to the artist's early Roman years, it shows a variant of the scene different from that occurring in the painting: the sides of the composition are reversed so that now it is not Baucis but Philemon who approaches Jupiter and Mercury seated by the table, and we can only surmise that the wife's figure was represented on the left where a portion of the drawing has been cut off. All other drawings on the subject formerly ascribed to Elsheimer were later attributed to Goudt who imitated Elsheimer's manner, most of the re-attribution taking place fifty years ago[5].

Later in the 19th century, above three hundred drawings were attributed to Elsheimer. The number was reduced by Möhle to sixty-eight certain and seventeen questionable works, and by Andrews to twenty-six (even though he attributed several new drawings to Elsheimer). The fact should make us extremely cautious whenever a new attribution crops up. On the other hand, research carried out by J. G. van Gelder, Ingrid Jost, Keith Andrews and others, has given the first consistent and clear image of Elsheimer's *oeuvre* as a draughtsman[6], creating firmer grounds for new hypotheses. Elsheimer's monographists have not yet considered our drawing which is mentioned only once in the literature[7]. That its value was acknowledged even in the past, is confirmed by the stamp (Lugt 1740) near the bottom left corner, testifying to its being part of the collection of Jean-Denis Lempereur (1701—1779), a famous collector and connoisseur in European drawing. The artistic class of the drawing is even at first glance superior to Goudt's similar works, and to the scene — recently with Lodewijk Houthakker in Amsterdam — previously ascribed to Elsheimer, among others by Möhle[8]. We do not find in it slender figures with too long legs, characteristic in particular of Goudt's drawings at the Institut Néerlandais in Paris and the Louvre (inv. no. 23006), but also visible in the scene in the British Museum (Figs. 5, 6)[9] nor the violent mann
in the drawing on the same subject in the *Frankfort Alb*
for the logic of the spatial lay-out and a sense of form.
in common with a set of figurative gouaches, the attrib
stioned by specialists today.

The gouache representations of *Tobias and the A*
Receiving the Head of St. John (Chatsworth), *The Bath*
scenes of the history of Ceres (in Hamburg and Zurich
period in Elsheimer's work and were executed in Ro
perhaps his utmost achievements as a draughtsman, v

5. Weizsäcker 1939, pp. 189—192; Möhle (1966, cat. n°. 43, pp. 145-
and 1957, pp. 125, 178) considers the attribution of a gouache on the
in London, recently with Lodewijk Houthakker in Amsterdam (our
was not confirmed by Andrews (1977, 1985).
6. Van Gelder/Jost 1967—68; Andrews 1971; Andrews MD 1971; Boon
in Frankfort in 1966 (catalogue Frankfort 1966/67) stimulated inte
was the first opportunity to see together and compare most of the
7. Mrozińska 1980, p. 156.
8. *Cf.* note 5.
9. The drawing in the Louvre: Demonts 1938, No. 528, table CXII (a
Another drawing on the same subject in the Louvre, ascribed to G
Elsheimer's school); Weizsäcker 1939, *loc. cit.*, Fig. 3, *Cf.* Möhle
10. Weizsäcker 1936, Fig. 118 (Table 101); Weizsäcker 1939, pp. 189-
11. Andrews 1977 and 1985, cat. n°s. 47, 48, 49, 50, 51 (Andrews 1977,
and 44). Andrews has recently ascribed to Elsheimer yet another g
-nude seated woman, which, so he believes, might have been a study
n°. 49 A, pp. 200 and 44).

UNIVERSITÄTS-BIBLIOTHEK HEIDELBERG
http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/bmusvars1988/0145
© Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg
gefördert durch die DFG