A New Acquisition for the 
Museum Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerp

Cornelis De Vos, Portrait of Jan Vekemans (c. 1625) about to be reunited with the portraits of his parents, Joris Vekemans and Maria van Ghinderdeuren, his brother Frans and one of his sisters. 
Photo: Michel Ceuterick
From the President

With spring upon us – unless, of course, you live in Syracuse – there is much to look forward to as the year unfolds, not in the least of which will be our sixth quadrennial conference. But before I discuss the latest news germane to Historians of Netherlandish Art, I would first like to thank Anne Lowenthal for having organized such a stimulating series of lectures on the life and work of the eminent scholar, Julius Held, which was our organization’s official session at the recent Annual Meeting of the College Art Association in Boston. It was good to see so many of you in attendance there, as well as at our reception later that day. Indeed, the presence of a large number of members at these two functions pays testimony to our continued vitality as an organization. This vitality is also evidenced by the many contributions we have received to our various endowment funds, particularly to the new Montias Fund. My thanks to all who have contributed, for their generosity.

I want to welcome our newest Board Members: Ron Sprok, Betsy Wieseman and Ann Adams. My thanks to everyone who agreed to run for the board, in what amounted to an extremely close election. I would also like to thank Eric Jan Sluiter, Perry Chapman and Nadine Orenstein as they leave the board after serving four years. One other change has been made. Fiona Healy, our European Treasurer, has agreed to serve in a double capacity as treasurer and European Liaison, replacing Marten Jan Bok. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Marten Jan for his services.

I am pleased to report that the Board of Directors had a very productive meeting over lunch in Boston. In addition to the typically perfunctory business that we conducted – something that preoccupies all boards, I suppose – I do have some exciting news to share with you: part of the meeting was devoted to preliminary discussions about launching an on-line, scholarly journal for our membership. It would likely take a form similar to that of the current, on-line journal, Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide; for those of you unfamiliar with that venture, I urge you to take a look at this successful journal the next time you happen to log onto the internet. The Board of Directors has actually commissioned a subcommittee, headed by our Vice-President, Stephanie Dickey, and myself, to investigate this possibility further. Naturally, start-up funding will be a prominent concern, as will issues of copyright. And lastly, we must resolve the problem of naming an editor and an editorial board. Nevertheless, we are all optimistic that our aspiration to launch an on-line journal will become a reality in the not too distant future.

Before I close, I should mention that planning for our next quadrennial conference, which will take place in November 8-12, 2006 in Baltimore and Washington DC, continues to proceed smoothly. We plan to send the membership a preliminary program, registration forms, and other pertinent information in May. I hope to see many of you at the conference!

Wayne Franits
Syracuse University

HNA News

HNA Conference, Washington-Baltimore
November 8-12, 2006

This is the last Newsletter before the HNA conference. The preliminary program, workshop sign-up sheet, registration and hotel information will be posted on the website as well as sent out as hardcopy to all members in May. For further information, please contact the conference organizers Aneta Georgievksa-Shine, anetagshine@yahoo.com, and Quint Gregory, quint@wam.umd.edu.

HNA at CAA

New York, February 14-17, 2007

The HNA-sponsored session is chaired by Ann Adams and Elizabeth Honig. The topic is: The Presence of History, The Persistence of Time. For the Call for Papers, see under Opportunities.

HNA Fellowship

The 2006 Fellowship was awarded to two recipients: (1) Katarzyna Plonka-Balus, Curator of Illuminated Manuscripts at the Czartoryski Museum and Library in Cracow (Poland), for travel and photographic expenses for research on: Ms. Czart. 30251, Ghent Associates and the Heritage of the Master of Mary of Burgundy; and to Claudia Goldstein, Assistant Professor of Art History at William Patterson University, Wayne (New Jersey), for travel to Antwerp and photographing objects at the Vleeshuis and Museum Mayer van den Bergh for her book in preparation: Keeping Up Appearances: Pieter Bruegel, Material Culture, and Dinner Parties in Early Modern Antwerp.

We urge members to apply for the 2007 Fellowship. Scholars of any nationality who have been HNA members in good standing for at least two years are eligible to apply. The topic of the research project must be within the field of Northern European art ca. 1400-1800. Up to $1,000 may be requested for purposes such as travel to collections or research facilities, purchase of photographs or reproduction rights, or subvention of a publication. Winners will be notified in February with funds to be distributed by April 1. The application should consist of: (1) a short description of project (1-2 pp); (2) budget; (3) list of further funds applied/received for the same project; and (4) current c.v. A selection from a recent publication may be included but is not required. Pre-dissertation applicants must include a letter of recommendation from their advisor. Recipient(s) will be asked to write a short account of the project(s) for publication in the HNA Newsletter. Applications should be sent, preferably via e-mail, by December 1, 2006, to Stephanie S. Dickey, Vice-President, Historians of Netherlandish Art. E-mail: dickey.ss@gmail.com. Address after July 1: Bader Chair in Northern Baroque Art, Dept. of Art, Ontario Hall, Queen’s University, Kingston, ON K7L 3N6 Canada.
HNA Board

Three new board members were elected and introduced to the membership at the HNA Membership Meeting and Reception at CAA in Boston, February 24, 2006. Ann Jensen Adams, Ron Spronk and Marjorie E. Wieseman are replacing H. Perry Chapman, Nadine Orenstein and Erc Jan Sluijter whose terms expired. The new board members will serve for four years (2006-2010). Fiona Healy, the European Treasurer, was appointed to serve as European Liaison (in addition to being the treasurer), replacing Marten Jan Bok who resigned.

Personalia

Ann Jensen Adams (UC - Santa Barbara) is a 2005-06 research scholar at The Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles.

Christiane Andersson (Bucknell University) has been appointed to serve on the International Committee of CAA’s Professional Interests, Practices and Standards committees.

Nicola Courtright (Amherst College) has been elected president of CAA for a two-year term, beginning May 2006.

Stephanie Dickey, currently Associate Professor of Art History at Herron School of Art and Design, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, has been appointed Bader Chair in Northern Baroque Art at Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, to begin Fall 2006.

Lars Hendrikman has been appointed curator of Old Master Paintings at the Bonnefantenmuseum in Maastricht, starting August 1, 2006.

Frima Fox Hofrichter is one of six scholars who edited and rewrote Janson's History of Art (Prentice Hall), introduced to the art historical world at CAA in February.

Koenraad Jonckheere received the 2005 Jan van Gelder prize for his doctoral dissertation, Kunsthandel en diplomatie. De veiling van de schilderijenverzameling van Willem III (1713) en de rol van het diplomatieke netwerk in de Europese kunsthandel (University of Amsterdam).

Anne-Marie Logan and Michiel Plomp were awarded the prize for Best Historical Show for Peter Paul Rubens: The Drawings (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), from The International Association of Art Critics, US Chapter.

Susan Maxwell has been appointed Assistant Professor of Renaissance and Baroque Art at the University of Wisconsin – Oshkosh.

Carol Purtle has been named to the newly created Benjamin Rawlins Jr. Professorship in the Department of Art at the University of Memphis.


Suzanne Walker has been appointed Assistant Professor in the Art Department at Tulane University, New Orleans.

Diane Wolfthal (Arizona State University) has been awarded a National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship for 2006 to research a book on Hugo van der Goes.

Exhibitions

United States and Canada

Wrought Emotions. Renaissance and Baroque Paintings from the Permanent Collection. Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Queens University, Kingston (Ontario), August 28, 2005 – January 26, 2007. Selection of works from the permanent collection showcases its strength in Dutch art, in large part due to the generosity of Alfred and Isabel Bader.


Jan van der Heyden (1637-1712). Bruce Museum of Arts and Science, Greenwich (Connecticut), September 16, 2006 – January 10, 2007. Selections from the exhibition will go to the Rijksmuseum and the Rembrandthuis, respectively.


Europe

Austria and Germany


Belgium


Traits gravés et dessinés au temps de Lambert Lombard. 
Cabinet des Estampes et de Dessins, Liège, April 27 – August 6, 2006.

La peinture aux Pays-Bas au siècle de Lambert Lombard. 
Musée d’Art religieux et d’Art mosan, Liège, April 28 – August 6, 2006. From the museum’s holdings.


Czech Republic


England and Scotland


Rembrandt et son école: dessins de l’ancienne collection royale de Dresde. Fondation Custodia, Paris, March 30 – May 21, 2006. The exhibition previously was shown in Dresden. The catalogue (by Christian Dittrich and Thomas Ketelsen), is reviewed in this issue.


French Republic


Rembrandt et son école: dessins de l’ancienne collection royale de Dresde. Fondation Custodia, Paris, March 30 – May 21, 2006. The exhibition previously was shown in Dresden. The catalogue (by Christian Dittrich and Thomas Ketelsen), is reviewed in this issue.


Hungary


Ireland


Italy


The Netherlands


Rembrandt in 2006

Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum


Rembrandt 400: All the Paintings, Part II. February 20 – June 1, 2006.


Rembrandt 400: All the Drawings, Part II: The Observer. October 14 – December 31, 2006.

Amsterdam, Museum Het Rembrandthuis


Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum


Amsterdam, Joods Historisch Museum


Amsterdam, Gemeentearchief


Amsterdam, Bijbels Museum


Amsterdam, Amsterdam’s Historisch Museum


The Hague, Museum Bredius


The Hague, The Mauritshuis


Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal


Rembrandt’s Landscapes. October 6, 2006 – January 7, 2007. Coming from Kassel (for cat. see under Germany)

Leiden, Prentenkabinet Universiteit Leiden


Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen


Voorburg, Huygensmuseum Hofwijck

Huygens ontdekt Rembrandt. April 8 – July 9, 2006

Russia


Spain

El fruto de la fe: el legado artístico de Flandes en la isla de la Palma en el siglo XVI. Antiguo Convento de San Francisco-Museo Insular, Santa Cruz de La Palma, October 7, 2005 – August 30, 2006. The exhibition was previously shown at the Fundación Carlos de Amberes, Madrid, and Kunsthall De Sint-Pietersabdij, Ghent. With catalogue.

Switzerland


Other Countries

Australia


New Zealand


Museum News

Aachen: The Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum has renovated its galleries for Dutch and Flemish paintings. The opening exhibition (from March 8) includes 21 paintings on loan from Berlin in addition to the Suermondt’s own holdings, as part of a new German collections mobility plan. The paintings will return to Berlin in 2010, to be replaced by another 25 that will travel to Aachen.

Antwerp: The Museum Mayer van den Bergh recently acquired Cornelis De Vos, Portrait of Jan Vekemans, c. 1625 (purchased by the King Baudouin Foundation, on loan to the museum). This completes the set of portraits of the children (the three that were actually portrayed; there were six in all) of Joris Vekemans and Maria van Ghinderdeuren, all of which, including the pendant portraits of the parents, are in the Mayer van den Bergh.

Berlin: The newly restored Bodemuseum on Berlin’s Museumsinsel was unlocked for a two-day architectural preview in December, to great acclaim. It will officially open later this summer, housing the sculpture collection, the Byzantine art museum and a selection of paintings from the pre-nineteenth-century collection of the Gemäldegalerie.

Canberra: The National Gallery of Australia’s small collection of old master paintings will go on long-term loan to state galleries in Melbourne, Adelaide and Sydney, joining those museums’ holdings to offer a fuller history of European art for Australian audiences. Among the works is Rubens’s 1622 Self-Portrait.

The Hague: The Mauritshuis recently acquired Rubens’s Old Woman and a Boy with Candles (c. 1616-17), which was in the artist’s own collection, as well as Jacob van Ruisdael, View of Bentheim Castle (c. 1652-54).

Stockholm: Four Swedish men were charged in December 2005 for the possession of a Rembrandt self-portrait that was stolen from the Nationalmuseum Stockholm in December 2000. The Rembrandt was recovered on September 15, 2005 in a Copenhagen hotel room. (From The Art Newspaper, January 2006)

Scholarly Activities

Conferences To Attend

United States and Canada

Celebrating Rembrandt

41st International Congress on Medieval Studies
Kalamazoo (Michigan), May 4-7, 2006.

For the extensive program, see http://www.wmich.edu/medieval/congress

Myth in History: History in Myth
Third International Conference of the Society for Netherlandic History, New York (Deutsches Haus, NYU), June 5-6, 2006.

Art historical topics:
Joy Kearney (Erasmus University, Rotterdam), Mythology in Northern European Painting: Orpheus Charming the Animals.
Anke Van Wagenberg (Salisbury University, Maryland), A Tradition Lost? Winter Feasting in Dutch and Flemish Prints.
Kimberlee Cloutier-Blazzard (Independent Scholar), The Wise Man Has Two Tongues: Images of the Satyr and the Peasant by Jordaens and Steen.

www.nnp.org

From the ‘Halve Maan’ to KLM: 400 Years of Dutch-American Exchange


Speakers who are HNA members are: Julie Hochstrasser, James Tanis, Lloyd DeWitt, Amy Golahny, Natasha Seaman, Christine Sellin, and Mary Brantl. The papers (68 in all) will be published by AANS.

AANS@socsci.umn.edu

Facing the Middle Ages

Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, October 14-15, 2006. In conjunction with the exhibition Witness to History: The Face in Medieval Sculpture (see above). Sponsored by the International Center of Medieval Art (ICMA).

From Icon to Art in the Netherlands


Sessions
John Hand/Ron Spronk (chairs), Unfolding the Early Netherlandish Diptych.
Mark Tucker/Lloyd DeWitt (chairs), Rogier van der Weyden: Sculpture and Painting in Early Netherlandish Art.

Ariane Mensger/Dagmar Eichberger (chairs), Looking Backward: The Meaning of Copying.

Shelley Perlove (chair), The Bible and Spiritual Enlightenment: Defining Dutch and Flemish Religious Devotion.

Natasha Seaman/Todd Richardson (chairs), Artistic Consciousness and the Emerging Art Theoretical Discourse in Painting, 1400-1700.

Stephanie Dickey (chair), Printmaking in Northern Europe 1450-1700: Medium, Market, and Message.

Julie Hochstrasser (chair), The Dutch in the World: Art and Collecting in a Global Milieu.

Contact: Aneta Georgievska-Shine, anetagshine@yahoo.com; Quint Gregory, quint@wam.umd.edu

The “motions of the mind”. Representing the Passions in the Arts of the Early Modern Netherlands

Queen’s University and Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Kingston, Ontario, November 17-18, 2006. Organized by Stephanie Dickey and David de Witt.

Contact: franziskagottwald@yahoo.de

Europe

Liége au XVIe siècle. Art et culture autour de Lambert Lombard

Université de Liége, in collaboration with the Centre d’Études Supérieures de la Renaissance de Tours, May 15-17, 2006. www.schist.ulg.ac.be/lombard/programme.htm

Dominique Allart (Univ. Liége), De nouveaux horizons pour la culture liégeoise au XVIe siècle. L’apport d’Erard de la Marck et de Lambert Lombard.

Alain Marchandisse (Univ. Liége), Figures de mécènes à Liége, autour d’Erard de la Marck.

Kris De Jonge (KUL), L’architecture de la Renaissance à Liége: vers une nouvelle évaluation.

Benoit Van den Bossche (Univ. Liége), La sculpture à Liége à l’époque de Lambert Lombard: état de la question.

Mathilde Bert (Univ. Liége), Dominique Lampson et ses correspondants: réflexions sur l’art, ses concepts et sa pratique.

Colette Nativel (Univ. Paris), Lombard vu par Lampson: la Vita Lombardii.

Cécile Oger (Univ. Liége), Les dessins et les peintures de Lambert Lombard: un nouvel éclairage sur le fonctionnement de l’atelier de l’artiste.

