

# Introduction

---

*LexArt. Words for Painting* is presented in the form of a dictionary and is the result of a research project on the writings on art published between 1600 and 1750 in France, Germany, England and the Netherlands. This research was conducted within the context of the *LexArt. Words for art: the rise of a terminology in Europe (1600–1750)* project, financed by the European Research Council (ERC- Advanced Grant no. 323761, 2013-2018).

The chronological and geographical limitations of this exploration of the terms and notions were justified by the growing importance, in both number and diversity, of the publications on art in Northern Europe from 1600 onwards, and more particularly from 1604, the year of publication of Karel Van Mander's *Het Schilder-Boeck* until 1750, a more flexible date depending on the countries studied. This date marked a significant transformation in what can be called art theory, as well as its mutation into aesthetics (*Ästhetik*), a term used at that time by Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten.<sup>1</sup> We focused on the writings published to the north of the Alps. On the one hand, German, Dutch and English texts and, to a lesser degree, French texts have been the subject of less study. On the other, the research carried out on Italian texts has been considerable and has often served as the basis for our current view of art theory. But this theory has too often been studied through the prism of these Italian texts, making it important to revisit them, revealing that they are often inadequate. As no works on art theory, and no translations, were published in the Baltic countries or Eastern Europe within the chronological limits that we set, they were not included in our study.

---

1. Alexander Gottlieb BAUMGARTEN, *Aesthetica*, Frankfurt/Oder, 1750.

Broadening the study to several countries and taking into account the more global geographical area of Northern Europe also made possible a new line of attack. It is certainly possible to evoke the fragmentation of identities, but at the same time, there are common conceptions of painting. This is how an intersecting history emerged, with no fixed identity and no allegiance restricted to a particular thought. The circuits through which the concepts travelled in Europe were not fixed, and concepts did not develop in an unequivocal manner. They were the result of appropriation, rooted in differing semantic environments, and in specific milieus. More than a single entity, this geographical area was effectively characterised by diversity in which a wide range of artistic creations thrived, and in which unity was created by the circulation of people, of knowledge and of artistic practices. Through the mobility of artists, and through the production and diffusion of the writings on art, a European conscience started to develop in a *République des arts* which was constructed in the image of the *République des lettres*.<sup>1</sup>

We conducted our research from a double point of view, both diachronic, questioning how these notions and concepts were received, and synchronic, taking an interest in their contextualisation. We thus examined the various meanings of a word from the perspective of a confrontation between the establishment of an artistic concept on the one hand, and the practice on the other, given that in the 17th century art theory was an explanation of practice. We then examined the meaning of the word, not in its general and contemporary sense, but on the basis of the one that was intended in the context of the text studied.

## 1 Why a Dictionary of Terms and Concepts?

*LexArt. Les mots de la peinture* has been conceived in the form of a dictionary, and is composed of 77 articles presenting synthesis of almost 250 notions. Rather than presenting a short article on each one, we preferred the form of longer essays constructed around cross-issues by grouping different concepts. These concepts appeared significant for the theory as it was laid out in the texts on artistic literature from

---

1. Françoise WAQUET, *La République des Lettres*, Paris, Bruxelles, 1997; Marc FUMAROLI, *Quand l'Europe parlait français*, Paris, 2014; Marc FUMAROLI, *La République des Lettres*, Paris, 2015; Antoine ARJAKOVSKY, *Histoire de la conscience européenne*, Paris, 2016; Thomas SERRIER, Étienne FRANÇOIS, *Europa. Notre histoire. L'héritage européen depuis Homère*, Paris, 2017.

the period concerned by the *LexArt* project. The articles were written using the citations collected in the database ([www.lexart.fr](http://www.lexart.fr)). These citations are always cited with the precise references of the book, and were sometimes transcribed. The *apparatus criticus* was completed by the translations used at the time, the terms associated or linked to the notion, a list of the sources cited and an indicative bibliography for the notion.

Based on citations extracted from a close reading of the sources, the *LexArt* dictionary has the opposite aim of a dictionary taken in the most general sense of the term. And yet, it was in the form of a dictionary that it seemed most appropriate for us to summarise our research, notion by notion, because it makes it possible to bring together a wide variety of concepts that it was important to study as separate entities. Taken together, they nevertheless form a coherent whole, and provide a very clear vision of the conception of painting formulated by the painters and theorists of the 17th and 18th centuries.

