

Catheline Périer-D'Ieteren, *Dieric Bouts. The Complete Works*, 397 pp, c. 300 colour plates and c. 100 b&w ills., Mercatorfonds, Brussels, 2006, ISBN 90 6153 638 3, (hardback), first published in Dutch (2005) and French (2005).

As Catheline Périer-D'Ieteren rightly emphasizes in the introduction of her monograph reviewed here, the fifteenth-century Louvain painter Dieric Bouts never received the international fame and art-historical attention which fell to other so-called Flemish Primitives such as Jan van Eyck, Rogier van der Weyden and Hans Memling. This is probably due to his somewhat dry, precise painting style and to compositions which tend toward the geometric, appealing less to the viewer's emotions and imagination than the work of his applauded fellow artists. Nevertheless, a thorough study of Bouts's oeuvre was published in 1925 by Max Friedländer as part of the series *Die Altniederländische Malerei*, and a monumental monograph on Bouts and his followers in 1938 by Wolfgang Schöne. These were complemented over the years by a steady flow of articles and in-depth studies of individual or small groups of Bouts paintings. While Friedländer and Schöne focused on defining the oeuvre and style, the subsequent studies were dominated by iconographical analyses and the results of scientific examination methods.¹ Three exhibitions were devoted to Bouts, one in 1957-1958 in Brussels and Delft and the second in 1975 in Louvain.² It was the 1998 exhibition in Louvain which coincided with three substantial publications on the artist, raising the hope of a leap forward in the study of Bouts.³ The monumental exhibition catalogue edited by the late Maurits Smeyers, however, did not fully live up to expectations. Although offering new insights in iconography and historical context, it turned out to be a missed opportunity to assemble a substantial group of autograph paintings by Dieric Bouts, leaving the need for renewed critical review of the Bouts oeuvre. Against this background Catheline Périer-D'Ieteren published her monograph on the artist, discussed here, with the main goal 'to do him (Bouts) justice by demonstrating the true role he played in the art of his times' (p. 9). Using the results of scientific examination methods (particularly infrared reflectography, X-radiography and dendrochronology), Périer-D'Ieteren aimed to review the attributions of Friedländer and Schöne in order to 'shed new light on Bouts's oeuvre' (p. 11), to propose working hypotheses concerning the collaboration between Bouts and his workshop and, as a result, to produce a coherent critical catalogue with a 'bolder and more substantially argued demonstration of attributions' than the 1998 exhibition catalogue had offered (p. 9).

Périer-D'Ieteren certainly succeeded in producing a monumental, lavishly illustrated monograph with a well-ordered layout. The reader finds his way easily to each painting, particularly through the references to the chapter- and catalogue numbers at the bottom of each page. The monograph was published in French (2005), Dutch (2005) and English (2006), the latter containing some corrections and improved quality of the illustrations.⁴ This review concentrates on the English edition. The excellent illustrations alone of each of the discussed paintings, often with additional details in large format, makes this monograph essential to anyone working on Bouts. The

author's accomplishment in studying most of the paintings first-hand, assembling the existing scientific examination results, as well as carrying out new scientific research, invites respect for her method of working. This enabled the author, among other things, to present all of the previously published results of technical research of individual or small groups of paintings within the context of Bouts's entire oeuvre, which is the foremost merit of this monograph. Only someone who has looked closely at all of the discussed works can challenge her attributions; therefore I will not discuss attribution questions here, but instead focus on the author's methodology in writing this monograph.

The book is divided into two parts, the first part containing eleven thematically arranged chapters and the second part consisting of a catalogue raisonné of Dieric Bouts's painted oeuvre. In the first part the author deals with the biography of the artist, the iconography of his paintings (written by Didier Martens), Bouts's sources and artistic personality, his painting technique, his workshop and artistic heritage. Additionally, a number of related works are analysed in separate chapters, that is the official commissions, the portraits, the Madonnas and the Tüchlein paintings. The catalogue raisonné consists of autograph works (cat.nos. 1-25), paintings by Bouts and his workshop (cat.nos. A1-A9) and problematic attributions (cat.nos. B1-B9), each part of which is chronologically arranged. The Dutch and French editions contain two Appendices, one with dendrochronological data and the second with transcriptions of two archival documents. In the English edition the author decided to replace the latter with an Appendix consisting of eighteen illustrations of infrared reflectogram assemblies and X-radiographs in order to make the technical documents more understandable. The monograph ends with a bibliography, a topographical index to the paintings and an index of names.

