

Paintings as Historical Evidence of Artistic Emotions

The Art of Hieronymus Bosch and the Soul of the Artist in Critical Discourse in the Seventeenth Century

Nils Büttner

This essay addresses the discourses within which the pictures of Hieronymus Bosch (c. 1450–1516) were understood as bearing witness to the artist's inner life and his emotions. Traditionally, art history finds it difficult to interpret paintings as immediate evidence of their creator's emotions. However, we should bear in mind that pictures have been understood in these terms for a long time. If we understand historical works of art as testimonials in the history of discourse, they also enable us conclusions on the *episteme* of the discourse about emotionality. For an archeology of discourses, Bosch's pictures are particularly interesting as they have been interpreted as bearing witness to the artist's inner life from the early modern period onwards. Thereby the paintings of the then long deceased painter from 's-Hertogenbosch are turned into testimonials for a very specific look on paintings and for the expectations of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century audience.

'Hieronymus Bosch [...] is [...] an artist who indulges in sick delusions, who vents his fantasies begotten in deprivation and suffering in bestial and pathologically curious inspirations [...] His imagery is especially striking through the distressing and sadistical combination of ideas displaying nudity in all manners of suffering imaginable'¹

This less than flattering characterisation of Bosch is documented in Alfred von Wurzbach's *Niederländisches Künstlerlexikon*, published in Vienna in 1906. However this both brief and drastic portrayal of the 'artist who indulges in sick delusions' reveals little about the painter

from 's-Hertogenbosch; it reveals much more about the art concept of former Austrian Imperial and Royal civil servant Alfred von Wurzbach, who dedicated the free time of his retirement to studies in art history and lexicography from 1876 onwards.²

In those years, the painter Hieronymus Bosch was virtually rediscovered. Over centuries, Bosch was known by name only, especially as most of his works were kept in Spain. In 1889, an essay by the German art historian Carl Justi on 'The works of Hieronymus Bosch in Spain' triggered an increasing interest in this particular painter.³

In the following decade, more and more reproductions of his work were made accessible to the public. The first printed photographic reproduction of his most famous work was a photogravure of the retable that was since known as *Garden of Earthly Delights* (1500–1505, Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, fig. 1) The photogravure was published in 1898.⁴ After things had become quiet for many years around the painter from 's-Hertogenbosch, his paintings were rediscovered by art history at the time when Sigmund Freud formulated his theories on trauma and established the term psychoanalysis.⁵ It is certainly no coincidence that there was also a rising interest in Bosch in the decades following the discovery of the human psyche and its analysis.

The first monograph about Bosch was released in 1907. With this book, Maurice Gossart met the growing interest in the 'faiseur de Dyables'. The epitheton 'devil maker' has been connected with the painter from the sixteenth century onwards. Its first use can be found about



Fig. 1. Hieronymus Bosch, *Garden of Earthly Delights*, 1500-1505, panel 220 x 195 cm, wings: 220 x 97 cm. Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado.



Fig. 2. Jacques le Boucq: *Jeronymus Bos peintre*, in: *Recueil d'Arras* (c. 1560, MS 266, Bibliothèque Médiathèque d'Arras, fol. 275).

half a century after the painters's death in the writings of Marcus van Varnewijck, who writes that Bosch used to be called the 'duvelmakere'.⁶ A rising number of opulent illustrated books catered to the renewed interest, yet the art historian Max J. Friedländer wrote in 1927 that 'most of what was written about Bosch reads as though it were taken from detailed descriptions of lost works'.⁷ Independent of this assessment, the various literary reactions show that Bosch fascinated thinkers for over 500 years.

The scientific view on the painters psyche

Alfred von Wurzbach's initial assessment that Bosch's surviving works were the source of the painter's personality finds its echo throughout many interpretations. In 1889, Carl Justi was one of the first critics who read Bosch's paintings as a mirror of the painter's mind and used them 'to at least be able to speculate about his inner person'.⁸

Many authors followed Justi in his endeavour. An extensive canon bears witness to the many attempts to use the surviving paintings as a means to analyse Bosch's psyche. In addition, there even was a phrenological analysis of the posthumous portrait preserved in the so-called *Recueil d'Arras* (c. 1560, Bibliothèque Médiathèque d'Arras, fig. 2).⁹ This portrait, which sheds more light on Bosch's posthumous reputation than on his looks had been reproduced in 1572 in a collection of engravings edited by Hieronymus Cock, and was widely circulated in later editions.¹⁰ The analysis of Bosch's features as displayed in the portrait lead Hermann Eßwein (1925) to the conclusion, that not all of Bosch's art was pathogenic, 'yet it is clearly discernible that one pathological element coexists beside another, full of healthiness and all-encompassing spirituality that we would wish on many others these days'.¹¹ In 1936 Cornelius Veth agreed with this assessment and tried to read Bosch's imagery as something different than a mere reflection of the painter's obsessions, whereas his contemporary Theodor Reik characterized the painter as 'highly neurotic'.¹² According to Reik, Bosch's paintings were a reflection of his angst and repressed desires.¹³ Robert Melville agreed, as

he claimed in 1946 that Bosch's visual concept of temptation was a painted journal of his day dreams resulting from the battle against masturbation.¹⁴ Ten years later, José Luis Gonzálaz's analysis of the paintings lead him to ascribe morbidly aggressive and libidinous instincts to Bosch, which were however sublimated in his art.¹⁵ Others were opposed to this pathologisation of the artist. Annie Chauvière speculated that Bosch displayed some neurotic tendencies but could not be labelled as psychotic.¹⁶ This view was shared by Ralph William Pickford in 1967, which however did not discourage him to interpret various details in Bosch's paintings as projections of oral, anal and phallic fantasies of the artist.¹⁷ An even less positive assessment of the painter's psyche is offered by Robert E. Hemphill, who believed the painter to be mentally and socially disturbed.¹⁸ And while the psychiatrist Gosewijn Jan Zwanikken mainly focused on the difficulties of pathologisation that Bosch's work presented, his colleague Alexander R. Lucas tried at the same time to align the assumed chronology of Bosch's body of work with the typical course of a mental illness.¹⁹ For Erika Fromm, his paintings were proof of his homosexuality and impotence, while others detected less individual problems in the paintings but understood them as universal archetypes of a collective subconscious.²⁰ In 1965 the art historian Charles de Tolnay called Bosch 'a predecessor of psychoanalysis who [applied] the whole range of his piercing wit to extract from memory and experience those dream symbols that are universal to all humanity'.²¹ As early as 1936, Abraham Hammacher had remarked that only a modern psychoanalyst could succeed to unravel Bosch's intricate symbolism.²² Art historians usually had a critical attitude towards the pathologisation of Bosch by psychologists and medical men, yet even their critical discourse is full of attempts to display Bosch as sick or healthy based on the evidence of his work or physiognomy.²³ For instance, Friedrich Markus Huebner regarded Bosch as a 'Schizothymiker', while voicing the opinion that it might be insufficient to attempt 'to solve the case of Hieronimus Bosch with the means of depth psychology'.²⁴ Otto Benesch also admonished attempts to misunderstand Bosch's demons as internal reality of the painter's soul, especially as pathographic studies that drew conclusions from the evidence of paintings to

