ExtravagANT. Paintings and Drawings by the Antwerp Mannerists on Show in Antwerp and Maastricht

Pseudo-Bles, The Beheading of Saint John the Baptist.
Oil on panel, 48 x 35 cm. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie.
From the President

With summer’s end and the onset of cooler weather, particularly here in upstate New York, I find myself re-energized as I think about the commencement of the academic year, the various exhibitions currently on view, and the appearance of new and stimulating publications, all of which attest to the healthy state of our field. Naturally, my thoughts turn as well to Historians of Netherlandish Art. Planning continues in the able hands of Quint Gregory and Aneta Georgievsk-Shine for our next quadrennial conference, which will take place in November 8-12, 2006, in Baltimore and Washington DC. As you are no doubt aware, the Conference Program Committee, consisting of H. Perry Chapman, Melanie Gifford, Larry Silver, Joaneath Spicer, and Ron Spronk, have recently issued a final, electronic call for session and workshop proposals. Naturally, I urge as many of you as possible to submit proposals.

Speaking of emails, by now all of you have probably seen the email appealing for additional funds to be contributed to our endowment in the name of our recently deceased colleague John Michael Montias. We have received several emails in response asking about the possible use(s) of the funds collected. I apologize for having neglected to mention in the original email appeal that the endowment fund is principally used to support the research and scholarship of members of our organization. Additional funds contributed in Montias’s name will most certainly be made available for this very same purpose.

Before I close I would also be remiss if I did not mention that at our last board meeting, the board unanimously approved an increase in annual dues (commencing with 2006), from the present $45.00 for regular members to $50.00, and from the present $65.00 for Supporting Members to $75.00. The dues for students, patrons, benefactors and institutions will remain the same. Our purpose in raising the dues is to help offset increasing administrative costs on a variety of fronts. I would also like to point out that this Newsletter (online) includes a ballot for three new board members. Please take the time to vote (for the ballot click on HNA News).

I look forward to seeing many of you at the College Art Association of America’s annual conference, which will take place in Boston, in late February 2006. We are planning to have a brief business meeting for our members, followed by our annual reception. I also hope to see you at the session that we are co-sponsoring with CAA and which is dedicated to the late Julius Held (see under HNA at CAA below).

Wayne Franits
Syracuse University

In Memoriam

Frans Baudouin
(1920-2005)

Frans Baudouin died on New Year’s Day, shortly before his eighty-fifth birthday. A student of both history and art history, he graduated from the University of Leuven during the Second World War. Shortly after the liberation of Belgium, Baudouin became a ‘Belgian Civilian Officer’ attached to the American Army’s ‘Monuments and Fine Arts Division’ and assigned the task of recovering art treasures from Belgian churches that had been taken to Southern Germany and Austria by the occupying forces. His career in art history really began with his appointment as assistant curator in the paintings department of the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. This position offered him an ideal opportunity to both refine his connoisseurship and to meet numerous senior and junior colleagues from all over Europe and the United States. Some of Baudouin’s oldest associations were forged during that period, especially his lifelong friendship with Ludwig Burchard and Roger-A. d’Hulst.

In Amsterdam, Baudouin also had the opportunity to mould his curatorial qualities and this did not go unnoticed in
his hometown of Antwerp, where in the early fifties the entire museum landscape was being reshaped and restructured. Thus in 1950 Baudouin became deputy keeper of the Rubens House, and in 1952 he was appointed director of the “Kunsthistorische Musea,” a newly formed ‘cluster’ of museums with the recently restored Rubens House as its centre. And it became the young art historian’s first and most important task to fittingly furnish this house. It is among Baudouin’s greatest achievements that he succeeded in bringing together a small but exquisite constcaemer that includes some works by Rubens himself as well as by his contemporaries; all in all it gives a good impression of the scope of the artist’s own collection and the environment in which he lived and worked.

As a scholar Baudouin had started his PhD research on the eighteenth-century Antwerp architect Jan Pieter van Baurscheit the Younger. He had to abandon this thesis for practical reasons, but was able to use his vast documentation to complete a monograph which was published some fifty years later (‘Jan Pieter van Baurscheit the Younger [1699-1768]’, Lira Elegans. Jaarboek Liers Genootschap voor Geschiedenis, IV, 1994 [1995], 382 pp.). And it was due to his familiarity with architectural history that he became aware of Rubens’ importance for the architecture of his time. This specific aspect became the main focus of Baudouin’s research, as witnessed by a few thorough and innovative studies of the Jesuit Church in Antwerp and, most importantly, by his involvement in what was to become his magnum opus, the volume of the Corpus Rubenianum devoted to Rubens’s role in the field of architecture and sculpture. His manuscript on Rubens’s involvement with the architecture of his own house and with that of the Jesuit Church was largely finished at the time of his death and is being edited for publication.*

The oeuvre of Dieric Bouts was another of Baudouin’s early research topics, and he collaborated on the important Bouts exhibition of 1957-58 in Brussels and Delft. As a sequel to this particular involvement he published a number of articles on the iconography of Bouts’s devotional paintings. His familiarity with religious iconography in medieval Netherlandish art proved very fruitful for his later publications on Counter-Reformation iconography in Flanders, including his authoritative study of 1989 on the function and the meaning of devotional painting in seventeenth-century Antwerp, which also included important paragraphs on Rubens’s role.

As a museum director Baudouin soon made clear that he intended to give his museum management a sound scholarly underpinning. This intention may now seem as forcing an open door but it was certainly not the general practice in mid-1950s Belgium. With limited funds he set up a library devoted to Rubens, his contemporaries and precursors, as well as a small photographic collection. Baudouin could not have foreseen that this enterprise would form the nucleus of the future Rubenianum. Even before restoration of the Rubens House had started, the need to establish a ‘Rubenianum’ as a specific research institute had been recognized. Ludwig Burchard, without doubt the greatest Rubens scholar of his age, informed Baudouin of his wish to bequeath his vast Rubens archive to Antwerp on condition that suitable accommodation could be found. He further expected the city to oversee the publication of his long-awaited multi-volume catalogue raisonné of Rubens’s entire oeuvre, a task on which Burchard had been working since the 1920s. This prompted Frans Baudouin and Roger d’Hulst to found in 1959 the Nationaal Centrum voor de Plastische Kunsten in de 16de en 17de eeuw, recently renamed the Centrum voor de Vlaamse kunst van de 16de en 17de eeuw.

In the 1970s, anthologies of Baudouin’s many articles on Rubens and his times were published in two lavishly illustrated books. A new anthology containing a selection of his more recent articles on Rubens as well as a complete bibliography has just been published. It was meant to be presented by his Rubenianum colleagues as a Festschrift for Baudouin’s 85th birthday. Fate decided otherwise and thus this book became a Liber Memorialis for a learned scholar, a brilliant curator, a cultivated, inspiring and very gentle and kind colleague and mentor.

Hans Vlieghe

* The Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard volume on architecture is divided into three parts: the Rubenshuis; the Jesuit Church; the “Rest”. The volume on sculpture (original together with architecture) will be written by another author. ** Frans Baudouin, Rubens in Context. Selected Studies. Liber Memorialis, Centrum voor de Vlaamse Kunst van de 16e en de 17e eeuw / BAI, Antwerp 2005, pp. 224, ISBN 9076704988.
John Michael Montias
(1928-2005)

Michael Montias, as he preferred to be known, lost his battle with cancer in late July, after a prolonged and courageous struggle. He was one of the greatest innovators in the field of Dutch art history, although he was trained as an economist and only came to art history in the middle of an already distinguished career.

In Michael’s own words, his interest in Dutch art was piqued as a teenager, when he came across a copy of Wilhelm von Bode’s vast, multi-volume study of Rembrandt, now long out of date but then the catalyst for his prolonged interest in Dutch painters. This seed was not to germinate until twenty years later, when Michael met Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann at Yale, where they were both professors. A polymath, Michael had explored a career in chemistry after reading a book on the periodic table, and considered a dissertation at Columbia on the prices of Dutch paintings at auction. However, his interests soon turned to economics, specifically comparative economic systems in the Soviet Bloc. It was in this field that he defended his dissertation and published extensively (e.g. Central Planning in Poland, 1962; Economic Development in Communist Romania, 1967). But his interest in Dutch art never flagged; in 1975 Michael received a summer grant to study the guild system in seventeenth-century Holland. Like Hans Floerke before him, he intended to survey the material, but now bringing to the equation his own expertise in statistical analysis and comparative economic systems. Michael so loved the project that soon he had absorbed virtually all of the relatively small archive of Delft, where he began his research. The results appeared in 1982 in a book that permanently altered the course of Dutch art history, combining that discipline with the field of economics in a way that was unprecedented, yet became intelligible to all (Artists and Artisans in Delft. A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century). From this pioneering work a new subfield was born, combining statistical study with an in-depth understanding of cultural history, a road later followed by several distinguished economists and historians.

Vermeer had always attracted Michael, and his archival pursuits began with this artist. In his first week in the archives in Delft, before he had fully mastered the Dutch language (let alone the cryptic archival script of the time) Michael found an unpublished document that mentioned Vermeer. That Friday evening he invited me to his third-floor walk-up in Delft to see what he had unearthed, and already he had written out three pages in longhand analyzing his relatively minor discovery. It was exhilarating to listen to him read this essay with an excited curiosity and infectious enthusiasm that never faltered, characteristics that would endear him to his readers and continue to inspire others through his published works. This material, along with hundreds of other documents that were studied in detail by Michael, led to his magisterial Vermeer and his Milieu. A Web of Social History (1989). The operative word in this title was “web”, because the material was more complicated than a spider’s web; only Michael had the consummate patience and delight in intricacies to follow all the strands of the fragmented remains, resurrecting an extended family that lived more than three centuries ago and endowing them with an importance as pressing as our own.

Michael’s interest reached beyond the archives to enliven these old papers with his extensive knowledge of history, languages (he was fluent in at least a dozen) and paintings. He loved the objects as much as the documents. When I met him in Dordrecht, where he stayed for a while in the mid 1970s, he showed me a shovel he bought in the local hardware store. As a weekend hobby he used this tool to excavate vacant building lots, unearthing everything from shards of pottery to clay pipes. This too he relished beyond measure, perhaps because it was not so different from his digging in the archives during the week.

Michael’s urge to possess objects from the past materialized in his collection of Dutch seventeenth-century paintings. He could afford little on his professor’s salary and all the major purchases were a struggle, but he never strayed from his devotion to acquisitions. It was only after protracted payments and serious fiscal hardship that in 1968 he managed to secure Goltzius’s wonderful Magdalen (now on long-term loan at the Metropolitan Museum of Art). In 1979, when Michael stumbled across an anonymous painting representing an Allegory of the Love of Virtue at Christie’s in New York, he froze in place, mumbling to me that the painting (or one exactly like it) had been fully described in a document in the Delft Municipal Archives, where it was described as the work of Giovanni del
Campo. Michael simply had to acquire the painting, no matter what. Happily, he did buy it and it now hangs on permanent loan to the Princeton University Art Museum. The painting was subsequently attributed to Valentin de Boulogne by Pierre Rosenberg, and it was included as such in the comprehensive exhibition, *Seventeenth-Century French Paintings in American Collections*. Although Michael published the Del Campo document and his painting in Egbert Begemann’s 1982 *Festschrift*, he was always uncomfortable with the attribution to Valentin. I only wish that he could have lived to see the final outcome of this debate, which might very well be resolved in accordance with Michael’s initial attribution to Del Campo. He also bought a beautiful *Magdalen* by Jan de Bray, which turned out to be fully signed and dated after a light cleaning. Had the inscription been known, he would never have been able to afford the painting. For an economist, Michael had a surprising disregard for money on a personal level. He loved what money could buy in the field of art, but never sought personal financial gain or creature comforts for himself. He once bought a painting attributed to Frans van Mieris, knowing that I was already preparing my dissertation on the artist. When I convinced him that his new acquisition was a later copy, he handed it over to me, saying: “Here, it’s better in your hands.”

After exhausting the Delft archives, Michael moved on to the motherload – the massive archives of Amsterdam. Undaunted by the enormous challenge, he began a thorough investigation of seventeenth-century auctions, returning to the subject he had first envisioned while a graduate student at Columbia. The result is his last book, *Art at Auction in 17th-Century Amsterdam* (2002), wherein he addresses the various roles of auction sales, collectors and art dealers in the art market with his usual eye for critical detail. So plentiful was the material and so enthusiastic was his personality, that it is no surprise that he was extremely prolific, publishing numerous articles on his finds and conclusions. Although by the end he was quite ill, he managed to write one last article devoted to attributions in Amsterdam inventories that will appear in *Simiolus* next year.

One insight that stands out from his various articles is his discovery that prices were linked to style. For example, by compiling valuations from seventeenth-century inventories, he demonstrated that a broadly painted landscape was less expensive than a minutely rendered genre scene, simply because the former was more quickly executed. He quantified the fact beyond a shadow of a doubt that even in Holland, that burgeoning birthplace of modern capitalism, “Time is Money.”

As one reads back through Michael’s art historical writing, it is remarkable to see so many points of inquiry – statistical, aesthetic, cultural, historical, sociological, to name only the most frequent – that he used to interrogate his subjects. He had an amazing memory, and his ability to recall anything he ever heard or read informed all his writings. He was unfailingly generous with his finds and always eager to discuss any obscure genealogical connection. He will be much missed in the many communities where his boundless curiosity found him active. Art History stole Michael away from Economics, but death robbed Art History of a beautiful mind.

Otto Naumann

---

**Editor’s Note**: An endowment fund has been established in John Michael Montias’s memory (see President’s message). Those wishing to make a contribution are asked to send a check to Kristin Belkin (23 South Adelaide Avenue, Highland Park, NJ 08904), made out to Historians of Netherlandish Art, with “Endowment Fund/Montias” written in the memo line. European contributors are requested to pay into the Historians of Netherlandish Art European Account (Postbank Berlin, within Germany: acct. no. 0744 146 108; BLZ 100 100 10; from outside Germany: IBAN DE88 1001 0010 0744 1461 08 and BIC PBNKDEFF), citing “Endowment Fund/Montias”.

---


**Bok Haak** (1926-2005) died on May 15, 2005. His contributions to the field of Dutch art are fundamental. He was one of the fathers of the new Amsterdams Historisch Museum and of the Rembrandt Research Project. His books *Rembrandt: his life, his work, his time* (1969) and *The Golden Age: Dutch painters of the seventeenth century* (1984) are among the most successful popular books ever written on Dutch art. (From Codart)
HNA News

Membership Dues Go Up

At the Board Meeting in Atlanta in February of this year, it was decided to raise the membership dues in two categories: Regular and Supporting Members. Starting in 2006, Regular Membership will be $50, and Supporting Membership $75. Dues notices will be mailed to the entire membership in January 2006. Those of you who would like to pay before then may go to the HNA website and print out the 2006 dues form and send to either Kristin Belkin or Fiona Healy.

HNA at CAA, Boston 2006

Session
Revisiting Julius S. Held

Chair: Anne Lowenthal
Ann Jensen Adams, Julius Held’s “Book of Tobit”: Rethinking the Viewer of Histories.
Benjamin Binstock, Julius Hero: Reframing Held’s Masterpieces.
Catherine B. Scallen, Julius S. Held and the Object of Art History: Collecting, Connoisseurship, Conservation, and the History of Taste.
Mariët Westermann, Blind Spots: Held and Rembrandt Studies.

Members Meeting and Reception

The Members Meeting and Reception will take place Friday, February 24, 2006, at 5:30 – 7:00 pm, at the Hynes Convention Center, Second Level, Room 207.

Personalia

Marten Jan Bok, Universiteit van Amsterdam, has been appointed ‘universitair hoofddocent’.
Julien Chapuis was awarded a Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute Fellowship (Williamstown, MA).
Taco Dibbits, former curator of seventeenth-century Dutch painting at the Rijksmuseum, has been appointed head of the paintings department. He succeeds Jan Piet Filedt Kok, who will stay on as chief curator of early Netherlandish paintings until his retirement in May 2008.
Blaise Ducos is the new curator of Dutch and Flemish paintings at the Louvre. He has succeeded Jacques Foucart, who retired in January after a tenure of many decades.
Rembrandt Duits (The Warburg Institute) received the 2004 Karel van Mander prize for his dissertation, Gold brocade in Renaissance painting. An iconography of riches (University of Utrecht, 2001).
Wayne Franits has been awarded a fellowship from the National Endowment for the Humanities for the 2005-2006 academic year. He will conduct research on Hendrick Terbrugghen.

Christopher Heuer has been appointed visiting scholar at the Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montreal for 2006.
Frima Fox Hofrichter and Ann M. Roberts are part of the team of specialists who revised Janson’s History of Art, seventh edition, coming out in February 2006, in time for CAA.
Charlotte Houghton has been promoted to Associate Professor at Penn State University.
Michael Kwakkelstein has succeeded Carel van Tuyl van Serooskerken as chief curator at the Teylers Museum.
Meghan Wilson Pennisi (Northwestern) has been awarded the AANS scholarship for 2005-2006 for the completion of her dissertation project, “Dutch Flower Still Life Painting in Middelburg ca. 1600-1620.”
Pamela Smith has been appointed Professor of History at Columbia University.
Freyda Spira has been awarded a Metropolitan Museum of Art fellowship.
Mark Trowbridge has been appointed Associate Professor of Art History at Marymount University in Arlington, VA.
Hans Van Miegroet has been promoted to full professor at Duke University.
Ashley West (University of Pennsylvania) is the David E. Finley Fellow, 2003-2006, at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, Washington. Her topic of research: Visualizing Knowledge: Prints and Paintings by Hans Burgkmair the Elder, 1473-1531.
Ernst van de Wetering has written a libretto for an opera centering on Rembrandt’s Judas Repentant (English private collection) in celebration of the artist’s 400th birthday next year. The opera, entitled Whoever is called Rembrandt, will open at the Municipal Theatre in Leiden in September 2006. (From The Art Newspaper, April 2005.)
Jacob Wisse has been appointed Associate Professor in the Department of Art, Stern College for Women, New York.
Diane Wolfthal has been awarded a 2006 Sylvan C. Coleman and Pamela Coleman Memorial Fund Art History Fellowship from the Metropolitan Museum of Art. She has also received a 2005 Paul Mellon Visiting Senior Fellowship from the National Gallery of Art’s Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, Washington.

Exhibitions

United States and Canada

Wrought Emotions. Renaissance and Baroque Paintings from the Permanent Collection. Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Queens University, Kingston (Ontario), August 28, 2005 – January 26, 2007. Selection of works from the permanent collection showcases its strength in Dutch art, in large part due to the generosity of Alfred and Isabel Bader.
Jan de Bray and the Classical Tradition. Speed Art Museum, Louisville (Kentucky), September 6 – December 4, 2005. The
exhibition was previously seen at the Currier Museum of Art, Manchester (New Hampshire) and the National Gallery of Art, Washington. With brochure.


**Rembrandt and His Time: Masterworks from the Albertina,** Vienna. Milwaukee Art Museum, October 8, 2005 – January 8, 2006. With paintings from various collections, including Landscape with the Good Samaritan (1638) from the Princes Czartoryski Museum, Cracow.

**Memling’s Portraits.** The Frick Collection, New York, October 12 – December 31, 2005. The exhibition was previously shown at the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid, and the Groningemuseum, Bruges. The catalogue, by Till-Holger Borchert, contains contributions by Maryan Ainsworth, Lorne Campbell and Paula Nuttall. To be reviewed.


**Austria and Germany**


England and Scotland


France

Frans Post (1612-1680). Le Brésil à la cour de Louis XIV. Musée du Louvre, Paris, September 29, 2005 – January 2, 2006. Paintings by Post which were given by Johan Maurits of Nassau-Siegen to Louis XIV in 1679. Also includes gouaches and engravings after the paintings as well as Barlaeus’s publication of 1647 of the Dutch colonial adventure, lent by Brazil’s National Library, with engravings by Post.


Hungary


Sigismundus, rex et imperator, 1387-1437. Szépmúvészeti Múzeum, Budapest, March 15 – June 18, 2006; Musée national d’histoire et d’art, Luxembourg, July 13 – October 15, 2006. A conference took place at the Centre Culturel de Recontres, Abbaye de Neumünster, June 8-10, 2005. For information: francois.reinert@mnha.etat.lu

Italy

Rubens: Eleonora de’ Medici Gonzaga and the Oratory of Santa Croce. Palazzo Ducale, Mantua, until December 11, 2005. The centerpiece of the show is Rubens’s Descent from the Cross (1602-03), recently discovered in a private German collection. The work was commissioned by Eleonora, the wife of Duke Vincenzo I Gonzaga, for her private chapel in the Gonzaga family church of Santa Croce. Also on show are works by Frans Pourbus and Otto van Veen. (See also under Museum News).


Caravaggio and Europe. Palazzo Reale, Milan, until February 6, 2006. Goes to Vienna. The artist and his followers, including from northern Europe.

The Netherlands


Rembrandt in 2006

Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal


Rembrandt in Leiden. Year round exhibition.
Leiden, Prentenkabinet Universiteit Leiden

Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum

Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum


Amsterdam, Museum Het Rembrandthuis

Rembrandt and British Printmaking. December 17, 2005 – March 12, 2006. Printmakers who were influenced by Rembrandt.


Rembrandt at Home. Year round exhibition.
Amsterdam, Joods Historisch Museum

Rembrandt in Leiden. Year round exhibition.
Leiden, Prentenkabinet Universiteit Leiden

Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum

Amsterdam, Museum Het Rembrandthuis

Rembrandt and British Printmaking. December 17, 2005 – March 12, 2006. Printmakers who were influenced by Rembrandt.


Spain

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

Switzerland


Other Countries

Czech Republic


Ireland

Northern Nocturnes. Nightscapes in the Age of Rembrandt. National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin, October 1 – December 11, 2005. Includes Elsheimer’s Flight into Egypt from the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, as well as Rubens’s (1614) and Rembrandt’s (1647) versions of the same subject, the former from Kassel, the latter in the NG of Ireland’s own collection. With catalogue by Adriaan Waiboer. To be reviewed.

Slovenia


Sweden

The Dutch Golden Age. Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, September 22, 2005 – January 8, 2006. To celebrate the publication of the catalogue of the permanent collection (to be reviewed). Includes loans from Amsterdam, Copenhagen and Oxford. Also on show is the recently recovered Selfportrait by Rembrandt, stolen in 2000.

Exhibition Review

Lucas Cranach and the Czech Lands

A praiseworthily didactic and scholarly exhibition is currently on show in the refurbished – in a Germanic ‘70’s’ style – Picture Gallery in Prague Castle (October 22, 2005 – January 8, 2006). Consisting in perhaps some one hundred works, it shows the extent to which Lucas Cranach, his workshop and followers trained in it, were patronized in the Czech lands north of Austria and east of Saxony.

An early admirer of Cranach’s art, probably stemming from when the artist was active in Vienna, was Stanislav Thurzo, Bishop of Olomouc. The Beheading of St. John the Baptist of 1515, and commissioned by him, is thought to have been the first of Cranach’s works in Bohemia. The composition would have been more suitable for a depiction of Calvary. Accompanying Herod, who is on horseback, is a halberdier prominent in the foreground, whose features are unmistakably those of the artist. Three other paintings in the exhibition are given to Cranach himself including a Lot and his Daughters and a large St. Anthony Abbot, the reverse of which showing Christ at the Tomb peculiarly set against a dark hanging, is the work of an assistant.

Indeed the attributional standpoint seems in some instances more severely restrictionist than would be usual further to the west of Europe. In the case of many of the paintings the participation of the studio is recognized. Of great interest are those cases when the studio hand or follower can be more clearly identified and a body of work assigned to him. One such interesting discovery, represented by a large body of works, is the master who signed himself ‘IW’ – perhaps to be identified with the Jan Wrtlik, who is recorded as a guest of the Prague painters’ guild from 1521-1531 and active in the region for at least another decade.

The exhibition surveys Cranach’s treatment of portraiture, the nude, moralizing genre and such Lutheran subject matter as the Woman taken in Adultery. The handling of the onlookers in examples of the latter brings that of Pieter Bruegel the Elder to mind, which serves as a reminder of the complex cross-currents in the story of painting north of the Alps in the troubled century of the Reformation.

A catalogue (in Czech, but with an extensive English summary) is available.

Gregory Martin
London

Museum and other News

Amsterdam: The Rijksmuseum acquired the only known Renaissance painted portrait of a black man, by Jan Mostaert. It is on show in the exhibition “Dames met Klasse. Margareta van York en Margareta van Ostenrijk” in Mechelen (see above).

Amsterdam: Codart appointed a new director after Gary Schwartz’s (partial) retirement: Gerdien Verschoor. Gary has been appointed as the webmaster.

Amsterdam: Portrait of an Elderly Woman in a White Bonnet went on view at the Rembrandthuis September 22, 2005, where it will remain until Sotheby’s January sale. The woman’s plain appearance (probably a servant) contrasts sharply with her rich fur collar. After extensive restoration and study, Ernst van de Wetering and Martin Bijl, former head of conservation at the Rijksmuseum, have concluded that the painting is a Rembrandt from about 1640 that someone tried, a century later, to transform into a formal portrait. (From The New York Times, September 22, 2005.)

Berlin: On view at the Gemäldegalerie is Jacob Jordaeans, Flora, Silenus and Zephyr, from a Berlin private collection. It is shown together with the drawing, which is in the Kupferstichkabinett.

Brussels: The Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België acquired Naiades Filling a Cornucopia by Abraham Janssens, from c. 1613.

Brussels: The 12-volume Antwerpse kunstinventarissen uit de zeventiende eeuw, by the late Erik Duverger, now has an index, which will be of immeasurable help in using this valuable reference work.

Germany: An early work by Rubens was recently discovered in a private collection in Germany: The Descent from the Cross, c.1602-1603; canvas, 203 x 257 cm. It is currently on view at the Palazzo Ducale, Mantua (see above). (From the FAZ, September 21, 2005.)
‘-Hertogenbosch: The Noordbrabants Museum acquired a painting of a church interior by Pieter Neefs the Elder (c.1578-after 1656) as gift from Mrs. J.F. den Brinker-Vissers. (Codart News)

Kingston (Ontario): The Agnes Etherington Art Centre acquired Jan Lievens’s *Head of an Old Woman in Profile* (called Rembrandt’s Mother), c. 1630, as a gift of Alfred and Isabel Bader.

