Addenda to *Flemish Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*

WALTER LIEDTKE
Curator, European Paintings, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Some of the best catalogue entries published by the Metropolitan Museum during the past decade are those that Guy Bauman contributed to *The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection* (1984) and to *Liechtenstein: The Princely Collections* (1985). Their worth was proven again when a problematic picture seen in 1988 led me back to Guy’s essay on a rare panel in Vaduz, “the masterpiece of Jan de Cock.” In two fluid pages Guy explains the uncommon subject and iconography, the artist’s distinctive presentation, and the “historical personage” himself—all quite remarkable considering that the identity of this obscure but important Flemish painter of the early sixteenth century has been a matter of extensive speculation in the literature. When I told Guy how much I admired this catalogue entry, he said, both to my surprise and to my relief, that whenever he began to wonder if he would amount to much as an art historian, he would re-read the Jan de Cock essay and decide to go on.

The exceedingly complex and fragmentary evidence encountered in the area of Early Netherlandish painting was well met by Guy’s restraint and sense of responsibility in writing about works of art. For the present article, in which the task is simply to discuss works added to the collection of seventeenth-century Flemish paintings since 1984, Guy’s example goes beyond what is needed, although his criticism is missed. A later publication of addenda to the Flemish catalogue will consist of revisions to the entries dating from 1984. Those notes especially will seem to me an inevitable and inadequate tribute to Guy.


Subsequent notes in this article follow each entry.

Additions to the Collection of Seventeenth-Century Flemish Paintings

A. New Accessions

**Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640)**

*A Forest at Dawn with a Deer Hunt* (Figure 1)
Oil on wood
Height, 24¼ in. (61.6 cm); width, 35½ in. (90 cm)

In very good condition overall. The painting was cleaned in 1989; the use of colored varnish to fill the pattern of craquelure in the receding trees and forest floor to the right had considerably diminished the impression of space and atmosphere, as is evident in earlier photographs. The foliage and a small pond in the lower left corner read unclearly due to craquelure and some light abrasion. The panel is composed of ten small boards (see Figures 3, 4). Their configuration suggests that the central section was first intended as a support and then was expanded; it seems likely that this occurred at an early moment in the course of Rubens’s work.

This superb landscape of about 1635 is a crucial addition to the Museum’s collection of Flemish paintings: with twelve varied works by Rubens, the *Feast of Acheloës* by Rubens and Jan Brueghel the Elder, five paintings from Rubens’s workshop, and five early copies after compositions by Rubens, a landscape painting by Rubens was the single most desired acquisition in this area. *A Forest at Dawn* is the first finished landscape by Rubens in America, and it appears to be the last that will appear on the market for decades to come. Almost all of the approximately three dozen known landscape paintings by Rubens have long been secure in British and Continental collections, many of them royal or princely.

The picture has been in a distinguished Welsh collection for more than 180 years: that of Sir Wat-
Figure 1. Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640), A Forest at Dawn with a Deer Hunt, ca. 1635. Oil on wood, 62.2 × 90.0 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Purchase, The Annenberg Foundation, Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, Michel David-Weill, The Dillon Fund, Henry J. and Drue Heinz Foundation, Lola Kramarsky, Annette de la Renta, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, The Vincent Astor Foundation and Peter J. Sharp Gifts; The Lesley and Emma Sheaf Collection, Bequest of Emma A. Sheaf, and Theodore M. Davis Collection, Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, by exchange; Gift of George R. Hann, in memory of his mother, Annie Sykes Hann, by exchange; Gifts of Mrs. George A. Hearn, George Blumenthal, George H. and Helen M. Richard and Mrs. George A. Stern and Bequests of Helen Hay Whitney and John Henry Abegg and Anonymous Bequest, by exchange; supplemented by gifts and funds from friends of the Museum, 1990, 1990.196

kin Williams-Wynn (1772–1840), fifth baronet, and his descendants. Their seat is Llangedwyn Hall in North Wales; so far as is known, A Forest at Dawn remained there almost continuously after its purchase in 1806 at the sale of the celebrated Lansdowne collection. In the catalogue of the auction held on March 19 and 20, 1806, at Lansdowne House in Berkeley Square, London, the painting appears as lot 62: “A Grand Landscape; scene, the Sun setting in fervid Heat, darting its fierce Rays from behind a Wood, in that richness of vivid splendor that art can seldom describe, and none but the daring hand of a great painter would attempt to accomplish—it almost dazzles the eye to look at it.”

The sale was attended by Sir Abraham Hume, a connoisseur, collector, and friend of Sir Joshua Reynolds. Hume's copy of the sale catalogue (Courtauld Institute Library) is annotated against lot 62: “This picture (which is engraved among Rubens landscapes [Figure 2]) belonged to Sir Joshua Reynolds and was sold by him in his life time to a friend for £100: bought by Sir W. W. Wynne [sic] for £320.” Reynolds died in 1792; two years earlier the London Morning Herald (April 5, 1790) reported on the March 27 sale of the collection of Nathaniel Chauncey (1716/17–1790): “The beautiful little landscape by Rubens, late in the Chauncey Collection, was purchased by Lord Lansdowne. . . . The
fervid sun-beams, through the trees, Sir Joshua appears to have been fired with when he painted his Iphigenia!" Reynolds painted a portrait of Chauncey (1774?), and is known to have had other dealings in pictures with him.

The only owner of the painting now known to have preceded Sir Joshua Reynolds is Rubens himself: A Forest at Dawn is almost certainly identical with no. 108 in the 1640 inventory of Rubens's estate: "Un bois avec un chasse à l'aube de jour, sur fond de bois." This entry in the Specification is the origin of the picture's present title. The lost Flemish original of the French Specification is derived from an inventory of Rubens's possessions begun on June 8, 1640, nine days after the artist's death.

The point is of interest because the subject may have been, for Rubens, a forest at sunset. Whether the yellow and red rays of the sun suggest "l'aube de jour," as they did in 1640, or "the Sun setting in fervid Heat" (1806) will be a matter of opinion and personal experience. It should be considered, however, that a fair number of landscapes by Rubens dating from the 1630s depict scenes in which a setting sun is surely intended. Similar effects of light pouring through trees are found in Rubens's Landscape with Cows in the Gemäldegalerie (SMPK), Berlin, and in the Landscape with a Waggon at Sunset in the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam. Goethe noted that the setting sun in the Return from the Harvest in the Palazzo Pitti, Florence, casts shadows in two directions and that this was an example of Rubens's artistic freedom. As in the case of Rembrandt's Night Watch (which became a "Day Watch" after cleaning), changing the title of A Forest at Dawn would be to argue naturalistic causes for artistic effects.

