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New Insights into Hendrik van Steenwijck the Younger’s Working Methods and Milieu

Anna Koopstra, Thomas Fusenig (appendix)

Recent technical investigation of Hendrik van Steenwijck the Younger’s Saint Jerome in His Study (1624, London, Courtauld Gallery) in combination with close study of two related works—a print and a drawing—have provided new insights into Van Steenwijck’s working methods and interests, in particular his use of prints. Neither of these subjects has received much scholarly attention heretofore. The article also covers the artistic milieu in Frankfurt where Van Steenwijck began his career at a time when Albrecht Dürer’s legacy was actively continued. And it offers clues about how Van Steenwijck made deliberate use of his background in pursuing a specific type of client in London. The discovery of an autograph letter of 1632, discussed and transcribed in the Appendix by Thomas Fusenig, further adds to our knowledge of Van Steenwijck’s professional and personal contacts.

1 Hendrik van Steenwijck the Younger (1580–before 1640), together with his father and teacher Hendrik van Steenwijck the Elder (ca. 1550–1603), became well known as the first Netherlandish painters to specialize in depicting Renaissance palaces and the interiors of Gothic churches. At first glance, Van Steenwijck’s Saint Jerome in His Study (fig. 1), signed and dated 1624 (fig. 2), may not seem characteristic of the art that brought him repute. The small painting is hugely significant, however, as it touches on many aspects of Van Steenwijck’s life and career. It reveals Van Steenwijck as an artist rooted in artistic tradition and connected to a network of contemporaries. This helped him to create works that would appeal to his clients. Finding new clients must have been crucial in light of the peripatetic existence he led: Hendrik van Steenwijck was active in Frankfurt, London, and Holland, and throughout his life he was probably a regular visitor to Antwerp, the city where he was born.

2 Saint Jerome in His Study stands out in the oeuvre because of its unusual composition. It belongs to the small part of Van Steenwijck’s extensive oeuvre that consists of figural compositions. Within this category of works, he took on a few subjects, including the subject of Saint Jerome, which
he painted in several variations. A typical example is *Saint Jerome in His Study* from the Portland Collection at Welbeck Estate (fig. 3), which shows the saint as a small figure in a spacious setting, in a landscape format. It dates from 1624, the same year as the Courtauld *Saint Jerome*. This means that both works were probably made in London where the artist had moved by 1617.
It has long been recognized that its extraordinary composition can be explained by the fact that *Saint Jerome in His Study* was made after a tiny engraving (fig. 4) by the engraver and publisher Theodor (or Dirk) de Bry the Elder (1528–1598) and/or his two sons, Johann (or Jan) Theodor (1561–1623), and Johann Israel (before 1570–1609).8 The De Brys were colleagues and contemporaries of the Van Steenwijcks, both father and son, in Frankfurt.9 The De Brys in turn based their engraving on a small pen-and-ink drawing, which also survives (fig. 5).10 From the “AD” monogram included in the print, it is evident that they believed that drawing was made by Albrecht Dürer.11

The underdrawing of *Saint Jerome in His Study* provides new insight into Van Steenwijck’s working methods and interests. The composition of *Saint Jerome in His Study* was fully and extensively underdrawn (fig. 6) in a combination of straight—apparently ruled—lines and vigorous free-hand hatching in what appears to be a dry medium. The purpose of the underdrawing appears to have been two-fold: first, to position the main elements of the composition on the panel, and second, to prepare and indicate areas of light and shadow.

To achieve the first, Van Steenwijck started mapping out the composition at the outer edges of the panel, as the underdrawn straight lines on all four sides show.13 Van Steenwijck continued “framing” the composition, top and bottom, by adding the arch and the step in the lower foreground. The latter, which achieves a gradual transition to the space of the viewer, is not present in the De...
Bry engraving. The figure of the saint was underdrawn within a separately delineated rectangle. In addition, Van Steenwijck made use of an elaborate system of drawn lines to replicate the way in which space is constructed in the print and also to measure and compose the composition. Several pinpoints are the remaining evidence of how these straight lines were made. Two of these pinpoints, in the bed, can be seen on the surface as tiny filled holes. One more can be found in the saint’s book (fig. 7). This must have been a time-consuming working method. Thanks to Edward Norgate (d. 1650), we know that Van Steenwijck indeed complained, exactly about this: “The onely Inconvenience incident to Perspective and whereof I have heard Mr Steinwicke complaine with indignation was that soe many were the lines perpendicular parralell and the rest, that another Painter, could compleate a pееce, and get his money, before he could draw his Lines.” The underdrawing of Saint Jerome in His Study makes Van Steenwijck’s complaint appear perfectly understandable—and truthful.
The underdrawing shows that rather than resizing and transferring the composition by means of a grid, Van Steenwijck used an organized, methodical approach to transfer the small engraving (the direction of the composition indicates that it was the print, not the drawing that was Van Steenwijck's model) onto a slightly larger wooden support.18

Van Steenwijck's approach in developing the composition reveals a thorough understanding of architectural space. His attempt to correct and clarify the interior, occasionally conflicted with the earlier model (the sixteenth-century drawing, ultimately) upon which the painting was based.19 An example of an alteration that shows his efforts to rationalize areas of ambiguous space in the interior depicted is the correction of the niche at the left, just above Jerome's desk. In the underdrawing Van Steenwijck followed the print, where the upper and lower parts of the niche are seen from different vantage points (from a low and high viewpoint respectively). In paint, however, Van Steenwijck strove for a more consistent rendering of the niche. As if to demonstrate its now more fully functional purpose, he placed an hourglass in the niche.