Madrid: The Museo del Prado received Juan de Flandes’ masterpiece *The Crucifixion* in lieu of taxes.

Neuburg an der Donau: The Staatssgalerie Neuburg in the west wing of the Schloss opened April 20, 2005. 120 pictures, including some of Rubens’s paintings executed for Neuburg, formerly in the Alte Pinakothek, are now on view here. See the review of the catalogue by Anne-Marie Logan in this issue.

Philadelphia: In preparation for its move to downtown Philadelphia, the Barnes Foundation has conducted a survey of its collections, resulting in many reattributions. Larry Silver has been in charge of northern European masters. According to him, Bosch’s *Temptation of St. Anthony* is a sixteenth-century copy of part of the original, and Rubens’s *Holy Family with St. John and an Angel* is by his workshop.

Stansstad (Nidwalden, Switzerland): The collection of Ruth and Anton Frey-Näpflin has been opened to the public. Includes works by Rubens, Jordaeus, David Teniers and others, admittedly – thus the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* – pieces about whose attribution scholars will not be undivided. Publication: *Aus Leidenschaft zur Kunst. Eine Auswahl aus der Sammlung Frey-Näpflin*: www.freynaepflinstiftung.ch

Stockholm, Nationalmuseum: The selfportrait on copper by Rembrandt that was stolen from the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, in December 2000 was recovered in Copenhagen. (From Codart)

Stockholm, Swedish Academy of Art: The RKD returned a drawing by Leonard Bramer stolen from the Swedish Academy of Art before the war and donated to the Dutch state, to its rightful owner during the CODART ACHT study trip to Sweden. (From Codart)

Scholarly Activities
Conferences to Attend
United States

**CAA 94th Annual Conference**
Boston, February 22-25, 2006
Sessions dealing specifically with northern European art, 1400-1800:

*Revisiting Julius S. Held*, chair *Anne Lowenthal* (HNA-sponsored session)

*Ann Jensen Adams*, Julius Held’s “Book of Tobit”: Rethinking the Viewer of Histories.

*Benjamin Binstock*, Julius Hero: Reframing Held’s Masterpieces.

*Catherine B. Scallen*, Julius S. Held and the Object of Art History: Collecting, Connoisseurship, Conservation, and the History of Taste.


*Northern Renaissance Art* (Open Session), chair Craig Harbison (U Mass Amherst)

*Northern European Art, 1600-1800*, chair *Jeffrey Muller* (Brown)

*Aspects in the Organization of Seventeenth-Century Antwerp Large Painting Workshops*, chair *Natasja Peeters* (Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Brussels)

*“Small Packages”? The Role of Local Culture in Northern European Art, 1400-1700*, chair *Jacob Wisse* (Stern College for Women, New York)

**The Renaissance Society of America Annual Conference**

**Myth in History: History in Myth**
For more information: Wim Klooster, Dept. of History, Clark University, Worcester, MA 01610; wklooster@clarku.edu.

**From the ‘Halve Maan’ to KLM: 400 Years of Dutch-American Exchange**
ANS@socsci.umn.edu

**Europe**

**6th Biennial ALCS (Association for Low Countries Studies) Conference**

**Innovation and Experience in the Early Baroque in the Southern Netherlands: The Case of the St Carolus Borromeus Church in Antwerp**
Hoger Instituut voor Architectuurwetenschappen Henry van de Velde, Antwerp, December 9, 2005.

*Werner Oechslin* (ETH Zurich), Baroque: space, time and historical knowledge.

*August Ziggelaar S.J.* (Copenhagen), P.P. Rubens and François de Aguilón.

*Sven Dupré* (Ghent University), François de Aguilón and his *Opticorum Libri Sex*.

*Barbara Haeger* (Ohio State University), The façade of the St Carolus Borromeus Church: marking the threshold of the sacred.

*Piet Lombaerde* (Hoger Instituut voor Architectuurwetenschappen Henry van de Velde, Antwerp), The role of the façade and the towers of the St Carolus Borromeus Church in the urban landscape of Antwerp during the seventeenth century.

*Ria Fabri* (Karel de Grote University College, Antwerp), Light, measurement and perspective: a theoretical approach to the interior of the St Carolus Borromeus Church.

*Antien Knaap* (New York University), Visual relationships between Rubens’s ceiling paintings and the altar of the Carolus Borromeus Church in Antwerp.
Léon Lock (University of London), The importance of sculpture in the interior of the St Carolus Borromeus Church.

Nathalie Poppe (Hoger Instituut voor Architectuurwetenschappen Henry van de Velde, Antwerp), The phenomenon of daylight in the interior of the St Carolus Borromeus Church: a new interpretation.

Marc Muylle (Hoger Instituut voor Architectuurwetenschappen Henry van de Velde, Antwerp), From light to sound: combining digital efforts in the simulation of the illumination and acoustic environment of the St Carolus Borromeus Church.

Joris Snaet (University of Leuven), The building of the Antwerp Jesuit Church: the creation of an ideal sacred space.

Bert Timmermans (University of Leuven), The chapel of the Houtappel family: the privatisation of the church and the extension of the house in seventeenth-century Antwerp.

**Campin in Context**

Tourna, March 30 – April 1, 2006.

Marnix Beyen (Universiteit Antwerpen), Het geval Campin/de le Pasture/van der Weyden: Verschuwende culturele identiteiten in België in de loop van de twintigste eeuw.

Marc Boone (Rijksuniversiteit Gent), Tournai-Gand dans la première moitié du XVe siècle: un axe privilégié d’échanges économiques et culturels.

Carla Bozzolo / Hélène Loyau (Laboratoire de Médiévistique Occidentale de Paris / Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes), Une tranche de la société tournaisienne à la Cour amoureuse dite de l’Occidentale de Paris / Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes).

Douglas Brine (Courtauld Institute, London), Campin’s contemporaries: painting in Tournai in the early 15th century.

Lorne Campbell (National Gallery, London), The de le Pasture/van der Weyden and Goffaert families: links between the artists of Tournai and Brussels.

Jean-Marie Cauchies (Facultés universitaires Saint-Louis de Bruxelles), Tournai et le Hainaut: voisinage, échanges et tensions.

Albert Châtelet (emeritus Université de Strasbourg), Robert Campin et le Hainaut.

Gregory Clark (University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee), Doornik aan de Schelde, Gand sur l’Escaut: panel painters and illuminators in two cities on one river in the time of Philip the Good.

Thomas Coomans (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven), L’ “art scaldeïen”: origine, développement et validité d’une école artistique?

Thomas Fudge (Canterbury University, New Zealand), Hussite influence in the Scheldt Valley.

Constanze Izzel (Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg), Peinture et hétérodoxie: échos hussites dans la peinture flamande.

Fabienne Joubert (Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne), Le Maître du Mansel et le milieu tournoisien.

Stephan Kemperdick (Kunstmuseum Basel), Flémalle/Campin/ Van der Weyden: Status questionis.


Philippe Lorentz (Université de Strasbourg), Quand la sculpture s’est faite peinture! Aux sources d’une révolution artistique: le Maître de Flémalle.

Susie Nash (Courtauld Institute, London), The Seilern Triptych in the Courtauld Institute in London: some new considerations.

Ludovic Nys (Université de Valenciennes et du Hainaut-Cambrésis), Le Maître de Flémalle à Gand: à propos du Mariage de la Vierge et de L’Annonciation du Prado.

Werner Paravicini (Institut Historique Allemand, Paris), Nobles hennuyers sur les chemins du monde: Jean de Werchin et ses amis autour de 1400.

Jacques Paviot (Université de Paris XII), Les pèlerins tournaisiens et hennuyers en Terre sainte au début du XVe siècle.

Bertrand Schnerb (Université de Lille 3), Tournai et Azincourt: l’histoire d’un désastre.

Graeme Small (University of Glasgow), Autour de la “Révolution démocratique de 1423” à Tournai: enjeux politiques, socio-économiques et culturels.

Karl Van Hoecke (Rijksuniversiteit Gent), Het schildersmilieu te Oudenaarde in de eerste helft van de 15de eeuw.

Dominique Vanwijnsbergh (Institut royal du Patrimoine artistique / Koninklijk Instituut voor het Kunstoffenpatrimonium, Brussel), L’enluminure à Tournai à l’époque de Robert Campin: nouvelles perspectives.

All further information: www.campin-in-context.com

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

Leiden University, April 20-23, 2006.

Speakers include Stephen Campbell (Johns Hopkins), Mark Meadow (UC Santa Barbara), Jeroen Stumpel (Utrecht), Hugo van der Velden (Harvard), Dennis Geronimus (NY University), Henk van Veen (Groningen), Bram Kempers (U Amsterdam).

For more information: www.pallas.leidenuniv.nl

**The Quest of the Original**


Contact: Hélène Verougstraete, Laboratoire d’Étude des oeuvres d’art par les méthodes scientifiques, 53 rue Cardinal Mercier, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium; couvert@art.ucl.ac.be

For Call for Papers, see under Opportunities.

**Past Conferences**

**United States**

**The Woodcut in Fifteenth-Century Europe**


Jeffrey Hamburger (Harvard), “in gebeden vnd in bilden gescbrieven”: Prints as Exemplars of Piety and the “Culture of the Copy” in Fifteenth-Century Germany.

Nigel Palmer (Oxford University), Woodcuts for Reading: The Codicology of Fifteenth-Century Blockbooks.
Paul Needham (Princeton University), The Earliest Illustrated Incunables.

Teresa Nevins (U Delaware), Picturing Oedipus in the Sion “Tapestry”.

Richard Field (Yale University Art Gallery), A Dominican Picture Panel from Saint Catherine’s Convent in Nuremberg.

Ursula Weekes (National Museum Institute, Delhi), Convents as Patrons and Producers of Woodcuts in the Low Countries around 1500.

Peter Schmidt (Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität), The Early Print and the Origin of the Picture Postcard.

Christopher Wood (Yale), What Did the Early Print Replicate?

Roland Damm and Alexandra Scheld (Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg), Paste Prints and Flock Prints: A Technological Approach.

Doris Oltrogge (Institut für Restaurierungs—und Konservierungswissenschaften, Cologne), Illuminating the Print: The Use of Color in Fifteenth-Century Prints and Book Illumination.

Shalom Sabar (Hebrew University, Jerusalem), Between Judaism and Christianity: The Blood Libel of Trent (1475) in Popular Woodcuts and Beyond.


Elizabeth Wyckoff (Davis Museum and Cultural Center, Wellesley College), “Discovering Truth in the fog”: Printmaking’s Origin Myths and Narratives.

Europe

11. Jahrestagung der Europäischen Totentanz-Vereinigung

Sächsische Landes—und Universitätsbibliothek, Dresden, April 29 – May 1, 2005.

HNA-related papers:


Peter Springer (Oldenburg), Das Selbstbildnis im Totentanz des Niklaus Manuel.

The papers will be published in ‘L’art macabre’, Jahrbuch der Europäischen Totentanz-Vereinigung.

To be or not to be a connoisseur? A Symposium as a Tribute to Hans Vlieghe


Hans Vlieghe (farewell speech), Jacob Jordaeus in het huishouden van Jan Steen.

Justus Müller Hofstede (Bonn), Ad honorem viri doctissimi optimique collegae Hans Vlieghe.


Carel Fabritius (1622-1654): Das Werk


Jørgen Wadum (Copenhagen), Technical Aspects of Fabritius’s Paintings.

Regine Kränz (Hamburg), Zur Restaurierung der “Torwache”.

Kornelia von Berswordt-Wallrabe (Schwerin), Zur Kompositionsweise im Werk von Fabritius.

Meinolf Trudzinski (Hannover), Porträt einer Frau.

Lisa Pincus (Chicago), Fabritius in Delft.

Volker Manuth (Nijmegen), Bemerkungen zur “Torwache”.

Gero Seeling (Schwerin), Konstanten in Fabritius’ Werk.

Renouveau et invention: la sculpture à travers l’histoire de ses matériaux

Université Libre, Brussels, October 13-14, 2005.

Of interest to HNA:

Michael Lefftz (Leuven), Diversité des matériaux et des usages dans la sculpture baroque liégeoise (17e-18e siècles).

Axel Gamp (Lausanne), The Swiss situation in the early Baroque.

Martin Hirsch (Munich), Late Gothic clay sculptures in Bavaria.

Alessandro Farnese e le Fiandre/Alexander Farnese and the Low Countries

Palais des Académies, Brussels, October 20-22, 2005


Flemish and Dutch Painters in Central Europe and Northern Italy in the Late 17th Century

University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, October 20-23, 2005.

De stadhouders in beeld: beeldvorming van de stadhouders van Oranje-Nassau 1570-1700 in contemporaine grafiek


Daniël Horst, ‘Deur Gods genade vroom in zijn daad’: het beeld van prins Willem I in propagandaprenten van de eerste jaren van de Opstand.
Christi Klinkert, Nassau in het nieuws. Nieuwsprenten van de militaire ondernemingen van Maurits van Nassau (1585-1625).


Elmer Koffijn, De wreker op de markt. Noordnederlandse beeldvorming van Frederik Hendrik en de organisatie van het prentenbedrijf.

Simon Groenveld, Van veelbelovend vorstenkind tot neerstortende Phaeton: de iconografie van stadhouder Willem II.

Nord/Sud. Presenze e ricezioni fiamminghe in Liguria, Veneto e Sardegna. Prospettive di studio e indagini tecniche

Università di Genoa, October 28-29, 2005.

Organized by the Universities of Genoa, Padua and Sassari, in conjunction with the exhibition on Gerard David’s Cervara Altarpiece.

Roger Van Schoute (emeritus Université Catholique, Louvain-la-Neuve), L’étude du dessin sous-jacent: un coup d’œil rétrospectif.

Molly Faries (Groningen and Indiana), Crosscurrents of influence and technique: the case of Jan van Scorel.

Bert Meijer (Istituto Olandese di Storia dell’Arte, Florence), La ricezione della pittura fiamminga nel Veneto.

Maria del Carmen Garrido (Prado), El dibujo subyacente de los cuadros atribuidos a Bellini y Giorgione del Museo del Prado.

Duilio Bertani (Università di Milano), La riflettografia IR ad alta risoluzione e la stampa in grande dei riflettogrammi: il loro utilizzo per lo studio di autori veneti.

Mari Pietrogiovanna (Università di Padova), La “Torre di Babele” della Cà d’Oro di Venezia.

Maddalena Bellavitis (Università di Padova), Le due “Crociﬁssioni” posteyckiane conservate nel Veneto.

Caterina Limentani Virdis (Università di Padova), La pittura in Sardegna nel quattro e cinquecento: le componenti nordichi.

Joaquim Garriga (Universitat de Girona), L’impianto spaziale di dipinti quattrocenteschi della Corona d’Aragona e due passi del “Libro dell’arte” di Cennino Cennini.

Rafael Cornudella (University of Barcelona), “Mestre Johannes, lo gran pintor del illustre duch de Burgumy:a”: la risposta valenzana a Jan van Eyck e la sua trascendenza in altri territori della Corte d’Aragona.

Aldo Sari (Università di Sassari), Lo stendardo processionale del Duomo di Sassari alla luce delle analisi riflettografiche.

Maddalena Bellavitis (Università di Padova), Indagini riflettografiche su opere sardo-catalane del Museo di Cagliari.

Maria Clelia Galassi (Università di Genova), Indagini riflettografiche su opere sardo-catalane del Museo di Cagliari.

Maria Clelia Galassi (Università di Genova), Pittura fiamminga e pittura ligure nel quattro e cinquecento: indagine sulle tecniche.

Anna de Floriani (Università di Genova), Appunti per una storia del collezionismo di manoscritti miniati franco-fiamminghi a Genova.

Ron Spronk (Harvard), Painter, pilgrim and knight: Jan Provost’s sojourn in Italy en route to the Holy Land.

Maryan Ainsworth (Metropolitan Museum of Art), Gerard David and Italy.

Elena Parma (Università di Genova), Frans Floris e l’iconografia delle arti liberali.

Chiara Masi (Università di Torino), Risultati delle indagini riflettografiche su opere di Pier Francesco Sacchi.

Art Market and Connoisseurship in the Dutch Golden Age

University of Amsterdam, November 4, 2005. Organized by Anna Tummers and Koenraad Jonckheere.

Koenraad Jonckheere (Amsterdam), Brand names, trademarks and nameless products. Painter names and seventeenth-century connoisseurship.

Anna Tummers (Amsterdam), The Painter versus the connoisseur. The best judge of pictures in seventeenth-century theory and practice.

Natasja Peeters (Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Brussels), ‘Like Ye Lawes of Medes and Persians’. Peter Paul Rubens’s attitude towards paintings’ prices in the early seventeenth century.

Hans Van Mieghem and Neil de Marchi (Duke), Connoisseur-dealer, asymmetry and transparency in markets for Netherlandish paintings in France.

Marie de Hongrie. Politique et Culture sous la Renaissance aux Pays-Bas

Musée royal de Mariemont, Morlanwelz (Belgium), November 11-12, 2005.

O. Réthelyi (Budapest), L’ère hongroise de Marie de Hongrie.

L. Gorter van Royen, Les régences de Charles Quint aux Pays-Bas.

J.-M. Cauchies (Brussels and Leuven), Les premières lieutenances générales dans les Pays-Bas (fin 15e-début 16e siècle).

G. Docquier, Une dame de “picques” parmi les valets? Une gouvernante générale parmi les hauts fonctionnaires des Pays-Bas habsbourgeois: le cas de Marguerite d’Autriche.

J.-P. Hoyois, La correspondance entre Marie de Hongrie et Charles Quint avant et au début de la régence, une édition sur le métier.

M. Weiss (Brussels), Les enjeux politiques des religions dans les Pays-Bas au 16e siècle.

L. Sicking (Leiden), La frontière maritime des Pays-Bas pendant la régence de Marie de Hongrie.

B. Federinov (Musée royal de Mariemont), La campagne de 1554. Binche, l’agonie d’une ville.

P. Martens (Leuven), La défense des Pays-Bas et l’architecture militaire sous Marie de Hongrie.

J. Kerkhoff, La cour de Marie de Hongrie.

C. Niedermann (ETH Zurich), La chasse à la cour de Marie de Hongrie.
Hartmut Krohm zu Ehren. Westeuropäische Kunst an der Wende zur Neuzeit

Staatliche Museen zu Berlin und Technische Universität Berlin, November 11-12, 2005.

Hans-Ulrich Kessler (Berlin), Ein Relief von Hans Schwarz in der Berliner Skulpturensammlung.

Tobias Kunz (Berlin), Eine spanische Hieronymusstatuette in der Berliner Skulpturensammlung.

Michael Roth (Berlin), Ein Hausaltärchen in Berliner Privatbesitz.

Hans Holländer (Berlin), Schachfiguren des Mittelalters in ihrem literarischen Kontext.


Lothar Lambacher (Berlin), Das sogenannte Zepter Karls des Großen aus der Abtei Werden im Berliner Kunstgewerbemuseum.

Eike Oellermann (Heroldsberg), Die Oberflächengestalt der Schnitzwerke Riemenschneiders – einst und heute.

Bernd Bünsche (Schleswig), Punzierte Holzoberflächen – ein eindeutiges Indiz für eine beabsichtigte monochrome Gestaltung von Skulpturen.

Antje-Fee Köllermann (Berlin), Polychrom. Überlegungen zu einer Ulmer Relieffolge im Augsburger Diözesanmuseum.

Annette Hörrig (Leipzig), Unterzeichnungen auf Tafelgemälden des Meisters des Pflockischen Altars.

Michael Brandt (Hildesheim), Vöges “Deutscher Schnitzer”.

Roland Kanz (Bonn), Wilhelm Pinders “Geisteswissenschaftliche Biologie”.

Lars Eisenläffel (Berlin), Hermann Voss – Wissenschaft am Scheideweg zwischen Museumskultur und Führerpropaganda.

Reiner Haussherr (Berlin), Vom Datieren von Kruzifixen.

Ulrike Heinrichs-Schreiber (Bochum), Zum Zusammenhang von Skulptur und Architektur an französischen Kirchenfassaden der Zeit um 1300.

Uta Bräuer (Berlin), Die Paulusfigur im Bodemuseum, Paris um 1300.


Italy and the Low Countries, Artistic Relations: Portraits, Still Lifes, Market and Kitchen Pieces

Universiteitsbibliotheek Utrecht, November 14, 2005.

Machtelt Israëls (Amsterdam), Absence and Resemblance: Sasseta’s Images of Bernardino degli Albizzeschi.

Paula Nuttal (Cambridge, England), Memling and Italian Renaissance Portraits.

Guus Sluiter (Amsterdam), Jan Kraeck alias Giovani Caracca, Portrait Painter at the Savoy Court.

Paola Squellati (NIKI, Florence), Frans Pourbus’s Portraits for the Gonzaga and Savoy Courts.

Francesca Rossi (Museo di Castelvecchio, Verona), Meat versus Fish: Market and Kitchen Scenes in the Age of the Counter-Reformation.

Zoran Kwak (NIKI, Florence/Leiden), Competing in Seductive Illusions: Kitchen Scenes by the Dutch Late Mannerists.

Kat Eisses (Utrecht), Culinary Catastrophes: Dutch Advertising for Italian Food.
The Limbourg Brothers. Nijmegen Masters at the French Court (1400-1416)

Stadhuis and Best Western Hotel Belvoir, Nijmegen, November 17-18, 2005. In conjunction with the exhibition (see above).

Hanneke van Asperen (Radboud Universiteit, Nijmegen), A Pilgrim’s Additions: Traces of Pilgrimage in the Belles Heures.

Till-Holger Borchert (Groeningemuseum, Bruges), Franco-Flemish Artists in the Service of the Courts: The Problem of Masonic Traditions around 1400.

Gregory Clark (University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee), The Master of Guillelbert de Mets, Philip the Good and the Breviary of John the Fearless.

Herman Colenbrander (Amsterdam), Guelders and France, another Connection.

Rob Dücker (Emerson College, Well, Netherlands), A Close Encounter? The Limbourg Brothers and Illumination from the Guelders Region.

Margaret Lawson (Metropolitan Museum of Art), Les Belles Heures: Materials and Techniques.

Stephen Perkinson (Bowdoin College), Likeness, Loyalty, and the Life of the Court Artist: Portraiture in the Calendar Scenes of the Très Riches Heures.

Pieter Roelofs (Museum Het Valkhof, Nijmegen), Facts and Fairytales about the Limbourg Brothers.

Victor M. Schmidt (University of Groningen), Some Notes on Johan Maelwael.

Patricia Stirmann (Centre national de la recherche scientifique, Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes, Paris), How Many Artists Contributed to the Très Riches Heures?

Cornelis Hofstede de Groot

Groninger Museum, Groningen, November 18, 2005. In conjunction with the exhibition (see above).

Irina Sokolova (Hermitage), New Findings on Cornelis Hofstede de Groot’s Relations with Russian Collectors.

Marijn Schapelhouman (RKD, The Hague), Cornelis Hofstede de Groot als kunsthistoricus en persoon.

Luuk Pijl, Wandeling door de tentoonstelling Van Cuyp tot Rembrandt. De verzameling Cornelis Hofstede de Groot met toelichting.

Centre d’Étude de la Peinture du XVe Siècle dans les Pays-Bas Méridionaux et la Principauté de Liège. Cinquantième anniversaire


L. Campbell, Rogier van der Weyden’s Friends, Colleagues and Neighbours.

M. Faries, Ongoing Studies on Workshop Practices.

A. Châtelet, La jeunesse de Jan van Eyck.


See also http://xv.kikirpa.be

“Elegant and Beautiful”. Holland after Rembrandt. Paintings, Drawings and Prints around 1700


Junko Aono (Amsterdam), Imitation or Innovation? The reception of the Dutch Golden Age in early eighteenth-century genre painting. A case study focused around Willem van Mieris.

Marten Jan Bok (Amsterdam), Arnold Houbraken as Inventor.


Barbara Gaechtens (Paris), Das Genre-noble. Von der allmählichen Historisierung der Genremalerei.

Frans Grijzenhout (Amsterdam), Hogarth in Holland: holländische Kunst und das Ausland.

Peter Hecht (Utrecht), Making sense of taste.

Koenaad Jonckheere (Amsterdam), Foreign paintings in the Dutch Republic (ca. 1680-1720) and its influence on Dutch painting.


Ekkehard Mai (Cologne), Laisses, Poussin and Frankreich. Einige Aspekte zu Theorie und Thematik im Vergleich.

Hessel Miedema (Amsterdam), Newtowanism and wissenschaftliches Kunstideal.

Michael North (Greifswald), Niederländische Gemälde und Sammlungen in europäischen Residenzen und städtischen Zentren (18. Jahrhundert).

Eddy Schavemaker (Maastricht), Eglon Hendrick van der Neer. Aspects.

Lyckle de Vries (Groningen), Gerard De Lairesse ‘Schilderboek’. Die Hierarchie der Genres.

Gregor Weber (Kassel), Theater und Malerei bei Hoet und Lairesse.

Vrouwen aan het Bourgondische Hof: Présence en Invloed

Mechelen, November 26-27, 2005. In conjunction with the exhibition Dames met klasse (see under Exhibitions).

Thérèse de Hemptinne (Universiteit Gent), La cour princière au bas moyen-âge: un laboratoire de gender?

Marion Damen (Universiteit Leiden), Margaret of York’s works of charity on the Isle of Voorde.

Maryan Ainsworth (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), Jan Gossaert’s Deesis, A painting for Brout?

Marie-Françoise Poiret (Monuments Français, Versailles), Le vitrail de sainte Suzanne dans l’église de Brou.
The American Association for Netherlandic Studies and the New Netherland Institute are pleased to announce the 13th Interdisciplinary Conference in Netherlandic Studies, to be held at SUNY Central in October 2006.

