Nr. 36, Cornelis de Heem, Blumen in einer gläsernen Vase: Der vorne über die Tischkante hängende Schlafmohn ist ein typisches Motiv Willem van Aelsts; tatsächlich befindet er sich identisch auf dessen Bildern: Verst. London (Christie's), 7. Juli 1989, Nr. 45, sign. u. dat. 1659, sowie Kapstadt, Kat. *The Max Michaelis Gift to the Union of South Africa. The Old Town House, Cape Town. Illustrated Catalogue of Flemish and Dutch Paintings* (T. Martin Wood), London 1913, S. 17f. Nr. 1, sign. u. dat., Tafel 1. Eine überraschende Beziehung quer zu den Schulen also, die im Einzelfall neue Fragen zur Bildgenese und Datierung aufwirft, aber auch grundsätzlich die isolierte Darstellung einer De Heem-Schule aufbricht. Nicht zuletzt zeigen Künstler wie Ernst Stuven, Rachel Ruysch, Elias van den Broek, Coenraet Roepel usw. Einflüsse De Heems *und* Van Aelsts.

Gregor J. M. Weber

Rezensionen

HELLA ROBELS, *Frans Snyders, Stilleben- und Tiermaler, 1579–1657.* München, Deutscher Kunstverlag 1989. 592 Seiten mit 284 Schwarzweißabbildungen und 8 Farbtafeln. DM 220,—.

Frans Snyders, Stilleben- und Tiermaler. 1579–1657 is the first monograph devoted to the great Antwerp painter, whom the author, Hella Robels, fittingly calls „the Nestor of Flemish still-life and animal painting." Snyders has not received the attention he deserves largely because scholars of Flemish art have focused on history painting as the most characteristic expression of Baroque art in the region. Concomitant with this attitude is the art-theoretical position that values still-life and animal painting, Snyders's specialities, less than history painting. Also the very real practical difficulties his œuvre presents, especially with regard to chronology and connoisseurship, have deterred scholars from studying his paintings. Born in 1579, Snyders gained his mastership in 1602, and from then on he produced a great abundance of pictures until shortly before his death. However, few paintings in his extensive œuvre are dated – Robels catalogues 259 surviving paintings – and the majority of these fall within a mere three years, 1613–1616. Furthermore, because Snyders uses the same motifs repeatedly throughout his career, and even, on occasion, identical compositions and arrangements, establishing a convincing chronology is fraught with difficulty. In addition, since replicas and variants were produced in Snyders's shop, the original often cannot be recognized with certainty. And outside the shop copies and variants were made, too, and passed off as originals, even in Snyders's lifetime. Given these circumstances, it is evident that connoisseurship is especially complex. Yet, despite these seemingly

insurmountable problems Hella Robels has been able to identify Snyders's corpus and construct its chronology. This accomplishment is a major contribution to the study of seventeenth-century art, and places scholars deeply in her debt. At last we have a clear and comprehensive picture of Snyders's art.

The book's structure is straightforward, methodical and easy to follow. An introductory chapter reviews the thematic content of Snyders's pictures and their interpretation; it traces the development of still life, particularly in the Netherlands, and discusses Snyders's innovative treatment of animal subjects, as well as numerous other topics, including installation, patronage, chronology and stylistic development. The last two problems are considered in detail in the third chapter, „Werk," where each theme Snyders represented – larders and market scenes with figures, game pieces and larders without figures, small and medium-sized still life, fruit garlands and fruit wreaths, hunting pictures and other types of animal scenes – is reviewed systematically. Also included in this chapter are separate studies on Snyders's collaboration with Rubens, on Snyders's collaboration with other artists, on oil sketches and drawings, and finally on the porcelain, ceramic and precious-metal vessels represented in the still lifes.

