

## Landscapes by Wolf Huber and Domenico Campagnola, invented, copied, and replicated

Christopher S. Wood



1 Wolf Huber, Forest Hut, c. 1514, pen and ink, 159 x 220 mm. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, inv. 32459

Wolf Huber and Domenico Campagnola, versatile and inventive artists, developed new approaches to the replication and marketing of images, recalibrating the relations between drawings and prints; between preparatory drawings, drawn copies of drawings, and drawn copies of prints; between drawings that stay in the shop and drawings that are sent out into the world; and between artists and non-artist collectors. Landscape was the semantically relatively neutral field where all this was worked out. Some of Huber's and Campagnola's landscape drawings may be understood – in fact were understood in their time, it is proposed here – not as the carriers of workshop processes of transfer and translation but rather as *pictures* of those processes. The notion of a drawing that represents the functions of drawing is the basis of a new definition of the independent drawing in the Renaissance.

Wolf Huber was born in the 1480s in Feldkirch in the Alpine province of Vorarlberg, and lived and worked mostly in Passau in Lower Bavaria. He painted altarpieces, independent devotional pictures, and portraits. Huber also designed thirteen woodcuts. Of the 162 drawings attributed to Huber by Franz Winzinger, nearly 50 are landscapes or tree or foliage studies, and about 20 more are subjects conspicuously set in landscapes. In addition, Winzinger lists 30 landscape drawings by other hands which he believes reflect lost originals by Huber. A further group of landscapes in the same manner Winzinger detaches from Huber, but in fact they too may derive directly or indirectly from

lost Huber originals. Among Huber's drawings, the landscapes and near-landscapes were the most likely to survive: Winzinger lists only eight preparatory drawings for the paintings and fifteen “free studies” of bodies, drapery, and so forth.

Wolf Huber's earliest landscape drawings are fantastic inventions involving impossibly steep crags, romantic castles, and expressive pollarded trees. He also made topographical drawings, depicting real places. Both kinds of landscape drawing stored ideas that could be used in prints or paintings. Beginning in the mid-1510s he created landscape drawings which synthesized the two types: they appear to be based on a real motif but are developed as compositions, that is, as depictions, which do not borrow their internal structure from reality but create it out of their own resources. In these drawings an equilibrium between two-dimensional pattern and a depicted virtual three-dimensional reality dominates the suggestion of a transcription of reality. A good example is the *Forest Hut* in Munich (fig. 1).<sup>1</sup> A composition has a formal theme that may or may not be coordinated with themes generated by the represented content of the drawing. In this drawing, form endorses content. A forest hut is a refuge. Huber brings out the vulnerability of that outpost of civilization by plunging the hut into a maelstrom of inward collapsing vectors. The bending of the fence, the logs, the path, the trees, and the rays of the sun suggest great forces bearing down on the little structure, threatening it. The distorting foreshortening of the hut redoubles the formal



2 Wolf Huber, *Forest Hut*, 1519, pen and two shades of brown ink on ivory laid paper, 140 x 195 mm. Princeton (NJ), Princeton University Art Museum, inv. X1952-85

theme of pressure from above. The artistic interest of the drawing, which far exceeds the interest of a drawing that pragmatically stores information about nature for later use, derives from the interaction between the theme generated on the level of the signifier and the theme proposed by the content.

Who is the composed landscape drawing for? This drawing is artistically complete and yet bears traces of its own genesis in improvisation and discovery, marks of hesitation and haste. It lacks the degree of finish expected in the early sixteenth century of publicly displayed works of art in any medium.

To answer this question we begin by noting that Huber's landscape compositions were frequently copied. Of the nearly eighty landscape compo-

sitions attributed to Huber by Winzinger, about half were copied, in some cases more than once (in ten cases the original by Huber survives as well, in thirty cases only the copy or copies). The copies are often dated, as are Huber's originals: 30 of his landscape drawings are dated in his own hand, ranging from 1505 to 1552.<sup>2</sup> The earliest date on a copy is 1519; there are dated copies from the 1520s, 1530s, and 1540s, as well as from 1568 and 1609, long after the artist's death in 1553. There are four copies of the Munich *Forest Hut*; Winzinger attributes none of them to Huber.<sup>3</sup> In fact he considers none of the landscapes to be a self-copy by the artist. The copy of the *Forest Hut* in Princeton, dated 1519, is certainly not by Huber (fig. 2).<sup>4</sup> The drawing simplifies its model. The cluster of five trees behind the hut becomes three trees. The hut has been steadied, draining the composition of drama.

Although some of the copies of Huber landscapes are dated, none are initialed, as many Huber originals are. The corpus was assembled by Peter Halm in 1930<sup>5</sup> and revised by Winzinger in 1979. At some point Winzinger will need to be overhauled. But for a long time there have been no significant new studies and few discoveries. Huber's landscape drawings pose many puzzles. How long did they stay in the workshop? Where were the copies made, and by whom? Were they ever sold or given to non-artists?

