

Book review

Erik Hinterding and Jaco Rutgers (compilers) and Ger Luijten (editor), *The New Hollstein Dutch and Flemish etchings, engravings and woodcuts 1400–1700, Rembrandt*, 7 vols., Ouderkerk aan den IJssel (Sound and Vision Publishers) 2013, in cooperation with the Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

In 1969 the 17th catalogue of Rembrandt etchings to be published since 1751 appeared in the series *Hollstein's Dutch and Flemish etchings, engravings and woodcuts, ca. 1450–1700*. It was compiled by Christopher White and Karel G. Boon and came in two volumes: one for the text, the other for the plates.¹ It was a landmark publication that has served as an indispensable reference tool for the study of Rembrandt's prints for the past 45 years. After several years of effort by the compilers and editor, *The new Hollstein* series of monographic studies of prints by Dutch and Flemish artists (hereafter *NHD*) completed the latest itemization of Rembrandt's in 2013. The result fully supersedes the earlier publication. This time it consists of seven volumes: two for the text, three with illustrations of all of Rembrandt's etchings in all the known states, and two with illustrations of all the known copies. As with the 1969 catalogue, the *NHD, Rembrandt* volumes represent the current state of knowledge of many different aspects of Rembrandt's prints based on new insights and research methods developed over the past decades.

One innovation in White and Boon's 1969 catalogue was its concise information about the quality of individual, unusual

impressions on different types of paper (or vellum or silk), and about the use of plate tone and exceptional burr, etc. The present catalogue by Erik Hinterding and Jaco Rutgers extends this information considerably, mostly thanks to the investigation of the watermarks and their interpretation, which made it possible to date a number of impressions of different states fairly precisely. One of the compilers of *NHD, Rembrandt* devoted his dissertation to the watermarks found in Rembrandt's prints, and his 2006 catalogue of them is far and away the uncontested authority in this field.²

Advances in digital photography offered a great improvement in the documentation of all the known states. The compilers could compare different states in unprecedented detail in order to note even the most minutely discernible differences. White and Boon compiled their catalogue mainly on the basis of their visual knowledge, and photographs, of the exceptional collections of Rembrandt etchings in the printrooms in Amsterdam and London, along with the study of impressions in about 30 collections in Europe and the United States. By contrast, the compilers of the 2013 catalogue visited 52 printrooms over a four-year period, and were able to include information about the impressions in some 50 other collections. This yielded the remarkable discovery of about 260 new states, which will be discussed further below.

In the decades following the Rembrandt Year of 1969 our knowledge of his paintings and drawings has increased enormously thanks to several fundamental studies, such as those about the paintings generated by the Rembrandt Research Project. In the case of the etchings, several catalogues of exhibitions,³ and individual collections,⁴ have already yielded many

1 C. White and K. Boon, *Hollstein's Dutch and Flemish etchings, engravings and woodcuts, ca. 1450–1700*, vols. 18–19, *Rembrandt van Rijn*, Amsterdam 1969, also published in an otherwise identical form as C. White and K.G. Boon, *Rembrandt's etchings: an illustrated critical catalogue*, Amsterdam 1969. The review of those volumes in *Simiolus* 6 (1972–73), pp. 70–76, by the lead author of the present review was the result of insights developed during the compilation of J.P. Filedt Kok, *Rembrandt: etchings and drawings in the Rembrandt House, a catalogue*, Maarssen 1972. He is happy to be joined in this review by a young art historian preparing the exhibition *Rembrandt's changing impressions*, which will be presented in the autumn of 2015 at the Wallach Art Gallery, Columbia University, New York.

2 E. Hinterding, *Rembrandt as an etcher: the practices of production and distribution*, 3 vols., Ouderkerk aan den IJssel 2006; earlier defended as a doctoral dissertation, E. Hinterding, *Rembrandt als etser: twee studies naar de praktijk van productie en verspreiding / Rembrandt as an etcher: two studies into the practice of production and distribution*, Utrecht 2001, 2 vols. Hinterding's publication was preceded by N. Ash and S. Fletcher, with a contribution by J.P. Filedt Kok, *Watermarks in Rembrandt's prints*, Washington 1998. See also T. Laurentius *et al.*, "Het Amsterdamse onderzoek naar Rembrandts papier: radiografie van de watermerken in de etsen van Rembrandt," *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum* 40 (1992), pp. 353–84, and T. Laurentius, exhib. cat. *Rembrandt etchings in a new light*, Chiba (Kawamura Memorial Museum of Art) & Machida (Machida

City Museum of Graphic Arts) 1993, pp. 162–79.

3 The following are the catalogues of major Rembrandt exhibitions featuring prints: H. Bevers *et al.*, *Rembrandt, the master and his workshop: drawings and prints*, Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum) & Zwolle 1991; A. Blankert *et al.*, *Rembrandt: a genius and his impact*, Melbourne (National Gallery of Victoria,) & Sydney (Art Exhibitions Australia) 1997, pp. 384–441; B. Bakker *et al.*, *Het landschap van Rembrandt: wandelingen in en om Amsterdam*, Bussum, Amsterdam (Gemeentearchief) & Paris (Fondation Custodia) 1998; C. White and Q. Buvelot (eds.), *Rembrandt by himself*, London (National Gallery), The Hague (Mauritshuis) & Zwolle 1999; J.L. Williams *et al.*, *Rembrandt's women*, Edinburgh (National Gallery of Scotland) 2001; E. van de Wetering *et al.*, *The mystery of the young Rembrandt*, Amsterdam (Museum Het Rembrandthuis) & Kassel (Schloss Wilhelmshöhe, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister) 2001; C.S. Ackley *et al.*, *Rembrandt's journey: painter, draftsman, etcher*, Boston (Museum of Fine Arts) 2003.

4 Most of the recent publications on collections of Rembrandt etchings are exhibition catalogues, some of which contain information about provenances and watermarks. Almost all of them are listed in the Literature section of the publication under review, vol. 1, pp. xiii–xliv.

