

Art Historians and Art Critics-II Huygens on Rembrandt

Author(s): Seymour Slive

Source: *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 94, No. 594 (Sep., 1952), pp. 260-264

Published by: Burlington Magazine Publications Ltd.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/870922>

Accessed: 18-09-2019 11:14 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Burlington Magazine Publications Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Burlington Magazine*

the poet is not difficult to understand. In commemorating the fall of the city after its heroic resistance to the Turkish siege, Delacroix honoured not only the cause of Greek independence, but with the very mention of Missolonghi evoked the memory of the English poet who had been the most spectacular champion of Greek liberty. The succession of Delacroix's inventions on Greek themes which began with the circumstantial description of the *Scènes des massacres de Scio*, for which the complete Salon title prepared by the artist referred the spectator to contemporary newspaper descriptions,

concluded with the allegory of *La Grèce expirant*. Here fact is transfigured by poetry, the object transformed into the symbol, and the tribute to national resistance paid less to individual heroism and suffering than to the defence of the abstract ideal of freedom for which Byron had sacrificed his life. That Delacroix himself considered the *Grèce expirant sur les ruines de Missolonghi* a memorial to Byron may be implied from his having sent it to England with his brilliant interpretation of the horrible culmination of *Marino Faliero*, on the first opportunity he had to exhibit in London.

SEYMOUR SLIVE

Art Historians and Art Critics—II

Huygens on Rembrandt

CONSTANTIN HUYGENS¹, one of the most outstanding men in the Netherlands during the seventeenth century, combined a lifetime of political service to his country with a mastery of all the polite accomplishments. In 1625, when he was 29 years old, he became secretary to Stadholder Prince Frederick Henry, and he remained in the service of the House of Orange until his death in 1687. His activities outside the privy council include a lengthy correspondence with Descartes, verse written in Latin, French and his mother tongue, and translations of John Donne into Dutch. He was an accomplished musician; an athlete who dared to climb the spire of the cathedral of Strasburg; and a nature lover who admired the Rheinfall at Schaffhausen and the pines in the Giardino Giusti in Verona. He was also a dilettante of the arts (Fig. 18).

Around 1630 Huygens began an autobiography which, among other subjects, discusses painting.² Huygens singles out Rembrandt and Jan Lievens as painters worthy of special mention. The young, polished diplomat who had already made a trip to Venice and three journeys to England wrote that the miller's son Rembrandt and the embroiderer's son Lievens were on a par with the most famous painters and would soon surpass them. High praise for the two young

Leiden artists who were not yet 25 years old. This commendation becomes even more impressive when one learns how familiar Huygens was with the painters of his time and how conscious he was of the great change which took place in Netherlandish painting during the first decades of the seventeenth century.

Huygens thought highly of the works of Hendrik Goltzius and Michiel Mierevelt, but he applauded a new generation of painters. He considered Paul Ravesteyn old-fashioned; Hendrick Vroom was a great marine painter in his time, but he has been surpassed by Porcellis and others, and because of the great progress which painting has made, it is unfortunate that Cornelis van Haarlem was not born thirty years later. He added that Hendrik Hondius, who was his own drawing master, was not very competent at rendering landscapes with light, fresh and lively lines; the hard and tight drawing of his engravings is more suitable for depicting static objects than grass, leaves, or shrubs. Hondius is criticised for his inability to depict what the great Dutch landscape artists represented in their work. Huygens was well aware of the achievement of Netherlandish landscape painters of the early seventeenth century and he asserted a book could be filled with their names. Poelenburg, Uytenbroek, and Van Goyen are cited and special attention is called to Jan Wildens, Paul Bril, and Esaias van de Velde. He believed that these skilful painters lacked nothing in order to show the warmth of the sun and the movement caused by cool breezes. It is in the representation of such things, Huygens feels, that the young painters will surpass their teachers.

Huygens seems to have recognised the possibilities of seventeenth-century tonal painting and was not appalled by the departure from the manneristic mode. This stylistic change had its complicated roots in Italy, where a similar shift took place two or three decades before Huygens wrote his autobiography. Italian Seicento writers also recognised the change in style in Italian painting. Discussions of the

¹ Material used in this article has been included in a study of *Rembrandt and His Critics: 1630-1730* submitted to the University of Chicago as a doctoral dissertation which will be published as volume II in the series *Utrechtse Bijdragen tot de kunstgeschiedenis* of the Utrecht University Institute of Art History.