Delphine Steyaert (IRPA), Le retable de l’église Saint-Denis à Liége. Notes sur la partie sculptée.

Nicole Dacos (ULB/FNRS), Lambert Lombard et Lambert Suavius: leurs débuts et leur voyage en Italie.

Yvette Vanden Bemden (FUNDO, Namur), L’étude des vitraux en région mosane.

Isabelle Lecoq (IRPA), Rayonnement et dépassement de l’art de Lambert Lombard dans le vitrail monumental liégeois de la seconde moitié du XVIe siècle.

Pierre Paquet (Univ. Liége/Région wallone), L’église Saint-Jacques à Liége, de l’ambiguïté cachée au paradoxe avéré.

Jean-Sébastien Misson (Région wallone), Maisons canoniales, demeures patriciennes et manoirs: la Maison Baar-Lechâlter et l’architecture civile liégeoise des XVIe et XVIIe siècles.

Pieter Te Poel (Bonnefanten-Museum, Maastricht), Daniel Mauch, ein deutscher Bildhauer zwischen Ulm und Lüttich.

Michel Lefftz (ULG), L’atelier Pallardin – Fiacre et la maître de Saint-Pierre-lez-Lièbrumont.

Dimitri Laboury (Univ. Liége/FNRS), De l’intérêt de Lambert Lombard pour les aegyptiaca.

Gwendoline Denhaene (KBR), La circulation des gravures au début du XVIe siècle aux Pays-Bas et dans la Principauté de Liége.

François de Callatay (KBR), Lambert Lombard et les monnaies antiques.

Renaud Adam (Univ. Liége/KBR), Recherches sur la bibliothèque de l’abbé Gérard van der Scaef (died 1532): contribution à l’étude des usages du livre imprimé à la Renaissance.

Pierre-Marie Gason (Univ. Liége), Librarieres, relieurs, imprimeurs et graveurs in ore leonis: contribution à l’histoire des pensées alternatives à Liége au XVIe siècle.

Xavier Hermand (FUNDO, Namur), Des livres pour la réforme. La copie d’emmanuscrits dans les monastères réformés du diocèse de Liége (XVe – début XVIe siècle).

International Medieval Congress


For all information: http://www.leeds.ac.uk/ims/imc/index.html

The Quest for the Original. Colloque XVI for the Study of Underdrawing and Technology in Painting

Bruges, September 21-23, 2006

Contact: couvert@art.ucl.ac.be

Das Meisterstück

Johann David Passavant Colloquium, Frankfurt/Main, November 25-26, 2006.

Contact: Andreas Tacke, tacke@uni-trier.de, or Bodo Brinkmann, brinkmann@staedelmuseum.de

CODART TIEN: Dutch and Flemish Art in France

Past Conferences

United States

Sixteenth-Century Society Annual Conference
Atlanta, October 20-23, 2005.

Art in the Netherlands, HNA-sponsored session, chair: Stephanie Dickey

Diane Wolthal (Arizona State, Tempe), Hugo van der Goes: A Historiographical Analysis.

Walter Melion (Emory, Atlanta), Icon and Presence in Otto van Veen’s Road to Calvary.

Dawn Odell (Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA), Porcelain and Experience in 17th-Century Holland.

Art and Culture in Renaissance and Early Modern Europe

Amy Powell (Temple University), Disappearing Acts: Images on the Eve of the Protestant Reformation.

Glenn Benge (Temple University), The World is an Orb, a Berry, a Fool’s-Cap Bell: Mapping The Garden of Earthly Delights by Hieronymus Bosch.

Larry Silver (U Penn), Breaking a Smile: Bruegel as Second Bosch.

Martha Gyllenhaal, Rembrandt’s Use of Statues and Casts.

Middle Atlantic Symposium in the History of Art
National Gallery of Art, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, and University of Maryland, March 31-April 1, 2006.

Of interest for historians of Netherlandish Art:

Ginny Treanor (University of Maryland), Charity Revealed: Rubens’ Portrait of Deborah Kip as a Personification of Charity.

Europe

Joachim von Sandrart zum 400. Geburtstag: ein europäischer Künstler und Theoretiker zwischen Italien und Deutschland

Joachim von Sandrart nel IV centenario della nascita: pittore e storiografo europeo tra Italia e Germania


Sandrart in Europa

Lucia Simonato (Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa), Sandrart e Venezia.

Andreas Tacke (Universität Trier), Sandrarts Eiertanz: Römische Bentfeste versus fortschrittliche Künstlerausbildung.


Esther Meier (Universität Heidelberg), Jenseits der Konfessionen. Sandrarts Beziehungen zu Schwärern und Spiritualisten.

Sandrart artista

Sybille Ebert-Schifferer (Biblioteca Hertziana, Rome), Mond, Kerze, Feuer: Sandrart als Maler von Nachtstücken.

Norbert Middelkoop (Amsterdams Historisch Museum), New Light on Von Sandrarts Dutch Scholars Portraits.

Michèle-Caroline Heck (Université Lille 3), D’une école de peinture à une “académie de papier”: les retables de l’église de Lambach.


Sandrart e la Teutsche Academie

Sabine Frommel (École pratique des hautes études – Sorbonne, Paris), Joachim von Sandrart und die Architektur.

Brigitte Kuhn-Forte (Biblioteca Hertziana, Rome), Le sculture antiche nella “Teutsche Academie” di Sandrart: alcune considerazioni e identificazioni.

Giulia Fusconi (Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Rome), Sandrart e Pietro Testa.

Silvia Danesi Squarzina (Università degli studi di Roma “La Sapienza”), La vita di “Josephus Riverius alias Hispanus Valentinus” scritta da Sandrart.


Formulating a Response: Methods of Research on Italian and Northern European Art, 1400-1600

Leiden University, April 20-22, 2006.

Jeroen Stumpel (Utrecht University), Recipes for Perspective – written and unwritten.

Bram de Klerck (Radboud University, Nijmegen), Gaudenzio Ferrari (ca. 1475-1546) and the Renaissance: Vasari versus Lomazzo.

Joost Keizer (Leiden University), Michelangelo and the Art of Not Describing.


Denis Ribouillaut (Paris I Sorbonne), Possessing a Landscape: Landscape Painting and Legitimation in Renaissance Italy.

Tanja Michalsky (University Frankfurt), Nature into Space. On the Perception of Landscape in Netherlandish Painting and Art Theory (16th-17th Century).
This period between 1400 and 1800 has classically been considered in terms of the establishment of the elite artist as an honoured figure in society, characterised by innate talent rather than inherited blood, worthy of (self) representation and inhabiting consciously aesthetic realms. Attention has been paid to the increasing significance attributed to authorship, both as manifest in the work and as constructed through the written discourse of art. The concept of the artist as creator has involved consideration of this figure’s relationship to God and to God’s creation: nature. The artist’s claim to both divine creativity and elevated status has been understood in terms of the possession of ‘noble’ virtue that emphasised the free exercise of the intellect and suppressed the material aspects of artistic production and consumption.

Yet artistic activity involved elements that were associated with bodily performance and desires: work for profit, skilled physical labour and a material product. Revisionist literature has acknowledged the artisanal and empirical dimensions of artistic creation and discourse and placed northerners at the centre of an alternative understanding of the artist that bears comparison with the enlightened scientist.

Signatures, workshop practice, copies, reproductions and issues of copyright offer further routes to consider the ways in which the artist was imagined, as do the habits and discourses of connoisseur-ship, the institutions of art and systems of reception and display. This volume will take the topic forward by considering ways in which artists of all kinds, men and women from both the southern and northern Netherlands, negotiated their positions in relation to varied and often contesting ideas of what it was to be an artist. We welcome contributions that make comparisons between the Netherlands and other regions, either within or beyond Western Europe.

The visual materials of the volume may include naturalistic representations of the artist such as self portraits and images of the artist in the studio or the gallery. We are also interested in allegorical treatments of the subject and the wider issue of self-reference. Other contributions may deal with the construction of the artist in the literature of art, in legal or scientific discourse, or through the institutions of art and the market. Historiographic contributions are also welcome.

The NKJ is dedicated to a particular theme each year and publishes essays that reflect the increasing diversity of approaches to the study of Netherlandish art. Contributions to the NKJ (in Dutch, English, German, or French) are limited to a maximum length of 7,500 words, excluding the notes.

The deadline for submission of proposals is June 1 2006. Selection of proposals will take place at the beginning of July. The deadline for submission of the articles for consideration and editorial comment is December 1 2006. Final decisions on the acceptance of any paper will be made by the editorial board following receipt of the complete text.

Proposals for papers, in the form of a 200-word abstract, should be sent to prof. dr. Joanna Woodall (Joanna.Woodall@courtauld.ac.uk) and prof. dr. H. Perry Chapman (pchapman@udel.edu).

Opportunities

Call for Articles or Papers

Journals

Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek/Netherlands Yearbook for History of Art

The Artist in the Early Modern Netherlands

Deadline June 1, 2006

Volume 59 (2008) will address the ways in which early modern Netherlandish artists were visualised, and visualised themselves.

This period between 1400 and 1800 has classically been considered in terms of the establishment of the elite artist as an honoured figure in society, characterised by innate talent rather than inherited blood, worthy of (self) representation and inhabiting consciously aesthetic realms. Attention has been paid to the increasing significance attributed to authorship, both as manifest in the work and as constructed through the written discourse of art. The concept of the artist as creator has involved consideration of this figure’s relationship to God and to God’s creation: nature. The artist’s claim to both divine creativity and elevated status has been understood in terms of the possession of ‘noble’ virtue that emphasised the free exercise of the intellect and suppressed the material aspects of artistic production and consumption.

Yet artistic activity involved elements that were associated with bodily performance and desires: work for profit, skilled physical labour and a material product. Revisionist literature has acknowledged the artisanal and empirical dimensions of artistic creation and discourse and placed northerners at the centre of an alternative understanding of the artist that bears comparison with the enlightenment scientist.

Signatures, workshop practice, copies, reproductions and issues of copyright offer further routes to consider the ways in which the artist was imagined, as do the habits and discourses of connoisseur-
**Fellowships**

**HNA Fellowship for Scholarly Research, Publications or Travel: 2007**

Scholars of any nationality who have been HNA members in good standing for at least two years are eligible to apply. The topic of the research project must be within the field of Northern European art ca. 1400-1800. Up to $1,000 may be requested for purposes such as travel to collections or research facilities, purchase of photographs or reproduction rights, or subvention of a publication. Winners will be notified in February with funds to be distributed by April 1. The application should consist of: (1) a short description of project (1-2 pp); (2) budget; (3) list of further funds applied/received for the same project; and (4) current c.v. A selection from a recent publication may be included but is not required. Pre-dissertation applicants must include a letter of recommendation from their advisor. Recipient(s) will be asked to write a short account of the project(s) for publication in the HNA Newsletter. Applications should be sent, preferably via e-mail, by December 1, 2006, to Stephanie S. Dickey, Vice-President, Historians of Netherlandish Art. E-mail: dickey.ss@gmail.com. Address after July 1: Bader Chair in Northern Baroque Art, Dept. of Art, Ontario Hall, Queen’s University, Kingston, ON K7L 3N6 Canada.

**Allen Whitehall Clowes Curatorial Fellowship**

The Indianapolis Museum of Art is pleased to announce a nine-month fellowship for outstanding junior scholars who wish to pursue curatorial careers in art museums. The fellowship will support scholarly research related to the Clowes Collection at the Indianapolis Museum of Art and will provide curatorial training in the field of European painting and sculpture.

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, 2006. The appointment is renewable.

Applications must be received by May 15, 2006. Applications should include a cover letter explaining your interest in the fellowship, a curriculum vitae, a concise statement describing your area of research and its relationship to the Clowes Collection and three letters of recommendation (academic and professional).

Send application materials to:

Ronda Kasl, Curator of Painting and Sculpture before 1800
Indianapolis Museum of Art
4000 Michigan Road
Indianapolis IN 46208-3326

**Courses**

**Amsterdam-Maastricht Summer University**

Introduction to the study of 17th-century Dutch Art in the Netherlands.

For detailed information and registration, [www.ansu.edu/courses/ARTH-2/](http://www.ansu.edu/courses/ARTH-2/)

Bret Rothstein’s fascinating new book is an exercise in sophisticated visual engagement. His basic premise is that certain early Netherlandish painters intellectually conceived and beautifully crafted their paintings because they expected select elite viewers to have a corresponding perspicacity. He considers the expectations and the limitations of sight as the foundation for this fictive discourse between artist and audience. At times, Rothstein’s explanations about the artists’ self-awareness of the limits of sight and of pictorial construction are challenging to follow. Peppered with words such as paradox, contradiction, however, and reflexive self-reference, he often explores one line of thought only to pull the reader suddenly in another and at times opposing direction. Yet the patient reader will benefit immensely from Rothstein’s close looking at and contemplation of some of the best known Flemish paintings.

The Introduction begins with a careful descriptive consideration of Petrus Christus’s *A Goldsmith in His Shop*. Rothstein charts how technical virtuosity permits the viewer to consider not only the scene but also the different expectations of the protagonists. The couple assesses the ring, the goldsmith assesses the couple, and the viewer assesses the three figures as well as the image reflected in the accompanying mirror. Rothstein wonders whether the emphasis on the visual simultaneously points out the limits of representation. The highly detailed goldsmith objects remain merely pictorial approximations, not the real things. Does an awareness of this boundary or limit relate to late fourteenth- and fifteenth-century writings by Jean Gerson, Geert Grote, or Jan van Ruusbroec, which stress the need to transcend the visual to higher levels of spiritual understanding? Here and in later chapters, Rothstein treats these texts as counterparts or analogs rather than direct sources for our artists.

Chapter 1 (“Picturing Vision”) uses Rogier van der Weyden’s *Bladelin Triptych* as an exemplum of the “complex dialectic between showing and seeing.” Rothstein argues that Van der Weyden offers a hierarchy of visual experience that “includes rich literal as well as metaphorical implications” (p. 45). In the center, direct corporeal sight of the Christ Child permits understanding. The sibyl and Magi on the wings see visions of Christ in the sky; that is, it is an image not the actuality of Christ that they experience. Emperor Augustus learns of Christ through the sibyl’s vision, so his is a “mediated echo” or an example of pure understanding that is unrelated to sight. The viewer, however, sees only a painted depiction, the product of the human hand, which is even further removed from the divine source. Rothstein thinks this practice parallels Ruusbroec’s approach to optical experience. “To see enables one to know, and knowledge leads one toward redemption. Corporeal sight, properly conceived and directed, is therefore a basic component of self-reform” (p. 32). Seeing leads to knowing and, in turn, knowing leads to understanding. If necessary, one begins with an image. Because of the power of sight, this image mentally recalled next leads us to a consideration of the meaning of what is imaged. Finally, this brings one to a deeper level of comprehension.

Chapter 2 (“The Imagination of Imagelessness”) argues that the artists’ concern with showing and seeing is matched by a self-awareness on the viewers’ part. In van Eyck’s *Virgin and Child with Joris van der Paele*, the canon’s gaze is unfocused. Indeed, he holds rather than wears his eye glasses. Rothstein suggests that in his visionary state Van der Paele has departed from sensory experience altogether. While this observation has been made by others, he claims the elite viewer (Van der Paele and his peers) would have recognized that the canon had transcended the allure of the physical or material world, which is so exquisitely presented by Van Eyck, for the “ideal of imageless understanding.” The viewer should aspire to reach the same more advanced spiritual level. Rothstein notes that this painting operates as a “paradoxically self-effacing bridge between image and understanding.” He finds his textual corollaries in the writings of Gerson and Ruusbroec who champion imageless devotion. A careful viewer would recognize the punning reference and the limits of artifice in Van Eyck’s presumed self-portrait, reflected in St. George’s armor; that is, the “painter (schilder) [portrayed] atop an illusory shield (schild)” (p. 76). Although the author discusses what he sees as “similar subversions of the persuasiveness of naturalism” in pictures by Van Eyck, Christus, and Van der Goes, I am less convinced by his claims for a clear intentionalty these artists. I also wonder whether he credits viewers with far more sophisticated visual literacy than we might expect in the fifteenth century. Or put differently, I am not sure most well-educated viewers of a Van Eyck or a Christus painting were seeking its visual insufficiency rather than its visual amplitude.

