

## Abstracts

**Toshiharu Nakamura, “Rubens’ ‘Judgement of Art’ and Sensuality: Criticism of Depictions of Nudity in the Age of Counter-Reformation”, *Western Art*, 16, 2012, pp. 85 – 110.**

After the Council of Trent, the Catholic Church condemned the lascivious image. Monumental paintings with nude figures, however, enjoyed great popularity in the first half of the seventeenth century. This article examines the relationship between censorship and Rubens. It also considers the circumstances attending the execution and reception of Rubens’ *Judgement of Paris* for the court of Philip IV of Spain, and demonstrates the importance of lifelike nudes for Rubens in light of his admiration for Titian and sense of rivalry with the Venetian master.

**Toshiharu Nakamura, “Van Dyck and Charles I: A Review of the London Years”, *Studies in Western Art*, 12, 2006, pp. 47 – 67.**

Van Dyck was remarkably successful throughout the years he spent in London in the service of Charles I. As “Principal Painter in Ordinary to their Majesties,” his official duty was to paint portraits of the king and his family, and he was also generously patronized by the courtiers and other aristocrats. G. P. Bellori reports, however, that in his last years, the artist earnestly hoped to retire from the continuous routine of painting portraits. In fact, Van Dyck seems to have been eager to receive more commissions to produce history paintings. This paper examines, in the first place, Van Dyck’s practices as a portrait painter with his workshop, and furthermore considers his unsatisfied ambition to be regarded as a history painter during the London period, especially in relation to his exquisite mythological painting *Cupid and Psyche*, which was presumably painted for the Queen’s House at Greenwich.

**Toshiharu Nakamura, “Rubens’ Approach to Ancient Sculpture and his Relationship with Annibale Carracci”, *Studies in Western Art*, 7, 2002, pp. 57 – 75.**

In his essay *De Imitatione Statuarum*, Rubens maintains that the painter must have a profound knowledge of ancient sculpture. But he warns not to imitate the hard and harsh effects of stone, and stresses the importance of representing figures made of flesh. This article examines how Rubens studied ancient sculptures and utilized them in his own oeuvre. It also demonstrates that Rubens’ position belongs to the anti-manneristic tendency centering on Annibale Carracci. Annibale regarded the direct imitation of nature as the most valuable source for artists. But he also valued a vital dialogue with the past quite highly. Therefore it is of considerable interest to us that Rubens possessed some drawings by Annibale and at least one copy after him in his own collection.

**Toshiharu Nakamura, “A Study of *The Horrors of War* by Rubens: The Story of Mars and Venus, Its Allegorical Meanings and the Iconographic Tradition”, *Studies in Western Art*, 1, 1999, pp. 49 – 82.**

In *The Horrors of War* by Rubens, we see Mars leave Venus, though she strives to restrain him with embraces, and advance with his bloodstained sword into the battlefield. Since ancient times, their tie has been regarded as a guarantee for peace. Rubens only inverted the image of their tie into that of parting, and thus succeeded in the creation of a “live allegory”. But in the iconographic tradition, their relation was usually shown in a very erotic way. Therefore by showing Venus and her lover Mars together, it was not easy to create a respectable image which is

suitable for transmitting an important political message. Amusing episodes centered on their secret meeting are told in Homer's and Ovid's texts. Referring to these texts, some painters represented Mars and Venus in a bedroom. On the other hand, a representation of sleeping Mars as an allegory of peace was also disseminated. It was only after several, unsatisfactory trials that Rubens found a marvelous solution for representing the relation between the God of War and the Goddess of Love in a persuasive way. He showed Mars's departure from Venus instead of their meeting, i.e., war instead of peace.

**Toshiharu Nakamura, "An Investigation on Rubens's *The Hero (Tugendheld) Crowned by Victory and Drunken Hercules*", *Bijutsushi: Journal of the Japan Art History Society*, 45/2(140), 1996, pp. 138–157.**

Rubens conceived of the two works, *The Hero (Tugendheld) Crowned by Victory* (Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich) and *Drunken Hercules* (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden) as a pair. Their subjects can be seen as a depiction of the differing response of two figures in the face to temptation by the pleasures of this world. The Munich work shows a warrior bound in antique style armor and holding a long stick as he steps on a satyr and is crowned by the goddess of Victory. In the right half of the composition we can see Venus and Cupid vanquished by this hero. Conversely, the Dresden work shows Hercules drunk on wine, holding a wine jug in his hand as he stumbles along on unsteady legs, supported by a satyr and a maenad. Hercules is shown so drunk that he cannot control his own actions, so much so that his symbol of military prowess, the club, has been snatched away by a Putto.

Krempel, who noted this opposition of the two central figures, has indicated that the two works are connected to the iconography of "Hercules at the Crossroads," and show what happens at the end of each of the two roads, the one leading to "virtus", and the other leading to "voluptas". She has also noted that Rubens's idea was to provide a warning against the addiction to pleasures, and that this kind of moralistic view reflected the thinking of the Neostoics. However, the cold luster of the warrior's armor in the Munich work and its remarkable contrast to the soft flesh of Venus, who sits with eyes brimming with tears, raises some doubt about this moralistic interpretation. In fact, in his paintings on mythological subjects, such as the "*Sine Cerere et Baccho friget Venus*" theme, Rubens differs from the strict abstinence advocated by the Neostoics, and seems to display a somewhat positive interpretation of the erotic and drinking.