For the Rembrandthuis in Amsterdam see Filedt Kok 1972, *op. cit.* (note 1), which was followed by a concise, fully illustrated catalogue of the etchings in E. Ornstein and M. Holtrop, *The Rembrandt house: the prints, drawings and paintings*, Amsterdam & Zwolle 1991, updated

new insights. The impact of the recent watermark research on the study of the etchings was first presented in the major exhibition *Rembrandt the printmaker* in Amsterdam and London in 2000–01, with a splendid illustrated catalogue by Hinterding, Ger Luijten and Martin Royalton-Kisch, which also contained insights by specialists in Rembrandt's drawings (Peter Schatborn) and paintings (Ernst van de Wetering).⁵ Another important contribution is Hinterding's catalogue of the Lugt Collection at the Fondation Custodia, an excellent study of the state of art-historical scholarship for nearly all of Rembrandt's prints.⁶

New Hollstein lacks the splendor of some of these exhibition and collection catalogues, but describes and illustrates every known state, and brings together a vast array of information about the physical properties of the prints. It is primarily a reference work and tool for the specialist. The 1972–73 *Simiolus* review of White and Boon's publication noted the lack of a statement about the method followed with the remark: "One

cannot escape the impression that the authors have gone to work in a flexible frame of mind, armed more with intuition than with method," and the observation that, "the great erudition of both authors has saved them from gross inaccuracy."⁷ One cannot accuse the authors of the *New Hollstein* of a similar working method or of being shy about explaining it. In addition to a preface by the editor and the acknowledgments of the authors, there is an introduction, an explanatory note to the catalogue, another essay about Rembrandt's copies and an extensive bibliography. The introduction is concise but lucid, and mostly covers new findings and insights. The complicated catalogue entries contain a massive amount of information and are built up in a systematic way, though inconsistencies and a number of mistakes in the entries were unavoidable.⁸ The various aspects of Rembrandt's etchings discussed in the catalogue will be examined in the following sections along roughly similar lines as in the 1972–73 review.

in a revised edition with added contributions by P. van der Coelen and E. Hinterding, *The Rembrandt House: a catalogue of Rembrandt etchings*, Amsterdam & Zwolle 2003. A selection from the holdings of the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett was published in H. Bevers *et al.*, *Rembrandt: ein Virtuose der Druckgraphik*, Berlin 2006. For Göttingen see G. Unverfehrt (ed.), *Rembrandt, schwarz-weiß: Meisterwerke der Radierkunst aus den Kunstsammlungen der Universität Göttingen*, Göttingen 1993, and for Kraków, K. Kruzel, *Katalog Gabinetu Rycin PAU w Bibliotece Naukowej PAU i PAN w Krakowie: szkola niderlandzka XVI, XVII i XVIII w., zsec XVI: Rembrandt*, Kraków 2006. In Paris there is the Bibliothèque nationale (Cabinet des Estampes, Réserves), see G. Lambert and E. Santiago Páez, *Rembrandt: la lumière de l'ombre*, Paris 2005; the Musée du Petit Palais, Dutuit Collection: S. de Bussierre (ed.), *Rembrandt, eaux fortes: collection Dutuit*, Paris 1986, and idem, *Rembrandt: eaux-fortes*, Paris 2006; for the Louvre, Edmond de Rothschild Collection, see J.-R. Pierrette (ed.) *Rembrandt: gravures et dessins de la Collection Edmond de Rothschild et du Cabinet des Dessins, Département des Arts graphiques du musée du Louvre*, Paris 2000; and on the Lugt Collection in Fondation Custodia see E. Hinterding, *Rembrandt etchings from the Frits Lugt collection*, 2 vols., Paris (Fondation Custodia) & Bussum 2008. For the Rovinski Collection in St Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum, see U. Aartomaa *et al.*, *Rembrandt, kuparilaatan mestari: grafiikka Valtion Eremitaasin Dmitri Rovinski kokoelmasta / Rembrandt, master of the copper plate: prints from the Rovinsky Collection at the State Hermitage*, Helsinki 2012. The catalogue for the show in the Staatliches Museum in Schwerin is H. Baudis and K. Röder, *Rembrandt fecit: 165 Rembrandt-Radierungen aus der Sammlung des Staatlichen Museums Schwerin*, Schwerin 1995, and the one at the St Louis Art Museum is F. Herndon-Consagra and P. Crenshaw, *Rembrandt: master etchings from St. Louis collections*, St Louis 2006. Exhibitions at the Albertina in Vienna were catalogued by E. Mitsch, *Die Rembrandt-Radierungen aus dem Besitz der Albertina*, Vienna 1970, with a selection in K.A. Schröder and M. Bisanz-Prakken (eds.) *Rembrandt*, Vienna 2004. Finally there are N. Minder, *Rembrandt: les collections du Cabinet des Estampes de Vevey*, Vevey 1997, and E. Hinterding *et al.*, *Rembrandts Radierungen: Bestandskatalog, Ehemalige Grossherzogliche und Staatliche Sammlungen sowie Goethes Sammlung*, Weimar 2011. Recent catalogues of private collections include N. Bialler *et al.*, *A collection of etchings by Rembrandt Harmensz. van Rijn (1606–1669) formed by Joseph R. Ritman: presented for sale by Artemis and Sotheby's*, London 1995; C. Juchli (ed.), exhib. cat.

Rembrandt: Radierungen aus der Sammlung Eberhard W. Kornfeld. Ausstellung in Erinnerung an Isaac de Bruijn, Spiez (Stiftung Schloss Spiez) 2009; N. Stogdon, *A descriptive catalogue of the etchings by Rembrandt in a private collection, Switzerland*, n.p. 2011 (a large private collection listed as Lausanne in *NHD, Rembrandt*).

5 E. Hinterding *et al.*, exhib. cat. *Rembrandt the printmaker*, Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum), London (British Museum) & Zwolle 2000.

6 Hinterding, op. cit. (note 4). Recent publications on the portraits and iconographical aspects of Rembrandt's prints are S. Dickey, *Rembrandt: portraits in print*, Amsterdam 2004; P. van der Coelen, exhib. cat. *Patriarchs, angels & prophets: the Old Testament in Netherlandish printmaking from Lucas van Leyden to Rembrandt*, Amsterdam (Rembrandthuis) 1996; and idem, exhib. cat. *Rembrandts Passie: het Nieuwe Testament in de Nederlandse prentkunst van de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw*, Rotterdam (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen) 2006.

7 Filedt Kok, review, op. cit. (note 1), p. 71.

8 A list of corrigenda has already been included at the end of vol. 7, pp. 382–85. We provide additional corrections in notes 18, 27, 35, 36, and 41 of this review. Further corrections supplied by the compilers on 22 May 2014 are as follows.

Vol. 1.

NHD 6: copy a: add "or Michael Willmann" after "attributed to Samuel van Hoogstraten," and add 1848,0911.232 after "London*".

NHD 98W: state IV: the comparative illustrations shown under this state should be swapped (but not the captions). The third state is touched with pen and ink. State V: the comparative illustration of state IV shown here is actually an illustration of state III (retouched with pen and ink).

NHD 109W: the watermark described under state V actually belongs under state IV.

Vol. 2.

NHD 184: wrong photograph for state IV.