Opportunities

Call for Papers

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

The American Association for Netherlandic Studies and the New Netherland Institute are pleased to announce the 13th Interdisciplinary Conference in Netherlandic Studies, to be held at SUNY Central in Albany, NY, on June 8-10, 2006, in concurrence with the exhibit “Legacy of New Netherland”.

Proposals for papers relating to all aspects of Dutch and Flemish society, history, and culture are welcome. Given the location and historical context of the conference, the organizers are especially interested in proposals in the following areas: the reception of Dutch culture in America, the reception of American culture in the Netherlands, and more specifically the reception of seventeenth-century Dutch culture in nineteenth-century literature, historiography, and art. Topics of interest might include the exploitation of modern Dutch values in American culture (cleanliness, godliness, commercialism), visual and literary representations of Rembrandt and Vermeer (famous Dutch artists in trivial literature and film), the limits of tolerance (cultural clashes in the early American territories), taverns and churches, the role of women in New Netherland, the Dutch role in the American Revolution, and more.

Deadline December 15, 2005.

AANS@socsci.umn.edu
https://mail.socsci.umn.edu/mailman/listinfo/aans

The Quest of the Original


Communications relating to the symposium theme should be submitted by December 15, 2005, to Hélène Verougstraete, Laboratoire d’Étude des oeuvres d’art par les méthodes scientifiques, 53 rue Cardinal Mercier, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium; couvert@art.ucl.ac.be

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

Queen’s University and Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Kingston, Ontario, November 17-18, 2006.

Historians of southern European art have paid considerable attention to the representation of emotions, psychological presence and interiority in portraits and history paintings of the early modern period. Avenues of investigation include the connection to literary traditions as well as the aspiration of artists to demonstrate the expressive potential of their art and their individual talent in this area. There is, however, no similarly extensive discussion about the depiction of the passions in Dutch and Flemish art. Yet the most prominent Dutch artist, Rembrandt, has always been famous for depicting the “inner life” of the protagonists in his history paintings, portraits and trompes. Already in his own time Constantijn Huygens praised Rembrandt for his depiction of the expressions of the human face. A variety of recent studies have emphasized his evocation of the inner life and spiritual existence of his figures. At the same time, other Dutch artists from Lastman to Lairesse were developing practical and theoretical strategies for the representation of human interiority. The 400th anniversary of Rembrandt’s birth in 2006 provides an occasion to examine the rendering of the passions in Rembrandt’s œuvre and its historical context: the activities of Dutch and Flemish artists of the early modern period (c.1500-1750) who shared an interest in depicting the “motions of the mind.”

We invite proposals for papers that explore aspects of this theme and that focus on issues such as shifting or competing strategies of representation, their function in paintings and other works of art, and the relationship between theory and practice. We also encourage papers that explore connections between the visual arts and other disciplines, such as literature, theater and science, and between artistic convention and social ideals for personal conduct and self—expression, as well as exchanges between Dutch artists and the art of the Southern Netherlands and other countries. We welcome proposals from junior and senior scholars in art history and in related disciplines.

The symposium will take place in conjunction with the exhibition Wrought Emotions: Renaissance and Baroque Paintings from the Permanent Collection at the Agnes Etherington Art Centre. There will be a study tour through the gallery with the Bader Curator of European Art Dr. David de Witt on Saturday, November 18, and a visit to the vaults on Sunday, November 19, 2006.

Funds may be available to cover travel costs, fully or partially, for the speakers. A publication of selected papers is planned.

A one-page proposal in English or French for a 30-minute talk and a two page c.v. should be sent via e-mail by March 13, 2006 to:

Franziska Gottwald: franziskagottwald@yahoo.de
Conference Organizers:
Stephanie Dickey, Indiana University, design. Bader Chair in Northern Baroque Art, Queen’s University, Kingston
David de Witt, Bader Curator of European Art, Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Kingston
Franziska Gottwald, PhD Candidate, Free University Berlin
Stephanie S. Dickey, PhD
Associate Professor of Art History
Herron School of Art and Design IUPUI
735 West New York Street, HR170
Indianapolis, IN 46202 USA
Tel. 317-278-9451
Fax 317-278-9435
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Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries


This vast and visually rich two-part exhibition necessitated multiple visits. The early material (made before 1200) was displayed in the Ruhrlandmuseum in Essen, where the exhibition borrowed the cool industrial feel of the Ruhrgebiet, and the atmosphere felt like the marriage between a ruined monastic complex – a fragment of a portal here, part of a library there – and a post-industrial techno club, teeming with low lights and warm bodies. The later objects (created 1200-1500) were on display in the Kunst—und Ausstellungshalle in Bonn, where the various zones of the exhibition corresponded to the architectural spaces (church, dormitory, scriptorium, etc.) in a late medieval female monastery, whose demarcation was suggested by eerie gossamer draperies suspended from the ceiling, upon which the shadowy silhouettes of walking nuns appeared. Such draperies, as well as the perforated metallic dividers in Bonn, emulated a semi-permeable membrane that only theoretically closed nuns off from the world, which was one of the key themes of the exhibition. Plenty of objects and structures on display (including works made in conjunction between nuns and professional artists outside the monastery walls, and manuscripts made in convents for lay patrons, to name but two categories) underscored the degree to which the visual culture of nuns demanded interaction with the outside world.

More than 150 collections lent some 600 objects, most of them with origins in German convents. Because of the nature of early conventual foundations for women, the early objects in Essen leaned toward the carefully crafted, the professionally made, and included an array of objects made of gold and gems, such as the dazzling twelfth-century gold, enamel, and walrus tooth reliquary from Elten, constructed as a miniature replica of a centrally planned church (cat. 129). In comparison with the early objects, the later works in Bonn more often came from the hands of nuns themselves. These included vast and labor-intensive textiles, many employing a tapestry structure finished with embroidered, quilted, and beaded details; manuscripts illuminated in convents, including those by Sibylla von Bondorf, a Poor Clare from Freiburg; and a besloten hofje from Mechelen, an enclosed garden encompassing a paradisiacal world made from pipe-cleaner sheep and silk-and-wire flowers. The catalogue covers both parts of the exhibition.

The organizers, who included Jeffrey Hamburger, Robert Suckale, Hedwig Röckelein, Carola Jäggi, Jan Gerchow, and Susan Marti, wrestled the huge amount of material into a meaningful
structure. Their categories were thematic, but at the same time told a story about the history of female enclosure and its visual culture that unfolded roughly chronologically. The first section comprised objects related to the early medieval abbess and her rule, including the eleventh-century gem-studded golden crown from Essen (cat. 1) that became one of the emblems for the exhibition. Not all of the objects were so visually dazzling, as they also included the wax seal of a twelfth-century abbess (cat. 12), and some twelfth-century coins stamped with the images of the enthroned abbess (cat. 13).

“Enclosure and the Rule” presented copies of nuns’ rules and tracts, while “Liturgy in the Church” showcased impressive architectural fragments, including an immense tympanum from a twelfth-century church in Cologne (cat. 35), as well as a plaster cast of the baptismal font from Frecchenhorst (cat. 50), one of the few reproductions on view. There were also objects selected for their aural, not visual, interest: a collection of earthenware vessels that had been set into the walls of the church of St. Walburga in Menschede to improve the acoustics during the singing of the Office (cat. 73). Another area of the Essen exhibition space was dedicated to manuscripts and book arts, where visitors could see twelfth-century manuscripts copied by nuns (cat. 108, for example), alongside the Anglo-Saxon stylus used to copy them (cat. 110).

“Patrons and Treasures” highlighted cult objects, reliquaries, and nuns’ relationships with their patron saints. This was followed by a look at the visual culture resulting from the noble or royal patronage of convents. Prominent here was a selection of objects from the women’s abbey of Chelles outside Paris, founded in the seventh century by Queen Balthild. These treasures included a long silk ribbon tied around a shiny lock of the queen’s auburn hair (cat. 170).

“New Orientation in the High Middle Ages” focused on book production, this time from the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Here we saw several exquisitely illuminated copies of texts by Hildegard of Bingen (cats. 198, 199), as well as manuscripts stemming from Benedictine and Augustinian Double Monasteries, which thrived in these centuries.

The second part of the exhibition, “The Era of the Orders” (in Bonn), had a much different structure, one based on the spaces of the late medieval convent and its functions. Because the rate of survival for these later objects far exceeded that of the earlier works, the organizers were able to reconstruct parts of entire convents. In particular, they assembled several magnificent objects from the Cistercian convent of Fröndenberg, including the immense painted reliquary with the Life of Mary (c. 1410-20, cat. 233). This reconstruction formed part of the first unit, “The ‘Outer Church’: Open for the Laity,” which showcased objects that put the public face on the convent and mediated between the nuns’ spaces and the public space. The catalogue cannot capture the diminutive size of the miniature Palmesel from the Dominican convent of St. Katharina in Wil, used for the nuns’ performance of the Entrance of Christ into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday (cat. 258). This section also housed a successful and engaging computer presentation featuring the Liber miraculumorum from the Dominican convent of Unterlinden in Colmar, a manuscript that chronicled a miracle-working image of the Virgin and its public (cat. 241).

Moving deeper into the exhibition corresponded to transgressing into the more private spaces of the convent. The next reconstructed space was the sacristy, filled with “earthly and heavenly treasures.” Reliquary busts, a ciborium made from a coconut, patens and chalices, and other objects necessary for the performance of the Mass – all of enormously varied quality – were on view. “The Nuns’ Choir” featured an array of objects for nuns’ devotions, including the sculpture group from the Mayer van den Bergh Museum in Antwerp representing St. John the Evangelist with his head resting on Christ’s breast, made by Meister Heinrich von Konstanz for St. Katharinental. For the first time in centuries, the thirteenth-century sculpture was paired with its pendant, representing Saint John the Baptist. A number of other sculptures from the same convent were brought together, including the Visitatio group from the Metropolitan Museum, in which Mary and Elizabeth clasp hands across their crystal bellsies.

Spinning off the theme of the enclosed garden, the next section thematized nuns’ enclosure, and included the small colored drawing representing the Heart as a House from St. Walburg in Eichstätt (cat. 340), with which Jeffrey Hamburger had essentially launched this entire project eight years ago in Nuns as Artists. A large selection of objects displayed in “Cells: The Quotidian, Visions, and Prayer” came from Wienhausen. The exhibition designers attempted to reproduce the feel of the cells in a convent, complete with a few of the large chests women brought with them when they entered the convent – chests too large to fit in the small cells and which therefore lined the hallways of the dormitories. Visitors might have had a more realistic experience visualizing this aspect of conventual living by visiting Wienhausen itself, which is open to the public. The exhibition then led through the chapter house and refectory, where the emphasis was on objects related to punishment, including illustrated tracts admonishing nuns to conform to prescribed behavior and scourges for self-use.

The penultimate section, “Guests’ Quarters and Abbey: The Opening to the World,” featured objects belonging to the late medieval abbess, as well as those found in the guests’ quarters that put a public face on the convent. Among the most eye-catching works was a manuscript found in the final segment of the exhibition (“The Workhouse: Readers, Writers, and Artists”). This manuscript looked as if it had been written in Morse code, all dots and dashes that correspond to the weaving pattern for constructing a gold border, as inscribed by a Poor Clare from Nuremberg (cat. 471). These final two sections presented a rich array of textiles, which, unfortunately, lose much in reproduction, especially the white weft-on-white-warp Lenten cloths.

And that’s not all: in addition to these two museums, a third venue – the treasury at the Cathedral in Essen – housed a continuation of the exhibition. The pièce de résistance there was the Golden Madonna, a tenth-century, burnished gold enthroned Virgin who gazes straight ahead with an unblinking stare (cat. 147).

The function of an exhibition catalogue is always multifold: it gathers together the expertise of a number of scholars (in this case, 118 of them), presents the state of knowledge about the objects displayed, and – in related fashion – brings the bibliography up to date. If these tasks are mastered, as they are in Krone und Schleier, the catalogue also serves as a reference for future scholarship. I should mention here that in addition to providing meaningful descriptions and interpretations of each of the objects in the exhibition and reproducing most of them in color, the catalogue also publishes meaty articles by an array of respected scholars: Jeffrey Hamburger and Robert Suckale, Gisela Muschhol, Klaus Schreiner, Hedwig Röcklein, Werner Rösener, Carola Jäggi and Uwe Lobbedey, Barbara Newman, Caroline Walker Bynum, Gabriela Signori, and Jan Gerchow and Susan Marti. The catalogue is packed with topics ripe for future research.

In conjunction with the exhibition was a colloquium, “Women – Monasticism – Art: New Research on the Cultural History of the Middle Ages” which brought together about 120 scholars and students.

In 1994, the Mayer van den Bergh Breviary was loosed by conservators from the restrictive neo-Gothic binding that had discouraged both scholarly perusal and photography and carefully dismantled. Its leaves were displayed individually to the world for the first time in 1996. Since that debut, in Flemish Illuminated Manuscripts, 1475-1550, where it merited over fifty pages of catalogue space, the Breviary has also enjoyed its own picture book (1997), a place in the landmark celebration of Flemish miniatures, Illuminating the Renaissance (2003), and most recently its own exhibition at the Mayer van den Bergh Museum in a new gallery space. This was the dismembered manuscript’s last and most lavish public appearance before rebinding, and Brigitte Dekeyzer’s accompanying monograph provides essential material for the scholar without unduly discouraging the civilian visitor. The book is drawn from her dissertation; she also wrote the entries on the Mayer van den Bergh Breviary for all the publications cited above, which explains both their unusual depth and the remarkably harmonious state of scholarship on the manuscript.

The scholarship devoted to the “Ghent-Bruges style” of manuscript illumination has been marked by four interests in particular: an urge to uncover the authorship of the miniatures in these highly prized manuscripts, a consideration of their links to panel painting, a fascination (quite understandable) with the illusionism of their borders, and more recently a recognition that these books have a lot to teach us about workshop practices. All of these approaches, however fruitful and necessary, can have the effect of fragmenting our perception of the book, whether by ignoring text at the expense of pictures or concentrating on the oeuvre of an individual artist whose hand might appear in dozens of manuscripts. One of the strengths of this book is that Dekeyzer has summarized and built on earlier scholarship, considering questions more often applied to earlier illumination – evidence of religious attitudes, the identity of the book’s patron, and the relationship between text and image, for example.

Dekeyzer divides her book into five chapters, introduced by a prologue that moves smoothly from the arrival of printing and the cachet of manuscripts, to the history of the Mayer van den Bergh Breviary itself, to the book’s contents and decoration. (Actually, her prologue is rather ceremoniously preceded by a Preface, a Foreword, and an Introduction.) Chapter I (“Like painted panels”) characterizes the “Ghent-Bruges” style not only by its famous combination of convincing “window-like” miniatures and trompe-l’œil borders, but moves into a more sophisticated discussion of light and implied space. Her summary of the phenomenon of Ringbom’s dramatic close-ups touches on painting technique as well as devotional motives.

Chapter II (“Word and image”) provides a tutorial on the various parts of a breviary and the illustration typical for each part. Even the mystifying apparatus for computing the date of Easter and other movable feasts is explained in helpful detail. She then tackles the relationship between texts in the Breviary and the images that accompany them, concluding that the miniatures in the Temporale function independently, concurrently with the text rather than, say, as illustration or commentary. The opening of the psalter, devoted to the life of David, emerges as an especially rich display, but more concerned with biblical history than ‘illustrating’ the psalms it introduces. The decoration of the rest of the psalter, however, follows a different and more subtle course, and Dekeyzer’s explanations are illuminating. Rather than the traditional illustration to “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God” (Psalm 52/53), which in the fifteenth century might simply show a jester, the Breviary followsth e spirit of the verse and depicts the Israelties turning from God to worship the golden calf.

Chapter III (“Masterly hands”) takes up the question of attribution and introduces us to the usual suspects: the Maximilian Master and his shop, the Master of James IV of Scotland and Gerard Horenbout (treated as distinct artistic personalities), and Gerard David. All were active around 1500, the date Dekeyzer proposes for the Breviary. Simon Bening, whose professional life seems to date back only to about 1521, has been dropped from consideration.

Chapter IV (“Between tradition and renewal”) does an excellent job of imposing order on the complex questions of where the Breviary’s artists found their compositions and how they used existing iconographic traditions. Dekeyzer orders her material by subject matter, proceeding from Old and New Testament stories to Apocrypha, tales of saints and miracles, and “icons of suffering.” Within those categories she is then free to dart from stained glass to panels to pattern drawings, usually under the shadow of Hugo van der Goes, and still keep the focus on iconography. The discussion supports her clarification of the Breviary artists’ particular kind of creativity, which lay in combinations of text and image rather than in novel compositions.

Chapter V (“In search of the patrons”) lays out the case for two finalists: Manuel I of Portugal and his second wife Mary of Castile. Portuguese text accompanying the Easter tables indicates that the Breviary was adapted, if not originally made, for a Portuguese patron. Since it is such a lavish book, the popular candidate has long been the king of Portugal, Manuel I (r. 1495-1521). Unfortunately, none of the elements we might expect to see in a book made especially for Manuel – his arms or the insignia of the Order of Christ or an emphasis on Manuel’s patron saint, Jerome – are present. Several inclusions in the calendar and choices for text and miniatures do suggest a patron with Franciscan and Augustinian sympathies, and that certainly applies to many members of the Portuguese royal family, but other choices point to a female patron. Dekeyzer convincingly discards Manuel as a candidate in favor of his queen, Mary of Castile. The many images of the Virgin in the second, later half of the book (including a rare full-page miniature of Our Lady of the Snow flanked by scenes of the founding of Santa Maria Maggiore) might suggest adaptation for a woman named Mary. Whoever the source of the commission, it seems we must acknowledge at least one change of intended owner to account for the omissions, repetitions, and subtle inconsistencies between one part of the manuscript and the next – what Dekeyzer calls the “book’s intrinsic and visual bipartite nature” (p. 171).
The two appendices deal with: 1) the liturgical and pictorial contents of the book; and 2) the illuminators implicated in its decoration. The first appendix is gratifyingly detailed, and includes the names of all the saints honored in the calendar pages (not just the ones the author has decided are significant) and in the litany. “Contents” includes the subjects of the miniatures and where they occur, of course, and also which pages receive borders and which borders are historiated.

Dekeyzer’s book is generously illustrated and clearly and engagingly written. The manuscript’s new accessibility restores it to the side of its more famous sisters: The Hours of Isabel la Católica in Cleveland, her Breviary in London, the La Flora Hours in Naples, and the Grimani Breviary in Venice. 2004 marked the centenary of the Mayer van den Bergh Museum, and the success of these interrelated projects – the expanded gallery, the conservation and generous display of one of the collection’s jewels, and this fine monograph – is as fitting a flourish as one could wish.

Elizabeth Moodley

Princeton, New Jersey


In line with the aims of Phaidon’s “Art & Ideas” series, Jeffrey Chipps Smith has written a portable and reasonably priced introduction to the period for students and the general reader. His extraordinarily ambitious remit takes a broad view of the Northern Renaissance indeed: the content ranges from about 1380 to 1580 and strays outside the Netherlands and Germany to visit England, Sweden, Bohemia and Switzerland.

Chipps Smith’s main goal is to write a contextual history of art but he sensibly imposes a broad chronological structure on the material. The earlier chapters, therefore, focus on the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries; they address the physical, religious and social settings of art and architecture, as well as the beginnings of printmaking. The later chapters, by contrast, deal with the sixteenth century; they analyze artists’ explorations of the “micro—and macrocosm” of nature, the upheavals of the Reformation and the century; they analyze artists’ explorations of the “micro—and macrocosm” of nature, the upheavals of the Reformation and the South. He gives a nuanced account of the influx of Italianate forms and ideas into such cosmopolitan centers as Antwerp or Brussels around 1500, recognizing the resulting mixture of practices and styles to be a distinctive part of the Renaissance experience (“Nowhere else in Europe could such a range of artistic traditions and experiments be viewed,” p. 308). However, had he adopted an international frame of reference for the appreciation and experience of Northern art, so much of which was transported abroad, the book would have provided a more balanced view of the period’s two great artistic traditions.

The book is generally successful in elucidating works of art. The chapter on “Dancing with Death” offers a stimulating cultural history of the subject of death based on a wide variety of thematically linked artefacts, from the low-cost woodcut to the lavish imperial tomb. Any book of this type should attempt to include lesser known works, and Chipps Smith fulfills this expectation: scattered among the standard repertory are such objects as the transi Tomb of Henry of Chichele (c.1424-26), an anonymous Augsburg print showing Brazilian Indians (c.1505) and Bernard Palissy’s glazed terracotta platter of wriggling sea creatures (c.1560). The book is especially interesting for its representations of lost schemes of decoration and display, including Hans Miélich’s Meeting of the Regensburg Council (1536), which shows the council chamber’s Last Judgment on display, and Hans Holbein’s House of the Dance of c.1520-1524.

As a result of its thematic organization, the text tells us very little about individual artists or their working environments: overall, Chipps Smith is more concerned with the experience of art than with its making. This contrasts sharply with James Snyder’s monographic approach in Northern Renaissance Art (1985), which has been the standard textbook for the period until now. Chipps Smith is sceptical – unnecessarily so, in my opinion – that Hubert van Eyck worked on the Ghent Altarpiece, which appears stylistically unified. It remains debatable to what degree style and technique were personal qualities within the context of familial workshops and training at this period. On the subject of the altarpiece, a clear oversight is the attribution of Philip II’s copy to Lucas de Heere rather than Michiel Coxie (who created it in 1557-1559). Though Chipps Smith pays the Master of Flemalle too little attention in the first chapter on the ars nova (because he focuses on the Valois courts as the initial and main catalyst for this development), it is remarkable just how many of the period’s main artists, themes and concerns he manages to touch on.

Chipps Smith’s writing is scholarly but light and moves quickly, aided by the absence of footnotes in this series (though a short section of missing text on page 350 interrupts the flow). He engages us in part by asking leading questions, such as “how differently we would evaluate the Renaissance in Italy if three-quarters of its pre-1520 religious art was destroyed; or if Milanese art survived but Florentine art did not. Similarly, how different would its future artistic course have been if most church building and decoratings, especially in cities like Rome, ceased for fifty or sixty years in the middle of the century?” (p. 380). Such expansive speculation is typical of this book, which is most valuable as an introduction for its unusual breadth of vision.

Susan Jones
Caldwell College

With the publication of its twentieth volume, the well-known *Corpus of Fifteenth-Century Painting* has undergone a major facelift. As explained by the authors in their Introduction, some of the points of departure that were formulated in the first volume (*Corpus Groeningemuseum Brugge, 1951*) are now considered to be too rigid, some outdated, even in some cases utopian.

The quest for completeness has been a major reason for the slow pace in the successive publication of volumes. With the bibliography of early Netherlandish painting growing dramatically year by year, the attempt to compile a comprehensive file on a work of art is not only cumbersome and prohibitively time-consuming, but irrelevant as well. As soon as a volume appears, it becomes outdated. For this reason, among others, many critics have called for a more synthetic approach, geared toward essentials rather than massive amounts of (often contradictory) information. As high-quality color photographs can now be published at reasonable cost, long, detailed descriptions and systematic color notes have become obsolete. The myth of “total objectivity” has also been questioned. In previous volumes, the author and systematic color notes have become obsolete. The myth of “total objectivity” has also been questioned. In previous volumes, the author remained in the background, given the opportunity to offer an opinion in a separate section at the end of each entry.

Meanwhile, a number of systematic museum catalogues of early Netherlandish paintings have appeared, offering valuable alternatives. In their catalogue of the National Gallery of Art’s collection, the authors, John Hand and Martha Wolff, demonstrate how rewarding shorter entries and the publication of comparative material can be (*Early Netherlandish Painting, The Collections of the National Gallery of Art Systematic Catalogue, Washington, DC, National Gallery of Art, 1986*). Moreover, their appreciation of the artistic quality of certain works, is never felt as an infringement upon their presumed objectivity.

In the Introduction to his recent National Gallery catalogue, Lorne Campbell identifies some of the natural advantages of more recent scholarship and explains his choice not to revise the London *Corpus* volumes of his predecessor, Martin Davies: “I have had greater opportunities to develop hypotheses, pursue arguments and pay greater attention to the people, artists and patrons, who were involved in the making of these pictures.” (*The Fifteenth Century Netherlandish Paintings, National Gallery Catalogues, London 1998, p. 7*.)

Having absorbed and learned from these and similar endeavors, the producers of the *Corpus* have arrived at a new format. As before, each entry contains ten sections, but they are now in a sequence that better reflects current developments and interests in art historical research:

1. Identification (*Corpus* no., inv. no. in the collection, artist – group & no., title, signature and date, inscriptions, heraldry and emblems, marks)
2. History of the work (origin and subsequent history, material history, exhibitions)
3. History of the research
4. Physical analysis (form, dimensions, support, frame, painted surface, marks, ground, underlying drawing, paint layer, varnish, restorations)

5. Pictorial analysis
6. Comparative material
7. Comments
8. Documents and literary sources
9. Bibliography
10. List of illustrations

With regard to the organization of entries, it is worth noting that the historiography of a work has become an independent section, whereas before author’s opinions were spread throughout different sections of the entry. It is also praiseworthy that the formerly byzantine reference system – e.g. Dhanens (302 378), by which the novice reader would be sent searching extensive bibliographical lists, before figuring out that the 302 referred rather irrelevantly to the 292th publication listed in the bibliography of the entry – has been replaced by a more common, user-friendly author-date-page reference in parentheses. Another major improvement is that illustrations are now included with the text, making comparison considerably easier.

What follows is the exemplary physical analysis with which the *Corpus* has made its high scholarly reputation since the very first volume. Evidently, due to the evolution of IRR—and XR-documentation, the technical images are more legible than in the earlier volumes. In the pictorial analysis, the painting is described and its iconography discussed. Lists of comparative material, withheld from the earlier volumes, are now fully integrated, while relevant works are illustrated in the Comments section.

For the first time, the curator of the host collection – in this case, of the Mayer van den Bergh Museum, Hans Nieuwdorp – is allowed the opportunity, in a brief Foreword, to share some relevant information on the history of collecting within the Museum. To my mind, it would be beneficial to make this a more elaborate introductory section in each volume.

