

## RECONTEXTUALIZING RAPHAEL: THE FUNCTION(S) OF INSCRIPTIONS IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY REPRODUCTIVE PRINTS

*Alexandra Kocsis*

### Texts and Images in Reproductive Prints

Single sheet prints which depict a work of art (a drawing, a painting, or a sculpture) invented by an artist different from the printmaker constitute a large group in sixteenth-century print production. These prints are often labelled with the term “reproductive”<sup>1</sup> to emphasize their role in the popularization and canonization of certain pieces of art. Since the new medium of engraving allowed making hundreds of copies of one image, it opened the circle of audiences and offered an easier tool for pursuing knowledge about images and style than ever before.<sup>2</sup> However, images made accessible this way lost their original context, and often became the objects of (re)interpretation. Inserting texts in reproductive prints was one way of manipulating the message of a picture, a practice which became especially widespread around and after the middle of the sixteenth century. The study of the relationship between texts and images in reproductive prints (a surprisingly understudied field of research) can widen the horizon in understanding how these prints were viewed or were intended to be viewed in the sixteenth century. A close analysis would help solve the main concerns about

---

<sup>1</sup> The use of this modern expression for sixteenth-century prints has sometimes been considered controversial and anachronistic in scholarship, but since the alternatives coined to replace it have not become widespread, recent literature still refers to “reproductive prints”. For a detailed discussion of this terminological issue see chapter 2.2 in my thesis: Alexandra Kocsis, “Text and Image on Reproductive Prints. A Case Study of Sixteenth-century Prints after Raphael’s Design” (MA thesis, Budapest: Central European University, 2014), 6–13.

<sup>2</sup> There is no evidence about the exact numbers of impressions made from one copper plate in the sixteenth century. Estimates based on technical possibilities, modern experiences, and standards of quality range widely from 200 high-quality impressions up to more than 1000 good impressions. A minimum of 300 impressions was probably needed to recoup the publisher’s investment, Michael Bury, *The Print in Italy 1550–1620* (London: The British Museum Press, 2001), 47; Joris van Grieken, “Establishing and Marketing a Publisher’s List,” in *Hieronymus Cock: The Renaissance Print*, ed. Joris van Grieken, Ger Luijten, and Jan van der Stock (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 23.

reproductive prints. How can they be distinguished from the rest of early modern print production? How do they differ from the referential chain of art works in which every new image reflected an earlier composition, and “copying was the normal way to make new things”?<sup>3</sup> The peculiarity of reproductive prints lay in the knowledge of authorship offered by the prints: the indication of the source either by inscriptions or by stylistic compositional references. It can be interpreted as a second (antiquarian or artistic) layer of understanding these prints which was preceded by the first layer, the subject of the image. In the Early Modern period, many more prints could have a “reproductive character” without acknowledging it as their primary function.<sup>4</sup> In this paper I focus on a few examples from the print production after Raphael’s works – pieces of art which were admired and sought after already in the painter’s lifetime, but even more after his early death in 1520.

### Reproduction or Reuse of a Motif?

A usual argument against categorizing prints as reproductive is the lack of acknowledgment of the *inventor*, i.e., the original artist of the composition.<sup>5</sup> Two Italian prints provide a good opportunity to review this concept; the sheets by Jacopo Caraglio (c.1525, *Fig. 1*) and Giulio Bonasone (c.1545, *Fig. 2*) show the same group of male nudes, a little boy leading a man carrying an elderly man on his back. Both prints are based on a group of figures which Raphael painted in the Vatican as part of the fresco *The Fire in the Borgo*. Inscriptions on both prints tell the viewer that the image mediates the story of Aeneas rescuing his father, Anchises, and his son, Ascanius, from the burning Troy; thus, the group, isolated from the fresco, gained a new Classical meaning instead of the original early

<sup>3</sup> Christopher S. Wood, *Forgery, Replica, Fiction. Temporalities of German Renaissance Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 18.

<sup>4</sup> One can support this notion of the different layers of a print with further evidence from the second half of the sixteenth century. Antonio Lafreri’s stocklist from between 1573 and 1577 lists prints primarily according to topic, but indicates the names of the designers (like Raphael, Michelangelo, Baccio Bandinelli, Titian, etc.) in each case after the short title-like description of the subject. For the stocklist see Franz Ehrle, *Roma Prima di Sisti V: La Pianta di Roma Du Pérac-Lafréry del 1577* (Rome: Danesi, 1908), 56–59. Bury also discusses this issue in Michael Bury, “The Taste for Prints in Italy c. 1600,” *Print Quarterly* 2, no. 1 (1985): 14.

