Willem van Tetrode (c.1525-1580), Hercules Pomarius, 1562-67.
From the President

Greetings from Amsterdam, where I have been enjoying my winter/spring sabbatical. It was a winter of vast cultural riches and nearly constant sunshine – oh yes, and some serious research. February snow in New York prevented me from attending the annual Board meeting of the Historians of Netherlandish Art – at least in bodily form – though I did attend orally through the technological miracle of a conference call. Among other matters, the Board decided to initiate an HNA listserv. Those of you with email addresses will soon receive the first message, announcing the April 2003 Newsletter and Review of Books online. Thereafter everyone will be able to use this listserv to get help with research or with pedagogical questions, and to share information about publications, conferences, job openings – about anything, in fact, related to the interests of our organization. (Too much mail already? You can also UNSubscribe!)

April will also see the arrival at our website (www.hnanews.org) of the promised Bibliography of Recent Articles, gathered from a list of 68 journals and yearbooks at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie. By accessing this Bibliography in the Members Only area, you will find dozens of articles categorized first by period and place, then by medium, e.g. Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: Paintings, Prints, Drawings, as well as a section on Museums, Collecting, and the Art Market. The Bibliography will be refreshed in November 2003, when the present one will be archived. We thank Adriaan Waiboer for compiling it and Board members Eric Jan Sluijter and Marten Jan Bok for assisting him. You can help Adriaan by emailing him the citation for your next published article at: aew211@nyu.edu. New, too, on the website will be guidelines for writing book reviews and for submitting applications for HNA grants.

We will soon install a program to track hits to various sections at the site. We hope to find that you are using the website more and more frequently for links to libraries, to research facilities, and to photographic services, as well as for the Membership Directory and much more. Although the site is now “finished,” we welcome your comments for improving it. What would make it more lively and compelling? Photos? Cartoons?

If you have forgotten your password to the Members Only section, please phone or email Kristin Belkin at 732-937-8394 or kbelkin@aol.com. And please remember to capitalize the first letter of the artist’s name in the password.

Finally, a word about our next international gathering. For 2005 or 2006 we are considering the Center for Renaissance and Baroque Studies, University of Maryland, in conjunction with the National Gallery, Washington. Given the excellent facilities at both of these institutions, and the wealth of museums and collections in the DC area, we are hoping to develop a very attractive conference.

May peace return.
Best wishes,
Alison Kettering.

In Memoriam

Julius S. Held
(1905-2002)

Julius S. Held, born April 15, 1905 in Mosbach, Germany, passed away in Bennington, Vermont, on December 22, 2002. Best known for his sensitive essays on Rembrandt (collected 1969 and revised 1991, Princeton University Press) and the definitive study of Rubens’s oil sketches (Princeton University Press 1980), he also wrote authoritatively on Dürer, Van Dyck, Jordaens, and other artists. A selection of his articles was edited by A.W. Lowenthal, D. Rosand, and J. Walsh, Jr., Rubens and His Circle (Princeton University Press, 1982; with a bibliography to that year). He studied at Heidelberg, Berlin, Vienna and Freiburg, where he earned the PhD summa cum laude (1930, renewed 1980) for his dissertation on Dürer in the Netherlands.

Julius’s interests were wide ranging, and from 1958, he helped form the painting collection of the Museo de Arte, Ponce, Puerto Rico. Among the many national and international honors he received are these: Mitchell Prize of 2000, for lifetime achievement; Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1994; two Annual Lectures in his honor at the Graduate Program, Williams College-Clark Art Institute; scholarships in his name at Barnard College and Columbia University; Pfalzgraf Otto Plakette, Mosbach, Germany, 1990; Award for Outstanding Achievement, Art Dealers Association of America, 1980; Honorary Director, College Art Association, 1975; Officier de L’Ordre de la Couronne, appointed by King Baudouin, Belgium, 1974. Beside these illustrious distinctions, his honorary membership in HNA might pale somewhat, but it was one close to his heart.

In 1997, a lecture hall at Barnard College was dedicated to him. A large portion of his drawing collection is at the National
Julius Held’s career began at the Staattliche Museen, Berlin, 1931-33, and, when forced to leave Germany, he emigrated to the United States in 1934. From 1937 to 1970, he taught at Barnard College and Columbia University, and also held appointments at New York University, Yale University, Bryn Mawr College, Institute for Advanced Study, University of Pittsburgh, and Williams College. In 1988, Julius returned to Mosbach, for the ceremony installing a plaque commemorating the Jewish citizens of the town, on the site of the synagogue which had been destroyed on Kristallnacht 1938. In 1994, he gave a lecture “The Holocaust from a Distance,” which detailed his experiences of the 1930s and 1940s.

Dedicated to his students and the discipline of teaching, Julius was a powerful guide in the seminar room. From sometimes dull slides (occasionally in black-and-white), he elicited revelatory insights into the expressiveness of pen and brush by Rubens or Rembrandt. His dry humor and kindness won him affection from students and colleagues. He integrated the study of original art works with their making and meaning, and occasionally, with his own collections. From his library of books with Rubens’s title-pages, he directed students in putting on an exhibition and writing a catalogue (Williamstown 1977). His advice to his students as novice collectors was astute: acquire what pleases you, but bear in mind that drawings by major artists of gruesome martyrdoms might be more affordable than scenes more agreeable to contemplate.

In his lectures and publications, Held emphasized the humanity of artists and their subjects. Even as he evoked Rubens’s tenderness toward Helene Fourment and her children, he uncovered Lucas Vorsterman’s murderous impulse toward the artist. In discussing the drawings, etchings and paintings of Rembrandt, he interpreted sight, speech, and touch as foremost themes; thus, he clarified the meaning of Rembrandt’s images of Tobit, Jacob Blessing Joseph’s Sons, Aristotle, and many other works. Held’s essay of 1950, “Rembrandt: Truth and Legend,” neatly examined the fluctuating reputation of the artist. Reprinted 1991, it has striking relevance for current reception studies. As professor, friend, and author, he had an inspiring and long reach. On an August evening a few years ago, Julius took the last cookie on the plate, and preliminary oil sketches which came straight from the master’s hand.

From his earliest experiences as an art historian, working with Max Friedländer in Berlin, Held’s enquiries centered on individual works of art and depended on contact with them; general questions and hypotheses were inspired by specific cases. These might lead him into areas he would never otherwise have ventured to write on: psychology and mental instability, for example, when the discovery of an angry outburst against Rubens inscribed by the engraver Lucas Vorsterman on a sketch in The Hermitage suddenly shed light on a mysterious story of an attempt on Rubens’s life. When circumstances exiled Held from the riches of the European museums he had known, he set himself to make the most of the material that was available around him. This resulted, for Rubens, in the important catalogue of works by him in public and private collections in America which appeared in 1947 (as Rubens in America) with an introductory apologia by J.-A. Goris – a text which shows the extent to which Rubens was perceived as problematic at the time, especially in an American context; here Goris points out too that Held has already done much to promote understanding of the artist and his work.

Rubens in America was also a kind of belated tribute to the artist on the tercentenary of his death. In 1940, the planned Rubens commemoration in Antwerp had been taken over by the occupying force – manipulated to Germanic “cultural” purposes and a racist ideology. That same year saw the publication of Held’s first article on Rubens. Held had become fascinated by a painting of a black prince that had appeared on the market in the late 1930s and been bought by Boston Museum, and which, to his surprise, turned out to be based not on a study from life but on a portrait by Jan Vermeyen. It is not hard to see Held’s investigation and celebration of the artist’s interest in portraying an African as, in part, a nicely pointed riposte.

Elizabeth McGrath
The Warburg Institute

Held and Rubens

Of all the Netherlandish artists who benefitted from Julius Held’s attention, Rubens is the one who was most, and most diversely, illuminated – in studies which marvellously capture the artist’s habits of thinking while elucidating his ways of working. Yet by his own admission Held’s love for Rubens was not spontaneous and natural; in his youth he evidently shared a prejudice of the age against the artist’s grandiloquent and propagandistic subject-matter, as well as his habits of studio organization and delegation. Initially it was the Dutch masters who attracted him, and, by extension, among the Flemings Jacob Jordaens, with his cheerful “earthiness”. Rubens he came to respect through a process of familiarisation which brought a gradual appreciation of the artist’s achievement; in particular, Held admired the way in which (unlike Jordaens, whom he judged rather harshly in this respect) Rubens never ceased to advance and to develop, retaining an enthusiastic engagement with the process of painting right up to the end of his life. It is significant then that in his two great books on the artist, Rubens. Selected Drawings and then The Oil Sketches of Peter Paul Rubens Held should have chosen to present Rubens through the evidence of his working methods, through the drawings and preliminary oil sketches which came straight from the master’s hand.

From his earliest experiences as an art historian, working with Max Friedländer in Berlin, Held’s enquiries centered on individual works of art and depended on contact with them; general questions and hypotheses were inspired by specific cases. These might lead him into areas he would never otherwise have ventured to write on: psychology and mental instability, for example, when the discovery of an angry outburst against Rubens inscribed by the engraver Lucas Vorsterman on a sketch in The Hermitage suddenly shed light on a mysterious story of an attempt on Rubens’s life. When circumstances exiled Held from the riches of the European museums he had known, he set himself to make the most of the material that was available around him. This resulted, for Rubens, in the important catalogue of works by him in public and private collections in America which appeared in 1947 (as Rubens in America) with an introductory apologia by J.-A. Goris – a text which shows the extent to which Rubens was perceived as problematic at the time, especially in an American context; here Goris points out too that Held has already done much to promote understanding of the artist and his work.

Rubens in America was also a kind of belated tribute to the artist on the tercentenary of his death. In 1940, the planned Rubens commemoration in Antwerp had been taken over by the occupying force – manipulated to Germanic “cultural” purposes and a racist ideology. That same year saw the publication of Held’s first article on Rubens. Held had become fascinated by a painting of a black prince that had appeared on the market in the late 1930s and been bought by Boston Museum, and which, to his surprise, turned out to be based not on a study from life but on a portrait by Jan Vermeyen. It is not hard to see Held’s investigation and celebration of the artist’s interest in portraying an African as, in part, a nicely pointed riposte.
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In Memoriam

Myra Dickman Orth (1934-2002)

Myra Orth, a scholar of French Renaissance manuscript illumination, died on November 30th, 2002 of brain cancer. An intelligent and witty colleague, Myra will be sorely missed by her family and friends.

Myra’s love of book arts came early. Her father, a member of the Grolier Club in New York, communicated his love of print culture to Myra, and her mother, a strong feminist and social worker, helped foster Myra’s independence and, perhaps, her uncanny ability to put down roots and flourish wherever she was planted. After receiving a BA from Cornell in 1956, Myra married Bill Orth. They moved to Europe, where they lived briefly in France and Germany before returning to Brooklyn. Myra began graduate study at the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University, where she worked with Colin Eisler and received her MA in 1964 with a thesis on Geoffroy Tory’s Books of Hours and her PhD in 1976 with a dissertation entitled Progressive Tendencies in French Manuscript Illustration, 1515-30: Godefroy le Batave and the 1520s Hours Workshop. Her academic trajectory was atypical, for she completed her advanced degrees largely by correspondence while raising her children, Laura and Peter, and moving with Bill and them to Belgium (1965-69), Australia (1970-72), Japan (1972), England (1972-75), and finally Paris. Myra lived in Paris until 1982, supporting innumerable Yale PhD candidates as au pairs and welcoming international scholars and friends who passed through the city to her kitchen salon on the Boulevard Raspail.

The American College in Paris hired Myra in the mid-1970s to teach Renaissance Art History. She quickly broadened her scope to include Baroque and French and English eighteenth-century art and architecture, and she served from 1980-82 as Department Chair and Head of the Humanities Division. Myra returned to the United States in 1982, teaching for a year at the University of Virginia, before moving to California to work at the Getty Center. From the mid-1980s until her retirement in 1991, Myra was Special Collections Curator at the Getty. She also taught for a year at the University of California, Santa Barbara. After her retirement, Myra and Bill moved to Boston, where easy access to the Harvard library and Logan airport allowed her to concentrate on research and writing, and to be close to her granddaughter Cara.

With the exception of an essay on the influence of Richardsonian architecture in Australia, a byproduct of her years there, Myra’s research centered on sixteenth-century manuscript illumination in France. Through a series of articles published in English, French and American journals and an essay in a catalogue for an exhibition at Ecouen, Myra mapped themes in French Renaissance book production. She was equally proficient in stylistic attribution and cultural studies, and she had a deep understanding of the interrelationships between such diverse arts as painting, graphics, metalwork, and enamels. Her publications show her range. Some make artistic attributions or explore relationships between miniaturists and woodcutters in books published by Geoffrey Tory. Others examine the influence of Antwerp mannerist drawings on French manuscripts, or explore patronage, analyzing selected manuscripts belonging to Louise de Savoy, Marguerite de Navarre, and Francis I. Still others employ case studies to show the impact of the culture of the French Evangelical Reform on book arts. Those who have enjoyed her work will be pleased to learn that Myra completed her volume on sixteenth-century French manuscripts, part of the Harvey Millar series, just before her death. It will be published later this year or early in 2004.

For those of us blessed by it, Myra’s friendship left as important a legacy as her work. Myra was witty, sharply intelligent, adventurous, and loyal. Her friends, who spanned generations, continents and fields of study, will miss her.

Anne Hedeman

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
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HNA News

Nominations for New Board Members

Nominations are in order for three new board members to be installed at the CAA convention in Seattle in 2004. The nominating committee, Stephanie Dickey, Reindert Falkenburg, and Linda Stone-Ferrier, invites your suggestions. We shall accept nominations until June 15, 2003. At this time, the committee will assemble a slate for membership approval. The ballot will be included in the dues notice sent to all members in November 2003. There will also be a version online which can be downloaded and printed.

Please send your suggestions to:
Linda Stone-Ferrier
Department of Art History
University of Kansas
209 Spencer Museum of Art
Lawrence KS 66045
lsf@ku.edu

HNA at CAA, Seattle, 2004

The HNA-sponsored session at CAA in Seattle, February 18-21, 2004, will be chaired by Nanette Salomon. Her topic is: The Long Legacy of the Devotio Moderna. For more information, including Call for Papers, go to www.collegeart.org.

HNA Fellowship

The HNA Fellowship was not granted in 2003 because there was no applicant whose project was eligible.

We urge members to apply for the 2004 Fellowship. Up to $1,000 may be requested for a scholarly project: this might include travel to collections or research facilities, or subvention of a publication. Funds will be distributed in April 2004. The recipient(s) will be asked to write a short account of his/her/their project(s) for publication in the Newsletter. The application should consist of: (1) short description of project (1-2 pp); (2) budget; (3) list of further funds applied/received for the same project; (4) current cv. A selection from a recent publication or (for students) a letter of recommendation may also be included. Please send the application by November 1, 2003, to:

Ellen Konowitz
Department of Art History
SUNY at New Paltz
75 South Manheim Blvd.
New Paltz, NY 12561
konowite@newpaltz.edu

Bibliography of Journal Articles on the HNA website

The HNA website (hnanews.org) has a new feature: a bibliography of current journal articles in Netherlandish and German studies. This is available to members only. The bibliography was compiled by Adriaan Waiboer, under the supervision of Eric Jan Sluijter. An update will appear in November, and from then on twice yearly, at the same time the new book list will appear. Unlike the New Titles list, the bibliography of journal articles will not be included in the hard copy or pdf file. It is hoped that this feature, along with the many other features offered on the website only, will encourage members to use the website more often, even those who rely on hard copy.

At the moment, the bibliography is compiled from the journals available at the RKD. We encourage members to inform either Adriaan or Eric Jan Sluijter of articles they have written or know of, especially in journals not searched by Adriaan: aew211@is9.nyu.edu; e.j.sluijter@hum.uva.nl

Personalia

Ingrid Alexander-Skipnes has been promoted to Associate Professor of Art History at Stavanger University College, Norway.

Frima Fox Hofrichter has been appointed chair of the History of Art Department at Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, NY.

Elmer Kolfin was awarded the prestigious Praemium Erasmianum for his dissertation: Een geselschap jonge luyden. Productie, functie en betekenis van noord-Nederlandse voorstellingen van vrolijke gezelschappen 1610-1645 (Leiden).

Claudia Swan received a Millard Meiss publication subsidy for her book Mimesis and the Imagination in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art (University of Chicago Press).

Alexander Vergara has been promoted to Senior Curator of Flemish and Northern European Painting at the Museo del Prado, Madrid.

Ernst van de Wetering received the 2003 College Art Association/Heritage Preservation Award for his study of Rembrandt’s technique and the intellectual roots of his art, Rembrandt: The Painter at Work (Amsterdam UP, 1997), and his additional writings on the philosophy and ethics of treatment of works by modern and contemporary artists such as Van Gogh and Barnett Newman.

David de Witt is the Bader Curator of European Art at the Agnes Etherington Art Centre at Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario.
Exhibitions

United States and Canada

The J. Paul Getty Museum Los Angeles

Five Hundred Years of Manuscript Illumination. February 11 – June 1, 2003.


Other Locations


Picturing Natural History. Flora and Fauna in Drawings, Manuscripts and Printed Books. The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, February 12 – May 4, 2003. This is the last major exhibition before the Morgan closes to the public for approximately two years to undergo an extensive expansion project.


Europe

Belgium

Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp


Other Locations


catalogue, with an introductory essay by Jeffrey Muller. www.rubens2004.be


Czech Republic


England and Scotland


France


Rubens universeel. Palais des Beaux-Arts, Lille, March 6 – June 14, 2004. For the symposium, see under Conferences to Attend.

Germany and Austria


Ireland


Italy


The Netherlands

The Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam


Scholten, Emile van Binnebeke and Francesca Bewer (Waanders; euro 30).


**Frans Hals Museum, Haarlem**


**Other Locations**


**Poland**


**Spain**


**Other than Europe and North America**

**Australia**


**Chile**


**Japan**

**Museum News**

**Antwerpen** – Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten: The triptych *Christ with Music-making Angels*, by Hans Memling, is back on view after undergoing extensive restoration.


**Coburg**: Forty-two works from the collection of Georg Schäfer (Schweinfurt) have been purchased by the Veste Corburg; a further six paintings were donated by the seller. Schäfer’s collection focuses mainly on works by masters from Augsburg, Nuremberg and Munich from the period between 1480-1560. Among the masterpieces is what probably is the earliest known painting by Grünewald: a predella showing *The Last Supper* and two saints. Other works include six paintings by Lucas Cranach the Elder, a *Madonna and Child* by Dürer, the *Taking of Christ*, by Hans Baldung Grien, an early work by Hans Burgkmair the Elder, a *Madonna* by Hans Holbein the Elder and two altar wings by Leonhard Beck (*FAZ*, February 24, 2003).

**London** – The National Gallery: The recently discovered (and spectacularly sold) *Massacre of the Innocents* by Peter Paul Rubens is on loan to the National Gallery for a period of three years. Understanding of this period in Rubens’s development will be enhanced by seeing the painting together with the gallery’s own *Samson and Delilah*, as well as three other works from the same period. The *Beheading of John the Baptist* (c.1608-09), will be coming from an American private collection for eleven months, and *Cain Slaying Abel* (c.1608-09) and *Moses and the Brazen Serpent* (1611) will be lent by the Courtauld Gallery for four months.


**Vienna**: The Albertina re-opened March 14, 2003, after a lengthy period of renovation.  

**Scholarly Activities**

**Conferences to Attend**

**United States**

**Anthropologies of Art**

Clark Art Institute, Williamstown, April 25-26, 2003.

Selection of speakers:

*Mariët Westermann* (IFA, New York University), The Objects of Art History and Anthropology.

*David Freedberg* (Columbia University), Pathos at Oraibi: What Warburg Did Not See.

*Hans Belting* (Karlsruhe), Toward an Anthropology of the Image.

**Beauty, Truth, Goodness: Aesthetics at the Crossroads**

9th Annual Meeting of the International Society for Phenomenology, Aesthetics and Fine Arts.


Paper presented by:

*Anat Gilboa* (University of Nijmegen), Aesthetics at the Crossroads: Rembrandt’s Portrayals of his Companions.

**Illuminating the Renaissance: Burgundian Identities, Flemish Artists, and European Markets**


**Burgundian Identity and the Book**

*Elizabeth Mooey*, Historical Identity in the Burgundian Netherlands: The Role of Manuscripts.

*Anne Korteweg*, Adolph of Cleves and the Politics of Collecting Flemish Manuscripts.

**Illuminators**

*Lorne Campbell*, Rogier van der Weyden and Manuscript Illumination.


*Elizabeth Morrison*, Narrative in the Art of the Master of the David Scenes.

*Judith Testa*, Source or Resource? Simon Bening’s Transformation of Workshop Patterns and other Pictorial Models.

**Miniatures and Borders**


*Kate Challis* and *Dagmar Eichberger*, Marginal Decorations, Precious Objects, and Private Pursuits.

**The Technique of Painters and Illuminators**

*Bodo Brinkmann*, Gerard David and his 1486 Escorial Hours.


**The Burgundian Model and International Court Patronage**

*Ronda Kasl*, Arts of Power, Castilian Patronage and the Burgundian Model.


**Other Markets for Flemish Manuscript Illumination**

*Roger Wieck*, French and Flemish Approaches to the Production of Books of Hours for the Mass Market.