NHD 236: there is no impression of the first state in the Fogg Art Museum in Cambridge.

NHD 298: wrong photograph for state II.

NHD 308: RP-P-OB-438 is a third state, not a second.

p. 329: Concordance H. 262 -> NHD. 315: should have been "rejected" (there is no NHD 315).

THE CHRONOLOGICAL NUMBERING OF THE ETCHINGS One of the most significant features is the introduction of a new chronological numbering for the 314 etchings by Rembrandt and his workshop, including the prints reworked at a later stage by different hands. The 1969 Hollstein edition still used the traditional numbering of prints in the iconographical order established by Bartsch in 1797.⁹ It seemed a wise decision at the time, since most printrooms arranged their Rembrandt holdings by Bartsch number. Only a few British collections (and one in New York) followed the chronological numbering introduced by Arthur Hind in his influential catalogue of 1912.¹⁰

The chronological order is certainly a great help for understanding the development of Rembrandt as a printmaker, the role of his workshop in the early 1630s, and his later experiments in printing. Since the Rijksprentenkabinet in Amsterdam and the British Museum printroom have already rearranged their Rembrandt prints in the *New Hollstein* order, the reviewers had the pleasure of seeing the prints in the newly proposed chronology. The order seems generally convincing and it contributes significantly to the enjoyment of seeing the prints as part of a working progression, as did Hind's ordering. The differences between both numbering systems for the early period are considerable, since Hind dated a number of the early experiments later, and excluded a number of prints in which he saw the involvement of another hand.

Since only about half of Rembrandt's prints are dated, fitting the undated works chronologically into his oeuvre is a task in itself. Occasional discrepancies exist in previous catalogues, with perhaps the most contrarian opinions (both in terms of attribution and dating) being in that by Ludwig Münz, but there was a considerable amount of consensus among the later authors.¹¹ The *NHD, Rembrandt* authors decided to tackle the problem *de novo* using recent watermark data in combination with traditional analyses of style in order to generate the current chronology that forms the basis of the new numbering system. Some interesting findings emerged. Some of the landscapes previously dated c. 1645 are now convincingly placed around 1641. This is not much of a difference, but it does help focus the issue of when, exactly, Rembrandt began exploring

the genre. The idea of the artist wandering forlornly in the polders after the death of Saskia in 1642 was always questionable and over-romanticized, but now it seems likely that those excursions, and the remarkable works to which they gave birth, took place even earlier than previously thought.

For the most part, the modern dating methods in *NHD, Rembrandt* reassuringly confirm traditional connoisseurship for the vast majority of undated works. Few of the new dates differ by more than two years from previous catalogues. When they do differ, dates from the earlier literature are conveniently noted in each entry. A large group of early works previously dated c. 1631 have been shifted back to c. 1629, putting them more firmly in the Leiden period. New dates for some major later works are also worth noting: *The Agony in the Garden* (NHD 269, now 1652 instead of 1657); and *La Petite Tombe* and *The adoration of the shepherds* (NHD 298 and 300, both 1657 instead of 1652). Interestingly, it turns out that Münz was right in all three of these cases, which are here confirmed by watermarks, although his numerous other dissenting opinions still appear to require a grain of salt.

REMBRANDT'S ETCHED OEUVRE Since most of Rembrandt's etchings are signed or bear his monogram, there is a considerable consensus among scholars about the attribution of his etched oeuvre. The days when a number of them were attributed to other hands (mostly pupils') seem to be over, with the exception of the involvement of Johannes van Vliet in Leiden, who probably shared a printing press with Rembrandt until 1634. In addition to the 11 prints signed by van Vliet after paintings by Rembrandt ("RHL inventor"; most of them dated 1631, 1633 and 1634), Martin Royalton-Kisch made the plausible suggestion in 1984 that most of the work in the large plates of *The Descent from the Cross* of 1633 (NHD 118, 119) and *Christ before Pilate* of 1635 (NHD 155) was done by van Vliet in collaboration with Rembrandt.¹² Watermark research confirmed this suggestion, and proved that Rembrandt used the same stock of printing paper in Leiden as van Vliet until he moved to Amsterdam in 1633.¹³ The signature on both prints, "Rembrandt f cum privile", demonstrates that they belong to Rembrandt's oeuvre.

⁹ The problem with this order was that many of the 376 prints listed by Bartsch were no longer attributed to Rembrandt, and some had been added. The 1969 Hollstein first described the autograph prints and added two sections at the end of book, one with the prints only known in later states and reworked by a pupil, and one with prints by unknown pupils.

¹⁰ A.M. Hind, *Rembrandt's etchings: an essay and a catalogue*, 2 vols., London 1912, and idem, *A catalogue of Rembrandt's etchings, chronologically arranged and completely illustrated*, 2 vols., London 1923. The Introduction in *NHD, Rembrandt*, vol. 1, pp. xlvii–xlviii, gives a concise survey of the various catalogues that have appeared since Gersaint's of 1751, which was the model for Bartsch and later authors. Hind's chronological catalogue of 1912, which was fully illustrated in 1923, was preceded by C.H. Middleton, *A descriptive catalogue of the etched work of Rembrandt*

van Rhyn, London 1878. K.G. Boon, *Rembrandt: the complete etchings*, New York 1963, which is also fully illustrated, has a chronological dating of the prints that more or less conforms to Hind from 1632 on. However, there are considerable discrepancies in the dating of the small early works, especially those later reworked by van Vliet.

¹¹ L. Münz, *Rembrandt's etchings*, 2 vols., London 1952. For a diagram indicating the number of etchings that Rembrandt made per year see Hinterding, *Etcher*, cit. (note 2), vol. 1, p. 58, fig. 28.

¹² See M. Royalton-Kisch, "Rembrandt: two Passion prints reconsidered," *Apollo* 119 (1984), pp. 130–32. On van Vliet as a printmaker see also C. Schuckman *et al.*, exhib. cat. *Rembrandt and van Vliet: a collaboration on copper*, Amsterdam (Museum het Rembrandthuis) 1996.

¹³ See Schuckman *et al.* op. cit. (note 12), and Hinterding, *Etcher*, cit. (note 2), vol. 1, pp. 83–92.

Here Rembrandt was following Rubens's example by publishing his major painted inventions in printed form with the aid of professional engravers. And again like Rubens, he carefully prepared oil sketches for them.