Sandwiched between the „Introduction" and the third chapter is a brief biography based on a close reading of documents. An Appendix, though not placed at the end of the chapter, is a helpful supplement, since it includes twelve letters documenting Snyders's stay in Milan in 1608–1609. Except for Crivelli's 1868 study of Jan Brughel, which is not readily accessible, these letters have not been published in their entirety. The most important addition to earlier accounts of the artist's life is the publication of the bequests in Snyders's fourth and final testament of 1655; these legacies identify the members of his large extended family, document his substantial wealth, and describe paintings, prints and drawings he owned, which are not listed in the inventory of Snyders's picture collection sent to the Parisian picture dealer Picart in 1659. However, a startling addition to the biography is incorrect. Robels reports, supposedly on the basis of entries in the municipal passport registry, that Snyders traveled to Holland in the company of fellow artists Gerard Seghers, Abraham Brueghel, and Adriaen van Utrecht in 1641 and again with Van Utrecht and Jacob Jordaens in 1642; but an examination of the registry does not support the claim. Passports were obtained by Snyders on June 13, 1635, March 2, 1638, April 1640, May 1641, March 1642, May 1643, April 1644, May 1646, and October 1645. These passports were essentially import/export duties on merchandise and not travel passes. In any case, Snyders's name is not recorded together with the other artists names: for example, for the May 1641 register Snyders's name appears on folio 28 recto, while Gerard Seghers's and Ambrosius Brueghel's are recorded on 28 verso.

Robels states her aim in the monograph's foreword: to collect and sort all available material so that Snyders's true identity can emerge distinctly. This aim is realized most completely in the catalogue raisonné, which accounts for

more than two-thirds of the book. It is divided into three sections: original work, including oil sketches and drawings; school pieces and false attributions; and documented pictures which cannot be recognized in surviving paintings. In the first and second sections a parallel order is used. Still life and its decorative applications is treated first, then animal pictures, and finally Snyders's collaboration with Rubens, Van Dyck and other figure painters. With few exceptions all pictures considered in the catalogue's first section are illustrated, eight with superb color plates, the remainder with fine black and white reproductions, but only twelve of the ninety drawings accepted are illustrated.

The catalogue is invaluable; not only do the entries give conventional data, which we would expect to find in this context, but considerable additional information is furnished as well: replicas, copies, copies with variations, and drawings are listed with bibliography; collaborators are mentioned; and finally interpretative observations are made summarizing arguments presented in the main body of the text. In short, the entries, though concise, are loaded with information and allow the reader to follow Snyders's development in each subject area by thumbing through the catalogue. While this arrangement works well for hunting pictures, it is less successful for still life.

Because still life is subdivided into three categories – markets and larders with figures, game pieces and larders without figures, and medium- and small-sized still lifes – and each category is treated as a self-contained unit, the still-life corpus is not presented in a continuous chronological sequence, making it difficult to follow Snyders's aims at a particular moment. Another problem derives from the fact that the categories are not defined by uniform criteria. Whereas the third group is identified by size, but precise dimensions are not given, content defines the first and second. A better way to have denoted the small and medium-sized pictures would have been with the recognized category of fruit piece, since the pictures's chief motif is a basket, or a bowl, or a tazza loaded with fruit.

Robels puts to rest the view that Snyders was primarily a painter of hunting scenes and secondarily a still-life painter: she accepts only thirty-eight hunting pictures, whereas she counts 169 still lifes. Snyders began as a still-life painter, according to Robels, and turned to animal subjects only later in his career. She dates the earliest hunt (cat. 221, *Wild Boar Hunt*) about 1615 and a *Cockfight* (cat. 203 I) about 1610–1615. Still life, on the other hand, can be found quite early, indeed, soon after Snyders obtained his mastership in 1602, at the age of twenty-three. Although I cannot accept the clumsy *Game, Fruit and Vegetable Still Life* (cat. 89 I), whose 1603 date is preceded by an uncharacteristic „pinx," rather than followed by Snyders's customary „fecit," or „f.", the Warsaw *Kitchen* (cat. 2) does appear to date from this time. Formerly assigned to Pieter Cornelisz van Ryck by the Warsaw National-Museum, Robels attributes it to Snyders. This picture is the most important addition to Snyders's œuvre in recent years, because it illuminates the earliest and least-known phase of Snyders's career. The Warsaw *Kitchen* is significant, too, because it indicates

