A Passion for Rubens continues with exhibitions in Braunschweig, Vienna and New York, Greenwich (Connecticut), Berkeley and Cincinnati, Québec City, and London.

Peter Paul Rubens, Young Woman Looking Down (Study for the Head of Apollonia), c.1627-28. Black and red chalk, heightened with white; 414 x 286 mm. Florence, Uffizi.
From the President

This is the last of my messages to you as President. New officers will be installed in February at the time of the CAA annual meetings. Our new US Treasurer is already known: Leopoldine Prosperetti has generously volunteered to take over these duties from Betsy Wieseman, who has done a splendid job. As for our new President and Vice-President, the posting this month includes a ballot, complete with biographical information. We urge you to cast your vote as soon as possible. I would like to thank Ellen Konowitz for serving as Vice-President with such efficiency and skill. Her duties have included planning annual receptions and HNA-sponsored sessions, organizing HNA Fellowship selections, and chairing nominating committees for new board members and officers – all accomplished with great care and attention to detail.

The past four years have brought many changes for Historians of Netherlandish Art. The most significant of them, the HNA website, had been set in motion energetically by Larry Silver during his 1999-2000 term. By 2002 the website was fully functioning, and in 2003 it was improved immensely by the initiation of the list-serve. We hope you are taking advantage of its special features, many of them unique to the site and unavailable in hard copy. Among these are the Bibliography of Recent Articles (meticulously compiled first by Adriaen Waiboer and then by Anna Tummers), the on-line Membership Directory, and the many sections open to the general public, including the rich array of Links. Have you forgotten the name of a particular photo service or research facility? Googling doesn’t help? Then click on Links. We want to express our gratitude again to those of you who initially supported the creation of the website, and to those of you who continue to support its functioning. Under new leadership the website will continue to evolve. Already in the works are plans to translate and publish various articles currently available only in Dutch and German. Perhaps we will also establish an on-line journal. By the way, you will receive the new password from Kristin Belkin early in 2005.

Other changes during the past four years include the welcome expansion of HNA’s international membership, attributable in part to the immensely successful 2002 conference in Antwerp, the first held in Europe. The HNA Board now reflects this international complex-ion. Our Review of Books has a different structure now as well. Kristin Belkin serves as Administrative Secretary and Editor to the Editorial Board, helped by Field Editors Jacob Wisse (14th and 15th century Netherlandish art), Larry Silver (16th-century Netherlandish art and English, German, and French art), Fiona Healy (17th- and 18th-century Flemish art), and Stephanie Dickey (art of the 17th- and 18th-century Dutch Republic), all of whom have done exemplary work in soliciting reviews. I want to thank Kristin Belkin, Administrator of HNA, for her abundant flexibility and good cheer in response to these many changes.

The website and listserve should make organizing our next International Conference much easier than before. The conference will take place in Washington the second weekend in November 2006, in conjunction with the opening of the National Gallery’s exhibition on Netherlandish diptychs. By now organizers Aneta Georgievsk-Shine and Quint Gregory have appointed a Program Committee. We are immensely grateful to Perry Chapman, Melanie Gifford, Larry Silver, and Ron Spronk for agreeing to serve on it. Aneta and Quint are planning receptions at various embassies and at CASVA, along with much else. Stand by for more details in the coming months.

February 2005, in Atlanta, we hope you will attend the annual reception (watch your email for time and place) and the HNA-sponsored session, chaired by Matt Kavaler, “The Uses of Italy and Antiquity: Reviewing a Renaissance in the Netherlands and Germany, 1400-1700.” Looking ahead to the CAA in Boston in 2006, we want to thank Anne Lowenthal for agreeing to chair a session honoring Julius Held.

It has been my immense pleasure to serve HNA since 2001. I look forward, as President Emerita, to working with my successor for the next four-year term.

Alison McNeil Kettering
Carleton College

From the Editor

As Alison’s term as president of HNA comes to an end (February 2005), I would like to thank her, in the name of the entire membership, for her dedication to the organization, her loyalty, sense of responsibility and plain hard work. She served longer than any of her predecessors since it was during her tenure that we decided to extend the term for officers to four years. In addition to the day-to-day responsibilities (and Alison took those very seriously), she presided over the Antwerp conference in 2002 and has been involved in the preparations for the next HNA conference in 2006 (see her editorial). She recognized the importance of our book reviews and established proper editorial policies. What literally started out on my kitchen table, with me writing most reviews, has become a valuable review journal with field editors and reviewers who are specialists in their respective areas. But her biggest, indeed herculean achievement has been the establishment of our website, not made any easier by an initially reluctant and suspicious editor. Alison worked tirelessly at her task, questioning, probing, pushing when necessary (and it often was) her sometimes less than enthusiastic editor and webmaster. You all benefit from the result.

Alison, you will be a tough act to follow!
HNA News

HNA at CAA, Atlanta 2005

The HNA-sponsored session in Atlanta (February 16-19, 2005) will be chaired by Matt Kavaler (University of Toronto). His topic is “The Uses of Italy and Antiquity: Reviewing a Renaissance in the Netherlands and Germany, 1400-1700.” For more information, www.collegeart.org.

The reception and business meeting will take place on Thursday, February 17, from 5:30 – 7:00 pm in the Chardonnay Room of the Atlanta Marriott Marquis Hotel, 265 Peachtree Center Avenue.

HNA Fellowship

Reports from the 2004 Fellowship Recipients

Chiyo Ishikawa used her award to offset some of the photography costs for her book: The Retablo de Isabel la Católica by Juan de Flandes and Michel Sittow, Turnhout: Brepols, 2004. With the grant awarded by HNA it was possible to reproduce every painting in color. The book will be reviewed in the next issue of the HNA Newsletter (April 2005).

Jennifer Kilian also used her grant money to fund part of the color reproductions – 32 in total – for her monograph and catalogue raisonné The Paintings of Karel du Jardin (1626 Amsterdam – 1678 Venice), scheduled for publication by John Benjamins in February 2005.

Past HNA Fellowship recipients are: Amy Golahny, Angela Vanhaelen, Kate Rudy, Andrea Pearson, Laurie Harwood, Jochai Rosen, Emilie Gordenker, Jennifer Kilian, Chiyo Ishikawa.

Personalia

John Michael Montias Honorary Member of HNA

HNA has appointed John Michael Montias an Honorary Member of the organization. This category of membership celebrates those whose scholarly contributions we recognize as being uniquely significant. Michael Montias’s name will appear alongside those of Charles Cattler, Egbert Haverkamp Begemann, Eddy de Jongh, Seymour Slive, Susan Urbach, and Julius Held. Michael’s many publications and the inventory database that he developed have truly opened new pathways. These achievements – especially remarkable for their interdisciplinary nature – will continue to invigorate our field for generations to come. Although Michael held a prestigious post in Economics at Yale University, his interest in Netherlandish art developed early on. In 1943, he recently told me, he came across Wilhelm Bode’s gilt-edged folio volume on Rembrandt, a book that positively riveted his attention. He was then 14 years old, working as a volunteer in the small library of the Albright-Knox Art Gallery. His interest resurfaced in 1954 when he considered writing his dissertation for the Department of Economics at Columbia on the prices of Dutch paintings at auction, using the annotated catalogues in the Frick Art Reference Library. This did not work out, partly because in those cold-war days, one could get financial support for working on the price system in centrally planned economies but not on the prices of Dutch pictures.

The time was just not right. But once Michael met Egbert Haverkamp Begemann at Yale in the mid-1960s, his interest in Netherlandish art revived yet again. Egbert gave Michael his first lessons in connoisseurship and soon afterwards Michael began to read Dutch art history in a systematic fashion. In 1975, he received his first summer grant to compare art guilds in the Netherlands. This entailed learning not only present-day Dutch, but acquiring the ability to read seventeenth-century hands. I remember meeting him in 1978 during one of his subsequent periods of study. He offered to show me around the archive in Delft, my first experience in any archive. Such generosity was entirely typical of his character. It was only one of hundreds of similar acts of generosity he extended to younger scholars. Since many of these scholars are members of the Historians of Netherlandish Art, it seems highly appropriate that the organization should recognize him with honorary membership.

Alison McNeil Kettering
HNA President

Hubert von Sonnenburg died July 16, 2004. He was Sherman Fairchild Chairman of the Paintings Conservation Department at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. His contributions to Netherlandish art were numerous, including essays on the painting techniques of Vermeer (Metropolitan Museum Bulletin, 1973), Rubens (1980), Adriaen Brouwer (with Konrad Renger, 1986), and Rembrandt (in Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt, together with Walter Liedtke, 1995).

Correction

In the last Newsletter (April 2004) the name of Erik Duverger’s father was incorrectly given as also Erik. His name was in fact Jozef.

Al Acres (Princeton University) held a Kress Senior Research Fellowship in 2003. His topic of research: Renaissance Invention and Christ’s Haunted Infancy.

Maryan Ainsworth, Dagmar Eichberger, Ariane Faber Kolb, Ronda Kasl, Marina Belozerskaya, Till Borchert, Reindert Falkenburg, Laura Gelfand, Melanie Gifford, John Hand, Max Martens, Carol Purtle and Ron Sprok, all received Getty Collaborative Research Grants in 2002-03.

Holm Bevers (Kupferstickkabinett, Berlin) was a 2002-03 Getty Museum Guest Scholar. He is working on a critical catalogue of Rembrandt’s drawings in the Berlin printroom.

Albert Blankert (The Hague) was a 2002-03 Getty scholar. His topic of research: Rembrandt’s Selfportrait in Cologne.

Lorne Campbell (National Gallery, London) was a 2002-03 Getty Museum Guest Scholar. His work at the Getty was connected to his monographic study on Rogier van der Weyden.

Perry Chapman (University of Delaware) is the 2004-05 Samuel H. Kress Senior Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, Washington. Her subject of research is: The Painter’s Place in the Dutch Republic, 1604-1718.

Susan Dackerman is a Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute Research Fellow for 2004-2005.

John Decker (UC-Santa Barbara) is the 2003-2005 Kress Pre-Doctoral Fellow at Leiden University. His topic is: The ‘Technology of Salvation’ and the Art of Geertgen tot Sint Jans: Material Manifestations of Redemption Theology.

Meredith Hale (Columbia University) was the 2003 Kress Pre-Doctoral Research Fellow at the National Gallery of Art, Washington. Her topic of research: Rombout de Hooghe and the Birth of Political Satire.

Christopher Heuer was a 2002-03 Getty Fellow. His topic: The City Rehearsed: Hans Vredeman de Vries and the Performance of Architecture. This is the subject of his dissertation which has since been submitted to UC-Berkeley.

Douglas Hildebrecht (University of Michigan) was a 2002-2004 Kress Pre-Doctoral Fellow at Leiden University. His topic is: Capturing Nature in Paint: Otto Marseus van Schrieck (1619/20-1678) and the Development of the Nature Piece in 17th-Century European Art and Science.

Julie Berger Hochstrasser has been promoted to Associate Professor in the School of Art and Art History at the University of Iowa. She also has been awarded the Dean’s Scholar Award for excellence in teaching and research.

Susan Jones (Highland Park, NJ) held a 2002-03 Getty Postdoctoral Fellowship for her book: After Van Eyck: Repetition, Continuation, and the Market for Eyckian Painting, c.1430 to c.1460.

Walter Melion, formerly Johns Hopkins University, was appointed the Asa Griggs Candler Professor at Emory University, Atlanta.

Catherine Reynolds (London) was a 2002-03 Getty Museum Guest Scholar. Her topic is the physical relationship between text and image in fifteenth-century Netherlandish manuscripts.

Achim Timmermann has been appointed Assistant Professor in the Department of Art History at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Filip Vermeylen (University of Antwerp) was awarded the Bainton Prize for Art History from the Sixteenth-Century Society and Conference, for his recently published book: Painting for the Market. Commercialization of Art in Antwerp’s Golden Age, published by Brepols (to be reviewed).

Aadriaan Waiboer (New York University) was the 2003 Kress Pre-Doctoral Research Fellow at the National Gallery of Art, Washington. His topic of research: Gabriel Metsu (1629-1667): Life and Work. More recently, he has been appointed curator at the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin.

Elizabeth Wyckoff, formerly New York Public Library, has been appointed Associate Curator of Prints and Drawings at the Davis Museum and Cultural Center at Wellesley College.

Exhibitions

United States and Canada


Byzantium and the West. J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, September 14 – December 5, 2004. Investigates Byzantine manuscript tradition and its influence on countries such as Germany and Italy.


Rubens Drawings. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, January 14 – April 3, 2005. Curated by Anne-Marie Logan, with a catalogue by the curator and Michiel Plomp. The exhibition is being shown in different form in Vienna (see below). To be reviewed.


Memling’s Portraits. The Frick Collection, New York, October 6 – December 31, 2005. The exhibition opens in Madrid (see below).


Austria and Germany


Drawings by Rubens. Albertina, Vienna, September 15 – December 5, 2004; Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, January 14 – April 3, 2005. The Vienna showing includes oil sketches and paintings. Curated by Anne-Marie Logan (for publication, see above).

The Unfinished Print. Städelisches Kunstinstitut und Städtische Galerie, Frankfurt, October 7, 2004 – January 2, 2005. The exhibition, curated by Peter Parshall, originated at the National Gallery of Art, Washington. It was previously seen at the Frick Collection, New York (June 2 – August 15, 2004). With publication.


Rubens in Wien. Das Kunsthistorisches Museum, Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der Bildenden Künste and the Liechtenstein Museum each will be showing its Rubens paintings, December 5, 2004 – February 27, 2005. There will be one catalogue for all three collections.


Belgium


England and Scotland


France


Maître au Feuillage Brodé (Master of the Embroidered Foliage). Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille, May 13 – July 24, 2005. For the conference, planned in conjunction with the exhibition, see under Scholarly Activities.

The Netherlands


Carel Fabritius: de jonge meester. Mauritshuis, The Hague, September 24, 2004 – January 9, 2005. With catalogue by F. Duparc et al. (Zwolle: Waanders, ISBN 90-400-8987-6 [Dutch], 90-400-8989-2 [English], euro 50). The show will be seen in Schwerin (Germany) after The Hague and not before, as initially planned and reported in the previous Newsletter.


Het verloren paradijs. Frans Hals Museum, Haarlem, November 12, 2004 – February 20, 2005. At the centre of the exhibition is Jan Mostaert’s West Indies Landscape.


Spain


Switzerland


Other Countries

Estonia

Low Sky, Wide Horizon. The Art of the Low Countries in Estonia. Kadiorg Art Museum, Tallinn, September 1, 2004 – March 1, 2005. For the conference held in conjunction with the exhibition, see under Scholarly Activities.

Luxembourg


Exhibition Reviews

Flemish Landscape in Essen, Vienna and Antwerp

The Flemish landscape exhibition, which opened last autumn at the Villa Hügel in Essen, spent the winter and spring in the Kunsthistorisches Museum and ended in a slightly truncated form in the Koninklijk Museum in Antwerp this summer, was an ambitious and praiseworthy survey of two centuries of the great Flemish specialization. Consisting at its largest (in Vienna) of 138 exhibits lent chiefly by 55 public institutions, it was an impressive display and was accompanied by a thorough, attractive nearly all German/Austrian compiled catalogue. The Vienna showing must have had pride of place, as the Museum is to all intents the home of Pieter Bruegel the Elder, whose works there are not ‘allowed out’ (I have heard, however, that his paintings were not integrated with the rest of the show).

As was to be expected, the scale was impressive at the Villa Hügel, though the lighting, relying on spotlights, was oppressive and disconcerting as the shadow of one’s head fell on the painted surfaces. The display at Antwerp was for the most part blessed with daylight, but there was an unexpected lack-lustre atmosphere, even though Jan Brueghel’s and Rubens’s Eve Tempting Adam had made a triumphant return to the city where it was created.

In the absence of paintings by the great Bruegel, his son Jan Brueghel the Elder and Rubens were the heroes of the exhibition, though an accolade is due to Lucas van Valkenborch, not surprisingly as Alexander Wied was one of the curators. However, two works by Cornelis van Dalem and a very rarely seen Pieter Baltens show that masterpieces in the genre were not a monopoly of Pieter Bruegel about the middle of the sixteenth century. Baltens’s The Parable of Wheat and Tares, which is set in a great and intricately detailed panorama, is one of, if not the most important landscape of the time excepting Bruegel’s oeuvre.

At the Villa Hügel, the later landscapes were thematically arranged and catalogued. The sections were uneven in range and quality: disappointing for instance was the marine section. The inclusion of paintings by Jan Porcellis and Adam Willaerts was bizarre, as although both Flemings by birth, their work is only known by what they later produced in the north. Better would have been some representation of Andries van Eertveld and Jan Brueghel the Elder and a fuller acknowledgement, say, of Bonaventura Peeters not to speak of Gillis. Another oddity is the generous display of the work of Roelandt Savery, active chiefly in or around Prague and then in Utrecht. Can he really be claimed as Flemish?

Rubens and the small group of his followers (his greatest followers were in the north through the medium of Schelte’s prints) were treated separately; so here was a great opportunity lost as his work is sadly usually shown in isolation. In so far as his landscapes can be categorized, it would have been instructive to compare his achievements with the treatment of similar subjects by other masters. Thus the great Meleager and Atalanta from the Prado could have been displayed with the other wooded or forest landscapes and the limpid Cattle by a Stream from Vaduz with the river landscapes. A suitable work by Bril or Martin Ryckaert (one of the notable absentees from the exhibition) could have been found to display beside the Psyche and Jupiter from the Prado that Rubens seems to have thoroughly reworked.

There are other surprising omissions: for example David Teniers the Elder, Sebastian Vrancx and Peter Snayers. More names could be
added granted that the remit of the Villa Hügel show extended to 1680. The Antwerp show’s span ended 50 years earlier, so it is odd that it contained a landscape by Siberechts of 1684, which happily prefigures English sporting art of the eighteenth century.


Gregory Martin
London

---

Museum News

Not Pieter Codde but Rembrand

An article by Bernhard Schnackenburg (Kassel), which appeared in the June 12th, 2004 edition of the Frankfurter Allgemeinen Zeitung (FAZ), takes the unusual step of adding to Rembrandt’s oeuvre – de-attribution being the more common procedure. For the convenience of those HNA/Codart members who missed his article, the following translated summary gives a brief outline of his argument. The entire article “Rembrandt als Student” can be downloaded under www.faz-archiv.de, using the search words: Schnackenburg Rembrandt. The cost is euro 0.75. Those wishing to contact the author directly can do so under: Schnackenburg.Ks@t-online.de

Rembrandt as a Student

The painting *Student with a Pipe or Melancholy* (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille) has for decades enjoyed a degree of fame that is difficult to reconcile with its attribution to the kleinmeister Pieter Codde. The painting’s importance for the work of Carel Fabritius and Jan Vermeer has long been recognized. While conducting research on Jan Lievens, Schnackenburg established that in 1627/28 the circle around Rembrandt and Lievens included not only Jan Davidz. De Heem but also the Amsterdam artist Pieter Codde (see his article forthcoming in *Oud Holland*). Codde and Rembrandt influenced each other. The painting in Lille at first appeared as an attempt on Codde’s part to emulate Rembrandt in style and quality. However, the whole issue of authorship was thrown wide open after F.G. Meijer established that the monogram CP was a forgery. Schnackenburg proposes the *Student with a Pipe* is by Rembrandt, and in his extensive FAZ article provides support for this by examining earlier scholarly theories, comparing it with secure works in Rembrandt’s oeuvre and drawing attention to its stylistic features. He interprets the painting as a selfportrait and relates it to Rembrandt’s time at the University of Leiden, which began in May 1620. This was, he argues, not the brief phase that has always been assumed but lasted for the considerably longer period of about two years. The bored expression on the student’s face recalls Jan Orlers’s statement of 1641 that Rembrandt had “neither desire nor inclination” for academic pursuits, so that his parents were forced to take him from the university and place him as an apprentice with a painter. The Lille painting vividly contrasts with another selfportrait: his 1628 *Painter in his Studio* (MFA, Boston) where boredom and distraction have been replaced by focused concentration.


