

Den Höhepunkt der Leidener Ausstellung bildeten ohne Zweifel die beiden zum ersten Mal nebeneinander placierten Bilder mit Christus am Kreuz, die Rembrandt und Lievens in einer Art Idealkonkurrenz 1631 gemalt haben (Le Mas d'Agenais bzw. Nancy, *Abb. 4a und 4b*), vielleicht um sich damit um Aufträge des Oranischen Hofes zu bewerben. Die Konfrontation war ein unvergeßliches Erlebnis. Trotz der äußeren Ähnlichkeit der Gemälde überraschte ihre unterschiedliche Auffassung. Die Häßlichkeit des Gequälten am Kreuz, die Rembrandt mit äußerstem Realismus wiedergibt, steigerte geradezu die Erhabenheit des sterbenden, der Erde entrückten Gottessohnes von Lievens, der dabei Werke von Rubens und van Dyck vor Augen hatte. Auch nach seiner Übersiedlung nach Amsterdam hat sich Rembrandt mit Arbeiten von Lievens auseinandergesetzt. Die in der Ausstellung gezeigten vier Radierungen Rembrandts von 1635 (B. 286-289) und deren Vorbilder von Lievens sind häufig diskutiert worden, doch fehlt noch immer ein überzeugendes Motiv für ihre Entstehung. P. Schatborn (S. 77) hält eine bewußte Kritik Rembrandts an den Blättern von Lievens für möglich. Tatsächlich kann man Rembrandts Zusatz zu seiner Signatur ‚geretuck‘ in dieser Weise deuten. Es fällt auf, daß Lievens' radierte *tronies* entgegen dem Brauch von rechts beleuchtet sind, was Rembrandt deutlich korrigierte.

Rüdiger Klessmann

REMBRANDT. THE MASTER AND HIS WORKSHOP

Drawings and Etchings. Berlin, SMPK, Altes Museum, 12 September – 27 October, 1991; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, 4 December, 1991 – 19 January, 1992

DRAWINGS BY REMBRANDT AND HIS CIRCLE

London, British Museum, 16 March – 4 August, 1992

(with one illustration)

Although the exhibition *Rembrandt. The Master and His Workshop* comprised virtually the same paintings in its three „stops“ – Berlin, Amsterdam, and London – the section of drawings by Rembrandt and his pupils shown in London was entirely different from the one presented first in Berlin and subsequently in Amsterdam. For Berlin and Amsterdam the organizers had agreed to select, from diverse collections, a number of the most representative drawings by Rembrandt himself and to add drawings that have recently been recognized as the work of his pupils. In London the British Museum, in its own premises, displayed its own drawings by Rembrandt and most of those by his pupils that are represented in the collection. The paintings share one catalogue for all three venues; the drawings in Berlin and Amsterdam are recorded in one catalogue, those shown in London in another. What in fact are two exhibitions of drawings will be considered here separately, in chronological order.

In Berlin the Rembrandt exhibition was staged in the Altes Museum on the Museum Insel, the first exhibition to be held there since the reunification of Germany. The drawings were shown with a certain austere dignity in newly refurbished, ample spaces. In Amsterdam the drawings were also placed in newly refurbished cabinets, on the upper floor of the Rijksmuseum, somewhat overcrowded but with a most successful fibre-optics lighting system that made them more clearly visible while exposing them to less danger.

The two sections of the Berlin/Amsterdam exhibition of drawings were meant to achieve two quite different goals. The first section was a redefinition of Rembrandt the draughtsman by means of his highest accomplishments in the main categories that can be discerned in this part of his work, the second a demonstration of recent art-historical reinterpretation, an attempt to present to the public some of the best of his pupils who recently have been shown to have been responsible for drawings hitherto attributed to Rembrandt himself.

In Berlin and Amsterdam only 40 drawings by Rembrandt were shown (and one 'hors catalogue', the landscape B.1228, formerly Chatsworth). To define Rembrandt as draughtsman in an exhibition had been tried many times before, but never by means of so few drawings. The first concerted effort was made in 1898 in the exhibition on the occasion of the inauguration of Queen Wilhelmina, when more than 350 drawings were shown, according to a prefatory note in the catalogue. (The drawings had no catalogue of their own, not even a printed list.) At the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris in 1908, 219 drawings were displayed (together with 282 etchings), and in Amsterdam in 1932 there were 123. In Rotterdam and Amsterdam as recently as 1956 no less than 256 were shown, and in Amsterdam in 1969 still as many as 116.