The function and cultural input of these ancient dictionaries, contemporary to our source texts, has already been studied.<sup>1</sup> And the constitution and readership of those dedicated more specifically to art have been explored by Cecilia Hurley, Pascal Griener<sup>2</sup> and Gaëtane Maes.<sup>3</sup> These dictionaries made it possible to better identify the material of our research. Without going into detail, this allowed us to reflect on the very nature of these books, and on how they have been used over the centuries. All this effectively guided our conception of this book.

Our project is situated somewhere between a dictionary and a lexicon, and was constructed around the study of words. These same words were our gateway into the writings on art. However, we had no interest in creating a catalogue of words, nor a lexicon, nor even a

---

1. Bernard QUEMADA, *Le dictionnaire de l'Académie française et la lexicographie institutionnelle européenne*, Paris, 1998; Manfred HÖFLER, *La lexicographie française du XVI<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Wolfenbüttel, 1982; Alain REY, *Le lexique: images et modèles. Du dictionnaire à la lexicologie*, Paris, 1977.

2. Cecilia HURLEY, Pascal GRIENER, "Une norme en transformation. La systématique du vocabulaire artistique au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle", dans T.W. GAEHTGENS, C. MICHEL, D. RABREAU, M. SCHIEDER (dir.), *L'art et les normes sociales au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 2001, p. 3–14.

3. Gaëtane MAES, "Les dictionnaires des Beaux-Arts au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle: pour qui et pourquoi?", dans J.L. FRIPP, A. GORSE, N. MANCEAU, N. STRUCKMEYER (ed.), *Artistes, savants et amateurs: art et sociabilité au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle (1715–1815)*, Paris, 2016, p. 171–184.

glossary. Rather, from the analysis of what lies behind the words, and what was revealed in the texts, our aim was to highlight their meanings, and their connections in a single language or in different languages. Obviously, the appearance of different terms, their use in a variety of linguistic fields, genuinely corresponds to the creation of a modern artistic lexicography that seeks to define as precisely as possible the content of each notion, resituated in its particular context of use. But the many bilingual, trilingual or multilingual dictionaries published from the early 16th century on did not take into account this plasticity in the terms of art.<sup>1</sup> Studying the translations published at the same time was therefore much more significant for our study. These translations revealed the adaptations and distortions in the meanings. It is thus significant for example that *peintre* was translated in England as *artist*, whereas this term (*artiste*) was not used in France, or that *goût* was translated into Dutch with two different terms, *aart* and *smak*. There are a great many examples, and they are often surprising.

Generally speaking, the great dictionaries published in the 17th century were unsuitable for our purposes. Either they were too general, or they continued to diffuse knowledge and conceptions that were out of synch with the content of the artistic literature, thus clearly demonstrating the long time periods needed to assimilate new notions and concepts. This was the case for the major dictionaries of the arts and sciences published in France, Germany or England. Concepts of art theory were rare and only slightly developed.<sup>2</sup> The term *art* for example was mostly understood in the sense of science.

All over Europe, the major dictionaries in French, German and English showed just how difficult it was for the specific art vocabulary, and more particularly painting, to be absorbed into the common

---

1. For example, *Colloquia et dictionariorum octo lingarum* published in Amsterdam and Delft in 1613, then in 1623 (Amsterdam, Leyden), 1624 (Amsterdam), 1627 (Venice), 1630 (Antwerp) then many other editions. For an exhaustive bibliography of the multilingual dictionaries published between 1600 and 1700, see William Jervis JONES, *German Lexicography in the European Context. A descriptive bibliography of printed dictionaries and world lists containing German languages (1600–1700)*, Berlin-New-York, 2000; Yves CHEVREL, Annie COINTRE, Yen-Mai TRAN-GERVAT, *Histoire des traductions en langue française (1610–1815)*, Paris, 2014.

2. Thomas CORNEILLE, *Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, Paris, 1694–1695; John HARRIS, *Lexicon Technicum, or an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*, London, 1704; Ephraim CHAMBERS, *Cyclopaedia: or, An Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*, London, 1728; Johann Heinrich ZEDLER, *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, Leipzig, 1732–1754.

language.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the language of literature or music was very widely included in artistic literature, and terms such as *agreement*, *arrangement*, and *harmony* were widely used to describe the manners of painting. They were not, however, the subject of real definitions, but much more an explanation often based on precise examples, thus establishing equivalencies between the terms and the object, or the painter's methods, they tried to put into words.

