
JULIUS S. HELD *The Oil Sketches of Peter Paul Rubens; a Critical Catalogue*. 2 vols. Princeton (NJ), Princeton University Press, 1980 (National Gallery of Art, Kress Foundation Studies in the History of Art, n° 7). I: 698 + xv pp., 71 fig.; II: xv pp. + 504 plates. \$125.00 (2 vols., cloth).

R.-A. D'HULST *Jacob Jordaens*. Translated from the Dutch by P.S. Falla. Ithaca (NY), Cornell University Press, 1982. 375 pp., 252 illus., \$95.00 (cloth).

ROY STRONG *Britannia Triumphans: Inigo Jones, Rubens and Whitehall Palace*. London, Thames and Hudson, Oxford University Press, 1980 (12th Walter Neurath Memorial Lecture). 72 pp., 59 illus., \$13.25.

All these works deal with seventeenth-century Flemish painting. Yet they differ greatly in approach. This is due partly to their varied scope, and also to the ages and nationalities of their authors. Taken together they give us a fascinating cross-section of many of the achievements in Flemish studies over the last fifty years, as well as some indication of the problems still remaining.

I say 'fifty years,' because in Professor d'Hulst's work, one finds him quoting an article on Jordaens published in 1933 by Professor Held (p. 326). This shows the kind of breadth and depth which one can expect in Professor Held's *opus* on Rubens' oil sketches, a worthy successor to his equally magisterial study of Rubens' drawings, published in 1959. In the preface to the latter Held stated that he had originally planned to do a *catalogue raisonné* of Rubens' drawings. But that proved too formidable a task, so he confined himself to a selection. However, in the case of the oil sketches he has managed a full catalogue, of some 456 items, plus 43 questionable or rejected attributions.

Professor d'Hulst's record of publication on Jordaens has been exactly the opposite. In 1974 he completed a four-volume study of the artist's drawings – a full *catalogue raisonné* of 450 items. He had hoped to treat the paintings in the same way, but has found the

task too much. It will have to be left to the younger generation.

Hence, what we have in Professor d'Hulst's new volume is a selective study of Jordaens' paintings, as was the case with Held's 1959 study of Rubens' drawings. Yet in these new volumes by Held and d'Hulst, what we are given are the fruits of their preoccupation with their respective artists over their entire life-times: two treasure-houses of ripe scholarship, which will doubtless be sources of fact, opinion and stimulation for many years to come.

It has not been one of Professor Held's aims to greatly enlarge Rubens' *oeuvre*, a process which has been one of the most dramatic aspects of Baroque studies in recent decades (in marked contrast to the discoveries concerning Rembrandt's *oeuvre* which has drastically contracted). On the contrary, one of Held's major aims has been to cleanse Rubens' *oeuvre* of wrong attributions, by establishing standards and stylistic criteria based on a complete study of the oil sketches. Inevitably some idols have fallen. One is the sketch of St. Gregory and other saints in the Seilern collection (n° A33) which has long appeared as one of the central pieces in the literature on the development of Rubens' greatest Roman commission, the Chiesa Nuova altarpiece. It is good to see this picture expunged, for this reviewer has never been happy with (amongst other features) the clumsy drawing of St. Domitilla, her vacuous expression, or the meaningless zig-zag forms in her drapery.

The individual entries in Held's catalogue are models of what catalogue entries should be: meticulous, concise, yet readable. A fine example is the London National Gallery *Miraculous Draught of Fishes* (Fig. 1) which Held dates ca. 1635-38, refusing to accept Gregory Martin's previous dating of ca. 1618-19. Martin's dating was based on the similarity between the oil sketch and the Mechlin triptych, and also the idea (erroneous as Renger noted in 1974) that the inscription on the Bolswert print must give a *terminus ante quem* of 1621. 'It is above all, however,' as Held trenchantly observes, 'the concept of the figure of Christ which adds an entirely new element; contrary to the massive and solidly sculptural Christ of the

Mechlin triptych, the Christ of the London sketch is caught in a graceful forward motion still further accentuated by the loosely fluttering drapery.'