In addition, there are reasons to believe that van Vliet re-touched some small early plates, most of them with sketches of heads: *tronies*, some self-portraits, figures, beggars etc. In his early years around 1629 Rembrandt prepared a number of copperplates with light sketches for these figures and heads, which were later cut into individual pieces and heavily reworked. Although Rembrandt started to work up a few of them, most are rather coarsely reworked, sometimes in series of states by another hand, probably van Vliet's. There are impressions, mostly unique, of Rembrandt's first efforts in a number of these small etchings (NHD 12, 17, 18, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30, 31, 33a-d, 39), but in the later states the heavy lines and the coarse, regular cross-hatching establishes a convincing separator between his work and reworking in his shop. There is a group of 17 prints that survives only in impressions of the later states of the reworked plate. In the 1969 Hollstein edition they were listed as "By Rembrandt only known in later states, reworked by a pupil." In NHD, *Rembrandt* they are listed in the sequence of prints made in or around 1631 with a "W" added to the number, specifically NHD 93W-109W. The chronological arrangement of this group of prints seems much more convincing than in earlier catalogues. Most of the reworked etchings bear the monogram "RL" or "RHL" and the date "1631" in the upper left (or more rarely right) corner. It must have been in or shortly after 1631 that it was decided to market some of Rembrandt's earlier etched sketches in a reworked version with his monogram. The question remains whether this was done with his permission, by van Vliet or someone in his workshop, since none of these plates is among the group of etchings that seems to have been reprinted regularly during his lifetime.

A few of the copperplates were cut into pieces and parts of them reused by the artist early in his career. It was already known that the plate of the *Sheet of studies of men's heads* (NHD 33) was cut into five small plates and reworked, and that only the figure of Joseph survived in the early *Flight into Egypt* (NHD 4), but that a small part of the plate was used to etch a *Self-portrait* (NHD 13). One new discovery made by the compilers, however, was that parts of the copperplate of *St Jerome kneeling* (NHD 3) of c. 1628 were used for small figure studies (NHD 23, 47).¹⁴ Similar discoveries of plate recycling in the early prints might likewise be possible in the future.

¹⁴ For a reconstruction of the divided plate see vol. 1, p. lv, fig. 9.

¹⁵ For references to these works in White and Boon 1969 see vol. 2, pp. 317-18.

¹⁶ Although Rembrandt's own involvement in the practice of production is carefully described in Hinterding, *Etcher*, cit. (note 2), and in his essay "'The incomparable *Reinbrandt*': Rembrandt als onafhankelijk prentmaker in het 17de-eeuws Amsterdam," in E. Kolfin and J. van der

Whereas the 1969 Hollstein edition still included and illustrated a section of "Prints by unknown pupils of Rembrandt," which were also described in Bartsch and Seidlitz, NHD, *Rembrandt* includes them only in the *Copies* volumes (when they are copies of certain Rembrandt etchings).¹⁵ Otherwise, they are excluded from the catalogue, leaving a group of anonymous etchings by Rembrandt's school that is only described and illustrated in the 1969 Hollstein. One point of note is that we are still poorly informed about the practical aspects of the printing and distribution of prints by Rembrandt, the involvement of assistants in the process, and the position of the artist on the Amsterdam print market.¹⁶

STATES The discovery and publication of new states is, of course, one of the main points of focus for many of the Rembrandt print catalogues *raisonnés* published to date. In this, NHD, *Rembrandt* does not disappoint. The compilers have given us an unprecedented number of new states, many of them previously difficult to detect due to the minute nature of the changes. Other, more obvious modifications were found in rare impressions in far-flung collections. Still others had already been noted by previous scholars in recent decades but had yet to be fully recorded or collated. Rembrandt's constant manipulations of his copperplates, and the long afterlife of many of them in the hands of others, have long justified the need for basic clarifications of his oeuvre up to the present day. While it is certainly possible that a few (but very few) undiscovered states might lurk in the shadows somewhere, the overwhelming impression one gets from NHD, *Rembrandt* is that finally it constitutes the definitive reference work for Rembrandt's states. This is an immense service and deserves the highest praise. The authors describe every state in the fullest possible detail and, in the case of those states in which many changes take place, the most distinctive or easily observable ones are described before those that are less apparent.

The description of posthumous states is a significant departure from the purview of White and Boon, who chose to focus only on changes that were probably made by Rembrandt himself. It is no surprise that the majority of states discovered and described for the first time in NHD, *Rembrandt* were not the work of the artist himself. Nevertheless, a significant number of newly discovered ones are indeed by Rembrandt. None of these discoveries amounts to a major image manipulation that will send art historians scrambling to substantially reinterpret particular works. The major changes have long been recorded.

Veen (eds.), exhib. cat. *Gedrukt tot Amsterdam: Amsterdamse prentmakers en -uitgevers in de gouden eeuw*, Amsterdam (Museum het Rembrandthuis) & Zwolle 2011, pp. 165-79, almost nothing is known about the printing studio in his house and the way he sold prints. For their prices see Hinterding, *Etcher*, cit. (note 2), vol. 1, pp. 59-65, and Hinterding, "Incomparable," above, pp. 192-95.

They are, for the most part, previously overlooked minor adjustments existing in only a few proof impressions. This is not to say that these discoveries lack consequence. Interestingly, many fall into Rembrandt's earliest period, up to about 1631. As the authors note in their introduction, these discoveries support the notion of a "young and rather inexperienced artist, working out his designs in very small steps as he tentatively explores the copper plate." It also suggests that Rembrandt had ready access to a printing press in his early years in order to effect these numerous small steps. A notable example is the much-studied *Self-portrait in a soft hat and a patterned cloak* (NHD 90), dated 1631, which turns out to exist in 15 states instead of 11, all of them by the artist.

Rembrandt's later prints yielded a few surprises as well. The iconic portrait of *Jan Six* (NHD 238) now has five states instead of four, with the addition of a new third state. Intermediate states were also found for the portraits of *Thomas Haaringh* ("Old Haaringh") (NHD 291) and *Lieven Willemsz van Coppenol, writing master: the larger plate* (NHD 306). And a closer look at one of the British Museum's impressions of *Jupiter and Antiope: the larger plate* (NHD 311) revealed it to be an early proof state retouched with both pen and brush, probably by the artist.

NHD, *Rembrandt* also departs from White and Boon's method by not counting accidental scratches as a state change, since they lack intent. The presence or absence of scratches, however, helps researchers determine whether an impression is early or late. In the new arrangement, impressions with or without a scratch are often (although not always) grouped together in the entries. On other occasions, the authors maintained a traditional parlance when describing variant impressions within the same state, such as the "black sleeve" and "white sleeve" impressions of *La Petite Tombe* (NHD 298). The distinction refers to the drypoint burr that is either present or not on the sleeve of the turbaned onlooker in the foreground. Although the two types are not grouped together, the black sleeve impressions are logically the earlier of the two. It was decided that no new state was warranted, because the change in appearance was due to gradual wear to the fragile drypoint burr and thus lacked intent. Another possibility is that the burr was simply scraped away at some point, and this would explain why impressions tend to be either one or the other.¹⁷ In any case, defining a state change strictly as a matter of intent gives rise to certain challenges in Rembrandt's oeuvre. An initiated user of the catalogue should be able to further parse certain states into early

and late impressions on the basis of drypoint wear, scratches and, with any luck, watermarks.

