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Staatsuitgeverij 's-gravenhage
The case of the Northern Netherlands

By 1525 the main lines of the argument about images that was to torment Europe for the rest of the century were already firmly drawn. The consequences of the argument had their epicentre in the Netherlands; but the rumblings and tremors would be felt in areas that covered a vast radius, from the northernmost reaches of Scandinavia to the straits of Gibraltar and Messina, from the British Isles in the West to Magyar Hungary and onward into the Balkans in the East. Almost everyone now acknowledges that if there was any single phenomenon that may be said to mark the commencement of the Revolt of the Netherlands, it was the great Iconoclastic events of August, September and October 1566. But it is all too often forgotten that the real target of these events—however they may be explained in terms of social, religious and economic motives—were images: paintings, sculptures, stained glass, prints; and that in the very period covered by this exhibition (but especially in the second and third quarters of 1566) the long-standing arguments about the use and validity of images, both in the churches and outside them, had come to a sudden and threatening head. This is the critical background to the present exhibition, along with a further equally revealing but in fact more painful issue: What actually happened to the images in 1566 and in the sporadic outbursts of Iconoclasm in the 1570s, and why were they attacked?

First of all, it is clear that in the sixteenth century to the great German and Swiss movements of the twenties and thirties, the English ones of the fifties and early sixties, and the French ones of the fifties and early sixties, the practical side of these momentous questions was embodied in the church's use of religious imagery—which ranged so visibly from sumptuous adornment to the cheaply propagandistic, from unimaginably splendid altarpieces to scruffy broadsheets. And the issues came to a head in the periodic outbursts of iconoclasm, from isolated acts in the first two decades of the sixteenth century to the great German and Swiss movements of the twenties and thirties, the English and Scottish one of the forties, the occasional French ones of the fifties and early sixties, and the
culminating catastrophe of the Netherlandish experiences of 1566. Of all the great reformers, Luther was the most benign on the subject of images. He was horrified by the outbreak on iconoclasm instigated by his follower Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt in Wittenberg in 1522. For Luther, the key text from the Decalogue Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth was to be interpreted (although he permitted them) and was to be taken specifically in conjunction with the insistence that ‘Thou shalt have not other God before me’. But in his catechetical writings, and in subsequent Lutheran catechisms the injunction on graven images was, in fact, omitted. Whereas for men like Karlstadt, the first commandment implied that one should have no images in churches (or, for that matter, in private houses), Luther’s primary concern was with the abuse of religious imagery. He saw the positive use of illustration both in biblical and in other texts, as a means of instructing the faithful; he was tolerant of religious images in churches (though he pointed to devotional and narrative subjects to devotional ones), and he does not seem to have worried too much about secular forms of imagery, whether public or private. What he did object to was the excessive money spent on adorning churches, and the motives for doing so—such as the assumption that the more expensive the material image, the higher the spiritual reward. This kind of implicit belief roused the concern was with the abuse of religious imagery. He knew how to poke fun at the standard Catholic justifications of religious imagery, including Deuteronomy 5 was not only an integral part of the Declarative (contrary to Catholic and early Lutheran thought) but constituted the substance of the second commandment. For Calvin there was no doubt about the biblical injunction against graven images; and it remained universally valid. Calvin was also more scathing and more satirical about the uses and abuses of images, particularly religious ones. He knew how to poke fun at the standard Catholic justifications of religious imagery, including the way in which early and only apparently authentic documents and councils were used to bolster the antiquity of the use of pictured images in churches. The proliferation of images was as meretricious as the absurd multiplication of relics, and in some cases the problem was identical: he challenged his readers to consider how many paintings they knew to have been reputedly painted by St Luke, and pointed to devotions to images of specifically apostolic saints. How could images which were so important leading as books of the allergate? Or so Burke coming? After all, prostitutes in their bordellos were often more decorously attired than images of the Virgin in the temples of the Papists. Christian images often bore the same relation to the image worship. Men and women could only be misled by the sensual materiality of images, better to hear and to attend to the pure word of God. These kinds of views were not only disseminated throughout the Netherlands by the early 1560s, they were also reproduced and modified—either substantially or only very slightly—in any number of treatises and sermons. I have concentrated on them because it was precisely these writers who informed and stimulated all the others. But let us examine the Netherlandish situation, especially the North Netherlands situation, at closer quarters. For the whole period we have been examining the problem of images was not only topical but crucial: by the time resentment against the Spanish Catholic regime came to a boiling point in the early 1560s, the image question had reached its most critical stage too. It provided every one of those travelling preachers who purveyed the doctrines of Luther, Zwingli or Calvin in one form or another with a target that may have been theoretical and theological at its core but was all too visible and militantly assailable in every corner of the Netherlands. If Erasmus’s criticism of the use of images grew out of his characteristically keen observation of their misuse, and of people’s folly in invest too much in them both spiritually and economically, there were other writers in the Netherlands whose criticisms were considerably more severe and whose arguments agreed with the main lines of Reformed thought. In the course of the 1520s, the anonymous author of pamphlet Van den Propheet Baruch took the apocalyptic prophet Baruch’s attacks on the idolatry of the Babylonians as the pretext for a sustained and passionate attack on what he saw as the idolatry of his own times. He did not mince his words, transforming a basically Lutheran outlook on images into a militant Protestant one. We are not to seek in a gentle sobriety, that yerny m Premiership died the heylightly gheerne souden have. He men haer beelden beschriek, des houtde steenen zien... Daer wort nu alaas grote affoordijen meede ghedane, als oyt melten afgoden der Heydenden... Endie eno ni dot dies zien, soo besonrome, soo behangtmen niet tussendt flouwede, ende kosteckler cleyouden, als oyt ni ene beheven. Endie die ander levende arme heylige, diet behoed, die laatst, naeckt ende bloot in hongerende dorst gae... (’is it not great folly that someone should suppose that the saints would be pleased to have their images visited, that are only wood and stone... Even greater idolatry is now committed than ever was the case with the idols of the Hea-then... And now that the saints are dead we visit them, and adorn them with silver, gold and velvet, and precious jewels—even though they do not need them. It is the other point. The saints who we adorn them, and whom we allow to go naked, hungry and thirsty...). Such blunt versions of well-known views would be repeated ad infinitum from one side of the Netherlands to the other. We find them in the Dutch
art and iconoclasm