Fortunately, the name of the Center has again been re-baptized – into *Centre d’étude de la peinture du quinzième siècle dans les Pays-Bas méridionaux et la Principauté de Liége.* This is after the original name, “Centre national de recherches Primitives flamands.” had been changed in the early ’90s under pressure of a Liégeois minister into the even more awkward “Centre international d’étude de la peinture médiévale des bassins de l’Escaut et de la Meuse.” Some colleagues wondered why the adjacent canals were not mentioned in the title, especially since Bruges lies neither on the Scheldt nor at the Meuse. Let’s hear it for progress!

Maximiliaan P.J. Martens
*University of Ghent*


Christa Grössinger will probably be best known to readers of this *Review of Books* for her very useful introduction to gender issues in early northern imagery, *Picturing Women in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art* (Manchester, 1997), a book that many of us doubtless have used in teaching. She has also published extensively on English misericords. This book seems to be an outgrowth of both.

Renaissance Art Review of Books (Chicago, 1989) or in a comparable
study, Michael Camille’s *Image on the Edge: The Margins of Medieval Art* (London, 1992), whose images she sees as a precedent; however, this book covers a wider range of subjects than the former and also takes note of the tone of presentation in ways that are not always evident in studies of northern art. That latter emphasis on the kind of humor in the images is one of the book’s chief strengths. But there are no comparanda adduced from either German or Dutch literature of the period to offer a verbal tone or corroboration of the conclusions drawn from looking at the images out of context.

After a pair of introductory chapters, the first on scatological and genital aspects of late medieval imagery and the second on prints as patterns (whose purpose here is not clear), subject-matter chiefly defines the remaining topics. Sometimes the groupings seem arbitrary, as in the broad notion of “Standards of Morality” (Chapter Three). That northern art is “moralizing” has been one of the standard tropes of scholarship for a generation now, though sometimes nuanced or criticized in more recent studies. Grössinger applies a rather blunt instrument to her objects of study, which mismatch the Children of the Planets tradition (as if this were a book on secular subjects rather than of humor) and proverb images along with tavern scenes and the Ill-Matched Pairs (perhaps she wants to construct her own Ill-Matched Pairs?). Her examples come chiefly from German artists, but she also freely mixes in Netherlandish examples. The resulting confusion or homogenization actually raises an interesting question, posed for peasant studies by Raupp as well as in those Bruegel studies that take account of German print sources: how much did later Netherlandish artists, including painters, know and draw upon German print precedents? But this is not the book to seek answers for such questions.

In effect, this is a primer – really useful in teaching topics that are well represented in prints but less well in paintings. While it includes the biggest names, especially the Housebook Master and Dürer, it also revels in less familiar artists who took up the topics that unfold in successive chapters: peasants (slim, especially in light of Raupp, Moysey, and other scholarship), warriors (ditto), women, wild men (and a single image of witches – for which there is a large and insightful literature), and grotesques (a surprisingly short chapter in light of the emphasis at the outset on low humor). In general, this book can be used only as an introduction, useful for its imagery and bibliography but not really positing new insights or studies in depth. Like Paul Barolsky’s *Infinitte Jest: Wit and Humor in Italian Renaissance Art* (Columbia, Mo., 1978), Christa Grössinger raises a most important subject and offers an approach to it. But at 80 euros in cost, the readership of this book is severely limited and cannot possibly fill its teaching purpose, unlike the paperback on women. Both the wide scope of this book and its relative lack of analysis leaves the reader wondering who used these images and whether one can really discern their level or tone of humor. After all, as with the celebrated debate over Bruegel peasants between Alpers and Miedema, one could either laugh at the depicted figures or, alternatively, sometimes actually laugh with them at the shared follies of the world.

Larry Silver

*University of Pennsylvania*

---


The three titles reviewed here constitute the proceedings of three conferences, published over only two years by the Verlag für Regionalgeschichte in its series, “Dortmunder Mittelalter-Forschungen. Schriften der Conrad-von-Soest-Gesellschaft. Verein zur Förderung der Erforschung der Dortmunder Kulturleistungen im Spätmittelalter,” edited by Thomas Schilp and Barbara Welzel. Volumes 1 and 3 contain important contributions on Conrad von Soest, an artist whose life and work remains to be investigated in detail. Volume 2 is dedicated to the *Eucharist Altarpiece*, the so-called “Goldenes Wunder” [golden miracle] in the Petrikirche in Dortmund, the largest surviving Antwerp retable of the early sixteenth century.

Conrad von Soest, who most likely resided in Dortmund, is certainly the most famous and independent Westphalian painter in the fifteenth century. His key works are the signed and dated altarpiece in the city parish church of Bad Wildeungen (1403), and the Marian altarpiece of c.1420 in the Marienkirche in Dortmund. A surviving contract of 1394 records that the wealthy couple, Conrad von Soest and Gertrud van Münster, married in Dortmund, witnessed by the city’s most distinguished burghers. The “Goldenes Wunder” was commissioned in 1521 by the Franciscans of Dortmund for the high altar of their Klosterkirche, situated close to the city walls. Since 1809, following the destruction of the Franciscan church, the altarpiece has been in the Protestant Petrikirche in the center of Dortmund, receiving far too little recognition. These volumes of conference proceedings set themselves the ambitious task of considering new areas of research through a continuous discussion of interrelated themes, and of opening up new perspectives. All three contain excellent color plates and black-and-white comparative illustrations.

Volume 1, *Conrad von Soest*, contains the proceedings of the conference held in Dortmund on November 9, 2001, at the initiative...
of Arthur Engelbert, founder of the Conrad-von-Soest-Gesellschaft. Brigitte Buberl’s Introduction is in the form of a status questionis, while the nine essays that follow concern themselves with the religious structures of late-medieval and eighteenth-century Dortmund, with artistic practices and techniques, stylistic development and grouping, as well as with issues such as what constitutes “ideal” and “real” in visual representation. What emerges is a multifaceted image of the artist, his world, and reception – a varied package further developed in the third volume of the series.

The historian Thomas Schilp focuses on forms of religious and spiritual thought in the late-medieval town. He suggests that it was primarily the commemoration of death and dying that provided the conception for groups of donors, who competed with each other for appropriate space in the church. Even the ecclesiastical institutions surrounding the donors were in competition. This leads Schilp to interpret the hidden inscription in the open book on the lectern in Conrad’s Death of the Virgin not as the signature of a self-confident artist, but as a reflection of his concern for the salvation of his soul. The author goes on to suggest that the Marian altarpiece was likely commissioned by the congregation of the parish church and the city council, and not – as Brigitte Corley believes – by the Marian Confraternity, which was dominated by patrician families.

Based on his examination of almost all of the works by Von Soest with infrared reflectography, the restorer Ingo Sandner comments on the artist’s working procedure. Among his conclusions are that the painter did not make detailed underdrawings, but set down his main forms with “bunches” of lines, the final surface precision being achieved in the paint layers. It remains to be seen, according to Sandner, whether this free transference of design was common practice, or whether methods of tracing were applied as early as the first half of the fifteenth century. He suggests that the underdrawings were executed with a pointed brush or a metal stylus, rather than charcoal – a practice likely derived from manuscript illumination.

Brigitte Corley – based on previously published research – recognizes a relationship to the miniatures in the Très belles heures of the Parement Master, with which Conrad only could have become acquainted as a member of the miniaturist’s Parisian workshop. In light of more recent discoveries, Barbara Welzel stresses the “dense intertwining of artistic contacts between Flanders and France in the years before and after 1400,” as well as the traveling habits and marriage politics of the courts, which contributed to territorial interlinking. Thus, Welzel argues, Conrad’s presence in a specific Parisian workshop is a mute point. Rather, comparison of his works with the Limbourg brothers’ miniatures in the Très riches heures demonstrates the international position of the Dortmund painter. Welzel proceeds to outline the close connections between Dortmund and Paris, the former being a trading city as well as Hansestadt and imperial city, which had regained its self confidence after the Great Feud of 1388-1390. Conrad’s stylistic ideals, ideal of beauty and sense of courtly fashion thus derive from Franco-Flemish court art, familiar to the artist from sketchbooks, among other sources.

Uta Hengelhaupt takes issue with the view, as expressed by Wilhelm Worringer in 1924, that it was Conrad’s essential achievement “to have introduced a foreign element of French-Burgundian art into Westphalian provincial art.” Hengelhaupt presupposes that “the transmission of stylistic developments” in Europe at the time of the international Gothic was achieved not by individuals, but at a much broader level – “a phenomenon difficult to recognize today, influenced as we are in our view by the accident of survival.” She convincingly demonstrates the significant impact of Stienese painting on Westphalian art during the fourteenth century – an influence she also claims for Conrad von Soest.

Annemarie Stauffer establishes an Italian connection in Conrad’s depiction of fabrics, focusing on their topicality and change in the course of the artist’s career, as well as on their documentary value and symbolic meaning. While Conrad depicts traditional, heraldically inspired fabrics in the Wildung Altarpiece, the Dortmund Altarpiece displays fashionably sumptuous silks from Lucca or Venice – a choice, Stauffer suspects, made by the patrons.

Volume 2 on Das “Goldene Wunder” documents the conference held in Dortmund in May 2003, under the auspices of several institutions. The varied approaches of the eleven essays are designed to stimulate further research on the “Goldenes Wunder.” The contributors analyze questions of cultural history and religious topography of late-medieval Dortmund, as well as documentary sources on the retable (the name of the carver of the shrine is recorded), issues related to workshop cooperation and working techniques of different studios, and involvement of the patron. Several essays serve to decode the iconography of the astonishing and complex pictorial program. Among its discoveries, the conference revealed that the figures of Peter and Paul, as patron saints of the Franciscan monastery, were part of the original altarpiece. The volume also reproduces for the first time photographs that trace the transformation of the retable, as well as the text of the contract in modern German.

Barbara Welzel discusses the history of the Dortmund altarpiece whose function and meaning are difficult to reconstruct after the secularization of 1803. The main altar apparently was the product of the efforts of many individuals – minor as well as prominent donors. Welzel evokes the social unity that was created between the parties, and emphasizes the importance of shared ownership of images in the coherence of groups. In a similar vein, Thomas Schilp argues that Reinoldus, the city’s patron saint, was instrumental in establishing a common identity. In medieval Dortmund, which saw itself as a religious community where ecclesiastical and charitable institutions competed with each other, the Eucharist Altarpiece can thus be understood as the Franciscans’ response to the Dominicans’ retable by Derik Baegert of the 1470s. Schilp further argues that both altarpieces were situated behind roodscreens, thus fully visible only to members of the convent, though he assumes that congregants were able to see parts of them through the roodscreens. This leads him to suggest that it may have been the “remoteness” together with “the possibility of partial visual perception” that made the retable into the “Golden Miracle” of Westphalia, the name by which it is still known.

We owe our knowledge of the identity of the carver of the altarpiece, Jan Gillisz Wrage, to Nils Büttner. Wrage, Büttner reveals, had a large workshop and adequate financial resources to procure materials for the project on advance. The carved components of the retable were considered the most important, liturgically as well as artistically. Surprisingly, only two other Antwerp carvers are known by name: Jan de Molder and Jan Genoots. According to Godehard Hoffmann, Jan Gillisz Wrage and the painter of the altarpiece, Adriaen van Overbeke, were contractors who, due to their iconographic knowledge and innovative approach, were able to attract and advise patrons. Hoffmann stresses the importance of the altarpiece beyond its liturgical function, since the pictorially relevant texts were not only accessible to the Franciscans but also to the literate public (in the vernacular). Because of this broad potential use, Hoffmann considers the original location of the altar piece as yet unresolved. Though the retable originates from the beginning of the Reformation, its iconographic program, Hoffmann points out, does not address the heated debate over the meaning of the Eucharist, but rather expresses a “lavish summation of traditional, ecclesiastic perceptions with a demonstrative gesture.”
Using the carefully thought-out program of the Franciscan altarpiece in Dortmund-Kirchlinde, Elisabeth Tillmann questions the often derogatory assumptions made about serial manufacture and mass production of Antwerp carved retables, whereas Ulrich Schäfer focuses on the division of labor in Antwerp carving workshops. Esther Meier and Heike Schlic both address the centrally depicted Mass of Saint Gregory, while Susan Marti discusses the function of the Mass in women’s convents and the adaptation made to pictorial formulae according to the recipients. Finally, Thomas Lentes offers new objectives for future research, arguing against the traditional concept of visual piety (Schauführungsmigkeit).

Volume 3, Dortmund und Conrad von Soest, contains the proceedings of the conference, organized by several German institutions, held in Dortmund in January 2004. Picking up on the approach initiated in Volume 1, Thomas Schilp, Barbara Welzel and their fellow contributors aim to place Conrad von Soest in a European and interdisciplinary context. Especially welcome among the diverse historical and art historical offerings is an examination of Conrad’s place within the social-historical milieu, and of the position of journeymen within the painting profession. The volume also publishes the marriage contract between Conrad von Soest and Gertrud van Münster, with transcription and translation.

The book opens with a discussion by Otto Gerhard Oexle on the culture of memory, which aims to reveal something about our own culture and that of the medieval past. In “Von Winckelmann bis zur Berliner Schule,” Gabriele Bickendorf examines and criticizes the inner dichotomy of German art historians—between the Germanization of the discipline on the one hand and an artistic ideal committed to Italy on the other. While the Italian origin of art history has been denied, she argues, the attempt to create a consistent history of German art has failed. Robert Suckale focuses on Cologne painting of the second half of the fourteenth century, demonstrating that an artistic transformation took place around the 1360s through the processing of Franco-Flemish models. This Cologne school, in which Suckale places Conrad von Soest as its most independent master, together with the art of Bohemia, stimulated the “ascent” of painting in Germany.

Going beyond Thomas Schilp’s contribution to the second volume here under review, Wilfried Ebhrecht discusses the holy city of Jerusalem as the model and goal of medieval urban society. Using Master Bertram’s altarpiece for the high altar of Sankt Petri in Hamburg (now Hamburger Kunsthalle), Iris Grötecke discusses the relationship between biblical narrative and the experiences of the viewer. Wilfried Reinhauser addresses the question of painters’ and craftsmen’s journeys, strengthening the previously expressed suggestion that Conrad traveled to Paris. Birgit Frankke discusses French art around 1400 through the themes of magnificence and the virtue of splendor.

Nils Büttner considers the signatures and subtle references to Conrad von Soest in the opened books in the Wildung Annunciation and Pentecost, as well as in the Dortmund Death of the Virgin, not so much as explicit provisions for the hereafter, as Schilp suggests (in Volume 1), but as simple memorials. Comparison between Conrad’s signature on the frame of the Wildung altarpiece and Jan van Eyck’s authenticated signatures leads Büttner to question the authenticity—as others have before—as of the inscription on the frame of the Ghent altarpiece.

Martin Büchsel broadens the discussion to analyze the artistic interconnectedness of Dortmund, Prague, Bruges, and Tournai. In her social-historical study, Monika Fehse, contrary to Brigitte Corley, excludes (with considerable certainty) the possibility that Conrad von Soest married a second time. She presents the image of a Dortmund burgher who may have been already advanced in years when, in 1394, he married Gertrud van Münster, who originated from the Münster nobility. With his considerable wealth, which could have been acquired only through trade—possibly international trade of pigments, and, consequently, with the ability to make large donations, Conrad should be seen, Fehse asserts, as a person elevated to the patrician circle. Thomas Schilp analyzes the political and urban culture of medieval Dortmund. Finally, in her discussion of the function of Conrad’s Marian images, Barbara Welzel refers to her essay in Volume 1, as well as to Oexle’s opening contribution in this volume, thus for the present closing the circle.

Happily, the publication of two more volumes is planned for November 2005, which should offer valuable discoveries, as well as pose new questions in the investigation of German art and culture around 1400.

Iris Brahms
Freie Universität Berlin
(Translated from the German by Kristin Belkin)

Short Notice

Inspired by what he considers to have been a dramatic misrepresentation and downgrading of the court of Guelders during a key century of independence (1371-1473), Gerard Nijsten aims in this work of cultural history to set the record straight. “In the Shadow of Burgundy” refers, then, not to the true legacy of the court but to the inferior position accorded it by historians. Nijsten, who published the basis for this book as a dissertation in Dutch (1992), constructs his thesis around a group of largely unexamined archival documents, most in the form of ducal accounts, which have survived in relatively large numbers compared with other courts. For historians of Netherlandish art, two aspects of this study—one, content-oriented, the other, methodological—should hold special interest. Nijsten’s discussion of the production and use of manuscripts (chapter 7) and of what he calls the “Visual and Applied Arts” (chapter 8) in Guelders offer useful contextual analysis of the role of the arts at a fifteenth-century court—especially as it is bolstered by firsthand archival documentation. The most interesting information relates to what has come to be classified as the decorative arts—e.g. stained glass, goldsmith work, tapestries, etc.; in doing so, this account conveys what might be considered a fairly typical picture of artistic production at a medium-sized northern court. The broader and perhaps more important contribution of Nijsten’s study is in its approach, focusing as it does not on the culture of the Burgundian ducal realm but on that of a decidedly smaller venue. Though the author struggles to emphasize, sometimes too mightily, the independence and coherence of the Guelders court, the overall benefits of his focused, contextual approach do emerge.

Jacob Wisse
Stern College for Women
Sixteenth Century


In a series of exemplary catalogues of the permanent collection of the Städel Institute in Frankfurt, this sumptuously produced volume follows two prior volumes by Jochen Sander of the Netherlandish and Italian pictures, and it complements an earlier volume of German paintings before 1500 by these same two collaborators. But this catalogue has true star appeal, featuring the most famous German artists, who make the Städel a pilgrimage site: Altdorfer, Baldung (3 works), Cranach (8 works of all periods and subjects), Dürer, Grünewald, both Holbeins. No serious art history research library should be without these indispensable Frankfurt volumes, especially this one.

Every individual entry includes meticulous presentation of data for a picture: dimensions, condition, technical information, description, provenance, scholarship history, and general discussion, which frequently includes thematic comparisons, other versions or copies, and the place of the image in the oeuvre of the artist in question. Some entries offer exemplary essays of important pictures or subjects. A good example is Baldung’s Weather Witches (1523), one of the rare paintings of this nefarious theme, so important to the artist in his drawings and so lastingly consequential for the period. But this extended discussion also places the striking pair of full-length nudes in contexts of female figures by Dürer and related imagery of both bathhouses and alchemy.

Also particularly strong is the rich range of Cranach pictures. These include traditional iconic images of the Virgin as well as post-Luther images of Madonna and Child or Christ among the Children. But a major full-length Cranach nude, Venus (1532), adds still more to the discussion of the nude in German art alongside Baldung’s witches.

Significant altarpieces or altarpiece components also adorn the Städel catalogue, in part derived from the Frankfurt Historisches Museum. These works generate informative, thoroughly researched, extended essays, including: Baldung’s St. John the Baptist Altarpiece (before 1520); Cranach’s Holy Kinship (1509); the Job fragment from Dürer’s Jabach Altarpiece (c. 1505, reconstructed); Grünewald’s grisaille wings from the top portion of the Heller Altarpiece (c. 1509/10; made for Frankfurt, reconstructed); and the complex wings and predella of Holbein the Elder’s Frankfurt Dominican altarpiece (1501). Four high quality panels from the Pullendorf Altarpiece by a master from the workshop of Zeitblom (Ulm, c. 1500), provide much needed modern scholarship.

To be sure, other wonderful conjunctions emerge as the arbitrary product of any fine collection. The Städel offers a particularly strong roster of portraits in good condition, presenting a miniature history of this kind of German painting: Barthel Beham’s moving juxtaposition of a father with his son (on fir, c. 1525; pendant in Philadelphia); Barthel Bruyn the Elder of a named couple (c. 1540/45); a dated man (1559) by Bruyn the Younger; Cranach the Younger’s Melanchthon (1559); Dürer’s so-called “Katharina Fürliegerin” with hair down (1497); Holbein the Elder’s Weiss (1522); Holbein the Younger’s tondo of Simon George of Cornwall (ca. 1535/40); and a Wolf Traut (1501; pendant Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza). Frankfurt portrait painters and their local patrons are especially well repre-

sented: Hans II. Abel, Von Holzhausen pendants (1523); pendant full-length donor portraits (1504) from the exterior relatable wings of the Stalburgs’ Hauskappelle; Martin Caldenbach Hess, Portrait of Jakob Stralenger (1506). In particular, Conrad Faber von Creuznach is uniquely present as portraitist of many of the same Frankfurt family patrons, including pendants of Von Holzhausen’s (1535; 1529) and Stralenger (? c. 1545; 1526), plus his familiar Double Portrait of Justinian von Holzhausen (1536).

A good example of the critical and thoughtful revisionist scholarship of this volume, which refuses to accept received wisdom or repeated scholarly traditions is its Dürer portrait entry (pp. 273-87). The canvas support, date, monogram, and Fürlieger heraldry are all duly noted, as are the six copies in various media, including an etching by Hollar (1646, with inscriptions). These copies also pair the Frankfurt image with a bound hair version of the same figure and coat of arms (Berlin). Of course here the scholarship history and basic questions hover around the identities of these two women (though sometimes copies have been taken as originals): same figure in different characterizations or sisters? The identification as “Katharina” begins in 1790 without evidence, adopted by Nagler in 1837 and reiterated amidst increasing scholarly contrasts between the two images, often calling one a saintly portrait historié. Archival research (Gumbel, 1928) revealed no Fürlieger daughters named Katharina in the late fifteenth century, but he also authenticated the family heraldry, though many open questions are evident still in the standard reference on paintings by Anzelwesky (1971, 2nd ed. 1991). Today the Berlin-Frankfurt pairing as Dürer originals is firmly established, and doubts about the inscriptions are allayed, at least allowing for condition issues of canvas. The best candidate for the sitter is Anna Fürlieger, born in 1484 and died in childbirth in 1507, which would mean that the Frankfurt picture could not be identified as a nun, nor does her age in 1497 match well with this seemingly older sitter. While the Berlin image looks like a betrothal portrait (and Dürer’s contemporary Tucher pendants) and appears before a window, in contrast the Frankfurt likeness sits on a dark monochrome ground like a praying saint (Buchner found a model in Bellini). Brinkmann poses the hypothesis here that Dürer’s double representation might even have stemmed from a more personal motive, to memorialize a deceased younger sister of his own (two candidates, one [Agnes, b. 1479] perhaps portrayed in a Holbein the Elder drawing in Berlin, a close comparison).

A good entry like this one both resolves old debates and sparks new hypotheses. Brinkmann and Kemperdick bring admirable thoughtfulness and close inspection of all evidence to their assessments of each picture in this important collection, which deserves comparison to Nuremberg, Munich, and Berlin as a temple of great German painting.

Larry Silver
University of Pennsylvania


In June 1997 a conference on the collecting of prints and drawings in Europe, c.1500-1750, was held at the National Gallery, London, organized by The Burlington Magazine and sponsored by the
rather to make sure that he would not buy the same image twice. However, this does not prevent it from being the most important inventory of prints to survive from the Renaissance period.

Matteo Lafranconi writes about Antonio Tronsarelli (?1528-1601), a Roman collector of whom he discovered a post-mortem inventory, where among other things, around 350 drawings are described. The exacting way in which they are catalogued – three-quarter have specific attributions – is quite remarkable for such an early date and often allows Lafranconi to match descriptions with existing drawings. Also extraordinary is the fact that 35 sheets were framed and presumably hung on the wall, outnumbering Tronsarelli’s 15 paintings. Among the draftsman, predominantly sixteenth-century Roman artists, were some contemporaries of Tronsarelli. The northern artists were Albrecht Dürer, Pieter Bruegel the Elder and Dionys Calvaert. Lafranconi had previously published this great discovery in 1998 (The Burlington Magazine, 140, August) including, in the appendix, a transcription of the inventory. Thus the article in the present book is basically a repetition of the author’s earlier article, without the useful appendix. (Therefore one will not find a reference to the “paesino a olio in una prospettiva de mano de Pietro Broghiel,” which was kept in an album [ibid., p. 547]). Regrettably, together with the omission of the transcription of the inventory, its location has been omitted too.

Michael Bury explores in some detail Giulio Mancini’s comments on a collection of art on paper in the latter’s Considerazioni sulla Pittura (1617-1621). These comments, which occur in a general section on display, acknowledge the existence of such collections that were actually part of paintings collections. As Bury rightly observes, discussion of such a phenomenon has often been neglected in the modern literature. However, I think one point Bury brings up could be clarified further. In Mancini’s own words, albums should be created according to “le materie, tempi, grandezza di foglio, nazioni e modo di disegno, s’a penna, lapis e carbone, acquarela, chiara scuro, tenta a olio, così ancora nei disegni di taglio . . . .” Bury, who interprets this to mean that albums be first classified by subject matter and then by period, size, etc., uses the quote to explain why in an aesthetic collection ‘subject matter’ received such prominence for arranging prints (Bury ignores the drawings), as in Mancini’s painting-display discussion. Although Bury cleverly argues the point, I wonder whether in this case the analogy between prints and paintings is entirely appropriate since it would seem, at least in my view, that Mancini was simply listing the possible ways of arranging works on paper without stressing one way over the other.

Jeremy Wood writes about Nicholas Lanier (1588-1666), one of the first serious collectors of drawings in England, and his collection, largely made up of sixteenth-century Italian art. From the beginning of the eighteenth century, a series of star-shaped marks have been associated with Lanier. Like an astronomer, Wood examines each star (introducing several new ones he recently discovered), in the end creating a glowing, multi-star-spangled sky. Not only Nicholas Lanier used star marks, in all likelihood also his uncle, Jerome. Wood’s knowledge of the collector marks of the Laniers is unsurpassed; it does not stop with the star marks, also Lanier’s handwritings and his mounts are discussed.