Rubens painted landscapes during two periods of his career: from about 1614 to 1620; and from the late 1620s (when he worked in Madrid and in London) to about 1638. His later interest in the subject is often related to his purchase in May 1635 of the Château Het Steen at Elewijt, and it is generally considered a more private side of his activity. The support here (see Figures 3, 4), a panel made up of small, seemingly leftover bits of wood, suggests that Rubens painted the picture for his own pleasure. A number of his landscape paintings remained in the artist's collection. Their imaginary viewers were, in a sense, Titian, Bruegel, Rubens himself, and a few of his artistic contemporaries, rather than the grand but less qualified critics for whom he had so often worked.

Rubens's Northern antecedents are sensed more strongly in his late landscape paintings, even while

Figure 2. Schelte à Bolswert (ca. 1581–1659), after Peter Paul Rubens, A Forest at Dawn with a Deer Hunt, ca. 1635–36. Engraving, 30.7 x 44.4 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Elisha Whittelsley Collection, The Elisha Whittelsley Fund, 1951, 51.501
his admiration of Titian colors the Flemish scenery. The most immediate models for this dramatic woodland view are found in paintings by Roelant Savery (see Figure 6) and by Gillis van Coninxloo. However, Rubens always found possibilities in works by other artists that they never exploited to the same extent; in general, he carried their ideas further by a renewed reference to nature (more objective versions of the light effects seen here occur in Rubens's drawings of actual landscapes),¹¹ and by adopting their and other artists' influences to the principles of his own style. Here, for example, Rubens's experience not only of Titian but also of Elsheimer affects the mood of the landscape (although Rubens's contact with Elsheimer can no longer be traced in any single motif).

The composition of A Forest at Dawn is inspired by patterns employed in earlier Flemish forest scenes, such as those by Savery, Coninxloo, Abraham Goovaerts, and Jan Brueghel the Elder. Coninxloo's oeuvre offers the most obvious examples of a surface filled with tree trunks and foliage. His space is organized by groups of trees closing the view to either side, and a third cluster of trees in the center divides the view into two principal recessions.¹² Brueghel modified this pattern in a more realistic direction (as had his father, Pieter Bruegel the Elder, in drawings) by opening up the masses and stressing continuity of space from side to side in the middle ground and background.¹³ The particular kind of repousoir seen on the left, with a blasted tree embedded in a mound of earth (Figure 5), was a favorite motif of Savery's and was admired by Jacob van Ruisdael and other artists who represent a more naturalistic stage of landscape painting than that of Savery. An engraving after Savery (Figure 6) offers the precedent of a brightly backlit forest complete with a hunter and hounds chasing three deer (a stag and two does, as appear in this picture).¹⁴

Few artists could obscure their references to earlier painters as much as Rubens does here and in other landscapes. His skill in reformulating compositions is complemented by a fluidity of brushwork quite unlike the linear handling of his forerunners. Strokes of bright color penetrate the darker passages and suggest daylight dissolving the apparent solidity of forms. Even in this densely wooded corner of nature one senses the sweep of earth and sky that conveys Rubens's conception of creation, or so it seems in contemporaneous and slightly later paintings, such as the Landscape with Rainbow (Wallace Collection, London) and the Landscape with the Château Het Steen (National Gallery, London).

Rubens's view of nature in the present picture differs from that in his more pastoral scenes. The bright flash of sunlight through the trees has the startling quality of an alarm, a signal that the chase has begun. Rubens's romantic vision of nature as an encounter of elemental forces, of opposites such as light and darkness, life and death, growth and decay, extends the imaginary, sometimes mystical tradition of Northern landscape and gives his essentially realistic landscapes a sense of myth and metaphor.
A much smaller oil on panel (23 × 30 cm) in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, is considered by some scholars to be a preparatory study for the Museum's picture.15 However, the comparison raises strong doubts about the Munich sketch's authorship.16

Schelte à Bolswert's engraving of the mid- to late 1630s (Figure 2) crops the view and suppresses the pool of water in the foreground. In the translation to a linear medium much is lost, while the debt to Savery (Figure 6) becomes more noticeable.

On the basis of comparisons with other landscapes by Rubens a date of about 1635 may be proposed. Wolfgang Adler suggested the period 1631–35, while Julius Held placed the painting and the oil sketch in Munich about 1635–36.17

1. Quoted in F. Broun (see Refs.), p. 137; the transcription in W. Adler (see Refs.) is inaccurate.
2. The information in this paragraph up to this point is entirely indebted to Broun (see Refs.), pp. 136–38.

4. Broun (see Refs.), p. 138 n. 5.

5. J. M. Muller (see Refs.), 1989, pp. 91–93, on the *Specification*.

6. The subject remained a forest at sunset in Smith's catalogue of 1830 and in the 1835 exhibition at the British Institution, no. 151.

7. Adler (see Refs.), nos. 31, 33, 35, 37, 41, 43, 48, 51, 58, 64, 66, 68.

8. Ibid., nos. 31 and 58 (pls. 89 and 141).

9. Ibid., p. 152 under no. 48.

10. See ibid., pp. 27–35, for an elaborate qualification of this view.


14. Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, *Roelant Savery in seiner Zeit (1576–1639)*, Cologne, 1985, no. 120. The similarity to Savery is underscored by comparisons of Rubens's deer hunt with Dutch and Flemish treatments of the subject from about the same time: for example, Salomon van Ruysdael's landscape of ca. 1690 in the Los Angeles County Museum, no. 52.24 (W. Stechow, *Salomon van Ruysdael*, Berlin, 1975, no. 238A).

15. J. S. Held, 1980 (see Refs.), no. 454, pl. 440; Adler (see Refs.), no. 49a.

16. This view is taken by Konrad Renger, curator of Flemish paintings at the Alte Pinakothek, and by Hubert von Sonnenburg, former director and chief conservator at Munich and now the head of Paintings Conservation, MMA. The composition of the Munich picture does not coincide with the central section of the Museum's panel (see Figure 3) but is a version, in a taller format, of the finished design.