<sup>5</sup> “...a reproductive print not bearing the name of the model’s creator is a contradiction in terms.” David Landau and Peter W. Parshall, *The Renaissance Print: 1470–1550* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 167.



Fig. 1. Giovanni Jacopo Caraglio: *Aeneas Rescuing Anchises*, c. 1525, British Museum, London. After Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo*, in the *Stanza dell'Incendio del Borgo*, Vatican. © Trustees of the British Museum



Fig. 2. Giulio Bonasone: *Aeneas Rescuing Anchises*, ca. 1545. Harvard Art Museums/Fogg Museum, Gray Collection of Engravings Fund. After Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo*, in the *Stanza dell'Incendio del Borgo*, Vatican. © President and Fellows of Harvard College

medieval story about Leo IV and the fire in Rome.<sup>6</sup> Because of the manipulation of the topic, one may doubt with good reason whether these prints were ever regarded as depictions of Raphael's fresco.

Both Caraglio and Bonasone attempted to preserve the stylistic unity of Raphael's group with relative accuracy. The fine changes (an additional box in the hand of the boy, Aeneas' beard, and the extended space between the boy and the two older figures) may indicate that Caraglio (and after him Bonasone as well) was working from preliminary drawings rather than the finished fresco.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> On the thematic difference of fresco and print see Jeremy Wood, "Cannibalized Prints and Early Art History: Vasari, Bellori and Fréart de Chambray on Raphael," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 51 (1988): 217.

<sup>7</sup> Madeline Cirillo Archer, *Italian masters of the Sixteenth Century*, The Illustrated Bartsch, vol. 28, commentary, ed. Walter L. Strauss (New York: Abaris Books, 1995), 196.

This may explain why the group was put in a new context. Caraglio placed the figures into an “unfinished landscape” where only the ground is drawn in detail; the background was left empty, thus they seem isolated not just from the original visual context, but from any narrative. The short vernacular inscription became essential therefore in understanding the depiction by providing the narrative framework for the figures.

*Qvest' e colvi che a Troia / il padre Anchise / trasse del foco et doppo / longo  
 errore / sotto la ripa Antan/ dra a posar mise //*

This is he who rescued his father, Anchises, from burning Troy and after a long wandering, laid (him) down to rest on the shores of Antandros.

The text identifies the main character without naming him, instead telling some background information of the story depicted, how Aeneas and his father reached the port of Antandros, which is supposedly the location of the scene in the print. The best way to describe the text would be to call it a “poetic label” since it helps the viewer identify the figures but discloses this information in a playful rather than a direct way.

Bonasone may never have seen Raphael’s fresco; he could have created his own version of Raphael’s motif by combining two printed sources without using the original. He probably took the group of figures from Caraglio’s sheet and adapted the image of the burning city in the background from a print by the Master of the Die.<sup>8</sup> As a third element of this combination, below the margin of the image, he (or his publisher) applied an inscription which is almost identical with the last two lines of the epigram *In gemmam suam* by the Neapolitan humanist, Jacopo Sannazaro.

*Haec est Iliacos pietas spectata per ignes /  
 cum verita est patrios laedere flama deos. //*

This is the piety beheld amid the flames of Troy,  
 when the fire feared to harm the paternal gods.<sup>9</sup>

The epigram of sixteen Latin lines is a description of Sannazaro’s own ring with an ancient cameo depicting Aeneas rescuing his father and son.<sup>10</sup> Since the

<sup>8</sup> Bartsch XV.224.72 (e.g., an impression in the British Museum, number V,5.149).

<sup>9</sup> The original poem ends *cum verita est profugos laedere flamma deos*. Translation based on Michael C. J. Putnam, *Latin Poetry* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), 268.

<sup>10</sup> The description of the gem and the poet’s contemplation of it were probably an important part of “the author’s self-definition,” thus it demonstrated his passion for antiquity and collecting. Karl Enekel, “Introduction. The Neo-Latin Epigram. Humanist

topic of the poem fits the image, one way of interpreting the choice of this text would imply that the intention was to identify the image as the reproduction of an ancient depiction through Sannazaro's description of an antique piece. However, the source of the text is not indicated on the print, so one cannot be sure if all the viewers could have identified the excerpt and evoked the whole poem. These two lines were carefully selected so that they do not contain any direct hint at the gem described; rather, they give the story a summarizing, evaluating conclusion (again without mentioning the main figures). The image-related character of the text must have been an important factor when this particular passage was selected for the print; similarly to the Italian text on Caraglio's sheet, it starts with a demonstrative pronoun and identifies the story in a sophisticated way, referring to Aeneas' heroic rescue of his father.