² The manuscript, in the Royal Library in The Hague, was written between May 1629 and April 1631. J. A. WOPF first published part of it in *Oud Holland*, 'Constantyn Huygens over de schilders van zijn tijd', IX [1891], pp. 106-36, with a Dutch translation. WOPF published the complete text in *Bijdragen en Mededeelingen van het Historisch Genootschap*, XVIII [1897], pp. 1-122. An annotated Dutch translation of the entire autobiography was made by A. H. KAN: *De Jeugd van Constantijn Huygens door hemzelf beschreven*, Rotterdam, Donker [1946], which includes an essay by G. KAMPHUIS: 'Constantijn Huygens als kunstcriticus', pp. 141-7. Dutch scholars cannot be accused of overlooking the importance of Huygens as a source, but he has been neglected by others; JULIUS SCHLOSSER, for example, does not mention him in his classic *Die Kunstliteratur*.



18. *Constantin Huygens with his Clerk*, by Thomas de Keyser. Signed and dated 1627. Panel, 92 by 69 cm. (National Gallery, London.)



17. Two pen studies for a *Mater Dolorosa*, and chalk studies of figures, by Rembrandt. (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.)

merits of these new tendencies, Carraccesque and Caravaggesque, are to be found in their texts. Though there seems to have been a good market among the amateurs for works of the so-called Naturalists, the latter were apt to be rated lower from a strictly theoretical point of view than the Bolognese group. This was a consequence of the wide acceptance of a hierarchical arrangement of the *genres* of painting; the highest category was of course that of historical compositions, a fact which gave the Carraccesque style an advantage from the start, since its suitability for that purpose was generally agreed upon.³ In the dichotomy set up between the two groups it was pointed out that the strong, unnatural lighting used by Caravaggio followers, and their dependence upon the model, make their work unsuitable for important compositions; while on the other hand, because the Carracci school selects and improves nature, gives no offence to decorum and employs more natural lighting, its method is perfect for serious, imaginative historical pieces.

Although Huygens was keenly aware of the innovations which Dutch *rurales pictores* used to revolutionise landscape painting during the twenties of the seventeenth century, he would not have disagreed with his Italian contemporaries that *historiographici pictores* painted the most important subjects. No seventeenth-century writer would have disputed this point. What is singular, is that Huygens did not demand that a certain *style* be employed when historical compositions were rendered. It is this which distinguishes him from the majority of his Italian contemporaries.

The Netherlands in his time, he stated, produced as many talented history painters as landscape artists. He lists the Utrecht Caravaggesques Honthorst, Terbrugghen and Baburen to support his point. Van Dyck, Abraham Janssens, Everhard van der Maes, Pieter Isaaksz, Lastman and Pynas are also cited. But Rubens is singled out as the greatest. Huygens is fascinated by Rubens' painting of a *Medusa* which combines charm and horror, and because of the terror which it creates is usually covered with a curtain.⁴ His eulogy of Rubens is an indication of his freedom from a bias which dictated a specific style for a specific subject. The absence of this bias enabled Huygens to write that soon Rembrandt and Lievens would surpass their contemporaries.

Huygens mentions the humble origins of both Rembrandt and Lievens and makes much of this fact. To him their low birth is superb proof against the argument that 'noble blood' is superior to 'ordinary blood'. To bolster his contention he cites the report that a group of doctors dissected the corpse of a nobleman in order to examine his blood and discovered it did not differ from that of a common burgher or farmer. Huygens adds that neither of the young artists are indebted to their parents for their talent. It would be a mistake to conclude that Huygens underlined the artists' humble origins because of particularly democratic currents in seventeenth-

century Dutch thought. Biographers of artists have accepted the fact that nature can distribute artistic gifts without checking the income or social status of the recipient at least since Ghiberti wrote that Giotto, when a lad, was discovered by Cimabue while drawing sheep on a stone. In the numerous stories of boys from the lower classes becoming great artists a teacher is generally involved, but according to Huygens neither Rembrandt nor Lievens owe anything to their teachers. Although he does not name them, he states they were quite ordinary, because the artists' parents were poor and could not afford to send the boys to better ones. Furthermore, their teachers would be ashamed of themselves if they saw how their pupils surpassed them. Huygens placed a premium upon creative ability and original conceptions. Shame, not pride and vicarious pleasure, was the reward of the teacher of a great master. Because Rembrandt and Lievens were not indebted to their teachers, but to their own talent, they would have gone as far in the mastery of their art even if they had none. Huygens considered this high commendation. Later writers find this a source of condemnation.

