The Rubenianum and RIHA

With its mission of facilitating and initiating art-historical research, the Rubenianum is anything but an isolated institute, even less so when in 2014 we became part of an organized network: RIHA, the International Association for Research Institutes in the History of Art.

Founded in 1998, RIHA today unites thirty-three institutes from twenty-one countries in Europe, the United States, Russia and Australia. With newly admitted institutes from Latvia and Georgia, the network is still expanding. In principle, the association welcomes research institutes that operate independently from museums or universities, while preferably limiting the number of member institutes per country to two. The Rubenianum became the second Belgian member institute, after the Royal Institute for Cultural Heritage in Brussels, and thus is the only Flemish member.

Among the founding and more recent member institutes are major (inter)national players, such as the Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte in Munich, the RKD – Netherlands Institute for Art History in The Hague, INHA in Paris, or even the State Institute of Art Studies in Moscow, employing some 250 researchers and staff members! Yet, the differences in scale between members do not make our exchanges less relevant or instructive – on the contrary.

RIHA promotes easy access to colleagues worldwide, allowing them to learn from best practices. Further advantages include a professional exchange programme as well as joint research initiatives. But the most tangible output is the online RIHA Journal, a double-blind peer-reviewed, scholarly journal for art history, with a unique decentralized system of local editors in member institutes. We are very much looking forward to seeing the first Rubenianum article appear in 2019!

RIHA has been gaining increasing importance in my work practice since I was elected secretary in 2017. As part of a dynamic international board, I hope to strengthen this platform and support present and future member institutions, as well as art history in general.

Véronique Van de Kerckhof
Director of the Rubenianum

Rubens’s garden screen and loggia restored

The standing Rubens acquired in his lifetime can still be gleaned today from the exterior of his house. In 1608 the artist returned to the North after spending eight years in Italy. He was then in his early thirties and on the threshold of a brilliant European career. Back in Antwerp, he soon succeeded in establishing a large studio that was impressively productive. By 1610 he could afford not only to buy a house but also to undertake extensive renovations based on his own designs, turning the property into a dazzling mansion with a garden that scarcely had its equal in the Low Countries.

Only two parts of the premises have survived more or less intact: the garden screen, fashioned after a triumphal arch, which forms the imposing passageway to the garden, and the loggia, appearing in the central arch as a point de vue that Rubens intended as a sensational garden prospect. Rubens drew inspiration for his palazzetto from Italian – more specifically Roman – examples. For instance, the form of the central section of the impressive gateway of his highly praised garden screen derives directly from the Porta Pia, Michelangelo’s famous city gate of 1563 at the end of the Via Pia on the Quirinale in Rome. Rubens may well have been the first to introduce the great Florentine’s architectural inventions to the Southern Netherlands.

In recent decades, however, the condition of the garden screen and loggia had deteriorated noticeably. After years of meticulous preparation, renovations began in September 2017. Both structures were carefully cleaned and expertly restored. Sculptural reconstruction of lost elements was avoided as much as possible. A self-supporting glass roof was installed to protect the garden screen from the elements. The completion of the restoration is nothing less than a milestone in the history of the museum and anticipates the publication of two Corpus volumes that will shed light on Rubens’s architectural activities: Architecture and Sculpture. Architectural Sculpture (CRLB, XXII.4) by Valérie Herremans and Architecture and Sculpture: The Rubens House (CRLB, XXII.2) by Nora De Poorter (forthcoming).
Interview with Kendra Grimmett
Belgian–American Educational Foundation Rubenianum Fellow, 2018–19

Bert Watteeuw, project leader of the planned Rubens Site, interviews Kendra Grimmett, a PhD candidate at the University of Pennsylvania. This year she is living in Antwerp as the Belgian–American Educational Foundation Rubenianum Fellow, 2018–19, and working on her dissertation, ‘Grappling with Hercules: Masculinity and the Heroic Male Nude in Rubens’s Time’.

The ‘Rubesian woman’ has attained proverbial status, perhaps through a history of predominantly male scholarship. Is your work an attempt at redressing an imbalance and at fleshing out a ‘Rubesian man’? In and beyond specialists’ circles, Rubens’s voluptuous female nudes are legendary, but fewer publications address the abundant male nudes in the master’s oeuvre. Often, scholarship on the female nude considers how male viewers interpreted and enjoyed those painted bodies – this is the conventional gender binary of male subject and female object. Although the recent essays in Rubens and the Human Body (2018) and the work of Lisa Rosenthal begin to interpret Rubens’s male figures, in my opinion, the question of how men viewed heroic male nudes requires further investigation.

