



Universiteit Utrecht

working papers #1:
art historian Willem Vogelsang

Nico de Klerk, November 2019



This work is part of the research program “Projecting knowledge – the magic lantern as a tool for mediated science communication in the Netherlands, 1880-1940” with project number VC.GW17.079 / 6214, which is financed by the Dutch Research Council (NWO).

The following text was written in the context of the NWO-funded research project Projecting knowledge: the magic lantern as a tool in mediating science communication in the Netherlands, 1880-1940, at Media and Performance Studies, Universiteit Utrecht. It is a working paper, which means that it is predominantly a 'reconnaissance report' prompted by the project's first case study, art historian Prof. Dr. Willem Vogelsang. In fact, all three researchers of the project initially focused on this case, knowing that sufficient documentation and newspaper reporting on Vogelsang was available, or at least located. This allowed us to explore the field of the photographically illustrated lecture and its contexts, which were to a greater or lesser extent unknown to the three of us. While one researcher's assignment is to focus on the use of the optical lantern in academic teaching, another on the emergence of an infrastructure for the illustrated lecture (production, distribution, exhibition, etc.), it is my task to focus on public outreach by academics through illustrated, public lectures.

Besides information about Vogelsang's public lectures (a list of which can be found in the Appendix), I also collected news reports and archival documents on Vogelsang's publications and his many other public activities. At some point this information will be input for the usual scholarly platforms. But the following text rather reflects the efforts to chart a research area that is new to me. It deals with a number of professional contexts of Vogelsang's work, both as an academic and as a public speaker, in order to get acquainted with various aspects of the illustrated lecture as a medium in the Netherlands during the first half of the 20th century. I therefore think that it makes more sense to present this as a work in progress, not officially published yet containing sufficient information to share with an interested readership.

I.

From 1907 through 1946 Willem Vogelsang (Leiden, 1875 – Utrecht, 1954) was a regular professor (or *ordinarius*) of Aesthetics and Art History—since 1923 only Art History—at the Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht (State University of Utrecht, today's Utrecht University). In recent publications he is commonly called the “first professor” of these disciplines in the Netherlands, an appellation that needs qualification and clarification.¹ Unlike Austria, Germany, France or Switzerland, as late as the final quarter of the 19th century, there was no chair of Art History here. The *Wet op het Hooger Onderwijs* (Higher Education Act) of 1876 addressed this situation by specifying that at least one of the four state-supported universities must include aesthetics and art history in its curriculum.² Only the newly named Universiteit van Amsterdam acted expeditiously: in 1877, the year the city's Athenaeum illustre was allowed to offer doctorate programs (hence the name change³), it appointed theologian Allard Pierson (1831-1896) professor of Aesthetics, Art History, and Modern Languages and Literature. Pierson was a regular professor, the only type of

¹ Only three recent references I know of avoid the issue of firstness and instead focus on the cultural, political, and/or institutional contexts of art history in the Dutch academe; Marlite Halbertsma, 'De geschiedenis van de kunstgeschiedenis in de Duitssprekende landen en in Nederland van 1764 tot 1933', in: Halbertsma, Kitty Zijlmans (eds.), *Gezichtspunten: een inleiding in de methoden van de kunstgeschiedenis* (Nijmegen: SUN, 1993), 70-72, and Annemieke Hoogenboom's partly overlapping 'Kunstgeschiedenis aan de universiteit: Willem Vogelsang (1875-1954) en Wilhelm Martin (1876-1954)', in: Peter Hecht, Chris Stolwijk, Hoogenboom (eds.), *Kunstgeschiedenis in Nederland: negen opstellen* (Amsterdam: Prometheus, 1998), 25-43, and 'De introductie van kunstgeschiedenis aan de Nederlandse universiteiten', in: Ton Bevers, Antoon Van den Braembussche, Berend Jan Langenberg (eds.), *De kunstwereld: produktie, distributie en receptie in de wereld van kunst en cultuur* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1993), 78-101. Repeatedly, however, Vogelsang was simply referred to as being the first to hold a professorial position; see for instance: Roman Koot, "'Een der grote universitaire centra voor wetenschappelijk kunsthistorisch onderzoek": de bibliotheek van het Kunsthistorisch Instituut te Utrecht', in: Koot, Michiel Nijhoff, Saskia Scheltjens (eds.), *Kunstabibliotheken in Nederland: tien korte schetsen* (Leiden: Primavera Pers, 2007), 53; Yvette Marcus-de Groot, 'Clara Engelen 1879-1956, museumdirecteur', in: *Biografisch woordenboek Gelderland, deel 5: Bekende en onbekende mannen en vrouwen uit de Gelderse geschiedenis* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2006), 38-41; Jolande Prudon, Wilma van Giersbergen, 'De "assistent-teekenaar": P.T.A. Swillens (1890-1963) en zijn collectie', in: Annemieke Hoogenboom, Inemie Gerards (eds.), *De Swillenscollectie: de kunsttechnische verzameling van het Kunsthistorisch Instituut te Utrecht* (Vianen: Optima, 2002), 10; Jan Bank, Maarten van Buuren, *1900: hoogtij van de burgerlijke cultuur* (The Hague: Sdu, 2000), 51; Gijs van der Ham, *200 jaar Rijksmuseum: geschiedenis van een nationaal symbool* (Amsterdam: Waanders-Rijksmuseum, 2000), 203; Arnoud Odding, *Ein durchaus pädagogischer Mensch: Willem Vogelsang achtthonderdvijfenzeventig – negentienhonderdvierenvijftig*, master thesis, Leiden University, 1994, 27; Chris Stolwijk, *"Die wetenschap noemen Gij en ik kunstgeschiedenis..."*. *Denken over kunstgeschiedenis in Nederland: J.G. van Gelder (1903-1980)* (Steenwijk: van Kerkvoorde & Hollander, 1991), 3, 76.

² *Wet op het Hooger Onderwijs van 28 April 1876* (Amsterdam: J.C. Loman, 1876), ch. III, § 2, section 43, 18; title IV, ch. II, section 2, 46.

³ *Ibid.*, ch. III, § 1, section 36, 14; title IV, ch. II-VIII, 44-58.

professorship recognized at the time—the 1876 Act had abolished the until then common title of professor by special appointment (Dutch: *buitengewoon hoogleraar*).⁴ As well, in the year the Act was passed author and philologist J.A. Alberdingk Thijm (1820-1889) had been appointed professor of Art History and Aesthetics at the Rijksacademie van Beeldende Kunsten (State Academy of Fine Arts), also in Amsterdam. This institute, however, trained artists, not scholars. In 1890, it appointed classicist Jan Six (1857-1926) as Thijm's successor. In 1896, Six moved to the Universiteit van Amsterdam, where he succeeded Pierson as a professor by special appointment of Aesthetics and Art History. (Since the 1890s increasing flexibility in academic employment, particularly in the sciences, had led to the reintroduction of this species of professorship, rendering the 1876 measure a dead letter, eventually leading to its revoke in 1905.⁵) In 1917 Six's appointment was converted into a regular professorship.

So, instead of one there seem to be four potential claimants to the “first” professorship of Art History and Aesthetics. But, judging from newspaper reports, the issue seems to be a retrospective one. In contemporary accounts of Vogelsang's appointment references to firstness are absent,⁶ while Alberdingk Thijm's and Pierson's hardly seemed fit for news: reports, such as there were, merely mention the start of their professorial lectures.⁷ One must conclude, rather, that later authors, explicitly or implicitly, considered some of these claims ‘under-substantiated’, be it for their lack of

⁴ Ibid., ch. IV, § 4, section 56, 21.

Professors by appointment were part-time positions. Appointees were commonly selected on the strength of their work or experience in other sectors of society. In the 1876 legislator's view, however, the dedication a professorship required made it incompatible with other pursuits. See: Peter Baggen, *Vorming door wetenschap: universitair onderwijs in Nederland 1815-1960* (Delft: Eburon, 1998), 130-131.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ ‘Wetten, besluiten, benoemingen, enz.’, in: *Nederlandsche Staatscourant*, #89 (April 17, 1907), 1. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMKB08:000170014:mpeg21:a0001>, and similar reports of his appointment in Dutch newspapers between April 17 and 19 and of his inaugural lecture between September 17 and 23, 1907.

⁷ For Alberdingk Thijm see: ‘Stadsnieuws’, in: *Het Nieuws van den Dag*, #2073 (December 4, 1876), 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010062731:mpeg21:p001>. For Pierson see: ‘Schoolnieuws’, in: *Het Nieuws van den Dag*, #2345 (October 23, 1877), 1. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010061264:mpeg21:a0005>.



Allard Pierson



J.A. Alberdingk Thijm



Willem Vogelsang



Jan Six



Wilhelm Martin

academic standing, inconsistency in scope, or arbitrary institutional embedment (or else they simply copied each other). As they are not discussed, the appointments of Alberdingk Thijm and Six at an art school may not have been considered as having the proper academic standing. Nonetheless, one of the abovementioned references does credit Alberdingk Thijm for his broad survey of the discipline, right up until the 19th century, “a form of art history that corresponds to our current understanding of it.”⁸ And although hardly acknowledged in recent publications, Jan Six, in his opening lecture, expressed a point of view that concurred with the ideas of contemporary innovative art historians in his emphasis on the importance of visual understanding (which he aphoristically formulated as: “the first rule for the practitioner of art history is to *look*, the second rule is to *look*, and the third is to *look*”).⁹ Secondly, the scope of a professorship was a matter of being either too broad or too narrow. Pierson’s assignment will likely have been considered too comprehensive (actually, it also included the theory and history of music¹⁰), while the university limited his art history to Antiquity.¹¹ Naturally, his successor, classicist Six, whose field of study was appropriately named, focused on Antiquity, yet he taught modern art, too.¹² Finally, the way the university positions were organizationally instituted may have played a role. Pierson and Six were appointed in the

⁸ Halbertsma (1993), 71. (*author’s translation*)

⁹ Jan Six, *Openbare les bij den aanvang zijner lessen als hoogleeraar aan de Rijks Akademie van Beeldende Kunsten den 13^{den} Februari 1890* (Amsterdam: De Roever Kröbel-Bakels, 1890), 19-21. (*author’s translation*)

¹⁰ Hoogenboom (1998), 27.

¹¹ Machtelt Schelling-van der Laan, ‘Kunst als geneesmiddel: Allard Pierson, de kunstgeschiedenis en de esthetica’, in: *De Negentiende Eeuw*, 21, #1 (1997), 30, 48-49. In this article Pierson is called “the first professor of Art History and Aesthetics” (30), apparently for chronological reasons.

In 1932, Vogelsang’s former assistant of ten years G.A.S. Snijders oddly and uninformedly wrote that his superior was “the first art historian at a Dutch university”, because Allard Pierson “of his own volition did not discuss modern art history”. RKD-Nederlands Instituut voor Kunstgeschiedenis, The Hague, Archief Vogelsang, NL-HaRKD.0287, Box IV, Item 1. (*author’s translation*)

¹² Halbertsma (1993), 70-71; Hoogenboom (1993), 88; M. Elisabeth Houtzager, ‘Verantwoording’, in: J.G. van Gelder, Houtzager, Béatrice Jansen (eds.), *Willem Vogelsang 1875 9 Augustus 1950: Commentarii* (s.l., s.n., [1950]), 7. (The unrecorded publishing year can be established from: ‘Levenswerk van een paedagoog. De “Commentarii” voor prof. Vogelsang’, in: *De Tijd: Godsdienstig-Staatkundig Dagblad*, 106, #34552 (October 10, 1950), 3. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:011202141:mpeg21:a006>).

Faculty of Philosophy and Literature, but the Universiteit van Amsterdam, or any other Dutch university for that matter, still had no chair of Art History. In his inaugural address Six commented on this circumstance by pointing out that art history, particularly that of Greco-Roman Antiquity, constituted a missing link in the Faculty's disciplinal composition.¹³

All in all, if there was any reason to call Vogelsang's appointment, in 1907, a "first" it was for being a *regular* professor to hold an *exclusive university chair* of Aesthetics and Art History (although the combination of a branch of philosophy and a branch of history revealed a lack of knowhow by its initiators, argued the bold new professor in his inaugural address¹⁴). Retrospectively, additional claims in support of his appointment are that he was the first professor in the Netherlands who was an art historian by *academic training*. (His contemporary Cornelis Hofstede de Groot, an art historian with no academic position, also had a German degree.¹⁵) Furthermore, he devised a much wider curriculum by including the applied arts and interior design and more art historical periods than art historians within or without the academe were wont to, notably the Middle Ages (at the time Antiquity and 17th-century Dutch painting were the common foci). Parenthetically, Utrecht's competitor for the chair, the Rijksuniversiteit Leiden (today's Universiteit Leiden), had to settle for a professor by appointment for one day a week. For this position

¹³ Jan Six, *De geschiedenis der kunst van Grieken en Romeinen en hare plaats onder de akademische wetenschappen. Rede uitgesproken bij het aanvaarden van het ambt van hoogleeraar in de Aesthetiek en Kunstgeschiedenis aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam op den 28^{sten} September 1896* (Haarlem: Joh. Enschede en Zonen, 1896), 7-10, 33. Six's comment can be read as a step forward from German writer and art historian Herman Grimm, who had argued a few years earlier, in 'Das Universitätsstudium der Neueren Kunstgeschichte' (1891), that art history was an "auxiliary discipline of history", quoted in: Daniel Adler, 'Painterly politics: Wölfflin, formalism and German academic culture, 1885-1915', in: *Art History*, 27, #3 (June 2004), 440.

Vogelsang, in his lecture that marked the beginning of his lessons as privatdocent at the Universiteit van Amsterdam, reminded his audience appreciatively of Six's address; *Kunstwetenschappelijke opmerkingen: rede, uitgesproken bij de opening zijner lessen in kunstgeschiedenis op 22 November 1900* (Amsterdam: Scheltema en Holkema's Boekhandel, 1900), 38.

¹⁴ Willem Vogelsang, *Aesthetiek en kunstgeschiedenis aan de universiteit. Rede bij de aanvaarding van het hoogleeraarsambt aan de Rijks-Universiteit te Utrecht den 25sten September 1907* (Utrecht: A. Oosthoek, 1907), 6-8.

¹⁵ Bank, van Buuren (2000), 50.

it picked Wilhelm Martin, then deputy director of Museum Mauritshuis and a *privatdocent* in Leiden since 1904.¹⁶

Perhaps the issue of firstness was mostly, if not merely, a matter of academic prestige between two universities angling for a chair created under government auspices.¹⁷ Because after having won out, Utrecht was in no hurry to develop the discipline institutionally or support it with adequate funds—nor were subsequent Cabinets. Vogelsang only had a few students, who couldn't even obtain a bachelor's degree, a situation that lasted until 1921. Nor was there an art history institute, or a room he could call his own. He reiterated his complaints about the conditions under which he was forced to work during these early years in the annual reports he submitted to the university's *College van Curatoren* (Council of Governors), its Crown-appointed administrative body. In the first of such reports, he writes:

Through the secretary of your Council at least one cabinet in the university building could be appropriated to me, in which the collection of diapositives has been placed, now adequately arranged and cataloged. The collection has been considerably enlarged and now comprises 2,823 items, which have been brought together for the University, partially systematically according to course, and partially grouped in a free manner and paid for by myself for lectures, etc., ordered and placed at the disposal of the University.

The index-catalog that I largely had to start and update myself is finished, the boxes have been labeled, the pictures arranged by school and masters or other perspectives, so that the situation might be called excellent were it not for the great distance between this storage space and the classrooms where I must lecture, which caused a host of difficulties and expenses (fetching and returning; breakage). The situation will not be acceptable as long as there is no purpose-built lecture hall with *Sciopticon* and accompanying storage facility for diapositives.¹⁸

¹⁶ Hoogenboom (1998), 27.

¹⁷ For details of the competition: *Ibid.*, 27-29; Hoogenboom (1993), 89-95.

¹⁸ Willem Vogelsang, 'Verslag van den hoogleeraar in de Aesthetiek en Kunstgeschiedenis over den cursus 1908/09'. *Universiteitsmuseum Utrecht. Archief Kunsthistorisch Instituut*, typescript June 1909 (uninventoried), [5-6]. (*author's translation*)

It took well over a decade before the situation could really be called “excellent”, until 1923 to be precise, the year Vogelsang’s tireless efforts were rewarded by a dedicated building for the Art History Institute (when the title of his chair was changed to Art History¹⁹). However, things had not always been as bad—or heroic—as one of his students reminisced with some sentimental license: “There was no institute! No book, no journal, no photograph, no lantern slide, let alone a projection lantern. There was nothing! Absolutely nothing!—There was everything: there was this professor!”²⁰ Indeed, elsewhere in the quoted report Vogelsang thanks the Council for providing funds to buy (unspecified) materials at an auction as well as a number of course books. Yet the fact remains that he initially held classes in his own study and many of the lantern slides he used in lectures were from his private collection.²¹ Furthermore, a recurring frustration in these reports to the Council concerned his students’ ineptitude to understand an artwork visually and their lack of historical and biblical knowledge—the latter, in his opinion, was a “parenting and schooling error”.²² While the relative lack of space, money, and students’ aptitude was real,²³ one shouldn’t rule out the possibility that this complaint—the substance of which, of course, he was to address in his classes—may also have served rhetorical purposes. Both historical-cultural contextualization and visual understanding constituted the pillars of his teaching²⁴, but the latter required funds to buy lantern slides and projection equipment, even perhaps to pay for man-hours to operate it.

¹⁹ ‘Professor dr. W. Vogelsang (1875-1954)’, in: *Catalogus professorum Academiæ Rheno-Trajectinæ*. <https://profs.library.uu.nl/index.php/profrec/getprofdata/2229/23/25/0>.

²⁰ G.J. Hoogewerf, in: J.G. van Gelder, E. Lagerwey, Hoogewerff et al., *In memoriam Willem Vogelsang 1874-1954* ([Utrecht], s.n., [[1955]], 11. (*author’s translation*)

²¹ Stolwijk (1991), 76.

²² Vogelsang (1909), [3].

²³ In her memoirs one of his earliest students describes Vogelsang’s impatience with their cluelessness; Annie Salomons, *Herinneringen uit den ouden tijd* (The Hague: Bert Bakker/Daamen, 1957), 135-136.

²⁴ Yvette Marcus-de Groot *Kunsthistorische vrouwen van weleer: de eerste generatie in Nederland vóór 1921* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2003), 52.



Kunsthistorisch Instituut, Drift 25, Utrecht

Despite these obstacles the Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht was a major opportunity to put into practice the new art historical views that Vogelsang had absorbed during his studies and subsequently introduced in various positions before his professorial appointment: as a privatdocent²⁵ at the Literary Faculty of the Universiteit van Amsterdam from 1900 through 1906; as many times member of the board (at times also chairman) of the influential Oudheidkundige Bond (Historical League) and editor of its *Bulletin* since 1904; and as deputy director of the Nederlandsch Museum voor Geschiedenis en Kunst (Netherlands Museum for History and Art)²⁶, from late 1903 until his professorial appointment in 1907, where he found a kindred spirit in Adriaan Pit, the museum's director.

II.

For his art historical training Vogelsang, of course, had had to go abroad. Of German parentage (but having lived in both Holland and Germany and having had a dual nationality for a number of years²⁷), Germany must have been his obvious choice, all the more so as it boasted chairs of Art History ever since 1860.²⁸ He registered as a student at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, in Munich, in 1894. Between then and the defense of his dissertation there, in July 1898, he had followed courses by what contemporaries

²⁵ Once common in the Netherlands, a privatdocent was not regular staff, but was paid a fee by students for teaching a subject that was not part of the curriculum (yet).

²⁶ This was one of five museums that were housed in the dedicated building for the Rijksmuseum, in Amsterdam. Although the building was officially opened in 1885, the Nederlandsch Museum only moved in from The Hague in 1887; it took another nine years before its allotted space was ready. In 1927, however, the museum was divided into separate sections for history and for sculpture and applied art, the result of a change in policy in which the original impetus of the Rijksmuseum, a place where both the history and art of the Netherlands would be collected and presented simultaneously, was abandoned in a process of "aesthetic purification"—a term later authors possibly took from Vogelsang's 1944 'In memoriam' of Adriaan Pit, quoted in: J.F. Heijbroek, 'Adriaan Pit, directeur van het Nederlandsch Museum: een "vergeten" episode uit de geschiedenis van het Rijksmuseum', in: *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum*, 33, #4 (1985), 233. Over the next ten years the arrangement of their respective displays was realized in distinct parts (or extensions) of the museum building; Barbara Laan, 'Kunstnijverheid en interieur in het Nederlandsch Museum voor Geschiedenis en Kunst in het Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam: ontstaan en opheffing van de cultuurhistorische presentatie 1875-1927', in: *Tijdschrift voor Interieurgeschiedenis en Design*, 39 (2014-2016), 69-102; Johan Bos, "De geschiedenis is vastgelegd in boeken, niet in musea". Van planvorming tot realisatie: het Nederlands Museum voor Geschiedenis in het Rijksmuseum, 1922-1939', in: *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum*, 45, #4 (1997), 262-309.