**Ex coll.:** Peter Paul Rubens, Antwerp (d. 1640; no. 108 in inventory of his estate); Sir Joshua Reynolds, London (sold to Chauncy for £100); Charles and Nathaniel Chauncy, London (Charles d. shortly before or in 1790, Nathaniel d. 1790; sale, Christie's, London, March 26–27, 1790, no. 87, for 62 gns. to Lord Lansdowne); William, 1st Marquess of Lansdowne, Lansdowne House, London (1790–d. 1805; sale, Lansdowne House, March 19–20, 1806, lot 62, for 305 gns. to Sir W. W. Wynn); Sir Watkin Williams-Wynn, 5th Baronet, Llangedwyn Hall, Oswestry, Wales (1805–d. 1840); the Baronets Watkin Williams-Wynn, Llangedwyn Hall, Oswestry, Wales (1840–1951); Sir Owen Watkin Williams-Wynn, 10th Baronet, Llangedwyn Hall, Oswestry, Wales (1951–87); Trustees of the 1897 Williams-Wynn Settlement (1897–89; sale, Christie’s, London, Dec. 8, 1889, lot 68, for £3,300,000, to Artemis); [Artemis, London, 1899–90]; Purchase, The Annenberg Foundation, Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, Michel David-Weill, The Dillon Fund, Henry J. and Drue Heinz Foundation, Lola Kramarsky, Annette de la Renta, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, The Vincent Astor Foundation and The Peter Jay Sharp Foundation Gifts; The Lesley and Emma Shearer Collection, Bequest of Emma A. Shearer, and Theodore M. Davis Collection, Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, by exchange; Gift of George R. Hann, in memory of his mother, Annie Sykes Hann, by exchange; Gifts of George A. Hearn, George Blumenthal, George H. and Helen M. Richard and Mrs. George A. Stern and Bequests of Helen Hay Whitney and John Henry Abegg and Anonymous Bequest, by exchange; supplemented by gifts and funds from friends of the Museum, 1990

1990–96

**Michiel Sweerts (1618–1664)**

*Clothing the Naked* (Figure 7)

Oil on canvas

Height, 34 ¼ in. (81.9 cm); width, 45 in. (114.3 cm)

The painting is in very good condition. It was cleaned in 1982, probably for the first time in this century.

This compelling picture is a comparatively late work by Sweerts, who was born in Brussels in 1618 and died in Goa, India, in 1664. In 1646 Sweerts was recorded as an *agregato*, or assistant, of the Accademia di San Luca in Rome, where he remained until at least 1652 and probably until 1654 or 1655. In 1656 he obtained permission from the city of Brussels to open a drawing academy. By 1659–60 he had moved to Amsterdam, where he painted this picture about 1660–61. A Lazarist priest who met Sweerts in the summer of 1661 records that the artist “eats no meat, fasts almost every day, gives his possessions to the poor, and takes communion three or four times a week.” Sweerts's subsequent travels with the Société des Missions Estrangères to Persia, and alone from Isfahan to India, are described in the present author's article on this picture and in the sources cited there.

Sweerts's religious convictions, which became obsessive at the end of his life, explain to some extent this moving and seemingly personal work. The subject is one of the Seven Acts of Mercy, six of which are described in Matthew 25:35–36. On rare occasions the Seven Acts were depicted in a single picture, as in Caravaggio's canvas painted in 1606 for the Pio Monte della Misericordia, Naples (where the work remains). The Acts were more commonly divided into seven scenes, which were well suited to the decoration of a church or charitable institution. For example, two artists from Bruges—Jacob van...
Michiel Sweerts (1618–64), *Clothing the Naked*, ca. 1660. Oil on canvas, 81.9 × 114.3 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, 1984, 1984.459.1

Oost the Elder and Jozef van den Kerkhove—painted a series of seven panels, each with an explanatory inscription, for the Church of Our Savior in their native city; one of the three panels by van Oost is dated 1643.³ Sweerts himself painted a series of seven canvases for an unknown patron in the early 1650s.⁴

Accordingly, it has been assumed that the Museum's picture is the only surviving or known composition from a series of seven canvases,⁵ but there may have been no others. There is surely a strong element of self-identification here, which would not have been easy to sustain in scenes of offering drink, food, shelter, and comfort to the sick and to prisoners. The latter two subjects and the seventh act, Burying the Dead, are also difficult to imagine as formal companions to the present picture. Furthermore, by the middle of the seventeenth century a few of the Seven Acts were in effect rendered individually as other subjects, such as “St. Martin and the Beggar” (clothing the naked), “The Good Samaritan” (sheltering a stranger), and “Cimon and Pero” (which Caravaggio employed to represent simultaneously feeding the hungry and comforting prisoners). Isolated acts of charity, such as giving money to the poor, are seen in Dutch paintings of church interiors and in some other contemporary pictures, such as Jan Steen's *The Burgher of Delft and His Daughter*, dated 1655.⁶ Acts of charity were advocated by Dutch preachers and were performed by several civic institutions as well as by religious groups.⁷ Given this context and Sweerts's own inclinations, *Clothing the Naked* can be understood as an independent work, however original it may be. Another possibility is that this is the first work of an ambitious commission that was then abandoned.⁸

In several paintings probably dating from the late 1650s Sweerts set two figures side by side; their
meaningful glances and gestures are emphasized by
the half-length or bust-length format and by the
close cropping of the view. *Feeding the Hungry*, a
small canvas in the St. Annen-Museum, Lübeck, is
similar to the Museum’s picture in composition and
in the gesture of giving, but the adolescent protagon-
ists both look to the viewer’s right.9 In their lack of
visual exchange they differ dramatically from the
*Unequal Lovers* in the Louvre, a painting that under-
scores the Flemish nature of Sweerts’s design in
compositions of this type. Sixteenth-century genre
scenes and double portraits (for example, Gossaert’s
*Elderly Couple* in the National Gallery, London), and
even earlier inventions, such as diptychs in which a
donor turns with joined hands toward the Virgin or
Christ, come to mind in connection with the pattern
employed in *Clothing the Naked*.