In many ways, this project extends feminist art-historical approaches that question male viewership of women and consider identity-based gender norms and performances; however, it flips the script to examine the male body. While we cannot know exactly how Rubens and his contemporaries responded to images of idealized male figures, I put depictions of Christ and Hercules in conversation with primary sources, such as letters, treatises and emblem books, which provide insights into gender discourses of the early modern Low Countries. My dissertation contributes to discussions of the ‘Rubesian man’ by ‘fleshing out’ competing ideas of masculinity that images of male bodies simultaneously convey and challenge.

Rubens’s career was Herculean and to some extent he seems to have identified with the mythical hero, yet he also comes across as a guarded man who excelled at the art of false modesty. Beyond the paintings, are you also looking at Rubens’s own concept of manhood? As a matter of fact, in my first chapter, Rubens functions as a case study for early modern Low Countries. My dissertation reminds readers how male viewers interpreted and responded to images of idealized male figures, in my opinion, the question of how men viewed heroic male nudes requires further investigation.

In the time of #MeToo, fluid gender boundaries and ‘toxic masculinity’, can we still learn from early modern ideals of male behaviour and perhaps from Rubens’s own neo-Stoic philosophy? Absolutely. History teaches us that, regardless of the century, people are people with relatable desires, goals and social pressures. My dissertation reminds readers that masculinity – like femininity – is too prescriptive (and prescriptive) and difficult to perform, whether we are discussing it in 1619 or 2019. In neo-Stoic philosophy, for example, Virtue – often personified by Hercules – is associated with moderation, self-control and good judgement. These are valuable characteristics; however, moderation and self-control can be too restrictive. In a mournful letter describing the death of his first wife Isabella Brant, Rubens notes how his overwhelming grief does not comply with neo-Stoic composure. He, instead, suggests that deep feelings are not ‘unbecoming to man’s nature’. Rubens simultaneously acknowledges the philosophy that ‘(neo-Stoic) real men don’t cry’, and challenges that idea with his personal experience. The letter documents the inherent tension between ideal masculinity and living men’s behaviours.

How is your stay in Antwerp affecting your work? I feel closer to Rubens than ever before. This is an immersive experience – seeing the Rubens House from my office at the Rubenianum and walking home past Nicolaas Rockox’s house. It is a privilege and an invaluable advantage to work here. With the stacks a few steps away, it feels as if I have my own personal research library. My favourite part is working in such close proximity to generous, supportive colleagues and leaders in the field. I will not forget how Arnout Balis stopped by my office to say hello, and we were able to meet and discuss his work on Rubens’s theoretical notebook. This is the best place to do my research.
Vincent Malò's Assumption of the Virgin in the Galleria Colonna unveiled

Since the foundation of the Rubenianum Fund in 2010 an annual field trip takes its generous benefactors and donors on an exclusive private tour ‘in the footsteps of Rubens’, visiting stately art collections all around Europe and beyond. For the seventh edition (October 2017) participants gathered in Rome, as reported in this newsletter (TRQ 2017.3, p. 3).

One of the visits was to the princely Galleria Colonna. The party was welcomed and introduced to its many art treasures by Maria Cristina Paoluzzi, a specialist on Roman baroque painting and managing director of the Viennese auction house Dorotheum’s Roman offices. She specifically called attention to three paintings long associated with Rubens and in need of an attribution, including an Assumption of the Virgin (fig. 1) by an unidentified follower of Rubens, as first suggested by Leo Van Puyvelde in 1950, and subsequently by Eduard Safarik and Hans Vlieghe. Dr Paoluzzi tentatively dated the painting to about 1650 in her 2015 catalogue of the collection. It is clear that the artist much depended on Rubens’s monumental Assumption, painted in 1625–26 for the Church of Our Lady in Antwerp (fig. 2). However, compared to the latter, the ‘Colonna Assumption’ is executed on an entirely different scale. The composition is less dynamic and shows more robust figures with paler skin tones. The positions of many of the figures have been reversed and their gestures largely revised. The artist also used a much cooler colour palette. The drapery folds are more pronounced and harder and have an almost metallic appearance. Contrary to Rubens’s celebrated altarpiece in Antwerp’s Cathedral, the picture is not rounded at the top, showing the Virgin closer to the upper edge. The group of angels hovering above has been slightly reduced in number. The angel on the upper left now holds the crown of roses directly above the Virgin’s head, which is more tilted towards heaven. Judging from its much-reduced format, the picture was probably not commissioned by some (local) church or convent but painted either on spec for the open market or for a private individual. Its size is well fitted for private devotion.