The first dictionaries dedicated to art, Baldinucci's *Vocabolario toscano dell'arte del disegno*<sup>2</sup> for Italy, and above all Félibien's *les Principes de l'architecture, de la sculpture, de la peinture*<sup>3</sup> focused more on techniques. It was nonetheless obvious that Félibien's *Principes* in particular competed to assemble, and then diffuse, the notions that were widely debated in art theory, and thus playing a part in providing art lovers with easier access to works. This was also how glossaries were presented, particularly that of Roger De Piles, which accompanied his translation of Dufresnoy's *De Arte graphica* (1668), and which, over the course of the re-editions, was the subject of major additions. But the articles remained very succinct. The first real dictionaries devoted to art were published in the middle of the 18th century. In 1746, François-Marie Marsy published, in two volumes, his *Dictionnaire abrégé de peinture et d'architecture où l'on trouvera les principaux termes de ces deux arts avec leur explication*.<sup>4</sup> It was based essentially on the writings of Dufresnoy, whose poem, *Arte graphica* (1668) he also translated, and those of De Piles. Pernetty adopted the model of

---

1. Antoine FURETIÈRE, *Le Dictionnaire universel*, The Hague, 1690; *Le Grand dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, Paris, 1694–1695; Pierre BAYLE, *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, 3<sup>e</sup> édition, Rotterdam, 1720; Louis MORÉRI, *Le Grand Dictionnaire historique, ou le Mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane*, Paris, 1st ed. 1674; Johann Heinrich ZEDLER, *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, Leipzig, 1732–1754.

2. Filippo BALDINUCCI, *Vocabolario toscano dell'arte del disegno: nel quale si esplicano i propri termini e voci, non solo della pittura, scultura, [et] architettura; ma ancora di altre arti a quelle subordinate, e che abbiano per fondamento il disegno . . .*, Florence, 1681.

3. André FÉLIBIEN, *Des principes de l'architecture, de la sculpture, de la peinture, et des autres arts qui en dépendent. Avec un dictionnaire des Termes propres à chacun de ces Arts*, Paris, 1676.

4. François-Marie MARSY, abbé de, *Dictionnaire abrégé de peinture et d'architecture où l'on trouvera les principaux termes de ces deux arts avec leur explication, la vie abrégée des grands peintres & des architectes célèbres, & une description succincte des plus beaux ouvrages de peinture, d'architecture & de sculpture, soit antiques, soit modernes*, Paris, 1746, 2 tomes.

this new type of dictionary,<sup>1</sup> as did Lacombe.<sup>2</sup> And their works were the first to be devoted to the terms of art and their specificities, while also adding biographies of artists and historical notions to the articles more specifically devoted to painting.

These texts corresponded to well-defined sociability circle, and were aimed at different publics.<sup>3</sup> But it is nevertheless possible to wonder to what extent all these tools, including the first forms of lexicon, as well as all the artistic literature with more or less significant inflections depending on the country, had as their aim, often even clearly admitted, to explain painting and train the eyes and judgment of spectators. In the preface to his *Dictionnaire portatif* (1757), Antoine-Joseph Pernety presented his project, and gave the advantages that he saw in the publication, while defending himself against “the bad humour of certain people, who made them cry out against the century’s taste for Dictionaries” (*la mauvaise humeur de certaines gens, qui les fait crier contre le goût du siècle pour les Dictionnaires*).<sup>4</sup> After this precautionary oration, he cited the different advantages of this type of publication. He wanted to diffuse, to as wide a public as possible, and including for those who were ignorant, the artistic vocabulary that he also esteemed to be essential: “How can we converse with Artists effectively, and reason with them about their Art, if we are unfamiliar with the terms that are specific to them, or if we do not know the real meaning in which they use them?” (*Comment en effet converser avec les Artistes, & raisonner avec eux sur leur Art, si l’on ignore les termes qui leur sont propres, ou si l’on n’est pas au fait du vrai sens dans lequel on les emploie?*).<sup>5</sup> This preoccupation was already that of Poussin, who sent letters to his patrons to explain to them his manner of conceiving of painting.<sup>6</sup> The difference that it is nevertheless necessary to underline was that the aim of Pernety was to diffuse this language as widely as possible.