Unlike his contemporary Albrecht Altdorfer, who issued nine landscape etchings at the beginning of the 1520s, Huber made no landscape prints. Some ideas developed in his landscape drawings, however, were published in his woodcuts, for example the *St George and the Dragon*, dated 1520 (fig. 3).<sup>6</sup> The lone soaring tree, the heaped-up crag, and the roiled clouds and radiating light of this woodcut are all familiar from the drawings, for example the *Mountain Landscape* in Berlin, a copy which bears the date of the lost original by Huber, 1517.<sup>7</sup> In the woodcut, the subject matter is overwhelmed by the landscape: either Huber lacked the will or the cutter lacked the skill to profile St George and the dragon clearly against their vegetal background. This woodcut broadcasts to a wide audience artistic ideas which, if they were confined to a single pen drawing, would be seen by very few people. A print, however, is unable to capture many of a drawing's most appealing features, for example, the traces of the artist's hesitating or experimenting hand. Moreover, a print – Altdorfer's etchings were for a long time the only exceptions – could not simply omit subject matter. Landscape in a print had to make room for a story. I believe that Huber was well aware of these problems and that his landscape drawings bore an evolving, reactive relation to the possibilities of publication, whether

by mechanical replication or by hand-copying. We will return to him later.

Domenico Campagnola was born probably around 1500 in Venice. His father was German; he was adopted by the artist Giulio Campagnola. His earliest works, a group of engravings and woodcuts, are dated or dated to 1517–18. By 1523 he is documented in Padua as *pittore*; a number of murals and oil paintings have been attributed to him. Domenico's early landscape drawings are close to Titian, for example this *Landscape* in the Uffizi in which transcription competes with composition (fig. 4).<sup>8</sup> The mountains and city in the background are lifted from other works, but the mass of earth and stumps in the foreground suggest direct observation. The function of such a sheet was basically to store ideas for paintings and prints. Titian's drawings and woodcuts provide the clue. Some themes in landscape drawings by Titian resurface in woodcuts of the 1520s and subsequent decades. An example is the *Landscape with Milkmaid*, usually dated c. 1525, cut by Niccolò Boldrini after a design by Titian.<sup>9</sup> In later decades about a dozen large landscape-oriented woodcuts were published after designs by Domenico Campagnola. A good example is the *Landscape with St John the Baptist* (fig. 5).<sup>10</sup> In these compositions Biblical, mythological or pastoral subject matter is engulfed by the drama of terrain, vegetation, and weather. Whereas Titian's *Landscape with Milkmaid* sat on a stable ground plane, Campagnola's *Landscape with St John the Baptist* is tumultuous, lawless. Among such vegetation and terrain, subject matter is supererogatory, as suggested coyly by John the Baptist himself, who points out to the approaching initiates their destination, invisible to us (though why are they walking away from the River Jordan?).

There is a large corpus of landscape drawings in more or less this manner, datable mostly to



3 Wolf Huber, *St George and the Dragon*, 1520, woodcut, 201 x 149 mm. London, The British Museum, inv. 1895,0122.438



4 Domenico Campagnola, *Landscape*, c. 1520, pen and ink, 222 x 368 mm. Florence, Gallerie degli Uffizi, Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe, inv. 1404E

the second quarter of the sixteenth century, whose attributions over the centuries have drifted around Titian and Campagnola. Giovanni Morelli gave them all to Campagnola. The corpuses are always being quietly adjusted, especially in the vicinity of Titian, by the respective curators. A large share of this interesting body of drawings is now simply unattributed. The ratio of copies to originals, the relation of these drawings to woodcuts, and the status of these sheets as “independent” drawings have never been systematically studied.

What is an independent drawing? It is not a period term. I will propose a definition that I believe helps sort out the Huber and Campagnola material, and perhaps other material. I wish to begin by differentiating the independent drawing from other kinds of drawing that could be mistaken for it. The independent drawing is not simply a finished or realized drawing, that is, a drawing to which nothing can be profitably

added. Such realized drawings are often described by scholars as presentation drawings or demonstration pieces. Examples from around 1400 are the *Search of the Magi* and the *Visitation* attributed to Lorenzo Monaco; an example from around 1500 is the *Death of Orpheus* by Albrecht Dürer. These are works which, although made in a medium associated either with the preparation of works in a more permanent medium or with the temporary storage of artistic ideas, have qualities of completeness and beauty that permit them to be compared to artworks in the sturdier media. This is a category determined by the *maker* of the drawing: the artist decides when the artwork is realized.

The independent drawing is also not simply a drawing valued as a relic of the fabrication process or a contact-relic of the artist, that is, a drawing that is extracted from the making process and preserved and valued beyond its initial usefulness within the workshop. Exam-

ples are the *Christ Teaching* by Martin Schongauer in the British Museum, owned, inscribed, and dated to 1469 by Albrecht Dürer, and the workshop studies by Quattrocento painters pasted into albums by Giorgio Vasari. These are functional drawings valued by other artists, and eventually by non-artists, for qualities unrelated to their original function. It is a category determined wholly by a beholder who assigns value beyond, or different from, the value the sheet had for the maker.