How and when the painting entered the Colonna collection is not known. It is first recorded as an original by Rubens in the 1714 inventory of the works installed in the gallery under Filippo Colonna II (1663–1714), 9th Duke and Prince of Palliano (‘Un quadro dj misura dj palmi sei e cinque par alto rapp. un Assunta con gl’Apostoli, e Gruppo d’Angeli originale di pietro Paolo Rubens con cornice liscia, e due ordini intagliati dorata spett.e come sopra’), but may already have been acquired by his father Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna (1637–1689). The eighteenth-century French astronomer Joseph-Jérome Lefrançois de Lalande noted in his travel journals: ‘On remarque dans cette galerie une Assomption de Rubens, dans sa premiere maniere; la composition en est bonne, & la couleur en est tendre & agréable’ (Voyage d’un François en Italie, fait dans les années 1765 et 1766, Venice, 1769). Its presence in the gallery, which opened to the public in 1703, is also recorded in a set of watercolour drawings commissioned by Fabrizio Colonna II in 1730 from Salvatore Colonnelli Sciarra, documenting the layout of paintings on the walls. At that time the Assumption hung in the sala grande, underneath a painting of similar dimensions, described in the 1714 inventory as ‘… un baccanale con huomini con armi alle mani originali di Pietro Paulo Rubens con cornice fondj color di noce, e riportati intagliati Dorati spett.i come sopra’. This enigmatic ‘Bacchanal’, last recorded in the 1783 catalogue, after which it must have been removed from the palace, is in fact a version of a Rubens composition, known as ‘The Marauders’ and generally dated to the artist’s last years of activity, circa 1637–40. It depicts a boisterous troupe of lansquenets carousing outside a tavern and harassing peasants. The scene is described in Rubens’s estate in 1640 (Specification, no. 90) as ‘Vne troupe des Suisses qui contraignent les paysans de leur donner de l’argent & couvrir la
Malo’ is recorded in Antwerp in 1651, asking after his father’s death, for a ‘Vincensio and namesake (1629–1668) may have done back and forth to Antwerp, but his son specialized in painting landscapes and had already arrived in Rome by 1625 and because he had lost his right hand), who is believed to be the alias of the Antwerp painter Vincent Adriaenssen (1595–1675), also known as ‘Leckerbetien’ or ‘Il Mozzo di Anversa’ (‘the stump of Antwerp’, einighen tijdt tot Genua ghewoont by sonderlinghe in het naeckt … hy heeft ende uytnemende in ‘t groot en cleyn en die de boeren dwingen om hun geld te geven en de tafel te decken op doek) and it is discussed for the first time in all its complexity in the forthcoming Corpus Rubenianum volume on Rubens’s Genre Scenes (Part xvii) by Nils Böttner, edited by myself and to be published later this year.

Following the visit of the Rubenianum Fund delegation, Dr Paoluzi asked Arnout Balis and his colleagues at the Centrum Rubenianum for help in trying to identify the painter of the ‘Colonna Assumption’. To this purpose high-resolution images were sent to Antwerp for close study. I almost jumped from my seat when I recognized the hand of Vincent Malò I (Cambrai c. 1602/06–Rome 1644) in it, for I had been researching and documenting the output of this much-neglected follower of Rubens for quite some time already.

As I found out later, Ludwig Burchard was of the same opinion, as his handwritten annotations on the back of an old Alinari photograph of the painting, retrieved from a stack of unsorted material in the Rubenianum’s vast documentation, make clear.

Vincent Malò I was active in Antwerp from about 1623, worked much in Rubens’s style and may have spent some time in his studio. In or about 1634 he left Antwerp for Italy (where called Vincenzo), arriving in Genoa, where he stayed for some time with the extremely well-connected painter and art dealer Cornelis de Wael (Antwerp 1592–Rome 1667), with whom he was to collaborate. Cornelis and his older brother Lucas had already settled there in the early 1610s, taking up residence in the Strada Nuova (now Via Garibaldi)!