²⁷ J.G. van Gelder, in: van Gelder, E. Lagerwey, G.J. Hoogewerff et al. ([1955]), 5.

²⁸ Heinrich Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte als Institution. Studien zur Geschichte einer Disziplin* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979), 237-241.

regarded as innovative art historians, such as classical archaeologists Adolf Furtwängler, in Munich, and Franz Studniczka, in Freiburg, or art historian Alois Riegl, in Vienna.²⁹ A number of sources mention that he studied in Paris.³⁰ Some, furthermore, claim that he studied with art historian Heinrich Wölfflin, who taught at the University of Basel. But one of these claims is uncertain, while another misinterprets a source, Vogelsang's 1946 farewell address, in which he sketched the changes in the art historical discipline over the past decades and its indebtedness to what "H. Wölfflin (...) has taught us"—the *us* here being the practitioners of the discipline, not an authorial *us*.³¹ Except for Munich, none of the references consulted is entirely clear about where and when he took his courses.

Fortunately, Vogelsang's papers enable us to establish to some extent what and where he studied during those four years. According to his notebooks he took several courses in archaeology with Adolf Furtwängler between 1894 and 1898; a course in 15th-century Flemish and German painting (Van Eyck, Van der Weyden, Bouts, Memling, and Dürer—some of whom he later discussed in both his academic and public lectures in the Netherlands), in 1896, with a privatdocent in Freiburg; in the same year he studied the art topography of Italy with Julius von Schlosser, in Vienna, where, in the years 1896-1897, he also attended Franz Wickhoff's lectures on the reproductive arts and his seminar on Monte Cassino, as well as Alois Riegl's course in the decorative arts.³² Neither this

²⁹ Odding (1994), 16-17; Stolwijk (1991), 18; Houtzager ([1950]), 5; see also: E.K.J. Reznicek, 'Willem Vogelsang: Duitsgeschoolde apostolische bekenners der vormen', in: *KHI addio: Utrechtse kunstgeschiedenis, herinneringen aan haar prominenten* (Utrecht: Stichting Vrienden van het Kunsthistorisch Instituut der Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, 1986), 7.

³⁰ Ibid.; Salomons (1957), 131; Odding (1994), 16, suggests he studied there with art historian Louis Courajod. Two identical news reports even claim an order of universities: "Freiburg, Vienna, Paris, and finally Munich"; 'Prof. Vogelsang 75 jaar', in: *Trouw*, 8, #1614 (August 5, 1950), 4. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ABCDDD:010826538:mpeg21:a0131> and *Het Parool*, 10, #1712 (August 8, 1950), 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ABCDDD:010835019:mpeg21:a0105>.

³¹ Odding (1994), 16, is quite sure that Vogelsang studied with Wölfflin, but his qualifier "probably in Basel" weakens his argument. Annemieke Hoogenboom, *De evolutie van de compositie: de kunsthistorische onderwijsplaten van Willem Vogelsang (1875-1954)* (Vianen: Optima, 2007), 11, misinterprets the phrase in Vogelsang's farewell address, *Veertig jaren kunstgeschiedenis aan de Universiteit te Utrecht. Afscheidscollege gehouden op 12 November 1946* (Utrecht: Kunsthistorisch Instituut der Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht, 1947), 14-15. Marcus-de Groot (2003), 52, mentions merely—but, perhaps, correctly—the influence Vogelsang has undergone from Wölfflin's ideas during his studies "in Germany and Austria."

³² 'Aantekeningen 1896-1898'. RKD Nederlands Instituut voor Kunstgeschiedenis, The Hague, Archief Vogelsang, NL-HaRKD.0287, Box 18.

source nor the abovementioned references allow one to fully determine specific influences. Vogelsang has been said to “idolize” Wölfflin,³³ whose approach to art— theorizing its fundamental, formal elements (“*Grundbegriffe*”)—would underpin Vogelsang’s own teaching. References consulted also mention art historians August Schmarsow, in Leipzig (although no record has been found that shows he studied with him), and Alois Riegl’s notion of *Kunstwollen*, in the sense of an expression of a culture’s worldview—which Vogelsang also incorporated in his teaching.³⁴

Equally unclear is whether there was a specific instance of the use of photographic slide projection that had inspired Vogelsang’s own pedagogic methods. The only document retrieved so far is a drawing he made as a student, dated “Winter 1897”, showing Adolf Furtwängler, pointer in hand, standing in front of a white circle apparently thrown on a screen by a lantern.³⁵ There being no evidence that Vogelsang studied with his admired Wölfflin, it is unlikely that the latter set an example for him. And even though one source dates Wölfflin’s earliest use of projection in class in 1893,³⁶ it made him a reluctant pioneer at best. After all, he had strong, and strongly argued, reservations about the accuracy of the photographic representation of artworks, sculpture in particular, reservations that he had set forth in an article published when Vogelsang was a student.³⁷

³³ Reznicek (1986), 8.

³⁴ Hoogenboom (2007), 10-15 and (1993), 93. The term has been unevenly defined, as it was also defined as a drive to make art; Christopher S. Wood, ‘Introduction’, in: Wood (ed.), *The Vienna School reader: politics and art historical method in the 1930s* (New York: Zone Books, 2000), 26-28.

³⁵ ‘Aantekenboekje bij college van Adolf Furtwängler, Winter 1897’. RKD Nederlands Instituut voor Kunstgeschiedenis, The Hague, Archief Vogelsang, NL-HaRKD.0287, Box 18. As the lantern can actually be seen on top of the screen, the performative set-up in the drawing is as complete as it is impossible.

³⁶ ‘Letter from Grimm to Wölfflin’, January 1894, Universität Basel, Nachlass Heinrich Wölfflin IV, 459a, quoted in: Zeynep Çelik Alexander, ‘Baroque out of focus: the question of mediation in Wölfflin’, in: *New German Critique*, 45.1, #133 (February 2018), 100.

Astonishingly, Swiss art historian Joseph Gantner, in an article that claims to give an overview of the *teaching* of art history at the University of Basel, makes not a single reference to the use, let alone the impact of photographs or their projection: ‘Der Unterricht in Kunstgeschichte an der Universität Basel 1844-1938’ in: Hans Christoph von Tavel, Peter Wignau-Wilberg (eds), *Kunstwissenschaft an Schweizer Hochschulen: Die Lehrstühle der Universitäten in Basel, Bern, Freiburg und Zürich von den Anfängen bis 1940* (Zürich: Schweizerisches Institut für Kunstwissenschaft, 1967), 9-24.

³⁷ Heinrich Wölfflin, ‘How one should photograph sculpture’, transl. from the German by Geraldine A. Johnson, in: *Art History*, 36, #1 (February 2013), 53-71 (orig. published in 1896, 1915). See also: Wolfgang M. Freitag, ‘Early uses of photography in the history of art’, in: *Art Journal*, 39, #2 (Winter 1979), 120-122.

In that respect Wölfflin differed from his contemporary formalist Schmarsow as well as from older art historians, such as Herman Grimm and Bruno Meyer, all of whom were more enthusiastically disposed to employ photographic reproductions and/or slides.³⁸ So was Richard Hamann, of a later generation, who in 1913 founded the Bildarchiv Foto Marburg at that town's university. It was meant as a repository for photographic records of artworks, especially architectural details that were practically unobservable from everyday standpoints, for which he and his co-workers used a purpose-built camera. A student of Wölfflin, Hamann shared his—and other art historians', notably John Ruskin's—skepticism that photographic reproductions could convey the complete "*künstlerischen Effekt*". But his photo archive mainly served (and serves) research purposes of a more documentary nature.³⁹

Insofar as the use of photographs in art history teaching caused any debate,⁴⁰ most of the referenced essays mention arguments that are either ontological—their "changes of scale", their "lack of veracity" or "lacking before nature"—or epistemological—"choice

³⁸ Dan Karlholm, 'Developing the picture: Wölfflin's performance art', in: *Photography and Culture*, 3, #2 (July 2010), 208; Angela Mattysek, "'Entdecker" und "Finder". Über die fotografische Wissensproduktion der Kunstgeschichte und die Probleme der Reproduktion von Kunstwerken', in: *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, 28, #3 (September 2005), 228-229; Adler (2004), 441-442; Freitag (1979), 122. As early as 1865 Grimm had published an article on the need for photographic libraries in art history teaching; Elizabeth Anne McCauley, *Industrial madness: commercial photography in Paris, 1848-1871* (New Haven - London: Yale University Press, 1994), 277.

Possibly, Wölfflin's article referenced above may have been a veiled comment on Grimms's much less aesthetically strict and prescriptive report on showing photographs of sculpture from various angles and distances, inside or in the open air under different sun conditions; Herman Grimm, 'Die Umgestaltung der Universitätsvorlesungen über Neuere Kunstgeschichte durch die Anwendung des Skioptikons. Erster Bericht', in: *Beiträge zur Deutschen Culturgeschichte* (Berlin: Wilhelm Herts, 1897 [1892]), 282-284.

³⁹ Mattysek (2005), 229-231; Peter H. Feist, *Beiträge Richard Hamanns zur Methodik der Kunstgeschichtsschreibung* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1980), 6, 8-9.

On Ruskin: Freitag (1979), 119-121. Film scholar Ian Christie ranks Ruskin among the "dedicated and innovative users" of the lantern; 'Through a glass brightly: the magic lantern in history, in: *British Academy Review*, 5 (January-July 2001), 21; <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/through-glass-brightly-magic-lantern-history>. However, insofar as Ruskin showed photographs during his Oxford professorship (1869-1878, 1883-1885), no mention is made of their being projected. His lectures' illustrations consisted predominantly of drawings and other pictures from his own collection—even by his own hand—or the university's. Only much earlier had Ruskin availed himself of lantern projections, albeit non-photographic: at the Royal Institution his "lectures on 'The Storm-cloud of the Nineteenth Century' were illustrated by a series of coloured pictures executed by Mr. Arthur Severn from drawings by Mr. Ruskin (...) and thrown on a screen by means of Mr. Wilson Barrett's limelight." Edward T. Cook, *Studies in Ruskin: some aspects of the work and teaching of John Ruskin* (Orpington - London: George Allen, 1890), 56.

⁴⁰ For instance, at a German conference on art history teaching, in 1902, most participants had no problem with photography; Frank Kessler, Sabine Lenk, "'...To not only tell, but also to show, and to show plenty...': the magic lantern as a teaching tool in art history around 1900", in: *Fonseca, Journal of Communication*, 16 (2018), 52.

of point of view” or the interposition of “an active intelligence between the object and its viewers”.⁴¹ But what these arguments implied for their specific use in academic teaching, whether or not in projection, remains underexposed. The fact, however, that a skeptic like Wölfflin, after having succeeded Grimm in Berlin in 1901, did develop an elaborate way of lecturing with projected slides shows that the perceived inherent disadvantages of photography, notably the loss of unmediated contact with the artwork, could apparently be overcome under certain conditions.

Such conditions are the subject of Mattysek’s referenced essay, in which she lists four compensating strategies, two of which—“ekphrasis”, or verbal description, and the illustrated lecture—relate to teaching; unfortunately she doesn’t pursue the didactic aspect.⁴² Karlholm’s essay does to some extent when he describes the very combination of these two strategies in Wölfflin’s art history classes in Berlin: by throwing an enlarged picture on a wall of a darkened room, followed, after a well-timed silence, by his seemingly extempore comments, students were enabled, according to the author, to “arrive at a synthetic comprehension of all visual elements.”⁴³ “Visual elements” is the operative phrase here, because, he goes on to explain, Wölfflin treated photographs precisely for what he considered them to be: “art-less facsimile[s]” whose very imperfections—one-sized, two-dimensional, black-and-white, and frameless, while in projection they were seen from an unvarying distance and under an unchanging angle—made them the ideally distractive tool for bringing out an artwork’s formal elements, conceived as a set of contrastive aspects, that were basic to his approach to art history.⁴⁴ (Rather than the mere

⁴¹ Quoted in Freitag (1979), 118-122.

Comparable discussions about the validity of reproducing artworks photographically vis-à-vis other contemporary techniques of reproduction, such as drawing and engraving, had been going on in France since the mid-19th century; McCauley (1994), ch. 7, particularly pp. 292-300. See also: Freitag (1979), 117-119.

⁴² Mattysek (2005), 231-232.

⁴³ Karlholm (2010), 209-210. However, the author’s description of Wölfflin’s famed double projections does not make sense when he writes that a projected photograph was superimposed over a projected “painting” (211).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 208.



Adolf Furtwängler



Julius von Schlosser



Alois Riegl



Heinrich Wölfflin

availability of the vast amount of slides Wölfflin had inherited from Grimm, what might have prompted him to employ them for the double projections in his classes was the comparison of individual works of art for a “conceptual research in art history”, which eventually led to the most systematic account of Wölfflin’s theory.⁴⁵) The emphasis on the performative merits of Wölfflin’s lectures in this rather artistically-minded essay, however, directs the author’s attention away from his initial focus on teaching. As a matter of fact, what he describes is in many ways similar to Grimm’s self-reported experiences with projection and simultaneous lecturing.

This is not the only instance in which the difference between contemporary established methods and the formalist approach to art history, which emerged in the late-19th century, appears to be overstressed. Without fail we are told that formalism heralded a move away from an explanatory method based on archival and contextualizing sources in favor of a more intuitive and contemplative, yet not necessarily less rigorous, method that focused on the artwork itself, even on an almost epiphanic experience of it.⁴⁶ But its use of projection as a means to attain the prominence of *Anschaung*, that is of visualization and contemplation, was not original. Its specific focus on what Adler in his essay calls “painterly compositional devices” may have been distinctive.⁴⁷ But his exclusive identification of the use of photographic slides with formalist art historians is weakly argued when he writes, invoking Heinrich Dilly, that “the development of late nineteenth-century photographic technology corresponds to the evolution of formalism’s success in the academy. The use of lantern projections (...) allowed the formalist to focus (...) on minute, observable details of the object, and on more sophisticated morphological

⁴⁵ Heinrich Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der Neueren Kunst* (München: F. Bruckmann, 1915); see also: Joan Goldhammer Hart, *Heinrich Wölfflin: an intellectual biography* (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1984 [1981]), 371-373, 431. My hedge *might*, however, stems from the fact that neither Wölfflin’s book nor Hart’s dissertation addresses the use of photography or its projection in his teaching or research.

⁴⁶ Adler (2004), 439-440.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 433.

comparisons between different objects.”⁴⁸ Besides the merely suggestive “corresponds” and the unspecified “technological development”, it should be pointed out that art historians of a different feather, such as Grimm, not only advocated projection, but used photography to focus on details.⁴⁹ And insofar as it concerned teaching, Wölfflin’s way of using the illustrated lecture further nuances the difference between him and his predecessor in particular. Because what they have in common is that each exploited the use of photographic slides to convey what they considered essential—“*grundlegende Begriffe*”⁵⁰—to works of fine arts. Grimm by playing up, through photographic projection, that which contributed to understanding an artwork, Wölfflin by stripping away, through the projected photograph, that which interfered with experiencing it. Both, in late career, summarized their positions with regard to teaching art history:

With enlargement considerable advantages emerge. By immediately giving my audience the real dimensions of the artworks, the artificial enlargement ceases to be confusing. On the contrary, it makes overview and assimilation in memory easier. It enables contemplation and, consequently, clarification of the objects, which was impossible with earlier presentations of reduced illustrations. The ideal content of the works comes more vividly to light. When looking at an original work, its captivating qualities may deceive one about their essential value, its appearance may make us think that it is intellectually more significant than it actually is; the skiopticon doesn’t permit such false appearances. Only first-class works pass the test. (...) The reigning dimness, if not darkness, during a lecture intensifies attentiveness.⁵¹

Is it not characteristic for the visual arts that they are self-explanatory and can be perceived as a matter of course? Admittedly, insofar as it concerns their objective content this claim is self-evident. An image represents something, a construction serves a purpose, a monument has a meaning; this needs to be explained. But the form (of which alone I

⁴⁸ Ibid., 444. However, no *slides* are mentioned, while the article’s illustrations are either copied from books—mostly Wölfflin’s publications—or from the collections of museums. And none of them shows details.

⁴⁹ Grimm (1897), 284, 295.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 292,

⁵¹ Ibid., 281-282. (translated by Frank Kessler and the author)

must speak here), doesn't it speak for itself as well? To understand a Japanese drawing, I do not need to learn Japanese. A medieval figure speaks directly to us, despite the centuries that separate us. Indeed, in general an image will be experienced as a message clearer than the written word. (...)

Granted that this is so, seeing is nonetheless something that needs to be learned. Obviously not everybody sees what it is. To explain a sculpture, in the sense of guiding the eye, is therefore in itself already a requisite element of art historical teaching.⁵²

This commonality is not to detract from the influential comparative approach to art history with which Wölfflin's name is associated. His reasoned juxtaposition of photographic images of artworks served as a tool to focus on what he considered the highest attainable goal of art history: the explanation of formal similarities (rather than, say, influence or evolution).⁵³ The word *reasoned* here is meant to stress another set of self-imposed limits his approach put on these juxtapositions: they are never random and disconnected, the similarities are never vague. Wölfflin's major work, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, clearly evinces this by positing a contrast between the fundamental principles of two *adjacent* periods in European art history, Renaissance and Baroque—both, moreover, in a highly abstracted ideal type.

By contrast, Vogelsang has left no scholarly statements on the use of photography in art history nor reflections of its pros and cons in teaching, even though he was a teacher first and foremost.⁵⁴ What we have is an endnote in the published text of his inaugural

⁵² Heinrich Wölfflin, 'Das Erklären von Kunstwerken', in: *Kleine Schriften (1886-1933)*, ed. by Joseph Gantner, (Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co, 1946a), 165-166, orig. publ. in 1921. (translated by the author and Frank Kessler)

⁵³ Alexander (2018), 89-91.

⁵⁴ Besides being a privatdocent, he had also been a part-time teacher of art history at a secondary girls' school in Haarlem, from 1904 through 1906; 'Middelbaar onderwijs', *De Telegraaf*, August 24, 1904, 12, #4344, evening edn., 1st section, 2. Delpher: <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:110554635:mpeg21:a0053>; 'Haarlem', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 78, #24533, August 19, 1905, morning edn., 1. Delpher: <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010649598:mpeg21:a0011>.

Indeed, despite his erudition, his reputation suffered over time, as he published no theoretical, scholarly works during his long professorship. It is the reason he was twice refused membership of the Koninklijke Nederlandsche Academie van Wetenschappen (Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences); Odding (1994), 55.

address at the Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht. It is a mere comment on a fantasy about a “perfect copying machine” for artworks, although it is:

[n]ot photography, which is something else. Photography does not copy, no more than a mirror imitates. It is the semblance of the image itself, although, because of the loss of various attributes, it shows it in an unfavorable condition, and so it is, again, more or less what a mirror image is to reality. Or: reality remains reality, even though one sees it through colored glass.⁵⁵

Whatever the disadvantages, an endnote—which suggests it was unspoken during the lecture—leaves no room for pursuing his thoughts on how to make photography serve his purposes. From another brief remark, in the abovementioned annual reports for the Council of Governors, while not even about photography specifically, we learn of his insistence on making his students see; Vogelsang considered “looking as the foundation of the description of a work of art and the description as a check on looking.”⁵⁶ And while the task of an art historian, in his opinion, was to see artworks “in their art-historical context“, students needed to “learn aesthetic appreciation”. Looking was conditional for their aesthetic receptivity.⁵⁷ Besides a convenient means to show artworks that were for all practical purposes inaccessible, this statement leads one to conclude that his use of photographic slides seems mainly to have been a method to combat the lack of visual and art historical knowhow.⁵⁸ This resonates in a text in which the representation of artworks as such is discussed, albeit in passing. It comes from his lucid introduction—published after his retirement in fact—to the full-color print illustrations in a book on Rogier van der Weyden’s painting *Pieta*:

⁵⁵ Vogelsang (1907), 39, n. 2. (*author’s translation*)

⁵⁶ Odding (1994), 32. (*author’s translation*)

⁵⁷ Vogelsang quoted in: Stolwijk (1991), 19-20.

⁵⁸ Besides the common instruction method of museum visits, Vogelsang also organized annual excursions, taking small groups of students to monuments and buildings in the Netherlands or its neighboring countries: Marcus-de Groot (2003), 56; Salomons (1957), 137; Houtzager [1950], 18 ff.

How often these paintings, besides good representations of them, have been described for us. Yet then, too, much was perforce left to the memory and comprehension of the viewer, above all his willingness to look and, if necessary, enlarge with a loupe. For some, perhaps, that sufficed, as they had already seen many originals; others, perhaps, might have been encouraged to study an accessible original as quickly and as detailed as possible. But most often such a reproduction of the whole painting was still too small and too unclear, not much more than an aid to better remember what it depicted.