In the 16th century, the term "iconoclasm" was first used to describe the destruction of images. The movement was particularly strong in the Netherlands, where the Dutch Reformed Church was established. The iconoclasts believed that images were idolatrous and that their destruction was necessary to achieve true reverence for God. The movement was supported by many prominent figures, including William of Orange, who allegedly told a Christian iconoclast in 1561: "I hope that the day will come when we shall be able to destroy all these abominations in the name of the true God."
bers of Rhetoric were those of the Painters, and here, as in several other of their plays, the very validity of their calling and their production were being substantively questioned if not actually mocked. In van Hanef’s own piece a painter is actually at the centre of the discussion. Although he defends his calling against the more radical iconoclastic stance, it is worth nothing that he admits (or is forced by the circumstances to admit) that if his productions were worshipped he would rather destroy than produce the paintings that he has produced actually three times in the four years before the great outburst of iconoclasm in 1566 that was to destroy the works of so many painters and undermine the possibilities of patronage for many years to come. What insecurity about their calling — at the very least — such attitudes must have generated! It is against this broad cultural background — and I have omitted vernacular poetry and songs such as the Anabaptist Liedekien van Vrae ende Antwoord van 1556,48 and Het blykjtu nu alle daghen van 1560,49 as well as an Amsterdam song published in that year and again in 1568.50 to say nothing of the many references to images in the Germanische Lieder — that we must begin considering the increasing numbers of actual outbreaks of iconoclasm. Initially they were isolated instances, but evidence that they were more than a passing problem comes from very early on in the period.

On 29 April 1522, an anti-heretical edict included a severe injunction against the destruction or removal of images and portraits in honour and memory of God, the Virgin and the Saints.51 That was the year of the destruction of images in Wittenberg, and iconoclasm soon became a widespread phenomenon throughout Germany. News of such events travelled swiftly to the Netherlands, through preachers, pamphlets, tracts and travellers. If there was any single group whose active hostility to images was clear from an early date it was the Anabaptists.52 Not surprisingly, in the very year in which the Heidelberg Catechism of 1562:


XCVI Vraghe. Wat heyscht God in tweede ghebodt?

Antwoorde. Dat wy God in gheenderley wijse afbeelde ende te hebben, om hem te vereeren of God daer litten daeroor te dienen.

XCVII Vraghe. Mach men ganschelieken geen beelden maken?

Antwoorde. God en en mach in ghederly wijse afbeelde en te hebben, om hem te vereeren of God daer litten daeroor te dienen.

XCVIII Vraghe. Meer souden men de beelden inden keken, als boecken der keeken niet moghen liden?

Antwoorde. Neert; want wy en moet niet wijzer zijn dan God; dewelcke sijne Christen door noot storme beelden, maer door de levenlieghe verkon dinghe sijns wonst will onderwesen hebben.53

Question 96: What does God require in the second commandment? That we in no wise make any image of God, nor worship him in any way that he has not commanded in his word.

Question 97: Should one therefore make no images at all? God can and should not be portrayed in any way; but as for his creatures, although they may indeed be portrayed, yet God still forbids one to make or have images of them, in order to worship him or by them to serve him.

Question 98: But may not pictures be tolerated in the churches as the laymen’s books? No. For we should not be wiser than God who does not wish to have his Christianity taught by dumb images, but rather by the living preaching of his word.

‘Stomme beelden’ (‘Dumb images’) was something to reckon with. Of all the Protestant confessions, this is the one that gained the widest currency in the Netherlands, and almost immediately. In the very year of its formulation it was translated into Dutch. Petrus Dathenus appended another translation of it to his Dutch version of the Psalms in 1566. It was officially adopted by the Convent of Wesel in 1568, by the Synod of Emden in 1571 and by the national Synod of The Hague in 1587; and along with the Confessio Belgica it became the basic creed of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands. This is the confession that entered Dutch Protestant thought at a time when it was struggling to disassociate itself from everything associated with Spain, and when images themselves turned out to be the clearest focus for the beginnings of the Revolt. The ideas encapsulated in the Heidelberg Confession became part of the mainstream of Dutch Calvinism, but their implications were to be much more deeply felt. They became part of the common theological stock of the Netherlands; and almost everyone knew them. But we have moved ahead too swiftly. Not surprisingly, in the very year in which the Heidelberg delegates assembled, the delegates to the greatest Council in Christendom, the Council of Trent, came to the realization that the Catholic Church urgently needed a unified stance on the subject of images. There had been plenty of individual declarations of the Church’s position in the face of the Protestant attacks, but the time had come to provide an official definition. Worried by recent outbreaks of iconoclasm in France, a group of French delegates exercised just sufficient pressure to ensure the passage of a decree on religious imagery at the very last session of the Council, on 3 and 4 December 1563.54 Perhaps it was simply that there was not enough time, and the Council was exhausted after eighteen years of deliberation — but it was a case of too little too late. Instead of providing a substantive matter raised by one Protestant writer after the other, the Council preferred to deal with the problem of abuses. It was as though the basic issue were beyond discussion: there was nothing wrong with images themselves, it seemed to be said, nor indeed with the principles of their use. Admittedly they could be misused; and that, it was felt, was the reason for the decree. Mistakenly the delegates must have felt that by dealing with the problem of abuse they could defate Protestant criticism; nothing then could have been farther from the case. The decree began with a traditional restatement of the value of the invocation and intercession of the saints and of the veneration of their relics. Images were to be retained in churches because the honour shown to them, referred to the protoplastes they represented. People could ‘be instructed and confirmed in the articles of faith’ by means of ‘the stories of the mysteries of our redemption portrayed in painting and statue’ (as opposed to the preaching and reading of scripture alone, as advocated by the Calvinists).55

After a restatement of medieval views of the exemplary value of images of the saints, it swiftly moved on to the matter of abuse. It explicitly forbade any ‘representation of false doctrine and such as might be of grave error to the uneducated’. Besides the elimination of all superstition and ‘pious quest for gain’, all lasciviousness was to be avoided, ‘so that images shall not be painted with seductive charm, or the celebration of saints days and the visitation of relics be prevented by the people into bawdy festivities and drunkenness’. In the final section of its decree, the Council set out to ensure the avoidance of abuses in the future, and it gave instructions for the ecclesiastical supervision of art that were to be taken up in any number of local synods in the immediately following years. No new or unusual images were to be carved up against the express approval of the bishop, who also had to give official approval for the acceptance of new miracles and relics. Disputes were to be referred to theologians, and if any doubtful or graver abuse needed to be eradicated, the matter was to await synodal decision, and ultimately that of the Pope.56 All this we may well have had considerable effects for later Catholic art, both in and outside the Netherlands; but for the time being the decree on images formulated by the Council of Trent was like a straw in the gathering wind. The images had been swept out of one German town after another; in France the Protestant forces were still causing trouble, while England had a new Queen, who would swiftly provide sympathetic asylum to Netherlandish opponents of Catholicism. The Netherlands was wandering and ready to fall; and the doctrines which the Council of Trent had so laboured to refute were everywhere in the air. Nothing could contain the impending cataclysm — least of all a group of aging clerics meeting in a man town after another; in France, art, both in and outside the Netherlands; and for the time being the decree on images formulated by the Council of Trent was like a straw in the gathering wind. The images had been swept out of one German town after another; in the Netherlands, through preachers, pamphlets, tracts and travellers. If there was any single group whose active hostility to images was clear from an early date it was the Anabaptists. Not surprisingly, in the very year in which the Heidelberg Catechism of 1562, contained the following question and answer:

XCVIII: Vraghe. Wat heyscht God in tweede ghebodt?