In his Gulden Cabinet der Edel Vry Schilderconst (1661), Cornelis de Bie mentions ‘dien grooten Meester Vincent Malo seer fray ende uytinemede in ’t groot en cleyn en sonderlinghe in het naeckt … hy heeft eenighen tijdt tot Genua ghewoont by Cornelis de Wael ende hy heeft gheschildert’. Later on, Malò spent some time in Florence, before finally settling in Rome, where he died on 14 April 1644 in the parish of San Lorenzo in Lucina. In some of the older literature he has at times been confused with one ‘Vincent Manciola’. This is believed to be the alias of the Antwerp painter Vincent Adriaenssens (1595–1675), also known as ‘Leckerbereton’ or ‘Il Mozzo di Anversa’ (‘the stump of Antwerp’, because he had lost his right hand), who had already arrived in Rome by 1625 and specialized in painting landscapes and battle scenes.

It is not known if Malò ever travelled back and forth to Antwerp, but his son and namesake (1629–1668) may have done so. I assume the latter probably returned after his father’s death, for a ‘Vincensio Malo’ is recorded in Antwerp in 1651, asking permission from the city authorities to organize a public sale of the pictures he owns (which may have included works of his father) in the tavern ‘Den Hert’ on the Meir, because he wants to leave town. For some reason he must have changed his mind, since in 1652 he was admitted in the Guild of Saint Luke as a ‘wijnmeester’ (son of a member), and it so appears that he signed his paintings using the same monogram as his father (‘VM’ in ligature).

I began to take a keen interest in Malò’s versatile oeuvre while preparing the catalogue entries on all the battles of the Amazons by and associated with Rubens for the first (of three projected) volumes on Rubens’s Mythological Subjects: Achilles to the Graces (Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, Part xi.1), published in May 2016. A large, almost square canvas owned by Marchese Clemente Doria and currently displayed on the piano nobile of the Palazzo Gio Battista Spinola on the Strada Nuova in Genoa (also known as the Palazzo Doria after its acquisition by the Doria di Montaldo family in 1723), which Burchard seems to have known only by description, was long thought to be by Rubens, but was correctly identified by Camillo Manzitti as a work by Malò (fig. 3), an attribution already suggested by Federico Alizeri in his Guida artistico di Genova (1846–47). Previously unpublished, it was first presented in the 2003 ‘Europalia Italia’ exhibition Anverso & Genova – Een hoogtepunt in de barokschilderkunst at the Royal Museum of Fine Arts in Antwerp (no. 33), curated by Marzia Cataldi Gallo and Nico Van Hout. In this work, Malò clearly drew inspiration from some of Rubens’s monumental and dramatic history paintings involving kicking and leaping horses and armed men in twisted poses, such as the Death of Decius Mus (c. 1616–17), the Conversion of St Paul (c. 1620–21) and especially the Lion Hunt (c. 1621). Rubens’s Battle of the Amazons (c. 1618–19) was the source for the scene in the background. It so happened that in 2014 participants of the Rubenianum Fund field trip to Genoa were invited for lunch at the private club Circolo Artistico Tunnel, situated on the piano nobile of the Spinola palace (TRQ 2014.4, pp. 1 and 6), unaware of the Amazons lurking nearby.

In the first Mythology volume (p. 198), I discussed the ‘Doria Amazons’ and its surprising relation to a little-known drawing of the subject from the so-called ‘Rubens Cantoor’ material preserved at the Statens Museum for Kunst in Copenhagen (inv. KKGB 127741). As with the ‘Colonna Assumption’ it is not known how and when Malò’s Amazons painting entered the Doria collection. It is first recorded there in 1766 by the Genoese painter and biographer Carlo Giuseppe Ratti, at which time it was believed to be an original work by Rubens. Manzitti assumed that Malò must have painted this picture shortly after his arrival in Genoa for a local patron, but according to Piero Boccardo, director of the Musei di Strada Nuova di Genova (private communication), the painting was already listed in an unpublished inventory of 1728 Inventario delli quadri e robbia venuta da Vianna) as the work of Rubens, and thus may have been bought in Vienna. If correct – and as I only realized after publication – perhaps then this is the Amazons painting by ‘Fincent Malo’ included in a list of pictures sent by Guillam Forchondt I (1608–1678) from Antwerp to Graz in 1675. On the other hand, in a newly published study it is tentatively suggested that the painting may already have been part of the collection of
Ambrogio Doria at the Di Negro Palace in Piazza Banchi in 1663. A proper monograph on Malò with a full catalogue raisonné of his works is yet to be undertaken. His paintings extant in and around Genoa have received some attention, most recently in the 2018 exhibition at the Palazzo della Meridiana in Genoa: Van Dyck e i suoi amici – Fiamminghi a Genova 1600–1640, curated by Anna Orlando. However, his early works in Antwerp and his later activity in Florence and Rome have hardly been investigated.