Huygens was able to appraise the difference between the works of Rembrandt and Lievens. The former is superior to Lievens in judgment and in the representation of lively emotional expression; Lievens, on the other hand, has a grandeur of invention and a boldness which Rembrandt does not achieve. Huygens selects Rembrandt's *Judas Returning the Pieces of Silver*, signed in monogram and dated 1629 and now in the collection of Lady Normanby,⁵ to show his superior ability to convey the expression of emotion in a small, carefully worked-out picture. This painting, he adds, can stand comparison with any Italian or ancient picture; in it the beardless son of a Dutch miller has surpassed Protogenes, Apelles and Parrhasius.

Discounting the propensity of a man with Huygens' humanistic background to summon the names of the ancient painters at the drop of a brush, we must nevertheless accept the fact that Huygens thought the *Judas* picture was an outstanding one. He tells us specifically what impressed him in the painting. It was Rembrandt's ability to depict expression, appropriate gestures and movement, particularly in the central figure of Judas who bewails his crime and implores for the pardon which he knows he will not receive. Rembrandt has shown a Judas whose face is full of horror, whose hair is in wild disorder and whose clothes are torn. His arms are contorted, his hands are pressed together and the whole body of the kneeling Judas seems ravaged and convulsed by his hideous despair.

Huygens applauded Rembrandt for his ability to paint a highly dramatic episode from the Bible. He heralds the Batavian as a great painter of historical compositions and adds that although Lievens is an excellent painter he will not easily achieve Rembrandt's ability for vivacious invention. Thus Rembrandt first won recognition as a history painter. There is no doubt in Huygens' mind that the miller's son is capable of depicting what he considered to be the most important *genre* of painting. This is another point which later

³ The author is very much indebted to Mr Denis Mahon, who clarified, in an extremely interesting correspondence, the complicated question of the attitudes of Italian amateurs and theorists toward the Caravaggesque and Carraccesque painters during the first third of the seventeenth century.

⁴ The picture Huygens admired was probably similar to the *Medusa* in Vienna, reproduced RUDOLF OLDENBURG: *P. P. Rubens, Klassiker der Kunst*, 5th ed., Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt [1921], p. 80. Huygens' reaction to the *Medusa* prefigures some of the fascination which nineteenth-century writers had for the same subject; cf. MARIO PRAZ: 'The Beauty of the Medusa' in *The Romantic Agony*, London, Oxford University Press [1933], pp. 25-50.

⁵ Several versions of the picture are known. On the basis of Isherwood Kay's notes, C. H. COLLINS BAKER published the version now in Lady Normanby's Collection as the original: 'Rembrandt's Thirty Pieces of Silver', *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE*, LXXV [1939], pp. 179-80; 235. To date this attribution has not been disputed.

critics will dispute; some of them will consider history painting Rembrandt's weakest *genre*.

The autobiography also contains the frequently quoted passage in which Huygens suggests to Rembrandt and Lievens that they should go to Italy to study, for if they became familiar with the works of Raphael and Michelangelo they would reach the heights of painting. The artists answered that now, in the flower of their youth, they had no time for travel. Moreover, they assert, the finest Italian works can be seen in Holland.⁶ The answer the artists gave Huygens does not imply that they did not think the Italians were worth studying. Both studied with Pieter Lastman who was in Italy during the first decade of the century. The influence of their teacher's style and subjects upon their work show they had great respect for Italian painting. Furthermore, Rembrandt served a three-year apprenticeship with Jacob van Swanenburgh who worked in Venice, Rome, and Naples. Another reason given for their reluctance to go South was that they did not want to interrupt their work by taking a trip. They were not lazy; Huygens wrote that he worried about their health because they worked so diligently.

Huygens' account of his suggestion that Rembrandt and Lievens go to Italy to perfect their art contains two important threads of the Rembrandt story: the artist's attitude toward Italian art and his working habits. Both threads became tangled and knotted long before the end of the seventeenth century.