I would define the independent drawing instead as a drawing that frames the relations of drawings to other drawings, and the relations of drawings to works in other media such as paintings or prints. Such a drawing is independent because it did not contribute to the process of fabrication of a more permanent work. It is in-

dependent also because it takes advantage of its own freedom from function in order to represent, and so denaturalize, the condition of dependency of most drawings. The independent drawing is valued as a *representation or picture of a workshop-based transfer process*. Such a drawing is not a real trace of a real process, but rather an image of a plausible stage within a non-existent process. The content of the independent drawing is the projective, dynamic, practical, and provisional quality of drawing; the movement from the incomplete to the complete; and the creative and searching quality of a drawing guided by an idea of completeness. Unlike the workshop relic, the independent drawing never in fact played an auxiliary role within a fabrication process. Unlike the presentation drawing, the independent drawing appears to be incomplete. But once artists know



5 Niccolò Boldrini, after Domenico Campagnola, *Landscape with John the Baptist*, about 1549-54, woodcut, 306 x 429 mm. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, Bequest of W. G. Russell Allen, inv. 1975.485



6 Domenico Campagnola, *Landscape with River*, 1525-1550, pen and ink, 240 x 380 mm. Paris, musée du Louvre, inv. 5542

that beholders – artists and non-artists alike – are interested in such drawings, they produce that incompleteness deliberately. Although the independent drawing appears incomplete, it is in fact realized in its own terms. Unlike the workshop relic, an object identified by the beholder, and unlike the finished drawing, an object identified by the maker, the independent drawing is a category determined by both maker and beholder.

The Munich *Forest Hut* by Huber and the *Landscape* in the Uffizi (1404E) by Campagnola are examples of independent drawings. So too is the *Landscape with River* in the Louvre (5542) by Campagnola, a work more refined, or at least more controlled, than Uffizi 1404E and more distant from Titian (fig. 6).<sup>11</sup> This drawing is an archive of conventional formulae. The bare knoll in the foreground is the half-hearted marker of the work's putative origin in obser-

vation. *Plein air* fabrication is by now a near-total fiction. The relation of the motifs to one another is settled; the drawing does not speak of hesitant involvement in an ongoing process. And yet there is no subject matter. The expectancy of the landscape, its availability as a theater for narrative, signals the work's, or at least some of the work's components', destination in a print or a painting.

Since the meaning of the independent drawing emerges out of its gestures toward its own notional but not literal source and destination, it is best if there is little semantic interference from a motif or subject matter. The artist wants a free hand to represent his own drawing practice's embeddedness in, but ultimate sovereignty over, process.

A workshop drawing was the cross-section of a collaborative creative process spread across



7 Domenico Campagnola, Landscape, c. 1525?, pen and ink, 166 x 241 mm. London, The British Museum, inv. 1848,1125.10

media and materials, hidden from the eyes of the public. Drawing stored artistic ideas, signposting the creative process, always pointing backward and forward, capturing creative flow like light on a photographic plate. The drawing that left the workshop published private content that in artistic terms was unrealized, was awaiting incorporation into a public artwork. Engravings also published ideas developed in the shop, but they could not so easily show artistically unrealized material. A print never had a 'project' quality. Moreover, there were beholders interested in gaining access to the shop, as it were, but who did not wish to participate in the community created by an edition, and who would wish instead to own the drawing that the print represented. This is where the independent drawings came in: a fiction of a shop draw-

ing. No real traces like wear and tear, no scribbling or crossed-out bits or commenced but uncompleted passages. It was more like the *ideal* of a workshop drawing.

In the first decades of the sixteenth century more and more non-artists were recruited into the population of beholders who valued such glimpses of the creative process. Drawings and prints created hierarchies of beholders, distinguishing *cognoscenti* from ordinary beholders and setting in motion cascades of ever finer discriminations. A woodcut such as the *Landscape with Milkmaid* was not understood by this new public as the publication of a finished or presentation drawing by Titian. It was understood as the publication of some ideas about landscape – motifs, forms – worked out in the shop



8 After Domenico Campagnola, Landscape with Couple Gathering Fruit, early 1540s, woodcut, 370 x 500 mm. Vienna, Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Venezianische DG Alte Aufstellung, fol. 13a

in the medium of drawing and destined for inclusion, eventually, in some painting. The Dutch artist and historian Karel van Mander said as much in his didactic poem about painting, published in 1604. Van Mander notes that generally Italians are not so good at landscape. He mentions as exceptions Tintoretto, Girolamo Muziano, and “the especially great Titian, whose woodcuts instruct us” in landscape.<sup>12</sup>

My argument is that the woodcut then created an elite demand for drawings by Titian. Since such drawings were scarce, Domenico Campagnola and others filled the gap. They made the drawings that the admirers of Titian's woodcuts coveted. An example is the *Landscape* in London BM 1848,1125.10, one of four or five drawings signed by Campagnola (fig. 7).<sup>13</sup> Like

Uffizi 1404E and Louvre 5542, this drawing assembles motifs familiar from the landscape backgrounds of paintings as well as features associated with drawings made directly from nature. The riders at right offer a hint of a story. The foreground is dominated by a formless mass which reads as the trace of a real observational stance in the world. The emptiness and pointlessness of the foreground mass read as signs of submission to the imperatives of workshop processes. I believe that this drawing, deliberately made to look unrealized, was nonetheless sent out into the world, perhaps given, perhaps sold, to a non-artist who understood quite a lot about art.

