(13); a happy ending to this quest is not necessarily a given. The farces, too, deal with love after a fashion, through the very popular late-medieval theme of "de strijd om de broek" (also the subject of illustration 15): they are the typically vulgar, typically slapstick depictions of the worst elements of non-aristocratic marriage.

De Vrooms introduction provides a useful synopsis of scholarship to date on the manuscript (paper, mid to late fourteenth century), originating locale of manuscript and plays (southern Netherlandic territories, possibly Brabant), theories of authorship (arguments range from advocating a single author to understanding similarities as inherent in language and genre, not person), staging (contemporary accounts suggest that by the end of the fifteenth century indoor and professional performances were organized, and admission was charged; relatively few actors played many roles with the help of masks), and audience (more likely burghers/citizens than the nobility, as the plays bear evidence of a transformation of the ideals of courtly love on the new morality of love only within marriage, and of marriage as the primary goal). As to genre, scholars display some undertainty about the exact meaning of "abel," and de Vrooms discussion of "tragicomedy" (see above) is an entirely plausible suggestion.

Interesting from the larger viewpoint of "Netherlandic Studies" is the matter of the series in which this volume appears. The Carleton Renaissance Plays in Translation, of which de Vrooms work is the latest volume (with seven more titles scheduled for publication in the next two years), aims at making available Dutch, Italian, French, Spanish, and German plays 1380-1680 to a much larger audience through English translation. De Vrooms is the third translation from Dutch in the series, having been preceded by two Vondel plays translated by Kristiaan Aercke, namely Gijsbrecht van Amstel (CP24, winner of the James S. Holmes translation award) and Mary Stuart or Tortured Majesty (CP 27). In "The Needles Eye: Translation and the Publisher," a well-articulated editorial report first presented as a key-note address at the Colloquium on Translation at McMaster University in 1991 (print: Dovehouse Editions, 1991), General Editor Donald Beecher reflects on the goal of the series: "to offer the English reader a representative measure of the theatrical life of the continent during the Renaissance," a goal he estimates will be reached after "at least fifty or sixty titles" (p.22). While some of the already popular plays sell well also in translation, the series is equally dedicated to making lesser known texts available, despite the lack of demand that might exist for the text prior and even subsequent to translation.

HERMINA JOLDERSMA
University of Calgary

Bram Kempers, ed.: *Openbaring en bedrog, de afbeelding als historisch bron in de Lage Landen*. Amsterdam UP, 1995. 203pp.

We have here what will no doubt be the first in a long line of studies using the admirable resources of the Atlas van Stolk collection for historical research, now that it is readily available to the public. (Our readers had a taste of its riches in J. C. Nix's article on its materials about Indonesia, fall 1995 p.19-33). In the words of the head of the van Stolk family forty years ago (as reported in a foreword by the present head, who traces the transition from private property to State resource), the collection is "verrekte lollig" and "verdomde interessant." The editors introduction suggests one of the infinite ways in which it is darned interesting: it embodies the double-edged nature of images. They can reveal more to us in a flash than words ever

could, but they can also deceive us. Theologians have been against them ever since the Ten Commandments were handed down; historians have inherited this mistrust and so have never shed on the societies they studied the light that they could have gotten from pictures. Art critics, on the other hand, have concerned themselves with artists, and traditions in painting, but not with the social significance of works. The present collection of six essays is an attempt to bridge the gap, with the aid of specialists from a variety of fields.

The part of the gap they have largely concentrated on is the use of various media, especially prints, by one faction to persuade the public that its political cause is just (revelation of the truth) and by the opposite faction who maintain that it is lies (unmasking deception). Who is revealing and who is lying, of course, depends on ones point of view. R. W. Scheller (history of medieval art, U. of Amsterdam) begins our story in the 15th century, before such manipulation of the public created, let alone relied on, national feelings. One was of ones locality, and then — if educated, at any rate — one felt European. The propagandists client, so to speak, was thus a ruler trying to persuade his subjects that his power was legitimate because he was descended from the ruling family of the place. The device used to persuade people of this was the heraldic shield, the coat of arms. Few other symbols appeared yet.

The 16th century, as the editor (Bram Kempers, professor of the sociology of art, U. of Amsterdam) tells us next, inherited this situation. However, when Holland changed hands for the fourth time in a century and the Habsburgs began to deny ancient rights in an attempt to exert unified control, a revolt began, first among the aristocrats and then in the whole country. The imagery used to manipulate opinion evolved accordingly, especially on the Dutch side. The coat of arms continued to be used, and since the lion figured in that of so many provinces, he became the independence forces symbol. He stepped down from his shield, however, and became more active in the world of fable, where other creatures joined in activities with him; for example, he is seen chasing Spanish pigs out of his garden. Already in the late 16th century we also see each political faction reinterpreting the others imagery. If the Habsburgs showed their lion being attacked by rebels portrayed as frogs, flies and mosquitoes (the plagues sent upon Egypt in Exodus), the "rebels" published a print in which frogs help the Dutch lion fight the pigs, and mosquitoes drive off grasshoppers: the little guy, it is implied, can fight the big guy. During the century the targeted public changes, so that the print with extensive polyglot verse explanation of the picture, and the mixed symbolism of animals, shields and known figures (William the Silent, the Duke of Alba, the latters advisor Cardinal Gravelle) largely give way to pamphlets, designed to keep up popular morale and support in the long war of independence. They are simple, the explanations are shorter and in Dutch only, and they rely very much on figures out of fables. As the chief figure in these, by accident and reaction, the aristocratic lion became the symbol of the Dutch republic.

