

## Early Dutch Painting: Thirty Years On\*

The lavish exhibition *Vroege Hollanders*, organised by the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen in 2008<sup>1</sup> gave me the enviable opportunity of seeing side by side a large number of the works which my research had focused on for many years leading to a publication in 1980.<sup>2</sup> Since the publication of this work, few studies have approached the subject as a whole, apart from the Rotterdam exhibition which had a similar ambition. Importantly, two new techniques of panel painting analysis, infrared reflectography and dendrochronology, which were only making their appearance at the time of my research, are now widely practised, and thus have brought new information. Consequently, it was tempting to return thirty years later to the questions raised by my original study, to bring the necessary corrections, and to determine what can be consolidated in the light of these new informations. A symposium organised by the Rotterdam museum at the end of the exhibition gave me the opportunity to engage in this exercise.

The originality of my research resided in its attempt to offer quite a precise chronology of the evolution of painting in the Northern Netherlands in the fifteenth century combining all available methods of dating. This is why the new information provided by dendrochronology can be valuable in confirming or contradicting my original proposals. This data must, however, be used with caution, carefully assessing its exact value. The only scientifically-established element brought by this analysis is the date of the last identifiable ring. One should remember that this date is established by comparing the cross-section of a painted panel with a series of dated cross-sections, so that one cannot exclude the possibility of an error, whether the operation is conducted by the naked eye or by a particular computer programme. From there, everything is hypothetical: indeed, in order to establish the date when the wood was used, one needs to assess – necessarily arbitrarily – the total number of sapwood rings which the tree must have featured when it was felled and how long it was left to dry. Peter Klein, whose work has been essential to this field had preferred in his first analyses to opt for long timespans – fifteen years of sapwood growth, ten years of drying – so as not to underestimate the time taken by the process. As a consequence, by accepting this raw data, one runs the risk of adopting too late a date for the works. The art historian should thus only take into account the lowest estimates for these two elements – i.e., nine years of sapwood growth, two years of drying, evaluations which could still be occasionally too long – and examine whether the date thus obtained, and therefore a later date for the execution of the painting, is compatible with historical data.

### Jan van Eyck in Holland

Although this topic occupies a very important chapter in my book, I shall not discuss it at length here. Indeed, I have extensively published on this subject in a study

originally intended to accompany an edition of the Turin and Turin-Milan Hours, initiated and subsequently abandoned by Electa editions.<sup>3</sup> Faksimile Verlag took over the project without taking into account the work which I had already completed, and asked Anne van Buren to write the commentary volume.<sup>4</sup> This publication, not easily accessible because of the exorbitant price of the facsimile, only contributes minor elements to the particular question of the eyckian intervention. A hitherto unknown single leaf acquired by the J. Paul Getty Museum has recently yielded important new information regarding the history of the manuscript.<sup>5</sup> The last owner to commission miniatures for the manuscript was none other than Engelbert I, Count of Nassau, and it was Jean de Pestivien,<sup>6</sup> also known as the Master of Jean Chevrot, who realised the greatest part of these illustrations, and probably oversaw the rest of the programme. The book must have passed to the House of Savoy in 1502 when the grandson of the Count of Nassau married Françoise-Louise of Savoy, daughter of the Count of Romont.

### Albert van Ouwater, also known as Lambrecht van Alpas (Alphen)

Friso Lammertse, in the Rotterdam exhibition catalogue, delivered the most surprising conclusion concerning this mysterious Haarlem artist.<sup>7</sup> No trace of this painter could be found in any document, except in a payment made for the funeral of his daughter, however this turned out to be the result of a misreading of the document. I had therefore suggested that his name had perhaps been transcribed erroneously by Karel van Mander. One should remember that van Mander had only obtained his informations in 1604 from Albert Simonsz, then aged sixty, who therefore had not known the master of Geertgen tot Sint Jans. He had heard about him from Mostaert who himself only knew the fame of this painter. The oral transmission of information over more than one hundred and fifty years, i.e. at least three generations, could well have caused the corruption of certain names. This is why I suggested that Lambrecht Rutghensz, a painter who was apparently important in Haarlem and documented from 1426 to 1468 could well be the artist we are looking for: a corruption of Lambrecht into Albrecht is an easy mistake, which can have resulted from an uncertain memory of the final 'brecht' to lead to the more common name of Albrecht. Antonio de Beatis changed in the same way the name of 'Hubert' into 'Roberto'. The Ouwater mystery still remained to be elucidated. After methodically searching the archives, Sjoerd Bijker found that this artist was also called 'Lambrecht van Alpas' in the Haarlem municipal accounts for 1446, which curiously had gone astray at the time when I was myself researching these records. Alpas must be understood as a variation on the name of the city of Alphen aan den Rijn located on the Oude Rijn, about twenty kilometres from Oudewater. P. Plemper explained in 1714 that its inhabitants were called 'Alpannen' because their ancestors had come from alpine regions, and that the town was sometimes called *Alpan*, or *Alphet*.<sup>8</sup> The corruption of Alpan into Alpas could be the result of a simple clerical error, or could have been induced by its closeness to the name of the river 'Alblas' in the same region. Confusing Oudewater with 'Oude Rijn' on the banks of which Alphen is located, is again possible, especially since these places are close, only about thirty kilometres away from each other. This precision regarding the name of Lambrecht Rutghensz thus seems to corroborate my hypothesis which was already supported by the payment made for the "cleaning"<sup>9</sup> of the backgrounds behind the apostle figures on the Saint Bavo pillars painted in a style very close to that of the Berlin *Raising of Lazarus*.

I had dated the Berlin *Raising of Lazarus* (Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie) to between 1435 and 1445 because it seemed to me that this work was earlier than the *Exhumation of Saint Hubert* at the National Gallery in London. Dendrochronological examination has here proved me wrong. Yet, it is not the date

of 1460 which should be retained, as the Rotterdam catalogue and other scholars argue. The last visible ring in the Berlin panel is dated to 1436, which suggests, if one adds nine years of sapwood, a felling of the tree taking place ca. 1445, and a possible use after two years of drying, as early as 1449. A date of ca. 1450 for the painting, i.e. ten years earlier, is thus perfectly plausible. This date would suggest that the Hollander was inspired by the Fleming whom I have recently identified as Louis le Duc, nephew of Rogier van der Weyden.<sup>10</sup> But this does not greatly affect my interpretation. This means that the compositional borrowings of the *Exhumation of Saint Hubert* were interpreted through the prism of an eyckian culture which changed their character.