Diana Dethloff gives a clear, well-written account of the drawings and prints collection of Peter Lely (1618-1680), its character, formation and arrangement. The drawings collection, whose main focus was sixteenth-century Italy, contained very few northern examples, such as works by Maerten van Heemskerck, Cornelis van Poelenburch, Cornelis Saftleven, and Anthony van Dyck (his Italian sketchbook, now in the British Museum, and oil sketches for his Iconography). Dethloff expresses surprise at the lack of

---

* Many thanks to Anne Varick Lauder, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, who commented on an earlier draft of this review. The fact that she, unlike me, has first-hand knowledge of the London conference was also very helpful.

1. Not included are the following papers: Ger Luijten on collections of seventeenth-century genre prints; Bernd Mayer on the collection of Fürst Maximilian Willibald von Waelburg-Wolfgang; Jane Roberts on Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel’s Leonardo drawings; Peter Parshall on John Evelyn’s Sculptura; and Catherine Monbeig-Goguel on the drawings housed at the Académie Royale, Paris.
Rubens or Rembrandt drawings. However, as the entire Dutch and Flemish schools were practically absent, this neglect seems rather consistent to me and hardly surprising. (By the way, most of the early collectors of Rubens drawings seem to have been more interested in his Italian retouched sheets – and these were the ones Lely had – than in the Flemish master’s own work.) In this respect a remark of Bainbrigge Buckeridge, an early biographer of Lely, may be illuminating: “In his younger days he [Lely] was very desirous to finish the course of his studies in Italy, but being hindered from going thither by the great business he was perpetually involved in, he resolved to make himself amends, by getting the best drawings, prints and Paintings of the most celebrated Italian Hands.” Of course there was a general appreciation of Italian drawings at the time in England, but Lely’s reasons for collecting Italian drawings or drawings by northern artists made in Italy as substitute for the “real thing” might at least partially be his own. The quality of Lely’s print collection (again predominantly Italian) was particularly noteworthy, as Dethloff makes clear. Her discovery of Roger North’s annotations on Lely’s prints of the portfolio lettering and numbering, in all likelihood reflecting the collector’s original arrangement, eventually will allow a reconstruction of his collection. Interestingly, it seems Lely organized his prints partly by state.

Genevieve Warwick concentrates on the emergence of the connoisseurial drawings collection in late seventeenth-century Italy, which she does by way of Padre Resta. As Resta’s primary concern was making attributions, he was particularly interested in defining an artist’s individual style in terms of handling. To visualize the artistic influences genealogia de pittori were created. Another important issue for Resta was the judging of quality, which should be done with historical contingency. Resta recognized drawings themselves as (important historical) documents. Along the same line he thought connoisseurs should explore and preserve archival documents, among the latter also attribution and provenance history of individual drawings. Warwick concludes by stating that Resta used the drawings to chart the history of art in visual terms, constructing his albums to strengthen connoisseurial skill in interpreting visual evidence and developing visual memory. Warwick’s eloquent arguments are very persuasive. My only question is: where does ‘chauvinism’ come in? Was Resta’s drawings album Felsina Vindicata contra Varasium, in which he tried to glorify the schools of Bologna against those of Florence, just a rare incident?

Carol Gibson-Wood and Cordélia Hattori focus on the drawings collections of, respectively, Jonathan Richardson Sr. (1667-1745) and Pierre Crozat (1665-1740), close contemporaries in England and France. Both collections were considered the most important in their respective country at the time and in both, the majority of the drawings were by Italian masters. Richardson’s collection, however, ‘only’ counted ca. 5,000 sheets, while Crozat had almost four times that amount. Furthermore, Richardson’s exceptional interests in Rembrandt and early Italian masters – something Gibson-Wood stresses – were less new in France at the time. This difference in quantity and the new connoisseurial interest in England, however, are not so surprising. If we are to believe Richardson, the English lagged far behind the Italians, French, Dutch and Flemish in connoisseurship. Richardson used a collector’s mark, Crozat did not, but the small numbers in pen and brown ink added at the time of the Crozat sale are a secure way of recognizing sheets from his collection. Crozat arranged his collection for the most part according to schools and chronology. Unfortunately, we are still left in the dark as to how Richardson had his collection organized, despite the elaborate shelfmark-system he left us on the back of his drawings and mounts. Again, much of the information given by the two authors was published elsewhere: Hattori in her detailed study on Crozat’s drawings collection in the Bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire de l’Art français (1997), pp. 179-208, and Gibson-Wood’s monograph: Jonathan Richardson. Art Theorist of the English Enlightenment, London 2000.

Nicholas Turner offers insight into his ongoing study of the drawings collection of Cavaliere Francesco Maria Niccolò Gabburri (1676-1742), a member of the court of Grand Duke Cosimo III. Gabburri’s collection was particularly strong in drawings by his Florentine contemporaries, such as Antonio Gabbiani, Alessandro Gherardini and Tommaso Redi. The drawings were preserved in albums, some of them by artists, some arranged iconographically by subjects (apparently no chronological series). Many of the drawn portraits of artists were framed behind glass. Identifying several drawings as from Gabburri’s collection through numberings and annotations on the back and through descriptions in surviving inventories, Turner is able not only to correct provenances of individual sheets, but also of larger groups of drawings; it was unknown for instance that the majority of the Italian drawings of William Fawkener (died 1768), now in the British Museum, came almost directly from Gabburri.

Although a very handy book, literally (light and small) and figuratively (bringing together a lot of relatively recently found information), my opinion of it is decidedly mixed. I greatly appreciate the initiative of the symposium and even more the effort that was put into publishing the papers (the more so since I did not attend the gathering in London). On the other hand I cannot but be slightly disappointed by the end result. First, five of the eleven papers bring more or less old news. In the cases of Lafranconi, Hattori, and Gibson-Wood, this was already known when the anthology was prepared for press. With Landau and McDonald it was clear their articles would be surpassed within a year.

The volume indeed should be commended for the cohesiveness and intersecting character of its contributions, as Caroline Elam aptly notes, but considering its restrictive subject matter, this is not so surprising. Apart from one Spanish and one French collector, the book is entirely devoted to collecting in England and Italy, and the discussed art is virtually all Italian. Collectors from German-speaking countries or from the Netherlands (North and South) are conspicuously absent. Basilius Amerbach, Jan de Bisschop, Laurens van der Hem, Carl Heinrich von Heinecken, Joris Hoefnagel, Samuel van Huls, Paul von Praun, Valerius Röver, Joachim von Sandrart, and Rudolf II, to mention only a few, do not even appear in the index. The inclusion of at least some of the papers dealing with collecting in Germany and the Netherlands delivered at the conference would have been welcome (see note 1). Another indication of the unfamiliarity with collecting on the northern European continent becomes clear from the cited literature, or better from its absence. Diana Dethloff laments how complicated and confusing the history of the Arundel Collection becomes after the death of the Earl and Countess. She was evidently not aware of Sam Dudok van Heel’s article on Arundel, which appeared in 1975 (“De kunstverzamelingen Van Lennep en de Arundel tekeningen,” Jaarboek Amstelodamum 67 [1975]). Similarly, Hattori ought to have cited Peter Schatborn’s seminal article on early collections of Rembrandt drawings of 1981 (“Van Rembrandt tot..."
Crozet, Vroege verzamelingen met tekeningen van Rembrandt,” Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 32 [1981]. Schatborn has a separate section on Crozet’s Rembrandt drawings. More importantly, it should be stressed that it was Schatborn in his 1981 article, who discovered that the drawings formerly in the Crozet collection were numbered and that Pierre-Jean Mariette wrote these numbers.

It is because of these lacunae, symptomatic of an overall neglect for considering the history of collecting in German speaking countries and the Netherlands, that the anthology, as lucidly written and scholarly as it is, may be viewed by some as a missed opportunity.

Michiel Plomp

The Metropolitan Museum of Art


Growing out of her dissertation, completed in 2000 for the Technische Universität, Berlin, Schollmeyer’s book is a substantial addition to the literature on Lower Rhenish painting. Jan Joest is at once important in his own right and as the teacher of Joos van Cleve who emigrated to Antwerp and Bartholomäus Bruyn the Elder who spent his long career in Cologne. Schollmeyer focuses on three altarpieces: one firmly documented; one ascribed to Joest; and one no longer extant but known through documents.

The first is the high altar of the Nicolaikirche in Kalkar. A committee formed of civic officials and church members began to work on the project in 1488/1490, but the carved center portion depicting the Crucifixion and the carved predella were not completed until 1500/1501. Completing the structure were twenty panels comprising the inner and outer wings painted by Jan Joest and his shop between 1505/1506 and 1508/1509. The outer wings (Feiertagsseite) depict scenes from the life of Christ while the inner wings (Feiertagsseite) are concerned with Christ’s Passion as well as Pentecost and the Death of the Virgin. Schollmeyer provides a complete presentation of the documents pertaining to the altarpiece, including a useful history of its restoration from the nineteenth century onward. A brief account of Joest’s working methods leads to a careful exposition of the iconographic and stylistic features of each painting. By virtue of both geography and politics, Lower Rhenish art is a particular amalgam of Netherlandish and German influences. Schollmeyer’s choice of comparisons is indicative of this situation. For example, Joest’s depiction of The Raising of Lazarus is usefully related to Geertgen tot Sint Jans’s painting of the same subject in the Louvre and The Raising of Lazarus by an unknown Cologne painter in the Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle, Durham. There are also associations with stained glass produced in Cologne. Schollmeyer reaffirms the traditional identification of the figure wearing a red hat at the far right of the Ecce Homo as Joest’s self-portrait. In her book on Jan Joest, published in 1997 and reviewed by me in the HNA Newsletter, vol. 16, no. 2, 1999, 35-36, Ulrike Wolff-Thomsen suggests that Joest painted himself in The Raising of Lazarus panel. For an interesting article on artist’s self-portraits see Paul van Calster, “Of Beardless Painters and Red Chaperons. A Fifteenth-Century Whodunit,” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte, 66, 2003, 465-492.

The second work to be discussed is The Seven Sorrows of the Virgin in the cathedral of San Antolin, Palencia. The inscribed panels bear the date of 1505 and also indicate that the altarpiece was commissioned by the bishop Juan Rodriguez de Fonseca. Following the death of Queen Isabella of Castile in 1504, Fonseca traveled to Brussels where he probably ordered the paintings. It has often been thought by Wolff-Thomsen and others that the artist who is referred to only as “Juan de Holanda” in the cathedral’s Libro de acuerdos was identical to the “Jehan de Holande” active at the court in Brussels from 1503 to 1505 and was Jan Joest. Schollmeyer rejects the attribution of the Palencia panels to Joest for a number of reasons. She finds it difficult to believe that Joest could have traveled to Brussels to work on an altarpiece at the same time that he was working for Kalkar on the high altar in the Nicolaikirche. More importantly her stylistic analyses and comparisons of the Palencia and Kalkar panels lead her to conclude that they are by two different artists; one small but telling point, for example, is the presence of Italianate ornament in several of the Kalkar panels and its complete absence in the Palencia panels. In my book on Joos van Cleve I accepted Joest as the author of The Seven Sorrows of the Virgin altar. Although I have yet to see the paintings, after reading Schollmeyer’s discussion I now have serious doubts about Joest’s authorship. Schollmeyer does not attempt to identify Juan de Holanda beyond noting that he worked in Brussels and that there seem to be no other works from his hand.

Lastly, there is the high altar of the Benedictine abbey at Werden, near Essen. It was finished in 1512, but by 1710 was no longer extant. The earliest surviving document, dated 1572, is important for a number of reasons. In addition to giving the date of the altarpiece it also names the artist “Johannes Jodoci Wesaliensis” which clearly seems to be Jan Joest of Wesel. Perhaps the most extraordinary revelation contained in this document is that Jan Joest wanted his paintings cleaned and revarnished every twenty years. In 1541 the task was entrusted to “Bartholomaeum Fuscum ciudem Coloniensi” who is none other than Bartholomäus Bruyn of Cologne. One assumes that Joest’s former pupil would have known how to care for his paintings, but one shudders to imagine what subsequent treatments were like. Schollmeyer discusses this in a separate article, “Zum Umgang mit Firnis um 1500. Jan Joests Verfügung von 1512, eine Quelle,” Zeitschrift für Kunsttechnologie und Konservierung, I, 2004, 93-100.

A major thesis of Wolff-Thomsen’s 1997 publication is that the Jan Joest who painted the wings of the Kalkar high altar was probably born in Haarlem and lived, worked, and died in Haarlem in 1519. Schollmeyer disagrees with this, and exhibiting a masterful and enviable command of archival and documentary sources, demonstrates that there were members of the Joest family in Wesel from the early fifteenth century on. Schollmeyer also notes a number of people named Bruyn or de Bruyn living in Wesel from the fourteenth century onward and reconfirms in effect the usual notion that Bartholomäus Bruyn the Elder was born in Wesel. Now a quiet town, in the fifteenth century Wesel was a Hanseatic city and a busy center for art and commerce.

Schollmeyer’s book illuminates a fascinating and sometimes neglected portion of Germany’s artistic landscape. The color plates are excellent and for the most part the black and white illustrations are adequate, but some are murky or too small for the complexity of the object they represent.

John Oliver Hand

National Gallery of Art

Truth in packaging. This book, based on the author’s 2001 Habilitationsschrift, delivers what its title promises. Beginning with a sketch of Altdorfer historiography as well as period religion, it claims to rehabilitate the basic purpose of the artist’s religious paintings within their moment, in contrast to recent scholars who have seen Altdorfer as either the founder of landscape painting or even of the modern artist’s self-assertion. Perhaps such interpretive disputations ultimately come down to scholarly temperament – theorist or historicist, seeking origins or finding contexts, even choosing landscape or religious figures as an object of study. Bushart’s viewpoint comes clear at the outset: to offer a strong case for the value of trying to recover Altdorfer’s own religious purposes – her version of the artist’s “way of seeing” (Bob Scribner) or of Baxandall’s “period eye” through a lens of spirituality at this problematic transitional moment of religious imagery.

Unlike Dürer’s theoretical treatises, Altdorfer left no documentation to show his attitude about art-making. Bushart argues for an enduring symbolic presence in these religious works over any goal of naturalism. She defines these images as physical manifestations of spiritual conceptualization (Gerson’s imagines for mental imagination) in ongoing response to Reformation-era challenges to religious imagery. Discussing the process of moving from visual Sehen to conceptual Schauen, she distinguishes between formats and subjects of each kind of picture and studies every separate category: small-format devotional imagery; affective epithets and altarpieces; and inventive prints. She makes the larger claim that these images stress a meditative encounter with the religious subjects by the pious beholder, and she pays particular attention to the viewer’s standpoint relative to the depictions, e.g. unconventional spatial arrangements in Crucifixions or in the massive building with multiple scenes, the 1526 Susannah and the Elders (Munich).

The first chapter analyzes the artist’s social-climbing ambitions and intellectual pretensions within his creative roles for varied patrons, including local scholars and the Emperor Maximilian. Bushart critically reviews earlier chronologies and hypotheses of origins and asserts the presence of a larger Altdorfer workshop (e.g. the older Historia Master) as well as distinctive procedures for each commission. The second chapter analyzes Altdorfer’s use of avant-garde models (Dürer, Mantegna), especially for private images in prints, but it argues that such naturalism also often upheld religious imagery, including famous icons (Madonnas ascribed to St. Luke) and religious experience of narratives. Bushart devotes extended attention to the subjective experience of Altdorfer’s small woodcut series, the Sin and Salvation of Humanity (ca. 1513) and to religious effects in the St. Florian Passion Altarpiece, through both its meaningful use of light as well as close adherence to prophetic texts. Significantly, she is the first scholar to offer systematic analysis of Altdorfer’s contribution with leading peers to Maximilian’s Prayerbook, finding it comparable to, and aware of Dürer’s own inventive dialogue with the texts. She also reminds us of how uncertain are the “facts” surrounding even Altdorfer’s most celebrated works, notably the St. Florian Passion Altarpiece, for which (using Czerny’s research of the 1880s) she recalls a connection of Maximilian to the monastery and to the Sebastian cult of its provost (Propst), Peter Maurer.

Altdorfer also used contemporary devotional literature, and his versions of Passion or Infancy narratives provide a dialogue with interactive pious adepts, a parallel process to verbal texts, such as Ulrich Pinder and Geiler von Kaysersberg and the rich Gospel retelling by Ludolph of Saxony. Bushart steeps herself in this material as she posits essentially late medieval images by Altdorfer. This makes her scholarship a summa of our understanding of such purposes, following Suckale and Hamburger. One could argue that in the process Altdorfer’s virtuosity and self-consciousness get downplayed, but Bushart also indicates how much his awareness of other leading artists (including older ones, esp. Schongauer) shows their common religious enterprise.

Within her larger vision, important new investigations of particular works or religious figures emerge. Particularly fascinated by Altdorfer’s matchless Birth of the Virgin (Munich), she notes the important role of St. Joseph (using Gerson) and the ring of angels within the novel church interior (rejected as Hieber’s planned church of the Schöne Maria in favor of a symbolic ecclesia, but these references are mutually compatible) and the related woodcut, Holy Family by a Fountain. She also notes the conceptual overlap between Susannah’s palace garden and the medieval Marian symbolic paradise, drawing traditional allegorical connections of chastity and ultimate judgment, but she goes further to argue for the process of viewing all of the narrative details of the Munich panel as a kind of theatrum mundi, imbedded in the temptations and deceptions of worldly senses. Discussing the Magdalene as a model of affective piety in several later Passion paintings, Bushart compares her conversion to that of the good thief (they even align in the Nuremberg and Berlin Crucifixions), even as she also foregrounds the good thief as a recurrent image of the choice of virtue and reception of grace. She also sensitively brings out implicit, if persistent, attitudes of anti-Semitism in the Passion imagery and slippage between biblical Jews and contemporay Turks as the enemies of the faith. Bushart even discerns in the distant background of several religious paintings a few tiny donor figures, included like pious epithets but nearly invisible (and unremarked by earlier scholars). Finally she revisits several other paintings that demand viewer (connoisseur-collector) competence and close inspection (Allegory, 1531, Berlin), emphasizing Altdorfer’s use of astrological prognostications, and she considers how his erotic imagery, like Baldung’s, implicates (courtly) viewer concupiscence.

Bushart concludes by considering the illusionism and originality of the artist’s late works against transformation of the nature and roles of art, criticized by Reformers of the era. But in her view Altdorfer’s landscapes should not be viewed anachronistically as the prelude to modernity and art’s autonomy, but rather as a basic allegorical component of religious content (a view that this reviewer also espoused earlier). She insists that close inspection of each religious image only reinforces her conviction, despite his innovations, that Altdorfer’s images cannot be viewed as autonomous art. This mature, systematic investigation of both artworks and contemporary religion makes her case powerfully persuasive.

Larry Silver
University of Pennsylvania


Annette Kranz presents the oeuvre and patrons of Christoph Amberger in a meticulously researched and generously illustrated study that brings the Augsburg portrait painter into the mainstream of German Renaissance art history. Since Amberger focused exclusively
on portraiture, and since his skill in the genre has been overshadowed by his contemporary, Hans Holbein the Younger, his reputation has suffered from a lack of serious interest among scholars. Yet Amberger’s portraits, produced over a period of two decades, present a temporal and geographic microcosm of upper-class Augsburg society. From the well-established Fugger banking family with Catholic and imperial loyalties, to the staunchly Protestant and socially ambitious Herbrot family, Amberger’s patrons comprise a multifaceted elite class. Kranz places artist and patrons into the larger context of the many political and religious issues facing Augsburg during some of the most crucial moments of Reformation unrest.

A short introduction invites us to view Christoph Amberger’s career as an opportunity for a social history of Augsburg. Because the sitters sought to impart their best social and moral aspects, the portrait becomes a valuable primary source. Kranz’s promise to use the portrait as a tool for social, economic, political and confessional analysis is delayed, however, by an overly long second chapter on the state of research on Amberger. In sum, there has never been a comprehensive study of the artist who was central to image making in early Reformation Augsburg. This reveals a larger issue in German art history of the sixteenth century: a coherent treatment is still lacking, and period studies still tend to be much biased in favor of Italian and Netherlandish art.

The third chapter consists of the artist’s biography; although necessary, the material reads like a Thieme-Becker entry. In the fourth and fifth chapters Kranz presents an analysis of portraits, then patrons, respectively. Although one could wish for a more integrated approach to these two closely related issues, here Kranz delivers her most intriguing material. In the concluding chapter, she thoughtfully analyzes how these portraits reveal a societal group in the midst of tremendous change and growth. The second half of the book is devoted to catalogue entries with forty-seven full page plates, plus an appendix of reprinted primary sources and bibliography.

Amberger came to Augsburg after training with Hans Maler of Schwatz. Although the city was dominated by Holbein the Elder and Burgkmair neither produced significant portraits. At first, Amberger adhered to an older German style that rejected space and contained the head within a relatively small frame. Augsburg patrons had long looked to Italy for their art collections and fashions, but this trend intensified in the 1530s. Although Amberger never traveled to Italy, he doubtless came into contact with Italian trends during the Reichstag of 1530, when foreign artists flooded the city. Jacob Seissenger’s portrait of Charles V created an almost immediate response from patrons eager to associate themselves with the emperor. Responding with a more fluid style, the artist integrated background shadows and architectural props in a larger half-length or even three-quarter length format. The sitters, now able to gesture and pose, show off costumes and attributes, exhibited a complex set of social, cultural and political networks.

In her chapter on Amberger’s patrons, Kranz presents the complex background of a city undergoing radical changes. Augsburg sided with the Reformation in 1534 and adopted an official policy of iconoclasm in 1537. In response to a sharp decline in the ruling population since the late 1490s, the patriciate admitted thirty-nine new families in 1538, breaching the strict social hierarchy that had gripped Augsburg since the fourteenth century. As newcomers sought to consolidate and legitimize their positions within an established hierarchy, Amberger’s production continued unabated. When the city was defeated by imperial forces after a disastrous alliance with the Schmalkaldic League, Amberger’s commissions dropped off as fortunes plummeted and political positions became dangerous and untenable.

Determining the social and political affiliations between the leading families, Kranz identifies the three major families of the Augsburg elite and seeks to differentiate their portrait types. The Herbrot family, strongly Protestant and newly rich, was in the financial elite, but was socially still associated with a merchant middle-class. The Fuggers remained Catholic and loyal to the emperor. The Welser family was confessionally less rigid, but also more difficult to place within Kranz’s system. Yet, she argues convincingly for a visible difference between Herbrot and Fugger representations. While the Herbrot preferred the older German style, the Fuggers’ aristocratic ambitions are subtly relayed in a set of companion portraits commissioned by Hans Jacob and Christoph Fugger. The brothers are shown with their hands on their hips in three-quarter length, wearing elegant black garments, and imperious gazes. Pose, attitude and size recall Seissenger’s portrait of Charles V. Interestingly, no “professional portraits” single out the many merchants among the sitters. Rather than using weights, coins, or ledger books, Amberger’s subjects represent themselves as the new aristocracy.

Despite the rich documentation, historical background, and analysis of individual works, the elusive goal of a social history remains just out of reach. The lengthy discussion of the portrait of Matthäus Schwarz in the catalogue, for example, reveals his social ambitions, but glosses over attributes such as the prominent background horoscope, by simply stating that he liked to dress up in fancy clothes. The very different portrayal of his wife, Barbara Schwarz, provides the opportunity to explore how wealthy women viewed themselves. Important questions of where portraits hung, how they were viewed, who their audiences were, and how that audience may have reacted to them in these physical contexts, remain unanswered.

All the same, Kranz’s work adds an incredible resource to this understudied area. The questions she leaves unanswered lay solid groundwork for further inquiry about Christoph Amberger’s patrons and the function of portraiture in sixteenth-century German art.

Susan Maxwell
University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

Seventeenth-Century Flemish


Rubens kehrt zurück [Rubens returns]. With this catchy phrase, the city of Neuburg on the Danube, one and a half hours north of Munich, promoted its new art museum dedicated to Flemish seventeenth-century painting. Opened on 20 April 2005, five hundred years after the founding of the Duchy of Palatine-Neuburg (Pfalz-Neuburg), the pictures are installed on two floors in the former living quarters of the renovated west wing of the castle. Construction of the complex began under Count Palatine Ottoheinrich (1502-1559), with the baroque east wing finished only in the late seventeenth century under Elector Philipp Wilhelm (1615-1690). The 500th anniversary was celebrated in the special exhibition Von Kaisers Gnaden (By the Grace of the Emperor) in another wing of the castle.

All works on display in this new branch of the Alte Pinakothek belong to the Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen (Bavarian state
collections). The Rubens paintings that returned to Neuburg are the two large side altars that once adorned the court Church of Our Lady (Liebfrauenkirche). The Adoration of the Shepherds and The Descent of the Holy Spirit were completed in 1619 and arrived in Neuburg the following year. Today they are exhibited on the top floor in an exceedingly large room as the highpoint of the newly created Staatsgalerie. Not returned, however, was the enormous Large Last Judgment, which had been installed above the high altar of the church in January 1618. It is Rubens’s most monumental painting and remains in the Alte Pinakothek in Munich, where it anchors the rightly renowned Rubens Rooms. Duke Wolfgang Wilhelm (1578-1653) of Pfalz-Neuburg commissioned the three altars in 1616-17 from Rubens for his church in Neuburg shortly after he had converted to Catholicism. The Liebfrauenkirche is situated on a small square on the way to the castle and is open to the public. In 1703 Johann Wilhelm (1658-1716), more commonly known as Jan Wellems and Wolfgang Wilhelm’s grandson, had Rubens’s altarpieces removed to his gallery in Düsseldorf. His court painter, the Venetian Domenico Zenetti, replaced them between 1700 and 1705 with The Assumption of the Virgin, The Deposition of Christ, and The Martyrdom of St. Barbara, thus introducing different subjects. In 1806 Rubens’s altars were brought to Munich with the Düsseldorf collection. Only the Large Last Judgment was exhibited in the Alte Pinakothek while the side altars were in Schleissheim.

