

HNA in Amsterdam - "Crossing Boundaries"

Workshop Summaries

Rethinking Riegl

Jane Carroll
jane.carroll@dartmouth.edu

Alison Stewart
astewart1@unl.edu

In 1902, Alois Riegl wrote the *Urquelle* for all subsequent studies of Northern European group portraits, *Das holländische Gruppenporträt*. In that work, Riegl expanded art history beyond the contemporary emphasis on formalism and stylistic evolution. Drawing upon his interest in the relationship of objects within a work, Riegl asked his readers to expand that idea to include the viewer of art as an active participant in the understanding of visual works, an element he called “attentiveness.” In short, Riegl's book crossed the accepted boundary of what art history could consider and made viewing art a living exchange between present and past, and between viewer and object. Since its publication, all who have dealt with group portraiture have had to come into dialogue with Riegl's book.

In 1999, the Getty responded to a revived interest in Riegl's theories and republished *The Group Portraiture of Holland* in a new translation with historical introduction by Wolfgang Kemp. This reissuing increased the accessibility of Riegl's work and reintroduced him to new generations of art historians. Prompted by that volume, we would like to gather together a group of scholars before the extensive collection of group portraits in the Amsterdams Historisch Museum. The venue of their Great Hall seems a perfect spot in which to reexamine the larger claims of Riegl's work, and discuss current understandings of Dutch group portraiture. In keeping with the conference theme, we will explore how this genre crosses such boundaries as public vs. private sphere, personal vs. group identity, or painted vs. inhabited space.

Format

Amsterdam Historisch Museum

In The Civic Guard Gallery

- Welcome
How the workshop came about and our goal (Alison, 2-3 minutes)
- Plan
Overview of workshop organization and what each speaker will be addressing (Jane, 2-3 minutes)

- Tour
Norbert Middelkoop, Curator of Paintings at the Amsterdam Historisch Museum, offers a tour of select group portraits in The Civic Guard Gallery and in the museum (c. 30 minutes).
- Discussion followed. (c. 15 minutes)

In a seminar room

Over coffee and tea, with a digital projector

Presentations:

Each speaker was introduced briefly and then spoke for maximum of 10 min. with slides.

1. Early portraits and Riegl
Laura Gelfand, Associate Dean of the Honors College, University of Akron, and Associate Professor where she has taught Northern Renaissance Art.
Idea of group identity developing and question of religious intent
 2. 17th-century group portraits and Riegl
Anne Jensen Adams, Professor of Northern Baroque Art, University of California-Santa Barbara
Questions of group identity and Riegl's use of the active observer
- Discussion followed. (c. 40 minutes)

Pictura and Emblemata in the Works of Otto van Veen and His Contemporaries

Ralph Dekoninck

ralph.dekoninck@uclouvain.be

Walter S. Melion

walter.melion@emory.edu

Whereas the scholarship on Otto van Veen (ca. 1551-1629) has largely focused on his association with Peter Paul Rubens, who would seem to have emulated him in significant ways (Justus Müller Hofstede), this workshop examined the image theory underlying his accomplishments as emblemist and altarpiece painter. Introductory remarks by Walter Melion summarized the state of research, calling attention to the artist's distinctive courtly appointments as *ingénieur du chateau* in Antwerp and *guardain de la monnoye de leurs altezes* in Brussels (Sabine van Sprang), to his inventive use of Jesuit-based penitential imagery in the *Meerseniens Altarpiece* of 1605-1607 and the *Carrying of the Cross Altarpiece* of ca. 1610 (Stefaan Grieten and Walter Melion), and to his novel allegorical staging of emblematic metaphors in the *Amoris divini emblemata* of 1615 (Anne Buschoff, Margit Thøfner, and Peter Boot). Melion closed with a short account of Van Veen's *Entombment* of ca. 1600, engraved by

Hieronymus Wierix, that exemplifies what might justly be called his method of visual exegesis, operative in the emblem books and altarpieces and especially evident in their joint reliance upon figurative analogy.

There followed brief presentations on work in progress by seven leading scholars. Ralph Dekoninck spoke on Van Veen's Paracelsan theory of the imagination, as outlined in his *Physicae et theologicae conclusiones* of 1621 and amplified in the *Life of Thomas Aquinas* series of 1610. Tine Meganck discussed Abraham Ortelius's comparison of Van Veen and Pamphilius, as this relates to the principle of *imitatio naturae naturantis* that seems to have been fundamental to the artist. Ulrich Heinen showed how frequently Rubens made use of Van Veen's emblematic figures (though not necessarily his emblematic arguments) when formulating pictorial subjects of all kinds – religious, historical, and allegorical. Margit Thøfner demonstrated how the *Emblemata Horatiana* of 1607 provides a rich source of pictorial precepts pertaining to the form and function of religious imagery and to the relation between pictorial and emblematic usage. Nathalie Jalladeau offered an account of the relation between divine and profane love, a theme to which Van Veen returned frequently in his paintings and emblem books. Emilie Granjon reported on the process of alchemical translation in the *Conclusiones* of 1621, as it is set out by means of images, letters, and signs. Finally, Agnes Guiderdoni-Bruslé outlined the different kinds of figurative element at play in Van Veen's emblematic language: drawn image, geometrical diagram, emblematic *figure parlante*, symbolic motif, and biblical figure. The discussion that ensued was rich and lively.

Locating Jan Lievens: New Perspectives on the Master and his Peers after 400 Years

Jacquelyn N. Coutré
jacquelyn.coutre@nyu.edu

Lloyd DeWitt
ldewitt@philamuseum.org

This workshop aimed to reposition and redefine Lievens's relationships with his seventeenth-century colleagues from a variety of standpoints. A fascinating paradigm of expressive multiplicity, itinerancy and shifting identity on the art market, Lievens transcended geographic and stylistic boundaries in ways that have yet to be fully contextualized. His oeuvre and legacy warranted a thorough reconsideration in light of the recent international exhibition, in which paintings, drawings and prints by the artist were unified for the first time without comparative works by other artists.