*Dominique Vanwijnsberghe*, Marketing Books for Burghers. Jean Markant’s Activity in Lille, Tournai and Bruges.

*Anne-Marie Legaré*, The Reception of the Master of the Dresden Prayer Book in the Hainaut.

**College Art Association**


Sessions related to HNA:

*Ingrid Alexander-Skipnes* (Stavanger University, Norway),
Cultural Exchange between the Netherlands and Italy, 1400-1530.

**Lynette Bosch** (State University of New York, Geneseo), Cultural Crossing: Spain, Portugal, Italy, the Netherlands, and the Americas.

**Caroline Bruzelius** (Duke), Courts and Court Style Revisited: A Session in Memory of Harvey Stahl.

**Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann** (Princeton), The Central European Diaspora.

**Nanette Salomon** (CUNY, College of Staten Island), The Long Legacy of the Devotio Moderna. (Sponsored by the Historians of Netherlandish Art.)

Europe

**Kunst in Beweging. Nieuwe trends in het kunsthistorisch onderzoek**


April 26: **Hans Vlieghe**, Hoe Vlaams is de Vlaamse kunst?

Previous lectures were given by:

**Karolien De Clippel**, Kunstgeschiedenis: de knepen van het vak.

**Jan de Maere**, Wetenschappelijk onderzoek: toeschrijving en diagnostiek in de marktsituatie.

**Filip Vermeylen**, Kunst en economie: de verspreiding van de Vlaamse schilderkunst, 1400-1800.

**Nico Van Hout**, De opbouw van een Rubensschilderij.

**Die makabre Kunst im Mittelalter und ihre Rezeption**


**Kunstdiskurs und weibliche Porträtkultur nördlich der Alpen**


**Copies, répliques, pastiches**


Contact: Professor Hélène Verougraete, verougraete@art.ucl.ac.be

**Le Rubens en Europe**

Lille and Arras, April-May 2004 (exact dates will be announced). In conjunction with the Rubens exhibition in Lille (see under Exhibitions: France).

**Rubens et la France** (Lille):

**Alexis Merle du Bourg** (Rennes), Rubens dans les collections françaises au XVIIe siècle.

**Patrick Michel** (Bordeaux), Rubens dans les collections françaises du XVIIe siècle.

**Gaëtane Maes** (Lille 3), La présentation de Rubens dans les biographies d’artistes au XVIIe siècle en France.

**Sophie Raux** (Lille 3), Rubens et les dessins de Fragonard.

**La réception de Rubens aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles** (Lille):

**Pascal Bertrand** (Pau), La conception de la tapisserie. Dialogue Rubens et Vouet et Rubens et Pierre de Cortone.

**Micheèle-Caroline Heck** (Lille 3), Rubens à travers la biographie, la conception de l’art et l’œuvre de Joachim von Sandrart.

**Jeffrey Muller** (Brown, Providence, RI), La place de Rubens dans la théorie de l’art à Anvers au XVIIIe siècle.

**Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann** (Princeton), Rubens et la peinture de l’Europe centrale au XVIIIe siècle.

**Lyckle de Vries** (Groningen), Gérard de Lairesse et la réception de Rubens en Hollande.

**La querelle du coloris: origine, histoire et expression à travers les arts** (Arras):

**Christian Michel** (Paris X), La Querelle du coloris en France.

**Thomas Puttfarken** (Essex), L’origine de la “Quelrelle du coloris” en Italie: Titien et Rubens.

**Jacqueline Lichtenstein** (Paris X), De Piles et la notion de coloris.

**Marion Boudon** (Tours), De la peinture à sculpture: Rubens et Duquesnoy.

**Aline Magnien** (Amiens), L’influence de Rubens dans l’élaboration de la théorie de la sculpture en France au XVIIe siècle: le rendu de la chair et de la vie par le coloris et le clair-obscur.

Past Conferences

United States and Canada

**Renaissance Society of America Annual Meeting**


**Krista L. Ninivaggi** (Rhode Island School of Design), The Annunciation: Memling vs. Rogier.

**Isaiah Smithson** (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville), Marian Iconography in Ancient Texts and Renaissance Paintings: The Virgin Mary as Created by and as a Reader of Texts.

**Lisa Rosenthal** (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign), Desiring Peace in the Dutch Republic: Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem’s Wedding of Peleus and Thetis, 1593.

Image & Imagination of the Religious Self in Medieval and Early Modern Europe

The Lovis Corinth Research Symposium, Emory University, Atlanta, April 3-5, 2003.

Speakers include: Reindert Falkenburg, Christine Göttler, Henry Luttikhuizen, Walter Melion, Larry Silver, Bret Rothstein.

Contact: Ms Toni Rhodes, trhodes@learnlink.emory.edu

Middle Atlantic Symposium in the History of Art

National Gallery of Art, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts; University of Maryland, Department of Art History and Archaeology, April 4-5, 2003.
Europe

Collectionner dans les Flandres et la France du Nord au XVIIIe siècle

Selection of papers:

Alexis Merle du Bourg (Université Rennes 2), Un paradoxe français: Rubens, le duc de Richelieu et le Nord.

Félicien Machelart (Université de Valenciennes et du Hainaut-Cambrésis), Commandes ecclésiastiques et collections privées en Hainaut-Cambrésis.

Alain Jacobs (Brussels), Les amateurs et collectionneurs de sculptures dans les Pays-Bas du Sud aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles. Premier état de la question.

Hans J. Van Mieghem (Duke University), Negotiating Netherlandish Art in France.

Marie Fredericq-Lilar (Université Libre, Brussels), Pieter Van Reysschoot (1738-1795), peintre, professeur d’architecture et collectionneur à Gand.

Filip Vermeylen (University of Antwerp), A la recherche de l’art vendu: la diffusion de la peinture flamande en France (XVI-XVIIIe siècles).

Sophie Raux (Université Lille 3), Les ventes publiques des collections des chanoines dans le Nord de la France au XVIIIe siècle.

Erik Duverger (University of Ghent), Le commerce d’art à Gand au XVIIIe siècle.

Guillaume Glorieux (Université Clermont-Ferrand 2), Les Peintres-marchands du pont Notre-Dame et les villes du Nord de la France: une production de tableaux “nordiques” pour un marché en expansion.

Christophe Loir (Université Libre, Brussels), L’art flamand dans tous ses états: l’exportation de l’art ancien et la décadence de l’art contemporain dans les Pays-Bas autrichiens de la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle.

Dominick Dendooven (Stedelijke Musea Ieper, Ypres), Les collections d’artistes à Bruges au XVIIIe siècle: miroirs d’un goût changeant et matériaux pédagogiques?

Elyne Olivier-Valengin (Université Paris I), De l’érudition à la curiosité: la collection de la famille Vandercruysse au XVIIe siècle.


Collecting Dutch and Flemish Art in New England


Ronni Baer (MFA, Boston), Collecting Dutch and Flemish Paintings in New England.


Tatjana Bosnjak (Belgrade), The Dutch and Flemish Collections in Belgrade and the New Plans for Cataloguing and Displaying them.

Bernd Lindemann (Basel), Proposal for a Database of Unused Frames Available for Loan to Other Collections.


Albrecht Dürer and his Legacy


Joseph Leo Koerner (London), Dürer’s Model.

Norbert Joepke (London), Dürer and Sculpture.

Fritz Koreny (Vienna), Albrecht Dürer and Hans Schäufelein: A Re-appraisal of Some Drawings.

Susan Foister (London), Dürer’s Nuremberg Legacy: The Case of the National Gallery Portrait of Dürer’s Father.

Mark McDonald (London), Dürer and the Columbus Inventory.

Mark Evans (London), Dürer and Italy Revisited: The German Connection.

Dora Thornton (London), Another Look at the Uses of Dürer Prints on Italian Renaissance Maiolica.

Hinrich Sieveking (Munich), German Draughtsmanship in the Ages of Dürer and Goethe: Parallels and Resonance.

Cultural Traffic and Cultural Transformation around the Baltic Sea, 1450-1720


Steffen Heiberg (National Historical Museum Frederiksberg Slot, Denmark), The Baltic, did it exist? Reflections over Political, Social and Cultural Differences of a Region.

Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann (Princeton University), The Artistic Geography of the Baltic.

Michael North (University of Greifswald, Germany), The Hamburg Art Market and its Influence in Northern and Central Europe.

Alexander Cowan (University of Northumbria, United Kingdom), Cultural Exchange in Danzig and Lübeck.

Marika Keblusek (Leiden University), Contributions of Dutch Artists and Architects to the Image of the Danish Monarchy.

Christian Krötzl (Finnish Institute, Rome), Networks across the Baltic: Pilgrims and Students.

Björn Poulsen (Arhus University), Trade and Conspicuous Consumption among Danish Peasants.

Jan von Bonsdorff (Tromsø University, Norway), Does Art Flow? The Dissemination of Medieval Art and Artisans in the Baltic Sea Area.

Juhan Maiste (Estonian Academy of Arts, Estonia), The Invasion of Neoclassicism to the East. From Berlin to St. Petersburg.

Konrad Ottenheym (Utrecht University), Reception of Dutch Classicist Architecture in Northeastern Europe.

Sebastian Olden-Jürgensen (Copenhagen University), Ceremonial Interaction across the Baltic around 1700.

Janis Kreslins (Royal Library, Sweden), Speaking the Same Language? Reflections on various outlooks and expressions in the Baltic.

Mencia de Mendoza


The conference focuses on the collecting activities of Mencia de Mendoza (died 1554), one of the most important collectors in Spain in the first half of the sixteenth century. As the third wife of Hendrik III, Count of Nassau, she moved with her husband to the Netherlands, where they formed part of the court of Charles V. Mencia patronized many important Netherlandish artists, among them Jan Gossaert and Bernard van Orley.

Speakers are: Maryan Ainsworth (Metropolitan Museum of Art), Mari-Tere Alvarez (J. Paul Getty Museum), Adam Beaver (Harvard), Fernando Benito Doménech (Museo Valencia), Marcus Burke (Hispanic Society of America, New York), Dagmar Eichberger (Heidelberg), Ariane Faber Kolb (Berkeley), Amparo Felipe Orts (University Valencia), Ronda Kasl (Indianapolis Museum of Art), Matt Kavaler (Toronto), Thomas Kren (J. Paul Getty Museum), Juana Hidalgo Ogayar (Universidad de Alcalá de Henares), Patricia Legorreta (Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia, Mexico D.F.), Fernando Marías (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), Helen Nader (Arizona-Phoenix), Suzanne Stratton-Pruitt (New York), Paul Vandenbroeck (KMSK, Antwerp).

Opportunities

Call for Papers: Conferences

Museums and Princely Collections in the 18th Century


Opened in 1754, the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum is one of the oldest public museums in Europe. It will celebrate its 250th anniversary in 2004. On this occasion an academic symposium is dedicated to questions regarding museums in 18th-century Europe. The symposium will focus on the following topics:

- The continuation and foundation of princely collections and their public access.
- The foundation of public museums by sovereigns.
- The definition and different stages of public.
- The tasks of museum staff and their operation of the museum, e.g. documentation and inventory, acquisition, and building equipment.
- Proposals for papers (30 minutes) are welcome; travel and accommodation for speakers will be taken care of. The deadline for submissions is August 31, 2003.

Organizer and contact: Prof. Dr. Jochen Luckhardt, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Kunstmunseum des Landes Niedersachsen, Museumstr. 1, D-38100 Braunschweig, Phone: +49 (5 31) 12 25-0, Fax: +49 (5 31) 12 25-24 08, e-mail: jluckhardt@museum-braunschweig.de; Prof. Dr. Michael Wiemers, Institut für Kunstgeschichte der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Kröllwitzer Str. 44, D-06120 Halle, Phone: +49 (3 45) 5 52 43 12, Fax: +49 (3 45) 5 52 70 40, e-mail: wiemers@kunstgesch.uni-halle.de

Positions

Senior Curator (Ref. NG03 BAND 4/5): Early Netherlandish, Dutch and Flemish Art

The National Gallery of Scotland in Edinburgh is seeking a highly qualified specialist to curate the outstanding early Netherlandish, Dutch and Flemish collection, which includes paintings, drawings and prints dating from circa 1450-1900. Within this specialism you will be responsible for cataloguing, proposing and curating exhibitions, writing, publishing and lecturing, as well as recommendations upon acquisitions, requests for loans and display. You will have done postgraduate research in this area and have a good working knowledge of the relevant European languages: experience of working with gallery collections will be valuable.

Salary range (Band 5): £19,656 - £25,553
Salary range (Band 4): £25,553 - £33,219

Appointment will be made related to relevant experience.

Civil Service Pension provisions enables NGS to offer a choice of pension arrangements.

Closing date for completed applications is 13th June 2003.

For further information and an application form for the above post, please telephone 0131 624 6282 (answerphone) or e-mail to: apply@nationgalleries.org, stating your name, address, the appropriate job reference number and job title.

Fellowships

American Friends of the Mauritshuis Fellowship

The American Friends of the Mauritshuis offers ad hoc grants in the field of art history to support an academic project devoted to a topic related to the collection of The Mauritshuis Museum in The Hague, The Netherlands. Recipients are required to travel to The Hague and are expected to work closely with the curatorial staff of The Mauritshuis. Grants range up to $10,000, depending on the financial requirements and merits of the project. Applicants are invited to submit a letter with a detailed description of the project to:

The American Friends of the Mauritshuis
22 East 80th Street
New York, NY 10021

Curatorial Fellowship in Indianapolis

The Indianapolis Museum of Art announces a nine-month fellowship, the Allen Whitehall Clowes Curatorial Fellowship, for junior scholars who wish to pursue curatorial careers in art museums. To be eligible, an applicant must be enrolled in a graduate course of study leading to an advanced degree, or be a recent recipient of a doctoral degree (within the last three years). The Clowes Fellow will receive a stipend of $16,000 and an educational travel allowance of $2,000. Housing will be provided. The nine-month fellowship period will begin September 1, 2003. The appointment is renewable.

Applications must be received by May 1, 2003.

Applications should include a cover letter explaining your interest in the fellowship, official academic transcripts, curriculum vitae, a concise statement describing your area of research and its relationship to the Clowes Collection, a writing sample and three letters of recommendation (academic and professional).

The American Friends of the Mauritshuis
4000 Michigan Road
Indianapolis, IN 46208-3326
**New Program at University of Amsterdam**

The University of Amsterdam will start a new master’s program on Dutch Art in European Context in September 2003: http://cf.hum.uva.nl/graduateschool/

---

**HNA Review of Books**

**General editor:** Kristin Belkin

**Field editors:**
- Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries: Jacob Wisse
- Sixteenth Century: Larry Silver
- Seventeenth-Century Flemish: Fiona Healy
- Seventeenth-Century Dutch: Stephanie Dickey

**Review Guidelines**

HNA accepts for review publications which deal with Netherlandish, German and Franco-Flemish art and architecture between 1350 and 1750. Members may request to review a particular book, or propose publications for review. The final decision rests with the field editor and/or general editor.

Reviewers need not be members of HNA.

Upon accepting a request for a review, the publication will be sent to the reviewer. The reviewer is requested to submit his/her review to the responsible field editor within a reasonable period, i.e. if not for the forthcoming issue, then for the subsequent one.

Deadlines for submission of reviews to field-editors are mid-March for the April Newsletter and mid-October for the November issue.

Reviews should be approximately 1000 words, not to exceed 1500. Field editors may request revisions or edit for length if necessary.

We encourage reviews that both provide an overview of the contents, which is particularly useful for foreign language publications, and are critical. We however request reviewers to maintain a fair and objective tone. The editors reserve the right to correct and shorten reviews. Heavily edited reviews will be returned for approval to reviewers before publication.

The reviewer alone is responsible for the content and accuracy of his/her review. Reviews do not express the opinions of the board nor of the field editors or general editor.

---

**Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries**


Cyriel Stoo’s book, *De celebratie van de macht*, uses the presentation scenes in Burgundian manuscripts made for Philip the Good and his son Charles the Bold as a starting point, leading the reader through a remarkably deft and informative examination of the artistic patronage of the dukes of Burgundy, who used the visual arts and literature to create a vision of rulership that would enhance their efforts to consolidate and legitimate their position in the Netherlands. Stroo begins by focusing on presentation scenes and related expressions of ducal status – the luxury objects that provided a background for courtly ceremonies. The discussion then broadens to consider the role of such works of art alongside the literary and historical texts being written for the dukes, in establishing an image of rule for the Burgundian dukes in a new land, turning established traditions toward new political objectives.

The first section examines these fifteenth-century presentation scenes as the culmination of a convention with its origins in ecclesiastical patronage: miniatures in which a canon, for example, reverently offers the book to a saint. Scenes of presentation in manuscripts made for the Burgundian dukes (and earlier patrons, such as the kings of France, a middle point that might have been explored further) draw on both the form and the flavor of homage that were established within a sacred tradition. Scenes of divine inspiration in these introductory images served to authenticate the texts that followed, an effect Stroo also sees in the reverential presentation scenes that preface so many Burgundian secular manuscripts. Stroo then introduces the presentation scenes in the *Chroniques de Hainaut* – one for each of the work’s three volumes, illustrated over a period of years for Philip and his successor. The bulk of this first section considers the cast and staging of that canonical scene of Burgundian court life, the frontispiece to the first volume of the *Chroniques de Hainaut* attributed to Rogier van der Weyden; its unprecedented impact on presentation scenes in later manuscripts; and a group of scenes that apparently resisted its influence, which are here classed as “autonomous.”

The next section broadens the inquiry to include other visual evidence of the Burgundian dukes’ self-representation, chiefly coats of arms, and the devices that supported them in one way or another, from the acanthus branches that frame miniatures to the tents, carpets, and suites of tapestry the dukes commissioned with such ardor, all hung with heraldry that defined, claimed, and celebrated their territorial possessions. Stroo also discusses the staging of state ceremonies such as the Joyous Entries, in which the dukes made their power known, and the traces of that symbolic apparatus in the manuscripts they commissioned. He notes, for example, that the presentation miniature in Charles’s copy of *Les Faiz d’Alexandre* of c.1470, in which the charged space between Charles and the kneeling donor is occupied by a sideboard heavy with jeweled vessels, recalls the three similarly laden sideboards described by Philip’s chroniclers; these apparently caused a stir at the meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece in 1456. We might be forgiven for concluding that a presentation scene like this reflects an actual ceremony – there is no real evidence that such rituals took place; but Stroo makes a good case in their favor. At the same time, he helps the reader to detect what might be called the emblematic armature beneath the representational image.

The third section addresses the extraordinarily rich contribution to the “celebration of power” made by the dukes’ stable of authors, translators, and historians, who drew on classical topoi, historical and mythical heroes, and conventions from the medieval tradition of princes’ mirrors to glorify their employers. At this point, Stroo brings in the dukes’ political situation within a discussion of their literal appropriation of certain territories and figurative appropriation of certain historical figures. The author’s choice of withholding an explanation of the political context that fostered a work of art (usually established early on to set the scene) is risky but surprisingly effective here, as it keeps our attention trained on the object of the inquiry.

Stroo’s topic is unusually complex, given the standing of the dukes of Burgundy, the financial resources behind their pretensions, and the wealth of contemporary witnesses, amateur and professional...
writers whose accounts provide him with the keynotes for his discussion of the political background to these representations. Several landmark exhibitions of Burgundian manuscripts at the Royal Library in Brussels (La miniature flamande in 1959, and the two anniversary exhibitions, La bibliotheque de Philippe le Bon/De Librije van Filips de Goede in 1967 and Charles le Temerai/Carle de Stout in 1977) made the manuscript patronage of Philip the Good and his son Charles the Bold better known. De celebratie van de macht builds on our growing knowledge about the artistic achievement of these impressive manuscripts, and considers the political messages they might convey – the “how” and “why,” one might say, now that we have tentative answers for the other basic questions. The book’s command of evidence from several disciplines deepens our understanding of the function and purpose of some extraordinary works of art – always a cause for celebration.

Elizabeth J. Moodey

New York Public Library


This is the third in a projected series of five catalogues on the Royal Museums’ collection of early Netherlandish painting. It follows Cyriel Stroo and Pascale Syfer-d’Olné’s volume on *The Master of Flémalle and Rogier van der Weyden Groups* (1996) and Cyriel Stroo, Pascale Syfer-d’Olné, Anne Dubois and Roel Slachmuylders’s volume on *The Dirk Bouts, Petrus Christus, Hans Memling and Hugo van der Goes Groups* (1999). The four authors of the 1999 volume have been joined here by Nathalie Toussaint as collaborators on seventeen catalogue entries on the museum’s Hieronymus Bosch, Albrecht Bouts, Gerard David, Colijn de Coter and Goossen van der Weyden Groups. The seventeen works span a period from about 1480 (Bouts’ *Penitence of Saint Jerome*) to the second half of the sixteenth century (the Nativity after Bosch); though most of them – thirteen – were painted between 1490 and 1530.

Each entry is structured according to roughly the same format used in the first two volumes of the series. Following a general physical description, provenance, a list of exhibitions in which the work has appeared, and a detailed account of past restorations and copious technical notes, the authors review the literature on the painting in a section called “Status Quaestions.” This amounts to a chronological summary of the work’s critical history, devoid for the most part of the authors’ opinion – except in “exceptional instances.” Then comes a discussion of “Iconography,” which offers broad explication of the work’s subject and interpretation. The authors finally tip their hand in the “Comments” section, drawing conclusions based on the technical, stylistic and iconographic information previously introduced. Full-page color plates and details of each painting are complemented by a range of black-and-white illustrations and comparative images, as well as by useful supporting technical material. Each catalogue entry features illustrations of the construction of the frame and panels, a photograph of the reverse of the painting, infrared photographs and reflectogram assemblies, and, in certain cases, X-radiographs that are consulted in discussions of paint application and condition. Dendrochronological analysis is used to help date the works, while a very few paint samples have been taken to support comments about technique.

