ST. PETERSBURG

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

JOHN C. VAN DYKE

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

By John C. Van Dyke

		PRICE
I.	*London*—National Gallery, Wallace Collection. With a General Introduction and Bibliography for the Series	*net* $1.00
II.	*Paris*—Louvre	*net* .75
III.	*Amsterdam*—Rijks Museum *The Hague*—Royal Gallery *Haarlem*—Hals Museum } bound together .	*net* .75
IV.	*Brussels*—Royal Museum *Antwerp*—Royal Museum } bound together .	*net* .75
V.	*Munich*—Old Pinacothek *Frankfort*—Staedel Institute *Cassel*—Royal Gallery } bound together .	*net* 1.00
VI.	*Berlin*—Kaiser-Friedrich Museum *Dresden*—Royal Gallery } bound together .	*net* 1.00
VII.	*Vienna*—Imperial Gallery *Budapest*—Museum of Fine Arts } bound together .	*net* 1.00
VIII.	*St. Petersburg*—Hermitage	*net* .75
IX.	*Venice*—Academy *Milan*—Brera, Poldi-Pezzoli } bound together .	*net* 1.00
X.	*Florence*—Uffizi, Pitti, Academy	*In Press*
XI.	*Rome*—Vatican, Borghese Gallery	*In Press*
XII.	*Madrid*—Prado	*net* .75

THE HERMITAGE

REMBRANDT: PORTRAIT OF A MAN
The Hermitage, St. Petersburg

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

ST. PETERSBURG

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE HERMITAGE

BY

JOHN C. VAN DYKE

AUTHOR OF "ART FOR ART'S SAKE," "THE MEANING OF PICTURES," "HISTORY OF PAINTING," "OLD DUTCH AND FLEMISH MASTERS," ETC.

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1914

Published September, 1914

PREFACE TO THE SERIES

THERE are numerous guide-books, catalogues, and histories of the European galleries, but, unfortunately for the gallery visitor, they are either wholly descriptive of obvious facts or they are historical and archæological about matters somewhat removed from art itself. In them the gist of a picture—its value or meaning as art—is usually passed over in silence. It seems that there is some need of a guide that shall say less about the well-worn saints and more about the man behind the paint-brush; that shall deal with pictures from the painter's point of view, rather than that of the ecclesiastic, the archæologist, or the literary romancer; that shall have some sense of proportion in the selection and criticism of pictures; that shall have a critical basis for discrimination between the good and the bad; and that shall, for these reasons, be of service to the travelling public as well as to the art student.

This series of guide-books attempts to meet these requirements. They deal only with the so-called "old masters." When the old masters came upon the scene, flourished, and ceased to exist may be determined by their spirit as well as by their dates. In Italy the tradition of the craft had been established before Giotto and was carried on by Benozzo, Botti-

celli, Raphael, Titian, Tintoretto, even down to Tiepolo in the eighteenth century. But the late men, the men of the Decadence, are not mentioned here because of their exaggerated sentiment, their inferior workmanship—in short, the decay of the tradition of the craft. In France the fifteenth-century primitives are considered, and also the sixteenth-century men, including Claude and Poussin; but the work of the Rigauds, Mignards, Coypels, Watteaus, and Bouchers seems of a distinctly modern spirit and does not belong here. This is equally true of all English painting from Hogarth to the present time. In Spain we stop with the School of Velasquez, in Germany and the Low Countries with the seventeenth-century men. The modern painters, down to the present day, so far as they are found in the public galleries of Europe, will perhaps form a separate guide-book, which by its very limitation to modern painting can be better treated by itself.

Only the best pictures among the old masters are chosen for comment. This does not mean, however, that only the great masterpieces have been considered. There are, for instance, notes upon some three hundred pictures in the Venice Academy, upon five hundred in the Uffizi Gallery, and some six hundred in the Louvre or the National Gallery, London. Other galleries are treated in the same proportion. But it has not been thought worth while to delve deeply into the paternity of pictures by third-rate primitives or

to give space to mediocre or ruined examples by even celebrated painters. The merits that now exist in a canvas, and can be seen by any intelligent observer, are the features insisted upon herein.

In giving the relative rank of pictures, a system of starring has been followed.

Mention without a star indicates a picture of merit, otherwise it would not have been selected from the given collection at all.

One star (*) means a picture of more than average importance, whether it be by a great or by a mediocre painter.

Two stars (**) indicates a work of high rank as art, quite regardless of its painter's name, and may be given to a picture attributed to a school or by a painter unknown.

Three stars (***) signifies a great masterpiece.

The length of each note and its general tenor will in most cases suggest the relative importance of the picture.

Catalogues of the galleries should be used in connection with these guide-books, for they contain much information not repeated here. The gallery catalogues are usually arranged alphabetically under the painters' names, although there are some of them that make reference by school, or room, or number, according to the hanging of the pictures in the gallery. But the place where the picture may be hung is constantly shifting; its number, too, may be subject to alteration with each new edition of the catalogue; but its painter's

name is perhaps less liable to change. An arrangement, therefore, by the painters' names placed alphabetically has been necessarily adopted in these guide-books. Usually the prefixes "de," "di," "van," and "von" have been disregarded in the arrangement of the names. And usually, also, the more familiar name of the artist is used—that is, Botticelli, not Filipepi; Correggio, not Allegri; Tintoretto, not Robusti. In practical use the student can ascertain from the picture-frame the name of the painter and turn to it alphabetically in this guide-book. In case the name has been recently changed, he can take the number from the frame and, by turning to the numerical index at the end of each volume, can ascertain the former name and thus the alphabetical place of the note about that particular picture.

The picture appears under the name or attribution given in the catalogue. If there is no catalogue, then the name on the frame is taken. But that does not necessarily mean that the name or attribution is accepted in the notes. Differences of view are given very frequently. It is important that we should know the painter of the picture before us. The question of attribution is very much in the air to-day, and considerable space is devoted to it not only in the General Introduction but in the notes themselves. Occasionally, however, the whole question of authorship is passed over in favour of the beauty of the picture itself. It is always the art of the picture we are seeking, more than its name, or pedigree, or commercial value.

Conciseness herein has been a necessity. These notes are suggestions for study or thought rather than complete statements about the pictures. Even the matter of an attribution is often dismissed in a sentence though it may have been thought over for weeks. If the student would go to the bottom of things he must read further and do some investigating on his own account. The lives of the painters, the history of the schools, the opinions of the connoisseurs may be read elsewhere. A bibliography, in the London volume, will suggest the best among the available books in both history and criticism.

The proper test of a guide-book is its use. These notes were written in the galleries and before the pictures. I have not trusted my memory about them, nor shall I trust the memory of that man who, from his easy chair, declares he knows the pictures by heart. The opinions and conclusions herein have not been lightly arrived at. Indeed, they are the result of more than thirty years' study of the European galleries. That they are often diametrically opposed to current views and beliefs should not be cause for dismissing them from consideration. Examine the pictures, guide-book in hand. That is the test to which I submit and which I exact.

Yet with this insistence made, one must still feel apologetic or at least sceptical about results. However accurate one would be as to fact, it is obviously impossible to handle so many titles, names, and numbers

without an occasional failure of the eye or a slip of the pen; and however frankly fair in criticism one may fancy himself, it is again impossible to formulate judgments on, say, ten thousand pictures without here and there committing blunders. These difficulties may be obviated in future editions. If opinions herein are found to be wrong, they will be edited out of the work just as quickly as errors of fact. The reach is toward a reliable guide though the grasp may fall short of full attainment.

It remains to be said that I am indebted to Mr. and Mrs. George B. McClellan for helpful suggestions regarding this series, and to Mr. Sydney Philip Noe not only for good counsel but for practical assistance in copying manuscript and reading proof.

JOHN C. VAN DYKE.

RUTGERS COLLEGE, 1914.

THE HERMITAGE

NOTE ON THE HERMITAGE

The picture gallery of the Hermitage was started with the haphazard collection of Peter the Great, but its real founder was the energetic Catherine II. That Empress not only built the building but began the acquisition of pictures on a large scale. In 1763 she acquired the Gotzkowsky Collection with its Rembrandts, in 1769 the Bruhl Collection with its Rubenses, in 1772 the Crozat Collection with its Italian and Dutch pictures, in 1779 the Walpole collection with its many Van Dycks from Houghton Hall, England. The initiative of the Empress was followed up by Alexander I, who, in 1814, added thirty-eight pictures from the possessions of the Empress Josephine, and by Nicholas I, who acquired two large groups of pictures from the collections of the Countess of St. Leu and Manuel Godoy. The last extensive addition was made in 1886 by Alexander III, who purchased the Musée Galitzine and added one hundred and eighty-two pictures to the gallery. These accumulations bulk large to-day and give the Hermitage an imposing and impressive appearance. There are over two thousand pictures, of almost every name and nature, for the visitor to study. The museum is perhaps the most interesting place in St. Petersburg.

Yet in spite of its history and its many pictures the Hermitage is something of a disappointment. Distance, as in the case of the Prado, has always lent some enchantment to it. It has been much talked about as the most wonderful of all the galleries and one naturally has great expectations. Perhaps the first shock of disenchantment comes with the portico of the building. If those huge, bizarre figures holding up the porch are a sample, what may be expected farther on? But the first plunge is the worst. There are disappointments ahead but there are also agreeable surprises. The forty-three pictures put down to Rembrandt, for instance, are disappointing in that hardly more than half a dozen are by Rembrandt; but they are agreeably surprising in that a good many of the forty-three are excellent pictures. Most of them were painted by Rembrandt's pupils or came out of his shop, which does not mean that they are third-rate pictures by any means. Some of them are good enough for the master but they are not his individual work. Of the genuine Rembrandts there is one supreme example—the so-called Sobieski portrait. Rembrandt never went beyond it. Aside from the great leader and his pupils, the Dutch School is fairly well represented here in the Hermitage. There are excellent examples of Terborch, Steen, Ostade, Dou, Wouwerman, Ruisdael, Van der Helst, Pieter de Hooch, Potter, Frans Hals. Very interesting is a large picture ascribed to Frans Hals the Younger, suggesting as it does that the sons

of Hals could do work good enough in its way to pass muster for that of the father.

The early Flemings and Dutch are not to be seen in numbers or in quality, though there are pictures put down to Jan van Eyck, Roger van der Weyden, and others, and a remarkable work by Lucas van Leyden. The later Flemings are, however, well shown, especially Rubens and Van Dyck. Nothing could be finer than some of the portraits by Rubens, notably that of the Lady in Waiting (No. 579); or by Van Dyck, that of Suzanne Fourment and Her Daughter (No. 635). Jordaens, too, has one very good portrait here, and there are several excellent pictures by Teniers the Younger. There is disappointment again in not finding the German School well represented—in fact, with the exception of Cranach, it is not represented at all—but there is agreeable surprise in the excellent French pictures by Poussin and Claude. There are nearly twenty examples of each painter. There are also beautiful pictures by Watteau, Lancret, Pater, Boucher, Fragonard, Chardin. The French section is excellent and should be looked at closely.

The Italian pictures are perhaps the most interesting of all. There are rare and odd examples here to puzzle the expert. Botticelli is named as the painter of one charming work; Perugino, Francia, and Cima are credited with other works. But the chief representation is among the fifteenth-century painters. The lovely panel put down to Giorgione, the doubtful

Leonardo, the Columbine picture by Melzi, the Raphaels, are all very attractive. The Giorgione is alone worth a trip to St. Petersburg for, notwithstanding the insistent doubt of its being by that painter, it is a masterpiece. The Venetians are, of course, shown in numbers. There are several Titians, Tintorettos, Bonifazios, and Veroneses, with two excellent Sebastiano del Piombos, one remarkably fine Tiepolo, and a score or more of canvases by painters in the school of name unknown. The Spanish School is here almost reduced to Murillo and Velasquez, with good pictures by both painters—especially the Velasquez study head of Innocent X—but one misses many of the early men of the school.

The building in which the pictures are shown is a large, rambling, palace-like receptacle decorated in a rather florid style but well enough lighted. The first floor, where there are priceless treasures (notably in Greek marbles and gold work), is not so well off for light as the second floor, where one finds the gallery of pictures. The hanging of the pictures sometimes provokes adverse comment but, generally speaking, it is very satisfactory. The main worry of the student or visitor does not come after he is in the gallery but before he enters. The anxiety is oftener about how to get into the building at all. There are regularly scheduled hours for opening and closing the Hermitage, but there are many exceptions to them. Every feast-day or saint's day or imperial-family birthday finds

the doors closed. Then there are sporadic closings for repairs or for no given reason. There are always attendants in the building and frequently on application one can have a special attendant assigned on payment of a small fee.

Catalogues in Russian and French were issued some years ago but they are now (1913) out of print, and the only catalogue obtainable is the French edition of the Italian and Spanish Schools. This catalogue has critical notes of some value and should be used. The pictures have labels upon them giving numbers, names, and titles in Russian and French. There is a Hanfstaengl volume containing reproductions of the pictures for sale at the entrance.

THE HERMITAGE

127. **Allori, Alessandro.** ***Portrait of a Young Man.*** The portrait seems very smooth, with over-elaborate roundness of contours in face and hands. The type is feminine, as the catalogue note suggests. The dress is now dark and melts into the background. Apparently in good condition.

Allori, Angelo. See Bronzino.

478 } **Amberger, Christopher.** ***Portraits of Man and***
479 } ***Wife.*** The man's portrait is much the better of the two. It is well done in the head if a little flat in the body.

1674. **Angelico, Fra.** ***Madonna with St. Dominick and St. Thomas Aquinas.*** The figures of the saints seem more positively characteristic of the painter than the Madonna. Fra Angelico's peculiarly fine feeling, his depth of sentiment do not appear to advantage in pictures of this size, but notice, if you please, the fine, pearly quality of colour. The picture is a fresco that has been transferred and injured somewhat in the process.

1963. ——***A Tabernacle.*** It is merely a frame or setting of gilt with angels painted on the gilt. It is possibly shop or pupils' work but is very lovely, nevertheless. What a very handsome piece of gilding!

598. **Backer, Jacob A.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** This gives but a slight hint of Backer's ability. He was a

portrait-painter of force and power second only to Rembrandt in his day and generation. No. 599 is of the same quality or its lack.

2. **Baldovinetti, Alesso.** ***Madonna and Child.*** It is a good, decorative piece, and the gallery direction has been wise enough not to put it in a square frame, as would have been done in many an Italian gallery. It was formerly considered a Masaccio and later on a Cosimo Rosselli. As a Baldovinetti it is hardly satisfactory. It is possibly by some follower of Fra Angelico. It has not enough character, not enough individuality, for Baldovinetti.

403. **Becerra, Gaspar.** ***A Sibyl.*** The picture is rather hard in its drawing but is good in colour. Perhaps Dosso Dossi as its possible painter would be nearer the mark than Becerra. Numbered in the catalogue 303 (?) but on the frame 403.

320. **Belotto Bernardo.** ***Rialto Bridge, Venice.*** It is a very good Belotto, but compares indifferently well with the fine Belottos in the Imperial Gallery, Vienna.

6. **Bissolo, Pier Francesco.** ***Madonna and Child.*** It was formerly regarded as a picture of the Bellini School. It should have been kept under that caption. The work is not remarkable in any way and is now badly repainted.

854. **Bol, Ferdinand.** ***Portrait of a Woman.*** A smooth performance and decidedly weak. Notice for likeness the lighting of the hands—their clarity, their ivory quality—in connection with the angel hands in the so-called Rembrandt, No. 791, or the Danaë hands in No. 802.

834. ——*A Warrior.* There is no indication of Bol in this work. Nor is No. 856 by Bol. It has upon it the bogus signature of Rembrandt.

850. ——*Portrait of a Man.* In Bol's smooth style. The sitter is the same young man that he painted several times, using him as a model for angels. The same sitter appears in pictures attributed to Rembrandt at Berlin and elsewhere. See also Nos. 845 and 853.

851. ——*Man and Woman.* Here we have another picture in Bol's smooth, velvety manner. It was no doubt popular in Bol's day, but it lacks in strength.

846. ——*Two Figures in Landscape.* It is weak work that shows its painter to no advantage. Such work as this is about all Bol is credited with in these days of collecting great names. Why should a really good picture be given to a Bol or a Flinck when it is just as easy to attach the name of Rembrandt? The great masters keep absorbing the little ones and perhaps eventually art history will be reduced to a few familiar names.

848. ——*Portrait of a Man.* With a woman's portrait for a companion piece, neither of them remarkable in any way.

847. ——*A Writer.* The handling is pretty rather than forceful. Had the surface of the picture been rubbed flat in the cleaning room or grimed with dirt and age until the colours were darkened and obscured, the picture would have been promoted to the Rembrandt rank and we should have had explanations about Rembrandt's late manner when his hand failed him. But Fate has remorselessly

preserved it and handed it down to us as just an ordinary Bol.

90. **Bonifazio dei Pitati.** ***Adoration of Shepherds.*** It is a poor picture even for Bonifazio. The drawing is loose where the painting is not thin, and the landscape is crude. Look at the mountains, trees, or sky for this crudeness. At one time the picture passed as a Palma.

92. ——***Holy Family.*** With saints on either side and a rather fine display of colour. It is decorative, handsome, with an interesting landscape. It is probably rightly placed as a Bonifazio, though it was formerly known as a Palma.

107. **Bonifazio, School of.** ***Holy Family.*** It is fairly good in colour. Probably the colour helped its former sale as a Titian. It shows a weak following of Palma.

110. **Bordone, Paris.** ***Holy Family.*** A rather hard picture with a bright-red robe, marked in the high lights. It is Bordone's work right enough but does not bring any one to his knees.

111. ——***Mother and Child.*** The child in the picture apparently foreshadows Van Dyck's method of composition. It is a rather coarse affair. Look at the hair, the dress, the sleeve—the sleeve that reminds one of Titian. The picture is some following of Titian but is hardly Bordone's. It may be a much-mauled copy. Badly repainted.

1846. ——***Allegorical Subject.*** A characteristic Bordone in his least attractive manner. The hair is ropy, and the costume is flickery with high lights. The colours are variegated but hardly harmonious in their variety.