the painter's psyche were – and still remain – popular.²⁵ Mostly, the debate within art history shows a certain amount of reservation against psychoanalytic readings, especially at those points where Freud himself dabbled in the field of art.²⁶

An unremarkable biography

Wherever art historians refute the psychologised interpretations, they usually return to the documented circumstances of the painter's life. The earthly span of the painter Jheronimus van Aken, who called himself Bosch, is exceptionally well documented for a contemporary of the fifteenth century.²⁷ Dating over a period of

42 years, more than fifty documents are preserved that allow conclusions on Bosch's life and work in the Dutch town of 's-Hertogenbosch. Most of the documents are official town records and bear witness to a life of prosperity for Bosch and his wife. He was one of the wealthiest citizens of his town and made the top one percent of the most prosperous tax payers. Besides his wealth, the fact that Bosch became a member of the still active Brotherhood of our Lady in the accounting year 1486/87 is an important constituent for his high status within the community.²⁸ The documents show Bosch as a pillar of the community and a high ranking Catholic with remarkably good contacts in the courtly world of his time. The fact that many of his paintings are listed in the records of court



HIERONYMO BOSCHIO PICTORI.

*Quid sibi vult, Hieronymus Boschi,
Ille oculus tuus attonitus? quid
Pallor in ore? velut lemures si
Spectra Erebi volitantia coram
Tibi Ditis auarum
Crediderim patuisse recessus
Tartareasque domos tua quando
Quicquid habet finis imus Auerni
Tam potuit bene pingere dextra.*

Fig. 3. Johannes Wierix (?), Hieronymus Bosch, 1572, engraving 20.8 x 12.3 cm. Archive of the author.

collections and the commissions he received from courtly circles place his work within the system of patronage.

Correspondingly, the subjects and arrangements of the paintings were not entirely the painter's free choice but might have depended on his patrons. According to the biographic facts known today, Bosch's contemporaries had no reason whatsoever to doubt his sanity or faith. Contemporary sources attest to his fame and evidence suggests that he attracted the attention of court patrons early in his career. His international fame is documented by the records of art collections where Bosch's works are listed early on. Especially striking is the amount of copies and imitations, the first of which may well date back to Bosch's own lifetime.²⁹ The countless copies, imitations and paintings inspired by him raise doubt as to whether conclusions on the emotions and inner life of Hieronymus Bosch can be called sound. If one takes into account the extensive number of Bosch's successors, the so-called deviant psychological disposition derived from his paintings becomes a mass phenomenon of unsettling proportions. Are those imitations also to be understood as documents of the disturbed inner life of their creators?

Paintings as testimonies of the inner life?

The number of paintings that are commonly considered to be Bosch originals has dwindled over the last couple of years.³⁰ Yet, even this reduction does not answer the basic question whether Bosch's works can be understood as valid testimonies to his inner life and the history of emotions.³¹ Another question that has yet to be asked is when Bosch's paintings were first understood in this sense. Even if one is disinclined to interpret the paintings as direct testimonies to the creators emotions, the central fact remains that from one specific point in time, they were understood in that specific way. Thus, they become evidence of the history of discourse and offer insights into the episteme of the debate on emotionality.³² This debate originates in the early modern period, thus making Bosch's paintings interesting evidence for an archaeology of discourse. Unfortunately, we have no evidence of early contemporary

statements dating back to Bosch's lifetime that would allow conclusions as to whether his paintings were read as mirror of his emotions. Yet, only a few decades after his death the first documents that follow this argumentation emerge. The documented perception of the imagery of the late painter from 's-Hertogenbosch testifies to a culture of emotions, in reflecting the expectations of the public in the sixteenth and seventeenth century.

A first trace of the idea that the paintings of Hieronymus Bosch do not follow a clearly defined assignment and an assigned topic but allow insight into his soul, can be found in the poem of the artist and writer Dominicus Lampsonius.³³ The poem was used as an accompanying inscription to the portrait of Bosch in the collection of artists' portraits edited by Hieronymus Cock (1572, archive of the author, fig. 3):

*'Quid sibi vult, Hieronÿme Boschi,
Ille oculus tuus attonitus? quid
Pallor in ore? velut lemures si
Spectra Erébi volitantia cora[m]
Aspiceres? Tibi Ditis auari
Crediderim patuisse receßus
Tartareasque domos. tua quando
Quicquid habet sinus imus Auerni
Tam potuit bene pingere dextra.'*

*'Hieronymus Bosch, what means your
frightened face
And pale appearance? It seems as though
you just
Saw all infernal spectres fly close around
your ears.
I think that all the deepest rings of
miserly Pluto
Were revealed, and the wide habitations
of Hell
Opened to you – because you are so
art-full
In painting with your right hand
depictions
Of all that the deepest bowels of Hell
contain.'*³⁴

The poem alludes to those images and topics that built the painter's early fame. Further contemporary statements include Lodovico Guiccardini, who characterised Bosch in 1567 as the famous inventor of fantastic and bizarre things and his contemporary Marcus van

Varnewyck, who testifies that Bosch used to be called the 'devil maker'.³⁵ Yet, Lampsonius's poem is more than just a hint to the public perception of Bosch as the 'duvelmakere'. By aligning his visionary topics with the artist's expression and the pallor of his face, a rhetoric bridge between the topics of his art and humoral pathology is created: His eyes, the mirror to his soul, betray a frightened expression.³⁶ His skin is pale, which is connected directly to the things perceived. The artist shows a bodily reaction connected to his mood or passions.³⁷ Early modern art critics were indebted to rhetoric and used to draw on the close connection between the artist's affective mood and the image created by him.³⁸ Horatius was one of the early voices who claimed that the ideal poet had to have cried himself, before he could make others cry.³⁹ According to Horatius' famous formula 'ut pictura poesis', this demand was transferred to the visual arts by various art critics.⁴⁰ If the artist is to convey authentic emotions, he should have lived the affects himself. If the depiction is authentic, the emotions the artist had in creating the work are transferred to the spectator.⁴¹ The description of Bosch's fear is thus to be understood as praise of the imaginative force of his paintings. Bosch himself was scared by the demons he painted. In that view, this state of the artist's soul can be read from his works, that allow insight into the artist's emotional life.