At the same time, the composition seems entirely
current with contemporary paintings in Amster-
dam. The most striking parallel is with Rembrandt’s
*Jewish Bride*, dated 1662 (Rijksmuseum, Amster-
dam), where two nearly frontal figures are united
by a significant gesture, by sympathetic glances that
do not meet, and by the absence of superfluous
scenery and details. (The impression that both art-
ists have devoted considerable thought and feeling
to the subject is a more personal coincidence.)
Sweerts also resembles younger artists in Amster-
dam, such as Ferdinand Bol, Bartholomeus van der
Helst, and Wallerant Vaillant, in the fluidity of his
technique, although this quality is already evident in
Sweerts’s Brussels period (for example, in the *Por-
trait of a Young Man*, dated 1656, in the Hermitage,
St. Petersburg).10 Sweerts sets this manner off
against the more emphatic modeling of the shirt in
the immediate foreground, which resembles the
sometimes white cloths used illusionistically in
monochrome still lifes (for example, by Willem
Claesz. Heda and Jan den Uyl). Thus the shallow
space gains in intensity, while the essential motif
takes on the weight of a moral conviction.

The figures in *Clothing the Naked* bear a haunting
resemblance to the seemingly more particularized
figures in Sweerts’s *Two Men in Turbans* (Figure 8).11
The latter are probably portraits, perhaps of mem-
ers of the Mission, while the figures in the Mu-
seum’s picture may be types based on the same
models or on people the artist knew.12 Together the
two paintings reflect a moment on the eve of a mis-
sion to very foreign lands, for purposes above com-
mon standards and beyond common sense.

1. Liedtke, 1983 (see Refs.), pp. 21–23, which includes refer-
ences for the biographical information given above. See also
my entry in Bauman, 1992 (see Refs.), no. 94.
2. A. Moir, *Caravaggio*, New York, 1982, pl. 37, with a discussion
of the subject. See also David Teniers the Younger’s *Seven Acts
of Mercy* in the Dulwich College Picture Gallery.
3. J. L. Meulemeester, *Jacob van Oost de Oudere en het zeveniende-
eeuwse Brugge*, Bruges, 1984, pp. 348–50, no. B51 (the prove-
nance is presumed).
4. Museum Boymans (see Refs.), nos. 24–28. Four of the seven can-
vases are in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; one is in the
Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford; another is in an English
private collection; and the seventh was sold at Christie’s, New
5. Museum Boymans (see Refs.), p. 59, under no. 55.
7. For a survey, see Historisch Museum, *Arm in de Gouden Eeuw*,
8. If Jozef van den Kerkhove (1667–1724) is indeed the artist
who completed Jacob van Oost the Elder’s series of panels for
a church in Bruges (see text above and note 3), then there
would have been a gap of at least fifty years in the execution.
The painting by Sweerts in Lübeck, *Feeding the Hungry*, is also
the only known work of a possible series (see text following).

Figure 8. Michiel Sweerts, *Two Men in Turbans*, ca. 1659–62.
Oil on wood, 21.7 × 17.8 cm. Malibu, The J. Paul Getty Mu-
seum (photo: The J. Paul Getty Museum)
9. Museum Boymans (see Refs.), no. 54.
11. Museum Boymans (see Refs.), no. 57; Mauritshuis, Terugzien in bewondering, exh. cat., The Hague, 1982, no. 85; Liedtke, 1983 (see Refs.), p. 23, fig. 2.
12. The inscription on the very small (21.7 × 17.8 cm) panel in the Getty Museum (where the painting is entitled Double Portrait) reads: "Sig:r mio videte / la strade de sa/lute per la mano di sweerts." One possible interpretation would be the following: "My Lord [the recipient of the painting], see the way to salvation [a way of life, or mission, as conveyed by the appearance of the figures], by the hand of [as depicted by] Sweerts." The intimate size of the panel suggests that it may have been a personal souvenir or "friendship portrait"; the type is known from painted miniatures, from portrait drawings in personal albums (e.g., Jacob van Campen’s drawing of Pieter Saenredam, inscribed by the sitter and dated 1628, in the British Museum), and also from larger pictures (e.g., Van Dyck’s Thomas Killigrew and William, Lord Crofts, in the collection of H.M. Queen Elizabeth II).


Ex Coll.: Ernestina Gräfin von Schönborn-Wiesentheid, Schloss Pommersfelden; Dr. Karl Graf von Schönborn-Wiesentheid, Schloss Wiesentheid; Rudolf Graf von Schönborn-Wiesentheid, Schloss Weiler; [Michael Tollemache Ltd., London, 1981]; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightman, Palm Beach, Florida, 1981–84; Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightman, 1984

1984.459.1

Jan Brueghel the Younger (1601–1678)

Aeneas and the Sibyl in the Underworld (Figure 9)
Oil on copper
Height, 10¾ in. (27.3 cm); width, 14¼ in. (36.2 cm)

Good condition. Surface scratches and small losses at the edges were retouched in 1992.

This small painting on copper, which probably dates from the 1650s, represents an aspect of Jan Brueghel the Younger’s work very different from the Museum’s fine Still Life: A Basket of Flowers. However, both types of pictures were directly inspired by Jan Brueghel the Elder (Jan I), whose unexpected death in the summer of 1625 brought Jan II back from a three-year sojourn in Italy to take over his father’s highly successful studio in Antwerp.

All of Jan II’s “hell landscapes” apparently date from the second half of the 1620s onward, beginning with the Temptation of St. Anthony and Christ’s Descent into Limbo, both of which are known in two nearly identical versions. The Museum’s picture, which has never been published or exhibited, repeats a composition known from at least three other autograph works, paintings on copper of about the same size: Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts, no. 6249 (26.7 × 35.9 cm), and examples in European private collections. About 1645–50 the artist and his studio also produced versions of Juno in the Underworld. Each of these series derives from similar subjects of different composition by Jan I; it seems unlikely that he ever painted works of identical design.