Chapter 3 (“The Devotional Image as Social Ornament”) considers how Van Eyck’s *Rolin Madonna* might use the “act of devotional practice as a mechanism for affirming or enhancing their social status” (p. 137). Drawing upon Rolin’s often cited foundation charter for the Hôtel Dieu in Beaune, with its stated desire “by means of a favorable transaction to exchange celestial goods for temporal ones ... and the ephemera that these are for things eternal” (p. 135). Rothstein reads Van Eyck’s painting as a form of negotiation between the earthly and the spiritual. He expresses surprise at the boldness of the painting since its directness seems contrary to an object for private meditation. Yet if this painting was designed eventually to serve as an epitaph, the flattering and most worldly portrayal of Rolin is hardly surprising. I find the suggestion (p. 99) that the composition expresses Rolin’s sense of class anxiety due to the precariousness of his position at the Burgundian court to be rather ahistorical. His position as chancellor was challenged seriously only a decade or more later. Rothstein’s idea that “earthly ambition is part of truly noble spirituality” needs to be developed much more to be convincing within this context. Is Rolin ruminating over a spiritual text, as Rothstein suggests, or being presented more generically as a pious man in prayer at his prie-dieu? In fact, would it have made a world of difference, Gerson’s writings not withstanding, to a fifteenth-century viewer?

Chapter 4 (“Senses of Painterly Strength”) grapples with the fundamental issue of painterly intention, one that is often difficult to resolve centuries after the fact. Rothstein’s basic theme is that these leading Netherlandish artists approached “the act of painting as a process of cultivating reflexive visual experience” (p. 138). He provides a fascinating reading of *A Goldsmith in His Shop* as a statement of Christus’s social and artistic ambition. Other suggestions are less convincing. For example, he explains the inclusion of the triple window reflected on the globe beneath Christ’s feet in the *Last Judgment Altarpiece* in Beaune as a clear and conscious reference to Van Eyck’s *Rolin Madonna* and Van der Weyden’s *St. Luke Drawing the Virgin and Child*. Yet clear to whom? Is this little detail precise enough to inspire recognition by Rolin? The author assumes Van der
Weyden “entered into a subtle (intervisual) dialogue with his patron. … Above all else, the fact of this dialogue tells us that, in the realm of the senses at least, the artist could momentarily enjoy equivalence with someone of a more elevated social and intellectual station” (p. 172). Rothstein also conjectures this detail afforded Van der Weyden the chance to participate in a separate dialogue with Van Eyck. The author’s discussion of these painters engaging in a kind of proto-paragone is intriguing if in need of further amplification. Having a fuller understanding of the status of contemporary Netherlandish sculptors and goldsmiths might make this discussion more convincing.

In the Epilogue (“Notes on the Rise of Visual Skill”) Rothstein introduces wordplay, the fourteenth and fifteenth century literary practice of verbal gamesmanship linking writer and reader. This takes the form of acrostics, puns, anagrams, and the like. The insightful reader is rewarded for his or her intellectual skills, literally for the virtuosity of one’s ability to read. Rothstein posits that this practice offers a literary counterpart to the sorts of reflexive visual games he has described in a few celebrated early Netherlandish paintings. I find this suggestion quite intriguing though I wish the author had raised this topic at the beginning of his book rather than in the last few pages. Rothstein concludes with the remark, “To paint well is to demand that the viewer observe equally well” (p. 188). Regardless of whether or not I agree with all of his suggestions, Rothstein rewards his patient reader with an intellectual tour-de-force that makes us ponder more deeply the possible intentions of these magnificent painters.

Jeffrey Chipp Smith

University of Texas at Austin


In her monograph on Queen Isabel’s Retablo, likely never completed and hence never assembled, Chiyi Ishikawa meticulously and convincingly examines that work of private devotion, commissioned in 1496 by the Queen of Spain. Authorship is Ishikawa’s primary concern, and she pores over the extant panels to identify the hands at work. Her stylistic and contextual analysis particularly tracks the trajectory of Juan de Flandes’ career and enumerates the political, religious, and literary attitudes within the court of Castile. She additionally provides a comprehensive catalogue of each surviving panel.

Sold individually after the queen’s death in 1504, most of the Retablo’s 47 original panels depict episodes from the life of Christ but were not associated with any artist in documents. Today 27 panels survive in various collections throughout the world. Two panels by Michel Sittow are explicitly attributed to him in inventories that provide the only definite authorial information. Several paintings had been stylistically linked to Juan de Flandes, and some scholars have even detected a third style in some. Ishikawa endeavors to prove this third hand is in fact that of Juan de Flandes, representing an earlier period in his Spanish career. Her most convincing evidence that Juan de Flandes was the principal painter of the Retablo comes from stylistic analysis. After pointing out the lack of another viable candidate for a third painter in court records, she divides the paintings into two groups: one clearly identified with Flandes, the other contested. She considers the groups in relation to other works attributed to Flandes, chiefly the early St. John the Baptist polyptych in Burgos and the later retablo for the cathedral in Palencia.

In dealing with the contested group, Ishikawa draws on evidence that Flandes was trained primarily as a manuscript illuminator in the Netherlands to argue that those panels come from an earlier period in his career. The Last Supper panel conveys a depth of space characteristic of miniatures. In contrast, the other group limits compositions to essential information in order to accommodate far-off viewers. This change accords with Juan de Flandes’ situation, where a Netherlandish manuscript artist adjusted to Spanish conventions of representation.

An important strength of Ishikawa’s argument is her use of infrared photography and x-radiography to reveal the panels’ underdrawing, exposing the artist’s distinctive technique. For example, below-the-surface examination of panels shows instances in both early and late groups where the artist’s underdrawing on the primed surface would then be modified aspects in the paint layer. Additionally, microscopic analysis reveals graphic idiosyncrasies, consistent in both groups, that could only have come from the same hand. On this basis, she confidently attributes the entire range of panels to Flandes and finally places the contested group within an early production phase of 1496-1498, with the other group comprising two phases, 1498-1502 and 1502-1504, respectively.

In addition to her scrutiny of the extant Retablo panels, Ishikawa examines historical records to trace the diverging paths of the paintings following the death of the Queen. For example, the inventory for initial sale of each panel is printed in translation in the first chapter and in transcription in the appendix, along with photographs of the original document. She follows the panels in the order they were purchased, profiling each buyer and describing the panels’ subsequent display. While not the primary focus of her book, Ishikawa reveals the afterlife of a work that became detached from its patron and took on new significance for subsequent viewers. In particular, she discusses Margaret of Austria’s purchase of a group of panels, raising issues of recontextualization.

Ishikawa also pays close attention to the overall climate of Isabel’s court. She discusses popular treatises on the life of Christ, linked to the subject matter of the Retablo. She introduces key figures in the orchestration of court life, including Fray Hernando de Talavera, instrumental in choosing certain scenes of the life of Christ for the Retablo. Since Ishikawa takes pains to reconstruct a context of court life and literature, it is surprising that she does not further discuss painting in that context. While her identification of Flandes as the principal painter for the Retablo project is persuasive, that analysis of authorship remains incomplete without this background.

Attribution of the contested panels raises issues regarding medium and format. Ishikawa only partly explores why and how often retablos were produced with so many panels during Isabel’s reign. Since Flandes evidently had to learn the local particulars of retablo painting and to adjust his style and approach for a specifically Spanish audience’s different visual expectations, she could usefully have mentioned other examples of altarpiece models for Flandes to strengthen her analysis. In addition, the idea that Isabel’s private altarpiece would have been a miniature version of retablos found in churches is not fully explored. Since these panels were stored in a cabinet during Isabel’s life, we do not know the intended setup of the finished Retablo, so drawing on other examples would have proven useful. Furthermore, the smaller scale of Isabel’s private Retablo raises the tantalizing question of whether such a work would have been seen, for example, as an intermediate form between miniatures in a book of hours, intended for the private contemplation of a single viewer, and those retablos viewed en masse by an entire congregation of worshippers.
Nevertheless, Ishikawa reconstructs a solid portrait of an artist at work in his new environment. Her engagement with this single work, chronicling its long life and fully documenting each remaining panel in her catalogue, elucidates issues concerning Isabel’s artistic patronage. While expounding the experience of a transplanted Flemish painter in the Castilian court, Ishikawa’s detailed analysis provides a useful model for in-depth study of a complex work.

Julia Perratore
University of Pennsylvania

Sixteenth Century


To review a pictorial handbook is not easy. This volume provides the equivalent of what P.J.J. van Thiel and the Rijksmuseum produced a generation ago, All the Paintings of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam (1976): a full pictorial roster of images – good, bad, and indifferent – in a major Dutch paintings collection. Coincidentally that same year, 1976, saw the founding of the Catharine Convent Museum in Utrecht as the national museum of religious culture in the Netherlands, formed out of three core collections: Bisschoppelijk Museum (Haarlem), Aartsbisschoppelijk Museum and Oud Katholieke Museum (both in Utrecht), to which was added the Stichting Protestantse Kerkelijke Kunst and significant loans of religious art from other major Dutch museums. In addition to the paintings in this catalogue a number of liturgical objects are on view in the Utrecht installation, which forms a rare blend of historically minded art-historical presentation, as if a fusion of the Rijksmuseum with the Amsterdam Historical Museum. Images in the Catharijneconvent span a period from the mid-thirteenth century through the twentieth.

Quite a few big names punctuate the collection, making more than a sampling of religious subjects and pictorial types. Perhaps the most striking images in the collection are Geertgen tot sint Jans’s Man of Sorrows (c. 1490 according to the catalogue) and a latter-day rediscovery, Rembrandt’s early (1626) Baptism of the Eunuch, a work published by museum conservator Henri Defoer in 1977. Another highlight, revealing the transition from Catholic to Protestant during the early years of the Dutch Revolt is a key work by Marten de Vos, Moses with the Tablets of the Law (c. 1575), where the crowd of Hebrews consists of portraits historiés of the Antwerp family Panhuys. This catalogue provides the full transcription of texts on this important, if understudied picture, thus permitting further scholarship beyond its prior display as the cover image of the contextual 1986 Catharijneconvent exhibition of religious art during a year devoted to the period of Iconoclasm: P. Dirkse, R.P. Zip. Ketters en papen onder Filips II. This lack of discrimination between the Northern and Southern Netherlands offers a welcome suspension of the anachronism of separating regions by modern Holland and Belgium.

Even with the presence of workshop images and copies, some important artists can be seen in some depth. Fully six pictures derive from the enormous output of Pieter Coecke van Aelst (plus two others by the related Master of 1518), and a further four from Jacob Cornelisz van Oostsanen. Nine different images, including intact triptychs, stem from local son Jan van Scorel, whose oeuvre also forms a highlight of Utrecht’s Centraal Museum.

From the seventeenth century Thomas de Keyser provided both religious scenes and his more familiar portraits (of the Utrecht Remonstrant preacher, Carolus Niellius and his wife; 1634) as well as a biblical scene with portraits historiés (1633). Indeed, portraits offer a serious segment of this religious collection, e.g. Michiel van Miereveld’s images of Jacob Cats (1634) and Johannes van Wtenbogaert (c. 1635; copy). Besides the familiar “pre-Rembrandt” religious images of Claes Moyaert (God Appears to Abraham in Sichem, 1628), several portraits of identified sitters, ranging from 1631 to 1652 enhance our understanding of later contributions by the artist. In similar fashion Pieter Franz de Grebber’s seven paintings from the 1630s and 1640s include both portraits and religious scenes. The Rembrandt circle is well represented as well: Pieter Lastman (Crucifixion, 1625), Govert Flinck (Isaac Blessing Jacob, c. 1635), Ferdinand Bol (Sacrifice of Gideon, 1640), Gerbrand van den Eekhout (Rebecca and Eliezer, 1662), and Arent de Gelder (Edna Blesses Tobias and Sara, c. 1705). At the turn of the eighteenth century eight of Jacob de Wit’s religious works, including a splendid grissaille medallion (Ruth and Boas Surrounded by Orphans, 1745), show how Flemish classicizing could be practiced in Amsterdam.

Besides these important quantitative constituents, the collection also includes some other important and qualitative individual pieces, both familiar and novel. A remarkable large triptych of the Last Judgment with the Triumph of Death (c. 1550-55) by Hermann Tom Ring expands the geographical range into Westphalia amid revived Catholicism in Münster, almost the inverse of De Vos. Another portrait historié by Werner van den Valckert features the Preaching of John the Baptist (1623). Utrecht painters have prominent imagery: Baburen’s Crowning with Thorns (1622-23), Abraham Bloemaert’s Crucifixion (1629), Jan van Bijlert’s Calling of Matthew (1625-30), Neglected classical imagery can be seen in Cesar van Everdingen’s Holy Family (c. 1660), with a contemporary complement from Rubens’s circle in Abraham van Diesenbeck’s Flagellation. Leading Haarlem painters include Salomon de Bray (Jael, Deborah, and Barak, 1635), Pieter Saenredam (St. Lawrence at Alkmaar, 1635), and Frans Hals (Portrait of the Preacher Nicolaas Stenius, 1650).

Finally, a number of important religious works of varying kinds deserve mention. One major polyptych with glass paintings in its center and almost fifty separate scenes is devoted to the Martyrdom of St. Thedosia (1545). A full triptych epitaph, made for the Goes rederijker Matthijs van der Straten (1555) and signed by Master Aegidius, is richly adorned with inscriptions and shows two simulated prints on the everyday side of its reverse. Several text panels of either the Ten Commandments with Moses (2 versions, S 45 and S 13) or “Solomon’s Prayer” (Proverbs 30; 1606) show later Calvinist emphasis on the Word. A large painted allegory, Triumph of Worldly Riches (Master LVC, 1663) loosely reprises the earlier didactic print by Maerten van Heemskerck (1564), Organ wings with the life of David (David Colijns, 1635-40) present an uncommon church furnishing of great importance throughout Dutch religious history.

Obviously such a work has tremendous scholarly potential. Emphasis of the individual entries is on provenance and literature with good transcription of texts but only passing references to thematic discussion, biography, or related images by the same artist. In short, this is a summary catalogue compared to the full discussions, e.g. the collection catalogues of the National Gallery, London or Washington, or the Staedel Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt. Nonetheless, every student of Netherlandish art will be grateful for this valuable resource to an important but less familiar collection in Utrecht.

Larry Silver
University of Pennsylvania

Katherine Crawford Luber begins her ground-breaking book on Dürer and Venice by showing that the present art historical emphasis on Dürer’s prints, rather than his paintings, and the related division between invention and color effects (*disegno* and *colore*) originated with Erasmus and Vasari in the sixteenth century. Luber sets out to remedy this lop-sided emphasis on Dürer’s prints by focusing on the paintings he made in Venice during his second trip to Italy in 1505-1507 and those painted in his hometown of Nuremberg in the following years. Luber convincingly makes the case that no real evidence exists to support Dürer’s first trip to Italy in 1494-1495.

