A Newly Discovered Rubens at the Getty

Peter Paul Rubens, *The Calydonian Boar Hunt* (c. 1611-1612)
Oil on panel, 59 × 90.2 cm. The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles
(Courtesy of the J. Paul Getty Museum)
From the President

I begin this brief editorial on a sad note: I recently learned of the death this past July of our colleague, Cynthia Lawrence, after an extremely lengthy and exhausting battle with cancer. To those of us who knew her, we fondly remember a first-rate scholar and, more importantly, a first-rate person who enriched the lives of all of us who were fortunate enough to have befriended her. She will be sorely missed. Please be sure to read the obituary that our colleague, Barbara Haeger, prepared especially for this issue of the Newsletter.

I have recently returned to teaching and administrative duties here at Syracuse University after having enjoyed a sabbatical during the 2005-06 academic year. Despite the added work loads and constraints on my already limited time, this re-entry into academe has been thoroughly enjoyable. Instead of spending the entire year myopically focused on the topic of my own research – Hendrick ter Bruggen – my renewed responsibilities have forced me to think in much broader terms about our discipline, more specifically, about the various fields in which our membership curates, teaches, and writes. There is certainly much happening this fall in terms of symposia, new publications, and exhibitions. But for our organization, all of this activity will culminate in our sixth quadrennial conference in Baltimore and Washington D.C. in early November. In fact, by the time you receive this Newsletter, this conference will be only days away. Thanks to the talents and efforts of Quint Gregory and Aneta Georgievsksa-Shine, along with those of the Conference Program Committee, our gathering promises to be highly stimulating and informative. It will provide many opportunities to hear papers on fascinating topics, to participate in thought-provoking workshops, and simply to enjoy one another’s company since many miles (and even oceans) normally separate us. Lastly, we will all have the privilege of viewing the major exhibition at the National Gallery of Art, Prayers and Portraits: Unfolding the Netherlandish Diptych, before it opens officially to the public. I am quite excited about all of these prospects and look forward to seeing all of you very soon.

Wayne Franits
Syracuse University

In Memoriam

Cynthia Lawrence
1946-2006

Cynthia Lawrence died on July 26 after a long and heroic struggle against cancer. She endured debilitating health problems with quiet fortitude and refused to allow the disease to limit her activities. She and her husband, David, took every opportunity to travel – returning to favorite cities (Leuven, Antwerp, Amsterdam) and exploring new locales, most recently Kyoto, Beijing and Macao. Nor did she allow her illness to impinge upon her total commitment to pursuing her research and to sharing her ideas with others. Until 2004, Cynthia continued to teach, and she remained an active and productive scholar. Nothing is a greater testimony to Cynthia’s commitment and amazing strength and courage than the publication of two major articles this year, one of which appeared posthumously: “Confronting Heresy in Post-Tridentine Antwerp. Coercion and Reconciliation as Opposing Strategies in Rubens' Real Presence of the Holy Sacrament,” Nederlands Yearbook for History of Art / Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek, vol. 55, 2004 (2006), and “Rubens and De Rincón in Valladolid: A Reconsideration of Rubens’s First Spanish Sojourn and a New Source for the Antwerp Raising of the Cross,” in: Manuscilva Amicorum. Contributions on Rubens and His Colleagues in Honour of Hans Vlieghe, ed. by Katlijne Van der Stighelen, Turnhout, 2006.

Cynthia, who received her BA from Oberlin and her MA and PhD from the University of Chicago (1978) and who taught for several years at Rutgers, was a professor in the Department of Art History at Temple University when she retired in 2004. Her fields of study embraced both painting and sculpture in both Flanders and The Netherlands. Cynthia was a scholar of rare breadth. At the same time, her work was solidly founded upon archival evidence and a meticulous examination of a vast array of sources, which earned her widespread recognition and a host of awards. The latter included the University of Chicago Baroque Studies Prize, numerous research fellowships from Temple University and Rutgers, as well as a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies and a Belgian American Educational Foundation Advanced Fellowship.

Cynthia is perhaps most well known for her exemplary study on the genesis of Rubens’s Raising of the Cross (“Before The Raising of the Cross: The Origins of Rubens’s Earliest Antwerp Altarpieces,” The Art Bulletin, 1999), which provides real insight
into Rubens’s process of invention, while contributing significantly to our understanding of Antwerp’s religious climate and the physical environment for which the work was created. That she was unable to complete her book-length study on the Raising of the Cross constitutes a serious loss to the field. As was revealed in her numerous conference papers on the painting and on St. Walburgis, the church for which it was created, the book promised to be a fascinating examination of the altarpiece in light of a range of meditational and liturgical practices as well as in the context of its location within St. Walburgis, a church, whose construction, she convincingly argued, evoked sacred sites in Rome and Jerusalem. Her hypothesis that the church was the site of virtual pilgrimages focused on the choir, which represented Calvary, was effectively and inventively supported by her exploration of the rich history of the Burecht, St. Walburgis’s parish.

Along with her book Flemish Baroque Commemorative Monuments 1566-1700, which established her as a leading authority on Flemish sculpture of the period, Cynthia produced numerous illuminating and impeccably researched articles (her footnotes are invariably mines of valuable information, ideas, and sources) on Counter-Reformation painting and sculpture in the Southern Netherlands. Her scholarship, however, is much more wide-ranging, encompassing studies on seventeenth-century Dutch painting and the role of women in the arts in the early modern era. Examples of her publications in these areas are her insightful book Gerrit Adriaensz: Berckheyde (1638-1698): Haarlem Cityscape Painter (Doornspijk, 1991) and her contributions to a collection of papers delivered at a symposium that she organized at Temple University. The resulting book, Women and Art in Early Modern Europe: Patrons, Collectors and Connoisseurs (Penn State 1997), which she edited, earned an honorable mention from the Society for the Study of Early Modern Women for books published in that year. Among Cynthia’s articles, one of the most fascinating is her compelling study of the monuments of naval heroes commissioned by the States General in the Dutch Republic to foster as sense of patria and to inculcate patriotic virtues, a study that also examines the evolution of the church tomb into the secular memorial (“Hendrick de Keyser’s Heemskerk monument: the origins of the cult and iconography of Dutch naval heroes,” Simiolus, 1992). Here again we can only regret that she was not able to complete the still larger project she had envisioned on the subject of state-sponsored sculpture dealing with national identity.

In addition to being an exemplary scholar, Cynthia was an extremely helpful and generous colleague. She shared her insights and her voluminous bibliographies freely and regularly offered constructive criticism in discussions following papers at the many national and international conferences she attended. She was particularly helpful to me when I began doing research on Rubens. Cynthia not only helped in very practical ways (providing me with a list of research facilities in Antwerp and Brussels along with telephone numbers, addresses and names of people to contact) but read several drafts of my first article with a critical eye and offered numerous helpful suggestions. I learned a great deal from our conversations, which I thoroughly enjoyed, as well as from her publications, and I am sure our colleagues and her students did the same. Cynthia was an impressive scholar, a great colleague, and dear friend; she will be much missed on all counts.

Barbara Haeger
Ohio State University

HNA News

HNA at CAA

New York, February 14-17, 2007

Session

The HNA-sponsored session is chaired by Ann Adams and Elizabeth Honig. The topic is: The Presence of History, the Persistence of Time. See the CAA website for more information.

Reception

All members are invited to the HNA reception at the CAA Conference in New York, Friday, February 16, 2007, 5:30-7:30 pm, Syracuse University’s Lubin House, 11 East 61 Street (a short walk from the Hilton Hotel).

Personalia

Al Acres has been appointed assistant professor of art history at Georgetown University, Washington DC.

Marcia Allentuck was elected to the Royal Society of Literature (Great Britain).

Odilia Bonebakker was awarded a Metropolitan Museum of Art Fellowship for 2006-2007.

Amy Buono (UC Santa Barbara) is a Paul Mellon Predoctoral Fellow in residence at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, Washington. Her topic is: Plumed Identities and Feathered Performances: Tupinambá Interculture in Early Modern Brazil and Europe.

Julien Chapuis, Associate Curator in the Department of Medieval Art at The Cloisters at The Metropolitan Museum of Art, has been promoted to Curator.

Amy Golahny (Lycoming College) holds an Ailsa Mellon Bruce Visiting Senior Fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, Washington, for fall 2006. Her subject is: Rembrandt and Italy.

Christopher Heuer was appointed Lecturer and Mellon Fellow in the History of Art at Columbia University (as of 2005).

Lynn Jacobs (University of Arkansas) received an NEH Fellowship for 2006-2007 for work on her book on triptychs.

Kathryn Rudy has been appointed Keeper of Illuminated Manuscripts at the Royal Library in The Hague, replacing Anne Korteweg, who will retire in March 2007.

Pamela Smith (Columbia) together with Tomny Beentjes (West Dean College) are the Samuel H. Kress Foundation Paired Fellows for Research in Conservation and the History of Art at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, Washington. Their topic is: Making and Knowing: Reconstructing Sixteenth-Century Life Casting Techniques.

Ashley West is a Paul Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, Washington. Her topic is: Hans Burgkmair the Elder (1473-1531) and the Visualization of Knowledge.

Betsy Wieseman has been appointed Curator of Dutch Painting at the National Gallery, London, starting December 1, 2006.
Exhibitions

United States and Canada

Wrought Emotions. Renaissance and Baroque Paintings from the Permanent Collection. Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Queen’s 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.


Monsters and Mayhem: Renaissance Prints from the Jones Collection. Minneapolis Institute of Arts, until December 1, 2006.


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


Dutch Treat: Rembrandt and Friends. Dayton Art Institute, Dayton (Ohio), until May 6, 2007.


The Coronation of the Virgin [by Bartholomäus Bruyn the Elder]: A Major Acquisition of a Northern Renaissance Altarpiece. Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton, October 20, 2006 – May 27, 2007. Painted 1515 for Peter von Clapis, law professor at the University of Cologne, and his wife, Bela Bonenberg. Includes information on conservation of the work performed by the Straus Center, Harvard University.


Europe

Austria and Germany


---

**Belgium**


**Zilver uit Antwerpen.** Zilvermuseum Sterckshof, October 1, 2006 – January 7, 2007. For the colloquium, see below.


The Stradanus exhibition in Bruges previously announced has been postponed to summer 2008.

---

**England and Scotland**


**Temptation in Eden: Lucas Cranach’s Adam and Eve.** Courtauld Institute Gallery, London, June 21 – September 23, 2007. The painting in the Courtauld will be the focal point of an exhibition that will bring together related works from other collections.

---

**France**


---

**Ireland**

**Dutch and Flemish Drawings from the Collection.** National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin, September – December 2006.

---

**The Netherlands**


**Rembrandt in 2006-07**

*Amsterdam, Bijbels Museum*


*Amsterdam, Gemeentearchief*

**The Rembrandt Documents.** October 9 – December 31, 2006.

*Amsterdam, Joods Historisch Museum*


*Amsterdam, Museum Het Rembrandthuis*


*Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum*

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

*Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal*


*Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen*


**Russia**

**Rembrandt, his Predecessors and Followers.** Pushkin State Museum, Moscow, September 11 – November 12, 2006.


**Switzerland**


**Other Countries**

**Israel**

**Love in European Art from the Collection.** Israel Museum, Jerusalem, February 14 – December 30, 2006.

**Japan**

**Works from the Royal Museum of Fine Arts, Brussels.** National Museum of Western Art, Tokyo, September 12 – December 10, 2006. Includes Bruegel’s *Fall of Icarus* and works by Rubens. After its Tokyo showing, the exhibition will move to the Nagasaki Prefecture Art Museum (January) and the National Art Museum in Osaka (April).

**Turkey**


**Exhibition Reviews**


This selection of some forty-eight works from the State Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg is shown in a most exotic location – buried deep in the Venetian Resort in Las Vegas, an enormous 4000-room hotel and casino complex complete with a replica of the Doge’s Palace, the Campanile, the Clock Tower, the Rialto Bridge and gondolas on a small river simulating the Canal Grande. The new Guggenheim Hermitage Museum consists of a small gallery space at the end of a long shopping arcade, the Grand Canal Shoppes, designed by the Dutch architect Rem Koolhaas. Its plain brown walls of Cor-Ten steel panels, supposed to evoke the rooms of the Hermitage, are in stark contrast to the lavish architecture of the expansive Venetian hotel-casino. This is the first exhibition in Las Vegas since the alliance between the State Hermitage Museum and the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation was established in 2000 that consists of works lent solely by the Hermitage. *Rubens and His Age* was organized by three of its curators, Natalya Babina, Natalya Grisyt, and Natalya Serebrianaya, in consultation with Susan Davidson, curator at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum. The majority of the exhibits, which consist of six paintings and five oil sketches by Rubens, nine portraits by Van Dyck, two works by Jordaens and Frans Snyders, a *David* by Jacob van Oost I and still lifes by Jan Fyt and Adriaen van Utrecht together with twenty exquisite silver and gilded religious and secular objects were shown previously in the exhibition *Rubens and His Age* in Toronto and Bilbao in 2001-02. The works in the Las Vegas venue are divided according to themes – Allegory and Mythology, Religion, Genre and Landscape and Portraits. Not shown previously was a group of later seventeenth-century chased and gilded silver or plain silver objects made in Augsburg and four of the Van Dyck portraits which were all hung at the end of the exhibition, among them full-length portraits of Charles I, Henrietta Maria, and Sir Thomas Wharton.

Rubens’s authorship for The Apotheosis of James I, a sketch associated with the Whitehall Ceiling shown here in Las Vegas that was also included in the Toronto-Bilbao venue in 2001-02 and later in the Courtauld exhibition in London in 2002-03 is doubted in Gregory
Martin’s recent *Corpus Rubenianum* volume of the Whitehall Ceiling (cat. 4e, fig. 83; reviewed in this issue).

All the works in the exhibition are reproduced in color in an Illustrated Checklist, introduced by some brief introductory remarks by Thomas Krens, director of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation.

Anne-Marie Logan
Easton, Connecticut

Museum and Other News

**Austin (Texas):** The Blanton Museum of Art at the University of Texas, Austin, is opening a new building. One of the highlights of the expansion is the display of a broad selection of old master and modern prints acquired by the museum from Leo Steinberg.

**Basel:** The rooms at the Kunstmuseum were rearranged after the closing of the Holbein exhibition. The northern old master paintings, “Von Witz bis Brueghel”, can now be viewed in a new light, with new relationships created by the hanging. Also to be seen are works not previously exhibited.

**Bruges:** The Groeningemuseum acquired *The Holy Family with the Infant John the Baptist* by Ambrosius Benson. Dated 1527, it is the earlist dated work by the artist that has survived.

**London:** A sketch of *The Assumption of the Virgin*, acquired by a British collector in 2000 and since then attributed to Rubens, is on loan to Chiswick House for three years, along with twenty works by artists such as Jacob Jordaens, Hans Rottenhammer and Erasmus Quellinus. *The Assumption of the Virgin* is thought to be a sketch for a larger modello in the Royal Collection. (From The Art Newspaper, October 2006.)

**Los Angeles:** The J. Paul Getty Museum acquired a newly discovered painting by Rubens, *The Calydonian Boar Hunt*, previously only known from later copies and engravings. The work has been described as one of the greatest paintings by Rubens in the United States (see illustration on title page).

**Warsaw:** Two paintings, *Scholar at his Desk and Girl in a Picture Frame*, in the Roayl Castle in Warsaw, have been re-attributed to Rembrandt after restoration. The two works were traditionally given to the artist but since Horst Gerson (who only knew them from photographs) questioned their authenticity, doubts had been expressed. The two paintings are at present on view in Berlin.

Scholarly Activities

Conferences to Attend

**United States and Canada**

*From Icon to Art in the Netherlands*


For the program and all further information, go to www.hnanews.org: HNA Conferences.

**CAA Annual Conference**

New York, February 14-17, 2007

The HNA-sponsored session is titled: *The Presence of History, The Persistence of Time*, chaired by Ann Jensen Adams (University of California, Santa Barbara) and Elizabeth Honig (University of California, Berkeley). Other HNA-related sessions:

Rediscovering Vermeer (chair: Benjamin Binstock).

Making French History (chair: Anne Hedeman, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign).


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

Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, November 17-18, 2006. Organized by Stephanie Dickey.

Jane Kromm (SUNY Purchase), Anger’s Marks: Expressions of Sin, Temperament and Passion.


Susan Anderson (NYU), Cornelis Dusart’s Watercolours of the Catholic Clergy: At the Intersection of Tronie and Caricature.

Sandra Mühlenberend (Akademie der Künste, Leipzig), John Bulwer’s *Pathomyotomia* – the Anatomy of Laughter.

Herman Roedenburg (Meertens Instituut, Amsterdam), Civility and Passion in the Dutch Golden Age.

Andrea Bubenik (Queen’s University), Dürer, Emotion and the Measured Body.

Jan Muylle (Katholieke Universiteit, Brussels), Ethos and Pathos in Alexander van Fornenbergh.

Thijs Weststeijn (Warburg Institute, London), Between Mind and Body: Painting the Inner Movements According to Samuel van Hoogstraten and Franciscus Junius.

Suzanne Walker (Tulane University), Composing the Passions in Rubens’ Hunting Scenes.

Ulrich Heinen (Bergische Universität, Wuppertal), “Subito terrore perculsum spectatorem”: Rubens and Huygens – Reflecting the Passions in Paintings.

Amy Golahny (Lycoming College), Pieter Lastman, Rembrandt’s Teacher: Narrative Exteriority and Interiority.

Stefan Grohé (University of Cologne), Rembrandt’s “Pathosformel”.

Franziska Gottwald (FU, Berlin), From the Body to the Face – Changing Depictions of Emotions in Dutch Art and Rembrandt’s Physiognomical Studies.

Perry Chapman (U Delaware), Reclaiming the Inner Rembrandt.

Douglas Stewart (Queen’s University, emeritus), Sir Godfrey Kneller, Rembrandt and “The Motions of the Mind”.

**The Netherlandish Seventeenth Century and Its Afterlives**

Europe

**Rembrandt: Wissenschaft auf der Suche**


**Zilver in Antwerpen. De handel, het ambacht en de klant**

Xaveriuscollege, Antwerp, November 15-16, 2006. In conjunction with the exhibition at the Zilvermuseum Sterckshof, info@zilvermuseum.be

Eddy Stols (KU Leuven, emeritus), Zilverhandel- en smokkel door Vlaamse kooplieden in Andalusië, Mexico en Peru.

Marianne M.C. Danneel (Museum Nationale Bank van België), De Antwerpse zilveren munten uit de 16de en 17de eeuw: een kwestie van vraag en aanbod.

Frieda Sorber (ModeMuseum, Antwerp), Goud- en zilverdraden in textiel.

