One of those who defined themselves as modern in order to believe": J.-K. Huysmans’s autobiographical comment in an 1883 letter to Paul Bourget, pinpoints an emerging paradox both in his and his period’s art. That is, an increasing focus on art and literature as stimuli for suggestively aestheticized religious and mystic experiences, yet as mediated through the fin-de-siècle’s newest scientific interests and discourses. There is a rich literature on science, its interfaces with art and transforming ideas of the spiritual from the mid-nineteenth century onwards – from Jules Verne’s “science-in-fiction,” Darwinist-inspired spiritual evolutionism, to Symbolist occultism – especially in fuelling fascination with shifting boundaries of fiction and life; sensation and self; modernity and the spiritual. The extent to which resurgent late nineteenth-century religious revivals or their newer expressions contributed to, politicized, and complicated this momentum is perhaps less explored and merits closer study. This article’s concern is a more specific, yet neglected aesthetics and politics of spiritual revival through conceptions of art which, arguably, were to contribute compelling new insights within these broader developments. Focusing on two of the period’s most prominent art writers – Fromentin and Huysmans – it examines their suggestive navigation of tensions between science, the natural, art and subjectivity around a growing interest in the spirituality of Northern European Renaissance artists as so-called “primitives” to develop models of art that do not so much transcend, but rather amplify these tensions.

My article’s particular focus is two-fold. First it considers how and for what purposes, Fromentin and Huysmans reposition ideas of “primitive” or regressive artistic tendencies from earlier art-historical periods as touchstones for a fin-de-siècle evolving modernity of vision and perception. My second, closely linked theme examines Huysmans’s developed interest in such innovations to show how, via Impressionism and especially from Certains (1889), his concern with a suggestive spirituality of both art and its experience, becomes consummately embodied in his emblem of the primitif modern artist.
Eugène Fromentin’s suggestively spiritual “Primitifs”: observation and invisibility

The genesis of this figure can be traced to Eugène Fromentin’s 1876 *Les Maîtres d’Autrefois*, especially to the final section’s journey to uncover the neglected “masters” of early Flemish and Dutch Renaissance art. Indeed it is here that Fromentin’s overarching themes of artistic revival and pilgrimage (“pèlerinage”), observation and reflection, of “visibility” and “invisibility,” reach their symbolic conclusions. What begins in the spirit of French Third-Republican discourses of nation-building through revivalism becomes instead, as unfolded in the geographically and publican discourses of nation-building through revivalism, an evolutionary genealogy of cultural progress.10 His is a narrative, therefore, that acknowledges the Van Eycks, Quentin Massys, Memling and the art of their contemporaries as emblematic of their period’s “dual artistic character” (“le double caractère de l’art”). Yet, above all, he sees it as marked by its medievalism and socially regressive emphases of Christian ritual in “paintings for the altar or [from] Redemption accomplished, is mediated “not by the art of the altarpiece,”11 to be displaced by the more humanistic, progressive vision expressed in Dutch seventeenth-century art, pre-eminently by Rembrandt’s.12 Fromentin traces a similar path of interests. However, it is precisely Taine’s trajectory and its underpinning teleological drive towards rational explanation of the work of art as itself a rational, scientific expression of its history, that Fromentin’s seeks overturn by his view of early Renaissance visual culture as sites for a mysterious “science” of inward evolution. In fact, his “primitives” provide stimuli for a reflective journey of perception and imagination which, for Fromentin, takes his readers to the possibilities of a deeper “seeing” which rejects discovery and scientific observation as mere encyclopaedic knowledge accumulation,13 to amplify the inward potential of the visible.