Highlighting the variety visible in his production, five scholars presented short talks as instruments of guided discussion. Lloyd DeWitt spoke about discerning authorship in the early drawings of Lievens and Rembrandt, particularly in light of surface and depth as rendered in different media. Bernhard Schnackenburg's paper, delivered by Lloyd

DeWitt, explored Lievens's eclectic beginnings as an artist, suggesting that in addition to Utrecht, Haarlem—particularly the multifaceted art of Pieter de Grebber—was an important source of inspiration. Stephanie Dickey presented a summary of recent research on Lievens as a printmaker: questions still remain about the scope of his oeuvre and the nature of his collaboration with other printmakers and publishers, especially in Antwerp. Amy Golahny considered Lievens's use of texts in the process of creation, comparing seventeenth-century authors' descriptions of his engagement with the written word with analysis of the fidelity of his paintings and drawings to the original texts. Jacquelyn N. Coutré offered a new reading of Lievens's painting of Mars in the former assembly chamber of the States of Holland and West Friesland, contextualizing it within the politics of the First Stadholderless Period and suggesting a renewed familiarity between Lievens and Gerard Honthorst.

Through the participation of the informed audience, a number of fruitful questions were raised, such as: the patrons of Lievens's early tronies and the nature of their "consumption" of them; the role Lievens's prints played in his social network; his contribution to the revival of the woodcut in the late 1630s and early 1640s; why Lievens favored the visual tradition over the written text in certain circumstances; the role that the publishing world and the book market in Leiden had on Lievens's work; and the nature of Lievens's renewed contacts with artists upon his return to Amsterdam in 1644. Speakers and audience members alike agreed that Lievens remains an artist rich in future research opportunities.

Netherlandish Art and "the reality effect": Where are we now?

Stephanie Dickey
dickey.ss@gmail.com

Wayne Franits
wefranit@syr.edu

Discussion leaders:

- Celeste Brusati, University of Michigan
- Stephanie Dickey, Queen's University
- Wayne Franits, Syracuse University
- Bret Rothstein, Indiana University
- Eric Jan Sluijter, University of Amsterdam
- Claudia Swan, Northwestern University

The goal of this workshop was to promote critical reflection on the current state of research into the relationship between Netherlandish art and the 'visible world'. How can we best define the complex relationship between nature and strategies of representation? What are the questions we should be asking? By what methodologies can the representation of "reality" in Dutch art best be studied and understood? These

questions generated lively discussion that concluded with the view that both the nature of representation and the representation of nature are still in need of critical investigation. Presentations were structured around examples drawn from early Netherlandish art as well as Dutch 17th-century portraiture, genre and still life painting. A reading list was circulated in advance that included the following publications: C. Brusati, "Reforming Idols and Viewing History in Pieter Saenredam's Perspectives," in M. Cole and R. Zorach, eds., *The Idol in the Age of Art: objects, devotions, and the early modern world*, Aldershot 2009; Roger de Piles, anecdote concerning Rembrandt's painting of a kitchen maid in *Cours de peinture par principes* (Eng. ed., *The Principles of Painting*, London, 1743, Preface, pp. 6-7) and related readings: Seymour Slive, *Rembrandt and his Critics 1630-1730*, The Hague 1953, pp. 129-131; Thomas Puttfarcken, *Roger de Piles' Theory of Art*, New Haven 1985, pp. 46-53, 88-92; Michiel Roscam Abbing, *Rembrandt toont zijn konst: bijdragen over Rembrandt-documenten uit de periode 1648-1756* (Academische proefschrift), Leiden 1999, Eng. summary pp. 242-243 (for Dutch readers, Chap. 3, pp. 89-127, is recommended); Lyckle De Vries, selections from his forthcoming introduction to Gerard de Lairese's *Groot Schilderboek* (1711), in press, used here by kind permission of the author; Julie Berger Hochstrasser, *Still Life and Trade in the Dutch Golden Age*, New Haven 2007, Chapter 8 and Conclusion; Elizabeth Honig, "The space of gender in seventeenth-century Dutch painting," in W. Franits, ed., *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*, Cambridge 1997; Peter Parshall, "Imago contrafacta: images and facts in the Northern Renaissance," *Art History* 16:4 (Dec. 1993), pp. 554-579; Bret Rothstein, *Sight and Spirituality in Early Netherlandish Painting*, Cambridge 2005, Chap. 4, esp. pp. 138-160; Eric Jan Sluijter, *Rembrandt and the Female Nude*, Amsterdam 2006, pp. 151-153, 206-212, 311-316.

Crossing to the Other Side: The Mediating Role of Epitaphs

Barbara Haeger
haeger.1@osu.edu

Description:

This workshop explored the varied means used by epitaphs and sepulchral monuments to present the threshold between this world and the next and to anticipate and/or make visible the crossing of it. As objects that provided the beholder with an image or images intended both to function in the present and to provide an intimation of divine revelation, many epitaphs served to mobilize the beholder's spiritual senses and longing for the divine, enabling him/her to gain a temporal glimpse of God, a glimpse that foreshadows seeing God "face to face" in eternity. In considering these and related works particular attention was paid to the various strategies employed to depict the crossing over from the realm of the visible to that of the envisioned, from the corporeal to the spiritual and, by implication, from the temporal to the eternal. In this context we discussed how some epitaphs explicitly make visible the process of mediation between

temporal and eternal. Triptychs especially lend themselves to this purpose as they allow for the presentation of multiple realms and actively unfold in time and space.

Consequently, we explored how at least one triptych marks thresholds, envisions their crossing, and addresses the beholder. Additional issues included the degree to which medium and format affect the mediating properties of a work, the nature of the conventions adhered to by a particular type of epitaph, or the way that features such as architectural frameworks and other markers of liminal zones get adapted as they migrate from sculpture to painting.

Preparation:

Participants were sent pdfs of the following and requested to read the first four essays. The readings, each accompanied by brief rationale, were chosen to provide a basis for considering the relationship among theories of vision, meditative practice, mysteries of the incarnation, and representations of Christ – the image of the invisible God and mediator between the temporal and eternal.