This identification also reinforces my hypothesis to attribute to this painter the original portrait of Jacqueline of Bavaria, only known through copies.<sup>11</sup> In 1983 J.K. Steppe published a passage from the inventory of the collections of Charles de Croÿ at the castle of Heverlee dating to ca. 1612, mentioning an inscription found on the upper border of the frame of a portrait of the princess, which read *Actum a<sup>o</sup> dni 1432 G III augusti a Lamberto de Eyck*.<sup>12</sup> He deduced from this that the brother of Jan van Eyck, known only through two archival references in 1430-1431 and in 1442 where his profession is not specified, was also a painter. Yet it would be surprising if, in the year that saw the completion of the *Adoration of the Lamb*, Jan should have let his brother have such an important commission, also giving him the chance to sign it with his own name. If the inscription included the name of 'Lamberto de Alpan' or a form using a Latin version of the name of the town, such as 'Albinis', the compiler of the inventory failing to decipher it, could have replaced it with the more famous name of Eyck. Alternatively, the name of the town may have been erased and replaced with one that could suggest a famous painter, even before the painting came into the hands of Charles de Croÿ, to increase the value of the work: such tricks could have already been used by art merchants at that period.



### *The Man with a Pink*, Jean II de Ligne

This reasoning also applies to the proposed attribution of *The Man with a Pink* (fig. 2) which is clearly related to the portrait of the princess, especially in the treatment of the hands as it appears in the copy now at the museum of Copenhagen. In this respect, the two paintings directly echo Karel van Mander's praise of the painter's great skill in rendering heads, hands and feet.<sup>13</sup> A tentative identification of this man can be proposed: he is the same man who appears to the extreme right on the drawing kept at the Louvre which I have interpreted as an *Allegorical depiction of the Conference at Biervliet* (fig. 1).<sup>14</sup> His prominent position in this composition indicates he is an important character and allows us to recognise him as Jean II, lord of Ligne, who negotiated the contract on behalf of Jacqueline of Bavaria for whom he acted as legal guardian. In 1440, aged eighty, he was to marry his second wife, Isabelle de Zevenberghe, daughter of Arnould de Zevenberghe, margrave of Antwerp.<sup>15</sup> The pink he is holding could thus be a reference to this union: the painting could have been conceived on its own or as a pendant to the portrait of his future wife. This identification is further confirmed by his strange tomb effigy (fig. 3), which was executed much earlier, probably before the death of his first wife who is shown lying beside him.<sup>16</sup> The face in stone has more youthful features than that in the painting, yet they are very close: deep eye sockets, narrow and rounded chin, prominent ears, and the same wrinkles on the forehead. That Jean de Ligne, who had remained strongly attached to Jacqueline of Bavaria, should choose for his portrait the same artist as her is not surprising, especially since his second wife came from Zeeland, close to where the princess had spent the latter part of her life.

1 *Allegorical Depiction of the Conference at Biervliet*, detail, Jean II de Ligne. Paris, Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, inv. 20.674.



<sup>2</sup> Albert van Ouwater, *Portrait of a Man with a Pink*, panel, 40 x 31 cm. Berlin, Gemäldegalerie.



<sup>3</sup> *Gisant of Jean II de Ligne*, detail. Ligne, Church of Our Lady.

In this case, however, dendrochronology is problematic. Peter Klein, who examined the panel on 19 February 1997, reports that the most recent identified ring dates to 1459. The painting can therefore not be the original portrait of Jean II de Ligne. The exceptional quality of the work, which has argued for many years in favour of an attribution to van Eyck himself, suggests it could be an autograph copy by his hand commissioned by the family to feature in some genealogical ensemble. Peter Klein considers 1468 as the earliest possible date for its execution, 1468 is also the year in which the name of Lambrecht van Alpas is last mentioned. The attribution of the painting to our artist himself, as autograph copy of the 1440 original thus remains possible.<sup>17</sup>

### The presumed Jan Coene or Lambrecht van Alpas

A curious artist worked alongside Jan van Eyck in Holland, contributing to the illumination of the *Turin-Milan Hours*, a hand which Georges Hulin de Loo had designated as H and whom he recognised as Jan van Eyck himself, Hand G being, in his opinion, Hubert van Eyck. As early as 1916, Max Friedländer had expressed the idea that the miniatures in this hand could be the work of a late imitator dating to ca. 1440, a proposal which is still repeated in numerous studies.<sup>18</sup> Yet I have shown that the depiction of the same patron in both groups G and H clearly proved that they were executed as part of the same campaign. I also offered to identify this artist who was very close to Jan van Eyck, as Jan Coene from Bruges who was active at the same



time and could have been his pupil.<sup>19</sup> The few things we know about his career make this hypothesis plausible, yet I have not found proof that could definitely confirm it.

It is in 1426 that Lambrecht van Alpas makes his first appearance as an independent master in Haarlem, i.e. nearly one year after the end of Jan van Eyck's stay in Holland, which suggests that he could have been part of his team, and could be one of the master's two companions mentioned in the accounts. It has been customary to try and define his personality exclusively through the *Raising of Lazarus* (fig. 5), a relatively late work which cannot have been painted before 1450. However, thirty or forty years earlier, he could have had quite a different style and may have then acquired an eyckian sensibility which remains observable in the only painting whose attribution is attested by the account of Karel van Mander. One can thus reasonably wonder whether the miniatures and paintings attributed to this mysterious Master H could not be by his hand rather than by Jan Coene.

In the miniatures, the heavy treatment of details in the faces of many figures gives them at first a slightly grimacing aspect which is totally absent from the painting in Berlin, and could thus argue against this identification. Yet one should not be deterred by such an objection: first because the disappearance of this feature could be explained by the natural evolution of the painter, and because his meticulousness could be an early expression of his interest in analysing faces, which is manifest in the *Raising of Lazarus* as well as in the *Man with a Pink*. The concentration of descriptive elements on such small surfaces as the faces of figures in miniatures could be the sole reason behind these grimacing features which then vanished when the painter worked on larger surfaces.