---

1. Antoine-Joseph PERNETY, *Dictionnaire portatif de peinture, sculpture et gravure*, Paris, 1757; reprint Geneva, 1972; trad. all. Berlin, 1764.

2. Jacques LACOMBE, *Dictionnaire portatif des Beaux-Arts*, Paris, 1752.

3. Gaétane MAES, 2016, p. 171–184; Cecilia HURLEY, Pascal GRIENER, 2001, p. 3–14.

4. Antoine-Joseph PERNETY, 1757, p. iii.

5. Antoine-Joseph PERNETY, 1757, p. iii.

6. Nicolas POUSSIN, *Lettres et propos sur l’art*, textes réunis et présentés par A. BLUNT, Paris, 1964; reed. avec préface de J. THUILLIER, 1994; Georg GERMANN, “Les dictionnaires de Félibien et Baldinucci”, *Revue d’esthétique*, 1997, no. 31/32, p. 253–258.

Dictionaries have been published in recent decades by art historians. Focusing on the Italian Renaissance and the second half of the 18th century, most paid little interest to the geographical space and the time period that interest us. Some focus essentially on techniques,<sup>1</sup> others are more specifically oriented towards aesthetics<sup>2</sup> and art criticism;<sup>3</sup> finally, there are others that include as field of study the major categories and methods of art history.<sup>4</sup> The ambitions of the LexArt dictionary are different. We covered a less broad period, and a specific and more limited geographical area, and thus excluded Italy (except for the translations of Da Vinci and Lomazzo published during our period). Obviously, when necessary, we retraced the foundations of a notion, just as art theory after 1750 was not taken into account except as a means of showing, in certain very specific cases, the prolongations.

We were attached to a synchronous approach to the discourse and artistic practice that this period covered. The term was thus integrated into networks that made it possible to reveal the equivalence of terms that do not have the same meaning, or on the contrary the links and ruptures. The different entries and occurrences in the various languages are not provided in their current translation, nor with their contemporary meaning, but are taken from the different ancient translations in order to give the most objective and critical overview of knowledge possible according to the sources. The purpose is not to provide definitions, nor to propose translations, but rather to highlight what was at stake in the usages, resituated in different contexts in time and space, by confronting different manners of thinking, painting and looking. About for example, the notion of *convenance* and its synonyms, *bien-séance*, *decorum*, *Wohlstand*, *welstand*, *decency*, *harmony* or *propriety*, it was important for us to first of all show how the four semantic fields are connected: conformity with history, adaptation to place, internal harmony, and fidelity to custom. It was also important to

---

1. Jean-Philippe BREUILLE, *L'Atelier du peintre et l'art de peinture. Dictionnaire des termes techniques*, Paris, Larousse, 1990; Ségolène BERGEON, Pierre CURIE, *Peinture & dessin: vocabulaire typologique et technique*, Paris, 2009; Dawson W CARR, Mark LEONARD, *Looking at Paintings. A Guide to Technical Terms*, Malibu, 1992.

2. Étienne SOURIAU (dir.), *Vocabulaire d'esthétique*, Paris, 1990; Jacques MORIZOT, Roger POUIVET, *Dictionnaire d'esthétique et de philosophie de l'art*, Paris, 2007; Michael KELLY, *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, Oxford, 2008 (1st ed. 1998), 4 t.

3. Luigi GRASSI, Mario PEPE, *Dizionario della Critica d'arte*, Turin, 1998, 2 t.

4. Karlheinz BARCK (dir.), *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe (ÄGB). Historisches Wörterbuch in sieben Bänden*, Stuttgart, 2000–2010, 7 vol.; Ulrich PFISTERER, *Metzler Lexikon. Kunstwissenschaft. Ideen, Methoden, Begriffe*, Stuttgart/Weimar, 2003.

show why decency, initially associated with the balance of bodies, was subsequently extended, through permeability with Dutch conception, to the sense of visual harmony, and then evolved until the middle of the 18th century.

