DUTCH PAINTINGS
in The Metropolitan Museum of Art
DUTCH PAINTINGS
in The Metropolitan Museum of Art

WALTER LIEDTKE

I

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
Yale University Press, New Haven and London
Contents

Volume I

Director's Foreword vii Flinck, Govert 201
Preface ix Gheyn, Jacques de, the Elder 211
Acknowledgments xv Goyen, Jan van 224
Note to the Reader xviii Hals, Dirck 246
Hals, Frans 250
Hanneman, Adriaen 305
Haverman, Margareta 308
Backer, Jacob 3 Heda, Willem Claesz 311
Bailly, David 14 Heem, Jan Davidsz de 314
Beerstraten, Johannes 19 Helst, Bartholomeus van der 323
Berchem, Nicolaes 24 Heyden, Jan van der 332
Berghe, Christoffel van den 28 Hobbema, Meyndert 341
Beyeren, Abraham van 31 Hondecoeter, Melchior d' 347
Bisschop, Cornelis 35 Hondius, Abraham 351
Bloemaert, Abraham 40 Hooch, Pieter de 354
Bol, Ferdinand 45 Hoogstraten, Samuel van 372
Bor, Paulus 53 Jongh, Ludolf de 377
Borch, Gerard ter 62 Jonson van Ceulen, Cornelis the Elder 380
Borssema, Anthonie van 83 Jonson van Ceulen, Cornelis the Younger 384
Bramer, Leonardt 87 Kalf, Willem 386
Breenbergh, Bartholomeus 94 Keyser, Thomas de 393
Brekelenkam, Quirijn van 101 Koninck, Philips 404
Bruggen, Hendrick ter 108 Lairesse, Gerard de 414
Cappelle, Jan van de 119 Leen, Willem van 422
Claesz, Pieter 126 Lingelbach, Johannes 425
Collier, Edwaert 130 Maes, Nicolaes 430
Cuylenborch, Abraham van 133 Marseus van Schrieck, Otto 450
Cuyp, Aelbert 136 Metsu, Gabriel 455
Dou, Gerrit 153 Miereveld, Michiel van 473
Drost, Willem 167 Mieris, Frans van, the Elder 480
Duck, Jacob 181 Mijtens, Daniel the Elder 484
Eeckhout, Gerbrand van den 185 Molijn, Pieter de 489
Ekels, Jan the Younger 193 Moreelse, Paulus 493
Fabritius, Barent 197 Murant, Emanuel 497
Volume II

Rembrandt van Rijn 547 Vosmaer, Jacob 925
Style of Rembrandt 708 Vries, Abraham de 931
Ruisdael, Jacob van 786 Vries, Roelof van 934
Ruysdael, Salomon van 801 Weenix, Jan 937
Schalcken, Godfried 821 Willaerts, Adam 942
Slingelandt, Pieter van 825 Wit, Jacob de 946
Sorgh, Hendrick 830 Witte, Emanuel de 963
Steen, Jan 835 Wouwermans, Philips 971
Stom, Matthias 848 Wtewael, Joachim 975
Strij, Jacob van 852 Wtewael, Peter 987
Tieling, Lodewijk 858 Dutch Painters 992
Velde, Willem van de, the Younger 862
Vermeer, Johannes 866 Bibliography of Works Cited 1005
Verspronck, Johannes 907 Index of Previous Owners 1060
Victors, Jan 910 Index of Paintings by Accession Number 1066
Vincboons, David 913 Index 1070
Vlieger, Simon de 917 Photograph Credits 1083
Vliet, Hendrick van 921
Among the many great collections in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, the more than 220 Dutch paintings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries may be regarded with particular pride and sympathy, for not only do they form the finest ensemble of their kind in the Western hemisphere, they also reflect the institution's growth from its earliest days to the present. One year after its incorporation in 1870, the Museum built upon the classical foundation of the sole object then in its collection, a Roman sarcophagus, by approving the purchase of 174 European paintings, of which only the largest part, Dutch pictures from the age of Rembrandt, could be said to offer an initial survey of a national school. To some extent, this was the consequence of what vice president William T. Blodgett encountered on the art market in Belgium and France. But his selection and the warm reception that the paintings received from Museum officials, the public, and critics in New York were also reliable indicators of American taste and reminders of the country's long-standing affinity for the Netherlands. The Museum's leading benefactors of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—the Gilded Age and its legacy—appear to have confirmed the preferences expressed in the 1871 Purchase with their gifts and bequests, while at the same time raising the standard of the Dutch collection to that of only a few other cities in the world.

As the author notes in his preface, the present publication has been anticipated for many years. Realistically, the earliest moment at which a catalogue of the Dutch paintings in the Metropolitan Museum might have appeared was during the curatorship of W. R. Valentiner, from 1908 to 1914. Although he headed the Museum's new Department of Decorative Arts, Valentiner was the first true scholar of northern European paintings to work in America, and an almost compulsive cataloguer of private and public collections. World War I, however, sent Valentiner back to his native Germany (he had earned his stripes under Wilhelm von Bode, director general of the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum in Berlin), and until well after World War II, none of the Museum's curators were primarily concerned with Dutch art. In earlier decades, the members of the small staffs of each curatorial department had wide-ranging responsibilities, and like Valentiner himself, were generalists. The key figures in the Department of European Paintings were the personable and perceptive Bryson Burroughs, who replaced the inflammatory Roger Fry in 1909 and served as curator until 1934; Harry B. Wehle, who joined the department in 1921 and was full curator from 1931 until 1948; Theodore (Ted) Rousseau, curator from 1947 until 1968 and curator in chief and vice director from 1968 to 1973; Margareta Salinger, who rose from cataloguer in 1930 to curator in 1967, remaining as curator emerita until 1985; and Claus Virch, who quickly advanced through the curatorial ranks between 1957 and 1970. With John Walsh, curator from 1970 to 1975, the Museum gained a scholar completely at home in the literature of Dutch art, in the language, and in the international network of figures in the field. Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, consultative curator for Dutch and Flemish painting from 1977 through 1979, gave valuable advice concerning the Museum's Dutch pictures (especially the Rembrandts) while working mainly on Rubens and Van Dyck.

A publication of this scale and significance would not have been possible without the generous support of a consortium of donors. We are deeply indebted to Hata Stichting Foundation for their sustained commitment to this project. We also thank Mr. and Mrs. M.E. Zukerman for their generosity in bringing this catalogue to fruition. Additional thanks go to the Kowitz Family Foundation and The Christian Humann Foundation for their support.

Not so long ago, collection catalogues like this one (although less ambitious) were entrusted to outside authorities. From about 1980 onward, Museum curators have been the sole or principal authors of exhibition and collection catalogues, and with appropriate exceptions this will undoubtedly remain the norm. Proud as we may be of our publications, however, they represent a comparatively small proportion of the knowledge gained and work accomplished in the Museum's curatorial, conservation, and education departments and in our libraries.

The primary goal of the Museum is, of course, the preservation and effective display of works of art, so that specialists and laymen alike may study and appreciate them. What happens in that process cannot always be cast into words, as Aristotle—certainly as Rembrandt depicted him—appears to have understood.

Philippe de Montebello
Director
The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Dutch paintings of the Golden Age—the century of Frans Hals, Rembrandt van Rijn, and Johannes Vermeer—constitute one of the great collections in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, and may also be described (with only a touch of poetic license) as the Museum’s first collection of any kind, going back to the founding purchase of 1871. As Henry James reported in his urbane essay “The Metropolitan Museum’s ‘1871 Purchase’” (1872), the majority of the 174 paintings that had been acquired in Brussels and Paris by the new institution’s vice president, William T. Blodgett, were either Dutch or Flemish, and most of the works from the southern, or Spanish, Netherlands treated themes “which we especially associate with the Dutch school—genre subjects, rustic groups, and landscapes.” James deals brusquely with the few conspicuously Baroque compositions by or attributed to Peter Paul Rubens, Anthony van Dyck, and Jacob Jordaeus. With a Yankee mistrust of courtly manners, he describes the treatment of a female portrait then ascribed to Van Dyck as “excessively, almost morbidly refined.” By contrast, Hals’s image of the cackling crone “Malle Babbe” (Pl. 69) is praised as “a masterpiece of inelegant vigour.” Here, James may be more pleased with his aperçu than with the picture, for most displays of lively brushwork are regarded by him with suspicion (the Venetian view painter Francesco Guardi employs “mere artifice and manner”), while confidence is placed in examples of close observation and craftsmanship (a Dutchman such as Jan van der Heyden [see Pls. 78, 79] “feels that, unless he is faithful, he is nothing”). Addressing himself to a certain class of readers, James reminds them what it is like “to have turned with a sort of moral relief, in the galleries of Italy, to some small stray specimen of Dutch patience and conscience.”

The 1871 Purchase was not an instance of collecting in the usual sense but an expression of American taste embodied in a typically American gesture, the wholesale acquisition of what one ought to have—in this case, a public gallery of old master paintings. The wisdom of Blodgett’s plan, in which Museum president John Taylor Johnston promptly became a partner, is underscored by the fact that very few European paintings of any kind were added to the collection between 1872 and 1889, apart from the Catherine Lorillard Wolfe bequest, in 1887, of more than fifty works by then-fashionable Continental painters. However, the loyal trustee (and later Museum president) Henry G. Marquand must have had the Museum in mind when he added a few Italian and Spanish paintings and a good number of northern European pictures to his collection of Barbizon landscapes and predictable pieces of decorative art (Oriental porcelain, Renaissance ironwork, and so on). In 1889, Marquand donated thirty-seven paintings to the Museum, including America’s first and most beloved Vermeer (Pl. 203) and works by Hals, Jacob van Ruisdael, Gerard ter Borch, and other Dutch artists.

Most of the works discussed in this catalogue came to the Museum through similar gifts and bequests made between 1900 and 1931. In addition to Marquand, the major benefactors included Collis P. Huntington and William K. Vanderbilt (all three were railroad entrepreneurs), the famous financier J. Pierpoint Morgan, the sugar monopolist Henry H. Havemeyer, the retail poten¬date Benjamin Altman, and his business partner Michael Friedsam. It was not until after World War II that building—or rather, refining—the collections of Dutch and other paintings in the Metropolitan Museum became a matter of curatorial judgment rather than the acceptance of manna from one heaven or another. With particular regard to Dutch masters, the Museum’s collection of European paintings reflects the wealth and taste of the Gilded Age, that period of (for some sectors of society) exceptional prosperity between the Civil War and World War I.

As a result, the Dutch collection is comparatively extensive (229 paintings) and rich in works by “Rembrandt, Hals and Vermeer, the three prime immortals of their school” (as the conventional opinion was expressed in 1930). Remarkably, paintings by those three artists represent about one-sixth of the entire collection: twenty (in my view) by Rembrandt, eleven by Hals, and five by
Vermeer. The remaining pictures are mostly by contemporaries of the same trio, whose careers span the six decades between about 1615 (Hals’s *Merrymakers at Shrovetide* [Pl. 58], of about 1616–17, is one of the artist’s earliest known works) and Vermeer’s death in 1675. Only eight pictures in the collection date from the 1700s, and only two fall outside the period 1600–1800: a modern imitation of a Vermeer, dating from about 1925–27 (Pl. 207; included here as part of the history of collecting the Delft painter’s work in America), and Abraham Bloemaert’s early *Moses Striking the Rock*, of 1596 (Pl. 9). James would have judged that Mannerist composition as beyond the pale. But scholars now think otherwise, since the Golden Age of Dutch art is said to have begun about 1580 and Bloemaert was one of Utrecht’s most respected artists until his death in 1651.

In addition to numerous masterpieces, the Museum’s panorama of Dutch painting has exceptional breadth, and in certain areas—landscape, portraiture, and genre scenes especially—extraordinary depth. Landscape painters represented by a few or several pictures include Aelbert Cuyp, Jan van Goyen, Meyndert Hobbema, Philips Koninck, Aert van der Neer, Jacob van Ruisdael, and Salomon van Ruysdael. And there are individual works by the pioneering Christoffel van den Bergh and Pieter de Molijn, a superb Brazilian vista by Frans Post, and characteristic landscapes by David Vinckboons, Johannes Beerstraten, and Philips Wouwermans. Among these views of farmland, forests, rivers, distant cities, occasional hills, and many dunes, a visitor to the Dutch landscape gallery will catch several glimpses of the sea (or, at least, large bodies of water) in pictures by Jan van de Cappelle, Van Ruysdael, Willem van de Velde the Younger, and Simon de Vlieger.

The great collectors of the Gilded Age were drawn instinctively to old master portraits, especially those from English country houses (as were many by Van Dyck) or stately homes in France. Businessmen such as Havemeyer evidently felt at their ease surrounded (as Havemeyer was in his library) by dignified Dutch individuals, who perhaps formed a society more polite than that of New York or implied prominent branches on the family tree. As a result, the Museum has a collection of Dutch portraits comparable with that of any European institution, except for the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, which is home to large group portraits of civic guard companies and other municipal organizations. Remarkably, there are a greater number of single and pendant portraits by Rembrandt in New York than in Amsterdam; the present catalogue includes thirteen, not counting the *Hendrickje Stoffels* (Pl. 134) as a proper portrait. There are also seven portraits by Hals, which, together with those by Rembrandt, a few of Rembrandt’s followers, and twenty other artists, form a nearly complete picture of seventeenth-century portraiture in the Netherlands. Among the finest examples are a great equestrian portrait by Cuyp (Pl. 33), *The Van Mookerken Family* by Ter Borch (Pl. 14), an ambitious self-portrait by Gerrit Dou (Pl. 37), three exceptional pictures by Thomas de Keyser (Pls. 98–100), Daniel Mijten’s full-length portrait of Charles I (Pl. 124), and works by leading figures from different cities, such as Michiel van Mierevel of Delft, David Bailly of Leiden, Adriaen Hanneman of The Hague, and Johannes Verspronck of Haarlem. Like several works in the style of Rembrandt, the two portrait-like pictures by Govert Flinck are actually tronies, or studies of imaginary characters based on live models.

Boasts give way to embarrassment (of the kind attributed to wealthy Dutchmen) when the plentitude of genre paintings is taken into account. Ter Borch, Gabriel Metsu, Jan Steen, and Vermeer are each represented by three genre scenes. There are two large and famous canvases (both given by Benjamin Altman) and a pair of lesser works by Hals, two sympathetic pictures of domestic life by Metsu, no less than seven paintings by Pieter de Hooch, and typical works by most of the other key figures from Amsterdam, Haarlem, Leiden, The Hague, and Rotterdam. One of the pictures by Quirijn van Brekelenkam, the charming *Sentimental Conversation* (Pl. 24), is actually too Vermeer-like to be described as typical, and that term is inadequate also for the paintings by Cornelis Bisschop, Frans van Mieris, and Peter Wtewael.

The naughty picture by Wtewael (Pl. 225) and a small panel by Jacob Duck (Pl. 41) are the Museum’s only good examples of genre painting from Utrecht. Like pictures of peasant life, those of carousing cavaliers and loose women by Utrecht artists such as Gerrit van Honthorst would have been frowned upon by the kind of collectors who in the first half of the twentieth century became Museum trustees. This predisposition was reinforced by lordly dealers such as Joseph Duveen. Compensation for the shortage of Caravaggiosque works in the collection may be found in Hals’s Honthorst-like *Boy with a Lute* (Pl. 61), Matthias Stom’s *Old Woman Praying* (Pl. 198), and a hypnotic masterpiece of the Counter-Reformation in Utrecht, Hendrick ter Brugghen’s *Crucifixion with the Virgin and*
Saint John (Pl. 25). In addition, The Disillusioned Maida ("The Enchantress"), by Paulus Bor (Pl. 12), is a bewitching concoction of the Utrecht style, from nearby Amersfoort.

As in the case of genre scenes, the history of taste accounts for the comparatively incomplete representation of Dutch still-life painting. In Duveen’s day, these works were too inexpensive to be worth the trouble in the art trade, but now certain types—flower pieces, especially—bring spectacular prices. Curator Theodore Rousseau made a consistent effort to strengthen this part of the collection, for example, by purchasing the perfectly preserved vanitas still life by Pieter Claesz (Pl. 28) in 1949, then a year later one of Jan Weenix’s finest “trophy” pictures of dead game birds and hunting gear (Pl. 216), and finally, in 1953, a classic prunk (“show”) still life by Willem Kalf (Pl. 97) and a “forest-floor” study of plants, reptiles, and insects by Otto Marseus van Schrieck (Pl. 115). Marseus is a fascinating example of the Dutch artist as naturalist. As most accounts of his career are outdated or inadequate, the biography below is more thorough than might be expected.

The vanitas picture by Claesz is too early in style and too distinctive in subject matter to be considered typical of so-called monochrome still-life painting in Haarlem. Thus, the Markus bequest (2003) of an exquisite “monochrome breakfast piece” by Willem Claesz Heda (Pl. 73) was a significant addition to the collection. Still missing are works by the most distinguished members of the first generation of still-life painters, such as Ambrosius Bosschaert and Balthasar van der Ast. However, each collection has its own character, and the Museum’s increasing harvest of seventeenth-century still-life painting (which includes works by Flemish, French, and German artists) is already remarkable for its inclusion of the earliest dated vanitas still life from the Netherlands, painted in 1603 by Jacques de Gheyn the Elder (Pl. 48), and a rarity from Delft, Jacob Vosmaer’s Vase with Flowers, probably of 1613 (Pl. 213). Two early still lifes by Jan Davidsz de Heem, one very small and the other enormous (by Dutch standards), and fancy still lifes by Kalf and Abraham van Beyeren date from the middle years of the century. Life on country estates is evoked not only by the large Weenix but also by Melchior d’Hondecoeter’s even grander and more animated Peacocks, of 1681 (Pl. 82). The canvas is a comparatively rare instance of a non-Italian gift to an American museum by Samuel H. Kress (in 1927). From the eighteenth century, the graceful bouquet painted by Margareta Haverman in 1716 (Pl. 72) is one of only two works indisputably by this artist. Willem van Leen’s Flowers in a Blue Vase (Pl. 105) shows the long floral tradition in Dutch painting adapted to interior decoration of the late 1700s.

In the first fifty years after the Museum was founded (in 1870), the American elite’s lack of sympathy for the cultures, myths, and religions of foreign countries was even more pronounced than it is among conservative Americans today. The main exception was made possible by viewing the Netherlands as a Protestant republic of hardworking individuals with strong family values, a nation, in other words, that anticipated some of the perceived virtues of the United States. As a result, a relatively small proportion of Dutch pictures imported to America were history paintings, works representing mythological subjects, episodes of ancient history, and religious scenes. In recent decades, however, a more comprehensive view of Dutch painting—one allowing for Catholic and princely patrons, foreign and cosmopolitan collectors, and artists who favored international styles such as Mannerism and Classicism—has gradually formed in the Museum’s collection, mainly through curatorial initiative. The most important example is the great Ter Bruggghen Crucifixion, mentioned above (it was purchased in 1956). John Walsh was one of the first curators to take corrective measures, securing, for example, the Bloemaert in 1972. The same thinking went into the present writer’s recommendations of Bartholomeus Breenbergh’s Preaching of John the Baptist, the minor but popular Annunciation of the Death of the Virgin, by Samuel van Hoogstraten, and Joachim Wtewael’s astonishing picture on copper, The Golden Age, of 1605 (Pls. 22, 91, 224; acquired in 1991, 1992, and 1993, respectively). The other history paintings by Dutch artists tend to follow the same pattern of acquisition: the works by Bor, Barent Fabritius, Abraham Hondius, Jacob Pynas, and Maes’s earliest known dated work, Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael, of 1653 (Pl. 108), were all given in the early 1970s (surely with Walsh’s encouragement), and Godfried Schalcken’s Cephalus and Procris (Pl. 191) was purchased in 1974. The history paintings that came in earlier did so in most instances because they were or were thought to be by Rembrandt (Pls. 39, 147, 150, 168, 174, 175), or were at the time unappreciated pictures in search of a suitable home (Leonaert Bramer’s Judgment of Solomon [Pl. 21], for example, given in 1911). The biggest coup of this kind was the gift in 1943 of Gerard de Lairesse’s magnificent Apollo and Aurora, of 1671 (Pl. 104), which
went from the grand town house in Amsterdam for which it was made into three centuries of obscurity. Of course, the greatest Dutch painting in America, Rembrandt’s *Aristotle with a Bust of Homer* (Pl. 151), happens to be a history picture, but that was a distinctly secondary consideration to the Museum officials who arranged for its purchase at auction in 1961.

The *Aristotle* is the only painting by Rembrandt or previously thought to be by Rembrandt that the Museum ever acquired by purchase rather than by gift or bequest. Similarly, none of the works by Ter Borch, Cuyp, Hals, Hobbema, De Hooch, Metsu, Ruisdael, or Vermeer were purchased, and the names of Van Goyen, Van Ruysdael, and several other important artists could be added to the list were it not for the pictures by them that were acquired in 1871. It should, however, be understood that the majority of gifts made to the Museum require considerably more initiative and diplomacy than does the average purchase. Trustees, directors, department chairmen, curators, and others all play leading roles, on some occasions with great success, at others without consequence. In the 1950s, Museum staff members consumed a fair amount of tea in Mrs. Erickson’s library, where the *Aristotle* hung.

Normally, about a third of the Dutch paintings are on view in the galleries. An exhibition of the entire collection, “The Age of Rembrandt: Dutch Paintings in The Metropolitan Museum of Art” (September 18, 2007–January 6, 2008), which has been made possible by Accenture, coincides with the publication of this catalogue. The timing of the exhibition could be said to represent a compromise between two anniversaries, Rembrandt’s four-hundredth birthday (he was born in 1606) and the centennial of the “Hudson-Fulton Celebration,” held in 1909. The Museum took part in the citywide festivities by mounting a grand exhibition of Dutch and American art. The twin pretexts for the extravaganza were Henry Hudson’s sail up the Hudson River in 1609 (the English captain served the Dutch merchant marine) and the same trip made by Robert Fulton’s steamboat in 1807. The connection must have made as much sense to artists and collectors as it did to maritime historians, as seventeenth-century Dutch art had strongly influenced American painters since the early nineteenth century. But the main point of the exhibition was to demonstrate that New York was on the world map of cultural capitals (with steamships carrying collectors from one to another). The part of the exhibition that did so was not the comparatively modest American section, but the galleries that displayed the 149 Dutch pictures, including (according to curator W. R. Valentiner) thirty-seven by Rembrandt. Some of the most important Dutch paintings now in America were in that exhibition—including Rembrandt’s *Aristotle* (as *The Savant*).

When the present writer completed the collection catalogue *Flemish Paintings in The Metropolitan Museum of Art* (1984), it was intended that the Dutch counterpart would follow in a timely fashion. As the Director notes in the foreword, a variety of pleasant distractions were placed in the way, such as the Liechtenstein, Zurbarán, and Lille exhibitions of 1985–86, 1987, and 1992–93, and, in 1995–96, “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt in The Metropolitan Museum of Art,” which, in retrospect, was crucial preparation for the corresponding sections of the present catalogue. Another contributing factor, if in a less obvious way, has been the Museum’s policy of allowing curators to flourish as scholars in their fields by (within reason) researching and writing about subjects that do not bear directly on the collections. “Vermeer and the Delft School” (2001), one of the Museum’s most ambitious exhibitions of the past few decades, grew out of work that began with my own dissertation in the early 1970s and continued as a personal preoccupation.

The literature that has appeared in the past twenty-odd years—to think back again to the Flemish catalogue—allows some degree of gratitude that the Dutch catalogue was not completed sooner. Rembrandt studies, in particular (including the many of 2006), have been valuable to this publication, but so have articles and books devoted to much less familiar figures. This will be clear to readers who consult the endnotes and the References section in each entry, and the bibliography, which has expanded exponentially with the passing of years.

Like the size of the bibliography, the scale of the catalogue as a whole calls for some comment. Compilers of the past, ranging from Wilhelm von Bode to Neil MacLaren, managed to say everything they had in mind in much less space. But it is telling that when it appeared in 1960, MacLaren’s *The Dutch School* was regarded as an overflowing font of knowledge about the subject in general, as well as a complete guide to the Dutch pictures in the National Gallery, London. Since that time, the literature of Dutch art has grown beyond all imagining, or rather, beyond what could have been expected in those innocent days before the arrival of the Rembrandt Corpus, Surowski’s
Gemälde der Rembrandt-Schüler (1983–[94]); approximately twenty-five hundred Rembrandt-school pictures presented in six volumes), monumental exhibition catalogues such as *Dawn of the Golden Age* (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, 1993), and monographs on Bloemaert, Van Goyen, Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem, Honthorst, Van der Neer, Netscher, Schalken, Van de Velde, and others that tip the scales in prodigious competition with the standard volumes on Hals, Rembrandt, and Ruisdael (not to mention Michelangelo). Substantial books (at least in terms of shelf space) have been published on painters who would be sufficiently covered by short discussions in *Oud Holland*, although it is helpful—to auctioneers, collectors, dealers, and curators—to have a stockpile of photographs in one place (MacLaren’s volume had none). Thus, the present catalogue betrays both vices and virtues that are common in the field. But it differs from similar publications in one respect that might mitigate criticism. At the end of each entry, under References, not only is every mention of the painting in print (with a few trivial exceptions) cited, but its essential content is summarized. This should save serious readers a great deal of time, if only by demonstrating that in some cases three or four references in a hundred need be further considered. The brisk chronological reviews of the literature also allow one to trace trends in taste, the rise and fall of misconceptions, and the gradual accrual of evidence or insight. Rather as in an archaeological dig, the profiles of opinion and scholarship offered in the References reveal long-term tendencies and sudden revelations. The fact, for instance, that a recent interpretation was advanced and rejected a century ago. Or that for fifty or a hundred years, almost nothing worth repeating was written about a great painting—as if the powerful image, like Medusa, had turned scholars and critics to stone.

The approach taken in the text of each catalogue entry, as in the References, exhibition histories, provenance sections (Ex Coll.), and condition notes reflects the assumption that the most likely readers—curators, collectors, teachers, graduate students, and laymen—are already conversant with some of the literature of Dutch art. As recently as ten or twenty years ago, it was fairly common for cataloguers to supply background information within a dense discussion of a specific work of art, as if the average reader would benefit from remedial interludes on such subjects as livestock, tulips, vanitas symbols, the prevalence of monochromatic palettes in the 1630s, and so on. Addressing professionals and passersby in the same breath has proven ill-advised in several publications. Nevertheless, it should be recognized that not all readers will have at their fingertips important details of historical information, and that a catalogue of paintings might be consulted by someone whose main interests lie elsewhere, such as the history of dress, music, travel, or collecting. For some readers, the most important questions may be those of provenance, the history of ownership, and great care has been given to the ex-collection sections at the end of each entry, which for the most part represent the work of other members of the Department of European Paintings over many years.

It may seem inconsistent with remarks made above that the condition notes at the top of each entry, all of which were compiled by Museum conservator Dorothy Mahon, are no longer than they are. Recent catalogues of Dutch art have been less parsimonious in this regard, for example by advising the reader in nearly every entry that lead white is present in the paint layers or that the surface of a seventeenth-century canvas reveals small areas of abrasion. Only the absence of either (or the presence of something less expected) could possibly interest the specialist, who, like any reader, will be content with a brief description of a picture’s state unless the case is unusual. Every one of the reports published here is based on close examination and, in many cases, conservation carried out in the past few years.

A similar effort has been made to convey the most essential information (for example, authorship and date) near the beginning of each entry, no matter how involved it becomes. And what of the ninety-nine biographies included in this catalogue, some of which are more substantial than the entries they precede? Many artists’ biographies, especially in exhibition catalogues, appear to have been written by reviewing recent examples and composing slightly altered versions. As a result, factual errors are perpetuated, even in standard reference works such as the *Dictionary of Art* (1996). This is especially regrettable at a time when archival research is flourishing, and finding the latest information is facilitated by Internet and electronic communication. Because the present catalogue covers a fairly comprehensive group of Dutch artists, it was considered appropriate to offer the most reliable biographies possible or to state where they might be found and to offer only synopses here. After all the biographies in these two volumes were written, the new
catalogue of the Frans Halsmuseum made its appearance. In it, Irene van Thiel-Stroman sets a standard for completeness and documentation that cannot be maintained in these pages; nor would it be appropriate to do so (her subject is more specifically the lives of Haarlem artists, based on extensive archival work). However, her findings have been absorbed, as have the contributions of most specialized publications through March 2007. Biographies were also greatly improved by consulting archival researchers such as Marten Jan Bok, S. A. C. Dudok van Heel, Jaap van der Veen, and the late J. Michael Montias. In one case, the search for better information (about Emanuel Murant) burst beyond the reasonable limits of this catalogue and landed where it belongs, in a volume dedicated to Montias’s memory.

Michael Montias is one of the many scholars who have made the past forty years a golden age in the study of Dutch art. The present writer was fortunate to work in that period, and moreover in an institution where the collection, resources, fellow staff members, and visitors—whether the general public or professional colleagues—were continual sources of inspiration. The people who in a spiritual or material way made this catalogue an aspiration and then a reality are recalled in the acknowledgments. What the paintings themselves have meant to the curator, who, for a moment in history, has had them in his nominal care (curar), is not an appropriate subject for a publication that presents them to others, but it is hoped that it will be sensed between the lines.

1. The quotes are from James’s article in the Atlantic Monthly, June 1872, reprinted in James (1872) 1916, pp. 55, 58, 65. For a history and complete catalogue of the 1871 Purchase, see Baertjers 2004. Only one object, a Roman sarcophagus, was previously owned by the Museum.

2. The history of the Museum’s collection of Dutch pictures is treated in the summer 2007 issue of the Metropolitan Museum Bulletin; see Quodbach 2007. For the more sweeping story of “Dutch Paintings in America: The Collectors and Their Ideals,” see Liedtke 1990.

3. Cortissoz 1930, p. 239. The National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., now has approximately 115 Dutch paintings of the seventeenth century (92 are catalogued in Wheeldon 1994). Comparable European collections are generally older and larger. There are, for instance, about 440 Dutch pictures in the National Gallery, London, which was established in 1824.

4. The Haarlem catalogue is cited in the bibliography as Biesboer et al. 2006.

5. See Liedtke and Bakker 2006.
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IN HONOR OF THE NETHERLANDS.
Note to the Reader

Catalogue entries are arranged alphabetically by artist and then in chronological order. In the case of undated works, a few slight departures from this system have been made (for example, under Style of Rembrandt) in order to juxtapose paintings of similar type. Page numbers, plate numbers, and figure numbers run consecutively throughout the two volumes. The three indexes at the end of volume 2 cover both volumes and include a general index, an index of previous owners (including dealers), and an index of paintings listed by accession number. The last index may be used to identify pictures for which the attribution or title has changed, and it also reveals the order in which works entered the collection.

In the entries, the artist’s name is given in the heading only when a modification such as “Attributed to” is required. (The artist’s name is also given at the bottom of every page.) The number before a painting’s title refers to its colorplate. Dimensions are given in inches and centimeters, with height preceding width. When a painting bears a signature, it is described either as “signed” or as “inscribed.” The latter term, when applied to signatures and dates, implies that the inscription is not original or may not for some reason be reliable.

Credit lines and accession numbers are given both in the entry’s heading and at the end of the entry, under “Ex Coll.” This section follows two others, “References” and “Exhibited.” The publications listed under References correspond to entries in the bibliography and are given in chronological order. Authors published in the same year are listed alphabetically unless their remarks call for a different sequence (e.g., “Brown 1975, reviewing White 1975, observes that . . .”). Under “Exhibited,” names of institutions are those employed at the time. Under “Ex Coll.,” names of dealers are given in brackets.

The following institutions appear in the text in abbreviated form:

- Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio
- Alte Pinakothek, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich
- Bodemuseum, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin
- Busch-Reisinger Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin
- Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden
- Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Staatliche Museen, Kassel
- Koninklijk Kabinet van Schilderijen Mauritshuis, The Hague
- Kunstmuseum, Öffentliche Kunstsammlungen, Basel
- Kupferstich-Kabinett, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden
- Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin
- Musée du Louvre, Paris
- Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid
- Das Städel, Städelisches Kunstinstitut, und Städtische Galerie, Frankfurt am Main
- The State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg
- Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence
- Wallraf-Richartz-Museum & Fondation Corboud, Cologne
- Westfälisches Landesmuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte, Münster
Jacob Backer was one of the best figure painters and draftsmen in Amsterdam in the 1630s and 1640s, his gifts evidently acknowledged as early as 1633–34 by his commission—when he was only twenty-six and, as an artist, new to the city—for the group portrait The Governesses of the Civic Orphanage of Amsterdam (Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam). Backer was born in the autumn of 1608 in Harlingen, an old port on the coast of Friesland, west of Leeuwarden. His parents were Hilk Folkertsdtra and Adriaen Tjerkes, a baker and a Mennonite. In 1611, after the death of his mother, his father married Eilsen Roeolfs, a widowed bakery owner from Amsterdam. The new family settled in that flourishing center of commerce and art, and, not surprisingly, adopted the surname Backer (bakker, meaning baker).

About 1626–27, the young artist went to study with Lambert Jacobsz (ca. 1598–1636), a painter of biblical subjects in Leeuwarden. This seeming return to the provinces was no such thing, since Jacobsz was the son of a prominent cloth merchant in Amsterdam and a product of the same Pre-Rembrandt circle that, about 1624, set the Leiden artist on his own path as a history painter. In 1620, Jacobsz married a young woman from Leeuwarden (an event commemorated in a poem by Vondel) and soon became a preacher in that city's Mennonite community, as well as its most important painter and art dealer. In the latter capacity, he worked with Rembrandt's future art dealer in Amsterdam, the Mennonite Hendrick Uyleiwenh (ca. 1584/89–1661). But for Backer's parents, as for Govert Flinck's (q.v.), it would have been Jacobsz's faith and character that encouraged them to send their son to Friesland.

Backer moved back to Amsterdam by 1633 and set up shop as an independent history painter and portraitist. His large canvas John the Baptist Relucting Herod and Herodias, signed and dated 1633 (Fries Museum, Leeuwarden), follows the grander of Jacobsz's two styles, which was inspired by artists in Utrecht and Antwerp. Backer emphasized the suavity of this manner, a direction that may have been encouraged somewhat by the Leeuwarden native Wybrand de Geest (1592–ca. 1662), who had traveled in France and Italy, and served as portraitist to the Protestant Nassaus and the Friesian nobility. Many of De Geest's formal portraits look like a synthesis of those by Paulus Moreelse (q.v.) and the Antwerp artist Cornelis de Vos (1583/84–1651). But what is sensed more strongly in Backer's biblical and mythological pictures of the 1630s (the latter including Granida and Daifilo; Hermitage, Saint Petersburg) and single-figure genre subjects (such as the painterly Shepherd with Flute, of about 1637; Mauritshuis, The Hague), is an interest in the Caravagggesque manner of Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.), who was De Geest's former teacher and a great success during the 1620s and 1630s, both in Utrecht and at the Dutch court in The Hague. Backer (like Rembrandt, Jan Lievens, and others in the same years) must have acquainted himself with recent painting in Utrecht, since the affinities extend to Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656), Jan van Bijlert (1597/98–1671), Moreelse, and his son Johannes (d. 1634). Also underlining the Utrecht connection are Backer's many pastoral subjects and his appealing nudes (both exemplified by Cimon and Iphigenia; Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig), neither of which could have had much to do with Jacobsz. The nudes are based on studies from life, and form part of a wonderful oeuvre of figure drawings.

Backer's debt to Rembrandt in the 1630s has been overestimated, and comes down essentially to his borrowing of some figure types (especially the "Noble Slav" variety; see Pl. 142) and a good dose of chiaroscuro. The latter is found in Backer's dignified Portrait of a Boy in Gray, dated 1634 (Mauritshuis, The Hague), where De Geest, De Vos, and Anthony Van Dyck seem more relevant than artists in Amsterdam. A Flemish flair is more obvious in Backer's Portrait of Abraham Vaters (formerly with E. Speelman, London) and in his casual self-portrait drawing of 1638 (Albertina, Vienna). The artist clearly had the ability to modify his manner according to his sitters' tastes, as is seen in a comparison of his portraits of the Remonstrant preacher Johannes Uyttenbogaert (1638; Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) or the lawyer François de Vroude (1643; Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) with his pendant oval portraits of the silversmith Jan Lutma and his wife (early 1640s; Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) and with the presumed portraits of Bartholomeus Breenbergh (q.v.) and his spouse (1644; Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam). Backer also painted large group portraits later in his career: The Civic Guard Company of Captain Cornelis de
Graeff and Lieutenant Hendrick Lauwrensz., of 1642 (which competed with Rembrandt's Night Watch and, on more even terms, with Bartholomeus van der Helst's Company of Captain Ruolof Bicker, in the Kloveniersdoelen of Amsterdam), and The Regents of the Nieuwezijds Institution for Relief of the Poor, of about 1650 (all Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). From works like the large Venus and Adonis, of about 1650 (Hessische Hausstiftung, Eichenzell, near Fulda), it appears that Backer would have been a worthy rival of Ferdinand Bol (q.v.) in the 1650s, but he died on August 27, 1651, not quite forty-three years old. He never married. Backer evidently returned a favor to Jacobsz by training his son, the talented Abraham van den Tempel (1622/23–1672), in Amsterdam. It is likely that Backer's nephew Adriaen Backer (ca. 1635/36–1684) and Jan van Neck (1635–1714) were his apprentices.4


2. For the paintings cited in this paragraph, see Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 1, nos. 5–7, 36, and fig. 74, for the group portrait of 1643. On the Mauritshuis Shepherd, which was ascribed to Bloemaert in 1785, see also Broos in Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, pp. 29–31, no. 2. Many of Backer's known drawings are reproduced in Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 1, pp. 117–175. The nude studies are considered an "effect of Rembrandt's lessons in Amsterdam" in The Hague 1992a, p. 89, where a quite misleading attempt is made to associate Backer with "Rembrandt's academy."


ATTRIBUTED TO JACOB BACKER

1. **Old Woman in an Armchair**

Oil on canvas, 50 1/8 x 39 1/8 in. (128 x 99.4 cm)
Inscribed (upper right): Rembrandt f. 1635; (upper left)
AET.SUE 70. / 8

The painting is well preserved. There are several minor losses and abrasions in the background, two small losses in the skirt, and a series of small losses to the right of the head in the headdress and the collar.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.603

Like a good number of former "Rembrandts," this large canvas in the Altman Collection was included in catalogues of the artist's work through Bauch's corpus of 1966 and then rejected by Gerson in 1968 and 1969 (see Refs.). In 1923, however, Van Dyke, no doubt responding to the frequent suggestion of Frans Hals's influence on the painting, assigned it to that master or to the "Hals school." Benesch, visiting the Museum in 1940, was the first to propose an attribution to Jacob Backer. In 1984, De Bruyn Kops supported the Backer attribution, observing that the hands were characteristic (presumably the Rijksmuseum curator was recalling the hands in Backer's portrait of the eighty-year-old Johannes Uyttenbogaert, dated 1638, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). The Dutch portrait specialist Rudolf Ekkart more recently concluded that the painting is either by Backer or after a lost portrait by him.

The brushwork in the face and hands is so fresh and purposeful that the notion of a copy may be dismissed. Nor is there any sign in the irregular contours of the costume, the nervous behavior of the hands, the subtle description of the
Figure 1. Jacob Backer, *Portrait of an Elderly Woman*, ca. 1638. Oil on canvas, 46⅔ x 36⅔ in. (118.7 x 92.4 cm). The Wallace Collection, London

cap and ruff, the luxurious fabrics, or any other passage to suggest that the painter was reproducing another picture. As for the attribution to Backer, it is supported mainly by comparisons with portraits of middle-aged or elderly women that are dated between 1636 and the early 1640s in Bauch’s monograph of 1926 and in Sumowski’s 1983 survey of Backer’s oeuvre. Unfortunately, the ideal comparison would be with the lost *Portrait of an Old Woman* (see fig. 2), which happens to depict the same sitter as the Havemeyer *Portrait of an Old Woman* (Pl. 2), discussed below. In good photographs, however, it appears that the brushwork in the face (with long strokes describing highlights on folds of skin), the drawing, and the use of shadows are quite comparable to the execution in the Altman canvas. The costume and hands in the latter recall Backer’s portrait of a younger woman (ca. 1640?) in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen. The handling in the so-called *Portrait of an Elderly Woman*, in the Wallace Collection, London (fig. 1), is also reminiscent of the Museum’s picture, although the picture of a distinctly younger woman (which Sumowski dates to about 1638) is more typical of Backer in its softer and smoother application of paint overall. The task of rendering dry and wrinkled skin in the Altman picture, its probably earlier date (ca. 1634?), and perhaps the inspiration of Rembrandt’s treatment of similar faces, like that in his *Portrait of an Eighty-three-Year-Old Woman* (*Aechje Clasdr Pesser*), dated 1634 (National Gallery, London), could account for the differences.

In sales of 1760, 1769, and 1782, this picture was paired with the *Portrait of a Man*, now in the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. Schmidt-Degener (1914; see Refs.) and later writers have convincingly discounted their connection as pendants. It has been noted that the crossed rings on the
woman's right index finger may indicate that she is a widow. In any case, the painting, in its design, and the figure, in pose and expression (alert, with a slight smile), convey an impression of self-sufficiency.

The inscription to the left gives the sitter's age as seventy and the date 24/3 (March 24), presumably the date of her birth. No trace of a year (other than that following the spurious Rembrandt signature) can now be found on the canvas.

1. Otto Benesch, oral opinion, December 20, 1940. The same view was expressed by Dian Cevat on January 4, 1966. Frans Lugt, visiting in December 1944, did not trust the attribution to Rembrandt.

2. C. J. de Bruyn Kops's oral opinion was recorded by the present writer on January 10, 1984. Rudolf Ekkart's report to the Museum, written some months after he had studied the Dutch portraits for two weeks, is dated November 3, 1988. For Backer's portrait of Yttenbogaert, see Sumowski 1983–1994, vol. 1, no. 62 (ill.).

3. See the color detail of the face in New York 1999-96, vol. 1, fig. 38.

4. See Sumowski 1983–1994, vol. 1, pp. 201, 262–67, nos. 59, 60, 61, 64 (paintings in Antwerp, Berlin, London, and Copenhagen, respectively), where references to Bauch's catalogue and other literature are provided. Also relevant, especially given the date of 1622, is the Portrait of a Fifty-six-year-Old Man attributed to Backer in the Museum Bredius, The Hague (ibid., no. 51; Blankert 1991, pp. 42–43, no. 5).


6. Bruyn in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3, p. 31, went so far as to say that “the basis for the remarkable, almost graphical [? treatment of the wrinkled head [in the Altman portrait] is the forceful brushwork in pieces like the London Portrait of an Eighty-three-Year-Old woman” (the idea is repeated in ibid., p. 709). This apparent influence sufficed, evidently, for Bruyn's conviction that the New York canvas was painted in Rembrandt's studio, even though the same scholar and his colleagues thought that it revealed “so slight a resemblance to Rembrandt's portraits from the 1620s that it is surprising that no-one doubted its authenticity until Gerson termed the Rembrandt attribution ‘not convincing,’” and notwithstanding their suggestion that the “workshop assistant trained elsewhere (Haarlem)?” (ibid., pp. 702, 704). On June 24, 1976, Bruyn suggested at the Museum that the picture was probably not by Backer, but possibly by a Haarlem painter.

7. See ibid., p. 704, for this observation, and on the different style of the Corcoran painting. In the curatorial files John Walsh recorded photographs at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Dokumentatie, The Hague, that reproduce small oval bust-length copies of the figures in the New York and Washington pictures (both collection of Jan Hamilton, Melrose, Scotland; sold at Christie's, London, June 18, 1824, no. 76, as by Rembrandt).

References: J. Smith 1839–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 177, no. 554, lists the canvas under portraits of women by Rembrandt, “now in the collection of Meijufrouwe Hoffman [sic], at Haarlem”; Lagrange 1859, p. 292, as a Rembrandt in the Duc de Morny’s collection, signed and dated 1635, “a magnificent portrait of a woman, some good old lady of the family, Rembrandt’s mother perhaps”; Thöré 1867, p. 542, cites the work as one of the Rembrandts in the collection of Baron Seillière; Bode 1883, p. 617, describes a portrait of an old woman, evidently this picture, as in the collection of the “Herzog von Sagan” in Berlin, where it was wrongly attributed to Van der Helst; Dutuit 1885, p. 20, records the picture as in the de Morny sale of 1865, “passed on to the Seillières collection” (!); Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 468; Monkhuse 1897, pp. 271–72 (ill.), as a Rembrandt in the collection of Arthur Sanderson, describes the subject and observes that the sitter is “said to be Rembrandt’s mother, but bearing little resemblance to her well-known face”; Amsterdam 1898, no. 35, as “Portret eener oude dame, zitterd;” signed and dated “Rembrandt f. 1635” (lent by Arthur Sanderson, Edinburgh); Hofstede de Groot 1908, unpag. no. 6 (in text section), and no. 35, pl. 6, offers a broad explanation of how this Rembrandt might have come to be influenced by Frans Hals; Bell 1899, p. 141, records the portrait as in the Sanderson collection; Hofstede de Groot in Bode 1897–1906, vol. 3 (1899), pp. 35–36, 192, 194, no. 224, pl. 224, observes that this Rembrandt portrait in the Sanderson collection “startles us by the stupendous truth and ten-derness with which the ugly and, in some respects, vulgar features are rendered,” and suggests that a portrait of an old man in an armchair in Lord Ashburton’s collection (now Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.) is a pendant; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 87 (ill.), 237, as Rembrandt’s “Portrait of an old lady” of 1635 in the Sanderson collection; A. Rosenberg 1906, no. 145 (ill.), 397, without comment but, following the suggestion of Hofstede de Groot (1899), juxtaposes the picture with the portrait of a (younger) man in the Ashburton collection; K. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 209 (ill.), 555, as with Duveen Brothers, London; Bredius 1912b, pp. 339–41, pls. 11–12, 14–15 (details), uses this picture (assumed to be by Rembrandt) to help prove that the Portrait of Elisabeth Bas (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) is by Bol; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 10–11, no. 5 (ill.), as a Rembrandt of 1635, describes the sitter as “a plain old lady who would sit upright in her chair in the attitude of a peasant who poses for the village photographer,” and opines of the picture that “from its tranquil and matter-of-fact appearance one would little suspect that its author was to show himself one of the most accountable among painters”; Schmitter-Degener 1914, pp. 1–2 (ill.), rejects the Corcoran portrait of a man as a possible pendant, noting its different format, composition, and style; Valentine 1914b, pp. 312, 315, fig. 3, feels that the portrait “cannot but remind us of Hals,” and that the sitter fights a dignified battle against the onslaught of old age; Altman Collection 1915, p. 83 (ill.), no comment; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 347 (under no. 738), 398, no. 868, as in the MMA, lists provenance, and catalogues the Corcoran portrait as a pendant; A. Burroughs 1923, p. 274, remarks that the picture “might easily be Rembrandt’s own work; but its hard, uncompromising surface defies one’s feeling and leaves no illusion of insight”; Meldrum 1923, pp. 85, 140, 190, pl. cxxi, states that the picture “anticipates the ‘Rembrandt touch’ of years later,” and identifies the sitter as a Mennonite, dressed in the fashion of 1620; Monod 1923, p. 302, mentions the portrait of a “very sad, very ugly septu-
genarian" in a review of the Altman Collection; Van Dyke 1913, p. 167, pl. XLIII, fig. 164, attributes the painting to Hals or the "Hals school"; Altman Collection 1928, pp. 74–75, no. 38 (ill.), inaccurately reprints the remarks in Altman Collection 1914; Valentin 1931, unpaged, no. 54, pl. 54, "shows the artist at a moment when he comes nearer to Frans Hals than at any other period of his life"; A. Burroughs 1932a, pp. 38, 39–91, figs. 3, 6 (X-radiograph detail), allows the painting to serve as a standard for Rembrandt portraits of the 1610s, in order to assign another picture to Flinck; Bredius 1935, pp. 9 (under no. 212), 15, no. 348, pl. 348, "perhaps" a pendant to the Corcoran portrait; Isaklov 1936, p. 16, reveals the influence of Hals on Rembrandt; A. Burroughs 1938, pp. 160, 161, cites the painting as a typical example of Rembrandt’s brushwork, notwithstanding Hals’s influence; J. Allen 1945, p. 73, cites the work as a "vigorously" Rembrandt; K. Bauch 1966, in essay (no. 32), p. 25, no. 491, p. 491, as by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1630, possibly the pendant to the Corcoran portrait; Gerson 1968, pp. 207 (ill.), 495, no. 185, considers the painting to be not by Rembrandt but from his Amsterdam circle, and also rejects the Corcoran picture, which is "perhaps the companion portrait"; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 273 (ill.), 505 (under no. 212), 577, no. 348, repeats Gerson 1968; Lecaldano 1969, p. 104, no. 171 (ill.), notes that the attribution is in doubt; Haskell 1970, fig. 10 (Altman gallery view); Van Eghen 1977, p. 11, suggests that the Corcoran and MMA portraits may represent Willem van der Pluym, a wealthy Leiden plumber, and his wife, Jaapen Carrels, noting that Marten ten Hove (see Ex Coll.) was their great-great-grandson; Baejer 1980, vol. 1, p. 150, as Style of Rembrandt, 17th century; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3 (1989), pp. 35, 610, 679, 699–704, no. C112 (ill.), figs. 2–4 (details of face, left hand, signature, and X-radiograph of face), implausibly supposes that the work was painted in Rembrandt’s studio, imagines that "the composition is taken partially from the 1634 full-length Portrait of Maria Bickenbok in Boston (no. 499),” astonished proposes that the Portrait of Antonie Coopel (on loan to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) could be the same painter, and rejects the Corcoran portrait as this picture’s pendant; Liedtke 1990, fig. 37 (Altman gallery view); Lloyd Williams in Edinburg 1992, p. 176, as with Arthur Sanderson until about 1906; Van Thiel 1992, pp. 40, 78, no. 35 (ill.), fig. 23 (gallery view), records the picture in the 1898 Amsterdam exhibition, and quotes the review by Jan Veth, for whom the painting was "een mooie Frans Hals"; Baejer 1995, p. 321, as attributed to Jacob Backer; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 96–98, no. 24 (ill.), tentatively attributes the painting to Jacob Backer and discusses other opinions; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 43, 112, 114, figs. 38, 147 (details), and 39, 148 (X-radiograph details), 149, rejects an attribution to Backer and sees some similarity to (but also differences from) the technique employed in the face of the Altman Portrait of a Woman (Pl. 2); Schnackenburg 2001, pp. 117, 121 n. 127, sees the influence of the Kassel Bust of an Old Man with a Golden Chain, which the author considers (taking the minority view) to be by Rembrandt; Quodbach 2004, pp. 94 n. 13, 95, 97, 98 n. 42, cites the work among Baron Seillière’s Rembrandts, notes the disappointing price it brought at the duc de Morny sale of 1885, and connects it with a portrait mentioned by Bode (1883, see above) as in the collection of the "Herzog von Sagan" in Berlin; Scallen 2004, p. 375 n. 49, as doubted in A. Burroughs 1923, Secret 2004, pp. 280, 476, cites the painting as a "Rembrandt" that "went through Duveen’s hands"; Groen in Corpus 2005, p. 326, fig. 8, and pp. 662–63, reports that the first ground contains red earth, umber, and quartz, and the second ground lead white, yellow ochre, a little red ochre, and lampblack, resulting in a light yellowish gray color.


Ex Coll.: J. A. Tourton or M. ten Hove (until 1760; their joint posthumous sale, Amsterdam, April 8th, 1760, no. 2, for Fl 85, with pendant to Yver); sale, Cok, Amsterdam, May 8, 1769, no. 66, for Fl 650, with pendant to Fouquet; Pierre Fouquet, Amsterdam (from 1769); ?Sainte-Foix (his/her anonymous sale, Le Brun, Paris, April 24th, 1782, no. 3, with pendant, for 2,399 livres to Donjon); ?Donjon (from 1782); ?Mme Hoofman, Haarlem (in 1836); Charles-Auguste-Louis-Joseph de Morny, duc de Morny, Paris (possibly by 1825, and certainly by 1863–1865; his estate sale, Palais de la Présidence du Corps Législatif, Paris, May 31, 1865, no. 69, for FFr 4,900); Baron Achille Seillière, Paris (in 1897); private collection (until 1888; sale, Christie’s, London, July 14 and 16, 1888, no. 167, as property of a gentleman, for £1,155 to Lesser); [L. Lesser, London, 1888–89]; Arthur Sanderson, Edinburgh (by 1897—until about 1906); [Duveen, London, until 1906; sold for $124,185 to Altman]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1906–1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.603

1. The composition is entirely conventional for the period, as is clear from comparisons with works by Backer (see fig. 1), Hals, Paulus Leire (see Sumowski 1981–94, vol. 3, no. 150), and others.
2. For the descriptions of this picture in the sale catalogues of 1760, 1769, and 1782, see Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3, p. 704 (under “Provenance”).
3. According to J. Smith in 1836 (see Refs.).
4. According to Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 398 (under no. 868), the painting was in the duc de Morny sale, Paris, May 24, 1822. Lagrange 1865 (see Refs.) places the work in de Morny’s collection.
5. In Quodbach 2004, p. 98 n. 42, the painting is connected with a portrait of an old woman by Rembrandt owned by “a Sagan relative in Berlin,” namely the “Herzog von Sagan” cited in Bode 1883, p. 617. Presumably this was Louis de Talleyrand-Périgord (Paris 1811–1880 Berlin), 4th Herzog zu Sagan (Sagan, where the family had a castle, is southeast of Berlin). The daughter of the previous owner, Achille Seillière (see Ex Coll.), was Jeanne Marguerite de Seillière (1839–1905), princesse de Sagan.
STYLE OF JACOB BACKER

2. Portrait of an Old Woman

Oil on wood, 28 x 24 in. (71.1 x 61 cm)
Inscribed (lower right): Rembrandt f. 1640; (upper left)
EF. SVE. 87.

The painting is well preserved. The grain of the oak panel
runs in a horizontal direction.

H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O.
Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.2

When this panel was in the Kann and Havemeyer collections,
it was highly regarded as a Rembrandt, winning particular
praise from Bode for the “extraordinarily loving care” with
which it was painted (1895; see Refs.). The picture held its
place in Rembrandt catalogues through Valentine’s unreliable
corpus of 1931, after which the work was dropped from scholar-
ly discussions for fifty years. Sumowski, in 1983, published
the painting as by Backer, an attribution made more tentatively
by Van Dyke in 1923 (see Refs.). Both critics draw attention to
a canvas formerly in the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, Berlin (fig. 2),
which depicts the same woman at about the same age, in the
same or very similar attire, sitting in a chair with a small book
and glasses in her hands. Her shoulders are at the same angle
to the picture plane as in the Havemeyer portrait but her head
is turned toward the viewer, and her expression is thoughtful
and stern. Bauch knew the Berlin picture well and in his 1926
monograph on the artist included it as a work by Backer dating
from about 1635–40.1 Wilhelm Martin and Otto Benesch
favored the same attribution for the present portrait when they
saw it in 1938 and 1940, respectively.2 A postwar predisposition
to describe former “Rembrandts” as products of later periods
was demonstrated by viewers of the painting such as Van
Gelder, Gudlaugsson, and Stechow.3 No specialist today would
doubt that the portrait was painted in or near Amsterdam
between about 1633 and 1640.

The current notion of Backer’s work in the 1630s is based
mainly on his stylish history and genre pictures (like those
cited in the biography above) and his most admired portraits,
such as the Portrait of a Boy in Gray, dated 1634 (Mauritshuis,
The Hague). One gains a very different impression of Backer’s
manner from the tronies of old men he painted about 1633–35,
such as Old Man with a Mirror (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) and
Old Man in a Beret and Fur Coat (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden),
which are monogrammed “JB” and “JAB,” respectively.4 The
latter picture and a few contemporary paintings by Backer
depict the same model as the one Rembrandt used for his
great canvas of 1632, Man in Oriental Costume (“The Noble
Slav”) (Pl. 142).5 Much as Rembrandt worked in a different
manner in the Bellona of the following year (Pl. 147) and demon-
strated a variety of techniques in portraits dating from 1632
(Pl. 141), 1633 (Pl. 146), and 1634 (for example, the Portrait of
an Eighty-three-Year-Old Woman [Aechje Claudisz Peser], National
Gallery, London),6 Backer appears to have modified his style
according to subject matter and figure type, especially about
1633–34, when he was in immediate contact with Rembrandt
and their mutual dealer, Hendrick Ulyenburgh (ca. 1584/89–1666).

Scholars for whom all this is familiar information—Bauch,
Martin, Benesch, Sumowski, Ekkart, among others—agree
that the Havemeyer portrait is in the style (or a style) of Jacob
Backer. When Bauch catalogued the lost Berlin portrait as by
Backer, he recalled “the same woman by Rembrandt (Backer?)
in the Havemeyer Collection” (1926; see Refs.). As noted above,
Sumowski (1983) considers both pictures to be by Backer. In
1988, Ekkart concluded that the Havemeyer panel is probably
a contemporary copy after a portrait by Backer (and that the Old
Woman in an Armchair [Pl. 1] is either by him or an early copy).7 The
present writer and Von Sonnenburg agreed with this opinion in the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” catalogue of
1995–96 (see Refs.), and it remains the most plausible hypothesis.

However, there are reasons for uncertainty. Presumably,
Backer’s original would have been more fluently painted (even
if he was working in the manner of his “Noble Slavs”), and
yet the presumed copyist, in the present picture, chose to ren-
der flesh (if not fur and cloth) as if he were emulating Gerrit
Dou (q.v.) or the other followers of Rembrandt who during
the early 1630s turned topographical description of old faces
into demonstrations of artistic skill. Often in those works
(Dou’s Old Woman with a Fur Hat, in the Gemäldegalerie,
Berlin, is a good example) the dryness and detail of wrinkled
skin are compared with painterly suggestions of soft fur and
other contrasting materials.8 The broadly stroked strips of fur in
the Havemeyer portrait are reminiscent of Backer and at the
same time seem atypical of a copy.9 The delicacy with which thin
skin and fine hair, veins, moisture in the eyes, transparency and
highlights in the collar and cuffs, shadows to the right of the
head, and other effects are described also speaks against the notion
of a copy, as do the pentimenti at the shoulder to the left and
at the top of the head.
Direct comparison with the *Old Woman in an Armchair* (Pl. 1) is necessary, given the supposition that these problematic portraits of similar sitters could be by the same hand. Their execution appears consistent, allowing for the fact that the Havemeyer painting is better preserved, is on wood not canvas, and represents a conscious effort to be even more specific in the description of an elderly woman’s face and hands. The same surprisingly broad indication of shadows between the fingers is found, and a similar sureness, crispness, and impressive sense of volume are evident in the caps and collars. Both figures are adequately but not convincingly set in space against a neutral backdrop. That two former “Rembrandts” of the same type may be found in the same collection is a coincidence but also a reflection of taste about 1900. The Havemeyer portrait was often mentioned in the same breath with the *Herman Doomer* (Pl. 148) and occasionally cited as a worthy companion in which the same sort of meticulous workmanship (then thought to be typical of Rembrandt about 1640) could be admired. When Altman bought the *Old Woman in an Armchair*, in 1906, it could have been said that he had acquired a “Rembrandt” portrait of the Havemeyer type.

Complicating the question of authorship in the case of the Havemeyer portrait is its relationship with a version formerly in the Yarborough and Ringling collections (fig. 3). To judge from photographs, the Yarborough painting, on a large panel, is inferior to the present picture and has suffered considerable wear. The face in the larger picture appears slightly younger and the expression comparatively vacuous. The hands are less well modeled, and the sitter’s left shoulder and arm form weaker, less supportive angles than in the Havemeyer version. One has the unexpected impression that with a little more age the old woman has gained strength, both in body and in character. The most likely conclusion would appear to be that the Yarborough picture records the format of the *principal* (first version) of the commissioned portrait, but that the Havemeyer painting gives a better idea of the missing work’s quality. The grain of the wood in the smaller panel runs horizontally, suggesting that the artist chose a wide board so as to execute the painting on a single piece of wood of the equivalent height (cradling prevents inspection of the back). Thus, Valentiner’s conclusion (1931; see Refs.) that the Havemeyer version was originally as large as the Yarborough panel is certainly mistaken. Rather, it must be a reduced replica or perhaps a slightly different version (aging the sitter somewhat?) of an original knee-length portrait. In this connection, it is intriguing that Michel, in 1894 (see Refs.), when comparing the Yarborough and Havemeyer
portraits, recalled that “another copy, probably by J. Backer, was sold by auction in London in March, 1889.”

No firm conclusion can be drawn about the actual execution of the Havemeyer painting, given incomplete evidence and the present state of Backer scholarship. It would be hasty to catalogue the picture either as attributed to Backer or as a copy after a work by him. The designation Style of Backer in this case allows for either alternative, and for the possibility that the Havemeyer and Yarborough paintings and the lost Berlin portrait of the same sitter came from a different North Holland artist’s studio.

2. Oral opinions, recorded in the curatorial files, in April 1938 and on December 20, 1940. Frederick Schmidt-Degener, on April 15, 1935, said, “Really Rembrandt.”
3. Oral opinions recorded in the curatorial files include the following: J. G. van Gelder, February 1944, suggested an eighteenth-century copy; R.-A. d’Hulst and Wolfgang Stechow, together on December 14, 1954, agreed that the picture is a later copy “rather than a fake, and suggested a nineteenth-century origin; Sturla Gudlaugsson, April 6, 1956, thought the picture probably copied an original by Bol rather than Rembrandt, and proposed a late-eighteenth-century date; D. Cevat, January 4, 1966, pronounced the picture a nineteenth-century exercise using an old panel.
6. On the London portrait, see the text and note 6 of the preceding entry.
8. See Leiden 2003–6, no. 22, for the Dou in Berlin, and nos. 12, 18, 19, 16, 38, 41, 54, 66, and figs. 84, 149, for analogous works by Rembrandt, Dou, Jan Lievens, and others.
9. Ekkart (see note 7 above) stated that the painting “has all the characteristics of a copy,” meaning that he found it harder and drier than such portraits by Backer as those in Anwerp and London (see New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 94). In 1994, Peter van den Brink, who at the time was planning a Backer exhibition, did not regard the present picture as a copy or as a work by Backer, although he did consider it an Amsterdam portrait of about 1635–18 (oral opinion, June 14, 1994). Von Sonnenburg in New York 1991–96, vol. 1, p. 114, cautions that “even copies produced in Backer’s workshop [or in Ulyenburgh’s workshop?] very closely resemble his originals.”
10. See Von Sonnenburg in New York 1991–96, vol. 1, p. 110, citing additional evidence that the Havemeyer panel has not been cut on the left.

References: Vosmaer 1877, pp. 123–24, catalogues the work as by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1640 or 1646, and describes the “fine and spiritual head” and the hands and head as very detailed in execution; Lefort 1883, p. 221 (ill. opp. p. 218, etching by Ramus), praises the picture at length (partly following Vosmaer 1877) and lists the Muller through Demidoff sales; Durtuit 1886, p. 20, catalogues the picture as a Rembrandt in the Demidoff and Nashirshkin sales; Emdel 1885, pp. 404, 406, records the Beunonnement sale of 1884, in which this “Rembrandt” was “la pièce importante”; Emdel 1886, pp. 108–99, “merveilleux tableau de 1646 ou 1649,” records the sale to Kann in 1885; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 307; “To Utilize the Loan Exhibit,” New York Times, February 12, 1893, p. 4, calls this picture “a companion” to Rembrandt’s “Gildeer” (Pl. 148); E. Michel 1894, vol. 1, p. 268 n. 1, calls the painting a “replica” of the Yarborough “Rembrandt” (fig. 3 here), and remembers seeing the present picture in Paris: “It appeared to be an old copy, smaller and less frank in manner. Another copy, probably by J. Backer, was sold by auction in London in March, 1889”; Bode 1895, pp. 71, 74 (ill.), cites the picture as “das ausserordentlich liebevolle durchgefahrene Bildnis der alten Frau vom Jahre 1640,” which passed rapidly through Paris collections before Havemeyer’s purchase of it, and records the Yarborough version as an excellent copy; Bell 1899, p. 184, lists it as a Rembrandt in Havemeyer’s collection, signed and dated 1640 or 1646; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 4 (1900), pp. 31, 148, nos. 276, 278, catalogues the picture as by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1640, with complete provenance, and calls the Yarborough version an old copy “which has been repeatedly exhibited as an original of late”; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 114 (ill.), 258, as by Rembrandt in 1640; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 186 (ill.), 398, as by Rembrandt in 1640; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 256 (ill.), 557, as by Rembrandt in 1640; Stephenson 1909, p. 167, in the Hudson-Fulton exhibition, “wonderfully warm and golden in coloring”; Valentiner in New York 1909, p. 90, no. 89 (ill. opp. p. 90), as by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1640, describes the sitter and lists collections; Breck 1910, p. 54, mentioned in passing as in the 1909 exhibition; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 2 (1910), p. 406, lists the painting as a Rembrandt in the Havemeyer Collection but calls the attribution “nicht ganz sicher”; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 299, no. 870, as by Rembrandt, dated 1640, records provenance, literature, and exhibitions, and describes the Yarborough version (fig. 3 here) as an old copy; Van Dyke 1923, pp. 45, 47, pl. vi, fig. 20, as by Jacob Backer, based on comparison with the portrait of the same woman in Berlin (“the work in both pictures is practically the same, and both were possibly done by Backer”); Downes 1923 (ill. opp. p. 666) quotes Van Dyke 1923 in the caption; Meldrum 1923, pp. 109 n. 1, 190, pl. clxxx, listed as by Rembrandt, dated 1640; K. Bauch 1926, p. 96 (under no. 195, the portrait of the same sitter in Berlin), records the painting as “the same woman by Rembrandt (Backer?) in the Havemeyer Collection”; Havemeyer Collection 1930, p. 3 (ill.), 4, as by Rembrandt, “hard and detailed, but tremendously telling”; Mather 1930, p. 455, considers this “Rembrandt” to be by the painter of Old Woman Reading the Bible in the Frick Collection and “hence an excellent Van der Pluym”; Havemeyer Collection 1931, pp. 20–27 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1640, lists collections; Valentiner 1931, unpaged, no. 70, pl. 70, as by Rembrandt, calls the Yarborough version (fig. 3 here) “now in the Ringling collection, Sarasota,” a workshop copy of the Museum’s picture, and concludes that its larger format “seems to prove that the original painting was larger and has been cut down at the bottom and possibly on the right side”; Havemeyer Collection 1938, p. 8, no. 29, catalogues the
picture as an 18th- or 19th-century copy after Rembrandt; Havemeyer 1961, p. 19, recalls the portrait “over the broad chimney place” in Havemeyer's library; Baelter 1980, vol. 1, p. 150, as Style of Rembrandt, 17th century; Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 1, pp. 201, 264 (ill.), no. 64, as by Backer about 1636–38, “im Stil des Berliner Porträts derselben Frau (Kat.-Nr. 60),” records the version formerly in the Yarborough collection as a copy; Weizenhofer 1986, pp. 64, 66, 68, 74 (photograph of Havemeyer's library), 224 (photograph of the picture hanging in the Knoedler exhibition of 1915), 254, pl. 20, records the purchase by Havemeyer and acknowledges that the painting is “now considered Style of Rembrandt” ; Liedtke 1990, p. 46, mentions Havemeyer’s purchase and observes that the painting “would have been considered authentic by any scholar of the period”; Havemeyer 1993, pp. 19, 310 n. 37, repeats Havemeyer 1961 and adds, “now considered Style of Jacob Adriaensz. Backer”; Freelinghysen in New York 1993, fig. 30, describes Havemeyer's library, in which this painting and other “Rembrandts” hung; Liedtke in ibid., p. 63, in a review of “the Havemeyer Rembrandts,” describes the picture as “possibly an old copy or studio version of a portrait by Jacob Backer”; Rabinow in ibid., pp. 91, 95, fig. 10, cites the work in the exhibition of 1915; Stein in ibid., pp. 211, 214, 252, records Havemeyer’s purchase of February 3, 1891, and the loan of the picture to the exhibitions of 1893 and 1900; Wold in ibid., p. 292, no. A11 (ill.), as Style of Jacob Adriaensz Backer, gives full provenance; Baelter 1995, p. 321, as Style of Jacob Adriaensz Backer; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 93–95, no. 23 (ill.), reviews the history of the painting’s connoisseurship and follows Ekkart in concluding that the work is an old copy after Backer; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 110, 111 (ill.), 144, no. 23, fig. 144 (detail), catalogues the picture as a “partial copy after Jacob Backer” describes the wood support (horizontal grain, evidently not cut down), and insists that “the diligent but blatantly labored paint application” evident here “bears no resemblance to Backer's fluent technique”; Broekhoff and Franken 1997, p. 76, notes that the work was cut from Rembrandt: catalogues long ago “but continues to be involved in discussions about the work of Jacob Backer”; Quodbach 2004, p. 99, fig. 7, reproduces an old photograph of Henry Havemeyer’s library (decorated 1890–92) in which this picture had a central place; Scallen 2004, p. 318 n. 14, notes the attribution made in New York 1995–96.


**Ex Coll.:** Gerrit Muller, Amsterdam (until 1827; his sale, at his residence, Heerengracht, Amsterdam, April 2, 1827, no. 57, as by Rembrandt; for Fl 2,005 to ?Lebic); Comte F. de Robiano, Brussels (until 1837; his sale, Hôtel du Début, Brussels, May 1, 1837, no. 543, for Br 6,000 to Nieuwenhuyzen); [D. Nieuwenhuyzen, Brussels (from 1837; sold to Demidoff)]; Anatole Demidoff, Prince of San Donato, Florence, and Paris (until 1868; his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, April 18, 1868, no. 11, for Frs 55,000 to Narischkine); B. Narischkine, Paris (1868–83; his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, April 3, 1883, no. 29, for Frs 31,000 to Beurnonville); Étienne Martin, baron de Beurnonville, Paris (1883–85; his sale, 3, rue Bayard, Paris, June 3, 1884, no. 291, for Frs 41,000, bought in; his anonymous sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, January 30–31, 1885, no. 68, for Frs 25,000 to Kann); Rodolphe Kann, Paris (from 1885); [Durand-Ruel, New York, 1890– 91; sold to Havemeyer, February 3, 1891, for $90,000]; Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1891–his d. 1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–d. 1929); H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.2.
DAVID BAILLY
Leiden 1584–1657 Leiden

A prominent portraitist and occasional still-life painter, Bailly was the son of a calligrapher and fencing master from Antwerp, Pieter Bailly. The young man studied with the local painter and doctor Adriaen Verburgh (d. 1622), whose brother-in-law Jacques de Gheyn II (q.v.) clearly influenced Bailly’s meticulous portrait drawings and his few known vanitas still lifes. De Gheyn served in turn as a model for Bailly’s nephews and pupils (from 1628 until about 1635), Harmen Steenwyck (1612–1656 or later) and Pieter Steenwyck (ca. 1613–after 1656).²

About 1602, Pieter Bailly and his family moved from Leiden to Amsterdam, where David continued his apprenticeship with the conservative portraitist Cornelis van der Voort (ca. 1576–1624). Van der Voort had an impressive collection of paintings by mostly Flemish masters, and Bailly (according to his contemporary biographer, Jan Orlers) spent much of his time copying them.³ In the winter of 1608, the twenty-four-year-old artist departed for five years of foreign travel and residence. Orlers reports that Bailly spent a year in Hamburg, and then traveled through several German cities and the Tirol to Venice, “and from there through the most renowned Italian cities to Rome.” In 1610, he returned to Venice, where he stayed five months, and then visited various German courts. According to Orlers, Heinrich Julius, duke of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (d. 1613), offered Bailly a handsome yearly pension, “which he politely refused.” Other German princes employed Bailly briefly, but virtually nothing about what he produced during his travels is known.⁴

Bailly’s earliest known dated work is a portrait in pen and ink dated 1621, when he was thirty-seven years old.⁵ About thirty of these finely finished portrait drawings (which were inspired by and admired by De Gheyn) have come to light, with dated examples ranging from 1621 to 1635.⁶ Portrait paintings by Bailly also date from the 1620s, and in 1628 paintings by him were cited in two Leiden collections.⁷ Bailly’s success as a portraitist seems to have been somewhat delayed after he was convicted of assaulting an auctioneer in 1622, which earned him a large fine, nearly resulted in banishment from the city, and probably cost him the commission for six large group portraits of civic guard companies, in one of which he served as ensign. The prestigious assignment was awarded to his principal rival in Leiden, Joris van Schooten (ca. 1587–1652).³

In a panel of about 1627 (private collection, Paris), Thomas de Keyser (q.v.) depicted Bailly seated in an interior at a table with a vanitas still life that was painted by the sitter himself.⁹ The combination of portraiture and still life, which curiously has been considered Bailly’s “most original contribution to 17th-century art,”¹⁰ was repeated in the artist’s masterwork, Vanitas Still Life with a Portrait of a Young Painter, of 1651 (Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden).¹¹

Paintings by Bailly that are closely related to his pen drawings include a miniature oval portrait of a woman, on copper, dated 1626 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), and the oval Portrait of Duke Ulrich, Bishop of Schwerin, on panel, dated 1627 (Hillerod Castle, Frederiksborg).¹² In the 1630s and 1640s, Bailly painted conventional portraits (usually on panel) that often depict Leiden professors or distinguished students, but also patrician sitters from Leiden and Amsterdam.¹³ A pair of small portraits of the artist and his wife date from about 1642; the male pendant was engraved in 1649 and reproduced in De Bie’s Guldener Cabinet, of 1661.¹⁴ These personal pictures were probably made to commemorate the aging bachelor’s marriage, on May 3, 1642, to the apparently middle-aged Agneta van Swanenburgh. During the next six years, Bailly was a leading figure in the Leiden painters’ “college,” which in March 1648 achieved its goal of becoming the city’s Guild of Saint Luke. The artist first served as hoofdman (headman), and in 1649 as dean.¹⁵

Bailly made out his will on April 18, 1657, and was buried on November 5 of that year.¹⁶ In June 1657, he was awarded the lucrative post of steward to the Theological College of Holland and West Friesland, which his widow briefly took over.¹⁷ She appears to have rented a house on the Rapenburg, Leiden’s finest canal, in 1667, but at her death in 1670 she was insolvent as well as childless.¹⁸


4. See Bruyn 1951, pp. 152–53, and Bruyn in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 3, p. 77, suggesting that Bailly may have painted history pictures in the manner of the Pre-Rembrandtists in Amsterdam.

5. Amsterdam and other cities 1991–92, no. 16, which on the basis of an old inscription on the verso is thought to represent the Amsterdam painter Jan Pynas (1585/84–1651).


7. See Bruyn 1951, p. 159, fig. 5 (1627), and Lunsingh Scheurleer, Fock, and Van Dissel 1986–92, vol. 58, p. 4, 8 (see also p. 10, citing the Orlers inventory of 1640, and the tables on pp. 12, 16).


11. In Bruyn in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 3, p. 78, and in Sluijter 1998a, pp. 187–89, it is suggested convincingly that the young painter is Bailly himself, as he appeared some forty years earlier. He holds a small Self-Portrait of about 1642 (see the text following). In Wurfbain 1988, the young man is imagined to be Frans van Mieris.

12. The Amsterdam portrait is catalogued in Van Mieris et al. 1976, p. 93, no. 416, as possibly a portrait of Hugo de Groot’s wife. The same woman and her husband (who is younger and bears no resemblance to the famous jurist) are found in portraits by Bailly (panels, each 27/4 x 19/4 in. [68.9 x 48.3 cm]), dated 1628 and 1625, respectively, which were with the art dealer Daphne Alazaraki, New York, in 1994. See Bruyn 1951, pp. 154, 159–60, fig. 5, for the portrait of Ulrich, who was the son of Christian IV of Denmark.

13. See Bruyn 1951, pp. 154–55, figs. 9, 10, 13, 14.


15. On Bailly’s marriage and his role in the guild, see Bruyn 1951, pp. 155–56. In W. Martin 1901, p. 88, it is proposed unpersuasively that Bailly was also an art dealer, evidently because a few sales and purchases by him are cited in guild accounts (Olbreem 1877–90, vol. 5, pp. 172–259; see the index under Bailly). The same source (p. 182) reveals that the painter had an unidentified pupil in 1645.

16. The relevant document was first published in De Baar 1973.


Attributed to David Bailly

3. Portrait of a Man, possibly a Botanist

Oil on wood, 33 x 24 1/2 in. (83.8 x 62.2 cm)
Dated and inscribed (center right): Ectatis 66/AN° 1641

The painting is well preserved, but throughout the background and in the black costume the paint surface is slightly abraded.

The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.39

This impressive portrait was once ascribed to Ferdinand Bol (q.v.), until Sturla Gudlaugsson more plausibly proposed Bailly.¹ The present writer supported this attribution in the Linsky Collection catalogue (1984) and still considers Bailly’s authorship likely. Rudolf Ekkart stresses the difficulty of attributing conservative Dutch portraits like this one, and also notes the “rather great variety” found in Bailly’s comparatively
Godlaugsson’s attribution of the painting to Bailly on the basis of a photograph must have been informed by his knowledge of two works by the artist: the Portrait of Anthony de Wale, Professor of Theology at the University of Leiden, of 1636, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (fig. 4), and the Portrait of an Unknown Professor or Pastor, signed and dated 1642, in the Van Heeckeren van Wassenaer collection at Kasteel Twickel. The three pictures are broadly similar in the presentation of the figure and in the emphatic gaze. The modeling of the hands and facial planes, in particular the creased brows, is comparable in the three portraits, as is the drawing of the ears and eyes (the latter circled by brownish shadow). The descriptions of skin, hair, and fabrics naturally differ from sitter to sitter, but they are consistent in quality and in certain characteristics of handling, such as the tendency to reinforce the costume’s contours with dark lines. The portraits in the Linsky Collection and in Kasteel Twickel are also similar in their use of furniture, which is in somewhat false perspective.

The identity of the sitter is not known. He could be a cleric or a professor (although his attire is not academic), an amateur of botany, a doctor, or an apothecary. The book, which shows two views of a narcissus, cannot be identified and is probably the artist’s invention.

This type of “scholar portrait,” which has sixteenth-century North Italian roots (as seen in works by Giovanni Battista Moroni), was popular in the Netherlands during the first half of the seventeenth century and was employed for amateurs as well as professionals. A well-known example is the portrait of the Haarlem shell collector Jan Goverzs van der Aer, by Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1617; P. and N. de Boer Foundation, Amsterdam, on loan to the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), which was painted in 1603 and promptly praised by Karel van Mander (1604).

1. The catalogue of the 1923 sale (see Ex Coll.) was compiled in part by Cornelia Hofstede de Groot, who had previously made a number of attributions to Bolt and may have proposed this one. Blankert 1982, p. 180, no. 8168, rejects the attribution to Bolt and appears to support Godlaugsson’s suggestion, which was made as a marginal note to a photograph at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague.


3. In letters of 1983 (curatorial files), C. J. de Bruyn Kops and J. Bruyn mention J. G. Cuyp, but Bruyn also suggests looking to Delft, and cites Palamedesz while dismissing Jacob Willemsz
Delft II (1619–1661) and Hendrick van Vliet (q.v.) from consideration. Bruyn’s “first reaction to Gudlaugsson’s attribution was quite positive” (letter of August 19, 1983). On portraiture in Delft about 1600–1650, see New York–London 2001, pp. 43–44 (50–51 on Palamedesz).

4. Palamedesz’s Portrait of a Scholar Aged 72, dated 1657 (Ader Picard Tajan, Paris, June 18, 1979, no. 110), may have brought the Delft painter’s name into consideration, but the comparison is not encouraging.


6. Similar ears are found in Bailly’s drawings, for example the presumed portrait of Theodorus Schrevelius, of 1642, in the Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Brussels (ibid., fig. 4), and in the Portrait of Johan Rutgers (Morgan Library and Museum, New York).

7. As suggested by Rudolf Ekkart, whose opinion was communicated and endorsed by F. G. L. O. van Ketshmar, director of the Stichting Iconographisch Bureau at The Hague (letter of August 25, 1983). One visitor to the Museum has insisted that the sitter must be a rabbi, but no historical evidence supports this modern impression (see Gans 1971, Rubens 1973, and Katchen 1984).

8. This opinion was expressed in a letter from the botanist and still-life specialist Sam Segal (April 2, 1983). Compare the herbal (also probably invented) in Willem Moreelse’s Portrait of a Scholar, of 1647 (Toledo Museum of Art).


REFERENCES: Blankert 1982, p. 180, no. 8168, rejects the attribution to Bol (see Ex Coll.) and suggests Bailly, following Sturla Gudlaugsson’s undated note in the photographic file of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague; Liedtke in Linsky Collection 1984, pp. 84–86, no. 29 (ill.), supports the attribution to Bailly and describes the sitter; Baeijer 1995, p. 303, as by Bailly.