In Chapter 2 Luber explores the first trip to Italy and how it was constructed in the literature. In Chapter 3 she explores the *Feast of the Rose Garlands* and Dürer’s appropriation of Venetian painting techniques for color, light and perspective there and in his mature works, both paintings and prints. Luber thereby expands the view of Dürer to involve more than artificial mathematical perspective. In Chapter 4 the same painting is the focus for ideas about the competitive, or eristic, aspect of artistic relationships between Dürer and Giovanni Bellini. Chapter 5 explores Dürer’s works after Venice, and Chapter 6 his use of preparatory drawings, rather than underdrawings, as learned in Venice in 1505-1507. She links these ideas with various portraits of Emperor Maximilian I, both painted and printed, and shows how Dürer traced lines from one drawing. Two appendices explore the history of the condition of the *Feast of the Rose Garlands* and Dürer’s theoretical writing on color.

Luber argues that both Dürer’s manner of painting and his sense of illusionistic space were influenced by his Italian trip of 1505 as based on over two dozen paintings by Dürer and his shop, for which technical examination was employed via infrared reflectography and other scientific tools. Luber calls for a revision of the art historical idea that Dürer was not gifted in painting and argues that Dürer was deeply affected by Venetian painting and its traditions. She makes the case that the underdrawing seen via scientific tools needs interpreting, not just describing, by art historians and can be used to support the study of other aspects of paintings, including subjects and attributions.

Luber includes helpful overviews of both the technical investigation of paintings, the technical literature on Dürer’s paintings, and the technical methods she used in her study, including infrared reflectography and X-radiography, and what, or what not, these methods make visible. She reached five hypotheses concerning underdrawings in Dürer’s paintings: his early use (before his trip to Venice in 1505) of fully worked-up underdrawings for form and volume with dense hatching and cross-hatching. Once in Venice Dürer’s use of underdrawing is minimized to contours or done away with altogether as he begins using blue-dyed Venetian paper. Dürer’s late paintings appear to make use of both his pre- and post-Venetian approaches to underdrawings while his portraits seem generally to have employed little if any underdrawing with the exception of his *Self-Portrait* of 1500 in Munich.

Luber links the existence of Dürer’s two trips to Italy in the literature with Goethe’s two well-documented trips, the first of which took place in 1786. She indicates the construction by nineteenth-century German scholars of a similar pair of Italian trips for Dürer. She also investigates the evidence offered in the literature for Dürer’s early trip including the visual (paintings, drawings, watercolors, and prints) and the documentary and the scholarly response to it. She focuses on four early paintings, which pre-date Dürer’s documented trip to Venice and have been attributed to Dürer in the literature as showing Italian influence. She convincingly dismisses them from the unquestioned attributions to Dürer, to whom Roberto Longhi linked them in the 1960s, because they either lack Dürer’s invention of “powerful and unified” compositions that are “fully realized” or show no first-hand knowledge of Italian painting or painting techniques, rather than from prints that traveled. The result is questioning the attribution to Dürer of *St. Jerome* in London and *Lot and his Daughters*, the verso of the *Haller Madonna* in Washington.

Luber’s doubting Dürer’s first Italian trip offers much food for thought and is a major contribution to the field of Northern studies. In reviewing and refuting evidence indicating an earlier trip, including letters by contemporary humanists Willibald Pirckheimer and Christoph Scheurl, and questioning the dating of Dürer’s watercolors showing *Innsbruck*, *Italian Mountains*, and *Italian Castle*, Luber uses varied art historical approaches that together burst the entrenched bubble constituting Dürer’s early travels to Italy. Luber also raises some very interesting questions including how Dürer might have afforded such a trip to Venice a few months after he returned from his journeyman travels and marriage – and setting up household and workshop – and whether Dürer had time to design and produce his *Apocalypse* book if he had traveled to Italy.

This review barely touches the surface of Luber’s rich study, which convincingly re-thinks Dürer’s art in several important ways. It offers fascinating information, including Dürer’s often blending his pigments on the painting with his fingers, and it insists that we should consider the artist’s presumed earlier Italian trip only if tangible artistic influence and evidence were left behind. It will be left to future scholars to examine this assumption and explore where Dürer went early in his career, and what he was involved in, when he might have been in Italy.

This book deserves a larger size allowing easier integration of illustrations within the text (see 19-38) closer to their discussion. Better-quality illustrations would make Luber’s impressive research all the clearer. These reservations aside, this reader is most pleased that Cambridge published this book when it appears, alas, to be leaving Northern Renaissance art history altogether.

Alison Stewart

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*


This volume offers a lively record of the proceedings of an international symposium held at the Robert Hull Fleming Museum of the University of Vermont in March, 2004. The topical focus of the symposium was Pieter Brueghel the Younger’s 1610 copy (owned by Adele Klapper and concurrently on exhibition at the Fleming Museum) of his father’s famous *Netherlandish Proverbs* of 1559. Contributors included Alan Dundes, Malcolm Jones, David Kunzle, Mark A. Meadow, Wolfgang Mieder, Yoko Mori, and Margaret A. Sullivan.

In his paper, “How Far Does the Apple Fall from the Tree?”, Alan Dundes, a folklorist from Berkeley, attempts a psychoanalytical...
interpretation of Bruegel the Elder’s *Netherlandish Proverbs*, and along the way takes critical aim at contemporary art historical analyses of the work. He complains of recent scholarly efforts, most importantly that of Margaret Sullivan, to locate the painting’s subject matter in the humanist culture of the sixteenth-century. He finds the effort to reconstruct the potential audience of the painting “a curious exercise in speculative reception theory.” (17) and suggests that it is reminiscent of “gesunkenes Kulturgut” theory, an elitist notion that basically felt that proverbs and other folklore was (sic) much too artful and ingenious to have been created by ignorant, illiterate peasants.” (18) He goes on to explain that proverbs culled from classical sources are themselves drawn from the historically vague sources of folklore. But, of course, these observations completely miss the point of Sullivan’s art *historical* project. The art historian is concerned with understanding what Bruegel’s painting may have meant to its original audience, its social meanings, and the fact, therefore, that sixteenth-century humanists may have been wrong about the origins of the proverbs they cherished and collected as nuggets of ancient wisdom is irrelevant to the historian of sixteenth-century culture. The elitist sensibility associated with the gesunkenes Kulturgut theory, therefore, cannot be fairly ascribed to Sullivan, for she is neither assuming nor seeking to discover the ultimate social roots of proverbs, but rather the meanings which they held for sixteenth-century northern humanist culture.

A related observation can be made of psychoanalytical (Freudian) interpretations of the sort undertaken by Dundes. They clearly have their own interest and value, but they do not generate the kind of historical, socially constructed meanings with which art historians are generally concerned. Because Freudian interpretations want to understand artworks in terms of the artist’s (self) expression of unconscious motivations that enjoy a universal and timeless relevance, they abstract both artwork and artist from their specific social context. Dundes’s own analysis is a case in point as he goes on to accumulate motifs from many of Bruegel’s images that suggest anal-erotic tendencies. As evidence, he points to the artist’s interest in (e.g., proverbs and children’s games), his pronounced anal-erotic tendencies. As evidence, he points to the artist’s interest in social context. Dundes’s own analysis is a case in point as he goes on to understand artworks in terms of the artist’s (self) expression of generally concerned. Because Freudian interpretations want to have their own interest and value, but they do not generate the kind of sixteenth-century northern humanist culture.

She is neither assuming nor seeking to discover the ultimate social ground next to the pillow, two details missing in all of the copies. She misses the point of Sullivan’s art. She further speculates that the Elder’s patron may have had an interest if it were to be integrally related to Renaissance habits of thought and symbolism.

Margaret Sullivan’s paper “Muti Magistri (Silent Teachers),” explores the issues of how Pieter the Younger acquired knowledge of his father’s art, and what can be learned about the Elder’s working process by comparing his panel with his son’s copies. The fact that some of the motifs in the Elder’s panel either differ from, or do not appear at all in his son’s copies has led several scholars to speculate that the son did not have access to the original. Sullivan suggests that the departures of copy from original were possibly due to the fact that the son worked from a preparatory drawing that was in his possession. Such a drawing would have served as the basis for the original painting, but would have been partially superseded by subsequent additions to the intended design. As evidence for her thesis, Sullivan points to two motifs which appear in the original, but in none of the copies: the man grabbing fish with his bare hands, and the man kissing the doorknocker. She makes the interesting suggestion that these two figures, since they are formally awkward, were added during the underdrawing stage of production at the behest of the patron. She further speculates that the Elder’s patron may have had an interest in medical matters because of the presence of a red gash on the forehead of the devil being tied to a pillow in the lower left-hand corner of the composition, and the wooden instrument lying on the ground next to the pillow, two details missing in all of the copies. She suggests that these details may have been added to the original composition at the specific request of a medically trained patron (she cites several well-known humanists who were doctors) because in sixteenth-century medical practice, mania was treated by making an incision in the forehead of the patient. She concludes by making a case for considering the large pen and ink drawing of Dulle Griet (c. 1561) in the Museum Kunst Palast as an authentic preparatory drawing for Bruegel the Elder’s painting of the same name.

Yoko Mori’s paper, “She Hangs the Blue Cloak Over Her Husband,” reports on the various uses to which four of Bruegel’s proverbs were put in contemporary images and literature in order to consider the nature of spousal relations in sixteenth-century Flemish culture. The four are: “She hangs the blue cloak over her husband”; “She would tie a devil to the pillow”; “One winds the distaff while the other spins”; and “Hen feeler.” After tracing several literary and visual precedents for the use of the blue cloak motif as a symbol for deceitfulness, she also points to the popular iconography of “unequal couples,” which is especially pronounced in Bruegel the Elder’s treatment of the motif. Mori also claims that the proverbs “She would tie a Devil to a pillow” and “Hen feeler” refer to transgressive spousal behavior, the former referring to the fearful image of a dominating wife, and the latter indicating a husband’s inappropriate (effeminate) involvement in woman’s work. The proverbial saying “One winds the distaff while the other spins,” however, shouldn’t be included in this thematic group because, as Mori herself points out, it simply refers to a situation in which someone starts an evil plan, and someone else finishes it.

Mark Meadow’s paper, “For This Reason or That the Geese Walk Barefoot,” begins by asserting that there is no single moral message to be found in the *Netherlandish Proverbs*, a point already argued in his 2002 book *Pieter Bruegel the Elder’s Netherlandish Proverbs and the Practice of Rhetoric*. He claims that the logical structure of the painting, which gathers proverbs into loose and interrelated clusters organized around similarities in theme, structure, and shared motifs, is similar to that found in contemporary “commonplace books.” (113) He then points out that this absence of a single message or meaning in the *Proverbs* is not the case in those of the artist’s prints that deploy proverbs in service to specific moral themes. He illustrates this point by analyzing the use of proverbs in several of Bruegel’s best known designs such as *Big Fish Eat Little Fish, Ass at School, Gluttony, Avarice, Envy,* and *Eek*. He concludes by addressing Bruegel’s interest in the theme of looking and knowing which the artist treated in the upper right hand corner of the *Netherlandish Proverbs*.

David Kunzle’s presentation, “Butting the Wall,” begins with a reassertion of the scholar’s well-known contention that Bruegel’s *Netherlandish Proverbs* cannot be regarded as an illustration of the “world upside down” theme. The real focus of his offering, however, is his suggestion that the artist’s addition of armor to three figures in the “world upside down” theme. The real focus of his offering, however, is his suggestion that the artist’s addition of armor to three figures in the painting is indicative of his hostility to the military of his time, and speaks to his “deep opposition to and distress at the violent repression and war the Spanish administration brought to the Netherlands.” The three male figures are butting his head into a brick wall; belling a cat; and warming his hands by the fire of another’s house.

Malcolm Jones, “Fiddlers on the Roof and Friars with Foxtails,” explores the relationship between Bruegel and the proverb iconography of David Tenier II’s *The Dutch Proverbs*. He dentifies five proverbs in Teniers that also appear in all the Bruegel variants; but go unrecognized in the diagrammatic key that accompanies the painting (Belvoir Castle). He then identifies five proverbs not in any Bruegel composition. He ends by considering the meanings of the


Not much is known about painting in Antwerp during the 1540s-1550s, and even less about female painters in the Netherlands in the sixteenth century. It is therefore both providential and coincidental to have two publications on the Antwerp painter Catharina van Hemessen (active 1548-1555) appearing in the same year.

During the period spanning the 1530s and 1550s, Italianate or classicizing forms replaced the very successful late-Gothic pictorial idioms in all segments of the Antwerp art market. The change took place in a tightly knit artistic milieu and involved such artists as Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Jan Sanders van Hemessen, the Master of the Prodigal Son, the Master of SS Paul and Barnabas (possibly Jan Mandyn), the young Pieter Aertsen, Cornelis Massys, the Brunswick Monogrammist (possibly Jan van Amstel) and finally Frans Floris. This creative environment also nurtured the artistic talent of Pieter Bruegel the Elder. At the same time, the expanding role of Antwerp’s print industry provided a decisive impulse for the dissemination of stylistic innovations. But the exact chronology of the stylistic evolution remains fuzzy due to the dearth of dated images and biographical data.

While some names of sixteenth-century Dutch female painters are known, works by only two of them have been identified: Catharina van Hemessen and Mechelt toe Boecop. Catharina was the daughter of the successful history and genre painter Jan Sanders van Hemessen and as such part of Antwerp’s most innovative artistic set. She painted mainly portraits, but also a few sacred histories. Altogether thirteen signed and for the most dated works are known, including her epochal Self portrait at the Easel of 1548 (Basel), which – not surprisingly – graces the cover of both monographs. However, the quality of her later portraits, such as the subtle Portrait of a Woman with a Lapdog (1551; London, National Gallery), is superior to that of the early selfportait. In addition, Catharina signed four history paintings, which though artistically less convincing are nevertheless interesting as documents of her stylistic development.

The two books by Marguerite Droz-Emmert and Karolien De Clippel respectively follow different intentions and focusses. Droz-Emmert developed her text from an essay on Van Hemessen’s Basel Self portrait. Her point of departure apparently is the idea that the earliest known selfportrait of a woman painting may be a key that helps us comprehend the artistic self-understanding of Renaissance women. The book begins with a summary of Catharina’s known biographical data and how they relate to the general history of the upbringing of women, the history of Antwerp and the court of the governor Mary of Hungary (pp. 15-44). Greater consideration is given to the iconographic tradition of the portrayal and self-portrayal of female artists (47-97). The essayistic text then changes to a thematically less focused monographic approach (99-140) and concludes with a list of works (175-181).

Although Droz-Emmert warns in her preface (10) that no attempt is made to characterize Van Hemessen’s oeuvre as a complete entity (“abgeschlossenes Ganzes”), this does not of course protect her publication from being judged according to professional standards. The reader gradually begins to doubt that the Self portrait provides compelling evidence about the artistic self-understanding of women. The iconographic section lists the usual suspects: a few French manuscript illustrations, selfportraits by Antonis Mor and Isaac van Swanenburg and references to Sofonisba Anguissola and Lavinia Fontana, though more promising is her discussion of the 1547 Self portrait by Ludger tom Ring the Younger in Braunschweig (67-71, fig. 6) since Tom Ring was probably in Antwerp during the 1540s.

The reader’s faith in the text’s reliability is eroded by vague formulations, sloppy research and the repeated transformation of pure assumption into hard fact. In the end, the book fails due to an indifference towards that essential art historical tool - connoisseurship. The last monographic section contains portraits that have nothing to do with Catharina van Hemessen but are treated as comparative pieces or examples of her artistic development. The “catalogue” of signed and attributed works is nothing more than an uncritical list, which at the most could have served as a starting point for further research but definitely does not count as an achievement worthy of publication. Though handsomely produced and containing eight color illustrations, the author did not fulfill her own goal of integrating Catharina van Hemessen’s Self portrait and other works into their contemporary contexts.