However, Jan Brueghel the Elder was well known for his inferno scenes, and he was clearly the leading figure in what may be considered a Flemish Baroque revival of a Netherlandish tradition that began with Hieronymus Bosch and continued with St. Anthony scenes by Bosch’s follower Pieter Huys (MMA, no. 14.133), and with hell landscapes by Hierri met de Bles (MMA, no. 1976.100.1, is an example after Bles). Contemporaries of Jan I, including Pieter Schoubroeck, depicted spectacular conflagrations such as the Burning of Troy, and in the broadest view one may also compare fire-lit nocturnal subjects by Elsheimer, Rubens, and Rembrandt.

Nonetheless, the present picture responds almost exclusively to the legacy of Jan Brueghel the Elder, who combined Bosch-like monsters and settings with such classical heroes as Aeneas, Juno, and Orpheus. These figures first entered the realm of
Netherlandish nightmare when Jan I was in Rome and Milan (1592–96) working for such distinguished patrons as the Cardinals Ascanio Colonna and Federigo Borromeo. The small copper, *Orpheus Singing for Pluto and Proserpina* (Florence, Galleria Palatina), is dated 1594, and the *Aeneas Carrying Anchises out of Burning Troy* (Munich) and *Juno in the Underworld* (Dresden) have been plausibly dated to about 1595–96. The most immediate precedent for the present picture, Jan I’s *Aeneas and the Sibyl in the Underworld* (Budapest, no. 553), is dated 1600[?]. and he painted two versions of the subject, one somewhat similar and the other very different, around the same time (Budapest, no. 551, dated 1600; and an undated work in Vienna). One of the Budapest paintings (no. 553) provides precise models for the nudes in the lower corners, and it similarly features a distant river and inhospitable creatures throughout. Jan II’s legendary couple and their nearest antagonists derive from the other picture in Budapest (no. 551), although the Sibyl’s pose more closely resembles that of Juno in the Dresden painting. A review of all the relevant material reveals that Jan II skillfully mixed motifs from several of his father’s compositions to arrive at something new, which he then varied only slightly in replicas. Some of the monsters and amazing structures (for example, the domed building on the riverbank) recall the Bosch tradition more than anything in Jan I’s work.

The subject is in good part merely a pretext for another painting of this type, but its source in Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Book VI, would have been familiar to many people in Jan II’s cultural sphere. After years
of Trojan travel, Aeneas consults the Cumaean Sibyl, who foretells his wars in Latium. She escorts Aeneas to the nether world, where they cross the Styx and encounter various dead figures, such as fallen lovers (including Dido, whom Aeneas had abandoned in Carthage) and warriors. In the haven of Elysium, Aeneas finds his father, Anchises, who points out the souls of men who in the future would be founders and heroes of Rome.


2. Klaus Ertz, *Jan Brueghel der Jüngere*, Freren, 1984, pp. 65 (on the *Höllenlandschaft* in Jan II’s oeuvre), 299–302, cat. nos. 126–129. The St. Anthony scenes are in Karlsruhe and Pommersfelden, while the Putatory views are in The Hague and Aschaffenburg. A version of the latter composition in an English private collection is dated by Ertz to the late 1630s (p. 65, cat. no. 136, colorpl. 25) because its smoother, harder manner and more local coloring suggest greater distance from the style of Jan I.


4. The St. Anthony picture in Karlsruhe (Ertz, op. cit., cat. no. 126) was previously published by Ertz as the work of Jan I (Klaus Ertz, *Jan Brueghel der Ältere*, Cologne, 1979, cat. no. 59, fig. 138), and Ertz was similarly unsure about the Brussels *Aeneas and the Sibyl* (1979, p. 130).

5. See Georges Marlier, *Pierre Brueghel le Jeune*, Brussels, 1969, chap. 3, on the name “Hell Brueghel” ("Brueghel d’Enfer"), which has been misapplied to Jan I’s younger brother, Pieter Brueghel the Younger. On all the fiery landscapes by Jan I (which include several subjects never treated by Jan II), see Ertz, op. cit., 1979, pp. 116–36.


8. Ertz, op. cit., 1979, cat. nos. 5, 26, 32, figs. 126, 135, 120, respectively. The view of Troy is modeled on Rome.

9. Ibid., p. 124, cat. no. 66, colorpl. 119.

10. Ibid., cat. no. 65, fig. 121; cat. no. 67, fig. 123.

EX COLL.: Gift of Mrs. Erna S. Blade, in memory of her uncle, Sigmund Herrmann, 1991

1991-444

B. *Old Accessions Newly Catalogued as Flemish Paintings*

**JAN JANSZ. DE HEEM (1650–after 1695)**

**Still Life: A Banqueting Scene (Figure 10)**

Oil on canvas

Height, 53¹/₄ in. (135.3 cm); width, 73 in. (185.4 cm)

Signed (lower left, on white tablecloth): JDN [in monogram]

Inscribed (falsely, in lower left corner): De Heem f

The painting is in sound condition, with minor losses at the edges and in the curtain in the left background. Lining of the canvas support, a herringbone twill, caused some flattening of the paint surface. Infrared reflectography reveals minor modifications in the course of execution, such as the height and alignment of the chair and the shape of the column’s pedestal. Isolated passages—for example, the cut lemon and the neck of the lute—have become transparent with age and show completed forms below. This appears to reflect the painter’s usual working procedure rather than revisions to the composition.

This large canvas, though not well known,¹ has been published recently as by Jan Davidsz. de Heem,² the celebrated Dutch painter who introduced this kind of luxurious still life in Antwerp after his arrival there in 1636.³ The close relationship to compositions by Jan Davidsz. de Heem is obvious (see Figure 11), but the execution is not nearly so refined as his or that of his most gifted son, Cornelis. One scholar has proposed an attribution to Jan van der Hecke (1620–1684), who painted similar objects and arrangements in the 1640s.⁴ Exhibitions of the past decade have made it somewhat easier to distinguish Jan Davidsz. de Heem’s many Dutch and Flemish followers, who included Alexander Coosermans, Jan Pauwel Gillemans, Johannes Hannot, Jan van der Hecke, Cornelis de Heem, the much younger Jan Jansz. de Heem, Christiaen Luyckx, Jacob Marrel, Pieter de Ring, and Joris van Son.