These ideas are evocatively explored in Fromentin’s long description of “The Lamb of God,” the central interior panel of the Van Eyck’s *Ghent Altarpiece* (completed 1432, St. Bavo’s Cathedral, Ghent), where this idea of heightened seeing codes an evolution of the process of descriptive observation itself. Even more striking is Fromentin’s emphasis on how the panel’s focus, the act of observation itself. Even more striking is Fromentin’s emphasis on how the panel’s focus, the act of contemplation, is mediated “not by the art of the manuscript illuminator but in painting.”14 In other words, aesthetically, by its art. Reflection is stimulated and prolonged by an accumulation of visual and material detail, and temporal narrative devices that move the reader as if meditatively, in space and time (through the panel’s iconographic details), as well as immersively into a visually intensified world. Description, however, becomes the basis for a greater mystery of exploration intimated in the panel’s patterns and rhythms of natural and aesthetic motifs and effects, from the earthly bands of worshippers – “[from]
ancient bards to Ghent bourgeois; [with] abundant beards, faces a touch flattened, protruding lips, utterly lively expressions— to the celestial sensations of the receding landscape with its “delicate colours” (“couleurs tenders”), fading “faintly tinged with blue marine” to the “iridescent pallor” of a poetically-charged dawn.15

It is here, as Fromentin suggests, not at its visual and symbolic centre, but at the panel’s blurred horizons, that “the spirit may there pause at infinity and dream there symbolical centre, but at the panel’s blurred horizons, that of a poetically-charged dawn.15 But this limitless mystery is also intensified by Fromentin’s sensory and art-critical magnifications of it, bringing the Van Eycks’ much older, emblematic realism closer to the perceptual experience of the fin-de-siècle viewer’s, actively developing the beholder’s senses through art-poetical evocations of indeterminacy to create a spirituality of both sensation and mood. Mirrored in Fromentin’s unfolding critical evocation, his text thus creates an analogous, mobile “poetry of looking” (“une poétique du regard”) to borrow Barbara Wright’s term.17 But this is also a poetry of painting’s materiality as spiritual metaphor, taking readers to further corresponding textual and sensory journeys: from presence to inwardness, from external to internal “view,” from sensation to ineffable mood, much as the devices of fifteenth-century Netherlandish religious art encouraged viewers to travel metaphorically by episodic narrative and descriptive fragments of observable reality, from secular to sacred realms.18

Yet Fromentin also positions the van Eycks as transitional figures. Their art becomes a staging-post towards Hans Memling’s greater realism, seen as more spiritualized, intense, expressive and as visionary. Here, the focus shifts to Jan van Eyck’s Bruges Virgin and Saint Donatian (The Madonna with Canon van der Paele 1434–36: Bruges, Groeningemuseum). Once more, Fromentin’s concern is to heighten and intensify a sense of the robustness of its “natural” effects, drawing out its mixture of “primitive” and opulent physicality: the Virgin, evoked as “ugly” (“laide”), her child, malformed – (“rachitique”), “a poor little malnourished type;”19 Saint George, characterized as strangely effeminate: “an androgynous type” (“une sorte d’androgyne”); the Donor with his hands “scored, all wrinkled” (“carrées, toutes rides”), his face, a “mask” its “rigid muscles, hardened, pitted by age” (“muscles réduits, durs, crevassés par l’âge”), all knit together by “subtle values” (“valeurs subtiles”) and colour tonalities, correspondingly “deep, muted and rich” (“grave, soud et riche”).20 Yet if this precise realism borders on the visibly aberrant and strange, Fromentin’s innovation is a powerful and new association that sees van Eyck’s art of vision as less evolved, artistically and spiritually, than Memling’s more suggestive, synaesthetic art of feeling. Memling, Jan van Eyck’s neglected pupil, eclipsed by an almost cult following stimulated by his elder’s art from mid-nineteenth century onwards,21 is thereby resituated and re-imagined not, as for Taine, emblematic of an inferior and atavistic stage of art and social development, but as a “primitive” in a more expanded, illuminating sense. His is now linked with a complexly mysterious art, more spiritually attuned to the nervous sensitivities and psychological inwardness identified by Paul Bourget as defining the signal modernity of the late nineteenth-century beholder/reader’s experience.22