that Snyders painted the figures in his own still lifes, an issue contested previously. However, he often collaborated with figural artists as well, which made his pictures even more desirable, according to Robels. While Cornelis de Vos, Snyders's brother-in-law, was Snyders's most frequent partner, his most famous was Rubens. Probably their first collaboration is the *Recognition of Philopoemen,* painted in late 1609 or early 1610. Designed by Rubens, this picture gives a Baroque compositional paradigm for market and kitchen pictures. Its influence is evident in Snyders's larder scenes, a subject that appeared in the 1610s and which is one of Snyders's most characteristic types, as Robels points out. In the Warsaw *Kitchen* and in the *Philopoemen* Caravaggesque tonalities predominate; about 1615 Snyders's palette becomes brighter and more colorful, paralleling Rubens's use of color at this time. Robels asserts that the four Leningrad *Markets,* which she identifies as Snyders' most famous pictures, occupied him at the end of the second decade. Following their completion, Snyders painted numerous markets and larders whose compositions are more agitated and whose technique is more painterly than in the preceding decade. In the thirties Robels observes greater monumentality, quieter arrangements and a significantly warmer palette. The final stage emerges in the forties and is characterized by elegance, sweeping curves and an atmospheric quality. While this account describes the markets and larders, it is applicable as well to small fruit pieces, a subject Snyders took up by the end of the 1600s. Robels remarks that the production of fruit pieces falls off in the twenties but resumes again in the thirties. The finest ones (cat. 168, 169) show fruit in landscapes. These late pictures have an Arcadian mood, intimated by park-like vistas with classical structures and by warm glowing light reminiscent of Titian's late pictures.

This chronology follows the one Robels set forth in her 1969 groundbreaking article, the first study to present a complete account of the development of Snyders's entire still-life œuvre. While the chronology is convincing in most respects, the date of one major picture should be reconsidered. *Larder with Kitchen Servants* (cat. 36) in Dresden. Whereas the Leningrad *Markets* supply paradigms for large still life in the 1620s and early 1630s, the Dresden *Larder* is the model for the later 1630s and 1640s. Robels, however, places it in the 1620s, which is too early, since the pose of the male servant derives from the young lover's on the right of Rubens's *Garden of Love* (ca. 1635). The picture's motif of the bitch with her pups was very popular, as indicated by its use no less than six times (cat. 36, 46, 61, 62, 66, and in a *Larder* in a private collection, New York, unknown to Robels). Like the *Larder,* Robels dates these pictures in the 1620s as well, but clearly they must postdate the Dresden painting.

An issue Robels addresses at length is whether Snyders's still life has symbolic content. As she points out, her study is the first to consider this issue. She argues that both the large market and larder scenes and the smaller fruit pieces are not merely decorative, but, like their Dutch counterparts, have

symbolic meaning. Robels posits that the significance of the market and kitchen pieces is determined by the figures, whose actions, she argues, illustrate popular proverbs. Since the smaller pictures do not have figures, meaning is located in motifs that have traditional symbolic associations. Robels suggests an antithesis between the material and the spiritual is intended in these pictures, with game representing erotic pleasure and grapes signifying Christ and the eucharist. Until about 1630, the antithetical principle is operative, and then it declines as a new secular attitude sets in. Another symbolic structure Robels finds in still life is the tetradic system of the four elements, which reflects the divine order of the cosmos, according to seventeenth-century belief. While Snyders often includes references to the elements in large and small pictures, according to Robels, she insists it would be incorrect to assume their presence in every still life. Although Robels uses many of the findings published by De Jongh and Segal, she does not blindly follow De Jongh's emblematic approach nor does she imitate Segal's rebus-like manner, where each motif is assigned a meaning „in malo" and „in bono." Her style of interpretation is less restrictive than the Dutch trend of the past two decades, but nonetheless indebted to it, and it is still predicated on the Panofskyian concept of the disguised symbol. As for new interpretative approaches (see, for instance, *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek,* vol. 40, which is devoted to Pieter Aertsen), Robels eschews the socio-economic altogether, and does not investigate meaning in relationship to other cultural forms, such as rhetoric and literature.

