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In 1530, Nuremberg’s poet-shoemaker Hans Sachs mentioned a fountain of youth located in the land of milk and honey, the so-called Schlaraffenland. Sachs located the fountain and Schlaraffenland some three miles behind Christmas. With this description, Sachs informed us of the sixteenth-century belief that there was more than one fountain of youth, that one of them was found in a mythical location, and that this particular fountain of youth would fulfill every gourmand’s dreams. The fountain of youth was for Sachs, therefore, more imaginary than real. Pieter Bruegel’s painting of Schlaraffenland (Munich, Alte Pinakothek) similarly delights in the gustatory and, therefore, sensual pleasures of the location Sachs names for the rejuvenating fountain.

Clearly there were contradictory opinions on the subject of the fountain of youth in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and these ranged from satirical descriptions of wrinkle-removing mills and furnaces in farces to medical discussions of elixirs for rejuvenating the old by the Swiss physician Paracelsus. The theory that Ponce de León was looking for the fountain of youth when he discovered Florida in 1513, though discredited, bears witness not only to the popularity of the concept, but also to the belief in the fountain as a reality, albeit one located in a distant place. As recently as 1977 the elixir Gerovital was imported from the German spa town Baden-Baden and was touted by some zealous supporters as a “fountain of youth.”

Sebald Beham designed a woodcut representing a Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse that has been convincingly dated based on copies to the years ca. 1530/31, when Sebald first used the monogram HSB printed at the center of the print. This date is corroborated by the only known dated impression, which also has a text (Oxford, the Ashmolean Museum); the date 1531 and the name of the publisher, Albrecht Glockendon, are printed at the end of the text below the print (Fig. 1). The woodcut is large. It was printed onto four sheets of full-size paper and measures over one foot high by three and one-half feet wide (506 x 1095 mm). It has more the size and format of a large foldout map than that of Sebald’s own postage stamp-sized engravings.

The woodcut is known in two states. According to Hollstein and Pauli (no. 1120), state I bears Beham’s monogram while state II includes the address of the Nuremberg publisher, Albrecht Glockendon. In the latter
state, known only in the impression at Oxford, Glockendon's address identifying him as publisher (Illuminist) is printed at the upper right of the fountain immediately below the border of the print: “Albrecht Glockendon Illuminist zw Nurmbergk.” cocktails Glockendon also signed his name, profession, and date below the image at the end of the text. The Oxford impression bears that text, which is lengthy, below the image. It is hand-colored in brown, blue, and black tones and includes a woman urinating at the edge of the bath basin, a detail that was later eradicated from the block. The Oxford impression appears, in fact, to be a unique example of the first state, and not the earliest impression of that state, judging from the breaks in the border lines at upper right. The order of the two states as discussed in the literature should, therefore, be reversed.

Beham’s print is unique in its juxtaposition of the subjects of the fountain of youth and bathhouse. In the left half of Sebald’s woodcut, old men and women, clothed and naked, arrive at the fountain of youth by stretcher and on crutches. Once in the fountain, the bathers—who are mostly male—are transformed into young musclemen who scale the fountain. They are also transformed into amorous bathers in the right part of the fountain basin and in the Bathhouse half of the composition. In the latter, lovers embrace at far right and lounge together in bed at upper center. A variety of bath utensils are strewn about before the bath basin, and a group of spectators on the roof drinks, converses, and provides music.

Because Beham’s print depicts both the fountain of youth and the bathhouse, which have two distinct pictorial traditions, each subject will be treated individually here. Representations of the fountain of youth date back to fourteenth-century French manuscripts and ivories in which the old are shown transported by means of horse-drawn wagons and wheelbarrows to rejuvenating waters.7

In the second half of the fifteenth century, the satirical and erotic potential of the fountain of youth theme in art was realized, and it was on this tradition that Beham drew. On a mid fifteenth-century French ivory comb (London, Victoria and Albert Museum), for example, a fool is represented between an old couple and a fountain with youthful bathers, thereby indicating the folly of the quest for youthfulness. The earliest German example of the fountain of youth has come down to us in the form of a tapestry produced in Alsace in the first third of the fifteenth century (Colmar, Musée d’Unterlinden).8 The old are transported by litter and crutches, as in Beham’s woodcut, and by wheelbarrow and backpack to an enclosed area, perhaps a garden, accessible by two large gates. Once stripped of their clothing and immersed in the fountain’s waters, the old regain their youthful energies and desires.

The young man and woman at center delicately reach for one another in the restrained manner reminiscent of the fourteenth century. The old man on crutches states, in the banderole, “Praise God that I, an old man, have found the fountain.” The young man on horseback behind the walls adds, “We were also old. Our money was well spent.”

The fountain of youth was first represented as a print, the least expensive medium considered to have been the most popular one, in the third quarter of the fifteenth century by the Master of the Banderoles (Fig. 2). His engraving of the 1460s stresses the erotic powers of the fountain’s waters.10 The fountain is set within a Love Garden, which had become the canonical setting for lovers by the middle of the fifteenth century when it included such water sources as fountains and springs.11 The thick wall of the fountain here forms the boundary between the old and young, as it does in Beham’s Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse.

In the Master of the Banderoles’ print, the young are engaged in erotic play. The young woman in the fountain offers her breast yet appears to push away the exploring hand of her young male companion. The directness of his action is repeated by the man in the
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lower right corner. The couple embracing, at upper right, continues this erotic activity—the man fondles the woman’s breast.