De Clippel’s study arose from her licentiaatsverhandeling of 1997 (K.U. Leuven) and was the bases for an article the following year (Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, 1998). Her book meets the demands of an up-to-date academic degree-piece: a clear structure, a balanced discussion of previous research including the numerous gender study contributions and careful archival research. Having discussed the biographical sources relating to Catharina’s life (15-33), De Clippel analyses the artistic sources that informed her portraits and history paintings (35-52), the “patriarchal” treatment of the artist by her contemporaries and art history and the contribution of gender studies (53-70). The classical oeuvre catalogue that forms the second part of De Clippel’s publication provides an exemplary study of Catharina’s secure works, gives a critical and reasoned discussion of attributions and deals with the most important doubtful and erroneously attributed works. Illustrations provide a good visual documentation of the artist’s works and the chief comparative pieces. De Clippel’s judgements are balanced and her evaluations careful, and her discussion of doubtful works is particular welcome as it saves time-consuming searching.

So, does De Clippel’s text leave issues about Catharina van Hemessen’s life and work unanswered? Given the length of time between her initial study and final publication, it would of course have been desirable to have been able to draw on technical studies to support her attributions. She for example provides no technical
information about the make-up of the panels or preparatory underdrawing, but does mention Nico van Hout’s restoration of a painting in a private collection (7, cat. B1). In view of the different versions of the Selfportrait at the Easel in Basel, Cape Town, and St. Petersburg, an infra-red examination for possible underdrawings could provide interesting results.

The clear delineation of Catharina van Hemessen’s portraits reveals how little is known about portraiture in Antwerp during the second third of the sixteenth century. An important point of reference is of course Antonis Mor, on whom however no comprehensive, up-to-date monograph exists. He remains the ‘collection bin’ for diverse artistic oeuvres, though one should not overestimate his role as isolated trendsetter. Though both Droz-Emnett and De Clippel see Van Hemessen’s Basal Selfportrait as a source for Mor’s own Selfportrait at the Easel of 1558 (Florence, Uffizi), the reference is more likely to Crispin van den Broeck’s Selfportrait of 1557 (Old Master Paintings, Netherlandish Office for the Fine Arts, The Hague, 1992, no. 331). Equally, one would like to know more about the important and clearly well-connected Master of the 1540s. More than any other, Willem Key (1515-16-1568) appears to have been a stylistic model for Van Hemessen – or was he her follower? The 1556 Portrait of a Man (Verona, Museo di Castelvecchio), attributed to Key, corresponds more or less to Catharina’s 1549 portrait in Brussels (KMVSK; inv. 4157; Cat. De Klippel A5). Only through clarification of such aspects will it be possible to judge with greater precision the role of French portraiture on Antwerp’s artists. The courtly style of Francois Clouet’s portraits is quite similar to examples found in Antwerp (see also Droz-Emnett, fig. 25).

Equally rewarding for the field of history painting would be an examination of the artistic circles in which Catharina van Hemessen moved. While De Clippel sees an archaising aspect to her Crucifixion (cat. B2), a similar composition exists that has been convincingly attributed to the young Pieter Aertsen (panel, 19.5 x 13.5 cm; Sotheby’s, London, 3 July 1997, lot 128; private collection, Spain; a second version: Courtauld Gallery, London, inv. P.1978.PG.4). Aertsen joined Antwerp’s St Luke’s Guild in 1535, but his earliest dated painting is from 1545/46. According to Van Mander, Aertsen trained under Jan Mandijn. But what kind of works did Mandijn paint? JosuaBruyn temptingly proposed he may be identical with the Master of Saints Paul and Barnabas. Young Aertsen also engaged with the work of Catharina’s father, Jan Sanders van Hemessen, as the facial types in the above-mentioned Crucifixion prove (and indeed the entire Passion cycle to which it belongs). Catharina’s works are thus to be placed in the tradition of the early works of her father and his artistic environment.

A final word on the subject of Catharina as a female painter and as such forced to work under particularly difficult circumstances. Judging from the sitters of her portraits, it is illuminating that she appears to have worked for urban/noble elite and the courtly milieu. The only other female Netherlandish artist whose works are known was a noblewoman – Mechelt van Lichtenberg toe Boecop (c. 1520 – Kampen 1598). Characteristically, Catharina appears to have stopped painting almost completely after her marriage, probably upon the birth of her first child. There is no doubt that – then as now – precious talent and irreplaceable creativity are lost when gender prevents half of the human race from fulfilling its individual possibilities.

Thomas Fuserig

Essen, Germany

(Translated from the German by Fiona Healy)

Seventeenth-Century Flemish


This catalogue, dedicated to the memory of Frans Baudouin, is a great achievement. Teréz Gerszí, the doyenne of Dutch and Flemish drawings at the Szépmûvészeti Mûzeum and now curator emerita, is to be congratulated for finishing a publication that was begun decades earlier. Associated with the museum since 1951 and former head of the collection of Prints and Drawings, Gerszí published widely on Paulus van Vianen, on the artists around Rudolf II in Prague, and on Bruegel and his age. The catalogue now complements two earlier ones of the museum’s drawings collections, one again by Teréz Gerszí on the sixteenth-century Netherlandish drawings, published in two volumes in 1971, and Andrea Czére’s 2004 catalogue of the seventeenth-century Italian drawings.

Research on the seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish drawings began with Edith Hoffmann in the 1920s and 1930s, which resulted in several exhibitions in the 1930s and ended with the one on copies and fakes in 1944. Her extensive research is acknowledged throughout in the concise and informative catalogue entries. Teréz Gerszí first drew attention to the museum’s outstanding collection of Dutch and Flemish drawings thirty years ago, in 1976, with her book on 64 masterpieces of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, published in several languages and with a second edition in 1983. The present complete catalogue describes all 350 Dutch and Flemish works, reproduced either in black and white or – for the more important examples – in fine color. The drawings are discussed in alphabetical order by artist, with copies included in the main text of the corpus after the catalogue entries of the respective artists. A good many drawings are signed, several are dated.

The greater part of the Szépmûvészeti Mûzeum’s collection of paintings, drawings, and prints came from the Esterházy collection, created during the first three decades of the nineteenth century by Prince Nicholas Esterházy (1765-1833). The prince was aided in his collecting by the Viennese engraver Joseph Fischer until the latter’s death in 1822. In 1810 the prince acquired from the Italian painter Antonio Cesare Poggi (1744-ca. 1836) a collection comprising hundreds of drawings in return for a life annuity of 3000 francs. Although largely Italian, there were some forty Dutch drawings in the group. Today they are primarily identified thanks to Poggi’s collector’s mark. A number of sheets with the collector’s mark of Sir Joshua Reynolds may also have come to Budapest via Poggi who may have acquired them in Paris.

In 1870 the heirs of Prince Esterházy sold his collection – 3,535 drawings, over 51,000 prints, 305 illustrated books, and 637 paintings – to the Hungarian State. The works were housed in the newly built palace of the Academy of Sciences, which was then renamed the National Picture Gallery and soon after became the Museum of Fine Arts. In the present catalogue, 213 or more than half of the 350 drawings discussed come from the Esterházy collection, identified primarily by the prince’s collector’s mark (Lugt 1965). About forty Dutch drawings joined the museum from the collection of the painter István Delhaes (1845-1901), the restorer of the collection of the Princes of Liechtenstein. During the late 1950s, a large number of drawings that had lain forgotten in the museum were identified on the basis of their respective collector’s marks as coming from the Esterházy or Delhaes collection.
The number of reattributions from the time the drawings were in the Esterházy collection is staggering and shows the enormous work that went into this publication. A case in point is the Susanna and the Elders, now attributed to Barend Fabritius (no. 73). Given to Rembrandt in the Esterházy collection, Bode (1908) classified it as a copy but Hofstede de Groot (1921) resurrected it, while Benesch (1954-57) and Sumowski (1957-58) saw in it a pupil’s work; Wegner (1967-68) was the first to suggest Fabritius, an attribution that has held. The thirty-six Rembrandt drawings that came with the Esterházy collection have now been reduced to six highly acclaimed originals, among them the often reproduced Saskia sitting by a Window, the Woman with a Child Frightened by a Dog, a drawing that Rembrandt retouched (no. 207). Watermill Farmhouse that went into this publication. A case in point is the Esterházy collection is staggering and shows the enormous work among them the often reproduced collection have now been reduced to six highly acclaimed originals, held. The thirty-six Rembrandt drawings that came with the Esterházy collection are now relegated to the Rembrandt school (nos. 209-40; one of the lions, no. 237, apparently is drawn over Picart’s etching published in 1729). A drawing of Two Old Men that Otto Benesch accepted as a Rembrandt original (V, no. 1087, fig. 1307) is now attributed to Willem Drost, following an opinion by Martin Royalton-Kisch (verbally; no. 61). More recently, Peter Schatborn (verbally, 1998) suggested “possibly Anthonie van Borssom” (no. 153) for a sheet with the Mocking of Ceres that Teréz Gerszi attributes to Johannes Leupenius, while she rejects his proposal of Samuel van Hoogstraten (no. 160) for the study of St. Peter Finding the Coin in the Fish in favor of Nicolau Maes?.

Of interest besides the Rembrandt group are several small pen sketches of figures, dancing nymphs, of Christ Carrying the Cross and the Three Graces by Hendrick Goudt (nos. 87-99). The collection also includes seventeen sheets that once were part of a sketchbook originally believed to be by Jan van Goyen but now attributed to a follower (nos. 105-121). Pieter Quast is represented by a handful of drawings, among them a Dutch Market Scene and an Illustration of a Proverb besides some single figures (nos. 192–197). The scholar who seems to have had the most impact in helping with the difficult task of reattributing the museum’s seventeenth-century Dutch drawings was J.Q. van Regteren Altena during a visit in 1969. Thanks to Andrea Czére’s work on the seventeenth-century Italian drawings, several sheets were moved from the Italian to the Dutch and Flemish schools, among them a Mountain Landscape by the Dordrecht artist Adriaen Honich (Lossenbruy) (no. 127) and a compositional sketch for Saint Dominic as Protector of Cremona with a detailed study of the saint in red chalk on the verso, here reattributed to Robert de Longe (Uberto La Longe) in accordance with an earlier annotation (no. 157). Andrea Czére identified several studies by Valentijn Leefbre (nos. 145-48), to which Nicholas Turner added yet another sheet (verbally; no. 149). Three landscape drawings originally attributed to Poussin or Claude are now given to Herman van Swanvelt (nos. 274-76).

Equally noteworthy among the Dutch sheets are an outstanding Adriaen van Ostade study of a Dutch Peasant Family (no. 177), Jan Both’s signed Forest Landscape of 1643, his first dated work after his return from Italy (no. 28); five drawings formerly listed as Jan Frans van Bloemen that are now reclassified as Johannes Jansz Collaert (nos. 52-56); and Frans van Mieris’s Young Man Sharpening his Pen (no. 163), a drawing that Otto Naumann had rejected in 1978 in his catalogue raissonné of the artist, is here returned to Van Mieris, partly because Naumann changed his opinion (verbally; 1995). Gerszi also favors Cornelis van Poelenburch for the Rocky Hillside (no. 184) over Alan Chong who saw in it the work of a pupil (Master Drawings, vol.25, 1987, pp. 3–62, no. 138). The Large Trees along a Road (no. 257), an unpublished drawing formerly given to Aelbert Cuyp is now firmly attributed to François Ryckhals based on research by Egbert Haverkamp Begemann (verbally; 2000), while two additional sheets originally also considered as Cuyp are catalogued as Anthonie Waterloo (nos. 306-07). Finally, the gray wash in Jacob Meeting Laban’s Shepherds, attributed to Van den Eckhout with a question mark (no. 70), was likely added at a later date.

In the process of cataloguing a respectable number of drawings were found that had been mislaid in the museum. Many of these unpublished drawings are copies after known artists or listed among the 35 that remain anonymous (nos. 316-50). Of interest among them are three small pen sketches by Jan de Bisschop (18-20) that now join the artist’s imposing portrait of a seated young lady, formerly attributed to Caspar Netscher (no. 17). The group also includes examples by Cornelis Saftleven (no. 261), Herman Saftleven (no. 263), Cornelis Symonisz. van der Schalcke (no. 265), and Abraham Genoels (nos. 79-81).

Among the far fewer Flemish drawings are a tender study of Rubens’s young son Albert (no. 249; see below), a drawing by Cornelis Bos of a Couple Embracing that Rubens retouched (no. 248), and an early, unusual Jordaens of The Holy Family with St. John, his Parents, and Angels (no. 136), first identified by Julius Held (verbally). Worth mentioning is a large study by Van Diepenbeeck for the so-called “Angels’ Gate” (no. 58), a signed landscape by Jan Siberechts (no. 267), and a fine still life with birds by Frans Snyders (no. 268). The catalogue rectifies the attribution to Pieter van Lint of his signed Judgment of Solomon (no. 156) of 1639 that originally was classified as a Fragonard copy after Raphael.

As for the drawing of Albert Rubens (no. 249), Teréz Gerszi strongly defends Rubens’s authorship for the engaging portrait of his older son. While I certainly agree that the Budapest version is superior to the one in Vienna, as Gerszi states here and previously in a small note in the Budapest museum Bulletin (2002), I still doubt that the Budapest drawing is entirely by Rubens. I was able to compare the two works in the small exhibition in Munich on Isabella Brant in 2003-04; in the 2004 Vienna exhibition (cats. 78, 79) the two drawings could be seen together only briefly before the Vienna version was removed.) In my opinion the black and red chalk that Gerszi observes in a close study under the wash could well be by Rubens. In appearance the original state of the work thus would be similar to the famous portrait study of Nicolaes Rubens with a Coral Necklace in the Albertina (reproduced in fig. 249/a). At a later time a rather sensitive hand added the wash and the fine pen work to give the drawing a painterly look. I cannot recognize Rubens’s hand in these additions, especially if one looks at the cross hatching and the small dots on the child’s chin. These are more reminiscent of an engraver’s work. The Albertina version is a copy after this state of the Budapest portrait as Gerszi maintains. Copies after Rubens’s drawings of his children also exist in the Hermitage and in the Copenhagen cantoor, which attest to their great appeal.

Two additional drawings are of interest for Rubens scholarship. An Assumption of the Virgin is here catalogued as Willem Panneels (no. 183) and relates to the latter’s etching of the same subject in reverse as far as the group of apostles and holy women are concerned but, most importantly, differs completely in the rendering of the Virgin raising to heaven. According to the late Frans Baudouin (in Flemish Art in Hungary. Kon. Vlaamse Academie van België, ed. C. Van de Velde, forthcoming), it may record Rubens’s lost modello that he submitted in 1611 to the church authorities to obtain the contract.
for his Assumption altarpiece in Antwerp Cathedral. The drawing was recorded in the Mariette sale of 1775; its appearance and whereabouts were unknown to David Freedberg who considered it a copy after the Schleissheim Assumption (Corpus Rubenianum, VII, no. 40.) The execution of the study has however nothing in common with Panneel’s drawings in the Copenhagen cantoor group, and although similar in composition it is not identical with the print, being larger and not traced. Accordingly, the issue of authorship continues to remain open. Baudouin attributed it to the circle of Rubens, which seems preferable. 
The Sacrifice of Iphigenia (no. 280), here attributed to Theodoor van Thulden, represents another record of one of the grisaille friezes on the garden façade of Rubens’s house. Baudouin suggested that the Budapest drawing might actually record Rubens’s lost original preliminary study.