Some of the first independent drawings “contained” printmaking. But then in turn new

kinds of woodcuts emerged that framed independent drawings. The relay continues. A woodcut such as the *Landscape with Couple Gathering Fruit*, designed by Campagnola probably in the early 1540s, must be understood as a published version of a drawing such as BM 1848,1125.10, offering to a wider public the glimpse into the workshop that the drawing had offered a single collector (fig. 8).<sup>14</sup> The hasty treatment of the mountains and the lack of internal spatial logic, so uncharacteristic of the Titian woodcuts, here read as the marks, persisting from drawings into the print, of the draughtsman's searching, pragmatic hand. But of course no woodcut can be quite as eloquently incomplete as the drawings are. Here for example the foreground formlessness that we saw in the drawings is populated. A print cannot reproduce an unrealized status. It can only represent the idea of non-realization. The woodcut, gathering ideas found in drawings (and paintings), presents itself as the publication of an experimental, open-ended drawing practice. The *Landscape with Milkmaid* is an example of such a publication, though the unstable, tilting terrain links it not to Titian but to the Campagnola drawings. Such woodcuts were then translated into the drawings, or the kind of drawings, they were supposedly based on, and in turn those drawings were copied, generating the huge corpus of landscape drawings attributed to or associated with Domenico Campagnola, of which there are nearly 200 in the Louvre alone.

Paradoxically, the copy of an independent drawing is still an independent drawing. That is because "independent" as I have defined it here does not mean literally that the work did not draw on any prior work. It means that the drawing became an object of interest because it was understood as framing another medium, or representing a function of drawing, that is, representing itself as a medium. (A print, too, can be

independent; so can a painting, naturally, although the sense of independence we are developing here would have to compete with so many other ways that a painting can be "independent"). The "Campagnola" landscape drawings staked out just enough distance from practical workshop function, which is a state of pure dependency, to gain a view onto that function. That is their independence.

The *Landscape with Woman with Spindle* in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (1972.118.243), attributed to Campagnola, stitches together several familiar modules: the foreground knoll, the buildings clustered around a tower, the wayfarers, the mountains, the atmospheric turbulence (fig. 9).<sup>15</sup> It resembles the woodcut *Landscape with Couple Gathering Fruit*, which collects similar modules and also plants a reclining figure, in fact two, in the foreground. One imagines a viewer who saw the woodcut and then coveted a drawing like the *Landscape with Woman with Spindle*. Drawings won their independence by framing prints. Woodcuts reasserted their independence by framing drawings.

Within the large "Campagnola" corpus, it is difficult to distinguish those drawings meant for non-artist beholders or collectors from those really used by artists as storage and retrieval devices for ideas, in effect using them in the way prints were often used. There is clear evidence that the Venetian landscape woodcuts were understood by other artists as disseminators of artistic ideas, meant for copying and use. For a non-artist this is what made the woodcuts desirable – the sense of eavesdropping on artists' conversations. Louvre 5544 gives the composition of the *Couple Gathering Fruit*, in the same orientation and slightly smaller (fig. 10).<sup>16</sup> This is a drawing after the woodcut. The Tietzes considered it too spontaneous to be a copy. But the



9 Domenico Campagnola, *Landscape with Woman and Spindle*, 1525-1550, pen and ink, 255 x 370 mm. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. 1972.118.243

drawing's apparent spontaneity is nothing more than a duplication of the aggregated, loose-knit quality of the woodcut. The draughtsman grasped that the woodcut composition, assembling agitated notations, aimed at little more than an unhabitable tumbling space with half a dozen vanishing points. Another doublet is the woodcut *Landscape with Travelers* and a drawing in Hamburg (21473), though in this case we may be dealing with the preparatory drawing for the print, or a copy after that drawing.<sup>17</sup>

The sequence of intermedial cross-references and allusions is complex and can never be pried apart. The hybridity was built in, for even at the start, in Titian's drawings, the woodcut is present. Detlev von Hadeln argued that Titian's drawing manner is not derivable from his Venetian predecessors Giovanni Bellini and Vit-

tore Carpaccio but rather that Titian learned cross-hatching and how to create optical effects with line from Dürer's woodcuts.<sup>18</sup>

At the start Domenico was reflecting the light of Titian. But at some point he became an artistic origin-point in his own right, even if the signatures seem to drop off. Marcantonio Michiel in 1537 mentioned "large landscapes on canvas and others in pen on paper" (*i paesi in tele grandi a guazzo e gli altri in fogli a penna sono di man de Domenigo Campagnola*) he had seen at Padua.<sup>19</sup> The Tietzes relayed Hadeln's comment: Domenico Campagnola was the first "draftsman by profession."<sup>20</sup> Of course, it is easy to forget, when you are focusing on prints and drawings, that paintings were the main thing. Rosand and Muraro point to Domenico's *Good Samaritan* in Coral Gables as a painting that draws on