Beside the well or spring, at upper right, a young man proclaims his erotic interests by the gesture of hand on knife placed between his legs. The bagpipe, which provides music for the lovers, is employed here for its shape as a symbol of the male genitals, as it was in contemporary literature. The Fountain of Youth by the Master of the Banderoles has thus become, at least in part, a fountain of lust.

Beham’s lovers in the Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse employ similar postures drawing on the fountain of youth and bathhouse pictorial traditions, both of which emphasized the erotic. In the bathhouse scenes, lascivious activities were depicted, including prostitution, that are said to have actually taken place in bathhouses going back to the thirteenth century. In Beham’s Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse woodcut, such erotic behavior is represented in both naturalistic and symbolic fashion.

For example, below Beham’s fountain a man embraces a woman and fondles her breast, as in the engraving by the Master of the Banderoles. The couple lounging on the bed in the Bathhouse half of Sebald’s woodcut similarly shows the man reaching below his companion’s skirts, as in the earlier engraving. The woman wears a matron’s bonnet that indicates her married state, thus compounding the indiscretion represented. At the far right of the woodcut, Beham depicted lovers sharing a drink, embracing, and exchanging amorous glances. In addition, a man offers a drink to a woman who accepts it. He still holds a crutch and is shown beside the second column from the left side of the bathhouse.

The offer of a drink was understood in the sixteenth century to be an erotic invitation, since this gesture was seen in contemporary literature and art as leading to lust. Both Hieronymus Bosch and Heinrich Aldegrever linked wine and lust in their representations of Luxuria in the Prado Tabletop of ca. 1500 (Fig. 3) and engraving of 1549 (Bartsch, 109). Sebastian Brant linked these ideas in his Ship of Fools of 1494:

A man shows no sound reasoning who only drinks for sordid ends,
A drunken man neglects his friends
And knows no prudent moderation,
And drinking leads to fornication.15

Brant was, it needs to be kept in mind, a member of the educated elite, a conservative minority that viewed the behavior of the majority of the German population as in need of reform. It is difficult to imagine that all of Beham’s audience would have responded in the same manner as Brant, that is, viewing the love play in the woodcut solely in moralizing terms. Enjoyment, even titillation, surely played a role in the viewer’s responses to Beham’s woodcut.

Beham included additional references to lascivious behavior. A naked man plays a fiddle as a woman removes her bathing cloth at the upper left of the bathhouse. The term “fiddling” (geigen spielen oder geigen machen) was slang for illicit sexual activity from the thirteenth to seventeenth centuries in both the German language and popular literature, such as carnival plays. “Fiddling” was illustrated with this meaning, for example, in a Bavarian wood relief dated 1511 of a fountain of youth (formerly Berlin, Deutsches Museum). There the man plays a fiddle, indicating his amorous intentions. In Urs Graf’s drawing, Allegory of Fiddling (Basel, Kupferstichkabinett; Fig. 4), the fool’s sexual intentions are depicted in an even clearer fashion. During a period in which the punishment suited the crime in Germany, promiscuous women were fittingly punished in stockades shaped like fiddles. Given this sexual context, it may be possible that the birds over the fountain combine realistic detail with the erotic connotations that vogel ("bird" or "penis") had in the sixteenth century. Indeed, the verb vogeln still means "to bird" or to have sexual intercourse in German.17

On the roof of Sebald’s bathhouse, a fool
holds his bauble at far left. The Master of the Banderoles similarly included a fool, whose presence underscored the folly of the erotic behavior of those newly transformed youthful lovers. Beham’s fool also appears to personify the folly of the quest for youthfulness by the old as well as the folly of seeking erotic love.

Beham reinforced the idea of folly through the inclusion on the right end of the bathhouse roof of a box of feathers, a Northern European reference to fools and folly. Feathers were first included in the fool’s garb around 1520, when the fool’s feather or gouch feather was bestowed upon Venus’s captives by Thomas Murner and Pamphilus Gengenbach in their publications titled Geuchmat (Gouchmat) of ca. 1520. The placement of the feathers in the right half of the woodcut underscores, therefore, the folly of the bathers below who are captive to Venus and to physical love.
The type of fountain used by Beham for his fountain of youth appears to have been popular in South Germany in the first half of the sixteenth century. The fountain, no doubt fueled by natural springs, was represented by Altdorfer in his *Holy Family at the Well* woodcut of ca. 1520 and by an anonymous Bavarian artist in the *Fountain of Youth* of 1511, mentioned above. These employ the type of fountain depicted by Beham with three basins and lion’s-head decoration. Beham’s fountain appears, therefore, to conform to a contemporary type of Renaissance fountain, which he decorated with Renaissance dolphin heads at the base.

The bathers in Beham’s fountain, like the fountain itself and the architecture, are Renaissance in type. Beham departed from tradition by including mostly men in the fountain of youth, muscular Renaissance men. The Master of the Banderoles, by contrast, included women, twice as many women as men to be precise, whose figures are thinner and more Gothic in appearance.

Hans Holbein depicted old and young of both sexes beside each other in his wall painting representing a fountain of youth (Fig. 5) datable to ca. 1517. It was painted for a third-floor hall in Jakob von Hertenstein’s townhouse in Lucern and is no longer extant. The painted copies from the nineteenth century are difficult to read, preventing a good analysis of figure types and activities represented. Holbein appears, nevertheless, to have depicted both the old and rejuvenated of both sexes seated together in his fountain of youth.