The great praise and respect which Huygens, the man of the world and the man of means, had for the self-made artist who was made of different flour than his father was not limited to the written word. He also helped Rembrandt to obtain important commissions. Although none of the attempts which have been made to recognise Huygens' features in Rembrandt portraits is completely convincing, we do know that in 1632 Rembrandt painted a portrait of Huygens' older brother Maurits who was secretary of the State Council from 1624 until 1642.⁷ A year or two later he made a portrait of Huygens' brother-in-law, Admiral Philipps van Dorp.⁸ And it is difficult to imagine that Huygens, Frederick Henry's secretary, did not have something to do with obtaining Rembrandt the important commission to paint the portrait of the Prince's wife, Amalia van Solms, mentioned in an inventory of 1632. There is also evidence that Rembrandt painted a portrait of the Prince which was a companion piece to the portrait of Amalia.⁹

⁶ FRITS LUGT: 'Italiaansche Kunstwerken in Nederlandsche Verzamelingen van Vroeger Tijden', *Oud Holland*, LIII [1936], pp. 97-135, has shown that their point about the number and quality of Italian works which could be seen in the Netherlands was not sour grapes or a lame excuse.

⁷ The portrait, which is signed and dated, is in the Kunsthalle, Hamburg. Maurits' name is written on the back of the panel in an old hand. In 1641 the portrait was listed in the will of Jacques de Gheyn III; cf. note 10 below.

⁸ The painting is lost. It is known from an engraving which is signed S. Savry and dated 1634. Reproduced in W. BODE and C. HOFSTEDÉ DE GROOT: *Rembrandt* . . . Paris, Charles Sedelmeyer [1905], VIII, Catalogue of pictures known by engravings, No. 14.

⁹ S. W. A. DROSSAERS, with annotations by C. HOFSTEDÉ DE GROOT and CH. DE JONGE: 'Inventaris van de meubel van het Stadhoudelijk kwartier met het Speelhuis en van het Huis in het Noordeinde te 's-Gravenhage', *Oud Holland*, XLVII [1930], No. 79, p. 213: *Een contrefeytsel van Haere Excie in profijl, bij Rembrants gedaen*. In a note to this entry, Hofstede de Groot suggested that the portrait is probably the same one which is mentioned as No. 26 in a 1667 inventory of the Oude Hof as a work by A. Hanneman and as a pendant to No. 25, the *Profile Portrait of Frederick Henry* by Rembrandt. Since Hanneman went to England around 1623 and did not return to the Netherlands until 1637 he could not have painted Amalia before 1632. Rembrandt's portraits of Frederick Henry and Amalia are lost.

But the faith which Huygens expressed in his autobiography in Rembrandt's future development was not based on the artist's ability as a face painter. In fact, we have some reason to believe that Huygens was not too impressed with Rembrandt's portraits. In 1633 he wrote a distich on Rembrandt's portrait of Jacques de Gheyn III:

Rembrandtis est manus ista, Gheiniq vultus:
*Mirare, lectore, es ista Gheinius non est.*¹⁰

These lines should not be interpreted too literally, for they can be explained as a rhetorical compliment of the sitter instead of adverse criticism of the painter. Huygens' confidence in Rembrandt's talent as a painter of historical compositions possibly induced him to convince the Prince to buy the painting recorded in the above-mentioned inventory as *Simeon in the Temple* by Rembrandt or Jan Lievens.¹¹ It seems that there was already confusion as to which of the two friends painted which picture while the paint on their works was still wet. A *Rape of Proserpina*¹² and a *Melancholy*¹³ attributed in the same inventory to Lievens may have also been painted by Rembrandt.

We are on firmer ground when we examine the choice commission of a Passion series which Rembrandt executed for Frederick Henry during the 'thirties. From letters which Rembrandt sent to Huygens we know that the latter acted as the artist's agent for the five pictures which make up the series.¹⁴ In a letter dated January 12, 1639 Rembrandt wrote that he would like to send Huygens a piece ten feet long and eight feet high for services rendered.¹⁵ This large canvas was probably the *Blinding of Samson*, dated 1636, in Frankfurt; it is the only picture made before 1639 which approximates the dimensions cited.