For completeness’ sake I would like to mention one small Rubens addendum: in 1966, the late Michael Jaffé (Van Dyck’s Antwerp Sketchbook, vol. I, pls. XLI-XLIII) published as Rubens’s work three pen drawings of parts of a human skeleton in the Budapest museum, where they were tentatively attributed to the Spanish artist Felipe de Liaño (1550/60-1625), an opinion he repeated in 1977 (Rubens and Italy, p. 31). This attribution apparently did not get recorded since there is no mention of it here and the drawings presumably continue to be catalogued as Spanish school.

The catalogue ends with a full bibliography, a subject index, index of former owners, and a welcome concordance of the museum’s inventory numbers with the catalogue numbers.

Anne-Marie Logan
Easton, Connecticut


In July 2002, the art world gasped when Sotheby’s knocked down to Lord Thomson of Fleet an old master painting for the unheard-of sum of almost $76 million (49.5 million) – a financial league in which hitherto the only players had been Impressionists and Picasso. The astonishment was all the greater given that the artist was Rubens, whose merits are beyond question but whose popularity rating certainly lags behind many of his contemporaries, the painting a (relatively) early work (ca. 1612) and thus not what a wider audience would hold as a ‘typical’ Rubens, and the subject, a disturbing Massacre of the Innocents, never easy to take at the best of times but rendered here with rarely seen violence and horrific realism. Following its acquisition, the painting went on display at the National Gallery in London, where under the aegis of David Jaffé it formed the focal point of an on-going, informal, in-house presentation, which continually juxtaposed the composition with various stylistically relevant works from the Gallery’s own Rubens collection as well as works lent by other institutions and private collectors. Visitors to the Rubens Room never knew what constellation they would encounter, what confrontations Jaffé had arranged to demonstrate the position of the Massacre within the artist’s oeuvre in the years following his return from Italy (1608).

It has then to be said that it was not without a degree of risk for the National Gallery to subsequently organize an exhibition that would again address – if in an expanded context – the same material. Moreover, given the spate of Rubens exhibitions in 2004-2005, what was to be learned from yet another show? As it happened, quite a lot. The exhibition immediately dispelled any fears of being treated to ‘more of the same.’ The National Gallery has considerable experience in organizing exhibitions that focus on a particular period in an artist’s career, and the Rubens exhibition reaffirmed the value of such an approach. An innovative and sometimes unconventional hanging succeeded in stimulating the viewer into seeing and understanding just how Rubens’s artistic mind worked, how a motif once applied was filed away – perhaps in the notebook known as the ‘Pocketbook’ (from which one of the two surviving sheets was exhibited), but certainly in his mind – to be used again in an improved, adapted or varied form. This approach was immediately evident upon entering the first room where the Battle of the Amazons (Potsdam; landscape by Jan Brueghel; cat. 1) of about 1598, but in any case pre-Italy, hung next to a hitherto unknown composition of the same subject (cat. 3), dated by Jaffé to 1603-1605 – the earlier date more convincing. This juxtaposition showed the extent to which Rubens was still occupied with what he had painted years previously. Instead of simply overwriting his northern experience with the new visual impressions of Italy, he recalled with astonishing clarity his earlier composition, reworked certain central motifs such as the group of two Amazons struggling with Hercules and the mounted Amazon holding aloft a severed head, and incorporated new ideas gleaned in Italy. This was for example admirably conveyed by the display of three drawings below the painting which allowed viewers to see, among other things, that Rubens derived the rather ungainly figure of an Amazon wrestling with one Greek while another grasps her around the waist from Michelangelo’s marble relief of The Battle of Lapiths and Centaurs – some would question the validity of including the drawing (cat. 31; Paris, Institut Néerlandais) since its attribution to Rubens has been doubted (by Anne-Marie Logan, Master Drawings 1977*), as is acknowledged in the catalogue; nevertheless, its presence contributed much to elucidating exactly how Rubens extracted ideas from visual sources and inserted them, suitably amended, into his own works. Precisely how much importance Rubens placed on re-working pre-Italian compositions was further apparent in the display of his three earliest renditions of the Judgement of Paris – for this reviewer a particular treat: the pre-Italian panel from the National Gallery, the small copper painting from Vienna (though I suggest a date closer to 1605 than the proposed 1601) and the Mannerist portrayal from Madrid (dated to 1606-1608, though it could conceivably be post-Italy.)

Rubens’s preoccupation with ancient sculpture is a well-explored subject, his many drawings (plenty of which were on show) testifying to his intense study of famous and less well-known examples. But it is rare to find statues and paintings displayed together; when they are it is most illuminating, as was the case with the grouping of the Venus Medici (a cast) and Abraham Janssens’s Pan and Syrinx (Bremen) in the 2004 Pan and Syrinx exhibition in Kassel. In London the focus was on the famous Crouching Venus of Doidalses, present as a small bronze and a large marble version. Their strategic positioning afforded visitors a continually changing perspective of the sculpture itself, and placed it against a changing panorama of paintings, thus illustrating not only how Rubens perceived and incorporated the

* Anne-Marie Logan communicated verbally her opinion on the following drawings: cat. 13 (Last Judgement – doublef); cat. 29 (Two Men Wrestling – perhaps gone over by another hand); cat. 35 (Study of Legs – a copy, cf. Master Drawings, 1977); cat. 38 (Écorché Nude – not by Rubens, more likely the printmaker, but not Pontius, to whom she attributes a drawing in the Welcome Institute); cat. 59 (The Entombment – too complete, too much wash, darker ink more like that used by Van Dyck)
The catalogue opens with three relatively short essays. The first by David Jaffé and Minna Moore Ede is a brief biographical account of Rubens’s early years, mapping the most important topographical locations, their artistic relevance, and received commissions up to the completion in 1614 of the Descent from the Cross (Antwerp Cathedral). In “Rubens’s ‘Pocketbook’: An Introduction to the Creative Process”, Jaffé and Amanda Bradley look anew at the artist’s famous notebook, which was destroyed by fire in 1720 (bar two sheets), though a partial (and often disputed reconstruction) can be made on the basis of three other sketchbooks and a printed source. Avoiding the problematic issue of the make-up of the lost original, the authors keep the theme of the exhibition in mind and discuss the Pocketbook as a compendium of invention and creativity by looking in particular at how Rubens reworked familiar motifs. Among other aspects, they take a closer look at his transformation of figures taken from Holbein’s Dance of Death and the varying contexts in which they subsequently appear in his paintings; Rubens was of course well acquainted with the German artist’s prints, having copied them (often with intriguing changes) prior to his departure for Italy (cf. exh. cat. Images of Death, Antwerp, Rubenshuis, 2000).

The final essay by Elizabeth McGrath on “Words and Thoughts in Rubens’s Early Drawings” examines the artist’s many inscriptions in Latin, Flemish or Italian on drawings, identifies the literary source in the case of citations (often from ancient texts) and discusses the nature of other types of inscriptions: sometimes these are notes to himself: about coloring, the illustration of different gestures, emotions, natural phenomenon etc.; sometimes they record more fundamental aspects of composition or means of expressing the passions; or they tell us of works of art he has seen and what he admired in them (e.g. Daniele da Volterra’s Deposition). Not all inscriptions are decipherable or easily understood, as is apparent from McGrath’s fascinating analysis of the sheet with Medea and her Children (fig. 24). As in the exhibition itself, we again see Rubens’s mind at work, how his visual sources (an ancient sarcophagus, an engraving by Bonasone) inspired his expressive sketch of the insanely jealous Medea while at the same time his vivid imagination is conjuring up an alternative form of depiction, recorded only in the inscription, and then (as McGrath astutely observed) revealed only through one small but essential word: vel (or).

The 91 catalogue entries were written by David Jaffé, Minna Moore Ede, Ulrich Heinen, Veronika Kopecky and Elizabeth McGrath, with contributions by Delfina Bergamaschi and Amanda Bradley, though in fact the great majority are a joint production by Jaffé and Moore Ede. The entries are organized into six categories, each prefaced by a short introduction to the particular topographical (On the Move; Reworking of Rome; Back in Antwerp) or iconographical (Battle Painter; Religious Painter; Sequences: Building a Composition) grouping; obviously some groupings are more homogenous than others. A more rigorous editing would have removed inaccuracies or inconsistencies, many of which scholars will catch but not the general public. The publication is lavishly illustrated, with comparative works reproduced in color and many interesting details of the actual exhibits. Under the best of circumstances, a catalogue can only offer a pale reflection of the visual experience of the exhibition it documents. The extravagant use of color illustrations throughout the present catalogue, notably for the illustrations of ancient sculpture (often shot from unexpected vantage points), does at least go some way towards conveying a flavor of the dynamics of this visually driven exhibition.

Fiona Healy
Mainz, Germany


The London publishing house Pallas Athene has come up with the very welcome and worthwhile project of assembling English
translators of early biographies of artists in an easily accessible publication. The present book on Rubens is the third in the series (after Raphael and Caravaggio; since then 3 volumes on Michelangelo have come out and Rembrandt and Velazquez are forthcoming*), and brings together three biographies: the first, written by Giovanni Baglione for inclusion in his Vitae dei pittori, scultori, et architetti moderni and published in 1642, just two years after the Flemish painter’s death, has been translated by Lisa Adams; this is followed by Joachim von Sandrart’s account from the Teutsche Academie of 1675 (Latin ed.: 1683), translated by Kristin Lohse Belkin; and finally two texts by Roger de Piles: the first, a vita proper, from his 1681 Dissertation sur les ouvrages des plus fameux peintres, avec la vie de Rubens, was translated by Katie Scott, the second, Reflections on the Works of Sir Peter Paul Rubens, is the English translation by John Savage (1706) of the French theorist’s L’Abrégé de la vie des peintres… avec un traité du peintre parfait (1699). A concise but lucid and informative introduction by Jeremy Wood characterizes the different approaches and interests of the three biographers, the sources of their knowledge of Rubens, his life and work, and the aspects of his successful career they found most fascinating.

Publication of individual books is scheduled either to coincide with an important exhibition – the Lives of Rubens, Caravaggio and Raphael appeared for the exhibitions in the National Gallery, London (Raphael: 2004; Caravaggio and Rubens: 2005), or to appear during an anniversary year, as in the case of the Lives of Rembrandt. The books are for their size (14.5 x 11 cm) lavishly illustrated in color, very affordable (approx. euros 10; $ 15; £ 7), and slim enough to conveniently fit the pocket of the interested public. Unfortunately, they are likely to get lost on the academic bookshelf. While it is understandable that successful sales and marketing tactics are very affordable (approx. euros 10; $ 15; £ 7), and slim enough to conveniently fit the pocket of the interested public. Unfortunately, they are likely to get lost on the academic bookshelf. While it is understandable that successful sales and marketing tactics are

The central motivation behind this exhibition was to place the National Gallery of Ireland’s Rest on the Flight into Egypt by Rembrandt in a wider context. One of the great achievements of the show was the unique opportunity it afforded to hang Rembrandt’s only nocturnal landscape alongside Adam Elsheimer’s Flight into Egypt from Munich, which may have prompted the Dutch artist’s composition and handling of light, and which he probably knew through Hendrick Goudt’s reproductive engraving. [Elsheimer’s painting recently was the subject of a small exhibition in Munich: Adam Elsheimer. Die Flucht nach Ägypten; see under New Titles.]

Beyond this fortuitous juxtaposition, the exhibition investigated the phenomenon of the Netherlandish nightscape, a limited and imprecise subcategory of landscape art most comprehensively surveyed by Wolfgang Stechow in the final chapter of his Dutch Landscape Painting of the Seventeenth Century (London, 1966). The Dublin exhibition, shown in one venue only, was a small, focused show of 31 paintings and 20 works on paper. The lenders were predominantly Dutch and German museums and private collectors, with the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam, providing the majority of the prints and drawings. Adriaan Waiboer, the National Gallery of Ireland’s first specialist curator of Northern European Art, deserves immense credit for having conceived and staged this exhibition almost within twelve months of having taken up his appointment.

Like most modern terms applied to subject matter from the seventeenth century, when classification was more fluid, the word ‘nightscape’ is inadequate to encompass the theme represented here. Many of the exhibited works depict scenes actually set in the late evening and twilight. Moreover, the figures and the narrative sometimes dominate the landscape elements, as, for example, in Rubens’s Flight into Egypt (Kassel), another response to Elsheimer’s seminal interpretation of the same subject. The prime stimulus of other works extended not from an abiding interest in nature or the night, but rather from an interest in documenting disasters such as fires, unusual natural occurrences like comets, or firework displays and other festive occasions which took place at nightfall. With the exception of Aert van der Neer and Egbert van der Poel, few artists turned their attention to the night scene with any regularity. Most only produced one or two examples, perhaps largely to demonstrate their facility at representing complex lighting effects.

Unfortunately the viewing experience was not aided by the installation of the show in the National Gallery’s uneasy labyrinth of cramped and sterile temporary exhibition rooms in the new Millennium extension. In particular the lighting system was a gimmicky and unnecessary intrusion. The decision was taken to blacken out the overhead windows, the only source of natural light, and to illuminate the works with a soft diffuse spotlighting from above. While the resultant semi-darkness may have been atmospheric, it created serious problems in fully and clearly apprehending the exhibits: a few of the more subdued works were so poorly lit that their detail was barely decipherable, others had cast shadows from frames, and some of the prints were given an odd glowing quality. The lack of light also made many of the information panels largely redundant.

The other problem with the layout of the exhibition was that there were insufficient numbers of high quality works to hold the

---

*The series also includes memoirs and recollections of Joshua Reynolds, Samuel Palmer, George Stubbs and Henri Rousseau.

Dieuwertje Dekkers, Volker Manuth, et al. [Cat. exh. Luuk Pijl (ed.), Gallery of Ireland. In Leonaert Bramer’s evocative some sparkling gems in the self-imposed gloom of the National C9) as probably the work of a later imitator. There were, however, briskly executed with a sunset landscape from the Louvre and the small-scale and briskly executed Landscape with Gallows from the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin. Visitors had to make do with engravings by Schelte Adamsz Volswert after Rubens’s more important nocturnal and evening landscapes. [It should be noted however that Rubens’s most beautiful nightscape, in the Courtauld Institute Galleries, cannot be lent.] The Evening Landscape from the Bredius Museum, which was exhibited as an undisputed work by Aelbert Cuyp, was excluded from Stephen Reiss’s monograph on the artist (Aelbert Cuyp, London, 1975) and rejected by Alan Chong (Aelbert Cuyp and the Meanings of Landscape, diss., New York, Institute of Fine Arts, 1992, vol. 2, p. 449, no. C9) as probably the work of a later imitator. There were, however, some sparkling gems in the self-imposed gloom of the National Gallery of Ireland. In Leonaat Bramer’s evocative Herdsmen near a Campfire (Fondation Aetas Aurea), the grey-blue of the slate support doubles as the nocturnal sky, which occupies one-half of the composition. Also memorable was Nicolaes Berchem’s Landscape with Crab Catchers by Moonlight of 1645 (private collection), which again successfully engages with Elsheimer’s challenge of depicting a variety of light sources in a darkened setting.

A short catalogue containing two essays and brief entries on all the exhibited works accompanied the exhibition. Waiboer’s introductory essay traces the evolution of the Dutch and Flemish nocturnal landscape from its origins in the fifteenth century to the late seventeenth century. In a wide-ranging survey, he deals succinctly and efficiently with issues such as the contemporary reception of the night piece and the technical advice given to painters of such scenes. The second essay, by Michiel Franken, is a lively account of Rembrandt’s artistic relationship with Elsheimer in the context of seventeenth-century notions of emulation. Using Ernst van de Wetering’s method, he demonstrates how Rembrandt’s understanding of concepts such as houding and kenlijkheydt was superior to that of the older artist. This publication is an important addition to the meagre literature on this often overlooked aspect of Netherlandish landscape art.