Antwoorde. Dat wy God in gheenderley wijse afbeelde en maken van, om hem te vereeren, of God daer litten daeroor te dienen.
court derogatory reference to them as 'Les Gueux', and the name stuck. But Margaret of Parma could not dismiss the beggars so lightly, and in the face of their demands for the moderation of the placards, she referred to the magistrates to be more lenient in their treatment of heretics. But the so-called 'Moderation' of 9 April with which Margaret responded to the rebels: Requested little to quell the growing unrest. Nothing seemed to be able to stop the proliferation of Calvinist preachers all over the country, and if they were not Calvinists they were of other more concealable Reformed persuasion. Whenever they could find a space they performed communion, baptised infants, or held their sermons. Because of the large number attending them, the sermons were most frequently held in the open air, and by the time Margaret forbade them in her palace of 3 July 1566 they could not be stopped.

Tension mounted, the sermons – the so-called 'hagpreekten' – were held under armed guard, the churches crowded, and the demands for their own Protestant places of worship were redoubled with ever greater fervour. Preachers poured into the county, from France, from Germany, from Switzerland and from England; and on 10 August 1566 at Steenwoorde in the South-Western corner of Flanders, following an inflammatory sermon by the former hatmaker Sebastian Matte, twenty or so members of the audience rushed to the convent and smashed all its images.

The leader there was Jacob de Buyzere, a former Augustinian monk who had turned preacher, and like Matte was also from Lier and a recently returned exile from England. Within the next three days they proceeded to Bailleul and Poperinghe, In each case preaching sermons and leading an increasingly large crowd of iconoclasts in the destruction of local images. The pattern of preparation and destruction was now established and the storm swept on. By the time it reached Antwerp on Tuesday 20 August the revolt was fully under way, and few towns could be sure that they would be spared the consequences of the iconoclastic fury. Almost everywhere there is evidence of the role of preachers, and of the fact that at least some if not all of the iconoclasts were hired and organised according to some preliminary plan – whether by preacher, local nobleman, local reformed community or any combination acting in concert. The instances of spontaneous mob activity (despite the allegations of contemporary historians) are rare, and most come after news from Antwerp and elsewhere had been carried to the North and East. The news fanned out in every direction. We will concentrate on what happened in the North Netherlands, but let us not forget that it affected the Southern areas of the country as well, and that the kinds of art on display in the northern exhibition are of the same kind.

The second group was the iconoclasts of the North. There was a huge amount of information about the course of iconoclasm in each of these places, and considerable discussion has been devoted to the issues of the extent of organization in each case, of the role of local nobility (like Brederode and Guelzburg), or that of William of Orange (who was frequently appealed to in the hope that he might stave off excesses of iconoclasm or violence), the social status of the iconoclasts, their numbers, the role of the preachers, the element of spontaneity in the initial outbreaks, as well as the whole complex issue of motivation and the relationship with the social, political and economic events of 1566. Since this essay has been written in the context of artistic production and thought about art in the period between 1525 and 1580, it is worth summarising the pressures on an already insignificantly populated area by the grain shortage of late 1565 early 1566, or the reorganization of the Netherlandish bishoprics and the consequent fear of the Inquisition; or the unhelpful attitude – to say the least – of the Regent of the Netherlands and – ultimately – the King of Spain. Here, as we consider the main outbreaks of iconoclasm in the North, in the very period that events were leading to the establishment of an independent Netherlands, let us concentrate on those details that bear largely on the relations between art and social act, between thinking about art and actual event.

As soon as they heard the news from Antwerp on 21 August a number of people gathered in St. Martin's in Middelburg. Slayly they began to break the images. The two burgomasters arrived and successfully appealed to the iconoclasts to leave the church, despite the presence of some who vehemently wished to follow the Antwerp example. Meanwhile the consistency was planning a more systematic form of iconoclasm. The next day a proclamation was issued against the destruction of images and the harming of priests and clerics. But
already a crowd had gathered in front of the church, and with a cry of ‘Vivent les guerres’, assailed its images. Within a few hours the images in the three principal churches and a beggar’s house were destroyed. The high altarpiece of the abbey was saved as a result of the intervention of the magistrates. Then the iconoclasts moved to the Arnenuiden, and set about their work with the help of members of the local population. From Middelburg and from other iconoclasts spread out, and a trail of destruction over the whole of the island of Walcheren. The chain of events is entirely typical.

In Breda the destruction was terrible; and here, in the cry of a prominent citizen as he led the iconoclasts in the Church of Our Lady, we have some measure of the pitch of sentiment against images: ‘Smijt alles uit dit pesthuis naar buiten’ (‘Throw everything from this plague-house outside’).

And then they destroyed the images according to an apparently predetermined plan. As for ‘s-Heerenhoog, we have considerable evidence for the activity, from the end of July on, of a preacher called Cornelis van Diest. There were attempts to stop him, but he nevertheless managed to enter the gates and began preaching. Almost immediately afterwards, on the evening of 22 August, a group gathered in St. Jans; they sang a psalm in front of the rood screen; and then began to smash the images until the ‘schutters’ finally arrived and closed the church. Much was thereby saved. But the remaining churches and cloisters were severely hit, and on 24 August the first sermon was held in the purified Cathedral. Still the reformed party was not satisfied, and they demanded four more chapels for their services. As in so many places, the storm was soon stilled; at least for a while, since when the townspeople heard of the possibility of the introduction of the inquisition there, a renewed and really remorseless outburst of iconoclasm swept through the churches and cloisters of the town.