Small differences between the engraving and the painting show Van Steenwijck “updating” the composition, for example by changing the appearance of both saint and lion. He made the saint younger than the model, while the face of the lion turned out, rather comically, more human than animal. The lion’s tail, which is hanging down from the balustrade in the print, was altered at a late stage, in paint, to a position Van Steenwijck must have found more pleasing (fig. 8). The style of the furniture, doorposts, and windows was also modernized. At first sight it seems that iconographically appropriate accessories such as books and other paraphernalia of the daily life of the saint added decorative and narrative detail. Yet these small alterations also served to accentuate surfaces and emphasize a correct and rational construction of space. This demonstrates that Van Steenwijck was not content with merely imitating his model, but that he strove to improve it.

Notwithstanding such thorough preparation, Van Steenwijck painted Saint Jerome in a rather straightforward, simple manner, with thin layers of paint on top of a creamy off-white ground, stretching to the edges of the support. Shadow and highlights were added with a fine brush. Paint was applied swiftly, betraying the artist’s confidence and his great skill as a draftsman. The use of color is subdued, with sparingly applied touches of red, green, and yellowish brown. The limited

Fig. 8 Detail of lion’s tail, Saint Jerome in His Study (fig. 1) (photomicrograph: by the author)
palette and the painting technique—at once fine and precise but also loose and free—are consistently found in other paintings by Van Steenwijck that are of the same scale, whether on wood or copper panels.20

The De Bry Family, Frankfurt, and the Dürer Renaissance

Saint Jerome in his Study provides a revealing glimpse into the artistic milieu in Frankfurt, starting with Dirk de Bry and his sons.21 Before settling in Frankfurt, Hendrik van Steenwijck the Elder and Dirk de Bry the Elder appear to have already met in Antwerp. In 1577, De Bry was probably admitted to the Antwerp Guild of Saint Luke as “Dierick de coopersnryer ende siversmit,” although the family name of De Bry is not given.22 Immediately preceding Dierick, the admission of Hendrik van Steenwijck the Elder (“Heynrick van Steenwyck, (de oude), schilder”) is listed.23 “Thiery de Bry” was certainly a member of the guild of Antwerp goldsmiths (which was separate from the Guild of Saint Luke) by 1582, when his children Johann Theodor and Johann Israel entered that same guild as his apprentices. Soon thereafter, Dirk de Bry left Antwerp for good, settling in Frankfurt.24 In this other important center of printing, publishing, and selling books (after Antwerp), he founded his publishing business.

When Van Steenwijck the Elder arrived in Frankfurt in 1586, he and Dirk de Bry must have reconnected.25 Many of De Bry’s contacts in Frankfurt can be traced to his Antwerp period; several were members of the Reformed community of which the Van Steenwijck family could also have been part.26 With the deaths in Frankfurt of Dirk de Bry the Elder (1598) and Van Steenwijck the Elder five years later (1603), a definitive transition to the next generation took place, with their sons continuing the family businesses.

Given the longstanding (professional and/or personal) relationship between their families, it is probable that the print of Saint Jerome came into the possession of Hendrik van Steenwijck the Younger directly through his contacts with the De Brys. Assuming this was shortly before 1624, the date of the painting, Van Steenwijck must have obtained the engraving from Johann Theodor De Bry.27

As for the drawing, the way in which it came to be owned by the De Brys possibly entailed a similar personal connection between colleagues. Benno Fleischmann attributed the drawing to Ludwig Krug (1488/90–1532), a master working in the Dürer circle in Nuremberg.28 This seems plausible, despite the fact that the extant drawings by Krug almost exclusively show designs for goldsmith work.29 Interestingly, during the last decade of the sixteenth century, two goldsmiths named Krug are documented in Frankfurt.30 They appear to have been immigrants from Strasbourg, the city where Dirk de Bry had started his career. Since goldsmiths and engravers were closely related professions (thanks to their handling of many of the same materials), the goldsmith’s activity was traditionally connected to the making of prints. It seems possible that the Krug and the De Bry families, who had several things in common, either became acquainted in Frankfurt, or already knew each other. Evidence for this remains to be found, however.31

While we do not know exactly how and when the De Brys became owners of the drawing of Saint Jerome “by” Dürer, the fact that they did is not surprising. They came into possession of it during
the period around 1600 that has been dubbed the “Dürer Renaissance.” This was a period that saw a great demand among artists and patrons for the master’s works, as well as for personal items. As an example, Van Steenwijck’s uncle Frederik van Valckenborch can be mentioned. Upon receiving a commission in 1607 from Archduke Maximilian III of Austria (1558–1618) to make a now lost copy of Dürer’s Heller Altarpiece (then in the Dominican church in Frankfurt), Frederik obtained copies of the original letters Dürer had written to his patron, the merchant Jakob Heller, directly from Heller’s heirs. In addition, Frederik, who had settled in Nuremberg by 1601, came into possession of Dürer’s death mask, which was made after friends opened Dürer’s grave one day after his burial in 1528. While interest in Dürer extended to all of his many activities, Dirk de Bry and his sons may have admired Dürer foremost as an influential printmaker and publisher and also as a successful businessman.

By the time it was owned by the De Brys, the “Dürer” drawing must have been deemed a prized possession. This may have played a role in its handling. Comparison between the drawing and the print suggests that, proceeding in an incredibly exacting, detailed manner, the De Brys transferred the drawing by eye, reproducing it line by line. The resulting print is a painstakingly correct exact copy.