The decision to write long articles thus became obvious, as it allowed us to better respond to this aim. We thus discussed the approximately 250 notions into 77 articles, as the best way to connect the issues that arose in the course of our research. For example, we grouped together *amateur*, *connaisseur* and *curieux* in a single article, as we also did for *copie* and *original*. On the other hand, certain notions have been split between several different articles, so that we talk about *amitié* or *entente* in the essays on *harmonie des couleurs* and *union*; or *assemblage* on the subject of *union* and *groupe*. The association of different terms as various aspects of a notion, are finally much closer to the still moving usage of the terms whose meaning had not yet been fixed with precision. An index makes it possible to move easily around all the articles. Translations (English, German, Dutch, Italian and Latin) and the different meanings given to a single term (*académie/école et académie/dessin*), as well as the precise references to the citations obtained in most cases from the database [www.lexart.fr](http://www.lexart.fr), complete the *apparatus criticus*.

The articles respond to each other and form a whole that is not just a collection of definitions, but highlights a new approach to painting. Behind the alphabetical order that is specific to this type of exercise, a framework is defined that traces the outlines of a new reading of paintings.

## 2 The Eyes of the Painter and the Eyes of the Spectator

Indeed, if words are like brushstrokes, which form in the mind the images of the things without which it is impossible to know them, there is nothing in the arts so important to speak well of them, and if necessary to judge all sorts of works, as knowing what each word means.

*En effet si les paroles sont autant de coups de pinceau, qui forment dans l'esprit les images des choses sans quoy il est impossible de les faire connoistre, il n'y a rien dans les arts de si important pour en bien parler, & de si*



*nécessaire pour juger de toutes sortes d'ouvrages, comme de sçavoir ce que chaque mot signifie*<sup>1</sup>.

This phrase by Félibien provides the full justification for our project. Just as one recognises in words the ability to create an image in a poem, they also have the ability to evoke the act of painting and the work itself. They also have the capacity to go beyond descriptions to speak of their essence, their nature and their reception in terms of sensations, in short, to speak of the experience of both the painter and the spectator. Through artistic literature, it is the work of the painter and the gaze of the spectator that are described to us like a watermark.<sup>2</sup> The texts on art theory provide us with the context in which the eyes that created the work, and those that regarded it, had been educated. They explain the know-how, models, and usages that brought precision to the conventions of representation. Defining these models made it possible to make an interpretation as close as possible to the intellectual, social and visual contexts in which the painting was produced. The words that described proportion, perspective and composition, were in perfect harmony with the object that they described.

The *LexArt* dictionary highlights two characteristics that are essential for understanding the art of the period envisaged. The first has already been revealed by the research on art theory in recent decades (in particular based on analyses of Hoogstraten and Sandrart and on French theory around De Piles), and was comforted by our research. It touches on the relationship between theory and practice. The theory of art North of the Alps was not an abstract conception focused on the Idea, but rather an explanation of practice. The second characteristic, which became evident in the course of the studies carried out in the context of the *LexArt* project, was the importance given to effect. In many of the texts written by art theorists, who were often artists, this notion was central and included in a double movement: the creative work of the painter, which was simultaneously the support for the gaze that the spectator will pose on the work.

---

1. André FÉLIBIEN, *Des principes de l'architecture, de la sculpture, de la peinture, et des autres arts qui en dépendent. Avec un dictionnaire des Termes propres à chacun de ces Arts*, Paris, 1676, préface n.p.

2. Élisabeth LAVEZZI, "Le peintre dans les dictionnaires des beaux-arts de Félibien, Marsy, Lacombe et Pernetty", *Diffusion du savoir et affrontement des idées, 1600–1770*, Montbrison, 1993, p. 383-392.

The eyes—the gaze—thus became a key element in the discourse on art. For these theorists, it was not a question of elaborating reflection on the relationship between visual perception through the theories of vision that were then being developed, nor for us to approach this question in the sense of a psychology of perception as it was presented by Gombrich.<sup>1</sup> On the contrary, our focus lay on the subtle internal processes that allowed a figurative representation to spring forth from the brushstroke, revealing to us how the painter saw, and how he invented by describing the passage from mental images to representation, how he transposed them on to the canvas, and brought them to life, thanks to the disposition, colours, light and movement. Thus, behind the formal, visual aspects, and behind the expression of what makes it possible to update them, the painter's eye appeared. The notion of effect as it was described by art theorists played a fundamental role, as it was situated at the meeting point between the gaze of the painter and that of the spectator: the former who conceived and painted in relation to the effect, and the latter who perceived the effect and received it.