In Amsterdam there had been a large number of sermons, and the situation was so tense that Brede- rode urgently requested Orange to come to the town and put it in order. On the very next morning (23 August) a group of merchants appeared in front of the Stock Exchange as the Wamoenstraat with several other merchant groups, purportly from some of the freshly destroyed altarpieces in Antwerp Cathedral. Not surprisingly, this alarmed the burgomasters, who immediately instructed the clergy of the Nieuwe Kerk to remove and hide as much as they could of their church furnishings. Much of our evidence for the events of these days comes from the eyewitness account of Laurens Jacobsz. Reael, who, despite his Protestant sympathies and the likelihood that he was actually present at the onset of at least iconoclastic outburst himself, made no bones of his deep antipathy to the wanton violence of the iconoclasts and — indeed — to the whole process of destruction. This apparently inconsistent stance is characteristic of the authors of any number of contemporary accounts; but it is entirely consistent with that strand of Erasmian thought that we find in Reael himself and in so many other of the leading figures in the drama of those days. Here Reael’s graphic description of the removal of precious objects for safekeeping: ‘Door dese waerschooninge men de geestelijcke persoonen bij de straat gelopen, dragende uide de kerck alle haer juwelien, als keleken, cbionia en mjeiagenweden: dit geschiede principael ontrent 11 uren voornimdaich, als alle de ambachtslieden gewoon spi naer maelt en te geaam (‘As a result of this warning, one could see the clergy in the street, carrying all their jewels out of the church, such as chalices, ciboria and vestments for the mass; this mainly took place around 11 o’clock in the morning, when the craftsmen were accustomed to go to their meals.’). What happened here, as in many other places, was that attempts were made to remove and hide the best works of art; but by now it was too little too late. A large group of men and women had gathered in the Nieuwe Kerk, but there, fortunately, ‘veel goede burgers hebben met veel goede woorden het voicx uit de kerck gekregen en de kerck vast toegesloten’ (‘by means of many good words a number of good citizens got the people out of their church, and closed the church shut.’). The Oude Kerk, on the other hand, suffered badly. There a grain-carrier called Jasper took exception to an inscription on a glass panel: ‘set daer hant in dat glasen bordeken dat gruwelike en godtastenck echicht.’ (‘there is a horrible and blasphemous poem hanging on that glass plate’), he exclaimed, and smashed it to the ground. Upon hearing the noise a group of youths started throwing stones at the paintings and sculptures, and began to pull them down. Fortunatel, some pictures had already been removed from the church. The ‘schutters’ were sent there, but the image-breaking grew more fierce yet. Finally the iconoclasts were appeased, and the church was closed. On 2 September, as elsewhere in the country, an official placard arrived from Brussels (it was dated 25 August) forbidding further iconoclasm under pain of death and confiscation, and insisting on the immediate repair of the churches and their furnishings.

But the lull was only temporary. Further violent assaults on images followed later in the month. On 26 September, the cloister of the Friars Minor was attacked ‘met een wonderlijke furie’ (‘with astonishing fury’), while on the next day the Carthusian monastery was similarly invaded. But there, after destroying some glass pictures and books, the crowd was persuaded to go home. Here as elsewhere the Friars Minor suffered particularly, for reasons that are still not entirely clear, but possibly because of their close association with the town government and their reported role in the investigation of heresy. In Delft women were in the forefront of the attack on the Minderbroeders, but there the Oude — and the Nieuwe Kerk were most gravely at risk. Images that had not been spirited away in time were destroyed, although in the Nieuwe Kerk the magistrates finally managed to persuade the iconoclasts to stop, and to prevent them from burning the objects they had dragged to the market-place. The overall result of these two horrifying waves of iconoclasm, however, was to deprive the churches of town of much of their most significant furnishings — and especially the pictures, organs, and glass. As van Bleyswijk was to comment of the Oude Kerk one century later: ‘De resterende Ornamenten en Cieren die in deze Kerck wel een aenschouwert en gij inisme geseerde en waer mede sy aldermeest proukende ende verierd was bestonerd en aengetast der Alten, uuverwenende Schilderijen en Tafereelen, kostelijke geschilderde Glasen, magnyfieke Orgalen en soo voorts alle meest de Beeld-stoomeren verniet, gerooyeste van geschonden; het hooge Auterze deze Kerke was in de furie soodanigen aengestetende ende verduestreut dat niet dan een Romp was overgebleven’ (‘the remaining ornaments and adornments which could previously be seen in this church were now to be seen no longer; it was a mere skeleton, consisted of sumptuous altars, outstanding paintings and pictures, precious stained glass, magnificent organs and so on. Most of these were destroyed, ruined, and damaged in the outbreaks of iconoclasm. The High Altar of this church was so assaulted and damaged in the fury that only the core of it remained.’). In Utrecht iconoclasm was immediately preceded by two characteristic events: first by the Protes- tants’ demand for places of worship of their own; and second by a sermon just outside the town gates, here by a preacher called ‘Scheie Gerrit’. When members of the reformed party met, they agreed that ‘de afgierlijkheyt van de beelden’ (‘the frightfulness of the images’) should be remo- ved from the churches, but promised to deposit these and other treasures in the Town Hall. The official investigation (of 1567) into the events of these days — here as elsewhere — provides us with ample evidence of the widespread and often impe- tuously violent destruction in the town. It also provides insight into one of the many personal casualties of those days, in its prolonged investiga- tion into the stance and action of Adrian de Wael van Vrooneswegen. Despite his repeated (and appa- rently justified) insistence that he adhered to the Old Faith, and despite his attempts to moderate iconoclastic activity, he was finally executed. In St. Gertrude’s, for example — where there is definite evidence of an attempt at systematic and complete destruction — he angrily shocked those at icono- clasts who were trying to break some windows (presumably with painted glass): ‘Ghy scheilmen, wat wilt jy doen? En een sijmynn gheen been- dell’ (you rascals, what do you want to do? They aren’t pictures after all, 139) A vigorous alteration ensued — but the glass was saved. There was much else that he managed to save, including the vaulings of the church itself. Since it had figures of the apostles painted on it, De Wael tried another approach: ‘Wat wyl jy gheen doen? Laet sten, men sel eener schilder kommen ende laten die beelden uutstrijcken’ (‘What do you want to do? Leave it alone, we will have a painter come and make the painting visible again.’) This was successful. But Ulrecht suffered badly, and the iconoclasts did their work in the Buurkerk, the Mariakerk, St. Nicholas’s, St. Gertrude’s, the clois- tors of the Dominican and the Friars Minor — and probably St. James’s too.

Iconoclasm in Leiden on 25 August was almost as frenzied and as random. A few days earlier the local rhetoricians had publicly derided the use of images; and when the iconoclasts got started, men, women and children apparently ran in and out of the chur- ches to the cry of ‘oek hier moet geheeren wat elders geschieh is’ (‘what has happened elsewhere must be done here too’). Although St. Peter’s was put under armed guard in the nick of time, the church of Our Lady, St. Pancras, and even the chapter house of St. Pancras were attacked; so, as usual, were the Friars Minor. In many places — probably mostly — theft of objects from the ransacked churches was successful. In some cases this was achieved by the preachers, the local nobleman, or the organizers of the iconoclasts; but here in Leiden, although the Council does appear to have allowed guilds and families to remove their altars and paintings to safety, parts of altars and other church furnishings
were transported to public places and offered for sale. It does appear to have been considerable and saleable, whereas everywhere else the vandalism flourished. Whereas elsewhere the penalties were often severe.