Godelieve Van Hemeldonck, Het ambachtshuis van de Antwerpse edelsmeden.

Filip Vermeylen (Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam and KU Leuven), Antwerpen als centrum voor de zilverhandel tijdens de 16de en 17de eeuw.

Bruno Blondé (UA Antwerpen), De plaats van het zilver in het Antwerpse consumptiepatroon van de 17de tot de 18de eeuw.

Jean-Pierre Van Rijen (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen and Instituut Collectie Nederland), De export naar Nederland van Jan Pieter Antoon Verschuylen, de meester van ‘het keurig behandelde ornament en de heerlijk uitgevoerde beeldgroepen.’

Leo De Ren (KU Leuven), Over samenwerking en verwantschap tussen Antwerpse beeldhouwers, schilders en zilversmeden tijdens het ancien régime.

**Das Meisterstück. Aspects of Artistic Training under the Rule of the Guilds in Europe between the Late Middle Ages and the Years around 1800**

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

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

**CODART TIEN: Dutch and Flemish Art in France**


**Watteau peintre flamand**

Valenciennes, April 5-6, 2007.

Flemish aspects in Watteau’s work, as well as the broader concept of robustness and refinement in art, literature, theatre and aesthetics in France in the first half of the eighteenth century. For information: cbarbafieri@aol.com; chrisrauseo@web.de

**Past Conferences**

**Celebrating Rembrandt**

Dartmouth College, April 22, 2006.

Susan Donahue Kuretsky (Vassar), Beastly Companions in Rembrandt’s Prints.

Shelley Perlove (U Michigan-Dearborn), Christians and Jews at the Table: Rembrandt’s Supper at Emmaus.

Clifford Ackley (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), Rembrandt: Actor and Dramatist.

Arthur Wheelock (National Gallery of Art, Washington), From Roadside Cottages to Hills in the Polders: Reality and Fantasy in Rembrandt’s Landscapes.

Michael Zell (Boston University), Rembrandt’s Printed Gifts.

Stephanie Dickey (Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario), Rembrandt’s Portrait Etchings on the Market.

**Painted Illusionism: Decorative Painting in the European Domestic and Public Interior, 1600-1950**


Richard Harmann (RKD), Decorative Paintings in the Netherlands. An Overview.

Angelica Dülberg (Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Sachsen, Dresden), Wall and Ceiling Paintings in Private Houses and Castles in Saxony around 1600 and in the 17th Century.

Martin Olin (Gotland University, Sweden), The Palace of Nicodemus Tessin in Stockholm: The Painted Interior as Artistic Confession.

Alastair Laing (National Trust, UK), Giuseppe Mattia Borgnis (1701-1761) and his Work in England.

Gaëtan Cassina (University of Lausanne), Die großen Leinwände in der Schweiz im letzten Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts.

Bernhard Jacque (Musée du Papier Peint, Rixheim, France), Panoramic Wall Hangings: Hidden Relations between Nothnagel in Frankfurt and Zuber in Rixheim.

Eugène Warmenbol (Université Libre de Bruxelles), Egypt on the Wall, or Egypt and Masonry.

Simone Vermaat (Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage, Rijswijk), The Dutch Artist Dolf Henkes (1903-1989) and his Monumental Art: A Case Study of a Unique Preservation Project.
Nederlandsche Künstler und Architekten an den mecklenburgischen Höfen


Carsten Neumann (Schlösser und Gärten, Potsdam), Niederländische Künstler am Hofe Herzog Ulrichs zu Mecklenburg (1556-1603).

Barbara Rinn (Institut für Bauforschung, Marburg), Daniel Marot und die barocke Stuckkunst in Mecklenburg.

Christine Kratzke (Universität Leipzig), Charles Philippe Dieussart und die Residenz Kloster Dargun.

Marcus Köhler (Hochschule Neubrandenburg), Das Schloß Rossewitz. Ein “niederländischer” Palazzo?

Ralf Weingart (Staatliches Museum Schwerin), Ghert Evert piloots Pläne für die Schlösser Schwerin, Poel und Neustadt.

Arbeid in de Zeventiende Eeuw

22nd Conference of the Werkgroep Zeventiende Eeuw, IISG (International Institute of Social History), Amsterdam, September 1, 2006.

Jan Lucassen (IISG), Arbeid in de zeventiende eeuw.

Elise van Nederveen Meerkerk (IISG), Textielarbeid van vrouwen en kinderen in de zeventiende-eeuwse Republiek.

Roeland Harms (Universiteit Utrecht), Handel in Letteren tijdens de 17e eeuw.

Bernadette Van Haute (University of South Africa), Ryckaert at Work. A Flemish Painter’s View of Labour in Art.

Jelle van Lottum (IISG), Twee landen, twee systemen? Het rekruteren van arbeid in Nederland en Engeland vergeleken (ca. 1600-1700).

Ariadne Schmidt (IISG), Gilden en de toegang van vrouwen tot de arbeidsmarkt in de Republiek.

Frans Blom (UvA), Een dichter werkt niet.

Annette de Vries (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen), Professie en strategie. Overdenkingen bij Adriaen van Ostade’s De schilder in zijn atelier.

Danielle van den Heuvel (IISG), Vrouwelijk ondernemerschap in de Republiek. Amsterdamse koopvrouwen in de zeventiende (en achttiende) eeuw.

Alison Kettering (Carleton College), Men at Work: Art and Labor in the Seventeenth Century.

Atelierpraktijken in de Vroege Nederlandse schilderkunst

Symposium honoring Molly Faries at her departure from the University of Groningen. Centraal Museum, Utrecht, September 19, 2006.

Ron Spronk (Harvard University Art Museums), Provoost and Italy.

Astrid Smeets (SRAL, Maastricht/University of Amsterdam), Ondertekening, verfmonsters en reconstructies: enkele resultaten van het De Mayerne-Program.

Daantje Meuwissen (Utrecht) and Micha Leeflang (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), De Calvarieberg in the Rijksmuseum: een vroeg werk van Jacob Cornelisz van oostsanen?

Linda Jansen (Groningen), Een Pieter Coecke van Aelst probleem.

Margreet Wolters (RKD/Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), Van papier naar paneel: het ontstaansproces van Joachim Beuckelaer’s Kruisiging in het Louvre.

Micha Leeflang (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), Joos van Cleve’s Aanbidding van de koningen inDetroit en Napels: Origineel en kopie?

Liesbeth Helmus (Centraal Museum), Jan van Scorel, Molly Faries en het Centraal Museum.

Displaced Identities: Exile in Early Modern Europe 1550-1730

King’s Manor, York, September 21-22, 2006.

Papers of art historical content:

Cordula van Wyhe (University of York), Death in Exile: French Politics and the Funeral Ceremony of Marie de’Médicis.


“Ut pictura meditatio”: The Meditative Image in Northern Art, 1500-1700

Second Lovis Corinth Colloquium, Emory University, Atlanta, October 12-14, 2006.

Art historical papers:

Walter Melion (Emory), Eros and Imitation in Hendrick Goltzius’s Life of the Virgin.

Barbara Baert (Leuven), Andrea Solario’s Head of Saint John on a Platter (Johannessenßchüssel), 1507: The Transformation of an Andachtsbild between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Andrea Catellani (Parma), Before the Preludes: Some Semiotic Observations on Vision, Meditation, and the ‘Fifth Space’ in Jesuit Spiritual Illustrated Literature (1500-1600).

Reindert Falkenburg (Leiden), Skin and Stone: Petrified Illusion in Early Netherlandish Meditative Painting.


Judi Loach (Welsh School of Architecture), An Apprenticeship of Seeing: Richeome’s Peintures Spirituelles.

Joost Vander Auwera (Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Brussels), Format and the Experience of Nearness and Distance in Flemish Seventeenth-Century Devotional Painting.

Rebecca Zorach (U Chicago), “Un autre respect pour les lettres des Princes”: Time, Devotion and Empire in the Almanacs of the Sun King.
Brou, un monument Européen à l’aube de la Renaissance

International colloquium, Monastère Royal de Brou, Bourg-en-Bresse, October 13-14, 2006. In conjunction with the exhibition Brou, chef-d’oeuvres d’une fille d’empereur, which closed with the colloquium.

Anne Adrian (Musée Anne de Beaujeu, Moulins), Anne de Beaujeu et le mécénat féminin en France à l’aube de la Renaissance.

Chantal Delomier (Institut national de recherches archéologiques preventives) and Alain Kersuzan, Le château de Pont d’Ain, place militaire et résidence comtale: nouvelles données livrées par archéologie du bâti.

Dagmar Eichberger (University of Heidelberg), Physical Distance – Spiritual Proximity: Margaret of Austria’s Presence in Brou and Malines.

Sophie Guillot de Suduiraut (Louvre), Le retable des Sept Joies de la Vierge.

Lars Hendrikman (Bonnefantenmuseum, Maastricht), La commande du triptyque dela Passion pour le maître-autel de Brou.

Ingrid van Woudenberg (Nijmegen), Les stalles du choeur de Brou: expression d’un amour religieux ou profane?

Pierre Anagnostopoulos (Université Libre, Brussels), Le jubé de Brou et les jubés brabançons.

Ethan Matt Kavaler (University of Toronto), Geometers at Brou: Architecture and Ornament in Spain, Brabant and Western Europe around 1500.

Jens Burk (Bayerisches Nationalmuseum), Conrad Meit à Brou et en Franche-Comté.

Frédéric Elsig (University of Geneva), Le présume Grégoire Guérard et la peinture en Bresse au temps de Marguerite d’Autriche.

Laurence Rivière-Ciavaldini (University of Grenoble), Le livre d’heures de Loys van Boghem, maître d’oeuvre de l’église de Brou.

Yvette Vanden Bemden (University of Namur), Les vitraux de Brou et le mécénat de Marguerite d’Autriche dans le domaine du vitrail.

Marie-Anne Sarda (Musée de l’église de Brou), Entre monument national et musée municipal, problématiques de la restauration du monastère royal.

Dominique Tritenne (Association des Amis de la Pierre et du Conservatoire National des pierres et Marbres), La marbre de Carrare utilised à Brou: L’évolution de la statuaire de Brou au fil des siècles.

Lionel Bergatto (Monuments historiques en Rhône-Alpes), Perspectives actuelles de restauration d’un monument historique: l’exemple de Brou.

Stof – tot nadenken. Over weefsel, plooi en textuur/ Thread for Thought. Thinking about Cloth, Folds and Texture


Sophie Oosterwijk (University of Leicester), Bakerkleden en lijkwaden in de middeleeuwse cultuur: een ingewikkelde kwestie?

Barbara Baert, Het textiel van Wernigrode. Nieuwe bijdragen tot de 13de-eeuwse borduurkunst in vrouwenkloosters.

Karen de Coene, Met sterren omhuld. Middeleeuwse analogieën tussen kleding, mens en kosmos.


Marjan Sterckx, Stoffelijk of stoffig? Het gebruik van stof in de beeldhouwkunst (18de en 19de eeuw).


Opportunities

Call for Papers

Images of Julius Caesar in Early Modern Europe

The Centre Interuniversitaire d’études sur la République des Lettres will hold a three-day conference entitled Images of Julius Caesar in Early Modern Europe, at the Université Laval, Quebec, October 4-6, 2007. Among questions raised are the following:

Who is Caesar associated with? Which virtues are components of modern images of Caesar: magnanimity, mercy, ambition, usurpation? Are there similar phenomena in the different European countries?

What kind of political, ideological or intellectual aims may explain these images?

How can shifts in representations be described? Is this an evenly-spread phenomenon throughout Europe?

Can such an evolution be explained by the gradual introduction of absolute monarchy? Is there a parallel shift at the end of the eighteenth century?

Is such an evolution linked to a better historiographical understanding of the Ancient world?

Who are the new heroes replacing Caesar as a model king, and why?

What is the impact of this evolution on literature and the arts?

We invite 250-word proposals in French or English. They should be sent, along with a brief vita, before November 15, 2006 to: michel.dewaele@hst.ultaval.ca and bruno.tribout@nuim.ie
Fellowships

HNA Fellowship for Scholarly Research, Publications or Travel: 2007

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

Organizations

Werkgroep Zeventiende Eeuw concerns itself with the study of seventeenth-century history and culture from an interdisciplinary perspective. It organizes a 2-day congress annually at the end of August, publishes a journal twice/year (Uitgeverij Verloren, Hilversum) and offers a prize annually for an original manuscript text. www.let.uu.nl/nederlands/nlren/werkgroep17
Sixteenth Century


Last fall, as part of a year-long celebration, “Mechelen 2005: City in Female Hands,” the city of Mechelen mounted a major exhibition, “Dames met Klasse: Margareta van York en Margareta van Oostenrijk,” of which the above book is the English catalogue. This ambitious undertaking included more than 150 objects in all media, from playing cards to prayer nuts, pomanders to chasubles, with books, manuscripts, sculpture, paintings, tapestries, game boards and a stuffed quetzal bird from Central America. The catalogue is equally rich and complex, with sixteen essays and 40 authors. And then there was the advance buzz that the installation had been designed by the celebrated, if controversial, London-based architect, Zaha Hadid. In the end, neither the exhibition, catalogue or design controversy, disappointed.

Margaret of York, sister of English Kings Edward IV and Richard II and wife of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, and her goddaughter, Margaret of Austria, daughter of Emperor Maximilian I Habsburg and Charles V’s “good aunt and more than mother,” were each widowed young in life and each settled in Mechelen soon afterwards (1477-1503 and 1506-1530, respectively). They established the city as their residence, seat of power, and sphere of influence. Of the two, Margaret of Austria was by far the more active and important as a patron and collector of art, and we are further fortunate to have detailed inventories of her collection. It is no surprise that the majority of the exhibition focused on her.

The catalogue divides the material into five broad themes, in each case introduced by three or four essays and followed by the entries. The categories are: Mechelen, city in female hands; family, dynasty, and diplomacy; female concerns and gender; religion and literary culture; and collecting and the wonders of the world. The choice of objects was assisted, it appears, by two other guiding principles: to maximize the media and genre mix in order to evoke the heterogeneous nature of the collecting and patronage; and to represent (as possible) actual work owned by the women, or close representatives, or other work by the artists. In all these respects the show and catalogue were successful.

For Margaret of York, several historical objects were included, such as her crown and a letter to the Mechelen aldermen (cat. 3, 5), but the main emphasis was upon devotional manuscripts or printed books commissioned by or associated with her, including a translation of Boëthius (cat. 79) and Caxton’s early, printed Arnolfini Double Portrait (London, National Gallery), bequeathed to her by Diego de Guevara, was not exhibited. Interestingly, Margaret also owned another husband-wife double portrait – the 1496 Master of Frankfurt panel in Antwerp (Koninklijk Museum) –, and, most significantly, two paintings by Jan van Eyck. Neither work was in the show. The intent had been to include the Madonna by the Fountain (Antwerp, Koninklijk Museum), but in the end it appeared only in the catalogue (cat. 99); and, unsurprisingly, the Arnolfini Double Portrait (London, National Gallery), bequeathed to her by Diego de Guevara, was not exhibited. Interestingly, Margaret also owned another husband-wife double portrait – the 1496 Master of Frankfurt panel in Antwerp (Koninklijk Museum) –, but it too was not exhibited.

The small painting that generated big excitement was Jan Mostaert’s Portrait of a Black African Gentleman (cat. 135), recently acquired by the Rijksmuseum. It is the earliest known European portrait painting of a black African. It dates to the 1520s, perhaps after 1526, and while it does not have a specific connection with Margaret, Mostaert was in her employ, and African slaves, common at Charles V’s court, may have accompanied emissaries to Mechelen. Two new studies of this important work, in the 2005 Rijksmuseum Bulletin (53: pp. 381-433), appeared too late for the catalogue. The article by Jan Piet Filedt Kok and Marieke de Winkel discusses dating and dress, relating the sitter’s costume to European court culture; and the article by Ernst van den Boogaart marshals evidence that the subject might be Charles V’s bodyguard, Christophe le More.

The exhibition organizers and writers wisely examined the two Margarets through a variety of lenses: dynastic politics, gendered activities, devotional practices, and artistic and cultural impact. The catalogue essays effectively illuminate these issues plus other related ones, such as the culture of gift giving, the collecting results of the
Spanish conquest of the New World, and the contrasting temperaments of the two women as bibliophiles. What was missing, not from the catalogue but curiously from the exhibition, was a greater sense of place, of the physical presence of Mechelen in all this. The exhibition did not, for example, utilize large photomurals of the two residences, the Court of Cambrai and the Court of Savoy, to establish settings, or include Margaret’s inventories as a guide to her placement of key works. The only nod in this direction was several nineteenth-century watercolors of her palace and an eighteenth-century floor plan (cat. 28-29).

At the Lamot, a handsome conference and cultural center in the heart of the old town, refashioned out of a former brewery, one entered the exhibit from the main lobby by ascending a narrow, enclosed stairwell, to emerge on an upper floor into the near-total darkness of the exhibition. Its space was lit only by dramatic spotlighting and by the illumination of display cases. Partitions dividing the space were often canted, and traffic pathways irregularly composed. The whole experience, of starting at one point and following a winding, narrow passageway into a dark, uncertain reality, resembled nothing so much as a kind of postmodern labyrinth. Hadid’s design drew attention to its own intentionality, of a deliberately novel space and its theatrical presentations, at the expense of normal traffic flow and the visibility of objects. The intense spotlighting on Meit’s marble Madonna and Child (cat. 122), for example, cast deep, black shadows that obliterated parts of the surface and distorted the sculpture’s volumes, while the bright lights on Van Orley’s Gethsemane tapestry (cat. 105) caused the gold and silver threads to visually “pop,” an experience utterly alien to the candlelight and daylight viewings of Margaret’s day.

Even these contemporary excesses, however, could not diminish the substantial achievements of the exhibit. The organizers and authors, most of all, Dagmar Eichberger, are to be congratulated on an exhibition that illuminated the two Margarets from so many useful perspectives; that brought together such a varied, representative, and beautiful grouping of works; and that resulted in a catalogue as exemplary in its scholarship and production values as this one is.

Dan Ewing

Barry University


Because of its location in the geographical center of the continental United States, the Nelson-Atkins Museum is perhaps less familiar than its peers, but it offers artistic treasures from almost all regions and periods (indeed, its Chinese collection remains one of America’s strongest). Supervised by former curator Roger Ward, the second of a series of systematic catalogues of both European and American paintings in Kansas City has now appeared under the auspices of Burton Dunbar, noted specialist in Netherlandish paintings and drawings, whose long-term appointment at the University of Missouri-Kansas City has given him intimate understanding of this collection. Dunbar introduces the volume with an essay on the history of the collection, followed by two further technical essays. Molly Faries discusses infrared reflectography and other methods of technical examination; her particular observations are noted in the catalogue entries. Additionally, Peter Klein’s study of the dendrochronology of the collection confirms plausible presumed dates for the major works on panel.