The final section of “Belgique” teases out and develops this shift in emphasis. Indeed, Fromentin’s close-up on Memling’s Mystical Marriage of St. Catherine (c. 1479, Bruges, Hôpital St-Jean) forms a mirroring pendant to van Eyck’s Bruges Virgin, heightening qualities that, in contrast to van Eyck’s, are evoked as strange, bizarre and unearthly. St Catherine anticipates an almost proto-Symbolist over-refinement. Her face is “child-like and girlish” (“enfantin et feminine”), her hands “full and long, tapering and transparent”; the seated Saint Barbara presents a similarly unearthly and attenuated grace with her “high, narrow neck” (“nuque haute et lisse”), her lips, “sealed and mystical” (“serrées et mystiques”).23 Paradoxically, however, it is in these seemingly “primitive” visual languages, that Fromentin finds expressed an art closer to its medieval “origins.” It is an art highly attuned to its materials and manual processes; an art of “luxury and the beauty of craft” characterized by a rich but concise expressivity of means that seems to develop in intensity before its perceived decline into imitation and formula.24 But even more significant for this argument are the ways in which Fromentin’s descriptive evocations again suggest links between these strange and “spiritualized” expressions of realism, new languages of art and a corresponding evolution in mid-nineteenth-century sensory and perceptual faculties. Textual magnifications (bordering on excess) of unusual sensory effects beginning in observation, thus become vehicles to transcend descriptive mapping, amplifying perception and illuminating the unseen. Fromentin’s art-critical language develops this idea, bringing Memling the artist and, more potently, his art’s mystery out of the shadows. Loaded with lexical evocations of sound, sight and touch that signify intense insight, these in fact, invert what Philippe Hamon calls naturalism’s “milieux transparent” – descriptive effects that render visible,25 instead pushing the reader’s acquisition of “savoir,” (description’s principal function) to intuiting the “unreadable” (“illisible”). There is, for example, Memling’s “extreme resonance of colour” and “passages of half-tones and vaporous half-tints not known even to Van Eyck.”26 In sum, what matters for Fromentin, is that such effects, in which colour-play (tonal, as tint, contrast and intensity) has become a principal agency of insight, are markers not of primitive, but of
evolved vision and heightened capacity to grasp this, of a
greater transfigured realism “which strikes one here like a
light.”32 It is an “illumination” in which Fromentin’s poeti-
cization of Memling’s visual and material mysteries and the
beholder’s engagement in this process, becomes central to
the transfigured “reality” it connotes: a process, inviting a
“seeing” with the spirit and not just as Van Eyck does with
the eye. Memling’s art thus becomes emblematic of a more
significant journey, via perception and the museum, of a
quasi-spiritual recovery and rediscovery. It metaphorizes
what Wright calls “a privileged space” (“un lieu privilégié”),
a Baudelairean “spiritual retreat” (“mansuétude surna-
turelle”) in which making art, including poetically, and the
sacred “act” may coalesce.24 Even more than this: it figures
a space which Fromentin actively identifies with an evolving
state of subjectivity, reflection and potential creation, like
the museums that house Memling’s paintings, as “a sort of
Virgin circumstance”29 of vision, language and art.
This final point is arguably Fromentin’s striking innova-
tion. On one hand, Memling’s art is projected as an alter-
native counter-cultural source for a modern mysticism. Yet
on the other, this mysticism is located less as an ambition
for late nineteenth-century nation-building or a new faith-
based “enlightenment,” but as suggestively correspondent
with a contemporary text and perspectives, seemingly dis-
tant from Fromentin’s. That is, Mallarmé’s 1876 defence
of Manet’s plein-air painting as a touchstone for a new artistic
vision and numinous ideology of it, that discovers mystery,
spiritual qualities – “une sorcellerie,” also suggestively
political – in the “science” as well as artistry of his art.30
Such subtleties in Fromentin’s approach, his suggestion,
via Memling’s and his other “primitives” art, of their “sci-
ence” of the visible as also evocative of mysterious intuition,
did not go unacknowledged by his readers. Indeed these
innovations in Fromentin’s art writings were highlighted
in an important 1881 reassessment of their “delicate art of
complex analysis,”31 challenging views, notably Zola’s, that
placed them as “reactionary” and which instead linked them
to a new, perception-driven and inward-looking modern,
literary naturalism, in which the Goncourts’ “nervous real-
ism” and Huysmans’s early writings are seen as determinant
exemplars.