As a footnote to the discussion of this composition, I would suggest that the kneeling figure of St. Peter, who appears in both the London and the Mechlin pictures, is strongly reminiscent in pose (reversed) and expression of the so-called *Dyng Seneca*, the Hellenistic sculpture now in the Louvre (Fig. 2), of which Rubens made many studies. Doubtless Rubens would have considered the expression and gestures of the Stoic philosopher, whom he much admired, and who is shown literally entering the next world, as peculiarly appropriate for St. Peter confronted by Christ. It is, of course, merely ironic hindsight to note that the antique statue really represents another fisherman!

The arrangement of the entries in Held's catalogue is admirable. Where he deals with a series, e.g. the Life of Constantine or the Whitehall Ceiling, the entries are preceded by lengthy introductory essays – veritable small monographs in some cases. Considering the richness of Held's work, and the amount of time and energy he must have invested, it may seem churlish to ask for anything more. Indeed, as far as organization is concerned, this reviewer has only one complaint: the indexes. On pages 321-22 we find a superb exegesis of the image of the putto and the dolphin, a motif which frequently occurs in Rubens' work. Sadly, you will not find it in the indexes.

One of Held's great discoveries in the course of preparing his book was that the Whitehall Ceiling canvases were no longer in their original positions. He published these findings in 1970, and as a result the ceiling paintings have now been given the arrangement which he argued for – a fine example of applied scholarship.

This reviewer accepts the 'new' arrangement of the Whitehall Ceiling, and all credit must be given to Professor Held for its discovery. Yet, paradoxically, I think it may have been done, in part, for the wrong reasons. I find the diagram on page 218, 'The place of the viewer as assumed in Rubens' design,' unrealistic in several respects. In checking these 'viewpoints' in the



FIGURE 1. Rubens, *Miraculous Draught of Fishes*. London, National Gallery. Held, vol. II, pl. 331.



FIGURE 2. *Dying Seneca*. Paris, Louvre.

Banqueting Hall itself, I found it impossible to make any real visual sense of the paintings at the opposite end of the Hall, either from the doorway or from the 'throne.' Hence the idea that the paintings were arranged to be seen by the occupant of the throne seems unlikely.

Moreover, to state that "This [i.e. the present arrangement] is the arrangement of the canvases in San Sebastiano and of most other Venetian ceilings of the second half of the sixteenth century" (p. 188) is partly misleading. S. Sebastiano, and also S. Francesco di Paola, do indeed have their ceilings arranged so that the viewer, having entered the nave, cannot see the paintings immediately above without walking some distance and turning around. However, the more usual positioning of ceiling canvases in Venetian churches, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, is that seen at S. Nicolo dei Mendicoli, SS. Apostoli, S. Marziale and the Gesuati, where the viewer simply walks through the entrance, looks up, and finds himself oriented for all the ceiling paintings in the centre of the nave.

Why should there be a different arrangement at S. Sebastiano and S. Francesco? The answer, I believe, is that in these churches (but not in the others mentioned above) the viewer's sight above the doorway is blocked by a monk's choir loft. Thus the viewer has to go a

considerable distance before he can see what is on the ceiling above the entrance: and having made that move, it is only logical, in terms of sight angle, that those pictures should be 'turned around' for him. At the Banqueting Hall there is no monk's choir, but there is a balcony which projects more than six feet, from half way up the wall, on the entrance and the sides.

Some twenty years ago, at the Courtauld Institute, there were, for students of the Baroque, memorable tutorials on Rubens by Professor Johannes Wilde and lectures on Van Dyck by Oliver Millar. But I do not recall any official notice of the artist whom one would now rank as the third of the great trio of seventeenth-century Flemish painters, Jacob Jordaens. Doubtless this reflected the opinions of the Courtauld staff that — certainly as we students thought — Jordaens was far too vulgar and uneven a painter to be taken seriously.

