

HNA in Antwerp 2002

March 13–16, 2002

Plenary Addresses

The State of Research in Fifteenth-Century Netherlandish Art

Martha Wolff

Later Netherlandish Art (and Scholarship)

Larry Silver

State of the Art in Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Studies

Eric Jan Sluijter

The State of Research in Fifteenth-Century Netherlandish Art

Martha Wolff

First of all, I would like to thank Alison Kettering, Martin Jan Bok and his committee for the decision to begin with a survey of where we are now and where we might go. In the fifteenth century I may have fewer objects than the speakers who come after me, but there are many unknowns! I will have to be telegraphic in my comments.

The most striking conclusion on surveying recent studies in fifteenth-century art in the Low Countries and neighboring regions is our current lack of a synthetic view of the subject. Panofsky's narrative fusing realism and symbolism in the development of the great Netherlandish painters now seems too restrictive. It has itself become an object of historiographic study, like the works of earlier pioneers of the field such as Gustav Waagen and James Weale. The new translation of *Early Netherlandish Painting* into German by Jochen Sander and Stefan Kemperdick presents Panofsky's book as a historiographic monument. Indeed, just in the last fifteen years a vast amount of new information has come to light, complicating our view of the artist's working process, the forces driving the consumption of art, and the broader social, political and religious context in which works of art came to life. Moreover, a chorus of different voices now doubts Panofsky's claim, formulated in relation to Jan van Eyck that "all reality is saturated with meaning," or, at any rate, with meaning that can be deciphered by applying the appropriate text.

The most striking instance is Panofsky's famous reading of the Arnolfini double portrait as a quasi-legal document of a marriage through symbolic meaning ascribed to everyday objects such as the faithful dog or the single lighted candle. Recent technical studies by Rachel Billinge and Lorne Campbell showed that just these objects, the chandelier, the man's street shoes and the dog, are not present in the carefully underdrawn preparation. They were added in the course of work on the painting, at the same time as Van Eyck made changes to find the right form for Arnolfini. Further, we now realize that Giovanni Arnolfini and Jeanne Cenami whose marriage has been so much discussed ?

cannot be the couple in Jan's painting of 1434. They were not married until 1447 according to a document recently published by Jacques Paviot and by Lorne Campbell showing that Philip the Good paid for their wedding gift in that year. Though Campbell has provided remarkable biographical detail on other, previously neglected members of the Arnolfini clan who could have commissioned the double portrait, the meaning of the picture remains elusive, not only because we know little about the couple, but because the picture itself is so innovative. Without a visual tradition of similar scenes as the subject for paintings, we are at a loss to explain its meaning. And yet we feel as viewers have through the centuries ? that it must have some special meaning.

No new narrative has taken the place of Panofsky's synthesis. In their book, *Die Erfindung des Gem?ldes*, published in 1993, Hans Belting and Christiane Kruse offer a stimulating analysis that takes into account the social pressures between court and town, the uses of devotional images and portraits, and much new information on patrons and the making of works of art. The authors frankly acknowledge a limitation in the way they have framed their questions, evident even in their title. The point of view that isolates painting on panel or canvas is modern and thus retrospective. Their book seeks to examine the origins of a medium that came to dominate other types of artistic production in the North only in later centuries as it was collected, held up for study by academies of artists, and finally displayed in museums. There is a growing awareness that, in the fifteenth century, tapestries and goldsmith work were more prestigious and expensive, while illustrated books survive in large enough numbers for their story to be most completely told. A new synthesis would need to knit together these different strands, incorporating not only the wealth of new material, but also the totality of artistic production. It is the interconnections between the religious and secular, political and domestic spheres, between the various media and other allied areas of patronage such as music that will yield a truer sense of the aesthetic that governed our period.

I would like to review very briefly the exciting array of resources that are now available for the study of fifteenth-century art. For painting, most remarkable perhaps is the vast new body of underdrawings retrieved through infrared reflectography, where only very limited preparatory material on paper has survived for us to study. Underdrawings are now published in numerous 'colloque' volumes edited by Roger van Schoute and H?l?ne Verougstraete, in recent exemplary collection catalogues from the St?del, the National Gallery, London, and the Mus?es Royaux des Beaux-Arts, Brussels, and in studies surveying the work of individual artists ? notably the Master of Fl?malle and Rogier van der Weyden by Van Asperen de Boer and his team and Gerard David by Maryan Ainsworth, to mention only fifteenth-century examples. This technology is now being applied to manuscript illumination and to painting of other times and places. The legibility of the published documents remains a problem, despite the advances of direct digital imagery. In order for this material to be absorbed into the mainstream of art historical research, more scholars need to examine the original documents, which are much more informative than their shrunken reproductions in print. These will become increasingly available through the good offices of the RKD, which has already archived documents from Dolf van Asperen de Boer and Molly Faries. Edwin Buijsen is in charge of the RKD's project, and he has kindly made an information sheet on it available at the registration desk here.

This body of underdrawings and other new information on artistic practice will undoubtedly illuminate the surviving works on paper. We can expect Fritz Koreny's forthcoming corpus of fifteenth-century Netherlandish drawings on paper to provide a range of telling connections between drawings, underdrawings and works in various media, together with his usual attentiveness to the nuances of invention and repetition. Wood analysis and dating (or dendrochronology), mostly undertaken by Peter Klein, provides important new information for paintings on oak panels, where there are otherwise few fixed points. It is most valuable in setting an earliest point for possible dating, or to link parts of a dismembered ensemble. Published in collection or exhibition catalogues, this material is gradually being integrated into larger studies.

These and other types of technical analysis have made us more aware of the collective and tradition-bound nature of painting workshops. Jellie Dijkstra's study of contracts and copying procedures is particularly instructive in showing how the authority of fifteenth-century devotional models lasted well into the sixteenth century. The two versions of Rogier's Mary altarpiece from Miraflores and Granada are a remarkable example of this phenomenon occurring at the most sophisticated level of patronage. I would like to dwell on this instance for a minute since it also illustrates how our own research is a collective process. The altarpiece in Berlin is intact, while the version in Granada has been partially cut and its right hand panel showing *Christ Taking Leave of his Mother* is now in the Metropolitan Museum. Scholars had been inclined to regard the triptych divided between Granada and New York as the first edition. But in 1981 Rainald Grosshans established that the triptych in Berlin was the altarpiece by Master Rogier given by King John II of Castile to the Charterhouse of Miraflores in 1445. As evidence he used provenance, substantial changes between the underdrawing and the final painting of the Berlin version, and the presence, in the Granada version, of a consistent perspective system unlikely to be employed by Rogier himself. I should remind you that the Granada version was given to the Capilla Real by King John II's daughter, Isabel the Catholic. In confirmation of Grosshans's conclusions, dendrochronology by Peter Klein demonstrated that the wood of the Met's panel could not have been used before the late fifteenth century. Working with this and other technical information, Dijkstra noted in 1990, that the panels from Granada had a gesso ground conventional for southern European practice, an indicator that they were made in Spain. She suggested that this replica of outstanding quality was made by a Flemish-trained painters working for Isabel the Catholic, Juan de Flandes or, more likely by Michel Sittow. Subsequently, dendrochronological analysis of the Granada panels and of parts of another altarpiece made by Juan de Flandes for Isabel the Catholic at Miraflores in 1496 to 1499 showed that both were made from the same lot of [Baltic!] wood (I am showing the panel of the *Birth of Saint John the Baptist* now in Cleveland from Juan de Flandes's altarpiece devoted to Saint John). This confirmation that both the faithful copy after Rogier and Juan de Flandes's *Saint John Altarpiece* were painted in the same time and place was published by Catheline P?rier d'Ieteren and her colleagues in 1993. Recently she and Maryan Ainsworth have each argued that Juan de Flandes painted the copy after Rogier, while Suzanna Urbach identified a panel formerly in a Hungarian private collection as the last missing segment of the *Saint John Altarpiece*. This extraordinary case shows the authority of Rogier's model and the care taken to duplicate

Netherlandish materials and techniques even in Spain half a century later. (In the spirit of the Bruges exhibition organized by Till Borchert, I should digress and add that this attentiveness to Netherlandish painting practice by Spanish patrons was not isolated. For special commissions the use of 'Flemish oak' might be stipulated in the contract as in Dalmau's Eyckian *Virgin of the Councillors* commissioned in 1443 by the city government of Barcelona. And we have found that 'Flemish' or more correctly Baltic oak, presumably transshipped through Flanders ? was used for Bernard Martorell's *Saint George* in Chicago, probably commissioned by the Barcelona city government for their chapel about 1435.

To new technical evidence we need to add a re-examination of documentary sources that goes beyond or looks critically at the compilations of nineteenth-century archivists. Elisabeth Dhanens and Max Martens have stressed the ambiguity and second-hand nature of the much-parsed Tournai guild records of Rogier van der Weyden in the workshop of Robert Campin. Combined with recently discovered documents suggesting Rogier's continued presence in Tournai to 1435 and with newly available underdrawings, this has led to the re-opening of attribution issues raised by the presence of Rogier in Campin's busy and crowded studio. Studies by Campbell, Ch?telet, De Vos, Dijstra, and Kemperdick ? some of them timed to coincide with Rogier's 500th birthday in 1999 ? take on these issues, providing many fresh insights, but, as might be expected, no resolution. Again the collective nature of painting practice emerges. Attention to documentary evidence has produced important results in relation to goldsmithwork as well. Hugo van der Velden has shown how much has been overlooked in the careers of court goldsmiths. Especially notable is his evidence for the high fees commanded by Loyet and Van Vlueten; these should be compared with artists working in other media. More comparative studies of inventories like Jenny Stratford's examination of the Bedford and Valois records could be very valuable. Renate Eikelmann used inventories, manuals, and other records together with chemical analysis to locate some important enamel pieces in the Burgundian Netherlands earlier than previously supposed.

Goldsmithwork held great intrinsic value and prestige, and played an important role in establishing a broader aesthetic, particularly for the early fifteenth century. The splendor of the few surviving works has been evident in outstanding exhibitions, particularly the 1995 exhibition of the *Goldenes R?ssl* at the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum following its restoration. This extraordinary *joyau* representing Charles VI of France kneeling before the Virgin and Child and their youthful court was a gift to the king from his wife at New Year's, 1405. It vividly demonstrates the luminosity and realism of metalworking techniques. These marvelous photographs, made when the image was disassembled after restoration, convey the extravagant richness of the gold support, either left bare or covered in opaque and translucent enamels (this is the interior of the figure of the Virgin seen from the back and this is the upper portion of the king's figure with the praying hands just visible). Gold was the metal of choice, not only because of its intrinsic value, but because it was necessary for the effect of the prized translucent red enamel or *rouge cler*, first introduced in the second half of the fourteenth century. A comparison of the luminosity of repeated layers of translucent enamel over gold with repeated layers of oil glazes seems to me inevitable.

