gebouw, in een korte draai naar links op den toeschouwer toe. Bovendien ontleende Rembrandt daaraan een karakteristiek detail, den tamboer rechts, die in beide composites als markante hoekfiguur dienst doet.

Het is overbodig om op de duidelijke relatie tussen de compositie van Stradanus en die van de Nachtwacht uitvoerig in te gaan. De lezer kan deze formele relatie zelf beoordelen, men lette b.v. ook op de dwergen bij Stradanus en op het vreemd, weglopenend manneke met een helm en buskruithoorn links bij Rembrandt.

Er worden in de inventaris van het bezit van Rembrandt in 1656 helaas geen gravures van Philips Galle en ook geen tekeningen van Stradanus vermeld, maar het zou goed verklarbaar zijn, waarom hij juist de gegraveerde geschiedenis van de Medici, waartoe de compositie van de Feeststoet van Cosimo I behoort, zou hebben geraadpleegd. De intocht van Maria de Medici, de kleindochter van Cosimo I, kan daartoe aanleiding zijn geweest. Wat Rembrandt 1638/1639 zocht, was een compositieel schema voor zijn schutterstuk, waarvan wij helaas niet precies weten, wanneer hij het begon te schilderen. Als hij het bij Stradanus vond, dan betekent het niet, dat dit de bewijsvoering van de Heren Begemann en Tümpel aantast. Integendeel, het versterkt alleen maar het historiserend karakter van het beroemde schutterstuk, waarvan de compositie eerdere thuisloot in het tijdperk van de hoogrenaissance, dan in het tijdperk dat wij barok noemen.

E. K. J. REZNICEK

Observations on Rembrandt

No systematic study of the borrowings in Rembrandt's oeuvre as a whole has yet been published (Note 1), but a general survey published in 1960 of the copying and interpretation of existing works of art (Note 2) reminds us again of the difference between the methods of Rubens and Rembrandt in this respect. Rubens' copy of Raphael's portrait of Baldassare Castiglione, for example, is a facsimile so detailed as to be misleading (Note 3), and this also goes for the many other drawn and painted copies he made of works by famous predecessors. In addition, he made many drawings of parts of compositions, especially figures, which he used as modelli for his paintings. A little-known example of this is the pose of the body of Christ in the Deposition in Antwerp Cathedral, which is based on that of the Christ in the Pietà by Michelangelo and Tiberio Calcagni in Florence Cathedral (Figs. 1, 2, Note 4).

By contrast, Rembrandt's pen sketch of the Castiglione portrait is not at all accurate. He has concentrated on what interested him most, the position of the arm, while the head, which obviously interested him less, has been turned slightly to the left and the facial expression wrongly drawn (Note 5). Rembrandt's method of reworking his models into compositions 'all his own' can perhaps be seen most clearly in the painting in Boston which is a recreation of the composition of Maarten de Vos' engraving of Christ in the Storm on the Sea of Galilee (Note 6). Here he has borrowed the main diagonal accent and some of the actions of poses of the figures, making a dynamic painting of his own in the spirit of the composition or the original. The fact that Rembrandt in his own inventions went ever further away from the originals that were his starting-point, makes the recognition and identification of his sources a risky business.
It is clear enough from early 17th-century art theory that studying and following models was a desideratum of artistic training. Van Mander's remarks on this permitted form of 'stealing' finding an apt practical illustration in the use his friend Cornelis van Haarlem made in his own compositions of arms taken from Maerten van Heemskerck's Roman sketchbook (Figs. 3, 4, Note 7). In this connection, however, Miedema has recently made the distinction clear between a slavish, recognizable imitatio of the style of a recognized master, from which one could not gain much honour, and the highly honoured aemulatio, whereby the model was surpassed (Note 8), and the same preference for aemulatio also appears in the Italian art theory of around the same period (Note 9).

When the borrowings in the work of Rubens and Rembrandt are seen against this background, then the concepts of 'copying' and imitatio seem applicable to Rubens much more than to Rembrandt. Rembrandt made only a number of more or less sketchy drawings after works by other masters (Note 10), the factors determining the character of the changing styles of his oeuvre being his aemulatio of Rubens between around 1632 and 1638, of the balanced compositions of the Italian High Renaissance later on (Note 11) and finally of the impasto and colour of Titian.

The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Tulp (Fig. 5)

In his appraisal of before 1902 of this painting Alois Riegl paid great attention to the variety of facial expressions and the chiaroscuro, seeing the composition in what now seems the too narrow context of the previous history of the Dutch group portrait (Note 12). He thought the composition could be explained in part from that iconographical tradition, but regarded the pyramidal structure as an innovation. This interpretation was largely followed by W. Martin, albeit he thought that the pyramidal composition could be traced back to Lastman. He, too, praised the brilliant originality of the picture, 'influence' being a dirty word as far as he was concerned (Note 13). This 'originality' theme has in fact predominated in most of the later literature (e.g. Note 19).

In a detailed study of 1939–40 Hubert Schrade blazed the trail along which William Heckscher was to go further twenty years later (Note 14). He went into the iconographical history of the painting much more widely, paying great attention to the depiction of the foreshortened nude, but his interpretation of the composition again stressed Rembrandt's originality. He did, however, compare the placing of the body in Rembrandt's composition with that (in reverse) of the body of Christ in a drawing by Dürer of the Lamentation (Fig. 6), though he thought it impossible that Rembrandt could have known this (Note 15). He further drew attention to Vesalius' conception of medicine as the holiest of all the arts.

In his summary of the problems surrounding the painting (Note 16) Horst Gerson pointed out the flaws in Heckscher's interpretation, demonstrating that the picture is certainly not a photographic record of an event (for some recent opinions on the anatomical aspects see Note 17) and making the important observations that the standing figure on the left is a later addition and that the picture has more the character of a history piece than a group portrait (Note 18). This last remark is a correct assessment, for when Rembrandt began on his first important commission The Tribute Money came to his attention. It is not clear whether he actually knew the painting Rubens made around 1614 (Fig. 7, Note 20), which was in a Dutch collection in 1687 (Note 21), but we know the picture soon became famous and well-known from the copies, versions and engravings made after it, including an engraving of 1621 by Vorstermans (Fig. 8, Notes 22, 23). The photomontage (Fig. 9) clearly shows that the Tribute Money composition was Rembrandt's starting-point for the Anatomy Lesson, especially when one remembers that not only is the standing doctor on the left a later addition, but that the three doctors who form the apex of the somewhat shaky pyramid were also probably added at a second stage (Notes 24, 25). The strongest argument for this borrowing is the third head from the left in the foreground of Rubens' composition, which Rembrandt has transformed into that of an Amsterdam doctor displaying the same tense attention. Rembrandt has also taken the shell (top left) and placed it in the dark niche behind Dr. Tulp as a symbol of wisdom.