The care and sensitivity with which the authors have looked, analyzed, and described these seventeen paintings is admirable, and represents one of the great achievements and benefits of the catalogue. Detailed description of paint application and technique in the “Technical Notes” is fascinating in and of itself, providing the reader with a remarkably vivid sense of the paintings’ color and appearance and of the painters’ respective working methods. But they are also practical and powerful tools with which the authors assess attribution and even draw conclusions about meaning. Particular insights are gained in connection with the group of eight paintings associated with Albrecht Bouts (ca. 1451/55-1534), making up almost half of the catalogue’s offerings. Anne Dubois and Roel Slachmuylders effectively define some of the essential characteristics of Bouts’s technique in his monumental Assumption of the Virgin Triptych (c.1495-1500), used in turn to establish the authorship – or degree of authorship – in the remainder of the group. The facial features, color application and style, and technical idiosyncrasies of Bouts’s *Penitence of Saint Jerome* (c.1480), for instance, provide convincing support for linking it to the Assumption and the core of the group. Bouts also comes off as a significantly more intuitive and sensitive painter than has been assumed previously. While this might be in part a natural result of studying Albrecht’s paintings on their own terms, and not in disadvantageous association with his more famous and talented father’s work, the entries do make a valid case for considering the son as an independent, coherent, and intelligent artistic personality. Though perhaps more because of the sheer number of entries than because of anything else, Bouts emerges as the unofficial star of this catalogue.

The thoroughness of approach has also allowed the authors to make discoveries about provenance and new suggestions about attribution, dating, and interpretation, which can be cited only partially here. An inventory of monasteries from 1798-80 by G.J.J. Boschaert is used to suggest that Bouts’s later Assumption of the Virgin (c.1500-1510) may have originally been commissioned for the abbey church of Cistercian nuns at Florival, just south of Louvain – a suggestion that helps broaden our understanding of the close ties the family of painters maintained with nearby religious institutions. Archival research has also allowed for a convincing provenance to be established for Colijn de Coter’s Johanna van Maerke Triptych (1522); it is linked to the abbey of Benedictine nuns at Vorst, near Brussels, where presumably the four female donors dressed in religious habits in the wings were based. Detailed examination of Gerard David’s *Adoration of the Magi* and consideration of its motifs encourage Cyriel Stroo and Pascale Syfer-d’Olné to date the work around 1500, a decade or so later than has been common. Throughout the catalogue, close, careful reading of content makes the entries potent resources for understanding and assessing the costume, religious iconography, and broad social context of the works.

A catalogue offering such detailed analysis of individual works cannot be expected to maintain a coherent thematic thread. Nor should it be judged according to the same standards applied to historical accounts of the period. But there are ways in which the organizers of this valuable catalogue have lost a chance to give richer definition to the works and to the period as a whole. Some of this has to do with the structure chosen for the catalogue entries. As opposed to the National Gallery’s catalogue of The Fifteenth Century Netherlandish Schools by Lorne Campbell (1998), for instance, which organizes entries according to the key issues of individual works (e.g. for Gerard David’s *Canon Bernardijn Salviati and Three Saints*: “Identity of the Donor,” “Attribution,” “Original Function,” “Original Location,” and “Date”), giving appropriate weight to each, this
catalogue imposes an unwavering organizational scheme that does not distinguish between the respective problems of different works. Thus, the *Temptation of Saint Anthony Triptych* (c.1520-1530) by Bosch’s workshop – a work whose motifs and iconography receive the bulk of the authors’ attention – and Goossen van der Weyden’s *Portraits of François Colibrant and Lysbeth Biers* – for which attribution and the relationship between the donors and artist are key – both follow the same format. A more streamlined and discriminating approach might make the authors’ focus on significant issues more apparent. In a broad sense, the catalogue could also have placed more emphasis on the artistic trends shared by the works. As Eliane De Wilde justifiably emphasizes in the Foreword, the era represented here (i.e. 1490-1530) is a “period of transition” in which “[a]rtistic production ... was still rooted in late medieval thought, yet increasingly influenced by new Renaissance developments and reflecting the changing religious and social context.” One wishes the authors had made more effort to define or draw attention to the newness of artistic practices and social customs represented by this group of paintings.

Certain awkward English phrases produce short-term confusion about the authors’ meaning. Does the “material history of the paintings,” for instance, refer to the works’ provenance or to their state of preservation and/or restoration? While meaning usually becomes clear in context within a few sentences, all confusion could have been eliminated through more sensitive translation and careful editing. This reader would also like to quibble with the use of the phrase *Status Quo*nt. n. partially because it is not English and does not have common usage in any current language; but also because it strikes an unnecessarily pedantic and dated note. If “Histrionography” seems too limited, and “State of the Question” is considered awkward, what about “Critical History”? Perhaps the organizers of subsequent volumes might consider the latter, a phrase that is clear, telling, and even somewhat dramatic – qualities that this thorough, accessible, indispensable catalogue possesses in spades.

Jacob Wisse
Adelphi University


Underdrawings in Renaissance Paintings marks the fourth entry in the National Gallery’s popular *Art in the Making* series. A joint project of the National Gallery’s Scientific, Conservation, and Curatorial departments, the exhibition and accompanying publication represent more than a decade of systematic scientific analysis at the National Gallery, one of few museums to have examined its collection in greater detail. The Herculean work of Research Associate Rachel Billinge, the infrared reflectogram “mosaics” that illustrate this volume have been assembled from digital images using computer programs developed by the National Gallery specifically for this purpose.

David Bromford’s excellent introductory essay begins with a brief history of the scientific study of paintings at the National Gallery. In a text that parallels the exhibition installation, Bomford defines underdrawings as the preparatory drawings that lie beneath the finished surfaces of paintings, and describes the scientific techniques used to identify and analyze them. Rarely visible through thin paint layers, underdrawings can be revealed and documented using infrared photography, a moderately sensitive method first used as an analytical tool in the 1930s, and by infrared reflectography, a highly sensitive technique first developed by the Dutch physicist J.R.J. van Asperen de Boer in 1960. Each of these scientific methods is clearly explained in terms that are easily accessible to the non-specialist. Bomford concludes his introduction by noting the various techniques and media used by artists for the execution of underdrawings. These include wet brush (identifiable by smooth, continuous lines), pen or quill drawings (evidenced by split lines), dry-line drawings (executed in charcoal or colored chalk) and transferred designs (using a grid system, incised tracing, or pouncing).

Following Bomford’s concise introduction to the subject, an essay by scientists Jo Kirby, Ashok Roy, and Marika Spring discusses in greater detail the materials and methods used by artists for the execution or transfer of underdrawings on the prepared surfaces of panels or canvases. By including several examples of microscopic and cross-sectional sampling analyses, the authors illustrate the difficulty of identifying underdrawing media simply through visual analysis, and caution that at all times, comparisons must continue to be made with the painted surface. Although clearly written, the rather technical tone of this essay may make it less appealing to the uninitiated general reader.

In an essay dedicated to the “Artists of the North,” curators Lorne Campbell and Susan Foister present an excellent summary of the purpose, style, and technique of drawings and underdrawings in the work of Jan van Eyck, Albrecht Dürer, Jan Gossaert, Hieronymus Bosch, and others. The authors are careful to identify underdrawings not as preliminary sketches or first ideas, but rather as the final step in a series of preparatory stages taken by the artist prior to applying paint to the surface of a panel or canvas. Particular attention is given to the role of drawings and underdrawings in the workshops of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century masters, in which replicas were often produced, and the execution or transfer of designs was frequently relegated to apprentices or journeymen.

Finally, an essay by restorer Jill Dunkerton and curator Carol Plazzotta addresses the importance of drawing and design in the production of Italian Renaissance paintings. The authors discuss the Italian concept of *disegno* as the synthesis of idea and execution, and identify how, through the understanding of this concept, drawings and underdrawings associated with Italian paintings differ from those of Northern artists. The importance of model books, collected drawings, and pattern cartoons in the production of Italian paintings is discussed at length. Several examples of traced, squared, or pounced underdrawings in the work of Pisanello, Vincenzo Foppa, Perugino, Lorenzo Lotto, and others clearly illustrate this point.

A catalogue of sixteen richly illustrated entries follows the four introductory essays. Paintings are arranged in chronological order, from Stephan Lochner’s *Saints Matthew, Catherine of Alexandria, and John the Evangelist* (c.1450) to Pieter Bruegel the Elder’s *Adoration of the Kings* (1564). Notable highlights include: Carlo Crivelli’s *Dead Christ Supported by Angels* (c.1470-75), underdrawn throughout in rapid, light strokes, with a brush and dilute ink; the Master of the View of St. Gudula’s *Portrait of a Young Man* (c.1480-85), whose extensive and detailed underdrawing is executed in bold, rapid strokes with a liquid medium; Raphael’s *Procession to Calvary* (c.1504), the infrared reflectogram of which shows evidence of transfer from a pricked cartoon, pounced with charcoal; and Marinus van Reymerswale’s *Two Tax Gatherers* (c.1540), whose detailed and carefully traced underdrawing follows precisely the painted surface of Reymerswale’s panel in the Louvre. The greater number of Netherlandish and German paintings over Italian paintings reflects the fact that these areas of the National Gallery’s collections have been more comprehensively studied to date.

Footnotes are detailed and extensive, although their placement at
the end of the volume rather than within their respective essays is somewhat cumbersome. The comprehensive Bibliography is organized according to topic and individual artist, with entries arranged alphabetically, by author or editor, within. A single page Technical Appendix, containing concise summaries of the scientific techniques used, provides a “how-to” guide for the specialist wishing to further explore or apply these methods in his or her own research (the Gallery’s custom-built VIPs-ip mosaic assembly software is available free via the Internet, with download information at www.vips.ecs.soton.ac.uk).

A valuable publication for the specialist and interested general reader alike, Art in the Making: Underdrawings in Renaissance Paintings represents the state of the art in the technical and stylistic analysis of underdrawings, and provides for all readers an easily accessible point of entry to the fairly complex world of infrared reflectographic studies.

Nancy E. Zinn
The Walters Art Museum


All of us readily acknowledge that the most important publications for scholars in both the museum and the academy are the comprehensive catalogues of permanent collections, though they seldom get the flashy coverage of either exhibition catalogues or artist’s monographs. In the field of early German art, the outstanding collections in that country form the foundations of all scholarship, and the Stüdel is exemplary in its ongoing catalogue productions. This volume continues the fine precedent of 1993, Niederländische Gemälde im Stüdel 1400-1530 by Jochen Sander. Brinkmann and Kemperdick are already familiar and respected names to scholars of Netherlandish art: Brinkmann for his work on fifteenth-century manuscripts, Kemperdick for his recent monograph on Campin.

Von Zabern has performed its customary exemplary production as well, furnishing high-quality color reproductions of all works as well as legible infrared mosaics and x-radiographs; generous comparative images bolster the stylistic arguments of the curators. Technological studies are complemented by careful line drawings, including punchmarks details of the important Lochner panels.

The collection begins with the four scenes of the interior wings of the Altenberg retable, a dismembered reliquary altarpiece whose central Madonna image, clearly related to Cologne sculpture, is in Munich (BNM). The catalogue entry (3-32) includes a full historiography, which in this case goes back to mid-seventeenth century antiquarianism in a manuscript history by the prior and includes a first full study by Graf Solms-Laubach (1926) as well as Ehresmann’s study in the 1982 Art Bulletin of its iconography and function. Later relocated in the nun’s balcony of the church, this large work must once have been designed as a main altarpiece. The original site was strongly associated with the blessed Gertrude (canonized in 1348); her mother, St. Elizabeth, appears with a tiny nun in the wings. However, like many other artworks these panels became dissociated from their original monastic context in the nineteenth century, only to become a part of the site, a hortus conclusus, as well as individual flowers, in particular those with mariological significance. Dating to around 1410/20 is based in part on the armored figure of St. George, and a core group of related works confirmed but nuanced (dating the Winterthur Anunciation and Strasbourg Joseph’s Doubt later, c.1430/40, noting their use of consistent shadows), including the rejection of a proffered name, Hans Tiefental of Schlettstadt. Attempts to find stylistic precedents largely fail, though the Norfolk Triptych provides some common features. The meticulous plant studies of this work also link it to the early fifteenth-century imagery, especially in North Italy, surveyed by Pächt (1950, not cited) and with imagery of love-gardens, such as the mid-century engravings of those subjects. The identity of the saints remains uncertain, without their usual attributes, yet the dominance (and heraldic prominence) given to female saints suggests that this might be a work intended for a woman’s cloister, itself associated with an image of paradise.

The great 1993 Lochner exhibition, organized by the Wallraf-Richartz Museum led to a full re-examination of that artist’s core works, including Frankfurt’s series, the Martyrdom of the Apostles (176-217), here reconstructed as the wings of the Last Judgment Altarpiece (Cologne, bearing similar punch marks, following Lukatis, 1993) and with the exterior Saints (Munich), with kneeling male donors and their arms. Carefully conducted technical studies, including full infrareds, even indicate color notations in the underdrawings; Brinkmann has also published these findings in the Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch (1997). There is no firm basis for dating, now usually assigned to the period 1435-40; Netherlandish influence is asserted but not specified (see the Cologne catalogue). The putative site for this commission was (following Gompf, 1997) the Catherine Monastery, the ensemble was reunited for the 1975 exhibition, “Kunst der Altenberg,” which includes punchmarks details of the important Lochner panels.

The other “star” picture is a Resurrection by the Housebook Master (308-26), recently examined in a fine monograph by Daniel Hess (1994). This is complemented by a workshop St. Jerome as well as an associate’s work, the right wing of the Monis Altarpiece. Of course, the Resurrection is well associated with other panels in Berlin and Freiburg (illustrated) in the so-called “Speyer Altarpiece.” This attribution was confirmed by technical studies of underdrawing by Filedt Kok in the Amsterdam exhibition (1985), though the disposition of the panels into a single altarpiece remains uncertain. Dating usually pointed around 1480 is slightly revised because of shoe style in the Crucifixion (Freiburg), suggesting rather 1485/90. Connections to Cologne, and by extension to the Netherlands, emerge from this picture. The authors agree with Hess in associating the paintings group with the drypoints of the Amsterdam Cabinet Master.

These are highlights of a collection both broad and deep in older German panels, including important pendant portraits by Master WB (Wolfgang Beurer) and a Nuremberg Youth, c.1490, plus a small Holy Family by the Master of St. Bartholomew. The curators have maintained the high standard already set by Sander in his Netherlandish volume. One can easily become impatient to see the sequel volume on sixteenth-century German art by the same authors!

Larry Silver
University of Pennsylvania

Frankfurt is the home of the name painting of the Master of the Paradise Garden, and that entry (93-120) is another highlight of this catalogue. This often discussed image offers a rich historiography, led by Ewald Vetter (165), which ponders localization in the Upper Rhine, often around Strasbourg, and the interpretation of the saints, the site, a hortus conclusus, as well as individual flowers, in particular those with mariological significance. Dating to around 1410/20 is based in part on the armored figure of St. George, and a core group of related works confirmed but nuanced (dating the Winterthur Annunciation and Strasbourg Joseph’s Doubt later, c.1430/40, noting their use of consistent shadows), including the rejection of a proffered name, Hans Tiefental of Schlettstadt. Attempts to find stylistic precedents largely fail, though the Norfolk Triptych provides some common features. The meticulous plant studies of this work also link it to the early fifteenth-century imagery, especially in North Italy, surveyed by Pächt (1950, not cited) and with imagery of love-gardens, such as the mid-century engravings of those subjects. The identity of the saints remains uncertain, without their usual attributes, yet the dominance (and heraldic prominence) given to female saints suggests that this might be a work intended for a woman’s cloister, itself associated with an image of paradise.
Shorter Notices


Albert Châtelet’s goal in this book is clear from its title: to identify the Master of Moulins, named after a triptych of the Virgin and Child Adored by Angels with Saints and Donors in Moulins Cathedral, with Jean Prévost, who served as master glazier and painter for Lyon Cathedral. The polemical character of the volume is apparent even in the author’s dedication to Louis Grodecki, the noted specialist in glass painting, who “first noted the intervention of the Master of Moulins in the windows of the Moulins Cathedral and who understood that he was none other than Jean Prévost.” In the opening chapter, “À la quête d’un artiste,” Châtelet briefly reviews attempts made over the past half century to attach a name to the anonymous master. First proposed, among other possibilities, by Paul Dupieux in 1946, the association of Prévost with the Master of Moulins was more passionately and unambiguously put forward by Châtelet himself in several publications (e.g. “A Plea for the Master of Moulins,” The Burlington Magazine, 104, 1962, pp. 517-24; “Au temps des Jean: l’Enigme du Maître de Moulins,” in: Anne de Beaujeu et ses Ènigmes, Académie de Villefranche-en-Beaujolais, Villefranche-sur-Saône, 1984, pp.110-23). Châtelet’s pleas have generally fallen on resistant ears, with most scholars identifying the Master with Jean Hey. The author here restates his case in thirteen short chapters, each devoted to a work, group of works, to an aspect of Prévost’s career, or to the activities of the French court. Châtelet places particular emphasis on the Master of Moulins’ style and its apparent connections to glass painting. The book’s second part is made up of six appendices, containing documents and brief catalogue entries on the works of Prévost, Laurent Girardin, “Jean Hay,” Pierre de Paix, the Master of Saint Giles (identified here as Wouter de Crane), and Hugo van der Goes.

Jacob Wisse
Adelphi University


The product of a sensitive reassessment of Hieronymus Bosch – and not a little frustration over the general state of scholarship on the artist – this book by Roger Van Schoute and Monique Verboomen is addressed to the general reader. In a concise, lucid foreword the authors identify some of the problems confronting Bosch studies. There is but a single painting, a Last Judgment of 1504, which can be linked to Bosch through historical sources; and this has not been securely identified with any surviving work. No existing work has a watertight attribution, and the numerous copies after the artist make sorting out originals from workshop production immensely difficult. Sources even mention the creation – a market, perhaps – of Boschian images after the artist’s death. Faced with this discouraging situation, Van Schoute and Verboomen resort to tradition, approaching their subject through the lens of iconography – a very untrendy but clear, telling, and possibly even brave strategy. They divide Bosch’s works into broad iconographic categories: moralizing scenes or allegories, scenes of the life of Christ, saints, and Last Judgments. Following a section devoted to the artist’s origins and milieu in ’s-Hertogenbosch and his biography, the paintings are discussed individually in brief, footnoteless essays that explain the subject and attempt to set themes within the context of the artist’s work and era. The book concludes with sections on the technical investigation of the artist, a critical catalogue of his paintings, and a general bibliography.

Jacob Wisse
Adelphi University

Sixteenth Century


This catalogue of the Metropolitan Museum’s splendid exhibition Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence (March 12 – June 19, 2002) presents a major study of a spectacular and important medium. Tapestries – enormous in size, opulent in materials, and lofty in subject – were the major form of figural art in the Renaissance courts, yet scholars have paid far less attention to them than to paintings of the period, and they have remained relatively unfamiliar outside of specialist studies. Tapestries in the Renaissance participates in a new scholarly concern for these late medieval and Renaissance art forms (akin to other recent exhibitions, notably the Met’s own Luminous Image show of Netherlandish glass roundels in 1995 and the Getty’s Painting on Light exhibition of German and Swiss stained glass in 2000). By examining the highest quality weavings in scholarly essays and catalogue entries, Tapestries in the Renaissance makes a vital contribution to Renaissance studies and will undoubtedly help attract broader attention to these works of art. The College Art Association recognized the show’s achievement by awarding Thomas P. Campbell, the exhibition’s organizer and the chief author of the catalogue, with the 2003 Alfred H. Barr, Jr., Award for Museum Scholarship.

Tapestry in the Renaissance examines the medium’s cultural context and stylistic development from the late medieval period to the High Renaissance, in both Northern Europe and in Italy. Campbell’s catalogue relates tapestries to their patrons’ lifestyles, tastes, and aspirations, demonstrating, for instance, how these works’ special qualities – their heroic themes, huge scale, and extravagant cost – were particularly suitable to project messages about power and magnificence, both secular and ecclesiastical. (We remember that Raphael’s tapestry designs for the Sistine Chapel, commissioned by Leo X, complemented Michelangelo’s grandiose frescoes.) The roles of key designers who developed and transformed the medium are also closely studied, including Raphael and Bernard van Orley; later, Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Jan Vermeyen, and Michiel Coxcie, among
others. Finally, the catalogue defines the physical and technical circumstances under which these complex works of art were commissioned and produced.

Throughout, the catalogue meticulously summarizes a vast amount of previous scholarship and presents many new arguments and insights. For instance, Campbell proposes to expand Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s oeuvre. During the 1530s, Coecke was a leading tapestry designer and the director of an important painting workshop in Antwerp, but his later artistic activity has virtually vanished from our view (he died in 1550). Campbell proposes that a number of tapestry designs, already tentatively associated with Coecke, represent the artist’s late work, arguing that tapestry design continued to occupy him at the height of his career.