10 Domenico Campagnola, *Landscape with Couple Gathering Fruit*, after 1545?, pen and ink, 300 x 430 mm. Paris, musée du Louvre, inv. 5544

motifs developed in the drawings. Suffice it to say that many of the drawings in the corpus were recognizable at the time as works by Domenico on the basis of familiarity with his paintings. The absence of signatures on the drawings only reinforced the fiction that they really were shop drawings (generally an Italian artist was less likely to sign a drawing than a German artist).

Did Venetian artists know Huber's drawings and understand them as a form of serial production, imitating prints? This seems unlikely. But I would note that Louvre 4768, a drawing attributed to Campagnola, strikes formal notes familiar from Huber: heaving terrain, a farm building slanting under pressure.

The approaches to landscape in the Venetian and German corpuses we are considering are

broadly similar. The subject matter in most of the Venetian drawings is dialed down close to zero, so as not to interfere with the form. But there is still content. The drawings depict local but not recognizable places. They represent raw but not inhospitable nature, shaped not by people so much as by God. This has the effect of gathering all the human artistry into the drawing technique. Artistry, in effect, is removed from the plane of the signified in order to highlight its presence in the plane of the signifier. Landscape permits this displacement of meaning from subject matter over to form. The source of value of the independent landscape drawing is the non-independence and functionality of drawing generally. The drawing finds a new ratio between functionality and creativity. Too much style and the drawing's rhetoric of authenticity will be weakened. Too much rhetoric of functionality and it won't be attractive.

This is true of the independent drawings by Wolf Huber as well. Here, too, there was a preference for a local landscape not too populated or cultivated, unkempt but not forbidding, a semi-wilderness. We are shown forest huts, not farms. Cities are distant. The deep significance of the local but non-topographical landscape in both the Venetian and the German drawings is that the content signals the withdrawal of the artwork from the vertical typological or substitutional chains that link works of art to one another across time. Iconographical and art historical lineages are suspended. The landscapes are thus comparable to drawings of non-mythological or other non-motivated nudes, for example nudes drawn from life, which also withdraw from history, both art history and modern history. There are plenty of examples in the Venetian tradition, fewer German examples. These are "local" nudes, as it were, offering a knowledgeable lay public a glimpse into workshop processes. The only meaningful contexts summoned by a landscape or a nude are the field of vision of the artist with pen in hand, and the body stripped of accoutrements. The nude, like the landscape, signifies "not culture." The draughtsman of landscape or nude cribs not from another artist, but rather from the divine artistry of land and flesh. Partially pre-cultural landscape content serves as a foil for artistic creativity which is also at once cultural and pre-cultural. The artist who rejects pre-formed motifs like iconography or artifacts in other media in favor of pre-cultural material such as landscape or the nude body claims a larger share of responsibility for the total sum of stylization visible in the work.

The corpus of landscape drawings by and after Huber also suggests intense intermedial relations. The several series of dated copies after a single drawing are a striking feature. There are no examples of such series within the Campagnola

material. The Huber copies raise the question of whether Huber, aware of the broadcasting potential of the Venetian landscape-oriented woodcuts as well as of Altdorfer's landscape etchings, decided instead to stick to the handmade medium and issue copies, offering them in a sense as handmade prints. In some cases, the copies are dated across a number of years, indicating that the original stayed in the shop. A valuable document is the *Landscape (View of Passau?)* in Braunschweig bearing the monogram AA and the dates 1522, 1543, and 1555 (W. 187a). 1543 was evidently the date of the original by Huber and 1555 the date of the copy. 1522 and AA were added by a later optimistic collector who wished to believe that at the start stood a drawing by Altdorfer. If the copies were made by assistants, were they exercises or were they meant to be distributed or even sold beyond the shop, as tokens of Huber's artistry? Did he make some of the copies himself? According to the documents, Huber's workshop in Passau was relatively large.<sup>21</sup> The *Landscape* in Braunschweig (W. 80), dated 1528, offers another clue: it is inscribed *das ist das erst*, implying that an original could easily be confused with a copy. It is hard to believe that Huber (if he wrote the inscription) would not know his own hand, so the inscription must have been a note to himself distinguishing the original from his own copies of it, unless the inscription was meant to help pupils distinguish the model from *their* copies. It is somewhat disturbing that the Braunschweig drawing, which we would like to consider an original, is so weak.

