

The Role of Nazarenism in the Renewal of Late Medieval Works: Johann Gruss the Elder's Restoration of *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* by Albrecht Dürer*

Olga Kotková

Abstract

KOTKOVÁ, Olga: The Role of Nazarenism in the Renewal of Late Medieval Works: Johann Gruss the Elder's Restoration of *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* by Albrecht Dürer.

This article focuses on the restoration of Dürer's famous painting *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* (National Gallery in Prague). The restoration work was done by Johann Gruss the Elder in 1839 – 1841. Gruss was a painter from Litoměřice in northern Bohemia. His work shows a degree of skill and knowledge of contemporary Nazarene art, which he applied in a somewhat stiff and simplified form. He was most influenced by the paintings, drawings and prints of Joseph Führich. The inspiration he drew from Führich's work to repair the face of the Virgin in Dürer's *Feast of the Rose Garlands* turns out to have been the correct choice: Führich's clearly defined period style (in which Führich equalled the work of Dürer) was something that Gruss, an artist of far more humble talent and limited abilities, could easily imitate. He Gruss sought inspiration directly in the works of the Old Masters and tried on his own to transfer their style to the provincial Nazarene style of the 1830s, he would most certainly have been unsure and would have fumbled artistically and the outcome would have been inconsistent. Modelling his work on Führich thus ensured the stylistic consistency of Gruss's additions.

Keywords: Albrecht Dürer, restoration, Johann Gruss the Elder, Joseph Führich, Feast of the Rose Garlands

The Feast of the Rose Garlands (fig. 1), created by the Nuremberg artist Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528) during his stay in Venice in 1506, is one of the best-known paintings in the National Gallery in Prague. The circumstances of the creation of the painting in the city on the lagoon and of the acquisition of *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* by Emperor Rudolf II for Prague have been the subject of numerous publications.¹ Here we shall instead focus on the painting's later fate, as this, too, is of key importance for understanding the current appearance of this masterpiece.

First, it is worth noting that, unlike the majority of the treasures in the famous former collection of Rudolf II, this painting was not transferred to Vienna, nor did it fall into the hands of the Swedes who, during the capture of Prague Castle (1648 – 1649), took everything they came across. An inventory of the castle's collections indicates that the painting had already fallen into very poor state over the course of the 18th century; notes from this period evaluate its appearance as “*so ganz ruinir*”.² The former gem of the Church of San Bartolomeo in Venice and then the pivotal work in Rudolf's famous

*This article was written within the framework of the following project: “Artistic Exchange in the Ore Mountains Region between the Gothic and the Renaissance” (Project NAKI – DF12P010VV046).

¹ See especially: ANZELEWSKY, Fedja. *Albrecht Dürer. Das Malerische Werk*. I-II. Berlin : Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1991 (1st edition 1971), pp. 191-202, no. 93 (with further bibliography); KOTKOVÁ, Olga (ed.). *Albrecht Dürer: The Feast of the Rose Garlands: 1506-2006* (exhibition cat., National Gallery in Prague). Prague : National Gallery in Prague, 2006.

² See inventories of 1718, 1737, 1763 and 1782: KÖPL, Karl. *Urkunden, Acten und Regesten und Inventare aus dem k. u. k. Statthaltereii-Archiv in Prag*. In *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* X, 1889, pp. LXIII-CC; especially p. CXXXVI (inventory of 1718; no. 300), CL (inventory of 1737, no. 220), CLXXIV (inventory of 1763, no. 84) and p. CXC (inventory of 1782, no. 84).



1 Albrecht Dürer, *The Feast of the Rose Garlands*, 1506. Prague, National Gallery in Prague.

collection remained hidden from public view and was stored alongside other unwanted items in the depths of the castle rooms. The lack of interest in Dürer's painting ultimately culminated in its being removed from the Castle's collections and being offered for sale at the notorious auction of 13 May 1782.³ It was purchased for one guilder and 18 groschen by a professor of general and literary history at Prague University, Franz Lothar Ehemant (1748 – 1782). He, however, did not enjoy *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* for long as he died six months after acquiring it and the painting went to a new owner – the Postmaster of Prague, Ignaz Georg von Fillenbaum. His heirs sold the painting in 1793 to the Abbot of the Monastery of the Strahov Premonstratensians, Václav Meyer.⁴