Amsterdam: The Rijksmuseum acquired Jan Steen’s Burgher of Delft and his Daughter. The painting had been at Perhyn Castle (Wales) for the past 150 years. See Rijksmuseum Dossier, by Wouter Kloek, ISBN 90-400-8727 (Dutch), 90-400-8817-9 (English), coming out in January 2005.

Brussels: At the beginning of 2004, a four-year project cataloguing the more than 50 paintings by or associated with Rubens was launched at the Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten. Project leader is Joost Vander Auwera; he is working with Natasha Peeters and Hélène Dubois.

Canterbury: The Royal Museum and Art Gallery acquired Van Dyck’s Portrait of Sir Basil Dixsil (c.1638).

Cologne: A diminutive winter scene by Esaias van de Velde was stolen from the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum in July 2004.

Glasgow: The Hunterian Art Gallery acquired Rubens’s drawing Head of a Bearded Old Man (pen and ink with white heightening). It is a preparatory study for Abraham in Abraham and Melchisedech of c.1625 (National Gallery of Art, Washington).

Houston (Texas): The Museum of Fine Arts in Houston has acquired its first Rembrandt, a 1633 oval Portrait of a Young Woman with a Lace Collar.

London: The newly authenticated Vermeer of a Young Woman Seated at the Virginals was sold at Sotheby’s in July 2004 for $30 million. The painting was authenticated by a committee consisting of four conservators (Martin Bijl, Libby Sheldon, Jørgen Wadum and Arie Wallert), two members of the Rembrandt Research Project (Ernst van de Wetering and Marieke de Winkel), Frits Duparc, director of the Mauritshuis, and Sotheby’s Gregory Rubinstein. The painting was sold to a private collector; it was on show in the Metropolitan Museum’s Vermeer and the Delft School in 2001, and is now on display at the Philadelphia Museum of Art (until March 30, 2005).

Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum acquired drawings by Cornelis Dusart, Peasants Playing Backgammon and Merry-Making in a Tavern, 1694, and Crispijn van den Broeck, Six Drawings Depicting the Creation and Fall of Man, 1575. Also recently acquired is a painting by Lucas Cranach the Elder, A Faun and His Family with a Stain Lion of 1526.

Rotterdam: 139 drawings and three prints, mainly by sixteenth-century German artists (including Holbein and Jacopo de’ Barbari’s Dead Jay), were recently located in Kyiv (Kiev), Ukraine. They belong to a group of 528 drawings that had been missing since their removal from the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen during World War II. They were on view in the exhibition “Holbein, Baldung and Beham. German Master Drawings from the Koenigs Collection. Return of a Lost Treasure,” July 9 – September 26, 2004. The show was accompanied by a catalogue (see under New Titles).


Vienna: Since its re-opening in 2003, the Albertina has staged a series of spectacularly successful exhibitions, while the study room remains closed. According to latest reports however, the new study room is scheduled to open in the summer of 2005.

Vienna/Moscow: Two seventeenth-century Dutch still lifes by Willem van Aelst and Rachel Ruysch, respectively, which prior to 1945 belonged to the Akademie der bildenden Künste, supposedly are in a Russian private collection. Questions of ownership need to be resolved before they can be returned to Vienna. A similar fate befell Rubens’ Tarquin and Lucretia, once at the Sansasouci Palace in Potsdam, now owned by the Moscow business man Vladimir Logvinenko. (From The Art Newspaper, May 2004.)

Weimar: On September 2, 2004, the Anna-Amalia Bibliothek suffered catastrophic losses through fire. It is estimated that 50,000 volumes, mostly from the 16th–18th century, have been destroyed.

Wittenberg: The ‘Lutherhaus’ has been extensively remodelled and renovated. The newly restored building (opened March 2003) intends to show Luther, the man and his work, as well as his later impact in the environment of his house. Excellent guides assist the visitor: Martin Treu, Martin Luther in Wittenberg: ein biografischer Rundgang, Wittenberg, 2003; Volkmar Joestel, Jutta Strehle, Luthers Bild und Lutherbild. Ein Rundgang durch die Wirkungsgeschichte, Wittenberg, 2003; Antje Heling, Zu Haus bei Martin Luther: ein alltagsgeschichtlicher Rundgang, Wittenberg, 2002.

Scholarly Activities

Conferences to Attend

United States

Diffusion of the Burgundian Court Style and the Legacy of Philip the Bold

The Cleveland Museum of Art, October 30, 2004. Held in conjunction with the exhibition Dukes and Angels: Art from the Court of Burgundy.

Elisabeth Delahaye (Louvre), Patronage and the Valois: Philip the Bold and his Brothers.

Till-Holger Borchert (Groeningemuseum, Brugge), Painting at the Burgundian Court: The Sieneese and Netherlandish Currents.

Ann Kelders (Bibliothèque Royale, Brussels), The Library of Philip the Bold and Margaret of Flanders and the Tradition of Book Collecting.

Sherry C.M. Lindquist (St. Louis University), The Chartreuse de Champmol: The Foundation, its Plan and Design.

Renate Prochno (Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Salzburg), The Chartreuse de Champmol: The Tombs, The Well of Moses and the Genesis of a Burgundian Court Style.

Sophie Jugie (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dijon), The Diffusion of the Burgundian Court Style and the Legacy of Philip the Bold: A Summary.
Gerard ter Borch: Contemplating the Interior

National Gallery of Art, Washington, November 7, 2004. In conjunction with the Ter Borch exhibition (see under Exhibitions).


Marjorie E. Wieseman (Cincinnati Art Museum), What’s Left Unsaid: Communication and Narrative in Paintings by Gerard ter Borch.

Arie Wallert (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), Ter Borch’s Materials and Methods of Painting. How Did He Do It?

Nanette Salomon (College of Staten Island), Double Trouble: Gesina ter Borch and Pendant Painting.

Alison Kettering (Carleton College), Ter Borch’s Grinder’s Family and its Questions.

For more information: www.nga.gov/programs/terborchabs.shtm

Looking at Seventeenth-Century Painting. A Symposium in Memory of Leonard J. Slatkes

The Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York, November 12, 2004.

Jeffrey Muller (Brown), Caravaggio’s Madonna of the Rosary in the Antwerp Dominican Church.

Albert Blankert (The Hague), Hendrick ter Bruggen Revisited.


Susan Koslow (Professor Emerita, Brooklyn College and The Graduate Center, City University of New York), Aristotle’s Apron: Science and Epistemology in Rembrandt’s Aristotle with a Bust of Homer.

Eddy de Jongh (Professor Emeritus, University of Utrecht), Signs from Heaven. Traces of Astrology in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Netherlandish Art.

For details see www.gc.cuny.edu

Peter Paul Rubens’s Oil Sketches and the Creative Process

Bruce Museum of Arts and Sciences, Greenwich (Connecticut), January 22, 2005. The symposium is organized in conjunction with the exhibition Drawn by the Brush: Oil Sketches by Peter Paul Rubens (see under Exhibitions).

Speakers: Gregory Martin (London), Nico Van Hout (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp), Alexander Vergara (Museo del Prado), Michiel Plomp (Metropolitan Museum of Art).

CAA 93rd Annual Conference

Atlanta, Georgia, February 16-19, 2005.

Sessions chaired by HNA members:

Wayne Franks (Syracuse), Historical Anthropology and the Art of Early Modern Europe.

Martha Hollander (Hofstra), Art and Shame.

Matt Kavaler (University of Toronto), The Uses of Italy and Antiquity: Reviewing a Renaissance in the Netherlands and Germany, 1400-1700. Sponsored by HNA.

Carol Purtle (University of Memphis), Art of the Northern Renaissance (Open Session).

Diane Wolffthal (Arizona State) and Anne Derbes, The Ideal of Poverty, the Rise of Capitalism, and Visual Culture in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe.

For more information see www.collegeart.org.

“Going Dutch:’ Holland in America, 1609-2009

University of Denver, March 25-26, 2005

Europe

Die Macht des Ausdrucks. Emotionen in Nahsicht


HNA-related papers:

Ulrich Heinen (Wuppertal), Stoisch trauernd. Bewältigungsstrategien bei Rubens.

Julia Seipel (Frankfurt), Von der compunctio zur compassio. Überlegungen zur Einsamkeit Christi in Bruegels Wiener ‘Kreuztragung.’

Carel Fabritius

The Royal Library, The Hague, December 2, 2004. Organized by the Mauritshuis and the Netherlands Institute for Art History (RKD), in conjunction with the exhibition (see under Exhibitions).

Speakers: Christopher Brown, Frits Duparc, Walter Liedtke, Volker Manuth, Peter Schatborn, Jürgen Wadum and Ernst van de Wetering.

For more information and registration: communicatie@rkd.nl, or see http://www.rkd.nl (under Activities).

CODART Acht: Dutch and Flemish Art in Sweden

Haarlem, March 6-8, 2005. Study trip to Stockholm will take place in September 2005.

Crown and Veil: The Art of Female Monasticism


Details on the exhibition and the proposed areas of discussion can be found at the following websites: http://www.ruhrlandmuseum.de/ http://www.bundeskunsthalle.de/ausstellungen/frauenkloester/index_e.htm
**Maître au Feuillage Brodé**

Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille, June 24-25 (tentative). Organized in conjunction with the exhibition on the Master of the Embroidered Foliage.

Tentative list of speakers

Till Borchert (Groningemuseum, Bruges), Lorne Campbell (National Gallery, London), Albert Châtelet (Strasbourg), G. Steyaert (Vrije Universiteit, Brussels), Didier Martens (Université Libre, Brussels), W. Whitney (Université Paris), Philippe Lorentz (Université Strasbourg), C. Perier d’Ieteren (Université Libre, Brussels).

**Flemish and Dutch Painters in Central Europe and Northern Italy in the Late Seventeenth Century**

Ljubljana (Slovenia), October 20-23, 2005. For more information, check codart.nl

**Past Conferences and Symposia**

**A House of Art: Rubens as Collector**


Organized by the curators, Kristin Lohse Belkin and Fiona Healy, the first day was spent in the exhibition. The focus was mainly on Rubens, with participants discussing issues of authorship and dating, as well as his copies after other artists, especially Titian, and his fable for retouching.

On the second day the participants moved to the Rubenianum where attention was given over to collecting. The speakers were as follows:

Filip Vermeylen, How to buy a painting? Outlets for Art Sales in Seventeenth-Century Antwerp.

Nils Büttner, Rubens at the Court of Margaret of Lalaing.


Zirka Filipczak, Rubens’s Collection; Van Veen’s Influence.

Bert Timmermans, The Elite as Middlemen and Collectors in the Antwerp Art World of the Seventeenth Century (1585-1700).

**Peter Paul Rubens zwischen Genua und Lille. Wege eines internationalen Künstlers im europäischen Barock**

Kunstgeschichtliches Institut Frankfurt/Main, July 16, 2004.

Ezia Gavazza (University of Genoa), Rubens and Genoa: The Freedom of Baroque Space.

Fiona Healy (Mainz), Re-Assembling Rubens’s House of Art.

Justus Lange (Staatliche Museen, Kassel), Zwischen Lille und Braunschweig: Die Kasseler Ausstellung “Pan und Syrinx, eine Erotische Jagd”: Vorgeschichte und Ergebnisse. (The exhibition and its catalogue are reviewed in this issue.)

Arnauld Brejon de Lavergnée (formerly Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille), Die Hauptthemen der Rubens Ausstellung in Lille.

**Rubens - Barocke Leidenschaften**

Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig, organized together with the Bergische Universität Wuppertal, October 4, 2004. A one-day symposium held in conjunction with the exhibition of the same title.

Gregory Martin (London), Rubens and English Politics.


Gero Seelig (Schwerin), Wine and Women: The Schwerin Lot and the Passions for Rubens’s Art in Holland.

Kirsten Lee Bierbaum (Cologne), Humour in Rubens and Giulio Romano.

Natasja Peeters (Brussels), Quintessence. Questions about the Brussels Paracelsus Portrait.

Colette Nativel (Paris), Rubens et les couleurs de la passion.

Andreas Thielemann (Rome), Constantia. Rubens and Stoicism.

**Petrarch and the Arts**

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, October 22-23, 2004.

Included paper by Leopoldine Prosperetti (University of Maryland at Baltimore County), Petrarch and the Low Countries: The Petrarch Master, the Bruegel Dynasty and the Human Condition.
Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries


This volume is number 14 of the *Le dessins sous-jacent et la technologie dans la peinture* series, which has been edited and organized biannually since 1975 by the indefatigable team of Hélène Verougstraete and Roger van Schoute. Like the preceding volumes, this book focuses on topical matters pertaining to the scientific examination of underdrawings and painted surfaces in works dating roughly from 1400-1600. It brings together thirty-one essays, written in French and English, presented by thirty-eight international participants in colloquium meetings held at Bruges and Rotterdam in September of 2001. Many of the essays are devoted to the paintings of Hieronymus Bosch, his followers, and imitators, marking two important exhibitions dedicated to Bosch held in that same year – one in Rotterdam, at the Boijmans Van Beuningen Museum, and the other in ’s-Hertogenbosch, birthplace of the painter. The book’s organization reflects this emphasis in its division into two nearly equal sections. Part I is devoted to problems in Bosch studies, and Part II concerns various other Netherlandish and Italian painters and workshops. The topics and methodologies explored in both sections are diverse, as are the ways in which the authors apply technical information to the study of art history. It is therefore both appropriate and necessary, given the brevity of this review, to highlight major themes and foci, delineated by representative essays and groups of essays, rather than to deal superficially with each in turn. I hope I will be forgiven the inevitable omissions that result.

Questions of attribution and chronology in paintings from the circle of Hieronymus Bosch are especially difficult, made more so by the lack of documentation concerning the artist and his workshop. The total number of works generally agreed to be by his hand ranges from thirty to forty in the literature. None of these shows a date and only seven bear his name, though the artist’s signature was freely employed by later followers and copyists. The paintings attributed to Bosch also vary significantly in their styles of underdrawing and application of paint; some even display different styles and techniques within the same panel. The best hope for clarification of these inconsistencies seems to lie with scientific analysis.

It is therefore appropriate that Part I of the book, devoted to Bosch and his followers, begins with an essay on dendrochronology by Peter Klein, whose tireless application of this process to the study of panel paintings has contributed enormously to the field of art history. Dendrochronology, which can establish the age of wooden panel supports by deducing when the tree in question was felled, has, in recent years, become an important tool for the study of Bosch’s paintings. Klein’s essay carefully and objectively considers the advantages and limits of the process, conceding that the number of years that a panel may have languished in an artist’s workshop before being painted is still impossible to know with certainty. Notable
among the other sixteen essays in this section are several that examine the phenomenon of copies after Bosch. Catherine Metzger’s study of Bosch’s so-called Death and the Miser admirably integrates the technical examination of the panel’s pentimenti with iconographical interpretation, and makes intelligent conclusions as to why certain changes may have been made. Susan Urbach’s and Carmen Garrido’s essay on “The Copy of the Garden of Earthly Delights in Budapest” and Peter van den Brink’s “Hieronymus Bosch as Model Provider for a Copyright Free Market” offer probing insights into the ways and means by which Bosch’s paintings were reproduced and transmitted via workshop practices. Also included in this section are the stunning revelations by Friso Lammertse and Annetje Roorda Boersma concerning Bosch’s so-called Peddler in Rotterdam, which now must be viewed as the unified exterior panels of a triptych that once included the Ship of Fools (Paris), Death of the Miser (Washington) and Allegory of Intemperance (New Haven).

Part II of the book consists of fourteen essays, including several on Italian painting, followed by a very useful bibliography compiled by Anne Dubois, which lists publications dating 2000-2002 on the technical examination of paintings. The first essay in this section, by Molly Faries and Maximiliaan P.J. Martens, on “Painting in Antwerp before Iconoclasm” is an expert integration of art historical method with technical studies. It offers a tantalizing taste of the socio-economic approach that will be followed in their research project in progress, supported by the Dutch organization for Scientific Research (NWO). Linda Jansen provides another excellent analysis of the Antwerp scene in her essay on workshop involvement in the production of multiple replicas of Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s famous Last Supper. Most illuminating are several essays in which images provided by infrared reflectography provide the basis for placing undated paintings within an artist’s stylistic development. Among these, Carol Purtle’s and Maryan Ainsworth’s studies are noteworthy, Purtle’s for her finely reasoned examination of Jan van Eyck’s Madonna in a Church, and Ainsworth’s for her revelatory essay on van Eyck’s Virgin and Child with the Canon van der Paele.

There is much to praise about this collection. The strongest essays admirably integrate scientific evidence with art historical methodology. However, as is to be expected in a volume of this breadth, the quality of the contributions is uneven. This is most evident in the essays that attempt iconographical analysis, where the most current scholarship often goes uncited, and limitations of space do not allow proper analysis. Also unfortunate is the paucity of images in some essays, even to the point of not illustrating the main image. All quibbles aside, however, this book, like the previous volumes in the series, provides an inestimable service to the field. In the past, art historians have been reluctant to take on the identification of Lochner’s own press-brocade mold, but still used in combination with the older underdrawing technique native to Cologne. Lochner’s 1447 application for Cologne citizenship, made at the time of his election to the city council, presupposes the period of residence in the city of at least ten years required by local statute. A recent discovery proves that the Altarpiece of the Patron Saints, long known as the Dombild, was commissioned in 1435, and was seen in place in the city hall in about 1440 by the Lüneberg painter Hans Bornemann. This lays to rest both Brigitte Corley’s Dombild Master, as well as Michael Wolfson’s justifiable concern for the leap of faith required in identifying the Dombild as the triptych by ‘Meister Steffan’ that Albrecht Dürer paid to view, since Dürer mentioned neither the subject nor the location of the work. Chaphuis presents other strong circumstantial evidence for the identification of Lochner’s Dombild as the city hall commission, for the Ratskapelle, built on the site of the former synagogue (1426, built two years after the expulsion of the city’s Jews) was dedicated to St. Mary in Jerusalem, and the council had long held papal permission to have Mass celebrated before its meetings. The iconography of the patron saints, Ursula, Gereon and the Magi constituted a specific statement of civic pride, and underscored Cologne’s role as a holy city. Chaphuis surmises that Lochner had seen the Ghent Altarpiece before going to Cologne, noting the influence of the Van Eyck Holy Virgins in the Ursula panel of the Dombild. Rather than postulate a period of training in an Eyckian workshop, however, as Otto Förster (1923) had done, he theorizes that Lochner may initially have been trained in a goldsmith’s workshop instead – a not unreasonable suggestion in light of the careers of such artists as Botticelli and Albrecht Dürer. He notes, furthermore, that Lochner’s style of precise rendering of three-dimensional objects sets an important precedent for Martin Schongauer’s modeling system, and that Lochner’s brilliant color and porcelain-like flesh tones have their counterparts in émail en ronde-brosse, rather than in painting.

