the art of the Netherlands” while Veth and Muller observed Dürer’s use of Netherlandish costume for the figures. Winkler acknowledged that Dürer was inspired to create a multi-figured scene in the tradition of old Netherlandish paintings while Panofsky agreed, stating that “…it cannot be questioned that he, like Massys and Gossart, paid homage to the great tradition of Early Flemish painting.” Rupprich also postulated that the horizontal format of the two *Christ Carrying the Cross* compositions was a direct result of the various processions Dürer witnessed in the Netherlands. It is true that Dürer commented extensively on the procession organized by the Church of Our Lady in Antwerp, but the extent to which Dürer might have found this event inspirational remains conjectural.

A number of paintings and prints have been compared with Dürer’s *Christ Carrying the Cross* drawings, such as Raphael’s *Christ Falls on the Way to Calvary*, Martin Schongauer’s *Christ Carrying the Cross*, and a lost painting of the subject by Jan van Eyck (Figs. 94-96). Charles Ephrussi suggested Raphael’s *Christ Falls on the Way to Calvary*, also known as *Lo Spasimo di Sicilia*, of around 1515 to 1516 as a primary

---


Dürer may have known the composition by means of a reproductive print by Agostino Veneziano of 1517 (Fig. 97). Both Ephrussi and the Tietzes suggested this work was among a possible group of prints given to Dürer while he was in the Netherlands by Raphael’s pupil Tommaso di Andrea Vincidor. In addition to other dealings with Vincidor, Dürer noted that “On Monday after Michaelmas 1520, I gave Thomas of Bologna a whole set of prints to send for me to Rome to another painter who should send me Raphael’s work in return,” although there is no indication that Dürer received any prints of Raphael’s work during this exchange.

As Dürer had depicted the motif of Jesus fallen under the Cross before, for example in his Large, Green, and Small Passions it is unlikely that he would refer to a painting by Raphael of the subject, particularly because Raphael’s painting and the corresponding print both emphasize a different theme, specifically a moment from the Seven Sorrows of the Virgin, when Mary is overcome with grief during the procession to Golgotha. Further, this kind of devotional subject might not have appealed to Dürer in the early 1520s because it focused more on Mary’s grief than on Jesus’ extraordinary

25 My source for Ephrussi is Tietze and Tietze-Conrat, Kritisches Verzeichnis der Werk Albrecht Dürers, 2: 18, cat. 787.


27 Conway, Literary Remains, 105 Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 158.

28 See Helen S. Ettlinger, “Raphael’s Lo Spasimo: Its Historical and Iconographic Background,” Source: Notes in the History of Art 1, no. 4 (1982): 13-15. The Seven Sorrows of the Virgin are the Prophecy of Simon, the Flight into Egypt, Christ Lost by his Mother, Christ on his Way to Calvary, the Crucifixion, the Descent from the Cross, and the Ascension.
sacrifice. In the oblong *Christ Carrying the Cross* (Fig. 6) Dürer downplayed the emphatic drama of the Virgin’s sorrow required of more devotional imagery and instead gave prominence to the thieves and the Daughters of Jerusalem, the emblems of Luther’s assertions regarding the appropriate and inappropriate meditation of Christ’s Passion.

A more relevant comparison can be made between Dürer’s 1520 oblong drawings and Schongauer’s *Christ Carrying the Cross* engraving of around 1475, which has already been noted by a number of scholars (Fig. 95). Schongauer’s engraving was widely known throughout northern Europe and as a young man Dürer was already familiar with his work. Schongauer and Dürer’s compositions share the same subject and orientation, and they both formed multi-figured elaborate friezes. It is therefore likely that Dürer thought of his predecessor’s engraving during the creation of his drawings.

Tellingly, Schongauer was among the fifteenth-century German artists who incorporated Netherlandish pictorial conventions into his early paintings and engravings, particularly the work of Rogier van der Weyden. Schongauer’s *Christ Carrying the Cross* composition was itself adapted from Netherlandish models, specifically a painting ascribed to Jan van Eyck, now lost, but known today through a drawing of around 1450-1460 in the Albertina, Vienna, as well as in several painted copies; a later sixteenth-
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30 After he completed his training with Michael Wolgemut from 1486-1489, Dürer left for his *Wanderjahre* and went to Colmar to meet with Schongauer around 1492, but the artist had died a year earlier.

century version in the Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest is considered the highest in quality (Figs. 96, 98). Although Schongauer depicted Jesus fallen under the weight of the cross as opposed to the standing representations seen in the Albertina drawing and Budapest painting, compositional elements such as the curve of the procession upward, the thieves side by side ahead of Jesus, and the figures on horseback at the front of the procession, suggest that Schongauer saw Van Eyck’s original, or at least a copy of it, while traveling in the Netherlands around 1470 for his Wanderjahre. 

Panofsky asserted that Dürer, like Schongauer before him, reverted to an “Eyckian scheme” for his Christ Carrying the Cross oblong drawings, particularly the one in which Jesus is shown standing (Fig. 6). Panofsky considered Dürer’s composition an improvement upon his Netherlandish predecessors because Dürer made the figures more prominent, increased their scale, brought them up to date, and organized them with clarity rather than in a “somewhat rambling caravan.” He also linked Dürer’s

32 I followed the dating for the drawing as listed in Otto Benesch, Master Drawings in the Albertina: European Drawings from the 15th to the 18th century (Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, 1967), 350, cat. 123. Peter Klein ascertained through dendrochronology that the felling date of the panel in Budapest was between 1500-1506. There are several copies of the work in panel and in manuscript illumination, including the painting in Gaasbeek Castle, Belgium, and a copy in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. See Ildikó Ember and Zsuzsa Urbach, eds., Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest. Old Masters’ Gallery: summary catalogue: Early Netherlandish, Dutch and Flemish paintings (Budapest: Szépművészeti Múzeum, 2000), 2: 58-59.


34 Panofsky, Life and Art, 220.

35 Ibid., 221.
horse and rider at the right in figure 7 with the horse and rider at the far left of the Eyckian Albertina drawing. This similarity suggests that Dürer was familiar with Van Eyck’s composition or any number of the later variations. The same could be said of a comparison between Dürer’s horse and rider groups at the right of each of his oblong drawings and a Northern Netherlandish panel of about 1470, also a derivative work from the early Eyckian prototype (Fig. 99).

Perhaps more in keeping with Dürer’s graphic sensibility and the oblong format is a comparison between figure 6 and Lucas van Leyden’s *Triumph of Mordecai* engraving of 1515 (Figs. 6, 100). Both works depict numerous figures arranged in an elaborate frieze situated along the picture plane and framed by architectonic devices. Lucas’s print illustrates a procession in which the Persian King Ahasuerus honored his Jewish wife’s cousin Mordecai by allowing him to ride through the city accompanied by the king’s court. Surrounded by various officials and reverent citizens, Mordecai travels a narrow path along the immediate foreground. Flanking the procession are walled archways that frame the composition and funnel the crowds toward the center. To avoid congestion, Lucas featured an extensive vista past the city walls, breaking the horizontality of the scene.

Dürer arranged his Passion composition in much the same way. While surrounded by officials and supporters, Jesus carries the cross slightly left of center. The procession is confined between two large architectural structures and minimal space is provided

---

36 Ibid.

37 Ainsworth believed this painting depicts the procession of the Holy Blood in Bruges based from an inscription on the red robe of the horseman to the front of the procession that includes words referring to a procession and blood. She asserted that based on the painting style the artist was from Utrecht and that he spent some time in Bruges, where he produced the painting. See Maryan W. Ainsworth and Keith Christiansen, eds., *From Van Eyck to Bruegel: Early Netherlandish Painting in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, exh. cat. (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1998), 107-109.
between the caravan and the stone walls to the rear. In both compositions, various implements positioned both vertically and diagonally, such as spears, instruments, crosses, and a ladder interrupt the horizontal plane. Like Lucas, Dürer provided a sense of depth and recession in an otherwise constricted scene by placing a Gothic arched portal along the back wall through which one can see the rest of the city. The kneeling figure of Veronica proffering her linen cloth echoes that of the kneeling citizen in Lucas’s print who, in respect, has taken off his hat. Both figures serve the same function—to halt each procession in order to focus attention on the main figure. Further, in Dürer’s work the stout man who walks closest to the picture plane with his back turned mirrors the position of the soldier who strides alongside Mordecai in the left foreground of Lucas’s engraving. Each figure provides another layer of depth as repoussoir elements that direct attention to the main figures.

It is evident that Dürer considered how Lucas structured such a processional engraving to position a large group of figures coherently before a civic backdrop that both implied a halted sense of movement and that encouraged contemplation of the scene. To minimize the horror vacui in his drawing, Dürer provided a distant view to the background. He also incorporated secondary figures like the large man in the foreground and the kneeling Veronica to the side to alert the viewer’s attention to Jesus, the central focus of the composition.

Dürer would have certainly known of Lucas prior to his trip to the Netherlands, as he was already a highly esteemed printmaker from the North and represented serious competition for the German master. In a letter written in Frankfurt from Johannes Cochlaeus to Dürer’s friend Willibald Pirckheimer in April of 1520, just a few months
prior to Dürer’s departure for the Netherlands, he wrote, “Please convey my compliments to Master Albrecht Dürer. Yesterday, the consul saw his Hieronymus and Melancolia at my house and gave us his high praise. I wonder, however, why his works were so rare here, while pictures by Lucas Hollandini were so often on sale.” It is evident from this brief passage that Lucas was well represented at the Frankfurt Fair, one of the most impressive commercial fairs in Germany and a venue Dürer often relied on for the sale of his prints.

Lucas’s popularity came from both his novel narrative depictions, for instance illustrating the moments surrounding the dramatic climax of the story, as well as the formal orientation of his engravings. In their 1983 catalogue, The Prints of Lucas van Leyden & His Contemporaries, Ellen S. Jacobowitz and Stephanie Loeb Stepanek explained that the horizontal format in which Lucas worked was “…one of the distinguishing and innovative features of Lucas’s oeuvre […] and was also unusual in the graphic arts at that time.” His method of engraving was much shallower than Dürer’s

---


39 Hutchison, Albrecht Dürer: A Biography, 32. Dürer mentioned in a letter to Willibald Pirckheimer from Venice dated 6 January 1506, “I gave my wife 12 fl., and she took in 13 in Frankfurt...” This suggests that Agnes Dürer was traveling to the Frankfurt Fair to sell prints on behalf of her husband. Ibid., 78.


and only a limited number of quality prints could be pulled before the plate wore down, thus limiting the supply and increasing demand.\textsuperscript{42}

Dürer’s familiarity with Lucas is also supported by their encounter while Dürer was in the Netherlands. Lucas sought out the older artist, traveling from his native Leiden to Antwerp, where Dürer documented the meeting in his diary. The June 8\textsuperscript{th} entry of 1521 relates, “Master Lukas who engraves in copper asked me as his guest. He is a little man, born at Leyden in Holland; he was at Antwerp. […] I have drawn with the metal-point the portrait of Master Lukas van Leyden. […] I gave 8 fl. worth of my prints for a whole set of Lukas’ engravings.”\textsuperscript{43}

For scholars, the significance of this meeting typically centers on Dürer’s influence on the enthusiastic younger artist. Certainly, subsequent to their exchange, Lucas created works similar to those produced by Dürer in the Netherlands, such as his Saint Jerome drawing after Dürer’s panel of 1521 (Fig. 101). Lucas also began a new Passion series in the same year that was modeled after Dürer’s earlier graphic oeuvre.\textsuperscript{44}

Conversely, Dürer’s interest in Lucas’s work remains unexplored in the literature. By looking at Dürer’s oblong Christ Carrying the Cross drawing and Lucas’s engraving of the Triumph of Mordecai together, it is evident that Dürer recognized the compositional merit of Lucas’s engraving, particularly his clear emphasis on a single


\textsuperscript{43} Conway, Literary Remains, 122-123; Rupprich, Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass, 1: 174. Although Dürer noted exchanging his work for a “whole set of Lucas’s engravings,” Lucas likely only brought his most significant works with him to Antwerp.

\textsuperscript{44} Jacobowitz and Stepanek, The Prints of Lucas van Leyden, 210-211. Dürer’s Saint Jerome, now in the Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga, Lisbon, influenced many artists in the Netherlands including Joos van Cleve and Marinus van Reymerswaele.
figure within a larger procession that moved along an urban pathway. Lucas’s engraving likely appealed to Dürer because the artist’s aim was to depict Jesus clearly surrounded by people who both understood and misinterpreted his sacrifice, but that was also static enough to encourage contemplation of the narrative by the viewer. It is also apparent that Dürer turned to Lucas’s spatial treatment of the landscape for a number of his other Oblong Passion compositions.

*The Agony in the Garden*

The oblong format encouraged Dürer to experiment with landscape elements, allowing him to transform the narrow and limited Agony in the Garden depictions of his previous years into compositions that provided him with a wider and deeper space in which to structure the narrative. Of the four oblong Agony in the Garden drawings, the 1521 Frankfurt drawing depicting Jesus in a prostrate position has received the most commentary regarding its possible artistic precedents (Fig. 3).

Developed primarily in the Byzantine tradition, the motif is rare among depictions of the Agony. Dürer may have known of it from a fifteenth-century drawing out of Wolgemut’s workshop by the so-called Master of 1483, now in Erlangen (Fig. 102).45 Wölfflin and Panofsky recognized the similarities between Dürer’s drawing and the early German work, but suggested that Dürer was instead recalling the sleeping disciple in the lower left predella of Mantegna’s Saint Zeno altarpiece in Verona (Fig. 103).46 As the
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drawing and *predella* are the only known nearly contemporaneous depictions of the motif, they should be taken into consideration as possible antecedents, at least for Dürer’s early 1508-1509 woodcut of the subject (Fig. 104).

While Dürer did not directly quote a specific source for the various elements of his other *Agony* drawings, he looked to the Netherlandish landscape tradition for direction on how to realistically depict large-scale figures within a broader natural setting. Certainly, Dürer was already familiar with depicting landscapes; for instance his many watercolor landscapes of the mid-1490s demonstrate the artist’s adeptness at depicting naturalistic settings and have been referred to as “the first modern landscapes (Fig. 105).”47 However, figures were not meant to be included in these compositions. Likewise, nearly all of Dürer’s narrative graphic works are designed within a vertical framework, employing a typically quick succession into space between the foreground and the background, like in his *Small Passion Agony in the Garden* (Fig. 106).