As opposed to adding states, one of the merits of the catalogue is actually the reduction of states in certain instances when impressions that were skillfully modified by hand fooled previous cataloguers into describing them as new states. Notable examples of this are *Brook with a grotto and a boat* (NHD 220) and the *Flight into Egypt: altered from Seghers* (NHD 271).¹⁸ These false, presumably forged states were no doubt difficult to detect, and the compilers have performed a notable service in this regard. A different case of state reduction is found in the portrait of *Pieter Haaringh* ("Young Haaringh") (NHD 292), in which the landscape painting behind the sitter added in drypoint was thought to have been burnished out by hand. Instead, the authors believe that wear to the drypoint lines made the image of the painting disappear of its own accord. The somewhat odd result is that two strikingly different images (one might say "with or without the landscape") are now in the same state.

POSTHUMOUS STATES One of the most noteworthy features of NHD, *Rembrandt* is the distinction it makes between states executed in Rembrandt's lifetime and those deemed posthumous. A line is drawn, literally, in each catalogue entry after the last state that could possibly have been made by Rembrandt. As is well known, the art market has long been flooded with posthumous impressions of Rembrandt's prints, many of which have made their way into public collections.¹⁹ Due to plate wear, paper type and other factors, many of these late states have been fairly obvious to researchers past and present. A significant number, however, fell into a gray area that has now been clarified tremendously thanks to the 'line', which greatly enhances our understanding of Rembrandt's procedures of work and rework by finally eliminating the later states from such considerations.

The first step in drawing the line was to catalogue completely, once and for all, the state changes in the later impressions. This in itself was a Herculean task, understandably avoided by previous cataloguers.²⁰ The survival of a number of albums of Rembrandt's prints from the eighteenth century onward were particularly helpful in this regard.²¹ Whereas the owners of the plates who published those albums have long been known — P.-F. Basan, H.-L. Basan, Auguste Jean, Alvin-Beaumont, *et al.* — NHD, *Rembrandt* links many of the later states with the specific publisher who issued them. This information auto-

with a catalogue of those that survive," *Simiolus* 22 (1993–94), pp. 253–315.

²⁰ An exception is the problematic catalogue, lacking in rigor but still popular with auction houses, by G.W. Nowell-Usticke, *Rembrandt's etchings: states and values*, Narberth (PA) 1967.

²¹ Surviving albums consulted for NHD, *Rembrandt* are listed in vol. 1, p. lxxv, note 33.

¹⁷ This was previously suggested by C. White, *Rembrandt as an etcher: a study of the artist at work*, 2 vols., London 1969, vol. 1, p. 70 (p. 69 in the 2nd ed., New Haven & London 1999); and by M. Royalton-Kisch in Hinterding *et al.*, op. cit. (note 5), pp. 280–81.

¹⁸ Note that the third tower is still mistakenly mentioned in the new state V, see vol. 2, p. 218.

¹⁹ The essential study of the copperplates and their subsequent ownership is E. Hinterding, "The history of Rembrandt's copperplates

matically narrows the possible date range for those impressions as well.

The second step was to determine exactly where the line should fall. A variety of factors presumably came into play whose importance and relative impact were weighted differently from case to case. Watermark analysis, the nature of the state change, and knowledge about later ownership of the plates were all undoubtedly important. Sometimes the authors express uncertainty with the phrases “Probably by Rembrandt” or “Possibly by Rembrandt” in states above the line. While the various factors involved in forming these opinions might seem clear enough in most cases, the opinions are never discussed in terms of the specific evidence used to form that opinion, and here the catalogue remains opaque. An example of where one misses such clarification is in the entry for *Clement de Jonghe* (NHD 264), a portrait that underwent a famously evocative series of changes. On the basis of Hinterding’s own recent watermark research, it has been forcefully argued that the fifth state could not possibly have been by Rembrandt.²² That opinion is reversed in NHD, *Rembrandt*, but without comment; the fifth state is simply restored to the oeuvre. Questions regarding the placement of the line might emerge in the future for other works as well.²³

Of fundamental importance to these questions is the knowledge about which copperplates survived after Rembrandt’s death. In 1993, an important moment for the study of Rembrandt etchings, the group of 78 surviving Rembrandt copperplates (last printed in 1906 by Alvin-Beaumont) appeared on the art market. Before being dispersed around the world, Hinterding carefully documented and studied them in relation to early sources.²⁴ Thanks to this, individual entries in NHD, *Rembrandt* contain a section about the former ownership of each copperplate when it is known. A considerable number of them had already changed hands during Rembrandt’s lifetime, prob-

²² Ger Luijten in Hinterding *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 5), p. 277; Hinterding, *op. cit.* (note 4), vol. 1, pp. 84, no. 200.

²³ For example, an impression of state VI of *Lieven Willemsz van Coppenol, writing master: the smaller plate* (NHD 305) in the Metropolitan Museum has a contemporary inscription dated 1661, but states V onward are deemed posthumous. Perhaps the date should not be trusted, after all, but the issue is particularly interesting in this case since a mezzotint rocker (a tool Rembrandt supposedly never used) was employed to make changes in every state after IV.

²⁴ Hinterding, *op. cit.* (note 19), pp. 253–315.