3. * **Botticelli, Sandro.** ***Adoration of Magi.*** It is an attractive picture in colour but is not particularly well drawn, is a little flat and wanting in the third dimension, with figures that sometimes do not detach from one another. The sentiment of it is more appealing than the technique, and the air of Botticelli about it is more apparent than real. It is not drawn as a Botticelli should be. The catalogue declares it like the same subject in the Uffizi, but the comparison with the Uffizi picture most decisively proves the Hermitage picture by another hand. The bad drawing of the architecture, the lack of articulation in the capitals of the pilasters, the broken arch at left, the sharp folding and the patterning of the draperies, the jumbled group at the right are not like Botticelli but approach the painter of the Adoration in the National Gallery, London (No. 1033), there put down to Botticelli but in reality nearer to Mr. Berenson's Amico di Sandro. This Hermitage picture is evidently a school piece done with muffled drawing, hazy gold work, and some richness of costume, but not done effectively, forcefully, cleanly, clearly, as Botticelli did his Uffizi Adoration. It was formerly ascribed to Mantegna but given by Waagen to Botticelli. A good work. When a picture is picked to pieces to show that its attribution is incorrect it does not mean that the picture is only fit for the junk room. There are plenty of good pictures in European galleries under misleading names or no names at all.

N. N. **Botticelli, School of.** ***Madonna Adoring Child.*** The jaw line of the Madonna is like a weak Botticelli, but the rest of the drawing is too feeble for any one but a follower or shop assistant—some

Jacopo del Sellajo of the time. The sentiment is very good and so, too, is the colour. Not in the catalogue (1913).

8. **Botticini, Raffaelo di Francesco.** ***Adoration of the Child.*** It is down to a son and pupil of Botticini in the catalogue, but the frame still says Lo Spagna. It belongs to neither of them but is, perhaps, a weak following of Ghirlandajo. The weakness is in the drawing as well as in the colour. See the catalogue note for the various attributions.

125. **Bronzino, Angelo (Allori).** ***Portrait of Young Woman.*** An unusual Bronzino not only in the drawing of the profile but in the elaborateness of the dress and the flowers. The head is flat and somewhat soft in modelling, as are also the hands. It is a handsome picture for all that it has been badly repainted.

513. **Brueghel the Elder, Jan.** ***Landscape.*** It is only a fair example of Velvet Brueghel. There are several other pictures by him in this gallery, but none of them is remarkable. No. 518 seems as good as any of them.

1693. **Brueghel the Younger, Peter.** ***Preaching of John Baptist.*** It looks like a copy. Notice the manner in which the foliage is done. It is flat and forceless, as are also the figures.

470 } **Bruyn, Barthel.** ***Portraits of a Man, Wife, and***
471 } ***Children.*** They are rather commonplace portraits of which Bruyn did enough and to spare, notably some of those in the Cologne Gallery. These panels were originally pointed at the top but have now been squared up.

35. **Bugiardini, Giuliano.** ***Holy Family.*** This is probably a genuine Bugiardini. The trees and landscape say as much and the Madonna confirms them. It is hurt in the shadow which has either darkened or been repainted. Notice this in the sleeping St. John where the shadow now appears false in value.

318. * **Canaletto, Antonio.** ***Reception of Count Gergi, Venice.*** Here are fine sky, air, and distance. The mass of figures on the Riva is well given, the colour is good, and the shadows quite right. Notice the light on the domes of the Salute and the well-drawn Doge's Palace. A large and handsome picture.

319. ——***Departure of the Doge.*** The picture creates an uncomfortable impression by the repeated horizontal lines in the boats and buildings. Moreover, the loading of paint to produce relief in the gold work is not too happy. At a distance you do not feel this so much and the picture seems to carry well. It is hardly so satisfactory, however, as its companion piece (No. 318).

831. **Cappelle, Jan van de.** ***River Scene with Boats.*** A very beautiful river scene with flat water, sails for spots of colour, and overhead a fine, warm sky. It is a charming picture.

89. **Capriolo, Domenico.** ***Portrait of the Artist.*** It is possibly by the same hand that did the Bravo at the Vienna Gallery (No. 207), now attributed to Palma Vecchio, only it is much poorer in quality than the Vienna picture. Of course it was at one time considered a Giorgione.

217. **Caravaggio, Michelangelo.** ***Young Man Playing a Mandolin.*** The picture is done with some

spirit, is rather well drawn if hard in the outlines and contours, and shows good flowers and fruit.

9. **Catena, Vincenzo.** ***Madonna, Child, and Saints.*** It is an indifferent but probably genuine example of Catena but not nearly so attractive as No. 1655, put down to Girolamo da Santa Croce but probably by Catena.

14. **Cesare da Sesto.** ***Holy Family.*** It seems a genuine Cesare, but is hardly an inspiration though thought for many years to be a genuine Leonardo. The drawing was almost always questionable with Cesare as it was not with Leonardo. Look here at the hands or at the impossible proportions of the Madonna's figure. Go on a little further and consider the loops and lines in the blue drapery, the pinched drawing of Joseph, and the large head of the Child. It will not bear analysis in its drawing and there is nothing to rave over in its colour.

4. **Cima, Giovanni Battista.** ***Madonna, Child, and Saints.*** It is a handsome picture, in perfect tone, with good atmospheric effect and holding together very well. It should be compared with No. 1965, which has less atmosphere. Formerly attributed to Giovanni Bellini. Considerably repainted and softened thereby.

1965. ——***Descent.*** A large picture, well held together except in the hill and sky, which meet abruptly. It is a little flat and lacking in depth. You may notice this even in the cross, which wants in the third dimension. The hands are badly done, but the colour scheme is rather good.

1676. * ——***Annunciation.*** This panel was perhaps originally the centre of a triptych as the catalogue

surmises. It has been transferred from wood to canvas and is now badly mangled, much repainted, but still shows Cima. The interior is very charming, with its window, bed, chair, and desk, while the angel is decidedly attractive. The Madonna and the landscape are both characteristic of Cima. Notice the quality of the lilies.

1428. **Claude Lorraine.** ***Landscape.*** Of the half-dozen or more examples of Claude in this gallery this landscape appears one of the best. The tree, perhaps, cuts the picture in two, but there is good foreground and distance, with a warm sky, a mellow haze, and a veil of atmosphere. It is rather imposing. No. 1429 is similar in style but cooler or greyer in the colour scheme. No. 1430 is too hot in the sky. The sea pieces Nos. 1435 and 1437 seem cruder, less attractive work. No. 1433 is more satisfactory.

469. **Cleve, Juste van (Master of Death of Virgin).** ***Holy Family.*** The attribution may be right enough but the picture in itself is not very good. Notice the hands, the ovals of drapery about the wrist, and the cut-in-two appearance of the panel by reason of its odd composition.

81. **Correggio, Antonio Allegri.** ***Madonna, Child, and Angel.*** There are several versions of this picture (notably one at Budapest), and one cannot be too sure which is the original. The Budapest example is in better condition than this in the Hermitage and has more verve about it. Certainly this Hermitage version is of no great pith or moment as art. The Correggio spirit is a bit over-done and the sentiment of it is mildly silly. The children are rather nice but the Madonna is almost as infantile and unintelligent as they. The

group is well put together with a good swing of line in the Child, the draperies are rightly handled, and the colour is acceptable. It has been rubbed and repainted until the finger-nails and toes have vanished.

82A. ——*Apollo and Marsyas.* It is a very good picture and has some handsome figures in it; but is it a Correggio? The catalogue argues its genuineness at some length. Before the picture one is not convinced; for the picture contradicts the argument. There seems not the slightest trace of Correggio in it. He never drew with any such severity of line, not even in his youth. The light-and-shade is not his any more than the composition. The colour is more like him but is perhaps deceptive. The picture is Florentine in character. An attribution to any definite painter would be doubtful.

461. **Cranach the Elder, Lucas.** ***Venus and Cupid.*** There are several versions of it in the European galleries. This one is a varied version and possibly a shop piece. It is graceful in line—perhaps too much so for the Elder Cranach.

460. ——*Madonna and Child.* It has probably been cut away from a larger picture. The Madonna is now far to the right on the panel. The work is a little soft in the drawing and somewhat too formal in the arrangement of the landscape. It has both charm and colour but is nevertheless a work of the shop or the school.

459. * ——*Madonna and Child.* If you will compare this picture with No. 460 you will notice that there is some difference not only in the quality of the colour but in the accuracy of the drawing and the

firmness of the flesh. Moreover, the foliage and landscape here are better done and more effective. Notice the apple-tree with its leaves and fruit. The picture is a charming piece of colour, with a very decorative arabesque about the Madonna's head and a fine landscape at the back. It is probably by the Elder Cranach.

462. ——*Cardinal Albert of Brandenburg.* This portrait has every appearance of being a poor school piece or even a copy. Notice the drawing of the nose, eye, or, if you will, look at the niggling upon the coat of arms. This is not the sure drawing of Cranach.

464. ——*Portrait of a Girl.* This has not the quality in either line or colour of No. 459. Such work as this is very frequent in European collections and suggests that there was a Cranach shop that turned out much inferior work under the name of the Elder Cranach.

1912. **Dou, Gerard.** *Portrait of a Geographer.* This portrait is in Dou's smooth style following Rembrandt. It is very well drawn and modelled but too smooth in the surface. It should be compared with No. 814 here, by Rembrandt, to establish the possibility of Dou having done both works. After that you should go to the small cabinets of Dutch pictures and see there the much better Dou, No. 907.

907. ——*Portrait of a Reader.* Here is a portrait by one of Rembrandt's minor pupils that is extremely well done. It is almost perfect in the drawing, is easily and cleverly painted, right in shadow, fine in colour, and excellent in atmospheric setting. It is pictures of this quality that have frequently been

taken from Dou and given to Rembrandt. No. 814 in this gallery is an illustration.

905. ——*Woman at Window.* This is Dou in his smooth, popular style which he adopted after he forsook Rembrandt and his methods.

620. **Dyck, Anthony van.** *Portrait of Sir Thomas Chaloner.* This portrait is fairly well drawn in the eyes, mouth, and cheeks though flat in the figure, slight in the hand, and finical in the doing of the hair and collar. All told, it is not a strong performance, not a great Van Dyck. There are some thirty Van Dycks in this gallery but many of them are indifferent examples and some of them are decidedly questionable.

632. ——*Portrait of Dr. Maharkyzas (?).* It is sharp in the outline of the nose and forehead but well drawn in the eyes and rather fine in the articulation of the jaw line. How realistic it is in the drawing and light-and-shade of the right hand! The left hand has been badly cleaned. The whole portrait has been hurt by bad treatment.

621. ——*Portrait of a Man.* The hands here are not very well done and the figure is a little vague. The forehead, eyes, and beard are good. It is not a strong Van Dyck and one regards it with a feeling that he was not wholly responsible for it. There are so many Van Dycks that smack of the shop and assistants in almost every European gallery.

609. ——*Portrait of Charles I.* This is a full-length of the King in armour and seems a more or less official portrait, worked up by Van Dyck's assistants, and perhaps given a final lick and a rub by Van Dyck himself. The armour is well enough drawn but is

a bit pretty in its surfaces for Van Dyck. Notice that the left arm and hand are lacking in conviction. It is a questionable Van Dyck.

610. ——*Portrait of Henrietta Maria.* It is evidently a companion piece to No. 609 and is of the same official character. Some follower of Van Dyck's, some Sir Peter Lely, might have done the work without creating a sensation in the art world. It is pretty all through. Notice the bad placing of the hands and arms and that will give you the quality of the whole portrait. It should be compared with No. 619, for the pictures have much in common—perhaps a common origin.

603. ——*Repose in Egypt (La Vierge aux Perdrix).* There is a version of this picture in the Pitti (No. 437) and other versions elsewhere. This St. Petersburg example is usually regarded as the original. It is large but not very good. The colour is cheap, especially in the blue, the drawing is rather uncertain (look at the Madonna's hands or her knees), and the doing of the trees, fruit, and foliage is strongly suggestive of the workshop assistant. Van Dyck never was a great success with these themes though they were much copied by his pupils.

629. ——*Portrait of an Old Man.* Here is a picture that apparently has the handling of Rubens with the drawing of Van Dyck. It may have been done by Van Dyck in Rubens's shop and afterward "touched by my own hand," as Rubens expressed it. A little pinched in the drawing but a fine piece of colour.

622. ——*Portrait of Man in Fur Collar.* This portrait is fairly well modelled though rather smooth and

pretty in its handling. Possibly the surface has been softened by stippling. The whole picture has suffered a cleaning-room change. At one time it was cut down to a bust portrait. Still, it is not a bad portrait even now.

607. ——*The Doubting Thomas.* The figure of Christ seems abnormally large in the hands and over-modelled in the shoulder and arm. And what weak, wishy-washy sentiment! It is not a satisfactory Van Dyck.

608. ——*St. Sebastian.* Here is more weak sentiment from Van Dyck, his shop, or his school. There is more or less affectation about it. Notice the agony of the angel or the make-believe of the hand drawing out the arrow. The flesh colour is clearer than usual and the general scheme of colour is fairly effective; but it is not a good example of Van Dyck.

630. ——*Portrait of the Banker Lumagne.* An imitator of Van Dyck—Carbone—did portraits just as good as this, with about the same quality as this, and in the same blackish tone of light and colour. It is probably a Van Dyck school piece or shop piece.

619. ——*Portrait of Lady with a Tulip.* It is difficult to believe that Van Dyck ever sank so low artistically as to paint a picture of this mental calibre and technical quality. You have but to look at the face for its mentality, and the boneless, pulpy, dropsical modelling of the hands and wrists for its technique. The sky—how sweet it is in colour! The whole picture is of the same quality. It was probably done by some follower of Sir Peter Lely's rank or even lower. Compare it closely

with No. 575 if you would know the difference between a true and a false Van Dyck.

575. * ——*Portrait of Isabella Brandt.* This is an excellent Van Dyck, done in his Rubensesque manner with forceful drawing all through. How well the head is placed on the neck, and how beautiful the surrounding black in contrast with the white! Notice further the well-drawn arms and sleeves, the placing of the figure in the chair, the quiet ease, the repose of the lady. The red curtain at the left may be a trifle high in key, but that is not very important. The architecture is sketchily done and rightly kept down in hue. The picture was formerly ascribed to Rubens and only recently given to Van Dyck. It is somewhat rubbed in the face and hands.

627. ——*The So-Called Family of Snyders.* This is a different group from the Snyders and Wife at Cassel, but it is a fairly good example of Van Dyck when under the influence of his master, Rubens. The space is over-crowded and the chairs add somewhat to the jumble. The heads are well relieved and fit well on the necks and bodies, especially in the woman's portrait. The hands are a little too prominent though well enough drawn. Notice the modelling of the child's head and also the very good colour which prevails throughout. The picture has been hurt by cleaning—so much so that the loading of white on the foreheads and noses shows too prominently and the heads have been somewhat flattened.

628. ——*Portrait of a Young Man.* This portrait belongs perhaps to Van Dyck's late period, when his pupils laid in most of his portraits and he did lit-

tle more than give them a few finishing touches, as his master, Rubens, had done before him. Of course, there are weakness and affectation. Notice this latter in the hands and somewhat in the pseudo-poetic look of the sitter. The picture is a little dim in its scheme of light, and the hands are blackened through dark under-basing. There is a certain nobility of air here which Van Dyck and all his pupils knew very well how to put into a portrait whether the sitter possessed it or not.

623. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** This portrait is hung very high (in 1913) and from its height appears like a Dutch portrait of some Amsterdam merchant. It does not look like a Van Dyck. No. 624 is done in the same manner and is evidently a companion piece.

631. ——***Portrait of the Banker Jabach.*** Painted in a smooth style and not free from pose. It is probably shop work, turned out with no great care or love. The sitter figured extensively in the art annals of his time and was supposed to be a person of taste.

635. ** ——***Portrait of Suzanne Fourment and Her Daughter.*** What a very charming scheme of colour! The lady's skirt with its gold-patterned red-and-silver bands, the child's dress, and the red curtain are all in perfect harmony. Van Dyck has shown more than his usual colour sense here in holding these different tones of red together. The gold of the lady's bodice carries on the colour scheme, while the white of the ruff and the black of the mantle act as central spots to focus the vision. What fine hands! Notice the child's hands in that of the mother, how beautifully they are indicated.

The pose of the child with the push-up against the mother is again excellent. A very good Van Dyck —so good that some critics are disposed to think Rubens did it. The lady's face is pallid from too much cleaning—the carnations of the flesh having been rubbed off. This is measurably true of the child's face.

633 } ——***Portraits of Two Ladies.*** These are weak Lely-
634 } like affairs, and it is not believable that Van Dyck had a hand in either of them. Just such portraits were turned out by a dozen or more of Van Dyck's assistants, pupils, and followers. But you never hear of these helpers and imitators. It is always Van Dyck who did the work and by no chance Jan van Belcamp, Boeyermans, Born, Geldorp, Mytens, Dobson, Jameson—to mention only the more prominent of the following.

617. ——***Sir Thomas Wharton.*** At first blush this portrait looks like Van Dyck repeating the pose of his Charles I in the large picture of the Louvre; but it is more likely the performance of some follower who is imitating the pose in the Louvre picture. It is a weak following of Van Dyck, entirely too pretty for him even in his decadent style. One can hardly believe that such a picture was ever allowed to go out of his studio. Carry the manner of doing the left sleeve and the landscape at the left, with the rock, across the room to the portrait of the Lady with the Tulip (No. 619) and you will recognise the same hand at work in both pictures. It was almost certainly not Van Dyck's hand.

616. ——***Portrait of Philip, Lord Wharton.*** This is a handsome portrait though one may entertain doubts about its origin. The figure stands well,

has a very good setting, and a fine landscape. Moreover, there is a decided charm about the picture. But there is no force. It lacks in vim, spirit, determination. The hand gives the measure of its strength. It is the hand of a woman. Lely did similar portraits to this, but what name is Lely's to conjure with when you can use Van Dyck's without let or hinderance? Another version of this portrait belongs to Lord Lucas and has recently been loaned to the National Gallery, London. Both pictures are, of course, originals, but are they originals by Van Dyck?