In several miniatures, Master H essentially conveys the idiom of the master of the workshop, as in the Crucifixion in the *Turin-Milan Hours*, God the Father enthroned, or in the Saint Thomas miniature in the *Turin Hours*. In the case of the *Virgo inter Virgines*, he probably adapts a drawing originally made by an artist working in the service of the duke of Berry, maybe the Master of the *Parement de Narbonne*, left



in an unfinished state on parchment. It is in the Lamentation, the Agony in the Garden and the Finding of the True Cross (although the latter was probably slightly reworked by Jan van Eyck himself), that one finds his most personal creations. What is at first striking in these compositions is the interest in the depiction of the foreground figures. With him, the landscape is a backdrop related to the protagonists of the scenes and yet, they do not seem to belong to it. This treatment is diametrically opposed to that of Jan van Eyck, as one can see most clearly in the *Journey of Saint Julian and Saint Martha* or the *Nativity of Saint John the Baptist* in the same manuscript. This is the reason why the scene of Saint Francis receiving the Stigmata now in Philadelphia cannot be attributed to the hand of Jan van Eyck, as the museum still argues.<sup>20</sup> In a similar way, all the figures in the *Raising of Lazarus* are gathered in the foreground, and the church, no matter how meticulously rendered, still belongs to the background. This same treatment appears on two other pages, featuring the Lamentation and the Agony in the Garden where lavish draperies spreading like corollas in the foreground seem to form a base to the scene like Mary Magdalene's cloak in the *Raising of Lazarus* (fig. 4 and 5).

In the Berlin painting, the reading of the composition is compellingly guided by hand gesture. Hands are meticulously rendered, and they form a circle around the head of Lazarus in the centre of the composition: the hands of Mary Magdalene, Christ, and Saint Peter, linked to his, and those of the two Jews which express rejection (fig. 6). This expressive treatment of the hands curiously features in all miniatures, even those which were initially designed by Jan van Eyck: in the *Crucifixion* scene, the hands of the Virgin and of Saint John are prominent, and in the *Agony in the Garden* the joined hands of Jesus raised towards the sky contrast with those of the three apostles, barely visible and yet creating bright areas in the composition, as if to stress the absence and distance engendered by sleep. In the *Lamentation*, the body of Christ is framed by three pairs of hands, that of Mary Magdalene, supporting his head, of the Virgin



gesturing towards his body, and those joined in prayer of the second holy woman expressing her sorrow. Even in the *Virgo inter Virgines*, the hand gestures of the two female saints, and the Virgin and Child visually relates these four foreground figures. Although the small scale of these details does not allow the painter to analyse them with the same accuracy as in his large scale paintings, they are never mere shapeless touches of colour but visibly convey the movement of fingers. We should finally stress a minor yet troubling detail: the nose of Lazarus, like that of saint Peter is depicted as if seen from below. Few painters would attempt to depict such a detail, probably to avoid its mundane character, but also because it is difficult to draw (fig. 7).

In spite of these observations, these may leave some doubts as to whether the first brushstrokes of the great Hollander should be recognised here. However, if one does not want to accept these works as his own, one must admit that he had close contacts with their author. In 1918, Max Dvorák had already proposed the name of Albert van Ouwater when discussing the *Turin-Milan Hours*.<sup>21</sup> His reasoning was however very different. He recognised in the miniatures painted by Hand G the skills which Karel van Mander attributed to the painter, and he argued they must have been executed ca. 1435 for Jacqueline of Bavaria. He thus was not preoccupied with their relationship to the *Raising of Lazarus* whose different stylistic features he explained by its later date. Although he knew the valuable work of Georges Hulin de Loo, he did not take into account the manuscript or its codicology, so that his discussion, as articulate as it may be, remains unjustified. Only Charles de Tolnay agreed with him, stressing



7  
Albert van Ouwater, *Agony in the Garden*, *Turin-Milan Hours*, folio 30 v°, detail, saint Peter. Turin, Museo civico.

however that such an attribution was only possible if one rejected that of the *Raising of Lazarus* to Albert van Ouwater.<sup>22</sup> There is therefore no relation between these proposals and the one which I am offering here, of which I am surprised, and somewhat embarrassed not to have thought of earlier.

### Dirk Bouts in Holland

The Holland origin of Dirk Bouts is as problematic as the personality of Albert van Ouwater: no trace of this artist could be found in the Haarlem archives. Frans Baudouin and myself have suggested he was a member of the important Albout family but this could not be confirmed. Dendrochronological studies have brought some important elements to the discussion, as I have recently tried to demonstrate in my review of the unfortunately disappointing monograph on this artist written by Catheline Périer d'Ieteren.<sup>23</sup> These show that for at least fifteen years the painter used wood that probably came from the same batch purchased around 1444. This concerns the paintings which I consider as his earliest works and which I held to have been painted in Holland. The hypothesis according to which the painter was forced to leave the Northern Netherlands after the Haarlem upheavals in 1444, circumstances which led the burgomaster Hugo Albout to exile is thus not yet to be excluded, as this purchase would be contemporary or slightly later. The *Triptych of the Virgin* (Madrid, Prado Museum) and *The Supper in the House of Simon* (Berlin, Gemäldegalerie), which I supposed to have been painted in Holland, could have been executed in the Southern Netherlands. The patron of the latter, whose cloak seems to identify him as a Premonstratensian, could be a monk from Tongerlo.

It thus seems that no work of this painter can be assigned to his Holland origins. In 1980, I had not been able to make any hypothesis regarding his early training, and I had mainly stressed the contacts, probably early in his career, with the painters of the Southern Netherlands. A training with Lambrecht van Alpas, known as Albert van Ouwater, can now be considered as very likely and the identification of Hand H as Albert van Ouwater seems to support this proposal.