The dust jacket of this volume shows the range of riches in the collection, presenting two Netherlandish paintings that span the time period: on the cover Petrus Christus’s charming Madonna and Child in a Domestic Interior; on the reverse Wtewael’s large Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian. Individual entries offer richly detailed discussion and illustrations, including color details, infrareds of key elements, and numerous comparative images. The catalogue comprises two segments: German paintings (1491-1558) and Netherlandish paintings (1454/55-1600).

Sometimes designations are almost too fine or even confusing within the literature. The very first image, Saints George and Wolfgang (no. 1), closely associated with the Housebook Master (or rather Master of the Amsterdam Cabinet), is now rechristened (following Daniel Hess) as “Master of the Monis Altar,” located in Frankfurt at the turn of the sixteenth century. This entry is complemented by a notable recent German publication: the Frankfurt Städel catalogue of early German paintings (Bodo Brinkmann and Stephan Kemperdick, 2002, 334-345), which shows the other wing of the same Monis Altar from the Frankfurt Dominican church. Another fine entry on Erhard Altdorfer’s St. John on Patmos (no. 2) successfully links this image with its mates from the Lambach Altarpiece (c. 1515: Regensburg, Historisches Museum), even as it helpfully identifies one bird on the branches as a female bullfinch (one of many helpful details of this meticulous catalogue) and reveals careful brush underdrawing imagery by Molly Faries.

Kansas City also features a remarkable Cranach Last Judgement, here dated to the 1520s, whose entry (no. 3) incorporates the recent dissertation by Bonnie Noble on Cranach and Luther (1998); however, these nude figures compare closely with the Berlin Fountain of Youth, a later work (dated 1546), and underscore the lack of dating discussion in the entry. Another substantial Cranach image of nudes is the 1535 Three Graces (1535; no. 4). In similar fashion, Cranach the Younger’s bearded portrait (1538; no. 5, on beech) could use a closer comparison in Chicago (F-R no. 416, also dated 1538, recently de-accessioned in a Sotheby’s auction). Good Barthel Bruyn the Younger betrothal pendants round out the Nelson-Atkins German holdings.

Hayne de Bruxelles’s Cambrai icon copy, Notre Dame de Grâce, a precious document of religious art practice, is often discussed, most recently in the late Byzantine exhibition, Faith and Power (Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2004, no. 350). Petrus Christus’ religious panel, here dated 1460-67 (no. 9) is a model entry (123-147), which ranges across its underdrawing, relationship of space to Van Eyck models, late dating, perspective construction, iconographic motifs and comparisons, as well as a highly original reading of the entire scene as an offering of the Christ Child for his mission by the Madonna before a bed that simultaneously denotes both her throne and virginity. Some formal comparisons link the work to Burgundian court manuscripts by Jean le Tavernier, following the lead of Ainsworth’s analysis (1995). The entry of another notable image, Memling’s early Madonna and Child Enthroned (c. 1465/70; no. 10), carefully attends to contour underdrawings and perspectival construction.

One new work, not visible while the museum was recently in renovation, portrays a Benedictine Abbot (called “School of Bruges,” c. 1500; no. 11), with comparisons. Another unfamiliar work is a well-painted Bosch workshop Temptation of St. Anthony (no. 14; Unverfehr, 1980, no. 34b). The catalogue also features a truly notable large triptych from the early sixteenth-century Leiden School (“Circle of Aertgen van Leyden,” no. 19), which deserves comparison to works in the Lakenhal and displays dazzling underdrawing and substantial changes.
For other Kansas City highlights of Netherlandish painting, already well-known but deserving wider notice, these rich entries provide an indispensable touchstone. An early Van Orley panel depicts The Knighting of Saint Martin by Emperor Constantine (c. 1514; no. 15; mate in the Metropolitan Museum, New York), a wing from a work for the Benedictine Abbey in Marchiennes, near Tournai, commissioned by Jacques Coène. Jan Gossaert’s important portrait of Jean de Carondelet (1525/30; no. 17), paired with the Tournai St. Donatian, probably flanked a central Madonna of the Grapes (Berlin). Faries’s underdrawing studies especially illuminate two landscapes: a Saint. Jerome by the Master of the Female Half-_lengths (c. 1525/30; no. 18) and a Herri met de Bles Good Samaritan (c. 1545-50; no. 22). A splendid Italianate Madonna and Child with Carnation (c. 1535; no. 21) by Joos van Cleve provides a paragon of this kind of work (no. 91 in John Hand’s 2004 monograph). Finally, the end of the century is amply represented by a rare Martin de Vos, Saint Andrew (1600/03; no. 24), and by Wivweal’s Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian (1600; no. 25; entry by Anne Lowenthal), the artist’s only monumental male saint and martyrdom.

Clearly a visit to Kansas City will repay the effort for any HNA member. But until that time, this well-produced and authoritative volume will provide all the necessary information and resources that a scholar could want.

Larry Silver
University of Pennsylvania


German artists other than Dürer have only recently begun to emerge from his shadow. Suddenly the Regensburg master, Albrecht Altdorfer, receives two important new books from the very same year and same German publisher (cf. Magdalena Bushart, Sehen und Erkennen: Albrecht Altdorfer’s religiöse Bilder, reviewed in this journal November 2005; both books unfortunately remained independent of each other). Until now, the principal work on Altdorfer has comprised catalogue work on his virtuoso, often miniature paintings, drawings, and prints, or analysis of his inventive landscapes (Christopher Wood, 1993). This tome, a habilitation publication, attempts a survey of content in the artist’s works and favorite themes, an “iconographic style” of presentation, beginning with religion and ending with amorous subjects, neglected by Bushart. But it remains selective as it attempts to reconstitute contexts for viewing that varied content.

Like Bushart, using theological treatises, Noll begins with extended consideration of late medieval piety and the process of prayer as a progress towards a vision of the divine. Sacred images play a role in this process, not just as the bible of the illiterate but also as a stimulus to affective devotion through pious compassion for (especially the crucified) Christ, Mary, and the holy figures, who also exemplify piety. Often specific accompanying prayers either direct or assist meditation in these Andachtsbilder; sometimes the combination of prayer and image (e.g. the Holy Face) could activate an indulgence. While little of this material is truly new, Noll offers an admirable and useful synthesis (but not a summary – a hundred pages!).

He then turns to Altdorfer at last: another long chapter (70 pages) on the virtuoso miniature woodcuts (40) of the cycle entitled The Fall and Salvation of Humanity, a work that clearly responds to Dürer’s Small Woodcut Passion. Noll works through the devotional content of this work, including its depiction of the Fall and the featured role of the Virgin, and he also assesses its artistic achievement through comparisons to both contemporaries and predecessors. Another chapter goes on to consider the sequence of painted Crucifixions by Altdorfer, considering their functions (donor epitaph, didactic staging within an altarpiece sequence), again in relation to visual traditions for this event. This kind of comparative method provides the strength of Noll’s analysis. It leads him to discern both the distinctive character (“expressive form”) of each Altdorfer image as well as to situate that work in relation to its precedents (usually prints) as well as the wider use context of late-medieval Christian art, including typology and other theological under-pinnings. As Noll duly notes the tense balance in Altdorfer’s art between private, personal devotion and virtuoso miniaturist display for connoisseurs, he also points to the retrospective revival of visual traditions imbedded in Altdorfer’s pictures. He notes, for example, how Altdorfer’s Kassel Crucifixion reprises older models from the “Soft Style” of around 1400, arguing that such figuration, like copies made after venerated icons, implies a sacred vision of the cross. Or how the Budapest Crucifixion, originally a private chapel image for the provost of St. Florian (there redated ca. 1520), after the Sebastian Altarpiece ( ), deliberately uses archaic compositions and figure types, a phenomenon that period scholars are beginning to investigate for paintings (e.g. Katharine Kruse on Hans Holbein the Elder) but had already noted for cult sculptures.

Late medieval period fascination with the Virgin also gave rise to distinctive Altdorfer imagery, often in dialogue with Dürer models, particularly the Madonna in Glory (c. 1522/25; Munich) and various graphics of the Virgin in a landscape—subject of the next chapter by Noll. A final coda is provided by graphic images of St. Christopher under the heading “from devotional image to collector’s item.”

As a concluding section, Noll finally shifts to “earthly love,” mythic subjects by Altdorfer – a topic neglected by Bushart. His method remains the same – to find literary analogues wherever possible, principally for the passionate tale of Pyramus and Thisbe. Noll also addresses another cluster of themes, biblical as well as mythological, from the Power of Women ensemble (“The Ambivalence of Sexual Relations”) as well as anonymous couples, including ‘ill-matched pairs.’

Deutscher Kunstverlag are to be congratulated on continuing to produce important art historical monographs on German Renaissance artists with generously plentiful, high quality images. In this particular case, it is regrettable that two simultaneous books by the same press about the same artist could not be put into greater dialogue. Each has its virtues and focuses on different artworks. The student who wishes to use original religious texts to establish the content of Altdorfer religious works or who wants to follow thematic sequences of his representation of favorite subjects will derive much from Noll’s well-researched study, even if his interpretations sometimes lack the bold, critical interpretive ventures of American scholarship, a contribution that seems to run counter to his own more solidly grounded temperament. In addition, his careful attention to Pyramus and Thisbe as well as other admonitory images of earthly love offers a major new addition to the Altdorfer literature.

Larry Silver
University of Pennsylvania

The past decade has seen a definite resurgence of art historical scholarship on Hans Holbein the Younger (1497/8 – 1543). Jochen Sander’s recent book contributes much to this reawakened dialogue. His primary goal is to analyze Holbein’s paintings created while the artist resided primarily in Basel in order ultimately to clarify questions of attribution and date. This period, specifically between the years 1515 and 1532, includes a brief sojourn in France (1523/24) and Holbein’s initial exploration of career opportunities in England (1526-1528). In addition to these journeys, Sander speculates that Holbein also traveled to the Netherlands before 1522 and to Italy sometime after the middle of the 1520s, either before or after his first trip to England.

Sander, Director of Paintings at the Städel in Frankfurt and teacher at the Albert-Ludwigs Universität in Freiburg im Breisgau, makes a compelling argument for examining this period in Holbein’s production. Despite the fact that this timeframe constitutes Holbein’s formative years, during which the artist seems to have experimented with a wide range of stylistic and aesthetic alternatives, scholarship on this period that focuses primarily on the works themselves remains underdeveloped. Instead, Sander maintains, scholars have directed their attention more to Holbein’s career in England and have produced heavily contextual studies, dealing with various cultural, artistic, and practical influences on the artist’s work, such as Humanism, the Reformation, Italian art, and patronage. Sander conjectures that scholars are hesitant to engage with this body of work because of its frustrating paucity of reliable documentation coupled with a bewildering plethora of stylistic manifestations. In addition, since much of the art produced contemporaneously was destroyed in the wave of iconoclasm that swept Basel in 1529, there is little material for scholars to employ comparatively, making the position of Holbein’s work within a larger artistic community difficult to situate.

Yet another reason why scholarship on Holbein’s Basel production is so thorny, according to Sander, is that a dense thicket of speculation and conjecture, grown wild within the large gaps left by inadequate documentation, has obstructed a clear view of what is actually known about the artist and his work. Sander’s secondary goal in his book is to eradicate this underbrush and its deleterious effects on scholarship by systematically differentiating between fact and fiction in the Holbein literature.

Indeed, the organization of Sander’s book responds directly to this goal. The introductory section includes a brief chapter explicating the rationale for and structure of Sander’s project, followed by a chapter on primary documentation, carefully delineating exactly what we can say with certainty about the artist as well as what still remains unclear. Sander quotes from these primary sources at length and often reproduces them in their entirety, yet another reason why this book is so useful. The documentary basis established in this chapter provides the foundation for the entire first section of the book, which is a critical look at what Sander calls “Holbein-Bilder.” With this phrase, Sander cleverly draws on the ambiguities of language, whereby he does not mean “pictures by Holbein” – i.e. works created by the artist – but instead is referring to “pictures of Holbein” – i.e. “knowledge” about the artist produced by a historically long line of interested parties. This process of image-making begins already in the sixteenth century with Basilius Amerbach, author of the highly influential inventory of Holbein’s work collected by Basilius’ father, Bonifacius, and continues throughout roughly a century and a half of art historical scholarship produced since the mid-nineteenth century. Some of the issues tackled in this first section include: the power of collecting practices in reifying an artist and his oeuvre; the ways in which restorations of images (and opinions about the outcome of that restoration) influence subsequent scholarship; the roles of Italian and Netherlandish art in Holbein’s stylistic and technical vocabulary; and differentiating between works by Holbein and those produced by his father, brother, and other Basel painters.

The bulk of Sander’s book is taken up with the next section, in which Holbein’s paintings produced between 1515 and 1532 are analyzed. Sander proceeds chronologically and systematically. If it is available, Sander quotes from the relevant documentation, including the facts pertaining to patronage and original viewing context. In addition, Sander also includes detailed discussions about and extended quotes from art historical scholarship pertaining to the painting at hand, sorting out fact from fiction, and providing a most welcome history of each image’s interpretation. But Sander is first and foremost interested in the individual painting itself. Thus, discussions of content, patronage, context, and function remain decidedly and consciously secondary. This may also be due to the fact that, for some of the paintings, several of these issues remain undocumented, and thus discussing them would necessarily involve conjecture and speculation; certainly by this point in the book, Sander has made it abundantly clear that he views such activities as intellectually irresponsible at best. Sander’s focus on the individual paintings also brackets out, with some rare exceptions, the artist’s other work particularly in the print medium. Nonetheless, in so doing, Sander remains true to his primary goal – to clarify the attribution and dating of Holbein’s Basel paintings. In his introduction he states clearly how he plans on achieving this goal:

“"So wird das jeweilige Bild zunächst auch in seiner Eigenschaft als materieller Gegenstand betrachtet und so hat die Beschäftigung mit ihm anfangs den Charakter einer quasi-archäologischen Annäherung. Von den auf diese Weise gewonnenen Erkenntnissen ausgehend, wird anschließend versucht, die künstlerischen Gestaltungsabsichten des Malers in der prozesshaften Entfaltung der Bildidee und ihrer materiellen Umsetzung im jeweiligen Werk zu erfassen.""

[First of all, each image is observed according also to its nature as a material object, and thus the engagement with it initially has the character of a pseudo-archaeological encounter. Next, building on the insights gained in this way, an attempt is made to grasp the painter’s artistic form-giving intent as evident in the development of the visual idea as process and in the material translation of that idea in each work, p. 13].

This quote succinctly yet powerfully characterizes not only Sander’s basic methodology but also his attitude toward the material itself.

What allows Sander to remain focused on the individual painting, and to remain true to the facts while thus avoiding speculation, is the technical data now available for Holbein’s pre-1532 paintings. Each one has undergone tests involving the use of x-rays, ultraviolet light, infrared photography and reflectography, and/or dendochronological examination. Thus Sander’s analysis of each painting includes a meticulous description not only of its composition but also of its material condition. In addition, Sander’s discussion of the data gathered from these scientific processes is extremely useful in understanding Holbein’s working method and style, and Sander adeptly uses these data, especially the underdrawings, to differentiate Holbein’s work from others’, and to clarify the genesis of individual works. Sander’s careful observations of these technical data not only allow him to further our understanding of Holbein. They also allow him to identify an artist most likely active in Holbein’s own workshop who continued to produce paintings in conscious emulation of
Holbein’s style after the master left Basel for England in 1526 (the so-called “Venus-Painter”); and to sketch out an initial reconstruction of the oeuvre of a contemporary Basel artist, Hans Herbst.

The book concludes with a catalogue, in which each of Holbein’s Basel paintings is given its own entry with information on material condition, technical data, documented restoration, provenance, copies, archival sources, and bibliography. A separate bibliography of frequently cited sources follows, along with two indices; one for people, places, and works; the other for subject matters/themes of the works discussed.

With so much information at hand, it would be impossible for such an extensive work to avoid repetition in parts, and Sander’s book does not escape this fate. However, Sander and his editors may very well have made allowances for this, as they most likely did not envision most readers making their way systematically through the 504-page book from start to finish. Although he is mostly successful in refusing to engage in speculation, Sander very occasionally transgresses his self-imposed boundary, as in his brief – and undocumented – discussion of a possible trip to the Netherlands prior to 1522 and a hypothetical meeting there between Holbein and Quentin Metsys and/or Jan Gossaert (p. 161). In addition, some of his readers will include art historians who are decidedly less allergic to speculation than he, who might find that even the reading and evaluating of documentary evidence involves a degree of interpretation, which is – sometime less so, sometimes more – a speculative enterprise. But the book has so many important insights to offer – not just about Holbein and his work during these early and formative years, but also about the history of Holbein scholarship – that it should be regarded as a fundamental constituent of the art historian’s library.

Pia F. Cuneo
University of Arizona


Dorothea Diemer’s tandem monograph on Hubert Gerhard and Carlo di Cesare del Palagio, two sculptors working at the late sixteenth-century court of Duke Wilhelm V of Bavaria, reaches far beyond the life and works of the artists. Diemer dusts off stacks of archival material to recreate lost monuments, pictorial cycles, ephemera and architectural projects. Sumptuously illustrated, her two-volume work represents the culmination of decades of research and engagement with late sixteenth-century court culture and artistic traditions tied to the cultural elite in and around Munich, Augsburg, Innsbruck, and other German-speaking cities.

Intimately familiar with the primary sources, the author is a formidable scholar who also possesses a thorough understanding of the technical aspects of her subjects’ media: bronze and stucco. In her introduction, she proposes that the long disinterest in this vital period in German art results from centuries of nationalism. Since the artists working for princely and wealthy patrons in the late sixteenth century were often either Netherlandish or Italian rather than German, the international, often mannerist style was often derogated. These two volumes substantially rectify the resulting scholarly neglect.

Volume I provides the narrative while Volume II, packed with crucial original documents and an extensive catalogue of works, is an invaluable resource for scholars of this period. In the five sections of the first volume, Diemer analyzes the individual and collaborative works of the two subject artists, supplies the necessary historical background that brought so many artists to the Bavarian court, and discusses court art during the reign of Wilhelm V. Geographically, Diemer ranges from s’Hertogenbosch to Florence as she tracks down the many foreign artists who congregated in southern Germany at the end of the sixteenth century.