Ex Coll.: Possibly T. H. Ward (until 1899; as “Man’s Portrait,” by Bol; sold to Agnew); [possibly Agnew, London, 1899; sold to Fischhof]; [possibly Eugène Fischhof, Paris, from 1899]; Achiilto Chesa, Milan (sale, American Art Association, New York, November 27, 1925, no. 18, as by Bol, for $2,900 to Bye); Dr. L. Bye (from 1925); Roland L. Taylor, Philadelphia (until d. 1943; his estate sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, April 5, 1944, no. 25, as by Bol, for $1,300); Mr. and Mrs. Jack Linsky, New York (1944–80); The Jack and Belle Linsky Foundation, New York (1980–82); The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982. 1982.60.29
The artist signed his given name as Jan or Johannes, or with alternative spellings of the latter, and his surname as Beerstraten or Beerstraaten, and with versions of both. His father was probably Abraham Danielsz van Emden, a damask worker who on December 26, 1610, at the age of twenty-one, married Meynsjen Luytendr, age twenty-seven, in the Oude Kerk, Amsterdam. The baptisms of four children from this marriage are recorded: Daniel, in 1612; Annetje, in 1614; Jacob, in 1618; and Johannes, on March 1, 1622.1 It has also been suggested that the painter’s father may have been the cooper Abraham Jansz, whose son Jan was baptized in Amsterdam on May 31, 1622.2 However, circumstantial evidence strongly supports Abraham Danielsz as the artist’s father. For example, the names Daniel and Jacob frequently appear in Beerstraten’s family. His own children, by his first marriage (in 1642) to Magdalena Tennesdr Bronckhorst (d. 1664), were named Abraham, Johannes, Jacobus, Magdalena, and Daniel (who were twenty-one, twelve, seven, five, and four years old in 1665).3 Daniel became a carpenter and had sons named Johannes and Jacobus; the latter had a son named Daniel, whose own son was called Jacob.4 It is also documented that on October 17, 1631, the artist became the guardian of the daughters (Meynsje, named for her grandmother, and Duyfje) of Daniel Abrahamsz Beerstraten; this would be his older brother, a barber (or barber-surgeon) who married in 1635 (with Abraham Danielsz, evidently his father, as witness) and died in the East Indies. Significantly, Daniel Abrahamsz’s surname was recorded as Beerstraten on the occasion of his marriage (when Johannes Abrahamsz was only thirteen years old).1

Shortly after his first marriage, Beerstraten moved into a house by the Haarlemmerpoort (the Haarlem City Gate of Amsterdam). In 1651, he bought a house at the western end of the Rozengracht, and lived there for the rest of his life (Rembrandt’s house, from about 1658 onward, was a few doors away).6 The painter married his second wife, Albertje Egbertsd Cral, on May 10, 1665, in the church at Sloterdijk,7 a village very close to the Haarlemmerpoort.8 Their life together was cut short a little over a year later: Beerstraten died in June 1666 and was buried in his neighborhood church, the Westerkerk, on July 1. Albertje died, probably in childbirth, within three weeks of her husband; her burial is recorded as taking place on July 19, 1666, one day after the painter’s posthumous daughter, Albertje, was baptized in the Westerkerk.9

It has been conjectured that the marine painter Claes Claesz Wouw (1592–1665) was the artist’s teacher. Beerstraten specialized in views of Dutch towns and noteworthy buildings, such as Gothic churches and medieval castles. Many of these pictures are winter scenes. He also painted imaginary views of Mediterranean seaports, in some instances with northern European churches incongruously set into the sunstruck terrain. The latter works inspired the Amsterdam artists Abraham Storck (1644–1708) and his less talented brother Jacobus (1641–ca. 1688).10 A few paintings of sea battles are also known (for example, The Battle of Terheide; Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).11

Several authors have attempted to distinguish the works of Johannes Abrahamsz Beerstraten from those of Abraham Beerstraten (possibly his son), a certain Anthonie Beerstraeten, and another Johannes.12 In any event, Johannes Abrahamsz was certainly the most successful artist with the surname Beerstraten and the author of the painting discussed below.

1. Oldewelt 1938, p. 86, where the date of Johannes’s baptism is given mistakenly as February 27, 1627. The error is corrected in Van Thiel 1968, p. 36 n, 7 (citing an obscure article by C. N. Fehrmann), and is noted in MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 13, where MacLaren 1960, p. 13, is corrected.
3. See Oldewelt 1938, pp. 81–82.
4. Ibid., p. 85.
5. Ibid., p. 85. On the same page it is noted, without remarking the coincidence, that one of the great-grandsons of Johannes Abrahamsz Beerstraten, Daniel (Jacob’s son; d. 1762), was a ship’s surgeon. As Oldewelt observes (ibid., p. 86), the many books and the barbershop sign listed in Johannes Beerstraten’s estate were probably inherited from his brother Daniel.
6. Ibid., p. 81. For the locations of Beerstraten’s and Rembrandt’s residences, see Dudok van Heel 1991a, map on p. 63.
7. Oldewelt 1938, p. 84, citing a document dated September 11, 1666, that mentions this detail while recording the acceptance of the couple’s daughter, “Albertje, age about seven weeks,” into an Amsterdam orphanage.
4. **Skating at Sloten, near Amsterdam**

Oil on canvas, 36¼ x 51⅝ in. (92.1 x 131.1 cm)  
Signed and inscribed (lower right, on stone wall): Sloten/ J·Beerstraoten/pingit

The overall abrasion to the paint surface is most extreme in the sky. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals that four individual and one pair of figures were painted out on the walkway next to the church that continues to the right over the bridge. Many changes were made by the artist to the positions and activities of the figures on the ice.

Rogers Fund, 1911 11.92

The village of Sloten, on the southwest edge of modern Amsterdam, was incorporated into the city in 1921. The Reformed Church (called the Petruskerk) was replaced in the 1860s. Its structural problems ultimately dated back to 1572, when Spanish troops destroyed a much larger church than the one seen here (which was built in the mid-1650s). Beerstraten's view in the Museum's painting and in a closely related canvas in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (fig. 5), shows the church from the north. The church tower of Amstelveen, to the southeast of Sloten, is visible in the left background of the Amsterdam picture.

The differences between the two versions of the composition are described in detail by Van Thiel (see Refs.). The church tower, the choir, the house behind the church, the bridge in front of it, the recession of the houses on the right, and many minor motifs are depicted differently. Van Thiel concludes that the church is more faithfully rendered in the signed painting in Amsterdam, which he feels is also more successful in its sense of space and in passages of naturalistic description. The latter point is supported by a comparison of areas like the bridge and the embankment on the right in the Rijksmuseum picture (where the light, surface textures, vegetation, and frozen canal are keenly observed) with the less specific handling of corresponding areas in the New York canvas.

However, it is not clear that the description in the Amsterdam painting coincides with a more reliable record of the church. Assuming that it does, Van Thiel suggests that the builder responsible for the modest new choir failed to strengthen its walls with buttresses (see fig. 5), and he goes so far as to associate this incautiousness with the choir's collapse in the late eighteenth century. But an engraving of approximately the same view published in “Descriptions” of Amsterdam in 1663 and in 1664 shows buttresses rising to the roofline all around the church and a tower more similar in shape to that in the Museum's picture. It seems likely, then, that buttresses were arbitrarily omitted from the choir in the Rijksmuseum canvas, perhaps to allow the handsome house behind the church to stand out more prominently. In the New York painting, the somewhat different house in the same position is taller and plainer, and a few trees have been eliminated, so that the buttresses help effect a graceful transition between blocky forms.

Beerstraten probably departed from actual appearances to some extent in both paintings. In the New York picture, the village of Sloten serves in part as a backdrop for a lively panorama of people enjoying themselves on the frozen canal. The figures in the Amsterdam painting, by contrast, amount to little more than conventional staffage. This shift in emphasis from more exclusively topographical concerns to the theme of winter pleasures in the tradition of Hendrick Avercamp (1585–1634) and many younger Dutch artists (compare the Museum's winter scenes by Van den Berghe and Van Ruysdael; Pls. 6, 189) explains the variations in the handling of space and attention to detail far better than Van Thiel's hypothesis that the two canvases were painted by different members of the Beerstraten family.
Figure 5. Johannes Beerstraten, *View of the Church of Sloten in Winter*, ca. 1660–64. Oil on canvas, 33⅜ x 50⅞ in. (80 x 128 cm). Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
This writer agrees with Brown (see Ref.) that the two paintings are sufficiently consistent in style with each other and with other works by Johannes Beerstraten to be both accepted as autograph. Van Thiel plausibly dates the Amsterdam picture to about 1648–59 on the basis of comparisons with Beerstraten's The Castle of Muiden in Winter, of 1658 (National Gallery, London), and with his so-called View of Ouderkerk in Winter, of 1659 (Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam). However, the two views of Sloten could just as well date from the early to mid-1660s. They are probably based on a single drawing of the village made at the site. The more straightforward treatment of the subject in the Rijksmuseum canvas suggests that it was most likely painted first.

Beerstraten drew and painted a fair number of views in Amsterdam and in nearby villages. The paintings usually feature one prominent building in a snow-dusted landscape, with ice skaters and other figures on a frozen waterway in the foreground. In addition to Sloten and Muiden, which would have been day trips for the artist, he also recorded views of churches farther afield: in the South Holland villages of Delfshaven, Nieuwkoop, and Rijswijk; in the North Brabant city of Hertogenbosch and the town of St. Michielsgestel; in the Gelderland village of Zoelmond; and elsewhere. Three paintings of Nieuwkoop are known, and two of them reveal changes in topographical details, staffage, the immediate foreground, and the overall impression of space, quite as in Beerstraten's views of Sloten.

It is not known whether the artist's pictures of churches in various locations followed a program he set for himself or reflect the interests of individual patrons. The latter seems likely in the case of Sloten, although the village, like Amstelveen and Ouderkerk, was generally admired for being older than Amsterdam. Schwartz recalls that the powerful Amsterdam burgomaster and art patron Cornelis de Graeff (1599–1664) was a major supporter of Sloten and its church during his tenure as the village lord of the manor, between 1650 and his death. The same office was held by his father, the Amsterdam burgomaster Jacob de Graeff (1571–1618), and various members of the family were married in the church at Sloten. Thus Beerstraten may have painted his views of Sloten for one of the De Graeffs, especially Cornelis. However, it is also possible that another patron was involved.

Of the various painters who in earlier years had recorded views of Sloten or the Sloterweg (the road leading to the village from the direction of Amsterdam)—for example, Claes Jansz Visscher (1587–1652), Roelant Roghman (1627–bur. Jan. 3, 1662), and an anonymous artist in 1639—the most important for Beerstraten must have been Rembrandt, his neighbor on the Rozengracht in Amsterdam. About 1645–50, Rembrandt made a number of sketches of cottages and other sights along the Sloterweg, of Sloten in the distance, and of the Sloten church and the ruins of its original choir. It has been suggested either that Roghman's drawings and etchings of the church inspired Rembrandt's sketch of the same motif (Nasjonalgalleriet, Oslo) or that the master and the young man drew views of the picturesque site from slightly different vantage points on an outing together. It seems likely that Beerstraten was aware of these precedents. He may also have been in touch with the De Graeffs—to compound that hypothesis—by Rembrandt, who was well known to Cornelis and his brother Andries de Graeff (1611–1709) in the 1650s and 1660s.

1. As noted in Bakker et al. 1998, p. 150.
2. Van Thiel 1968, pp. 54, 56 n. 4, briefly reviews the church's history and the evidence found in prints dating from about 1640 onward. See ibid., p. 51, for the identification of Amstelveen and the Osdorperweg leading out of the view to the right. The Rijksmuseum painting is discussed and reproduced in color in Perth–Adelaide–South Brisbane 1997–98, no. 22.
3. Dapper 1668, p. 34, and Von Zesen 1664, p. 139, cited in Van Thiel 1968, pp. 54, 56 n. 3, fig. 3. The tower in the Amsterdam painting resembles that seen in Geertruydt Roghman's etching of the church dating from about 1647 (ibid., fig. 4), which also shows the ruins of the former choir. (See also Roelant Roghman's etching of about 1645–48, Old and New Church in Sloten, which of course shows the church and the ruins of the old choir before the new choir was built; Bakker et al. 1998, pp. 352–53 nn. 11–13, fig. 4, for this print and other images of the church by Roelant and Geertruydt Roghman.) Plop 1997, p. 58, notes that the similar tower in Beerstraten's drawing of the church at Rijswijk (see note 6 below) “does not correspond with reality.”
4. Van Thiel 1968, pp. 35, 36 n. 6. For the London picture, see MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 14–16, pl. 13. The identification of the “Ouderkerk” view as such has been strongly doubted, for example in Blankert 1979, p. 36, no. 41, and in Copenhagen–Amsterdam 2001, pp. 47, 169 (under no. 44). The painting is catalogued as View of Ouderkerk in Winter in Van Thiel et al. 1976, p. 106, no. C94 (on loan from the City of Amsterdam).
5. An impressive group of Amsterdam views is in the Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam (see Blankert 1979, pp. 22–32). The composition of The Noorderkerk in Winter (no. A944), with skaters on the Prinsengracht in the foreground, recalls the Sloten and Muiden views.
6. For Beerstraten’s drawing of the church at Rijswijk, dated 1664, see Plop 1997, p. 58, no. 26, where “five comparable drawings depicting church exteriors” in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam, are cited by inventory number. There are actually six such drawings, two of identified churches and the others of the cathedral of Hertogenbosch and of the churches in Delfshaven, Zoelmond, and Saint Michielsgestel (kind communication of Marijn Schapelhouman in January 2004). On the last drawing, which
records a church destroyed in 1836, see Schapelhouman 1990, pp. 120–23.

7. Beerstraten’s canvas The Village of Nieuwkoop in Winter with a Child’s Funeral Procession (Sépéművészeti Múzeum, Budapest) is inscribed “Nukoop naar leeven gedaen door J. Beerstraten” (see Czobor 1967, no. 48, where versions in Hamburg and Leeuwarden are cited). The Church at Nieuwkoop, in the Kunsthalle, Hamburg, is almost identically inscribed. There is no funeral procession, and the figures are entirely different. The churches in the Budapest and Hamburg pictures must depend upon a single drawing, but the houses and tower in the distance recede somewhat differently.

8. As noted in Bakker et al. 1998, p. 303.

9. G. Schwartz in Vancouver 1986, p. 329, noting that, according to the churchmaster Engelberticus Sloten, Cornelis de Graeff “showed exceptional favor to the village of Sloten” in the period 1652–55, “for example by buying a plot of land for the minister to put up a splendid house [the one behind the church’s choir in Beerstraten’s painting], . . . all of this from means and income of the city of Amsterdam.” There is some confusion in the literature about when the church was rebuilt. Schwartz (in ibid.) goes on to report that “in 1663–64 the church was completely rebuilt, once more with the help of de Graeff.” But this is inconsistent with the documentary evidence cited in Bakker et al. 1998, p. 303 n. 7, which indicates that the church’s “restoration was carried out in 1644.” An engraving published in 1663 and 1664 (see text above and note 3) shows the church as completed, not as in the course of reconstruction. Apparently Schwartz, here and in Vancouver 1986, p. 61 (under no. 25), confused Sloterdijk, the village on an inlet of the riverIJ just west of Amsterdam (see the maps in Bakker et al. 1998, p. 303, location 5.9 for Sloten, and p. 354, location 6.2 for Sloterdijk). De Graeff’s payment for the rebuilding and expansion of the church at Sloterdijk in the year 1664 was acknowledged by an inscription above the pulpit (Van der Aa 1852–76, vol. 5, p. 107). In May of the following year, Beerstraten’s second marriage took place in the same church (see the biography above).

10. As recorded on several genealogical Web sites found through the search engine Google, using the keywords De Graeff and Sloten together.

11. See Bakker et al. 1998, p. 322, fig. 4 (annot.); p. 345, fig. 7 (Visscher); and p. 335, fig. 4 (Roghman).

12. See the biography above, note 6.


15. See G. Schwartz 1985, pp. 204, 223, 286, and 375–76 in the index under various De Graeffs. That Rembrandt’s full-length portrait of a man dated 1639 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel) represents Andries de Graeff, as S. A. C. Dudok van Heel proposed decades ago, is maintained forcefully by Jeroen Giltaij in Frankfurt 2003, pp. 134–37 (under no. 27).

REFERENCES: Van Thiel 1968, pp. 51, 54–55, 56 n. 2, fig. 2, describes the differences between the Museum’s picture and the version in Amsterdam (fig. 1 here), and considers the former so much weaker in quality that he believes it must be by another painter, perhaps a relative (but not a son) who was also a J. or even a Jan Beerstraten and who was inclined to imitate the better-known artist’s signature; G. Schwartz in Vancouver 1986, p. 61 (under no. 25, the Amsterdam version), reports that the New York picture “is believed to be a copy [sic] by Beerstraten’s son,” thus misreading Van Thiel while restating his conclusion; C. Brown in MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 14 n. 11, rejects much of Van Thiel’s argument, maintaining that “the discrepancies between the two paintings are not great enough to justify their attribution to two different hands”; Baxtler 1995, p. 328; Perth–Adelaide–South Brisbane 1997–98, p. 68 n. 1 (under no. 22), as “another version” of the Amsterdam picture; Van der Most 2002, p. 28, as “a slightly different version” of the Amsterdam painting.


EX COLL.: Sale, F. Muller & Co., Amsterdam, April 25, 1911, no. 5, for Fl 2,750 to “Johnson” (John G. Johnson, by wire, on behalf of the MMA); Rogers Fund, 1911 11.02
Nicolaes Berchem

Haarlem 1621/22—1683 Amsterdam

The son of Pieter Claesz (q.v.), Nicolaes (or Claes) Pietersz Berchem was born in Haarlem about 1621 or 1622.¹ Guild records indicate that he studied drawing with his father in 1634. Berchem took his surname from his father’s birthplace, which is now known to have been the village of Berchem, near Antwerp.² Houbraken reports that the young artist’s teachers were Jan van Goyen (q.v.), Claes Moeyaert (1591–1655), Pieter de Grebber (ca. 1600–1652/53), Johannes Wils (1603–1666), and Jan Baptist Weenix (1621–1660/61).³ Weenix was actually Berchem’s fellow student under Moeyaert in Amsterdam, and his collaborator on a painting of the 1650s, The Calling of Matthew (Mauritshuis, The Hague).⁴

Berchem registered as a master in the Haarlem painters’ guild on May 6, 1642, and in the same year took on three pupils. He married in 1646.⁵ About 1650, he traveled with his friend Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.) to Westphalia, where both artists made sketches of the Castle of Bentheim, a motif they used in landscape paintings of the 1650s.⁶ It is not certain that Berchem ever went to Italy, but likely that he did so in 1650–51.⁷ The artist is documented in Haarlem in 1656 (when he bought a pleasure house and garden) and in 1657. He appears to have lived in Amsterdam throughout the 1660s. Berchem and his wife were again residents of Haarlem in 1670, and in 1674 he was still a member of the Haarlem painters’ guild. At an unknown date the couple moved to the Lauiergracht in Amsterdam, where Berchem died on February 18, 1683. He was buried five days later in the Westerkerk.⁸ His widow auctioned his collection of paintings (which brought 12,000 guilders on May 4, 1683) and his books and graphic works (December 7, 1683), which included many prints by the Florentine painter, engraver, and etcher Antonio Tempesta (1555–1630).

Berchem’s early work is generally consistent with Haarlem landscape painting in the 1640s, although it also reveals the influence of Pieter van Laer (1599–?1642), a landscape painter and printmaker from Haarlem who was in Italy from about 1625 until the late 1630s.⁹ After 1650, Berchem adopted a lighter palette and depicted panoramic vistas in an Italianate style inspired by Jan Both (ca. 1615/16–1652) and Jan Asselijn (ca. or after 1610–1652). During the 1660s, the work of Adam Pijnacker (ca. 1620–1673) also made an impression on him. In his mature work Berchem is so eclectic and versatile that his ideas seem to come from countless sources and at the same time to be all his own. In addition to idyllic landscapes, the artist painted some imaginary Mediterranean harbor scenes in which his suave figure style takes center stage (the most admired example is A Moor Presenting a Parrot to a Lady, of the 1660s; Wadsworth Athenaeum, Hartford).¹⁰ He also painted figures in landscapes by Van Ruisdael, Meyndert Hobbema (q.v.), and others. An accomplished draftsman and etcher,¹¹ Berchem made over fifty original prints representing Italianate landscapes and farm animals.

Berchem had many pupils and imitators. The former included Karel du Jardin (1626–1678), Abraham Begeyn (ca. 1635–1697), Willem Romeyn (ca. 1624–1694), Pieter de Hooch, and Jacob Ochtervelt (q.q.v.). Works by Berchem were greatly esteemed in the eighteenth century, particularly in France, and for most of the nineteenth century as well.

1. See the biography of Berchem by Irene van Thiel-Stroman in Biesboer et al. 2006, pp. 122–5. The artist is not identical with the Claes, son of Pieter Claesz of Steinfurt, who was born in October 1620.
4. The panel, which both artists signed, is discussed in Hoetink et al. 1984, pp. 122–23, no. 7. On the question of whether Berchem actually studied with the slightly younger Weenix, and for brief remarks on the other teachers named by Houbraken, see Jennifer Kilian’s article on Berchem in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 3, p. 757.
5. On Berchem’s wife (who was the stepdaughter of Johannes Wils) and the couple’s children, see Van Thiel-Stroman in Rotterdam—Frankfurt 1999–2000, pp. 236, 242.
6. See Slive 2001, pp. 23–27, where Berchem’s drawing of Bentheim dated 1650 and two landscape paintings of 1656 that include the castle are illustrated. For Berchem’s Westphalian Landscape with Castle Bentheim, of 1656 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), see also Enschede 1980, no. 5. That Van Ruisdael was “een groot vrije van N. Berchem” is stated in the former’s biography in Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 3, p. 66.
5. Rest

Oil on wood, 17 x 13 1/2 in. (43.2 x 34.3 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): cBerghem 1644 [CB in monogram]

The painting is well preserved but has suffered slight abrasion throughout. As the paint film and ground have become more transparent over time, the wooden support has begun to assert itself visually, appearing as darkened spots in the sky. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals that most of the composition is freely underdrawn; the dog at lower right, however, was not underdrawn.

Purchase, 1871 71.125

This is one of the earliest known works by Berchem, painted in 1644, when he was about twenty-two or twenty-three years old. In the past, the signature has been misread as “Berchern,” and the date considered illegible or no longer discernible. However, the date read by Scharborn in 1974 (see Refs.) is visible to the naked eye and quite clear under magnification. The inscription has not been modified or reinforced.

The work has its awkward moments, especially in the female figure and in the cow, with the horns seemingly perched atop its head. But the trees and sky are fluidly painted with considerable skill, and the figures, while lacking the artist’s later flair, are (as Albert Blankert has noted) characteristic of his early work. Most of the composition was prepared with underdrawing. There are five white female goats and one dark male goat, shown nibbling a plant. The dog (which is not underdrawn) sniffs or licks the ground. Water may have been suggested in the lower right corner of the picture, but as in other areas of the ground this passage is now too thin to read closely.

Similar compositions are familiar from Berchem’s oeuvre of the 1640s. One of the most analogous designs is that of the Italian Landscape, dated 1645, in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp. The same general arrangement of forms, with trees to the side, figures resting beneath them, and a deep recession over mostly flat landscape, dates back to the mid-1630s in the work of Jan van Goyen (q.v.), Pieter van Laer (1599–1642), and other artists working in or associated with Haarlem.

As Scharborn has shown, the figure of the standing man is based on a drawing by Berchem of about 1643–44 (fig. 6). The pose has been slightly modified, especially in the right leg. Although evidently sketched from life, the pose can be traced back to the Farnese Hercules. A view of the Roman statue from the back was drawn by Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1617) in 1591 and engraved by the same artist about 1592. Goltzius’s stepson Jacob Matham (1571–1631) also drew the rear of the sculpture a little later in the 1590s. It seems likely that these images were occasionally copied, or used to pose models, by drawing students in Haarlem.

In 1926, Hofstede de Groot identified this picture with a painting in the sale of the collection of Nicolaas van Bremen, in Amsterdam (at the firm of De Winter and Yver), on December 15, 1766, where it sold with a pendant; and with no. 6 (which was offered without a pendant) in the 1846 Heiris sale in Brussels (see Ex Coll.). Nevertheless, it appears doubtful that it is identical with the one in the earlier sale. The two Berchems in the Van Bremen collection are described in the sale catalogue as “Een Veedrift in ’t gebergte” (A cattle drive in the mountains), measuring one voet and four duimen high by one voet and eight duimen wide, and “Een weerga daar een Herder en Herderinne same legge te koute by veel Vee” (A pendant with a shepherd and a shepherdess lying together in conversation next to many cattle), measuring one voet and six duimen high by one voet and eleven and a half duimen wide.

The second painting is somewhat larger than the Museum’s picture and appears to differ in several details. Moreover, the paintings in the Van Bremen sale are specifically described as broad, not tall-format pictures. Each work in that sale is
described carefully in terms of height ("h.") and breadth ("bc."), and the information throughout appears to be reliable. At present, then, this "lovely Berghem" (according to Henry James in his article on the 1871 Purchase) cannot be traced before it appeared in the large estate sale of the Belgian art dealer Hérès in 1846.

1. Conservator Dorothy Mahon kindly assisted in studying the inscription, in October 2004. The 45 have angular tops (as here), not open.
2. Albert Blankert, letter to the writer dated May 9, 1996, firmly agrees with the several scholars who had earlier considered the work typical of the early Berchem, and suggests a date of about 1645. On visits to the Museum, Sturla Gudlaugsson (1966) and Horst Gerson (1964) described the picture as a good early work. Blankert held to this opinion when he reinspected the picture in 2003.
3. Noted by Dorothy Mahon (see note 1 above).
4. See White 1982, p. 22 (under no. 21). To his examples one might add Landscape with a Nymph and a Satyr, dated 1647 (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles).
5. The two pictures are reproduced together in Stechow 1964, figs. 9, 10.

8. See Amsterdam–New York–Toledo 2003–4, no. 42, where Jan de Bisschop’s etching after Matham’s lost drawing (reversing the pose, as here) is illustrated as fig. 42c.
9. Hofstede de Groot 1907–28, vol. 9 (1926), p. 222, no. 618, where the painting is said to be the pendant of Hofstede de Groot’s no. 628b.

REFERENCES: MMA 1871, pl. 3 (etching by Jules Jacquemart); Decamps 1872, p. 437, mentions this picture as in the MMA; James (1872) 1956, pp. 59, 61, considers it “a lovely Berghem”; Harskamp 1988, p. 76, as in the MMA; Hofstede de Groot 1907–28, vol. 9 (1926), pp. 222, 224, no. 618; Von Sick 1930, p. 17, fig. 6, considers the work, “of extraordinary quality,” to be closely related to a painting dated 1647 (formerly Cook collection, Richmond); Schaaf 1951, pp. 14, 15 n. 22, as dating from about 1647; and as closely related to the Italian Landscape, of 1645 (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp), and to the Millicent and Cattle by a Spinney, dated 1647; Ann Arbor 1964 (under no. 5) compares the Resting Shepherdesses, an early Berchem in the Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio; Gerson 1964, p. 346, supports the comparison with the Oberlin picture; Stechow 1964, p. 15, fig. 10, observes that the New York and Oberlin paintings feature “the same combination of Italianate foreground and Dutch background”; Santifaller 1972, p. 486, fig. 3, describes the work as “Berchem’s famous painting” and as the kind of peaceful landscape that inspired Tiepolo; Schatborn 1974, pp. 6–8, 15–16 n. 11, fig. 5, notes that Berchem’s drawing of a standing shepherd in the Rijskmuseum, Amsterdam, was used for the male figure in the Museum’s picture, which the author considers to be dated, “most probably,” 1644; Schatborn in Amsterdam–Washington 1981–82, p. 67, fig. 2, and p. 130 (under no. 11), repeats the comparison made in Schatborn 1974; White 1982, p. 22 (under no. 21), considers A Shepherd and Shepherdesses with Flocks, in Windsor Castle, and the Museum’s picture to belong to a group of Berchem paintings dating from the mid-1640s; Baetjer 1995, p. 326, as signed “Berchem,” with no mention of the date; Baetjer 2004, pp. 170, 173, 197, 221–22, 245, appendix IA, no. 159 (ill. p. 221), fig. 12, includes the Van Bremen sale of 1766 in the provenance (see Hofstede de Groot 1907–28).

EX COLL.: [Monsieur Hérès, Brussels, until 1846; his sale, Schoeters and Étiennne Le Roy, Brussels, June 19, 1846, no. 6, for BFr 650]; Marquis Théobule de Rodes, Brussels (until d. 1867; her estate sale, Hôtel des Commissaires-Priseurs, Paris, May 30, 1868, no. 2, for FFr 1,020 to Gauchez); [Léon Gauchez, Paris, with Alexis Févre, Paris, 1868–70; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris (1870; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, Paris, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1870–71; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.123
Christoffel van den Berghe

Antwerp ca. 1590–1628 or later; active in Middelburg

The artist’s family fled Flanders and settled in the Zeeland city of Middelburg. Very few relevant documents are known apart from those recording Van den Berghe in 1619 as a “leader” in the painters’ guild of Middelburg, and in 1621 as the guild’s dean. In December 1621, he bought a house in Middelburg (“in de Corte Breestraete bij ’t Begynhoff”), which he still owned in January 1628. The archives of Bergen op Zoom (in neighboring North Brabant) indicate that the artist intended to marry in May 1627, but a document of June 1628 reveals that the wedding bells never rang.

Van den Berghe worked in two genres that flourished in Middelburg during the early 17th century, flower pictures and landscape painting. One of his few dated works is Vase of Flowers in a Stone Niche, signed “CV BERGHE 1617” (Philadelphia Museum of Art, John G. Johnson Collection). The picture has been described as a synthesis of qualities found in flower still lifes by the Middelburg master Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder (1573–1621), and by the Fleming Roelant Savery (1576–1639), who at the time lived in Amsterdam. Van den Berghe’s other known still lifes are mostly in the same vein, except for Still Life with Dead Birds, signed and dated “Cvberghie 1624” (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles), and a vanitas picture with a skull, shell, and vase of flowers.

The painter’s landscapes are now as rare as his flower pictures. Key works for defining his oeuvre are the small pendants on copper in the Mauritshuis, The Hague, which are typically monogrammed “CVB” (and date from about 1615–20). These animated river views, representing the seasons of summer and winter, strongly recall landscapes by Adriaen van de Venne (1589–1662), who worked in Middelburg during the first quarter of the century (his earliest known paintings are from 1614, and include a pair of summer and winter scenes). Landscape painting in Middelburg followed Flemish conventions, so that the earlier attribution of the Mauritshuis pictures to David Vinckboons (q.v.), and later to Paul Bril (ca. 1554–1626), is not surprising. Van den Berghe’s small Winter Landscape with Ice Skaters in the Museum Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerp, is contemporary with the paintings in The Hague. The little Landscape with Peasant Wagon (art market, 1967), in the manner of Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568–1625), had its original monogram, “CvB,” altered to read “JB.” Finally, the miniature Wooded Landscape with a Gothic Palace (private collection, Germany) shows a more imaginary side of Van den Berghe’s work, and recalls forest scenes painted in Amsterdam by Vinckboons and by Gillis van Coninxloo (1544–1607).

Van den Berghe appears to have painted the figures in all his landscape pictures, and they help to distinguish his works from those by other artists. The painting discussed below is an important addition to his known oeuvre.

2. Bol 1956, p. 194, on the house and the betrothal. Van den Berghe is not documented after 1628. On evidence for a still life supposedly dated 1642, see note 3 below.
4. Segal in Amsterdam 1984, p. 76.
5. Jaffe 1997, p. 10 (ill.). As suggested in Meijer 1994, pp. 150, 156 n. 5, the still life said to be signed and dated “C. V. Bergh 1642” (presumably a misprint for 1624) in a Middelburg auction of 1779 is very probably identical with the Getty picture. Segal in Amsterdam 1984, p. 78, suggested that the canvas was actually painted by Gillis de Bergh (ca. 1600–1669), but this is not at all convincing.
10. Bol 1982b, p. 9, fig. 3.

28 Christoffel van den Berghe
6. A Winter Landscape with Ice Skaters and
an Imaginary Castle

Oil on wood, 10 ¼ in. x 17 ¼ in. (27.3 x 43 cm)

The condition of the painting is good; however, the castle,
frozen water, ice skaters, and tree branches are abraded. The
panel has been thinned to ½ in. (.32 cm) and laminated to a
plywood panel support that has been cradled.

From the Collection of Frits and Rita Markus, Bequest of
Rita Markus, 2005 2005.331.1

The earlier attribution of this picture to the pioneering painter
of winter scenes Hendrick Avercamp (1585–1634) goes back to
1929, when the Dutch connoisseur Cornelis Hofstede de Groot
(1869–1930) provided his expertise to a London art dealer. Clara
Welcker, who published the standard monograph on Avercamp
in 1933, generally deferred to Hofstede de Groot’s opinions,
and although she did raise the question of the panel’s author-
ship, she allowed that it appeared to be one of Avercamp’s ear-
liest known works.1 Her affirmative answer is explained partly
by the fact that the painting was said to bear Avercamp’s
monogram (no inscription is visible now), and also because
landscapes by Christoffel van den Berghe were unknown at the
time. For the past seventy-five years, the picture has evidently
received almost no critical scrutiny.2 The Markus bequest to the
Museum will help to clarify the early development both of
Avercamp and of the winter scene in Dutch art.

Comparison with pictures that were certainly painted by
Avercamp early in his career, such as the Winter Landscape dated
1608 (Billedgalleri, Bergen), a simpler skating scene dated 1609
(private collection), Ice Skating near a Village, of about 1609–
10 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, on loan to the Mauritshuis,
The Hague, since 1924), and A Winter Scene with Skaters near
a Castle, of about 1609 (National Gallery, London), shows
that the “Mute of Kampen” (Avercamp, a deaf-mute, was
known by this sobriquet) employed similar compositions to
the one found here, but that he had a very different sense of
space, form, atmosphere, and coloring.3 Avercamp’s ground
planes extend clearly and deeply toward the horizon, and his
buildings, which look geometrically three-dimensional, assist
the figures, trees, boats, and other forms in measuring prog-
ess from foreground to background, and even from side to side. He favors light tones overall with many local color accents, resulting in a crisp atmosphere well suited to his usual subject of a frozen river on a sunny day.

The present picture creates a very different impression. The artist seems more interested in filling the composition with curious shapes, delicately balanced, than in measuring distances (the sense of depth, compared with Avercamp's, appears rather rushed, and the ground plane slightly concave). Jagged silhouettes are exploited to artistic effect, but are softened by the thin application of paint and intimations of atmosphere. In these qualities the work is indeed "very Flemish," as noted by Blankert (see Refs.), for a Dutch landscape of this early period. (The costumes, as well as the style of the picture, suggest a date of about 1615-20.) And the painting is also reminiscent of Avercamp or any artist working in North Holland (for example, David Vinckboons; q.v.) than of the winter landscapes that Adriaen van de Venne (1589-1662) painted in Middelburg during the same years. Both the figures and the setting in Van den Bergh's small Winter Scene of about 1615-20 (Mauritshuis, The Hague) strongly support an attribution of the Markus picture to that contemporary of Van de Venne's in Middelburg.

The painting's subject, the pleasures of wintrertime, raises the question of whether the panel, like the Mauritshuis picture, might originally have had a pendant depicting summer. The view is centered on a pink brick castle with a typical Flemish tower, a gate tower, and a drawbridge. A village, dominated by a church, closes the hazy view in the left background. Beyond the last houses receding on the right, a windmill on a hill is faintly visible through bare branches. A small farmhouse, a hayrick, and a larger building (possibly an inn) are framed by craggy trees on the left, where a snow-dusted boat is also frozen in the ice. Myriad figures stand, walk, talk, skate, sleigh, and play on the ice. In the right foreground, the group of five figures seen from the back—three men sporting swords and two women, one with a high lace collar and fur muff through which she grasps a gentleman's hand—represents the upper class. Nearby figures could be described as middle class, except for the boy deflecting by the tree to the left, who is inconveniently approached by a boy with a snowball. Crows perch in the trees and fly in the cloud-streaked sky.

The central motif of a castle occurs in many Dutch winter scenes of this period, both in paintings and in prints. Castles with moats, and even in lakes, were common in the Netherlands, and offered a picturesque backdrop—and perhaps a perennial flavor—to winter scenes of people at play.

1. C. Welcker 1979, p. 88 (pp. xvi, 201, on the author's debt to Hofstede de Groot).
2. However, Otto Naumann (oral opinion, ca. 1990) mentioned the possibility of Van den Bergh's authorship at least a decade ago. Since then, the present writer has borne the picture in mind when examining the landscapes by Van den Bergh in The Hague and in Antwerp (see the biography above), and paintings by Avercamp and other possible candidates. Anthony Chrichton-Stuart, of Christie's, New York, also knew the Markus picture during the 1990s and independently came to the conclusion that it is probably by Van den Bergh.
3. See Amsterdam 1982, nos. 1, 2, 5, and MacLaren/Brown 1992, pp. 3-4, no. 1340, pl. 3, for good photographs of these pictures. For the Bergen panel of 1605-6, see also Stuttgart 2005-6, pp. 73-75, no. 18.
4. See Duparc 1980, pp. 12-13; Bol 1982a, pp. 100-10; figs. 82, 83; or The Hague 2001-2, no. 11 (fig. 1 for the pendant).
5. See, for example, Keyes in Amsterdam 1982, pp. 39-42, figs. 11-14, and pp. 150-51, no. 33.

References: C. Welcker 1933, pp. 88, 204, no. 513, pl. 1, fig. xiii, cites the painting as an early work by Hendrick Avercamp, with the art dealer N. Beets in Amsterdam; C. Welcker 1979, pp. 88, 204, 237-38, nos. 513, 5406, 5415, pl. 1, fig. xiii, adds provenance of 1929; Blankert in Amsterdam 1982, p. 27, lists the picture (known only from Welcker's monograph) as one of the early, "very Flemish" pictures" by Avercamp, dating from about 1605-8.

Exhibited: Amsterdam, Kunsthandel J. Goudstikker, "Hollandsche winterlandschappen uit de 17de eeuw," 1933, no. 3.

Ex Coll.: [Asscher and Welcker, London, in 1929]; [P. de Boer, Amsterdam, and Ch. de Burlet, Berlin, in 1930]; [N. Beets, Amsterdam];[4 Frits and Rita Markus, New York; From the Collection of Frits and Rita Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2005 2005.311.1

1. C. Welcker 1979 (see Refs.) lists the work as with Beets at or about the time of publication in 1933 (1st ed.).
ABRAHAM VAN BEYEREN

The Hague 1620/21–1690 Overschie

Van Beyeren is best known for his *pronkstilleven* (still lifes of luxurious objects), like the one discussed below, but in the Netherlands especially he is also admired for his fish still lifes. His father, Hendrick Gillisz van Beyeren, was a glazier in The Hague. In 1626, the painter was cited in guild records as a pupil of Tyman Cracht (ca. 1600–1643/46), who is known to have worked on the decorations of Honselaarsdijk Palace, the Stadholder’s palace near The Hague, in 1638. After a brief period in Leiden, where he married Emmerentia Stercke in 1639, Van Beyeren returned to The Hague and became a master in the painters’ guild in 1640. At an unknown date, Van Beyeren’s first wife died (leaving him a widower with three daughters). In 1647, the artist married Anna van den Queborn, a painter, and daughter of the engraver and portraitist Crispijn van den Queborn (1604–1652). Anna’s aunt Maria van den Queborn was married to a painter of fish still lifes, Pieter de Putter (ca. 1600–1659), who was probably Van Beyeren’s main source of inspiration in pictures of this type dating from the 1640s.

A large votive panel made by Van Beyeren and another artist in 1649 for the fishermen’s guild in Maassluis displays his talent for depicting fish and marine views. However, the average fish still life brought very little money, even in The Hague, where the genre flourished. Financial difficulties were probably the main reason that Van Beyeren moved from place to place. In 1657, he joined the painters’ guild in Delft, but returned to The Hague in 1661. From 1669 to 1674, he lived in Amsterdam, and then moved farther north to Alkmaar, where he joined the guild in 1674. The next year, he and his wife returned to South Holland, living first in Gouda (1675–77) and then near Rotterdam in Overschie, where the artist bought a house in 1678. He purchased another house in Overschie in 1680; Anna was said to be sick in bed when she made out a will in 1679, but the date of her death is unknown. Van Beyeren remained in Overschie until he died in 1690.

The first known *pronk*, or fancy, still lifes by Van Beyeren date from the early 1650s. They are quite elaborate banquet displays with expensive silver, porcelain, glassware, fruit, lobsters, and so on, which like the settings (silk-covered tables, large-scale architecture, and in some pictures curtains drawn aside) suggest the influence of Jan de Heem (*q.v.*; see Pl. 75). The turn to this type of still life by Willem Kalf (*q.v.*) and others at about the same time, or somewhat earlier, must have encouraged Van Beyeren to produce costlier pictures, and to attract a more discerning clientele. Some of the luxurious objects in his banquet still lifes are rather closely described, but on the whole he retained and refined the broad technique and brown tonalities that he had earlier employed in fish still lifes. “Monochrome” banquet still lifes were a specialty of Pieter Claesz and Willem Claesz Heda (*q.q.v.*) in Haarlem, and Van Beyeren must have been familiar with their work as well. The great majority of his fancy still lifes are tall in format and busy in design, with warm local color accents and numerous reflections (in this regard, Kalf’s Paris-period luxury still lifes come to mind). Van Beyeren often worked on a larger scale than most of his Dutch colleagues, painting pictures about a meter high.

The artist also painted fish still lifes after 1650, as well as quiet pictures of wineglasses and fruit, a few flower pieces, and paintings of dead game birds. The known dates tend to indicate that the most elaborate works were generally painted in The Hague or Amsterdam, which is what might be expected, but the many undated works by Van Beyeren make the issue of market demand difficult to judge.

1. The term is explained in Segal 1989, where “sumptuous still life” is chosen as an ungainly English equivalent. The verb *pronken* means to show off, preen, or display ostentatiously.
4. See ibid., p. 339.
5. On De Putter and Van Beyeren, see Meijer in Utrecht–Helsinki 2004, pp. 37–42, and pp. 247–49 for more on De Putter. He is incorrectly described by some authors as Van Beyeren’s brother-in-law, for example in P. Sutton 1990a, p. 16.
Verbeeck the Younger was active in The Hague during the 1660s and 1670s (see The Hague 1998–99, p. 355). 7. See Helbers 1947, where the following documents are quoted: “Anna van Beyeren, living on the Turfmarkt, coming from Amsterdam,” became a member of the Jansekerk in Gouda (a Reformed Church) on September 29, 1675. The same register describes her on June 20, 1677, as “Anna van Beyeren, housewife of Abraham van Beyeren, having lived on the [Turf]markt, is departed to Overschie.”

8. The relevant documents were published in Bredius 1915–22, part 7, pp. 15–14.

9. In Meijer 2003, p. 162 (under no. 9), it is suggested in a discussion of one of Van Beyeren’s earliest still lifes of this type that he probably started painting them during the second half of the 1640s. The Ward collection of Netherlandish still lifes in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, has five examples by Van Beyeren (ibid., nos. 9–13), including a fish still life, probably of about 1653–60.

10. As noted in ibid., p. 163, where Cornelis Kruys (1619/20–1654) is also discussed. Some useful remarks on Van Beyeren’s development, taking into consideration still lifes by Jacques de Claeuw (1633–1694 or later), are found in S. Sullivan 1974.

11. For examples of the last type, dated 1661 and 1675, see S. Sullivan 1984, figs. 97, 98.

12. According to Segal 1989, p. 173, no dated pronsellevens are known from the period 1637–66, which includes the years Van Beyeren lived in Delft. However, some Delft artists worked for clients in The Hague.

7. Still Life with Lobster and Fruit

Oil on wood, 38 x 31 in. (96.5 x 78.7 cm)
Signed (left, on table): AVB: f [AVB in monogram]

Van Beyeren’s palette was usually understated, but it is clear that this painting has lost some local color with age.


Probably dating from the early 1650s, this panel was painted quite thinly and freely, with an understated palette that has lost some color with age. Blue tones, in particular, have diminished; the table cover was most likely a stronger purple, and of course the Chinese cup was originally blue and white. Thinning of the paint with age (not abrasion) has caused some loss of form, and the impression of hovering highlights in the tall, silver-gilt covered cup, a decorative or ceremonial piece known as a Buckelpokal (knobby goblet, in German; cups in this style were made mainly in Augsburg and Nuremberg).

The composition could be characterized as a simpler, quieter, more intimate version of a type of banquet, or prons, still life (see Van Beyeren’s biography above) that flourished in Antwerp during the 1640s, with artists such as Jan de Heem...
(q.v.), Alexander Adriaenssen (1587–1661), and Adriaen van Utrecht (1599–1652). In 1646, Van Utrecht contributed to the decorations of the Huis ten Bosch, near The Hague, and thus may have come to Van Beyeren's attention in the court city.

The lobster, the tipped-over tazza, and the sliced melon were common motifs in works by De Heem and his circle well before Van Beyeren's earliest known use of them in a dated picture, the quite Flemish-looking *Large Still Life with Lobster*, of 1653 (fig. 7). In that canvas, a lobster is the centerpiece in a pile of luxurious tableware and cascading fruit, while in the New York picture the lobster, on a pointed silver platter with a peeled lemon (recalling Kalf; see Pl. 97) and a single shrimp, is placed to the side (where the lobster's claws point to the artist's monogram). A long stem allows one of three peaches to dangle over the near edge of the table, as do an unusual number of motifs (even for a still life of this kind). Green grapes surround the melon, and purple grapes set off a large peach in the Wanli bowl (actually a tall cup of a type known as a *kraalkop*, or crow cup, in Dutch). Behind the tazza is a *façon de Venise* wineglass, half-full, and to the lower right is a pocket watch on a blue ribbon. The timepiece, like the dazzling reflections and the very freshness of the fruit, would have suggested to viewers of the period life's swift passage. They might also have recognized the soldier crowning the covered cup as the “Christian Knight” (Miles Christianus), who through faith alone overcomes the Seven Deadly Sins. In literary accounts, the hero is rarely concerned with avarice and gluttony, but he rises above those temptations here.

1. See Vienna–Essen 2002, nos. 4, 85, 86, 89, 90, for examples of the Antwerp type; and ibid., p. 374, on Van Utrecht's work for the Dutch court.
2. See Van der Hul-Ketel 1983, p. 119. A crowlike bird is painted in the center of many Wanli cups of this shape, hence the name.
3. One of the most balanced treatments of this subject, in an entry on a painting by Van Beyeren that includes similar motifs, is by De Jongh in Amsterdam 1982, pp. 79–83 (under no. 7).

References: Virch 1970, p. 3, gives basic catalogue information; Walsh 1974a, pp. 348–49, fig. 12, describes the picture as “a relatively sober work of the 1650s thinly and fluently painted,” identifies the “tall silver-gilt covered cup, a type made in Nuremberg in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, the silver-gilt tazza of the same period and the Ming porcelain bowl,” and suggests the influence of Willem Kalf; MMA 1975, p. 92 (ill.); P. Surton 1986, p. 190, mentioned; Baejer 1995, p. 127; Gernar-Koeltsch 1995, vol. 2, p. 104, no. 28/32 (ill.); Meijer 2003, p. 165, notes the similar lobster, dish with pointed rim, melon, and other motifs in Van Beyeren's *Still Life with Lobster and Turkey* (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford), and suggests, indirectly, a dating to the early 1650s.

Ex Coll.: [Galerie Scharf Lucas, Vienna; sold to a private collection, Vienna]; private collection, Vienna, and later Greenwich, Conn. (by 1918–71; seized in Paris by the Nazis, held at Alt Aussee, Austria [1024/3]), and at Munich collecting point [1275], returned to France, October 30, 1946; restituted; given by owner to MMA; Anonymous Gift, 1971 1971-254

1. According to a letter from the present owner of the gallery, dated June 20, 2000, the gallery has no records dating before 1938.
Houboken, who like Bisschop was a native of Dordrecht, reports that the artist was born on February 12, 1630, and died in 1674 at the age of forty-four, leaving eleven children. These and other specific details, and the fact that the biographer devotes a paragraph to each of Bisschop's painter sons, Jacobus (1658–1697 or later) and Abraham (1670–1731), suggest that he obtained his information from a member of the immediate family.1

The artist's father, Jacob Dionyzs Bisschop, was a tailor and the proprietor of an inn, De Pauw (The Peacock), on the Wijnstraat in Dordrecht. Jacob's wife, Anna van Beveren, came from Utrecht. Houboken records that the young Cornelis studied with Ferdinand Bol (q.v.), who was also from Dordrecht. This must have been in Amsterdam, presumably during the second half of the 1640s. In this period, Bisschop may have become acquainted with, in addition to Bol, two other Rembrandt pupils from Dordrecht, Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.), who was with Rembrandt until about 1647, and Nicolaes Maes (q.v.), who was in the master's studio between about 1649–50 and 1652 or 1653. In any case, Bisschop was strongly influenced by Bol's work of the 1640s and by Van Hoogstraten and Maes during the 1650s and later. Affinities with Gerbrand van den Eeckhout and Willem Drost (q.v.) underscore Bisschop's early connection with the Rembrandt school.

On October 26, 1653, Bisschop and Geertruyt Botland, "both of Dordrecht," were married in that city.2 The couple's first child, Anna, was baptized less than six months later, on April 10, 1654. Caterina was born in 1655, Maria in 1656, and then a child was born about every other year, altogether eight girls and four boys.3 The parallel to Vermeer's life is intriguing: Vermeer, also an innkeeper's son, was born in 1632, died in 1675 at the age of forty-three, and left his wife with eleven children, seven or eight of them girls. There was also, as in Delft, art dealing in the Dordrecht family, according to Balthasar de Monconys (1611–1665), who visited the Bisschops in July 1653, a few weeks before his better-known visit to Vermeer. The learned French diplomat describes Bisschop's wife as a seller of paintings and sewing thread, and the artist himself as a painter who also decorated cabinets, chests, toilettry cases, and so on.4 On April 6, 1669, another connoisseur and diarist, Pieter Teding van Berkhout (1643–1713), traveled from the court city of The Hague to Bisschop's studio, and found him "a painter excellent for perspective." About five weeks later, on May 14, 1669, Teding van Berkhout paid his first visit to Vermeer; upon his second visit, on June 21, he noted that "the most extraordinary and the most curious aspect" of Vermeer's work "consists in the perspective."5

The best illustration of this "aspect" in Bisschop's oeuvre is The Apple Peeler, of 1667 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which may also be described as his most Vermeer-like work.6 This and other scenes of middle-class life by Bisschop were inspired mainly by genre pictures painted in Dordrecht by Maes and Van Hoogstraten, although they also reflect broader developments in the region of South Holland.7 In religious and mythological pictures of the 1650s and 1660s, and in a few paintings of old women reading Bibles, Bisschop is clearly a follower of Maes. As in that artist's work, a warm palette and rich effects of light and atmosphere recall Rembrandt and artists in his circle about midcentury.8

In the 1660s and 1670s, Bisschop was also quite active as a fashionable portraitist, Houboken refers to the many artful examples that may be seen not only in the province of Holland but also in Zeeland, Brabant, and elsewhere. The most impressive portrait known today is Bisschop's painting of himself in 1668 (Dordrecht Museum, Dordrecht).9 The dignified Portrait of a Wine Merchant's Family, dating from about 1670 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel), is a large fragment.10 In 1671, the artist was commissioned to paint his thirteen-figure portrait, The Male and Female Regents of the Holy Sacrament Hospital (Dordrecht Museum, Dordrecht).11 This project and the request, in the last year of his life, that he become court painter to the king of Denmark (according to Houboken) are among several signs of the considerable esteem that Bisschop earned during his twenty-year career, although he struggled to meet the needs of his growing family.12 Another sideline, in addition to painted chests and boxes, was the fabrication of approximately life-size dummy-board figures, that is, illusionistic cutouts depicting people. Houboken relates that one of these chansonnier pictures, as they are sometimes called, was offered tips by unsuspecting houseguests.13

Cornelis Bisschop
Dordrecht 1630–1674 Dordrecht
well have been this kind of work that attracted the attention of Christian V of Denmark, since his court artist Cornelis Gijsbrechts (ca. 1630–after 1675) painted illusionistic still lifes, including large cutout pictures like the *Trompe-l’œil Easel with Fruit Piece*, of about 1670 (Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen).  

1. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, pp. 220–22, on the Bisschops. In a mostly helpful biography, Loughman in Dordrecht 1992–93, p. 85, states that Bisschop was baptized, as opposed to born, on February 12, 1630.  


5. See New York–London 2001, pp. 14, 168 n. 56, on these visits by Teding van Berkhout, and p. 414 on his family and for another instance of enthusiasm for print culture.  


7. See Liedtke 2000a, chap. 4.  


8. A Young Woman and a Cavalier

Oil on canvas, 38 1/4 x 34 1/4 in. (97.8 x 88.3 cm)

The paint surface has been flattened and abraded overall. The most serious alteration is the loss of form in the woman’s red bodice where the modeling glazes have been disrupted.

The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.33

The painting was little known until it came to the Museum with the Linsky Collection in 1982. In a letter of 1954 to Jack Linsky, W. R. Valentin proposed (or accepted) an attribution to Gabriel Metsu (q.v.), and noted the possible connection with a picture exhibited as by Metsu in 1858. The present writer’s conclusion, in 1984 (see Refs.), that the work was painted about the early 1660s in Dordrecht by Cornelis Bisschop has been consistently supported by specialists. The paintings by Bisschop that are most comparable in style date from the late 1650s and the 1660s, and include the signed *Old Woman Seated in Thought* (Spencer Collection, Althorp);*Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife* (Kunstmuseum, Düsseldorf), which was formerly said to be signed and dated 1664; and the large *Self-Portrait*, of 1668 (Dordrecht Museum, Dordrecht). Bisschop followed Maes in his occasional rendering of domestic scenes on a large scale, with figures set against dark backgrounds (as in the Althorp canvas) and soft effects of light, shadow, and atmosphere. A warm palette, typical of Dordrecht, and a comparatively broad application of paint are found in works of this type, which include, according to Sumowski, *A Young Man and a Girl Playing Cards*, in the National Gallery, London. The young man in that painting and, more obviously, the amorous visitor in the Linsky picture strongly
resemble Bisschop himself, to judge from the Self-Portrait of 1668 (which must follow the present work by five or six years). Furthermore, the woman in the New York canvas seems to be the same model Bisschop employed in a few pictures dating from the 1660s, such as Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife (mentioned above) and The Apple Peeler, of 1667 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). Brière-Misme concluded plausibly that she is Bisschop’s wife, Geertruyt Botland.8

It was suggested in the Linsky Catalogue catalogue (see Refs.) that Bisschop’s reputation for painting approximately life-size dummy-board figures (see the biography above) was relevant to the attribution of A Young Woman and a Cavalier. The scale and silhouetted effect of the figures in this canvas bring those illusionistic works to mind. Houbraken noted that Bisschop’s cutout figures with candlesticks in their hands are painted in the manner of night pieces.7 However, it should also be recalled that figure paintings, including genre scenes (like Vermeer’s Mistress and Maid, of about 1666–67, in the Frick Collection, New York), were occasionally given very dark backgrounds in the early to mid-1660s, and were sometimes executed on a larger scale than usual.8 For an artist already familiar with Maes’s large-figure genre paintings of the 1650s, this fashion of the next decade must have had particular appeal.

The subject of Bisschop’s painting brings to mind antecedents such as Gerrit van Honthorst’s Young Couple Lighting a Candle with a Hot Coal, of about 1622 (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig), and Rembrandt’s The Prodigal Son in the Tavern, of about 1655 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden).9 In the latter, the painter and his wife served as models, and almost certainly were meant to be recognized.10 Rembrandt’s canvas has been placed in the context of a tradition (or common practice) in which artists depicted themselves as the Prodigal Son or pictor vulgaris, a type that wittily plays on the contemporaneous norm of presenting oneself as a gentleman, courtier, or learned individual (as in Dou’s Self-Portrait; Pl. 37). Van Mander reports that Düren gave his own features to the Prodigal Son in his engraving of 1498, and he also praises Hans von Aachen’s portrait of himself carousing with a lute-playing courtesan (private collection), which probably dates from the 1590s and anticipates the arrangement of the figures in Bisschop’s composition.

Among the Dordrecht painter’s contemporaries, Jan Steen (q.v.) routinely used his own well-known features, as well as those of family members, in ribald genre scenes (as in Pls. 196, 197), and Metsu more politely cast himself as a modern-day Prodigal Son in a tavern with his well-dressed wife, in a panel dated 1661 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden).11

We do not know if Bisschop expected viewers to recognize the figures in the present painting as himself and his wife (if it is she), but this would hardly have been surprising in the rather small art world of Dordrecht. And the work may have hung in the artist’s own home. However, its sympathetic treatment of romance seems in harmony with Dutch genre pictures of the 1660s—by Gerard ter Borch, Pieter de Hooch (q.v.), and others—in which no personal note is found. Furthermore, the young woman and her “cavalier” (the traditional term implies no more than gallant behavior) are not meant as models of decorum. To judge from his hat and sword belt (and perhaps the cloak hung on the wall to the right), the young man has just arrived on the scene; but the point of his visit appears to have been understood in advance. The woman picks up a wine jug and silver candlestick, on which the painter displays his ability to render reflections. The couple will no doubt retire to another room. For some viewers the extinguished wick of the candle, and perhaps the wick trimmer on the tray, may have been regarded as vanitas symbols, while other viewers may have remembered the saying “De kaers uyt, de scheemschoe uyt,” meaning, “When the candle goes out, shame is extinguished too.”12 Of course, the candlestick is also an illusionistic motif, projecting forward from the bodice and apron, where its shadow falls. The object’s distortion, implying a very close point of view, draws added attention to it, and is an artistic conceit employed frequently enough in the period for Bisschop’s Dordrecht colleague Samuel van Hoogstraten to have complained about it.13 Whether or not the candlestick and jug were also meant (as they would have been by Steen) as allusions to male and female anatomy is a question that, thankfully enough, must remain in the shadows of the past.

The painting’s carved and gilded frame is remarkable, and possibly original to the picture. The canvas is unusually close to square in format, and neither it nor the frame has been cut down, suggesting that Bisschop himself may have put them together.14 An expert on Dutch frames, C. J. de Bruyn Kops, considers the frame likely to have been made in the Netherlands during the 1660s.15 A pair of frames in a very similar auricular style, but without the elephant heads and lion’s muzzle at the top, are original to portraits of Jasper Schade and his wife, dated 1654, by Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Elder (q.v.; Rijksmuseum Twente, Enschede).16 Another similar frame is seen in the background of Metsu’s A Man and Woman Seated by a Virginal, of about 1663–65 (National Gallery, London).17

38 CORNELIS BISSCHOP
1. See Refs. and Exh. In a letter from W. R. Valentiner (in Los Angeles) to Jack Linsky, dated June 7, 1954, the scholar observes, "from the excellent color reproduction which you sent, it was not difficult to see that the painting is a fine work by Metsu," and he refers to Hofstede de Groot's no. 573 (see Refs.). A black-and-white photograph made in New York for Mr. Linsky (now in the curatorial files) bears on the back Valentiner's certificate, dated February 2, 1955, to the effect that the painting is by Metsu, and probably dates from about 1665-60.

2. Oil on canvas, 57 1/2 x 39 1/4 in. (146 x 100 cm), signed and dated "C. Bissch. . . 165(?)" according to Sumowski 1983-[94], vol. 3, pp. 1962, 1966 n. 86 (with earlier literature), and p. 1995 (ill.).


4. Dordrecht 1992-93, pp. 90-92, no. 6, where the colorplate is much too red. The present writer has examined the Self-Portrait in Dordrecht on several occasions and is convinced that the Linsky painting is by the same hand.

5. Sumowski 1983-[94], vol. 3, pp. 1962, 1966 (the proper note, n. 82, is not indicated, but begins in the twelfth line of n. 81), p. 1993 (ill.). In MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 377-72, no. 1247, pl. 299, the work is catalogued under follower of Rembrandt, and Sumowski's attribution to Bisschop is considered "interesting" but "speculative" (see also Bomford et al. 2006, p. 209, where the attribution to Bisschop is doubted). Sumowski's comparison to the Althorp picture and his suggestion that the male figure in the London canvas strongly resembles Bisschop himself are not considered in MacLaren/Brown 1991.

6. Brière-Misnie 1960, p. 188.


8. See my discussion in New York–London 2001, p. 393, where Vermeer's large canvas in the Frick Collection is compared with Michiel Sweerts's Clothing the Naked, of about 1660-61 (MMA) and with works by Frans van Mieris (q.v.) and Karel du Jardin (1620-1678). In Bisschop's painting the woman's pose, the artful interplay of contours, and certain effects of light, like the indirect illumination of the man's face, are also typical of the period (compare Vermeer's Young Woman with a Water Pitcher; Pl. 205).


10. See Chapman 1990, pp. 114-20, where it is supposed that Rembrandt "made the picture for himself and not on commission" (p. 114).

11. Ibid., p. 118, cites these and other examples, and refers to Van Mander 1604, fol. 209v (on Dürer) and fol. 209r (By Aachen). The painting by Van Aachen is illustrated in Kaufmann 1988, p. 72, fig. 11. A variant of that composition, A Young Couple, of about 1596 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), shows Van Aachen and his wife, Regina di Lasso, in different poses; see Fucikova in Essen 1988, pp. 211-12, no. 92, pl. 13. On Metsu's self-portrait with his wife in a tavern, see also F. Robinson 1974, pp. 29, 33, fig. 14. Also relevant are the remarks in Corpus 2005, pp. 142, about Frans van Mieris placing himself in genre pictures and modeling for trompes.

REFERENCES: The painting is possibly that cited in Hofstede de Groot 1907-27, vol. 1 (1907), p. 308, no. 1756, as A Woman Holding a Jug and a Man behind Her, by Gabriel Metsu, with no mention of support, dimensions, or inscriptions, where the author notes that the work was "exhibited at Leeds, 1888, no. 371, [lent by] Baron de Ferrières"; Liedtke in Linsky Collection 1984, pp. 94-96, no. 31, attributes the work for the first time to Cornelis Bisschop, describes the subject as an amorous genre scene, and suggests that the artist used himself and possibly his wife as models; W. Liedtke in MMA, Notable Acquisitions, 1932-1984 (New York, 1984), p. 36, summarizes the entry in Linsky Collection 1984; Chong and Wieseman in Dordrecht 1992-93, p. 28, fig. 21, cite the work as a typical genre piece by Bisschop, and as closely related to large-scale genre paintings by Nicolaes Maes; Baer 1995, p. 333; Liedtke in New York 1995-96, p. 331 (under no. 53), mentions the picture in connection with Maes's influence on Bisschop; Salomon 2004, p. 127 n. 26, places it within a broad tradition of images that associate "lust and drunkenness."


EX COLL.: [Baron de Ferrières (in 1868; as by Gabriel Metsu, "A Woman Holding a Jug and a Man behind Her")]; Mr. and Mrs. Jack Linsky, New York (by 1954-60; as by Metsu); The Jack and Belle Linsky Foundation, New York (1980-82); The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982-1982.60.33

1. Valentiner's letter of June 7, 1954, to Jack Linsky (see note 1 above) suggests that the collector had recently bought the picture in London or Paris. A photograph of the painting in the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, was obtained from P. Landry, Paris, in 1953.
Bloemaert’s life spanned the entire period of the Eighty Years’ War, from the revolt of 1566 (he was born on December 24) to the Peace of Westphalia (1648) and beyond (he died at the age of eighty-four on January 13, 1631). Once Paulus Moreelse and Joachim Wevels (q.v.) had died, both in 1638, Bloemaert stood alone as the grand old man among Utrecht artists, and remained very productive until the end of his life. He was an eminent teacher, and his students included Hendrick ter Brugghen (q.v.), Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656), Jan van Bijlert (1529/38–1671), Cornelis van Poelenburgh (1594/95–1667), Jacob Gerritsz Cuyp (1594–1651/52), Jan Both (ca. 1615/16–1652), and Jan Weenix (q.v.).

Bloemaert’s father, Cornelis Bloemaert (ca. 1540–1593), was a sculptor and architect from Dordrecht. In 1567, he worked in ’s Hertogenbosch, repairing the damage done by iconoclastic rioters in the previous year. The family settled in Utrecht by 1576, where Abraham trained with his father, with a drunken dauber (according to Van Mander) named Gerrit Splinter, and with Joos de Beer (active 1575–ca. 1601), a former pupil of the famous Antwerp painter Frans Floris (1519/20–1570). “Even though he [De Beer] was not one of the best painters himself, he had many handsome works by [the Floris disciple Anthonie] Blocklandt [1533/34–1583] and other clever masters in his house. Here Bloemaert copied in oil a piece by Dirck Barendsz [1534–1592], being a contemporary banquet [scene].”

This tuition ended because Bloemaert’s father “felt that he had enough clever pieces of his own for copying,” for example the Floris designs after which his son had made drawings earlier, and “a very clever kitchen piece by the elder Langen Pier,” that is, Pieter Aertsen (1507/8–1575).1

Van Mander writes of the regret Bloemaert expressed to his pupils, saying that he never had the advantage of studying with a “good master.” However, the practice of copying designs by a variety of artists was not a bad beginning for such a precious draftsman. In 1581 or 1582, when Bloemaert was about fifteen years old, he was sent to Paris to work for two and a half years with a certain Master Herry, and then briefly with Hieronymus Francken (ca. 1540–1610). The latter served the French court at Fontainebleau, where Bloemaert must have studied the decorations by Rosso Fiorentino, Niccolo dell’Abate, Primaticcio, and others. Bloemaert’s earliest known dated painting, the ambitious Slaying of the Niobids, of 1591 (Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen), has been described as “unthinkable without the distant examples” of Rosso and Primaticcio, although its main debt is to Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem (1626–1638).4

Between about 1585 and 1590, Bloemaert evidently worked with his father in Utrecht. In 1591, they went to Amsterdam, along with Cornelis’s former pupil the famous architect and sculptor Hendrick de Keyser (1566–1621). Cornelis worked for the city as an engineer, and Abraham finally established himself as an independent artist. He became a citizen of Amsterdam in October 1591, and for the next two years came to know some of the major artists of the day, including Van Mander, Jacques de Gheyn (q.v.), and the engravers Jacob Matham (1571–1631), Jan Muller (1571–1628), and Jan Saenredam (1565–1607). In the spring of 1592, Bloemaert married Judith van Schonenburgh, a woman from a patrician family in Utrecht who was nearly twenty years his senior. After his father’s death in the fall of 1593, Bloemaert settled in Utrecht. His wife died of the plague in 1599, and on October 12, 1600, the artist married a brewer’s daughter, Gerarda de Roij. The couple had numerous children, four of whom became artists: Hendrick (1603/4–1672), a painter and poet; Cornelis (ca. 1603–1692), a painter and important printmaker; Adriaen (ca. 1609–1666), a painter; and Frederick (ca. 1616–1690), an engraver who worked mostly after his father’s designs, including those for the Konstyrk tekenboek (Artistic Drawing Book; Amsterdam, 1711).

Bloemaert flourished in the next three decades. With Paulus Moreelse (q.v.) as the driving force, he helped to establish a new painters’ guild in 1611, and about a year later an academy for students of drawing. His style after 1600 turned in a more naturalistic direction, and his mythological and religious compositions, many of them set in thriving landscapes, became widely known through engravings by Matham, Saenredam, and several other printmakers. A devout Catholic, Bloemaert accepted a number of important commissions for altarpieces, among them the Adoration of the Shepherds (Louvre, Paris), which was painted in 1612 for the Convent of the Poor Clares in ’s Hertogenbosch, where his sister Barbara was a nun.5

In 1617, Bloemaert and his family moved into a large house
A portrait of Bloemaert, dated 1609, was painted by Moreelse (Centraal Museum, Utrecht), and served as the model for prints by Matham and others.7

1. For these remarks in Van Mander's 1604 biography of the young Bloemaert, see Van Mander/Miedema 1994–99, vol. 1, p. 446 (fol. 297v), and the commentaries in vol. 6, pp. 84–91. No works by De Beer survive. As discussed in ibid., vol. 6, p. 88, De Beer's death was the subject of a letter by the Utrecht humanist Aernout van Buchell (mentioned here also in the biographies of Moreelse and Willeerts) in February 1591, so he did not die in 1599 as stated in C. J. A. Wansink's biography of Bloemaert in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 4, p. 310. On Barendsz, see Judson 1970.
3. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 449 (fol. 297v).
4. Roethlisberger 1993, p. 66 (under no. 14), and see pl. II. The most extensive biography of Bloemaert is that contributed by Marten Jan Bok in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 551–87, where, however, the stay in France receives almost no attention (pp. 556–57). Slightly more is offered in Van Mander/Miedema 1994–99, vol. 6, pp. 92–97. The most useful concise biography of Bloemaert is Bok's in Amsterdam 1993–94, pp. 300–301, which does not mention any of the artist's works. Some major examples are cited by Wansink in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 4, pp. 310–53.
5. Roethlisberger 1993, no. 222, pl. 333. See Bok in ibid., pp. 567–70, on Bloemaert and the "Catholic elite" of Utrecht, to which he was allied by marriage.
6. Ibid., nos. 425, 513, pls. 595, 697. For the canvas of 1626, see also Broos 1993, pp. 65–71, no. 3.
9. Moses Striking the Rock

Oil on canvas, 31½ x 42½ in. (79.7 x 108 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): A. Bloemaert fec. a.* 1596

The paint surface is flattened and blanched, and abrasion has exposed the crowns of the canvas weave.

Purchase, Gift of Mary V. T. Eberstadt, by exchange, 1972
1972.171

In Bloemaert's version of the Old Testament subject (Exod. 17:1–6), the children of Israel march out of Egypt either naked or provocatively dressed, and weighed down with earthenware pots, copper-lined cookware, and, in the arms of their least modest maiden, a silver-gilt ewer dating from the late sixteenth century (A.D.). The issue of drinking water had come up before, and despite Moses's performance of a miracle, and his injunction to "diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God" (Exod. 15:22–27), complaints and disputes arose repeatedly. These were answered by bread raining down from heaven (Exod. 16:1–5), the striking of water out of solid rock (the Mountain of Horeb, meaning "dry," in the Sinai desert), and other solutions, culminating with the Ten Commandments (which, because of incidents surrounding the Golden Calf, required two drafts).

Bloemaert had employed largely nude ensembles in earlier mythological works, such as The Wedding of Peleus and Thetis, of about 1590–91 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), and The Judgment of Paris, of about 1592 (private collection). The Flood (Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven), a mostly male affair from the first half of the 1590s, brought the same sort of staging into the religious realm. However, that academic study of strained anatomy hardly prepares one for the hysterical mood and frenzied eroticism of Moses Striking the Rock. Apart from a small number of marginal figures, a character comparable to the central one here does not occur again in biblical scenes by Bloemaert.

The graceful young woman's prominence led one scholar to suggest that the artist's subject is really Aqua, an allegory of water. This is highly unlikely, given the absence of paintings by Bloemaert depicting the three other elements, and the fact that every motif in the composition, including the central figure, is consistent with the episode described in Exodus. Moses, in the left background, is shown just after having struck the rock, and his followers are in the first throes of responding to the miracle. People bend and stretch extravagantly in an effort to contain the lifesaving flow of water. Two men, to the lower left and right of Moses, raise their faces to Heaven in thankful prayer. In the background, camels are brought forward to drink and small groups of figures reveal somewhat less excessive responses to the latest sign that the Lord is watching over them. The flourishing foliage on the outcrop of rock indicates that Moses combined basic survival skills with his unfailing faith.

The central figure has been compared with the heroine in Vasari's Andromeda and the man in the left foreground with a bending bather in Michelangelo's Caccia cartoon. The Florentine roots of Dutch Mannerist figure types are well known. But more directly relevant to the Museum's picture is Bloemaert's knowledge of the decorations at Fontainebleau, especially Primaticcio's stucco Caryatids (1541–44) in the Chambre de la Duchesse d'Étampes, whose gracefully raised arms, sinuous contraposto, and the elegant ewer at one maiden's feet suggest that Bloemaert's memory of the palace, filtered through his more immediate experience of prints by and after Goltzius (who like Primaticcio emulated Parmigianino), informed the female figure types and poses in this design. The extraordinary display of fancy fabric, however, is typical of Bloemaert himself. The male figures, especially the one to the left, bring to mind nude nudes by Cornelisz van Haarlem. The density of the composition, with its balletic interplay of poses and gestures, and its calculated placement of props and stage scenery, is somewhat more in the spirit of Joachim Wtewael (q.v.), Bloemaert's contemporary in Utrecht, than of their Haarlem associates. On the whole, Bloemaert's composition may be described as an original invention inspired by an eclectic survey of recent Dutch Mannerist forms. The intended viewer was an experienced connoisseur.

As noted by several scholars (see Refs.), a drawing in the Musée du Louvre appears to be a copy of a preparatory drawing by Bloemaert for this composition. The right half of the drawing, including the main figure, is largely in agreement with the painted design, but the two most prominent figures to the left are quite differently posed (although they play the same roles), and the cow has not yet arrived.

1. Roethlisberger 1993, nos. 12, 17, pls. 26, 40.
2. Ibid., no. 16, pl. 24.
3. Roos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 168 (under no. 8), where fig. 6 is an engraving after Goltzius, Aqua, dated 1586. The image is that of a nude female figure in the foreground with a large urn spilling water and, in the background, the Baptism of Christ.

5. Among the relevant engravings by Goltzius are Strauss 1977, nos. 170 (Andromeda, 1583), 235 (various figures in the famous Wedding of Cupid and Psyche, 1587), and 315 and 317 (the female figure type in Pygmalion and Galatea, of 1593, and Venus in Half-Lengths, of 1596).

6. The best-known picture with such figures is Cornelisz’s Massacre of the Innocents, of 1591 (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem); Van Thiel 1999, no. 43, pls. v, vi. See also ibid., pl. iv, and pl. 79, 80.

7. This point is stressed by Seelig in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, p. 133, and it undercuts his claim that “the analogy with [Christian] salvation is obvious.” As noted by Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 167, the Utrecht art lover Aernout van Buchell mentioned a Bloemaert painting (now lost) of Moses Striking the Rock in a diary entry of 1591. Broos associates the lost picture, which was evidently quite large, with Bloemaert’s drawing of the subject in the Schlossmuseum, Weimar (ibid., p. 167, fig. 3), but in Roethlisberger 1993, vol. 1, pp. 92–93, the drawing is convincingly dated to a later decade.

8. The most convenient reproduction is in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 167, fig. 4.

References: Frimmel 1892–1901, vol. 1 (1892), p. 120 n., reports recently seeing this previously unknown painting by Bloemaert at Miethke’s, Vienna; Frimmel 1909, p. 67 n., recalls the painting as with Miethke about twenty years earlier, and states that it is probably the picture that was sold in a Pusonji auction, Vienna, December 1872; Delbasso 1928, pp. 24–25, 74, no. 8, fig. VIII, mentions the remote position of Moses; Lindeman 1928, p. 233, considers the Louvre drawing (see end of text above) a sketch for the composition, and describes how the central female figure in the painting is strongly set off from the rest of the painting by her light coloring; Lindeman 1929, pp. 120, 233, believes the Louvre drawing to be a sketch for the composition; Luger 1929–33, vol. 1, p. 13 (under no. 86), considers the Louvre sketch a study for the painting, but “would not be astonished to discover elsewhere a better version of this drawing”; M. Lavin 1965, p. 123, compares a figure in the Museum’s
picture with one in the monochrome River Gods with Apollo and Daphne (Busch-Reisinger Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.); Roethlisberger 1967, pp. 20–21, cites the picture as an example of the growing importance of landscape in Bloemaert’s work during the 1590s, and sees the artist as closely associated with Wtewael and Cornelisz van Haarlem at the time; Bennett and Mongan in Minneapolis and other cities 1968, unpagd (under no. 5), consider Bloemaert’s Ritual Washing of the Infants, a drawing of 1616, to recall earlier biblical narratives like this one; Hill in Poughkeepsie 1970, pp. 18–19, no. 3, pl. 38, “shows the influence of Spranger and Goltzius, and most especially that of Cornelis van Haarlem”; Stalke 1970, p. 432 (under no. 3), suggests that the painting is “an autograph replica, perhaps with some studio participation, of a now lost prime version”; Lowenthal 1974b, pp. 127–28, 131, 133, fig. 5, relates the picture’s style to that seen in Wtewael’s oeuvre; Walsh 1974a, pp. 340–41, 349 no. 1, 2, fig. 1, celebrates the work as the Museum’s first Dutch Mannerist painting, rejects the estimate offered in Stalke 1970, and compares a “possibly earlier” drawing of the same subject by Bloemaert, with the figures differently arranged (Schlossmuseum, Weimar); MMA 1975, p. 92 (ill.), superficially describes the picture’s style; Hibbard 1980, pp. 276, 278, fig. 498, views the work as “an elaborate pantomime” and as “possibly an autograph replica of a lost painting”; Nichols 1980, pp. 5–6, fig. 1, considers the typically Mannerist composition and observes that the “seductive, seminude figure paradoxically symbolizes salvation through living water since the Old Testament story (Exod. 17:2–6) was understood as a prototype of New Testament baptism”; Lowenthal 1986, pp. 69–70, fig. 14, compares the painting as an example of Bloemaert’s style with pictures by Wtewael; P. Sutton 1986, pp. 179–80, fig. 334, pens a turgid appreciation; Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 165–68, no. 8 (ill. p. 164) and fig. 1 (detail), erroneously assumes that the painting was owned by Mary Eberstadt (see credit line below), compares the Louvre drawing (which is apparently a copy of Bloemaert’s preliminary sketch for this composition), and suggests implausibly that the picture’s subject is actually “Agnus rather than a story from the Old Testament”; P. Sutton in ibid., p. 104, observes that the canvas “came during John Walsh’s curatorship”; W. Robinson in Amsterdam and other cities 1991–92, p. 20 no. 3 (under no. 1), compares the style of the Abrams drawing with that of the Museum’s picture and other works; Liedtke in New York 1992–93, p. 95 (under no. 11), cites the painting as an instance of Bloemaert’s shift in the mid-1590s away from convoluted surface effects, and toward more realistic anatomy and figure types; Roethlisberger 1993, vol. 1, pp. 22, 92–93, no. 46, vol. 2, figs. 81–83, pl. IV, considers the picture one of the foremost works of Bloemaert’s Mannerist phase, describes the composition, and sees the agitated figures as embodying the agonies of thirst; Baetjer 1995, p. 206; C. J. A. Wansink in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 4, p. 150, notes the more evenly distributed figures, compared with those in earlier works; C. Brown 1997, pp. 22–23, 70, fig. 6, frontis. (detail), describes the composition and some figures as “closely modelled on those of Cornelis van Haarlem”; Seelig in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, pp. 132–35, 408, no. 1, and pp. 271, 272 (under no. 46), considers “the analogy with salvation” obvious in this pivotal work, reviews sources for the figures in Michelangelo, Cornelisz van Haarlem, and antique sculpture, and (in n. 11) rejects Broos’s (1990–91) idea that the painting constitutes an allegorical representation of water; Spicer in ibid., p. 24, as a work that beautifully exemplifies a love of complexity; P. Sutton in Rotterdam–Frankfurt 1999–2000, p. 124, compares Pieter de Grebber’s handling of the same subject in about 1620; Roethlisberger 2000, p. 160, fig. 11, dates the Weimar drawing (see Walsh 1974a above) later and relates it to Bloemaert’s painting of the subject, dated 1611, in Halle; Hardin in Saint Petersburg 2001, pp. 14, 38 (ill.), 53, 56, no. 3; Metzler in ibid., pp. 30–31, discusses the placement of the main figure (Mosee) in the background as an example of contemporary taste; Roethlisberger in ibid., pp. 16–17, 19. Bolton 2007, vol. 1, pp. 29, 31 (under nos. 39, 44), discusses the Louvre drawing, which the author rejects.