### The Master of the Taking of Christ

The three panel paintings attributable to this painter<sup>24</sup> present us with one of the most challenging problems concerning the 'Bouts Group', as it was coined by Paul Coremans. Catheline Périer d'Ieteren saw in their author a close collaborator of the master, and she recognised his hand in works which are so different from the two Munich wings that her proposals cannot be retained.<sup>25</sup> Here again dendrochronology is problematic. The last identified ring in the Munich wings dates to 1461, which means that the panels could hardly have been used before ca. 1472. Yet a copy, or rather a version of them was painted by the so-called Lyversberg Passion Master, active in Cologne, on the wings of the main altarpiece at the Chartreuse de Sainte Barbe which was commissioned by Peter Rinck in 1464 according to the annals of the convent. Indeed this date could correspond solely to the commission, but it would be surprising for it to only be executed ten years later.<sup>26</sup> In this particular case, the conclusions of the dendrochronological examination seem difficult to reconcile with the historical data, to such an extent that one could wonder whether they are to be trusted.<sup>27</sup>

In any case, I would hesitate today to maintain that the artist at work on these panels was from Holland. The few reasons I had invoked to support this now do not seem to me substantial enough. If we accept such a late date as 1472, one could envisage an artist very close to the master, possibly belonging to his atelier, to whom

he would have entrusted the execution of the paintings for Cologne, while he was busy with the more prestigious commissions made by the city of Leuven. One could even perhaps propose the name of Dirk Bouts the Younger, who died in 1490 (or early 1491), and thus likely only had a fifteen-year career.<sup>28</sup>

### Geertgen tot Sint Jans

The section dedicated to this artist at the Rotterdam exhibition was disconcerting. The twelve paintings gathered under his name presented very different features. It is therefore not surprising that one of the organisers, before I could see the exhibition wrote to me: 'reading the panel presenting the works of Geertgen in the exhibition, one cannot understand how they can be by the same painter, it may be that they were painted by three, four, or five different artists.' During the symposium organised at the end of the exhibition, Micha Leeflang, a young colleague who had been involved in the preparation of the exhibition, presented with enthusiasm the paintings which in her opinion could be considered as autograph, such as the Vienna panels (unfortunately not included in the exhibition): they were the ones I had selected in 1980.

On this question, dendrochronology brings some interesting precisions which have not been fully exploited.<sup>29</sup> The last rings on four of the paintings which I had considered as work of the master are virtually identical, indicating 1458 for the two wings of *The Altarpiece of the Hospitallers* and the Cleveland *Adoration of the Magi*, and 1457 for the Louvre *Raising of Lazarus*. In the Berlin *Saint John the Baptist in the Wilderness*, the ring produces the slightly earlier date of 1448, while the Utrecht *Man of Sorrows* which I consider as the last known work of the artist indicates 1461. However, the triptych of the *Adoration of the Magi* in Prague which I had believed to be an early work presents a ring dated to 1467: it thus probably does not belong to the same group and should be given a later date.

Truus van Bueren, who studied the history of the convent, gave her preference to the date of 1481 provided by Peter Klein for the execution of the Vienna panels, probably because of its 'scientific' origin.<sup>30</sup> Yet it is only an estimate based on three factors, of which only one is scientifically established, that of the date of the last identifiable ring, 1456 in this case, to which were arbitrarily added fifteen years of sapwood and ten years of drying. However, if one were to count nine years of sapwood and two of drying, one could envisage that the painting of the panels took place anytime from 1467, or expressed differently, between 1467 and 1481, this latter date being a *terminus ante quem* rather than a *terminus post quem*. It would have made sense to confront historical elements with this data. All documentary evidence pre-dates 1481, as I showed in my book. Geertgen certainly arrived at the Commanderie before 1472, probably ca. 1468, and the acquisition of the relics of Saint John the Baptist by the Great Master of the Order in 1484 provides a *terminus ante quem* (and not *post quem*!) as the authentication of the relics was provided by a different legend from that depicted by the painter. Yet the significance of these elements paled in comparison to a scientifically established date, however erroneously.

Taking into account the history of the Johannites, it is likely that Geertgen was the protégé of Pieter van Schoten, commander at Haarlem from 1460 to 1472. I offered to date the execution of the altarpiece between 1470 and 1475, considering that the painter was active between 1465 and 1475. These proposals are perfectly compatible with dendrochronological examination, as even the Utrecht *Man of Sorrows*, painted on the most recent panel could have been executed after 1472 and can thus fit into these dates.

On the other hand, the same examination conducted on certain paintings, which some persist in attributing to the master, shows that they cannot have been executed so early: the Amsterdam *Holy Kinship* with a last ring dated to 1475 was probably not

painted before 1486, the Berlin *Virgin and Child* not before 1483 (ring dated to 1472), the *Saint Jerome in the Wilderness* at the De Boer Foundation not before 1490 (ring dated to 1479), the Winterthur *Adoration of the Magi* not before 1482 (1471 ring), and the *Tree of Jesse* at the Rijksmuseum not before 1480 (1469 ring). The oldest ring in this group dates to 1469, which is twelve years later than the oldest of the panels used by Geertgen who, having died aged twenty-eight, could not have been active more than around ten years. For these paintings to be by his hand, one would have to suppose that the painter used a stock of old wood for one group of paintings, while at the same time using some more recent panels, which is not unlikely. Dendrochronological analysis thus confirms that a whole group of paintings attributed to the Johannites painter should be removed from his oeuvre, as I had suggested.

Basic instructions regarding colour appear on infrared reflectography of the panels from the *Altarpiece of the Hospitallers*. Some were already visible in views taken by J.R.J. Asperen de Boer: I took some of these into account in my 1980 publication, but they were especially visible in the views taken by Molly Faries in 1991.<sup>31</sup> I am tempted to draw from this evidence that Geertgen had a collaborator (a conclusion which I had not reached in my book): no such indications would have been needed, had he been working on his own. This associate could be the one I called Master of the Amsterdam Holy Kinship, the closest hand to the painter. To the paintings I attributed to him, one should add the *Triptych of the Adoration of the Magi* now in Prague which I had mistakenly held to be an early work of Geertgen. This is however not possible, as dendrochronological examination reveals a last ring dated to 1467, implying that the painting could only have been executed ca. 1478 at the earliest.

A curious detail could confirm this hypothesis. In the painting dedicated to the relics of Saint John the Baptist in Vienna, I have shown that the young man behind the group of Johannites can be recognised as a self-portrait of the painter. Beside him to the left, beyond the elderly man with a black hat, stands a bearded youth who has very similar features to those of Saint Bavo in the left wing of the Prague triptych (fig. 9 and 10). The artist responsible for the Prague painting probably did not intend to depict the saint as himself, but he may have based this face on his own, with a few subtle variations. We find other examples of this practice in Northern Netherlandish painting.<sup>32</sup> It is not possible to establish with certainty whether this artist is Vrederic Hoon, documented from 1463 to 1505, as I have suggested before.