But how to recognize his hand? Connoisseurship and the process of art attribution/authentication is not an exact science. It often starts with a ‘gut feeling’. The way an artist paints or draws human figures, heads, hands and feet, as well as certain landscape features (trees, foliage, skies) and animals (especially horses), together with a particular use of colour and a certain modus operandi in preparing compositions, often betray him (or her). It takes a trained eye and years of close study to be able to analyse and positively identify an artist’s individual style, much like someone’s handwriting. Malò’s (stock) figures are characterized by their plump bodies, round heads with eyes deep in their sockets, and are often gazing upwards, as in ecstasy.

It appears that Malò painted several versions of the Virgin’s Assumption. There is one in the Galleria Sabauda in Turin (fig. 4), and another – without apostles – in the Church of San Francesco in Moncalvo Monferrato d’Asti, a copy of which is in the Galleria Palazzo Bianco in Genoa. A somewhat larger version, which I myself had identified as by Malò, surfaced in a private collection in 2016 (fig. 5). In a past life belonging to the collection of the Brooklyn Museum, it was de-accessioned and brought to auction by Sotheby’s in New York (1 February 2013, lot 465) with its old attribution to Cornelis Schut I (1597–1655). The painting failed to sell but was acquired shortly after by its present owner, who had it cleaned and very kindly provided me with photographs for study. In a fortunate series of events, the ‘Colonna Assumption’ was also cleaned and restored to its former glory in the course of 2018 by Laura Ferretti. Infrared images, made during the final stages of restoration, reveal how the composition was extensively prepared by a swift and creative chalk underdrawing throughout, outlining most of the figures, with numerous small adjustments or pentimenti introduced by the artist (figs. 6–7).

I was also lucky to have spotted another version of the same composition in a small auction in Ireland (canvas, 167.1 × 239.7 cm), a ‘sleeper’ tucked away in the rich reserves of the Royal Museum of Fine Arts (inv. 214), where it was ascribed to Frans Francken II (1581–1642). When I was shown this painting some weeks later, I recognized Malò’s hand in it, an attribution that was confirmed by the re-appearance of his signature in the lower right corner during treatment shortly thereafter. The second painting I want to introduce here is the large and unfortunately very dirty Drowning of Pharaoh’s Army in the Red Sea (canvas, 167.1 × 239.7 cm), a ‘sleeper’ tucked away in the rich reserves of the Royal Museum of Fine Arts (inv. 214), where it was mistaken for a work of Hans Jordaens III (1595–1643). It entered the museum in 1810 and reportedly came from the house of the
dean of the chapter of Antwerp Cathedral. It so appears that in his early years Malò was increasingly drawn to depicting narrative scenes of violence and despair (abductions, battles and massacres of all sorts), often set in landscapes with a multitude of (small) figures occupying the foreground, as well as festive triumphs of Neptune and Amphitrite at sea. The above two paintings certainly are less ‘Rubensian’ in style and indeed much closer to the cabinet-sized works produced by Frans Francken II and artists from his circle, such as Hendrick van Balen I, Hans Jordaens III and Simon de Vos.

Moreover, in Brussels too there is an overlooked Malò painting eagerly awaiting recognition: an altarpiece of the devotion to ‘Onze-Lieve-Vrouw-ten-Troost’ (‘La Vierge consolatrice’) in the church of ‘Onze-Lieve-Vrouw-van-Goede-Bijstand’ or ‘Notre-Dame-de-Bon-Secours’ (built 1664–94). It caught my eye on a random visit to this baroque church on the Kolenmarkt in the very heart of the city and – although high up on the wall and rather difficult to photograph – it appears remarkably close to the ‘Colonna Assumption’ in style and execution (figs. 8–9). Where it comes from and how it got there is not known. All this goes to show that discoveries can still be made when or where you least expect them.