Interest in another luxury medium tapestry has been expressed in several exhibitions of prime examples. A major exhibition summarizing recent work is opening at this moment at the Metropolitan Museum. *Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence*, organized by Tom Campbell, will bring together an extraordinary group of tapestries and related drawings from 1460 to 1560, and in June the Met will host an international symposium (June 6-8, 2002) on the making, marketing, patronage and function of Renaissance tapestries. Recent scholarship emphasizes the complexity of tapestry production. The patron, the author of the program, the artists who made the preliminary patterns, painted the cartoons, and wove the tapestries, and the entrepreneur who sold them all might be in different locations. Even in rare instances when tapestries, preparatory material, and documents do survive from this early period, as in the case of the history of Troy series shown here, it is difficult to sort out their relationship. Scot McKendrick has proposed that the numerous documented sets of eleven tapestries of the *History of Troy* were made on spec by the Grenier family of entrepreneurs in Tournai for sale to interested princely houses. The workings of the tapestry industry are relevant for students of the marketing of paintings or sculpted altarpieces, particularly with respect to patterns, sub-contracting, and export. The key role of tapestry narrative cycles in dynastic and political image-making is only now receiving much needed study. Jeff Smith signaled a beginning and Birgit Franke has followed up in a recent book on the story of Queen Esther at the Burgundian court taking drama, pageantry and court ceremony into account.

The question of narrative brings us to the book, where there has been a real explosion of information, resources and analysis. While a previously unpublished painting is a great rarity, the emergence of a previously unknown manuscript is a relatively common occurrence. I show a newly discovered leaf from the much-discussed Turin-Milan Hours recently acquired by the Getty Museum and soon to be published by James Marrow in the *Revue de l'Art*, together with the *Virgin and Child* from Campin's workshop discovered a few years ago and acquired by the National Gallery, London. In manuscript studies too, exhibitions offer an excellent opportunity for interdisciplinary research. Thom Kren and Scot McKendrick are organizing a major exhibition for the Getty and the Royal Academy in 2003 to deal with the last flowering of Flemish illumination, touching on its relation to panel painting. Catherine Reynolds and Maryan Ainsworth will also contribute to the catalogue. In general manuscript research has also focused on questions of production. There has been an outpouring of new tools that make scattered material available for study, among them collection catalogues, facsimiles, and surveys of various regional centers of production. The production of important workshops has been defined in extensively illustrated monographs like Gregory Clark's volume on the Master of the Privileges of Ghent, Bernard Bousmanne's on Willem Vrelant, and Bodo Brinkmann's on the Master of the Dresden Prayerbook. Jonathan Alexander has provided a very useful guide to illuminator's methods of work, and Anne Van Buren is bringing her much anticipated comparative study of costume in dated manuscripts to a conclusion. We now have monographs on important texts and their illustrative cycles the *Bible moralis?*, the *Speculum Humanae Salvationis*, the *Dialogues* of Pierre Salmon and others. Readership, patronage, and the use of devotional texts like the book of hours have been probed. Questions of artistic personality have received lively debate.

Thus, the date and identity of the brilliant Hand G of the *Turin-Milan Hours* continues to be an issue. The oeuvre of the Master of Mary of Burgundy has been narrowed and the connection of the books he illuminated to Mary of Burgundy has been called into question, though not the artist's hypersensitive genius.

The question remains how do we bring a new synthesis out of this wealth of fresh information? How do we continue our fruitful investigation of the artistic process without forgetting to ask questions about meaning? How do we account for the emergence of a succession of great creative personalities when much artistic production was bound by tradition and routine? We can begin by paying more attention to the social context in which the objects resided to contemporary hierarchies of value. We need to think more about questions of social practice and display in this period, combining this with the more nuanced view of the artist's working process that we now possess. We now recognize that in the fifteenth century the court and the nobility preferred to invest in goldsmith work and tapestries, while the administrative class, the urban patriciate, and the guilds (and, interestingly, foreign princes), patronized painters. Hence, we should be attentive to upward mobility and the deployment of indicators of social status. Historians of the Burgundian court and administration have pointed the way here. Ceremonial and etiquette, the organization of palaces and houses, costume, the legal and practical details of religious endowments all have much to tell us, particularly in the way they may differ among various social groups. By looking at art through the prism of this broader social context, we will gain a sense of how the image of the artist changes during this period. For example, it would be worthwhile to consider when paintings were first given as diplomatic gifts in the North, in place of tapestry or jewelry. If we pay more attention to texts and contexts describing the fabric of life in the fifteenth century, such as Eleonore de Poitiers' *Les Honneurs de la Cour* (newly edited by Jacques Paviot), we may gain a better sense of the permeable nature of the boundary between the sacred and the secular.

The notes added into this lecture text are intended to give readers a succinct bibliographical guide to recent literature. In almost every instance they could be considerably expanded, as could the topics touched on in the brief talk. Nevertheless, I hope that they will some useful guideposts for an exploration of recent research in fifteenth-century Netherlandish art.

1. Erwin Panofsky, *Die altniederländische Malerei. Ihr Ursprung und Wesen*, translated by Jochen Sander and Stefan Kemperdick, Cologne, 2001. Explorations of the philosophical, cultural, and biographical bases for Panofsky's art history include, Michael Ann Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History*, Ithaca, N.Y., 1984 and Keith Moxey, "Motivating Art History: Panofsky and Nationalism," *Art Bulletin*, 77 (1995), pp. 392-401. On Waagen, see, Gabriele Bickendorf, *Der Beginn der Kunstgeschichtsschreibung unter dem Paradigma 'Geschichte': Gustav Friedrich Waagens Fröhschrift 'Ueber Hubert und Johann van Eyck'* (Heidelberger kunstgeschichtliche Abhandlungen, N.F., 18), Heidelberg, 1983. On Weale, see Lori van Biervliet, *Leven en Werk van W.H. Weale, een Engels Kunsthistoricus in Vlaanderen in de 19de eeuw* (Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Schone Kunsten, Verhandelingen, no. 55), Brussels, 1991.

2. For this trend, see Craig Harbison, "Realism and Symbolism in Early Flemish Painting," *Art Bulletin*, 66 (1984), pp. 588-602, Jan Baptist Bedaux, *The Reality of Symbols. Studies in the Iconology of Netherlandish Art, 1400-1800*, The Hague, 1990, and Reindert Falkenburg, "The Household of the Soul: Conformity in the M?rode Triptych," and Peter Parshall, "Commentary: Conformity or Contrast," both in Metropolitan Museum of Art, *Early Netherlandish Painting at the Crossroads. A Critical Look at Current Methodologies*, ed., Maryan Ainsworth, New York, 2001, pp. 1-17 and 18-25.

3. Rachel Billinge and Lorne Campbell, "The Infra-Red Reflectograms of Jan van Eyck's Portrait of Giovanni (?) Arnolfini and his Wife," *National Gallery Technical Bulletin*, 16 (1995), pp. 47-60 and Lorne Campbell, *The National Gallery Catalogues. The Fifteenth Century Netherlandish Schools*, London, 1998, pp. 174-211.

4. This document is discussed in Campbell 1998, pp. 195 and 209, as in preceding note, and Jacques Paviot "Le double portrait Arnolfini de Jan van Ecyk," *Revue belge d'arch?ologie et de l'histoire de l'art*, 66 (1997), pp. 19-33. It is published in full by Hugo van der Velden, "Defrocking St Eloy: Petrus Christus' Vocational *Portrait of a Goldsmith*," *Simiolus*, 26 (1998), pp. 268-269, doc. no. 2.

5. Hans Belting and Christiane Kruse, *Die Erfindung des Gem?ldes. Das erste Jahrhundert der niederl?ndischen Malerei*, Munich, 1994. Several collections of essays offer notable surveys of topics and points of view on painting: "Om iets te weten van de oude meesters." *De vlaamse primitieven: herontdekking, waardering en onderzoek*, ed. Bernhard Ridderbos and Henk van Veen, Nijmegen, 1995, and *Les primitifs flamands et leurs temps*, ed. Roger van Schoute and Brigitte de Patoul, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1994. Another survey volume, *Die Kunst der Burgundische Niederlande: Eine EinfY(R)hrung*, ed. Birgit Franke and Barbara Wenzel, Berlin, 1997, extends this approach to other media.

6. The volumes of papers given at the biennial colloque 'pour l'Etude du dessin sous-jacent dans la peinture' are published by the Universit? Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve. Collection catalogues fully utilizing this material include Jochen Sander, *Niederl?ndische Gem?lde im St?del 1400-1550*, Mainz, 1993 (with contributions by Stephan Knoblauch and Peter Klein), Campbell (1998) as in n. 3 above, and Cyriel Stroo, Pascale Syfer d'Olne *et al.*, *The Flemish Primitives: Catalogue of Early Netherlandish Painting in the Royal Museums of Fine Arts, Belgium*, Turnhout, 1996 (two volumes devoted to Rogier van der Weyden and his followers and to Bouts, Christus, Memling, and Van der Goes). Among specialized studies, see J.R.J. van Asperen de Boer, J. Dijkstra, R. van Schoute, *et al.*, "Underdrawings in Paintings of the Rogier van der Weyden and Master of Fl?malle Groups," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, 41 (1990) and Maryan Wynn Ainsworth, *Gerard David, Purity of Vision in an Age of Transition*, New York, 1998.

7. Edwin Buijsen, Curator of Research and Technical Documentation at the RKD, made this description available at the conference:

"The aim of the project is to create at the RKD an archive of technical research data which can be consulted by scholars, students and other people interested in the material aspects of paintings. At present the bulk of the available material concerns infrared reflectography (IRR) and consists of three components:

- 1) the archive of Prof. J.R.J. Van Asperen de Boer, mainly consisting of hand assemblies and photo-negatives of his IRR-research (ca. 1800 rolls);
- 2) the archive of Prof. Molly Faries consisting of photo-negatives (ca. 1400 rolls);
- 3) IRR-images made with the camera belonging to the RKD, consisting of a small number of photo-negatives and, from 1997 onwards, frame-grabbed material.

As a first step in archiving this material and disclosing it for public use, a computerized data-base has been developed. This now includes data of the IRR examination of more than 1000 paintings, including many Early Netherlandish works from the 15th and 16th centuries, but also a considerable number of Italian and German paintings, seventeenth-century Dutch masters such as Frans Hals and Jan van Goyen, and even much later artists such as Monet and Mondrian. At this moment the data-base is for internal use only, but we plan to make it accessible for researchers through the RKD's website. At the RKD we are now in the process of digitizing the photo-negatives of Van Asperen de Boer and Faries, but it will still take many years before this is completed.

One can personally consult the available material (original hand assemblies and/or digitized photo-negatives) at the RKD, after making an appointment first (and provided the material is not restricted). It is also possible to inquire for specific material by sending a letter, fax or e-mail. Then we can provide lists of the available material. Upon request and against payment we can make photographs of hand assemblies or make computer assemblies of digitized photo-negatives for further study or for publication (which is only allowed with permission by the owner of the painting). In special cases the RKD enables experienced IRR researchers ? other than RKD staff ? to make computer assemblies of digitized IRR images (provided they comply with all restrictions governing this material).

It is our aim to further enlarge the archive by encouraging other experts, both from the academic and the museum world, to make their research material available. Besides IRR-material also the results of other forms of technical research will be included in the near future, as well as documentation related to the restoration of paintings."