For this reviewer (and I suspect many others) it was the great Ottawa exhibition of 1968, organized by Professor Michael Jaffé, which opened one's eyes to Jordaens. Its wealth of material ranged from great religious pieces like the *Dublin Church Triumphant*, the *Stonyhurst Four Doctors of the Latin Church*, the *Skokloster Holy Family Embarked* and the *Ulster St. Christopher*, through the great 'proverb'

pictures (one of which Ottawa subsequently acquired from the Earl of Wemyss), the splendid tapestry designs (a modello for one of which Ottawa had recently bought), and the superb selection of drawings.

Professor Jaffé's catalogue was lavish. Professor d'Hulst's monograph is on a grand scale and appropriately sumptuous for its subject: a folio of nearly four hundred pages, with a mass of fine illustrations, many in colour. The publishers are to be congratulated on a handsome piece of book production.

One inevitably compares Jordaens with Rubens. Of course historically, this is just as unjustifiable as with van Dyck, as Horst Gerson observed. Both van Dyck and Jordaens belong to a younger generation. Yet Jordaens is so dependant on Rubens for his style and for many compositional ideas, that one cannot help constantly referring back to the earlier master. Also, his great range in media provokes comparison with Rubens.

Yet one must remember that Jordaens lived to the age of 85 — over twice as long as van Dyck and twenty-two years longer than Rubens. But perhaps the greatest difference between Jordaens and the other two Flemish painters is that he never went to Italy. Indeed, he made only a few short journeys during his entire life, and these to other parts of the Southern and Northern Netherlands. As Professor d'Hulst remarks in his opening

sentence, 'Few artists have been so closely associated with their native city ...'

Professor d'Hulst steers a masterly course through a mass of material: the products of Jordaens' lengthy life and his studio. The artist's life does not – unlike those of Rubens and van Dyck – provide the biographer with convenient changes of scene, so d'Hulst switches his focus from the development of Jordaens' style to aspects of his work such as portraiture, drawings and tapestry design. Also, he opens his book with a background chapter on Antwerp and concludes with one entitled 'Jordaens the Man and the Artist.'

This last chapter is full of brilliant insights and analyses. Yet this reviewer finds himself in disagreement with parts of it, especially the second paragraph (p. 314):

Rubens and Van Dyck were both court painters who served the aristocracy and were in time ennobled themselves; Jordaens on the other hand was on the side of the people and the bourgeoisie. Rubens grew up in a humanistic environment and Van Dyck came of a patrician family; both enjoyed an upper-class education ... They were men of wide culture ... Jordaens belonged to a class that expected much less from life. His father had made a good living as a respected linen-merchant, but the family's outlook and habits did not take much account of refined cultural values. Jacob himself, as A. Stubbe has written was 'a worthy bourgeois who devoted his whole life to ensuring his own standard of living. He regarded that standard, along with his artistic talent, as entitling him to be treated respectfully by people of every class, to have a say in the city's affairs, to follow his own bent in political and religious matters ...' This defiantly bourgeois attitude, at a time when community life centred on the court and the aristocracy, gave Jordaens a special position as a man and an artist ...

It is surely incorrect to call Rubens a 'court painter who served the aristocracy.' This myth was exploded by Frans Baudouin in 1967 in a famous article where he demonstrated that on Rubens' return to Antwerp from Italy in 1608, the decisive patronage for him came not from the court and aristocracy, but from middleclass townspeople like Nicholas Rockox, the burgomaster, and the merchant Cornelis van der Geest. Van Dyck too found his early patrons amongst this group.

A second point concerns the education of the three Antwerp pain-

ters. We know much about Rubens' upbringing and education. We really know nothing about van Dyck's except by what we can infer from his background. We do know that he was apprenticed to the painter Hendrik van Balen at the age of ten, hence his formal education could not have been extensive. Jordaens was not apprenticed until the age of fourteen, but we know nothing specific about his education either as d'Hulst admits (p. 18).