For the oblong intaglio prints he completed, Dürer chose subjects that did not depict a specific narrative event and that did not readily integrate figures within broader landscapes. For instance, his 1518 etching *Landscape with Canon* depicts the main figures in the immediate right foreground set high above an extensive vista with a sharp dip in the middle ground (Fig. 107). The figures are in front of the landscape, rather than incorporated into it, and while Dürer added small figures further from the picture plane, they predominantly act as staffage instead of active agents to the scene. Dürer’s 1519 engraving of *Saint Anthony*, although not technically a landscape, has a similar layout to

---

the etching in that he situated the saint alone in the immediate right foreground with a complex cityscape as the backdrop (Fig. 108).

The *Oblong Passion* drawings with landscape elements required Dürer to conceive of the pictorial arrangement as incorporating figures within the setting instead of simply in front of it. For his 1520 Karlsruhe and 1524 Frankfurt *Agony in the Garden* drawings, Dürer staggered his figures in the landscape to indicate depth, and used natural elements like trees to frame the compositions (Figs. 2, 3). Dieric Bouts’s *Gathering of Manna* panel from his *Altarpiece of the Holy Sacrament* of 1464-1467 (Fig. 109) illustrates the same staggered approach. Lucas van Leyden was particularly adept at placing figures and wildlife in intervals within his compositions to suggest realistic space since his early artistic development evolved from this Netherlandish formula for rendering depth. His own *Agony in the Garden* of 1509 is a useful example to compare with Dürer’s two drawings (Fig. 110).

Lucas’s *Agony* is the first episode of his engraved *Round Passion* series. He composed the scene, bordered by a circular decorative frame, with the sleeping apostles situated in the extreme central foreground. Jesus kneels in the right middle ground facing a large stone altar on top of which rests a small chalice and host. His body is turned to the right away from the viewer and he is unaware of the entrance of the soldiers into the garden diagonally to the left. Beyond these figural groups are a deep landscape vista and open sky. While this engraving was completed as a roundel, Jacobowitz and Loeb
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49 The series may have been intended for use as a model for stained glass. Jacobowitz and Loeb Stepanek noted that Van Mander thought Lucas could have been a glass painter in addition to his profession as a painter and engraver. Jacobowitz and Loeb Stepanek, *The Prints of Lucas van Leyden*, 78.
Stepanek believed the ways in which Lucas constructed the composition looked as though he had designed it with an oblong orientation in mind, but later formatted it to fit within a roundel.\(^{50}\) The authors specifically pointed to the “...tiered development of recessive space, the zigzag scattering of isolated figural groups, and the pyramidal composition of the central group.”\(^{51}\)

Dürer’s 1520 Karlsruhe *Agony* (Fig. 2) is similar to Lucas’s engraving in the size and placement of the disciples in the immediate foreground as well as in the apparent narrative emphasis; the initial focal point of the drawing and print appears to be the apostles’ inability to remain awake, however the distance between Jesus and his followers in both works accentuates the solitary nature of Jesus’ suffering.\(^{52}\) Like Lucas’s design, the disciples in Dürer’s drawing are depicted at the lowest level of the composition with Jesus at its highest, while the soldiers in the background are placed between in the upper middle ground. Additionally, Dürer arranged his figures in a “zigzag” formation beginning with the apostles at the right, moving diagonally to Jesus at the left, and then back to the soldiers near the drawings’ central axes. This figural arrangement mirrors Lucas’s and is even more apparent when Lucas’s engraving is viewed in reverse (Fig. 111).

Lucas routinely framed his composition by a set of trees, a device also used by Dürer in his 1524 rendition of the scene (Fig. 5). The placement and arrangement of the

\(^{50}\) Ibid., 78.

\(^{51}\) Ibid.

\(^{52}\) While the placement of the disciples in the foreground of the *Agony* was common among Dürer’s earlier prints and drawings, he did not treat the organization of space between Jesus and his Apostles the way in which Lucas had in this work. It is notable that the recession into the background is gradual while Dürer’s is often one of quick succession, with the middle ground suppressed. See for example the *Agony* prints from his *Engraved and Small Passions*.  
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trees is nearly identical in the two works, also better seen in reverse. For instance, Dürer placed a single tree along the left edge of his 1524 drawing and two trees at a diagonal axis along the right, just as Lucas did in his Agony engraving. Further, “...one of Lucas’s favourite motifs...” was to accentuate important figural groups by placing trees as a visual anchor. Dürer employed this design element for both his 1521 and 1524 Frankfurt Agony drawings (Figs. 3, 5). For instance, compare Dürer’s placement of the disciples among several trees with the same motif in Lucas’s 1509 Christ Carrying the Cross from the Round Passion and his Samson and Delilah woodcut of around 1512, just to name two examples among many (Figs. 112, 113). Dürer did not use this device in the same way in his early Passion depictions. Visual indicators that Dürer typically relied on included isolated columns or architecture and singular trees typically placed somewhere in the middle ground, as can be seen in his 1510 Large Passion Betrayal of Christ woodcut (Fig. 114).

It is also useful to compare Lucas’s Agony roundel engraving with the same scene from his later Passion series of 1521, completed shortly after his meeting with Dürer in the Netherlands, to further illustrate the way in which Lucas’s earlier treatment of space fundamentally differed from Dürer’s (Figs. 110, 115). As with Dürer’s Small and Engraved Agony prints, Lucas here condensed his scene to fit within a vertical framework. In doing so, he lost the three distinct spatial zones and open atmosphere of his earlier work and essentially confined and stacked his composition much like Dürer’s earlier compositions.

In comparing Dürer’s works with just these few compositions by Lucas, it becomes evident that Dürer rethought his use of space by adjusting the placement and

---

53 Anzelewsky, Dürer, His Art and Life, 212.
natural elements of the drawing to fill the broader area of the oblong format. Like Lucas, Dürer used certain motifs to emphasize the location of significant figures, such as tree clusters, and indicated depth using a proper foreground, middle ground, and background.

By applying the oblong format and distancing the figural groups from one another, Dürer allowed for a contemplation of both groups simultaneously, rather than specifically on Jesus. Although the significance of the Agony narrative is primarily Jesus’ despair, it is also about the ignorance of the disciples about Jesus’ suffering and their own sinfulness. In Dürer’s earlier work, such as the Agony from the Engraved Passion, the eye moves directly to Jesus, essentially lingering there instead of equally on his disciples. The horizontal back and forth movement of the eye between Jesus and his disciples in the oblong drawings encourages a consideration of their relationship, Jesus’ sacrifice for their salvation. Rather than promote vicarious suffering with Jesus to the viewer and thereby the blueprint to merit-based redemption, Dürer’s emphasis rests on Jesus’ willing sacrifice for his disciples and by extension humankind through Christian love, a more evangelical perspective.

The Bearing of the Body

As mentioned in chapter two, Dürer’s 1521 Bearing of the Body drawings from his journey to the Netherlands depict a relatively rare theme: a liminal moment within the Passion narrative first represented in Byzantine manuscript illumination and later within the larger passion narratives of thirteenth-century Italian crosses. Dürer illustrated the same subject in his early Entombment from his Large Passion, but the busy and vertical design of the woodcut focused less on Jesus’ suspended body than the Virgin collapsed in
the right foreground (Fig. 116). By contrast, his late 1521 Bearing of the Body drawing emphasizes the act of carrying Jesus’ body as well as the slow, intentional movement of the extended processional scene that follows (Figs. 8, 9).

Scholarship regarding the 1521 Bearing of the Body drawings has largely stressed their relationship to Italian prototypes, particularly compositions of the Entombment by both Mantegna and Raphael (Figs. 117, 118). Mantegna’s Entombment engraving of around 1465-70 was likely derived from the earlier depictions found in Dugento crosses, but Mantegna enhanced these sparse compositions by emphasizing the funerary aspects of the episode. He added additional figures, exaggerated their grief, and created a more elaborate setting. In contrast with Mantegna’s frieze of two distinct figural groups staggered across the picture plane, Raphael provided a more unified structure for the central panel of his Baglioni Altarpiece of 1507 by overlapping the bearers and mourners into a cohesive group. Both versions show the Virgin collapsed and surrounded by women as well as Golgotha in the right background. In these grief-stricken scenes, the figures outwardly lament and women make physical contact with Jesus’ corpse.

---

54 Evidence from Dürer’s early career demonstrates that Mantegna’s engravings particularly intrigued him. Two drawings completed around 1494-1495 show Dürer copied Mantegna’s Battle of the Sea Gods and Bacchanal with Silenus engravings. He likely also knew of Mantegna’s Entombment, at least by 1508, as Dürer appears to have modeled the figure of John the Evangelist from his 1508 Crucifixion engraving on the same figure from the Entombment.

55 While this subject was already included in the narratives of Dugento crosses, scholars suggest that Mantegna derived inspiration for the scene from classical relief sculpture depicting the burial of Meleager found on antique sarcophagi. See Jay A. Levenson, Konrad Oberhuber, and Jacquelyn L. Sheehan, Early Italian Engravings from the National Gallery of Art (Washington DC, The National Gallery, 1973), 173n7. Mantegna’s Entombment was considered one of his later prints, dating to the 1490s, but this view has recently been amended to the time period between 1465-70. See ibid., cat. 70; Jane Martineau, ed., Andrea Mantegna, exh. cat. London, Royal Academy of Arts (Milan; Electa, 1992), cat. 38-39. The treatment of light and shadow of the engraving are much more in keeping with Mantegna’s manner of painting during his early period in Mantua, while elements of Mantegna’s Crucifixion panel, completed in Verona shortly after mid-century, includes a similar configuration of Mary assisted by women at the base of the cross as well as the grief stricken pose of John the Evangelist.
Wölfflin and the Tietzes referred to the Mantegnaesque quality of Dürer’s 1521 Nuremberg Bearing of the Body, although the latter scholars thought the similarity rather weak.\(^{56}\) Winkler believed the resemblance of the Nuremberg drawing to Mantegna’s engraving was coincidental, although he admitted that Dürer would have known of it by that time.\(^{57}\) Panofsky regarded Dürer’s Nuremberg rendition as derivative of Mantegna and noted the similarities in the general arrangement of figures and in the bearer that steps backward (Fig. 8).\(^{58}\) In contrast, Anzelewsky thought that the drawings reflected the influence of Raphael’s painting of the subject.\(^{59}\)

While the similarities between Dürer’s Nuremberg drawing and Mantegna and Raphael’s compositions include the subject and the placement of the figures in a frieze, Dürer’s other drawing of the episode departs from the Italian examples in the oblique position of Jesus’ body and the higher viewpoint. Further, Dürer’s drawings differ from Mantegna and Raphael in the expression of emotion. His Italian counterparts made use of dramatic gestures and turbulent atmospheric elements, such as strong winds, to indicate psychological distress, while Dürer’s drawings exhibit subdued emotional behavior. As noted early on by Knackfuss in 1900, there is an overall lack of spectacle and drama in Dürer’s drawings.\(^{60}\) Knackfuss believed the event reflected a “…natural incident in the life


\(^{57}\) Winkler, *Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers*, 4: 28, cat. 796.

\(^{58}\) Panofsky, *Life and Art*, 219.

\(^{59}\) Anzelewsky, *Dürer, His Art and Life*, 212.

\(^{60}\) Knackfuss, *Dürer*, 138.
of the people...,” rather than a highly intensified religious moment. With the exception of the woman whose arms are raised in lamentation at the center of the Florence version, the gestures and poses of Dürer’s figures are muted.

Dürer’s compositions take on a more restrained and stoic northern European character as the importance of naturalism and the depiction of realistic human actions and reactions are prioritized. He imparts a sense of controlled emotion, particularly in the depiction of the Virgin in the Nuremberg drawing (Fig. 8). Distanced from Jesus’ body and covered almost entirely by her heavy mantle, the Virgin inclines her head slightly downward and holds her concealed right hand to her chest. Her eyes are completely hidden from the viewer and while she is in the presence of other mourners her reserved posture and veiled appearance impart a withdrawn and solitary sense of grief. This veiled mourning is far removed from the lachrymose figure of the swooning Madonna who required assistance in both Mantegna’s and Raphael’s depictions.

The Virgin’s quiet dignity in the Oblong Passion is reminiscent of the figural types created by Rogier van der Weyden, who excelled at instilling powerful emotion in his figures without the use of overt drama. In reference to Rogier’s Descent from the Cross, Lorne Campbell noted that Rogier did not attempt “…to differentiate reactions dramatically by contrasting gestures or facial expressions. The immense power of the painting lies less in attempts to understand and portray the emotional reactions of the protagonists than in indirect, even subliminal, attacks on the feelings and thoughts of the

61 Knackfuss, Dürer, 138.
viewer.”\textsuperscript{62} Both of Dürer’s \textit{Bearing of the Body} drawings display this Northern sensibility.

While the majority of scholarly opinion has considered Dürer’s \textit{Bearing of the Body} drawings largely derivative of Italian models, some authors have also noted various Netherlandish motifs. For instance, Veth and Muller recognized that the Virgin wears a Netherlandish Beguine’s habit in the Nuremberg drawing (Fig. 8).\textsuperscript{63} As noted by Winkler, this figure is based on a study drawing created by Dürer while in the Netherlands (Figs. 119).\textsuperscript{64} Winkler also suggested that Dürer followed a Netherlandish scheme or pattern more closely in the Florence drawing than in the Nuremberg version, which he felt was somewhat stiff and artificial.\textsuperscript{65} Anzelewsky stated that the drawings were influenced by Netherlandish art (in the same sentence where he noted Raphael as a model), but as with Winkler’s comment regarding an overall Netherlandish scheme to the drawings, Anzelewsky refrained from adding additional commentary regarding which artists or artworks he meant.\textsuperscript{66}


\textsuperscript{63} Veth and Muller, \textit{Albrecht Dürers Niederländische Reise}, 1: 43.