Although there is no evidence that he was ever in Italy, Huber had access to Italian material. The drawing *Nude in Landscape* in Hamburg (W. 7) as well as the two Amsterdam drawings of nudes (W. 163-64), copies after Huber, reveal that Huber knew Florentine drawings of the fif-



11 German, mid-sixteenth century?, Landscape with Rustic Buildings, engraving, 127 x 171 mm. Paris, musée du Louvre, Collection Rothschild, inv. 4061

teenth century, probably from the shop of Filippino Lippi. Huber almost certainly knew Venetian woodcuts with landscape themes, and possibly landscape drawings. An engraving in the Louvre, *Landscape with Rustic Buildings*, is evidence of German access to Venetian landscapes, albeit rather late for our purposes. The work is attributed to Campagnola but seems to me unrelated to his printmaking manner (fig. 11).<sup>22</sup> The textured, soulful buildings are described with fine, attentive strokes. This could be a German rendering of Venetian themes. Armin Kunz has pointed out to me that at least one impression of this print in a private collection bears a watermark depicting a city gate: that is, a Ravensburg mark most likely from the mid-sixteenth century. If Huber knew Venetian landscape drawings he may have understood

them as different forms of publication of graphic ideas. At any rate, by the time he encountered Venetian drawings, if he did, he had already developed the idea of producing drawings for a public beyond the shop. A more immediate prompt for Huber may have been the signed and dated landscapes by Altdorfer in gouache or on panel.

Huber as we noted made woodcuts that disseminated landscape ideas. But he never published any prints that imitated the Venetians by radically reducing subject matter (no one in Germany made landscape-oriented woodcuts, with the exception of the strange Nuremberg woodcut attributed to Niklas Stoer<sup>23</sup>), nor did he imitate Altdorfer by publishing landscape drawings in the form of etchings. One of the sources

of value and meaning of Huber's drawings was instead, possibly, the fact that they were precisely *not prints*. His independent drawings addressed a public who understood prints as the way artists communicated with one another, and collected prints for that very reason – it was like intercepting a message sent from one artist to another. For such a collector, a unique handmade relic of the workshop process, or at least a drawing that represented that process, was more desirable than a print.

The dated copies of Huber's *View of Feldkirch* offer a good test of the hypothesis that Huber's landscape drawings were representations of workshop drawing practices rather than – or as well as – transmitters of pictorial ideas or mere exercises for pupils. The version in London (W. 71), dated 1523, would seem to be the drawing that launched the sequence of six surviving copies (fig. 12).<sup>24</sup> The date, however, does not match the moment when we know Huber was in Feldkirch to install an altarpiece. Possibly the lost original was dated 1521 and the London drawing is a copy (by Huber himself or not). The version in Munich, with the dates 1527 (model?) and 1530 (copy?), is good enough to have been attributable, for some scholars, if not for Winzinger, to Huber. The Berlin version (KdZ 838) bears three dates: 1540 and 1542 on the recto, 1546 on the verso. The watermark of this sheet is shared by other Huber drawings, suggesting that the copy was made in the workshop. The version recently acquired by Harvard (W. 71c) is dated 1542 (fig. 13).<sup>25</sup> The Harvard copy simplifies: there are fewer penstrokes in the foliage; the rays of the sun are straightened; there is less variation in the lines. The lines appear to sit on top of the page. Nevertheless the drawing was considered by Erwin Heinzle to be a self-copy by Huber, and it cannot be ruled out that the artist sometimes made hasty copies of his own works.<sup>26</sup> The version in Erlangen is

dated 1548, and another is dated 1568. One copy is undated. The multiple dates on the Berlin and Munich versions suggest that the copies were not all made from the original (whether London or a still earlier drawing), but rather from other copies. This implies that the original may have left the shop at some early point. Some of these drawings are more fully realized than others; others are stylish in a way that recalls the sketch or project-quality of some workshop drawings. They are all pictures of a style, as much as they are pictures of the world.

Huber's drawings of the 1520s seem to register knowledge of Altdorfer's landscape etchings. The *View of Feldkirch* resembles the etching the *Large Fir*, which dates no later than 1522.<sup>27</sup> We cannot exclude the possibility that Altdorfer's landscape etchings were themselves competitive responses to Huber's independent landscape drawings of the 1510s. For Altdorfer's *Large Fir* seems itself well aware of Huber's *Bridge Landscape* in Munich, dated 1515 (W. 42).

By not making landscape prints and instead distributing his ideas only in the medium of drawing, Huber could maintain the fiction that his landscape drawings were functional workshop material, perhaps studies of motifs meant to be adapted to the backgrounds of paintings. Such drawings were valuable – so the fiction – because he was a great artist. Distributing drawings was a way of signaling to the world that you were no run-of-the-mill artist but an artist of stature, like Dürer. For now, however, we cannot prove that these drawings had a non-artistic public in Huber's lifetime. Unfortunately Winzinger gives little information about the provenance of the Huber drawings. The copy dated 1548 of the very early landscape drawing in Oxford (W. 4) suggests that some sheets, at least, were carefully preserved in the shop for many decades, and therefore not meant for the





12 Wolf Huber, View of Feldkirch, 1523, pen and ink, 313 x 213 mm. London, The British Museum, inv. 1883,0714.101



13 Wolf Huber, View of Feldkirch, 1542, pen and ink, 308 x 208 mm. Cambridge (MA), Harvard Art Museums, inv. 2008.239

eyes of non-artists. Nevertheless there is ample reason to conclude that some of the landscape drawings in the manner of Huber and Campagnola were sold to amateurs or collectors of art.<sup>28</sup>