Assigned readings and brief accompanying rationale:

Carol Purtle, “The Context of Jan van Eyck’s Approach to the Thyssen Annunciation Diptych,” in: John Oliver Hand and Ron Spronk (eds.) *Essays in Context: Unfolding the Netherlandish Diptych*, pp. 73-83. Purtle makes a convincing case for the memorial function of the work and connects the painting with the biblical passage that figures so prominently in discussions of vision as experienced in time and beyond time: “We see now through a darkened mirror: then, however face to face” (I Corinthians 13:12).

Carol Purtle, “Conclusion” in *The Marian Paintings of Jan van Eyck*, pp. 168-73. This text, which Purtle cites in her discussion of the diptych, considers what she describes as Van Eyck's complementary interests in the moment of the entrance of God into human history and the final reality of the eternal kingdom.

Margaret R. Miles, “Vision: The Eye of the Body and the Eye of the Mind in Saint Augustine’s *De trinitate* and *Confessions*,” *Journal of Religion*, 63 (1983): 125-142. In her illuminating consideration of Augustine's differentiation of the glimpse and the gaze as ways that one “sees God.” Miles, like Purtle, discusses I Corinthians 13:12.

Lynn F. Jacobs, “Rubens and the Northern Past: The *Michielsen Triptych* and the Thresholds of Modernity,” *The Art Bulletin* 91(2009): 502-524. This article explicitly addresses the use of what Jacobs calls the miraculous threshold to connect disparate spaces and disparate times within the triptych format.

Supplementary reading:

Douglas Brine, “Evidence for the Forms and Usage of Early Netherlandish Memorial Paintings,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*.

Barbara Haeger, “Rubens’s *Rockox Triptych*: Sight Meditation, and the Justification of Images,” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, 2006 (volume 55: *Rubens and the Netherlands*): 117-153. Should you decide to read any portion of this, focus on pages 123-141.

Workshop structure:

The workshop included two presentations.

The organizer first provided an introduction that considered some key issues raised in the readings and then focused on two epitaphs by Rubens in which the mediating roles of the image and of Christ are explicitly addressed: the *Rockox Triptych* and Saint Gregory, surrounded by saints, venerates the miraculous image of the *Madonna and Child* (originally intended as an altarpiece that also served as an epitaph). Here it should be noted that discussion of the latter was based on Ilse von zur Mühlen’s indispensable study: *Bild und Vision*.

Jeffrey Chipps Smith explored a trio of epitaphs and a tomb commissioned by Cardinal Albrecht von Brandenburg. His fascinating presentation of these sixteenth-century sculptures provided an important addition to the other objects being considered: Flemish paintings of the 15th and 17th centuries. More significantly, his exploration of the cardinal’s imagined perpetual contemplation of sacred images and objects provided by the tomb’s baldachin and intended setting added another dimension to the workshop and stimulated a great deal of discussion.

The rest of the workshop was given over to a wide-ranging discussion that tended to focus on the works featured in the presentations. An unanticipated aspect was the interest displayed in the issue of gender, specifically in the gender of those figures, either donors or saints, who solicited the engagement of the viewer and/or figured corporeal or spiritual seeing.

Breaching Boundaries: Print Collecting and Fitting the Cartesian Scheme in the 19th Century

Meredith Hale
mmh43@cam.ac.uk

Kathryn Rudy
kathryn.rudy@gmail.com

This workshop considered the afterlife of printed images made in the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, many of which were literally trimmed out of their contexts by curators and institutions seeking to classify and codify large bodies of material. A genre that from its inception transgressed boundaries – between high and low, aesthetic and practical – presented particular problems for the institutionalization of collecting and

the resulting separation between text and image is notable even to the contemporary print room visitor. The reproducibility, relative cheapness, and ephemeral nature of many prints invited multiple uses throughout their history, including those that resulted in the destruction of the object itself.

Some opening remarks adumbrated some of the key themes of the workshop: collecting, contextualization and recontextualization. These were followed by three informal presentations. Kathryn Rudy showed early prints that were removed from the Netherlandish manuscripts that had protected them until the nineteenth century. She has reconstructed the original manuscript homes of several hundred early prints that are in the Department of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum; these prints were formerly preserved in manuscripts that were transferred to the Department of Manuscripts. (Virtually) reconstructing the manuscripts-cum-prints offers an avenue to understand the reception of early prints. In the example elucidated here, they help to answer the question: what prints would a beghard in Maastricht have available to him in 1500, and how did he have to alter those prints to put them to use?

Gero Seelig of the Department of Paintings at the Staatliches Museum Schwerin fascinated the audience with his presentation of Jost Amman's woodcuts that have only survived as decoration on simple wooden boxes. They were not collected as copper prints were in the same period, but rather consumed through use. The nineteenth-century separation of media into between kinds of art has resulted in their art historical oblivion. However, these works offer a wealth of material evidence about the original use of prints, as they appear to have been made for the purpose of ornamenting boxes and transforming cheap, friable boxes into colorful decorated finery. The prints bound to three-dimensional objects became uncategorizable for the museum curators.

Meredith Hale presented a group of Dutch political prints from the late seventeenth century in the collection of the British Museum with the aim of understanding how they were categorized in the context of nineteenth-century campaigns to catalogue the BM's works on paper. Were Romeyn de Hooghe's political prints and broadsheets, superior in quality to many of the anonymous prints that depicted the same subjects, treated differently by the nineteenth-century curator? Did they occupy a place somewhere between historical material and 'fine art', as they do now, and does that explain the separation of texts and images that has taken place in a number of cases?

Hale found that the vast majority of this material, including prints by de Hooghe, entered the BM's collection not via such great collectors of Dutch prints as Sloane, Cracherode and Sheepshanks, but as part of large groups of historical prints bought from scholar-collectors and via block purchases from print dealers. The separation of texts and images took place before the prints ever entered the BM's collection and, far from being 'aestheticised', when such prints were catalogued in the 1860s and 70s it was not the images that were privileged but the texts.

Workshop participants included an international audience from North America and Western Europe, including academics and curators. Discussion focused on the

consequences of boundaries made by institutions in the nineteenth century on reception and scholarship.