The Master of the Brunswick Diptych is another artist close to Geertgen, whom Karel Boon offered to identify as Jacob Jansz (documented from 1483 to 1509), teacher of Jan Mostaert, and to whom I attributed a slightly larger number of works. Dendrochronological analysis of the Amsterdam *Tree of Jesse* and of the *Saint Jerome* now at the De Boer Foundation gives results compatible with these dates. It would have been interesting to conduct the same analysis on the diptych at the Brunswick museum after which this painter was called before the identification with Jacob Jansz was put forward.

Although the Amsterdam *Adoration of the Magi*, with a last ring dating to 1454, could have been executed anytime after 1465, it seems to me that it does not belong stylistically to Geertgen's early career. The early date of its support could mean that the artist was using a much older panel. The matter is further complicated by the existence of a painting very close in composition in the collection of Oscar Reinhart de Winterthur.<sup>33</sup> The last ring in this painting dates to 1471, which implies that it could hardly have been executed before 1480. I had attributed it to the Master of the Holy Kinship, but the low quality of its craftsmanship, more visible since its recent restoration, and the greater inventiveness of the central panel in the Prague triptych which could be earlier, would rather indicate the work of a hand close to this master taking its inspiration from the same original model (possibly a lost early work by Geertgen) as Jacob Jansz for the Amsterdam *Adoration of the Magi*.



<sup>9</sup> Master of the Amsterdam, *Holy Kinship, Triptych of the Adoration of the Magi*, detail, head of Saint Bavo. Prague, Národní galerie v Praze.



<sup>10</sup> Geertgen tot Sint Jans, *The Burning of the bones of Saint John the Baptist*, detail, head of the presumed assistant to Geertgen. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.

## The Waterlandt

Dendrochronology can also be misleading, as for the *Virgin in the Sun* and *Crucifixion* diptych shared between the Boijmans Van Beuningen Museum and Edinburgh. The most recent ring identified on the latter dates to 1443 and thus would suggest a date of execution in or after 1454 which would justify the attribution to Geertgen, asserted early on. However, analysis on the *Crucifixion* wing gives the date of 1462, which implies that the painting was not executed before 1473. A close collaborator of Georges Wildenstein had provided me, at my request, with a photograph of the Rotterdam panel before it joined the Van Beuningen collection, while asking me not to shed doubts on the attribution: implicitly, he thus acknowledged that Georges Wildenstein and himself did not have great faith in it. Yet, the charm of the composition has convinced numerous art historians who do not seem to have been troubled by the discovery of the second panel, which suffers from a weak composition and mediocre craftsmanship. For my part, I still believe that my reasons (which I have

presented before) to attribute it to the Master of the Antwerp Triptych are still valid and were made even more visible through the recent restoration of the eponymous triptych which has made the quality of its execution more apparent.

I had also offered to identify this artist, together with the Master of the Figdor Deposition who seemed to be very close, with two brothers, Mouwerijn and Claesz Simonsz van Waterlant who were active in the late fifteenth century in Haarlem, as is shown by the extensive archival evidence. Jeremy Dupertuis Bangs strongly disagrees with me on this point.<sup>34</sup> I am not sure I was right in this proposed identification and have not had the opportunity to seriously re-examine the basis of my argument. However, the thesis of Jeremy Dupertuis Bangs rests on unconvincing elements. He identified the coat of arms appearing in the stained glass window in the background of the *Holy Family in a chamber* at the Dresden museum as belonging to this family of painters, and Konstanze Krüger has justly shown that this identification could not be retained.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, the group of paintings which Jeremy Dupertuis Bangs gathered displays very different styles in which it would be difficult to recognise the hands of two brothers. The study conducted by this historian remains however extremely important as he published a vast amount of archival documents related to this family, and perhaps I will indeed have to review the hypothetical identification I had made.

### **The Master of the Manna, brother Tymanus and Hugo Jacobz**

The *Gathering of the Manna* and the *Crucifixion* in the Douai museum and the Rotterdam *Offering of the Jews* once formed a Eucharistic altarpiece. The idea of combining the two Old Testament scenes with the Crucifixion could have come from examples found in the chapel of the Miraculous Corporal in the Orvieto Cathedral. Neither in 1980 nor at the time of the 1990 exhibition at the Chartreuse Museum in Douai,<sup>36</sup> was I aware of M.L. Wurbain's publication, which provides critical information.<sup>37</sup> Indeed it reveals that in the Leyden convent of Val Saint Jérôme, commonly known as Lopsen, two monks, called Tymanus and Tricus, practised painting. This institution, founded around 1404, was at first linked to the Utrecht congregation and had adopted the rule of the Third Order of Saint Francis. Around 1460, it switched to the Augustinian rule and became associated with Windesheim Brethren. The activity of Tymanus, the first of these painters, is documented between 1446 and 1482, and he had Hugo Jacobsz as his collaborator in 1469 and 1471.

I have insisted on the close links between the Master of the Manna and the painter of the Saint John panels which van Regteren Altena attributed to Hugo Jacobsz.<sup>38</sup> The documents support this attribution and could argue in favour of identifying the Master of the Manna as brother Tymanus. It is difficult to understand why these identifications are not yet unanimously accepted.

### **The Master of the Virgo inter Virgines**

Recent publications on this artist have not contributed anything particularly new, apart from a few results of dendrochronological analyses realised by Peter Klein and published by Claudia Unger, which raise more questions than they bring conclusions.<sup>39</sup> A large number of wood engravings printed in Delft, and certainly based on drawings by the artist, suggest he flourished between 1483 and 1498. The last identifiable ring of the Prado *Lamentation* panel which I considered as the earliest known work of the artist indicates 1451 and thus argues for an execution from 1462, which is certainly far too early. As the composition is a variation of one of the

panels of the *Altarpiece of the Hospitallers* painted by Geertgen, it thus can hardly be dated before 1470 at the earliest. The date of 1476 proposed by Jeroen Giltaij is thus plausible, although its precision is based on the hypothesis of fifteen years of sapwood followed by ten years of drying.<sup>40</sup> The presumed wings of this painting, kept at the Suermondt Museum (Aachen), however, present a ring dated to 1466 and their reverse to the following year which argues for a date of execution from 1478.<sup>41</sup> This date is not impossible for the whole ensemble, but seems slightly too late when taking into account the dates of the first wood engravings made after the work of this painter. Should one infer from this that these wings were not designed to accompany the Prado painting, as Jeroen Giltaij argues, or that they were added to it at a slightly later date?