Artistic imagination and public reaction

Another critic who saw Bosch's paintings as an immediate reflex of his artistic imagination was the painter and art critic Karel van Mander, who printed a Dutch translation of Lampsonius' poem in his *Schilder-Boeck*:⁴²

'Who will relate all the wonderful or peculiar fancies which Jeronimus Bos had in his head and expressed with his brush, of phantoms and monsters of hell which are usually not so much kindly as ghastly to look upon.'⁴³

In conveying the idea that Bosch's imagery had its source within the artist's innermost soul, Van Mander reproduces a topos of art theory

that dates back to antiquity.⁴⁴ It is an idea that was expressed by Albrecht Dürer as early as the sixteenth century, who wrote in an early draft of his textbook on painting that 'a good painter is full of figure within'.⁴⁵

The importance of artistic imagination was also emphasized by Franciscus Junius in 1637, who introduced the terms *imitatio* and *phantasia* (imitation and imagination) as a powerful force for artistic creation as well as the reception of art.⁴⁶ Not only the artist needs imagination to create a piece of art, but also the spectator needs imaginative powers to be able to see and fully understand artistic expression.⁴⁷ Franciscus Junius recommended art lovers to enrich their imagination by using powerful, visual memories and offered a wide range of inspiring quotes from antique literature, by means of which the encounter with works of art was to be intensified.⁴⁸ With this reinforcement, the spectator was enabled to trace the emotions of the depicted subjects that were created with adherence to the rules of imitation of nature, and feel the same intensity that the artist felt when the depicted subjects sprung from his imagination. Junius spelled out very specific demands for the artist's imaginative abilities, who according to him, had to exercise his imaginative powers every day to awaken and strengthen them.⁴⁹ The powers of imagination were seen in direct connection to the artist's inner strength and ability for empathy and sympathy for the moods and emotions of others.⁵⁰

Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo also acknowledged the contemporary notion that Bosch drew his frightening and emotionally touching images from his innermost self. In his pamphlet on painting from the year 1584, Lomazzo mentioned Bosch's specialty: 'strange appearances and frightening and disturbing dreams.'⁵¹ The emphasis on the scary quality of these images is just as interesting as van Mander's allusion that Bosch's imagery was 'usually not so much kindly as ghastly to look upon', – 'dickwils niet alsoo vriendlijck als grouwlijck aen te sien.'⁵² As Van Mander's biography of the painter Pieter Bruegel shows, in the course of the sixteenth century a new perception of the imagery of hell started, that used to be characterized as merely horrifying. This new assessment is closely connected to the person of Pieter Bruegel the Elder, of whom Karel von Mander writes that



Fig. 4. Pieter Bruegel the Elder: *Extravagance or Lechery (Luxuria)*, 1558, engraving, 22.5 × 29.5 cm. Archive of the author.

he had a similar method of work to Hieronymus Bosch (1558, archive of the author, fig. 4):

‘He had practised a lot after the works of Jeroon van den Bosch and he also made many spectres and burlesques in his manner so that he was called by many *Pier den Drol*. This is why one sees few pictures by him which a spectator can contemplate seriously and without laughing.’⁵³

The images of hell and devilries following Bosch during the sixteenth and seventeenth century show – just like the paintings of the master from ‘s-Hertogenbosch

‘delusional, abysmal witchery, horrible visions that torture Saint Anthony with their terrible spectres, full of furies, fire and flames, full of infernal noise and other demoniac rage and strange adventures.’⁵⁴

Yet, the public impression made by the imagery of David Ryckaert (1612-1661), whose art inspired Cornelis de Bie to write the lines

quoted above, and fellow painters like Joos van Craesbeeck (1605/1606–c. 1660) and others was considerably different (c. 1650, Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle, fig. 5):

‘These are works that surely evoked pleasure if not laughter, and their artifice is obvious, even while their subjects deal with issues of ultimate destiny and the deepest of spiritual questions.’⁵⁵

Obviously, the themes and motifs on the paintings of Bosch’s successors were no longer seen as threatening but full of clever allusions and contributions to the culture of wit and humour that was cultivated in the Netherlands at the time.⁵⁶ Yet, when it came to the reception of the art of Hieronymus Bosch, this new interpretation does not seem to have affected the belief that the art of this particular painter vented his innermost pain and angst-ridden inner turmoil. Therefore his paintings were still seen as sinister and uncanny which is why Joachim von Sandrart, who relied heavily on



Fig. 5. Joos van Craesbeeck: *The Temptation of St Anthony*, c. 1650, canvas 78 x 116 cm. Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle.