In its clarity, conciseness, and judicious selection the small exhibition in Berlin and Amsterdam conveyed a clearer idea of the singular achievement of Rembrandt the draughtsman than did the larger exhibitions of 1956 and 1969. Rembrandt came across much clearer and far stronger than ever before for two reasons. First, recent scrutiny has separated many drawings from Rembrandt's œuvre and attributed them to other artists, whether known by name or unidentified. Peter Schatborn, the moving force behind this clarification for some years, made the selection for this exhibition. He defined the categories constituting Rembrandt's drawn œuvre and then tried to represent each category by means of at least one drawing, and preferably only by very few. Certainly previous exhibitions also endeavored to represent all aspects of Rembrandt's drawings, but on those occasions less rigorous criteria were applied to the process of establishing such categories. The selection of drawings for the exhibition of 1956 (in which I was involved), for instance, also tried to be comprehensive by representing all aspects of the artist's œuvre, but in retrospect the process of categorization at times seems to have been more intuitive than systematic and the selection affected by easy assumptions rather than rigorous scrutiny.

Ever since he contributed to the Rembrandt exhibition in Amsterdam and its catalogue in 1969, Schatborn has had a profound effect on our understanding of

Rembrandt as a draughtsman. Slowly and gradually, nurtured by broad experience in virtually every kind of Dutch drawing, he has developed a way of seeing and questioning visual features that has proved to be extremely constructive for the clarification of Rembrandt's work. After having dazzled art historians and collectors alike with his ability to establish the authorship of drawings of genre-like figures in chalks as well as pen and ink, he published his first sustained analysis of the methods that until then had governed the study of Rembrandt drawings in his review of the second edition of Otto Benesch's *Drawings of Rembrandt: Complete Edition* originally published in 1954-57 (*Simiolus* VIII, 1975/76, pp. 34-39). His analysis of these methods, and particularly of their deficiencies, took the lengthy review that I wrote in the *Kunstchronik* in 1961 a step forward.

Also in the 1970s, another Dutch art historian set out to question Rembrandt's oeuvre along the same lines. Although it was not published until 1988, Jeroen Giltaij had virtually completed his new catalogue *The Drawings by Rembrandt and his School in the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen* by March 1978. Giltaij's careful reasoning resulted in a drastic reduction of Rembrandt drawings in Rotterdam to no more than thirty-six. It is likely that both Schatborn and Giltaij were affected by the mood of reevaluation of Rembrandt's paintings initiated by the members of the Rembrandt Research Project beginning in the late 1960s.

Schatborn carried his studies of drawings by Rembrandt and his school further. This led in 1985 to two fundamental publications, both on drawings in the Rijksmuseum, that complement each other: the catalogue *Drawings by Rembrandt, his Anonymous Pupils and Followers* and the article „Tekeningen van Rembrandts leerlingen“ (*Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum* XXXIII, pp. 93-109). The catalogue, in particular, sets standards for the judicious discussion of arguments leading to the attribution of a work to a certain artist. Since then, Schatborn has published articles of great significance, particularly in the *Kroniek van het Rembrandthuis* and *Master Drawings*. Equally influential, however, must have been the discussions that he has had over the years with colleagues in this comparatively small field of specialists. The spoken word must have contributed to the remarkable phenomenon that recent opinions about Rembrandt's drawings voiced by Emmanuel Starcky in Paris 1988/89 and in London by Martin Royalton-Kisch (see below) differ only marginally from those of Schatborn but are a marked distance from Benesch (1954-57). Schatborn has stimulated the entire present generation of historians of Rembrandt drawings.