The book is written in the plural first person, a form not uncommon in Belgian publications. This convention usually leads to confusion as to who is meant by 'we' – as in this particular case. With Périer-D'Ieteren as the sole author on the cover, Didier Martens wrote the complete fourth chapter on iconography while Valentine Henderiks is mentioned as assistant on the titlepage. In the introduction Périer-D'Ieteren makes clear that Henderiks's 'documentary research and critical participation during the process of writing' was invaluable for this publication (p. 12). Therefore, it remains unclear whether the plural first person here should be taken literally or not.

The introduction explains the structure and aims of the monograph, ending with lines of credits. Apart from explaining that Friedländer's and Schöne's studies were the starting point for the selection of works in the present catalogue raisonné (p. 10), the existing literature is not reviewed. Although throughout the book the literature is discussed in the texts on the individual works and the catalogue entries, it would have been useful to have a general review of the abundant publications on Bouts. However, the book starts with a biography of Dieric Bouts followed by a short discussion of his two sons Albert and Dieric the Younger, who also were painters. While

this first chapter is based on published material, the original sources were not consulted. Transcriptions of two important archival documents concerning the commission of the *Holy Sacrament* altarpiece were included in an Appendix in the Dutch and French editions, but these were left out in the English edition. This may be a logical decision, since such an Appendix is only useful when all the known documents are included and critically analysed in the text. Here, the different published hypotheses concerning Bouts's date of birth, his training and date of arrival in Louvain are summarized and concluded by the author's choice of the most plausible hypothesis. In this respect the book does not offer any new insights into the biography of the artist, but – admittedly – renewed comprehensive archival and historical research would be necessary in order to tackle the many remaining questions and gaps in our knowledge of Bouts's biography and this is evidently beyond the scope of this monograph. One issue that could have been dealt with, however, is that of Bouts's first name, which is now in an unscholarly way adjusted to the language of each edition: in the French edition the artist is called 'Thierry' and in the Dutch edition 'Dirk'. Because 'Dick', the English translation of Dirk, was doubtlessly considered unsuitable, the English edition chose 'Dieric' which is closest to the original spelling. As the author herself emphasizes, the artist's name is usually spelled 'Dierick' in the archival documents (p. 17), while Bouts spelled his own name in a handwritten receipt 'Dieric' (fig. 4). Based on these published sources, the author could easily have made a case for either 'Dieric' or 'Dierick', and have used that choice consequently in the three editions. Furthermore, references to published sources are often missing,⁵ which is a persistent problem throughout the book, and in this chapter relevant publications are absent in the footnotes and bibliography.⁶

Even fewer footnotes account for the statements in the second chapter on the mystery of the Haarlem school of painting. This short five-page chapter is quite general in tone, starting out with fifteenth-century painting in the northern Netherlands and concluding with the seventeenth-century Dutch school. Albert van Ouwater and Geertgen tot Sint Jans are mentioned in passing, but the author is unable to take a stand in the specific relationship between these artists and Bouts. On p. 23 in the first chapter she states that Dieric Bouts 'absorbed the art of Albert van Ouwater', while on p. 30 in the second chapter she argues the 'clear influence of Bouts' on Van Ouwater in a triptych of *Pilgrims to Rome*, known through a German copy.⁷ Another problem is the contrast between the clear phrasing of most of the text and the vague statements along the lines of Paul Philippot. Incomprehensible sentences like 'The space, experienced as ambient luminosity, became more continuous, and both architecture and figures entered naturally into it.' (p. 31) certainly do not help to unravel the mystery of the Haarlem school. It might have been more effective to insert a reduced version of this text into the first chapter.