The De Bry engraving of *Saint Jerome in His Study* was executed nearly a century after the drawing. It is typical of the tiny prints of the so-called Kleinmeister (“Little Masters”) from Nuremberg, a term that was coined by Joachim von Sandrart (1606–1688), who himself received his training from Johann Theodor de Bry. The Frankfurt-born Von Sandrart informs us about the level of skill that allowed the De Brys to replicate their model by eye. In his own vita in the *Teutsche Akademie* (published in Nuremberg, in three volumes between 1675 and 1680) Von Sandrart reports that by a very young age he was able to copy in pen and quill “good engravings and woodcuts” in such a way that his mentor Johann Theodor de Bry and the latter’s son-in-law Matthaeus Merian mistook his copies for original prints.

Undoubtedly, this kind of training, preserved through master-student apprenticeships, often in a familial context, was already in place during the preceding generations.

Von Sandrart’s remark offers an apt illustration of the level of skill artists like the De Brys (and the Van Steenwijcks) possessed, which allowed them to copy from a model. The insight provided by Von Sandrart could also explain why Johann Theodor (or, perhaps less likely, his brother Johann Israel) executed a print after a drawing by Dürer in the first place—perhaps it was made as part of his training. The importance of prints also helps explain the lack of surviving drawings by Hendrik van Steenwijck the Younger: they were not necessary as preparatory material. Van Steenwijck (and his father) could work from prints (or other models), copying these by eye onto the support, then working them up in paint.

**Van Steenwijck’s Use of Prints as Sources**

*Saint Jerome in His Study* is not the only example in Van Steenwijck’s oeuvre of a painting that was made after a print. Another of his compositions, *Saint Jerome in His Study* (fig. 9), painted on a copper plate and signed exactly the same way as the Courtauld *Saint Jerome* (though it is...
not dated), is also based on an engraving by Dürer (fig. 10). It appears that the subject of Saint Jerome prompted Van Steenwijck to turn to an earlier model; Dürer’s famous rendition of the subject must have made him the logical choice to follow. Additionally, as students of perspective, father and son Van Steenwijck may have been particularly attracted to Dürer for his visual and theoretical explorations of the subject.

A third work by Van Steenwijck that is modeled after a print is Two Figures in a Church (fig. 11).
The small painting on copper is signed with Van Steenwijck’s monogram and indistinctly dated. It was probably made in the years around 1615. The source for the composition of Two Figures in a Church was an engraving by Albrecht Altdorfer (ca. 1480–1538), that other prolific German painter and printmaker (fig. 12). Altdorfer’s etchings on iron of the synagogue in Regensburg have been dubbed “the earliest Northern prints to have been directed primarily to recording the lineaments of an actual architectural structure.” This adds further support to the hypothesis that Van Steenwijck’s attraction to prints by Dürer and Altdorfer specifically originated in his recognition of their achievements in depicting architectural spaces and buildings.

Van Steenwijck must have been acquainted with prints like these from the earliest beginnings of his career in Frankfurt, through his teacher (his father), and through contacts with colleagues in Frankfurt, including printmakers such as the De Brys. A contemporary parallel for this can be found in Adam Elsheimer (1578–1610), who began his career in Frankfurt about the same time as Hendrik van Steenwijck the Younger. Elsheimer made several of his earliest paintings after prints by Dürer, Schongauer, Altdorfer, and Baldung. Elsheimer must have become acquainted with prints through his teacher, Philip Uffenbach (1566–1636). We know that Uffenbach, a printmaker, owned a selection of Dürer’s drawings.

The works by Van Steenwijck that are based on prints by great past masters were never exact copies. Instead, the artist modernized and improved the models he used. Furthermore, unlike the De Brys and Elsheimer, Van Steenwijck did not turn to these prints as part of his training, or at the early beginning of his career. The Interior of a Cathedral Dedicated to a Profane Form of Worship (Kent, England, Maidstone Museum and Bentlif Art Gallery), a painting from 1624 (the same year as Saint Jerome in His Study), evidences that around this time Van Steenwijck the Younger was preoccupied with prints. Its unusual inscription—in which the father is credited as inventor and the son as author of the composition (Henri van Steinwick Inventor 1591 Henri van Steinwick Fecit 1624)—is the only instance in the oeuvre in which Van Steenwijck distinguished between the idea and the execution of a composition, first and foremost made by printmakers.

Van Steenwijck’s decision to diversify his subject matter and start producing figural compositions may explain why he, in need of new imagery, turned to prints. In particular while preparing his move to London, Van Steenwijck seems to have specifically tailored the subject matter and style of his paintings to appeal to the interests of an elite, educated audience in England. Van Steenwijck’s turn to prints by Dürer and Altdorfer at this point must have been part of a deliberate strategy.

A Saint Jerome for an English Client?

The earliest known owner of Saint Jerome in His Study is the Honorable Major Robert Bruce (1882–1959), from Glenernie, Dunphail, Morayshire, from whose estate the work was sold at auction on June 20, 1948, where it was acquired by Count Seilern. Bruce was a descendent of an ancient Scottish family. His distinguished lineage began with Thomas Bruce (1599–1663), 1st Earl of Elgin, and Edward Bruce (d. 1662), 1st Earl of Kincardine. While there are many generations separating the earliest known owner of the Courtauld Saint Jerome from Van Steenwijck’s lifetime, its aristocratic provenance may nevertheless be of relevance when further unearthing the work’s first owner.
Van Steenwijck’s depictions of *Saint Jerome in His Study* may have been particularly popular with those surrounding the court of King James I and, subsequently, that of King Charles I. These were the same clients who were attracted to Elsheimer’s works. The significance and appeal of Saint Jerome, the scholar responsible for translating the Bible into Latin, must have grown in England after the authorization of a new translation of the Bible into English by King James I in 1611. Van Steenwijck’s connections in English courtly circles appear to date from around the same time. A fictive painting by Van Steenwijck with the *Liberation of Saint Peter*, signed and dated 1613, can be seen in the background of a portrait of the musician, painter, and courtier Nicholas Lanier (1588–1666) (private collection) by an unidentified Netherlandish artist. Lanier, who was the brother-in-law of the earlier mentioned Edward Norgate, perfectly fits the type of client who would have been pleased with a painting of the scholar saint in his study.