\textsuperscript{64} Winkler, \textit{Die Zeichnungen Albrecht Dürers}, 4: 28, cat. 796. This observation was repeated in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum catalogue of German drawings and in the Brussels catalogue for the exhibition devoted to Dürer’s journey in the Netherlands. See Germanisches Nationalmuseum, \textit{Kataloge des germanischen Nationalmuseums: die deutschen Handzeichnungen} (Nuremberg: Verlag des Germanisches Nationalmuseums, 1968), 86-88, cat. 65; Anzelewsky, Mende and Eeckhout, eds., \textit{Albert Dürer aux Pays-Bas}, 78, cat. 91.

\textsuperscript{65} Winkler, \textit{Albrecht Dürer, Leben und Werk}, 309.

\textsuperscript{66} “The Entombment reflects the influence of Raphael, who had painted the subject in 1500, as well as that of Netherlandish artists.” Anzelewsky, \textit{Dürer, His Art and Life}, 212. This date is a typographical error, as the painting was finished in 1507. Strieder noted that the scene of Jesus carried to the tomb was “a popular subject in the Netherlands,” and added that “in Germany it was replaced by representations of the lamentation for Jesus, or of the entombment.” Peter Strieder, \textit{Albrecht Dürer: Paintings, Prints, Drawings}, trans. Nancy M. Gordon and Walter L. Strauss (New York: Abaris Books, 1982), 132.
These observations by earlier scholars regarding the Netherlandish characteristics found in the drawings indicate that several authors recognized a relationship between Dürer’s Bearing of the Body drawings and Netherlandish examples. However, the impact of early and contemporary Netherlandish art has been largely overlooked in favor of Italian examples.

In contrast to their Byzantine and Italian counterparts, depictions of the Bearing of the Body in Flanders and the Northern Netherlands during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries tend to be more nuanced and are often conflated with other Passion events, such as the Deposition, Lamentation, and Entombment. One composition in particular was widely popular and was likely still circulating in the market during Dürer’s time in the Netherlands. A drawing from the workshop of Rogier van der Weyden, which is compositionally related to his Descent from the Cross altarpiece, illustrates the rare episode (Fig. 120). It had a significant impact on representations of the scene into the mid-sixteenth century through copies and variants in both painting and sculpture.

67 Few Netherlandish artists seem to have treated the event without ambiguity. For instance, Hans Memling depicted the Bearing of the Body twice as part of larger Passion programs, first in a narrative painting, Scenes from the Passion of Christ (Turin, Galleria Sabauda) of around 1470 and later in his last large triptych, known as the Greverade Triptych (Lübeck, Sankt-Annen-Museum), of 1491. While the episode is just one of many vignettes of Christ’s Passion in the former, the Bearing of the Body is featured along the bottom half of the right interior wing under a scene of the Resurrection. See Dirk de Vos, Hans Memling: the complete works (Ghent: Ludion Press, 1994), 105-109, 320-329, cats. 11, 90.

68 Because of the popularity of the composition among panel painters and sculptors several proposals have been made for the artist, purpose, and function of the drawing. It has variously been considered the work of a member of Rogier van der Weyden’s workshop, an original by Robert Campin, and a drawing by Rogier’s assistant and follower Vrancke van der Stockt. Felix Thürlemann believed the drawing to be a preliminary design by Robert Campin for the Prado Descent from the Cross, which he also attributed to Campin. See Felix Thürlemann, “Die Madrider Kreuzabnahme und die Pariser Grabtragung: das Malerische und das Zeichnerische Hauptwerk Robert Campins,” Pantheon 51 (1993): 18-45. Winkler, Verhaegen, and Koreny attributed the work to Van der Stockt based on stylistic characteristics, such as the treatment of facial features and garments. See Friedrich Winkler, “The Drawings of Vrancke Van Der Stockt,” Master Drawings 3 (1965): 155–158; Nicole Verhaegen, “The Arenberg ‘Lamentation’ in the Detroit Institute of Arts,” trans. Frank J. Smolar, The Art Quarterly 25 (1962): 295-312; Fritz Koreny, Early Netherlandish Drawing from Jan van Eyck to Hieronymus Bosch, exh. cat. (Antwerp: Rubenshuis, 2002), 121. The drawing has also been considered a copy after a lost painting by Rogier as well as a
According to Fritz Koreny, this drawing “...counts among the most-copied pictorial inventions of early Netherlandish painting.”

The drawing depicts the moments directly after Jesus was taken down from the cross and is not in a strict sense a Lamentation, Deposition, or Entombment, but rather a transitional phase. Set in a shallow space, Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus hold Jesus’ body aloft while the Virgin kisses her son in a final farewell akin to the Lamentation. The Virgin’s quick embrace and the position of Mary Magdalen crouched at Jesus’ feet both serve to pause the procession momentarily. However, it is clear by Nicodemus’s wide gait in the center and Joseph’s extended right leg to the left that the cortège is still in progress. The lobed tracery in the upper left corner of the drawing and the void above Nicodemus’s head in the center suggests it might have been intended as part of a painted altarpiece, a design for a carved retable, or connected to a reliquary design or shrine.


Verhaegen suggested that the reserved space in the upper center of the drawing was to accommodate a reliquary or shrine and confirmed that the drawing was related to a sculpture from around 1460 that bears a guild stamp from Brussels and is closely related to the Louvre drawing. These factors lead Verhaegen to suggest that the drawing was a model for the sculpture. Verhaegen, “The Arenberg ‘Lamentation;’”: 298, 305-306. Fredricksen believed the drawing was a copy from a lost original and the empty space between the two arches accommodated a window or “some other architectural impingement above it.” Fredricksen, “A Flemish Deposition,” 134.
instance, Burton B. Fredricksen illustrated at least eleven painted variants in his essay on a related painting acquired by the J. Paul Getty Museum in the late 1970s, which is currently considered a work by a follower of Rogier van der Weyden (Fig. 121). As the panel is closely related to the drawing, Fredricksen posited that the Getty painting was a copy after a lost altarpiece by Rogier. He suggested that although there were more extant copies of Rogier’s _Descent from the Cross_, there were enough after the lost altarpiece that we can assume that “...it was seen by and known to a large public.” He further believed that “...it must have been one of the greatest monuments of Flemish painting during its time and—if we can assume that it was by Rogier—probably one of his most famous altars.”

The Getty panel does not include the empty space between the two arches as seen in the drawing, but is replaced with the base of the cross and ladder. It is however the only variant to have a gold background as subsequent versions featured panoramic landscapes. One such example is a triptych from the workshop of the Master of Frankfurt, which features the _Bearing of the Body_ in the center and a _Bearing of the_
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72 Fredricksen, “A Flemish Deposition,” 134.

73 Ibid. For a bibliography related to Rogier’s lost altarpiece, see Micheline Comblen Sonkes, _Dessin du XVe siècle: Groupe van der Weyden; Essai de Catalogue des Originaux du Maître, des Copies et des Dessins Anonymes Inspirés par son Style_ (Brussels: Centre national de recherches Les Primatifs flamands, III, 1969) 5: 136.

74 Fredricksen believed that the gold background may have mirrored the original altarpiece and suggested that this panel was one of the earliest copies after Rogier’s lost painting. There are small variations between the drawing and the figures in the Getty panel. For instance, in the panel the figures are less slender, more full-bodied, and the drapery is not as sharply modeled. The shoes also differ—in the drawing they are pointed, while in the Getty painting they appear as rounded. These small details suggest that the painter stemmed from a tradition outside of Rogier’s workshop and Brussels in general, perhaps originating in the Northern Netherlands, specifically Haarlem, but according to Fredricksen likely working in Antwerp. The author also linked the Getty panel to the Master of Saint Bartholomew, who was working in the Utrecht tradition and had no connections to Haarlem, but does not attribute the work to him. Fredricksen, “A Flemish Deposition,” 147.
Cross and Resurrection on the left and right wings, respectively (Fig. 122). The central panel features a composition congruent with the Getty panel, but differs in the considerable continuous landscape extending across the three panels. The Master of Frankfurt, who has been tentatively identified as Hendrik van Weluwe, was active in Antwerp from 1483 to 1533 and ran a large workshop that specialized in creating works based on early Netherlandish masters such as Rogier van der Weyden and Hugo van der Goes for both private patronage and for the art market.75

Ambrosius Benson, an artist active in Bruges from 1518 to around 1550 also produced panels of this composition (Figs. 123, 124) along with other artists who continued to present the episode before a vast and verdant landscape, sometimes with a central cross (Fig. 125) and sometimes without (Fig. 126).76 That artists in popular art centers such as Antwerp and Bruges continued to create works based on this Rogierian prototype into the sixteenth century attests to the popularity of the scene in the Low Countries.

If Fredricksen is correct in his assertion that this composition was among the most widely known of Rogier’s now lost altarpiece, and based on the current visible evidence of multiple copies and variants, it can be presumed that Dürer either would have known of the composition or that he saw one of these works on the market in Antwerp or Bruges. Dürer’s Nuremberg Bearing of the Body shares a number of similarities with this Rogierian composition (Fig. 8). For instance, as in the Louvre Rogierian Bearing of the


Body drawing and the later variants, Dürer’s large-scale figures in his Nuremberg drawing fill the foreground in a frieze. While it is apparent that the bearers progress toward the tomb, the overall sense of movement is relatively static, particularly among the mourners. Jesus’ nearly nude body is the focal point of the Louvre drawing as it is in Dürer’s Nuremberg version.

The twisting central figure of the same drawing is comparable to the central bearer in the Louvre drawing and the painted copies and variants in which the figure’s right knee is turned awkwardly toward the viewer, while his shoulders shift forward and his head leans away from the corpse he carries.77 The placement of the tree along the central axis of the Nuremberg drawing reflects the position of the cross in most of the Rogierian Bearing of the Body variants. Although Dürer clearly referenced Golgotha in the background of his drawing, the tree can still be viewed as a substitute for the crucifix and refers to the Netherlandish paintings he viewed while traveling. These pictorial similarities suggest that Dürer was aware of the Netherlandish compositions at the time of his oblong drawings.

Dürer’s Florence Bearing of the Body shares the high viewpoint and processional character with the contemporary designs of Lucas van Leyden, particularly his Conversion of Saint Paul of 1509 wherein the figures slowly traverse the countryside.

77 The positioning of the legs of Dürer’s central figure are awkward in the sense that the left foot and shin are pointed toward the viewer although it is clear that he is striding to the right. Paula Nuttall noted that Rogier van der Weyden employed precarious poses to enhance emotional effects, citing the central figure from the Bearing of the Body drawing in the Louvre and the figure of Nicodemus from the Prado Descent from the Cross. She also suggested that Raphael used a similar convention of the extended leg for the bearded figure to the right of Mary Magdalen in his Entombment of 1507. Paula Nuttall, From Flanders to Florence: The Impact of Netherlandish Painting, 1400-1500 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 242-251. In a similar manner, Dürer seems to have employed this Rogierian convention for his figure in the Nuremberg Bearing of the Body. The Antwerp Mannerists also frequently positioned their figures in awkward poses.
(Figs. 9, 127). Just as Dürer depicts the transitional moment of Jesus’ internment, Lucas’s print depicts the transition of a man’s sin to his own salvation through his conversion to Christianity. As a Roman citizen, Saul was a persecutor of Christ’s followers. While Saul was travelling to Jerusalem on a quest to arrest Christians, a bright light shown from the heavens startling Saul who subsequently fell to the ground. The voice of God called forth beseeching “Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting Me (Acts 9: 4)?” After Saul’s response, the Lord told him to go to the city of Damascus, where he would find further instructions. After the exchange, Saul opened his eyes, but was blinded. Upon his arrival in Damascus he was baptized as a Christian and regained his sight. From then he was a preacher of God’s Word until his martyrdom in Rome.\(^7\)

Rather than depict the pivotal dramatic moment when Saul is blinded as the central scene, Lucas placed the event further back in the landscape where it is less obvious. Dürer used the same device, although not to such a drastic degree, in his Florence Bearing of the Body by depicting Jesus, the key figure of the procession, obliquely left of the central viewpoint. As Kantor noted in his discussion of the drawing, Dürer presented the event after it had already passed by the viewer.\(^7\) Both Lucas’s and Dürer’s works also give primacy to the secondary group of figures in the foreground, for Lucas the blinded Saul led to Damascus, and for Dürer, Jesus’ mourners. To link the two separate figural units each artist incorporated an intermediary figure, a drummer in the engraving and a distraught woman in the drawing. The viewpoints of both works are high, allowing each event to unfold over a broad surface.


\(^7\) Jordan Kantor, *Dürer’s Passions*, exh. cat. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Art Museums, 2000), 35.
Dürer’s choice of narrative event is similar to Lucas’s engraving in that he depicted a point in the story that occurs between what is usually depicted. Like Saul, who is featured in the moment after his revelation but before his actual baptism into Christianity, Jesus is shown between the location of his death on the cross and his temporary resting place. Like the accompanying participants in each work, the viewer is meant to reflect on the transitional significance of the moment.80

Dürer’s Florence Bearing of the Body drawing also features a monumental portal along the right edge that serves as a framing device for the composition and provides a gateway for the mourners to move toward the sepulcher. Lucas had used the same device in his engraving The Return of the Prodigal Son of around 1510 in which two figures at the left emerge from the arched entryway of a classical structure to join the figures depicted in the center (Fig. 128, 9). From this building, a series of architectural structures extend diagonally into the background and provide a sense of depth within the engraving. Dürer employed a similar architectural device in the Florence drawing wherein a series of arcades recede diagonally into the background from the main gate in the lower right foreground. When set against Lucas’s engravings, the drawings demonstrate that Dürer valued the Dutch artist’s use of space and distinctive compartments of recession, as well as the framing devices afforded by large architectural elements.