Karel van Mander as a source, still claimed in 1675 that Bosch had ‘an abundance of strange thoughts, which he imitated and brought to paper with his brush, especially the hellish furies and spectres horrible to behold.’⁵⁷

‘The difference, that in my opinion exists between the paintings of that man and the others’

No matter how witty and humorous images of hell were thought of in Sandart’s days, the paintings of Hieronymus Bosch were not considered funny. Shortly after the middle of the sixteenth century Felipe de Guevara had differentiated the works of Bosch from the works of his successors:

‘That which Hieronymus Bosch did with wisdom and decorum others did, and still do, without any discretion and good judgement; for having seen in Flanders how well received was this

kind of painting by Hieronymus Bosch, they decided to imitate it and painted monsters and various imaginary subjects, thus giving to understand that in this alone consisted the imitation of Bosch. In this way came into being numbers of paintings of this kind which are signed with the name of Hieronymus Bosch but are in fact fraudulently inscribed: pictures to which he would never have thought of putting his hand but which are in reality the work of smoke and of short-sighted fools who smoked them in fireplaces in order to lend them credibility and an aged look.’⁵⁸

About half a century after that, Fray José de Sigüenza remarked on the subjectivity and the individuality of Bosch’s paintings. His remarkable statements can be found in the *History of the Hieronymite order*, written in 1605, a detailed chronicle of the El Escorial monastery, that had been founded by Philipp II of Spain.⁵⁹ Four centuries after the Council of Trent, which had expressed explicit opposition to those paintings from Bosch’s time that were

criticised by the Reformation, Sigüenza tried to explain the partiality of the most Catholic king towards those paintings. King Philipp's authority also became a moral touchstone for the author, that placed Bosch's art above the suspicion of heresy.⁶⁰ If one was to cast only a fleeting glance on the paintings, one could get the idea that these works were heretic, when in fact they were 'books of great wisdom and artistic value.'⁶¹ They could inspire the spectator to reflect on their sins and explore their own spiritual life. And 'the difference that, to my mind, exists between the pictures of this man and those of all others', Sigüenza states, 'is that the others try to paint man as he appears on the outside, while he alone had the audacity to paint him as he is on the inside.'⁶² Therefore, everyone could profit from their contemplation:

'one can reap great profit by observing himself thus portrayed true to life from the inside, unless one does not realize what is inside himself and has become so blind that he is not aware of the passions and vices that keep him transformed into a beast, or rather so many beasts.'⁶³

With his analysis based on Bosch's paintings, Sigüenza almost achieves a psychologisation before the invention of psychology. Bosch's demons are also the spectators' demons, are part of the 'inner man' that Bosch describes, according to Sigüenza. The viewer of Bosch's paintings beholds himself in the mirror of his soul. At the same time, he sees those inner images that are of devilish origin:

'that the arch fiend creates in order to confuse, worry, and disturb that pious soul and his steadfast love. For this purpose he conjures up animals, wild chimeras, monsters, conflagrations, images of death, screams, threats, vipers, lions, dragons, and horrible birds of so many kinds.'⁶⁴

The saints and hermits who keep their calm in the midst of devilish uproar illustrate the serenity that is the ideal to strive for:

'And all this he did in order to prove that a soul that is supported by the grace of God and elevated by His hand to a like way of life cannot at all be dislodged or

diverted from its goal even though, in the imagination and to the outer and inner eye, the devil depicts that which can excite laughter or vain delight or anger or other inordinate passions.'⁶⁵

Following Sigüenza's argument, Bosch's paintings offer insight into the human soul. This however does not change the fact, 'that his pictures were done with great attention and care, and that with care they should be viewed.'⁶⁶ Sigüenza described Bosch's paintings as both emotionally charged and as direct affective insights into the human soul.

His countryman Francisco Pacheco, who wrote about Bosch in 1649, did not follow Sigüenza in this estimation. 'There are enough documents that help addressing the higher and more difficult topics, about the personalities, if one makes time for such pleasures that have always been despised by the high masters', he wrote, only to continue:

'Nonetheless some seek such pleasure: This is the case with the genial ideas of Hieronymus Bosch for the various forms he gave his demons, for the ingenuity that gave such joy to our king Philipp II, what is proven by the great number of paintings he collected. Yet, Father Sigüenza praises him without measure and turns these phantasies into mysteries which we cannot recommend to our painters, – and now let us move on to more pleasurable subjects.'⁶⁷

Reading these sentences by Pacheco, it is possible to deduce that the perception of Bosch's paintings was not only influenced by the works as such, but also by the recipients' expectation. For Pacheco, the paintings of Bosch were no 'mysteries' and he did not care much for them himself. Obviously, even as early as then, one could approach an object with very different expectations and stances that influenced the interpretation. And what an observer saw in a painting was not only influenced by the imagery and the subject, but also by the known or assumed intention of the artist. This fact was mentioned by Karel van Mander as well, who – in contrast to Pacheco or Sigüenza – had probably never seen an original painting by Bosch.⁶⁸ In fact, he was ready to ascribe the same sincerity to alleged Bosch-originals,

which today are all known to be the works of his successors. He also took those paintings as evidence of Bosch's dark artist soul, which appear quite humorous today. The specific perception of Bosch's art reveals quite a bit about their viewers from the past and their notions concerning the emotions expressed in them, which became – or could become – the starting point of their contemplation.

Conclusion

An answer to the question whether Bosch's paintings really are the inner expression of artistic emotions will not be given or even attempted in this conclusion. Yet the paintings by Bosch offer evidence that the Dutch art viewers of the late sixteenth century were

inclined to interpret art as an expression of the artist's psyche. Even if the puzzle remains unsolved as to whether Bosch's paintings reveal his innermost feelings, the perception of his art offers far reaching conclusions on the history of reception. And if one takes into account the insights gained by the later perception of Bosch's œuvre, other paintings of artists from the seventeenth century can be interpreted and viewed differently. They too may have appeared as the expression of artistic emotion. Within the context of contemporary art criticism and the viewer's expectation expressed by it, every painting could be seen as the testimonial of artistic emotions. Therefore, the perception of the paintings of Hieronymus Bosch becomes an example of how images can in fact become witnesses of an inner emotional life, when seen in the perspective of historical discourse.

1. 'Hieronymus Bosch [...] ist [...] ein in krankhaften Wahnvorstellungen schwelgender Künstler, der unter Kasteiungen und Entbehrungen seiner überhitzten Phantasie in bestialischen und pathologisch merkwürdigen Inspirationen Luft machte. [...] Seine Darstellungen interessieren vor allem durch die peinlichen, sadistischen Ideenverbindungen, mit welchen er die Nacktheit unter allen erdenklichen Qualen zur Schau stellt': Alfred von Wurzbach, 'Hieronymus Bosch', *Niederländisches Künstler-Lexikon*, 3 vols., Vienna, 1906-1911, vol. 1, pp. 146-151, p. 146.