The panel remained at Strahov until it was sold to the Czechoslovak state in 1934. The period when *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* was in Strahov Monastery was of fundamental importance for it, as it was then that the panel, which was already in very poor condition, underwent general restoration, which fundamentally altered its appearance. The schemes of preservation (figs. 2, 3) show that approximately one-fifth of the painting had already come loose completely and had to be painted in

³ *Inventarium über die in allhiesieger k. u. k. Schatzkammer vorfindigen Figuren, Maschinen und Effekten, welche auf allerhöchsten K. u. K. Befehl den 13. Monatstag May 1782 zum besten des allhiesiegen armen Besorgung-Stift licitando veräußert worden*, Archiv of Prague Castle, Castle inspection, inv. no. 107, no. 84.

⁴ On this sale see recently: MACHALÍKOVÁ, Pavla. *Objevování středověku. Tři kapitoly k recepci gotického umění v Čechách v pozdním 18. a raném 19. století*. Praha : Artefactum, 2005, p. 111; KOTKOVÁ, Olga. *The Feast of the Rose Garlands in the Imperial Collections in Prague*. In KOTKOVÁ 2006, 126.



2 Albrecht Dürer, *The Feast of the Rose Garlands*, 1506: a photograph showing the degree of preservation: the white areas indicate where the original painting is missing (© Pavlína Strnadová).



3 Albrecht Dürer, *The Feast of the Rose Garlands*, 1506: a photograph showing the degree of preservation: the white areas indicate where original Dürer's surviving painting (© Pavlína Strnadová).

(and partly also painted over); the areas of damage ran along the vertically joined planks of the support, especially in the middle, which means that the damage affected the central part of the scene and especially the figure of the Virgin, the Christ Child resting on her lap, the face of the kneeling Pope and the face of the angel with the lute.⁵ The circumstances that led to the deterioration of the painting in the 1830s are explained in the literature.⁶ But let us concentrate on the impairment of art opinion at that time and opinion on the restoration of Late Medieval works.

Abbot Jeroným Josef Zeidler (1790 – 1870) decided in 1839 that the demanding repair work the painting required was to be undertaken. He gave lengthy consideration to the steps that needed to be taken. In his notes, published by Josef Neuwirth in 1885,⁷ we read that the painting was already more or less destroyed by that time, the chalk ground was lifting and the painting itself was flaking away. To prevent the total destruction of the most precious work of art in the Strahov picture gallery he entrusted it to the care of painter Johann Gruss the Elder from Litoměřice (1790 – 1855).⁸ The choice of Gruss was met with consternation even then; Zeidler was known for his extensive contacts in the art world⁹ and could have approached some famous artist, such as František Tkadlík (1786 – 1840), who in 1836 became the Director of the Prague Academy.¹⁰ Instead, however, Zeidler, turned to a little-known painter who worked in northern Bohemia. The Abbot had full confidence in Gruss, however, because he knew him personally from the time when they were both students of philosophy in Prague and he often gave him other commissions as well. The two men were also linked

⁵ The diagram was done by Pavlína Strnadová of the National Gallery in Prague, see these photographs in: KOTKOVÁ 2006, p. 90-91.

⁶ See above all: RAVE, O. Paul. Dürers Rosenkranzbild und die Berliner Museen 1836/1837. In *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* LVIII, 1937, p. 267-283.

⁷ NEUWIRTH, Joseph. *Albrecht Dürers Rosenkranzfest*. Leipzig; Prag : G. Freytag; F. Tempsky, 1885, p. 32-34.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 32-34.

⁹ On Zeidler see recently: ŠTURC, Libor. [entry] Jan Adolf Brandeis. Strahovský opat Jeroným Josef Zeidler. In ZÁPALKOVÁ, Helena – ŠTURC, Libor (eds.). *Speculum mundi. Sbírání kláštera premonstrátů na Strahově* (exhib. cat., Muzeum umění Olomouc). Olomouc : Muzeum umění Olomouc, p. 104, no. 102.

¹⁰ On painter František Tkadlík see especially: PETROVÁ, Eva, *František Tkadlík*, Prague 1960 (with references to the sources and earlier literature).