Perhaps it was the continued popularity of the Bearing of the Body in Antwerp and Bruges in the form of painted variants from the workshops of such artists like the Master of Frankfurt and Ambrosius Benson that encouraged Dürer to depict the scene. As

80 Other formal similarities between Dürer’s Florence Bearing of the Body and works by Lucas van Leyden include Dürer’s use of three distinct spatial zones with figural components in the foreground, a clearly established middle ground, and distant hills and mountains in the background like in Lucas’s engraving Dance of Saint Mary Magdalene of 1519. Both compositions are framed by natural elements, such as trees, or a combination of both architectural and natural components.
an artist engaged with Christ’s Passion for the entirety of his career, Dürer would have seen and recognized the transitional moment of the Bearing of the Body in these works. His depiction of the scene as a particularly somber, less melodramatic funeral procession distances his drawings from the influence of Mantegna and Raphael and aligns them more with a Netherlandish tradition of understated emotion. Like Rogier, who did not convey varying psychological states with exaggerated gesticulations, Dürer took a more indirect approach to the figures in the *Oblong Passion* by depicting them as accessible ordinary humans.

Dürer’s emphasis on the mourners in his *Florence Bearing of the Body* echoes Lucas’s tendency in his many-figured compositions to feature a collective group rather than a single figure. In their discussion of Lucas’s *Ecce Homo* of 1510, Jacobowitz and Loeb Stepanek noted that by emphasizing the crowd and placing Jesus in a secondary position Lucas was “...presenting religion in the most immediate terms...,” and that his “...emphasis on humanity, on the people’s shared responsibility rather than Christ’s suffering, would later exemplify much of Reformation theology.”81 The prominence of the bystanders in Dürer’s drawings, including the *Christ Bearing the Cross* compositions, represents his rethinking of the narrative significance of the episodes to one in which humanity plays a vital role, where Jesus becomes “...a Christ for you and for me...”82


The Last Supper

Compared to other episodes from Christ's Passion, scenes of the Last Supper are relatively rare in the Netherlands during the fifteenth century for reasons that are still unclear. Barbara G. Lane explained this phenomenon by demonstrating the relationship of the liturgy to Netherlandish panel painting. According to her, Jesus’ consecration of the bread and wine at the Last Supper has direct parallels with the actions of the priest during the Catholic Mass. Because the priest reenacts this pivotal moment and speaks the words of Jesus as laid out in the Gospels, a pictorial example of the scene was rendered unnecessary.

However, Craig Harbison argued that the Flemish church records analyzed by Jacques Tousseart demonstrated that the laity was less concerned with the Mass in that period and that church attendance was irregular, suggesting that even if the event were repeated by a pictorial example nearby, it would likely hold little concern for the average churchgoer. Perhaps the paucity of altarpieces depicting the Last Supper has to do more with the limited devotional accessibility of the Eucharist compared to other scenes from Christ’s Passion, such as the Crucifixion, Deposition, and Lamentation. Representations of these more dramatic scenes emphasize the corporeal suffering of Jesus, while


depictions of the Last Supper likely inspired less affective piety and empathetic suffering from devout viewers.

The most significant Netherlandish example of the Last Supper from the period is Dieric Bouts’ *Last Supper Altarpiece* of 1464-67, after which the majority of subsequent examples, even into the early sixteenth century, were modeled (Fig. 129). Commissioned by members of the Brotherhood of the Holy Sacrament for one of their two chapels in Saint Peter’s Church in Louvain, the altarpiece features the *Last Supper* as the central panel and four scenes from the Old Testament on the interior wings.\(^{86}\) The surviving contract details the program specifically chosen by the Brotherhood and overseen by two theologians at the University of Louvain.\(^ {87}\) The *Last Supper* takes place within a spacious domestic interior (Fig. 130). Jesus is at the center of a large rectangular table around which the twelve apostles sit.\(^ {88}\) With his right hand raised in a gesture of blessing, Jesus gazes directly toward the viewer while holding the host above the chalice with his left hand. The disciples sit calmly without incident as Jesus consecrates the bread and wine; additional bystanders stand to the rear.\(^ {89}\) The emphasis of the work is clearly the

---

\(^{86}\) Counterclockwise from the top left, the Old Testament scenes include the Meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek (Gn 14: 18), The Feast of Passover (Ex 12), The Gathering of Manna (Ex 6), and Elijah in the Desert (1 Kgs 19).

\(^{87}\) Pächt, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, 100.


\(^{89}\) It would seem from the extant examples that Judas’ betrayal of Jesus was a less popular theme for depictions of the Last Supper. Of those that feature the scene, the emphasis is on Jesus feeding the bread to his betrayer, not his announcement of the betrayer’s existence. “He it is to whom I shall reach bread dipped. And when he had dipped the bread, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon (Jn 13:26).” An example is the interior wing of a now disassembled altarpiece in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid, attributed
institution of the Eucharist, supported by the inclusion of the Old Testament episodes of prefiguration.90

Scenes of the Last Supper occur with more frequency during the first quarter of the sixteenth century, particularly among the Antwerp Mannerists.91 Known for their large output and pictorial repetition, their depictions of the Last Supper include homogeneous pictorial arrangements in which Jesus sits at the center of a large rectangular table usually before an ornate cloth of honor and surrounded by his disciples. The settings include palatial Renaissance interiors and distant city views visible through tall rounded archways.92 Much as in Bouts’ work, Jesus enacts the consecration of the Eucharist in these paintings. A well-preserved Mannerist triptych with the wings still attached also illustrates the continued juxtaposition of Old Testament episodes with the


90 Lane suggested that Bouts’ Last Supper panel was related to Corpus Christi imagery in which the exhibition of the host is most prominent. She saw Jesus as performing the role of the priest at mass with the table acting as the altar. Lane, The altar and the altarpiece, 112-113. Thematically related depictions of Jesus acting in a clerical manner include illuminations from manuscripts, for instance Christ Elevating the Host in the Petites Heures du Duc de Berry, Paris, Bibliothèque National, and Joos van Ghent’s Altarpiece of the Communion of the Apostles of 1473-74 for Federigo da Montefeltro, Galleria Nazionale delle Marche, Ducal Palace, Urbino.


theme, in this instance *The Meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek* (Gn 14:18) and *The Gathering of Manna* (Ex 6) from early Netherlandish examples (Fig. 131).93

While his 1523 *Last Supper* drawing primarily depicts Jesus’ announcement of the betrayal, Dürer did include the sacramental chalice and bread on the table directly before Jesus, which he had not done in his previous renditions of the scene. Panofsky indicated that Dürer’s inclusion of these elements “...may have been suggested by a representational tradition which had tended to emphasize the sacramental rather than the historical aspects of the scene...” and proposed Bouts’ altarpiece as a possible stimulus.94 On his return trip home, Dürer stopped in Louvain for a short time and may have viewed the *Last Supper Altarpiece* in Saint Peter’s church.95 However, there is no formal similarity between the two works and any relationship between the drawing and altarpiece would be strictly on a thematic basis. Since the episode was less prevalent in the Netherlands and the contemporary Netherlandish versions relied heavily on Italianate elements, Dürer likely did not look to Netherlandish examples for his *Last Supper* drawing of 1523.

**Conclusion**

The aim of this chapter has been to show that while Dürer scholars have briefly acknowledged the *Oblong Passion* drawings’ debt to Netherlandish art, an extended

---

93 See Ainsworth and Christiansen, eds. *From Van Eyck to Bruegel*, 262-265, cat. 68.

94 Panofsky, *Life and Art*, 222-223. Panofsky believed more strongly that Dürer’s inclusion of the chalice related to the “Chalice Controversy” of the Reformation.

95 In his entry for 12 July 1521, Dürer wrote “We passed through two villages and came to Louvain, breakfasted and spent 13 st.” Conway, Literary Remains, 125; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, 1: 177.
discussion of specific examples has allowed for a more precise reading of how Dürer’s
drawings directly reflect Netherlandish pictorial tradition. So far, scholars have relied on
generalities to explain their character, such as the drawings display “epic elements” and
they are drawn in a “landscape format.” By comparing Dürer’s drawings with specific
works that Dürer likely knew of prior to his journey, such as Lucas van Leyden’s prints,
or the works that he saw while there on the marketplace and in religious establishments,
like the Eyckian *Christ Carrying the Cross* and the Rogierian *Bearing of the Body* copies
and variants, it is evident that there were certain characteristics of Netherlandish art that
Dürer appreciated and worked into his new Passion drawings. Among them are the
realistic incorporation of figures within a landscape or before a city backdrop, the
accessible genre-like depictions of religious themes, and the emphasis on naturalistic
displays of emotion.

The *Oblong Passion* drawings exhibit numerous departures from Dürer’s earlier
Passion scenes in terms of the use of space, depiction of the landscape, and emotional
tone. In the prints of Lucas van Leyden specifically, Dürer found examples of how to
successfully arrange figures and architecture to show a crowded procession without
obscuring the main focus of the narrative. He developed a similar approach to his
landscape design wherein he used three distinct spatial zones and staggered the figures in
zigzags across the picture plane to indicate depth. Like Lucas, Dürer added visual
indicators such as trees or large architectural elements to guide the viewer’s eye and to
frame the composition. Dürer also incorporated a Netherlandish sensibility to the
behavior of his figures. Instead of the overt drama and raw emotion characteristic in
scenes of Christ’s Passion, Dürer instilled in the figures of Jesus, the Virgin, and his followers, quiet reflection and understated grief.

Whether Dürer had planned to work extensively again on Christ’s Passion before he left for the Netherlands will likely remain unknown. It is possible that as Dürer experienced the Reform movement in the Low Countries he conceived of producing drawings that could reflect a number of Martin Luther’s concepts related to Christ’s Passion, such as faith and love. It is clear from the appearance of the drawings that he wanted his new Passion to be visually distinctive from the others in his body of work that demonstrated a careful reconsideration of the implications of Jesus’ sacrifice. By designing the Oblong Passion in a landscape format, Dürer broadened the scenes and incorporated elements to his compositions that he typically did not use for his previous Passion scenes.

In his large processional prints, Lucas’s focus on humanity likely appealed to Dürer. The German artist’s inclusion of many figures surrounding Jesus on the way to Calvary, his emphasis on the three disciples at the Garden of Gethsemane, and his depiction of a large funeral procession after Jesus’ death, echoed Luther’s principle that through Jesus’ suffering and death for the atonement of mankind, God reveals his love and interaction with humanity. Overt depictions of despair and mourning to elicit piety became unnecessary as the attainment of salvation shifted from merit-based works to God’s grace under Luther’s theology. Under this rationale, more modest depictions of Jesus and his followers better suited the narrative. In Netherlandish art, and Lucas van Leyden in particular, Dürer found ways to conceive of Christ’s Passion in a different visual language than he had done so in all of his other early Passion series.
Conclusion

Past scholarship of the *Oblong Passion* has been dominated by three key figures in Dürer studies: Heinrich Wölfflin, Friedrich Winkler, and Erwin Panofsky. Much of their focus pertained to issues of connoisseurship and style and while each scholar indicated a generalized role of Netherlandish art in the development of the *Oblong Passion*, they continued to look to Italian artistic precedents to explain the uniqueness of the drawings in Dürer’s oeuvre.

Until the late 1990s, literature on the drawings remained in many ways unchanging. Larry Silver opened the conversation regarding a possible evangelical reading of the Florence 1520 *Christ Carrying the Cross* (Fig. 7) and the 1521 Frankfurt *Agony in the Garden* (Fig. 3) while Jordan Kantor attempted to explain Dürer’s disengaged treatment of Jesus’ figure from the viewer and the high viewpoint of several of the drawings in terms of the iconoclast debates.¹ These discussions focused on individual drawings from the *Oblong Passion* group, rather than on the series as a whole. As a majority of the information regarding the *Oblong Passion* is largely found in monographs as part of Dürer’s Netherlandish journey and among his late religious works (and in these cases only superficially) or dispersed in collection and exhibition catalogues, this study is useful to the researcher who is looking for information regarding the series in its entirety.

The specific goals of this study have been to underline the particular ways in which the *Oblong Passion* drawings differ compositionally and conceptually from his earlier treatment of the Passion narrative and why these changes might have occurred at this moment in his career. The broader aim of this dissertation has been to provide an inclusive study of all of the *Oblong Passion* drawings to highlight their significance within Dürer’s late oeuvre and to show that deeper understanding and consideration of their function and meaning can provide insight into Dürer’s working method and his consideration of Christ’s Passion during this late stage in his career.

The second decade of the sixteenth century represents a pivotal period in Dürer’s life. He sought novel experiences in the Netherlands, such as viewing works by early Netherlandish masters, traveling to various towns and cities in the Low Countries, and meeting fellow artists and foreign dignitaries. Dürer also sought a deeper understanding of religious discourse through the works of Martin Luther as well as alternative methods of pictorial representation based on the works of Netherlandish artists. The *Oblong Passion* drawings embody all three of these aspects in Dürer’s life during this period, yet have not received appropriate attention in the literature, specifically in regards to Dürer’s overall drawing praxis, the inclusion of evangelical elements into his artwork, or how the drawings pertain to the theme of artistic exchange, in this instance between Netherlandish and German artists.

Through an examination of Dürer’s previous Passion works, specifically those produced as part of a series, it is clear that Dürer considered which media to use and which narrative moments to include in order to reach certain audiences. To that end, each series differed in some way, but still remained consistent and recognizable as
representations of the Passion by Dürer. By comparing Dürer's later oblong drawings of the subject with his previous renditions, it is apparent that Dürer deliberately moved away from his earlier, canonical depictions of the scene by changing the orientation of the drawings, by shifting the point of view, and by minimizing the focus on Jesus’ suffering.

Although the *Oblong Passion* has been typically categorized as preparatory for an unfinished printed Passion series, I believe the drawings held a complementary or even alternative purpose for Dürer. From an early stage in his career, Dürer considered the many ways in which drawing could aid in the development of his ideas rather than strictly as prototypes for other works in different media. Dürer made multiple versions of the same episode for many of the themes in the *Oblong Passion*, each differing in pictorial arrangement and meaning. These extant versions not only show us Dürer’s working method for developing a design, but also reveal his shifting ideas on how a particular scene could be represented. As Dürer was working in a different orientation from his previous works and because the drawings had a different dramatic emphasis than before, they can also be viewed as Dürer’s visual and intellectual embodiment of the narrative that might not have had a primarily utilitarian function.