Chapter three focuses in on Bouts's official commissions in Louvain: the *Altarpiece of the Holy Sacrament* and the two *Justice Panels*. The documented official commission for the *Last Judgment* is just briefly mentioned at the end of the chapter and probably not taken

into account here because the Lille panels with the *Way to Paradise* and the *Fall of the Damned* and the Stockholm fragment with the *Head of Christ* are not universally accepted as the remaining fragments of this commission. However, with the author's well-argued opinion that the Lille and Stockholm panels do represent this commission, the extensive entry of these paintings in the catalogue (cat. nos. 16-18) would have fit well into this chapter. All aspects of the *Sacrament* altarpiece and the *Justice Panels* are discussed, from the history and iconography to the painting style and technique and in the case of the *Justice Panels*, the attribution problems. The published opinions are carefully weighed against renewed observation of the paintings and data from technical research. The result is a useful overview of the issues concerning these paintings, and in the case of the *Justice Panels* a reasoned argument in the debate of the attribution of the *Execution of the Innocent Count* of the *Justice Panels*. There are two small issues I want to address, the first concerning the proposed identification of the laymen in the *Last Supper* of the *Holy Sacrament* altarpiece. Périer-D'Ieteren rightly emphasizes that the proposed identifications so far remain hypothetical since there is no proof linking them to a person or name (p. 36).⁸ But the same can be said of her own proposed identification of these laymen as Dieric Bouts and his two sons. According to the author, her argument would be supported by a statement by Bouts in a handwritten receipt 'stipulating that the altarpiece was his work, and thus revealing the importance he attached to it.' (p. 36). This seems an over-interpretation of a simple receipt which would be required to state that the item(s) had been paid for.⁹ The second and more interesting issue concerns the original organization of the four panels forming the two side wings of the *Sacrament* altarpiece. In addition to stylistic and compositional arguments for one or another arrangement, the results of dendrochronological examinations by Peter Klein (1987) and later by Jozef Vynckier (1998) offered the chance to obtain final material proof. While Peter Klein concluded in 1989 and again in 1995 that the four compositions were originally painted on four independent panels,¹⁰ Vynckier argued in 1998 that they were originally painted on two supports with the *Meeting of Abraham and Melchisedech* above the *Feast of the Passover* on one support and the *Gathering of the Manna* above *Elijah in the Desert* on the second support.¹¹ Périer-D'Ieteren ends the discussion with these finding by Vynckier. However, the valuable counter arguments published by Klein in 2001 against Vynckier's conclusion of two supports for the four compositions should have been incorporated here.¹² Confusion is further raised as Klein's dendrochronological dating is given in the Technical Appendix (p. 370) with merely a reference to Vynckier's dating, while Vynckier's dating is exclusively mentioned in the Technical notes in the catalogue (p. 273).

Although Périer-D'Ieteren has put considerable effort into the iconographical descriptions of the discussed paintings, she delegates an in-depth iconographical analysis of Bouts's oeuvre to Didier Martens, her colleague at the Université Libre in Brussels. In chapter four he concentrates mainly on the respective role of the artist, the commissioner and the adviser in the creation of the painted compositions. Departing from this interesting question, Martens shows

that the official commissions from church or municipal authorities have a more complex iconography than private commissions as a result of the intervention of iconographic advisors, which comes as no surprise. Furthermore he convincingly argues that particular uncommon features in small works for private devotion, which were usually made for the free market, could hint at an intervention of the commissioner. However, the analogous role Martens attributes to the artist Dieric Bouts and the modern-day psychologist in eliciting images in the client's consciousness seems too far-fetched to me (pp. 73 and 76).

Dieric Bouts's sources and artistic personality are the subjects of chapter five, which excels particularly in capturing the individual character of Bouts's work. The discussion of his sources (mainly Van Eyck, Van der Weyden and northern Netherlandish painting) is used here chiefly to emphasize the distinctiveness of his oeuvre rather than the similarities to previous masters, thus emphasizing the individuality of the artist.