8. Maryan Ainsworth's monograph on Gerard David cited in n. 6 above is a model for the integration of dendrochronological analysis into a larger study. For dendrochronological analysis in connection with recent exhibitions, see Peter Klein, "Dendrochronological Findings of the Bouts Group," in *Bouts Studies. Proceedings of the International Colloquium* (Leuven, 26-28 November 1998), ed. Bert Cardon, Maurits Smeyers, Roger van Schoute, and H?l?ne Verougstraete, Leuven, Paris, Sterling, Virginia, 2001, pp. 411-422, and idem., "Dendrochronological Analysis of Works by Hieronymus Bosch and his Followers," in *Museum Boijmans-Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, Hieronymus Bosch. New Insights into his Life and Work*, exhib. cat., ed. Jos Koldeweij, Bernard Vermet, and Barbera van Kooij, 2001, pp. 121-131.

9. Jeltje Dijkstra, *Origineel en kopie: en onderzoek naar de navolging van de Meester van Fl?malle en Rogier van der Weyden*, Amsterdam, 1990.
10. Rainald Grosshans, "Rogier van der Weyden: Der Marienaltar aus des Kartausen Miraflores," *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 23 (1981), 49-112 and idem., "Infrarotuntersuchungen zum Studium der Unterzeichnung auf den Berliner Alt?ren von Rogier van der Weyden," *Jahrbuch preussischer Kulturbesitz*, 19 (1982), pp. 137-177.
11. Peter Klein, "Dendrochronological Studies on Oak Panels of Rogier van der Weyden and his Circle," in *Le dessin sous-jacent dans la peinture. Colloque VII 17-19 septembre 1987*, Louvain-la Neuve, 1989, pp. 28 and 33; see also Maryan W. Ainsworth, "Implications of Revised Attributions in Netherlandish Painting," *Metropolitan Museum Journal* (Essays in Memory of Guy C. Bauman), 27 (1992), pp. 59-68.
12. Dijkstra 1990, pp. 78-109, esp. p. 92, as in n. 9 above.
13. C. P?rier-d'Ieteren, A. Rinuy, J. Vynckier, and L. Kockaert, *Apport des m?thodes d'investigation scientifique ^ l'?tude de deux peintures attribu?es ^ Juan de Flandes*, Geneva 41 (1993), pp. 107-118.
14. Catheline P?rier-d'Ieteren, "Le Retable de la Vierge de la Capilla Real de Grenade et les peintres d'Isabelle de Castille," *Revue belge d'arch?ologie et d'histoire de l'art*, 67 (1998), pp. 3-26, and Maryan W. Ainsworth, "Commentary: An Integrated Approach," in *Metropolitan Museum of Art 2001*, pp. 110-113 (as in n. 2 above); for the *Ecce Agnus Dei* from the Saint John altarpiece, see Zsuzsa Urbach, "An Early Netherlandish Painting Formerly in a Hungarian Private Collection," *KY(R)l?nlenyomat a MY(R)v?stzett?rt?neti ?rt'es't?*, 50 (2001), pp. 1-13 (in Hungarian with English summary on pp. 12-13). The present whereabouts of the panel, formerly in the L?fkovits collection and deposited in the museum in Debrecen before World War II, are unknown. The known panels from Juan de Flandes' altarpiece are reunited in the exhibition *Jan van Eyck, de Vlaamse Primitieven en het Zuiden*, at the Groeningen Museum, Bruges, until June 30.
15. Judith Berg Sobr?, *Behind the Altar Table, the Development of the Painted Retable in Spain, 1350-1500*, Columbia, Missouri, 1989, pp. 29, 51, 167-8, 213-4, 288-97 (transcribing and translating the contract).
16. Judith Berg Sobr?, in Martha Wolff *et al.*, *Netherlandish, French, German, and Spanish Paintings before 1600 in The Art Institute of Chicago*, forthcoming, citing Peter Klein's dendrochronological analysis.
17. Elisabeth Dhanens, *Rogier van der Weyden. Revisie van de documenten*, (Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van Belgi', Klasse der Schone Kunsten, Verhandelingen, no. 59), revised as Elisabeth Dhanens and Jellie Dijkstra, *Rogier de la Pasture van der Weyden. Introduction ^ l'oeuvre, relire des sources*, Tournai, 1999, and Maximiliaan P. J. Martens, "Approaches

to the Heuristics of Early Netherlandish Art," in Metropolitan Museum of Art 2001, pp. 26-39 (as in n. 2 above).

18. Lorne Campbell, "Rogier van der Weyden and his Workshop," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 84 (1994), pp. 1-24; Albert Châtelet, *Rogier van der Weyden: problèmes de la vie et de l'oeuvre*, Strasbourg, 1999; Dirk de Vos, *Rogier van der Weyden. The Complete Works*, Antwerp, 1999; Dijkstra 1999, as in preceding note; and Stephan Kemperdick, *Der Meister von Flämalle: die Werkstatt Robert Campins und Rogier von der Weydens*, Turnhout, 1997 and idem., *Rogier van der Weyden, 1399/1400-1464*, trans. Anthea Bell, Cologne, 1999. For the documents that may refer to Rogier's activity in Tournai, see J. Dumoulin and J. Pijcke, *Comptes de la paroisse Sainte-Marguerite de Tournai au XVe siècle. Documents inédits relatifs à Rogier de la Pasture, Robert Campin et d'autres artisans tournaisiens* (Tournai, Art et Histoire, 7), Tournai and Louvain-la-Neuve, 1993, pp. 279-320 and Dhanens and Dijkstra 1999, pp. 156-57; for the underdrawings, see Van Asperen de Boer *et al.* 1990, as in n. 6 above and Grosshans 1981 and 1982, as in n. 10 above.

19. Hugo van der Velden 1998, as in n. 4 above, and idem., *The Donor's Image: Gerard Loyet and the Votive Portraits of Charles the Bold*, Turnhout, 2000.

20. Jenny Stratford, *The Bedford Inventories: the Worldly Goods of John, Duke of Bedford, Regent of France (1389-1435)*, London, 1993.

21. Renate Eikermann, "'mit Niderlendischen schmelzwerch': Das Regensburger Emailkistchen," in *SchatzkammerstY(R)cke aus der Herbstzeit des Mittelalters: das Regensburger Emailkistchen und sein Umkreis*, exhib. cat. Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich, 1992, pp. 37-58. See also Helmut Trnek, "Burgund oder Venedig? Zur entwicklungsgeschichtlichen Stellung des sogenannten Burgundischen Emails," in *Naturwissenschaft in der Kunst. Beitrag der Naturwissenschaften zur Erforschung und Erhaltung unseres kulturellen Erbes*, ed. Manfred Schreiner, Vienna, Cologne, and Weimar, 1995, pp. 37-47.

22. Reinhold Baumstark, ed., *Das Goldenes Rössel: ein Meisterwerk der Pariser Hofkunst um 1400*, exhib. cat. Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich, 1995.

23. The chemical properties of enamel types introduced in the fourteenth century are analyzed by Mark T. Wypyski and Rainer W. Richter, "Preliminary Compositional Study of 14th- and 15th-Century European Enamels," *Technique*, no. 6 (1997), pp. 48-57.

24. Notable exhibitions such as those of the holdings of the Patrimonio Nacional have focussed on the early sixteenth century, however; see Guy Delmarcel *et al.*, *Golden Weavings: Flemish Tapestries of the Spanish Crown*, exhib. cat., Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich, Gaspard de Wit Foundation, Mechelen, and Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, 1993, and Arlette Smolar-Meynart, *Age d'or bruxellois: tapisseries de la couronne d'Espagne*, exhib. cat., Cathedral of Saints Michael and Gudule, Brussels, 2000.

25. This point is emphasized by Fabienne Joubert, *La tapisserie* (Institut des études Médiévales, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental, B-I.B.4), Turnhout, 1993 (with extensive bibliography) and idem., "Les tapisseries de la fin de moyen âge: commandes, destination, circulation," *Revue de l'Art*, no. 120 (1998), pp. 89-99.
26. Scot McKendrick, "The Great History of Troy: A Reassessment of the Development of a Secular Theme in Late Medieval Art," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 54 (1991), pp. 43-82.
27. Jeffrey Chipps Smith, "Portable Propaganda: Tapestries as Princely Metaphors at the Courts of Philip the Good and Charles the Bold," *Art Journal*, 48 (1989), pp. 123-129 and Birgit Franke, *Assuerus und Esther am Burgunderhof: zur Rezeption des Buches Esther in den Niederlanden (1450-1530)*, Berlin, 1998.
28. Among collection catalogues, particularly exemplary are the volumes on Dutch and Flemish manuscripts from the ...sterreichisches Nationalbibliothek begun by Otto Pöcht and continued by Ulrike Jenni and Dagmar Thoss and those from the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, under the direction of Lilian Randall. Among numerous facsimiles, the complementary volumes on the so-called Turin-Milan Hours are especially notable: Eberhard König, Gabriele Bartz *et al.*, *Die Blätter im Louvre und das verlorene Turiner Gebetbuch, RF 2022-2025, Département des arts graphiques, Musée du Louvre, Paris und Handschrift K.IV.29, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, Torino, Lucerne*, 1994 and Anne van Buren, James Marrow, and Silvana Pettanati, *Das Turiner-Mailänder Stundenbuch*, Lucerne, 1994 (commentary 1996). The range of regional studies is evident from the volumes of essays, *Masters and Miniatures: Proceedings of the Congress on Medieval Manuscript Illumination in the Northern Netherlands* (Utrecht 10-13 December, 1989), ed. Koert van der Horst and Johann-Christian Klamt, Doornspijk, 1991, and *Flanders in a European Perspective: Manuscript Illumination around 1400 in Flanders and Abroad: Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven 7-10 September 1993*, ed. Maurits Smeyers and Bert Cardon, Leuven, 1995. Studies of neighboring regions are also relevant; see for example Kathleen L. Scott, *Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles. Later Gothic Manuscripts 1390-1490*, London, 1996 and Susie Nash, *Between France and Flanders. Manuscript Illumination in Amiens*, London and Toronto, 1999.
29. Gregory T. Clark, *Made in Flanders. The Master of the Ghent Privileges and Manuscript Painting in the Southern Netherlands in the Time of Philip the Good*, Turnhout, 2000; Bernard Bousmann, "Item a Guillaume Wyelant aussi enlumineur". *Willem Vrelant. Un aspect de l'enluminure dans les Pays-Bas méridionaux des ducs de Bourgogne Philippe le Bon et Charles le Téméraire*, Turnhout, 1997; and Bodo Brinkmann, *Die Flämische Buchmalerei am Ende des Burgunderreichs. Der Meister des Dresdener Begetbuch und die Miniaturisten seiner Zeit*, Turnhout, 1997. These and other extensively illustrated volumes are part of Brepols's substantial contribution to literature on fifteenth-century art.
30. J. J. G. Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators and their Methods of Work*, New Haven, 1992.

31. She reports that this study of dress and costume in the art of northern Europe from 1325 to 1515 will be published in conjunction with a major exhibition at the Morgan Library organized by Rogier Wieck for 2006. It will include an album of dated images, an English and French glossary, and essays addressing issues including the medieval attitude towards dress and artists' use of realistic or fantastic costume.