Jan Gossart: Questioning Old Assumptions

Maryan Ainsworth

maryan.ainsworth@metmuseum.org

In view of the monographic exhibition "Man, Myth, and Sensual Pleasures: Jan Gossart's Renaissance" in the fall of 2010 at the Metropolitan Museum of Art and in the spring of 2011 at the National Gallery, London, this session endeavored to reconsider the artist's contribution to the history of early Netherlandish art. Two main issues were chosen for presentations and discussion by two contributors each.

These two issues were:

1 – Gossart's Role in the Netherlandish Revival of Antiquity. That is, to what extent were Gossart's mythological images created as a response to the artist's experience in Italy? Or, was it instead a direct dialogue with the revival of Netherlandish antiquity that informed his art?

2 – How can we position Gossart's style in the development of Northern Mannerism? What is at stake in calling Gossart a Mannerist artist?

Issue 1 was presented in position papers by Stephanie Schrader (Associate Curator, J. Paul Getty Museum) and Marisa Bass (Ph.D. student, Harvard, History of Art Department).

Stephanie Schrader argued that although it is easy to recognize Jan Gossart's unprecedented treatment of idealized nudes, ancient mythology and classical architecture, it is more challenging to explain why and when this change occurred. She addressed how characterizing Gossart's trip to Italy as the pivotal moment in his career brings with it many faulty assumptions. By examining Gossart's two drawings of warriors in fantastic armor (Dresden and Frankfurt), she suggested that Gossart's interest in the antique began previous to the trip to Italy. Through her analysis of a Hercules ice sculpture made for a Brussels festival in 1511, she indicated that Gossart's humanist patron, Philip IV of Burgundy, was the primary instigator for the Netherlandish artist's revival of the antique.

In support of her view of Gossart's contribution to the Netherlandish revival of antiquity, Marisa Bass discussed a letter by the humanist Gerard Geldenhouwer to Cranevelt, which praises Gossart's arrangement in Philip IV of Burgundy's palace at Wijk bij Duurstede of paintings and statues of imperial portraits, the latter, Marisa believes, polychromed by Gossart. She proposed that these portraits should be linked to the series of terracotta busts listed in the inventories of that residence, and argued that

the letter offers crucial evidence concerning the reception of Gossart's antiquarian images within his local circle of patrons and humanist colleagues. The majority of Marisa's paper focused on the reconsideration of Gossart's first documented mythological painting, the so-called *Neptune and Amphitrite*, revealing how the work was created in dialogue with the rediscovery of antiquity in the province of Zeeland, and ultimately arguing for a new identification of the painting's subject as *Neptune and Zeelandia*.

More in agreement with each other than not, both contributors emphasized the pivotal role of Philip of Burgundy and his humanist court for Gossart's role in the Netherlandish revival of antiquity.

Issue 2 was presented in position papers by Nanette Salomon (Professor at the College of Staten Island, CUNY) and Ethan Matt Kavalier (Associate Professor at the University of Toronto).

Nanette Salomon argued for the value of calling Gossart's art mannerist. She did so by defining Mannerism, and Gossart's work, as a set of artistic practices that enact a self-conscious mindset; one that is shared by other 16th-century artists, both canonical and non-canonical, such as Amico Aspertini. Among the most compelling defining elements of this mindset, she indicated, is the inference of artistic literacy on the part of the viewer. This is achieved by quoting visual sources, especially classical ones, in an intentionally disparate manner. Gossart's disjunctive retooling of normative Renaissance illusionism similarly produced an art of orchestrated disorder. The elements are forged together to form a new kind of artistic unity, which gives value to the work as a creative expression in and of itself and not as a mimetic reflection of the "real" world. Appreciating Gossart as a Mannerist, thus, sheds light on the affect of his art and on the cultural aspirations of his patrons.

Matt Kavalier, on the other hand, argued that Mannerism is not a particularly enlightening term. This stylistic label, highly popular and often debated for much of the twentieth century, has begun to disappear from art historical literature largely due to its imprecision. The emphasis on elegance, virtuosity, and *grazia* as preconditions of Mannerism, a definition heavily dependent on the literature of courtly manners, risks overly aestheticizing sixteenth-century artworks and divorcing them entirely from subject matter or content. A lack of consensus on the boundaries of Mannerism renders the term problematic even as an ahistorical analytical tool. Kavalier argued that the notion of Mannerism in the Netherlands requires separate treatment, for it has quite varied sources and cultural references, and the use of this Italo-centric term tends to homogenize distinct phenomena such as the so-called Antwerp Mannerism of the early sixteenth century with its playful patterns and the more sophisticated Dutch Mannerism of Utrecht and Haarlem at the century's end. Although there may be real qualities in certain works of sixteenth-century art that might loosely be called Mannerist, the insistence on a unified artistic movement is an inconsistent construct of modern times.

Studio Scenes in Netherlandish Art

Alison M. Kettering
aketteri@carleton.edu

Annette de Vries
vriesade@xs4all.nl

From the 15th through the 17th century, Netherlandish artists produced numerous images of artistic production and professional engagement, as either the main subject or an inset. Whether the framework was religious, classical, or contemporary, these images present visually recognizable, though largely imaginary, scenes of ateliers and such related spaces as encyclopedic galleries. This workshop examined the multiple ways in which studio scenes conceptualized and meditated on the artist's profession and in the process constructed personal and/or collective identities. The workshop concentrated on two main issues: a. studio scenes as visualizations of artistic identity, profession, ideals etc. and b. studio scenes in relation to practice.

Perry Chapman wonderfully introduced the session by taking Joris van Swieten's *Artist as a Luteplayer* (Lakenhal, Leiden), as a point of departure for juxtaposing ideas on the artist as craftsman with the artist as intellectual. She discussed the impact of Dominicus Lampsonius's claim in his account of the painter Jan of Holland (Jan van Amstel): the Netherlander [as opposed to the Italian artist] has his intelligence in his hands. Thereafter three presentations sharpened our view on ways of looking at studio scenes in terms of the ideal artist. Julie Hochstrasser discussed the possible meanings of music-playing artists as linked to notions of the artistic profession. Frima Fox Hofrichter gave a close reading of Jan Miense Molenaer's *The Artist's Studio* (Berlin).