Along the same lines chapter six deals with Bouts's painting technique, described and analysed through careful observation of all the autograph paintings and the existing technical material, such as infrared reflectogram assemblies, X-radiographs and, to a small degree, paint samples. The observations of the underdrawings described here, are more systematically incorporated in the catalogue part. It is unfortunate that the author chose not to do the same for the X-radiographs and paint samples; the latter are not even included in the lists of technical data in the catalogue.¹³ One of the interesting new insights the author puts forth in this chapter is the extensive use of incised lines in the works accepted as autograph, not only used for architectural elements but also for positioning certain forms and figures (p. 94). In the concluding paragraph, however, some confusion arises when the author discusses the mechanical methods used to reproduce devotional paintings, as these paintings are only dealt with in chapter eight. Moreover, she attributes the variation in style in the underdrawings to the creativity of the artist, as Van Asperen de Boer had already done (p. 110), while earlier in the chapter proposing to offer 'a different view of the disparities involved' (p. 99). Apart from these side issues, this chapter is the first sensible attempt to provide an overall comprehensive analysis of Bouts's painting technique.

In chapter seven Périer-D'Ieteren discusses the relatively small group of autograph portraits by Bouts. Autonomous portraits, donor portraits, *portraits historiées* and possible self portraits pass in review in separate paragraphs. The only three known autonomous portraits - the London and New York ones and a silverpoint drawn *Portrait of a man* from Northampton - are discussed in well-reasoned entries. The London *Portrait of a man*, dated 1462, could well be titled *Portrait of a man, possibly Jan van den Winckele*, since the author supports this hypothetical identification by Lorne Campbell. Strictly speaking, the New York *Portrait of a man* should have been discussed in the paragraph of the donor portraits, because it is a fragment from a larger altarpiece. The Amsterdam drawing of a kneeling donor is somewhat out of place as it is, as the author emphasizes herself, a drapery study and not a portrait; as such it would have been better placed in chapter six in a paragraph on the use of

drawings on paper for the execution of paintings. With the engraved portrait of Dieric Bouts in Lampsonius's book from 1572 as point of departure, many art historians have been in search of self portraits. In chapter three Périer-D'Ieteren had previously argued for the man on the right in the *Last Supper* as being a self portrait, and in this chapter she adds the New York *Portrait of a man* as another possibility. I personally do not see the resemblance, as the supposed self portraits have more elongated faces and differently shaped noses than the Lampsonius portrait. Moreover, the highly speculative nature of these kinds of discussions makes this the least interesting issue presented in this chapter.

The more substantial group of paintings with the Virgin and Child, both autograph and in collaboration with the workshop, is discussed in entry-like paragraphs comprising chapter eight. The author distinguishes three types, the Virgin suckling the Child, the Virgin embracing the Child and the Virgin seated on a throne with the Child standing in her lap. The outstanding entries contain, among other things, careful observations of painting style and analyses of the infrared reflectogram assemblies and X-radiographs. Based on these observations, Périer-D'Ieteren confidently deciphers the division of hands within some works and describes the collaborative process in the Louvre, Florence and Frankfurt *Virgin and Child* paintings. The result is a daring undertaking which certainly fulfills the author's promise in the introduction to offer a bolder and more substantially argued demonstration of attributions than the 1998 exhibition catalogue.

The hypothetical reconstruction of an altarpiece on canvas, as first proposed by Bomford, Roy and Smith, is the subject of chapter nine. Four of the five *Tüchlein* paintings from this hypothetical altarpiece have survived and are each individually discussed in entry-like paragraphs. Périer-D'Ieteren is not convinced of this reconstruction as she observes differences in style between the paintings. The London *Entombment* and the Pasadena *Resurrection* are considered autograph works and part of a whole, to which the Los Angeles *Annunciation* might also have belonged, despite its style differences suggesting an earlier execution. Due to the differences in the Brussels *Crucifixion*, the author proposes the Master of the Munich Betrayal, or another member of Bouts's workshop, as a likely candidate. Strangely enough these conclusions are not incorporated in the catalogue part, where all four paintings are dated the same, ca. 1450-1455, and where the *Crucifixion* is catalogued as an autograph work.