Could these prints be regarded as reproductive even though they keep silent about Raphael's role? Or did they copy the figures to create new meaning, independently of the fresco? A good argument for the reproductive character is the accurate stylistic reflection. Raphael's *all'antica* vocabulary was an important tool in editing a print of this classical subject using image and text. The prints probably played an important role in the reception of Raphael's fresco as well; the painted figures were at some point identified with the printed ones. In 1550, Giorgio Vasari described this detail as "pictured in the same way that Virgil describes how Anchises was carried by Aeneas."<sup>11</sup> It is an open question whether it was Raphael's own intention to read the figures in this way – in which case the prints only adapted and disseminated this idea. However, Vasari may have been affected by the prints as well – in this case, the prints shaped the historical thinking about the fresco.<sup>12</sup> Caraglio and Bonasone used Raphael's composition, probably inspired by Virgil's description, to reconstruct an antique topic, an "imaginary work of art" which never existed in this form.<sup>13</sup> The labeling character of the inscriptions served to emphasize and enhance this interpretation of the figures.

---

Self-Definition in a Learned and Witty Discourse," in *The Neo-Latin Epigram: a Learned and Witty Genre*, ed. Susanna de Beer (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), 12.

<sup>11</sup> Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, ed. Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi (Florence: Sansoni, 1966–87), vol. 4, 193–194.

<sup>12</sup> The identification of the group as Aeneas, Anchises, and Ascanius was so widespread that in 1610, on his print published about the whole fresco, Philippe Thomassin commented on this issue, emphasizing that it is a misinterpretation. Wood, "Cannibalized Prints and Early Art History," 217.

<sup>13</sup> For a similar idea, see Madeleine Viljoen, "Prints and False Antiquities in the Age of Raphael," *Print Quarterly* 21 (2004): 235–247.

## Multiple Functions? A Publisher's Strategy for Reproducing Raphael

Giorgio Vasari's idea about the importance of prints transmitting artistic inventions across the Alps<sup>14</sup> was realized by Hieronymus Cock's publishing house in Antwerp, among others. Publishing prints after Italian works of art was presumably an important part of his business strategy and indicating the original artists became more important compared to prints from before 1550.<sup>15</sup> All five sheets published by Cock after Raphael's works<sup>16</sup> acknowledge the painter's role as the inventor (the most ambiguous case is the *Adoration of the Magi* where only a capital "R" may refer to the painter). These inscriptions concerning authorship must have played an important part in marketing the sheets, at least one can assume this based on the visual emphasis laid on them. For example, on Giorgio Ghisi's print after Raphael's *School of Athens* (Fig. 4), the inscription *RAPHAEL. VRB. INVENTOR* is put on a pedestal, framed, and of relatively large size. Looking at the sheet, one's eye immediately finds this inscription, located almost in the middle of the composition, right below the main character of the scene. While captions concerning authorship explicitly present the sheets as reproductive, these prints provide evidence of the multiple functions prints had at the same time through the thematic texts. They demonstrate convincingly that the reproductive character was only one aspect of these prints and the rigid distinction between artistic and devotional prints could not be applied carelessly in this period.

The most obvious choice to contextualize an image of a Biblical story is a scriptural quotation. Hieronymus Cock used excerpts from the Bible extensively; however, he seems to have laid greater emphasis on applying more varied sources. Criteria of selection may have been the image-related and summarizing character of texts.<sup>17</sup> A late antique *titulus*, a verse from Prudentius' *Dittochaeum* (or *Tituli historiarum*), was probably selected for the *Adoration of the Magi* (Fig. 3), a print after the tapestry design by Raphael's workshop, because it met these criteria.

<sup>14</sup> Barbara Stoltz, "Disegno versus Disegno stampato: Printmaking Theory in Vasari's *Vite* (1550–1568) in the Context of the Theory of *disegno* and the Libro de' Disegni," *Journal of Art Historiography* 7 (2012): 9.

<sup>15</sup> Timothy Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock: Printmaker and Publisher* (New York: Garland, 1977), 156–163; *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Joris van Grieken et al, 125–147.