Paul Crenshaw raised the question of how representations of the artist compare with representation of other professions. The larger part of the workshop, however, concentrated on presentations dealing with the relation between painted studio scenes and everyday artistic practice. Jan Piet Filedt Kok used Dirck Bagaert's *St. Luke Painting the Virgin* to illustrate the importance of the process of painting in relation to the creation of the artist's identity. Marjolijn Bol raised the question whether the pen position of the boy in Jan van Scorel's *Portrait of a Boy (flouting the rules)* can be related to how painters held their brushes. Diane Wolfthal argued that François Bunuel's *Atelier* (attr.) not only shows a dealer's shop—rare as such—but focuses our attention on the reverse of paintings and whether or not this has implications for our understanding of the painting.

Meaning also can be distilled from changes that were made in the underdrawing, as for example in Rembrandt's *Self-Portrait* (Kenwood), the topic of Zirka Filipcak's presentation. She argued that Rembrandt removed a depiction of the brush in the course of making this painting. Ulrike Kern showed us a drawing representing an unusually tidy artist's workshop: Willem Drost's *An Artist's Work Table by a Window Overlooking a River, 1650-55* (attr.). She pointed out some differences in the lighting as compared with other depictions of artist's studios or contemporary manuals. Michael

Zell introduced the role of the artist's model into the discussion by focusing on Rembrandt's female nudes etchings. In the end, Alison Kettering shifted the attention to the possible meanings of objects and other implements (still lifes incorporated into the studio scenes) in relation to the topic of the artist's profession.

The presentations generated a lively discussion that resulted in the conclusion that more research into everyday artistic practice is necessary if we want to understand fully ideas about the artist's profession represented in studio scenes. The workshop did not solve the riddles posed by the various presentations, but stimulated participants to perceive studio scenes as relevant to issues concerning the mechanical as well as the liberal aspects of the artist's profession. To be more precise, as Annette de Vries pointed out, the manual or mechanical probably was a more crucial and positive force in the process of elevating the status of the artist's profession than we often acknowledge. The intelligence of the (northern) artist, indeed, seems to have been in his hands.

The Diffusion of Styles and Motifs in Netherlandish Prints and Drawings, 1520-1620

Huigen Leeftang
h.leeftang@rijksmuseum.nl

Nadine Orenstein
Nadine.Orenstein@metmuseum.org

The workshop examined the interchange of styles and motifs between draftsmen and printmakers in the Netherlands and other parts of Europe during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The session took place in the Study Room of the Rijksprentenkabinet which allowed a fruitful discussion to take place before actual works of art. In advance of the session, five speakers proposed topics that would center around five to six drawings and prints in the collection. The idea was that each speaker would have about ten minutes to present his topic after which viewing of the works by the workshop participants and discussion of the topic would take place. The topics included works in progress, thoughts to bounce off colleagues and more worked out ideas.

Nadine Orenstein presented several prints by Jan Gossart next to prints by Marcantonio Raimondi, Albrecht Dürer, and Hendrick Goltzius. She discussed how in his prints Gossart seems to combine Northern prints with Italian sculpture much in the way that Goltzius did several decades later.

Ed Wouk showed several color prints after Parmigianino, Hubert Goltzius and Frans Floris and discussed the various methods employed to reproduce Floris's designs in color, which ones were more successful than others.

Matt Kavaler discussed several drawings by Northern mannerists—Hans Speckaert, the master of the Egmond Albums and Joost van Winghe—working in Italy and wondered about the sources of their styles and whether these artists should be classified as Italian or Northern.

Huigen Leeftang showed a drawing for a print by Bartholomeus Spranger recently acquired by the Rijksmuseum and described its role in the creation of the print by Jan Muller. He further discussed the possible Italian sources of the Spranger drawing style, among which drawings by Raffellino da Reggio and Jacopo Zucchi.

Dorothy Limouze discussed portrait drawings by Aegidius Sadeler and artists in his circle, some intended as designs for prints. She convincingly attributed a drawing in the Rijksmuseum (Boon 408) that was catalogued as Aegidius Sadeler to Lucas Kilian.

Persistent Piety: Questions of Religion in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Netherlandish Art

Shelley Perlove
sperlove@umich.edu

Larry Silver
lsilver@sas.upenn.edu

The workshop opened with five short presentations dealing with different aspects of “Crossing Boundaries” in religious art of the Netherlands in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Henry Luttikhuisen’s presentation, “On Crossing the Great Divide through Spiritual Pregnancy and Imaginative Pilgrimage,” addressed the practice of imaginative pilgrimage in late medieval and early modern Europe by comparing two images, a small panel painting of Passion Scenes often attributed to the workshop of Geertgen tot Sint Jans (ca. 1490) and Boëtius à Bolswert’s engraving from Antonius Sucquet’s *Vir virtae aeternae* (1620). He argued that although both works elicited an empathic response by meditative self-reflection, there is a significant, though subtle, shift in the way in which spiritual pilgrimage was understood or was practiced. Rather than encourage the viewer to find her or his own way, the print appears to offer a more orthodox trail, a more clearly defined means of journeying towards spiritual perfection. Its meditative itinerary is already laid out in alphabetic sequence. Discipline and penance remain crucial religious practices, but they have become more straightforward or more clearly articulated. Both images advocated heartfelt charity, performed in imitation of Christ and the saints, as an effective means to walk with God, while simultaneously traveling closer with Him. However, in the engraving, the path of imaginative pilgrimage is predetermined.

Els Stronks presented the paper, “A plea for the study of illustrated religious literature in the Dutch Republic.” She emphasized that in the last few decades it has been argued that the progress of the development of visual culture in Northern Europe was not stopped by the Reformation. A number of art historians have also reiterated this point in relation to the Dutch Republic. Applying this understanding of the Reformation to the development of illustrated religious literature in the Dutch Republic after 1600, however, shows that this culture was in fact severely interrupted: from the end of the sixteenth century onward, religious literature produced in the Dutch Republic contained far fewer illustrations than literature produced in the neighbouring countries where old and new visual traditions intermingled earlier and more thoroughly. This impasse was only overcome, as it seems, by the efforts of a number of rebellious Dutch authors to appropriate literary models from neighbouring countries. The exact nature of the specificity of the Dutch situation and the influence of international exchange of religious imagery are yet to be established, resulting in this plea for the study of Dutch illustrated religious literature by art historians and literary scholars alike.