Chapter ten is devoted to the Bouts workshop. Périer-D'Ieteren not only tries to identify individual hands, but also attempts to define the specific contribution of the different collaborators in paintings produced in the workshop of Dieric Bouts. Through her close study of the paintings, combined with results from technical examination, the author makes argued cases for defining artistic personalities, particularly in the case of the Master of the Munich Betrayal. The author starts out with the oeuvre of the oldest son Dieric Bouts the Younger, identified by Schöne in 1938 with the Master of the Pearl of Brabant. Her conclusions remain problematic in two ways. First of all, there is not a single piece of evidence to link a particular painting with this artist, let alone a whole oeuvre. The only known fact is that

he was a painter and inherited, together with his younger brother Albrecht, the painting tools and equipment as well as the unfinished paintings from his father. The assumption is that he would have painted in his father's style, but this offers no argument to attribute either one of the Boutsian oeuvres to him, as Smeyers had argued previously in 1998.¹⁴ Périer-D'Ieteren, however, goes along with the oeuvre as defined by Schöne, except for the Munich *'Pearl of Brabant'* triptych and the Louvre *Lamentation* (cat.nos. A2-A3). Based on the early dendrochronological dating of both these works, painted respectively after 1454 and 1460, she concludes that Dieric the Younger, who was born around 1448, would have been too young to execute these works (pp. 180-181). This way of arguing is problematic as dendrochronology can only provide a *terminus post quem*, while the most likely *terminus ante quem* (two to ten years after the felling date) is based on statistic probabilities and as such can never be used as an argument against an attribution.¹⁵ The overview of all the dendrochronological results in the Technical Appendix clearly illustrates this point, as three paintings were executed several decades after the felling date of the tree their supports were made from.¹⁶ Subsequently, the oeuvre of Albert Bouts is discussed. Rather than analysing his style and technique in his documented *Assumption of the Virgin* triptych and other major paintings, the author focusses on the host of replicas and copies of small devotional paintings presumably produced in his workshop. Interesting is the author's new finding of the extensive use of tracing with a stylus for these works. This is somewhat weakened however, by the comment that the more frequently used way of pouncing cannot be excluded (pp. 183-184). A discussion of the Master of the Tiburtine Sibyl follows with a sensible analyses of his work and role in the workshop of Bouts.¹⁷ The major part of the chapter is devoted to a renewed analysis of the oeuvre by the Master of the Munich Betrayal, resulting in a newly defined oeuvre of autograph paintings and works of collaboration between Dieric Bouts and this master. The confident presentation of these attributions makes one wonder why they weren't carried through in the catalogue part. Departing from the text, catalogue numbers A6, A8 and A9 for example would have been correctly catalogued as works by the Master of the Munich Betrayal instead of by Bouts and workshop. At least it would have been helpful to find the attributions mentioned at the top of each catalogue entry. The conclusion at the end of the chapter is more an ongoing discussion on the work by the Master of the Munich Betrayal than a conclusion summarizing the preceding text.

Chapter eleven is devoted to Bouts's artistic heritage, both in the Low Countries and abroad. The merit of this chapter is the compilation of influences published before in studies of individual artists or art works. Furthermore and very rightly so, the author considers not only paintings, but also drawings, engravings, illuminated miniatures, sculpted retables and other decorative objects. The result is a useful overview of the impact by Bouts, which is quite substantial. Where painted glass is concerned, the author could have mentioned the roundel with *The Fall of the Damned* based on the Lille painting with the same subject and the roundel with *The Last Supper* by Jacob Cornelisz. van Oostzanen inspired by Bouts's *Last Supper* in

