

Nicht nur diese Tendenz der Kunstpädagogik, technische und formale Problemlösungen zu verabsolutieren, schafft eine Barriere zur Kunstgeschichte, sondern auch die komplementäre Tendenz, künstlerische Fragestellungen auf die des Ausdrucks von Subjektivität zu reduzieren. Hier könnte die Kunstgeschichte einer bedenklichen subjektivistischen Entwicklung in den letzten Jahren entgegenwirken, indem sie die unverzichtbare Funktion der Objektivierung künstlerischer Intentionen übernimmt. Sie kann klarstellen, daß auch die individuelle Handschrift, Formensprache und Fragestellung historisch und sozial geprägt sind, daß es sich auch hier um „symbolische Formen“ handelt, die intersubjektiv vermittelbar sein müssen, um rezipiert werden zu können.

Zwar stellt der Übergang von rationaler kunsthistorischer Analyse zu freier künstlerischer Assoziation und Phantasietätigkeit sicher weiter ein Problem dar, an dem sich Kunsthistoriker und Künstler reiben. Aber die Kunstdidaktik sollte beides zu verbinden suchen, oder wenigstens ein Experimentierfeld bilden, auf dem Möglichkeiten der Anregung künstlerischer Tätigkeiten durch analytische Verfahren erprobt werden.

Der Chance, auf ein neues Berufsfeld, nämlich die Schule, hin ausbilden zu können, sollte sich die Kunstgeschichte nicht länger verschließen, indem sie sich wie bisher gegen die Lehrerausbildung institutionell wie inhaltlich weithin abschottet. Der Forschung und Lehre werden damit neue Impulse, die gerade die Ansprüche von Laien vermitteln, vorenthalten, die diese dringend nötig haben. Mit Sicherheit läßt sich sagen, daß in Zukunft auf eine Didaktisierung der Wissenschaften und ihre Orientierung auf „Abnehmer“ nicht wird verzichtet werden können. D. h. es wird auf Dauer auch an den Universitäten keine „Elitewissenschaft“ bestehen können, die sich ihrer Legitimierung und Verantwortung der breiten Bevölkerung gegenüber entziehen kann. Die Einrichtung von „Wissenschaftsläden“ in unseren europäischen Nachbarländern (und in anderen Disziplinen auch bereits in der BR Deutschland) sind ein Indiz für diese Entwicklung. Es hieße zudem die Tradition der Kunstgeschichte preisgeben, wollte man Lehre und Forschung im gesellschaftlichen Abseits zu einer Rarität für Spezialisten verkümmern lassen. Ihr Gegenstandsbereich war einmal zentral für die kulturelle Praxis des Bürgertums, über ihn definierte sich zu einem guten Teil die Humanbildung. Diese Tradition sollte die Kunstgeschichte fortsetzen und erneuern.

Jutta Held

## REZENSIONEN

W. KUYPER. *Dutch Classicist Architecture. A Survey of Dutch Architecture, Gardens and Anglo-Dutch Architectural Relations from 1625 to 1700.* Delft University Press, 1980. xxx and 326 pp. text, 266 pages of illustrations.

Dutch seventeenth-century classical architecture came into being in the 1620s: a three-dimensionally conceived style of building inspired by that of classical antiquity-

ty, both directly and through its study and revival elsewhere, yet tailored to suit the needs of a protestant republic and of an often chilly, marshy land with crowded cities and no native building stone. The style was favoured by leading Amsterdam citizens from the start, quickly followed by patrons in the stadholder's circle at The Hague. In the ensuing decades the new architecture became general, ousting, so far as conditions allowed, the traditional structures, overlaid surface by surface with mannered 'renaissance' decoration, of the preceding age. The architect, in the sense of a designer of buildings who is not an artisan, appeared in the United Provinces at the same time. Dutch seventeenth-century classicism was heralded by experiments in spacial design by Hendrik de Keyser (d. 1621), who was trained on the job, but its first champion was the painter and architect Jacob van Campen, a quick mathematician (thus equipped to cope with the subtleties of the classical style), possessor of De Barbaro's Italian edition of Vitruvius, constant user of Scamozzi's *l'Idée dell'Architettura* (Venice, 1615), yet no master of the builder's craft.

Another painter and architect who furthered the change, Salomon de Bray, perceptively chronicled the metamorphosis in building taking place before his eyes, as early as 1631. Other contemporary writers, among them the connoisseur Huygens and the ever well-informed poet Vondel, throw revealing light on the origins and reception of the new style, and successive Dutch editions of translations from Scamozzi (from 1640) and of works derived from these, testify to its growing popularity. Its further adaptation to Dutch needs by Pieter Post and Justus and Philips Vingboons, leading members of the next generation, is largely recorded in prints for which the architects themselves were responsible.