The large Marian retable kept at Salzburg presents a last ring dating to 1448, which suggests the painting was executed sometime after 1459. Yet, it seems impossible to argue that it predates the more hesitant and clumsy Prado painting, which confirms the artist was not using the wooden panels in a strictly chronological order. The dating of this triptych thus presents us with a problem difficult to solve. Transporting such a piece by land to Hallein must have been challenging. Should thus one envisage, as Jeroen Giltaij suggested at the symposium, that it was executed *in situ* by the artist on his way to Italy, like Jan van Scorel did in Obervellach in 1520? Such a hypothesis cannot be excluded but seems quite unlikely, as no trace of such an Italian journey can be found in the whole production of the Master of the Virgo inter Virgines, even though one could imagine that he then travelled to Lucca where he could also have painted *in situ* the large triptych now at Barnard Castle in England. A shipping of the latter by sea (as in the case of the *Portinari Altarpiece*) would have been considerably easier and the commission could have come from a Luccan merchant or banker based in the Northern Netherlands (but was there any?). The Hallein panel could also have been sent by sea to Venice and quite easily pursued its journey by land via Udine and Villach. It could also have been commissioned by some merchant involved in the commerce of salt from the Austrian mines.

The dendrochronological analysis of the Enghien *Lamentation* is also disconcerting: the last identified ring dates to 1431<sup>42</sup> and could argue for a felling ca. 1440 and the execution of the painting anytime from 1442, which is totally implausible. The date of 1482 was suggested as it corresponds to the arrival of prior Gaspar van der Stock, from the Delft charterhouse,<sup>43</sup> to the Herne Charterhouse to which it belonged, and remains possible. The outstanding pictorial quality and expressivity of the work, made more visible by its recent restoration, clearly indicate that this is a later production. This would imply that the painter began his career at least ca. 1475, if not slightly earlier.

Another somewhat surprising element is the date of the last ring of the *Resurrection* panel at the Rijksmuseum, which would date the execution of the painting after 1464. Yet no analysis was done of the two other panels (Norfolk and New York), which may come from the same ensemble, so that one cannot rule out the possibility of an older panel having been used only for this painting which seems contemporary with at least the first wood engravings, i.e. around 1483.<sup>44</sup> Thus the artist, like Dirk Bouts, must have had access to a stock of panels which he gradually made use of in a random order.

This would support the identification of the artist with Dirc Jansz, documented at Delft between 1474 and 1495. He was probably the son of Jans Isbrantsz, also a painter, only documented from 1446 to 1458 but whose career was certainly longer, and must have inherited his father's atelier. One can also envisage that an artist more concerned by the quality of his panels than other painters would have made them age longer prior to using them.

Finally, the panel of this painter's eponymous work, the Amsterdam *Virgo inter Virgines*, the latest one among all the analysed panels, presents a 1470 ring suggesting an execution in or after 1481. One is actually inclined to argue for a later date, ca. 1490, judging from the style, more appeased and most of all less spontaneous than in the Enghien *Lamentation* or the Saint Louis *Entombment* whose style is close to the 1480s engravings. In the absence of any solid chronological landmark, one cannot exclude the possibility that the artist may have painted simultaneously in two different manners, one more pictorial and expressive, the other less spontaneous and with simpler compositions, depending on the patron and the subjects depicted. The three distinct periods I had proposed for his career do not seem as clear as I had suggested.

The only conclusive element provided by dendrochronology for this painter is that concerning the Vienna *Nativity* which I, together with other scholars, was reluctant to attribute to this artist. This attribution must be rejected once and for all because the earliest possible date for the execution of this painting is 1488, a time when the artist had certainly asserted his style, as is shown by the engravings based on his drawings, whereas if he was the author of this painting it could only plausibly belong to his early works. My proposal to assign this painting to Hugo Jacobsz at the beginning of his career, hesitantly imitating a few formulas used by the Delft painter, thus remains valid.

### Looking back...

It was in 1958, thanks to the exhibition *Middeleeuwse Kunst der Noordelijke Nederlanden* at the Rijksmuseum that my ideas had become more precise. During the ensuing fifty years, the proposals I have made have mostly met a rather unanimous scepticism, as is shown by the review of my publication by Karel Boon,<sup>45</sup> as well as the short anonymous completely negative note (by a Scottish hand?) published by the *Burlington Magazine*<sup>46</sup> or even, to a certain extent, the Rotterdam exhibition catalogue. It is thus a real satisfaction to observe that the studies conducted during this period, be they historical or scientific only lead to minor modifications of what I had published in 1980.

The most important amendment which I offer is to increase the importance of Lambrecht Rutghensz, aka Albert van Ouwater. His identification with Master H in the *Turin-Milan Hours* sheds light on the transmission of Eyckian models in the Northern Netherlands. I am surprised I did not make this proposal earlier, but it will undoubtedly be met with great reserve. It is not easy to abandon the traditional image of this artist, known for a single painting considered as a late work, which dendrochronological analysis combined with the premise of lengthy sapwood and drying periods have dated, unnecessarily and very certainly wrongly, about ten years too late. It seems already so difficult to gain support for the dating of Geertgen's works, for which historical data and scientific analysis however converge.

The resulting picture of painting in the Northern Netherlands in the fifteenth century is not radically transformed. It is that of a school close yet different from that of the Southern Netherlands with which exchanges developed, in both directions. To Eyckian influences from the south answered those of the north with the move of at least two important masters: Dirk Bouts and Gerard David.

20 september 2008

## Post Scriptum

My colleague and friend Joshua Bruyn has recently sent me his article on the Vienna panels by Geertgen ('Een gedachtenisvenster voor Claes van Ruyven en Geertgen tot Sint Jans' *Johannespaneel te Wenen*, *Oud Holland* 122 (2009), pp.81-120). He identifies Nicolas van Ruyven as the main figure in the group witnessing the discovery of the relics of saint John the Baptist, gesturing towards the knights of saint John with his left hand. Although I had also made this identification, it had not been presented in my book, due to editing reasons. However, rather than supporting a late date for the activity of the painter, as is argued by the author, it reinforces my earlier proposals according to which this man is the son of Agneten van Scoten, whose coat of arms features to the left in the lower part of the engraving published by Joshua Bruyn, and thus belongs to the family group formed by the two van Scoten whom I recognised in the painting. I have shown in 1980 that theories based upon the history of the relics and resting of the identification of the patron as Jan Willem Janz were not acceptable. Concerning the misguided use of dendrochronology, one will refer to the present article. In spite of the esteem and friendship I have for the author, I can only wholly reject the conclusions of his publication and regret that we did not have the opportunity to discuss this matter earlier.