EX COLL.: Possibly Jan Vincent Coster, Amsterdam, in 1622; John Andrews (his sale, Christie’s, London, March 3, 1832, no. 65, “A. Bloemaert, 1596. Moses striking the rock”; sold to art dealer Tuck for £8.8); Isidor Sachs, Vienna (until d. 1871; posthumous sale, Posony, Vienna, December 17, 1872, no. 97); [H. O. Miechke, Vienna, about 1890]; Carl Franze, Teschen (until 1916; his estate sale, Lepke’s, Berlin, November 7, 1916, no. 63); Prof. Dr. Curt Glaser, Berlin (by 1928–33; sale, Internationales Kunsthaus, Berlin, May 9, 1935, no. 241, to GURLITZ); [Wolfgang GURLITZ, Munich, 1933–at least 1962]; [Adolphe Stein, Paris, until 1965; sold for $8,000 to Kleinberger]; [Kleinberger, New York, 1966–66; sold to Reid]; Bagley Reid, New York (1966–73; sold to MMA); Purchase, Gift of Mary V. T. Eberstadt, by exchange, 1972 1972.171
Ferdinand Bol
Dordrecht 1616–1680 Amsterdam

Bol was a highly successful artist in Amsterdam, but like several slightly later pupils and followers of Rembrandt he came from the South Holland city of Dordrecht. He was baptized there on June 24, 1616, in a Reformed Church. His father, Balthasar Bol (d. 1641), earned a comfortable living as a master surgeon, and Ferdinand's brother Jan entered the same profession. The artist's teacher is not named in documents. However, Jacob Gerritz Cuyp (1594–1651/52), the father of Aelbert Cuyp (q.v.) and the most prominent painter in Dordrecht at the time, is a likely candidate.1

Bol probably went to study with Rembrandt in Amsterdam in about 1636, and he appears to have remained with that master until about 1641. The earliest signed and dated works by Bol are from 1642 (see the Portrait of a Woman, below), when he was already twenty-six. It has been plausibly suggested that Bol's role in Rembrandt's workshop evolved from that of a student to that of an assistant during the late 1630s, but there is no evidence indicating that he collaborated with Rembrandt or with another pupil or assistant on any particular work.3

Like Rembrandt, Bol specialized in portraits and history pictures. His style in works of the 1640s is often strongly reminiscent of Rembrandt, as is especially evident in several self-portraits, in biblical paintings such as The Holy Women at the Sepulchre, of 1644 (Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen), and The Sacrifice of Isaac, of 1646 (Mansì Collection, Lucu),4 and in drawings and etchings of the same decade. In commissioned portraits, particularly those of women (see Pl. 10), Bol moved more quickly away from his teacher, as did Govert Flinck (q.v.) and other former Rembrandt pupils during the mid- to late 1640s.

In 1633, Bol married Elisabeth (or Lysbeth) Delf (1628–1660), the daughter of Elbert Delf and Cornelis Dircksdri Spiegel. The latter's older brother, Elbert Spiegel, was receiver general of the Amsterdam Admiralty, in which Elbert Delf served as venue master. In addition, Cornelis's eldest brother, Hendrick Spiegel, was an Amsterdam city councillor and burgomaster.6 These connections brought Bol a number of important commissions, although he had already established a reputation in 1649 with his large canvas Four Regents of the Amsterdam Lepers' House (Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam).7 Nine years after Bol's first wife died, Bol married the wealthy widow Anna van Erckel (1624–1680); the couple settled into a grand house on the Herengracht in Amsterdam, and the painter evidently retired (no work is known to date from the last decade of his life). In 1673, the Bol's moved to a house on the Keizersgracht (the present no. 67).8 The erstwhile artist survived his wife by three months; he was buried on July 24, 1680, in the Zuiderkerk.

Among Bol's most prestigious, if not attractive, pictures are the five-meter-high (more than 16 ft.) overmantel Pyrrhus and Fabricius, which he painted in 1656 for the burgomasters' chamber of the new Town Hall of Amsterdam (now the Royal Palace, where the work remains in situ), and three canvases of the early 1660s depicting classical subjects suitable to the council chamber of the Admiralty.10 Bol's portraits of public figures include several of the naval hero Adm. Michiel de Ruyter.11 However, the most memorable works, after the last Rembrandt-esque pictures (like the probable double portrait of 1649, The String of Pearls; Philips Electronics, Eindhoven), are classicist mythologies such as the Venus and Adonis, of about 1660 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). In these paintings one might discover qualities reminiscent of Rembrandt and the Cuyps, but the impression of tender thoughtfulness is personal to Bol and found throughout his most distinctive works.

Over the past three centuries, Bol was often credited with paintings that could not be attributed to Rembrandt himself. Of the nearly five hundred pictures that were once ascribed to him, about 190 are accepted today.14 According to Houbraken, Cornelis Bisschop (q.v.) and Gottfried Kneller (1646–1723) were pupils of Bol.15

1. For these details, see Blankert 1982, p. 16, where J. G. Cuyp's apparent influence on the young Bol is discussed.
2. Ibid., pp. 18–19.
3. On this point, see Liedtke 1999b, pp. 23–24.
5. Drawings by Bol are expansively catalogued in Szmowski 1979–95, vol. 1, pp. 197–599. Bol made about sixteen etchings; four of
10. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 34⅝ x 28 in. (87.3 x 71.1 cm)
Signed and dated (left center): f: Bol fecit/1642

The painting is well preserved, although the surface texture has been slightly flattened. There are several small flake losses distributed throughout the background and a few small losses in the sitter’s hair, forehead, and hands.

Theodore M. Davis Collection, Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, 1913 30.95.269

The earliest known paintings by Bol to actually bear dates are three portraits of women dated 1642: the present work; a similar portrait of a woman, perhaps in her twenties, in the Baltimore Museum of Art; and a portrait of a middle-aged woman in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin. The date on the New York painting was read as 1643 in the past, but microscopic examination of the worn signature and date reveals an inscription almost identical to that on the Berlin canvas, ending in a tall script “16” and a tighter, angular “42.” The only known works by Bol bearing the date 1643 appear to be David’s Dying Charge to Solomon, a painting in the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin (mistakenly assigned by several scholars to Gerrit Willemsz Horst), and an etching, Holy Family in an Interior. A date of 1644 appears on a few large biblical pictures; on the introspective Portrait of a Young Man in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt; and on the Portrait of a Lady, also in Dublin.

It is likely that a number of male portraits by Bol dating from the early 1640s are now lost or unidentified, and a companion to the Museum’s painting may probably be counted among them. The emphasis given here to the sitter’s beautiful dress, with its cascading layers of lace, and to her treasure trove of pearls and other jewelry would be typical of a Dutch portrait made to commemorate a betrothal or marriage. The ring on the left hand may be a betrothal ring, which was often worn on the little finger. To be sure, apparently independent female portraits, like Rembrandt’s lavish Portrait of a Young Woman, probably Maria Trip, of 1639 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), feature similarly detailed displays of costume and jewelry. But pair portraits were far more common in the seventeenth century (before many of them became separated) than were independent portraits of women. And in Bol’s picture the presentation of the sitter suggests the existence of a companion piece. The woman is modestly and perhaps deferentially posed, turned a bit to the left (her right, where a pendant male portrait conventionally would have been placed), and holds her closed fan in a position that invites the viewer’s eye to move in the same direction.

Rembrandt’s example was obviously important for Bol’s early efforts as a portraitist. In addition to the portrait of Maria Trip mentioned above, the present painting may be compared with Rembrandt’s Portrait of Agatha Bas, of 1641 (Royal Collection, London). But Bol’s earliest dated portraits reveal a mastery of technique and composition and a gift for characterization that are quite his own.

1. Blankert 1982, nos. 117, 121, 122, pls. 126, 130, 131, where the date of the Museum’s picture is given as 1643, following earlier
publications (see Refs.). The date on the tronie of a young woman in Potsdam has been read as 1643 in the past, but Blankert (ibid., p. 139 [under no. 156]) reads the inscription as "f.Bol.f/1642." See also Hollstein 1949— , vol. 3, Bol nos. 6, 9, and 14, for etchings of male figures dated 1642.

2. See the facsimile of the Berlin portrait's inscription in Statliche Museen zu Berlin 1931, p. 10 (under no. 809).

3. Blankert 1982, pp. 163–64, no. 136. That the Dublin painting is "a very fine early masterpiece by Bol" (Potterton 1986, p. 16 [under no. 47]; see fig. 235 for a photograph of the signature and date) was established in Richardson 1978 and in Bruyn 1983, pp. 211–13, figs. 1, 2.


5. Blankert 1982, nos. 7, 16, 17, pls. 4–6 (biblical pictures), no. 98, pl. 107 (man), no. 118, pl. 127 ("lady"). For the Frankfurt painting, also Sander and Brinkmann 1991, p. 20, pl. 3. For the Dublin portrait, see also Potterton 1986, pp. 13–15, no. 810, fig. 17, and fig. 236 for a photograph of the inscription, which closely resembles that on the New York canvas (except for the last digit).

6. See Kunz 1917, p. 224, on this usage, and Dulton 1912, p. xlviii, for various forms of betrothal and wedding rings.


8. See D. Smith 1982a, p. 2, and chap. 3 ("Typology and Convention in Pair Portraiture").

9. Ibid., p. 41, mentions the similar crossing of hands at the waist, "a common gesture of feminine passivity" in Bol's Portrait of Masia Ruy, dated 1650 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; Blankert 1982, no. 146, pl. 17). The figure in the pendant Portrait of Roderic Meinwaeer (also in the Rijksmuseum) is posed with Van Dyckian swagger.

10. See De Jongh in Haarlem 1986a, pp. 36–40. Exceptions were made in the case of betrothal portraits (ibid., pp. 66, 195 [under nos. 1 and 40, respectively]). The rigidity of the convention is questioned in Raupp 1986, p. 256, and in Hinz 1987, pp. 649–50.

11. Compare the similar position of the hands and fan in Frans Hals's pendant portraits in the Taft Museum, Cincinnati (see the present writer's entry in E. Sullivan et al. 1995, pp. 142–44, where D. Smith 1982a, pp. 111–12, figs. 44, 43, should be added to the literature).


REFERENCES: Boston Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin 1 (1903), p. 31, notes the work as among the pictures lent to the museum by Theodore Davis; Valentinier in New York 1909, no. 3, as dated 1644, "the last figure nearly illegible"; Breeck 1910, p. 56, considers the "golden tone" to reflect the "first style of Rembrandt"; B. Burroughs 1918, pp. 15, 16, as "unusually delicate"; A. Burroughs 1918, pp. 457–60, figs. 4, 8 (radiograph of face), suggests that "the portrait was begun and perhaps finished with more delicacy than it now seems to possess," and observes that "the hair originally covered part of the forehead at the sides, [and] that the outline of the cheek was more sensitive"; Isarlov 1936, p. 34 (under "Addendum I: Liste des tableaux signés et datés de Ferdinand Bol"); records the work as dated 1643; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 13, as signed and dated "f. Bol fecit/1642"; Blankert 1982, pp. 36, 138, no. 122, pl. 131, gives the date as 1643 but records the inscription as "f. Bol f/16 . . ."); and describes the work as "executed with the same thoroughness as the Portrait of an Old Lady, of 1642, in Berlin; Baetjer 1995, p. 333, as signed and dated "f. Bol fecit/1642"; Liedtke in E. Sullivan et al. 1995, p. 160, cites the picture in order to dismiss the Taft Museum's Young Man in a Feathered Beret as an early work by Bol; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 23, 141, no. 43, as one of Bol's earliest known independent works, dated 1642 not 1643, perhaps depicting a newlywed.


Oil on canvas, 31¼ x 26 in. (80.3 x 66 cm)  
Signed and dated (lower right): FBol/1657 [FB in monogram]  
The painting is in good condition. There is a large area of restoration in the sky at top left, and the girl's cheeks have been enhanced with fine strokes of rosy red paint.  
Purchase, George T. Delacorte Jr. Gift, 1957 57.68

The young girl in this portrait was identified recently by Ekkart (see Refs.) as the nine-year-old Petronella Elias (born in Amsterdam on August 17, 1648, and died there January 5, 1667). She was the daughter of the merchant Joost Pietersz Elias (1622–1694) and his first wife, Rebecca Spiegel (1625–1651), who was a first cousin of Bol's wife, Elisabeth Dell. On May 8, 1666, Petronella married her mother's cousin (and Bol's brother-in-law) Gerard Elbertsz Dell (1644–1688). ¹ She died eight months later, at the age of eighteen.

As described in detail by Ekkart, the present painting is cited on a list of twenty-one seventeenth-century "Family portraits in the possession of Wigbold Slicher, President of the Court of Holland, Anno 1783." ² The compiler of the list, and of a second list (also dated 1783) of twenty-four family portraits owned by another descendant,³ was probably Slicher's son Raimond (1752–1807), an amateur artist. He made small pastel copies after several of the family portraits, including an oval composition repeating the head and shoulders of the figure in the Museum's picture.⁴ Each of the surviving copies is extensively annotated on the back with information that proves to be reliable.

Although the sitter's father long outlived his daughter and her mother, the portrait descended in the latter's family. Ekkart suggests that the girl's maternal grandfather or her aunt—that is, Rebecca Spiegel's father, Elbert Spiegel (1600–1674), or the eldest of her four sisters, Elisabeth Spiegel (1628–1707)—ordered the portrait from Bol. Elbert Spiegel, the artist's uncle by marriage (see the biography above), started a tradition of commissioning family portraits. In 1638 and 1639, the Amsterdam portraitist Dirck Santvoort (ca. 1610–1680) painted a set of five panels representing the daughters of Elbert Spiegel and his wife Petronella Roeters (1599–1647)—our Petronella's grandmother—with attributes of the Five Senses. In her portrait (fig. 8), the twelve-year-old Rebecca Spiegel, Petronella's mother, holds fruit in her left hand and in her gathered skirt, thus assuming the role of Taste. Petronella's aunt Elisabeth (with a flute), Margriet (with a dog and mirror), Geertruyt (with a pecking bird), and yet another Petronella (with a wreath of flowers) represent Hearing, Sight, Touch, and Smell, respectively.⁵

In its composition the portrait by Bol recalls three of the portraits by Santvoort, but it comes closest to the portrait of the sitter's mother in design, costume, and, of course, the attribute of fruit. Ekkart concludes, "the fruit depicted there as a symbol of Taste has here [in the Museum's painting] lost that meaning and was evidently included only to supply a parallel with the earlier girl's portrait."⁶

This remark would seem to overstate the case, considering that the motif of children holding fruit or flowers is common in Dutch portraiture, quite apart from those rare cases in which the Five Senses are symbolized. Ekkart himself, in discussing Jacob Willemsz Delff's 1581 portrait of a two-year-old boy holding a basket of pears and cherries (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), has observed that "bowls and baskets of fruit often feature in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century art as allusions to fertility, which helps explain their regular appearance in paintings of children."⁷ Other examples range from Jan Gossaert's The Children of Christopher II of Denmark, dating from about 1526, to Jan de Bray's Boy with a Basket of Fruits, dated 1638,⁸ and include Aelbert Cuyp's Girl with Peaches (Mauritshuis, The Hague); Portrait of a Young Woman Holding a Basket of Fruit, attributed to Jacob Fransz van der Merck (ca. 1610–1664);⁹ Salomon de Bray's Child with Cherries, of ca. 1655;¹⁰ and, most likely, Santvoort's portrait of Rebecca Spiegel, where the reference to the sense of taste need not exclude other meanings.¹¹ In these examples, the motif of fruit suggests that the child is the product of a fruitful marriage, and in some instances of a careful upbringing, like fruit that must be cultivated.¹²

Flowers, like the garland in Petronella's hair, usually suggest the innocence of youth.¹³ The almost celebratory manner in which the fruit is presented in Bol's portrait of Petronella Elias is understandable, given that in 1657 she was the only (and, as it happened, last) child of Joost Elias and Rebecca Spiegel, whose son, Pieter, had died in 1653 at the age of two.¹⁴

The silver-gilt basket reappears, filled with flowers, in Bol's large portrait of Jan and Catharina van der Voort, dated 1661 (fig. 9).¹⁵

1. Ekkart 2003, p. 35 (under no. 516).
2. Ibid., p. 32, where the document's title is given in the original Dutch and in English. Ekkart (ibid., pp. 32–36) publishes the list of twenty-one portraits as Appendix I, "The Slicher inventory, 1783."
3. Ibid., pp. 36–41 (Appendix II), "The Testaart inventory, 1783."
4. Ekkart 2003, p. 7 (under no. 515).
7. Ekkart 2003, p. 35 (under no. 516).
8. Ibid., p. 32, where the document's title is given in the original Dutch and in English. Ekkart (ibid., pp. 32–36) publishes the list of twenty-one portraits as Appendix I, "The Slicher inventory, 1783."
9. Ibid., pp. 36–41 (Appendix II), "The Testaart inventory, 1783."

Figure 8. Dirk Santvoort, Portrait of Rebecca Spiegel as the Sense of Taste, ca. 1638–39. Oil on wood, 24 x 19¼ in. (61 x 49 cm). Private collection

This document lists twenty-four seventeenth-century portraits of members of the Slicher family and their relatives. The paintings were in the possession of Cornelis Anthony Testart (1743–1830), town clerk of Haarlem, whose grandmother was a first cousin of Wigmold Slicher's father.

4. Ibid., pp. 16 (on Raimond Slicher and his pastel copies, six of which are known today), 26, fig. 16.
5. Eckart 1990b, figs. 1–5; also in Eckart 2002, figs. 7–11.
6. Eckart 2002, p. 26. Perhaps the wreath of flowers in the girl’s hair (see also the text below) was inspired by the one held by her aunt Petronella, who died at the age of twenty-six in 1636. She was married to Barend Elias (1621–1691), the slightly older brother of Petronella’s father.
9. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. See Haarlem 1986a, p. 187, fig. 37e, as by Van der Merck or Jacob Gerritsz Cuyp.
11. Santvoort may have intended double readings in each of the five portraits of the Spiegel children, since all the attributes they hold, with the exception of the mirror (spiegel, in Dutch), are found in Dutch portraits of children where there is no reference to the Five Senses. The flute could refer to family harmony (see Haarlem 1986a, pp. 40–45), the dog and the finch (both on leashes) to proper training (see Haarlem–Antwerp 2000–2001, pp. 19–21, 148), the fruit to fertility and “cultivation” (see note 12 below), and the flowers to youth and innocence (see note 13 below). A similar case of attributes referring to family virtues and the Five Senses at the same time is evidently found in Hendrick van Vliet’s contemporary (1640) portrait of Michiel van der Dussen, his wife, and their five children (Stedelijk Museum Het Prinsenhof, Delft); see the present writer’s discussion in New York–London 2001, p. 408 (under no. 80).
12. See Haarlem–Antwerp 2000–2001, p. 19, for Jacob Cats’s proverb about the upbringing of children, “Tucht baert vrucht” (Discipline bears fruit), and similar thoughts.
13. See ibid., pp. 24–25, and p. 206 (under no. 53), Jan Baptist Weenix’s Girl as Shepherdess, of ca. 1650, where Ripa’s allegorical figure of Innocence is cited. See also the discussions of Paulus Moreelse’s Portrait of Two Children in Pastoral Clothing (1622) and Bernard Zwaerdenbroeck’s painting of the same title (ca. 1645), in Utrecht–Frankfurt–Luxembourg 1993–94, nos. 40, 39.
15. As noted in Blankert 1982, p. 135 (under no. 173).


Ex Coll.: Probably Wiggbold Slicher (1627–1718), receiver general of the Amsterdam Admiralty, and his wife, Elisabeth Spiegel (1628–1707; the sister's aunt); probably their son Antonis Slicher (1655–1743); probably his son Hieronymus Slicher (1689–1736); his son Wiggbold Slicher (1714–1790), presiding judge at the Court of Holland, The Hague; possibly his second wife, Dina Henriette Backer (d. 1801); probably Wiggbold Slicher's eldest son, Jan Slicher (1745–1813), burgomaster of The Hague; probably his unmarried sister Anna Catharina Slicher (1739–1827; half sister of Raimond Slicher [see text above]); Robert Ludgate, London (by 1834–at least 1835); the Bunbury family, Barton Hall, Bury Saint Edmunds, Suffolk; [Scott & Fowles, New York]; Miss Mary Hanna, Cincinnati; [Knoedler, New York, in 1929]; Mrs. Joseph Heine, formerly Mrs. I. D. Levy, New York (until 1944; sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, November 25, 1944, no. 261, for $7,000); Sydney I. Lamon, New York; [Knoedler, New York, until 1917; sold to MMA]; Purchase, George T. Delacorte Jr. Gift, 1937 37.68.


2. See Ekkart 2002, pp. 23–24, on the dispersal of the portrait gallery owned by Wiggbold Slicher (d. 1790).
Paulus Bor
Amersfoort ca. 1601–1669 Amersfoort

Bor came from a wealthy Catholic family in Amersfoort, which is about ten miles east-northeast of Utrecht. His grandfather Bor Jansz was one of the most prominent citizens in Amersfoort, and his father, also named Paulus Bor, was a successful cloth merchant there. All three generations of the family served as regents in church and charitable organizations.

Nothing is known of Bor's youth or training as a painter, although he was clearly acquainted with contemporary works by the major artists of Utrecht, in particular Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.) and Jan van Bijlert (1597/98–1671). In 1623, Bor was living in the parish of San Andrea delle Fratte in Rome, in a house with three minor Netherlandish artists, and in 1624 he lived in the Piazza di Spagna with two of the same northerners and the Roman painter of low-life subjects Michelangelo Cerquozzi (1602–1660). The young Dutchman was a founding member of the Schildersbent, the fellowship of Netherlandish artists in Rome, along with the Utrecht painters Dirck van Baburen (ca. 1594/95–1624), Cornelis van Poelenburch (1594/95–1667), and (most likely) Van Bijlert, and other Dutch artists such as Leonaert Bramer and Bartholomeus Breenbergh (q.q.v.). Bor was given the "Bent" nickname of Orlando, presumably in reference to Ariosto's Orlando Furioso. He returned to Amersfoort and joined the painters' guild there about 1626.

In 1632, Bor married Aleijda van Crachtwijk, who came from a patrician family in his hometown. The bride and groom together had assets worth 10,000 guilders, which is about what a prosperous middle-class couple would spend in ten or twelve years. With rental and investment incomes, Bor certainly did not have to paint for a living. These circumstances may shed light on the artist's work: a small oeuvre (about two dozen paintings are known) revealing an eclectic style, some amateurish qualities, and the occasional highbrow subject. However, other artists in Bor's circle touched upon learned themes, and wealth did not always prove a deterrent to talent and industry (see, for example, the biography of Joachim Wtewael below).

One of Bor's earliest known works is a broad, sober, thirteen-figure group portrait dated 1628, The Van Vanvelt Family Saying Grace (Saint Pieters-en-Blokland Gasthuis, Amersfoort).

In the early 1630s the artist formulated his mature manner, which derives mainly from the "Haarlem Classicists" Salomon de Bray (1597–1664), Jacob van Campen (1592–1657), and Pieter de Grebber (ca. 1600–1632/33). Van Campen was a decisive figure for Bor's career. In 1626, the Haarlem artist and classicist architect inherited his mother's family estate, Randenbroek, near Amersfoort. Bor's connection with the new "Lord of Randenbroek" (for whom he acted as a witness in 1628) served as his entree into the most prestigious cultural milieu in the country, that of Constantijn Huygens, secretary and artistic adviser to the Stadholder, Prince Frederick Hendrick.3

Some of Bor's paintings are close enough in style to Van Campen's to have been attributed to that artist in the past.4 In 1637, Bor and De Grebber worked for Van Campen on the Surrounding Gallery in the Great Hall of Honselaarsdijk, the prince's country house outside The Hague. The decorations featured musicians, servants, and revelers on an illusionistic balcony extending around the coved vaulting of the room.5 A canvas by Bor, evidently The Finding of Moses, of about 1635–37, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, hung in Huygens's new house in The Hague. The landscapes in this picture and in The Flower Sellers, of about 1640 (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm), are generally considered to be by the Haarlem specialist Cornelis Vroom (1593/95–1666).6 Six paintings by Bor were listed in the inventory of Van Campen's estate, and the latter's debt of 1,000 guilders was noted in Bor's legacy twelve years later.7

Bor presented a few of his paintings to charitable institutions. In 1631, he gave a "bust-length picture of a devout woman" to the Saint Jobs Gasthuis (Hospital) in Utrecht.8 His Descent from the Cross, of the 1630s (Centraal Museum, Utrecht), is possibly identical with the painting of that subject cited (without giving the artist's name) in the 1641 inventory of the Saint Elisabeths Gasthuis in Amersfoort, of which Bor's mother-in-law, Everarda van Dorsten, was the "mother general."9 In 1666, Bor became a regent of the local Catholic almshouse De Armen de Poth (The Poor of the Pot) and painted two canvases for the Regents' Chamber (they remain in the Stichting De Poth, Amersfoort). The larger of the two, a chimneypiece, depicts the Holy Ghost framed by a flight of chubby cherubs bearing bread and a garland of vegetables.

P A U L U S B O R  53
Bor died on August 10, 1669. He left a large estate to his wife, which at her death in 1687 was divided between their two daughters, the unwed Judith Christina and the well-married Anna Maria.10

1. Leonard Slatkes, in his useful biography of Bor in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 4, p. 377, states that Bor joined the guild in 1630, which is actually the date that the guild was recognized as such by the city magistrates; see Bok in Utrecht–Braunschweig 1986–87, p. 224. The latter biography, which cites documentation and earlier literature, is acknowledged as the main source of information in the unpublished doctoraatscriptie (master’s thesis) by Ad Bercht (1991), pp. 7–13, from which some details are adopted here.

2. See Haarlem 1986a, no. 74.

3. See Huiskens, Othone-Cheym, and Schwartz 1995, p. 38 (Bor serves as a witness on Van Campen’s behalf, in 1628), and pp. 38–43, 45, on Randenbroek as a country retreat, hunting lodge, and center of culture, where Constantijn Huygens and Count Johan Mauritius visited in 1636. In 1635, Van Campen’s neighbor Everard Meyster named Bor among a number of hunting enthusiasts in his poem “Goden-landspel om Amersfoort” (ibid., p. 49, on Meyster; Bercht 1991, p. 8, where it is asked whether Meyster meant “our painter”).

4. See Bok in Utrecht–Braunschweig 1986–87, pp. 59–60, where it is implausibly suggested that Bor was Van Campen’s pupil, and Rotterdam–Frankfurt 1999–2000, pp. 23–24, 144.


8. Ibid., pp. 224–25 n. 13, citing the source of 1778. The gift is discussed at greater length in Bercht 1991, pp. 10, 16, 25–26, 93, no. 21. The painting was presumably similar to The Magdalen by Bor in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool.

9. Noted in Bercht 1991, p. 20, where it is also observed that no such painting is found in an inventory of the hospital dating from 1628. Bercht cites Van Beurden 1924, pp. 81–83.


12. The Disillusioned Medea (“The Enchantress”)

Oil on canvas, 61½ x 44½ in. (155.6 x 112.4 cm)
The painting is well preserved.
Gift of Ben Heller, 1972 1972.261

This poetic painting, one of Bor’s finest works, dates from about 1640. Its subject and its relationship to a similar picture in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (fig. 10), have been debated, but it is concluded here that the two canvases were indeed painted as a pair and depict the (in Bor’s treatment) complementary stories of the disillusioned Medea and Cydippe with Acontius’s apple, as told in Ovid’s Heroides (letters 12 and 20–21, respectively).

In the New York canvas, a woman holding a wooden wand sits below a statue of Diana, goddess of the hunt, identified by the crescent moon above her brow (only barely discernible in the reproduction), a bow and quiver of arrows, and a hunting dog at her side (his head is visible just above the melancholy heroine’s head). The graven image is draped with garlands of flowers, and is honored also by incense burning in the large urn at the center of the picture and in the elaborately carved torchère. The arrangement of temple props leading back to the right requires some explanation, since—as often in Bor’s work—motifs are assembled with an eye to surface design rather than clarity of spatial disposition. The smoking urn, supported by a curved buttress crowned with a carved goat’s skull, is meant to be right behind the seated figure. This form is festooned with flowers, which carry the eye from the woman’s silhouette (enhanced by an elongated arm) and the flowing folds of her drapery to the ascending torchère, where climbing putti balance the form of the skull. The broad base of the torchère is ornately sculpted with two heads, apparently male and female. Behind the torchère is a second, larger urn, bowl-shaped and embellished by a winged sphinx in relief. The lower left corner of the composition is filled by a tasseled red velvet pillow and a plinth on which the faint trace of two heads in profile (over-
lapping, as on antique cameos) are visible under strong light. The woman in the foreground is set off from the olive tones of the somber background by bright light (looking very much like daylight rather than the torchlight one might expect), and by her white blouse and the shiny fabrics of her blue skirt and gold brocaded mantle (used by the artist in other pictures; see Refs.). There are hints of Dutch reality in the woman’s reddish face and hands, as compared with her white torso, and in her plain prettiness, of a type Odysseus would surely never have encountered in his Mediterranean wanderings.

That the lady is Medea was first suggested by Mazur-Contamine in 1981 (see Refs.). The modern image of Medea is perhaps typified by Delacroix’s large canvas Medea About to Murder Her Children, of 1838 (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille).1 Although the Romantic painter is thought to have been inspired by Corneille’s play Médée, of 1635, his picture hardly prepares one for the different treatments that date from the seventeenth century.2

It would be helpful to review the myth before considering Bor’s interpretation. Jason, a youth of Iolkos, is ordered by the king to fetch the Golden Fleece, which is in the possession of King Aeëtes of Colchis and guarded by a dragon that never sleeps. Accordingly, Jason gathers together the finest men of Greece and sets sail on his ship, the Argo. After many adventures Jason and his band of Argonauts arrive in Colchis, where Jason approaches the king. Aeëtes promises to give up the Golden Fleece if Jason will yoke together two bronze-footed bulls, plow the grove of Ares, sow the earth with the teeth of the watchful dragon, and slay the warriors who will have sprung up from the ground. The king has a daughter, Medea, who is a sorceress. Medea falls in love with Jason and offers to assist him if he will marry her and take her with him to Greece. This Jason agrees to do, and with Medea’s protection he accomplishes his tasks. But the king reneges on his promise. So Jason absconds with the Golden Fleece, and with Medea embarks on the Argo, pursued by the king and his henchmen. After many horrific encounters the couple arrives at Corinth, where they live happily with their two sons for ten years. But Jason weary of Medea and, with an eye to the future, divorces her and takes another wife, Creusa (or Glaucis), daughter of the king of Corinth. Medea, enraged, sends a poisoned gown and diadem to her rival. When Creusa puts on the garment, she is consumed by fire. Medea, in a passion of revenge against Jason, goes on to murder their sons.

The story of Medea is described variously by Hesiod, Pindar, Apollonius, Euripides, and other ancient authors. In the seventeenth century, Netherlandish artists who depicted Jason, his companions, or Medea usually drew upon Ovid’s Metamorphoses (7:1–425). However, less familiar sources were also consulted, and modern versions composed. Thus Rembrandt’s large etching of 1648, Medea, or the Marriage of Jason and Creusa (fig. 11), was made as a frontispiece to a version of Medea written and published that year by his patron Jan Six. It is interesting for Bor’s painting that Rembrandt’s print does not correspond with any line or scene in Six’s play. Jason and Creusa never make it to the altar, to say nothing of a royal wedding in an Amsterdam church. Nor is the explanatory verse below Rembrandt’s image drawn from any couplet in the play.3 The lines (composed by Six?) were added by a professional engraver in the fourth state of the plate. Earlier impressions, on Japanese paper, were intended as independent works of art for a small circle of connoisseurs. It was apparently concluded that some explanation of the image would be needed by viewers who acquired the etching together with the play. The inscription reads:

Crea’s en Jason hier elkandren Trouw beloven:
Medea Jasons vrouw, onwaerdghijl verschoven,
Werdt opgehefist van spijt, de wrecksucht voet haer aen.
Helaes! Ontrouwighyedt, wat komt ghij dier te staen!

(Creus and Jason here pledge their troth to each other.
Medea, Jason’s wife, unjustly shoved aside,
Was inflamed by spite, [and] vengeance drove her on.
Alas! Infidelity, how dear your cost!)4

Without this verse or the context of the printed play, it is doubtful that many viewers of the 1640s would have recognized Medea in Rembrandt’s print, or the marriage of Jason and Creusa (which does not occur in classical versions of the story). The subject might be taken for a biblical scene, unless one realizes that the figure in the foreground holds a dagger and a container of poison in her hands, and that above her is a statue of Juno, whom Rembrandt introduces (it has been suggested) as a patron saint of deceived wives.5 Of course, Rembrandt and Six could have identified the subject for collectors who received the print directly from them. In the case of Bor’s paintings of Medea and Clydippe, the explanation almost certainly went in the other direction, from patron to artist. These large pictures are probably the finest works Bor ever painted, which, together with the comparatively obscure subject matter, implies that they were commissioned by someone who made quite specific demands.

The story of Clydippe requires a temple of Diana, and yet the statue in the Rijksmuseum canvas (which has not been
Figure 10. Paulus Bor, Cypripedium with Aconteus’s Apple, ca. 1640. Oil on canvas, 59 1/8 x 44 7/8 in. (151 x 114 cm). Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
significantly trimmed) has no identifying attributes. The analogous scene in the story of Jason and Medea can be staged with or without reference to Diana, but Ovid’s *Heroides* and, to a lesser extent, other classical sources provide ample reason for including her. Thus the two pictures clarify each other: Medea broods by the altar of Diana, where Jason had vowed fidelity, and Cydippe kneels at the same location, staring at the object that will bind her to her own object of desire.

For those not familiar with the story, Bor’s patron could have seized the opportunity to enlighten them: Acontius had fallen in love with Cydippe, whose family was of higher social standing than his. One day, when she was worshiping at the temple of Diana at Delos, he tossed an apple (or an orange) in front of her. She picked it up and, noticing that the fruit was inscribed, read the words aloud: “I swear before Diana that I will wed Acontius.” Cydippe’s parents presented her with more suitable prospects, but whenever a marriage was arranged, Cydippe would become ill. Eventually, an oracle revealed the reason, and Cydippe was permitted to marry her intended. The story had been adapted by Ovid (43 B.C.–A.D. 17) from the *Aetia* (Causes), by the Hellenistic poet Callimachus (ca. 305–ca. 240 B.C.), but in the seventeenth century only Ovid’s *Heroides* provided more than a passing reference to Cydippe and Acontius. Bor would have used the Dutch translation by Cornelis van Ghistele, which was published in Antwerp in 1559.5

As noted above, the story of Medea was more widely available.
Diana's name, however, is rarely invoked. The goddess is mentioned only once by Euripides, when Medea exclaims, “O mighty Themis [guardian of oaths] and my lady Artemis [Diana], do you see what I suffer, I who have bound my accursed husband with mighty oaths?” (Medea, lines 160–63).7 Diana has even less to do with Medea in Ovid's Metamorphoses, where Medea is portrayed as a witch and murderess too preoccupied to pause for reflection. Bor's Medea comes from a very different text by Ovid. As one classics scholar has observed, “The few hints of Medea's dreadful powers in Heroides 12 do little to detract from her self-representation as an unjustly injured wife and lover, the victim of an ungrateful Jason.”8

In Medea's letter to Jason, as imagined in Heroides 12, she remembers where their story began.

There is a wood... in [which] there is—or certainly there was—a shrine to Diana; The golden goddess stands there, made by a barbaric hand. Do you know the place? Or have places disappeared from your mind, along with me? We came there. You began to speak first, with unethical lips.

Jason begs Medea, “by the three-fold face and hidden rites of Diana,” to save him and his men. If she does, “then my soul will vanish into thin air before any woman, but you will be a bride in my chamber. Our accomplice will be Juno, ruler of sacred marriage, and the goddess in whose marble temple we are.”9 Jason's faulty iconography appears not to have influenced Dutch poets and painters (although his remark is interesting for Rembrandt's print). In Six's Medea (line 36), for instance, Jason himself remembers that he promised to marry Medea “before the altar of Diana.”

That Bor based Cypippe with Aemontius's Apple on Ovid's Heroides is beyond doubt, and the same text is by far the most likely source for the New York picture. In her letter to Jason, Medea describes how she beat her breast and tore the wretch from her hair (12.193–37), and in the painting, though she can hardly be described as overwrought, her hair does fall and flowers dangle behind the upraised hand that cradles her head in the conventional pose of melancholy. Elsewhere in the Heroides (15.115–22) a different heroine relates, “After my grief had found itself, I felt no shame to beat my breast, and rend my hair,” and explains, “Modesty and love are not at one. There was no one did not see me; yet I rent my robe and laid bare my breast.”10

Obviously the artist conveys these ideas in the most understated manner, which is rather what one expects of Bor (there is almost no action in his entire oeuvre), and what best suits the comparison with his figure of Cypippe. Both women are lost in contemplation, Cypippe of her uncertain but probably happy future, Medea of a past and a future that are all too clear (the two infants, carved on the torchère, hint of her grotesque resolve). The one woman is innocent, a maiden, the other experienced with men. Observations such as these could go on late into an evening; the paired stories offer more than the sum of their parts. There is the irony, for example, that both Cypippe and Creusa become too ill to marry, but with very different consequences. Cypippe finds love with a man of lesser station; Medea, a princess, is betrayed by one.

If Bor's Medea is unusual, there are obvious reasons why. First, the comparison with Cypippe, which was almost certainly assigned to Bor, perhaps by a patron who wished to treat with classical erudition the familiar Dutch theme of the contented marriage.11 It has also been observed that the Heroides was a difficult source for artists, since the main elements of each story have to be pieced together from often indirect references.12 But as painters treat subjects freely (so Six explains in his preface to Medea), according to their temperaments, so may poets too take liberties.13

The Amsterdam and New York paintings serve as pendants in formal as well as iconographic terms. The Distilled Medea was almost certainly meant to be seen on the viewer's left, with Cypippe on the right, so that the statues of Diana close the space to either side. Medea slumps to the left, Cypippe leans to the right, and the various forms on the floor recede from the outside corners of the compositions. It would be expected in a Dutch interior of the time that the two works would have been installed at either side of an architectural element such as a fireplace. The open spaces and rhythms that flow between the two compositions would have suited such an arrangement; the smoking urns may have flanked an actual hearth. Significantly, both scenes are illuminated from the right, the Amsterdam picture more brightly, an unusual approach that implies a real source of light to the right of the two canvases. Several motifs—the garlands, the goats' skulls, the red pillows—link the pictures together; they are also consistent in color scheme. It has been noted that the figures differ in scale,14 but the difference is not great (one might imagine Medea on her knees, like Cypippe), and the observation expects of Bor a consistent handling of proportions not found elsewhere in his oeuvre.15 In any case, whatever shortcomings the pictures may have, they are slight considerations compared with their conceptual novelty and the quality of their execution.

A smaller version, dated 1663, is in the Louvre.
2. In addition to illustrated editions of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and Rembrandt’s etching of 1648 (fig. 11 here), see Ruben’s early drawing *The Flight of Medea* (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam; Meijs 2001, no. 3), which is based on an ancient sarcophagus, and Castiglione’s *Sorceress* (*Medea*), of the 1650s (Wadsworth Athenaeum, Hartford; see Percy 1970).

3. Except for the occasional “Hecale!” The entire play, *Medea. Tirrnegel* (Amsterdam, 1648), which runs to 1,418 lines, was obtained from www.leidenuniv.nl/dutch/ceerlon/SixMedea1648.html. Six confines himself to the events that take place in Corinth.

4. For the history of this print, and for a slightly different translation of the inscription, see Rassieur in Boston–Chicago 2003–4, pp. 209–10 (under no. 138).

5. Ibid., pp. 210, 211 n. 3, credits this observation to Clifford Ackley. However, Juno is described differently in Ovid’s *Heroides* 12 (see text below).

6. See Mazur-Contamine 1981, pp. 6, 7–8 nn. 2–4. The author notes that the famous Dutch poet Joost van den Vondel (1623–1680) was acquainted with the letters of Acanthus and Cydippe in the *Heroides*, but he translated only small fragments of them (*Briefen der Heilige Maagden*, 1642). After Van Ghistele’s translation of 1599 (Ovidius Naso, *De Griecocr Princiiren en de Jonkvrouwen slaetige Sandbrissen* ... [Antwerp, 1599]), the next treatment in Dutch was by Jonas Cabelja (1623–1680), a lawyer at the Court of Holland in *The Hague* (*Trouwbrissen de blauwe Vorsten en Minnebrissen de Vorsten en Vorsten, van P. Ovidius en Annes Sabinus, op gelijk getalen Neder. waren overgezet* [Rotterdam, 1657]).


9. The quotes are from a translation by James M. Hunter, who has placed “An Ongoing Translation of Ovid’s *Heroides*” on the Internet. The same lines, from the Dutch translation of 1599, are quoted in Bercht 1991, p. 35.

10. See Ovid 1914, p. 155, in letter 12 (Medea to Jason), and p. 189, in letter 15 (Sappho to Phaon). These sources are noted in Mazur-Contamine 1981, p. 7.

11. Frantis 1992a, chap. 2 (on the bride and wife in Dutch culture), offers a good introduction to the subject. Ovid’s *Amores*, in loose translations, sometimes served as a literary guide to courtship (ibid., p. 37).


13. From the “Voorreden” of *Sia’s Medea* (see note 3 above): “gelijck de schilders plegen, wanneer sy een saeck, elk nae eygen sinlijckheydt, op bysondere wijse yttebeelden.”


15. Compare, for example, the relative scale of the figures in Bor’s pendant pictures *Bacchus and Ariadne*, in the Muzeum Narodowe, Poznani.

**References:** Morgan 1824, vol. 2, p. 373, cites the painting as *A Sorceress* by Salvador Rosa, in the “Ghigi Palace,” Rome; Longhi 1943, p. 29, pl. 66, as a masterpiece by Bor, dating from 1630–40 and recalling Gentilechi; V. Bloch 1949, pp. 106–8, figs. 3, 4, describes the figure as “so vry Dutch, so exquisitely phlegmatic ... the offspring of a distinctly flavoured and agreeable provincialism,” and calls the canvas now in the Rijksmuseum “the pendant” (without further explanation); Van Regteren Altena 1949, pp. 108–9, wonders whether the work is really by Bor and not Jacob de Ghey van III; V. Bloch 1952, p. 19, describes the work as “la singolare ‘Sibilla’ domestica,” and dates it from about 1641; Hoogewerff 1953, p. 131, pl. 13, as “an exceptional masterpiece” by Bor; Longhi 1953, p. 57, regrets that he could not study the picture in good light “at Amersfoort” (meaning Utrecht) in order to consider its dating more closely; Nicolson 1901, p. 252, as *The Enchantress*, dating from just before 1640, and as having “a companion piece in a private collection in Basle” (the Rijksmuseum painting, fig. 10 here); Utrecht–Antwerp 1922, no. 17, p. 12, dates the picture to the 1620s; D. Sutton in London 1935, pp. 11–12, no. 9 (ill.), on the basis of her attributes, concludes that “this rather lost and dumpy girl might thus be a Circe,” and speculates whether the work dates from the artist’s Roman years; D. Sutton 1955, p. 25, describes the nature of Caravaggio’s influence; Waterhouse 1955, p. 222, calls the work “Bor’s fantastic *Après-midi d’une sorcière*”; Bandmann 1960, p. 76, fig. 29, mentions the painting among pictures of enchantresses holding wands; J. Rosenberg, *Silve, and Ter Kuile* (1966) 1973, p. 298, fig. 237, as dating from “c. 1640(1),” describes it as typical of Bor’s style, which is supposed to have been influenced by Caravaggio, Orazio Gentileschi, and Rembrandt; *Museum Narodowe w Poznaniu* 1972, p. 10 (under no. 6), notes that this work and the *Ariadne* in Poznań are similar in composition and format; Walsh 1974a, pp. 346, 348, 349 nn. 14–17, fig. 11 and cover, believes that Bor may have intended the figure “as a nameless member of the species enchantress, traditionally melancholic,” and concludes that this canvas and the one in the Rijksmuseum are probably not pendants, but may have been from a series of similar works; Anthony M. Clark in *MMA 1975*, p. 93 (ill.), describes the work as “Italianate, earthy, enigmatic, and amusing,” and as possibly “an allegory of sloth, melancholy, and magic”; Von Moltke 1977, pp. 150–52, 157, 159, no. 9, fig. 102, considers the painting a pendant of the “so-called *Pomona* in Amsterdam,” describes the two pictures in detail but finds their meaning unclear, and notes that the same brocaded material is seen in Bor’s *Magdalen* (*Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool*) and *Jesus in the Temple* (*Centraal Museum, Utrecht*); Nicolson 1979, p. 24, lists the painting under works by Bor as *Sorceress* (*Circe*); Mazur-Contamine 1981, pp. 5–9, 8 nn. 7, 10, fig. 2, dates the work to about 1640, identifies its subject as “the disillusioned Medea,” and considers the painting to have been intended as a pendant to the canvas of about the same size in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, which is said to depict another subject drawn from Ovid’s *Heroides*, Cydippe with Acanthus’s Apple; P. Sutton 1986, p. 180, observes that the figure here, with her “oddly disaffected expression,” is sometimes identified as Circe, but is yet to be satisfactorily explained; Moiso-Diekmann 1987, pp. 107–8 (under no. 81), summarizes opinions whether this painting and the similar picture in the Rijksmuseum were intended as pendants, and agrees with Mazur-Contamine that they probably were; Nicolson 1989, vol. 1, p. 66, and vol. 3, pl. 1619, as *Sorceress* (*Circe*), and as possibly a pendant to the Rijksmuseum’s *Mythological Figure* (*Pomona*); Bercht 1991, pp. 27, 29, 31–33, 35–40, no. 12, fig. 16, repeats Von Moltke’s remark about the brocaded material, considers the female type characteristic of Bor, and discusses the subject, attributes, and possible sources in literature; Van den Brink in Utrecht–Frankfurt–Luxembourg 1993–94, pp. 132, 133–34 n. 7, fig. 16.1, considers the subject to be “the disillusioned Medea,” agrees
with Mazur-Contamine's dating to about 1640, and compares Bor's painting A Scene from "The Spanish Gypsy" (Pietrosec, Don Juan, and the Gypsy Woman Massimo), of 1641 (Centraal Museum, Utrecht); Baetjer 1995, p. 308, as The Enchantress; Buelo in Huisken, Ottenheim, and Schwartz 1995, p. 232 n. 47, as The Dillusions Medea, notes J. G. van Gelder's unpublished attribution of the picture to Jacob van Campen; Slive 1994a, p. 232, fig. 310, repeats the remarks in J. Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1996; Heller in Raleigh-Milwaukee-Dayton 1998-99, pp. 90-92, no. 9 (ill.), dates the picture about 1638-40 and reviews Mazur-Contamine's argument, but concludes with little explanation that the identification of the figure as Medea cannot be supported and therefore neither can "the theory of pendants"; Giltaij in Rotterdam-Frankfurt 1999-2000, pp. 144, 146-47 (under no. 20), figs. 20a, b, considers the subject of "the disillusioned Medea" to be a plausible identification, but doubts that this painting and the Cydippe in the Rijksmuseum were intended as pendants, given their slightly different sizes and seemingly unrelated compositions; Sotheby's, Amsterdam, Old Master Paintings, sale cat., May 14, 2002, p. 70 (under no. 48, The Annunciation by Bor), observes the same candlestick in that painting (now in Ottawa; see Dolphin 2007 below) and in the Museum's picture, where Medea "seems to be a contemplative paraphrase of the Virgin Annunciate"; Cavalli-Birckmann 2005, p. 101, fig. 2, compares the central woman in Bor's The Flower Seller (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm) with the female type in the Museum's picture; Liedtke in Martigny 2006, pp. 76-82, no. 13, publishes an abbreviated version of the present entry; Liedtke in Barcelona 2006-7, pp. 46-49, no. 9, repeats the entry in Martigny 2006; Rosenberg 2006, pp. 102, 103 (ill.), as "Medea Betrayed," of about 1640, perceives in this picture realism and poetry combined; Bikker in Bikker et al. 2007 (under no. 25), a catalogue entry on the Rijksmuseum picture (fig. 10 here), considers it to be a pendant of the New York painting and independently comes to essentially the same conclusions as those described in the text above, except that a date of about 1640 is considered possible; Dolphin 2007, pp. 92, 93 n. 4, fig. 26, as The Enchantress, compares The Annunciation of the Death of the Virgin by Bor (National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa).


Ex Coll. 1: The Prince of Chigi, Castelfusano, Rome (by 1824-1944; as by Salvador Rosa; sold through Ceccconi to Busiri Vici [according to the latter and Federico Zeri]); Andrea Busiri Vici, Rome (1941-at least 1953); Ben Heller, New York (until 1972); Gift of Ben Heller, 1972 1972.261
Gerard ter Borch

Zwolle 1617–1681 Deventer

Ter Borch was trained by his father, Gerard ter Borch the Elder (1582/83–1662), in the small city of Zwolle, in the eastern Dutch province of Overijssel. His mother, Anna Buikens, died in 1621, and his father married Geesken van Voerst (d. 1628) the same year. In 1634, the precocious draftsman, who had already visited Amsterdam and probably Haarlem, went to study with the Haarlem landscape painter Pieter de Molijn (q.v.). He returned to Zwolle in the spring of 1635 and left shortly thereafter for London, where he entered the studio of his uncle by marriage Robert van Voerst (1597–1636). As court engraver to Charles I, Van Voerst (who had trained in Utrecht under the prolific printmaker Crispin de Passe the Elder [1600–1617]) reproduced portraits by Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656), Michiel van Miereveld, and Daniel Mijtens (q.q.v.). Thus, Ter Borch in his late teens became familiar with the work of several of the most successful court portraitists in Europe, and was exposed to life in a great foreign capital. However, he was back in Zwolle by April 1636, escaping the plague to which Van Voerst succumbed.

Between the winter of 1636–37 and about 1639, Ter Borch traveled to Italy and probably to Spain. He must have visited Rome, where his father had flourished (about 1605–11), and where he presumably painted the Procession of Flagellants (Musée Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), which records a Roman custom but also resembles nocturnes by De Molijn.

In the early 1640s Ter Borch appears to have resided mostly in Amsterdam. He painted small portraits that recall works by Thomas de Keyser (q.v.), Hendrick Pot (1580–1657), and Govert Flinck (q.v.), and guarded scenes of the type that Pieter Codde (1599–1678), Willem Duystier (1598/99–1635), and Pieter Quast (q.v.) produced in the 1630s. He was in Münster during the peace negotiations of late 1645 to May 1648, where he joined the entourage of Adriaen Pauw (delegate for the Province of Holland and West Friesland) and painted portraits of Dutch and Spanish dignitaries. A multfigurige portrait, The Swearing of the Oath of Ratification of the Treaty of Münster, May 15, 1648 (National Gallery, London), immortalizes the moment when the Netherlands was finally recognized as an independent country.

From 1648 until 1654, Ter Borch was evidently based in Amsterdam, but he was also in The Hague (1649 and later; see The Van Moerkerken Family, below) and must have visited Zwolle occasionally. His half sister Gesina (1631–1690), an amateur draftsman and watercolorist, served as a model for some of his genre scenes dating from about 1648 onward, and her own work of the time reveals his influence. It was probably in connection with a trip to The Hague that Ter Borch visited Delft, where in April 1653 he witnessed a deposition together with the twenty-year-old Johannes Vermeer (q.v.).

On February 14, 1654, Ter Borch married his father's third wife's younger sister Geertruyt Matthijs in Deventer, where he became a citizen the following year. (Deventer is south of Zwolle in Overijssel, not far from Münster in neighboring Westphalia.) During the next two decades in Deventer the painter was somewhat removed from the main centers of Dutch art, but the superb genre scenes for which he is most remembered (such as Curiosity, Pl. 17) and his portraits of important patrons in Overijssel and Amsterdam demonstrate that he continued to move in cosmopolitan circles. Caspar Netscher (q.v.) was his pupil from about 1655 until about 1658, a period during which Ter Borch painted a number of his finest works.

In 1672, Deventer was occupied by troops of the Archbishop of Cologne and the Bishop of Münster, who were allies of Louis XIV. Ter Borch retreated to Amsterdam (his wife had died the same year or earlier) and returned to Deventer in the summer of 1674. He spent his remaining years there, although he was also active in The Hague and Haarlem for brief periods. He died in December 1681, and was buried in the family grave in Zwolle.

Ter Borch was one of the most accomplished Dutch genre painters of the period. His habit of drawing from life (which began at about the age of eight) and his searching approach to portraiture may have contributed to his treatment of genre figures as distinctive characters. Ter Borch's scenes of contemporary life are at once sophisticated and remarkably naturalistic, with psychological shadings as subtle as his descriptions of satin and silk.

A full-length Self-Portrait of about 1668 is in the Mauritshuis, The Hague.
13. A Young Woman at Her Toilet with a Maid

Oil on wood, 18¾ x 13¾ in. (47.5 x 34.5 cm)

The original high finish of the entire paint surface has suffered from abrasion.

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.190.10

This small panel of about 1650–51 seems, in retrospect, to introduce several of the most admired qualities of Ter Borch's mature style (as found, for example, in Curiosity; Pl. 17). His extraordinary ability to describe surface textures, especially of fabrics, is already evident here in the maid's modest, deep green dress, in the young woman's yellow blouse and pink-coral satin skirt, in the claret-colored velvet on the chair, and in the rusty tones of the tablecloth and bed hangings. The play of light on the crinkled skirt looks entirely different from that on the oversize silver pitcher and basin, or on less reflective surfaces such as the lady's blond tresses and the turned-wood chair supports. These effects are rendered with the artist's typical reserve. The brush, comb, and expensive boxes, like the fancy borders on the satin skirt and the chair's upholstery, are imbued with overall effects of light and atmosphere, allowing such motifs as the pitcher and the mirror's ebony frame to quietly play their more significant parts.

The picture has been cited as one of the earliest Dutch genre paintings of its kind, described variously as a “high-life interior,” a “high genre scene,” and other cumbersome formulations. The claim is hardly indisputable, but the painting is the first known example by Ter Borch that presents full-length figures in a well-appointed domestic interior, thereby anticipating many compositions by him and by artists such as Frans van Mieris, Gabriel Metsu, and Johannes Vermeer (q.q.v.) in which the same or a similar theme is addressed. The specific subject of a woman admiring or adorning herself in front of a mirror may be traced back in Netherlandish art at least two centuries, for instance to the scene labeled “Superbia” (Pride) in Hieronymus Bosch's Tabletop with the Seven Deadly Sins, of 1485 (Prado, Madrid). The theme flourished in sixteenth-century art and literature, and became one of the most common vanitas images in Dutch and Flemish art of the 1600s. Two examples that might be mentioned in connection with the present picture are an engraving by Jacques de Gheyyn II (q.v.) in which a woman is shown preening before a mirror and a panel of about 1645–50 by Erasmus Quellinus the Younger (1607–1678) in which the woman's gesture and the general arrangement of figures and objects are similar (fig. 12).

Ter Borch treated the subject of a young woman before a mirror in at least two earlier but quite different compositions: a small circular panel of about 1645–49 for which the artist's half sister Gesina served as model (formerly in a private collection, Paris); and a painting of about the same date, known only from copies, that includes a maid combing her mistress's hair while a page holds the mirror. The first picture reveals how effectively Ter Borch could combine artistic sources with direct observation. Gesina was also the model for the patrician young woman in the Museum's painting, and here again she is
shown looking downward and revealing the long line of her back and neck. The artist's study of feminine activity "from life" may have inspired this figure of a young woman preoccupied with a ribbon or other decoration (the detail is no longer legible), and perhaps also the idea of letting a maid observe the woman's self-absorption by glancing in a mirror. Thus the most meaningful motifs in the picture, the mirror as a symbol of vanity and the basin and pitcher as a symbol of purity, are linked by the actions of the maid. However, she simply assists the young lady, and shares her pleasure in prettiness. The perception of vanity is left to the viewer, of whom the two figures seem charmingly unaware.

Later interpretations of the subject differ considerably from this one, and even Ter Borch's may be considered conventional by comparison. 10

1. See, for example, P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, p. xxxiv, on "the rise of the high-life interior."
2. On this point, see Naumann in ibid., p. 239, and, for a broader perspective, Liedtke 1988.
3. The interest of this picture for Vermeer is stressed in Liedtke 2000 a and by Liedtke in New York–London 2001 (see Refs.).
6. Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 2, pp. 98–99, refers to this Flemish painting, which the author believes is by Christoffel van der Lamen (ca. 1606–1616/17). DeBruyn 1988, no. 78, must be right to accept the earlier attribution to Erasmus Quellinus the Younger. The painting is said to be signed (lower left): "E. Quellinus." It was formerly in the collection of Joseph Fievé (sale, Brussels, April 30, 1947, no. 47). The work is compared with Vermeer's Woman with a Pearl Necklace (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) in Liedtke 1988, p. 103, and in Liedtke 2000 a, pp. 237–38.
8. Gudlaugsson 1959–60, no. 76. Compare the figures in Molenaer's so-called Lady World (see note 5 above).
9. On hand washing as a traditional symbol of purity or innocence, see Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 2, p. 123, and Amsterdam 1976, p. 195, both of which cite contemporary emblem books. Snoe-Reinsma 1973 discusses the basin and pitcher as a symbol of purity or innocence in Dutch art. Compare Style of Rembrand, Plate Washing His Hands (Pl. 175), and Vermeer's Young Woman with a Water Pitcher (Pl. 203). In an article that usefully reviews the theme of a woman at her toilet, Sluijter (1988, p. 161 n. 25) doubts that such a pitcher and basin would have suggested purity to a contemporary viewer, as opposed to vanity (as in Roeme Visscher's Sinnepoppen [Amsterdam, 1614], no. 1211). However, no persuasive argument is offered, and the proper reading of such a motif would appear to vary with the pictorial context.

References: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 4 (1833), p. 124, no. 19, refers to the painting as "The Toilet," mistakenly including the Dulas sale of 1778 in the provenance; Blanc 1857–58, vol. 1, p. 404, as in the Blondel de Gagny sale (sold for FFr 3,000), vol. 2, pp. 289, 531, records the Villers sale of 1812 and the Patureau sale of 1837; Bode 1900, no. 17 (ill.); Glück 1900, p. 91, as "one of [the artist's] delightful small pictures with full-length figures"; Bode 1907, vol. 1, pp. 71, 87, no. 86; Nicolle 1958, p. 197, as a perfect example of Ter Borch's "suprême distinction"; Hellens 1911, pp. 68–68, 125 (ill. opp. p. 72);

Figure 12. Erasmus Quellinus the Younger, A Woman before a Mirror, with Her Maid, ca. 1645–50. Oil on wood, 15 1/4 x 12 1/16 in. (38.5 x 32.5 cm). Formerly collection of Joseph Fieve.  

GERARD TER BORCH
Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 5 (1913), p. 23, no. 50, as with Duveen, and gives a full description and provenance; B. Burroughs 1931a, p. 353; Plietzsch 1944, p. 31 (under no. 73), mentions the panel in connection with the painting of a similar subject in Dresden; Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, pl. 80, and vol. 2, p. 23 no. 7, and pp. 98–99, no. 80, suggests a date of about 1640 or shortly thereafter, observes the repetition of a few motifs in other pictures by Ter Borch, briefly discusses the theme, notes the influence of the main figure in a painting by Jan Steen, and considers it possible that the latter’s father-in-law, Jan van Goyen, owned the present panel or sold it on Ter Borch’s behalf; Westers 1961, pp. 94–95, fig. 13, discusses the silver pitcher and basin in this and another painting by Ter Borch; Haverkamp-Begemann 1966, p. 39, fig. 6, describes the work as the first in which the artist “chose a patrician interior as a setting”; Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 68, fig. 89, considers a painting by Van Mieris to be “basically derived” from this one; P. Sutton 1982–83, p. 12, repeats Gudlaugsson’s observation that the main figure appears to have been borrowed by Jan Steen; P. Sutton and Naumann in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, p. 151 no. 1, and p. 239, follow Haverkamp-Begemann’s observation; P. Sutton 1986, p. 187, fig. 266, considers the picture “one of the earliest works to display the elegance that would pervade genre painting in the second half of the century”; Kettering 1993, pp. 117 no. 14, 121 no. 62, notes that a “lady in light-coloured satin” occurs similarly in other paintings by Ter Borch; Bactet 1994, p. 323; A. M. Kettering in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 4, p. 382, as Ter Borch’s most innovative picture of about 1650, “often considered the earliest example of a new type of genre painting . . . the high-life interior”; Westermann 1997, pp. 213–14, fig. 120, as the kind of Ter Borch from which Steen adopted figures; Strouse 1999, p. 568, mentions Morgan’s acquisition of the picture; Liedtke 2000a, pp. 104, 118, 237–38, fig. 292, compares works by Vermeer and by Erasmus Quellinus the Younger; Strouse 2000, p. 31, fig. 33 and detail on p. 3, as one of the old master paintings that J. Pierpont Morgan purchased in 1907 from the Kann estate (through Duveen); Frnitis in Frnitis et al. 2001, pp. 2–3, fig. 1, describes the refined style of the painting; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 17–18, 151, 161, 163, 384, fig. 17, compares works by Vermeer; Vergara in Madrid 2003, pp. 96, 235, no. 1, notes the influence of this type of painting by Ter Borch on Van Mieris and Vermeer; P. Sutton in Dublin–Greenwich 2003–4, p. 164, fig. 1, compares Steen’s Bathsheba with King David’s Letter, of about 1659–60 (private collection); Frnitis 2004, pp. 98–100, fig. 88, cites the painting as an early example of this compositional type and praises its descriptive qualities; Washington–Detroit 2004–5, pp. 27, 33, 81, 84–86 no. 17, 138, 141, 200 (notes to no. 17), 202 n. 6 (under no. 21), identifies the model as Gesina ter Borch, describes the theme, analyzes the artist’s technique in painting satin, and offers other observations, based partly on a draft of the present entry; Yapou 2005, p. 81, mentioned; Van der Ploeg in The Hague–Washington 2005–6, p. 157, fig. 51b, cites this picture in support of the erroneous claim that Ter Borch “was the first to paint a scene of a young woman from the affluent classes while she made her toilet.”


EX COLL.: Blondel de Gagny, Paris (until 1776; his sale, Paris, December 10–24, 1776, no. 73, together with a painting of the same dimensions by Dominicus van Tol, for FFr 3,000); [Le Brun, Paris (until 1778; his sale, Paris, January 10, 1778, for FFr 1,900)]; the architect Villers (until 1812; his sale, Le Brun, Paris, March 30, 1812, no. 44, for FFr 2,400 to Bernardeau); Monsieur L. Lapeyríre (by 1817–25; his sale, Paris, April 14ff., 1817, no. 60, for FFr 2,450 to Vas [bought in?]; his sale, Paris, April 19ff., 1823, no. 164, for FFr 4,000); Théodore Patureau (until 1837; his sale, Paris, April 20–21, 1837, no. 40, for FFr 7,800 to the auctioneer E. Leroy); Vicomte Bernard du Bus de Gisignies, Brussels (until 1882; his estate sale, Brussels, May 9–10, 1882, no. 78, for 8 Fr 26,000 to Thibaudeau); Léopold Goldschmidt, Paris (in 1898); Rodolphe Kann, Paris (by 1900–d. 1905; his estate, 1905–7; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, London and New York, 1907; sold for £12,500 to Morgan]; J. Pierpont Morgan, New York (1907–d. 1913; his estate, 1913–17); Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.180.10.
14. The Van Moerkerken Family

Oil on wood, 16 1/4 x 14 in. (41.3 x 35.6 cm)
Inscribed (upper left, on ribbon): V:MOERKERKEN NYKERKEN

The painting is well preserved, although the man's garment is abraded. Pentimenti associated with the hand that holds a watch indicate that the artist made changes in this area.

The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982. 1982.60.30

This charming portrait of the artist's cousin Hartogh van Moerkerken (1622–1694), his first wife, Sibilla Nijkerken (1625–1665), and their son Philippus (1652–1688) is generally dated to 1633–54 on stylistic grounds, and more specifically on the basis of the boy's apparent age (he was born January 8, 1652, and seems here to be about two years old). The slightly eccentric composition has not been modified and is consistent with the designs of several group portraits and genre scenes painted by Ter Borch in the early 1650s. The low placement of the figures in the picture field sets them apart from the family crests and suggests space and intimacy with characteristically limited means.

Hartogh van Moerkerken was the son of Gerard ter Borch the Elder's sister Maria, who in 1610 married the Delft goldsmith Justinus (or Joost) Jansz van Moerkerken. The younger Van Moerkerken also settled in the area of Delft and The Hague, in the village of Monster. Ter Borch was probably in or in the vicinity of The Hague more often during the early 1650s than is known from documents, one of which records him as a witness, together with Johannes Vermeer (q.v.), in Delft on April 22, 1653. According to that deposition, Johan van den Bosch, a captain in service to the States General, had guaranteed payment to a young woman of 1,000 guilders due to her from the estate of the late Lord of Treslong, former governor of Den Briel. Ter Borch had other contacts with gentlemen in service to the national government at The Hague. The man in the Museum's picture was States General representative to the district of Den Bosch ('s Hertogenbosch), and the paterfamilias in Ter Borch's similar family portrait of about 1654, The De Liedekerke Family (fig. 13), was a captain of the States General fleet who at the time resided in Delft (or who had just moved from there to Leiden). The artist's involvement with government figures went back to his years in Münster (late 1645 to May 1648), when he served the powerful delegate of the Province of Holland and West Friesland, Adriaen Pauw (see the biography above). Ter Borch also appears to have been on good terms with Jan van Goyen (q.v.), who lived in The Hague, owned or dealt in paintings by Ter Borch during the early 1650s, and in about 1653 sat for a small portrait by him (Collection of the Princes of Liechtenstein).

The watch in the Linsky painting has been variously interpreted. It has been suggested that the watches here and in The De Liedekerke Family are vanitas symbols, and that in the latter portrait the timepiece probably also refers to the young man's death in or about 1659. However, the proud look of his parents speaks against this idea, which together with the three heraldic crests at the top of the panel suggests that the mother's gesture—she appears to pass the watch to her son—perhaps refers to his eventual succession as head of the family. This would account for the emphasis given in both pictures not only to the watch, which certainly may be described as an heirloom, but also to the female figure. Ter Borch departs from the usual convention in Dutch portraiture by placing both wives in positions of honor, to their husbands' right. This arrangement may have been intended to acknowledge the woman's essential role in providing the family with a male heir. The different displays of a watch in Ter Borch's two family portraits would appear to support rather than discourage this interpretation. The teenaged son of the De Liedekerkes, an older couple, had just entered the University of Leiden and thus was beginning to stand on his own. In the Van Moerkerken portrait, by contrast, the husband seems to express to his lovely young wife his contentment that he now has a proper successor, whose small hand she protectively holds. The boy's placement between his parents is echoed in the configuration of the family crests, with the son's hanging like a pendant below those of his parents. That both the mother and son predeceased the father may have given the watch its more usual significance as a memento mori for Hartogh van Moerkerken in his late years, but this was probably not the object's principal meaning when the portrait was painted.

Symbols in Dutch art are occasionally multivalent, depending on the context. The interpretation suggested above does not exclude the watch's more familiar function as a vanitas motif (a reminder of mortality) or as a symbol of temperance. Ter Borch referred to the latter concept by featuring a watch in a number of genre pictures, including two in the Museum's collection (Pis. 15, 17). A conspicuous watch key might underscore the idea of moderation or temperance (the connection between the Latin temperare, "to moderate," and tempus, "time," would have been understood by a person of Van Moerkerken's standing). The importance of temperate behavior was complexly related to the production of progeny through Dutch
views on marriage, procreation, and mortality. Healthy children were considered gifts of God, and in this culture it was commonly felt that people should not just count but also earn their blessings.

The little boy wears a flat beret called a bonnet in both Dutch and English. They were usually made of velvet or silk, and are cited in seventeenth-century inventories as well as depicted in Dutch portraits of boys. Feathers, jewels, and fancy ribbons often decorated a bonnet. It was usually worn over a tight cap called a bijijsje and a flep, or “cross-cloth” of linen, which gave added protection to the head and also pinned the ears flat.10

Several years before this picture was painted, in 1645, the Hague painter and engraver Crispijn van den Queborn (1604–1632) made a half-length portrait of Hartog van Moerkerken (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam).11 And in the mid- to late 1650s, Ter Borch’s half brother Harmen (1618–before September 1677) painted single-figure portraits of Hartog van Moerkerken, Sibilla Nijkerken, and their young children Maria, Cornelis, and the twins Justinus and Harmen. (A portrait of Philippus may have been painted by Harmen ter Borch but none is recorded.)12 In the nineteenth century these five pictures, together with the Museum’s painting, descended from the Van Moerkerken family to the De Fremery family of ’s Gravesande and, later, California.

1. Compare Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, pls. 76, 90, 91, 97, and 101 (the last is reproduced as fig. 13 here).
2. See ibid., vol. 2, p. 46, for the elder Ter Borch’s family tree.
4. On this painting, see Gudlaugsson 1959–60, no. 101, and Haarlem 1986a, no. 53.
7. This reading, first proposed by the present writer in Linsky Collection 1984, p. 87, is supported in Gaskell 1990, p. 129. As De Jongh in Haarlem 1986a, p. 238 n. 8, observes, clocks and watches could also suggest impartial public service, usually on the part of judges and magistrates. This could be relevant in the case of Hartog van Moerkerken, but the manner in which the watch is displayed in the Linsky pictures does not support its identification as a professional attribute.
8. The sitter in Rubens’s early Portrait of a Man, possibly an Architect or Geographer, which is also in the Linsky Collection (see Liedtke 1984, pp. 187–91), holds a watch immediately in front of a dividers and square. The latter objects have always been interpreted as professional attributes but may (or may also) symbolize temperance, since only a bridle occurs more frequently as a symbol of that virtue.
9. The hypothesis that in some Dutch portraits (and perhaps still lifes and genre scenes) a watch key was intended to emphasize the idea of moderation deserves further consideration. The watch itself keeps proper measure only when it is wound, and could thus suggest the judicious regulation of one’s allotted time. This might explain the apparent focus on the watch key in the present picture and others, for example Pieter van Slingelandt’s Portrait of a Man with a Watch, of 1688, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Leiden 1988, no. 67). In Pieter Nason’s Portrait of a Man, of 1664 (Tambov Picture Gallery, Tambov, Russia), the sitter displays a watch and is about to wind it with a key.
10. We are grateful to Marieke de Winkel for this information and for references to documents dating from the 1630s to the 1680s (personal communication, April 12, 2006).

REFERENCES: Moes 1897–1905, vol. 2 (1905), p. 108, nos. 5094, 5096, and p. 151, no. 5477, records the sitters; Hellens 1911, pp. 99–100 (ill. opp. p. 32), describes the composition; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3 (1913), pp. 84–85, no. 248, p. 92 (under no. 282), and p. 142, describes the figures and their costumes, dates the picture to 1653–54 on the basis of the boy’s apparent age, and considers it “not very happily composed”; Pützsch 1944, pp. 16–17, 44–45, no. 45, pl. 45, dates the painting to about 1644–45 on the basis of the boy’s apparent age, describes the composition, and compares it with other

---

Figure 13. Gerard ter Borch, The De Liedekerke Family (Anthony Charles de Liedekerke, Willemina van Brackel, and Their Son Samuel), ca. 1654. Oil on wood, 17¾ x 13⅞ in. (44 x 39 cm). Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem
family portraits by the artist; Chapuis 1914, p. 72, fig. 90; Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, pp. 93, 261 (pl. 102), 420, and vol. 2, pp. 40, 43, 46, 112–13, 287, no. 103, identifies the sitters, dates the painting to about 1633–34, and compares it with The De Liedtke Family (fig. 13 here); The Hague–Münster 1974, p. 118, mentioned; Sarasota 1980–81 (under no. 9), cites the picture in connection with a miniature portrait by Ter Borch that bears an inscription referring to the Van Moerkerken family; Amsterdam 1982, p. 119, fig. 29a, considers the watch a symbol of transience; Liedtke in Linsky Collection 1984, pp. 86–88, no. 30, discusses the sitters, the watch, and the composition, and records the literature through 1982; W. Liedtke in MMA, Notable Acquisitions 1983–84 (New York, 1984), p. 54 (ill.), describes the watch as “an heirloom signifying that, in time, the son will become head of the family”; De Jongh in Haarlem 1986a, pp. 236, 238, fig. 21a, claims that “in such a case the watch unques tionably serves as a memento mori”; P. Sutton 1986, p. 184, supports Liedtke’s reading of the watch; Gaskell 1990, p. 129, notes that the watch may indicate succession from father to son; P. Sutton in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 105, mentioned; De Jongh in Yamaguchi and other cities 1994–95, p. 137, fig. 47b, and pp. 62–63 in the English Supplement, repeats De Jongh in Haarlem 1986a; Bactier 1995, p. 233; Ekkart 1995, p. 172, compares the picture with Van den Queborn’s earlier portrait of Hartogh van Moerkerken (see text above).


EX COLL.: Hartogh van Moerkerken, Monster, the Netherlands (until d. 1694; by descent to James de Fremery, 5 Gravesande, the Netherlands, and later Oakland, Calif. [by 1894–at least 1913]; Paul de Fremery, San Francisco, Calif. [until 1942; his sale, Waldorf-Astoria, New York, December 16, 1942, no. 26, to Koetsier for Linsky]; Mr. and Mrs. Jack Linsky, New York (1943–80); The Jack and Belle Linsky Foundation, New York (1980–82); The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.30

15. A Woman Playing the Theorbo-Lute and a Cavalier

Oil on wood, 14 1/8 x 12 3/4 in. (36.8 x 32.4 cm)

The painting is well preserved, although there is slight abrasion in the thinly painted shadows in the figure of the soldier, his hat, and the top right background along the right edge. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals some finely drawn lines in the head of the woman that loosely outline the top of the head, the hairline, and the curls that fall to the shoulders, the chin, the left side of the neck, the necklace, and the top of both shoulders.

Examination by X-radiography reveals that the woman’s head was originally placed higher and that changes were made in the position of the music book and the left hand of the soldier, which initially just touched the edge of the music book.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.617

The small Ter Borch in the Altman Collection has been dated convincingly to about 1678. It depicts a young woman playing a theorbo-lute and singing with a young man. He wears a sword and holds a hat, indicating that this is a brief social call. The lady is stylishly dressed and coiffed for the occasion. With her right hand, she strums the instrument’s strings: she is playing chords not melody. The songbook in front of her does not show lute tablature and must contain vocal music, although the couple appears to know the present tune by heart. In this scene of genteel courtship, the duet resonates to the heartstrings, which, however, may quiver only so long as music is in the air. The watch on the table quietly recommends temperance. 3

Ter Borch’s intimate view of a domestic interior is so naturalistically conceived that one might be surprised to discover that the composition is closely related to other works by the artist. He had already used the same fireplace, seen from a low angle and to the upper left, in Carousing Soldiers, of about 1656–57 (private collection, Paris). 5 Like the curtained bed in that painting, an illegible map in the present picture helps to define the rear wall, and to set off the figure in profile. The careful dovetailing of shapes between the man and the woman reminds one of Vermeer’s approach to design at about the same time, but Ter Borch’s style differs strongly in most respects. Ter Borch dwells upon tactile sensations, and delights in reflections—on metalwork, silk, satin, and wood. The table carpet artfully serves as a foil for the shiny surfaces of the woman’s costume and the man’s sleeve, while his fingertips encourage the viewer to imagine the carpet’s touch.

By the late 1650s, Ter Borch had been arranging three-quarter-
Figure 14. Detail of Ter Borch's *A Woman Playing the Theorbo-Lute and a Cavalier* (Pl. 15)
length figures around tables, in compositions of similar format, for about ten years. The poses and gazes of the couple in the Altman painting unexpectedly resemble those of two male figures in the small, moody Inn Scene, of about 1648 (formerly Wetzlar collection, Amsterdam). Similarly, the table set at an angle very close to the picture plane, or some analogous element (like the bench in the Boy Fleecing a Dog, of about 1635, in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich), was a device that the artist employed especially in the mid-1650s, for example in the Music-Making Woman with a Page, of about 1657 (Louvre, Paris), and in the contemporaneous Lute Player with a Young Man (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp). As Guilaumson noted, the figure of the theorbo player in the Museum's painting recalls the young woman in blue who plays alone at a table in The Suitor's Visit, of about 1658 (National Gallery, Washington, D.C.). Her features, however, resemble those of another model, and her jacket reappears in yet another work. Of course, it was common practice to recycle compositional schemes, studio props, and models. What is remarkable in Ter Borch's pictures, especially those of the 1650s, is his ability to make these motifs and conventions appear freshly observed each time.

A somewhat later drawing after the painting is in the British Museum, London, and a pastiche in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden, copies the left side of the composition, adopting a figure from the artist's An Officer Dictating a Letter while a Trumpeter Waits (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.).

Ter Borch would later return to the same theme in, for example, A Young Woman Playing a Theorbo to Two Men, of about 1667–68 (National Gallery, London), where, however, the woman's spirits are not uplifted by song.

Formerly titled by the Museum A Woman Playing the Theorbo for a Cavalier.

1. Laurence Libin, research curator, Department of Musical Instruments, has noted on several occasions that the instrument is a theorbo-lute, a somewhat smaller instrument than a theorbo. He also observes that the woman is strumming, not playing a melody, and that therefore the Museum's former title, A Woman Playing the Theorbo for a Cavalier, is inaccurate. The term "cavalier" is poetic license; the young man is probably in the army but not necessarily in the cavalry.


3. Guilaumson 1959–60, no. 123; see also the different fireplace in no. 96 (Rotterdam), and the same one in nos. 115, 141.

4. Ibid., no. 69.


7. See ibid., no. 140, copy a. Curator Martin Royton-Kisch considers the drawing to be "perhaps by a good eighteenth-century hand" (letter dated July 8, 1997).

8. Guilaumson 1959–60, vol. 2, p. 149 (under no. 142b), implicates Caspar Netscher (q.v.), who served as model for the man. Wiesman 2002, p. 315, no. 271, catalogues a canvas in Baroda, India, as a "variant after" the Museum's picture, with the clothing and setting altered to "Italizing taste," and describes the Dresden painting as "another pastiche copy."


REFERENCES: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 4 (1833), pp. 125–26, no. 25, lists the painting, with provenance; Altman Bequest 1913, p. 226, listed; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 5 (1913), p. 50, no. 133, as in Altman's collection; Monod 1923, p. 310, considers the picture a late work; Altman Collection 1928, no. 45; Pletzsch 1944, pp. 23–24, 53, fig. 87, compares other works by Ter Borch; Guilaumson 1948–49, pp. 248 n. 1, 263, no. 87, as not a late work, but about 1658; Guilaumson 1959–60, vol. 1, pp. 115, 297, pl. 140, vol. 2, pp. 148–50, no. 140, dates the picture to about 1658, gives provenance, compares other paintings by Ter Borch, and lists works derived from this one; B. Scott 1973, pp. 28, 50, fig. 6, as owned by Marigny and later by Calonne; Walsh 1973, fig. 34, claims that the artist "paints objects in consistently sharp focus"; C. Brown 1984, pp. 120 (ill.), 137, describes the amorous situation; F. Surten 1986, pp. 187–88, "suggests something of [Metsu's] debt"; Liedtke 1990, pp. 48–49, mentioned; MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 42, notes that the fireplace is similar to the one in the London picture (see text above); Jäkel-Scheffmann 1994, p. 99, fig. 102, describes the subject; Baejer 1995, p. 324; Düchting 1996, pp. 57, 58 (ill.), paraphrases C. Brown (1984); Wiesman 2002, p. 352, no. 271, catalogues a "pastiche copy" of the painting in Baroda, India; Waibser in Rotterdam–Frankfurt 2004–5, p. 216, fig. 1, considers the picture to have been influenced by a painting by Metsu in Kassel; Washington–Detroit 2004–5, pp. 122, 174, 175, 212 n. 4 (under no. 48), compares the setting to that found in Ter Borch's Three Soldiers Making Merry, of about 1666 (private collection), and the subject to that of The Music Party, of about 1668–70 (Cincinnati Art Museum).

EXHIBITED: London, British Institution, 1829, no. 37 (lent by William Wells); London, British Institution, 1832, no. 71 (lent by William Wells); London, Royal Academy, 1876, no. 81 (lent by William Wells).

EX COLL.: Willem Lormier, The Hague (by 1732; sold to L. Lormier for fl 160); his sister L. Lormier, Rotterdam (by 1734; sale, The Hague, July 4, 1765, no. 285, for fl 420 to Cooq); Abel-François Poisson, marquis de Méans et de Marigny, Paris (until d. 1781; sale, Paris, March 18–April 6, 1782, no. 108, for fl 1,900 to Le Brun); [Le Brun, Paris, from 1764]; Charles d'Averley, Paris (bequeathed to Calonne); Charles-Alexandre de Calonne, Paris (by
16. Portrait of a Seated Man

Oil on wood, 14 1/2 x 12 in. (35.9 x 30.5 cm)

The paint surface is abraded, and a 1 in. (2.5 cm) diagonal scratch on the sitter's face extends from the left cheek to just below the lips. The oak panel is beveled and retains its original thickness.

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.35

The first of seven paintings by Ter Borch to enter the Museum's collection, this anonymous portrait probably dates from the late 1650s or early 1660s. The blond gentleman sits in front of a small table covered by a deep red cloth, which is complemented (as often in Ter Borch's portraits) by an olive green background. The chair is completely obscured by the figure's conical presentation, which finds an echo in the shape of the hat. The sitter's right arm is supported fashionably in the folds of his cloak, which flows voluminously over his lap. His knees are well separated, and barely discernible to the lower right is his left calf, stockinged and beribboned.

The patron was presumably one of Ter Borch's numerous clients in and around Deventer. A good number of single male portraits by the artist are known, many, like this one, that include a hat resting on a table. To judge from the present figure's placement in the picture field, as compared with that of men in Ter Borch's pendant portraits, the Marquand painting never had a mate.

1. Gudlaugsson 1959–60, no. 132, suggests a date in the late 1650s, without explanation. On the basis of style or costume one could just as well assign the portrait to the early 1660s. The man's collar, cuffs, tall hat (with a relatively narrow brim), and hairstyle should be considered: compare ibid., vol. 1, pls. 110, 111, 118, 183, etc., and works by other portraitists of the period. The charts of hats and collars published in Meyer 1986, pp. 83–85, 95–97, are remarkably unhelpful.