Robels's treatment of Snyders's animal pictures, the first comprehensive account of this aspect of his œuvre, is a major contribution to the study of Baroque art. Although Snyders's reputation was founded on his hunting scenes, his actual achievement in this area has been uncertain because his pictures often were confused with ones by Paul de Vos and Jan Fyt. Robels argues that Snyders began to paint hunts around 1615, and the earliest example is the *Boar Hunt* in the Barberini and Corsini Gallery, Rome (cat. 221). This date conflicts, however, with Rubens's characterization of Snyders's abilities. In 1617, distinguishing himself from Snyders, Rubens asserted that Snyders excelled in portraying dead animals, especially birds, whereas he was superior in representing live animals at their highest passion. This assessment suggests that Snyders had not yet begun to design his own hunting pictures in the 1610s. Nevertheless, he may have painted animals in hunting pictures invented by other artists at this time, as, for instance, the dogs and the boar in the impressive Dresden *Boar Hunt* (cat. 308 I; Munich replica, cat. 308 II), which Robels attributes to Van Dyck, and dates about 1618–1620. The dogs, however, are not Van Dyck's invention, but Rubens's. Hounds in nearly identical or closely related poses are seen in Rubens's Marseilles *Boar Hunt* and the Dresden *Landscape with a Boar Hunt* and not at all in Van Dyck's pictures. In the 1620s, Snyders invented a new type of hunting picture that shows a dog pack in pursuit of prey without hunters. The boar hunt seems to

have been most in demand, since more of these pictures survive than of any other hunt; the second most popular subject was the stag hunt. Snyders portrayed wolf, bear, bull and fox hunts as well. At the same time Snyders invented his own compositions, he also collaborated with Rubens in the 1620s, 1630s and in 1640 on hunting pictures.

Snyders's hunting scenes, particularly the pictures painted for the Spanish court (e.g., cat. 232), change dramatically in the later 1630s, according to Robels. These show a new unity between animals and landscape, which is accomplished by placing the animals in the midst of landscape elements, rather than in front of them, and by enveloping the entire scene in an atmospheric veil. Robels explains the change as arising from pressure to complete many pictures in a brief period of time: to carry out the royal commissions Snyders speeded production by using a more painterly and lighter technique. In my opinion, however, the differences between the dogs in these pictures and the ones Snyders represented in the hunting pictures of the 1620s (e.g., the Brussels *Stag Hunt,* cat. 237) and in paintings of dogs in domestic interiors in the 1630s (e.g., cat. 187, 188) suggest that another artist painted them. These animals are considerably more delicate, thin-limbed, less muscular and less well articulated. According to Robels, in Snyders's later years he relinguished the field to Paul de Vos. However, the 1653 Kensington Palace *Boar Hunt* (cat. 236) indicates that shortly before his death in 1657 Snyders was still painting hunting scenes. Moreover, the inventory of Snyders's estate lists seven originals and seven copies, which indicates he kept a stock of hunting pictures by his own hand, as well as copies after them.