615. ——***Portrait of the Earl of Danby.*** This portrait is probably referred to Van Dyck's "Genoese period" because of its pretentiousness in costume and attitude, but whatever period it be assigned to does not make it other than a rather thin affair from top to toe. There is no positive strength in type, figure, drawing, or colouring. It is graceful, smooth recitation, of which there is enough and to spare here in the Hermitage under Van Dyck's name. He was profligate and improvident in his latter-day art and life, but not so feeble nor so careless as galleries, collectors, and dealers would make him out.

580. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** Something in the head speaks for Van Dyck but much in the hands speaks for Rubens. It is a betwixt-and-between portrait of a kind frequently seen in the galleries at Munich and Dresden—a Rubens-Van Dyck portrait. But a very good one.

581. ——***Portrait of a Woman.*** This is a companion portrait to No. 580 and has the same or similar characteristics. The head looks as though Van

Dyck had painted it, but the hands are those of Rubens. Both pictures have been somewhat enlarged from their original dimensions by added canvas at the sides. They are very good portraits.

840. **Eeckhout, Gerbrandt van den.** ***A Philosopher.*** A very good piece of work by some Rembrandt follower, not necessarily Eeckhout. The drawing seems a little unusual for him, but the general look of the picture suggests Eeckhout's early style. He was a man evidently of considerable versatility, and it is not possible to pin him down to one manner of painting. Something of an imitator of others, he adopted several manners or styles at different times.

841. ——***A Smoker.*** This picture and also Nos. 1860 and 838 give one a meagre and rather erroneous impression of Eeckhout. He was a Rembrandt follower, to be sure, but with more force than is here indicated.

433. **Escalante, Juan Antonio.** ***St. Joseph and Infant Christ.*** The picture is fairly good in colour and in its depth of shadow. The painter belonged to the school of Madrid and was influenced by Tintoretto.

443. * **Eyck, Jan van.** ***Annunciation.*** An exceedingly interesting picture and so good a one that critics of rank have agreed in thinking it a Jan van Eyck. Superficially, it is, of course, in his style and with his types, but there is a certain cramped and laboured workmanship showing in the detail that militates against such an attribution. It lacks sureness of touch. Van Eyck was not only confident about his drawing, but he worked with an ease born of confidence. His surfaces are

smooth and slip readily from one part or texture to another part or texture without hardness and without jar. Here, however, there is the small indented or imposed surface of the goldsmith, in the robe of the angel, for instance. The same kind of hard, metallic quality appears in the wings and, more superficially, in the hands and faces. Again, the colour, the light, and the shade are hardly what we look for in Jan van Eyck. And yet it may be a work of his hand. Certainly it is very near him. It possibly came out of his shop and was largely worked upon by pupils. Not the best of the attributed Van Eycks but a picture of considerable merit. Probably the left wing of a triptych.

444. ——***Crucifixion and Last Judgment.*** These are the wings of a triptych—the central panel having disappeared. The Crucifixion is done in the Van Eyck manner and with types of men, women, and horses taken from the celebrated Adoration of the Lamb. It is done in a smoother manner than No. 443, with smaller figures, more attenuated hands and faces. The panel is over-crowded with figures, and the colour lacks in clearness. In the distance the city, mountains, and sky are fairly good. The Last Judgment is even smaller and more miniature-like in character, less well drawn, more crowded with figures. The same hand probably did both panels, but that hand was not Jan van Eyck's. The panels are probably the work of some Van Eyck follower using his master's materials.

155. **Farinato, Paolo.** ***Adoration of Magi.*** This picture on its face suggests a following of Paolo Veronese, and, Farinato being known as a Paolo fol-

lower, the picture is handed over to him. It had one other chance for its paternity—Zelotti. Whatever nowadays is too poor for Paolo must be Farinato or Zelotti. School of Paolo would fill the bill better.

236. **Feti, Domenico.** ***Portrait of an Actor.*** This portrait is done with some energy and is a good piece of coarse painting. See also the David, No. 231.

855. **Flinck, Govert.** ***Portrait of a Woman.*** It is necessary to say again that the pupils and followers of Rembrandt are almost as much confused with one another as with Rembrandt himself. The early deception of dealers and collectors has resulted in a very tangled web. Here, for instance, is a portrait put down to Flinck that bears every indication of being by Lievens. It has the Lievens softness of line and modelling. Nothing about it points to Flinck.

844. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** This is a pretty and no doubt a popular portrait. It is thinly painted and fairly well drawn. From such work one comes to believe that Flinck was a very weak brother who could paint nothing better than this. That is an erroneous conclusion. The best work of Flinck is given to Rembrandt and his second best to Bol, Eeckhout, and Lievens. No. 842 is of the same weak quality as this and even smoother in surface.

1851. **Florentine School.** ***Coronation of the Madonna.*** A fine bit of decoration—frame and all. What very good colour!

69. **Francia, Francesco.** ***Madonna, Child, and Saints.*** A pyramidal composition which fills the

space and the arched top fairly well. The Francia sentiment is here and some of the affectation of his school. They show in the inclination of the heads and the pseudo-sadness of the faces. The angels below are very good. It seems a rather odd picture for Francia though the colour speaks for him.

68. **Francia, Giacomo.** ***Madonna and Child.*** This is a poorly done school piece with the false signature of Francesco Francia on the globe held in the Child's hand. It is badly drawn with a crude landscape. Ordinarily, in these piping times of attributions, it would be given to Boateri.

1848. **Garofalo, (Benvenuto Tisi).** ***Marriage in Cana.*** The picture is large and in composition somewhat unusual for Garofalo. It is not badly done in the figures, the table, and the still-life. The shadows are dark and the colours sooty. The background seems to have been inspired by Raphael's School of Athens. Originally the picture was arched at the top but is now pieced out with added canvas and squared up. Two pendent pictures, much injured, are at Gatschina.

59. ——***Adoration of Shepherds.*** A large but somewhat inferior Garofalo. It lacks in quality.

60. ——***Holy Family.*** A typical Garofalo shop piece, rather good in colour and pleasing in sentiment, but the kind of work that came from his shop in a stream and reflective of the work of assistants rather than the master.

61. ——***Christ on the Way to Calvary.*** The colours are forbidding and the sky and clouds are crude. The Garofalo output shows better in smaller pictures.

867. **Gelder, Aert de.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** This portrait and also No. 1831 give little or no hint of Aert de Gelder. The latter is perhaps nearer to him than the former, but neither of them is characteristic or even probable. The Prodigal Son (No. 797) in this gallery is assigned to Rembrandt but it is by Aert de Gelder. Probably the Rembrandt here of Pallas Athena (No. 809) is also by Aert de Gelder. Either of the two so-called Rembrandts is nearer De Gelder than these attributed portraits.

112. ** **Giorgione (Giorgio Barbarelli).** ***Judith.*** This picture is one of the gems of the Hermitage—a picture refined in spirit and charming in form and colour. Perhaps the spirit of it is its most pleasing quality. It is more serenely beautiful than any Italian picture in the gallery, not excepting the so-called Raphaels. The purity and loveliness of the head are in measure paralleled in the head of the Giorgione Venus at Dresden, that of the St. Sebastian at Vienna (No. 63), the Castelfranco Madonna, and in lesser degree in the portrait at Berlin (No. 12). It seems to agree with all these in its exaltation, its elevation, its serenity, its refinement.

Nor does it lack in agreement with the Dresden Venus as regards the figure. One feels the same clearness of outline and loveliness of modelling, the same flow of all the parts into one perfect whole. Notice how the head imperceptibly slips into the neck and shoulders, the waist into the hips, the legs into the feet. If you wish to apply that badly misused word "rhythm" you will find its illustration here in the unity of this figure. Smaller resemblances to things Giorgionesque ap-

pear here and there. The foot is like the Dresden Venus, the mouth is curved at the corners, the sword agrees with the armour in the Castelfranco Madonna, and again the landscape, sea, sky, foliage are quite in the style of the Castelfranco picture.

But there are also some differences. The pose of the figure with the left leg forward is seen later in Titian's St. Margaret at Madrid but not in any Giorgione. Nor is the colour faded out in the high lights usual with Giorgione or of frequent occurrence in Venetian art. It is more peculiarly Milanese. This is equally true of the light-and-shade which seems too fragile for Giorgione. The type seems right enough but about the accessories one cannot be so sure. The crinkled drapery, the hands, the meagreness of the enfolding shadows, the doing of the head under the foot, the grass near it, the tree—all apparently point to Milanese work. It is amazingly fine, very beautifully done; but was it done by Giorgione or Cesare da Sesto? It is quite worthy of the young Giorgione and seems very close to him, but with our present limited knowledge of him it is impossible to be positive about his painting this picture. It was formerly thought a Raphael and afterward passed as a Moretto. It now seems to lie between Giorgione and Cesare da Sesto, though Cesare painted no work of this importance at present known to us. In any event, we should not lose sight of the fact that it is a beautiful picture.

The white veiling of the under garment is darkened below the knee and is not now in value, the leg is repainted in gouts, the hands are badly hurt, also the head of Judith and the head under her

foot. Probably the wing of an altar-piece the other parts of which have disappeared.

1655. **Girolamo da Santa Croce.** ***Madonna, Child, and St. John.*** The picture is charming in the Madonna, the children, the landscape; and decoratively very lovely in colour. The attitude and the parapet recall the Warrior Adoring the Child by Catena in the National Gallery, London. The picture is nearer, perhaps, to Catena than to Girolamo.

1945. ——***A Saint.*** This and its companion picture both show the yellow-streaked sky and the peculiar figures characteristic of Girolamo da Santa Croce, but they are not wonderful works in any way.

446. **Goes, Hugo van der.** ***Annunciation.*** The interior is very nice. The picture hardly gives us the strength of Van der Goes but has some charm of colour. There is a distant landscape of considerable beauty.

1721. **Goyen, Jan van.** ***Landscape.*** It is a rather mediocre Van Goyen in colour, in atmosphere, in sky, and in clouds. And what could any one say in praise of the frame?

22. **Granacci, Francesco.** ***Adoration of Child.*** The picture has been variously attributed, as the catalogue suggests. It belongs to the Florentine School and is certainly nearer to Granacci than to Perugino or Ghirlandajo, its former putative parents. The Madonna suggests Bugiardini, as do the trees and the landscape.

65. **Grandi, Ercole di Giulio Cesare.** ***Deposition.*** It was formerly put down to Ortolano until Morelli

attributed it to Grandi. It shows the influence of Francia and is hardly well enough done to be by any painter of rank.

411. **Greco, Il (Domenico Theotocopuli).** ***Portrait of a Poet.*** This portrait shows Il Greco in his less mannered style and is even more sane and serious than the portraits by him in the museum at Toledo. It is rather finely done.

1962. ——***Peter and Paul.*** Here are the mannerisms of Il Greco but they do not appear in highly exaggerated form. There is a morbid strain in the sentiment as well as in the colour but both are rather attractive. Morbidity is something that calls for praise when seen in Botticelli but is often objected to in Il Greco. Why?

1847. * **Guardi, Francesco.** ***A Prospect.*** What a very charming picture in light, shadow, air, colour! And how vigorously the figures have been put in! They have character and action as well as colour. So much rubbish is now listed under the names of Canaletto and Guardi that it is a pleasure to meet occasionally so good a picture as this.

1648. ——***A View.*** It is rather striking in its light, air, distance, colour; but it has not the quality of the Guardi, No. 1847, hanging near it.

771. **Hals, Frans.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** It is a careless performance—not breadth of handling but mere carelessness, want of precision. Look at the hands or the hard, ropy hair. It looks as though some pupil in the shop had been set at work upon it. This doubtless often happened, yet when and where do we hear mention of a Hals school piece?

770. ——*Portrait of a Man.* This, again, looks like a shop piece, emanating from Hals but with much pupils' or assistants' work about it. The cheeks, eyes, and mouth are fairly well drawn, but notice the indecision of the hair. The pupils of Hals are not negligible. If you think so pray look at No. 774 in another room. For a wonder it is put down to Frans Hals the Younger. There were four sons, all of them painters, working with the Elder Hals, but most of their pictures, with some by Judith Leyster and Dirk Hals, are under the name of the Elder Hals.

772. ——*Portrait of a Man.* Here is a portrait that comes precious near to some one of the Judith Leyster calibre. It is not drawn in the head, mouth, nose, and chin with the strength and certainty of Frans Hals. And what shall one say in defence of the drawing of the figure? Go close and notice the petty niggling of the hair and the ineffective work on the white linen at the elbow—or is it the wrist? The signature at the right has been painted in and painted out so many times by various owners that there is now a black spot on the canvas. Evidently it has not proved satisfactory.

773. ——*Portrait of a Man.* This is by the Elder Hals more surely than any other work attributed to him in the gallery. It is more definite, more certain in drawing and handling, though it still has a feeling of having been worked upon by some pupil in the school. You could hardly fit this figure into any one of the shooting-company pictures at Haarlem. It lacks the vigour and force of the Haarlem works. In type it is a little like the Jolly Toper (No. 1091) at Amsterdam, but again, it has not the

vitality and spirit of the Amsterdam picture. It is, however, the best Hals in the Hermitage—one had almost said the only one.

774. **Hals the Younger, Frans.** ***Boy with Armour.***
* Here is a much better picture than is sometimes given to the Elder Hals. It is, in fact, not only good in characterisation but also in drawing and handling. Notice the ease, if not the absolute certainty, with which the hair is brushed in. The armour is excellent and holds its place well. And what a fine scheme of colour! It is sober, serious, subdued, and yet harmonious and pleasing. If Frans the Younger could do work of this calibre, why have we not seen more of it? Were all his pictures of boys sold under his father's name and monogram? One may entertain grave doubts about many of the laughing-boy pictures put down to the Elder Hals at Cassel and elsewhere. Judith Leyster, we feel sure, did some of them. Why could not Frans the Younger have done others of them?

611. **Hanneman, Adriaan.** ***William of Nassau-Orange.*** This portrait shows the facile following of Van Dyck by an eclectic painter who derived first from Mytens and then from Van Dyck himself. So close was the following that this portrait was long attributed to Van Dyck, but the drawing and handling finally proved unconvincing and the picture was given to Hanneman. Who knows now if it is rightly placed? How many of this man's pictures are still masquerading under Van Dyck's name? The portrait here attributed to Van Dyck (No. 617) seems to be by the same hand as this one. When it is considered that there were a

score or more of Van Dyck followers of the Hanneman rank and very few of their pictures to be found under their names, the chances of Van Dyck being saddled with their productions seem very large.

490. **Heemskerck, Maerten van.** ***Crucifixion.*** A triptych that has some of Heemskerck's strong drawing about it and yet is not a satisfactory or representative example of the man. The large picture in the Haarlem Museum (No. 155) is worth a dozen of it. The donors and their patrons in the wings are much the best portions of the triptych. Possibly a workshop picture but not negligible for that reason.

1725. **Heerschop, Hendrik.** ***Mother and Child (?).*** The picture is rambling in drawing but very good in colour. The figure is centralised in light, has loaded high lights and dark surroundings.

1713. **Heyden, Jan van der.** ***Landscape with Houses.*** The sky is glassy—a common appearance with this painter—but he usually gives us, as here, good atmosphere and buildings that are set well into the landscape. A minute, painstaking Dutchman who was fond of placing every brick in a wall just exactly right but who was, nevertheless, an artist with a feeling for light, air, and colour.

466. **Holbein, Ambrosius.** ***Portrait of Young Man.*** The head is rather well done though the shoulders are lax in drawing and the hand is bad. The colour is pleasing. Perhaps the best part of it is the landscape and the Germanised Renaissance architecture which make a decorative background for the figure. The supposed painter was a brother of Hans Holbein the Younger.

861. **Hooch, Pieter de.** ***A Concert.*** This is a poor following of Pieter de Hooch by some one less skilled than Janssens and no better than Verkolie. Notice the bad drawing and painting of the faces, hands, the table-cloth, the mandolin. Even the dog on the floor has been distorted.

860. * ——***Lady and Her Cook.*** Here is an entirely different tale from No. 861. The picture is carefully drawn and easily painted. Any feature of it that you may pick out will bear close analysis. Look, for instance, at the colour of the dresses or of the whole picture. It is excellent. The light, air, and distance are again quite perfect. Notice the receding planes of the picture—how absolutely each keeps its place and all of them blend and run together! Even the pretty little scene through the garden gate is in perfect keeping. Compare it with No. 861 and you cannot fail to see the difference between a genuine De Hooch and an imitation.

943. ——***Bedroom with Figures.*** It is an unusual subject for De Hooch, but that is about the only reason for doubting its being done by him. There is beautiful colour in the woman's dress, a charming light, some very good drawing, and some easy handling. Notice the Van Mieris (No. 915) opposite, and contrast its cold light and colour, its metallic textures, with this De Hooch. The background comes up and fits about the bed rather closely, in a way characteristic of Janssens but not foreign to the young De Hooch. The picture has borne several names before its present one.

1918. **Isenbrant, Adriaen.** ***St. Jerome.*** The picture shows a following of Gerard David but is not necessarily by Isenbrant, who is merely a name and

about whom we know little or nothing. In the European galleries one meets with a number of pictures soft in drawing and modelling, dark in shadows, and grey-blue in colour that seem to have been painted by one man. The man is called Isenbrant, but the real Isenbrant may have been quite guiltless of the pictures. No. 454 seems more typical of this David follower than the picture before us.

650. **Jordaens, Jacob.** ***Satyr and Peasant.*** It is a hot, rather brutal Jordaens but has some strength about it. He did this subject several times or had it done in his shop. Other versions at Cassel, Budapest, Munich.

651. ——***Family Meal.*** This is a rather fine Jordaens though restless in composition and perhaps overfilled with figures. The light and colour of it are very good. It formerly passed under the title of the Family of Rubens.

652. ——***Group about Table.*** The visitor will probably not care to linger long over the pictures of Jordaens, but perhaps he can take time to notice in this picture the roundly modelled heads. How strong and virile they are!

653. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** The student interested in attributions can dig out of this fine portrait many analogies with the portrait of Admiral Borro in the Berlin Gallery, there thought to be by Velasquez. Start with the drawing of the head and do not overlook the hands, for they are the most positive of all in resemblance to the Borro. The column, the curtain, the costume, and particularly the handling of the brush, all seem to wake memories of the

Borro which is probably not Borro, and the Velasquez which is probably not Velasquez but Jordaens.

864. **Koninck, Salomon.** ***Interior with Figures.*** Notice here the Rembrandtesque quality of the room and the window with its light. Just such pictures as this are continually being fastened upon the name of Rembrandt, whereas they were done by his pupils and followers, such as Koninck, Victoor, and Poorter. In this gallery under Rembrandt's name the picture No. 798 will disclose similar effects.

837. ——***Cræsus and Solon.*** In the manner of its treatment, especially in the turban and jewels, this picture should be compared with the alleged Rembrandt, No. 1777, in this gallery.

1917. **Kulmbach, Hans von.** ***Demonstration of the Cross.*** These two panels are now very handsome in colour in spite of much repainting. Some of the angels' robes are beautiful, and there is enough awkwardness about the figures to make them naïve. Notice the little angel high up on the panel. The donor in the corner has a fine head though it is now injured.

13A. **Leonardo da Vinci.** ***Madonna and Child (Madonna Litta).*** This is a picture about which there has been much controversy as regards its painter. Originally it passed as a Cesare da Sesto; much later Waagen promoted it to a Leonardo da Vinci; Crowe and Cavalcaselle thought it designed by Leonardo but executed by Zenale; Morelli believed it by Bernardino de' Conti. It is almost certainly by the painter of the Madonna and Child at Budapest (No. 115), there ascribed to Boltraffio. The hands (especially the fingers), the feet, the head, and

the body of the Child are very like in both pictures. The Budapest picture is probably by Bernardino, and so is this Hermitage example.

It is a Leonardesque picture, graceful, elevated, full of right feeling, and originally, no doubt, well drawn, but now it is sadly messed by repainting, so that the hands are ill favoured, the colours crude, the sky raw. It has been entirely repainted—so much so that no one can tell exactly what is under it. But a graceful group and very lovely in its contours.

15. ——***Portrait of a Woman.*** This is evidently an attempt by some Leonardo follower to do the Mona Lisa, nude to the waist, and rather a poor attempt at that. The hands and arms are boneless and the figure spineless. The hair is ropy, the eyes are not true to each other, and the landscape is very crude. It will never do for Leonardo. See the catalogue note upon it.

468. * **Leyden, Lucas van.** ***Healing the Blind.*** It has the look of Lucas in types and in drawing, but the handling seems much too coarse and rough for him. He was usually more limpid and flowing with his brush, as may be noticed in the Berlin examples of him. This Hermitage example may have been hurt by repainting, for it was probably at one time transferred from wood to canvas and injured in the process. The lines of the wooden panel are still apparent in the canvas. It is a fine, decorative triptych, with very brilliant colours and a superb mountain landscape at the back. How fine, again, decoratively, the figures in the wings holding the shields! The newly gilt frame hurts the general effect.

816. **Lievens, Jan.** ***Portrait of an Old Man.*** This is a fairly good example of Lievens and shows his soft modelling and his light scheme of colour. Moreover, it discloses a technical trick of his which he employed almost invariably—that is, ploughing the beard or hair with the wooden end of the brush while the paint was wet. His pictures often pass for Rembrandts, for instance, at Cassel, Nos. 229, 230, 231, 233. Indeed, this picture was once attributed to Rembrandt.

1967. * **Lippi, Filippino.** ***Madonna Adoring.*** Certainly a handsome picture though now a little flattened by rubbing so that the angels' wings at the left are diaphanous. You can see the towers of the city through the wings. The flowers are pretty but not accurately done and the foreground of grass is formal and mannered. The background suggests Mr. Berenson's painter—Amico di Sandro. The motive of angels and flowers is not unlike the Botticini in the Pitti, No. 347. The picture is hardly by Filippino but is a very good picture for all that. The angels are lovely in sentiment and the colour is excellent. Not in the catalogue in 1913.

115. **Lotto, Lorenzo.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** The interior of the room with the small figures at the back near the window is very good. The figure of the man is rather bad though the hands and head are fairly well done. The colour is a little raw in the red. It has some force but little of the spirit of Lotto about it. At first it was an Antonio Moro, then a Bordone, now a Lotto—for the passing hour.

1939. ——***Christ on the Mount.*** It looks Lottesque and yet has something about it reminiscent of

Florence and Andrea del Sarto's School. Notice the apostle at the extreme left for Andrea's type. Moreover, the landscape is half Florentine. And yet the feeling and colour are Lottesque. Not catalogued in 1913.

76. ——*Madonna and Child.* There is no very good reason to think this picture by Lotto. It is somewhat removed from him in type, colour, drawing, and spirit. Crowe and Cavalcaselle thought it a ruined picture merely reminiscent of Lotto. Before their date it was considered a Leonardo da Vinci, then a Cesare da Sesto. It cuts a poor figure at the present time. The hands are bad, the hair is hard, the curtained background fails to keep its place. It is a version of a picture in the Johnson Collection, Philadelphia.

71. **Luini, Bernardino.** *Madonna and Child.* An unusual Luini in type and colour, with more spirit than is common with Luini but not enough to raise it above sweetness. It was formerly regarded as a Leonardo da Vinci. In the northern galleries there are few of the sooty-looking Milanese pictures that have not had their day as Leonardos.

72. ——*St. Catherine.* Dark in shadow and now false in value as regards the high lights, especially in the linen at the wrists. The white flowers of the hair make spots on the pattern, the drapery is much criss-crossed over the figure and is angular in its foldings, the hands are a little short and pulpy. But it is a typical Luini though once put down to Leonardo. Probably much repainted at the right and left.

73. ——*St. Sebastian.* Luini is almost always weak, but here he has tried to be strong by taking a

young Samson for a model. In spite of it the picture is merely pretty from start to finish. There is something Germanic about the type, as though Luini had been studying northern masters. See the catalogue note on this picture.

1969. **Maineri, Gian Francesco.** ***Christ Bearing the Cross.*** A picture similar in subject and treatment is in the Uffizi (No. 1572), put down to Maineri. Presumably that is how this Hermitage picture derives its name. It has about it a suggestion of Luini, of Jacopo di Barbara, of Giorgione, of North Italy, though Maineri belonged at Ferrara. Not a great work.

307. **Maratta, Carlo.** ***Portrait of Clement IX.*** It is overposed and too conscious, weak in spirit and poor in colour, but it is not badly painted. There are other versions of it at Bologna and Chiswick.

74. **Melzi, Francesco.** ***Portrait of a Young Woman.*** This is the so-called Columbine—a picture with a history and considerable mystery. It belonged to Marie de Médicis, the Duke of Orleans, William II of Holland, and was celebrated under the names of Columbine, Flora, Vanity. Of course it was a picture by no less a person than Leonardo da Vinci. But now that the prosaic truth has pushed itself forward the Columbine becomes just a Portrait of a Young Woman, and not by Leonardo but by one of his weaker followers, Francesco Melzi. Other painters' names were tried but failed to convince. It was pronounced a Luini by Waagen, a Solario by Crowe and Cavalcaselle, and Morelli thought it "an undoubted work by Gianpietrino"; but the type and workmanship are too closely re-

lated to the Melzi at Berlin (No. 222) to leave any doubt about the same hand having done both pictures.

And the saddest part of all is that the picture is not a very good one. It is impressive at the first glance but does not hold up well. The sentiment is weak. It is the Leonardo type sweetened and prettified to weakness. The drawing lacks in energy and force, the contours are just a little too rounded, the hands a little too soft and pulpy. Moreover, the arabesque of leaves with their Japanese push-in from nowhere is too prominent, too spotty, too hard. It is a little tawdry because over-accented. The high lights of the hair are disturbing for the same reason. The pretty type, the patterned dress, the unusual framing of leaves and flowers have combined to give this portrait more fame than it deserves.

880. **Metsu, Gabriel.** ***Interior with Figure.*** Apparently it is as good a picture as any Terborch, but there is considerable difference between the men both mentally and technically. Metsu has less dignity and simplicity, is more ornate in his colour, involved in his drawing, and glassy in his surfaces. But here is a charming picture of his, nevertheless. No. 878, while just as good in its drawing, is disagreeable in its slate colour and inky in its background.

877. ——***Interior with Figures.*** The work is easily painted and is brilliant in colour but a little flashy. The whites seem crude. Even a painter of Metsu's modest rank can hardly be held responsible for all the works ascribed to him.

449. **Metsys, Quentin.** ***Madonna in Glory.*** The colour is somewhat hot and the aureole surround-

ing the Madonna with its black-edged clouds is crudely done. It is not very good work and certainly not work in any way related to Quentin Metsys. It is now generally considered to be by Jan Prévost.

742. **Mierevelt, Michiel Janz.** ***Portrait of a Child.*** If we should, for the nonce, forget the matter of attributions and even decline to pry into the technique of this picture we might find something in the subject worthy of admiration. Look at it merely for the portrait of a pretty little Dutch child in picturesque costume with a parrot on her finger, and how very charming as well as true to Dutch life it becomes! In spirit, not technique, it is comparable to the children's portraits by Velasquez at Vienna.

916. **Mieris, Frans van.** ***Breakfasting.*** It is very accurately drawn and rather good in colour but the surface is too porcelain-like. It has no breadth of beam either mentally or technically. No. 915 is no better.

401. **Morales, Luis de.** ***Mater Dolorosa.*** This is a fair illustration of Morales's rather lachrymose art, which extends to the attenuation of the face, figure, and hands. If you will study these features in connection with the Il Greco (No. 1962) you will discover a possible influence of Morales on Il Greco. Another version of this picture in the Madrid Gallery. See also here No. 400 for similar sentiment, drawing, and colour.

113. **Moretto da Brescia.** ***Faith.*** With just a shade of affectation perceptible about it, not only in the head but in the hands. It is a little too

ecstatic to be true. The drawing is now hurt by repainting, but perhaps the hands were always a little pulpy and the right arm rather badly done. The colour is excellent, the flowers very good, and the mountain landscape quite in Moretto's usual vein. The silver tone or envelope peculiar to this painter is apparent. The picture formerly passed as a Bordone and then as a Palma.

114. ——*Portrait of a Man.* The tone of this portrait is like Moretto's work, though the head might have been done by, say, Moroni. Originally it passed as a Calcar, Waagen gave it to Moretto, Dr. Bode thinks it a Bordone, the catalogue queries it—so the student has a wide range in the choice of the painter. The left hand is well drawn. The curtain at the right and the background of the figure have, perhaps, been repainted.

480 } **Moro, Antonio.** ***Sir Thomas and Lady Gresham.***
481 } The man's portrait is the better done. It is in Moro's exact style, with some hardness of drawing and undue length of arm, but, generally speaking, it is accurate if precise. The woman's portrait is not so satisfactory.

482. ——*Portrait of a Man.* This portrait is hung in a place of honour on the wall although it is a much weaker performance than the Sir Thomas Gresham (No. 480). The weakness is not only in the drawing of the face, hands, and sleeve but in the colour scheme.

154. **Moroni, Giovanni Battista.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** It is not an important portrait whoever painted it. The figure is badly placed on the canvas and is not improved in any way by the parapet with its letter-

ing. It is common enough work though once thought to be a portrait of Aretino, done by Titian. The present attribution is questionable.

371. **Murillo, Bartolomé Estéban.** ***Immaculate Conception.*** This is one of the many versions of this subject painted by Murillo. In some respects it seems better than the Soult picture in the Louvre. They were both considered wonderful at one time, but there is a more modest estimate made of them at the present day. They are too loose in drawing, and too ecstatic in sentiment.

367. ——***The Repose in Egypt.*** It is probably as good a Murillo as there is in this gallery without being a great picture in either thought or technique. The Madonna is pretty, sweet, and soft in modelling, the drawing of the Child leaves something to be desired, the Joseph is questionable, and the landscape is vapoury. It needs to be repeated that Murillo is not, and never was, a great master.

373. ——***Vision of St. Anthony of Padua.*** It is a version of the picture in the cathedral of Seville—possibly a school copy. The Seville picture is vastly more impressive because of its size and its excellent setting.

372. ——***Deliverance of St. Peter.*** The drawing is rambling (notice the arms and hands of the angel), but the handling is rather facile for Murillo. It is a very good example of his art and yet has little distinction about it. Notice the cheapness and the vulgarity of the colouring or the questionable quality of the light and the shadow.

379. ——***St. John Baptist.*** This will be regarded by some visitors as the masterpiece of the gallery but

it is a poor, dinner-plate performance. Its weakness is pathetic and its sentiment is something worse. If you do not agree, try to find some good drawing or some good colour in it. The shadows are more or less pot-black, the clouds are smoke, and the light, such as it is, comes from St. John and the sheep rather than the sky. The catalogue has the candour to say that the picture is a copy of the one in the National Gallery, London.

1117. **Neer, Aart van der.** ***Holland Landscape.*** With a wide sweep of land and sky. The light back of the windmill is penetrating. The picture is almost like a Hercules Seghers though a little sharper in its drawing than Seghers's work.

474. **Orley, Bernard van.** ***Descent from Cross.*** The figures seem fairly well drawn though some of the heads do not fit the bodies any too well. The robe of the Magdalen is handsome, but her head and figure are twisted too much. The colour is that of a late Fleming following Italy. A fairly good landscape is shown. The panel probably belonged to an altar-piece, and may be by Van Orley, though it seems a bit hard for him. It was formerly attributed to Lucas van Leyden, and then to Dürer. Much injured.

1839. ——***Christ on the Mount.*** There is some good rock drawing shown here, several highly coloured robes, and some sentiment of a mediocre quality. Just why it should be put down to Van Orley is not apparent. It is not a wonderful work whoever did it.

952. **Ostade, Adriaen van.** ***Interior with Figures.*** A very good piece of painting showing a well-lighted interior, with an atmospheric envelope and

excellent colour. No. 1767 is, perhaps, less interesting but is worth looking up.

948. ——*Woman at Window.* A fine bit of fat painting. And what rich colour! At their best, what excellent painters these so-called "Little Dutchmen"! See also No. 954 though it has less quality.

947 } ——*Musicians.* These are good examples of Van
949 } Ostade's drawing, colour, and handling. What a technician he was! How skilful with his fingers! He was no great thinker, no bearer of any great message to mankind, but in every detail of craftsmanship what a past master he was!

962. **Ostade, Isaac van.** *Landscape with Figures.* A typical Isaac van Ostade with his somewhat spotty high lights seen on the tree trunks at left and the weeds at right. He painted quite a number of Paul Potters in common with Verbeecq, or rather their pictures were sold by dealers for Potters in the bad old times of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

165. **Palma Vecchio.** *Portrait of a Man.* The attitude, the figure, the hand and glove are Palma's, or at least very like him, but the drawing is hard in the head, eyes, and nose, the hair is crudely done, and the surface is not attractive. It has probably suffered much from repainting. The catalogue queries the attribution but does not put the picture back in the Venetian School where it was originally. No. 91, put down to Palma's following, is badly injured and probably never was of much importance.

7. **Perugino, Pietro.** *Portrait of a Man.* This looks a little like a Perugino but the colour and

the eyes are suggestive of Costa. Formerly it was listed as belonging to the School of Perugino, but it has been promoted for some unknown reason. It is a handsome portrait with some seriousness in the mood.

1938. ——*St. Sebastian.* The repainting of the face and neck has ruined the foreshortening of the jaw and made it heavy. The signature is too prominent to inspire confidence. Perugino would hardly have had such bad taste. The picture is a version—perhaps merely a copy—of the upper part of the St. Sebastian in the Louvre (No. 1566A). The arrow and the signature may be later additions.

29. **Piero di Cosimo.** ***Holy Family.*** It is a version of the Piero in the Borghese Gallery (No. 343) as the catalogue suggests. The landscape at back with the sea and sky is characteristic of Piero, as also the cattle. It is handsome in colour and good in the robes though it may be only a varied copy. Notice the red of the Madonna's robe. The figures fill the space well.

18. * **Piombo, Sebastiano del.** ***Descent from the Cross.*** This is an important Sebastiano; in fact, one of his very best figure pieces. The composition is a little unusual. The eye is led from the outstretched figure of Christ back to the Madonna and thence by the arm of the apostle over to the tomb at the right. This arrangement fills the foreground with figures cast in the form of a loose oval. The upper part of the picture is given over to a wonderful landscape under a lurid sky. The action is dramatic, the feeling tragic, and yet there is nothing uneasy or restless about the composition or the figures. The action, types, draperies are

suggestive of the influence of Michelangelo. This is noticeable in the Madonna and in the figure prying off the cover of the tomb. The figure of Christ, and especially the face of the Magdalen, are Giorgionesque. Again one feels in the robes and faces at the left some suggestion of Raphael. Sebastiano blended them all together to make a strong amalgam of his own. How fine the figure of the kneeling Magdalen and the collapsed figure of Christ! The Madonna may be a bit academic, but the figure is not the less excellent of its kind. All of the figures seem slighter than those in the Raising of Lazarus in the National Gallery, London (No. 1), and the colour is, perhaps, less pronounced in depth. The blue here is somewhat crude and the other colours too dark to correspond with the high key of the white sheet. It is, however, a notable picture.

17. ——***Christ Bearing the Cross.*** It is a large version or variation of the Madrid picture (No. 345). There is no certainty about the painter of either of them, but they are, at any rate, nearer to Sebastiano than any other painter in sight. This example suggests the influence of Michelangelo in the muscular strain of it and is Giorgionesque in its shadows. It is apparently a blend of Roman and Venetian methods.

19. * ——***Portrait of Cardinal Pole.*** There is so much of Roman method about this portrait that, naturally enough, it was long supposed to be by Raphael. It is drawn in a large, Raphaelesque way, as you may see by looking at the hands or the costume. Even the washed out high lights are Raphaelesque. The beard now melts into the robe, as the possible

result of repainting, and the colour is not very good; but this is a strong portrait, nevertheless. It is excellent in characterisation—a manly, positive, forceful type that commands respect. Excellent, too, in execution for all its following of the great ones at Rome.