4 5 Johann Gruss the Elder, *Abraham Praying for Divine Blessing in a Landscape*, 1840. Prague, Picture Gallery of the Royal Canonry of Premonstratensians at Strahov.

by friendship.¹¹ Gruss gave Zeidler for his fiftieth birthday a large canvas he had painted, entitled *Abraham Praying for Divine Blessing in a Landscape* (fig. 4), which we know of from literature on this period.¹² A look at the canvas provides a good idea of Gruss's abilities: Abraham, in a pathetic but somewhat stilted pose, is set against a background of tall mountains, but the centre of the picture is empty. It was beyond Gruss's powers to master both composition and correct proportions. On the other hand, in a small and intimate work (such as the drawing of the Head of Christ; fig. 5), where he did not have to worry about the construction of the composition, Gruss shows a degree of skill and knowledge of contemporary Nazarene art,



5 Johann Gruss the Elder, *Head of Christ*, Prague, Royal Canonry of Premonstratensians at Strahov.

¹¹ On Johann Gruss the Elder see particularly: DOSKOČIL, Oldřich. Johann Gruss the Elder and Painting as a Kind of Religiosity. In KOTKOVÁ 2006, p. 181-191.

¹² DOSKOČIL, Oldřich. [entry] Johann Gruss the Elder, *Abraham Praying for Divine Blessing in a Landscape*. In KOTKOVÁ 2006, 230, no. III /17.

which he was able to display in a somewhat stiff and simplified manner.

Letters exchanged between Abbot Zeidler and Johann Gruss, which were discovered only a few years ago, indicate that the restoration work started on 23 July 1839 but was accompanied by substantial difficulties. These are discussed extensively in the letters. Gruss had originally thought that the restoration work could be fully completed within the course of two to three weeks, but in the end “9 volle Wochen mit unermüdetem Fleiß an diese Arbeit gefesselt war [...]”.¹³ But even that amount of time was not enough for Gruss. The Abbot wanted to accelerate the pace of the repair work any way he could so that he could display the work in the monastery picture gallery and the painter found himself under evident pressure. As a result he did not let the fills and grounds dry properly before he began the retouching: “...und kann nur mit gutem Gewissen nur einen Fehler nachweisen – der von üb[?] le Folgen hätten seyn können, nemlich diesen – daß ich zu hastig und eilig mit den Verrichtungen vorwärts schritt, ohne die gehörigen Zwischenräume und Zeitfristen zu beobachten, die man des Trocknens wegen bei allen Ausfertigungen von Oelgemälden und Oelrestorationen zu beobachten für gut findet [...]”.¹⁴ This and other errors had an obvious impact on the overall state of Dürer’s painting. Nevertheless, Gruss produced the best work of his life under the given circumstances and the manner in which the restoration was carried out was consistent with the contemporary approach to the renovation of Medieval works. The style of the retouching and overpainting also almost surprisingly show that he had good knowledge of the form of Nazarene painting he would have encountered in Central Europe in the 1820s and 1830s. Also admirable is his personal attitude to the work entrusted to him and his great respect for Albrecht Dürer, which is clear in the aforementioned letters: “...eile ich zu meinem geliebten Albrecht und mache mit Herzenslust die Wunden vollends heil, die Zeit und Unglumpf geschlagen haben [...]”.¹⁵ Gruss knew both František Tkadlík and Josef Führich, as all three had studied at the Prague Academy under Josef Bergler the Younger.¹⁶ All three painters were also linked by strong religious conviction, and their Catholic faith understandably showed through in their art. Tkadlík also oversaw the beginning of Gruss’s repair work on Dürer’s painting, as again is indicated in the letters: “Leicht könnten Eure Gnaden von Sachverständigen vielleicht von unserm Freund Kadlik [Tkadlik] selbst disem Tadel über meine Eile vernommen haben [...]”.¹⁷ Tkadlík’s role during in this repair work should not, however, be overestimated; Tkadlík became seriously ill in the autumn of 1839 and he died on 16 January 1840,¹⁸ and Gruss did not complete the restoration of Dürer’s painting until 31st October 1841. Furthermore, if we look at the face of the Madonna in *The Feast of the Rose Garlands*, which is Gruss’s work, there is no analogy to be seen with Tkadlík’s work,