32. John Lowden, *The Making of the Bibles Moralis?es*, University Park, Penn., 2000; Bert Cardon, *Manuscripts of the Speculum Humanae Salvationis in the Southern Netherlands, c. 1410-c. 1470: A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth-Century Book illumination and of the Function and Meaning of Historical Symbolism*, Leuven, 1996; and Anne Dawson Hedeman, *Of Counselors and Kings: The Three Versions of Pierre Salmon's Dialogues*, Urbana, Ill., 2001.

33. On the book of hours, see Roger S. Wieck, *Time Sanctified. The Book of Hours in Medieval Art and Life*, exhib. cat. The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, 1988, and Paul Saenger, "Books of Hours and Reading Habits in the Later Middle Ages," in *The Culture of Print: Power and the Uses of Print in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Rogier Chartier, Princeton, 1989, pp. 141-173. Studies of patronage have emphasized that of the Burgundian dukes, but have also extended to the duchesses, thereby serving as a beginning to study of women as patrons; see Patrick M. de Winter, *La Biblioth?que de Philippe le Hardi, duc de Bourgogne (1364-1414)*, Paris, 1985; Laetitia Le Guay, *Les princes de Bourgogne lecteurs de Froissart. Les rapports entre le texte et l'image dans les manuscrits enlumin?s du Livre IV des Chroniques*, Turnhout, 1998; *Margaret of York, Simon Marmion, and the Visions of Tondal: Papers delivered at a Symposium Organized by the Department of Manuscripts at the J. Paul Getty Museum in Collaboration with the Huntington Library and Art Collections, 21-24 June, 1990*, ed. Thomas Kren, Malibu, 1992; Claudine Lemaire and Mich?le Henry, *Isabelle de Portugal, duchesse de Bourgogne, 1397-1471*, exhib. cat., Biblioth?que royale Albert Ier, Brussels, 1991.

34. For opinions for and against Hand G's identification as Jan van Eyck, see Hans Belting and Dagmar Eichberger, *Jan van Eyck als Erz?hler: frY(R)he Tafelbilder im Umkreis der New Yorker Doppeltafel*, Worms, 1983; Maurits Smeyers, "Answering Some Questions about the Turin-Milan Hours," in *Colloque VII*, 1989, pp. 55-70, as in n. 11 above; Albert Ch?telet, *Jan van Eyck enlumineur: les Heures de Turin et de Milan-Turin*, Strasbourg, 1993; Van Buren 1994, as in n. 28 above; James Marrow, "History, Historiography, and Pictorial Invention in the Turin-Milan Hours," in *In Detail: New Studies of Northern Renaissance Art in Honor of Walter S. Gibson*, ed. Laurinda S. Dixon, Turnhout, 1998, pp. 1-14; Catherine Reynolds, "'The King of Painters'," in *Investigating Jan van Eyck*, ed. Susan Foister, Sue Jones, and Delphine Cool, Turnhout, 2000, pp. 1-16.

35. See Eberhard K?nig, Fedja Anzelewsky, Bodo Brinkmann, and Frauke Steenbock, *Das Berliner Stundenbuch der Maria von Burgund und Kaiser Maximilians*, exhib. cat., Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz, 1998 and Brinkmann 1997, as in n. 29 above.

36. A number of scholars have pointed to these broad patterns of patronage and use, among them, Craig Harbison, *Jan van Eyck: The Play of Realism*, London, 1991; Maximiliaan Martens, "La client?le du peintre," in Van Schoute and Patoul 1994, pp. 144-179, as in n. 5, above, and Jeffrey Chipps Smith, "The Practical Logistics of Art: Thoughts on the Commissioning, Displaying and Storing of Art at the Burgundian Court," in *In Detail 1998*, pp. 27-48, as in n. 34 above.

37. For example, Hermann Kamp, *Memoria und Selbstdarstellung: die Stiftungen des Burgundischen Kanzlers Rolin*, Sigmaringen, 1993, and the studies of Werner Paravicini on the structure of the Burgundian court, among them "Soziale Schichtung und sociale Mobilit?t am Hof der Herz?ge von Burgund," *Francia*, 5 (1977), pp. 127-182 and "Die Hofordnung Philips des Guten," *Francia*, 13 (1985), PP. 191-211.

38. Jacques Paviot, "El?onore de Poitiers, Les Etats de France (les honneurs de la Cour)," *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Soci?t? de l'Histoire de France* (1998), pp. 75-137.

Later Netherlandish Art (and Scholarship)

Larry Silver

When I was a student, I liked to think of myself as a 'young Turk,' though now perhaps with so many of my colleagues here today younger than I am, I should consider myself instead as a 'moldy oldie.' Back in the early 1970s, a small group of us here today began exploring what was then a non-existent field of sixteenth-century Northern art, caught in what the Dutch proverb calls 'between stools.' It was neither Italian Renaissance, which was then the dominant paradigm and the intellectual center of the entire discipline, nor was it the celebrated prior century of Jan van Eyck, of those 'primitifs flamands' often taken to be a counterpart and contemporary of the pictorial experimentation of Florence. Neither was it the upcoming 'Golden Age' of Dutch seventeenth-century painting (but not of sculpture or architecture), for which it was only occasionally cited as a lesser prelude.

These were the views imbedded in the canonical scholarly work of Erwin Panofsky, whose major monographs *Early Netherlandish Painting* of 1953 and *Albrecht Dürer* of 1948 had generally defined the role of Northern art in relation to Italy and the overall phenomenon of a nascent artistic modernity. Panofsky followed the lead of founding Belgian and Dutch scholars as well as of German connoisseur, Max Friedländer, whose very term, "altniederländische Malerei," he then freely borrowed in literal English translation.

Whether or not we are comfortable with such terms as the "new art history," we have learned to be more methodologically self-conscious since then. We do not have to be deconstructionists to realize that our attention to an artist like Dürer predisposes us to several distinct modern biases towards named artists, towards painters, towards trends like the celebrated Flemish naturalism that are considered progressive for the illusionistic art of the following four centuries. As a result, we do not often attend to anonymous craftsmen, nor to other media, including the most expensive ones like tapestry or armor, which were so important in the Burgundian court world of Huizinga (as was so well discussed by Martha Wolff), let alone other media, such as ivories and alabasters, wood sculptures, stained glass, or illuminated manuscripts, which seem still to have the taint of vestiges from an earlier, lingering, medieval visual culture, even though they still persist, well into the sixteenth century, alongside the new printed books and single sheets of prints.

Our initial neglect of German art, where paintings were often anonymous and still painted with real gold, often went unnoticed, reinforced by the stigma attached to German culture by justifiable biases, generated by twentieth-century politics. French and English and Spanish art were similarly consigned to cultural oblivion as backwaters relative to Flemish art. Bohemian or Polish art lay beyond both the political gulf of a Cold War Iron Curtain as well as a Slavic language barrier. Even early Dutch painting of the fifteenth century had to wait until 1980 for a modern analysis from Albert Châtelet.

Today, geographical boundaries have been expanded broadly to encompass all of Central Europe, scholarship led especially by Thomas Kaufmann, following the earlier,

more regional apologetics of Jan Bialostocki of Poland. Indeed, we are likely now to look at the contact between Europe's art and other regions of the world after 1492, whether we look at Spain and the New World, or else the Portuguese and then the Dutch, in Africa and Asia. We find a broader vision underlying the important recent anthology, edited by Claire Farago, a specialist in Italian art, appropriately entitled *Reframing the Renaissance* (1995). One groundbreaking exhibition catalogue on America, bride of the sun, was prepared in 1992 by Paul Vandebroek. Another, *Terra Australis* (1988) was the collaboration between William Eisler and Bernard Smith. International collaborations by Jesuits abroad have recently been examined by Gauvin Bailey. We begin now to study the reciprocal importance of foreign ventures on Dutch visual culture, particularly in the form of maps and atlases, as in the recent volume by historian Benjamin Schmidt. In an era of increasing interest in what is termed cultural geography, there is still too little connection between art history and the current researches in history or literature from a postcolonial perspective. In addition, we visual specialists have left out the profoundly visual world of cartographers, in spite of what we learn from such fundamental Dutch map scholars as Gunther Schilder and Kees Zandvliet, that there is a continuous tradition linking the later sixteenth century mapmaking to the Golden Age. Here new researches and a workshop at this conference by Mari't Westermann, featuring such younger scholars as Rebecca Parker Brienen, are beginning at long last to tackle the rich legacy of foreign travel imagery and publications in colonizing Holland.

Recent decades have somewhat redressed prior deficiencies for neglected visual culture in Flanders: tapestries have benefited from the ongoing expertise of Guy Delmarcel, architecture from the researches of Krista De Jonge, wooden sculptures from Lynn Jacobs, and stained glass from Ellen Konowitz as well as Tim Husband's outstanding Cloisters exhibition of 1995. Stephen Scher and others have redressed the omission of attention to the political and intellectual mementos of bronze medals in both Germany and the Netherlands of the sixteenth century. We still lack work on French decorative arts, especially the brilliant Limoges enamels of the sixteenth century and the experimental ceramics of Palissy. Despite a major exhibition in Nuremberg of 1985, the crucial work of Wenzel Jamnitzer and German metalwork of Munich and Prague remains to be re-investigated. We can all thank Frits Scholten for his magnificent exhibition catalogue on Adriaen de Vries, and hope that other great, boundary-crossing bronze sculptors receive increased attention in future. There has even been renewed attention to temporary, if grandiose, spectacles as objects of study, such as the entries and festivals of cities and courts; a notable contribution to this research was the 1998 *NKJ* volume, *Hof-, staats- en stadscermonies*, edited by Mark Meadow. Even hidden artworks, the preparatory drawings by artists, has been revealed through the ongoing infrared technology and intensive researches of the Louvain-le-Neuve group, of the team at the National Gallery London, and of Molly Faries and Maryan Ainsworth, especially in her book-length study of Gerard David.

German art has also begun to receive more attention, especially in the Anglophone world, led by such figures as Thomas Kaufmann, Jeffrey Chipps Smith, Joseph Koerner, Christopher Wood, Christiane Andersson, Alison Stewart, Pia Cuneo and Andrew Morrall. The recent catalogue on Tilman Riemenschneider by Julian Chapuis and the

ongoing researches into Adam Kraft by Corine Schleif are deepening our contemporary understanding of the important sixteenth-century media of wood and stone sculptures. A stellar example of collaboration between German and American scholars occurred just last year in the re-examination of stained glass in both Germany and Switzerland in the exhibition "Painting on Light" by Barbara Butts and Lee Hendrix. Chipps Smith has produced a lavish book on German sculpture of the later sixteenth century, simultaneously shedding light on neglected media and masters, while also addressing the larger part of the sixteenth century, so often neglected, after the departures of Durer and Holbein; moreover, he is now completing a volume on Jesuit churches throughout Germany, going well beyond the usual emphasis on Reformation patronage in the homeland of Martin Luther. Jörg Breu in Augsburg has benefited from the joint attentions of both Pia Cuneo and Andrew Morrall. Another young scholar, Susan Maxwell, is working on the court culture of Wittelsbach Munich.