2. On this "elite," see Kettering 1999.

3. See, for example, Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, pls. 240–45.

REFERENCES: Caffin 1902, p. 274, observes that the portrait's "quiet directness and subdued color give it an unmistakable dignity"; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 5 (1913), p. 100, no. 317, records that the picture was purchased by Marquand in 1888 in London, and describes the sitter as standing; Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, pl. 152, vol. 2, p. 164, no. 152, dates the portrait to the late 1650s; Lidtke 1990, p. 36, mentions it among Marquand pictures; Banerjea 1995, p. 333.


EX COLL.: Purchased by Marquand in 1888 in London (according to Hofstede de Groot; see Refs.); Henry G. Marquand, New York (1888–89); Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.35
17. Curiosity

Oil on canvas, 30 x 24 1/2 in. (76.3 x 62.3 cm)

The condition of the painting is good, although some areas of the surface are abraded. The original finish is disrupted on the pink bodice of the woman at left, the headdress of the woman writing, the figure of the woman looking over her shoulder, and the objects on the table.

The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.38

The subject and quality of this picture, one of the key works of Ter Borch's maturity, have attracted many writers and a succession of discerning collectors. The painting probably dates from about 1660-62, when the artist lived in Deventer, but the luxurious interior and the casual elegance of the juffertjes ("young ladies," as the picture itself might have been titled in the seventeenth century) evoke the cosmopolitan milieu of Amsterdam (compare Pl. 118).

The traditional title, Curiosity, may be traced back as far as Smith's catalogue (1833) and pays homage to the pert beauty on the right. The woman on the left, however, is the main protagonist, her dreamy expression betraying her pleasure at the arrival of the unsealed letter on the table. With her bare shoulders, sumptuous dress (to which Ter Borch devoted virtuoso attention), and string of pearls, the young lady could be described as the Venus in a modern-day Judgment of Paris, with the male viewer cast in the title role. The artist awards her with shimmering fabrics and the strongest light. Although she appears capable of composing an appropriate reply to the letter, the woman is assisted by a slightly older companion, perhaps her sister, whose attire suggests that her own courting days are over and that she now lives a comfortably settled life.

As has often been noted, letter writing flourished in the Netherlands in the 1650s and 1660s as a refined form of social discourse. Painters such as Ter Borch, Metsu, Van Mieris, and Vermeer treated the theme in a variety of invented situations. Manuals by Dutch and French authors (for example, Jean Puget de La Serre's Le secrétaire à la mode, 1630; Dutch ed., 1651) offered advice and models, with formulaic exchanges such as: "Madam, I should not take the Libertie to let you know [how] extreme I honour you, if the absolute power of your beauty did not force me to it"; and, "Sir, I am much obliged . . . but I have no other liberty left me, except to give you thanks, as I do very humbly." These lines could easily serve as captions to paintings by Metsu and by many of his contemporaries, but they fail to do justice to Ter Borch's dozen or more paintings concerned with private correspondence. In the present picture especially, the painter's close connection with his half sisters, in particular the amateur poet and artist Gesina (1631-1690), surely contributed to his affectionate sensitivity to how young women might behave on such an occasion. Another half sister, Jeneken (1640-1675), has been proposed as a model for the figure on the left, while the curious young woman resembles Gesina as she appears in pictures dating from several years earlier. The letter writer may be another version of Gesina, much as Rubens's wife, Helena, served not only as a model but also as a favorite type.

The candlestick and watch on the table are most likely conventional vanitas motifs. The watch's winding key, which hangs on a chain over the edge of the table, perhaps conveyed to contemporary viewers the idea of self-regulation, that is, temperance. Symbolic motifs in Ter Borch's oeuvre are usually unobtrusive, and quite secondary to the artist's interest in human behavior and emotions. A painting like this one would have been considered a conversatiestuk (conversation piece), in which various nuances of meaning and observation might be discussed and appreciated.

Details of costume and interior decoration, as well as the little spaniel on the velvet-upholstered stool, reappear in other paintings by the artist. The somewhat similar composition and nearly identical dimensions of his Lady at Her Toilet, of about 1660 (Detroit Institute of Arts), led Gudlaugsson to conclude that it was painted as a pendant to the present picture. It seems more likely, however, that the two works are independent representations of the same theme, that of a woman's world in which a man is the main concern.

1. Esmé Quodbach (in conversation, 2006) has drawn attention to the popularity of Ter Borch's paintings in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century France, reflected in the present picture's provenance, as well as that of other works by Ter Borch in the Museum's collection.

2. J. Smith 1839-42, vol. 4 (1833), p. 118, no. 6, and vol. 9 (1842), pp. 339-30, no. 3, as "The Letter, or female curiosity." The idea of curiosity is not mentioned in the sale catalogues of 1762, 1777, and 1805 (see Ex Coll.) or in an eighteenth-century print. P. Sutton in Philadelphia—Berlin—London 1984, p. 149, refers to "the eighteenth century's anecdotalizing title Curiosity," but it seems likely that Smith is the inventor, as with similar titles printed in roman type in his catalogue. The preceding entry in Smith (vol. 4, p. 118, no. 5) is Le Magistre Hollandois, and the author notes, "engraved by Basan, under the above title."

3. Kettering 1993, p. 103, discusses the presumed suitor and, on p. 122 n. 69, describes the woman on the left as "the main love..."
interest.” See also pp. 99–101 on bright satin and the task of painting it, and p. 103 on posture and movement as prescribed in conduct books of the period.


10. Kettering 1991, p. 121 n. 62, sees Gesina as the model for “all (but one) of Ter Borch’s earliest toilet scenes,” for example Gudlaugsson 1999–60, nos. 77, 80 (Pl. 12), 83, 113. The pose of the figure leaning over the back of a chair recalls that of a maid in a scene of letter reading, Iudulof de Jongh’s The Message, of 1657 (Landesmuseum, Mainz); see Fleischer 1989, fig. 83, or Stükenbrock 1997, pp. 256–60.

11. See P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, p. 150 n. 3, citing Gudlaugsson 1999–60, vol. 2, p. 168, and The Hague–Münster 1974, no. 44. Gudlaugsson (p. 169) relates the dog to an Italian proverb published by Jacob Cats: “A woman is like a lapdog,” or, more loosely, “The lady is a trap.” In my view, the dog is effective enough as a compositional element (which helps to focus attention on the opened letter and watch).


References: Buchanan 1824, vol. 2, p. 67, no. 45; J. Smith 1830–42, vol. 4 (1833), p. 118, no. 6, cites the painting as “Curiosity” in the collection of the duchess de Berry, and incorrectly as in the Live de Jullly sale of 1769, and vol. 9 (1842), pp. 320–30, no. 3, observing that “this capital production is of the highest excellence”; Blanc 1857–58, vol. 1, pp. 510, 514, vol. 2, pp. 225, 421, lists sales; Blanc 1861, vol. 1, p. 16 of the section on Ter Borch; Galichon 1868, p. 406, as from the “Galerie de San Donato”; G. Reid 1872, pl. 13; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 5 (1913), p. 62, no. 169, describes the picture, mistakenly refers to the figure on the right as a “maid-servant,” and gives provenance; W. Gibson 1928–29, ill. opp. p. 322; A. Alexandre 1929, pp. 119 (ill.), 122; Bache Collection 1929, unpagd (ill.); Heil 1929, pp. 4, 16 (ill.), mentioned; Wilenski 1929, p. 339, pl. 105, listed as with Duvene; Hendy 1931, p. 32, considers the picture “a triumph of meticulous manipulation”; W. Martin 1936, pp. 240, 512 n. 337, as a work of about the 1670s; Bache Collection 1937, no. 39; Duvene Pictures 1941, no. 207, as from 1660–65; Bache Collection 1943, unpagd, no. 38 (ill.); Heil 1943, pp. 19 (ill.), 24, mentioned; Wehle 1943, p. 288, “an exceptionally brilliant work”; Plietsch 1944, pp. 27, 47, no. 56, dates the picture to about 1657–58; Wilenski 1945, p. 161, pl. 103; Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, p. 124, 314 (ill.), vol. 2, p. 168, no. 164, dates the painting to about 1660 or shortly thereafter, identifies the model for the woman on the left as Ter Borch’s half sister Jenneken, and compares motifs in other pictures by him; Haverkamp-Begemann 1956, p. 40, fig. 4, mentions a mantel similar to the one depicted here in the Town Hall of Deventer; Von Sonnenburg 1973, figs. 86 (detail) and 92 (X-radiograph detail), caption to fig. 92, observes that the X-radiograph “shows a much-reworked image”; Walsh 1973, fig. 57, as about 1660; The Hague–Münster 1974, p. 156, no. 44, admires the image’s courtly elegance and detects symbolic motifs, including the foot warmer; F. Robinson 1974, p. 64; Kirschenbaum 1977, pp. 40, 58 n. 47, misnames the picture “The Curious Servant”; Hibbard 1980, pp. 342–44, fig. 620, considers it typical of “Ter Borch’s elegant, discreetly anecdotal paintings”; Naumann 1981, vol. 1, pp. 37–38 n. 42, 111 n. 143, mentioned as an example of the theme; Liedtke 1984b, p. 62 (ill.); P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, pp. 149–51, no. 12, pl. 71, supports Gudlaugsson’s dating and discusses the picture’s influence on Metsu; P. Sutton in Hoetink et al. 1985, pp. 45–46, fig. 7, considers Metsu’s Young Woman Composing Music in the Mauritshuis, The Hague, to be “freely based” on this composition; Paris 1986, pp. 266, 268–69 n. 6, fig. 2, repeats the preceding observation; P. Sutton 1986, p. 187, “even the dog seems to take an interest”;

Moiso-Diekamp 1987, pp. 495–94, no. 157, rejects Gudlaugsson’s suggestion that Ter Borch’s Lady at Her Toilet (Detroit Institute of Arts) may have been intended as a pendant to the present picture; Kettering 1988, vol. 1, p. 148 (under no. 67588), compares the composition of a drawing by Ter Borch in which the fireplace and two women at a table are similar; Leiden 1988, p. 137 n. 7, suggests that the curious young woman arouses the viewer’s curiosity; Liedtke 1990, p. 53, mentions the canvas as a Bache acquisition of 1927; Ingamells 1992a, p. 201, suggests that the subject of Metsu’s The Letter Writer Surprised in the Wallace Collection, London, may derive from this picture; Kettering 1993, pp. 95, 105, 110, 112 n. 69, fig. 53; imagines the seventeenth-century male viewer’s voyeuristic response and discusses the woman on the left and the possible significance of her handkerchief; Todorov 1993, p. 127, fig. 78, misinterprets the subject, considering the figure on the left simply “content to be there”; Werche in Frankfurt 1993–94, pp. 144, 146, fig. 8.2, compares other paintings of letter writers by Ter Borch; Jäckel-Schegloff 1994, p. 86, fig. 77, describes the subject; Baetjer 1995, p. 324; A. M. Kettering in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 4, p. 382, cites the picture as an example of the letter-writing theme reaching a culmination in Ter Borch’s oeuvre; Westermann 1997, p. 246 n. 55, compares a painting by Steen; Wieseman 2002, p. 341, no. 222, records a partial copy in the Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh; P. Sutton...
18. Burgomaster Jan van Duren

Oil on canvas, 32 1/8 x 26 1/4 in. (81.5 x 66.5 cm)
Signed (center left): GTB [monogram]
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975 1975.1.141

19. Margaretha van Haexbergen, Wife of Jan van Duren

Oil on canvas, 32 x 26 1/4 in. (81.3 x 66.1 cm)
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975 1975.1.142

Dutch paintings in the Robert Lehman Collection are catalogued by Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann in The Robert Lehman Collection II (Sterling et al. 1998).

These full-length portraits of the Deventer burgomaster Jan van Duren (1613–1687) and his wife, Margaretha van Haexbergen (1614–1676), are in several respects (for example, type, scale, and date) ideal complements to the other five paintings by Ter Borch presently in the Museum’s collections. As Haverkamp-Begemann explains, the pictures were painted in Deventer about 1666.¹ In that year, the artist himself became a Gemeenman (representative) of one of Deventer’s eight wards, which placed him in regular contact with the city council. Many of Ter Borch’s sitters of the 1660s and 1670s were members of Deventer’s political elite.²

After he married and moved to Deventer in 1644, Ter Borch specialized in portraits that have been described as “small-scale, full-length, stately in appearance, remarkably spare in setting”—a type that was comparatively rare outside the

in Dublin–Greenwich 2003–4, pp. 20, 38, 63, fig. 11, describes the behavior of the figures; Franits 2004, pp. 104–6, 183, fig. 93, describes the subject, the setting, and the contemporary viewer’s likely response, and mistakenly considers the figure on the right to be a maid; Kettering, Wallert, and Wheelock in Washington–Detroit 2004–5, pp. 36, 137, 138–40, no. 35, pp. 141, 207 (notes to no. 35), and large detail on title page, describes precisely how the satin in this picture was painted, compares the subject and setting in A Lady at Her Toilet, of about 1666 (Detroit Institute of Arts), discusses the theme and related works by Ter Borch, and repeats Haverkamp-Begemann’s remark about the fireplace resembling one in the Deventer Town Hall, Waiboer in Rotterdam–Frankfurt 2004–5, p. 219, fig. 2, considers Metzu to have based his figure of a man in Young Woman Composing Music (Mauritshuis, The Hague) on the curious woman in this painting.

Ex Coll.: Gaillard de Gagny, Paris (sale, Paris, March 29, 1702, no. 15, to Randon de Boisset for FFr 3,600); Randon de Boisset, Paris (sale, Paris, February 27–March 25, 1777, no. 52, to Le Brun for FFr 10,000); [Le Brun, Paris]; Robit (sale, Paris, May 11, 1801, no. 151, to Bonnemaison for FFr 9,000); [Bonnemaison, Paris]; Duchesse de Berry, Paris (by 1813; sale, Paris, April 4–6, 1837, no. 2, to Demidoff for FFr 15,200); Anatole Nikolaevich Demidoff, Prince of San Donato, Florence (from 1837; sale, Paris, April 18, 1868, no. 19, for FFr 71,000 to Sellière); Baron Achille de Sellière, Paris (from 1868); his daughter Princess Jeanne Marguerite de Sagan, later duchesse de Tillyrand-Périgord, Paris (by 1883); Baroness Mathilde von Rothschild, Grünberg, near Frankfurt-am-Main (by 1912–d. 1924); Baron Goldschmidt von Rothschild, Frankfurt-am-Main (from 1924); [Duveen Bros., London and New York, by 1927; sold to Bache on October 16, 1927, for $175,000]; Jules S. Bache, New York (1927–44); The Jules Bache Foundation, New York (1944–49); The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.38
eastern Dutch province of Overijssel. Most of these pictures are considerably smaller than those in the Lehman Collection. The pendants make a magnificent impression in their size, condition, and dignified reserve. The last quality owes something to Spanish court portraiture, about which Ter Borch was better informed than most of his Dutch contemporaries.

2. As noted in Kettering 1999, p. 48.
3. The quote is from ibid., p. 46, where the point about rarity is somewhat exaggerated.
4. See the plates in Gudlaugsson 1999–60, vol. 1, where dimensions and dates are given. About fourteen portraits (ibid., pls. 134–86, 206, 207, 211–13, 252, 254–57, 259) are approximately as large as the Lehman pair.

REFERENCES (additional to those given by Haverkamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, pp. 153–58, nos. 33, 54 [ill.]): Kettering 1999, pp. 46–48, 57–58, figs. 1, 2, dates the paintings to about 1667, and cites them as prime examples of “Ter Borch’s portraits for the Deventer elite”; Kettering in Washington–Detroit 2004–5, pp. 158–59, 209–10, nos. 42, 43, dates the paintings to about 1666–67, discusses Van Duren and his wife as patrons, describes their dress, and suggests that like similar works by Ter Borch the pictures were probably given elaborately carved wooden frames.


Anthony van Borssom (or Van Borssom) was baptized in Amsterdam on January 2, 1631. His father, Cornelis van Borssom, was a mirror maker from Emden, the German seaport on the northeastern Dutch border. The artist married a woman from Emden, Anna Crimpings, on October 24, 1670. At the time, Van Borssom shared a house with his father on the Rozengracht in Amsterdam, but by September 9, 1671, the date he drew up a will, he was living on the Prinsengracht. A more modest address was recorded on March 19, 1677, when he was buried in the Westerkirk.

The influence of Rembrandt's landscape etchings on drawings by Van Borssom has led scholars to suppose that he was the master's pupil about 1645–50, but the assumption remains unsupported by documents. During the first half of the 1650s, the young draftsman recorded views in the area of Emmerich and Cleves. In his approximately two dozen known paintings and in his numerous drawings, Van Borssom proves himself to have been an eclectic artist whose ideas came from a considerable variety of contemporary Dutch painters and draftsmen. Some works of the 1650s recall the young Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.); several of the 1660s were inspired by Philips Koninck (q.v.); and other pictures derive from landscapes by Jan Wijnants (1632–1684) or Aert van der Neer (q.v.), park views with birds by Melchior d'Hondecoeter (q.v.), church interiors by Hendrick van Vliet (q.v.), or still lifes by Otto Marusev van Schrieck (q.v.). A number of paintings by Van Borssom are clearly dependent upon cattle pictures by Paulus Potter (1625–1654) and in a few cases borrow bovines from Potter's prints.

Van Borssom may be counted among the fair number of Dutch artists who were much better draftsmen than painters (the closest comparison would be with the Rembrandt pupil Lambert Doomer [1624–1700]). His pen drawings, while occasionally derivative, are mostly records or convincing evocations of rural landscape, farm buildings, ruins, and scenes of everyday life. Van Borssom's sketching style was imitated in the eighteenth century by Jacob van Strij (q.v.) and others, while his manner of painting became confused with that of Albert Klomp (ca. 1618–1688) or, optimistically, with the far more sophisticated technique of Potter.

1. A. D. de Vries 1885, p. 69, for this and the following details. The record describes the bride as thirty years old, "parents dead," and as living with her sister on the Herengracht in Amsterdam.
6. On Van Borssom's relationship to Van der Neer, see Schulz 2003, pp. 43–44.
8. See Liedcke 1982, p. 129, no. 121, fig. 121.
10. See the examples cited in Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 1, no. 199–204, which include the picture discussed below.
20. Barnyard Scene

Oil on canvas, 20 x 27 in. (50.8 x 68.6 cm)

As a result of abrasion and the increasing transparency of the paint over time, the darker passages have lost definition. The cow at center and the two pigs at lower right, all of which were painted with more opaque mixtures, are well preserved. In the sky are numerous points of abrasion along the crowns of the weave. The cross on the top of the tower is not original. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals underdrawing that outlines the cow at center and a few lines that describe the shed and tower.

The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 $31,100.12

A dilapidated barn borders the property of a country house with a slender tower. A busy dovecote crowns the barn doorway; another birdhouse and a number of earthenware jugs invite small birds to nest on the château's tower and gable. Three cows (one being milked), two pigs, and a quartet of chickens (two of them now nearly invisible) animate the barnyard, which is sparsely strewn with plants, rocks, and a few mussel shells (the only inedible part of someone's leftovers). A line of trees recedes diagonally to a view of improbable hills and a man and dog herding a flock of sheep.

The painting evidently acquired a Paulus Potter signature between its sale in 1872 as a work by Albert Klomp (ca. 1618–1688) and its sale from the Kums collection in 1898. The artist was listed as unknown in the 1910 catalogue of the Yerkes collection, but no reservations about Potter's authorship were expressed by Hofstede de Groot in 1912 or in the Duveen sale of 1913. In 1932, Burroughs and Wehle published the picture as a fine example of Potter's work, although the signature had come off in cleaning a few months earlier. The attribution was changed to Klomp in 1940 and was maintained for fifty years, despite the fact that Niemeijer, in 1962, convincingly assigned the painting to Anthonie van Borssom.

The country house in the background occurs in slightly different form in two drawings by Van Borssom, one of which is signed. The unsigned drawing (Museum Fodor, Amsterdam) shows a formal garden next to the house, while the signed and stronger drawing (fig. 15) includes the more plausibly setting of a fenced-in yard and trees. The subject of the signed drawing has been described since the eighteenth century as a view in the village of Soest, near Utrecht, but Broos and Luykx have shown that the house is almost certainly the jachtslot (hunting castle, or small country house) Toutenburg in the village of Maartensdijk, near Utrecht. Parts of the house survived until the late eighteenth century.

The drawing cited above and other signed sheets (one of which represents a barn like the one seen here) strongly support an attribution of the Museum's picture to Van Borssom. Comparisons with a few signed paintings of similar subjects leave no doubt. Van Borssom recalls Pieter de Hooch (q.v.) in that his figures and animals are usually less well described than their environments. The cattle in particular look patched into the present composition, with little regard for the overall impression of space, light, and atmosphere. Nearly the same three cows are depicted in a canvas by Van Borssom (art market, 1998), although they are juxtaposed differently. Sumowski noticed that the recumbent cow was derived from an engraving by Potter; the other cows may also have been borrowed from Potter prints. The spiky plants in the foreground (which set off the scene like a row of footlights) are modeled on still lifes by Otto Marseus van Schrieck (see Pl. 115), whom Van Borssom imitated in his own paintings of plants and forest animals.

This scene is probably an early work by Van Borssom, dating from about 1650–55, to judge from comparable paintings by the artist and their relationship to Potter. Van Borssom's Potter- and Klomp-like pictures are more naive exercises in landscape painting than are those recalling the dune landscapes of Jacob van Ruisdael, the panoramas of Philips Koninck, or the valley views of Cornelis Vroom (1590/91–1661). These painters appear to have revealed to Van Borssom the virtues of broader pictorial effects such as atmosphere and a natural flow of space, qualities that are not conspicuous in the present work.

No other view of a barnyard by Van Borssom features a fine country house. Nonetheless, the juxtaposition of disparate structures in the Museum's painting has no particular significance beyond that of picturesque effect, and the Dutch conviction, here maintained more or less unconsciously, that the cow was a prime mover of the country's prosperity.

Previously attributed by the Museum to Albert Klomp.

1. The faint cross atop the tower was introduced by a restorer at an unknown date (kindly noted by conservator Dorothy Mahon in July 2006).
2. See Ex. Coll. The illustrated entry in the 1898 sale catalogue is remarkably flattering to the picture, as is Max Rooses in the catalogue's preface, p. xiii. Potter was very popular throughout the
Figure 15. Anthonie van Borssom, Castle Toutenburg, Maartensdijk, near Utrecht, early 1650s? Pen, brown ink, and watercolor, 8⅜ x 13⅞ in. (22.2 x 34.2 cm). The Morgan Library & Museum, New York, Purchased as a Gift of Mrs. Charles W. Engelhard
the previous note (York, The Hague 1994–95, no. 8a). Common sources in Potter probably explain the similarity between the cows in the Museum's picture and those found in paintings and drawings by Cornelis Saftleven (1607–1681) dating from the 1650s to at least 1670 (see Amsterdam 1993, no. 81).

14. A signed example is in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 1, no. 217).

15. See ibid., nos. 187–89.


**References:**

Kunst 1821, p. 21, no. 130, cites the work as by Paulus Potter; Yerkes Collection 1910, no. 100, as by an unknown artist; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 4 (1912), pp. 627–28, no. 91, as a late Potter, "Cows in a Meadow," featuring "a building with a tower similar to the castle of Binkhorst near The Hague"; Pène du Bois 1917, p. 402 (ill. p. 401 [hanging on wall]); Valentinier 1928, p. 17, as a signed work by Potter; Burroughs and Wehle 1932, p. 49, no. 86, as Barnyard Scene by Potter, "departing widely from the conventional subject matter of his Italianate contemporaries"; New York 1934, p. 17, no. 25, as by Potter; Niemeijer 1962, pp. 63, 74, fig. 1, as Landnis in Soest by Van Borsom, on the basis of comparisons with two drawings by the artist that show the same house (see fig. 15 here); Chicago–Minneapolis–Detroit 1969–70, p. 81 (under no. 159, the Fodor drawing), restates Niemeijer's conclusions; Bénézet 1976, vol. 3, p. 450, records the price in the Kuns sale of 1858; Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 2 (1979), p. 750, follows Niemeijer 1952; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 101, as by Klomp; Broos 1981, p. 109, as one of the few paintings that can be attributed to Van Borsom, with the country house Tournenburg in Maartensdijk, near Utrecht, as "filling-in"; Boerner 1982, p. 38 (under no. 28, the Morgan drawing); Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 1, pp. 439, 444, no. 200 (ill.), as Landscape with Milkmaid by Van Borsom, noting that a cow was adopted from an engraving by Potter; Felice Stampfle in Ryskamp 1984, pp. 224–25, supports the attribution to Van Borsom; Baetjer 1995, p. 333, as by Van Borsom; Schulz 2002, p. 43, as Landscape with Castle-Soest, and as an example of Van Borsom imitating other artists.

**Exhibited:** New York, MMA, "Landscape Paintings," 1934, no. 25, as by Potter; American Federation of Arts, traveled 1934–17.

**Ex Coll.:** Prince Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz (1711–1794), Vienna [according to the Hochschild sale cat., 1838]; Baron de Hochschild, London (his estate sale, Christie's, London, March 1–6, 1858, no. 1442, as by Potter, for £33 11s. 10d. to "Rippe"); the duc de Persigny, Paris (?) [sale, April 4, 1872, no. 12, as by Klomp, sold for FFr 750 to Tourguenéff (?)]; Édouard Kunz, Amsterdam (by 1891; sale, Feb. 1898, no. 124, as by Potter, sold for 25,000 to Montaignac); Charles T. Yerkes, Chicago (sale, New York, April 5–8, 1910, no. 100, as "Landscape" by an unknown artist); Dowdeswell, London; [Duveen Bros., New York; public sale, April 29, 1915, no. 8, as by Potter]; Michael Friedsam, New York (1915–31); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 22.100.12

**Nineteenth century.** In 1801, when the Society of Fine Arts in New York sent John Vanderlyn to Paris to obtain copies after masterpieces by Raphael, Correggio, Titian, and other famous painters, Vanderlyn himself added Potter to the list (see Liedtke 1990, p. 27).

3. See Refs. and Ex Coll. With regard to the Durven sale in New York and Friedsam's purchase of the picture, it is worth recalling that Potter, along with Van Ruisdael, Hobbema, and Cuyp, was considered one of the most desirable Dutch landscape painters during the Gilded Age in America. See Liedtke 1990, pp. 27, 31, 34, 37, 41, and 42 (on an implausible "Potter" in Peter Widener's collection).

4. See Refs. A record of the cleaning, dated August 1, 1922, is in the curatorial files.

5. See Refs. John Walsh favored Niemeijer's attribution, which Horst Gerson also proposed (undated note in files). See also Chicago–Minneapolis–Detroit 1969–70, Broos 1981, and Sumowski 1983–[94] under Refs. below. The change to Klomp in 1940 was probably influenced by Wilhelm Martin's oral opinion (1938) that the painting is not by Potter, and it was certainly encouraged, according to Louise Burrough's note in the curatorial files, by the exhibition of a painting assigned to Klomp but falsely signed "Potter" in Burlington Fine Arts Club, Catalogue of a Collection of Counterfeits, Imitations and Copies of Works of Art (London, 1924), p. 49, no. 26 (lent by the Earl of Crawford).

6. Niemeijer 1962, figs. 1, 2; Meischke 1978, p. 96, fig. 8 (the Amsterdam drawing); Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 2, nos. 307, 343.


8. Broos 1981, p. 106, citing P. J. E. Luyck's oral identification, which Broos supports with comparative material. A map of 1641 (ibid., p. 107) shows the sixteenth-century structure surrounded by trees. Van Borsom's signed drawing (fig. 15) and two eighteenth-century views (ibid.; figs. b, c) show roads and a canal close by the house, which may account for the straight line of trees in the present painting.


10. Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 1, nos. 199–204, and a canvas on the art market in 1970 (see note 11 below).

11. Christie's, Amsterdam, November 9, 1998, no. 113 (ill.). The painting, inscribed "Paulus Potter. F" was attributed to Van Borsom by Buijsen in The Hague 1994–95, p. 78 n. 2. Compare also the landscape painting signed by Van Borsom that was sold at Sotheby's, London, November 4, 1970, no. 10 (ill.), and the barnyard scene in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 1, no. 202).

12. Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 1, p. 429, citing the print recorded by Hollstein 1949–, vol. 17, p. 213, no. 3. As Buijsen notes in The Hague 1994–95, p. 78 n. 2, the cow also occurs in Potter's painting Two Cows and a Bull, of 1647 (private collection, on loan to the York City Art Gallery, York, England).

13. Compare the cow being milked in the background of Hollstein 1949–, vol. 17, p. 212, no. 1 (dated 1650), and the standing cow in no. 8 (p. 216); also the standing cow in the painting cited in
Leonardt Bramer

Delft 1596–1674 Delft

The long-lived Leonardt Bramer, who in his heyday was the most esteemed artist in Delft, was born there on Christmas Eve in 1596. Almost nothing is known about his family, and his teacher is not identified in any contemporary source. De Bie’s biography of 1661 reports that Bramer set off for Rome at the age of eighteen, stopping at Arras, Amiens, Paris, Genoa, and Livorno en route. On February 15, 1616, in Aix-en-Provence, Bramer contributed a drawing of figures in a landscape and a dedicatory poem to the album amicorum of Wybrand de Geest (1592–ca. 1662), a painter from Leeuwarden who had trained with Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.). Bramer is recorded at various addresses in Rome between 1616 and 1627; in the early 1620s he shared living quarters with Wouter Crabbeth (ca. 1594–1644), the painter from Gouda. The two artists, along with Dirck van Baburen (ca. 1594/95–1624), Paulus Bor (q.v.), Bartholomeus Breenbergh (q.v.), and Cornelis van Poelemburch (1594/95–1667), were founding members of the Schildersbent in Rome, a fellowship of Dutch and Flemish artists.

This was an exciting time for a Netherlandish painter to be living in Rome, in the neighborhood of Santa Maria del Popolo and other churches where large canvases by Caravage could be studied. Two of the leading Caravageque painters from Utrecht, Baburen and Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656), painted altarpieces and other major works in Rome between about 1615 and 1620. The most important Italian and French representatives of the Caravageque manner, Bartolomeo Manfredi (1582–1622) and Valentin de Boulogne (1591–1632), were active in the same milieu. Bramer’s response to these artists was complemented by his enthusiasm for the small dramatic figure paintings of Adam Elsheimer (1578–1610), an interest he shared with Rubens, Rembrandt, and the latter’s teacher Pieter Lastman (1583–1633) and more immediately with Elsheimer’s compatriot in Rome, Goffredo Wals (ca. 1599/1600–1638/40). It has been suggested plausibly that Bramer, like Wals, may have worked for the illusionistic muralist Agostino Tassi (1578–1644), from whom he may have acquired his unexpected expertise in fresco painting. Some small pictures painted by Bramer in Italy, in particular stormy seascapes, are so similar to works by Tassi that their attributions have gone back and forth. Bramer also had in common with Wals the support of Gaspar Roomer (d. 1674), a Fleming who lived in Naples and collected contemporary pictures by the hundreds. His inventory of 1634 refers to sixty small landscapes by Wals and “forty small paintings” by Bramer. In Rome, where the painter was nicknamed Leonardo delle Notti, he also enjoyed the patronage of Mario Farnese and of the Dominican cardinal Desiderio Scaglia (elected in 1631). Very few works certainly dating from Bramer’s Italian years are known, although it has been assumed that his paintings on slate date mostly from that period. Domenico Fetti (1588/89–1623) is one of several Italian artists who appear to have influenced the theatrical notti (night scenes) of the 1620s.

In October 1627, Tassi’s famous pupil Claude Lorrain intervened in a knife fight between two Italians and Bramer, thereby getting wounded and possibly saving the Dutchman’s life. By early December, Bramer was back in Delft. He joined the painters’ guild on April 30, 1629, and by 1637 was a member of the Knightly Brotherhood, an exclusive civic guard company. The artist flourished during the 1630s and 1640s, to judge from the houses he bought, and the frequent mention of paintings by him in the possession of prominent citizens. Collectors of his works included wealthy merchants and manufacturers in Delft, burgomasters, aldermen, solicitors, and so on. Bramer’s prices were not high, but his mostly small paintings were produced quickly and are cited more frequently than pictures by any other artist in Delft inventories of the 1630s through the 1670s, except for works by Hans Jordaens.

According to the inscription beneath an engraved portrait of Bramer in Jean Meyssens’s Images de divers hommes desprit sublime (Antwerp, 1649), the artist worked not only for “Farnese” and “Scala” in Italy but also “painted several works at Rijswijk for His Highness the Prince of Orange Frederick Hendrick and for his Excellency Count [Johan] Maurits of Nassau, and other princes.” Meyssens treats Bramer as if he were Delft’s answer to Rubens, but it is true that two large mythological paintings by him were installed in the Stadholder’s new country house at Rijswijk, and an allegorical picture of Fortune Distributing Treasures hung in Honselaardijk, Frederick Hendrick’s other château near The Hague.
Perhaps this experience with palace decoration stirred Bramer's memories of mural painting in Italy. In February 1633, he signed a contract to paint frescoes on the walls of a passageway that ran between his own house and that of Anthonie van Bronchorst, who would give him 300 guilders and a silver pitcher worth 50 guilders.19 The artist was paid substantially less in 1657 when he painted a fresco in a garden house behind the Gemeenlandshuis (Communal Land House) in Delft.20 In 1660, Bramer received 100 guilders as a first payment for his work on a much larger decorative project, the Painted Room in the Nieuwe Doelen (New Civic Guard House). The Delft historian Dirck van Bleyswick records that the meeting hall was "most attractive, having all the walls painted in the Italian manner in fresco or damp plaster by the famous Leonard Bramer, all befitting and suiting the purpose of the place."21 Like Bramer's other frescoes, the Doelen decorations did not last long in the Dutch climate. In 1667, he was paid for repairs, and in the same year he started work on a set of large mural paintings—this time on canvas—for the Grote Zaal (Great Hall) in the Prinsenhof of Delft. The main scene (to judge from a drawing dated 1742) told the story of the Romans and the Sabines, while classical or biblical banquet scenes were placed over the fireplaces on the end walls. To the sides musicians on a balcony and other figures placed within illusionistic architectural settings recall Veronese's frescoes in the Villa Barbaro at Maser. A few drawings and one large canvas of about 1665–70 provide further evidence of Bramer's approach to wall and ceiling decoration, which may be traced back to Renaissance Italy through the works of Netherlandish court painters such as Hans Vredeman de Vries (1526–1609) and Van Honthorst.22

Weyerman, in 1729, described Bramer as "a talented and diligent draughtsman, as evidenced by thousands of drawings in the hands of collectors."23 In addition to studies for murals, ceilings, and what appears to have been a perspective box,24 Bramer made suites of drawings devoted to biblical, classical, and literary themes as finished products for collectors. Typical examples are the 140 drawings dating from the 1650s illustrating Virgil's Aeneid and the 72 scenes from The Life of Lasarillo of Tormes, which Bramer presented to the wealthy artist and art dealer Abraham de Cooge in 1646. The known series of drawings are mostly devoted to ancient history, but the 65 "Street Scenes" (Straatwerken), of about 1659, represent all kinds of professions and derive from popular prints.25 In his graphic oeuvre and in his paintings of occasionally obscure subject matter, Bramer allowed himself to appear as the learned artist and virtuoso inventor.26 The variety and sheer abundance of his works, which he dashed off on wood, canvas, copper, slate, paper, and wet plaster, imply a concept of artistic creativity somewhat out of proportion to the average painting by him (like the one discussed below), and to his mastery of technique. Bramer was a respected member of the Delft painters' guild, which appointed him hoofdman (headman) in 1644–45, 1660, and 1664–65. He was evidently Catholic, and a lifelong bachelor. No pupils are recorded, although a few minor figures may have received instruction from him.27 In his late years the elderly artist appears to have had trouble supporting himself. He was buried in the Nieuwe Kerk of Delft on February 10, 1674.28

1. According to Van Bleyswick [80], vol. 2, p. 859. See Huys Jansen in Delft 1994, p. 13, where it is suggested that "Bramer, still alive in 1667, could actually have told this [the date of Bramer's birth] to Van Bleyswick." Perhaps, but the information is found in volume 2, of 1680.
2. In Delft 1994, p. 13, Paul Huys Jansen identifies the artist's father as Henricus Bramer, who was "possibly . . . the same as the painter of equestrian pieces" (meaning cavalry skirmishes, like those depicted in Delft by Palamedes Palamedesz [1607–1638]), but then observes that "Henricus may have been Leonart's brother or cousin." In Plomp 1986, p. 104, it is more clearly explained that Bramer's father was named Henricus, but that the artist after whom Leonart Bramer made a drawn copy of a painting, "Henricus Bramer" (according to an inscription on the sheet), was more likely Leonart's brother and a "Sunday painter." Bramer's father was probably not a painter, since his son paid six, not three, guilders (the fee for a master's son) when he joined the Guild of Saint Luke in Delft (as noted by Wichmann 1923, pp. 3–4, and Plomp 1986, p. 104 no. 4). It is also unlikely that the son of a minor artist (if not a wealthy dilettante) would have been able to afford the journey to Italy (see Montias 1982, p. 46, on this point). Bramer's mother, Christijtge Jans, died in May 1638 (Delft 1994, p. 18).
3. Wichmann (1923, p. 70) implies that Bramer's teacher may have been Adriaen van de Venne (1589–1662), a hypothesis that is considered "very attractive" in C. Brown 1995, p. 46. However, Van de Venne, although a native of Delft, lived in Leiden before his Middelburg period of 1614 and 1624. In New York–London 2001, p. 66, the present writer mentions Hans Jordaens the Elder (1555/60–1629) as a more plausible candidate, considering that he was an esteemed master in Delft, a specialist in history pictures with small figures, and, like Bramer, a painter of peasants, soldiers, nocturnes, fires, and other "clever things" (Van Mander/ Miedema 1994–99, vol. 1, p. 290, fol. 238v).
4. De Bie 1661, p. 252. The passage is reprinted in Delft 1994, p. 27. Bramer probably passed through Antwerp on his way to Arras.
5. As noted by J. W. Noldus in the entry on Bramer in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 4, p. 565, who fails to cite (even in his bibliography) Delft 1994, where (pp. 14–15, fig. 2) Bramer's calligraphic lines are reproduced. The date is fifty-two days after Bramer's nineteenth birthday, which tends to support De Bie's information.
that Bramer was eighteen when he began his overland journey to Italy.


9. On Tassi and Bramer, see the essay by Plomp and Ten Brink Goldsmith in Delft 1994, pp. 52–53, figs. 6, 7 (shipwreck scenes by Tassi and Bramer), and no. 14.


11. On Farnese and Scaglia, see Delft 1994, p. 33: C. Brown 1995; and New York–London 2001, p. 67, where it is said that Farnese lived mostly in Parma. This is corrected by Noldus in *Dictionary of Art* 1996, vol. 4, p. 656, where it is noted that Farnese lived in Rome as general of the papal army.


14. For these details, see Delft 1994, pp. 16–17.

15. See ibid., pp. 18–19 (buys a house on the Korenmarkt in 1643, for 2,500 guilders; buys an investment property in 1645). Montias 1982, p. 121, remarks on the high property tax paid by Bramer.


17. See Delft 1994, pp. 19–21, fig. 5. The information was borrowed by Filippo Baldinucci in 1681 (Baldinucci 1845–47, vol. 4, p. 527).


20. See Delft 1994, pp. 21, 63 (misstating the payment, which was apparently 32, not 12, guilders), 200, 243 n. 4.


26. Bramer’s choice of unusual subjects and aspects of his style in the 1640s have been connected with the Utrecht painter Nicolaes Knupfer (1603 or ca. 1609–1651), most recently in Saxton 2001, p. 38. However, this inclination is also found in the work of other Dutch painters (see the entry for Paulus Bor in this catalogue), and must reflect the intellectual tastes of patrons.

27. The hypothesis that Bramer was Vermee’s teacher is considered unlikely and unhelpful in New York–London 2001, p. 147. Adrian Verdoel, Pieter Volmarinck, and Pieter Vromans have also been proposed as Bramer pupils (see Delft 1994, pp. 10, 37).

28. See Delft 1994, pp. 28–29, for documents suggesting financial difficulties, and p. 31 for the record of Bramer’s burial.
21. The Judgment of Solomon

Oil on wood, 31½ x 40½ in. (79.1 x 102.9 cm)

The painting is in poor condition. It is severely abraded, and as the thinly applied oil paint has grown more transparent over time, the effect of the medium brown ground preparation has increased. Consequently, there is an overall loss of detail in the dark passages and an enhancement of the contrast between the light and dark passages. The oak panel is composed of four horizontal boards. There is paint loss along the three horizontal panel joins and at the edges of the multiple horizontal splits in the bottom board.

Gift of National Surety Company, 1911 11.73

This painting of the 1640s is one of a few known works by Bramer that treat the Old Testament subject of the Judgment of Solomon (1 Kings 3:5–28). In a dream the Lord appeared to Solomon, who was the son of David and Bathsheba and David's successor as king of Israel. The youthful monarch beseeched God for "an understanding heart to judge thy people," and the Lord answered that his request would be granted, because he had not asked for wealth, a long life, or the lives of his enemies. "Lo, I have given thee a wise and an understanding heart; so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee." Furthermore, Solomon would be blessed with riches, honor, and longevity, providing that he kept God's commandments. Upon waking, Solomon burnt offerings before the ark of the covenant "and made a feast to all his servants." Then two women, harlots who shared a house, came to the king with conflicting stories about their newborn children, for each woman had recently given birth to a boy. One of the infants had died in the night, and was supposedly switched with the living child by the unfortunate mother. But the woman with the surviving son pleaded that she had done no such thing. In the first act of Solomonic wisdom, the king ordered that the living child be cut in two, so that each woman would have half. The true mother cried out for the baby's life, concealing the child to the other woman, who at the same time expressed her assent to Solomon's decision. Whereupon he gave the child to its actual mother, and all of Israel came to respect their new king, "for they saw that the wisdom of God was in him."

In Bramer's picture, Solomon sits on a high throne flanked by the usual figure of a lion. Older men behind the throne and in the crowd underscore the king's youth. A carpet cascades from his feet to the lifeless baby on the ground. The center of interest, and the one passage of impressive painting, consists of the duplicitous mother and a swordsman dangling the live baby by one foot (fig. 17). The executioner's pose recalls that of The Diocletians, or Horse Tamers, one of the most admired ancient sculptural groups in Rome. Behind the good mother, with her hands raised in protest, a man on a horse and a host of male figures suggest recession in space (although the onlookers gathered against the low walls to the left could not in reality stand on the same ground plane as the horse and the rest of the crowd). The ambiguity of the entire background is such that one might suspect drastic revisions by the artist, with overpainted passages now showing through. But the haphazard space is as typical of Bramer as is the mishmash of architecture, which features a monumental column to the right, an arched window in the center background, and in the left distance something like the wall or wing of a Renaissance villa surmounted by classical statues and set against trees and an evening sky. That this backdrop fails to suggest the earliest days of Jerusalem is a moot point in the case of an artist who freely mixed ancient, medieval, and modern buildings in, for example, his illustrations to Livy's History of Rome (Ab urbe condita).②

Bramer's figures are thinly dashed on a dark layer of paint, with flashy white and yellow highlights used to pick out the key protagonists in the overall tonality of golden brown. This bold but superficial technique may be traced back to the artist's earliest pictures on slate, copper, and wood, as may the broad outlines of this picture's Baroque design. However, Bramer was also inspired by Rubens' Judgment of Solomon, of about 1613–17, which was known from several versions, and from Boëtius à Bolswert's engraving (fig. 16). (Christiaen van Couwenbergh, Bramer's colleague in Delft, also appears to have referred to Rubens' invention in a painting of about 1640.)③ The original painting by Rubens was made for the Town Hall of Brussels, and burned in 1695. A pupil's version of the Brussels painting is in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, and another version was in Bramer's own city of Delft by the late seventeenth century, and possibly earlier.④ Responses to Rubens are found in Bramer's king and in the two thoughtful figures on the near side of the throne, and especially in the gesturing mother (who in the Rubens is the real one) and in the suspended child. Another treatment of the subject by Bramer, dated 1643 (location unknown),⑤ resembles Rubens's arrangement in that the false mother is standing and faces Solomon from the far side. The true mother, on her knees in the foreground, is a more desperate version of the false mother in the Museum's painting. In other respects, the
Figure 16. Boetius à Bolswert after Rubens, *The Judgment of Solomon*, ca. 1650–62. Engraving, 17¼ x 20¼ in. (44 x 51 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art 31.301.7016
panel of 1643 has little in common with Rubens’s composition or with the present picture, apart from Bramer’s usual nocturnal staging and theatrical light.

A taller Judgment of Solomon by Bramer, with fewer figures, a deep foreground, and a spare, stagelike setting, is in the Saint Annen-Museum, Lübeck, and probably dates from the late 1640s or early 1650s. The artist employed somewhat similar compositions in paintings of the Queen of Sheba before Solomon, for example in a tall panel in a private collection, Milwaukee, and in a broad panel in Jagdschloss Grunewald, Berlin, both of which probably date from between 1645 and 1655. Other images, such as a drawing of Joseph Interpreting Pharaoh’s Dreams, dating from about 1655–60 (National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa), are also reminiscent of the present picture in their designs.

During the seventeenth century, courtrooms and similar
chambers in the town halls of the Netherlands were usually decorated with images of justice. The most common subject was the Judgment of Solomon, although themes drawn from ancient history, such as the Judgment of Cambyses or the Judgment of King Zaleucus, were also portrayed. In Delft itself, Pieter van Bronckhorst (1588–1661) painted a large Judgment of Solomon, dated 1622, for the vierschaar (tribunal) of the newly built Town Hall. However, Bramer's comparatively small paintings of the Judgment of Solomon, and even the large version of Rubens's composition that was in seventeenth-century Delft, were intended for private collectors. A large Judgment of Solomon by Bramer was recorded in a Delft collection in 1666, and a painting of the same subject by his presumed pupil, Pieter Vromans, together with a "large painting of Diogenes by Bramer," was in the collection of Dirck van Brunnwijk (d. 1646), who owned a sawmill in Delft. In 1665, paintings of the Judgment of Solomon and of the Justice of Willem III, by unnamed artists, were recorded with landscapes and still lifes in one of the rooms of Hendrick Schaff's house in Amsterdam. Schaeff was a notary, and it may be supposed that the private owners of pictures depicting the Judgment of Solomon and similar themes were often people whose professions involved the administration of justice or scrupulous behavior. It may be worth noting in this regard that the present picture was given to the Museum by the National Surety Company.

6. As suggested in Delft 1994, p. 172 (under no. 48). A Judgment of Solomon by Bramer, said to be dated 1630, was in the collection of General Roudzewicz in Saint Petersburg, according to a note in Semenov Collection 1906, p. xxi n. 2 (see also Wichmann 1923, p. 97, no. 21).


9. See Breninkmeyer-de Rooij in Washington–Detroit–Amsterdam 1980–81, pp. 66–67, and no. 63 (Zaleucus) in the same catalogue; Liedtke 1984a, pp. 233–34 (Cambyses); Van Gent in Amsterdam–Jerusalem 1991–92, p. 95, where it is implausibly stated that the Judgment of Solomon was less frequently depicted by Dutch artists on a small scale for private buyers than on a large scale for public buildings; and Huiskamp in ibid., pp. 134–55, on Old Testament scenes in town halls and other public buildings in the Netherlands.


11. As explained in Lokin 2004, p. 81, Ewout van Bleijswijkstra, who gave the Rubensian picture to the city of Delft in 1703, had inherited it from his father, the former burgomaster Heijnderick van Bleijswijkstra.

12. Wichmann 1923, p. 97, no. 22.


REFERENCES: Blankert 1975b, pp. 12–13, 15, fig. 3, cites the painting as an example of Bramer's work in Delft; Bader in Milwaukee 1976, p. 102, fig. 23, comparing Bramer's Queen of Sheba before Solomon (private collection, U.S.A.), notes that Bramer was "singularly fond of subjects with King Solomon"; Blankert 1978b, pp. 11–12, fig. 4, repeats Blankert 1975b; Montias 1982, p. 147, fig. 6, dates the painting to the 1650s; Blankert in Ailourd, Blankert, and Montias 1986, pp. 71–72, fig. 48, repeats Blankert 1975b; Plomp 1986, p. 110 n. 5, compares the composition of this picture with that of Christian van Couwenbergh's Historical Subject (Semiramis Commanding Her Husband's Death), of about 1640; F. Sutton 1986, p. 180, considers the work "especially attractive"; Maier-Pfreusker 1991, p. 189, accepts Montias's dating to the 1650s and suggests that Van Couwenbergh referred to this composition when designing his lost painting of a historical subject (see Plomp 1986); Delft 1994, p. 172 (under no. 48), fig. 48a, compares Bramer's different treatment of the subject in his painting in Lübeck; Bactier 1995, p. 327; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 64–65, fig. 68, compares the picture with the Van Couwenbergh painting mentioned above (see Plomp 1986) and concludes that "the two painters were working along parallel lines about 1640."


EX COLL.: Gift of National Surety Company, 1911 11.73
It is not known when Breenbergh returned to the Netherlands, but it was probably about 1629–30. In September 1633, he married the Protestant Rebecca Schellingwou (after 1604–1667), daughter of a prominent cloth merchant. The couple lived in Amsterdam in the Dijkstraat and, from 1648, at various addresses on the Lauriersgracht, the Prinsengracht, and the Herengracht. They had two sons, Pieter and Hendrik, neither of whom went into their father's profession. Breenbergh was buried on October 5, 1657, in the Oude Kerk.

The artist flourished during the 1630s, when he treated biblical subjects (especially Old Testament scenes) and mythological themes. Although Breenbergh incorporated motifs he had drawn in Italy, his compositions, palette, and demonstrative figures recall Lastman and other history painters working in Amsterdam. A few portraits by Breenbergh are known. Portraits presumed to be of Breenbergh and his wife, painted by Jacob Backer (q.v.) in 1644, are in the Amsterdam's Historisch Museum.

Breenbergh had no known pupils and did not exercise much influence on the art of his time. It is possible that Amsterdam was not the best market for his work; most of the Dutch painters who were successful in a similar vein—even some whose work was influenced by Breenbergh—lived in Utrecht or in the area of The Hague. His drawings were especially important for Jan de Bisschop (1628–1671), the lawyer and gifted amateur draftsman who moved from Amsterdam to The Hague.

1. Most of these biographical details are adopted from Roethlisberger 1981, pp. 2–4. See also Nico Schouten, Sijtje Eevertse in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 4, p. 733, especially on Breenbergh's connection with Van Poelenburgh; on that with Bril, see also Schatborn in Amsterdam 2001, p. 66.
3. Roethlisberger in Amsterdam 1981, p. 4, figs. 218a,b.
22. The Preaching of John the Baptist

Oil on wood, 21⅞ x 29⅞ in. (54.6 x 75.2 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): B.B.f. A 1634
The painting is very well preserved.


This well-preserved panel of 1634 has long been recognized as one of Breenbergh’s finest works. The artist had recently settled in Amsterdam, and the most highly regarded history painter in the city, Pieter Lastman (1583–1633), had just died. It is possible that Breenbergh intended the picture as a special demonstration of his abilities. The dramatic distribution of Roman ruins, castles, and hill towns in a panoramic Italian landscape, the remarkably diversified survey of curious types in the crowd around John the Baptist, the choice of a biblical subject that had particular resonance in the Netherlands, and the care devoted to byverk (as embellishments or accessories were called in contemporary descriptions of paintings), like the repousse of plants and still-life elements in the foreground, suggest that after a decade’s residence in Rome the artist intended, by producing masterworks like this one, to make a name for himself in his native country.

The Baptist, holding a cross-shaped staff on a hillock to the right, points upward and commands his listeners, “Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand” (Matt. 3:2). Each of the Gospels tells the story of John preaching in the wilderness of Judaea, but for Breenbergh’s composition the most interesting account is that of the patron saint of painters, Saint Luke.

And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching
Figure 18. Detail of Breenbergh’s *The Preaching of John the Baptist* (Pl. 22)
the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth; And all flesh shall see the Salvation of God. (Luke 3:1-6)

John then enjoins the people to acts of charity, urging them to live within their means. To the publicans he says, “Exact no more than that which is appointed you,” and to the soldiers, “Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages” (Luke 3:12–14).1

Rather as some figures in the crowd attend less to the preacher than to people nearby, the viewer’s glance is drawn to secondary figures, especially the spectacularly plumbed soldier in the center of the painting. The figure’s extravagant chapeau, colorful silk costume, and cocky contrapposto are typical of the mercenary soldiers known as Landsknechten (lansquenets), a favorite subject of sixteenth-century German printmakers.2 Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.), Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem (1562–1638), Rembrandt, and other Dutch painters adopted the type when they depicted soldiers of the past, mythological warriors, and imaginary mercenaries of their own time.3 The inclusion of exotically dressed characters in outdoor preaching scenes was common from at least the time of Pieter Brueghel the Elder (ca. 1525–1569), whose Sermon of Saint John the Baptist (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest), dated 1566, was known through many versions by his sons Pieter Brueghel the Younger (1564/65–1637/38) and Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568–1625), and by artists in their circle.4

A different preaching scene, Jacques Callot’s etching The Sermon of Saint Amandus, of about 1622, was the source for Breenbergh’s Landsknecht and for the Roman soldiers in the right foreground of the Museum’s picture. The old man—a publican?—with a walking stick and keys attached to his belt could have been adopted from the same print.5 However, the most prominent figures in the center of the composition also bring to mind Rembrandt’s recent introduction of conspicuous witnesses to biblical events, such as the turbaned figure of Joseph of Arimathea in the foreground of The Descent from the Cross, of about 1632–35 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), and in his etching of the same subject (1633).6

Only a firsthand inspection of Breenbergh’s painting allows one to appreciate the variety of intriguing individuals who surround John the Baptist (fig. 18). Figures mounted on camels, horses, and donkeys represent different social stations; women range from apparent princesses to impoverished peasants. A noteworthy figure is the pensive soldier seated at the foot of the preacher’s mound. In the central group, a priestly, comic character presses his hands together and smiles in adulation. The more distant areas in the left background are occupied by travelers resting in the shadows of the ruins and by figures at a well. An archway flooded by sunlight yields a distant view. The Roman ruins, derived from Breenbergh’s own drawings of the Colosseum, and the fallen column to the left may be meant to suggest the decline of an empire as a different kingdom comes.7 Accordingly, it may be wondered whether the mother and child in the foreground were intended as anachronistic reminders of the Virgin and Child (with whom John the Baptist often appears as an infant), and whether the child’s playful pose, with one arm vigorously raised, is a conscious reference to Christ at the Last Judgment, as seen in Michelangelo’s fresco in the Sistine Chapel.

The Preaching of John the Baptist had been a popular subject in Netherlandish art since the time of Joachim Patinir (ca. 1480–1524) and Herri met de Bles (ca. 1510–after ca. 1550). Scholars have debated whether Bruegel’s painting of 1566 (mentioned above) was intended to refer to the Spanish suppression of Protestant worship and the Calvinist response of Laagerepreken (hedge preaching) to large crowds in the fields surrounding Antwerp, Breda, and ’s Hertogenbosch.8 The practice spread to Holland in July 1566, when mass sermons were held outside Hoorn (where Breenbergh probably grew up), and then near Amsterdam and Haarlem, followed by Utrecht, Leeuwarden, and elsewhere.9 The power of the evangelical movement and the fact that Bruegel filled most of his composition with a close view of the crowd surrounding John the Baptist suggest that the painting did have political significance. More relevant to Breenbergh’s picture is the fact that a considerable number of Dutch artists treated the same subject between the 1590s and the 1630s. They include Bloemaert (in as many as a dozen examples),10 Cornelisz van Haarlem (in the large canvas of 1602 in the National Gallery, London),11 Lastman (in a lost painting of 1611),12 Joachim Wtewael (in a panel dated 1618; Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen),13 Claes Moeyaert (in a panel of 1631; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm),14 and Rembrandt (in the grisaille painting, of about 1634–35, in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin).15 Rembrandt’s composition is thought to have been made in preparation for an etching.

Of course, not all these works would have been understood by contemporary viewers as referring to Protestant worship, to the Dutch struggle for liberation from Spain (which was ongoing in the 1630s), or to both these closely related concerns.16 But
the Preaching of Saint John was a favorite subject of Protestant collectors, and the Protestant mode of worship—preaching the word of God in the vernacular from a pulpit surrounded by a congregation—was a frequent subject in Dutch literature and art (for example, the “Sermons,” as the pictures were sometimes called in contemporary inventories, that painters such as Pieter Saenredam (1597–1665) and Emanuel de Witte (q.v. set in the interiors of actual Dutch churches).18

Furthermore, several biblical and mythological subjects, as well as historical subjects set in ancient times, were interpreted as analogous to, or even prefigurations of, the Dutch war of independence.19 One of the keenest chroniclers of the new nation’s history and mythology, the preacher and historian Willem Baudart (1605–1640), in his 1616 account of the so-called Nassau Wars against Spain, explicitly compared John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness with the Netherlandish hedge preachers of 1666.20 Breenbergh’s painting, if it was meant to evoke nationalistic sentiment, would have recalled not only the rebellion of the 1600s and the contemporary wars of religion (in which mercenaries played a large part) but also the currently popular stories of the Batavian nation, the ancient Dutch people who rose as the Roman Empire fell.21

The picture was in particularly distinguished collections between the 1770s and the 1840s. Johan van der Marck, who bought it at auction in 1768, was a four-time burgomaster of Leiden and a director of the West Indies Company in Amsterdam. In the catalogue of his own collection, he praised the present work as being “as handsome in its drawing and Imagination of the Passions, variety of clothing, and elaborate-ness of Painting, as is to be seen by this master.” At the sale of Van der Marck’s estate in 1777, the painting was bought by the dealer Pieter Fouquet, who acted for or sold it to Pierre-Louis-Paul Randon de Boisset, the receiver general of France. At his estate sale of 1777, the work went to the great collector Joseph-François, comte de Vaudreuil, who in 1784 sent it with his other non-French pictures to auction.22 In about 1802, the painting was sold by a Parisian dealer to Pieter van Winter, a wealthy merchant in Amsterdam, who in the preceding thirty years had formed one of the greatest private collections in the Netherlands. At Van Winter’s death in 1807, “Mr. van Winter’s collection,” which many connoisseurs visited in the family home on the Keizersgracht, was inherited by his daughters, Lucretia van Winter and her younger sister Anniewes. During the next fifteen years, Lucretia added fifty-three old masters to the collection (her own Vermeer, The Milkmaid, joined her father’s Vermeer, The Little Street; both are now in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). In 1822, Lucretia married Hendrik Six van Hillegom, and her share of the Van Winter pictures was added to the works of art owned by that famous family of collectors. Their two sons (see Ex Coll.) gradually sold off the Six van Hillegom–Van Winter collection during the second half of the nineteenth century.23 The Breenbergh was one of the first pictures to go, sold in 1851 to the well-known Brussels art dealer Charles J. Nieuwenhuys. The painting’s later history in England, Czechoslovakia, and America has been discussed elsewhere.24

1. For an interesting commentary on John the Baptist’s message and the broad audience for which it was intended, see Walter Wink in Metzger and Coogan 1993, pp. 371–73.
3. See Roethlisberger 1993, nos. 18–20, pls. 43–45; Van Thiel 1999, no. 181, pls. xxiv and 189 (Venus and Mars, 1604; the male costume is described on p. 123); ibid., no. 43, pls. 177, 178 (soldiers in Cornelisz van Haarlem’s Preaching of John the Baptist, of 1602, National Gallery, London); and Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, p. 84 (under no. 1), where Hans Holbein the Younger’s drawing Two Languetys is compared with Rembrandt’s Bust of a Man in Gorget and Cap, of about 1626–27 (private collection).
7. The third chapter of Luke begins with a sonorous reminder of Roman authority: “Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness.” Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 201, fig. 3, illustrates one of Breenbergh’s drawings of the Colosseum. Similar ruins occur in a number of Breenbergh’s earlier paintings.
8. Bruegel’s reference to contemporary events was evidently first suggested in Glück 1932, pp. 73–74 (under no. 27). The question is reviewed in Katona 1963.
14. A. Tümpel 1974, pp. 257–58, no. 94, fig. 238 (see also nos. 95–97); Stockholm 1992–93, no. 42.
REFERENCES: Possibly Hoet 1732–70, vol. 1, p. 123, no. 12, as "een kapitaal stuk van Bartholomeus Breenbergh, zeer heerlyk geschildert," records such a picture's sale in Amsterdam on September 12, 1728; Hoet 1732–70, vol. 1, p. 133, no. 9, as "St. Jans Predicatie, kapitaal, van B. Breenbergh. 110 – 0," would appear to record this painting's sale in Amsterdam on May 7 and 8, 1709; and p. 135, no. 15, as "Sint Jans Predicatie, vol Beelden, in een Landschap, zynze een kapitaal Stuk van Bartholomeus Breenbergh, zeer heerlyk geschildert. 430 – 0," appears to record the picture's sale in Amsterdam on July 17, 1709, and possibly p. 240, no. 2, as "Johannes de Dooper in de Woestyn, van B. Breenbergh, 310 – 0," records such a picture's sale in Amsterdam on March 22, 1720; Joullain 1783, p. 26, records the picture's sale from the Randon de Boisset collection in 1777; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 1, p. 179, listed as in the Randon de Boisset collection and (erroneously) as in the collection of Gerrit Brauncamp; Feinblatt 1949, pp. 268, 271, describes the composition as an example of Breenbergh's "standardization of the ruin landscape for the background of any historical epoch"; Bille 1961, vol. 2, pp. 90–91, clarifies that the present picture was not the one in the collection of Gerrit Brauncamp; "Notable Works of Art Now on the Market," Burlington Magazine 91 (1969), p. 416, pl. XIX, lists the painting as with the Schweitzer Gallery, New York, and (erroneously) as from the collections of Peter Paul Rubens and Gerrit Brauncamp, Foucatt in Paris 1970–71, p. 29 (under no. 28), compares the painting with "Christ Healing the Sick," dated 1631?, in the Louvre; Fuchs 1971b, pp. 80–81, fig. 31, compares it with Rembrandt's oil sketch of the same subject in Berlin, maintaining that the landscape by Breenbergh is more stately and Italianate; Bénêté 1976, vol. 2, p. 292, as in the Vauvreuil sale (see Ex Coll.); Sales 1977–80, vol. 1, pp. 239–40, 366, fig. 41.22, and vol. 3, p. 1000 n. 25, notes the adaptation of figures from German prints or perhaps from Filippo Napoleoni; Roethlisberger 1981, pp. 17, 68, no. 165, pls. 165 and 165 detail, notes that the painting was called a masterpiece in the sale catalogue of 1802 (see Ex Coll.), that the ruins are (as in earlier paintings by Breenbergh) inspired by the Colosseum, and that the figure of the soldier in the right foreground was borrowed from an etching by Callot (see text above); Haak 1984, p. 144, fig. 298, "whereabouts unknown," offers an unhelpful comparison with Van Poelenburgh's approach to composition; Vergara 1985, p. 405, sees the painting as "in a vastly different style—or 'styles,'" than Breenbergh's work of the Italian years; A. Adams in New York 1988, pp. 24–25 (ill.), 39, no. 7, suggests that the artist "dignifies and heroizes the scene" by "setting the painting [sic] in a distant and ancient location"; Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 197–203, no. 14, offers a long and partly erroneous account of the picture's provenance (with interesting biographical details), and repeats a few of Roethlisberger's observations; Roethlisberger in New York 1991, pp. 33–35, no. 12, sees the painting as a "masterful example of the huge strides" Breenbergh made shortly after returning to Amsterdam, where he had "renewed contact with Pieter Lastman," and draws attention to the distinguished collectors who owned the work in the second half of the eighteenth century; W. Liedtke in "Recent Acquisitions," MMA Bulletin 50, no. 2 (Fall 1992), p. 31 (ill.); Baezter 1995, p. 507; Priem 1997, pp. 121, 123, 188, fig. 31, and p. 218, no. 28, for the first time records the painting in the collection of Pieter van Winter and of his daughter Lucretia van Winter (see Ex Coll.), Wintermann 2000, pp. 118, 120, fig. 73, "painted while Rembrandt was working on his version"; Kuretsky in Poughkeepsie–Saratoga–Louisville 2005–6, pp. 214–16, no. 53, describes the subject and the artist's treatment of it, suggests that a distinction is made between figures in light and figures in areas of darkness, compares Rembrandt's grisaille painting in Berlin, and mentions hedge preachers in the Netherlands. 


EX COLL.: : Sale, Amsterdam, September 12, 1708, no. 12, for Fl 450; : Sale, Amsterdam, May 7–8, 1709, no. 9, for Fl 150; : Sale, Amsterdam, July 17, 1709, no. 15, for Fl 430; : Sale, Amsterdam, March 22, 1720, no. 2, for Fl 510; Theodore Boetemaker and his wife, Jacoba Elisabeth ten Grootenhuyys, Amsterdam (until 1768; her estate sale, Amsterdam, March 30, 1768, no. 2, for Fl 510 to Van der Marck); Johan van der Marck, Leiden (1768–73; his estate sale, Amsterdam, August 25, 1773, no. 30, for Fl 800 to Fouquet); Pierre-Louis-Paul Randon de Boisset, Paris (until 1777; his estate sale, Rémy and Julliet, Paris, February 27ff., 1777, no. 96, for 5,019.19 livres); Joseph-François, comte de Vaudreuil, Paris (1777–84; his sale, Paris, November 24–25, 1784, no. 40, for 4,990 livres to Lengler); sale, Paillet and Delaroch, Paris, July 19–29, 1802, no. 13, for 1,881 livres to Paillet; [Alexandre Paillet, Paris, 1802; probably sold to Van Winter in or shortly after 1802]; Pieter Nicolaas Simonsz van Winter, Amsterdam (in or shortly after 1802–d. 1877); his daughter, Lucretia Johanna van Winter, Amsterdam (1807–22); Lucretia Johanna van Winter and her husband, Hendrik Six van Hillegom (1822–her d. 1845; his d. 1847); their sons, Jan Pieter Six van Hillegom and Pieter Hendrik Six van Vromade, Amsterdam (1847–51; [their] anonymous sale, November 25, 1851, no. 7, for Fl 250 to Nieuwenhuyys); [Nieuwenhuyys, Brussels and London, from 1851]; Charles Scarsbrick, Scarsbrick Hall or Wrightington Hall, Lancashire (until 1801; his estate sale, Christie's, London, May 10–15, 1861, no. 675, for £28 10s. to Bohn); Henry George Bohn, North End House, Twickenham (1861–85; his estate sale, London, March 20, 1885, no. 200); J. Passmore Edwards, London (until 1902; sale, Christie's, London, April 7, 1902, no. 60, for £19 19s. to Schroeder); Baron Karl Kuffner de Dioszegh, Castle Dioszegh, near Bratislava (until 1940); his son, Baron Raoul Kuffner de Dioszegh and Baroness de Dioszegh [the painter Tamara de Lempicka], New York (1940–48; sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, November 18, 1948, no. 29, for $475); [Paul Drey, New York, 1948–51]; Julius Weitzner, New York, in 1951; sold to Chrysler]; Walter P. Chrysler Jr., New York (1951–at least 1958); [M. R. Schweitzer, New York, by 1969; sold to Humann on May 5, 1969, for $24,000]; Christian Humann, New York (lent to MMA 1970–73; sold to Feigen on December 18, 1973, for $90,000); Richard L. Feigen, New York (1974–91; sold to MMA); Purchase, The Annenberg Foundation Gift, 1991–1991.305

1. This and the above lots must refer either to the Museum's painting or to Breenbergh's larger picture of the same subject, Roethlisberger 1981, no. 203 (collection of Richard Feigen, New York).
2. Documentation and information on Humann's purchase and sale of the picture were kindly sent to the present writer by Claus Virch of The Christian Humann Foundation, in a letter dated October 7, 2003.
Quirijn van Brekelenkam

Zwammerdam? after 1622–ca. 1669 Leiden

Quirijn Gerritz van Brekelenkam, a Leiden painter of humble household scenes, craftsmen and shopkeepers, hermits, and occasionally more stylish figures, was probably born shortly after 1622 in Zwammerdam, a village on the Oude Rijn river just north of Gouda, halfway between Leiden and Utrecht. He and his three sisters were the children of Gerrit Adriaensz de Flitter and Magdalena Crijnendr. The artist adopted the name Brekelenkam, which may refer to a small place (kam is short for kamp, or camp). Most likely, he trained in Leiden, where he joined the painters’ guild on March 18, 1648. A few weeks later, on April 11, he married Marie Jansdr Carle (or Scharle) in the Catholic church at Rijnswaterswoede, a village northeast of Leiden. During the next seven years, four girls and two boys were born to the couple. In August 1665, Marie died. Van Brekelenkam remarried a year later, in September 1666. With his second wife, the widow Elisabeth van Beaumont, he had three children, a daughter and two sons. All the painter’s children were baptized Catholic in Leiden. Van Brekelenkam was still living in May 1668, when he paid dues to the guild; a work dated 1669 is attributed to him. He probably died in 1669, perhaps of the plague that spread in Leiden during that year, claiming thousands of lives in 1669 and 1670.

The artist appears to have struggled financially. Various debts are recorded, for rather small amounts. Another sign of ill fortune is the inconsistent quality of the painter’s production. An anonymous writer of the eighteenth century made the same observation, reporting that Van Brekelenkam was “a little man, [who] had many children and domestic cares and very little means, which is the reason for his having done many bad pieces, which he tossed off quickly in order to get some money in his pocket.” In the same account, it is said that the painter’s colleagues “often sought his company, as he was very witty and funny, having as well the gift of being able to imitate everyone’s speech and mannerisms.”

The two pictures in the Museum’s collection convey reliable impressions of Van Brekelenkam’s work at the lower level (but by no means the bottom) of his qualitative range (Pl. 23) and of his abilities when making a special effort (Pl. 24). The paintings also suggest the scope of his subject matter, from working people in modest dwellings to the much less frequent scenes of fashionable figures in comfortable interiors. The latter works date from the 1660s and bring Delft painters to mind, though Van Brekelenkam’s sources of inspiration may be found right in Leiden, with Gabriël Metsu (q.v.) and followers of Gerrit Dou (q.v.) such as Adriaen van Gaesbeck (1621–1650).

Many works by Van Brekelenkam depict diligent craftsmen and shopkeepers—cobblerstailors, spinners, fishmongers, and vegetable sellers. One of the finest examples of this genre is Interior of a Tailor’s Shop, dated 1653 (Worcester Art Museum). Van Brekelenkam’s domestic subjects include kitchen maids, lacemakers, and young women going to market (most reminiscent of Nicolaes Maes; q.v.), and old women preparing a meal. Scenes of child care are not uncommon. Occasionally the artist employed the niche-like window favored by Dou and Metsu (for example, in The Gold Weigher, of 1668, in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich); other pictures (again, of the 1660s) reveal an admiration of Gerard ter Borch (q.v.). A few paintings of hermit monks might be thought to reflect the sympathy of a poor Catholic painter. What is more certain is that Van Brekelenkam’s variety of themes, all of them well tested in the marketplace, betray not only imagination and industry but also the persistent need to turn out a popular product. The artist did have at least one important patron, however, Hendrik Bugge van Ring (d. 1669). Of the 237 paintings owned by the Catholic collector in 1667, eighteen were by Van Brekelenkam, including, interestingly, several of saints.

1. The date is given as September 5, 1656, in Lasius 1992, p. 8, but as September 24, 1656, in Leiden 1988, p. 80, citing the same document. The later date is correct (kind communication of André van Noort, Archivist, Regionaal Archief Leiden, July 21, 2006).
3. See Lasius 1992, p. 9, where two debts are described. The author dismisses the claim made in many short biographies of Van Brekelenkam that he obtained a license to sell beer and brandy.
4. Ibid., p. 11, for the Dutch and this translation. The anonymous author wrote an unpublished commentary on Hoet 1752–70. The phenomenon of large output and poor quality is found in the oeuvres of a number of contemporary painters, for example Aert van der Neer (q.v.).
23. The Spinner

Oil on wood, 19 x 23¼ in. (48.3 x 64.1 cm)
Signed and dated (on base of spinning wheel): Q V B 1653

The painting is well preserved. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals that a round platter beneath the black cast-iron pot at lower right was painted out by the artist.

Purchase, 1871 71.110

This panel, acquired in the 1871 Purchase, is a typical work by Van Brekelenkam, signed with his initials and dated 1653. While hardly the equal of contemporary works such as the Interior of a Tailor’s Shop, also dated 1653 (Worcester Art Museum), the painting is entirely consistent in execution with such pictures as Man Spinning and Woman Scraping Carrots, of about 1653–54, in the John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art.¹

As in the Philadelphia painting, the subject here is an elderly couple seen together in the main room of a very modest home. The woman spins yarn while the man sits with his hands folded over a walking stick. Not surprisingly, he wears a coat and fur hat in this interior scene, with its feeble fire in the hearth to the right, and a spiral staircase where heat would rise faster than the occupants could. The artist has framed the view with a silhouetted water pump and wooden bucket to the left, and cookware by a rough bench to the right. Red-glazed earthenware pots, one turned over on a damaged platter, flank an iron cooking pot with a wooden lid. The arrangement suggests not so much disorder as recent washing up. A pewter tankard stands on the bench, stitching foreground and background together. The still-life elements, with their glints of light, textures, and function as repoussoirs, recall similar interiors (with L-shaped floor plans, as here) by the Antwerp artist David Teniers the Younger (1610–1690), and by the Rotterdam painters Pieter de Bloot (1601–1688), Herman (1609–1684) and Cornelis Saftleven (1607–1681), and Hendrick Sorgh (q.v.).²

On the rear wall, above the small doorway (which may lead into a storeroom), an old map bearing the inscription "MARE GERM(ANICUM)" (as the North Sea was usually labeled) peels off the wall. Like the map of South America in the Philadelphia picture, the large sheet of parchment is meant merely as cheap decoration, like a faded poster in modern times. The small cupboard, topped by a plate or colander and a Bible, holds some meat (smoked ham?) on a plate, a wedge of cheese in a bowl, and a loaf of bread. The large leather bag hanging on the pillar must be the old man's.

Most of the motifs in the composition—an elderly couple with a spinning wheel, a pump in shadow to the left, the door, cupboard, and spiral staircase—are found in an earlier painting attributed to Gerrit Dou (formerly with P. de Boer, Amsterdam),³ though Van Brekelenkam's figures have different features and clothing, the objects are not the same, and the earlier work lacks the view to the fireplace and motifs in the right foreground. Perhaps an even closer prototype was known to Van Brekelenkam. Like other types of interiors introduced or made familiar by Dou, this one had a long life in Leiden. All of Van Brekelenkam's interiors are invented, using the local pictorial dialect. "The same interior," as one scholar loosely describes it, occurs not only in the Philadelphia painting but also in the cluttered Kitchen Interior, dated 1659 (Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, Geneva), and in a number of other works.⁴

In Leiden, one of the leading centers of the Dutch cloth trade, spinning was a widespread cottage industry, with both men and women doing piecework at home, supplying yarn to factory looms.⁵ The act of using a spinning wheel, which in Maerten van Heemskerck's portraits of a well-to-do couple (1529; Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) is a sign of virtue on the distaff side,⁶ in Van Brekelenkam's work reflects a hard reality, people working more than twelve hours a day for pennies. Of
course, the Dutch painter was no Courbet; his picture offers praise for hard work and humility rather than social commentary. The Bible placed on top of the cupboard serves as a reminder of the couple’s prayer before each meal (itself a frequent subject in the artist’s oeuvre). The elderly were considered exemplary in their contentment with little, their diligence and spirituality. These points were made by Johan de Brune in his book Emblemata of zinne-werck (Amsterdam, 1624), beneath the engraved illustration of an old woman who spins while her husband whittles by the fire.7

1. Philadelphia—Berlin—London 1984, nos. 18, 19. The reservations of Lasius (see Refs.) can in good part be explained by his never having viewed the work. The fine quality of certain passages such as the old man’s face and the bench to the right cannot be appreciated in photographs.

2. On the approach to space in the work of Rotterdam genre painters and their relationship to Antwerp, see Liedtke 2000a, pp. 159–60.

3. Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 1, no. 247, as by Dou between 1630 and 1635. The Dou specialist Ronni Baez has not seen the picture but considers it doubtful as an autograph work.


5. P. Sutton in Philadelphia—Berlin—London 1984, pp. 160, 161 n. 4, comments further on the textile industry, and cites social historians. Labor was extremely cheap in good part because of the flood of immigrants from the Spanish Netherlands. In England, where there was also a cottage industry of spinners, the earliest known use of the term “homespun” dates from 1591 (according to lexicographers). See also Haak 1984, pp. 222–23.


and by other authors. Elderly people in Dutch genre paintings are also discussed in Franits 1993c. On the subject of spinning as a virtuous activity, see also Dresden-Leiden 2000-2001, pp. 49-51, and Stukkenbrock in Mat et al. 1995, pp. 94-96, no. 36.


Ex coll.: Copley Ashley Cooper, 6th Earl of Shaftesbury, Saint Giles’s House, Wimborne, Dorset (until d. 1831); his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 31, 1852, no. 18, for £5 10s.; Baron de Heusch, Château de l’Andweck (until 1870); his estate sale, Étienne and Victor Le Roy, Brussels, May 9-10, 1870, no. 4, for £300 to Le Roy; [Étienne Le Roy, Brussels, through León Gauchez, Paris, 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870-77; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.110

24. Sentimental Conversation

Oil on wood, 16 7/8 x 13 7/8 in. (43.3 x 35.2 cm)
Signed (lower right, on table stretcher): QB (in monogram)

The painting is generally well preserved, except for paint layers in the ash gray cloth draped over the table to the lower right. This passage appears disrupted and blanched, possibly due to the discoloration of a small pigment. The panel retains its original thickness, with bevels intact. There is a tight cluster of three microscopic pinpoints near the center of the composition, coincident with the lower left corner of the landscape on the wall and toward which all theorthogonals of the perspective scheme recede. Infrared reflectography reveals that the upper sleeve of the woman’s velvet jacket was painted over a wide band of brocade.

The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.19

This painting in the Friedsam Collection, one of Van Brekelenkam’s finest works, dates from the early 1660s. In 1913, Bode described it as “a chef-d’oeuvre,” and as signed with the artist’s monogram. There appears no reason to doubt the authenticity of the QB in monogram (B inside a large Q) to the lower right, on the stretcher of the table.

The popular subject is presented as if it were based on direct observation, which the figures may well have been. A gentleman in fashionable clothing and a crisp linen collar has come calling on a young lady in a handsome house. The woman is also richly attired, in an ermine-trimmed, garnet-colored velvet jacket, which like her skirt and cap reveals chic good taste. Her posture and the way she holds a wineglass are exactly comme il faut. She takes pleasure in the anecdote or comment she conveys, gesturing unconsciously with her left hand. Van Brekelenkam was surely less aware than present-day viewers that the woman’s prettiness is of a common Dutch type, but he is almost as sensitive as Gerard ter Borch (q.v.) in tracing her profile and the curls gracing her temples and her long neck.

The young man has mastered the art of appearing absorbed in conversation while his eyes are as attentive as his ears. In the way he holds his hat, rests his right hand, and assumes a casual contrapposto on his chair, he could win Castiglione’s approval as a potential courtier. The figures sit quite close together, which seems consistent with their body language and looks of absorption and implies that they are fairly well acquainted and far from indifferent to each other’s charms.

Like Vermeer’s Cavalier and Young Woman, of about 1657 (Frick Collection, New York), where two similarly posed and juxtaposed figures are seen, the present picture employs familiar conventions of depicting courtship. The couple have played or will play a duet, he on the violin, she on the lute that lies on the table. Draped over the table is the visitor’s sword belt, elaborately fringed and lined in scarlet. The hilt of the sword, an impressive piece of sculpted silver, is poised above a leather volume on the table, in a brief encounter of contemplative and active, indoor and outdoor lives. The book, which appears to be neither a Bible nor a collection of songs, is there to suggest (perhaps to the suitor) that the lady was reading as she waited.
for the man to arrive. A stoneware pitcher provides a point of focus for the seemingly random arrangement of objects on the table, and adds at least two more textures to those that are surveyed in the still life.

Many pictures of polite company, especially those painted during the 1650s and 1660s in Leiden and Delft, show a similar corner of space, with a receding wall and windows on the left, a beamed ceiling overhead, and two or three figures grouped around or next to a table. While it could be said that no other painting by Van Brekelenkam is so reminiscent of De Hooch and Vermeer, the similarity reflects a complex regional development rather than direct influence between particular works.¹ Even the closing of the nearest shutter over the window is found often in works of similar composition, and here lends the scene a slightly stronger sense of privacy. To the right of the upper windows, the shadowy form of a birdcage floats in front of the window moldings. This routine reference to virginity (lost, endangered, or closely guarded) was sensibly taken out by overpainting, which has become transparent with time. The rocky landscape, very much in the style of Allart van Everdingen (1621–1675),² remains the only symbolic reference to the progress of love, which can resemble a rocky road. But here, the wayfarer on a steep path, seen to the right between the heads of the courting couple, intimates that they have chosen the more difficult path of virtue, like Hercules—and for that matter like the vast majority of Dutch men and women who were interested in finding a mate. It is true that many foreigners were surprised at the freedoms afforded to young couples in the Netherlands, where meeting without chaperones was commonplace.³ But Dutch courtship was regulated by firm convictions as well as by various rules. One of the more appealing aspects of this painting is the way in which natural feelings, or at least gestures and expressions, emerge in a situation where proper behavior is precisely prescribed.