15 December 2009

## NOTES

\* Translation by Catherine Yvard

<sup>1</sup> F. Lammertse and J. Giltaij, exh. cat. *Schilderkunst van de late Middeleeuwen, Vroege Hollanders*, with contributions by M. Damen, M. Faries, J.P. Filedt Kok, K. Goudriaan, L. M. Helmus, M. Leeftang, D. Meuwissen, G. Verhoeven and M. Wolters, Rotterdam (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen) 2008.

<sup>2</sup> A. Châtelet, *Les Primitifs Hollandais*, Freiburg 1980 (English edition: *Early Dutch Painting*, London and New York 1981).

<sup>3</sup> A. Châtelet, *Jean van Eyck enluminéur*, Strasburg 1993.

<sup>4</sup> A.H. van Buren, J.H. Marrow and S. Pettenati, *Heures de Turin-Milan. Inv. N° 47, Museo Civico d'Arte Antica, Torino*, Turin and Lucerne 1996.

<sup>5</sup> A. Châtelet, 'L'enseignement paternel dans les heures de Milan-Turin', *Tributes in honor of James H. Marrow*, ed. by J. F. Hamburger and A. S. Korteweg, Turnhout 2006, pp. 147-154.

<sup>6</sup> Before, I adopted 'Pestivien' for the name, as it seemed the most usual form. Following further research, it may have been more accurate to adopt 'Pestivien', as it corresponds in this form to a few Breton villages and an ancient lordship (Bulat-Pestivien and Mael-Pestivien, Côtes d'Armor).

<sup>7</sup> Rotterdam 2008 (note 1), p. 66, note 18.

<sup>8</sup> P. Plemper, *Beschryving van de Heerlykheid en het Dorp Alphen aan den Ryn*, Leiden 1714, (Facsimile, Nieuwkoop 1969), p. 64. M. Gyseling gives the following spellings Alpen, Alphem, Alpem, Alphem, Halpheim, Alpheyn (in: *Toponymisch woordenboek van België, Nederland, Luxemburg, Noord-Frankrijk en West-Duitsland: voor 1226*, 1, Ghent 1960, p. 48): Alpen could also have led to the corruption Alpas.

<sup>9</sup> 'verwaschen' (1439 text, NHA, Haarlem, Stadsarchief, inv. N° 331, fol. 132v).

<sup>10</sup> A. Châtelet, 'Rogier van der Weyden : quelques retouches à la vision de son œuvre', *Revue belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art*, 75 (2006), pp. 75-91, here p. 81.

<sup>11</sup> Attributed to Jan Mostaert, *Portrait of Jacqueline of Bavaria* (Copenhagen, Museum of Fine-Arts) and *Recueil d'Arras* (Arras, Médiathèque, Ms. 266, fol. 36).

<sup>12</sup> J.K. Steppe, 'Lambert van Eyck en het Portret van Jacoba van Beieren', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie. Analecta. Klasse der Schone Kunsten* 44 (1983), nr. 2.

<sup>13</sup> 'seer uytnemende van tronien, handen, voeten en laecken' (Karel van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, Haarlem 1604, fol. 205 v°).

<sup>14</sup> Châtelet 1980 (note 1), p. 197, nr. 21.

<sup>15</sup> Prince A. de Ligne, *Histoire généalogique de la Maison de Ligne*, Brussels 1950, p. 52; G. Martin, *Histoire et généalogie des maisons de Ligne et d'Arenberg*, Lyon 2003, p. 28. L. Nys published in *Francia* (35, 2008, pp. 63-94) an article ('Jean van Eyck et Clèves') in which he proposed to recognise in the *Man holding a Pink* a portrait of Duke Adolph II of Cleves (1373-1448). In spite of the quality of his research, his conclusions are not valid: firstly, because the Order of Saint Anthony in the Duchy of Cleves did not really expand, and the shape of the collar seems to have been different; secondly, because the portrait of Adolph II of Cleves is not close enough to the Berlin portrait.

<sup>16</sup> I would like to express my gratitude to Mr Pierre Mouriau de Meulenacker for taking photographs of this sculpture for the purpose of my research.

<sup>17</sup> One should note however that the panel was cut along its upper, lower and right sides. The missing parts have been replaced by wooden strips on these three sides and have been repainted. Therefore, only the right side has an original painted border. This seems to have happened soon after the painting was executed: if the dendrochronological examination was inadvertently performed on one of these replaced strips, the slightly late date obtained could thus be explained and the execution of the painting could still be dated to ca. 1440. I am very grateful to Stephan

Kemperdick for giving me the opportunity to examine this panel.

<sup>18</sup> M.J. Friedländer, *Von Eyck bis Brueghel*, Berlin 1916, pp. 16-17 (English edition: *From van Eyck to Bruegel*, London 1956, p. 11).

<sup>19</sup> In addition to the reference given in note 3, see also 'Un collaborateur de Jean van Eyck en Italie', *Relations artistiques entre les Pays-Bas et l'Italie. Études dédiées à Suzanne Sulzberger* (Études d'histoire de l'art publiées par l'Institut historique belge de Rome, IV), Brussels-Rome 1980, pp. 43-60.

<sup>20</sup> See J.R.J. van Asperen de Boer, K. Bé, M.H. Butler, P. Klein, K. Crawford Lubber, J.J. Rishel, M. Smeyers, J. Snyder and C. Spantigati, *Jan van Eyck: Two Paintings of Saint Francis receiving the Stigmata*, Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1997.

<sup>21</sup> M. Dvorak, 'Die Anfänge der holländischen Malerei', *Jahrbuch der königlichen Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 39 (1918), pp. 51-79; also published in *Das Rätsel der Kunst der Brüder van Eyck*, Munich 1925, pp. 245-273.

<sup>22</sup> Ch. de Tolnay, *Le Maître de Flémalle et les Frères van Eyck*, Brussels 1939, pp. 35-37.