I have also asserted in this study that the *Oblong Passion* drawings are directly related to Dürer's interest in Martin Luther’s teachings, specifically Luther’s highly popular *Sermon on Meditating on the Holy Passion of Christ* of 1519, which Dürer likely owned and which gave instruction about proper and improper ways to meditate on and understand the purpose of Christ’s Passion. Dürer’s lack of emphasis on Mary’s grief and his minimization of Jesus’ suffering demonstrates his move away from a largely devotional and penitential presentation of Christ’s Passion that emphasized empathetic
participation in Jesus’ torments. Instead, Dürer underscored Jesus as a model for one’s complete faith in God’s will, demonstrating that God’s grace is given to those who believe in Jesus’ atoning sacrifice and that mercy cannot be earned through good works performed out of fear. Dürer also placed more emphasis on the people surrounding Jesus during his difficult moments to illustrate humanity’s role in his death and that the trials Jesus endured were not just for the deeply pious, but for mankind—criminals and devout alike—who trusted in Jesus and asked for salvation. By interpreting Dürer’s drawings through the lens of Luther’s sermon on Christ’s Passion, I have provided a deeper evangelical understanding of Dürer’s oblong drawings as well as his evolving approach to the Passion narrative.

In order to represent his reconceptualization of Christ’s Passion, Dürer broke from his traditional devotional method of depiction and broadened the compositional field to slow the viewing process and allow for contemplation. Such concentrated looking is much like the conscientious reading of the Gospels. By reviewing a passage and meditating on the significance and implications of Jesus’ lessons and his sinless death, the Word of God takes precedence over the earthly rules of redemption created by man, a powerful notion asserted by Luther in his sermons.

Dürer was not accustomed to depicting many-figured groups in an oblong format among architectural elements or within landscapes. As a model, Dürer looked to specific pictorial devices used by Netherlandish artists to develop his compositions. I have argued that one can see Dürer’s borrowing of Lucas van Leyden’s modes of representation the most, particularly in the ways in which Lucas developed depth through the progressive staggering of figures along diagonal axes, his use of natural elements such as trees and
architecture to frame his scenes, and the placement of visual cues to direct attention to significant areas in the work. This shows a more reciprocal artistic exchange between Dürer and his Netherlandish contemporaries then previously considered.

This study belongs in the larger discussion of Dürer’s Passion imagery and as part of the challenging dialectic regarding Dürer’s artistic involvement with the Reformation. It has particularly addressed Dürer’s attitude toward Martin Luther’s teachings and his prescriptions on meditating Christ’s Passion. It has demonstrated the ways in which Dürer translated these theological matters into visual expression and how he created clear pictorial arrangements and accessible religious figures based on a Netherlandish artistic tradition.

Recent scholarship on Dürer’s drawing praxis, the function of his drawings, and the scientific investigation of the underdrawings in his early paintings has encouraged further dialogue about Dürer’s creative process, topics that are here applied to the development of his late drawings.² Further research of Dürer’s late drawn oeuvre, for instance the set of sacra conversazione sketches he completed contemporaneously with the Oblong Passion, is just one example of Dürer’s late artistic output that would benefit from contemporary scholarship. Compared to Dürer’s Passion drawings, a closer study of these sketches could contribute to our understanding of Dürer’s relationship to Roman Catholic altarpiece production during the early stages of the Reformation.³

---


³ For a full discussion of the drawings, see Panofsky, Life and Art, 225-229.
By examining Dürer’s drawings within the context they were made, in this instance during a rapidly evolving religious movement and under new foreign cultural experiences, this dissertation has provided critical interpretation of a series of unique drawings that until now have remained understudied. The *Oblong Passion* drawings demonstrate that Dürer not only re-conceptualized a subject he had been engaged with most of his life, but that he incorporated current religious concepts and adaptations from Netherlandish artworks into his novel designs.
Appendix 1:

_Martin Luther._ “Ein Sermon von der Betrachtung des heiligen Leidens Christi”  
_(A Sermon on Meditating on the Holy Passion of Christ), 1519_

Transcribed from Robert Guy Erwin, “The Passion and Death of Christ in the Piety and Theology of the Later Middle Ages and Martin Luther” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1999), 411-422.

1. Some people, when they think about the sufferings of Christ, do so in such a way that they just become angry with the Jews, about whom and poor Judas they sing and curse, and just leave it at that; blaming other people as they always do, cursing and attacking their enemies. But this is not to meditate on the passion of Christ, but rather on the misdeeds of Judas and the Jews.

2. Others point out the usefulness and benefit that comes to them by meditating on the suffering of Christ. These have been led astray by a saying attributed to Albert the Great: that it is better once to have meditated rightly on the passion of Christ than to have fasted an entire year, to have prayed the whole Psalter every single day, and so forth. In blindly following after this, people contradict the very benefit of Christ’s suffering they seek. They carry with them little paintings, prayer books, letters of indulgence, and crosses, and some of them go so far as to claim that these things protect them from drowning, attack, fire, and all sorts of dangers. In this they hope to make out of Christ’s sufferings a blessing for themselves, quite against the nature of the thing.

3. Yet others have such compassion for Christ that they bewail and weep for his innocence just like the women who followed after Christ from Jerusalem, and whom he reproached by telling them that they ought instead to weep for themselves and for their children. These are the kind of people who tear the passion story apart, and elaborate a great deal on things like the farewell scene at Bethany and the sorrows of the Virgin Mary, and as a result never get anywhere. Doing this, they can hold forth about the passion for so many hours that only God knows whether it is better to stay or fall asleep. In this group also belong those who have been taught of the great benefits of the holy Mass, who in their simple-mindedness have come to believe that it is sufficient simply to have heard a Mass said. This we are led to think by the saying of some teachers that the mass works “_opera operati, non opera operantis_”—that is, by itself, and counts as pleasing [to God], as merit and worth for us, as though that were enough. But the mass is not instituted for its own worth, but for the value it has for us, especially for the sake of making us consider the Passion of Christ. Where this is not understood rightly, the mass is made fleshly, unfruitful work, as good as it may be in itself, — for what does it help you that God is God, if God is not God for you? What good does it do you to eat and drink, though eating and drinking are healthful and good in themselves, if they are not healthy for you? And mind this: no number of masses can procure a benefit that one ought not to seek in them at all.
4. They, however, rightly meditate on the passion of Christ who look at him in such a way that their hearts shrink back in terror and their consciences despair. This fear should come from an apprehension of the strong wrath and unchanging seriousness of God toward sinners and their sin, that he would not spare even his only, most-beloved Son to make those sinners free of it, to make for them a heavy sacrifice, such as is described in Isaiah 53: “For the sake of my people’s sin I have struck him down.” What must otherwise have befallen the sinner, if it took the most dear child being struck down for him? This must be an inexpressible, unbearable profundity, that so infinitely great a person must take this on, and suffer and die for it—and when you consider this truly deeply, that God’s Son, the eternal wisdom of the Father, himself suffered for you, then you will indeed be frightened, and the more deeply, the better.

5. And you should not consider this well and not doubt that you are the one for whom Christ was martyred, and it was your sin that did this. With this same point Saint Peter (in Acts 2) struck the bolt, when he said to them in their own language: “You have crucified him”—and three thousand of them, tormented and trembling, then asked the apostle: “O dear brother, what shall we do?” etc. Therefore, whenever you see the nails of Christ piercing his hands, know surely that this is your doing; when you see his crown of thorns, know that it was for your evil thoughts, etc.

6. Now indeed, where one thorn pierces Christ, surely more than a hundred thousand thorns ought to pierce you, in fact, they should pierce you even much more cruelly than that. For where on Christ a nail pierces a hand or foot, you should suffer such and yet much worse as well—and this will surely happen to those who allow the sufferings of Christ to be lost on them. This grim mirror, Christ, does not lie nor mock us. What it shows us must be fulfilled in abundance.

7. Such a holy fear is shown by Saint Bernard, when he says: “I thought I was safe, and I knew nothing of the eternal judgment that had been given over me in heaven, until I saw how the only Son of God had shown me such mercy, and stood up for me, and had given himself over to the judgment that was meant for me.” Alas, I should no longer play at my own security, when the situation is so grave. Therefore Jesus bids the women: “Weep not for me, but for yourselves, and for your children.” And says further: “If all this is accomplished with the green wood, what will happen with the dry wood?” as if to say, “Learn from my martyrdom, what you deserved, and how it should be with you.” In this the saying comes true: “Once beaten, even a small stick can frighten a large dog.” As the prophet says: “They shall reproach themselves about him.” This is the way [the Jews] were frightened, as I said above, in Acts 2, so that they cried out to the apostle: “O brother, what shall we do?” Thus also sings the Church: “I will think on it with earnestness, and my soul will cringe within me.”

8. This is the point on which one should practice, for almost the whole benefit of the passion of Christ for us depends on this: that one should come to an understanding of oneself, and be frightened and overcome for its own sake. For whatever person this does not come to pass, for that person the sufferings of Christ have been for naught; for the actual natural work of the passion of Christ is this” that it should make that person
conformed to Christ, so that in the same way Christ is woefully martyred in body and soul for our sins, like him we too should be martyred in conscience on account of our sins. Consider this example: An evildoer is condemned for having murdered the child of a prince or king; and you, confident, sang and danced, as though you were entirely innocent, until you are attacked and captured for having encouraged and aided the criminal in his deed. In that case the world would become too narrow for you, and you would despair, particularly when your conscience abandoned you. You should therefore despair even more when you consider the suffering of Christ, for like the evildoers, the Jews, now that they have condemned and driven out God and become aware of their sins; that they are indeed, who have murdered and crucified God through their sins, as it was said.

9. Whosoever is so hard and dry of soul that he does not, in the face of Christ’s suffering, feel the dread and a bad conscience, he should be afraid; for there is no other choice for him but to be conformed to the image and the suffering of Christ, whether in this life or in hell. At the very least, he must fall into such fear and trembling at the moment of death, and then in purgatory, writhe as he feels everything that Christ felt on the cross. And it is indeed cruel to await one’s death. Therefore you should ask God to soften his heart toward you and permit you to meditate on the suffering of Christ fruitfully. For we are not able to do this by ourselves, but only from God’s implanting it in our hearts, that we are able profoundly to meditate on Christ. And it is this meditation, and no other teaching you may be given, that can pull you out of yourself, to accomplish what you need, seeking and desiring God’s grace, knowing that you accomplish this through his grace and not yourself. Thus it is that those whom we have mentioned earlier, who do not consider the passion of Christ aright and do not cry out to God on its account, but rather approach it out of their own merits and imagination, can deal with it only as mere humans do, and that unfruitfully.

10. Who, therefore, is able to consider God’s suffering rightly for a day, an hour, yes, even a quarter-hour—of that person we can freely say that it would be better for him than if he had fasted a whole year, prayed the whole Psalter daily, indeed, than if he had heard a hundred masses; for this right consideration changed the person in his very substance, and almost like baptism, gives him a new birth. This is the right, natural, noble work of the passion of Christ, that it kills the old Adam, drives out all the evil desires, evil joys, and false confidence that we derive from creaturely things, in the same way that Christ was forsaken by all the world, and even by God.

11. But because the accomplishment of this work is not in our hands, it may come to pass that we ask for it, and not receive it, at least in that hour; nonetheless, we ought not despair or give up. For we may then receive it at a time when we didn’t ask for it, as God wills and only God can know, for God is free and unbound. It will happen that a person may be troubled in conscience, and consider himself and his life evil, and yet not know that the sufferings of Christ have accomplished this in him—perhaps because he had never thought about it, unlike those who hang on their thoughts of Christ’s passion and still fail to come to any understanding of themselves. For that person, then, the passion of Christ is concealed but real; for the others it is apparent but illusory—and God’s way is
often to turn the page, so that those understand the passion who do not meditate on it, and those truly hear the mass who do not listen, while those who listen hear nothing.

12. At the moment we are in Holy Week and preparing to observe Good Friday in a worthy way. Then we will celebrate Easter and the resurrection of Christ. When a person is fully aware of his sinfulness, and horrified of himself, he must still take care that sin does not remain in his conscience, for this will certainly lead to despair. So as soon as our sins have flowed forth from of Christ and become recognizable to us, we must pour them out on him again, and free our consciences. So take care that you do not act like those erring persons who, in their sins, bit and gnaw at their own hearts, and strive after good works and satisfactions, and run here and there, or buy indulgences to work off their sins and be free of them—this is impossible. Unfortunately this false confidence in satisfaction and pilgrimages is very common.

13. But you throw your sins from you, and onto Christ, when you believe firmly that his wounds and suffering are your sins, which he carries and for which he pays, as Isaiah 53 says: “God has laid all our sins on him”; likewise Saint Peter: “He carried our sins in his body on the wood of the cross.” According to Saint Paul, “God has made him a sinner for us, in order that we might be made righteous through him.” On these and such sayings you must put your entire trust and dependence, and the harder your conscience torments you, the more firmly you must rely on them. For if you don not do this, and hope instead to still [your conscience] through your contrition and satisfaction, you will never come to repentance and must despair in the end. For our sinfulness is too strong for us, and when we try and deal with it only within our consciences and in ourselves, it will live on in us. But when we see that our sins lie on Christ, and that he overcomes them through his resurrection; and when we believe boldly that they have been made nothing, are dead—for they may not remain in Christ, they have been consumed in his resurrection, and you see no wounds nor any pain in him, then this shows you what has happened to your sins. Therefore when Saint Paul says that Christ died for our sins, and is raised for our righteousness, he means that in his suffering he reveals our sin to us and destroys it, and through his resurrection he makes us righteous and free from all those sins, however much we believe the contrary.

14. If you are not able to believe this right now, then you should ask, as I said before, for God to help you—because this gift is in God’s free hand, and he will give it to you, at one time openly, at another secretly, as I have said above about suffering. But encourage yourself to do this: first, no longer look at the suffering of Christ (until that has done its proper work and frightened you) but look through it and see his kindly heart, how much it is filled with love for you, until it forces you to see that it carries the weight of your conscience and your sin. Then your heart will become sweet toward him, and the confidence of your faith will be strengthened. Thereafter climb further, through Christ’s heart to God’s, and see that Christ would never have shown you all this love, but that God wanted you to have his eternal love—God to whom Christ has been obedient out of love for you. Here you will find the divine, good, paternal heart, and be taken thus, as Christ himself said, though Christ to the Father. And you will understand what Christ said: “And God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son...” etc. This is
what it means rightly to understand God, when one sees God not in his power or wisdom (for these are fearsome) but in his goodness and love. Then faith and confidence can exist, and one is truly born anew in God.