the *Holy Sacrament* altarpiece.¹⁸ What I miss here is a paragraph on the heritage of Dieric Bouts in the work by Louvain painters other than members of the Bouts family. The work by Jan van Rillaer the Elder, in particular, whose early paintings show clear reminiscences of Bouts would have been worthwhile to include.¹⁹ The discussion on Bouts's influence abroad lacks the persuasive and convincing examples of the first part of the chapter. For example, the argument that images of Bouts's *Justice* panels must have been circulating in Italy, because of the supposed copying of the cart-shaped brazier from Bouts's *Ordeal by Fire* by the Ferrarese artist Benvenuto Tisi, is weak (p. 222). Passages without footnotes or illustrations such as the one on page 226, stating that in northern Germany Henrich Funhof and Hermen Rode were 'struck by the solemnity of Bouts's figures and the austerity of his compositions', are too vague. The author herself states correctly at the end of the chapter that Bouts's influence is 'a wonderful field of research, still little explored' (p. 227).

Part II, the catalogue, is divided into three sections, the first containing twenty-five autograph works by Dieric Bouts, the A-part containing nine works by Bouts and his workshop and the B-part presenting nine problematic attributions. Drawings, although dealt with in the text (pp. 120-123, 214-215), are not incorporated in the catalogue. In the B-part the author chose to exclusively restrict herself to works that were erroneously attributed to Bouts by Friedländer and Schöne, a strict delimitation justified by an over-simplified statement that all the other works that were wrongly attributed by others over the years were 'too numerous to address in this publication' (p. 360).

Each catalogue entry includes the dating, location, inventory number and the catalogue number in Friedländer and Schöne, followed by technical notes, restoration, provenance,²⁰ exhibitions and bibliography. The technical notes contain the measurements, a list of executed technical examinations as well as descriptions of the support, frame, condition and underdrawing. A description of the painting style, as well as the attributions of previous authors between brackets in the bibliography are absent but would have been a welcome addition here. Extensive entries are added of paintings that are not dealt with in length in the previous chapters. As such, the catalogue is clearly arranged. The numbering of the catalogue entries however, is not consistent: the two Lille *Last Judgment Panels* are catalogued as two succeeding numbers (cat.nos. 16-17), while the two *Justice Panels* are catalogued as one number (cat.no. 24). More problematic is the fact that the *Justice Panels*, which were finished after Bouts' death, are placed within the autograph works (cat.no. 24), while the *Hippolytus Triptych*, also left unfinished at Bouts' death, is presented among the 'Bouts and workshop' works (cat.no. A7).

The major problem is the inconsistency of attributions for the same paintings. An example of this is the conflicting attribution of three small versions with the *Virgin and Child* in the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Bargello in Florence and the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (cat.nos. 7, 9 and 10). All three paintings are listed in the catalogue as autograph works by Bouts. However, in the text on the three versions (on pp. 128-133) the author focuses on the stylistic and technical differences between the paintings. There,

the Metropolitan version is presented as the prototype painted by Dieric Bouts himself (p. 129), while the Bargello version 'may have been created in the same workshop' and might even be considered by the hand of Dieric Bouts the Younger (p. 132); the San Francisco painting 'should be regarded as a copy' (p. 132). The extensive arguments showing the differences between the three versions leave no doubt that the Bargello and San Francisco paintings should have been inserted in the A and B-categories of the catalogue. An inconsistent attribution is presented again in the author's assessment of the Louvre *Virgin and Child*, which is incorporated as an autograph work by Dieric Bouts in the catalogue (cat.no. 20). However, the author argues elsewhere at length that the *Virgin and Child* 'should be attributed to Dieric Bouts the Younger who, for the skillful layout of the composition, may have been helped by his father' (pp. 150 and 155). It is clear that the Louvre *Virgin and Child* should have been inserted in the A-part of the catalogue. The same holds true for the Fogg Art Museum's *Virgin and Child*, which is included in the catalogue as an autograph work (cat.no. 25), but with a *post mortem* dating after 1475; elsewhere the author argues that the painting would have been a collaboration between Albert Bouts, who executed the Virgin, and an assistant who painted the figure of Jesus (p. 158-160). A similar discrepancy appears in the author's treatment of the