John Loughman

University College, Dublin


The first Dutch university-educated art historian, Cornelis Hofstede de Groot (1863-1930), grew up in the North Netherlandish towns of Kampen and Groningen and, because of poor health, at spas in France and Germany. He studied classical languages in Groningen and Leiden and art history in Leipzig. In 1891 he became vice-director of the Royal Picture Gallery the Mauritshuis, and in the same year published his dissertation on Arnold Houbraken’s Groot Schouwburg. From 1898 Hofstede de Groot worked independently, published extensively and collected a vast number of drawings (mostly seventeenth-century Dutch) alongside his collection of paintings and medals. Among his most important publications are the Handzeichnungen Rembrandts (1906) and the Beschreibendes und kritisches Verzeichnis der Werke der hervorragendsten holländischen Maler des XVII. Jahrhunderts (1907-1928). His documentation, the basis of his publications, forms the foundation of the RKD (founded 1932) in The Hague. Already in 1914 he promised his collection of paintings, as well as an important part of his collection of drawings to the museum in Groningen. This collection has been the starting point of the exhibition and its accompanying catalogue Van Cuyp tot Rembrandt – De verzameling Cornelis Hofstede de Groot in the Groninger Museum.

The time and location of this exhibition were well chosen. Apart from Hofstede de Groot’s large bequest left to Groningen, it coincides with the “Rembrandt year”, commemorating an artist of whom this connoisseur was a highly influential specialist. It also took place at a time when a new museum, focussing on regional history, led to a fierce debate in the local media. Finally, it seems to be part of a tradition of the Groninger Museum, to put influential figures in national cultural history in the spotlight, following for instance museum director Jos de Gruyter. The present exhibition consisted of 88 drawings and 29 paintings, seven of which are not included in the catalogue since they were never in the possession of Hofstede de Groot (even though, for instance, Ferdinand Bol’s Portrait of Elisabeth Jacobodr, is the only work mentioned in the director’s foreword, and it will play a pivotal role in a presentation in the Rijksmuseum this year).

The catalogue further consists of six 10-15 page essays, dealing with several aspects of Hostede de Groot and his collection. Luuk Pijl, responsible for the concept of the exhibition and editor of its catalogue, places the realization of Hofstede de Groot’s collection in an historical context, sketching his network of dealers, connoisseurs and museum professionals. Herman Overmars and Henk van Veen have written an essay on Hofstede de Groot’s place in Dutch art history, which can even be connected, through his student Horst Gerson, to the present day art history department at Groningen University. Rudi Ekkart stresses the importance of Hofstede de Groot’s numerous scholarly contributions, including the (then relatively new) method of using and comparing photographs. Volker Manuth analyzes Hofstede de Groot’s importance for Rembrandt researchers and concludes that, notwithstanding his reputation as a ‘scholarly’ art historian, he is also firmly rooted in the nineteenth-century romantic tradition. The author concludes, apparently in agreement with Hofstede de Groot’s 1922 stipulation: “dealing with Rembrandt is among the greatest aesthetic pleasures in the world” [translated from the catalogue].

Esmée Quodbach’s interesting essay deals with ‘American Collections Rich in Dutch Art.’ She gives an overview of the American situation around 1900 and provides insight into Hofstede de Groot’s two-month journey to the United States in 1908, probably the first visit to the New World by an eminent Dutch art historian. By this date some of the most important American collections, such as those of P.A.B. Widener and H.C. Frick, had relatively recently been established, partly at the expense of the impoverished French and British aristocracy. Dieuwertje Dekkers describes Hofstede de Groot’s role in the ‘Museumkwiste’: the early twentieth-century Dutch debate on the position of museums in society.
Regrettably, the catalogue does not contain an essay dealing with Hofstede de Groot’s position in the international discourse; his relationship with Max Friedländer – practically his contemporary, who graduated in Leipzig in the same year, also a specialist of drawings, and whose documentation forms another important part of the RKD – is discussed nowhere. One of the more fundamental weaknesses of the catalogue is the lack of coherence. Luuk Pijl’s biography of Hofstede de Groot is repeated in Herman Overmars’ and Henk van Veen’s essay on the famous art historian’s place in Dutch art history. Some biographical facts, like his study of art history in Leipzig, are repeated four times in this contribution (pp. 13, 15, 16, 18), alongside lengthy biographical data that are repeated in other essays. Moreover, one would expect this particular retrospective essay to have been placed at the end, since it takes for granted knowledge that will only be dealt with in the following essays.

One only seldom learns how one aspect of Hofstede de Groot’s career has influenced another. In the chapter on the ‘Museumkwestie’, De Groot’s thesis of 1911 follows directly after the paragraph on the ‘Commissie de Groot (1904-1907)’. Hofstede’s 1911 theorem that the meaning of an art museum is defined by its possession of masterpieces, rather than a large number of mediocre pieces, however, appears to have been inspired by his American journeys of 1908 and 1909. At least, already in 1908 the New York Times quoted him as saying: ‘To make a museum the best in the world rather than the greatest is […] the true ideal toward which to reach.’ (cited from the catalogue). His 1911 appeal to the Dutch government to establish such a museum is essentially a repetition of his appeal of 1908 to important American collectors.

The regrettable lack of coherence also affects the catalogue itself. The sequence is alphabetical and does not follow the exhibition. One wonders why the editor made such an arbitrary decision. Of course, for a catalogue of Hofstede de Groot’s collection this would be among the obvious solutions, but since the exhibition only covers part of the collection, others might have been more welcome to the reader. Thematic grouping, as in the exhibition, would have given better insight into Hofstede de Groot’s favorite subjects. Another more illuminating arrangement might have been following the collector himself. Most of the exhibited works have a lengthy pedigree, and Pijl and others have been able to establish when Hofstede de Groot acquired them (an extensive exhibition history and bibliography is included in every entry). It remains for another author or for the reader him/herself to find out what influence Hofstede de Groot’s development and travels may have had on his collecting policy.

Moreover, the entries themselves sometimes relate clearly to the central theme of the book, but quite often only consist of a brief discussion of the work or artist under consideration. One cannot go as far as Hofstede de Groot did himself when he judged the new arrangement of the Rijksmuseum in 1900, but a clearer motivation for the catalogue would have been most welcome. This may be, understandably, due to time pressure. Writing over a hundred entries on a couple of dozen artists is not an easy job, and certainly a time-consuming one.

Notwithstanding its imperfections, this exhibition is one of the first to take into consideration Dutch people’s own history. It sheds some light on the way Dutch art history came into being and thereby gives the reader an idea of the origin of a Dutch canon. This alone makes the project worthwhile.

Lars Hendriksman
Groningen


In preparation for the Rembrandt year, these publications collectively present some of the less studied works, particularly drawings, by Rembrandt and artists close to him, in three major European collections. Color plates in all these publications are of high quality, and invaluable in making these fragile and sometimes obscure works more accessible.

The last named publication, documenting a loan exhibition from the Albertina to Milwaukee, sets the context for Rembrandt drawings within Dutch seventeenth-century draughtsmanship from Jacques de Gheyn II to Jan van Huysum. As a survey of high quality drawings that are unquestioned in their authorship, it documents a stunning display of both formal and informal imagery. Inherently, it is also the most straightforward and least daring of the three exhibition catalogues under review. Organized chronologically and thematically, the 112 exhibited works are particularly dazzling in landscape and genre, with some fine portraits and still lifes. The refined selection encourages the viewer to make connections among works of similar subject and technique by different artists, including the selection of 9 etchings and 18 drawings by Rembrandt. One is thus invited to compare Savery’s Elephant Rubbing against a Tree (cat. 3) with Rembrandt’s Three Studies of an Elephant (cat. 24). Savery’s animal is clearly uncomfortable and a distinct personality, while Rembrandt’s, caught in motion, is lying down, eating, or obediently walking. The intimate horizontal landscapes by Jan van de Velde II (cats. 11 and 12) contrast with the more formal panoramic landscapes by Cuyp (cats. 65 and 66) and Saftleven (cat. 79). Rembrandt’s Kötages (cat. 29) is echoed for pen technique and general design in Doomer’s Village Street (cat. 81). The preference for black chalk in sketchbooks used out-of-doors is apparent from Jan van Goyen’s small precise landscapes (cats. 18 and 19) and Rembrandt’s views around
Amsterdam (cats. 32-34). A few of the lesser known draftsmen are included, which will stimulate interest in their work, e.g. Marten de Cock (cat. 9) and Herman Henstenburgh (cats. 108-109).

The catalogues from Munich and Dresden take a more focused approach to Rembrandt. The authors have taken pains to present their ‘Rembrandt’, ‘formerly-Rembrandt’ and ‘around-Rembrandt’ drawings in ways that often ask questions without solving some of the thornier attribution issues. They have also considered carefully the historiography of Rembrandt drawings and the foundation of their respective collections in the eighteenth century, often with early acquisitions en bloc and of mixed quality. The pattern that emerges is one of a reduction in the drawings considered to be by Rembrandt with some certainty, an increase of assignment to named pupils, and an acknowledgement of the category “school/follower of Rembrandt” as a grey area worthy of more investigation. In both catalogues, there is a concerted effort to identify pupils.

When it was first inventoried in 1781, the Munich collection possessed some 373 Rembrandt drawings. In his comprehensive catalogue (1906), Cornelis Hofstede de Groot listed 1613 drawings as by Rembrandt, of which he considered 155 in Munich to be authentic Rembrandts. Otto Benesch (1957) catalogued 1,467 drawings as by Rembrandt, of which about 75 were in the Munich collection: since then, about 19 are regarded as certainly by Rembrandt. The Dresden collection had acquired its Rembrandts in large part by 1753. There, Hofstede de Groot considered 90 of the original group of 125 drawings to be by Rembrandt. Benesch reduced this number to 48, and at present, the number stands at 21. This reduction in authentic drawings parallels the general trend in the study of Rembrandt paintings since the Rembrandt Research Project was founded in 1968. Recognizing that the study of Rembrandt’s oeuvre — in paintings, drawings and prints — is dauntingly complex, scholars have collaborated in many ways, especially in exhibition catalogues and in the RRP. Yet even there, consensus by committee is often elusive. There is, however, a need to integrate study of the artist’s works in various media more fully, even as this approach is often followed, and to interpret these works more completely. One example is found in the relationship of the various drawings of the Beheading of John the Baptist to the etching of the same subject (Munich, cats. 32-33), which should be understood in light of Mennonite martyrdom (see S. Dickey, “Mennonite martyrdom in Amsterdam and the art of Rembrandt...,” in W.Z. Shetter and L. van der Cruyssse, eds., Contemporary Explorations in the Culture of the Low Countries, Lanham, 1996: 81-103). Another example is in the striking late Dresden drawing Diana and Actaeon (cat. 117; see also, for an integrated approach, Erik Hinterding, “Rembrandt’s Etchings of Biblical and Mythological Subjects: Associations with his Painting,” in Akira Kofuku, Rembrandt and Dutch History Painting in the 17th Century, Tokyo, 2004: 139-55).

The Munich and Dresden catalogues indicate the wildly varied and subjective standards for drawing connoisseurship that have prevailed from the eighteenth century, and judiciously present a core group of drawings that, at least for now, we may unequivocally accept as by Rembrandt. The Dresden catalogue is organized in a fascinating way: by three dates — 1890, 1954/57, and 2004 — that indicate the major revised attributions of the drawings gathered around Rembrandt’s name. The first section concerns some of the drawings that Hofstede de Groot rejected as Rembrandt in 1890, and that Christian Dittrich and Thomas Ketelsen now assign to Philips Koninck (cats. 1-6), Jan Victors (cats. 7-8), and others. The second section concerns Benesch’s assessment of some of the Dresden drawings that had been considered as by Rembrandt, usually putting them in the category of ‘copy’ or ‘pupil’ (cats. 53-56, 68-64). In the third section, groups of drawings by Flinck (cats. 66-71), Bol (cats. 72-74), Drost (cats. 76-77, 78-81) and a few others better define these artists’ draughtsmanship, and allow speculation on these artists’ copying of inventions that may have originated in Rembrandt’s workshop.

The material presented in the Munich and Dresden catalogues suggests topics for future study. One is the drawings of an artist in the studio (Munich cats. 2 [Hoogstraten] and 3-4 [pupils]); Dresden cat. 49; and Louvre, Munich ill. p. 59) in relation to paintings, notably the Aert de Gelder Zeuxis (Frankfurt). Another is the careful copying of pen drawings of history subjects by pupils and followers to understand workshop practice and teaching methods better; these drawings include Study for a Beheading (Munich cat. 32 and ill. p. 139), Doubting Thomas (Munich cat. 86 and ill. p. 310), Christ among the Doctors (Munich cats. 89-90), David Leaving Jonathan (Dresden cat. 53 and Rembrandt prototype, Louvre, ill. p. 124), and Departure of the Prodigal Son (Dresden cat. 67 as Flinck and ill. p. 139 as Bol). Rembrandt treated Ganymede as a wailing toddler carried aloft by the eagle in a drawing and painting, both in Dresden (Dresden cat. 102 and ill. p. 184). Is this image a parody of ideal beauty or a political allusion of the Spanish prince? Rembrandt’s drawing includes the two parents who watch their departing son. Rembrandt’s painting omitted the parents, perhaps to heighten the child’s psychological and physical distress. But in Karel van Mander III’s variant of Rembrandt’s painting (known in Haelwegh’s etching), narrative elements are included in the feast of the gods among the clouds. More consideration to the narrative is here warranted, as it seems Rembrandt’s isolation from the context was unsatisfactory to Van Mander III.

The volume edited by Thea Vignau-Wilberg (2003) presents essays from the symposium held in Munich in February 2002 in connection with the exhibition, Rembrandt auf Papier. These analyses amplify the discussion of some of the Munich drawings. One example of a most fruitful exchange concerns the two nearly identical sheets of the Standing Oriental Warrior, which were exhibited together in Munich (Munich cats. 69-70 and Dresden cat. 96). Marian Bisanz identified the sheathed weapon as an Akan sword from Ghana. Christian Dittrich related these drawings to other works by Rembrandt. Thea Vignau-Wilberg proposed that these drawings are after the same model, from life; she suggested that the Dresden sheet, more vigorously drawn and with more anatomical detail, is by Rembrandt, and the Munich sheet, with its vagueness in the head, might be by Lievens (Munich cats. 69-70).

In his essay on drawings in the collection of Elector Carl Theodor von der Pfalz, Michiel Plomp identified nine large Rembrandt drawings that were shown prominently in the print room (then in Mannheim), an exceptional circumstance as no other single artist was represented with so many on display. None is now considered as by Rembrandt. Five of these are preparatory for Bol’s paintings in the town hall, Amsterdam (Munich cats. 41, 42, 44, 45, 46). Three others are The Pharaoh after the Death of his Son, The Raising of Lazarus, and The Angel Telling to Manoah and his Wife (in Munich, Graphische Sammlung, but not in the 2001-02 exhibition catalogue). These nine sheets are grand dramatic scenes in pen, chalk and wash. It might be easy to understand how viewers might have been impressed with them, but it is hard to reconcile these sheets with any comparable and genuine (at least for us) drawings by Rembrandt.