What happened in The Hague, on the other hand, was quite different. After its initial spurt of unrest, the churches were methodically stripped. Two days later, a prostitute in an ordnance forbidding the destruction of images on 23 August, the President of the Provincial Council of Holland ordered that the images be removed from the town's churches 'met ander stichtelied sommer company' ("in all tranquility and without disturbance"), and saw to it that twelve men were paid seven 'stukers' each to do the necessary work, while the 'schutters' guarded and locked each church. Here are the poles of iconoclasm in 1566: on the one hand, disorderly destruction, plundering and theft, with motives of obsequent or mercenary; on the other hand, controlled and sometimes systematic iconoclasm, often for sound theological reasons, with little if any theft and some saving on the grounds of the artistic merit of particular works of art. We cannot examine every outbreak of iconoclasm here, but there are a few further details that are both symptomatic and telling.

Den Briel, for example, offers further instances of supervised iconoclasm (on the day after it struck Leiden and The Hague). It was one of those towns where the range of reformed beliefs was strikingly broad, from Anabaptism to pure Calvinism, and where it is not always easy to identify the particular grouping to which individuals belonged. Here the main churches — St. Catherine's and the Maerlant Church — were closed in time, and thus were spared the worst of the onslaught, but the remainder were more or less severely assaulted. In the cloister of the Poor Cleres, Pieter Michiels gave specific instructions as to which images should be spared and which not, while after the destruction in the cloisters and convents two of the foremost Protestants (one man and one woman) appeared 'omme tebeze lone of de biskope myrings to be secthe gesicht ende vercomen was'. Indeed, they were heard enthusiastically to proclaim: 'God sj gelofet dot desse vere gecoomen es want het noester aelus geschien'. This kind of blunt and unreasonable justification was also offered by Sem Jansz. of Monnikendam, when he asserted that those who attacked the images and shattered them were simply doing God's will. How could one provide an argument against folkishly apodeictic assertions such as these? Perhaps the iconoclasts knew that, and even if so, there is no evidence of such sophistication. Marx van Sint Adelgangi could claim of the Antwerp iconoclasts that it must have been the will of God, however much they may have been the will of Goci, since otherwise how could so few people have achieved (sic) so much in so short a time. Such determinate views of the destruction of images were not uncommon, and for a short time some people held images very cheap indeed.

Den Briel itself offers the spectacle of some very odd but telling behaviour on the part of the local None groups (who, one might have thought, would have been even less disposed to pictures and sculpture than the following suggests). On Ash Wednesday in 1566, they gathered in their church in the local town hall, where five images from the St. Roch church were on display, as well as a chest with some liturgical accesso-

Qurinusz pronounced judgment on the St. Roch images and the other objects. Thereupon the rhetoricians took them and threw them into the fire. All the while they sang refrains and chanted psalms, as if it were a High Mass. A few days later, on 13th-14th August, the town hall was set on fire, the images in the church were destroyed, and the rioters burned some missals, organized a spontaneous group assault, but rather a few isola-

No more vivid picture of the kinds of exchange that took place on the eve of iconoclastic outbreaks could be wished for than that offered by a contemporary account by a nun tells of the events of 27-30 August when the images were destroyed in the town and its vicinity: "Maer dat volk tierde en maecote soo bistter genucht met roepen, singen en spoten, dat men deu geten peap, heer Thomsenn, niet verstaen kon dat ze..."'sken de strotte de klep om de muur, jij had d' eer d' ander riepen: toefst d' ander riepen: gei liget het al wat git se held die derde riepen: coeckoeckel sopo- mreip g eighteen saemendertel: de swaren duyvel staat hier op den preekstoel!" (but the crowd raved and made such a loud noise with their shouting and singing and mocking that one could not understand the beggar's pope, Mr. Thomsenn. They jumped around in their cloths, they called one to the other 'toef'; the other shouted "everybody you say is a liar", a third person shouted 'coeckoeckel' and some all shouted together: 'The black devil is standing on the pulpit here')

Frivolity and fury went hand in hand. Asperen was only affected on 8 October. There Wessel van Boetselaer ordered the churches to be stripped. Willem van Zuylen van Nyevelt, 'dross' of Curlicum (who had already destroyed his own family chapel) arrived with a preacher and half a dozen soldiers whom he placed around the churches and cloisters. Thus guarded, the iconoclasts could then range free and do their work of destruction untroubled by zealous warders or other officials. And so one could continue the sorry tale.... Much more unusual than these lamentable events — lamentable at least for art — were the cases of the towns which escaped iconoclasm altogether. Haarlem is perhaps the most notable example, for there were repeated demands for Protestant places of worship. The requests were at least partly met; but if there was one figure who may be said to have prevented the worst of the storm from affecting Haarlem it was Dirck Volkertszen Coornhert. Despite the threat of his efforts being grossly misunderstood (as we learn from the sustained inquiry of 1567 into his activities in August and September, 1566), and at considerable risk to himself, Coornhert managed to stave off the demands for iconoclasm; he made repeated and sometimes clandestine attempts to reach the Prince of Orange in order to invoke his help in those critical days — and all this despite his evident lack of sympathy with the Catholic use of images. For Coornhert, even if images were desecrated or abused, there could still be no justification for their disorderly removal, and this, along with his distaste for civil unrest, must have lain at the roots of his strenuous and ultimately successful efforts.