¹³ National Archive Prague, Premonstratensian Order at Strahov, Documents ÚK I Q 1832-1837, box 487; see also to this correspondence: KOTKOVÁ, Olga. Dürers Lament: Johann Gruss Restores The Feast of the Rose Garlands. In KOTKOVÁ 2006, especially p. 197-201.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ The contacts among Gruss, Führich and Tkadlík are described for instance by DOSKOČIL, Oldřich. Odras provinčního nazarénismu v díle Johanna Grusse staršího (1790-1855). In KAISEROVÁ, Kristina – VESELÝ, Martin (eds.). *Národ místo boha v 19. a první polovině 20. století. Sborník příspěvků z konference konané na Univerzitě J. E. Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem 2005*. Ústí nad Labem : Univerzita J. E. Purkyně, Ústav slovansko-germánských studií, 2006, pp. 52-73.

¹⁷ National Archive Prague, Premonstratensian Order at Strahov, Documents ÚK I Q 1832-1837, box 487; see also to this correspondence: KOTKOVÁ, Olga. Dürers Lament: Johann Gruss Restores The Feast of the Rose Garlands. In KOTKOVÁ 2006, especially 197-201.

¹⁸ PETROVÁ 1960, p. 118, 126.

and in any case, Tkadlík's female figures are based mainly on the work of Raphael, and nothing like that is reflected in any way in Gruss's additions to the painting. A look at the Virgin, with her long face, strong chin, long pointed nose and her hair brushed back, clearly shows that Gruss carefully studied the work of his friend Joseph Führich; compare it, for instance, to the face of St Genevieve in the drawing *Genevieve Listens to the Song of Golo* (1824 – 1825; fig. 6) from the cycle created for the edition of Tieck's *Legends of St. Genevieve* (published in 1830 – 1831).¹⁹



6 Joseph Führich, *Genevieve Listens to the Song of Golo*, 1824 – 1825. Prague, National Gallery in Prague.

A similar type of female figure (concretely in the case of Mary Magdalene) was used by Führich in *The Entombment* (after 1834; fig 7), a painting that reproduces the design Führich created (1834) for the last station of the *Stations of the Cross* on Petřín Hill in Prague. The appearance of this design was also spread by a graphic print by Josef Skála in 1836,²⁰ which Gruss, working on the *Feast of the Rose Garlands* from 1839, could easily have been familiar with. Führich (who moved permanently to Vienna in 1834) “supplied” Gruss, however, with far more than just the face of the Virgin – it was through Führich that Gruss came to terms with Dürer's artistic heritage, for as Führich himself acknowledged in his biography this was the Master he most admired.²¹ In particular the experience of Dürer, which occurred on Twelfth Night in the early 1820s, profoundly affected him.²² Various

paraphrases of Dürer's work and especially of his drawings and engravings, which Führich came face to face with while he was in Vienna, appear regularly in Führich's art. Sometimes he adopted Dürer's model 'verbatim, at other times he borrowed only a particular motif– for instance, in the lower right-

¹⁹ TOMÁŠEK, Petr. Přestupní stanice Praha: Joseph Führich v Čechách na počátku 30. let 19. století / Zwischenstation Prag: Joseph Führich in Böhmen in den frühen 30er Jahren des 19. Jahrhunderts. In MACHALÍKOVÁ, Pavla – TOMÁŠEK, Petr (eds.). *Josef Führich (1800 – 1876). Z Chrastavy do Vídně / Joseph Führich (1800 – 1876). Von Kratzau nach Wien*. Praha : Národní galerie v Praze ve spolupráci s Oblastní galerií Liberec, 2014, especially pp. 220-222, fig. no. 122.

²⁰ TOMÁŠEK, Petr. Ve službách „trůnu a oltáře“: Führichovo umělecké a pedagogické působení ve Vídni / In den Diensten von „Thron und Altar“: Führichs Künstler- und Lehrtätigkeit in Wien. In MACHALÍKOVÁ – TOMÁŠEK 2014, especially 247-250, fig. nos. 134-135.

²¹ See also: KOTKOVÁ, Olga. [entry] Joseph Ritter von Führich, *The Entombment*. in: KOTKOVÁ 2006, 213-214, no. III/7.