<sup>16</sup> *School of Athens, The Heavenly Hosts Praise the Trinity, Sacrifice of Abraham, Adoration of the Shepherds, Adoration of the Magi*. Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 163.

<sup>17</sup> For example, in the *Sacrifice of Abraham* (after the scene from the ceiling fresco of the Stanza di Eliodoro), a text from a didactic genre, the so-called picture Bible (*Historiarum veteris testamenti icones ad vivum expressae*) was used to popularize Raphael's image.



*Hic preciosa Magi sub virginis ubere Christo /  
 dona ferunt puero, myrrbeque, et thuris, et auri /  
 Miratur genitrix tot casti ventris honores, /  
 Seque Deum genuisse, hominem regemque supremum. //*

Here the wise men bring costly gifts to the child Christ on  
 the Virgin's breast,  
 of myrrh and incense and gold.  
 The mother marvels at all the honors paid to the fruit of  
 her pure womb,  
 and that she has given birth to God and man and king  
 supreme.<sup>18</sup>

Due to its genre, the verse not only tells the story of the *Adoration of the Magi*, but directly refers to the image by the means of the demonstrative pronoun *hic* and the present tense, namely, it describes not (only) the story but an image of it (a fictive or concrete one which can be replaced with the one by Raphael).<sup>19</sup> The use of a *titulus* in religious painting (in wall painting as well as in book illumination) was a common feature in the medieval period, and Cock's use of Prudentius' verses might be regarded as a continuation of this tradition in print. However, Prudentius' work is a particular case, as it was never applied to any kind of art works in the Middle Ages (nor did it influence other *tituli*) and was probably regarded as a *Biblia Abbreviata* and used as school text from the eleventh century onward.<sup>20</sup> The *Dittochaeum* was transmitted in hundreds of manuscripts, always together with other works by Prudentius, and later it was also part of the printed editions of his *Opera* (among others published by Aldus Manutius in Venice in 1501 and Christophe Plantin in Antwerp in 1563). It is tempting to assume that Cock's use of Prudentius' *tituli* was part of the rediscovery of this ancient text, an

<sup>18</sup> Translation by H. J. Thomson in The Loeb Classical Library, *Prudentius*, vol. 2, ed. T. E. Page (London: William Heinemann, 1953), 359.

<sup>19</sup> It is widely debated whether the verses were composed as fictive *tituli* (i.e., only a literary genre, abbreviated Biblical paraphrases without any practical purpose) or as an explanatory text for a concrete image cycle. Recently Arwed Arnulf has accepted the latter interpretation, even if the cycle of the images is no longer surely identifiable, whereas Christian Kaesser regarded the work as an attractive epigrammatic adaptation of the biblical content. Arwed Arnulf, *Versus ad Picturas. Studien zur Titulusdichtung als Quellengattung der Kunstgeschichte von der Antike bis zum Hochmittelalter* (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1997), 102; Christian Kaesser, "Text, text, and image in Prudentius' Tituli Historiarum," in *Text und Bild: Tagungsbeiträge*, ed. Victoria Zimmer-Panagl (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010), 164–165.

<sup>20</sup> Arnulf, *Versus ad Picturas*, 105.

attempt to use it in the way originally intended. Interestingly, four more prints<sup>21</sup> were published by Cock with the appropriate verses from the *Dittochaëum*.

Cock probably had the text at hand in a printed or manuscript version and discovered that the summarizing character of short texts fitted single sheet prints with biblical subjects well. He could simply have applied the verses as a useful version of an abbreviated Bible. However, he may have been aware of the original function of Prudentius' work and wanted to revitalize the antique tradition of *tituli* in connection with reproductions of Italian art; maybe he planned to apply all the verses to a series of prints. The use of an antique image-related text could have been meant to emphasize the reproductive character of the printed sheets.

In other instances, the publisher's strategy with inscriptions was to reach a wider audience beyond the connoisseurs. Making the image more accessible also implied manipulating the topic, as in the case of Giorgio Ghisi's print after Raphael's *School of Athens* (Fig. 4). All the original inscriptions of the fresco (book titles, diagrams, handwriting, and drawings) which had served to identify the figures as ancient philosophers<sup>22</sup> were omitted and a new inscription was added explaining the story, depicted as Paul preaching in Athens, with the help of a scriptural paraphrase, a summary of a section from the Acts of the Apostles.<sup>23</sup>

PAVLVS ATHENIS PER EPICVRAEOS /  
 ET STOICOS QVOSDAM PHILOSO- /  
 PHOS ADDVCTVS IN MARTIVM VICVM, /  
 STANS IN MEDIO VICO, SVMPTA OC- /  
 CASIONE AB INSPECTA A SE ARA. /  
 DOCET VNVM ILLVM, VERVM, IPSIS /  
 IGNOTVM DEVM. REPREHENDIT IDO- /

<sup>21</sup> Another *Adoration of the Magi* after Maarten van Heemskerck, *The Crossing of the Red Sea* after Bronzino, the *Baptism of Christ* after Andrea del Sarto, and *The Building of Solomon's Temple* after Frans Floris.