Identified owners of Van Steenwijck’s paintings in England show that Van Steenwijck succeeded in reaching an aristocratic, learned audience. For example: the earliest known owner of *Saint Jerome in His Study* from the Portland Collection at Welbeck Estate (mentioned above), Edward Harley, 2nd Earl of Oxford (1689–1741), was a grandson of Robert Harley (1579–1656), master of the mint under Charles I. Van Steenwijck probably sought to attract other prestigious patrons, like Thomas Howard (1585–1646), the 2nd Earl of Arundel. His interest in art and, especially, architecture—evident from his collection of books on these subjects—intersected with Van Steenwijck’s. Howard also had a keen interest in the work of German masters and owned prints and drawings. This shows that interest in Dürer was widespread, not just on the Continent, and not just among artists. This elite group of highly educated men, who, among other subjects, were interested in Dürer and in architecture, must have been attracted to Van Steenwijck’s work. After all, he was an artist with experience in, and knowledge of, the same subjects. This particular type of English patron and Van Steenwijck were a good match.

Another of Van Steenwijck’s interests is revealed by Thomas Fusenig’s discovery of an autograph letter from 1632 to the scholar Theodoricus Gravius (see Appendix; fig. 13). The letter suggests

*Fig. 13 Letter of May 18, 1632, by Hendrik van Steenwijck the Younger to Theodoricus Gravius. University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1399, part II, fol. 104 r-v (photo: © Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford)*
that by the early 1630s Van Steenwijck moved in circles of men with an interest in specific scientific and alchemistic knowledge. Van Steenwijck's relationship with Johann Theodor de Bry may have played a role in these contacts. Following his brother Johann Israel's death in 1609, and after moving the firm from Frankfurt to Oppenheim, Johann Theodor published works of several authors (philosophers, medics, mystics, alchemists) with a scientific/hermetic interest. Furthermore, one of the texts mentioned in the letter, referred to as the “Wasserstein,” was published in 1619 by Lukas Jennis, another Frankfurt publisher. Jennis was closely related to the De Brys, since Jennis's mother had been married to Johann Israel de Bry.

*   *    *

The new insights presented here into the genesis of *Saint Jerome in His Study* have shown that Van Steenwijck was an accomplished draftsman, skilled in the art of composition, proportion, and construction of space. Through his training and contacts in Frankfurt, which included his long-time friends the De Bry family, he was closely acquainted with Dürer's work. The interest in Dürer, among artists and patrons alike, led Van Steenwijck to turn to prints when he was about to relocate to London. Van Steenwijck's dealings in Frankfurt, London, and Antwerp, in combination with his peripatetic mode of existence, must have enabled him to stay in touch with an extended network of artists and scholars in different locations. Although more evidence remains to be found, at the very least Van Steenwijck's contacts provide an intriguing glimpse into the learned aristocratic circles in which the first owner of *Saint Jerome in His Study* should be sought.

Appendix: A Letter by Hendrick van Steenwijck the Younger from 1632

Thomas Fusenig

MS
Ashmole 1399, part II, fol 104 r-v (Henri vom Steenwijck to Theodorus Gravius, May 18, 1632); 20 cm in height, ca. 22 cm in width

Written in a quick cursive hand, folded, with address on the exterior; closed with a wax seal (broken). The transcription has been formalized and edited for readability and comprehension.

On the exterior of the sheet: To mijn werij loving friend Mr. Theodorus Gravius / Lintford

Gross günstiger Her(r) undt freundt das Schrijben \ von dem 21. April / beneben dem / Wasserstein, auch die mue So in ghomen habt im des her(r)en / ghehabte mue² im ab schrijben des Jacob. B. Explicatio ist / mir wool beha(n)diget war foor Ich dem hern danke / v vor diße her(r) en danke. Das Schrijben so mich der Junge / hans zuge- zu mir ghebrach(t) hat habbe Ich dem / Mr. Allardin geliwrt³ Sagte mir ws das(s) er dem / her(r)en selbst wolte Antworten. So es noch nicht getan / hat wil Ich anhalten das(s) es die neste woge⁴ ghes[...]⁵ / wirt, undt als dan(n) auch selbst an den herrn von al[...]⁶ / weijt Lustiger schrijben -a antwort auf des herrn-begere / begeren.

*   *    *
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A letter in German dated May 18, 1632, from Hendrick van Steenwijck the Younger to the theologian and alchemist Theodoricus Gravius (also known as Theodore Graw), adds an interesting snippet of information to the artist's biography, even if its contents seems rather mundane. In 1631 Gravius, who was originally from the Kassel area and thus a fellow Hessen compatriot of Van Steenwijck, settled in Great Linford, some ninety kilometers northwest of London.

The letter is preserved amid Gravius's papers, which, together with the literary estate of his mentor, Richard Napier, found their way to the Bodleian Library in Oxford. Richard Napier (1559–1634) was a respected Anglican cleric based in Great Linford who practiced alchemy and medicine and left a substantial amount of writing. In 1630, he took under his wing and into his home the penniless Gravius, who was highly knowledgeable in alchemy and conversant with the hermetic sciences.