²² On Führich's experience of Dürer see: MACHALÍKOVÁ, Pavla. Pražská Akademie: školení, cesty, vzory / Die Prager Akademie: Schulung, Reisen, Vorbilder. In MACHALÍKOVÁ – TOMÁŠEK 2014, 82-83 (with earlier bibliography to this point).



7 Joseph Führich, *The Entombment*, after 1834. Kroměříž, Collection of the Archbishopric of Olomouc, Archiepiscopal Castle and Gardens.

hand corner of a picture entitled *The Shepherd Henry over Golo's Dead Body*²³ (1826) he placed plants and grasses à la Dürer. In all likelihood Führich had seen these drawings in 1822 or 1823 while residing in Vienna, or he allowed himself to draw inspiration from the physiognomic types of Dürer's male and female saints. Similarly, a rabbit in the right-hand corner of the canvas *St Genevieve Consoled by an Angel*²⁴ (1826) is inspired by the famous drawing *Resting Hare* by Albrecht Dürer.²⁵ That Gruss was inspired by the work of Führich in his repainting of the face of the Virgin turns out to have been the correct choice: Führich's clearly defined period style (in which Führich equalled the work of Dürer) was something that Gruss, an artist of far more humble talent and limited abilities, could easily imitate. Whereas if he had sought inspiration directly in the works of the Old Masters and tried on his own to transfer their style to the provincial Nazarene style of the 1830s, he clearly could not have avoided artistic fumbling, uncertainty and disunity. The adoption of Führich's typology thus ensured the stylistic consistency of Gruss's additions. In our opinion it is therefore impossible to regret that Gruss, in completing the painting of Dürer's *Feast of the Rose Garlands*, did not have at hand any work by Dürer or even a copy of Dürer's *Feast of the Rose Garlands* (at this point it was already in Vienna), for which he would subsequently have been criticised even in the Strahov Monastery,²⁶ and all the evidence suggests that it did not occur to either Gruss or Zeidler to look for work by Dürer to refer to in connection with the restoration even though there were prints by Dürer available in the monastery library. It is a pity, however, that Gruss did not know of the copy of *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* (fig. 8) created as a drawing and on a far smaller scale by Václav Mánes in 1823,²⁷ just before the original began to deteriorate extensively in the first half of the 1830s. The more subtle proportions of Mánes's Virgin and her generally more graceful expression may have been more like Gruss's work than to the strong hand of Dürer. In addition, the drawing by Mánes, stored in the collections of the Prague Academy, was extremely precise and captured one detail that Gruss deprived us of: Mánes captured the fly that Dürer originally placed on the cloth on the knee of the Virgin. This fly, which Dürer jokingly placed right by the feet of the Christ Child, was one of the most famous motifs of the Dürer original. After the restoration, done in 1839 – 1841, the fly had vanished from the painting, and it is impossible to know now with any certainty whether the part of the painting where the drapery and the fly were had already flaked away (this was one of the most damaged areas) and was therefore not visible, or whether placing an insect on the knee of the Mother of God had offended Gruss's Nazarene sentiments, further reinforced by his profound Catholic faith.

²³ MACHALÍKOVÁ, Pavla. Inspirace literaturou a ilustrace / Literarische Inspirationen und Illustrationen. In MACHALÍKOVÁ – TOMÁŠEK 2014, 177-180, fig. no. 100.

²⁴ Ibid., fig. no. 99.

²⁵ Dürer's watercolor drawings *The Great Piece of Turf* (1503) and *Resting Hare* (1502) were kept in the collection of Duke Albert von Sachsen-Teschen (1738 – 1822), the founder of the Albertina – see recently: SCHRÖDER, Klaus Albrecht. Albrecht Dürer in the Albertina. In ROBISON, Andrew – SCHRÖDER, Klaus Albrecht (eds.). *Albrecht Dürer. Master Drawings, Watercolors and Prints from the Albertina* (exhibition cat., National Gallery of Art, Washington). Munich; London; New York: Delmonico Books; Prestel, 2013, pp. 1-5.