Although there are no sources which inform us what the court thought of the series, the fact that the *Entombment*, *Resurrection*, and *Ascension* were ordered by the Prince himself as pendants to the *Elevation* and *Descent from the Cross* proves

¹⁰ *De Gedichten van C. Huygens, naar zijn handschrift uitgegeven door J. A. Worp*, Groningen, Wolters [1893], II, p. 246. The portrait dated 1632, London, Dulwich College, was listed in De Gheyn's will dated June 3, 1641, with its companion piece, the portrait of *Maurits Huygens*; cf. A. BREDIUS: 'Rembrandtiana', *Oud Holland*, XXXIII [1915], p. 33. The identification of the De Gheyn portrait made by H. E. VAN GELDER: 'Marginalia bij Rembrandt: I. De Pendant van Maurits Huygens', *Oud Holland*, LX [1943], pp. 33-4 was recently confirmed by an inscription found on the back of the panel; cf. E. K. WATERHOUSE: *An Exhibition of Paintings by Rembrandt arranged . . . for the Edinburgh Festival Society* [1950], No. 5; J. G. VAN GELDER: 'The Rembrandt Exhibition at Edinburgh', *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE*, XCII [1950], p. 328.

¹¹ DROSSAERS, *op. cit.*, No. 64, p. 205: *Een Symeon in den tempel, Christus in zijne armen houdende, door Rembrandts oft Jan Lievensz. gedaen*. This entry may refer to Rembrandt's painting of this subject in the Kunsthalle, Hamburg.

¹² *Ibid.*, No. 43, p. 203: *Een groot stuck, daer Pluto Proserpina ontschaect, door Jan Lievensz. van Leyden gemaect*. In a note to this entry Hofstede de Groot writes that later inventories mention a *Rape of Proserpina* by Rembrandt, now in the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, which, in spite of the fact that it is only 83 by 78 cm. and therefore can hardly be called *een groot stuck*, may be the picture cited in the 1632 inventory.

¹³ *Ibid.*, No. 51, p. 204: *De Melancoly, sijnde een vrouw, sittende op eenen stael aen een taeffel, daerop liggende boecken, een luyt ende andere instrumenten, door Jan Lievensz.* J. G. VAN GELDER demonstrated in a lecture given at the Courtauld Institute in 1952 that Rembrandt's *Minerva* in the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum and the *Minerva* in the Mauritshuis (probably by William de Poorter) are representations of *Melancholy*. The Berlin picture agrees very well with the inventory description. Moreover, it, as well as the *Rape of Proserpina* mentioned in the note above, came from the collection of the House of Orange.

¹⁴ The seven extant letters are reprinted in C. HOFSTEDÉ DE GROOT: *Die Urkunden über Rembrandt*, The Hague, M. Nijhoff [1906], Nos. 47, 48, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 65.

that the paintings found favour with the most important patron of the Netherlands.¹⁶

In the January 12, 1639 letter Rembrandt wrote that he would send the Prince the *Entombment* and *Resurrection* in an effort to please him. He added that these two pictures remained so long on his hands because in them he concentrated upon expressing 'the greatest inward emotion' (*die meeste ende die naetuerelste beweegelijkheid*).¹⁷ This objective was, of course, one of the major tasks of any serious history painter. Rembrandt showed his preoccupation with the expression of emotion around the same time on a drawing which represents two pen studies of a *Mater Dolorosa* and some chalk studies of figures, when he wrote with the same pen which drew the *Mourning Virgin*, that 'A devoted treasure is kept in her noble heart for the consolation of her empathetic soul'¹⁸ (Fig. 17).

Frederick Henry's interest in Rembrandt's Biblical paintings was not a passing fancy. In 1646, one year before he died, the Prince paid Rembrandt 2400 guilders for an *Adoration of the Shepherds* and a *Circumcision*.¹⁹ If we consider that Rembrandt received about 1600 guilders for the *Night Watch* in 1642, we can conclude that the artist was very well rewarded

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 47.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 65. The interpretation of this phrase has been the subject of much discussion among Rembrandt scholars: cf. H. E. VAN GELDER: 'Marginalia bij Rembrandt—De natureelste beweegelijkheid', *Oud Holland*, LX [1943], pp. 148–51; he reaffirmed his interpretation in a review of Jakob Rosenberg's *Rembrandt* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948) in *De Nieuwe Stem* [1949], pp. 291–5. Also cf. ROSENBERG, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 116; 226, note 29. WOLFGANG STECHOW endorsed Rosenberg's explanation in his review of the book in *The Art Bulletin*, XXXII [1950], p. 253, note 1. The author presents his reasons for accepting H. E. van Gelder's explanation of the phrase in the work cited in note 1 above.