2. Constantin von Wurzbach, 'Wurzbach-Tannenberg, Alfred Ritter von', *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, vol. 59, Vienna, 1890, pp. 13-15; Fritz Fellner and Doris A. Corradini (eds.), *Österreichische Geschichtswissenschaft im 20. Jahrhundert. Ein biographisch-bibliographisches Lexikon*, Vienna, 2006, p. 465.

3. Carl Justi, 'Die Werke des Hieronymus Bosch in Spanien', *Jahrbuch der königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, 10 (1889), pp. 121-144.

4. Hermann Dollmayr, 'Hieronymus Bosch und die Darstellung der Vier letzten Dinge' *Jahrbuch der Kunst-historischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 19 (1898), pp. 284-343, 'Garten der Lüste', plates 42 and 43.

5. For a first reference to this connection, see, Anthony Bertram, *Hieronymus Bosch*, London - New York, 1950, p. 4.

6. Marcus van Varnewyck, *Van die beroerliche tijden in die Nederlanden en voornamelijk in Ghendt 1566-1568*, Ferd[inand] Vanderhaeghen (ed.), 4 vols., Ghent, 1872-1876, vol. 1, p. 156, 'die men hiet den duvelmakere'; around this time Lodovico Guicciardini described Bosch's specialty in his *Descrittione di (...) di tutti i Paesi Bassi altrimenti detti Germania Inferiore. Con piu carte di Geographia del paese, & col ritratto naturale di piu terre principali, al gran re cattolico Filippo d'Austria*, Antwerp: Guglielmo Siluio, 1567, p. 98: 'Girolamo Bosco di Bolduc, inuentore nobilissimo, & marauiglioso di cose fantastiche & bizzarre.'

7. Max J. Friedländer, *Geertgen van Haarlem und Hieronymus Bosch*, Berlin, 1927, p. 84: 'Das Meiste, was über Bosch geschrieben worden ist, liest sich, als ob es ausführlichen Beschreibungen verschollener Werke entnommen sei.'

8. '[...] um wenigstens über seinen inneren Menschen Vermutungen zu gewinnen': Justi, 1889 (see note 3), pp. 121-144, here: p. 122. See Roger H. Marijnissen and Peter Ruyffelaere, *Hieronymus Bosch: Das vollständige Werk*, Antwerp, [1988], pp. 23-43; Stefan Fischer, *Der "Garten der Lüste" von Hieronymus Bosch: Ansätze und Methoden der Forschung*, Norderstedt, 2001, p. 17; Stefan Fischer, *Hieronymus Bosch: Malerei als Vision, Lehrbild und Kunstwerk*, Cologne, 2009.

9. 'Jeronimus Bos peintre' is in the *Recueil d'Arras* (MS 266, Bibliothèque Médiathèque d'Arras, fol. 275) as one of five portraits of painters in a collection of portraits of writers. The whole Codex encompasses 289 portraits and was compiled by Jacques le Boucq around 1560, who was a herald and master of ceremonies at the court of Charles V. See Albert Châtelet (ed.), *Visages d'antan, le recueil d'Arras*, Lathuile, 2007; Godfried C. van Dijck, *Op zoek naar Jheronimus van Aken alias Bosch: De feiten; familie, vrienden en*

opdrachtgevers; ca. 1400 - ca. 1635, Zaltbommel, 2001, p. 75; Lorne Campbell, 'The Authorship of the Recueil d'Arras', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 40 (1977), pp. 301-313. A painted copy is preserved in Amherst College, Mead Art Museum, panel, 13,97 x 11,11 cm, inscribed: 'Jeroni: Bos, oud 45'.

10. For the 'PICTORVM ALIQVOT CELEBRIVM' see Matthijs IJssink, 'Bosch, Bruegel and the Netherlandish Tradition', *Hieronymus Cock: The Renaissance in print*, Joris Van Grieken, Ger Luijten and Jan Van der Stock (eds.), exh. cat., Leuven, Museum M - Paris, Institut Néerlandais, Brussels, 2013, pp. 272-273; URL: <http://www.courtauld.org.uk/netherlandishcanon/index.html> (31.08.2013).

11. '[...] sondern ihr deutlich wahrnehmbares pathologische Element besteht neben einem anderen ebenso deutlichen, dessen Gesundheit, dessen seelische Weite wir heute sehr vielen wünschen möchten.': Hermann Eßwein, 'Physiognomisches zur Kunst des Hieronymus Bosch', *Ganymed*, 5 (1925), pp. 11-25, here: p. 19. Victor Willem Damien Schenk comes to a similar conclusion: *Tussen duivelgeloof en beeldenstorm: Een studie over Jeroen Bosch en Erasmus van Rotterdam*, Amsterdam, 1946. Some years before that, with yet another positive diagnosis Max Picard (*Die Grenzen der Physiognomik*, Erlenbach, 1937, p. 138f.) had compared the Bosch portrait from the 'Recueil d'Arras' with a portrait of Machiavelli.

12. Cornelis Veth, 'Kroniek', *Maandblad voor beeldende kunst*, 13 (1936), pp. 347-349.

13. Theodor Reik, 'Een psychologisch raadsel. Jeroen Bosch, "fayzeur de diables"', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 60 (1936), p. 8.

14. Robert Melville, 'The Snake on the Dining Room Table', *View*, 6th ser. no. 3 (May 1946), pp. 9-10.

15. José Luis González, 'La sublimación en la obra del pintor Jeronimus Bosch', *Revista de Psicoanálisis*, 13 (1956), pp. 83-84. For the concept of art as therapy, see Hendrik Enno van Gelder, 'El Escorial. Een gesprek met Romare', *Elzevier's geïllustreerd maandschrift*, 90 (1935), pp. 1-18, here: p. 17: 'Bosch bant de duivelen uit door ze te overmeesteren met zijn penseel.'

16. Annie Chauvière, *Introduction à une étude psychopathologique du fantastique dans l'oeuvre de Hieronymus Bosch*, Paris, 1965.

17. Ralph W. Pickford, *Studies in psychiatric art: Its psychodynamics, therapeutic value and relationship to modern art*, Springfield, Ill, 1967, pp. 305-307. On the use of paintings in therapy of mental illnesses see Manfred Rust, 'The paintings of Hieronymus Bosch in guided affective imagery', *Katathymes Bilderleben innovativ. Motive und Methoden*, Gisela Gerber and Franz Sedlak (eds.), Munich, 1994, pp. 138-154.