Writing “in great haste” (In grosser eijl), Van Steenwijck addresses Gravius as “my very beloved friend” (mij verij Loving friend). He thanks him for two texts the latter had sent on April 21: the “Wasserstein” and a copy Gravius had laboriously made of the “Explicatio” by “Jacob B.” The (further?) writings, which were brought to him by a servant called Hans, were delivered by Van Steenwijck to a Mr. Allardin. The latter would answer separately. Should he fail to do so, Van Steenwijck would urge him to reply the following week. Van Steenwijck himself would also write more extensively then, since, for reasons he would explain, he was not able to do so at the moment. To conclude, he assures Gravius of his friendship and willingness to be of service before sending him, also on behalf of his wife, all best wishes.

The spelling of his first name as well as that of his family name at the end of the letter (“Henri. vom Steenwijck”) is in accordance with that found in signatures on paintings Van Steenwijck made in England. The combination of written German and Netherlandish peculiarities, particularly the repeated use of “ij” for “ei,” reveals his Netherlandish mother tongue. Similarly, when he writes “nexte woge” (“next” instead of “nächste”) it shows a remnant of the time he spent in England, as well as the Netherlandish pronunciation of “g,” instead of the German “ch.” Van Steenwijck may have written the letter from London or from Holland.

The letter contains a small surprise. The mention of “Wasserstein” is a reference to an alchemistic-theosophical text. The Wasserstein der Weisen, allegedly written by Johann Ambrosius Siebmacher or Lukas Jennis, was first published by the latter in 1619 in Frankfurt. One of numerous early seventeenth-century texts that elaborate on the manufacture of the philosopher's stone by connecting alchemy with theological speculation, the Wasserstein der Weisen must have ap-
pealed to the medical-alchemical interests held by Napier and his pupil Gravius. The name of the second text is more ambiguous. However, since Gravius was the first in England to translate a text by the German mystic Jakob Böhme (1575–1624), the text referred to in the letter as by “Jacob. B.” must be one he authored. Although we cannot be certain which treatise the letter refers to as the “Explicatio,” it perhaps concerned a copy of Gravius’s Theologiae mysticae, seu theosophiae Jacobi Bohemi, compendium, which has been preserved in the Bodleian Library in the same composite volume of manuscripts as the letter by Van Steenwijck. In light of the fact that Gravius’s own writings were inspired by hermetic-alchemical examples, it seems entirely plausible that a compilation of an alchemical treatise and another text either by, or about, Böhme, were exchanged. Unfortunately, the identity of “Mister Allardin,” to whom Van Steenwijck forwarded a (or: the) letter by Gravius, remains to be found.
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18 Black, A Descriptive, Analytical, and Critical Catalogue, col. 1099, Nr. 14: “Theologiae mysticae, seu Theosophiae JACOBI BOHEMI, compendium; ejusdem quippe libri epitome, in gratiam R. T. conscripta, per GRAVIUM” (Ms Ashmole 1399, part II, fol. 88r–93v). Other possible candidates would be Sex puncta mystica (Kurze Erklärung Sechs Mystischer Puncte; 1620), the Mystrium Magnum (Erklärung über das erste Buch Mosis; 1623) or the Clavis (Schlüssel, das ist Eine Erklärung der vornehmsten Puncten und Wörter, welche in diesen Schriften gebraucht werden; 1624).


20 On the outside of Van Steenwijck’s letter, Gravius started drafting (in German) a letter to “Mr. Alartin,” in which theosophical considerations about the sorrowful condition of the human soul after the Fall of Man are discussed. The text begins as follows: “(und) weil ich mich in d(ie) ∼<rige complexion so tieff verschlammt befinde, darin d(as) astrum (female symbol) [Venus] seine Vernnis (?) strafllos einschuster.” In closing, Gravius writes: “bitte wollet mir zu guth halten was ich aus fulle [lies: Fülle] m(eines) (heart symbol)ns geschrieben, u(nd) w(as) d(as) gemüth durch d(en) geist frei aus gestoßen.”

21 Perhaps the recipient was a member of the Allardin (Alartin, Alardijn) family, who, after having been exiled, settled in Bremen in the sixteenth century. In the later seventeenth century, several members of this family became theologians. Robert van Roosbroeck, Emigranten: Nederlannde Vluchteligen in Duitsland (1550–1600) (Leuven: Davidsfonds, 1968), 239 (Dionys Alardin), 243.
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For the lives and works of Hendrik van Steenwijck the Elder, Hendrik van Steenwijck the Younger, and the latter’s wife Susanna Gaspoel, also a painter, see the monograph by Jeremy Howarth, *The Steenwyck Family as Masters of Perspective (Pictura Nova XII)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009); for an extensive and detailed review, see Thomas Fusenig, “Book Review of Jeremy Howarth, *The Steenwyck Family as Masters of Perspective,*” *Oud Holland* 125 (2012): 131–47. HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1163/18750176-90000005 The church interiors for which Van Steenwijck is best known will not be discussed here; for these, see most recently, Claire Baisier, ed., *Divine Interiors: Experience Churches in the Age of Rubens*, exh. cat. (Antwerp: Museum Mayer van den Bergh, 2016).

Van Steenwijck was born in an artistic milieu. His mother, Helena van Valckenborch, was the daughter of Marten van Valckenborch (1534–1612), the patriarch of an extensive family of artists from Louvain. Van Steenwijck’s parents probably met through Hendrik the Elder’s professional contacts with Helena’s father and her uncle Lucas van Valckenborch (ca. 1535–1597).

It is also a unique work, since Van Steenwijck appears not to have made any copies or variations on it.

From the numbers listed by Howarth (Howarth, *The Steenwyck Family*), these works account for some 15 percent of Van Steenwijck the Younger’s oeuvre.