**Huysmans’s “spiritual” matter: science, artifice and “les primitifs”**

From an early point in his art criticism, Huysmans, like
Fromentin, was similarly preoccupied with an emerging
fascination with a more spiritually-directed art of late
Medieval and early Renaissance so-called “primitives”
and to the potential of its temporally and aesthetically
“regressive,” yet spiritualized aspects. But his attitude
to this interest, unlike Fromentin’s, was initially ambivalent,
shown in his scepticism towards late-nineteenth-century
Medieval and spiritual revivals with their consumerist trapp-
ings, bibelots and cultish mysticism.32 As he quipped late
in life about a growing tide of “modern” saints and spiritu-
(alism: “The main difficulty is to distinguish between hys-
terical subjects and those filled with the spirit of divinity.”33

A youthful attraction to early Northern (and Italian)
Renaissance art is thus initially tempered by his distaste for
its contamination by modern bourgeois fashions. His 1879
Salon review, for example, attributes to the Belgian Jan van
Beers’s religious costume-dramas, a vogueish realism imitat-
ing a “primitif” style – “It’s Van Eyck in hats [...] up-to-the-
minute archaism”– while communicating nothing of its
modernizing spirit.34 Religious fakery inspires further bile
about the recently-built Church of Nôtre-Dame de la Trin-
ité as a shell without “croyants” for the bourgeois “church-
as-smoking-room” (“l’église-fumoir”), this “prayer-stool-
cum-boudoir” (“ce prie-dieu Sophie”), little more than a
fashionable backdrop for aspiring ladies taking their “lunchs
mystiques.”35 And sacred object cults, running themes in
both his fiction and art criticism, is a recurrent obsession.
We find it mercilessly satirized in the proliferating “relies”
accompanying the pilgrims’ oblations at the start of La
Cathédrale (1898), or in Les Foules de Lourdes (1903), in
the opening account’s “explosion of knick-knackery of luxury
goods”36 at the holy Grotto; its phantasmagoria of ghastly
religious bric-à-brac, substituting for mystic revelation,
for “l’esprit divin.” But in Huysmans’s late art criticism, a
developed interest in the art of the so-called “primitives,”
elaborated in his 1904 evocation of Matthias Grünewald’s
art, coupled with what Huysmans sees as the potency of “a
realism of hidden regions” (“d’un réalisme avec dessous”)37–
offered a way out of a spiritual darkness, both aesthetic and
ideological.38 The regressive “realist” of an earlier age be-
comes, as for Fromentin, but through more explicitly con-
temporary aesthetic and cultural routes, an emblem for a
suggestive spirituality of art and being – one that resituates
the “sacred” in the act of perception and ideas of its corpo-
real embodiment, as much as in spiritual subject-matter or
in ways of capturing and communicating it.

Paradoxically, this is a process that begins not merely
in revivalism, but as for Fromentin, is linked both with
ideas of enhanced perception and a mysterious painterly
materiality, stimulated by Huysmans’s initial interest in
Impressionist modernity. Moreover, Huysmans’s view of
Impressionism echoes ideas which Paul Bourget, in an
important early article linking literary naturalism and visual
Impressionism, situated not in “Impressionist” modern-life
subjects, but in its treatment, foregrounding, as Bourget
sees, by continuous nervous “exasperation,” a modern
urgency of nerves in a focus on the potential of perception
to re-create the “real.””39 This focus permeates Huysmans’s early 1880s responses to Impressionist art in ways that suggest his treatment of Impressionism in L’Art moderne (1883) as part of a trajectory of interests and approaches, not, as some scholars see them,40 opposed to but anticipating the apparently anti-modern, Symbolist themes of Certains (1889), extending to his post-conversion Trois primitifs (1905).

