

carries out varied commissions from individual patrons but works for a market of anonymous consumers, in the hope that his wares will find favour with the public. It was the competition in this open market, so Friedländer implied, that caused the painters, crowded into the teeming export centre of Antwerp, to resort to the development of new specialities. What had probably been a practice inside the late mediaeval workshop, the division of labour into figure painters, background painters and, say, still-life specialists, now broke up into the various '*genres*' to be cultivated by those most likely to make a living by any given speciality.

The importance of this explanation for our 'institutional' aspect is evident. The landscape specialist is obviously the most tangible representative of this institution, but equally clearly he cannot function without his counterpart, the consumer or collector, who creates the demand. What type of public provided the market for this unprecedented kind of painting—or, to put it as concretely as possible, how could anyone demand landscape paintings unless the concept and even the word existed?

It is in Venice, not in Antwerp, that the term 'a landscape' is first applied to any individual painting. To be sure, the painters of Antwerp were far advanced in the development of landscape backgrounds, but there is no evidence that the collectors of Antwerp had an eye or a word for the novelty. The inventories of Margaret of Austria, Regent of the Netherlands, which may be taken as representative of the most cultured taste of a Northern household in the first decades of the sixteenth century, do not contain a single reference to a painting without a subject—be it landscape or *genre*.⁸ But at the very time when these inventories were drawn up Marc Antonio Michiel uses the expression 'a landscape' quite freely in his notes.⁹ As early as 1521 he noted *molte tavolette de paesi* in the collection of Cardinal Grimani¹⁰ and the contrast with the Northern inventory is all the more interesting in that these paintings were by the hand of Albert of Holland.¹¹ We do not know if they were pure landscapes—probably they were not—but for the Italian connoisseur they were interesting as landscapes only. There are various similar entries in Marc Antonio's lists, the reference, for instance, to 'the landscapes on large canvases and others drawn on paper with the pen by the hand of Domenico Campagnola';¹² but the most memorable is perhaps the description of Giorgione's *tempesta* as 'a small landscape [*paesetto*], on canvas, with a thunderstorm, a gipsy and a soldier'.¹³ Whatever else the painting may illustrate, for the great Venetian connoisseur it belonged in the category of landscape painting.

Marc Antonio's references to 'landscapes' are by no means isolated in the world of Italian connoisseurs. We hear that in 1535 Federigo Gonzaga of Mantua was offered a collection of 300 Flemish paintings of which he bought 120. 'Among them,' says an eyewitness, 'are twenty which represent nothing but landscapes on fire which seem to burn one's hands if one goes near to touch them.'¹⁴ Thirteen