In 1983 Ingvar Bergström was the first to suggest Jan Jansz. de Heem, one of the least familiar artists in this group, as the possible author of the Museum’s picture.⁵ Since then, Sam Segal has independently proposed the same attribution on several occasions.⁶ Two works in the 1991 Utrecht exhibition, “De Heem and His Circle,”⁷ and comparisons with a few other pictures that have been assigned convincingly to Jan Jansz. de Heem leave no doubt for the present writer that he is indeed responsible for the ambitious painting in New York.

Johannes de Heem, now known as Jan Jansz., was the first son of Jan Davidsz. de Heem's second mar-
riage, to Anna Ruckers. Jan Jansz. was baptized in the St. Joriskerk in Antwerp on July 2, 1650, and was thus nineteen years younger than his half brother Cornelis de Heem. On the day before he died (May 17, 1655), Cornelis referred to each of the surviving children of Jan Davidsz. de Heem in a notarized statement, which is the last known mention of Jan Jansz. The only other details known of his life are that he lived in Utrecht with his parents between 1667 and 1672 and that (according to the contemporary biographer Arnold Houbraken) he was his father's pupil.8

One painting exhibited (hors-catalogue) in Utrecht is a great banqueting still life set on a terrace with a column and curtain in the background, and is somewhat similar to the present picture in composition and in the motif of a tall guild cup.9 In both paintings the metal and glass objects are impressively rendered, the fruit less so (although the leaves are gracefully described), while the drapery is flat and dull throughout. These uneven characteristics are also evident in the other banqueting picture exhibited in Utrecht,10 in which the drawing, highlights, and slightly textured surfaces of the silver tray and covered pitcher come very close to their counterparts in the chair and to the wine can (wijndrank, a pewter pitcher) on the table in the painting in New York.

Finally, the large canvas sold in Monaco as by Jan Jansz. de Heem is very similar in execution to the Museum's picture and bears the same monogram.11 The treatment of the guild cup and the other metal objects corresponds in every way, from the closed, mechanically rhythmic outlines to the painterly dabs and strokes that suggest highlights in a seemingly Flemish, not Leiden-like way. Regular curves drawn

Figure 10. Jan Jansz. de Heem (1650–after 1695), Still Life: A Banqueting Scene, ca. 1670–80. Oil on canvas, 135.3 X 185.4 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Charles B. Curtis Fund, 1912, 12.195
by Jan Jansz., as in the pitcher handles, foreshortened plates, and chairback, tend to align themselves with the picture plane to artful effect (the trait is more manner than mistake). In general, the calligraphic gestures of Jan Davidsz. and Cornelis de Heem become with Jan Jansz. a sort of marching music of the spheres. On a small scale, however, he recalls his half brother's arabesques, as in the twisting lute strings to the left.

The objects depicted here are mostly standard for a *prunck* (a "show" or "preen") still life, except for the clock and the guild cup surmounted by a bird. The latter is probably derived from the slightly different guild cup in Jan Davidsz.'s celebrated canvas *Un Dessert* in the Louvre (Figure 11), which is dated 1640 and "was possibly the first" picture of this type. The Louvre painting features similar drapery and tablecloths, a narrow landscape view to the left, a lute, a basket of fruit, and pewter plates with lemons at the near edge of the table. A different *façon de Venise* wineglass and two tall wine flutes (the shorter one with a glass cover) are also found in Jan Davidsz.'s composition. The circular map, the globe, and books in the father's painting may be compared in both formal and symbolic terms to the monumental vanitas motif of the clock in the son's composition. Elaborate symbolic programs are often read into still lifes of this type, but here nothing more is meant than that the objects offer merely temporal pleasures in addition to their richly decorative effects.

Large clocks are unusual in Dutch and Flemish still lifes, and the form of this one is unfamiliar. It would appear to be of provincial manufacture, using common metals and woods. An expert in the field has described the clock as probably weight-
driven, with the movement in a "posted frame," a single hour hand, and a striking mechanism. He describes the object as perhaps, to some extent, an invention by the artist; as probably dating from the first half of the seventeenth century; and as definitely unsuited to its elegant surroundings in the picture. Perhaps this was the artist’s idea: the clock intrudes like a skull in an elegant portrait, or like a church bell announcing the lateness of the hour.

The chair, the basin and ewer on it, and the tall guild cup are all consistent with early-seventeenth-century designs. The blue-and-white pitcher, however, has a twisted handle like those that occur in Northern European ceramics from about 1660 onward. The execution as well as the design of the painting has a distinctly mid-seventeenth-century look, leading to the conclusion that it dates from the 1670s rather than later on.

Formerly attributed to Jan Davidsz. de Heem

1. The painting was last on view in the mid-1970s and was rarely exhibited during the preceding thirty years.
2. See Greindl (see Refs.), Larsen (see Refs.), and Sutton (see Refs.).
4. Claus Grimm, oral opinion, on a visit to the MMA in October 1983. Compare the canvas by van der Hecke signed and dated 1645 in Kunsthandel P. de Boer, Collection 1956, Amsterdam, 1956, n.p. (ill.), listed in Greindl (see Refs.), p. 359, no. 1, among twenty-one works by or attributed to the artist.
5. I. Bergström, oral opinion, Dec. 5, 1983. In 1987 Bergström identified a canvas signed 16H as by Jan Jansz. de Heem (sold at Christie’s, Monaco, Dec. 3, 1988, no. 14, ill. in color); this painting is discussed below.
6. Most recently in March 1991, at Maastricht, where we discussed his de Heem exhibition (Segal, 1991).
7. Segal, op. cit., 1991, nos. 34, 34A (see note 9 on the latter). This exhibition concentrated on questions of connosieurship by comparing works by de Heem with those by his pupils, followers, and copyists.
9. A printed addendum (no. 34A) to the catalogue, with full details but no photograph, was made available at the Utrecht exhibition in 1991. The privately owned painting (canvas, 86 x 118.5 cm) was sold at Christie’s, London, May 4, 1979, no. 3 (ill.), and at Christie’s, Amsterdam, May 21, 1985 (evening session), no. 187 (color ill.), in both sales as by J. D. de Heem (in 1985 with a certificate from W. Bernt dated 1978). The painting is is confusingly entered three times by Greindl (see Refs.) in her list of paintings by J. D. de Heem, pp. 359–61, nos. 10, 69, and 88.
10. Segal, op. cit., 1991, no. 34, a canvas, 82.5 x 107.5 cm, color ill. on p. 103.
11. See note 5.
13. Pocket watches are, of course, a common vanitas element in still lifes of this type and in the Haarlem and Leiden banquet still lifes from which they originate. See Andrew Moore, Dutch and Flemish Paintings in Norfolk, London, 1988, no. 15, pl. vi, for a large clock of different design similarly placed in the composition. Moore catalogues this picture, called The Yardmouth Collection (Norwich Castle Museum), as “Dutch School,” ca. 1665, and discusses possible authors, of whom Pieter van Roestraten is the most plausible.
15. Dutch and English examples are well known. A later (ca. 1700–25) Dutch example in the MMA is illustrated in Louis L. Lipski, Dated English Delftware, Michael Archer, ed., London, n.d. (1982?), fig. 268. All the objects in this painting were thoroughly researched by Nancy Minty during her internship at the MMA in 1988.