In 1883, for example, Huysmans repeatedly reads Impressionist painting against the grain of its perceived objectivity and such narratives of its progressive modernity as Edmond Duranty’s.41 Instead, he stresses its heightened sensations of uncanny, unseen forces acting on nature, for example, turning Monet’s visions of modern railways into phantasmagorias, or seeing Pissarro’s hyper-real colour notations as alchemically-conjured landscapes, evoked as “melting to excess,” (“chauffées à l’outrance”).42 Fantastic “science” and exaggerated perception, here, work to extend the language of his art criticism. What is more, its painterly “science” and exaggerated perception, here, work to extend “a wild frenzy” (“un hourdage furieux”), of disintegrating matter, paint and colour.43

Also signally building on earlier ones, reprising Huysmans’s travels in 1888 to discover German “primitifs”44 and first encounter with Grünewald’s Cassel Crucifixion (1523–4, Karlsruhe: Kunsthalle). It is an encounter also yoked ontologically with the artificial thrust of his Certains articles, in which this growing interest in “primitifs” artists converges with modern Impressionist art, science and their writing into Huysmans’s art-critical and literary concerns at this period to develop alternative models for a contemporary (Northern-focused) spiritual art.

In Certains, for example, Degas’s 1886 Bathers paintings incite in him powerful modern-Medieval transferences, between visions of their bathers’ strangely atrophied flesh, unearthly, almost putrescent beauty and what he calls “the unseen, so resonant of certain “primitifs.””45 “Le Monstre” compares Redon’s Tentation lithographs (La Tentation de Ste Antoine, 1888, Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago) to the hellish fantasies of both modern germ science and medieval bestiaries in a hybrid metaphor of darkness:

psychological, natural and aesthetic, as potent new sources of mystery in art. But, again, “les primitifs” and, in particular, Grünewald’s art, provide the stimuli for these developed science-artifice-spiritual analogies. Memorably reimagined in his novel Là-Bas (1891), in Durtal’s confrontation with the visceral spirituality of Grünewald’s Cassel Crucifixion, and its projection to Durtal’s time across the “chasms” of a lost world,46 Huysmans finds his emblem, not of a revival, style or cliché of “the Middle-Ages rewound” (“le moyen âge raccordé”),47 but of an active interference, an embodied, corporeal mysticism, as an occulted modernity in late nineteenth-century art and literature. Indeed, the need for emblems that might continue to answer to both imperatives yet revitalize and transform them, is central to Huysmans’s contrasting Flemish and Cologne school “pilgrimages” in Trois primitifs, highlighted with particular force in his detailed evocation of Grünewald’s “spiritual naturalism”: this discussion’s final focus.

Trois primitifs: regression and perception – towards a modern “spiritual” art

At its core is Huysmans’s developed treatment of his theme of the “regressive” modern artist. Indeed, the 1904 “Grünewald” article,48 as the centre-piece of Trois primitifs, in an important sense, reprises – temporally and imaginatively – the final stages of the journey of Les Maîtres d’Autrefois to the aberrant but “spiritualized” realisms of Dutch and Flemish art. Like Fromentin’s “Memling,” it “pioneers” – retrieving from obscurity a new “primitive” modern, even though Fromentin’s remains an occulted presence in Huysmans’s text. It follows, too, other travels, art-historical and fictional, from Emile Verhaeren’s 1886 “Les Gothiques allemands” – the first treatment to identify a potential fin-de-siècle appeal in Grünewald’s intense colourism and “art farouche”49 – to Durtal’s encounters
(in Là-às) with “primitive” artists (notably, again, Rogier van der Weyden, Metsys, Memling, the van Eycks), their “untranslatable” disturbances in image, mood and verbal evocations, acting as points of transference, “an exit from the senses,” between an unseen spirituality of past and present. But Huysmans amplifies these sources in two ways that are of signal relevance here. First, is his stress on the abnormal intensity of Grünewald’s language of expressive realism – he does this through a heightened mediation of its sensational effects on its viewers – as a model for reanimating contemporary naturalism linked with his conception of the primitifs’ “absolute realism permeated by gushes of the spirit” (“réalisme absolue avec jets d’âme”). Second, is his communication of this idea in an expressive science and artistry of perception as spiritual, which in turn, figures a transformation and evolution in the viewer’s potential “spiritual” engagement with Grünewald’s art.

The journey begins, emblematically, like the final stages of Fromentin’s, in an apparently forgotten corner of art history. Yet Huysmans’s detailed response to Grünewald’s Isenheim Altarpiece turns his revival into another more illuminating exploration. That is, he sees in Grünewald’s expressive naturalism an art pushed to frontiers of realism and symbolism to a point of aesthetic and spiritual expansion – where art, materiality, subjective and spiritual realities converge.