As the art theory of the time described the different manners, rather than conceptions, it clearly revealed the possibility of renewing the way one looked at a painting. The terms used by painters did not only contribute to transposing their jargon into the everyday language as a means of explaining their art. More than the definitions, it is the descriptions of notions which make up the body of art theory that shape the spectator's gaze. What does he see? What kind of visual experience does the painter elicit by describing the treatment of colour or light? Is the gaze captured by the idea or the history? Or by the forms? Approaching a painting through perception and recognition, or through aesthetic pleasure, is a question that was asked by Jean-Pierre Changeux.<sup>2</sup> It is very present in theoretical texts, and reveals an essential change in the conception of art. There are two approaches to paintings that clearly stand out. The first is evident in the writings of many theorists. It corresponds to the perception of forms and figures organised according to a certain rhythm, which leads to an understanding of painting through its order and which, without excluding the multiplicity of meanings (or episodes), is created

---

1. Ernst GOMBRICH, *L'art et l'illusion: psychologie de la représentation picturale*, Paris, 2002 (1st ed. angl. 1960).

2. Jean-Pierre CHANGEUX, *Raison et plaisir*, Paris, 1994, p. 38–39.

from the different parts of the history represented. But a second form of perception also developed: that of the painting through the effects of colour and light. The exploration of a painting through its parts, in accordance with the order of the history, taking into account composition and meaning, was thus opposed to an approach to the whole which captured the spectator's attention in one sudden instant.

Painting or looking at a painting in parts or as a whole has always been a key issue for the painter. What Jean-Pierre Changeux called the harmony of the senses and reason,<sup>1</sup> or what we might call the eye of reason, was thus opposed to the sensitive eye which gradually started to dominate in the writings. This shift is perceptible in the description of notions such as composition, or the relationship between drawing and colour. A real inversion took place. The eye that regarded the whole on the basis of the parts was opposed to a vision of the whole, the *tout-ensemble* for French theorists, which soon found equivalents in other countries. Although the definition of aesthetic sentiment was not yet clearly formulated, it was being prepared in the importance given by theorists to agreement, pleasure and to a certain conception of grace.

“Talking about painting” did not merely introduce the spectator into the artist's studio, showing him “how to paint”. It also introduced him into the painting itself, showing him what it was important to see, and how to see it. As they took into account the practice of painting, or took as their basis the analysis of works, and were also conceived as an education of the spectator's eye, the art literature, could be considered as a source for awakening a new way of looking which included the painter's intention (*intento*) far from defining a theory. As proposed by Sandrart, explaining his aim when writing the *Teutsche Academie*: “It is for this reason [to attain the *intent*, the intention and the aim of the painter] that one must allow the paintings to descend gently into the soul and reason. The present work expects the same politeness of the noble reader” (*C'est pour cette raison [pour atteindre l'intento, l'intention et le dessein du peintre] que l'on doit laisser descendre les tableaux doucement dans l'âme et dans la raison. Le présent livre attend la même politesse du noble lecteur*).<sup>2</sup> These writings formed the eyes to better see and played a part in shaping the “period eye”, as it was

---

1. *Ibidem*, p. 46.

2. [Darum soll man die Gemälde in das Gemüte und den Verstand langsam hinablassen. Dergleichen Höflichkeit erwartet auch gegenwärtiges Buch von dem edlen Leser], Joachim VON SANDRART, *Teutsche Academie*, 1675, p. 103.

defined by Baxandall.<sup>1</sup> By revealing the mental, intellectual and visual universe that made it possible to better understand a work of art, they were essential for penetrating the artistic productions of this period with a synchronous *apparatus criticus*.

Michèle-Caroline HECK  
[Translated by Kristy Snaith]

---

1. Michael BAXANDALL, *L'Œil du Quattrocento: l'usage de la peinture dans l'Italie de la Renaissance*, Paris, 1985 (1st ed. angl. 1972); Michael BAXANDALL, *Words for picture: seven papers on Renaissance art and art criticism*, Yale, 2003; Peter MACK, Williams ROBERT, *Michael Baxandall, vision and the work of words*, Farnham Burlington, 2015.