EX COLL.: [Horace Buttery, London]; Purchase, Charles B. Curtis Fund, 1912

12.195
Attributed to Jacob van der Heyden (1573-1645)

The Interior of Strasbourg Cathedral (Figure 12)
Tempera and shell gold on vellum
Height, 5¼ in. (13.3 cm); width, 4⅞ in. (10.5 cm)

The work is lightly abraded overall, with some flaking, especially within 3 centimeters of the bottom. The figure in black to the lower right has been consolidated; there is inpainting and consolidation in the area of the choir screen. The vellum is slightly cockled.

This very small painting on vellum corresponds closely in reverse to Jacob van der Heyden’s engraving of the interior of Strasbourg Cathedral (Notre Dame). The engraving (Figure 13) bears a Latin inscription stating that the subject was drawn in 1616 and that the print was made by Jacob van der Heyden, “engraver of Strassburg,” in 1627. The figures in the painting wear costumes dating from about the mid-1620s; on the whole, they correspond to figures in the print, but there the figures are slightly less numerous and the costumes seem earlier in date (the four male figures in the center foreground of the painting, in clothing of about 1625, do not occur in the print). Quite independently of this consideration, it is highly unlikely that the engraving is based on the present work, which is about one-quarter of the size of the printed image.

It would appear, then, that the painting and the engraving are both based on a single drawing, presumably the one made in 1616. The author of the drawing must have been van der Heyden himself: the style of the figures in both images resembles his, and he was an artist skilled in rendering a wide variety of subjects, including city views.
Van der Heyden's father, Jan, a portrait painter from Mechelen (Malines), fled to Cologne for religious reasons by 1590 and in 1600 became a citizen of the Protestant free city of Strasbourg. The information given by all modern biographers (but not by Sandrart in 1675) that Jacob van der Heyden was born in Strasbourg in 1573 is illogical, since he was already a teenager when the family left the Southern Netherlands. The report that he was a pupil of another Mechelen painter, Raphael Coxie, is consistent with the hypothesis that Jacob was in Mechelen or Brussels (where Coxie was active from about 1586 onward) until the end of the 1580s.

Van der Heyden's activity in Strasbourg from 1608 to about 1635 is documented by his many engravings. During the last ten years of his life he probably resided mostly in Brussels. It is likely, however, that van der Heyden's work as a publisher and as an engraver for foreign presses had him traveling frequently. It has also been supposed that some of the German princes portrayed in van der Heyden's engravings were visited by him at their own courts (for example, Baden-Durlach and Hessen), which would seem to be implied by Sandrart's remark that the artist was "bei den hohen Potentaten sehr wohl angesehen." 4

Paintings by van der Heyden are recorded, but none is identified today. The present picture—which could be considered a colored drawing but for its medium—recalls the few surviving drawings of church interiors by Flemish architectural painters such as Hendrick van Steenwyck the Younger. 5 The closest known precedent for a small painting on vellum of precisely this type—that is, a view of an entire Gothic church interior from an ideal vantage point—is signed in monogram by Marten van Val-
ckenborch and dates from about 1600.  Similar small paintings on panel and on copper are well known and, when comparable to this work in subject and in composition, may be described as a distinctly Flemish specialty.

The design employed here was common in architectural paintings of the Antwerp school from the 1580s onward; van der Heyden would certainly have known examples by the van Steenwys and by Pieter Neeffs the Elder. In the latter artist's pictures the staffage is arranged quite similarly, although the line of figures in the immediate foreground of the painting on vellum (not in the print) is a peculiar and, on this scale, naively appealing idea.

One is so accustomed to seeing views of Antwerp Cathedral and of imaginary Catholic churches presented in this way that the Protestant nature of the subject should be emphasized. Apart from stained glass and the organ, the church has been stripped of altarpieces and all the other embellishments that it would have had before the Reformation. Worship is centered not at the choir but at the pulpit at the side of the nave. The choir stalls to the left and in the southern aisle in the right background were presumably removed from the choir, which reveals nothing but a window beyond the distant choir screen. None of the visitors is worshiping; at the moment, the church interior is an extension of the market square. In the lower left corner a warder carries a large ring of keys. The man to the lower right is a minister. A gentleman puts something into the collection box in the middle of the nave. These figures slightly modify the figures found in the print, which may have been made (following the drawing of 1616) at about the same time.

Known impressions of the print bear a three-line dedication in German to Anna Maria Widd (née Brandt) on New Year's Day 1628. One might wonder whether she was also presented with this charming keepsake of Strasbourg Cathedral.

Formerly attributed to Pieter Neeffs the Elder

2. Ibid., nos. 150–64, for comparison.
3. Ibid., pp. 77, 81, 82.
5. For example, the round drawing probably by van Steenwyck in the Lugt collection (Victoria and Albert Museum, Flemish Drawings of the Seventeenth Century from the Collection of Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris, London, 1972, p. 130, no. 97, pl. 30 and color ill. on cover); and the supposed view of the Jacobskerk, Antwerp, a drawing in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam, which is attributed to Daniel de Blieck (W. Bernt, Die Niederländischen Zeichner des 17. Jahrhunderts, Munich, 1957, I, no. 69) but is in my view by Hendrick van Steenwyck the Younger.
9. J.-Y. Marieotte, Director of the Archives in Strasbourg, provided the following information in a letter of Aug. 28, 1991. Anna Maria Brandt, daughter of the Strasbourg merchant Thiebold Brandt, married Reinhardt Widd (or Widt, Wied, Wydt) on May 15, 1615. He was born on July 7, 1582; her birthdate is not known. The couple had a son, Johann Reinhardt, baptized on Trinity (the eighth Sunday after Easter) in 1617. The godfather was the baby's grandfather, Heinrich Widd, who was a member of the Chambre des XV (city governors) from 1609 to 1620. A Widd family owned important properties in Dorlisheim, near Strasbourg, but it is not certain that they are the same Widds. The archives of Notre Dame are preserved in the city archives, but Mr. Marieotte did not find anything relevant in them.