Now that the modern way of publishing also allows us to inspect various parts separately, our description method must necessarily be a different one. Now we can comment on a Master's signature, even before one has seen the original or after the reader believes to have seen it. Our attention is captured in a completely different way. Not only are we adverted to *what* it says, but we are also forced to see *how* and by which means the painter has executed his theme.⁵⁹

Besides photography and slide projections, the passage contains the merest allusions to some of the strategies to make an absent artwork present, such as description and eyewitness reports of originals.⁶⁰ And although it can be seen as an indirect, and retrospective, reflection on the use of (black and white) photographs, these passing remarks actually come closest to what can be construed as a statement on the photographic slide itself, albeit a rather mundane one: they suggest that their use was simply a practical, expedient means, the obvious shortcomings of which were apparently preferred to more time-consuming methods.

⁵⁹ Rogier van der Weyden: *Pieta*, intr. by Willem Vogelsang (Amsterdam – Antwerpen: V.H. van Ditmar, 1949), 7. (*author's translation*). The book was the first in a series meant to "examine the style and technique of the great masters in detail, on the basis of one of their most typical works. Each volume consists of seven colored plates, of which the frontispiece represents the entire painting and the other ones reproduce details in true size."; 'Vorm en kleur', *De Tijd: Godsdienstig-Staatkundig Dagblad*, 106, #34609, 16-12-1950, 3. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:011202198:mpeg21:a0086>. A 1948 advertisement actually mentions "8 reproductions in 8 colors"; 'Advertentie De Posthoorn', *Het Parool*, 8, no. 1181, 13-11-1948, 6. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ABCDDD:010828764:mpeg21:a0067>.

⁶⁰ Mattysek (2005), 231-232.

I end this section with two comments on interpretation, both sparked by the use of photography in art history. Firstly, and unsurprisingly, none of the referenced articles mention André Malraux's controversial treatise 'Museum without walls', originally published, under a different title, in French in 1947; only Freitag quotes his maxim-like phrase "For the last hundred years (...) art history has been the history of that which can be photographed."⁶¹ Today that phrase has lost its slightly provocative aspect and almost reads as a tribute to what has become established, albeit technically updated, practice. However, some of Malraux's often sweeping and unscholarly comments are nonetheless more incisive with regard to photographic illustration—although, unfortunately, their force is weakened by self-contradiction or ambiguity.

One of his acute and at first glance critical observations turns photography's scale changes and loss of detail on its head:

"[P]hotography imparts a family likeness to objects that have actually but slight affinity. With the result that such different objects as a miniature, a piece of tapestry, a statue and a medieval stained-glass window, when reproduced on the same page, may seem members of the same family. They have lost their colors, texture and relative dimensions (...); each, in short, has practically lost what was specific to it".⁶²

The point is well-taken, and refers back to the treatise's opening statement on the situatedness of artifacts (not necessarily what are now called works of art) and how they functioned in ways unreproducible in their new repositories, notably Western art museums, or in illustrated art books. But while the quote initially appears to critically reflect on juxtaposing reproductions, in the next sentence Malraux suddenly backtracks, stating as a latter-day formalist that through photography their style—his main topic and,

⁶¹ From: André Malraux, 'Museum without walls', in: *The voices of silence*, transl. from the French by Stuart Gilbert (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990 [1953]), 30.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 21.

thus, definitely a matter of “affinity”—is “the gainer” in this illustrative arrangement (copiously featured, incidentally, in his own text).

Next he points out that, more insidiously—Malraux’s word—, contiguous photographic reproductions tend to become ‘contagious’. His example is the pairing of two illustrations, which he describes as follows: “The art of the Steppes was a highly specialized art; yet, if a bronze or gold plaque from the Steppes be shown above a Romanesque bas-relief, in the same [printed] format, it becomes a bas-relief.” Here the reader is wrongfooted again, because Malraux actually welcomes this perceptual shift as a liberation. Besides being undeniably Western-oriented, his terse yet highly rhetorical explanation is that “reproduction frees a style from the limitations which made it [a plaque from the Steppes] appear to be a minor art”—note the misleading shift from “highly specialized” in the earlier quote to “minor art” in the next.⁶³ Still, what juxtapositions like this point up is an effect seldom noticed, let alone discussed—not just in fine arts contexts—, although it concerns an everyday cognitive phenomenon: the mutual influence of simultaneous, contiguous or sequential presentation of artifacts—or, as here, their reproduced images—and how they affect interpretation. Disappointingly, though, Malraux’s greater awareness of how the mind works is not followed through. On the contrary, he exalts the unconcern with chronological development and topographic origin of *unreasoned* comparisons for their possibility of creating “fictitious arts”.⁶⁴ Indeed, it is only because his treatise, although clothed as art history, is actually about art that he was able to allow himself such license.

Secondly, and ironically, while Malraux can juxtapose anything he wants, he does not allow the viewer much license. His certainty about the viewer’s interpretation is

⁶³ Ibid., 21-22.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 24.

nevertheless questionable. This is a line of thinking that the quotations of Grimm and Wölfflin above evince as well: they all treat stylistic and formal elements as guidelines, if not instructions, for the viewer—Wölfflin actually once used the phrase “*Führer für das Auge*”.⁶⁵ Art history appears here as a discipline that assists viewers in perceiving what is ‘really’ there, even to distinguish, as Grimm claimed, between first-rate and lesser works, if only in the dark. But, as historian Charles Ambler reminds us, this is tantamount to making stylistic and other formal aspects implicitly stand in for beholders’ responses. This, he writes, is “a textual determinism that effectively marginalizes the audience”, because it neglects a text’s “reception (...) in specific historical circumstances”⁶⁶, including, I suppose, an art history class in the 1890s.

The word *text* in my quotation generalizes the statement yet camouflages the fact that it comes from a book on the reception of American popular cinema outside the US, more specifically from a chapter on its screening in a British colonial context, the Copperbelt mining areas of northern Rhodesia—today’s Zambia—in the mid-20th century. It describes how commercial film distributors, censors, and government authorities alike subjected the content and style of American fare to inspection before showing it to local audiences, mostly workers and their families living in the mining companies’ compounds. Besides programming ‘wholesome’ information films, this meant cutting anything that contained potential challenges to the colonial order, commonly defined in terms of violence and sex. Based on judgments framed by these parties’ own cultural terms, notably the “race-defined” notions of their audiences, the adapted prints were considered fit to neutralize local spectators’ alleged impressionability.⁶⁷ Needless to

⁶⁵ Heinrich Wölfflin, ‘Über Galeriekataloge’, in: Wölfflin (1946b), 156, orig. publ. in 1907.

⁶⁶ Charles Ambler, ‘Popular films and colonial audiences in Central Africa’, in: Melvyn Stokes, Richard Maltby (eds.), *Hollywood abroad: audiences and cultural exchange* (London: BFI, 2004), 135.

⁶⁷ Filmmakers, too, were advised “to employ ‘a technique which is skillfully related to the psychology of the African’”, such as sharply focused images and sustained visual continuity; quoted in: *Ibid.*, 138-139.

say, such efforts misfired, as they disregarded local cinema-going practices, interpretations rooted in local cultural forms, and local ways of audience behavior. Copperbelt audiences' focus on stock scenes rather than plot, even when not scissored by the censor, is the most striking example of the latitude of reception, not just with regard to style and content, but also to what a film was expected to be or do.⁶⁸ Still, their modes of reception were not exclusively localist. For instance, the many westerns (mostly B-series) were appropriated as audience favorites and had a noticeable effect on the dress and play of the young and the speech of all.

The most crucial flaw of the contemporary powers that be, however, was to not realize that submission to the goals of colonial authorities was in all likelihood the last thing on audiences' minds, as reception—and resistance—occurred within the compounds, smack inside the very contact zone, and the power structure and antagonisms it implied, in which they lived.⁶⁹ In more tolerant, and tolerable, circumstances, there might have been less compelling reasons why audiences responded largely on the basis of their own cultural norms, perhaps even showed a willingness to understand a foreign artifact more positionally.

Parenthetically, wide cultural divisions are not a necessary condition for the disparity between what producers put into an artifact and consumers take from it. That is what we learn from Roland Marchand's deeply researched study of American advertizing in the 1920s and 1930s. The example may seem arbitrary at first sight, but for the study of reception its relevance is priceless, because even in an industry that "had few rivals in the expenditure of money and effort in assessing audience response" all that funds was

⁶⁸ Ibid., 133-138, 143.

⁶⁹ *Contact zone* is defined as a situation "in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict"; Mary Louise Pratt: *Imperial eyes: travel writing and transculturation* (London - New York: Routledge: 1995 [1992]), 6.

apparently badly needed to figure out, time and again, how to associate its “selling messages with the values and attitudes held by their audience.”⁷⁰

While Marchand quotes sociologist Herbert Gans’s statement—echoed by Ambler—that “the critics’ practice of inferring effects from content is not valid”⁷¹, this does not mean, I submit, that reception is a ‘free-for-all’ in which anything goes—a position to which Malraux tends to adhere. There is a practically unavoidable logic to reception, as social life is built on the assumption that society’s members habitually make sense, not nonsense, of whatever comes their way, be it speech, behavior or cultural artifacts, regardless of the considerations and circumstances that shape their specific response to it. But it can be competitive nevertheless, insofar as meanings and ways to get at them are often propagated in order to acquire normative or even legal force. As Ambler reported, the combined efforts of film distributors and colonial censors in mid-20th-century northern Rhodesia dismally failed to attain that goal. The illustrated lecture that became widely popular in the Netherlands in the late 19th century was not generally regimental in intent, but an edifying medium nevertheless, meant to shape their audiences in its bourgeois initiators’ own image. Albeit up to a limit.

III.

In 1900 Vogelsang returned to the Netherlands, where he was admitted as *privatdocent* of Art History at the Universiteit van Amsterdam in October of that year.⁷² In his opening lecture, on November 22, he stressed the importance of Art History within academic

⁷⁰ Roland Marchand, *Advertising the American Dream: making way for modernity, 1920-1940* (Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press, 1985), xix.

⁷¹ Herbert Gans, *Popular culture and high culture: an analysis and evaluation of taste* (New York: Basic Books, 1974), 32.

⁷² ‘Stadsnieuws’, in: *Het Nieuws van den Dag*, #9443, October 26, 1900, 3rd section, 7. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010127570:mpeg21:a0079>, and similar announcements on October 26 and 27.

curricula as a discipline that connects the sciences and history—similar to what Jan Six, a few years earlier, had expressed in his abovementioned inaugural address.⁷³ It was, incidentally, also the first of many recorded occasions where Vogelsang voiced his concern about pupils' lack of basic relevant knowledge and visual understanding, along with his annoyance at the reluctance of secondary schools to redress this omission, and his worry how this state of affairs might affect the academic discipline of art history in the near future.⁷⁴ The lecture did not yet signpost his theoretical penchants, save a casual sneer against the “Darwinist” construction of artistic ‘family trees’, nor his pedagogic methods, specifically slide projection—even though it was in this very lecture that he apologized for discussing only a limited number of art historical questions and problems, as he “had no series of images at his disposal for ongoing illustration.”⁷⁵

Apparently it took a while for things to coalesce, a circumstance reminisced in the festschrift for Vogelsang's 75th birthday, in which his career as a privatdocent was summarized as progressing from “passing round pictures to projection”.⁷⁶ And newspaper reports show that his public illustrated lectures around this time, too, were a ‘mixed media’ affair. The earliest Dutch reference retrieved, a lecture on ‘De verlichting van woonhuizen bij dag en nacht’ (Indoor illumination by day and night), in January

⁷³ Six (1896), 7-11, 33.

⁷⁴ Vogelsang (1900), 42-45.

This was a recurrent concern, which he felt was intimately related with art and drawing lessons in primary and secondary education. In 1917, during the parliamentary debates on the education budget he signed a petition that stressed the crucial importance of drawing lessons at all school levels; ‘Het kunstonderwijs’, in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 90, #28671 (January 17, 1917), morning edn., 1st section, 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010653851:mpeg21:a0057>. He returned to the topic in his first columns in *De Telegraaf*: ‘Ketterij over kunst, kunnen en kennen. Nieuwe stroomingen in het teekenonderwijs’, in: *De Telegraaf*, 33, #12358, February 21, 1925, evening edn., 3rd section, 9. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:110565202:mpeg21:a0206>, ‘Teekenonderwijs’, in: *Ibid.*, #12393, evening edn., 3rd section, 9. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:110562997:mpeg21:a0197>, and ‘Tweede ketterij van kunnen, kennen en kunst’, in: *Ibid.*, #12420, April 25, 1925, evening edn., 3rd section, 9. Delpher, <https://www.delpher.nl/nl/kranten/view?coll=ddd&identificer=ddd:110563042:mpeg21:a0178>.

⁷⁵ Vogelsang (1900), 37-38.

⁷⁶ Houtzager ([1950]), 6.

1902, reports that Vogelsang used both “slides and drawings”.⁷⁷ Interestingly, the topic of this illustrated lecture was similar to one that he had presented two years before, in Freiburg, but then “*an Hand einer langen Reihe trefflicher chronologisch geordneter Lichtbilder*”.⁷⁸ The performative variety of the dispositifs implied by these two presentations can be taken to reflect the vast difference between the two countries’ infrastructure for photographically illustrated lectures (producers, distributors, sales points, supply companies, venues) at the turn of the 20th century.

But the winds of change had begun to blow. In the late 1890s, the infrastructure for projecting knowledge in the Netherlands was taking firmer shape. In an expanding market a number of new institutes and companies provided on-site and/or rental services (operator, lecturer, equipment, slides series, and/or lantern readings) or sold equipment, slides, and supplies. One was the Sociaal-Culturele Vereeniging ‘Ons Huis’ (Socio-Cultural Association ‘Our Home’), founded in 1891. It was dedicated to the uplift of the working classes; local chapters were set up over the years and merged under the name Toynbee-Vereeniging. In June 1898, this association, in cooperation with kindred organizations, initiated a “lantern exchange”, including readings, for both its local chapters and non-associated organizations, under the name ‘Vereeniging tot het houden van Voordrachten met Lichtbeelden’ (Association for the Performance of Illustrated Lectures). At the end of the year it boasted a catalog of slides series on such varied topics as Dutch architecture, entomology and myrmecology, Michelangelo, (steam) navigation, the human body and its malformations, astronomy, history of the railways, Old Dutch painting, telephony, antique

⁷⁷ ‘Verlichting van woonhuizen’, in: *Deventer Dagblad*, 17, #4962, January 17, 1902, 2. Under more or less similar titles Vogelsang presented this illustrated lecture at two more venues in the Netherlands during this month.

Sometimes there was no projection at all. A report on his lecture ‘De geschiedenis van het venster’ (History of the window), in March 1902, mentions that “to illustrate his talk he passed around a number of drawings and photographic images.” RKD-Nederlands Instituut voor Kunstgeschiedenis, The Hague, Archief Vogelsang, NL-HaRKD.0287, Box 15, Item 1902-1903 W. Vogelsang, Piece ‘Newspaper clipping of March 13, 1902 with review of said lecture, pasted on cardboard’.

⁷⁸ Newspaper clipping ‘Ueber Zimmerbeleuchtung’, from: *Freiburger Tagblatt*, December 31, 1900. Ibid., Item 1900-1901-1905, Piece 8.

sculpture, volcanism, and the Netherlands East-Indies along with a host of other geographic topics.⁷⁹ This was the beginning of what by all accounts became the country's largest and most comprehensive catalog of slides series and readings, either commissioned or distributed under license. In 1911, responding to increased demand, particularly from the educational field, it became an independent body, renamed Lichtbeelden-Vereeniging—later Lichtbeeldeninstituut (Lantern Slide Association/Institute)—, that meant to serve “all who wish to promote knowledge and education”⁸⁰ by producing, distributing, and selling photographic slides. Not limited to membership anymore, it is no surprise to find in its business papers correspondence concerning financial support from third parties, most regularly the Department of Education, Arts, and Sciences⁸¹).

Next, in 1900, C.A.P.I., a photographic supplies store since 1894, started selling lanterns as well as slides from its expanding network of stores, while it regularly published updated manuals and catalogs. A C.A.P.I. sales catalog of the early 1900s contained, besides all sorts of equipment and supplies, such slide sections as ‘Doré’s Bible’, ‘Flowers, fruits, etc.’, ‘Marble statues and groups’, ‘Wild animals’, ‘Temperance slides’, ‘Art history’, various places domestic and foreign, comic slides as well as interstitial slides (e.g. ‘Welcome’, ‘Intermission’—although these could also be meant for film projections, as contemporary projectors were equipped to project both slides and film). Because the slides could be bought individually, no need was apparently felt to

⁷⁹ ‘Notulen der bijeenkomst afgevaardigden van Toynbee-Vereenigingen, June 19, 1898’; text of advertizement ‘Voordrachten met lichtbeelden voor vereenigingen en particulieren beschikbaar’; circular ‘Vereenigingen tot houden van voordrachten met lichtbeelden’, December 1898. Rijksacademie van Beeldende Kunsten, Amsterdam, Archief Lichtbeeldenvereniging (uninventoried), ‘Album’.

⁸⁰ ‘Lichtbeelden-Vereeniging’, in: *Nieuws van den Dag*, #12683 (April 20, 1911), 4th section, 12. Delpher, <http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010108686:mpeg21:p012>. Vogelsang was a board member of this new corporation.

⁸¹ ‘Ministerie van Onderwijs, Kunsten en Wetenschappen, April 28, 1921; ‘Ministerie van Onderwijs, Kunsten en Wetenschappen aan Bestuur van de Lichtbeeldenvereniging’, April 20, 1922; ‘De Minister van Onderwijs, Kunsten en Wetenschappen aan Bestuur van de Lichtbeeldenvereniging’, February 21, 1925. Rijksacademie van Beeldende Kunsten, Amsterdam, Archief Lichtbeeldenvereniging (uninventoried), binder with correspondence.

create more tightly pre-arranged series.⁸² In the early 1910s, finally, Amsterdam-based photo supplies store and portrait studio Merkelbach and the Vereeniging ‘Koloniaal Instituut’, soon after its foundation in 1911, entered this market as well.⁸³

The extent of the demand for slides series by universities, for both teaching and educational outreach, must have contributed to the emergence and growth of these companies—after all, it had a small army of prominent academics on its advisory committee, among whom Vogelsang.⁸⁴ But it seems unlikely that they were vital for the latter’s economic viability. Newspaper advertizements show that, besides academics, representatives of a host of institutes, associations, corporations, but also individuals who specialized in certain topics increasingly used the illustrated lecture as a medium to teach, instruct, publicize or propagate a large variety of concerns and interests.⁸⁵

Indeed, this has been called a time of “cultural and political emancipation”.⁸⁶ As well the late 19th century witnessed an emphatically government-led educational reform through consecutive legislation that encompassed the entire system, from primary education to the university. Besides the abovementioned 1876 *Wet op het Hooger Onderwijs*, parliament had passed the *Wet op het Middelbaar Onderwijs* (Secondary Education Act) in 1863, the *Wet tot Regeling van het Lager Onderwijs* (Act for the Regulation of Primary Education) in 1878, and the *Leerplichtwet* (Compulsory Education

⁸² *Catalogus van fotografietoestellen en benooidigheden* (Nijmegen – Amsterdam – Groningen – Den Haag: Ivens en Co., n.d. [1903]), 158-171; Daan Buddingh, ‘De toverlantaarn in Nederland’, at: *De Luikerwaal*, https://www.luikerwaal.com/newframe_nl.htm?/nederland1_nl.htm.

⁸³ On Merkelbach, see: *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ ‘Lichtbeeldenvereniging’, in: *Arnhemsche Courant*, 98, #7606 (April 20, 1911), afternoon edn., 2nd section, 5. Delpher, <http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMKB08:000100674:mpeg21:p005>, and similar reports around that date.

⁸⁵ A small, random catch gives a sense of the range of organizations active in this market: Nederlandsche Maatschappij voor Tuin- en Plantkunde (Dutch Society for Horticulture and Botany); Vereeniging voor Facultatieve Lijkverbranding (Association for Elective Cremation); Nederlandsche Vereeniging van Spiritisten ‘Harmonia’ (Dutch Association of Spiritualists ‘Harmonia’); Sociëteit van Handwerkslieden (Society of Craftsman); Centraal Genootschap voor Kinderherstellings- en Vacantiekolonies (Central Society for Rehabilitation and Holiday Camps for Children); Nederlandsche Vereeniging ‘Onze Vloot’ (Dutch Association ‘Our Navy’); Nederlandsche Padvindereorganisatie (Dutch Scouting Organization); Nederlandsch-Roomsche Reisvereniging (Dutch Catholic Travel Association); Nederlandsche Heidemaatschappij (Dutch Agricultural Reclamation Corporation); NV Nederlandsch-Amerikaansche Fruitteelt Maatschappij ‘Virginia’ (Dutch-American Fruit-Growing Corporation ‘Virginia’, Ltd.), as well as the Argentinean consul.

⁸⁶ Bank, van Buuren (2000), 14.