Howarth (Howarth, *The Steenwyck Family*) lists twenty-four works with the subject of Saint Jerome (though this also includes the odd work that has seemingly little to do with Van Steenwijck, such as cat. II.D21, a painting in the Bonnefantenmuseum, Maastricht, inv. 1073).

Howarth, *The Steenwyck Family*, cat. II.D5, 236, panel, 21.6 x 30.5 cm, signed (“Henrei van Steinwic”) and dated 1624, Welbeck Abbey, Portland Collection, inv. 000347. The earliest signed and dated example of a Saint Jerome by Van Steenwijck is from 1602 (painting on copper, in the Pinacoteca Nazionale, Siena).


8 The connection between print and drawing was first published by Count Antoine Seilern, who attributed the discovery to his friend Fritz Grossmann. Antoine Graf Seilern, Paintings and Drawings of Continental Schools other than Flemish and Italian at 56 Princes Gate London SW 7 (London: Shenval Press, 1961), 3.


10 For the drawing, see Benno Fleischmann, “Eine Deutsche Kleinmeisterzeichnung,” Die Graphischen Künste (1936): 86–88. The dimensions of the drawing and those of the engraving are nearly identical.


12 Recent examinations undertaken for this study in the Courtauld Institute’s Department of Conservation and Technology included X-radiography (2016; by Aviva Burnstock) and microscopic analysis (December 2016 and May 2017; by the author). Already available material consisted of infrared reflectography (undertaken in January 2015 with an Osiris camera, by Aviva Burnstock in the Courtauld Institute’s Department of Conservation and Technology) and dendrochronological analysis (done in December 2015 by Ian Tyers).

13 The horizontal line along the upper edge is not only drawn but also incised; a pinhole is visible on the surface at the upper right. More underdrawn short vertical lines along the upper edge of the panel probably served to measure the composition in relation to the support.

14 It seems that Van Steenwijck borrowed these elements from Dürer’s widely known 1514 engraving of Saint Jerome in His Study and from woodcuts from Dürer’s Life of the Virgin series, published several years earlier.

15 Shorter underdrawn marks, similar to those seen along the upper edge of the panel, probably helped Van Steenwijck measure this area separately, fixing the position of the figure in relation to the rest of the composition, which was to be stretched slightly to the right to accommodate the composition’s rectangular format onto a support with more square proportions.
Most of the diagonals converge in the same area, near the right-hand corner of the foot of the bed, just below the railing.


Despite its modest dimensions (26.9 x 21.6 cm), the support of *Saint Jerome in His Study* is constructed from two vertical wooden boards. Dendrochronological analysis has shown that the narrowest board is from the eastern Baltic. Report by Ian Tyers of December 2015 (in the painting’s curatorial files), 38–40. It is probably by coincidence that the (underdrawn) rectangle around the figure of the saint approximately (though not exactly) coincides in width with the narrowest of the two boards that make up the support.

For example, Van Steenwijck added ribs to the simple barrel-vaulted ceiling, as he did in his church interiors, only to find that the ribs did not meet correctly.

The painting technique can also be compared to that of a heightened drawing in the Getty Center, Los Angeles, *Crypt of a Church with Two Men Sleeping* (12.2 x 16.5 cm; inv. 85.GG.42). The drawing possibly dates from 1625, one year later than the Courtauld *Saint Jerome*. A similar drawing has survived in the Albertina (inv. 8171; 10.7 x 12.8 cm). It is likely that the few surviving drawings by Van Steenwijck, rather than having a preparatory function, were presentation drawings, similar to the function of the drawings mentioned in the inventory of Charles I (where they are described as: “5 Little Cartouns . . . of prospective = done by Stanewick to Serve for. Patrons”). See Christopher White, *The Later Flemish Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2007), 293.

Theodor de Bry the Elder was born in Liège. He left before 1560. In that year he is first recorded in the Lutheran city of Strasbourg, where he became a member of the goldsmith’s guild, and married his first wife; both of his sons were born there. According to Zülch, the first trace of De Bry in Frankfurt also dates from 1560. Walther Karl Zülch, *Frankfurter Künstler, 1223–1700* (1935; repr., Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Sauer & Auvermann KG, 1967), 365–68.


Rombouts and Van Lerius, *De Liggeren*, 1:263.

In August 1584 the Antwerp goldsmith Hans van Balen (d. 1605), who worked with De Bry, reported that De Bry was planning to leave Antwerp soon. Van Balen’s initials must be those found on an engraving by De Bry for a knife handle (British Museum, inv. 1904,0608,2), an activity described by Van Groesen as “a common intermediary activity for goldsmiths-turning-engravers in the late sixteenth-century.” Van Groesen, *The Representations of the Overseas World*, 60. HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1163/EJ.9789004164499.1-565


It cannot be excluded that Van Steenwijk had already owned the engraving for some time.
Fleischmann, “Eine Deutsche Kleinmeisterzeichnung.” Ludwig Krug was trained by his father, Hans (d. 1519), a goldsmith employed in the workshop of Dürer’s father, Albrecht the Elder (1427–1502).


30 Zülich, Frankfurter Künstler, 614.

31 The fact that the De Brys credited the drawing’s authorship to Dürer may indicate they were unaware of its provenance. Alternatively, it may have been a deliberate decision on their part to copy “Dürer.”


33 There is no physical evidence, such as scored lines on the sheet, to suggest it was mechanically copied, though it is possible that De Bry made use of a transparent sheet to trace the composition from the front of the drawing, without damaging it, and transfer the design onto the printing plate. I thank Christof Metzger for his permission to view the drawing.