Like Haarlem, Nijmegen was spared any form of organized or large-scale iconoclasm; but even so it was necessary to send two commissioners to investigate what had happened there in 1566. After all, along with Roermond, Venro and Zaarloom, Nijmegen was one of the 'mauvaises villes' of Gelderland; and what seems to have happened there on 23-25 September 1566 was clearly quite enough to justify its reputation (along with its evident sympathy for several of the Protestant factions). There was nothing which one might call an iconoclastic movement there, no concerted or even spontaneous group assault, but rather a few isola-
ted incidents — all of which provide eloquent testimony to individual hostility to images in general and Roman image-worship in particular. Isolated incidents like these must be taken into account as we learn to accept the modern interpretation of iconoclasim in the Netherlands as organized and non-`
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glutious', 'ludicrous', 'stupid', 'crazy', 'senseless', 'hostile to art', 'wild', 'blind', 'ludicrous' and so on and so forth. It is not at all surprising to find mass destruction that was not always intended by Pieter Aertsen were destroyed for 't jotjmer der kunst door het niet ononderstand' ('that tragic loss to art through swelling stupidity'). Amongst these was the High Altar of the Nieuwe Kerk in Amsterdam, with a Nativity on the centre panel and a St. Mary Magdalene Adoration of the Magi on the wings, a Martha and Mary of St. Catherine was apparently represented on the reverse. Delft had been particularly rich in works by Aertsen; the Catharina monastery had a Crucifixion triptych by him, with a Nativity and an Adoration of the Magi on the wings and Four Evangelists on the exterior, while the Nieuwe Kerk had an Adoration of the Magi on the High Altar, with an Ecce Homo 'en soo yet anders' on the wings. All, according to van Mander, were lost; but it is worth noting that two of the Evangelists from Delft altarpiece survive (Pinson's 'Delft'), along with a portion of the Magi and a fragment of the Nativity (cat. 230-31 and 229). Yet another Crucifixion altarpiece by Aertsen used to be in Wartenaal in North Holland, and this is what happened to it: 'Dit werk als A˚ 1566, t'geheve men in zijn razerije was, wier in stukken geseigden mit bijlen, allowed de Vrouw van Soneveldt t'Ackerman daer voor boodt 100, pontit: want assencion wier de Kerck bracht om haar te leveren vielen de Boeren als uytsinnigh daer op en brachten die schoon Const te niet.'137 ('Even though the window of Soneveldt from Alkmaar offered 100 pounds for it, this work was smashed to pieces with axes when the people were raving in 1566, for when it was being brought from the church to deliver it to her, the peasants mindlessly fell upon it and brought the beautiful work of art to nothing'.) Although it may well have been part of Van Man- der's 'programme' to destroy the opposition between culture (as represented by painting) and non-culture, the sequence of events is one that we may recognize from contemporary chronicles. No wonder that van Mander tells how Aertsen deserted and dangerously lost his temper with the iconoclasts: 'Pieter was in a furious rage, and among all the things which he did the Weerelt told of the scattering of the church's works - already it was only decimated by iconoclasm - 'onder dekkes van't veilen coopen, en nae Spangeyen gesonden' ('under the pretense of wanting to buy them and sent to Spain'); in the same town the great Crucifix from Geertgen tot St. Jans, which had formerly stood over the high altar of St. John's, was destroyed, along with one of its wings. The remain-
der as having stood on the high altar of the Nieuwe Kerk did not stand there but elsewhere in the church. The High Altar was in fact a complex of altars, with the High Altar of the Nieuwe Kerk described as having stood on the high altar of the Nieuwe Kerk. Ten dage in Burgemeester te pronck in Teyten gelijck die meerendeels de rasend Kerckto such a large number of works, "alle welcke rarities and lamentable and clear; he even invokes soo is oockte beklaghen soo weynigh recht to their condition. Blocklandt. The consequences of iconoclasm for the 11000 virgins. The great fire of 1654 raises one of the most drastic effects of iconoclasm on the Oude Kerk in Delft; but after referring to the fact that only the monument was commissioned in 1568 for the huge sum of 1500 'Carolusgulden'; but it was never completed. Payments run until 1572 and then the town suffered new troubles. This may be all too typical of the disturbed state of the Netherlands during these years, but there is no hint of the extent of the minister, and the classicizing spoor of what was actually made by Tetrode (unfortunately lost in the great fire of 1654) raises one of the most profound questions of the period as a whole. Despite the degradations of the iconoclasts, and despite the unrest thus caused in the hearts and minds of artists, iconoclasm did not sound the death knell of Dutch art, as might have been expected. On the contrary: it inaugurated a period of unparalleled innovation. To some extent this may have been sparked by the way in which both Protesants (as van Beytsvijck suggested) and Catholics united in condemning the iconoclasts. The groundswell in favour of art grew on both sides. One year after the events of 1566 and in direct response to them, the pastor of the Oude Kerk, Martinus Duncanus published his Cort Onderscheyt tussegh Godlijcke ende Algoldische Beelden. Although significant in the vernacular and although it enjoyed the accolade of two reprints, the book is filled with extremely traditional arguments in favour of images buttressed by an armoury of biblical quotations: and, as its title suggests – it reflected the theological arguments underlying the iconoclast position by suggesting the elimination of abuses, rather than dealing with the fundamental issues at stake. In the end, a book like this – just as the even more traditional De vetustissimo sacrarum imaginum was published in the same year by Frederick Schenck van Toutenburg, the future Archbishop of Utrecht – was irrelevant.

If church art was no longer to flourish in the way it had before, every other form and genre seems to have been newly inspired. Van Mander himself may have bawled the effects of iconoclasm in no uncertain terms, but as soon as he arrived in Haarlem in 1579 he joined a group of fellow painters and sculptors who seem to have taken what had so recently happened as an opportunity to rethink the very bases of their art, and to produce new forms and new styles. The situation in the Southern Netherlands must then have seemed even bleaker. Perhaps these the consequences of iconoclasm were even worse; and the application of the Council of Trent’s recommendation for the ecclesiastical supervision of art cannot have helped. It is true that one of the immediate results of iconoclasm in 1566 was the publication, in the Southern Netherlands, of a great spate of treatises in favour of images – but only ostentatiously in favour. In fact, in their attempt to purify images of misuse and abuse (whether actual or potential), many of them turned out to be inordinately prescriptive and censorious. Artists in the South cannot but have been unerved by phenomena like these; but in the North their situation was, for the time being at least, rather more encouraging. This may have had more to do with the security and stability offered them by their new and newly independent homeland, and with the growing mood of confidence in the country at large, then with the direct effects of iconoclasm. But without the challenge offered by the whole question of images and by the terrible consequences it so briefly had, the course of Dutch art would have been entirely different.

4 Significance of the image question in art

This period, like every other, leaves many enigmas behind. Among the questions that relate directly to the objects and concerns of the present exhibition is this: To what extent do the controversies and events we have been discussing reflected in visual form in the years between 1525 and 1585? The issue is not at all as simple as or clear as one might expect. Two monuments, both published by Hessel Miedema, could by their very nature not be included in the present exhibition, but should nevertheless claim our attention. The first is a large-scale structure that can obviously not be moved, and is typical of the kind of monument that once must have existed in much greater abundance than now (Fig. 8). The second is a kind of low-level pictorial performance on the vaulting of a church that was typically covered over with a layer of plaster and whitewash until its recent recovery (Fig. 9). Both monuments could not be more representative of the more ordinary kinds of art in the period before iconoclasm – so much of which is now lost – than those largely prestigious objects represented in the present exhibition. They are thus paradigmatic not only in their stylistic range, from the workaday to the comparatively distinct; but also and above all in their iconography, which reveals the dialectic between Catholicism and Reformed belief in all its tension – even though the monuments were for at least notionally Catholic places. They point to the acute difficulty of defining the doctrinal, theological and fidescum stansiance implicit in so many of the objects produced before and during iconoclasm. The first of these monuments is the roodscreen of the gallery known as the ‘kraak’ in the Reformed (Herord) church at Oosterend in Friesland (Fig. 8), it is in wood and is dated 1554. The ornamental elements of this work clearly derive from the types and techniques popularized by Cornelis Floris; but what is of concern to us here are the notable figurative subjects and the vernacular texts above the gallery and below the scenes. The texts derive from a Bible published by Jacob van Liesviet in Antwerp in the 1530s. While Liesvet only felt foul of the inquisition for the marginal illustration of his 1542 edition of the Bible (which was not used by the artist of the ‘kraak’) and was executed in 1545, we must nevertheless confront the possibility of reformed influence here.