15. When, therefore, your heart is confirmed in Christ, and you have become sin’s enemy through love, not out of fear of pain, so from that time the suffering of Christ will become an example for your entire life, and you will meditate on them in a new way. For up to now, we have considered this a sacrament, that works in us that we too suffer; now we will think of it as something that works through us. Like this:

   If you are burdened by sickness or a day of woe, think of how insignificant that is compared to Christ’s crown of thorns and nails.
   If you much do what appalls you, or give up what you want to do, think of how Christ was bound, and led captive here and there.
   If you are assailed by pride, see how your Lord was mocked and despised by evildoers.
   If unchastity and fleshly desires press against you, consider how bitterly the tender flesh of Christ was whipped, pierced, and bruised.
   If hate and envy attack you or you seek revenge, think of how Christ prayed with many tears and cries for you and all his enemies, when he could instead have avenged himself.
   If troubles or any kind of adversity of body or soul weigh you down, gird up your heart and say: “Hey, why can I not endure even a small adversity, when my Lord’s troubles and fear caused him to sweat blood in the garden. What kind of lazy, shameful knave will lie in bed, when his master struggles with in the cords of death?

   See, therefore, in the face of all slander and vice once still find strength and encouragement in Christ. And this is a proper meditation on Christ’s passion, this is the fruit of his suffering, and those who are skilled in this exercise do better than that they who hear every recitation of the passion story, or hear every Mass that is read—not that the Masses are not good, but that to meditate on them idly helps not at all.

   These we may call true Christians, who show forth Christ’s life and name in their own lives, as Saint Paul says: “Those who belong to Christ have crucified their flesh and all its desires with Christ.” For the passion of Christ must not just be dealt with by words and appearances, but with life and truth. As Saint Paul warns us: “Think of him, who suffered such a struggle with the evil one, that you may be strengthened and not cast down in spirit.” And Saint Peter: “As Christ has suffered in his body, so you should arm and strengthen yourselves in this thought.” But such a consideration [of the passion of Christ] has become extraordinary and unusual, though the letters of Saint Paul and Saint Peter are full of it. We have turned the substance into a mere appearance, and only consider the sufferings of Christ as they are shown to us in pictures and painted on the walls.
Appendix 2:

The Adoration of the Magi

The format, dating, and execution of Dürer’s 1524 *Adoration of the Magi* is analogous to his late *Oblong Passion* drawings and suggests a close relationship between them (Fig. 1, Vienna, Graphische Sammlung Albertina). Therefore it is germane to this study to outline the basic characteristics of the drawing, its critical reception, the Netherlandish characteristics of the composition, and its possible meaning in relationship to the other *Oblong Passion* drawings. However, due to the iconographical dissimilarities, I am presenting the *Adoration* separately from those drawings devoted to episodes of Christ’s Passion.

The Drawing

According to the narrative of Jesus’ infancy from the Gospel of Matthew, wise men from the East seeking to pay homage to the king of the Jews traveled to Jerusalem where they were instructed by Herod to go to Bethlehem, the town where the birth of the Messiah had been prophesized (Matt. 2:6).1 Once there, “...they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down and worshipped him. And when they had opened their treasures, they presented gifts to him: gold, frankincense, and myrrh (Matt. 2:11).”

---

1 “But you, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, are by no means least among the rulers of Judah; for out of you will come a ruler who will shepherd my people Israel.” The prophecy that Matthew wrote is a conflation of Micah 5: 2, 4. “But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient times.” “He will stand and shepherd his flock in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God. And they will live securely, for then his greatness will reach to the ends of the earth.”
Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century western artists commonly depicted the magi with their vast retinues. However, Dürer’s representation focuses primarily on the principal figures from Matthew’s account. Arranged in a frieze, the three magi approach the Holy Family from the right. The Virgin sits outside on a raised courtyard and holds the tightly swaddled Christ Child in her lap, while Joseph stands to their left, hat in hands. Kneeling before the group, the eldest king, Caspar, presents his gift first and is the only figure to look toward the Christ Child. The second king, known as Melchior, strides forward toward the Holy Family, but turns to the third king and grasps his arm in a gesture of invitation. Noting his companion’s touch, Balthasar steps forward.

To set the Holy Family apart from their venerators and to provide the composition with an appropriate visual hierarchy, Dürer used architectural elements as a framing device. Jesus, Mary, and Joseph are divided from the magi by a foreshortened stone partition, which is surmounted by the base of an Ionic column without fluting. Behind the Holy Family, Dürer placed a large stone archway covering an ox and ass as well as a house with a worn thatched roof. An open window reveals the Annunciation to the Shepherds in the distance. Behind the truncated wall and shrubbery, Dürer depicted a second domestic structure before a distant hillside with a gabled roof and leaded windows. Dürer’s monogram and the date of the drawing are inscribed in the lower left foreground.

**Scholarly Reception**

In the mid-nineteenth century, Gustav Friedrich Waagen questioned the dating of the drawing, suggesting instead a date of 1506, and considered the application of two different inks evidence that the composition was outlined by Dürer but finished by
another hand (the left half of the drawing was completed with pen and light grey ink while the right was finished in black). Later scholars have since consistently disagreed with Waagen’s assessment. Additionally, the drawing’s relationship to the *Oblong Passion* has been variously considered by a number of scholars. Eduard Flechsig and Hans Tietze and Erika Tietze-Conrat thought the drawing distinct from it, noting that the event was not part of the canonical Passion narrative. In contrast, Heinrich Wölfflin and Erwin Panofsky considered Dürer’s late *Adoration* the prelude to the entire series.

Although Waagen doubted the drawing’s authenticity, he thought the figures were skillfully executed and that the Holy Family demonstrated a distinct tenderness. Wölfflin noted the kings’ movement “...toward the Madonna like a broad wave and in her they meet a contrast of perfect calm.”

---

2 Gustav Friedrich Waagen, *Die vornehmsten Kunstdenkmäler in Wien*, 2 vols. (Vienna: Braumüller, 1866), 2: 166. The gifts of the magi and the hilt of the third king’s sword have been colored in with a light yellow wash, thought to be by a later hand. The recess in the foreground, Dürer’s monogram, and the date are drawn with black ink while Joseph’s upper eye lid, eyebrow and under the nose have been reinforced in black as well. Other drawings by Dürer are composed with two different inks. For instance, the upper half of Dürer’s *Calvary* of 1511 is completed in brown ink, while the lower half is in black (Vienna, Albertina, inv. 3128). In conversation, Anja Grebe expressed her doubt on the authorship of the drawing, noting the distinctly Netherlandish characteristic of the composition, which she felt pointed to Netherlandish authorship. She also cited the artist’s use of crisp parallel lines as stylistically unlike Dürer. However, Dürer’s full authorship of the drawing has only been questioned by Waagen, while the execution of the drawing and the parallel hatchings align with Dürer’s late drawing style and particularly corresponds with his 1524 *Agony in the Garden* (Städelisches Kunstinstitut). I agree with her opinion about the Netherlandish character of the work, but disagree with her conclusions, which have yet to be published. Anja Grebe, interview by author, Nuremberg, Germany, July 20, 2012.


5 Waagen, *Die vornehmsten Kunstdenkmäler*, 2: 166.

psychological depth and fine compositional arrangement while Winkler asserted that Waagen’s assessment was a misjudgment and lavished great praise on the drawing, observing that the details “shined like crystal.” Later scholars such as Walter Koschatzky, Alice Strobl, and Anna Scherbaum considered Dürer’s Adoration a fine example of his drawing style from the period and particularly noted the drawing’s clarity as well as the artist’s melding of elements from his earlier renditions with various features from Netherlandish paintings he viewed abroad.

**Comparison of the Adoration with Dürer’s Earlier Work**

Prior to his 1524 drawing, Dürer created two woodcuts of the Adoration of the Magi and painted the subject once (Figs. 2-4). Contrasts between Dürer’s earlier renditions and his late drawing include the vertical orientation, additional figures in the magi’s retinue, and the several disparate styles of architecture, for example, rustic dilapidated stables juxtaposed with Romanesque architecture. There is a sense of communion between the figures in his earlier works as the Virgin and Christ Child engage with the magi through touch or the overlapping of figures. In contrast, Dürer’s

---


9 Dürer’s prints of the Adoration include a woodcut for the *Life of the Virgin* of around 1501-1503 (B. 87) and a 1511 woodcut (B. 3). His painting of the subject was completed in 1504, Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi. Between 1501 and 1503, Dürer produced a preliminary sketch for a woodcut Adoration, Bayonne, Musée Bonnat (W. 294).
late drawing demonstrates a clear solemnity and withdrawal of the Holy Family from their venerators, lending a formality to the scene not expressed in his earlier works.

This formality and less festive depiction of the episode is in keeping with Dürer’s *Oblong Passion* drawings of this period wherein the figures’ emotional responses to the events are mitigated and more introspective. Proleptic references to Christ’s Passion, such as the conspicuous column between the Holy Family and the magi—a reference to Jesus’ flagellation—and the rectangular tomb-like recess in the foreground act as clear reminders of Jesus’ Passion and the reasons for his incarnation, namely the atonement of mankind’s sins.¹⁰

At the time of his creation of the *Adoration* drawing in 1524, Dürer was conscious of the theological debates and social changes related to the religious reform movement in northern Europe and had included a number of Martin Luther’s evangelical principles regarding Christ’s Passion into his *Oblong Passion* drawings.¹¹ The departure of the 1524 *Adoration* in compositional arrangement, the distillation of the scene to the principal figures from Matthew’s Gospel, and the clearly somber depiction of the event from his earlier works suggests that, in addition to his less devotional reconceptualization of Christ’s Passion, Dürer was also reconsidering the significance of this episode and how to convey its meaning in light of current religious discourse.

¹⁰ Anna Scherbaum noted that the recess is reminiscent of a grave and is a reference to Jesus’ later internment. See Scherbaum in Robison and Schröder, *Albrecht Dürer: Master Drawings, Watercolors, and Prints from the Albertina*, 278.

¹¹ For example, see the discussion of Dürer’s 1520 *Christ Carrying the Cross* drawing (Uffizi 1078E) in chapter three of this dissertation.
For Martin Luther, the primary significance of the Epiphany was the complete faith required of the Magi to find the location of the Christ Child. In his 1522 Church Postil published in Wittenberg, Luther composed a commentary for the Advent season based on the Gospels. In his passage regarding the Epiphany, the reformer told the story of the three wise men through the perspective of human reason and how the magi needed both the interpretation of scripture and complete faith in the Lord’s directions, i.e. the star that guided them to Bethlehem, to reach the Christ Child. Although the magi expected to find newborn royalty in the metropolis of Jerusalem and more fanfare at the prospect of the birth of a new king, they were instead directed to a small village to find an unidentified child. Luther noted that if the magi were common men they would have thought their journey fruitless or misguided and returned home. Instead, they continued on to Bethlehem as directed in the Scriptures. Luther emphasized:

For although they enter a lowly hut and find a poor young wife with a poor little child, and find less of royal appearance than the homes of their own servants presented, they are not led astray. But in a great, strong, living faith they remove from their eyes and their minds whatever might attract and influence human nature with its pretense, follow the word of the prophet and the sign of the star in all simplicity, treat the child as a king, fall down before him, worship him, and

---

12 The full text of Luther’s sermon on the Epiphany has been transcribed and edited by Richard P. Bucher and published online, [http://www.orlutheran.com/html/mlsema02.html](http://www.orlutheran.com/html/mlsema02.html) (accessed 8 November 2013). Bucher’s text was taken from John Nicholas Lenker, ed., *Sermons on Martin Luther* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1995) 1: 324-367. This volume was originally published as idem., *The Precious and Sacred Writings of Martin Luther*, vol. 10 (Minneapolis: Lutherans in All Lands Press., 1905).

13 Martin Luther, *Auszlegung der Epistelln vnd Euangelien die nach brauch der kirchen geleßen werden vom Christag biß auff den Sontag nach Epiphanie* (Wittenberg: Johann Grunenbergk, 1522). This citation was taken from Benjamin T. G. Mayes and James L. Langebartels, eds., *Luther’s Works*, Church Postil 1, vol. 75 (Saint Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 2013), xvn11.

14 The wise men’s consultation of Scripture occurred when Herod called upon his priests to locate the birth of Jesus. “And assembling together all the chief priests and the scribes of the people, he inquired of them were Christ should be born. But they said to him: In Bethlehem of Juda. For so it is written by the prophet. (Mt 2: 4-5).”
offer gifts. This was a strong faith indeed, for it casts aside many things which impress human nature.\textsuperscript{15}

Luther’s attention to faith in the Word of God and his divine signals, in this instance when the magi realize their initial expectations had been rendered inaccurate, is a lesson to Christians to remain steadfast in their own faith. At the end of his sermon, Luther explained that:

He who holds fast to the Word alone, trusts and abides in it, does not doubt that what the Word says will come to pass; he who does not dictate aim or time or means and ways, but resigns all freely to God’s will and pleasure as to when, how, where, and by whom he will fulfill his Word; he, I say, has a true living faith which does not nor can not tempt God.\textsuperscript{16}

Although it is currently unknown whether Dürer owned a copy of Luther’s Church Postil of 1522, the artist’s 1524 drawing emphasizes a more domestic setting, the magi without their vast entourage, and the separation of the Holy Family from their venerated to establish an appropriately “royal” hierarchy, reflecting Luther’s considerations of the event as denoted in his homily. In addition, Melchior’s guiding gesture to Balthasar behind him signals a reassurance that this is the child they sought. The faith of the magi as understood by Luther is complemented by Dürer’s prefiguration of Jesus’ Passion in that complete faith in God’s will and in Jesus’ atoning sacrifice are both required for salvation.