Despite his many publications on drawings by Rembrandt and his pupils, Schatborn has written little about his methods and the underlying principles that have done so much to clarify the issues of authorship. He wrote a few paragraphs in the introduction to the Rijksmuseum catalogue of 1985, and in individual catalogue entries he has reasoned individual cases. In the Berlin-Amsterdam catalogue we are presented not only with forty entries representative of his reasoning but also with an introductory essay that is his first sustained analysis of Rembrandt as a draughtsman. At the risk of oversimplification one

could say that he analyzes as yardsticks for comparison the individual components of what for better or worse must be called the „style“ of a given drawing. For him, this „style“ is the sum total of idiosyncratic interrelationships between medium, technique, manual motion, purpose, narration, expression, gesture, space, light and other technical and formal aspects of a drawing. Schatborn is a master in defining the function of a line or wash in the context of subject, expression, composition, and action. He very ably demonstrates that even when certain features vary from drawing to drawing, in certain instances their particular complex interrelationship could only have been created by the mind and hand of one artist. He does so with due observation of chronology, influences, and derivatory features or imitative ambitions. He always tries to define the artist's intentions behind the structure of graphic means. The emphasis is on interrelationship. What counts is not the type of a line but how the line works in context of subject, expression, and other features. Schatborn conveys these considerations in clear and felicitous wording, sometimes coining words, like „rommelig“ (disorganized, unfunctional) used to describe a lack of Rembrandtesque graphic interrelationships. As always, whether a drawing is by Rembrandt or a pupil ultimately depends on whose firmly established core of comparable drawings displays the most compelling similarities to it. Schatborn's sophisticated analysis of the interrelationship of style, subject, and so on within each drawing has greatly reduced the inevitable shifting of definitions of these cores and particularly their peripheries. In comparison with this systematic and detailed contextual interpretation, Benesch's definition of graphic characteristics of drawings by Rembrandt and his entourage had an abstract and superficial quality. He often only hinted at or merely implied similarities instead of specifically analyzing them in relation to the goals the artist or artists tried to achieve with their specific graphic tools. Not that Schatborn's method never fails, as I will indicate toward the end of this review, but admirable it certainly is.

The Berlin/Amsterdam exhibition of drawings was the result of many years of assiduous analytic looking. Schatborn established convincing categories of drawings. Appropriately, the category of independent history scenes was most broadly represented by nine drawings (cat. nos. 5, 6, 16, 18, 19, 31, 32, 34, 36), followed by pen studies from life (cat. nos. 9, 12, 14, 20, 35) and landscapes in pen and wash (cat. nos. 21, 27, 28, 29, 30). A model sheet was included as well (cat. no. 8), and there were of course portraits in pen (cat. no. 17) and silverpoint (cat. no. 3), and animals in different media (cat. nos. 13, 15, 26). The one category that was absent was that of compositional studies in red chalk, of which the *Idolatry of Solomon* in the Louvre would have been an ideal representative, and Rembrandt's copies of Mughal miniatures were not represented as well as one would have wished (the one from Amsterdam, cat. no. 37, is not one of the most impressive). In spite of these few *desiderata*, the exhibition was indeed excellent.

The institutions of Berlin and Amsterdam each contributed seven drawings, the remaining twenty-six were borrowed from public institutions and private collectors. These obviously honored Peter Schatborn and the other organizers by

lending the requested works. Particularly welcome was the *Seated Old Man* from the collection of Alain Delon (cat. no. 2), which had been shown previously only in an auction room and in one gallery exhibition. An unusual and constructive choice was Rembrandt's *Self-portrait as an Artist* (cat. no. 4) of the early 1630s (about 1633?) from the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett. Although known and accessible for generations, this serious, unembellished self-portrait, so different from others, had never received the attention it deserves.

Drawings by Rembrandt have frequently been exhibited with drawings by his pupils (particularly successfully in Worcester, Mass. in 1936, and in Chicago in 1969/70) in order to demonstrate the effect Rembrandt had on artists of his time who were mesmerized by his methods and his style. In the present exhibition, however, the organizers wished to demonstrate how certain drawings formerly thought to be by Rembrandt should be attributed to some of his pupils. This meant that Lambert Doomer, Gerbrand van den Eeckhout, Samuel van Hoogstraeten, Philips Koninck, and other excellent artists strongly affected by Rembrandt were not included. Eleven drawings were exhibited, two each by Ferdinand Bol, Nicolaes Maes, Willem Drost, and Johannes Raven and three by Aert de Gelder. In each case an ex-Rembrandt drawing (two in the case of Aert de Gelder) was juxtaposed with one established long since as a work by Rembrandt. In contrast to the „workshop“ section of the painting exhibition, here the art-historical concept produced a convincing visual statement. The reason was the high quality of the drawings by these pupils (only Johannes Raven was somewhat out of his league), whose devoted dependence on Rembrandt is eloquent testimony to his power. This section demonstrated how an artist's *persona* is expanded when his oeuvre is convincingly enlarged, and how Rembrandt's image is clarified by the elimination of *corpora aliena*.