Nowhere has recent scholarship contributed more to our understanding of a medium and its international ramifications than in the burgeoning culture of prints, whether woodcuts or intaglios. Here, too, the reigning paradigms have shifted significantly since Panofsky, who still defined prints primarily in terms of the signal masterworks of a single peintre-graveur, DY(R)rer. Other printmakers were still barely attended to when I was a student, but the growth industry of monographs on prints has begun, starting with founding masters of the fifteenth century, to Lucas van Leyden and Hendrick Goltzius in the sixteenth. It is astonishing today to realize that these two later major artists only began to receive serious scrutiny in the 1970s with the work of Dutch scholars, led by Filedt Kok for Lucas and Reznicek for Goltzius, as well as of Americans, such as Parshall for Lucas and Melion for Goltzius. We can now eagerly anticipate the multi-media Goltzius exhibition next year, co-sponsored by museums in Amsterdam, Toledo and New York.

Beyond such titans, we begin to attend to artists who were virtually invisible before the sixteenth century became an object of study, for example Maarten van Heemskerck, for whom we owe such a debt to Ilja Veldman, or Martin de Vos by Christiaan Schuckman. Even in Germany, we need to single out the studies devoted to such printmakers as Altdorfer (by Winzinger and Mielke), the Nuremberg Kleinmeister (Stephen Goddard), and even Hans Holbein the Elder (Christian MY(R)ller). No German artist has had his stock rise higher than Hans Baldung, whose paintings (von der Osten) and graphics (Matthias Mende as well as Marrow and Shestack) have both been objects of study. We also now have a synthetic overview of both German and Netherlandish printmaking by Peter Parshall (along with David Landau for Italy) in their penetrating study of *The Renaissance Print, 1470-1550* (1994).

Perhaps nowhere else besides printmaking do we see so many new questions and insights raised in the past quarter-century. First, artistic production. Parshall and Landau outline the collaborative aspects of printmaking as a process as well as the importance of experimentation in techniques. They also point to the role of both cutters of woodblocks and publishers in both Antwerp and Nuremberg. Timothy Riggs first began this revaluation process by focusing on the later professional publisher of prints, by Bruegel and numerous other artists, *Aux Quatre Vents* in Antwerp, Hieronymus

Cock. In 1993 Riggs and Silver together attempted to address a different kind of print production, undescribed by the concept of *peintres-graveurs*: the phenomenon of the professional engraver, who collaborated with a publisher to realize prints after the designs of painters or draftsmen. Riggs's pioneering work spawned studies on publishers and professional printmakers, including Galle and Cort (by Manfred Sellink), Coornhert and the family de Passe (by Ilja Veldman), the brothers Wierix (by Marie Macquoy Hendrickx), and Hendrick Hondius (by Nadine Orenstein). We now have impressive, comprehensive publications of the corpora of these printmakers, by the New Hollstein, by the Illustrated Bartsch, and by Sound and Vision Interactive.

The study of works of art has become more interpretive in the last quarter century. Indeed, while one of the principal current approaches has remained close focus on the individual artworks or artists, that attention has taken on a more sophisticated self-awareness. One way we might characterize this interpretation is the application of phenomenology to the object of study. Here I think in particular of Joseph Koerner's deep reading of the complexities, even contradictions, of DY(R)er's 1500 Munich *Self-Portrait* as well as the intertextual reference and inversion between DY(R)er's art as theme and the subsequent art of Baldung as variation. In similar fashion, Christopher Wood has joined Koerner's project of locating the roots of modern artistic self-consciousness in the chiaroscuro drawings and landscape subjects of Albrecht Altdorfer.

For the Netherlands, Reindert Falkenburg's analyses of religious paintings of both the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries proceeds from a powerful empathic experience of the works themselves but also builds upon either contemporary spiritual literature or even classic pieces, such as his current work, using St. Augustine as a foundation of understanding the central panel of Bosch's *Garden of Delights*. Mark Meadow's close study of Bruegel's *Netherlandish Proverbs* painting of 1560 reveals not only important structures of juxtaposition within the picture but also close affinities with patterns of thought in Renaissance commonplace books. Though there has not been a great deal of attention to French sixteenth-century art, similar interpretive close readings of works have formed a major contribution to our sense of newly emerging artistic identity. Here I want to single out the analysis by Catherine Randall of complex French court architecture as a counter-cultural reaction by Calvinist designers to a dominant Catholic society during the Wars of Religion as well as the far-ranging dissertation by Rebecca Zorach of a culture of excess in Fontainebleau ornament.

Beyond what we might term the visual rhetoric of the work of art, we also find scholars giving new attention to the dialogue between Renaissance verbal rhetoric in its multiple forms and the purposes of visual art. I have already mentioned Mark Meadow, and here I also am thinking of Falkenburg's use of the rhetorical trope, familiar from Erasmus and his contemporaries, of "paradoxical encomium." Walter Melion has also worked on formative texts, beginning with Karel van Mander's crucial *Schilderboeck* of 1604 as well as the writings on art by Ortelius and Lampsonius; lately Melion has turned his analytical mind to the vast text-image dialogue in Nadal's illustrated religious tracts and related publications of the Counter-Reformation in Antwerp. Connections between Netherlandish urban Chambers of Rhetoric and the visual arts were investigated in a

1993 Amsterdam conference, where Meadow, Falkenburg, and Nina Serebrennikov made groundbreaking interventions in dialogue with scholars of *rederijkers*.

From the opposite side of the equation, the ongoing studies of early modern, urban, bourgeois literature by Herman Pleij, particularly his books of the *Blue Ship*, the *Snow Puppets of 1511*, and the *Land of Cockaigne*, have illuminated visual motifs of Netherlandish art. Almost the inverse of Pleij's consideration of shared and historically situated visual and verbal culture is Keith Moxey's recent work, notably his *Practice of Theory* and *Practice of Persuasion*, which argue for a radical indeterminacy or fully subjective construction of meaning in visual interpretations as well as history in general. Authorship and argument, that is, rhetoric, he argues, shape art historical writing to fulfill the ideology and interested purpose of the narrative.

One aspect of Netherlandish art that has finally begun to receive necessary attention is the contribution of style to the understanding of a picture's effect and message. There is still too little analysis of the mimetic turn in the fifteenth century in terms of either the analysis of meaning or of theories of seeing, namely what is coming to be called "visuality" (Robert Nelson, ed. 2000), but there has been some real headway in the interpretation of that imported, Italianate formal presentation, often known as Romanism, in sixteenth-century Flanders. A major 1995 catalogue by Nicole Dacos, *Fiamminghi a Roma*, tackled the documentary and forensic side of this issue. Beyond this foundation of travelling artists, there has been a variety of interpretive studies, led by Eric Jan Sluijter's investigations of both Italianate ideal physical forms and classical mythological subjects. In both Sluijter's dissertation on the *heydensche fabulen* in Dutch painting as well as his instructive essays, many of them collected in the recent volume entitled *Seductress of Sight*, Sluijter focuses his attention primarily on the generation of Goltzius and its repercussions for later Dutch art. It is not difficult to understand how nationalistic art historians would have seen such imported forms and subjects as "foreign," opposed to a mimetic indigenous tradition of landscapes or genre images during the sixteenth century, preferring a Bruegel to a Frans Floris or a Heemskerck, for example, but it is gratifying to see such topics finally addressed as part of the fuller art historical record. Recent exhibitions, such as "Bruges and the Renaissance" as well as "Dutch Classicism in Seventeenth-Century Painting," also redress an earlier, willful omission. To a certain extent the same research is happening on the level of individual artists, most notably Jan Gossaert, who is the focus for two promising younger scholars, Ariane Mensger and Stephanie Schrader.

Moxey's recent methodological deconstruction of the discipline reverses his own earlier, social historical interpretations of artworks, particularly prints, ranging from Master ES and the Housebook Master to Nuremberg woodcuts in his *Peasants, Warriors, and Wives*. There he often interrogated the relationship between broadsheet images and their accompanying texts by the likes of Hans Sachs. Representations of soldiers in particular have received focused attention by the historian of warfare, J. R. Hale, and by a new anthology on art and warfare, edited by Pia Cuneo. A more anthropological and cultural reading of the figures of fools, peasants, and beggars is provided by Paul Vandebroek in both his study of Bosch "between folk life and city culture" as well as in his catalogue essay, *Beeld van de andere, Vertoog over het zelf*. Artistic representations

of various genre subjects in prints formed the basis of a rich survey by Eddy de Jongh and Ger Luijten in their 1997 *Mirror of Everyday Life*. Family history has become a topical issue, both in respect to the relations between the sexes and the rearing of children. Historians have made notable contributions to this literature, most notably Stephen Ozment for Germany; for the Netherlands Jeroen Dekker has provided new foundations, and the role of art has recently been reasserted for images of children in the exhibition *Pride and Joy*, by Jan Baptist Bedaux and Ruddi Ekkart. Here, too, we can single out the interpretive investigations of portraiture that have become much more prominent, led by Joanna Woodall. And patronage studies have never been stronger. I think, for example, of Corine Schleif's work on Nuremberg patricians, and I anticipate in particular the forthcoming study of Margaret of Austria by Dagmar Eichberger.

Considerations of sex and gender have inflected many another study of our period, led by the fine prints catalogue by Diane Russell and Bernadine Barnes, entitled *Eva/Ave*. There is also a forthcoming anthology on gender issues, edited by Alison Stewart and Jane Carroll, entitled *Sisters, Saints and Sinners*, which will add to such interpretations. Witchcraft issues have been well explored for both Germany and the Netherlands, by numerous historians, led by Lyndal Roper and Charles Zika, as well as art historian Linda Hults and the co-authors of an important Dutch anthology of 1985, *Tussen heks en heilige*. Images of rape, often taken from illuminated manuscripts and military prints, have been sensitively analyzed by Diane Wolfthal. However, there is still too little attention paid to a more positive eroticism during a period in which the erotic became thematized for mythological figures as well as more ordinary humans. This material has been given closer analysis for Italy recently by Bette Talvacchia, but a seminal essay by Janey Levy on the Behams' erotic engravings in the 1988 Kleinmeister exhibition remains an isolated study for Northern art. Some attention to studies of the erotically charged female nude for Dürer and Baldung (Sigrid Schade and Joseph Koerner) as well as Cranach (Charles Talbot) take on this topic for some of the leading German artists, but more artists and depth of analysis are still needed. Recently the period significance of clothing has received a sensitive reading by English literary historians Anne Jones and Peter Stallybrass. The actual social roles of female patrons, particularly the rulers Margaret of Austria (Dagmar Eichberger), Mary of Hungary (Dirk van den Boogaert), Catherine de' Medici (Sheila Ffolliott), and Elizabeth I of England (Roy Strong), have lately received due attention.

As these considerations of cultural and social issues suggest, one of the things that has changed dramatically over the past quarter century (has it truly been that long?) is the quality and the quantity of our conversations. Art history as a discipline, I am fond of saying, is by its very name interdisciplinary between the internal history of art itself and the role of art as history, as the visual culture of any culture under study, whether that be late medieval, early modern, Renaissance, Reformation, or an emerging national or even imperial culture. Our conversations have become richer during this period: conversations within the HNA across the Atlantic, conversations between museums and academies (exemplified by our joint meeting with the curators of CODART), conversations between art historians and other kinds of historians, including historians

of literature, science, religion, and politics. Some of what I propose to chart here in the remaining time will be the records of such dialogues.