Central to this idea is Huysmans’s stress on the perceptual and cognitive mystery of the viewer’s experience of the Isenheim polyptich, differing from contemporaries’

Matthias Grünewald (Mathis Nithart Gothart). The Crucifixion, from the Isenheim Altarpiece, c.1512–15, oil on panel, Musée d’Unterlinden, Colmar, France/ Bridgeman Images.
interest in Grünwald’s art, by his approach to it as a dialogue. The Altarpiece’s complicated structure, with its four layers of painted surfaces, unusually has, as its outside panel, the Crucifixion, depicted not as an event, but as a meditation on the most gruelling aspects of suffering. Huysmans’s encounter with it fleshes out this aspect, emphasizing the Crucifixion’s sombre and vivid realism, as materially, cognitively and even spiritually overwhelming. Yet the movement is also to recover what is aesthetically and spiritually modern and pertinent, especially from the human and material darkness of the “Crucifixion”: a process Huysmans mirrors further on, in magnifying the plenitude of the brilliant colour and strange majesty of the Resurrection and final scenes of the Desert Saints within. His focus thus turns on the abnormal intensity seen as central to Grünwald’s expressive plastic language, stressing, in a vocabulary remarkably similar to his 1889 treatment of Cézanne’s “hourdage” (“frenzy”), its “typhoon of disintegrating art” (“typhon d’art déchéant”), “impression of overwhelming horror” (“impression de lamentable horreur”), making it difficult to take in, “it stuns you” (“il vous abasourdit”), evoking an unknown, that transcends a capacity to grasp it in language. What is more, the sense of being at the limits of narrative or art-critical possibility, creates a parallel dynamic of the alterity of the Crucifixion’s visual and material “typhoon” and the Resurrection’s answering “effusion of an almost palpable divinity” (“effusion de la divinité presque tangible”) (figuring similar “violations” of body/language boundaries in Les Foules de Lourdes), which Huysmans builds through an abnormal intensity of perceptual encounter, that becomes a form of disperception as malady and vision. This approach, while not new to Huysmans’s art-criticism, here acquires greater aesthetic and cognitive complexity. His evocation of Grünwald’s crucified Christ as a collection of leaky and rotten body parts, with his giant, disproportionate body, “livid and putrefying,” “nails, blue with decomposition,” “cheek, striated with the stripes of martyrs,” would seem almost comical if it were not so frightful. And this idea of perceptual revulsion bordering on the pathological as key to grasping the intensity of Grünwald’s “realism,” is developed in Huysmans’s amplified contrasts between the “brutal” Colmar (Isenheim) Christ and the more visually and theologically refined later Karlsruhe copy.

Yet, for Huysmans, it is also by its very limitations that the Colmar Christ, both “theological and primitive” (“théologique et barbare”), seems to push the boundaries of Grünwald’s art to a new expressive level. Strikingly, this visual “barbarism” is again linked to something highly modern and evolved on the part of the viewer: to a perceptual, subjective intensity it invites. Indeed, Huysmans develops what become the Colmar Christ’s generative discontinuities of colour, scale and sensory effects in a further series of contrasts between visual scale, Christ’s exaggerated one; St. John’s, “bald and sickly” (“glabre et minable”); Mary Magdalen’s “ugly and dislocated” (“laide et disloquée”), contrasting with the Virgin’s “ethereal, fine and absolutely modern” (“friée et fine, toute moderne”), and their linking in an overarching dynamics of material, aesthetic and spiritual darkness and light.