Brussels *Crucifixion Tüchlein*, as mentioned above. Catalogued as number 2 of the autograph works, the author argues elsewhere that its 'Dutch-influenced style diverges markedly ... from that of Bouts' (p. 174), and that it could have been painted by a member of Dieric Bouts's workshop, most likely the Master of the Munich Betrayal (p. 176). Then again on p. 194 she regards the painting as a collaboration between Dieric Bouts and a member of his workshop other than the Master of the Munich Betrayal. These inconsistencies in attributions are incomprehensible, since the author evidently spent much time to come to her well-reasoned arguments for answering attribution questions in her text. More importantly, they do hamper the ambition of this monograph to offer a substantially argued demonstration of attributions, as promised in the introduction.

Despite the noted problematic areas, this monograph adds significantly to our understanding of Dieric Bouts by its comprehensive examination of the artist's oeuvre and workshop and by offering new insights into his working methods, in particular his use of incised lines to prepare his compositions. A tighter editing of the book however, as noted in my review, would have made for a more convincing study.

YVETTE BRUIJNEN

NOTES

¹ Some examples are: M. Ainsworth, exh.cat. *Facsimile in early Netherlandish painting: Dieric Bouts's "Virgin and Child"*, New York (The Metropolitan Museum of Art) 1993-1995; D. Bomford, A. Roy and A. Smith, 'The Technique of Dieric Bouts, Two Paintings Contrasted', *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 10 (1986), pp. 39-57; P. Eikemeier, *Dieric Bouts. Johannes der Täufer weist auf Jesus hin: Siehe, das Lamm Gottes (Ecce Agnus Dei)*, Munich 1990; M. Leonard et al., 'Dieric Bouts's Annunciation. Materials and Techniques: a Summary', *The Burlington Magazine* 130 (1988), pp. 517-520; N. Veronee-Verhaegen, 'La Chute des Damnés de Thierry Bouts au Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lille. Note iconographique', *Bulletin van het Koninklijk Instituut voor het Kunstpatrimonium* 13 (1971-1972), pp. 20-29; F. van Molle et al., 'La Justice d'Othon de Thierry Bouts', *Bulletin de l'Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique* 1 (1958), pp. 7-69.

² F. Baudouin, exh.cat. *Dieric Bouts*, Delft (Museum Prinsenhof), Brussels (Paleis voor Schone Kunsten) 1957-1958; J. Crab ed.,

exh.cat. *Dirk Bouts en zijn tijd*, Louvain (Sint-Pieterskerk) 1975.

³ M. Smeyers ed., exh.cat. *Dirk Bouts (ca. 1410-1475) een Vlaams Primitief te Leuven*, Louvain (Sint-Pieterskerk and Predikherenkerk) 1998; M. Smeyers, *Dirk Bouts. Schilder van stilte*, Louvain 1998; A. Bergmans ed., *Leuven in de Late Middeleeuwen. Dirk Bouts. Het Laatste Avondmaal*, Tilt-Brussels 1998.

⁴ *Thierry Bouts. L'oeuvre complet*, Brussels 2005; *Dirk Bouts. Het volledige oeuvre*, Brussels 2005.

⁵ For example on page 15 the author mentions that the name of Dieric Bouts crops up in several sixteenth-century texts without giving references. On page 17 there is no reference to the source of the first appearance of Bouts in the town records of Louvain. Other missing references occur frequently. In the English edition two footnotes are added, but do not complete the missing references by far. Furthermore, fig. 2 shows the portrait of Dieric Bouts from Lampsonius, but with the eulogy on Bernard van Orley. See for the correct eulogy: M. Smeyers 1998

Schilder van stilte (note 3), fig. on p. 11.

⁶ Some of the missing literature: A. Meulemans, 'De Leuvense Broederschap van Sint-Lucas', *Jaarboek van de Geschied- en Oudheidkundige Kring voor Leuven en Omgeving* 19 (1979), pp. 3-63; J. Wisse, *Official City Painters in Brabant, 1400-1500: a documentary and interpretive approach*, dissertation New York University, Ann Arbor 1999. As far as the references to exhibition catalogues is concerned, in the list of exhibitions on page 393, the museums where the exhibitions were held are missing.