18. Robert E. Hemphill, 'The personality and problem of Hieronymus Bosch', *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 58 (1965), pp. 137-144, esp. p. 137: 'Some inference can now be made about the personality and nature of Bosch. He was withdrawn and inward-looking, unaware of the warmth of love, unmoved by human pleasures and disappointments, unconcerned with children. He was introspective, engrossed with mystical philosophy and magic, he was almost certainly an alchemist, he believed

implicitly in witchcraft, and he was a doubtful Christian. He was a schizoid personality.' See Robert E Hemphill, 'Hiëronymus Bosch, visionair kunstenaar', *Abbotemo*, 4 (1969), pp. 24-29.

19. Gosewijn Jan Zwanikken, *Jeroen Bosch*, 's-Gravenhage, 1967, p. 11; Alexander R. Lucas, 'The imagery of Hieronymus Bosch', *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 124 (1968), pp. 1515-1525. The essay is followed by a critical reply by George Mora, who rejects the socio-historical thesis and demands a more specific inclusion in the socio - historical context (ibid. *Discussion*, pp. 1523-1525).

20. Erika Fromm, 'The manifest and the latent content of two paintings by Hieronymus Bosch: a contribution to the study of creativity', *American Imago*, 26 (1969), pp. 145-166. D. Tschassovnikarov and G. Markov, 'Personologische Untersuchungen über einige Urbilder im Schaffen von Hieronymus', *Psychiatrie, Neurologie und Medizinische Psychologie*, 32 (1980), pp. 623-630; Alfred Ribí, *Die Dämonen des Hieronymus Bosch: Versuch einer Deutung*, Künast, 1990.

21. '[...] als Vorläufer der Psychoanalyse die ganze Schärfe seines durchdringenden Geistes, um aus seiner Erinnerung und Erfahrung, jene Traumsymbole hervorzuholen, die in der ganzen Menschheit Gültigkeit haben.' Charles de Tolnay, *Hieronymus Bosch*, Baden Baden, 1965, p. 31.

22. Abraham Marie Hammacher, *Jeroen Bosch: 1450-1516*, Amsterdam, [1936].

23. H. T. Piron, 'Zur Psychoanalytischen Deutung des Hieronymus Bosch', *Jheronimus Bosch*, Roger H. Marijnissen (ed.), Ghent, 1972, pp. 177-196. For a critical discussion see Fischer 2009 (see note 8), p. 12.

24. '[...] dem ›Falk‹ Hieronymus Bosch mit den Werkzeugen der Tiefenpsychologie beikommen [...] zu wollen'. Friedrich Markus Huebner, *Hieronymus Bosch. Das Werk des Malers*, Berlin, 1939, p. 8, p. 11.

25. Otto Benesch, 'Hieronymus Bosch and the Thinking of the Late Middle Ages', *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift*, 26 (1957), pp. 103-127. This is where the references to the parallels of Bosch's pictures with the dream images of the surrealists belong. They begin with William Gaunt, 'A Fifteenth-Century Surrealist: Jheronimüs Bosch', *The Studio*, 116 (1938), pp. 189-196; Friedrich Markus Huebner, *Die Nacht der Versuchung: Eine Erzählung um den "Liebesgarten" des Hieronymus Bosch*, Oldenburg (Oldb.), 1957, p. 96.

26. Sigmund Freud, *Eine Kindheitserinnerung des Leonardo da Vinci*, Leipzig, 1910. See also Klaus Herding, *Freuds Leonardo: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit psychoanalytischen Theorien der Gegenwart*, Munich, 1998.

27. For an overview of the biography of Hieronymus Bosch see Paul Huys Janssen, 'Hieronymus Bosch. Facts and records concerning his life and work', *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, 68 (2007), pp. 239-254. Summarized: Nils Büttner, *Hieronymus Bosch*, Munich, 2012.

28. Fischer 2009 (see note 8), p. 23f. Marijnissen and Ruyffelaere 1988 (see note 8), p. 12; Van Dijk 2001 (see note 9), p. 173; Gerd Unverfehrt, *Wein statt Wasser: Essen und Trinken bei Jheronimus Bosch*, Göttingen, 2003, p. 56; Godfried C. van Dijk, *De Bossche Optimaten: Geschiedenis van de illustere Lieve Vrouwebroederschap te 's-Hertogenbosch, 1318-1973*, Tilburg, 1973.

29. Compare the still groundbreaking study by Gerd

Unverfehrt, *Hieronymus Bosch: Die Rezeption seiner Kunst im frühen 16. Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1980.

30. Fritz Koreny, *Hieronymus Bosch, die Zeichnungen: Werkstatt und Nachfolge bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts; catalogue raisonné*, Turnhout, 2012, pp. 28-57.

31. That the painter himself uses his art to express his personality is an early representation of Horaces 'ars poetica'. See Wolf Steidle, *Studien zur Ars poetica des Horaz: Interpretation des auf Dichtkunst und Gedicht bezüglichen Hauptteils (Verse 1-294)* [1939], Würzburg-Aumühle, 1967, p. 14f.; Ulrich Reißer, *Physiognomik und Ausdruckstheorie der Renaissance: Der Einfluß charakterologischer Lehren auf Kunst und Kunsttheorie des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts*, Munich, 1997.

32. See Michel Foucault, *L'archéologie du savoir*, Paris, 1969.

33. Jochen Becker, 'Zur niederländischen Kunstliteratur des 16. Jahrhunderts: Domenicus Lampsonius', C.H.A. Broos, J.P. Filedt Kok et al. (ed.), *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, 24 (1973), pp. 45-61; Sarah Meiers, 'Portraits in print. Hieronymus Cock, Dominicus Lampsonius, and *Pictorum aliquot Germaniae Inferioris Effigies*', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 69 (2006), pp. 1-16. compare note 9 for source.

34. For the translation see [Karel van Mander], *The lives of the illustrious Netherlandish and German painters, from the first edition of the Schilder-boeck (1603-1604)*, translated and commented by Hessel Miedema (ed.), 6 vols., Doornspijk, 1994-1998, vol. 1 (1994): The Text, p. 125-126.