Finally a few remarks about individual drawings by Rembrandt exhibited in Berlin and Amsterdam follow here:

Cat. 5 *Christ Carrying the Cross*. Berlin. B.97. That in this drawing Rembrandt took Martin Schongauer's *Great Ascent to Calvary* as his point of departure is in this catalogue stated for the first time, if I am not mistaken. This relationship adds considerably to our understanding of Rembrandt's interpretation his predecessors.

Cat 7, 8 *Sketches of Figures and Model Sheet*. Berlin and Birmingham. B.141 and 340. It must be called a miracle that these two beautiful, large drawings of many figures have not been cut up in the past and that both were available in the exhibition.

Cat. 10 *The Rape of Ganymede*. Dresden. B.92. It seems possible that, as he did in other compositional drawings, Rembrandt made this drawing after having started the painting, to calculate the position of the „parents“ in the left bottom corner, which he then did not include.

Cat. 17 *Seated Old Woman*. Rotterdam. B.757. Schatborn's change of attribution of the *Seated Old Man* in the F. Lugt Collection, Paris (fig. 17^c), from Salomon Koninck to Rembrandt is difficult to accept.

Cat. 20 *Interior with Saskia in Bed*. Paris. B.426. It should be noted that, in contrast to his opinion in other instances, Schatborn is inclined here to accept the grey wash as Rembrandt's own addition. I wonder.

Cat. 39 *The Conspiracy of the Batavians*. Munich. B.1061. I still believe that the drawing in Edinburgh that I published in 1973 as a first draft (and a summary, unattractive sketch) by Rembrandt for this subject is by the artist.

The exhibition in London differed fundamentally from the one in Berlin/Amsterdam. The British Museum showed its entire magnificent collections of drawings by Rembrandt and all significant drawings from his school. In keeping with the general theme of the painting exhibition, the museum also wanted to demonstrate in a catalogue that the present view of Rembrandt as a draughtsman, particularly with regard to the extent of his work, differs from that laid down by Otto Benesch in his corpus of 1954-57 (with additions up to 1970). The result was a mixture of drawings that stylistically do not belong together and that intellectually were treated on different levels. This may have been inevitable, and not every visitor may have expected a unified theme, but the exhibition must have confused many. Nonetheless, this was an impressive show of more than two hundred beautiful drawings, often displaying widely divergent concepts, a feast for the eye and a delight for the professional art historian who could make comparisons between drawings otherwise kept in countless boxes.

The catalogue addresses itself to about half the drawings exhibited. Martin Royalton-Kisch catalogued all 105 drawings in the British Museum that Benesch had accepted as works by Rembrandt, including the nineteen that he himself now rejects. He also included some drawings that were recently acquired or that Benesch had not known or disregarded (cat. nos. 51, 75, 78). The drawings in the catalogue are grouped in four sections: drawings by Rembrandt (cat. nos. 1-86); school of Rembrandt, retouched by Rembrandt (cat. nos. 87-89); drawings by anonymous followers of Rembrandt (cat. nos. 90-95); and drawings by named followers of Rembrandt (cat. nos. 96-108). The exhibition, however, included another eighteen drawings (by my count) of unidentified followers that were not catalogued, and a staggering eighty by named artists of his circle that also were not catalogued. As the preface states, this is only a preliminary, partial catalogue; the full catalogue is scheduled to appear in a few years' time.

