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This study examines the life and work of the fifteenth-century Tournai painter, Jacques Daret. A pupil of Robert Campin, the so-called "Master of Flémalle", Daret is the author of one of the best documented of all Early Netherlandish altarpieces, the Arras Altarpiece, which was completed for the Abbey of St. Vaast, Arras in 1435. Apart from this fact, little else is generally known about him.

Following a review of the Campin, Flémalle, and Daret literature in chapter 1, a biography of Daret is presented in chapter 2. By considering the evidence of the painter's activity as designer of tapestries and metalwork, decorator for court festivals, and his possible role as illuminator of manuscripts, a more complete understanding of Daret's extended career is attained.

As his only documented works, the four surviving panels from the Arras Altarpiece form the basis for an analysis of Daret's individual style in chapter 3. Along with an examination of the paint surfaces, Daret's underpainting and underdrawing styles as revealed by X-radiography and infrared reflectography are also discussed. In chapter 4, this stylistic analysis is applied to a group
of paintings whose attributions are currently debated. New attributions are proposed which not only extend Daret’s oeuvre beyond the four Arras panels, but also raise questions about our current understanding of fifteenth-century workshop practices.

An analysis of the historical context, original appearance, and iconographic program of the 1434-35 Arras Altarpiece is presented in chapter 5. Daret’s second major work for the Abbey of St. Vaast, the lost Holy Spirit Altarpiece of c.1453-55 is discussed in chapter 6. Along with its historical context and iconographic program, a theoretical reconstruction of its original appearance, based on an analysis of the St. Vaast documents and a comparison with extant paintings in the circle of Daret, is proposed. Conclusions of the study are summarized in chapter 7.
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INTRODUCTION

Jacques Daret was one of the most successful artists of the fifteenth century. Today, he is virtually unknown. One reason for this surprising paradox is that only four paintings have been firmly identified as his work: the Visitation, (figure 1), the Nativity, (figure 2), the Adoration of the Magi, (figure 3), and the Presentation in the Temple, (figure 4).1 Together with a now lost Annunciation, they formed the exterior of one of the best documented of all Netherlandish altarpieces, commissioned by Abbot Jean du Clercq in 1433-35 for his funerary chapel in the Abbey of St. Vaast in Arras.2 Through a review of his complete artistic activity, an analysis of the remains of his c.1434-35 Arras Altarpiece, and an investigation of the data relevant to his c.1453-56 Holy Spirit Altarpiece, this

1Today the Visitation and Adoration of the Magi are in the Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin; the Nativity is part of the Coleccion Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid; the Presentation in the Temple is in the Petit Palais, Paris.

study is an attempt to rectify the discrepancy between Daret's present obscurity and the success he enjoyed during his own lifetime.

* * * * *

A native of Tournai, Daret was trained in the workshop of Robert Campin, the so-called "Master of Flémalle," one of the most important innovators of panel painting in fifteenth-century Flanders. Following his inscription as an independent master in 1432, Daret was employed at the Abbey of St. Vaast in Arras from 1433 to 1457. Along with designs for metalwork and tapestries, he completed a second altarpiece between 1453 and 1456 for the abbey's chapel of the Holy Spirit. The following year, Daret worked in Lille as a painter of decorations for the Oath of the Pheasant feast, hosted by the Duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good. Finally, in 1468, he worked in Bruges as the

---

3 Maurice Houtart, Jacques Daret, peintre tournoisien du XVe siècle (Tournai: H. & L. Casterman, 1907), 22.
5 Ibid., 62, 89-90.
artistic director for the wedding feast of Philip's successor, Charles the Bold, and Margaret of York.⁷

Despite his association with one of the most important Early Netherlandish masters, and his documented activity for such important patrons as Abbot du Clercq and the Dukes of Burgundy, Daret has received only summary treatment in the literature. To date, no comprehensive critical study has been made of this artist's life and work that accounts for his extensive career or explores the possibility of expanding his oeuvre beyond the four documented panels. Of the twenty-six paintings in the "Campin Group",⁸ only nineteen are generally accepted as the work of Campin himself. The authorship of the remaining seven is debated. My research demonstrates that three of these paintings can be attributed to Jacques Daret, while two others may be associated with his workshop.

In contrast to previous authors whose scholarship has been primarily restricted to documentation or iconographic interpretation, I have approached Daret both conceptually, and as a connoisseur. My goal has been to examine all the evidence of Daret's work and to reconsider the form and function of both of his Arras altarpieces within the context of their original monastic setting. In addition, by

⁷Laborde, Les Ducs de Bourgogne, 2:332-333, item 4443.

⁸The term "Campin Group" is used here to identify a group of paintings all of which exhibit a similar Campinesque style.
considering every known aspect of Daret's career, as painter, designer of metalwork and tapestries, manuscript illuminator, and artistic director, I will summarize more thoroughly the activity of this significant artist who is generally overlooked today.

* * * * *

Chapter 1 provides a review of the literature concerning Jacques Daret, Robert Campin and the "Master of Flémalle" since the rediscovery of "Flemish primitive" painting in the early nineteenth century. Along with a discussion of the controversy surrounding the identification of Campin with this anonymous master, Hulin de Loo's authentication of Daret's authorship of the Arras panels is summarized. The remainder of the chapter reviews the Daret scholarship since Hulin made this important discovery in 1909.

Jacques Daret's biographical data are presented in chapter 2. Although the original documents concerning Daret's life and extensive artistic activity were destroyed during the first and second world wars, many were published prior to their destruction. From these published accounts, it has been possible to reconstruct an outline of the artist's life and career from his boyhood in Tournai to his last recorded payment in 1468.
Chapter 3 is devoted to the identification of Daret’s individual painting style. The four Arras panels are compared with the accepted works of Robert Campin and the unique style of each artist is defined. Along with an examination of the painted surfaces, the underdrawing and underpainting stages of each work as revealed by infrared reflectography and X-radiography are also compared.

Applying this stylistic analysis in chapter 4, variously attributed paintings in the "Campin Group" are considered in comparison with the Arras panels. New attributions to Daret are proposed; others, suggested by previous authors, are refuted.

Daret’s two St. Vaast altarpieces are analyzed in chapters 5 and 6. The original form and monastic setting of each is considered, and their respective place in the development of fifteenth-century devotional imagery is discussed. The iconography of the c.1434-35 Arras Altarpiece is summarized in Chapter 5, and a new interpretation, reflecting the political position of the Abbey of St. Vaast with respect to the town of Arras, is suggested.

Chapter 6 is devoted to a discussion of Daret’s lost Holy Spirit Altarpiece of c.1453-56. Through an analysis of the description of the altarpiece in the St. Vaast documents, and through a comparison of that description to other paintings in the "Campin Group" and another altarpiece
of the same period, a theoretical reconstruction of the retable's original appearance is proposed. Conclusions of the study are presented in chapter 7.
CHAPTER 1

JACQUES DARET IN THE LITERATURE AND
THE CAMPIN-FLÉMALLE PROBLEM

In the early decades of the nineteenth century, scholars and connoisseurs began to express a greater interest in the nature and origins of fifteenth-century Netherlandish painting. Calling this distinctive period style "Flemish primitivism", similarities were noted among a large group of paintings which at that time were loosely attributed to Roger van der Weyden.¹ In 1858, Passavant was the first scholar to account for stylistic variations within the group by dividing the paintings between two phases in Roger's career, one youthful and the other mature.² To "Rogier van der Weyden the Younger" he attributed four panels in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt: the Virgin and Child, (figure 5), the St. Veronica, (figure 6), the Holy Trinity, (figure 7), all said to have come from the Abbey of Flémalle, near Liège; and the

¹These early years of scholarship are summarized in Suzanne Sulzberger, La Rehabilitation des Primitifs Flamands 1802-1867 (Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1961).

Bad Thief, (figure 8), apparently a fragment from a larger Crucifixion group. Passavant also included in this group the two portraits of a man and woman in the National Gallery, London, (figures 9 and 10).

As director of the Berlin Museum, Wilhelm von Bode was allowed, in 1887, to examine a small Annunciation Triptych, (figure 11), in the collection of the Mérode family in Brussels. Although he linked it stylistically to Passavant’s selected group, Bode believed the triptych to be the work of a second artist to whom he also attributed the Virgin and Child before a Firescreen in the National Gallery, London, (figure 12). Identifying the triptych as his basis for future attributions, Bode called this anonymous artist the "Master of Mérode".

Bode’s theory of two artists was supported by his colleague Hugo von Tschudi in 1898. However, not having access to the Mérode Triptych (figure 11), Tschudi used the alleged Flémalle Abbey panels as his foundation for further attributions and, consequently, renamed Bode’s "Master of Mérode" the "Master of Flémalle". Along with the Frankfurt panels (figures 5-8), the Mérode Triptych (figure 11), and

3Today, the Mérode Triptych is in the Cloisters Collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.


the London Virgin and Child before a Firescreen (figure 12), Tschudi attributed to this master the Nativity in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dijon, (figure 13), the Heinrich von Werl with St. John the Baptist and the St. Barbara in the Prado, Madrid, (figures 14 and 15), a Crucifixion in Berlin, and the Brussels portraits of Barthélemy Alatruye and Marie de Pacy. 6

The oeuvre of the newly recognized "Master of Flémalle" was further expanded by the Belgian art historian Georges Hulin de Loo on the occasion of the 1902 exhibition of Flemish Primitives in Bruges. 7 Like Bode and Tschudi before him, Hulin also acknowledged the styles of two different artists and attributed the Virgin in Glory in the Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence, (figure 16), to the anonymous "Master of Flémalle". Hulin's greatest concern, however, was determining the artist's identity and it is in his introductory essay to the catalog that Jacques Daret is first associated with the "Master of Flémalle". 8

---

6Today, both the Crucifixion in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin, and the two portraits, (now in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Tournai), are described as "after the Master of Flémalle".


8Ibid., 25-37.
Hulin argued that, in both quantity and quality, no other artist, except Jan van Eyck or Roger van der Weyden, was as important in the fifteenth century as the "Master of Flémalle". Wishing to attach a name to this anonymous genius, he searched for documentary evidence of an individual who could measure up to such a reputation. For Hulin, Jacques Daret was that person.

Hulin found Daret's name recorded twice in the Burgundian accounts. The first time was in February, 1454 when he worked in Lille as a painter and designer of entremets for the Voeu du Faisan banquet hosted by Philip the Good. In 1468 Daret was employed by Philip's successor, Charles the Bold, as director of artistic activities for the duke's wedding feast which was held in Bruges in July of that year. On both occasions, Daret received a high payment for his work.

Guided by the coats of arms on the backs of the portraits of Barthélemy Alatruye and Marie de Pacy, Hulin next turned his attention to the Tournai archives where he found additional evidence to support his thesis. In the

9 Laborde, Les Ducs de Bourgogne, 1:423, item 1539. In contrast to our current definition of a sweet or dessert, in the fifteenth century, an entremet was a diversion or entertainment that took place between courses at a banquet.

10 Ibid., 2:332-333, item 4443.

11 The Tournai archives were destroyed by fire in 1940. Today, the best sources for the documents are Amaury de la Grange and Louis Cloquet, "Études sur l'art à Tournai et sur les anciens artistes de cette ville," Mémoires de la société
Tournai documents, he found Daret's inscription on April 12, 1427 as an apprentice in the atelier of Robert Campin. Daret's fellow pupil was Rogelet de la Pasture (Roger Van der Weyden), which, for Hulin, explained the similarities in painting styles previously noted by Passavant. Daret's importance was further supported, Hulin believed, by his election to the position of guild provost on October 18, 1432, the same day that he entered the guild as an independent master.

Hulin thought Daret's rapid rise to fame was also reflected in the Prado panel which included a portrait of Heinrich von Werl with St. John the Baptist, (figure 14). Painted only six years after Daret had become an independent master, Hulin argued that Werl, who was Provincial Minister of the Franciscan Order in the Diocese of Cologne and a

11

historique et littéraire de Tournai 21 (1887); Houtart, Jacques Daret (1907); idem, "Quel est l'état de nos connaissances relativement à Robert Campin, Jacques Daret et Roger van der Weyden?" Annales de la fédération archéologique et historique de Belgique 3 (1914): 88-108.

12 The excerpts from the 1424-1480 register of the Tournai painter's guild relative to Campin, Daret, and Roger van der Weyden may be found in Emile Renders, La solution du problème Van der Weyden, Flémalle, Campin (Bruges: Charles Beyaert, 1931), 1:127-173. The entries specific to Jacques Daret are transcribed in appendix A.
member of the Council of Basel, would only have commissioned an artist of some renown to paint his portrait during his visit to Flanders in 1438.  

Finally, the author recalled three panels in Berlin, the Visitation, (figure 1), the Adoration of the Magi, (figure 3), and the Presentation in the Temple, (figure 4), which appeared to belong to a series and were dated c.1460 by Bode. From the coat of arms on the shield behind the kneeling figure in the Visitation panel (figure 1), Hulin identified the donor as Jean du Clercq, Abbot of St. Vaast in Arras from 1428 to 1462. Hulin knew that Daret had been employed by the abbot between 1441 and 1457 and had designed a tapestry for him during that time. However, he believed

---

13 Presumably the left wing of a larger ensemble which also included the St. Barbara (figure 15), the portrait panel is inscribed with the date 1438. For Werl’s biography, see Dietrich Jansen, "Der Kölner Provinzial des Minoritenordens Heinrich von Werl, der Werl-altar, und Robert Campin," Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbbuch 45 (1984): 7-40.

14 For the dating of the Visitation and Adoration of the Magi panels, see Wilhelm von Bode, Königliche Museen zu Berlin. Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der Gemälde (Berlin: W. Spemann, 1898), 210-211, nos. 527 and 542. For the Presentation in the Temple, see idem, The Collection of Oscar Hainauer (London: Chiswick Press, 1906), 69, no. 56, as The Circumcision of Christ.

the panels to be the work of a pupil of Daret, painted after the artist's departure from Arras in 1458, and therefore in accord with Bode's dating of c.1460.

Hulin's identification of the anonymous "Master of Flémalle" with the historical figure Jacques Daret was immediately received in the literature. Perhaps inspired by the new status given to this local master, the Tournai historian Maurice Houtart wrote the first biographical essay on Daret shortly after the Bruges exhibition. 16 Houtart's study was based on information culled from parish records and the Tournai municipal archives but did not account for every period of Daret's long career.

Meanwhile, Hulin continued his investigation, and in 1909, changed his mind about the identity of the "Master of Flémalle". 17 First, he believed the paintings attributed to this artist were too archaic in style to post-date 1432, the year of Daret's inscription as an independent master. Secondly, the Werl panels, dated 1438, appeared to him to be mature, rather than early works in the master's oeuvre. Consequently, Hulin suggested that the dates for the "Master of Flémalle" be shifted back several years. Acknowledging the stylistic affinities to Roger van der Weyden, he

16Maurice Houtart, Jacques Daret. Also published in idem, "Jacques Daret, peintre tournaisien de XVe siècle," Revue Tournaisienne 3 (1907): 5-8, 32-36, 45-49.

proposed that the "Master of Flémalle" was most likely Robert Campin, the teacher of both Van der Weyden and Daret in Tournai.

This left unexplained the three pictures that he had seen in Berlin seven years earlier. \(^{18}\) Although he continued to associate them with the "Master of Flémalle" on stylistic grounds, Hulin questioned their dating to 1460 on the basis of the costumes of the Magi in the Adoration panel (figure 3) as well as the "old iconography" of the subject. \(^{19}\) Moreover, the apparent age of the donor did not support such a late date. \(^{20}\) Hulin therefore wondered if the panels might be dated some twenty-five years earlier and if they might have been painted by Jacques Daret himself.

Hulin found the answer to these questions in three documents. The first text was the Journal de la Paix d'Arras, written by Dom Antoine de la Taverne, grand provost of the Abbey of St. Vaast. A daily, eye-witness account of

\(^{18}\)By 1909 the Presentation in the Temple was in the possession of the brothers Duveen, London.

\(^{19}\)According to Hulin, the iconography of the kings as caucasian men of youth, middle-, and old-age is a characteristic of Adoration scenes of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. By the mid-fifteenth century one of the Magi is nearly always depicted as a Moor. See Hulin de Loo, "An Authentic Work," 206.

\(^{20}\)Born in 1376, Jean du Clercq would have been eighty-four years old in 1460. For Du Clercq's biography, see Adolphe de Cardevaque and Auguste Terninck, L'Abbaye de Saint-Vaast. Monographie historique, archéologique et littéraire de ce monastère, 3 vols. (Arras: Alphonse Brissy, 1865-1868), 1:210-212.
the treaty negotiations that took place at the abbey during the summer of 1435, Taverne’s journal had been edited and published in 1651 by Jean Collart.21 In two entries for July, Taverne described the abbot’s great pleasure in showing the visiting dignitaries his new altarpiece in the Lady Chapel of the abbey church. Taverne noted, in particular, the visitor’s admiration of the pictures on the exterior of the altarpiece.22

Collart’s notes provided a further description of the altarpiece, which had been moved to the Chapel of the Abbots by the seventeenth century. The exterior panels of the retable depicted an Annunciation, a Visitation, a Nativity, an Adoration of the Magi, and a Circumcision, (a subject often confused with the Presentation in the Temple). Collart then identified the portrait of the donor in the Visitation as the Abbot Jean du Clercq. Not only did these two sources describe the three paintings in question, but established for them a terminus ad quem date of 1435.


22The pertinent excerpts from Taverne’s journal are transcribed in chapter 5. For this study, I have also used Antoine de la Taverne, Journal de la Paix d'Arras (1435), ed. André Bossuat (Arras: Société Anonyme L'Avenir, 1936). Bossuat’s edition includes Collart’s comments.
The confirmation of Daret's authorship came from the third source, the account book of all the works executed for Jean du Clercq during his tenure as Abbot of St. Vaast, which had been published by Loriquet in 1889. In three entries, Daret is recorded as the recipient of payment for having painted and gilded the interior and exterior of the shutters, the interior sculpture, an antependium, and a set of protective linen covers (custodes) for the altarpiece. Although the entries were not dated, Hulin knew from Taverne's journal that the new altarpiece had been installed by 1435. Since the Tournai archives recorded Daret still in residence there in 1433, Hulin dated the paintings to c.1434-1435.

Thus, by analyzing the stylistic similarities of the three Berlin paintings in comparison with the works attributed to the "Master of Flémalle", and by documenting their authorship to Jacques Daret, Hulin concluded that the anonymous "Master of Flémalle" could be none other than Daret's teacher Robert Campin. In 1911, Hulin discovered Daret's Nativity (figure 2) in the Colnaghi Collection in London. By comparing the composition and iconography of

---


24 Ibid., 71-72, items 10-12. The entries recording Daret's payments are transcribed in appendix B. Each of these specific projects will be discussed further in chapter 5.

the painting with its presumed source, the Dijon Nativity attributed to the "Master of Flémalle", (figure 13), Hulin further strengthened his Campin-Flémalle argument.

Since Hulin's pioneering studies, the identity of Robert Campin as the "Master of Flémalle" has continued to be discussed in the literature. Maeterlinck rejected Hulin's thesis in 1913 and argued, unconvincingly, that the anonymous master was instead the Gent painter Nabur Martins. Both Winkler and Destree accepted Hulin's identification as the most logical of the current hypotheses. Destree cautioned, however, that the painter's true identity could only be proven by documentary evidence.


Friedländer tentatively accepted Hulin’s theory in 1924, but continued to call the painter the "Master of Flémalle" rather than Robert Campin.29 In contrast, Renders emphatically argued that the "Master of Flémalle" continue to be identified as Roger van der Weyden.30 Renders further maintained that Roger van der Weyden had been a student of Jan van Eyck and therefore was not the Rogelet de la Pasture who had been a pupil of Campin in Tournai.31

In 1939, Tolnay supported Renders’s observation of the stylistic relationship between the works of Van Eyck and the "Master of Flémalle", but acknowledged the painter’s


31The question of two Rogers was later addressed by Theodore H. Feder, "A Reexamination through the Documents of the First Fifty Years of Roger van der Weyden’s Life," The Art Bulletin 48 (1966): 416-431. For a recent discussion of this, as yet, unresolved issue, see Elisabeth Dhanens, Rogier van der Weyden: revisie van de documenten (Brussels: Kawlusk, 1995).
identity as Robert Campin.\textsuperscript{32} Burroughs also recognized the master as Campin and further separated him from Roger van der Weyden by using X-radiographic analysis to identify the two artists' individual "hands" in the underpainting of works attributed to each of them.\textsuperscript{33} Render's claim was further refuted by Davies, who confidently accepted Robert Campin as the "Master of Flémalle".\textsuperscript{34} In 1953, Panofsky fully embraced Hulin's thesis, arguing that although no documentary evidence existed to confirm the equality of the two individuals, their identity could not be disproved by the documents either.\textsuperscript{35}

Since Panofsky, the focus of the Campin-Flémalle debate has shifted more toward an analysis of the artist's oeuvre, rather than the verification of his identity.

\textsuperscript{32}Charles de Tolnay, \textit{Le Maître de Flémalle et les frères van Eyck} (Brussels: Éditions de la Connaissance, 1939), 12-17.

\textsuperscript{33}Alan Burroughs, "Campin and Van der Weyden Again," \textit{Metropolitan Museum Studies} 4 (1933): 131-150; idem, \textit{Art Criticism from a Laboratory} (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1938), 204-217. The use of X-radiography for connoisseurship studies will be further discussed in chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{34}Martin Davies, "National Gallery Notes III. Netherlandish Primitives: Rogier van der Weyden and Robert Campin," \textit{Burlington Magazine} 71 (1937): 140-145. The author's assessment of the distinct contributions of Roger van der Weyden was fully developed in \textit{Rogier van der Weyden} (London: Phaidon Press, 1972).

the 1960s, Frinta accepted Campin as the "Master of Flémalle", but questioned the authorship of several of the paintings attributed to him.\textsuperscript{36} In particular, Frinta argued that the Mérode Triptych, (figure 11), showed evidence of a collaborator or assistant whom he believed to be Roger van der Weyden.

The Mérode Triptych also played a key role in Campbell's contribution to the Campin-Flémalle controversy in 1974. Although he agreed with the identification of the "Master of Flémalle" as Robert Campin, Campbell re-assigned a portion of the artist's oeuvre to an anonymous follower or pupil. Recalling Bode's study of nearly a century earlier, Campbell again called this follower the "Master of Mérode".\textsuperscript{37}

Most recently the Campin-Flémalle problem has been addressed by a team of scholars under the leadership of the Dutch physicist J. R. J. van Asperen de Boer. Using infrared reflectography to study the preparatory drawings beneath the surfaces of the paintings, the Van Asperen de Boer team.


\textsuperscript{37}Lorne Campbell, "Robert Campin, the Master of Flémalle and the Master of Mérode," \textit{Burlington Magazine} 116 (1974): 634-646. Along with the Mérode Triptych, Campbell also attributed the London Virgin and Child before a Firescreen (figure 12), and the Prado Werl Shutters (figures 14 and 15) to his "Master of Mérode".
Boer group has challenged the attribution of several paintings which have generally been accepted as the work of the "Master of Flémalle".  

Today, although most scholars believe that the "Master of Flémalle" is identical to the historical figure Robert Campin, the debate continues. Although minor stylistic variations exist within the group of paintings generally attributed to this artist, I am comfortable in accepting that the "Master of Flémalle" and Robert Campin are one and the same. In the present study, the name Robert Campin has been used consistently for the sake of clarity.

* * * * *

In contrast to the continuing debate over Robert Campin and the "Master of Flémalle", neither the identity of Jacques Daret nor his authorship of the Arras Altarpiece has ever been questioned since Hulin de Loo's discovery of them.

---

38 An extended study undertaken in the 1970s and 1980s, the compiled data were published in J. R. J. van Asperen de Boer, J. Dijkstra, and R. van Schoute, "Underdrawing in Paintings of the Roger van der Weyden and Master of Flémalle Groups," Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 41 (1990): 10-16, 64-129. See also idem, Underdrawing in Paintings of the Roger van der Weyden and Master of Flémalle Groups (Zwolle: Waanders Uitgevers, 1992), 10-16, 64-129. The use of infrared reflectography for connoisseurship studies will be further considered in chapter 3.

39 The variety of opinions expressed at the Robert Campin symposium held at the London National Gallery in March, 1993 indicates that the debate is far from being completely resolved. For the symposium papers, see Susan Foister and Susie Nash, eds., Robert Campin, New Directions in Scholarship (London and Turnhout: The National Gallery and Brepols, 1996).
in 1909. However, the literature dedicated to Daret is sparse and has been primarily directed toward the comparison of his four extant panels with similar works attributed to Campin. Daret's second altarpiece for the Chapel of the Holy Spirit at St. Vaast has rarely been mentioned, nor has his extended activity as artistic director or designer of tapestries and metalwork been thoroughly examined.

Friedländer supported the scholarship of both Hulin and Houtart, but was the first to raise the issue of quality with respect to Daret's work; he characterized Daret's style as "run-of-the-mill" within its milieu. Although he praised Daret's attention to naturalistic details and his ability to create stimulating surface effects, Friedländer criticized his poor draftsmanship and lack of understanding of human anatomy.\(^4^\)

In 1937, Lestocquoy offered a more extensive discussion of the documents relating to Daret's activity in Arras and was the first to propose a reconstruction of the c.1434-35 Arras Altarpiece. Along with a brief discussion of Daret's 1453 Holy Spirit Altarpiece, Lestocquoy noted the artist's work as a tapestry designer, as well as his collaboration with the founder Michel de Gand on metalwork projects for the Abbey of St. Vaast.\(^4^1\)

\(^4^0\)Friedländer, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:36.

\(^4^1\)Jean Lestocquoy, "Le rôle des artistes Tournaisiens à Arras au XVe siècle: Jacques Daret et Michel de Gand," Revue belge d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art 7 (1937): 211-
Panofsky considered Daret's work as "positive proof" for Hulin's Campin-Flémalle argument.⁴² Although he recognized Daret as a competent painter, Panofsky viewed the Arras panels merely as imitations of Campin compositions. Following Hulin's lead, Panofsky compared Daret's Nativity (figure 2) with Campin's Dijon Nativity (figure 13), and his Presentation in the Temple (figure 4) with the Campinesque Betrothal of the Virgin in the Prado (figure 49). For the Visitation and Adoration of the Magi panels (figures 1 and 3), Panofsky proposed a link to Campin workshop models known to us today through an early Roger van der Weyden Visitation in Leipzig and a late fifteenth-century copy of an Adoration of the Magi in Berlin.⁴³

In 1957, Gottlieb challenged Panofsky's opinion that Daret was little more than a Campin copyist.⁴⁴ By comparing the two artists' Nativity panels (figures 2 and 13), the author promoted Daret's distinct artistic personality and praised his ability to simplify what she viewed as chaotic compositions in Campin's work. Gottlieb further supported her thesis by comparing the Annunciation

⁴²Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 1:157-158.
⁴³Roger's Leipzig Visitation and the Berlin Adoration of the Magi are illustrated in Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:figures 311 and 223, respectively.
in the Musée d’Art Ancien, Brussels (figure 37) with the center panel from the Mérode Triptych (figure 11), and attributing it to Daret.45

Daret’s contributions as an independent artist were further championed by Vines.46 In her analyses of the iconography of the Arras Altarpiece, Vines argued that the composition of Daret’s Nativity (figure 2) was derived from contemporary mystery plays rather than from a Campin prototype. As a result, she concluded that Campin’s Nativity (figure 13) was modelled after Daret’s and proposed that the date of the Dijon panel be modified accordingly.47

Daret’s role as a tapestry designer was considered in 1990 by Joubert.48 By comparing the figure types, costume details, and architectural settings depicted in the Beauvais Cathedral Life of Saint Peter tapestry series with those in the Arras panels, Joubert attributed their designs to Jacques Daret in collaboration with the French painter Nicolas Froment. Noting in particular the expressive facial

45The issues raised by Gottlieb are discussed further in chapter 4.


types in fragments from the *Story of Alexander* series now in Rome, the author proposed a second collaboration between Daret and Froment in the 1450s.

In the most recent study of Daret's work, three of the Arras paintings were analyzed by the Van Asperen de Boer group. Using infrared reflectography to examine the *Visitation* (figure 1), the *Adoration of the Magi* (figure 3), and the *Presentation in the Temple* (figure 4), the authors confirmed the distinct nature of Daret's underdrawing style and its consistency within the Arras panels. 49

Apart from discussions of the Arras Altarpiece, the paucity of literature devoted to the career of Jacques Daret indicates that much work remains to be done on this artist. By examining his documented as well as his extant works, and by considering re-attributions for several paintings in the "Campin Group", it is my hope to make a substantial contribution to the literature concerning this important, yet often neglected, Early Netherlandish master.

---

CHAPTER 2
BIOGRAPHY OF JACQUES DARET

In the years following the 1902 Bruges exhibition, Jacques Daret enjoyed a new level of importance resulting from his identification as the "Master of Flémalle". Maurice Houtart published the first biographical study about Daret in 1907. Following Hulin's pivotal discoveries regarding Campin, Daret, and the Arras panels, Houtart published a revised version of Daret's biography in 1914.

As the only sources for many of the documents which were destroyed in 1940, Houtart's essays offer the essential information on Daret's early years in Tournai. However, they do not fully account for his life outside that city. Similarly, the account books of the Abbey of St. Vaast and the Burgundian Court records provide fragmentary information on the artist's life in relation to specific

1 Houtart, Jacques Daret.
2 Houtart, "Quel est l'état?"
3 Loriquet, "Journal des travaux."
4 Laborde, Les Ducs de Bourgogne; and Dehaisnes, Archives du Nord.
commissions. It is only through the combination of these sources that a satisfactory biography of Jacques Daret can be reconstructed.

The family name of Daret is a familiar one among the artists listed in the Tournai municipal and parish records during the fifteenth century. Jacques's grandfather, Jean Daret, was a woodcarver whose name appears several times in the accounts of the Church of St. Brice between the years 1397 and 1423. Jacques's father, Jean II, was also a sculptor. However, unlike his escrineur father, Jean II is described in the accounts as a tailleur d'images which identifies him as a carver of stone as well as of wood.

Jean II Daret and Jeanne l'Escarlatier were married sometime before May 11, 1403. The couple had four children, Jacques, Isabelle, Catherine, and Jean, before Jean II was widowed at an unknown date. Following their mother's death, Jean II Daret put his children in the care

---

5 For a list of Tournai artisans bearing the name Daret, Houtart cites De la Grange and Cloquet, "Études sur l'art à Tournai" but provides no page number. See Houtart, Jacques Daret, 24.

6 Archives paroissiales de Saint-Brice, as cited in Ibid., 24, note 2.

7 Ibid., 25, note 1.

8 For this information, Houtart cites the testament of Jeanne l'Escarlatier's uncle Jehan Thalart (1403) in the Tournai archives. Ibid., 26, note 1.
of guardians who saw to their daily needs and schooling while he pursued his own career and married for a second time.

The expenses incurred during the long period of the Daret children's guardianship were recorded in three documents. The first of these comptes de tutelle, which would presumably establish the date of Jeanne l'Escarlatier's death, was no longer extant when Houtart conducted his archival research. The second account was begun by a new guardian, Bernard de Gand, on April 21, 1418 and completed on October 5, 1423. The third account covered the children's tutelage from October 5, 1423 to August 3, 1426. ⁹

From the second document, Houtart learned that Belotte (Isabelle), who had been consigned to the care of her paternal grandfather, died on November 18, 1419 as a result of a gangrenous infection. ¹⁰ In February of the previous year, Catron (Catherine) was placed in the home of an embroiderer in order to learn that craft. Her death on May 22, 1426, during an epidemic in the city, was recorded in the third account. ¹¹

---

⁹ Archives Communales de Tournai, Comptes de tutelle de Belotte, Catron, Hacquinet et Jacquelotte Daret, 1418-1423; Comptes de tutelle de Catron, Haquinett et Jacquelotte Daret, 1426, as cited in Ibid., 26, note 2.

¹⁰ Ibid., 27.

¹¹ Ibid.
The documents were the most informative with respect to the youngest son Haquinet (Jean). He was first assigned to a painter named Gui Villain, who fed and clothed him in exchange for a yearly allowance of 4 livres. Following his sister Isabelle’s death, he took her place in the home of their grandfather, who received 4 livres, 5 sols annually for the boy’s care. From 1420 to 1423, Jean studied reading and writing, first with a Master Robert, then with Master Jean Meullet. In 1423 Jean’s father arranged for him to be placed in the workshop of Simon Josson, a tailleur d’images in Valenciennes, who agreed to feed, house, discipline, and train the boy in exchange for his assistance in the shop.\textsuperscript{12}

Houtart found the first mention of Jacquelotte (Jacques) Daret in the account dating from 1418. In an entry recording his receipt of money for the purchase of wedding gifts for two of his fellow workers, Daret is described as living in the house of Master Robert Campin his teacher, working at his trade, ("demeurant à la maison Maître Robert Campin son maître, ouvrant de son métier").\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 27-28.

\textsuperscript{13} Comptes de tutelle de Bellotte, Catron, Hacquinet et Jacquelotte Daret, 1418-1423, as cited in Ibid., 29. Campin was a family friend who had collaborated with Jean Daret in 1414 and helped to arrange the placement of Haquinet Daret in the workshop of Simon Josson. Houtart, therefore, saw him as the logical choice to be Jacques’s teacher. See idem, 24, 19.
From this entry, and those concerning young Jean, Houtart was able to estimate the year of Jacques's birth. Since the guardianship accounts were closed in 1426, Houtart concluded that Jean had reached the age of majority, fifteen, by that year, and calculated his birth to 1411. By this estimation, Jean would have been twelve years old in 1423 when he began his vocational training. Similarly, Jacques must have been at least twelve years old in 1418 when he was recorded as living and working in Campin's house.

Because the first account was missing, Houtart could not determine the exact year that Daret entered Campin's shop. However, since he was already described as "working at his trade" in the 1418 entry, Houtart assumed that Daret was well established in the shop by that time. Moreover, as no annual allowances were recorded in the accounts for Jacques, he must have been earning his own living. Houtart proposed that Daret had begun his training with Campin three years earlier, in 1415, and therefore calculated his birth to 1403.14

14Ibid. Recently, Châtelet proposed that Daret entered Campin's shop immediately following his mother's death in 1412, and thus determined his birth year to be 1400. However, since the exact date of Jeanne l'Escarlatier's death is unknown, Châtelet's factually stated argument is less convincing than Houtart's calculated estimate. See Albert Châtelet, "L'Atelier de Robert Campin," in Les Grands Siècles de Tournai (Tournai: Cathédrale de Tournai; and Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1993), 17.
Between 1418 and 1423, Daret received the tonsure from the Bishop of Cambrai.\textsuperscript{15} Although traditionally regarded as the initial step toward a clerical life, the practice of tonsuring was also common during the fifteenth century as an act of re-affirming one’s faith. By accepting the tonsure, the recipient was removed from temporal jurisdiction and became entitled to the benefits of ecclesiastical law, such as protection from personal violence and exemption from military service. As there is no evidence that Daret ever completed clerical training or joined an ecclesiastical order, it is likely that his intentions in being tonsured were toward these personal or political ends. It is also possible, as Houtart suggests, that Daret took the tonsure as a means of furthering his Latin education, since only tonsured individuals were allowed to pursue theological studies.\textsuperscript{16}

One of the last entries for Jacques Daret in the guardianship accounts records his receipt of money from his father in order to travel to Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen) in July, 1426. That year Aachen was the site of a great pilgrimage, where the holy relics were venerated from the

\textsuperscript{15}Houtart, \textit{Jacques Daret}, 29.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., 30. In addition to the knowledge of religious and secular history, Houtart identified Latin as an essential part of an artist’s training. For the history and significance of the tonsure, see R. Naz, \textit{Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique} (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1965), 7:1289-1293.
tenth to the twenty-fourth of July. In addition to the spiritual benefits to be gained from this experience, it is possible that Jean Daret sent his son on the Aachen pilgrimage to escape the plague that had already killed his daughter Catherine in May, or to avoid the political unrest that was occurring in Tournai that year.  