Diemer examines the collision of tradition-bound German sculpture workshops, such as that of the Vischer family, with new theories about inventiveness and originality that were informing Italian practices. Although the bronze sculptor does not need the technical skill of a carver and thus can work more directly in the medium through wax, terracotta, or stucco models, she also investigates how northern artists received their training in a medium that required a sizeable financial outlay and was notoriously hazardous. Large-scale bronze casting was an expensive undertaking that northern artists did not practice as often as their Italian counterparts. Diemer’s book explores the many foreign artists who congregated in southern Germany at the end of the sixteenth century.

For many years, a great deal of sculpture from Munich was considered either anonymous or was attributed to well-known sculptors like Adriaen de Vries. The collaboration of many artists on large-scale projects during this period creates complicated issues for interpretation and attribution. Northern courts were commissioning the same sort of Gesamtkunstwerk that the Medici instituted for representational reasons in Florence. Neither Hubert Gerhard nor Carlo di Cesare del Palagio designed their own works. The court artist and artistic director throughout the last two decades of the sixteenth century, Friedrich Sustris, provided the drawings for much of the work that the sculptors executed.

Although no one artist can be credited with many of these courtly commissions, Diemer still gives the talent and inventiveness of the individuals a thorough treatment. Many local German artists, long left anonymous as mere assistants on important projects, are finally given names. The decision to give both artists equal time proves to be fortuitous since it allows Diemer to consider the differences in training between North and South.

Hubert Gerhard was born in s’Hertogenbosch where he could not have been exposed to much, if any, bronze casting. Surmising that Gerhard must have received some sort of training before he left for Italy, she follows him to Antwerp and Cornelis Floris, who, however, only worked in marble. Gerhard arrived in Florence in 1581, where his contact with the workshop of Giambologna afforded him the experience necessary to translate both style and technique to the many commissions that the court at Munich offered, especially the decade long project of furnishing sculpture for the colossal church of St. Michael’s.

Diemer also tracks the career of Carlo di Cesare del Palagio through a paper trail that begins in Florence but results in his collaboration with Gerhard in Munich. Although Carlo was hired to complete stucco work in the Munich Antiquarium, the experimental nature of bronze casting in the North afforded him the opportunity to execute his own castings in bronze. Carlo was learning “on the job,” so to speak, and despite being fired by the father of Wilhelm V, Duke Albrecht V, for substandard work, he was later retained by Wilhelm, evidence that the young duke was determined to retain Italian artists who could create an artistic culture equal to Florence.

After explaining the genesis of the artists, their training as well as how their patrons came to seek them out, Diemer meticulously
examines the works themselves, from grave monuments to garden complexes, elaborate fountains and architectural decorations. Some pieces, such as *Mercury or Perseus*, both set up in a court garden, were almost direct copies of Giambologna and Benvenuto Cellini prototypes. Other works, such as the many angels, saints, and apostles that inhabit St. Michael’s church, are unique to their setting.

The sheer magnitude of production in the last two decades of the sixteenth century is staggering and indicates a tremendous financial investment by Wilhelm V. Since most of the sculpture belongs within a larger context, Diemer provides important programmatic interpretation in addition to the visual analysis of individual pieces. Her careful research and understanding of technical issues combined with her fluid narrative style results in the most thorough account of the artistic undertaking of the Bavarian court to date. Intelligent and intelligible, these two volumes create a rich world that develops a cultural history as well as an art history for South Germany on the eve of the seventeenth century.

Susan Maxwell
*University of Wisconsin Oshkosh*

---


Regular readers of this *Review* might recognize the whimsically named Museum Het Zotte Kunstkabinet from its earlier exhibition, *De Zotte Schilders* (2003), catalogue by Eric De Bruyn and Jan Op de Beeck. Both that catalogue and this one originated from a Mechelen research institute, Centrum voor oude kunst ‘t Vliegend Peert, named for the historic pand of the city where it is housed. Now Op de Beeck returns with a smaller study – in three languages (Dutch, French, and English) – about the widow of Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Mayken Verhulst.

Although she was named by Guicciardini as one of the four most important female artists in the Low Countries (1567), little documentation sustains our knowledge of this woman (though Adolf Monbailieu studied her Mechelen painters’ family, summarized here), known for her miniatures and tempra pictures. Most notably, she supervised the posthumous publication (1553) of the seven-part woodcut frieze designed by Coecke, *Ces Moeurs et Fachons de Faire des Turcz*. We can observe (with Timothy Riggs) that in this respect Verhulst was followed by another publisher’s widow, Hieronymus Cock’s wife, after 1570. Indeed, an evaluative study of Coecke himself beyond the monograph by Marlier (1966) is long overdue.

Op de Beeck’s bombshell is his identification (following Simone Bergmans, 1963) that Mayken Verhulst was the widely influential but still anonymous (despite facile attempts to equate him with Jan van Amstel) Master of the Brunswick Monogram. But his enlarged illustration of the monogram (p. 94) clearly reveals other letters – A and S besides V, I, and M – that undermine this hypothesis (he reads the I as “inventor”).

While Coecke’s woodcuts are well known (recently included in the New York exhibition of late Byzantine art, *Faith and Power*, 2004, no. 253), this catalogue shows all inscriptions and includes the full seven images from a version in the Plantin-Moretus Museum in Antwerp, so it will be useful for study purposes. However, this catalogue does not offer much new interpretive material, and its English translations needed proofreading by a native speaker.

A final chapter appears only in Dutch (with resumés) and summarizes the state of our knowledge about Bruegel, Pieter Baltens, and Mechelen, notably their side wings for the documented altarpiece (1550-51) for the glovers’ guild.

Larry Silver
*University of Pennsylvania*

---

**Seventeenth-Century Flemish**


The Systematic Catalogue series, documenting the rich collections of the National Gallery of Art in Washington, continues to grow since its inception in the 1980s. Exactly twenty years have passed since the publication of the exemplary first volume, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, by John Oliver Hand and Martha Wolff. The present volume, the sixteenth in the series, is devoted to the collection of seventeenth-century Flemish painting. No better scholar than Arthur K. Wheelock could have been chosen for the task, for not only has he served as long-term curator of the National Gallery’s Netherlandish Baroque paintings, but is also well known for his excellent catalogue, *Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century*, published in 1995. He could moreover rely on a highly qualified team of restorers, who also carried out special technical examinations of the Flemish works.

Compared with old European collections, the Gallery owns a comparatively small number of Flemish paintings, less than sixty in total. The uneven distribution of artists and genres means the collection does not offer a general historical overview of the very diverse nature of artistic production in Flanders. Especially sorely missed are examples of the cabinet paintings that were typical for Antwerp, though exceptions include *Dishes with Oysters, Fruit and Wine* by Osias Beert the Elder and *Flowers in a Basket and A Vase* by Jan Brueghel the Elder. Equally under-represented are landscapes, with just two by the latter, one by David Teniers the Younger and two from the studios of Abel Grimmer and Peeter Gyssels; examples by the great masters of Baroque still-life and marine painting are sought in vain. However, viewers have no difficulty in recognizing the highlight of the collection – the Gallery’s outstanding group of portraits. Of these, the most dazzling are by Anthony van Dyck, represented by no less than seventeen autograph works, a number that reflects his high esteem, which at the time of the founding of the National Gallery in 1941 far exceeded that of Rubens. Bequests by Peter A.B. Widener (1942) and Andrew W. Mellon (1937, 1940) laid the foundation for the Flemish collection in Washington, followed by gifts from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation (1952). During the 1930s, Mellon succeeded in acquiring paintings that were sold off by the Soviets from the Hermitage in St. Petersburg. The taste of the leading collectors of the new world was for aristocratic elegance, so that their lack of interest in works by Jacob Jordens hardly comes as a surprise, and even today he is still not represented in the collection.

Mellon and Widener’s indisputable preference for portraits by Van Dyck has informed the special character and high quality of the...
National Gallery’s Flemish collection. These works reveal the artist’s close relationship to the family of his teacher Rubens, as is so impressively demonstrated by Van Dyck’s portraits of Rubens’s wife, Isabella Brant, and of his sister-in-law, Susanne Fourment. Painted in 1621 before Van Dyck departed for Italy, both show a comparable stylistic approach and psychological conception – indeed, both women, who were also distantly related, even wear the same, costly chain. Isabella’s portrait appears brighter overall, with a looser and more open brushwork, particularly in the background, an impression undoubtedly heightened by an early relining. André Felibien’s account in 1666 that Van Dyck painted a portrait of Isabella before leaving Antwerp, as a present for Rubens, is certainly plausible and, as Wheelock convincingly argues, can be taken to refer to the present painting.

Equally notable are Van Dyck’s later life-size portraits of aristocratic women with their children or servants. His 1633 portrait of the English queen Henrietta Maria shows her together with fourteen-year old Sir Jeffrey Hudson, her court dwarf and member of her intimate circle. With her right hand she touches the small monkey perched on the arm of Hudson, who gazes up at her while holding an orange, a reference to the orange tree in the background as a symbol of love and loyalty. Van Dyck depicts this imaginary scene of the young woman standing next to the column and crown, the insignia of the court, turning ever so slightly towards Hudson with moving intensity and great psychological perception. According to the catalogue text, the painting exudes the neo-platonic ideal of a life devoted solely to the intellect that permeated the English court. But does the resulting interpretation really do justice to the portrait’s individual message? One may assume that Van Dyck’s skill made it possible for him to identify the personal wishes of the queen and replicate them in a suitable fashion. That he was moreover particularly talented in portraying children is evident from his two paintings of 1623 showing the children of the Genoese patrician Giacomo Catteno – here the decisive influence of Titian is easily discernible. With admirable meticulousness Wheelock describes and analyzes not only the state of preservation and manner of execution of all of Van Dyck’s portraits but also evaluates their style and importance.

But beyond these works, the collection also offers other important examples of Flemish portraiture. The most outstanding of these is the group portrait of Deborah Kip, wife of Balthasar Gerbier, with her children. Rubens, a friend of Gerbier, began the painting whilst staying with the family in their house in London in 1629/30, and though he brought it back to Antwerp, he never completed it, so that upon his death it was finished by another artist, probably Jacob Jordaeus. While a technical examination of the support, composed of numerous pieces of canvas, contributed to a greater understanding of the painting’s evolution, the lack of a compositional drawing or preparatory sketches by Rubens means that the reconstruction of his original intentions must remain conjectural. The function of the visually domineering caryatids on the upper right, quite possibly by Jordaeus, is unclear and suggests that at the time of Rubens’s death only the figures had been executed.

Problems of a different kind are found in the half-length portrait of an elegant man against a landscape background (pp. 103-107). Dated to around 1630, the black-and-white coloring of this impressive work is anything but conventional and is reminiscent of the chiaroscuro style of the Roman followers of Caravaggio while simultaneously betraying something of Rubens’s manner, particularly evident in the evening landscape. Previously thought to be the work of Jordaeus, it is now attributed to an unknown seventeenth-century Flemish artist, though Wheelock does make the interesting suggestion that it might be by Jan Cossiers. This proposal is certainly worth following up, even if Cossiers figural paintings show a rather different, looser type of brushwork and only a few comparable portraits by him exist. The man’s expression and self-confident pose has much of a self-portrait, and Wheelock refers to an engraving by Pieter de Jode after a self-portrait by Cossiers at an advanced age. This can be augmented by a 1626 painting by Simon de Vos (Musée du Louvre), published by Hans Vlieghe, showing Cossiers in profile (La Revue du Louvre, 1968, pp. 67-68). The physiognomy of the painter is quite close to that of the man in the Washington portrait and certainly seems to support the identification of the sitter as Cossiers.

It was only in the 1960s that the outstanding group of Van Dyck portraits was matched by the acquisition of a number of important works by Rubens. They also serve as an impressive demonstration of the importance accorded history painting in Antwerp, and include modelli for tapestries. Of course Rubens’s monumental Daniel in the Lions’ Den deserves mention. Its importance remained long undetected despite its seamless provenance stretching back to 1618, when sold by Rubens to Sir Dudley Carleton, so that it practically constituted a new discovery for the artist’s oeuvre when acquired by the Gallery in 1965. The National Gallery today owns nine autograph works by Rubens, two of which were painted during his time in Italy. The Fall of Phaeton was begun in 1604; its bold and highly dramatic composition is particularly interesting as Rubens clearly worked on it until about 1606 and during this time continually made corrections and additions, described by Wheelock in detail. The use of light and the handling of spatial difficulties inherent to the scene posed a particular challenge. It is plausible to assume Rubens brought the Fall of Phaeton back to Antwerp after he left Italy since aspects of the composition appear in some of his later works, such as the Defeat of Sennacherib (c. 1615) in Munich. It however remains uncertain whether the Hero and Leander in New Haven really is the pendant to the Washington painting, a suggestion first proposed by Michael Jaffe on the basis of similarities in style, date and dimensions; no other pair showing the same thematic constellation is known.

The almost life-size portrait of Marchesa Brigida Spinola Doria, painted in Genoa in 1606, shows Rubens’s early mastery and the enormous scope of his imagination. Robbed of its full glory by having been cut down on all sides sometime before 1886, the painting originally hung together with Rubens’s equestrian portrait of Giovanni Carlo Doria (Genoa, Palazzo Spinola), Brigida’s brother-in-law. Because of commitments in Rome, the artist had little time to complete the commission, and in the Technical Notes on this work Wheelock provides a detailed description of Rubens’s brushwork and a lively account of the various stages of execution. The paint and the make-up of the support of all works discussed in the catalogue were systematically analyzed and the manner in which the findings were evaluated for their relevance for the artistic interpretation of each work must be seen as one of the outstanding features of the catalogue.

In a fascinating study that far exceeds the call of duty for a catalogue text, Wheelock offers interesting insights into the master-piece of the Flemish collection: Rubens’s Daniel in the Lions’ Den of c. 1615. He connects Rubens’s account of the event, which was rarely depicted and which differs from established pictorial tradition, with the spirit of the Counter Reformation and its deliberate emphasis on the role of Old Testament heroes as typological prefigurations for events of the New Testament on the one hand, and with the intellectual world of Stoicism, familiar to Rubens and his brother Philip from the teachings of Justus Lipsius on the other. Rubens succeeded in infusing these ideas into a composition so unusual that its authenticity has at times been questioned, though his authorship, also evident in the numerous pentimenti, is indisputable. What remains unanswered is the question of who or what inspired Rubens. In view of its
enormous size (224 x 330 cm), the possibility that he simply executed it for his own satisfaction can be excluded in favor of an unknown patron who commissioned the work for a specific location sometime before 1615. Since the painting was still in Rubens’s studio in 1618, when he offered it to Dudley Carleton, one can only assume the patron was either dissatisfied with the result or for some unknown reason withdrew from the contract. The lions, which Rubens proudly noted were drawn ‘from life’, take up the greater part of the composition and in view of the subject’s theological message conceivably have been considered inappropriate. We know Rubens sometimes re-acquired his own compositions for high prices – the early history of Daniel requires further clarification.

Wheeler’s catalogue is a lavish work that offers rich pickings for scholars of Flemish Baroque painting. It sets a very high standard for future catalogues in this area.

Rüdiger Klessmann
Augsburg
(Translated by Fiona Healy)


Although the text, as the author tells us, was completed at the end of the last century, Gregory Martin’s two volumes on Rubens’ paintings for the Whitehall Ceiling is the most exhaustive and up-to-date study of this major work, and, apart from possible interpretative refinements, is unlikely to be superseded. This magnus opus in the artist’s oeuvre is particularly significant for being the only major decorative scheme by him to remain in situ; only relatively recently, with the clutter of the museum of the Royal United Service Institution removed, the room refurbished and the canvases on the ceiling restored and correctly reordered, can it be seen in all its glory. It is sad that more people do not come to visit it. It is of course physically difficult to study, an exercise in neck-bending which is made all the more demanding by the wealth of meaning we now know to be present in each canvas. As far as scholarship is concerned, it is only within the last half century with the publications of Oliver Millar, Per Palme and Julius Held that the ceiling has received its due. Martin builds on this base – Fiona Donovan’s study on Rubens and England (2004) appeared too late to be considered [Ed.: See review by Gregory Martin in this issue] – the importance of which he fully acknowledges, and is able to add new facts and much detail and discussion. There is, however, a good deal we do not know about the whole project, and the author is ever ready to speculate quite widely, but he is always punctilious in separating fact from supposition. He offers the reader a stimulating and highly satisfactory analysis of the commission.

The substantial introduction offers a very wide-ranging examination of the history of the project, starting with the architecture of the Banqueting House and ending with the influence of the canvases on later artists. The early history of the commission, that is between Rubens’s reference in a letter to the commission in 1621 and his arrival in London in 1629, remains tantalisingly unclear, despite the amount of existing correspondence about the English court and the artist. Although there is neither correspondence nor recorded contacts with Rubens during these years, it is clear that something was going on, and Martin suggests that George Gage and Tobie Mathew, both resident on the Continent at the time, were the English contacts deputed to deal with the artist. He also interestingly infers the involvement of Charles I, when still Prince of Wales, in the scheme from the beginning, which provided a highly desirable element of continuity when James I died in 1625. It would have been, as Martin points out, an unusual collaboration between the king and his heir.

The important new evidence about the commission consists in the two programs, or ‘projects’ as they were called, relating to the ceiling, which were discovered in the British Library and were published by Martin in 1994. The first was probably drafted before but edited after the death of James I and the second therefore taking account of his heir’s changed perception of what the ceiling should show, moving from a celebration of the life of the king to being ‘designed to the memory of King James’. Both show the Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland in the central oval rather than the Apotheosis and therefore composed before the ‘Multiple Bozzetto’ (see below) and before the final program was settled with Rubens. The authorship of the ‘Projects’ remains unknown and several candidates, including Inigo Jones, the most obvious choice, and Balthasar Gerbier are considered.

In discussing the iconography, Martin stresses the importance of the image of the king, who appears in all three central canvases, and the royal regalia. Although no drawings for the ceiling are known and, it has been surmised, none were needed in view of the numerous oil-sketches, Martin argues that drawings for the king’s appearance, his dress and regalia must surely have been made. In this context one can recall the several drawings of the head of Maria de’ Medici made as an aid to the Medici cycle.

A matter of continuing debate has been the degree to which the artist was personally involved in the execution of the final canvases, with opinions varying from entirely by Rubens to largely by the studio and retouched by Rubens. Martin accepts the participation of the studio but thinks it likely that, before ‘signing off’ each canvas, the master reviewed each figure and its clothing, retouching where necessary. He develops the interesting notion that the hand of Jan van den Hoecke, who seems to have been one of Rubens’s chief assistants in the 1630s and who certainly played a role in the execution of the decorations for the Introtitus Ferdinandi, can possibly be recognized in certain details.