Mia Mochizuki raised some essential questions in her workshop presentation, “Imagined Boundaries in the Study of Netherlandish Religious Art.” She focused upon elements potentially restricting the boundaries of the study of religious art and posed the questions:

- What qualifies as “religious” art?
- How should we study religious art?
- What does the analysis of religious art offer the field of art history?

She offered ways of moving research forward that would include the construction of a more nuanced vocabulary, the acceptance of function as an evaluative yardstick, and the inclusion of theological and religious studies in interdisciplinary criticism.

Shelley Perlove’s “Crossing Boundaries between Biblical Judaism and the Primitive Church” focused upon Rembrandt’s interest in recreating the history of the young Jesus in relation to Temple rituals and architectural reconstruction. She placed the artist’s attraction to the Temple theme in the context of Dutch religious culture, and emphasized the role of such texts as the Bible, Josephus, and Constantijn L’Empereur’s *Mishnah Middot plan of the Temple* published in 1630 in Leiden. The works by Rembrandt under discussion are the etching of *The Presentation of Christ in the Temple* of 1630, and the painting of 1631 of the same subject in The Hague. Details within these works offer evidence in support of the identification of specific spaces and activities within the Temple Courtyard of Women, yet the juxtaposition of the Temple setting in relation to the infant Jesus is meaningful in various ways. In every case Christ’s humility is juxtaposed with the hierarchy of Temple priests and the material richness of Temple settings. Both works, as in other examples by Rembrandt, invoke Christ as the new high priest who atones sin and displaces Temple rituals, precisely as related by St. Paul.

Dagmar Eichberger discussed the story of Jonah in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century northern art. The typological pairing of the story of Jonah with the Entombment and

Resurrection of Christ can be found in several early modern epitaphs, choir screens, and altarpieces. This traditional interpretation of the Old-Testament story remains a popular option throughout the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. A shift in focus was, however, brought about soon after Luther's pamphlet on the book of Jonah was published in 1526. The narrative title page by Cranach stressed the fate of Jonah and the conversion of the people of Nineveh. During the second half of the sixteenth century, several print series develop the theme even further by highlighting Jonah's preaching in Nineveh and God's willingness to forgive those who repented. The way the story is now told by van Heemskerck, De Vos, and Collaert can be read as a visual response to the religious and political conflicts which rule the Netherlands during this period.

These thoughtful presentations were the springboard for lively discussion which touched upon:

1. the importance of pursuing new methods and sources in studying religious art
2. the emphasis upon the works of art as major evidence in establishing connections with textual sources
3. the idea of broadening the boundaries of the study of religious art by including such topics as Dutch art in Japan or Japanese artistic reactions to Dutch art
4. broadening religious studies to include objects of material culture rather than simply focusing upon so-called "high art"
5. the importance of investigating the various functions of art and placing them within the context of the broader culture
6. the study of what would be deemed "idolatrous" especially in terms of the representation of the Dove of the Holy Spirit and other symbols
7. the difficulties and pitfalls in characterizing certain works as either Protestant or Roman Catholic

ECONOMIC COMPETITION AND ARTISTIC RIVALRY: ARE THEY INEXTRICABLE?

Erna Kok
erna.kok@planet.nl

Eric Jan Sluijter
e.j.sluijter@uva.nl

"A good painter pursues the kind of art that is held in esteem in the place where he is working and is often stimulated by competition in the art," wrote Samuel van Hoogstraten. The relationship between economic competition and artistic rivalry, both implied in this quotation, is at the core of the research program *Artistic and Economic Competition in the Amsterdam Art Market, c. 1630-1690; History Painting in Amsterdam in Rembrandt's Time*.^[1] Underlying this project is the basic assumption that these two processes are inextricably linked and determined the techniques, styles and themes of newly produced paintings in an art market where artists, art dealers,

connoisseurs and the art-buying public continually interacted with one another. We assume that in this competitive environment painters actively positioned themselves by developing personal styles ('handeling') and iconographies, as well as by organizing their means of production in effective studio structures and processes, working out strategies of marketing and keeping up relations with (networks of) customers. Investigations focus on the choices artists made to achieve certain artistic and/or economic goals in relation to one another and *vis à vis* certain (groups) of buyers, and on the question how these choices affect changes in production process (process innovation) and changes in form, content and function (product innovation).

However, one encounters several obstacles when crossing boundaries between socio-economic research and the examination of artistic developments and when investigating how artists handled the boundaries between economic and artistic concerns. The basic assumptions concerning the concepts of artistic rivalry, economic competition and their interconnectedness as well as their relation to process and product innovation raise many questions. What is the nature of the economic competition between painters and how did this develop during the 17th century? How does the competition between painters compare with economic competition in other crafts? How did socio-economic motivations affect artistic rivalry and *vice versa*?

Eric Jan Sluiter Universiteit van Amsterdam

How to understand the relation between artistic rivalry and economic competition in the 17th century?

Would painters have been aware of the economic advantages of clustering and have consciously differentiated manner and price, however slightly, to direct the client's choice? Would they intentionally have picked up new motifs or novel techniques to make a better profit? Would the lesser talented artist have considered keeping up with new trends and differentiating them slightly just an economic necessity to survive in a competitive art market?

And would the ambitious and talented painters have viewed innovations and improvements in the first place as artistic competition – “looking at each other with an envious eye” as Van Hoogstraten said - trying to surpass each other in quality?

And does this imply economic competition as well?

Erna Kok, Universiteit van Amsterdam

Friends the best way to succes: the concept of friendship as an alternative for economic and artistic competition.

At his arrival (1633) to the unfamiliar city of Amsterdam, Flinck was assured of affluent family and the networks of Rembrandt and art dealer Uylenburg. The stylistically adaptable Flinck was an active net worker and obtained a honourable position as friend, *and* success as painter, in the network of eminent magistrates.