Lucas Cranach’s panel painting of 1546 (West Berlin, Gemäldegalerie; Fig. 6) included only old and young women in his fountain of youth. The statue of Venus and Cupid atop the fountain has been seen as an ironic reference to Venus’s powers. The representation of only women in Cranach’s
The folly of rejuvenating the old for sexual purposes was humorously represented by Erhard Schönh in his woodcut dating to ca. 1535 (Fig. 8). Schöhn depicted both old and young men and women in a fountain similar in type to the one represented by Sebald, down to the lion’s-head decoration. The satirical tone of the print is set by the figure on top of the fountain, a fool exposing his genitals topped by a cock’s head. The erotic associations of the bird were well known at the time, and were employed in more subtle fashion by Dürer (see Fig. 14). The fool’s function as manniquin pis adds a distinct note of humor of a more bawdy and popular nature than Cranach’s more restrained Venus. Schöhn’s lusty fool thus fuels the waters of the fountain of youth and produces amorous creatures such as the lovers embracing behind the fountain, in the manner of the bathers in Beham’s Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse woodcut.

Beham’s representation of the Fountain of Youth thus falls well within the standard pictorial tradition of the theme, which satirized the idea that the old could be rejuvenated for love and sex. Beham’s depiction of the fountain of youth coupled with a bathhouse, on the other hand, is unique in the pictorial tradition of fountains of youth. Beham clearly paired fountain and bathhouse because of each subject’s dependency on water. In the late Middle Ages, springs were believed to have fueled the fountain of youth. In the sixteenth century, the springs fueling the fountain of
youth were, according to popular belief, specifically mineral springs with healing properties. The bathhouse Beham chose to represent is an outdoor bath fueled by mineral springs of the spa type visited in 1511 by Lucas Rem, 41 years old, who bathed four to eleven hours daily at Bad Pfeffers. Such baths were used more for their curative powers than for purposes of hygiene. Beham filled his mineral bath, nevertheless, with activities that took place at tub baths or steam baths used for hygiene.

Representations of bathhouses used for cleansing became numerous in the second half of the fifteenth century, and they are believed to reflect the height of popularity of bathing at that time. Bathing was then seen as a pleasure, and was always enjoyed in the presence of others. Singing and music-making had been part of the enjoyment of the bath much earlier, by around the year 800, and by the sixteenth century eating and drinking had also become important aspects of bathing pleasure. At that time, Nuremberg had a dozen public bathhouses and many private ones, not unusual numbers for European cities at the time. In Beham’s woodcut, singing and music-making are shown on the bathhouse gallery while eating, drinking, and conversing are depicted at lower right. Erotic behavior, another enjoyable aspect of the bath, is represented throughout the work, as noted above.

The sexual reputation of bathhouse goings-on was documented as early as the thirteenth century in ordinances and in a poem by Neithart. These stress the sexually responsive services provided by female attendants and other immoral activities. The Master of the Banderoles’ Bathhouse engraving of 1460-70 (Fig. 9) depicted the erotic behavior for which bathhouses had acquired their bad reputations. An edict of 1486 in Breslau, for example, expressly forbade prostitutes from residing in the town’s bathhouses. Co-ed bathing likewise
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had a long history of prohibition, although it appears to have been extremely popular, judging by the works of art over the centuries that document it.30

In Beham’s woodcut the mingling of the bathers proved to play an especially important role and appears to reflect popular custom. Beham capitalized on the erotic appeal of the bathhouse subject, and on the erotic taste of the period, by playing with the various levels of reality within the bathhouse and with the pictorial tradition of the presence of a voyeur in bathhouse representations, noted already by Panofsky.31

The gallery of entertainers and merrymakers on the roof of Beham’s bathhouse may have represented the continuous balustrade around some bath basins, an architectural construction that can be traced back at least to the bath at Baden in 1417.32 This type of bi-level construction appears to have been used at the English royal bath, located at Bath, in the seventeenth century, as represented by Thomas Jonson in his engraving of 1672 (Fig. 10).33 Beham’s print certainly appears to have employed a similar kind of gallery, also documented by Beham’s contemporary Albrecht Altdorfer in a drawing of ca. 1535 (Florence, Uffizi; Fig. 11) that was produced for a wall painting at the bath of the episcopal court at Regensburg, a painting extant today in fragments.34 The embracing lovers and the women bathing, at lower left and right, are now familiar elements in bathhouse scenes.

The potential for eye contact between bathers and onlookers certainly existed in contemporary baths with balconies or galleries. Beham represented this contact, and more, between a young male bather in the fountain and a man on the left part of the gallery.35 The former shoots a clyster at the latter’s backside. This procedure was performed at bathhouses along with bloodletting, leeching, surgery, and other medical services by barbers and surgeons, although certainly in less dramatic fashion than represented here.36 The manner in which Beham introduced the clyster prominently at the center of the composition adds both scatological and humorous notes to his print.