⁷ In this specific instance a footnote with data on this German painting as well as an illustration would have been helpful.

⁸ Yet, on page 262, the author strangely enough claims that the proposed identification by Bert Cardon of one figure on the *Holy Sacrament* altarpiece as Erasmus van Baussele is most probably right.

⁹ Please note that the transcription of Bouts's receipt (fig. 4) as given in footnote 4 on page 59 is not

accurate. It should read: ...*de(n)*
werc dat ic ghemaect hebbe de(n)
heilichen sacrament.

¹⁰ P. Klein, 'Bericht über die dendrochronologische Untersuchung der Flügel 'Mannalese' und 'Traum Elias' (rechts) sowie 'Abraham und Melchisedech' und 'Paschafest' (links) des Triptychon 'Abendmahl' (D. Bouts); in: R. van Schoute and H. Verougstraete-Marcq ed., *Le Dessin sous-jacent dans la peinture. Colloque VII, 17-19 septembre 1987. Géographie et chronologie du dessin sous-jacent*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1989, pp. 171-172; P. Klein, 'Dendrochronological Finding of the van Eyck-Christus-Bouts Group', in: M.W. Ainsworth ed., *Petrus Christus in Renaissance Bruges. An Interdisciplinary Approach*, New York-Turnhout 1995, pp. 149-165.

¹¹ J. Vynckier, 'Laboratoriumonderzoek', in: A. Bergmans ed., *Leuven in de Late Middeleeuwen. Dirk Bouts. Het Laatste Avondmaal*, Tielt-Brussels 1998, pp. 228-235.

¹² P. Klein, 'Dendrochronological Findings of the Bouts Group', in: B. Cardon et al., *Bouts Studies. Proceedings of The International*

Colloquium, Louvain-Paris-Sterling 2001, pp. 411-422, in particular p. 417.

¹³ In the case of cat.nos. 4, 12 and 15 the author shows illustrations of paint samples in the text (fig. 82-84 and 98), but does not list the paint samples in the Technical notes of the catalogue entries.

¹⁴ M. Smeyers 1998 *Schilder van stilte* (note 3), p. 132.

¹⁵ Please note that the author herself emphasizes the prudence with which one should use the dendrochronological results for dating, for example on page 180. In the entry of the Munich 'Pearl of Brabant' (cat.no. A2), the author even admits in footnote 10 on page 323 that caution is necessary with interpreting the results of dendrochronology; this makes her firm conclusions in the text all the more incomprehensible.

¹⁶ These are cat. nos. 7, 9 and 18.

¹⁷ The author spends one paragraph on the Master of Saint John on Patmos, whose name work in Rotterdam (cat.no. B8) is attributed to the Bruges Master of the Legend of Saint Lucy. In the

text on p. 192 the author agrees with this attribution, while in the catalogue entry on p. 368 she inconsequently attributes it to an artist from the circle of the Master of the Legend of Saint Lucy. The author also mentions Jan Rombouts who, according to Schöne, was trained in Bouts's workshop. She was apparently not aware that the sole painting attributed to Rombouts was de-attributed in the 1998 Louvain exhibition catalogue, by consequence of which Jan Rombouts can no longer be considered a Bouts-trainee. See Louvain 1998 (note 3), cat. no. 85.

¹⁸ Both published by T. Husband ed., exh.cat. *The Luminous Image. Painted Glass Roundels in the Lowlands, 1480-1560*, New York (The Metropolitan Museum of Art) 1995, cat.nos. 26 and 40.

¹⁹ See Y. Bruijnen, 'Reminiscences of Dirk Bouts in the work of Jan van Rillaer', in: *Bouts Studies. Proceedings of the International Colloquium (Leuven, 26-28 November 1998)*, Louvain 2001, pp. 317-330.

²⁰ The Provenances are unfortunately without references.