Act) for children between ages six and twelve, in 1900. Alongside, there was a flowering of adult education and night schools, courses in all kinds of intellectual and practical topics, and other, often private initiatives of knowledge dissemination. Given the predominance of more or less radical liberal governments during the late 19th and early 20th centuries⁸⁷, uplift and education were part of a broader mission, the goals of which were to a great extent formulated from an economically, politically, and socially dominant, bourgeois perspective that was only partly self-serving.⁸⁸ It had its roots in ideals that had crystallized in the late-Republican years of the second half of the 18th century, spurred by what was described as “the moral decay of an impoverished population” and the expectation that “moral restoration and expansion of skills” would reinvigorate the once glorious nation.⁸⁹ Prominent among contemporary initiatives was the Maatschappij tot Nut van ‘t Algemeen (Society for the Promotion of the Public Good), founded in 1784. Initially its efforts were directed, on one hand, at improving elementary education through brochures aimed at (future) professionals and the provision of learning materials for pupils and, on the other, at modernizing academic learning, viz. removing the obstacles—the use of Latin and the predominance of the classics—to the dissemination of up-to-date knowledge.⁹⁰ During the first half of the 20th century it was one of the most active societies in organizing illustrated lectures in its divisions all over the country. The

⁸⁷ “Radical” liberalism was a term that emerged in the late 19th century for a group of social liberals who were united around the ideology of state intervention, particularly in creating conditions for the development for those who lived in, or were threatened with, economic and social exclusion; Ibid., 32-39. Still, the idea of *economic* liberalism was powerful enough to delay or dilute social legislation until the 1890s; Auke van der Woud, *Koninkrijk van sloppen: achterbuurten en vuil in de negentiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2010), 225-232.

⁸⁸ And when it was, it did not always come from ‘above’. Around the turn of the 20th century, Henri Polak’s leadership of the diamond workers union, for instance, was strongly characterized by uplifting, high cultural activities that were meant to boost its workers’ image—even though these activities did not enduringly match demand or interest; Marc Adang, “‘Eens zal de dag, opgaand, vinden arbeid en schoonheid vereend’: over socialisme en kunstopvoeding in Nederland aan het begin van de twintigste eeuw”, in: M.G. Westen (ed.), *Met den tooverstaf van ware kunst: cultuurspreiding en cultuuroverdracht in perspectief* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 1990), 71-104.

⁸⁹ Wijnand Mijnhardt, ‘Sociabiliteit en cultuurparticipatie in de achttiende en vroege negentiende eeuw’, in: Ibid., 62; Onno Boonstra, *De waardij van eene vroege opleiding: een onderzoek naar de implicaties van het analfabetisme op het leven van inwoners van Eindhoven en omliggende gemeenten, 1800-1920*, doctoral thesis, Landbouwniversiteit Wageningen, 1993, 35.

⁹⁰ Joost Kloek, Wijnand Mijnhardt, *1800: blueprints for a national community*, transl. from the Dutch by Beverley Jackson (Assen – Basingstoke: Royal Van Gorcum – Palgrave, 2004 [2001]), 109-111.

paragon of mid-19th century liberalism was Samuel Sarphati, whose many far-reaching initiatives, from a regular garbage collection service to the Paleis voor Volksvlijt (Amsterdam Crystal Palace, a translation copied from the source's English abstract that identifies his inspiring example), were born of first-hand knowledge—he was a GP in Amsterdam—and a conviction that education was conditional to lift people out of poverty and misery and share in the prosperity that an industrialized country would offer.⁹¹ Instead of the late-18th century restorative nationalist ideology, Sarphati's aims seem rather to have been inspired by a sense of an across-the-board national progress.⁹²

When Vogelsang entered the lantern lecture circuit at the turn of the 20th century many edifying initiatives had been undertaken. Indeed, “cultural and political emancipation” suggests that urgent issues, notably illiteracy and disease control, had been to a greater or lesser extent successfully addressed. However, throughout the 19th century—and later—working and living conditions left much to be desired.⁹³ It even seems that the spectacular level of literacy—during the last quarter of the 19th century illiteracy has been calculated to dip under 10% nationwide⁹⁴—was an outlier within the realm of social reform. The general conclusion of these studies was that the disappearance of illiteracy had been fundamentally a matter of internalizing, over the course of the 19th century, the propagated values of a modernizing society. These values, the aggregate of various

⁹¹ Emile Wennekes, *Het Paleis voor Volksvlijt (1864-1929): 'Edele uiting eener stoute gedachte!'* (The Hague: Sdu, 1999), 25-37; Bank, van Buuren (2000), 35-36.

Not all contemporary initiatives, though, were meant for the *common* wealth. The Amsterdam zoo 'Natura Artis Magistra', for instance, long restricted its premises, facilities, and lectures to its initiators' (upper) middle class peers; Donna C. Mehos, *Science and culture for members only: the Amsterdam zoo Artis in the nineteenth century* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006).

⁹² Henne van der Kooy, Justus de Leeuwe, *Sarphati, een biografie* (Amsterdam: Atlas, 2001).

⁹³ On living conditions: van der Woud (2010); on working conditions, see the chapters on entrepreneurs Regout, Scholten, and Jurgens & van den Bergh in: Wim Wennekes, *De aartsvaders: grondleggers van het Nederlandse bedrijfsleven* (Amsterdam – Antwerpen: Atlas, 1993), 45-78, 79-105, 221-281.

⁹⁴ Onno Boonstra, *Regionale verschillen in de daling van het analfabetisme in Nederland 175-1900. Working paper for the Scientific Research Community Historical Demography* (Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit, June 2009); Boonstra (1993), 51-52, 139.

secondary conditions (ideological, religious, economic, cultural, etc.) had effected a change of perspective that stimulated parents to send their children to school—before compulsory education was enacted in 1900—simply because it was regarded as the high road to social advancement.⁹⁵ As time passed such a decision would have been reinforced by parents' own literacy, contributing, in its turn, to the edifying efforts. But while combatting illiteracy had a long and slow history, there had hardly been time to address the enormous housing, health, and economic problems in the wake of the explosive population increase in Dutch cities during the last quarter of the 19th century.⁹⁶ Notably, the Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen put in its efforts and employed its network, but their brochures on hygiene—a potentially mutually beneficial combination of two urgent issues—were not aimed at those who needed its advice most.⁹⁷

As noted, the expansion around 1900 of businesses and providers in the field of illustrated lecturing served a more diversified market. While edification was still an important element, the (illustrated) lecture also became a prominent medium for knowledge updating, in response to the many changes in science, industry, transportation and communication infrastructure, politics, and society. As historian Auke van der Woud argues, in the late-19th century *edification* had taken on two different meanings, each representing a different cultural framework. Traditional edification, such as conceived by the Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen, was not only meant for peer audiences, but was also aimed to induct the lower strata of society into what he calls classic, or 'high', cultural and moral values—the values of the few, one might say. The new cultural values were of a much more practical, technical, and material nature and, above all, of a massive scale.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Ibid., 28-32.

⁹⁶ van der Woud (2010), 22-29.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 245-246.

⁹⁸ Auke van der Woud, *De nieuwe mens: de culturele revolutie in Nederland rond 1900* (Amsterdam: Prometheus – Bert Bakker, 2015), 12-18 and passim; see also his: *De nieuwe wereld: het ontstaan van het moderne Nederland* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2006).

In his books on the topic he adduces many manifestations of this new culture as it gradually, and around the turn of the 20th century more vigorously, manifested itself and advanced on established norms and values. But as the increasingly popular illustrated lecture is not mentioned, one has to tread carefully here.⁹⁹

While, plausibly, this medium had ridden piggyback on the very success of earlier 19th-century uplifting efforts, in the process it had undergone a bifurcation. This can be seen in the slide series and their readings in the new suppliers' catalogs (while their frequently updated and supplemented issues signaled an expanded scale and mode of operation). On the one hand, staple elements of high culture were prominently retained with series on art, religion, travel or (natural) history. This orientation was reinforced, furthermore, by the *absence* of topics commonly considered uncultured; references to a lecture on the fairground only date from the early 1870s.¹⁰⁰ And I have found no lectures on cinematography's history or other new mass entertainments. In a similar vein, travel slide series, particularly of cities, commonly called at reputable places such as public and religious buildings, monuments, museums or zoos¹⁰¹, but never at cinema palaces, sports accommodations or fairground and circus entertainments—except within the context of a world exhibition¹⁰²—, while industrial topics certainly did not as a rule include the manufacture of beer or spirits.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ In contrast to van der Woud's 2006 book on the rise of modern transportation and communication networks in late-19th century Holland, in *De nieuwe mens* his chapter of vignettes on turn-of-the century media and cultural institutes lacks the deep knowledge of the former book. Moreover, the absence of the illustrated lecture in this chapter may signal a common yet erroneous association with 19th-century high culture only and, consequently, a lack of mass appeal. See also the review by Thunnis van Oort, in: *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis*, 21, #1 (2018), 124-127.

¹⁰⁰ P.H. Testas, 'Volksvoordrachten in Nederland', in: *Staatkundig en Staathuishoudkundig Jaarboekje voor 1870* (Amsterdam: Vereniging voor de Statistiek in Nederland, 1870); H.T.R. Hubrecht, 'Volksvoordrachten in Nederland', in: *Ibid.*, 1871; P.H. Testas, 'Volksvoordrachten in Nederland', in: *Ibid.*, 1872.

¹⁰¹ See e.g. 'Praatjes bij plaatjes over Londen', in: *Catalogus der Lichtbeeldenvereeniging-Centraal Bureau voor Lantaarnplaten* (Amsterdam n.d. [1912]); 'Wandelingen door Amsterdam zooals 't was en zooals 't nu is', in: *Supplement Catalogus der Lichtbeeldenvereeniging-Centraal Bureau voor Lantaarnplaten* (Amsterdam, 1912).

¹⁰² I only know of one foreign example: *Paris Exhibition, 1900* (Bradford: Riley Bros., 1900). Magic Lantern Society, <http://www.magiclantern.org.uk/readings/pdfs/90700/90761.pdf>.

¹⁰³ Except, unsurprisingly, in France. I came across one lantern reading, titled *Vin, bière, cidre et vinaigre* by Gustave Tallent (Melun: Imprimerie administrative, 1900), on the website of the Musée nationale de l'Éducation, Rouen (<https://www.reseau-canope.fr/musee/collections/fr/museum/mne/vin-biere-cidre-et-vinaigre-notices-sur-les-vues/f1c09d30-b234-4ee3-9850-35a43863a5d4>).

On the other hand, catalogs increasingly featured practical slides series and series that informed audiences about contemporary, often technical or scientific topics and the changes they had caused. Examples are the abovementioned topics of steam navigation, railways, telephony or astronomy, but topics as socialism or women's emancipation and suffrage belong here, too. Examples of more practical, instructive topics were medicine and hygiene, workplace safety, sewage treatment, or workers' allotments. As we have seen, to disseminate these topics a host of associations had entered the field besides the organizations that had built the edifying lecture circuit.

Vogelsang's public illustrated lectures, however, are everything but illustrative of this transformation, except in its negation. As his career progressed he increasingly limited his field of operation to a specific market segment: that of professional and lay organizations dedicated to art or architecture, as well as art museums around the country. His appearances at more obviously uplifting organizations may, perhaps, be taken as much as a sign of his sense of mission or duty (or, as his successor put it, as being "active for activity's sake"¹⁰⁴) as of the changes these organizations themselves had gone through and the different aims of more recently founded ones—not to mention the high social strata their founders more often than not belonged to. In fact,

[t]hese associations continued a centuries-old tradition of 'civilizing missions' that developed according to a more or less fixed pattern: an emerging elite with a new set of values distinguishes itself as a social middle group by first shielding its culture from what it considers an uncivilized lower class, and subsequently initiates efforts to promote its culture there, albeit by preserving the mutual dividing lines.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ van Gelder [1955], 5.

¹⁰⁵ A.B.G.M. van Kalmthout, *Muzentempels: multidisciplinaire kunstkringen in Nederland tussen 1880 en 1914*, doctoral thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam, 1998, 237. (author's translation)

Moreover, not all organizations were equally edifying. Take for instance the Katholieke Kunstkring ‘De Violier’ (Catholic Art Circle ‘The Gillyflower’), before which Vogelsang gave a few illustrated lectures between 1903 and 1914, and again in 1933 and 1939.¹⁰⁶ Founded in 1901, ‘De Violier’ was an association of Catholic artists and intellectuals that saw its mission as “elevating the arts and advancing a sense for art”, understood as ecclesiastical art, including literature and poetry.¹⁰⁷ This inward-looking program was hardly the sort of edification one would immediately associate with the term. What’s more, with the Constitution of 1848 and the reestablishment of episcopal hierarchy in the Netherlands, in 1853, Catholic emancipation had been legally and institutionally achieved. Effectively, ‘De Violier’ belonged to the many dedicated organizations and venues where Vogelsang gave most of his lectures.

An organization with a more explicitly uplifting mission was the abovementioned Vereeniging ‘Ons Huis’. According to its bylaws its aim was to “advance the higher education of the working man through instructive and sociable meetings”¹⁰⁸, while a newspaper elucidated:

¹⁰⁶ See among similar reports: • ‘Over Pieter Brueghel’, in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 76, #23649 (March 14, 1903), morning edn., 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010648525:mpeg21:a0030>.

• ‘De Violier’, in: *De Tijd: Godsdienstig-Staatkundig Dagblad*, #17423 (December 14, 1904), 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010408239:mpeg21:a0027>.

• ‘Picturale en muzikale parallellen en antithesen’, in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 79, no. 2475 (March 28, 1906), evening edn. 3rd section, 10. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010650180:mpeg21:a0136>

• ‘De Violier’, in: *De Tijd: Godsdienstig-Staatkundig Dagblad*, #18602 (November 6, 1908), 6. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010548148:mpeg21:a0094>.

• ‘Violier’, in: *Het Centrum*, 29, #8647 (December 10, 1912), 1st section, 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010004107:mpeg21:a0034>.

• ‘De Violier’, in: *De Tijd: Godsdienstig-Staatkundig Dagblad*, #20466 (December 2, 1914), 3. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010548286:mpeg21:a0061>.

• ‘Katholieke Kunstkring “De Violier”’, in: *Ibid.*, 88, # 26803 (February 16, 1933), 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010534293:mpeg21:a0038>.

• ‘Spaansche kunst. Voordracht van prof. Vogelsang over Francisco de Zurbarán’, in: *Ibid.*, 95, #30925 (November 7, 1939), morning edn., 4. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010989843:mpeg21:a0095>.

¹⁰⁷ ‘Katholieke Kunstkring De Violier’, Katholiek Documentatie Centrum, https://www.ru.nl/kdc/bladeren/archieven-thema/subpagina-archieven-thema/cultuur-vrije-tijd-ontspanning/archieven_van/archieven/katholieke_0/; Van Kalmthout (1998), 257-274; see also: L.J. Rogier, N. de Rooy, *In vrijheid herboren: Katholiek Nederland 1853-1953* (The Hague: Pax, 1953), 497.

¹⁰⁸ ‘Ons Huis’, in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 64, #19516 (July 3, 1891), evening edn., 2nd section, 5. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010146968:mpeg21:a0053>.

'Ons Huis' will give the working man everything, besides the fulfillment of life's necessities, that can be helpful to him. He can develop his mind, cultivate, and recreate, and in the gym he can vigorously exercise his muscles, which are often the source of his livelihood. But the most wonderful expectation the management nourishes is the bond it will create between the more and less socially privileged, between the more and less intellectually endowed.¹⁰⁹

The association's first program of (non-illustrated) lectures for the 1892-1893 season reflected the times with its wide mix of intellectual and practical topics. Among the latter were topics such as 'First aid', 'What we eat and drink', and 'Infant care', and a classic of the lantern repertoire, 'Alcohol abuse', that were common among most of the late 19th-century efforts to improve the conditions of society's lower strata. The former reflected the ambition to provide a "higher education" for its members. They were arranged in the larger sections of Literature and Aesthetics; Physics, Geography, and Ethnology; History, Political Science—all, according to a newspaper report, "practically above the working man's knowledge". These topics nevertheless made up the majority.¹¹⁰ In the next season's program one finds the first reference to the use of lantern slides.¹¹¹ Incidentally, what may support van der Woud's thesis of two cultural frameworks and their friction is that during the decades around the turn of the 20th century new attempts were made to curtail or terminate the very leisure activities that some of these organizations' audiences were also wont to visit. Whereas before fairgrounds and blood sports were targeted, from the early 1900s onwards film shows were criticized for their allegedly undermining effects on morals and/or health.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ 'Ons Huis', in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 65, #19778 (May 5, 1892), evening edn., 1st section, 1. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010146449:mpeg21:a0012>. (author's translation)

¹¹⁰ 'Voordrachten in "Ons Huis"', in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 65, #19973 (November 6, 1892), evening edn., 1st section, 1. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010147777:mpeg21:a0011>.

¹¹¹ 'Ons Huis', in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 67, #20374, (March 5, 1894), morning edn., 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010146226:mpeg21:a0025>, for a lecture on March 14 on 'Opium on Java'.

¹¹² See e.g.: Thunnis van Oort, *Film en het moderne leven in Limburg: het bioscoopwezen tussen commercie en katholieke cultuurpolitiek (1909-1929)* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2007), 32-44.

Between 1902 and 1918, Vogelsang appeared on this association's platform a number of times, too. Given its mission statement, he probably lectured there before mixed audiences—"the more and less intellectually endowed". But overall the topics of his lectures, all illustrated, were similar to what he presented elsewhere: 'Fine arts of the past century', in 1903; 'Dutch sculpture of the past centuries', in 1906; 'Diego Rodriguez de Silva Velazquez', in 1915; 'Dutch 17th-century interior painting (Steen, P. de Hoogh, Vermeer)', in 1916; 'Dutch 17th-century landscape painting', in 1917 and/or 1918.¹¹³ The few times Vogelsang lectured before what may well have been unmixed working-class audiences, such as Handwerkers Vriendenkring (Manual Laborers' Circle of Friends), Vereeniging 'Kunst aan het Volk' (Association 'Art for the People'), and Vereeniging tot Bevordering van Fabrieks- en Handwerksarbeid (Association for the Promotion of Factory – and Manual Work), his topics—'Illumination in residential houses', 'Traditional costumes', and 'Rembrandt'—did not differ from his lectures elsewhere either.¹¹⁴

That, of course, makes one wonder what kind of "working man" was addressed here, and whether it included the new proletariat in the towns' and cities' slums. Because 'Ons Huis' or the diamond workers union were organizations for or of skilled workers,

¹¹³ See among similar reports: • 'Ons Huis', in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 76, #23589, (January 13, 1903), evening edn., 2nd section, 6. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010647234:mpeg21:a0103>.

• "'Ons Huis'", in: *Het Nieuws van den Dag*, #11070, (January 31, 1906), 2nd section, 6. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010163932:mpeg21:a0124>.

• "'Ons Huis', Rozenstraat", in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 88, #27979 (February 23, 1915), morning edn., 2nd section, 8. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010651788:mpeg21:a0150>.

• "'Ons Huis", Rozenstraat', in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 89, #28377, (March 27, 1916), evening edn., 3rd section, 9. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010652667:mpeg21:a0140>.

• "'Ons Huis"- Rozenstraat. Voordrachten 1917-1918', in: *Weekblad van den Algemeenen Nederlandschen Diamantbewerkerbond*, 23, #38, (September 21, 1917) and *Mercurius: Orgaan van de Vereeniging van Handelsbedienden Mercurius*. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMIISG06:001448038:00001> and <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMIISG10:000735032:00001>.

An announcement for the same topic appeared on March 1918, either a repeat of this lecture or a rescheduling of the one announced in September 1917; see "'Ons Huis", Rozenstraat', in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 91, #29088 (March 13, 1918), evening edn., 2nd section, 6. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010653128:mpeg21:a0135>.

¹¹⁴ 'Uitnodiging van de Vereeniging tot Bevordering van Fabrieks- en Handwerksarbeid te Rotterdam voor voordracht 'De verlichting van het woonhuis', op di. 15 februari, 8u., in *Zaal Caledonia*'. RKD Nederlands Instituut voor Kunstgeschiedenis, The Hague, Archief Vogelsang, NL-HaRKD.0287, Box 15, Item 1909-1910; "'Kunst aan het volk'", in: *Het Volk: Dagblad voor de Arbeiderspartij*, 14, #4249, (February 11, 1914), 2nd section, 8. Delpher, <https://www.delpher.nl/nl/kranten/view?coll=ddd&identificer=ddd:010022755:mpeg21:a0067>; 'Voordracht Prof. W. Vogelsang', in: *Weekblad van den Algemeenen Nederlandschen Diamantbewerkerbond*, 26, #1, (January 2, 1920). Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMIISG06:001457001:00005>.

whose leaders were socially closer to Vogelsang than to their members.¹¹⁵ But on the basis of archival materials and newspaper reports no inferences can be made if and to what extent Vogelsang addressed these audiences differently from those at dedicated venues. Reports of his lectures, for instance, cannot give us more definite answers, because as a rule newspapers, most of which served a middle-class readership, reviewed lectures delivered at dedicated associations and organizations, as well as the *Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen*, adult schools, etc., not at the modern uplifting ones that associated themselves more explicitly with the working class; all the referenced items about 'Ons Huis' and the other three organizations mentioned above are advertizements or announcements. But what these records do show is that, with very few exceptions, the topics of Vogelsang's illustrated lectures changed frequently over the years, while repeat lectures were limited. (One source states that the public lectures ran more or less parallel with his university lectures,¹¹⁶ but that is not borne out by the data collected.) And although one can at least expect that Vogelsang adapted his vocabulary or asides to an audience's assumed level of sophistication, there is no evidence that he developed separate lecture topics for separate audiences.