This author believes that the Munich work was conceived from the traditional subjects of "Venus and Mars", and while the warrior receives the crown of victory, it secretly shows the inhumanity of heartless military ethics. In this regard, even though Hercules is shown in the Dresden work as completely clumsy and helpless, the painting reflects Rubens's ideals in its depiction of the enjoyment of life that occurs in a world filled with peace.

**Toshiharu Nakamura, "P. P. Rubens *Die Geißelung Christi der Paulskirche zu Antwerpen*", *Bijutsushi: Journal of the Japan Art History Society*, 37/2 (124), 1989, pp. 109–121.**

Rubens' Gemälde die *Geißelung Christi* der Paulskirche zu Antwerpen (um 1614) stellt einen in der damaligen Bildtradition seltenen Typus dar, nämlich den seitlich an die kurze Säule gebundenen Christus. Man fand bereits die möglichen Vorbilder für diese Christi Figur heraus und klärte die ikonographische Herkunft der kurzen Geißelungssäule. Trotzdem wurde niemals der enge, bedeutsame Zusammenhang zwischen Figur und Säule in

Betracht gezogen. Nach meiner Meinung ist diese Figur Christi an der kurzen Säule weder rein stilistisch noch rein ikonographisch zu erfassen. Die kurze Säule gibt die *“Sacra Colonna”* wieder, die als historische Martersäule Christi in Sta. Prassede in Rom aufbewahrt wird. In der Zeit von Rubens war die Echtheit dieser Säule als Reliquie umstritten. Um ihre Echtheit zu beweisen, erdichtete man dann eine beachtenswerte Erklärung. Christus sei zweimal geißelt worden und bei der zweiten Geißelung sei er an einer kurzen Säule gebunden gewesen, und deshalb auch der Rücke geißelt worden. Spiegelt nicht Christi Figur von Rubens diese Diskussion wider? Dadurch, daß Christus in seitlicher Ansicht dargestellt wird, wird auch der Rücken, der soll geißelt worden sein, weil Christus an der kurzen Säule gebunden war, tatsächlich im Gemälde für den Betrachter sichtbar.

In Gent befindet sich eine Ölskizze für das Gemälde. Diese Skizze fertigte Rubens vielleicht in heimlicher Konkurrenz mit Caravaggio an, wie es aus dem Motiv, *“ein Scherge tritt den Fuß in Christi Wade“*, zu schließen ist: denn dieses Motiv stammt offensichtlich aus der *Geißelung* von Caravaggio in Neapel. Abgesehen von der Formatveränderung, scheint Rubens bei der Ausführung des Gemäldes nur in geringem Maße von der Skizze abgewichen zu sein. In Hinblick auf ihren Kommunikationsmodus besteht jedoch ein großer Unterschied zwischen den beiden. Während in der Skizze die Aktion in einer ungestümen, gewaltsamen Bewegtheit dargestellt ist, so versinkt im Gemälde die Mißhandlung mehr im Dunkel: hier hält Christus eher aufrecht und wendet dem Betrachter großenteils den Rücken zu. Diese Darstellungsweise erfüllt nicht das Postulat erzählerischer Inszenierung voller Bewegtheit, jedoch wird auf dessen Kosten die symbolische Sprachfähigkeit der Hauptfigur für den Betrachter verstärkt.

**Toshiharu Nakamura, *“Rubens’ Tod von Seneca: Ein Aspekt der Antikenrezeption”*, *Bigaku: Journal of the Japanese Society of Aesthetics*, 44/3, 1987, pp. 50–62.**

Das um 1611 von Rubens geschaffene Gemälde, *Der Tod von Seneca*, ist ein interessantes Beispiel von der Antikenrezeption bei Rubens. Er bediente sich als Vorlage seines Senecas einer antiken Statue, die damals als Darstellung des sterbenden Seneca missinterpretiert wurde. (Heute wird sie als afrikanischer Fischer gedeutet.) Aber wie Müller Hofstede darlegte, stellte die negroide Physiognomie der Statue dem Maler ein Problem, denn sie passte nicht gut einem römischen Philosophen wie Seneca. Später wählte Rubens als Seneca-Bildnis eine andere antike Büste mit einem nobleren und vergeistigteren Antlitz, nämlich den sogenannten Pseudo-Seneca. Auch diese Büste galt damals fälschlich als authentischer Bildniskopf von Seneca. Bekanntlich ist der heroische Tod von Seneca von Tacitus in seinen Annalen berichtet. Schwierig festzustellen ist jedoch, ob unser Gemälde, das ikonographisch als Rubens’ Neuerfindung anzusehen ist, mehr als ein Historienbild ist. Offensichtlich wurde das Gemälde von niederländischen Neustoizismus angeregt und Rubens deutete damit sein Verhältnis zur stoischen Philosophie an. Dazu noch mitzudenken ist, wie G. Hess meint, die rezeptionsgeschichtliche Tradition von *“Seneca Christianus”*. Ich will jedoch in Rubens’ Seneca keine direkte Beziehung damit sehen, sondern eher, wie etwa im ekstatischen und inspirierten Aufblick Senecas, das Hineinschlupfen des Formenvokabulars von den Märtyrerbildern des Barock feststellen.

© 2014 Toshiharu Nakamura