<sup>22</sup> Plato and Aristotle hold their most important works on the fresco with the captions *Timeos* and *Etica*. Suzanne Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1985), 63.

<sup>23</sup> It has been noted several times that there was general confusion about the subject of Raphael's fresco; even Vasari commented on its topic erroneously as a syncretistic depiction of philosophers and evangelists. The fact that an engraving, published by Philippe Thomassin in Rome, even sixty years later identified the subject of the image as Saint Paul and Saint Peter is quite remarkable regarding the reception of the fresco. Konrad Oberhuber, *Polarität und Synthese in Raffaels Schule von Athen* (Stuttgart: Urachhaus, 1983), 54. For further bibliography see Wood, "Cannibalized Prints and Early Art History," 216; Sharon Gregory, *Vasari and the Renaissance Print* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 147.

LOLATRIAM, SVADET RESIPISCENTIAM. /  
 INCVLCAET ET VNIVERSALIS IVDICII /  
 DIEM, ET MORTVORVM, PER REDIVI/VVM /  
 CHRISTVM / RESVRRECTIONEM. / ACT. / XVII //

Paul in Athens, brought by the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers to the Areopagus, standing in the middle of the hill. Taking the opportunity from an altar he had seen, he teaches of the one great, true God, unknown to them. He censures idolatry and exhorts them to repentance. He also teaches of both the day of universal judgment and the resurrection of the dead through the reborn Christ. Acts 17.<sup>24</sup>

The reinterpretation of Plato as Paul was probably based on the depiction itself: the bold, long-bearded figure could easily be mistaken for traditional depictions of the apostle. His finger pointing upwards must have played a major role in this confusion. There are important connections between the explanatory text and particular motifs of this image; the text may have been deliberately composed to link the visual motifs and replace the missing attributes. The inscription begins with saying that Paul is standing in the middle of the Areopagus (on Mars Hill, as the Romans referred to it), which helps the viewer identify the protagonist at first glance with the associations about Paul's iconography in mind. There is also a hint at the setting of the image; the word idolatry could easily be connected with the life-size naked sculptures of Apollo and Athena in the niches. The last sentence may refer to the gesture of Plato/Paul, as the pointing upwards could be associated with Christ's gesture in depictions of the Last Judgment (although it is not exactly the same). Therefore, by means of the text, particular parts of the composition gained new meaning; a new context was created for Raphael's image. The inscription served as a precise explanation, leading the viewer's attention to the essential parts of the composition.<sup>25</sup> In this sense, the text can be regarded as a hint at the devotional use of the print. The change in meaning may have been an effort to extend the range of the potential audience. Besides the well-educated, highly positioned individual collectors for whom Raphael's composition was important because they were aware of the original fresco, a larger group of people could become interested in the print

<sup>24</sup> Translation from Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 61.

<sup>25</sup> As Elizabeth McGrath remarked, the inscription made Raphael's allegorical image to a *historia* (a narrative image). Elizabeth McGrath, "Von den Erdbeeren zur Schule von Athen," *Vorträge aus dem Warburg-Haus* 2 (1998): 154–166.

alone. The image, completed by the text, was no longer an exclusive object but visual evidence of a syncretistic view of the world (as it only reserved the original topic partially and replaced the originally pagan protagonist with a Christian one).