My third point concerns the quotation from A. Stubbe, from this same source d'Hulst quotes, again admiringly, as his own last paragraph (p. 323):

The Dutch must have realized that their way led in quite a different direction from that of Jordaens. Their firmly held views on life and art placed them in the vanguard of their time, whereas the most realistic of Flemish Baroque painters [i.e. Jordaens] was still the prisoner of a mental outlook that was moving towards exhaustion along with the absolutist world from which it sprang.

Who was A. Stubbe? He published a book on Jordaens and the Baroque in Flemish in 1948. Yet one looks in vain for a citation of this work in the standard sources on Jordaens. For example, it is not cited in the *Pelican History of Art* volume by Horst Gerson (1960), nor does it seem to be listed in Jaffé's catalogue (1968), nor d'Hulst's own catalogue of Jordaens' drawings (1974).

That Stubbe should be missing from these works is not, perhaps, surprising. For his views on the Baroque are terribly old-fashioned and restricted. No one today believes that the baroque style originated with the absolutist monarchy however enthusiastically some monarchs took up the style. Moreover, the Baroque still had a long time to run in other countries after Jordaens' death in 1678. The fact that there is a decline in artistic value in much of Jordaens' late works is surely a matter of personality, not sociology, just as his less refined approach to subject-matter (as compared to Rubens or van Dyck) is a matter of his own desires and tastes, rather than a function of his class background.

In Professor d'Hulst's book one sometimes gets the feeling that he is underrating his subject. One hastens to add that in a way this is understandable, considering the paucity of written records and the

presence of so much inferior studio work. But is it really fair to say, as is said page 316, 'There is no sign of any non-artistic activity on his part, nor does he seem to have had much intellectual curiosity'? Three early self-portraits (232-34) show the artist holding what appears to be a lute, a difficult instrument to learn to play. The very large painting *Diogenes in Search of a Man* (Dresden) seems, as d'Hulst himself observes, to embody something of the artist's own personality, and hence indicates that he had imbibed the Stoicism of Rubens and his circle. Jordaens' conversion to Calvinism from Roman Catholicism suggests a man with at least some deep intellectual convictions.

Finally there is the series of Cupid and Psyche canvases which Jordaens painted for the ceilings of his own house. Those that survive are in the Van der Linden collection, Antwerp (204-6), but thanks to the generosity of their owner were exhibited a few years ago at the National Gallery in Ottawa. This reviewer remembers well admiring their daring foreshortenings and the soft, warm, mysterious character of the colour. Professor d'Hulst is very harsh about them and says that 'Jordaens evidently had in mind some of Rubens' ceiling pieces' (p. 236). However, some are baroque re-workings of Giulio Romano's ceilings in the Palazzo del Tè. But whatever their visual sources and however one rates their quality, the prominent presence of depictions of the Cupid and Psyche story in Jordaens' house strongly suggests a commitment to Neo-Platonism on the part of the painter, since the story was allegorized in Antiquity and from the Renaissance on as the ascent of the soul.

The third volume under review here is by Sir Roy Strong, Director of the Victoria and Albert Museum and former Director of the National Portrait Gallery, London. Dr. Strong is the author of many books and exhibitions, which have contributed enormously to the development of British studies in the last two decades by breaking new ground and demolishing previous opinions. One of the keys of Dr. Strong's success is that his initial training was as a historian, not an

art historian. Consequently he always tends to look at things from a slightly different angle.

The present book is no exception. As a study of Inigo Jones' Banqueting House (which of course contains the only one of Rubens' ceiling decorations to survive *in situ*) and the Whitehall Palace designs of the early Stuarts, Dr. Strong is following to some extent in the footsteps of Per Palme's *Triumph of Peace*, 1957. But that was a detailed comprehensive study. This is a lecture, one of those given in memory of Walter Neurath, the founder of the famous publishing firm of Thames and Hudson, who interestingly enough also published Palme's book.