In 1990-91 Konrad Renger dedicated a small, excellent exhibition at the Alte Pinakothek in Munich to these three works: Peter Paul Rubens. Altäre für Bayern, where he published for the first time Rubens’s letters and documents pertaining to the commission. Facsimiles of some of these documents are now exhibited at the beginning of the newly created museum. Also on display is a reproduction of Rubens’s drawing of The Birth of the Virgin in the Hart Collection, Nashville, Tennessee, which served as model for one of two stucco reliefs (ca. 1620) by the Castelli brothers in the church. The documents also briefly mention two drawings after two versions by Rubens of the Assumption of the Virgin (today in Brussels and Düesseldorf; Jaffé Rubens, Catalogo Completto, 1989, nos. 382, 523). No corresponding drawings by the master are known and Renger has convincingly suggested they were executed by a pupil; this helps explain why the relief with the Assumption is far less animated than either of Rubens’s paintings.

The collections formed by Elector Max Emanuel of Bavaria (1662-1726) and Elector Johann Wilhelm of the Palatine (1658-1716), two Wittelsbach cousins, are especially well represented in Neuburg. 73 of the exhibited works are from the Bavarian state collections (kurbayerisch) in Munich and Schleissheim. 27 come from the collection of Johann Wilhelm in Düsseldorf, 15 belonged to the Mannheim gallery of Elector Karl Theodor (1724-1799), while 18 formerly were in the collections of the Dukes of Palatinate-Zweibrücken in Carlsberg castle (evacuated in 1799).

The opening of this trove of Flemish baroque paintings, which also includes a few examples from painters in Liège such as Bértholet Flémalle (1614-1675) and Gérard Douffet (1594-1660/61), is a great event because many of the works were little known and could be studied only in less than ideal light conditions in the storerooms. Rubens’s two enormous altars obviously are the main attraction for the general public. The full-length portrait of Wolfgang Wilhelm, attributed to the studio of Anthony van Dyck and based on the original in Bremen, greets the visitor at the entrance to the large exhibition space (p. 124). The new galleries are beautifully installed and the works nicely spaced to allow for a most enjoyable viewing. One work is especially intriguing – namely the gallery picture of 1666 by Wilhelm Schubert van Ehrenberg (1630/37-1676), painted in collaboration with Jacob Jordaeus, Gonzales Coques and other painters of the Antwerp guild of St. Luke (138-143).

The additional Rubens paintings on view are either doubtful attributions, studio work, or outright copies according to the catalogue. One might add here that all the entries on Rubens, Van Dyck, Jordaeus, Teniers, and Otto van Veen are by Konrad Renger. The text is written with the general public in mind and includes artists’ biographies and a bibliography but no index.

The preliminary oil sketch mentioned in the catalogue for The Holy Trinity, originally in the Augustinian church in Munich and here attributed to the Rubens studio (223), has been in the Kunstmuseum Basel since 1988 (inv.no. G1988.24). Before Julius Held accepted it as an original Rubens sketch (The Burlington Magazine, 1987, 578-80) it was attributed to Cornelis Schut. A Rubens contemporary should definitely be considered. Accessible for the first time as well is the small St. George, based on Rubens’s large, early painting in the Prado of c. 1606. Painted on paper and pasted on canvas, it certainly is a copy, as Konrad Renger rightly states (228). Of the two modelli for the Decius Mus series, Renger questions The Obsqueyes of Decius Mus that Held had accepted (p. 234; Held, Rubens Oil Sketches, 1980, no. 4) and prefers to identify it as a copy after a lost original; the other is clearly a copy. Rubens’s original of The Martyrdom of St. Ursula, on which the small copy on copper exhibited in Neuburg and tentatively attributed to Thomas Francken is based (162), now belongs to the Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth, Texas (inv. no. AP1993.04; Jaffé 1989, no. 458). Listed only as “Flemish, first half of the 17th century” are the two full-length portraits of King Sigismund III of Poland (1566-1632) and his wife Constance in coronation regalia (144-45). Previously attributed to Rubens and more recently to Pieter Claesz Soutman (ca. 1595-1657), they are now considered to be after lost originals (why not by Soutman?) and copied in 1642, the year Anna Catharina Constantia, the daughter of the Polish king, married the Elector Philip Wilhelm. Exhibited as well is a copy of Rubens’s lost painting of Lansquenets Carousing, here attributed to Simon de Vos, as Rüdiger Klessmann first suggested (326).

Rubens’s paintings are complemented by many fine examples of his contemporaries that are of great interest. Besides Jordaeus’s Selfportrait (178) we also find two apparently unpublished works, Whoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me (184; from Castle Seehof) and An Old Drunk (unknown provenance; 187). A version of Anthony van Dyck’s Healing of the Paralytic at Buckingham Palace, London (113; Barnes/de Poorter/Millar/Vey, Van Dyck. Complete Catalogue, 2004, I.A2) is of interest as are two fascinating groups that up to now were difficult to see since they were in store: the five study heads on paper pasted on panel (116-121) and the ten grisaille portraits on panel for the Iconography (126-137). The study heads originally were attributed to Jacob Jordaeus, but are now considered to be early Van Dyck’s of c. 1615-1616 (Barnes etc. 194-98). A Van Dyck puzzle that remains inconclusive are the ten grisailles for his Iconography, which are by different hands; Renger believes none seems good enough to be by the master himself (126). Another well-represented artist is David Teniers with a group that includes his fifteen mysteries of the rosary, all on copper, and the tour-de-force of The Fair at the Church of St. Maria dell’Impruneta, a very large painting with about 1200 figures that Teniers based on an etching by Jacques Callot. Several hunting scenes by Frans Snyders reflect the taste of the noble collectors. During restoration work Jan Cossiers’s signature and the date 1657 was discovered on his Fortune Teller. The paintings were also investigated with infrared reflectography and any new insights are mentioned in the catalogue texts.

Many of the works selected for this new baroque museum are small in size, often painted on copper or panel. Jan Brueghel the
Elder’s compositions, some of which were painted in collaboration with Hendrik van Balen, are truly beautiful. To compare them with copies by other artists or similar works by Jan Brueghel the Younger is a wonderful and revealing exercise. Also deserving special mention is Otto van Veen’s series of fifteen small pictures on copper rendering the mysteries of the rosary, at times embossed with gold.

With this new Staatsgalerie in Schloss Neuburg, Bavaria’s rich collections of Flemish seventeenth-century paintings, housed in the Alte Pinakothek, in Schleissheim and now here, have become fully accessible not only through visits to the respective galleries but also through two recent publications. The present catalogue was preceded in 2002 by the richly illustrated Flämische Malerei des Barock by Konrad Renger in collaboration with Claudia Denk where the most important Flemish paintings in the Alte Pinakothek are discussed (reviewed by Karolien De Clippel in this journal, April 2005). As Reinhold Baumstark writes in his preface, any visitor interested in Flemish Baroque art now needs to include after Madrid, Munich, and Vienna this new museum in Schloss Neuburg.

Anne-Marie Logan
Easton, Connecticut


The publication of this catalogue of seventeenth—and eighteenth-century Flemish paintings in the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig is a cause for celebration. This old and distinguished collection of Flemish paintings, which was largely formed in the late seventeenth century by Herzog Anton Ulrich (1633-1714), and originally housed in the Schloss Salzdahlum, has never before been sufficiently studied. The only complete record of the collection heretofore was the check list of paintings executed before 1800 that the museum published in 1976. Fortunately, this present publication, which catalogues 159 Flemish paintings in the collection, was written by Rüdiger Klessmann, whose intimate knowledge of these works was gained through his many years as the museum’s distinguished director.

Duke Anton Ulrich apparently gained his interest in Dutch and Flemish paintings on a trip he took to the Netherlands in the late 1650s. He seems to have had strong literary interests, which probably accounts for the large number of subject paintings found in this collection. While the Duke, who was a Protestant, had a stronger preference for Dutch painting than for Flemish art, he had wide-ranging interests, and collected portraits, landscapes and still lifes as well as religious and mythological works.

As with many old collections, this one is crowned with a few wonderful masterpieces, but is also interesting for the many minor masters whose works are little known and studied. Thus, the catalogue is valuable not only for its informative texts about major works by Peter Paul Rubens (Judith with the Head of Holofernes and Portrait of the Marchese Ambrogio Spinola), Anthony van Dyck (Portrait of Lucas van Uffel), and Jacob Jordaens (Adoration of the Shepherds), but also for its discussions of interesting paintings by lesser masters, including Paul Brill (Roman Landscape with Ruins), Caspar de Crayer, (Tobias and the Angel), Ludovicus Finson, (Allegory of the Five Senses), Joos de Momper and Jan Brueghel the Elder (The Four Seasons), and Cornelis de Vos (Allegory of Transience).

These highlights are among the 40 paintings illustrated in color in a plate section following the individual entries. All the other works, including a number which cannot be firmly attributed, are reproduced in black and white. While one might wish for larger images and more color, this catalogue is the first instance in which many of the minor works in the collection have been illustrated at all. The catalogue also includes a section containing photographs of all the signatures that could be properly recorded.

Although larger in format, this volume complements Klessmann’s 1983 scholarly catalogue of the museum’s Dutch paintings. In fact, a number of artists who one might have expected to have been included in the present volume, including David Vinckboons, Roelant Savery and Alexander Keirincx, were discussed in that earlier publication since they spent much of their career in the Dutch Republic. The character of the entries in the two volumes is quite comparable. While informative, they tend to be relatively short, consisting primarily of a cursory description of the work and its subject matter, followed by a discussion of artistic precedents and comparable works, and a synopsis of proposed dates and attributions.

Two areas in which Klessmann does not delve into extensively are stylistic or iconographic issues. For example, in the discussion of Peter Paul Rubens’s powerfully expressive Judith with the Head of Holofernes, c.1616, little is said of the way Rubens used chiaroscuro effects or bold brushwork to help bring the scene to life. Nor does Klessmann discuss Rubens’s effective use of an artificial light source to illuminate the scene, a visual conceit the artist derived from Adam Elsheimer’s Judith Beheading Holofernes (Wellington Museum, Apsley House, London), a painting he had in his own collection. Similarly, one would have liked to have learned about the visual and thematic appeal of this subject for the artist’s contemporaries and the moral message that Judith’s heroic act would have conveyed.

While Klessmann does discuss the complex panel construction and the interesting pentimenti found in this work, artists’ materials and techniques, and the condition of paintings are other areas of inquiry that receive little attention in this catalogue. As Klessmann explains in his introduction, a systematic analysis of the Flemish paintings was not possible to complete in time for the scheduled publication of this catalogue as part of the 250th anniversary of the museum in 2004.

As one would expect with a careful scholarly assessment of such a collection, a number of reattributions have been made. Most of these, 43 in all, concern relatively minor paintings, but the reassessment of one work is of some significance. Klessmann, following the lead of a number of recent scholars, has rightly attributed the imposing Portrait of a Man, c. 1616, to Anthony van Dyck, a work that had hung in this collection as a painting by Peter Paul Rubens ever since it was in Schloss Salzdahlum in the early eighteenth century. Most reattributions in collection catalogues tend to be demotions, but not all. Following the lead of Wolfgang Adler, Klessmann has concluded that Jan Wildens painted the previously unattributed Landscape with the Huntress Diana (inv. no. 1126). This catalogue, thus, brings forth a wide range of material that will provide new insights to our evolving understanding of Flemish art, and for that we are extremely grateful to Rüdiger Klessmann and the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum.

Arthur Wheelock
National Gallery of Art, Washington
The complete scientific compilation of natural history, especially the animal and plant world, was the principal project of the Accademia dei Lincei. Founded in 1603 by the Roman nobleman Federico Cesi (1585-1630) for “the study of nature and particularly mathematics,” the academy went on to become an interdisciplinary, trans-national network of scientific exchange. Cesi and his fellow members commissioned innumerable drawings of plants, animals and fossils. Following Cesi’s death in 1633, the Roman scholar Cassiano dal Pozzo (1588-1657), a member since 1622, acquired from Cesi’s estate his library, manuscripts, scientific instruments and natural history studies. Together with his own extensive antiquarian studies, these were integrated into Pozzo’s Museo Cartaceo (Paper Museum).

Over 6000 of these drawings, for the most brilliantly colored and executed with a hitherto unknown precision, have to date been identified in public and private collections, a large number by David Freedberg. He already published two sections in the Catalogue Raisonné of The Paper Museum of Cassiano dal Pozzo (David Freedberg and Enrico Baldini, Citrus Fruit, London 1997; Andrew C. Scott and David Freedberg, Fossil Woods and Other Geological Specimens, London 2000); another volume is scheduled for 2006, and additional volumes are planned for the future.

The detailed reconstruction of the complicated, almost 100-year history of the creation, collection and publication of the various parts of the Museo Cartaceo allows Freedberg to pay new tribute to the considerable scientific and historical ambitions as well as methodological achievements of Cesi and his circle. In close proximity to his sources, Freedberg brings to light a dramatic piece of scientific and pictorial history and develops a fundamental epistemology of natural history illustrations in the first half of the seventeenth century.

As Freedberg shows, Cesi began by assembling numerous images of individual objects with the goal of ordering natural history in its entirety, using empirical comparison and identification. With this visual encyclopedia he hoped, independent of known systems of classification, to decipher the inherent order of nature. The as yet unclassified life of the New World was viewed as particularly promising for this empirical project, which is why Cesi, from 1610 at the latest, went to great lengths to acquire copies of a famous, richly illustrated but still unpublished collection of images of the animals and plants of Mexico, which Francisco Hernández had executed between 1571 and 1578 for the Spanish king.

It was practically inevitable, as Freedberg convincingly shows, that this rigid fixation on the visualisation of nature would lead to a revision of the original project and to a critical reflection about the value of images for scientific purposes. For example, the almost obsessive documentation of anomalies in and hybrid forms of plants and their fruits – and also of fossils – hindered a purely inductive construction of an explicit classification based on the direct study of the individual features of nature (e.g. pp. 351-353; 367f; 375; 377).

Scrutiny through the newly-invented microscope, available to the Lincei by 1618 at the latest, appeared to offer a smooth transition from simple visibleness to classification. Between 1623 and 1628, the Lincei used it to make plant studies (p. 33, also pp. 41, 398) and a detailed engraving of bees (1625; pp. 161, 189-190) – here Freedberg gives a commendable demonstration of the extent to which natural history studies, archaeology, philology and panegyrics are interwoven. But the newly won precision of sight only resulted in a never-ending multiplication of the visible, which made the possibility of classification even more complicated (p. 377). This microscopic documentation of the surface of natural objects actually hindered an analysis of the inner structure and individual organs of living things. However, it became increasingly obvious to Cesi that such an analysis was the prerequisite for a substantiated classification that did not rely solely on the physiognomic principle of superficial similarity (pp. 354f., 404-407). A purely empirical study of countless natural objects basically emphasized their singularities and irregularities, it was therefore not representative of the actual order of nature but rather its disorder. It thus proved impossible to obtain extensive scientific clarification, which Cesi believed would lead to the reduction of the array of data. The methodological aporia of purely empirical research thus became apparent: the problem of pure induction, the sheer insoluble conflict between the overwhelming mass of individual data and the necessity for classification as the means of clarification. And so, paradoxically, it was Cesi himself, who had named his academy after the proverbial sight of the lynx, who became critical of the visual documentation itself.

The Lincei thus increasingly directed their attention from the surface to the inner parts of living things – here also supported by the microscope – by using dissections. But the only scientifically reliable approach was an organology of the inner structures of such organisms and the systematic description of their construction, which in turn was based on mathematical – arithmetic as well as geometric – principles (p. 366). The Lincei noticed that the comparison of reproductive organs especially facilitated classification, and therefore documented them with particular frequency in their drawings (pp. 71, 225-233). However, the laboriously acquired imagery on Mexico’s animal and plant world proved, with few exceptions, to be worthless for such organological analyses.

The arrangement into categories of the mass of visual material and the large number of new observations of details is considered by Freedberg to be the central problem for an empirical study of nature, one that Cesi also reflected upon. In 1628 Cesi organized his methodological views in ramistic tables. His original epistemic faith in the pure visual as the means of acquiring knowledge aimed at totality was replaced by his concept of “phytichnographica”, the geometric depiction of a plant. The only path to understanding was one defined by rules of recognition: schematic, geometrized drawings, backed up by organological analysis using dissection and the microscope (pp. 387f., 393). Pure induction alone, without the establishment of a system of classifying categories, could not resolve the conflict between image and classification and allow the variety of natural things to be ordered. Using this methodical basis, Cesi appears to have formed an idea of the serial chain of living things, and to have even acquired a sense of the importance of time for the development of species and thus for the explanation of intermediary and mixed forms (pp. 386, 391).

Galileo Galilei’s (1564-1642) relationship to the Lincei, of which he became a member in 1611, provided Freedberg with his subtitle: Galileo, his Friends, and the Beginnings of Modern Natural History. He interweaves his story of the Lincei’s study of natural life with that of Galileo. Almost in passing, Freedberg succeeds in enriching the latest Galileo studies by establishing the connection between courtly social structures and scientific advancement. Drawing on hitherto ignored sources, Freedberg shows how Galileo’s growing conflict with the Jesuits, and later also with Pope Urban VIII (1568-1644), whose nephew Francesco Barberini (1597-1679) became a member of the Lincei in 1623, is closely related to Cesi’s own history and that of his research (pp. 81-147). Particularly informative is the author’s analysis of Cesi’s epistemological – and thus image-theoretical – orientation.
on Galileo’s scepticism about the external appearance of things (pp. 387, 390).

Cesi’s examination of Galileo’s methods, especially his reduction of the variety of astronomical phenomena by means of mathematical – in particular geometrical – principles, is seen by Freedberg as the beginning of Cesi’s revision of his own method of studying living things. The visual schema motivated by reason made him aware of the deficiencies of purely empirical observation. Cesi died in 1630, aged 45, without having demonstrated clearly the outcome of his change of method. Freedberg’s enthusiastic restate-
ment of the Lincei as part of the heroic early development of modern science thus ends as a melancholic review of an ambitious project in which the flood of detailed images made the acquisition of usable scientific knowledge impossible.

To illuminate the natural history research of the Lincei and to place it in a scientific-historical context, Freedberg was forced to more or less disregard other traditions of interpretation: magical, Paracelsian, theological or ancient. For it was exactly these universalistic concepts which had for so long obscured the empirical methods of the Lincei and prevented recognition of their scientific-historical achievements. Freedberg’s reconstruction of their empirical-historical accomplishment paves the way towards re-examining the metaphysi-
cal roots of Cesi’s motivation. What was the motivation behind Cesi’s undefeated desire to contribute to “progress in the field of natural history” (p. 8)? Recent studies have highlighted the importance of stoic philosophy for the Lincei (e.g., E. Reeves, Painting the Heavens: Art and Science in the Age of Galileo, Princeton 1997; Irene Baldriga, L’occhio della lince: i primi Lincei tra arte, scienza e collezionismo [1603-1630], Rome 2002). The Stoa’s particular interest in natural history was based on the notion that only a matter-of-fact perception of things, one completely free of delusion, could prevent false judgements and with them affects against nature. The stoic ethic explains why the Stoa developed a method of direct understanding that was close to an empiric approach. Perhaps it was the great importance the Stoa placed on the unadulterated perception of the senses as the precondition for leading a life according to the laws of nature that explains why Cesi and his friends clung to the idea that the precise documentation of their observations was the quintessence of their knowledge of nature. Thus in Freedberg’s reconstruction of the Lincei’s research, one gets the sense that the stoic ethic was possibly the driving force of the beginnings of early modern natural history studies.

Even if Cesi’s studies in the end failed – as Freedberg conclusively shows – the enthusiasm of his circle of friends for the precise observation of nature, often with the help of instruments, set an important cultural-historical standard. Andreas Thielemann has since shown the fundamental importance of the Cesi circle for the depiction of nature in the pictorial arts (Natur pur? Literarische Quellen und philosophische Ziele der Naturdarstellung bei Elsheimer. Paper presented at the 2004 symposium Adam Elsheimer and sein römischer Kreis. Rom und der Norden. Wege und Formen des künstlerischen Austauschs, Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rome. Publication forthcoming). It is evident from the letter of 28 August 1609 from Giambattista della Porta to Cesi (excerpts in Freedberg, pp. 101ff.) that Cesi by then already knew of the construction of the telescope and not just in 1612 when Galileo visited Rome. Thus Thielemann argues that Adam Elsheimer (d. 1610), who was close to Cesi and his circle, studied the Milky Way through Cesi’s telescope and recorded his observations in his Flight into Egypt of 1609.

Freedberg’s Eye of the Lynx once again incorporates Netherlandish art into the international context of the newly developing scientific culture of the visible of around 1600 and thus offers historians of Netherlandish art a new criterion against which to test Svetlana Alpers’s well-known thesis of the northern “art of describing.” It would, for example, be interesting to examine how the visual culture of the Netherlands influenced Netherlandish members of the Lincei, such as Johannes van Heck from Deventer. One could also read Freedberg’s reconstruction of Cesi’s epistemically based scepticism towards images as a fundamental criticism of the tendency of the modern-day “Visual Media Studies” to see media history and the history of knowledge as parallel developments. But above all, one should take Cesi’s collection of images as a methodological menetekel of our own discipline and present-day art historical methods: the more visual data one collects, the more difficult it becomes to make fundamental inductive evaluations.

Ullrich Heinen
Bergische Universität, Wuppertal
(Translated from the German by Fiona Healy)


For those too young to have seen the great round of Rubens exhibitions staged in the 400th anniversary year of 1977, the remarkable 2004-05 exhibition, shown in Vienna and New York, was the first opportunity to see a full display of the artist’s achievements as a draughtsman. There have, of course, been other Rubens drawings exhibitions since 1977, but these have tended to concentrate on specific aspects of his work or career, or have been drawn from a limited range of sources, so this was the first time in a generation that a truly comprehensive picture had been presented of the processes by which Rubens worked towards his finished paintings, and the other uses to which he put the media of drawing, and sketching in oil on paper.

Underpinning our understanding of these aspects of Rubens’s art is the work done by the late Julius Held, and in particular his Rubens, Selected Drawings (in its first edition of 1959, and the extensively revised 1986 edition), and The Oil Sketches of Peter Paul Rubens (1980). Current scholars have, however, made significant further contributions to our understanding of Rubens’s drawings, and none more so than Anne-Marie Logan, the primary organiser of this exhibition; the selection of drawings and sketches seen here, and also the analysis and discussion in the admirable catalogue, reflected and presented a distillation of all the most recent scholarship in the field. It also demonstrated most effectively (for anyone who might have doubted it . . . ) that Rubens was a truly great draughtsman, who could harness astonishing power and remarkable subtlety to create immensely profound drawings in a wide range of media and techniques, and on an equally wide variety of scales, reflecting the various functions of his drawings.

At this point I have to confess that I was not able to see the exhibition in its Vienna incarnation, so my comments are based only on study of the New York exhibition, and the Vienna catalogue; but apart from the obvious added dimension provided by the inclusion of paintings, oil sketches as well as drawings in the Vienna showing
As Logan pointed out, since the last Rubens extravaganzas of 1977, his style could vary between different drawings of the same type, and drawing (the very Leonardesque, sketchy study sheet, cat. 10, the comparison); how the work of Renaissance masters influenced not after Michelangelo’s were various: how Rubens looked at earlier prototypes (his drawing artist ever made. The themes explored by this part of the exhibition justified. The room was devoted to Rubens’s activities in Italy, and 9) for which Logan’s preferred dating of c. 1601-02 seems on balance Descent from the Cross begin the ‘main course.’ Equally impressive was the St. Petersburg Equestrian Portrait of the Duke of Lerma the magisterial Munich pen and wash study (cat. 13) for the 1603, whereas most young artists would simply copy the earliest composition faithfully, hoping to learn something in the process, right from the start Rubens imposed his own artistic personality, altering details, making striking changes of scale, and in some cases taking figure groups from different prints and combining them into totally new compositions.

The exhibition opened, appropriately enough, with some of the copies that Rubens made, throughout his career, after works (many of them prints), by other artists. Even in the earliest of these copies, we immediately see the originality of mind and technique, and also the self-confidence, that marks Rubens out as one of the great draughtsmen. Whereas most young artists would simply copy the earlier composition faithfully, hoping to learn something in the process, right from the start Rubens imposed his own artistic personality, altering details, making striking changes of scale, and in some cases taking figure groups from different prints and combining them into totally new compositions.

Entering the second room at the Met, one was confronted with the magisterial Munich pen and wash study (cat. 13) for the 1603. Equally impressive was the St. Petersbourg Descent from the Cross, mounted on the back of the same stand (Cat. 9) for which Logan’s preferred dating of c. 1601-02 seems on balance justified. The room was devoted to Rubens’s activities in Italy, and contained everything from copies after classical and Renaissance works, to some of the most elaborate compositional studies that the artist ever made. The themes explored by this part of the exhibition were various: how Rubens looked at earlier prototypes (his drawing after Michelangelo’s Libyan Sibyl alongside Michelangelo’s own drawing of the subject – a remarkable, if initially rather unexpected comparison); how the work of Renaissance masters influenced not only his drawing style but the very way he used the medium of drawing (the very Leonardesque, sketchy study sheet, cat. 10, the immensely elaborate compositional study sheets, cats. 14, 17); how his style could vary between different drawings of the same type, and even the same subject.

Here we also saw some of the many new discoveries in the show. As Logan pointed out, since the last Rubens extravaganzas of 1977, many drawings that were previously totally unknown, or were thought to be lost, have come to light, and of the 113 drawings entirely or partially by Rubens in the exhibition, no fewer than 13 fell into this category. (It is also worth noting that a significant number of these recent discoveries have been acquired over the last few years by the Met.) In this second room alone, we had the important, recently discovered Cologne study after the classical sculpture, Centaur Tormented by Cupid, fascinatingly different in degree of finish from Rubens’s other known study after the same sculpture, in Moscow (cats. 20-21), as well as the study of the so-called Dying Seneca seen from behind (cat. 23, private collection). Again, the difference not only in finish but also in finesse between this Seneca and the drawing of the same sculpture from the other side, in the Hermitage, is immensely striking – so much so that one has to doubt whether the St. Petersburg drawing can really be by the master himself.