Although Daret was recorded in the workshop of Robert Campin as early as 1418, it was not until April 12, 1427, that he was formally inscribed in the guild register as having begun his apprenticeship ("commencha son appresure") with Master Robert Campin. After having worked as a varlet or assistant in Campin’s shop for at least nine years, it seems inconsistent that Daret would only be starting his apprenticeship on this date, and at the presumed age of twenty-four. However, in Tournai, an official apprenticeship appears to have been considered the final phase of an artist’s training rather than the initial one. Furthermore, following the reform of the guild ordinances in 1423, all artists desiring to establish

17 Houtart, Jacques Daret, 30-31. Combined with his earlier receipt of the tonsure, his possible motivation by sincere religious feeling would suggest that Daret’s consideration of an ecclesiastical career should not be discounted entirely. For the Aachen pilgrimage held every seven years, see Heinrich Schwarz, "The Mirror of the Artist and the Mirror of the Devout," in Studies in the History of Art Dedicated to W. E. Suida on his Eightieth Birthday (London: Phaidon Press, 1959), 101-102.

18 Archives Communales de Tournai, Registre de la Confrérie de Saint-Luc, as cited by Houtart, Jacques Daret, 31. For the full text of this entry, see appendix A.
themselves as independent masters in the city were required to first enter the guild as apprentices, and to complete this final period of training. For those content to work as journeymen in another master's atelier, no formal apprenticeship was necessary. 19

As suggested by the diversity of Daret's own career, it is also possible that he remained in Campin's shop for this extended period in order to gain expertise in media other than panel painting. Between 1430 and 1431, Campin painted a Crucifixion scene in a new missal for the Church of St. Marguerite. 20 In 1438, he designed a Life of St. Peter tapestry series that was woven by Henri Beaumentiel for the Church of St. Peter. 21 Although Campin's activity as a designer of metalwork has not been documented, the precision with which he depicts metallic objects in his


20 For this recently discovered evidence of Campin's activity as manuscript illuminator, see Chanoine Jean Dumoulin and Jacques Pycke, "Comptes de la paroisse Sainte-Marguerite de Tournai au quinzième siècle. Documents inédits relatifs à Roger de la Pature, Robert Campin et d'autres artisans tournaisiens," in Les Grands Siècles de Tournai (Tournai: Cathédrale Notre Dame; and Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1993), 301, item 148.

21 De la Grange and Cloquet, "Études sur l'art à Tournai," 123, as cited by Houtart, Jacques Daret, 14, note 3.
paintings suggests that he was not only familiar with the metalsmiths' craft, but, like other painters, may have provided patterns to local metalsmiths as well.\textsuperscript{22}

On October 18, 1432, Jacques Daret entered the guild of Saint Luke as an independent master.\textsuperscript{23} From this date, he is called Maitre Jacques Daret in the guild records, a title given to only nine other painters in Tournai during the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{24} Along with this distinction, Daret was named prévôt, or dean, of the guild at a dinner celebrating the feast of Saint Luke the same day. While Houtart believed this title to be a civic appointment and an indication of Daret's superior artistic reputation,\textsuperscript{25} Schabacker interpreted it as an ecclesiastical office which reflected the religious side of the guild.\textsuperscript{26} Alternatively,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22}For a discussion of the collaborations between the painters, weavers, sculptors and metalsmiths in Tournai, see Houtart, \textit{Jacques Daret}, 11-12.
\item \textsuperscript{23}Archives Communaules de Tournai, Registre de la Confrérie de Saint-Luc, as cited by Houtart, \textit{Jacques Daret}, 35. See also appendix A.
\item \textsuperscript{24}The other maîtres were Master Houdain, Henri le Quien, Robert Campin, Roger van der Weyden, Andrien Damiens, Loys le Duc, Nicaise Barat, Simon Marmion, and Jacques Lombart. See Renders, \textit{La solution du problème}, 1:133-173.
\item \textsuperscript{25}Houtart, "Quel est l'état?" 97.
\item \textsuperscript{26}To support his theory, Schabacker, "Observations," 26-27, cited Daret's reception of the tonsure as a youth, and the more frequent appearance of the term prévôt in ecclesiastical, rather than municipal records during this period. For the ecclesiastical office of prévôt, see Naz, \textit{Droit Canonique} 7:213.
\end{itemize}
Daret’s election to the position of guild prévôt may have been motivated by the extent of his training, or by his possible Latin education.

Following his graduation, Daret established his own atelier in Tournai. On January 8, 1433, Daniel Daret was inscribed in the guild register as his first apprentice. Daniel, Jacques’s half-brother from their father’s second marriage, completed his training on February 10, 1441, and was named painter to the Duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good, in 1449. A second apprentice, Éleuthère du Pret, entered Daret’s workshop on June 18, 1436 to learn the art of illumination. In contrast to the five-year period of apprenticeship required for panel painters, it appears that an illuminator was only required to train for two years, as Du Pret’s entry into the guild as a free master was recorded on July 16, 1438.²⁷ While Daret’s own activity as an illuminator has not yet been documented, it seems fair to assume that Du Pret would only have apprenticed himself to a master who also had experience in this medium.²⁸ Moreover,

²⁷Houtart, Jacques Daret, 36. See also Alexandre Pinchart, Archives des arts, sciences et lettres, (Gent: E. Vanderhaeghen, 1881), 3:72.

²⁸Although a few authors have speculated on Daret’s probable activity as a manuscript illuminator, no convincing attributions have been proposed to date. See, for example, Winkler, Die Flämische Buchmalerei des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts (Leipzig: Seemann, 1925), 36-44; Jeffrey Chipps Smith, "The Artistic Patronage of Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy (1419-1467)" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1979), 260-263; and Vines, "The Arras Altarpiece," 232-241.
as evidenced by the careers of Jan van Eyck, Robert Campin, Simon Marmion, and Stefan Lochner, we know that panel painters often worked as manuscript illuminators in the fifteenth century.

Although the entries for his apprentices show that Daret maintained an active workshop in Tournai, we know from other sources that he also worked outside his native city during this time. From 1433 to 1457, Daret also resided in Arras where he was employed by Jean du Clercq, Abbot of the Benedictine Abbey of St. Vaast, for a variety of projects relating to the decoration of the abbey church. Daret’s name first appears in the St. Vaast accounts in 1433. The entry, which describes him as living in Arras at that time, ("lors demourant à Arras"), records Daret’s payment for having painted the abbot’s sepulchral monument in the chapel of Notre Dame.

By July of 1435, Daret had completed painting and gilding the first of two altarpieces for Du Clercq, the so-called Arras Altarpiece in the Lady Chapel, from which the four panels survive today. Between 1435 and 1436, Daret made a series of portraits of all the abbots of the

---

29Loriquet, "Journal des travaux." Although mentioned briefly here, the specific commissions will be discussed in detail in subsequent chapters of this study. See also appendix B.

30Ibid., 71, item 8.

31Ibid., 71-72, items 10-12.
monastery, beginning with St. Vaast, and ending with Jean du Clercq, the abbey’s sixty-eighth leader. According to a description of the church written by Dom Adrian Pronier in 1600, the portraits were painted on four large wood panels which were attached to the walls of the Lady Chapel, on either side of the altar table.

In July, 1441, Daret painted a Resurrection of Christ in tempera on canvas, from which Guillaume au Vaissel wove a tapestry antependium for the shrine of St. Vaast in the choir of the abbey church. Although it was common practice for painters to provided designs to tapestry weavers, the value of Daret’s patron as an independent painter was significant.

---


33 Dom Adrian Pronier, "Recueil des antiquitez et aultres choses plus remarkable guy se retrouvent en l’eglise de St. Vaast d’Arras (1600)," reprinted by Comte Auguste de Loisne and Roger Rodière in Épigraphie du département du Pas-de-Calais 7 (1925-1931): 528-542.

34 Loriquet, "Journal des travaux," 82-83, item 55. For the inscriptions and coats of arms woven into this tapestry, see Loisne and Rodière, Épigraphie du Pas-de-Calais, 7:461-462, item 1177.

35 For a discussion of the frequent collaboration between painters and tapestry weavers, see Houtart, Jacques Daret, 11-12; and Jean Lestocquoy, "Où en est l'histoire de la Tapisserie?" Bulletin de la commission départementale des monuments historiques du Pas-de-Calais 6 (1938): 490.
work of art is suggested by the fact that Abbot du Clercq kept the canvas model after the tapestry was completed, and displayed it in his private chamber.\textsuperscript{36}

The same year Daret collaborated with the Tournai metalsmith Michel de Gand on a brass lamp for the choir, and a gilded brass column, candelabra and cross for the high altar.\textsuperscript{37} Daret worked with Michel de Gand again in 1446, on a monumental cross which was dedicated to St. Bernard and erected outside the church in the Place St. Vaast.\textsuperscript{38}

Between 1453 and 1456, Daret painted and gilded a second triptych for an ensemble that was installed above the altar in the abbey’s new Chapel of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{39}

Early in 1454, Daret was called to Lille to work on the decorations and entremets for the festival of the Voeu du Faisan. Hosted by the Duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good, in order to muster support for his intended Crusade to Constantinople, this lavish banquet took place in the ducal palace on the seventeenth of February. One of several

\textsuperscript{36}Loriquet, "Journal des travaux," 63.

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., 83-84, items 57-60.

\textsuperscript{38}Ibid., 85, item 62. For a discussion of the political significance of this cross, and an engraving of its appearance prior to its demolition in 1750, see Henri Loriquet, "La place Saint-Vaast et la croix dite de St. Bernard," Bulletin de la commission départementale des monuments historiques du Pas-de-Calais 5 (1884): 383-402.

\textsuperscript{39}Ibid., 90, item 76. Daret’s Holy Spirit triptych will be discussed further in chapter 6.
painters hired to paint temporary decorations such as processional banners, wall hangings, and stage sets, Daret was assisted by four varlets and was paid a comparatively high salary of 20 sols per day for eleven days of work.\textsuperscript{40}

Following his return to Arras later that year, Daret completed the last of his documented assignments for the Abbey of St. Vaast when he directed Robert de Moncheaux in the re-painting of the tomb of the abbey's founder, King Theodoric III, which was located in the choir of the church. At the same time, the polychrome of the figures on Jean du Clercq's tomb monument in the Lady Chapel was also refreshed.\textsuperscript{41} Daret was assisted in his direction of Moncheaux by the renowned Arras painter and tapestry designer Bauduin de Bailleul.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{40} Laborde, \textit{Les Ducs de Bourgogne}, 1:423, item 1539. In comparison to Daret, the other painters were paid between 6 and 12 sols per day. Daret's varlets received 6 or 8 sols per day. See also Dehaisnes, \textit{Archives du Nord}, 196.

\textsuperscript{41} Archives du Pas-de-Calais, fonds de Saint-Waast, compte des "carités at assenes" de la fabrique, H 99, fol. 54v, as cited by Lestocquoy, "Le rôle des artistes," 218-219, note 1.

\textsuperscript{42} Daret's association with Bauduin de Bailleul at this time lends support to Joubert's theory regarding Daret's continued activity as a designer of tapestries in the 1450s. See Joubert, "Jacques Daret et Nicolas Froment," 44-45. For a further discussion of Daret's probable affiliations with the workshop of Bailleul, see Jean Lestocquoy, "L'atelier de Bauduin de Bailleul et la tapisserie de Gédéon," \textit{Revue belge d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art} 8 (1938): 119-135.
Although there is no record of Daret being employed by Abbot du Clercq after 1456, local census records indicate that he continued to maintain a residence in Arras until 1457. According to the Rentier de Saint-Waast of 1446, rents were received by the Abbey of St. Vaast for the maison de l'Écurie, (the house of the stable), at the corner of the Place de la Madeleine and the Rue de la Gouvernance in which Daret was recorded as living at the time, ("à présent y demeure Jacque Daret pintre"). The same entry was repeated in the accounts until 1458 when the house was identified as the place where Daret used to live, ("et y demeuroit Jacqs Daret pintre"). 43

Although we cannot be certain on what date, or for what reason Daret returned to his native city of Tournai, his name again appears in the municipal accounts and guild records beginning in the early 1460s. In 1461, he designed and painted a figure of a soldier, (couleuvrinier), for one of the turrets on the city's Belfry. 44 During this period, he also accepted new apprentices into his workshop. Haquinet le Bacre, who had begun his training with his father Jean le Bacre in 1459, completed his apprenticeship with Daret, and entered the guild as a free master on

43Ibid., 213. For the Rentiers, see E. Morel, Plan d'Arras-Ville en 1382, reconstitué d'après les documents contemporains (Arras: Rohard-Courtin, 1914).

44De la Grange and Cloquet, "Études," 224 as cited by Houtart, Jacques Daret, 41, note 3.
February 27, 1463.⁴⁵ Hans de Strasbourg, a varlet who had apparently come to Tournai with Daret from Arras, was received into the guild on August 24, 1464.⁴⁶ A third apprentice, Amandin de Liauwe, began his apprenticeship with Daret on June 14, 1464, but abandoned the profession on August 10, 1467, after being transferred to a new master, Jehan Senellart, in July, 1466.⁴⁷

On March 28, 1468 Daret left for Bruges where he worked for seventy-eight days on the decorations and entremets for the opulent festival celebrating the marriage of Charles the Bold and Margaret of York that took place in July. In the first payment made to artists on April 16, 1468, Daret is identified as the director of several other painters ("conduiteur de plusieurs autres peintres sous lui").⁴⁸ In contrast to his payment for the 1454 Lille

---

⁴⁵Registre de la Confrérie de Saint-Luc, as cited by Houtart, Jacques Daret, 41, note 2.

⁴⁶Houtart, "Quel est l'état?" 98-99, note 1. For the full text of the entries regarding these two individuals, see Renders, La Solution 1:143.

⁴⁷Houtart, Jacques Daret, 42. The text, reproduced in appendix A, describes this transfer taking place after the death ("après le trépas") of Daret in 1466. Since Daret was still alive in 1468, Houtart believed this to be an error made by the copyist of the guild register in 1482. See idem, "Quel est l'état?" 99, note 2.

⁴⁸Laborde, Les Ducs de Bourgogne, 2:332-333, item 4443.
banquet, on this occasion, Daret received the highest salary of 24 sols per day plus an additional 3 sols for his daily board.\textsuperscript{49}

Daret remained in Bruges until July 12, 1468.\textsuperscript{50} Like the date of his birth, the exact date of Jacques Daret's death is unknown. It is generally believed to be 1468, as no further mention of his name has been found in any of the documents after that year.

\textsuperscript{49}Daret's salary was equaled by only one other artist, Vrancke van der Stockt of Brussels. See Ibid., 2:333, item 4449. By comparison, most of the other painters earned between 6 and 10 sols per day.

\textsuperscript{50}Archives Générales du Royaume, Chambre des Comptes, No. 1795, as cited by Houtart, "Quel est l'état?" 99, note 3.
CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF DARET’S STYLE AND PAINTING TECHNIQUE

Introduction

Most connoisseurs tend to discuss style in terms of its development through various stages in an artist’s career. In the case of Jacques Daret, however, it is only possible to define his style as it was circa 1435. As the only certain examples of his work that survive today, the four panels from his Arras Altarpiece must be the basis of any discussion of Daret’s individual approach. Sadly, no portions of his second St. Vaast altarpiece have been identified to provide us with an example of his painting style in the 1450s. While it is true that the extant panels date from an early period in Daret’s long career as an independent artist, it is important to remember that they are the products of a mature, fully trained master, and not the creations of an inexperienced youth as some authors would suggest.¹

¹Vines, "The Arras Altarpiece," 13, stresses the significance of Abbot du Clercq’s selection of the "young" (my quotation marks) Daret to complete this important commission. Similarly, Houtart, "Quel est l’état?" 98, describes the altarpiece as "un oeuvre de jeunesse". It should be remembered, however, that by 1434 Daret would have been more than thirty years old, and would have had at least
In this chapter, I shall begin with descriptions of the four Arras panels which are based on my first-hand examination of the paintings. Following this overview, the specific elements of Daret’s style and painting technique will be discussed in comparison with those of Robert Campin in order to characterize the individual manner of each artist. In addition to a consideration of the paint surfaces, a comparison of the artists’ respective underpainting and underdrawing styles as revealed by X-radiography and infrared reflectography will also be made.

Descriptions of the four Arras panels

The Visitation, (figure 1), is the first of four extant panels from the altarpiece completed by Daret in 1435 for the abbey of St. Vaast in Arras. The triptych, dedicated to the Virgin Mary, had shutters decorated on the exterior with five narrative scenes from her life. Four panels depicting The Visitation (figure 1), The Nativity (figure 2), The Adoration of the Magi (figure 3), and The Presentation in the Temple (figure 4), were arranged horizontally over the lower portion of the carved interior.

sixteen years of experience in the métier.

²The titles, approximate dates, and present locations of the paintings that I accept as the work of Robert Campin are listed in appendix C.
Above them, a panel representing The Annunciation, now lost, covered the raised central section of the retable.

The first painting depicts the meeting of the Virgin Mary and her elderly cousin Elizabeth in the presence of the retable’s patron, Abbot Jean du Clercq. The two women stand close together in a verdant spring landscape filled with flowering plants and budding trees. A road winds into the distance, suggesting that Elizabeth has come from the city on the high horizon in the left background to meet Mary, who has traveled from her home in Nazareth to visit her.

More than a simple reunion, the event represents the moment when Elizabeth and Mary each recognize the miraculous nature of the other’s pregnancy. The women incline their heads gently toward each other as Elizabeth looks into the face of her cousin. With her eyes lowered slightly, Mary does not return her gaze. Elizabeth raises her left hand in a gesture of quiet surprise as she gently places her right hand on the Virgin’s abdomen. The Virgin reciprocates with her right hand while she daintily holds the edge of her mantle between the thumb and fingertips of her left.

Both women are richly dressed. Elizabeth wears a deep violet, fur-lined dress beneath a rose red mantle, edged with gold embroidery. The Virgin’s fur-lined dress is deep blue. Her mantle, also deep blue, is fastened at her shoulders by two jeweled clasps. Along its edge, passages from a medieval hymn identifying Mary as the Queen of Heaven
are embroidered in gold thread. In contrast to the Virgin, whose long hair flows in loose waves over her shoulders, Elizabeth's head is covered with the white linen veil and chin strap of a married woman.

The artist has taken great care to distinguish between the relative ages of the two women. While the skin of the Virgin's youthful face is pale and creamy pink in color, Elizabeth's complexion is slightly darker with a bluish cast shadowing her eyes. Elizabeth's advanced age is further suggested by the wrinkles around her eyes and mouth, as well as her slightly stooped posture. In contrast, the Virgin's face is fuller; her skin is firm and smooth in texture. Both women have the heavy eyelids, strong noses and small chins that are characteristic of Daret's facial type. Numerous gilded rays behind the heads of both women identify their divine status.

Witnessing the meeting of the Virgin and Elizabeth is the donor, Abbot Jean du Clercq. The abbot, clad in the black habit of a Benedictine, kneels in prayer in the left foreground of the composition. He faces the two women with his white, jeweled miter placed on the ground before him and his gold crozier held vertically between his joined hands. With his tonsured head raised slightly, Du Clercq's reverent

3Beginning with the words "Ave regina coelorum; Ave Domina angelorum," this antiphon was sung at the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin. For the complete text, see Gottlieb, "The Brussels Version," 57, note 12.
gaze is directed toward the face of the Virgin. The abbot's age (fifty-nine years in 1435), is suggested by the soft folds of flesh in his chin and neck, the furrows in his forehead, and the lines at the corner of his eye. His complexion is darker, ruddier than the women's; his hair is highlighted with streaks of grey at the temples. A shield bearing Du Clercq's coat of arms (quartered, 1 and 4 red, with a gold crown; 2 and 3 blue, with a gold band bearing three coins), hangs from the cut branch of a leafless tree directly behind him at the left edge of the composition.

The abbot's point of origin is also suggested by the road that recedes from his figure in the foreground to the walled city just below the horizon in the upper left corner of the panel. Dominated by a large church building viewed from the east, the city is surrounded by a moat or river. The towers and gate of the grey crenellated wall are carefully described. On the steps of a gate in the wall, the tiny figure of a woman rinses laundry in the water while a pair of white swans swims nearby. On the opposite shore, a group of rustic dwellings is clustered near the gate of a bridge spanning the water.

* * * * *

---

4 For Du Clercq's coat of arms (écartelé, aux 1 et 4 de gueules à une couronne d'or; 2 et 3 d'azur à la bande d'or chargé de trois tourteaux), see Loisne and Rodière, Épigraphie du Pas-de-Calais 7:497, items 1254-1255; and Chanoine Van Drival, Nécrologe de L'Abbaye de St. Vaast d'Arras (Arras: A. Courtin, 1878), 339, plate II.
The second surviving panel from the Arras Altarpiece represents the Nativity, (figure 2). Beneath the thatched roof of a rustic stable, the Virgin and two women are gathered around the Christ Child who lies, surrounded by rays of divine light, on the ground before them. Joseph looks on from just outside the stable, his gaze echoed by the ox and ass who watch attentively from behind Mary. Above the animals three angels sing together while a fourth angel, hovering over the right corner of the stable, points to the Child below. From a source outside the picture, golden rays of heavenly light descend through holes in the stable roof to highlight the event below.

Wearing a deep blue dress and mantle, the Virgin kneels in adoration with her hands crossed over her breast. Her hair flows in loose waves over her shoulders and down her back. In contrast to her more elaborately decorated cloak in the Visitation panel (figure 1), here, only a thin band of gold is visible along the edge of the Virgin’s mantle. Golden rays surround her head as she looks down at her newborn son.

The Virgin and Child are accompanied by the two midwives who, according to the apocryphal gospels, were present at Christ’s birth. Directly across from the Virgin is Salome, the skeptical midwife whose hand was made lame in punishment for her doubting Mary’s virginity. She looks at the Child with a distressed expression while both of her
hands hang limply from her wrists. Between Salome and the Virgin, is the second midwife, Zebel. Glancing down at the Christ Child, she gestures toward the infant with her left hand, identifying Him as the cure for Salome’s affliction.

Beyond the circle of the kneeling women, Joseph stands outside the shed at the right edge of the composition. In accordance with tradition, he is depicted as an older man, with thinning grey hair, grizzled beard, and wrinkled face. Over his deep carmine red robe, Joseph wears a heavy brown mantle, the edge of which is folded back over his arm, revealing the creamy white fabric lining. Around his waist is a leather belt from which his purse and knife are suspended. Pushed back from his head, his dark teal blue cloth hat is draped over his shoulders. Holding a candle in his right hand, he shelters its flame with his left.

In contrast to the simple garments of Mary and Joseph, the two midwives are more richly dressed. Zebel wears a fur-lined, bright red surcoat over a green blouse and dark purple skirt. Beneath her surcoat, a rose colored belt and cluster of keys hang from her waist. Her hair is covered by a veil of transparent fabric under which a thin jeweled filet is visible on her forehead. Her knife and purse lie on the ground before her.

Unlike Zebel, who is dressed in contemporary European fashion, Salome is depicted as an exotic Middle-Eastern woman with an earring and turban-wrapped head. From beneath
her turban a single long braid falls down her back. She wears a red and gold brocade surcoat with short, jeweled sleeves over a blue chemise or underdress. Over her surcoat she wears a green brocade houppelande whose collar and decoratively scalloped edges are trimmed with brown fur. From beneath her houppelande, a thin, dark green belt with a jeweled tip falls to the ground in front of her. A wider violet colored belt circles her waist over her houppelande, and descends behind her.

As in the Visitation (figure 1), the event takes place in the foreground of a green landscape that recedes to a high horizon line. A cluster of modest buildings appears in the near distance, just to the right of the stable roof. Across the road from the buildings an angel dressed in a bright red robe announces the Child’s birth to three shepherds below. Far in the distance, a city, painted in hazy blue atmospheric perspective, is barely visible on the high horizon.

* * * * *

The Adoration of the Magi is depicted in the third panel (figure 3). The Holy Family and the three kings who have come to honor the newborn Christ Child are gathered at the front of a rustic stable which is set at a forty-five degree angle to the picture plane. As in the two previous panels, the meeting takes place in the foreground of a
spring landscape. The figures are placed close to the picture plane and occupy most of the foreground space.

The Virgin is seated beneath the peak of the stable's thatched roof. Above her lap, she holds the infant Christ out toward the eldest of the three magi, who kneels in adoration before Him. Lowering his eyes in reverence, the kneeling king delicately raises the Child's hand to his lips with his right hand while he offers a jeweled, gold ciborium with his left. From his position to the left of the rough-hewn tree trunk supporting the front corner of the stable, Joseph, bending slightly, reaches for the magus's gift with his left hand as he reaches to remove his hat with his right.

Behind the eldest, kneeling magus, stands the second, middle-aged king. Gazing down at the Christ Child, he holds a gold ointment jar rather awkwardly with his left hand as he reaches to remove his crowned turban with his right. At the right edge of the composition the youngest of the three kings quietly awaits his turn to pay homage to the Child. Watching the interchange between the infant and his elder companion, he stands in graceful contrapposto, holding his gift of a covered gold chalice with his right hand and his crowned, fur-trimmed hat at his side with his left.

As in the Visitation panel (figure 1), the artist has taken care to differentiate between the ages of the figures. The advanced years of the kneeling magus are suggested by
his bald head and sagging jowls. Behind him, the turbanned magus appears to be younger, although the lines around his eyes indicate that he is not a youth. In addition to his age, the second magus is distinguished from the others by his long hair, beard, and semitic facial features. By contrast, with his clean-shaven, smooth face, the magus standing to the far right appears to be the youngest of the three. It should be noted however, that the head of the youngest king has been largely re-painted, and may not, therefore, reflect Daret’s original conception.\(^5\)

Again, the Virgin’s complexion is smooth and creamy pink in appearance. With a serene expression she lowers her head slightly, attentively watching the tender interaction between the eldest king and her infant son. Unlike his representation as an older man in the Nativity panel (figure 2), here Joseph is depicted as middle-aged, with thinning darker hair, dark whiskers, and fewer wrinkles. The Christ Child is particularly charming with His mixed expression of fascination and delight as he eyes the old magus before Him. In addition to the rays of light descending from the star above them, gilded radiances behind the heads of the Virgin and Christ Child reveal their divinity.

\(^5\)According to Dr. Gisela Helmkampf of the Berlin Museum conservation department, the head of the youngest king was re-painted at an unknown date prior to the acquisition of the panel by the Gemäldegalerie as part of the Solly Collection in 1821.
Along with his interest in the relative ages and ethnic origins of the figures, Darete again displays his talent for depicting lavish costumes in this picture. All three of the magi are richly dressed. The hem and sleeves of the eldest king's rose-red robe are trimmed with ermine. At the collar and cuffs, the black brocade fabric of his under shirt is visible. His crystal-handled sword is suspended from a heavy, jeweled belt worn low around his waist. He wears a gold necklace set with pearls and gems and a gold crown adorns his red and green hat on the ground before him. The second magus wears a loose, green brocade robe that falls to the ground in columnar folds. The richness of his garment is enhanced by its jewel-encrusted collar and fur-lined, slit sleeves. Beneath his robe he wears a vermillion red undershirt. At right, the youngest magus is dressed in a belted, purple and gold brocade houppelande that is trimmed with sable at the collar, cuffs and hem. His hat is made of matching fur and is banded with a jeweled crown. He wears dark grey hose, black shoes with long, pointed toes, and gold spurs. From his belt a tiny blue and silver purse is suspended.

In contrast to the richly garbed visitors, Joseph is again simply dressed in a long, deep violet-red robe and dark teal fabric hat. Around his waist he wears a leather belt from which his knife and green fabric purse hang. As in the Visitation (figure 1), the Virgin wears a deep blue
dress and mantle, the edge of which is embroidered in gold with excerpts from the "Ave regina coelorum" hymn. No longer falling loosely over her shoulders, her hair is now covered with a white linen veil.

Consistent with the other three panels from the altarpiece, the horizon is high; the landscape tilted slightly to suggest its recession. The meeting of the magi takes place at an inn midway between the foreground and the horizon, at the right. Slightly farther in the distance, a cluster of buildings suggests a village. Finally, a larger city is barely visible beyond the water on the distant horizon. An attempt to unify the spatial recession of the background has again been made through the inclusion of a road that winds through the landscape and eventually leads the viewer to the horizon at the top of the picture.

* * * * *

The final panel depicts The Presentation in the Temple (figure 4). Gathered around a cloth-covered altar in the center of the picture are the figures of the Holy Family, Simeon, the aged prophetess Anna, and three female attendants. The temple is an octagonal, vaulted and domed pavilion, set within a grassy landscape. The building is constructed of greenish-grey stone; its dome is supported by eight decorative red marble columns. The three arches at
the front are open, allowing the viewer to witness the event taking place within. The solid walls beneath the five remaining arches are pierced with stained-glass windows.

Standing on the raised platform of the temple, Mary approaches the altar from the left. Bending forward slightly, she offers her infant son to Simeon who stands on the opposite side of the altar. With his hands reverently covered by a sheer green cloth, the old man reaches expectantly forward to receive the Child who looks up at him quizzically. Behind the altar, a young woman wearing a bright red dress and matching mantle smiles down at the Child as she watches the event. In her right hand she holds a basket containing two grey turtledoves; a large green candle is held daintily in her left.

Behind the Virgin another woman, wearing a green cloak over a deep violet dress, holds a large yellow candle. In contrast to the maid at the center of the composition whose hair cascades loosely over her shoulders, this woman's head is covered by a white linen veil and chin-strap. To her right, at the left edge of the picture, Joseph steps through an open arch onto the temple platform, aided by the tau-cross walking stick in his right hand. With his mouth slightly open, he holds up a large white dove with his left hand as he watches the transfer of the Child over the altar.
Corresponding to Joseph at the right edge of the composition, a third female attendant stands with her back to the viewer. She holds a basket of two white doves awkwardly in her left hand and a white candle in her right. Behind the figure of Simeon stands Anna, the old prophetess of the Temple. Watching the event at the altar intently, she holds a candle with her right hand as she raises her left hand to her breast in the speaking gesture traditionally associated with her prophecy.

As in the Adoration and Visitation panels (figures 3 and 4), the Virgin wears a deep blue, fur-lined dress and mantle whose edge is embroidered in gold with passages from the "Ave regina coelorum." Her head is covered with a white linen veil. The complexion of her somewhat idealized face is pale and creamy pink in color. Joseph is dressed as he appears in the Nativity panel (figure 2), with a deep carmine red robe, brown mantle, and dark teal hat.⁶

Again, we see Daret's interest in decorative and exotic costumes in the figures of Simeon, Anna, and the young woman in the right foreground. As in many fifteenth-century paintings, Simeon is dressed as the High-Priest of

⁶Vines, "The Arras Altarpiece," 118, note 60, has suggested that Joseph's costume is typical of medieval Jewry. His representation as a Jew is further strengthened by his semitic features and his walking stick in the shape of a tau-cross, which, according to tradition, was the mark made on the door-posts by the Jews the night of the Passover. See James Hall, Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), 78, 214.
the Temple in a long grey-violet robe that is decorated with jewel-studded, gold embroidery at the collar, cuffs, shoulders, and hem. Silver bells hang from the hem of his garment and a large jeweled brooch is fastened over his chest. Behind Simeon, Anna wears a striped turban. The transparent fabric of her chin-strap reveals Hebrew lettering embroidered around the gold collar of her blue dress.

The maid to Anna’s left is the most luxuriously dressed. She wears a green chemise with full sleeves and a floral-patterned, fur-lined skirt beneath a cherry red, short-sleeved robe whose collar, cuffs, and hem are heavily encrusted with gold and precious gems. She wears a padded, ring-shaped hat in the same red and green colors as her robe and chemise. She extends one foot, in a bright red shoe, from beneath her skirt. With her lavish costume, face shown in profile, and single long braid, she bears a striking resemblance to the figure of Salome in the Nativity (figure 2).

As in the previous three panels, we again find the artist paying careful attention to differences in the ages of his figures. In contrast to the firm skin and youthful appearance of the Virgin and the three female attendants, Anna is depicted as an elderly woman with a bony face, wrinkled skin and down-turned mouth. Simeon is equally mature, his great age emphasized by his long white hair and
flowing white beard. Joseph is again portrayed as an older man, close in appearance to his depiction in the Nativity (figure 2). Golden rays of light behind the heads of the Virgin, Christ Child, Simeon and Anna identify their divinity and set them apart from the other figures.

In contrast to the other three scenes which take place in an open landscape, the Presentation (figure 4) is the only panel whose setting may be considered an interior. Although a shallow band of grass and plants is visible in the immediate foreground, and glimpses of the high horizon appear at both edges of the panel, the composition is dominated by the temple structure. Set close to the picture plane, the floor of the temple is tilted slightly to suggest recession in depth. The placement of the figures within the structure is symmetrically balanced with three figures on either side of the jeweled altar table. Due to her placement at the center of the composition, the smiling young woman behind the altar might easily be mistaken for the Virgin at first glance.⁷

⁷Gottlieb, in fact, appears to have done so in her analysis of the picture. See Gottlieb, "The Brussels Version," 56.
Daret’s depiction of space and perspective

Because the panels come from Daret’s first major commission as an independent master, it is not surprising to find in them similarities to the work of Robert Campin. To better understand Daret’s use of Campinesque sources, as well as how his style and technique can be distinguished from that of his master, it is perhaps most useful to compare the two artists’ versions of the Nativity.

Although, as has been observed frequently, the composition of Daret’s Arras panel (figure 2) is clearly derived from Campin’s Dijon Nativity (figure 13), it differs from it in several respects.8 Campin’s version is a multi-figured composition that includes three shepherds at the stable window who take part in the adoration of the Child. The viewer’s eye travels from one section of the picture to the next, gradually absorbing the various aspects of the narrative. The composition of Daret’s Nativity (figure 2) is much simpler. By restricting the shepherds to the upper right corner of the picture, Daret has reduced the number of figures in his depiction of the event to the Holy Family, angels, and the attending midwives, all of whom focus their attention on the infant Christ in the center foreground. While Campin includes text-containing banderoles to explain

---

8The iconographic sources for both Campin’s and Daret’s Nativity panels will be discussed in chapter 5.
the legend of the midwives, Daret includes no textual references; the story is conveyed through gesture alone.