Far from being a narrow, specialized study, Campbell’s book sheds light on larger issues of Renaissance art history, such as the interrelations between the North and Italy, as well as the nature of collaboration and workshop practice. Since many of the major Renaissance painters devoted energies to tapestry design, our understanding of this art form clarifies our view of the period as a whole. Moreover, tapestries incorporate a wealth of Renaissance imagery. For instance, very few early Netherlandish paintings survive to show secular, classical, or Old Testament subjects, although there is evidence that more of these works did once exist. Tapestries--produced in the same years as, say, the devotional paintings of Rogier van der Weyden or Hans Memling--provide these “rare” themes in abundance. Tapestry in the Renaissance includes numerous allegories (such as the Met’s lovely panel of the Unicorn defends itself, from the well-known set woven in the Netherlands c.1495-1505), contemporary and historical battle scenes, Old Testament stories and heroes, and classical subjects. These woven panels may shed light on the lost secular scenes rendered in paint (notably the lost van der Weyden Herkinbald murals); moreover, we can speculate about how certain types of subjects held special associations with specific media.

The exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum was a majestic survey of tapestry design, displaying more than forty tapestries, nineteen drawings and cartoon fragments, and two prints. Visitors to the Met were lucky enough to experience the sheer beauty of tapestry under optimal conditions. For readers of the catalogue, the excellent color illustrations hint at the amazing effects achieved by the sparkling threads of gold, silver, and silk woven into these most luxurious and costly images of the Renaissance. In its presentation of both scholarly and visual evidence, Tapestry in the Renaissance makes a most compelling case for the medium’s mainstream importance in the history of art.

Ellen Konowitz
SUNY-New Paltz


One of the wonderful things about exhibition catalogues in Europe is their combination of seriousness and scope. America is so obsessed with blockbuster exhibitions and mega-catalogues to accompany them that a serious, smaller scale presentation of a truly art historical topic rarely gets staged. Yet on the Continent, often in smaller museums, thematic exhibitions with scholarly essays in modest publications find appreciative audiences who enjoy the art and its subjects, even if the names of canonical culture heroes do not dominate the wall labels. Braunschweig featured similar prior exhibitions on thematic issues of scholarly topicality, including Dutch emblem imagery and reproductive engravings.

Before this catalogue the subject of Netherlandish carnival images had also been examined usefully but within a wider time frame a decade earlier in another catalogue, Vastenaard-Carnaval (Charles Mool, ed.), mounted in ’s-Hertogenbosch (Noordbrabants Museum, 1992). Of course, Raupp’s magisterial Bauernsitten (Niederzier, 1986) forms the essential background for any analysis of peasant scenes. And at the outset of any and all observations stands the famous Large Feast (ca. 1540, cat. no. 1) by the celebrated, anonymous Brunswick Monogrammist (often identified as Jan van Amstel).

This Braunschweig catalogue begins with two excellent essays by its organizers. Gatenbröcker examines the origins and meanings (especially as cultural symbols) of the genre of peasant weddings and village kermis scenes. Her focus is the Flemish tradition, highlighted by Bruegel, in both paintings and prints before 1600. This fine analysis and the exhibition in general remind us anew of how much of what is normally taken to be essential to Dutch genre imagery in the seventeenth century actually began in the prior hundred years, with roots in German graphics as well as Flanders.

In the related second essay Andreas Vetter studies the bounded pleasure garden as a sanctuary of festivity, carved out of the wider world, just as a festive day or wedding event is carved out of the annual calendar. Aristocratic celebrations form his cultural focus. Both ancient authors and Olympian gods as well as the shepherds of pastoral appear in his significant literary citations. The French court of the Valois tapestries also offers a touchstone, as do the Dutch aristocratic “merry companies” in a garden park, the turn-of-the-century innovation of Vinckboons and Esias van der Velde in Holland (now see the new monograph by Rodney Nevitt, Art and the Culture of Love in Seventeenth-Century Holland, Cambridge, 2003; reviewed in this issue), here interpreted chiefly as moralizing, still connected to the traditions of the love garden and the five senses.

The exhibition itself ranges beyond the essays, starting with German prints and extending to both seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish artists -- unusually, the largest number of works were produced by (or after) David Vinckboons and Sebastian Vranckx. Unlike many studies, which attend primarily to the anonymous figures of the lower classes in village settings, this exhibition and essays also include festivity among members of the upper classes, noting as well the frequent presence of prominent and prosperous guests at the occasions of either kermis or wedding. There is also a kind of inverted relationship between these peasant festivities and the emerging theme of “merry companies.” Though confined to an exhibition catalogue, this revisit of these complementary themes offers the most thorough interweaving of their rich relationship while also working well as an insightful and engaging encounter with a wide range of works, mostly graphic.

Larry Silver
University of Pennsylvania

As one of the most active scholars on the art patronage of Emperor Maximilian I Habsburg, I rejoice in this systematic, thoroughly researched study of the ruler’s most ambitious and encompassing art work, the *Arch of Honor*. Originally a dissertation, directed by Profs. Haussherr and Anzelewsky, at the Freie Universität, Berlin, it more than fulfills its role as the true completion of the work of the late nineteenth-century scholars who published editions of these Habsburg glories, especially Eduard Chmelarz (JKS AK, 1886) and Franz Schestag (JKS AK, 1883). This kind of careful study of a single monument has become rare today and is all the more welcome for its attention to a German print ensemble whose sheer scale usually resists such full analysis and whose hybrid forms usually fail to elicit sympathetic readings by modern observers, especially Dürer specialists.

Composed as a mural of coordinated woodcuts by the Dürer workshop in Nuremberg, the *Arch* remains a complex mixture of both imagery and ideas. Schauerte begins with an overview of the object and earlier literature, but his first close inspection is dedicated to the genesis of the project, which he localizes not only with Maximilian’s own ambitions to establish his legacy, beginning in 1502 with early plans for his own tomb, but also with his new sense of need for memorials after the loss of his son, Philip the Fair, in 1506 and his own provision of a tomb for his father, Emperor Frederick III, in Vienna (completed 1513). These connections of the *Arch* to his tomb projects are often overlooked by print specialists, so it is noteworthy that the final disposition of the tomb in Innsbruck was enhanced by reliefs derived from the scenes of the *Arch*, added to the bronze statue by Maximi\'\'s successor in Austria, Ferdinand I (who also ordered prints made from the completed blocks of the woodcut *Triumphal Procession*). Schauerte claims, imaginatively, that this posthumous arrangement in fact reverts to the original tomb plan for a (from the *Prayerbook* of Basilea, and seven other packs of woodcut *Arch*). He further calls attention to neglected sketch design for an unexecuted apsidal fresco cycle of spiritual deeds at Wiener Neustadt, which might have produced a simpler, revised grave site. Even if one does not follow all of his reconstructed processes, Schauerte considers the evolving, interactive and compound forms of the *Arch* as much as its final shape.

Dürer’s participation in the project has not been re-examined since Meder, but this study chiefly revisits the written sources, reprinted, rather than the drawings and connoisseurship issues. Schauerte concludes that the genealogy was less responsible for delays after 1515 than the side additions by Altdorfer (which reprise the shape of the Castilian castle towers) and their relevant texts, as well as the succession of Charles as King of Spain (signaled at the top of the family tree and by the castle shape itself in this argument).

Extended analysis of the components of the *Arch* completes the study in depth. Decorative elements are compared to the marginal imagery of Maximilian’s *Prayerbook* for their inventive playfulness and as hieroglyphs and devices are compared to nascent emblems or to allegories for their Renaissance emphasis on complex layers of meaning, outlined only in part in the explanatory text by Stabius. Here Schauerte builds upon the pioneering insights of Giehlow.

But the real strength of this study is in its holistic sense of the *Arch* as part of the memorial projects conceived by Maximilian, especially his other evolving fixation, his own tomb, as well as his chief commemoration of the son who predeceased him, Philip the Fair, king of Spain. Numerous subtle and informed considerations about the use of antique forms and their relation to contemporary practices of royal ceremonies also abound throughout this analysis. Finally, the volume concludes with indispensable and meticulously assembled documentation: texts, sources, and catalogues of both the blocks preserved in the Albertina as well as the published editions (with watermarks). Schauerte deserves the lasting thanks of all who study this rich artwork, brought into sharp focus for the first time in almost a century.

Larry Silver
*University of Pennsylvania*


Dr. Anzelewski, author of the standard catalogue of Dürer’s paintings, who retired as Director of the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett in 1984, celebrated his eightieth birthday on 17 March 1999, and was honored five days later with the symposium at which the twenty-five papers included in this Festschrift were presented. The papers are divided into four groups: 1) on late gothic art; 2) new discoveries concerning Dürer’s own work; 3) those dealing with Berlin’s own holdings; and 4) Dürer’s historical context. Of particular interest in relation to the artist himself are Peter Strieder’s article regarding Agrrippa’s categorization of the term “Melenconia I” as pertinent to painters and architects, who have the ability to foretell natural catastrophe; Matthias Mende’s identification of the Small Horse (B.6) as Bucephalos, the favorite steed of Alexander the Great; Werner Schade’s article on the fragment in the Kistler collection representing the rescue of a drowned boy; Tilman Falk’s study of a copy after a lost Dürer drawing, done on a Brussels paper securely datable to 1522; Hartmut Krohm’s essay linking the Holy Family in Egypt, from the Marienleben, with both Philostratus’s description of Daedalus’s workshop, and with Sixtus IV’s institution of the feast day of Joseph and sermon for Nativity stressing Joseph’s role as surrogate for God the Father; Dürer’s personal interest in fashion, by Volker Manuth; Helmut Nickel’s on his reaction to the items sent from Mexico to Charles V by Cortez, and the afterlife of Dürer’s *Rhinoceros* in eighteen-century Japan, by Naoki Sato.

Papers dealing with aspects of Netherlandish art were contribut- ed by Albert Châtelet, on an item of costume in the October page from the Très riches heures: Bodo Brinkmann’s attribution of a Pietà formerly in the Chrysler Museum (Norfolk, Virginia) to Josse Lieferinxe; Barbara Welzel’s article on the relationship of the Master of the Love Garden’s *Large Garden of Love to Burgundian tapestry*; Matthias Weniger’s on Jan Provost as miniaturist; and Bernd Konrad’s discovery of the influence of Lucas van Leyden’s *Last Judgment* in the underdrawing of an altarpiece in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum attributed to Narziss Renner.

Among the items from the Kupferstichkabinett are Holm Bevers’ study of a drawing after Ludwigs Schongauer; Renate Kroll’s attribution of a flower study to Matthias Grünewald; Wolfgang Milde’s discussion of a manuscript of the *Passion of St. Lucy* from the cloister of St. Vincent, Metz, with miniatures by Sigebert of Gembloux; and Sabine Heiser’s article on Goya’s *Sleep of Reason* (Capricho 43). By way of a coda, Michael Roth has traced the posthumous adventures of the cast of Dürer’s hand; Ursula Mielpke discusses Lucas Schnitzer’s etchings of seventeenth-century Nuremberg ceremonial fireworks; and, most importantly, Magdalena
Anzelaewski and Matthias Weniger have provided a full bibliography of the guest of honor’s own publications, from 1954 until 1999.

Jane Campbell Hutchison

University of Wisconsin-Madison


In this attractively produced book Kurt Löcher, former curator of old master paintings at Nuremberg’s Germanisches Nationalmuseum, explores Barthel Beham’s artistic production. Arranged in roughly chronological order by medium, the book is divided into short chapters on Beham’s woodcuts, engravings, early paintings from Nuremberg, portraits from Munich, and drawings, among others. Löcher devotes much effort to the catalogue entries on paintings and drawings within the format of an oeuvre catalogue, and his bibliography is extensive, especially in the area of German exhibition and museum catalogues. The accomplishment of this book is bringing together for the first time an overview of Beham’s life and works in one volume with high-quality illustrations.


In this attractively produced book Kurt Löcher, former curator of old master paintings at Nuremberg’s Germanisches Nationalmuseum, explores Barthel Beham’s artistic production. Arranged in roughly chronological order by medium, the book is divided into short chapters on Beham’s woodcuts, engravings, early paintings from Nuremberg, portraits from Munich, and drawings, among others. Löcher devotes much effort to the catalogue entries on paintings and drawings within the format of an oeuvre catalogue, and his bibliography is extensive, especially in the area of German exhibition and museum catalogues. The accomplishment of this book is bringing together for the first time an overview of Beham’s life and works in one volume with high-quality illustrations.

Beham is perhaps better known for his politics than his art. Born in 1502 in Nuremberg at the beginning of Dürer’s international success, Barthel is believed to have been trained by Dürer and his slightly older brother Sebald. Due to their unorthodox religious views, the brothers were expelled from Nuremberg early in 1525 but allowed to return later that year. The brothers soon went separate ways: Barthel settled in Munich around 1527 and Sebald in Frankfurt c.1531. Barthel worked for the Bavarian duke Wilhelm IV in Munich and traveled to Italy in the duke’s employ where he died in 1540. He is best known for his painted portraits made during the 1530s.

An appendix helpfully lists documents for Barthel’s life in the Nuremberg and Munich archives in the original German. We learn that Barthel was the youngest and most radical of the three godless painters tried by Nuremberg’s town council, along with brother Sebald and Jörg Pencz. Although the literature has viewed Sebald as the most radical of the three, Löcher’s careful review of the documents convincingly corrects this false art historical picture placing Barthel in that role (p. 15).

Barthel’s greatest accomplishments lie in the area of engraving and portrait painting, but the arrangement of the book presents his woodcuts early on (pp. 21-28). This placement is unfortunate because Beham’s association with woodcuts needs to be seriously questioned if not rejected. Gustav Pauli’s catalogue of Barthel’s prints from 1911 still serves as standard reference by scholars, and Pauli rejected altogether attributions of woodcuts to Barthel, giving them instead to Sebald in his catalogue of 1901. Heinrich Röttinger linked Barthel to woodcuts in his catalogue of 1921, but the attributions were bypassed by complex, often unconvincing explanations. Röttinger’s attributions have unfortunately stuck in the literature, including the Hollstein German print series, and Löcher’s book.

The themes of Löcher’s book appear to be the influence on Beham’s art of the Renaissance for classicizing subjects and volumetric forms and of the Reformation for the large number of portraits, both engraved and painted. Löcher’s extensive research and publications on German portraiture are cited in the catalogue and bibliographical entries. But the direct discussion of Löcher’s ideas, rather than reference to them, would have been helpful to the reader who is left frustrated by a lack of development of ideas and wondering why Löcher attributes particular works to Beham. In both catalogue entries and text, the inclusion of much visual description of images illustrated and the absence of a theme or specific point results in unfocused discussion. Sometimes the beautiful illustrations do not agree with Löcher’s description of them, as in the case of the portrait of the Bavarian Chancellor Leonhard von Eck in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (p. 70). The illustration shows him wearing a creamy white shirt and light brown overshirt, which the text describes as yellowish-white and gray.

Beham’s contributions as a portrait painter emerge from the illustrations and catalogue entries. From the portraits painted in Nuremberg of Johann and Magdalena Neudörfer around 1527 (figs. 67-68) to a scorekeeper of 1529, (fig. 82), the portraits are impressive, monumental undertakings that tantalize the eye with luscious renderings of fabric and fur. Beham emerges as a portrait painter of extremely high quality, contemporary with Holbein the Younger, especially when the Large Wittelsbach series showing ancestors of the Bavarian dukes for the Munich residence is explored with its impressive half-length portraits of Duke Ludwig X of Bavaria from 1530 (fig. 109). The Small Wittelsbach series includes bust-length portraits, including Ottheinrich, Duke of Palatinate-Neuburg, 1535, exhibited in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (fig. 144), with its beautiful pink-orange hues. Fascinating are the “ricordi,” drawings in chalk and colored pencil that made visual records of the completed paintings of Duke Wilhelm IV and Duchess Maria Jacobäa (figs. 145-148) for the workshop should further demand arise.

A clear articulation of Beham’s style in general would have been welcome as would a critical evaluation of individual works’ attributions and issues. The reader wonders why Löcher assigns paintings to Beham that appear simplified and flat, sometimes lacking psychological depth (Woman at a Spinning Wheel, fig. 82), and why such bright, glaring light is employed for the portrait of a woman of 1529 in Denver (fig. 84). Differences in quality are sometimes explained by the state of preservation, as in the Large Wittelsbach series (p. 154), but when exactly did those changes take place, and were they deliberately executed by a restorer?

Löcher’s book is a welcome albeit traditional addition to the art historical literature. It will be the task of future generations to build on Löcher’s work to articulate Beham’s style(s), and evaluate its role, meanings, and effectiveness as a tool in the critical study of Beham’s oeuvre. In so doing, the position of Beham’s workshop, later copies, and restoration work should be illuminated. Once this difficult work is accomplished Beham’s role in, and contributions to, early sixteenth-century German art will more easily be appreciated.

Alison Stewart

University of Nebraska-Lincoln


This attractive booklet comprises a pair of essays by Stephen Goddard and James Ganz that address remarkable correspondences between the prints of Hendrick Goltzius and the bronzes of the Dutch sculptor Willem Danielsz van Tetrode. The two studies were occasioned by a modest exhibition held by the Clark Institute at Williamstown that was made possible by a generous loan from the Hearn Foundation, which provided three choice bronzes by Tetrode and numerous engravings by Goltzius. The photography in the catalogue is exemplary and brilliantly supports many of the points made by the two authors. Details of Goltzius’s engravings are well reproduced. Even more impressive, the surfaces of Tetrode’s bronze statuettes are faithfully represented in the color illustrations, which give a good indication of the surface patina.

Willem Danielsz van Tetrode, the less familiar of the two artists, was born in Delft around 1525. From 1545 until 1567 he studied in Italy, first in the shop of Cellini and then with Guiliole Della Porta. Significantly, Tetrode helped restore a number of ancient sculptures like the Farnese Hercules, which was to exert such an attraction on Goltzius and his northern brethren. Further, he made bronze copies of antique figures for an Italian nobleman, possibly bringing models of these statues with him on his return to the north. Tetrode’s large altarpieces for Delft were destroyed during the iconoclasm of 1573, probably prompting his move to Cologne, where he attracted the attention of another printmaker, Adriaen de Weerdt. Tetrode remained known principally through his elegant, finely chased statuettes. He took part in an artistic development along the Eastern Netherlands and Lower Rhine that witnessed the conflux of de Weerdt, Goltzius, and Coornhert, his teacher.

The impetus for the show is in one sense a thesis that Anthony Radcliffe presented in 1984, arguing for the formal dependence of Goltzius on Tetrode. As Goddard elaborates, the question of Goltzius’s interest in Tetrode’s sculpture becomes more interesting in the context of the so-called Haarlem Academy, for studies after plaster casts, and, indeed, sculptural models were a main avenue of access to antiquity for the artists of Haarlem. Goltzius’s study of Tetrode is more than just a case of artistic influence or attraction but rather relates to the vogue for antiquity and the nature of studio practice between the prints of Hendrick Goltzius and the bronzes of the Dutch sculptor Willem Danielsz van Tetrode. The two studies were occasioned by a modest exhibition held by the Clark Institute at Williamstown that was made possible by a generous loan from the Hearn Foundation, which provided three choice bronzes by Tetrode and numerous engravings by Goltzius. The photography in the catalogue is exemplary and brilliantly supports many of the points made by the two authors. Details of Goltzius’s engravings are well reproduced. Even more impressive, the surfaces of Tetrode’s bronze statuettes are faithfully represented in the color illustrations, which give a good indication of the surface patina.

The author presented her study of Hans Vredeman de Vries’s 1577 treatise ARCHITECTURA Oder Bauung der Antiquen aus dem Vitruvius, as a habilitation thesis in Braunschweig in 2000. Part One, which focuses on the artist himself, starts off with a useful overview of Vredeman’s early critical fortune and with the actual *status quaestionis*. In its discussion of early literature, i.e. preceding Hans Mielke’s 1967 doctoral thesis, this chapter seems rather biased towards German-language texts. To complete this picture, we also refer interested readers to Luc Verpoeest’s stimulating article on the late nineteenth-century “nationalistic” Vredeman-revival in Belgium, which triggered German scholarly interest in the artist at the close of the century (Luc Verpoeest, “Hans Vredeman de Vries en de Belgische architectuur in de negentiende eeuw: Architectuurgeschiedschrijving en nationale identiteit,” in: Heiner Boggrefe, Thomas Finsug, Barbara Uppenkamp, eds., *Tussen stadspaleizen en luchtkastelen. Hans Vredeman de Vries en de Renaissance* [exhibition catalogue Antwerp, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, September 14 – December 8, 2002], Gent/Amsterdam: Ludion, 2002, pp. 375-381, reviewed in the HNA Review of Books, November 2002). These early Vredeman experts are still relevant for today’s research: it is astounding to what extent their image of Vredeman and the so-called “Flemish Renaissance” still persists in more recent studies, including the catalogue cited above and the book under review here.