²⁶ On the copy from Vienna (now in Kunsthistorisches Museum) and Gruss' restoration see: STRAKA, Cyril A. Dürerova Růžencová slavnost na Stahově. In *Týn*, 1918, Vol. 2, Nr. 8, p. 334.

²⁷ See for instance: MACHALÍKOVÁ 2005, 112, 116 or KOTKOVÁ, Olga. [entry] Václav Mánes, *The Feast of the Rose Garlands*. In KOTKOVÁ 2006, 204-205, no. III./1.



8 Václav Mánes after Albrecht Dürer, *The Feast of the Rose Garlands*, 1823, Prague, Academy of Fine Arts.

Gruss's possibly conscious omission of the fly could be understood with some lenience, as its presence in Mánes's drawing causes confusion even today. For example, in a full-page reproduction of a detail of the Virgin that was published in the journal *Umění* the fly is missing and was clearly simply touched out as a defect.²⁸ It is any surprise, therefore, that Gruss, a painter on the artistic periphery with no knowledge of art history or theory or of the scientific approaches to the renovation of art heritage did not understand this joke of Dürer's?

Any assessment of Gruss's restoration of *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* must take into account the influence of the Nazarenes. The leading figures in the Nazarene movement (among them Joseph Führich and František Tkadlík) interpreted the works of Gothic art and the Renaissance in a certain way in their work to produce a comprehensible form that other artists (and the public at the time) were capable of accepting and understanding.²⁹ While Führich had had his horizons widened by his stays in Rome and then in Vienna (where he moved permanently in 1834)³⁰ and was therefore able to come to grips with the legacy of the great Nuremburg Master, this was beyond the grasp of Gruss, who spent his entire life in the north of Bohemia, which he left only on his trips to Prague and, on

²⁸ Compare with the illustration on the back of the front cover of volume 5, LIII, 2005.

²⁹ See for instance: DOSKOČIL 2006, 52-73.

³⁰ See an overview of Führich's life and his stays in Vienna: MACHALÍKOVÁ – TOMÁŠEK 2014, 320-323.

rare occasions, to nearby Dresden. Nevertheless, Gruss devoted a great deal of effort to restoring or one could even say rescuing Dürer's picture and he clearly also felt a responsibility towards Abbot Zeidler, which awoke in him painting skills that he did not demonstrate elsewhere. However, this also fits the general attitude of the Nazarenes at that time, whose lives were strongly informed by their faith, and in this respect one can understand why Zeidler entrusted *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* to Gruss – seen in the wider context this choice was justified. The technical execution of the restoration was something else and in this respect both the Abbot and Gruss failed, for at the interface of the original parts and the later additions an undesirable raising of the paint occurred that had a negative effect on the painting's appearance and showed the lack of experience Gruss had in the restoration of panel paintings created with the level of technique and the dimensions of this one. It must be said here, however, that *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* is an extremely difficult work. According to findings Dürer himself made some errors in the procedure,³¹ meaning that the restoration of the (technologically) damaged painting was beyond the capabilities of the time, and without Gruss's intervention the layers of the painting would have deteriorated further and today there would be little left of *The Feast of the Rose Garlands*. Viewed from this angle, the loss of the fly seems trivial; the major part of Dürer's gem of a work has been saved, even though we have to look at it differently: the painting offers not only the valued symbiosis of Nuremburg and Venice painting, but also the (so far insufficiently appreciated) combination of two periods of art, separated by centuries.

³¹ MARTIN, Andrew J. „Das hat sich ain quarter befunden, in vnserer Capeln, von der Hand des Albrecht Dürers.“ *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* in San Bartolomeo di Rialto (1506 – 1606). In KOTKOVÁ 2006, especially 59, 61-62, 65-66.

Cite:

Kotková, Olga: The Role of Nazarenism in the Renewal of Late Medieval Works: Johann Gruss the Elder's Restoration of *The Feast of the Rose Garlands* by Albrecht Dürer. In *Forum Historiae*, 2017, Vol. 11, No. 2, p. 26-35. ISSN 1337-6861.

Olga Kotková is the curator of the Collection of Old Masters in the National Gallery in Prague. Her research concentrates on Netherlandish, German and Flemish painting and sculpture of the 14th to 17th centuries.

Contact: kotkova@ngprague.cz