The painter depicted a similarly posed young woman a number of times, although never so successfully as here. The
closest resemblance to both figures is that found in a picture last seen on the art market in the 1930s (fig. 19). 4 Women with different features but approximately the same pose, and seen from the same angle are found in paintings in the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig, and elsewhere. 5 Two of these pictures are dated 1662 and support a comparable date for the Museum's picture, where the composition is also typical of about 1661–62. The superior quality and stronger individualization found in the present painting suggest that it precedes the other works. A similar landscape occurs in The Seller's Application, in the Suermontd-Ludwig-Museum, Aachen, and in the Cardplayers, formerly in Vaduz. 6

1. These stylistic conventions, typical of the South Holland region, are described in Liedtke 2000a, chap. 4.

2. See, for example, A. Davies 2001, pls. 65, 154, V, VIII. Stechow's remark (see Refs.) that the landscape is “Flemish-looking” is a surprising slip.

3. See Frantis 1993, pp. 60, 211 n. 127.

4. Lasius 1992, no. 840. The back of the old photograph of this picture in the curatorial files is inscribed “36 x 47 cm./bois” and “GK Paris/GK New York.” This must stand for the Galerie Kleinberger of Paris and New York, which left a photographic archive to the Museum. A version of this composition, with a maid cooking oysters to the left and a child standing next to her, was formerly in the collection of P. A. B. Widener, Philadelphia (ibid., no. 819).

5. Klessmann 1983, pp. 57–38, no. 312, and Lasius 1992, no. 231 (Couple Playing Cards, dated 1662). See also Two Women and an Old Man Drinking Wine (art market, 1968; Lasius 1992, no. 221); Couple Drinking Wine (art market, 1982; ibid., no. 222, pl. 74); and Man Playing a Lute and a Woman with a Parrot, dated 1662 (art market, 1986; ibid., no. 842).

6. As noted by Stechow (see Refs.) and Lasius 1992, no. 215, pl. 71 (Aachen), and no. 230 (Vaduz).

References: Bode 1973, preface (unpaged), p. 46, no. 27, pl. 27, describes the painting as “A young Couple, taking wine together,” signed with a monogram, and considers the picture “one of the very best” known works by the artist, and close to Metsu; Valentiner 1928a, p. 16, as “The Entertaining Suiton,” signed in monogram; Stechow 1960, p. 177 n. 27, finds the landscape painting on the wall in other pictures by Van Brekelenkam, with slight variations, here being “more Flemish-looking”; Vey 1966, p. 214, no. 188 (ill.), as in the collection of Johann Peter Weyer, Cologne, in 1832, as by Metsu; Liedtke 1990, p. 52, mentioned as in the Friedsam Collection and as exceptional in the artist’s oeuvre; Lasius 1992, pp. 47, 64, 144, no. 223, pl. xi, dates the work to about 1663, notes similar figures in other paintings by the artist, describes the suiton (incorrectly) as a young officer, and the violin (dittro) as a sign of “moral laxity”; Liedtke 1992a, p. 104 n. 12, compares the pose of the man with that of the male figure in Vermeer’s Cavalier and Young Woman; Beecher 1995, p. 327, with no mention of the monogram; Liedtke 2001, p. 189 n. 12 (reprint of Liedtke 1992d); Frantis 2004, pp. 132–34, fig. 119, sees the influence of Ter Borch, and places the painting in its social context; Fusenig 2006, p. 50, notes the similar landscape paintings in the backgrounds of the Aachen and New York genre scenes.


Ex Coll.: Probably Johann Peter Weyer, Cologne (in 1853); 1 Lady Wantage, Lockinge, London; E. A. Leatham, Miserden Park, Cirencester, Gloucestershire (in 1868); Sir George Donaldson, London; August de Ridder, Schinberg, near Kronberg im Taunus, Germany (d. 1913; his estate, 1913–24); his estate sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, June 2, 1924, no. 7, for FFr 105,000 to Kleinberger; 2 [Kleinberger, Paris and New York, 1924; sold to Friedsam]; Michael Friedsam, New York (1924–d. 1931); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.19

1. See Vey 1966, p. 214, no. 188, Der Besuch, by Metsu. The painting is listed in the 1832 catalogue of Weyer’s collection (no. 248) but not in the 1859 and 1862 catalogues.

Hendrick ter Brugghen

The Hague? 1588–1629 Utrecht

Ter Brugghen was, with Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656) and Dirck van Baburen (ca. 1594/95–1624), one of the most important Dutch painters to work in a Caravaggesque manner during the early decades of the seventeenth century. Honthorst, during his long career, was much more influential in the Netherlands, while the short-lived Baburen’s career was made mostly in Rome, except for the last two or three years of his life, when he was back in Utrecht. Ter Brugghen was certainly the finest painter of the three, with regard to both describing appearances (especially qualities of light) and stylistic refinements. He was highly esteemed by his contemporaries, including Constantijn Huygens, secretary and artistic adviser to the Dutch princes, and evidently by Rubens, who visited Utrecht in 1627 and may also have encountered Ter Brugghen twenty years earlier in Rome. Although the artist died three years before Johannes Vermeer (q.v.) was born, he appears to have made a brief but profound impression on the Delft painter’s early work.¹

The artist’s father, Jan Egbertsz ter Brugghen (or ter Brugge, ca. 1561–1626), probably came from the province of Overijssel, but was in Utrecht by June 1581, when he was appointed secretary to the Court of Utrecht. He had recently married Sophia (Feysgen) Dirckx, a widow. About 1585, Ter Brugghen became bailiff of the Provincial Council of Holland in The Hague, where his son Hendrick was probably born, in 1588.² The future painter may have received his first drawing lessons in the court city, but from about 1602 onward (when his father was intermittently in Utrecht) he was almost certainly, as Joachim von Sandrart claimed, a pupil of the great Utrecht master Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.). Ter Brugghen may be identical with a cadet of his name, who in the spring of 1607 was serving in the army of Ernst Casimir of Nassau-Dietz. If so, he must have begun his long stay in Italy during that year, rather than in 1605 or 1606.³ In any case, he was the only Dutch Caravaggesque painter to have been in Rome during Caravaggio’s lifetime. It is possible that he made a second trip to Italy between 1619 and 1621.⁴

Ter Brugghen was in Milan during the summer of 1614 and then traveled home through Switzerland, together with three minor Dutch artists. He is listed as a member of the Utrecht painters’ guild in the accounts for the year 1616–17. On October 14, 1616, he married Jacomijna (or Jacoba) Verbeeck, who was his elder brother Jan’s stepdaughter. By 1624, the couple had four children: Sophia, Elizabeth, Huberta, and Richard. In January 1625, their fifth child, Johannes, was baptized, and another daughter, Commertgen, was baptized in January 1627. In March 1628, one of the two youngest children died, but another, Aert, was baptized in October 1628. The artist died during a plague on November 1, 1629, at the age of forty or forty-one. A daughter, named Henricgen in his honor, was born in March 1630. Ter Brugghen’s three youngest children died between 1631 and 1633; his wife died in January 1634.⁵

By 1626, the artist and his family lived in a narrow street in the center of Utrecht called the Snippevliet. They rented a large house from Johan Wevel, brother of the painter Joachim Wtewael (q.v.). Honthorst lived on the same street.⁶ Ter Brugghen was closely associated with Baburen between about 1622 and the latter’s death in 1624.

Until 1985, it was assumed that Ter Brugghen was Catholic, based on a genealogical error and the artist’s sympathetic treatment of some explicitly Catholic subjects. However, he was married in a Reformed Church, and the four baptisms of his children that are recorded also took place in Reformed Churches. Bok suggests that Ter Brugghen, who apparently did not become a member of a particular congregation, was Protestant but did not hold orthodox Calvinist views. Sandrart, who knew Ter Brugghen at the end of his life, refers to his “profound but melancholy thoughts.”⁷

No works from the Italian period have been identified so far, but it is clear that Ter Brugghen was influenced not only by Caravaggio but also by his follower Bartolomeo Manfredi (1582–1622) and by other Roman painters such as Orazio Gentileschi (1563–1639) and Carlo Saraceni (ca. 1579–1620). The earliest known dated paintings by Ter Brugghen are The Supper at Emmaus, of 1616 (Toldeo Museum of Art), and The Adoration of the Magi, of 1619 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).⁸ Among his most admired pictures are The Calling of Matthew, of 1621 (Centraal Museum, Utrecht), the pendant paintings of flute players, of 1621 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel), Saint
Sebastian Tended by Irene, of 1625 (Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin, Ohio), and the painting discussed below.9

The Saint Sebastian and earlier pictures such as Christ Crowned with Thorns, of 1620 (Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen), reveal a distinctive use of physiognomic types, poses, restless hands, and compositional devices derived from sixteenth-century and occasionally older Netherlandish sources. Ter Bruggen also retained more of the Late Mannerist qualities that flourished in Utrecht than did his Caravaggesque colleagues; his beautifully peculiar color harmonies might be described as something like Bloemaert’s palette done over from nature. Concerning other aspects of the artist’s style and expressive qualities, the reader should turn elsewhere, especially since Ter Bruggen’s oeuvre was a preoccupation of the two leading scholars of Caravaggism in Northern Europe, Benedict Nicolson and Leonard Slatkes.10


5. See Bok and Kobayashi 1985, pp. 10–13, for all the details in this paragraph, with references to the documents published at the end of the same article. A family tree is provided in ibid., pp. 16–17.


9. Ibid., nos. 5, 10, 11, 20, 21.

10. Slatkes’s survey of Ter Bruggen’s work in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 5, pp. 2–6, is the best short introduction. Wayne Franits is currently editing the late Leonard Slatkes’s monograph on Ter Bruggen.

25. The Crucifixion with the Virgin and Saint John

Oil on canvas, 61 x 40 3/4 in. (154.9 x 102.2 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed: (lower center) HTB
[monogram] fecit/162[ ]; (on cross) IN RI

The painting is well preserved. The gray color of Mary’s cloak and the gray-green cast of the night sky suggest that these passages may contain a discolored smalt pigment.

Funds from various donors, 1916 36.228

Ter Bruggen’s Crucifixion, one of the great treasures of the Museum’s Dutch collection, was painted about 1624–25 in Utrecht, most likely for a Catholic schuilkerk, a clandestine or “hidden” church.1 The picture’s style strongly recalls religious paintings and prints dating from the previous century, and has inspired comparisons (see Refs.) with works by Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528), Matthias Grünewald (ca. 1475/80–1528), and Utrecht’s own Jan van Scorel (1495–1562). As discussed below, some scholars have suggested that the painting may have been made to replace—and even to resemble—an earlier altarpiece. However, the artist also emulated his Northern European predecessors in other religious pictures, where, as here, older forms are combined with everyday figure types and passages of naturalistic description.2 Ter Bruggen’s apparent goal in scenes of Christ’s Passion and similar subjects was to recapture the expressive power of Late Gothic and Early Renaissance Andachtsbilder, or devotional images, which are often remarkable for their tragic character.

In discussing the picture’s “archaic” qualities, most writers refer to its “iconic structure” and to the figure of Christ.3 Christ’s
bony, angular, greenish gray body, with its pinched torso, sinewy arms, and tortured hands, has reminded many viewers of Grünewald's Crucifixion scenes, but the pose of Ter Bruggen's Savior is almost graceful compared with Grünewald's grim figures of Christ, and his skin is smooth rather than exoriated. Comparison of Grünewald's Small Crucifixion, of about 1511/20 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), with the engraving made after it by Raphael Sadeler the Elder in 1605 (fig. 20) reveals similar adjustments to contemporary taste and style (the drapery, for example, has taken on volume, rhythm, and more elaborate folds). Sadeler's print was commissioned specifically as a reproduction, and it helps to clarify how Ter Bruggen's figure of Christ (which in its pose follows current conventions) represents a Baroque emulation of earlier art, not the untempered imitation of an older model. Similarly, John's slashed doublet, and perhaps Mary's head covering, remind one of sixteenth-century dress, but their faces seem studied from models discovered in a country church, where openmouthed wonder as well as pure religious feeling might have been found.

With regard to style rather than type, the figures of Mary and John are sophisticated, and entirely of their time. Light streaming from the left creates a strong sense of volume in their garments, which exhibit the artist's characteristic attention to balanced masses and rhythmic lines. The light and the transparent shadows that fall over the figure of Christ are consistent with the illumination throughout, but in tonality they suggest the strange aura of an eclipse. The face of Christ, as Nicolson noted, is very similar to the naturalistic face of Christ in Ter Bruggen's Incredulity of Thomas (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which he dates slightly earlier. It appears likely that the head crowned by thorns is a somewhat simplified repetition of the head in the Amsterdam painting, which may have been based on a live model.

As for the iconic nature of the composition, Ter Bruggen repeats a traditional arrangement that is found in Netherlandish prints and paintings dating back to the fifteenth century. In examples from that period, the Virgin and Saint John the Evangelist stand, as here, in nearly the same shallow zone.
of space as Christ (his knees, in the Museum's picture, overlap John's robe). The cross is often stunted, so that the figures of Mary and John nearly fill the areas to either side. In some Late Medieval images, a slight concession to receding space is made not only on the simple ground plane but also by making the figure of Christ somewhat smaller in scale (Ter Bruggghen's Christ, in a standing position, would be about twenty percent smaller than Mary and John). Versions of this iconic design continued through the sixteenth century and into the Baroque period, as seen in a triptych with the Crucifixion, dated 1626, by the Haarlem Catholic Willem Claesz Heda (q.v.; art market, 2001). The arrangement is also common in small sculptural groups of the period. (The waxy, wooden, or "alabaster-like" quality of John's intertwined fingers may indicate that Ter Bruggghen intended some resemblance to the kind of sculptures that were found in major Dutch churches before the iconoclastic revolt.) More commonly, of course, contemporaries of Ter Bruggghen, such as Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1617), in his engraving of 1585, Pieter Lastman (1583–1633), in his various Crucifixion scenes, and Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.), in his monumental Crucifixion of 1629 (Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht), with its "antiquated" type of Christ, departed from older pictorial patterns in favor of tall crosses, deep recessions, figures in action, and full descriptions of the setting. Ter Bruggghen adjusts to modern times in the qualities of light, space, and volume, mentioned above, and also in the very low viewpoint, an approach recalling that of recent altarpieces painted in Rome. The low horizon makes for a sobering encounter with the skull and bone, which (with the battered wedges used to erect the cross) forms an emblem of death not unlike Jacques de Gheyn's (Pl. 48), as well as one of Bloemaert's (which Jan Saenredam engraved about 1600).

The starry sky, indicating "darkness over all the land" (Matt. 27:45), is treated abstractly in works of the early fifteenth century, more naturalistically as a night sky by Grünewald, and so naturalistically by Ter Bruggghen that (his olive tone notwithstanding) one writer relates the effect to an actual eclipse which the artist could have seen. But this ignores the arbitrarily dramatic device of silhouetting the standing figures against brilliant light (as if the sun of the "sixth hour," meaning noon, had slipped below the horizon) and setting the Savior's illuminated body against the darkened sky. Indeed, when one compares the later afternoon sky in Ter Bruggghen's approximately contemporary Saint Sebastian Tended by Irene (Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin, Ohio), his miraculous vision of angels in the Annunciation of 1629 (Stedelijk Museum, Diest), and even his more luminous genre scenes, the Crucifixion's transformation of observation into artistic effect is not surprising.

The question of the painter's distinctive coloring need not be considered here, but it is worth noting that some scholars have related the present work's palette to paintings by contemporary artists, such as Ter Bruggghen's teacher Bloemaert and to Guido Reni (1575–1642). Similarly, Slatkes, although he supports the theory that the New York canvas was commissioned as a "pseudo-family heirloom," compares its "deliberately archaic" quality with Goltzius's virtuoso imitation, in The Circumcision, of 1594, of Dürer's engraving technique and figure types. This seems to imply that Ter Bruggghen, perhaps with Sadeler's engraving after Grünewald in mind, took up the modern "game of imitation and emulation" that Goltzius played in his six Masterpiece prints. The one in the style of Dürer almost winks at the connoisseur by including a self-portrait, and by setting the old-fashioned figures in a faithfully described corner of Haarlem's familiar church.

A more plausible context in which The Crucifixion may be placed is that of the Counter-Reformation in Utrecht, which emphasized the Passion of Christ and the sacrament of the Eucharist. Before the painting itself, one is struck by its conspicuous cascades of blood, which hang like lengths of rope from Christ's hands, feet, and the wound in his side. There is nothing naturalistic about the flow of blood, especially when one compares contemporary pictures like Gerrit van Honthorst's Saint Sebastian, of about 1623 (National Gallery, London), or Ter Bruggghen's own painting in Oberlin of the same saint pierced by arrows. Indeed, it could be said that the most archaic feature of The Crucifixion is not its hieratic composition, type of Christ, or starry sky, but its rendering of blood, in equal measure from four wounds, as if it were streaking down the surface of the altarpiece (this is sensed especially in the blood descending from Christ's side).

Thus, what might have been (as in Grünewald) a visceral stimulus to empathy is treated by Ter Bruggghen as an unmistakable symbol of the Eucharist. There was no more important point of doctrine for the Catholic church in the northern Netherlands during the early decades of the seventeenth century, and it is known that specifically in the many clandestine Catholic churches of Utrecht, "devotion to the Eucharist played a central role." This would appear to explain the Virgin's stare, in this picture, at the wound in Christ's side, and her holding of hands, as if she were not the Mother of God but a devout worshipper witnessing a miraculous event. In other words, Mary serves as intercessor for the faithful. Similarly, John draws the viewer's attention to Christ's bloody brow.
Figure 22. Detail of Ter Brugghen’s *The Crucifixion with the Virgin and Saint John* (Pl. 25).
In Utrecht, where perhaps a third of the population (and most of the nobility) was Catholic, the practice of Catholicism was tolerated, but public displays of the religion were prohibited. In this climate, even within the sanctuary of a hidden church, the more aggressive themes of the Counter-Reformation were avoided, and basic tenets—redemption through Christ's sacrifice, the Virgin as intercessor, the inspirational role of the saints—were underscored. It was consistent with this conservative approach to content that (in contrast to the Flemish Rubens) Dutch painters working for Catholic clients often adopted traditional forms, thereby emphasizing continuity with the old Catholic church and suggesting the reformist spirit of the resurgent faith. Ter Bruggghen, although he was firmly Protestant, was evidently recognized for his ability to convey an impression of venerability in Catholic images. He was probably well connected with Catholics, in part through his teacher Bloemaert, but also because he was an artist esteemed by patrician collectors (and reportedly by Rubens as well). In any case, his work for Catholic churches was not unusual for a Protestant artist in Utrecht or elsewhere in the Netherlands.

It is understandable that scholars of Dutch art have been less attuned to the effects of the Counter-Reformation on pictorial conventions than have their colleagues in the fields of Flemish, French, Spanish, and especially Italian painting. Aurigemma's comparison (1993; see Refs.) of The Crucifixion's "neo-medieval" character with qualities one finds in paintings by Ludovico Carracci (1535–1619), Lavinia Fontana (1552–1614), and other Italian artists is, by contrast, an entirely expected insight coming from that writer's academic community. A parallel to Ter Bruggghen's altarpiece is found in Carracci's Annunciation, of about 1583–84 (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna), "with its drastically simplified, 'neo-quattrocentesque' style, unprecedented in Bologna," but to be followed by numerous examples painted in Bologna, Rome, and elsewhere in Italy, under the influence of Counter-Reformation thought. For example, painted his Madonna and Child with Saints Sebastian and Francis, of about 1597–1600 (private collection), in Rome with an "insistently isochronic composition [that] seems distinctly archaic," and this has been connected with the antiquarian interests of one of the Vatican's most influential figures, Cardinal Cesare Baronio (1518–1607). Sassoferato (1609–1685) is well known for his emulation of sixteenth-century religious pictures, by Raphael especially (as in the Virgin of the Rosary, in Santa Sabina, Rome), but also by Dürer. One could draw many other parallels to Ter Bruggghen's archaising manner in The Crucifixion, from works as modest as the woodcut Man of Sorrows by Giuseppe Scolari (act. 1592–1607) to the majestic and austere Christ on the Cross (Art Institute of Chicago) that Francisco de Zurbarán (1598–1664) painted in 1627 for a monastery in Seville. If anything, Rubens's response to the Counter-Reformation has obscured its importance for Catholic art in the Dutch provinces, although the revival of the triptych represents an attempt to recapture the authority of Late Medieval religious art in the Netherlands. A closer Flemish analogy to Ter Bruggghen's conservatism in The Crucifixion may perhaps be found in Abraham Janssens van Nuyssen's The Dead Christ in the Tomb, with Two Angels, of about 1610 (MMA), which revives (through a print after Goltzius) a type of "angel picta" common in northern Italy during the sixteenth century.

About 1624, or perhaps slightly later, an unidentified artist copied the upper half of The Crucifixion as part of a new composition, which features a donor's family kneeling in prayer (fig. 21). The inscription on the banderole names "Adriaen Willemsz. Ploos" (Ploos) as dying in 1540, his son (d. 1539), and his wife (d. 1535). The canvas (not panel) purports to be a copy of a grave board, or "memorial tablet," said to have been in a church in Loosdrecht, but this is completely implausible, first as a Dutch design of the 1540s, and second because it is partially derived from a picture that is recognizable from the early seventeenth century. The raison d'être for this copy of an old painting that actually never existed is found in the lower left corner, namely the crest of the Van Amstel van Mijnden family. This detail was crucial to the campaign of an Utrecht lawyer, politician, and ally of the Stadholder, Prince Maurits, namely Adriaen Willemsz. Ploos (1585–1639), who wanted to prove himself descended from a noble line and to style himself (as his descendants still do) "Ploos van Amstel." Ploos was one of the twenty-four judges who, as a favor to the prince (and themselves), sentenced the famous statesman Johan van Oldenbarnevelt (1547–1619) to death for alleged treason. Ironically, Oldenbarnevelt himself had used the same ploy in an attempt to elevate himself socially, using an old triptych with donors and a long inscription dated 1444. The wood of which the central panel is composed is from a tree felled in 1616 at the earliest.

Ploos enlisted the Utrecht humanist and genealogist Aernout van Buchell (1561–1644) in his campaign. According to a document written in his hand and dated February 19, 1624, Van Buchell had been shown "a copy of a memorial tablet that had hung in the church there [Loosdrecht] of those [people] from whom he [Ploos] is supposed to descend." From this, Bok concludes that in 1624 the original memorial tablet was "no longer" (or never) in Loosdrecht; that the copy

II4 HENDRICK TER BRUGGHEN
may have been a different one from the canvas in the Centraal Museum (fig. 21); and that Van Buchell was, if not suspicious, at least reserving judgment. It is of slight interest for the Ploos affair, and of greater interest for Ter Bruggen, that Van Buchell was well connected with the major Utrecht artists of the day (see the biographies of Bloemaert, Paulus Moreelse, and Joachim Wtewael), and was something of a specialist (as print collector and connoisseur) in Dutch artists of Lucas van Leyden’s generation and in the “Dürer Renaissance.”

A somewhat different idea of (or for) the Loosdrecht tablet is found in a watercolor drawing that is preserved in a voluminous file of transcripts and documents used in January 1642 by Ploos’s son Gerard Ploos van Amstel in his application for admission into the Utrecht Ridderschap (Knighthage). In the drawing, the six family members of about 1540 are spread out wide on a grassy ground plane and are joined by two unfinished figures of bishops (their helmets replace Ter Bruggen’s skull at the foot of the cross), all of them kneeling below a version of Ter Bruggen’s Christ on the cross, and with Mary and John now placed well to each side, as if they were the Ploos parents’ patron saints. The drawing is absurd as a reconstruction of a sixteenth-century composition, and no knight of the Ploos family ever existed. Van Buchell would have known this or would have easily found it out. The “copy” he saw in 1624 was either the canvas in the Centraal Museum or yet another version. His testament of 1630 on behalf of Adriaen Ploos mentions seeing a copy of an old tablet with some different details: for example, the coats of arms were painted on the frame, and the inscription was on the “foot” of the “panel,” which suggests some sort of predella or base.

In 1993, Schillemans came to the unexpected conclusion that a Ploos memorial tablet of about 1540 actually existed and was more or less faithfully copied in the Centraal Museum canvas, which in turn (according to his hypothesis) inspired the design and figure types of Ter Bruggen’s Crucifixion. Schillemans also suggests that Adriaen Ploos may have “had something to do” with the commission, despite the fact that he also accepts an enlarged version of The Crucifixion (private collection, Turin) as an autograph work of the artist’s Italian period. In the present writer’s opinion, the most positive observation one might make about Ploos’s connection with the Museum’s picture is that he (or the copyist who worked for him) recognized the archaic qualities of Ter Bruggen’s composition and realized that it might be useful for his own ends.

The painting in Turin is certainly later than the New York canvas and by another hand. It is curious that it shows only slightly more of Mary and John at the bottom of the canvas than is seen in the Centraal Museum’s “copy” of the memorial tablet. But this may be a coincidence, if the Turin canvas has been cut down (the upper corners are cropped laterally and at the top to Christ’s hands). Although the Turin picture repeats only about two-thirds of The Crucifixion, it is considerably larger (74 x 68½ in. [188 x 173 cm]). Having not seen the painting in Italy, the present writer prefers not to speculate about its national origin.

Another copy, evidently by a minor Dutch artist, is in the Saint Clemenskerk at Nes, in Friesland.

It is possible but improbable that the “Christ on the Cross by van der Bruggh” in the estate of the Amsterdam art dealer Johannes de Renialme (1637) is identical with the present picture. The most likely owner of the painting in the preceding decades was not a private party but a hidden church in Utrecht, which probably would not have disposed of such a powerful work by one of the city’s most celebrated masters.


2. On some of Ter Bruggen’s borrowings from prints by Dürer and Lucas van Leyden, see Van Kooij 1987. The painter’s references to earlier northern artists are discussed in almost every relevant catalogue entry, which, it might be stressed, are those for religious pictures, in particular those depicting Passion scenes or martyrdoms. See also Leeflang in Amsterdam–New York–Toledo 2003–4, pp. 224–25, where Hendrick Goltzius’s emulation of Passion series by Dürer and Lucas van Leyden is discussed, and it is noted that Goltzius’s example was “used by Karel van Mander, Jacques de Gheyn II and Nicolaes de Brayn as the starting point for similarly archaizing Passion series.”


4. On Sadeler’s print, see Aschafenburg 2002–3, pp. 301–2, no. 185, where the taste for Dürer and his contemporaries at the courts of Rudolf II in Prague and Wilhelm V in Munich is also discussed, and Joachim von Sandrart’s admiration of Grünewald’s Small Crucifixion (in Munich, about 1560) is mentioned.

5. See Nicolson 1982, p. 43 (under no. A2), pls. 32, 33, for a direct comparison of the two heads.


7. Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, May 8, 2001, no. 44. The type of Christ, with a fluttering loincloth, the figures in general, and of course the triptych form, are inspired by Early Netherlandish examples. For a sixteenth-century variation with a spectacular sky, see the
panel attributed to the Flemish painter Michiel Coxcie in a sale at
Drouot Richelieu, Paris, June 24, 1998, no. 2. Compare also
Jacques de Gheyn's triptych dated 1618 (Xhosa Castle, Namur),
with the Crucifixion in the center and the patrons and their
patron saints on the wings (Van Regerteren Altena 1983, vol. 2,
pp. 12–13, no. 113), and vol. 3, pl. 11). This work, made for a
Catholic count (seen here in armor), is deliberately archaic in
style and in some respects anticipates Ter Bruggghen's design.
8. There are many examples, for instance the bronze Ceris on the
Cros with Mary and John, of about 1613–17, by Leonard Kern
(Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg).
9. The quote is from Slates in San Francisco–Baltimore–London
1997–98, p. 153. The herringbone pattern of John's fingers is
probably the artist's invention, and a variation on the remarkable
examples of clasped and gesturing hands that are found earlier
in his oeuvre.
11. See Amsterdam 1991–92, nos. 8 (1615), 9 (1616), and Van Schooten
und Wüstefeld 2003, no. 43 (1625).
12. Roethlisberger 1993, no. 438, fig. 615. Roethlisberger (ibid., vol. 1,
p. 28) considers the design traditional and "the type of Christ
antiquated," but the "stirring grandeur," the palette, and so on are
Baroque.
13. Ibid., no. 15, fig. 101. The broad use of the term "embleem" here
stresses the heraldic look of Ter Bruggghen's skull, which of
course identifies Calvry (place of the skull).
14. For example, in the Roemond Passion scenes (Rijksmuseum,
Amsterdam, no. A1491), painted in Gelderland about 1615, which
is mentioned by Slates in San Francisco–Baltimore–London
16. For the Oberrin and Driet pictures, and Ter Bruggghen's Flute
Player in Kassel, see San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98,
nos. 10, 15, 41.
the previous page, Slates contrasts the "self-consciously old-
fashioned" approach taken in The Crucifixion with Ter Bruggghen's
"earlier applications of sixteenth-century Netherlandish artistic
motifs [which] were apparently utilized to make the new Italian
Caravagesque elements acceptable to more conservative Utrecht
tastes." This seems an implausible hypothesis to apply to the city
of Bloemert and Wtenaad, and overlooks the rapid reception of
Caravagesque pictures by Gerrit van Honthorst, Dirck van
Buburen, and others during the 1620s in the same place.
19. The quote is from Leeflang's discussion of the Masterpiece
engravings by Goltzius in Amsterdam–New York–Toledo 2003–
4, p. 212 (under no. 73).
well known, the emphasis on the Eucharist and Holy Communion
was a response to the Protestant attack on the doctrine of trans-
substantiation. But it was also central to the reform movement
within the Catholic church, which especially in the Dutch
provinces stressed the basic doctrines of the faith.
21. Compare Rubens's handling of Eucharistic motifs in The Descent
from the Cross in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Liège (discussed by
the present writer in New York 1992–93, pp. 60–61 [under no. 1]).
70, closely examines the complicated question of how many
Catholics could be counted in Utrecht during the seventeenth
century, and suggests that perhaps thirty-five percent of the pop-
ulation was Catholic about 1650. Despite his praise of Kaplan's
essay, Paul Huys Jansen, in his review of the relevant exhibition
catalogue in Simidios 27 (1999), p. 102, simply repeats the com-
mon misconception that in Utrecht "the majority of the popu-
lation remained Catholic."
23. As noted by Spicer in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–
98, pp. 18–21.
24. In stressing this point, Kaplan, in ibid., p. 71, notes that the
Protestant painter Jan van Bijlert (1597–1671) "produced a large
number of works for Catholic schuilkerken, including altrapezes."
25. An exception is provided by Spicer in ibid., who briefly discusses
Ter Bruggghen's Crucifixion in a section of her essay called "Body
and Spirit: The Impact of the Counter-Reformation" (pp. 17–24,
p. 20 on Ter Bruggghen's picture), and who placed the painting
and seventeen others in a section of the catalogue bearing the
same title (pp. 132–85, nos. 1–18). Nonetheless, the entry on The
Crucifixion, by Slates, does not refer to any religious interests
in Utrecht, but (like literature going back to 1618) treats the
work as a stylistic curiosity, explained by Ter Bruggghen's admira-
tion of earlier art and perhaps by a private patron's desire to create
the impression that his family tree had "Early Netherlandish"
roots.
26. The quote is from Gail Feigenbaum's entry on the painting in
Bologna–Fort Worth 1993–94, p. 12. The present writer is grate-
ful to Keith Christiansen for this and other references.
refers also to a frescoed "icon" of three saints in Santa Susanna,
Rome, by Baldassare Croce (1588–1632). On Baronio, see De
Maio et al. 1985. See also Glen 1977, p. 15, on the use of a com-
position derived from Gerard David (ca. 1460–1523) in the fresco
decorations of Il Gesù in Rome.
28. See Sassoferrato 1990, nos. 16 (a Virgin in the style of Diërctier),
54 (Virgin of the Rosary), 62 (The Annunciation), and see also
p. 22, no. 61, Christ on the Cross with the Virgin and Saint John,
dated 1598, by Simone De Magistris.
29. See Feliciano Benvenuti in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 28,
pp. 214–15 (ill.), where the influence of Hans Baldung Grien
(1484/85–1545) and Rhenish printmakers is mentioned.
30. See New York–Paris 1987–88, no. 2, where the "exeges of the
Counter-Reformation" are discussed (p. 76).
31. As noted in Glen 1977, p. 23.
32. As discussed in Liedtke 1984, pp. 109–11, pl. 49.
33. My colleague Maryan Ainsworth, curator of European Paintings,
confirmed this impression.
34. See Bok 1996 on Oldenbarnevelt, Ploos, and a third case of false
claims to nobility based on "old" pictures.
35. See Pollmann 1999, p. 188: "As an expert on genealogy and her-
aldry, Bachiels [Van Buchell's Latinized name] was repeatedly
called as an expert witness in disputed claims of nobility. Although
he actively co-operated in the attempts of Adrian Ploos, the
Stadholder's power-broker in Utrecht, to defend his dubious
rights to the extension 'Van Amstel', he was also truly appalled by
the many people in Utrecht with aristocratic pretensions."
The document is transcribed in Ploos van Amstel 1990, col. 283, *bijlage* (addendum) no. xix. The Utrecht archivist and art historian Marten Jan Bok, who discussed the same subject in Bok 1990, kindly checked the original document on the present writer’s behalf and commented extensively on its contents (personal communication dated August 10, 2001, in the curatorial files).

37. Personal communication (see previous note).


39. Schillemas 1993, pp. 146–47. This document, too, was discussed in Bok’s communication (see note 36 above).


41. Schillemas 1993, pp. 159–60, fig. 3, where it is improbably suggested that the canvas (70% x 50 in. [178 x 127 cm]) is from the studio of Ter Bruggen. It was previously attributed to Gerardus Wigman (1673–1741).


REFERENCES: *The London Times*, November 23, 1916, p. 12, notes the picture’s sale and compares its painter with Mantegna and Grünewald; *Illustrated London News*, December 8, 1916, p. 974 (ill.), records the sale (“a record price”), and reports erroneously (see Ex Coll., note 2 below) that the painting was originally acquired from a furniture store for an amount equal to less than $100; *Die Weltkunst* 36, no. 24 (December 15, 1916), p. 19 (ill.), gives the price as £11,000; Easby and Borrem 1977, pp. 38, 40, 43 (ill.), mentions the work as an outstanding acquisition; Gerson 1997 (ill.), cites the picture as evidence of Ter Bruggen’s “reassessment”; Nicolson 1988a, pp. 6, 8, 22, 41, 45, 79–82, no. 449, pls. 32, 34, 52, 56, 57, describes the painting’s style and (quite subjectively) its expressive qualities, compares the head of Christ in the *Incredulity of Saint Thomas* (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), considers this picture probably the one cited in the Amsterdam art dealer Johannes de Renialme’s estate inventory of 1697 as “Christ on the Cross by van der Brugge,” discusses at length the partial copy with added donors (see text above), dates the Museum’s picture about 1624–26 on the basis of comparisons with other paintings by the artist, and regards the influence of Grünewald as of “little doubt”; Nicolson 1988b, pp. 88, 90, fig. 4 (detail of skull), dates the painting to about 1623–26 and compares it with the newly discovered *Saint Jerome*; Virch 1998, reports the picture’s rediscovery and its purchase by the MMA, describes the composition, coloring, and figure types (“these saints are but unpretending Dutch peasants”), and reviews earlier northern examples of the subject; Frankfurter 1959, p. 62 (ill.), on the price and “new mode” on the art market for Ter Bruggen; Gerson 1999, p. 317, proposes a date of about 1625 for the picture, which “has no parallel in Dutch painting of this time”; Maisen 1960, p. 215, fig. 61, notes a source in Dürer; Nicolson 1960, p. 470 no. 22, approves of the Grünewald comparison made in Virch 1988; Plietzsch 1960, pp. 143, 145, comments on the picture’s expressive power, and on the price it brought at auction; Judson 1961, p. 347, suggests that the canvas served as an altarpiece in a private chapel or hidden church, cites earlier uses of stars in the skies of Crucifixion pictures, and suggests searching for a source in fifteenth-century German or Dutch panel painting; H. Gerson, “Hendrick ter Bruggen,” in *Kindersgr* 1964–71, vol. 1 (1964), pp. 163–64, sees the picture as a high point of the artist’s religious painting; Stalke 1965, pp. 52–53 n. 27, 91, considers the interlaced fingers of Saint John likely to have been derived from Baburen, with an awareness of the same expressive device in sixteenth-century northern prints, and on p. 91, mentions “A. Ploos, who may have commissioned a copy of *Terbruggen’s Crucifixion*”; Stechow 1965, pp. 49–50, fig. 1, detects a debt to Grünewald, but not for the colors or for the “haggard and weightless” figure of Christ; Stalke in Dayton–Baltimore 1965–66, pp. 28–30, no. 9 (ill.), gives provenance, full literature to date, and details about the partial copy with donors, finds the deliberate use of archaizing elements difficult to explain unless (as Judson suggested) the work was painted to replace an earlier picture, cites some possible Dutch prototypes, and approves Nicolson’s dating to about 1624–26; Stechow in ibid., pp. 7–9, suggests the possible influence of a Gothic sculpture, and praises the picture’s formal qualities; Boston 1970, p. 38 (ill.), finds “something beyond realism here . . . the impression of an almost unbearable supernatural event”; Van Thiel 1971, p. 109, finds the work “Gothic,” but the usual comparison with Grünewald too specific; Nash 1972, fig. 23, compares a Rembrandt *Christ on the Cross*; Spear 1976, p. 106, contrasts the picture’s “Gothic” expressiveness with the “mundane reality” of a contemporary work by Ter Bruggen; Bernt 1979–80, vol. 3, no. 1249 (ill.); Hibbard 1980, p. 269, fig. 357, “Grünewaldian”; De Jongh in Utrecht 1980, pp. 10, 31 n. 52, considers the painting probably the one cited in De Renialme’s estate inventory of 1677; C. Brown in Washington–Detroit–Amsterdam 1980–81, pp. 15, 104–5, no. 11 (ill.), notes that the subject and deliberate archaism are unusual, suggesting “a particular commission, perhaps a replacement for a fifteenth- or sixteenth-century altarpiece”; Kitson 1981, p. 444, fig. 70, finds “elements of German renaissance art and a baroque light effect” in this “hauntingly beautiful work”; Hecht 1981–82, p. 185, a “first-rate” work, “very peculiar, Germanically severe”; Hecht and Luijten 1986, p. 194 (ill.), refers to the Museum’s acquisition of the painting in a review of the artist’s critical reception, which flourished in the 1950s; P. Sutton 1986, p. 180 (ill.), describes “this remarkably hieratic image” as having qualities more Gothic than Baroque, and as “one of the most monumental and powerful Dutch paintings in the collection”; Stalke in Utrecht–Brünschweig 1986–87, pp. 129–30, 133–36, no. 21 (ill.), suggests that the archaic qualities may indicate that the painting replaced an earlier one, compares the coloring and low horizon in the artist’s *Saint Sebastian Tended by Irene*, of 1635, suggests a dating close to that work’s, and repeats the comparisons to earlier Dutch images made in Dayton–Baltimore 1965–66; Kitson 1987, p. 137, finds the coloring reminiscent of earlier works by Bloemaert; De Meyere 1967, p. 310, fig. 16, mentions the possibility of De Renialme’s ownership; Schnackenburg 1987, p. 172, cites the painting as an example of Ter Bruggen’s remarkable range and is convinced by the suggestion that the work was intended as an altarpiece; Turin 1987, p. 42 (ill. on foldout opp. p. 42), dating the painting incorrectly to 1620, discusses its relationship to the version in a private collection, Turin, which is claimed to be earlier (see text above); “Un Ter
Brugghen [sic] Romano," Il giornale dell'arte, no. 50 (November 1987), p. 51, repeats the information found in Turin 1987; C. Brown 1988, pp. 91–94, 97 n. 19, 23, fig. 14, discusses similarities, especially of color, in a "Crucifixion" by Guido Reni, and reports (based on examination by Joyce Pesters) that the Reni in the colors in the New York painting, including those in the sky, have not changed significantly; W. Kloeck 1988, p. 51, compares a Dutch altarpiece of about 1400; Nicolson 1989, vol. 1, p. 191, listed, with basic information; Liedtke 1990, p. 55, mentioned as a postwar purchase; Schilleman 1992, p. 42, described as outside the author's topic of discussion because it cannot be traced back to a specific church; Aurigemma 1993, pp. 30–52, fig. 8, refers to the work's neomedieval or archaic quality as something one finds also in works by Lavinia Fontana, Ludovico Carracci, and other Italian artists; Schilleman 1993, pp. 137–42, 147–49, fig. 1, supports Slatkes's conclusion that the picture must have been based on a sixteenth-century composition, compares the copy in Nijmegen and the version in Turin (accepting the owner's idea that the latter is autograph and dates back to about 1612–13, when Ter Brugghen was in Italy), and relates the painting to the Ploos epiphany (fig. 21 here), which is considered as a reliable copy of an earlier work; Baejer 1995, p. 304; Albert Blanken in Saur AKL 1992–1996, vol. 14 (1996), pp. 504–5, as certainly dating from about 1625; Bok 1996, pp. 201, 212, fig. 4, summarizes the conclusions of Schilleman 1993, and links the painting to several archaic (or "fake") works of art that were employed to suggest noble lineage; Slatkes 1996, pp. 217–18, compares the figure of Mary in "ter Brugghen's 1623 New York Crucifixion" with the artist's newly discovered painting of a religious woman holding a candle to establish that the latter represents the Death of the Virgin; C. Brown 1997, p. 33, discusses the painting's "strikingly archaic" style; Olde Meirink and Bakker in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, p. 79, comments on the connection with the Ploos epiphany; Slatkes in ibid., pp. 151–55, 411, no. 8 (ill.), considers this work's "self-consciously old-fashioned" qualities exceptional, notwithstanding the artist's "earlier exercises in the use of archaizing elements," dates the work to about 1625 (largely on the basis of similarities with Saint Sebastian Tended by Irene), reviews possible Dutch prototypes dating from the 1400s, and discusses the Ploos epiphany (fig. 21); Spicer in ibid., pp. 20, 394 n. 20, describes the approach here and in an earlier religious painting by Ter Brugghen as a homage to "earlier Netherlandish traditions"; Wheelock 1998, p. 52, reports the circumstances of the picture's commission, as given in the catalogue; Raleigh–Milwaukee–Dayton 1998–99, p. 213, no. 3 (ill.), includes the work in a checklist of Caravaggescque paintings in America; Blanken 2004, pp. 101–13, fig. 85, mentioned as in the exhibition of 1980–81. Seaman 2006, chap. 4, discusses the blood at length, dismisses the Ploos epiphany, and assumes that this picture is the version owned by de Renialme.


EX COLL.: [Johannes de Renialme, Amsterdam (d. 1677)]; 1 Christ Church, South Hackney, London (ca. 1878–1956); [Nigel Foxell, Oxford (1956); sale, Sotheby's, London, November 28, 1956, no. 115]; 2 Funds from various donors, 1956 16.228

1. De Renialme's ownership of the picture is doubted in the last paragraph of the text above.
2. According to Nigel Foxell (personal communication, January 2, 2007), the painting served as the altarpiece of a side chapel in Christ Church, South Hackney, London, until shortly before that building was demolished in 1956. The canvas was transferred to Saint John's in the same parish, from which Mr. Foxell purchased the picture for £75. He placed the picture in the Sotheby's sale, and gave the net proceeds, less ten percent, to the Diocese of London. The Museum is grateful to Mr. Foxell for this new information, and to Jonathan Lopez (New York) in facilitating the contact.
One of the greatest painters of water and shipping, and above all . . . one of the greatest painters of the Dutch school," according to Hofstede de Groot, Van de Cappelle is indisputably one of the two or three most admired marine painters of the seventeenth century. He was not a professional artist in the narrow sense, but a wealthy amateur who was keenly active as a painter, draftsman, and collector. His father, Franscoys van de Cappelle (1592–1674), ran a successful dye business which the painter inherited late in life. The woman he married (before 1653), Anna Grootingh, also came from a prosperous family. In 1653, her mother left the couple three houses in Amsterdam, but they lived in yet another on the Keizersgracht. About 1663, they moved to the Kooistraat, near the Zuiderkerk. At his death in December 1679, Van de Cappelle, by then a widower, left his four sons and three daughters the dye works, six houses and other properties in Amsterdam, a country house on the river Vecht, a pleasure yacht, "44 bags of ducats" and bonds altogether valued at 92,720 guilders, and about two hundred paintings and six thousand drawings. The collection was remarkably concentrated, suggesting that in a few cases the artist bought large lots at estate sales. He owned 883 drawings by or after Hendrick Avcamp (1585–1634), nine paintings and over thirteen hundred drawings by Simon de Vlieger (q.v.), six paintings and about five hundred drawings said to be by Rembrandt (q.v.), ten paintings and more than four hundred drawings by Jan van Goyen (q.v.), sixteen pictures by the pioneering seascape painter Jan Porcellis (before 1584–1632), five paintings by Hercules Segers (1589/90–1633/38), and a variety of works by Flemish, German, Italian, and French artists.

The artist was self-taught, according to a verse by Gerbrand van den Eckhout (q.v.) that accompanies a drawing by Van de Cappelle in the album amicorum of the humanist Jacob Heybrocq (1654). His paintings dating from the late 1640s and early 1650s are mostly indebted to De Vlieger. From designs and motifs that Van de Cappelle shares with Hendrick Dubbels (1620/21–1676) and Willem van de Velde the Younger (q.v), Kelch concludes that, about 1650 the three artists may have worked in Weesp, the old town on the Vecht near Amsterdam where De Vlieger lived between 1649 and his death in 1653.

During the 1650s, Van de Cappelle's style evolved from close description and a palette of silvery tones to a more painterly manner and warmer coloring. There are no immature works to speak of: even comparatively early pictures like the State Barge Saluted by the Home Fleet, of 1650 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), are remarkable for their variety of diverting light effects, and for the skill with which ships are arranged in perspective on the nearly undisturbed surface of a bay or sea. The artist dwells on rippled reflections in the water and sunlight shining through clouds, which wonderfully foil the maritime forest of ships at anchor. In later works, such as The Disembarkation of the Fleet, of about 1660 (fig. 23), and the seascape discussed below, beige and reddish brown sails tend to blend together, here like coulisses framing a stage, there like sheets or veils thrown over furniture. In these rich effects, there is some resemblance to contemporary works in other genres, such as Abraham van Beyeren's more muted still lifes (see Pl. 7) and Emanuel de Witte's moodier architectural views.

Van de Cappelle's oeuvre has been described as small, considering that fewer than 150 paintings are known. But this number, which compares closely with the known oeuvres of artists such as Gabriel Metsu and Frans Post (q.q.v.), is impressive for an amateur who evidently painted for less than twenty years. Assuming a normal rate of survival of his paintings, it seems likely that Van de Cappelle turned out at least one painting a month and a number of drawings (the majority of which are lost). Most of the known drawings are winter scenes, a subject the artist also treated in a small number of paintings (Russell counts fewer than twenty) and in one of his two signed etchings.

In November 1666, Van de Cappelle was described as a dyer, which may indicate that he had taken over his elderly father's business. No pictures dating from after the mid-1660s appear to be known.

Portraits of Van de Cappelle by Rembrandt, Hals, and Van den Eckhout are listed in the inventory of his estate but are now unknown.

1. Margarita Russell, whose 1973 monograph on Van de Cappelle is based on Hofstede de Groot's catalogue, claims that the artist is
"now considered the outstanding marine painter of 17th-century Holland," and that "more than any other artist of his time, with the exception only of Rembrandt, van de Cappelle was a painter of light" (M. Russell in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 5, pp. 679, 681). However, the names of Willem van de Velde the Younger and Johannes Vermeer (q.q.v.) have also been advanced. Keyes in Minneapolis–Toledo–Los Angeles 1990–91 calls Van de Velde "the greatest Dutch marine painter of the seventeenth century." The posthumous competitors probably would have awarded first place to their mentor, Simon de Vlieger (q.v.).

2. Breen 1913b, p. 112, on Van de Cappelle's purchase of the house on the Koestraat, for 2,300 guilders, on May 21, 1661.

3. See C. Welcker 1979, p. 94.

4. Most of these details are adopted from the excellent biography by Kelch in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, pp. 287–88. The inventory of Van de Cappelle's estate was first published in Bredius 1892, pp. 131–36, and is translated into English in Russell 1975, pp. 49–57. The paintings by Segers may have come from Rembrandt's collection (he owned eight in 1666), considering how many of Rembrandt's own works were acquired by Van de Cappelle.


7. See Russell 1975, fig. 6, or Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 5, p. 680, fig. 1.

8. For the Rotterdam canvas, see Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, no. 65.


10. Ibid., where the locations of some drawn and painted winter scenes are cited, and where other etchings attributed to Van de Cappelle are dismissed. See also Russell 1975, pp. 30–32, figs. 22–30, 40–42, 44, 45, 47. A drawing of a winter landscape (Teylers Museum, Haarlem) is discussed in Cambridge–Montreal 1988, p. 83 (under no. 18), and in Plomp 1997, pp. 113–14 (under no. 94).

11. This could have been the reason the artist moved from the Keizersgracht to the Koestraat in about 1663. From there it was a very short walk down the Kloveniersburgwal (toward the Munneplein) to the Raamsgracht, where the dye works was located. In the seventeenth century the small Raamsgracht, south of the Zaiderkerk, was called the Verwers Gracht, after the Dutch word for dye (trenner). In a letter of April 28, 2004, J. E. A. Boomgaard, director of the Gemeentearchief (Municipal Archives), Amsterdam, kindly clarified these details, reviewed the values of houses on the Koestraat and larger adjoining canals, and concluded that Van de Cappelle's "move to the Koestraat seems to be somewhat surprising indeed. A house along the main canals meant much more social status."

12. However, Russell (1975, p. 19) notes that an easel was still set up in the artist's studio at his death, and an unfinished painting was found there.

13. See ibid., pp. 50, 52, nos. 11, 32, 102.

26. A State Yacht and Other Craft in Calm Water

Oil on wood, 27½ x 36½ in. (69.9 x 92.4 cm)
Signed (lower right): Cappelle
The boats and the water are well preserved but the thinly painted sky has become more transparent over time.

Francis L. Leland Fund, 1912 12.31

This signed and authentic work of about 1660 has been the subject of several misconceptions: that Van de Cappelle is not the author; that the picture bears a date of "1671 (or 5)" (there is no trace of any date); that its condition is unsatisfactory; and that it represents "the mouth of the Scheldt."

Before 1979, the picture's appearance was affected by discolored varnish (mostly a Vynlilt varnish applied in 1947), and the work was rarely on view. In its cleaned state, the painting, although thinner in the sky and drier in touch, appears similar in style and execution to such works as The Disembarkation of the Fleet, of about 1660, in Rotterdam (fig. 23).3 The Rotterdam picture is on canvas, is more elaborate in composition, and is on the whole a finer and more ambitious work. But there can be little doubt that the New York panel was painted by the same hand, using a comparable palette and employing a few similar motifs, in particular the two most prominent boats in the center of the middle ground (although they are closer to the viewer in the Museum's painting) and the nearest sailboat in the right background. Russell also compares a canvas
Figure 23. Jan van de Cappelle, *The Disembarkation of the Fleet*, ca. 1660. Oil on canvas, 43½ x 56¾ in. (111 x 144 cm). Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam
of the 1660s in the National Gallery, London (fig. 24). Especially impressive in the present work are such characteristic passages as the reflections in the foreground, the impasto strokes in the clouds and in the sunlit central sail, the silhouetting effects throughout the composition, and the luminous recession on the right.

As Kelch has observed in connection with the painting in Rotterdam, this type of subject in the oeuvres of Van de Cappelle, Hendrick Dubbels (1620/21–1767), Willem van de Velde the Younger (q.v.), and other masters active in the 1650s and 1660s derives from a group of "naval parades" by Simon de Vlieger (q.v.), and above all from his panel of 1649, *The disembarkation of Prince Frederick Hendrick of Orange on the Merwede at Dordrecht*, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. De Vlieger himself, in works of about 1649–50, and Van de Cappelle in his *State Yacht with Inland Craft in a Calm*, of 1649 (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles), almost immediately adopted a practice of "dehistorification" in response to the Vienna prototype, so that "all that remained of the event was its event-like quality." In the New York panel, as in the Rotterdam canvas, a church reminiscent of the Grote Kerk in Dordrecht is visible in the background, and a dignified figure, wearing a medal on a ribbon, sits in the back of the crowded sloop (or, more properly, a state barge) trawling the Dutch flag. A crest decorates the stern of the yacht, which flies the same tricolors, and a crown is emblazoned on the Dutch flag at the back of the supply barge in the foreground (which includes a cannon in its pile of freight). But there would be no point in attempting to identify the historical occasion depicted here or in any of the pictures by Van de Cappelle that represent essentially the same subject, the anchorage of a small fleet and disembarkation of a distinguished person in a calm river or bay. In a broad view, the theme of these paintings, which flourished right after the Treaty of Münster (1648), is peace in the Netherlands after many years of war.

Precedingly titled by the Museum *The Mouth of the Scheldt*.

1. See Refs. A fair number of oral opinions are recorded in the curatorial files. E. Schmidt-Degener (April 15, 1935) told H. B. Wehle that the work was an eighteenth-century copy. Jakob Rosenberg (June 8, 1936) "considers this very good." A. B. de Vries (Winter 1935–36) thought the painting might be a late eighteenth-century copy. J. G. van Gelder (February 24, 1954) stated that the subject is not the mouth of the Scheldt, but may be that of the Maas. Wolfgang Stechow (December 14, 1954) thought the painting "could be a copy" (but see note 2 below); R. A. d'Hulst (on the same day) noted that it had "something English" about it. Sturla Guðlaugsson (April 6, 1956) believed it to be a "later copy—paint not seventeenth century." Daan Cevat (January 4, 1966) described it as "a good example," noting that Van de Cappelle was a friend of Rembrandt's and was responsible for Rembrandt's going twice to England. J. S. Held (March 1971), as "possibly dubious as Cappelle." Cevat again (February 5, 1973), as "genuine but weak;" Jan Kelch (November 8, 1979), as not by Van de Cappelle, but
resembling the work of Hendrick Dubbels. Margarita Russell (February 11, 1986) considers the painting to be certainly by Van de Cappelle (the figures and all the rest characteristic), but suggests that it was overpainted in the past. Kelch (July 24, 2004), based on firsthand examination of the painting, considers it to be typical of Van de Cappelle about 1660. His earlier doubts were based on the information given in Russell 1975 (see Refs.) to the effect that the picture bears a signature and a date of 1671 or 1675.

2. Wolfgang Stechow, in a letter dated July 29, 1962, noted that in the Museum’s 1954 catalogue the picture is said to be dated 1671, but that there is no mention of a date in the catalogue of 1924 or in Valentin’s article (1944, p. 283). “It would be by far the latest date we have on any of his pictures, and it is therefore very important to me to find out what the facts are.” Curator Claus Virch answered in a letter dated August 6, 1963, that examination with a microscope and with raking light revealed “no trace of a date whatsoever. Where a date should appear—if there had been one—the picture is somewhat worn, but the same is the case with the signature which is still visible.” Virch also writes that Schmidt-Degener and De Vries considered the picture a later copy or imitation (see note 1 above), but that he personally was “convinced that it is by Cappelle.”

3. See Jan Kelch’s entry in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, no. 65, where a date of about 1660 is maintained on the grounds of style, coloring, and the form of signature—“I V Cappelle,” as opposed to “I V Capel” or “I V Cappelle,” was used from 1652 onward. (In the case of the present picture, the artist appears to have inscribed his name without initials.)


5. Kelch in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, p. 268 (under no. 65, the Van de Cappelle in Rotterdam); see also pp. 198–99 (under no. 37, the De Vlieger in Vienna) on “dehistorification” and p. 196, fig. 1 (the Van de Cappelle in the Getty Museum), and pp. 260–61, no. 54, where “the impression of a pseudo-event” is created by Dubbels.

6. On the state barges (“used for ferrying dignitaries from one vessel to another or from land to a ship”) and state—or admiralty—yacht (called a princesjacht when used by the stadholder), see Leo Akveld’s “Glossary of 17th-Century Dutch Ships” in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, p. 31.

7. Other paintings of this type by Van de Cappelle include the panel dated 1650 in the National Gallery, London (see MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 73 [under no. 964]), where a previous attempt to place Frederick Hendrick in the sloop is rightly questioned), a canvas of about 1650 in the same museum (ibid., p. 78, no. 4446), and a painting of about the same date in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp (no. 767). For similar works by Dubbels, see Middendorf 1989, nos. 5, 14, 19, 20, 27 (other works may be relevant, but poor illustrations do not allow judgment). For analogous works by Willem van de Velde the Younger, see M. Robinson 1990, vol. 1, pp. 303–72 (sec. 3.3, “Dutch Yachts”).

REFERENCES: B. Burroughs 1912, p. 76 (ill. p. 79), describes the work as a new acquisition and as “a marvel of skilful painting and luminosity”; B. Burroughs 1914 (and subsequent editions), as signed “V K V Cappel(=?)”; Hofstede de Groot 1927–27, vol. 7 (1923), p. 170, no. 45, as “A River Scene—Say to be the mouth of the Schelde,” and as “in the collection of E. H. Griffith, London, 1910”; Valentin 1944, pp. 281–82, 283, fig. 8, compares the composition favorably with the De Vlieger in Vienna (see text above); J. Allen and Gardner 1944, p. 16, as signed and dated “I V Cappelle [167]?1”;

Russell 1975, pp. 37, 67, no. 44, and p. 89 (under no. 9), repeats Hofstede de Groot’s entry but adds that the painting is “signed lower right: J V Cappelle 167(1 or 5).” and records another version known only from a photograph in the Frick Art Reference Library; D. Sutton 1979, p. 393, records that Robert Langton Douglas recommended the “large and brilliant” painting to John G. Johnson, who in turn recommended it to the MMA, and p. 433, fig. 19, as sold by Douglas to the Museum “at the suggestion of J. P. Morgan and J. G. Johnson,” and as previously in the collection of Mrs. E. V. Stanley, and in that of “the liberal politician, Henry Labouchère, first Lord Taunton,” which Douglas catalogued in 1909–10; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 23, as signed “I.V. Cappelle” with no mention of a date; D. Sutton 1986, p. 191, mentioned as one of the Museum’s “lovely marines”; Baetjer 1991, p. 129, as signed “I.V. Cappelle” without mention of a date; Kelch in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, p. 300 n. 3, as “purported to date from 1671 (V or 5)” and as “probably not authentic” (see note 1 above on Kelch’s retraction of this opinion).


EX COLL.: Henry Labouchère, Lord Taunton, Taunton, Somerset (d. 1869); probably by descent to his eldest daughter, Mary Dorothy Labouchère (Mrs. Edward James Stanley) (1869–ca. 1907); Major E. H. Griffith, London (in 1910); [Robert Langton Douglas in partnership with Colnaghi, London.]; Francis L. Leland Fund, 1912.

1. The statesman Henry Labouchère (1798–1869) held many offices, including Lord of the Admiralty (1832–34). His wife died in 1830, and he had no sons. In 1872, the eldest of his three daughters, Mary Dorothy (d. 1920), married Edward James Stanley (1826–1907). His death may have occasioned the sale of the present painting, if indeed his widow owned it. Presumably, the “Mrs. E. V. Stanley” mentioned in D. Sutton 1979 (see Refs.) is a transcription error for Mrs. E. J. Stanley.

2. D. Sutton 1979, p. 423, reports, “As Douglas was unable to handle the Labouchère-Stanley collection on his own account, he went into some form of partnership with Colnaghi’s.”
STYLE OF JAN VAN DE CAPPELLE
(18TH OR 19TH CENTURY)

27. Winter Scene

Oil on wood, 13¾ x 19½ in. (34 x 49.5 cm)
Inscribed (lower right): J.V DE CAPPELLE

The paint surface has a soft and artificially distressed appearance. The oak panel—½ in. (.95 cm) thick—is composed of two boards joined with the grain running horizontally. On the reverse, there are very evenly beveled edges along the sides and bottom but not at the top, which suggests that the support was cut from a larger panel.

The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.16

Van de Cappelle’s authorship of this awkward picture has been consistently doubted by the few scholars who have considered the question in recent decades.¹ That the picture must be a later imitation was suggested independently by the collector Daan Cevat (oral opinion, 1966), by Museum conservator Dorothy Mahon (2004), and by Horst Gerson when he stated that the painting might be by Andries Vermeulen (1763–1814).³

Examination of the wood support also suggests a later date. The oak panel is beveled on three sides but is cut at the top, where the wood is thickest. Wood supports of the seventeenth century were beveled to reduce thickness at the edges so that the panel would fit into the shallow rabbet of a frame. Thus, it appears that the present panel was originally larger, and cut down for reuse. X-radiography reveals no other image below the paint surface, which makes it seem likely that the wood was borrowed from an old cabinet or piece of furniture.³

It is impossible to say whether the now obscure signature dates from the same period as the painting. At different times in his career, Van de Cappelle signed his pictures “I V Capel,”
"I v Capelle," and "I v Cappelle," but the form "De Cappelle" is not found on authentic works. As Russell notes in her monograph, "both copies and imitations of pictures by Van de Cappelle and his circle were produced throughout the eighteenth and well into the nineteenth century." No other version of the composition is known, and its design, with its wedge of ice and cottages aligned like carriages on a toy train, does not encourage the idea of a lost original. Comparison with winter scenes certainly by Van de Cappelle underscores their much subtler conception and execution, and also confirms that the imitator had this artist in mind rather than Aert van der Neer (q.v.) or another seventeenth-century painter of similar subjects.

Gerson’s mention of Vermeulen brings one closer to a likely date for the Museum’s picture and to its level of quality, although that artist’s least impressive paintings are superior to this one. Original works strongly reminiscent of seventeenth-century winter landscapes date from throughout the next two hundred years; in addition to Vermeulen, painters such as Andries Schelfhout (1787–1870), Barend Cornelis Koekkoek (1803–1862), and Johann Bernard Klombeck (1815–1893) are among the many representatives. Within this long tradition the present painting seems most at home among works dating from the early to mid-nineteenth century.

1. See Refs. and note 1 under Ex Coll.
2. See Refs. under Russell 1975 and note 1 below.
3. Conservator Dorothy Mahon was the first to suggest that the wood panel was recycled from some older context (in conversation with the writer, May 2004).
5. Ibid., p. 47.
6. Compare ibid., figs. 22–30, 93, 96.

REFERENCES: Woermann 1907, pp. 233–35, no. 288, cites the painting as by Van de Cappelle, with a facsimile of the signature reading approximately "J WIT DE CAPPELLE," and as purchased from "Dr. P. Mersch (Sedelmeyer) aus Paris" in 1904; Hofstede de Groot 1907–28, vol. 7 (1918), p. 229, no. 179, as by Van de Cappelle, with a descriptive text borrowed from Woermann, "fully signed lower right"; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 7 (1925), p. 208, no. 179, as "signed in full to the left [sic] at foot," and as in the Weber sale of 1912, no. 288, sold for 5,400 marks to Kleinberger; Valentin 1928a, p. 24, as by Van de Cappelle, signed "J.v.Capelle," and as very likely dating from the mid-1650s; Russell 1975, p. 90, no. 21, fig. 94, as by an unknown follower of Van de Cappelle, with a rubbed and almost illegible inscription reading "J. v. CAPPELLE," and noting that "according to the Museum records the attribution has been doubted before, e.g. by J. S. Held [1971] and by Gerson [1976] who suggested Vermeulen as the artist"; Baert 1995, p. 339, as by Jan van de Cappelle.

EX COLL.: Paul Mersch, Paris (until 1904; sold through Sedelmeyer[? ] to Weber); Eduard F. Weber, Hamburg (1904–d. 1907; his sale, Berlin, February 20–22, 1912, no. 288, to Kleinberger for 5,400 marks); [E. Kleinberger Galleries, Paris and New York, 1912; sold for $4,000 to Friedsam]; Michael Friedsam (1912–d. 1931); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931: 32.100.16

1. Notes recording the opinions of Held and Gerson remain in the curatorial files, as does a memo of 1972 written by curator John Walsh: "I am still dubious about this, as the quality of execution seems markedly below Cappelle’s average."
Pieter Claesz

Berchem? 1596/97–1660 Haarlem

Little is known of Claesz’s early life, and until recently he was confused with a Pieter Claesz from Steinfurt or Burgsteinfurt, Westphalia, who died in Haarlem by the spring of 1639. The artist, “Pieter Claessens van Berghem schilder,” was so described on January 3, 1661, two days after his burial (which would mean that he died in the last days of 1660). On that occasion, his daughters, “Lucia and Catharina Pieters who are twins aged twelve years born in Haarlem,” were placed in an orphanage. Their mother, Trijntien Lourensdr, from Flanders, became Pieter Claesz’s second wife in Haarlem on August 8, 1635; the civil ceremony suggests that they were Catholic. Also cited in the document of 1661 is the twins’ half brother, “Claes Pieters van Berghem schilder,” namely Nicolaes Berchem (q.v.). Two married half sisters are also named. The village of Berchem, from which Claesz and, more conspicuously, his son Nicolaes adopted their surnames, is near Antwerp.¹

The date of Claesz’s first marriage (about 1620?) and the date of his entry into the Haarlem painters’ guild are not known, but a Pieter Claesz is listed as a member of the guild in 1634. It is thought that he trained in Antwerp, where he probably came into contact with Flemish still-life specialists such as Osias Beert (ca. 1580–1624).

Dated paintings by Claesz are known from almost every year of his career, beginning with a work of 1621 and ending with a few of 1660.² The early Still life with Smoking Implements, Brandy Jug, Beer Glass, and Playing Cards (private collection) is signed and dated “Pieter Claessen/ANNO 1622,” but nearly all the other known works are monogrammed Pc, with a capital C speared by the long stem of a capital p.³ These initials and stylistic similarities have led to some confusion between still lifes by Claesz and those by the Fleming Clara Peters (1589?–after 1657).

Claesz was a key figure in the development of still-life painting in Haarlem, especially with regard to the “monochrome” manner that he employed during the second half of the 1620s and in the 1630s. As in the picture discussed below, he would often group together a small number of objects on a tabletop, dwelling upon their different surfaces and responses to light. The effects of candlelight as well as daylight intrigued the painter, with a glass usually playing a prominent role. Some early works, such as the Sumptuous Tabletop Still Life with Turkey, of 1627 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), and a greater number of later pictures, like the large canvas of 1644 (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest), which Claesz painted in collaboration with Roelof Koets (1592–1651), are much more elaborate than the subtle compositions of the 1650s.⁴ Claesz would have been inspired to paint more ambitious arrangements and luxurious motifs by the Haarlem specialist Willem Claesz Heda (q.v.) and other artists who, like Jan de Heem (q.v.), reflected broader trends in Dutch and Flemish still-life painting. In his last decade especially, Claesz developed a painterly technique and a warmer palette. His work appears to have been highly regarded by local collectors, to judge from the 121 pictures by him that are listed in Haarlem estate inventories of the seventeenth century, many of which record the possessions of prominent citizens.⁵


2. See Brunner-Bulst 2004, pp. 266–351, where 244 pictures by Claesz are catalogued. The author of that monograph refers to Claesz’s “last work, a still life with fish,” as a work of 1656 in Haarlem–Zürich–Washington 2004–5, p. 58, presumably the last work mentioned in her essay and included in the exhibition.


5. For these two paintings, see Haarlem–Zürich–Washington 2004–5, nos. 13, 40 (ill. pp. 40, 94, respectively).

6. See Biesboer in ibid., pp. 35–26. Anne Lowenthal in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 7, p. 370, concludes that “the porcelain, glassware, metalwork and foods he depicted were of the sort found in homes of the Dutch middle class, who in turn purchased Claesz’s paintings.” This statement would appear to underestimate the value of many of the objects that Claesz represented, and the social level of his known patrons.
28. Still Life with a Skull and Writing Quill

Oil on wood, 9½ x 14¼ in. (24.1 x 35.9 cm)
Signed and dated (to right of skull): PC [in monogram]
/[^x^] 1628-

The painting is well preserved.

Rogers Fund, 1949 49.107

This superb early work by Claesz, in pristine condition, was long considered to date from 1623 until the question was revisited, in 1984, at the request of Martina Brunner-Bulst, whose monograph of 2004 and the Claesz exhibition of 2004–5 (see Refs.) now make clear that in style and subject matter the painting is typical of the late 1620s. Technical examination of the date inscribed on the painting confirms that it is intact and can be read only as 1628.1

The picture represents, with haunting verisimilitude, a skull resting on a folder of papers and a leather-bound book, both of which have the curled, worn look of long use. A roemer, or drinking glass, is propped against the side of the skull, with the rim balanced on the stone tabletop. In the left foreground, a small inkwell lies on its side and extends over the chipped edge of the table and a quill pen is suspended between the book and the wooden toggle of a leather pen case. The wick glows with its last spark of life in the earthenware oil lamp, emitting a faint trail of smoke.

The clarity of light, its suggestion of textures, casting of shadows, and creation of substance and space testify to Claesz’s exceptional powers of observation. Rubbed areas on the oil lamp (the handle of which is unglazed), the shiny teeth in the skull, and the frayed corners of the book give a vivid sense of a life lived in the recent past. The artist must have studied these or very similar motifs in the studio, and perhaps arranged them approximately as they are presented here. One reason for the extraordinary success of his illusionistic approach (in addition to the immediately noticed qualities) is the painter’s precise rendering of difficult shapes and volumes, which falters
slightly only in the base of the lamp, perhaps an artistic choice. The composition is strong and subtle, with crossing diagonals and oval shapes corresponding across carefully constructed voids. The shadows of the pen, the rim of the glass, and the strap of the pen case greatly enhance the impression of three-dimensional space in the foreground. The fall of light in general—and, of course, the window reflected in the glass—suggests the larger space of a room, and implies that our roving eyes have come to rest on something too disturbing or too significant to be ignored. The position of absolute authority given to the skull is more compelling in this painting than in the emblematic arrangement by Jacques de Gheyn painted twenty-five years earlier (Pl. 48); here the effect is more realistic, as though the force of nature has taken its course beyond human control.

The simplicity and directness achieved in this work were gradually distilled by Claesz over a period of several years, in which he could be said to have reached a moment of early maturity. The Vanitas Still Life with Brass Candlestick, Writing Materials, Letter, Pocket Watch, and Anemone, of 1623 (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem), continues the additive distribution of motifs found in earlier works, but reduces their number, focusing on two objects, the candlestick and the skull. The Vanitas Still Life with Violin and Glass Ball, of about 1628, in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg (fig. 25), is more complex and repeats the motifs to some extent the placement of the lamp, pen, pen holder, inkwell, roemer, book, and folders of papers that are found in the New York composition. Of known works by Claesz, it is not a vanitas picture with a skull but the Still Life with Books and Burning Candle, of 1627 (Mauritshuis, The Hague), that anticipates the present work in its concentration, but the impression is of a small world of reflections and shadows, rather than that of a stark encounter with death in the light of day.

The subject might be interpreted as one of many variations on the theme of worldly accomplishments—writing, learning, dabbling in the arts—that ultimately come to nothing: all is vanity. Claesz’s more encyclopedic Vanitas Still Life, of 1628 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), with musical instruments, armor, and objects representing the fine arts and scholarship, certainly has this meaning. In the Museum’s painting, however, the book and folder of papers are closed, the glass is overturned, the lamp and pen have been put aside. In such a setting the skull is not merely an intrusion into a world of human activity, but the familiar attribute of a scholar or philosopher. For the original owner of a work of art such as this one, the image probably expressed not only the vanity of knowledge but also the knowledge of vanity, much as a contemporary portrait of a person holding a skull conveyed the sitter’s belief in a spiritual life after death.

The wisp of smoke in the lamp and the reflections in the glass are signs of fleeting existence too common in Dutch pictures to be discussed here (see under discussion of De Gheyn, Pl. 48). The familiar motif of the tipped-over glass is given an explanation in a still life by an anonymous contemporary of Claesz’s of a skull, books, a watch, a glass, and an extinguished candle (private collection). Carved into the side of the chipped stone tabletop is the inscription:
Het glas is leegh. De tyd is om.
De keers is uyt. Den mensch is storn.

(The glass is empty. Time is up.
The candle is out. Man is silent.)

1. Correspondence from Martina Brunner, dated August 24, 1982, explains in some detail how the numbers 3 and 8 can be confused in Claesz’s inscriptions. Examination under magnification in 1983 confirmed her reading of 1628 (see Brunner-Bulst 2004, p. 312 (ill. “Kat. 37,” a detail photograph taken by the Department of Paintings Conservation at the Museum).


6. Düre’s engraving Saint Jerome in His Study, which includes a skull on the windowsill, is a special case (the scholar saint) within this tradition. Another is Shakespeare’s Hamlet (“Alas, poor Yorick!”). See also Samuel van Hoogstraten’s Young Man Readings, of 1644 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam; Brusati 1995, pp. 44–45, fig. 32), and the lost family portrait by Carel Fabritius, in which a young scholar sits at a desk with books and a skull (The Hague–Schwerin 2004–5, p. 46, figs. 37, 38, for the surviving visual evidence). For other examples, see Caen–Paris 1990–91, p. 66, fig. 18 (the captions of figs. 18 and 19 are switched), and pp. 200–201, no. F.53; also compare Jan de Heem’s vanitas still life of a skull and books, ibid., pp. 254–55, no. 0.18. Wurfbain, in his brief essay in Leiden 1970 (unpaged), offers a few observations concerning humanist scholars and the vanitas theme.

7. See the portraits of people with skulls catalogued in Caen–Paris 1990–91, pp. 180–91, nos. F.44–49. A portrait of a couple attributed to Dirk Jacobsz (ca. 1497–1567) and the same painter’s Portrait of Pompeius Oco, both featuring skulls, is discussed by De Jongh in Haarlem 1986a, pp. 98–101 (under no. 11). In Frans Hals’s Portrait of a Man Holding a Skull, of about 1611 (Barber Institute of Fine Arts, Birmingham, U.K.), the sitter points to the skull in his hand as, in a sense, a portrait of himself in the future (see Slive 1970–74, vol. 3, pl. 2; also Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, no. 2). Some sixteenth-century Netherlandish portraits feature illusionistic paintings of skulls on the back of the panel; see Bergström 1956, p. 15, fig. 13.

8. See Basel 1987, no. 29, where the painting is catalogued as by Claesz (it is not accepted in Brunner-Bulst 2004). Bergström in Leiden 1970 (unpaged) first drew attention to the picture and its inscription. See also Weh 1982, p. 34, where the inscription is connected with the Museum’s picture and it is noted that the meaning of the Latin word vanitas is “empty.”

REFERENCES: A. Bredius in Kunstchronik 20, no. 11, (December 25, 1884), p. 197, records De Stuers’s purchase of the painting at the Amsterdam auction of October 14, 1884 (see Ex Coll.), referring to it as “einer der schönsten, frühen Pieter Claesz, eine Vanitas mit herrlich gemaltem Schädel, Büchern, Römer, Uhr [sic] u. von 1623”; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 1 (1906), p. 285, listed as the first among dated works by Claesz, “Eine Vanitas. 1623,” in the Muller sale, Amsterdam, 1884; E. W. Moe, “Pieter Claesz,” in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 7 (1912), p. 38, as the artist’s earliest known dated picture, of 1623, in the collection of Alphonce de Stuers, Paris; Baecker 1980, vol. I, p. 28, as dated 1623; Hibbard 1980, p. 335, fig. 277, as dated 1623; Weh 1982, p. 34, as dated 1623, describes the composition and its meaning, with particular attention to the overturned glass as a vanitas symbol; P. Sutton 1986, p. 190, as dated 1623; Liedtke 1990, p. 51, as “early and extraordinary”; Segal in Utrecht–Braunschweig 1991, pp. 23, 52 n. 28, and p. 132 (under no. 4), as dated 1628, discerns the influence of this kind of vanitas still life by Claesz in works by W. C. Heda (1628) and by Jan de Heem (1628 and 1629); Roethlisberger 1993, vol. I, p. 102 (under no. 53), mentions the picture among early vanitas still lifes that are “more narrative” than the Museum’s painting by De Gheyn (Pl. 48); M. Brunner-Bulst in Saur AKI. 1992–93, vol. 19 (1998), p. 354, listed; Chong and W. Klock in Amsterdam–Cleveland 1999–2000, p. 140–42, no. 15, as dated 1628, describe the subject and composition, compare the Museum’s painting by De Gheyn, and claim that “the specific vanitas meaning of the painting is open-ended”; Brunner-Bulst 2004, pp. 131, 170, 185, 225–26, no. 37, and p. 352 (detail of inscription), notes the close relationship between this composition and the right half of W. C. Heda’s Vanitas, of 1628, in the Museum Bredius, The Hague, places the work among other “pure vanitas still lifes” that Claesz painted, and reports on the rereading of the date in 1982; Haarlem–Zürich–Washington 2004–5, pp. 46, 120, no. 18 (ill. pp. 10, 89 [detail]), as dated 1628, and as revealing “tremendous concentration.”


EX COLL.: Graeff van Polbroek, Amsterdam (by 1877–84; sale, Van Pappelendam and Schouten, Amsterdam, May 16, 1877, no. 28, bought in for Fl 200); sale, Muller and Van Pappelendam, Amsterdam, October 14, 1884, no. 20, for Fl 450; Chevalier Alphonse de Stuers, Madrid and Paris (1884–at least 1912); by descent to Chevalier H. de Stuers, Château La Tourangelle, Gland (until 1947); sale, Fischer, Lucerne, October 21–25, 1947, no. 2973); [N. Katz, Dieren, until 1949; exchanged with Kleinberger]; Kleinberger, New York, 1949; sold to MMA; Rogers Fund, 1949 49.107
EDWAERT COLLIER
Breda ca. 1640?—after 1707 London or Leiden

The still-life painter Edwaert Collier (also spelled Colyer and Collier) may have trained in Haarlem, since a number of his early paintings recall monochrome still lifes in the manner of Pieter Claesz and Willem Claesz Heda (q.v.), and works by younger Haarlem natives such as Jan Jansz van de Velde III (1620–1662) and Vincent van der Vinne (1628/29–1702). Between 1667 and 1691, Collier is documented in Leiden. He married Maria Franchoys, a widow, in 1670. As a widower, he was betrothed to another woman in May 1674, but that union was prevented by a promise made previously by the intended bride. In 1677, Collier married Cornelia Tielman in Leiden, and, again as a widower, in 1681 he wed Anna du Bois. In 1693, he went to London, where he evidently worked until about 1702. On still lifes dating from between that year and 1706, the artist often added “Leyden” or “tot Leyden” (in Leiden) to his signature, as on a letter-rack still life (Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden) that includes a speech given by Queen Anne in 1703. (Another trompe l’œil picture of the same type, signed “E. Collier, 1703,” features Dutch texts and a portrait print of Erasmus.) As of now, the earliest known dated work by Collier appears to be a Claesz-like composition dated 1661 (formerly private collection, Wassenaar), and the latest a still life dated 1707 and inscribed “fecit London.”

In subject and style, Collier’s vanitas still lifes follow a Leiden tradition that dates back to the late 1620s with works by Jan Lievens, Jan de Heem, and Gerrit Dou, and continues with David Bailly, his pupils Harmen Steenwyck and Pieter Steenwyck, De Heem’s pupil Pieter de Ring, and others. Haarlem artists such as Claesz, Van der Vinne, and Jan Vermeulen have also been associated with Collier’s vanitas compositions. His letter-rack still lifes must have been inspired by examples painted in the 1650s and 1660s by Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.) and Wallerant Vaillant, and by the similar trompe l’œil still lifes that Cornelis Bisschop painted as early as 1656 in Amsterdam. Letter-rack and other illusionistic pictures were popularized in London during the 1660s by Van Hoogstraten, and at the Danish court between 1668 and 1672 by Cornelis Gijsbrechts. Collier’s contribution to this international fashion was made mainly during his years in London, where his topical pictures of documents, newspapers, letters, portrait miniatures and medals (often of Charles I), quill pens, and other items seemingly stuck behind ribbons tacked to boards were sufficiently appreciated to be copied and imitated by English artists.

1. Compare the accounts of M. Wurfbain in Dictionary of Art, vol. 7, p. 368, and of F. Meijer in Samt Akl. 1992– , vol. 20 (1998), p. 299. According to Wurfbain, Collier was separated from his wife in April 1682. A vanitas still life by Collier dated 1684 (formerly private collection, Recklinghausen) includes a painter with a palette, displaying in his right hand a portrait drawing of a woman; see Bergström 1956, fig. 133, or Vroom 1980, vol. 1, fig. 180. The male figure is plausibly (given the nature of the still life and the inscription “Leyden”) assumed to be a self-portrait, and one would presume that the woman is his wife.