In addition to being fewer in number, Daret’s figures are larger with respect to the overall dimensions of the panel, and are placed closer to the picture plane. In Campin’s Nativity (figure 13), the figures are set further back in space and occupy a smaller portion of the total composition. Daret places his figures close to the picture plane, thereby offering a greater sense of immediacy to the viewer. While this characteristic is consistent in all four of Daret’s pictures, it is most effective in his Presentation (figure 4), where the viewer himself completes the circle of figures around the central altar.

In Campin’s Nativity, (figure 13), the stable is represented in three-quarter view, receding from the picture plane at a forty-five degree angle. The stable in Daret’s Nativity, (figure 2), is set parallel to the picture plane. With its stable shown in three-quarter view and similar background landscape elements, Daret’s Adoration of the Magi (figure 3) seems to echo the setting of Campin’s Nativity (figure 13) more closely than does his Nativity panel (figure 2).

Although Daret’s Presentation (figure 4) contains the most complex spatial construction of the four pictures, the interior space of the Temple is still rather simply, and inaccurately depicted. While the steps in the foreground
are tilted to suggest spatial recession, the viewer is allowed a partial glimpse of the interior of the vaulted ceiling at the same time. The three open sides of the Temple appear to comprise one half of the structure's perimeter; the remaining five sides are compressed to form the other half. Unlike Campin's roomier shed, both Daret's stable and his Temple are barely large enough to accommodate the figures within them.

The horizons in both Daret's and Campin's Nativity pictures are high, although the recession of the landscape is more convincingly represented in Campin's by the road that winds gradually to the city at the water's edge in the distance. By contrast, the landscape in all four of Daret's Arras panels functions more like a theatrical backdrop, with each succeeding hill defining another vertical plane of space behind the foreground figures. Even in the Visitation panel (figure 1), where Daret has attempted to connect the abbot to the city in the background, the effect of the receding path is not completely successful.

In addition to awkward spatial transitions, Daret's representation of the specific landscape elements is also vague. In contrast to the carefully detailed landscape in Campin's Nativity (figure 13), Daret's landscapes are primarily solid fields of green pigment with an occasional naturalistically depicted tree or shrub added for interest. While the foregrounds in his Visitation (figure 1) and
Presentation (figure 4) are covered with abundant plant life, the foreground spaces in his Nativity (figure 2) and Adoration of the Magi (figure 3) are simply represented as flat areas of color, completely devoid of any naturalistic elements.

Despite his problematic treatment of space, Daret has been fairly successful in suggesting aerial perspective by including the hazy outlines of tiny cities painted in blue-grey tones on the distant horizons of his pictures. Even more surprising is his inclusion of remarkably naturalistic details such as, in the Nativity (figure 2), the carefully described birds on the roof of the stable, or the icicles that hang from its front edge.⁹

Figure and facial types

Along with his different approach to space and perspective, Daret distinguishes himself from Campin in the representation of his figures. In general, Daret’s figures are less weighty than Campin’s. Their bodies are more slender; their proportions more delicate and doll-like.

---

⁹Herbert Friedmann, The Symbolic Goldfinch, Its History and Significance in European Devotional Art (Washington: Pantheon Books, 1946), 7-8, has identified the bird directly above Zebel’s head as a goldfinch, and the two birds at the peak of the roof as a pair of barn swallows. For the iconographic significance of these birds, see chapter 5.
While Campin's figures are modelled to appear fully three-dimensional, Daret's figures seem flatter and less volumetric.

In Daret's Visitation panel (figure 1), both the Virgin and Elizabeth are depicted as slender women, with narrow, sloping shoulders. The Virgin's neck is awkwardly stiff; her head a long oval. The hands of both women are small and graceful. Although the fabric of their mantles gathers in folds around them on the ground, there is no sense of where their feet are located. Consequently, they do not appear to stand firmly on the ground, but seem instead to hover just above it.

The same female figure type is also found in Daret's other three panels. The figures of the midwives in the Nativity (figure 2), and those of Anna and the attending women in the Presentation (figure 4), are depicted with the same narrow shoulders and slender proportions as the two women in the Visitation (figure 1). Both Zebel and the central maid in the Presentation (figure 4) display the same thick neck as the Virgin in the Visitation (figure 1). Although her appearance is altered by the addition of a veil in the Adoration (figure 3), and the Presentation (figure 4), Daret's depiction of the Virgin remains otherwise consistent in all four of the altarpiece panels.
Daret's basic, slim figure type is not restricted to his treatment of women. In the three pictures in which he appears, Joseph is represented as a diminutive man with tiny hands and slight proportions. Similarly, in the Adoration (figure 3), all three of the magi are depicted as slender individuals. The body of the eldest magus is unusually long from the shoulders to the knees. The figure of the middle-aged magus appears quite flat and has the same narrow, sloping shoulders found in Daret's female figures. With his small, elegantly tapered feet, the youngest king appears almost balletic in his gracefully affected contrapposto.

While the general impression of Daret's figures is diminutive, the specific features of their anatomy are largely masked by their garments. Although the artist takes great care to describe the decorative aspects of the costumes, it is often difficult to plot the figures beneath the surface of the heavy fabrics.

It is much easier to discern the anatomical structure beneath the garments of Campin's figures. In his Nativity (figure 13), for example, Campin clearly describes the projection of Joseph's bent knee with the star-shaped pattern of folds and highlights in the fabric covering it. In contrast, the body of Abbot du Clercq in Daret's Visitation (figure 4) appears as a flattened mass of black fabric from which a fully modelled head and hands project at the collar and cuffs.
The weaker anatomy of Daret's figures is particularly evident in the depiction of their hands. Small and delicate, the hands of Daret's figures do not display a convincing underlying bone structure. The skin lacks the creases, folds, and knuckles which are so carefully described by Campin, as an examination of his Frankfurt Virgin and Child (figure 5), or his London Virgin and Child before a Firescreen (figure 12) clearly demonstrates. In addition to their smooth appearance, the hands of Daret's figures are often awkwardly articulated at the wrists and sometimes bend in anatomically impossible positions. This tendency is clearly demonstrated by the hands of the middle-aged magus in the Adoration (figure 3), and the prophetess Anna in the Presentation panel (figure 4).

* * * * *

In his depiction of female faces, Daret's approach varies, depending on the age of the figure. His young women have long, oval faces with slightly receding chins. Their noses are rather large and straight; their mouths are small with thin upper and full lower lips. Their eyes are also small, with both the heavy upper and lower lids defined by deep creases. The skin of Daret's young women is smooth and their complexions are uniformly pale and creamy in color.

The figures of the Virgin and Salome in the Dijon Nativity (figure 13) clearly illustrate the differences in Campin's basic female facial type. Their faces are fuller,
rounder, with small knob-like chins and tiny, bud-shaped mouths. Although rather close-set, their eyes do not have the heavy eyelids that Daret's women have. Despite the differences between the two artists' preferred types, the maid behind the altar in Daret's Presentation (figure 4) is still quite Campinesque in appearance. With her slightly inclined head and hair swept back from her face, she bears a resemblance to the Virgin in Campin's Aix Madonna in Glory (figure 16).

In contrast to the young women in Daret's paintings, the older Elizabeth and Anna have thin, bony faces, with darker complexions. Unlike the smooth, creamy skin of the Virgin and her young attendants, these older women bear deep vertical creases in their cheeks, and wrinkles surround their eyes and mouths. Only the exotic Salome and the maid shown in profile in the Presentation (figure 4) depart from this basic scheme of facial types. Daret has given these women long, sloping noses, drooping eyes, and down-turned mouths.

Daret's depiction of male faces is less easy to categorize in terms of stock "types" than his representation of female faces. While the figure of Simeon appears to be based on a standard model for a prophet with his long white hair and beard, the remaining male figures in the Arras panels display a greater degree of individualization. Of course, this quality is to be expected for the figure of the
abbot in the Visitation, and the sensitivity with which Darett has rendered his portrait suggests that Du Clercq’s physiognomy was studied from life (figure 17).

Most surprising however, is Darett’s depiction of Joseph. Unlike Campin’s stock representation of him as an elderly man with a bald head and full, white beard, Darett depicts him as a Jewish man of middle-age. His hair is thin and greying; his beard short and dark. As Vines suggests, Joseph’s appearance may reflect the changing attitudes toward the saint expressed during the early decades of the fifteenth century by the church reformers Pierre d’Ailly, bishop of Cambrai, and his pupil Jean Gerson.¹⁰ Revering Joseph as an honorable husband to the Virgin, Ailly and Gerson argued for the institution of the Feast of the Holy Marriage at the Council of Constance in 1416. Although it was not universally granted until 1725, the Feast of the Marriage of Mary and Joseph was adopted in Arras by 1430.¹¹ We may, therefore, postulate that Darett was responding to the specific wishes of his ecclesiastical patron when he depicted Joseph as a middle-aged man in the Arras Altarpiece just five years later.¹²


¹²For the cult of St. Joseph and the resultant changes in his appearance in art of the fifteenth- and sixteenth-centuries, see Marjory Bolger Foster, "The Iconography of St. Joseph in Netherlandish Art 1400-1550" (Ph.D diss.,
**Color**

Perhaps the area in which Daret departs furthest from the style of his master is in his choice and use of color. If one compares the Arras panels with almost any painting by Campin, the basic difference in their respective palettes becomes immediately apparent. Campin's colors tend to be cool and silvery in tonality. He often adjusts his colors with generous admixtures or underlayers of white to create both dramatic highlights and pale, pastel tones. This effect can be seen in the bleached, bluish-grey robe of the Angel in the *Mérode Annunciation* (figure 11), or in the lavender-white dress of the Virgin in the London *Virgin and Child before a Firescreen* (figure 12). Although Campin tends to restrict his palette to reds, blues, and browns, he sometimes blends or layers his pigments to create more complex shades of purple or green.

In contrast, the first impression of Daret's colors is that they are more vibrant and decorative than those of Campin. Daret's palette is warmer, with a more frequent use of yellow rather than white to enliven his colors. His blues and greens in particular are brighter and more jewel-
like than Campin’s more saturated hues. Along with a warmer palette, Daret frequently blends and layers his glazes to create unusual colors such as the deep violet of Elizabeth’s robe, the teal blue of Joseph’s hat, or the cherry red and grass green of the maid’s costume in the foreground of the Presentation (figure 4).  

Daret further exploits the decorative potential of his colors by juxtaposing complementary hues. This technique can be appreciated in the contrast of Salome’s violet belt cinched around the waist of her green houppelande in the Nativity panel (figure 2), or in the bright vermillion red sleeves protruding from the green brocade robe of the middle magus in the Adoration (figure 3). With the exception of the stained-glass windows of the Temple and Simeon’s pale violet-grey robe in the Presentation (figure 4), Daret does not use pastel tones in the Arras panels.

14 As no microscopic, micro-chemical, or spectro-photographic analyses have been made of the four Arras panels, their specific pigments, binding media, and layer structure have not yet been determined. For a discussion of the pigments most frequently found in Early Netherlandish paintings, see Paul Coremans, "La Notation des couleurs. Essai d’application aux Primitifs flamands," De artibus opuscula XL. Essays in Honor of Erwin Panofsky, vol. 1 (Princeton: Institute for Advanced Study, 1960), 76-81. An overview of painting techniques most commonly used in fifteenth-century Flemish pictures is given by Catheline Périer-D’Ieteren, "La technique picturale de la peinture flamande du XVe siècle," in La pittura nel XIV e XV secolo: il contributo dell’analisi tecnica alla storia dell’arte, ed. Henk W. van Os and J. R. J. van Asperen de Boer, (Bologna: CLUEB, 1983), 7-71.
Along with his use of color for decorative purposes, Daret also employs color as a compositional element. For example, in the Nativity (figure 2), the bright red robe of the angel in the upper right corner draws the viewer’s gaze to that area of the panel where the Annunciation to the Shepherds takes place in the background. In the immediate foreground of the same picture, the pale, creamy flesh of the infant Christ stands out dramatically against the amorphous field of the greenish-brown earth beneath Him. Similarly, in the Presentation (figure 4), the bright red columns on either side of the altar, and the red garments of the maid behind it, act as framing devices that focus the viewer’s attention on the exchange of the Child at the center of the picture. Daret further enhanced this effect by applying a brown glaze over the red pigment of the remaining columns to reduce their intensity and suggest their recession into space.

* * * * *

Daret also departs from Campin in his liberal use of metallic gold in the Arras pictures. In each of the four panels, he surrounds the heads of the sacred figures with gilded radiances, and includes gilded rays of heavenly light in the Nativity (figure 2), and Adoration of the Magi (figure 3). To create these golden rays of light, Daret applied powdered gold to raised ridges of yellow pigment.
mixed with mordant size. The same gilding process was used to decorate the hems of the mantles worn by Elizabeth and the Virgin, as well as the green cloth covering Simeon's hands.

Although this technique is not consistently found in paintings attributed to Campin, it occasionally appears. In the Dijon Nativity (figure 13), for example, Campin decorated the edge of the Virgin's mantle with mordant gilt embroidery and surrounded the body of the Christ Child with a gilded radiance that echoes the golden rays of the sun in the distance. Gilded radiances also emanate from the head of the Virgin in the Aix Madonna in Glory (figure 16), and from the heads of the Virgin and Child in an Interior in London (figure 55). However, the use of metallic gold in such elements remains exceptional in Campin's oeuvre rather than being, as in these examples, the rule.

Daret used a different type of gilding for the gifts of the magi, the abbot's crozier and escutcheon, the altar medallions, and the jeweled borders of garments. In this process, a thin layer of gold leaf is applied to a flat area of the prepared ground of the picture which has been

---


16 In all of the examples mentioned, the yellowish-tan mordant is clearly visible in areas where the gold is abraded.
"reserved" from the rest of the paint surface. Following application, the gold is then burnished to darken its color and enhance its reflective potential.

After gilding, Daret added the specific details of the gifts, crowns, and crozier with black paint to create the illusion of sculpted metalwork. Similar details were painted over the altar decorations and the gilt borders of the costumes of Simeon, Anna, and the handmaiden in the Presentation (figure 4), to which jewels and pearls were also added using white and colored pigments. This effect is most masterfully achieved in the jeweled decoration of Simeon's robe where the gold leaf itself is applied in a basket-weave pattern. It is interesting to note, however, that while the abbot's crozier is carefully crafted to simulate a three-dimensional metal object, the shield bearing his coat of arms is painted to look like a painting (figure 17). 

The inclusion of flat areas of gilding is also a characteristic in some of Campin's paintings, but occurs primarily in works dating from the earlier part of his

---

17 This technique, known as Schwartzlotzeichnung, (black lead drawing), appears to have its origins in stained-glass painting. See Cologne, Wallraf-Richarz-Museum, Stefan Lochner Meister zu Köln. Herkunft-Werke-Wirkung (Cologne: Wallraf-Richarz-Museums, 1993), 250.

18 Although none of Daret's metalwork designs survive, the intricate details of the Abbot's crozier in the Visitation and the gifts of the magi in the Adoration clearly reveal his familiarity with the goldsmith's art.
career. Both the London Seilern Entombment Triptych (figure 18) and the Frankfurt Bad Thief fragment (figure 8) are notable for their gold grounds. Two other early panels attributed to Campin, the Berlin Madonna on a Grassy Bench (figure 54), and the Cleveland St. John the Baptist (figure 19), feature gilt halos heavily outlined in black.¹⁹

The technique used by Daret in the Arras panels is closest to that used by Campin to create the halos in the Frankfurt Virgin and Child (figure 5) and the Philadelphia Christ and the Virgin Mary (figure 20), in which the illusionistic details of metalwork and jewels are painted over the gold leaf with black and colored glazes. While this technique effectively enhances the iconic quality of these two images, the inclusion of flat areas of gilding seems somewhat archaic in Daret's otherwise naturalistically depicted narratives.

Campin's more modern approach can also be seen in his treatment of costume decorations. Unlike Daret's use of metallic gold to embellish the costumes of his figures, the gold and jeweled borders of the garments in Campin's paintings are illusionistically created using colored

¹⁹Infrared reflectographic analysis of the Seilern Entombment Triptych has identified five concentric rings around the head of Christ in the right panel. This suggests that Campin's original intention was to include a gilded halo similar to those found in the Berlin and Cleveland panels. See Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 85-87, figure 64.
glazes. Examples of this technique can be found in the robes of the London Virgin and Child Before a Firescreen (figure 12), the Frankfurt St. Veronica (figure 6), and Salome in the Dijon Nativity (plate figure 13).

**Brushwork and technique**

With respect to brushstroke and impasto, Daret's painting technique is quite similar to Campin's. With the exception of the raised ridges of mordant mentioned above, the panels of both artists are thinly painted, and their surface textures are generally smooth. When each artist's works are examined in raking light, a thicker application of paint can often be found along contour lines and at the edges of folds. A heavier impasto can also be detected in the textures of hair and brocade fabrics, architectural decorations, or in the reflective highlights of jewels and pearls. Both Campin and Daret apply their pigments in tiny strokes, using small brushes so that individual brushstrokes are nearly undetectable at a normal viewing distance.²⁰

²⁰In the Arras panels, a thicker, rougher surface is visible in the blue areas such as the Virgin's robe and mantle. A similar effect can also be seen in the blues of many of Campin's panels. This is most likely due to the grainy texture of the inexpensive azurite pigment commonly used as an underlayer for more costly ultramarine blue on the surface. I thank Ms. Catherine Metzger of the National Gallery of Art, Conservation Department for her explanation of this technique. See also Ashok Roy, ed., Artists' Pigments: A Handbook of Their History and Characteristics, Vol. II, (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1993; New
Although similar, there are several ways in which the two artists' techniques may be distinguished. In the treatment of hair, for example, Daret (figure 21) tends to work from dark to light, layering fine strokes of lighter pigment over darker ones to simulate the highlights of individual strands of hair. In contrast (figure 22), Campin creates hair with a more complex intermingling of light, medium, and dark strokes of color. This difference in technique is also illustrated in each artist's rendering of the thatched roof of the Nativity stable (figures 2 and 13).

By continuing our comparison of the two Nativity panels, we can see how Campin and Daret differ in their technique for creating specific details of wood, stone, and skin. Campin creates the illusion of cracks in wood or stone by placing unblended strokes of light and dark pigments immediately next to each other for a crisp, sharp edge. Daret begins with a similar juxtaposition of light and dark paint strokes, then blends them together slightly to soften the effect. A comparison of the faces of Joseph or the shepherds in Campin's Nativity (figures 13 and 23) with those of Simeon or Anna in Daret's Presentation (figures 4 and 24), reveals that, similarly, each artist uses a distinctive technique to create wrinkles in the skin.

---
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of his aged figures. Daret's more subtle approach to modelling is particularly evident in the portrait of Abbot Du Clercq in the Visitation (figure 17).

Most distinctive is Daret's inconsistent treatment of transparent and reflective surfaces. Employing the technique used by Campin to paint the diaphanous sudarium of the Frankfurt St. Veronica (figure 6), Daret is successful in depicting the icicles, Anna's veil, and the green cloth covering Simeon's hands as transparent substances. 21 However, unlike Campin's representation of gems as both translucent and reflective objects (figures 5 and 20), the jewels decorating the altar in the Presentation (figure 4) and the garments of various figures in the Arras panels are depicted as reflective surfaces only. From these examples it appears that Daret is only able to simulate transparency when the transparent material is painted over another object, such as the stable beams, Anna's collar, or Simeon's hands. This weakness is most notable in the treatment of the windows of the Temple in the Presentation (figures 4 and 24). Although Daret used pastel hues to suggest the effect of sunlight shining through them, the windows look more like panel paintings than translucent panes of stained-glass.

21The flesh tone of Simeon's hands is clearly visible through the green pigment of the cloth covering them, (figure 24). Infrared reflectographic analysis has revealed that the hands are also completely underdrawn. The addition of the cloth may thus reflect a compositional change. See Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 135-136, figure 133.
We can extend this comparison to the way in which Daret and Campin depict the eyes of their figures. Unlike Campin, who shows a remarkable ability to capture both the translucent and reflective qualities of the human eye (figure 10), Daret is only successful in representing eyes as moist, reflective surfaces. Consequently, the eyes of Daret's figures (figure 17) lack depth, and appear as flat, opaque objects, rather than the semi-transparent spheres they should be.

**Daret's underpainting style**

Since the second world war, the application of scientific techniques to the examination of pictures has become increasingly important in the field of art history. 22 As a means for examining the layers beneath the surface of a painting, and therefore, increasing our understanding of an artist's creative process, one of the most frequently used techniques is X-radiography. When a painting is exposed to X-radiation, the differential density of the pigments used in its creation can be recorded on film. Pigments of high density, such as lead-white, lead-tin yellow, or mercury-containing

vermillion block the penetration of X-rays and appear as unexposed white areas on the film negative. Oil glazes and vegetable-based pigments, which are too low in density to obstruct the penetration of X-rays, appear as dark areas on the film. However, since glazes are frequently applied in thin layers over white underpaint, they are often undetectable in X-radiographs. Although other mineral compounds and metals, such as gold leaf, will also partially obstruct X-rays, an X-radiograph is primarily a record of the lead-white pigment used to develop the composition in the underpainting layers.

First used to detect modifications in an oil painting in 1896, the technique of X-radiography was not widely accepted for the study of pictures until the 1930s with the work of Burroughs and Wolters. While Burroughs referred briefly to Daret's underpainting technique, his primary focus was the application of scientific analysis to the study of paintings in an effort to resolve the Campin-Van der Weyden identity question. By comparing the X-radiographs of variously attributed panels, he was able to

---

distinguish the work of Robert Campin from that of Roger van der Weyden on the basis of their individual underpainting styles.

If we compare X-radiographs of Daret’s Adoration of the Magi (figure 25) and Campin’s Dijon Nativity (figure 26), we can see how these two artists also differ in their underpainting styles.\(^{24}\) In general, Campin’s underpainting style is smoother and more refined than Daret’s. He applies lead-white pigment with small strokes, blending carefully as he models his forms. Campin’s use of lead-white to create three-dimensional volume is clearly visible in the folds of Joseph’s sleeve and the star-shaped pattern on his projecting knee. The highlights on his nose, cheekbone, and bald head stand out boldly from the shadowed areas around them, as do those on the Virgin’s forehead, cheek, and chin. Campin’s use of white for the creation of pale, pastel tones can also be seen in the heavy white underpainting of the Virgin’s robe and mantle.\(^{25}\)

\(^{24}\)I thank Dr. Rainald Grosshans of the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin for allowing me to examine the X-radiographs of the Visitation and Adoration panels, and for providing me with photographs of them. Additional X-radiographs of the Dijon Nativity are illustrated in Micheline Comblen-Sonkes and Nicole Veronée-Verhaegen, Les Primitifs Flamands: Le Musée des Beaux-Arts de Dijon (Brussel, Centre National de Recherches "Primitifs flamands", 1986), plates CXLIII, CXLVI, CLIV, CLXIV.

\(^{25}\)Campin’s characteristic underpainting style can also be seen in X-radiographs of the Virgin and Child before a Firescreen, illustrated in Burroughs, Art Criticism, figure 109; the Hermitage Holy Trinity, illustrated in Vladimir Loewinson-Lessing, and Nicolas Nicouline, Les Primitifs
Daret's underpainting style is less polished than Campin's. Although the face of the Virgin and the body of the Christ Child display a smooth, somewhat idealized approach, the faces and hands of the magi are more coarsely underpainted. Daret's figures are not carefully modelled into three-dimensional forms as are Campin's. Unlike Campin's selective and dramatic use of lead-white to create highlights and volumes, Daret's white underpainting appears to be thinner and more evenly distributed throughout the composition. The figure of Joseph is so thinly underpainted that he is almost invisible in the X-radiograph. A heavier application of lead-white is detectable in the Virgin's veil, the eldest king's collar and cuffs, and in the turban and fur-lined sleeves of the middle magus.

Daret's coarser brushwork can also be seen in the X-radiograph of the Visitation (figure 27). Again, the face of the Virgin is more carefully underpainted than those of the other two figures. Lead-white is applied thickly in

Flamands: Le Musée de l'Ermitage Leningrad (Brussels, Centre national de Recherches "Primitifs flamands", 1965), plate XXXV; and the Mérode Annunciation, illustrated in Printa, Genius of Campin, figures 21 and 22.

26 The damaged face and original short hairstyle of the youngest king are clearly visible in the X-radiograph. Traces of the original gilded fleurs de lis pattern on the back of the panel are detectable through the woodgrain, along with a seal at the left edge.

27 Details in the X-radiograph are partially obscured by the shadow of the wooden cradle supporting the panel. Four dowels, used to join the planks, are visible. As in the Adoration panel, a seal is visible at the left edge.
Elizabeth's veil and chin-strap; her facial features and hands are only crudely suggested. The white pigment used in the abbot's miter is also clearly visible. Tiny dots of white indicate the highlights of its jewels and pearls. Although the buildings of the walled city in the background are rather carefully indicated, the road connecting the city to the foreground is underpainted in broad streaks of white paint. As in the Adoration (figure 25), the figures are rather thinly underpainted and do not stand out clearly as three-dimensional volumes. 28

The difference between Campin's and Daret's underpainting technique can most easily be demonstrated by comparing X-radiographs of Daret's portrait of Abbot du Clercq in the Visitation (figure 27), and Campin's London Portrait of a Man (figure 28). 29 The face of Campin's man is smoothly and meticulously underpainted. Lead-white is applied in small, carefully blended strokes to model the features and to create subtle highlights on the forehead, cheekbone, and chin. In contrast to the face, the modelling of the hat and coat is more loosely executed in broader, less blended brushstrokes.

28 Several white lines are visible around the heads of the Virgin and Elizabeth which correspond to their gilded radiances. Because powdered gold is not sufficiently dense to block X-rays, this suggests that lead-tin yellow was used in the mordant for the gilding process.

29 Also illustrated in Burroughs, Art Criticism, figure 113.
In the figure of Jean du Clercq, Daret makes no distinction between the brushstrokes in the underpainting of the face of the abbot and that of his garment. Both are equally rendered in coarse brushstrokes that appear somewhat hastily applied. A series of heavy strokes suggests the forehead; another the bridge of the nose. A third, curving sweep of lead white forms the orbit of the right eye. The crude underpainting of the abbot's head is especially surprising when compared with his very sensitively modelled portrait on the panel's surface. While Campin's figures appear nearly finished in their underpainting stage, Daret's figures are decidedly incomplete when seen without their final layer of color.

**Daret’s underdrawing style**

In addition to the underpainting layer revealed through X-radiography, the preparatory drawings beneath the surface of a picture can also be studied through the process of infrared reflectography. Significantly more sensitive than infrared photography, the technique of infrared reflectography was developed for the study of panel paintings in the 1960s by the Dutch physicist J. R. J. van...
Asperen de Boer. Today, infrared reflectography is one of the most widely used techniques for the scientific examination of pictures.

When a painting is scanned with an infrared-sensitive television camera, the paint layers become transparent, revealing any preparatory drawings on the prepared ground of the panel beneath. The resulting image, called a reflectogram, may then be compared with the surface of the painting to identify compositional changes. By comparing the reflectogram with X-radiographs, one can determine whether these changes were made during the underpainting stage or in the final paint layers. Because a reflectogram ostensibly records the artist's original conception and his personal draftsmanship, the underdrawings may be considered artworks themselves, and may thus be analyzed for their individual stylistic properties.


Various methods exist for preserving infrared reflectograms. Most of the reflectograms published to date are mosaics of photographs taken directly from the television monitor. More homogeneous, but less detailed reflectograms can be obtained from computer-generated assemblies. For a new method in which computer-generated reflectograms are superimposed over color images of the paint surface, see Rachel Billinge and Lorne Campbell, "The Infra-red Reflectograms of Jan Van Eyck's Portrait of Giovanni Arnolfini and his Wife Giovanna Cenami," National Gallery Technical Bulletin 16 (1995): 47-60.
The underdrawings in Daret’s Visitation, Adoration, and Presentation, have been extensively documented along with the underdrawings in several paintings attributed to Robert Campin. From these reflectograms, several observations can be made about the different working methods of these two artists.

In the Visitation (figure 29), Daret uses short, dark lines to indicate the edges of folds in Elizabeth’s right sleeve. Softer, lighter lines identify the vertical folds of her mantle and outline the contours of her hands and cuffs. Parallel hatching is visible in Elizabeth’s robe and inside the Virgin’s mantle, suggesting areas of shadow. The tapering ends and fluid quality of all of these underdrawn lines indicates that they were executed with a brush and liquid medium.

The reflectogram assemblies for Daret’s Visitation also reveal several compositional changes. The Virgin’s nose and mouth were originally underdrawn in a slightly higher position, and there are shifts in the position of the

---

32 Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 10-17, 64-136. For reflectograms of Daret’s Nativity, see Colin Eisler, The Thyssen-Bornemisz Collection. Early Netherlandish Painting (London: Sotheby’s, Philip Wilson, 1989), 83. I am grateful to Dr. Van Asperen de Boer for making his original data available to me at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie.

33 Also illustrated in Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 131, figure 127.
thumb and fingers of Elizabeth's right hand.\textsuperscript{34} Most interesting is the Virgin's right hand, which is underdrawn in two positions; one above her abdomen, and the other extended toward Elizabeth. A shadow in the X-radiograph, (figure 27), indicates that her hand was also underpainted in this raised gesture before being completed in the lower position in the final paint stage.

Compositional changes are also evident in a representative reflectogram of Daret's Adoration panel (figure 30).\textsuperscript{35} Joseph's hat is smaller in the underdrawing and the folds of his right sleeve are underdrawn in a completely different pattern. The general outline of his purse is visible, but none of its ornamental detail is underdrawn.

The underdrawing technique is identical with that of the Visitation panel. Short, broad strokes define the edges of folds in Joseph's coat and in the turban of the middle king. Very few hatched lines are detectable. Where they do appear, such as on Joseph's chest, they seem to indicate general areas of shadow.

\textsuperscript{34}The reflectogram assembly of the Virgin's head is illustrated in Van Asperen de Boer, \textit{Underdrawing}, 132, figure 128.

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., 133, figure 129.
The infrared reflectographic data is most complete for Daret's *Presentation* panel, where the majority of the underdrawing occurs in the figure of Joseph, (figure 31).\(^{36}\) Long, fluid lines outline the contours of his robe and mantle; the edges of folds are softly suggested. As in the *Visititation* and *Adoration* panels, little hatching is visible. Oblique parallel lines can be found on the inner layers of Joseph's clothing, and in the portion of Simeon's robe to the right of the column.

Few compositional changes are detectable. Most of the individuals' facial features are clearly indicated in the underdrawing and are followed closely in the final paint surface. The five circular ornaments on the front of the altar are freely underdrawn without a compass. The awkward underdrawing of the column bases and the Temple vaults (figure 32) further underscores Daret's problematic approach to the depiction of perspectival space. As noted previously, Simeon's hands are underdrawn completely.

By examining representative reflectograms of paintings attributed to Robert Campin, we can see how Daret's underdrawing style differs from that of his master. In the robe of the Frankfurt *Virgin and Child* (figure 33), for example, the edges of folds are decisively underdrawn with

---

\(^{36}\)The *Presentation* panel has been scanned in its entirety. Additional reflectogram examples are illustrated in Ibid., 135, figure 131, and 136, figure 133.
thick, dark lines. These lines, which are also executed with a brush, often end in hooks that enhance the curvature of the fold they depict. In contrast to Daret’s infrequent use of hatching, Campin uses hatching extensively in his underdrawings. While Daret’s light parallel hatching merely suggests general areas of shadow, Campin uses hatching and cross-hatching to "carve out" shadows and to create the illusion of three-dimensional volumes.

Another example of this technique can be seen in the underdrawing of the figure of Joseph in the Mérode Triptych, (figure 34). Similar to the turban of the middle king in Daret’s Adoration, the edges of the folds in Joseph’s hat are clearly indicated by Campin’s characteristically bold, hooked lines. However, unlike Daret, Campin also employs short, parallel lines to further define the shadowed areas of the crumpled fabric, as well as the shadow cast by the hat on Joseph’s forehead.

In general, Daret’s underdrawing style is softer and somewhat looser than Campin’s. His lines are predominantly thinner and lighter than the dark, firmly underdrawn lines visible in reflectograms of Campin’s paintings. While Campin carefully describes and models his figures and their

37Ibid., 11, figure 2. Additional examples of Campin’s underdrawing of drapery are illustrated for The Virgin and Child before a Firescreen, 73, figures 45, and 74, figure 46; the Dijon Nativity, 80, figures 51 and 52; and the Mérode Annunciation, 112-115, figures 101-104.

38Ibid., 109, figure 97.
settings in his underdrawings, Daret’s underdrawings appear to reflect only abbreviated versions of the compositions that will eventually be realized on the surface of the pictures. Like his underpaintings, Daret’s underdrawings seem to be "short-hand" notations, rather than complete compositional designs.
CHAPTER 4
SPECIFIC ATTRIBUTIONS RECONSIDERED

Introduction

Having identified the individual styles and techniques of Jacques Daret and Robert Campin in the previous chapter, we shall now consider the authorship of several, variously attributed paintings in the "Campin Group". The majority of this chapter will be devoted to those paintings, generally given to Campin in the literature, whose authorship, I believe, can be assigned to Daret instead. Following this discussion, a few comments will be made on a small group of paintings whose proposed attribution to Daret I find difficult to accept.

In contrast to previous scholars whose connoisseurship has sometimes been limited to the study of photographs, with the exception of one, I have been able to examine each of these paintings first-hand. In addition to my study of the paint surfaces, I have analyzed X-radiographs and infrared reflectograms whenever possible to determine the style of the underdrawings and underpaintings contained in each work. My conclusions are drawn from the combined evidence of all the available data.
The Berlin Portrait of a Young Man

Among the variously attributed paintings associated with Robert Campin is the Portrait of a Young Man in Berlin (figure 35). Both Friedländer and Davies accepted the portrait as the work of the master. Tolnay and Printa believed it to be a copy after a lost Campin original. Panofsky considered it a "school" piece, reflective of Campin's style. Burroughs attributed the painting to Jacques Daret, primarily on the basis of X-radiographs (figure 36), and their similarity to those of the Brussels Annunciation (figure 37).

As an examination of the X-radiograph (figure 36) reveals, the style of the underpainting in the Berlin portrait is also very close to the underpainting found in the figures of Elizabeth and Abbot du Clercq in the Visitation panel (figure 27). Similar to the underpainting of the head of the abbot, coarse strokes of lead white are used to highlight the forehead of the man in the Berlin portrait. There are heavy strokes of white along the length

---

1 The painting is currently identified in the Gemäldegalerie as the work of the "Master of Flémalle".

2 Friedländer, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, 2:72; and Davies, *Roger van der Weyden*, 244.

3 Tolnay, *Maître de Flémalle*, 60; and Printa, *Genius of Campin*, 118.


5 Burroughs, *Art Criticism*, 212-213; an X-radiograph of the portrait is illustrated in figure 94.
of the nose, as well as broadly applied highlights in the ear and neck. In a manner that is virtually identical to the underpainting of the abbot’s face, a rounded sweep of white defines the curvature of the young man’s eye socket. Although little undermodelling is visible in the garments, lead white appears to be applied in brushstrokes similar to those in the facial features. A comparison with the meticulously underpainted face and more loosely modelled garments of Campin’s London Portrait of a Man (figure 28) clearly illustrates the marked difference in the underpainting styles of these two pictures.