120. **Pordenone (Bernardo Licinio).** ***Family Group.*** The work shows something of Titian, Giorgione, Palma, and, as usual with eclectic or assimilative art, it lacks force. There is nothing wonderful about it. Formerly attributed to the painter's master, Giovanni Antonio Pordenone.

117. **Pordenone (Giovanni Antonio Licinio).** ***Apples of the Hesperides.*** This is handsome in its decorative quality, has an excellent landscape, with good colour and good movement in the figures. It is a pendent sketch to No. 118. The attribution of both of them is doubtful.

116. ——***The Temptation.*** The picture, for no specific reason that can be named, seems reminiscent of Palma. Crowe and Cavalcaselle thought it by Cariani—the convenient Cariani who acts as a clearing-house for so many questionable Venetian pictures. There is a glimpse of a patch of sky through a circular window at the right that is interesting.

1056. **Potter, Paulus.** ***Landscape and Cattle.*** The picture is entirely too good for Potter. No authentic work of his leads one to think that he ever reached any such height as this in either landscape or figures. The landscape here is excellent in the depth of the woods and the distance. It reminds one somewhat of Camphuysen.

1051. ——***Cattle in Landscape.*** If this picture is by Potter then he must be credited with a finer sense of light, air, and colour than his more famous pictures reveal. The picture is too good for him. It does not agree with pictures by Potter in the Dutch galleries.

1052. ——***A Picture-Gallery.*** The interior shows a series of hunting pictures on the wall, most of them after Paul Potter's works. The interior itself is put down to Potter but is by a cleverer hand than his. The pictures on the wall are all in tone, which was something that Potter could hardly produce with one picture to say nothing of a dozen. The copyist here was a better painter than the master he copied.

1055. ——***Wolfhound.*** At first one cannot see the dog for the signature, and when finally he comes to contemplate the animal he finds a hard silhouette against a hard sky, with some grey paint for a river and a landscape. It is Potter right enough but Potter at his worst.

1057. ——***The Bull.*** It is a true Potter but calls for no applause. Camphuysen and Cuyp, again and again, produced better cattle pictures without applause and practically without the notice of the world. If ever admiration in art was mistakenly bestowed it was in the case of Paul Potter.

1053. ——***Departure for the Hunt.*** Compare this picture with the Potter No. 1054 and detect, if you can, the same hand at work. It is by some small Dutchman painting in a smooth, glassy manner after Wouwerman. He was a better painter than Potter and his name was possibly Pieter Verbeecq.

1772. ——*Cattle before a Shed.* The drawing of the figure and the flat, white cow are indicative of Potter's brush as well as the Paris-green high lights on the foliage. It is probably a genuine Potter, but if it were labelled Berchem or Du Jardin would any one stop to look at it?

1400. **Poussin, Nicolas.** *Galatea's Triumph.* It will give one some idea of Poussin's good drawing and also of his rather tawdry colouring. It is a following of the Roman School of Giulio Romano but not a very satisfactory following. Poussin never possessed much sense of colour and even his line was not a matter so much of personal feeling as of academic rule.

1413. ——*Landscape with Classic Figures.* It has some largeness of form, but is drab-coloured and slate-like in hue. It does not live up to the fine Diogenes landscape in the Louvre. No. 1414, with a very cold blue sky, is, perhaps, of the same quality. In this French room the student should not fail to look at the Watteaus and Lancrets. They do not enter into our present scheme of Old Masters. We may speak of them hereafter, but while the student is here he should not neglect them.

435. **Puga, Antonio.** *Knife-Grinder.* This painter is supposed to have been an imitator of Velasquez. Few of his pictures are known under his name because perhaps they are masquerading under the name of Velasquez. This Knife-Grinder is a following of the early style of Velasquez. It is coarsely done.

1162. **Pynacker, Adam.** *River View.* Look at the lift of the sky and its reflected light upon the water.

It is not a wonderful picture nor by a wonderful man, but at least it is worth looking at.

1666. **Raphael Sanzio.** ***The Crucifixion.*** This is a much-transferred, much-restored triptych that was originally given to Perugino and later assigned to Raphael for insufficient cause. It contains many features taken from Perugino, such as the figures of St. Jerome, the Christ on the Cross, the Magdalen. The whole arrangement, in fact, is suggestive of some one following the Perugino in S. M. Maddalena dei Pazzi, Florence. But a coarseness and harshness in the figures and the whole landscape background with its rocks, sea, city, and especially the lace-work foliage against the sky are direct denials of Perugino and also of Raphael. Neither of them ever did such foliage or made any such close-woven pattern in the background. They were devoted to revealing space at the back, whereas the painter of this picture is intent upon shutting it out. It is the work of some Perugino imitator who sought to improve on the master by putting in more detail in the landscape and greater height in the figures. Raphael, even in his early work, was much simpler than this in landscape, much rounder in the figures, less angular in the folds of his drapery, and by no chance so hard in his line or so airless in his distance. The picture was probably painted by Amico Aspertini. See and compare closely with the signed Aspertini at Berlin (No. 118).

39. ——***St. George.*** There are several copies and versions of this picture—the largest and most varied being ascribed to Dosso Dossi in the Dresden Gallery (No. 124). The name of Raphael rather than

the interest of the picture has made it famous. To tell the truth, it has very little interest as art. It is a youthful performance whoever did it, with a juvenile horse and dragon, a boyish St. George, and some well-painted armour. Perhaps the St. Sabra at the right, as in the Louvre St. George by Raphael, is the most interesting part of the picture. The landscape is odd even for an early Raphael and the foliage of the trees at the left does not agree with the foliage at the right. Nor does the horse agree with the early horses of Raphael nor the dragon with the early dragons of Raphael. The picture sheds no light upon Raphael, because he probably never did it despite the long history attached to it and the signature on the harness of the horse. It belongs nearer to Bologna than to Umbria.

1667. ——***Madonna and Child (Madonna Conestabile).*** There is an interesting history connected with this picture which is told in the catalogue note. The history is really more interesting than the picture itself. It is a very slight affair and of no great importance as art no matter who did it. The types are not Raphael's, nor the landscape, nor the draperies, nor the drawing. The hands of the Madonna are badly drawn, which is not unusual in early Raphaels, but this is not the bad drawing of Raphael; and the bow at the breast is thinly done, which is again not unusual in early Raphaels, but this is not the thin painting of Raphael. It is an "authentic" Raphael and generally accepted as by him, but he never painted it. Transferred to canvas and much repainted. There are several copies of it. Look at the good frame.

38. * ——***Madonna, Child, and St. John (Madonna della Casa d'Alba).*** This is a graceful picture. The

composition is excellent and the figures fill the space admirably. The drawing, too, is right if a little academic in the repetitions of the lines of the robe, in the hand of the Madonna, in the pose of the Child. The group is well knit together, but not in a hard, sculpturesque way, though there is some apparent influence of Michelangelo here. There is a large freedom about the figure of the Madonna and something like a graceful sprawl to the whole group. The colour is cool but the blues seem to be well placed, and the blue of the sky matches that of the robe. As for the landscape, it is spacious enough, but not very Raphaelesque. On the contrary, the figures are Raphaelesque without being Raphael. There is a suspicion of Giulio Romano in the colour but it cannot be confirmed. But, aside from who painted it, the picture is really very good, a fine composition, and the best of the attributed Raphaels in the Hermitage. Both the face and the figure of the Madonna have been injured and the whole picture has been much restored. There are many copies. Read the catalogue history of this work. It has had an eventful career.

40. ——***Portrait of an Old Man.*** The pose of the head is a reminder of Raphael but the rest of the portrait comes nearer to the manner of Ridolfo Ghirlandajo than to Raphael's. There can, however, be little certainty about a surface so much restored and repainted as this. Notice the hard outline, the wrecked eyes, nose, and mouth. The original painter is lost under many repaintings.

37. ——***Holy Family.*** Judging by the St. Joseph, one might think that Bacchiacca had been at work

here, though the head and hands seem too well drawn for him. The Madonna's figure (notably in the bust, arm, and hand) is decidedly Raphaelesque though the knees are rather bad. The Child's head does not fit his body any too well and the hip appears abnormal, but the enlarged hand is again Raphaelesque. The landscape affords no clew. The types, colour, composition, and drawing all seem a little unusual for Raphael and the spirit of it is not his at all. How posed the Child! How dull the Madonna! How commonplace the beardless Joseph! A problematical picture. Much repainted.

811. **Rembrandt van Ryn.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** The
*** Rembrandts at the Hermitage (there are forty or more put down to his name) are the same miscellaneous group of pictures, representing the output of the Rembrandt shop and much of the school, that one sees in other European galleries. Anything that is dark in shadows and violent in light or everything that is kneaded, thumbed, or messed in the pigments is ascribed to Rembrandt, until we marvel not only at his versatility but at his great unevenness and his many failures. Could a great master, such as Rembrandt undoubtedly was, so blunder in twenty different styles or are we witnessing the blunders of his twenty different pupils? Again the question must be asked: What has become of the work of the pupils? Why the hundreds of pictures assigned to Rembrandt and only a baker's dozen to his pupils? Occasionally one sees a Bol or a Flinck or an Eeckhout rightly attributed because, perhaps, the pictures are too weak to pass as Rembrandts even with the uninitiated; but all the first-class Bols, Flincks, Eeckhouts, Backers,

Maeses, Lievenses were long ago signed up and sold as Rembrandts. The reason for this was always obvious. Galleries and collectors wanted Rembrandts, not Flincks and Eeckhouts, and the obliging dealers of yesteryear (and some of to-day) sold them the pupil's works as the master's, at enhanced prices. In the same way they sold Verbeecqs and Isaac van Ostades for Paul Potters, Verkolies for Terborchs, Janssens for Pieter de Hoochs, Segherses and Van Udens for Rubenses. Signatures and dates were changed to meet the commercial demand. The Rembrandt signature is to-day found on pictures that no one pretends are by Rembrandt. You will find it, for instance, in this gallery on the Bol picture No. 856. The natural result of such forgery and misrepresentation is, of course, confusion. The Rembrandt pictures here in the Hermitage are as confused as in other European galleries, and all that we can do is to express a frank opinion on each picture, postulating its authorship as nearly as possible on technical grounds. Signatures, tradition, history, the names of famous owners, the belief of crowned heads are not worth a sou in connection with these pictures and should be entirely laid aside. The technique of each picture must speak for itself.

Now if Rembrandt was the great master that history proclaims him (and there is no doubt about it), then he was necessarily a great technician and thoroughly understood the grammar of his art. Every master, of course, occasionally nods, slips, or is careless in the drawing of, say, an eye or a hand, but his work, as a whole, will be grammatically sound. A Titian, a Rubens, or a Rembrandt will not radically differ or vary in his technique any

more than a Shakespeare, a Homer, or a Goethe. The theme may vary, and one may be done with more enthusiasm and spirit than another, be more pleasing, more effective, greater in content, as one Shakespearian drama may go beyond another, but the grammar, the style, the handling of it will not essentially vary. No great master has half a dozen styles, though in the course of his development he may show several manners. The man who paints in half a dozen styles is the imitator. The imitations thrown off by Rembrandt's pupils and followers are the very things that produce the appalling jumble of Rembrandt attributions in the European galleries. They not only confuse the young student but apparently some old connoisseurs and a good many gallery directors. The only way out of this maze is, as we have already suggested, to judge every picture by its grammar, its quality, and its spirit. The question must be asked anew before every so-called Rembrandt here in the Hermitage: Is it conceived, seen, drawn, and handled in accordance with the Rembrandt standard? What is the Rembrandt standard? Why, the Lesson in Anatomy, the Night Watch, the Five Syndics, the Saskia and the Coppenol at Cassel, the Manoah at Dresden—to mention only a few prominent examples. There is in the Hermitage one portrait that belongs among his most notable achievements—the Portrait of a Man (No. 811). We must use it here as a criterion of Rembrandt's style but not apply it too strictly, for it is Rembrandt at his best, and he was not always painting up to it. All the so-called Rembrandts here are below it—far below it. It is a great masterpiece. But even in Rembrandt's inferior work there will

be an echo of the mind and hand seen in this portrait, a tang of the spirit and loftiness of the master. There will be no headlong plunge to lower levels, no lapses of mind, spirit, and hand, all three, no complete breakdown or even violent change in view or method. A man who could see things so largely, do them so boldly, draw and paint them so broadly, firmly, soundly, truly as this portrait proclaims would not be likely to turn about the next month and do a highly niggled portrait in the style of Gerard Dou, or a weak, soft, pumpkin-like head in the style of Jan Lievens, or a pretty, spotty, velvet-and-silk costume in the style of Koninck. Yet these latter are precisely what we find here in the Hermitage catalogued as Rembrandts. Let us examine them beginning with the best Rembrandt sometimes called the Portrait of Sobieski (No. 811).

The great breadth of this so-called Sobieski portrait is one of the first things to catch the eye. The masses of light and dark are large, not finical or fussy or petty in any way. There is nothing spotty or jumpy or glittering about it. The model has been seen in the mass and in relation to his envelope and light. The portrait is comparable to those in the early Lesson in Anatomy or in the late Five Syndics, and, while not precisely like them, it agrees with them perfectly. The setting of the portrait, the atmosphere of it, is absolutely right in every respect. Go back in the room and notice how this head and bust set in and have air about them. The tone of the portrait is again quite absolute in its truth. There is no false high light or colour out of key or shadow too dark. Nothing in it disturbs you or jars you. It is all in perfect

harmony. As for the drawing, when and where did you ever see anything done with the astounding certainty of this, ever see such naturalistic, absolutely sure drawing as here? Begin with the drawing of the eyes and nose, the ponderous mass of the face, the brutal strength of the mouth and chin, the huge welts of flesh in the neck. What a powerful face it is! And what a figure! Do you notice its depth through—the indicated bulk of it? The hand you may think ill-drawn, but not so. It is rightly suggested in its weight and mass, belongs to the figure perfectly, and was wisely subordinated to the head as regards detail. How Rembrandt handled his brush—how unerringly! Do you notice how he brings out the modelling of a cheek, brushes in a moustache, touches a chain or pendant with a single stroke, accomplishing things with apparently a minimum of effort, hitting them the first time and not returning to fumble them? Look at the cane or chain or fur. Look at the texture of the hat melting so mysteriously into the background.

The portrait belongs to Rembrandt's grey-golden period and was possibly a likeness of some model used by all the members of his school and mistakenly supposed to be a likeness of Rembrandt's self. It is the same face that one sees in the so-called Rembrandt portraits scattered so thickly through the European galleries. But how far and away beyond them all is this Hermitage portrait! It is a wonder and a marvel that denies and contradicts three quarters of the attributed Rembrandts in this gallery.

812. * ——***Portrait of a Girl.*** This portrait is sometimes called the Jewish Bride and again has been known

as a Saskia; but it is probably only a model's head and was probably done by a Rembrandt pupil or follower now unknown. It is a very good portrait, is well drawn though a little hard in the outline and somewhat brittle in the flowers. Decoratively it is excellent. The pale green-and-grey colour holds together well and the tone of it is right enough. The picture has some charm, but it is too light in spirit, in colour, in shadows, in handling for Rembrandt. Compare it with No. 811 and you will find nothing in the one that parallels or even suggests the other. The painter of it probably did the Artemisia (No. 2132) in Madrid and the Head of a Young Girl in the Ridder Collection now in New York. He possibly also did the Samson (No. 802) and the Proserpina (No. 823) at Berlin. The use of flowers in the hair suggests a following of Lastman.

792. ——*Abraham's Sacrifice.* This is said to be the original of the picture in the Munich Gallery (No. 332) and the Munich picture is said to be a pupil's copy touched up by Rembrandt's own hand. But there is very little difference between the pictures, and neither of them entirely agrees with the Rembrandts of undisputed genuineness. Still, there is some authority of document and tradition for this St. Petersburg picture. It is a pity the picture itself does not proclaim Rembrandt a little more positively. The pretty surfaces of the angel do not speak for him. See the note on the Munich picture.

813. * ——*Portrait of an Oriental.* A head that is clearly and cleverly done, with considerable skill of drawing and handling, fairly good relief, and good set-

ting. It is just such a head as Flinck occasionally did—especially in the type and head-dress—but it is much finer and stronger than the portrait heads usually given to him. If a Rembrandt, and the date of 1636 is correct, then it comes within one year of the so-called Sobieski (No. 811). If he did it at that time, how does it happen to be so much poorer and weaker in style? And how did he manage to change his style again so violently in the same year (1636) as to do the Samson and Delilah at Frankfort (No. 642)? No other painter in history ever did or could change so radically or so frequently as this versatile creation of the collectors and the dealers miscalled Rembrandt. There is a head similar to this in No. 813 in the Centurion Cornelius picture of the Wallace Collection—a picture that lies between Flinck and Fabritius. This St. Petersburg portrait was probably done by the same hand that did the Wallace Collection picture.

843. ——***Portrait.*** The painter of this portrait did a smaller but similar head of a boy now in the Wallace Collection (No. 201), there ascribed to Rembrandt. The same head with similar painting appears again in the picture No. 1634 in the Amsterdam Museum, now ascribed to Moeyaert as formerly to Hoogstraaten. None of the pictures is badly done, but the point is that none of them has anything in common with Rembrandt's mind or hand. Notice, if you please, how different is this porcelain face from every other face in the gallery put down to Rembrandt. Not one of the forty so-called Rembrandts tallies with it.