However, I also want to point out that the boundaries between regions and centuries, which seemed so sacrosanct when I began discreetly organized into North vs. South, Renaissance vs. Reformation, fifteenth vs. sixteenth vs. seventeenth centuries, as this conference roster of speakers maintains now begin, quite legitimately, to blur. We now see continuities where once we saw differences or breaks. Even the toughest boundary of all, between modern Belgium and Holland, has become fluid, as the keen current interest in Pieter Bruegel can even attract scholars from both parts of Brabant and remind us of the common language behind the *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, which devoted several recent issues to both Bruegel and the emerging art market of his era.

Indeed, Bruegel scholarship offers a useful index of what has been happening of late in our field more generally. Rhetorical interpretations of Bruegel's work range from the rather literal association of the artist with ancient Roman satirical texts by Margaret Sullivan to the issues of imitation and emulation of earlier visual models evoked by both Mark Meadow and Nina Serebrennikov. Walter Gibson continues to use contemporary literature to support his readings of imagery in relation to contemporary cultural attitudes. Matt Kaveler reads Bruegel images of peasant labor and leisure in relation to larger issues of social order, while Larry Silver considers Bruegel's output in relation to the market pressures to be a second Bosch or an identifiable "brand name" artist while also considering the artist's ongoing preoccupations with nascent capitalism in the busy port city of Antwerp. A recent, major contribution to Bruegel and the nascent world of mapping was produced by Nils BY(R)ttner. Another is the iconological study of Erasmian elements in Bruegel by JY(R)rgen MY(R)ller, entitled *Das Paradox als Bildform*. And of course we are all indebted to the great exhibition of Bruegel graphics last year, organized by Nadine Orenstein and Manfred Sellink.

In similar fashion, a recent volume, *DY(R)rer and his Culture*, was jointly edited by art historian Eichberger and historian Zika, and it features a mixture of authors from both disciplines. Topics include: views of nature and early collections, Germanic patriotism and representations of both local landscape and contemporary soldiers, images of witchcraft and of love, "ways of seeing," problems of censorship and allegories of virtue, and the historiography of DY(R)rer's canonical status and collecting. What we discover in reading the entirety of this book is how much and in how many ways the artist DY(R)rer participated in his contemporary culture.

One area where art history has contributed greatly to this same kind of interdisciplinary understanding of a major early modern phenomenon is the foundational contribution of visual imagery to taxonomic representation of the natural world at the advent of the scientific era. Peter Parshall has written magisterially about "counterfeit" images, especially replicable printed images, whose verisimilitude made them major contributors to the taxonomic classification of the natural world in the sixteenth century

birth of early modern scientific knowledge. We have learned much of Dyer's animals and their legacy from both Fritz Koren and Colin Eisler. Lately Pia Cuneo has carefully studied the visual and verbal understanding of horses, hippology in sixteenth-century German art. Christopher Wood has underscored the importance of the concept of "curiosity" to that era of collecting and learning, and Claudia Swan has discussed de Gheyn's vivid drawings within the learned culture of Leiden University, especially Carolus Clusius. Interestingly, such conversations are not just confined to art museums: one of the most fascinating exhibitions on the subject of scientific wonder stemmed from the Amsterdam Historical Museum, its *De wereld binnen handbereik* exhibition of 1992.

Like the multidisciplinary interests of early modern collectors of natural wonders, modern scholars have also collaborated with art historians to consider this crucial period of knowledge expansion. Historians Pamela Smith and Paula Findlen have just published essays from a rich conference, *Merchants and Marvels*, where art history meets with commerce and science. Roberta Olson's collaboration with astronomer Jay Passachoff complements her researches into the representation of comets. Related contributions to art history have also come from historians Lorraine Daston and Katherine Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature* (1998). But art historians have also made major contributions to the understanding of knowledge through its visual codification; most notably here two recent exhibitions deserve mention: the 1997 study of the humors by Zirka Filipczak, *Hot Dry Men/Cold Wet Women*; and the 2000 examination of "Memory and Knowledge in Early Modern Europe" by Claire Sherman, *Writing on Hands*.

I am really not sure that the so-called "new art history," at least in its dialogue with history or historical anthropology, is so very different from what many of us a generation ago were accustomed to calling "art in context." Ironically, this approach to attempting an interpretive but verbally and ethnographically grounded analysis was a much more significant movement in literary history, where it has come to be called "the new historicism." Our current research moves into a more inclusive notion of what constellates "visual culture" in its historical period, permitting attention to objects, often anonymous, that were not previously considered artworks at all. Jan van der Stock's close study of sixteenth-century Antwerp archives, *Printing Images in Antwerp* (1998) offers a newly inclusive range of all printed images, including wallpapers and anonymous, cheap religious images, in a newly encompassing presentation of published visual works. Similarly, Parshall devotes attention in his book to religious images, broadsheets, town plans, and maps, as well as what we would now call "scientific illustrations," such as herbals.

Parshall's rethinking of print culture reminds us how long we have neglected both the production and the consumption of anonymous, inexpensive woodcuts in the formative years of printmaking, but David Axford is preparing an exhibition on these works, which offers particular attention to the uses of these prints in private devotions and pilgrimages, offering important continuity with devotional images in illuminated manuscripts, especially favorite saints or indulgenced images, such as the Virgin in the Sun or the Holy Wound of Christ, with accompanying prayers. For such images we

return to the late medieval practices drawn by Huizinga and lately by Eamon Duffy's history, *Stripping the Altars*. Wonderful studies of visual culture in the late medieval affective spirituality of pre-Reformation Germany were sketched by the late, great Bob Scribner, culminating in his study of their transformations into "popular propaganda" in early Reformation prints, *For the Sake of Simple Folk* (1981), or in the more specialized consideration of Passion imagery and contemporary practices of public corporal punishment for criminals, Mitchell Merback's *The Thief, the Cross, and the Wheel*.

Indeed, such studies of religious affect return us to the very experience of art works, to such general studies as Hans Belting's *Likeness and Presence* (1994; German ed. 1990), subtitled "a history of the image before the era of art," defined by the author as our very own watershed early modern period, particularly the Reformation in the North. Well beyond our period but still firmly based within it lie continuities of evocative and emotive visionary works, as outlined by David Freedberg for both erotic and religious images, including humble votive images or pilgrimage souvenirs, in his *Power of Images* (1989).

Freedberg's work has also attended to the fear and loathing of images in the form of iconoclasm, particularly the 1566 destruction of images in the Netherlands. But earlier, German Protestant iconoclasm has received considerable interest from religious historians, such as Carlos Eire (*War against the Idols*, 1986), Lee Palmer Wandel (*Voracious Idols and Violent Hands*, 1995) and Sergiusz Michalski (*Reformation and Art*). Earlier attempts to define Lutheran art have been evaluated by Peter and Linda Parshall in their 1986 analytical bibliography, particularly of the many historical exhibitions of the 1983 Luther year. Now the Marian images in Reformation-era Germany have been examined in the dissertation by Bridget Heal, while the Reformation content of Augsburg artist Jörg Breu has been examined by Andrew Morrall in his new monograph.

If I have here often stressed the dialogue between art history and sister disciplines of the humanities, I should also stress that art history has recently come to be a major contributor to economic history. Here some of the work has been collaborative across disciplinary lines, led chiefly by art historian Hans van Miegroet and his colleague from economics, Neil De Marchi. This pair has participated in another major trend of the past quarter-century: the return to the archives, and there they have found troves of dealers' inventories that have permitted both quantitative and qualitative assessments of these taste-makers and exporters of Netherlandish art to other parts of Europe and the emerging colonial worlds. Other major contributors to the study of art markets and economic or social history of art are Michael Montias, John Loughman, and Martin Jan Bok, who have devoted considerable energies to prices and inventories of Dutch art of the seventeenth century, which lies beyond my focus. The very subject of the market as a site of transaction, usually of vegetable produce, also forms a subject in its own right for sixteenth-century Flemish painting, with considerable implications for issues of commodification and the cash nexus of human interactions, as we have learned from Elizabeth Honig. Subjects of money and its corrupting power form a staple of later Netherlandish art, as outlined by economic historian Basil Yamey in his understated book, *Art and Accounting*. At the outset of the sixteenth century, the active art market

in Bruges and the issues of art production for that market have received attentive investigation by Jean Wilson, as articles by Dan Ewing, Lynn Jacobs, and Filip Vermeulen, have amplified this Flemish picture for the Antwerp art market. More broadly, an ambitious collaboration in progress about the Antwerp art market and its methods of production has been undertaken by Groningen colleagues Max Martens and Molly Faries. Another important collaborative project, the Mapping Markets Project, includes the talents of Andrew Morrall, Michael North, Neil De Marchi, and Hans van Miegroet.

What I see emerging at present, therefore, is an art history that is more truly collaborative, making use of the best questions and scholarship from adjacent disciplines: literature, history, science, economics, or politics. While we still have much to learn from re-examinations of archives, of underdrawings, of objects themselves? we surely see and learn many new things about the objects we study when we reflect anew about methods and questions, or when we are challenged to use visual culture to contribute to the general knowledge about other aspects of culture: family or gender, values or knowledge, wealth, status or power. When we follow the lead of such scholars as Reindert Falkenburg or Eric Jan Sluijter, both of whom practice their own dialogue across the Atlantic as well as across the chronological habits of dividing by centuries, when we make active collaborations, such as Max Martens and Molly Faries on the Antwerp art market or Dagmar Eichberger and Charles Zika on the culture of Albrecht Dürer, we are all enriched for the enlarged conversation. Let us remember that our discipline is built on that conceptual dialogue between art and history, between objects and culture, between past and present. The sixteenth century is a complex, tumultuous period, but also a period firmly situated between the Flemish *ars nova* and the Dutch Golden Age, between late medieval and early modern history, between regionalism and international colonialism. We should strive to be at least as flexible and receptive as the artists and media we seek to study (think Dürer), to be conscious of our modern biases and our scholarly methods, as we engage in the ultimate dialogue at once to analyze the differences between ourselves and the media and culture of a lost age, while continually making the connections that necessarily link those very remnants to our present age.

State of the Art in Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Studies

Eric Jan Sluijter

It is revealing that, when I was asked to speak about the present situation in the study of Netherlandish art of the seventeenth century, I misunderstood the question and thought I had to speak about research in Dutch Art. Only when I saw the program of this conference, did I realize with a shock that I was supposed to discuss research in Flemish art too. This is a telling example of the traditional and still existing autism between Dutch and Belgian art historians. A few years ago, when I had to write a critical comment accompanying a bibliography of everything Dutch art historians had published between 1993 and 1998 on art of the early modern period, it suddenly struck me, as I was going through the many hundreds of titles of books, articles and catalogues, that Dutch art historians write about almost everything, except Flemish art after the late sixteenth century. It was an appalling discovery that even publications on Rubens and Van Dyck were absent. The other way round, the same can be said of Belgian art historians. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the time of flowering nationalism as well as the period when the discipline of art history took shape, Dutch and Belgian art historians drew precise territorial lines along the geographical borders of that time. Even today it seems as if, where it concerns the art of The Netherlands after the fall of Antwerp in 1585, an iron curtain has come down which was never fully lifted. Nowadays it has nothing to do with nationalism, I hope; in the first place, it has everything to do with a now long established tradition in the research and teaching of art history: if there are no specialists in the field teaching it at the universities, there will be no offspring. In The Netherlands for instance, there has been a sustained tradition of many good specialists teaching Italian art, so that there is always a next generation of Italianists, but no 'Fleminists.' Thus, and this is also true of the present generation of art historians, the few who publish in both fields are foreigners: American, English or German.