¹⁸ The drawing, dated around 1637, is in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. J. Q. VAN REGTEREN ALTENA: *Catalogo: Mostra di incisioni e disegni di Rembrandt*, Rome, Colombo [1951], No. 62, transcribed the inscription: *een dyvoet thesoor dat in een sijn herte bewaert wert tot troost haerer beleevende siel*; this is the reading which has been accepted.

¹⁹ HOFSTEDE DE GROOT: *Urkunden*, *op. cit.*, No. 107, item dated November 29, 1646 in the Prince's *Ordonnantieboek*. The *Adoration*, signed and dated 1646, is now in Munich. The *Circumcision* is lost.

by Frederick Henry for his efforts in the branch of painting which seventeenth-century theoreticians considered most important and which Huygens recognised as Rembrandt's forte.

The 1646 payment is the last indication which we have of a link between Rembrandt and Constantin Huygens. When Amalia van Solms dedicated *Huis ten Bos* to the memory of the Prince, after he died, Huygens drew up a list of fourteen painters whom he would like to be employed to decorate the *Oranjezaal*.²⁰ The names of Honthorst, Caesar van Everdingen and Pieter de Grebber were included, but Rembrandt's was not. By the time Huygens made his list Rembrandt had already begun to express 'the greatest inward emotion' without resorting to the intensification of light, the emphatic gestures, the frenzied movement and obvious expression which are found in the Judas picture, the Passion series and above all in the *Blinding of Samson*. The man who considered Rubens the greatest painter of the Netherlands was not prepared to follow Rembrandt's departure from the style of the High Baroque.

However, Huygens' omission of Rembrandt's name from his list should not be interpreted as one of the events which started Rembrandt on his journey into oblivion and which ended in total obscurity by the time of his death. That journey never took place. Rembrandt was never without an appreciative audience. Huygens' famous sons, Constantin II and Christiaan, took up their father's interest in art and Rembrandt when they were young students at the University of Leiden in 1645,²¹ and we know that Constantin II was in contact with the artist as late as 1663.²² An interest in Rembrandt, from the very beginning of his career to its end, seems to have been part of the tradition of the remarkable Huygens family.

²⁰ J. G. VAN GELDER: 'De Schilders van de Oranjezaal', *Nederlandsch Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* [1948–9], p. 126.

²¹ HOFSTEDE DE GROOT: *Urkunden*, *op. cit.*, No. 104.

²² *Ibid.*, No. 261.

Shorter Notices

A Mosan Reliquary at Luton Hoo

BY CHARLES OMAN

OVER thirty years ago H. P. Mitchell published an excellent series of seven articles¹ on 'Some enamels of the school of Godefroid de Claire' but since then the subject of Mosan champlevé enamelling has hardly been mentioned in this Magazine. The Exhibition of Mosan Art which was inaugurated at Liège last summer and which has since migrated to Paris and Rotterdam, has done much to quicken the interest in the art of the Meuse valley in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In the case of the writer it provided a unique opportunity of examining at close quarters a small group of pieces which were closely akin to one which had come to his notice when preparations were being made

¹ THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE, Vols. XXXIV, XXXV [1919], XXXVI [1920].

to open to the public the Wernher Collection at Luton Hoo. He is now enabled to describe and illustrate this piece by kind permission of Sir Harold Wernher, Bart.

Fresh plaques of Mosan champlevé enamel and fragments of goldsmith's work have been turning up at not infrequent intervals since the quest for Mosan art became intense about fifty years ago. Few largish pieces have, however, been added. As far as the writer is aware the subject of the present article has not previously been published. All that is known of its history is that it was acquired by the late Sir Julius Wernher, Bart (d. 1912), who was forming his collection during the two decades on either side of the year 1900. The accounts relating to the acquisition of the Wernher Collection were reduced to ashes in a safe during the 1940 blitz.

The reliquary of Ste Ode (Fig. 21) belongs to the type which has been christened *pignon de chasse* because it has the appearance of the gabled end of a shrine. They were placed high above the altar retable so that the casual visitor should get the impression that a complete shrine was there.² Essentially the reliquary

² See the description of the high altar of St Servais, Maastricht, by two Bollandists in 1668, quoted by F. BOCK AND M. WILLEMEN: *Die mittelalterlichen Kunst- und Reliquienschatze zu Maastricht* [1872], p. 62.