Beham also depicted contact between bathers and viewer. The bather seated on the edge of the bath, just below the scatological element, derives from the oft-quoted river god engraved by Marcantonio Raimondi about 1517-1520 (Fig. 12).37 This figure looks directly at the viewer. Given his naked state, a heightened sense of intimacy is imparted to his gaze that establishes contact with the viewer. The woman who rests her head on her hand in melancholic fashion, on the lower right edge of the bath basin, similarly confronts the viewer with her gaze. The man holding onto the far right column above her, furthermore, peeks at the embracing couple seated above her, as does the woman at the next column. These onlookers are both men and women. Such activity is clearly voyeuristic, serving to heighten the erotic nature of the work, with the voyeurs in the print appearing to function as surrogate for the viewer.

Like the other activities represented in Beham’s Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse, voyeurism had erotic appeal. Voyeurism also had a basis in pictorial tradition that reflected contemporary life. Gengenbach ridiculed voyeuristic activities in his Gouchmat, calling specific attention to the monks and clerics of all ages who hid in corners and peeked into the small windows of Basel’s Malzgasse brothel.38

In art of the time, the voyeuristic potential of women bathing was realized in several additional works on paper from the Nuremberg school. In Dürrer’s drawing of a Women’s Bathhouse dated 1496 (formerly Bremen, Kunsthalle; Fig. 13), a bearded old man peers through the window (upper left) at the women bathing. Dürrer depicted a steam bath with women and a few children indoors, a bath in which the two women in the foreground wear straw bathing hats. Such hats were worn to protect the hair and
facilitate washing, thus serving the same function as the present-day shower cap. In the left bay of Beham’s bathhouse, two women sport the same bathing hats. In Dürer’s drawing, the standing woman represented in near frontal view beats herself with a bundle of twigs, a practice for increasing sweating that was employed more by women bathers than by male bathers. One of Dürer’s women bathers brushes her hair and looks directly at the viewer. The pitcher before her would have been filled with hot water, heated on the oven at upper right, and poured into the wooden tubs scattered throughout the bathroom. Cold water would have been added from the tap, at lower right. The objects represented at the bottom of the drawing and in Beham’s woodcut were also objects used in bathhouses—hairbrush and comb, water tub, and sponge for washing body and hair. The scissors represented in Beham’s print, at lower right, were used for hair cutting by
Figure 14
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barbers, like the one in the small scene over the bath.

The voyeuristic aspect of Düre’s drawings was furthered by the woman at center, who stares directly at the viewer, heightening the work’s eroticism and appeal by identifying viewer with voyeur. This is supported by the old man who peers through the window. These details certainly suggest male viewers interested in naked women and female viewers who identified with the women represented. Although it is generally assumed that viewers in the sixteenth century were male, the subject of viewing and gender remains an unexplored but potentially fruitful avenue for future research.

Düre’s Women’s Bath is believed to have been a design for a woodcut never executed that served as pendant to Düre’s Men’s Bath created about 1496-98 (Fig. 14). The latter represents a bath outdoors for men. Düre included the social side of bathing through the inclusion of drink and music-making and he represented the men in contemporary bathing fashion. They sport breeches or underpants, and like their female counterparts they protect their hair from getting wet with bathing hats, here made of cloth and straw, or they wear their hair on top of their heads. Düre added a humorous note by placing a rooster or cock atop the long water spout next to the man leaning on the post, who has often been identified as the artist himself. This “cock” device was also used in Schön’s fountain of youth woodcut (see Fig. 8) in more blatant fashion. Although the gaze of the man behind the bathhouse wall suggests voyeurism, his presence in no way imparts a similar energy or tension to that of the voyeur in Düre’s women’s bath, where a lone male peeks at a female bath company.

Beham also designed a Women’s Bath woodcut of about 1543 (Fig. 15). Here women bathe indoors alongside children, in the manner of the bathers in Düre’s drawing. New here is the presence of a male bathhouse attendant and the spiked device he offers the woman who has been cupped, a service regularly requested in bathhouses to further circulation and in real life provided by male bathhouse attendants. Judging from the woman’s gesture—she points to her cupped arm—she appears to discuss the attendant’s offer of the spiked device in relation to the cups. Although no voyeur is included in Beham’s composition, the frame and round form suggest that the viewer is voyeur by looking through a window. The male bathhouse attendant may, furthermore, have served a similar titillating function as the only man present. Finally, Beham clearly exploited the erotic potential of this group of women bathing when he posed the woman seated above the playing children. Her bathing cloth draws attention to her exposed genitals, which Janey Levy has also written about. Her pose can be generally compared to that of the woman crouching at the edge of Beham’s outdoor bathhouse (see Fig. 1).

Two additional bathhouse prints from the Nuremberg school continue to exploit the voyeuristic potential of the bathhouse. In a woodcut attributed to Sebald Beham from about 1543 (Fig. 16) that represents a women’s
bath, Dürer’s drawing of the subject is represented, albeit freely, in reverse. The four figures at left, the room, and its appointments derive directly from Dürer. A woman washing the back of the mountainous woman, at lower left in the Beham print, stares at the viewer as in Dürer’s drawing, but the slightly flirtatious smile of Dürer’s figure has been marred by crude cutting in the Beham work. The bearded man peering through the window at right, although represented less subtly, adds a prurient twist with his voyeurism, suggesting once again that the viewer is male.