In the following room, the emphasis was on the artist’s subsequent compositional drawings, and in contrast with the works from the early Italian period, it was striking that many of these studies were relatively small, executed in pen and ink and wash. Perhaps because of the contrast in scale with the drawings in the previous room, these pen and wash studies seemed particularly refined and beautiful: the Metropolitan Museum’s Susanna (cat. 25 – another recent discovery) was the most moving of the group, but the others (cats. 26-7, 29-30) were hardly less exquisite. In the same room, the juxtaposition of the small compositional study (cat. 28) for the famous London Samson and Delilah, and the spectacularly Michelangelesque Rotterdam chalk study of a Kneeling Male Nude Seen from Behind (cat. 35) told us an enormous amount about the relationship between composition studies and individual figure studies in Rubens’s work.

The fourth room, dedicated to the artist’s early Antwerp period of 1608-15, was a theatrical performance of the first order. To the left, we had a staggering wall with three superb, monumental figure studies for the Antwerp Raising of the Cross (cats. 37-39), and on the far wall were the key studies of Daniel and of various lions for the Washington Daniel in the Lions’ Den (cats. 45-48). The drawings in this room were all of such extraordinary quality and power that no viewer could fail to understand why Rubens was the most widely acclaimed and respected European artist of his time.

If there were any lingering doubts on this front, walking into the next room would surely have dispelled them. Here, we were presented with Rubens the portraitist. The astonishing Albertina series of red and black chalk drawings of his family; the two wonderful, technically innovative, and very different, drawings of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel (cats. 79-80), the two versions of the portrait of the Jesuit Nicolas Trigault (cats. 73-73), and the splendid so-called Korean man (cat. 75; apparently once exhibited in Seoul, where experts said the costume was certainly not Korean). Whereas the largely black chalk figure studies of the previous room showed a perhaps slightly self-consciously monumental side of Rubens’s drawing style, the portraits are entirely different. In most of them, he combined black and red, and sometimes also white, chalk in rather variable permutations, and also used pen and ink for highly distinctive points of emphasis in the eyes and eyelashes. Technically, this approach to the use of chalk, though vaguely Zuccaresque, has no parallels before the drawings of Watteau, and in terms of the freedom with which Rubens combined the various media, these portrait drawings have absolutely no equivalents in the art of his own time. There is also a superb feeling of personal contact and intimacy, which to my mind makes these some of the artist’s greatest works; there are few, if any, drawings by Rubens which are more profoundly beautiful than the Albertina portraits of his cherubic son Nicolaas in a coral necklace (cat. 81) and the slightly heavy-lidded young girl, probably

his daughter Clara Serena, who was a lady-in-waiting to the Infanta Isabella in Brussels (cat. 84). And as an Englishman, I must also say that my heart was warmed by the contrast between on the one hand the massively distinguished portraits of the Earl of Arundel and the achingly refined and elegant chalk study of the Duke of Buckingham (cat. 77), and on the other the thoroughly lumpen depiction of Marie de’ Medici (cat. 76).

In the following room, we found a rather heterogenous selection of drawings from Rubens’s later Antwerp years. The impact of this room suffered from the inclusion of rather too many medium quality figure studies from the Albertina (e.g. cats. 65, 69), and the result was an impression – which may or may not be justified – that Rubens used drawings less passionately in his later career. In any case, there is no doubt that the drawings in this room included few if any masterpieces to compare with those in the previous two. But perhaps this was just a reflection of how differently Rubens used drawings in preparing his later works. There were, however, certain revelations here too, such as the surprising technical similarity between the Albertina Study of an Ox (cat. 99) and the Oxford Portrait of the Earl of Arundel (cat. 79); in both drawings, we see an otherwise very unusual combination of ink washes and red and black chalk, and a degree of personal engagement that makes the drawing of the ox (and also the study of a horse, cat. 97) feel for all the world like one of the artist’s great series of portraits. They even share the touches of pen and ink in the eyes and eyelashes, which are otherwise never found outside of Rubens’ portrait drawings. Apart from these drawings, the highlights of the room were probably the lovely Albertina study of A Young Woman Holding a Bowl (cat. 60); eerily anticipatory of Ingres, and the three figure studies for the Saint Ildefonso Altarpiece (cats. 70-72); yet although the latter studies are very freely drawn in a striking combination of red and black chalk, they suffer in comparison with the superbly sensitive portrait drawings in the previous room.

In the last two rooms of the exhibition, where the focus was on Rubens’s late works, on his retouching of copies by others, and on his drawings for prints, we found ourselves more in the territory covered by other exhibitions of recent years. Particularly in the field of the retouched works, Anne-Marie Logan has been in the vanguard of a school of thought with which I am not totally in agreement (see my review in April 2003 Newsletter of Jeremy Wood’s Edinburgh and Nottingham exhibition of 2002), but with the few exceptions mentioned in the specific notes below, the works of this type exhibited here were not particularly controversial, and gave a good and fair picture of how Rubens adapted anonymous copies after earlier (largely Italian) prototypes. The monumental figure studies of the earlier rooms were, for the reasons outlined above, absent, but there were still various interesting compositional sketches and modelli for printmakers, as well as the fine series of studies related to Jegher’s print after The Garden of Love (cats. 90-96). But it was nonetheless slightly disappointing that an exhibition which had contained, in its middle rooms, some of the greatest and most moving drawings of the early years of the seventeenth century, should end in this slightly academic and functional way. This is not, I hasten to emphasize, the fault of the organizers, but rather the natural outcome of the evolution in the way that Rubens used drawings during the course of his career. Quite simply, he grew out of the sort of drawings that he made in his early and middle career, turning instead to oil sketches, and this means that even the greatest exhibition of the artist’s drawings, of which this was undoubtedly one, could never represent all aspects of his genius.

In the realm of landscape, the disappointments were, perhaps, more avoidable. It was sad to see Rubens’s amazing abilities as a landscape draughtsman represented in New York only by the British Museum’s incredibly beautiful, but untypical, Trees Reflected in Water at Sunset (cat. 104), and another study from the Ashmolean (Cat. 105). The Vienna exhibition was stronger in this regard, including the extraordinary Landscape with a Fallen Tree from the Louvre, although that drawing has been the subject of one of the most significant attribution debates in recent Rubens scholarship. In 1999, Martin Royalton-Kisch reattributed it to Van Dyck,** but I remain unconvinced by his arguments, and see in the Louvre drawing and in the related study at Chatsworth a scale and breadth of conception and execution which are untypical of Van Dyck’s landscapes, and entirely consistent with my understanding of Rubens’s landscape drawings.

These last, qualifying comments should not in any way overshadow the two key achievements of this extraordinary exhibition, which were to present the discoveries and scholarly advances of the last thirty years of Rubens drawings studies, and to show to a new generation Rubens’s capabilities as a draughtsman. In the modern museum world there will inevitably be compromises in terms of what can and cannot be exhibited, but there can be no question that this show succeeded handsomely on both fronts, and presented very successfully the astonishing range, variety, quality, confidence and power of Rubens’s drawings. His skills were so much in demand, and he was so successful a teacher, that the area of overlap between his own works and those of his pupils will always be the subject of debate, but it is a testament to the success of this exhibition that these issues of attribution, so crucial to much of recent Rubens scholarship, seemed here peripheral, in the context of such a definitive picture of the spirit and achievements of the master in this medium.

The following are notes on selected individual drawings, by catalogue number:

16 The attribution of this unique group of anatomical drawings has understandably been debated, but their power and unorthodoxy, as well as the existence of the related Pontius prints, in my view adds up to a persuasive argument for Rubens’s authorship.

19-21 Comparative illustrations here of the other drawings discovered in Cologne in 2000 would have been helpful.

34 It was rather unsatisfactory to show only the recto of this drawing, and the verso in facsimile, rather than both sides in the original. (The same comment goes for cat. 96).

38 It is ironic that Rubens, the great reworker of drawings by others, should in turn have had one his finest figure studies reworked by Jacob de Wit.

42 As for 34, it was a shame not to show both sides of the drawing, and the condition of the exhibited side is so poor that its inclusion in the exhibition served little purpose.

43 As I believe David Freedbeg has independently suggested, I am convinced this drawing is actually by Cornelis Schut.

52 It is inconsistent that the early history of this drawing, as described in the catalogue entry, is not given under provenance.

53-55 It would have been helpful to have had the related prints exhibited alongside these drawings.

65 The handling in this drawing does not seem to fit very well with that of the surrounding works, and I wonder if it might not perhaps be by Van Dyck, rather than Rubens.

Although only ever published as Rubens, some scholars have proposed that this drawing is actually by Van Dyck, a suggestion that I find implausible, particularly in the light of the juxtaposition of this drawing with cat. 67, which is certainly by Van Dyck.

The extraordinarily unorthodox and adventurous technique seen in this drawing has apparently led some to question the attribution to Rubens, but I see this drawing as a magnificent affirmation of the artist’s originality and inventiveness as a draughtsman, and as one of his greatest portraits.

It was surprising that this drawing, which was catalogued – perhaps, for Erik Larsen, The Paintings of Anthony van Dyck (2 vols. 1988). Though the newly published Catalogue Raisonné certainly supersedes both, it does not relegate Glück to the obsolescent shelf, for only a few of the paintings he attributed to Van Dyck have been dropped from the present volume, and in whose preface the authors generously acknowledge their debt to his scholarship (based of course in part on the findings of earlier generations) and connoisseurship.

Those wishing to survey the variety and breadth of the oeuvre of Anthony van Dyck (1599-1641) or provide a handy reference in a footnote have hitherto reached for Gustav Glück, Van Dyck, des Meisters Gemälde, Klassiker der Kunst (1931, 2nd rev. ed.) or, for Erik Larsen, The Paintings of Anthony van Dyck (2 vols. 1988). Though the newly published Catalogue Raisonné certainly supersedes both, it does not relegate Glück to the obsolescent shelf, for only a few of the paintings he attributed to Van Dyck have been dropped from the present volume, and in whose preface the authors generously acknowledge their debt to his scholarship (based of course in part on the findings of earlier generations) and connoisseurship.

The decision facing all those embarking on a Catalogue Raisonné is how to structure the artist’s oeuvre, with the two most obvious choices being chronologically or thematically. Glück, like all KdK volumes, is chronological, as is Michael Jaffé’s, Rubens. Catalogo Completo (1989), whereas Wethey’s three-volume Titian is classified thematically, with a chronological sub-order within the various genres of religious and mythological history painting and portraiture. The solution devised for the present catalogue undoubtedly had much to do with the division of labor among the four authors, each of whose knowledge of specialist areas of Van Dyck’s oeuvre made him/her particularly well-qualified to assume responsibility for one of the four sections into which the artist’s life has been divided. Van Dyck never put down roots in the same fashion as Rubens, who while permanently resident in Antwerp from 1609 actually led a restless sort of life, often traveling abroad on artistic or diplomatic missions, with the younger artist’s life falling into four distinct periods determined by his geographic location: I) early years in Antwerp and first visit to London [Nora De Poorter – with Millar and Barnes for the English period: Oct. 1620-March 1621]; II) Italy [1621—July 1627; Susan Barnes]; III) the second Antwerp period [1627-March 1632] and Brussels [late 1633/early 1634-mid 1635; Horst Vey]; and IV) London [1632-1641: Oliver Millar]. Each author introduces his/her section with a short introductory essay that outlines in exemplary fashion the major professional and personal occurrences and characterizes the stylistic and thematic features of his work for that particular period. The individual entries are themselves organized thematically; religious works; secular history (mythology, poetry, allegory); portraits of known sitters (A-Z); unknown sitters (by format [full length to heads]); male, female, children).

The eagerly-awaited publication of the artist’s paintings and oil sketches is a weighty tome containing a total of 826 entries, all generously illustrated in color or black-and-white. Each entry consists of the provenance as known, a selective bibliography, and inscriptions (cited in full). All non-English quotations are translated; the few technical details relating to condition, over-painting, changes to the support etc. are included in the text, as is information concerning copies and versions – though here the possibility of following the Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard and listing them together before the text might have been a sensible alternative. The texts themselves vary in length and focus on relevant issues of composition, style, technique, iconography, on occasion dating, and, as is essential in a study of the oeuvre of one of the great portrait painters, the sitters, their familial connections and positions within the social hierarchy. They in general satisfy the reader’s desire for an overview of the relevant issues and include additional references for further reading. Even if one on occasion misses a more in-depth discussion of
De Pooeter is equally uncompromising when it comes to establishing a chronology for the early Antwerp years, which she maintains is “out of the question” (p. 16). Rejecting the idea of a stylistic progression from a rough style (Glück’s “derbe oder plumbe” group) to a smoother one, she sees Van Dyck consciously employing coarse brushwork to emulate the Italian masters. She further points out that the artist actively ‘muddles’ his techniques in his history paintings, using rough strokes for male features and smoother ones for females. But even though De Pooeter’s reluctance to establish even the vaguest of chronologies is supported by forceful reasoning, it is hard to imagine she has not formed some idea of how that development might appear. One is as a consequence left with a vague sense of disappointment at not being allowed to share in – and above all – benefit from her considerable expertise as a connoisseur of early Van Dyck.

While it is becoming increasingly common for scholars to collaborate on monographs (as opposed to exhibitions where collaboration has been the norm for some time), the participation of four experts of equal standing must at the very least be unusual, if not indeed unique. One can only pay tribute to the dedication and resolve of the four authors of this ambitious Catalogue Raisonné, which on the one hand encompasses a unifying presentation of Van Dyck’s oeuvre while on the other testifying to the scholarly individuality and values of each contributor.

Fiona Healy
Mainz, Germany

Seventeenth-Century Dutch

As a discerning collector, generous benefactor, and perceptive scholar, Alfred Bader has made a lasting and significant contribution to the study of Netherlandish art. His autobiography Adventures of a Chemist Collector (London, 1995) presents his lively activities and personality. The present, beautiful volume presents 22 essays by scholars and museum professionals whose diverse insights into Dutch and Flemish art reflect the breadth of Dr. Bader’s own interests.

As befits Dr. Bader’s activities as a collector, Rembrandt and his associates have a central position in this publication. Yet the broader range of Bader’s concerns is reflected in essays on topics including Old Testament subjects and Italian art, such as Pierre de la Ruffinière du Prey’s discussion of Wenzel Hollar’s etchings of the Jerusalem Temple, Clovis Whitfield’s identification of the character in a Carracci portrait, Astrid Tümpel’s evocation of Jerusalem, and Martha Wolff’s discussion of Kings David and Solomon in Antwerp Mannerist paintings. Two essays concern Jacob van Ruisdael: George Keyes on aspects of the artist’s landscapes and Seymour Slive on the artist’s work for Cornelis de Graeff and other patrons. Drawings, as newly discovered sheets, stages in the working process, and underdrawings, are the focus of essays by David McTavish on De Gheyn, William Robinson on Jan Muller, Axel Rüger on Van Bassen, and Marjorie Wieseman on Netscher. Arthur Wheelock explores the viewer’s experience of a painting with particular respect to the

Ronni Baer analyzes Dou’s Old Woman Cutting Bread, probably the artist’s earliest candlelit scene, which has been acquired recently by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. David De Witt thoughtfully considers the small oil on copper, Scholar by Candlelight, now attributed to Rembrandt (Bader collection) in terms of its authorship and style, and in the context of practice and themes by Rembrandt and Brouwer. Christopher Brown highlights the drawings by Rembrandt and paintings by his pupils in Oxford. Volker Manuth relates Van den Eckhout’s Tobias, Anna, and the Goat of 1652 (Bader collection) to well-known precedents by Buytewech and Rembrandt, and considers the artist’s choice of dramatic moment, painterly expressiveness, and thematic interpretation. Christian Tümpel analyzes Aert de Gelder’s religious iconography in terms of the artist’s renderings of themes also treated by Rembrandt and known to both artists through print series, the Statenbijbel, and Flavius Josephus. Tümpel observes that, in contrast to Rembrandt, De Gelder “removes all uncertainties from his painting” with respect to identification of subject (p. 217).

Walter Liedtke reopens the question of the identity of the main figure in Rembrandt’s Aristotle with a Bust of Homer (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art). The earliest notation (1654) refers to the painting as “Aristotle or Albertus Magnus.” By considering why the picture could have been considered to represent either of these philosophers, Liedtke enlarges the range of its associations to include the human senses, especially sight and touch. One omission in his otherwise extensive bibliography is Jaco Rutgers, “Rembrandt naa en faam in Italia in de zeventiende eeuw,” Kroniek van het Rembrandthuis 2003/1-2, pp. 3-21, which contains accurate transcriptions of the relevant documents (published elsewhere in other forms). I mention this for the sake of completeness, and because the Kroniek is an extremely useful and sometimes overlooked publication.

Douglas Stewart examines the possible connections between Lievens, Van Dyck, Rubens, and Rembrandt during the 1620s; his suggestion, published in 1990 (“Before Rembrandt’s ‘Shadow’ fell . . .”), The Hoogsteder Mercury, vol. 11, 1990, pp. 42-47) and reaffirmed here that Lievens may have apprenticed in Antwerp as early as 1620-21 was considered “too daring” in the exhibition catalogue Mystery of the Young Rembrandt, Kassel/Amsterdam, 2001-2002 (p. 107), but given the stylistic comparisons and circumstances, should be kept within the discourse. The possibility that Lievens was in Antwerp 1620-21 is bolstered by the two states of his portrait in Van Dyck’s Iconography: first without, and then with, his moustache; the two impressions taken together may indicate that Van Dyck first knew Lievens as a youth, and later reworked the plate to portray a more mature man.

This brief summary cannot encompass the many gems of nuanced interpretation, visual analysis, and solid reasoning presented in this stimulating collection of essays, a fitting and elegant tribute to one who has done so much to further the study of Netherlandish art.

Amy Golahny
Lycoming College


The Learned Eye takes its name from a passage in Franciscus Junius’s treatise on painting (1641) in which he argues for informed viewing as the essential skill on which critical aesthetic judgments must be based. This concept provides an appropriate framework for a volume dedicated to Ernst van de Wetering, whose acute and astute observations on the art of Rembrandt and his contemporaries have contributed to shaping the discipline of Dutch art history for more than thirty years. At a moment when the Festschrift is in danger of extinction due to publishers’ lack of interest, The Learned Eye presents an excellent model for the continuing viability of this venerable academic tradition. Beautifully produced, with many color illustrations, and yet available in an inexpensive paperback edition, this volume of essays by colleagues and former students of Van de Wetering manages to allow each author the freedom to showcase his or her own research while still assembling a fairly well-focused selection of topics. This is accomplished by bringing together essays that employ one or both of the methods for which Van de Wetering has become well-known: close study of the physical properties of paintings and careful reading of primary sources. With remarkable frequency, these methods milk new insights from materials that are already familiar. A pervasive goal is discernment of the conditions under which Dutch artists practiced their craft and interacted with their patrons. As a specific example, the concept of houding, or the artist’s manner of handling the paint, invoked by Van de Wetering in his study of Rembrandt’s methods (Rembrandt: The Painter at Work, Amsterdam 1997) and elsewhere, is addressed in several of the essays (see pp. 63, 87, 99, 108); that the authors’ deployment of the term is not entirely consistent simply affirms that the investigation of theory in relation to method exemplified by Van de Wetering’s own work is still a valuable avenue of inquiry.

Following an introduction and a brief biography of Van de Wetering by Thijs Weststeijn, the volume is divided into four parts. Part I, “The Work of Art,” focuses on technical examination of works of art, with essays by the conservator Karin Groen (on the use of red underpainting), the dendrochronology expert Peter Klein (on the use of wood in Rembrandt’s workshop, with impressive charts and graphs), the restorer Martin Bijl (on a portrait of Theodorus Schrevelius by Frans Hals) and the former drawings curator (among other talents) Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann (on the authenticity of a drawing by Rembrandt in Boston). Part II, “The Rules of Art,” includes four essays that combine the study of seventeenth-century art theory with analysis of specific works: Margriet van Eikema Hommes on methods of blending figural contours into a painted composition, based on examples in the Oranjezaal of the Huis ten Bosch (a useful examination of rarely-seen works, with many detail photographs); Anna Tummers on Albert Cuyp’s use of compositional motifs to create perspectival depth (with resulting doubts about the attribution of a painting in the Frick Collection); Arthur Wheelock on color symbolism in Dutch painting, with particular attention to notes in the TerBorch family album; and Thijs Weststeijn on the relationship between Samuel van Hoogstraten’s use of rhetorical concepts (affectus, enargeia, ornatus) and the work of his master, Rembrandt (an important contribution to our understanding of Rembrandt’s place in classical tradition).
Part III. “The Artist’s Reputation,” presents three relatively divergent topics. Christopher Brown considers the oil sketch by Anthony van Dyck for a decorative frieze depicting the annual Garter Procession; this work, if completed, would have been Van Dyck’s largest painting, and an early description by Bellori provides evidence for its significance to the artist’s career. Madelon Simons considers the role and status of architects at the Bohemian court. Mariette Haveman examines the commentary, unjustly neglected in her view, of Etienne Delécluze on the art and life of his master, Jacques-Louis David. Eric Jan Sluijter theorizes about why Hendrick Goltzius, at the ripe age of 42, turned to painting, and from whom he might have learned the art.

The essays in Part IV, “Painters, Patrons and Art-Lovers,” approach three topics from the viewpoint of the owner or connoisseur. (The figure of the liefhebber, or art lover, has become a regular presence in Dutch art history thanks primarily to Van de Wetering’s fascination with the term.) Michiel Franken discusses the appreciation of copies in the milieu of Bernini, Poussin and their patrons Richelieu, Pozzo and Chantelou. Walter Liedtke situates paintings by Gerard de Lairesse and Jacob de Wit in their original context of decorative cycles for grand interior spaces in Amsterdam and The Hague. Henk van Os ends the sequence with a discursive meditation on the history of landscape painting, incorporating German Romanticism, Edward Norgate’s comments on Flemish landscape, and reminiscences of a field trip shared with Van de Wetering and others in 1965. One imagines that his essay might have made an excellent after-dinner speech at a banquet in Van de Wetering’s honor. Instead, with this volume, we are treated to a scholarly smorgasbord whose pleasures will be much more long-lasting.

The book concludes with a bibliography of Van de Wetering’s publications, beginning with a report on the restoration of a painting by Vermeer published in 1972 and ending with Volume IV in the Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings, the series of monumental (and monumentally expensive) catalogues documenting the findings of the Rembrandt Research Project; this volume, reorienting the framework from chronological to thematic with a study of Rembrandt’s self-portraiture, is due out momentarily as of this writing. The book concludes with a bibliography of Van de Wetering’s publications, beginning with a report on the restoration of a painting by Vermeer published in 1972 and ending with Volume IV in the

**Dutch Seventeenth-Century Genre Painting:**


Dutch Seventeenth-Century Genre Painting: Its Stylistic and Thematic Evolution represents a publishing event: a new survey devoted solely to the eponymous phenomenon, “from its first manifestations in the seventeenth century to the early eighteenth century.” Although treating a much-studied area of art history, this book has no exact parallel. Its more than 300 pages are written in a single voice by a scholar exceptionally well versed in the vast body of relevant literature, to which he has previously made frequent, significant contributions. Beautifully produced in a sizable format, the book accommodates nearly 160 illustrations of seventeenth-century Dutch genre paintings, some eighty in black-and-white, over seventy in color, and eleven large, well chosen color details. Approximately fifty book illustrations, emblems, and captioned prints are reproduced for comparison, along with twenty more images of other kinds. A welcome number of high quality works from private collections, and instances of fresh observations and data, provide treats for the specialist.

Moreover, with a sufficient index and exemplary bibliography, Dutch Seventeenth-Century Genre Painting constitutes a packed storehouse of art historical information, presented with an eye toward broad usefulness and appeal. Franits organizes its rich contents according to an intelligently clear scheme, explaining: “The book is divided into three parts, comprising the respective periods, 1609-48, 1648-72, and 1672-1702. Each part begins with a brief overview of Dutch history during the period in question, focusing on a decisive event (or events) and its ramifications for contemporary society and culture.” Under each of the three parts are chapters that begin with a discussion of a particular city, and then of its leading genre painters “because it was these masters who were at the forefront of artistic developments.” (pp. 6-7) Three chapters break from the pattern by focusing on one or more individual painters. Thus, Chapter 7 belongs to Gerard ter Borch and Caspar Netscher, Chapter 14 to Jan Steen, and Chapter 18 to Godfried Schalken, Eglon van der Neer, and Adriaen van der Werff. Franits assigns approximately one-tenth of the text to the straightforward historical material concerning the three periods and the characteristics of the selected cities. This establishes a firm armature for discussing works of art that, as often as not, defy similarly straightforward interpretation.

The Introduction begins: “Dutch seventeenth-century genre paintings, commonly known as scenes of everyday life, encompass a startling variety of subject matter. . . . they are unassuming but nonetheless illustrate with great charm and conviction the life and times of a long-vanished culture.” (p. 1) Here and throughout the book, however, Franits repeatedly undermines the concept of illustration by invoking two related principles: the tenuousness of the links between portrayal and reality, and the power of convention. The deceptiveness of “the most outstanding aspect of these images, namely, their ostensible capacity to proffer unmediated access to the past” (p. 1) – in other words, illustration – will by now strike many informed readers as a straw man in need of more supple substitutes.