802. ** ——***Danaë.*** This is a very well-known picture and by no means a poor one. It is decidedly good

in the figure though there are lapses in the drawing and some hardness in the modelling. There is also sharpness in the outlines as you may see in the nose. The ornaments of the couch, the arabesque of glittering gold that frames the picture are over-done and in rather poor taste. One fails to see Rembrandt in this glitter, or in the nude figure, or in the old woman at the back, or in the gilt cupid. Moreover, the colour and light are too mouldy and lacking in depth and clarity for him. If you take the light, colour, drawing, and handling back to the Manoah at Dresden, or the Saskia at Cassel, or even the so-called Sobieski here in the Hermitage you will find them in disagreement. This Danaë is too weak for them. Again there is a thinness about the shadows that does not agree with Rembrandt's work. There is, of course, considerable luminosity in the flesh and a decided sense of form comparable to that which Eeckhout displayed in his bathing women attributed to Rembrandt in the Louvre, the National Gallery, and at Berlin. The picture is more like Eeckhout or Bol than Rembrandt though not characteristic of any of them. It agrees better, perhaps, with what we know about Horst. The picture would better be called a Rembrandt school piece for the present. It is an uncommonly good one, which may account for its being given to Rembrandt. But the painter of the Night Watch and the Five Syndics never did it. See the note on the Rembrandt No. 791 in this gallery, a work possibly by the same hand as shown here.

828. ——*Portrait of a Young Man.* This portrait is hung high on the wall, but at a distance it has the appearance of an early Rembrandt though smooth

in handling and not too forceful in modelling. An early Flinck at Amsterdam (No. 926A) suggests, however, that others besides Rembrandt were capable of doing such portraits as this.

842. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** It is similar to No. 828 but not so good in the shadow on the collar, which is blackish. They may be early Rembrandts though a bit smooth and lacking in force for the master. On the wall they are hung too high to see their handling or to study them closely in any particular.

800. ——***Descent from the Cross.*** This is an enlarged variant of the picture in the Munich Gallery (No. 326) and was probably done by some Rembrandt pupil or assistant. It is darker, less luminous than the Munich picture and has harder outlines. The light seems sharper and more artificial than is customary with Rembrandt.

808. * ——***Portrait of a Writer.*** This bears a resemblance to the Coppenol portrait at Cassel, but the likeness is, perhaps, more in the sitter than in the technique though this latter attempts to follow the Cassel picture closely. Certain features, such as the ruff in its lack of substance and the hands in their laboured drawing, show its weakness. Moreover, the wonderful modelling in the forehead, eyes, cheeks of the Coppenol is not so forcefully repeated here. But this portrait is very near to Rembrandt. He probably had something to do with it, may have painted it, and afterward been made a fool of by restorers. The ruff, the high lights on the sleeve, the table-cloth, the background are rather ineffective now. Yet the pose and look, the scheme of light and colour are very Rembrandtesque. And the head, while frailer

than the Cassel Coppenol, is fairly well done. The portrait must be accepted as a Rembrandt for the present though it may prove to be a school piece of some sort.

824. * ——*Portrait of an Old Man.* The sitter here is the same individual that passes elsewhere as Rembrandt's brother, and Bol painted him a number of times. This is a forceful portrait—forceful enough to be by Rembrandt—and possibly he did it. The hat is very good as is also the shadow on the face. The beard from the ear to the chin has been fumbled and the outline of the cheek is uncertain, but it is a fairly good piece of work all told. Rembrandt could have done it without being too proud of it or yet ashamed of it.

814. ——*Rembrandt's Father in Military Costume.* There is reason for thinking this an excellent example of Gerard Dou in his early Rembrandtesque manner, before he grew petty in detail, hard in modelling, and glassy in surface. It is the clever imitation that we see here and not the original. Notice the smallness of the conception and (even now) the smoothness of the manner as compared with Rembrandt's work. Look about you at the so-called Rembrandts, compare them with this picture, and you must notice the differences in style, in method, in handling, if not in mental grasp. Practically all the Dous of this quality and this date, or earlier, are under Rembrandt's name. His manner when he became smoother (too smooth to pass for Rembrandt) you can see just beginning in the Dou here, No. 1912. At Cassel (No. 257) he again painted this alleged Rembrandt's father. The model was older; Dou had become more fussy

and his surface much smoother. The picture was assigned to Rembrandt for many years but finally was handed back to Dou. At the Amsterdam Gallery there is a copy of this Hermitage picture that is falsely signed with the name of Rembrandt according to the Rijks Museum catalogue.

796. * ——*Holy Family.* There is in the Louvre a small interior, probably done by Adriaen van Ostade (No. 2542), and in the Cassel Gallery another interior (No. 240) that suggest the painter of this Hermitage picture. Rembrandt never did any of them though his name is used in connection with all of them. He had little sympathy with anything that was merely pretty or catchy or sentimental. The Madonna here (as in the other examples referred to) is too fair, the motive too slight, the play too superficial. If we dismiss the name of Rembrandt from consideration of this picture it remains to be said that here is a fine interior, beautifully set in atmosphere, and very handsome in colour and light. It is not impossible that Adriaen van Ostade may have done it, though it must be confessed it is different and perhaps better than what we usually associate with him and his work. That it is not by Rembrandt is almost a certainty. Whoever did it produced a very good picture, and, after all, that is the main consideration.

798. ——*The Workers in the Vineyard.* This little picture is probably by the painter of the Philosophers in Meditation (Nos. 2540 and 2541) in the Louvre. The same scheme of light and the same method of treatment are apparent here as there. Some follower of Rembrandt, possibly Koninck, did all three of them. Notice the Koninck interior (No.

864) here in the Hermitage for its similarity to this picture.

804. ——*Old Woman with Book.* This is believed by one of Rembrandt's biographers to be Rembrandt's mother and the book in her lap a Bible. From that the inference is drawn that she was a pious woman and brought Rembrandt up in the faith, which accounts for his painting so many religious pictures. This is biographical history as it is manufactured. As a matter of fact, the portrait was probably painted by Nicolas Maes and Rembrandt never saw it. The scheme of sharply forced light, the dark shadows, the red at the sleeves, the cramped drawing of the face and hands all point to Maes. It is a very good portrait. Indeed, these near-Rembrandts are very good pictures but the point needs continual emphasising that they are not Rembrandts. See, in connection with this portrait, the same model by the same hand in No. 807.

805. ——*Portrait of an Old Woman.* This is the same sitter as in Nos. 804, 806, and 807. It was probably not Rembrandt's mother but a model used by the whole school. Nos. 804 and 807 are apparently closer together as regards their painter than Nos. 805 and 806. The last two, in the handling of the whites and reds, suggest Eeckhout, whereas the first two are more positively like Maes than any other of the school. They are all effective portraits though dark in shadows and forced in the high lights.

806. ——*Portrait of an Old Woman.* Larger, freer, and coarser in the handling than No. 807 and incomparably poorer in every way than No. 811, yet still

a portrait of considerable force and vigour of handling. It comes nearer to Eeckhout than any other of the Rembrandt School.

807. ——***Portrait of an Old Woman.*** Another alleged portrait of Rembrandt's mother in the early Rembrandtesque manner of Nicolas Maes and probably painted by him. The reds, the dark, blackish shadows, the drawing, and the hesitating handling are all indicative of Maes but not at all indicative of Rembrandt. See No. 804 by the same hand.

826. ——***Young Girl with a Broom.*** The girl is leaning over a fence near a well in the foreground. How very foreign to the serious mind of Rembrandt is such a subject, to start with! But it comports precisely with the rather trifling mind of Eeckhout. It is Eeckhout as we know him in the Old Man with a Red Cap (No. 828J) in the Berlin Gallery. Not only is it Eeckhout mentally but it is Eeckhout technically. Here is Rembrandt's scheme of light-and-shade pushed to an extreme and become blackish; here is his drawing become uncertain; here is his handling exaggerated in breadth and lacking in effect through hasty facility. The exaggerator is Eeckhout.

1777. ——***David and Absalom.*** The method and manner of Rembrandt are here prettified and sweetened for popular consumption by some facile pupil who gauged public opinion better than his master. Stand back and see how really pretty it is. Close to view it is uncertain in the drawing of the turban, the face, the hands. The near figure wants in relief of the head and shoulders, and the legs are badly drawn. The handling is free enough but thin and a little weak. The picture was painted

by the same hand that did the Minerva (No. 828c) at Berlin—that is, probably Koninck. See the Koninckx here, No. 837, and at Amsterdam, No. 1375, for resemblances.

820. ——*Portrait of a Man.* Sometimes called the portrait of Menasseh ben Israel and a very good picture, but not by Rembrandt. The drawing is too heavy, the shadows too dark, the envelope too uncertain. Notice the drawing of the eyes and nose, the messy painting of the beard, the uncertain background. It is a near-Rembrandt, a school piece only. The painter of it did also No. 2539 in the National Gallery, London.

809. ——*Pallas Athena.* Look closely at the drawing in this head of Pallas and you will see that it is the work of a clumsy and unskilled brush. The helmet is askew, the plumes are not drawn, the armour on the shoulder is not rightly modelled, and its high lights are not rightly placed. The handling is free and slashing but ineffective; the background has no depth; the foreground low down has an arch of mere paint which presumably was meant for the shield of Pallas. After you have looked at this picture long enough to convince yourself of its inadequacy, go at once to the so-called Sobieski portrait (No. 811) and see if you can find any likeness between the ignorance and vagueness of the one and the knowledge and absolute certainty of the other. This Pallas has every appearance of being a poor start, something left unfinished, by Aert de Gelder. It is a muddy performance.

818. * ——*Portrait of an Old Man.* A fine head though a little soft in modelling. The hands are rather lumpy and pumpkin-like in texture, the figure is

guessed at, and the chair is lost in the foggy background. Perhaps the weakness of the figure causes the head to protrude and push forward. Notice the scrappy little cap on the head, and also the good colour of the portrait. The painter of this portrait also did the Head of a Turk at Munich (No. 325), the Old Man (No. 1600) at Dresden, put down to Flinck, and also the Amsterdam Flinck (No. 919). For the present this Hermitage portrait may be called a Flinck, too.

795. ——***Fall of Haman.*** A fairly good picture but with some queer modelling in the foremost figure and rather badly drawn hands. The figures at the back are, perhaps, out of scale, but not out of value. The background is dense and dark. The painting of the turban, the high lights on the nose, the types, the illumination all point to the painter of the Centurion Cornelius in the Wallace Collection (No. 86) and allied pictures, including No. 813 here in the Hermitage. It is by Flinck or Fabritius.

794. ——***Joseph Accused by Potiphar's Wife.*** The same subject, types, and general treatment appear again in the Berlin Gallery picture (No. 828H). The forced scheme of light, the clumsy painting of the bed, the spotty high lights on the costumes, the badly drawn hands, the rambling drawing of the figures, the handling all suggest Eeckhout in his careless manner. When he chose he could do better work than this. If he did the Bathing Women in the Paris (No. 2549) and London (No. 54) galleries—and it is possible—he was certainly a draughtsman of considerable skill when in the mood.

825. ——***Portrait of a Young Man.*** This is the model that sometimes passes as Rembrandt's son, Titus. Bol painted this type a number of times with variations and modifications to suit the characters depicted. Perhaps the Bol portrait here (No. 850) is the same model. This portrait (No. 825) is a sketchy performance with black shadows and black ground—something started but never finished. Its rough and fumbled surface is the reason why the portrait is dated 1660 and put down as an old-age Rembrandt. It is not Rembrandt's work at any age but that of some pupil or follower whose name we are unable to give.

797. ——***Return of the Prodigal Son.*** In this picture the loose, not to say bad, drawing, the uncertain colour scheme, the ineffectual handling are proofs positive to the Rembrandt experts that Rembrandt painted the picture at the end of his life and in the year of his death. But did not Rembrandt have blundering pupils who never did accurate work at any time? Was Rembrandt in his old age the only blunderer in the school? Are we to believe this picture a Rembrandt because it is bad and has in addition the unusual and questionable signature of "R. v. Ryn"? What about Aert de Gelder as a blunderer and a possible painter of the picture? It fits him as exactly as it misfits Rembrandt wholly and completely. The composition, with one group falsely prominent in light and another group at the back falsely inconspicuous in the shadow, is a marked mannerism of Aert de Gelder. Whenever he used two or more figures in different planes they almost always failed to hold together because untrue in their values. Again, the loose, rambling drawing and the free

but ineffectual handling are to be seen in almost all of his work. What would not Rembrandt have made of the prodigal's feet, the father's hand, the scheme of light, the mystery of shadow! De Gelder has slurred them all by his want of skill, his inability to cope with a picture of this size. For this poor work notice merely one feature—the arch of the door with the vine at back and the badly relieved figure near it. The silver-grey colour with terra-cottas and reds is again a colour mannerism of De Gelder. The silver-greys at the wrists and elbows of the father are positively his, and the terra-cottas are to be found everywhere in his pictures. There is no touch of Rembrandt here. Moreover, the admiration of those who think it a Rembrandt is somewhat ill bestowed. It is not a great picture—not even for Aert de Gelder. As for the possibility of its being by Rembrandt, think of it in connection with the Night Watch or the Syndics or the Lesson in Anatomy, and immediately the possibility vanishes.

799. ——***Peter's Denial.*** Look at the figure holding the candle—at the false shadow on the face and arms, their bad drawing, the bad hands. Go directly into the near cabinet and compare it with the face, hands, and shadows of the Danaë (No. 802). Do you think the same hand did both of them? Then have a look at the so-called Sobieski portrait (No. 811). Again, do you think the same hand did all three of them? Compare this Peter's Denial with the Prodigal Son (No. 797) across the room, and can you not see in the rambling drawing, the colour scheme, the figures at the back the same hand—the hand of Aert de Gelder? The figures in the foreground are mixed up and rather

pasted together; in the background they are out of value. This picture is close to the Prodigal Son in its authorship and far removed from Rembrandt's work. It is dated 1656, but in 1655 Rembrandt did the Flayed Ox in the Louvre (No. 2548)—a picture that is as absolute in its mastery from one end to the other as this Peter's Denial is inadequate and ineffectual from one end to the other. Nos. 797, 799, and 809 are by De Gelder or very near him. They are supposed to be Rembrandts because black and messy wanderings with the brush—in other words, because of their failings rather than their successes.

823. * ——***Portrait of an Old Lady.*** A very good, dark-shadowed portrait that belongs to the school rather than to the master. It comes as near to Maes as any painter that can be identified by name. The reds and the blackish shadows are his. It is carefully drawn and painted—is, in fact, good enough for Rembrandt but not by him if we are to believe other examples by him such as the so-called Sobieski portrait or the portraits at Cassel.

819. ——***Portrait of a Young Woman.*** The dark shadows at the wrists with the quality of the red and the handling of the whites suggest Maes as the possible painter here. The table-cloth and fruit are also like him but the hands and face have not his cramped drawing. It has no Rembrandt quality and is only a fair portrait. Probably some pupil did it but which one would be difficult to say.

829. * ——***Portrait of an Old Lady.*** It is an Elizabeth Bas type of portrait and was possibly done by Rembrandt, though it is not to be forgotten that Backer, following Rembrandt, did portraits of this

same fine quality, notably in the Berlin Gallery (No. 1640) and at Darmstadt. Go close and see how smoothly and serenely simple it is in handling, drawing, light, air, setting. It is smoother than the Elizabeth Bas at Amsterdam, smoother than the Backer at Berlin. That makes one feel it may not be a Rembrandt though a star picture.

817. ——***The Toilet.*** This picture is sometimes referred to as a portrait of Saskia, but the Saskias are frequent in gallery catalogues and (as with the Hendrickje Stoffels and Titus likenesses) are largely imaginary with the catalogue makers. This is only a model posing for a picture and is a work by some Rembrandt pupil or follower. Not even the most rabid believer in handing over every questionable school piece to the master can sustain an argument for this picture as a Rembrandt. It is a charming study in colour and light. The head is well done and the whites of the collar and scarf are excellent in quality.

833(?). * ——***Portrait of a Woman.*** This portrait is probably by the painter of No. 817 and is even finer, better, more lovely in colour, and more charming in spirit than that picture. It is quite worthy of Rembrandt but it is not at all in his manner. How very different it is from the so-called Sobieski here, or the Saskia at Cassel, or the Manoah at Dresden! Painters—even the greatest of them—do not vary their point of view, their manner, their method so violently. As for a change of base that would enable a painter to do a picture like this and then at a later date paint a picture like No. 792, hanging opposite, it would seem impossible.

801. ——***The Doubting Thomas.*** The Rembrandt manner is more apparent here than the Rembrandt hand or the Rembrandt mind. It is too smooth and slippery with the brush for the master, too pretty in the types, a little too affected in the hands of the Christ. Besides, he was a more sober and serious-minded person than this picture discloses. It is by some pupil or follower whose name can only be guessed at.

815. * ——***Portrait of an Old Jew.*** A good portrait—a very good portrait—done securely, forcefully, freely, but truly. There is much varnish upon the surface and a glass over it which make it look a little different from the other Rembrandts here. Look closely at the drawing of the eyes, nose, mouth, and the painting of the beard. It is not so forceful, so heroic in spirit and in method as the so-called Sobieski, but it is possibly by the same hand in a smoother and less positive manifestation. The word "possibly" is used advisedly, for one cannot be too certain about pictures in a school where there were so many very talented imitators and followers. Besides, there were forerunners. There is a general look about this picture (to say nothing of the drawing of the ear and eyelids) that reminds one of Lastman—the master of Rembrandt.

822. ——***Hannah and Samuel.*** Aside from poor colour, bad drawing in the hands and figure of the mother, false values in the whites, and a flat background, can any one believe Rembrandt guilty of the trite sentiment here shown? He was a profound emotionalist, if you will, but never a sentimentalist. Nor did he ever paint any such merely

pretty child as this. Notice how the figures fall out of the frame for want of atmospheric setting—something in which Rembrandt was a past master.

1858. ——***The Woman of Samaria.*** As a Rembrandt it is a palpable absurdity. It has the black shadows and clumsy drawing of No. 799, and, though it may not be by Aert de Gelder, the figure at the well suggests him. The landscape, however, is hardly his. The picture is some sort of school piece by a painter unknown to us.

827. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** Supposed to be a portrait of Jeremias Decker, a Dutch poet. It is hot in the face and heavy in the handling. These failings probably account for its being dated 1666 and referred to Rembrandt's last manner. It is doubtful if he did it. The portrait is the work of some one in the school trying to imitate Rembrandt's ease without having Rembrandt's skill. Again go back and look at the eyes and moustache of the so-called Sobieski and see how they compare with the eyes and moustache here.