Ex Coll.: Carl Ernst Huver, Long Island City, New York (until 1950); Rogers Fund, 1950

50.209

HENDRICK VAN STEENWYCK THE YOUNGER
(about 1580–1649)

A Renaissance Portico with Elegant Figures
(Figure 14)
Oil on copper
Diameter, 4 3/4 in. (11.1 cm)
Signed (bottom center, on step): hen[—] v. STE[—] wyck 16[—]

The paint surface is in good condition, with small chips lost in several places, especially in the woman seated on the step, and in the architecture to the extreme left. Cleaned and retouched in 1945.

This very small painting on copper was assigned to the Department of European Paintings' collection of miniatures when it was given to the Museum in 1945. In subject and size the picture is not a typical
miniature, and it should have been included in the catalogue of Flemish paintings, as were small views of church interiors by Pieter Neeffs the Elder and by Pieter Neeffs the Younger.

Hendrick van Steenwyck the Younger was the son of Hendrick van Steenwyck the Elder, who left Antwerp and settled in Frankfurt, probably during the troubled 1580s. In 1604 Carel van Mander described the elder van Steenwyck as reportedly having died the year before and the younger van Steenwyck as already active as a painter.¹ He may have worked in Antwerp before moving to London, where he was “currently living” according to a declaration made in Amsterdam by the Antwerp picture dealer Anthony Goetkint.² In 1626 or 1629 van Steenwyck added perspective backgrounds to two Holbein portraits in the collection of Charles I,³ and in 1626 he painted the monumental architectural background in Daniel Mijtens’s portrait of the king (Galleria Sabauda, Turin).⁴ Van Steenwyck probably moved to Holland by about 1640, and he is described as an “architectural painter of The Hague” in the inscription below his portrait in the 1645 edition of engravings after Van Dyck known as the Iconography.⁵

Imaginary views of Late Renaissance architecture (which include church interiors, views of elegant companies in stately rooms, and so-called palace courts, such as the present example) have well-known origins in Antwerp,⁶ but after 1600 appear to have been collected by aristocratic connoisseurs of art and architecture in London and The Hague. The subject here can certainly be described as courtly both in the figures and in the architecture.
The portico in the foreground, with its balcony and stepped terrace, suggests an entrance to a palace in the latest architectural style, a decorative Doric comparable to that found in Flemish church design from about 1610 onward. The building in the left background recalls the Queen’s House at Greenwich (designed by Inigo Jones in 1616) but has taller proportions and an open gallery above that lends an Italianate flavor to the whole. An arcade connects this building with a fanciful Late Gothic chapel in the right background, which completes the impression of a grand palace complex. Similar elements are found in van Steenwyck’s more extensive palace views dated 1610 (National Gallery, London) and 1614 (Mauritshuis, The Hague). The representation of porticoes, terraces, arcades, and other features unsuited to the Netherlands climate was popularized by the prolific painter and printmaker Hans Vredeman de Vries (1527–ca. 1606), but his elaborate inventions are reflected here only in the general arrangement and in the deep red, veined marble column. 7

Two couples, at least one of them amorous, linger on the portico, where a gentleman emerges from the doorway bearing a tall flute of red wine. 8 Eight men in the left background are engaged in some sort of athletic exercise (not fencing), which is watched by small groups of mostly female figures in the middle ground, to the left, and under the arcade. The costumes, the picture’s palette (with its brown-cream-green zoning of space), and comparisons with other paintings by van Steenwyck suggest a date of about 1615. 9

The small size and perhaps the shape of the painting raise the question of whether it may have played a part in a larger decorative scheme, for example, on a chest or cabinet. The support, the copper, and the subjects usually found on Flemish cabinets speak against the idea. Finely detailed paintings small enough to be held in the hand were occasionally kept in cabinet drawers, for example, the “Boxe” of several drawers in the “Carbonett Room” of Charles I, which was reserved mostly for “Meddalies and Limbed peces and all other rarities.” 10 The royal collection included at least twelve pictures by Hendrick van Steenwyck the Younger and “A little boock of Prosspectives” by him. 11

3. Oliver Millar, The Tudor, Stuart, and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, London, 1963, p. 58, under no. 27 (pl. 12), and p. 62, under no. 39 (pl. 15).
4. Liedtke (see Refs.), p. 33, fig. 1. Pendant pictures of Charles I and Henrietta Maria in similar architectural settings are in Dresden (nos. 1187 and 1188); both are dated 1637, and the king’s portrait is signed HENRI VAN STEINWICK.
5. Ibid., pp. 33–34, for a fuller discussion of van Steenwyck’s probable activity in or around The Hague in the 1640s, and p. 70 for a reproduction of the portrait print.
7. Compare Vredeman de Vries’s painting in Vienna: Jantzen, Das Niederländische Architekturbild, Leipzig, 1910, fig. 5; T. D. Kaufmann, The School of Prague, Chicago and London, 1988, no. 25.3. The portico recalls that found in an engraving by Hendrick Hondius after Paul Vredeman de Vries, 1606 (Briels, op. cit., fig. 337).
8. This detail and some of those described below were examined under a microscope. The picture may have been painted and perhaps was originally appreciated with the aid of a magnifying glass.
9. Microscopic examination of the date reveals only that the third digit may be a “1.” An old cardboard liner inside the brass frame now encasing the picture bears the inscription “Jan van Delen. 1614. Amsterdam.” This appears to be a comparatively modern error for the architectural painter Dirck van Delen and an attempted reading of the date.
11. Ibid., p. 416.


EX COLL.: Gift of Mrs. James Eads Switzer, in memory of her aunt, Yrene Ceballos de Sanz, 1945

45.94.2