\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 367, passage 110.
Dürer’s *Adoration* and Netherlandish Art

More than any drawing associated with the *Oblong Passion*, Dürer borrowed recognizable elements from the works of his northern predecessors—including Rogier van der Weyden, Joos van Ghent, and Jan Gossaert—for his 1524 *Adoration*, demonstrating the artist’s interest in and knowledge of the early Netherlandish masters. Scholars have suggested that Dürer’s representation of the second magus was directly inspired by the same figure in Joos van Ghent’s tüchlein *Adoration of the Magi* of about 1465 (Fig. 5). This is reflected in the slight *contrapposto* stance and the movement of the arms in each figure. Dürer’s depiction of Caspar recalls the same figure in Jan Gossaert’s *Adoration* of about 1510 to 1515 (Fig. 6) while Balthasar has been associated with his counterpart in Memling’s *Adoration of the Magi* triptych in Madrid (Fig. 7). Small flowers adjacent to Balthasar’s foot correspond with those in Rogier van der Weyden’s *Columba Altarpiece* in Cologne and Hugo van der Goes’s *Monforte Altarpiece* (Figs. 8, 9), while Dürer’s thatched roof with exposed beams was also likely appropriated from Rogier’s *Columba Altarpiece*. While these specific instances of adaptation have been noted previously, a crucial comparison between Dürer’s *Adoration* drawing and an engraving of the same subject by


18 Catherine Scallen brought the similarity of Gossaert’s depiction of Caspar to Dürer’s representation of the analogous figure in his drawing to my attention. According to Lorne Campbell, in 1600 the painting was located in a chapel dedicated to the Virgin in the Abbey church in Geraardsbergen, a town south of Ghent and west of Brussels. It is possible that Dürer could have traveled through the village. For more information about the patronage of the painting and its location, see Lorne Campbell, “Jean Gossart, The Adoration of the Kings,” published online 2011, from *The Sixteenth Century Netherlandish Paintings with French Paintings before 1600* (London: forthcoming).


his contemporary Lucas van Leyden has yet to be considered (Fig. 141). Completed in 1513, Lucas’s engraving places the episode within an urban setting and features both interested onlookers to the event and indifferent passersby. In each work the Holy Family is set apart by architectural structures in the lower left foreground, while a frieze of figures approaches along the picture plane. Although Lucas’s rendition has many more participants, the physical interactions between Melchior and his servant in the right foreground directly correspond to the poses and gestures of Melchior and Balthasar in Dürer’s drawing. In each, Melchior holds his gift in his right hand while extending his left arm back toward the figure behind him. The interplay of hands, with a hat as the main connective element, is also noticeably similar. Lucas has Melchior pass his hat back, while the corresponding figure in Dürer’s drawing grasps Balthasar’s forearm. This interaction between kings is unique among Dürer’s representations of the scene and provides substantial confirmation that Dürer was inspired by Lucas’s print.

**Conclusion**

When considered together with Dürer’s other oblong drawings completed in the early 1520s, it is evident that Dürer was actively depicting scenes from the life of Jesus in a landscape format at this point in his career. If the sole purpose of the *Oblong Passion* drawings is considered as preparatory for an unfinished woodcut series, then the inclusion of the *Adoration* as the preface to the series remains unknown. If, however, one considers the drawings as Dürer’s intellectual rumination on the events of Jesus’ life and Passion, then the analogous format and the reworked religious connotation of the *Adoration* suggests a complementary relationship.
Like the Passion drawings, Dürer departed from his canonical depiction of the subject to correspond better with a widened compositional surface and to modify the devotional emphasis of the work. As in his depictions of the *Agony in the Garden* (Figs. 2-5) and the *Christ Carrying the Cross* (Fig. 6), the broader theme of the 1524 *Adoration* reflects the evangelical principle of having faith in times of doubt and that salvation lies in believing in Jesus’ sacrifice and God’s saving grace. Rather than the more populous and interactive depictions of his earlier Adoration compositions, Dürer stripped the scene down to the principal figures from the Gospel and instilled a quiet solemnity to the episode. Dürer’s reworking of the story emphasizes Jesus’ non-regal incarnation through the representation of the domestic setting and modesty of the Holy Family while the incorporation of elements relating to Christ’s Passion further solidify that Jesus was born to atone for the sins of humanity.

As with the other oblong drawings of this period, Dürer recalled aspects of early Netherlandish painting that he may have seen in the Netherlands during his sojourn. More importantly, the structure and compositional arrangement is further in line with Lucas’s 1513 *Adoration of the Magi*. In this work, Dürer found a model for his large-scale figures and the specific interactions between them. This adaptation from Lucas is consistent with Dürer’s oblong *Christ Carrying the Cross* of 1520 (Fig. 6), his 1520 *Agony in the Garden* (Fig. 2) and his 1521 *Bearing of the Body* (Fig. 9) in which the elements of the landscape, compositional arrangement, viewpoint, and understated figural emotion recall Lucas’s engravings.
Appendix 3:

The Progression of Scholarship on Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Netherlandish and German Drawings from the Late Nineteenth-Century to the Present

Modern scholarship of northern European drawings began during the late nineteenth-century, coinciding with the professionalization of the fields of art history, connoisseurship, and art criticism as well as the systematic organization, arrangement, and management of museums.\(^1\) During this period of epistemological change, European institutions with significant drawings collections began cataloguing and then publishing their holdings.\(^2\) Through photographically-illustrated publications, a practice that was also a new phenomenon at the time, reproduction of previously unfamiliar or unknown drawings provided scholars with comparative material that allowed them to reconstruct the first stages in the working process of old masters.\(^3\) While collection catalogues of the period encompassed a wide range of national traditions, this essay is primarily concerned with the study of the northern European drawings of Germany and the Netherlands dating from the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

---


\(^2\) Before 1900 the first publication of the Netherlandish drawings in Berlin’s Kupferstichkabinett was Friedrich Lippmann's Zeichnungen alter Meister im Königlichen Kupferstich-Kabinett zu Berlin (Berlin: G. Grote, 1876) followed by Jos Schönbrunner's catalogue of the drawings in the Albertina, Handzeichnungen alter Meister aus der Albertina und anderen Sammlungen (Vienna: Gerlach & Schenk, 1896-1908).

\(^3\) Preziosi has noted that the field of art history is indebted to the development of photography. “...—indeed, art history is in a very real sense the child of photography, which has been equally enabling of the discipline’s fraternal nineteenth-century siblings, anthropology and ethnography. It was photography which made it possible not only for professional art historians but for whole populations to think art historically in a sustained and systematic fashion—....” Preziosi, “The Art of Art History,” 522.
The extant corpus of northern European drawings dating before 1500 amounts to approximately three thousand works, enabling a substantial amount of information to be amassed from the study of the materials, techniques, and functions of drawings.\(^4\) Over the past thirty years, older collection catalogues have been revised and updated in both European and American institutions with significant holdings of the period, while exhibitions devoted to the drawing practices of both individual artists and groups of artists have increased dramatically, resulting in a greater understanding of how drawings were used in an artist’s production process.

Scholarship has evolved from the limited commentary of early catalogues to publications that contain longer, more extensive entries, comprehensive bibliography, and fuller discussions of past scholarly judgments. The number and quality of reproductions has also increased and more illustrated comparative material is now provided. Additionally, the growth in publications related to specific collections and the increase in number of exhibitions that focus on drawings from this period demonstrate the high value they have attained as records of the preliminary stages in the development of an artwork and as the first tangible evidence of an artist’s conception.

Even though considerable accomplishments have been made in drawings scholarship, much research still needs to be completed. For instance, no comprehensive survey of the drawings from northern European regions exists, making a general understanding of the subject difficult. Moreover, the artistic similarities between the style and motifs of fifteenth-century Netherlandish and German drawings in particular, makes it difficult at times “…to distinguish between Netherlandish and German work with the

\(^4\) According to Koreny, around 600 Netherlandish drawings and 2,500 German drawings have survived from the late fourteenth to late fifteenth century. See Fritz Koreny, *Early Netherlandish Drawing from Jan van Eyck to Hieronymus Bosch*, exh. cat. (Antwerp: Rubenshuis, 2002), 7.
desired certainty.” An attempt to fill this lacuna and to provide a more inclusive view of drawings from this period has been underway for nearly 20 years. Since 1994, Fritz Koreny has spearheaded a project funded by the *Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung* (Austrian Fund for the Advancement of Scholarship) to catalogue approximately 600 Netherlandish and 2,500 German drawings from international collections, which will be compiled in a *Corpus of German and Netherlandish Drawings from 1350 to 1500*. In a 2003 article Koreny projected that the *Corpus* would be completed in 2006, however its publication is still eagerly awaited.

The following brief discussion will highlight specific collection and exhibition catalogues from the late nineteenth century to the present in order to establish both the standard models from which a majority of the early catalogues derived as well as those publications that have significantly contributed to the development of scholarship regarding fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Netherlandish and German drawings. This approach will demonstrate that important developments have been made in drawings scholarship, namely its increasing comprehensiveness and accessibility in collection catalogues, publications devoted to focused temporary exhibitions that bring together works from a variety of institutions, and through more extensive representation on museum websites.

---


Collection Catalogues

One of the main motivations for producing a collection catalogue during the late nineteenth-century was to classify and index an institution’s or private collector’s holdings. Among the first publications in which Netherlandish and German drawings were featured as part of a larger collection was Friedrich Lippmann’s 1882 Zeichnungen alter Meister im Kupferstichkabinett der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin, which consisted of six portfolios containing 160 leaves that reproduced German, Netherlandish, Flemish, Dutch, Italian and French drawings in Berlin’s collection. Lippmann, the director of the Kupferstichkabinett, provided a brief history of the collection as well as a short overview of the various materials and types of drawings discussed. Each entry provided the proposed artist or school, a title of the work, followed by a brief description and the medium used. As the catalogue entries were not arranged chronologically or by region, but rather by artist, Lippmann was not attempting to provide the stylistic development of the drawings, but, rather, a record of the collection.

It was not until after World War I (1914-1918) that major new developments in the publications of drawings occurred. Within a ten-year period, from 1921-1931, several European institutions produced catalogues based on specific national groupings. Of the German and Netherlandish drawings, the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, led the way with

---

8 Lippmann, Zeichnungen alter Meister.

9 Stephanie Buck, Die Niederländischen Zeichnungen des 15. Jahrhunderts im Berliner Kupferstichkabinett: Kritischer Katalog (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), 18. Similarly, from 1896 to 1908 Joseph Schönbrunner compiled twelve volumes of the Albertina’s entire old masters drawing collection (the last two volumes were completed by Joseph Meder) called the Handzeichnungen alter Meister aus der Albertina und anderen Sammlungen. In addition to its own holdings, the publication featured other drawings from Viennese institutions as well as examples from Frankfurt, Prague, Budapest, and Florence. Included were more than 1,400 unbound facsimile reproductions, making the volumes both large and cumbersome. More of a presentation piece than a useful reference guide, each volume featured a title page printed in color, a short introduction, a table of contents, and a short description of each drawing.
Max J. Friedländer (Lippmann’s successor) and Elfried Bock’s *Handzeichnungen deutscher Meister des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts* in 1921. A catalogue of the Netherlandish drawings from the collection followed in 1931. Other notable publications from this brief period included the Graphische Sammlung Albertina catalogue of Netherlandish drawings (1928), which was organized chronologically and demonstrated a progression of artistic technique and method, rather than by artist or school. The Universitätbibliothek Erlangen (1929), the British Museum, London (1932), and the Musée de Louvre, Paris (1929-1933), also published extensive inventories of their northern drawings.

---


11 Elfried Bock and Jakob Rosenberg, eds., *Die Niederländischen Meister; beschreibendes Verzeichnis sämtlicher Zeichnungen mit 220 Lichtdrucktafeln, Staatlich Museen zu Berlin* (Frankfurt am Main: Prestel-verlag, 1931). The catalogue was devoted to drawings from the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries. Its aim was to provide full accessibility to the museum’s Netherlandish drawings collection, providing the reading with a short descriptive paragraph for each entry, a report of the verso of a drawing when applicable, and references to similar works in other collections.

12 Otto Benesch, ed., *Die Zeichnungen der niederländischen Schulen des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts* (Vienna: A. Schroll, 1928). The Albertina’s Netherlandish drawings catalogue was published two years after Alfred Six’s catalogue of the Venetian drawings in the collection. Similar to Friedländer and Bock’s German catalogue of 1921, Otto Benesch, the then assistant curator at the Graphische Sammlung Albertina, presented short descriptions of the drawings with reproductive plates presented separately. He also arranged the catalogue chronologically rather than alphabetically to account for anonymous artists.

13 Elfried Bock, ed., *Die Zeichnungen in der Universitätbibliothek Erlangen* (Frankfurt am Main: Prestel, 1929); Arthur M. Hind and Arthur E. Popham, *Catalogue of Drawings by Dutch and Flemish Artists Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, vols. 1-4 by A. M. Hind, vol. 5 by A. E. Popham (London: British Museum, 1915-32); Frits Lugt and Jean Vallery-Radot, *Inventaire Général Des Dessins Des Écoles Du Nord*, vol. 5 (Paris: Éditions des Bibliothèques nationales de France, 1936). Elfried Bock’s catalogue of the drawings in the Universitätsbibliothek, Erlangen, contained approximately 1,700 drawings of the fourteenth to eighteenth centuries and was the first in a series of publications sponsored by the Prestel Society, whose aim was to present collections from lesser-known German museums such as those in Weimar, Braunschweig, and Hamburg. While the catalogue only featured 613 collotype reproductions, entries were provided for the roughly 1,421 German and Swiss drawings as well as the 122 Netherlandish, and roughly 150 French and Italian drawings. Bock grouped them according to artist name as well as school, contributing new attributions to many. See also C D., review of *Die Zeichnungen in der Universitätbibliothek Erlangen* in *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 57, no. 330 (1930): 148.