2. Private collection; see Grimm 1988, p. 178, fig. 122.

3. The former is cited in Vroom 1980, vol. 1, pp. 136–37, fig. 179, vol. 2, p. 43, no. 189, and the latter (art market, 1980) is noted by Meijer (see note 1 above). Other authors cite different works and dates, which appear to be less reliable.


6. For this type of still life by Van Hoogstraten, see Brusati 1995, pp. 95–96, 162–68, figs. 56, 111, 112, and Amsterdam–Cleveland 1999–2000, pp. 61–63 (where C. Brusati also discusses Vaillant and Cornelis Gijsbrechts), 233–34, nos. 13, 14. Vaillant’s letter-rack still life dated 1658 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden) is reproduced in Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden 1995, vol. 1, p. 1000, no. 391/1. For works by Bisschop, see ibid., vol. 2, pp. 197–99, and Amsterdam–Cleveland 1999–2000, pp. 23–24, fig. 22 (1658), and pp. 228–30, no. 35 (Account Books of the City Treasury of Amsterdam, which was painted in 1655 to serve as an overdoor in the Town Hall of Amsterdam and won considerable acclaim).

7. On Gijsbrechts, see the biography of Cornelis Bisschop above, note 14.

29. Vanitas Still Life

Oil on wood, 37 x 44 1/2 in. (94 x 112.1 cm)
Signed and dated (left, on book): EC [in monogram]/1662
Inscribed: (left, on ring) E·K; (left, on book) Almanach . . . ;
(center, on bookmark) VANITAS; (center, on print) JACOB CATZ
RIDDER RAED/PENSION. VAN H.M.HEEREN/STATEN.VAN.
HOLLANT.CVRAT. (Jacob Cats, Grand Pensionary of Their
Majesties the Lords of the States of Holland); (on left page of
book) Sermon X (Sermon 10); (on right page of book) DE
DERDE ENDE/VIERDE DECAS DER SER./MOOGEN HENRCHI
BLLINGE . . ./DAT TWEEDE DEEL/JESVS./DESE·IS MYN
LIEVE SONE/in den welcke mijn ziele/te/verde is. Hoort
hem.Mat. (The Third and Fourth Decades of the Sermons of
Heinrich Bullinger . . . Volume Two. Jesus. This is my beloved
Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him. Mat[thew 17:3])

The condition of the painting is poor. It has suffered abrasion
throughout, and in the background at upper left a large
area of paint has been completely lost.

Purchase, 1871  71.19

Collier put his initials in two places on this early work: “EC”
in monogram, above the date 1662 on the almanac (where the
quill pen could suggest the freshness of the inscription); and
“E·K” on the gold ring (Collier was a common alternative
spelling, often used by the artist himself). The painting is a
fairly conventional, but well-conceived and well-composed, vani-
as picture. The focus of the design in the area of the tipped-
over silver tazza and green-glass roemer (which with the watch
recall still lifes by Willem Claesz Heda; q.v.) and the organiza-
tion overall, with various X-patterns countering the impression
of disarray, indicate that in his early twenties Collier had
already mastered the syntax of a visual language in which earlier
masters, including Pieter Claesz and Jan de Heem (q.q.v.), had
expressed themselves. The actual execution is another matter:
Collier has a dry, rather petty touch, which he overcomes some-
what in the elaborate decorations of the tazza and other
reflective surfaces. Even allowing for condition problems, however, the pearls (on a red ribbon), the moneybag, the oil lamp (with a faintly smoking wick), and the books look nearly as wooden as the violin and the shawm. Later works cannot be described as great advances beyond this point.

Heda also comes to mind in connection with the fancy glass pitcher in the left background, and with the “monochrome” tonality throughout. Except for isolated patches of local color, the palette is quite restrained, perhaps in deference to the sober tenor of the subject. Some loss of color is the result of age, but the hints of burgundy in the table cover and the red in the flag were always subordinate to browns.

The flag must refer to military or, more specifically, civic guard service, and is thus a sign of worldly honor (compare Rembrandt’s The Standard-Bearer (Floris Soup); Pl. 152). In general, the objects refer to wealth and individual accomplishment, with (as often in Leiden still lifes) the vanity of learning given particular emphasis. Literature, secular music (unidentified), and hobbies such as astronomy (indicated by the crude version of a Blaeu celestial globe; see Pl. 156) will all pass away like whiffs of smoke, days marked by an almanac, hours ticked off by a watch, a tune played on the shawm, and measures of music. A string on the violin has conspicuously snapped. In this familiar context one hardly needs the skull, the hourglass, and the inscription in the center, “vanitas.” But then pedantry, too, is a Leiden tradition.

Collier often included books and prints in his vanitas pictures. In some cases they represent mundane diversions, but usually the books and the person portrayed in a print (for example, Erasmus or Admiral Tromp) are meant for the viewer’s edification. The portrait print of the popular writer Jacob Cats (1577–1661) in the museum’s painting was engraved by Michael Natais after Pieter Dubordieu, and was published in Alle de werken van Jacob Cats (1655). Collier raised and enlarged the first line of the inscription, which is below the image in the actual print, and set it off on a plaque. Cats had recently died, and he serves here as an exemplary figure, remembered for public service and moral advice. The large book is one volume of a Dutch edition of The Decades, or Fifty Sermons Divided into Five Decades, by the Swiss reformer Johann Heinrich Bullinger (1504–1575). Each “decade” consists of ten sermons. The third decade opens with sermons on material possessions, wealth, theft, and so on.

The earliest known dated painting by Collier is evidently a less ambitious vanitas still life of 1661, in which some similar motifs are found. Several still lifes by Collier are dated 1662, including a canvas in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; a canvas on the art market in 1999; and another sold in 2001. Comparable pictures date from the succeeding years.

1. Celestial globes in other works by Collier have been interpreted as references to eternal life, especially when juxtaposed with a terrestrial globe (see Auckland 1982, p. 201, and New York 1988, p. 45). Such a reading here would appear unsustainable.
2. For a brief synopsis of the “musical vanitas” in Dutch painting, see Liedtke 2000a, pp. 69–70. In that passage the present writer mentions the following lines from Jan van der Veen’s Zinne-Beelden oft Adams Appel (Amsterdam, 1659), emblem no. 32: “De Vedd of piool die wert God beter, meer Gebruycyt tot ydel-heyt, als tot Gods lof en eer” (The Fiddle or Violin which would better serve God is used more for vanity than for God’s praise and honor).

References: Decamps 1872, p. 437, cites the work as “une remarquable Vanitas” by Cesar van Everdingen; MMA 1872, no. 61, as by Cesar van Everdingen (based on the monogram); Harck 1888, pp. 76–77, notes that the picture is called a Van Everdingen but the monogram is Collier’s, as is the painting; E. W. Moe, in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 7 (1912), p. 263, as the earliest known dated work by Collier; Vorenkamp 1933, p. 108, as the artist’s earliest known work, dated 1662; Bol 1982c, p. 154, as the earliest known dated work by Collier; De Jongh in Auckland 1982, p. 201 (under no. 40), dates a vanitas still life in the Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden, to Collier’s early period, based on comparison with the Museum’s picture and others; A. Adams in New York 1988, p. 45 (under no. 11), refers to the Museum’s picture in order to date a painting by Collier in a private collection; Baetjer 1995, p. 341; Gemar-Koeltzsch 1995, vol. 2, p. 256, no. 80/2 (ill.); Maarten Wurfbain in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 7, p. 568, mentioned; F. G. Meijer in Saur AKL 1992–95, vol. 20 (1998), p. 300, listed; Baetjer 2004, pp. 203, 245, no. 63 (ill.), clarifies provenance.


Ex coll.: By descent to Martin, comte Cornet de Ways Ruart, Brussels (until d. 1870); [Étienne Le Roy, Brussels, through Léon Gaucher, Paris, until 1870, as by Cæsar van Everdingen; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871
The artist is not well documented. It is assumed he was born in Utrecht about 1620, since he joined the painters' guild there in 1639. He has been described as possibly a pupil of Cornelis van Poelenburch (1594/95–1667), who, however, was in England between 1637 and 1641, when Van Cuylenborch might have been studying with him. In any case, he was very much influenced by that artist and must have been impressed by his success in court circles (The Hague and London), and also by that of Van Poelenburch's probable pupil Dirck van der Lisse (1607–1669). Unlike those artists, Van Cuylenborch appears to have worked only in Utrecht. He was married there on May 23, 1641. Most of his known paintings date from the 1640s. He died in November 1658.

Van Cuylenborch specialized in arcadian landscapes with mythological and occasionally biblical figures, and in somewhat melodramatic grotto scenes. The latter, which are enlivened by mythological or contemporary figures, were derived from early works by Van Poelenburch and also from paintings by Carel de Hooch (d. 1648), who was active in Utrecht during the 1630s. The ruins and catacombs of Rome and both natural and artificial grottoes in Italy (for example, the nymphaeum of Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli) caught the imagination of Netherlandish artists as early as the 1530s, when Marten van Heemskerck (1498–1574) and Herman Posthumus (active by 1536–d. after 1542) explored the Domus Aurea of Nero.

Van Cuylenborch was a talented figure painter (he occasionally contributed staffage to works by other artists), although not nearly as refined as Van Poelenburch. His landscapes (apart from the grotto views) are comparatively naturalistic, in a style generally resembling that of Jan Both (ca. 1615/18–1652). The Van Poelenburch manner continued with younger artists such as Jan van Haensbergen (1642–1705).

4. For a collaboration with the landscapist Willem de Heusch (1645–1692), see San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, p. 306, fig. 2 (a panel dated 1643 in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Nîmes, to which Nicolas Knupfer also contributed). A different sort of collaboration, with Jacob Duck (q.v.), is discussed in Rosen 2004.
30. Bacchus and Nymphs in a Landscape

Oil on wood, 22 3/8 x 28 7/8 in. (58.1 x 72.1 cm)
Signed (lower left): AvC f [AVC in monogram]

The painting is in good condition. The oak panel has been thinned to a thickness of 1/4 inch (.32 cm), attached to an oak panel support 1/4 inch (.64 cm) thick, and cradled. There is paint loss along a horizontal split just above the main figurual group that extends the width of the panel, and abrasions along the left and lower edges. The wood grain has grown more visible in the sky as the paint film has aged. The darkened pores of the grain are also visible in the more thinly painted and slightly abraded group of figures at lower right.

Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900  25.110.37

This lighthearted mythological picture is a typical Van Cuylenborch, probably from the 1640s. It was given to the Museum as a “Landscape” by Cornelis van Poelenburch (1594/95–1667), and the monogram was misread as “CP.” Curator Harry Wehle corrected these errors in 1948.

Apart from Bacchus, who enjoys a flute of red wine, none of the figures appear to be intended as a specific mythological personality. The naked nymphs in the foreground receive fruits and vegetables from two heavily laden putti, one posing like a little Atlas with a basket on his head (fig. 26). Five putti cavort overhead, pulling vine tendrils from the trees. In the right background, a nymph and satyr dance, another nymph with drapery around her hips plays a flute or some other instrument, and a satyr on his knees appears to hold a large jug (details are unclear due to abrasion). The dark green area of the foreground is attractively embellished by twigs and leaves.

The graceful woman seated on a rock occurs variously in the

![Figure 26. Detail of Van Cuylenborch's Bacchus and Nymphs in a Landscape (Pl. 30)](image-url)
artist’s work. In this case, she comes closer than usual to one of Raphael’s Three Graces in the Sala di Psiche of the Villa Farnesina, Rome, which was widely known through engravings. However, there are many similar figures in Dutch art, as seen in the work of Joachim Wtewael (q.v.), Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem (1562–1638), Van Poelenburgh, and others.¹ There may be some Renaissance source for Bacchus as well, but Van Cuylenborch perused earlier material for useful ideas rather than familiar quotations. The chubby-cheeked type holding a modern glass is very much a Batavian Bacchus, like the one in the title print of Dirck Pers’s book on the use and misuse of wine, _Bacchus Wonder-werken_ (Amsterdam, 1628).²

2. See Roodenburg 2000, p. 76 (ill.).

**References:** Bakiet 1995, p. 124.

**Ex Coll.** Collis P. Huntington, New York (until d. 1900; life interest to his widow, Arabella D. Huntington, later [from 1913] Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, 1900–d. 1924; life interest to their son, Archer Milton Huntington, 1924–terminated in 1931); Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900. 25.110.37
Cuyp came from a family of artists in Dordrecht, where he spent his entire artistic career. He was the only child of the painter Jacob Gerritsz Cuyp (1594–1657/58), whose diverse oeuvre includes various kinds of portraits as well as history pictures, genre paintings, and still lifes. J. G. Cuyp and his two half brothers, the painter Benjamin Gerritsz Cuyp (1612–1652) and the glass painter Gerrit Gerritsz, the Younger (1603–1651), were the sons of the glass painter Gerrit Gerritsz (ca. 1565–1644), who moved from Venlo (east of Eindhoven) to Dordrecht about 1585. Jacob Gerritsz adopted the surname Cuyp by 1617 and, in 1618, married Aertken van Cooten, from Utrecht. He was a prominent figure in the Dordrecht painters’ guild and the teacher of Benjamin and Aelbert, and most likely also of Paulus Lesire (1612–after 1654/56) and Ferdinand Bol (q.v.).

Unlike Bol, Cornelis Bisschop, Samuel van Hoostraten, Nicolaes Maes, Godfried Schalcken (q.v.), and even his own father, Aelbert Cuyp was almost unknown outside Dordrecht during the seventeenth century. His reputation in the late eighteenth century, especially in England, and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was almost equal to that of Jacob van Ruisdael and of Meyndert Hobbema (q.v.). He is routinely numbered among the Italianate landscapists of his generation and was known in the past as “the Dutch Claude,” but it appears certain that he never went to Italy.

Cuyp was baptized in the Reformed Church of Dordrecht during the later days of October 1620. By the time he was nineteen, he was active as an independent artist and also as his father’s collaborator: three landscapes of 1639 are his earliest known works, while he also painted landscape backgrounds in family portraits by his father that date from 1640, 1641, and 1645. Cuyp’s early style and motifs have been associated with the work of the Gorcum painter Herman Sattileven (1609–1683) and others, especially Jan van Goyen (q.v.), who lived in The Hague from 1632 onward and was an influential figure throughout the southern part of the Province of Holland. Collectors and artists in the court city and in nearby centers such as Delft, Rotterdam, and Dordrecht also were traditionally attentive to developments in Utrecht (J. G. Cuyp was no exception), so that Cuyp’s apparent interest in the Italianate landscapes of Cornelis van Poelenburgh (1594/95–1667) in the early 1640s and, from 1645 onward, those of the newly returned Jan Both (ca. 1615/18–1652) is not unexpected. However, the degree to which Cuyp responded to Both was exceptional, and becomes even more conspicuous in works of the 1650s (see Landscape with the Flight into Egypt; Pl. 32). Also important for the formation of Cuyp’s style were his sketching tours in the provinces of Holland and Utrecht about 1642, and in the Rhine Valley in 1651 or 1652.

The death of Jacob Gerritsz Cuyp (by 1652) apparently improved his son’s prospects as a portraitist in Dordrecht; the equestrian portrait of the young Pompe van Meerdervoort brothers (Pl. 33), discussed below, is an early example of his work for the city’s leading families. In July 1658, Cuyp himself moved up in society when he married the slightly older Cornelia Boschman (1617–1689), who was the widow of a wealthy regent, Johan van den Corput. Cuyp and his wife had only one child, Arendina (1659–1702), although Cornelia had three children from her first marriage. The artist became a man of property and responsibility. In 1660, he was made a deacon of the Reformed Church, and an elder in 1672. The following year, he was named regent of the Dordrecht hospital and was also placed on a list of one hundred candidates for municipal office who were loyal to the new stadholder, Willem III. In 1679, he was named a member of the High Court of South Holland. From 1663, Cuyp lived with his family in a large house in the Wijnstraat, and he and his wife also acquired large tracts of land outside the city. The artist’s net worth was 42,000 guilders in 1689, the year of his wife’s death. There is no evidence that he continued to paint after about 1660.

Cuyp’s mature works date from the late 1640s to the late 1650s. In addition to many works in which groups of cows are set in meadows and along riverbanks (see Pl. 33), Cuyp painted superb views of the river Maas at Dordrecht (some with anchored fleets), of the river Waal at Nijmegen, and of cliffs along the Rhine; a number of equestrian pictures (not all of them with portraits); and still interiors, religious subjects set in landscapes, and conventional portraits.

Drawings made out of doors were an important part of
Cuyp’s creative process, but the paintings are very much studio products, even when their wonderful light effects are convincingly observed. A remarkable aspect of the artist’s typical pictures is the way they transform Netherlandish landscape into something like the Roman campagna in the late afternoon on a spring or summer day. As in paintings of pastoral subjects and picturesque countryside by contemporaries such as Paul Potter (1625–1654) and Nicolaes Berchem (q.v.), this image of a Dutch Arcadia was made for an urban clientele.

2. On Cuyp’s reputation after 1700, see Chong in Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, pp. 42–48 (p. 43, for “the Dutch Claude”).
3. For two examples of collaboration dated 1644, see Reiss 1975, nos. 16, 17, and nos. 1 and 4 for landscapes by Aelbert dated 1639. See also Chong 1991 on Aelbert Cuyp’s early work. His development will be further clarified in Chong’s forthcoming monograph. Chong’s claim (1991, p. 608) that some of Aelbert’s earliest works “directly recall” the Antwerp landscapist Josse de Momper II (1564–1615) seems somewhat simplistic, considering the Fleming’s popularity in Holland and the emulators who were active in the southern part of that province during the 1630s. On this point, see New York–London 2001, pp. 83–86, 187, 264.
4. These details are adopted from the biographies of Cuyp by Chong in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 290, and in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 8, p. 291. As noted by Chong in Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, pp. 40–41, Cuyp’s wife was the granddaughter of Franciscus Gomarus, the founder of the Counter-Renemans, who were strong supporters of the House of Orange.

31. Piping Shepherds

Oil on canvas, 33 3/4 x 47 in. (90.8 x 119.4 cm)
Signed (lower right): A. cuyp. F.

The artist’s monochrome palette as well as abrasion of the surface contribute to the picture’s generally impoverished appearance.

Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 25.110.15

The Huntington picture is a signed early work by Cuyp, probably painted about 1643–44. Although larger than most works painted by the artist when he was in his early to mid-twenties, the painting shares with them a fluid touch and a palette reminiscent of Jan van Goyen (q.v.); pale browns and yellows blend together in the landscape, tans and grays in the costumes, and blues in the sky. The color of the light and the fall of the shadows suggest that the time is late afternoon, which is consistent with the alignment of Dordrecht Cathedral on the horizon to the far left. A mood of quiet contentment prevails: the boy plays a flute, the man a bagpipe, and a younger boy lies on the ground, while attentive cows and smiling sheep seem to assemble for the music or for the walk back home. The playful dog, by contrast, appears to eye the viewer.

Reiss (see Refs.) seems somewhat uncertain of the attribution, and implies that the figures and animals may be by Aelbert’s father, Jacob Gerritsz Cuyp (1594–1631/32). The question is raised by the general resemblance of the figures to types painted by the elder Cuyp, and by known examples of collaboration between father and son in the early 1640s. The execution, however, reveals no indications of more than one hand, and is entirely consistent with Aelbert’s undisputed works of the early 1640s, such as Sunset near Dordrecht (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam)4 and Orpheus Charming the Animals (private collection, Boston).5

As several authors have noted (see Refs.), the landscape in the left background, with its distant view of Dordrecht Cathedral (the Grote Kerk), corresponds with a drawing, Dordrecht from the East (Rijksprentenkabinett, Rijksmuseum, AELBERT CUYP 137
Amsterdam), made from nature by Cuyp about 1641–43. Cuyp used the same study for the backgrounds of *The Kicking Horse* (John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art) and *Landscape near Dordrecht with Shepherds Teasing a Goat* (private collection, the Netherlands). The latter is also similar to the Museum’s picture in its grouping of trees and animals at the right, and in the scale of the shepherds (who differ, but wear the same hats).

The boy lying on the ground is an early instance of a common motif in Cuyp’s work. The sheep probably derive from examples by his father. The entrance of cows and other animals from offstage is a common occurrence in the elder Cuyp’s oeuvre, where a model for the dog is also found. To judge from their facial types, the musical shepherds may also have immediate antecedents in the work of Cuyp’s father, but none is presently known.

A copy of two-thirds of the composition, cropping the left side and replacing the dog with a copper jug, was on the art market in 1990.

1. As concluded by Alan Chong in his dissertation on Cuyp (Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, 1992, unpaged; entry kindly provided to the Museum). Chong dismisses Reiss’s reservations (see Refs.), and considers the foliage and figures typical of Cuyp in the early 1640s.

2. In letters to the Museum dating from 1951 and 1952, Reiss suggests that the picture (which he had not seen) is probably by J. G. Cuyp. In Reiss 1975, p. 75 (under no. 42), the author acknowledges mistakenly attributing an early work by Aelbert Cuyp to J. G. Cuyp in Reiss 1993.

3. For example, Dordrecht 2002, nos. 26, 27, 30; Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, no. 3.


6. Reiss 1975, no. 61, where a detail of the painting is reproduced.


8. Compare the drawing *Three Studies of a Young Shepherd* (Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), from which one of the figures was adopted in a painting of the 1660s (see Amsterdam–Washington 1981–82, pp. 120–21, fig. 2; MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 86, no. 82a, fig. 24, pl. 75). Similar figures occur in the work of Jan Both (see Amsterdam–Washington 1981–82, pp. 64–65, fig. 1).


10. See ibid., no. 18 (the same dog, in a portrait of 1648), and no. 26 (the cow).

11. Christie’s, New York, April 4, 1990, no. 203 (ill.).

REFERENCES: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 5 (1834), p. 366, no. 76, records the painting as in the Bessborough sale of February 1801; Hofsteede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 2 (1909), p. 238a, as in the Bessborough sale of February 1801, and p. 102, no. 331, as in the collection of Mrs. C. P. Huntington, New York, and describes the composition; Valentin in New York 1909, pp. xxiv, 8, no. 7 (ill.), as “early work, about 1640–50”; Breek 1910, p. 61, mentioned; B. Burroughs 1925a, pp. 142, 146 (ill.), 180, as “the well-known Piping Shepherds by Aelbert Cuyp,” with a vision of “uncommon simplicity and objectivity”; J. Holmes 1930, p. 182, listed; Barnouw 1944, p. 23; Reiss 1975, pp. 9, 86, 87, 207, no. 51, as by the “Cuyp studio 1640–43,” closely related to J. G. Cuyp’s work, the background based on a drawing in the Rijksmuseum (see the following ref); J. G. van Gelder in Dordrecht 1977–78, p. 128 n. 1 (under no. 48), notes the use of a landscape drawing by Aelbert Cuyp, *Dordrecht from the East*, of about 1641–43 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), as the basis for the left background in this picture; Yapou 1981, pp. 160, 165 n. 15, repeats Gilray’s (JfE), i.e., Van Gelder in Dordrecht 1977–78 observation in connection with the background of another painting by Cuyp (Reiss 1975, no. 52): P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, as an early work by Aelbert Cuyp “which is sometimes thought to be a collaboration between Aelbert and his father”; Duparc in Cambridge–Montreal 1988, p. 88, fig. 1 (under no. 21), repeats the information about the Rijksmuseum drawing; Liedke 1990, p. 37, mentioned as part of Collis Huntington’s bequest; Baerjer 1995, p. 326.


Ex Coll.: Earl’s of Bessborough, Roehampton (by 1801–92); their sale, Christie’s, London, February 5–7, 1801, no. 60, as “A Landscape and Cattle, a View from Nature, in Holland,” bought in for £409 10s.; their sale, Christie’s, London, April 7, 1803, no. 60, as “A Landscape and Cattle, a View from Nature in Holland,” bought in for £189; their sale, April 1, 1848, no. 87, bought in for £240; their sale, March 14, 1891, no. 148, as “A Sunny River Scene,” bought in for £180; their sale, June 11, 1892, no. 62, for £200, to Colnaghi, London; [Martin Colnaghi, London, from 1892]; [Sedelmeyer, Paris, in 1894]; Collis P. Huntington, New York (until 1900); life interest to his widow, Arabella D. Huntington, later [from 1913] Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, 1900–d. 1924; life interest to their son, Archer Milton Huntington, New York, 1924–terminated in 1925); Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 25.110.45
32. Landscape with the Flight into Egypt

Oil on wood, 18 x 22 7/8 in. (45.7 x 58.1 cm)
Signed (lower left): A.C

The painting is well preserved. The final glazes are disrupted in the passages of foreground vegetation that appear blanched. Microscopic examination reveals an admixture of fine brass particles in the dark, transparent final glazes in the trees and other vegetation at lower right.


One of the clearest examples of Cuyp's response to the Italianate landscapes of Jan Both (see the biography of Cuyp above), this panel of about 1650 shows the Holy Family on the left, traveling on a path in the light of a radiant sunset. The way to Egypt appears to have taken Mary and Joseph down the Rhine and along the coast of Liguria, although the view behind them seems an evocation of distant memories of those places rather than signs of recent experience. As is well known, Cuyp never went to Italy himself, but he borrowed the Claudian light, cicalpine motifs, and compositional ideas that Both employed in his prints and paintings. For example, Both's etching The Ferry (fig. 27) is very similar in composition to the present picture and includes analogous details, such as wayfarers with donkeys, herders with cows, distant towers, and a few light clouds colored by the descending sun. Some of Both's paintings of about 1645-50 are strikingly similar to this picture in tonality as well as design, and in their idyllic mood.

About two dozen landscapes by Cuyp are enlivened by religious figures, and at least three of them by the Holy Family on their way to Egypt. A large canvas in the care of the Instituut Collectie Nederland (Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage), Amsterdam, probably painted about 1645-48, shows the Holy Family with their donkey in a river valley, passing a bagpiper quite like the one in the Museum's Piping Shepherds (Pl. 31). The beautiful Flight into Egypt from the Carter Collection (Los Angeles County Museum) could be described as a larger and more elaborate version of the present work. And while the two paintings date from about the same time, one would imagine that the Carter picture is the slightly later.

The placement of religious figures in extensive landscapes went back to the beginning of the genre in the Netherlands and continued through the seventeenth century (see Pls. 22, DV1), though by about 1650 the practice was more common in some regions (South Holland and Utrecht, for example) than in others. The story of the Flight into Egypt (Matt. 2:13-14) was especially popular, perhaps because many Netherlanders had fled persecution themselves, but more broadly because the subject allowed for spectacular scenery. In this regard, the whole tradition could be said to head downhill from Pieter Brueghel the Elder's painting of 1565 (Samuel Courtauld Trust, Courtauld Institute of Art Gallery, London), where the Holy Family treks from an alpine meadow into all God's creation.

Some of the most impressive examples of the next generation are by Paul Bril, in the frescoes of the Palazzo Pallavicini-Rospigliosi in Rome and in a small, superb painting on copper of about 1595 (private collection); by Jan Brueghel the Elder, in panels of 1600 (private collection) and 1607 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg); and by Adam Elsheimer, whose painting on copper of 1609 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich) was engraved by Hendrick Goudt in 1613. Through either a copy or the print, Elsheimer's composition inspired Rembrandt in his nocturnal landscape of 1647, The Rest on the Flight into Egypt (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin). Rubens's treatment of the subject, in a small panel of 1614 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel), is atypical, since the figures nearly fill the moonlit space.

Cuyp's approach follows not only that of Both but also that of the Dutch Italianate landscapists in general. Cornelis van Poelenburgh's Landscape with the Flight into Egypt, of 1625 (Centraal Museum, Utrecht), was evidently the first of nine pictures he devoted to the subject. Bartholomeus Breenbergh (q.v.) depicts The Rest on the Flight into Egypt in a panel of

Figure 27. Jan Both, The Ferry (View of the Tiber in the Campagna), ca. 1645-50. Etching, sheet 7 3/4 x 11 3/4 in. (19.8 x 28.1 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1960 60.621.47
Figure 28. Herman van Swanevelt, *The Flight into Egypt*, ca. 1645–50. Oil on copper, 8 ¼ x 10 ½ in. (21 x 27 cm). Private collection
1614 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich). Not surprisingly, one of Both's landscape etchings of the 1640s centers on the Holy Family and two donkeys on a winding road. Paulus Potter's *Flight into Egypt*, of 1644 (formerly Newhouse Galleries, New York), has been mentioned in connection with Cuyp's pictures, but one of the closest parallels, in date and in its sympathy with Both, is a small painting on copper of about 1645–50 by Herman van Swanenelt (ca. 1600–1635; fig. 28), who worked in Rome from the late 1630s until 1644, when he moved to Paris.

2. Los Angeles–Boston–New York 1981–82, p. 43, fig. 3 (incorrectly as on panel); Rijksdienst Beeldende Kunst 1992, p. 77, no. 322 (ill.), as on canvas, 41 4/5 x 60 4/5 in. (106.3 x 154 cm).
4. Wheelock in Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, pp. 176, 208 (under no. 41), places the Carter picture in the mid- to late 1650s, with no mention of the painting in New York.
5. For the painting on copper, see London 2002, no. 1.
6. Ertz 1979, nos. 62, 154, figs. 239, 251. The Flemish tradition of imaginary forest landscapes is followed in Jacob van Geel's *Rest on the Flight into Egypt*, of 1633, in the Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum, Hannover (Wegener 2000, pp. 182–83, no. 76 [ill.]).
9. This work has been extensively exhibited, for example in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, no. 69 (see also no. 70), and in London 2002, no. 4.
10. As noted by Chong in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 407, fig. 2, in connection with the Pelenburch of 1625.
11. See Chong in ibid., pp. 198–99, fig. 2, and p. 408.

**Exhibited:** Lucerne, Kunstmuseum Luzern (date unknown).1

**Ex Coll.:** Mrs. Edward Romilly, London (until d. 1878; posthumous sale, Christie's, London, March 23, 1878, no. 128, for £190 or £204 10s. to Colinagh); [Colinagh, London, from 1878]; Etienne Martin, baron de Beuninville, Paris (until d. 1881; his estate sale, Pillot, Paris, May 9–16, 1881, no. 247, as “Paysage, soleil couchant,” for FFr 10,050 to Sedelmeyer); [Sedelmeyer, Paris, from 1881; sold to Kann]; Rodolphe Kann, Paris (by 1900–d. 1903; his estate 1903–7; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, London and New York, 1907–13; sale, American Art Association, New York, April 29 (or 19), 1915, no. 9, for $4,000 to Knoedler]; [Knoedler, New York, 1915–27; sale, Christie's, London, July 8, 1927, no. 114, for £441 to Duits]; [Duits, London, from 1927]; [A. S. Dry, Munich, in 1931]; Mrs. Siegfried (Josephine) Bieber, Berlin and New York (until d. 1970);2 Bequest of Josephine Bieber, in memory of her husband, Siegfried Bieber, 1970 1973-135-2

**References:** W. Roberts 1897, vol. 1, p. 300, notes the sale of 1878; Bode 1900, pp. xiv–xv, pl. 28, describes the subject and style (“affinities with Jan Both”), and places the work at “the end of his first period”. É. Michel 1905, p. 398, praises the picture as a youthful work, recalling Potter; Bode 1907, vol. 1, pp. ix, 36, no. 34 (ill.), repeats Bode 1900; Nicole 1908, p. 108, notes the picture as one of four Cuyp's in the Kann collection; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 2 (1909), p. 135, no. 442, describes the composition and gives provenance through Duveen in 1907; J. Holmes 1930, p. 167, fig. 5, mentions the work as formerly in the Kann collection, compares it with a similar picture then in the Fisher collection, Detroit (now Los Angeles County Museum); Walsh 1974a, p. 149, fig. 13, records the bequest to the MMA and observes that in its composition and golden sunlight the picture “reflects more clearly than most Cuyp's the inventions of Jan Both”; Los Angeles–Boston–New York 1981–82, pp. 43–44, fig. 4, compares the painting with the larger panel in the Carter collection, which is very similar in composition and also includes the *Flight into Egypt*; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, cites the work as a “golden Both-like landscape probably painted by Cuyp in the early 1650s”; Gaskell 1990, pp. 446–47, fig. 2, compares the composition of Cuyp's *Evening Landscape* in the Thyssen collection; Chong 1994, p. 610 n. 32, mentions the work among others with bright Italianate light; Bactier 1995, p. 327.

1. A stamped sticker on the back of the panel reads “Kunstmuseum Luzern KH 215.” The Kunstmuseum was unable to identify the exhibition (letter from curator Cornelia Dietzsch, dated December 12, 2000). However, a date in the early 1950s is likely, considering that the probable owner, Siegfried Bieber, emigrated to the United States in 1934.
2. Siegfried Bieber (1873–1960), a Berlin banker, moved to the United States in 1934. Various efforts have been made to determine whether he owned the painting in Germany, but so far these have proved unsuccessful.
Oil on canvas, 41¼ x 6½ in. (109.9 x 162.2 cm)
Signed (lower left): A. Cuyp. fecit.

The painting is very well preserved. A pentimento is visible just above the horizon line over the head of the running figure at left. Examination with infrared reflectography reveals that the building now behind the portrait group was first painted in the middle ground at left.

The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931
32.100.20

This exceptionally fine picture in the Friedsam Collection represents two young members of a distinguished Dordrecht family: on the left, Cornelis Pompe van Meerdervoort (1632–1685), and, in the center, his slightly older brother Michiel (1632–1653), who died not long after Cuyp completed the portrait. The sisters are identified in the 1749 inventory of the estate of Cornelis’s descendant Johan Diederik Pompe van Meerdervoort: “Een stuk, zijnde een schoorsteenstuk, verbeeldende de heer Michiel en Cornelis Pompe van Meerdervoort op de jagt gaande met haar praeceptor, knechts etc. door A. Cuyp” (A piece, being a chimneypiece, depicting the Messrs. Michiel and Cornelis Pompe van Meerdervoort going to hunt with their instructor, servants etc. by A. Cuyp).¹ In a much earlier inventory, one made of the contents of the Huis te Meerdervoort (the family castle at Zwijndrecht, near Dordrecht) shortly after Cornelis Pompe van Meerdervoort’s death in 1680, the items “in the children’s room” included a painting depicting “d’heer Cautier te peert met 2 Jonckhers en Willem de koetsier, voor de schoorstenen” (Mr. Cautier on horseback with 2 milords and Willem the coachman, over the mantelpiece).²

When Cuyp made this portrait, there were only three living members of this particular branch of the Pompe van Meerdervoort family, Adriana van Beveren (1618–1678) and her two sons, Michiel and Cornelis. Her husband (also named Michiel) died in 1639, just two years after the couple’s marriage and before the birth of their second son. With the latter’s death in 1653, the thirty-five-year-old widow was left alone with her fourteen-year-old son, Cornelis, who was to outlive her by two years. In the 1670s, he had his portrait painted by Samuel van Hoostraten (q.v.; the canvas is in a Dutch private collection), and although at least twenty years had passed since his features were recorded by Cuyp, the resemblance to the boy on the left in the Museum’s picture is unmistakable.³

Cornelis was more fortunate than his mother with respect to the longevity of his spouse and children. In 1662, he married Alida van Beveren (1640–1680; daughter of Jacob van Beveren and Johanna de Witt). They both died in 1680, leaving fourteen children, who included Jacob (1666–1720) and Michiel (1668–1721). In 1723, Jacob’s son Johan Diederik (1697–1749; mentioned above) married his first cousin, Michiel’s daughter Johanna Alida (1691–1749). They too died the same year, leaving three daughters aged about twenty-six, twenty-one, and twenty (two sons had died in infancy). None of these women ever married. It appears likely that at some time after two of the sisters, Adriana and Maria Christina, died in 1778 and 1781, respectively, their sister and heir, Christina Elisabeth (1729–1801), sold the painting by Cuyp.⁴ This family history allows us to complete the provenance of the picture (see Ex Coll.), which passed from one generation to another with ownership of the Huis te Meerdervoort.

Adriana van Beveren was almost certainly the first owner of Cuyp’s painting, and she is one of three parties who may have commissioned it. As discussed below, such a picturesque portrait of two boys on horseback made a very different impression on contemporary Dutch society than it does on the average viewer today. The young gentlemen represent the male line of a distinguished Dordrecht family with extensive land holdings in the area of Dordrecht and in the province of Gelderland. The Huis te Meerdervoort itself (fig. 39) was purchased by the boys’ paternal grandfather (and the older son’s namesake), Michiel Pompe van Meerdervoort (1578–1625). Their maternal grandfather, Cornelis van Beveren (1591–1663; Lord of Sreveldshoeck, West-Ittselmonde, and De Lindt), was one of the wealthiest and most influential citizens of Dordrecht. He held numerous high public offices, including burgomaster of Dordrecht (repeatedly), receiver general of South Holland, representative to the States of Holland and to the States General, and was ambassador to Denmark, Hamburg, England, and France (Louis XIII knighted him in 1635).⁵ This heritage rests on the shoulders of the young horsemen in Cuyp’s painting, and then within a year or two the older one died. Ironically, Mr. Cautier’s gesture, meant simply as a command to the retainer Willem, became one that in later years could have been read as an act of pointing to the immediate family’s sole heir and, in still later years, to their patriarch.

It is possible that Van Beveren himself commissioned the
portrait, or that the boys' uncle Matthijs Pompe van Slingelandt (1621–1679) was the patron or the person who suggested having this type of portrait painted, and by whom. It was for Matthijs Pompe, "Lord of Slingelandt" and other estates, that the artist's father, Jacob Gerritsz Cuyp (1594–1651/52), painted a full-length portrait of the patron's six-year-old son, Michiel Pompe van Slingelandt, in 1649 (Institut Collectie Nederland, on loan to the Dordrechts Museum, Dordrecht). The boy is shown briskly walking in the countryside, with a falcon on his arm and a dog just in front of him, tracking a scent. The young hunter wears a Turkish tunic of red velvet, antique sandals, a sixteenth-century bonnet, the same kind of saber that his cousins wear in the present picture, and other elements of fancy dress. The portrait thus signifies that the boy is a member (and, as it happens, the male heir) of a family with large estates, hunting privileges, and certain similarities to their social superiors at the court of The Hague.

The Meerdervoort estate was located across the Oude Maas from Dordrecht, just south of the village of Zwaanendrecht. As seen in Cuyp's slightly earlier canvas The Avenue at Meerdervoort (fig. 30), the castle and its surroundings (to the left) were separated from the river by a road on a dike and by a canal (to the right). The Grote Kerk of Dordrecht is visible to the northeast (right background). A young groom stands on the avenue, holding the reins of two saddled ponies. A man on a horse approaches from the direction of the house, and further down the avenue stand two boys and a woman, who are surely meant to be identified as Adriana van Beveren and her sons.

The setting in the Museum's picture does not derive from the same neighborhood. The partly ruined castle in the background is imaginary (similar walls and towers occur elsewhere in Cuyp's work), and was probably intended to suggest a seigneurial past. As has often been noted, the view in the left background is based on The Rhine near Elten (Fondation Custodia, Institut Néerlandais, Paris), one of the drawings Cuyp made in the area of Nijmegen about 1651–52. The church and cloister of Hoog-Elten are seen on the hill below Cornelis's akimbo arm. To the far left, on the near side of the river, are the church and village of Rindern, while the town and church of Laag-Elten appear beyond the sailboats on the Rhine. No specific connection between the area of Elten and the Pompe van Meerdervoort family is known (although they owned land elsewhere in Gelderland). Cuyp used the same drawing for a picturesque landscape painting with riders and sheep, Cavaliers Halted, One Sketching (Collection of the Duke of Bedford), which also dates from the early 1650s.

The Friedsam canvas is among the earliest examples in the Netherlands, or anywhere in Europe, of sisters from outside court circles depicted in an equestrian portrait. The type had previously been, and indeed remained in other countries, a prerogative of royalty and high nobility. To some extent, the Dutch development during the 1650s may have been related to the collapse of the House of Orange as a political power and the rise of a burgher from Dordrecht, Johan de Witt (1625–1672), as the effective leader of the United Provinces. During the same "stadholderless period," wealthy middle-class patrons of the arts, encouraged by a generally flourishing economy, favored forms of interior decoration, dress, and social behavior that were associated with the aristocracy. The purchase of country estates, and with them lordly titles and hunting rights, was one of the most conspicuous signs of gentrification, and this rise in stature was often underscored by pictures of country houses (for example, by Jan van der Heyden; q.v.), of dead game (see Pl. 216), and of fashionable gentlemen or couples riding to hunt (as in landscapes of the 1650s by Ludolf de Jongh and Philips Wouwermans; q.v.). Artists such as Bartholomeus van der Helst (q.v.) in Amsterdam, Jan Mijtens (ca. 1614–1670) in The Hague, and Anthonie Palamedesz (1601–1673) in Delft painted portraits of male figures, married couples, and families with dead game, hounds, and hunting equipment.

In Dordrecht, Cuyp and his father were leaders in this genre; as early as 1641 they collaborated on a canvas, Family Group in a Landscape (Israel Museum, Jerusalem), in which successful hunters are featured prominently among nine figures in a rural landscape. Aelbert Cuyp's several equestrian portraits of the early to mid-1650s are all pictures of wealthy burghers (most

Figure 30. Roelant Roghman, Huis te Meerdervoort, near Dordrecht, 1647. Black chalk and gray wash, 13⅔ x 19⅝ in. (34.5 x 50.3 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Frits and Rita Markus Fund, 2001.200.636
likely from Dordrecht) hunting with hounds, and the reference to this aristocratic pastime is the reason that horses are featured in the first place. It appears likely that Cornelis van Beveren encouraged the artist’s turn to equestrian portraiture, whether or not he commissioned this picture. With his experience of foreign courts, he would have realized that Cuyp’s equestrian portraits represented a new form of Dutch liberty, since even people like the Pompe van Meerdervoorts would not have enjoyed hunting privileges in other countries, including the Spanish Netherlands not far to the south.

The dogs in this painting are greyhounds and foxhounds. The animal leading the pack at the left edge of the composition appears to be Cuyp’s awkward attempt to render a running hare. The costumes are not normal hunting attire, but exotic outfits modeled on Hungarian dress. As Gordenker has explained, the two boys and their riding instructor wear tight-fitting velvet coats, or *dolmans*, over elaborate shirts. The coachman to the right wears a looser and heavier coat called a *mense*. The hats are more European, but fanciful. Cornelis’s cap resembles a Turkish turban, Michiel’s bonnet is modestly outdated and trimmed with a chain, and the other hats are Dutch ideas of eastern European headgear. The swords are probably based on a European saber of Orientalizing design. Since Cuyp used the same or similar motifs in contemporary pictures, they were probably based on studio props. Like the castle and the overdressed servants, the theatrical costumes worn by the Pompe van Meerdervoort brothers create the romantic aura of a noble family that extends over borders and back in time. It may seem fitting that the painter did not quite succeed in placing the heads of Cornelis and especially Michiel in the picture, so that it would resemble life itself.
1. G. Veth 1884, p. 260.
2. The Hague 1911, no. 948.
4. It is also possible that the painting was sold by the Pompe van Meerdervoort sisters at some earlier moment after their parents died. By 1781, when the surviving sister was fifty-two years old, it was clear that her line of the Pompe van Meerdervoort family would die out with her and the Huis te Meerdervoort would pass to another line of the family. Genealogical tables of the Pompe van Meerdervoort and Van Beveren families, with particular attention to the ownership of the Huis te Meerdervoort, are provided in Van der Leer 1994, pp. 92–96. See ibid., p. 60, fig. 20, for Nicolaas Verkolje’s portrait of Johan Diederik Pompe van Meerdervoort with his wife and their first daughter, dated 1724.
5. Van Beveren was an important figure for cultural and especially literary life in Dordrecht: see Van Vliet and De Niet 1995.
7. As described by Gordenker in Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, pp. 55–56, fig. 5.
8. See the map of about 1676 in Van der Leer 1994, p. 52, fig. 12.
9. For similar towers and walls in various arrangements, see Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, nos. 16, 30, 33, 34, 40.
10. Brussels and other cities 1668–69, no. 32; Dordrecht 1977–78, no. 71. See also Refs. below, especially under Reiss 1975.
11. Reiss 1975, no. 120.
12. See Liedtke 1986b, chap. 2, on “symbolic themes” in equestrian portraiture, and pp. 79–83 on the Dutch development. Paulus Potter’s Dick Tulp on Horseback, of 1663 (Six Collection, Amsterdam; ibid., pl. 179), is a contemporary example remarkable for its princely scale and design. For a nearly complete catalogue of Dutch equestrian portraits, see Leeuwarden–s Hertogenbosch–Assen 1979–80.
13. See Israel 1995, chap. 29. Of course, there was no causal relationship between politics and the rise of the bourgeois equestrian portrait in the Dutch Republic, but rather a mental climate in which the emulation of aristocratic forms must have seemed less inappropriate than before.
14. This kind of still life is surveyed in S. Sullivan 1984.
18. This point is missed in Wheelock 1999a, p. 51, where hunting is said to have become “a popular pastime for the aristocracy in the second half of the seventeenth century” (it had been for centuries, in their case), and that “in this instance [Cuyp’s Lady and Gentleman on Horseback, in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.] the hunt theme merely served as a pretext for the unusual [i.e., equestrian] portraits.”
19. Reiss maintains that Van Beveren’s three sons (all in their twenties) appear in Cuyp’s large canvas Huntsman Halted (Barber
Institute of Fine Arts, Birmingham, U.K.; that one of Van Beveren's sons is the horseman in *The Negro Page* (Royal Collection, London); and that he may have commissioned *The Avenue at Meerdervoort* (fig. 50 here) and the present portrait of his grandson (Reiss 1975, pp. 9, 34, 129, 156, 162, pls. 113, 115, 121–22). See also White 1982, pp. 33–34, no. 37, pl. 33, on *The Negro Page*. However, Alan Chong in his dissertation (Chong 1992) rejects the conjectural identifications of Van Beveren's sons.

20. As discussed in Koslow 1966.


References: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 5 (1844), p. 326, no. 150, cites the painting as "A Gentleman with his two sons" in the Sanderson collection, with provenance from 1825; Waagen 1838, vol. 2, p. 400, as in the Sanderson collection, with Smith's title, "executed with unusual care in all parts"; Jervis 1814, p. 326; Waagen 1844, vol. 2, p. 289, as in the Sanderson collection; G. Veth 1884, pp. 260–61, mentions the description of this painting in the 1749 inventory of Johan Diederik Pompe van Meerdervoort's estate (see Ex Coll.), where the sitters are named, identifies their parents, and (n. 69) notes that the picture was not sold at auction in 1749 but remained in the family and was sold privately later on (location unknown to Veth); Sedelmeyer Gallery 1895, p. 6, no. 3 (ill. p. 7), as "The Prince of Orange with his sons," and as brought to England by M. Delahante; W. Roberts 1897, vol. 2, pp. 248–49, records the results of the 1848 and 1895 sales of the painting; Mocs 1897–1905, vol. 2 (1905), p. 223, entry no. 6005 (Cornelis Pompe van Meerdervoort), no. 1, records the information given in G. Veth 1884; Giller 1909, p. 369, praises the work in the most flowery terms; Hoefstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 2 (1909), p. 31, no. 85, records the information given in G. Veth 1884, but does not connect it with his; p. 183, no. 617, "A Cavalier and His Two Sons Starting for the Hunt," describes the subject, suggests that "the landscape resembles the neighbourhood of Hoch and Nieder Eiten on the Rhine," and records the provenance from 1829 onward; Marguillier 1909, p. 24, describes the work (then in the Kann estate) as a family portrait on horseback, the father in a long tunic of black velvet, the boys in red and blue, the valet in brown; Bode 1911, p. 23, as a portrait of a father and his sons on horseback; "Die Versteigerung der Sammlung Maurice Kann," *Der Kicorne* 3 (1911), p. 119 (under no. 12), sold for FFr 160,000 to Fischhof; Mourey 1913, pp. 4, 6 (ill.), "une oeuvre absolument magistrale"; Valentin 1928a, p. 22, as painted about 1655–60; J. Holmes 1930, pp. 168, 183, no. 38, as "The Gentleman with two Sons before the Departure for the Chase," in the Friedsam Collection, as an example of Cuyp's late style; Staring in *The Hague 1933*, no. 918, as in Fischhof sale of 1913; identifies the sitters, based on the 1689 and 1749 inventories (see Ex Coll.), which were earlier in the possession of a family descendant, the late Jacob Stoop, of Zwijndrecht; Reiss 1913, pp. 45, 46, fig. 15, observes that the painting cannot date from later than 1693 because Michiel Pompe van Meerdervoort died in November of that year; Staring 1913, pp. 177–188, credits the identification of the sitters made in Reiss 1913, adding that this had already been accomplished in *The Hague 1933* (by Staring himself); Dattenberg 1967, p. 72, no. 78, reports that a view of Hochelen is found in the background (compare Hoefstede de Groot 1907–27 above); Brussels and other cities 1968–69, vol. 1, p. 53 (under no. 32), notes that the background derives from Cuyp's drawing *The Rhine near Eiten* (Fondation Custodia, Institut Néerlandais, Paris); Paris 1970–71, p. 30 (under no. 35), cites the "discovery" made by Staring (1953); Broos 1974, p. 198 n. 9, includes the painting in a list of equestrian portraits by Cuyp; Reiss 1975, pp. 9, 161, 205, 210, no. 121 (ill.), as painted 1652–53, identifies the figures, and notes that the same landscape occurs in Cuyp's *Cavaliers Haleten, One Sketching*, in the Duke of Bedford's collection (ibid., no. 120); Dordrecht 1977–78, p. 174 n. 2 (under no. 71), restates the observation that the background depends on Cuyp's drawing *The Rhine near Eiten*; G. Brown 1979, p. 7, repeats the information that the background depends on Cuyp's drawing; Leeuwarden's Herroogenboch-Assen 1979–80, pp. 103–3, no. 65 (ill.), included in a list of Dutch equestrian portraits; Duparc 1980, p. 24, sees the relationship between horses and riders in the painting as "distinctly unhappy" (evidently meaning in formal terms); Burn 1984, p. 58 (ill.), finds "traces of Persian influence" in the costumes; Broos in Paris 1986, p. 186, fig. 4, observes that the position of the rider on the left occurs again, in reverse, in Cuyp's drawing of a man on horseback in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge; P. Sutton 1986, p. 184, mentioned among Dutch portraits in the MMA; Chong in Amsterdam–Bostom–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 111, fig. 8, and p. 304 n. 4, cites the painting as an instance of the artist's patronage in Dordrecht, and notes that the castle is invented although Cuyp did include the Huis te Meerdervoort in another picture; Schama in ibid., p. 81; Herbert 1988, pp. 163, 168, fig. 165, compares the recession of space in Degas's horse-racing pictures; Liedtke 1989, pp. 83, 134, 301, fig. 68, no. 184 (ill.), pl. 28, praises the painting for its setting of mounted figures in landscape "to create the impression of an everyday event," and as an "anticipation of a common kind of 'conversation piece' painted by French and especially English artists of the next century"; Frantis 1990, p. 219, remarks that the motif of a child with a horse refers in this case to hunting and social status, not training; Liedtke 1990, p. 52, listed as one of Friedsam's bequests to the MMA; Chong 1991, p. 611 n. 35, notes that the portrait may be dated by the death of one of the sitters; Ingamells 1991b, p. 72, mentions the painting in connection with Cuyp's *The Avenue at Meerdervoort* (fig. 30 here), where the brothers evidently appear at a younger age; Chong in Dordrecht 1992–93, p. 125, fig. 1 (under no. 18), and p. 126 (under no. 19), uses the approximate date of the picture to date Cuyp's *Riders in a Landscape* (private collection); Loughman in ibid., p. 154, cites the work in relation to J. G. Cuyp's *Portrait of Michiel Pompe van Stigliandt*; Frantis 1993a, p. 239 n. 169, allows that the picture does not convey pedagogical notions, as do some Dutch portraits of children with horses; Van der Leer 1994, pp. 52–53, fig. 13, describes the figures in connection with the history of Meerdervoort castle; Baertjé 1991, p. 126, records that the painting was installed over a fireplace in the Meerdervoort house, for which it was painted; Wheelock 1995, p. 48, sees Eitelenberg in the background, and pp. 52, 54, 55, 56 n. 10, compares aspects of Cuyp's *Lady and Gentleman on Horseback*, of about 1665 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.); Sluijter in Dordrecht–Enschede 2000, p. 105, fig. 145, describes a copy (with variations) of this painting, by Jacob van Strij (q.v.); Fenton 2001, p. 81, "a glossy presentation of social aspirations"; Chong in Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, pp. 35–36, 39, 150–51, 200, no. 29 (detail ill. on AELBERT CUYP 147
p. 34), identifies the figures in the painting and its original location, citing documents, notes the status symbols (including servants), dates the work to about 1625–35, describes the setting, and discusses the significance of hunting in the Netherlands; Gordenker in ibid., pp. 53–54, 56–57, fully describes the unusual costumes and their origins; Wheele in ibid., pp. 22, 188, 172, admires the avoidance here of anecdotal incident, and relates the painting to other equestrian pictures by Cuyp; Cornelis 2002, p. 244, "perfectly illustrates that Cuyp’s patrons belonged to the upper classes of Dordrecht society who liked to show off their land-owning status and hunting privileges"; Van Noortwijk in Dordrecht 2002, p. 153, fig. 35b (under no. 35), compares the portrait with that of the sitter’s cousin by J. G. Cuyp; Paasilinna in Athens 2002, p. 116, fig. 1 (under no. 23), refers to Jacob van Strij’s copy of this “famous painting”; L. de Vries 2002, p. 209, reviews the virtues of the picture and approves Gordenker’s analysis of the costume but questions the suggestion that Hungarian style implied Protestant sympathies; Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, p. 75, compares the picture with the Equestrian Portrait of Pieter de Roover (“Salmon Fishing”), of about 1630, in the Mauritshuis, The Hague (fig. 246 here); 4 Liedtke 2005a, p. 192, cites the picture in a review of Dutch paintings made for specific locations; Neumeister 2005, p. 213, mentioned in connection with an equestrian portrait of a man painted in the style of Thomas de Keyser.


Ex Coll.: Adriana van Beveren and her son Cornelis Pompe van Meerdervoort, Zwiendrecht (ca. 1652/53–d. 1680; 1680 inventory of his estate, Huis te Meerdervoort, Zwiendrecht, as “in the children’s room: Mr. Caulier on horseback with 2 milords [Jonkheers] and Willem the coachman, over the mantelpiece” [see text above]); his son Jacob Pompe van Meerdervoort (1680–d. 1720); his son Johan Diedrik Pompe van Meerdervoort, Zwiendrecht (1720–d. 1749; 1749 inventory of his estate, as “A piece, being a chimneypiece, depicting the Messrs. Michiel and Cornelis Pompe van Meerdervoort going to hunt with their instructor, servants etc. by A. Kuyp” [see text above]); Maria Christina (1723–1781), Adriana (1728–1778), and Christina Elisabeth (1729–1801) Pompe van Meerdervoort (1749–before 1803); [Alexis Quatresols de la Hante, Paris and London]; Walsh Porter (until 1803); sale, Christie’s, London, March 22, 1803, no. 28, as “Prince of Orange on Horseback, and attendants going out to the Chase [sic], finely treated,” sold for £145; Monsieur L[apeyrièr], Paris (until 1835); sale, Galerie Le Brun, Paris, April 19th, 1825, no. 103, as “La Partie de Chasse,” for £1,000 to Emmerson; Thomas Emmerson, London (1825–29); his sale, Phillips, London, May 2, 1829, no. 165, as “La Partie de Chasse du Prince d’Orange,” sold for £1,102 10s.; Richard Sanderson, London (by 1834–48; sale, Christie’s, London, June 17, 1848, no. 25, as “Prince of Orange on a grey horse,” for £550 10s. to Norton); [Norton, London, from 1848]; Mrs. Lyne Stephens, Lynford Hall, Norfolk (until d. 1895; her estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 11, 1895, no. 311, as “The Prince of Orange with his sons prepared to depart for the chase,” brought to this country by Mons. Delahaut [sic]; for £2,010 to Wertheimer]; [Charles J. Wertheimer, London, and Sedelmeyer, Paris, 1895; sold to Kann]; Maurice Kann, Paris (1895–d. 1906; his estate, 1906–11; his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, June 9, 1911, no. 12, as “Départ pour la chasse,” for FFr 160,000 or 170,000 to Kleinberger and Fischhof]; [Kleinberger and Eugène Fischhof, Paris, 1911–13; sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, June 14, 1913, no. 50, for FFr 145,000 to Kleinberger]; Monsieur Magin, Paris (until 1922; sale of his sequestered property, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, June 23, 1922, no. 12, for FFr 62,000 to Kleinberger]; [Kleinberger, Paris, 1922; sold to Friedsam]; Michael Friedsam, New York (1922–d. 1931); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32,000.20.

1. As late as April 1962, Holmes wrote letters to the Department of European Paintings, asking to see the painting in storage, and complaining that his late dating “was attacked publicly” by Reiss (1953) and by Staring (1953).

2. The two drawings of riders in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, that Broos considers studies for the Museum's picture (Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, p. 75) are described by Chong in his 1992 dissertation as "late 18th-century, perhaps by Jacob van Strij."
34. **Young Herdsmen with Cows**

Oil on canvas, 44 3/4 x 52 3/8 in. (113.1 x 133.4 cm)
Signed (bottom left): A : cuyp.

The landscape portion of this painting, the cows, and the human figures are very well preserved; there are, however, large losses and significant abrasions throughout the sky.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913  14.40.616

The Altman Cuyp, which like the artist’s *Landscape with the Flight into Egypt* (Pl. 32) was also in the collection of Rodolphe Kann in Paris, is a classic work dating from the later years of his activity, about 1655–60. As a large and typical picture by Cuyp, the canvas could hardly have been better chosen to complete the trio—with Altman’s Hobbema and Ruisdael (Pls. 80, 182)—of Dutch landscapists one ought to have represented in a great collection of old masters, according to the art dealers and critics of America’s Gilded Age.¹

In proposing a comparatively late date for this painting, Alan Chong refers in particular to the handling of the clouds, which have a crispness and “Italianate sheen” not found in works of the early 1650s.² The overall composition varies a scheme that the artist had employed for about a decade,³ but with an assurance that belies the impression of inventing a scene in the studio. Cuyp’s familiar idea of aligning parallel cows so that they overlap and gently lead the eye into depth is lent rhythm and grace by the arrangement of the resting animals, which continue the curve of the hill. The foursome serves as a foil to the crowning motif, a standing black cow silhouetted against the bright sky and facing in the opposite
direction. This carries the view into the rolling landscape on the other side of the river, which is also crossed by the bent branches to the lower left. The display of plants on the right ascends (assisted by some manure) toward the synchronized row of cows, so that no part of the landscape lacks flowing lines and attractive passages. Between the vertical elements of the standing cow and the pointing shepherd, the horned head turned toward the viewer is perfectly placed.

These aesthetic refinements are suited to Cuyp’s subject, which has been described as a “Dordrecht Arcadia.” In other contexts, the cow could serve as a national emblem, or as a sign of Dutch prosperity. In Cuyp’s hometown, it is possible that such a painting would have evoked personal associations, since a number of his patrons owned farms in the area. However, the hilly terrain, Claudian light, and stately composition convey a sense of well-being unfettered to any time or place, other than Europe since the age of Horace and Virgil.

Comparisons with Cuyp’s drawings of cattle show how important these studies were for his paintings, and also how the artist tended to idealize the animals in the final work. In addition to landscape and animals, Cuyp also drew studies of plants like those to the lower right, the largest of which may be butterbur.

A copy of the present picture was on the art market in 1983.10

1. A parallel provenance is found in the case of Cuyp’s Equestrian Portrait of Cornelis and Michiel Pomy van Meerdervoort (Pl. 33), which went from the collection of Maurice Kann (Rodolphe’s brother) through Paris dealers to Altman’s successor, Michael Friedsam. An important link between the Kann and Gilded Age collectors in America was Wilhelm von Bode, in his role as adviser (kindly mentioned in conversation by Esmée Quodbach, 2006). As noted in Liedtke 1990, p. 39, there were eleven landscapes by Jacob van Ruisdael, seven by Hobbema, and eleven pictures by or said to be by Cuyp in the 1909 Hudson-Fulton exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum. Apart from his examples by these artists, Altman owned no other landscape paintings dating from before the nineteenth century. He had earlier followed the fashion of buying “pictures of the Barbizon school” (as Mary Berenson, wife of Bernard, disdainfully observed; see Samuels 1987, p. 76).


3. Compare Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, nos. 19, 35, which are dated in the years about 1650. As Chong notes in his dissertation (see previous note), the two adult figures (there is also a boy) recall the staffage in Five Cows with Herdsmen, of the late 1640s (Earl of Harrowby collection; Reiss 1975, no. 73).

4. As noted in Wheelock 1999a, p. 34, and repeated by Wheelock in Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, p. 130, Cuyp would often stretch his cows’ heads forward, “in a way that suggests a degree of alertness and even intelligence not normally associated with this species.”


6. See Spicer 1983, where Jacob Cat’s praise of Dutch cows (1666) is quoted on p. 356.


8. See Liedtke 2003 on the rise of the bucolic tradition in Dutch landscape painting, and for references to most of the specialized literature.

9. On this point, see Rüger in Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, p. 132, and Chong in ibid., p. 134, noting that Cuyp would “manipulate the color of his cattle to achieve picturesque effect.” The drawing of a cow in the Hofsteder de Groot Collection (Groninger Museum, Groningen) appears to have served as a study (in reverse) for the nearest cow in the Museum’s picture, as noted by Bolten in Groningen 1967, p. 56 (under no. 17). The same drawing is catalogued in Groningen 2005–6, p. 126, no. 21.


11. Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, April 29, 1985, no. 273 (canvas, 42 5/16 x 50 5/16 in. [108 x 128 cm]), as after Cuyp.

References: Bode 1900, p. xv, pl. 30, describes the painting as a stately, masterful Cuyp in the Kann collection, one of two “aus England stammende Bilder”; Friedländer 1901 (ill. p. 13); É. Michel 1901, p. 399 (ill.), as one of the most accomplished pictures of Cuyp’s maturity; Marguillié 1903, p. 28 (ill. p. 26), notes the admirable rendition of atmospheric effects; Bode 1907, vol. 1, pp. 19, 34 (pl. 32, opp. p. 34), praises the picture as “excellent” in its rendering of the animals and the landscape; Connaissance 19 (September–December 1907), frontispiece, as with Duveneck Brothers; Nicolle 1908, p. 198, mentioned; Hofstede de Groot 1907–7, vol. 2 (1909), p. 72, no. 217, as in Altman’s collection, with a description of the subject; Monod 1923, p. 110, “C’est le nec plus ultra de ses symphonies de sérénité”; Altman Collection 1928, pp. 86–87, no. 47, as from the Kann collection and “cited by various authorities”; J. Holmes 1930, p. 182, no. 19, listed; J. Burroughs 1931a, p. 80, no. 599–3; J. Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, p. 154, pl. 131 (rev. ed., 1972, pp. 263–64, fig. 210), as dating from about 1665, and showing “classical elements” and “a power of expressive organization [that] is as remarkable as the depth of feeling before nature and the pictorial beauty”; Bolten in Groningen 1967, p. 56 (under no. 17), lists the work as one of the pictures for which a drawing of a cow by Cuyp in the Hofsteder de Groot Collection (Groninger Museum, Groningen) served as a study; Hibbard 1980, pp. 348–50, fig. 629, as “a bucolic paradise of herds and herdsmen”; P. Sutton 1986, p. 197, mentioned as “an excellent mature example of Cuyp’s art”; M. Scott 1987, p. 47, mistakenly cites the work as an example of about 1650; Liedtke 1990, pp. 48–49, fig. 36, identified in a view of Altman’s art gallery in his Fifth Avenue house; Baetjer 1995, p. 327; Slive 1995a, pp. 195–96, fig. 268, repeats the remarks in J. Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, p. 154, but revises the dating to about 1655–60; L. Miller, “Benjamin Altman,” in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 1, p. 731, mentioned.
ATRIBUTED TO AELBERT CUYP

35. *Children and a Cow*

Oil on wood, 17¼ x 21¾ in. (43.8 x 54.6 cm)
Inscribed (lower right): A cuyp.

The painting is in good condition, but the paint film has grown thin with age and suffered slight overall abrasion. There is minor paint loss along the horizontal panel join running through the cow’s legs, the waists of the two boys, and the girl’s head. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals that the head of the girl and that of the boy at left were underdrawn. The small child between them was painted on top of the fully completed landscape.

Bequest of Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer, in memory of her father, George Griswold, 1934 34.83.1

As might be expected of a work that is close in style to the teenaged Aelbert Cuyp, and also to that of his father and teacher, Jacob Gerritsz Cuyp (1594–1651/32), this painting has elicited differing opinions. F. Schmidt-Degener and W. R. Valentiner (oral opinions, both in April 1933) accepted the picture as by the young Aelbert Cuyp. Horst Gerson (1960s?) was uncertain, and wondered whether J. G. Cuyp might have painted the work. Albert Blankert believed that the younger Cuyp was probably responsible, based on firsthand examination of the picture in 2003. Alan Chong, however, in his 1992 dissertation on Cuyp, thought that another, anonymous pupil
of J. G. Cuyp might be the artist. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that such a disciple of the elder Cuyp, working in a manner very close to the young Aelbert's, is a hypothetical figure. Furthermore, the inconspicuous signature on the panel appears to be genuine.

The painting is rather hard to judge from reproductions, where the landscape, the cow, and indeed all the forms look flatter than they do in the work itself. Thinning of the paint layers and the visible wood grain contribute to this effect. Originally the landscape must have receded convincingly from the vegetation in the left foreground, which is sketched with some skill. The trees and bushes in the right background appear consistent with similar passages in the young Aelbert's work. The body of the cow is thin and in the lower half worn; the head suggests that some modeling and textures have been lost. Of course, one rarely encounters a smiling cow in nature, but happy cows (and sheep) are not uncommon in works by Jacob Gerritsz and by Aelbert Cuyp from the 1630s, for example, the *Shepherd and Shepherdess in a Landscape*, which they painted together in about 1639-40 (Musée Ingres, Montauban). The same dog and very similar sheep are found in paintings by both the young Aelbert Cuyp, including the Museum's own *Piping Shepherds* (Pl. 31), and his father.

The girl in the Museum's picture, including her costume and hat, is (with the exception of the hands) quite well painted, with attractive highlights in the skirt, and sufficient modeling. The male figures are also successful, though worn. The three shepherd crooks are finely rendered and, like the straw hat, require explanation if the painting is dismissed as a minor pupil's work. However modest, the picture might be employed to illustrate two basic principles of connoisseurship: that a work must be seen in the original; and that its strongest passages, as well as its weaknesses, must be explained. Accordingly, the present writer feels that the picture may be ascribed to Aelbert Cuyp in the second half of the 1630s, with the understanding that this is a tentative attribution, and that our knowledge of the artist's earliest efforts is limited.

The faces of the figures have a family resemblance but are not standard types. The Cuyps painted a good number of portraits of actual children in pastoral settings. Lamb's are commonly included as symbols of innocence, and several pictures by Jacob Gerritsz show a girl feeding flowers to one of her fleshy companions. A dog, cows (usually in the background), and shepherd crooks suggest responsibility, or good upbringing, a virtue that reflects upon the parents who commissioned the portrait. In a broad view, the pastoral theme suggests an ideal age of innocence, when humankind had not yet been exposed to misfortune and selfish desires, and animals lived in harmony with people (as these domesticated animals clearly do).

Previously catalogued by the Museum as by Aelbert Cuyp, and (from 1990) as Style of Aelbert Cuyp.

1. Chong 1992, unpagd. After reviewing the Museum's Cuyp's with Alan Chong in 1990, the present writer requested that *Children and a Cow* be recatalogued as Style of Aelbert Cuyp (the work had previously been catalogued as autograph).
3. See ibid., p. 33, figs. 31, 32, nos. 18, 30.
4. J. G. Cuyp's pioneering role in this specialty is discussed in ibid., pp. 32-35.
5. Ibid., p. 33, figs. 31, 32. In both paintings by J. G. Cuyp (locations unknown), a lamb is shown actually eating the flowers; the girl in fig. 31 (a panel dated 1639) is in precisely the same pose as the girl in the Museum's picture. See also ibid., p. 34, fig. 33, a drawing by J. G. Cuyp in which two girls feed flowers to sheep in front of their watchful parents; and p. 37, fig. 39, and pp. 142-43, no. 30.
6. See the discussion under Joachim Wtewael's *The Golden Age* (Pl. 224).


EXHIBITED: Nashville, Tenn., Fisk University, Atlanta, Ga., Atlanta University, and New Orleans, La., Dillard University, 1911-12, no cat.

Ex Coll.: George Griswold (from 1861; said to have been purchased by him in the Netherlands); Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer (until d. 1934); Bequest of Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer, in memory of her father, George Griswold, 1934 54.183.1


8. See ibid., pp. 34–35, fig. 9.

9. On the connection between Elsheimer and the Amsterdam circle of Rembrandt’s teacher, Pieter Lastman (1583–1633), see the biography of Jacob Pynas below.

10. See Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 1, no. 273, for the Munich picture. Ronni Baer in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 9, pp. 192–93, fig. 1, considers The Village Greeter to mark a change in Dou’s work.

11. See Sluijter 2000b, chap. 6 (pp. 239–44 on the reflection of light).

12. On the paragone with sculpture in Dou’s work, see ibid., pp. 210–13.

13. This complicated issue is touched upon frequently in ibid., chap. 6.


15. See, for example, The Young Mother (Mauritshuis, The Hague), which is discussed in Frans 1993a, pp. 16, 84, fig. 5.

16. This question is briefly considered by Baer in Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, p. 30, 44 n. 41. Noted there is Pierre Lebrun’s advice to would-be connoisseurs (learn to talk about style rather than about subject), which has essentially nothing to do with the real connoisseurs who bought Dou’s work.


18. See Sluijter in Leiden 1988, p. 26, and Baer in Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, p. 31. On Pieter Spiering “Silvercroom,” see also New York–London 2001, pp. 12, 512, 520. Spiering was Sweden’s ambassador to his own country, the Netherlands, between 1657 and 1659. It is not always made clear in biographies of Dou that Christina was only six years old when her father died in 1632 and she became queen. The paintings that Dou sold to the Swedish crown through Spiering must have actually been acquired by the chancellor, Axel Oxenstierna, who served as regent from 1632 until Christina’s majority in 1644, and also as the United Provinces’ crucial ally in the Thirty Years’ War. From 1644 until 1652, Christina opposed many of Oxenstierna’s policies. She suffered a nervous collapse in 1652 and abdicated in 1654. In Gaskell 1982, p. 15, Spiering’s purchase of paintings by Dou for “his” queen is associated with Christina’s “attempting to improve the intellectual and artistic tenor of her court,” an ambitious program for a preteen. Similarly, in Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, p. 30, Baer remarks that Christina’s “own taste ran to the Italianate, so much so that in 1651 the queen returned to Spiering eleven of Dou’s paintings.” She probably had nothing to do with their purchase in the first place.

19. See Sluijter in Leiden 1988, pp. 38–39, on what is known of Dou’s domestic and foreign patrons. The author notes that some major collectors in Leiden itself had no works by Dou, or only one or two.


36. An Evening School

Oil on wood, arched top, 10 x 9 in. (25.4 x 22.9 cm)

The old man, young girl, open book, candles, and hand of the figure at right who reaches to light a candle are very well preserved. An extensive network of wide cracks that appeared as the paint dried disfigures the balance of the composition, including the two boys and the entire background. There are minor losses along the central panel join. The dark maroon-brown curtain that borders the composition along the top is not original. Absent in a photograph published in 1913, this feature was added sometime before the painting was acquired by the Museum. The irregular edges and lopsided shape of the arched top suggest that either the panel has been pared down along the top or that this is not the original format. The slightly chipped paint around all edges indicates that the panel was trimmed on all sides before the cradle was attached.

Bequest of Lillian M. Ellis, 1940 40.64

This small picture was probably painted by Dou about 1655–57 (as suggested by Baer; see Refs.), or within the next couple of years. It thus appears to anticipate the artist’s best-known pictures of a teacher and his young students working by candlelight, The Night School (Uffizi, Florence), which is thought to date from about 1660, and a panel that goes by the same title (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which probably was painted a few years later. These works are considerably larger overall, 18 1/2 x 14 1/2 in. and 20 3/8 x 13 5/8 in. (45.9 x 36.4 cm and 53 x 40.3 cm), respectively, although the scale of the figures is not much different. An earlier painting of a similar subject, dated 1645, is The Schoolmaster (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge). The panel is about the same size as the New York picture (which, however, may have been cut down; see condition note above), and the composition is similar in reverse, except for the absence of a figure in the foreground. All the pupils are boys, and their teacher looks like a stern taskmaster about to impose discipline.

In the present painting, by contrast, a sympathetic old pedagogue sharpens the point of his quill pen, while two quiet boys and an earnest girl are intent upon their studies. The girl leans over her book, following the text with her finger, and the seated boy practices writing with careful concentration. The standing boy must have just arrived, as suggested by the hat in his hand and by the maid (or some member of the teacher’s household), who carries a lantern. The boy lights another candle, which will certainly be needed when he settles down to work.

Dou painted a good number of night scenes in the 1650s and 1660s. Here the candlelight allows the artist to demonstrate his skill in handling highlights and shadows (the maid’s face, illuminated from below, is noteworthy), and to contrast the features of the old man and the young girl. The candle standing like a beacon in the midst of the scholars is surely also intended as a metaphor for knowledge, a common notion in antiquity and in the seventeenth century. Cesare Ripa’s figure of Cognitio (Understanding) is a young woman who follows the text of a book with one hand and holds a flaming torch in the other. It is possible that Dou meant the lighting of the second candle to convey the idea of learning passed on from teacher to pupil.

As discussed by several writers, the act of sharpening a pen (an independent subject in Dutch art) signifies the notion of practice, which is suggested more literally by the boy who is diligently writing. About 1660, Dou painted an unusual triptych (lost, but known from Willem Joseph Laquy’s copy of the late eighteenth century, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) illustrating Aristotle’s maxim (repeated by his compatriot Plutarch) that “three things are needed to achieve learning: nature, teaching, and practice; but all will be fruitless unless practice follows nature and teaching.” The phrasing here is not that of the ancient author but Arnold Houbraken’s in 1721, in a learned aside (citing Aristotle) in his discussion of the eclectic training that the Rotterdam painter Michel van Musscher (1645–1705) received. These words of wisdom must have come up occasionally in the studios of Leiden artists, and in the classrooms of the city’s venerable university. Dou’s own pupils (see the biography above) clearly grasped the idea.

2. W. Martin 1913, p. 68 (ill.). A slightly better reproduction may be found in Gerson, Goodison, and Sutton 1960, pl. 16.
Gerrit Dou
Leiden 1613–1675 Leiden

Gerrit (or Gerard) Dou was one of the most successful and influential Dutch artists of the seventeenth century. It could be said, broadly, that he modernized the descriptive tradition of Early Netherlandish painting, in good part by adopting the young Rembrandt's observational preferences and some of his stylistic devices, specifically the use of light and shadow for illusionistic and dramatic purposes. Dou was Rembrandt's first student and would become the master's most independent former pupil. Once Rembrandt had left Leiden, Dou was the city's leading painter.

Dou's parents, Douwe Jansz de Vries van Arentsveld (ca. 1584–1616) and the widow Maria (Marijtgen) Jansdr van Rosenburg (ca. 1585–1651), married on November 6, 1609. Maria's first husband had a glassmaking business, and Douwe Jansz took it over. Only one other shop in Leiden, that of Pieter Couwenhorn (ca. 1599–1654), was more important in producing painted glass windows for churches.

Gerrit, born April 7, 1613, began his artistic career by studying drawing with the engraver Bartholomeus Dolendo (ca. 1560–1626), about 1622–23. He then trained as a glass painter with Couwenhorn for two and a half years, and entered the glassmakers' guild in 1625. Dou and his brother Jan, who joined the guild during the same year, worked in their father's shop. It is not known whether his personal inclination or practical business considerations led Gerrit to give up his father's profession for easel painting, but on February 14, 1628, he signed on with Rembrandt, who was twenty-one years old and beginning to attract the attention of connoisseurs. Dou stayed with Rembrandt for three years and, according to Jan Orlers, in 1641 emerged as "an excellent master."

In his early paintings, Dou adopted a number of subjects from Rembrandt, including the theme of a painter in his studio, studies of old people as hermits or biblical figures, and tromen of interesting characters (see the discussion of tromen under Rembrandt's Man in Oriental Costume; Pl. 142). Some portraits and still lifes also date from the 1630s. The figures set in interiors and the tromen of old people are especially reminiscent of Rembrandt's contemporaneous work. It has been suggested that the meticulous nature of glass painting helped to determine Dou's fine technique and even his preference for working on a small scale, but the hypothesis has been put forward somewhat to the neglect of the many Dutch artists who painted small, precisely described figures, including portrait miniaturists (for example, David Bailly [q.v.] in Leiden), and history painters such as Bartholomeus Breenbergh (see Pl. 22), Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem (1562–1638), Joachim Wtewael (see Pl. 224), the German Adam Elsheimer (1578–1610), and, in Leiden, Rembrandt himself and his colleague Jan Lievens (1607–1674). That Dou studied initially with an engraver (and that Rembrandt worked in the medium as well) probably attracted him to miniature miracles of observation by printmakers ranging from Lucas van Leyden (ca. 1494–1533) and his German contemporaries to Hendrick Golzius (1588–1617) and other Netherlandish engravers of his and the next generation.

In the 1640s, Dou appears to have painted fewer portraits, and he diversified his repertoire of genre subjects beyond those he had depicted earlier—a world of artists, musicians, and scholars surrounded by appropriate paraphernalia (for example, An Interior with a Young Violinist, dated 1637, in the National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh)—to include domestic and related themes, as in The Spinner Saying Grace, of about 1645 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), and The Village Grocer, of 1647 (Louvre, Paris). The latter picture shows four figures in the rapidly receding space of a shop interior, which is framed by an arched stone window. This so-called niche format was previously used in portraiture, and in flower still lifes by Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder (1573–1621) and his followers. It also recalls the framing devices used by fifteenth-century Netherlandish painters in portraits, portable altarpieces, and manuscript illumination; the last art form had been especially important in Leiden and nearby Delft during the preceding two centuries. Dou made the niche device (seen in his Self-Portrait and in Gabriel Metsu's A Woman Seated at a Window; Pls. 37, 117) into a trompe l'oeil window, which the viewer identifies with the picture plane. Space projects strongly in both directions, into the background, and around and in front of the frame and sill. Subtleties of light and shadow, and some atmospheric effects (achieved in good part through graduations
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of coloring), complement Dou's painstaking description of physical qualities—textures of stone, fabrics, hair, and so on—and of showpiece motifs like tapestries, metal vessels, worn books, and pristine bottles of wine, water, and more unsavory fluids. The description of light reflections in Dou's pictures was especially praised by contemporaries such as Philips Angel, in his celebratory address "In Praise of the Art of Painting," delivered on Saint Luke's Day in 1641 and published the following year.11

Dou's most impressive pictures include those that variously demonstrate the power of art to deceive and delight the eye, and the ability of painting to triumph over sculpture.12 However, his microcosmic surveys of interior space are occasionally claustrophobic, their suggestion of volume dependent on the presence of figures and a clutter of props. There is less sense in Dou's work than in Rembrandt's that he was interested in observation per se, as opposed to the creation of illusionistic effects.13 Except for his paintings of hermits in prayer and a few other works, Dou's pictures often give the impression of great skill and learning invested in qualities of interest solely to art lovers.

In the 1650s and 1660s, the lifelong bachelor often depicted pretty young women, young mothers, cooks, and maids, in some cases with erotic symbols.14 In other works, and even in those with hints of romance, the artist's main theme is domestic virtue.15 The modern idea that Dou's subjects were of less interest to his patrons than his virtuoso execution has some truth to it, but it is also contradicted by the promptness with which Dou adopted newly fashionable subject matter, and the care with which he selected motifs, designed compositions, and conceived iconographic programs.16 Contemporary accounts, however, dwell upon Dou's obsessively patient technique: stories of several days devoted to a single motif (a broom, for example) accompany descriptions of hourly rates (six guilders, according to Joachim von Sandart) and pictures selling for six hundred to over a thousand guilders (the price of a small house).17

Dou's patrons were people of considerable means. His well-known connection with the Swedish court was made by Pieter Spiering, who through his father François Spiering's tapestry firm in Delft became known with Queen Christina's father, King Gustaf II Adolf (1594–1632).18 Norwithstanding the (total of?) eleven paintings that went through Spiering to Stockholm (and back to him in 1652), and Cosimo III de' Medici's visit to Dou's studio in 1669 and later acquisition of a self-portrait (the panel of 1658 in the Uffizi, Florence), Dou's most important patrons appear to have been residents of Leiden and other cities in the Province of Holland.19 The leading enthusiast in Leiden was Johan de Bije (or de Bye), a Remonstrant (like Vermeer's contemporary patron Pieter van Ruijven), who owned twenty-seven works by Dou and arranged to have them exhibited for a year in 1665–66.20 Another collector of the artist's work was the Leiden professor of medicine François de le Boe Silvius, who at his death in 1673 owned 185 paintings, ten of which were by Dou.21 It is also noteworthy that the States General, when presenting Charles II with the "Dutch Gift" of artworks upon his restoration in 1660, included three paintings purchased directly from Dou. These and a canvas by Titian were given special mention by the king in his words of appreciation delivered to the Dutch ambassadors.22

Dou was one of the founding members of the Leiden painters' guild in 1648. He influenced many local artists, and taught a good number of them, including Frans van Mieris the Elder, Godfried Schalcken, Pieter van Vingelandt, and Matthijs Naiveu (q.v.), as well as lesser-known figures.23 The fijnbouwer ("fine painter") tradition that Dou established in Leiden extended well into the eighteenth century with the Van Mieris family and other artists, and into the nineteenth century with Dutch and German imitators. His reputation among critics and collectors has soared and dipped with the winds of taste, but his importance for the history of Dutch art is beyond doubt.24

Dou was buried on February 9, 1675, in the Pieterskerk, Leiden.