1 M.C. Paoluzzi, La collezione Colonna nell’allestimento settecentesco. La Galleria degli acquarelli di Salvatore Colonnelli Sciarra, Rome 2013, nos. F.5 (Raccanale) and F.7 (Assunta), pp. 150–51 and 153–54, figs. 20 and 73.
2 See A. Stoesser, Van Dyck’s Hosts in Genoa: Lucas and Cornelis de Wael’s Lives, Business Activities and Works (Pictura Nova, xix), Turnhout 2018, which will be officially presented on 20 September at a symposium dedicated to the artistic relations between Antwerp and Genoa, as announced on p. 7 of this issue.
4 Report by Beatrice De Ruggieri and Marco Cardinali of Emmebi diagnostica artistica, Rome, 15 June 2018, kindly provided to me by Patrizia Piergiovanni.
Antwerp and Genoa share a similar history as important trade centres in the early modern period. The Rubenianum is pleased to announce a symposium on the artistic connections between Antwerp and Genoa in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. A select number of specialists will present papers on the many connections between the harbour cities, including an active art trade, Genoese patronage of Flemish artists in both Genoa and Antwerp, and cross-pollination between Flemish and Genoese artists, of which the Genoese sojourns of Rubens and Van Dyck are undoubtedly the best-known examples. The event, which is co-organized with La Dante di Anversa and also made possible through the generous support of the Istituto Italiano di Cultura in Brussels, coincides with the presentation of Alison Stoesser’s volume in the Pictura Nova series: Von Dyck’s Hosts in Genoa: Lucas and Cornelis de Vlue’s Lives, Business Activities and Works, published in 2018. | Lieneke Nijkamp

Mapping the Max Rooses Archives
Rubenianum digitization project – 2020

The writer and literary critic Max Rooses (1839–1914), a prominent figure in the Flemish Movement, was the first curator of the Plantin-Moretus Museum and an authority on Rubens. In fact, Rooses’s L’Œuvre de P. P. Rubens – arguably the first catalogue raisonné of Rubens’s oeuvre – established the framework for the Corpus Rubenianum. Rooses’s wide range of activities explains why his archive has been dispersed among various collections in Antwerp and beyond.

The Rubenianum holds Rooses’s preparatory material for the Rubens catalogue, among other things; the Letterenhuis harbours a vast archive on Rooses’s literary activities; and the Royal Museum of Fine Arts preserves seventy-nine of Rooses’s notebooks. Additionally, as its first curator and director, Rooses left his stamp on the Plantin-Moretus Museum, which is reflected in its institutional archives.

These four Antwerp institutions have decided to join forces in mapping their combined Rooses archives in a project funded by the Flemish Government and directed by the Rubenianum. The archives will be inventoried, a relevant selection of objects will be digitized, and all of this will be made publicly available online. Finally, the diverse archival collections will be contextualized through an online exhibition at the Archiefbank Vlaanderen, another partner in this one-year-long project.

As a result, the combined inventory will allow researchers to find their way through the different archives more easily. This will not only aid those working in the field of Rubens research (or other fields in which Rooses was active), but also enhance our understanding of the institutional histories of the different participating collections. Moreover, this unique collaborative project will allow the Rubenianum to gain relevant experience in digitizing its archival collections – of which the Rooses archive is the oldest and most fragile – and, more specifically, develop best practices concerning the phenomenon of dispersed archival collections. Finally, we hope that this project will pave the way for a comprehensive biography of Max Rooses, who is such an important figure in the cultural history of Antwerp. Because our project to map Rooses’s paper legacy extends beyond the partner institutions, we kindly invite anyone aware of relevant, related information to contact us. | Lieneke Nijkamp

The Rubenianum Lectures
Sunday, 23 June 2019, 11 am

PROF. MANFRED SELINK
Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten Antwerp

Bruegel and Beyond

For the first time, Professor Sellink will share with the public his insights on the survival of Pieter Bruegel’s iconic style in late sixteenth-century Antwerp, in the decades before his sons took up the production of copies, replicas and variants.

This lecture marks the start of the Summer Course for the ‘Study of the Arts in Flanders – The Age of Bruegel in Context’, organized by the Rubenianum, kmska and Flemish Art Collection.

The lecture is in Dutch and takes place at the Rubenianum.

Rubens, Marchesa Brigida Spinola Doria, 1606. National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC
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