Much of the architecture of Holland's golden age survives. Its style had some influence abroad: notably in England, at a time when cultural contacts across the North Sea were strong. Yet, in spite of the wealth of records, it was seldom studied in depth or viewed in the round before the present half-century, its earlier discussion being mainly confined to the publication, itself invaluable, of archival material, to the stylistic comparison of plans, elevations, or details, too often seen as separate entities, and to apparently subjective assessments of quality. Since about 1950, however, there has been a change of emphasis. Studies have appeared of individual works or groups of works seen in their historical and cultural context and as a three-dimensional whole, and examples of town planning and of garden design — both important adjuncts of Dutch classical architecture — have been similarly examined. With this, the foundations on which a first survey of the subject might in part be based have at last been laid.

It is against this background that the book discussed here must be placed. New assessments are called for and can now be made. In responding, Mr. Kuyper is generous. He surveys not only Dutch seventeenth-century classical architecture but also its influence in England, and Dutch garden design as well. Town planning is dealt with occasionally in passing. If only because it was essential to the scheme for improving The Hague of which Huygens' house and the Mauritshuis formed part, and to Van Campen's designs, equally revolutionary in their time, for both Haar-

lem's Nieuwe Kerk and Amsterdam's Town Hall, this subject should perhaps have had higher priority. In a very useful final chapter 'The Printed Sources' are surveyed for the first time: prints documenting Dutch seventeenth-century buildings, and architectural treatises and handbooks in Dutch, including translations into Dutch, published in the United Provinces in the seventeenth century. Misleadingly in view of the title, treatises used by Dutch architects but published abroad are not included, though such sources are of course mentioned in the text and notes. There are 266 pages of illustrations. A bibliography covering the book's many topics was not to be expected but, through the wide-ranging though at times capricious index, references to much literature cited may easily be traced.

The author's account of his main theme, Dutch classical architecture, the aspect of his book which is reviewed here, is interspersed with the treatment of his other themes and arranged in part chronologically and in part by subject. Thus his account of the style's leading architects, both Dutch and English, in Part II, appears between sections on 'Preludes to Classicism and Seventeenth Century Churches' (up to Dutch influence on Wren) and on 'Country Houses and Gardens in Holland' (to the end of the seventeenth century). In a fourth section, 'The Flat Style, 1670—1700', the author deals with later seventeenth-century Dutch architects and their works, the term 'flat style' referring to the relatively sober surfaces of these buildings. The houses of William III and his court, though in some respects more richly decorated than most, are included here, as well as two unexecuted church designs, and Dutch influence in England in the later part of the century. Finally, historicism in Dutch seventeenth-century architecture is discussed, and conclusions are drawn. The wisdom of this arrangement is open to doubt, for related themes are too often split up, making it hard to piece the unfolding story of Dutch classical architecture together and to view the scene as a whole. The discussion of Van Campen's Haarlem church, for example, precedes the account of Van Campen himself, where this milestone in his achievement and in Dutch art is not referred to.

The somewhat piecemeal approach which the book's set-up implies also qualifies the treatment of other aspects of its main theme. In line with earlier traditions in Dutch architectural history, the planning and tangible features of the buildings dealt with are often described and compared in some detail. Yet the picture given of the nature of the architecture concerned, thought of in terms of solid form and of space, and used pertinently to meet specific needs, strikes one as fragmented and at times incomplete. (How otherwise, for example, could a description of the Maurits-huis's plan be separated from the discussion of the house at large by some 50 pages, or could the, in a church so apposite, spacial proportions of Arent van 's Gravesande's Marekerk, Leiden, which symbolise perfect or divine harmony and may well refer to the Heavenly Jerusalem, fail to have been mentioned?) In addition, terms relating to architectural styles are too often used without clear definition, among them 'Dutch (seventeenth-century) classicist architecture' itself, and important contemporary clues to what in essence was going on are not always exploited. The significance of Huygens' explanation that the figures on his pediment represented

the three principles of good architecture — derived from Vitruvius — of renaissance theory is not fully brought out in connection with the design of his house, and his reference to these principles in complimenting the Amsterdam burgomasters on their new town hall is passed over, though the literature concerned is used. Among other such instances, De Bray's momentous assessment of what could and could not be done with classical architecture in the Dutch republic, and Huygens' pithy comments of 1651 on developments in Dutch building, put into the mouth of a bargee passing his country house, might also have contributed to the story told. If missed chances are mentioned, however, it must also be remembered that the book brings together a vast amount of information and documentation and points the way to still more.

Finally it must be said that various claims made and conclusions drawn by the author are open to discussion, the grounds on which they are based being far from clear. The statement 'It is probable that Van Campen had visited London' early in his career is not substantiated. Patently, one would suppose, Huygens did not desire to obscure the 'design history' of his house in The Hague. His jottings, made with the intention of informing his sons but alas not worked out, surely demonstrate the contrary. To the present writer's knowledge there is no reason for regarding him as the probable 'director' of a design bearing the monogram SGL for the Amsterdam Town Hall. The design's Italian features, together with Huygens' connections with architecture and his Italian journey, hardly in themselves provide grounds for this. Nor is there concrete evidence for his 'strategems in securing the commission' for that building for Van Campen. Irrelevancies occur in the notes, yet matters such as those mentioned here are not always fully explored.