Virgil Solis’s engraving of a Bathhouse Waiting Room (Fig. 17) caps the Nuremberg bathhouse prints created by Dürer and Beham. The Solis print was executed about mid-century, perhaps after a lost drawing by Heinrich Aldegren, whose monogram appears on a large cartellino below the stairway. The clothed woman on the stairs appears to point to the monogram or to the bathing hats on the ledge below, thus
Figure 17
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appearing to be part of the same self-referential play between work and audience present in Dürrer's *Women's Bath* and Beham’s *Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse*.

A swarm of men, women, and children fill Solis’s bathhouse waiting room and appear to pass the time as they wait their turns for the bath. They talk, relax on the floor, embrace, and are shaved beside the window, as in Beham’s woodcut. The woman in Solis’s print walking gingerly over the only embracing couple points to their sensuously entwined bodies while confronting the viewer with her gaze, made all the more poignant by her nakedness.48 Directly above her head, the face of a bearded male stares in the direction of the viewer. This raises the question of whether it is significant that the man is, once again, bearded, if not old as in the other Nuremberg bathhouse prints (Figs. 13 and 15). As did Solis, Beham represented bathers in his *Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse* who view other bathers: men who view lovers, a woman who views and interrupts lovers, and a man, copied from Marcantonio, who confronts the viewer directly with his gaze.

Contemporary representations of bathhouses produced for known locations suggest that impressions of Sebald’s *Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse* could have hung in bathhouses or private homes, if not in other locations. Altdorfer’s wall painting (Fig. 11) was produced for the bath of the bishop’s court at Regensburg. It was commissioned by Johann, Count Palatine, in his capacity as administrator of the bishopric of Regensburg. Reflections of Johann’s reputedly sumptuous and wasteful lifestyle, which was compared by a contemporary to that of the Roman Lucullus, may be difficult for the modern viewer to recognize in Altdorfer’s work.49 Altdorfer’s wall painting shows women bathing and lovers embracing, as in Beham’s woodcut.

Holbein’s now destroyed wall painting of a fountain of youth (Fig. 5) was painted for the private home of Jakob von Hertenstein in Lucern. Hertenstein was chief magistrate of Lucern and a wholesale merchant.50 His interests and those of Holbein clearly led the artist to emphasize the folly of the old over the erotic, as in Beham’s woodcut representing two fools being carried on a litter.

One final wall painting that bears a striking resemblance to Sebald Beham’s *Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse* woodcut was executed for the waiting room of Philippine Welser (the learned wife of Archduke Ferdinand) at Schloss Ambras outside Innsbruck (Fig. 18).51 These wall paintings depicting bath scenes and a fountain of youth were made for private viewing in the bathhouse of a bishop and in the private homes of wealthy merchant families and members of the nobility. Beham’s large *Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse* on paper could easily have served a similar function in Nuremberg’s public and private baths. As mentioned earlier, these numbered some dozen public baths with private baths increasing in number during the sixteenth century due to the spread of syphilis. Beham’s woodcut could, thus, have served as wall decoration seen by all classes in Nuremberg’s public baths and by burghers and craftsmen in their own homes. Such large woodcuts have been shown to have been glued or tacked onto walls over wainscoting in the houses of well-to-do burghers; the Oxford impression, with its delicate color and elaborate text printed on separate paper, suggests higher quality, and thus more expensive work, than the plainer uncolored impression in West Berlin, which lacks the text. Beham’s *Large Kermis* woodcut (Fig. 19) I have shown elsewhere to have been hung in similar locations, as well as on the walls of inns.52

The text in twelve columns below the *Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse* reflects the popular tastes of such a broad audience. Parts of the text agree with Sachs’s farce of the preceding year described at the beginning of this paper, including the belief that the
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fountain of youth was imaginary. The text identifies Glockendon as the author (col. 12) and begins with the introduction of what is called a wonderful bath, which no one has ever seen, a bath called Gungel brunn or Gungel fountain, where ailments of all kinds are cured. As in Sach's Schlaraffenland, pancakes cover the houses and gingerbread the walls and fences, while Schweinebraten form the beams. The bath rejuvenates the male member, and beautiful women enjoy bathing there.

Glockendon's text and Beham's woodcut have several general points of agreement. Glockendon includes a miraculous fountain in which the sick and lame are healed, sexual innuendo in the description of the root and curative effect of the bath on the male member, scatological passages including the peasant woman who defecates, the representation of beautiful young women, and a moralizing note against amusements and for good works, which will earn one God's eternal grace.

Only one detail in the woodcut corresponds exactly with the text. The woman carried on the back of her companion into the fountain of youth, at upper left, defecates in the same manner detailed graphically in the text. In the right half of Beham's woodcut, the small-breasted women appear to agree with Glockendon's description of female beauties at the bath. The fool and feathers on the bathhouse gallery, in addition, point to the moralizing veneer for the bathhouse activities depicted; the Beham image, however, lacks Glockendon's Reformation appeal to good works for the poor. The correspondence between woodcut and text is, therefore, at best general. The text, moreover, complements the woodcut with its sensual appeals of all kinds. (The text is summarized in the Appendix.)

Sebald's Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse and Large Kermis are similar in size and composition and provide a useful comparison that furthers our understanding of Beham's visual vocabulary on a number of counts.

Both woodcuts were printed on four large sheets of paper side by side in the years 1531 and 1535 by Albrecht Glockendon at Nuremberg, and each employs prominent scatological elements at the center of the composition.