In a long account of the ceiling after about 1637 up to about 1970, two recurring themes stand out. The first relates to the physical survival and the frequent campaigns of restoration and cleaning of the canvases. Discolouration was a particular problem since, following the destruction of Whitehall Palace by fire in 1697, the room served as the Chapel Royal for nearly two hundred years. The first campaign of restoration already carried out in 1687 and since then no less than seven have taken place, the last, a surface cleaning in 1994-95. As a result of the installation of scaffolding and the removal of the canvases from their setting on a number of occasions, their correct installation on the ceiling became an issue, which was only satisfactorily resolved in 1972.

The second recurring theme is the artistic reputation of the ceiling, a subject which attracted surprisingly contradictory opinions over the course of three centuries. Lauded by such visitors as Cosimo de’ Medici III in the century of its creation, it was praised in later centuries by such figures as George Vertue and William Seguier, who thought it was the ‘finest ceiling in the world’. Others held far less flattering assessments of quality. Sir Christopher Wren perversely thought Robert Streeter’s ceiling in the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxford, was better. Sir Joshua Reynolds, who, following his visit to Flanders, became a Rubens admirer and the owner of what he thought were two
sketches for the ceiling, totally ignored the work in his Discourses. Perhaps most damaging for their reputation at the time were the highly critical opinions of that great German connoisseur, Gustav Waagen, who saw nothing to esteem.

The catalogue raisonné of the canvases and the preparatory oil-sketches offers as thorough and detailed an examination of each work connected with the scheme as one could hope for, covering in extenso iconography, physical make-up and execution, authenticity and style. Beginning with the Multiple Bozzetto with subjects for seven compartments (No. 1), that marvellous oil-sketch, unique in Rubens’s œuvre, now on loan to the National Gallery in London, the catalogue moves on to the lost Overall Modello (No. 2), described by Van der Doort as having been sent to Charles I for approval, and subsequently displayed in the ceiling of the Cabinet Room in Whitehall. Rather than identifying it, as is sometimes proposed, with the oil-sketch of the Apotheosis of James I (No. 4e), in St. Petersburg (see below), which in fact only represents one of the nine subjects compartments, Martin persuasively argues that it was likely to have escaped being sold at the time of the Commonwealth by remaining in situ at Whitehall, and that it was later destroyed in the great fire of 1698.

Of the generally accepted oil-sketches, Martin rejects three as the work of Rubens. Following Oliver Millar he is clearly right to take a stand against the Hermitage sketch of the Apotheosis of James I, just mentioned, and his arguments about its lack of quality were confirmed, at least for the present writer, when it stood out like a sore thumb among unquestionably genuine oil-sketches, exhibited at the Hermitage Rooms at Somerset House in 2003-04. Less convincing is his dismissal of the Mercury and Argus (nos. 3g/5g), in Boston, an unusual work in containing studies for two different subjects. Although Martin deploys some subtle arguments, tentatively attributing it to Jan van den Hoecke, it stood up well in the exhibition of Rubens’s sketches at the Bruce Museum, Greenwich, Connecticuticut in 2004, an event too recent to have been recorded here. On the other hand, his strictures against the other Whitehall sketch in Boston, Hercules Crushing Discord (No. 6b), already criticized but nevertheless accepted by Held, are fairly persuasive.

Overall Martin’s volume stands out by virtue of its perspicacity and precision as one of the best in the Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard series. As usual, the volume is very fully illustrated, but with the addition, for the first time in a volume of the Corpus Rubenianum, of colour reproductions. Fourteen plates, of the interior of the Banqueting Hall, sections of the ceiling with its elaborate moulding, as well as details of some individual canvases, give Corpus readers a good impression of Rubens’s use of color throughout the series, but are, as always, no substitute for the real thing.

Christopher White
London


Fiona Donovan has written a trail-breaking survey of Rubens’s relationship with England, centred on the nine paintings he provided to decorate the ceiling of the Banqueting Hall of Whitehall Palace in London. Her book grew out of a doctoral thesis submitted to Columbia University in 1995, but is to a very great degree mercifully free of seminar jargon.

Design and content seem at odds in that the text is well researched with up to date references, while the layout, with one wide margin on each page, a liberal number of illustrations and plentiful, good color reproductions, suggests a coffee table destination. As Rubens had his fair share of English admirers from mid-career onwards, it is extraordinary that Donovan’s is the first book to take as its theme this important aspect of his professional life. And as one who has worked in the same vineyard, I salute it. [Ed.: see review by Christopher White of Gregory Martin’s Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard volume on the Whitehall Ceiling in this issue.]

Donovan begins by telling the story of English – or rather as it should be described – British patronage of Rubens from the first contact made on behalf of Sir Dudley Carleton, King James I’s ambassador to the Estates General in The Hague, in 1616. She opens with a discussion of the importance placed by Carleton and others on the authenticity of paintings leaving Rubens’s studio. This English preoccupation with authorship – widely and legitimately indulged still today – was most likely fuelled by the artist’s openness than by the perspicacity of his early admirers. Perhaps not enough is made of the falling-out over Lord Danvers’s attempt to foist a damaged Creation of the Animals by a member of the Bassano family on Rubens. Equally, more could have been said about the artist’s later disgust at the Spanish offensive alliance with France against Great Britain that put a temporary stop to his negotiations with the Duke of Buckingham. The Spanish envoy, the Marquis de Leganés, who finalized the alliance in Paris, was on his way to Brussels and, of course, not to The Hague.

The view advanced by Donovan that Rubens’s famous paragraph in his letter of 12 September 1621 arose from his ‘decision to lobby on his own behalf’ for the Banqueting Hall commission is curiously Madison Avenue-ese, and ignores evidence of careful, British diplomatic preparation. And the initiative concerning the gift of the Crucifixion, on which Albert J. Loomie has thrown much light (Burlington Magazine, 138, 1996, 734 ff; 140, 1998, 680ff), came not from the Archduchess but from the recipient of the painting, Sir George Calvert. The picture which arrived was much bigger than had been specified and evidently had just been extracted from the artist’s stock.

The story that ends with the artist’s arrival in London in June 1629 is a rich and complex one; it is nicely told here with only a few slips along the way. Similar is the exposition of Continental Culture and the Early Stuart Court, her next chapter, although perhaps culture is too wide in scope for the matter in hand. Condensed are accounts of the impact made by leading personalities, who have been treated at greater length elsewhere: Henry Prince of Wales, Inigo Jones, the Earl of Arundel, the Duke of Buckingham and, of course, Charles I himself.

Like others before her, Donovan contrasts James I and his son Charles. James, whose reputation is still here thought to be appositely described as that of a buffoon, gets the old stick for hunting too much – the only monarch of the time to be so criticized. More seriously James is taken to task for not acting in a way he would never have dreamt of: his “court lacked the direction necessary to direct cultural reform. There was never any controlled supervision from the top.” In another context, contemporaries would have been nonplussed by her assertion that the “Vatican . . . relaxed restrictions on Protestant visitors.”

As is shown in her next chapter, Envoy and Artist, Rubens afforded his Spanish masters with a sharp analysis – still ignored by historians – of the British court during his stay in the capital in 1629-30. Donovan gives a good idea of the problems Rubens faced as he accomplished the diplomatic task he had been entrusted with. Contrary to what she says, the artist had nothing but admiration for
the King; it was his advisers that were criticized for fickleness. To give an idea of the tension of the situation, she might have dwelt on the artist’s agitation at having borne the brunt of Lord Weston’s anger (Weston then the most powerful of the King’s ministers) at Spanish prevarication. And when so much else is covered, it is a pity that absent is a report of the great day in January 1630 when Rubens accompanied the Spanish Extraordinary Ambassador on his formal reception in the Banqueting Hall.

Of course her theme is greatly enriched by the art Rubens produced when diplomacy did not absorb his time. And it is a curious fact, to which Donovan draws attention, that he painted no formal portrait of Charles I, with whom he was in quite frequent contact, although he conveyed a clear likeness of the King in the guise of St. George in the sublime St. George and the Dragon (Royal Collection). How the don Joseph Mead (recte Mede), who was never knighted pace Donovan, got wind of the work so soon after it was executed, remains a mystery. Donovan might have mentioned the artist’s erratic diplomatic behaviour in the weeks immediately before his departure.

Of the ceiling decoration itself, Donovan sums it up as projecting “an impression of the authority, prestige and sanctity of the English court.” The point would have been well made if for ‘English court’ she had written ‘the house of Stuart.’ On the whole a perceptive guide to the iconography is given; it is seen as both generalized and polysemous, for the true meaning of the “less readily identifiable figures is multifaceted.” The account of the outside compositions is less sure-footed: the long processions are misplaced and despatched in the wrong direction. The monstrous head of Minerva’s victim is not spotted, so she is identified as personifying setidion rather than ignorance. Similarly is missed the garment torn away by temperance’s victim, which allows her identification as intemperance, while the object displayed by temperance in the bozzetto is wrongly read as a rudder.

If memory serves me right – I hope it does – there is a memo in the archive of the Ministry of Works from a Government minister, who had accompanied King George VI round the Banqueting Hall at its re-opening after the War in 1951, in which he complained that he had not been properly briefed about the paintings. He would not have had to complain so much had he had Fiona Donovan’s book to hand.

Gregory Martin
London


Among the many exhibitions of Rubens’s work that took place in the year 2004, the Brunswick exhibition Peter Paul Rubens: Baroque Leidenschaften deserves particular mention. Here a topic is explored that was from the early seventeenth century onwards intrinsically connected with the experience of Rubens’s art: the visual energy of his figural inventions reaching out to the viewers, the emotional impact and bold actuality of his historical, mythological and allegorical tales. Rubens’s work epitomizes a quality that had become of central importance in art theoretical literature from the late sixteenth century onwards: the capacity of a lively and life-like image to engrave itself deeply on the mind, provoking our physical response. The Brunswick exhibition investigates the mechanisms and visual strategies of Rubens’s emotionally effective art through all genres and periods of his vast work.

Like the exhibition, the catalogue is organized into six sections focusing on three clusters of affects and passions: ‘Love, Ecstasy, Desire’; ‘Fear, Wrath, Triumph’; and ‘Faith, Love, Hope’. A section titled ‘Withstanding’ (‘Standhalten’) assembles the artist’s most gruesome and psychologically most difficult inventions as well as his images of Seneca, which were motivated by classical statuary and his preoccupation with the Stoic and Neostoic virtue of constantia. Two final sections, ‘The Atelier of the Passions’ and ‘The Theatre of the Passions’, discuss Rubens’s work sheets and sketches as the building blocks of his pictorial compositions and assemble the large and more than life-size paintings for which Rubens’s artistic temperament, as he himself claimed, was particularly suited. Both exhibition and catalogue begin with Paulus Pontius’s engraved Rubens portraits, presenting the artist as a high-ranking aristocrat with a composed and serene mind.

While focusing exclusively on Rubens’s work, the book reaches far beyond an exclusively monographic approach; it is first and foremost a contribution to the study of emotional culture in early modern Europe, a topic which has received increasing attention in the course of the past ten years. The catalogue is introduced by nine essays that investigate various aspects of Rubens’s art or its early modern reception. Büttner’s comments on Rubens’s biography are particularly suited to introduce an exhibition on ‘Baroque passions.’ Rather than searching for biographical elements that would allow insight into Rubens’s ‘affectional household,’ Büttner explores the topoi Rubens and his humanist friends employed to fashion an artistic self that conforms with the ideals of Antwerp’s urban elites. Aristocratic dignity, too, was in accord with the claims and self-understanding of the higher stratum of Antwerp’s elites. Within this context the publication of Paulus Pontius’s engraving after Rubens’s self-portrait for the Prince of Wales (later Charles I) in 1630 – the year Rubens received knighthood from this very king – suggests a calculated use of printed portraits and an individual and social self-understanding that Rubens shared with the city’s humanists and high-ranking officials.

Ulrich Heinen’s essay (‘Peter Paul Rubens – Baroque Passions’) introduces the project as a whole. Heinen is currently preparing a broader study on the representation of the passions in Rubens’s work and the visual media of the early Baroque, on which the concept of this exhibition is based. Departing from a broad and multifaceted understanding of affects, Heinen investigates the role of emotions in rhetorical practice, philosophical anthropology and visual aesthetics. It has long been known that Seneca’s work had a great appeal for Rubens and his friends, and newer studies have once more documented the importance of Neostoicism for the history of natural science and political thought. Rubens owned both Lipsius’s Seneca edition and the edition of Seneca’s tragedies by the Jesuit Martin Delrio. Delrio’s poetics offers a parallel model of aesthetic experience in which the profound and immediate emotion of the audience serves as a means to achieve an equanimous, even-tempered mind.

Heinen further employs Seneca’s description of the effects of ‘ictus’ – a blow or shock involving intellect and emotions – in order to explain Rubens’s violent imagery that takes the spectator by surprise and works on the mind independent from the will. In a similar manner, one might add, did Bishop Gabriele Paleotti speak of realistic images (imagini fatte al vivo) that ‘violate our unwary senses’ (che quasi violentano i sensi incauti), provoking ‘bodily alterations and signs.’ Rubens’s powerful paintings, as Heinen further explains, were created at a time when the concept of passion itself
changed, from something that afflicts or befalls one (passio, affectus) to a more inward movement or emotion caused by the physical movements of the heart. Combined with a careful analysis of Rubens’s artistic strategies and techniques, Heinen’s broad anthropological, philosophical and historical approach to Rubens’s artistic project introduces his work as part of a larger attempt to understand, represent and interpret the passions of the mind: a project intimately linked to a new affective culture, which began to emerge in the 1600s in the scientific disciplines and the arts.

In her article on ‘love as painted by Rubens’ (the subtitle may be translated as ‘perceiving the unexpected, interpreting the expected’), Fiona Healy convincingly demonstrates that Rubens often inverted conventional iconographies and compositional patterns by adding gestures or attributes in order to complicate the depicted story, give it a new or ambivalent perspective. It is through these elements that the attention of the viewer is stimulated and engaged. With the example of the Louvre Kermesse flamande Healy shows that Rubens frequently mixed pictorial genres – in this case adding elements of erotic and matrimonial allegories to a subject of comical satire. Rubens’s depictions of violence, as Andreas Vetter argues, similarly make use of motifs and gestures that directly address the viewer offering him or her an aesthetic vocabulary of choice. While Healy and Vetter argue primarily from the visual evidence of the paintings themselves, the articles by Birgit Franke and Barbara Welzel investigate the social and visual practices in which Rubens’s works were received. Franke interprets Rubens’s Garden of Love and his Bacchic Scene in the Vienna Galerie der Akademie as images that stimulate and allow for sensual delight, the grotto imagery referring to the artificial garden grottoes that served as both private areas and ‘free spaces’ within the context of courtly life. Welzel looks at the frequent practice to veil and reveal the most prominent art works in early modern collections. The painted picture galleries, a pictorial genre invented in early seventeenth-century Antwerp, reflect a social use of images and visual media that implies the verbal and gestural response of the beholder. The study of early modern practices of display and concealment is of particular importance in that it shows the picture gallery as a site of pleasure, communication and affective response. The essays by Silke Gatenbröcker and Thomas Döring present the Brunswick collections of Rubens’s paintings and prints, while Claus Kemmer discusses the central role of Rubens in Roger de Piles’s theoretical writings and in seventeenth-century art theory in the Netherlands.

The core of the book is – according to this reviewer – formed by the 93 catalogue entries. Written by Ulrich Heinen and Nils Büttner, they are beautifully tailored to the general theme. The authors explore the range of expressive possibilities of Rubens’s work; his artistic and painterly techniques that make a figure appear to communicate with the beholder. Both authors refer extensively to Rubens’s practice to use figural inventions in various contexts and thus change and vary their emotional color and tone. If available, information about owners or early viewers is given; when applicable, subsequent artistic explorations these works provoked is discussed. In their richness and density the catalogue essays form an intriguing commentary on a central problem of early Baroque art – the representation of the passions of the mind. From various perspectives they document the forms of friendship and shared love of art that were lastly the source of Rubens’s pictorial inventions.

Christine Göttler
University of Washington


Only sporadic traces of Rubens’s written art theoretical views have survived, making them a particularly challenging subject for scholars. Considerable attention has in recent years been paid to aspects of his workshop practice and the formation of his own art collection. Moreover, his very penetrating visualisation of the affetti has been discussed in recent studies and exhibition catalogues, especially by scholars such as Arnout Balis, Ulrich Heinen and Jeffrey Muller. The publication by Eveliina Juntunen under review here – originally submitted to the University of Jena as a doctoral thesis – is in keeping with this particular line of research and must be viewed as a supplement to the above-mentioned studies.

Juntunen argues that Rubens also visualizes his art theoretical viewpoints and principles in a number of relatively large history paintings with mythological subject matter, all of them executed in Antwerp between c. 1611 and c. 1618. The author refers (p. 33) to documents which imply that a certain number of paintings from this particular category were not made in order to meet a specific patron’s wishes, but were kept by Rubens in his house, “on spec” in the hope that they might attract the attention of a humanist-oriented audience. This audience was to be found in Antwerp or elsewhere in the Southern Netherlands, but even more so in the Northern Netherlands, which had become more easily accessible during the period of the Twelve Years Truce (1609-1621). Ever since Matthias Winner published his ground-breaking thesis in 1957 on the function and meaning of the Antwerp gallery pictures, art history is familiar with the interpretation of this particular group as “painted art theory.” Juntunen, however, explicitly seeks to distinguish her approach from Winner’s, preferring to consider the paintings under discussion as implicit visualizations of art theoretical considerations (“bildimplizierte Kunsttheorie”).

Unlike altarpieces and other devotional pictures, which possessed a very clear liturgical function and had to be in keeping with severe canonical instructions and regulations, the painter of “fabulen” or “poetryen”, as mythological subject matter was often described in seventeenth-century documents, had a kind of poetic licence. He could choose from a variety of literary sources, including Greek and Latin epics, poetry and drama, ekphrases of famous but lost ancient art works and also from more contemporary mythographical literature. And in visualizing a mythological story a painter could easily set his own accent, by the selection of a specific aspect of the myth but also by using his imagination to elaborate the depicted scene.

In this context Juntunen gives a thorough discussion of the following mythological scenes, which, she argues, were painted by Rubens as demonstrations of his specific ideas about art and artistry: The Rape of the Daughters of Leucippus (Munich, Alte Pinakothek), Juno and Argus (Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum), Ixion Deceived by Juno (Paris, Musée du Louvre), The Daughters of Cecrops Discovering Erichthonius (Vienna, Liechtenstein Museum), Perseus and Andromeda (St. Petersburg, Hermitage) and The Battle of the Amazons (Munich, Alte Pinakothek).

