

outstanding contribution as a colorist was not given fair recognition until much later. Because of the murky amber cast by the accumulation of dirt and layers of tinted varnish applied by picture restorers to protect the paintings, Rembrandt was thought to be a monotonous colorist with a low-keyed palette. Only when the brilliance of his works was unveiled by cleaning, after World War II, did his original natural skin tones, brilliant whites, and cool grays come forward. I have been told that Rembrandt's painting *Night Watch* (1642) is most talked about in this vein, and the tale that goes with it is both amusing and sad. Let me dwell on the story a little bit more to draw a parallel with eidetic imagery along the lines I have hinted above.

The *Night Watch* was commissioned by Captain Banning Cocq and seventeen members of his civic guards as a group portrait. The work measured thirteen by sixteen feet and contained thirty-four figures all portrayed in a blaze of light, color and motion. Years later, about two feet of the painting was cut off from one side and a chunk of space was cut from the bottom as well, in order to fit a particular wall space. The original title was *The Company of Captain Frans Banning Cocq and Lieutenant Willem van Ruytenburch*; and it was not given the more well-known (totally incorrect) name until the late eighteenth century after layers of varnish and dirt had covered it over. As this strange story continues, we are told that when the painting was fully restored after World War II and its brightness revealed, it was renamed *Day Watch*. Although it was known that the depicted civic guards did not go out on any watches, day or night, apparently this did not matter. My point here is that the so-called restorers and theorists applied the incorrect "treatment" to the original work of art, thereby covering it up and relegating the beautiful fine detail to darkness and obscurity.