E. de Jongh (iconology and art theory, U of Utrecht) widens the discussion to embrace the whole of art. All art claims to *be* what it can only *represent*, he says, and we agree to this convention. The painter may change what he sees, e.g. add a tree to give his landscape depth. The 17th century considered it a positive (artistic) action to deceive us by putting a bulding in an alien setting, or

importing something imaginary or from elsewhere into a known setting. All this we understand, and we also understand that one glosses over deformities when painting someones portrait. But in those days it was also in order to alter someone elses work and sign it oneself ("improvement"). Indeed, the only outcry de Jongh tells us of was caused by a political and religious manipulation, namely a Catholic print claiming that miraculous figures were found in an apple tree branch; no less an artist than Pieter Saenredam was commissioned to rush out a "counter-print" giving a rational explanation of this supposed event.

With the essay of Frans Grijzenhout (Rijksdienst Bildende Kunst) we return to the political arena. In the 1780s the stadholder Willem V was opposed by the Patriots, who wanted greater military preparedness against England; some prominent clergy agreed, and in some cities a militia drilled in the church. The official reaction was to launch a print campaign declaring the Patriots to be heretics and portraying the militant pastors as divided lengthwise into incompatible halves, clergy and soldiers — a potent symbol of hypocrisy. Again, the image, itself a manipulation of public opinion, was reversed (manipulation was done in the opposite direction) by portraying such men as Christian soldiers fighting against evil. Something even more interesting happened to the image of Janus the two-faced god, which was also used against the patriots: a satirical journal called *Janus* was published. That readers were invited to laugh at both sides in the dispute, and not to take sides, was new in itself, but so was the way the symbol was used: it needed no words of explanation.

N.C. van Sas (social history, U. of Leiden) looks at something rather simpler: anti-Napoleonic prints of about 1800. Unlike earlier parts of the book, all the illustrations are from the Atlas van Stolk, but in this essay all but one are English. In the Netherlands, indeed, between Napoleons censorship and weariness with politics, little was produced, though we may note the innovation of publishing collections of prints (albums) as a summary of recent events. In England, the print had evolved towards the cartoon: captions were short, people and things in the picture were labelled, people spoke in balloons, and nations were represented not so much by animals as by people with their supposed national characters — in other words, stereotypes. Thus the Dutchman was grumpy, wore ill-fitting brown clothes, and was always smoking his pipe. At first he was blamed for making money out of all the combatants, but once the Netherlands was liberated and an ally, that observation was forgotten: he became the simple friend whom the British sailor protected!

The last essay, by Jan Bank (history, U of Leiden), looks at the public image of the monarchy, mainly in this century. The proliferation of media — everyone can have a camera, and journalists have zoom lenses — has meant loss of privacy for the royal family and inability to dictate the image the public has of them. They have worked on their image, however, first with photographs and more recently by appearing on TV and even, in 1988, being the subject of a two-hour programme. The essay also discusses the implications of seeing royalty on horseback. The Dutch never wanted the stadholders to glorify their dynasty with equestrian statues, but Wilhelmina was photographed on horseback in an effort to make the monarchy more visible, and then for national morale she appeared reviewing her troops in a 1916 film about the Netherlands preparedness to defend its neutrality by force of arms if

necessary. Two equestrian statues of her were made, one to mark her role as leader in exile in World War II. Juliana, however, chose to show greater solidarity with her people by being photographed riding a bike. Beatrix seems to combine a modern approach to her job with use of the traditional image implied by riding a horse; in the 1988 TV programme, the last segment shows her galloping away along the beach — an act that seems intended to show she has the force of character of a ruler.

Like any book of separate essays, this one does not provide "continuous coverage" of the subject. Even so, the volume offers virtually a history of the Netherlands as reflected in pictures. The introduction, however, seems rather to promise to show us how to interpret pictures in the light of Dutch history, or else how to use pictures to shed light *on* Dutch history, neither of which is quite what we have here. But then, do pictures reflect society and enrich our understanding of events, or do we need to know events in order to understand pictures? If the volume makes us ask ourselves such questions, this is all to the good.

Certainly images can tell us what segments of the nation they were aimed at, and how events were shown to the target public at the time. The book can thus be seen as a partial study of the historyof collective mentalities. It is not a direct study, of a corpus where the mentalities themselves speak to us (as they do, for example, in diaries), but it can tell us a great deal, for the publishers certainly knew their publics. (Literary and other works, I suppose, can speak to us for the public of a given time, or from them). However we classify the topic of the book, it will give readers a great deal of pleasure, recalling Dutch history and familiar illustrations (familiar in a number of cases, anyway); the illustrations, both black-and-white and colour, are superb, and the whole book is a pleasure to browse in. All those concerned with its production are to be commended, and we look forward to more volumes like it.

BASIL D. KINGSTONE
University of Windsor

Blake Lee Spahr, Thomas F.Shannon and Wiljan van den Akker, eds.: *Vantage points, Festschrift for Johan P. Snapper*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1996 (Publications of the American Association for Netherlandic Studies, 10). 266p.

Any undue solemnity which might hang over this homage is dissipated by the frontispiece: a photo of Prof. Snapper consulting a large volume, one foot propped on an open drawer of his desk. An introduction describes the lifes work of this ebullient and active man who has done so much for Dutch Studies at Berkeley and has Dutch, Belgian and American honours to prove it. There is also a *tabula gratulatoria* listing 87 names, and a page listing the annual holders of the Peter Paul Rubens chair at Berkeley in the history and culture of the Lowlands, which Snapper worked to create; but there is no bibliography of his publications. It is true that he has not yet stopped publishing; long may he not stop.

The volume has eighteen contributions arranged in alphabetical order of the contributors, distinguished scholars all. However, I will discuss them in chronological order of the topics.

We begin in the eighteenth century, with two articles which also refer directly to the volumes title. Margriet Bruijn Lacy (Butler