Reflectography sheds valuable new light on the extent of collaboration that must have gone on in Lochner’s workshop, for some of his most elaborate underdrawings underlie portions of the Dombild that were completed in the painting stage by an assistant. It
also reveals passages in which Lochner seems to have turned over the underdrawing to an assistant, whose work the artist himself then corrected in the paint layers. Dendrochronology makes it clear that the Raleigh St. Jerome, formerly seen as a piece linking Lochner to early training in Flanders, must have been painted after 1439, and the reflectograms show underdrawing totally unrelated to Lochner.

The book includes a complete catalogue of the paintings and their related works, as well as appendices comprising Truus van Bueren’s modern English translations of the documents, including those previously brought to light by J.J. Merlo and Carl Aldenhaven.

Jane Campbell Hutchison
University of Wisconsin-Madison


A budding Jacquemart de Hesdin scholar from Mons or a slightly overwhelmed college freshman from Namur would do well to pick up this lucidly crafted volume, designed to guide them over the practical hurdles of writing about and practicing art history. References are updated in this second edition, which is organized into four broad sections – each moving the student into progressively more focused experience of and thinking about a subject. Though accommodating researchers of ancient and modern art alike, the guide does (naturally) reflect the particular expertise and interests of its authors, Roger Van Schoute and Hélène Verougstraete, whose most recent work on the scientific examination of northern European paintings is reviewed elsewhere in this newsletter.

Jacob Wisse
Adelphi University


What do HNA members read when they go on holidays? Some of us carry a lot of new books and catalogues, discussed in the HNA Newsletters; others buy a good novel or thriller and try to forget HNA for a couple of days or weeks. However, to those of you who want to combine fun reading with HNA, and who can read Spanish, I would like to recommend this excellent and funny thriller, in which fiction and the concerns of HNA are combined.

The author, born 1963, is an Argentinian psychoanalyst who became a successful novelist – in his country and internationally – since the publication in 1996 of El Anatomista. El secreto de los flamencos is a historical thriller in which Francesco Monterga, a Florentine painter of the late Quattrocento, and the brothers Greg and Dirk Van Mander of Bruges act as bitter rivals. Greg, the older brother, now blind, possesses the secret of perfect oil painting. Each chapter of the book bears a pigment as title: Rojo bermellon, Azul de ultramar and so on, until the final one: Coloris in status purus. One of Monterga’s apprentices, Hubert van der Hans, spent ten years with the Van Mander brothers and is now spying in Monterga’s library. The plot, full of intrigues and crimes, leaves the reader spellbound till the last page when all is revealed. The author evokes Florence and Bruges in a text full of nudges to art history. The cover illustration is a close-up of Van der Weyden’s Portrait of a Lady in the National Gallery of Art, Washington.

I enjoyed very much reading this postmodern pseudo-historical novel while spending some days on the shores of Lago di Garda this summer.

Guy Delmarcel
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Sixteenth Century


For over a decade, Mark Meadow has explored how the humanist study of rhetoric informed the early Netherlandish “period eye.” His first publication on this topic, in 1992, investigated the structure of knowledge in Bruegel’s Netherlandish Proverbs; his most recent – Pieter Bruegel the Elder’s Netherlandish Proverbs and the Practice of Rhetoric – returns to and expands upon this earlier work. The title is both straightforwardly descriptive and deceptively modest. Meadow does limit his interpretive field to a single painting. Yet his book offers far broader insight into habits of mind inculcated in urban elites by a system of public education based in classical rhetoric, and into the ways these inflected Netherlandish visual culture. In the process, he reveals intellectual sophistication behind images that may, at first, appear naïve. He argues persuasively that Netherlandish Proverbs served as a multivalent conversation piece for an educated audience, rather than simply as a moralizing sermon on human failing.

Meadow first analyzes Bruegel’s formal strategy in ordering the vast body of information in the painting. He identifies thematic clusters of proverbs marked by architectural settings, axial arrangements, and parallel gestures. For example, Bruegel collects adages relating to hunger in the image’s hovel, while he locates those concerning wastefulness near its castle (38). One vivid horizontal register includes four figures shitting in three separate proverbs, as well as no fewer than six sets of exposed buttocks, punctuated by a portly man “pissing at the moon” (42–46). The echoing body registers of a burgher who “casts roses before swine” and of a nobleman who “spins the world on his thumb” underscore these sayings’ similarities and differences (44–45). Meadow wisely attempts neither an exhaustive catalogue of the proverbs themselves nor of the artist’s techniques for interrelating them. Rather he points out how spatial intersections among Bruegel’s associative skeins allowed for myriad visual (and conversational) routes through the painting.
Meadow next explores how Bruegel’s image relates to three sixteenth-century humanist preoccupations: obsession with proverbs, interest in collecting, and the study of formal rhetoric. He provides an overview of Netherlandish proverb literature from Erasmus’ Latin Adagia of 1500 through Symon Andriessoon’s mid-century compendium of Dutch spreukwoorden, thereby tracking the spread of humanist interest in adages from Latin and Greek into the vernacular. Significantly, he correlates this movement with increased opportunity for social advancement among individuals (such as Andriessoon and, implicitly, many in Bruegel’s audience) whose education did not extend to classical languages. Meadow also associates proverb collecting with the learned passion for Wunderkammern – those assemblages of diverse natural and man-made artifacts which operated as microcosms of the physical world and human accomplishment. He further traces the thematic clusters in Bruegel’s painting to Erasmus’ and Agricola’s ‘notebook systems’ of knowledge, themselves derived from the spatial loci of Classical rhetoric. In his final chapters, Meadow asks how Bruegel’s audiences would have understood the self-consciously derivative nature of this and other of his paintings, with their references to and elaborations upon imagery by Hieronymus Bosch, Joachim Patinir, and Frans Hogenberg. He finds his answer in the writings of the artist’s contemporaries – Guicciardini, Lampsonius, Ortelius – who describe Bruegel’s work in the classicizing critical vocabulary of imitatio and emulatio: the process of gaining and displaying knowledge of an earlier master’s works, and the competitive effort to surpass them.

Meadow offers compelling evidence that humanist metacritical discourse played an important role in both the production and reception of Netherlandish Proverbs. His study makes available new rhetorical tools for the interpretation of sixteenth-century imagery, and broadens our understanding of how period mentalities shaped viewing practices. Nevertheless, I find Pieter Bruegel the Elder’s Netherlandish Proverbs not quite satisfying, for Meadow stops short of reintegrating his rhetorical discoveries into a balanced reading of the painting. To be fair, this was never his goal. Meadow states explicitly that his concern is “with the synchronic intellectual context of Bruegel’s painting and not the diachronic pictorial context” (159, n. 27). But by maintaining this narrow focus, he leaves behind a curiously dematerialized and Italianized Netherlandish Proverbs. In the end, the artwork seems more a rational construct than a vivid object offering sensual delight and psychological insight; more a demonstration piece of imported erudition than a celebration (if ironic) of local artistry, native wisdom, and human foible. Surely its demonstration piece of imported erudition than a celebration (if ironic) of local artistry, native wisdom, and human foible. Surely its reception of the Latin title of Nadal’s book, opposed by Homann’s reader-friendly English. Indeed, even when Melion quotes passages from The Infancy Cycle, he does so through his own translations rather than using those made available by Homann. It is hard to recognize the same text behind these two translations. Homann’s purpose is stated straightforwardly in “A Note about Translation.” He wants to change Nadal’s complex, humanist Latin prose into English that can be followed by modern readers schooled on TV sound bites and Newsweek journalism. Since, for Homann, S.J., the text retains intact its original religious character, his translation enters directly into the living Jesuit spiritual tradition. But for Melion the Adnotationes are the object, if not exactly of historical analysis, then at least of learned commentary in the manner of sixteenth-century humanism. Instead of readability, it seems as if he wants to demonstrate through his translations that Nadal’s texts were conceived and formulated in a past tradition of ideas, structures, and terms. Although it is perfectly valid to offer the passages as historical artifacts, one might expect that this scholarly approach would be supported by the Latin texts, enabling readers to judge for themselves the accuracy of translations. In the body of his essay Melion inconsistently quotes Latin texts sometimes with, and sometimes without, an English translation or paraphrase. In so doing, Melion addresses an ideal learned audience that may no longer exist. This reader headed straight for the dictionary.

Although difficult to read, Melion’s essay rewards patience by tracing the intricate connections between vision and spiritual knowledge that run through some chapters of Nadal’s book. Each chapter starts with an engraving that illustrates sequentially the gospel reading of the week, with the places and successive events marked by letters that match descriptions in a table at the bottom of the sheet; below these markers also agree with a more expansive, lettered set of annotations in the text that follows the gospel reading itself.

To make the most of his theme, Melion focuses attention on a small group of chapters, selected from the whole book rather than from just the Infancy Cycle, in which vision and seeing play an active part in the narrative, even becoming a metaphor for the process of meditation itself. For example, in Christ’s appearance to the apostles after the resurrection, faith is confirmed by sight and by Christ’s statement that all power is given to him. These are things we can make present in spirit through meditation. Melion convincingly places the beginning of this spiritual journey in the engraving that moves the


This book contains two separate and very different parts. First, in an introductory study (pp. 1-96), Walter S. Melion closely scrutinizes The Art of Vison in Jerome Nadal’s Adnotationes et Meditations in Evangelia. Melion provides an initial general account of format and function, a summary of previous scholarship on the Adnotationes, and a short life of Nadal (1507-1580). Second, the text of The Infancy Narratives from Nadal’s Annotations and Meditations on the Gospels, accompanied by reproductions of the original Wierix brothers engravings, is given in a complete translation by Frederick A. Homann, S.J. (pp. 97-180). Homann also attaches “Some Notes and References” at the end, intended to clarify theological and doctrinal issues in Nadal’s text that may be obscure to twenty-first-century readers.

Divergent purposes already are evident in Melion’s scholarly adherence to the Latin title of Nadal’s book, opposed by Homann’s reader-friendly English. Indeed, even when Melion quotes passages from The Infancy Cycle, he does so through his own translations rather than using those made available by Homann. It is hard to recognize the same text behind these two translations. Homann’s purpose is stated straightforwardly in “A Note about Translation.” He wants to change Nadal’s complex, humanist Latin prose into English that can be followed by modern readers schooled on TV sound bites and Newsweek journalism. Since, for Homann, S.J., the text retains intact its original religious character, his translation enters directly into the living Jesuit spiritual tradition. But for Melion the Adnotationes are the object, if not exactly of historical analysis, then at least of learned commentary in the manner of sixteenth-century humanism. Instead of readability, it seems as if he wants to demonstrate through his translations that Nadal’s texts were conceived and formulated in a past tradition of ideas, structures, and terms. Although it is perfectly valid to offer the passages as historical artifacts, one might expect that this scholarly approach would be supported by the Latin texts, enabling readers to judge for themselves the accuracy of translations. In the body of his essay Melion inconsistently quotes Latin texts sometimes with, and sometimes without, an English translation or paraphrase. In so doing, Melion addresses an ideal learned audience that may no longer exist. This reader headed straight for the dictionary.

Although difficult to read, Melion’s essay rewards patience by tracing the intricate connections between vision and spiritual knowledge that run through some chapters of Nadal’s book. Each chapter starts with an engraving that illustrates sequentially the gospel reading of the week, with the places and successive events marked by letters that match descriptions in a table at the bottom of the sheet; below these markers also agree with a more expansive, lettered set of annotations in the text that follows the gospel reading itself.

To make the most of his theme, Melion focuses attention on a small group of chapters, selected from the whole book rather than from just the Infancy Cycle, in which vision and seeing play an active part in the narrative, even becoming a metaphor for the process of meditation itself. For example, in Christ’s appearance to the apostles after the resurrection, faith is confirmed by sight and by Christ’s statement that all power is given to him. These are things we can make present in spirit through meditation. Melion convincingly places the beginning of this spiritual journey in the engraving that moves the

Charlotte M. Houghton,
Pennsylvania State University
viewer to devotion. When the disciples meet Christ on the way to Emmaus, he disguises himself, an innocent deception that prompts meditation, suggesting spiritual exercises on the necessity of Christ’s suffering on the road to salvation. Christ’s divinity, then revealed to sight. The blind man of Jericho is prompted by faith to ask Christ for help, and his faith is answered by grace that provides sight.

Melion subtly unravels the intricate connections woven between physical and spiritual sight, present and eternal time, crossing between images and meditations. He always makes sense and writes clearly. As a result the analysis is stimulating and instructive, a useful essay to read and consult. Yet the essay works more as a commentary than as a history. One does not really come away understanding Nadal’s position in a history of visual images used for meditation. It is even difficult to figure out how Nadal’s approach to meditation differs significantly from what Ignatius of Loyola had set out earlier in his Spiritual Exercises. No attempt at all is made to situate the engravings in a larger tradition of meditation narratives, for example, in relation to the spiritual pilgrimages that Reindert Falkenburg has proposed as the underlying structure of Joachim Patinir’s landscapes (Joachim Patinir, Landscape as an Image of the Pilgrimage of Life, trans. Michael Hoyle, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1988). Nor does Melion make any reference to a history of book illustration in which the Adnotationes fits (see The Illustrations of Books Published by the Moretuses, Plantin-Moretus Museum, Antwerp, 1996). Sometimes his commentary becomes confusing, because it is hard to see where a paraphrase of Nadal ends and Melion’s own opinion begins.

Thus Melion’s essay makes a real contribution to our knowledge of links – between the sense of sight as understood in the sixteenth century, religious pictures, and religious meditation. He builds on solid foundations. Homann’s translation of The Infancy Cycle from Nadal’s book is consistently readable, and the quality of the illustrations is excellent. It is also gratifying that the Wierixx’s engravings are reproduced in color, thus conveying the tonal richness of their work. An added feature of the book, slipped inside the back cover, is a CD-ROM containing high resolution scans of all 153 engravings from the 1607 edition of the Adnotationes. It allows magnification of details up to 3 x. Beyond that the images disintegrate into pixels.

Two more volumes are planned. Vols. 2 and 3 will present translations of The Passion Narratives and The Resurrection Narratives from Nadal’s Annotations, though without explanation about why these sections have been chosen. In the Preface Joseph F. Chorpenning, O.S.F.S., describes Melion’s study as a thorough introduction to Nadal, his book, and its images. So one wonders whether the subsequent volumes will be illuminated by further interpretive studies.

Jeffrey Muller
Brown University

Seventeenth-Century Flemish


Despite the fact that three times during the second half of the twentieth century the need to pay death duties or raise funds for other reasons led to the departure of substantial groups of drawings, in terms of its range and quality, the Duke of Devonshire’s collection at Chatsworth remains second only to the Royal Collection amongst private collections of Old Master Drawings in Britain. It is also the only one of the many great drawings collections formed in eighteenth-century England that has survived in anything approaching its original form; some drawings were added after the early nineteenth century, and others left in 1957, 1984 and 1988, but the disposals are well documented, allowing us to form a very clear picture of how the collection was constituted in the early/mid eighteenth century.

Although the 4th Earl and 1st Duke of Devonshire (1640/41-1707) did buy drawings (for example the 14 Guercino landscapes acquired sometime between 1681 and 1689 from the artist’s nephew, Benedetto Gennari, who was then working at the English court), the key figure in the creation of the Chatsworth drawings collection was William Cavendish, the 2nd Duke (1673-1729). He seems to have been buying as early as 1693-94, at the 2nd sale from the Lely collection and the two Lankrink sales, and clearly continued to be a very active collector for the rest of his life, benefiting from the advice of Jonathan Richardson the Elder. Amongst his more successful art market forays were the acquisition of a number of lots at the 1717 sale that dispersed many of the drawings originating from the collection of Padre Resta and subsequently owned by John, Lord Somers, and his 1723/24 purchase in Rotterdam of at least 225 drawings from the estate of Nicolaes Flinck. Including, amongst many other highlights, the famous Rembrandt landscapes, Van Dyck portraits and Leonardo caricatures, the Flinck collection had also been targeted by Pierre Crozat, but the Duke snatched the drawings out from under the nose of the great French collector. As late as 1728, only months before his death, he bought the Claude Lorrain Liber Veritatis, with its 200 highly important drawings by the master. This was a hard act to follow, and no subsequent member of the family was to match the 2nd Duke’s contribution to the drawings collection, although the 4th Duke’s marriage to the daughter of Lord Burlington in 1748 did bring in important drawings by Palladio, Inigo Jones and Rubens, and the 6th Duke bought the majority, if not perhaps the most important, of the drawings by Callot.

The composition of the Chatsworth collection reflects the date and method of its formation. As in other collections that were largely gathered in the early eighteenth century by one or two individuals relying on their own taste and the specific opportunities that presented themselves, there are highly important, and often very numerous, groups of drawings by certain artists, but nothing at all by other contemporaries. Just like the Royal Collection, where there are unparalleled holdings of Avercamp, Canaletto, Guercino and Sebastiano Ricci, but not a single study by Rembrandt, so here we have disproportionately fine groups of drawings by artists such as Van Dyck, Claude, Callot and, of course, Rembrandt, within the context of a collection of Northern drawings that is very far from encyclopaedic. This is surely because in the early eighteenth century, albums of drawings originating from the studios of seventeenth-
century artists often still remained intact, reflecting both the preferred method of storage of drawings, and the simple fact that not so much time had actually passed since the drawings were made. Whereas by the mid nineteenth century many Old Master drawings had already been circulated on the market as individual sheets, in about 1700 there had often not been time for this to happen. Nor was the market for individual, separately mounted sheets yet highly developed. Thus the album of Rembrandt landscape drawings that had passed from the studio of the artist via his pupil Govaert Flink to the latter’s son, Nicolaes, was still intact when acquired, with the rest of the Flink collection, by the 2nd Duke of Devonshire in 1723/24 (little more than half a century after Rembrandt’s death).

Our understanding of the overall nature, scope and quality of the collection has been immeasurably enhanced by the publication of the magnificent, boxed, five-volume catalogue of the Northern drawings at Chatsworth, written by the late Michael Jaffé, which describes – and perhaps more importantly reproduces in generally excellent, large-size color illustrations – nearly 1,000 drawings of these schools. Together with the four volumes by the same author on the Italian drawings, which appeared in 1994 and describe a similar number of drawings, this means that full technical descriptions and images of all the Old Master Drawings still at Chatsworth, and a number that once were but are no longer, are now for the first time generally available. The high points of the collection were, of course, already long familiar from a host of travelling exhibitions, and a typescript list of the entire collection was prepared by the Courtauld Institute in 1963, but although the preparation of a full catalogue had first been discussed as early as the 1870s, nothing concrete was actually done to bring this about until Jaffé began his work in 1980.