For the sake of perspective on historical investigation of the art of drawing in the Northern Netherlands in the seventeenth century, it may be useful to discuss briefly the scope of the catalogue and the exhibition. The limitation of the catalogue to drawings Benesch had accepted meant that the catalogue was defined not so much by the new approach to the subject as by a previous opinion that turned out to be partly fallacious. That Benesch made many mistakes we have known for some time, and the new ideas Royalton-Kisch presents are excellent, but one wonders why new wine should be poured into old vessels. Future generations may be puzzled or amused by the degree of authority the present art historian attributes to authors like Benesch, and also Bredius. It is

unlikely that for a study of drawings by Raphael and Dürer only the drawings (or all the drawings) that Oskar Fischel or Friedrich Winkler had accepted half a century ago would be republished in the light of new points of view. The drawings would instead be regrouped to reflect the new concepts. Rembrandt seems to elicit fascination with authority, both the authority of his artistic persona and that of his interpreters.

This seems to be the case as well with the tendency to group Rembrandt's pupils together with Rembrandt himself, even when their works have little or nothing in common with Rembrandt. When A. M. Hind catalogued all the *Drawings by Rembrandt and His School* in the British Museum in one volume in 1915, he justified the arrangement by recalling the powerful effect Rembrandt had on his „school“. Precedents for this arrangements can be found in sale catalogues, where the tendency has always existed to combine less important with more important drawings, whether in portfolios or lots. Frits Lugt did not follow this tradition in his Louvre catalogues, but rather placed all the known pupils of Rembrandt alphabetically among the other Dutch artists. Henkel, however, adopted Hind's scheme in his Amsterdam catalogue of 1942, and so did Giltaj in Rotterdam in 1988 (I presume partly because the Koenigs drawings were grouped together that way), and now Royaltan-Kisch has reintroduced Hind's arrangement for the London exhibition (but not for the catalogue). Numerous drawings by Jan Lievens, Gerard Dou, Govert Flinck, Anthonie van Borssum, Gerbrand van den Eeckhout, and others, impressive though they may be, have nothing to do with Rembrandt. Lugt's solution was better: keeping the unidentified artists with Rembrandt and the named ones with the other Dutch artists places the former where they belong and safeguards the individuality of the latter.

Royaltan-Kisch's catalogue, not surprisingly, is particularly concerned with the question of authenticity. Which drawings are by Rembrandt, which not, that now is the question. Of the 105 drawings Benesch attributed to Rembrandt, nineteen are disattributed here, and probably more will have to be shifted to „unidentified“ or „named“ contemporaries. Even when subject matter is discussed – and the catalogue does so whenever it is appropriate – other data such as technique, provenance, literature, and the discussion of authorship, date, and similarities with other drawings assumes such a weight that the genius of Rembrandt is threatened to be buried – at least in the words. „Scholarship“ must be pursued, but it does cast a shadow. Most of what we learn that is new about this great artist does not touch the essence of his art. Together, however, all the small details, and particularly the clearer distinction between what he made himself and what is merely a reflection of his talent in others, add to our understanding and admiration of Rembrandt himself. And the excellent illustrations give us better access to the artist than ever before.

Royaltan-Kisch traces the history of the collections of Rembrandt drawings in the British Museum and the history of their interpretation. He makes clear how much progress we have made in a century, and also what nuggets of appreciation lie buried in the past, like Thoré-Bürger's essay „Les dessins de Rembrandt au

British Museum“ in the *Revue germanique* of 1858, which is mentioned in the introduction and quoted throughout the catalogue. Royalton-Kisch also presents a most useful survey of the various efforts – and failures – to solve the „Problems of Authenticity (c. 1850-1992)“.

Royalton-Kisch describes media, paper, distances between chain lines, watermarks and even the presence and type of borderlines in painstaking detail, going beyond other recent catalogues. In earlier studies, particularly in his 1984 discussion of Rembrandt's *Ecce homo* in the National Gallery, he had already convincingly reinterpreted fundamental technical features of major works by the artist. The numerous technical new observations in this catalogue, like the discovery of charcoal in cat. no. 18, are most welcome. In one respect, however, I can follow him only partway. I am not certain that as many papers are prepared with light brown wash as he states (cat. nos. 14, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 62). With the naked eye it is very difficult to distinguish between such a wash and plain darkening of the surface, and in some cases, for example no. 30, corrections in white seem to have prevented daylight from changing the color of the paper thereby creating the impression of a brown wash on the paper not protected by the heightening. (The tendency to interpret some darkened paper as washed started in Schatborn's catalogue of the drawings in Amsterdam in 1985.) The accurate reconstructions of the provenances and the literature of all the individual drawings are extremely useful. So are the small black-and-white illustrations in the text obviating the need to constantly search for the colorplates when reading the entries. Indeed, the texts contain everything one could wish to know about these drawings, in a clear and convenient presentation.