Part Two contains a meticulously structured analysis of the treatise itself. Extremely useful is the author’s precise discussion of the different editions, the first German (1577) and the first Netherlandish ones (1581) in particular; like the first part, this chapter contains many factual connections of older (and more recent) literature, the result of the author’s extensive travels which allowed her to personally examine most extant copies of the treatise. The reader is greatly aided by the fact that both of these editions are integrally – and very clearly – reproduced in appendices (the Netherlandish edition without the plates, which are identical to the ones in the German edition). Detailed analytical schemes allow a closer reading of Vredeman’s proportional “system,” which apparently was not very systematic at all mathematically speaking. It is to the author’s great merit that she, once all calculations were done, arrived at a clear evaluation of ARCHITECTURA’s value and originality as a treatise (and not just a model book). This part closes with a discussion of Vredeman’s underlying intentions. Here Vredeman’s original position in the development of Renaissance architectural theory comes to the fore: he was, after all, the first to publish that the new “antique” style was in fact “Italian” (thus robbing it of the universal character implied in the term “antique,” used in Netherlandish sources since the early years of the sixteenth century), and that adaptation to local building custom was needed; many able Netherlandish architects had already shown how to do this in practice.

This context is treated by the author in Part Three, which carries the title ‘ARCHITECTURA between Architectural Theory and Building Tradition.’ This section starts off with a prologue: a study of involves sculpture. The attempt to portray sculpture in two dimensions – subjecting plastic form to the engravers – indeed suggests an offshoot of the paragone debate, as Goddard suggests.

Ethan Matt Kavaler
University of Toronto


The author presented her study of Hans Vredeman de Vries’s 1577 treatise ARCHITECTURA Oder Bauung der Antiquen aus dem Vitruvius, as a habilitation thesis in Braunschweig in 2000. Part One, which focuses on the artist himself, starts off with a useful overview of Vredeman’s early critical fortune and with the actual *status quaestionis*. In its discussion of early literature, i.e. preceding Hans Mielke’s 1967 doctoral thesis, this chapter seems rather biased towards German-language texts. To complete this picture, we also refer interested readers to Luc Verpoeest’s stimulating article on the late nineteenth-century “nationalistic” Vredeman-revival in Belgium, which triggered German scholarly interest in the artist at the close of the century (Luc Verpoeest, “Hans Vredeman de Vries en de Belgische architectuur in de negentiende eeuw: Architectuurgeschiedschrijving en nationale identiteit,” in: Heiner Boggrefe, Thomas Finsug, Barbara Uppenkamp, eds., *Tussen stadspaleizen en luchtkastelen. Hans Vredeman de Vries en de Renaissance* [exhibition catalogue Antwerp, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, September 14 – December 8, 2002], Gent/Amsterdam: Ludion, 2002, pp. 375-381, reviewed in the HNA Review of Books, November 2002). These early Vredeman experts are still relevant for today’s research: it is astounding to what extent their image of Vredeman and the so-called “Flemish Renaissance” still persists in more recent studies, including the catalogue cited above and the book under review here.

Part Two contains a meticulously structured analysis of the treatise itself. Extremely useful is the author’s precise discussion of the different editions, the first German (1577) and the first Netherlandish ones (1581) in particular; like the first part, this chapter contains many factual connections of older (and more recent) literature, the result of the author’s extensive travels which allowed her to personally examine most extant copies of the treatise. The reader is greatly aided by the fact that both of these editions are integrally – and very clearly – reproduced in appendices (the Netherlandish edition without the plates, which are identical to the ones in the German edition). Detailed analytical schemes allow a closer reading of Vredeman’s proportional “system,” which apparently was not very systematic at all mathematically speaking. It is to the author’s great merit that she, once all calculations were done, arrived at a clear evaluation of ARCHITECTURA’s value and originality as a treatise (and not just a model book). This part closes with a discussion of Vredeman’s underlying intentions. Here Vredeman’s original position in the development of Renaissance architectural theory comes to the fore: he was, after all, the first to publish that the new “antique” style was in fact “Italian” (thus robbing it of the universal character implied in the term “antique,” used in Netherlandish sources since the early years of the sixteenth century), and that adaptation to local building custom was needed; many able Netherlandish architects had already shown how to do this in practice.

This context is treated by the author in Part Three, which carries the title ‘ARCHITECTURA between Architectural Theory and Building Tradition.’ This section starts off with a prologue: a study of
the position of the treatise within Vredeman’s engraved oeuvre. Vredeman’s other ‘best-known’ work, the *Perspective* (1604), is shown to fall short of the theoretical standard set by ARCHITECTURA. The discussion of Vredeman’s source material is again thorough. The evaluation of Coecke’s Serlio editions seems greatly indebted to de la Fontaine Verwey. Comparison of Coecke’s different editions (the Flemish Book IV of 1539 and of 1549, the German Book IV of 1542/1543, the French Book IV of 1542) can however be pushed further; careful reading shows an unexpected Vitruvian purism in Coecke’s commentaries. Coecke is Vredeman’s opposite: he belonged, in fact, to the fringe of the scholarly world for whom study of antiquity and study of ancient texts were one (like Frans Cranevel in Mechelen, in whose library Vitruvius stood next to Erasmus’ works; Jean Lemaire de Belges whose 1507 manuscript *Des Anciennes pompes funerailles* shows the first complete excavation of an ancient tumulus in the Low Countries; or Cornelis and Jan Grapheus; and Peter Gillis in Antwerp). Vredeman can be said to have had connections to the same world: his 1562 series of small architectural views was dedicated to Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, who in 1557/1558 commissioned his secretary Stephanus Pighius, the famous antiquary, to study a Roman silver vase discovered in his see (Arras). Vredeman’s publisher, Hieronymus Cock, also published the first complete recording and reconstruction of an antique building, the Baths of Diocletian, for the cardinal (1558). And there is Pierre Ernest de Mansfeld, whose Luxembourg palace had a garden with many “antique” features, started in the 1560ies. These points could have served to underline how far Vredeman goes the other way.

To strengthen his position, Vredeman invokes the example of famous Netherlandish masters. These are summarily presented by the author (without illustrations) – with an understandable focus on Cornelis II Floris. More surprising is the complete absence of comment on the Netherlandish building tradition, i.e. the original component in Vredeman’s architecture, all the more so since the author credits Vredeman’s interpretation of it with universal appeal. The artist explicitly mentions, amongst others, brick-and-stone masonry and mullioned windows, which in the early 1540ies Jacques Du Bruocq, for one, had shown how to transform “à l’antique,” using pediments, and create Roman-style window surrounds with “ears.” The author’s analysis of the treatise’s value could have been well served by a closer look at the work of Vredeman’s older contemporaries. As it stands, her text again takes up the essentially well served by a closer look at the work of Vredeman’s older “ears.” The author’s analysis of the treatise’s value could have been shown to fall short of the theoretical standard set by ARCHITECTURA. The discussion of Vredeman’s source material is again thorough. The evaluation of Coecke’s Serlio editions seems greatly indebted to de la Fontaine Verwey. Comparison of Coecke’s different editions (the Flemish Book IV of 1539 and of 1549, the German Book IV of 1542/1543, the French Book IV of 1542) can however be pushed further; careful reading shows an unexpected Vitruvian purism in Coecke’s commentaries. Coecke is Vredeman’s opposite: he belonged, in fact, to the fringe of the scholarly world for whom study of antiquity and study of ancient texts were one (like Frans Cranevel in Mechelen, in whose library Vitruvius stood next to Erasmus’ works; Jean Lemaire de Belges whose 1507 manuscript *Des Anciennes pompes funerailles* shows the first complete excavation of an ancient tumulus in the Low Countries; or Cornelis and Jan Grapheus; and Peter Gillis in Antwerp). Vredeman can be said to have had connections to the same world: his 1562 series of small architectural views was dedicated to Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, who in 1557/1558 commissioned his secretary Stephanus Pighius, the famous antiquary, to study a Roman silver vase discovered in his see (Arras). Vredeman’s publisher, Hieronymus Cock, also published the first complete recording and reconstruction of an antique building, the Baths of Diocletian, for the cardinal (1558). And there is Pierre Ernest de Mansfeld, whose Luxembourg palace had a garden with many “antique” features, started in the 1560ies. These points could have served to underline how far Vredeman goes the other way.

To strengthen his position, Vredeman invokes the example of famous Netherlandish masters. These are summarily presented by the author (without illustrations) – with an understandable focus on Cornelis II Floris. More surprising is the complete absence of comment on the Netherlandish building tradition, i.e. the original component in Vredeman’s architecture, all the more so since the author credits Vredeman’s interpretation of it with universal appeal. The artist explicitly mentions, amongst others, brick-and-stone masonry and mullioned windows, which in the early 1540ies Jacques Du Bruocq, for one, had shown how to transform “à l’antique,” using pediments, and create Roman-style window surrounds with “ears.” The author’s analysis of the treatise’s value could have been well served by a closer look at the work of Vredeman’s older contemporaries. As it stands, her text again takes up the essentially late nineteenth-century concept of a “Flemish Renaissance” centered on Antwerp.

Taken all in all, this is an important study, which offers a new look at Vredeman’s *ARCHITECTURA*: not a mere model book, but an original voice in the debate of antique vs. modern.

Krista De Jonge  
*Katholieke Universiteit Leuven*  

---

### Seventeenth-Century Flemish


My first impression of the exhibition, which I saw in Essen, was that it was unusually large and impressive for a thematically-focused show (126 works). It comprised eleven sections corresponding to different categories of still-life painting: trompe l’œil; vanitas; market and kitchen pieces; game still-life; laid tables; fruit and sumptuous still-life; flower pieces; religious and allegorical themes. Next to some huge “pronek” still-lifes, the pantries, kitchen and market scenes accounted for many of the big works. Compared with Dutch still-life paintings, such large pieces were a specific feature of Flemish still-life until 1680.

Of the 56 artists represented, ten executed over half the works exhibited, with, surprisingly, no examples by Frans Ykens, Hieronymus Galle, Pieter Gyssels or Andries de Coninck; that shown as Jan Philips van Thielen (no. 123) is a misattribution, while Nicolaes van Veerendaal appeared only as co-painter in two pictures. Such co-operation between specialists is of course a characteristic of Flemish artistic production. A clear “foreigner” is Ambrosius Bosschaert the Younger (no. 26), a Dutch painter whose father was born in Antwerp. The inclusion of Jan Davidsz de Heem (born Utrecht 1606) is understandable, since he was working in Antwerp by 1635. His enormous influence on many of the Flemish and Dutch still-life painters is hardly shown in the exhibition. Although Adriaen van Utrecht is represented by two large sumptuous paintings (nos. 4 and 85), they do not really show the extent of his influence on De Heem before he began painting his own large sumptuous still-lifes.

Unfortunately not all paintings were of the highest quality or in good condition (nos. 19, 21, 49, 79, 81, 102, 124), so that here less would have been more. It is of course not always possible to obtain only first class works, but I believe good alternatives could have been found for artists such as Osias Beert and Jacob van Es. Moreover, a more rigorous definition of still-life would have eliminated some works (e.g. nos. 12-14, 59).

Several attributions or dates are in my opinion disputable:

*No. 28 is not by Jan van Kessel, but all elements are found in Jan Brueghel the Elder’s 1612 *Flower Piece* (Bergamo, Accademia Carrara, inv.no. 1466), a copy of which (Prado, inv.no. 1421) is tentatively attributed by K. Ertz (*Jan Brueghel the Elder*, 1979, p. 283) to Jan van Kessel, but I strongly doubt this attribution.  

*No. 29 might be a copy after the Van Kessel in the Mellon collection, Virginia.  

*No. 31 is a rather weak copy in poor condition after Jan van Kessel.  

*No. 32 has no attribution and there is doubt about its Flemish origin.  

*No. 41 is by a follower of Snyders in a much later frame.  

*No. 106 is not Jan Davidsz de Heem but by the German Ernst Stuven who worked in Holland.  

*The book still-life by Jan Davidsz de Heem mentioned on p. 143 is dated 1629 not 1625.
A small correction to Wied’s clarification of Jean-Baptist de Saive I’s authorship of a series of six market pieces (p. 180). The signed painting shown in the Beuckelaer exhibition in Ghent (1986-87; no. 227), and later sold as by Jean-Baptiste de Saive II (Christie’s, London 7-7-2000, lot 36, not 38), is not by the same Jean-Baptiste de Saive I (nor by his son Jean-Baptiste de Saive II). The painting is signed FRA...SAFVES., and is by Frans de Saive, a brother of Jean-Baptiste II, documented as a master painter in Antwerp in 1599, and known as Francisco de Namur. Another work of this master is a signed Lamentation in Schleissheim.

On the misunderstanding surrounding the attribution of a work by Hieronymous Francken the Younger to Hans Anton François (Schütz, p. 27), see Sam Segal, A Prosperous Past: The Sumptuous Still-life in the Netherlands, 1600–1700, cat. exh. 1988–89 (chapter 3).

No. 114 is undated.

No. 123 is not by Jan Philips van Thielen. It might be by the Italian Mario Nuzzi, known as Mario dei Fiori. It belongs to a series of flower wreaths, often with flying birds or butterflies.

The identification of the flowers in Bosschaert (no. 99) is incorrect. Other misidentifications include Lilium chalcedonicum for a white form of Lilium martagon (no. 5), Zinnia and Jasmine for daisy and stock (no. 51). I cannot identify a chrysanthemum in no. 126, perhaps the flowers referred to are Marguolds. The so-called peony in no. 80 is a rose and accordingly misinterpreted.

The catalogue has eleven essays corresponding to the eleven sections in the exhibition. Each essay is immediately followed by the entries. The quality of the contributions is uneven, and too much reliance has been placed on German language publications. More careful editing would have corrected mistakes and omissions in the bibliography, and one would have liked to have had the names of contributors to exhibition catalogues rather than just the exhibition location. The three-column text lay-out is a bit dense and I found the colored bars before the catalogue numbers bothersome, the colored line at the bottom of each page superfluous, and irritating below the reproductions, which are excellent.

The various authors take different approaches to the issue of symbolism. Braakensiek provides an erotic interpretation of Alexander Adriaenssen’s sumptuous Still-life with Dead Fowl (no. 86), but leaves us pondering the meaning of the hanging dead black lapwing on the left and the hanging bunch of white grapes on the right. He suggests an interesting erotic connection between engravings of laid tables, one by Gillis van Breen and one after David Vinckboons, and texts by St. Augustine and later humanists which relate the senses to abundance and temperance (pp. 226-227). Prohaska (no. 126) fails to explain why the pear is a symbol of the allembracing love of Christ. Wieczorek relates the lion mascarons on a glass vase by Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder (no. 99) to the Resurrection of Christ as the lion of Juda. Ertz rightly rejects Bremminkmeijer-de Rooy’s proposal that no moralizing message is present in the later works of Jan Brueghel the Elder.

The exhibition was not as prestigious a project as the Dutch Still-life exhibition in Amsterdam and Cleveland (1999-2000) and did not have the same opportunity to obtain the best works. The catalogue gives an interesting overview of Flemish Still-life painting, without, it must be said, providing many new findings, and one is advised to check references. Despite such reservations, the catalogue is certainly a valuable and beautifully executed contribution to one’s library and the exhibition was a show which certainly delighted the senses.

Sam Segal

Amsterdam


The recently published volume (in 2 parts) of the Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, the Catalogue Raisonné of the work of Peter Paul Rubens, is most exceptional, in that it has so little to do with Rubens’s oeuvre as such. As stated by the author in his preface, the subject of the work under review pertains to the only book Rubens himself published: the renowned Palazzi di Genova. Moreover, this splendid publication by the Antwerp painter deals only with architecture, specifically 31 Genoese palaces and 4 churches, all of which were built between 1540 and 1620, and most probably seen by the artist during his sojourns in the city between 1604 and 1607. The original folio edition, probably edited by Rubens himself, consists of two volumes. These were, at first, bound separately, but in most subsequent editions were issued in one volume. In all, both volumes contain 139 engravings. The first has 72 plates of 12 urban palaces and villas, marked with the letters A to K, and two extra urban palaces are identified by the names of the then proprietors. The second volume deals with a wider range of architectural types by illustrating the very diverse ground plans and façades of 23 buildings, including four churches.

Rott’s introduction offers a critical history of the research that has been done since the nineteenth century. He highlights two major problems, the first being the common misunderstanding that Rubens himself made the drawings of the Genoese palaces. This erroneous attribution originated in Bellori’s 1672 biography of Rubens and made good until 1977. In fact, Rubens purchased the drawings for the first volume while in Italy, and acquired most of the drawings for the second volume around 1620. The second problem concerns the identification of the palaces depicted in the prints. This issue was resolved thanks to the numerous studies by Mario Labò and, more recently, Ennio Poleggi. Rubens’s Genoese patrons and clients are also considered by Rott. It seems the palaces of those noble families known to have acquired and/or commissioned works from the artist are all represented in the Palazzi di Genova.

The first chapter of Rott’s book discusses extensively the relations between Rubens, his book Palazzi di Genova and the preparatory drawings. Since 1908, the 122 surviving drawings, of a total of 137, all belong to the exceedingly rich Drawings Collection at the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in London. Rott points out that nearly seven of the twelve buildings in the first volume offer variations on the scheme for the Villa Cambiaso (1548), designed by the architect Galeazzo Alessi (1512-72). This villa is characterized by a square ground-floor plan, divided in nine rectangles. The same layout was repeated on the second level, which explains the very compact form of this type of patrician house. The central section is characterized by the circulation zone and, on the second floor, also by the formal rooms such as the sala. The sections on each side consist of private rooms. When the sala occupies the total height of the first floor, servants’ quarters and service areas are situated in mezzanine storeys. A similar arrangement can be found in the façade. This simple and rational structure was typical for this new type of urban palaces and became a model for later Genoese constructions.

Concerning the process of editing, the author remarks that the engravings for the first volume are based on a scale of 1:1 compared with the drawings, which were executed during the 1550s and later. From a caption on the first plate it seems that Nicolaes Ryckemans was the engraver. He was employed by Rubens after the latter’s dispute with Lucas I Vorsterman. Rott believes the drawings for the
second volume were made only several decades later, perhaps c.1600, based on the names of the proprietors cited by the different draughtsmen. In a few places, Rubens replaced the name of the commissioning patron by that of the current owner. Furthermore, Rott remarks that the engraver has used three scales for the transfer from the drawings to the prints, namely 1:0.95, 1:1.07 and 1:1.27. The editorial rearrangement of the material clearly shows the drawings were collected during different phases. Rubens himself was probably responsible for a number of corrections, and surely approved of the others. The quality of the architectural representations — ground plans, façades, and longitudinal and the transversal sections — is very high for that period, and is comparable with the tradition of illustrations of ancient architecture, such as those of the Colosseum in the Codex Coner.

The second chapter of Rott’s book draws a comparison between the drawings and Genoese Renaissance architecture. All the palaces and villas represented are still in existence today. Nevertheless, the drawings tend to record an earlier state of the buildings, which are not always in accordance with the finished edifice. In the drawings for the second volume of Palazzi di Genova, the draughtsman deviates considerably in his representations of the ground plans and elevations from the actual buildings. One could say we see the constructions more standardized as models.

One of the most typical characteristics of Genoese architecture around 1600 is the use of painted decoration on the façades as well as in the interiors. It is therefore remarkable that neither the drawings nor the engravings of the interiors in volume one contain representations of such painted decoration. Nor is it always clear whether the artist reproduced a façade with painted decoration or stucco. In volume two, the façades show decoration in relief as well as in fresco. Rott concludes that the drawings for the first volume show a higher degree of quality than those for the second. The technical execution of the engravings is of a similarly high standard in both volumes. Noteworthy is the exclusive use of orthogonal projection in all cases and the systematic rendering of longitudinal and transversal sections. This method of representation was common practice among Renaissance architects working in Rome, e.g. Antonio da Sangallo the Younger. Alessi probably belonged to his circle. His rational projects served as models for other architects such as Giovanni Castello, Rocco Lurago and Barhalomeo Bianco, and also for several patrons.

In the third and final chapter the author draws attention to possible external circumstances and personal motives behind Rubens’s decision to publish his book on contemporary Genoese architecture. This chapter is of a more hypothetical and speculative nature. Rubens’s preoccupation with architecture at this time could be related to the important commissions for various altarpieces and for the decoration of the exterior of two Jesuit churches: St. Ignatius in Antwerp (1617-18), and the Court church in Neuburg on the Danube (1619). Furthermore, when he was building his new house-cum-studio on the Vaartstraat (now Wapper) in Antwerp, Rubens bought several books on architectural theory by such important authors as Vitruvius, Philandier, Barbaro, Serlio, Scamozzi, Francart etc.

It was also important for the Antwerp painter to publish works from Antiquity and from the Italian Renaissance, because of their great exemplarv value. During the 1620s Rubens had strongly consolidated his position as a well-esteemd artist in Europe and this gave him the opportunity to have his publication distributed as a model book. In this context Rott also addressed the important question of whether Rubens, at a time when he was also involved with diplomatic affairs, could have used his book as a “piece of elaborate and curtly propaganda in support of Spain,” as suggested by John Rowlands (Rubens: Drawings and Sketches, London: British Museum, 1977, p.110). Rott, however, refuses to give any credit to this idea.


The outstanding exhibition, Rubens, Drawing on Italy, shown in Edinburgh and Nottingham, shed considerable light on the highly complex subject of Rubens’s reworking and “improvement” of drawings by other artists. This highly rewarding – and (at least in Nottingham, where I saw it) surprisingly beautiful – exhibition gave the opportunity to see at first hand the full range of the works document Rubens’s long-lasting and profound involvement with the arts of Italy. Understandably, the show raised a variety of complex issues, as did the associated symposium, held in Nottingham (November 29-30, 2002); the symposium program included papers, mostly excellent, from Donatella Sparti, Bert Meijer, Nico van Hout, Kristin Belkin, Anne-Marie Logan, Justus Müller Hofstede, Jeremy Wood, Zirka Filipczak and Elizabeth McGrath.