791. ——***Abraham Receiving the Visit of Angels.*** This is a school piece of considerable merit and was probably done by the painter of the Danaë (No. 802) in another cabinet. Notice the hands of the angel at the right, how like in transparency they are to those of the Danaë. The handling here is spirited and easy but not too sure. The angel with back toward us is flat and wants in modelling, the faces are smooth and a bit pretty, the Abraham is a little weak. They are very like Bol in these respects and very unlike Rembrandt. He (Rembrandt) disliked smooth surfaces, for they did not catch sufficient light-and-shade for him. He did not believe

in the beauty of the pretty, the regular, the formal; he believed in the beauty of the ugly—as the Germans put it. He cared not at all for graceful outlines or prettily turned forms and faces; on the contrary, he liked the wrinkled face and the graceless form because they lent themselves readily to realistic modelling, to the play of light-and-shade, to effects of broken colour. But his pupils and followers were all inclined to smooth out his wrinkled fronts and prettify his hard, intensely human verities. The result was just such pictures as this Abraham Receiving the Visit of Angels—pictures done by Bol, Flinck, Koninck, and others. Bol did the same subject of Abraham in the Amsterdam Gallery, but it is a weaker performance than this. We cannot place this Hermitage picture. It lies somewhere between Bol, Flinck, and Eeckhout as does the Danaë.

810. ——*Study of an Old Jew.* Rembrandt's scheme of light-and-shade came from his second master, Lastman, who in turn derived from Caravaggio; but Lastman refined upon the darkness of Caravaggio and Rembrandt greatly refined upon Lastman by banishing blackness and giving wonderful luminosity to his shadows. With Rembrandt's pupils—Eeckhout, Fabritius, Drost—a reaction set in and they returned to the Neapolitan darkness of Caravaggio. They exaggerated Rembrandt's effects of light intensified and fortified by dark to an unwonted degree. This Study of an Old Jew exemplifies the pupil's exaggeration. The blackness of the shadows, the whiteness of the beard, the squareness of the hands are much more like Eeckhout than Rembrandt. The effect is forced. Given an eccentricity or a mannerism in the mas-

ter, and the pupils can always be relied upon to drive it into the last ditch.

793. ——***Joseph's Bloody Coat.*** A Rembrandt school piece, very puzzling as regards its painter but certainly not by Rembrandt. The heads and hands are sufficient in their denial of Rembrandt though they are fairly well drawn. The colour and light are not his but again they are fairly effective. It belongs somewhere in the school and was possibly painted by one of those pupils of Rembrandt who left a name in the municipal records but not a single picture upon any gallery wall.

803. **Rembrandt, School of.** ***Grace before Meal.*** In the generous distribution of school pictures to Rembrandt, why did the management of the Hermitage hesitate about giving this picture to him? And why not give him No. 1907? They are both of them just as good as work put down without reservation to the master. But they are rightly relegated to the school, where about three quarters of the so-called Rembrandts in this gallery should be placed.

191. **Reni, Guido.** ***Adolescence of the Virgin.*** A typical Guido in spirit, colour, and drawing. Notice the soft modelling of the face and hands.

333. **Ribera, Jusefe (Lo Spagnoletto).** ***St. Jerome.*** This picture is in Ribera's usual style—that is, with exaggerated high lights and dark shadows following Caravaggio. The drawing is realistic and forceful and the colouring is good. But one seldom grows enthusiastic over Ribera.

1916. **Romanino, Il (Girolamo Romani).** ***Madonna and Child.*** Here is a picture that again presents

us with crossed or cocked eyes—a peculiar earmark of Romanino. The so-called Giorgiones at Budapest (No. 145), at Dresden (No. 186), at the Uffizi Gallery (Nos. 621 and 630) all have the same crossed eyes, the same bad drawing, the same careless handling. And they were all of them done by Romanino and not by Giorgione. Notice in this picture the Giorgionesque hand. And the very good colour.

58. **Romano, Giulio.** ***The Fornarina.*** This is a hard version or variation of the Fornarina portrait in the Barberini Palace in Rome. The sitter is supposed to have been the model and the mistress of Raphael, but if you will read the catalogue note you will learn that she has been supposed to be several other (historical) characters. The portrait is probably not by Giulio.

221 } **Rosa, Salvatore.** ***Ulysses and Democritus.*** Two
222 } pictures that are excellent in decorative quality. The colour echoes Paolo Veronese though darker. The landscapes are harsh in the clouds and skies, but perhaps such features as these give force to the pictures. They are certainly of much excellence—excellent not only for Salvatore but for any one.

576. * **Rubens, Peter Paul.** ***Portrait of Helene Fourment.*** A full-length portrait of Rubens's wife in a silver-grey tone, somewhat unusual for the painter but very attractive, refined, even distinguished in its colour. The flesh agrees with the costume and is silvery, too. The painting is freely done in the ruff, hat, and feather fan, and the texture of the black satin dress is realistic. The figure stands well, has beautifully painted hands, and

has also repose and a well-bred air. Notice how different is the landscape from the usual work attributed to Rubens but possibly done by Van Uden or Wildens. A fine portrait.

587. ——*Portrait of a Man.* A thinly, sketchily painted Rubens but very well indicated in the drawing. Notice the roundness of the head as a result of truthful modelling—the presence of the third dimension. There is a grey background.

646. ——*An Apostle (?).* It is a finished sketch, possibly for an apostle, and was probably done by Rubens though his pupils sometimes put forth such work. There is a series of these pupils' sketches or copies at the Prado, Madrid.

588. ——*Portrait of Man in Fur Cap.* This is probably a Rubens school piece. It has not the certainty of drawing or handling that goes with Rubens. Notice the wooden nose, the narrowness of the eyes, the vagueness of the brush-work in the figure and costume.

1784. ——*Madonna and Child.* This is another school piece of no great merit. Notice the bad drawing of the Child's arm and hand or the hands of the Madonna. It has a prettiness about it and a sentiment that are not Rubens's. Nor is the colour his. It has not his quality.

585. ——*A Monk.* It will not pass muster as a Rubens no matter how it may be labelled or catalogued. It does not show either his drawing or his handling. Said to be a study for a picture at Cologne but it is more likely a school copy. No. 584 is of about the same quality. This picture (No. 585) has a false frame about it and is probably a fragment

of a larger work. The panel has been cracked across the lower part of the head.

535. ——*Abraham Dismissing Hagar.* This is rather fine in colour and in the sky; but how are we to account for the badly drawn neck and its bad placing upon the shoulders in the Hagar or the peculiar right arm and hand of the Sarah? Rubens was an impeccable draughtsman. Did he do this work or is it pupils' work? The Abraham is Rubens's model, but he sat for the pupils, too.

543. ——*Christ in the House of Simon.* This is a Rubens that was probably turned out of the shop —the work of pupils and assistants. He himself probably "touched" the hair of the Magdalen and the figure of the Christ but no more. The third head to the right of the Christ suggests Van Dyck's hand. The same head is assigned to Van Dyck in the Berlin Gallery (No. 798F). Notice how merely pretty the woman at the back carrying the basket. And what badly drawn arms she has! The best part of the picture is the kneeling Magdalen.

538. ——*Madonna and Child.* It is almost certainly the work of a follower—some one like Seghers. It is too smoothly and prettily done for Rubens, lacks his robustness, has not his strength of colour, falls far short of his strength in characterisation.

578. ——*Portrait of an Old Lady.* This looks like a free Flemish copy of some Dutch portrait. In type, costume, and general air it is a Dutchwoman by some one like Backer but it is Flemish in handling. The same painter possibly did the Ruts portrait in the Morgan Collection, New York, there attributed to Rembrandt. He was probably some

Flemish-influenced Dutchman whose name we do not know.

595. ——***Landscape with Rainbow.*** It is a fairly good landscape but not necessarily done by Rubens. The drawing of the figures does not suggest him. It is worth while saying again that Rubens did not miss his drawing whether the figures were great or small but that Wildens and Van Uden missed it frequently. One or the other of them probably painted this landscape. Compare it with the landscapes in No. 549 or No. 550 and notice the difference. A similar landscape in the Louvre.

582. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** A sketchily done portrait with a great deal of skill and force behind the brush. Look at the splendid modelling and texture of the hand, the firm drawing of the eyes, nose, and mouth. If you wish for superb brush-work, done once and done finally, look at the hair in this portrait. Rubens did every stroke in it. In good condition.

549. * ——***Venus and Adonis.*** It is by Rubens's own hand, done in his early style, with red shadows in the flesh and beautiful flesh-notes all through the picture. The figures are Flemish, rather large, to be sure, but rendered absolutely and perfectly. The colour is very good and the landscape is probably not by Wildens but by Rubens himself. Look at the dogs, for they are as well drawn as the figures. Almost all of the dogs in the Rubens school pictures have the anatomies of sheep or pigs. A smaller version at Berlin (No. 763B) probably done by pupils or assistants in the school.

583. ——***Portrait of a Young Lady.*** The sitter looks like some one in the Fourment family. She was

evidently a beauty and Rubens painted her beautifully, but, unfortunately, the cleaning room has rubbed away a modicum of that beauty. But it remains a fine portrait. The work is fairly early and the scheme of colour is unusually dark.

579. * ——*Lady in Waiting to the Archduchess Isabella.* What a lovely type! What an epitome of the eternal womanly is in this fine face! The eyes in their look have a charm and an irresistible appeal. It is a noble face but full of sympathy, fine feeling, true sentiment. Where now are your jibes at Rubens as the painter of the gross and the sensual! Nothing could be more delicate, more refined, more elevated than this. It is superbly done in a smooth, flowing pigment that seems drifted in rather than painted in. The contours of the nose, brows, forehead, cheeks are not suffused with shadows as in Leonardo's faces, but they are just as rounded, just as melting, just as perfect. Go close and look at the ease with which the work is done—the master craftsmanship of the most accomplished technician in the history of art. Notice the brows, the hair, the pupils of the eyes, even the touch of high light in the eyes and on the tip of the nose. Notice again the doing of the ruff and dress. Then stand back and see how perfectly the head fits into the ruff, the ruff travels around the neck, and both of them belong to the figure below. Finally, will you notice how the whole figure stands within the picture frame within an envelope of atmosphere and shadowed light? A fine portrait.

550. * ——*Bacchus.* This is a picture that may be objectionable to some people because of its subject.

One would hardly care for it as a drawing-room decoration. It is gross, riotous in its flinging to the winds of all restraint, and yet superb in its very abandon. It is a Bacchic scene in spirit as well as in forms. There is a complete let-go, an apotheosis of intoxication. That may not please as a theme, but, granting the artist the privilege of painting what theme he will, we cannot here criticise the fulness nor the adequacy of the presentation. This is the Roman Bacchus plus the Flemish grossness of intoxication. Decoratively it is a fine piece of colour and technically is right in almost every respect. The figure of the nymph at the back is a trifle frail in drawing, as though some pupil had been at work upon it. It is a late picture. The red shadows of the earlier Venus and Adonis (No. 549) have here given place to the brown shadows which Rubens used in his last manner. Notice the landscape for its breadth and freedom. These landscapes in Rubens's figure pictures should always be noticed, for they are contradictory of so many landscapes put down to Rubens but really by Wildens, Van Uden, and others of his pupils.

551. * ——***Bacchanal—March of Silenus.*** A sketchy picture of Rubens's early period and apparently all by his own hand. Again, the subject does not please, is not attractive, but the workmanship is beyond reproach. The bulk and body of the figures—their tactile values, if you prefer that term —are quite perfect. Notice these in the figure at the extreme left. This figure is the most engaging of the group and is wonderfully fine in the head, shoulders, arm, and back. What perfect drawing and flesh colour! And what exquisite modelling!

The beauty and delicacy of this modelling are just as fine, just as complete an expression in art as the drawing of Raphael or the colour of Paolo Veronese. The coarser figures lying down are no less rightly drawn and modelled. What a group in its swaying motion, its riotous abandon! And how well the group fills the canvas! The colour is excellent though not so brilliant as Rubens usually gives. Notice the red shadows of the flesh, the breadth of the landscape, and the atmospheric envelope. A fine picture in spite of its subject.

594. ——***Landscape.*** If you will compare this landscape with that of No. 595 and those in the backgrounds of Nos. 549 and 550 you will discover two or three different kinds of landscape, done by two or three different painters, yet all put down under the name of Rubens. No. 549 in its background shows Rubens in his early period as No. 550 does in his later and broader style. Nos. 594 and 595 do not show Rubens at all but were, perhaps, done by Wildens and Van Uden or some other follower or assistant of the master.

591. ——***Le Croc en Jambe.*** This is said to be a replica, with variations by Rubens, of the picture in the Munich Gallery (No. 759); but the drawing of the figures, the hands, the eyes, the noses does not disclose the master-hand of Rubens. Notice the handling of the hair in both the nymph and the shepherd and compare it with that in Nos. 549, 579, and 582. The work is probably an old copy. The variations do not prove its originality. Copyists frequently diverge from their original model in the same way that engravers take liberties with their texts. It was and is common-enough practice.

552. ——*Andromeda and Perseus.* This is an earlier version of the same subject now in the Berlin Gallery (No. 785). There are many differences or variations in the pictures, this earlier version being closer knit together in its composition and more excited in its action. The types, too, are more youthful, less ponderous, more graceful. Notice this in the Andromeda or the Genius at the top with the crown of bays. It is a handsome piece of colour and is freely and easily handled. Rubens may have done all of it unaided by pupils.

554. ——*Neptune and Cybele or Tigris and Abundance.* It has not the vim or snap, the force or skill of Rubens. The drawing is soft and the colour lacks in distinction. It is a decorative piece turned out by members of the school, probably under the direction of the master. But it is good as decoration and not necessarily bad because the brush of Rubens cannot be seen in it.

559 } ——*Philip IV and Elizabeth of Bourbon.* They
560 } are said to be replicas of the Munich portraits, but these latter are themselves probably copies and not originals. The St. Petersburg portraits are certainly copies and not replicas. A replica, strictly speaking, is a repetition by the master himself. A person as much in demand as Rubens probably spent no time in copying his own portraits when he had a studio full of pupils who could do the work in a manner satisfactory at least to patrons.

536. ——*Adoration of Magi.* This is merely a school piece in which one can, perhaps, see the hand of Seghers in the colour, the textures, the brush-work, and the surfaces.

1785. ——*Caritas Romana* (*Cimon and Perus*). It is another version (probably a school copy) of a picture many times repeated by the pupils of Rubens. One can see the repetition or the reiteration of it at Amsterdam (No. 2066).

546. ——*Descent from Cross.* Said to have been painted at the same time as the celebrated Descent in the Antwerp Cathedral. It seems impossible. The well-supported, heavy-falling figure in the Antwerp picture gives place in this Hermitage picture to a figure that does not fall or bear down and is not convincingly supported by the apostles and holy women. Besides, the composition is broken by cross lines that give a step-ladder effect instead of the rhythmical, swinging grouping of Rubens with its sense of action and life. It is unbelievable that the mind of Rubens could plan such a group as this. The handling of it confirms one's unbelief about it. Notice, for instance, the uncertain quality of the high lights in the Magdalen's robes. Notice also the forced and laboured drawing, the much-mixed colour of those robes. The whole picture is of this indifferent quality and leads one to think it a school piece and not a very good one at that.

540. ——*Madonna and Child Enthroned.* This picture is hung too high (1913) for one to feel certain about its origin, but it has superficial indications of being school work.

541. ——*Madonna, Child, and Saints.* This is a brilliantly coloured picture with suggestions here and there (especially in the Child and the Magdalen) of Rubens's own hand; but the figures at the sides are less well done and seem to be pupils' work. The

drawing is not entirely satisfactory and the colour scheme is a bit spectacular and lacks in quality.

563 } ——*Sketches for the Antwerp Triumphal Arch.*
564 } These sketches by Rubens are worthy of study not only for their beautiful colour but their excellent, sketchy drawing. Even in tentative work Rubens's drawing is almost always positively indicated or at least suggested. There are half a dozen sketches of this series.

557. ——*Sketch for St. Ildefonso Altar-Piece.* This is the first thought, the initial conception of the splendid, large altar-piece now in the Vienna Gallery. Rubens varied it, changed and added to it very much, when he came to paint the large picture. Notice that the colour is much subdued in the sketch. All of Rubens's sketches are less brilliant than his finished pictures.

569 } ——*Sketches for the Marie de Médicis Series.*
570 } These sketches are interesting not only as colour but because of their variation from the larger finished pictures in the Louvre. In them one can trace the growth of pictorial ideas and see the artistic reasons for the numerous changes. They are here merely pictorial notes—suggestions for composition and colour—but very enjoyable notes.

1145. **Ruisdael, Jacob van.** *Landscape.* Again the typical convention of Ruisdael, done with very little light and a parsimony of colour, as though Holland were the one country on earth where the sun did not shine and colour failed to appear save in drabs and cool greys. But, of course, Ruisdael was a picture maker first and a recorder of facts afterward, and he made very good decorative pictures.

24. **Sarto, Andrea del.** ***Holy Family.*** There is another version of this picture in the National Gallery, London (No. 17), and a better work than this. Both versions are claimed as the originals, but neither of them gives us an adequate idea of Andrea. They are slight and somewhat perfunctory performances.

257. **Sassoferrato, Il (Giovanni Battista Salvi).** ***Madonna and Child.*** About the feeblest and most decadent picture in a room filled with works of the Decadence. But the public has always loved Sassoferrato and much admires this work. Is it for its dreadful colour or its bad drawing of the right arm and hand or its sickly sentimentality?

121. **Schiavone, Il (Andrea Meldola).** ***Jupiter and Io.*** A fine landscape and reminiscent of the large landscape in the Louvre put down to Titian (No. 1587). The figures are graceful and decorative but not well drawn. According to the catalogue only the figures are Schiavone's work, the landscape being credited to Domenico Campagnola, a Venetian painter and engraver of the first half of the sixteenth century.

1964. **Simone Martini.** ***Madonna.*** This is the type and attitude of the Madonna in Simone Martini's Annunciation in the Uffizi Gallery (No. 23). Both the type and the picture were extensively copied, in whole and in part, by pupils and followers. This Hermitage picture is probably the work of a pupil or assistant.