The method of analysis Royalton-Kisch applies to Rembrandt's drawings resembles that of Schatborn. But he places more emphasis, where possible, on technical features, and he probes the internal interrelationships of the various graphic and representational elements of a drawing less deeply, relying more on general formal appearance. He relishes the intellectual challenge posed by the relationship between various drawings and between drawings and paintings or etchings (particularly cat. nos. 6^a, 12, 13, 14, 15). His conclusions signify a great step forward in comparison with Benesch and are thereby a welcome contribution to a better understanding of the artist. Royalton-Kisch also has the courage to form an opinion that differs from the accepted one, and he is to be respected for that courage, even if one cannot always agree with him.

Only a few drawings and their elaborate entries need to be singled out for comment here:

Cat. 2 *Sketch of a Man Leaning over a Table*. H.14, B.35. Motif, light-and-dark contrast, and date of origin suggest that Rembrandt made the drawing in conjunction with *The Supper at Emmaus*, the painting in the Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris (CRP A16).

Cat. 3 *Sketch of a Rabbi*. H.21, B.28. The subject is not clear, and *Man in a Turban* would be a more prudent title.

Cat. 4 *Christ Washing the Feet of His Disciples*. B.182. Sumowski convincingly suggested a date of about 1632 (*Rembrandt erzählt das Leben Jesu*, Berlin, 1958, p. 198).

Cat. 5 *Diana at the Bath*. H.9, B.21. It would need to be established whether lines can be transferred to a copper plate by means of the sharp point of black chalk, or whether the sharpness of the lines was caused by a metal tracing instrument.

Cat. 6^a *The Raising of Lazarus*. Etching touched by Rembrandt, B.83^a. The inclusion of touched prints in the exhibition greatly added to its usefulness. The same applies to cat. no. 8^a.

Cat. 13 *The Angel Preventing Abraham from Sacrificing His Son Isaac* (*Abb. 3*). H.6, B.90. Although some of the comparisons of details of execution in this drawing and others, particularly the combination of red chalk and black/grey wash found also in Rembrandt's *St. Paul* in the Louvre (B.15, ca. 1629; Starcky 1988/89, no. 3), at first look convincing – as they did to me when listening to Royalton-Kisch's lecture in Amsterdam in January 1992 – closer observation of the drawing itself and comparison with the two paintings (*St. Petersburg*, by Rembrandt, and *Munich*, by a pupil, retouched by Rembrandt) makes it much more likely that this drawing is a variant of the *St. Petersburg* painting made in the studio at the time that the *Munich* painting was planned or in progress. To sum up the arguments: 1. The overall appearance of the drawing, its gestalt, has something unstructured, haphazard about it („rommelig“ in Schatborn's terminology). 2. The execution of certain details, such as Abraham's face and body, Isaac's legs, and the black wash contouring the light areas, is not in keeping with what we know of Rembrandt's work. 3. It would be illogical to assume that Rembrandt included the ram and placed the angel frontally in this drawing and eliminated the ram and turned the angel sideways in the *St. Petersburg* painting, and then let a student under his supervision reinstate these relinquished positions. 4. The signature does not look like Rembrandt's even when one allows for the abrasion. 5. The (very faint) black contours of the figures and the changed position of the knife, adduced by Royalton-Kisch to strengthen his supposition that the drawing precedes the *St. Petersburg* painting could just as well be part of a student's effort to copy and modify the painting. Supposing that this is a student drawing made under Rembrandt's supervision is far simpler than postulating its role as a preliminary design. The drawing is more likely a variant of Rembrandt's *St. Petersburg* painting done in his studio, like the painting in *Munich* and the painted variant of *The Angel Raphael Leaving Tobit* (CRP III, 1989, no. A121; copy in private coll., p. 241, fig. 10), where the angel also was moved into a frontal position. This in essence was Müller Hofstede's opinion (1929) and it still makes sense. There is no reason to assume that the drawing was made by the painter of the *Munich Sacrifice*, but it would not be impossible.