The exhibition contained copies by Rubens himself after Italian works, copies and drawings by other artists retouched or adapted by Rubens, and also drawings by Italian masters which were in his collection but which he did not rework. The copies by Rubens himself included paintings as well as drawings, and indeed one of the highlights of the exhibition’s Edinburgh incarnation must have been the juxtaposition of Titian’s great Diana and Callisto (Sutherland Collection) with Rubens’s full-size painted copy (The Earl of Derby). But as the exhibition title makes clear, it was primarily through the medium of drawing that Rubens looked at Italian art, and one of the exhibition’s main achievements lay in its success in elucidating, through a fascinating stylistic and qualitative spectrum of the works, exactly how Rubens studied Italian art through drawings.

In Nottingham, the drawings were grouped according to the Italian artists to which they related (“Raphael,” “Michelangelo,” etc.), so the viewer was able to gain an immediate impression of what aspects of each of these masters’ works particularly interested Rubens, how he reacted to them in his own copies and his reworkings of copies by others, and in some cases which drawings by those...
Italian artists he owned. In the fine selection of works, and in the text of the catalogue, we see the fruition of Jeremy Wood’s extensive research on Rubens as a drawings collector and on Rubens’s retouching of the drawings in his possession. The catalogue provides the first reasoned account of how Rubens’s copying of Italian prototypes, and his retouching and reworking of copies made by others, evolved during the course of his career. The details of the chronology that Jeremy Wood has set out will undoubtedly be the subject of continuing discussion, as will his dating of certain individual copies/retouchings, but his establishment of a general chronological structure within Rubens’s works of this type is nonetheless a very valuable contribution.

Rubens brought back from Italy a great number of drawings after Italian prototypes, to which he referred for the rest of his life. He made elaborate drawn copies after Leonardo, Raphael, Michelangelo and others (though usually of individual figures or figure groups, rather than whole compositions); he made, and reworked, counterproofs of his own copies (e.g. cats.12-13); he took fragmentary or damaged drawings by other artists and “repaired” or extended them; and he acquired or commissioned drawn copies of important compositions, which he then reworked, retouched and in some cases cut up and rearranged entirely.

Particularly amongst the drawings in the last two of these four categories, Rubens’s intervention was often so extensive that it can be extremely difficult to be absolutely sure where the work of one hand ends and that of another begins or, indeed, whether there really are different hands present in the same sheet. On a certain level, one could argue that it actually doesn’t matter that much whether a particular copy after, say, Polidoro is entirely by Rubens, or is a copy by another anonymous hand which Rubens acquired and reworked extensively, since the primary significance of that drawing is as a record of what aspect of Polidoro’s work or what figures from his compositions Rubens valued enough to want to record and keep, and the end result is always more a reflection of Rubens’s vision of these figures than of Polidoro’s. But on another level the connoisseurship questions do, of course, matter enormously, as the understanding of Rubens’s working method and drawing technique presented in Jeremy Wood’s exhibition catalogue will also define his forthcoming Corpus Rubenianum volume on the retouched copies of Italian works, which will be the standard reference work on the subject for the coming generation. It is therefore a source of some concern not only that quite a number of Wood’s conclusions regarding attribution were hotly disputed by many of the scholars who gathered in Nottingham in November, but also that there was precious little consensus within those dissenting views.

For my part, while in many cases I agree entirely with Wood’s judgement, I do believe that a significant number of the drawings that were exhibited as anonymous copies or original works by other artists, retouched by Rubens, were in fact entirely drawn by Rubens himself. In some of these cases Rubens appears to have made a conscious effort to imitate not only the composition but also the style of an earlier master: most striking perhaps is the British Museum’s drawing after two figures from Bellini’s Frari Triptych (cat.3), in which I simply cannot discern two hands. Similarly unsustained, in my view, is the assertion that the Fitzwilliam study of Two Robed Men (cat.61, as “Attributed to Bartolomeo Passarotti, retouched by Rubens”) is by two different hands. The penwork does indeed bear some resemblance to Passarotti’s style, but without the washes and heightening, which Wood says are later reworkings by Rubens, the figure simply does not exist: the elements of the different media are entirely complementary in this drawing, which has to be entirely by one hand—that of Rubens. I also believe this is true of a number of other drawings, most strikingly the two British Museum drawings, after the figure from Raphael’s Fire in the Borgo (cat.22) and Polidoro’s Man Leading a Horse (cat.33), and the Louvre copy after Raphael’s Virgin and Child with Saint Elizabeth and the Infant Saint John the Baptist (cat.25), the last of which I see as totally comparable in technique and handling to the British Museum’s Pan and Syrinx, after Raphael or Giulio (cat.26), here exhibited, in my view correctly, as a straight copy by Rubens. I also think cats. 16 and 27 are entirely by Rubens, and possibly also cat.15 (definitely by one hand, but perhaps Rubens studio, rather than Rubens himself). Cat.38, though not by Rubens, is surely also by one hand, probably Quellinus.

As for the many drawings in which two stages of execution are indubitably visible, I propose that several of the rather routine underlying copies, which we all agreed were subsequently enlivened and worked up by Rubens, are matter-of-fact record drawings that he himself made on arrival in Italy, and returned to at a later date. He made a number of rather uninspiring record drawings of this type—e.g. the series of copies after Michelangelo’s Sistine Prophets (see cats. 9-10)—as well as many more accomplished, freely interpretative copies, often over the base of a routine copy; logically, I would have thought Rubens was no less likely to have used his own copies as his point of departure for the second, freer category of drawing, as he was to have used one of the many anonymous copies that we know he had in his possession. Wood accepts something approaching this creative history for one drawing in the exhibition, the Leonardo-inspired Fight for the Standard, in the British Museum (cat. 5), and to some extent also for the reworked counterproof of Rubens’s own copy after another Michelangelo figure (cat. 13), but I would, on stylistic grounds, extend this to a number of others, including cats. 17, 23, 40 and 68, as well as cat. 36 (rather confusingly, the artist line in the catalogue lists this drawing as entirely by Rubens, but the subsequent entry describes it as a reworking by Rubens of an anonymous, earlier copy).

These opinions regarding attribution also have implications regarding the question of the extent to which Rubens was prepared to interfere with and “improve” the works of other artists. As Wood and others have noted, Rubens does seem to have had a very well developed idea of what was or was not acceptable to rework. I believe this tendency to respect original works by good artists was actually much stronger than Wood suggests, and that Rubens hardly ever interfered significantly with the original drawings by major artists that he owned; the fine studies by Annibale Carracci (cats.71 and 73) and Baldassare Peruzzi (cat.18) are cases in point. As argued above, I do not believe the (partial) attributions to Passarotti, Polidoro and Federico Zuccaro of cats. 15, 16, 27, 61 and 68. Nor do I think the underlying drawings, reworked by Rubens, in cats. 44 and 58 are actually by Taddeo Zuccaro or Battista Franco; the former I think is merely a studio or later copy, the latter a Giulio Romano studio copy after the associated print.

There were some examples in the exhibition of drawings by important artists that also incorporated a significant contribution from Rubens, but almost all of these were, however, “repair jobs,” like the Liverpool Federico Zuccaro drawing of The Conversion of Mary Magdalene (cat. 70), in which Rubens replaced entirely the lost lower left corner of the sheet but did not interfere with the undamaged parts of the composition, suggesting that his respect for Federico’s draughtsmanship may have outweighed considerations of stylistic consistency. Slightly more complicated but still, I would say, consistent with the patterns of intervention or non-intervention that I have described above is the Louvre drawing of A Woman with two Children in Front of a Fire (cat. 75), exhibited as Annibale Carracci, retouched by Rubens. Here, Rubens has taken a small scrap by an Italian artist and has enlarged the composition considerably on all sides, adding further figures which extend well onto the original sheet. In fact, so dominant are the elements introduced by Rubens that it is hard to come to a clear conclusion regarding the attribution of the
central figure group; Wood’s assertion that it is by Annibale is not wholly convincing, but even if he is right, this original was such a fragmentary scrap that it is perfectly understandable that Rubens should have had no qualms about revising it extensively.

Of all the drawings in the Nottingham showing of the exhibition, the only one in which I felt a genuinely attributable drawing by an artist of some significance had really been fundamentally reworked by Rubens was the British Museum Assumption of the Virgin, originally by Domenico Campagnola (cat. 56). To this one might perhaps add cat. 43, but Rubens’s intervention in that drawing seems to me minimal, and I am also not entirely convinced of the attribution to Taddeo Zuccaro of the original.

Given the complexities of all these connoisseurship issues, this exhibition could very easily have been impenetrable to all but a select band of cognoscenti. But irrespective of one’s views regarding the attribution of individual sheets, the exhibition presented on several different levels an intriguing and beautiful account of Rubens’s intense involvement with Italian art, and has made a very valuable contribution to our understanding of this rich and fascinating subject.

Gregory Rubinstein
Sotheby’s, London

Alfons K.L. Thijs, ed., Prosper Arents: De Bibliotheek van Pieter Pauwel Rubens: een reconstructie. With contributors by Frans Baudouin, Lia Baudouin, Elly Cockx-Indestege, Jacques De Bie, Marcus de Schepper (De Gulden Passer, 1961 published his initial findings as an “Inleiding tot de bibliografie” of knowledge did Rubens have?

In 1675 Joachim von Sandrart wrote of Peter Paul Rubens, whom he had met personally, that his erudition was marked by “extraordinary genius, wit and understanding.” Art historians have always seen Rubens as the prime example of a “Pictor doctus,” an educated artist. While the reputation of Raphael and Titian rests solely on their artistic output, Rubens’s fame derives both from his standing as one of the foremost European painters of his age and from his considerable importance as a learned diplomat. But exactly what sort of knowledge did Rubens have?

Rubens’s numerous letters contain not only copious clever and witty citations from ancient literature, as was the custom of the time, but also provide clear indications of his intellectual interests and reading habits. It was Rubens’s extensive correspondence that contained many of the works mentioned in the artist’s correspondence, while of course many of the books were acquired by Albert himself, who was a lawyer. Moreover, we will never know if Rubens actually read “from cover to cover” all the works mentioned in lists or in correspondence, and unfortunately no book annotated by the artist himself has hitherto been found. Nevertheless, in many cases it is possible to establish with relative certainty which books Rubens owned and accordingly which subjects interested him. In her 1997 Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard volume on Rubens’s history paintings, Elizabeth McGrath shows that Rubens especially acquired publications related to particular projects.

Taken in the context of his literary, historical, philosophical, political and artistic interests, the reconstruction of his library clearly makes a valuable contribution to understanding Rubens’s life and work. Knowing more about his intellectual interests opens up new possibilities in interpreting his iconographically often complex oeuvre. Furthermore, the present volume provides an interesting addition to recent research on readership, and will hopefully provide new impetus for the study of artists and their books (see for example the forthcoming study by Amy Golahny, Rembrandt’s Reading: The Artist’s Bookshelf of Ancient Poetry and History, University of Amsterdam Press). In general, comparatively little research into the reading habits, literacy and ownership of books has been undertaken to-date, and a systematic study for the Southern Netherlands has not yet been carried out. (H.W. de Kooker/B. van Selm, Boekcultuur in de Lage Landen 1500-1800, Utrecht 1993; Christian Coppers, “Der Bürger liest - liest der Bürger?,” Stadtbilder in Flandern. Spuren bürgerlicher Kultur, 1477-1787. Exh. cat., Schallaburg 1991, pp. 210-218).

A comparison with other seventeenth-century book collections shows that Rubens’s library was unusual for the time (Jan A. Goris, “La bibliothèque d’un marchand milansois à Anvers au XVIIe siècle,” Revue Belge de Philologie et d’Histoire, 3, 1924, pp. 851-856). Most upper-middle class households in Antwerp contained more than thirty books, and it was not rare to find collections of 200 and more. The approximately 500 titles owned by Rubens made his one of the most extensive in Antwerp, but the largest was that of printer and publisher Plantin, whose 1592 inventory lists 728 books.

A detailed index makes the bibliography very easy to use, and an English summary of both essays (43-45; 76-80) ensures access to a wider audience.

Nils Büttner
University of Dortmund

(Translated from the German by Fiona Healy)
Seventeenth-Century Dutch

That Inspired by Italy was the first exhibition of Italianate landscape painting in Great Britain “really a theme for the philosopher.” The phrase comes from a relevant source, Henry James’s comparison of Dutch and Italian view painting, in “The Metropolitan Museum’s ‘1871 Purchase’” (Atlantic Monthly, June 1872). According to James, Jan van der Heyden’s so-called Quay at Leyden (actually an imaginary view) demonstrates the typical Dutchman’s “fidelity and sincerity,” whereas Francesco Guardi, in two faithful views of Venice, trusts “mere artifice and manner” to convey the “grace of his daily visions.” The young critic cites “the great ‘Italian Landscape’ by Cornelis Huysmans” as worthy of the new collection, but touts Ruskin’s line in dismissing the Venetian artist as “beautified.” Desmond Shawe-Taylor, director of the Dulwich Picture Gallery, recalls in his foreword to the catalogue under review that Ruskin considered the “inbred vulgarity” of Dutch art to be especially obvious when the painter tried to employ his imagination, in example in “that hybrid landscape, introduced by Wouwermans and Berghem.”

Dulwich has been a hothouse of such hybrids since 1811, when one of the two principal founders of the gallery, Sir Francis Bourgeois, left eight Wouwermans, five Berchems, and twenty-two other specimens to the college. His bequest, with its near absence of Van Goyens and the like, reflected the eighteenth century’s admiration of Claude, Cuyp, Both and other Oltmannonts. Both the rise and precipitous fall of this taste were brought home to the present writer perhaps twenty years ago when he recommended to Sir John Pope-Hennessy that the Metropolitan Museum purchase a big canvas by Berchem (now in the Getty Museum). “But it’s a corridor picture!,” the English eminence exclaimed. That depends on where you grew up.

The exhibition itself was a memorable experience, with the sixty-two pictures (a third privately owned) hung tightly but effectively. Most of them are beautiful, but this is difficult to judge from the reproductions in the catalogue, which are sometimes misleading in color and scale. Overexposed details appear to have been selected with an eye to conservation issues, especially in the case of the cover shot.

Perhaps with a broad audience in mind, Laurie Harwood’s introductory essay surveys who went to Italy when (or not at all), and sketches in the movement’s sources (Bril, Elsheimer, Claude, etc.). While a more thorough discussion of cultural background would have been welcome, the introduction and the catalogue section (also by Harwood) synthesize valuable information on the movement (much of it available in more scattered form in publications such as the Dictionary of Art [1996] and Frits Duparc’s insightful essay in Italian Recollections: Dutch Painters of the Golden Age [Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, 1990]). Harwood’s paragraphs on landscape painting in Rome during the pontificate of Urban VIII (1625-1644) provide useful kernels of information, such as the reminders that Philip IV ordered at least fifty landscapes from Claude, Poussin, Gaspard Duchet, Jan Both and Herman van Swanenvelt for the Buen Retiro, and that, as Helen Langdon points out, Claude was esteemed by his contemporaries as “master of naturalism” (p. 21).

The mention of Philip IV’s commission might have been accompanied by references to other distinguished patrons of Italianate painters and their predecessors such as Gregory XIII (Bril), Cardinal Federico Borromeo (Jan Brueghel), Prince Orsini (Breenbergh), Cardinal Antonio Barberini (Swanenvelt), and Innocent X (Jan Baptist Weenix). Cornelis Poelenburch secured a grand slam of supporters: Cosimo II, Charles I, Prince Frederick Hendrick, and, in the artist’s native Utrecht, Baron van Wytenhorst, who owned fifty-five of his works. While not discussing taste per se, Duparc, in his essay of 1990, noted the positive reviews and high prices enjoyed in the Netherlands by many of the Italianate landscapists, in contrast to the fortunes of contemporaries such as Hobbema, Koninck, and Aert van der Neer.

Patronage is also relevant to the on-going question of who should be defined as “Italianate.” For those who believe that the term is wrongly applied “to artists who never left the northern Netherlands but who worked primarily in an Italianate style” (Laura Laureati, Dictionary of Art, vol. 9, p. 462), canonical names such as Cuyp, Wouwerman, Wynants, and Jan Weenix fly out of the pigeonhole. In choosing to include these masters, Harwood subscribes to the broader view that, as stated by Peter Sutton, “most Dutch Italianates produced the majority and best of their works not in Italy but after returning to the Netherlands,” and that “seventeenth-century Dutch art theorists made no categorical distinction between a national and Italianate school of landscape painting” (Masters of 17th-Century Dutch Landscape Painting, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1987-88, p. 45; the first quote paraphrases a line in Albert Blankert’s “Introduction” to Nederlandse 17e Eeuwse Italianiserende Landschapschilders, Centraal Museum, Utrecht, 1965; revised Davaco edition, Soest, 1978, p. 39).

Not only the category “Italianate,” but also that of “landscape” has limited modern thinking on this rich and complex subject, which is essentially the admiration of one country – or rather, a large part of European society – for the culture, monuments, natural environment and the past of Italy. Future studies of the Dutch Italianates, and much-needed monographs on Berchem, Both, Dujardin, Lingelbach, Poelenburch (one is promised), or J. B. Weenix, will do well to consider that patrons such as Frederick Hendrick, Charles I, and their courtiers collected not only views of Italy but also pictures of imaginary classicist architecture, paintings on pastoral themes, treatises by Vitruvius and Serlio, classical sculpture, travel literature, and memories of the Grand Tour (see A. Frank-van Westrienen, De Groote Tour [Amsterdam, 1983], which is subtitled “Tekeningen de educatievers der Nederlander in de zeventiende eeuw”). One of the curiosities of current scholarship is that classical and Renaissance writers figure in our pages on the Netherlandish countryside but are not brought into the story of Dutch artists in Arcadia (for the former see H. Leeflang, “Dutch Landscape, The Urban View. Haarlem and its Environments in Literature and Art, 15th-17th Century,” in Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek, 48 [1997], pp. 52-116, and W. Gibson, Pleasant Places: The Rustic Landscape from Bruegel to Ruisdael, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2000). One looks in vain for names such as Giorgione, Titian, and Campagnola in the Dulwich catalogue’s “index of artists,” as one would also for Guaraní, Ovid, Virgil, recreation, ruins, rustic, picturesque and schilderachtig had Dulwich provided the more substantial index such a publication deserves.

Christopher Brown makes a cameo appearance in the catalogue with eleven paragraphs on the Bentvueghels, the majority of whom were actually from Antwerp, like the supposed “flower painter Jan Frans van Bloemen” (p. 39; called “Orizzonte” for good reason). This essay on what the “Bent” was, who were its members, their cute nicknames and “riotous initiation ceremonies” is a fun read, but offers no discussion of landscape apart from a passing reference to companionable rambles in the Roman campagna. The sketches made there, in the transitory streets of the Eternal City, and in numerous short-lease studios are surveyed in Anne Charlotte Steland’s essay, “Drawings by Dutch Italianate Painters” (smoothly translated by Delphine Lettau). With Renate Trnek of Vienna, Steland (in Braunschweig) is one of the foremost scholars of the Dutch Italianates (see the catalogue’s substantial bibliography), which is obvious throughout her twenty-
two pages of sophisticated learning and connoisseurship. Her thirty-three illustrations, a few of them unforgettable, make one wish drawings were included in the show.

Walter Liedtke  
*The Metropolitan Museum of Art*


This book is about Dutch genre painting of love and courtship in the context of the youth culture that flourished during the first half of the seventeenth century. It focuses on outdoor and indoor company scenes along with a few portraits by Hals and two etchings by Rembrandt. Although many of the artists’ names and their works are familiar to specialists, Nevitt probes their content in novel ways. One of the book’s most important contributions is its discussion of the literary context for the paintings and prints. Another is Nevitt’s approach to meaning, for he takes both the works’ moralizing and celebratory messages equally seriously. In doing so, he encourages us to understand these works equally as complex and equivocal in their handling of love themes as the better-known paintings by Vermeer and Ter Borch. Nevitt accomplishes all of this with a personal style that matches his subject matter well. Without reading the acknowledgements, one would never guess that the study began as a dissertation. He writes with a light touch that includes humor, witty turns of phrase, and personal insight, as well as intelligence and sophistication.

In his informative and thought-provoking introduction, Nevitt defines what he means by youth culture. He discusses the content of the songbooks, their moral tone, their relatively youthful authors, and their intended readers in light of marriage and courtship customs and practice. Along the way, he raises interesting questions about the response to art from an audience whom he considers engaged, yet often conflicted. In particular, he raises the question whether viewers saw any real contradictions between the demands of morality, on the one hand, and the entertainments of pleasure, on the other. He launches the argument that seventeenth-century writers and artists affirmed virtue in their audience rather than sermonized to those in need of instruction. Since he assumes that the texts and painted images depicted the very audience which consumed them, he finds that the texts and images suggest ways for us to understand viewer response to their themes.