In addition to the similarities in the underpainting, several features of the finished surface of the Berlin portrait also support an attribution to Daret. As noted by Burroughs, the awkwardly large and blocky ear of the young man is similar to the ear of Abbot du Clercq in the Visitation (figure 17), and his long, angular nose resembles those of Elizabeth and the Virgin. A comparison may also be made between the subtle modelling of the young man’s chin and neck and that in the abbot’s face. In both portraits, a short horizontal line below the mouth defines the chin, and soft greys are blended with the flesh tones to create shadows and the impression of whiskers. Like the abbot’s

---

6 Ibid., 213.
black habit, the young man’s red hat and green brocade coat lack three-dimensional volume and appear as flat fields of color from which his face emerges.

Most similar is the treatment of the eyes in the Berlin portrait. As is typical for Daret, the young man’s heavy-lidded eyes are depicted as reflective surfaces only. The grey pupils resemble flat disks on the surface of the eyeballs rather than curved portions of spherical forms as they do in Campin’s portraits (figures 9 and 10). Like the eyes of several of Daret’s Arras figures, the eyes in the Berlin portrait are not symmetrically positioned in the face. As a result, the young man’s gaze has a somewhat awkward, unfocused appearance.

Unfortunately, because no infrared reflectograms of the Berlin portrait are available, the style of any underdrawings present beneath the paint layers cannot be analyzed at this time. However, on the basis of the similarities in the underpainting style to that of the figures in the Arras Visitation (figure 1), as well as the approach to specific features on the surface of the picture, I believe that the Berlin Portrait of a Young Man (figure 35) should be attributed to Jacques Daret rather than to Robert Campin.
The Brussels Annunciation

One of the most debated attributions in the "Campin Group" is that of the Brussels Annunciation, (figure 37). Both Friedländer and Winkler considered the painting a free copy of the center panel of the Mérode Triptych (figure 11). Frinta believed it to be a copy, not of the Mérode Annunciation, but of an earlier lost work by Campin. Campbell considered it a workshop piece, earlier than the Mérode Triptych, and based on a sculpted, rather than painted, model. Noting the correspondence between details in the underdrawing of the Mérode Triptych and the surface composition of the Brussels Annunciation, the Van Asperen de Boer group also proposed a date for the Brussels

---

7 For the most recent discussion of this panel, see Cyriel Stroo and Pascale Syfer-d’Olne, The Flemish Primitives I: The Master of Flémalle and Roger van der Weyden Groups. Catalogue of Early Netherlandish Painting in the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium (Brussels: Brepols, 1996), 37-50.

8 Winkler, Meister von Flémalle, 27-31, and Friedländer, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:70.


10 Campbell, "Robert Campin," 634-646. According to Houtart, Jacques Daret, 10, a sculpted Annunciation, whose design was probably Campin’s, was installed in the Tournai town hall in 1424.
version which is earlier than that of the Mérode Triptych. Burroughs attributed the panel to Daret on the basis of X-radiographs. Gottlieb supported Burroughs's opinion with additional stylistic comparisons to the Arras panels. Châtelet also endorsed an attribution to Daret, proposing that the painting was executed in Campin's workshop, according to the master's design.

With its close resemblance to the center panel of the Mérode Triptych (figure 11), there would seem to be little doubt that the Brussels Annunciation (figure 37) has its origins in Campin's workshop. Yet, the number of copies and variants also suggests that the basic composition may have been known from other sources as well. Despite its frequent identification as a "workshop piece", I believe

---

12 Burroughs, Art Criticism, 211-212.
13 Gottlieb, "The Brussels Version," 53-59. Gottlieb's analysis was based on her examination of photographs only. Consequently, she did not discuss the color, brush technique, nor specific details of the Brussels picture.
that an individual hand, distinct from Campin’s, can be identified in every stage of the creation of the Brussels panel.

The reflectograms reveal several compositional changes between the underdrawings and the surface of the picture. Slight shifts exist in the position of the windows, shutters, corbels and ceiling beams. Both the table and the bench were originally underdrawn in a steeper perspective. The size and position of the objects on the table appear slightly different in the underdrawing, and a niche was originally placed in the wall where the broom now hangs. The most significant changes are found in the fireplace, which was underdrawn at a different angle and with a larger opening (figure 38).

The numerous changes in the architecture suggest that the artist responsible for the underdrawing struggled with the creation of the interior space. Alternatively, if he copied the setting from a pre-existing model, he appears to have had difficulty translating it to the prepared panel.

16 Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 97-102, figures 81-88.

17 Stereomicroscopic examination of the picture has revealed that the niche was partially completed in the underpainting layers. See J.R.J. van Asperen de Boer and Jelly Dijkstra, "Some Technical Aspects of Two Master of Flémalle Paintings: The Brussels and the Mérode Triptych," in Le dessin sous-jacent dans la peinture. Colloque VI: Infrarouge et autres techniques d'exam, ed. Hélène Verougstraete-Marcq and Roger van Schoute (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1987), 41-44.
Along with the corrections in the placement of the bench, table, and fireplace, the wavering quality of the underdrawn lines in these areas further suggests a lack of confidence or experience.

In contrast to the uncertain underdrawing of the architectural setting, the underdrawing in the figures is more assured (figure 39). The facial features of both the angel Gabriel and the Virgin are clearly and completely underdrawn. The angel’s right eye was originally placed lower, and there is a shift in the contour of his left temple. The Virgin’s eyes were underdrawn in a more open position. Her nose was slightly shorter than it appears on the picture’s surface.\(^\text{18}\) The hair of both figures is schematically indicated by parallel, wavy lines.

The most extensive underdrawing is found in the garments of the figures. In addition to the underdrawn lines that define the edges of drapery folds, some hatching is used to indicate areas of shadow. In the Angel’s alb, the hatched lines tend to be long and widely-spaced (figure 39). In contrast, the three-dimensional quality of the Virgin’s robe is less defined. The hatching is narrower, and is primarily drawn parallel to the main fold lines. Widely spaced parallel hatching identifies the

\(^{18}\text{Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 99, figure 85.}\)
shadowed area of the bench behind the Virgin (figure 40). The feathers of Gabriel’s wings are only summarily suggested by loosely drawn lines (figure 39).

The style of the underdrawings in the Brussels Annunciation is not identical to either the underdrawing of Campin’s Mérode Annunciation, or that of Daret’s Arras panels. However, there are aspects of the underdrawing that resemble the styles of each of these artists. The use of hatching to create concave, shadowed areas in drapery folds, like those in the angel’s alb, is a fundamental characteristic of Campin’s underdrawing style (figures 33 and 34). Widely-spaced, parallel hatching is frequently used by Daret to suggest general areas of shadow (figure 31). The problems displayed in the construction of the perspectival space are similar to those noted above in the underdrawing of Daret’s Presentation (figure 32). Also similar to Daret’s underdrawing technique is the short-hand notation of details such as the feathers in Gabriel’s wings.

As a member of Campin’s workshop, Daret may have had a hand in the underdrawing stage of the Brussels picture. If he alone is responsible for the underdrawing, the adherence to characteristics of Campin’s underdrawing style would support the notion that he closely followed a model drawing of the composition made by Campin. Alternatively, Campin himself may have collaborated on, or corrected, Daret’s
underdrawing as it progressed. Finally, we cannot discount the possibility that Daret may not have yet fully developed his own individual underdrawing style.

An examination of a representative X-radiograph of the Brussels *Annunciation* (figure 41) further suggests Daret’s participation in the creation of the picture. In contrast to the smooth, precise underpainting in Campin’s Dijon *Nativity* (figure 26), or his Frankfurt *Virgin and Child* (figure 42), the underpainting in the Brussels picture is coarser and less detailed. Broad strokes of lead-white highlight the Virgin’s forehead, cheek, and neck. A heavy line of white marks the bridge of her nose. Unlike the delicately detailed hands of Campin’s Frankfurt Virgin (figure 42), the hands of the Brussels Virgin are only crudely suggested (figure 41). While the edges of drapery folds are loosely indicated, there is little sense of their three-dimensional volume. In contrast to Campin’s carefully modelled forms, the figures and objects in the Brussels picture appear much flatter in the thin underpainting layer.

If one further compares the X-radiograph of the Brussels *Annunciation* with X-radiographs of Daret’s *Adoration of the Magi* (figure 25), or *Visitation* (figure

\[19\] The X-radiograph of the Brussels Virgin is also illustrated in Stroo and Syfer-d’Olne, *Flemish Primitives I*, 40, figure 8. The image is partially obscured by the pattern of the wood cradle supporting the back of the panel.

\[20\] Also illustrated in Printa, *Genius of Campin*, figure 30.
27), the affinities between their underpainting styles can readily be seen. The underpainting of the Virgin’s face in the Brussels picture is very similar to that of the Virgin in the Visitation panel. The shallow relief of the figures and generally thin application of lead-white are also consistent with Daret’s underpainting technique. As a result of these comparisons, Burroughs’ attribution of the underpainting of the Brussels Annunciation to Daret seems justified.

In addition to the stylistic similarities noted in the underdrawing and underpainting of the Brussels Annunciation, several features of the paint surface also support an attribution to Daret. Along with the awkwardly constructed perspective of the interior space noted above, the location of the figures within that space is not completely successful. Placed on either side of the tilted table top, the angel and the Virgin appear to be situated in the same plane as the table, rather than in front of it. Similarly, the Virgin does not sit convincingly on her cushion in front of the steeply receding bench.

The figure and facial types of Gabriel and the Virgin also find parallels in Daret’s Arras panels. Narrow, with a pointed chin, the angel’s face is similar to that of the woman standing behind the Virgin in the Presentation (figure 4). His nose, like the Virgin’s in the Presentation, is long and straight. With its thin upper lip
and fuller lower lip, the angel's mouth is akin to the mouths of Daret's young women. Again, we see Daret's distinctive treatment of the eyes as reflective, but not translucent, objects.

Although the face of the Brussels Virgin also resembles the face of Daret's Virgin in the Arras panels, the extensive retouching of the abraded paint surface renders unreliable any direct comparison of the two. However, general similarities can be noted in the shape and disposition of her head, her large ear, and the basic forms of her facial features. While the wavy pattern of both figures' hair is more schematic than the hair of the figures in the Arras panels, the technique used to depict it, in which highlight strokes are painted over a base of darker tones, is comparable to Daret's (figure 21).

The figure type of the Brussels Virgin is very similar to the bodies of the women in the Arras panels. Like the central maid in Daret's Presentation (figure 4), her shoulders are narrow and sloping, and her head tilts awkwardly on her rather thick neck. With the exception of her projecting knees, there is little sense of the body beneath her garments. In agreement with its fully modelled underdrawing, the body of the angel is more convincingly volumetric than that of the Virgin. Both figures display Daret's distinctive treatment of hands in their lack of surface details and seemingly "boneless" construction. The
problematic articulation of the Virgin’s right hand may be compared with the gesture of Anna in the Presentation (figure 4).

Unlike the cool, silvery tones in Campin’s Mérode Triptych (figure 11), the colors in the Brussels Annunciation (figure 37) are warmer, and more in keeping with Daret’s palette in the Arras Altarpiece.21 The angel’s greyish-blue alb includes a hint of teal. A darker shade of the same blue is used in the Virgin’s dress. Her mantle is a rich red; the cloth draped over the bench a deep green. In contrast to the brightly colored wings of the angel in Campin’s Mérode Annunciation (figure 11), the wings of the Brussels angel are more subtly depicted in soft shades of grey and teal blue.

The Brussels Annunciation (figure 37) also includes metallic accents not found in the Mérode Triptych (figure 11). As in the Arras panels, excerpts from the "Ave Regina Coelorum" hymn are embroidered on the hem of the Virgin’s mantle in gold. Mordant gilt embroidery also decorates the cuffs of the angel’s alb and stole. In contrast to the naturalistic blue sky painted in the windows

21 Although no samples have been taken to determine the exact nature of the pigments used in the Brussels picture, an approximation of the layer structure has been made from stereomicroscopic examination. See Van Asperen de Boer and Dijkstra, "Technical Aspects," 42.
of the Mérode Annunciation (figure 11), the windows of the Brussels version open onto an archaic "gold" ground of yellow-glazed silver leaf. 22

In this analysis of the Brussels Annunciation (figure 37), the hand of Jacques Daret has been identified in every stage of the picture's creation. Although Daret's participation in the completion of the picture is thus supported by visual analysis, the dating of the Brussels painting remains speculative. While it is true that details in the underdrawing of the Mérode Annunciation (figure 11) correspond to the surface of the Brussels panel, this does not necessarily mean that the Brussels version was completed at a substantially earlier date. 23 Campin and Daret may have worked on their respective versions at the same time, with Campin changing and "improving" the Brussels composition in his own Mérode Annunciation. This possibility is further suggested by the summary treatment of the setting in the underdrawing of Campin's picture. As noted by the Van Asperen de Boer group, unlike the carefully modelled figures, only those architectural details that

22 Ibid., 42. According to William Suhr, "The Restoration of the Mérode Altarpiece," Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin 16 (1957): 144, the same technique was originally used in the windows of the Mérode Annunciation.

23 Recalling Campbell's earlier argument for a separate "Master of the Mérode Triptych", the Van Asperen de Boer group has suggested that the Brussels Annunciation may be the work of an earlier master from whose work the Mérode Annunciation was copied. See Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 113-116.
differ from the Brussels version, such as the oval windows, niche, towel rack, and firescreen, are completely underdrawn in the Mérode picture.\textsuperscript{24}

Regardless of their precise chronology, the inter-relationship of these two pictures suggests that we expand our present conception of workshop practices to include the possibility of master-assistant collaborations, and revise our current notion of the "shop piece" as merely a second-rate work. Yet, even with the help of his teacher, it is doubtful that Daret could have completed the Brussels Annunciation (figure 37) until he had acquired advanced training in the shop. Moreover, it seems unlikely that a workshop assistant would have been given this level of responsibility until he was well established. For these reasons, I would assign the Brussels panel to the period of Daret's official apprenticeship, c.1427-1432.

\textbf{The Hermitage Virgin and Child}

Once joined as a devotional diptych, the Hermitage panels of the Holy Trinity (figure 43), and the Virgin and Child (figure 44), have also been debated in the literature. Tschudi first attributed the two pictures to the "Master of Flémalle" in 1898.\textsuperscript{25} Winkler and Friedländer accepted both

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., 108-116.

\textsuperscript{25}Tschudi, "Der Meister von Flémalle," 116.
panels as the work of the master, while Panofsky believed the Trinity to be a replica of an original by Campin. In their extensive catalog entry, Loewinson-Lessing and Nicouline attributed both paintings to Campin, assigning them to the later part of his career, c.1433-35.

In contrast to the more common attribution of the paintings to Campin, both Liphart and Tolnay saw the panels as the work of the young Roger van der Weyden. In spite of the inconsistencies he observed between the two pictures, Frinta nevertheless attributed both of them to Jacques Daret. Van Gelder also assigned both panels to Daret, noting their stylistic affinity to Campin's work c.1425. While I cannot agree with the attribution of both panels of the Hermitage Diptych to Jacques Daret, I do think the stylistic discrepancies noted by Frinta are worthy of further consideration.

---

26 Winkler, Der Meister von Flémalle, 45; Friedländer, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:72; and Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 172-173.


29 Frinta, Genius of Campin, 65-67. Frinta's assessment was based on his examination of photographs only.

30 J. G. van Gelder, "An Early Work by Robert Campin," Oud Holland 82 (1967): 3. Like Frinta, Van Gelder was working only from photographs.
As no reflectograms have yet been made of the Hermitage panels, a thorough discussion of the underdrawing cannot be undertaken at present. However, some observations can be made from the infrared photographs. 31 A small amount of underdrawing can be detected in the Virgin and Child panel (figure 45), revealing minor shifts in the position of the Virgin's right hand and the Child's left arm. The Virgin's mantle appears transparent under infrared light, but only the main fold lines are indicated by underdrawing. In contrast, in the Trinity panel (figure 46), small areas of cross-hatching can be detected in the folds of God's robe and mantle. Precisely drawn and carefully placed, this cross-hatching is quite similar to the underdrawing of the angel's alb in Campin's Mérode Annunciation. 32

A comparison of the X-radiographs reveals differences in the underpainting styles of the two pictures as well. 33 As one might expect from the pastel tones on the surface of the Trinity (figure 47), a fairly heavy application of lead-white can be seen in the curtains of the baldachin and in Christ's loincloth. The sculpted decorations on the throne

31 The infrared photographs are illustrated in Loewinson-Lessing and Nicouline, Le Musée de l'Ermitage, plates XI and XXV.

32 Illustrated in Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 113, figure 102.

33 Loewinson-Lessing and Nicouline, Le Musée de l'Ermitage, plates XXIII and XXXV.
are carefully and completely underpainted. Characteristic of Campin’s underpainting style (figures 26 and 28), the more thinly underpainted figures emerge gradually from the background as three-dimensional forms. Subtle highlights appear on Christ’s arms, chest and legs, and on the folds of God the Father’s garments. In all areas of the picture, the underpainting is smoothly executed with tiny brushstrokes.

The X-radiograph of the Virgin and Child panel (figure 48) reveals an image of much lower relief than that of the Trinity (figure 47). The edge of the fireplace and the towel are rather thickly underpainted, and the edges of drapery folds are indicated. Similar to the underpainting in Daret’s Arras panels (figures 25 and 27), broad areas of highlights appear on the Child’s forehead, shoulder, and left arm, and on the Virgin’s forehead, nose and chin. The shape of the her head is rounder than its final appearance and her feet are not clearly underpainted. The sculpted figure on the fireplace is only crudely suggested. Unlike the meticulous underpainting in the Trinity panel (figure 47), the brushstrokes in the Virgin and Child (figure 48) are looser and less refined.

In addition to the differences noted in their preparatory layers, the two panels of the Hermitage Diptych display significant disparities in their painted surfaces as well. At first glance, the viewer is immediately struck by the difference in the colors of the two pictures. The
Trinity panel (figure 43) is painted in Campin’s characteristically cool palette. God the Father, wearing a blue mantle over his red robe, is enthroned beneath a pale, bluish-white baldachin. His light tan throne floats in an undefined space set against a green-flecked, black background. To His right, He supports the body of the dead Christ, who displays the wound in His side while the white dove of the Holy Spirit hovers just above His left shoulder. The same basic red, blue and white color scheme also appears in the Virgin and Child panel (figure 44). Although cooler than those in the Arras panels, the specific hues are warmer and more saturated than those of the Trinity (figure 43). The Virgin’s robe is a deep greenish-blue, and her mantle is a brighter, richer red than the robe of God the Father.  

Her hair is an unusual coppery-blond.

The Hermitage panels are most dissimilar in their representations of the figures. In the Trinity (figure 43), the figure of God the Father sits solidly on His throne. His knees are clearly highlighted beneath the heavy folds of His garments; His white shoes extend logically from the hem

---

34 The differential opacity of the blues seen in the infrared photographs indicates either a difference in pigment or a difference in paint thickness. With its gritty surface, the Virgin’s robe was probably painted by layering ultramarine blue over less expensive and more coarsely textured azurite. In contrast, the smoother, more thinly glazed mantle of God the Father suggests pure ultramarine applied directly over the lead-white underpainting. As azurite also has a greener hue than ultramarine, this may also account for the warmer tonality of the Virgin’s robe. See Roy, ed., Artists’ Pigments, 23-66.
of His robe. In facial type, He is very like Campin’s typical elderly men, such as Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus in the Seilern Entombment (figure 18), or Joseph in the Dijon Nativity (figure 13). The wrinkles in His face are precisely indicated by unblended strokes of light and dark paint, and his long, wavy beard is created through the complex layering of several pigment shades. His eyes are convincingly painted as moist, translucent spheres.

The Christ is also consistent with Campin’s figure style, as a comparison with the Frankfurt Trinity (figure 7) or Bad Thief fragment (figure 8) demonstrates. His body is carefully modelled to reveal its underlying structure. The musculature is well defined; veins and tendons are indicated in the neck, legs, arms and hands. The skin of His chest yields naturalistically beneath the pressure of His right hand as He displays the wound in His side.

If we compare the figures in the Virgin and Child panel (figure 44), with those in the Holy Trinity (figure 43), a rather different approach can be seen. Like the seated Virgin in Daret’s Adoration of the Magi (figure 3), the figure of the Hermitage Virgin is not convincingly three-dimensional. Her shoulders are narrow and sloping, and her knees are hard to locate beneath the crumpled folds of her fur-lined robe. Since she is seated on two cushions on the floor, the Virgin’s pose is difficult to understand. While her head and shoulders are nearly frontal, the
position of the Child suggests that her undefined lap is to be seen in three-quarter view. Her pose is further complicated by the position of her feet, which extend in profile from the hem of her robe at left.\textsuperscript{35} While the graceful pose of the Virgin's right hand is comparable to Elizabeth's left hand in the \textit{Visitation} (figure 1), her left hand bends awkwardly at the wrist like the hands of the Brussels Virgin (figure 37) and Anna in the \textit{Presentation} (figure 4).

In basic type, the Hermitage Virgin resembles Campin's Aix Virgin in Glory (figure 16). However, with her thick neck, larger mouth, and full lower lip, she also recalls the central maid in Daret's \textit{Presentation} panel (figure 4). While the hairstyles of these three women are the same, the technique used to paint them is not. Unlike the complex intermingling of colors in the Aix Virgin's hair (figure 22), the hair of the Hermitage Virgin is more simply represented by coppery highlight strokes painted over a field of reddish-brown. The same technique for the depiction of hair is found in the Arras panels (figure 21) and the Brussels \textit{Annunciation} (figure 37).

A similar comparison can be made between the figures of the Christ Child in the Aix and Hermitage panels (figures 16 and 44). In the \textit{Virgin in Glory} (figure 16), the

\textsuperscript{35}The Virgin's feet appear to have been added in the final paint layer since they are not clearly visible in the X-radiograph.
infant's body is carefully modelled in His active pose. Naturalistic folds of skin accentuate the roundness of the abdomen and the articulation of the joints. As with the figure of the adult Christ in the Holy Trinity (figure 43), the skin of the Aix Child's chest responds to the gentle pressure of His mother's fingers. The body of the Christ Child in the Hermitage Virgin and Child (figure 44) looks rather bloated by comparison. Although larger and more robust than the Christ Child in the Arras panels (figure 2-4), as is characteristic for Darets' Infants, His head is not convincingly supported by a neck, and there is little concern for either the underlying structure of the body or its surface detail. Unlike the carefully modulated eyes of God the Father in the Trinity (figure 43), the eyes of the Christ Child have the flat, staring quality often found in Darets' faces (figure 35).

From the physical evidence of hinges and a closure mechanism, there is no doubt that the two Hermitage panels once formed a diptych.36 Although the original frames have been altered, the dimensions of the panels and their painted surfaces are identical.37 Moreover, the similarity in the woodgrain of the two panels suggests that they were made

36Loewinson-Lessing and Nicouline, Le Musée de l'Ermitage, 6-7.
37Ibid., 5.
from the same plank. While this strongly suggests that the two panels were always intended to form a diptych, it cannot confirm that the two halves were completed at the same time, or that they were both painted by the same artist.

With its close stylistic affinities to other accepted works by Campin, I am confident in accepting the Hermitage Holy Trinity (figure 43) as the work of that master. In addition to the paint surface, the style of the underdrawing and underpainting also supports an attribution to Campin. The facial types of God and Christ, and the precise modelling of their features suggest a date for the panel in the 1420s. This dating is further suggested by the broad, angular drapery folds, comparable to the style of the drapery in the Frankfurt Virgin and Child (figure 5), or in the Frankfurt Trinity (figure 7).

In contrast to the Holy Trinity (figure 43), I would propose that the Hermitage Virgin and Child (figure 44) was painted by Jacques Daret rather than Robert Campin. Although the underdrawings cannot be thoroughly studied at this time, the X-radiographs display an underpainting technique which is consistent with that found in the Arras panels (figures 25 and 27), and in the figure of the Virgin in the Brussels Annunciation (figure 41). An attribution to Daret is further supported by the surface of the picture.

38 Ibid., 6.
With its warmer palette and distinctive figure style, the Virgin and Child (figure 44) seems more closely allied with the Brussels's Annunciation (figure 37) and the Arras panels (figures 1-4) than with the works of Campin.

Since we know that the Virgin and Child (figure 44) was intended to form a diptych with Campin's Holy Trinity (figure 43), it is likely that Daret painted the panel according to the design, and under the close supervision of his master. Yet, the precise depiction of the shuttered window with its illusionistic view of the city beyond, would suggest that Campin may have participated directly in the completion of the panel.39 Although the basic type of the Hermitage Virgin resembles Campin's Aix Virgin in Glory (figure 16), due to the crumpled drapery style and awkwardly steep perspective of the setting, a dating closer to that of the Brussels Annunciation, perhaps c.1425-27, would seem plausible.

39 The window in the Hermitage panel may be compared with the windows in Campin's Mérode Triptych (figure 11), the Virgin and Child before a Firescreen (figure 12), or the St. Barbara (figure 15).
The Prado Betrothal of the Virgin

In contrast to the much debated Brussels Annunciation (figure 37), the Prado Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49) is almost always attributed to Campin in the literature. Friedländer accepted it as the work of Campin, proposing that it may have formed a diptych with the Prado Annunciation (figure 51). Panofsky placed it within Campin's oeuvre between the Seilern Entombment Triptych (figure 18) and the Dijon Nativity (figure 13). Noting the Rogerian influences in some of the figures, Châtelet dated the picture to c.1426-32. Frinta did not accept it as an early work by Campin but believed it to be the work of a later artist who copied freely from him. Citing the lack of unity in the composition, Fischel also rejected an attribution to Campin and assigned the panel to a Brussels painter, c.1440-1450.

---

40 Friedländer, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:70. The two paintings have been linked since their entry into the Escorial in the sixteenth century. Both pictures entered the Prado in 1839. See Davies, Roger van der Weyden, 256.

41 Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 1:160-161.


43 Frinta, Genius of Campin, 61-64.

The Prado panel depicts two scenes from the lives of the Virgin and St. Joseph (figure 49). At left, the Miracle of the Flowering Rod takes place in a Romanesque style temple. This event is followed in the right half of the picture by the Marriage of the Virgin and Joseph beneath the portal of a Gothic church whose construction is not yet complete. On the reverse of the panel, the figures of St. James and St. Clare are painted en grisaille (figure 50). The reflectograms of the Betrothal display a wide variety of underdrawing techniques. In some of the figures, areas of shadow are briefly suggested with short, widely spaced lines, while the garments of others are softly modelled with cross-hatched or parallel lines. Slight shifts are detectable in the contour lines of many of the hands and faces. The many changes in the underdrawing of the buttresses and steps suggest the artist's difficulty in depicting their perspective accurately. The dome of the Temple was originally broader, and the spandrel reliefs were underdrawn larger, and in a lower position. The capitals are not underdrawn.

45 For the complex iconography of the panel, see Graham Smith, "The Betrothal of the Virgin by the Master of Flémalle," Pantheon 30 (1972): 115-132. The subject will be discussed further in chapter 6.

46 I thank Dr. Rocio Arnaez of the Prado Museum for allowing me to study the infrared reflectograms and X-radiographs of both the Betrothal of the Virgin and the Annunciation. Examples of the reflectograms of the Betrothal panel are illustrated in Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 88-96, figures 66-73.
The underdrawing of the figures of St. James and St. Clare is completely different in style. Executed with a broader brush, the figures and their shallow niches are fully and rapidly underdrawn. Loose, freely drawn lines indicate facial features, hair, and principal fold lines. Hollows and shadows are defined with long cross-hatching and curved, parallel lines. While slight changes are detectable in the faces of the figures, more substantial adjustments can be seen in the columns and their bases. The divergent underdrawing styles of the two sides of the panel suggest the hands of two different artists. In neither case, however, are the underdrawings completely analogous to those known by Campin or Daret.

Because both sides of the Prado panel are painted, the X-radiographs are very difficult to decipher. In general, the figures appear to be more thinly underpainted than the architecture. Throughout the composition, lead-white is smoothly and carefully applied. In contrast to what one might expect from the underdrawing, the grisaille figures on the reverse of the panel are also quite smoothly and evenly underpainted.

---


48 Examples of the X-radiographs of the Betrothal panel are illustrated in Frinta, Genius of Campin, figures 62 and 63.
Although the colors are somewhat obscured by darkened varnish, the Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49) is quite decoratively painted. The Virgin’s robe and mantle are a deep blue, while Joseph is dressed in a dark purple robe and blue cowl. The High Priest’s robe is an unusual shade of turquoise, with purplish shadows. Along with its flowery palette, the Prado picture also reflects Daret’s preference for richly ornamented costumes. The garments of several of the figures are heavily encrusted with jeweled borders. The Virgin wears a gilded crown of fleurs de lis. Mordant gilding decorates the hem and cuffs of her mantle, as well as the High Priest’s robe and stole. The medallion on his miter is painted in the same Schwartzlotzeichnung (black lead drawing) technique used by Daret for the gifts of the Magi and the abbot’s crozier in the Arras panels (figures 1 and 3). 49

In basic type, the figures in the Prado Betrothal (figure 49) can be related to the circle of Campin. Although her elaborate crown recalls those of Jan van Eyck’s Madonnas, the face and figure of the Prado Virgin are quite Campinesque. 50 The figures of Joseph and the young attendant standing in front of the Virgin are more Rogerian

49 See above, 70.

50 Compare, for example, Van Eyck’s Madonna in a Church, or Madonna of Chancellor Rolin, illustrated in Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:figures 236 and 244.
in style. But, with her richly decorated costume and long braid, the woman depicted with her back to the viewer is more closely related to the maid at the right edge of Dare's *Presentation* (figure 4). In contrast to the main figures, the coarse features and animated expressions of the onlookers suggest a source other than the "Campin Group". Even the most humble of Campin’s figures (figure 23) reflect a degree of dignity which is substantially higher than the one displayed by these common folk.

The Prado picture has often been cited as the source for Dare's Temple in the *Presentation* (figure 4). Indeed, the awkward perspective of the two structures, in which the receding floors and vaults are visible at the same time, is quite similar. The buildings in both pictures are richly decorated with sculptural details that are painted in a thick, creamy impasto (figure 51). In conception and technique, the stained-glass windows of the Prado Temple are virtually identical to the windows in Dare's *Presentation* (figure 21).

---

51 The figure of Joseph may be compared with his counterpart in Roger’s *Miraflores Altarpiece*, illustrated in Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, 2:figure 319; the proportions and elegant pose of the acolyte are similar to the figure of St. Michael in Roger’s *Last Judgement*, Ibid., 2:figure 327.

The presence of the grisaille figures of St. James and St. Clare (figure 50) on the reverse of the Betrothal panel (figure 49) suggests that it originally functioned as a wing for a folding altarpiece.\(^5\) This idea is further supported by the repetition of the Betrothal composition in a sixteenth-century panel made for the Church of St. Catherine in Hoogstraten (figure 52). Depicting several scenes from the Life of St. Joseph, the two events shown in the Prado panel are featured in the left third of the Hoogstraten picture.\(^5\)

With its seeming dependence on the works of Campin, Roger, and Daret, I find it difficult to accept a direct attribution of the Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49) to Campin. Moreover, the ambitious depiction of the perspectival space suggests a later date, perhaps in the 1450s. If this is the case, it would seem that the Prado picture was influenced by Daret’s Presentation in the Temple.

\(^5\) Dating it to c.1415-20, Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, 1:161, believed the Prado panel to be the earliest example of an altarpiece shutter that was completely painted. The Van Asperen de Boer group proposed that the panel was originally affixed to a wall, and that the grisaille figures were added to the back of the Betrothal c.1450, when it was redesigned for use as a free-standing altarpiece. See Van Asperen de Boer, *Underdrawing*, 90.

\(^5\) The oblique perspective of the architecture at the left and right sides of the Hoogstraten picture further suggests that it was copied from a triptych with movable wings. There is, however, no trace of paint on the reverse of the panel. For the history of the Life of St. Joseph, see Roeland de Ceulaer, *De Sint-Catharinakerk te Hoogstraten* (Gent: Snoeck-Ducaju and Sons, 1988), 168-169.
(figure 4) rather than the reverse. I would propose, therefore, that the Prado Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49) be assigned to a workshop assistant of Daret, working under his direction. Furthermore, due to the similarity in the painting technique of the Temple buildings, and the identical treatment of the stained-glass windows, Daret's direct participation in the completion of the Prado picture cannot be discounted.

The Prado Annunciation

Although it is often discussed in connection with the Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49), the Prado Annunciation (figure 53) is not generally accepted as the work of Campin.55 While Frinta believed it to be a copy after a lost Campin original, Panofsky called it a pastiche.56 Davies denied an attribution to Campin on the basis of the inferior quality of the execution.57 Like the Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49), Fischel assigned the panel to a

55 Both panels are 76.5 cm in height. The Annunciation has been trimmed along the right edge to a width of 70 cm. The Betrothal of the Virgin is 88 cm wide.

56 Frinta, Genius of Campin, 116-117; Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 1:175.

57 Davies, Rogier van der Weyden, 256.
Brussels painter of the mid-fifteenth century.\(^{58}\) Both Van Gelder and Châtelet attributed it to Jacques Daret.\(^{59}\)

Unlike most fifteenth-century Flemish depictions of the subject which take place in bourgeois domestic settings, the Prado Annunciation (figure 53) is set in a church. While this may reflect the wishes of the patron, it may also indicate a specific geographical origin for the picture.\(^{60}\) It has been proposed that, along with the Prado Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49), the Annunciation (figure 53) may have been part of a larger altarpiece ensemble.\(^{61}\)

Unfortunately, because the panel has been planed, no traces of paint can be detected on the reverse.

The available scientific data on the Prado Annunciation (figure 53) is not conclusive enough to support an attribution of the picture to Jacques Daret.\(^{62}\) The X-

\(^{58}\)Fischel, "Die Vermählung Maria," 3-18.


\(^{60}\)With its origins in Parisian miniatures of the late fourteenth century, the Annunciation taking place in an ecclesiastical setting is more often found in French, rather than Flemish paintings in the fifteenth century. See David M. Robb, "The Iconography of the Annunciation in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," The Art Bulletin, 18 (1936): 495-500, 517.

\(^{61}\)For the painting's possible origins in a larger ensemble, see Friedländer, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2: 70; and Davies, Roger van der Weyden, 256.

\(^{62}\)My discussion is based on first-hand examination of the reflectograms and X-radiographs. None of the scientific documents have been published.
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radiographs are obscured by the woodgrain of the panel and surface irregularities resulting from the planing of the picture. The underpainting is extremely thin and many of the details are difficult to discern. As in the Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49), the figures are thinly underpainted, while the details of the architecture are indicated with a more heavily loaded brush. Because no underdrawing is detectable in the infrared reflectograms, comparisons cannot be made to the underdrawing styles of either Campin or Daret. ⁶³

In contrast to the underlayers of the picture, the surface of the Annunciation (figure 53) suggests close affinities to the work of Daret. The palette is warmer than Campin's; the angel's cope is an orangish-red and the Virgin's robe is deep blue. ⁶⁴ Mordant gilding decorates the hems of their garments and gilded rays of divine light emanate from God the Father and from the head of the Virgin. The details of the angel's gilded morse are painted in the same technique as the medallion on the High Priest's miter in the Betrothal panel (figure 49).