Cat. 14 *Sketch after Leonardo's 'Last Supper'*. H.3, B.444. Royalton-Kisch does not doubt that in the large drawing in the Robert Lehman Collection

Rembrandt copied and varied an early Milanese print (Hind V. 10), but supposes that for the London drawing (cat. no. 14) he was influenced as well by Soutman's drawn copy after Rubens (now in Chatsworth). This seems an unnecessarily complex sequence of events. It is much more likely that this drawing came into being without the intermediary of Soutman's copy after Rubens. The following points can be made: 1. The cut-off point of the composition of the London drawing, just beyond Christ's arm, is a logical one for anyone interested in copying only the group of apostles and would not have needed to depend on Soutman's example. 2. The London drawing is on exactly the same scale as the Robert Lehman Collection drawing, and apparently on the same paper and in the same chalk. Rembrandt went right on varying the apostles – his main interest in the entire sequence of drawings – when he had finished the large New York drawing. 3. The drapery and other details in the background of the London drawing are abbreviated remnants of the background of the New York version, and not derived from Soutman's copy.

Cat. 15 *The Entombment of Christ (over the Raising of Lazarus)*. H.2, B.17. Following his more detailed article in *Master Drawings* (1991) but with new evidence, Royalton-Kisch here also proposes a complex answer to the questions posed by this drawing, particularly the date 1630 it bears. Royalton-Kisch rightly emphasizes the homogeneity of the drawing and the apparent proximity in time of the superimposed Entombment and the underlying Raising of Lazarus, and the presence of now largely abraded corrections in white chalk. He supposes that Rembrandt made the drawing about 1635 as a copy of the print by Jacob Louijs after Jan Lievens's painting of the Raising of Lazarus and that he backdated it to 1630 in reference to the date of the design by Jan Lievens. The most sensible solution to the puzzle posed by the date on Rembrandt's drawing was proposed by Peter Schatborn in the catalogue of the Lievens exhibition in the Rembrandthuis in 1988/89 (no. 17): Lievens had his etching after his painting ready by the end of 1630, when Rembrandt made his copy and dated it, but finished his painting only in (early?) 1631 and dated it accordingly. (The date is reliable, as Christopher Brown informed me at the time the painting was taken care of in the National Gallery in London.) The following questions could be raised: 1. It seems strange that Rembrandt would accurately copy a composition by Lievens years after he had absorbed and transformed its basic tenets in a painting (Los Angeles, CRP A30, ca. 1629/30) and an etching (B.73, ca. 1632). It is much more likely that he did so when he was involved with those works, particularly because when copying the etching he deviated from it in one fundamental detail, namely by representing the body of Lazarus, not merely his hands. He introduced this feature also in the Los Angeles painting and in his etching. 2. A date of about 1635 on the basis of style seems very late. The London drawing is difficult to date because Rembrandt made no other drawings with comparable mixed purposes (copy and study for painting) and also because similar quick, rough, and tentative sketches for narrative compositions from the years 1630-35 do not provide clear parallels to this Entombment. The multiple lines meshed into a web of figures equipped with ovoid

blocked heads in this Entombment do find however a certain parallel, in spite of a broader execution, in the black chalk drawing *Baptism of the Eunuch* of about 1629 in Munich (B.13; not unanimously accepted). 4. There is in my opinion no compelling reason to believe that Rembrandt copied the print by Jacob Louijs rather than the etching by Lievens. The differences between Rembrandt's drawing and Lievens's etching can be explained as independent alterations and are not necessarily reflections of Louijs's print.

Cat. 41, 42 *The Dismissal of Hagar and Ishmael* and *The Man of Gibeah offers Hospitality of the Levite and his Concubine*. H.34, B.524 and H.39, B.554. As Royalton-Kisch suggests in the catalogue and on the labels, these two drawings may well turn out to be by Ferdinand Bol.

Cat. 51 *Three Orientals in Discussion*. Not in H. or B. We know little about Rembrandt's black chalk drawings and even less about those of his students. This drawing has much in common with drawings accepted as Rembrandt's, but it also differs from them, particularly in the insistent parallel hatching in many areas and the frequent doubling up of lines, one drawn on top of the other. We know of no black chalk drawings by Aert de Gelder to compare or contrast with this one, but it is not inconceivable that he made similar ones.