Huber's landscape drawings were copied by several known artists: Hans Leu the Younger, Hanns Lautensack, Augustin Hirschvogel, and one Franz Buch, active in Ulm between 1542 and 1568. None of these artists as far as we

know worked directly under Huber, in his workshop. A landscape by Hans Leu (W. 226), however, according to Winzinger, came down to us together with three other drawings closely linked to Huber and so may have belonged to the Huber workshop stock. Lautensack made landscape drawings and etchings from the 1540s on, imitating Huber's motifs and style. Hirschvogel, born in 1503 and so a contemporary of Domenico Campagnola, also made landscapes under Huber's influence, including three drawings dated 1536, 1537, and 1538. Hirschvogel's etching *Five Trees* (Bartsch 60) copies the drawing in Budapest (W. 73a) that copies a lost original by Huber reflected in a counterproof in Berlin (KdZ 4857, W. 173). The etching of the *Footbridge*, dated 1546 (there is also a copy in Braunschweig), is an adaptation of the watercolored drawing by Huber in Berlin (KdZ 1692, W. 65), whose terminus ante quem is 1522, the date of a miniature in Wolfenbüttel. A weak drawing in Princeton signed "S. Knüs," in turn, copies the Hirschvogel etching.<sup>29</sup> Hirschvogel seems to have understood Albrecht Altdorfer's etchings, too, as designs for further use: his drawing in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris copies Altdorfer's etching Bartsch 74.

All this went on for decades. Oberhuber notes the influence of Campagnola's *Landscape with Wandering Family* on Pieter Bruegel.<sup>30</sup> Two copies of lost Huber originals bear the date 1609 (W. 183-4). The Brescian painter Girolamo Muziano, who worked in Rome throughout the second half of the sixteenth century, disseminated many of his teacher Domenico Campagnola's ideas.<sup>31</sup> Many of the Venetian drawings in the Louvre, meanwhile, come from the Crozat and Mariette collections where they were widely admired, often as works by Titian, by French artists in the eighteenth century. Many were engraved by the Comte de Caylus and others: for example, Louvre 5534, which contains

motifs from the woodcut *Landscape with Milkmaid*.<sup>32</sup> Dreyer notes an eighteenth-century French etching after the woodcut *Landscape with the Couple Gathering Fruit*.<sup>33</sup> The drawing *Landscape with Woman and Spindle* in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (see above) was copied by Antoine Watteau.<sup>34</sup> Oberhuber mentions an eighteenth-century print in the Albertina that renders British Museum 1848,1125.10 in aquatint and etching.<sup>35</sup> In sum, Huber's and Campagnola's ideas about landscape, style, and medium traveled forward in time on branching paths, reinforcing the family ties between drawings and prints. Their independent drawings, modifying the pact between artist and beholder, wrote themselves into the history of modern art.

- 1 Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, inv. 32459. Franz Winzinger: Wolf Huber. Das Gesamtwerk, 2 vols., Munich/Zurich 1979, n. 26 (henceforth as "W."). 159 x 220 mm.
- 2 The date on W. 1, *Golgotha*, is surely to be read as 1512, not 1502.
- 3 Winzinger saw impressions of a stylus on the Munich sheet, evidence of a direct copy by tracing. But he does not consider any of the four surviving copies of that drawing to have been produced by this mechanical method; nor does any copy of a Huber landscape seem to have been a direct tracing.
- 4 Princeton University Art Museum. W. 26b. 140 x 195 mm. See Robert A. Koch: "Original or Copy?" Two Renaissance Landscape Drawings, in: Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University, 22 (1963), pp. 3-6 and fig. 3. The other copies are in Bremen, Weimar, and the ex-Koenigs collection.
- 5 Peter Halm: Die Landschaftszeichnungen des Wolfgang Huber, in: Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst, N. F. 7 (1930), pp. 1-104.
- 6 W. 14. 201 x 149 mm.
- 7 Berlin, SMB Kupferstichkabinett, KdZ 835, W. 193.
- 8 Florence, Gallerie degli Uffizi, Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe, inv. 1404E. 222 x 368 mm. The drawing was traditionally given to Titian but now generally to Domenico Campagnola. Hans Tietze & Erika Tietze-Conrat: The Drawings of the Venetian Painters in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Centuries, New York 1944, n. 1987, as "anonymous in the