### **The Inventor, the Printmaker, and the Poet: Reproductive Prints around 1600**

While acknowledging the inventor became an almost unwritten rule towards the end of the sixteenth century, additional texts did not disappear but gained new importance. Composing an elaborate textual framework for images, moreover competing with the visual by giving additional layers of interpretation, was a challenging but at the same time familiar task for humanists around 1600. Jacob Matham's print after Raphael's fresco, the *Parnassus* in the Vatican, carries three signatures, those of the painter, the engraver, and the poet of the thematic inscription (*Fig. 5*); this sheet is no longer "only" a reproduction of Raphael's masterpiece but presented by the inscriptions as the complex result of collaborative work. The illusionistically painted paper fixed to the window frame reflects on the *cartellino* of Marcantonio Raimondi's earlier print (ca. 1510–1520) after the fresco, which carried the signature of Raphael.<sup>26</sup> Matham put the indication of Raphael's invention on the window embrasure, while his new, bigger *cartellino* is filled with a Neo-Latin poem. Thus, the inscription related to authorship became more directly related to the depiction itself, it is no longer an "addition," but became part of the composition in the form of a fictive painted signature. Matham's name (*Maetham effigiavit, et sculp. Roma*) appears right next to Raphael's, with an emphasis on the fact that he created the print in Rome, probably after having seen the original. Indeed, all the details are given accurately after Raphael's work. However, because of the elongated format of the sheet, one feels that the figures do not have enough space around them; they are robust and pressed into the reduced rectangular area. The printed image is still far from the original from a modern photographic point of view.

Placed on the *cartellino*, the thematic inscription is presented as a supplementary explanation, a commentary, even in its form, a piece of paper added later which extends the meaning of the depiction on a poetic level. The *cartellino* plays an important role in creating a twofold artistic illusion. It connects the space of the painted figures with the real space of the room, thus referring to them as mere depictions on the wall. By revealing the illusionistic nature of the figures' space,

---

<sup>26</sup> Lisa Pon, *Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi: Copying and the Italian Renaissance Print* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 94.



5. Jacob Matham: *Parnassus*, ca. 1596, British Museum, London. After Raphael's fresco in the *Stanza della Segnatura*, Vatican. © Trustees of the British Museum

the whole sheet is presented as a reproduction of the fresco. The form of the *cartellino* is the first level of interpretation, while the poem inscribed on the piece of paper interprets the depiction of the fresco on a second, poetic level. The author, Cornelius Schonaeus, a Neo-Latinist from the so-called Haarlem Latin School, produced epigrams extensively for various printmakers, in collaboration with both Hendrick Goltzius and his pupil, Jacob Matham,<sup>27</sup> thus he had an elaborated idea about what fits on a mythological sheet.

*In coetu Aonidum residens, et dulcia tangens /  
Fila manu Phoebus, recreat presentia vatum //  
Ora suo cantu, Musis mirantibus ipsis /  
Threicium blando pulsatum pectine plectrum. / C. Schonaeus //*

Surrounded by the band of the Heliconians (the Aonian Muses) and touching with his hand the sweet-sounding chords, Phoebus fills the faces of the surrounding poets

<sup>27</sup> Julie L. McGee, *Cornelis Corneliszoon van Haarlem (1562–1638). Patrons, Friends, and Dutch Humanists* (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf Publishers, 1991), 319.

with delight by means of his song and gently touching his  
 Thracian lute with the plectrum as the Muses admire him.<sup>28</sup>

The text seems to be a simple description of the scene at first glance, although it reflects rather the effort of completing the image on another level. Beyond applying sophisticated mythological names, for example, the one he uses for the Muses (*Aonides*) from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (V.333), Schonaeus laid special emphasis on speaking about Apollo's song and music, which amazed the Muses and the poets. It was a vivid topos of early modern theoretical discourse that legends and inscriptions can make images speak, or sing, in this case. The interaction of the text and image could convey a more complex message than either alone by addressing a different sense than seeing and by referring to textual knowledge (in this case to Ovid) at the same time.<sup>29</sup>

As demonstrated through these examples, texts played a crucial role in the reception process of prints by guiding the viewer's attention in the image or providing additional information about the topic and authorship. Through the combination of image and text, single sheet prints became a more complex product, full of references to different kinds of information and to different traditions of knowledge. Having a print after Raphael in hand (or pasted in an album), the sixteenth-century audience not only received an image, but a particular image fitted into a rich (con)textual framework compiled and edited by printmakers and publishers.

---

<sup>28</sup> The translation was created with the great help of Cristian-Nicolae Gașpar.

<sup>29</sup> Jochen Becker, "Zur niederländischen Kunstliteratur des 16. Jahrhunderts: Domenicus Lampsonius," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 24 (1973): 52; Margriet Hoogvliet, "Mixing Text and Image. French and Italian Theories from the Late Middle Ages to the Early Sixteenth Century," in *Multi-media Compositions from the Middle Ages to the Early Modern Period*, ed. Margriet Hoogvliet (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 75–103.