Cat. 69, 70 *A Clump of Trees in a fenced Enclosure* and *A Clump of Trees with a Drawbridge*. H.108, B.1255 and H.107, B.1256. Wear on the bottom corners indicates that in both cases the top of the scene (the sky) was in the gutter of the sketchbook; the bottom border of the subject on cat. no. 70 indicates that the sheets were not neatly and uniformly trimmed, and that this sheet overlapped the next one by a few millimeters.

Cat. 75 *Landscape with a Farm, with two Hay-Barns*. H.123. Royalton-Kisch has had the courage to defend Rembrandt's authorship. A new facet of the artist thus may have been established. The pen lines seem acceptable without much difficulty. The watercolor forms such a homogeneous unity with the pen lines that separation of hands seems difficult. Furthermore, the watercolor differs in handling from what other artists of the time – Ferdinand Bol, Gerbrand van den Eeckhout, Lambert Doomer, Philips Koninck – were doing. Its unusualness should not prevent us from recognizing it as a work by Rembrandt as long as a parallel embellishment by a contemporary or later artist has not been established.

Cat. 78 *Landscape: The Bend in the Amstel at Kostverloren House, with a Dug-out in the Foreground*. B.1266. It is fortunate that the British Museum was placed in a position to acquire this drawing. Landscape was not the strongest suit of the collection, and this is one of Rembrandt's best.

Cat. 83 *A Road Passing an Inn Surrounded by Trees*. H.106, B.1329. The drawing seems to have been heavily reworked by another hand: the entire left bottom corner, the posts in the right foreground, and shadows in some of the trees apparently were added by someone else.

Cat. 100-104. H. 84, 85, 88, 86, 91; B. 1001, 1093, 1092, 1090, 1382. Attributed to Willem Drost. Also *Lot and his Family leaving Sodom*. H.89, B.A 36 (not in cat.).

Cat. 106-108. H. 96, 95, 94; B 1147, 1143, 1145. Attributed to Johannes Raven. While Rembrandt's œuvre is shrinking these years, his pupils and followers are becoming better defined and the number of drawings attributed to them is increasing. Sumowski and now Schatborn, Royalton-Kisch, and others have contributed to the rehabilitation of artists whose work had been absorbed in a mass of ill-understood pseudo-Rembrandt drawings or anonymous school pieces. In reviewing the new attributions to Drost and Raven in this catalogue, and to Carel Fabritius, Aert de Gelder and, again, Raven in Schatborn's Amsterdam catalogue of 1985, one cannot avoid the impression that the criteria for attributing a drawing to a pupil are less stringent than for maintaining it within Rembrandt's canon.

This application of different measures is understandable and can be detected as well in the volumes of the *Corpus of Rembrandt paintings*, and even in Schatborn's catalogue and article of 1985 mentioned above. Optimism and generosity easily prevail when the positive reconstruction of an insufficiently known artistic personality is served, whereas demanding severity predominates when a great artist needs to be protected against the diluting effects of past expansionist tendencies. Both attitudes aim to be constructive. One must observe, however, that a single drawing connected with an unsigned painting attributed to Drost is the main basis for a rapidly expanding œuvre of drawings, and the one signed drawing by Johannes Raven has permitted the attribution tentatively and not wholly convincingly as Royalton-Kisch points out, of at least five drawings to the same hand. The difficulty is the lack of certainty whether the „style“ these drawings share manifests one artist or a group of artists reaching for the same goal with the same means under the guidance of the same teacher.

For almost a century – since 1898 – comprehensive Rembrandt exhibitions have reflected changing attitudes towards the artist. Never before, however, has the conscious need to change an imperfect historical image influenced a Rembrandt exhibition so strongly as in 1991/92. These exhibitions and their catalogues are a landmark in art-historical responsibility. Schatborn and Royalton-Kisch, the former having the luxury of presenting a synthesis, the latter the demanding and at times thankless task of having to express an opinion on everything gathered by the vagaries of collecting, fulfilled their different tasks in admirable ways. Students and admirers of Rembrandt will remain grateful to them.

Egbert Haverkamp Begemann