Bol also chose Rembrandt as master, but did lack blood friends. Still, through his marriage with Elysabeth Dell (1652) he achieved a solid position in the networks of the admiralty and magistrates, which gained him continued commissions. His second marriage to Anna van Erckel (1669) offered him the opportunity to refrain from painting.

In this short presentation I will take the careers of Govert Flinck [1615-1660] and Ferdinand Bol [1616-1680] as an example to question the meaning of economic competition as it concerns the top segment of the Amsterdam art market. For painters who were working for top of the bill clients, I believe that the alternative concept of friendship is more appropriate to understand their artistic and social-economical position at the marketplace.

Elizabeth Nogrady, Institute of Fine Arts, NYU

Artistic competition and artistic collaboration: the Pastor Fido commission for Honselaarsdijk

The theme of my short presentation would be the relation between artistic competition and artistic collaboration, using as a case study the Pastor Fido commission for Honselaarsdijk (which, as you know, is the topic of one my dissertation chapters). To begin I would describe briefly how the artists who worked on the project were from a tight-knit network in Utrecht as described by Erna. I would go on to discuss how, in my dissertation, I argue that this project was a collaboration in which the artists worked together to create a Utrecht "brand" of art designed to appeal to the highest level of patronage in the Northern Netherlands at the time, the House of Orange. Examples, such as Cornelis van Poelenburch's willingness to abandon his usual small-scale format, would be used as evidence that the artists made an extra effort for the paintings to appear together as a cohesive group.

But, then I would raise the question that I never fully resolved in my dissertation: how would this project have been received by patrons Amalia van Solms and Frederik Hendrik as well as sophisticated viewers such as Huygens, etc? Would they have viewed the bringing together of a group of separate works by individual artists not as a collaboration, but as a form of competition that provided the opportunity for connoisseurial comparison? Would the participating artists, while they indeed worked together to complete the project, also have viewed the Pastor Fido commission as a chance for viewers to compare them to their peers, and to prove themselves the finest artist in the group?

Adriaan Waiboer, National Gallery of Ireland

The idea that Dutch seventeenth-century genre paintings are trustworthy representations of life and society at the time is an idea that has been refuted a long time ago. Painters of everyday life did not represent everyday life, at least not the full scope of it. They limited themselves to depicting only a small number of pastimes, activities and settings that were visually appealing. Given the small range of depicted subjects, it may even be argued that most genre painters were more interested in studying each other's works than looking at their own environment for inspiration. This was certainly true for genre painters of the third quarters of the seventeenth century—the focal point of this presentation—who repeated a limited number of subjects again and again, often soon after each other. Two notable exceptions were Gerard ter Borch and Gerrit Dou, both of whom introduced many new subjects, motifs and figure postures, adopted by their contemporaries and artists from later generations. [At this point I would like to present a series of images of two or three examples of subjects painted by a large number of genre painters, such as a woman peeling apples and a woman making lace, a woman writing/reading a letter].

In this presentation I would like to discuss the possible reasons for the repetitive representation of certain subjects in genre painting in the period 1650–75. A lack of originality may be the first reason that comes to mind—“borrowing” motifs and postures was to a certain extent a kind of ‘copy-pasting’ or ‘ripping’ *avant la lettre*. This may have been true for third- and fourth-rate painters. Late in their careers, even Dou and Ter Borch frequently repeated their own subjects or those popularised by their students or followers. However, a lack of originality cannot explain why an artist such as Johannes Vermeer rarely painted a subject that had never been painted before.

Another possible reason is that artists painted subjects they knew would be highly appreciated by their clients. If a collector had recently bought a painting of a man writing a letter, it probably would pay off to paint a variation such as a man reading a letter or a woman writing a letter, rather than a man sneezing or a man trimming his moustache. Painters, thus, tended to stick to a limited range of highly appealing and easy-to-sell subjects.

Another possible reason is that artists took up the challenge of beating others at their own game. Winning in a competition, whether artistic or athletic, is only fulfilling and praiseworthy if it is done on the same territory or track and using the same equipment. For artists such as Vermeer painting a woman making lace was more than just painting a fine work that was most likely going to be purchased by his presumed patron, Pieter van Ruyven. It was an opportunity for him to engage in an artistic competition with his fellow artists, such as Gerard ter Borch, Gabriel Metsu, Nicolaes Maes, Casper Netscher, all of whom had previously painted women performing the same task, but not in the same way. Each of them had their own style, technique, approach, ways of interacting with the viewer, all of which were aimed at making their paintings stand out when viewed by collectors and other artists.

Bert de Munck, Universiteit van Antwerpen

How can guilds have been economically beneficial at all? Given that art as a product is hardly standardized and artists constitute a highly mobile workforce with a wide range of both general and specific skills.

Hypothesis: There is ample evidence that guild regulations were not incompatible with economic efficiency and expansion. Thought provoking theories have been devised about the reasons for this, but empirical evidence to support them is ambivalent at best.

My hypothesis is that guilds may have been economically beneficial as an unintended consequence, but the rules as they were conceived and installed by the guild boards and city administrations cannot be understood from the perspective of 'embedding' or 'creating' markets as is currently done. In stead, they should be addressed from a socio-cultural and political-ideological perspective, which includes changing ideas about privileged corpses and egalitarian brotherhood. Ultimately, we should try to understand the way in which these values and norms transformed in the context of changing market forces and changing notions of the self.

[1] Funded by NWO - for a full description of the program and sub-projects, see: <http://burckhardt.ic.uva.nl/ecartico/>

Virtual Confrontation of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Flemish and Dutch Group Portraits

Beatrijs Wolters van der Wey
beatrijs.woltersvanderwey@kikirpa.be

The workshop was intended to discuss Dutch and Flemish portraits of civic guard, militia, boards of governors, members of corporations and guilds. Held in the Amsterdams Historisch Museum, it was an opportunity to confront in situ corporate group portraits with comparable examples from the Southern Netherlands shown in reproductions.