3. Orlers 1641, p. 377. A number of relevant documents preserved in the city archives of Leiden are cited by Sluijter in Leiden 1988, p. 96. Maria's first husband was Vechter Vechtersz. Cuypers, with whom she had a son and a daughter.
4. See Ronni Baer, "The Life and Art of Gerrit Dou," in Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, pp. 28, 44 n. 23, on this point. Gerrit's brother Jan was probably seen as the eventual heir to his father's business. His date of birth is unknown, but he was surely the first son, since he was given his paternal grandfather's name. (Gerrit's patronymic, Dou, is short for Doweszoom, "Douwe's son"). Douwe Janz and his son Jan were still registered in the glassmakers' guild in 1628, when Gerrit's name was dropped (ibid., p. 44 n. 23).
37. Self-Portrait

Oil on wood, 19¼ x 15¾ in. (48.9 x 39.1 cm)
Signed (left, on ledge): GDO[U] [GD in monogram]
Inscribed (in book, upside down): Gdov

The painting is very well preserved. The blue color of the plant leaves at left suggests the use of a fugitive yellow lake pigment.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.607

Dou's self-portrait in the Altman Collection is one of his latest, dating from about 1665 when the artist was approximately fifty-two years old. It is difficult to estimate how many self-portraits were painted by Dou in the course of some forty years, perhaps about a dozen, or several more.1 Nine autograph self-portraits, including the present one, are listed below in approximate chronological order, with another example (no. 5) that is known from copies.

1. Self-Portrait, said to date ca. 1635–38, but perhaps from about 1640. Cheltenham Art Gallery and Museums, Cheltenham, England (fig. 31). Oil on wood, arched top, 7¼ x 5½ in. (18.3 x 14 cm). The painter is seated in the foreground, in conventional attire except for his beret. He holds a palette and brushes, and rests his right hand on a plaster cast of a head, which perhaps refers to proper training (drawing after sculpture) as well as to imitation. An apsè-like section of classical architecture in the left background frames the artist's head and shoulders, and an easel is seen in the right background. Baer 1990, no. 20; Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, no. 7; London–Sydney 2005–6, no. 13.

2. Self-Portrait, ca. 1645–48. Kremer collection, Spain (fig. 32). Oil on wood, 4¾ x 3¼ in. (12.4 x 8.3 cm). In this very small, half-length portrait, the artist presents himself as a dignified young gentleman in conventional attire, wearing a hat and holding gloves. In the right background, at some distance, is an easel supporting a history picture, with props suggestive of learning (a lute, globe, and old armor). Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, no. 40; Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, no. 14.
Figure 33. *Self-Portrait*, 1647. Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden

Figure 34. *Self-Portrait*, ca. 1610. Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig

Figure 37. *Self-Portrait*, ca. 1665. Private collection, Naples, Florida

Figure 38. *Self-Portrait*, ca. 1661–67. Musée du Louvre, Paris
3. *Self-Portrait*, dated 1647. Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden (fig. 33). Oil on wood, 17 7/8 x 13 5/16 in. (45.3 x 34.7 cm). In a composition resembling one of Dou's more complicated genre scenes, he shows himself seated (in about one-fifth of the picture field), and surrounded by attributes of the arts and learning. A beret and a fancy Japanese-style robe worn over ordinary clothing create an artistic impression. The painter draws in a large folio, flanked by appropriate models, such as the plaster head (the same as in no. 1) on the sill in the foreground, and the large sculpture of Hercules and Cacus in the background. A globe, violin, lute, music score, and books attest to various accomplishments. There is no easel, but the Oriental parasol used to protect fresh paintings from dust, seen in no. 2 and other self-portraits, is prominently featured here, probably as a personal signature. W. Martin 1913, p. 17; Baer 1990, no. 40; Dresden–Leiden 2000–2001, pp. 27–29; Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, p. 35, fig. 10; London–Sydney 2003–6, no. 13.

4. *Self-Portrait*, ca. 1650. Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig (fig. 34). Oil on wood, oval, 10 5/8 x 9 in. (27 x 23 cm). In this unusual self-portrait, the artist presents himself as a proper gentleman (with hat and gloves) seated at a table on which he displays a small painting of three figures in an interior. They have been identified as Dou's parents and his brother Jan (d. 1649). W. Martin 1913, p. 18, right; Braunschweig 1980, no. 4; Baer 1990, no. 36.


5. *Self-Portrait*, 1650s. Residenzgalerie, Salzburg; formerly Czernin collection (not illustrated). Oil on wood, 9 x 6 3/4 in. (23 x 17 cm). Not accepted as autograph by Baer and other scholars. Looking at the viewer, the painter is seen in half-length, leaning on the sill of an arched stone window, palette in hand. The interior behind him shows, under a parasol, a painting on an easel, next to a table and globe. A trompe l'œil piece of paper on the exterior of the windowsill, between the artist's hands, bears his name and a partially legible date. W. Martin 1913, p. 18 (left); Baer 1990, no. 53; illustrated and discussed in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, p. 232, and in London–The Hague 1999–2000, p. 238, in each case in an entry for no. 2 above.

6. *Self-Portrait*, dated 1658. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence (fig. 35). Oil on wood, 19 3/8 x 15 1/8 in. (49.3 x 33.9 cm). The painter appears half-length in an arched stone window, resting one hand on a skull, and gesturing toward an hourglass with the other. He wears the dignified attire of a gentleman, and has a sober expression. A large, obscure painting in an elaborately carved and gilded frame stands behind him. Below the windowsill, the wall is decorated with the well-known Duquesney relief of playful putti (as in the Museum's picture, but less covered by other motifs). The picture celebrates illusionism and at the same time suggests that all visible things are fleeting illusions, vain and transient. W. Martin 1913, p. 19 (left); Chiarini 1989, pp. 110–11; Baer 1990, no. 75; Sluiter 2000b, p. 220, fig. 167; Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, p. 31, fig. 5.

7. *Self-Portrait*, dated 1665. The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City (fig. 36). Oil on wood, 21 1/2 x 15 1/2 in. (54.7 x 39.4 cm). The artist, seen in three-quarter-length, stands with one elbow leaning on a carpet-covered table (where a book is set down momentarily), and with his left hand on a walking stick. He wears a fur-lined velvet robe and a fur hat. The setting is a portico with columns; in the background, across water, is the Blauwoort of Leiden, where a chamber of rhetoric met. Dou added this view to the painting in 1667 or somewhat later, which required shortening the balustrade across the foreground (it became the table) and lengthening the figure from a half-length presentation at a window (as in the New York painting). The portrait is inscribed "age 52," and shows Dou as a literate and prosperous citizen of his native Leiden. W. Martin 1913, p. 20; Baer 1990, no. 88; Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, no. 27.

8. *Self-Portrait*, ca. 1665. Private collection, Naples, Florida (fig. 37). Oil on wood, arched top, 23 3/4 x 17 3/4 in. (59 x 44.5 cm). The artist is seen in slightly more than half-length standing behind the low sill of an arched stone window. He rests his right hand on a large book open on the sill, where a plaster head (as in nos. 1 and 3), another book, a silken sash, and a flask of amber liquid also appear. He holds a palette and brushes, and wears a fur-lined cloak, or tabbaard, and a fancy beret. A tapestry hangs inside the window, pulled to both sides. In the background are an easel and, on a table, a violin, a globe, and an écorché figure of an athletic male. Below the windowsill is an elaborate cartouche in high relief, within which "Gdov" is inscribed. As in no. 7, Dou appears as a prosperous and learned gentleman, but here also as an artist in

9. Self-Portrait, ca. 1665. The Metropolitan Museum of Art (Pl. 37). Oil on wood, 19 1/8 x 13 7/8 in. (48.9 x 39.1 cm). Dou is seen in half-length with one elbow resting on the sill of an arched stone window, holding between his fingers one leaf of a large and well-used book. A palette and a sheaf of brushes are displayed in his other hand. The artist wears an elegant, "historical" cloak (similar to that in no. 8), in dark green with detailed trimming, and a blue beret with red and gold piping. A red curtain, edged in gold, is gathered up inside the window, and an easel protected by a parasol appears in the shadowy interior. An empty birdcage, receding in perspective like a small demonstration piece, is mounted in the window frame to the right. Below the sill, the Duquesnoy relief (see below) is partly obscured by a long, colorfully striped silk sash and a creeping vine that casts a shadow on the sculpture and ascends the wall to the right. In the left foreground, a cracked terracotta flowerpot stands on a plinth, permitting marigolds (?) to bask in sunlight. In the figure and in other respects, the Museum's picture is similar to no. 8, but no other self-portrait by Dou illusionistically extends forms in front of the window (the apparent picture plane) to such a degree.

10. Self-Portrait, ca. 1665–67. Musée du Louvre, Paris (fig. 38). Oil on wood, arched top, 12 7/8 x 8 3/4 in. (32.5 x 21 cm); original paint surface, 8 1/2 x 6 1/4 in. (22.5 x 16 cm). The half-length figure of the artist nearly fills an arched window. His right hand hangs over the sill, and in his left hand he holds a palette and brushes. He wears a fur-lined robe and a beret. In the background, a spare interior with a column is seen in raking window light. At some later date, another painter expanded the window frame and placed a still life with a bottle in the foreground. The work recalls Dou's earliest self-portraits in its small scale and comparative simplicity. W. Martin 1913, p. 21 (right); Paris 1988–89, pp. 20–22; Baer 1990, no. 79, as ca. 1660.

It should be noted that Dou's paintings of pipe smokers in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and in the National Gallery, London, are no longer considered self-portraits, and the identity of the sitter in the so-called Self-Portrait of about 1640 (private collection, Scotland) is also uncertain.5

Rembrandt, with his much more complex program of painting, drawing, and etching self-portraits throughout his career, exercised some influence on Dou's self-portraits through the early 1650s, but from the Uffizi painting (fig. 33) of 1658 onward, the impression made by the master is more obvious. The famous Self-Portrait of 1640 (National Gallery, London) was, as for other Rembrandt pupils, former pupils, and followers, the most important model for Dou, who probably knew some of the Rembrandt school derivations as well. Despite its slight swagger, the figure in the Kansas City self-portrait of 1663 (fig. 36) is the most reminiscent of Rembrandt's self-portrait dated 1640, whereas the more upright figure in the Naples picture of about 1666 (fig. 37) has taken on something of the authoritative (as opposed to refined) poses one finds in Rembrandt's Self-Portrait of 1658 (Frick Collection, New York) and in the self-portrait with a palette, brushes, and a maulstick of about 1661–62 (Ivagh Bequest, Kenwood House, London).

The figure in the Museum's self-portrait could be said to blend elements of the figures in the Kansas City and Naples self-portraits, thereby showing a learned gentleman at his ease (perusing a book for inspiration or for a reliable source), and at the same time depicting a working painter whose intellect and skill allow him to capture any appearance, and a moment in time. Thus art triumphs over mortality. This familiar topos—*ars longa, vita brevis* (which Seneca attributes to Hippocrates)—must have had special significance for an artist like Dou, who worked slowly and in some cases for hundreds of hours on a single painting, creating something that would long outlast him, and that would carry his image (like portraits of artists from the past) into the future and into an imaginary pantheon of important painters. The concepts of the learned artist and of painting's superiority to poetry or sculpture were pressing issues when linked with the prospect of achieving immortality through art. One did not hear of routine works by average painters in connection with the idea, but rather of great artists who through grand or sophisticated projects, and through extraordinary technique or virtuosity, contributed something memorable to the profession. Ultimately, the artist's identity consisted of the works he or she left behind, a point that was consciously demonstrated in ambitious self-portraits such as this one. Late self-portraits must have been regarded as especially significant, since they added the evidence of fortune, fame, skill, and experience (perhaps even wisdom) gained in the course of a career. A youthful self-portrait was like a trial masterpiece produced upon entrance into the painters' guild, but a late self-portrait was a masterwork submitted for judgment by posterity.

Two characteristics of Dou's self-portraits are quite unlike self-portraits by Rembrandt, and they reflect fundamental differences between the two artists. First, Dou made liberal use
of symbolic or otherwise meaningful motifs and second, he insisted on illusionism as the standard by which artistic virtuosity was to be measured. It has been shown that Dou's aesthetic was in line with current art criticism, particularly that of his Leiden colleague Philips Angel. However, it may also be allowed that Dou's idea (as revealed in his self-portraits) of what constituted excellence in an artist and in works of art was plainly tailored to the style he settled upon in his youth, and to his usual subject matter. One need only refer to Nicolas Poussin's contemporaneous work, including his celebrated Self-Portrait of 1650 (Louvre, Paris), or to Rembrandt's Aristotle with a Bust of Homer (Pl. 151, which, like the present picture, touches upon the paragone of painting and sculpture) and his mature self-portraits (see Pl. 157), to place Dou's manner of presenting himself in a national and international context, where he appears as the chief exponent of a local or regional style (despite sales to a few foreign courts).

In the Altman panel and in the Uffizi Self-Portrait of about seven years earlier (fig. 35), Dou includes a relief below the window that repeats the composition of a marble sculpture (Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome) carved in 1626 by François Duquesnoy (1597–1643). After training in his native Brussels, Duquesnoy established himself in Rome, where, under the influence of antiquity, Titian, and Poussin, he became a leading representative of the classicist style. Painters as different as Dou and Rubens would have named Duquesnoy one of the great sculptors of their time, and would have been proud that he came from the Netherlands. The putti relief, now known as Children with a Goat or Bacchanale of Children, was familiar from casts that circulated in northern Europe from about the late 1640s onward. Dou appears to have depicted the relief for the first time in The Violinist, of 1653 (Princely Collections, Vaduz Castle, Liechtenstein), and he included it in several other genre paintings over the next twenty years.

With reference to those pictures, and even in discussions of Dou's self-portraits, the relief's significance has been variously interpreted, sometimes with little regard for the pictorial context. Here, however, its meaning seems to be fairly straightforward. The mask held by the putto to the left stands for deception, the ability to fool the eye, which will be tested on the resistant goat. In addition to a palette, a mask is one of the main attributes of Pictura, the Art of Painting, as seen in Ripa's illustration of the allegorical figure, and in the exquisite little painting of Pictura, dated 1661 (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles), by the prince of Dou's pupils (according to Houbraken), Frans van Mieris (q.v.). Because the mask itself is artifice, used here to deceive an animal, art could be said to triumph over nature, meaning that it fools a living creature into mistaking art for life. Dou's apologist Angel, in his Lof der Schilder-Konst (In Praise of the Art of Painting), of 1642, retells Pliny's shopworn tale of the contest between two great painters of antiquity, Zeuxis and Parrhasios: Zeuxis depicted grapes so realistically that birds tried to peck at them, but Parrhasios painted a veil over the still life to such lifelike effect that Zeuxis later tried to pull it aside. Indeed, Dou was dubbed "the Dutch Parrhasios" in a laudatory verse by the Leiden poet Dirk Traadenius in 1662; the artist himself probably encouraged the comparison. It therefore seems likely that, in the self-portrait, the birdcage, the small bunch of grapes next to it, the vine, the curtain hanging inside the window, and perhaps the sack dangling over the relief are intended as allusions to the story of Zeuxis and Parrhasios. The reference may seem oblique, but Dou's patron (evidently his greatest supporter, Johan de Bije; see Ex Coll.) could simply have had the meaning explained.

Duquesnoy's relief does double duty in this picture (and others by Dou), for in content it concerns imitation, and in form it represents sculpture in the paragone with painting, the Renaissance debate about which art was superior. In his Lof der Schilder-Konst, Angel offers some clever, if not concise, remarks on the subject, among them the observation that only painting can distinguish colors, textures, and insubstantial things such as light (including reflections, shadows, and atmosphere and, of course, the illusion of space—and all of this on a flat plane rather than in three dimensions). Dou's painting includes a laudatory reference to convincing illusion of sculptural relief (on the flowerpot as well), but in fact the great Duquesnoy's work of art is cast into the shade by Dou's virtuoso description of the vine and the sack in front of it. A little more salt could be poured into the wound, at least in conversation, if Dou had known (as he might have, from Joachim von Sandrart) that Duquesnoy's putti reliefs were in good part inspired by the works of Titian, such as the putto-strewn Worship of Venus (Prado, Madrid), which was then in the Aldobrandini collection in Rome.

The cracked flowerpot, and the flowers themselves, probably symbolize transience, quite as in floral still lifes of the period (see the discussion of Jacob Vosmaer's A Vase with Flowers; Pl. 213). Fahy (1982; see Refs.) identifies the flowers depicted by Dou as marigold or calendula, noting that the latter may bloom all year long and thus "def[y] the rules of nature." It is possible that Dou was aware of this, since his city was home to eminent botanists. If so, and if the flowers are calendula, they might be meant as an analogy to the enduring nature of Dou's
art. However, the blooming plant more likely conveys the usual idea of mortality, as in biblical passages that describe the life of humankind, for example, “He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down” (Job 14:1–2). Whatever the reading, Dou’s self-portraits would tend to suggest that the motif, like the painter’s general demeanor in the present work, is an expression of erudition rather than humility.

A few copies of the Museum’s painting are known.17

1. Moes 1897–1905, vol. 1, pp. 241–43, lists twenty-eight self-portraits by Dou or records of the same, but some entries are redundant (different records of the same object), and others refer to works that are either not self-portraits, or are no longer accepted as by Dou (for example, nos. 3, 4, 9–17, 21, 24).

2. Also catalogued in Van der Ploeg, Runia, and Van Suchtelen 2002, no. 10.

3. On the subject and date of the Braunschweig portrait, see Sluijter 1998a, p. 190, fig. 18.


7. See Šafářík and Torselli 1982, p. 33, pl. 37; Boudon-Machuel 2005, no. 08.045b, fig. 34.


9. As noted in ibid., p. 186, citing The Grocer’s Shop, of 1672 (Royal Collection, London). On The Violinist, see also Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, no. 20, where in a note to the entry (p. 140 n. 3) several of these pictures are listed, and the title of the relief is confused with that of another sculpture by Duquesnoy in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Sacred and Profane Love (Hecht 2002, fig. 8).

10. Baer in Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001 concludes that the relief “simply signals Dou’s painterly abilities and Pictura’s deceptive qualities.” See also Dresden–Leiden 2000–2001, p. 41, and Franits 2004, pp. 116–18. In Hecht 2002, p. 191, the author criticizes Josua Bruyn for finding erotic content in the relief, asking whether Dou’s “own or somebody else’s libido” would have been an issue “in the self-portrait that was sold to [implying, “intended for”] the Grand Duke of Tuscany.” This is a good point made poorly, since the painting was acquired by Cosimo III de’ Medici in 1676, a year after Dou’s death.

11. See Amsterdam 1989–90, no. 14, and an illustration of Ripa’s Picture (which Dou would have known from the Dutch translation, Ripa 1644a). For Houbraken’s remark about Van Mieris, see the latter’s biography below.


13. For De Bie, see Dou’s biography above, note 20. On the collecting of self-portraits by contemporary Dutch art lovers, see Corpus 2005, pp. 156–59, with references to Dou and De Bie, and criticism of Ronni Baer’s idea that Dou’s self-portraits were a form of self-expression or autobiography.


15. L. Hadermann-Misquich in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 9, p. 409, describes the relief by Duquesnoy as “one of his most pictorial marbles, in which he exploited to the full the possibilities of all gradations of relief to create a scene full of atmosphere and animation.”

16. See Hecht 2002, pp. 193–94 (n. 21 on Sandrart’s visit to Dou’s studio, and on the German artist’s study, with Duquesnoy, Poussin, and others, of one of Titian’s Bacchanals in the Aldobrandini collection).

17. The one listed in Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1, p. 438, no. 282a, may be identical with the old copy (wood, 13 1/4 x 10 3/4 in. [33 x 26 cm]) sold at Galerie Fischer, Lucerne, December 2, 1993, no. 2050. A copy (wood, 14 1/8 x 10 13/16 in. [36.8 x 26.7 cm]) that omits the vine and rusticates the wall around the window was sold at Parke-Bernet, New York, May 16, 1951, no. 32 (ill.). A later, cropped version of the composition, omitting the vine and the flowerpot on a plinth and with a different relief (seven putti misbehaving), was in a private collection, Buenos Aires, during the 1980s.

References: Descamps 1753–54, vol. 2, p. 225, remarks, “Chez M. le Marquis de Voyer, le Portrait de Gerard Dou”; J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 1 (1829), pp. 34–35, no. 101, as purchased by Erard in 1825 for FFr 25,000, erroneously dates the picture to when Dou was about forty years old, and fully describes the composition, and vol. 9 (1843), p. 19, no. 60, “now in the Collection of M. Kalkbrenner, at Paris”; Nagler 1835–52, vol. 18 (1848), p. 115, no. 26, engraved by Pierre Alexandre Tardieu; Pavillié 1860, p. 138, prints the remarks of Paul d’Ivry on the Piérad sale, who gives the buyer’s name as M. Baring, and who finds the work dreadful (despite its fame) because of its finish, anatomy, and color; Moes 1897–1905, vol. 1 (1897), p. 244, no. 22 (under subject no. 206), portraits of Dou, listed as in the Kalkbrenner collection; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), pp. 438–39, no. 283, reviews the motifs, including “the well-known relief by Duquesnoy” and “a pot of marigolds,” and adds the 1860 sale to the provenance; W. Martin 1912a, p. 172, no. 57, listed as in the Altman Collection, with provenance; W. Martin 1913, p. 179, fronts. (dated “about 1660–1665” in the caption), describes the picture as untraced between the 1860 sale and its acquisition by A. Schloss “about 1905”; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 27–28, no. 18, reports that the picture “passed through the collections of M. Kalkbrenner and Mr. Say, and so to its late owner”; Monod 1923, p. 309, compares the Louvre Self-Portrait; (nn. There is no published reference for forty years, except for Altman Collection 1928, pp. 81–82, no. 43, which repeats Altman Collection 1914); Van Hall 1965, pp. 82–83, no. 35, listed; Walsh in New York 1972, p. 12, no. 9, compares the artist’s serious expression with that in Rembrandt’s self-portrait of 1660 (Pl. 157 here), and observes that “by the time Dou painted this self-portrait he was famous and rich, but not of a mind to show himself simply as a human being”; Hibbard 1980, p. 336, fig. 607, parrots Walsh’s remarks found in New York 1972; Naumann 1981, p. 71, fig. 98, observes the “references to book-
learning and artistic heritage”; Fahy 1982, p. 7 (ill. on p. 6), relates that the study of plants reached a high point at the time, as can be seen in Dou’s self-portrait “as a prosperous artist-gentleman,” and mentions the grapevine and the urn holding “a pot marigold or calendula,” adding that the latter can bloom all year long, and is thus “one of the few plants that defies the rules of nature”; Hennemuller 1983, vol. 1, pp. 226–27, 232–43, 245–46, 249, 256 n. 17, 18, 257 n. 19, 260 n. 32, 262 n. 32, and vol. 2, figs. 175, 177 (details), dates the painting to 1660–65, discusses the symbolism in detail, and sees the work as a visual commentary on the epigram Ars longa, vita brevis; P. Sutton 1986, p. 184, remarks the “elegant costume” and “a large volume, probably an allusion to the scholarship required of a successful artist”; Christies in Leiden 1988, p. 210 n. 1, compares the pose with one employed in a portrait by Pieter van Slingelandt; Foucart in Paris 1988–89, pp. 20, 22, compares the self-portrait in Paris, which is possibly the last known; Baer 1990, no. 112, suggests a date of about 1665, and describes the work as “the only extant self-portrait by the artist to include a flowerpot; hence, it is probably the painting listed as no. 22 in the contract between De By and Johannes Hannet”; Liedtke 1990, p. 48, mentions the work among Altman’s pictures; P. Sutton 1992, p. 61, cites this and other self-portraits by Dou to demonstrate that the Portrait of a Young Man in the Samuel collection is not one; Baer 1995, p. 322; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 142, no. 45, dates the picture to about 1665, notes that Dou presents himself as a learned painter, and that the cracked flowerpot is probably meant as a symbol of transience; Westermann 1997, p. 230, fig. 156, briefly notes the picture’s contribution to the paragone of painting and sculpture; Baer in Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, p. 48 n. 98, cites the painting in connection with the motto Ars longa, vita brevis, and notes that “the emphasis on the artist’s tools, the dignified costly dress, and the steady serious regard” recalls sixteenth-century portrait prints of artists that function as “a memoria, an image intended to transcend death,” p. 140 n. 5, mentions the picture in a list of works by Dou that depict the Duquesnoy relief, p. 142 n. 1 (under no. 37), excludes this work as the self-portrait seen in 1662 by the Danish scholar Ole Borch, when he visited Dou’s studio, and p. 142 n. 1 (under no. 29), lists the picture as one of the self-portraits by Dou that have the character of a personal manifesto; Scholz in Dresden–Leiden 2000–2001, p. 20, in a discussion of Dou’s technique, describes the paints visible on the artist’s palette, noting “six or seven colours set out round the edge of his palette and four mixtures in the middle”; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, p. 439 n. 10, mentions this and another self-portrait by Dou of about 1665 (fig. 37 here) in connection with a work by Emanuel de Witte that contrasts the illusionistic limits of painting and sculpture; Hecht 2002, p. 196, fig. 15, discusses Dou’s “somewhat obsessive” use of the Duquesnoy relief here and in other pictures; M. Hollander 2002, pp. 65–67, 68, 70, fig. 29, considers this work Dou’s “most direct, even blatant, praise of painting and, in particular, his own skill,” and discusses the significance of various motifs in the picture.


Ex Coll.: 1 John de Bije (or de Bye), Leiden (in 1665); 2 Voyer d’Argenson (in 1754); Chevalier Sébastien Erard, Château de la Muette, Passy (1825–d. 1831); bought for FFr 25,000; his estate sale, Paris, April 23–August 7, 1832, no. 76, for FFr 19,250, bought in; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, June 22, 1833, no. 45, for £603 15s.; [Étienne Le Roy, Brussels]; Kalkbrenner, Paris (in 1842); M. Périer, Vincennes (until 1860); his estate sale, Hôtel des Commissaires Priseurs, Paris, March 20–21, 1860, no. 17, for FFr 37,000 to Baring); A. Schloss, Paris (from about 1905); 2 Henry Say, Paris; [Scott & Fowles, New York, until 1907; sold for $45,000 to Altman]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1907–d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.607

1. As noted in Baer 1990, no. 112, n. 2.

2. For a list of the twenty-seven paintings by Dou in De Bije’s collection, see Lunsingh Scheurleer, Fock, and Van Dissel 1986–92, vol. 38, p. 486 (appendix 1). De Bije owned three self-portraits by Dou, described as (no. 11) “Gerrit Douw his portrait in small”; (no. 15) “Douw himself with father and mother”; and (no. 22) “Douw himself with a flowerpot, [seen] from outside, with one candlelight.” The last term could simply mean a dimly lit interior, rather than a visible candle. Baer 1990, no. 112, considers the Museum’s picture to be De Bije’s.
Willem Drost
Amsterdam 1633–1659 Venice

One of Rembrandt’s most gifted pupils, Willem Jansz Drost was also one of the most short-lived, dying before his twenty-sixth birthday. He was baptized in the Nieuwe Kerk, Amsterdam, on April 19, 1633, and buried in Venice, after having worked there some three years, on February 25, 1659.¹ Documentary evidence for both dates has only recently been discovered, and has assisted in a plausible sketch of Drost’s career. When basic information about his life was unknown, including the approximate dates of his training with Rembrandt and of his departure for Italy, Drost’s hypothetical oeuvre often served as a receptacle for works previously thought to have been painted by Rembrandt as early as about 1645 and as late as the 1660s.²

Drost’s father, Jan Barentsz (ca. 1587–1639), was a bookseller from Antwerp. On November 19, 1644, he married Mary (or Marietje) Claesdr (b. ca. 1591) in the Nieuwe Kerk of her native city, Amsterdam. The couple had eight children, according to surviving baptismal records. When their son the future embryo worker Claes Jansz Drost (1622–1689) was baptized, Jan Barentsz was described as a bookseller, but in 1627 he was recorded as a schoolteacher.³ At his death in 1639, he left his widow with four children. The eldest, Barent Jansz Drost (b. 1615), appears to have supported the family as a barber surgeon. He married in 1653 and moved to Zaandam. Drost’s only surviving sister, Engelje (1624–1665), married a furnituremaker in 1646.

Houbraeken (1721) identifies Drost as a history painter, “a pupil of Rembrandt,” and a colleague of the German painter Johann Carl Loth (“Carlotto”; 1632–1698) in Rome.⁴ “Guglielmo Drost of Amsterdam” is also said to be “of the school of Rembrandt” in an inventory dated 1655, which records the possessions (including a lost painting by Drost) of the brothers Agostino and Giovan Donato Correggio in Venice.⁵

Bikker suggests that Drost may have been drawn into Rembrandt’s circle through an association with the ebony worker Herman Doomer (see Pl. 148) and his son, the painter and draftsman Lambert Doomer (1624–1700), who was (at the least) a Rembrandt follower.⁶ Drost’s tenure with Rembrandt is usually dated between about 1648 and about 1650–52. It has also been suggested that Drost studied earlier (before he turned fifteen) with Rembrandt’s pupil Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.).⁷ This would have been about 1646–47. However, it is also possible that Van Hoogstraten, who was nearly six years older than Drost, may have simply made a strong impression on the novice painter. Attributions of Rembrandtesque pictures dating from the second half of the 1640s have gone back and forth between Van Hoogstraten and Drost, and it is clear that the teenager admired pictures that the Dordrecht artist painted during his early years in Amsterdam.

The listing of a picture by Drost in a Venetian inventory of 1655 suggests that he arrived in Italy by that year. Houbraeken was probably misinformed about Drost’s living for any length of time in Rome, considering that no works by him are cited in seventeenth-century Roman inventories; but a fair number are recorded in Venice. In any case, at the age of twenty-two Drost was working in Italy, and no evidence suggests that he ever returned to the Netherlands during the remaining few years of his life. At the time of his death in early 1659, he was said to have been ill for four months and to have been living in the house of a certain Cornelia van Baerle in Venice. This patron was probably a merchant, originally (like the famous humanist Caspar van Baerle, or Barlaeus; 1584–1648) from the Spanish Netherlands. His brother Giovanni Giacomino (presumably, Johannes Jacobisz) was living in Venice by 1639, and is cited in a later document as a merchant of Genoa. In 1651, Giovanni witnessed an affidavit together with Agostino Correggio (mentioned above).⁸

The earliest known dated work by Drost is a very small etching, inscribed “W. Drost/1652,” which shows the artist in half-length, smiling at the viewer (fig. 41).⁹ The Museum’s Portrait of a Man (Self-Portrait?) (Pl. 38) and its probable pendant, Portrait of a Woman (the Painter’s fiancée?) (fig. 39), are most likely both from 1653. Batolobola with King David’s Letter (fig. 43) is dated 1654. The last is clearly an Amsterdam picture, as is The Sibyl (Pl. 39), of about the same date. A formal portrait of a Dutch woman with a fan (private collection) is also dated 1654.¹⁰ Pictures of this brief Dutch period reveal an ability to work in both a painterly and a polished manner, the latter being expected in portraiture but also found in figures like the bare-breasted model who appears as Bathsheba in the Louvre picture.

In Italy, Drost adopted a tenebrist style that had roots in Caravaggism and the work of Jusepe de Ribera (1591–1652).
The *tenbroos* manner was practiced in Venice by Giovanni Battista Langetti (1635–1676), Antonio Zanchi (1631–1678), Loth, and Drost. Among the pictures that Drost painted in Italy are two self-portraits, one in the guise of John the Evangelist (art market, 2008) and the other the moody image in the Uffizi, Florence. The relationship between Loth and Drost has been a matter of conjecture. In 1685, Cosimo III de’ Medici’s agent in Venice, Matteo del Teglia, wrote to the Grand Duke with respect to the Uffizi self-portrait that Drost “was an esteemed artist in his time, and was the master of S. Carlo Loth, who is still alive, and saw him execute it while he [Loth] was studying.” Although a few scholars considered Loth to have influenced Drost, Ewald (1961) and Bikker (2005) maintain convincingly that the slightly younger Drost had more experience and took the lead in adopting a tenebrist style. He thus transformed Rembrandt’s approach into a romantic manner, for which the master himself was arbitrarily admired in Venice during the eighteenth century.

38. *Portrait of a Man (Self-Portrait?)*

Oil on canvas, 34 3/8 x 28 3/8 in. (87.6 x 72.4 cm)
Signed and inscribed (lower left): Wilhelm[?] Drost. f/A [??] / Am[ster]dam.

The entire paint surface is severely abraded. There are several small losses in the sitter’s coat and a few in the right background, large areas of loss in the top left corner, and another on the crown of the hat.

Given in memory of Felix M. Warburg by his wife and children, 1941, 41.116.2

This portrait has long been accepted as the pendant to Drost’s *Portrait of a Woman (the Painter’s Fiancée?)* (fig. 39), which is signed and dated “Drost f. —1653.” (see Refs.). The two canvases first became known in a London sale of 1884; they were separated in the art market after they appeared in a London sale of 1903. When the paintings were exhibited side by side in 1992, it was obvious that they are consistent in execution (although the Bredius picture is better preserved) and work well as a pair, providing that the woman’s portrait is placed to the viewer’s left. This departure from the conventional placement of the man to the left—that is, on the woman’s right-hand side (or “heraldic right”)—usually indicates that the sitters were betrothed rather than married.

The form of the signature on the male portrait and whether there is any evidence of a date have been variously reported (see Refs.). As revealed by Abraham Bredius in 1912–3 and 1929, the cartellino bearing Drost’s signature and a date of 1653 or 1655 had been covered over by someone in the art trade in order to sell the painting as a Rembrandt. Removing the overpaint must have caused damage to the inscription. There is enough space for the “Wilhelmus” (the Latin form of Willem) read by Hofstede de Groot before 1913, but only a
possible period can now be discerned following the much abraded “Wilhelm.” Above the artist’s name is a decorative flourish that may have been read in the past as a date, but this is doubtful. In the center of the cartellino, which is now nearly void, are the remains of a capital A followed by slight traces of other painted marks. Presumably, “Ao 16??” was once in this area, but disappeared a long time ago. The remains of “Amsterdam,” with flourishes, are at bottom center.

Bredius, who owned the pendant portrait, proposed in 1929 that the New York painting is a self-portrait by Drost. This identification has fallen out of favor in recent literature, but it deserves to be more closely considered.

First, the young man resembles Drost as he appears in his etched Self-Portrait of the previous year (fig. 41), which could have been made as little as a month or as much as about twenty-three months earlier. The wide-spaced eyes, the arching eyebrows, and the shapes of the nose, mouth, and chin are similar. The hair looks the same, but is cut shorter in the painting, where there is also a small amount of facial hair.

Second, the importance of the cartellino bearing Drost’s inscription has been underestimated. The motif is not comparable (as has been claimed) with Rembrandt’s monogram on the letter held by Marten Looten in the portrait of 1652 (Los Angeles County Museum of Art), where the sitter’s name is far more prominent, nor with the signature placed on a paper in the
background of another Rembrandt portrait of 1632. The notion of an almost unknown artist making such a conspicuous display of his signature on the formal portrait (or, more unexpectedly, the betrothal portrait) of a person other than himself is implausible, without some special explanation. By contrast, the illusion of a sheet of paper stuck between the surface of the painting and the frame is precisely the sort of device, or demonstration piece, that Netherlandish artists (following their Italian colleagues) employed to draw attention to their skill and their name at the same time. Examples are found in a variety of genres, including still life (by Edwaert Collier [q.v.] and others), marine painting (Jan Porcellis’s Stormy Sea, of 1629, in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich), and portraiture. The fact that Drost, on this one occasion, signed with his full name and added the place, probably the date, and calligraphic flourishes strongly suggests that the painting is indeed a self-portrait. It should also be noted that the placement of the hand on the chest, while found in portraits of diverse gentlemen (for example, Rembrandt’s Marten Looten), is especially common in Dutch and Flemish self-portraits and portraits of fellow artists. The gesture is often meant as a reference to artistic temperament, and has origins mainly in sixteenth-century Venetian painting.

Third, the young woman in the pendant portrait bears a strong resemblance to the model in Drost’s Bathsheba with King David’s Letter, of 1644 (fig. 43), and in his Young Woman in a Brocade Gown (fig. 42), of about the same date. The long, thin, slightly upturned nose, the high brow, the slim ovoid face, and other features are quite similar. This is not a matter of the artist’s having a standard female type, from which he did not vary, even when attempting to capture an individual’s appearance. The most likely explanation is that Drost, like Rembrandt, employed his young wife (or companion, in Rembrandt’s contemporary pictures) as a convenient model in paintings of Bathsheba and other eroticically charged characters.

At present, Drost’s possible engagement in 1653 and his marriage in 1653, 1654, or at any other time are not indicated by known documents. It may well be that an Amsterdam record (like that of Drost’s baptism) has long been overlooked, or that the painter’s presumed fiancée was from another city or town and the marriage took place there (where records may or may not survive). If Drost was married before he went to Italy, his wife probably would have stayed at home; a number of cases are known in which married painters made the expensive and potentially risky trip on their own. For example, about 1642 Jan Baptist Weenix (1621–1660/61) went to Rome, leaving behind his wife and fourteen-month-old son, Jan Weenix (q.v.), to whom he did not return until about four years later.

It is also possible that Drost’s wife died, or that he was never betrothed, in which case the Museum’s picture would have to be considered as a portrait of an unidentified gentleman.

1. See Ex Coll. below, and Blankert 1990, p. 74, where the year of the 1884 auction is mistakenly given as 1883.
2. As in Maes’s portraits of Jacob Binkes and his fiancée, Ingina Rotterdam (Pls. 113, 114), discussed below. See also Haarlem 1986a, p. 195 (under no. 40).
3. For these comparisons, see Bikker 2005, pp. 97–99, where the reference should be to Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, nos. 452, 454.
4. For example, that the sitter is his brother or best friend. But the present writer is unable to cite an example in support of this hypothesis. The proper comparison would be with pendant portraits by Rembrandt (for example, Pls. 143, 144, 146, 148), where the famous master’s signature is inconspicuous.
5. See, for example, the Museum’s Christ Crowned with Thorns, by Antonello da Messina (ca. 1430–1479), where the creased cartellino reads “Antonellus messan,a/[us]/me pin[x]sic” (Bactier 1995, pp. 69–70). Bernaert van Orley’s Holy Family, of 1522 (Prado, Madrid), has a cartellino projecting into the viewer’s space, with the artist’s signature and the date. The device was especially common in northern Italy during the 1500s. One of the clearest versions of the motif is found in Ribera’s Drunken Silenus, of 1626 (Museo e Gallerie Nazionale di Capodimonte, Naples), where the cartellino (with Latinized signature and reference to the academy in Rome) is being torn by a snake.
6. The device is common in formal portraiture, for example, Samuel Hoffmann’s full-length Portrait of Elisabeth Schmid-Blarer von Wartensee, dated 1629 (Landgut zur Schipf, Herrliberg, Switzerland; Schlägl 1980, no. 18). A less conventional example is David Bailly’s Vanitas Still Life with a Portrait of a Young Painter, dated 1651 (Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden), where the young man is probably Bailly himself (as suggested by J. Bruyn in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 1, p. 78, and in Sluiter 1998a, pp. 187–89).
7. See Raupp 1984, figs. 42, 46–49, 52, 66, 74, 76, 120, 129. The gesture as a sign of sincerity is mentioned above in connection with Frans Hals’s Portrait of a Bearded Man with a Ruff (Pl. 62). However, the examples given in ibid. support the more specific reading in the case of an artist. Van Dyck used the gesture repeatedly in portraits of artists: see Barnes et al. 2004, nos. II.48, III.91, III.116, III.117, III.149, III.155, III.161, III.168, III.221, III.232.

References: Broedius 1913c, col. 275, reports that when the picture was with Lesser in London, it was signed and dated “Willem Drost 1655,” but now that it is with the art dealer Ehrich in New York, the cartellino bearing the signature and date has been removed or overpainted in order to pass the picture off as a Rembrandt; C. Hofstede de Groot in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 9 (1913), pp. 576, 577, describes the canvas as signed and dated “Wilhelmus

Willem Drost
Drost f 1657” and considers the portrait of a woman in the Breeding collection a pendant; Breeding 1915–22, part 3 (1977), pp. 887, 890, no. 2, suggests that portraits “of the deceased and the widow” by Drost in the 1657 Leiden estate inventory of Jacob Gerritsz van Velsen are the Museum’s collection (described as signed and dated “Wilhelm Drost f 1653”) and the female pendant signed “Drost f 1653” in the author’s own collection; Van Dyke 1923, pl. 60, 61, 62, 63, pl. x, fig. 33, considers this work “alone sufficient to indicate his (Drost's) singularity” and “an excellent portrait than which there are few better in the Rembrandt oeuvre”; Breeding 1929, p. 96, 98 (ill. p. 97), gives a personal account of seeing this “very Rembrandt-esque” painting on the New York art market, which he mentioned to Warburg (who bought it immediately), records the inscription as “Wilhelm Drost f. 1653” (“or 1653”; n. 1), and considers the sitter to be Drost himself and the woman in the pendant portrait (owned by Breeding) to be the artist’s wife; Hofstede de Groot 1929, p. 36, mentions the work as a Drost formerly in the “MacCornick” collection; Valentiner 1939, pp. 300, 303, 325 n. 4, fig. 4, describes the work as “clearly signed Wilhelm Drost,” considers the spelling of the first name to indicate that the artist was German, dates the work as 1655, sees the portrait and its pendant in the Breeding collection to be close in style to Rembrandt’s work, and identifies the picture with one sold in Amsterdam on December 17, 1850 (with a pendant); Bach in New York 1940, p. 74, no. 99, as Self-Portrait, reads the “date” as 1655; Wehle 1942, pp. 160–61 (III), describes the portrait “of a young Dutch burghe” by Drost, and considers it to dismiss The Sibyl (see next entry) from Drost’s oeuvre and to place it back in Rembrandt’s; Valentiner in Raleigh 1916, p. 116, no. 21, surprisingly sees the sitter as “a middle-aged man (Jacob Gerritsz van Velsen),” and the canvas as dated 1655; MacLaren 1960, pp. 107, 108, as dated 1653 not 1655, supports an attribution to Drost of a woman’s portrait in the National Gallery, London; Pietzsch 1960, p. 181, cites the picture as one of Drost’s few certain works; Ewald 1965, pp. 36, 36–37 n. 3, refers to the painting in an attempted outline of Drost’s activity; Bruyn in Montreal-Toronto 1969, pp. 79, 80, suggests that the signature confirms a German origin; Haak 1969, p. 223, fig. 371, as dated 1653; Rijkin 1969c, p. 33, commends the picture’s inclusion in the exhibition of 1969; Sumowski 1969, pp. 376, 383 n. 23, in an unreliable sketch of Drost’s career, mentions the work as a portrait of Jacob Gerritsz van Velsen, dated 1653; Cunningham in Chicago-Minneapolis-Detroit 1969–70, p. 19, considers the painting of only “moderate help” in establishing Drost’s oeuvre; Judson in ibid., pp. 33, 54–55, no. 40, as Self-Portrait?, the date read variously as 1653, 1655, 1656, or 1666, maintains that the signature reads “Wilhelmus,” the Latinized form of Willem, and that this is probably a self-portrait by Drost, and the Breeding picture a portrait of Drost’s wife; Bernt 1970, vol. 1, no. 331 (III), as Portrait of a Gentleman, 1655; Blankert 1978a, pp. 91–92 (under no. 49), 168 (III), considers both the painting and its pendant in the Museum Breeding as from 1653, but does not believe they represent Drost and his wife, or Van Velsen and his wife, but possibly members of the Valkenburg family (based on the supposed presence of the pictures in an auction of 1850); Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 48, as not dated; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 1, pp. 610, 617, 664, no. 335, considers it as signed “Wilhelmus Drost” and dated 1653, pendant to the Breeding picture, but rejects all previous identifications of the sitter; Haak 1984, p. 169, repeats the discredited idea that the signature indicates a German origin; Van Velzen in New York and other cities 1985–87, p. 50 (under no. 10), as more likely depicting a member of the Valkenburg family than Drost himself; M. Scott 1987, p. 31, observes that the inscription confirms that Drost worked in Amsterdam; Foucart in Paris 1988–89, p. 93, cites the work in support of an attribution to Drost of the Portrait of a Young Scholar in the Louvre; Blankert 1991, p. 74, fig. 49A, repeats Blankert 1978a; MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 113–14, as signed “Wilhelmus Drost,” follows MacLaren (1965) in considering the painting to support an attribution to Drost of a woman’s portrait in the National Gallery, London; Huys Janssen in The Hague 1992, pp. 110–11, 113–14 (under nos. 5, 6), as possibly a portrait of a member of the Valkenburg family, and the Breeding painting as depicting the sitter’s wife (the pictures are reproduced as facing plates, with the woman on the left); Ingamells 1992a, p. 87, repeats the idea of the German name; Baetjer 1995, p. 37; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 28, 29, 106, 108, 119, 144, no. 46, as dated 1653; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, p. 24, observes that the canvas was given a double-layer ground; Ben Broo in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 9, p. 300, as one of Drost’s earliest dated works, the form of the signature implying “German descent”; White 1999a, p. 33, as dated 1653; Hamburg 2000–2001, pp. 32, 40 n. 145, as dated 1652; Ekkart in Utrecht 2002, pp. 70, 72, 120 n. 6 (under no. 11), follows Bikker’s dissertation (2001) in doubting the pendant relationship with the Portrait of a Woman in The Hague; Bikker 2005, pp. 7, 17, 33, 67, 74, 92, 95, 96–99, no. 22, and pp. 101, 102, 105, 161, 184 (notes to no. 32), as Portrait of a Man, agrees with MacLaren that the visible “date” is merely an ornamental flourish, argues at length against all previous identifications of the sitter, and accepts the pendant relationship with the Portrait of a Woman in the Museum Breeding, but notes that the usual convention of placing the man on the woman’s right is reversed.


**EX COLL.** 1 Albert Levy, London (until 1884; posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, May 3, 1884, no. 24, for £54 18s. 10d. to Lesser); [lesser, London, from 1884]; James MacAndrew (or McAndrew), Belmont, Mill Hill (until 1903; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, February 14, 1903, no. 128, as “Portrait of the Artist,” for £462); [Lesser, London]; [Ehrich, New York, by 1913–at least 1915]; Felix M. Warburg, New York (ca. 1915–d. 1937); Mrs. Felix M. Warburg (1937–41); Given in memory of Felix M. Warburg by his wife and children, 1941. 41.116.2
39. The Sibyl

Oil on canvas, 38½ x 30¼ in. (97.8 x 78.1 cm)

X-radiography reveals that The Sibyl was painted over a composition turned upside down. The surface is extremely worn, and the impasto was somewhat flattened when the painting was lined at some earlier time. The red lake glazing in the background and dark passages of drapery painted over the light reddish brown priming that the artist used to cover the composition underneath are seriously abraded. Much of the red lake and orange-colored ochre glazing that finished the thickly applied highlights in the turban and the pastose drapery covering the shoulder has been lost. Damage to the face and hands reveals patches of the dark underlayers that interrupt the once softly blended ochreous scumbles used to model these features.

Theodore M. Davis Collection, Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, 1915 30.95.268

Drost’s authorship of this picture has been supported by most specialists since 1932 (see Refs.), and may be considered as beyond reasonable doubt. Comparisons with other works by the young artist suggest a date of about 1654, when he was still in Amsterdam and very much under the influence of Rembrandt.

The painter’s technique was greatly clarified by conservation carried out in 1995 by Hubert von Sonnenburg, in preparation for the exhibition “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt in The Metropolitan Museum of Art.” As he reported in the catalogue, the present composition was painted over another one (evidently with a similar figure) by turning the canvas upside down, applying a light reddish brown priming, and then laying in extensive areas of shadow. More opaque paints were scumbled over this dark but translucent layer to describe drapery and other forms. The face was rather softly modeled in warm ochreous tones, and thick impasto was used in the drapery on the shoulder and in highlights on the turban and along the neckline. In the past, the assertiveness of these highlights and of the impasto cloak was considered as typical of the late Rembrandt, as alien to Drost, or as suggestive of later intervention, but technical examination reveals that these effects were toned down considerably by scumbling and glazes when the artist completed the picture. The apparent inconsistencies of execution, and the soft or painterly touch that some critics have seen as differing from Drost’s style of about 1654, are largely the result of the artist’s working in a more superficial manner than usual because of the preexisting design, and of later abrasion and other damage. Before 1995, the effects of past cleanings and old restorations played an inscrutable part in the responses of connoisseurs.

Despite these considerations, the manner of execution found in the Museum’s picture has often reminded scholars of other paintings by or attributed to Drost, in particular the Young Woman in a Brocade Gown, of about 1654 (fig. 42). Furthermore, the facial type in that painting, in The Sibyl, and in the original (Dresden) version of the Young Woman with a Pearl Necklace (see fig. 44) could be described as idealizations or variations of the features seen in the Bredius Portrait of a Woman (the Painter’s Fiancée?), dated 1653 (see fig. 39), and in the Bathsheba with King David’s Letter, dated 1654 (fig. 43). Whether or not that model is the artist’s fiancée or wife (see the discussion in the preceding entry), the transformations of the figure type are comparable to those found in the favorite female types of Rubens, Rembrandt, and other artists of the period.

The picture has been known as The Sibyl since its earliest trace. Presumably, the title was chosen on analogy with the similarly posed and comparably dressed figure in Domenichino’s celebrated Cumaean Sibyl, of about 1616–17 (Galleria Borghese, Rome). It has been plausibly suggested that one of the many painted copies of that picture (which was not engraved until the eighteenth century) was seen by Drost in the Netherlands. The possibility of another Italian source cannot be excluded, since
Orazio Gentileschi, Guercino, and other cispine painters treated the subject. Dutchish precedents include Jan van Eyck's Cumaean Sibyl, on the exterior of the Ghent Altarpiece, and Maarten van Heemskerck's Erythraean Sibyl (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which was painted in 1564 on the wing of a private triptych. Ten full-length sibyls (each with a book), engraved by Philips Galle after Anthonie Blocklandt, were published in Antwerp in 1575, and are inscribed with verses by Philip II's librarian, Benito Arias Montano (1527–1598).

In contrast to these earlier northern examples, where each sibyl's foretelling of the coming of Christ is either obvious from the pictorial context or conveyed by an inscription, Drost appears to have chosen the subject (as in his erotic Bathsheba) as a mere pretext for the image of an exotic creature. Without the apparent source in Domenichino's picture or a similar Italian composition, and without the book (which is hard to explain otherwise), the figure would not be any more readily identified with a classical or religious subject than Drost's contemporary Young Woman in a Brocade Gown has been, which is to say, not at all. Similar observations might be made in regard to Rembrandt's Hendrickje Stoffels (Pl. 154) and his Woman at an Open Door (see fig. 181), both of which date from about the mid-1650s, and other works produced in Rembrandt's circle in Utrecht, Haarlem, and elsewhere in the Netherlands. The general type goes back to pictures of courtesans by Venetian painters such as Titian and Palma Vecchio. The tenor of those works already resonates in the paintings of sibyls by Gentileschi and Domenichino, and is more plainly adopted in a seventeenth-century Roman artist's series of twelve canvases depicting sibyls, who wear mostly modern dress, have no books, and appear to have nothing on their minds. Were it not for the painted labels, one would probably identify the series as a typical gallery of beauties the artist hypothetically encountered at European or Middle Eastern courts. Not only Drost's femme fatale, who foresees little more than a memorable evening (for the male viewer, at any rate), but also the painter's smoldering palette and impetuous brushwork may be regarded as tributes to Venetian art. The Sibyl, as a painting, could be taken (admittedly, with the advantage of hindsight) as a prediction that a pilgrimage to Venice was to come.

2. The suggestion that the impasto cloak was added at a later date, advanced in Van Regteren Altena 1967, p. 70, was echoed by some visitors to the Museum. Seymour Slive (1986), for example, agreed, with the attribution to Drostd, as did the following (oral opinions recorded in the curatorial files, unless otherwise stated): Frederick Schmidt-Degener, 1935; Wilhelm Martin, 1938; W. R. Valentinier (letters dated July 1, 1942, and April 12, 1946, objected to the Museum’s change of attribution from Drostd back to Rembrandt); Wolfgang Stechow, 1954 (considered the face as by Drostd); Horst Gerson, 1960a; Bob Haak, 1971. Different opinions were offered by other scholarly visitors: Otto Benesch, 1940 (rejected Rembrandt, and was unsure of Drostd because of the heavily painted cloak); Jakob Rosenberg, 1942 and 1947 (rejected Rembrandt; the painting could date from 1660s); A. B. de Vries, 1952 (doubted seventeenth-century origin); Ellis Waterhouse, 1912 (Dutch, and not by Reynolds); J. G. van Gelder, 1914 (not Rembrandt; perhaps from the period but repainted in the eighteenth century); Snrua Gudlaugsson, 1916 (not Rembrandt, “roughly done”; mentions B. Fabritius, but without conviction); D. Cevat, 1966 (by a very good painter, perhaps a pupil from Rembrandt’s late period); E. Speelman, 1982 (by Horst).

3. See especially Liedtke in New York 1953–56, vol. 2, p. 108, and Bikker 2005, pp. 74–75 (under no. 10). The latter suggests that “misinterpretation of the painting’s condition” may have led the present writer to “date the painting so late,” namely, to about 1654–60 (at the time, Drostd’s date of death was unknown, and his development was much less well understood than it is today). Bikker himself dates the picture to about 1654. The remark is perplexing, considering that my co-author, Hubert von Sonnenburg, made the painting’s condition clear for the first time in print. A detailed report of John Brealey’s technical examination of the painting, signed by this writer and dated July 14, 1986, is in the curatorial files.

4. J. Veth 1935 (see Refs.) compared the two works for the first time in print.


6. Michelangelo’s monumental Sibyls on the Sistine ceiling will be recalled, but have nothing to do with Drostd. Sibyls by Andrea del Castagno, Raphael (engraved by Agostino Musi), and other earlier Italian artists are known. Guercino was commissioned in 1651 to paint The Cumaean Sibyl with a Patera (National Gallery, London, on loan from Sir Dennis Mahon since 1992; Salerno 1988, no. 281, pl. 28). Gentileschi’s Sibyl (Museum of Fine Arts, Houston), which is usually dated to the early 1620s, is closer than the Domenichino to Drostd’s picture in the curving arrangement of the arms and the glance at the viewer (see Raleigh and other cities 1994–95, no. 14). The same Gentileschi has been cited in association with Van van Bijkert’s Girl with a Lute, of about 1630–35 (Hertzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig; see Huys Janssen 1998, pp. 142–43, no. 115, pl. 68, fig. 37).


8. On the Berlin picture, see Kelch in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, pp. 267–71 (under no. 43), where Drostd’s presumed response to Palma Vecchio is brought into consideration.

9. See, for example, F. Lammersen’s discussion of Salomon de Bray’s Young Woman in an Imaginary Costume, dated 1622 (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem), in Rotterdam–Frankfurt 1999–2000, pp. 100–103 (under no. 9).


References: Eidelberg 1885, p. 405, records the price of “Une Sibylle” by Rembrandt in the sale of 1884; Eidelberg 1886, p. 199, records the price in the sale of 1885, and considers the general tonality too dark; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 7 (1902), pp. 17–18, 118, no. 328, pl. 528, publishes “The Sibyl” in Mr. T. J. Blake’s Collection, New York, as a “hitherto unknown” Rembrandt of about 1667, one of his “few summarily executed pictures”; Siedelmeyer Gallery 1902, no. 31; “The Sibyl, by Rembrandt . . . .”, [Boston] Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin 3 (1902), p. 45, reports the loan from Davis’s collection, and quotes Bode at length; R[oger] E. F[isher], “Rembrandt’s Sibyl,” MMA Bulletin 1, no. 13 (December 1906), pp. 162–63, notes the loan to the MMA, and heaps praise upon the picture, which “shows Rembrandt’s increased power of synthetic construction,” and much more; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 386 (ill.), 561, rejects Bode’s dating for one in the mid-1660s, close to the Hendrickje in the Mendelssohn collection, Berlin; Valentinier in New York 1909, p. 102, no. 101, as by Rembrandt, “painted about 1666”; J. Veth 1915, pp. 13–14, fig. 39, sees this painting, “which has not yet been given enough thought,” as Rembrandt’s response to The Cumaean Sibyl by Domenichino (Galleria Borghese, Rome), which he may have known through a copy or variant; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 141–42, no. 214, as painted by Rembrandt about 1667, although the sale catalogue of 1884 (see Ex Coll.) records a signature and date of 1654, “no longer to be found”; Valentinier 1921b, p. 126, note to p. 39, considers the author’s earlier dating to about 1666 to be supported by the 1884 sale catalogue’s record of a date, 1654, on the canvas; Meldrum 1923, p. 204, cc. 46–47, fig. 2, listed as a Rembrandt of “c. 1667(? )”; Van Dyke 1923, p. 64, pl. II, fig. 38, attributes the painting to Willem Drostd for the first time, based on comparisons with the style and type of figure found in that artist’s Young Woman in a Brocade Gown (fig. 42 here), and with the figure type in the Balthsheba of 1664 (fig. 42 here); Downes 1923, p. 666, in a sensible review of Van Dyke 1923, notes that catalogue’s attribution of The Sibyl to Drostd; Weisbach 1926, pp. 214, 217, as an artful late work by Rembrandt; B. Burroughs 1928b, p. 15, 16, listed as by “Drostd (? );” and described as “the famous Sibyl!” that Valentinier and others now attribute to Drostd; Bredius 1935, p. 18, pl. 438, as by Rembrandt with no comment; Chicago 1935–36, p. 21, no. 11, as by Drostd, citing Van Dyke, Valentinier, and F. Schmidt-Degener (1935 oral opinion) in support; Worcester 1936, p. 27, no. 12, repeats entry published in Chicago 1935–36; Valentinier 1939, pp. 308, 311, fig. 15, in a monographic article on Drostd, attributes the work to that artist, notes that the cleaning was revealing, and considers the date of 1654 (recorded when the painting was auctioned in 1884) to represent “exactly the period when we believe Drostd must have been in closest relations with Rembrandt”; Boreninus 1942, p. 10, fig. 9, as a Rembrandt of about 1667 (with no mention of contrary opinions), compares Domenichino’s Cumaean Sibyl, revealing how the Dutch
master was indebted to Italian art for important design qualities; Ivins 1942a, pp. 3, 9 (ill.), as by Rembrandt about 1660; Ivins 1942b, pls. 23, 24, as by Rembrandt about 1660; Wehle 1942, p. 161, observes that the painting was “recently for a few years labeled Drost,” but now that one may compare Drost’s Portrait of a Man (Pl. 38) given to the Museum by Mrs. Warburg and her children, it becomes clear that both pictures cannot be by the same artist and therefore “the Museum takes this occasion in all modesty to reattribute its Sibyl to Rembrandt himself”; J. Allen 1944, p. 74, as “probably by Rembrandt”; J. Rosenberg 1948, vol. 1, pp. 204, 236 n. 15, vol. 2, fig. 270 (detail of head), maintains that “here we have a pupil—Valentine suggested Drost—imitating Rembrandt’s late, bold impasto technique, yet his rather loose splashes of paint fail to suggest any substantial form”; Valentiner in Raleigh 1936, p. 38, mentions as a work by Drost; Plietsch 1960, p. 182, defends Valentine’s attribution to Drost; J. Rosenberg 1964, pp. 126–27, fig. 270 (detail), reprints J. Rosenberg 1948; Kühn 1965, p. 190, lists the work as a Rembrandt in a table giving ground colors (yellowish white); K. Bauch 1966, p. 49 (under Bredius no. 458), lists the picture as an impressive work by Drost; Van Regteren Altena 1967, p. 70, considers the female type characteristic of Drost, but not the broadly painted mantle, which could have been added at a later date; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 186, is “not sure about the attribution to Drost, but cannot see any trace of Rembrandt’s own brushwork in the picture” either; Riikin 1969c, p. 31, cites the work in support of another attribution to Drost; Wegner 1970, p. 33, considers the execution “softer” than in typical Drosts; Arpino and Lecaldano 1978, p. 131 (ill.), included among dubious attributions to Rembrandt; Baetjer 1980, vol. 3, p. 110, as Style of Rembrandt; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 5, pp. 3089, 3166, no. 2035, as by Drost about 1654, close in execution and figure type to the Wallace Collection’s painting, the subject probably (as in Domenichino) a sibyl; Jeromack 1988a, p. 108 (ill.), mentioned as long attributed to Drost; Baetjer 1995, p. 320, as Style of Rembrandt; Liedtke in New York 1991–96, vol. 2, pp. 106, 108–10, 112, 114–15, 119, no. 39, as attributed to Drost ca. 1654–56, suggests (incorrectly) that it was painted in Italy (considering the apparent connection with Domenichino), and cautions that pictures such as this one are often painted in a different manner than the formal portraits by the same artist; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 66–67, 69, fig. 34 (detail), describes the picture as extremely worn (mostly because it was painted over a discarded composition), considers the impasto passages autograph, and explains that the striking highlights and the “yellow in the pastose drapery covering the shoulder” would have been considerably toned down by scrambling with an orange-colored ochre tone; Binstock 1999, p. 147 n. 40, cited as by Drost; Sallen 2004, pp. 297, 375 n. 52, as first attributed to Drost in Van Dyke 1923; Bikker 2005, pp. 27, 30, 59, 68, 73 (under no. 9), 73–75, no. 10, and p. 182 (notes to no. 10), with numerous references, maintains that the picture was painted by Drost about 1654 (based on comparisons with works by Drost in the Museum Bredius, the Wallace Collection, and the Louvre), and considers the question of whether Drost intended to paint a sibyl or not as uncertain; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 666–67, 672–73, reports that the first ground contains quartz, clay minerals, a little brown earth, and chalk, resulting in a light yellowish brown color.


Ex Coll.: Richard Clemson Barnett, London (until 1888; his sale, Christie’s, London, January 22, 1881, no. 90, for £273 to Lesser); [Lesser, London, as by Rembrandt, from 1881]; Baron Étienne de Beurnonville, Paris (by 1884; his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, June 31, 1884, no. 291, as by Rembrandt, “signé à droite et daté 1654,” bought in at FF 18,100; his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, January 30–31, 1885, no. 69, as “Une Sibylle,” by Rembrandt, for FF 6,500); [Sedelmeyer, Paris, in 1902]; [T. J. Blakeslee, New York, in 1902]; [Lawrie & Co., London, by 1902–1; their sale, Christie’s, London, January 28, 1903, no. 102, for £3,360, bought in]; [Trotti, Paris, 1901; sold for £6,000 to Davis]; Theodore M. Davis, Newport, R.I. (1903–1915); Theodore M. Davis Collection, Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, 1915 30.95.268
COPY AFTER WILLEM DROST

40. Young Woman with a Pearl Necklace

Oil on canvas, 33½ x 24½ in. (84.1 x 62.2 cm)
Inscribed (lower right): [illegible]

The painting is well preserved except where damage from lining and harsh cleaning in the past has destroyed many glazes in the flesh tones.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.659

The painting in the Altman Collection is an anonymous copy of Drost’s Young Woman with a Pearl Necklace, of about 1654, in the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden (fig. 44). Its age is difficult to determine, but a date in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century would appear likely. Compared with the original, the modeling of the face is schematic and descriptive qualities are simplified throughout, so that the precise nature of the cap, jacket, and fur wrap (draped over the woman’s right arm) is unclear. The collar of the white blouse is especially conspicuous in its failure to resemble the counterpart in Dresden—or, for that matter, any kind of cloth (something like white-glazed earthenware comes to mind). The woman’s expression, which in Dresden is reflective and evocative, is here rather vapid.

Few Dutch pictures in the Museum’s collection have fallen so far from grace as this one has. In 1909, Hoftede de Groot (see Refs.) published the “very important painting” as Rembrandt’s apparent portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels (compare Pl. 154), known previously only through a “copy” in Dresden attributed to Barent Fabritius (q.v.). At the time, the painting was with the art dealer Lesser in London, but it soon became a “Duveen.” On February 2, 1910, Hoftede de Groot’s erstwhile collaborator, and more senior colleague in Berlin, Wilhelm Bode, wrote to Duveen Brothers in London (which had asked for his opinion), “I not only believe it that it is a true picture by Rembrandt but I have no doubt that it is a very fine one of his best period and of marvellous preservation.” More praise follows in the letter, along with an identification of the figure as undoubtedly “Rembrandt’s second wife Hendrikje” and a dating to about 1666. In a postscript, Bode adds, “Indeed, I think so highly of the picture that I shall certainly include a reference to it in the forthcoming supplement to my Work on Rembrandt” (which never appeared). In a letter dated February 12, 1910, Bode adds: “Dear Mr. Duveen, I have to thank you for the pleasure of showing me the Hendrikje by Rembrandt since you had it cleaned from London dust. It looks splendid in his marvelous colour, masterly broadness of pencilwork and splendid preservation. I was much interested to see now the full signature just as I thought to discover it when you showed me the picture first before washing it. The date is, as much as I can see, 1666. That corresponds exactly with the age of Hendrikje. Believe me/Yours very truly/W Bode.”

In an article on “the Rembrandts of the Altman Collection,” published in 1914, the expansive Valentiner (see Refs.) praised “the portrait of Hendrickje of 1666,” with its “thickly applied pigment [that] flows over the surface in a broad stream . . . Nothing is carefully shaded or carried out in detail.” And although “this portrait of Hendrickje reveals the comfortable kindliness and genderness of her nature, it lacks the charm of some others—for example, of the one in the Museum at Berlin. Hendrickje, it should be remembered, was merely a girl of the people.”

Figure 44. Willem Drost, Young Woman with a Pearl Necklace, ca. 1654. Oil on canvas mounted on wood, 30¾ x 24¾ in. (78 x 62.5 cm). Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden
Actually, the model for the original version of this fancy picture, or tronie, may have been Drost’s companion, not Rembrandt’s, although the resemblance between the young woman in the Dresden painting and the figure in Drost’s Portrait of a Woman (the Painter’s Fiancée?) (see fig. 39) is less striking than in other paintings of about 1654 (see the discussion above, under Drost’s Portrait of a Man (Self-Portrait?); Pl. 38). The first author to reject the painting as a Rembrandt was the iconoclastic John Van Dyke, who in 1923 (see Refs.) considered it “probably by Bemaert Fabritius,” noting that the Dresden version was attributed to him, and “supposed” to be a copy after the Museum’s “Rembrandt.” By 1939, Valentiner, citing
earlier doubts (see Refs., 1931 and 1939), had come around to a similar opinion, arguing at some length that “the Altman picture is a copy after that in Dresden,” as was evident to him from its less original conception, more superficial execution, and absence of certain details. Valentin detected a close relationship between Fabritius and Drost, and was inclined to see the present painting as Fabritius’s copy after Drost, to whom the author assigned the Dresden canvas, citing similarities with that painter’s *Bathsheba with King David’s Letter*, of 1644 (see fig. 43), and *The Sibyl* (Pl. 39). Like Van Dyke, who saw a distinctive “Fabritius red” in the Altman canvas, Valentin found “in the reddish brown of the coat something of the color of Barend Fabritius.” But comparisons with works of the 1630s by that artist serve rather to dismiss than to support the attribution. In retrospect, one must applaud Valentin’s insight, even though he ends with the observation that “the girl is again most likely Hendrickje, whose character Drost represents this time [in the Dresden painting] with great charm and not without that mystery which must have been an expression of her fine feminine instinct.”

On Valentin’s advice (and against Schmidt-Degener’s), curator Harry Wehle changed the Museum’s attribution of the Altman picture from Rembrandt to Fabritius in December 1937. In 1991, at the present writer’s tardy instigation, the Museum’s designation was changed from “Attributed to Barent Fabritius” to “Copy after Willem Drost.”


2. Bode’s original letters are in the Museum’s curatorial files. On February 22, 1910, the London office of Duveen Brothers sent the New York branch (“Duplicate Mailed Paris”) a letter headed “Lesser Rembrandt” (original letter of February 2 was enclosed, along with the news that Dr. Hofstede de Groot had posted his letter “this morning.” Hofstede de Groot’s certificate dated May 9, 1910, is also in the curatorial files, and declares the picture “an unquestionable Rembrandt [underlined] of his best period.” A copy of the Duveen letter of February 22 is annotated (evidently by Altman), “4/8/10 Never rec’d this letter from Duveen but have copy of it in Stoffels book.”

3. Record on the curatorial catalogue cards, noting that F. Schmidt-Degener (April 15, 1933) “considers this not even [Barent] Fabritius, suggests that it is only a repetition of Fabritius in Dresden.”

References: Hofstede de Groot 1909a, p. 181, fig. 7, publishes the “very important” picture as a Rembrandt “from his ripest time,” apparently depicting Hendrickje Stoffels, and close to Rembrandt’s *Woman at an Open Door*, in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin (fig. 181 here); Hofstede de Groot 1909b, pp. 167–68, fig. 7, repeats the previous publication’s information in translation; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 21–22, no. 13, as *Hendrickje Stoffels*, by Rembrandt, noting that the sitter “rose to a position of intimacy with her master,” although in this picture she “has no great claim to good looks, and a shadow on the upper lip does not add to her charms”; Valentin 1914a, pp. 338, 361, discusses the work extensively as Rembrandt’s portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels of 1666 (see text above); Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 359, no. 719, as *Hendrickje Stoffels* by Rembrandt; “painted about 1658,” copy in the Dresden Gallery, 1908 cat. no. 1901, as by Barent Fabritius; Bredius 1921, p. 151 (under S[eit] 87), as certainly not by Rembrandt, but by “a pupil, e.g. Barent Fabritius?,” the only one of Altman’s dozen “Rembrandts” that is wrong, and he never liked it (according to the executors of his estate); Valentin 1921b, p. xxiii, no. 87, pl. 87, as Rembrandt’s *Hendrickje of about 1658*, the “old copy” in Dresden incorrectly ascribed to B. Fabritius; A. Burroughs 1923, p. 272, as the so-called *Portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels*, a weak study identical with one by B. Fabritius in the Dresden Gallery, and probably painted by a fellow pupil; Monod 1923, p. 302, as perhaps by Maes; Van Dyke 1923, pp. 77–78, pl. xv, fig. 52, as “probably by Bemaert Fabritius”; Altman Collection 1928, pp. 64–65, as by Rembrandt; *Hendrickje Stoffels*; Valentin 1931, no. 136, pl. 136, as Rembrandt’s *Hendrickje of about 1658*, but the attribution “is not quite certain. The painting is very much in the style of Barend Fabritius, whose similar although somewhat weaker painting is preserved in the Dresden Gallery”; Valentin 1939, pp. 318, 321, fig. 24, as probably by Barent Fabritius, after Drost’s *Hendrickje in Dresden*; Pont 1958, p. 133, has not seen the painting and therefore declines to offer an opinion about Fabritius’s possible authorship; Ewald 1965, pp. 36–37 n. 3; Ritkin 1969a, p. 27, as a copy by B. Fabritius after the Dresden Drost; Sumowski 1969, p. 382 n. 13 (under no. 3), as a copy after Drost; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 25, as attributed to Barent Fabritius; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 1, p. 616 (under no. 312), as “copy with changes in the clothing after the Dresden Drost; Baetjer 1991, p. 357, as a copy after Drost’s painting in Dresden; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 108, 110–11, 119, no. 30, as a copy after Drost’s painting in Dresden; Scallen 2004, pp. 296, 375 n. 49, as rejected in A. Burroughs 1923; Bikker 2005, p. 67, fig. 7a (under no. 7), as a copy of the Dresden Drost; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 666–67, reports that the first ground contains red earth, and the second ground lead white and a little brown ochre, resulting in a yellowish color.


Ex Coll.: J. Osmaston, Hawkhurst Court, Billingehurst, Sussex; [Lesser, London, in 1909]; [Duveen, London, in 1910; sold to Altman on March 22, 1910, for $150,000]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1910–d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.629
Jacob Duck
Utrecht ca. 1598/1600–1667 Utrecht

The Utrecht genre painter Jacob Jansz Duck was the second son of Jan Jansz Duck, from the village of Vleuten (just west of Utrecht), and Maria Booij. His parents married on January 10, 1596, which suggests that their first son, Johan, may have been born in that year or the next, and Jacob between about 1598 and 1600. Entering into this calculation is the fact that he was apprenticed to a goldsmith in 1611, became a master in the goldsmith’s guild in 1619, and married on April 29, 1620. His father’s profession is not known, but his mother sold cloth from the family home on the Donkere Gaard in the heart of Utrecht.

In 1621, Duck was listed as a drawing student of the Utrecht painter Joost Cornelisz Droomshoofd (1586–1665) and other masters, and in the same year he was recorded as an apprentice portraitist. Duck was still a member of the goldsmiths’ guild in 1642, but it is clear that by the late 1620s and probably earlier, he was working mainly as a painter. He donated a picture of a musical company to the Saint Job’s Hospice of Utrecht in 1629.

The gift is one of several indications that Duck was Catholic. His marriage to Rijkgen Croock was a civil not a church ceremony (the former often indicates that the couple was Catholic), and two of Duck’s brothers, Johan and Cornelis, were priests. Jacob and his wife had at least eight children, but their names and dates of birth are mostly unknown.

Like Duck’s mother, his wife and father-in-law were linen merchants; his wife took over her father’s business in 1643. Five years later she died, by which date the couple was living in a rented house on the Nieuwegracht near the Magdalena Bridge. Duck continued to live there with his six unmarried daughters. He appears not to have prospered. After his death in January 1667, his daughters declined their inheritance, since the artist’s debts were expected to exceed the value of his assets.

It was supposed in the past that Duck spent time in Haarlem, since pictures by him were offered in a lottery there in 1636. However, charitable lotteries in Dutch cities often included paintings by artists from other towns, and Duck is documented in Utrecht during the same period. In 1660, he was living in The Hague, where he joined the painters’ confraternity Pictura at an unknown date. Pictures by Duck are recorded in collections at The Hague. He returned to Utrecht in 1661.

Duck’s parents were friendly with Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.), who witnessed their will in 1658. Connections with other artists can only be deduced from Duck’s oeuvre. He was obviously aware of the Amsterdam guardroom painters Pieter Codde (1599–1678) and Willem Duyster (1598/99–1658), and in the 1650s he adopted compositional and other ideas from painters active in Leiden and Rotterdam (Ludolf de Jongh [q.v.] is recalled by Duck’s Guardroom Scene, dated 1655). Apart from his rather stark lighting and theatrical gestures, Duck has comparatively little in common with the Caravagesque painters of Utrecht. He was an eclectic artist, a very good painter of figures and still-life motifs, with a frequently peculiar approach to pictorial space (broad, deep, and disconnected) in those compositions where the scheme is not clearly derived from someone else’s example. It is something of a tribute to Duck’s inventive interpretations of guardroom, tavern, and bordello scenes that writing on his work tends to deal almost exclusively with iconographic questions. A more surprising aspect of the literature on Duck is that his relationship with the Utrecht painter Nicolaes Knüpfer (1603 or ca. 1609–1655) remains to be explored.

1. See no. 20 on the plan of Utrecht in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, pp. 88–89, and pp. 381–82, 438, for M. J. Bok’s biography of Duck, from which most of these details are taken. Agnes Groote’s entry in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 9, p. 164, offers the familiar reminder that Duck was long confused with Jan de Duyn (1629/30–1678; on this artist of The Hague, see The Hague 1668–99, pp. 301–2). Additional biographical information is given in Salomon 1998a, pp. 16–18, for example, the fact that the artist gave his age as about sixty in July 1660 (p. 16 n. 2, citing Obreen 1877–90, vol. 5, p. 291).
2. As Bok explains in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, pp. 381–82, records of Catholic baptisms in Utrecht during this period have been lost.
4. As noted in Salomon 1998a, p. 17.
6. See Salomon 1998a, p. 18, where it is mentioned that a guard-
41. A Couple in an Interior with a Gypsy Fortune-Teller

Oil on wood, oval, 9 ½ x 13 in. (25.1 x 33 cm)
Signed (lower right, beside fireplace): JDVCK [JD in monogram]

The painting is in very good condition, although the highlights on the women’s faces have been reinforced and the paint is chipped along the slightly irregular border. The oak panel retains its original thickness, with bevels intact. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals that the chair at left was undrawn.

Gift of Dr. and Mrs. Richard W. Levy, 1971 1971.102

This small oval panel was painted by Duck about 1632–33, to judge from other pictures by the artist, the painting’s composition and coloring (works by Dirck Hals [q.v.] as well as by Pieter Codde and Willem Duyster should be compared),¹ and the style of the woman’s clothing (see, for example, Rembrandt’s Portrait of a Woman, dated 1632; Pl. 144). Curator John Walsh, who in the later 1970s titled the picture The Procuress, suggested on stylistic grounds that it must be earlier than one of Duck’s very few dated works, Merry Company, of 1635 (private collection).² This is consistent with the conclusions of other scholars (see Refs.).

The subject, however, has nothing to do with prostitution, although the arrangement of the three figures superficially recalls Utrecht paintings like Dirck van Baburen’s The Procuress, of about 1622 (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston).³ In Duck’s picture, by contrast, a woman in very proper attire responds skeptically to the words of an old fortune-teller. The latter’s boldly striped mantle, her appearance in general, and her “profession” make it clear that she is a gypsy.⁴ The lady’s companion, who has placed his cloak and sword on the empty chair, wears an extravagantly feathered cap and an impatient expression. The setting must be a tavern, considering its plain décor, the glass of red wine to the far left, and the smoking requisites dropped onto the floor (a clay pipe, a metal tobacco box, and tobacco in a paper wrapper). The fireplace offers heat and nothing else; such a hearth in the kitchen of a Dutch house would be provided with cooking implements. A sure sign that the room is not part of a private home is that the gypsy has been admitted to it.

Saloman considers the painting as the earliest of several paintings by Duck featuring gypsy fortune-tellers.⁵ A fine excursion on the theme of gypsies in Netherlandish art is offered by Sutton in his discussion of Jan Steen’s scene set in front of a country inn, The Fortune-Teller, of about 1650 (Philadelphia Museum of Art).⁶ In addition to examples by Jacques de Gheyn, Dirck Hals, Lenaert Bramer (q.q.v.), and several other artists, Sutton refers to Jacob Cats’s popular poem “Het Spaesn Heydinnetje” (The Spanish Gypsy Girl), of 1657, and the actual circumstances of gypsies in Holland during the seventeenth century.⁷ As Salomon observes, Dutch literature and theater employed gypsies to assist the progress of romantic situations, usually by palm reading (which was given a physiological explanation at the time).⁸ Duck, however, in a departure from the lighthearted norm in Utrecht and elsewhere, shows a fortune-teller ill received by people who look incapable of having a good time.⁹

In a painting probably dating from about five years later (private collection, Bern), Duck shows an elegantly dressed young woman in an inn declining to have her fortune read by an elderly gypsy woman, despite the encouragement of her handsome suitor. The figure of the gypsy recalls the one in the Museum’s picture but comes much closer to the study of an old gypsy woman in a drawing by Duck (Museum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte, Lübeck).¹⁰ The man in the present painting

1. On Knupfer, see San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, pp. 269–69, no. 45, and pp. 383–84 (biography by Bok), and Saxon 2005, where the question is not considered. However, Saxon agrees that Knupfer and Duck share qualities of style and expression, and that Duck is the more likely debtor (personal communication, February 23, 2005).
is repeated as a full-length figure leaning on a large sword in a somewhat later panel by Duck, *Tavern Scene* (formerly in a Swedish collection).\(^{11}\) That he painted the figure in half- and full-length versions suggests that he made a full-length drawing of the figure before he painted either panel.

The use of a broad oval format, which is common in works by Duyster, also is found in Duck’s *Bordello Scene*, of the 1630s (art market, 1979).\(^{12}\) The oak support of the New York painting is beveled on all sides and (despite some slight shaving around the edges) retains its original shape. When the picture was in the Jaucourt collection, it was engraved by Jean Augustin Pâtou, who reversed and altered the composition to a rectangular format and added over the fireplace the motif of a drawing of a peasant’s head in profile.\(^{13}\)

Previously titled by the Museum *The Procurers*.