The majority of Vogelsang's outreach activities took place, as noted, at niche organizations whose names often announced their artistic pursuits. Some examples are: *Provinciaal Utrechtsch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* (Province of Utrecht's Society for Arts and Sciences; Utrecht, founded in 1781); *Kunstlievend Genootschap Pictura* (Art-Loving Society Pictura; Groningen, 1832); *Maatschappij Arti et*

¹¹⁵ van der Woud (2010), 389-39, writes that the bylaws of 'Ons Huis' stipulated that five of its board members must be workers and five others women. A haven for "the lesser man" and woman, it remains unclear whether that would have included the "ragged" men and women that his book features prominently. Van Kalmthout (1998), 247, writes about the Amsterdam chapter of 'Kunst aan het Volk', founded by artists, that members largely belonged to the top layers of the lower classes (skilled workers, teachers, office clerks, etc.), a statement based on: Cornelis Veth, 'Kunst aan het volk. Contra', in: *Pro en Contra: betreffende vraagstukken van algemeen belang*, series V, #6 (Baarn: Hollandia-Drukkerij, 1909), 13-14.

¹¹⁶ Houtzager ([1950]), 15 ff.

Amicitiae (Society Arti et Amicitiae; Amsterdam, 1839); Academie voor Beeldende Kunsten en Technische Wetenschappen (Academy of Fine Arts and Technical Sciences; Rotterdam, 1851); Kunstvereniging Artibus Sacrum (Art Association Artibus Sacrum; Arnhem, 1855); Arti et Industriae (The Hague, 1884); Bouwkunst en Vriendschap (Architecture and Fellowship; Rotterdam, 1890); Vereeniging Hendrick de Keyser (Amsterdam, 1918); or Vereeniging van Beeldende Kunstenaars te Hilversum (Association of Visual Artists, Hilversum; 1932). Besides, he lectured before various historical, literary, archaeological and/or scientific societies, a number of organizations with a wider cultural or educational mission, such as local adult schools (Dutch: *Volksuniversiteiten*) and local divisions of the Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen. On the whole one notices that from c. 1920 onwards Vogelsang's illustrated lectures gravitated more exclusively to organizations and institutes dedicated to matters artistic and aesthetic. Of course, one expects to find a professor of Art History there, still one wonders what drove this gravitation.

Whether or not it was a gradual process, I take Vogelsang's rectorial address of 1921 as a moment that explicitly, and publicly, signaled this direction. What's more, he took this occasion to reflect on the edifying mission so characteristic of the times and to which he contributed so frequently, calling it a moment "to put one's illusions on the scales of critique". The address concerned "the demand for the general dissemination of (...) the enjoyment of art", which, he pronounced, had become a "slogan"—visibly adopted, as we have seen, in the names of societies and associations, such as 'Kunst aan Allen' (Art for All) or 'Kunst aan het Volk'. But slogans, he commented, are merely concise opinions: the power they thereby gain is cancelled out by the truthfulness they thereby lose.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁷ Willem Vogelsang, *Nullis non an nonnullis? Rede naar aanleiding van den 285^{sten} gedenkdag van de stichting der Utrechtsche Hoogeschool op 26 maart, uitgesproken den 13^{en} april 1921 door den rector magnificus Dr. W. Vogelsang* (Utrecht: J. van Druten, 1921), 6-8. Its Latin title can be translated as: *For everybody or for a few?*

While his topic promised to go against received wisdom, the address as a whole is disappointingly verbose. One even wonders if his peer audience was familiar with the scatter of names of artists, artworks, and critics of all ages, in a year—1921—when at long last Art History was to become a full-fledged, degree discipline in the Netherlands. Here, one senses, his erudition went beyond a classic education and was display rather than substance (laced with a few easy snubs, such as his identification of film with “tenth-rate screen beauties”, evidently not being up-to-date with the professional level attained in both the industry and criticism—and, I guess, proud of it¹¹⁸). His conclusion, although confessedly based on scanty evidence, is nonetheless unambiguous: as throughout the ages, with small upswings and downswings, only a limited segment of any population had a talent for purely aesthetic experiences, one cannot fail to perceive the deceptiveness of all current efforts, whether the founding of associations, the publishing of periodicals or the performing of illustrated lectures, in promising “to give to all....what does not belong to all and never can be!” Here, Vogelsang did nothing less than set the aesthetic experience apart from all other goals of the edifying efforts of the time. Unlike, say, language acquisition, sports, or science, he pronounces aesthetics a matter of “talent”, of giftedness, that can merely be stimulated or thwarted. It is not even, he argued, a question of sensitivity, which presupposes at least a degree of susceptibility to change, let alone a skill that can be learned.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 31. One finds a similar instance of superiority in a newspaper survey among public figures on Amsterdam’s ban on Sunday dancing. Calling the measure “futile”, Vogelsang apparently felt the need to assert his *haut bourgeois* values, stating that nevertheless “that part of the nation most inclined to reflection would eminently welcome one pandemonium-free day per week”; ‘Publieke opinie over het dansverbod’, in: *De Telegraaf*, 34, #12945 (October 5, 1926), evening edn., 2nd section, 5. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:110564713:mpeg21:a0190>. (author’s translation)

His argument was certainly not new.¹¹⁹ Nor was it unique: it echoes considerations that had been set forth in a polemical essay more than a decade earlier.¹²⁰ As well the abovementioned association ‘Kunst aan het Volk’, founded by what can be considered as Vogelsang’s social peers, reasoned that “[a]rt is for *all* to enjoy, the one more, the other less, according to everyone’s natural talent”; it only differed in believing that “the enjoyment becomes stronger and deeper when this natural talent is being developed through illustration and practice.”¹²¹ But *talent*, of course, is a muddy explanatory term. It concerns, as anthropologist Tim Ingold writes, a merely vague idea of an alleged causal agent, one of those “pre-installed”, circular concepts that claim no more than “that people do things because they do them”.¹²² Either unperturbed by or unaware of this fallacy, Vogelsang’s address is less an apologia for high culture (although, of course, it undergirds everything he says) than a claim to exceptionalism.

But while he declared, consistent with his stance, that a training program for developing aesthetic sensibility makes no sense, in his address he does endorse an educational context that stimulates and facilitates introspection and self-examination (while implying a change of academic selection criteria, which might have future spin-off effects).¹²³ No doubt this is related to the public assent he had given the year before to a proposal for a new type of school, called Apollineum, where the stimulation of emotion and fantasy, moral character building, and physical exercise outweigh theoretical and analytical subjects (favoring reading, composition, and elocution over grammar, the

¹¹⁹ Vogelsang (1921), 30-31. In his inaugural address, back in 1907, he had stated, more or less similarly yet quite esoterically, that art historical knowledge can only then be attained when “receptiveness can already be assumed. Because what else is seeing (...) than the willingness of the soul to receive the thrust, the ray, the expressive power of every thousandth of an inch of a work of art...”; Vogelsang (1907) 31. (*author’s translation*)

¹²⁰ Veth (1909), 12-28. This essay is one half of an invited polemic about bringing art to the people. Writer and illustrator Jan Veth’s ‘Contra’ argument followed a ‘Pro’ essay written by writer and museum curator Frans Coenen, one of the founders of ‘Kunst aan het Volk’ in 1903.

¹²¹ Quoted in: Adang (1990), 91. (*author’s translation*)

¹²² Tim Ingold, *Anthropology: why it matters* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2018), 31-32.

¹²³ Vogelsang (1921), 31-32.

philosophy of math over its technique, and cultural history over a “*Histoire bataille*”) in a curriculum that aimed to foster beauty, “the highest of mankind’s non-material virtues”. Although the proposal was “actually meant for all”, the school clearly targeted future artists—indeed, many established artists, among them Vogelsang’s friends architect H.P. Berlage and actor-stage director Willem Royaards, had shown an interest and given their written assent, too.¹²⁴

That Vogelsang’s claim to exceptionalism also had a political significance became explicit a year later when he was involved with the initiative to elect a cohort of “Onafhankelijke Kamerleden” (independent members of parliament)—i.e. MPs who were not held to party loyalty or program affiliation—for the general elections of July 1922. The initiative was born of a concern about the interests of and budgets for art and culture, which were crushed between party discipline, coalition compromise, and one-sidedly “material” government policies. Soon a committee—Vogelsang served on its board—was formed to find prospective candidates for “the cultural edification of the Dutch people”,¹²⁵ preferably, one commentator writes, candidates of an artistic mindset, as “an artist was eminently able to judge independently, as he possessed the requisite open mind.”¹²⁶ After a series of mostly poorly attended meetings throughout the country in the run-up to the elections,¹²⁷ the list of Independents failed to reach the electoral threshold, receiving only 15,000 votes, and was never heard of again.

¹²⁴ W.G.A. Frans, ‘Ingezonden stuk: “Het Apollineum”’, in: *Het Vaderland: Staat- en Letterkundig Dagblad*, 52, #194 (July 1, 1920), evening edn. A, 1-2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010006686:mpeg21:p002>.

¹²⁵ ‘Onafhankelijke kamerleden’, in: *Haagsche Courant*, #12023 (April 27, 1922), 2nd section, 1. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMKB04:000140727:mpeg21:a0019>; ‘Kunst en politiek’, in: *De Tribune*, 149, #15 (March 24, 1922), 1. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010467944:mpeg21:a0005>.

¹²⁶ I.C. van der Vlies, ‘Roijen, Jean François van (1878-1942)’, in: *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland*. Resources Huygens ING, Amsterdam, <http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/bwn1880-2000/lemmata/bwn2/royen>.

¹²⁷ At one of those meetings, in The Hague, Vogelsang was announced as a speaker, but his contribution went unreported; ‘Onafhankelijke kamerleden’, in: *Het Vaderland: Staat- en Letterkundig Dagblad*, 54 (June 14, 1922), morning edn., 1. <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010007890:mpeg21:a0007>.

IV.

Meanwhile, Vogelsang's public lectures continued unabated as if no rectorial address had ever been delivered. Plausibly, though, his withdrawal from non-dedicated organizations, particularly those with an uplifting agenda, was most consistent with the address's argument and suggests he must have weighed his own words carefully. After all, *his* public lectures, like their academic counterparts, were meant to improve audiences' understanding, not their enjoyment. But possibly it was also a matter of demand to which he may have been sensitive. Notably, in 1917 his lecture series on 'Kunst en kunstbeschouwing' (Art and art appreciation) attracted the highest number of students—311—of the three courses offered by the same institute; the ones on teaching the enjoyment of music and on recent Dutch literature—the latter by Vogelsang's former student Annie Salomons—attracted significantly less students, 174 and 244, respectively.¹²⁸ Indeed, the large newspaper trail of Vogelsang's (mostly illustrated) public lectures suggests that among academics venturing outside the university he was quite prominent. Already before his professorship, in 1904, he had been recognized as one of the regular lecturers in the country.¹²⁹ And with few exceptions, from the earliest newspaper reports onwards he was praised for his carefully arranged slides or his clear, informed manner of lecturing. Small wonder that his lifelong career as a public lecturer—which unlike so many others was not dependent on self-advertizing—shows no serious breaks, apart from World War II, despite the impressive number of social duties, of both national and local scope, that he performed for decades, too.

¹²⁸ 'De Utrechtsche Volksuniversiteit', in: *Het Volk: Dagblad voor de Arbeiderspartij*, 18, #5866, (October 5, 1917), 2nd section, 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010023870:mpeg21:p006>.

Vogelsang's series, either in three or five lectures, was repeated twice between 1917 and 1919.

¹²⁹ Quoted in: van Kalmthout (1998), 191.

Still, the abundance of archival materials and news reports does not gel into a sound base for evaluating his lecturing career. There is plenty of detail, but insufficient coherence. For instance, the *Projecting knowledge* research team has inspected some 6,000 slides of a collection that belonged to the Universiteit Utrecht's Art History Institute, now housed at the RKD-Nederlands Instituut voor Kunstgeschiedenis (RKD-Netherlands Institute for Art History), in The Hague; another estimated 17,000 slides from the same provenance are currently being checked for water damage before they may become available. The slides the team did inspect are kept in c. 90 boxes of various sizes; they are commonly arranged according to a number of straightforward organizing principles, such as art form, artist, country, location, building, etc. Some, mostly smaller boxes, however, are much less orderly. Taken together this suggests that in its present state this glass slide collection may well be a snapshot of its use not long before its removal, with the systematically ordered boxes 'at rest' while the other ones show less easily definable traces of use for a specific purpose or occasion. We do know that this collection had been untouched and uninventoried ever since it arrived at the RKD. And while there is no documentation of the time of its arrival, it certainly was long since Vogelsang had left the university, in 1946, after which date his successor J.G. van Gelder supplemented and partly substituted the slides.¹³⁰

Therefore, this collection cannot easily, if at all, be meaningfully linked with Vogelsang's public illustrated lectures. There are slide titles or numbers mentioned in his written lecture notes, either as lists or interspersed with the notes in his papers, housed at both the RKD and at Utrecht's Universitaire Bestuursdienst (University Administrative

¹³⁰ Stolwijk (1991), 77. Some slides clearly reflect the work and interests of van Gelder. One example is the Oranjezaal (Orange Room), whose painted ceiling and paintings represented events in the life of stadholder Frederik Hendrik (1584-1647), dedicated by his widow Amalia van Solms in 1652, on which van Gelder published a monograph; *ibid.*, 71. A number of slides, moreover, have his name written on their frames or masks,

Another temporal giveaway is post-World War II spelling on a number of frames and masks.

Department). But there is no sequence, let alone a series of slides in the boxes we have inspected so far that can be unambiguously matched. Moreover, the numbers they were given in these notes are not up to date, and probably ceased being so the moment a lecture had been delivered or a course completed; subsequent users have overwritten, or rather ‘overstickered’, information on a slide’s frame or mask with marks fitting their own purposes. Typically, for instance, the numbers on the slides in a box of the Art History Institute’s collection labeled ‘Gebouwen in Vlaanderen’ (Buildings in Flanders) do not correspond with the numbers in Vogelsang’s lecture notes to a list of streets and buildings in Belgium, mostly Flanders, but also Germany.¹³¹ And while the slides in this box all come from the same distributor or provider, it is not at all exceptional to find boxes with slides of different provenance—a manner of compilation that shows that a series of slides in performance can be much more ‘unstable’ than catalogs’ slides series suggest.

As well Vogelsang’s papers contain items in various states of incompleteness and at different levels of coherence with the slides we know of. Most extremely, there are both notes for lectures that have not been identified with the help of slides (yet)¹³² and complete lectures that were delivered without slides—such as his opening speech at an exhibition of Isaïc Israëls, not long after the painter’s death.¹³³ A curiosity is a lecture on Leonardo da Vinci, which exists in typescript and in print (albeit with handwritten notes and corrections in both); each is identically incomplete and each ends on the same sentence: “Using a series of projected slides speaker proceeded to sketch the development of Leonardo’s art, emphasizing his manner of composition and drawing...”¹³⁴ A typed list

¹³¹ RKD-Nederlands Instituut voor Kunstgeschiedenis, The Hague, [Glasplatencollectie Kunsthistorisch Instituut Utrecht], Box [2], ‘Gebouwen in Vlaanderen’; Universitaire Bestuursdienst, Utrecht, Archief Kunsthistorisch Instituut Utrecht, Box 6, Item 232, Item “Three typed papers “Architectencursus 1. April 1919””. The brackets signify the project researchers’ unofficial inventorying activities.

¹³² See e.g.: Ibid., Box 6, Items 248, 250, 254, 261, 271.

¹³³ RKD-Nederlands Instituut voor Kunstgeschiedenis, The Hague, Archief Vogelsang, NL-HaRKD.0287, Box [11].I, Item ‘Voordracht t.g.v. de tentoonstelling gewijd aan Isaïc Israëls’ schilderijen, De Kunst, Utrecht, 12 juli 1935’.

¹³⁴ Universitaire Bestuursdienst, Utrecht, Archief Kunsthistorisch Instituut, Box 6, Item 239, Pieces ‘*De kunst van Leonardo da Vinci* (Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, 1919)’ and typescript of the same.

of mostly Italian artworks to this lecture, meant for a performance in Germany, does not correspond to the slides found so far. Moreover, in two Dutch reviews of this lecture the slides were said to show non-Italian artworks, too.¹³⁵ So, besides a few complete texts for official appearances abroad¹³⁶ and/or those he intended for publication, the general incompleteness must be attributed to the fact that he created his own illustrated lectures, for which no readymade readings were necessary (or available). In other words, I venture that Vogelsang lectured most of the time from notes *only*. Journalist-poet Jan Engelman confirmed this in so many words when he wrote that Vogelsang's "masterpieces were his lectures and lessons (...). He could improvise beautifully."¹³⁷

The fact that the materials Vogelsang worked with, the texts and the visuals, cannot be meaningfully 'married' is presumably a recurrent problem, not limited to this particular case. A few general reasons can be given for this, even though more research is needed to support what follows.

- *Storage*. This was and is the most basic consideration for contemporary distributors, businesses, and individual performers as well as for subsequent repositories and archives. All are faced with the same question: are objects made of different materials yet hang together also kept together, or are they separated? For up-to-date archives there is only one answer to this question: they separate them for the simple reason that different materials require different storage conditions; it depends on their record-keeping to

¹³⁵ Universitaire Bestuursdienst, Utrecht, Archief Kunsthistorisch Instituut Utrecht, Box 6, Item 239, Item 'typescript Leonardo-Vortrag am 2. Mai 1919'; 'Leonardo da Vinci', in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 92, #29499 (May 3, 1919), evening edn., 2nd section, 9-10. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010655971:mpeg21:a017>; 'Kunst en Wetenschap', in: *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 32, #240, (October 15, 1919), 1st section, 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010668153:mpeg21:a0010>.

The overlap between the German- and Dutch-language materials suggests that all these materials were prepared for similar or identical performances, as 1919 was the 400th anniversary of Da Vinci's death.

¹³⁶ See e.g.: Universitaire Bestuursdienst, Utrecht, Archief Kunsthistorisch Instituut Utrecht, Box 6, Items 235 (Frankfurt), 247 (Madrid), and 248, 255, and 259 (Brussels).

¹³⁷ Jan Engelman, 'In memoriam: Prof. dr. Willem Vogelsang. Bezielend middelpunt te Utrecht', in: *De Tijd: Dagblad voor Nederland*, 110, no. 35831 (December 16, 1954), 3. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:011202967:mpeg21:a0085>.

maintain the relation between the two. But for a company or an individual lecturer, I assume, material considerations are usually subordinate to operational efficiency as well as heavily dependent on available space. And given the demand for certain topics, another question that will have presented itself, to companies particularly, is: how many copies of a slides series or lantern reading must be kept in stock? Here, I assume, readings have an advantage over slides series, given their smaller size, lesser weight, and lower cost per print impression. But I suspect this comes with a downside: the greater number of copies of lantern readings may also have made them, in contemporary perception, more disposable. At least that is what, to date, survival rates suggest: the amount of slides retrieved during the recent, renewed scholarly interest in this medium seems to be higher than titles of readings.¹³⁸ Still, decreasing postwar demand, the marketing of the carousel slide projector in the mid-1960s (which particularly expanded the home entertainment market, but found its way into art history classes, too), and the rise of other home entertainments, notably TV, rendered many slides collections obsolescent and discardable.

- *Performance.* Illustrated lectures are a tenuous phenomenon in the sense that their substantive elements—lantern slides and lantern readings—do not easily stand alone, the visuals even less than the readings. Without these readings' organizing frame the slides' very discontinuity renders their arrangements indeterminate. One might say, therefore, that it is only in performance that illustrated lectures come into their own.¹³⁹ Indeed, even a more or less coherent lineup of slides (albeit with a few puzzling 'misfits' at the end) showing 17th-century Dutch architecture (exterior and interior views), a few

¹³⁸ A recent overview of renewed interest and scholarship (in France and Switzerland) is tellingly titled *La plaque photographique* (the photographic slide); Denise Borlée, Hervé Ducet (eds.), *La plaque photographique: un outil pour la fabrication et la diffusion des savoirs (XIX^e-XX^e siècle)* (Strasbourg: Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg, 2019).