²⁵ D. de Hoop Scheffer and K.G. Boon, “De inventaris-lijst van Clement de Jonghe en Rembrandts etsplaten,” *De Kroniek van het Rembrandthuis* 25 (1971) pp. 1–17, and D. de Hoop Scheffer, “Nogmaals de inventaris-lijst van Clement de Jonghe,” *De Kroniek van het Rembrandthuis* 26 (1972) pp. 126–34. The inventory was first published in A. Bredius and N. de Roever, “Rembrandt: nieuwe bijdragen tot zijne levensgeschiedenis III,” *Oud Holland* 8 (1890), pp. 173–86, although at the time it was thought to list impressions of the prints rather than the copperplates themselves. The full inventory of Clement de Jonghe’s copperplates was published in J. van der Waals, exhib. cat. *Prenten in de Gouden Eeuw: van kunst tot kastpapier*, Rotterdam (Museum Boijmans Van Beu-

ably around the time of his bankruptcy in 1656. Almost none of the new owners added a publisher’s address to the plates, since they wanted to sell impressions as Rembrandt’s originals. Due to the fact that the copperplates formed part of the assets of printmakers and publishers, their later owners were located in a number of inventories. In the seventeenth century, the role of Clement de Jonghe (1624/25–77) as the owner of 74 plates was already fairly clear from the publication of the detailed study of them in 1971 by de Hoop Scheffer and Boon.²⁵ Thanks to watermark research it is now possible to identify a number of impressions that were printed by Rembrandt or his publishing house.²⁶

One of the most interesting discoveries among the late state changes is the presence of small, unobtrusive marks (usually two dots, sometimes a plus sign) in the corners of certain plates that were added by a later owner to distinguish recent impressions from earlier ones. Evidence suggests that these marks were added not long after Rembrandt’s death, perhaps around 1700, and thus their presence almost always indicates a state change just below the line. Once one knows where to look for them, they provide a quick and easy way of judging whether an impression dates from the seventeenth century or not. How convenient! These marks were only first noted in 2006 by Krzysztof Krzuzel, who found them on 18 works. NHD, *Rembrandt* expands this number to 29.²⁷ Unfortunately, the compilers missed the appearance of these marks on a significant number of impressions.²⁸ Because the discovery was so recent, one could understand that they only began noting this state after their research was under way. The difference, though, is often between an impression that is lifetime and one that is not.

After the addition of the dots, a number of the plates were reworked with a rocker. The compilers found traces of mezzotint in many of the later states that had previously been over-

ningen) 2006, Appendix 3, pp. 206–15; and in F. Laurentius, *Clement de Jonghe (ca. 1624–1677): kunstverkooper in de Gouden Eeuw*, Houten 2010, pp. 127–50.

²⁶ See Hinterding, *Etcher*, cit. (note 2), vol. 1, pp. 141–44; and Laurentius, *op. cit.* (note 25), pp. 85–119.

²⁷ Krzuzel, *op. cit.* (note 4), pp. 305–08, see NHD, *Rembrandt*, vol. 1, pp. lviii–ix. Prints with these marks are NHD 49, 53, 112, 127, 165, 178, 184, 186, 188, 189, 196, 210, 216, 229, 233, 236, 240, 242, 258, 264, 269, 270, 278, 279, 283, 286, 301, 308, 314.

²⁸ A cursory check of online museum databases revealed the appearance of the dots on many impressions incorrectly catalogued as earlier states, so curators would be wise to double-check the state listings of their prints in this group itemized in note 27 above. For example, impressions of NHD 178 found in the Fogg Art Museum (two impressions), the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the Art Institute of Chicago are state II, not state I; an impression of NHD 196 in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, is not state I; impressions of NHD 210 in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Fogg Art Museum are state II instead of I; and an impression of NHD 270 in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, is not state I.

looked in a remarkable number of works. While it is certainly possible that Rembrandt knew of the new technique (or even owned a mezzotint rocker) the authors convincingly demonstrate that mezzotint only appears in state changes made after his death.²⁹ It would have been helpful to state in the individual entries whether the rocker was serrated or straight (since both were used), because the subtler additions can be difficult to spot, even under close scrutiny.

Thanks to a sale catalogue of the estate of the jeweler and art dealer Jean de Bary of 26 November 1759, it is clear that he owned 29 copperplates by Rembrandt, and must have printed a sizeable number of posthumous impressions with heavy, irregular plate tone. He was also probably responsible for a group of forgeries for which two copperplates were superimposed to arrive at new Rembrandt prints, which were mistakenly attributed to the French printmaker Claude Henri Watelet (1718–86) in the past.³⁰

In addition to the group of 78 copperplates reprinted by Basan and later printers, which remained together until 1993, and a few other surviving copperplates,³¹ there are 45 others that were mentioned after Rembrandt's death in inventories of Clement de Jonghe (1679), Jean de Bary (1759), Pieter de Haan (1767) and others,³² including six that were reprinted in England between c. 1816 and 1826.³³

PROPERTIES OF THE INDIVIDUAL IMPRESSIONS Although the distinction between changes made to the copperplates during Rembrandt's lifetime and afterwards has now become much clearer, the line between autograph impressions made during his lifetime and afterwards remains more of a puzzle when there are no changes made in the plate (no state difference) and when there is no discernible watermark in the paper. Sometimes it is possible to tell a difference between early and later impressions by taking into account the amount of drypoint or copperplate wear, as is sometimes indicated in the entry.

As already mentioned, the study of the watermarks made it possible to distinguish more datable editions of impressions of

the same state in the case of a number of prints. For example, Hinterding's 2006 publication identified seven different watermarks for *The three trees* of 1643 (NHD 214), which is known in only one state. Seventeen sheets of the first edition, which was printed in 1643, have an identical watermark of a foolscap with five-pointed collar (variant A.a). A second edition, from around 1645, was made on paper with the Strasbourg bend (variant C.a) known from two impressions. A third edition, printed around 1652 on paper with the Strasbourg lily (variant E'.a. and the countermark wk'.a.) is known in eight impressions. The four other watermarks, all of them found just once, cannot be dated.³⁴

In Meder's catalogue of Dürer's prints, each state is divided into different categories – (a), (b), (c) and so on – in order to indicate the specific quality of the impressions in relation to the watermarks found in their paper.³⁵ For watermarks, of course, it works only for prints on larger paper formats. It might have been rewarding to attempt to do this with the Rembrandt etchings as well. To date, the differences in quality within a particular state remain a question of connoisseurship practiced in auction catalogues, print dealers' catalogues and catalogues of private collections.

As with White and Boon, *NHD, Rembrandt* records individual impressions that were printed on deluxe papers or supports, such as Japanese paper, Chinese paper, oatmeal paper (also called cartridge or *kardoespapier*), vellum and silk. Rembrandt experimented with these various supports to great effect, beginning around 1647 (except for silk, which apparently is found only in posthumous impressions). Because the compilers visited so many more collections than White and Boon, the *NHD* edition provides a much better picture of the extent to which Rembrandt used these various supports, and for which prints, and even which states, they were most commonly used. The reader should be cautioned, however, against culling such data for meta-analysis.³⁶ In general, researchers should trust their own eyes when checking the works in front of them against the entries.³⁷

²⁹ Vol. 1, pp. lvi–vii.

³⁰ Vol. 1, pp. lix–lxii, with illustrations.

³¹ The plate of NHD 149 is in Göttingen, the one of NHD 172 is in Jerusalem, that of the Jan Six portrait (NHD 238) is still in the Six family collection, and the plate of *Abraham entertaining the angels* of 1656 (NHD 295), which was used as the support for a landscape painting by the Antwerp artist Pieter Gysels or a close follower, was acquired in 1997 by the National Gallery of Art, Washington.