In a very detailed way Juntunen interprets The Rape of the Daughters of Leucippus as an example of a creative and emulative
appropriation of the canonical highlights of Italian cinquecento painting. In this particular case, Rubens seeks to demonstrate his ability to harmonise the Tuscan-Roman style and Venetian colour by referring for the former to Michelangelo and Giambologna in particular, and to Titian for the latter. Thus Rubens seems here to seamlessly connect with the art theoretical discussions on disegno, colorito and paragone which had been so instrumental in making possible the revolutionary stylistic innovation heralded by Annibale Carracci shortly before 1600.

The next chapter of the book (“Kunststücke der Malerei”) is devoted to a very specific interpretation of a group of four paintings which Juntunen discusses as interrelated compositions. She considers their particular subject matter as well as their specific stylistic treatment as connected with a number of topical art theoretical issues. She interprets Juno and Argus as a demonstration of painting’s mimetic power, an aspect that is further examined in her discussion of Ixion deceived by Juno. This picture is presented by Juntunen as a striking visualisation of inganno degli occhi, the acme of optical illusion, a pictorial quality which from antiquity onward had always been stressed as the summit of artistic virtuosity. According to Juntunen, Rubens demonstrates in his Daughters of Cecrops Discovering Eriochthonius how _ars_ and _natura_ are to be considered the point of departure for all artistic creativity. He also, she contends, visualizes in this work his view that sculpture should be regarded as superior to painting, and enhances her argument by referring to Rubens’s own views as defined in his _De Imitatione Statuarum_. The _Peragone_ and _Andromeda_ in the Hermitage is also considered to express Rubens’s art theoretical views with the mythological figures representing, according to Juntunen, _ingenium_ and _studium_ as two essential conditions for fruitful artistic activity. Rubens also addresses the issue of _paragone_ by modelling the naked figure of Andromeda on the ancient statue of Venus of Cnidos. It looks as if Rubens has infused this famous Greek sculpture with flesh and blood, a demonstration as it were of his view that a painter should refrain from imitating cold marble too literally. That this work should be regarded as a painted art-theoretical allegory is further supported by the fact that around the same time Rubens painted a second version of the composition, only slightly different from the Hermitage painting, as one of the _trompe l’œil_ frescoes decorating the outer wall of his studio, which – as has been brilliantly demonstrated by Elizabeth McGrath – visualize, as it were, his particular art theoretical views.

Juntunen’s final chapter is devoted to a thorough discussion of the Munich _Battle of the Amazons_. Here the author makes clear how in this case Rubens built up his composition by ingeniously integrating motives from the four most famous High Renaissance battle scenes: Leonardo da Vinci’s _Battle of Anghiari_, Michelangelo’s _Battle of the Centaurs_, Raphael’s _Battle of Constantine_ and Titian’s _Battle of Cadore_. Thus the Munich panel can be seen as one of the most brilliant examples in Rubens’s entire oeuvre of creative _aemulatio_.

The pressure of time may well be responsible for a limited number of minor flaws: contrary to Juntunen’s claim (p. 23, n. 100), Erik Duverger’s publication of inventories of seventeenth-century Antwerp art collections was completed in 2002, followed in 2004 by an index of names; the modello for the front of the _Arcus Ferdinandi_ from the 1635 _Pompa Introitus_ series has long been lost and is certainly not identical with the copy, possibly from Rubens’s workshop, now in the Rubenshuis (p. 39, fig. 3); the reference (p. 82) to the church of Santa Maria Novella in Rome should read Chiesa Nuova Santa Maria in Vallicella; _The Daughters of Cecrops Discovering Eriochthonius_ no longer hangs in Vaduz but is one of the treasures of the recently opened Liechtenstein Museum in Vienna; leaving aside Cornelis van der Geest, the first known proprietor of the _Battle of the Amazons_ was the Duc de Richelieu and not his great-uncle, the more famous Cardinal Richelieu. Some quotations from Dutch publications contain transcription errors, such as the quotation from Carl Van de Velde’s monograph on Frans Floris’s house (p. 115). A final remark on the book’s layout: this monograph would have benefited from additional illustrations, especially for comparative material. But apart from these rather pedantic remarks, Evelina Juntunen’s tentative interpretation of a selection of Rubens’s mythological compositions as pictorial visualisations of his ambitions as a _pictor doctus_ provides stimulating reading. Her essays are pioneering work and it is my sincere hope that this fresh look at a particularly important segment of the artist’s oeuvre will inspire further research on Rubens’s sublime interpretation of ancient culture and especially for the study of his paintings with mythological subject matter.

Hans Vlieghe
Rubenianum, Antwerp


Lisa Rosenthal’s _Gender, Politics and Allegory in the Art of Rubens_ is an ambitious project, covering three fundamental aspects of Rubens’s pictorial rhetoric. The aim of the book is to demonstrate the key role of gender in the artist’s political allegories. The first chapter clearly sets out the author’s methodology as a combination of semiotics and psychoanalysis, while at the same time situating Rubens’s paintings in their historical and iconographical context and within their contemporary reception. Rosenthal also considers how meaning evolves in Rubens’s own oeuvre not only through the preparatory stages of the sketch and repeated engagement with themes, but also across different pictorial genres. Psychoanalysis is presented as a complement to an iconographical interpretation, to address aspects of the paintings for which, she posits, there was no language before the twentieth century: themes of male empowerment and disempowerment in relation to women, of identification with and disassociation from the feminine, possession and loss, as they are dramatized in the representation of male and female figures in Rubens’s paintings.

Rosenthal shows how these concerns were articulated in Rubens’s day in the allegories of Rubens’s predecessors, particularly his teacher, Otto van Veen, and in a wide range of literature, from satires on domestic life to moral philosophy and political treatises. She emphasizes the multivalent nature of Rubens’s allegories as a key element of the pleasure of their interpretation on several interconnected levels. For example, she argues that the notion of masculine autonomy at the heart of Neo-Stoic moral philosophy was founded on the very anxieties towards the feminine that have since been identified and analyzed in Freudian psychoanalysis. She argues that in the Lipisian Neo-Stoic philosophy advocated by Rubens and his milieu, masculine identity was expressed in terms of perceived sexual difference, as an internal struggle against ‘womanish vices.’ Rosenthal also demonstrates how the masculine hero was invoked by Lipsius as a model for the political leader who must suppress the forces of revolt. Although the study is structured as a series of case studies of paintings which are not ordered chronologically, and the semiotic approach emphasizes a reception-based interpretation, the role of Rubens as maker remains crucial to the project.

Rubens’s activities as diplomat to the Spanish crown endowed him with a privileged political perspective quite unique among artists
of his day, adding an extra rhetorical charge to his allegories on the benefits of peace and the horrors of war. Also at stake is Rubens’s position in regard to the mentalities of his own day. The paintings that form the key part of Rosenthal’s study are ostensibly part of a moralizing allegorical discourse of oppositions based on perceived sexual difference; however, Rosenthal proposes that Rubens’s paintings exceed those of his predecessors by exposing in various ways the instability and contingent nature of gender as a cultural construction. For Rosenthal the insistent physicality of Rubens’s figures and the complex interaction between them complicates their legible, allegorical function. The cumulative impression of the book is that Rubens was also deeply ambivalent about the role of men and women within the humanist construction of masculine virtue that he formally advocated.

The book consists of six chapters, three of which are based on material previously published in articles. Rubens’s group portraits of the family are used to frame the whole book, leading to his representation of peace in the London Minerva Protects Pax from Mars in the first chapter, while the last chapter is devoted to Rubens’s portraits of his wife and children. In the second chapter, Rosenthal underlines the centrality of maternity in Rubens’s rhetoric for the desirability of peace, according to conventions that he had formulated earlier through family portraits. Rosenthal demonstrates how these portraits articulated the prevailing patriarchal vision of family, and how Rubens invoked this same rhetoric in his painting for Charles I, thus making a crucial link between ideologies of fatherhood and kingship. She suggests that Rubens was the first to focus on the exclusion of the father from the family, which was a consequence of this prevalent idea of virtue, and also on the problems that arose from it. She sees Rubens’s portraits of his family as a subjective account of the ‘dispossession’ at stake in the father’s necessary exclusion from the domestic realm, the implications of which for Rubens as an artist are explored in the last chapter of the book.

Rubens’s ambivalence towards traditional ideals of heroic masculinity is explored in the following two chapters, emphasizing the complexity in Rubens’s oeuvre of interactions between either Venus or one of her manifestations, and a masculine hero resembling Mars or Hercules. Traditionally, the significance of Venus was ambiguous because she was the goddess of both sensuality and maternal love, which could be interpreted as vice and virtue. So, too, the meaning of Mars as god of war and aggression was unstable and contingent on his relationship to Venus, and vice versa. Chapter three opens with two versions of The Hero Crowned by Victory (Munich and Kassel) and the conflicting desires provoked in the hero by the surrounding feminine figures. The first version is contextualized within the moralizing, allegorical tradition of the Christian Knight, in which the internal struggle against the passions was represented in terms of a violent suppression of women. Rosenthal argues that in Rubens’s painting, the hero’s attempts to subjugate the women and his uneasy reaction to the female personifications undermines rather than emphasizes his moral superiority over them. She presents a number of paintings in which she identifies aggression and warfare as the unfortunate consequence of the exclusion of the masculine hero from the positive, disarming influence of women, exemplified by Venus imploring Mars to restrain his fury in the Pitti Palace Horrors of War.

Drunken Hercules (Dresden) was listed in Rubens’s inventory as a pendant to the Hero Crowned. However, Rosenthal does not analyze them in the conventional way in terms of opposition or contrast, but rather at the beginning and end of the chapter, as poles of Rubens’s evolving ideas about empowerment and disempowerment. For Rosenthal, Drunken Hercules reflected Rubens’s preoccupation with the bacchic world of ecstatic loss of boundaries, which she characterizes as his desire for identification with the feminine world of maternity. However, the way in which the material is presented does suggest that Rubens and his milieu considered the bacchic condition to be permanent and defining (in other words in opposition to the heroic), but there is also ample evidence that bacchic behavior and laughter were perceived as a necessary temporary release from civic responsibility. In social custom this took the form of carnival and other such public festivities. Nor can a moralizing disposition always be assumed in Rubens’s audience, since pastoral scenes of the hero dallying with his lover held an important place in epic literature.

Two paintings, Hercules Mocked by Omphale (Louvre) and Venus Lamenting Adonis (private collection), are analyzed in the fourth chapter as scenes of men dominated by women. The case that they were conceived as pendants in the form of marriage allegories by their patron, Gian Vincenzo Imperiale, needs to be made more persuasively. Rosenthal presents a wide range of contemporary literature reflecting anxieties about women’s dominance in the domestic sphere, which lead her to a detailed psychoanalytical reading of Hercules Mocked by Omphale. She also draws on contemporary reception of this painting as evidence that it provoked a titillating pleasure in the viewer, as the heroic male who identifies with the feminine yet ultimately emerges with his masculinity intact, which the author explains in terms of Freudian theories of castration anxiety and the substitution of the phallus as fetish. A combined iconographical and psychoanalytical reading is applied to Venus and Adonis, which is read as a tragic recasting of this narrative of masculine loss.

The chapter ‘Occasio: violence and allegory’ is a culmination of Rosenthal’s complex argumentation around the mechanisms of gender and power in Rubens’s allegorical paintings. It is a thorough iconographical and psychoanalytical account of a workshop copy made after Rubens’s lost Occasio allegory, an image now little known but demonstrably of great importance in the seventeenth century. The allegorical conceit, as Rosenthal presents it, is that of the hero taking the opportunity to make peace. Rosenthal provides a fascinating iconographical account of the evolution of the personification of Occasio in Rubens’s preparatory sketches and the final composition, from a captive being pulled along by her forearm to a bride offered to the hero. The author’s intricate psychoanalytical reading of the composition involves an analysis of violence as a constituent part of allegorical language, culminating in a detailed exposition of the hero’s Medusa shield according to Freudian psychology, as a ‘shield’ against castration anxiety combined with the fear of female procreativity.

Rosenthal’s book offers an alternative reading of Rubens, usually considered an extremely self-confident artist who was absolutely at ease with his place in the world. It builds on Svetlana Alpers’s study of Rubens’s artistic creativity and identification with the feminine, and Margaret Carroll’s work on gender and violence in Rubens’s political allegories. It asks us to re-think the tendency to cast Rubens’s identity into distinct public and private roles, and to see him instead as an artist whose domestic life directly informed his paintings in the service of politics. It is well written and persuasive, and the focus on the construction of political power through gender is particularly compelling. The psychoanalytical interpretation is not applied consistently throughout the book, with the most sustained application of Freudian psychoanalysis only introduced in chapters four and five. The book is overall a thought-provoking contribution to Rubens scholarship.

Lucy Davis

Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts

National Gallery of Art

This is an excellent catalogue of an exemplary show which studies the evolution of Rubens’s Adoration of the Magi. The painting, now in the Prado, was commissioned for the Antwerp Town Hall in 1609, then given to a Spanish diplomat, Rodrigo Calderón, in 1613, then revised by Rubens himself in 1628/9, when, after Calderón’s disgrace, it entered the royal collection. Conveniently there is a copy of the painting as it was in 1609 (London, private collection). The catalogue includes a detailed technical examination made during its recent restoration, which shows that almost all the painting was modified by Rubens in a way that sometimes subtly, sometimes substantially, changed the impact of the painting. Only the kneeling king (and even he has had a few tailoring adjustments to his cuff) and his page are unchanged. Much of the catalogue is devoted to mapping and interpreting these changes, which offer invaluable insights into the artist’s own reassessment of his painting.

In his essay in the volume, Joost Vander Auwera uses new archival material to show how Rubens’s painting was originally destined for the south wall of the state room in the Antwerp Town Hall and was finished, he suspects, before the signing of the truce on 9 April 1609 and certainly before January 1610. (Given the present taste for black frames it is worth noting an original gold frame is documented.) This location suggests that Rubens’s painting was lit with morning sunlight from the left and approached from the right. The painting certainly does seem to have an off-right principal view, which accords with this placement in the room. On the opposite wall was Abraham Janssen’s Allegory of Antwerp and the River Scheldt (Antwerp, Royal Museum). Both paintings were surrounded by portraits of the dukes of Brabant, by Antonio de Succa, reinforcing the right of the Habsburg archdukes Albert and Isabella to rule the city – with the aid of the Virgin, Antwerp’s protector.

The authors interpret the porters on the right of the painting and the Magi themselves as representing trade, and thus having a special significance for Antwerp (see Dan Ewing’s article in the forthcoming volume of essays accompanying the exhibition Extravagant. A Forgotten Chapter of Antwerp Painting, Antwerp and Maastricht, 2005-06, in: Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen, 2004-05.) I suspect however, that depictions of the Adoration of the Magi were particularly informed by the Renaissance tradition of grand formal entrances to cities with impressive entourages, and the many examples of Italian Adorations support this view. What is certain is that Rubens’s treatment is distinctive. Vergara rightly casts a large net to interpret the imagery ranging from antique statues and reliefs through Rubens’s life drawings to works by Elsheimer and Michelangelo.

Rubens’s 1609 version of the Prado Adoration was emphatically relief-like in its layout. This characteristic seems to be more than an imitation of the Antwerp taste for painted wooden sculpture. Rather, here we have Rubens’s antiquarian interest in ancient Roman sarcophagi projected into paint. In his reworking of the picture in 1628 it is notable that he allows a little more diagonal emphasis, and there is further breaking into the foreground relief to create pictorial depth but the artist remains true to his original conception. Curiously, although Rubens was anxious to update his finish to a softer, more Titan-like style, he also sought to retain the integrity of the original concept, even to the extent of repositioning elements such as the camel driver to the right in the extended canvas. The c.1613 Caledonian Boar Hunt (recently acquired by the J. Paul Getty Museum and reproduced on the title-page of this issue) provides an interesting parallel; that picture is forced into the mould of a classical relief of the same subject, and Rubens was evidently satisfied with the composition, which essentially he retained in a later version (Vienna). It is interesting that the reconstructions of ancient paintings that Rubens made for the decoration of the façade of his own house were also reminiscent of ancient relief compositions, just as his early mythologies are inspired by ancient sarcophagi. The Adoration should be read as an ancient Roman composition recast in a Christian context.

Of course, like all of Rubens’s compositions, the work is informed by his wide interest in post-antique sources, especially Renaissance ones. Vergara draws attention to the motif of the horse bending its head to its lifted left leg, which Rubens introduced into his expanded composition in 1628 and which he took from Titian’s Adoration of the Magi (Escorial, Monastero di San Lorenzo). He also finds the Venetian’s influence in the standing porter. In the latter case the inspiration is literally copied from Raphael – at least via a Marcantonio print (Man Carrying Base of Column [The Illustrated Bartsch, vol. 27, p. 148-9]), but we can imagine many routes for this transmission to Rubens. Heroically athletic porters were, somewhat oddly, employed in the foreground of High Renaissance and Mannerist paintings following Raphael’s Coronation of Charlemagne to funnel the eye to the principal action in the middle distance. Instead Rubens uses them to advertize his admiration of the Herculean physiques of antiquity and Michelangelo. So excited is he by this aspect that he even forgets to clothe one of them in the oil-sketch for the painting. The back of the man unloading the camel who has been moved to the right is again from an ancient Roman source. A workshop copy of a Rubens drawing shows this is directly based on the antique statue of Two Wrestlers in the Uffizi (M. van der Meulen Corpus Rubenianum, fig 177). These minor observations only further emphasize the profound influence of Rubens’s Italian trip on his painting.

The catalogue has numerous and useful details of the Prado painting. One only misses a reproduction of the didactic photograph included in the exhibition which traced out the infrared scan of the Capture of Samson (Chicago, The Art Institute); this has Rubens’s first draft of the Adoration of the Magi underneath the paint layer of the Old Testament scene. But this is indeed little to complain of in an otherwise excellent publication. It is hard to think of a better survey of a single work.

David Jaffé
National Gallery, London

Ever since the correspondence between Jan Brueghel the Elder and his benefactor in Milan, Cardinal Federico Borromeo, was brought into circulation the reference by the Velvet Brueghel to Peter Paul Rubens as his secretary has brought bemusement to historians of Netherlandish art. Imagine Bloemen-Brueghel referring to the aristocrat among painters as an epistolary assistant! Comparison between Rubens’s polished epistles and Brueghel’s phonetic rendering of Italian reinforced the assumption that the two painters moved in different spheres: one a man of the world; the other the mass producer of humble pictures. Now read the publicity of an exhibition, which opened at the Getty Museum, now to be seen at the Mauritshuis in The Hague. The two painters, it appears, collaborated in the production of nearly two dozen paintings, in which the presence of the one does not minimize the role of the other. They forged a bond; it was a fruitful friendship; their collaboration was a partnership of equals. In the parlance of humanist friendship – *s six notarius!* – they were, indeed, each other’s secretary.