¹³⁹ Moreover, an illustrated lecture's elements are not as potentially meaningful or engrossing *in between* performances for individual consumption as, say, a film watched on a laptop or a play read silently. It is the unmediated, mutually acknowledged interaction, between a live performer and a live audience, that is the basis of this difference.

contemporary maps, and a mausoleum is, when inspected in the box where it is stored, hardly more than a row of reproductions of public historical buildings in what were at the time prominent towns, almost exclusively in Holland—in fact the words *public*, *prominent*, and *Holland* reflect my own effort to grasp the slides' organizing principles (helped by the names or initials of architects written on the masks). The same goes for the abovementioned series 'Gebouwen in Vlaanderen': although probably slightly disordered, this array of mostly historical buildings of more or less grandeur (e.g. churches, belfries, castles) also contains a number of slides showing countryside scenes and interiors of more humble constructions (an inn, windmill or living room). And although all this is held together by geography—Flanders—and by provenance—UTB, possibly a tourist organization—, with no reading, printed or written lecture notes the narratives that these slides served as illustrations to remain ultimately elusive, even within an art historical context.¹⁴⁰ Add to this the often unequal pictorial quality of slide series, alternating, say, commissioned photographs from specialized firms with homemade copies of book illustrations, it comes even less as a surprise that so many photographic slides have been dumped. And salvaging the transparencies was often of no use, because they couldn't be reused in new projection format, if they had not become obsolete in the first. While one would have expected the more narratively organized lantern readings to have survived in greater quantity, that appears again not to be the case.

Fortunately, Vogelsang's career can nonetheless be followed in an abundant paper trail: between 1900 and 1954 there is not a year in which his name is not mentioned, whether in connection with a lecture, publication or another occasion related to his professional

¹⁴⁰ RKD-Nederlands Instituut voor Kunstgeschiedenis, The Hague, [Glasplatencollectie Kunsthistorisch Instituut Utrecht], Box [65] and [02], respectively.

biography. But it is not just the abundance from which we benefit. It is its duration that reveals quite consistent ways of reporting in Dutch newspapers during the first half of the 20th century.

The earliest reports in Dutch papers on photographically illustrated lectures appeared in the late 1870s. It may actually have been earlier, but the Dutch word *lichtbeelden* (projected slides) cannot be disambiguated in a number of items retrieved in the database of digitized newspapers, Delpher. At the time the word referred to both photographic and painted slides (in the 1870s the latter may well have been more common still), while it was also used for photographic illustrations in a book. During the heyday of the photographically illustrated lecture, as indicated in the research project's time frame—1880–1940—, Dutch newspapers reported quite distinctly on these performances, certainly when they became a fixture of public entertainments around the turn of the 20th century. As a rule their coverage was factual and focused almost exclusively on the lecture. Longer reviews actually read as extensive outlines that followed its drift or argument.¹⁴¹ The illustrations were barely commented on, and when they were, it was in the most perfunctory way. They feel like an afterthought stuck on at the end of the piece, often without even mentioning when they were projected during the performance, how many slides there were or what they showed.¹⁴² Despite this omission, the reports' apparent factuality does give a rather unobstructed impression of

¹⁴¹ Only one retrieved news report mentions a "printed survey", although it is not entirely clear whether it refers to the lecture or the slides to be shown: 'Ons Huis', in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 76, #23589 (January 13, 1903), evening edn., 2nd section, 6. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010647234:mpeg21:a0103>. But without such aids only the detail of summaries allows one to infer that the slides were shown *after* the lecture, when the lights were up. In many reports, though, one is left in the dark about when they were projected: during or at the end of a lecture, or both; in the former case, handouts would have been helpful, as lights were dimmed during projection. One reporter actually apologized for his "hardly noteworthy" review of a lecture by Vogelsang, as "the lights had to be constantly dimmed for the sake of the projected slides"; at least he implied when the slides were projected; 'De Violier', in: *De Maasbode*, 38, #8936 (May 17, 1906), 1st section, 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMKB04:000191118:mpeg21:p001>.
¹⁴² See e.g.: 'Kunst en Kunstbeschouwing', in: *Arnhemse Courant*, 104, # 9649 (December 15, 1917), 2nd section, 5. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMKB08:000103785:mpeg21:a0020>; and in a report on a lecture that was announced as "illustrated" the projected slides are not mentioned at all: 'Bussum', in: *De Gooi- en Eemlander*, 42, #31 (April 19, 1913), 2nd section, 5. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:011163308:mpeg21:a0039>.

the performance's spoken part.

One only realizes how fortunate a circumstance this is when compared with post-World War II coverage. It was then that new reporting styles, copied from models already prominent in prewar England and America, emerged in Dutch papers. What made it distinctive was that journalists interposed themselves more explicitly and more often between reported event and reader (this was also reflected in the increased use of the interview format). For one thing, it changed the way in which public speech events, such as illustrated lectures, but also political debates or commemorative speeches, were covered: rather than being respectfully relayed in quasi-complete form, reports were much more summary and/or contained more comment. The new style's shift to more condensed, newsworthy content was crucially supplemented by an approach that took the perceived opinions and needs of a paper's readership into consideration.¹⁴³ So, given that there was a new, postwar generation of readers with new interests, a generation that did not go to illustrated lectures as much as their parents and grandparents had—a change compounded eventually, I presume, by television—, it is understandable that the careers of lecturers, or those who remained, were not followed as extensively as had been customary. Whereas prewar reporting on illustrated lectures can be said to correctly reflect their popularity, the scantiness of postwar reporting prematurely suggested the medium's demise.

Back to prewar reporting, it is when looking at the reviews of all the arts and entertainments, particularly in Arts and Letters or Arts and Science sections, that one notices a discrepancy. For instance, a 1918 report on a lecture by Vogelsang dutifully follows his argument with hardly any comment. The word *speaker* (as in, "Next, speaker

¹⁴³ Pien van der Hoeven, Huub Wijffes, 'Concentratie en kritische autonomie, 1950-2000', in: Wijffes, Frank Harbers (eds.), *De krant: een cultuurgeschiedenis* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2019), 254-262.

compares...” or “At the end of his argument speaker points out...”) is in fact a marker of this reporting style.¹⁴⁴ Next to this report, in the same ‘Arts and Science’ section, is a review of a performance of George Bernard Shaw’s farcical play *Men kan nooit weten* (original title *You never can tell* [1897]). As the reviewer tells that the play was performed quite a few times in recent years, he apparently felt he could dispense with plot summary. Instead he comments, appreciatively yet also mildly critically, on Shaw’s reputation and writing, and on this particular performance’s direction and dialog.¹⁴⁵

Such unintended juxtapositions of reviewing styles can be found in a number of instances—particularly during the interwar decades when the abovementioned, separate sections became more common—, in which virtually uncommented reports of Vogelsang’s lectures stand alongside quite expert reviews of other entertainments: a report of a lecture by Vogelsang on Leonardo da Vinci, which again typically followed the “speaker”, preceding a review of chamber music performed at the Amsterdam Concertgebouw (“The beautiful mood of the solemnly tender second movement was accomplished by the immediate attack of horn and oboe and splendidly sustained.”)¹⁴⁶; or a report of his lecture on two Dutch medieval painters that basically seems to quote him verbatim next to a critical review of a new novel (“...an effort to define a few major themes of life, while the author doesn’t have the mental power to embrace the versatility of the problem.”).¹⁴⁷

The discrepancy, of course, is that reviews of plays, concerts, literature, but also operas or exhibitions, were shaped by a reviewer’s *opinion*, if not expertise. Here,

¹⁴⁴ ‘Lezing prof. Vogelsang’, in: *Arnhemsche Courant*, 105, #9673, (January 16, 1918), 1st section, 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMKB08:000104093:mpeg21:a0010>.

¹⁴⁵ ‘Stadsschouwburg’, in: *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁶ See respectively: ‘Academie’, in: *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 69, #50 (February 20, 1912), morning edn. B, 1. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010032046:mpeg21:a0012> and ‘Concertgebouw – Sextet’, in: *Ibid.*, B, 3. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010032046:mpeg21:a0054>.

¹⁴⁷ See respectively: ‘Geertgen tot St. Jans en de Meester van de Virgo inter Virgines’, in: *De Maasbode*, 59, #20981 (December 16, 1926), evening edn., 3rd section, 5. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMKB04:000196004:mpeg21:a0062> and ‘Romans’, in: *Ibid.*

journalists did interpose themselves, all the while showing that they were the proper and capable persons for the task. At the time reviewing seems to have been an ‘enclave’ within the newspaper business, one where opinion was requisite and valued, in accordance with the high culture norms which were deemed appropriate for the art forms mentioned. Further research would be needed to establish if this was indeed a matter of policy, in the sense that reviewers of, say, art or music customarily reported on exhibitions and concerts, but not on lectures *about* art and music. Quite possibly, illustrated lectures were routinely covered by reporters of the city or domestic desks, sections where such reports are just as often found as on the arts, letters, and/or science pages. In fact, the lectures’ very ubiquity, frequency, and range of topics may well have been a practical obstacle to more expert coverage.

V.

“A boy’s head, attributed to Hals by Vogelsang, is most certainly not made by this master and such certificates do not in the least enhance an esteemed historian’s reputation.”¹⁴⁸ That was the ringing conclusion of an art exhibition review in the late spring of 1942. And while no arguments were given for this verdict, it was not one that could have been easily dismissed, as it was written by a bylined reviewer, not a common thing at the time. This reviewer, W. Jos. de Gruyter, was an art historian by training himself (in 1955 he would be appointed director of the Groninger Museum). Essentially, he was a peer reviewer who, as the piece clearly demonstrates, spoke the same professional language as Vogelsang did.

Newspaper reports of Vogelsang lending his expertise for the certification—or authentication—of artworks began to appear in the mid-1920s, and more prominently in

¹⁴⁸ W. Jos. de Gruyter, ‘Oude schilderijen en een certificaat van Vogelsang. Kunstzaal Astrid’, in: *Het Vaderland: Staat- en Letterkundig Nieuwsblad*, 74 (June 15, 1942), evening edn. B, 1. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010020325:mpeg21:a0091>. (author’s translation)

the 1930s and in the early 1940s. It was a new and probably lucrative side-career,¹⁴⁹ even though quite a few reports expressed doubts about his opinion. In fact, de Gruyter had taken aim at Vogelsang's expertise before: "In my opinion Vogelsang has mistakenly attributed a very dark *Herbergtuin met boeren* [Inn courtyard with farmers] to Adriaen van Ostade."¹⁵⁰ Others were even mockingly critical, as in:

Finally, a few words about a very remarkable piece in which professor Vogelsang bluntly states to have recognized a self-portrait by Rembrandt. (...) [This] Rembrandt (...) would date back to the great master's early period. Apparently, the master must have had a moment of foresight, because it shows the painter at a rather ripe age".¹⁵¹

These and similar reports suggested more generally that certification was not the surefire solution against fakes and forgeries art dealers and museums had hoped it would be.

Since the late-19th century the art trade played an increasingly prominent role in the world of the fine arts, particularly by supporting and selling the work of living artists. Exhibitions on art dealers' premises became important events for publicity and/or sale. America proved to be a most profitable market, particularly for selling a nostalgically rustic vision of the Netherlands, exemplified by the works of Jozef Israëls, Jacob Maris, Anton Mauve, and other Hague School painters. This interest came in the wake of "a boom in the old Dutch master art market" in the US, in fact the period of Dutch art history that the Hague School harked back to.¹⁵² However, the "unlimited funds" of the new American

¹⁴⁹ One of the reasons why art historian Cornelis Hofstede de Groot had turned down a professorship at the Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, in 1907, was that the university was not prepared to adapt his salary to what he earned with his expertise; Hoogenboom (1993), 92; Friso Lammertse, Nadja Garthoff, Michel van de Laar, Arie Wallert, *Van Meegeren's Vermeers: the connoisseur's eye and the forger's art* (Rotterdam: Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, 2011), 118, n. 7.

¹⁵⁰ W. Jos. de Gruyter, 'Oude kunst bij Bennowitz', in: *Het Vaderland: Staat- en Letterkundig Nieuwsblad*, 73 (May 24, 1941), evening edn. B, 1. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010019679:mpeg21:p00>. (*author's translation*)

¹⁵¹ 'Belangrijke kunstveiling. Aert de Gelder overtreft zijn concurrent Rembrandt', in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 63, #19036 (April 16, 1940), 4th section, 4. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:011002360:mpeg21:a0225>. (*author's translation*)

¹⁵² Annette Stott, *Holland mania: the unknown Dutch period in American art & culture* (Woodstock: Overlook Press, 1998), 12, 28-34; Bank, van Buuren (2000), 43-45.

industrialist millionaires and their buying fever of Dutch 17th-century paintings also became a cause for concern, in the press and in government circles, and sparked a widely-felt consciousness of a national heritage, a heritage that was in danger of being drained away.¹⁵³ Focal points for the resurgence of this consciousness were the Rembrandt exhibitions of 1898 and 1906, on the occasions of the investiture of Queen Wilhelmina and the 300th anniversary of the painter's birth, respectively.¹⁵⁴ Art history's contribution to this reinvigorated sense of national heritage was the publication of source materials that established Rembrandt's and other 17th-century Dutch artists' oeuvres. Meanwhile, the art trade, faced with a growing number of forgeries to dupe the rich yet almost proverbial ignorant American clients, engaged a number of art historians for the authentication of artworks in order to restore trust in the business.

During the first half of the 20th century certification became a routine procedure whenever artworks were exhibited and/or auctioned. Particularly in the 1930s and 1940s, when many people felt or were forced to sell their art collections (under German occupation, since May 1940, with the press forced into line by 1942, this was a thing not allowed to be mentioned in news reports¹⁵⁵) there were many occasions when a work by Rembrandt, Vermeer, Hals or by less well-known old painters was offered for sale. For example, the referenced April 1940 report on an auction observed that "while on the one hand all the Rembrandts are disappearing underground [to prevent them from being looted should the German army invade the country—which it did less than a month later],

¹⁵³ Stott (1998), 19-22.

¹⁵⁴ Bank, van Buuren (2000), 50-55.

¹⁵⁵ Johannes Koll, *Arthur Seyß-Inquart und die deutsche Besatzungspolitik in den Niederlanden (1940-1945)* (Vienna – Cologne - Weimar: Böhlau, 2015), 253; Gabriele Hoffmann, *NS-Propaganda in den Niederlanden. Organisation und Lenkung der Publizistik unter Deutscher Besatzung 1940–1945* (Munich-Pullach - Berlin: Verlag Dokumentation, 1972), 121, 228-229.

on the other there is the fact that within the space of one year no less than three canvases attributed to Rembrandt have surfaced at auctions in this town.”¹⁵⁶

Before Vogelsang entered the field of certification, respected art historians as Abraham Bredius and Hofstede de Groot had long been sought-after names. In those years hiring their expertise to obtain an authoritative seal of approval largely meant relying on comprehensive, mostly stylistic connoisseurship.¹⁵⁷ The reputation of these experts notwithstanding, this did not always guarantee unanimous agreement. Vogelsang’s identifications of “an early Judith Leyster” and “a Tintoretto”, for instance, were qualified as “opinions with which, as more often, not all experts would agree.”¹⁵⁸ And as late as 1954 Max Friedländer, another esteemed art historian, dismissed his certification of a Rembrandt painting, stating that it had been made by his pupil Ferdinand Bol, only finished and signed by the master.¹⁵⁹ Ever since the 1920s, moreover, this positivist way of establishing an artwork’s authenticity as a whole faced increasing criticism, and competition, from advocates of scientific, experimental methods (such as X-raying). In fact, in 1924, in a lawsuit involving an alleged Frans Hals painting, *De lachende cavalier* (The laughing cavalier), the court decided against Hofstede de Groot’s opinion, declaring the painting a forgery, a ruling that was firmly based on the scientific examination of the painting’s pigments and binding mediums.¹⁶⁰ In Belgium, in 1934, the establishment

¹⁵⁶ ‘Belangrijke kunstveiling’ (1940), 4. (*author’s translation*)

¹⁵⁷ Lammertse et al. (2011), 68-74.

¹⁵⁸ ‘Veiling in het Gebouw Leesmuseum. Nalatenschap en atelier van den schilder A.F. Reicher. Antiquiteiten, schilderijen, wapens’, in: *De Telegraaf*, 46, #17163 (May 28, 1938), evening edn., 5th section, 9. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:110578269:mpeg21:a0321>.

¹⁵⁹ ‘Een Rembrandt geveild’, in: *De Tijd: Godsdiensdig-Staatkundig Dagblad*, 109, #35619, 08-04-1954, 3. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:011203062:mpeg21:a0128>.

¹⁶⁰ Lammertse et al. (2011), 72.

Given the abovementioned criticisms of Vogelsang’s stylistic certifications, it is intriguing to find him discussing these *new* methods, too, in an illustrated lecture, ‘Forgeries in the field of painting’, before the 1928 general assembly of the Vereeniging van Museum-directeuren (Association of Museum Directors), which possibly invited him to lecture on this topic. He ended the lecture with the hedge that “despite the most careful technical and stylistic examination with all the available means, there is no guarantee against mistakes.”; ‘Directeurendag’, in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 101, #328816 (July 6, 1928), evening edn., 3rd section, 9. Delpher, <http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010659957:mpeg21:p009> and similar reports of that date. (*author’s translation*)

of the Centraal Laboratorium der Belgische Musea (Central Laboratory of Belgian Museums) to conduct specialized physical and chemical research, precisely for authentication as well as preservation purposes signaled a change. It was this lab that was commissioned by the Amsterdam district court to assist in a case that would eventually be the undoing of style-based certification.

The occasion became widely notorious. It was, of course, painter Han van Meegeren's confession, in 1945, of having forged *De Emmausgangers* (Supper at Emmaus), the alleged masterpiece by 'Vermeer' that had been bought and exhibited, in 1937, with much fanfare by the then Museum Boijmans, in Rotterdam. The scandal upset just about the entire Dutch art historical world and drew considerable attention from abroad.¹⁶¹ To investigate the matter the Belgian lab's director Paul Coremans was asked to head an international committee of experts to conduct the sort of technical research that all those involved in the canvas's certification and acquisition had failed to do at a time when these techniques were available. (When asked if the forgery couldn't have been detected earlier, Dutch team member A.M. de Wild replied, "I could have proved the forgery, had I only been given the opportunity to make an X-ray."¹⁶²) The committee's findings were embargoed, although in October 1947 Coremans illustrated his testimony in court with projected lantern slides.¹⁶³

¹⁶¹ Lammertse et al. (2011), 42-65. The painting had been bought in 1937, after more than one renowned Dutch art historian, including the directors of the Rijksmuseum and Museum Boijmans, had declared its authenticity; it was, until this revelation, considered a high point in Vermeer's oeuvre.

Vogelsang's connection with this scandal seems only very indirect. The 1937 annual report of the Vereeniging 'Rembrandt', an association that, among other things, assists museums with art purchases, mentions that Vogelsang had been reappointed to its board; the same report proudly announces that it had contributed a significant sum for the acquisition of 'Vermeer's' *De Emmausgangers*; Vereeniging Rembrandt. Jaarverslag over 1937. Belangrijke kunstwerken voor ons land behouden, in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 111, #36415 (June 15, 1938), morning edn., 3rd section, 9. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=KBNRC01:000054596:mpeg21:a0115>. As a board member, though, Vogelsang was present in Rotterdam at the official, high-profile unveiling of two new acquisitions of the Museum Boymans, besides *De Emmausgangers* also *Man met rode muts* (Man with the red cap), a Rembrandt that was re-attributed in 1988 to the School of Rembrandt.

¹⁶² 'De zaak van Van Meegeren', in: *De Waarheid* (October 29, 1947), 2. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010852128:mpeg21:a0027>

¹⁶³ 'Han van Meegeren trad voor zijn rechters. Internationale belangstelling voor het proces tegen de schilder van de Emmausgangers', in: *De Gooi- en Eemlander*, 76, #11511 (October 29, 1947), 1. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:011154969:mpeg21:a0010>

The van Meegeren case was a watershed in that it marked the moment that physical, chemical, and other experimental methods began to gain the upper hand over intuition, memory, and viewing experience.¹⁶⁴ And although these methods did not prevent disagreements either—as evidenced by the extensive newspaper coverage of heated discussions about *De Emmausgangers* and another ‘Vermeer’, *Het laatste avondmaal* (The last supper), after Coremans’s team’s findings were released in late 1949—, now the arguments were cast in a new, technical language. Another pillar of high culture had been toppled.

Perversely, however, it can be argued that van Meegeren’s initial success had been made possible by the very expertise and erudition of men as Bredius, Hofstede de Groot, Vogelsang, Friedländer, and others, no matter how much they sometimes disagreed among themselves. It was they who had built the world in which art forgers like van Meegeren could thrive. Moreover, Hofstede de Groot’s apologia *Echt of onecht? Oog of chemie?* (Real or fake? Eye or chemistry?)¹⁶⁵, written after having lost the court case concerning *De lachende cavalier* and in which he discussed, and dismissed, all the case’s scientific examinations, read like a forger’s handbook from which later forgeries had actually benefitted.¹⁶⁶ As the first director of the Groninger Museum explained in a newspaper interview:

An art forgery is a scientific masterpiece. The well-informed forger delivers in, say, 1880 exactly that what the scientific community knows about a certain master. It could be that in 1881, when new discoveries regarding that master threw a new light on his art, the 1880 forgery appeared to be deficient or unconvincing. Thus, in [19]37, van Meegeren delivered precisely the Vermeer, meaning the italianizing Vermeer influenced by

¹⁶⁴ Lammertse et al. (2011), 106.