In the past, it became traditional, and this is also true of art historians (such as Horst Gerson) who studied both fields, to emphasize those characteristics which were identified as distinctly Flemish or Dutch, and we all know the familiar catchwords. Hans Vlieghe however, in his new Pelican survey of Flemish art, explicitly emphasizes the continuities in the arts of both countries, and he underlines that one sees more or less the same stylistic and typological developments in genre, landscape and still life painting. After having finished the book he presented a paper ("Flemish art, does it really exist?", published in *Simiolus*), in which he spoke about his growing doubts while writing his survey. At the same time he pointed out that at the time itself, and still as late as Houbraken, no real distinction was made between artists from the Northern or Southern Netherlands, while in foreign countries they were all considered *Fiamminghi*, or Flemings. Moreover, the artists themselves, whether from the northern or southern Netherlands, drew together when they were, for instance, in Rome or London. Thus, it is fitting that the only recent survey covering both fields is a book produced for the Italian market *La pittura dei Paesi Bassi*, under the supervision of Bert Meijer.

Recently there have also been exhibitions in which Dutch and Flemish art was, with good reason, presented together, not only when the focus was on international trends, such as the paintings by Dutch and Flemish followers of Caravaggio exhibited in Raleigh and other American cities, or the exhibition *Greek Gods and Heroes in the Age of Rubens and Rembrandt*, in Athens and Dordrecht, but also in the large still life exhibition in Cleveland and Amsterdam. In an important exhibition on women artists through the ages, *Elck sijn waerom* (in Antwerp and Arnhem), an initiative of Katlijne Van der Stighelen, north and south were brought together as well. In addition two recent and stimulating conferences, last year in Leiden about Netherlandish artists in Britain (as a matter of fact incorrectly entitled "Dutch Artists in Britain") and the highly productive conference in Middelburg on "Art for the Market" in 1998 covered both. Things are changing. Of course it is entirely legitimate to make a choice in surveys or exhibitions between art and artists of Flanders or those within the Seven Provinces, but not in the thoughtless manner that has been common for such a long time.

From Jan Briels's two books on Flemish painters in the Northern Netherlands, although in some respects a bit problematic in their approach, we have learned much more about the role of the immigrant artists in the Northern Netherlands, especially during the transition period at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century. But there is still a lot to be done in defining more precisely the role of those immigrants, painters, dealers as well as consumers, in the explosive developments in the cities of Holland. And, apart from that, we should not stop at examining the common origins, the transfer, and the many ongoing relationships. This should also be a starting point for getting the nature of the interactions as well as the differences in the developments into sharper focus, and for exploring with greater precision how these relate to local art markets, to types of consumers, to religious and political circumstances, and to the shaping of contemporary images of identity. Cultural stereotypes about 'Hollands' and 'Brabants' were constructed and emphasized from the start. We too often assume nowadays that such stereotypes were nineteenth-century constructions. So, it will be clear that the two workshops today and tomorrow of Stephanie Dickey about "Antwerp and Amsterdam, Artistic Exchange and Cross-Fertilization," and the one of Barbara Haeger, Nicola Courtright and Susan Koslow, about "Constructing Ideologies and Aational Identites in Netherlandish Art," are both highly opportune. As a matter of fact, today's politics may also help a little in bringing Dutch and Flemish art historians together, since it is possible to get funding from the Netherlands and Flemish Research Organizations for projects in which Flemish and Dutch scholars work together. This is already happening in an extensive research program in the history of architecture, supervised by Krista de Jonge and Koen Ottenheim (whose workshop tomorrow on architecture, architectural theory and architectural engraving also concerns North and South), while a project is being planned about a comparison in painting-techniques in Flanders and Holland between 1580 and 1630, in which hopefully several institutions in Flanders and The Netherlands will participate.

Reviewing the recent literature, it becomes clear that the number and nature of publications in the field of Dutch and Flemish art are quite different. On the Flemish front the 'Rubens Forschung' and Van Dyck studies are undeniably dominant. In fact, an excellent cross section of current research interests in Flemish art of this period, can be

found in the book with essays, *Concept, Design and Execution in Flemish Painting, 1550-1700*, the result of a six-year project, edited by Hans Vlieghe, Arnout Balis and Carl Van de Velde; also here, whichever way you look at it, Rubens takes central stage. In the case of Dutch art, the number and the variety of publications in subjects, artists and approaches are truly bewildering. Many things have happened during the last decades that have far-reaching consequences for the way we look at this art. For that reason it was quite alarming that little of this could be found in the catalogue of the prestigious exhibition *The Glory of the Golden Age* at the bicentennial anniversary of the Rijksmuseum: the texts in the big catalogue on painting and decorative arts (the one on prints and drawings was a different case) could as well have been written twenty years ago. This catalogue was compiled by members of the educational department and meant for a large public, but even then one has the duty to include the many new insights. As it stands, a book that was sold to more people than any other book on Dutch art, confronts this public with beautiful plates on the one hand, but on the other with uninspired texts, which mainly seem to be compiled on the basis of monographs on artists. It seems almost an offence to much of the art historical labor of the past twenty years. Luckily the contrary is true for the little, but delightfully unconventional survey on *The Art of the Dutch Republic* by Mari't Westermann, who is at the moment undoubtedly the most prolific producer of literature on Dutch art.

Surveying the literature on Flemish and Dutch art of the last eight or so years, it is striking that at both sides the two giants, Rubens and Rembrandt, are still attracting by far the most attention, at the same time often functioning as boosters of new developments in the discipline. In the case of Rubens it has to be said that lately he almost seems to have been eclipsed by Anthony van Dyck who, during the last decade, was so lucky as to have been born 400 years ago in 1999 and to have died 350 years ago in 1991. As Jeffrey Muller described recently, the absolute low point of Van Dyck's reputation was between the two world wars, when he was considered the decadent, over refined, deracinated son of Flanders as an antipode to the virile, healthy Rubens. But Van Dyck made a spectacular comeback in huge exhibitions with impressive catalogues in Washington in 1991, in Genova 1997 and Antwerp and London in 1999, as well as in some splendid smaller exhibitions with excellently researched catalogues: on landscape drawings by Martin Royalton Kisch and on Van Dyck and the art of printmaking by Ger Luijten and Carl Depauw, and finally in two sizable books with symposium papers that were diverse in approaches as well as in quality.

For Rubens studies, it is of course the *Corpus Rubenianum* that still carries the field, that monument, which, at a steady pace, continues already for 35 years with impeccable scholarship, and with admirable concern for the developments and changes in art historical methodology. Not long ago Kristin Belkin remarked somewhat wryly that this exemplary series barely attracts the local press, while everything about Rembrandt (as well as every utterance coming from the Rembrandt Research Project, one may add), elicits international front page attention; fascinating to think about.

The high level of scholarship of the *Corpus Rubenianum* gave us some of the best books of the last decade, among them Elizabeth McGrath's *Subjects from History* of 1997, which is not only one of the most distinguished in the Rubens Corpus, showing in every

respect the strength of the series, but in my view also the most impressive book on Netherlandish art of the seventeenth century that appeared during the last years. In an almost playful way, with marvelous sprezzatura, as if she were emulating Rubens himself, she combines a wide learnedness with acute visual analysis of the works of art. Her understanding of the characteristics of Rubens's inventions, his use of texts and subtle wit, is highly compelling; I would say that her book instructs, delights and moves as few other art historical writings do.

Apart from the Corpus volumes, and the lively, concise monograph of Kristin Belkin in the new Phaidon series *Art & Ideas*, several important books were published of which I only mention Fiona Healy's *Rubens and the Judgement of Paris*, a book of incisive scholarship. That a workshop will be held today about Rubens's 'Allegorical Inventions,' and that there is one tomorrow on 'Image and Ritual of Scherpenheuvel,' seems to fit perfectly into recent concerns in scholarship on Flemish art, in the latter case because a lot of research is presently being done in the field of post-tridentine iconography of church decoration.

If there were no large exhibitions of Rubens's work during the last years, only the relatively modest but strikingly effective exhibition with a delightful catalogue *Making and Meaning in Rubens's Landscapes*, by Christopher Brown, Rembrandt represents in this respect an entirely different case. Even without the excuse of being born or having died some round number of years ago, he managed to get a host of important exhibitions with massive catalogues. Not only are Rembrandt studies booming, also on the exhibition circuit there seems no end in sight, as Stephanie Dickey recently remarked. Apart from the large Rembrandt exhibition in 1992 in Amsterdam, Berlin and London, there was the exhibition *Rembrandt/not Rembrandt* at the Metropolitan Museum in 1995, an unusual presentation around Rembrandt connoisseurship, that was the more interesting because the two main authors, Walter Liedtke and Hubert von Sonnenburg had entirely different approaches to connoisseurship. There was *Rembrandt by Himself* in London and The Hague in 1999, to which I will return, Albert Blankert's *Rembrandt: A Genius and his Impact* of 1997 in Melbourne, where Rembrandt himself was remarkably well represented with less obvious works and with an excellent selection of works by pupils. Then there was the small but nice exhibition *Rembrandt's Treasures* in the Rembrandthuis (1999), contextualizing his collecting activities, the delightful exhibition and important catalogue of Rembrandt's drawings made in and around Amsterdam of (1998), and *Rembrandt the Printmaker* in Amsterdam and London (2000), accompanied by the exemplary and beautifully produced catalogue by Erik Hinterding, Ger Luijten and Martin Royalton Kisch, with much new material about the production of prints. But we are not yet finished, the most recent exhibitions being "Rembrandt Creates Rembrandt," in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, presenting a thoughtful examination of only a few years of Rembrandt's activities, last year the quite spectacular exhibition "Rembrandt's Women", in Edinburgh and London, and finally the exhibition on the young Rembrandt in Kassel and presently in the Rembrandthuis, visualizing Ernst van de Wetering's rethinking of the first volume of the Rembrandt Corpus, which resulted in a truly probing and personal exhibition that offers much food for thought.