What Strong does in this lecture is to argue 'the essentially Jonesian roots of the ceiling programme. Transmuted, of course, it inevitably was by the brush of Rubens into the international idiom of the baroque, but there are so many details which Rubens could only have reached by reference to a written programme compiled by someone familiar with the mythology of the Stuart dynasty as it had developed over a period of thirty years' (p. 14). For Oliver Millar, the programme was conceived by Rubens and Charles I; D.J. Gordon thought it must be Inigo Jones and Archbishop Laud. But as Strong points out, Laud 'was never noted for his interest in the arts ... Surely the person who drew up the programme was Inigo Jones' (p. 14). Strong goes on to argue that because Jones designed the building, and because of his association with the masques performed in it, he must have drawn up the programme for the ceiling.

This makes a great deal of sense, in the abstract. And when Dr. Strong applies his theory to individual scenes and figures on the Whitehall Ceiling, there are some excellent results. For example, his analysis of the 'Ancient British' character of the dress of the figures at the right in the *James I recreates the Empire of Great Britain* is convincing.

But this reviewer is less than happy about the position to which Rubens seems to be relegated. First a small, but not unimportant point: Dr. Strong rightly refers to the 'Solomonic thread as the all pervasive one' (p. 34) on the ceiling. But in discussing the picture of James I enthroned in a niche between Sol-

omonic columns, he says: 'The prime source for such columns north of the Alps was, of course, the Raphael cartoons which were purchased by Charles I and used in the Mortlake tapestry workshops' (p. 36). Yet Rubens used the Raphael version of the Solomonic columns (the originals of which are still in St. Peter's in Rome) as early as 1602-3 for his St. Helena altarpiece for S. Croce in Gerusalemme, Rome. He later employed the motif frequently, amongst other places in the group portrait of the *Countess of Arundel and her train* (Munich) of 1620. Van Dyck also employed it during his first English visit, 1620-21, in the *Continence of Scipio* (Oxford) painted for the Duke of Buckingham. However, it should be noted that the Raphael tapestry cartoons were not actually purchased for England until 1624.

A more important point concerns the same Rubens ceiling painting of James I enthroned. Dr. Strong sees Minerva putting down the hydra (which takes place below at the right, pl. 34) as antipapal iconography. 'What Rubens,' he says, 'would surely have been kept in ignorance of when presented with the programme was how specifically anti-Catholic the panel was. To most Protestants the hydra was the Pope identified as the Beast of the Apocalypse. And Jones, we know, was reformist' (p. 39).

The idea that Rubens was hoodwinked into painting anti-Catholic propaganda is incredible. It is also difficult to understand why Charles I, who commissioned the ceiling paintings, would have wanted such propaganda. In a place which was used for, amongst other things, the reception of foreign ambassadors, it would have been a gross insult to most. Also, the king was accused by extremist Protestants of being popish, especially in his use of works of art. Had the Whitehall Ceiling actually contained antipapal propaganda we may be sure that some royalist apologists would have made much of it. But they are silent.

As my colleague Professor Christianson has observed, the Beast of the Apocalypse which Protestant writers identified with the Pope and Anti-Christ was the one described in Revelations 13,1. This creature had seven heads, ten horns and ten crowns, and is the one shown in the 1611 woodcut illustrated by Dr.

Strong (the three 'spare' crowns being worn by the Pope as his tiara), page 38. But the hydra on the Whitehall Ceiling has no crowns, and only four heads. As a student of mine, Ms. Mary Crawford, has noted, Rubens had already employed a three-headed, crown-less hydra in the *Reconciliation of Louis and Marie* in the Medici cycle.