In a general way the use the vernacular does not point, implicitly at least, to the desire for a more direct relationship between latly and scripture; but by this time the phenomenon was not especially unusual. What is unusual is the iconography of the scenes on the ‘kraak’. There are eleven subjects from the Old Testament (of which 8 are derived from the Books of Kings) and only 7 from the New. Some of the scenes are taken from the Liesviet Bible of 1538, while others are clearly based on illustrations in Bibles such as those published in Antwerp in 1533-34 by Wilmert Vorsterman (placed on the Index of forbidden books in 1546) and by Hendrick Peetersen in Middelburg in 1541. The Old Testament subjects include ones which had rarely been represented before, such as The angel routing the Assyrians, Josiah called to the throne, Joab killing Amasa, David’s last words, David writing a letter to Joab, and – as an exceptional representation from the apocryphal book of Daniel – Daniel unmasking the preists of Bel. Most unexpectedly, the Old Testament scenes do not stand in typological relationship to the New Testament ones; rather, as Miedema noted, they are exemplary. They emphasize the directness of God’s relationship with Man and the directness of the artist as Redeemer. This is how Miedema characterized the iconography of the ‘kraak’ as a whole: ‘des scenes geven blijk van een zeer levendige belangstelling voor de moderne bijbelvertalingen, een belangstelling die geen behoefte meer heeft aan traditionele liturgische of typologische formulies maar daarin de duidelijke naderdom op het exemplarische karakter van bijbelvertalingen waar een directe relatie tussen God en de mens blijkt’ (‘the scenes provide evidence of a very lively interest in the modern translations of the bible, an interest that no longer has any need for traditional liturgical or typological formulas, but which places clear emphasis on the exemplary nature of those biblical stories in which a direct relation between God and man is apparent’).

But, as he rightly cautioned: ‘Het zou voorbarig zijn, deze nieuwe iconographie het gevolg te noemen van de reformatie, niettemin stelt hij het waarschijnlijk dat het verlaten van de typologie voor een veel directer exemplarische iconographie samenhangt met de nieuwe directe vroomheid waarin de hervorming tot stand zou komen, maar waarbij eerder de naam van Erasmus dan die van Luther moet worden genoemd’ (‘It would be rash to...
call his new iconography reformation iconography. It seems more likely that the abandoning of type I, L. seems more likely that the abandonment of type II, is not to be attributed to this new iconography, which may be more directly related to the new iconography that developed in the Low Countries in the late 16th century. The new iconography may have been influenced by the work of Lucas van Leyden, who produced a series of prints showing the destruction of the idols of Babylon, which were interpreted as a symbol of the destruction of the idols of Rome. This new iconography was also influenced by the work of Maerten van Heemskerck, who produced a series of prints showing the destruction of the idols of Rome, which were interpreted as a symbol of the destruction of the idols of the Roman Catholic Church.