The Mauritshuis since long owns one of the truly spectacular examples of the two artists’ joint authorship. It is *The Garden of Eden*, produced in c. 1617, which sparkles with the greenery of a freshly created world, the variegated colorations of creatures and the warm flesh-tones of the first parents (cat. no. 4). The Getty, in its turn, proudly displayed its recent acquisition, the unusually large *Return from War: Mars Disarmed by Venus*, painted about seven years earlier in c. 1610 (cat. no. 2). It is an early example of the kind of “encyclopedic allegory” that would find its apogee in the famous Madrid allegories of the five senses, one of which, the *Allegory of Taste*, the Prado generously lent to the exhibition (cat. no. 8). It makes eminent sense that the Getty Museum and the Mauritshuis, both known for technical expertise in the examination of small-format, precious paintings, would enter into a partnership of their own and dedicate an exhibition to the “working friendship” of Antwerp’s premier painters.

A visit to take in the visual experience of the pictures and to admire their installation was not in the cards. This review is based exclusively on the richly illustrated catalogue of the twenty-nine works that form the exhibition. Consisting of three parts, this handsome publication opens with an essay by Anne Woollett, continues with extensive catalogue entries by Woollett and Ariane van Suchtelen, and concludes with a technical essay by conservators, Tiarna Doherty, Mark Leonard, and Jørgen Wadum.

Entitled *Two Celebrated Painters: The Collaborative Ventures of Rubens and Brueghel, ca. 1598-1625*, Woollett’s essay settles once and for all that the painters were equally eminent and that Brueghel, not Rubens, was the chief impresario of these delectable fantasies. The careers of the two men are outlined in separate sections beginning with Brueghel, who, like his father, traveled to Italy for a visit that lasted from c. 1590 until May 1595. In Rome he studied with the landscape painter Paul Bril and improved his hand through copying drawings by the late Matthijs Bril. The Bril brothers capitalized on the taste in Rome for easel paintings with landscape subjects including not just generic panoramic views, but also coastal scenes, marine paintings, hermitage landscapes, fire and sub-terranean landscapes. In c. 1593, Bril and Brueghel drew the attention of an important ecclesiastical prodigy, Federico Borromeo, who would dedicate his career at the papal curia and in Milan to the institutions of Catholic Reform. The young cardinal likely was drawn to Brueghel by virtue of his association with Paul Bril and the perception of his family name as a marketable brand in the picture market. In any case, he took him into his service and tutored him in the invention of pictorial novelties that were meant to function as doctrine-free visual therapy in the cabinet of a Christian gentleman. Brueghel returned to Antwerp in the Fall of 1596, four years before Rubens left for Italy in 1600, affording the painters a brief period to meet and collaborate on the piece that opens the exhibition, *The Battle of the Amazons* of c. 1597 (cat. no. 1). Rubens returned in 1608 and with cultural revival in sight opted for Antwerp as his permanent base. The *Return from War* signals the resumption of his friendship with Brueghel, who was already into the second decade of his Antwerp career. In tracing Rubens’s career Woollett discusses other instances of collaboration: his efforts to combine history with imposing still-lifes by Frans Snyders or altering a landscape by Paul Bril to customize a souvenir of Tivoli (figs. 26 and 29). The essay closes with further cultural analysis of a partnership of equals that was based on “mutually held principles” and presents itself as the culmination of a tradition that is rooted in the Ghent altarpiece and the various forms of collaboration that evolved in the production of illuminated manuscripts and the weaving of tapestries. The final essay, entitled *Brueghel and Rubens at Work: Technique and Practice of Collaboration*, presents the technical evidence of a fluid process of concept, design and execution by which two excellent talents manage to unite their distinctive styles of brushwork and individual visual modes into homogenous pictures that proclaim the fulsome beauty of Antwerp painting.

Of the twenty-nine paintings in the show, thirteen are by our eminent duo. These are followed by other partnerships including Jan’s collaborations with Hans Rottenhammer, Hendrick de Clerck, and Hendrick van Balen as well as Rubens’s collaboration with Snyders in the *Diana Returning from the Hunt* from Dresden and the Vienna *Medusa*. The catalogue ends with five solo works: two Brueghels in the Getty collection: a preaching scene and an *Entry into Noah’s Ark*. The latter was a stock-in-trade subject that earned the painter the nickname Paradise-Brueghel (cat. nos. 25-29). Two panels with animal studies reveal Brueghel’s considerable skill as a draughtsman. The final picture, on view in The Hague only, is Rubens’s oil sketch for the second version of his altarpiece for the Oratorians in Rome. With its famous division of iconic image and rhetoric of praise it prepared the way for the highly successful Garland Madonnas and other Garland imagery, which follow the conceit of suspending an iconic image of providential deities within the accumulation of tributes to their beneficence.

The catalogue entries are extensive and richly illustrated. The many figures complete our knowledge of the collaborative works with images of the garlands from Munich and Glasgow and the missing Prado allegories (figs. 1, 54-47, and 83). The catalogue refrains from speculation on collaborative efforts that have left their traces in the artistic literature but cannot be firmly related to existing works. For instance, was there a prototype for the Martha and Mary pictures co-produced by Brueghel’s son and Rubens (a charming example survives in Dublin) and did Rubens and Brueghel produce other types of Madonnas for Albert and Isabella, such as a purported *Forest Madonna with Forget-me-nots*?

Nor does the catalogue touch upon collaboration as a joining of two poetical modes that create a new kind of allegory. In the Getty *Mars and Venus* Rubens casts the theme of the end of the war as a
fable, whereas Brueghel presents a visual atlas of all possible motifs that can be brought to bear upon the topic. In this sort of production, Rubens is the expert of the mythical allegory, whereas Brueghel excels in the encyclopedic still-life. Together they established a fertile method, rooted in the rhetorical devise of definitio per descriptionem, for creating an endless stream of pictures that treat the abstract themes of a well-ordered universe (the seasons, the months, the elements, the continents, the senses, etc.) through the enumeration of objects that pertain to them. A method, by the way, that was already prefigured in the art of Hieronymus Bosch and Pieter Bruegel the Elder. In the Garland pictures, the Paradise Landscapes, and the Allegories of the Senses and the Elements, Brueghel’s encyclopedic genius prevails, whereas in Pan and Syrinx or the scenes from Diana’s Hunts, the Rubensian fable is dominant.

One of the matrices for these joint exercises is court culture as it flowered under the Dukes of Brabant and their Habsburg heirs in the past and was re-energized with the arrival of Albert and Isabella in the present. Achelous’ Feast may have originated as a witty reprise of the theme of the banquet as a satirical genre that by exaggerating the excesses of a banquet at court corrects the behavior of courtiers (cat. no. 3). The Allegory of Taste, now set in an imaginary room near Albert’s favorite hunting lodge, repeats the theme (cat. no. 8). The Vision of St. Hubert depicts the conversion of a reputed Habsburg ancestor in the forest of Soignies and underscores the importance of that forest in the spiritual vocation of his modern descendants (cat. no. 7). Gardens filled with flowers form another court theme. In fact, it is not clear whether the riot of flowers in the various allegories and garlands reflects or stimulated the faror hortensis that took early seventeenth-century Europe by storm.

Each picture in this show is a rich summary of a generic tradition or a cultural discourse. The publication of this beautiful catalogue invites the continued exploration of a gamma of cultural poetics that stimulated the origination and reception of pictures that are virtually inexhaustible in their visual riches.

Leopoldine van Hogendorp Prosperetti
Baltimore

Seventeenth-Century Dutch


The work of the cultural historian Herman Roodenburg has long been of interest to art historians who share his fascination with codes of civility in early modern social discourse. In this book, Roodenburg builds upon a series of insightful conference papers and journal articles to explore in depth a central theme of his research: the significance of elegant, cultivated posture and gesture as an attribute of social distinction among the elite classes in seventeenth-century Holland.

For art historians interested in decoding any work of Dutch art in which the human figure is represented, this study offers important insights. From Roodenburg’s careful reading of courtesy manuals, diaries, and other primary sources, we learn that the contrast between the flat-footed awkwardness of peasants depicted by Ostade and Steen and the graceful deportment of wealthy citizens portrayed by Hals, TerBorch and others is not just a pictorial convention, but a reflection of contemporary practice. The conscious separation between natural and genteel behavior served an essential function in controlling social discourse. Erect bearing, moderate gestures, and a habitual stance akin to classical contrapposto were inculcated in children of the upper classes through a variety of activities such as dancing, riding and fencing. These qualities were consistently advocated in instructional manuals for these sports and for the cultivation of polite conversation and manners. An intriguing recurrent theme is the close parallel between the ideals advocated in courtesy books and those found in texts on the techniques of acting and painting.

An exemplary case throughout the book is the family of Constantijn Huygens, secretary to Stadhouder Frederik Hendrik. Huygens’s diaries and other ‘egodocumenten’ provide an especially rich archive of information about this family and its rising social status. Their story is of interest not only for biographical data about the remarkable individuals who belonged to this clan, but also as a model for the upward mobility of Holland’s burgher elite. It is clear that Huygens took a sustained interest in rearing his sons Constantijn the Younger, Christiana and Lodewijk to look, live and behave like gentlemen, even going so far as to submit the adolescent Constantijn to a painful operation to correct an unattractive kink in his neck. A highlight of their education was foreign travel, especially to France, where they could perfect their social skills through daily practice in genteel conversation.

Most of the sources Roodenburg cites were written or published originally in languages other than Dutch, not for lack of indigenous texts, but because the educated upper classes preferred to read, write and converse in French or Italian. Dutch translations of courtesy books, by the time they appeared, were aimed at a more plebian market. Roodenburg relies frequently on inventories of the libraries of the Huygenses and their contemporaries for evidence of their interests and concerns. It is a fair assumption that men who owned copies of Castiglione’s Courtier and other manuals of civility, as well as books on fencing, horsemanship, and other polite activities, made a point of being knowledgeable about these topics. To offer one small quibble, however, I wonder if Roodenburg’s tendency to accept this evidence at face value is too generous. Owners of large libraries do not always read every book they possess, nor do they necessarily practice all the activities described there. Certainly, the building of a library for its own sake was less common in the seventeenth century, when books were more precious commodities than they are now, but ownership of several different copies or editions of the same text suggests the acquisitive passion of the collector as much as the reader’s interest in the book’s contents. Nevertheless, to the extent that displaying one’s library in the home provided a mute demonstration of one’s education and interests, the owner of such books could certainly present himself to his visitors as well-informed on the polite arts. Books and other domestic accessories, as well as clothes, made the man – but, as Roodenburg shows, physical deportment was an even more essential quality by which civility was literally embodied.

Following a general introduction to the problems and methods at hand, the discussion is divided into chapters that establish the cultural context of life in the Dutch Republic, the centrality of physical grace to the concept of self-fashioning, and the consistent emphasis on bodily ideals in the arts of painting, acting and preaching. An important central focus is the sociological concept of habitus, or behavior so well-ingrained as to be practiced habitually, without conscious thought. To achieve this instinctive level of response requires repetitive practice, preferably at a young age, and this
method was applied to the education of the Huygens boys and others of their class. Castiglione’s concept of sprezzatura, or seemingly artless grace, defines the ideal end product of such a campaign, although Roodenburg clarifies the distinction between the more artificial and self-aggrandizing conduct of the sixteenth-century courtier and the later, French-inspired ideal of the honnête homme, whose manners were more understated and whose primary aims were to charm and to please.

Of most direct interest to art historians will be Chapter 4, “Painting and Civility.” Here, Roodenburg shows that not only did the depiction of the figure by painters such as Steen and TerBorch reflect contemporary codes of manners, but both the paintings themselves and the painters’ manuals written by Karel van Mander, Samuel van Hoogstraten, Gerard de Lairesse and Arnold Houbraken were recommended by writers on manners as sources of instruction for personal conduct. Indeed, in their practical advice to painters on how to construct a pose or display an emotion, these authors offer unusually specific and concrete descriptions of pervasive ideals. Thus, texts composed for the education of artists take their place alongside courtesy books as essential clues to, and manuals for, the practice of civility. Furthermore, as demonstrated in the next chapter, there is a particular reciprocity between acting and painting: the actor’s body, like the figure on the canvas, is artfully composed to express conventions of status, character and mood. This applies both to individual figures and to interactions among groups. (For instance, in both theatrical scenes and painted cityscapes, the most important person in a cluster of figures is usually placed in the middle.)

Although Dutch painting can no longer be understood as a transparent “mirror of everyday life,” body language is such a fundamental component of social discourse that its construction in figure painting, to be intelligible to its audience, must express a widely accepted code of conduct. Roodenburg’s exemplary study makes this point from a variety of angles, and his extensive bibliography provides a treasure trove of sources that deserve to be further mined for clues to the relationships between pictorial imagery and its social context. Clear, well-organized and straightforward, Roodenburg’s prose makes his thoroughly researched conclusions look inevitable, even easy: like its subjects, a model of savoir faire.

Stephanie S. Dickey
Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario


(The review first appeared in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, May 3, 2006)

Joseph Heller, in Picture this (1988, p. 59): “Rembrandt did some fifty-two self-portraits that have come down to us, and several of these Rembrandts are not by him. It is hard to conceive of self-portraits not executed by the subject, but here they are.”

Ernst van de Wetering, in The Self-Portraits, vol. 4 (2005, p. 89) of A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings (begun 1968): “There is one category of non-authentic self-portraits whose existence became clear to us only when we had virtually completed this volume of the Corpus. This category of ‘self-portraits’ of Rembrandt was executed by workshop assistants or pupils. . . . The discovery imposes drastic limitations on the effectiveness of the methods, presumed to be objective, that we had initially hoped could introduce order into the group of paintings long taken to be Rembrandt’s self-portraits. . . . Indeed, the fact that the usefulness of these ‘objective’ methods of authentication was undermined by the discovery of the category of ‘self-portraits’ painted by other workshop members is due entirely to our effort to apply those methods as consistently as possible.”

How is it possible that a plain, essential fact, obvious to an attentive non-art historian like Joseph Heller, could have remained invisible to a famous team of Rembrandt specialists until it undermined their methods of authentication? At the end of this review I will answer that question, but first . . .

In 1968 a group of Dutch art historians submitted to the Netherlands Organization for Scientific and Scholarly Research (NWO, then ZWO) a successful grant proposal for a large-scale study of the paintings of Rembrandt van Rijn. The group called itself the Rembrandt Research Project (RRP) and its publication A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings. The object of the proposal was a scholarly question of some significance: “What statements can be made concerning the authenticity and autograph nature of the paintings attributed to Rembrandt on the basis of research concerning material structure and stylistic properties, iconological interpretation and documentary facts?” In support of this aim, all documents related to the issue were to be reproduced. The project was to be completed within ten years.

In the event, none of these aims was achieved. Because the scientific evidence in the Corpus concerning the “material structure” of Rembrandt’s paintings consisted almost entirely, where it existed at all, of research conducted by a large assortment of third parties, it was incomplete, mutually incompatible and inconclusive. Iconology played almost no part when it came to the determination of authenticity. The relevant documents were not reproduced or used as evidence for authenticity, and ten years after 1968 the RRP had yet to publish the first of a series of volumes. Nor did the RRP make good on its other stated aims: no uniform criteria for responsible attributions were defined, no group of core works singled out as reference points, no controllable vocabulary established. Instead, the RRP went straight ahead with attributions of its own, in the same strain of stylistic and qualitative analysis that connoisseurs had always employed and that had gotten its predecessors into the very quandary from which the RRP wished to escape.

Yet, when vol. 1 of A Corpus appeared in 1982 (vol. 2 came out in 1986, vol. 3 in 1989), it was greeted with widespread enthusiasm. The idea had taken hold, abetted by the publicity surrounding the publication, that the RRP had succeeded in founding a new connoisseurship, more firmly based on system and science than previous methods. The field seemed inclined to accept that the RRP had made good on the proud ambition proclaimed in 1969 by the project leader, Josua Bruyn. The aim of the Project, he said at a high-power symposium in Chicago, was to frame “a precise definition of our observations and of the standards by which we interpret them. Only thus will our opinions become rational judgments.”

1. Letter to the editor of NRC Handelsblad, 24 January 1992, by Herman Colenbrander, secretary of the Foundation for Art History Research.
Fast forward to 2005. On p. vi of vol. 4, we read a disclaimer, drafted with the help of two lawyers, stating that “the opinions expressed in this volume (IV), and the previously published volumes I-III in the Series A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings, should be understood as ‘opinions’ that are meant for academic use only.” And more in this vein. Not only has the RRP toned down its claims for the judgements in vol. 4, it has also disavowed the ideology and degraded the judgements previously published in vols. 1-3.

In the early 1990s the RRP underwent a change of leadership. Josua Bruyn and three of the other founding members of the group resigned en bloc because they were unable to agree with the fifth man, Ernst van de Wetering, who now took over the Project on his own. Vol. 4 reflects his new way of doing things. The main changes:

- The ideal of connoisseurship by committee, which was intended to reduce the subjectivity of attributions, has been abandoned.
- The much criticized grading system of the RRP has been discarded. In vols. 1-3 A stood for genuine Rembrandt, C for definitely not by Rembrandt, while B meant that the RRP could not make up its mind. (This was the case for only 12 of the 280 paintings with main entries.) The entries in vol. 4 are given the Roman-Arabic numbers IV 1 to IV 29.
- The organization of the Corpus has been restyled. Vols. 1-3 covered chronological periods from 1625 to 1642. Vol. 4 adds only the small number of self-portraits that had not yet been published in the earlier volumes, while offering reappraisals of some already catalogued. Since the RRP intends to deal with all of the remaining 200-odd candidate Rembrandts in a single volume 5, whatever system resided in the division of the volumes has been undone.
- The composition of the Corpus has been transformed. Vols. 1-3 contain entries on 280 paintings with brief prefatory essays and appendixes. Vol. 4 consists mainly of lengthy texts by Van de Wetering (more than 270 pages), Mariët de Winkel on costume, Karin Groen on painting ground and Jaap van der Veen on documentation, followed by entries on 29 paintings. The ratio of essays to entries has increased by a factor of 20. The essays are unfortunately buried in monumental Corpus volumes costing 1000 euros, where they will be inaccessible to most art historians.
- Van de Wetering pays more attention than did Bruyn et al. to questions of condition and is more receptive to the possibility of collaboration or later intervention. This is very much to the good, and brings the Corpus more into line with current thinking about studio practice and the history of restoration.
- High-quality color reproductions have been added, which contribute greatly to the functionality of the book. Previous volumes were nearly exclusively in black and white, as much a matter of principled mistrust of color reproductions, I assume, as of cost.
- What brought Ernst van de Wetering to execute these changes? “Reviewing the three past decades,” he writes in the preface to vol. 4, “it is evident that this project – as with every project attempting to chart a complex phenomenon – is not only a path to resolving the problems involved, but also a learning process.”
- From whom, we may ask, has Van de Wetering learned? The answer lies in the footnotes. His prefatory essay contains 47 references to publications that have appeared since 1982. Of these, 29 are to his own writings and another 14 to publications by junior members or associates of the RRP working under him. Only four refer to outside authors. None of these are reviewers of a preceding volume or scholarly critics of the Project. Van de Wetering’s lessons, it seems, come from himself.