³² NHD 5 (?), 6 (?), 31 (?), 53 (from the Basan group, lost), 76 (?), 86 (?), 88, 89, 91 (?), 92, 112 (?), 117 (?), 122, 124, 152 (?), 155, 156, 164, 166 (?), 168, 173, 175, 182, 185, 188, 194, 196, 197, 204 (?), 213, 215, 223, 232, 239, 241, 265, 267, 269, 274, 275, 285, 287, 298, 299, 311, 314.

³³ Reprinted in *200 etchings*, c. 1816 and 1819 by John M'Creery, in 1819 and 1822 by W. Lewis and in 1826 by J. Kay: NHD 92, 122, 124, 194, 269, 314.

³⁴ Hinterding, *Etcher*, cit. (note 2), vol. 1, pp. 51–53, vol. 2, pp. 298–

99. Hinterding gives many similar examples, such as vol. 1, pp. 53–57, 81, 94–95, 120–23.

³⁵ See Hinterding, *Etcher*, cit. (note 2), pp. 15–16. It is interesting to note that in neither this publication nor in *NHD, Rembrandt* a systematic attempt has been made to connect the specific watermark of a print with the characteristics of the impression or related edition.

³⁶ In the course of writing this review we compared all of the Rembrandt prints in the Rijksprentenkabinet in Amsterdam with their entries in *NHD, Rembrandt*, and found that 14 impressions on Japanese paper had not been noted: NHD 236 (three impressions), 239, 243, 269, 282, 289, 293 (two impressions), 303, 305 and 311 (two impressions; as well as two on vellum), NHD 305 (two impressions); and one on silk, NHD 172. None of these should have been a surprise, as they had all been previously published as such in White and Boon. One hopes that this systematic error is endemic to the Rijksprentenkabinet alone.

³⁷ For example, the Morgan Library's first state impression of *Jan*

A note about usage. *NHD, Rembrandt* wisely sticks to traditional terms such as “Japanese” for a thick yellowish paper of Asian origin, “Chinese” for a very thin, translucent whitish paper of Asian origin, and “oatmeal” for a paper of European origin with visible, variegated fibers. Our understanding of the origins (and original purposes) of such papers might improve with future research, and perhaps our terminology as well. For now these traditional terms remain the most useful.³⁸ The perceptive reader will notice that the term “Indian paper” has been completely eliminated in *NHD, Rembrandt*, although this is nowhere commented upon in the text. The term is indeed fraught for several reasons, not least of which is the confusing etymological relation to the early Dutch term *oost-indisch papier*, indicating paper imported from Asia by the Dutch East India Company. On the other hand, some of Rembrandt’s prints were printed on papers that appear remarkably similar to those of Indian miniature paintings, a type of art that we know interested him. In any event, its use was relatively rare. White and Boon applied the term to *Jan Asselijn, painter* (NHD 236), *A scholar in his study ('Faust')* (NHD 270), and *St Francis beneath a tree praying* (NHD 299). In *NHD, Rembrandt*, those impressions are now listed as “oatmeal paper?”, the implication of the question mark being that previous cataloguers confused a lighter type of western oatmeal paper with an East India Company import (whether from India, Indonesia or elsewhere in Asia).³⁹ If that is indeed what the authors imply, it forms an intriguing hypothesis, but one that still needs to be tested.

As stated at the beginning of this review, the results of the research on the watermarks in the impressions on western paper is one of the major improvements in our knowledge of the production practice of Rembrandt etchings to have taken place in recent decades. Hinterding had already published the results at length in 2006, and there is a reference to the specific type of watermark used in several states of many of the prints in *NHD, Rembrandt*, with a reference to his 2006 watermark catalogue at the end of each entry. We would have preferred a rather more detailed summary of the method and results in the introduction and, in the entries, references to watermarks found in individual impressions rather than having them listed at the end of the entry among the watermarks for the states as a whole. Since it turns out that it is possible to divide a number of prints into between two and four different editions, thanks to the use of datable batches of paper, more information in the entries could

have allowed for a further distinction between earlier and later impressions. As it stands, one needs to use *NHD, Rembrandt* in tandem with Hinterding’s 2006 publication, where one might find relevant information about watermarks in individual impressions. Furthermore, *NHD, Rembrandt* claims to make use of newly discovered watermarks found between 2006 and 2013, but specific information about them is missing.⁴⁰

PLATE VOLUMES The editorial decision to illustrate all the states of Rembrandt’s prints and their copies in full size (as far as the volume format allows) is another of the great merits of the New Hollstein edition. It has resulted in five plate volumes with more than 2,200 illustrations on over 1,500 pages. In addition, the two text volumes contain numerous small illustrations of magnified details in order to distinguish between the different states wherever necessary. These are extremely helpful. Though the black-and-white illustrations often look rather gray in comparison to the original impressions, they are generally sharp and accurate. Leaving aside the cost, the choice of a simple black-and-white halftone instead of duotone offset, as in the plate volume of 1969, or of color reproductions, as in the Amsterdam and London catalogue of 2000, was a wise one. The different qualities of the digital images supplied by the different owners would have resulted in large contrasts in tone and quality. Many more good illustrations of individual impressions are now available, thanks to *NHD, Rembrandt*, but the images in several handbooks, such as the Rovinski “Atlas,” Münz, White of 1969, and in a number of exhibition and collection catalogues, remain indispensable for comparing the different impressions of a print. One can only regret that the brief references to these handbooks given in the 1969 Hollstein edition (as R., Mz, White etc.) have not been included in *NHD, Rembrandt*.

COPIES Although copies after Rembrandt’s etchings were listed in the 1969 Hollstein and earlier catalogues, they rarely attract much attention in the literature. The decision to describe all the known copies and illustrate them in two volumes of plates is one of the great merits of this catalogue. Their artistic quality turns out to be very uneven and seldom deceptive, but this complete overview provides many insights into the early appreciation of Rembrandt’s prints from the seventeenth to the mid-nineteenth century. Although the reasons for listing and illustrating the copies are already given in the general

Lutma, goldsmith (NHD 293) is on vellum rather than Chinese paper.