To take on the single-handed writing of a catalogue of some two thousand drawings of the Italian, French, German, Dutch, Flemish, English and Spanish schools requires a certain kind of mind. It demands an astonishingly broad understanding and knowledge of the art of drawing, of a type that is all too rare in the modern age of monographic expertise, and it also takes a degree of self-belief that allows the writer to express strong opinions about such a variety of specialist fields. Most readers of this review will not need to be told that Michael Jaffé possessed both of these elements in bucket-loads. (Perhaps he should have worked for an auction house!)

Looking (and talking) more and more like an Old Testament patriarch as the years went by, Jaffé knew an extraordinary amount about so many aspects of Western art, not just the Flemish painters with whom his name is most closely associated, and was always extremely willing to share what he knew, both through his highly influential years of teaching at Cambridge and in less formal contexts. But he was also an astonishingly opinionated man, and the volumes of this catalogue reflect both these strands of his personality. Few other scholars in modern times could have catalogued such a wide range of drawings with such deep knowledge and insight, but few would have been so outspokenly sure of their own judgement across the board, and so cursorily dismissive on occasion of the views of other, generally highly respected, scholars. Frequently, attributions are not defended with substantial arguments so much as delivered as incontrovertible statements of fact: the word “manifestly” recurs in many a one-sentence note. On a few occasions the bombastic language becomes quite startling, notably in the vitriolic attack directed at Oliver Millar for his “senseless” review, of “unbecoming arrogance,” of Jaffé’s own earlier publication of Van Dyck’s Antwerp Sketchbook. Though in principle rather refreshing, this sort of outspokenness does not sit entirely comfortably with the format and scholarly apparatus of a modern systematic catalogue.

Equally, the way some drawings are accorded relatively extensive commentaries while others of similar importance receive only a sentence or two, is a little surprising. There is certainly a tendency these days to write far too much about drawings of little importance, but the minimalism of some of Jaffé’s notes is more frustrating than refreshing (e.g. the Rembrandt drawing, no. 1494, for which the total commentary is “Benesch dated this 1654-1655, but it could be five years earlier”). While this was also to a certain extent a characteristic of the Italian volumes, the imbalance in terms of depth of treatment is more pronounced here, perhaps partly due to the fact that Jaffé’s health was declining for several years prior to his death in 1997, and although he submitted a nominally complete manuscript at the end of 1996, he had clearly not been able to bring his full previous powers to the final stages of its preparation. This is particularly evident in the literature cited for the individual drawings, where there are fairly numerous omissions; with the few exceptions listed below, this is not the place to provide missing references, but users of the catalogue should nonetheless be aware that despite the publication date of 2002, virtually no post-1996 literature is given for the drawings, and the references are also by no means complete regarding earlier publications. By contrast, the concordances, general bibliographies, indexes, lists of exhibitions in which Chatsworth drawings were included, etc., which fill the last 53 pages of the fifth volume, are nothing if not exhaustive; there is even a list of all the drawings, organized alphabetically by title, the usefulness of which is not immediately apparent.

Jaffé’s catalogue is not a precise reflection of the current holdings of Northern drawings at Chatsworth, in that it includes a number of works that are no longer there, and excludes certain large groups of drawings which are, but have already been fully published elsewhere – notably the 400 Inigo Jones designs for the court masques of Charles I. Although initially somewhat confusing (one might not at first expect to find entries on drawings in the Getty Museum in a catalogue of the Chatsworth collection), this arrangement is actually very satisfactory, as it is much more useful to have, for example, the entire group of 30 Rembrandt landscapes from the Flink album published together, than to read only about the 18 that remain at Chatsworth today. The fact that a certain drawing is no longer in the collection is clearly indicated, with an asterisk by the Chatsworth inventory number, and in the provenance notes. The inclusion of these drawings also reveals the precise effect on the collection of the two main disposals of the twentieth century. In 1957, to help pay the taxes arising from the death of the 10th Duke, Holbein’s cartoon of Henry VIII and Henry VII (no.1546) was transferred to the National Portrait Gallery, and the Claude Liber Veritatis, and Van Dyck’s Italian Sketchbook went to the British Museum (the Claudes, already fully published elsewhere, are not included in this catalogue, but the Holbein is, as is the Van Dyck, the first complete publication of this highly important sketchbook). Then, in 1984 and 1987, 86 individual sheets were auctioned from the collection, including great works by Raphael, Rembrandt, Rubens, Van Dyck and others. The present catalogue, where all these drawings are included in their original context, reveals that while these losses unquestionably diminished the collection, this effect was by no means catastrophic, and very few works were sold when there was no counterpart of approximately comparable quality that remained.

To conclude this review, I would like to give a brief summary of each of the five volumes, indicating the main highlights of the collection described therein, with a few comments on individual drawings.

**Volume I.** Not surprisingly, perhaps, Jaffé devoted the first volume to drawings by Van Dyck and Rubens. Here are the nine extraordinary black chalk portrait drawings by Van Dyck for his Iconography (one of which was sold), the three revolutionary
landscape watercolors (one sold to the Getty), and the Antwerp and Italian sketchbooks (the latter, now in the British Museum, catalogued in full; the former, still at Chatsworth, represented only by an extended article, of ever-increasing vehemence, supplementing and supporting Jaffé’s own earlier publication; see M. Jaffé, Van Dyck’s Antwerp Sketchbook, 2 vols., London (1966). There are also exceptional religious drawings by Van Dyck, and figure and landscape studies by Rubens. Both artists have been the subject of numerous recent publications and exhibitions, but one new suggestion that should certainly be noted here is Martin Royalton-Kisch’s much-debated reattribution from Rubens to Van Dyck of the two splendid studies of dead trees (nos. 1156-7; see M. Royalton-Kisch, The Light of Nature. Landscape Drawings and Watercolours by Van Dyck and his Contemporaries, exh. cat., London, British Museum, and Antwerp, Rubenshuis, 1999, nos. 1, 2).

**Volume II** describes the other Flemish School drawings. Here, the most important individual drawing is the magnificent view of Rome by Pieter Bruegel the Elder (no. 1178). Also of considerable interest, though, are the two drawings (nos. 1179, 1180), long thought to be by Bruegel, here called “Attributed to Pieter Bruegel the Elder,” but already some years ago tentatively given by Mielke to Roelandt Savery, and subsequently included in the recent Bruegel drawings exhibition or mentioned in the catalogue under the newly-coined name, “The Master of the Mountain Landscapes” (see Nadine M. Orenstein et al., Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Drawings and Prints, exh. cat., Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, and New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2001, pp. 266-76). Also in the immediate surroundings of Bruegel are the seven very good drawings by the Master of the Small Landscapes (nos. 1197-1203, several also included in the 2001 Bruegel exhibition). In addition, there are three other significant sets of Flemish drawings: the album of small but fine emblematic drawings by Crispijn de Passe (nos. 1208-1268), the other significant sets of Flemish drawings: the album of small but fine emblematic drawings by Crispijn de Passe (nos. 1208-1268), the album of largely Roman views attributed to Sebastian Vranck, and a series of exceptionally good, though poorly preserved, watercolors by Vanvitelli (nos. 1327-1343). The condition problems suffered by quite a few of the drawings at Chatsworth can, by the way, be attributed to the misguided actions of the 6th Duke, who in around 1830 proudly declared that he had had drawings “rescued from portfolios and installed framed in the South Gallery”, a space expressly adapted for the purpose by Sir Jeffrey Wyatville, and where drawings continued to hang, to their great disadvantage, right up until 1906.

**A few specific comments on attribution.** Jaffé catalogues only nos. 1161 & 1162 as autograph works by Paulus Bril, but Louisa Wood Ruby, in her recent monograph on the artist’s drawings, also accepts, seemingly with good reason, no. 1164, here called “Manner of Paulus Bril” (see L. Wood Ruby, Paul Bril, The Drawings, Turnhout 1999, no. 17). No. 1184, which Jaffé gives to Craesbeeck, seems close to the style of Dirck de Vries (who cannot possibly have drawn no. 1505, in the next volume). The attribution of no. 1270 to Artus Quellinus seems implausible. No. 1342 does not fit stylistically with the rest of the Vanvitelli sequence, and in my view is actually by Claude Lorrain.

**Volume III** contains a thoroughly eccentric selection of Dutch drawings: 30 Rembrandt landscapes and several other good figure drawings by the artist, but hardly any examples of the other leading landscape draughtsmen of the seventeenth century. The other main highlights of this part of the collection are the volume of drawings by Jan de Bisschop and Jacob van der Ulf (nos. 1398-1441 – with in some cases rather unconvinving transcriptions of Dutch place names), and the fine sheets by Goltzius (no. 1448), Goudt (nos. 1450-52) and Heemskerk (nos. 1454-8). But the Rembrants, and the landscapes in particular, are the heart of this volume, and in several cases there is information to add, mainly as a result of the astonishing research of Boudewijn Bakker, Erik Schmitz, Marië van Berge and others in preparation for the exhibition Landscapes of Rembrandt. His favourite walks (Amsterdam, Gemeentearchief, and Paris, Institut Néerlandais, 1998-99). The exact locations depicted in several of the drawings have now been identified, notably nos. 1475, 1478 (both views on the Sloterweg), 1483 (Weesperzijde road), 1485 (Taphouses on Schinkelweg, looking towards the Overtoom), 1487 (the Inn “Huis te Vraag”) and 1488 (Amsteldijk, looking towards the Omval). For those sheets sold in 1984 and 1987, there is also some important recent provenance to add. No. 1480 was sold again, New York, Sotheby’s, 26 January 2002 (lot 45) and is now in a European private collection; no. 1481 was owned by Michael S. Currier, sold from his estate, New York, Christie’s, 28 January 2000, lot 115, is now in the Fentener van Vlissingen collection, and was recently exhibited in Haarlem (see Hans Verbeek, Travels through Town and Country. Dutch and Flemish Landscape Drawings 1550-1830, exh. cat., Haarlem, Teyler Museum, 2000, no. 39); and no. 1495 was also in the Currier collection, was lot 114 in the 2000 sale, and is now in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.

**A few specific comments.** The attribution of no. 1443 to Breenbergh is unconvincing, and it seems closer to, probably not actually by, Asselijn. Nos. 1444-1447 were (convincingly) published as Hendrick Feldman by Gorissen as long ago as 1965. In no. 1459, the overworking in grey/white seems unconvincing for Hoogstraten; Sumowski’s suggestion of Renesse seems better. It is very peculiar that the fine plant study by the Flemish artist Jan Siberechts, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, is included here in the Dutch volume (no. 1501). No. 1502 seems unconvincing as Swanevelt, and closer to drawings recently published by Peter Schatborn as Horatius de Hooch (see P. Schatborn, Drawn to Warmth. 17th-century Dutch artists in Italy, exh. cat., Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, 2001, p.142). The form of signature on no. 1503 is that generally used by Willem van de Velde the Elder, rather than the Younger, and the initials on no. 1504 are wrongly described in the catalogue, and are not autograph. Both drawings must be by the Elder van de Velde. The attribution of no. 1506 to Cornelis Vroom is unconvincing, and not accepted by other scholars. Finally, Jaffé’s doubts concerning the traditional attribution to Wieringen of no. 1507 seem misplaced, but I think the grey wash, the white heightening and possibly even the figure in the left foreground must have been added by a later hand.

**Volume IV** deals with the German, English and Spanish drawings. Here are the two magnificent Holbein portraits (nos. 1544, 1545), the cartoon and the jewellery designs by the same artist, the highly important series of drawings by Hollar documenting his journey to Prague with the Earl of Arundel in 1636, and notable one-offs such as the atmospheric Gainsborough landscape (no. 1583) and the large study by Peter Lely of one of the Knights of the Order of the Garter (no. 1584). The attribution to Baur of nos. 1512-1527 seems curious, and I would prefer to classify these drawings simply as by an anonymous follower of Callot. The inclusion of the beautiful early silverpoint drawing (no. 1538) in the German volume seems to me incorrect: I see it as Dutch, and very close to Lucas van Leyden, to whom it was, indeed, originally attributed in the collection.

**Volume V**, covering the French drawings, is again notable for the sequences of drawings by certain artists. Here, these artists are Callot (the famous Chatsworth Callot album contained 270 etchings and 146 drawings, some of which were described by Jaffé in a published paper given at the 1992 Paris/Nancy Callot conference), Claude Lorrain (still well represented here, despite the departure of
By way of conclusion, it is hard to improve on the words of the 11th Duke of Devonshire, printed inside the dust jacket of each of the five volumes: “The catalogue will stand as a monument to Michael Jaffé’s formidable scholarship and endeavour in producing it, for which other scholars and students will have cause to be grateful for many years to come.” One might only add that although there are certainly flaws in this catalogue, which His Grace was perhaps too polite to mention, these imperfections do not in any significant way undermine the enormous achievement that the publication represents, an achievement that is all the more powerfully presented thanks to the superb quality of the production and printing of the books themselves.


Guy Delmarcel served as curator of textiles at the Musée du Cinquantenaire in Brussels from 1975–1990 and as Professor of the History of Art at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from 1981–2002. His many books, articles, lectures, and exhibitions reveal his exceptional knowledge of and passion for Flemish tapestry. While serving as curator at the Cinquantenaire, he acquired significant sixteenth- and seventeenth-century tapestries for the collection, and inspired curators at other institutions to purchase Flemish pieces. His exhibitions helped to draw international attention to the field of tapestry. Studies such as Les Chasses de Maximilien (1993), Tapestries for the Courts of Federico II, Ercole and Fernante Gonzaga, 1522-1563 (1996), and Rubens’s Textiles (1997) have made a tremendous contribution to tapestry research and its place within art historical scholarship.

If you are looking for a history of Flemish tapestry in this book, you will be disappointed. For that you need to consult Delmarcel’s Flemish Tapestry (1999), a major study on the history of tapestry published in Dutch, French, and English. But what you will find in this book is a series of diverse essays on tapestries in American and European collections that celebrate Delmarcel’s various research interests, his methodology, and his capacity for encouraging others to study Flemish tapestry. His colleagues at the Department of Archaeology, History of Art, and Musicology at Leuven produced the volume to honor him on his retirement. The book begins with an introduction by Brosens, who summarizes Delmarcel’s course of study and his contributions to tapestry scholarship, followed by a bibliography of his extensive research from 1966-2002. Following are thirteen articles by renowned scholars and curators of Flemish tapestry throughout Europe and the United States, for whom Delmarcel served as colleague, friend, teacher, and mentor.

The essays can be grouped around various themes in which there is much to be discovered about the iconography of tapestry series primarily from the medieval and early modern periods; marks and signatures of weavers, on which Delmarcel is preparing a major study for publication; and the nature of patronage by European kings and noble families. Newly published and freshly studied archival materials produce new analyses of styles and attributions, interesting information about collectors and collecting habits, and the uses of tapestries in ceremonial occasions.

Pascal-François Bertrand (University of Pau) explores issues related to patronage and connoisseurship through his work on the collector Roger de Graignière (1642-1715), a passionate student of genealogy and heraldry, who amassed a collection of roughly 150 drawings that document fifteenth- to seventeenth-century tapestries belonging to about 90 French families around 1700. The drawings, housed in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, are executed with infinite precision and demonstrate that patrons possessed a preference for tapestries with portraits, emblems, coats of arms, and other symbolic details integrated into borders and central narrative scenes.

Two of the articles focus on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century tapestries in Italian collections. Lucia Meoni (Florence) discusses Flemish tapestries in the Medici Collection, a tradition of patronage that began with Cosimo I (1519-1574) and continued with other members of the family. Nello Forti Grazzini (Milan) examines the artistic relationship between Flanders and Italy through an analysis of an Adoration of the Shepherds (c.1535-1550) in Milan that he attributes to Michel Coxcie. In the second part of his essay he reviews the marks and signatures on tapestries bearing the coat of arms of Paolo Giovio, a collector of tapestries. Thomas P. Campbell (Metropolitan Museum of Art) examines Flemish tapestries in English collections through a very thorough analysis of the ten pieces in the Story of Abraham at Hampton Court Palace, the designs for which he attributes to Bernard van Orley and Pieter Coecke van Aelst. His suggestion, based on new evidence, that Henry VIII commissioned the tapestries around 1540-41 with a specific iconography to honor the patriarchal continuation of the Tudor line is very convincing.

Flemish tapestries in royal collections are yet another theme around which several of the essays can be grouped. Delmarcel himself was especially interested in tapestries purchased by the Spanish royal family, and the history of Flemish pieces in that unique collection is reviewed by Concha Herrero (Patrimonio Nacional, Madrid). Maria Hennel-Bernasikowa (Wawel Castle, Cracow) studies the Flemish tapestries assembled between 1550 and 1560 by Sigismund II Augustus of Poland. Based on reports and other documents, she demonstrates how these tapestries were used for a variety of Poland’s royal ceremonies including coronations, weddings, funerals, and other occasions, a tradition that continued until the end of the eighteenth century. Iain Buchanan (Auckland University) provides new documentation on tapestries purchased in Antwerp by King Eric XIV of Sweden from 1560-1561. Interestingly, against Eric’s wishes, his half brother John III married Catherine of Poland, the sister of Sigismund II Augustus, resulting in a combination of the Swedish and Polish tapestry collections later in the sixteenth century. Another link among these royal collections is provided by Rotraud Bauer (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) who examines the Six Ages of the World (Mundi Aeva) in the outstanding tapestry collection in Vienna. This set bears the unidentified weaver’s mark “So eine Arbeit”, which also appears on pieces in the Swedish Royal Collection. Antwerp and Brussels tapestry merchants had contacts throughout Europe and often sold famous and/or highly regarded tapestries produced in the same workshop to different royal collectors. Wendy Hefford (Victoria and Albert Museum) reviews and analyzes the confusing documentation concerning the Horsemanship tapestries purchased by King Charles I of England in 1635, and probably later bought by Cardinal Mazarin in 1653. She draws connections to the Small Horses and Large Horses tapestries, the latter based on designs by Jordens. Both series were produced numerous times during the
seventeenth century, and she proposes an earlier dating in an effort to connect them with Charles’s tapestries. The documentation concerning these tapestries is difficult to sort through, and unfortunately none of Charles’s Horsemanship tapestries are known today.

Other essays consider tapestries woven around 1700 and the collecting of Flemish pieces by museums. Ingrid De Meûter (Musée du Cinquantenaire, Brussels) examines the work of the landscape artist Pieter Spierinckx (1635-1711) and the cartoons he painted for tapestry. By cross-referencing source material Hillie Smit (Leiden University) was able to identify and document a set of four eighteenth-century tapestries, Scenes of Country Life, based on the work of David Teniers II (1610-1690). Constantijn IV Huygens purchased the tapestries, which were delivered in 1729, and subsequently set an important trend in The Hague for acquiring Teniers tapestries from the Urbanus Leyniers workshop in Brussels. Christa C. Thurman (Art Institute of Chicago) examines the collection of Flemish tapestries in the museum focusing on those produced 1660-1700. The first pieces were acquired in the late nineteenth century and through time have come to constitute a collection representing diverse styles, periods, themes, and manufacturers. The essay by Birgitt Borkopp-Restle and André Bruttillot (Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich) on a sixteenth-century edition of the Story of St. Paul in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich demonstrates how fruitful the results can be when conservators and art historians work collaboratively.