Van de Wetering’s lessons to himself are not all bad. A felicitous change is that the terms in which attributions are discussed are richer, more personal and less categorical than in vols. 1-3. Van de Wetering introduces a form of probability logic named after the British preacher and mathematician Thomas Bayes (1702-1761), who, according to Van de Wetering, “observed that our beliefs are not all-or-nothing convictions based on simple yes-or-no answers to decisive questions, but rather that there are degrees of belief, that one arrives at a conclusion through inductive reasoning using arguments of varying probability” (p. 109). This is a welcome contribution to the theory of connoisseurship, albeit more as a description of what connoisseurship is not rather than what it is. The entries in the earlier Corpus volumes, with their categorical judgements, are distinctly non-Bayesian. They often give one the uncomfortable feeling that the observations and arguments were massaged to match the conclusion. This was demonstratively the case with regard to judgements concerning the authenticity of the signatures on paintings published in vols. 1-3. The handwriting experts who were called in, twenty years into the Project, were visibly shaken to find that the RRP had approved the authenticity of nearly all the signatures on paintings which they accepted, and disputed the authenticity of the signatures on paintings they rejected. “These statistically improbable high scores . . . are explainable if in a number of cases the researchers had allowed themselves to be guided more by the convincing authenticity of the painting than by the handwriting evidence.”

Equally non-Bayesian is the ratio of “simple yes-or-no answers” (95% in vols. 1-3, categories A and C) to “degrees of belief” (the 5% of category B). By rights the ratio should be closer to the reverse.

Van de Wetering’s discussions of authenticity in vol. 4 are more open to the contradictory evidence that nearly always attends Rembrandt problems. It cannot be said, though, that he has banned the massaging of evidence. When Corpus number C56, a painting in the Berlin of Rembrandt in a feathered cap, was rejected Rembrandt, in 1986 (vol. 2), it was seen not only as uncharacteristic and unusual for Rembrandt, but also suffering from “crammed placing of the figure,” displaying “clumsy heaviness in the appearance of the figure,” with a cap and feather “not really effective in creating depth,” in the chain a “hurried manner of painting [that] is far from effective”, a color scheme with “no parallel in any of Rembrandt’s works from these years.” The upper part of the face was “weak in execution, . . . flat and patchy.” The “transitions from the face to the hair are noticeably weak,” while “the somewhat primitive bravura of the brushstroke . . . does not always help to create clarity in the shape of the head or an effect of depth” and so on (vol. 2, pp. 671-72). Now that Van de Wetering has re-attributed the painting to “Rembrandt and studio,” it has become a “brilliant, broadly painted self-portrait, . . . and a demonstration of Rembrandt’s mastery of the ‘rough manner’” (p. 603) and we read of its “brilliantly applied brushstrokes that are left emphatically visible” (p. 216). At the least, Van de Wetering owes us an explanation of what happened to all those detailed criticisms of virtually every aspect of the painting, in the X-rays as well as the surface, from vol. 2. Analysis of that kind—close observation and quality judgements coupled to an attribution—it was the central contribution of the RRP to art history. We will not

---

5. In vol. 4, p. 216, note 299, Van de Wetering writes of the attribution to Flinck that “this author was not convinced of this attribution (team decisions taken by majority vote could sometimes hold sway over personal opinions).” However, Van de Wetering did not make use of his right to add a dissenting minority opinion to the entry.
learn the lessons that need to be learned from the case of the *Corpus* until a proper critique is written of how that detailed, highly negative judgement from 1986 relates to the lyrical one of 2005. Indeed, not only the credibility of the *Corpus* but of connoisseurship itself is at stake here.

No Rembrandt specialist can consult the *Corpus* without comparing the opinions of the RRP with his or her own. In my book of 1984, *Rembrandt, his Life, his Paintings: A New Biography*, I arrived at many of the same conclusions as those in vol. 4 of the *Corpus*, something that is not always acknowledged there. Concerning *Corpus* no. IV 11, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, Van de Wetering writes, “The authenticity of this painting was never doubted in the literature until 1986, when Tümpel attributed it to an anonymous follower of Rembrandt.” That is inaccurate. I expressed doubt in my book of 1984, p. 380.

Of the 29 entries in vol. 4, I shared the same opinion concerning Rembrandt’s authorship of 26. With regard to the other three paintings, in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza (IV 2), Kassel (IV 9) and Aix-en-Provence (IV 16), whose authorship I doubted in 1984, I am now convinced by the arguments of Van de Wetering and others that they were painted by Rembrandt. Of the seven non-self-portraits in the “Addenda et corrigenda” to vol. 4 that were doubted or rejected in vols. 1-3 and are now accepted by Van de Wetering, I published six as Rembrandts in 1984 (figs. 12-14, 49, 211-12) and expressed a more positive judgement on the seventh (Bredius 633; p. 380) than the RRP. Should one be positively impressed that in the 1980s Van de Wetering put his name to wrongheaded deattributions and has now reversed them without acknowledging that other colleagues did not misguide themselves in the first place?

To return to the question posed above: how could Van de Wetering seriously say that only after years of pursuing a wrong course did he discover an error that was plain for all to see? How could he have imagined that an unstable category such as self-portraiture could provide a basis for “objective” methods of authentication? The answer is that Van de Wetering is mistaken. His claim that this phenomenon was a “discovery” of the Rembrandt Research Project in the early 2000s is demonstrably inaccurate. In vol. 2 of the *Corpus*, published in 1986, the portrait of Rembrandt in Berlin discussed above, previously called a self-portrait, was attributed by the RRP to Flinck (C 56). The painting had been examined in 1968 by Ernst van de Wetering and Simon Levine, who presumably drafted the entry on it in the *Corpus* but in any case co-signed it as authors. That entry includes a forthright acknowledgment of the existence of “self-portraits” painted by other workshop members. Recognition of this category is there said to be “in line with thoughts expressed earlier by [Horst] Gerson [*Rembrandt Paintings*, 1968, p. 66]: “... since we know portraits of Rembrandt by Flinck, we must surely reckon it possible [a misquotation; Gerson wrote, more strongly, ‘plausible’] that other students painted his likeness.” In vol. 4, Van de Wetering footnotes Gerson (with the wrong page number, 62), but downplays his contribution, as if Gerson had not put his finger on a phenomenon Van de Wetering now claims to have discovered. Van de Wetering does not refer at all in this discussion to *Corpus* entry C56, with its matter-of-fact elaboration on Gerson’s findings. In other words, the justification Van de Wetering brings forward for the “drastic limitations on the effectiveness of the methods” applied by the RRP to the self-portraits in vol. 4 is based on an inaccurate claim. This heavy methodological and historical statement in *Self-portraits* misrepresents the record.

The 690 pages of this major publication contain an unimaginably vast wealth of information, much of it new, on “the group of paintings long taken to be Rembrandt’s self-portraits” even while deconstructing that category. Many passages and entries are excellent, indispensable contributions to our knowledge of Rembrandt. Yet—and as a gluton for information, I do not say this readily—I find the *Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings* oppressively massive. There is no way for a researcher, let alone a reader, to digest it without writing his own précis and making his own indexes as he goes along. The minimal and highly selective indexes to the 3200 pages of vols. 1-4 are pitifully insufficient. Who can possibly remember what is in them? Only future students of the same material will have the motivation to plow through these books for the nuggets they need.6

Finding out what is not in them is even more difficult. I cannot be certain, but as far as I could tell this 690-page volume on Rembrandt’s self-portraits lacks mention of a fact that is highly relevant and perhaps essential to our understanding of the subject. When Rembrandt was fifteen years old, at the very time he left school for studio, a remarkable print was published that I believe was germane to his specialty in self-portraiture. It was a reproduction by Andries Jacobsz. Stock of a self-portrait of Rembrandt’s great forebear and model Lucas van Leyden, painted when Lucas was fifteen. The caption says of the painting that it showed the “incomparable painter and engraver, when he was fifteen years old, depicted from a portrait of himself by his own hand.” We learn further that Lucas died in 1533. In 1633 Rembrandt etched a self-portrait that comes close in pose to that of Lucas. It was the first of his self-portraits to be signed Rembrandt only, another emulation of Lucas. Who can doubt that the impressionable and ambitious young Leidener Rembrandt, when he began portraying himself by his own hand, was not inspired by his admired model?

Actually, it would seem that Ernst van de Wetering would doubt it. The omission of the print by Andries Stock might be perfectly intentional. Van de Wetering is staunchly opposed to personal interpretations of self-portraiture before the nineteenth century. He takes the fact that Rembrandt’s self-portraits were ‘commodities’ that were sold to collectors for proof that they were devoid of self-reflection, indeed of any personal meaning. His favored interpretation is that self-portraits came into being to satisfy the desire not of artists but of collectors to have images of artists. He cites print series like the *Iconography* of Anthony van Dyck and the Medici collection of painted self-portraits: “One would have to conclude that Rembrandt’s activity in this field, taken as a whole, should be seen as the result of ‘external pressure’ rather than the ‘internal pressure’ presumed by [Perry] Chapman.”7 Van de Wetering is not impressed by the fact that Rembrandt created more self-portraits – far more – than any other artist of the early modern period. Nor does he take account of the great diversity of guises Rembrandt assumes in his self-portraits, images for which no “external pressure” can be held responsible and which would not fit into a gallery of self-portraits. His insistence that no personal or psychological meaning can be attached to self-portraiture in the seventeenth century, that no speculation about individual identity is admissible, is too categorical and too limiting. In any case, it is at odds with the Bayesian approach Van de Wetering claims to apply. For all it has to offer, vol. 4 of the *Corpus* of

---

6. A project known as the Digital Rembrandt Archive, based on the RRP archive, has been announced by Amsterdam University Press and the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie. However, it does not include a digitally searchable version of the *Corpus* itself.

7. *Corpus*, vol. 4, pp. 132-44. In the course of a lengthy polemic against Perry Chapman’s assertion that the self-portraits represented “heightened self-consciousness,” Van de Wetering latches onto Eddy de Jongh’s use of the term “commodities.”

8. *Corpus*, vol. 4, p. 139.
Rembrandt Paintings is a letdown when it comes to understanding the relation between Rembrandt Harmensz. van Rijn and his self-portraits.

Gary Schwartz
Maerssen, The Netherlands


Around a core group of about 10 paintings and 26 prints, the exhibition catalogue of Rembrandt and the Rembrandt School presents a well-chosen number of paintings by artists associated with Rembrandt: Lastman, Jan Pynas, Moeyaert, Lieveen, Dou, Flinck, Bol, Victors, Eeckhout, Barent and Carel Fabritius, Van Rennesse, Maes, Drost, and De Gelder. Through comparative illustrations of works by Rembrandt, the school paintings are put into a context of theme and style of the master. The selection of school paintings gives prominence to pictures that are otherwise less well known, such as Dou’s Still-Life with Boy Blowing Bubbles (Tokyo, The National Museum of Western Art), Lieveen’s Christ and the Centurion (The Hague, Hoogsteder & Hoogsteder), and Drost’s Young Man at the Window (Copenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst).

The conference proceedings consist of eleven essays in English, which provide an overview of the current issues in Rembrandt studies. Akira Kofuku discusses the inherent difficulty of establishing authenticity in the works of any artist, and specifically Rembrandt, by considering various versions of the same subject and workshop participation. He further considers narrative composition and realistic depiction, to show how the reality of Dutch life may be incorporated into history subjects. In some cases, as in the unattributed Holy Family at Night (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, as Rembrandt Workshop) and Maes, Young Woman at the Cradle (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum), the boundary is blurred between genre and identifiable historical subject. Taco Dibbets traces the critical fortunes of the 1965 Rembrandt invention to arrive at their own original composition, David de Witt examines Aert de Gelder and Jan Steen in light of Houbraken’s Groot Schilderboek, with particular respect to expression, fine and loose handling of paint, and naturalism. He concludes that De Gelder strove to attain the ‘perfect picture,’ one that combined lofty subject matter, the expressiveness of Steen, and the technique of the late Rembrandt (p. 92). Yoriko Kobayashi-Sato discusses Rembrandt’s tronies as actual likenesses intended for use in history paintings; of the 22 tronies listed in Rembrandt’s 1656 inventory, ten were by Rembrandt, and others by Brouwer, Raphael, and Jan van Eyck (p. 98).

Akihiro Ozaki places Rembrandt’s Danae (St. Petersburg, The Hermitage) in its iconographic and seductive contexts, to help explain why this painting is so compelling. Toshiharu Nakamura examines Rembrandt’s competitiveness with Lievens and rivalry with Rubens in the specific case of Samson Blinded (Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut). Erik Hintzinger compares Rembrandt’s painted and etched versions of similar subjects, which furthers our understanding of the complex relationship between these media. Marten Jan Bok reconsiders Rembrandt’s fame and his works’ popularity in light of the Dutch art market. By analyzing a sample of Dutch inventories, he demonstrates that, in the course of the seventeenth century, still-lifes, landscapes, and seascapes gained popularity, while biblical subjects and family portraits tended to decline. Rembrandt, who favored biblical subjects, was thus a specialist in a category whose market share was shrinking. This circumstance, combined with Rembrandt’s overspending and mismangement of his finances, contributed to his 1656 bankruptcy.

Taken together, these thoughtful essays cohere in their consideration of the reception and historiography of Rembrandt and his workshop.

Amy Golahny
Lycoming College


To optimally experience the precious creations of the Dutch fijnschilders – those tiny painted worlds, rich and dense with an obsessive attention to detail – one should view them in an environment that embraces, rather than denies their insistent charms. As, most of us regularly, if ever, have the opportunity to examine these objects under perfect circumstances – holding them in our hands, slowly devouring the image and teasing out its manifold beauties and visual puzzles. We must content ourselves with those rare museum galleries that are designed to encourage close looking and that recreate (insofar as is possible) the warm domestic environments for which these pictures were originally created. Happily, the intimate rooms of the Mauritshuis, and the Dutch Cabinet galleries at the
It must be said, at the expense of anatomical accuracy, exaggerating the sinuous contours that unify the composition – often, elegance on scenes of modern life by elongating proportions and rendering them with almost supernatural clarity. He imposes classical artistic skill. The artist responded to contemporary admiration for his towards an ultra-refined style rather than a precipitous falling-off in colorations. These are, we learn, the product of a conscious evolution can be frankly unpleasant in their pneumatic distortions and acid addresses the issue of the artist's rather mannered late works, which artist's uniquely sophisticated use of color and light. Naumann also deployed to achieve it. Precise formal analyses draw our attention to the long study of Van Mieris's work, and demonstrates an almost minuscule hiccups in an otherwise intelligent, thought-provoking, and handsome catalogue.

Perhaps because of Van Mieris's extraordinary fame and rarified clientele (and thanks to Naumann’s pioneering research), we are better informed about his life and work than about many of his contemporaries. Buvelot's essay provides a succinct and lively introduction to the artist’s work and its significance, deftly constructing a vivid image of one of the most highly regarded artists of his age. In the essay and throughout the catalogue, Buvelot provides a wealth of enticing details about the formal sources, iconography, provenance, or technique of these voluable images, and gracefully draws it all together with consistently perceptive analyses.

Naumann’s essay on Van Mieris’s personal style draws on his long study of Van Mieris’s work, and demonstrates an almost instinctive understanding of the artist’s intent and the means employed to achieve it. Precise formal analyses draw our attention to the artist’s uniquely sophisticated use of color and light. Naumann also addresses the issue of the artist’s rather mannered late works, which can be frankly unpleasant in their pneumatic distortions and acid colorations. These are, we learn, the product of a conscious evolution towards an ultra-refined style rather than a precipitous falling-off in artistic skill. The artist responded to contemporary admiration for his depiction of materials by tightly juxtaposing even more of them, and rendering them with almost supernatural clarity. He imposes classical elegance on scenes of modern life by elongating proportions and exaggerating the sinuous contours that unify the composition – often, it must be said, at the expense of anatomical accuracy.

Eddy de Jongh’s essay (“Frans van Mieris: Questions of Understanding”) is a concise apologia for the interpretation of subject matter in paintings by Frans van Mieris. Citing the seventeenth-century’s love for metaphor, enigma, humor, and a particular ambiguity that invites a multiplicity of responses, De Jongh broadens our view of what these paintings might have meant to a contemporary audience, in part by blending the “reading” of a picture with a conscious appreciation of its sensual visual appeal. Accordingly, throughout the catalogue the symbolic language of Van Mieris’s paintings is presented with a light touch, suggesting rather than imposing interpretations and ultimately inviting the reader/viewer to take a more participatory role in their unraveling.

The catalogue demonstrates impressive knowledge and understanding of Van Mieris’s achievements, but avenues for research still remain. One such concerns the possible existence of autograph copies of paintings by Van Mieris, discussed in Cat. 33, A Woman Feeding a Parrot, and elsewhere throughout the catalogue. Contemporary copies by Frans the Elder’s son Willem van Mieris and other artists can be identified (and are exhaustively catalogued by Naumann 1981). In the case of Woman Feeding a Parrot, the primary version, unmistakably by Van Mieris himself (private collection, England), is painted on panel; the second version, the authorship of which is in question (National Gallery, London), is on a more costly copper support. Might the master’s primary version have been kept as a studio exemplar to show prospective clients, who could then opt for a more extravagant rendering on copper?

The catalogue itself is beautifully produced by Waanders. The English translation was expertly done by Beverly Jackson, who must be commended for capturing delightfully nuanced descriptions. One or two quirks must be noted, however: the translation of the opening phrase of Coenrad Droste’s couplet in entry no. 25 (Teasing the Pet) renders “Wie heeft met Turks tapyt, bont en fluweele kleeren” as “Who has ever contrived, with Turkish rugs, colors velvet and bright.” Perhaps a more appropriate translation might be “Who has ever contrived, with Turkish rugs, fur, and velvet clothing”? And the title of Cat. 46 manages to be misleading in both Dutch and English: “Dubbelporret van een Echtpaar op een Bordes” or “Double Portrait of a Couple Standing on a Flight of Steps,” when there are no steps in evidence and at least one of the figures is seated. But these are miniscule hiccups in an otherwise intelligent, thought-provoking, and handsome catalogue.

Marjorie E. Wieseman
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