Other essays, all focused on drawings in Munich, include: Andreas Burmester and Konrad Renger’s technical investigation of several of the apocryphal drawings; Thomas Ketelsen’s iconographi-

Rembrandt’s last portrait print came about because, on 22 December 1664, the artist’s son, Titus, who lived with his father in Amsterdam, happened to be walking down the street in Leiden when he was hailed by the publisher Daniel van Gaesbeek, who asked him if he knew a good engraver (“een curieus plaetsnijder”). When Titus recommended his father, Van Gaesbeek was understandably skeptical for he needed a portrait that could be published in a book, Jan Antonides van der Linden’s edition of Hippocrates’s collected writings; Rembrandt was known for his etchings, not for his engravings. Nonetheless, Titus was convincing. Not surprisingly, however, the resulting posthumous portrait of Van der Linden, which Rembrandt made with his customary combination of etching, dry point and engraving, was much too fine and delicate to be published in the book. Titus was at this point legally in charge of his father’s finances and business. We do not know what it took him to persuade Rembrandt to undertake a commercial commission that went so against the grain of his previous portrait print production. Presumably it was for the money.

Rarely do the documents spell out so precisely how one of Rembrandt’s portraits came about, and, as we learn from Stephanie Dickey’s intelligent analysis, rarely, too, were his portrait prints either motivated by such exclusively commercial concerns or so clearly the product of happenstance. The contribution of Dickey’s masterful Rembrandt: Portraits in Print is to piece together as clear a picture as possible of the circumstances surrounding the genesis and reception of the seventeen portraits and three formal self-portraits that Rembrandt etched over the course of his career. Dickey argues, absolutely convincingly, that Rembrandt’s etched portraits and self-portraits “record his contribution to an aesthetic community celebrated in 1660 as a ‘Dutch Parnassus,’ a circle of artists, authors and art lovers that included not only associates and patrons of the artist, but also poets such as Joost van den Vondel and Jan Vos.” (11) She demonstrates that, to a remarkable degree, Rembrandt’s formal portraits were of people he knew and with whom he shared aesthetic and artistic interests, and that they were part of a broader cultural production, testifying to “a fascination with the articulation and celebration of individual character and accomplishment.” (11)

By examining Rembrandt’s portrait prints against the conventions of a genre that tended to have inscriptions, be engraved reproductions of paintings and/or be circulated in series, Dickey brings out the unconventionality of Rembrandt’s etchings, which were produced independently, as original works of art, mostly without inscriptions, and never in series. In her epilogue, Dickey quotes the poet Jeremias de Decker, who wrote in 1667 that Rembrandt painted his portrait “not in order to spin an income from it, but purely out of good will, as a noble offering to our Muses, [and] out of love of art.” In illuminating the “private, aestheticized nature of his production” and its suitability for the intellectual interests of his clients, Dickey shows us the extent to which the motivation of “love of art” was not just an abstract ideal, even when it was necessary, also, to make a profit. It is most refreshing to see Dickey go against the current trend to commodify Rembrandt’s production when she writes, “his increasing defiance of prevailing taste makes it difficult to conclude that his motives were purely mercenary. [His] Etchings, especially, appear to be the product, in most cases, of a close association between artist and sitter. It was among the humanists and connoisseurs of Amsterdam that these relationships developed.” (25)

Dickey’s book expands on and develops her 1994 Institute of Fine Arts dissertation. Her approach is associative; indeed, it is a model of the method advocated by Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, which is to examine all the associations that the work of art would have had for the artist and his contemporaries. The result is an incomparably nuanced, subtle and thorough understanding of the motivations behind, the meanings and reception of, and Rembrandt’s stakes in virtually each of the portraits. What becomes absolutely clear is that each likeness came about under highly individuated circumstances and that Rembrandt treated each sitter as an individual. Just as clear, though, is that however singular and original his portraits may have been, they were produced in dialogue with the period’s portrait conventions and traditions.

Dickey approaches her material chronologically and, thus, begins with Rembrandt’s first truly ambitious formal likeness of himself, the flamboyant Self-Portrait in a Hat and Patterned Cloak, which he etched in 1631, the year he left his native Leiden for the greater challenges and opportunities of Amsterdam. This was also the year in which he painted his first formal portraits. Dickey rightly brings out the extent to which, in this self-portrait, Rembrandt relied, at least initially, on the model of Anthony Van Dyck’s print series of uomini illustri, the so-called Iconography, to fashion for himself an international courtly guise that may have been intended to appeal to potential clients associated with the court in The Hague. Through close analysis of three impressions of intermediate states of the etching that Rembrandt retouched with black chalk, Dickey reveals “a shift in direction away from Van Dyckian swagger” toward a more prosaic image that was more in keeping with the reality that he would be working for an Amsterdam burgher clientele not yet ready for courtly glamour.

Chapter 2, “Burning with Zeal for God,” treats Rembrandt’s etched portraits of three preachers in scrupulous detail, to bring out how they at once met a broad demand for inspirational images of religious leaders, arose out of particular, varied circumstances, and transformed existing traditions for representing saints and scholars in their studies. Rembrandt, Dickey demonstrates, develops from suggesting “interiority through the depiction of an abstracted or introspective gaze,” (34) in his first formal etched portrait, dated 1633, of Jan Cornelis Sylvius, to characterizing these preachers as extroverted scholars, as in his second posthumous portrait of Sylvius.
of 1646. Dickey uses the three religious men – the Reformed pastor Sylvius, the Remonstrant leader Johannes Wtenbogaer, and the Mennonite preacher Cornelis Claesz Ansol – to elucidate just exactly what was at stake in the complex of Protestant factions that colored spiritual and political life in Rembrandt’s day, and to demonstrate that Rembrandt was ecumenically liberal from the outset. This chapter also brings out the range of associations Rembrandt had with his sitters, from Sylvius, who was a relative by marriage, to Ansol, whose portrayal, Dickey argues, demonstrates Rembrandt’s “courageous sympathy with the movement to which so many of his acquaintances belonged.” (49)

With Chapter 3, on The Goldweigher, the allegorical portrait of Jan Wtenbogaer (cousin of Johannes), who was Holland’s Receiver-General or chief tax collector and also an art collector and notable patron of painters and poets, Dickey begins to build the detailed descriptive analysis of the circles of art lovers, poets and artists who made up Rembrandt’s cultural milieu. Jan Wtenbogaer, whom Rembrandt portrays as “virtuous steward of the public funds” (88), was representative of the many regents and burghers who aspired to the ideal of the mercator sapiens (wise merchant), advocated by Caspar Barlaeus, who called for the “citizens of Amsterdam to bring about ‘a union of Mercury and the Muses’ by combining a love of profit with a love of learning.” (81) So too was Jan Six, whose etched portrait, Jan Six in his Study, of 1647, is sensitively discussed (in Chapter 5) as a conceptual and technical tour de force befitting the new ideal of gentlemanly learned introversion. As Dickey points out, Rembrandt’s three most ambitious etched portraits – the images of Jan Wtenbogaer and Jan Six, along with that of the print collector and apothecary Abraham Francen (Chapter 7), each of whom is shown in his office or study – depict men “whose complex ties to the artist involved financial as well as aesthetic matters.” (145) These are also men of greater wealth and higher status than the painter Jan Asselijn, the print dealer Clement de Jonghe, and the silversmith Jan Lutma, whom Rembrandt portrayed more modestly.

Rembrandt also portrayed himself more modestly than he did his collector friends and acquaintances. Dickey may be right that the 1648 Self-Portrait at a Window (Chapter 6) draws on the pictorial tradition of the scholar in his study, but the type has been so transformed as to be virtually unrecognizable. The study has become the studio, in which the sole evidence of scholarship is the book that Rembrandt reduces to a support on which to rest the plate he is etching. Although Dickey rightly raises questions about Rembrandt’s quite literate but essentially non-literary relation to the written word (16), she does not extend this discussion to show how markedly Rembrandt differentiates himself from such erudite contemporaries as Jan Six.

The differences between Rembrandt’s relatively straightforward images of art producers, including himself, and the much more elaborate portraits of the art lovers, with their detailed interiors, raises questions of status that Dickey might have delved into in greater depth. The union of Amsterdam’s intellectually sophisticated economic elite with artists as a “Brotherhood of Painting” – at auctions, in kunstkamers and studios, on the occasion of St. Luke’s day feasts, and through poems about images – is evidence of a breach or blurring of long (and still) standing distinctions in class and status. Patrons, painters, and poets came together over art; but to what extent was their contact limited to artistic matters and, in Rembrandt’s case, art-related financial matters, and to what extent did it represent a wider, if only temporary, breakdown of social distinctions? To what extent were studios and kunstkamers special sites, and St. Luke’s day festivities special occasions, where differences in wealth, education or power were overlooked? In other words, where did the artists really stand in relation to their patrons? Where did Rembrandt really stand in relation to the collectors with whom he became financially entangled? And, for that matter, what would he have made of the poems that were penned about his portraits (many of which were quite clichéd and all of which are translated in the appendix)? These are, to varying degrees, unanswerable questions. The important contribution of Stephanie Dickey’s outstanding book is that we now have a full picture of Rembrandt’s cultural milieu against which to ponder them.

H. Perry Chapman
University of Delaware
New Titles

Journals

*The Burlington Magazine,* vol. 148. February 2006, contains several articles on Northern European art, as well as reviews of books in Netherlandish art:

Susan Frances Jones. New evidence for the date, function and historical significance of Jan van Eyck’s ‘Van Maelbeke Virgin’.

Lene Bogh Ronberg and Jorgen Wadam. Two paintings in Copenhagen re-attributed to Rembrandt.

Libby Sheldon and Nicola Costaras. Johannes Vermeer’s ‘Young woman seated at a virginal’.

Walter Liedtke. An early work by Jacob Jordaens rediscovered.

Reviews


Bernard Aikema. *From Flanders to Florence. The Impact of Netherlandish Painting, 1400-1500,* by Paula Nuttal.

Jeltje Dijkstra. Répertoire des peintures flamandes des quinzième et seizième siècles, 5: Collections du Nord-Pas-de-Calais. La peinture de Flandre et de France du Nord au XVe et au début du XVIe siècle, by C. Heck.


*Scientia Artis,* vol. 2. Published by the Koninklijk Instituut voor het Kunstpatrimonium/Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique, Brussels 2005. The volume is devoted to the stained glass windows in Saints Michael and Gudule cathedral in Brussels (history, conservation, restoration). Edited by Isabelle Lecocq.

Books


Fusenig, Thomas, in collaboration with Christine Vogt, *Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum Aachen. Bestandskatalog der Gemäldegalerie: Niederlande von 1550-1800*. Munich: Hirmer, 2006. ISBN 3-7774-2965-1, euro 58. – Almost all of the some 90 Flemish and 130 Dutch paintings discussed in this catalogue are illustrated in color, often augmented by details. The museum’s latest acquisition, Rembrandt’s 1632 Portrait of a Young Man, decorates the jacket of the cover. The Flemish artists represented in the collection include Rubens, Van Dyck and their contemporaries Jordaeus, Snyder, Francken; among the Dutch artists are Rembrandt’s pupils Flinck, Backer, Aert de Gelder, as well as painters from the northern centers in The Hague, Haarlem, Leiden and Rotterdam; among the sixteenth-century artists are Aertsen and Jacques de Backer, with Regters and Fournier among the eighteenth-century painters. Since the last catalogue appeared almost 75 years ago, over 60 new attributions have been made, including a Christ Child, previously catalogued as “Spanish, ca. 1600” but now given to Marten de Vos. All artists’ signatures are illustrated, as are seals and marks; a detailed list of collections is included, thus adding to our knowledge of sixteenth-century bourgeois collecting.


Miroirs du sacré. Les retables sculptés à Bruxelles, XVe-XVIe siècles. Production, formes et usages. Under the direction of Brigitte


**Schip, Thomas, and Barbata Welzel (eds.).** *Dortmund im Mittelalter. Stadtführer (Dortmunder Mittelalter Forschungen, 6).* Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2006. ISBN 3-89534-616-0, euro 15.


**Steiger, Johann Anselm (ed.).** *Passion, Affekt und Leidenschaft in der Frühen Neuzeit (Wolbenbüttler Arbeiten zur Barockforschung, 43).* Wolbenbüttel: Herzog August Bibliothek, 2005. ISBN 3-447-05336-4, euro 159. – Includes contributions by Ulrich Heinen (introduction to the section: Passion, Affekt und Leidenschaft an der äußeren Grenze der Kultur und in der inneren Erfahrung, together with Johan Verbemcknoes); Nils Bütter (Bilder von “Grimmigen Menschfresser Leuten” – Von der Autopsie zum Topos), and Cordula van Wyhe (Between Chastity and Passion: The Impact of the French Exiles on the Cult of Courtly Love at the Brussels Court in the 1630s).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historians of Netherlandish Art</th>
<th>Endowment Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Challenge Grant of $5,000.00 given by James Marrow</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jan Six Society ($1 to $49)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Allentuck in memory of Charles Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Berkowitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Gifford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Hamburger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. B. L. Harwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Berger Hochstrasser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson Kurtin Communications, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Minty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne M. Morganstern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Sutton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Wolfthal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonna Yapou-Kromholz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John the Magnanimous Society ($50 to $99)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous gift in memory of Dana Goodgal-Salem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna R. Barnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste Brusati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice I. Davies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson G. Duprey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura D. Gelfand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola B. Gellman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Sutherland Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Sutherland Harris in memory of Seymour Slive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Howell Jolly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan C. Katz Karp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne W. Lowenthal in memory of James O. Belden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Pearson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopoldine van Hogendorp Prosperetti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontine Radler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary of Burgundy Society ($100 to $249)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous gift in memory of Dana Goodgal-Salem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous gift in honor of the late Charles Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous gift in honor of Irina Sokolova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiane Andersson in honor of Julius Held’s 91st birthday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerlinde de Beer in honor of George Keyes for his services as president of HNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mária van Berge-Gerbaud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Perry Chapman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles D. Cuttler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles D. Cuttler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice I. Davies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice I. Davies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene and Arthur Elkind in honor of Egbert Haerkamp Begemann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondation Custodia, Collection Frits Lugt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Gaskell in memory of Salim Kemal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola B. Gellman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele and Gordon J. Gilbert in honor of Ivan Gaskell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Golahny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Sutherland Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Hutchison in memory of Jan Bialostocki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Hutchison in memory of Wolfgang Stechow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan M. Kavaler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison McNeil Kettering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Koslow in honor of Julius Held</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Donahue Kuretsky in memory of Beatrijs Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Marie Logan in honor of Kristin Belkin and all her hard work on behalf of HNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne W. Lowenthal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Lowenthal in honor of Seymour Slive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mellinkoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila D. Muller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Perlove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Chippis Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joaneath Spicer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancellor Rolin Society ($250 to $499)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous donor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Alice Honig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Keyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Koetsier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Bernard G. Palitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joaneath A. Spicer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Van Haeften</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philip the Good Society ($500 to $999)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George S. Abrams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Hagopian van Buren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Hagopian van Buren in memory of L. M. J. Delaissé Richard Green Galleries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constantijn Huygens Society ($500 to $999)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. William Middendorf II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admiral Maarten Harpertsz. Tromp Fund ($500 to $999)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotheby’s, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Arundel Society ($1,000 to $2,499)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David G. Carter in memory of Roger-A. d’Hulst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David G. Carter in memory of Paul Coremans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
Carol J. Purtle in memory of Norris Kelly Smith

**John Michael Montias Fund**
Marten Jan Bok
David Carter
Perry Chapman
Pamela Decoteau
Larry Goedde
Amy Golahny
Emilie Gordenker
Julie Hochstrasser
Alison Kettering
Eric Jan Sluijter
Arthur Wheelock, Jr.
Jean Wilson
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 $75 per year.
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
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