34 It is unclear how many impressions of the print exist; it is not listed in Hollstein. Two impressions of the print can be found in the British Museum; inv. E,2.82 (reproduced here) and 1845,0809.624. A small scratch underneath the lion suggests they are possibly impressions from the same plate, with E,2.82 being of slightly better quality. As Fleischmann reports, the Albertina also keeps an impression of the print. Fleischmann, “Eine Deutsche Kleinmeisterzeichnung,” 86.

35 It is likely that the drawing of Saint Jerome in His Study was always intended as a model for a print, though no contemporary sixteenth-century prints of it are known.


38 Little has been said about Hendrik van Steenwijck the Younger’s use of prints as sources. The only instance of prints as sources named by Howarth are Steenwijck the Elder’s derivations from Vredeman de Vries’s prints, published by Cock and Galle between 1560–1600. Howarth, The Steenwyck Family, 63–65; see also Jeremy Howarth, “The Influence of Hans Vredeman de Vries on Hendrick van Steenwijck the Elder (c. 1550–1603) and Hendrick van Steenwijck the Younger (1581/82–1649),” in Hans Vredeman de Vries und die Folgen, eds. H. Borggreve and V. Lüpkes (Marburg: Jonas Verlag, 2005), 129–35.

39 Christie’s, New York, January 31, 2013, lot 202. Prior to that sold at Sotheby’s, New York,
May 13, 1994, lot 27. Howarth, The Steenwyck Family, cat. II.D. 13. The engraving (Bartsch VII.139.114) is slightly smaller than the painting. Again, Van Steenwijck decided to make small changes to the appearance of the Saint and the room, and to the lower edge of the composition.

The interest in architecture connects the composition of the Courtauld Saint Jerome in His Study with that of Saint Jerome in His Study by the Italian Antonello da Messina (London, National Gallery, NG1418), dated around 1475. In addition to stylistic correspondences, the “study” of Antonello’s Jerome is placed in a churchlike interior, which is intriguing in light of Van Steenwijck’s oeuvre. The earliest provenance for Antonello’s work is in Venice in 1529; when Waagen saw it in 1838 in the collection of Thomas Baring it went as a “Dürer” (Gustav Friedrich Waagen, Kunstwerke und Künstler in England und Paris (Berlin: Nicolai, 1838), 2:253–54), while in 1876 Éphrussi thought it to be a work by Jacopo de Barbari (Charles Éphrussi, Notes biographiques sur Jacopo de Barbari dit le Maître au caducée, peintre-graveur vénitien de la fin du XVe siècle (Paris: D. Jouaust, 1876). Dürer and De Barbari shared an interest in the subject of perspective: Dürer is said to have learned the latest about perspective (and proportion) from De Barbari (who worked in Nuremberg between 1500 and 1503). The two had first met in Venice on Dürer’s first trip to Italy.

I thank Thomas Fusenig for sharing this unpublished information with me. For the painting, see Howarth, The Steenwyck Family, cat. II. E16. Sold at Bonhams, London, April 10, 1986, lot 233 it was last seen at Salomon Lilian, Amsterdam.

A work that has been assumed to be its pendant (current location is similarly unknown) shows a similar composition and shares the same provenance, though it is unclear if these works were conceived as a pair. Also painted on copper, it is dated 1612, which could—but does not necessarily need to—be the date of both paintings.

Two Figures in a Church is part of a group of nine paintings with similar compositions (though none is an exact copy of the other) and the same slightly obscure subject matter. Eight of the nine works are on copper panels. The only work of the group that was executed on a wooden panel is also the largest: the painting Esther and Mordechai (Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art, dated 1616). Its different support and larger dimensions could suggest that this work was a specific commission.

In connection with the copper engraving that is its model, it is of additional interest that Howarth reports that Two Figures in a Church (which he refers to as “Figures in a temple”) was painted on the reverse of a copper plate that is etched with studies of figures, which suggests it was intended to be used for printing. Howarth, The Steenwyck Family, cat. II.E15 to II.E23.


Van Steenwijck the Elder’s first professional link to printmaking dates from 1576, when he drew a map of Aachen for the Civitates Orbis Terrarum published by Braun and Hogenberg in Antwerp between 1572 and 1617. It is possible that Van Steenwijck the Elder’s contact with Jean Mofflin (d. 1587), one of his few identified patrons, came about via his Antwerp contacts in the printing industry. As a bibliophile, Mofflin was in regular contact with the influential Antwerp book printer and publisher Christopher Plantin (ca. 1520–1589): on November 4, 1586, Mofflin sent a letter to Plantin stating he was looking for an engraver to reproduce an image: “you will find in this image
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a snail, upon which you will place my devise – tecum habita Joannes Moflin.” Max Rooses and Jan Denucé, *Correspondence de Christophe Plantin*, vols. 8 and 9 (Antwerp: De Groote Boekhandel/The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1918), 84.

47 Most famously, Elsheimer’s *Witch Riding Backwards on a Goat* (Royal Collection at Hampton Court Palace), painted on small copper plate (13.5 x 9.8 cm), was made after an engraving by Dürer, which is almost identical in dimensions. It is assumed that the work was made before the artist went to Italy in 1597. Rüdiger Klessmann, *Adam Elsheimer 1578–1610*, exh. cat. (Frankfurt: Städelisches Kunstinstitut/Edinburgh: National Gallery of Scotland/London: Dulwich Picture Gallery, 2006).


49 Uffenbach had also inherited a volume of drawings by Matthias Grünewald. The collecting of works by Dürer would continue into the next generation of Frankfurt artists: according to Von Sandrart his cousin Michel Le Blon (1587–1656), who trained as a goldsmith and also as an engraver with Johann Theodor de Bry, possessed a collection of works by Holbein and Dürer. Joachim von Sandrart himself also owned works by and objects related to Dürer, including “ein kleiner Hieronymus im kupfer”; he also came into possession of one of Dürer’s most important and early drawings, *Death of Orpheus* (Hamburger Kunsthalle), which he obtained from Immanuel Ayrer (1647–1690) in Nuremberg, to whom the drawing had passed by descent.