The principle of conventionality generally proves more fruitful. Here, genre painting as a category is defined and made recognizable by repetitions “of specific styles and motifs,” and especially by “the restricted number of themes that artists depicted, ones that were used continually, often over several generations.” (p. 1) “The chosen images do in fact substantiate this familiar observation. But repeated so often, it tends to obscure that variety and innovation, arguably of equal importance even if immersed in conventions, often cry out for fuller acknowledgement. Conventionality, after all, characterizes nearly every artistic culture, including our own. The author’s assault on “any naïve assumption that seventeenth-century Dutch paintings are simple ‘slices of life,’” sometimes prevents the recognition of new forms of lifelikeness that require more than a dutiful rehash or a mere passing nod. Franits’s Introduction exemplifies the pervasive and often
Rembrandt’s occurrence as a common theme in the expected juxtaposition of falling under that rubric with others outside it but expressing helpful strategy would have been to compare works now accepted as works, which merits more pointed acknowledgment. Symptomatically believe, from the intrinsically confounding nature of many such a certain scenario were bound to convention in a remarkably free for the view that the factors that led a “leading” genre painter to create instead of a female attendant, and a doctor using the medically mention – seems more plausible, given the presence of a husband figure between its paws. But did he conceive of her as beset by hysteria, as Franits confidently claims? Pregnancy – Celeste Brusati’s interpretation – seems more plausible, given the presence of a husband figure instead of a female attendant, and a doctor using the medically discredited yet pictorially standard pregnancy test – a scrutinized form of the woman’s urine. To complicate matters, Franits also illustrates the presumed pendant, Two Women by a Cradle (Springfield, MA, fig. 131), in which a look-alike woman gazes lovingly at her newborn. As Brusati pointed out in her book on Van Hoogstraten, by 1833 the husband had been overpainted, and remained so until quite recently. Was the alteration effected to bring the image in line with the more usual type of “doctor’s visit,” to make it more conventional? Franits acknowledges that “the placid, restrained imagery in this era of heightened civility” might have shaped Van Hoogstraten’s version of the subject. An apt conclusion, and support for the view that the factors that led a “leading” genre painter to create a certain scenario were bound to convention in a remarkably free manner. Furthermore, if these two scenes by Van Hoogstraten originally formed a sequence, as Franits suggests, their order here should be reversed.

Dutch Seventeenth-Century Genre Painting contains a fair number of equally baffling explanations; these result mostly, I believe, from the intrinsically confounding nature of many such works, which merits more pointed acknowledgment. Symptomatically, Franits skirts the difficulty of defining genre painting. One helpful strategy would have been to compare works now accepted as falling under that rubric with others outside it but expressing distinctly similar themes. “Domestic rectitude” does make an occurrence as a common theme in the expected juxtaposition of Rembrandt’s The Holy Family with Angels (St. Petersburg, fig. 134) and one of Nicolaes Maes’s paintings deriving from it, a young mother beside a cradle (Worms, fig. 133). Franits writes about the comparison particularly well, yet confines it within the context of Maes as an artist. Likewise, the wonderfully rendered set table in Maes’s Old Woman Saying Grace (Amsterdam, fig. 135) could have been compared with independent still lifes of similar motifs in order to clarify the essential role of the human figure in genre paintings. And, say, Dirk Hals’ Woman Tearing a Letter (Mainz, fig. 23) might have been paired instructively with a full-length portrait of a sitter inhabiting a prominent, highly descriptive interior. Usually, portraitists bestowed on the sitter a distinct formal emphasis, much as fashion photographers slightly disassociate costumed models from their surroundings. Occasionally, however, we cannot visually distinguish portraits from genre paintings in the absence of clear evidence concerning their original function. Moreover, genre scenes and landscapes with contemporary figures often overlap to an extent that renders mute the idea of different subject categories. In another vein, painter and writer Arnold Houbraken (1721) famously owned a large biblical scene by Jan Steen that he later described in purely secular terms. Possibly, he did think knowingly. But many a compiler of auction catalogues and the like were simply less concerned about generic classification than we are today, a point worth noting. Had Franits placed such caveats out in the open, he might have avoided those occasions of dissonance between his exuberant certainty of tone and the uncertainty sure to nag others about what they perceive.

For the ever-inquiring scholar, any area of study will always be a moving target. Franits, who finished the text in 2002, succeeded in hitting dead center as often as any expert could, resulting in a book that will long outlive individual arguments to which such intriguing paintings give rise.

Lisa Vergara
Hunter College


Scholarship on seventeenth-century Dutch art has tended to be conservative, for the most part sticking to the well-trodden paths of archival research, iconography, and Stilgeschichte. On the rare occasions when it has ventured into large thematic questions that cut across individual genres, symbolic conventions, or local schools, the results have generally been mixed, or at least controversial. Witness Svetlana Alpers’s The Art of Describing (Chicago 1984). Susan Kuretsky’s exhibition Time and Transformation sets a new standard, however, both in its broad scope and in the flexibility and expansive-ness of its guiding ideas. The show, which is still traveling (it will be at the J.B. Speed Museum, Louisville, KY, January 10 – March 26, 2006), ranges across the whole corpus of Dutch art, touching on nearly every genre, medium, and mode from the beginning of the century to its end, and including a wide variety of artists, from famous to very obscure. There are Dutch and Italianate landscapes, pastoral and picaresque visions of country life, biblical and journalistic narratives, allegories, still lifes, portraits, scientific illustrations, and more. A lifetime’s experience with objects and collections has gone into assembling Time and Transformation. Indeed, the catalogue’s cover illustration of Delft in Ruins by Daniel Vosmaer was the topic of Susan Kuretsky’s first publication as a Vassar undergraduate.

Given the scale of the undertaking, the big subject of Time might easily have fallen prey to fuzzy thinking. But Kuretsky has dodged that hazard by focusing primarily on ruins, which turn out to be commoner and richer in meaning than one might have thought: a true
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master theme in their way. Through ruin and decay, time “thickens,” as Bakhtin would say, and generates layer upon layer of association and memory. Inevitably, some of those layers carry the familiar vanitas messages that have been a stock in trade for generations of iconographers. Yet moral platitudes seldom strike the dominant note here. The breakdown of forms and boundaries intrinsic to the ruination process also can dissolve stable distinctions between nature and culture, as well as between art and reality. One of Kuretsky’s major themes is the way such transformation lends itself to new forms of aesthetic consciousness, as the description of dissolution breaks down into more or less autonomous lines and brush strokes. On the broadest level one might argue that the mutability of all canons and conventions, be they social or formalistic, is in some sense latent in the ruins theme. In that respect, it might even be considered integral to the realist enterprise as a whole.

Kuretsky divides her subject into five headings: “Monumental Ruins in the Dutch Landscape;” “Rustic Ruins;” “Flooods, Fires, and other Disasters;” “Time and Travel,” which mainly deals with Italianate images of classical ruins; and a final section, “Time and Transformation Embodied,” that expands into other forms of transience and ruination: hermits and outcasts, dissected, “ruined” bodies, vanitas still lifes, and a fascinating family portrait by Nicolaes Maes. Accompanying her long, thoughtful Introduction are five catalogue essays by colleagues with special expertise of one kind or another. The last of these, by Eric P. Löffler of the RKD, provides an interesting twist by surveying the state of Dutch ruins today. The others focus on the first four headings in the catalogue. Each is useful and informative in its own way, but some authors seem to have been less ready than Kuretsky herself to break with the methodological habits of the past. For example, Lynn Federle Orr’s essay, “Embracing Antiquity,” takes a rather conventional, survey approach to Dutch Italianate artists’ treatment of Roman ruins. Issues of descriptive accuracy vs. fantasy and the picturesque predominate, leaving little time for deeper questions about what drew these artists to the subject in the first place. She effectively ignores David Levine’s important work on the Bamboccianti’s paradoxical inversions of classical ideals, which offers critical insights into the meanings of ruins. Fortunately, Levine was able to speak for himself in a lecture at the symposium for the exhibition at Vassar last spring (other speakers were Walter Liedtke, Ann Jensen Adams, Celeste Brusati, and Seymour Slive, with Mariët Westermann as respondent).

Arthur Wheelock’s piece on “Accidents and Disasters” delves more deeply into the issues his subject poses, noting that pictures of contemporary disasters are relatively uncommon in Dutch art, which usually treats the “here and now” in terms of recurrent patterns of everyday existence. Where catastrophic events do provoke art, he sees a native tendency to find moral and providential meaning beneath the chaos. No doubt this is true, and he may also be right to tie such optimistic attitudes to a widespread vision of seventeenth-century Holland as a “Golden Age.” Then as now, however, arcadianism cannot bear close scrutiny. Wheelock seems to be looking too hard for cultural unities in a subject more naturally prone to confusion and contradiction. It might have been more profitable to probe what appears to have been a growing split in the period between allegorical and journalistic modes of historical interpretation, the one rooted in retrospection and convention, the other bound to the present moment in all its openness and specificity.

On the other hand, Walter Gibson’s discussion of rustic ruins in “Bloemaert’s Privy” is built on distinctions and contradictions. Unlike the “noble” ruins of medieval castles or Roman temples, ramshackle peasant shanties and privies have no history. They belong to the anonymous, unpoetic realm of low-life. But rather than seeing all these scenes as moralizing, as others have, Gibson proposes some positive readings, based on pastoral visions of the simple life or the aesthetics of the picturesque. There are certainly subjects where this view holds up, particularly those involving shepherds or hermit saints. But where privies are involved, there is plenty of room for laughter too, as Gibson acknowledges. What he might have stressed a little more, though, is that rustic ruins are inherently equivocal. All pastoral entails a reversal, seeing the low as high, the bumpkin as poet. And with inversion comes at least the possibility of irony. Sometimes low may just be low after all.

The best essay in the book is Catherine Levesque’s “Haarlem Landscapes and Ruins: Nature Transformed,” which is likely to become indispensable. Her subject is narrower than the others; landscape prints in the city from Goltzius to Segers. But because these are brilliant artists working at a critical, defining moment for both Dutch history and the realist mode in art, she is able to turn this sharp focus into profound observations about the meaning of ruins for Dutch art. Scenes of cultivation and rebuilding amidst historic castles demolished by Spanish invaders make for meditations on past and present, time and diligence, death and renewal. Levesque also points to a subtle, many-sided interplay between art and nature in these prints. Rebuilding projects aside, dissolution lends itself to regeneration as art when the forms of ruin and nature merge in a shared vocabulary of fluid line. Her discussion of the inspired and eccentric Hercules Segers is especially fine in this regard. A final section on “The Necessity of Ruins” discusses how Dutch ruins and the prints about them opened up a new way of thinking about history itself. Just as importantly, the essay offers special insights into the reflexive qualities inherent in the realist project in general. It is not just a matter of descriptive fidelity, and it never was.

Time and Transformation is in many ways a new kind of show, offering new ways of thinking about Dutch art and its meanings. Susan Kuretsky has given us a model to imitate and to build upon.

David R. Smith
University of New Hampshire


The point of departure for Christiane Häselin is the observation that in many of his works, Rembrandt attempts to visualize the intangible: the spoken word. She explains this phenomenon as the painter’s reaction to the religious and cultural changes which had taken place in the Netherlands from the middle of the sixteenth century. In the predominantly Protestant society in which Rembrandt lived, the discussion about the primacy of the word, and with it the act of speaking and of hearing – over the image, and thus over sight – was a constant presence. According to Häselin, Rembrandt participated in the ongoing debate by challenging the dominance of the spoken word: by making the voices of his protagonists visible, he invalidated the disparity between the written word and the image. Häselin’s study of the conventions for depicting acoustic phenomena reveals that Rembrandt introduced subtle changes into the iconographic tradition.

After a short overview of research to date, Häselin addresses the cultural, historical and theological attitudes that would have formed Rembrandt’s understanding of how the spoken word could be represented. Most important was, of course, the Protestant position on
the visual arts. Calvin in particular rejected religious imagery altogether, and cited the Bible as support. He maintained that only the word of God, transmitted through the sermon, should be used for instructing the faithful. The influence of reformatory and Calvinist ideas on the form and content of art in the Dutch Republic is hotly debated by scholars; Häslein follows those authors who believe that aspects such as subject, iconography, format, etc. were largely dependent on the confessional climate in which the artists – and the collectors – lived and worked. By analyzing various written sources such as Bible translations, sermons, plays and emblematic literature, Häslein can show that not only did Dutch society actually prefer hearing the word of God spoken to visual representations but that it even harbored a certain hostility towards images, even though this in no way diminished the enormous demand for paintings in general. According to Häslein, this was possible because artists adapted to the changes that had come about through the Reformation by giving preference to certain subjects and developing iconographic solutions that mirrored Protestant convictions.

The next chapter deals with contemporary discussions on the representation of acoustic phenomena. In addition to art theoretical treatises, Häslein draws on poems on paintings, religious and moral tracts, physiognomic texts, (auto-)biographical works and rhetorical manuals. While she does indeed show that the issue of artistic visualization of the audible and the opposition of word and image are discussed in a number of texts, her choice of sources appears somewhat arbitrary since the value of her findings is quite limited with regard to Rembrandt. Häslein herself admits that only a small number of these texts could have been relevant for the artist’s pictorial inventions (p. 236), and the reader is sometimes at a loss as to why certain authors, e.g. Cornelis de Bie, are discussed at all.

The core of the book centers on an analysis of a selection of Rembrandt’s paintings, specifically his depictions of the Sacrifice of Abraham and portraits of preachers painted in the 1630s and 1640s, in which the visualization of the spoken or heard word is one of his artistic concerns. Again the author draws on an impressive number of written sources. According to Häslein, Rembrandt’s first history painting to depict the spoken biblical word is his Sacrifice of Isaac (St. Petersburg, A. Bredius, Rembrandt, 1935, no. 498). In contrast to earlier representations of the subject, she assumes that Rembrandt sought to convey that Abraham heard rather than saw or felt the angel’s presence by depicting the scene as a continuous narrative: thus, while we see that the angel touches Abraham’s wrist, this actually happened only after he had dropped the knife, i.e. after Abraham heard the angel. However, it cannot be excluded that the angel touched Abraham while he still held the knife. Häslein’s interpretation of the depiction of sight in Rembrandt’s painting is highly speculative. Since Abraham and the angel do not look at each other she assumes that Abraham does not actually see the angel even though he looks straight toward the heavenly messenger. The radical break with the pictorial tradition of depicting hearing and seeing is less evident in Rembrandt’s rendition than Häslein would have us believe. The visualization of the acoustic, and thus the word of God, quite obviously plays a role in Rembrandt’s painting: the angel speaks to Abraham, and Isaac, his eyes covered by his father, only hears of his salvation. This does not, however, mean that the other senses are excluded. Rather, Rembrandt’s dramatic composition employs all the senses to emphasize the emotional climax of the narrative.

Häslein shows that in his portraits of preachers from the 1630s and 1640s, Rembrandt employs a variety of means to convey the central importance for the sitters of hearing the word of God and the (audible) delivery of His message in sermons. In addition to the effective deployment of large folios and dramatic lighting, Rembrandt favored certain poses and gestures. He repeatedly shows the hand-on-the-heart motif, which Häslein interprets as a sign that the divine word has entered the sitter’s heart, since contemporary belief held that only then could God’s word be properly understood – hearing alone was not enough. Another means of visualizing the word of God discussed by Häslein is that of ‘inclined ears’ (geneigte ooren). This expression was used in seventeenth-century theological and edifying literature to describe someone with a lightly inclined head and meant the person was listening intently. Rembrandt’s full-length Portrait of Johannes Elison (Boston, MFA, Br. 200) of 1634 uses both ‘inclined ears’ and the hand-on-the-heart to indicate that the preacher has heard the word of God and keeps it in his heart.

Rembrandt’s use of these motifs for portraits of preachers is typical for the genre, but it cannot be said in all cases to be a true iconographic innovation. The old tradition of portraying scholars with books and texts was one that Rembrandt knew and used when depicting preachers. Moreover, the hand-on-the-heart motif was also a familiar gesture in portraiture when Rembrandt painted his first portraits of preachers in the 1630s. The master’s real innovative strength in the visualization of the word appears in his 1641 portrait of the Mennonite preacher Cornelis Claesz. Anso and his wife Aeltje Gerritsdr. Schouten (Berlin, Br. 409). In her detailed analysis of this unconventional work, Häslein convincingly explains the functions of speaking and listening. The portrait is both a manifestation of contemporary ideals of gender roles and of the central goal of the preacher’s life: the public and private transmission of the word of God. Anso is both the representative of his profession and its ideal; his audience not just his wife but also the viewer of the painting.

There can be no doubt that the visualization of speech and of preaching, and indeed hearing the word of God is central to Rembrandt’s portraits of preachers. However, to conclude from this, as Häslein does, that Rembrandt’s preoccupation with the Protestant understanding of the relationship between word and image was essential to his art is methodologically unsound. Since it was common in seventeenth-century Dutch portraiture to refer both to the sitter’s social position and occupation, a reference to the word of God or the sermon would have been obligatory for preachers’ portraits. One must assume that patrons would have insisted on the appropriate depiction. In order to prove that the religious environment of his surroundings exerted decisive influences on Rembrandt’s art, it would be necessary to show that his paintings contain specifically Protestant principles and ideals that were not already common to the subject. Unfortu-

nately, Häslein did not examine history paintings that address the theme of speaking and listening, such as the Two Old Men Disputing (Melbourne, Br. 423) or the two Samson paintings in Berlin and Dresden (Br. 499, 507).

By depicting the ‘invisible’ word, Rembrandt partook in the paragone debate on the supremacy of the word or the image, as Häslein states. In this way the artist followed the art theoretical doctrine of “ut pictura poesis.” For this reason one wonders if the master’s “speaking images” really show the “inadequacies of the visual” (“Unzulänglichkeit des Visuellen;” p. 233). Is it not more probable that the paintings were a demonstration of their creator’s astonishing virtuosity and proof of his ability to compete with poets? Häslein did not avail herself of the opportunity to examine closely the meaning of “ut pictura poesis” for Rembrandt’s visualization of the spoken word. Her interesting excursus on Jan A. Emmen’s study of Joost van den Vondel’s poem on Rembrandt’s portrait of Anso gives an idea of how fruitful a wider look at contemporary poetic works that deal with the impossibility of rendering a sitter’s intellect and spirit (and therefore also the word) in painted portraits would have been.
The dearth of illustrations – just 13 in total – make it difficult for the reader to follow the author’s observations on the role of the acoustic for Rembrandt. The reproductions are mainly of lesser known works, often referred to only in passing, and while the high cost of illustrations is something we are all too familiar with, the author (and/or her publisher) has not done herself a favor by failing to include those images that are central to her argument.

Dagmar Hirschfelder

Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg

(Translated from the German by Fiona Healy)


On the morning of Monday, October 12, 1654, the former sexton of the Oude Kerk in Delft was sitting to Carel Fabritius for his portrait in the latter’s studio on the Dolenstraat. Between 10 and 10:30 in the morning the 80,000 pounds of gunpowder stored in one of Delft’s nearby arsenals, ‘t Secret van Hollandt’, exploded, destroying roughly one-third of the city. The house collapsed around Fabritius and his client. Among the more than 500 estimated victims of the catastrophe were the artist, his pupil MatthiasSpoors, his mother-in-law Judick van Pruyssen, a brother or brother-in-law of the artist, and his sitter Simon Decker – and probably a good deal of Fabritius’s work.

Fabritius was just 32 years old and had been painting for about ten or eleven years. He had moved to Delft from his native Middenbeemster only four years earlier, at about the time of his second marriage, to the Amsterdam widow Agatha van Pruyssen, whose family was originally from Delft. Fabritius may have hoped her family connections would help him find patrons, for – like many seventeenth-century Dutch painters – throughout his life he seems to have had trouble making ends meet. He did not join the Delft guild, for example, until 1652, and even then paid only six of the required twelve guilders, and surviving documents concern a variety of unpaid loans.

For over a century, Fabritius’s few surviving paintings have provided a glimpse of an extraordinarily talented artist, whose unusual and enigmatic subjects have tantalized generations of art lovers. Yet, even in seventeenth-century inventories, some of his paintings were apparently listed under the names of others artists. It was only in 1807 that he again emerged into public notice when his paintings were apparently listed under the names of others artists. It was only in 1807 that he again emerged into public notice when his paintings were apparently listed under the names of others artists.

The Raising of Lazarus (Warsaw, cat. no. 1), and the four recently attributed history paintings suggest a close knowledge of the older master’s work, reinforced by the tentative attribution to Fabritius of the Slaughtered Ox and three portraits once attributed to Rembrandt. In 1981, Christopher Brown published a full monograph and catalogue raisonné on Fabritius. This book detailed all known documents of the artist’s life and all known paintings; eight, to be exact. When a signed painting of Mercury, Argus and Io (now Los Angeles County Museum of Art) appeared at a sale in Monaco in 1985, a new dimension was added to our understanding of Fabritius’s style, permitting the convincing attribution to the artist of three additional early history paintings whose attributions have circulated in the literature under a variety of artists in the circle of Rembrandt: Hagar and the Angel (Coll. Schönborn-Buchheim, Vienna, on loan to the Residenzgalerie, Salzburg); Hera (Pushkin State Museum, Moscow); and Mercury and Aglauros (Museum of Fine Arts Boston), catalogue numbers 2, 3 and 6, respectively.

In the exhibition for which this book is the catalogue, Frits Duparc has thus taken the opportunity to bring together all twelve of the known signed and convincingly attributed paintings: starting with Brown’s eight paintings, he has removed the Man in a Helmet (Groningen, cat. 13), added a Selfportrait rejected by Brown (Munich, cat. 4) and, in addition to the four history paintings mentioned above, tentatively attributed four more paintings: the Slaughtered Ox in Glasgow (p. 34, fig. 23) that the Rembrandt Research Project has suggested may have been painted by Fabritius when he was in Rembrandt’s studio, and three portraits once attributed to Rembrandt that the RRP has also suggested may be by Fabritius instead: a half-length portrait pair of an unknown man and woman (Coll. Duke of Westminster; p. 37, figs. 27, 28), and the Portrait of an Elderly Woman (Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto; p. 39, fig. 31). The one painting in the catalogue that is difficult to reconcile with the rest on the basis of the catalogue photograph is the added Selfportrait in Munich (cat. no. 4) which has been so marred by past retouchings and retouchings that, to my eye, a secure attribution is difficult.

What appears to have been the most ambitious of Fabritius’s paintings will, however, remain forever an enigma. This is the large family portrait signed and dated 1648, destroyed by a fire that swept through the Museum Boymans in 1864. It is now known only through a textual description in the 1862 museum catalogue, a watercolor created from memory after the fire, probably by the diplomat Alphons de Steurs (different in a few details from the published description), and a drawing of one of the figures in the sketchbook of the nineteenth-century Rotterdam artist Jacob van Akkersdijk. The portrait measured 161 x 237 cm. or 5.25 x 7.75 feet. Duparc rightly places it in a class with the large-scale family portraits that Bartholomeus van der Helst was creating in Amsterdam at about the same time, comparing it with one now in the Hermitage dated 1647 (the caption accompanying the photograph incorrectly dates the latter to c.1655, although Duparc’s essay correctly suggests that Fabritius might have been able to see it before finishing his own painting in 1648). Duparc is tempted to link Fabritius’s Family Portrait to a payment of 78 guilders and 10 stivers made to the artist by Balthasar Deutz in October 1649. If this payment was indeed received for this large family portrait, given the usual cost of such portraits, either it was a partial payment or the artist was sorely underpaid.

Indirect evidence suggests that Fabritius worked as an older assistant in Rembrandt’s studio from around 1641 to 1643. Certainly his Raising of Lazarus (Warsaw, cat. no. 1), and the four recently attributed history paintings suggest a close knowledge of the older master’s work, reinforced by the tentative attribution to Fabritius of the Slaughtered Ox and three portraits once attributed to Rembrandt himself. But by the time Fabritius moved to Delft in 1650, he was creating paintings of striking originality. Even his inventive early history paintings tantalize us with a talent that was recognized in his own time: shortly after his death he was praised by the publisher...
Arnold Bon (in Dirck van Bleyswijck’s 1667 description of the city of Delft) as “the greatest artist... that Delft or Holland has ever had.” While an unsurprising encomium for a recently deceased colleague, the surviving work does reveal a very talented artist.

The high quality of the catalogue illustrations, as well as the entries written by Gero Seelig and Ariane van Suchtelen, masterfully reconstruct for those who have not seen the exhibition a sense of Fabritius’s special qualities, from the unusual subjects of many of his history paintings to the richly varied paint handling by which he created faces, silk fabrics, craggy walls, bird feathers, and perspective effects. The latter range from a view of Delft’s Nieuwe Kerk from the southeast (National Gallery London, cat. no. 9), apparently produced for a perspective box – of which sources indicate Fabritius created a number – to the trompe l’oeil nail that protrudes, between the names of sitter and artist, from a weather-beaten wall in the Portrait of Abraham de Potter (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, cat. no. 8). The exhibition and its record in this beautifully produced catalogue are a fitting tribute to an original and still enigmatic artist.

Ann Jensen Adams  
*University of California at Santa Barbara*

**New Titles**


**Crécy, M.-C. de (ed.),** *De Mons à la cour de Bourgogne* (Burgundica, 12). Turnhout: Brepols, 2005. ISBN 2-503-52021-9, euros 60. – Includes essay by Anne Van Buren.


*De zaak Van der Veken*. Brussels: Koninklijk Instituut voor het Kunstpatrimonium, 2005. Brochure that accompanied an exhibition at the Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Brussels, January 27 – February 20, 2005 (see previous Newsletter). Addendum: The material for the publication was largely supplied by the Laboratoire d’étude des oeuvres d’art in Louvain-la-Neuve which was responsible for the exhibition Fake or not Fake, at the Groeningemuseum, Bruges, November 26, 2004 – February 28, 2005.
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Decker, John, The Technology of Salvation and the Art of Geertgen tot Sint Jans: Manifestations of Salvation Theology in Material Culture. UC Santa Barbara, M. Meadow.


Hughes, Meghan, Facing the fifteenth Century: The Portraits of Jan van Eyck. IFA/NYU, C. Eisler.


Niedzialkowska, Beata, “Ars Nova” in Poland: Artistic and Cultural Realitions between Poland and Belgium in the Late Middle Ages. Iowa, R. Bork.
**Austria**


**Belgium**


**Germany**


**Mock**, Markus Leo, Kunst und Erzbischof Ernst von Magdeburg (1464-1513). Humboldt-Universität Berlin, Prof. Suckale.


**Pfeiffer**, Götz, Der Meister des Berswordt-Retabels und der Stilwandel der Tafelmaler am Niederrein und in Westfalen um 1400. Humboldt-Universität Berlin, Prof. Krohm.


**Wehlen**, Bernhard, “Antrieb und Entschluss zu dem, was geschieht.” Studien zur Medicin-Galerie von Peter Paul Rubens. Saarbrücken Prof. Dittmann.
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Mr. and Mrs. Bernard G. Palitz
Joaneath A. Spicer
Johnny Van Haeften

Philip the Good Society ($500 to $999)
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