What then is the meaning of the hydra on the Whitehall Ceiling? As Dr. Strong is aware (and says so in n. 39, p. 68), 'The hydra in Ripa can refer to Envy, Wickedness, Vice and the Seven Mortal Sins.' I suggest it was these ideas which both Jones and Rubens had in mind for the Whitehall Ceiling. Both would have known the classical sources of the imagery, viz. the legend of Hercules destroying the hydra as one of his labours. Indeed when Rubens painted this scene for the *Arch of the Mint*, one of the decorations for the *Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi* in 1634 (at the very time when the Whitehall Ceiling paintings were being completed), he employed the figure of Hercules which he had designed previously for one of the ovals of the Whitehall Ceiling.

Rubens' connexion with the Banqueting Hall seems to have begun almost as soon as it was completed. He mentions the 'hall in the new palace' in his famous letter to William Trumbull in September 1621. For Dr. Strong the wording of this letter is a firm indication that the Banqueting Hall was, from the beginning, part of a large-scale complex - a 'new palace' (p. 61). (Rubens' original letter was apparently in French, and hence he used the words 'la sale au nouveau palais'.) Dr. Strong may be right about this. James I may have been planning to have the whole of Whitehall rebuilt by Jones. But one would hesitate to put such a specific meaning on Rubens' words. The Banqueting Hall would certainly have been large enough by itself to be called 'palace,' 'palais,' or 'palazzo.' Presumably Rubens was sent some kind of drawing of it, and he would have recognized its relationship with Palladio's Vicentine Palazzi. Moreover, at this very moment Rubens must have been assembling the material for his *Palazzi di Genova*, which was published in 1622. While many of these palazzi are very large, others, e.g. Palazzi 'G' or 'I' and those of Niccolo Spinola or Andrea

Spinola, are more modest in scale.

Yet Dr. Strong is very right to stress the Solomonic imagery in the Banqueting Hall, not only in Rubens' ceiling, but in the architecture itself. Many of the parallels which he suggests between the latter and Villalpando's reconstruction of the Temple of Solomon are most convincing. As he says, 'it is fascinating that the copy of Villalpando now in the British Library belonged to the old Royal Library and bears James I's arms on its binding. In addition, when Charles I was imprisoned at Carisbrook Castle he spent his time studying our key book ...' As support, I might add that I have made a lengthy study of the use of the Solomonic column in England. While I have found many instances of its use by the Stuarts or their supporters, I have yet to find it employed by their opponents.

Despite my disagreements with some of Dr. Strong's ideas, I think his book is a valuable contribution. It is immensely stimulating, as a good lecture should be. As he admits, page 16, 'Rubens to some extent gets lost,' because he is trying 'to look at the ceiling from the English or Jonesian end.' In this he succeeds. He adds that he makes 'no apology for this' because he has no doubt 'that Rubens scholars will in their turn tilt the balance back again.' Since this is a review of Flemish studies, I hope I will be forgiven for trying to do precisely that.

J. DOUGLAS STEWART
Queen's University

LOUISE VOYER *Saint-Hyacinthe, de la seigneurie à la ville québécoise*. Montréal, Libre Expression, 1980 (Patrimoine du Québec). 122 p., 5,95\$. — *Églises disparues*. Montréal, Libre Expression, 1981 (Patrimoine du Québec). 168 p., 5,95\$.

MADELEINE GOBEIL-TRUDEAU *Bâtir une église au Québec, Saint-Augustin-de-Desmaures: de la chapelle primitive à l'église actuelle*. Montréal, Libre Expression, 1981. 126 p., 7,50\$.

La parution d'une série d'ouvrages sur l'architecture québécoise aux Éditions Libre Expression, à

compter de 1980, marquait l'aboutissement d'un long et pénible cheminement pour attirer l'attention du public sur cet aspect négligé de notre histoire. Ces ouvrages, parus à intervalles réguliers, avaient pour fonction de diffuser des mémoires de maîtrise ou des études réalisées à l'université Laval, appuyant en cela les mouvements de conservation ou de mise en valeur d'un patrimoine immobilier qui avait déjà beaucoup souffert. Malheureusement, la teneur de ces livres et le moment de leur parution sur le marché ne leur permirent pas de jouer les rôles qu'on leur avait assignés. Procédons à un examen sommaire de trois de ces ouvrages.