In the Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse, the clyster jet unifies the two halves of the composition. Beham also added another scatological element of the woman urinating at the bathhouse edge, which is included only in the impression at Oxford. This detail is underscored by the man placing a small pan beneath her, which draws attention to her activity. In the Large Kermis, Beham included a peasant who has drunk to excess and who is accompanied by a canine companion. This group visualizes a popular expression for inebriation, the "drunken matins," described in the Proverbs of 1541 by Sebastian Franck exactly as depicted by Beham. Franck was
Sebald's brother-in-law. The expression was also represented on the title page of a pamphlet, probably printed in the 1530s at Nuremberg (Fig. 20), which identified the expression by name and represented it in the form of woodcut illustration. In the Large Kermis, Sebald also included a mound of excrement to the left of the inn. In both the Large Kermis and Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse, the scatological appears to have served as humorous enticement. In the Large Kermis, the proverb depicted also served the moralizing purpose of warning against the effect of too much drink.

Sebald employed additional devices that help unify his woodcut compositions. In each he employed pointing and an embracing couple. In the Fountain of Youth, a woman taps the couple embracing under the fountain. In the Large Kermis, a similar couple, this time fully clothed, points out for the audience the dentist's assistant who is robbing the patient.

In the Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse and the Large Kermis, Sebald has repeated the central idea in many forms throughout the composition. In the Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse, he stressed the erotic through embrace, more direct forms of touching, and through the visualization of the expression “fiddling.” In the Large Kermis, excessive drinking is underscored by the drunken peasant, by the expression “drunken matins” employing the dog, by the grapevine referring to wine directly above, and by the wild boar or pig carried at lower left that represented gluttony in contemporary art.

Beham also stressed the learned, in particular the classical tradition, by quoting Virgil in the inscription below another kermis woodcut. In the Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse, Beham’s learned quotations are visual rather than textual or linguistic, deriving from the classically inspired prints of Marcantonio Raimondi.

The repetition of a central idea in a variety of ways is also characteristic of contemporary legislation issued in Nuremberg, where the authorities attempted to control behavior at local kermises. Such sources demonstrate that Beham worked in a manner fully in keeping with sixteenth-century modes of expression. Although similar legislation from Nuremberg contemporary with Beham’s Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse exists for bathhouses, it does not prove helpful for Beham’s woodcut. The laws issued in Nuremberg attempt to limit access to public steam baths because of illnesses spread by sweating in a time of plague. Beham’s Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse is certainly not a steam bath, and it includes no references to bathhouses as carriers or spreaders of the plague that I have been able to find, although there may be subtle references in the flowers and the bloodletting at lower right.

Sebald Beham’s Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse and his Large Kermis functioned as popular forms of entertainment. They amused and titillated their audiences by stressing sexual acts and bodily functions, by recording contemporary customs, objects, and popular expressions, by quoting from learned texts and prints, and by adding a moralizing note to the amusements represented. Understood on several levels, Beham’s Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse and his Large Kermis were well suited to decorate the walls of public and private baths and inns, and other centers of socializing and entertainment, in Nuremberg during the decades surrounding Dürer’s death.

Appendix: The Text Below Sebald Beham’s Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse Woodcut

The text begins with the introduction of a wonderful bath, which no one has ever seen, and discusses its numerous virtues. The bath, called Gangel fountain, cures ailments of all kinds, including weakness of body and severed limbs, which will grow back after contact with the miraculous waters. Pancakes cover the houses, gingerbread covers the walls and fences, and schweinebraten cover the beams. The text goes on:
In each house a fountain gushes forth Malmsey wine and good wine flows through the streets. The houses have fine gardens with fruit of all kinds and fences of \textit{bratwurst}. The rain is made of cream and the hail sugared almonds; the large lakes are stocked with fish cooked to perfection.

Those who like to gamble will find it enjoyable, for as much as you lose you will win back. A good liar is rewarded three gulden per lie, and whoever lies with a beautiful woman receives twenty gulden in payment; whoever lies with a virgin, twice as much.

I, Albrecht Glockendon, do not therefore wish to stay and will quickly make my way. Whoever wants to have fun should come along and not look back. I invite you sweet, young, fine women to the bath to cool your young hearts and expel pain. And to all those who want to become pregnant, I give them fertility.

All who would like to get pregnant can try a root that grows freely in the Netherlands, under many names, and serves both rich and poor. Remember which root is the best when you take it in your hand. It moves like a worm, has a form like a liverwurst, is pointed like a carrot, and is by nature damp and hot. Remember sweet girls and young women, that cold streams serve the root well, and whoever gives it to you should tell you how and when to take it. Many women praise it as red gold. The bath is noble—in it limbs grow back, the lame and ailments are healed, including those of the eyes, noses, feet, and hands. The bath reduces all defects and rashes, including one nose that constantly dripped snot down over the mouth.

He who is lacking in his eleventh finger should bathe in the bath, for it will make him fresh, hard, long, and straight. It will renew so wonderfully that many a young woman will be happy. The bath is very noble for shitting, as I myself have seen—a peasant woman was carried to the bath on a man's back. She constantly shat some 100 maggots at once onto her legs and shirt and farted until her arse was sore and she wailed. She beshat all the walls in her house such that it appeared the pig celebrated its wedding, as her husband said. He brought her to the fountain and let her bathe and her maladies disappeared. In addition, a 100-year-old woman gained a youthful body and resembled my lover, on whom the sun never shines, she is so chastely white. She is meek and walks quietly, is friendly and wise; she stands in the bloom of youth, and is very virtuous. Her faith in God and me is simple and unquestioning. She is moderate, just, careful, industrious. Her beauty includes long golden hair and brown eyes.