⁶³Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 125.

⁶⁴Like those of the Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49), the colors of the Annunciation are somewhat darkened by old varnish.
While the Virgin is clearly derived from Campin's Mérode Triptych (figure 11), the angel more closely resembles Daret's female types (figures 1-4), and the figure of Gabriel in the Brussels Annunciation (figure 37). His face is narrow, and his nose is long and straight. His eyes are heavy-lidded; his chin is small and round. Although, as is characteristic of Daret's figures, his body is largely hidden beneath his heavy vestments, his pose echoes that of the angel in the Brussels panel. Like the wings of the angel in the Brussels Annunciation (figure 37), the wings of the Prado angel are naturalistically painted in soft shades of grey and blue.

Most distinctive is the depiction of the architecture. Although the spatial recession of the Virgin's chamber is rather sophisticated, its relationship to the rest of the structure is unclear. Similar to the spatial construction in the Brussels Annunciation (figure 37), a view is provided into an adjoining space whose perspective appears to be more accurate than that of the main room. In the heavy impasto of its sculptural details, the church is painted in a manner that is quite similar to the Temple in Daret's Presentation (figure 4). The windows are gilded and painted in pastel tones to suggest transmitted light through stained-glass, but, as in the windows of Daret's Temple, the effect is not

---

65 The damaged lower portion of the Virgin's face and neck have been repainted.
completely successful. The unusual tracery crenellations, as well as the odd mixture of secular and ecclesiastical architectural elements, can also be found in the abbey buildings in the left background of Daret’s *Visitation* (figure 59).

I am hesitant to attribute the Prado *Annunciation* (figure 53) to Jacques Daret. However, it seems clear that the artist responsible for the panel was quite familiar with both his compositions and working method. On the basis of the similarity of the angel to Daret’s figures, and of the painting technique of the architecture, I am inclined to see the Prado *Annunciation* (figure 53) as the product Daret’s workshop. If so, Campin’s figure of the reading Virgin could have been known through model drawings. Because the perspectival recession of the architecture is rather advanced, I would date the picture to the 1450s.

Both the *Annunciation* (figure 53) and the *Betrothal of the Virgin* (figure 49) can, therefore, be understood as the work of Daret assistants. However, the stylistic variations between the two pictures would suggest that they were executed by two different individuals. As in the *Betrothal of the Virgin* (figure 49), the technique of the architectural decorations and stained-glass windows suggests that Daret’s own participation in the *Annunciation* (figure 53) cannot be ruled out.
The Berlin Madonna on a Grassy Bench

Among the paintings whose proposed attribution to Jacques Daret I find difficult to accept is the Madonna on a Grassy Bench in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin (figure 54). While Friedländer and Davies accepted it as an early work by Campin, Panofsky recognized it only as "shopwork". Van Gelder and Frinta identified Daret as the shop assistant responsible for the panel, and dated it to the 1420s.

Since it is displayed in the same room as the Visitation (figure 1) and the Adoration of the Magi (figure 3), a direct comparison can easily be made between the Madonna on a Grassy Bench (figure 21) and Daret's panels. One is immediately struck by the contrast between Daret's slender figure types and the greater solidity of the Virgin in this small panel. Her knees are clearly indicated beneath the heavy fabric of her mantle which falls in deep, angular folds on the ground around her. With its grassy setting and green and gold cloth of honor, the palette of the Berlin Madonna is dominated by a deep green color, quite different from the bright yellowish-green of the landscapes in Daret's paintings. The Virgin's dress is blue; her mantle is rose-red.

---

66 Friedländer, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:70; Davies, Rogier van der Weyden, 243-244; and Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 1:160.

67 Van Gelder, "An Early Work," 3; Frinta Genius of Campin, 120.
The Berlin Madonna (figure 54) is most closely related to Campin’s Seilern Entombment Triptych (figure 18). The angular style of her drapery is comparable to that of the two women seen from behind in the central panel. Her oval face, straight nose, and pointed chin, are strikingly similar to those of the flying angels in the center Entombment panel, as is the treatment of her hair with its regularized pattern of waves and complex, layered colors. The technique used to create her gilded halo and brocade cloth of honor is virtually identical to that used in the Cleveland St. John the Baptist (figure 19).

An attribution of the Berlin Madonna on a Grassy Bench (figure 54) to Campin is further supported by an examination of the reflectograms in which underdrawing is detectable in the figures alone.68 Along with several adjustments in the positions of their heads and hands, the Virgin’s robe and mantle are completely underdrawn. The edges of fold lines are firmly indicated and careful hatching is used to define volumes in a style that is similar to the underdrawing in the Frankfurt Virgin and Child (figure 33).

---

68 Illustrated in Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, 76-78, figures 48 and 49.
In light of the existing data, I find the attribution of the Berlin Madonna on a Grassy Bench (figure 54) to Campin completely acceptable.\textsuperscript{69} With its close stylistic affinities to the Seilern Entombment Triptych (figure 18), a dating c.1415-20, would seem appropriate.

The London Virgin and Child in an Interior

The most recent addition to the "Campin Group" is the Virgin and Child in an Interior (figure 55). Since its acquisition by the National Gallery in 1986, this tiny panel has generally been recognized as a work of Robert Campin.\textsuperscript{70} However, noting a similarity between the facial type of the London Virgin and the Virgin in the Arras panels, Campbell has instead argued for an attribution of the picture to Jacques Daret.\textsuperscript{71}

Because no infrared reflectograms are available, any underdrawings in the picture cannot be discussed at present. However, the meticulous underpainting revealed in the X-radiograph bears little resemblance to Daret's looser and

\textsuperscript{69}No X-radiographs are available to confirm Campin's style in the underpainting.


\textsuperscript{71}Campbell's opinion was expressed at the Robert Campin Symposium which was held at the National Gallery, London in March, 1993.
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less refined underpainting style.\textsuperscript{72} The figures are modelled into fully three-dimensional forms, and the smallest details of the interior setting are carefully underpainted. The brushstrokes are tiny and the lead-white is smoothly applied.

A careful examination of the paint surface further supports an attribution to Campin. Painted in the familiar blue, red, and white color scheme, the hues are consistent with Campin’s characteristically cool, silvery palette. Like the Virgin in the Mérode Annunciation (figure 11), the structure of the London Virgin’s body is clearly indicated beneath the heavy folds of her robe. In His slender proportions and alert expression, the Christ Child is strikingly similar to the Child in Campin’s Virgin and Child before a Firescreen (figure 12).

Along with the convincing volume of the figures, the specific details and textures of skin, hair, fabrics, wood, and metal are carefully depicted. Like the fire in Campin’s St. Barbara (figure 15), the fire in the London panel radiates a warm, glowing light that is reflected off the wall, floor, and lintel of the hearth. Mixing with the natural light from the open window and the candle on the mantle, the firelight casts complex shadows like those in the Mérode Annunciation (figure 11).

\textsuperscript{72}The X-radiograph is illustrated in Smith and Wyld, "Campin’s Virgin and Child," 571, figure 3.
Although it may be argued that the gilded radiances emanating from the heads of the Virgin and Child are more characteristic for Daret’s paintings, they are not completely foreign to Campin’s work. With her long face and rather prominent nose, the Virgin does resemble the women in Daret’s Arras panels. However, all other aspects of the panel seem too strongly allied with Campin’s style to convincingly support an attribution to Daret.

The Washington Virgin and Child with Saints

The authorship of the large Virgin and Child with Saints (figure 56) in The National Gallery of Art, Washington has also been debated. While Friedländer and Stange believed it to be the work of Campin alone, Seymour allowed for the participation of workshop assistants. Noting its dependence on both Campinesque and Rogerian

---

73 Compare, for example, the radiances around the Christ Child in the Dijon Nativity (figure 13), or around the head of the Virgin in the Aix Virgin in Glory (figure 16).

sources, Hand and Wolff ascribed the panel to a mid-century follower of Campin.\textsuperscript{75} Frinta, Van Gelder, and Châtelet identified that follower as Jacques Daret.\textsuperscript{76}

An examination of the reflectograms of the Washington panel reveals an underdrawing style unlike that of either Campin or Daret.\textsuperscript{77} Underdrawn with a brush, the lines are predominantly thick and very freely executed. Many changes are evident in the position of the figures' heads and facial features.\textsuperscript{78} Details, such as hair or drapery folds, are only summarily suggested; rarely do they correspond to the finished surface of the picture. Short, widely spaced hatching is detectable in general areas of shadow.

Like the underdrawing, the underpainting of the Virgin and Child with Saints bears little resemblance to the underpainting styles of either Campin or Daret. The panel is very thinly underpainted and the specific details of the


\textsuperscript{77}I thank Dr. John Hand of the National Gallery of Art for making both the reflectograms and X-radiographs of the picture available to me. A representative example of the underdrawing is illustrated in Hand and Wolff, \textit{Early Netherlandish Painting}, 36, figure 2.

\textsuperscript{78}The reflectograms show that the attendant saints were originally intended to have circular haloes. The haloes were removed during a subsequent stage in the painting process. Ibid., 35.
figures or setting are difficult to discern. In no area of the underpainting is Daret’s distinctively coarse brushwork detectable.

Like its underpainting and underdrawing, the surface of the panel supports an attribution to neither Campin nor Daret. With the exception of St. Catherine’s light pink mantle, the colors are rather dry. They are not consistent with Campin’s silvery, cool palette, nor are they the decoratively florid hues used by Daret in the Arras panels. Most unusual is the green-brown couleur changeant effect displayed in the robe of St. John the Baptist.

The artist responsible for the Washington Virgin and Child with Saints (figure 56) was clearly familiar with the work of both Campin and Roger van der Weyden. The pose of St. John the Baptist is derived from the figures of the Baptist in the left wing of Campin’s Werl Altarpiece (figure 14) and Roger’s Medici Madonna, while St. Catherine appears to be copied after Roger’s Reading Magdalen.\(^{79}\) The figures of the Virgin and Christ Child can be traced to the Louvre drawing of the Virgin and Child with Saints and Donors, attributed to the circle of Campin.\(^{80}\) Even the yellow flower in the foreground is copied from Campin’s Frankfurt Virgin and Child (figure 5).

\(^{79}\) For Roger’s Medici Madonna and Reading Magdalen, see Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting 2:figures 332 and 316.

\(^{80}\) Ibid., 2:figure 231.
Along with the many borrowings from the works of Campin and Roger, the additive nature of the composition further suggests that the Washington picture may be considered a pastiche. As noted by Wolff, the figures fit together like pieces of a puzzle, rather than overlapping or successfully interacting with one another.\(^{81}\) With respect to the present study, I am comfortable in accepting the Washington Virgin and Child with Saints (figure 56) as the work of a follower of Campin other than Jacques Daret.

The Adoration of the Christ Child

Finally, in 1995, the Adoration of the Christ Child, now in a German private collection (figure 57), was attributed to Jacques Daret by De Vrij.\(^{82}\) Although I have not yet had the opportunity to see this painting first-hand, from my examination of photographs, I find this attribution difficult to accept.

In general terms, the Adoration of the Child (figure 57) may be compared with Daret’s Nativity (figure 2). The event is depicted with a minimum of figures, set close to the picture plane. The placement of the Virgin and Child is similar to that in Daret’s composition, as are the gilded

\(^{81}\)Hand and Wolff, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, 38.

radiances that emanate from them. A variety of birds is perched on the thatched roof of the stable, and a rough-hewn tree trunk supports one corner of the structure. As in Daret's panel, Joseph holds a candle in his right hand.

While these elements of the composition may have been derived from Daret's Nativity (figure 2), other features indicate that the artist was familiar with the work of other fifteenth-century Netherlandish painters as well. Both the pose of the Virgin and Joseph's facial expression find their origins in Roger van der Weyden's Miraflores Altarpiece. 83 The stable, in form and placement, is nearly identical to the shed in Petrus Christus' New York Nativity, 84 while the inclusion of the shepherds at right seems to be derived from his Nativity in Washington. 85 Although present in Daret's Nativity (figure 2), Joseph's candle can ultimately be traced to Campin's Dijon Nativity (figure 13).

Stylistically, the figures are not in keeping with Daret's figures in the Arras panels. The head of the Virgin is much smaller and rounder than the heads of Daret's Virgin, and her hair is more schematically painted. Tiny and ill-proportioned, the body of the Christ Child bears little resemblance to its sturdier counterpart in the Arras

---

83 Illustrated in Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:figure 319.
84 Ibid., 2:figure 411.
85 Ibid., 2:figure 402.
**Nativity** (figure 2). In the aggressive modelling of their faces and the fussy, angular folds of their drapery, these extremely humble figures bear a strong resemblance to examples found in German painting of the mid-fifteenth century. In this context, the seemingly archaic gold-ground can be better understood. 86

Although the **Adoration of the Child** (figure 57) is clearly based on Netherlandish sources, any direct connection to Daret or his workshop seems unlikely. In contrast, I would assign this panel to a Westphalian painter active in the 1450s. 87

* * * * *

Although the four surviving panels from the **Arras Altarpiece** are the only documented works of Jacques Daret, the analyses presented in this chapter demonstrate that other paintings in the "Campin Group" can be associated with him as well. In addition to his probable authorship of the **Berlin Portrait of a Young Man** (figure 35), the Brussels **Annunciation** (figure 37), and the Hermitage **Virgin and Child**

---

86 The **Nativity** c.1457 by the Westphalian painter Johann Koerbecke is a particularly close example. See Alfred Stange, *Deutsche Spätgotische Malerei 1430-1500* (Königstein im Taunus: Langewiesche, 1965), 5-9, 29.

Daret’s design influence can also be found in the Prado panels of the *Annunciation* (figure 53) and the *Betrothal of the Virgin* (figure 49). While the remainder of the paintings would seem to be the work of Robert Campin or other followers, these Daret attributions not only help us to better understand the breadth of his career, but also allow us to expand his oeuvre beyond the Arras panels.
CHAPTER 5
THE ARRAS ALTARPIECE, c.1434-35

Introduction

In this chapter, Jacques Daret's first altarpiece for the Abbey of St. Vaast will be considered. Along with the historical context of the commission, the initial placement and usage of the retable in the abbey church will be discussed. Through an analysis of documentary evidence and eyewitness descriptions, a theoretical reconstruction of the original appearance of the altarpiece will be proposed.

Following the discussion of the retable's original form and function, the iconographic program of the ensemble will be summarized and an additional interpretation, based on unusual features found in two of the exterior paintings, will be advanced. The chapter concludes with a few thoughts on the historical significance of the Arras Altarpiece in relation to other devotional works of the fourteenth- and fifteenth-centuries.
The commission in its historical context

Begun in 1259 and consecrated in 1298, the Church of St. Vaast was still unfinished when Jean du Clercq became abbot in 1429 (figure 58).¹ At the east end, only the chevet and transept were complete. Around the chancel, the ambulatory was surrounded by nine chapels. The axial chapel (figure 58, d), which was dedicated to the Virgin Mary, was flanked by three polygonal chapels on either side. One additional square chapel on each of the north and south sides completed the chevet.

West of the transept, only the first bay of the nave was complete. At the second bay, a temporary wall separated the chevet and transept from the rest of the unfinished church. A single bell tower, dating to the eleventh century, stood on the site of the west façade. Between the transept and the tower, the remaining eight piers of the nave were built just to the height of the springers. Only the foundations of the aisles and side chapels were in place.

Immediately following his election, Du Clercq initiated a campaign to complete, restore and embellish the abbey church that would occupy him for the rest of his life.² He began with the Chapel of Notre Dame which, although structurally complete, was yet undecorated (figure 58, d). Having chosen the Lady Chapel as his burial place, Du Clercq’s first commission was for the construction of his own funerary monument. Along with an inscribed paving stone, the abbot’s tomb included a sculpted epitaph that was installed in the wall of the chapel on the south side of the altar table.³ The mason Baudin Le Veel constructed a stone monument with five arched niches for which the sculptor Collard de Hordain carved stone figures of the kneeling abbot, St. John the Evangelist, St. John the Baptist, St. Benedict, and St. Vaast. Jacques Daret completed the monument by painting and gilding the figures along with their architectural niches.⁴

²Between 1429 and 1462, Du Clercq spent more than 20,000 livres from his personal discretionary funds on the completion and decoration of the abbey church. Loriquet, "Journal des travaux," 61.

³Eyewitness descriptions of Du Clercq’s tomb can be found in Taverne, Paix d’Arras, ed. Collart, 179-181; and Pronier, "Recoeur des antiquitez," 533. The inscription is recorded in Loisne and Rodière, Épigraphe du Pas-de-Calais, 7:463-464, item 1180.

⁴Payments for the project are recorded in Loriquet, "Journal des travaux," 70-71, items 5-8. According to a pre-determined contract, Daret received an allotment of wine and eight measures of wheat in addition to a cash payment of 84 livres.
When his funerary monument was finished, the abbot turned his attention to the decoration of the altar (figure 58, e). Again, Collard de Hordain was employed to carve a cabinet with folding wings for an altarpiece in wood.\(^5\) Like Du Clercq's epitaph, the cabinet contained a series of architectural niches, each topped with a tabernacle and decorated with flying buttresses (arboutères). The niches were intended to house a group of alabaster figures, representing the twelve Apostles and a Coronation of the Virgin, that Du Clercq had purchased from a German merchant in May of 1432.\(^6\)

Daret's contributions to the completion of the altarpiece are recorded in three undated entries in Du Clercq's account book.\(^7\) In the first, (item 10), he was paid 85 livres, 8 sous for having painted both the interior and exterior of all the wings (tous les foeullés) of the retable in fine gold, fine azure, and other fine colors. In addition to the wings, this sum included payment for a panel located below and in front of the altar table (desoubz audevant dudict autel), that probably functioned as an antependium. Although the subject of the antependium is not

\(^5\)Ibid., 71, item 9.

\(^6\)Ibid., 69, item 3. Since the number of figures is stated as fourteen, Loriquet proposed that the Coronation group comprised figures of the Virgin and Christ only.

\(^7\)Ibid., 71-72, items 10-12. For the full text of these entries, see appendix B.
specified, the phrase "aussy pareillement" suggests that it was painted in full color with gilded accents like the wings.

The second entry (item 11) records Darets' receipt of 82 livres, 11 sous for painting and gilding the interior and exterior of the altarpiece cabinet, and for embellishing the interior sculpture. The architectural members were gilded and the backgrounds of the niches were painted and gilded with various colors to imitate cloth-of-gold. The vaults under the tabernacles were painted blue and sprinkled with gold stars. The faces of the alabaster figures were naturalistically colored; their hair and beards were gilded.

The final entry (item 12) records Darets' payment for having painted a set of protective coverings (custodes) for the new altarpiece. The sum of 10 livres, 16 sous included the cost of the linen, ribbons and tacks from which they were made. The exact form of these custodes is not specified in the documents. However, the use of ribbons and tacks in their construction suggests that the linen was stretched on a wooden framework to create a protective panel.

---

8 Loriquet, "Journal des Travaux," 72, note 2, identified the custodes as the altarpiece wings. Hulin, "An Authentic Work," 207, interpreted them as curtains which were drawn over the closed altarpiece. Vines, "The Arras Altarpiece," 37, confused them with the taffeta curtains that surrounded the altar table.
rather than hung over the altarpiece like curtains. While the low payment for the custodes may simply reflect the inferior value of paintings on cloth, it may also indicate, as Lestocquoy proposed, that the custodes were painted *en grisaille.*

* * * * *

In the summer of 1435, the Abbey of St. Vaast was the site of the peace negotiations that took place between Charles VII of France, the Duke of Burgundy Philip the Good, and Henry V of England. Antoine de la Taverne’s daily account of this congress, the *Journal de la Paix d’Arras,* contains the earliest mention of the *Arras Altarpiece* following its completion and installation on the altar table of the Lady Chapel.

---

*Although this type of protective fabric panel was more commonly used for organs, a few examples from altarpieces have also survived. For this technique, see Diane Wolfthal, *The Beginnings of Netherlandish Canvas Painting: 1400-1530* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 20, 24, 28.

Lestocquoy, "Le rôle des artistes," 216. Lestocquoy’s suggestion is further supported by the fact that, unlike the entries for Daret’s other paintings, no colors are mentioned in the accounts with respect to the custodes.

On July eighth, the first of the mediators, the Cardinal of Cyprus, Hugues de Lusignan, arrived in Arras.\(^\text{12}\) Two days later, the cardinal and his entourage of archbishops, bishops, abbots, and doctors came to the abbey where they were escorted into the church by Jean du Clercq. After venerating the sacred relics (figure 58, b) and viewing the precious silver retable on the high altar (figure 58, a), the cardinal:

...alla, accompaignez desdis seigneurs, en le chappelle Nostre Dame et prist grant plaisir de veir une table d'autel et les paintures estant sur icelle que de nouvel ledit monseigneur l'abbé avoit fait mettre en icelle chappelle.\(^\text{13}\)

[...went, accompanied by the said lords, into the chapel of Our Lady and took great pleasure in seeing an altarpiece and the paintings on it that the said lord abbot had recently placed in this chapel.]

On July sixteenth, the papal legate, the Cardinal of Santa Croce, Nicolò Albergati, arrived at the abbey. Again, Abbot du Clercq personally attended to the cardinal and his distinguished party.\(^\text{14}\) After kissing the reliquary casket that contained the body of St. Vaast (figure 58, b), the cardinal heard mass which was sung by the abbot himself. At the conclusion of the mass:

\(^{12}\)The brother of the King of Cyprus, the cardinal represented the Council of Basel at the congress. See Taverne, Paix d'Arras, ed. Bossuat, 3-4.

\(^{13}\)Ibid., 8-9.

\(^{14}\)Among the bishops and theologians who accompanied Cardinal Albergati was the Augustinian doctor Tommaso Parentucelli who would become Pope Nicholas V in 1447. See Ibid., 15, note 2.
...ledit cardinal alla en le chappelle Nostre Dame pour veoir une table painte que avoit fait faire nouvellement monseigneur l'abbé de ladite eglise. Lequel print grant plaisir a veoir la painture de ladite table.¹⁵

[...the cardinal went into the chapel of Our Lady in order to see a painted altarpiece that my lord the abbot had recently had made for the church. He took great pleasure in seeing the painting on the altarpiece.]

By recording these events, Taverne's journal provides us with an indisputable terminus ad quem date for the completion of the Arras Altarpiece. The reactions of the cardinals also suggest that the altarpiece was an impressive sight in its newly finished state.¹⁶ Moreover, the fact that Du Clercq displayed the new retable to his honored guests along with the most important relics and treasures of the abbey indicates that he took immense pride in his latest acquisition.

Taverne's journal includes a third reference to the newly installed Arras Altarpiece that informs us about its earliest use. On July twentieth, Abbot du Clercq received permission from Cardinal Albergati to have the Mass of the

¹⁵Ibid., 15-16.

¹⁶Although the cardinals' remarks are particularly emphatic with respect to Daret's paintings on the exterior of the altarpiece, it is likely that they had seen the interior also. According to Taverne, the silver retable on the high altar was opened in honor of the Cardinal of Cyprus' visit. See Ibid., 8.
Virgin celebrated daily in the Lady Chapel.\(^\text{17}\) However, perhaps wishing to have this event coincide with a major feast day, Du Clercq waited until September eighth, the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin, to inaugurate this daily mass. In an entry for this day, Taverne writes:

...ledit jour, monseigneur l'abbé de cheens chanta et celebra la messe Nostre Dame en la chappelle de ladite Nostre Dame et fut le premiere messe qui y fut chantee, depuis que ledit monseigneur l'abbé y avoit fait mettre et assir le table qui y est present.\(^\text{18}\)

[...on this day, my lord the abbot of this house sang and celebrated the mass of Our Lady in the chapel of Our Lady and it was the first mass which was sung there (my italics), since the said lord abbot had made and placed there the altarpiece which is there now.]

Among the dignitaries present at this mass were the Duke and Duchess of Burgundy; the Duke's infant son Charles, the Count of Charolais; and the personal representative of Charles VII, the Duke of Bourbon. The significance of the occasion is further underscored by the actions of Cardinal Albergati, who awarded a one hundred day indulgence to all who had attended the festival mass.\(^\text{19}\)

\(^{17}\)Ibid., 17. Prior to this, the daily celebration of the Mass of the Virgin had taken place in the abbey's Chapel of St. Peter. See also Cardevacque and Terninck, L'Abbaye de Saint-Vaast, 1:214.

\(^{18}\)Taverne, Paix d'Arras, ed. Bossuat, 74.

\(^{19}\)Ibid., 75. Following the receipt of a bull from Pope Eugenius IV, which permitted the daily Mass of the Virgin to be sung perpetually in the Lady Chapel, the chapel was officially consecrated on June 14, 1437. See Loriquet, "Journal des travaux," 77-78, item 33.
Original appearance

Although Taverne’s journal provides us with accounts of the earliest display and use of the Arras Altarpiece, it does not include a detailed description of what Du Clercq’s new retable looked like. Additional clues to the original appearance of the altarpiece can be found in two eyewitness descriptions that date to the seventeenth century. The earlier of the two is the inventory of the abbey church and its decorations written by Dom Adrian Pronier c.1600. Following his description of the panels of the abbots’ portraits in the Lady Chapel, Pronier writes:

Peu plus bas lesdites tables, y a ung très beau tableau d’albastre, représentant la Coronation de Nostre Dame, sur les foeuilletz duquel toute sa vie est fort artificiellement peinte.20

[A bit below these pictures, there is a very beautiful alabaster altarpiece, representing the Coronation of Our Lady, on the wings of which her whole life is most artificially painted.]

In an earlier entry in his inventory, Pronier described another altarpiece on the altar table in the Lady Chapel. This suggests that by the end of the sixteenth century the Arras Altarpiece had been moved to a different location in the chapel. The situation is further complicated by the fact that both altarpieces are described as containing alabaster figures of the twelve Apostles and a Coronation of the Virgin. However, Pronier’s

20Pronier, "Recoeul des antiquitez," 533.
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description clearly states that in this other retable, the Virgin was crowned by the Holy Trinity, and that the exterior wings were painted with an image of the Crucifixion attended by the Virgin, St. John the Evangelist, St. John the Baptist, St. Barbara, St. Vaast, and St. Catherine.  

The most detailed description of the original appearance of the Arras Altarpiece comes from Jean Collart's 1651 edition of the Journal de la Paix d'Arras. In a note to Taverne's account of Cardinal Albergati's visit to St. Vaast on July sixteenth, Collart writes:

Cette table d'Autel a esté du dupuis transportée en la Chapelle appelée des Abbez, parce qu'en icelle ils y prennent leurs habits Pontificaux; ladite table d'autel contient en son long les douze Apostres en de belles niches dorées, au milieu & au dessus sont les statués de Iesus-Christ & de la Vierge sa Mere assis en leurs Thrones; ladite table d'Autel se ferme avec deux volets, lesquels en dedans sont parsemés des fleurs de lys d'or sur azur, au dehors ils contiennent cinq tres-beaux tableaux, en celuy d'enihat est peinte l'Annonciation Nostre-Dame, au premier du costé de l'Evangile, la Visitation auquel Carré ledit Abbé Iean du Clercq est peint au naturel au genoux revestu de son habit Regulier ayant sa Crosse en main & sa Mittre à ses genoux: au second est la Nativité de nostre Seigneur: au troisiesme l'Adoration des Roys, & au quatriesme la Circoncision.

[This altarpiece has since been transported into the chapel called the Abbots', because in it they put on their pontifical vestments; the altarpiece contains in

---


22 Taverne, Paix d'Arras, ed. Collart, 200. As neither Pronier nor Collart mention the antependium or the custodes, it would seem that they were no longer in use during the seventeenth century.
its length the twelve Apostles in beautiful gilded niches, at the center and above are the statues of Jesus Christ and the Virgin His mother seated on their thrones; the altarpiece closes with two wings, on the interior of which are strewn gold fleurs de lis on azure, on their exterior they contain five very beautiful pictures, on the top one is painted the Annunciation to Our Lady, in the first position on the side of the Evangelist, (is) the Visitation in the corner of which the Abbot Jean du Clercq is painted from life on his knees dressed in his regular habit having his crozier in hand and his miter at his knees: in the second position is the Nativity of Our Lord: in the third position the Adoration of the Kings, and in the forth position the Circumcision.

Collart's description helps to solve several questions regarding the original appearance of the Arras Altarpiece. For example, in contrast to the imprecise description in Du Clercq's account book, Collart clearly identifies the number of wings as two. This suggests that the phrase tous les foeullés which appears in the entry recording Daret's payment for painting the wings refers to the multiple surfaces of the shutters rather than the number of the wings themselves.\(^\text{23}\) The interior pattern of gold fleurs de lis on an azure ground is confirmed by traces of paint and gilding on the reverse of the Adoration of the Magi panel.

\(^\text{23}\) Loriquet, "Journal des travaux," 71, item 10. See also appendix B. In contrast to Collart's description, Lestocquoy, "Le rôle des artistes," 215-216, envisioned the Arras Altarpiece as a polyptych, with the Annunciation painted on a small pair of wings independent from those containing the Visitation, Nativity, Adoration, and Presentation pictures.
In addition to establishing the format of the altarpiece as a triptych, Collart's description also provides clues about the shape of the wings. The four extant panels (figures 1-4) were arranged in a single, horizontal row across the width of the altarpiece exterior. The Visitation and Nativity were paired on the left shutter, while the Adoration of the Magi and Presentation (identified as a Circumcision) were located on the right shutter. Positioned in the center, above them, the lost Annunciation must have been painted on a divided panel whose left half was attached to the top of the Nativity panel and whose right half was joined to the top of the Adoration panel. The resulting wings would be L-shaped, and attached to the retable cabinet by hinges at their extreme left and right sides.

Because none of the surviving panels bear any evidence of hinges or closures, it would seem that they were originally enclosed in some type of framework. This idea is further suggested by an inscription recorded in the sixteenth century from a painted altarpiece bearing the portrait and coat of arms of Jean du Clercq. Dated 1462, the inscription read: Domnus Joës du Clercq, abbas Sci Vedasti. Spiritus Sancte Deus, miserere mei, (Lord Jean du Clercq, abbot of St. Vaast. Holy Spirit of God, have mercy
From its presence on a painted retable, and its inclusion in the Épigraphie among other inscriptions from the Lady Chapel, it would seem that this inscription was found on the Arras Altarpiece. However, as no trace of an inscription is found on any of the panels from the altarpiece, it must have been painted on the frame of the triptych, and was presumably added at the time of the abbot’s death on September fifteenth of that year.

Without the Annunciation panel, it is impossible to estimate the original height of the Arras Altarpiece. However, knowing the dimensions and arrangement of the four surviving pictures, we can calculate its approximate width. When closed, the retable would have measured at least 208 cm (approx. 6 feet, 10 inches) wide. With the wings open, the total width of the triptych would have exceeded 416 cm (approx. 13 feet, 8 inches). From these estimates, it is easy to understand why Cardinals Albergati and Lusignan were so impressed when they saw Du Clercq’s new altarpiece for the first time.

---

24 Simon Le Febvre de Blairville, Épitaphier des églises d’Arras, (end of sixteenth century), Bibliothèque d’Arras, ms 328, f° 123, as cited in Loisne and Rodière, Épigraphie du Pas-de-Calais, 464, item 1181. I thank Dr. Joseph Lynch of The Ohio State University Department of History for his assistance with this translation.

25 The inscription is recorded separately from those on the abbot’s funerary monument and, therefore, does not appear to have been associated with it.

26 Each of the panels measures 57 x 52 cm.
In addition to his description of the paintings on the exterior of the Arras Altarpiece, Collart's notes also provide us with information about the alabaster figures in its interior. Loriquet's assumption that the Coronation was represented by a pair of figures is confirmed by Collart's description of the enthroned figures of Christ and the Virgin. Unfortunately, because none of the Arras figures have been identified, neither their style nor their precise size can be determined.27

The arrangement of the figures within the cabinet of the altarpiece also remains speculative. From Collart's description of the Apostles in niches "along its length" and the Virgin and Christ "at the center and above" them, it would seem that the figures were displayed in two stories. In this arrangement, the Apostles would probably have occupied individual niches across the full width of the lower story. Centered above them, the Virgin and Christ would have been seated beneath a separate tabernacle in the upper register. When the wings of the altarpiece were closed, the Annunciation halves would have covered the

---

27Eisler, Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection, 86, proposed that the figures of the Apostles may have been similar to the Apostle series attributed to the "Master of the Rimini Crucifixion" now in Frankfurt. Lestocquoy, "Le rôle des artistes," 216, believed the figures of the Coronation pair to be larger than those of the twelve Apostles.
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Coronation, and the panels of the **Visitatin**, **Nativity**, **Adoration**, and **Presentation** would have covered the row of Apostles below.

Alternatively, as Lestocquoy has proposed, the Apostles could have been divided into two groups of six on either side of a raised central section in which the Virgin and Christ were enthroned.\(^{28}\) Originating in Tournai funerary reliefs, variations of this format were frequently used in Flemish and Northern French altarpieces during the first half of the fifteenth century.\(^{29}\) As all of the sculpture would be revealed at once when the L-shaped wings were opened, either arrangement of the figures would have been equally successful.

\(^{28}\) In Lestocquoy's proposed reconstruction, which is based on the c.1425-34 Fressin Retable de la Vierge, the Apostles are paired in three niches on either side of the central Coronation. Alternatively, they may have occupied individual niches, or been arranged in four groups of three. See Lestocquoy, "Le rôle des artistes," 216.

\(^{29}\) See Joseph de Borchgrave d'Altena, *Retables en pierre du Hainaut* (Mons: Joséé Mambour, 1968). The 1406 Retable de Viesly (illustrated on page 9), and the Retable de Beauvois (illustrated on page 15) are particularly close examples.
Iconographic program

Dedicated to the Virgin Mary and installed in the abbey’s Lady Chapel, the Arras Altarpiece depicted six events from the life of the Virgin that correspond to the principal Marian feasts of the liturgical calendar. On the triptych’s exterior, Daret’s five paintings of the Annunciation, Visitation (figure 1), Nativity (figure 2), Adoration of the Magi (figure 3), and Presentation in the Temple (figure 4) formed a standard Infancy Cycle. In contrast to these narratives from the Virgin’s earthly life, the sculpted figures on the interior of the retable depicted the apocryphal story of her coronation as Queen of Heaven following her death and assumption.


31 In addition to the subjects depicted in Daret’s paintings, images of the Circumcision, the Flight into Egypt, and the Massacre of the Innocents were often included in cycles devoted to the Infancy of Christ. See Karl Künstle, Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst (Freiburg: Herder & Co., 1928), 321-375; and Gertrud Schiller, Iconography of Christian Art, 2 vols. (Greenwich: New York Graphic Society, Ltd., 1971), 1:26-33.

As a devotional image, the Coronation of the Virgin first appeared in monumental art in the late twelfth century. As a result of increased devotion to the cult of the Virgin, the Coronation had, by the end of the thirteenth century, become one of the most popular Marian subjects. Not recognized by a separate liturgical feast day, the Coronation was celebrated along with the Assumption of Mary as the most important of the Marian feasts.