The book is beautifully designed and produced, and color illustrations accompany most of the essays. It will be useful for students of tapestry and others curious to learn more about designers, weavers, and collectors in the field of Flemish tapestry. It stands as a tribute to Delmarcel, who through his amazing energy and enthusiasm set a high standard for scholarship and promoted the serious study of tapestry and others curious to learn more about designers, weavers, and collectors in the field of Flemish tapestry. It stands as a tribute to Delmarcel, who through his amazing energy and enthusiasm set a high standard for scholarship and promoted the serious study of tapestry using sound methodological approaches.

Kristi Nelson
University of Cincinnati


Erik Duverger will be remembered by all historians of Netherlandish art as a scholar who discovered and published enormous amounts of archival material. This publication, printed only just after his death earlier this year, was the last surprise he came up with.

Duverger discovered the Van den Berge family archive (at some point devided in two parts and currently preserved in the Ghent City Archives and University Library) and brought it back to light. Francisco-Jacomo van den Berge, as it now appears, was an important gentleman dealer, living in Ghent and working together with an associate, Gillis van der Vennen, who travelled all the time. They set up an art trade between Paris, Flanders, Brabant and Holland.

The documents, cover a period of some forty years (1692-1733). Duverger worked through all documents in the collection and retained 427 for publication. The nature of the archival documents is diverse. The major part consists of letters, but accounts, inventories, stock-lists and auction catalogues are also included. Duverger does not explain his selection criteria, but we may assume that he only transcribed those documents mentioning works of art.

The large quantity of notes and letters written by these Ghent dealers and their foreign trading partners – as now published by Duverger – offers so much information that it will take years for several scholars to complete the puzzle of their trading network. Moreover one will undoubtedly have to go back to the archives to study all other documents as well in order to get a complete understanding on how the art trade of Van den Berge functioned. Unfortunately, Duverger lacked the time to study that thoroughly himself.

In the introduction (in French) Duverger informs us on what he knew about the several people named in the documents. He starts with the key figures Francisco-Jacomo Van den Berge and Gillis van der Vennen, followed by some brief information on some others mentioned in the book. It does him honor that he still underook this effort. The book has a good and almost complete index.

Though there remains work yet to be done, it is possible to give some indications on how important this publication is for Netherlandish art history and especially for scholars studying the art market. Of the few dozen paintings mentioned in the book, I will pick but one example, in order to show that this publication will open up a range of opportunities for renewed provenance research, as well as to show that it will provide us with new insights into the art market of the early eighteenth century.

A painting which was part of the the ‘stock’ of Van den Berge en Van der Vennen in 1700 was the Drunken Silenus by Rubens (now in Munich, Alte Pinakothek). It was bought from a Ghent counselor named J. de Jonghe. By 1707 it was sold to the Rotterdam dealer Quirijn van Biesum, who apparently was the company’s Rotterdam associate. On one of his trips to Düsseldorf, Van Biesum took the painting with him, where he sold it to the Elector Johann Wilhem, with whose collection it ended up in Munich. Although the sheer fact that the painting came from a Ghent collection, was sold to a Dutch art dealer and brought to the elector is interesting by itself (all unknown), one should look at the complete picture. Quirijn van Biesum and Gillis van der Vennen, who seemed to have played an important role in this ‘transfer’ were merely delivery men. In Ghent, the financial backing came from Van den Berge and in Rotterdam, it was the famous merchant and collector Jacques Meyers who supported these kinds of transactions financially. Jacques Meyers is known to have been a gentleman dealer with an aristocratic clientele. For example, he sold Nicolas Poussin’s Seven Sacraments to the Duke of Orleans in 1716. The Silenus is just one example. Other paintings mentioned are for instance Anthony van Dyck’s Portrait of Everhard Jabauch (Hermitage), Poussin’s Entombment (Dublin), Rubens’s Landscape with a Cart Crossing a Ford (Hermitage) and many more.

As a few dozen paintings and persons are mentioned in the several letters and accounts of Van den Berge and Gillis van der Vennen, one can imagine that studying these sources will give us new and clear insight into the elite art trade in the first decades of the eighteenth century. They operated in Paris, Gent, Antwerp,
Rubens received from the city in 1609-10, largely thanks to the care of a close friend, Gaspar Gevaerts (Gevartius). Although when his wife Isabella Brant died, had left them behind in Antwerp in 1621, the picture entered the Spanish Royal collection. There Rubens enlarged the original canvas of his Adoration by about 73 percent, adding to the top and the right of the painting. The statuesque magus in a red mantle now marks the center of the composition. At the right, on the addition, the artist included his own portrait as a knight on horseback. A youth guiding a horse appears at the lower right and the camels in the background become more pronounced, including the men unloading the gifts. The artist also changed the old man standing behind the majestic magus in the center into a youth, facing to the left and tending the king his hat. Behind the Holy Family, in the painting at the left, Rubens introduced a large column and an ivy tree whose branches grow into a larger roof covered with sheaths of reeds above. This large column is here interpreted as the column of peace reminiscent of the one from the Templum Pacis in Rome, today erected on the Piazza S. Maria Maggiore. Since it is placed directly behind the Holy Family the simpler interpretation of the Virgin symbolizing the pillar of the Church might be preferable, as Vergara suggests.*

Hans Ost further reminds the reader that the broken spider web example to Rembrandt? Rubens probably was the one who suggested this project to Philip IV because such a drastic alteration of the original surely could only be undertaken with the latter’s permission. The king was well acquainted with Rubens and apparently visited his studio in the Alcázar often to watch him paint.

The aim of Hans Ost was to interpret in the present study the changes Rubens introduced in his reworking of the original canvas and to place them in the context of the later years, 1628-29. In his opinion, the references to the theme of war and peace are found throughout the composition. It was the time of the 80-years war and peace would not come until 1648 with the signing of the treaty of Münster. Furthermore, the work was now part of the Spanish Royal collection and hung in the private quarters of the King, another reason a change might have been welcome.
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the Albertina [inv.no. 17648]). Whether the artist actually took drawings of his sons with him to Spain is mere conjecture; Rubens had a very good memory. Equally speculative is the elaboration on a drawing in the Institut Néerlandais, Paris, representing a Kneeling Youth. It is a design for a funerary monument that was originally attributed to Erasmus Quellinus (1607-78). In 1965 Justus Müller Hofstede saw in the drawing a typical work of Rubens, an opinion that has found few followers, although Hans Ost accepts it and dates the study to Rubens’s months in England, 1629-30. According to him Rubens here created a design for a funerary monument for his ailing older son Albert (1614-57), who at that time was gravely ill in Antwerp. (See for the drawing now also Ulrich Heinen in Peter Paul Rubens. Barocke Leidenschaften, Exh. cat. Braunschweig, 2004, no. 55, ill. in color). While the study has Rubenesque aspects, several details speak against his authorship in my opinion. For one, Rubens seldom used red chalk for compositional studies but vastly preferred pen and brown ink and some wash. In the late 1620s, early 1630s oil sketches predominate. It is also debatable whether Rubens – the diplomat of peace, as Ost calls him – would have represented his son as a knight in armor. All in all, it may be a nice idea but as long as the attribution of the drawing is in doubt, hardly defensible.

This challenging book, therefore, raises many questions whose answers often lie in the eye of the beholder. The publication is well illustrated with several details in color to facilitate following the author’s arguments.

Anne-Marie Logan
The Metropolitan Museum of Art

*The reviewer would like to thank Alexander (Alejandro) Vergara for sharing his forthcoming essay on the painting which has recently been restored. It will appear at the end of November 2004, to accompany an exhibition around the painting.


What prompted Rubens to produce a tapestry series with eight scenes devoted to the life of the Greek hero Achilles? What do we know about Rubens’s working method in producing preparatory works for the series, and what visual and literary sources influenced Rubens in creating it? These questions and more are addressed in the beautiful exhibition, Peter Paul Rubens: The Life of Achilles, organized by the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and the Museo Nacional del Prado. The exhibition brought together seven sketches from Rotterdam and three modelli from Madrid produced for the series, as well as works, including tapestries (full set in Rotterdam, only one in Madrid), from several other public and private collections. The Rotterdam sketches and the Madrid modelli were beautifully restored for the occasion. The exhibition and accompanying catalogue shed new light on Rubens’s working practice in moving from sketch to modello to tapestry and thus present an important contribution to the study of Flemish tapestry during the seventeenth century.

The exhibition catalogue, a collaborative effort among several individuals, includes both essays and technical information about the tapestry series. Three of the articles explore various aspects of its production: the preparation of the sketches and modelli (Friso Lammertse); the cartoons and tapestries woven after them (Guy Delmarcel); and the visual and textual sources for the series (Fiona Healy). A richly illustrated catalogue presents the eight scenes of the Achilles series, including sketches, modelli, and tapestries for each of the designs, many shown in color. Both the exhibition and the catalogue build on the exemplary work of Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, The Achilles Series in the Corpus Rubenianum (1975), and Julius Held, The Oil Sketches of Peter Paul Rubens (1980).

In his essay, Lammertse thoroughly reviews what is documented about the initiation of the Achilles series, one of four tapestry programs designed by Rubens, and the works produced for it. He reminds us that Rubens thought of tapestry as a whole, not as individual pieces, and critical components of the creative process included where the tapestries would hang and the size of the room. But, even today, little is known about the commissioning of the series, the patron for it, or how it came into being. Daniel Fourment, Rubens’s father-in-law and a tapestry merchant, is frequently connected with the series since sketches and tapestries were found in his home, and he may have owned the cartoons (full scale models) as well. Given that the editio princeps was woven with expensive silver thread, Delmarcel suggests that the series was most probably produced upon commission. But Fourment’s precise role remains unconfirmed as to whether he was engaged as an agent from the start and commissioned the series for the open market, or had a potential client in mind, or whether the works came to him after the first order was completed. It can be assumed, given Rubens’s other commissions, that he maintained a fair amount of control over which events in the life of the hero to illustrate and that he would have been well versed in Homer’s Iliad and other sources on Achilles known in the seventeenth century.

Lammertse examines in detail the entire process that Rubens and his studio went through to produce designs for a tapestry series. This consisted of work in several stages: first, oil sketches on wood panel were produced by Rubens himself, followed by larger-scale modelli also on panel executed with the help of assistants, and, finally full-scale models or cartoons on paper were produced in the studio. All the Rotterdam panels have been thoroughly studied and analyzed down to the joining of the boards, the panel maker marks on the back, and the type of priming applied. Using research provided by Boersma, Rubens’s painting technique and the imprimatur used for each of the sketches is carefully described. What we learn is that the amount of detailing varies from sketch to sketch, but that all of the sketches have unpainted margins, about a half a centimeter on all four sides, where black chalk marks indicate most probably a grid for enlarging the sketch into a modello. Lammertse suggests that grid lines were actually drawn on the sketches and then erased, since no traces can be detected today. He substantiates this hypothesis by citing several seventeenth-century texts where this approach is recommended, including a manuscript of Theodoor Turquet de Mayerne, a friend of Rubens interested in the technical aspects of painting. Some type of grid system can also be detected on the modelli, based on the presence of small score marks on their edges. Thus, we are provided with new insights about the use of the grid as a technical aid in Rubens’s studio and its importance for transferring designs from one medium and scale into another.
Delmarcel’s essay thoroughly reviews what is documented about the cartoons on paper, which no longer survive, and the various Brussels workshops that produced editions of the tapestries. He explores the different manufactories that wove sets of the tapestries and shows how they often introduced their own interpretation of the original design into their pieces. They also used different border decorations – Rubens had originally designed his own borders for the series – perhaps to suit the tastes of clients. He suggests that further study of the owners of Achilles tapestries might yield additional information about the tapestries and the series itself. The influence of Rubens’s Achilles series on contemporary Flemish artists, like Jacob Jordaens, is examined, as is its legacy in the eighteenth century.

Healy’s essay provides fresh information about the literary and visual sources for the life of Achilles, specifically the iconography for the eight episodes Rubens chose to represent. She stresses that Rubens depended on both original texts and Renaissance handbooks for details of the narrative, but also relied on his own intuition to produce designs that stress both the heroic and human sides of Achilles’s character. She thoroughly investigates the visual and textual sources for the architectonic borders designed by Rubens for the series; these provided the artist with further possibilities to comment on the narrative through the application of illusionism and personification. She is especially interested in the origin of the ‘term’ figures employed by Rubens in his borders, and suggests that the structural scheme used for a series of frescoes in the Chateau d’Oiron in Bonnivet, near Poitiers, may be an important source for the dialogue between narrative and border that Rubens creates in the tapestries. Given the prominence accorded to Achilles’s childhood and education, she tentatively suggests that the patron might have been a woman, specifically a mother, though no name has come to light.

The catalogue presents information on the sketches, modelli, and tapestries connected with the Achilles series. Special attention is given to the technique of the sketches, based on research by Boersma, and the modelli, with careful descriptions of the underdrawing and painting technique. Several color illustrations are included that show cross sections of the paint layers and the imprimatura. Another section is devoted to the provenance of the sketches, modelli, and cartoons. Each catalogue entry includes information about one or two tapestries woven after Rubens’s designs and the unique features of the different editions.

The Life of Achilles is one of Rubens’s smaller projects, but the high quality of the sketches and modelli, as confirmed in the exhibition, place it among his most outstanding works. This publication, with its new findings in the use of technical aids, especially the application of the grid, and the expanded discussion about the sources for the series, makes a significant contribution to our understanding of Rubens’s approach to tapestry and the place of the Achilles series in his vast and rich oeuvre.

Kristi Nelson
University of Cincinnati


With this exhibition the Staatliche Museen in Kassel celebrated the repurchase in 2001 of the cabinet piece, Pan and Syrinx of c. 1617, painted by Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), who added the figures, and Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568-1625), who is responsible for the surrounding landscape elements and the birds. Count Wilhelm VIII of Hessen-Kassel, the founder of the museum, originally acquired the painting in 1747 for his collection. In the early nineteenth century the work was put on a shortlist by Vivant Denon who was sent to Kassel to choose works for the Musée Napoléon in Paris. When Jérôme Napoléon, who resided in the castle in Kassel as King of Westphalia, fled in 1813, the Pan and Syrinx left with him and reappeared in various auctions only in the second half of the twentieth century. Now, almost 200 years later, it is back with its rightful owner.

The exhibition began with Rubens’s well-known, signed Flight into Egypt of 1614 at Schloss Wilhelmshöhe (no. 1) and ended with his late small oil sketch of Pan and Syrinx in Bayonne of 1636, designed for the Torre de la Parada (no. 28) commission, together with a cabinet picture of the same subject by Théodoor van Thulden (1586-1653) and Jan Wildens (1606-1669), on loan from the Louvre to the museum in Hazebrouck (no. 29). The focus was on the newly acquired Pan and Syrinx painting, however. In his introduction to the accompanying catalogue, Bernhard Schnackenburg, the recently retired curator of the Kassel art collections and driving force behind the painting’s acquisition and the exhibition, traces its history from 1747 until 1851. He even located the work in an earlier hanging in the Kassel castle, surrounded by works by Philip Wouwerman and a still life by Jan Fyt.

The subject of Pan and Syrinx is taken from Ovid’s Metamorphoses. Pan, half-man, half-goat, is wooing the nymph Syrinx, who escapes his advances by turning into reeds, from which he then creates his pipes. Justus Lange, the curator of the exhibition, discusses the theme in his catalogue essay, tracing it from the sixteenth century through engravings and drawings to the time of Rubens and Brueghel. According to Bettina Werche, the Pan and Syrinx by Hendrick van Balen (1575-1632) in the National Gallery, London (no. 11), although still dated c. 1615 in the catalogue and considered to be painted in collaboration with the Elder Brueghel, is entirely by Van Balen and dates from 1605-08. Van Balen therefore would be a likely artist to have introduced such representations in Antwerp. (Bettina Werche’s monograph on Hendrick van Balen is forthcoming. She rejects the Van Balen attribution of another Pan and Syrinx composition in a private collection, no. 10). The Kassel version, a collaboration between Rubens and Jan Brueghel the Elder, is surrounded by another five examples of the theme by or attributed to Jan Brueghel the Younger (1601-78), among them a further version where Rubens added the figures (no. 23; private collection, New York). In three of the Pan and Syrinx compositions (nos. 24-26), the collaborators are merely associated with the Rubens workshop or Rubens followers (unpublished, private collection; Schwerin; Lille), while the example in the British Royal collection is here exhibited as a copy after
Rubens (7; no. 27; entry by Christopher White). To assist the visitor in differentiating between the Elder and the Younger Brueghel, two paintings of Diana and her Nymphs (nos. 21, 22, Munich and Musée de la Chasse, Paris) by Jan Brueghel the Elder were added, one again a collaboration with Rubens. Kassel also exhibited a painting by the Elder Brueghel from its own collection. In addition, the Staatsliche Museen included Joos de Momper’s Landscape with a Village in Winter of c.1615, painted with the Elder Brueghel (no. 2).

Christine van Mulders contributes an overview of Ruben’s collaboration with Jan Brueghel the Elder and the Younger, the topic of her dissertation. (This subject will be taken up specifically in 2006 in an exhibition planned jointly by the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, and Mauritshuis; some of the opinions formed in the Kassel exhibition might find a response there.) The possibility to compare the various collaborative efforts and possibly sort out specific artists from the generic attribution to the Rubens workshop was the great challenge in Kassel.

Joost Vander Auwera finally discusses the Kassel Pan and Syrinx with related compositions by Jacob Jordaeus (1593-1678) and Abraham Janssen (c.1571-1632), dated c.1618-19 and c.1619, respectively. In these two, full-size paintings the figures are much more prominent, while the landscape is reduced to basics like the bundle of reeds (nos. 19 and 20). Small bronze sculptures of the Venus Medici and the Venus Kallipygos as well as a marmor torso of an Aphrodite from the collection of Antiquities in Kassel were included as prototypes for the Syrinx figures.

Among the few drawings in the exhibition were two sheets by Rubens, the study of Four Female Figures (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) and the Reclining Pan (National Gallery of Art, Washington) as well as a Pan and Syrinx by Karel van Mander (1548-1606) from the Uffizi, Florence. The female figure in the Amsterdam drawing, likely inspired by an antique statue of the Venus pudica type that Rubens copied in Rome (preserved in copies in the Rubens cantoor) probably served as a guideline for the Kassel painting.

Besides Justus Lange, who wrote most of the catalogue entries, texts were also contributed by Agnes Tieze and Thorsten Smidt. The rather outré design of the catalogue invites you to act as a voyeur in texts were also contributed by Agnes Tieze and Thorsten Smidt. The catalogue part ends with a list of the lost and rejected works. In a brief conclusion Heinrich discusses Willeboirts’ work in the context of Flemish seventeenth-century painting. Volume two begins with the publication of thirty-three documents that refer to the artist. Although not translated, each document is preceded by a brief synopsis of its content. After the ample footnotes and bibliography follow the 180 plates. Besides a general index we also find one for the subjects and for the present and former locations.