All participants were invited to familiarize themselves with the theme reading beforehand three relevant articles. Brief introductory presentations by Norbert Middelkoop, Beatrijs Wolters van der Wey and Rudi Ekkart, set out the context in which such paintings were executed and functioned, both in the North and in the South, evoking more questions and problematic aspects when looking for their interpretation.

Most revealing was the material presented from the cities of Antwerp, Brussels and Mechelen as to their quantity—the existence of these portraits was hardly known—and differentiation of iconography and typology—much more than in the North. The need for an interdisciplinary approach by historians and art historians, already pursued in Holland, became once again evident when considering the importance of studying the portraits in relation to their function and to the whole material culture of that body of works. Only then, questions about the patron’s motivation when ordering a group portrait and when, for instance, choosing a specific compositional scheme, may be answered more satisfactorily. Moreover, reality is much more nuanced than the general theses about the reasons for commissioning a group portrait, are able to express. This confirms the value of a detailed description of the individual circumstances wherein the portraits were executed, on the basis of the paintings themselves and of as much archival and historical data as possible.

Up to now, there is no evidence of direct North/South influence regarding group portraiture. The portraits rather seem to be situated within a local tradition, which may even differ from city to city.

The Dutch Seventeenth-Century Cityscape: Crossing Boundaries between Art, Architecture and Urbanism

Everhard Korthals Altes
e.korthalsaltes@tudelft.nl

Short presentations of around 10 minutes were followed by discussion. Speakers were: Boudewijn Bakker, Michelle Packer, Pieter Roelofs, Jaap Evert Abrahamse, Freek Schmidt, and Everhard Korthals Altes.

Everhard Korthals Altes discussed Berckheyde’s views of the Herengracht and focused on two issues:

1. Who acquired these views? Were these paintings commissioned or bought by people living on this particular part of the Herengracht and/or were they bought by persons who were interested in topography and cartography?
2. How did foreign travelers such as Cosimo de’Medici and Lord Fitzwilliam perceive the newest parts of Amsterdam? How did they judge the architecture and the urban design of Amsterdam?

Pieter Roelofs looked at the definition of cityscapes and argued that Walter Liedtke’s view (in his review of the exhibition in Washington and The Hague in *The Burlington Magazine*) is too narrow. In Roelofs’s view, paintings of Dordrecht by Cuyp capture its essential elements, namely those of a city along a river with an important harbor, and can therefore be included in a show on cityscapes. Roelofs also discussed the motifs of

painters like the Storck brothers, who often depicted ships on the canals near the city borders of Amsterdam.

Michelle Packer focused on scenes showing the construction of buildings in Dutch seventeenth-century art, such as the Town Hall on the Dam. She expanded and complicated the well-established relationship between urban pride and cityscape imagery by exploring how seventeenth-century viewers used images like these to construct memories and to manage their experiences of the changing urban environment.

Boudewijn Bakker discussed the question whether the *View of the Haarlem Gate* and the *View of the Rondeel*, both possibly painted by Hendrick Vroom (Amsterdams Historisch Museum), were originally conceived as pendants or not. Despite their similar format and related subjects – i.e. old versus new city fortifications – there is no conclusive evidence that they were painted as a pair.

Jaap Evert Abrahamse, a specialist in the urban design of seventeenth-century Amsterdam, attempted to verify whether paintings such as Berckheyde's *View of the Herengracht* of 1685 (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum) are idealized or realistic. In his view they are very realistic. He also drew attention to the possible correlation between Van der Heyden's work for the municipal government and the way he emphasized certain elements in his cityscapes.

Freek Schmidt concluded this workshop by focusing on eighteenth-century cityscapes, and addressed the issue of whether the renewed interest in cityscapes at that time was due to the appearance of publications such as the *Atlas Fouquet* or the city description by Jan Wagenaar?

Pieter Lastman: Out of Rembrandt's Shadow *In Memoriam Christian Tümpel (1937–2009)*

Tico Seifert

Tseifert@nationalgalleries.org

Adriaan E. Waiboer

awaiboer@ngi.ie

This workshop, which was proposed by the late Christian Tümpel and held in his honour, focused on Pieter Lastman's life and work in its historical context. Adriaan Waiboer and Tico Seifert gave brief introductions. The former highlighted the importance of Christian Tümpel's contributions to the Lastman research over the last four decades, and stressed the importance Lastman had on his contemporaries and artists of later generations. The latter presented potential topics to be (re-)visited: shaping the corpus of Lastman's paintings and drawings, reviewing old and new attributions, with particular attention to his less well known early career in Amsterdam

and Italy; Pieter Lastman as a designer for prints executed by his brother Claes Pietersz.; and interpretations of Lastman's re-use of figures as 'patterns of success'.

Three invited speakers then gave short papers, each followed by discussion. Amy Golahny (Lycoming College, Williamsport PA) spoke on *Lastman in Italy: What he saw and how he used it*. During his years in Italy 1603-07, Lastman studied antiquities and the art of the 16th century as well as that of his contemporaries. After returning to Amsterdam, he made use of various motifs from the works of Michelangelo, Veronese and Caravaggio, among others, and also ancient buildings and sculptures in Rome. Tor J. Hønningstad (independent scholar, Oslo) reflected on *Pieter Lastman's Patrons* with a particular focus on the lost stained glass window for the Zuiderkerk in Amsterdam after his design (Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, painted copy by Thomas de Keyser, Paris, Fondation Custodia-Lugt Collection). David de Witt (Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Queen's University, Kingston ON) presented *Pieter Lastman: Theory in Practice*, tracing patterns of borrowing from Lastman's work beyond the familiar examples from the work of Rembrandt. Lastman seems to have served as kind of extended textbook to young artists of subsequent generations, in particular on elevated topics: imagination of the theme, compositional focus and richness, and elegant and convincing posing of the figure. Even later biographers (e.g. Houbraken) suggest this kind of lasting reputation of the artist.

The workshop closed with discussions in front of Lastman's paintings in the Rembrandthuis, focussing on *Manoah's Sacrifice*, *Christ and the Canaanite Woman* and *The Triumph of Mordechai*.