Nevitt titles Chapter 1 “The New Garden of Love.” In Vinckboons’s hybrid depictions of outdoor companies the author finds representation of both sin and innocence. In discussing Esaias van Velde’s more focused scenes, Nevitt problematizes the contrast between “moral” and “celebratory” content further. In particular, Esaias’s paintings approached the emotional and moral complexities of love more empathically than did those of Vinckboons. Analyses of Dutch amatory songbooks are integral to his arguments, and his readings of the garden parties often arise from the parallels he finds in these. I found his commentary on silence particularly effective – that is, his discussion of the strategies devised by writers to express shyness, melancholy, and loneliness, and the ways that artists in their turn conveyed the cessation of communication between lovers. Throughout, Nevitt asks us to examine the figural details in these paintings very closely, and he provides illustrations that make our looking both possible and compelling.

In Chapter 2, Nevitt turns to merry companies by Buytewech, Elyas, Molenaer, Hals, and others. The chapter consists of a series of mini-essays – on prostitution, fashion, maps and proto-nationalism, gameboards, and specific paintings. At times the chapter seems sprawling. But he holds it together by returning continuously to his main argument: these paintings engaged viewers in multiple ways, by amusing and dispelling melancholy and at the same time by instructing and judging. By doing so, he reassesses the content of works that for generations have been considered simply moralizing. Nothing is simple for Nevitt. He rejects such binary oppositions as vrijster and prostitute, celebration and admonition, aristocratic conduct and sober, even crude, native behavior. He concludes that the moral issues raised by these pictures are dependent on a Dutch youth culture that sanctioned and kept in suspension both sides of the dialectic.

Chapter 3 focuses on Rembrandt’s *The Three Trees* and *The Omval* with their couples hidden amid foliage. Arguably this chapter might have been omitted, and indeed more or less the same text was published in the volume of *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* on Nature and Landscape (1997). Yet by including it here, Nevitt shows how these etchings raise similar issues to the company paintings Here again he develops a dialectic of seeing, this time between observation and fantasy, familiarity and strangeness, and the friction between these supposed opposites. He concludes both the chapter and the book by meditating on the themes of transience. In doing so, he broadens his notion of a readership and viewership to include all ages.

This is a splendid, original, richly rewarding book, the second contribution to Cambridge University Press’s four-part series on Netherlandish Visual Culture.

A final note: I should mention the misleading cover illustration showing Vermeer’s *Concert* of 1658-60 in the Isabella Stuart Gardner Museum, Boston, a picture executed after the period that concerns Nevitt. More appropriate is the back-cover illustration, Hals’s *Double Portrait of Isaac Massa and Beatrix van der Laen* of 1622 in the Rijksmuseum, a painting he analyzes in some detail. Today, publishers of books on seventeenth-century Dutch art of any subject prefer to grace their covers with Vermeer, it seems, and one can fault them for exploiting the art. But maybe Cambridge’s goal was even cannier than good marketing strategy – displaying the Gardner painting in bookshops as a kind of “Wanted” poster, reminding passersby of the sad fact that this theft still remains unsolved.

Alison M. Kettering  
*Carleton College*


After having been without a curator of Dutch and Flemish art for several years, the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston hired Ronni Baer in 2000. (Formally, she is the Mrs. Russell W. Baker Curator of European Paintings.) Baer started her tenure with some important new acquisitions, including *The Adoration of the Shepherds* by Theodoor van Loon and *Susanna and the Elders* by Hendrick Goltzius. Baer’s first exhibition devoted to Dutch paintings from Boston collections opened at the MFA this past summer. The publication accompanying the show includes an essay detailing the history of collecting Dutch art in Boston. The text lucidly describes the activities of private as well as institutional collectors and gives a detailed account of the museum’s own collection and exhibition history. The paintings in the exhibition are reproduced in beautiful color plates, but regrettably no catalogue entries are included and only minimal information about each picture is given.
For the exhibition, Baer selected sixty excellent works by Dutch masters, which were displayed in three rooms, arranged by genre. Since the owners of the works remained anonymous, the focus was on the works themselves, rather than their provenance history, which formed the principal theme of the catalogue. The first room, devoted to figure paintings, highlighted various schilders pictures, together with a number of history paintings and portraits. An attractive genre painting by Dirck Hals represents a merry company playing music in an outdoor setting. Rather than displaying the rowdiness and flirtations of some of the artist’s dissolute company scenes, this painting delights in the fanciful dress and a suggestive exchange of glances between a group of men and women. A more sexually explicit picture is the Pieter Quast painting of peasants which playfully juxtaposes a bare-breasted woman holding a urinating child, an amorous couple frolicking in the hay, and a prominently placed goat that daringly looks out at the viewer. Such lowlife themes were few, however, as most of the paintings in this room represented refined genre scenes and portraits of the upper classes of Dutch society.

Of the portraits, the one by Jan Baptist Weenix of the De Kempenaer family is a particularly fine example. Set against a monumental architectural background, the female members of the family are rendered in beautifully pictured costumes. The rather loose painting style, coupled with the informality of glances and poses, and the inclusion of genre-like elements, such as the doll held by daughter Margrieta and the dog-drawn carriage holding the youngest, place the painting in a venerable tradition of portrait painting by such masters as Frans Hals. The highlight of this room was undoubtedly the Selfportrait by Gerrit Dou that shows the artist in a characteristic window frame, surrounded by pointed references to his craft. The drawn away carpet at the top of the niche is a clear reference to the story of the antique painter Zeuxis, who tried to pull off a painted curtain from a picture by his rival, while the violin, the opened books, and the statue point to the rivalry between painting, music, poetry and sculpture. Jan Steen’s Drawing Lesson, hanging next to the Dou, also constitutes a visual commentary on the pictorial arts. Steen shows an artist next to a pupil, as he draws a Virgin and child in black chalk on blue paper. The curled pages of the drawing book, the light engulfing the surface of a white statue, and the knife and ink pot extending over the edge of the table, reveal a Dou-like interest in illusionistic tricks and the tactile qualities of surface. While Dou’s visual statement is rather self-conscious, Steen manages to integrate references to the art of picture-making into a plausible rendering of everyday life.

No private collection of Dutch art is complete without a representative example of the country’s rich tradition of landscape painting. Not surprisingly the largest portion of the show was devoted to this genre. The early phase of landscape painting in the Netherlands was represented by small monochromatic paintings by Esais van de Velde, Pieter van Sintvoort, and Jan van Goyen. Landscape paintings from mid-century included a fine painting of a mountainous landscape by Herman Saftleven which does not represent a local scene, but an Alpine setting in the tradition of landscapes by Pieter Brueghel the Elder. No less than six superb paintings by Jacob van Ruisdael offered the possibility for a concentrated study of this artist’s mature work.

The final room brought together a wonderful survey of thirteen still life paintings and three architectural paintings. The ontbijtij by Pieter Claesz is a masterful example of a monochromatic still life. A silver jug, a roemer, an amber dish, a plate of fruit, a pie arranged on a table with a white cloth. The opened almanac, the peeled lemon, the broken nuts and the half-eaten pie give the suggestion of a prior human presence, of things touched and consumed. In a witty gesture, Claesz painted the letters P and C next to the emblem on the title page of the almanac, clearly making a reference to his personal monogram. A second painting by Claesz is more reminiscent of the Flemish still life tradition. Far less subdued in tone, this work includes a brightly colored peacock pie, apricots in a china bowl, confectons and a cooked goose. Delighting in illusionistic virtuosity, Claesz captures a reflection in the silver jug and includes his name with a date on the blade of a knife occupying the center of the composition.

Apart from these well-known names, this section also included lesser-known painters, such as Adriaen Coorte. Coorte subtly breaks with the conventions of earlier still life painting by having objects suspended from a cord or displayed on table corners that do not occupy the entire width of the picture. The wonderful Still Life with Shells delights in the odd shapes, openings, and curves of various shells and a skeleton and brings out these forms through bright light set off against a dark background. Amongst the architectural paintings in this room, Jan van der Heyden’s depiction of the Westerkerk is a real gem. The painting combines a refined view of the city’s architecture with small vignettes of urban professions and daily activities.

This beautifully designed exhibition of rarely seen works reveals a taste amongst Boston collectors for illusionistic refinement and pictorial artifice. With only four history paintings in the entire show, these collectors clearly displayed their appreciation for what might be called the descriptive aspects of Dutch art.

Anna C. Knaap
Institute of Fine Arts, New York University


This exhibition and its catalogue survey portraiture and portrait patronage in Amsterdam from the city’s rise as the leading mercantile center of the Netherlands through its sedate quiescence in the eighteenth century. With a catalogue published only in Dutch and an exhibition seen only at the Amsterdams Historisch Museum, “Kopstukken” (translated in English promotional materials as “Face Values”) seems to have been designed primarily for a local constituency. While Amsterdammers, and especially descendants of the prosperous merchants portrayed, can take pride in their distinguished visual heritage, the catalogue will be of wider interest for historians concerned with Holland’s contribution to Baroque self-fashioning.

An impressive team of scholars contributed to this project. Introductory essays chronicle the development of portrait painting and collecting in Amsterdam (Norbert Middelkoop), survey the generations of portrait painters (Rudi Ekkart), discuss the dynastic and social significance of portraiture for newly prosperous burgher families (S.A.C. Dudok van Heel) and explore the qualities that give Rembrandt’s portraits a unique place in this milieu (Jan Baptist Bedaux). Shorter essays introduce the thirteen sections into which the works are divided: paintings by portrait specialists working in the first third of the seventeenth century (Wouter Kloek), role portraits (Marijke de Winkel), dynamic portraits (S.A.C. Dudok van Heel), artists’ portraits (Volker Manuth), occupational portraits (Marten Jan Bok), group portraits of the leaders of trade guilds (Norbert Middelkoop), charitable organizations (Michiel Jonker) and militia companies (Paul Knevel), private portraits of individuals and families (Jan Baptist Bedaux), works of the later eighteenth century (Frans Grijzenhout), portraits of eighteenth-century art lovers (Paul Knolle), and several centuries of portraits from the Backer family (S.A.C. Dudok van Heel). Eighteen writers (among them Eric Domela Nieuwenhuis, Friso Lammertse, Jan Six [the 11th?] as well as several of the essayists) contribute catalogue entries, most of which empha-
A central aim of the exhibition is to demonstrate the pivotal role of Amsterdam as a cultural and economic nexus for the development of several portrait types that have come to be seen as quintessentially Dutch. The main emphasis is placed on the historical and social context for the growing market rather than on specific stylistic or iconographic innovations. In selecting objects for display, the primary criterion appears to have been the status of the sitter(s), not the artist, as an Amsterdam citizen. This results in a somewhat curious appropriation of painters who spent most of their careers elsewhere (Miereveld, Ter Borch, Sandrart, et al.) as Amsterdam portraitists. How their personal styles might have differed from, or contributed to, prevailing trends in the metropolis is an important topic not fully addressed in the catalogue.

The Golden Age of Amsterdam portraiture makes an impressive beginning with an assemblage of life-size portraits by the first great generation of painters to serve the new burgher elite: Cornelis van der Voort, Werner van den Valkert, Thomas de Keyser and Nicolaes Elias Pickenoy. Van der Voort, who emigrated from Antwerp and died in 1624, stands out as a trendsetter who established many of the types and conventions followed in subsequent decades.

Central importance is given to the various types of large group portraits, which are seen both as the most important portrait commissions awarded by the upper echelon of patrons and the most challenging demonstration of their makers’ artistic prowess. Of the 135 Dutch militia guild paintings now known, 57 were produced in Amsterdam (Knevel, p. 194). Regent group portraits blossomed under the avid patronage of a few specific organizations, especially the surgeons’ guild. Meanwhile, the patrician life-size, full-length individual portrait was adapted for the network of wealthy families (Bicker, Hooft, De Graeff, et al.) whose country estates and townhouses along the newly built canals afforded space for displays of quasi-aristocratic status. The value of these works as artistic monuments is balanced by their social significance as demonstrations of communal alliances and values.

The authors’ close attention to documentary evidence highlights the importance of practical circumstances in the commissioning, design and display of portraits. Large group portraits were only possible for those organizations possessing substantial wall space on which to hang them, and commissions often coincided with a building renovation or move to new quarters. While the concentration of capital and population in the metropolis attracted numerous portraitists who came to Amsterdam to make their fortune, a patron’s selection of an artist remained primarily a local matter, based on convenience and word of mouth. Family dynasties, seldom stretching back farther than the mid-sixteenth century, were manufactured by taking liberties with genealogy. Burghers seeking a distinguished lineage were not averse to prioritizing the distaff side, if the wife’s family tree was longer or more prestigious. When portraits from life were missing, imaginary likenesses (usefully described as dynastic icons by Dudok van Heel) were conjured up to fill the blanks in the sequences of ancestor portraits that quickly became a requisite feature of patrician décor.

Luckily for Rembrandt, no single portraitist dominated the scene when he arrived in the early 1630s, and the competent, painstaking style then in vogue was quickly eclipsed by his pictorial bravado. It is appropriate, therefore, that while most of the essays in the catalogue are expert but unremarkable summations of fact, J.B. Bedaux’s discussion of Rembrandt stands out for its idiosyncrasy. Bedaux embeds close readings of some of the artist’s liveliest portraits within a discussion of the anthropology of facial expression and body language. Having read up on African tribal rituals of ancestor worship, Darwinian analysis of physiognomy, and pop psychology on the physical language of love (p. 72: the Mennonite pastor Cornelis Anso’s middle-aged wife tilts her head as she listens not because she is inspired by his preaching, but because she is sexually attracted to him!), Bedaux argues that what separates Rembrandt’s portraits from the rest is their ability to suggest incipient movement. Facial expressions register meaning, psychologists tell us, not as fixed signs but as sequences of movements that wax and wane. A portrait must therefore be read as a moment within a temporal continuum, and Rembrandt’s suggestive style allows this better than the detailed precision of artists like Pickenoy, whose figures appear frozen in place. Remarkably, Bedaux does not once refer to Rembrandt’s own professed interest in giving his figures “de meeste ende natuereleste beweechelijckheid,” a claim to motility of both body and spirit that nicely anticipates his argument. Rembrandt’s work is represented in the exhibition by only three portraits: Maria Trip (ca. 22), whose youthful finery contrasts with the simple widow’s attire of her mother, Aletta Adriaensdr. (cat. 23), and the late self-portrait from the Mauritshuis (cat. 37), in which the aging artist gazes benignly from beneath a silk beret. Its scumbled impasto and peachy tones must have appealed to his last pupil, Aert de Gelder, whose broadly brushed portraits of Dordrecht patrons, as independent of convention as those of his master, are far more innovative and appealing than any of the eighteenth-century works included here.

While a few eighteenth-century portraits, notably those by Wybrand Hendricks and Adriaen de Leelie, stand out for their liveliness, the majority serve only to reinforce the dependency of artists in this period on prototypes devised by their seventeenth-century forbears. Subtle innovations in style and content result mainly from the infusion of foreign influence, promoted by the presence in Amsterdam of artists such as Tischbein and Liotard.

Stephanie Dickey
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis


The seventeenth-century Dutch landscapist Jacob van Ruisdael has recently been the subject of both a magisterial catalogue raisonné and an exhibition focusing on the earliest years of his career. An impressive 788 pages in length, Seymour Slive’s catalogue consists of chronologies of Ruisdael’s life and his dated works, followed by catalogues of 694 paintings, 136 drawings, and 13 etchings, as well as
dubious and wrongly attributed works (163 paintings and 50 drawings). The paintings are grouped according to type, ranging from identifiable views, through grainfields, windmills, and waterfalls, to seascapes and winter scenes. A number of sections are preceded by substantial introductions. The individual entries are equally informative, including references to copies of Ruisdael’s paintings by other artists. In the first of two appendices, addressing the problem of “Dr. Jacob van Ruisdael,” Slive concludes that it is doubtful that our Ruisdael was the “Jacobus Ruijsdael” recorded in 1676. The second appendix explores John Constable’s fruitful encounters with Ruisdael’s art. The catalogue ends with a number of indices, including a concordance to earlier Ruisdael catalogues, and a selective bibliography, as well as a final supplement containing works that appeared after the catalogue was completed. Almost every work is illustrated. Many illustrations are in color and most of very good quality. Also illustrated are related works by other artists and, where possible, views of the original sites that Ruisdael painted. A number of fine color details allow us to study Ruisdael’s painting technique.

Slive’s catalogue will be consulted by scholars for generations to come, but I have one caveat. With a binding that is rather less than sturdy, the volume must be used with some care. This is unfortunate because not only specialists, but anyone with a love of Dutch landscape painting will surely want to browse through Slive’s pages, strolling leisurely, as it were, through some vast gallery devoted to Ruisdael in the company of its exceptionally well-informed and lucid curator. A prolific artist, Ruisdael was also a revolutionary one. Unlike the tonal landscapes of his predecessors, Ruisdael’s earliest works already show the dramatic compositions, saturated color, and intensely observed details of trees that mark a new phase in Dutch landscape painting. This development was examined in depth in the exhibition held in Hamburg and Haarlem in 2002. Concentrating on Ruisdael’s earliest paintings, the exhibition displayed 31 of his pictures (plus one unsure attribution), and a selection of landscapes by predecessors and contemporaries, including Jan van Goyen and Solomon van Ruysdael, as well as Ruisdael’s pupil, Meindert Hobbema.

Published for the Haarlem venue, the catalogue is prefaced by four essays. Pieter Biesboer surveys the material conditions underlying landscape painting in Haarlem, including patronage, guild organization, and the prices fetched by the works of various landscapeists. Huigen Leeflang discusses how the Haarlem countryside was perceived by seventeenth-century Dutch writers, a subject on which he has published valuable studies elsewhere. Jeroen Gilijtma examines Ruisdael’s earliest development, between 1646, when he produced some 12 dated paintings at the age of 17 or 18, and 1650, when he made an excursion to Burgsteinfurt. On the basis of the dated pictures, Gilijtma reconstructs the young Ruisdael’s artistic development almost from month to month. Ruisdael’s teacher probably was not his uncle Salomon van Ruysdael, but his father Isaack, represented here by a signed picture dated 1646 (Cat. no. 1). Jacob manifests his originality in his very first works. However, his landscapes became more conventional immediately after his admission to the painters’ guild in 1648. As several writers suggest in the catalogue, this temporary retreat from innovation may have come about because, no longer under his father’s protection, he was now competing on the open market. His travels in 1650 initiated a new phase of innovation.

Martina Sitt examines Ruisdael’s new concepts of landscape and space, as well as his working methods, as revealed by x-radiograph examination. He did not search hesitantly for new forms, but eschewing underdrawing, he structured his landscapes boldly in terms of light and shadow. The catalogue entries, written by a number of scholars, are generally informative, if occasionally repetitive, and with one exception are accompanied by color illustrations. They include two paintings, cat. nos. 9 and 14, rejected by Slive as authentic Ruisdaels (Slive, dub136, which he calls a borderline case, and dub65 respectively). Conversely, one painting considered doubtful in the Haarlem exhibition (no. 25) is accepted by Slive (no. 370).

Closing the volume is a final essay by Jochen Becker, who takes Ruisdael’s Mill at Wijk bij Duurstede (which has no catalogue number) as a starting point for a useful survey of current interpretations of his landscape imagery, including the “scriptural readings” of Joos Bruyn and others. Although Becker has reservations about the utility of this mode of pictorial exegesis, he enthusiastically embraced elsewhere in the catalogue. Thus, we learn, among other things, that a dead tree alludes to the transitoriness of life (cat. no. 30), a linen bleaching-field symbolizes the “purity of the soul and the power of divine grace” (cat. no. 1), and a half-dead tree with young shoots evokes both Psalm 1:3 and Job 14: 1-12 (cat. nos. 40, 41). These and similar pious associations may well have occurred to seventeenth-century viewers of Ruisdael’s landscapes, but to what extent they reflect Ruisdael’s own intentions is another matter. Skeptics will probably agree with Slive, who generally dismisses such readings as unverifiable. More plausible is the suggestion made often in the catalogue that Ruisdael’s landscapes offered occasions to contemplate the goodness of God as manifested in natural scenery. Indeed, Leeflang cites J. van Westerhoven’s book of 1685, whose title translates as The Creator Glorified in his Creatures, illustrated by Coenraad Decker’s etched view of the Haarlem dunes that remarkably calls to mind a Ruisdael Haarlemjpe. Leeflang notes that Van Westerhoven and Ruisdael belonged to the same Mennonite community in Haarlem, but since the latter had been a member of the Dutch Reformed Church in Amsterdam since 1657, not too much can be made of this association, and, as Leeflang concludes, the extent to which Ruisdael shared Van Westerhoven’s intensely religious view of nature must remain an open question.

Walter S. Gibbon
Case Western Reserve University


Gerlinde de Beer’s monograph on the great Dutch marine painter Ludolf Bakhuizen is a welcome addition to the strikingly limited scholarship on this artist. The foremost seapace painter in the Dutch Republic after the Van de Velde’s departure for England in late 1672, Bakhuizen was a celebrated and productive artist right to the end of his life – his last dated painting is from 1705. Since the late nineteenth century, however, there has been scant scholarly attention paid to him. Wilhelm von Bode, for example, writing in 1917, saw Bakhuizen’s works as exemplars of a marked decline in the quality and naturalism of Dutch marine painting, a view largely unchallenged until Laurens Bol’s pioneering re-evaluation of Bakhuizen’s pictures in 1973 (Die Holländische Marinemalerei des 17. Jahrhunderts, Braunschweig, 1973). The exhibitions in Amsterdam and Emden in 1985 remain the only shows devoted solely to him as well as the major modern publications on his work.