Heinrich discusses slightly over one hundred works, namely 78 history paintings, allegories, and large figure compositions with the related oil sketches, studio versions, copies, and drawings, followed by 21 portraits, among them two self-portraits, eight copies after Anthony van Dyck, and ending with a list of 150 works known only through the literature. Most of the original paintings and some of the studio versions are reproduced in good black and white illustrations. Discussed are also five questionable attributions and some 81 rejected works.

Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert’s family originally was from Antwerp and Roman Catholic. Later in the sixteenth century his grandfather moved to Bergen op Zoom in the Northern Netherlands, where they were allowed to continue their faith. For unknown reasons the family name Bosschaert was expanded to include Willeboirts; it is with this name the artist chose to sign his paintings. (Axel Heinrich refers to the artist almost exclusively as Willeboirts but uses the full name in the captions.) In 1628 Thomas Willeboirts returned to Antwerp in the Southern Netherlands, where he entered the studio of Gerard Seghers (1591-1651). At that very time Rubens had left the city on diplomatic missions to Spain and London. Willeboirts apparently remained in Seghers’ studio for eight years. In 1636-37 he became a master in the Antwerp guild and also a citizen. Among his first works in 1636-38 are the paintings executed in collaboration with Rubens for the Torre de la Parada that Philip IV of Spain commissioned. What singles Willeboirts out is the patronage of Prince Frederik Hendrik in The Hague. The prince had become aware of Willeboirts’ work during the siege by the Dutch army of Bergen op Zoom. Willeboirts, a Catholic artist born in the Northern Netherlands but now residing in Antwerp thus worked for the protestant court in the Northern Netherlands beginning in 1641 until the death of Frederik Hendrik in 1647. The artist may have been seen as a close substitute for Anthony van Dyck who had worked for the Dutch court briefly in The Hague in late 1631 until early 1632 but then went to England. (See Frans Baudouin, “Van Dyck in Den Haag,” in: Oranienbaum. Huis van Oranje. Exh. cat. Oranienbaum, 2003, pp. 152-63). After 1647 Willeboirts’ only major commission from The Hague was the work for the decorations in the Oranjzaal in the Huis ten Bosch. Thirty paintings are still known today that Willeboirts executed for the Dutch court. The artist also acted as an agent in Antwerp to find art for the prince’s palaces, for example from Rubens’ estate in the early 1640s.

Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert was one of the best and most important Flemish painters who continued history painting after Rubens and Van Dyck. Rather than a follower of his teacher Gerard Seghers he is seen as a worthy follower of Anthony van Dyck. Hans Vlieghe even considered it possible that Willeboirts may have been trained by Van Dyck, since some of his paintings are so close to those of the older master (“Thoughts on Van Dyck’s Early Fame and...
Influence in Flanders,” in: Van Dyck 350. Studies in the History of Art, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, vol. 46 [Symposium Papers 26] edited by Susan J. Barnes and Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr. National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1994, pp. 210, 214). Contrary to earlier statements the artist apparently did not travel to Italy. Thomas Willeboirts had a total of nine pupils, six of them registered in the liggeren. One of his last, Johan van Elewijn, inherited all of his teacher’s drawings, which today seem to be lost for the most part. A trace of them is still found in the inventory of Erasmus Quellinus (1607-1678) where 37 drawings and academies, In Influence in Flanders,” in: Van Dyck 350, Washington, 1994, p. 180, figs. 5-6; J. Douglas Stewart “Pieter Thys (1624-77): Recovering a ‘scarcely known’ Antwerp Painter.” Apollo, 145 (1997), p. 41, fig. 8; and J. Douglas Stewart, “Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert and Pieter Thys. A Tale of Two Tangled Antwerp Painters,” in: Van Dyck 1599-1999, Conjectures and Refutations, ed. by Hans Vlieghe, Turnhout, p. 279, fig. 10); The Martyrdom of St. James in Toulouse (Kat. A68, fig. 102). J. D. Stewart, in: Van Dyck 1599-1999, 2001, p. 281. fig. 12). Stewart, furthermore, accepted the signature P. Thys on the painting of the Toilet of Bathsheba and therefore considered the work to be by this artist, whereas Axel Heinrich considers it to be false and therefore attributes the picture to Willeboirts. (Gateshead, Shipley Art Gallery; Kat. A50, fig. 77; Stewart, in Apollo, 1997, p. 40, fig. 6; and in Van Dyck 1599-1999, 2001, pp. 271-72). For both of these paintings there exist preliminary black chalk drawings of Putti and of an Amor (Kat. A50a, fig. 78; Kat. A67a, fig. 101), which Heinrich gives to Willeboirts while Stewart attributes them to Pieter Thys. The drawings associated with these two works – in my opinion – differ in execution from the four other black chalk studies that Heinrich associated with Willeboirts (preserved in Antwerp, Paris, Cologne, and Haarlem; Kat. A2a, fig. 4; Kat. A30c, fig. 47; Kat. AP16a, fig. 137 respectively. The drawing of St. George in the Lugt collection, Paris, is not for a painting but after one for a print and thus does not qualify for comparison. One may wonder whether this latter work is by Willeboirts or rather by a studio hand for the engraving by Theodoor van Kessel; Kat. A23a, fig. 36).

Vlieghe and Stewart also opted for Thys with regard to yet another painting, Time and the Goddesses of Fate, formerly in Sanssouci (Kat. A30, fig. 45, with a somewhat modified studio version in Grenoble; again with two accompanying drawings. Hans Vlieghe, Flemish Art and Architecture 1585-1700 [Pelican History of Art], New Haven and London, 1998, p. 98, fig. 127; Stewart, in: Van Dyck 1599-1999, 2001, p. 272). Since Hans Vlieghe is one of the editors of the Pictura Nova series, one would have liked to hear whether he adheres to his attribution of the painting to Thys. One drawing that Axel Heinrich here attributes to Willeboirts Bosschaert, the preliminary study for The Vision of St. Francis Xavier in the University Library, Warsaw (Kat. A34a, fig. 59; Stewart, in: Van Dyck 1599-1999, 2001, p. 271, fig. 3 also as Willeboirts Bosschaert) for the painting of the same subject in Munich (Kat. A34, fig. 58) is very close to drawings by Jan Boeckhorst, to whom Michael Jaffé attributed the drawing earlier.

This is a reminder that some of Willeboirts’s work at times also approaches that of another artist from the circle of Anthony van Dyck, Jan Boeckhorst (1604-1678). The rare paintings attributed to Willeboirts in the United States, namely the Venus and Adonis in Sacramento (Kat. A10Ka), is here considered to be a copy – possibly by Jan de Duys – based on the original in Braunschweig (Kat. A10, fig. 21; Walter Liedtke and Guy Bauman had listed it in 1992 in their
Charles I’s collection. The star of this area was, for many visitors, The Banquet of Cleopatra, a recent acquisition from the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, at times attributed to Anthony van Dyck but also to his circle, would have been welcome in connection with Willeboirts’s Perseus and Andromeda, formerly in castle Schwedt a. O. but lost since 1945. (For the Los Angeles painting [inv.no. M85.80] see Christopher Brown, in: Flemish Paintings in America, Antwerp, 1992, p. 262, no. 83 ill. in color, as Anthony van Dyck; Erik Larsen, Anthony van Dyck, Frederik, 1988, vol. 2, p. 514, Cat. A 311, ill.). The Andromeda in the Los Angeles painting is very similar to the corresponding figure in the lost Willeboirts painting, which the artist signed and dated 1646 (Kat. A 35, fig. 60).

These comments should not detract from the great achievement this catalogue of Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert’s oeuvre represents. Since the large majority of his work, including some of the second versions, studio replicas and even rejected works is illustrated, the two volumes will become a most useful resource for further identifications of paintings and oil sketches should they resurface.

Anne-Marie Logan
The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Seventeenth-Century Dutch


Visitors to Edinburgh in the summer of 2004 had the good fortune of finding the crème de la crème of the British Royal Collection’s Dutch paintings in the Queen’s Gallery at the Palace of Holyroodhouse. The Queen’s Gallery, refurbished in 2002 by Edinburgh-based Benjamin Tindall Architects, was initially intended for showing works on paper. The space is essentially one large open room with a pitched timbered roof, and a second, rectangular space to the rear. Although the walls are hung in a peacock blue fabric that would suit drawings better than darker pictures, the Queen’s Gallery is in fact a fine venue for small-scale paintings because it manages to be both intimate and airy. The Queen’s Gallery has, with this exhibition, been transformed into a cabinet for the rarest of Dutch jewels.

Opening with Gerrit Houckgeest’s Charles I, Queen Henrietta Maria, and Charles, Prince of Wales, Dining in Public, the first part of the exhibition gathered a group of paintings associated with Charles I’s collection. The star of this area was, for many visitors, Rembrandt’s An Old Woman (‘The Artist’s Mother’), to this viewer rather unfortunately flanked by still lifes by Maria van Oosterwijck. From then on, the arrangement seemed to be more or less by genre and time period, moving sequentially from Haarlem painting, including the characterful Hals Portrait of a Man of 1630, to fijnschilders, with two pictures by Dou, to Delft painters De Hooch and Vermeer, to low-life genre scenes by the Ostades, Steen and others, to Dutch landscapes, to Rembrandt, represented by the recently-resurrected Selfportrait in a Flat Cap, to Italianate landscape, and ending with paintings made after about 1650, most notably the late Cuyp Evening Landscape and Steen’s sexy Woman at her Toilet. The Royal Collection is so strong that it is able to cover all these bases, and to do so with outstanding examples, most in excellent condition. Many of these pictures are familiar to us, either through reproduction or from recent exhibitions, but to see them all together at once leaves an indelible impression of the wealth and quality of the Royal Collection’s Dutch holdings.

Although the display seems to have been ordered roughly by chronology, some obvious exceptions must have been made for the unusual architecture of the Queen’s Gallery. This leads to some interesting consequences. Probably due more to the size of the walls than anything else, Jan de Bray’s Banquet of Cleopatra received pride of place on a large central wall in the centre of the show. This is perhaps an unintended, but felicitous, correction to the popular perception of Dutch paintings as dominated by genre scenes and landscapes, and places Dutch Classicism at the centre. Somewhat less fortunate was Rembrandt’s Selfportrait, tucked around a corner next to a door. But this is a minor quibble, because it was a rare treat to see these pictures, often in much easier viewing conditions than in their usual home.

Frankly intended as an overview of Dutch painting for the interested layman, Christopher Lloyd’s catalogue of the exhibition is designed in an attractive, small format, loaded with good color reproductions and well-priced at £7.95. The catalogue begins with a short chapter called “The critical eye: Dutch paintings of the Golden Age,” which gathers together quotes about Dutch painting by commentators from Van Mander to Simon Schama. Lloyd then provides an introduction, covering basic information about the history of the United Provinces, the development of Dutch painting in a very general sense, and its critical reception (particularly in Britain), closing with a brief discussion of the “recent upsurge in interest in Dutch seventeenth-century painting.” Succinct entries for the paintings on display, largely drawing on existing scholarship and with a reference to Christopher White’s catalogue of the collection, make up the rest of the book.

Lloyd’s clearly-written catalogue provides a useful introduction to the field. While the book is obviously not intended as a scholarly resource, it is a shame that for those who might have the energy to pursue some of the ideas Lloyd presents, there are no footnotes (not even for the quotes at the beginning of the catalogue), and only a very brief bibliography. The introduction is as distinctive as Lloyd’s own handwriting, which was used for the title on the cover of the catalogue, and yet it is also surprising that the author chose to emphasize certain ideas over others. But this results in a slightly idiosyncratic balance. When reviewing the critical reception of Dutch paintings, for example, Lloyd places a heavy emphasis on British writers and artists (although he does include a generous nod to Fromentin and early French commentators). This emphasis might have been usefully related to collecting patterns in Britain, and particularly among the Royal Family, but this is not pursued. The survey of recent approaches to Dutch art history pauses at a discussion of scholars’ attempts to ferret out ‘meanings’ in paintings – focusing on De Jongh, Alpers and Schama – and then moves on quickly to conclude with novels set in seventeenth-century Holland, such as Tracy Chevalier’s novel, Girl with a Pearl Earring. Although in such a format Lloyd could not possibly review all of the more recent developments in the field, one regrettable omission is any discussion of new findings concerning the Dutch art market and the
use of Dutch pictures in the interior, topics that would surely interest
the general reader. Even so, the catalogue admirably serves as a brief
introduction to Dutch painting and to the riches of the British Royal
Collection.

Emilie Gordenker

National Gallery of Scotland

Peter C. Sutton, Lisa Vergara, and Ann Jensen Adams,
with Jennifer Kilian and Marjorie E. Wieseman, 
Love Letters, Dutch Genre Paintings in the Age of Vermeer. [Cat. 
exh. Bruce Museum of Arts and Science, Greenwich, CT, 
January 31 – May 2, 2004; National Gallery of Ireland, 
Dublin, October 1 – December 31, 2003.] Dublin: National 
Gallery of Ireland, 2003. 208 pp, 76 color plates, 94 b&w 

A decade ago, few connoisseurs of old master painting would 
have listed the Bruce Museum, in suburban Greenwich, Connecticut,
among major exhibition venues. Peter Sutton, who joined the Bruce 
as Executive Director in 2001, is rapidly changing the profile of this 
modest institution with well-crafted exhibitions that take advantage of 
his expertise as a curator, dealer, administrator and scholar of 
Netherlandish art. Love Letters, with its engaging theme and high-
quality paintings, brought crowds to the Bruce after opening at the 
National Gallery of Ireland in Dublin. Following several shows on 
more contemporary themes, the Bruce now hosts Drawn by the Brush, 
the first exhibition of Rubens oil sketches in more than fifty years and 
the first-ever exhibition in the US. While the roster of skilled genre 
painters contains no surprises (TerBorch, Elinga, De Hooch, Metsu, 
Van Mieris, Ostade, Netscher, Steen, et al.), lenders included an 
eclectic roster of venerable institutions from the Netherlands, Europe 
and the US alongside private collections, both acknowledged and 
anonymous. The resulting assemblage mixes canonical objects with 
some that have rarely been shown or studied.

The catalogue of Love Letters may not be as hefty as Sutton’s 
landmark Masters of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Genre Painting 
(Berlin/London/Philadelphia 1984), but it is more opulently produced. 
Each painting exhibited merits a full-page color illustration (some-
times accompanied by a close-up detail), and there are numerous 
comparative figures in color or black-and-white. Thematic essays by 
three scholars examine the pictorial tradition and its historical context 
(Peter Sutton), the structure and content of Vermeer’s epistolary 
scenes (Lisa Vergara) and the social practice of penmanship (Ann 
Jensen Adams). Thorough catalogue entries, written by Sutton, 
Jennifer Kilian and Marjorie Wieseman, present concise biographies 
of the artists and lucid analyses of each of the forty-four paintings 
exhibited. Considering its widespread popularity and complex social 
significance, the letter as a pictorial theme has received relatively 
little scholarly attention. The only synthetic monograph is a long-
outdated volume by Jean Leymarie (The Spirit of the Letter in 
Painting, 1961). While two earlier exhibitions, Leselust (Frankfurt 
1993) and In het licht van het lezen (Haarlem 1992), surveyed the 
pictorial representation of books as well as letters and included 
portraits and still life as well as narrative scenes, the present 
exhibition focuses (with one or two exceptions) on the letter as a favorite 
example of Dutch genre painters specializing in the depiction of elegant 
domesticity. Building upon recent discoveries in social and literary 
as well as visual history, the catalogue offers an up-to-date and richly 
contextualized account. In his introductory essay, Sutton traces the 
migration of epistolary imagery from Haarlem in the 1630s to 
Amsterdam, Leiden and Delft. He then surveys the growth of literacy, 
the development of the postal system, and the social functions of 
letter-writing. Given the many practical uses of the letter, as well as 
the fact that male literacy rates were far higher than those of women, 
it is significant that the majority of genre paintings employing the 
 motif depict female figures at home, engaged in correspondence of a 
private, and usually presumed to be amatory, nature. Yet, like so 
many aspects of Dutch schijnrealisme, the sense of intimacy is 
illusory. As discussed by Sutton and Adams, instructional manuals 
counseled temperance in the expression of personal emotion, 
suggesting both polite verbiage for all occasions (from unrequited 
passion to condolence) and the artful penmanship by which to convey 
it. As Adams points out, epistolary correspondents were well-aware 
that their sentiments might be read aloud, perused by nosy messen-
gers, or even published without their consent. The choreographed 
interactions of writers and readers in paintings by Metsu, De Hooch 
and TerBorch mimic, in pictorial form, the artful decorum of 
epistolary expression, exemplified by numerous quotations in the 
catalogue essays and entries.

Vermeer’s contribution to the genre, as examined by Lisa 
Vergara, remains enigmatic. In his first known treatment, the Dresden 
Letter Reader of c.1657, X-radiographs reveal his deliberate obfuscation 
of an amatory context: the blank rear wall once displayed a 
painting of Cupid, while the table with its still-life of ripe peaches (a 
metaphor, in Vergara’s reading, for the marriageable young lady, or 
vrijster, stationed just above it) once held two wine goblets. Here and 
in the witty Amsterdam Love Letter, the drawn curtain in the 
foreground invites the gaze of a viewer who might be construed as the 
very writer whose words inspire such complex responses in their 
recipient. Proceeding from Arthur Danto’s concept of artistic beauty 
as the internal coherence of form and subject, Vergara’s sensitive 
reading yields to the poetic inferences of emotional nuance that 
Vermeer’s pristine orchestrations of figure, light, and space seem 
destined to evoke. Yet, her concluding discussion of Vermeer’s 
circumstances, including a likely personal connection with a local 
author of epistolary poetry who was related to the artist’s major 
patron, Pieter Claesz van Rijoven, re-establishes Vermeer, like Metsu,
Ter Borch and other contemporaries, as a practitioner whose success lay in catering to the interests of paying customers. For the upwardly mobile citizens of the Dutch Republic’s wealthy urban centers, the vogue for letter-writing reflected a new level of sophisticated social interaction. By illuminating this practice and its pictorial expression, this exhibition and its catalogue provide a valuable contribution to the literature on Dutch genre painting.

Stephanie S. Dickey  
Herron School of Art & Design, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis


Catchpenny prints rank among the most fascinating ephemera produced in the Dutch Republic. Yet aside from a series of what are essentially coffee-table books penned by Maurits de Meyer decades ago, an exhibition at the Rijksprentenkabinet in 1976, and some scattered entries in other exhibition catalogues, these crude yet intriguing prints have scarcely received the scholarly attention they deserve. Fortunately, the publication of Angela Vanhaelen’s Comic Print and Theatre in Early Modern Amsterdam has rectified this situation. Vanhaelen’s learned, interdisciplinary study ties several popular graphic themes to their broader social and cultural milieu, namely, the theatre, the marketplace, class and gender issues, and especially, shifting concepts of the city of Amsterdam. The intricate interconnections between prints on one hand, and these diverse phenomena on the other, are mediated through the postmodern theories of Foucault, de Certeau, Chartier and others concerning the phenomena on the other, are mediated through the postmodern theories of Foucault, de Certeau, Chartier and others concerning the

The first chapter of the book serves as the introduction and is cleverly subtitled “The Consequence of the Trivial.” Here Vanhaelen sets forth the parameters of her study. Specifically, she ties the subject matter of catchpenny prints, which can be somewhat base, to farce performances on the Dutch stage and discusses their appropriation by contemporary audiences. In doing so, she demonstrates that both are too easily and misleadingly associated with the lower classes. In this respect, Vanhaelen’s observations about the functions and reception of Dutch theatre are heavily indebted to the research of the Dutch literary historian, René van Stipriaan. The remaining chapters address specific catchpenny-print themes that enjoyed enduring popularity (literally so, because the woodblocks from which the prints were pulled were endlessly recycled by later publishers).