Popham was the first publication regarding Netherlandish drawings of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries written in English. He had previously written a short booklet on the subject in 1926. See idem.
As with the circumstances of the First World War, the years during the Second World War (1939-45) prohibited any substantial publishing of fifteenth-and sixteenth-century northern European drawings. Although there were post-war publications of collections that had not previously been inventoried, such as those at the Bibliothèque Nationale (1950), the Staatliche Kunsthalle, Karlsruhe (1955), Frankfurt’s Städelisches Kunstinstitut (1973), and the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (1978), the format and objective of collection catalogues for northern European drawings largely stayed the same for roughly forty-five years.

Drawings of the Early Flemish School (London: Benn, 1926). The first four volumes of the Netherlandish drawings at the British Museum were compiled by Arthur M. Hind and were devoted to the seventeenth century onward. Popham’s volume is divided between centuries and arranged alphabetically by known artist, followed by the anonymous works for each century. The catalogue is not fully illustrated, but Popham justified this by noting that those drawings not reproduced had been illustrated elsewhere. While Popham provided the reader with a brief introduction to the material, particularly of the techniques used by artists of the period, he did not go into any length about stylistic development. The entries are comprised of short descriptions of the compositions and references to similar works in other collections.


15 Staatliche Kunsthalle, Alteutsche Zeichnungen aus der Staatlichen Kunsthalle Karlsruhe (Baden-Baden: Klein, 1955). This was a small handbook of 32 German drawings.


18 See also, Edmund Schilling, The German Drawings in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle and Supplements to the Catalogues of Italian and French Drawings: With a History of the Royal Collection of Drawings by Anthony Blunt (London: Phaidon, 1971); Per Bjurström, ed., Drawings in Swedish Public Collections: German Drawings, vol. 1 (Stockholm: Allmaenna Foerlaget, 1972);
In fact, the characteristics of collection catalogues did not substantially change, save for the quantity and quality of the information provided, until the late 1990s with the publication of the Robert Lehman Collection of European drawings at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1999, took a more comprehensive and contextually historical approach to the stylistic development of the drawings, detailed within the extensive catalogue entries.\(^{19}\) Comprised of the expertise of five separate authors and accompanied by ample reproductions of comparative material, the catalogue was arranged chronologically with substantial interpretive readings of the works, their historical context, and issues of attribution. Previously, most of the interpretive discussions of the drawings would have been explored in more focused publications, such as in journal articles or monographs.\(^{20}\)

The best example of how far collection catalogues have come since the early twentieth century is Stephanie Buck’s 2001 *Die niederländischen Zeichnungen des 15. Jahrhunderts im Berliner Kupferstichkabinett: kritischer Katalog*. Using a comprehensive approach, Buck provided a detailed introduction that began with an overview of the holdings of fifteenth-century Netherlandish drawings in the Kupferstichkabinett, and continued with a history of the collection itself. Buck departed

---


20 Up to that point, collection catalogues had reflected the objective that Karel G. Boon had set out in his 1978 publication of the drawings in the Rijksmuseum that “...on the assumption that a museum catalogue should first provide information and that art historical problems should be treated in specialized monographs, I have tried to be as brief as possible in discussing the drawings.” For a critique of Boon's method, see J. Richard Judson, review of *Catalogue of the Dutch and Flemish Drawings in the Rijksmuseum, II: Netherlandish Drawings of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries in the Rijksmuseum*, by Karel G. Boon, *Master Drawings* 19, no. 1 (1981): 42. While John Rowlands provided a great deal of depth on the specific objects in his catalogue of German drawings from the British Museum, London, he did not provide an overview of the development of German drawing practices of the period. See John Rowlands, *Drawings by German Artists and Artists from German-Speaking Regions of Europe: The Fifteenth Century, and the Sixteenth Century by Artists born before 1530* (London: British Museum Press, 1993).
from most previous catalogues in the specificity and thoughtful overview of the important issues regarding the drawings of the period. She divided this information into sections dealing with originals and copies, attribution and dating questions, the examination of underdrawings as a useful tool for the identification of function, types of drawings and their functions, techniques of execution, and issues related to iconography.21

**Exhibition Catalogues**

In addition to collection catalogues, exhibitions have become increasingly important for the further dissemination of current scholarship to experts, students, and a wider public audience through accompanying publications. From the late 1920s to the mid 1960s, there were relatively few exhibitions devoted to northern European drawing.22 While several shows were held during the 1970s, particularly related to Dürer, the promotion of northern European drawings by way of exhibitions increased drastically in

---

21 Buck, *Die Niederländischen Zeichnungen*. Similarly to Buck’s revised treatment of Berlin’s Netherlandish drawings, the University Library at Erlangen also revised and added to its first early catalogue. See Hans Dickel, ed., *Zeichnen vor Dürer Die Zeichnungen Des 14. Und 15. Jahrhunderts in der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen* (Petersberg: Imhof, 2009). With contributions by Buck and Messling, the introduction featured a history of the collection while the essays imparted a brief overview of the period and information regarding the function of drawings in the workshop. It is rich with sizable entries, comparative material, and large color reproductions. Buck’s assertion that the study of underdrawings to help establish the function of a drawing was first discussed by Maryan Ainsworth in her seminal article of 1989 in which she argued that, “Questions of authenticity, authorship, and date, as well as consideration of an artist’s working methods, may now be more fully investigated in the light of information provided by underdrawings.” See Maryan Ainsworth, “Northern Renaissance Drawings and Underdrawings: A Proposed Method of Study,” *Master Drawings* 27, no. 1 (1989): 5, 6. As technology has continued to advance from the early development of technical studies in the late 1960s and early 1970s, increased comparative material and documented underdrawings continue to aid scholars in numerous ways, including in distinguishing copies from original drawings.

the 1980s, with five major shows held between 1983 and 1988 in both Europe and North America.Larry Silver noted in 1988 that, “In the realm of sixteenth-century German art, much of the most durable and fundamental scholarship now appears in the form of the exhibition catalogue.”

Exhibitions such as *From a Mighty Fortress: Prints, Drawings and Books in the Age of Luther, 1483-1546* of 1983 and *The Age of Bruegel: Netherlandish Drawings in the Sixteenth Century*, both staged in 1986, increased the exposure of English-speaking audiences to northern European drawings and allowed visitors who could not travel to European museums to see the works in North America. *The Age of Bruegel*, which was held at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. and at the Pierpont Morgan Library (now the Morgan Library & Museum) included 123 drawings by approximately fifty-five

---


25 *From a Mighty Fortress* was shown at the Detroit Institutes of Arts, the National Gallery of Canada, and the Kunstsammlungen der Veste Coburg, in Coburg, Germany. It presented a wide array of graphic material such as prints and books, but drawings were also a significant part of the exhibition and showcased works produced during the Reformation from such artists as Martin Schongauer, Albrecht Dürer, Hans Baldung, Albrecht Altdorfer, Hans Burgkmair and Lucas Cranach. See Christiane Andersson and Charles Talbot, eds. *From a Mighty Fortress: Prints, Drawings and Books in the Age of Luther, 1483-1546*, exh. cat. (Detroit: Detroit Institute of Arts, 1983).
artists, and featured subjects from figure, landscape, and religious studies.\textsuperscript{26} The catalogue, with separate entries for each work, also featured several introductory essays related to the historical period, the function of sixteenth-century drawings in the Low Countries, and a case study of Jan Gossaert’s stylistic evolution, particularly the influence of Italian art in his drawings. The project not only synthesized current scholarship of the field, but also brought attention to lesser-known artists, a beneficial result of such focused shows.\textsuperscript{27}

During the late 1980s and late 1990s several exhibitions were devoted to German drawings, including a focused exhibition of Albrecht Altdorfer’s work in 1988 in Berlin and Regensburg, the British Museum’s \textit{The Age of Dürer and Holbein: German Drawings 1400-1550}, and later in 1997-98 \textit{Dürer, Holbein, Grünewald: Meisterzeichnungen der deutschen Renaissance aus Berlin und Basel}, which featured 180 works by roughly 25 artists from both the Berlin and Basel Kupferstichkabinett collections.\textsuperscript{28} In 1999, the National Gallery of Art in Washington staged an exhibition with nearly all the works from the 1997 \textit{Dürer, Holbein, Grünewald} show that featured nearly 200 drawings.\textsuperscript{29} Called \textit{From Schongauer to Holbein: Master Drawings from...


Basel and Berlin, the exhibition and accompanying catalogue presented the issues of artistic development by laying out the format of both chronologically.30

Significant exhibitions devoted to northern European drawing continued to bring together important works from several collections for study and interpretation. The 2002 exhibition Early Netherlandish Drawings from Jan van Eyck to Hieronymus Bosch, held at the Rubenshuis in Antwerp, brought together forty-nine drawings and was arranged around four important artists and their workshops, namely Jan van Eyck, Rogier van der Weyden, Hugo van der Goes, and Bosch.31 The exhibition, which was the first devoted to the drawings of the period made possible through extensive loans, aimed to “…make this little-known material more accessible to a broader public, and to awaken greater interest in the draughtsmanship of the period,” and to “provide an overview of the essential stages of development in early Netherlandish drawing.”32 The catalogue featured detailed entries of the drawings as well as reproductions of comparative material and was grouped according to artist rather than by theme or function.33 In addition to bringing together so

30 Maryan Ainsworth thought the accompanying catalogue to the exhibition lacked “…an overview of the drawings’ various functions and a discussion of how their technique and relative state of finish indicate the particular relationship between artist and patron, or between artist and workshop assistants or collaborators.” See Maryan W. Ainsworth, review of From Schongauer to Holbein: Master Drawings from Basel and Berlin, by Andrew Robison, Master Drawings 39, no. 1 (2001): 64.

31 Koreny, Early Netherlandish Drawings. The exhibition was held during the year-long celebration of Belgium’s artistic heritage, which included other exhibitions such as Jan van Eyck: Early Netherlandish Painting and Southern Europe, held at the Groeningemuseum, Bruges and Medieval Mastery, an exhibition of illuminated manuscripts held at the Stedelijk Museum Vander Kelen-Martens, Leuven. See Till-Holger Borchert, The Age of Van Eyck: The Mediterranean World and Early Netherlandish Painting 1430-1530, exh cat. (Ghent: Ludion, 2002); Kris Callens, ed., Medieval Mastery: Book Illumination from Charlemagne to Charles the Bold, 800-1475, exh. cat. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002).

32 Koreny, Early Netherlandish Drawings, 7. According to Douglas Brine this exhibition was the first loan exhibition devoted to the drawings of the period. See Douglas Brine, review of Early Netherlandish Drawings from Jan Van Eyck to Hieronymous Bosch, by Frits Koreny, Renaissance Studies 17, no. 2 (2003): 282-286.

33 Maryan Ainsworth questioned the lack of attention to the function of the drawings in the exhibition as well as the decision to cap the show with the works of Hieronymus Bosch rather than Gerard David.
many noteworthy works, the exhibition was celebrated for “...focusing attention on the often-neglected field of early Netherlandish drawings.”

Two other shows of note from the first decade of the twenty-first century were both devoted to works from German speaking regions, primarily the 2003 exhibition *Wendepunkte deutscher Zeichenkunst: Spätgotik und Renaissance im Städel* in Frankfurt which displayed works by German Renaissance artists such as Dürer and Burgkmair and the 2007 exhibition *Central European drawings from the National Gallery of Canada*, held in Ottawa and which showcased drawings from their own collection. As of 2012, the most recent exhibition devoted to northern European drawing was the Metropolitan Museum’s *Dürer and Beyond: Central European Drawings before 1700*. Arranged chronologically, but broadly enough that drawings could be grouped according to region

---


and theme, the exhibition and accompanying catalogue showcased many drawings that had never been on view or published to any great extent. The central European drawings in the collection from the period that were not included in the exhibition or catalogue have been made available on the museum’s website, a clear indication of how information will be disseminated by museums in the future.37

As this brief survey has shown, the character and purpose of collection and exhibition catalogues has changed dramatically since the first major publications of the late nineteenth century. As fifteenth- and sixteenth-century northern European drawings became more accessible as a result of published inventories, greater comparative research has been possible. Scholarship regarding the materials and techniques of drawings has grown, as has the understanding of the function of copies and originals. At one time, most extant drawings of the period were considered copies after completed paintings. However, in conjunction with recent scientific developments in the study of underdrawings, the role of drawings as preparatory works and as teaching tools in the workshop has become better understood.38 While efforts have been made to provide

37 Ibid, vi.

38 Frits Lugt’s 1968 publication of the Netherlandish drawings at the Louvre was among the first to address the significance of underdrawings at a time when technical art history was in its infancy. See James Snyder, review of Musée du Louvre-Inventaire Général des dessins des écoles du Nord: maîtres des anciens Pays-Bas nés avant 1550, by Frits Lugt, The Art Bulletin 54, no. 1 (1972): 88. While such art historians as J.P. Filedt Kok and Micheline Comblen-Sonkes undertook technical studies during the 1970s, the number of documented underdrawings was still relatively small. As technology has continued to advance and more underdrawings are being recorded, their study has aided scholars in numerous ways, including the distinguishing between copies and original drawings. See Ainsworth, “Northern Renaissance Drawings and Underdrawings;” Stephanie Buck, “Comparing Drawings and Underdrawings: The Possibilities and Limitations of a Method,” in La Peinture et le Laboratoire: Procédés, Méthodologie, Applications: Colloque XIII, Bruges, 15, 16, 17 Septembre 1999, eds. Roger van Schoute and Hélène Verougstraete (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 201-212; J.P. Filedt Kok, “Underdrawing and Drawing in the Work of Hieronymus Bosch: A Provisional Survey in Connection with the Paintings by him in Rotterdam,” Simiolus 6 (1972/73): 133-162; Micheline Comblen-Sonkes, “Rogier Van Der Weyden Dessinateur: Comparaison de ses Dessins Autonomes et du Dessin sous-Jacent de ses Tableaux,” Bulletin, Institute Royal du Patrimoine Artistique, Brüssel (1977): 130-141.
contextual information as well as describe the important stylistic developments of the time, it is clear from recent catalogue and exhibition reviews that more comprehensive information regarding style and function is both necessary and desired. It is hoped that with the publication of a *Corpus of German and Netherlandish Drawings from 1350 to 1500*, that many of these issues will be addressed.
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