While the theme of the Coronation is logical for a triptych dedicated to the Virgin, it would seem that this imagery also had particular significance for Jean du Clercq. If we examine the portrait of the abbot in the Visitation carefully (figures 1 and 59), we can see the same event taking place in the crook of his pastoral staff.

---

33 The iconographic development of the Coronation of the Virgin is summarized in Gertrud Schiller, Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst, 4 vols. (Gütersloher: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1980), 4, part 2:110-154; Mâle, The Thirteenth Century, 246-258; Künstle, Ikonographie, 564-583; and Réau, Iconographie, 2:615-626. For a comprehensive discussion of this subject, see Philippe Verdier, Le couronnement de la Vierge: les origines et les premier développements d'un thème iconographique (Paris: Vrin, 1980).

34 Mâle, The Thirteenth Century, 246. For an analysis of the cult of the Virgin in the Middle Ages, see Marina Warner, Alone of all her sex: the myth and cult of the Virgin Mary (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1976).

35 Réau, Iconographie, 63. The Feast of the Assumption of Mary is celebrated on the fifteenth of August.

36 The Abbot’s personal devotion to the Virgin is demonstrated by his choice of the Lady Chapel as his own funerary chapel, as well as his campaign to complete and decorate the chapel immediately after his election.
Although the abbot's personal ownership of this crozier cannot be documented, the precision with which Daret has depicted it suggests that it represents the actual staff used by Du Clercq during his tenure as Abbot of St. Vaast.  

In contrast to the obvious choice of the Coronation group, the inclusion of the figures of the twelve Apostles on the interior of the Arras Altarpiece is less clear. Because they were present at Mary's death and her assumption, the Apostles may have been included as references to these final events of the Virgin's earthly life. At the same time, the Apostles may have been selected by the abbot patron for their significance as pastoral role models. As Christ's closest followers, the Apostles were particularly revered in monastic circles for both their communal lifestyle and their evangelical mission. The inclusion of the Apostles can also be explained by the fact that the Abbey of St. Vaast owned relics of all twelve saints. Housed in an ivory casket, the relics of the twelve


Apostles were enshrined in the abbey's altar of relics (figure 58, b) next to the corporeal remains of the abbey's patron, St. Vaast.39

* * * * *

Because no fragments of the panel have survived, it is impossible to determine the appearance or the specific iconography of the lost Annunciation. However, other examples of the subject from the "Campin Group" may offer some possibilities. Having trained in the workshop of a master who frequently depicted religious subjects in domestic settings, Daret may have depicted the Arras Annunciation in a manner similar to the Mérode or Brussels versions of the narrative (figures 11 and 37). If so, the panel would have to be divided rather awkwardly along a vertical line passing through the window, table and right knee of the Virgin at the center of the composition.

One possible solution to this problem can be found in the Prado Annunciation (figure 53), in which the figures of Gabriel and the Virgin are separated by the architecture of their ecclesiastical setting. Allowing for the completion of the pier at the right edge of the panel, the composition can easily be divided by a vertical line at the right edge

39 Cardevacque and Terninck, L'Abbaye de St. Vaast, 3:139-140. For the influence of relics on the determination of devotional subjects, see Mâle, The Thirteenth Century, 315-320.
of the central pier.\footnote{As previously noted, the panel has been trimmed along the right edge. See above, 119, note 55.} The resulting halves would each house a complete figure and would be free of confusing portions of garments, furnishings, or architectural elements.

Although the framing of the figures within an architectural "space-box" is similar to Daret's approach in the Presentation panel, the elaborate decoration of the church and the complexity of its interior space would argue against a consideration of the Prado Annunciation as a fragment from, or copy after, the c.1434-35 Arras Altarpiece.\footnote{For a stylistic analysis and dating of the Prado Annunciation to the 1450s, see above, 119-123.} Yet, in its basic format, the Prado picture may reflect a composition similar to that of Daret's lost Annunciation panel.

* * * * *

In the Visitation (figure 1), Daret depicts the meeting between the Virgin and Elizabeth, wife of Zacharias, described in the Gospel of Luke.\footnote{Luke 1:39-56.} According to Luke, the Virgin went into the hill country of Judea to see her kinswoman soon after receiving the Annunciation from the angel Gabriel. Upon Mary's arrival, Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit and thus became the first person to whom the miracle of the Incarnation was revealed.
Generally paired with scenes of the Annunciation, or featured as part of an Infancy Cycle, images of the Visitation can be traced to the early fifth century. In the Middle Ages, the event was usually depicted as the meeting and embrace of the two women in front of the city gates, or as an intimate conversation between them. By the thirteenth century, the conversational format became the more common iconography of the subject.

In Daret's painting, Elizabeth and the Virgin stand close to each other. With her left hand raised in salutation, Elizabeth gently places her right hand on the Virgin's abdomen, thereby recognizing her as the mother of God. The Virgin returns her touch, acknowledging that after many childless years, she is to bear the infant John the Baptist. The miraculous nature of Elizabeth's pregnancy is further underscored by her depiction as a woman of advanced age. The fertility of the two women is echoed in the abundant spring landscape.

---

43 For the iconographic development of the Visitation, see Schiller, Iconography, 1:55-56; Künstle, Ikonographie, 341-344; and Réau, Ikonographie, 2:195-210.

44 Schiller, Iconography, 1:55.

45 Although they are often cited as evidence for the origin of Daret's Visitation composition in Campin workshop models, Roger's Visitation panels in Leipzig and Turin both show Elizabeth bending forward to embrace the Virgin rather than standing in conversation with her. See Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:figures 311 and 312.
In addition to the meeting of the Virgin and Elizabeth, the Visitation also contains allusions to the theme of the Coronation depicted on the interior of the triptych. As in the Adoration of the Magi (figure 3) and the Presentation in the Temple (figure 4), the hem of the Virgin’s mantle is embroidered with the words "Ave Regina Coelorum" which proclaim her as the Queen of Heaven. Mary’s future identity is further suggested by the tiny depiction of her Coronation taking place in the crook of the abbot’s staff.

Despite his proximity, neither of the women acknowledge the abbot kneeling in prayer on the ground before them. Rather than his actual physical presence, it is perhaps the abbot’s spiritual presence that is suggested here. Through his personal devotion, he has been granted a vision of the Visitation taking place in the countryside outside the abbey of St. Vaast.46

* * * * *

The third narrative from the Infancy Cycle on the exterior of the Arras Altarpiece depicts the Nativity (figure 2).47 The birth of Christ is only briefly noted in


47 The iconographic development of Nativity imagery is discussed in Schiller, Iconography, 1:58-88; Künstle, Ikonographie, 344-353; and Réau, Iconographie, 213-255.
the Gospels. While Luke's account emphasizes the announcement of Christ's birth to the shepherds, Matthew merely mentions the Nativity as the fulfillment of ancient prophecy. Like its model, Campin's Dijon Nativity (figure 13), Daret's Nativity (figure 2) reveals a complex iconographic program compiled from various, additional sources.

One of the principal sources from which both Campin's and Daret's Nativity panels are derived is the Revelationes of St. Bridget, a fourteenth-century Swedish mystic who experienced visions while on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. In Bridget's account of the Nativity, the event took place in a cave. Here, attended only by an ox and ass, the Virgin delivered her son without pain or effort while in an ecstatic state of prayer. Accompanied by the songs of angels, she immediately knelt and worshipped the Child whose body shone radiantly on the ground before her.


49For a stylistic comparison of these two panels, see above, 59-62. In contrast to the present discussion, Vines stresses the contrasts between Campin's and Daret's Nativity panels, and suggests that each artist was influenced by a different contemporary literary source for the completion of his picture. See Vines, "The Arras Altarpiece," 157-186; and idem, "Some Questions," 41-44.

50An English translation of St. Bridget's vision is found in Henrik Cornell, The Iconography of the Nativity of Christ (Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistiska, 1924), 12-13.
In the Arras picture, the Virgin kneels in adoration before the Infant Christ whose tiny nude body is surrounded by golden rays of light. As described by St. Bridget, her hair falls loosely over her shoulders; her hands are crossed over her breast in a gesture of humility. Joseph holds a candle in his right hand as a reference to the one that was, according to St. Bridget, outshone by the divine light of the Christ Child. As in most Northern depictions of the Nativity, Daret’s is set in a stable rather than a cave. The ox and ass watch attentively at left.

In addition to Joseph’s candle and the adoring posture of the Virgin, the Arras Nativity includes an additional reference to the Revelationes of St. Bridget that has thus far been overlooked. With His hands outstretched and His feet crossed, the pose of the Infant parallels that of the adult Christ of the Crucifixion. In another vision, Mary revealed to Bridget that, looking at the tiny hands and feet of her Child, she was overcome with grief.

Inspired by the Meditationes Vitae Christi by Pseudo-Bonaventura, the iconography of the Adoration of the Child became increasingly popular from the fourteenth century. See Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 1:46, note 3.

Unlike Bridget’s description of her white tunic and mantle, Daret’s Virgin wears blue garments consistent with those depicted in the Visitation, Adoration, and Presentation panels.

Schiller, Iconography, 1:76.

Although Eisler interpreted the pose of the Child as a reference to the Crucifixion, he did not speculate about its origins. See Eisler, Early Netherlandish Painting, 90.
knowing that they would one day be pierced. The Virgin then explained that her only comfort came from knowing that Jesus Himself wished it to happen.\footnote{Bridget’s vision of this pre-figuration of the Crucifixion is summarized in Schiller, \textit{Iconography}, 1:83.}

Daret’s \textit{Nativity} (figure 2) contains other references to Christ’s Passion as well. Vines interpreted the dry tree strut supporting the corner of the shed as a reference to the Tree of Knowledge that became the cross of Christ.\footnote{Vines, "Some Questions," 46-48.} Friedmann identified the goldfinch and barn swallows perched on the roof of the stable as symbols of the Passion and Resurrection.\footnote{Because they were believed to feed on thorns and thistles, goldfinches were associated with Christ’s Passion in the Late Middle Ages. Similarly, because they were thought to hibernate in mud during the winter and emerge in the spring, swallows were symbolic of the Resurrection. See Friedmann, \textit{The Symbolic Goldfinch}, 7-8; and Vines, "Some Questions," 52.} A further allusion to Christ’s sacrifice can be found in the three angels in the upper left corner of the picture, who, as Vines notes, are vested in the liturgical garments worn by the assistant ministers at the Mass.\footnote{Vines, "The Arras Altarpiece," 178-179.} In this context, in addition to being a mark of
His humanity, Christ's flesh can be interpreted as His chasuble, thereby identifying Him as both the celebrant and the sacrifice of the Mass.\textsuperscript{59}

Along with the events described by St. Bridget, Daret's Nativity includes the legend of the midwives that originated in the apocryphal Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew and was popularized in the Middle Ages by the Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine.\textsuperscript{60} According to Voragine, Joseph summoned two midwives, named Zebel (or Zelemi) and Salome, to assist the Virgin during her delivery. When they arrived and saw that the Child had already been born, Zebel rejoiced in awe upon realizing that Mary had given birth while remaining a virgin. Requiring proof of this miracle, Salome asked to examine the Virgin, whereupon her hand withered and fell lame. In Daret's picture, both of Salome's hands hang limp from her wrists. Zebel, echoing the gesture of the angel above her, points to the Christ Child as the cure for Salome's paralysis.\textsuperscript{61}


\textsuperscript{60}Voragine, Golden Legend, 46-51.

\textsuperscript{61}In contrast to Daret's conveyance of the narrative through gesture alone, Campin's Nativity includes inscribed banderoles that identify the figures and relate the story. See Charles I. Minott, "Notes on the Iconography of Robert Campin's Nativity in Dijon," Tribute to Lotte Brand Philip, Art Historian and Detective (New York: Abaris Books, Inc., 1985), 113-116.
By the fourteenth century, the narratives of the Annunciation to the Shepherds or the Adoration of the Shepherds commonly appeared along with images of the Nativity.⁶² While Campin includes these humble figures adoring the Child in the foreground of his Nativity (figures 13 and 26), Daret confines their presence to the right background where they receive the news of Christ’s birth from an angel hovering in the sky above them.

* * * * *

Called the Epiphany in the Golden Legend, the story of the Wise Men from the East is told only in the Gospel of Matthew.⁶³ Guided by a star to Jerusalem, the magi asked Herod where they could find the newly born King of the Jews. After consulting with the priests and scribes, Herod directed them toward Bethlehem, where the star again guided them to the place of Christ’s birth. In the Adoration of the Magi (figure 3), Daret depicts the magi worshipping the Christ Child and offering Him gifts upon their arrival at the stable of the Nativity.

In the Arras panel, the seated Virgin holds the Child above her lap, presenting her Son to the eldest magus who kneels in adoration before Him. This imagery, traceable to

⁶²The narratives concerning the shepherds are discussed in Schiller, Iconography, 1:84-88.

⁶³Matthew 2:1-12. For Voragine’s account of the Epiphany, in which the divinity of the Christ Child was revealed to the magi by the star, see Voragine, Golden Legend, 84-88.
the third century, can be interpreted as both a reference to
the Virgin's role as the sedes sapientiae (seat of wisdom),
and as a statement of Christ's royal status.\textsuperscript{64} No longer
the maiden of the Visitation or the Nativity, the Virgin's
head is now covered with the veil of a married woman. Above
the Child, divine light descends from the star positioned
just over the peak of the stable roof.

Traditionally represented as men of youth, middle- and
old-age, by the twelfth century the magi were also depicted
as kings.\textsuperscript{65} Here, they are dressed as fifteenth-century
European noblemen, in robes and houppelandes made of rich
brocades, trimmed with fur and jewels. Each man's hat is
decorated with a gold crown to further identify his royal
status. Only the turban and semitic features of the middle-
aged magus suggest their origins in the East.

In contrast to earlier depictions in which the
presentation of the gifts was the principal subject, the
human nature of the Christ Child and His personal
relationship with the magi became a more significant aspect
of the iconography in the late Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{66} The eldest
magus is often depicted kissing the Child's foot, or, as in

\textsuperscript{64}For the iconographic development of the Adoration
of the Magi, see Schiller, \textit{Iconography}, 1:94-114; and Künstle,
includes the theme of the Adoration of the Magi in his
discussion of Nativity imagery.

\textsuperscript{65}Schiller, \textit{Iconography}, 1:110.

\textsuperscript{66}Ibid., 1:111.
the Arras panel, His hand. Sometimes the Infant responds by laying His hand upon the old king’s head in a gesture of blessing. To further emphasize His humanity, the Christ Child is generally depicted nude.  

Here, the Virgin presents Him in transparent swaddling clothes that clearly reveal His body beneath.

Beginning in the thirteenth century, the objects containing the magi’s gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh were often modelled after contemporary liturgical vessels. Perhaps as a reflection of his growing reputation as an honorable husband to the Virgin, Joseph frequently takes an active part in fifteenth century depictions of the story by accepting the magi’s gifts as he does in Daret’s picture.

---


68 Along with the recurrence of the dry tree strut previously noted in the Nativity (figure 2), the actions of the Virgin, who holds her son over her lap as she presents Him to the eldest magus, can also be interpreted as a reference to the sacrifice of Christ. See Ursula Nilgen, "The Epiphany and the Eucharist: On the Interpretation of Eucharistic Motifs in Medieval Epiphany Scenes," The Art Bulletin 49 (1967): 311-316.

69 Schiller, Iconography, 111. The resemblance of the gifts in Daret’s painting to actual vessels has been noted above, 72.

70 For the changing status of Joseph in the early decades of the fifteenth century, see above, 67.
In the background of Daret's painting, the retinues of
the magi are shown arriving at an inn in the middle
distance. An increasingly popular subject in Northern panel
paintings during the fifteenth century, the theme of the
procession of the magi appears to have its origins in
manuscript illuminations of the late fourteenth century. 71

* * * * *

The final narrative depicted on the exterior of the
Arras Altarpiece is the Presentation in the Temple
(figure 4). The story of the Presentation of Christ is told
in the Gospel of Luke, where it is combined with an account
of the Purification of the Virgin. 72 According to Mosaic
Law, the first-born son was to be presented to God thirty
days after his birth. During this ceremony, the child could
be redeemed from service in the Temple by the payment of
five shekels. 73 The ritual of Purification was also
defined by the Law of Moses. Forty days after giving birth
to a son, the mother was to bring a lamb, and a young pigeon
or turtledove to the Temple where they would be sacrificed

71 Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 1:64.
Schiller, Iconography, 1:113, cites examples in the c.1413-
1416 Très-Riches Heures du Due de Berry.

72 Luke 2:22-40. For a thorough analysis of
Presentation imagery, see Dorothy C. Schorr, "The
Iconographic Development of the Presentation in the Temple,"
The Art Bulletin 28 (1946): 17-32. See also Schiller,
Iconography, 1:90-94; and Künstle, Iconographie, 365-368.
Réau, Iconographie, 2:256-266, discusses the Presentation
along with the iconography of the Circumcision of Jesus.

73 Exodus 13:12-15; Numbers, 18:15-16.
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as a sin offering. If she was unable to bring a lamb, an offering of two turtledoves or two pigeons could be substituted.\textsuperscript{74}

Along with references to the Purification of the Virgin, Luke's Gospel also includes the story of the meeting of the Holy Family with Simeon, a pious man of the Temple who had been promised by the Holy Spirit that he would not die until he had seen the Savior. Celebrated from the fourth century in the Eastern Church, this festival, known as \textit{Hypapante}, was not adopted in the Western Church until the end of the fifth century.\textsuperscript{75}

By the fourteenth century, the separate themes of the Presentation, the \textit{Hypapante}, and the Purification of the Virgin were frequently combined into a single image, as they are in Daret's picture.\textsuperscript{76} Dressed in a richly decorated robe, the nimbed figure of Simeon assumes the role of the High Priest. With veiled hands, he reaches across the altar to receive the Christ Child from the Virgin. Behind him,

\textsuperscript{74}Leviticus 12:2-8.

\textsuperscript{75}Schorr, "Iconographic Development," 18.

\textsuperscript{76}Recounted under the title of the Purification of the Virgin, the three events are likewise combined in Voragine, \textit{Golden Legend}, 149-154.
Anna, the aged prophetess of the Temple, raises her hand to her breast as she too recognizes the Infant Christ as the Redeemer of Jerusalem.\(^{77}\)

In reference to the offerings required for the Virgin's Purification, a young woman stands behind the altar holding a basket with two pigeons. Completing the symmetrical composition, Joseph enters the Temple at left, while a female attendant approaches from the right holding another basket with two doves.\(^{78}\) Generally regarded as an error on the part of the artist, the presence of four sacrificial birds in Darett's Presentation may also indicate a source for the composition in the apocryphal Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew.\(^{79}\)

The candles held by the four women in the Arras panel can be interpreted as references to a ceremony first performed in the seventh century, at which worshippers carried candles to honor the Virgin on the day of her Purification. From the thirteenth century, this ceremony

\(^{77}\)Usually present in Italian versions of the subject, Anna is seldom included in Northern depictions. See Schorr, "Iconographic Development," 26.

\(^{78}\)With its symmetrical arrangement of figures around a central altar table, Schorr identifies a compositional source for Darett's painting in Ambrogio Lorenzetti's Uffizi Presentation of 1342. She does not, however, postulate how Darett might have known Lorenzetti's panel. See Ibid., 29.

\(^{79}\)According to Schorr, discrepancies exist in several texts of Pseudo-Matthew's Gospel. In some versions, two turtledoves and two pigeons are required, while in others, the sacrificial birds are defined as two turtledoves or two pigeons. See Ibid., 19, note 20.
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was known as Candlemas, and was celebrated along with the Purification of the Virgin as one of the principal Marian feasts. 80 The Feast of the Purification is further suggested by the text of the "Ave Regina Coelorum" hymn embroidered on the hem of Mary’s mantle. 81

Along with the traditional iconographic elements of the Presentation in the Temple and the Purification of the Virgin, Smith has identified additional details in Daret’s panel that he interprets as references to the roles of Christ and the Virgin as the Co-Redeemers of mankind. 82 On the carved capitals, eight scenes from the Creation story are depicted. Of these, the stories of the Creation and Fall of Man, and his subsequent Expulsion from the Garden of Eden are the most prominently displayed on the four capitals closest to the viewer. While these images make clear man’s need for salvation, they also serve to identify Christ and the Virgin as the new Adam and Eve.

In addition to the carved capitals, three scenes from the life of Noah are illustrated in the stained glass windows of Daret’s Temple: Noah in the Vineyard, the Drunkenness and Shame of Noah, and the Ark Afloat. According to Smith, these scenes may also be interpreted as

80Ibid., 27. See also Schiller, Iconography, 1:92. The Feast of the Purification of the Virgin is celebrated on the second of February.

81See above, 45-46, note 3.

82Smith, "Betrothal of the Virgin," 132, note 64.
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parallels to the sacrificial theme reflected in the Presentation, in which Christ's body is offered at the altar of the Temple. 83

* * * * *

In her interpretation of the iconography of the Arras Altarpiece, Vines argued that the images depicted on the exterior of the triptych placed particular emphasis on the Virgin's role as Mediatrix. 84 For this reason, she further proposed that Abbot du Clercq had deliberately selected these subjects for the shutters of his new altarpiece in order to highlight his role as host of the 1435 congress, and to honor his guests, the cardinal mediators Nicolò Albergati and Hugues de Lusignan. 85

It is clear from the documents, however, that Du Clercq had already envisioned a retable dedicated to the life of the Virgin in 1432, when he purchased the alabaster Coronation group for its interior. Consequently, an Infancy

83 Ibid. Specifically, Smith notes the Eucharistic symbolism in the scene of Noah in the Vineyard. He identifies the Drunkenness and Shame of Noah as a prefiguration of the Mocking of Christ, and interprets the Ark Afloat as a symbol of the Church Triumphant following the Crucifixion.

84 Vines's analysis of the Arras Altarpiece is limited to a discussion of the imagery of Daret's four extant panels. She does not address the iconographic program of the triptych as a whole.

85 According to Vines, "The Arras Altarpiece," 33-35, the recognition of their host's gesture helps to explain the Cardinals' enthusiastic response to the paintings on the new triptych.
Cycle would have been a logical choice for the exterior wings, and the Virgin's intercessory role naturally understood within it. Moreover, since all the subjects depicted on the Arras Altarpiece correspond to Marian feast days, the liturgy itself would seem to have been the determining factor in the iconographic program of the triptych. Finally, if we consider the fact that Arras was not chosen as the site of the peace negotiations until February of 1435, it would seem unlikely that Daret could have designed and completed the five paintings in less than five months.

In contrast to Vines's event-specific interpretation of the iconography of the Arras Altarpiece, certain features of Daret's paintings suggest the long-established role of the abbey as both the religious and secular authority of the

---

86 This would also help to explain why subjects not associated with liturgical feasts, such as the Flight into Egypt or the Massacre of the Innocents, were not included in the retable's Infancy Cycle.

87 The date and location of the treaty negotiations was decided during a meeting between the French and the Burgundians at Nevers. The English did not receive their invitation to the congress until the eighth of May. See Dickinson, Congress of Arras, 20-21, 163-164.

88 Vines suggests that because Du Clercq had been an adviser to Philip the Good since 1429, he would have been privy to the Duke's plans for the congress, and, therefore, could have anticipated the selection of his abbey as the location for the peace negotiations. See Vines, "The Arras Altarpiece," 35.
town of Arras. In the background of the Visitation for example (figures 1 and 59), a group of buildings, including a church viewed from the east, is shown rising above a crenellated wall that surrounds them. Noting the compositional relationship between the buildings and the portrait of Jean du Clercq, scholars have traditionally identified this walled complex as the Abbey of St. Vaast. However, after comparing these structures with contemporary maps of the town (figure 60), and plans of the abbey (figure 61), I propose that this walled complex is

---

89 My discussion is restricted to the walled town of Arras (la Ville), and does not include the smaller, separately walled Cité which was situated on the opposite bank of the Crincon river, (see figure 60). As the site of the Cathedral of Notre-Dame, la Cité was independent from the authority of the Abbey of St. Vaast and fell under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Arras and Cambrai.

90 Vines, "Some Questions," 46; Eisler, Early Netherlandish Painting, 85; and Berlin, Gemäldegalerie Katalog, 134. Vines, "The Arras Altarpiece," 129, also interprets the buildings as Elizabeth's home.

91 The map illustrated in figure 60 was published by Bossuat in his 1936 edition of Taverne's Journal de la Paix d'Arras. The location of the principle buildings, gates, and landmarks can be confirmed by comparison with the c.1382 map published in Morel, Plan d'Arras-Ville.

92 The plan of the Abbey of St. Vaast is illustrated in the sixteenth-century Journal de Dom Gérard Robert, religieux de l'Abbaye de Saint Vaast d'Arras, contenant plusieurs faits arrivés de son temps, principalement en la ville d'Arras, et en particulier dans la dite abbaye (Arras: Académie d'Arras, 1852). Although the abbey complex was bounded by walls, they were neither fortified, nor surrounded by a moat.
intended to be a figurative portrait of the town of Arras and an image of the abbey’s political position within it.93

While general parallels can be noted between the moat, gates, and towers in the picture (figure 59) and those in the plan of the town (figure 60), the painter’s artistic license prevents us from drawing direct correlations between the actual plan of the town and its appearance in the background of the Visitation (figure 59). The walled town is much too small, and few buildings other than the abbey church have been included as identifying landmarks. The neighboring Cité d’Arras is suggested by the faint shapes of buildings painted on the distant horizon, beyond the waters of the Crinchon river.

Daret situates the abbot in the landscape to the east of the church so that the chevet faces the viewer. By orienting the composition so that the easternmost part of the church is positioned directly above the Abbot’s portrait, and by linking the building to him with the road,

93This relationship between the donor and his identifying city may be compared to Roger’s Bladelin Triptych in which the portrait of the donor, Peter Bladelin, is accompanied by the town of Middleburg in the background of the central Nativity panel. See Davies, Roger van der Weyden, 201-202. Recently, Denis Coutagne, “La Vierge en Gloire du Maître de Flémalle,” Impressions du Musée Granet 8 (1992): 11-13, has proposed a similar connection between the Augustinian donor and the city, which he identifies as Tournai, in the background of Campin’s Virgin in Glory.
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Daret seems to have included a reference to the actual location of the altarpiece for which the Visitation panel was painted. 94

In addition to its location, Daret also exaggerated the size of the church in relation to the remainder of the town. 95 While the relative size of the church may have been enlarged to make it more easily recognizable, it is also possible that its exaggerated size was intended to convey the abbey’s dominant position with respect to the surrounding town.

With its establishment as a royal abbey in the year 673 by Theodoric III, the Abbey of St. Vaast became the principal temporal authority of the town of Arras that grew up around it. 96 Shortly after attaining royal status, the abbey was granted episcopal immunity by Pope Stephen III. This act invested the Abbot of St. Vaast with a spiritual authority over the Ville d’Arras equal to that held by the

94 With its unusual roof dormers, crow-step gables, and rectangular mullioned windows, the rectangular structure behind the chevet would appear to be another building in the abbey complex.

95 The actual scale and location of the abbey can be confirmed by an examination of the c.1718 relief map of Arras now in the collection of the Musée des Beaux-Arts. A representative view of the abbey church is illustrated in Lestocquoy, "Plan de l’Eglise Saint-Vaast," 60.

96 Theodoric’s royal charter is reproduced in Cardevaque and Terninck, L’Abbaye de Saint-Vaast, 1:30.
Bishop in the neighboring Cité.\textsuperscript{97} Protected by both royal and pontifical charters, the abbey retained sovereignty over the town until 1789, even after the establishment of a separate town council at the beginning of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{98}

The Abbey of St. Vaast owned most of the land on which the town of Arras had been constructed. Buildings could not be erected or altered; roads could not be paved; wells could not be dug without permission of the abbot. The houses in which the citizens lived were the property of the abbey and rents were collected annually.\textsuperscript{99} The abbey also regulated all commercial transactions in Arras, and imposed tariffs on all goods bought or sold by foreigners.\textsuperscript{100} As head of this powerful institution, the abbot enjoyed virtually all the

\textsuperscript{97}Ibid., 1:31-36. As a mitered abbot, the Abbot of St. Vaast was exempt from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Arras and Cambrai, and fell under the direct authority of the Pope.

\textsuperscript{98}The early statutes of the abbey are preserved in Chanoine van Drival, Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Vaast d'Arras rédigé au XIIe siècle par Guimann (Arras: Académie d'Arras, 1875). For a summary of the rights and prerogatives of the abbey from the seventh to the eighteenth centuries, see Cardevacque and Terninck, L'Abbaye de Saint-Vaast, 2: 173-248.

\textsuperscript{99}For examples of the Rentiers de Saint-Waast recorded in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, see Morel, Plan d'Arras-Ville, 9-14.

\textsuperscript{100}A list of all goods subject to this tax (tonlieu) is provided in Cardevacque and Terninck, L'Abbaye de Saint-Vaast, 2:194-198.
privileges of a landed noblemen. In this context then, the exaggerated size of the abbey church in the Visitation panel (figure 59) may be viewed as a symbol of the abbot's secular power as well as his religious leadership.

An additional site-specific reference is suggested by an unusual feature in the Presentation panel (figure 4). Here, Joseph approaches the altar of the Temple holding a large, white bird in his left hand. With its resemblance to the manifestations of the Holy Spirit found in other paintings in the "Campin Group" (figures 7 and 43), there can be no doubt that the bird is a dove. However, since the required turtledoves or young pigeons have already been more than adequately supplied by the two female attendants, Joseph's actions would appear to have a different meaning.

Within traditional Northern depictions of the subject, Joseph's offering of a single white dove is unprecedented. In many Presentations, such as Melchior Broederlam's on the exterior of the c.1392-1399 Retable de Champmol, Joseph merely acts as an observer. Sometimes,

101 Third in the political hierarchy of the region below the King of France and the Count of Artois, the abbot's position has been compared with that of a Viscount. See Ibid., 2:185.

102 For an extensive discussion of Joseph's role at the Presentation, see Foster, "Iconography of St. Joseph," 130-140. Additional examples may also be found in Schorr, "Iconographic Development."

103 Broederlam's Presentation is illustrated in Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:figure 105.
he participates in the ritual by holding a candle as he does in the Presentation from Roger van der Weyden’s c.1460-62 St. Columba Altarpiece. In German versions of the subject, such as Stefan Lochner’s 1447 Darmstadt Presentation, Joseph is often shown counting the five shekels required to redeem the Child from service in the Temple. Occasionally, Joseph does bring the sacrificial birds to the Temple, either carrying them in a cage or basket as he does in the Très Belles Heures de Notre-Dame, or in his hands as he does in the Presentation miniature in the c.1400 Très Belles Heures de Jean de Berry. It should be noted, however, that when Joseph assumes this role, the birds are clearly depicted as the pair of pigeons or turtledoves required for the purification sacrifice.

Although the dove in Daret’s Presentation (figure 4) could be interpreted as a manifestation of the Holy Spirit that inspired Simeon’s recognition of the Christ Child as

104 Ibid., 2:figure 354.

105 Lochner’s Darmstadt Presentation is illustrated in Cologne, Stefan Lochner, 51. A variation on this theme, in which Joseph is shown reaching into his purse, is found in Lochner’s 1445 Presentation in Lisbon. See Ibid., 327.

106 This Presentation from the so-called Turin-Milan Hours is illustrated in Millard Meiss, French Painting in the Time of Jean de Berry. The Late Fourteenth Century and the Patronage of the Duke (London: Phaidon Press, 1967), figure 43.

107 Also known as the Brussels Hours; the Presentation is illustrated in Ibid., figure 187.
the Savior of Israel, it would seem unusual for it to be held by one of the human participants. Alternatively, Joseph's presentation of the dove may refer to an event that took place at the abbey annually from the fourteenth century onward.

Each July fifteenth, St. Vaast's day, and the so-called jour de relation, the mayor and aldermen of Arras, along with representatives from the town's confraternity of Notre-Dame des Ardents, were required to pay tribute to the abbey and to pledge their continuing allegiance to its leader. Following a procession to the abbey complex, the civic officials were escorted into the church, where a ceremony was performed at the high altar. Along with gifts of candles and flowers, members of the confraternity presented the abbot with the key to the chapel of Notre-Dame des Ardents in the town's Petit Marché (figure 60). Approaching the altar, the mayor then offered a single white dove to the abbot as a token of thanks for the monumental stone cross which had also been erected in the Petit Marché. While presenting the dove, the mayor was required to make a speech in which he recognized the abbey as the rightful owner of the land on which both the chapel and the cross had

108 In this case, the name "St. Vaast's day" refers to the abbey rather than its patron saint, whose feast day was celebrated on the sixth of February.

109 For this annual ceremony of homage, see Cardevacque and Terninck, L'Abbaye de Saint-Vaast, 2:185-190.
been built.¹¹⁹ Virtually unchanged, this ceremony was performed until the abbey's closure in the eighteenth century.¹¹¹

In the Arras Presentation (figure 4), Joseph opens his mouth as if to speak, as he approaches the altar to offer the dove. While it is unlikely that the figure of Joseph is intended to be a portrait of a particular individual, his actions may have been included as an analogy to the ceremony of tribute that took place at the abbey each summer. Seeing the presentation of the Holy Family's gifts depicted in this familiar way, local viewers would not only be reminded of the abbey's authority, they could also be visually informed about the themes of offering and redemption that are essential to the narratives of the Purification of the Virgin and the Presentation of the Christ Child in the Temple.

Called le Carcan (the collar, or yoke), this sandstone cross had been erected in 1315 by the mayor of Arras as an act of protest against the abbey's political dominance over the town. After much dispute, an accord was reached between the Abbot of St. Vaast and the city magistrates which allowed the cross to remain standing in the Petit Marché in exchange for the annual recognition of the abbey's sovereignty. See Auguste Terninck, Arras, histoire de l'architecture et des beaux-arts dans cette ville depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la fin du XVIIIe siècle (Arras: Sueur-Charruey, 1879), 109-110.

In the year 1712, the mayor of Arras was cited for not properly recognizing the abbey's ownership of the Petit Marché while making his offering of the dove to the abbot. See Cardevacque and Terninck, L'Abbaye de Saint-Vaast, 2:189, note 2.
**Historical significance**

With its combination of painted panel wings and interior sculpture, the **Arras Altarpiece** was a variant of a German carved altarpiece known as a **Schnitzaltar**.\(^{112}\) One of the earliest surviving examples of this combination of painting and sculpture in Netherlandish art is the **Dijon Retable de Champmol**, in which an interior carved by Jacques de Baerze is closed by shutters which were painted by Melchior Broederlam.\(^{113}\) Although the **Arras Altarpiece** resembled the Dijon triptych in its basic format, it differed from it in its more extensive use of panel painting. Like its German prototypes, the **Retable de Champmol** includes carved wooden figures on the interior sides of its wings. In the **Arras Altarpiece**, the heavier alabaster sculptures were confined to the interior cabinet and the wings were painted on both sides.

The **Arras Altarpiece** also departs from the **Retable de Champmol** in the additive approach of its construction and its combination of media. In contrast to the Dijon triptych whose wood interior is entirely carved in high relief, the **Arras Altarpiece** featured free-standing alabaster figures

\(^{112}\) For the German origins and subsequent development of these Netherlandish "compound altarpieces", see Lynn F. Jacobs, "Aspects of Netherlandish Carved Altarpieces 1380-1530," (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1986), 48-73.