Chapter 2, “Comedy and the Spaces of Pedagogy,” proffers lengthy analyses of two seventeenth-century Dutch genre paintings, a raucous schoolroom by Jan Steen and a tender mother teaching her child to read by Caspar Netscher; both include catchpenny prints among the plethora of telling motifs. This segues into a valuable discussion of the theatre and its perception among contemporary religious and social groups who debated its perceived pedagogical function within public life. In turn, catchpenny prints are reintroduced into the argument as striking parallels are proposed between the reception of prints and stage productions. The third chapter, “Playing the Market...,” is dedicated to the representation of the celebrated story of Tetjeroen, the loveable quack turned successful businessman. In Vanhaelen’s view, in an era of changing capitalist strategies, the presence of Tetjeroen in catchpenny prints provided an active site through which readers/viewers could fathom deeper questions concerning theatricality – Tetjeroen adopts the role of an actor in hawking his wares – and merchant identity, for merchants were widely perceived to exhibit manipulative skills in conducting business transactions.

“Home Truths...,” the fourth chapter, considers the immensely popular tale of Jan de Wasser who is mercilessly henpecked by his domineering wife, Griet. The Catholic underpinnings of this tale are adroitly illuminated by Vanhaelen, who then examines its survival in catchpenny prints after having been expurgated from the stage in the late seventeenth century, a time in which theatrical productions were reformed under the powerful influence of Nil Volentibus Arduam.

Once again, catchpenny prints are regarded as sites through which pressing social issues and gender concerns are contested. The final chapter, “Where do Babies Come From?,” was easily the most engrossing one. Here Vanhaelen explores folklore surrounding Volewijk, an actual jut of land lying across Het Ij from Amsterdam, that served as a gallows field for executed criminals yet bizarre enough, was simultaneously the mythical source of the city’s children. The discussion is quite wide-ranging here, involving city descriptions and accompanying maps of Amsterdam, public spectacles of execution, and even the professional status of midwifery. All were undergoing change; for example, Volewijk disappears from city descriptions in the late seventeenth century at precisely the same time that public spectacles of execution were on the wane. In contrast, the folktale of Volewijk continued to flourish in catchpenny prints, which yet again demonstrates the ability of these supposedly uncomplicated art works to provide compelling social critique in a city wrestling with notions of its urban identity. This makes for truly fascinating reading.

Obviously, such a brief review of Comic Print and Theatre in Early Modern Amsterdam cannot do justice to its dazzling erudition and complexity. At its best, the book sheds ample light on the multifarious reception of print images that earlier scholars have typically considered crude and simple – after all, they are ostensibly addressed to children. At its worst, the book is larded with jargon and at times, proposals interpretations that those readers less sympathetic to critical theory will construe as symptomatic of postmodernism gone awry. It would have also benefited from a formal conclusion to tie the diverse and elaborate strands of Vanhaelen’s arguments together. To this reviewer, Vanhaelen’s study lacked a sufficiently nuanced understanding of the social hierarchies of the Dutch Republic. The use of the term burgher, for example, in a catchall manner to describe anything that is middle class (see, for example, p. 130) is actually inconsistent with seventeenth-century notions of it. As Prak, Meijer Drees, and others have argued, in the Dutch Republic, the designation burgher, denoting citizenship for those of appropriate social standing, was remarkably fluid, purely local (as opposed to national), and invoked or revoked for politically expedient ends. More significantly, as a contemporary term, burgher referred not so much to members of a specific urban class (as it does today)
but rather to a community of persons who manifested desirable behaviors, thereby excluding those members of the lower echelons of society in the process. And these “desirable behaviors” were promulgated by the elite, not by the middle class (a terribly confusing and much-misused term in its own right). In this sense, the predominant role of elites in constructing social and cultural ideals is underestimated by Vanhaelen, as is their use of ever-evolving concepts of civility to shape the conduct of social inferiors, including the so-called middle class.

Wayne Franits
Syracuse University

Note: This book was supported in part by a subvention from the Historians of Netherlandish Art. Information about available grants may be found on the HNA website.


This volume brings together papers from the Ninth Interdisciplinary Conference on Netherlandic Studies held at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in May 1998, by our sister organization, the American Association for Netherlandic Studies. As I noted in an earlier review for this Newsletter, interdisciplinarity is the hallmark of both the AANS and its publications. While the 2003 volume of proceedings is typically wide-ranging, its pervasive theme is the literary interpretation of history. Eleven of the nineteen articles concern Dutch literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Although only two essays (both recently superseded by larger studies) address art historical topics, many of the contributions shed light on the socio-cultural context of Netherlandic art.

The collection opens with an essay by Wiljan van der Akker and Gillis J. Dorleijn based on the keynote address from the 1998 conference. Their subject is the historiography of Dutch literature, or should we say, Dutch and Flemish literature? Are the poetic productions of the northern and southern Netherlands two separate traditions, or one? In taking this question – answered differently by succeeding generations of literary historians – as their central focus, the authors explore a relationship complicated by cultural, religious and linguistic tensions. Dutch literature, at least until the 1880s, dominates the field, with Flemish authors often measuring success by recognition in the North more than at home. Readers interested in the interactions between Dutch and Flemish visual culture will find themselves in a thought-provoking parallel universe.

Equally broad in scope is Arthur L. Loeb’s survey of the history of Dutch Jewry before the Holocaust. This study was, according to the author, provoked by an American colleague’s statement that one could not be both Jewish and Dutch. In twelve pages, Loeb presents a masterful overview of Judaism in the Netherlands from Roman times forward, demonstrating that Jewish citizens have made a continuous contribution to the culture of the region.

Linguistic theory is represented by Robert S. Kirsner, “Linguistics as Politics: On the Role of Alternative Approaches within Dutch Linguistics” (pp. 125-140), Henriette Louwerse, “Customizing One’s Voice: Languages in Migrant Writing” (pp. 155-164), and Kristin Lovrien-Meuwese, “French Loanwords in Dutch: The Mouth is Mightier than the Pen” (pp. 165-174). While Kirsner takes a technical approach, complete with impressive charts and equations, Louwerse considers two cultural factors, the implicit suspicion with which native Dutch critics have approached the works of writers for whom Dutch is not a mother tongue, and the hybrid expressivity that such foreigners bring to their adopted language. Lovrien-Meuwese focuses on the infiltration of French words into Dutch in the sixteenth century, hypothesizing that words like sla (from French salade) and schoonvader (from French beau-père) developed not from the literary taste for French among the elite, but from oral contacts between working class Dutchmen and Wallonian immigrants. This case study of how patterns of immigration and intermarriage form the sociological catalyst for linguistic development offers a parallel to the contemporaneous influx of Flemish artists that invigorated Dutch painting at the turn of the seventeenth century.

Aspects of early modern culture are addressed in four other essays. Michael Galvin, “The Administration of Parochial Charity in Burgundian Flanders” (pp. 51-62), compares the institutions known as “poor tables” that offered food and other forms of relief to the deserving poor of fifteenth-century Bruges and Ghent, demonstrating that the activities of civic charities and the social status of the men who directed them varied greatly according to local conditions. Ton J. Broos, “Travelers and Travel Liars in Eighteenth-Century Dutch Literature” (pp. 29-38), examines the varying blend of fact and fancy in several purported eyewitness accounts by Dutch travelers to Africa. His exploration of the indistinct boundary between observed truth and deliberate fiction serves as a cautionary reminder that primary sources must be interpreted with care.

Amy Golahny, “Rembrandt’s World History Illustrated by Merian” (pp. 73-86) analyzes two drawings made in Rembrandt’s studio around 1655 (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rennes, Ben. 1014 and Valentiner Collection, Ben. 1015) as evidence that Rembrandt owned and consulted an edition of Johann Gottfried’s world history (Historica Chronica, oder Beschreibung der fürhnhmsten Geschichten..., Frankfurt, 1630) with plates by Matthias Merian. Both drawings depict an episode treated frequently in early modern writings on ancient history but rarely in art: the Roman consul Popilius Laenas challenging the Seleucan King Antiochus Epiphanes. Golahny’s assertion that Merian’s illustration, not a print by Joseph Amman as previously proposed by Kieser (1941) and Timpel (1969), was Rembrandt’s source is convincing and enables a nuanced reading of Rembrandt’s dramatic narrative. If Golahny’s attribution of the Rennes drawing (usually considered autograph) to a Rembrandt pupil is correct, we have an intriguing juxtaposition of competing versions of an assigned theme, one stronger in draughtsmanship, the other clearer in compositional structure. This topic is further elaborated in Golahny’s recently published book, Rembrandt’s Reading (Amsterdam University Press, 2003), reviewed by Larry Silver in an earlier issue of this Newsletter.

For Christine Petra Sellin (“Seventeenth-Century Netherlandish Paintings of the Biblical Hagar and Ishmael: Painterly Conceptions of Familial Life and Community in a Developing Nation”, pp. 187-208), the pictorial theme of the Egyptian concubine Hagar’s banishment from Abraham’s household and rescue in the wilderness resonates with contemporary concerns about inheritance, family dynamics, and the potentially disruptive role of immigrant servant girls in the Dutch household. While Italian artists preferred the rescue-in-a-landscape, Hagar’s banishment, with its complex interaction of characters, held greater appeal for Dutch artists and
viewers. Sellin backs up her argument with citations from literary sources including Luther, Calvin, Jacob Cats and the playwright Abraham de Koninck, whose morality play, *Hagars vluchte ende weder-komste* (1616) presents Hagar’s contentious relationship with her mistress, Sarah, as a humorous illustration of ambition, pride, and, ultimately, obedience to God. Sellin’s concluding interpretation of Hagar’s expulsion as a symbol for political defense of territory by the new Dutch ‘family’ of provinces is less fully worked-out in this essay, but may be further explored in her recently completed dissertation (UCLA 2003).

Modern literary movements are examined in articles on Darwius and the Dutch novel, 1860-1910 (Mary G. Kemperink, pp. 115-124); Dutch and Flemish crime fiction (Sabine Vanacker, pp. 223-236); constructions of the city in the journal *De Vlag* (Eveline Vanfrausen, pp. 237-246); the “movement of the eighties” (Dorleijn and van den Akker, pp. 19-28); Gruppe 47 and the Vijftigers (Katherine Ebel, pp. 39-50); Marga Minco’s *Nagelaten dagen* (Johan P. Snapper, pp. 209-222); and Dutch poetry of the 1960s (Bertram Mourits, pp. 175-186). South African literary topics include Afrikaner idealization in Dutch historical novels (Wilfred Jonckheere, pp. 87-94) and “The First Afrikaans Movement”, 1875-1906 (Danie Jordan, pp. 95-114).

This tidy book (and the PAANS series overall) provides a model for the economical publication of scholarly research, accomplished through a combination of volunteer editorial work and modest production values. The University Press of America is to be commended for its continuing commitment to such publications in the face of increasing commercial pressures.

Notes: (1) Users of spelling-sensitive electronic search engines should note that the first name of the co-editor, Jolanda Vanderwal Taylor, is misspelled on the title and colophon pages. (2) This writer has served on the PAANS editorial board but was not consulted in respect to the present volume.

Stephanie S. Dickey

Herron School of Art & Design, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis


The biographical lexicon is one of those genres in which scholars in the humanities summarize the current state of knowledge in their field. It is an indispensable tool for those wanting to get quick access to an often widely dispersed body of knowledge bearing on often minor historical figures. Art history has a long tradition in developing such tools, which will remain in demand as long as art lovers will be curious about artists other than the great masters alone.

Dutch art history can boast an old tradition in writing biographical dictionaries, each building on top of the other. Starting with Karel van Mander, there is a long chain of names, such as Houbraken, Van Gool, Immerzeel, Kramm, Wurzbach and Waller, which are still quoted over and over again. Among these, Roeland van Eynden and Adriaan van der Willigen’s *Geschiedenis der vaderlandsche schilderkunst*, 4 vols. (Haarlem 1816-1840) was an important link between the early biographers and modern scholarship. Thirty years later, Adriaan van der Willigen Pz. (a nephew) published his *Les artistes de Harlem*, for the first time concentrating on one local school. And now a third Adriaan van der Willigen (died 2001) continues the family tradition with a dictionary of Dutch and Flemish still-life painters.

While serving in the Netherlands diplomatic service for 34 years, Van der Willigen collected notes on painters, in order to satisfy “a desire to make some contribution to hard knowledge” alongside his “work towards peace and development.” His “dream to get the facts right” meets with the utmost approval of the undersigned reviewers, who only regret that they did not have the chance to undergo Van der Willigen’s “training at the British School for Military Intelligence, [which] had taught [him] to distinguish facts from rumours.” The book has greatly benefited from his rigorous concentration on the historical facts. Another important factor contributing to the success of Van der Willigen’s project was the fact that, from 1990 on, he found a highly competent collaborator in Fred Meijer, the RKD specialist on still life painting. Meijer eventually finished the book after Van der Willigen’s death, adding substantial amounts of material from the RKD’s vast collections of images and unpublished biographical notes as well as from the recent literature.

The book supplies information on 850 Dutch and Flemish painters who are known to have painted still lifes, together with another 35 painters who may have painted such subjects, and “a handful of unidentified monogrammists.” The great majority of the artists lived in the major cities of the United Republic and in Antwerp in the seventeenth century. All were active between 1525 and 1725.

The book is a very fine piece of scholarship. It not only updates our knowledge on already known masters, but along the road, the authors were able to identify many masters totally unknown to most art historians and even to specialists in the field. They traced works by several masters from whose hand no still-life paintings were known so far, as well as works by artists whose existence was known from written sources only. Meijer estimates that the book covers about twice as many artists as previous listings (in Wurzbach, Thieme-Becker, and other standard dictionaries).

For each painter, the same basic biographical data are listed, as well as representative works, whether preserved in public collections or in private hands or only known from old inventories and auction sales catalogues. None, however, is illustrated. This, of course, made it possible to produce the book at a reasonable price. References to published sources are kept as brief as possible. The book contains six short appendices on “monogrammists, unidentified masters, pupils of masters specialized in still-life painting, artists who drew or engraved still-life subjects or painted them in watercolors etc., other records and signatures pertaining to still-life paintings,” and finally the theme of “the slaughtered pig (or oxen).” An attractive feature of the book is the insertion of many names in alphabetical order with an arrow referring the reader to an appendix where more information may be sought (e.g. Baltus, with an arrow pointing to Appendix E.1) or to the standard variation of the name of the artist in the book (e.g. Fopsen, with an arrow to Jacob van Es).

Traditionally, dictionaries of biography are compilations of published material. Over the centuries, this has led to many mistakes creeping into our body of knowledge. Such mistakes have turned out to be extremely resistant to correction, leaving us with countless ‘phantom artists’ who never existed but who often have had whole oeuvres attributed to them. The authors’ aim to incorporate only...
reliable data therefore deserves praise. However, their decision not to do original research is regrettable. Recent developments in the accessibility of large quantities of archival material in both the Netherlands and in Belgium would have made it possible to complete many now sketchy biographies without too much difficulty. This is especially important in cases where there remains uncertainty about the artist’s period of activity.

The fate of all biographical dictionaries is that they never are the last word on a subject. Instead, they induce other scholars to pursue new avenues of research or to amplify or correct hitherto accepted information, with the effect of making it obsolete. Fred Meijer is clearly aware of this. He acknowledges in his foreword that “many more [still life artists] should probably have been listed.” And, indeed, we found at least a dozen new names of still life artists in Eric Duverger’s Antwerpsche kunstventarissen, 12 vols. (1984-2002). This source, which is surely available at the RKD, was apparently not consulted by the authors. Similarly, art dealers may find works by unlisted still-life painters in their stock, just as collectors may find them hanging on their walls.

This is a important book which should not be absent from any serious scholar’s book shelf. We thoroughly enjoyed reading and using it and we trust that it will encourage other readers – as it encouraged us – to come forward with so far unpublished material on Dutch and Flemish still-life painters.

Marten Jan Bok and J. Michael Montias
University of Amsterdam / Yale University


Sometimes it is necessary to take a small step backward in order to get set for a long leap forward. Such was the sense of the exhibition “The Mystery of the Young Rembrandt,” sponsored by the Staatliche Museen Kassel and the Museum het Rembrandthuis Amsterdam in 2001-2002. The catalyst for the show was the conviction of similarities to accepted works. The process must be carefully measured against the intuitive conviction of similarities to accepted works. The process must be transparent, and the practitioner must maintain a keen awareness of footholds and reaches, expressing them in terminology that is

The attribution of the latter is built on the case for the former, and in his essay “Delimiting Rembrandt’s Autograph Oeuvre – an Insoluble Problem?” Van de Wetering once again demonstrates that he is acutely aware of, and exceptionally able to express in verbal form, the procedures and pitfalls in building a catalogue raisonné. The “house of cards” risk is carefully measured against the intuitive conviction of similarities to accepted works. The process must be transparent, and the practitioner must maintain a keen awareness of footholds and reaches, expressing them in terminology that is appropriate to degrees of certainty.

That said, words sometimes fail, and consensus in a scholarly community is best built on personal interaction. To that end, a scholars’ day was held in Amsterdam at the conclusion of the exhibition, at which approximately 100 attendees were able to share opinions and present papers in an informal setting. Such events are enormously productive, even when they have an opposite effect than one would hope. Indeed, on many of the attribution questions central to the exhibition, particularly assignments to artists in Rembrandt’s workshop and circle, little consensus was reached. These gray areas are notably difficult because of our inability to “backtrack” from the moment of emergence of a young artist’s discreet identity to discern his earlier work while still heavily under the influence of the master or while still within the workshop itself. Van de Wetering’s essay confirms that this issue was addressed already in the seventeenth century: “We must also guard against the opinion, expressed at the conference, that our inability to put a name on so many paintings means that the process is flawed, and that many of these works of high quality must be by Rembrandt himself. He had a large number of students; the fact that we know so many by name is pure happenstance, due in no small measure to the trouble that Rembrandt continually found himself in, resulting in many declarations made to notaries. That said, there were countless students we will never know, and some were quite adept at mimicking his skills. It is also important to remember that Rembrandt was hired by Hendrick Uylenburgh to lead a fully functioning workshop that had been in business for years under several prior masters. Moreover, the onus of attribution is always to make a positively-directed case: not “Why isn’t it by
Rembrandt’s” but “Why is it?” . The latter question is always more difficult.