Robels does not find symbolic or moralizing meaning in the hunting scenes; however, she points out that Aesopic fable pictures, domestic animal scenes and bird concerts do have a moralizing dimension. According to Robels, Snyders began to depict these themes in the 1620s, and she points out he was the first to make them the subject of a cabinet picture. While she is quite right to emphasize Snyders's originality, Rubens, in fact, may have anticipated Snyders insofar as Aesopic fables are concerned, as Balis has argued („Fabeluitbeeldingen in de 17de-eeuwse Vlaamse schilderkunst," in *Zoom op Zoo. Antwerp zoo focusing on Arts and Sciences,* ed. C. Kruyfhooft, Koninklijk Maatschappij voor Dierkunde van Antwerpen, 1985, pp. 259–75). Snyders's originality is most evident in the pictures showing pet monkeys and dogs and cats in kitchens and larders; these pictures are invented and are not based on an iconographic tradition, as are the fable and the bird-concert pictures. Robels rightly asociates these pictures with proverbs and suggests that several adages may apply to a single picture, as for instance, *Dogs Disputing a Bone* (cat. 186). Although Robels sensitively describes these scenes, she counts them as lesser achievements than Snyders's still life, an opinion I do not share. *Dogs and a Cat in a Larder* (cat. 188), for instance, shows Snyders at his best.

Drawing is a significant aspect of Snyders's œuvre, but it has not received the attention it deserves; Robels's catalogue is the first to treat this subject

scientifically. She accepts ninety drawings and rejects 133. About a third are still lifes, while the remainder are animal studies and pictures of animal themes. The large number of still-life drawings is unique for this time period. Their existence suggests that the drawings, which are highly finished for the most part and agree with surviving paintings, played an important role in Snyders's workshop, serving both as *modelli* and as *ricordi.* They are drawn in pen and ink, and wash is added for tone. Included among the animal drawings are a large number of chalk studies of hounds on tinted paper. Robels illustrates this group with an ambitious piece showing a wounded hound (cat. Z 50), which in my opinion is a copy after a dog in the *Stag Hunt with Diana* (cat. 305 a), rather than a preparatory study for it. The arch of the dog's back is slack in comparison to its counterpart in the painting, and the ground plane indicated under the back does not extend to the head, which seems to float in space. Also the color notation alongside the dog, which was probably written by the draughtsman, is not in Snyders's hand. Robels does not explain why Snyders used chalk only for animal studies and not at all for still life; this question should be addressed.

This valuable book supplies the long-needed study that presents a unified view of Snyder's work and which makes clear why he was so esteemed by his contemporaries. Its substantial scholarship supplies the foundation for all future research on Snyders, on Flemish Baroque still life and Baroque animal painting; *Frans Snyders* is a first-rate accomplishment that deserves an honored place among the classic monographs on seventeenth-century artists.

Susan Koslow

ERNST PETRASCH, HANS GEORG MAJER, REINHARD SÄNGER, EVA ZIMMERMANN, *Die Karlsruher Türkenbeute. Die „Türkische Kammer" des Markgrafen Ludwig Wilhelm von Baden. Baden. Die „Türkischen Curiositaeten" der Markgrafen von Baden-Durlach.* München, Hirmer 1991. 480 Seiten, zahlreiche Abbildungen in Farbe und Schwarz-weiß.

Die Karlsruher Türkenbeute gehört zu den Glanzstücken des reichen badischen Kulturbesitzes. Markgraf Ludwig Wilhelm von Baden (1655–1707), der „Türkenlouis", hat sie als kaiserlicher Oberbefehlshaber an der Türkenfront erworben, an der er vom Entsatz Wiens 1683 bis kurz nach seinem großen Sieg bei Slankamen 1691 äußerst erfolgreich kämpfte. Etliche Stücke haben auch sein Onkel, der kaiserliche Hofkriegsrat, Markgraf Hermann von Baden (1628–1691), sein Schwiegervater, Feldmarschall Herzog Julius Franz von Sachsen-Lauenburg (1641–1689), und sein Verwandter, Feldzeugmeister Karl Georg von Baden-Durlach (1648–1703), beigetragen, aber der Großteil stammt vom „Türkenlouis" selbst. Die Erwerbungszeit und wohl auch die Entstehungszeit der Türkenbeute ist somit auf die