These ideas are reprised most forcefully in the Crucifixion’s evocation of its subjects’ passage through a state of material and figurative disintegration, from “a backdrop beginning in darkness,” to aesthetic and spiritual re-composition. But here also, the stress on heightened perceptual registers, especially of colour sensation, that for Huysmans “fills the eye” with dark and radiance – “giving hue and tone, despite their sombre depths,” lights up “Christ’s vitreous skin,” irradiates the Virgin’s “astonishing whiteness” – pushes a perceptual grasp of Grünwald’s visceral, symbolic realism to a point of abnormally intense cognition, to a point in other words, “where heightened cognition creates space for the spiritual.” Yet inasmuch as Huysmans suggests an inner absorption of the art-work through extended linguistic and imaginative “imitations” (imitatio) to induce a state of intense spiritual preparedness – advent, which in Medieval Christian mysticism, emerges as a pre-condition of faith, Huysmans also intimates this as aesthetically and psychologically conditioned and contingent. Perhaps most striking, however, is that Huysmans repositions Grünwald’s modernity in its very dissolution of hierarchies between body, sensation, art and mystery, in which boundaries of history and the present; perception and being are enlarged, become “spiritualized.”

In this way, Huysmans’s presentation of the Colmar polyptych, what he identifies as strikingly spiritual in Grünwald’s art, transcends a focus on a “pseudo-spirituality” of subject, object or type, distancing his approach from Catholic spiritual revivals or, indeed, the virulent mysticism of such groups as Joséphin Péladan’s “Rose+Croix,” which he dismisses as “mysticism for schoolboys” (“mysticisme des pions”). It becomes, rather, a process analogous to the Symbolist critic Aurier’s idea of “prolongation” as spiritualized poetic expansion. As his mirroring evocative dyptich of the Colmar Resurrection panel shows, the sense of Christ’s “blossoming and scintillating” transfiguration, heightened by its material and chromatic suggestiveness: “these Japanese fabrics which metamorphose […] from one colour to another,” is seen, therefore, as much to do with a potential of perception and its capacity to recreate spiritual plenitude, as of subject-matter or its expression. Picking up on a Symbolist idea of form as a route to the ineffable, Huysmans situates the mysticism of Grünwald’s Resurrection as translated by “the game of colours and lines” (“les simulacres des couleurs et des lignes”) that serve to pro-
long aesthetic reflection, taking viewers, as Huysmans avers, more deeply into spirituality than any theologian could. But significantly, these “Symbolist’ elements of Grünewald’s art do not negate its naturalist visual and painterly effects as means of extending or “prolonging” its suggestive power. Rather, for Huysmans, Grünewald’s Isenheim Altarpiece reveals him as “a full-throated mystic” (“en pleine hallali mystique”64): a process in which the viewer-as-mystic, is moreover implicated, compelling engagement as much with the material force and “barbarism” of Grünewald’s vision as with its spiritual message. As Huysmans affirms: “He [Grünewald] is at the same time, a naturalist and spiritualist, savage and civilized, frank and complicated.”65

He is also modern, offering a visceral experience of art as a form of “primitive” reality that Huysmans now associates with a powerful racial vitality. Paralleling a rather unsettling connection Fromentin makes between Memling’s spiritually rarefied types and their “purification” by his art, this racial subtext points to a darker message in Huysmans’s “Grünewald,” explicit in its pendant “Frankfurt Notes,” in a stark vision of the “primitif” as a racially exclusive ideal.66

In sum, what is striking here is that Grünewald’s presentation as a barbarian (“un barbare”), gestures less to an emblem of martyrdom with which Huysmans could identify, as some scholars argue,67 but to something more mould-breaking. That is the re-positioning of the fin-de-siècle viewer as a “primitive,” whose perceptions are galvanized to a point of responsive tension and primal identification, strung, as it were, between the dark glass of the aesthetic and belief.

If Fromentin’s physical and emblematic pilgrimage in the closing pages of Les Maîtres d’Autrefois traces a neglected history of art to the possibility of a more spiritualized present one, in short, from the museum to the sanctified space, Huysmans’s visit to Colmar is also framed as a journey. But it is one paradoxically that leads rather from art to the cloister, than from the cloister more deeply into art. Similarly, the example of Grünewald’s spiritual naturalism subsumes a more narrowly-focused 1890s Symbolist interest in suggestive or expressive languages of “form” as routes to the ineffable into an amplified and mysterious naturalism. It fuses science and subjectivity in the exemplary emblem of Grünewald’s regressive modernity, making this – and not Catholicism per se – portal to, and bearer of, spiritual and aesthetic insight in a new re-energized model of art, at once visceral and luminous, both dark and light, as “mystique,” “symboliste” and “barbare.”
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