Far too often, scholars engaged in a field as complex and well-published as Rembrandt studies focus too narrowly on issues of attribution, documentation or iconology. When confidence in a hypothesis is reached, it is easy to forget the speculative nature of the whole enterprise. For example, catalogue entry no. 7 (Bob van den Boogert) plausibly identifies the 1626 history painting in Leiden as The Clemency of Charles V but, in an otherwise fine contribution to the long-vexing question of this painting’s theme, refuses to consider the ramifications of the potential subject for its possible owner Petrus Scriverius on the grounds that any such hypotheses would be speculative. To my mind, there is much speculation going around, and there is nothing wrong with that as long as we recognize it as such and use the appropriate terms. Applied to connoisseurship, the sooner we not only recognize – as Van de Wetering does – that some questions are insoluble, but take the next step and allow ourselves to be comfortable with that limitation on knowledge, the more we can challenge basic assumptions and move forward with a new set of questions.

Paul Crenshaw
Washington University in St. Louis


The end of the twentieth century, and beginning of the twenty-first, have seen no diminution of interest in the seventeenth-century artist Rembrandt van Rijn, at least as gauged by museum exhibitions. Exhibitions on Rembrandt’s self portraits (London and The Hague, 1999-2000), his depictions of women (London and Edinburgh, 2001), his early Leiden works (separate exhibitions in Boston, 2000, and Kassel and Amsterdam, 2001-2002) and his prints (Amsterdam and London, 2001-2002) all attested to the continued popularity of Rembrandt’s art with modern audiences. As themed shows, these exhibitions also reflected a desire to illuminate specific aspects of Rembrandt’s art, as opposed to the staging of a monographic retrospective of his entire career as an artist.

Rembrandt’s Journey: Painter, Draftsman, Etcher, shown at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts and the Art Institute of Chicago in 2003-04, would at first glance appear to differ from these other exhibitions in surveying the artist’s career more broadly. Yet despite its title, this most recent Rembrandt exhibition was above all devoted to a thematic presentation of Rembrandt’s prints: 160 were included in it, as compared to 35 drawings and 23 paintings. Clifford S. Ackley, whose 1980 exhibition catalogue Printmaking in the Age of Rembrandt holds a place of absolute distinction in the scholarship of Dutch prints, curated the exhibition. His perspicacious choice was to define “Rembrandt’s journey” through a thematic approach that grouped works predominantly by subject matter, and only secondarily by chronology.

Unlike many contemporary exhibition catalogues, Rembrandt’s Journey: Painter, Draftsman, Etcher, is not intimidating to the general public in length or scholarship, yet it still maintains value for serious students of Dutch art. Four essays precede the catalogue entries, two by Ackley, and two by his Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, colleagues, Ronni Baer and Thomas E. Rassieur. Ackley’s first essay traces the exhibition’s theme of “Rembrandt’s Artistic Journey” and provides a general introduction to Rembrandt’s art, including a useful section on print connoisseurship. In the second essay, Ackley discusses the use of gesture and pose by Rembrandt in his biblical etchings as a primary means of achieving expressiveness. Though neither essay is particularly innovative, they stand as brief, readable surveys of their subjects. In “Rembrandt’s Oil Sketches,” Ronni Baer takes on the unenviable task of discussing a subject largely covered only a few years previously by Ernst van de Wetering in his essay in Rembrandt the Printmaker (Amsterdam-London 2000, pp. 36-63). While Van de Wetering organized his essay around discussion of the relationship between Rembrandt’s oil sketches and his prints, either executed or hypothesized, Baer treats each of the ten oil sketches independently and hence in greater detail. She also includes in her discussion one painting not treated by Van de Wetering: David with the Head of Goliath before Saul of 1627, now in the Kunstmuseum, Basel. As she admits, the painting is an ‘anomaly’ when placed among Rembrandt’s other oil sketches because of its range of color (the others are essentially monochrome sketches). However, its status as the earliest of Rembrandt’s oil sketches might well account for this difference. Baer’s other contribution is to treat the issue of the posthumous reception of the oil sketch in European art up into the twentieth century as a way of understanding current attention to Rembrandt’s oil sketches. The issue of the later reception of Rembrandt’s art is one traced in nearly all the introductory essays to the catalogue, as well as in some of the catalogue entries. This emphasis is certainly a welcome trend in museum scholarship.

Thomas Rassieur describes the evolution of Rembrandt’s techniques over the course of his career as a printmaker, and the reader’s sense of indeed “Looking over Rembrandt’s Shoulder” at this Printmaker at Work. This catalogue essay is the earliest in the catalogue, as well as in some of the catalogue entries. This emphasis is certainly a welcome trend in museum scholarship.

The thematically arranged catalogue entries are supplemented by an exhibition list that provides the technical information and provenance for each object. This allows the authors of the catalogue entries (Ackley, Rassieur, Sue Welsh Reed, and William W. Robinson of the Fogg Art Museum) to discuss several works of art within each entry, thus building on the exhibition’s premise: to explore Rembrandt’s engagement with subjects repeatedly throughout his career. This organization worked well overall, both in the exhibition itself and in the catalogue. (This author saw the exhibition at the Art Institute of Chicago.) For example, the discussion of “Head Studies and Fantasy Portraits” from the 1630s (cat. nos. 28-34) helped to highlight the importance of this category in Rembrandt’s art in the earlier part of his career. The attempt to maintain some chronological organization as well, however, at times frustrates the reader. For example, Rembrandt’s earliest depictions of the artist in his studio (nos. 18-19) are separated from later renderings (nos. 85-89), while examples of the Presentation in the Temple from several decades are discussed together (nos. 1-3). To understand the changes in Rembrandt’s approach to self-portraiture over time, readers must peruse three separate catalogue entries; such an organization serves least the general audience for such a catalogue. The entries are

This book is the result of a doctoral dissertation written for the Katholieke Universiteit, Nijmegen. In a compact volume comprised of six chapters, Anat Gilboa sets herself a daunting task: a survey of Rembrandt’s formal and iconographic approach to the representation of women. While admiring her ambition, this reader often wished that the author had focused on a tighter theme so that some of her insights could have been explored and defended at greater length.

Following a general introduction and an overview of the topic (Chapter One), each chapter traces a pictorial theme through Rembrandt’s career. Chapter Two examines representations of the Virgin Mary, Chapter Three formal portraits of women, Chapter Four the nude and eroticism, Chapter Five depictions of Rembrandt’s wife, Saskia van Uylenburgh, and companion, Hendrickje Stoffels, and Chapter Six goddesses and heroines. Each chapter attempts to draw conclusions about the evolution of Rembrandt’s approach to the theme. Gilboa observes that Rembrandt’s pictorial engagement with the female body and the female psyche began somewhat hesitantly but gained in confidence and depth as he matured. Narrative details increasingly gave way to intense concentration on the individual figure. His treatment of controversial subjects was often morally neutral, reflecting the artist’s concerns for naturalism and pictorial tradition more than any didactic interest. Gilboa concludes that Rembrandt’s attitude toward women blends personal independence toward social convention with a deep-seated conservatism, while his depictions maintain a shifting balance between the psychological and the symbolic, the representational and the ideal.

Several chapters contain valuable observations that deserve further investigation. Despite his Protestant context, Rembrandt represented Mary, the mother of Christ, more often than any other female figure (the focus of Chapter Two). After 1641, he painted no female portraits until 1654, and his return to the genre met with little appreciation (pp. 88-89). His female heroines are curiously static, even passive, compared with those of contemporaries such as Rubens and Honthorst; perhaps equally significant is the near-absence from his work of aggressively heroic males (p. 158). Gilboa’s analysis of these points, while clear and well-organized, is often quite brief. (A nice exception is the more extended discussion of the two late Lucretias, interpreted as reflective of Rembrandt’s ‘gender politics,’ pp. 166-170).

The format of the book reflects editorial choices that enhance its physical appeal but detract from its scholarly effectiveness. While the publishers invested in a hard cover, glossy paper and sixteen high quality color plates, only minimal footnotes and black-and-white illustrations accompany the text. Not illustrated are many works by Rembrandt, even some that are discussed at length, as well as various intriguing comparisons. Perhaps to compensate for this, the author expends precious verbiage on describing details of composition and content. While the bibliography demonstrates awareness of relevant recent publications, such as *Rembrandt’s Women* (exh. cat., Julia Lloyd-Williams, et al., Edinburgh/London 2003), the contributions of other authors on specific issues and objects are not always referenced in the brief notes, making it difficult to see how much of Gilboa’s sensible analysis is truly her own.

As a dissertation, this volume is a promising beginning for Gilboa and a well-rounded, although necessarily summary, discussion of the topic at hand. As an accessible survey of an important theme, it is sure to be consulted by scholars interested in issues of gender and representation as well as specialists in the art of Rembrandt and his Dutch contemporaries.

Stephanie S. Dickey
Herron School of Art, Indiana University-Purdue University
Indianapolis


In the centuries following the death of Rembrandt, the artist’s reputation fluctuated to an extreme, falling to its lowest ebb in the eighteenth century, and rising to its zenith in the late nineteenth century. Two scholarly publications, one by Alison McQueen and the other by Catherine B. Scallen, closely investigate the period that witnessed a meteoric rise in Rembrandt’s fame. These scholarly books, published by Amsterdam University Press, examine the critical responses to Rembrandt’s art from different perspectives. McQueen charts Rembrandt’s rising star as a painter, draughtsmen, and
informed the critical assessments of Rembrandt's art during this vital period. Scallen focuses upon the years 1870 to 1935, a period of considerable scholarly controversy in which the number of works attributed to the artist grew exponentially, totaling over 700 paintings, and the prices for Rembrandt's art soared. Scallen concentrates upon the most influential Rembrandt scholars of the period, the museum curators Wilhelm von Bode, Abraham Bredius, Cornelis Hofstede de Groot, and Wilhelm Valentin. Scallen demonstrates how these early “art history professionals” influenced...
fact that Eckhout’s first one-man show in the Netherlands was hosted by the Mauritshuis in The Hague, the home of Rembrandt’s Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp and Vermeer’s View of Delft, would seem to suggest that this artist and his unusual body of work have been officially integrated into the larger narrative of seventeenth-century Dutch art. The Mauritshuis was the venue, however, primarily for historical reasons. It was originally built for Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen (also called “The Brazilian”), who was both governor of the Dutch West India Company’s short-lived colony in Brazil and Eckhout’s patron there.

This small exhibition included all 21 paintings that are currently attributed to Eckhout, but only six of his drawings, hundreds of which have survived. While rather limited in scope, the slim catalogue is an elegant, high-quality production – the fortunate result of clear and clever design. It includes reproductions of only fourteen drawings by Eckhout, but readers will be delighted to find large, high-resolution illustrations in color of all paintings. Speaking as an Eckhout scholar, these are the best reproductions of the artist’s works that I have ever seen in a publication. The catalogue is divided into four parts: an introductory essay by Quentin Buvelot, a natural history analysis by Dante Martins Teixeira and Elly de Vries, a short overview of Eckhout’s life by Florike Egmond and Peter Mason, and a brief series of appendices (primarily presenting historical material).

Buvelot is a curator at the Mauritshuis and a specialist on the Dutch classicist Jacob van Campen, an artist whose paintings from the 1650s borrow motifs from Eckhout’s Brazilian paintings and drawings. In his essay “Albert Eckhout: A Dutch artist in Brazil,” Buvelot provides a clearly written and scrupulously footnoted overview of the artist’s works, both those produced in Brazil and those usually attributed to his post-Brazilian period. Of all of the contributors to the catalog, Buvelot is the only one who displays any sensitivity to the visual qualities of Eckhout’s paintings. In his discussion of the ethnographic paintings, for example, he calls attention to the artist’s “practiced hand” and his “subtle and naturalistic palette.” His descriptions of Eckhout’s style as “meticulous” and “informative” nonetheless reinforce the traditional view of Eckhout as a passive recorder, not an active and inventive creator. Furthermore, Buvelot’s overview appears to boil down the recent scholarship on Eckhout to the fairly limited (albeit important) issue of whether or not his work into the larger context of seventeenth-century Dutch art. Although this is a very attractive publication, it compares unfavorably with the scholarship that resulted from the 1979 exhibition, “Zo wijd de wereld streek,” at the Mauritshuis, of which the catalogue Johanna Maurits van Nassau-Siegen, 1604-1679: a Humanist Prince in Europe and Brazil (ed. E. van den Boogaart, et al.) remains an essential reference work. Even the catalogue Albert Eckhout Returns to Brazil, 1644-2002 (Barbara Berlowicz, ed., Copenhagen: Nationalmuseet, 2002), which accompanied the Danish/Brazilian exhibition of the same title, provided a more generous view of the diversity of current scholarship and gave greater attention to both the drawings and the still lifes. Finally, since the main thrust of the 2004 catalogue is to call into question both the location of production and the original venue intended for Eckhout’s paintings, it would have been useful to provide a new interpretation of the images to address this. Given the fact that scientific, archival, and visual evidence may be found to support each side of the argument – Brazilian versus European production and display – it seems that a viable interpretation for each scenario is necessary.

The final essay, “Albert E(e)ckhout, court painter,” was written by historian Florike Egmond and the cultural anthropologist and Eckhout scholar Peter Mason. This biography of the artist is largely a critique of H.E. van Gelder’s seminal 1960 Oud-Holland article. As I noted in my dissertation on Albert Eckhout and Georg Marcgraf (Northwestern 2002), even after one re-traces van Gelder’s steps in the archives (the Oud-Holland article, which was published posthumously, has no footnotes), large gaps in Eckhout’s biography remain. Where did he train (in Groningen, Amersfoort, and/or Amsterdam) and with whom? I suggested that Eckhout could have completed his apprenticeship in Amersfoort and that Jacob van Campen was the most likely person to have put him into contact with Johan Maurits. Here Egmond and Mason provide additional evidence for these assertions, suggesting that the high social standing of the Eckhout family (possibly Eckhout’s relatives) in Amersfoort would have provided the appropriate entrance into the artistic circle of Jacob van Campen. Their idea that Eckhout could have worked in Paulus Bor’s studio, however, would have been considerably strengthened by a discussion about artistic production – the treatment of which is notably lacking here. As I discuss in my forthcoming book on Eckhout, there are drawings by the artist in the collection of the Jagiellon Library in Krakow that strongly suggest stylistic as well as thematic affinities to the work of Bor and Jacob van Campen. The strength of Egmond and Mason’s essay, however, lies in archival, not artistic, evidence. Their most important contribution is the presentation of new documents, which allow them not only to dispute the traditional spelling of Eckhout’s name (they favor Eeckhout) but also attack the authenticity of the artist’s signatures on the paintings now in Copenhagen, thereby challenging the traditional view that these images were produced in Brazil.

It is unfortunate that this exhibition, which was both a homecoming (Eckhout’s paintings, now in the museum in Copenhagen, have been in Danish collections since 1654) and an overdue tribute, is accompanied by a catalogue that does so little to place the artist and his work into the larger context of seventeenth-century Dutch art. Although this is a very attractive publication, it compares unfavorably with the scholarship that resulted from the 1979 exhibition, “Zo wijd de wereld streek,” at the Mauritshuis, of which the catalogue Johanna Maurits van Nassau-Siegen, 1604-1679: a Humanist Prince in Europe and Brazil (ed. E. van den Boogaart, et al.) remains an essential reference work. Even the catalogue Albert Eckhout Returns to Brazil, 1644-2002 (Barbara Berlowicz, ed., Copenhagen: Nationalmuseet, 2002), which accompanied the Danish/Brazilian exhibition of the same title, provided a more generous view of the diversity of current scholarship and gave greater attention to both the drawings and the still lifes. Finally, since the main thrust of the 2004 catalogue is to call into question both the location of production and the original venue intended for Eckhout’s paintings, it would have been useful to provide a new interpretation of the images to address this. Given the fact that scientific, archival, and visual evidence may be found to support each side of the argument – Brazilian versus European production and display – it seems that a viable interpretation for each scenario is necessary.

Dante Martins Teixeira is a zoologist who has published extensively on Dutch Brazil and Elly de Vries is an art historian whose work has focused on Eckhout’s drawings. Their essay “Exotic novelties from overseas” is primarily concerned with classifying the artifacts of material culture pictured in Eckhout’s figural works and identifying the individual specimens of flora and fauna represented in all of his paintings. As part of their overarching project of fixing diversity of current scholarship and gave greater attention to both the drawings and the still lifes. Finally, since the main thrust of the 2004 catalogue is to call into question both the location of production and the original venue intended for Eckhout’s paintings, it would have been useful to provide a new interpretation of the images to address this. Given the fact that scientific, archival, and visual evidence may be found to support each side of the argument – Brazilian versus European production and display – it seems that a viable interpretation for each scenario is necessary.

Rebecca Parker Brienen

University of Miami

Note: The author’s book, Visions of Savage Paradise: Albert Eckhout, Court Painter in Colonial Dutch Brazil will come out in 2005 (University of Amsterdam Press).
New Titles

Journals

The Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch 2004 is devoted to Peter Paul Rubens, with a contribution by Ulrich Heinen on Rubens’s garden.

Books


Elen, Albert, German Master Drawings from the Koenigs Collection. Return of a Lost Treasure. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2004. – Catalogue of the exhibition of sixteenth-century German...
drawings taken from the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen during World War II and recently discovered in Kyiv (Kiev), Ukraine.


**Nakamura, Toshiharu (ed.), Rembrandt as Norm and Anti-Norm*. Papers given at a colloquium held at the Graduate School of


Schröder, Klaus Albrecht, and Heinz Widauer (eds.), Peter Paul Rubens. Cat. exh. Albertina, Vienna, September 15 – December 5, 2004. Vienna: Albertina; Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, 2004. ISBN 3-7757-1514-2. – This is the expanded German version of the catalogue that will accompany the Metropolitan Museum showing of the exhibition (see under Exhibitions). The catalogue entries which will also appear in the American edition are by Anne-Marie Logan and Michiel Plomp. Both versions of the catalogue will be reviewed.
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Dekoning, Marion, The Battle of Lekkerbettje: Imagery and Ideology during the Eighty Years War (1568-1648). USC, T. Olson.


Hearne, Michelle, Anne de Bretagne (r. 1491-1514): Images of Medieval Queenship in Early Modern France. SUNY Binghamton, J. Wilson.
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Whitman-Coleman, Sally, Empathetic Constructions in Early Netherlandish Painting: Narrative and Reception in the Art of Hans Memling. UT Austin, J. Smith.


Europe

Belgium

Mauffort, Danielle, Le peintre anversois Peter Thijis (1624-1677). L’un des derniers élèves d’Antoine van Dyck. Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Prof. Ignace Vandevivere.

Germany


Friederichs, Anke, Der Meister des Wimpfener Quirinusaltars. Tübingen, Prof. Klein.


Oth, Sabine, Das Wort in den Bildern von Jerg Ratgeb. Frankfurt/M.

Quermann, Carolin, Der Mariendod von Hugo van der Goes. Distanzen als Gegenstand der Bildanalyse. FU Berlin, Prof. König.


**Initial Challenge Grant of $5,000.00 given by James Marrow**
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Benefactors contribute $200 per year to the Historians of Netherlandish Art; Patrons give $100 per year; Institutions and Businesses give $100 per year; Supporting Members give $65 per year.
Historians of Netherlandish Art 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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