Her eyebrows are perfect, her cheeks like alabaster, her ears and nose the right size and shape, her nose pointed yet slightly curved, her small mouth red like a ruby, her teeth snow white, her neck is also white and her chin cleft. Her hands are white as ermine, her fingers long and noble, her arms white as are her small breasts. She has small beautiful veins that are blue in color and as thin as a strand of hair. Above she has two small nipples that couldn't be finer. Her belly is round and as white as chalk. More noble legs and more beautiful feet and knees I've never seen. If one goes to a bath with such a woman, he will certainly not suffer. If he embraces and kisses her and does not truly enjoy it, he is a sad man.

No one is worthy of such a woman who does not praise and honor all women. For whoever honors them is intelligent and honors the maid who carried God. I wish them happiness and good luck. All joy has a sad end; instantaneously we may be forced to leave all earthly goods, which help us not at all. We live but a short time filled with anxiety and bitterness.

Yet many a wealthy person does not accept this truth and causes himself eternal sorrow. He has temporal pleasure with a variety of amusements, forgetting thereby the poor. He does not consider what happened to the rich man, who, seeing the hungry and sick Lazarus before him, denied
him the crumbs of bread on his table that he gave to his dog. He suffered severe punishment. I advise you to feed the poor, console and clothe them, and God will have mercy on you. For what we have done here for the poor, God accepts as if we had done it for Him. Albrecht Glockendon, who wrote this verse, wishes you God’s grace at the Last Judgment.

Albrecht Glockendon Publisher 1531.

Notes
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22. Geiberg, 1585. For the accompanying woodcut of a Rejuvenating Furnace for Men of ca. 1540 (Gotha, Schlossmuseum), see Geiberg, 1584.

23. Martin, 224-227; 224 for the 16th-century view that mineral springs fueled the fountain of youth. On natural springs, see Lorenz Fries, Tractat der Wildbnder (Strasbourg, 1519). The frontispiece includes a woodcut showing a fool and bathers. For an illustration, see Kraus catalogue 91, no. 51, and Fig. 23. Walter Gibson kindly provided me with this citation. For a related
woodcut by Sebald Beham, see his Bathing Party (Pauli, 1220) from the Spiegel und Regiment der Gesundheit (Frankfurt am Main, 1544), title page, and the Bancket der Hofe und Edelleute (Frankfurt am Main, 1551). Aldegrever engraved a similar composition (Hollstein, 44) of The Rich Man at the Table, from the series of 1554 about the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus.
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29. Martin, 86.

30. Martin, 85. For the Master of the Banderoles’ print, see Lehrs, 4:99 and Hollstein, 12:72.


35. The person on the gallery has male genitals, but hair long enough to be a woman’s.


38. Andersson, 122, cites Gengenbach’s German.


40. Von Bock, 15, for the bundle of twigs (Wedel). To increase circulation, bloodletting and cupping were employed. See von Bock, 17, 20, and the text above for Beham’s Women’s Bath of ca. 1535.

41. The flowers strewn on the ledge at lower right may be roses, and the man holding his nose nearby to the left may be bleeding himself. Magdalena Paumgartner, living in late 16th-century Nuremberg, recommended frequent bathing with sweet-smelling rosewater to avoid the plague. See Ozment, 17. On the rose, see also Stewart, Unequal Lovers, 57, for possible erotic associations. The man at lower right in Beham’s Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse woodcut, third day from the right, holds a flower, perhaps a carnation, which has traditionally been related to betrothal and matrimony. See Stewart, Unequal Lovers, 93, and more recently, Keith P. F. Moxey. “Chivalry and the Housebook Master,” Livelier than Life, the Master of the Amsterdam Cabinet or the Housebook Master, ca. 1470-1500, J. P. Filet Kok, ed. (Amsterdam: Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, 1985), 66.

For the 16th-century belief that the plague could be avoided through frequent bathing with rosewater, bloodletting, sobriety, eating and drinking in moderation, and abstinence from sexual relations, see Ozment, 117-118.

For a representation of a woman brushing her hair with a brush like the one depicted in Dürrer’s Women’s Bathhouse, see Dürrer’s drawing in the Uffizi used as decoration for a casket end, discussed recently by Rowlands, Age of Dürrer, no. 63b, with bibliography.

42. For Dürrer’s Men’s Bath (Bartsch, 128), see Smith, Nuremberg, 98, and Dürrer in America, no. 84, where the various interpretations are reviewed.

43. For Sebald Beham’s Women’s Bath woodcut (Pauli, 1223, and Geisberg, 267), see Smith, Nuremberg, 267.

44. Von Bock, 17. For female attendants and other women employed in bathhouses, see Merry Wiesner,

51. This wall painting was brought to my attention recently. A full analysis of it must await another occasion.

52. For the paintings of Francis I having bath-related subjects and that were hung in his bath at Fontainebleau, see Janet Cox-Rearick, *La Collection de François Ier* (Paris, 1972), discussed after cat. no. 7. I am grateful to Myra Orth for offering this reference and information about Francis’ bath. For the use of large prints over wainscoting, see Horst Appuhn and Christian von Heusinger, *Riesenholzschnitte und Papiertapeten der Renaissance* (Unterschneidheim, 1976), 106f. Keith P. F. Moxey also discusses the large woodcut as a wall hanging in his “Sebald Beham’s church anniversary holidays: festive peasants as instruments of repressive humor,” *Simiolus* 12 (1981-1982): 129. For a discussion of the prints as wall decoration, including at Inns, see Stewart, *Peasant Festivals*, 162. On the kerms woodcuts by Sebald Beham and his brother Barthel, see Stewart, *Peasant Festivals*, ch. 2. Sebald Beham’s *Large Kerms* is Bartsch, 168.