¹⁶⁵ Cornelis Hofstede de Groot, *Echt of onecht? Oog of chemie?* (Den Haag, s.n., 1925)

¹⁶⁶ Lammertse et al. (2011), 73-74.

Caravaggio, that art history was waiting for. That is why *De Emmausgangers* forgery (...) was accepted as the missing link and triumphantly embraced.¹⁶⁷

Parenthetically, one of Vogelsang's earlier certifications, of *Loth en zijn twee dochters* (Lot and his two daughters), as an authentic Vermeer was received with skepticism. However, the counterarguments were explicitly based precisely on such Italianate, stylistic arguments.¹⁶⁸

More generally, what the quoted museum director described is reminiscent of what sociologist Anthony Giddens has called "a mutual interpretative interplay between social science and those whose activities compose its subject matter." For this he introduced the more technical term *double hermeneutic*, by which he meant that "[t]he theories and findings of the social sciences cannot be kept wholly separate from the universe of meaning and action which they are about. But, for their part, lay actors are social theorists, whose theories help to constitute the activities and institutions that are the object of specialized social observers or social scientists."¹⁶⁹ The social sciences, and here I would include the humanities, do not merely (or even mostly) observe and draw up conclusions (let alone laws), for they cannot principally be disinterested. After all, in his opening lecture as privatdocent at the Universiteit van Amsterdam, back in 1900, Vogelsang had in fact helped to constitute a new activity by effectively making a mission statement saying that the country was badly in need of respected art historians if the

¹⁶⁷ 'Professor Vorekamp (directeur van Groninger Museum): "Vergenoegde roker van Frans Hals? Nee, Van Meegeren is de schilder"', in: *Het Parool*, 9, #1367 (June 25, 1949), 7. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ABCDDD:010828949:mpeg21:a0189>. (author's translation)

¹⁶⁸ 'Oude kunst bij de firma De Vries', in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 103, #33663 (November 6, 1930), evening edn., 3rd section, 9. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010661471:mpeg21:a0241>.

Nowadays this painting is not listed in annotated catalogs of Vermeer's works, not even as questionable. See e.g.: Jonathan Janson, *Complete interactive Vermeer catalogue*, last updated December 12, 2018. Essential Vermeer 2.0, http://www.essentialvermeer.com/vermeer_painting_part_one.html#.XVQyvugzaM8; Albert Blankert, 'Catalogue', in: Blankert, John Michael Morris, Gilles Aillaud (eds.), *Vermeer*, 2nd rev. edn. (Amsterdam: Meulenhoff, 1992 [1986]), 170-206.

¹⁶⁹ Anthony Giddens, *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2014 [1984]), xxxii-xxxiii.

discipline was to have any impact on those who decided on cultural matters and policies.¹⁷⁰ And so it had. And then it hadn't. The change itself is testimony to the way knowledge production becomes part of the reflections, practices, and purposes of society's members (or "lay sociologists", in the words of the ethnomethodologists), beyond the intent and control of those who had set themselves the original task.

This, I propose, fundamentally constitutes the tragic aspect of Vogelsang's career. Surely, his reputation had suffered a decline since the mid-1920s. Beginning with what he envisioned as a (self-initiated) twin appointment at both Utrecht and the Universiteit van Amsterdam, after Jan Six's death in 1926, this ambition, after a long drawn-out process, eventually ran aground: in May 1928, the Amsterdam city council decided on two other professors by appointment;¹⁷¹ the Faculty of Philosophy and Literature's criticism of the lack of scholarly publications to Vogelsang's name will have affected its decision.¹⁷² Indeed, his only scholarly publication dated from the early 20th century, the thoroughly systematic and erudite catalog of the furniture collection in the Nederlandsch Museum voor Geschiedenis en Kunst, a publication, of course, that largely served the improvement of museum practices.¹⁷³ This lack of what we now call a published track record, the abovementioned refusal of membership by the Koninklijke Nederlandsche Academie van Wetenschappen as well as the skeptical opinion of the Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht's Council

¹⁷⁰ Vogelsang (1900), 39.

¹⁷¹ 'Professorenbenoeming' and 'Benoemingen', in: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 101, #32755, (May 5, 1928), morning edn., section 2, 7. Delpher, <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010659224:mpeg21:a0168> and similar reports of that date.

¹⁷² Hoogenboom (1998), 34.

¹⁷³ Willem Vogelsang, *Catalogus van de meubelen in het Nederlandsch Museum voor Geschiedenis en Kunst te Amsterdam* (Amsterdam: Nederlandsch Museum voor Geschiedenis en Kunst, 1907). The same motive had inspired his systematic, scathing review of the catalog of the Rijksmuseum's plaster casts; W. Vogelsang, 'Naar aanleiding van een catalogus van pleisterafgietsels', in: *Bulletin van den Nederlandschen Oudheidkundigen Bond*, 8, 2nd series (September 1915), 190-208. The review, its contexts, and the polemic it sparked are documented in: May Meurs, 'De gipscollectie van het Rijksmuseum II: opkomst en verval van een hulpmiddel voor het Nederlands kunstonderwijs', in: *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum*, 50, #2 (2002), 265-293.

of Governors about his scholarly accomplishments¹⁷⁴ had made Vogelsang vulnerable. But his tragic flaw, though, was the culture change he did not see coming, even perhaps as far back as the turn of the century. No change, or even the need to, was probably felt when you were born into, continued to live in, and never ventured outside of your *haut bourgeois* social milieu. But at a time when just about everywhere else you looked things were being adapted, reconstructed, overhauled or replaced one cannot be entirely blameless for not noticing. But even if he did see it, as his 1921 rectorial address suggests, he ran away from it.

Another change, a modern change of sorts, was the German occupation of the Netherlands, between May 1940 and May 1945. Not only did Vogelsang suffer severe personal losses during this time—his wife, daughter, son-in-law, and two grandchildren all died during the war¹⁷⁵—, it would also have tragic repercussions for his career. The immediate postwar years were a time to settle accounts. Within the academe this took the form of government-appointed Colleges van Herstel en Zuivering (Councils of Restoration and Cleansing) at all universities; their task was to evaluate those staff and students who were suspected of having in one way or another “obliged the enemy”.¹⁷⁶ With regard to Vogelsang the Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht’s council concluded that “carrying on his regular duties during occupation showed a lack of appreciation of the exceptional conditions at the time”, conduct, the Council deemed, “that rather served the interests of the occupying powers” and that certainly did not lead one to expect a “loyal cooperation in the reconstruction of the Fatherland”. Examples it adduced, based on letters to the Council of

¹⁷⁴ Hoogenboom (1998), 35.

¹⁷⁵ Salomons (1957), 141.

¹⁷⁶ Sander van Walsum, *Ook al voelt men zich gewond: de Utrechtse universiteit tijdens de Duitse bezetting 1940-1945* (Utrecht: Universiteit Utrecht, 1995), 146.

two of Vogelsang's former assistants¹⁷⁷, were his refusal to allow any illegal activities, even meetings, within the Art History Institute; to encourage his students to sign the so-called declaration of loyalty (a form introduced during German occupation, in 1943, for students and released soldiers that stated that the undersigned would refrain from acts against the Third Reich; students who did not sign the declaration—a large majority—were refused entrance to their university); to continue his teaching after May 1, 1943 (during the time when the Council of Governors had closed the University until June 1, following nationwide razzias on students since February of that year); and, finally, hiring as his assistant a member of the Dutch fascist party NSB and, after the latter had left, a former student of his, M. Elisabeth Houtzager, who had signed the abovementioned declaration.

On this evidence the Council ruled, in September 1945, that Vogelsang was to be honorably dismissed, while stipulating that he was barred from attending the Academic Senate (or council of professors).¹⁷⁸ On September 21, 1945, Vogelsang was notified of his suspension from his work as well as from all his other public functions.¹⁷⁹ And while in March 1946 the Faculty of Literature and Philosophy asked the Council for Vogelsang's temporary re-appointment, due to a lack of teaching staff¹⁸⁰, the Council answered, on behalf of the Secretary of Education, Science, and Cultural Protection, that "major objections" precluded an exception to its earlier decision. Most likely Vogelsang's

¹⁷⁷ H.A. Noë, 'Letter to the Zuiverings Commissie voor de Universiteit te Utrecht', July 9, 1945, and J.S. Witsen Elias, 'Letter to the Voorzitter van de Zuiveringscommissie van de Rijks-Universiteit te Utrecht', [July 1945]. Utrechts Archief, Record group 59 College van Curatoren van de Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, Subrecordgroup 59.2 Archief van het College van Herstel en Zuivering van de Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht, Item 2909 'W. Vogelsang'. A similar letter mentioned in the Council's papers, by Vogelsang's colleague professor Grondijs, has not been archived.

I thank the Utrechts Archief for providing access to the Council's classified papers concerning the case of professor Vogelsang.

¹⁷⁸ All quotes from: 'Conclusion of the College van Herstel en Zuivering van de Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht'. Ibid. (Curiously, incidentally, in all its communications in the summer of 1945 the Council spelled his name "Vogelzang".)

¹⁷⁹ Major General F. Daubenton, 'Beschikking van den Chef van den Staf Militair Gezag' September 21, 1945. Ibid., Item 2909 'W. Vogelsang'.

¹⁸⁰ Letter of Faculty of Literature and Philosophy Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht to Commissie van Herstel en Zuivering, 'Tijdelijke voorziening kunstgeschiedenis', March 2, 1946. Ibid., Item 2928 'Stukken betreffende W. Vogelsang en J.G. van Gelde [sic], hoogleraren in de kunstgeschiedenis, 1945-1946'.

irreparable loss of prestige, clearly articulated in his former assistants' letters, played a decisive role in this decision. This opinion was also hinted at in a letter by the abovementioned Secretary earlier that month, in which he informed Vogelsang of a change in the law that would allow him to join the Senate's meetings after all. And although, he added, various parties had urged him to prevent this, he had decided instead to write this letter to appeal to Vogelsang's common sense in the hope he would save himself a lot of trouble.¹⁸¹

In his farewell address, in November 1946, Vogelsang briefly commented on the Council's verdict, stating that the very existence of the Art History Institute had been at stake and that he had defended its teaching against "invasions", although what that meant precisely he did not explicate. While "war conditions", in his view, had forced him to act the way he did, "postwar conditions", particularly his suspension pending the Council's decision, had prevented him from even taking any action at all.¹⁸²

The comment does suggest a wide and persistent difference in perception. The Art History Institute, his hard-earned creation, doubtlessly made him protective and inflexible. But perhaps the perceived service to "the interests of the occupying powers" may have had other motives. Appeasement, for instance; after all his only daughter, her husband and their children had been taken to Westerbork, the transit camp from where inmates were sent to the Nazi death camps in Germany and eastern Europe. This, I readily admit, is speculative. And will remain so: despite abundant archival materials, not in the least thanks to Vogelsang's own archiving of his professional activities (notebooks with sketches of architectural details, etc., or newspaper clippings of his illustrated lectures

¹⁸¹ Secretary of Education, Science, and Cultural Protection [G. van der Leeuw], 'Letter to Willem Vogelsang', March 4, 1946. Ibid.

¹⁸² Vogelsang (1947), 20.

stuck on cardboards), no diaries or other egodocuments have been known to come down to us. Private circumstances, let alone his inner life, will remain unrevealed.

Many years after these events I find it futile to have an opinion on this matter. Besides the lack of more private sources, during the past seven decades shades of gray have been allowed to emerge in between the monolithic, categorical verdicts to which people were condemned, both legally and informally, since war's ending: either you were "on the right side" (for acts of resistance, for instance) or "on the wrong side" (for sympathizing, obliging or collaborating with the enemy, or simply for not having resisted). This common practice of moral branding may have sharpened Vogelsang's tragic flaw. And what may have aggravated it even more is that each university's Council of Reconstruction and Cleansing was autonomous; hence the verdicts of similar false steps or offenses were often grossly incommensurate.¹⁸³

The above mostly deals with a number of professional contexts of Vogelsang's illustrated lectures. In public life, though, there were many activities Vogelsang was involved in: membership of a number of local or national governments' advisory boards; board member of countless organizations at home and abroad; a regular external assessor of secondary school exams; and jury member of many (art) competitions, throughout his career. And while I have mentioned or touched upon a few of his other public or private activities—his columns for *De Telegraaf*, his certifications of artworks—, a more extensive evaluation of his activities and accomplishments will have to wait for a comprehensive biography (by someone else).

¹⁸³ van Walsum (1995), 140-141.

Appendix: Vogelsang's lecture topics

- **Ueber Zimmerbeleuchtung / Verlichting van huizen in vroegere tijden / Verlichting van woonhuizen bij dag en nacht / De Verlichting van het woonhuis**, respectively

December 1900 | Breisgau-Verein Schauinsland, Freiburg

January 1902 | 'Oudheidkundig Genootschap', Muntgebouw, Amsterdam

January 1902 | 'Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen', Deventer

February 1910 | Vereeniging tot bevordering van Fabrieks- en Handwerksnijverheid te Rotterdam, Zaal Caledonia, Haringvliet-Rotterdam

- **Kunst en mode / *Kunst en mode in betrekking tot het kostuum**, respectively

February 1902 | 'Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen', Deventer

February 1903 | Bouwkunst en Vriendschap, Rotterdam

**unclear whether the Rotterdam lecture was identical to, or at least overlapped with, the first one*

- **Rembrandt en zijn werken**

December 1902 | Vereeniging ter bevordering van het Kunstleven, Deventer, Schouwburg

- *Beeldende kunsten in de voorgaande eeuw*

January 1903 | 'Ons Huis', Amsterdam

- **De Groote Kerk (of St. Lebuïnuskerk) te Deventer**

February 1903 | | 'Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen', Deventer, Schouwburg foyer

- **Pieter Brueghel († 1569), den oudsten**

February 1903 | Pictura, Groningen

March 1903 | 'Katholieke Kunstkring De Violier', Muntgebouw, Amsterdam

March 1903 | 'Rotterdamsche Kunstkring', Rotterdam

April 1903 | Vereeniging ter Bevordering van het Kunstleven, Deventer

**given the distance in time, I assume that the following instances of lectures on Pieter Brueghel the Elder were not identical to those of 1903, nor perhaps to each other*

- **Pieter Bruegel de Oude**

December 1926 | 'Provinciaal Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen in Noord-Brabant', genootschapsgebouw, Den Bosch

- **Pieter Breughel**

November 1929 | 'Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond', afd. Rotterdam, Handelshoogeschool, Rotterdam

- **Pieter Breughel de Oude***

March 1934 | kunsthandel P. de Boer, Amsterdam

**on the occasion of the Breughel exhibition; unclear whether exhibition or lecture took place in abovementioned art gallery or the lecture only*

- **Pieter Breughel D.O.**

January 1935 | 'Volksuniversiteit Enschede', Geheerzaal Volksuniversiteit, Enschede

- **Pieter Brueghel**

October 1945 | Mauritshuis, Den Haag (on the occasion of the exhibition 'Nederlandse kunst in de 15e en 16e eeuw')

- **Het intérieur (meubilair) – voorheen en thans**

February 1904 | Tielsche Kunstvereniging, Tiel

March 1904 | Academie, Rotterdam

October 1904 | Genootschap 'Pictura', Groningen

- **“Kunstbeschouwing met toelichtende voordracht** door de heeren W. Steenhoff en dr. W. Vogelsang. Ten toon gesteld zullen worden een collectie waterverven van nieuwe Hollandsche meesters, en moderne Fransche en Hollandsche gekleurde prenten en etsen...”

October 1904 | 'Ons Huis' Rozenstraat, Amsterdam

- **Albrecht Dürer en Lucas van Leyden**

December 1904 | Vereeniging 'Oud Leiden', Stadszaal, Leiden

December 1904 | 'Katholieke Kunstkring De Violier', Amsterdam

January 1905 | Genootschap 'Architectura et Amicitia', bovenzaal café Parkzicht, Stadhouderskade, Amsterdam

- **De Nederlandsche beeldhouwers, hun verleden en toekomst / Nederlandsche beeldhouwers, voorheen en thans**, respectively

February 1905 | Academie van Beeldende Kunsten en Technische Wetenschappen, Rotterdam

March 1905 | Comité van St. Lucas, Kleine Concertzaal Stads Doelen, Delft

- **Hollandsche beeldhouwkunst**

April 1905 | 'Die Haghe', Gebouw De Vereeniging, Willemstraat, Den Haag

- **Hoe moeten meubelen zijn?**

Winter 1905-1906 | Academie van Beeldende Kunsten en Technische Wetenschappen, Rotterdam

- **Nederlandsche beeldhouwkunst van vroeger eeuwen**

January 1906 | 'Ons Huis', Rozenstraat, Amsterdam

- **Bouw en Inrichting van Musea**

February 1906 | Genootschap 'Architectura et Amicitia', Amsterdam

- **Picturale en muzikale parallellen en antithesen / Muziek en schilderkunst een parallel*;**

combined with violin performances Vogelsang's spouse Jeanne Vogelsang-Hijmans

March 1906 | 'Katholieke Kunstkring De Violier', bovenzaal American Hotel, Amsterdam

May 1906 | 'Katholieke Kunstkring De Violier', restaurant Royal, Den Haag

**possibly identical to the 1906 performance*

May 1920 | 'Maatschappij [voor Beeldende Kunsten]', Herengracht, Amsterdam

[January 1932] | Alkmaar [see: file 243 KHI archief Univ.museum Utrecht; not in Delpher or Alkmaar municipal archive]

- **Rembrandts leven en werken**

December 1906 | Vereeniging ter Bevordering van het Kunstleven, Deventer

**possibly different from Rembrandt en zijn werken (1902), as this lecture was held in the year of the painter's 300th birthday was commemorated*

• **De Nederlandsche beeldhouwkunst en haar verhouding tot de Renaissance in de 16e en 17e eeuw**

March 1907 | 'Ned. Anthropologische Vereeniging', Koningszaal Natura Artis Magistra, Amsterdam

• **Wanden, vloeren en plafonds**

February 1907 | 'Arti et Industriae', Zuidh. Koffiehuis, Den Haag

• **Noordnederlandsche beeldhouwkunst in de 15e en 16e eeuw**

March 1907 | Friesch Genootschap van Geschied-, Oudheid- en Taalkunde, Groote Zaal-Visser, Leeuwarden

• **De Nederlandsche beeldhouwkunst in de 15e eeuw**

February 1908 | Geschied- en Letterkundige Vereeniging, Kleine Concertzaal, Middelburg
possibly overlaps with Noordnederlandsche beeldhouwkunst in de 15e en 16e eeuw

• **Maskerade**

March 1908 | dispuut 'Vrije Studie', Delft

• **Nederlandsche beeldhouwkunst tussen 1200 en 1500**

March 1908 | Vereeniging ter Bevordering van Nuttige Kennis, Utrecht

• **Meubelen in onze musea / *Het interieur in de Gothiek en de Renaissance**

June 1908 | Vereeniging tot Bevordering van Vreemdelingenverkeer voor Utrecht en omstreken, Gebouw van Kunsten en Wetenschappen

January 1909 | 'Maatschappij ter Bevordering van de Bouwkunst', Musis Sacrum, Arnhem

a review of the 1909 lecture suggests that it is probably identical to **Meubelen in onze musea*

• **Het portret / *Het portret van de vroegste tijden tot op heden**

November 1908 | R.K. Kunstkring 'De Violier', Gebouw tot Bevordering van Bouwkunst, Marnixstraat, Amsterdam

December 1908 | Vereeniging tot het houden van Kunstbeschouwingen, Amicitia, Amersfoort

January 1911 | Teyler's Stichting, Haarlem

March 1914 | Academie, Rotterdam

possibly identical to **Het portret*

March 1909 | Vereeniging tot Opwekking van het Kunstleven te Deventer, Schouwburgzaal

• **Hollandsche meubelen der renaissance**

February 1909 | 'Vereeniging voor Duitsche Kunstnijverheid', Berlijn

*possibly partly identical to **Het interieur in de Gothiek en de Renaissance***

• **Tuinen en parken**

February 1910 | Leidsche Kunstvereeniging, Leiden

- **Middeleeuwsche beeldhouwkunst**

March 1910 | Artibus Sacrum, Arnhem

- **Traditie in het schildersambacht**

September 1910 | Bond van Nederlandsche Schilderspatroons, Internationale Tentoonstelling van Schilderswerk, Gereedschappen, enz., Den Haag

- **Geschichte der Innenausstattung des holländischen Hauses / Das altholländische Haus und seine Einrichtung / Het Nederlandsche woonhuis en zijn inrichting**, respectively

January 1910 | Breisgauverein Schau-ins-Land, Freiburg, Kaufhaushalle

November 1910 | Landesgewerbemuseum, Stuttgart

early 1911 | Commissie voor H.O., Winterswijk

- **Het Nederlandsche woonhuis** [course]

[November 1910] | 'Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen', Winterswijk