De Beer states three goals for her monograph: to trace Bakhuizen’s artistic development, to describe his unmistakably high quality as an artist, and to discuss his importance for the genre of marine painting from his time to ours. In this last regard, the book is not notably successful, but it accomplishes its other goals amply. Beginning with an overview of Bakhuizen’s life and career, De Beer draws heavily on Arnold Houbraken’s biography of Bakhuizen, as well as on a trove of family documents bequeathed to the
Rijksprentenkabinnet by a descendant of the artist in 1905. She reproduces these documents photographically in an appendix, along with the pages from Houbraken’s biography.

Bakhuizen was born and raised in Emden, and did not move to Amsterdam until he was nineteen (De Beer’s reasons for insisting that this must have been by 1649, rather than 1650 as Houbraken states, are not completely convincing). In Amsterdam he initially worked for Guillelmo Bartolotti as a bookkeeper and calligrapher. Despite the absence of direct documentation, De Beer expends some effort to define Bakhuizen’s education in Emden. She suggests Herman Friesenburg, who taught calligraphy, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and navigation, as Bakhuizen’s writing master. She also argues that many features of the artist’s career, including his relationships with poets, his own Latin verses, and his self-portraits as a scholar and gentleman, reflect a sound humanist education. Probably the most striking thing about his education, however, is that he apparently received no formal training in painting. According to Houbraken, Bakhuizen simply started drawing ships from life at age nineteen and gained his knowledge of marine painting by working with practicing artists, most notably Allaert van Everdingen and Hendrick Dubbels. This period of learning must have spanned a few years at least, but De Beer wants to compress it into a few months in 1649-1650 because of two signed paintings dated 1649 and 1650. The whereabouts of neither painting is known and the accuracy of their dates cannot be determined. That the next dated paintings are from 1658 suggests that these earlier dates may not be accurate. It seems particularly unlikely that the winter scene putatively signed by Bakhuizen and dated 1650 is an original invention that Hendrick Dubbels, a much older artist, then copied.

The author has a slight tendency to aggrandize Bakhuizen, but his remarkable paintings, especially from the mid-1660s when the artist hit his stride, do not require special pleading. At his best (and he was at his best for decades), Bakhuizen’s seascapes are remarkable for their richness of color, their complexity of chiaroscuro effects, and their subtlety of light reflections, especially in water and sails. They are also works of vivid energy, often involving vessels in dynamic compositional structures organized on crossing diagonal axes on the surface and in depth. De Beer attempts to describe these compositions and their visual effects. She often succeeds in articulating Bakhuizen’s ability to combine the grand and monumental with naturalistic accuracy of detail, a trait he shares with a number of the greatest land- and seascape artists of this period in Dutch art, including Jacob van Ruisdael and Willem van de Velde the Younger. Less successful are her attempts to link some significant subjects and stylistic variations to particular political, economic, or social developments. While sometimes suggestive, these contextual references often seem arbitrary since they cannot be adduced to explain similar subjects or style changes at other times. De Beer is also not interested in the implications of an important feature of Bakhuizen’s work, his tendency to exaggeration or inaccuracy of detail. Masts that are too long, taffarel (stern board) decorations that are not historically accurate, major warships or East Indiamen that are depicted far too close to shore for vessels of such draft, all are characteristics of Bakhuizen’s work in a genre in which meticulous accuracy in rendering maritime architecture and tactics was and is the standard of quality. Clearly, Bakhuizen sought powerful expression first, something one does not always find with the Van de Veldes, among others. But this preference probably contributed to the slighting of his work in the twentieth century when Dutch marine painting became increasingly the province of scholars and collectors more interested in historical veracity in marine art.

A feature of Bakhuizen’s career that distinguishes him from the Van de Veldes is the number of portraits in his oeuvre from the 1650s onwards. De Beer provides a survey of Bakhuizen’s sitters, and she notes especially the portraits of a number of poets, including the noted eulogist of Dutch naval prowess, Jan Antonides van der Goes. While De Beer notes some general points of resemblance between his poems and Bakhuizen’s paintings, it would seem that more could be done with this relationship. At the same time, one has to recognize the distance between the classicizing poets of “Nil volentibus arduum,” the literary and artistic society founded by the art theorist Gerard de Lairesse, and the commitment to naturalistic accuracy of a painter like Bakhuizen. While Antonides was a member of “Nil,” Bakhuizen was not, despite, as De Beer notes, his clear inclination towards De Lairesse’s circle and his experimentation with classicizing compositional structures known to him in prints by Claude and after Poussin.

De Beer’s book excels in gathering a great mass of material, including Bakhuizen’s drawings and prints, and ordering it chronologically. She also discusses a number of his most important followers and imitators. This is a valuable service considering the artist’s large oeuvre and the huge number of copies and imitations of his work. The information she provides on copies and variants of a number of major pictures will be of great interest to curators, dealers, and collectors, pending the publication of the catalogue raisonné that the jacket blurb notes she is producing. What is missing in this volume is a more synthesized vision of Bakhuizen’s career and his art. We have no sense of an overview of his preferences in subject matter—how often his paintings depict war ships and yet how rarely he depicts actual battles; how often his images involve ocean-going commerce or shipping in local waters, but how rarely he deals with fishing. His relationships with poets are mentioned but their implications are not considered in depth, just as his fame as a calligrapher is not brought into relation to his artistic stature and his consciousness of his own artistry and fame. The author emphasizes Bakhuizen’s strong tendency to reinvent the compositions and subjects of earlier generations of Dutch and Flemish marine artists. She also notes the number of self-portraits in his work, including six paintings. These images depict Bakhuizen as a gentleman; in one case, his learning in mathematics, geography, and astronomy and his skill as a writing master are emphasized. This all suggests a distinctly self-aware artist, who consciously sought to absorb and rework styles and subjects while retaining his own artistic identity. His failure to standardize the spelling of his family name until well into his career is thus surprising. Surprising, too, is De Beer’s use, without explanation, of the spelling “Backhuysen” when the artist himself tended from the late 1680s to favor the spelling “Bakhuizen.” This is the spelling used in the notices of his death and the spelling adopted by the Amsterdam exhibition of 1985.

The production of the book is for the most part lavish and well-organized. The large number of excellent color reproductions is a valuable feature. I do have two quibbles. Many detail photographs are reproduced at the same or nearly the same scale as the whole image, in effect cancelling the point of a detail. All reproductions of Bakhuizen’s pictures have both a figure number and a catalogue number, the latter presumably referring to De Beer’s forthcoming catalogue raisonné. It is sometimes difficult to locate illustrations, since the text often cites pictures by catalogue number, while the illustrations are numbered sequentially by figure number. These are, of course, minor points in a book that makes an overview of the work of a major artist available for the first time.

Lawrence O. Goedde
University of Virginia
New Titles

Journals

Master Drawings, Vol. 41, No. 3, Autumn 2003

The issue is devoted to Early Netherlandish Drawings. It contains the papers delivered at the symposium in Antwerp, June 24, 2003, which was held in conjunction with the exhibition at the Rubenshuis (June 14 – August 18, 2002).


Stephanie Buck, The Impact of Hugo van der Goes as a Draftsman.

Maryan W. Ainsworth, “Diverse patterns pertaining to the crafts of the painters or illuminators:” Gerard David and the Bening Workshop.

Fritz Koreny, Drawings by Vrancke van der Stockt.

Erwin Pokorny, Bosch’s Cripples and Drawings by his Imitators.

Review: Maryan W. Ainsworth, Early Netherlandish Drawings from Jan van Eyck to Hieronymus Bosch, exhibition catalogue by Fritz Koreny, with Erwin Pokorny and Georg Zeman.

Nationalia Biografisch Woordenboek


Books


Van de Wetering, Ernst, Rembrandts verborgen zelfportretten. [Cat. exh. Rembrandthuis, Amsterdam, January 30 – March 16, 2003.] Amsterdam: Rembrandthuis, 2003. – Two self-portraits, one from the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin, the other, recently discovered in a French private collection.


**List of Periodicals Accessed in the Bibliography of Journal Articles on the HNA website: www.hnanews.org**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodical</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Kroniek van het Rembrandthuis</td>
<td>Kunstchronik: Monatschrift für Kunstwissenschaft, Museumswesen und Denkmalpflege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunstschrift: Openbaar Kunstbezit</td>
<td>Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Low Countries. Arts and Society in Flanders and the Netherlands: A Yearbook</td>
<td>Master Drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritshuis in Focus</td>
<td>Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van Belgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De achttiende eeuw: documentatieblad van de werkgroep achttiende eeuw</td>
<td>The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amstelodamum: maandblad voor de kennis van Amsterdam, orgaan van het genootschap Amstelodamum</td>
<td>Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek/Netherlands Yearbook for History of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo: The International Magazine of the Arts</td>
<td>Openbaar Kunstbezit in Vlaanderen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Art Bulletin: An Illustrated Quarterly Published by the College Art Association of America</td>
<td>Oud Holland: Nieuwe Bijdrage voor de Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Kunst, Letterkunde, Nijverheid, enz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Bulletin of Nationalmuseum Stockholm</td>
<td>The Oxford Art Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History: Journal of the Association of Art Historians</td>
<td>Pantheon: Internationale Jahreszeitschrift für Kunst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artibus et Historiae: An Art Anthology</td>
<td>Print Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biuletyn historii sztuki</td>
<td>Renaissance Studies: Journal of the Society for Renaissance Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boletín del Museo del Prado</td>
<td>Reuze en de koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van Belgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire de l’Art français</td>
<td>The Seventeenth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin of the National Gallery in Prague/Bulletin Národní Galerie v Praze</td>
<td>Statens Museum for Kunst: Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin van het Koninklijk Instituut voor het Kunstpatrimonium/Bulletin de l’Institut Royal Patrimoine Artistique</td>
<td>Studies in Iconography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum</td>
<td>Tableau: Tijdschrift over beeldende kunst, museumactiviteiten en kunsthandel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Burlington Magazine</td>
<td>Umení, Journal of the Institute for Art History of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Journal of Netherlandic Studies/Revue Canadienne d’études Néerlandaises</td>
<td>Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch: Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connaissance des Arts</td>
<td>Weltkunst: Illustrierte Zeitschrift für Kunst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dordrechts Museum Bulletin</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresdener Kunstblätter: Zweimonatschrift der Staatliche Kunstsammlungen</td>
<td>De zeventiende eeuw: cultuur in de Nederlanden in interdisciplinair perspectief: tijschrift van de werkgroep zeventiende eeuw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Crossings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emblematica: An Interdisciplinary Journal for Emblem Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antwerp Royal Museum Annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen: Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Museums Wien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahrbuch Preussischer Kulturbesitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konsthistorisk tidskrift: revy för konst och konstforskning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kritische Berichte: Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historians of Netherlandish Art is an international organization founded in 1983 to foster communication and collaboration among historians of Northern European art from medieval to modern times. Its membership comprises scholars, teachers, museum professionals, art dealers, publishers, book dealers, and collectors throughout the world. The art and architecture of the Netherlands (Dutch and Flemish), and of Germany and France, as it relates to the Netherlands, from about 1350 to 1750, forms the core of members’ interests. Current membership comprises around 650 individuals, institutions and businesses.

HNA organizes and sponsors a major research conference every four years. It also holds an annual meeting in conjunction with College Art Association conferences, where members share interests and information in debates, symposia, or lectures. HNA offers news of exhibitions, acquisitions and other museum news, conferences, recent publications, and members’ activities, as well as extensive book reviews on its webpage at www.hnanews.org. Twice a year this information is also offered in hard copy. A Membership Directory is available on HNA’s website.

HNA grew out of a national symposium on Netherlandish art held in the spring of 1982 at Memphis State University. Its initial research conference, held at the University of Pittsburgh in 1985, drew over two hundred participants from seven countries. The Pittsburgh meeting set the standard for four further international conferences held in Cleveland (1989), Boston (1993), Baltimore (1998), and Antwerp (2002). HNA has been an affiliated society of the College Art Association since 1984, and was incorporated in New York State as a not-for-profit corporation in 1988.

Membership in Historians of Netherlandish Art is open to any individual or organization interested in the study of Netherlandish, German and Franco-Flemish art and architecture, whether as a vocation or avocation. Membership privileges include participation in HNA activities annually at College Art Association meetings and at HNA-sponsored conferences, access to the online Newsletter and Review of Books, the Membership Directory, and the hard copy version of the HNA Newsletter and Review of Books.

For information contact Kristin Belkin, 23 South Adelaide Ave, Highland Park NJ 08904; 732-937 83 94; kbelkin@aol.com, or Fiona Healy, Marc-Chagall-Straße 68, D-55127 Mainz, Germany; FionaHealy@aol.com
Endowment Fund

Initial Challenge Grant of $5,000.00 given by James Marrow

Jan Six Society ($1 to $49)
Marcia Allentuck in memory of Charles Mitchell
Melanie Gifford
Jeffrey Hamburger
L. B. L. Harwood
Julie Berger Hochstrasser
Robinson Kurtin Communications, Inc.
Nancy Minty
Anne M. Morganstern
Diane Wolfthal
Yonna Yapou-Kromholz

John the Magnanimous Society ($50 to $99)
Anonymous gift in memory of Dana Goodgal-Salem
Al Acres
Donna R. Barnes
Celeste Brusati
Alice I. Davies
Wilson G. Duprey
Laura D. Gelfand
Lola B. Gellman
Ann Sutherland Harris
Ann Sutherland Harris in honor of Seymour Slive
Penny Howell Jolly
Susan C. Katz Karp
Anne W. Lowenthal in memory of James O. Belden
Andrea Pearson
Leontine Radler

Mary of Burgundy Society ($100 to $249)
Anonymous gift in memory of Dana Goodgal-Salem
Anonymous gift in honor of the late Charles Mitchell
Anonymous gift in honor of Irina Sokolova
Christian Andersson in honor of Julius Held’s 91st birthday
Gerlinde de Beer in honor of George Keyes for his services as president of HNA
Maria van Berge-Gerbaud
H. Perry Chapman
Charles D. Cuttler
Charles D. Cuttler
Alice I. Davies
Arlene and Arthur Elkind in honor of Egbert Haverkamp Begemann

Foundation Custodia, Collection Frits Lugt
Ivan Gaskell in memory of Salim Kemal
Adele and Gordon J. Gilbert in honor of Ivan Gaskell
Amy Golahny
Jane Hutchison in memory of Wolfgang Stechow

Alison McNeil Kettering
Susan Koslow in honor of Julius Held
Susan Donahue Kuretsky in memory of Beatrijs Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij
Anne-Marie Logan in honor of Kristin Belkin and all her hard work on behalf of HNA
Anne W. Lowenthal
Constance Lowenthal in honor of Seymour Slive
Ruth Mellinkoff
Erika Michael
Shelley Perlove
Jeffrey Chipp斯 Smith
Joaneath Spicer
Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr.

Chancellor Rolin Society ($250 to $499)
Anonymous donor
Elizabeth Alice Honig
George Keyes
David Koetser
Mr. and Mrs. Bernard G. Palitz
Joaneath A. Spicer
Johnny Van Haeften

Philip the Good Society ($500 to $999)
A friend
George S. Abrams
Anne Hagopian van Buren
Anne Hagopian van Buren in memory of L. M. J. Delaissé
Richard Green Galleries

Constantijn Huygens Society ($500 to $999)
J. William Middendorf II

Admiral Maarten Harpertzsz. Tromp Fund ($500 to $999)
Sotheby’s, New York

Earl of Arundel Society ($1,000 to $2,499)
David G. Carter in memory of Roger-A. d’Hulst
David G. Carter in memory of Paul Coremans
David G. Carter in memory of Jacques Lavalleye
Maine Community Foundation, at the recommendation of Anne van Buren
Joann and James Nordlie
The Samuel H. Kress Foundation

Pottekijker Society ($2,500 to $4,999)
Jack Kilgore

HNA Presidents’ Society ($1,000 and above)
George Keyes in memory of Jan Gerrit van Gelder
George Keyes in memory of Hans Mielke
Benefactors
Alexander Galleries
(Alexander Acevedo)
Kahren Jones Arbitman
Alfred Bader
David Giles Carter
H. Perry Chapman
Charles C. Cunningham, Jr.
Hester Diamond
Michael Enthoven
Adele and Gordon J. Gilbert
John H. Kilgore
Susan Donahue Kuretsky
Jan de Maere
James H. Marrow
J. William Middendorf
Mr. and Mrs. Bernard G. Kalitz
Benjamin Rifkin
John Walsh

Patrons
Maryan W. Ainsworth
Christiane Andersson
Eva Allen
Luis E. Bacó-Rodríguez
Shirley K. Bennett
Nancy Bialler
Joaquin Bordiu
Celeste Brusati
Alan Chong
Nico Cobelens
Alice I. Davies
Marion J. de Koning
Peter Donhauser
Arthur H. Elkind
David Freedberg
Thomas Fusenig
Ivan Gaskell
Lola B. Gellman
Aneta Georgievskas-Shine
Walter Gibson
Lawrence Goedde
George Gordon
Barbara Haeger
John Oliver Hand
Ann Sutherland Harris
Valerie Hedquist
Charlotte Houghton
Timothy Husband
Jane Hutchison

Supporting Members
Alison Kettering
George Keyes
David Koetser
Walter Liedtke
Julia Lloyd Williams
Henry Luttikhuizen
William Mahart
Ann Alilise Mayer-Meintschel
Rhona MacBeth
Walter Melion
Pamela Merrill Brekka
Erika Michael
Keith Molesy
Sheila Muller
Herman A. Papbruwe
Carol J. Purtle
Leontine V. L. Radler
Ann M. Roberts
Mr. and Mrs. Bennett
Robinson
William Robinson
Michael Rohé
Gregory Rubinstein
John H. Schlichte Bergen
Diane Scilla
Jeffrey Chipp Smith
Joaneath Spicer
Ron Spronk
Charles Talbot
Joop van Cooeden
Johnny Van Haeften
Hans J. Van Miegroet
Andrew D. Washton
Matthew A. Weatherbie
Mariët Westermann
Arthur Wheelock
Gloria Williams
Jean C. Wilson
Jim Wright

Institutions and Businesses
Joel R. Bergquist Fine Arts
C. G. Boerner Inc.
The Boijmans Van Beuningen
Museum, Rotterdam
Brepols Publishers NV
Brown University, Rockefeller Library
Centrum voor de Vlaamse
Kunst van de 16de en 17de
eeuw, Antwerp
The Cleveland Museum of Art,
Ingalls Library
James Corcoran Fine Arts
Erasmus B.V.
Fogg Art Museum, Fine Arts
Library, Harvard University
The Frick Art Reference Library
The Getty Research Institute,
Serials Section
Indiana University Library
Institut Royal du Patrimoine
Artistique/Koninklijk
Instituut voor het Kunstpatrimonium, Brussels
Institute of Fine Arts, Library,
New York University
Istituto Universitario
Olandese di Storia dell’ Arte
Kunstmuseum Basel,
Bibliothek
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Thomas J. Watson Library
Otto Naumann Ltd.
Princeton University Libraries
Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht,
Letterenbibliothek
Stedelijke Musea, Brugge
Universitätsbibliothek
Heidelberg
Universiteit Utrecht
University of Amsterdam,
Bibliotheek
Anton W. van Bekhoven,
Antiquarian Bookseller and Publisher

Honorary Members
Charles Cuttler
Egbert Havercamp Begemann
William Heckscher (died 1999)
Julius S. Held (died 2002)
Eddy de Jongh
James Snyder (died 1990)
Seymour Slive
Susan Urbach

Benefactors contribute $200 per year to the Historians of Netherlandish Art; Patrons give $100 per year; Institutions and Businesses give $100 per year; Supporting Members give $65 per year.
Historians of Netherlandish Art

Officers

President - Alison McNeil Kettering
William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor of Art History
Carleton College
Northfield MN 55057

Vice President - Ellen Konowitz
Associate Professor of Art History
SUNY at New Paltz
75 South Manheim Blvd
New Paltz NY 12561

Treasurer - Marjorie E. Wieseman
Curator of European Painting and Sculpture
Cincinnati Art Museum
953 Eden Park Drive
Cincinnati OH 45202

European Treasurer - Fiona Healy
Marc-Chagall-Str. 68
D-55127 Mainz
Germany

European Liaison - Marten Jan Bok
Mauritsstraat 17
NL-3583 HG Utrecht
The Netherlands

Board Members

H. Perry Chapman
Stephanie Dickey
Reindert Falkenburg
Nadine Orenstein
Larry Silver
Eric Jan Sluijter
Linda Stone-Ferrier

Newsletter & Membership Secretary

Kristin Lohse Belkin
23 South Adelaide Avenue
Highland Park, New Jersey 08904

Layout by Marty Perzan - Network Typesetting, Inc.

Contents

In Memoriam ................................................................. 2
HNA News ................................................................. 5
Personalia ................................................................. 5
Exhibitions ................................................................. 6
Museum News ........................................................... 9
Scholarly Activities
Conferences: To Attend ................................................ 9
Past Conferences ....................................................... 10
Opportunities ........................................................... 12

HNA Review of Books

14th and 15th Centuries ............................................... 13
16th Century ............................................................. 17
17th and 18th Centuries: Southern Netherlands ............. 22
17th and 18th Centuries: Dutch Republic ....................... 27
New Titles ............................................................... 33