- sphere of the early Titian." William R. Rearick: Tiziano e il disegno veneziano del suo tempo, Florence 1976, n. 54, as Domenico. It resembles British Museum Inv. 1848,1125.10 (see fig. 7 above) but can be dated somewhat later, to about 1520. On the tendency in recent decades to reassign Titian drawings to Campagnola, see David Rosand & Michelangelo Muraro: Titian and the Venetian Woodcut, Washington (D.C.) 1976, p. 125, n. 7. Peter Lüdemann: Tiziano. Le botteghe e la grafica, Florence 2016, pp. 58-60, pp. 67-81, offers substantial discussions of Domenico's involvement with Titian and in particular as a landscapist.
- 9 Peter Dreyer: Tizian und sein Kreis, Berlin 1971, n. 20. Rosand & Muraro 1976 (as in note 8), n. 21. The composition of this woodcut appears in reverse in the drawing Louvre 5573. Tietze & Tietze-Conrat 1944 (as in note 8), n. A 1959, dismissed the Louvre drawing as a workshop copy of the print; Dreyer saw it as possibly a counterproof of an original drawing by Titian; Rosand and Muraro considered it Titian's cartoon for the print.
- 10 306 x 429 mm. Hans Tietze and Erika Tietze-Conrat: Domenico Campagnola's Graphic Art, in: Print Collector's Quarterly, 26 (1939), n. 7. Rosand & Muraro 1976 (as in note 8), n. 27, as c.1535, cut by Boldrini.
- 11 240 x 380 mm. Tietze & Tietze-Conrat 1944 (as in note 8), n. 545, as shop of Domenico.
- 12 Karel van Mander: Das Lehrgedicht des Karel van Mander, ed. by Rudolf Hoecker, The Hague 1916, VIII, 24, pp. 206-207.
- 13 166 x 241 mm. Tietze & Tietze-Conrat 1944 (as in note 8), n. 483. Konrad Oberhuber: Disegni di Tiziano e della sua cerchia, Vicenza 1976, n. 58. Following the Tietzes, Oberhuber saw this as a youthful work of Domenico.
- 14 370 x 500 mm. Rosand & Muraro 1976 (as in note 8), p. 30. Dreyer 1971 (as in note 9), n. 36. Tietze & Tietze-Conrat 1939 (as in note 10) did not consider the print to have been designed by Campagnola; see also Tietze & Tietze-Conrat 1944 (as in note 8), n. A 1446.
- 15 255 x 370 mm.
- 16 300 x 430 mm. Tietze & Tietze-Conrat 1944 (as in note 8), n. A 1446.
- 17 Rosand & Muraro 1976 (as in note 8), n. 28 and fig. III-8. Dreyer 1971 (as in note 9), n. 33.
- 18 Detlev Freiherr von Hadeln: Zeichnungen des Tizian, Berlin 1924.
- 19 Rosand & Muraro 1976 (as in note 8), p. 138.
- 20 Tietze & Tietze-Conrat 1944 (as in note 8), p. 123.
- 21 See Winzinger 1979 (as in note 1), p. 20.
- 22 Louvre, Rothschild Collection, inv. 4061. 127 x 171 mm. David Landau, in: exhib. cat. The Genius of Venice. 1500-1600, ed. by Jane Martineau & Charles Hope, (London, Royal Academy of Arts, 25.11.1983-11.3.1984), London 1983, n. P 20, judged it a very early work by Domenico.

- 23 See Christopher S. Wood: Albrecht Altdorfer and the Origins of Landscape, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London 2014, pp. 313-15, fig. 195.
- 24 London, The British Museum, Inv. 1883,0714.101. 313 x 213 mm.
- 25 Cambridge (MA), Harvard Art Museums, Inv. 2008.239. 308 x 208 mm
- 26 Exhib. cat. Die Kunst der Donaueschule 1490-1540. Malerei, Graphik, Plastik, Architektur, ed. by Otto Wutzel, (Linz, Stift St. Florian und Schloßmuseum Linz, 14.5.-17.10.1965), Linz 1965, n. 313.
- 27 Bartsch 67; Wood 2014 (as in note 23), pp. 303-304, fig. 173.
- 28 Tietze & Tietze-Conrat 1944 (as in note 8), p. 124, on Domenico Campagnola: "we may assume the existence of an active workshop busying itself with the production of landscapes. This mass production...evidently met a newly rising need." Likewise Winzinger 1979 (as in note 1), p. 42, reckons that at least some landscape drawings in the manner of Wolf Huber were done by his assistants as commissions. Heinzle, in: exhib. cat. Die Kunst der Donaueschule 1965 (as in note 26), n. 313, suggests that many of the best copies were done by Huber himself for collectors.
- 29 Koch 1963 (as in note 4), fig. 1.
- 30 Konrad Oberhuber: Renaissance in Italien. 16. Jahrhundert, Vienna 1966 (Kunst der Graphik; 3), p. 121, n. 181.
- 31 John J. Marciari: Girolamo Muziano and Art in Rome, Ph.D. Diss., Yale University, 2000.
- 32 See Dreyer 1971 (as in note 9), n. 20. On the engravings after drawings in the Jabach collection, published in 1754, see Rosand & Muraro 1976 (as in note 8), p. 139, n. 11.
- 33 Dreyer 1971 (as in note 9), n. 36.
- 34 Watteau's copy is also in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, inv. 1972.118.237. Louvre 5577 is Watteau's copy of Louvre 5550, a relatively weak landscape associated with Domenico.
- 35 Oberhuber 1976 (as in note 13), n. 58.