\(^{113}\) Commissioned in 1392 by Philip the Bold for the main altar of the Chartreuse de Champmol in Dijon, the retable was installed in 1399. See Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, 1:86-89, figure 41; 2:figures 104, 105.
which were placed in a carved wooden cabinet, and covered by painted shutters. Although unusual, the existence of many alabaster figures in the collections of the world's museums would suggest that this "mixed media" approach was not rare among fifteenth-century devotional images.\textsuperscript{114} Sadly, few complete altarpieces of this type survive today.\textsuperscript{115}

Although it would seem that Jean du Clercq had envisioned a retable when he purchased the alabaster figures for its interior in 1432, we do not know what factors dictated its final appearance. On one hand, the abbot's purchase of the figures from an itinerant merchant, and his subsequent reliance on both local and foreign craftsmen to construct a triptych around them, may be interpreted as an indication of the relative isolation of the abbey. Alternatively, the number of different artisans involved in the completion of the project may suggest a highly specialized guild system in which the activities of each craftsman were narrowly defined. Finally, the additive

\textsuperscript{114}Perhaps the best known examples are the c.1430 alabaster figures attributed to the Master of the Rimini Crucifixion, now in the Liebieghaus Museum in Frankfurt. For a proposal of their original function, see Anton Legner, "Der Alabasteraltar aus Rimini," \textit{Städel-Jahrbuch} 2 (1969): 101-168. In light of the present study, the four fifteenth-century alabaster Apostles in the Musée de la Ville, St. Omer would also be worthy of further investigation.

\textsuperscript{115}Along with a theoretical reconstruction of the Rimini Crucifixion Altarpiece, Legner, "Der Alabasteralter," illustrates a Passion Altar in the Church of St. Reinold, Dortmund (figure 40), and a Crucifixion Altarpiece in the Niedersächsische Landesgalerie, Hannover (figure 71) as examples of this type of "mixed media" retable.
approach of the **Arras Altarpiece** may simply reflect the eclectic tastes of a patron who could afford to be selective about the manufacture and appearance of his commissions.\(^{116}\)

Like its unusual composite appearance, the place of the **Arras Altarpiece** within the development of devotional imagery is also difficult to define. While there is clearly a tendency during the course of the fifteenth century toward altarpieces composed entirely of painted panels, a direct evolutionary course cannot easily be plotted. Netherlandish painted altarpieces survive from the first decades of the fifteenth century,\(^{117}\) while carved retables continued to be popular into the sixteenth century.\(^{118}\) Yet, with its large format, and full-color exterior panels, the **Arras Altarpiece** does anticipate the large, painted triptychs that became more prevalent in the second half of the fifteenth century.

\(^{116}\) It should be noted that the abbot employed a similar method for the construction of his funerary monument. The stone was imported from Pronville; the architecture was constructed by the local mason Baudin Le Veel; the figures were carved by Collard de Hordain; and the monument was painted by Jacques Daret. See Loriquet, "Journal des Travaux," 70-71, items 5-8.

\(^{117}\) Notable examples include the c.1400 **Calvary of the Tanners Guild** in the Groeninge Museum, Bruges; and the c.1415 **Norfolk Triptych** in the Boymans-Van Beuningen Museum, Rotterdam.

\(^{118}\) For several examples of carved wood altarpieces dating from the late fifteenth century, see Joseph de Borchgrave d’Altena, *Retables en bois du Hainaut* (Mons, 1968).
CHAPTER 6

THE HOLY SPIRIT ALTARPIECE, c.1453-56

Introduction

Twenty years after completing the Arras Altarpiece, Jacques Daret was employed by Abbot Jean du Clercq to paint a second triptych for the Church of St. Vaast. Originally installed above the abbey’s altar of the Holy Spirit, no fragments of this Holy Spirit Altarpiece are known today. Nor, in contrast to Daret’s well-documented Arras Altarpiece, do any eyewitness descriptions exist that might shed light on its original appearance and function.

Perhaps due to this lack of physical evidence, few scholars have attempted to discuss what may be considered Daret’s second most important work.¹ However, by carefully analyzing the payment records for the altarpiece, and by comparing the description of the altarpiece contained in those documents with panels that can be attributed to artists in the circle of Daret, I believe it may be possible

¹To date, only Loriquet, "Journal des travaux," 62; and Lestocquoy, "Le rôle des artistes," 217-218, have briefly mentioned this second altarpiece.
to decipher the form and meaning of the Holy Spirit Altarpiece and to propose a theoretical reconstruction of its original appearance.

The commission in its historical context

In May of 1448, Jean du Clercq received permission from Rome to continue the construction project that he had begun in 1429. Along with the approval of Pope Nicholas V, the papal bull was accompanied by a grant of 10,000 francs to be used, according to the abbot's discretion, for the "decoration, augmentation, reparation, perfection and completion" of the Church of St. Vaast.²

Begun immediately, this second phase of construction included the completion of the remaining four bays of the nave, the corresponding bays of the side aisles, and the vaults.³ The construction of the side chapels begun in the

²Loriquet, "Journal des travaux," 85-86, item 63. Having attended the 1435 Congress of Arras as Tommaso Parentucelli, the newly-elected Pope was acquainted with both Jean du Clercq and the incomplete state of the abbey church. See above, 141, note 14.

thirteenth century was completed, and two additional chapel spaces were enclosed along the south side aisle (figure 58). 4

Along with the construction of the new portions of the church, the flying buttresses of the chevet, and the upper portions of the transept façades were also renovated. The west façade was completed, and the bell tower, which had been partially destroyed by fire in the late fourteenth century, was repaired. Work continued on the church until the final sculptural decoration of the west portal was completed in 1463, one year after Du Clercq's death. 5

In addition to the construction of the building itself, Du Clercq also spent lavish sums to decorate and furnish its interior. In the spring of 1450, he commissioned a new set of pontifical vestments for himself that were made of blue silk and red cloth-of-gold. 6 He purchased liturgical vessels and candelabra for the new chapels, 7 and had a painted and gilded alabaster statue of

---

4 Five chapels dated to the thirteenth century: the first and second chapels west of the transept on the north side; the first and second chapels west of the transept on the south side; and one chapel in the southwest corner, attached to the west façade. See Lestocquoy, "Plan de l'Eglise," 62-63.

5 The initial payments for the portal sculpture are recorded as the final entry of Du Clercq's account book. See Loriquet, "Journal des travaux," 91-92, item 80.

6 Ibid., 87, items 66 and 67.

7 Ibid., 90, item 77.
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the Virgin installed above the high altar of the church. Du Clercq’s most expensive project during this period, however, was the decoration of an altar dedicated to the Holy Spirit.

Original appearance

Because no fragments or eyewitness descriptions of the Holy Spirit altar decoration exist today, our knowledge of its original appearance is limited to information contained in four brief entries in Du Clercq’s account book. In the first entry (item 73), Martin Thoulet, a sculptor from Douai, was paid 67 livres, 4 sous for having carved stone figures of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit accompanied by several angels; the figures of Saint Vaast, Saint John the Baptist and Abbot du Clercq; and the stone pedestals on which these figures stood above the Holy Spirit altar. According to the second entry (item 74), Thoulet received an additional 38 livres, 8 sous for having carved the stone tabernacles which were installed above the sculpted figures.

---

8 Ibid., 91, item 79.
9 Ibid., 89-90, items 73-76.
10 Ibid., 89, item 73.
11 Ibid., 89, item 74.
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The third entry (item 75) records the payment of 4 livres, 16 sous to the Arras cabinet maker Jehan Le Brief for having made an altarpiece (table d’autel) of wood, complete with two shutters with which it could be closed.12 Described as a work of carpentry (ouvrage de hucherie), this altarpiece was a triptych composed of wood panels, which was presumably installed above the altar, beneath the sculpted figures.13 In contrast to the 60 livres, 2 sous that Collard de Hordain received for the elaborately carved wooden cabinet of the Arras Altarpiece, the low sum paid to Jehan Le Brief suggests that this triptych was quite simple in construction.14

Daret's contributions to the decoration of the Holy Spirit altar are briefly described in the fourth entry (item 76). He is first identified as having painted both the interior and exterior of the triptych en plate peinture. On the inside of the retable several narratives of the Holy Spirit were depicted. The exterior of the wings included

---

12Ibid., 89-90, item 75. The shutters are described as deux huis encaissilliez. According to Loriquet, this means that when they were closed, the shutters were recessed within the framework of the altarpiece.

13A nearly contemporary example of this type of altar decoration can be found in the Burgundian church of Rouvres-en-Plaine, in which figures of the Virgin, St. John the Evangelist, and St. John the Baptist are installed above the altar. See Pierre Quarré, Jean de la Huerta (Dijon: Musée des Beaux-Arts, 1972).

14For the payments to Collard de Hordain for the Arras Altarpiece, see Ibid., 71, item 9.
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images of four prophets who mentioned the Holy Spirit in their writings. In addition to the triptych, Daret is also recorded as having gilded and painted Thoulet’s sculpted figures, as well as the star-strewn backgrounds (camp semé) of their stone niches.\(^\text{15}\)

For his combined efforts, Daret received the impressive sum of 192 livres. Comparing this substantially higher payment with the 85 livres that Daret received for painting the wings of the Arras Altarpiece, Lestocquoy interpreted it as an indication of Daret’s increased reputation by this time.\(^\text{16}\) It should be noted, however that this value represents Daret’s total payment for work on the Holy Spirit ensemble. If all of Daret’s payments for the Arras Altarpiece are totaled, the sum equals 177 livres. While the higher payment may also indicate that the Holy Spirit triptych was larger than the Arras Altarpiece, it may simply reflect its more extensive painted decoration. In contrast to the Arras Altarpiece which bore narratives only

\(^{15}\)Ibid., 90, item 76. "à Jacque Daret, paintre, pour sa paine et sallaire de avoir paint une tavle d’autel, en plate peinture, en laquelle a pluseurs ystoyres du Saint-Esperit ens ou fons de ladite table, et es feullés d’ichelle IIII proffêtes faisant mension dudit Saint-Esperit, avecq ce doré et paint pluseurs personnaiges tant de monseigneur saint Jehan comme de saint Vaast et dudit Saint-Esperit, avecq tout le camp semé et verni, comme on poeult veoir, par marchié fait a luy en tasque, la somme de--IX\(^\text{m}XX\) lb., monnaie d’Artois." See also appendix B.

\(^{16}\)Lestocquoy, "Le rôle des artistes," 217.
on the exterior of its wings, both the interior and exterior of the Holy Spirit triptych were painted with figural subjects.

The exact location of this new altarpiece in the Church of St. Vaast is not clearly stated in Du Clercq’s accounts. Unlike the entries for the Arras Altarpiece, which repeatedly identify its location in the Lady Chapel, the entries for the Holy Spirit Altarpiece only mention its placement above the Holy Spirit altar. In his description of the church c.1600, Pronier identifies the second chapel west of the transept on the north side of the nave (figure 58, g) as the former Chapel of the Holy Spirit. It would seem from Pronier’s description, however, that, by the early seventeenth century, the chapel had been rededicated to the Holy Cross, and that it was undergoing renovation or repair.17 Due to the unfinished state of the renovations, Pronier does not describe the chapel’s furnishings in detail.18

Finally, although the individual entries for the Holy Spirit altar decorations are not dated in Du Clercq’s account book, their approximate dates can be determined from other, dated entries in the documents. Just prior to the payments for the Holy Spirit ensemble, an entry dated March

17Pronier, "Recoeul des Antiquitez," 541. Pronier’s text reads: "...la chappelle encommencée de Ste-Croix, quy fut celle du St-Esprit..."

18Ibid., 542.
24, 1453, identifies the sculptor and stonemason Evrart Julien as the recipient of 12 livres 8 sous for an elaborate new altar table. Following the payments for the new triptych and additional furnishings for the altar of the Holy Spirit, the next dated entry was recorded on October 20, 1456. The Holy Spirit Altarpiece can, therefore, be securely dated to c.1453-56.

Iconographic program

With no surviving fragments, it is difficult to discuss the iconography of the Holy Spirit altar decorations with any degree of certainty. However, from the brief description of the ensemble contained in Du Clercq's accounts, some probable assumptions can be made. We know, for example, from the payments made to Martin Thoulet that,

---

19 Loriquet, "Journal; des travaux," 88-89, item 71. The proximity of this entry to those for the Holy Spirit Altarpiece suggests that this new altar may have been the one for which the new triptych was made. This is not, however, clearly stated in the accounts.

20 Ibid., 89-90, items 73-77. To complete the decoration of the Holy Spirit altar, Du Clercq purchased silver and black damask, two copper candle holders, and various liturgical vessels.

21 Ibid., 91, item 78. This entry records building expenses that are unrelated to the Holy Spirit altar or its decoration.
along with the figures of St. Vaast, St. John the Baptist, and Jean du Clercq, the principal subject of the sculptural decoration was the Holy Trinity.

An increasingly popular devotional subject from the twelfth century onward, the Holy Trinity was depicted in a variety of ways during the Late Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{22} In one type of Trinity, known as a Gnadenstuhl or "Throne of Grace", God the Father is depicted on His throne, supporting the tiny figure of the adult Christ on the cross before Him. God holds the ends of the crosspiece in His outstretched hands while the dove of the Holy Spirit hovers between the heads of Father and Son. A variation of this type of Trinity can be seen above the fireplace in Campin’s St. Barbara panel (figure 15). In this Trinity, God the Father supports the crucified Christ from a standing, rather than a seated position.

Another type of Trinity, in which the body of the dead Christ is held directly in the hands of God the Father, appears to have its origins in Burgundian art c.1400.\textsuperscript{23} In this type of Trinity, known as a Not Gottes or Pitié de Nostre Seigneur, Christ’s human suffering is emphasized rather than the symbolic sacrifice of His crucifixion. God

\textsuperscript{22}For the origins and iconographic development of Holy Trinity imagery, see Schiller, \textit{Iconography}, 2:122-124; and Emile Mâle, \textit{Religious Art in France. The Late Middle Ages} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 140-144.

\textsuperscript{23}Schiller, \textit{Iconography}, 2:219-224.
the Father either stands or sits on His throne, supporting the dead Christ at His side in a manner reminiscent of a Pietà (figure 7). In some examples, such as Campin’s Hermitage Trinity (figure 43), Christ is portrayed as the Man of Sorrows, displaying the wound in His right side to the viewer. Between the heads of the two figures, the dove of the Holy Spirit hovers just above Christ’s left shoulder. According to its description in the St. Vaast accounts, Thoulet’s sculpted Trinity was accompanied by several angels. While the angels may have surrounded the figures of the Trinity in adoration, they may have also been included as mourners for the dead Christ.24

* * * * *

The iconography of Daret’s painted retable is equally speculative. Despite the description of several stories of the Holy Spirit on its interior, the specific events are not identified in the accounts. Nor is the number of narratives indicated. Because the exterior of the wings are described as containing the images of four prophets, it has been assumed that only four prophets were depicted, and that each prophet was accompanied by only one narrative subject.25

24 If we consider the Rogerian Trinity in Louvain (figure 62), in which four sorrowing angels accompany the figures of God the Father and Christ, we might imagine that the sculpted Trinity above the Holy Spirit altar may have been depicted in a similar way.

25 Lestocquoy, "Le rôle des artistes," 217-218, assumed a 1:1 correlation between the four prophets on the exterior and the number of stories depicted on the interior of the
However, it is also possible that additional figures may have accompanied the four prophets, or that each prophet's writings may have been illustrated by more than one scene.

Three events from the New Testament are generally recognized as the principal manifestations of the Holy Spirit: the Annunciation to the Virgin; the Baptism of Christ; and the Descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.\(^\text{26}\)

As told in the Gospel of Luke, the angel Gabriel appeared to the Virgin and informed her that, through the power of the Holy Spirit, she would conceive and bear the Son of God.\(^\text{27}\)

Although the physical presence of the Holy Spirit is not specifically mentioned by Luke, from the eleventh century, it was usually represented in scenes of the Annunciation by a dove, descending from heaven on golden rays of light.\(^\text{28}\)

Beginning in the fourteenth century, the dove of the Holy Spirit was sometimes replaced by the tiny figure of the Infant Christ, as it is in the center panel of the Mérode wings.


\(^{27}\)Luke 1:26-38.

Triptych (figure 11).\textsuperscript{29} In some versions, such as the Prado Annunciation (figure 53), the figure of God the Father observes the event from His heavenly position at the top of the composition.

With its stylistic affinities to the documented work of Jacques Daret (figures 1-4), and its apparent dating in the 1450s, it is possible that the Prado Annunciation (figure 53) may reflect the composition of the lost Annunciation from the Holy Spirit triptych.\textsuperscript{30} As noted above, images of the Annunciation taking place in a church are more commonly found in French rather than in Flemish paintings during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{31} While this could suggest a French origin for the Prado Annunciation (figure 53), it may also indicate its use in an ecclesiastical, rather than a private setting.

The second principal story of the Holy Spirit, the Baptism of Christ was the first event at which the Holy Spirit manifested itself in physical form in the Scriptures.\textsuperscript{32} According to the Gospel of Matthew,\textsuperscript{33} at the

\textsuperscript{29}Schiller, \textit{Iconography}, 1:46.

\textsuperscript{30}In this study, the Prado Annunciation has been attributed to a member of Daret's workshop, and dated to the 1450s. See above, 119-123.

\textsuperscript{31}Ibid., 120, note 60.

\textsuperscript{32}For the iconography of the Baptism of Christ, see Künstle, \textit{Ikonographie}, 375-380; Réau, \textit{Iconographie}, 2:295-310; and Schiller, \textit{Iconography}, 1:127-143.

\textsuperscript{33}Matthew 3:13-17.
moment of His baptism, the Holy Spirit descended upon Christ's head like a dove while God declared His divinity with the words, "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased."\textsuperscript{34}

From the thirteenth century on, images of the Baptism of Christ were generally depicted in a landscape setting.\textsuperscript{35} Christ stands in the waters of the river Jordan at the center of the composition as John the Baptist anoints His head with water. The dove of the Holy Spirit hovers with outstretched wings above Christ's head, while the figure of God frequently appears in the sky above, completing the Trinity.

Traditionally viewed as the first act of Christ's public life, the Baptism of Christ was, from the fourteenth century onward, also interpreted as the first event of His Passion.\textsuperscript{36} The juxtaposition of Christ's Baptism in the painted retable with His final appearance in the sculpted Trinity would, therefore, be logical within the iconographic program of the Holy Spirit ensemble. The presence of the sculpted figure of St. John the Baptist further supports the inclusion of this subject in the iconographic program of the

\textsuperscript{34}Matthew 3:17.

\textsuperscript{35}Schiller, \textit{Iconography}, 1:137.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., 1:143.
triptych. One example of a Baptism of Christ from the circle of Campin can be found in the center panel of Roger van der Weyden's c.1450 St. John Altarpiece.\(^{37}\)

Recounted in the Acts of the Apostles, the story of the Pentecost is the third principal narrative of the Holy Spirit.\(^{38}\) In images of the Pentecost, the Holy Spirit is generally depicted as tongues of fire, descending on rays of heavenly light, and resting on the heads of Christ's disciples. By the fifteenth century, a dove was often included as the source of divine light.\(^{39}\) Since the Pentecost was the event by which Christ instructed His followers in their priestly mission and thereby established His Church, images of the Pentecost are generally limited to gatherings of the twelve Apostles only. In those images in which the Virgin is included, she may be interpreted as a personification of the Church itself.

As the final communication of the Holy Spirit which was promised in the Annunciation and first manifested at the Baptism of Christ, it would seem logical for an image of the Pentecost to have been included in the iconographic program of the Holy Spirit triptych. Moreover, as in the Arras

\(^{37}\)Illustrated in Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 2:figures 342 and 344.

\(^{38}\)Acts, 2:1-47.

\(^{39}\)New Catholic Encyclopedia, "Holy Spirit." See also Künstle, Ikonographie, 517-521; and Réau, Iconographie, 2:591-596.
**Altarpiece**, the apostolic theme inherent in the story of the Pentecost would have carried particular significance for the abbot donor.\(^{40}\)

In addition to the Annunciation, Baptism of Christ, and the Pentecost, several other narratives could also be considered as possible candidates for inclusion on the *Holy Spirit* triptych. We might consider, for example, the Visitation, in which Elizabeth, filled with the Holy Spirit, recognized the divine nature of the Virgin’s pregnancy;\(^{41}\) or the story of Simeon who, inspired by the Holy Spirit, identified the Christ Child as the Messiah at His Presentation in the Temple.\(^{42}\) Similarly, the apostle Paul was filled with the Holy Spirit causing his sight to be restored in the final stage of his conversion.\(^{43}\) Finally, as Pronier’s c.1600 description of the other Coronation altarpiece in the Lady Chapel tells us, the Coronation of the Virgin was sometimes enacted by all three persons of the Trinity rather than one or two.\(^{44}\)

\(^{40}\)For the evangelical mission of the Apostles as a monastic ideal, see above, 153, note 38.


\(^{43}\)Acts 9:10-19.

\(^{44}\)Pronier, "Recoeul des antiquitez," 533.
One additional event through which the Holy Spirit was revealed is the story of the Miraculous Flowering of Joseph's Rod.\textsuperscript{45} According to the Protoevangelium of James, the Holy Spirit caused Joseph's staff to spontaneously bloom in the Temple, thereby identifying him as God's chosen guardian to the Virgin Mary.\textsuperscript{46} During the Middle Ages, the Miracle of the Rod and the subsequent Betrothal of Mary and Joseph were frequently associated with the story of the Annunciation as early events in the life of the Virgin.\textsuperscript{47}

A subject not often found in Northern painting, the Miracle of the Rod is depicted in the left half of the Prado Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49), a painting that can be directly associated with Jacques Daret.\textsuperscript{48} As previously noted, the presence of the grisaille figures of St. James and St. Clare on the back of the panel (figure 50), suggests

\textsuperscript{45}For the iconography of this somewhat rare subject see Künstle, \textit{Ikonographie}, 326; and Smith, "The Betrothal of the Virgin."


\textsuperscript{47}For the inclusion of these subjects in cycles dedicated to the Life of Mary, see Künstle, \textit{Ikonographie}, 321-328. Voragine, \textit{Golden Legend}, 204-208, mentions the Miracle of Joseph's Rod and the Betrothal of the Virgin within his account of the Annunciation.

\textsuperscript{48}For the attribution of the Prado Betrothal to a member of Daret's workshop and a proposed dating of the panel in the 1450s, see above, 113-119.
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that the Prado picture had its origins in a larger ensemble.\textsuperscript{49} This theory is further supported by the repetition of the composition in the left third of the Hoogstraten \textit{Life of St. Joseph} cycle (figure 52).\textsuperscript{50} It is, therefore, possible that, like the Prado \textit{Annunciation} (figure 53), the \textit{Betrothal of the Virgin} (figure 49) may have been copied from the \textit{Holy Spirit} triptych.\textsuperscript{51} If so, the figures of St. James and St. Clare could have been added to accommodate the interests of a different patron or to meet the specific needs of the copy’s intended location and use.\textsuperscript{52}

* * * * *

The four prophets on the exterior of the \textit{Holy Spirit Altarpiece} are not clearly identified in Du Clercq’s account book either. Although it would seem logical for the four major prophets of the Old Testament (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel) to be represented, this may not have

\textsuperscript{49}See above, 118, note 53.

\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., 118, note 54.

\textsuperscript{51}The inclusion of the \textit{Betrothal} composition in the iconographic program of the \textit{Holy Spirit Altarpiece} is further supported by the local significance of the subject. The Feast of the Marriage of Mary and Joseph, had been celebrated in Arras since 1430. See above, 67, note 11.

\textsuperscript{52}Noting the presence of St. Clare on its reverse, Châtelet has recently proposed that the Prado \textit{Betrothal of the Virgin} was made for a convent of Poor Clares. See Châtelet, "L’atelier de Campin," 30, note 33.
been the case.\textsuperscript{53} Daniel makes no reference to the Holy Spirit in his writings and, therefore, would not appear to be a likely candidate for inclusion in the iconographic program of the triptych.

As the most important prophet of the Holy Spirit, one would expect to find Isaiah among the figures on the exterior of the Holy Spirit triptych. In addition to his discussion of the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit,\textsuperscript{54} Isaiah's statement, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel,"\textsuperscript{55} is generally recognized as the principal prophecy of the Annunciation and the Incarnation. Moreover, Isaiah's words, "Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen in whom my soul delights; I have put my Spirit upon him..."\textsuperscript{56} can also be interpreted as a foretelling of God's praise and the descent of the Holy Spirit at the Baptism of Christ.

\textsuperscript{53} The prophets of the Old Testament are traditionally divided into the four major prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel), and the twelve minor prophets (Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi). See Molsdorf, \textit{Christliche Symbolik}, 158-169; and Künstle, \textit{Ikonographie}, 303-312. I am also grateful to Dr. Christopher Begg of the Theology Department of The Catholic University of America for sharing his expertise on this subject.

\textsuperscript{54} Isaiah 11:1-3.

\textsuperscript{55} Isaiah 7:14.

\textsuperscript{56} Isaiah 42:1.
The second most likely prophet to be depicted on the exterior of the Holy Spirit Altarpiece is the minor prophet Joel, whose prophecy foretold the events of the Pentecost. As Peter explains to his fellow apostles, Joel prophesied the Descent of the Holy Spirit in his statement, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and daughters shall prophesy..."^57

While the inclusion of Isaiah and Joel would seem likely, the identity of the remaining prophets is less certain. Along with his repeated declaration, "the Spirit lifted me up,"^58 Ezekiel’s prophecy of the closed gate was generally interpreted as a reference to the sustained virginity of Mary at the Annunciation.\(^59\) Similarly, in addition to their prophecies of the power of the Spirit,\(^60\) both Micah and Zechariah were sometimes regarded as prophets of the Annunciation.\(^61\) Finally, although his writings were usually interpreted as predictions of Christ’s Passion, Jeremiah’s foretelling of the righteous Branch that would

\(^{57}\)Acts 2:17-20. 
\(^{58}\)Ezekiel 3:12. 
\(^{59}\)Ezekiel 44:2. 
\(^{60}\)Micah 3:8; and Zechariah 4:6. 
\(^{61}\)From their positions in the upper lunettes, Zechariah and Micah witness the Annunciation taking place below them on the exterior of the Ghent Altarpiece. See Panofsky, Early Netherlandish Painting, 1:207, and 2:figure 274.
rise up from the house of David was also understood as a prophecy of the Annunciation and Incarnation of Christ.\textsuperscript{62}

**Theoretical reconstruction**

In addition to the Prado pictures of the Annunciation (figure 53) and the Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49), the painted wings of an altarpiece never previously associated with the Holy Spirit Altarpiece may, in fact, provide us with the most complete suggestion of what Daret's second triptych may have looked like in its original state.

During the fifteenth century, the neighboring territories of Flanders, the Artois, and Picardy were fertile centers for the exchange of artistic ideas and influences. Artists and craftsmen of all \textit{métiers} frequently traveled between the cities of Tournai, Arras, Amiens, and Lille, either in response to specific commissions, or allying themselves with local workshops.\textsuperscript{63} A prime example

\textsuperscript{62}Jeremiah 23:5. A notable example of Jeremiah's appearance in this context is the c.1445 Aix Annunciation Triptych, in which the central Annunciation panel was flanked by the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah in the wings.

\textsuperscript{63}The cross-influence of French and Flemish art of all media during this period is well documented. See for example, Friedrich Winkler, "Die nordfranzösische Malerie im 15. Jahrhundert und ihr Verhältnis zur altniederländischen Malerie," \textit{Belgische Kunst-Denkmäler} 1 (1923): 247-268; Jean Lestocquoy, "Relations artistiques entre Arras et Amiens à la fin du XVe et au début du XVIe siècle," \textit{Bulletin de la société des antiquaires de Picardie} 37 (1937-38): 325-328; and Susie Nash, "Some Relationships Between Flemish Painting and Illumination in Amiens c.1400-1460," in \textit{Flanders in a}
of this cultural exchange, the St. Bertin Altarpiece is generally regarded as one of the most significant works of Franco-Flemish art of the fifteenth century.

The St. Bertin Altarpiece was commissioned in c.1455-1456 by Abbot Guillaume Fillastre for the high altar of the Benedictine Abbey of St. Bertin in St. Omer. A lavish monument of gilt silver and precious stones, the interior of the retable was covered by a pair of wooden shutters that were painted on both sides. The metalwork interior of the altarpiece was destroyed in 1793. Only the painted wings have survived.

---


65 For an analysis of the wings and a proposed reconstruction of the complete altarpiece, see Edith Warren Hoffman, "A Reconstruction and Reinterpretation of Guillaume Fillastre’s Altarpiece of St.-Bertin," The Art Bulletin 60 (1978): 634-649. Hoffman’s article includes transcriptions of several eyewitness descriptions of the altarpiece prior to its destruction at the end of the eighteenth century.

66 Today, the panels are divided between Berlin and London. For a complete history of the wings since their separation from the triptych, see Martin Davies, The National Gallery, London 3 (Brussels: Centre national de Recherches "Primitifs flamands", 1970), 19-26; and Berlin, Staatlichen Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie Katalog (Berlin: Mann, 1975), 252-253.
The exteriors of the wings are painted entirely en grisaille (figure 63). Flanking a central Annunciation group, the fictive statues of four prophets and the four evangelists are depicted within illusionistic stone niches. On the left wing, Mark and Micah are paired in the first niche. John and Solomon occupy the second niche, followed by the angel Gabriel. On the right wing, the Virgin Annunciate is flanked by David and Matthew in the fourth niche, while Isaiah and Luke occupy the fifth.

When opened, the interior of the shutters revealed several stories from the life of St. Bertin, the patron saint of the abbey, and the saint to whom the triptych was dedicated (figure 64). Set within a series of architectural spaces, each scene is depicted in full color. The stories are arranged chronologically, from left to right. Next to the donor’s portrait which occupies the first architectural unit, the birth of St. Bertin takes place within the second structure. The saint’s death is depicted in the final scene on the right wing.

---

67 For the origins and significance of the juxtaposition of Old Testament prophets with New Testament apostles and evangelists, see Molsdorf, Christliche Symbolik, 158-166; and Mâle, The Late Middle Ages, 230-236.

68 For the inclusion of kings David and Solomon among the Old Testament prophets, see Künstle, Ikonographie, 304.

69 For the iconography of the remaining scenes, see Dehaisnes, "Recherches du retable de Saint-Bertin," 287-292.
The main subject of the sculpted interior of the St. Bertin Altarpiece was the Crucifixion, which was flanked on either side by scenes from the lives of the Virgin and Christ. Rising above the central Crucifixion, a Tree of Life was topped by the symbolic figure of a pelican, feeding her young with blood from her own breast. Two angels knelt at the base of the tree, while a eucharistic reserve in the form of a dove, was suspended from one of its branches.

Neither the metalsmith responsible for the interior shrine of the altarpiece, nor the painter of the shutters has been firmly identified through documents. Until the late nineteenth century, the wings were attributed to Hans Memling. Today, they are generally accepted as the work of Simon Marmion, a native of Amiens who was active in Valenciennes during the second half of the fifteenth century.

While Lestocquoy cited the Arras Altarpiece as

70 According to a procès-verbal dated July 12, 1791, these scenes depicted the Annunciation, the Visitation, Christ appearing to the Magdalene, and Christ and St. Thomas. For the full text, see Otto Bled, "Note sur le retable de l'Abbaye de Saint-Bertin," Société des antiquaires de la Morinie, Bulletin historique trimestrial 10 (1887-1901): 608-616.

71 The pelican, who pierces her breast to nourish her young with her blood was a common analogy to the sacrifice of Christ. See Hall, Subjects and Symbols, 238.

72 Marmion's authorship was first proposed in 1892 by Dehaisnes, "Recherches du volets de Saint-Bertin," 483-488. For a recent discussion of this attribution and a technical analysis of the panels, see Rainald Grosshans, "Simon Marmion and the Saint Bertin Altarpiece: Notes on the
a possible source of inspiration for the St. Bertin Altarpiece, I would propose that it was Daret's second triptych, the Holy Spirit Altarpiece, that served as the model for Marmion's St. Bertin wings.

* * * * *

With its combination of painted wings and sculpted interior, the St. Bertin Altarpiece does, indeed, bear a resemblance to the format of Daret's Arras Altarpiece. Yet, in its overall conception, the St. Bertin Altarpiece is also remarkably similar to the description of the Holy Spirit Altarpiece that is contained in the account book of Jean du Clercq. Both triptychs were closed with a single pair of wings that were painted on both sides. In both altarpieces, figures painted on the outside of the wings were accompanied by a series of narrative subjects on the inside. In the iconographic programs of both altarpieces, the figures on the exterior prefigured the principal themes that were depicted on the interior.


74 As described in the St. Vaast accounts, the figures on the exterior of the Holy Spirit triptych included four prophets who referred to the Holy Spirit in their writings. On the exterior of the St. Bertin wings, Micah and Isaiah are the prophets who foretold Christ's coming, while Solomon
Although a direct connection between the Holy Spirit triptych and the St. Bertin Altarpiece cannot be documented, the sense of friendly rivalry that existed between the abbeys of St. Vaast and St. Bertin, and that of their respective leaders, can be readily established. Like his fellow abbot Jean du Clercq, Guillaume Fillastre occupied positions of considerable ecclesiastical and secular power.\textsuperscript{75} In 1437, Fillastre was named Bishop of Verdun by Duke Philip the Good. He was appointed Abbot of St. Bertin by Philip in 1442, although his position was not ratified by Pope Nicholas V until 1451. In 1456, he succeeded Jean Chevrot as Bishop of Tournai and became Philip's Counsellor of Finances the same year. As the heads of neighboring Benedictine abbeys, and advisors to the ducal court, Fillastre and Du Clercq were, no doubt, well acquainted. It is, therefore, possible that they shared ideas on artistic patronage along with their views on politics and religion.

In addition to the relationship of the two abbots, specific examples of artistic influence can also be cited between the two abbeys. When it was rebuilt for the fourth time, and David are ancestors of Christ. For a further discussion of the relationship between the exterior figures and the interior Crucifixion of the St. Bertin Altarpiece, see Hoffman, "Reconstruction and Reinterpretation," 645-648.

\textsuperscript{75}For Fillastre's biography and a discussion of his major accomplishments and artistic commissions, see Baron Joseph du Teil, Un amateur d'art au XVe siècle Guillaume Fillastre (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1920).
time between 1311 and 1500, the Church of St. Bertin was modelled after the Church of St. Vaast in both its floorplan and its elevation." Similarly, the sculptural decoration that Fillastre had made for the west portal of the Church of St. Bertin in 1473 was copied directly from the sculpture group that Du Clercq had commissioned for the west portal of the Church of St. Vaast in 1461.

Perhaps most significant for a comparison of these two altarpieces, however, is the documented interaction of the two artists. Like Daret, Simon Marmion was employed as a painter of decorations for the Voeu du Faisan banquet hosted in Lille by Philip the Good in February of 1454. Marmion, then a resident of Amiens, was employed for nine days at the median salary of 12 sols per day. Working together in Lille, it is likely that the two artists became acquainted with one another and possible that they shared ideas about their respective work.