Comme le soulignait Daniel Latouche dans un journal de facture publicitaire publié par la maison d'édition, l'ouvrage de Louise Voyer, *Saint-Hyacinthe, de la seigneurie à la ville québécoise*, « fera un très bon guide » (dans *Livres d'ici*, Montréal, vi, 30, 1). Après une soixantaine de pages racontant en quatre parties l'histoire de la petite ville de 1794 à 1920, l'auteur présente les principaux monuments de ce lieu, tentant d'en comparer certains à des modèles connus; cela nous vaut des photographies de l'église Notre-Dame de Montréal, de la chapelle des Récollets, des églises de l'Acadie, de Saint-Mathias et de Saint-Grégoire de Nicolet. Ces comparaisons ne sont pas poursuivies dans le cas des autres types de bâtiments qui sont regroupés suivant les services dispensés. Chacun fait l'objet d'une notice descriptive, accompagnée d'une photographie souvent empruntée à la Société d'histoire régionale. Les deux sections regroupant les notes et la bibliographie, une après chaque partie, nous révèlent les causes de la brièveté du texte: l'auteur a manifestement limité l'exploration des sources et se contente d'utiliser des monographies, des fonds déjà constitués (comme le fonds Morisset et celui de la Société d'histoire régionale) ou des journaux locaux. Quelques mentions de documents notariés émaillent ces listes; elles trahissent malheureusement l'absence de dépouillement systématique des archives notariales et municipales qui nous aurait vraiment permis de comprendre l'évolution, ou l'absence d'évolution, aussi intéressante, de cette petite ville québécoise.

Ce livre se révèle donc un excel-

lent exercice d'assemblage qui aurait dû cependant amorcer une réflexion de l'auteur avant la publication de l'ouvrage suivant. *Églises disparues*, déposé chez les libraires au cours du premier trimestre de 1981. Cette réflexion ne semble pas avoir eu lieu, car l'auteur, dans ce cas, regroupe par ordre alphabétique des dossiers d'églises qui ont été la proie d'incendies, de démolitions, ou de transformations radicales leur ayant fait perdre leur caractère original. L'ouvrage est abondamment illustré; quelques photographies, surtout celles qui proviennent de l'Inventaire des Biens culturels, sont très connues, ayant illustré de nombreux livres ou articles portant sur l'architecture religieuse au Québec avant 1850. L'ouvrage de Luc Noppen intitulé *Les églises du Québec* (publié chez Fides en association avec l'Éditeur officiel du Québec, en 1977) portant sur les églises existantes construites avant le milieu du XIX^e siècle, on peut penser que le livre signé par Louise Voyer se voulait un complément du précédent. Il n'en a malheureusement pas la qualité, parce qu'il n'en a pas la profondeur. On se sert encore une fois des monographies paroissiales, de quelques études, des fonds déjà constitués; quelques dossiers étant très minces, le texte et l'illustration en sont un peu étirés. On notera au passage la curieuse formation des sigles décrivant les fonds d'archives que certains historiens associés à l'université Laval utilisent à l'occasion. Ces nouveaux sigles ne tiennent pas compte de l'appellation que les propriétaires des fonds ont eux-mêmes créée, et entraînent des confusions inutiles. Le souci du détail subit quelques anicroches; les références adoptent plusieurs formes au gré des pages et l'érudit Huguette Latour devient, à la page 104 par exemple, une inexistante Huguette Latour qui aurait vécu au milieu du XIX^e siècle.

Cet ouvrage constituait donc à la date de sa parution un état sommaire des dossiers sur certains bâtiments à usage religieux; l'étude de Madeleine Gobeil-Trudeau, disponible au même moment, devait se révéler beaucoup plus dense et plus consistante.

Bâtir une église au Québec, Saint-Augustin-de-Desmaures: de la chapelle primitive à l'église actuelle est présenté