<sup>23</sup> A. Châtelet, 'De Dirk Bouts et des examens dendrochronologiques', *Revue de l'Art* 156 (2007), pp. 91-96.

<sup>24</sup> *The Taking of Christ and The Resurrection* with, on the reverse, *Saint John the Baptist and Saint John the Evangelist* (Munich, Alte Pinakothek) and the *Annunciation* (Lisbon, Gulbenkian Foundation).

<sup>25</sup> C. Périer d'Ieteren, *Thierry Bouts*, Brussels 2005, *passim*.

<sup>26</sup> The inversion of the relationship between these two works, proposed by A. Scherrer, implying that the Master of the Taking of Christ would have copied the compositions conceived by the Master of the Lyversberg Passion ('Der Meister der münchener Gefangennahme: Werk und Wirkung', *Bouts Studies*, ed. by B. Cardon, M. Smeyers, R. Van Schoute and H. Verougstraete, Leuven 2001, pp. 57-70) is not sustainable, as the Cologne artist was clearly not capable of such inventivity and the 'Boutsian' inspiration for his work is too obvious.

<sup>27</sup> P. Klein, when asked, did not admit the possibility of revising his analysis which he considers final.

<sup>28</sup> W. Schöne had attributed to this painter a few paintings gathered around the *Pearl of Brabant* (Munich, Alte Pinakothek; see W. Schöne, *Dieric Bouts und seine Schule*, Berlin 1938, pp. 179-189). If this triptych is restituted to Dirk Bouts the Elder, as I am presently arguing along with other art historians, it is possible to assemble a very different corpus of works under this name.

<sup>29</sup> This data is mentioned in the Rotterdam catalogue. A more legible table was published by P. Klein in *Venite Adoremus. Geertgen tot Sint Jans und die Anbetung der Könige*, ed. by M. Reinhard-Felice, Winterthur 2008, p. 90.

<sup>30</sup> T. van Bueren, *Macht en onderborigheid binnen de Ridderlijke Orde van Sint Jan. De commandeurspportretten uit het Sint Jansklooster te Haarlem*, Haarlem 1991; T. van Bueren and M. Faries, 'The "portraits" in Geertgen tot Sint Jans Vienna Panels', in *Dessin sous-jacent et copies*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1991, pp. 141-150; T. van Bueren, *Tot Lof van Haarlem. Het beleid van de stad Haarlem ten aanzien van de kunstwerken uit de geconfisqueerde geestelijke instellingen*, Hilversum 1993.

<sup>31</sup> Faries 1991 (note 30). The author also presented other views at the symposium organised at the end of the Rotterdam exhibition, on 26 May 2008.

<sup>32</sup> For instance, Jacob Janz and the Master of the Virgo inter Virgines (Châtelet (note 2), pp. 126 and 235).

<sup>33</sup> See the 2008 Winterthur catalogue with a contribution by S. Kemperdick and J. Sander who curiously maintain the attribution to Geertgen (*op. cit.* note 29, pp. 23-60).

<sup>34</sup> J. Bangs, 'The Masters of Alkmaar and Hand X. The Haarlem Painters of the Van Waterlant Family', *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 60 (1999), pp. 65-162.

<sup>35</sup> See exh.cat. *Das Geheimnis des Jan van Eyck: die frühen niederländischen Zeichnungen und Gemälde in Dresden*, Dresden (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen) 2005, nr. 73, pp. 193-195 and note 7, p. 219. I have also opposed a few arguments to Dupertuis Bangs' publication in *Visages d'Antan. Le Recueil d'Arras (XIV<sup>e</sup>-XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, Lathuile 2007, p. 239.

<sup>36</sup> Exh.cat. *Le Maître de la Manne*, Douai (Musée de la Chartreuse) 1990, with contributions from F. Baligand, A. Châtelet, J.R.J. van

Asperen de Boer et J. Degenne.

<sup>37</sup> M.L. Wurbain, 'De Meester van de Manna-Inzameling: Broeder Tymanus?', *Boymans Bijdragen*, 1978, pp. 24-35, see also P.F.J. Obbema, 'Panel Painting and Book Illumination in a Monastic Workshop ca. 1440-85: Evidence from the Accounts of Lopsen near Leiden', in: *Masters and Miniature*, ed. K. van der Horst and J.C. Klamt, Doornspijk 1991, pp. 381-400.

<sup>38</sup> J.Q. van Regteren Altena, 'Hugo Jacobsz', *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 6 (1955), pp. 101-117.

<sup>39</sup> M.R. de Vrij, *De Meester van de Virgo inter Virgines*, Amsterdam 1999; C. Unger, *Die Tafelgemälde des Meisters der Virgo inter Virgines. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des Kunstgebietes der nördlichen Niederlande im 15. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 2004.

<sup>40</sup> Rotterdam 2008 (note 1), nr. 44, p. 259.

<sup>41</sup> Peter Klein, who examined the panels, confirmed that the two Annunciation fragments, now reunited as a single panel, are indeed of the same wood as the two groups of saints. In the Rotterdam catalogue, Jeroen Giltaij rejects the identification of the paintings in the Suermondt museum as the wings of the Madrid painting because of their insufficient width, which yet could have been compensated by the frame.

<sup>42</sup> I am grateful to Jeroen Giltaij for kindly providing me with this result obtained during the preparation of the Rotterdam exhibition.

<sup>43</sup> K. Boon, 'De Meester van de Virgo inter Virgines', *Oud Delft* 2 (1963), pp. 18-21; see also I. Vandevivere and R. Guislain-Wittermann, 'La Lamentation du Maître de la Virgo inter virgines à l'Hôpital Saint-Nicolas d'Enghien', *Bulletin Koninklijk Instituut voor het Kunstpatrimonium* 11 (1969), pp. 109-133.

<sup>44</sup> Jeroen Giltaij, who recently re-examined the New York painting, judges that its poor level of craftsmanship does not allow it to be associated with the Amsterdam *Resurrection*. This is not how I recollect the painting, but maybe we do indeed have to consider that it was never part of the same altarpiece.

<sup>45</sup> K.G. Boon, 'Boekbespreking', *Oud Holland* 95 (1981), pp. 162-167.

<sup>46</sup> *The Burlington Magazine* 124 (1982), p. 26.