1317. **Snyders, Frans.** ***Still-Life.*** Hung high on the wall of the main Flemish room of this gallery are a large number of pictures by Snyders represent-

ing animals alive and dead. They are done in his usual manner—a manner that becomes a trifle wearisome after a time.

440. **Spanish School.** ***Portrait of a Commander.*** It is a hard and rather dark portrait, a figure standing at full length, and a partial following of the portrait of Ferdinand of Austria in the Prado, Madrid. The modelling is severe and the painting somewhat rudimentary. Look, for instance, at the head.

895. **Steen, Jan.** ***Interior with Figures.*** One fails to see just where Steen materialises in this picture. It seems wholly different in its drawing and handling from other works put down to Steen—for example, No. 896. And it is much inferior to No. 896.

896. * ——***The Doctor's Visit.*** Here is Steen almost at his best. The drawing is excellent and the colour very beautiful. Notice the skill in the handling of the red dress, the red curtain at the back, or the still-life on the table. How thoroughly well drawn the figure of the lovely young girl with her head upon the pillow—the love-sick one that Steen painted more than once! The figures at the back are merely accessories. A fine picture but a little retouched.

898. ——***The Happy Drinker.*** This is a fairly good Steen though dark in its lighting and colour. He did much better work, however, as you may see by examining his other pictures in this gallery.

899. ——***Interior with Figures.*** It is probably by Steen but not a shining example of his work. See also No. 900, which is of similar quality.

1844. ——*Interior with Figures.* Doubtless these pictures by Steen have more fetching titles than are here given but the student can distinguish the pictures better by the numbers. This is a much finer piece of work than No. 897, for instance, but it still does not show Steen to advantage. It is too glassy in surface, too superficial in handling. The interior is carelessly done. No. 1788 shows the same careless workmanship.

672. **Teniers the Younger, David.** *An Antwerp Shooting Company.* The largest of several large Teniers in this gallery. They are regarded as "important examples" of the master, but that importance is, perhaps, more historical or descriptive than pictorial. Some of the smaller pictures by Teniers are to be preferred, notably such a work as No. 673. It is finer in every way.

673. * ——*The Guard.* This is an excellent Teniers done with great sureness and truth of drawing and much ease and grace of handling. How beautifully everything is brushed in! Notice the flag, the coat, the armour, and the plumes at the left, or the standing figure in the centre, or the landscape at the right. And what beauty in the colour! How well these better examples of the minor Dutchman stand the test of time and intimate acquaintance! The reason for this is very apparent. The work is done in a masterful manner—masterful for any and all times.

874. * **Terborch, Gerard.** *Mandolin Player.* How beautiful the figure of the girl in the satin gown! The man at the left is less interesting. The high lights on the man's sleeve and shoulder are a little spotty though the figure is fairly well drawn. How well

the figures melt into the atmosphere of the room! And what a largeness there is about these small figures—largeness of comprehension and vision! The colour is excellent. A very good Terborch.

870. * ——*The Glass of Lemonade.* Another beautiful Terborch with the same largeness of vision and beauty of workmanship that mark No. 874. What charming surfaces not only in the satin and fur but in the man's hat, hand, and hair! This of its kind is perfect handling, perfect rendering of textures, perfect expression in form and colour. What well-drawn figures! And what lovely colour! The table at the right is a little disturbing and fails to fill the space well. The room is correctly drawn, is true in values, and is filled with atmosphere. An excellent picture.

643 } ——*Portraits of Man and Wife.* They are very
644 } questionable Terborchs. The drawing (look at the hands) and the colour are not good enough in quality for Terborch. The interior is too bare and airless, the curtain too flashy in high lights, the lace work entirely too hard. The portraits are not sufficient for Terborch but may answer for some pupil or imitator.

871. ——*The Violin Player.* This is a good picture in the style of Terborch, showing clever painting and a fine colour scheme, but it is possibly not by Terborch. It may be accepted with reservations.

872. * ——*The Letter.* Excellent in every way! The satin gown is not more perfect in colour and texture than the chair, the table-cloth, the pictures on the wall, or the interior itself with its fine depth of shadowed light and atmosphere. And how well

everything is drawn! Even things not realised exactly are, nevertheless, wonderfully suggested. Notice the back of the lady's head, for instance, with all that is there implied. The work of a master technician who, at his best, is, perhaps, the most perfect of all the Little Dutchmen.

873. ——*The Letter Reader.* This sounds like the voice of Jacob but the hands are those of Esau. Which is to say that this picture has the look of Terborch but is possibly the work of an imitator. The Terborch quality is lacking in the drawing, in the colour of the red table-cloth, in the satin, in the yellow bodice, in the grey wall at the back. Nothing in it rings quite true.

317. * **Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista.** *Cleopatra's Feast.* Done probably about the time Tiepolo was painting the fresco in the Palazzo Labbia at Venice—that is, at the height of his power. This is an excellent representation of the master, a picture conceived and executed with great verve and spirit, composed with proper balance and restfulness, set in architecture worthy of Paolo Veronese. What superb colour! Even the blue at the left, though it "howls," does so melodiously. And how freely and yet surely it is painted! Everything is touched lightly but rightly. Even the details, such as the fruit in the dish, the dog at the right, or the verde-antique in the floor, are infallibly right in their doing. What a superb piece of decoration! Look at it from across the gallery. It is seldom that one sees so good a Tiepolo on gallery walls.

1671. ——*The Liberal Arts Presented to Augustus.* The inevitable comparison between this picture and the larger Cleopatra's Feast (No. 317) results unfa-

vourably to this example, though it is handsome in colour and is done with spirit and skill. It is effective work. Notice the good landscape at the right with the buildings and water.

134. **Tintoretto (Jacopo Robusti).** ***St. George.*** This is a school version of the St. George and the Dragon in the National Gallery, London (No. 16), to which has been added the foreshortened figure of the Slave in Tintoretto's Miracle of the Slave in the Venice Academy. It has slight value as art, and no value whatever as explaining Tintoretto.

132. ——***Birth of the Virgin.*** The figures are too slight, the colour too thin, the drawing too frail for Tintoretto. Look at the figure at the right standing in the attitude of the chief figure in the Finding of the Body of St. Mark in the Brera (No. 143), and mentally compare this figure with that. The comparison will not confirm this Hermitage picture as a Tintoretto. Look farther here at the bad bed, the hard figure in it, the snaky curtains. Even the drawing of the balustrade at the left is wrong, and the floor will not lie down flat. It is a poor-enough school piece.

137. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** A very questionable Tintoretto. Even the catalogue queries it. It may have been done by some pupil or follower but seems more like a Bassano school piece. Formerly it passed as a Paris Bordone.

93. **Titian (Tiziano Vecellio).** ***Madonna and Child.*** The type of this Madonna is, perhaps, more Giorgionesque than Titianesque. It belongs in the same class or at least is near to the Gipsy Madonna at Vienna (No. 176), which means that it is also

close to the supposed Giorgione Madonna, at Madrid (No. 288). These three Madonnas are very much alike and closely related, but they scarcely reveal Titian's mind or hand. They are nearer Giorgione. The right hand in this Hermitage Madonna is very suggestive of Giorgione, as are also the brow, hair, and drapery. The Child also has the Giorgione look and spirit. All three of the Madonnas mentioned agree fairly well with the Castelfranco Madonna, but they are not so well done. There is a Bellinesque niche of architecture back of this Hermitage picture.

94. ——***Ecce Homo.*** It is a much thumbed and grimed canvas that originally may have been started by Titian. There is nothing important or even interesting about it now.

95. ——***Salvator Mundi.*** This picture may be referred to Titian's last years with some probability. It is loosely and rather heavily painted, and neither in drawing nor colour is in any way remarkable.

96. ——***Madonna, Child, and Magdalen.*** The Titianesque hand in this picture is not enough to warrant its attribution to Titian. It is too coarse in spirit, too odd in drawing for Titian. Some follower, assistant, or copyist did it. There are many replicas and copies of it scattered through the galleries, as the catalogue note intimates. The picture is much injured by repainting as may be seen in the Magdalen's throat and white scarf now turned brown in tone.

97. ——***Christ Bearing the Cross.*** This is probably a repetition of the picture at Madrid which in turn

is perhaps Titian at second hand. None of the versions of this picture seems entirely by Titian's hand though repainting may have quenched the identity of that at Madrid.

98. * ——*Repentant Magdalen.* This seems to have been a popular picture, for there are many versions of it elsewhere. There is every reason to suppose Titian did this example. It is very much in his style in both drawing and handling. Even the version in the Pitti has not the strength of this later Hermitage example. It is fine in bulk and body as well as in colour. And what a good tree and sky! It is, perhaps, not the most admirable Titian in the world but it is his.

99. ——*Toilet of Venus.* Such pictures as this make a grand display and seem wonderful at the first glance, but they do not bear the analysis that every masterwork should withstand. Of course it is the one and only original and the many versions of it elsewhere are all copies. But a short study of it rather strengthens the impression that it, too, is some sort of a copy. The handling of it is no more like Titian's handling than that of the avowed copy in this gallery (No. 108). Look at the work on the border pattern, or the high lights on the hair, or the drawing of the eyes and brows. And what a bad reflection in the mirror! Titian is under it in a way, and he may have been clouded by repainting, but there is nothing about it today that is better than a copy.

100. ——*Danaë.* There are half a dozen versions of this picture in the European galleries, the best ones being at Naples and Madrid. This Hermitage picture follows the Madrid example and is

probably one of the worst of the versions. Look at the old woman at the right, with her dreadful profile, and this will give the quality of the whole work. If you are not willing to accept the drawing and handling of this figure as final, then study the drawing of the face of the Danaë for a few moments or the dull imitation of Titian in the distant mountains. It is only a poor copy.

101. ——***Portrait of Paul III.*** The original of this picture is in the Naples Gallery and is one of the celebrated and well-preserved Titians. The Naples portrait is a magnificent example of Titian, the prince of all portrait-painters. But the Hermitage catalogue refers to it as a "replica," the intimation being plain that the only original is this Hermitage example. There are many copies of the Naples portrait and this at St. Petersburg is neither better nor worse than the others.

102. ——***Portrait of Cardinal Pallavacini.*** The Titian attribution comes from the hand and robe, but the picture is, perhaps, nearer to Sebastiano del Piombo following Raphael. The catalogue queries it as a Titian.

103. ——***Portrait of a Doge.*** It is nowhere near Titian. It looks like a poor copy of Tintoretto. Look at the flat cap, head and hand, or the hop-skip-and-jump placing of high lights on the sleeves and robe. The picture has no value and should be in the storeroom.

105. ——***Portrait of Young Woman.*** The likeness here to Titian is all on the surface. The portrait has not his mental force or technical handling and is probably a school following or latter-day copy.

1678. * ——*St. Sebastian.* This is evidently a late Titian and has the look of a canvas started but never brought to completion. The underlying structure of the body is given in a large, full way. The essentials of form are made known, but the details are omitted. It is a fine bit of colour in spite of the messy surface of the background. The head is that of Titian's Magdalen. Up to 1892 this picture was kept in the storeroom of the gallery, while Guido Reni and Carlo Dolci bloomed along the walls for the admiration of the tourist. Happily the times and the taste have changed.

733. **Uden, Lucas van.** *Landscape.* Notice this landscape closely for its somewhat crazy cattle, horses, and figures, its flashily painted foliage, and green distance. This is the sort of picture continually attributed to Rubens in the European galleries, whereas it is by one of his followers and assistants. So far as general effect goes it is a rather good effort. It is only when you put it on the rack that it winces. And, of course, it has only a superficial resemblance to the real landscape of Rubens.

418. * **Velasquez, Diego de Silva y.** *Portrait of Innocent X.* This is probably the original sketch, made from life by Velasquez, for the large portrait in the Doria gallery, Rome. There are, however, other repetitions of the head elsewhere, and each has its claimants as the original. But the certainty of the touch, the strength of the modelling proclaim this St. Petersburg portrait to be not only an original sketch, but by a master-hand such as Velasquez possessed. It is in his style—his manner of handling. Stand back in the gallery and notice the large realism of it—the greasy flesh of the fore-

head, the sunken, fox-like eyes, the heavy brows, the red nose, the flabby mouth, the rather malicious lip and chin. It is all a tentative, a sketchy statement, but how superbly truthful in the large essentials! Look again at the ear, how well it is put on the head, how the cap is dragged down over the skull, how the jaw is foreshortened from the chin, how the whole head fits into the neck and collar. The cape and figure are merely suggested. The colour is a little hot, but probably that was true to the original. And the keen analysis of character is true to history. The pope was the same man in fact that Velasquez has written him down here with the paint-brush. He saw and painted him truly from without, and that external appearance proved the index of the internal man. A superb sketch.

1849. ——***The Breakfast.*** This, like many another of the early Velasquez pictures, is of questionable origin. It is, perhaps, necessary to repeat that Ribalta, Pacheco, and others did pictures of a nature very similar to this. A so-called Zurbaran (No. 350) in this gallery approximates it in style without paralleling or equalling it. The drawing in this No. 1849 is true enough but hard. Notice the still-life on the table. Beruete thinks it genuine though repainted in the heads.

419, 420, 421 ——***Philip IV and the Count of Olivares.*** These are Velasquez school pieces or copies, not too well done, and certainly not done by Velasquez. No. 420 is a copy of the portrait of Philip IV in the National Gallery, London.

422. ——***Portrait of the Count of Olivares.*** The work now seems rather hard and poor, though this may

have come from cleaning-room injuries. It is possibly an original work of Velasquez, though there is nothing about it that Mazo or others in the Velasquez shop could not have done.

122. **Venetian School.** ***Madonna and Child.*** It is positively hard in outline though bright in colour and has figures, buildings, and landscape faintly reminiscent of Giorgione. It is not far from such a Giorgione follower as Cariani, though Crowe and Cavalcaselle thought it by Previtali.

84. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** With a Lottesque hand on the parapet. The portrait lacks stamina, being weak in character and soft in drawing. It formerly passed as a Correggio in the good old gallery days when only the great gods of art were invoked and the demigods and mere mortals were relegated to the silences.

138. **Veronese, Paolo.** ***Moses Saved from the Nile.*** This may be only a school piece, though it seems good enough to be by Paolo himself. The slightness of it rather leads one to think it of the school, but the sketchy quality suggests Paolo. What very free handling! And what very good colour! Look at the picture from the middle of the room and how very decorative it is! Those in the school were not always wrong, nor the master always right. There are many similar pictures attributed to Paolo in the different galleries—notably at Madrid (No. 502). See also the companion piece (No. 139).

140. ——***Repose in Egypt.*** It is a weak school piece of indifferent drawing and colouring. Look at the angels' wings, or the Madonna's face, or the donkey's head without a body, and then ask yourself

if a painter of Paolo's calibre would be likely to do it. Nos. 141 and 143 are of similar origin.

145. * ——*Descent from the Cross.* The figure of the angel holding the hand is very like Paolo—more so than any other portion of the picture, though it is all probably by his brush. The drawing is a little careless, but the painting is very spirited and energetic—too much so for a mere school piece. Yet it is not precisely a characteristic Paolo though a very good picture.

146. ——*Holy Family and St. Catherine.* It is only a school piece or a copy and is now hung too high for any one to see it properly. Even the catalogue queries it.

147, 148. ——*Allegories.* Sketchy work that has some quality of colour. They are by some pupil or follower of Paolo—some one of the rank of, say, Farinato. The catalogue questions their being by Paolo.

149, 150. ——*Diana and Minerva.* Small figures standing in niches. They are merely sketches, or at least done in a sketchy manner, but how very good they are in drawing and colour! Notice the modelling of Diana's head and leg.

789. **Verspronck, Jan Cornelis.** *Portrait of a Man.* A very considerable portrait done with intuition, right feeling, good drawing, and easy handling. Ordinarily it would have been converted into a Frans Hals, but perhaps the signature was too prominent and forbidding.

1183. **Vlieger, Simon de.** *Harbour with Shipping.* A very large De Vlieger, lacking in quality and perhaps more panoramic or historic than artistic.

No. 1702 is smaller and much better. It is in one of the cabinets devoted to the Little Dutchmen.

445. **Weyden, Roger van der.** ***St. Luke Painting the Virgin.*** This is a version of a picture a copy of which is in the Munich Gallery, another in the Boston Museum, and two others in private possession. Probably Roger inspired them all but had nothing directly to do with any one of them. Possibly his original has been lost and only these copies survive. This Hermitage version, however, is vastly better than that at Munich. The distant landscape with water is very good as is also the general colour scheme. Notice also the fine robe of St. Luke and the gold under-dress of the Madonna. Injured in the hands and elsewhere.

447 } **Weyden, School of Roger van der.** ***Trinity and a***
448 } ***Madonna and Child.*** These are crudely done panels, rather raw in colour, false in high lights, and hard in drawing. Notice the poor handling in the fur across the lap of the Madonna or the bad foreshortening of the brass in the corner. They have some relation to the work of the Master of Flémalle, though just what would be difficult to express in exact terms. In the Louvre work of the same nature and subject is put down to Colin de Coter.

1017 } **Wouwerman, Philips.** ***Sand-Dune Landscapes.***
1045 } The wanderer in European galleries sees white-horse Wouwermans *ad infinitum* until the very name on a picture-frame becomes almost a weariness to the flesh. But occasionally Wouwerman omits the white horse and rises to a height. Here, for instance, are two landscapes of superb decorative quality in their silver-greys. They are lovely in colour, in light, in air, in clouded skies. They may

be a little soft and wanting in Rousseau strength, but what decided charm they have!

1116. **Wynants, Jan.** ***Landscape.*** A large and very characteristic Wynants—that is, characteristic in its emptiness. It lacks in quality and is prosaic all through. Ruisdael is dull enough at times but Wynants usually goes beyond him in this respect.

348. **Zurbaran, Francisco de.** ***Praying Child(?).*** The picture has very good sentiment and rather naïve feeling. Besides, the colour is excellent.

INDEX OF PICTURES BY NUMBERS