The question of the meaning of the new iconography is still a matter of debate. Some scholars have argued that the new iconography was intended to be a direct attack on the Catholic Church, while others have argued that it was intended to be a more general criticism of the state of affairs in the Low Countries. The new iconography may have been intended to be a reflection of the political and social changes that were taking place in the Low Countries at the time. The new iconography was also influenced by the work of Maerten van Heemskerck, who produced a series of prints showing the destruction of the idols of Rome, which were interpreted as a symbol of the destruction of the idols of the Roman Catholic Church.
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chosen to represent the priests of Bel in the earlier series as torsured monks: is this simply anti-clerical, or is it more tendentious than that—particularly in the light of the abundantly evident idolatry of these priests and their rightfull overthrow?\footnote{1} Certainly almost every one of these series contain scenes of the slaughter of idolatous priests. These are not the only allusions to idolatry and to Iconoclasm; there is a number of others in the prints before he returned to Haarlem in 1574, when he was churchwarden of St. Baavo’s in Haarlem.\footnote{2} In the Clades Ludisceorum series he represented the destruction of the Temples of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar again by Titus (destruction by enemies of the true religion).\footnote{3} He was a close friend of Dirck Volckertzoon Coornhert, who, more than anyone else appears to have staved off serious Iconoclasm in Haarlem.\footnote{4} Could it be that in prints like the Haerseck ran not actually advocating the destruction of images, but rather suggesting that if the churches were to be purified, then the process should only be carried out at the behest of the rightful authorities—an idea that is frequent not only in the major Reformations works, but also in Coornhert himself.\footnote{5} One of the most striking features of all the prints noted above is the emphasis on the presence of the ruler (or the prophet) at each of the major Iconoclastic events. But whether this puts these images closer to Catholic attitudes or rather to those of Luther or Calvin must still remain unclear. The most likely possibility is that the stance is to be aligned with that broad Erasmian strain in Dutch culture to which we have already alluded. We now know, as a result of the work of IJsbrand Jan Vrolijk that if there was any artist at this time who might be called humanist—both in the narrow and the broad senses—it was Heemskerck;\footnote{6} and in this respect we may well want to come to similar conclusions as those which Mie- derna arrived at in the case of the vastly different objects in Oosterend and Hardenberg. For all that, there is certainly a strong sense in these works by Heemskerck of the potential idolatrousness—at least of images. If there were any images of the sixteenth century which seem to be making a statement in favour of iconoclasm it is these; could it be that the artist here is only insisting on the right way of going about it?\footnote{7} It will be apparent from the abundance of questions raised here how difficult it is to come to specific conclusions either about particular attitudes or about the precise nature of the relationship between topical issues and subject matter. If anything, this is simply an indication of the richly textured context of thought about images and their value during the whole period covered by the exhibition. If it were easier to unravel single strands then the fabric would be less rich than it palpably is, and one would be less given to insist on the importance of viewing all images of the period in the context we have been describing. There are of course a number of images of a polemical or satirical nature whose import in not unclear at all; but these—perhaps interestingly—seem to come mostly from the Southern Netherlands. It may simply be a question of survival, but the booklets of the anonymous Ghesaert’s remarkable Allegory of Iconoclasm (Fig. 18) or the engraving of 1566 headed “It is to verloren, ghebben oft ghescheten; ik heb de beste carse ghestreken, 1566” (Fig. 19). The first shows a monstrous face-like landscape, on which are scattered a variety of scenes showing the abuse of the sacraments and other aspects of Catholic devotion: above the pope, surrounded by monks and bishops, and furnished with indulgences and rosaries and the like, while below the accouterments of the liturgy (including many images) are being smashed to bits or carted away to destruction.\footnote{8} The second print shows the removal and destruction of images (in the left background), while on the right a devil carries the cross and other Catholic insignia, while a bishop says “Hort den duvel toe” (“because all this stuff belongs to the devil”) reads the inscription. Below the devil, monks and bishops worship the pope as the whore of Babylon seated atop a seven-headed beast on an altar.\footnote{9} One assumes there must have been many others like these; but unfortunately we are left with the more ambiguous kinds of imagery. Perhaps it was simply safer to leave the matter ambiguous; or perhaps it was the effectiveness of the censors that eliminated the more explicit and the more blatantly subversive visual commentaries. There is one artist in whom all these questions come together—and yet remain elusive and frustratingly unanswered: Pieter Aertsen. Despite the attention devoted to him in the last fifteen years—most notably by Jan Emmens—the whole question of how it is that Aertsen came to paint his remarkable kitchen and genre-pieces (cf. cat. 225-28) has still not been entirely resolved.\footnote{8} One can do no more than speculate on the possibility that at least part of the motivation (quite possibly unconscious) may have been a result of impotence with traditional forms of religious art; and that the motivation may well have sprung from the influence of Protestant ideas about such forms and their functions.\footnote{9} But we cannot know the answers to these questions until we have more biographical information (especially concerning the reasons for his return from Antwerp to Amsterdam in 1556) and further insight into the kinds of work he produced after 1566; when commissions for altarpieces were dramatically limited. Certainly we know of his deep and unsurprising exasperation at the destruction of his works in that year and after.\footnote{10} But what are we to make of the wholly surprising painting of The Idiocy of Nebuchadnezzarow in Rotterdam (Fig. 20)? Here is a work which shows the more and more clearly idolatrous image erected by the King of Babylon, while in the background, unmistakably, are the three holy children—Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego—who were prepared to die for their opposition to the idol which so offensively domin- ated the scene and is so grossly venerated there.\footnote{11} It is hard to imagine how the topical significance of the scene could have gone unnoticed by anyone in the Netherlands in the years covered by this exhibition (and the same subject was also represented in Rotterdam, see Dieriks 1966, Freedberg 1973 and the excellent study by Duke/Kolff 1969, which although comparatively local gives the reader the most possible illumination and the main historiographic and sociological issues. On these particular aspects of Erasmus’ criticism, with the relevant sources, see Freedberg 1971. For these and other aspects of Erasmus’ attitude to art, see, inter alia, Gies 1935, p. 257-79, Panofsky 1969, p. 200-27, and Moscy 1977A, p. 122-28. For the best overview of the reformation debate, see Von Campenhausen 1960. Karstade’s Von Abndung der Bilder (Wittenberg, 1522) is available in the edition by H. Lietzmann (Bonn, 1911). For Hat- ter and his 1525 booklet entitled Ein Urteilt Gottes...wie man sich mit all...gegen und bildnussen halten soll, see n. 17 below. The landscape on the Byzantine Iconoclasm is now vast. A good compendium of information, with useful bibliographic aid and selection of texts is provided by Bryer/Herrin 1977. For the best discussions of these arguments, see Von Campenhausen 1952, and Kitzinger 1954. The argument continues of course form St. Basil, and is to be found in the course of his discussion of the essential unity of the Trinity in the De Sprritus Sancto, XVI, 45, 80.
but a useful guide to their role and to the literature on them is provided by Mack Crew 1978. For an attempt to assess the relationship between the kinds of ideas about the subject. As they might have been purged by the preachers and the actual outbreak of iconoclasm, see Freedberg 1976.

BRN I, p. 261 and 271. For the references in this and the next paragraph, I am indebted to Moxey 1977, p. 144-48. For the general treatment of De Varto, see Hebble, in BRN I, p. 122. The work appears on the 1590 Index.

Published by Sebastian Heyden in Nurnberg in 1524.

The passage is taken from Graphica's Transit end Spiegел der Sachen and is reproduced in BRN I, p. 188. The Transit end Spiegel der Sachen first appeared in 1525, and then again in 1531 and 1557; inevitably it found its way onto the Indices of 1550 and 1576.

BRN I, p. 416. The work concerned is Der Voi der Ronishe Kreken, which after its first appearance in Norwich in 1530 was re-edited in London in 1535. Eden, 1536 and Antwerp, 1547—before appearing on the Index of 1579.


For more on the significance of Old Testament scenes, see Marcus 1977 and 1979, especially pp. 148-153 which, along with p. 144-48, as cited in n. 22 above, appear in almost exactly the same form in Moxey 1977, p. 149-62.

Maerj miiusko gijoket al verloren piene/aen dees gereedmaakte belden van godt verboden...het sijn al afgedoren', as in De Vooys 1928, p. 191-92. For the rest of this prolonge to the Second Apostel Play by van Haecht, see p. 191-97. De Vooys, p. 29-30 plausibly suggests that while the painter, like van Haecht himself, appears to have adopted a Lutheranism on these matters, his purpose is presumably to be regarded a Calvinist.

Ibidem, p. 40-41. These are exactly the precedents that appear in any number of present-image treatises and the Lutheranism — as, for example, in at least one work which will appear later in this discussion (cf. p. 78 above). cf. also the discussion of the iconoclastic position of Luther, Christensen 1979, p. 42-65 and 598). See too 

As, for example, in Kuiper/Leendertz 1981, p. 43-234; and Freedberg 1973, p. 50-56. For examples of the 'kraak' of Oosterend and of the 'kraak' of Haecht, see p. 191-97. De Vooys, p. 37.
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1619. For the full text, the textual history and the variants, see Bakhuis van den Brink 1970, p. 291-298 (for more on the various translations see p. 35-36). It is worth noting – as one considers the problems of variant readings – the differences between the texts of the answer to Question 99 as given here, and that of the two latter extended translations of 1563 and 1565, which run as follows: ‘Neent: want wij en zullen niet wijzer zijn dan Gods, de welde van zijn Christenheid en het verwoorden van stome afgoden, maer door de leven- dige predicaat uits woorden wil onder- wesen ofte gelheer hebben.’ ‘Predicaat’ for ‘verkwistinghe’ and ‘stome beelden’ for ‘stome afgoden’ are changes worth pondering.

10 These matters are all carefully and brilliantly set out in Jedin 1953, p. 143-49 and 494-20.
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154 For a variety of attempts to come to grips with these problems, see especially Eumaetus 1973 and Moxey 1977, 1978. Krendl 1983 is devoted to the religious paintings, but does not raise the kinds of issues broached here.
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