- **Architectuur**

November 1910 | 'Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen', Academie, Rotterdam

- **Italiaansche bouwkunst**

February 1911 | Diligentia, Den Haag

- **Rembrandt**

februari 1911 | 'U.L.V.G.', Hygiënische Laboratorium, Utrecht

**unclear whether either or both are identical to earlier Rembrandt lectures in 1902 or 1906*

- **Geschiedenis der bouwkunst** [four-part course]

November 1911- May 1912 | 'Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond', Hotel du Soleil, Nijmegen

- **Michel Angelo**

November 1911 | 'Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen', Rotterdam

February 1912 | 'Kunst aan Allen', Diligentia, Den Haag [adv]

unclear whether the above two lectures were more or less identical to:

February 1924 | Natuurkundig Genootschap, Concerthuis, Groningen

- **De ontwikkeling der tuinkunst**

November 1911 | 'Mij. tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst', Hollandais, Den Haag

• **De beeldhouwkunst der Renaissance in Italië***

January 1912 | 'Gooische Kring voor Hooger Onderwijs buiten de Hooge School', Tuinzaal Concordia, Bussum

**the annual report of the Gooische Kring voor Hooger Onderwijs mentions that "professor Vogelsang talked four nights about the Italian Renaissance."*

• **Leonardo da Vinci***

January 1912 | 'Mij. Tot Nut van 't Algemeen', [Nutsgebouw], Deventer

February 1912 | Academie, Rotterdam [organisatie door de Academie]

February 1912 | 'Friesch Genootschap van Geschied-, Oudheid- en Taalkunde', zaal-Visser, Leeuwarden

May 1919 | t.g.v. 400e sterfdag, 'Provinciaal Utrechtsch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen', Utrecht

October 1919 | 'Natuurkundig Genootschap', Concerthuis, Groningen

October 1923 | 'Maatschappij Rembrandt'. Grote zaal Bellevue, Amsterdam

**unclear to what extent these lectures were identical*

• **Rafaël's Stanzen**

December 1912 | 'Katholieke kunstkring De Violier', American Hotel, Amsterdam

• **Over kleederdrachten van de vroege middeleeuwen tot heden (met Lichtbeelden) / *Kleederdrachten**

December 1912 | plaats onbekend, Openbare Leeszaal

**possibly identical to the December 1912 lecture (locations certainly imply a soimilar audience)*

March 1914 | 'Kunst aan het Volk', Amsterdam

• **Mathias Grünewald (de schilder van het Isemheimsch altaar te Colmar) / *Mathias Grünewald, respectively**

March 1913 | 'Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen', Nutszaal**, Rotterdam [adv]

**given the distance in time I do not assume that these lectures were identical*

January 1927 | 'Academie van Beeldende Kunsten', Den Haag

***was a cinema as well*

• **Het landschap in de Nederlandsche kunst**

April 1913 | Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen, Tuinzaal Concordia, Bussum

• **De tentoonstelling van Noord-Nederlandsche schilder- en beeldhouwkunst vóór 1575, te Utrecht in 1913 gehouden**

September 1913 | Utrecht, Gebouw Kunsten en Wetenschappen, on the occasion of the opening of the 'Tentoonstelling van Noord-Nederlandsche schilder- en beeldhouwkunst'

February 1914 | 'Kon. Oudheidkundig Genootschap', Muntgebouw, Amsterdam

November 1914 | 'Kon. Oudheidkundig Genootschap', [Muntgebouw], Amsterdam

• **De meubileering van het Nederlandsche woonhuis in vroeger en later tijd***

February 1914 | 'Oefening kweekt Kennis', Den Haag

**possibly partly identical to the two 1915 lectures on (Dutch) interiors and the lecture of December 1916*

- **Diego Rodriguez de Silva Velasquez**

December 1914 | Katholieke Kunstkring 'De Violier', zaal Lux, Reguliersbreestraat, Amsterdam

December 1914 | Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen, [Nutszaal], Rotterdam

February 1915 | 'Ons Huis', Rozenstraat, Amsterdam

- **'t Nederlantse woonhuys in de XV, de XVI, de XVII, mitsgaders de XVIII eeuwen**

March 1915 | Oudheidkundig Genootschap 'Niftarlake', Breukelen

*see also the February 1914 lecture **De meubileering van het Nederlandsche woonhuis in vroeger en later tijd***

- **De meubileering van het huis van de vroegste tijden tot op heden***

November 1915 | 'Vereeniging tot opwekking van het Kunstleven', foyer Schouwburg, Deventer

possibly partly identical to the February 1914 lecture **De meubileering van het Nederlandsche woonhuis in vroeger en later tijd*

- **Ceramic**

March 1915 | 'Mij. van Nijverheid, Logegebouw, Arnhem

- **Johannes Vermeer en Pieter de Hoogh**

November 1915 | 'Friesch Genootschap', zalen-Rodenhuis [v/h zaal-Visser], Leeuwarden

possible overlap with lecture **Nederlandsche binnenhuisschilders der 17e eeuw (Steen, P. de Hoogh, Vermeer, enz.), March 1916*

- **De beeldhouwkunst in verband met de bouwkunst***

December 1915 | 'Architectura et Amicitia', Kamer van Koophandel (Nieuwe Beurs), [Amsterdam]

**on the occasion of a series of talks on architecture*

- **Kleine Nederlandsche beeldhouwwerken uit de 15e en 16e eeuw**

February 1916 | 'Kunst aan Allen', [Amsterdam]

- **Nederlandsche binnenhuisschilders der 17e eeuw (Steen, P. de Hoogh, Vermeer, enz.)**

March 1916 | 'Ons Huis', Rozenstraat, Amsterdam [ann]

- **Albert Durer [sic] als graphisch kunstenaar**

April 1916 | Mij. Tot Nut van 't Algemeen, Breda

- **De meubileering en inrichting van het woonhuis van de tweede helft der 17e eeuw tot in de 19e**

December 1916 | 'Vereeniging tot opwekking van het Kunstleven', Deventer

**possible overlap with lectures on Dutch interiors of February 1914, March 1915, and November 1915*

- **Rainer Maria Rilke in seinem Verhältnis zur bildenden Kunst**

January 1917 | 'Vereeniging voor Duitsche letterkunde', Bovenzaal Harmonie, [Groningen]

- **Fransche schilderkunst in de 18e eeuw**

March 1917 | Comité voor kunstlezingen, Haarlem, Concertzaal De Kroon

- **De ontwikkeling van het aesthetisch beginsel in de 18de eeuw in Frankrijk**

April 1917 | 'Arti et Amicitiae', Amsterdam

*possibly partly identical to **Fransche schilderkunst in de 18e eeuw, March 1917***

- **Breitner**

October 1917 | on the occasion of the exhibition of the Genootschap 'Voor de Kunst', Utrecht

- **17e-eeuwsche Nederlandsche landschapschilders**

October 1917 | 'Ons Huis', Rozenstraat, Amsterdam

March 1918 | 'Ons Huis', Rozenstraat, Amsterdam [ann]

- **Van Bach tot Schubert; combined with violin performances by Vogelsang's spouse Jeanne Vogelsang-Hijmans**

November 1917 | Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen, Nutszaal, Rotterdam

- **Kunst en kunstbeschouwing** [four-part course]

December 1917-January 1918 | 'Het Comité voor Hooger Onderwijs buiten de Universiteiten', Logegebouw, Arnhem

*according to a report in *Het Volk: Dagblad voor de Arbeiderspartij*, 18, no. 5866, 05-10-1917, 2nd section, 2, also delivered at the Volksuniversiteit Utrecht*

- **De Noord-Nederlandsche schilderkunst der 15e eeuw**

March 1918 | 'Kunst aan Allen', gebouw Heijstee, Heerengracht 545, Amsterdam

- **Schaduwbeelden van Griekse vazen**

April 1918 | 'Ver. tot bestrijding der Tuberculose in Utrecht', Stadsschouwburg, Utrecht

- **Het portret in de schilderkunst**

February 1919 | 'Maatschappij voor Beeldende Kunsten', Herengracht, Amsterdam

December 1919 | 'Maatschappij voor Beeldende Kunsten', Herengracht, Amsterdam

- **De aesthetische beginselen der 18e eeuwsche bouwkunst**

October 1919 | 'Vereeniging Volksuniversiteit', Den Haag

- **Rembrandt**

January 1920 | Algemeene Nederlandsche Diamantwerkersbond, Handwerkersvriendenkring, Amsterdam

- **De Oud-Nederlandsche schilderkunst**

April 1920 | 'Kunstgenootschap Enschede', Koffiekamer der Groote Sociëteit, Enschede

- **De jongste richtingen in de schilderkunst / Moderne schilderkunst / Van impressionisme tot essentialisme**

October 1920 | Utrecht

November 1920 | 'Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen', Amicitia, Amersfoort

November 1920 | 'Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen', gebouw Oppert (Nutszaal), Rotterdam
identical to:

- **Hedendaagsche stroomingen in de beeldende kunst**

January 1920 | Den Haag, besloten kring

March 1920: Hengelo, Storkfabrieken

see: Commentarii

- **Het Nederlandsche boerenleven en schilderkunst en muziek / Het leven der landelijke bevolking in de 16e en 17e eeuw***, *respectively; combined with violin performances by Vogelsang's spouse Jeanne Vogelsang-Hijmans*

April 1921 | 'Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond', Pulchri Studio, Den Haag

May 1921 | Spaansche Week, Madrid

**text probably identical to Het oud-Nederlandsche volksleven in schilderkunst en muziek (radio broadcast, October 1933)*

- **De stijl in de Nederlandsche kunst**

May 1921 | Spaansche Week, Madrid

- **De Noord-Nederlandsche kunst van de 15e en 16e eeuw**

announced in June 1921 | Vacantieleergangen voor Afrikaners en Vlamingen door het Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond, Leiden

- **Schilderkunst en rederijkerij (over de aesthetische waarde van het werk der Romanisten)**

June 1921 | 'Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde', Leiden

- **Bloeitijd der Spaansche kunst**

December 1922 | 'Genootschap Nederland-Spanje', Pulchri Studio Den Haag

- **Spaansche beeldhouwkunst**

February 1923 | 'Genootschap Nederland-Spanje', Pulchri Studio Den Haag [ann]

- **Hieronymus Bosch**

March 1923 | 'Rotterdamsche Kunstkring', Rotterdam

October 1923 | 's-Hertogenbossche Kunstkring', Stadhuis, Den Bosch

June 1930 | Vlaamsche Tentoonstelling, Paviljoen der stad Antwerpen op de Wereldtentoonstelling, Antwerpen

- **Stijl der Noord-Nederlandsche schilderkunst / *Beeldende kunst der Nederlanden**

February 1924 | 'Nederlandsche Oudheidkundige Bond', Ridderzaal, Den Haag

December 1931 | tweede Delta-conferentie, Utrecht

Vogelsang called the December lecture **Stijl der Noord-Nederlandsche schilderkunst*

- **Byzantijnse kunst**

April 1924 | Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden

- **Teekenen naar model**

March 1924 | 'Genootschap Kunstliefde', Kunsthistorisch Instituut, Utrecht [ann]

- **Het ornament en de ornamenteele suggestie**

December 1924 | 'Leidsche Kunstvereniging', Stedelijk Musuem De Lakenhal, Leiden

- **Compositie in de schilderkunst der Italiaansche Renaissance**

November 1925 | 'Mij. tot Nut van 't Algemeen', zaal Amicitia, Amersfoort

- **Geertgen tot St. Jans en de Meester van de Virgo inter Virgines**

December 1926 | Vereeniging 'Geloof en Wetenschap', Den Haag

preceded by two arias on the violin, performed by Mrs. Vogelsang-Hijmans

- **Hollandsche bouwkunst van den tegenwoordigen tijd**

February 1927 | 'Vereeniging der Kunstvrienden', Breslau

possibly identical to:

- **Moderne Nederlandsche architectuur**

December 1927 | 'Duitsch Nederlandsch Gezelschap', Aachen

- **Het Bouwbedrijf in de Middeleeuwen aan de monumenten geïllustreerd**

February 1928 | Nederlandsche Handels-Hoogeschool, Rotterdam

- **Schilderkunst en godsdienst**

February 1928 | Vereeniging 'De Middaghoogte', in de Engelse Kerk, Begijnhof, Amsterdam

introduced with violin performances by Mrs. Vogelsang-Hijmans

- **Dürer en de kunst / Albrecht Dürer**

March 1928 | Haarlem

December 1928 | 'Volksuniversiteit Enschede', Enschede

**probably identical, as both were delivered on the occasion of the 400th anniversary of the painter's death*

- **Utrechtsche middeleeuwsche sculptuur**

April 1928 | Vereeniging 'Oud-Utrecht', Utrecht

- **Vervalschingen op het gebied van schilderijen**

July 1928 | 'Vereeniging van Museum-directeuren', Almelo

- **'De gedekte tafel van de 14e -20e eeuw'**

December 1928 | on the occasion of the exhibition 'De gedekte tafel', the returns of which will be used for the benefit of the "stichting Amsterdamsche kolonieverpleging voor kinderen, die zwakke en zwakzinnige kindeen uitzendt.", Huyze Goudstikker, Amsterdam

- **El Greco**

December 1928 | 'Firma Goudstikker'*, Rotterdamsche Kunstkring, Rotterdam

February 1929 | 'Leidsche Kunstvereening', bovenzaal café-restaurant In den Vergulden Turk, Leiden

October 1937 | Genootschap 'Spanje-Spaansch Amerika', gebouw der A.M.V.J. (Vondelstraat 8), Amsterdam

November 1937 | Genootschap 'Spanje-Spaansch Amerika', Huize Anjema (Lange Vijverberg), Den Haag

**on the occasion of an exhibition with works of El Greco, among others*

unclear whether the latter three are identical to the 1928 and 1929 lectures

- **Leonardo's betekenis in de geschiedenis der kunst**

March 1929 | 'Vereeniging van Beeldende Kunstenaars', Hotel Hamdorff, Laren

- **De anonyme meester van de wanddecoratie van de kapel van Guy van Avesnes in den Dom te Utrecht**

September 1930 | 12e Internationaal Kunsthistorisch Congres, Brussel

for peer group of art historians during an international congress

- **Nederlandsch Indië in de schilderkunst**

November 1930 | 'Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond', afd. Rotterdam, Handelshoogeschool, Rotterdam

- **Noord-Nederlandsche binnenhuizen**

December 1930 | 'Koninklijk Museum', Antwerpen

- **De monumentale beeldhouwkunst der late Middeleeuwen**

February 1931 | Academie van Beeldende Kunsten, Den Haag

- **Rafaël**

October 1931 | Vereeniging 'Geloof en Wetenschap', Eindhoven

- **[Rubens]**

October-November 1931 | Rotterdamsche Kring, 4-delige cursus

notes found in file 233, archief Vogelsang, Universiteitsmuseum Utrecht; not mentioned in Delpher

• **De Beeldhouwkunst der Renaissance in Italië / *Florentijnsche beeldhouwers der Renaissance**

November 1931 | Arnhemsche Volksuniversiteit, Arnhem [ann]

December 1931 | Academie van Beeldende Kunsten, Den Haag

**probably identical to the November lecture*

• **Mysteriën uit het leven van Christus en de H. Maagd**

April 1932 | Vereeniging 'Geloof en Wetenschap', aula Gymn. Augustinianum, Eindhoven

February 1933 | 'De Violier', Paviljoen Vondelpark, Amsterdam

• **Hubert & Jan van Eycks Altaar weer op de oude [plaats]**

1932 | Gent

• **De portretten van Willem van Oranje***

February 1933 | 'Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond, afd. Rotterdam, i.s.m. Commissie voor de viering van het vierde eeuwfeest', Rotterdam

**on the occasion of the 400th anniversary of William of Orange's birthday*

• **Betrekkingen van Noord-Nederlandsche kunst der 15e eeuw tot de kunst van het buitenland**

April 1933 | 15e Nederlandsche Philologencongres, Academiegebouw, Leiden

• **Het oud-Nederlandsche volksleven in schilderkunst en muziek***, *combined with violin performances by Jeanne Vogelsang-Hijmans*

• October 1933 | radio broadcast for Luxemburg radio

**possibly identical to:*

• **Het Nederlandsche boerenleven en schilderkunst en muziek / Het leven der landelijke bevolking in de 16e en 17e eeuw**

• **De schilders der vroege Florentijnsche Renaissance, over Masaccio, Uccello en Castagno***

July 1934 | Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam

**in a series of lectures about Italian art on the occasion of exhibition 'Oud-Italiaansche kunst in Nederlandsch bezit', Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam*

• **Michael Angelo als beeldhouwer***

July 1934 | Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam

**in a series of lectures about Italian art on the occasion of exhibition 'Oud-Italiaansche kunst in Nederlandsch bezit', Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam*

• **Michelangelo als schilder***

August 1934 | | Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam

**in a series of lectures about Italian art on the occasion of exhibition 'Oud-Italiaansche kunst in Nederlandsch bezit', Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam*

- **Meubelen**

September 1934 | Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam

in a series of lectures about Italian art on the occasion of exhibition 'Oud-Italiaansche kunst in Nederlandsch bezit', Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam

- **Hoe leeren wij kunstwerken zien?**

October 1934 | Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen, Ede

- **Isaac Israëls**

March 1935 | [Pulchri, Den Haag], opening of exhibition

July 1935 | De Kunst, Utrecht [work by Israëls, mostly in Utrecht]

almost identical lectures for two exhibitions; no illustrations

- **Monumentale kunst**

October 1935 | Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam

- **Van Geertgen tot Sint Jans tot Lucas van Leyden**

October 1936 | Museum Boymans-Van Beuningen, Rotterdam

on the occasion of the exhibition 'Jeroen Bosch en de Noord-Nederlandsche primitieven'

- **Een Nederlandsch schilder in Spanje**

December 1936 | Genootschap 'Spanje-Spaansch Amerika', bovenzaal American Hotel, Amsterdam

- **Hugo van der Goes en Geertgen tot Sint Jans, twee karakterschilders**

February 1937 | 'Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond', afd. Den Haag, Pulchri Studio, Den Haag

- **Beteekenis en functie van het ornament**

March 1938 | 'Vereeniging van Beeldende Kunstenaars Hilversum', gebouw De Vereeniging, Hilversum

- **Noord-Nederlandsche primitieven, 1e deel, in the review re-titled as *Bestaat er inderdaad een Noord-Nederlandsche kunst?***

November 1938 | Stedelijk van Abbe-Museum, Eindhoven

- **Het probleem der Noord-Nederlandsche kunst, 2nd part of what initially was announced as *Noord-Nederlandsche primitieven***

December 1938 | Stedelijk van Abbe-Museum, Eindhoven

- **Beeldende kunsten der 17e en 18e eeuw***

November 1938 | Volksuniversiteit Hengelo

**restricted to France*

- **Hoe de 17e -eeuwsche schilders onze architectuur zagen**

February 1939 | Vereeniging 'Hendrick de Keyser', bovenzaal American Hotel, Amsterdam

- **Italiaansche en Nederlandsche beeldhouwers in de 15e eeuw**

March 1939 | genootschap 'Dante Alighieri', afd. Den Haag, Den Haag

March 1940 | vereeniging 'Dante Alighieri', [Den Haag]

- **Dateering Rogier van der Weydens 'Maria met kind'**

July 1939 | Eerste Nederlandsch Congres voor Kunstgeschiedenis, Utrecht
peer group event

- **De betekenis van Beets' Camera obscura**

november 1939 | Utrecht, rederijderskamer

*no illustrations

- **De Spaansche meester Francisco de Zurbarán (1593-1664)**

November 1939 | Genootschap 'Spanje-Spaansch Amerika' i.s.m. 'R.K. Kunstkring De Violier',
Muzieklyceum, Amsterdam

- **Oud-Fransche beeldhouwkunst**

January 1940 | 'Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond', afd. Rotterdam, Geheerzaal van Museum
Boymans, Rotterdam

- **Goya's 'Les desastres de la guerra'**

December 1940 | Genootschap 'Spanje-Spaansch Amerika', grote zaal American Hotel,
Amsterdam

- **Spaansche miniaturen**

September 1941 | Genootschap 'Spanje-Spaansch Amerika' en 'Koninklijk Oudheidkundig
Genootschap', [Amsterdam]

- **Jan van Eyck**

October 1941 | 'Rotterdamsche Kunstkring', Museum Boymans, Rotterdam

- **Het portret in de beeldende kunst**

December 1942 | 'Vereeniging van Beeldende Kunstenaars te Hilversum', Hotel Het Hof van
Holland. Hilversum

* does not overlap with the 1908 lecture of the same title; of the 1919 one no review has come
down to us

- **Rubens' missie in de schilderkunst**

January 1943 | aula Museum Boymans, Rotterdam

- **Verschijnselen van antieke Barok**

May 1949 | Verbondsdag 'Nederlands Klassiek Verbond', Hotel Figi, Zeist

- **De groten der Spaanse schilderkunst** (lecture series)
October 1950 | Paviljoen Vondelpark, Amsterdam
only an announcement



Willem Vogelsang at his desk (with slides) at the Kunsthistorisch Instituut, Utrecht