35. [Lodovico Guicciardini], *Descrittione di M. Lodovico Guicciardini, Patritio Fiorentino, di tutti i Paesi Bassi altrimenti detti Germania Inferiore. Con piu carte di Geographia del paese, & col ritratto naturale di piu terre principali, al gran re cattolico Filippo d'Austria*, Antwerp: Guglielmo Siluio, 1567, p. 98: 'Girolamo Bosco di Bolduc, inuentore nobilissimo, & marauiglioso di cose fantastiche & bizzarre.' Varnewyck 1872-1876 (see note 6), vol. 1, p. 156: '[...] een geschilderde tafel ende es daer Ons Heere zijn cruuse draecht, ghedaen bij meester Jeronimus Bosch, die men hiet den duvelmakere, omdat zijns ghelijcke niet uut en quam van duvelen te maken. Dit was eene vanden besten sticken; dander en waeren middelbaer.'

36. About the ideas on the body as a semiotic system that was popular in early modern dutch art theory see Jan Nicolaisen, "gemoet": Anmerkungen zur Beschreibung des "inneren Menschen" in der holländischen Malerei des 17. Jahrhunderts', *Ad fontes! Niederländische Kunst des 17. Jahrhunderts in Quellen*, Claudia Fritzsche, Karin Leonhard and Gregor J. M. Weber (eds.), Petersberg, 2013, pp. 281-304, esp. pp. 284-292.

37. Those were in fact, as Seneca emphasizes in *De Ira* (III, 1), not identical to the passions.

38. See Ulrich Heinen, *Rubens zwischen Predigt und Kunst. Der Hochaltar für die Walburgenkirche in Antwerpen*, Weimar, 1996, p. 188, note 64.

39. Horatius, *ars poetica*, 101-104: 'Ut ridentibus adrident, ita flentibus adflent| humani vultus. Si vis me flere, dolendum est| primum ipsi tibi: tum tua me infortunia laedent'. This idea is based on the term *euplastike*, that Aristotle stipulates in his *Poetics* (17, 1455a, 32f.). See Hans-Joachim Raupp, *Untersuchungen zu Künstlerbildnis und Künstlerdarstellung in den*

Niederlanden im 17. Jahrhundert, Hildesheim et al., 1984, p. 142, note 459.

40. This idea was easy to transfer from words to images, because the theory of rhetoric proclaimed since antiquity the effectiveness of mental images for the emotional conviction of the audience. Vgl. Quint. Inst.Or. 6,2,29-32.

41. See Moshe Barasch, 'Der Ausdruck in der italienischen Kunsttheorie der Renaissance', *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, 12 (1967), pp. 33-69, here: p. 37-38 and pp. 46-47; Norbert Michels, *Bewegung zwischen Ethos und Pathos. Die Wirkungsästhetik italienischer Kunsttheorie des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts*, Münster, 1988, pp. 24-25, 245; Heinen 1996 (see note 38), p. 188, note 64.

42. 'Ieroon Bos, wat beduydt u soo verschrickt ghesicht, | En aenschijn alsoo bleeck, het schijnt oft even dicht | Ghy al het helsch ghespooock saeght vliegghen om u ooren. | Ick acht dat al ontdaen u zijn de diepste chooren | Gheweest van Pluto ghier, en d 'helsche wonsten wij | V open zijn ghedaen, dat ghy soo constigh zijt, | Om met u rechter handt gheschildert uyt te stellen, | Al wat in hem begrijpt den diepsten schoot der Hellen.' Miedema 1994-1998 (see note 34), vol. 1, fol. 216v-217r.

43. Miedema 1994-1998 (see note 34), vol. 1, fol. 216v, p. 125.

44. For the antique references of this concept see Franciscus Junius, *De Pictura veterum libri tres*, Amsterdam, 1637. The central term in this tract is clarity (*enargeia*), which is reevaluated as the highest goal of artistic development: 'Praesertim cum Poeticae phantasiae finis sit ekplexis [admiratio], Pictoriae verò enargeia [evidential],' *ibid.* [I,4,6], p. 37. See Franciscus Junius, *The Painting of the Ancients*, London, 1638 [I,4,6]; in: Franciscus Junius, *The Literature of Classical Art*, 2 vols., Keith Aldrich, Philipp Fehl and Raina Fehl (eds.), Berkeley et al., 1991, vol. 1, p. 57-58. See also Ulrich Heinen, 'Peter Paul Rubens: Barocke Leidenschaften', *Peter Paul Rubens: Barocke Leidenschaften*, Nils Büttner and Ulrich Heinen (eds.), München, 2004, pp. 28-38, esp. p. 29.

45. '[...] ein guter Maler ist jnwendig voller vigur': Hans Rupprich (ed.), *Dürer: Schriftlicher Nachlaß*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1956-1969, vol. 2, p. 113.

46. Allan Ellenius, *De Arte Pingendi: Latin literature in seventeenth century Sweden and its international background*, Uppsala, 1960, p. 37; Nils Büttner, 'Peter Paul Rubens und Franciscus Junius: Aemulatio in Praxis und Theorie', *Aemulatio: Kulturen des Wettstreits in Text und Bild (1450-1620)*, Jan-Dirk Müller, Ulrich Pfisterer, Anna Katharina Bleuler and Fabian Jonietz (eds.), Pluralisierung & Autorität, 27, Berlin, 2011, pp. 319-367.

47. Junius 1637 (see note 44), [I,4,6], p. 37; Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl 1991 (see note 44), vol. 1, p. 58.

48. Junius 1637 (see note 44), [III,8-11], pp. 221-318; Heinen 1996 (see note 38), p. 303, note 52.

49. Junius 1637 (see note 44), [I, 3], p. 37. For this reference see Raupp 1984 (note 39), p. 140f.

50. Junius 1637 (see note 44), [III, 4], p. 184. Raupp 1984 (see note 39), pp. 142-143.

51. Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, *Trattato dell 'arte della pittura scultura ed architectura, diviso in sette libri*, Edition Rome, 1844, vol. 2, pp. 201-202: 'Girolamo Bosch fiammingo, che nel

rappresentare strane apparanze, e spaventevoli ed orridi songi, fu singolare e veramente divino.'