77 Lestocquoy, "La Cathédrale d'Amiens," 124.

78 Laborde, Les Ducs de Bourgogne, 1:422, item 37; and Dehaisnes, Archives du Nord 4:196.

79 Ibid. By comparison, the older and more experienced Daret earned 20 sols per day. Daret's varlets were paid only 8 and 6 sols per day.
While it is likely that Jean du Clercq attended the Lille banquet as one of Philip's distinguished guests, his name does not appear in the various chronicles of the event.\textsuperscript{60} In contrast, Guillaume Fillastre's attendance is well documented.\textsuperscript{81} As Dehaisnes suggests, it was perhaps on this occasion that the Abbot of St. Bertin met the young Marmion, whom he would later commission to paint the wings for his new altarpiece.\textsuperscript{82}

Finally, the dates of the two altarpieces further support the theory that Marmion's St. Bertin Altarpiece wings may have been modelled after Daret's Holy Spirit triptych. We know from the St. Vaast documents that the decoration of the Holy Spirit altar was completed before October, 1456. According to the St. Bertin accounts, the St. Bertin Altarpiece was begun sometime between June, 1455 and June, 1456.\textsuperscript{83} If we recall the great pride with which

\textsuperscript{60}The lists of participants are primarily restricted to those courtiers who pledged their allegiance to the Duke and vowed their military support for his intended Crusade against the Turks in Constantinople. See, for example, Mathieu d'Escouchy, Chronique de Mathieu d'Escouchy, ed. G. Du Fresne de Beaucourt (Paris: 1863), 2:113-237; and Olivier de la Marche, Mémoires d'Olivier de la Marche, Maître d'Hôtel et Capitaine des Gardes de Charles le Téméraire, ed. Henri Beaune and J. D'Arbaumont (Paris: Société de l'histoire de France, 1884), 2:340-394.

\textsuperscript{81}Du Teil, Guillaume Fillastre, 14.

\textsuperscript{82}Dehaisnes, "Recherches du retable de Saint-Bertin," 486-487.

\textsuperscript{83}Ibid., 477-478. A chronogram on the base of the interior of the retable recorded the date of its installation on the high altar of the church in June, 1459.
Jean du Clercq presented his new *Arras Altarpiece* to his distinguished guests in 1435, we can easily imagine that he would have taken similar pleasure in displaying the decoration of the Holy Spirit altar when it was finished. If, indeed, Guillaume Fillastre had seen Du Clercq’s latest acquisition, the nearly consecutive dates of the *St. Bertin Altarpiece* would suggest that Fillastre commissioned the triptych in response to the newly completed *Holy Spirit Altarpiece*.

* * * * *

In light of the chronological relationship between the *Holy Spirit Altarpiece* and the *St. Bertin Altarpiece*, and the parallels in format that I have suggested above, let us now consider the possibility that the Prado panels of the *Betrothal of the Virgin* (figure 49) and the *Annunciation* (figure 53) may actually represent fragments of the *Holy Spirit* triptych rather than copies from it.

Although they can easily be understood as Daret’s designs, the Prado panels do not appear to be autograph works by Daret himself. If not copies, they would appear to be the work of two different workshop assistants working under his direction. Yet, with their related subjects

---

This, according to Dom Charles de Witte, *Le Grand Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Saint-Bertin* 8:6, as cited by Dehaisnes, "Recherches du retable de Saint-Bertin," 478.

84 The stylistic discrepancies of the two pictures, as well as Daret’s possible role in their completion have been noted above. See above, 113-123.
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and similar compositional formats, the two Prado panels would work well together as the interior left wing of the Holy Spirit Altarpiece. The physical data of the pictures further allows for the possibility that they were joined at one time. Each panel is constructed from three, horizontal planks; each measures 76.5 cm in height. 85

In accordance with its traditional location in Marian or Infancy cycles, the Annunciation (figure 53) would have occupied the first position on the open left wing. The Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49) could have been the second scene on the interior of the shutter. In this proposed arrangement (figure 65), the depiction of the Annunciation and Betrothal narratives within units of architectural space can be directly compared with the compartmentalization of the scenes from the life of St. Bertin depicted on the interior of Marmion's wings.

Similarly, the grisaille figures of St. James and St. Clare (figure 50) on the back of the Betrothal panel could have served as models for the arrangement of the prophets and evangelists on the exterior of the St. Bertin wings. This would further suggest that the exterior of the Holy Spirit triptych contained eight figures, rather than just the four prophets mentioned in the accounts. While no traces of figures can be detected on the back of the

85The Betrothal of the Virgin is 88 cm wide. The Annunciation has been trimmed along its right edge to a width of 70 cm.
Annunciation panel, the fact that it has been planed suggests that it may have been painted at one time.

As we have seen above, the legends of the Miracle of the Rod and the Betrothal of the Virgin had their origins in the Protoevangelium of James. As the textual source for these stories, the figure of St. James would, therefore, have paralleled the prophets whose writings were illustrated by stories of the Holy Spirit on the interior of the triptych. St. James’s presence on the Holy Spirit Altarpiece could further be explained by the fact that a portion of his cranium was revered as one of the most important relics of the Abbey of St. Vaast.

While the presence of St. James can be easily justified, the reason for the inclusion of St. Clare is less evident. As a Franciscan saint, Clare would seem an unusual choice for an altarpiece made for a Benedictine abbey. Nor, unlike her companion St. James, can she be directly associated with the events depicted on the reverse of the panel. If, on the other hand, the Prado Betrothal

---

86 See above, 197.

87 By extension, one could postulate, on the exterior of the right wing, Matthew as the New Testament source of the Baptism of Christ, and Peter as the commentator on the Pentecost.

88 For a list of the St. Vaast relics, see Cardevacque and Terninck, L'Abbaye de Saint-Vaast, 3:137-145.

89 For the life of St. Clare, see Karl Künstle, Ikonographie der Heiligen (Freiburg: Herder & Co., 1926), 163-165; and Réau, Iconographie, 3:316-319.
represents a copy rather than a fragment from the Holy Spirit triptych, the position given to St. Clare may, in the original, have been occupied by one of the Old Testament prophets, or perhaps by Luke as the New Testament source for the story of the Annunciation.

* * * * *

To summarize, I would envision the decoration of the Holy Spirit altar in the following way: In contrast to the inverted T-shape of Daret’s earlier Arras Altarpiece, the Holy Spirit triptych was probably rectangular in shape. Across the full width of the exterior, the figures of four prophets, probably accompanied by four additional figures, would have been painted in a single row. Similar to the figures on the exterior of the St. Bertin Altarpiece and those of St. James and St. Clare (figure 50), the exterior figures would probably have been executed en grisaille, and set within a series of fictive stone niches.

On the interior of the triptych, several narratives of the Holy Spirit were probably depicted in a series of separate scenes. At left, an Annunciation, either the Prado panel or one similar to it (figure 53), may have been

---

50 My assumption is based on the low payment to Jehan Le Brief for the construction of the wooden triptych, and the presumed installation of Martin Thoulet’s sculpted figures in the wall above it. See above, 186.
depicted as the first narrative. Next to the Annunciation, the stories of the Miracle of Joseph’s Rod and the Betrothal of the Virgin could have been paired as the second scene. The Baptism of Christ may have been painted on the right wing, while the Pentecost could have been included as the final story of the Holy Spirit.

As the prophets most closely associated with the Annunciation, Isaiah and perhaps Ezekiel, Micah, or Zechariah, would likely have been depicted on the exterior of the left shutter. Jeremiah and Joel, the prophets of Christ’s adult life and of the institution of His Church, would probably have been painted together on the right shutter. Although additional figures are not specifically mentioned in the St. Vaast accounts, the symmetry of the triptych argues for the presence of eight figures, rather than four.

Above Daret’s painted triptych, Martin Thoulet’s sculpted figures were probably installed in the wall behind the altar table. In the center, the Holy Trinity, perhaps depicted as a "Throne of Grace", was surrounded by angels. Standing beneath carved stone tabernacles, the figures of St. John the Baptist and St. Vaast would have occupied positions on either side of the central figures. As the

91 The physical condition of the Prado Annunciation further suggests a rectangular format for the Holy Spirit wings. The top edge of the panel bears no evidence that it has been trimmed of a vertical extension.
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donor’s patron saint, St. John the Baptist would probably have presented the kneeling figure of Jean du Clercq to the Trinity from the viewer’s left.

Although this proposed reconstruction of the Holy Spirit Altarpiece is based on an examination of the factual record, an analysis of works that can be directly associated with Jacques Daret, and a comparison with an altarpiece that appears to have been influenced by Daret’s work, it cannot be considered to be more than an educated speculation at this point. For every possible solution, an equal number of questions remains. Until additional documentation or possible fragments are discovered, the actual appearance of the Holy Spirit Altarpiece will remain hypothetical.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSIONS

This study has been an attempt to better understand the life and extended career one of the best documented, yet least recognized Netherlandish artists of the fifteenth century, Jacques Daret. Although he was trained in the workshop of one of the most important masters of the fifteenth century, and employed by some of the most prominent patrons of his day, Daret's achievements are little known today.

This situation is clearly demonstrated by the review of the literature presented in chapter 1. While Daret's teacher, Robert Campin, has been the subject of extensive research and debate since the re-discovery of "Flemish primitive" painting in the early nineteenth century, the name of Jacques Daret appears only occasionally in the literature. The scarcity of scholarship devoted to Daret clearly identifies the need for a more thorough examination of the artist's biography and artistic activity beyond his only surviving works, the four panels from the c.1434-35 Arras Altarpiece (figures 1-4).
More than a just a review of the literature, chapter 1 also provides a concise history of the Campin-Flémalle problem from its origins in the early nineteenth century to the present. The variety of opinions regarding the identity of the anonymous "Master of Flémalle" have been presented, and the logic behind Hulin de Loo's discovery of Jacques Daret as the author of the *Arras Altarpiece*, and of his subsequent identification of Robert Campin as the "Master of Flémalle," is summarized.¹

In chapter 2, Daret's biography has been reconstructed from the Tournai documents and from the record of his complete artistic activity. From this biography, a picture of the artist emerges that is both richer and more informative than any offered to date. We see, for example, that Daret prepared for his career as an independent master during a long training period, and that his training probably included additional instruction in media other than panel painting. From a consideration of his various commissions, and the length of his career, it is also evident that Daret was a very successful artist whose talents were sought by some of the most important patrons of the day.

¹For the historian's own recounting of this discovery, see Hulin de Loo, "An Authentic Work," 202-208.
An analysis of Daret's style and painting technique was presented in chapter 3. In contrast to previous authors who have dismissed Daret as a mere Campin copyist, or those who have perhaps written too enthusiastically about his abilities, my goal has been to present a more balanced and objective evaluation of his individual approach. Through a comparison of the four surviving panels from the Arras Altarpiece with as many of Campin's paintings as possible, a greater understanding of Daret's personal style has been gained. At the same time, a more precise definition of Campin's characteristic style has also been attained.

Although the Arras panels clearly demonstrate that Daret was a capable painter, his style is somewhat unimpressive when compared to the innovative and more refined approach of his master. Daret's figures are weaker than those of Campin, and his compositions are often confused by a problematic depiction of three-dimensional space. Yet, with their warmer, more vibrant colors, more extensive use of metallic gold, and frequent inclusion of richly decorated costumes, Daret's pictures are quite aesthetically pleasing in their own right.

Along with the properties of the paint surfaces, Daret's underdrawing and underpainting styles as determined by X-radiography and infrared reflectography have also been examined. By combining the scientific data with the results of traditional methods of connoisseurship, this study
offers, for the first time, an analysis of Daret’s approach at each of these stages in the creative process. In comparison to Campin’s carefully executed underdrawings, Daret’s underdrawings appear to be merely summary sketches of his finished compositions. Similarly, unlike the meticulous underpainting of Campin’s paintings, the underpainting in Daret’s panels appears somewhat crude and hastily applied.

Applying the information attained from a comparative examination of Daret’s and Campin’s paintings, the authorship of several, variously attributed panels in the “Campin Group” was considered in chapter 4. Three paintings which are generally attributed to Campin: the Berlin Portrait of a Young Man (figure 35); the Brussels Annunciation (figure 37); and the Hermitage Virgin and Child (figure 44) have here been attributed to Jacques Daret. Similarly, two other paintings usually associated with Campin: the Prado Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49), and the Prado Annunciation (figure 53) have been identified as the work of Daret workshop assistants.

Although these attributions expand Daret’s minimal oeuvre, they must, by consequence, also reduce the number of paintings attributable to Campin. Furthermore, the attribution of the Brussels Annunciation (figure 37) and the Hermitage Virgin and Child (figure 44) to Daret during his period of apprenticeship suggests that we reconsider our
current notions regarding the organization and division of labor within the Late Medieval workshop, or at least within Campin's. As my discussions of these paintings have demonstrated, it would appear that apprentices or assistants were sometimes given large amounts of responsibility for the completion of paintings, and that they may have worked in direct collaboration with their masters more often than we realize.

While the analysis of these early panels helps us to understand the formulation of Darets individual style, the attribution of the Prado panels of the Annunciation (figure 53) and the Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49) to Darets workshop in the 1450s suggests that the painter's style did not change markedly as his career progressed. As these two pictures demonstrate, many of the problematic elements found in Darets earliest attributed works, such as the rather clumsy drawing of figures and the inaccurate depiction of perspectival space, are still evident in his designs of the 1450s. Moreover, the presence of the Campinesque, Rogerian, and Eyckian elements in the Prado Betrothal (figure 49) suggests that Daret continued to be influenced by the work of other Netherlandish masters throughout his career.2

Counterbalancing these new attributions, Darets authorship of four additional panels previously given to him has been refuted. Both the Berlin Madonna on a Grassy Bench

2See above, 116-117, notes 50 and 51.
(figure 54) and the London Virgin and Child in an Interior
(figure 55) are here accepted as works by Robert Campin. The Washington Virgin and Child with Saints (figure 56) has here been accepted as the work of a Campin follower other than Daret, while the Munich Adoration of the Child (figure 57), has here been attributed to a Westphalian painter of the mid-fifteenth-century.

The Arras Altarpiece, Daret's first major commission, and his only surviving work, was analyzed in chapter 5. Along with the historical context of its commission by Abbot Jean du Clercq, the placement and earliest use of the triptych in the Lady Chapel of the Church of St. Vaast has been discussed. Through an examination of the abbot's account book, and a careful reading of eyewitness descriptions, I have formulated a reconstruction of the original appearance of the altarpiece that allows for a more flexible interpretation of the documentary evidence than does Lestocquoy's 1937 reconstruction of the triptych.⁴

Through an analysis of the Marian iconography of the Arras Altarpiece, the liturgy has been identified as the determining factor for the overall program of the altarpiece. In addition, a new reading of the retable's exterior, in which site-specific elements in the Visitation and Presentation panels (figures 2 and 4) are interpreted as references to both the spiritual and temporal position of

the Abbey of St. Vaast, has been suggested. Finally, the eclectic format of the Arras Altarpiece has been discussed briefly in relation to other devotional images of the fifteenth-century.

Never previously discussed in detail, Daret’s second major work, the Holy Spirit Altarpiece was considered in chapter 6. As the only surviving record of the altarpiece, the description found in the St. Vaast accounts was taken as a starting point for a discussion of the historical context of the commission and an analysis of its probable iconographic program.

On the basis of a comparison of this description with the nearly contemporary St. Bertin Altarpiece, I have proposed a theoretical reconstruction of the original appearance of Daret’s Holy Spirit triptych. The similarities noted between the Holy Spirit triptych and the St. Bertin Altarpiece not only offer an additional example of the cross-influence of Flemish and Northern French painting during the fifteenth century, they also provide convincing evidence for a specific relationship between the artists Jacques Daret and Simon Marmion.

Additional evidence for the reconstruction of the Holy Spirit Altarpiece was provided by a comparison of the triptych’s description in the St. Vaast accounts with the Prado panels of the Betrothal of the Virgin (figure 49) and the Annunciation (figure 53). By considering these two
panels as possible fragments of, or copies from, the *Holy Spirit* triptych, this reconstruction offers a new interpretation of the original context of the pictures, yet still allows for their traditional association with each other. Moreover, by discussing these paintings in relation to an altarpiece that dates to the 1450s, my research suggests that Panofsky’s view of the *Betrothal* panel (figure 49) as the work of Campin in the 1420s is no longer tenable. 4

Although this study provides a more comprehensive discussion of Jacques Daret’s life and work than any other to date, several avenues exist for further exploration. While Daret’s activity as a designer of tapestries has been the subject of recent research, his role as a metalwork designer has not yet been explored. Similarly, his possible activity as a manuscript illuminator has yet to be confirmed either by documentary evidence or through convincing attributions. Although much research has been dedicated to the historical and political significance of the Burgundian court festivals of 1454 and 1468, little scholarship has been devoted to the contributions of the numerous artists who were hired to execute the decorative programs for these lavish events.

4 Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, 1:160-161. The presence in the Prado *Betrothal* of Roger’s decrepit Joseph type of the late 1440s further supports an attribution of the panel to an artist other than Campin.
Through a careful analysis of Daret's individual painting style, and an examination of the form and historical context of his two most important works, the c.1433-1435 Arras Altarpiece and the c.1453-1456 Holy Spirit Altarpiece, it has been my goal to produce a dissertation that more completely analyses the life and work of this important, yet often forgotten, Early Netherlandish master.
APPENDIX A

DARET-SPECIFIC INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE
TOURNAI REGISTER OF ST. LUKE, 1423-1482

f° 81: Jaquelotte Daret, natif de Tournay, commencha son apresure le douzième jour d'avril l'an mil CCCC. vingt sept avec le dit maistre Robert; et a parfait son apresure bien et deuement.

f° 17° n° 3: Maistre Jaques Daret, natif de Tournay, fut receu à le francise du mestier des paintres le jour Saint Luc oudit an [October 18, 1432], et fut fait ledit Jaques prevost de Saint Luc icelui jour au disner.

f° 82°: Danelet Daret, natif de Tournay, commencha son apresure le 8e jour de janvier l'an mil CCCC. XXXII [1433],² avec son frère Jaquelotte Daret, nouvel maistre paintre. Et a parfait son apresure deuement.

f° 82°: Haquinot le Bacre commencha son apresure le IIIe jour de septembre l'an mil CCCC. LIX avec son père Jehan le Bacre paintre; et parfait son apresure avec maistre Jaques Daret aussi paintre.

---

¹Reprinted in Emile Renders, La solution du problème Van der Weyden, Flémalle, Campin (Bruges: Charles Bayaert, 1931), 1:133-155.

²Recorded in "Easter Style", this date should, therefore, be understood as 1433, rather than 1432. For an explanation of this dating system, in which the date of Easter is used to determine the start of the calendar year, see C. R. Cheney, ed., Handbook of Dates for Students of English History (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1978), 5-6.
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f° 88: Amandin de Liauve commença son apresure le XIIIe jour de juing l'an mil CCCCC. LXIII avec maistre Jaques Daret paintre. Lequel Amandin après le trespas dudit Jaques Daret fut remis par le doyen et jurez avec Jehan Snellart pour parfaire son apresure le VIe jour de juillet l'an mil CCCC. LXVI, et depuis ledit Amandin se partit sondit maistre le Xe jour d'aoust l'an mil CCCC. LXVII sans parfaire sondit apresure et a laissiet ledit mestier.
APPENDIX B

DARET-SPECIFIC ENTRIES FROM
THE ACCOUNT BOOK OF JEAN DU CLERCQ

8. Item, payet par mondict seigneur l'abbé, comme dessus, à maistre Jaques Daret, paintre, pour lors demourant à Arras, pour son sallaire d'avoir paint et assoney de tous poins de son mestier de painture ledicte archure, tabernacle, et tous les ymages de la sépulture dudict monseigneur l'abbé estant en ladicte cappelle de Nostre-Dame à Saint-Vaast, comme on poeuet veoir et percevoir, par marchié fait audict maistre Jaques Daret, en ce conprins le vin didict marchié et VIII mencaulx de bled que il eut par ledict marchié, chascun mencaud au pris de X s., la somme de IIII²x IIII libz., dicte monnoie.

10. Item, payet par mondict seigneur l'abbé, comme dessus, au dessusdict maistre Jaques Daret, paintre, pour le painture de le table d'autel estant en ledicte cappelle Nostre-Dame, pour avoir paint de fin or, de fin azur et d'aultrez fines couleurs tous les foeulles de ledicte table par dehors et dedens, et aussy pareillement le table de desoubz audevant dudict autel, comme on poeuet veoir et percevoir et ainsy qu'il est contenu en une cédulle et devise qui faitte et signée de mondict seigneur l'abbé et dudict Daret, pour le quelle chose bien faire et assonir lui fu paiet, en ce conprins le vin dudict marchié, la somme de IIII²x V libz. VIII s., monnoie dicte.

---

11. Item, payet par mondict seigneur l'abbé, comme dessus, au dessusdict maistre Jaques Daret, paintre, pour avoir doré de fin or dedens et dehors ladicte table d'autel, c'est assavoir tous les pillers et arbouttères petits et grans, et les vaussures des tabernacles de boin azur semmées d'esstoilles d'or, et toutes les augives et rozettes douu millieu doré de fin or, les campagnes des ymages faire de plusieurs couleurs de drap d'or, et tous les visages des ymages estoffer sur le vis bien et nettement avoec barbes et kaveux et pareillement les kaveux de Nostre-Dame dorer de fin or et briefment estoffer et assonir de tous poëns, comme on poëut veoir et percevoir toute ladicte tabls ainsi qu'elle est sur ledict autel, en ce comprins le vin dudict marchie, la somme de IIIIxx II libz. X I s., monnoie dicte.

12. Item, payet par mondict seigneur l'abbé, comme dessus, au dessusdict maistre Jaques Daret, paintre, pour avoir paint les custodes de ladicte table d'autel tant dessoubz comme deseure, en ce comprins toille, rubans et dachettes pour ycelles custodes, la somme de X libz. XVI s. VI d., monnoie dicte.

55. Item, payet par mondict seigneur l'abbé, comme dessus, à Jaques Daret, paintre, le VIIe jour de juillet mil IIIIc XLI, pour ung patron de toile de couleur à destempee, contenant XII aulnez de lonc et IIII aulnes de larghe ou environ, ou quel est l'istoire de la Résureccion Nostre-Seigneur Jhesu-Crist bien painte et figurée, sur le quel patron a esté fait ung tappis hauteliche de ladicte histoire de la Résureccion, le quel patron est et a esté mis par l'ordonnance didict monseigneur l'abbé en sa salle quarree, en ce comprins XXXVI aulnes de kanévach sur le quel kanévach fu fait ledict patron, la somme de XXIII libz. XV s., monnoie dicte.2

---

2The Arras tapestry weaver Willaume au Vaissel used Daret's patron to make an altar frontal for the abbey's altar of relics. Ibid., 83, item 56. For the coats of arms and inscriptions that were woven into this tapestry, see Loisne and Rodière, Épigraphie du Pas-de-Calais, 7:461-462, item 1177.
57. Item, payet par mondict seigneur l'abbé, comme dessus, à maistre Miquiel de Gand, fondeur de laitton, demourant à Tournay, pour avoir livré ung lamppier portant candélabre de laitton, le quel est mis et pendans au cœur de ladicte église, et fu fait selon le patron que Jaques Daret paintre, avoit fait, la somme de LIII libz. XVI s., monnoie dicte.

60. Item, a esté payet par mondict seigneur l'abbé, pour avoir fait doré ladicte coulombe, candelers et croche chy dessus déclairiïé, à ung nommé Jacque Daret, la somme de XXIII libz., monnoie dicte. ³

62. Item, pour le paine et sallaire de Jacque Daret, pointre, pour avoir doré ledicte croix et fait les fleurs de lis d'azur, XII livres. ⁴

76. Item, payé par ledit révérend père en Dieu, et qu'il a donné des deniers venans de sadicte croche, à Jacque Daret, paintre, pour sa paine et sallaire de avoir paint une tavle d'autel, en plate peinture, en laquelle a plusieurs ystoyres du Saint-Esperit ens ou fons de ledite table, et es feullés d'ichelle IIII proffètes faisant mention dudit Saint-Esperit, avecq ce doré et paint plusieurs personnaiges tant de monseigneur saint Jehan comme de saint Vaast et dudit Saint-Esperit, avecq tout le camp semé et vernis, comme on poeult veoir, par marchié fait à luy en tasque, la somme de IXxx XII lb., monnoie d'Artois.

³The previous entry records payments made to Michel de Gand for having made a brass column, copper candel holders, and a copper cross for the high altar of the church. Loriquet, "Journal des travaux," 84, item 59.

⁴This complete entry, dated April 5, 1447, also records the payment made to Michel de Gand for having cast a monumental brass cross in Tournai and for transporting it to Arras. Ibid., 85, item 62. For this cross, which was erected in front of the abbey church, see Henri Loriquet, "La place Saint-Vaast et la croix dite de St. Bernard," Bulletin de la commission départementale des monuments historiques du Pas-de-Calais 5 (1884): 383-402.
APPENDIX C

TITLES, APPROXIMATE DATES, AND PRESENT LOCATIONS OF PAINTINGS HERE ATTRIBUTED TO ROBERT CAMPIN

Seilern Entombment Triptych (c.1415),
London, Courtauld Institute Galleries

Madonna on a Grassy Bench (c.1415-20),
Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie

St. John the Baptist, fragment (c.1415-20),
Cleveland, Museum of Art

Nativity (c.1420-25),
Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts

Holy Trinity (c.1425),
St. Petersburg, The Hermitage

Virgin and Child in an Interior (c.1425-30)
London, The National Gallery

Virgin and Child before a Firescreen (c.1425-30)
London, The National Gallery

Mérode Triptych (c.1425-30)
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art,
The Cloisters

Portrait of a Man (c.1425-30)
London, The National Gallery

Portrait of a Woman (c.1425-30)
London, The National Gallery

Virgin and Child (c.1425-30)
Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut

St. Veronica (c.1425-30)
Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut
Trinity (c.1425-30)  
Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstmuseum

Bad Thief, fragment (c.1425-30)  
Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstmuseum

Christ and the Virgin (c.1425-30)  
Philadelphia, Museum of Art,  
The John G. Johnson Collection

Virgin in Glory (c.1430-35)  
Aix-en-Provence, Musée Granet

Heinrich Werl with St. John the Baptist (1438)  
Madrid, Museo del Prado

St. Barbara (1438)  
Madrid, Museo del Prado
Figure 1: Jacques Daret, Visitation, 1434-35. 57 x 52 cm. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 2: Jacques Daret, *Nativity*, 1434-35. 57 x 52 cm. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 3: Jacques Daret, *Adoration of the Magi*, 1434-35
57 x 52 cm. Madrid, Coleccion Thyssen-Bornemisza.
(Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 4: Jacques Daret, Presentation on the Temple, 1434-35. 57 x 52 cm. Paris, Petit Palais. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 5: Robert Campin, Virgin and Child. 160 x 68 cm. Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 6: Robert Campin, St. Veronica. 151 x 61 cm. Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 7: Robert Campin, Trinity. 149 x 61 cm. Frankfurt, Städelches Kunstinstitut. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 8: Robert Campin, *Bad Thief*, fragment. 133 x 92.5 cm. Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 9: Robert Campin, Portrait of a Man. 40.7 x 27 cm. London, National Gallery. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 10: Robert Campin, Portrait of a Woman. 40.7 x 27 cm. London, National Gallery. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 11: Robert Campin, Mérode Triptych. 
Wings: 64 x 27 cm; Center: 64 x 63 cm. 
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 
The Cloisters. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 12: Robert Campin, *Virgin and Child before a Firescreen*. 63 x 48 cm. London, National Gallery. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
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Figure 13: Robert Campin, Nativity.  
84 x 70 cm. Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts.  
(Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 14: Robert Campin, Heinrich von Werl with St. John the Baptist, 1438. 101 x 47 cm. Madrid, Museo del Prado. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 15: Robert Campin, *St. Barbara*, 1438. 101 x 47 cm. Madrid, Museo del Prado.  
(Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 16: Robert Campin, Virgin in Glory. 48 x 21 cm. Aix-en-Provence, Musée Granet. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 17: Jacques Daret, *Visitation*, 1434-35. Detail: Portrait of Abbot Jean du Clercq. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 18: Robert Campin, Seilern Entombment Triptych. Wings: 60 x 22.5 cm; Center: 60 x 48.9 cm. London, Courtauld Institute Galleries. (Photo: Van Gelder, "An Early Work," fig. 6)
Figure 19: Robert Campin, St. John the Baptist, fragment. 17.3 x 12.5 cm. Cleveland, Museum of Art. (Photo: Van Gelder, "An Early Work," figure 13)
Figure 20: Robert Campin, *Christ and the Virgin.*
28.5 x 45 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art,
The John G. Johnson Collection.
(Photo: Philadelphia Museum of Art)
Figure 21: Jacques Daret, *Presentation in the Temple*, 1434-35. Detail: Virgin, Child, and Maid. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 22: Robert Campin, *Virgin in Glory.*
Detail: Virgin and Child.
(Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 23: Robert Campin, Nativity. Detail: Shepherds. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 24: Jacques Daret, Presentation in the Temple, 1434-35. Detail: Simeon. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 25: Jacques Daret, *Adoration of the Magi*, 1434-35. X-radiograph.
(Photo: Staatliche Museen, Berlin)
Figure 26: Robert Campin, *Nativity*. X-radiograph. (Photo: Comblen-Sonkes, *Le Musée de Dijon*, plate CXLIII)
Figure 27: Jacques Daret, Visitation, 1434-35. X-radiograph. (Photo: Staatliche Museen, Berlin)
Figure 28: Robert Campin, Portrait of a Man. X-radiograph. (Photo: Burroughs, Art Criticism, figure 113)
Figure 29: Jacques Daret, *Visitation*, 1434-35. Infrared reflectogram: hands of Elizabeth and the Virgin. (Photo: Van Asperen de Boer, *Underdawing*, figure 127)
Figure 30: Jacques Daret, *Adoration of the Magi*, 1434-35. Infrared reflectogram: Joseph. (Photo: Van Asperen de Boer, *Underdrawing*, figure 129)
Figure 31: Jacques Daret, *Presentation in the Temple*, 1434-35. Infrared reflectogram: Joseph's robe. (Photo: Van Asperen de Boer, *Underdrawing*, figure 130)
Figure 32: Jacques Daret, Presentation in the Temple, 1434-45. Infrared reflectogram: Temple vaults. (Photo: Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie)
Figure 33: Robert Campin, *Virgin and Child*. Infrared reflectogram: the Virgin’s mantle. (Photo: Van Asperen de Boer, *Underdrawing*, figure 2)
Figure 34: Robert Campin, Mérode Triptych. Infrared reflectogram: Joseph. (Photo: Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, figure 97)
Figure 35: Jacques Daret(?), Portrait of a Young Man. 37 x 30 cm. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 36: Jacques Daret(?), Portrait of a Young Man. X-radiograph. (Photo: Burroughs, Art Criticism, figure 94)
Figure 37: Jacques Daret(?), Annunciation. 58 64 cm. Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 38: Jacques Daret(?), *Annunciation*. Infrared reflectogram: fireplace. (Photo: Van Asperen de Boer, *Underdrawing*, figure 82)
Figure 39: Jacques Daret(?), Annunciation. Infrared reflectogram: Gabriel. (Photo: Van Asperen de Boer, Underdrawing, figure 88)
Figure 40: Jacques Daret(?), *Annunciation*. Infrared reflectogram: the Virgin’s robe. (Photo: Van Asperen de Boer, *Underdrawing*, figure 86)
Figure 41: Jacques Daret(?), Annunciation. X-radiograph: the Virgin. (Photo: Burroughs, Art Criticism, figure 92)
Figure 42: Robert Campin, Virgin and Child. X-radiograph. (Photo: Frinta, Genius of Campin, figure 30)
Figure 43: Robert Campin, Holy Trinity. 34.3 x 24 cm. St. Petersburg, The Hermitage. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 44: Jacques Daret(?), Virgin and Child. 34.3 x 24 cm. St. Petersburg, The Hermitage. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 45: Jacques Daret(?), Virgin and Child. Infrared photograph. (Photo: Loewinson-Lessing, Le Musée de l’Ermitage, plate XI)
Figure 46: Robert Campin, Holy Trinity. Infrared photograph. (Photo: Loewinson-Lessing, Le Musée de l’Ermitage, plate XXV)
Figure 47: Robert Campin, Holy Trinity. X-radiograph. (Photo: Loewinson-Lessing, Le Musée de l'Ermitage, plate XXXV)
Figure 48: Jacques Daret(?), Virgin and Child. X-radiograph. (Photo: Loewinson-Lessing, *Le Musée de l’Ermitage*, plate XXIII)
Figure 49: Assistant of Jacques Daret(?), Betrothal of the Virgin. 76.5 x 88 cm. Madrid, Museo del Prado. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 50: Assistant of Jacques Daret(?), St. James and St. Clare. 76.5 x 88 cm. Madrid, Museo del Prado. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 51: Assistant of Jacques Daret(?), Betrothal of the Virgin. Detail: Temple. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 52: Copy after Jacques Daret(?): Life of Saint Joseph. 64 x 204 cm. Hoogstraten, Church of Saint Catherine.  
(Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 53: Assistant of Jacques Daret(?), Annunciation. 76.5 x 70 cm. Madrid, Museo del Prado. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 54: Robert Campin, *Madonna on a Grassy Bench*. 37 x 25.5 cm. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie. (Photo: Van Asperen de Boer, *Underdrawing*, figure 47)
Figure 55: Robert Campin, Virgin and Child in an Interior. 18.7 x 11.6 cm. London, National Gallery. (Photo: National Gallery)
Figure 56: Follower of Robert Campin, Virgin and Child with Saints. 122.2 x 151.2 cm. Washington, National Gallery of Art. (Photo: National Gallery of Art)
Figure 57: German(?), late 15th century, Adoration of the Christ Child. 65 x 50 cm. Germany, Private Collection. (Photo: Julius Böhler)
Figure 58: Plan of the Abbey Church of St. Vaast:
a) High altar; b) Altar of relics; c) Tomb of
Theodoric III; d) Chapel of Notre Dame; e) Site of
Arras Altarpiece in 1435; f) Treasury; g) Chapel of
the Holy Spirit. (Photo: Lestocquoy, "Plan de
l'Eglise St. Vaast," 62)
Figure 59: Jacques Daret, *Visitation*, 1434-35. Detail: left background. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 60: Map of Arras c. 1435. (Photo: Antoine de la Taverne, Paix d'Arras, ed. Bossuat)
Figure 61: Plan of the Abbey of St. Vaast.  
(Photo: Gerard Robert, *Journal.*)
Figure 62: Roger van der Weyden(?), Trinity. 126 x 90 cm. Louvain, Museum Van der Kelen-Mertens. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 63: Simon Marmion, St. Bertin Altarpiece, c.1455-59. Exterior of wings. 54 x 145 cm each. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie and London, National Gallery. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 64: Simon Marmion, St. Bertin Altarpiece, c.1455-59. Interior of wings. 54 x 145 cm each. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie and London, National Gallery. (Photo: ACL Brussels)
Figure 65: Proposed reconstruction of interior left wing of the Holy Spirit Altarpiece, c.1453-56.
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