The author presents his material in English, to the benefit of scholars abroad. No comprehensive survey of his main subject has appeared except in Dutch since that in Galland's now outdated handbook of 1890. Of the linguistic slips perhaps inevitable in a work of this kind, few are seriously misleading, though the frequent use of 'editor' for 'publisher' in the survey of printed sources and elsewhere may be mentioned here. Yet in other respects the foreign reader is less well served. The statement hidden in a note that "'Holland' ... is sometimes used for the whole Republic" is insufficient. The term's use without distinction for both province and state is at best ambiguous and the, to the outsider bewildering, 'remoteness from Holland' of Middelburgh remains unexplained. Again, it is not mentioned in the text that the 'Noncalvinist' churches discussed (Ch. 5) stood or stand in Amsterdam, and definitions of some of the Dutch words used are hard to find. Many assessments of buildings, parts of buildings, or even persons, moreover, couched in the most general terms, not fully explained and not helped by translation, may also baffle the reader: 'rather an able building', 'extremely picturesque if not completely Gothic', 'not an inspiring architect', to name but a few.

A valiant attempt has been made to do justice, in one volume, to no less than three complex subjects none of which, at the time of publication, had been recently

surveyed. It is sad that the resulting book, a richly illustrated compendium pointing the way to so much, is marred by so many blemishes.

Katharine Fremantle

ERICH HUBALA, *Johann Michael Rottmayr*. Mit einem Beitrag über die Stellung des Malers in der Geschichte der barocken Maltechnik von MANFRED KOLLER. Herold-Verlag Wien 1981. 308 S. Text, 272 SW-Abbildungen, 24 Farbtafeln. Leinen mit Schutzumschlag. DM 198,—

Eine Monographie über Johann Michael Rottmayr (1654—1730) bedarf keiner Begründung. Umfang, Vielfalt, Qualität und Wirkung seines Werkes sichern ihm ebenso einen hohen Rang in der Geschichte der deutschen Malerei wie sein zielstrebigster Aufstieg vom kleinstädtischen Organistensohn aus Laufen an der Salzach zum geadelten „Kaiserlichen Kammermahler“ Rottmayr von Rosenbrunn in Wien. Seine Tätigkeit reichte von Salzburg und Wien bis nach Böhmen, Mähren, Schlesien, Franken, Schwaben, Bayern, Südtirol und Kroatien. Mit den Deckengemälden in Salzburg, Frain, Breslau, Pommersfelden, Melk und Wien, mit seinen großformatigen Altarblättern und Historienbildern setzte er sich an die Spitze der Gründergeneration einer eigenständigen deutschen Monumentalmalerei im 18. Jahrhundert. Sein Einfluß und Eindruck auf die österreichischen und süddeutschen Freskantanten hält bis zum Beginn des Klassizismus an. Das fresco buono ist ihm ebenso vertraut wie die Sakkotechnik oder die Ölmalerei auf der Wand, die flüchtig andeutende Entwurfszeichnung wie das bildmäßig vollendete Aquarell, der ausführungsgeladene Bozzetto auf Leinwand wie das skizzenhafte Kleinbild oder die kleinbildhafte Ölskizze, die komplizierte Allegorie wie die allegorisierende Mythologie oder das schlichte Heiligenbild. Als Kolorist führt er aus dem Tenebroso des 17. Jahrhunderts in die volle Farbenpracht des deutschen Spätbarock und Rokoko, als Bildgestalter aus der Renaissancetradition tektonischer Kompositionsschemata zur Eigenstimmigkeit von Farbe, Licht, Rhythmus und Massenverteilung innerhalb des Bildfeldes, die eine der wichtigsten Voraussetzungen für die Leistungen der folgenden Malergenerationen in Süddeutschland und Österreich werden sollte.

Daß Erich Hubala immer wieder eindringlich auf diese Schlüsselstellung Rottmayrs hinweist und sie anschaulich zu machen versteht, daß er im direkten Gespräch mit dem Werk vor allem den Künstler Rottmayr zu Wort kommen läßt, ohne der modernen Aufzählungssucht kunsthistorischer Vorbilder und Anregungen zu frönen, macht — für mich jedenfalls — den Wert seines Buches aus. Wenn er Prunk und Vornehmheit als „die hervorstechenden und durchgehenden Züge der Farbe bei Rottmayr“ (S. 94) bezeichnet, wenn er seine volkstümliche Sprache, jenes „Großschreiben“ (S. 92) hervorhebt, die Rottmayrs Figurenbildung charakterisiert, wenn er bei der Beschreibung des elterlichen Epitaphs in Laufen (S. 16) auf