Apart from Simon Schama's daring attempt to look through Rembrandt's eyes, written in an engaging prose that reaches a large public, there are quite a lot of recent books worth mentioning, but the most important is undoubtedly Ernst van de Wetering's *Rembrandt at Work*, a collection of studies, several of them essays originally written for the Rembrandt Corpus, and with some new chapters added. Reading this book we realize how much Ernst van de Wetering has enriched our knowledge and understanding, not only of the relation between technical and creative aspects in Rembrandt's works, but also in our insights in working methods and studio practices in general. Furthermore, his analysis of painting techniques in combination with a careful rereading of the contemporary vocabulary in treatises on painting, something we also find in some important publications of Paul Taylor ? has led to new insights in the artistic process. And related to this, Van de Wetering has highlighted the role of the connoisseur and the terms and categories in which seventeenth-century connoisseurs would have talked about painting. I think that the impact of Ernst van de Wetering over the years can hardly be overrated, even if his opinions sometimes provoke objections, as for instance in his essay for the *Rembrandt by Himself* catalogue. Arguing convincingly that the self portraits may have functioned as samples of virtuosity meant for connoisseurs interested in artistic skill and celebrity likeness, he rudely brushed aside, calling them nineteenth-century concepts, any notion of self-portraiture as being bound up with individual identity, in passing condemning Perry Chapman's book on Rembrandt's self-portraits as anachronistic. However, those who read Perry Chapman's important book know that she carefully locates Rembrandt's conception of individual identity within in a seventeenth- century context. For a good understanding of the issues at stake in this discussion I can refer to Stephanie Dickey's acute review of the *Rembrandt by Himself* catalogue in the *Art Bulletin*.

Anti-theoretical as this catalogue is, the other extreme should also be mentioned, a book written by an outsider coming from literary studies: Rembrandt's fictions of the pose. *Rembrandt against the Italian Renaissance*, by Harry Berger Jr., of which the first 350 pages entirely consist of theory, covering almost all aspects of post modern cultural theory and the politics of portraiture in the early modern period, while the last 200 pages contain a provocative discussion of Rembrandt's self-portraits, shifting the attention from the painter's act of painting likeness, to the sitter's part in the act of portrayal and self-portrayal.

A whole range of approaches to one work by Rembrandt, is to be found in the very useful series of Cambridge University Press on one work of art, in this case Rembrandt's *Bathsheba* in the Louvre. Although the ugly appearance of the book is shameful, with badly printed reproductions and, even worse, Bathsheba in mirror image on front and back cover, it is a wonderful way to present current methodology: documentation and technical analysis, up to date iconological interpretation, as well as literary theory and semiotics. Not only useful for students, but for all of us. This sampling of approaches we also find in that valuable collection of essays *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting*, edited by Wayne Franits, with old essays that played a more or less decisive role in the debate about the significance of Dutch art for their original audience, to which important new articles were added that acknowledge more recent methodologies. An enormous range of present scholarship is also to be

found in the book with no less than 23 symposium papers delivered in Washington and The Hague on the art of Vermeer ? Vermeer, the artist who may have eclipsed Rembrandt in the sheer numbers of people attracted by the recent exhibitions of his work in Washington and The Hague, and last year in New York and London, where he was spectacularly shown within a Delft school constructed by Walter Liedtke. But the number of publications on Vermeer do not come near to those on Rembrandt, it is only in recent novels that he suddenly outstrips him, which says a great deal about the startling public response to his art. The scholarly books that appeared, tend to be original and provocative, a special case being Ivan Gaskell's challenging book, *Vermeer's Wager. Speculations on Art History, Theory and Art Museums*, in which, mainly through the art of Vermeer, he explores how art works are mediated not only through reproduction, in particular photography, but also through displays in museums.

For the remaining minutes I have to venture into the whole field of recent publications on Netherlandish Art apart from the biggest names. And then the staggering variety becomes too much for me to handle, I am afraid. First of all, the *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* merits special attention, because it stimulates innovative studies alongside more traditional research around certain topics. The present editors, Reindert Falkenburg, Herman Roodenburg, Frits Scholten, Jan de Jong and Mari't Westermann have a sure hand in choosing topics which are, time and again, in the center of up-to-date interests and debates in the field of Dutch and Flemish art. At the same time they manage to assemble exciting collections of articles, often thought provoking and always of a thoroughly scholarly quality, intermingling interdisciplinary concerns with sound art history. The yearbooks about Goltzius, about *Image and Self Image, Nature and Landscape, Art for the Market, The Art of Home in The Netherlands ?* and I mention only the ones of which the focus is primarily on the late sixteenth- and seventeenth centuries, belong to the most important publications of the last years and are required reading of every student in the field. They make clear in how many directions good art historical scholarship may go without losing any of its specificity, at the same time undercutting notions that traditional art history belongs to the past, or that all new art history is nonsense. On the contrary, they show how well they may inform each other, and that the worst thing one can do is dismiss everything that differs from one's own approach. We have seen this attitude for instance in some reviews of the just mentioned yearbooks. Such an attitude, in which one does not even try to understand what others are talking about, in both camps often marked by a kind of condescending arrogance, is absolutely unprofitable and only helps to widen the gulf between the two, a gulf that often, but not always, coincides with the study of Netherlandish art in the Netherlands and Belgium on the one hand, England and America on the other, with Germany somewhere in between, and which has a lot to do with different traditions in academic education.

Well, that being said, it is gratifying that on the one hand during the last years there has still been an enormous production of traditional monographs with catalogues raisonnés, which many decades from now will still be used eagerly. Among them are huge ones, I only think of the almost improperly fat monographs on Gerrit van Honthorst by Judson and Ekkart and Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem by Van Thiel, as well as the many normal sized ones, some of them focusing on one aspect of an artist's oeuvre, such as the

beautiful book by Kristi Nelson on Jacob Jordaens's tapestry designs. On the other hand, these are balanced by less traditional books on one artist, such as Mari't Westermann's entertaining *Amusements of Jan Steen*, in which Jan Steen's comical work is interpreted within the context of comic literature and performance, rituals and social practices, or Celeste Brusati's *Artifice and Illusion* that offered a wonderfully versatile approach to Samuel van Hoogstraten's written and painted works, which are discussed as highly self-reflexive and as elements of his formidable self-fashioning, a book that exemplifies the best in recent critical scholarship in Dutch art.

I have to pass over the incredible activities on the exhibition front, exhibitions accompanied by catalogues that often become standard works on the subject (not always something to be happy with, if only for the lack of indices): in the first place an amazing number of large and important monographic exhibitions, from many artists of the old canon like Potter, Steen, Van Goyen, Dou, and Cuyp, to more recent additions such as Judith Leyster, Norbertus Gysbrechts and Michael Sweerts. And I should add here that many of the catalogues have a prominent section on technique, which emphasizes the importance of the many recent and accessible studies in painting techniques that confront a wide audience with new directions in technical research, and make us all more conscious of the process and the act of painting as well as of workshop practices.

I will also pass over the staggering variety of thematic exhibitions showing the many directions in art historical as well as public interests: from the spectacular, but also debatable selection of paintings under the denominator 'Dutch Classicism,' by Albert Blankert, to the beautiful exhibition on Children Portraits, and from impressive exhibitions on Pastoral Art or Greek Mythology, to those on Seascapes or Winter Scenes, as well as a remarkable outpouring of exhibitions and catalogues on the art in Dutch cities: Dordrecht, Rotterdam, Haarlem, Alkmaar, Utrecht, Zwolle, The Hague and Delft, all very different in character and quality, sometimes mainly compilations of older literature, but more often adding much new material to our knowledge. There is a lot of other important work that I have to skip now, such as some very interesting studies on the complicated role of religious denomination that has been attracting more attention over the last years; studies about the relation between art and the natural sciences which will also be discussed in a workshop here; several important iconographic and iconological studies, exploring how themes articulate the concerns of the culture in which they were made, among them several on women and the issue of domesticity. And I would have liked to dwell on the recent surge of interest in the representation of the home, not only in the latest *NKJ*, but also in the interesting catalogue accompanying the exhibition *Art & Home*, and in the delightful book *Het Nederlandse interieur in beeld*, containing a large and exemplary selection of paintings, drawings and prints of Dutch interiors from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, with highly expert texts by Willemijn Fock.

Much goes on in the study of seventeenth- century art literature, in this field we thankfully received within five years the incredible *Fundgrube* of Hessel Miedema's five immensely thorough volumes with comments on Van Mander's *Lives*; but here I only wanted to mention the wonderful and erudite article by the oldest and most prominent HNA-member, Julius Held. His study in the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld*

Institutes of Scribanius's discussion of Antwerp painters in his 1610 city description, was published when Julius was 93 years old. To attain this level of scholarly sophistication at such an age, is the highest we can strive for as art historians, although I wonder if any of us will ever emulate Julius's achievement.

One field that is really booming, is that of the print culture, the importance of which we already came across in new publications on Van Dyck and Rembrandt. At last, it is becoming part of the canon of Dutch art, as we could see in the huge exhibition and catalogue of *The Dawn of the Golden Age*, in which prints got deservedly a very important place. Next to the steady production in the ever useful and important New Hollstein-series, it is the process of printmaking and print publishing that gets much attention now, as in the new series on prints and printmaking, in which appeared Nadine Orenstein's book on Hendrick Hondius's business, and Ilja Veldman's two impressive volumes on Crispyn de Passe and his family. But also within the study of prints the variety is enormous, extending to the interpretation of themes and subjects as well, from the traditional iconographic methods in the delightful exhibition of Eddy de Jongh and Ger Luijten on genre prints, to the steady stream of densely argued readings of printed images by Walter Melion.

Finally, what really changed our view of Dutch painting most fundamentally, so that no survey, be it a book or a lecture course, can ever be the same as, say ten years ago, are the studies about the art market, about the relations between producing, selling and buying of paintings, about the socio-economic circumstances under which art was made, sold and used. In contrast with the rather crude Marxist approach from the sixties and seventies, the more recent achievements in this field went hand in hand with a host of new archival research, which, since the generation of Bredius, had long been neglected. But this changed drastically with the work of Michael Montias, Marten Jan Bok, Willemijn Fock, Jaap van der Veen, Pieter Biesboer, John Loughman and, of course, Duverg? here in Antwerp. If we only think of the research in probate inventories, and here the work for the Getty Provenance Index, which became a very important art historical tool, has played a truly stimulating role? then we realize how much we have learned from this in quite a short span of time. The most recent result is the delightful book *Public and Private Spaces. Works of Art in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Houses*, based on extensive inventory research by Loughman and Montias.

To ask questions about the connections between the production of paintings and social and economic factors, or to question how painters positioned themselves in the local market with certain types of products, such questions have become so self-evident, that it is hard to realize how this changed our thinking in quite a short period. It was of course Michael Montias's work, starting with his *Artists and Artisans in Delft* (which appeared already twenty years ago), that gave the signal, followed by his many articles about price and labor costs, art dealers, economic factors and style, the volume of the production of paintings, and studies on probate inventories. Important next steps were the dissertation of Marten Jan Bok on *Supply and Demand in the Dutch Art Market*, and the publications by Neil De Marchi and Hans Van Miegroet on price and market mechanisms, on market value of copies and originals, on the Antwerp art export, etc. The conference at Middelburg of 1998 and the *NKJ* on *Art for the*

Market, contributed greatly to our understanding of the interdependence of the artistic and the economic and showed how the field, first stimulated by economists and historians, is expanding and how the results are taken up by art historians and developed in several directions. Many projects are now under way: at this conference we will hear more about present and future research when De Marchi and Van Miegroet give a presentation of the *Mapping Markets for Paintings Project*, in which many scholars are working together. To conclude, I am certain that at this conference we may look forward to many workshops and sessions which take up a variety of exciting directions that will engender much stimulating research in the near future.