50 I thank Pernille Richards from the Maidstone Museum and Bentlif Art Gallery for providing me with a detail of the signature, which unfortunately is difficult to reproduce. It can be found on one of the columns of the church that is visible behind the two figures on the right, one of whom is carrying a torch. Van Steenwijck the Younger’s decision to include his father in the signature (in the same way as de Bry credited Dürer with the invention of the *Saint Jerome in His Study*) is not only indicative of his engagement with prints at this point in his career but is also proof of the artist’s intent to pay homage to earlier generations of artists.

51 Sotheby’s, London, June 20, 1948, lot 87. Bruce sold eight Dutch and Flemish paintings, including works by De Heem and Teniers and one work (a church interior) jointly signed by Neefs and Francken.

52 Victor Alexander Bruce (1849–1917), the 9th Earl of Elgin and 13th Earl of Kincardine, the father of Major Robert Bruce, owned other paintings by seventeenth century masters, including Rembrandt and Caspar Netscher; some he inherited from his ancestors, while others were probably bought by him. At least one more painting Major Bruce had inherited from his father—an *Allegory of Winter* by Abraham Bloemaert, last seen at auction at Christie’s, London, December 2, 2014, lot 25—was passed on by descent to his daughter.

53 Thomas Bruce was granted Houghton House as his seat in 1624 by King James I, while Edward Bruce was a close confidant of King Charles I. The earldoms of Elgin and Kincardine were joined in the mid-eighteenth century. Another of his forebears, Thomas Bruce, 7th Earl of Elgin and 11th Earl of Kincardine, was responsible for bringing the Elgin Marbles to Britain.

54 Despite its signature and date, unfortunately none of the paintings of Saint Jerome that can be found in the Getty Provenance Index can be identified with certainty as the Courtauld *Saint Jerome in His Study*.

55 Even though Elsheimer’s *Witch Riding Backwards on a Goat* entered the collection of King Charles I of England in 1639 as a gift from an English diplomat who probably purchased the painting in Germany, it clearly evidences the king’s taste for Northern Renaissance art. The “new”
compositions by Van Steenwijck and Elsheimer’s early works have in common a distinct use of light and shadow—in particular in Van Steenwijck’s paintings of the Liberation of Saint Peter—which seem to have been very popular with English clients.


57 Two of the six paintings with the subject of the Liberation of Saint Peter today in the Royal Collection are recorded in the collection of Charles I. See White, The Later Flemish Pictures.


59 Another notable collector with similar interests is the 1st Duke of Buckingham, George Villiers (1592–1628). Villiers collected works of art with the help of Balthasar Gerbier, among others.

60 His interest in reproductive engraving is evidenced by the fact that he had his art collection reproduced by printmakers.

61 A letter from Dürer to Niclas Kratzer, astronomer to Henry VIII (Kratzer was depicted by Hans Holbein in a 1528 portrait today in the Musée du Louvre), probably once in possession of Abraham Ortelius, came to be owned by his great-nephew Emanuel van Meteren (1535–1612), who was consul for the traders of the Low Countries in London. A large collection of letters written to Ortelius ended up in possession of the Dutch church in London (Austin Friars), probably via Van Meteren. They were dispersed when the Dutch church decided to auction the collection. See for the letter to Kratzer, written by Dürer from Nuremberg on December 5, 1524 (currently untraced), Joannes Henricus Hessels, ed., Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae archivum, 1: Abrahami Ortelii at virorum eruditorum ad eundum et ad Jacobum Colium Ortelianum epistulae (Cambridge: Typis Academiae sumptibus Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae, 1887), 3–4.

62 This interest in alchemy and an unorthodox form of Protestantism is typical of the combined scientific and mystical approaches that existed among scholars at the time. Several of the original Fellows of the Royal Society (the following generation of scientists in England; it was founded in London in 1660) similarly held interests that joined antiquarian and scientific interests with more occult pursuits. An example is Elias Ashmole (1617–1692), a student of alchemy and collector of material related to natural history. Van Steenwijck’s letter to Gravius was part of Ashmole’s collection of manuscripts, a large part of which he bequeathed to the University of Oxford and which can today be found in the Bodleian Library.

63 The De Bry firm corresponded with scholars from all over Europe—men who were often moving from place to place because of political circumstances and were able to communicate in different languages, like Van Steenwijck. For Joachim von Sandrart’s connections to these scholars, see Esther Meier, “Jenseits der Konfessionen: Sandrarts Beziehungen zu Schwärmen...


65 An alternative, more skeptical interpretation one could make of the curt, short note is that Van Steenwijck was merely the middleman in delivering the two writings to the unknown Mr. Allar-din/Alartin.

66 Alexander Bruce, second Earl of Kincardine (1629–81) and a distant forefather of the Courtauld painting’s earlier owner Robert Bruce, was also present at the 1660 foundational meeting of the Royal Society in London, as was Elias Ashmole. See A. J. Youngson, “Alexander Bruce, F.R.S., Second Earl of Kincardine (1629–1681),” Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London 15 (1960): 251–58. HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1098/RSNR.1960.0024 Bruce’s interest in scientific matters, is evident from his surviving correspondence (starting in the 1650’s) with his friend Robert Moray, the so-called Kincardine Papers (1657–73), published by David Stevenson, ed., Letters of Sir Robert Moray to the Earl of Kincardine, 1657–73 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).
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