53. Gungel may have been a place name. It is not listed in Grimm, or in Alfred Götzte, *Friühneuhochdeutsches Glossar*, 7th ed. (Berlin, 1967).

Gunkel was Franconian for distaff (Kunkel); see Götzte, 113. For Gümmpel in a text by Sachs, *Nasentanz zu Gümmpelsbrunn*, see Stewart, *First “Peasant Festivals,”* 172. Gümmpel referred to the bullfinch, fool, penis, and to a large red nose, after the color of the bullfinch.

54. I am grateful to David Landau, Oxford, for having pointed out the detail of the woman urinating in the *Fountain of Youth-Bathhouse* impression at Oxford during the early 1980s.

Franck’s “drunken matins” (*die truncken Metten*) was cited in slight variation from the original by Grimm, vol. 6, col. 2147. For the original, see Sebastian Franck, *Sprichwörter* (Frankfurt am Main: Christian Egenolff, 1541), pt. 2, f. 148r (Staatsbibliothek München, 4* L. eleg. m. 79):

O das ist daß ein grosse ehr, wer eh feier abent macht, vnd den wist her ausz thät, der ist sater hochs marter ein gütt gesel, seines leibs ein held, er darff doch in stich sitzen, vnd einem gütt gesellen vnd weinhelden eines gretenart, bizsß dasß in der Bachus (So noch stierker ist das er, vnd nit gern mit jm zergobl scharzten lasst) unter die banck wifft, de er anfahet die truncken mettin mit den langen noten zu singen, dasß all hund vnd sew zulauffen, vnd sich des gesangs vnd der mettin frewen.

This expression captured by Franck clearly reflected one popular in the 15th century, if not earlier. The “drunken matsins” was illustrated on the title page woodcut of a drinking tract of 1505 and in Hans Weiditz’s colored woodcut, *Satire of an Abbot*, with text, both dating probably to the 1530s. In the latter, a fat abbot sits in a horse’s jawbone, which is pushed across ice by nuns. The text explains that the abbot, who is very cold, wishes to be pulled off the ice and drink with the others, after which they will sing the drunken matsins.

For the woodcut of ca. 1505, see Dialogismus Hieronymi Emser de origine propinandi vulgo comptandi . . . (Leipzig: Melchior Lotter, 1505). See Paul Hohenemser, ed., *Flugschriftensammlung Gustav Freytag* (Frankfurt am Main, 1925), 64, no. 829. The Freytag Collection is now available on microfiche, with illustrations. See *Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Frankfurt am Main*. *Flugschriftensammlung Gustav Freytag*, 746 microfiches
(Munich and New York, 1980-81). For the Weiditz, see Heinrich Röttinger, "Neues zum Werke Hans Weiditz," Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vorzüglichende Kunst, Beilage der Graphischen Künste, vol. 2 (1911): 50, no. 9. The latter is only partially readable in Stewart, Peasant Festivals, Fig. 65.

55. Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica. A photocopy in the Volksliedarchiv, Freiburg im Breisgau, provided the initial evidence that culminated in the uniting of proverb and image.

56. See, for example, Erhard Schön’s anamorphic woodcut, What do you See (Was Siehst du) of 1538 (Röttinger, 203), in which a defecating man is represented below Jonah emerging from the whale. This print wittily compares the expulsion of Jonah with that of the most ordinary physical kind, in the manner of what Mikhail Bakhtin for Rabelais calls the “material bodily lower stratum” and the substitution of the upper parts of the body by the lower parts, in a manner “lighter in the bodily sense.” See Mikhail Bakhtin, Rabelais and His World, trans. Helene Iswolsky (Cambridge, 1965), ch. 6, 368-436, esp. 377 and 380. For the Schön woodcut, see Michael Schuyt and Joost Elffers, Anamorphoses. Games of Perception and Illusion in Art (New York, 1975), Fig. 8.

57. For the pig as an emblem of gluttony, see Hans Burgkmair’s woodcut of 1512 (Bartsch, 59) and Altdorfer’s engraving of 1549 (Bartsch, 109), illustrated in Stewart, Peasant Festivals, Figs. 68 and 67.

58. Sebald’s Kermis (Oxford) includes the following inscription from Virgil’s Georgics, below the image: “Ah too fortunate the peasants, if they were to know their blessings!” (“O fortunatos nimium/sua si bona norint/ Agricolas”). This passage derives from book II, lines 438-459. See H. Rushton Fairclough, trans., Virgil, The Loeb Classical Library, rev. ed., vol. 63 (London, 1978), 149. Parshall discusses the visual quotations from Marcantonio in detail in his essay in the present collection of studies.

59. For the minutes and printed mandates of Nuremberg’s town council, see Stewart, Peasant Festivals, 109-116.