52. Miedema 1994-1998 (see note 34), vol. 1, fol. 216v.

53. Miedema 1994-1998 (see note 34), vol. 1, p. 190; fol. 233r: 'Hy hadde veel ghepractiseert, nae de handlinghe van Ieroon van den Bosch: en maeckte oock veel soodane spoockerijen, en drollen, waerom hy van velen werdt geheeten Pier den Drol. Oock sietmen weynigh stucken van hem, die een aenschouwer wijslijck sonder lacchen can aensien.'

54. Cornelis de Bie, *Het gulden cabinet van de edel vry schilderconst*, Antwerp, 1662, p. 310f: 'Dat is t'wanschappen spooock des afgronts wree ghesichten | T'gen' quelden Sint Anthoon, met helse wederlichten | Vol furi, vier en vlam, vol vreeselijck ghedruys | T'gen somwijl sijne deught ded' vluchten door het Cruys. | Voorts ander toovery en vremde aventuren.'

55. Larry Silver, "'Second Bosch": Family Resemblance and the Marketing of Art', *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, 50 (1999), pp. 31-56, here: p. 49. See also Karolien De Clippel, *Joos van Craesbeeck (1605/06- ca.1660): Een Brabants genreschilder*, 2 vols., Turnhout, 2006, vol. 1, pp. 64-65, vol. 2, p. 365.

56. De Clippel 2006 (see note 55), p. 65. For the (*clucht*) culture of the sixteenth and the seventeenth century in the Netherlands see Johan Verberckmoes, *Laughter, jestbooks and society in Spanish Netherlands*, Basingstoke, 1999.

57. 'Also hat HIERONYMUS BOS unzählbar viel selzame Gedanken im Kopf gehabt/ die er mit dem Pensel nachgemacht und gebildet/ absonderlich die höllische Furien und Gespenster/ die sehr greulich anzusehen waren.' Joachim von Sandrart, *L'Academia Todeasca della Architectura, Scultura & Pittura: Oder Teutsche Academie der Edlen Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste*, Nürnberg, 1675, II, book 3 (Netherlandish and German), pp. 242-243.

58. James Snyder (ed.), *Bosch in Perspective*, Artists in Perspective Series, Englewood Cliffs, NY, 1973, p. 29; Felipe de Guevara, *Comentarios de la pintura (1560)* [...] *Se publican por la primera vez con un discurso preliminar y algunas notas de Antonio Ponz*, Madrid, 1788, pp. 41-42: 'Esto que Hyerónimo Bosco hizo con prudencia y decoro, han hecho y hacen otros otros sin discrecion y juicio ninguno; porque habiendo visto en Flandes quan accepto fuese aquel género de pintura de Hyerónimo Bosco, acordaron de imitarle, pintando monstruos y desvariadas imaginaciones, dándose á entender que en esto solo consistia la imitacion de Bosco. Ansi vienen á ser infinitas las pinturas de este género, selladas con el nombre de Hyerónimo Bosco, falsamente inscripto; en las quales á él nunca le pasó por el pensamiento poner las manos, sino el humo y cortos ingenios, ahumandolas á las chimeneas para dalles autoridad y antigüedad.'

59. Fray Joseph de Sigüenza, *Tercera parte de la Historia de la Orden de p. Geronimo*, Madrid, 1605, pp. 837-841.

60. Sigüenza 1605 (see note 59), p. 837: 'Tengo tanto concepto (por empear desto postero) de la piedad y zelo del Rey nostro fundador, que si supiera era esto assi, no admitiera sus pinturas de[n]tro de su casa.'

61. Snyder 1973 (see note 58), p. 34; Sigüenza 1605 (see note 59), p. 837: 'Quiero mostrar agora que sus pinturas no son disparates, sino vnos libros de gran prudencia y artificio.'

62. Snyder 1973 (see note 58), p. 35; Sigüenza 1605 (see note 59), p. 837: 'La diferencia que a mi parecer ay de las pinturas deste hombre a las de los otros, es, que los demas procuraron pintar al hombre qual parece por de fuera, este solo se atreuio a pintarle qual es dentro.'

63. Snyder 1973 (see note 58), p. 41; Sigüenza 1605 (see note 59), p. 841: 'Se sacara grande fruto, viendose alli cada vno tan retirado aluiuo en lo de dentro, sino es que no se adierte lo que este dentro de si y està tan ciego que no conoce las passions y vicios que le tienen tan defigurado en bestia, o en tantas bestias.'

64. Snyder 1973 (see note 58), pp. 36-37; Sigüenza 1605 (see note 59), p. 838: 'de otra las infinitas fantasias y monstruos que el enemigo forma, para trastornar, inquietar, y turbar aquella alma pia y aquel amor firme; para esto finge animals, fieras, chimeras, monstrous, fuegos, muertes, gritos, amenazas, viuoras, leones dragones, y aues espantosas y de tantas Fuertes.'

65. Snyder 1973 (see note 58), p. 37; Sigüenza 1605 (see note 59), p. 838: 'Y todo esto para mostrar que vna alma ayudada de la diuina gracia, y lleuada de su mano a semejante manera de vida, aunque en la fantasia y a los ojos de fuera y

dentro, represente el enemigo lo que puede mouer a risa ò deleyte vano, ò yra y otras dessordenadas passiones, no seran parte para derribarle ni mouerle de su proposito.'

66. Snyder 1973 (see note 58), p. 41; Sigüenza 1605 (see note 59), p. 841: 'que sus pinturas son de cuydado y studio, y con studio se han de mirar.'

67. Francisco Pacheco, *Arte de la Pintura*, -Sevilla, 1649, pp. 431-432: 'Bastante documento para que se haga caso de las cosas mayores, I mas dificultosas, que son las figuras, y se huya de semejantes divertimientos, despreciados siempre de los grandes Maestros: aunque algunos los buscan de propósito, como sucede en los ingeniosos caprichos de Gerónimo Bosco, con la variedad de guisados que hizo de los [432:] demonios, de cuya invención gustó tanto nuestro Rei Filipo Segundo, como lo manifiesta lo mucho que juntó deste genero. Pero (à mi ver) onralo demasiado el Padre Fr. Iosefe de Ciguença, haziendo misterios licenciosas fantasias, à que no combidamos a los Pintores. I passé mos a la gustosa material [...].'

68. For an overview of the works known to Karel van Mander see Hessel Miedema, in: Miedema 1994-1998 (see note 34), vol. 3 (1996), pp. 55-58.