³⁸ The information given about the special papers used by Rembrandt is limited, vol. 1, p. lxiii. There is a useful survey by K. Mayer Haunton in Bialler *et al.*, op. cit. (note 4), unpag., at the back of the book. Detailed attention was paid to Rembrandt’s prints on Japanese paper at a recent exhibition in Tokyo; see A. Kofuku, “Japanese paper in Rembrandt’s oeuvre,” in idem (ed.), exhib. cat. *Rembrandt: the quest for chiaroscuro*, Tokyo (National Museum of Western Art) and Nagoyo (City Art Museum) 2011, pp. 329–41; see also idem, “Rembrandt prints on

Asian paper and their reception” in A. Kofuku and H. Kumazawa (eds.), *Rembrandt: the quest for chiaroscuro. Essays*, Tokyo 2012, pp. 129–38.

³⁹ On this see Hinterding, *Etcher*, cit. (note 2), vol. 1, pp. 112–14. An impression of *Jan Asselijn* in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, that is usually described as being on Indian paper, has a fragment of a wheel watermark, indicating that it is, after all, European; see Hinterding, *Etcher*, cit. vol. 1, p. 182, note 335).

⁴⁰ Introduction, vol. 1, p. lxi.

introduction, a separate, more extensive and revealing essay titled “Copying Rembrandt: an introduction,” is given at the beginning of the two plate volumes for the copies.⁴¹

PROVENANCE For obvious reasons, to avoid making the cataloguing project too complicated and time-consuming, the provenance of the different impressions is rarely given. The catalogue only supplies the signatures of the Mariette family of print dealers, with dates between 1652 and 1700, along with a few other relevant inscriptions, mostly from the seventeenth century.⁴² This is useful, but hardly a help for reconstructing the more or less continuous chains of ownership of albums with Rembrandt etchings of high quality stretching back to the artist’s own day.⁴³ As a result of watermark research carried out in the past few decades, many impressions in the major collections are no longer fully pasted onto their mounts, which makes it easier to study the provenance in the context of the collections. Nick Stogdon’s recent catalogue of a significant private Swiss collection of Rembrandt etchings is a monumental example of connoisseurship, partly due to the quality of the reproductions in the beautifully produced volume.⁴⁴ It combines the study of individual impressions with a knowledge of their provenance to gain a better understanding of the fascination for Rembrandt’s prints during his lifetime and in later centuries. Stogdon’s impressive appendix of collectors, auctioneers and dealers offers a wealth of information over and above the groundwork done by Frits Lugt in his *Marques de collections* of 1921.

Of course that kind of information is not what one expects in a pure print catalogue, but it is essential for an understanding of the taste for Rembrandt’s prints during the periods of collecting after his death. Further study of early collections of his prints remains a desideratum.⁴⁵ Although more or less complete catalogues of a number of etching collections have been published, especially the ones in Paris,⁴⁶ a lot still remains to be done. One might wish for an online database in which print curators from around the world publish information about the provenances of their holdings of Rembrandt etchings.

⁴¹ Vol. 1, pp. lxiii, and vol. 6, pp. vi–xxiii.

⁴² There are probably more references to Mariette inscriptions missing, among them on impressions in the Rembrandthuis: NHD 28–29 (both with “P. Mariette 1672”), NHD 154 (“P. Mariette 1668”) and NHD 264 V (“P. Mariette 1687”). A more serious omission in the literature list is S. Dickey, “Inscriptions and the reception of Rembrandt’s etchings,” in M. Roscam Abbing (ed.), *Rembrandt 2006*, 2 vols., Leiden 2006, vol. 1, pp. 137–54, who discusses the handwritten poems on impressions of NHD 239 II in Paris and NHD 275 I in London, and the inscriptions on the portraits of *Jan Cornelis Sylvius* (NHD 124 I in Cambridge), *Jan Uytenbogaert* (NHD 172 II in Vienna), and the *Large Copenel* (NHD 306 V in New York).

⁴³ See Filedt Kok, review, op. cit. (note 1), p. 54, and Filedt Kok in H. Buijs (ed.), exhib. cat. *Un Cabinet particulier: les estampes de la Collection Frits Lugt*, Paris 2010, pp. 164–66. A few such chains are: (1) Mariette > Pierre Remy > Pond > Astley; (2) J.P. Zoomer > Zanetti > D.

CONCLUSION A comparison of *NHD, Rembrandt* with the 1969 Hollstein edition immediately makes it clear that this is another major step forward. Both compilers were employed by the publisher for a period of four years to carry out their investigations and write the volumes. It is clear that this massive investment on the publisher’s part needs to be recouped through sales of the seven volumes, which explains the rather high price for the set. In the longer term, in our opinion, the images and catalogue information should be made available online, in much the same way as they already are for the Rembrandt holdings of certain individual institutions. The next catalogue of Rembrandt etchings could be a work in progress in a digital format based on *NHD, Rembrandt*, with more information about the individual impressions (technical details about paper, watermarks etc., provenance with references), and whenever possible the variant impressions in the states that are known in several editions.⁴⁷ For a few prints, such as the *Christ presented to the people: oblong plate* (NHD 290) and *Arnout Tholinx, inspector* (NHD 294), a census of the known impressions has already been taken that could serve as an example for such a project.⁴⁸

The condition for such a digital catalogue is that after a number of years a revised version of *NHD, Rembrandt* would be put online with corrections and additions and the full provenances, with links to the websites of the larger printrooms like Amsterdam and London, which have most of their holdings online already. Under light editorial supervision, the curators of the many institutions that have impressions of Rembrandt etchings should be able to add information and specific details about their holdings. Until then, however, the seven-volume paper edition of *NHD, Rembrandt* will be indispensable for anyone interested in Rembrandt’s etchings, as well as long afterwards for the pleasure of browsing in the volumes of plates.

JAN PIET FILEDT KOK
AMSTERDAM

ROBERT FUCCI
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK

Vivant-Denon > Woodburn > J. Wilson; (3) V. Röver > Ploos van Amstel > Aylesford > Holford; (4) Willem Six > Houbraken > van Leyden and J. Barnard.

⁴⁴ Stogdon, op. cit. (note 4).

⁴⁵ Stephanie Dickey is preparing a publication on the subject.

⁴⁶ See note 4.

⁴⁷ On the basis of the text in *NHD* we have added all the available and relevant information on provenance, watermarks, illustrations etc. to digital entries for HND 264, *Clement de Jonghe, printseller*, and HND 300, *The Adoration of the Shepherds: a night piece*, which can be consulted at www.hollstein.com/file/download/pdf/NHD264-B272.pdf and www.hollstein.com/file/download/pdf/NHD300-B046.pdf respectively.

⁴⁸ A.T. Eeles, “Rembrandt’s *Ecce homo*: a census of impressions,” *Print Quarterly* 15 (1998), pp. 290–96 (with addenda in *Print Quarterly* 17 (2000), p. 49). For Tholinx see Stogdon, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 232–34.