1. See the biography of Duck above.
2. Undated note in curatorial files. The panel (Salomon 1998a, p. 154, no. 58, fig. 99) was with the dealer Salomon Lilian, Amsterdam, in 1993. Another Duck dated 1615, *Interior with Lady and Cavalier*, is published in Norwich 1988, no. 110.
3. The suggestion in Walsh 1974a, p. 344, that the gypsy woman “may be a procurer” was encouraged by his reading of the fire tongs as a symbol of sexual excitement (ibid., p. 346). The theme is easier to find in literature of Dutch art dating from the 1970s than in this picture.
4. Compare the costume, physical type, and behavior of the gypsy woman in *Fisherman and Gypsies on a Beach* by Arent Arentsz Cabel (ca. 1585–1611), in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid (Gaskell 1990, pp. 310–11, no. 68).
10. See Salomon 1998a, p. 129, figs. 119, 121.
11. Lund 1953, pp. 18–19, no. 19, pl. 13. A detail of the figures is reproduced in Béguin 1952, p. 115, fig. 3.
13. The Museum owns an impression (53.1000.359) that bears an inscription naming the artist (“Durt”), the collector, and the engraver.

References: Béguin 1952, pp. 114, 115 n. 18, compares the picture with paintings by Duck dating from about 1630–35; Lund 1953, p. 18, no. 18, gives the apparently mistaken information that the painting was purchased on November 18, 1933 (1947?), from Galerie Sante Lucas, Vienna; Walsh 1974a, pp. 344, 346, 349 n. 11, fig. 8, as *Couple with a Gypsy Woman*, dates the picture (“a kind of miniature Baburen”) to the early 1630s, describes the subject and the “peculiar composition,” interprets the fireplace as a reference to enflamed passions, and compares the Lubeck drawing of a gypsy woman by Duck; P. Sutton 1986, pp. 186–87, fig. 266, questions the former title, *The Procurers*; Kislik–Grosheide 1988, pp. 201–2, 207 n. 7, figs. 2, 3, notes the open tobacco box, clay pipe, and folded paper containing tobacco on the floor to the lower right; Baetjer 1995, p. 308; Salomon 1998a, pp. 128–29, 147, no. 27, fig. 118, pl. vii, as *Gypsy Fortune Teller (The Procurers)*, discusses the work as Duck’s earliest known representation of a gypsy fortune-teller, dating from the early 1630s, in which the strong contrast of physiognomic types is reminiscent of the Utrecht Caravaggisti.


Ex Coll.: Louis, chevalier de Jaucourt, Paris (until d. 1779; as by Ducq, “Le Petit Menteur”; [D. A. Hoogendijk, Amsterdam, in 1912, as by Johan le Ducq]; R. H. Ward, London (until 1934); sale, Frederik Muller, Amsterdam, May 15–17, 1934, no. 119, as by J. Duck); [Galerie Sante Lucas, Vienna, 1934; sold to Lundström]; Edna Lundström, Malmö, Sweden (1934–60; sale, Winkel & Magnusson, Copenhagen, May 7–21, 1969, no. 483); [Brian Koetsier, London, in 1970; sold to Feigen]; [Richard L. Feigen, New York, until 1971]; Dr. and Mrs. Richard W. Levy, New Orleans (1971); Gift of Dr. and Mrs. Richard W. Levy, 1971 1971.103
Gerbrand van den Eeckhout
Amsterdam 1621–1674 Amsterdam

This versatile and prolific painter and draftsman was born in Amsterdam on August 19, 1621, the eighth child of Jan Pietersz van den Eekhout (1584–1652) and Grietje Claesdr Lydecke. His father and his brother were goldsmiths, and in the 1650s Gerbrand drew a series of “Various artful inventions to be made in gold, silver, wood and stone.”

In 1633, Jan Pietersz, who had been widowed two years earlier, married Cornelia Dedel (1594–1660), the daughter of a wealthy director of the East India Company (VOC) in Delft, which considerably lifted the family’s fortunes and social standing.

Houbraken records that Van den Eeckhout was a pupil of Rembrandt’s. This was probably between about 1635 and 1639. In the 1640s, he painted numerous religious pictures strongly influenced by Rembrandt and by the master’s teacher, Pieter Lastman (1583–1633). The older artist’s example is reflected in the palette of pictures such as Isaac Blessing Jacob (Pl. 42), discussed below, and in body language that is often legible to a fault. In a broad view, Van den Eeckhout’s religious, mythological, and history pictures—he favored edifying scenes from antiquity—reveal a development similar to that of Ferdinand Bol and Govaert Flinck (q.v.v.). But Van den Eeckhout was much more eclectic, employing both detailed and broad techniques, and turning also to guardroom and stylish genre scenes (see, for example, Pl. 43), as well as to landscapes (especially drawings) and portraits historiés.

In 1657, with the help of his brother Jan (who was head of the wine rackers’ guild), Van den Eeckhout received the commission for an important group portrait, Four Officers of the Amsterdam Coopers’ and Wine Rackers’ Guild (National Gallery, London). He would paint the same guild’s officers in 1673 (Amsterdams Historisch Museum). Single portraits date from throughout the artist’s career, but portraiture was not Van den Eeckhout’s main interest. Special emphasis must be placed upon his drawings which, even allowing for many misattributions, are extraordinary for their number and for their technical and thematic range.

The painter and draftsman was also an etcher, an amateur poet, a collector, and an adviser on art (he was often asked to appraise pictures). He never married, although in his last years (he died at the age of fifty-three) he shared a fine house on the Herengracht with the widow of his brother Jan (d. 1669). Van den Eeckhout was buried in the Oudezijds Kapel in Amsterdam on September 29, 1674. His appearance is known from a drawn self-portrait, dated 1647 (Collection Fris Lugt, Fondation Custodia, Institut Néerlandais, Paris), and from an engraved image in Houbraken’s Grote Schouburgh.

1. See Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 3, p. 1374, on this and other series of designs by or partly by Van den Eeckhout.
3. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, p. 100. The frequently quoted remark by Houbraken that Van den Eeckhout was Rembrandt’s “great friend” is found in ibid., vol. 1, p. 174. However, the meaning of the sentence is not entirely clear: “He [the landscapist Roelant Roghman (1627–1693)] was in his time, with Gerbrand van den Eekhout, a great friend of Rembrandt van Ryn.” That Roghman and Van den Eeckhout were friends is known independently.
4. On this point, see Liedtke 1999b, p. 22, and Liedtke 2004b, p. 68.
5. Manuth (see note 2 above) keeps the artist with Rembrandt until 1640/41.
42. Isaac Blessing Jacob

Oil on canvas, 39⅜ x 50⅜ in. (100.6 x 128.3 cm)
Signed and dated (lower center): G V eckhout/A° 1642

The painting is generally in good condition, although the headboard and the curtain above it have been severely abraded.

Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1890 23.110.16

This is an early work by Van den Eickhout, painted in 1642, when he was about twenty-one years old and had been out of Rembrandt's studio for two or three years. Earlier paintings by the artist include another Isaac Blessing Jacob, dated 1641 (art market, London, ca. 1914), and The Presentation of Christ in the Temple, of 1641 (not 1671; Szémmüzesset és Múzeum, Budapest). Several biblical pictures of the early 1640s are known, including Gideon's Sacrifice (location unknown), The Dismissal of Hagar (formerly Edzard collection, Munich), and Jacob's Dream (Muzeum Narodowe, Warsaw), each of which is dated 1642, and Joseph Telling His Dreams, dated 1643 (Boo Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina). The majority of these subjects were especially popular in Rembrandt's circle. Other artists who represented Isaac Blessing Jacob (Gen. 27:21–23) include Jan Lievens (1607–1674), in a painting known through an engraving by Jan Joris van Vliet; Gövert Flinck (q.v.), in his well-known canvas of 1638 (fig. 45); Gerrit van Honthorst (ca. 1612–1672), in a painting dated 1638 (Dulwich Picture Gallery, London) and in contemporary works; and Jan Victors (q.v.), in a painting probably of about 1645–50 (Louvre, Paris). It has been suggested in the past that Van den Eickhout (in the present picture), Flinck, and others were influenced by an earlier drawing of the subject by Rembrandt, but the two examples usually cited are no longer accepted as autograph works.

Like most of his colleagues, Van den Eickhout shows Isaac's son Jacob kneeling for the blind patriarch's blessing, as contrived by Isaac's wife, Rebekah. The firstborn, Esau, had been sent out by his father to hunt for venison, which was to be enjoyed by Isaac before he conveyed his legacy. Rebekah then instructed Jacob, who was her favorite son, to fetch "two good kids of the goats," one of which is seen served on the table together with salt in a silver cellar, bread, a knife and napkin, and an extravagant vessel for wine. Jacob wears his brother's "goodly raiment" and quiver, and the kids' hair upon his hands, so that he would feel like the rougher Esau to his father's touch. Esau enters in the background, and will soon discover how he has been cheated out of his blessing, as well as his birthright (Gen. 25:29–34).

Unfortunately, none of this is effectively staged by Van den Eickhout, who makes Isaac look slow-witted rather than trusting, Rebekah didactic rather than duplicitous, and the sons mere props, with Jacob's face turned away from the viewer. A comparison with Flinck's painting of 1638 shows how much the young artist might have achieved had he been concerned more with the figures' emotions than with their household goods. The arrangement of the exotic bed, with its fancy head- and footboard, the canopy above, the table, and the platform seems to have been inspired by Rembrandt's famous Danaë, of 1636 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), which is thought to have been reworked by Rembrandt himself in the early 1640s. A painting plausibly attributed to Ferdinand Bol (q.v.) and dated to about 1640–41, Isaac and Esau (private collection), and the same artist's canvas dated 1643, David's Dying Charge to Solomon (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin), appear to be contemporaneous responses by a former fellow pupil to the same Rembrandt prototype.

The silver ewer stands for the riches that Jacob will inherit, and reproduces one of the first masterpieces of the auricular style in the Netherlands (fig. 46). Adam van Vianen's covered ewer made in 1614 for the Amsterdam guild of silversmiths (of which Van den Eickhout's father was a member). The piece was commissioned in memory of Van Vianen's brother Paulus, who had died the year before in Prague. Adam van Vianen was highly esteemed by artists and collectors, and this particu-
lar example of his work captured the imagination of numerous painters, no doubt in part because its bizarre form allowed it to pass as an object from an ancient and foreign land. Pieter Lastman (1583–1633) included the ewer in at least seven pictures dating from between 1615 and 1630. Other Dutch artists who incorporated the ewer in one or more paintings include Adriaen van Nieulandt (1587–1658), in a large kitchen still life dated 1616 (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig); Thomas de Keyser (q.v.), in a group portrait of the Amsterdam silversmiths’ guild, dated 1627 (formerly Musée des Beaux-Arts, Strasbourg; destroyed in World War II); Jacob Backer (q.v.), in David and Bathsheba, of 1640 (art market, 1996); Salomon Koninck (1629–1656), in King Solomon’s Idolatry, of 1644 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), and at least five other paintings; and Flinck (q.v.), in Marcus Curtius Denuitus Refusing the Gifts of the Samnites, dated 1666 (Royal Palace, Amsterdam). Van den Eckhout himself passed the object on from Isaac’s house to King David’s palace (1646; Národní Galerie, Prague), and to scenes of Scipio’s continence (ca. 1652; Instituut Collectie Nederland, Amsterdam) and Joseph returned to his brothers (ca. 1668; Skokloster Castle, Sweden).

1. With Lesser, London, according to R. Bangel in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 10 (1914), p. 335. Bangel describes the “blond, bright Rembrandtesque tonalism” of the painting, suggesting that its palette differs from that of the Museum’s picture. He does not give measurements. The painting may be the same as the one in the following sales. In both catalogues the dimen-
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sions (39½ x 49½ in. [100.3 x 125.7 cm]) are given, but there is no mention of a signature or date: Christie's, London, March 4, 1921 (property of Mary, Lady Carbery, and other sources), no. 11; sold to Peacock; Christie's, London, April 27, 1925, no. 70, sold to Spiller. Another painting dated 1645, Moses and Aaron, is untraced since 1891 (see Sumowski 1983–94), vol. 2, p. 735 (under no. 392).


4. Ibid., vol. 3, no. 1182.


8. See Refs., under Judson in Chicago–Minneapolis–Detroit 1969–70, and under Hausherr 1976. The two drawings in question are catalogued in Benesch 1954–57, vol. 3, as no. 507, fig. 667 (formerly Van Dicmen collection, Berlin), and no. 509, fig. 669 (formerly Bondi collection, Vienna). Martin Royat-Kisch, at the British Museum, considers Benesch no. 507 to be by or close to Nicolaes Maes, as others have suggested before. Benesch no. 509, and to a lesser extent nos. 508 and 510 (also catalogued by Benesch as Rembrandt drawings of Isaac Blessing Jacob), he considers “close to the [Carel] Fabritius Group,” which needs further work to know whether these really belong” (personal communication, February 18, 2005).

9. See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3, p. 29, fig. 18, and pp. 215–16, figs. 6, 8. The empty chair facing the dramatis personae is also a Rembrandt device, found, for example, in his large etching The Death of the Virgin, dated 1659 (899).

10. As noted by T. Schroder in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 32, p. 401 (ill. p. 400). Klessmann 1981 discusses the negative meaning of the ever in several Dutch paintings, relating it to an emblem in Visscher 1614, which explains that such objects are useless for daily life and serve instead to foster conflict, discord, and so on.

11. See van Molen 1979 on Van Vianen’s fame and on the representation of his silver ewer in various Dutch paintings. A more detailed account of the object’s appearance in pictures is given in Duyvene de Wir-Klinkhamer 1966, pp. 86–96. The use of contemporary silver to decorate ancient tables was not unusual; compare the Museum’s painting of Rubens and Jan Brueghel the Elder, The Feast of Achelous, of about 1614–15 (Liedtke 1984, pp. 194–95, pl. xiv).

12. According to Broos 1993, p. 170, where Van den Echohout and four other painters are also named. See also Amsterdam 1991–92, nos. 8, 11, and Van Schooten and Wüstefeld 2001, no. 43, for Lastman’s use of the ever in paintings of 1615, 1617, and 1621.


14. Duyvene de Wir-Klinkhamer 1966, pp. 95–97, fig. 14. See also the discussion of De Keyser’s Portrait of a Silversmith, dated 1650, in the sale catalogue Pictures and Watercolours from Longleat, Christie’s, London, June 14, 2002, no. 591, where the group portrait is reproduced.

15. The painting survives as a fragment; Christie’s, London, July 3, 1996, no. 318.


17. Von Molike 1965, no. 113, pl. 22.


REFERENCES: B. Burroughs 1923a, p. 142 (ill. p. 146), mentions the painting as part of the Huntington bequest; Chicago 1935–36, p. 24 (under no. 16), cites the picture in the entry for Flinck’s painting of the subject, dated 1618; Israël 1916, p. 34, listed (“Oud?”) among paintings signed and dated by Van den Eechkout; Ivins 1942a, p. 13, listed as one of the approximately sixteen works by Rembrandt pupils on view in the Museum’s galleries; Brion and Heimann 1916, p. 212, fig. 55; Sumowski 1957–58, pp. 239, 276, fig. 127, compares the picture with the Rembrandt school Chriswash the Feet of the Disciples, in the Art Institute of Chicago; Sumowski 1962, pp. 11–12, includes it among early paintings by Van den Eechkout that reveal the influence of Pieter Lastman; Duyvene de Wir-Klinkhamer 1966, pp. 91, 93, fig. 13 (detail), cites the work among pictures that include Adam van Vianen’s silver ewer of 1614; Haak 1969, p. 183, fig. 294, shows “a strong dependence on Rembrandt” and depicts Van Vianen’s ewer; Judson in Chicago–Minneapolis–Detroit 1969–70, pp. 37–38, no. 41 (ill. p. 129), compares the picture’s composition with that of a drawing by Rembrandt [?], and with Flinck’s painting of the subject dated 1658; R. Roy 1972, pp. 7–9, 212, no. 11; Figler 1974, vol. 1, p. 60, listed; Bader in Milwaukee 1976, pp. 16–17, no. 13 (ill.), compares Rembrandt and Lastman, and offers original remarks on the interpretation of the subject; Hausherr 1976, pp. 27–28, fig. 19, agrees with Judson (in Chicago–Minneapolis–Detroit 1969–70) that Van den Eechkout appears to have referred to a drawing by Rembrandt; Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 3 (1980), p. 1210 (under no. 603), compares the composition to that of a drawing by Van den Eechkout, David’s Promise.
to Batstelshe, of about 1642–43 (MMA); Fouchart in Washington—Detroit—Amsterdam 1980–81, p. 163, mentions the work among interpretations of the subject by Rembrandt pupils; Broos 1981, p. 110, refers to the silver ewer; Sunowski 1985–94, vol. 2, pp. 720, 726, 762, no. 397 (ill.), describes the picture as an early work influenced by Lastman and by Rembrandt’s approach to composition, coloring, and chiaroscuro, and vol. 6, p. 1600, listed among Rembrandt school pictures of this subject; P. Sutton 1986, p. 181, relate the painting to Rembrandt; Fouchart in Paris 1988–89, p. 85, cites the work in a list of paintings of this subject by Rembrandt disciples; Liedtke 1990, p. 57, noted as part of the Huntington bequest; P. Sutton 1990a, pp. 82, 83 n. 17, mentions the inclusion of the silver ewer; Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 224–28, no. 19 (ill.), discusses the subject, dwells at length on the silver ewer, and confuses the picture’s provenance; Sunowski in The Hague 1992a, pp. 59–60, fig. 20, claims that Lastman influenced the composition and coloring; Baertjé 1995, p. 328; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 22, 145, no. 47, discusses Rembrandt’s influence, compares the work unfavorably with Flinck’s painting of the subject dated 1638, and mentions interpretations by other Rembrandt pupils; Logan in ibid., p. 197 (under no. 83), observes that the composition is similar to that employed in the Museum’s drawing by Van der Eckhout, David’s Promise to Batstelshe, Ben Broos in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 9, p. 742, fig. 1, describes the painting’s style as a combination of “Lastman’s palette and Rembrandt’s lighting and formal language,” and notes the inclusion of the ewer by Van Vianen; T. Schroder in ibid., vol. 32, p. 401, cites the painting as one of the many to illustrate Van Vianen’s famous ewer; Galliein 1997, pp. 96–97 (detail ill.), uses the painting to illustrate the ewer; V. Manuth in Saar AKL 1992–96, vol. 32 (2002), p. 236, listed.


Ex Coll.: ?Elisabeth Hooft, widow of Wouter Valckenier (until d. 1796; her estate sale, C. Blasius et al., Amsterdam, August 31–September 1, 1796, no. 10, for Fl 630); ?Pieter Nicolaas Simonsz van Winter, Amsterdam (until d. 1807); ?his daughter Annewe (Anna Louisa Agatha) van Winter, Amsterdam (1807–19); Annewe van Winter and her husband, Willem van Loo (1813–his d. 1847; her d. 1877); possibly sold to Alphonse, Gustave, and Edmund de Rothschild, Paris; ?Collis P. Huntington, New York (until d. 1900; life interest to his widow, Arabella D. Huntington, later [from 1911] Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, 1900–d. 1924; life interest to their son, Archer Milton Huntington, 1924–terminated in 1925); Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 25.110.16

1. See Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 225–26. The possibility that the painting was in Pieter van Winter’s collection adds some weight to the identification of the Museum’s picture with the Van den Eckhout of this subject described in the 1796 sale catalogue. Broos (ibid., p. 226) concludes that the Museum’s picture was also in a sale held at The Hague on April 24, 1737 (see Hoet 1752–70, vol. 3, p. 13, no. 34), but this is too conjectural for inclusion under Ex Coll. here.

2. See Priem 1997, p. 219, no. 58.

3. In a letter dated March 9, 2000, Michael Hall, curator to Edmund de Rothschild, describes his study of a manuscript inventory and valuation prepared by Frederic Reiset, director of the Louvre, for the Rothschild family with a view to the purchase in bloc of the Van Winter–Van Loo collection in 1877 (see also Priem 1997, p. 104). “The widow Van Loo died in 1877 and her children sold most of the pictures to a consortium of Rothschilds. . . . Some pictures were refused and sold in Amsterdam in the following year. Some pictures were sold by the Rothschilds after they had been divided. I believe your Gerbrand van den Eckhout to be no. 28 in Lot 3 of Riessel’s valuation, destined for a French Rothschild, as yet unidentified.” The Van Loo sale in Amsterdam was held on February 26, 1878, and did not include the painting by Van den Eckhout (kindly checked by Edwin Buijsen at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague).

4. Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 225, 226, 228 nn. 5, 8, invents a scenario according to which another painting by Van den Eckhout, sold in London in 1921 and 1925 (see text note 1 above), might be the Museum’s picture. The latter painting was in the collection of Collis P. Huntington when he died in 1900, leaving his paintings to the Museum. Cited by artist and title, it was listed as in the hallways of Collis P. Huntington’s house at 2 East 37th Street, New York, in an appraisal of the collection dated October 21, 1902 (kindly brought to the present writer’s attention by Barbara File, Museum archivist, on February 24, 2003).
43. A Musical Party

Oil on canvas, 20 x 24¼ in. (50.8 x 64.5 cm)

The painting is in a poor state. Its surface is severely abraded from past cleaning. The increasing exposure of the medium-brown ground, which has contributed to the overall darkening of the painting, is the result partially of natural aging and partially but more significantly to restoration treatments that have physically and optically thinned the paint layers. X-radiography reveals large losses of paint and ground along the perimeter, especially at the bottom and left side. Raking light reveals the rough texture of later filling and retouching, which extends 1–4 in. (2.5–10.2 cm) into the paint. A thin strip of golden metallic paint has been applied to the edges all around. Small modern nails set at intervals of ⅛ in. (3.2 cm) have been driven into the face of the painting along all borders.

Bequest of Annie C. Kane, 1926 26.260.8

Although entirely typical of Van den Eckhout in the early 1650s, this painting was given to the Museum as a work by the Amsterdam genre painter Barent Graat (1628–1709), and was earlier considered to be by Pieter de Hooch (q.v.). Both artists set similar figures on terraces, Graat as early as 1632, and De Hooch not until the 1660s. Van den Eckhout has long been a familiar figure as a Rembrandtesque history painter (see Pl. 42), but his important contribution to scenes of modern society was generally overlooked until the 1960s. Valentine must have known the artist’s A Party on a Terrace, of 1652 (fig. 48; sold by the dealer R. Langton Douglas to the Worcester Art Museum in 1922), or with a similar work when he suggested in 1930 that the New York picture was actually by Van den Eckhout.

The painting shows five stylish young people socializing on the garden terrace of an impressive country house, to judge from the scale of the columns and the extent of the trees. A servant stands to the left, looking in the direction of the couple singing from a songbook (the woman keeps time with her hand). Another songbook lies open on the table (compare those in A Musical Party by Gabriel Metsu; Pl. 116). The man in the background gestures to his heart, to whom his lovely companion seems to respond somewhat stiffly (she holds a fan, which can indicate a cool reception). Van den Eckhout made just such an encounter the main motif of the painting in Worcester (fig. 48), where couples in the background appear to be further along in their courtships. The main figure here probably feels that he has much to offer a young woman, given his especially chic attire and the fashionable attribute of a greyhound (which implies hunting; see Pl. 33). The empty chair to the right, although quite an elegant piece of furniture, offers little hope of pleasure to a dandy cast in the role of fifth wheel. The young man’s body language is both natural and symbolic, the pose of someone spending too much time watching other people enjoy themselves and of figures in art (going back at least to Dürer’s famous engraving of the subject) that stand for melancholia.

It has often been observed that the pictures of buitenpartijen (alfresco parties) and gezelschappen (Merry Companies) painted by Van den Eckhout, Jacob van Loo (1614–1670), and other Dutch artists in the 1650s and 1660s brought an earlier type of composition up-to-date, namely, the scenes of wining, dining, making music, and musing about making love that were often set on palatial terraces and on the grounds of grand estates by such painters as David Vinckboons (q.v.), Esaias van de Velde (1587–1630), and Willem Buytewech (1591/92–1624). Like Gerard ter Borch (q.v.), if not so consistently, Van den Eckhout brought to this genre an eye for how people hold themselves and behave in social situations. He also modernized his Rembrandtesque style (compare Pl. 42), so that the play of light and shadow not only brings out the key protagonists but also suggests mood and other qualities, in this case a physical intimacy similar to that found in his contemporaneous pictures of courtship set indoors (in particular, the Musical Company, of 1653, in the Gemeentemuseum, The Hague, and the Interior with a Singing Couple and a Listener, of 1655, in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen). The composition is also very much of the 1650s, with its triangular grouping of figures, vertical elements, and nearly parallel arms and legs. Unfortunately, the appeal of the picture has been much diminished by darkening with age and abrasion (see condition note above).

1. See Graat’s paintings of modern-day prodigal sons dated 1662 and 1663 in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Van Thiel et al. 1976, p. 247).
2. In Pietzsch 1960 the chapter on painters of genre interiors and Merry Companies in Amsterdam and elsewhere after 1650 includes numerous secondary figures and also Jacob van Loo (1614–1670), who is now usually cited in the same breath with Van den Eckhout as a key figure for Dutch genre painting in the 1650s (see, for example, Naumann in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, pp. 258–39 [under no. 64]). Van den Eckhout is not mentioned at all. In 1956, Valentiner gave him his due, albeit in the curious context of “Rembrandt and his pupils” (see Exhibited), and in J. Rosenberg, Slive, and ter Kuile 1966, p. 94, it is acknowledged that “around 1650 he depicted genre scenes which anticipate Pieter de Hooch.” The Worcester Party on a
Figure 48. Gerbrand van den Eeckhout, *A Party on a Terrace*, 1652. Oil on canvas, 20½ x 24½ in. (52.4 x 62.2 cm). Worcester Art Museum, Worcester, Massachusetts
The painting was partly on the basis of comparison with the superior Eckhout in the museum at Worcester.

In 1977, curator John Walsh pursued the matter at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, concluding that this is a typical work by Eckhout of the 1650s.

On keeping time with a raised hand, see Fransis 1993a, p. 208 n. 89, and Liedtke 2000a, p. 246, fig. 304, on the same gesture in The Concert, of about 1665–67, by Vermeer (Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston). As noted there, the act of measuring musical time might be taken as a reference to the virtue of temperance, depending on the context (see also Salomon 1998a, p. 124). Such a meaning is more likely intended in the painting by Vermeer (where a brothel scene hangs on the wall behind the singing woman) than in the Van den Eckhout.

See Fransis 1993a, pp. 43–44, 208 n. 86.

As noted in ibid., pp. 44, 208–9 n. 90.

7. See Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 3, p. 1370 (under no. 603), Van den Eckhout's drawing Party on a Terrace (Fondation Custodia, Institut Néerlandais, Paris), citing earlier literature; P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, pp. xix–xxx, nos. 25, 43, 64, 112, 113, 121, 122, pls. 1–5, 87, 88; Pittsburgh 1986; Fransis 1993a, pp. 37–46; Haarlem–Hamburg 2003–4, nos. 1, 2, 4; and Fransis 2004, pp. 18–33. Prints were important for this tradition, as is evident from several that are discussed in Amsterdam 1997a, for example, nos. 8, 12, 19, 28, 33, 34.

8. Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 2, nos. 503, 509. The subject of the Copenhagen picture bears comparison with that of the New York painting, which probably dates from two or three years earlier.

References: Valentiner in Raleigh 1956, p. 117, no. 26, as by Van den Eckhout, "formerly attributed to Barent Graat," compares the painting of 1652 now in the Worcester Art Museum (fig. 48 here); R. Roy 1972, p. 212, no. 141, as probably dating from the mid-1650s; F. Robinson in Saint Petersburg–Atlanta 1975, pp. 34–35, no. 21 (ill.), dates the work to the early 1650s and compares similar genre paintings by the artist; Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 4 (1981), p. 1796, relates the costume of the figure in the foreground to that of the Prodigal Son in a drawing by Barent Fabritius; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 2, pp. 747, 870, no. 507 (ill.), suggests a date of about 1652–53 on the basis of similar works by the artist that bear dates; P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, p. 201, fig. 2, compares the painting with the artist's A Party on a Terrace, of 1652 (fig. 48 here); Fransis 1993a, pp. 44–45, fig. 29, and p. 208 n. 89, compares the Worcester painting and describes the behavior of the figures, in particular that of the man in the foreground with "his head resting on his hand, the time-honored gesture of melancholy," which identifies him as "the classic spurned suitor"; Baecker 1995, p. 328; Liedtke in New York 1991–96, vol. 2, pp. 22, 145; V. Mantini in Saur A.K. 1992–3, vol. 32 (2002), pp. 214, 216, listed, and cites the work as representing an important step in the development of Dutch genre painting during the 1650s; Fransis 2004, pp. 179, 289 n. 23, fig. 163, describes the subject in detail, and notes that the spurned suitor's laments are like those commonly voiced in amatory poetry and songs of the period.


Ex coll.: Probably William C. Schermerhorn (d. 1903), New York, father of the following; Annie Corrient Schermerhorn Kane, New York (by 1923–d. 1926); Bequest of Annie C. Kane, 1926 26.260.8
Jan Ekels the Younger
Amsterdam 1759–1793 Amsterdam

Ekels was born in Amsterdam on June 28, 1759.¹ He died there (reportedly after a stroke) on June 4, 1793, shortly before his thirty-fourth birthday.² He was trained by his father, Jan Ekels the Elder (1724–1781), a cityscape painter in the tradition of Jan van der Heyden (q.v.). The elder Ekels’s father owned a dye factory, and the family was prosperous. Jan the Younger did not pursue painting and drawing in order to support himself.

Ekels was enrolled in the Amsterdam Teknacademie (Drawing Academy) on October 5, 1774, and in 1776 won third prize. Still a teenager, he spent the next two years studying art in Paris, and between 1779 and 1781 he was again at the Amsterdam academy. In 1783, with two artist friends, Daniel Dupré (1752–1808) and Jacques Kuyper (1761–1808), Ekels traveled up the Rhine, visiting places such as the picture galleries in Düsseldorf and Mannheim. Upon his return to Amsterdam, he became active in the recently formed Felix Meritis Society, a “Temple of Enlightenment” on the Keizersgracht, which was (and remains) devoted to the pursuit of the arts, sciences, and learning in general. In his will, he left 1,000 guilders to the organization.

Ekels is best known for “conversation pieces” like the one discussed below. One of his most admired works is the Writer Sharpening His Pen, of 1784 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which is at once very much of its time and an homage to earlier Dutch masters such as Gabriel Metsu and Johannes Vermeer (q.v.).³ A full-length portrait of an officer, dated 1787, and an undated portrait of the landscapist Egbert van Driest (1745–1818) give some idea of the artist’s range as a portraitist.⁴ An impressive group portrait of two couples playing music dates from 1785.⁵ Two small genre pictures, one of a smoker, dated 1787, the other of a young draftsman seated by a window (n.d.), are in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt.⁶

Fewer than two dozen paintings by Ekels may be located today. However, works now unknown are cited in a number of old sale catalogues and estate inventories. An obituary published in the Algemeene Konst- en Letterbode of June 13, 1793, refers to the artist’s widespread fame, especially as a draftsman. In addition, “many of his paintings are preserved in the Cabinets of the foremost and most knowledgeable amateurs, and are most highly esteemed.”⁷

1. See Knoef 1928, p. 97 n. 7. Ekels was baptized “Joannes Hermannus” in a Catholic ceremony. His mother’s name was Sebilla Angenent.
2. Ibid., p. 98. Ekels was buried in the Nieuwezijds Kapel on June 6, 1793.
3. See Loos, Jansen, and Kloek 1995, no. 32. See also the drawing of three men playing cards (1784) discussed in Haarema 1989, p. 218 (under no. 245). Like other works by Ekels, the drawing (which was made in preparation for a painting now lost) represents modern figures but adopts the composition of a seventeenth-century genre scene.
4. For the portrait of an officer, see Van Thiel et al. 1976, p. 216, and Blankert 1979, pp. 101–2, no. 136. On the portrait of Van Driest, see De Bruyn Kops 1968.
6. Sander and Brinkmann 1995, p. 29, figs. 27, 28. The picture of a humble smoker brings Adriaen van Ostade (q.v.) up-to-date.
7. Quoted in Knoef 1928, p. 49.

44. Conversation Piece (The Sense of Smell)

Oil on canvas, 25 1/2 x 23 1/2 in. (65.7 x 59.7 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right, on dado): I.EKELS. F/A
17[I][I7][I]

The paint surface is abraded throughout along the crowns of the canvas weave.

Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Bertram L. Podell, 1981 1981.239

This characteristic work by Ekels was probably painted in 1791, as the now fragmentary date was read in the past (see Refs.). The picture almost certainly comes from a series of five canvases depicting the Five Senses, of which four paintings are presently known. The Sense of Hearing (fig. 49) was in collections together with the Museum’s picture until 1964, and reappeared on the
English art market in 1994. The Sense of Taste ("The Wine Tasters"), signed and dated 1791, is in Leiden (fig. 50). It depicts a standing gentleman draining the last drop from a wineglass, while a maid offers a glass of wine to a seated man holding a clay pipe. The fourth canvas (fig. 51), has confounded critics, since it too appears to represent Taste. Two men sit casually at a table, one holding a glass of wine, the other a pipe. A young woman stands behind the table, resting her arm on the back of a chair. The man with the wineglass points to it and speaks while glancing upward thoughtfully, as if extolling the virtues of the wine. His two companions listen, smile, and seem to stare at the glass. Within the narrow parameters defined by the series as a whole, it is reasonable to assume that the picture represents Sight.

When the New York painting was sold in 1964, it was entitled Taste, and it was correctly noted that a man takes snuff, another man smokes (he lights his clay pipe in a metal brazier), and a woman dips a biscuit in a glass of wine. However, Knoef (see Refs.) was surely correct in calling the painting Smell. In each of the four known pictures, the figure on the left appears to define the subject: a man drinks, a man sniffs, a woman listens demonstratively (her seated companion does not), and a man points to his glass as if drawing attention to the wine’s color. It is conceivable, of course, that the London painting stood for Taste in another series of pictures, but none of its figures is tasting anything, and biscuits (present in Leiden and New York) have not been provided. No other known painting by Eekels qualifies as a representation of one of the senses.

The four paintings are all on canvas, with the same dimensions. Each one shows two men and a woman in a room, which is furnished with a colorful rug, a covered table with the same kind of chairs, and in three of the pictures a foot warmer. The backgrounds all feature a bare wall with a curtain pulled to one side and a door to the left or right, with an overdoor painting depicting a classical relief (in the present picture, maidens worship a Bacchic herm). Indications that at least one of the men is visiting occur throughout: a coat tossed over a chair, a hat set down on the floor, and in the Museum’s picture a walking stick.

The idea of painting a series of pictures devoted to the Five Senses is one of the many notions Eekels derived from seventeenth-century Dutch art. However, the treatment of the theme in a suite of gentrified genre scenes was his own idea. This allowed him to indulge in a none too searching survey of modern manners, and a closer study of various poses, gestures, and expressions. The latter interest, when observed in the series as a whole, creates the impression of an artist who had spent a good deal of time in a drawing academy.
A drawing teacher speaks about a piece of sculpture, and a seated female student stands at it. However, this smaller canvas (23⅓ x 17⅛ in. [59.5 x 45 cm]) with two figures cannot belong to the same series as the paintings under discussion.

REFERENCES: Knoef 1928, p. 51, fig. 1 (opp. p. 49), cites the painting as with the art dealer Dr. Benedict & Co., Berlin, considers the work to represent Smell within a series of paintings depicting the Five Senses, and states that the picture dates from 1791; Knoef 1943, pp. 25–26 (ill. p. 22), as Smell, dated 1791, repeats the author's remarks of 1928, including praise for the painting's quality, notwithstanding the "impersonal formalism" of the woman's face; Mander and Mitchenson 1955, pp. 269–71, fig. 2, as Smell, relates the painting and that representing Hearing to Ekels's canvas in the National Theatre, London (called Taste; see text above), and notes that both The Sense of Smell and The Sense of Hearing were in the Walfrid sale of 1928 (see Ex Coll.); De Bruyn Kops 1968, pp. 61, 66 n. 10, describes the canvas as one of four known pictures representing the Five Senses; Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal 1983, p. 129 (under no. 88), relates the picture to The Sense of Taste ("The Wine Tasters"), dated 1791, in Leiden (see text above); Baejte 1995, p. 343, as Conversation Piece.

EX COLL.: [Dr. Benedict & Co., Berlin, until 1928]; C. Walfrid (1928; his sale, Jacob Hecht, Berlin, November 13, 1928, no. 386a, with no. 386, Hearing); [private collection, Brumfield, Nottingham; sale, Christie's, London, July 17, 1964, no. 209 as Taste, followed by no. 210, The Sense of Hearing], for Gm 180 to Houthakker; [Bernard Houthakker, Amsterdam, between 1964 and 1968]; Mr. and Mrs. Bertram L. Podell, New York (until 1981); Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Bertram L. Podell, 1981.239

1. De Bruyn Kops in 1968 (see Refs.) described the painting as passing from the 1964 auction to the Amsterdam art market and then to a private collection. A Houthakker sticker is on the stretcher.
Barent Fabritius and his celebrated brother, Carel (1622–1654), were the oldest of at least eleven children born to the schoolteacher and minor painter Pieter Carelksz (ca. 1598–1653) and his wife, Barbertje Barentsdtr van der Maes (1601–1667). The family lived in Middenbeemster, a village in the Beemster polder about nineteen miles north of Amsterdam. The brothers must have learned the rudiments of painting from their father. In May 1641, when Barent was sixteen (he was baptized on November 16, 1624), he and Carel were confirmed as members of the Beemster's Reformed Church. In September of the same year, Barent married the girl next door and shortly after moved to Amsterdam, where he became one of Rembrandt's most gifted pupils. The family's adoption of the Latinized surname Fabritius has been much discussed. Barent was preceded in using it by his father and older brother.

By the fall of 1643, Carel's wife and two infants had died and he had returned to Middenbeemster. He remained there until 1650, when he married a woman in Delft and was said to be living there. It seems likely that Carel's proximity was important for Barent, who so far as is known never studied with an artist outside his immediate family. His earliest known works, which date from about 1650 onward, reveal the influence of Carel's paintings of the 1640s, and of Rembrandt in a more general way. Barent's best pictures date from the mid-1650s and are even more indebted to his brother's recent work. They include the Portrait of a Man as a Shepherd, of about 1655 (Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna), which is probably a self-portrait.

On August 18, 1652, "Barent Pietersz. Fabricius, bachelor from Beemster, living in Amsterdam, and Catharina Musser, bachelorette from Breda, living in Delft," were married in Middenbeemster. The couple's sons, Pieter and Valentin, were baptized in the same town on April 7, 1653, and April 25, 1655, respectively. A portrait by Barent of the municipal architect of Leiden, Willem van der Helm, and his wife and son (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) is dated September 30, 1656, and suggests that he may have moved there at that time. On January 22, 1657, the artist signed a contract to rent a house in Leiden for three years, beginning on May 1 of the same year. He joined the Leiden painters' guild on May 14, 1658, and paid his annual dues on October 9, but next to that entry in the account book it is noted (possibly at a later date) that he had left the city.

Between August and December 1662, Fabritius was paid for his work on five large canvases depicting biblical parables, which were installed on the front of the balcony below the organ in the Lutheran Church of Leiden. Three of the paintings survive and are in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. He is recorded as a resident of Middenbeemster, and as a member of the Reformed Church there, in the register for the year 1661–66. Fabritius was living in Amsterdam in the year of his death. He was buried there on October 20, 1673, in the Leidse Kerkhof, leaving his wife and six children.

Fabritius painted religious pictures intended mostly for private clients, and some mythological works and genre pictures. He could have made a career as a portraitist, but evidently failed or declined to do so. His works of the 1660s are generally inferior to those of the previous decade, which may reflect financial realities (hasty production often went with hard times), and, for this artist, an unfortunate shift in contemporary taste. The looser, smoother, more elegant manner that Fabritius developed in his later years is found in other Dutch painters of the time—Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (q.v.) seems the closest parallel and may have been a model—but the turn away from descriptive qualities in favor of a suaver style led the artist into territory he was unprepared to explore.

1. See the family tree in The Hague–Schwerin 2004–5, p. 12, and F. Duparc's essay, pp. 14–16. Another Barent, born in 1623, died before the painter Barent was born, and at least one other child died in infancy.
2. See ibid., pp. 15–17. Some scholars connect the name with carpentry, others with its earlier use by humanist scholars.
3. This is all the more apparent now that a few pictures of the 1640s have been added to Carel Fabritius's known oeuvre: see The Hague–Schwerin 2004–5, nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, and compare Barent's Expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael, of about 1650 (Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco; see Pont 1998, no. 3, fig. 3; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 2, no. 347; and Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, no. 81).
45. Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael

Oil on wood, 19 7/8 x 14 in. (49.5 x 35.6 cm)  
Signed and dated (bottom center): [Abraham van Mijtjens]/1618

The painting is well preserved, although the tree branches painted over the sky at upper right are slightly abraded. The oak panel retains its original thickness, and the bevels are intact around all the edges.

Bequest of Harry G. Sperling, 1971 1976.100.23

The signature and date on this well-preserved picture are almost invisible under normal viewing conditions, but there is no doubt about the reading given above. In 1658, Fabritius was thirty-four years old and living in Leiden with his family. He had probably been painting since his mid-teens, but no works dating from before about 1650 are known. One of the earliest, a canvas in the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, depicts the same subject as this one, which was exceedingly popular in Rembrandt’s circle and with Protestant collectors. The theme and its prominence in Dutch art are discussed below in the entry for Nicolaes Maes’s painting *Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael* (Pl. 108), which dates from five years earlier.

In his previous treatment of the scene (Gen. 21:14), Fabritius was influenced by Rembrandt but more obviously based his composition on a painting of 1612 by Rembrandt’s teacher, Pieter Lastman (1583–1633; the panel is in the Kunsthalle, Hamburg). In several works that date or may be dated between the San Francisco canvas, of about 1650, and the present work, Fabritius clearly benefited from the influence of his brother Carel (1622–1654), adding effects of texture, daylight, and shadow to domestic settings. In the Museum’s painting, by contrast, the artist appears to have returned to a manner more exclusively of the Rembrandt school in the 1650s, which is not unexpected for an artist working in Leiden and no doubt looking to Amsterdam for inspiration, as he had before. Carel Fabritius’s example resulted in a Delft-like interlude in his brother’s work, during which he painted several of his best pictures. Two or three years after Carel’s death, however, Barent’s style became more similar to that of Maes, Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (q.q.v.), and other Rembrandt pupils who first flourished in the 1640s or early 1650s (see Pls. 42, 108).

Although the painting is a comparatively minor work by Fabritius, it should be said that reproductions do not do it justice. In the brown tones that dominate in the wooded landscape and in the garments, the fall of light and the use of local color concentrate the dramatic moment. The bold red of Abraham’s jacket below his tan cloak is echoed in the clothing of his son. Hagar is heavily dressed in muted greens and whites, with a brick red coat circling her waist. A straw hat is tied at the back, and is awkwardly juxtaposed with a farm-house in the distance. The trees and green hill in the background suggest that Hagar and Ishmael are being banished to Westphalia rather than to a wilderness in the Middle East.

Comparison with other biblical pictures by the artist assures one that this rather sentimental staging of the subject is entirely sincere. Abraham, at the age of one hundred, still has the physical and emotional strength to give his concubine a gentle shove and to point out her path. The manner in which Hagar slumps in despair on his shoulder, with hands clasped together, is affecting and (to the writer’s knowledge) original. Ishmael’s expression seems inconsistent with the mood of his parents and no match for what the young Maes achieved. It seems likely that Fabritius meant to suggest bravery and trust. In his right hand the boy holds onto the cord of Hagar’s gourd filled with water (shoes and a knife also hang from her waist). His bow and quiver of arrows, conspicuously displayed, remind us that the future founder of the Ishmaelites would grow strong hunting in the wild.

Previously titled by the Museum *Hagar and Ishmael*.

2. For example, The Satyr and the Peasant, of about 1652 (Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford), Tobit and Anna with the Kid, of the mid-1650s (Museum Ferdinandum, Innsbruck), and Elkanah with His Wives Penninah and Hannah (Galleria Sabauda, Turin). See Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 2, nos. 549, 555, 556.


REFERENCES: Pont 1918, pp. 47–48. 103–4, no. 4, fig. 17, describes the painting as signed and dated 1658, from the collection of Sir Joshua Reynolds, "the situation outstandingly thought through"; Sumowski 1995, p. 288, suggests that the figure of Abraham depends on a drawing by Rembrandt; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 55, omits any reference to the signature and date; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 2, pp. 912, 915 (under no. 547), 918, 920 (under no. 573), 917, no. 537 (ill.), considers the work a solid achievement, despite weaknesses in drawing and technique, describes the sympathetic characterizations of Abraham and Hagar, and notes the artist's two other known treatments of the subject; P. Sutton 1986, p. 183, listed; Broun 1987, p. 14, no. A1, suggests that Reynolds never actually owned the work, but purchased it for his friend George Chambers; Baetjer 1985, p. 129, omits any reference to the signature and date; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 19, 145–46, no. 48 (ill.), 149 (under no. 51), gives the proper reading of the signature and date, and notes that the painting depicts one of the biblical themes that Rembrandt evidently assigned to pupils; Irene Haberland in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 10, p. 733, mentions the Museum's picture and paintings in Hull and San Francisco as representations of the same subject by Fabritius.


EX COLL.: Sir Joshua Reynolds, London (possibly acting as agent for Chambers); Sir William Chambers, London, Hampton Court, and Whitton Place, near Hounslow (d. 1796); by descent to George Chambers; Chambers family; Miss E. M. Chambers (until 1977; sold to Leger); [Leger, London, 1977; sold to Kleinberger]; [Kleinberger, New York, 1977–75; bequeathed by Harry G. Sperling, last surviving partner of the firm, to MMA]; Bequest of Harry G. Sperling, 1971. 1976.100.23

1. Daniel Pont was made aware of the painting, its inscription, and provenance through a letter sent to him from Harry Sperling (November 18, 1957).

2. Benezch 1973, pp. 159–60, no. 504, fig. 665. There is a slight similarity.
Govert Flinck
Cleve 1615–1660 Amsterdam

According to Arnold Houbraken, who knew Flinck's son, the artist was born in the “winter month” (December) of 1616. However, his birth occurred nearly two years earlier, in January 1615. His father was a Mennonite cloth merchant in Cleve, which is southeast of Arnhem and was at the time (as now) a German city. Houbraken tells the tale that Flinck's father strongly opposed his son's desire to be an artist, until the Mennonite preacher, painter, and art dealer Lambert Jacobsz (ca. 1598–1636), gave a sermon in Cleve, met the Flincks, and “changed their minds completely.” About 1629, when he was approximately fourteen years old, Flinck went to study with Jacobsz in Leeuwarden (Friesland). Jacobsz himself was the son of a wealthy cloth merchant in Amsterdam, but after his marriage in 1620 he settled in Leeuwarden, his wife's native city. His work is closely related with the Pre-Rembrandtist circle in Amsterdam and to some extent also with the Caravagggesque movement, the same influences that Rembrandt experienced, however differently, in the 1620s. Jacobsz's art-dealing business was connected with that of Rembrandt's dealer in Amsterdam, the Mennonite Hendrick Uylenburgh (ca. 1584/89–1661).

Houbraken also reports that Flinck, in Leeuwarden, became the roommate and “companion in art” of Jacob Backer (q.v.). It must have been helpful to the teenage Flinck that at least for a few years, he had a gifted colleague who was about seven years older (Backer became an independent painter in his native Amsterdam by 1633). On behalf of Jacobsz and Uylenburgh, Flinck was probably copying and imitating paintings by Rembrandt before they ever met. When Flinck became a pupil or apprentice of Rembrandt is a matter of debate. Von Moltke has Flinck in Rembrandt's Amsterdam studio from 1633 until 1636, and other scholars have found this convenient for their reattribution of works by Rembrandt (or simply in his style) to Flinck during that period. But Houbraken explicitly says that Flinck was with Rembrandt for one year, and “in that short time” he became so adept at painting in Rembrandt's manner that pictures by Flinck were sold as works by the master's own hand. It is quite possible that Flinck remained in Leeuwarden until 1635 or even 1636, so that his association with Rembrandt would have taken place in 1635–36 or during most of the latter year. Flinck's earliest known independent works date from 1636, for example, the small full-length portrait of his Mennonite cousin Dirck Leeuw (which still belongs to the Amsterdam Mennonite community).

In the later 1630s, Flinck established himself as a successful artist in Amsterdam. Paintings such as Isaac Blessing Jacob, of about 1638 (see fig. 45), are Rembrandtesque but distinctive, not a small achievement for someone who had just emerged from under Rembrandt's wing. In 1642, when Rembrandt finished The Night Watch, Flinck also painted a large group portrait for an Amsterdam civic guard company, and did so again in 1645 and 1648 (all three canvases, as well as Rembrandt's, are in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). During the 1640s, Flinck flourished as a history painter and as a fashionable portraitist, his style in the latter specialty adhering to or departing from Rembrandt's according to the patron's taste. His ability to charm is obvious in portraits of children, pictures of sleeping cupids, and paintings of half-naked goddesses.

In May 1644, Flinck bought two houses on the Lauriersgracht (now Nos. 76 and 78) for 10,000 guilders. The top floors served as his studio and gallery for the remaining sixteen years of his life. Houbraken describes a Rembrandt-like array of exotic costumes, armor, weapons, embroidered hangings, and bolts of old velvet, in addition to fine casts of ancient sculpture and other studio props. The same writer relates that burgomasters such as Cornelis and Andries de Graeff would drop in on Flinck, and he would visit the homes of amateurs such as Jan Six and the tax collector Johannes Weenbogaert. The information comes from Flinck's son, Nicolaes Anthonis Flinck (1646–1723), who became a distinguished collector and director of the East India Company (VOC) in Rotterdam. His mother, Ingelij Thoveling (1609–1651), the daughter of a VOC director in Rotterdam, had married Flinck in June 1645; she died six years later. Flinck remarried in 1656. His bride, Sophia van der Houve, was the daughter of another VOC director in Rotterdam. The wedding was commemorated in a poem by Joost van den Vondel, who also provided panegyrics for a number of Flinck's public paintings.

The 1650s brought the artist a string of prestigious commissions, including portraits of the Elector of Brandenburg (1652)
and of Johan Maurits, count of Nassau-Siegen (1618), and the Allegory on the Memory of Frederick Hendrick, Prince of Orange, which Flinck painted in 1654 for the widowed princess Amalia van Solms. When the great Town Hall of Amsterdam was nearing completion in 1655, the painter’s international Baroque style (of a very Dutch sort) and his good connections won him the commission for the nearly 16½ x 13 foot (5 x 4 m) canvas Marcus Curtius Dentatus Refusing the Gifts of the Samnites, dated 1656 (still in situ). In 1658, he produced the equally large and more agitated picture Solomon’s Prayer for Wisdom (Council Chamber, or “Moses Room,” in the former Town Hall, now the Royal Palace, Amsterdam). These successes led to the contract, in late 1659, for twelve large canvases to decorate the Great Gallery of the Town Hall. However, Flinck died on February 2 of the following year, at the age of forty-five. He was buried five days later in the Westerkerk.

According to a witness in 1649, Flinck’s workshop was occupied by a number of students and assistants at that time. His only known pupil, however, is the Düsseldorf painter Johannes Spilberg (1619–1690), who spent several years with Flinck in the 1640s.17

2. In Von Moltke 1965, p. 9, and in many later sources, Flinck’s date of birth (baptism?) is given as January 21, 1615, but no document is cited.
3. Cleve in North Rhine-Westphalia. In 1647, the Elector of Brandenburg appointed Johan Maurits, count of Nassau-Siegen, stadtholder of Cleve. Flinck’s success with both noblemen is described in Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, p. 22. The Mennonites were a conservative branch of the Anabaptists. They emphasized the study and personal interpretation of scripture, and individual responsibility for one’s own salvation.
4. For Jacobsz’s biography and an example of his work, see The Hague 1992a, pp. 157–51.
5. On Uylenburgh’s business, see London–Amsterdam 2006 (pp. 165–69 on Flinck’s collaboration with Uylenburgh about 1645–58).
6. J. W. von Moltke in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 11, p. 169. The article is remarkably slight, given the artist’s stature and the writer’s experience. Compare Van der Veen in London–Amsterdam 2006, p. 160, where it is suggested that in the absence of further evidence Flinck’s arrival in Amsterdam “can perhaps better be placed ‘around 1635.’”
7. For example, Kelch in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, pp. 314–17 (biography of Flinck and attribution of Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait in Berlin to Flinck, at the implausibly early date of about 1633). See also Bruyn in ibid., p. 73 (Flinck “entered the workshop probably in 1635 and stayed for only one year”).
9. See Liedtke 1999b, p. 17, and Liedtke 2004b, pp. 52, 68, 70 n. 34.
15. For these two commissions, see Von Moltke 1965, p. 41, nos. 30, 113, pls. 12, 22. An autograph replica of Solomon’s Prayer for Wisdom (Rob Jones University Collection, Greenville, S.C.) is discussed by Wheelock in Washington–Detroit–Amsterdam 1982–83, p. 166 (under no. 37).
Oil on canvas, oval, 26½ x 19½ in. (66.7 x 50.5 cm)
Inscribed (lower right): Rembrandt f/1633

The painting has been transferred from wood to canvas. An inscription on the stretcher records that this was done in Paris in 1769. Microscopic fragments of the original oak panel remain along the vertical line just right of center that marks the position of the former panel join. There are numerous small losses in the background, along a vertical split at left, and just above the left corner of the mouth. The Rembrandt signature and the date were applied on top of the original paint layer, but they predate the transfer.

Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1959 60.71.15

The painting was transferred from a wood panel to a canvas support in 1769, and its surface suffered in the process. In 1732, the work was listed in the estate inventory of Charles Jean Baptiste Fleuriart, comte de Morville (d. February 3, 1732), as one of “deux têtes de Rembrand.” Evidently the picture had been arbitrarily paired with a painting of a young woman by Rembrandt, probably his celebrated canvas, A Girl at a Window, of 1645 (Dulwich Picture Gallery, London). De Morville had been French ambassador at The Hague from 1718 until 1720 and was familiar with other important collectors of the day, including Valerius Röver in Delft and the Polish count Charles Henry d’Hoym in Paris. D’Hoym, a distinguished bibliophile as well as an amateur of paintings, apparently purchased the present picture from de Morville’s estate.

Rembrandt’s name and the (for him) plausible date of 1633 swim in a suspicious pool of paint to the lower right. Until the picture was cleaned in 1995, the inscription, heavy overpainting, and varnish lent the work a surface and tonality that were considered typical of the master by nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century connoisseurs. However, Wilhelm Martin, in 1921, cited the work as an example of “genuinely signed Rembrandts among which non-autograph pictures may be found.” Scholars such as Bredius, Valentiner, and Bauch (see Refs.) maintained the attribution to Rembrandt, but Gerson, in 1969, referred to the picture’s problematic condition and concluded that “even on the strength of what can be seen of the original paint, an attribution to Rembrandt is unjustified. Perhaps a work by G. Flinck.”

The attribution to Flinck is so convincing and so widely accepted that it is reasonable to catalogue the work under his name rather than under “Style of Rembrandt.” Sumowski, in assigning the Shepherdess (his title) to Flinck, compares the Saskia as Shepherdess, formerly in the Harrach collection, Vienna, which has long been recognized as a Flinck painted in the manner of Rembrandt during the late 1630s, and the Young Shepherdess in a Window (Louvre, Paris), which is signed by Flinck and dated 1641. The Harrach painting, Flinck’s Woman with a Turban and Veil, of about 1636 (Devonshire Collection, Chatsworth), his Woman with Feathered Hat and Veil (formerly Galerie Fischer, Lucerne), and the Museum’s picture are similar not only in execution and in exotic figure types but also in their derivation from Rembrandt, the most obvious known model being his Bust of a Young Woman (“Saskia”), of about 1633 (fig. 52), which depicts a veiled and bejeweled beauty with a straight nose, level lips, dark brows, and a direct gaze. At least two other Rembrandtesque Flincks should be compared with the New York painting, the Girl in Arcadian Dress with a Dog (Fuji Art Museum, Tokyo) and the Shepherdess, in the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig, which is signed and dated 1636 and a pendant to the signed Rembrandt (?) as a Shepherd, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Finally, another onetime “Rembrandt” and former “Saskia,” the oval Young Shepherdess as Flora (Louvre, Paris), is convincingly ascribed to Flinck by Foucart and is strongly reminiscent of the present “Saskia as Flora.”

In all these pictures, it is not only the execution but also the palette, the drawing of the faces, and the way shadows are used to model features such as the nose (especially the underside) and lips that may be considered typical of Flinck in the second half of the 1630s. Even when a figure by Rembrandt served as model, Flinck introduced his own peculiar type of physiognomy: heads in the shape of elongated ovals with flattened sides, slight, sloping shoulders, and a short, curving, almost amphibious fore-arm and hand. He is also fond of fussy flowers, and fabrics that make up for their lack of substance with a display of shimmering detail.

The title employed for a century (see Refs.), “Saskia as Flora,” is doubly mistaken. Any resemblance to Rembrandt’s wife derives from the influence on this work of paintings by Rembrandt that depict an idealized type somewhat reminiscent of Saskia (much as Rubens’s second wife, Helena Fourment, is recalled by his Venuses and other female figures of the 1630s). It is true that the figure here, crowned with a wreath of flowers, is similar to the goddess in Rembrandt’s Flora of 1634 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), but the attribute of a shepherd’s crook
qualifies Flinck's young woman for a place in Arcadia not a
seat on Mount Olympus. Her fashion sense also points to pasto-
ral occupations, of the kind practiced by ladies of the Dutch
court. As noted by Louttit (1973; see Refs.), exotic veils and
striped silks, despite their look of Oriental opulence rather than
rustic simplicity, were part of the pastoral mode in the 1630s.
The genre flourished not only in painting and prints but also
in the theater, poetry, and other forms of literature. It has
occasionally been suggested that the popularity in Rembrandt's
circle of this type of tronie and of closely related types (Flinck's
Woman with a Turban and Veil at Chatsworth, for example, is
some sort of Persian princess) initially had to do with the mar-
teting talents of Saskia's cousin Hendrick Uylenburgh. But the
prevalence of the pastoral theme in Utrecht (which depended
partly on court patronage) and in countries other than the
Netherlands makes it clear that Rembrandt's street in
Amsterdam served as an avenue to a larger artistic world.

Roscam Abbing (1999; see Refs.) reconstructed the painting's
eighteenth-century provenance. It follows from this valuable
information and from Gersaint's description of the picture in

1747 (see Refs.) that the original support must have been a
rectangular panel. Thus, the composition would have more
closely resembled that of Rembrandt's Bust of a Young Woman
(“Saskia”), which appears originally to have been rectangular.

1. Roscam Abbing 1999, pp. 167–70. See also note 2 under Ex Coll.
below.

2. As explained by Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1,
p. 61, the Rembrandt signature and the date of 1633 were painted
in a light gray layer that was still wet at the time, and that was
applied on top of the original paint surface. The false signature
must predate the transfer of 1765. Compare the doubtful inscrip-
tion on Rembrandt's Bust of a Young Woman ("Saskia"), of about
1633 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 359,
fig. 4 [under no. 475]).

3. W. Martin 1921, p. 30 ("Aber sogar unten den echt bezeichneten
Rembrandts dürften sich nicht eigenständige Bilder befinden.
"
The hypothesis that Rembrandt signed works executed by stu-
dents or assistants and the reference to his Leiden pupil Isaack
Joudervile (1612/13–1643/48) in the same paragraph anticipate

4. Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 355 (under no. 98).

5. Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 5, p. 3099 (under no. 2081), compar-
ing his nos. 665 and 673 (see vol. 2, pp. 1032, 1034), which are
also catalogued in the standard monograph on Flinck: Von
Molthe 1961, nos. 139, 141.

6. On the Rijksmuseum painting (commonly but erroneously said
to represent Saskia), see Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 353–60, no. 475.
It is cited as a source for Flinck in Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 2,
pp. 1031–32 (under nos. 619 [Chatsworth] and 665 [Harbach]).
The ex-Tuebron Flinck (ibid., no. 661; Von Molthe 1961, no. 166)
was helpfully available for study prior to its sale at Sotheby's,
New York, May 18, 2000, no. 17.

7. The Tokyo painting (Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 6, no. 2279) is the
best version of several by or after Flinck, which include a
canvas in the Kunsthalle, Hamburg (ibid., vol. 2, no. 662, as by
Flinck; Kersel 2001, pp. 94–95, no. 292, as from Flinck's work-
shop). For the Braunschweig and Amsterdam pendents, see Von
Molthe 1965, nos. 130, 140, pls. 26, 27; Sumowski 1983–94,
vol. 2, nos. 655, 666; and J. Kelch in Berlin–Amsterdam–London
1991–92a, p. 318, no. 61.

8. A. Rosenberg 1904, p. 94, as Rembrandt's Flora; Bode 1971, p. 4,
pl. 3, as Rembrandt's Saskia; Foucart in Paris 1988–89, pp. 55–67,
as by Flinck about 1651 (inv. no. RF 1661–69).


10. Louttit 1973 remains fundamentally important for this subject,
notwithstanding its brusque treatment in Kettering 1983, p. 113,
(under no. 1, the Flora in the Hermitage). The article centers on
Rembrandt's Flora of 1635 (National Gallery, London; Corpus
1982–89, vol. 3, pp. 148–60, no. 312, under that title), which is
called Saskia van Uylenburgh in Arcadian Costume in MacLaren/
Kieser 1941–42 (see Refs.) deserves special mention for insisting
that the Museum's picture represents not Flora but a shepherd-
ess, a point hastily overlooked by the present writer in New York
The Museum's picture is described in Gersaint 1747 (catalogue of the Fonspernus sale in 1747–48), pp. 197–98 (under no. 434), as on wood, 30 pouces (about 31¼ in. [81 cm]) high by 23¼ pouces (about 23¼ in. [64.1 cm]) wide, as rounded above ("sa forme est ceinturée par le haut"); p. 198), and as serving as a pendant to the following lot (no. 435), having been enlarged to this end ("ayant même été agrandir à cet effet"; presumably the top of the panel was shaped at the same time). The pendant in question is almost certainly Rembrandt's Girl at a Window, of 1645 (Dulwich Picture Gallery, London), which is described as "Une autre Portrait de même forme & de même grandeur au rectépendant" (the Dulwich painting is on canvas, 32¼ x 26 in. [81.6 x 66 cm], with rounded corners at top). White in Washington—Los Angeles 1985–86, p. 102 (under no. 26), cautions that no. 435 in the Fonspernus sale may have been Rembrandt's Kitchen Maid (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm) or the Rembrandt school Girl at a Dutch Door; in Woburn Abbey (Sumowski 1983–94), vol. 6, no. 2298a, attributed to Van Hoogstraten, rather than the Dulwich picture, but these candidates are conclusively dismissed in Roscam Abbing 1999, pp. 107, 108, 159, figs. 28, 41. In the Blondel de Gagnysale of 1776 no. 70, "La servante de Rembrandt, connue sous le nom de la Grassceuse" (the Dulwich picture), is "peint sur un canvas rond à top," 30 x 23¼ pouces, and no. 71, "Une jeune & jolie femme à microps, grande comme nature, couronnée de fleurs," is described (without specifying the support) as "de même forme & grandeur que le précédent." This suggests that when the painting was transferred from wood to canvas in 1765 it remained rectangular (but with rounded corners at top). In the Destouches sale of 1794, no. 13, "Une belle figure de jeune fille . . . couronnée de fleurs" has been reduced to 24 x 18 pouces (25¼ x 19¾ in. [64.8 x 48.6 cm]; very close to its present dimensions) and is described as painted on canvas "de forme ovale." For complete transcripts of these sale catalogue entries, see Roscam Abbing 1999, pp. 229, 237–58, and 238–39.

12. See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 351 (under "support"), 360 (under "copies"). The painting is also discussed by Lloyd Williams in Edinburgh—London 2001, p. 98 (under no. 98), where it is observed that "the balance of the picture is convincing as it stands and the oval may, after all, be original." But the remark is meaningless in the absence of technical evidence.

References: Gersaint 1747, pp. 197–98, no. 434, catalogues the painting in the Fonspernus sale of 1747–48 as "Un Joli Portrait de femme couronnée de fleurs," by Rembrandt, "connu parmi les Curieux, sous le nom de la belle Jardinière," on wood, rounded on top ("sa forme est ceinturée par le haut"); 30 x 23¼ pouces (71¼ x 23¼ in. [81 x 64.1 cm]), and states that the picture was enlarged to serve as a pendant to no. 435 in the same sale, Rembrandt's "Portrait de sa Servante" (see note 11 above); J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 168, no. 322, catalogues a portrait of "A Young Lady" by Rembrandt from the Destouches collection, evidently this picture, and refers to no. 508; Pichon 1880, vol. 2, pp. 80, 86, as by Rembrandt, listed in the 1732 and 1737 inventories of the collection of Charles Henry d'Hoyum (as nos. 421 and 82, respectively); Bode 1906b, pp. 8–10 (II), as "Saskia als Flora," by Rembrandt, in the collection of Meyer von Stadelhofen, notes that the painting has suffered from transfer to canvas, compares a portrait of Saskia in Lord Elgin's collection (now Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; fig. 32 here), dates both works to 1633, and considers the manner of execution close to that of a "Flora" in the Galerie Schloss, Paris (now Louvre, Paris, inv. no. 1961–69, as by Flinck); A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 138 (ill.), 353, 371, dates the picture to about 1634; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 116, 138, no. 204, as with the dealer Krämer in Paris, describes the subject as Flora "with the features of Saskia," suggests a date of about 1635, states that the painting was transferred from canvas to panel (actually vice versa) in 1795, and (under no. 2064) tentatively identifies it with the picture in the Destouches sale of 1794; W. Martin 1921, p. 30, rejects the work from Rembrandt's oeuvre; Hofstede de Groot 1922, p. 16, disagrees with Martin (1921), defending the attribution to Rembrandt; Valentin 1930b (ill. following p. 4), as "Portrait of Saskia as Flora," by Rembrandt, in the collection of William R. Timken, New York; Valentin 1931, unpagd, no. 32, pl. 32, "Saskia as Flora" by Rembrandt, dates the picture to about 1633–34, based on related works and "the pale greyish tone"; Benech 1936b, p. 14, calls this the earliest "Flora" by Rembrandt, and close to the 1633 "Saskia" in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (fig. 32 here); Bredius 1935, p. 6, no. 98, pl. 98, "Saskia as Flora," by Rembrandt, no date proposed; Kieser 1941–42, p. 155, perceptively questions the identification of the figure here (and in Rembrandt's paintings in London and Saint Petersburg) as Flora, as opposed to a shepherdess; K. Bauch 1966, p. 14, no. 256, pl. 256, as "Flora" by Rembrandt, about 1632–33, Saskia serving as model; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 86 (III), 353, no. 98, "Saskia as Flora (?)" a work that has suffered considerably, states that an attribution to Rembrandt is unjustified, and concludes, "perhaps a work by G. Flinck"; Lecaldano 1969, p. 131 (III), "Ritratto di Saskia incornonata," included among doubtful attributions; Lootz 1973, p. 125 n. 18, mentions the gauzy veil covering the head as an exotic exception to the usual simplicity of Arcadian dress; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 180, no. 167 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Kettering 1977, p. 20 n. 3, pp. 22–24, fig. 5, as "Saskia as a Shepherdess," attributed to Rembrandt, notes that his authorship has been questioned, makes an effort (p. 24 n. 14) to preserve the picture as at least Rembrandt's invention in 1633, and observes that if by Flinck the picture would have to date from 1636 or later; Baertel 1980, vol. 1, p. 151, as "Style of Rembrandt," of uncertain date; Jansen in Amsterdam—Groningen 1983, p. 156 (under no. 33), considers the painting a possible Flinck of about 1636 or later, based on the argument in Kettering 1977; Kettering 1983, pp. 47, 61, 78, 79, 148 n. 91, fig. 41, "Saskia as a Shepherdess" attributed to Rembrandt, dated 1635, repeats Kettering 1977, and calls this picture (despite its discussion as a possible Flinck of 1636 or later; p. 148 n. 91) the "first of the shepherdess portraits outside Utrecht and the first of Rembrandt's pastoral compositions"; Foucart in Paris 1988–89, p. 57, observes that the provenance (Paris sales of 1748 and 1777) assigned by Hofstede de Groot 1907–27 (vol. 6, no. 203) to Flinck's oval Young Shepherdesses as Flora (Louvre, Paris) is actually that of the Museum's picture, which is another oval "ex-Rembrandt"; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 5, pp. 3099, 3212 (ill.), no. 2081, as "Shepherdesses," attributes the painting to Flinck about 1637–40, and adopts the provenance information recorded by Foucart in Paris 1988–89; Baertel 1995, p. 318, "Saskia as Flora," by a follower of
Rembrandt; Bruyn 1995, pp. 108–9, calls the picture a pastiche of uncertain date; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 15, 17, 70, 91–93, no. 22 (ill.), as "Flora," attributed to Govert Flinck and dating from about 1650–58, compares similar works by Flinck, and briefly discusses the subject and Amsterdam market for inexpensive paintings of Flora; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 28, 61, 65, 83 (clean state), as attributed to Flinck, notes the "rather early" transfer of the painting from wood to canvas; Roscam Abbing 1999, pp. 167–70, 174, 226 (under Rembrandt owned by Charles Henry d'Hoym), 227 (under the 1712 estate inventory of de Morville), 239 (under the sale of 1748), 239 (under the sale of 1794), 244, fig. 45, as "Flora," now attributed to Flinck, provides important new provenance information (see note 11 above); Ketelsen in Hamburg 2000–2001, pp. 54, 56 (under nos. 7, 8), describes the picture as a "Flora" attributed to Flinck, which depends directly on Rembrandt, and suggests that Flinck painted this and similar pictures for the art dealer Hendrick Uyleenburgh; Ketelsen 2001, p. 91 n. 6, repeats the point made in Hamburg 2000–2001; Dickey 2002, pp. 27, 38, fig. 16, and p. 214 n. 57, as by Flinck about 1658–58, compares the "shimmer of patterned oriental silk" found in this painting with the richness of fabrics in Dutch court portraits of women in fancy dress, and suggests that "a feminine type based on Saskia's likeness may well have become a trademark motif" of Rembrandt's studio; Bogh Rasmussen in Copenhagen 2006, pp. 197, 293 n. 8 (under no. 38), notes that the picture is now considered to be by Flinck; Krog in ibid., p. 291 n. 3 (under no. 34), as by Flinck.


Ex Coll.: Charles Jean Baptiste Fleuriau, comte de Morville, Paris (until d. 1732; his inventory, dated March 1, 1732, one of "deux têtes de Rembrandt," probably sold privately shortly afterward for 800 livres); Charles Henry, comte d'Hoym, Paris (1712–d. 1716; 1712 inv., p. 11, nos. 420 and 421, "Deux tableaux représentant l'un la Crasseuse de Rembrandt avec son pendan"; d'Hoym's 1737 inv., nos. 82 and 83, "Une Flore, une Crasseuse, sur bois avec bordure, 400 livres"); Angrand, vicomte de Fonspertuis (his sale, Paris, Ger-
saint, March 4, 1748, no. 434, with "pendant" no. 435, for FFr 2,001 to Blondheim de Gagny); Augustin Blondel de Gagny (until d. 1776; his sale, Remy, Paris, December 10–24, 1776, and January 8–22, 1777, no. 71, sold for FFr 680 to Destouches); Destouches, Paris (until 1794; his sale, Le Brun jeune & Julliot, Paris, March 21, 1794, no. 11, as "Une belle figure" by Rembrandt, for FFr 431 to Le Brun); J. B. P. Le Brun, Paris, in 1794; J. H. Meyer von Stadelhofen, Château d'Hermance, Switzerland (in 1906); Kraemer, Paris, in 1916; Wildenstein, New York; Mr. and Mrs. William R. Timken, New York (by 1930–his d. 1949); Lillian S. Timken, New York (1949–d. 1999); Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1999 60.71.15

1. The present writer strongly disagrees with Bruyn's negative assessment of Sumowski's (1983–94) work on Flinck. Here (Bruyn 1995) and elsewhere, the Dutch critic reveals an eccentric view of the artist.


3. See Roscam Abbing 1999, p. 167. Charles Henry d'Hoym (1694–1736) was ambassador from Saxony-Poland to France between 1720 and 1729. According to Pichon 1899, p. 91, and Roscam Abbing 1999, p. 156, d'Hoym left Paris for Dresden on March 1, 1729, and never saw his Parisian collections again (he was imprisoned in Castle Königstein and hanged himself in his cell on April 21, 1736). However, he purchased paintings in absenta through his secretary, Isaac Milbourne (Roscam Abbing 1999, pp. 167, 168). A sale or auction of d'Hoym's 161 or more paintings is not recorded but must have taken place.

4. There are three annotated copies of this sale catalogue in the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague (copies were kindly sent by M. de Voogd). Two of them record the buyer as Destouches. One of them gives the price as FFr 680, and the other two as FFr 679 and 19 808 (there were 20 to the franc). The Paris sales of 1748 and 1776–77 (Lugt 1938–64, vol. 1, nos. 682 and 2616) were thought by Hofstede de Groot (see 1907–27, vol. 6, p. 136, no. 203) to have included a similar painting by Flinck (now in the Louvre, Paris), but Foucart in Paris 1988–90, p. 57, suggests that the entries in the sale catalogues actually refer to the New York not the Paris picture. Sumowski (1983–94), vol. 5, p. 3099, under no. 2081) adopts Foucart's information, but misprints the date of 1777 as 1771. The provenance is clarified in Roscam Abbing 1999 (see Refs.).


GOVERT FLINCK 207
47. Bearded Man with a Velvet Cap

Oil on wood, 23¾ x 20½ in. (60.3 x 52.4 cm)
Signed and dated (left center): G. flinck f:1645

The picture was painted over a portrait of a woman. There is some abrasion in the cloak and the lower part of the beard, revealing points of impasto from the first composition, and paint loss along a split in the panel at the top left corner. The oak panel was trimmed at the top corners and then triangular pieces of wood were attached, returning the panel to its present rectangular shape. The last digit of the date is indistinct, but can be read with magnification.

Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900  25.110.27

This tronie, an imaginary portrait probably based on a live model (see the discussion under Rembrandt’s Man in Oriental Costume; Pl. 142), would be recognized as typical of Flinck in the 1640s even if the panel were not signed and dated. X-radiographs (fig. 53) show that Flinck painted his dashing if no longer youthful character over a female portrait, which itself seems consistent with the artist’s work in the early to mid-1640s.

The man wears a red velvet beret trimmed with a gold chain and a black, fur-lined cloak over a medium-green jacket. Originally these colors were set off against a deep olive background, but this has darkened almost to black with age. The gold pendant is a type often employed by Rembrandt and artists in his circle to suggest antiquity or the exotic Middle East.

Perhaps the most striking aspect of the picture is the wispy white beard, which was something of a signature motif for Flinck, especially in the 1640s. Even in more carefully descriptive pictures such as The Apostle Paul, of about 1636 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), Flinck lends a rhythmic flair to flowing facial hair. Here, however, the effect is much more artificial, a calligraphic display that might just as well describe an eddy of water or tall grass buffeted by wind. Sumowski’s critique of the picture (see Refs.) was anticipated by curator Harry Wehle: “Photos [of other works by Flinck] all bear out authenticity of MMA example in vacuity of expression and emptiness of handling.” Empty or not, the manner of execution is a clear instance of how far Flinck had distanced himself
from Rembrandt by the time he was thirty and had been out of the master’s studio for about eight years.

The most similar works by Flinck in type and style include the _Bearded Old Man with Beret and Gold Chain_ (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin) and the so-called _Portrait of a Rabbi_ (formerly Guterman collection, New York), both of about 1642. A good number of similar figures were depicted in a generally comparable style by the Amsterdam artist Salomon Koninck (1609–1656) during the 1640s.

1. The young woman does not appear elsewhere in Flinck’s oeuvre, so far as is known. Compare the style of his _Portrait of a Woman_, in a Swedish private collection (Von Moltke 1965, no. 435, pl. 49), which dates from about 1643–45 and has been thought to possibly represent the painter’s fiancée or wife (see Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 2, p. 1035 [under no. 681]).

2. For a large detail of Saint Paul’s head, see Von Moltke 1965, pl. 7.

3. Memo dated 1939 in the curatorial files, comparing Flinck’s _Self-Portrait_ of 1639, in the National Gallery, London. In reproductions of the Museum’s painting, the face usually appears smoother and harder than it really is, and the beard softer.

4. Von Moltke 1965, nos. 177, 178; see also nos. 269, 271, which date from several years later. See also Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 2, nos. 676 (the Dublin painting in color) and 678 (the Guterman panel, which was sold from that collection at Sotheby’s, New York, January 14, 1988, no. 15).

5. See Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 3, nos. 1104, 1108 (dated 1643), 1111, 1113, 1126, 1129. One of the most similar works by Koninck, signed and dated 1642, was with the Alfred Brod Gallery, London, in 1957 (a clipping from what appears to be their catalogue is in the curatorial files).

REFERENCES: Von Moltke 1965, p. 117, no. 249 (ill.), records that the top corners of the panel were added later, and claims that “the same model appears” in Flinck’s painting _Marcus Curtius Dentatus_, of 1636, in the Town Hall of Amsterdam (where there are three or four similar types); Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 2, pp. 1003, 1035, 1114, no. 682, considers the picture to be of “negligent” quality, a “straggler” compared with the excellent _tronies_ of old men that precede it; Liedtke 1990, p. 37, mentioned as part of the Huntington bequest; Baetjer 1991, p. 322; Liedtke in New York 1991–96, vol. 2, pp. 100, 101, 147, no. 49 (ill.), compares the quality of Rembrandt’s _Herman Doomer and the style of Man with a Steel Gorget_, by a follower of Rembrandt (Pls. 148, 166), and describes the work as a typical _tronie_ by Flinck, who first painted such imaginary portraits under Rembrandt’s influence; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 114, 117, figs. 154, 155, employs an X-radiograph of the painting (fig. 33 here) in an attempt to attribute _Man with a Steel Gorget_ (Pl. 166) to Flinck.


EX COLL.: Collis P. Huntington, New York (until d. 1900; life interest to his widow, Arabella D. Huntington, later [from 1917] Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, 1900–d. 1924; life interest to their son, Archer Milton Huntington, 1924–terminated in 1925); Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900. 25.110.27
Jacques de Gheyn the Elder
Antwerp 1565–1629 The Hague

Jacques or Jacob de Gheyn II is often called “the Elder” to distinguish him from his son Jacques de Gheyn III (1568–1641), who drew and etched in a manner that generally resembles his father’s. Jacques II was the son of Jacques (Jacob Jansz) de Gheyn I (1537/38–1581/82), a now obscure draftsman, engraver, and glass painter. Karel van Mander, who had known Jacques II for at least fifteen years when the *Schilder-Boeck* was published in 1604, writes that the artist’s parents were from Utrecht and “were descended from a distinguished and honourable lineage there.” Only the first name (Cornelia) of Jacques I’s wife is known, which was mentioned when their son Isaac was baptized in Antwerp in 1567. Jacques II’s baptism is not documented, but Van Mander states that he was born in Antwerp in 1565. Jacques I joined the Antwerp guild in 1558, at the age of about twenty (in an Antwerp document of 1564 his age is given as twenty-six). It is not surprising that a Dutch designer and painter of stained glass went to work in the artistic and commercial capital of the Spanish Netherlands. Utrecht artists of the 1550s often looked to Antwerp for training or inspiration, one of the most important being Anthonis Mor (1516/20–1576).

It is not known whether the De Gheyn family, with three boys and a girl, had already moved to the northern Netherlands by the time Jacques I died in 1581 or 1582, although Van Mander records that he had heard of a stained-glass window by the artist in the Oude Kerk of Amsterdam. The date of the elder De Gheyn’s death is estimated on the basis of Jacques II’s remark to the biographer that he was seventeen years old when his father died. Reportedly, the son completed Jacques I’s unfinished glass paintings, and started his own career by engraving and painting in gouache. This would have been in Utrecht. About 1585, Jacques II, then twenty years old, entered the workshop of Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1617) in Haarlem, where he made great progress as a draftsman and engraver. Whether De Gheyn was Goltzius’s pupil for two years and then his assistant or set up his own shop in Haarlem is uncertain. Goltzius departed for Italy in October 1590, and by 1591 De Gheyn moved to Amsterdam, where he made engravings after his own designs and those of other artists, including Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.). It was probably about 1590–91 that the gifted engraver Jan Saenredam (1565–1607) studied with De Gheyn.

In 1593, the artist was entrusted by the City and Admiralty of Amsterdam with the commission for an engraving on two sheets, *The Siege of Gruenendael*, which celebrates one of Prince Maurits’s victories. Although De Gheyn, to his later regret, sowed some wild oats in his first years in Amsterdam, he was well established as a draftsman and engraver by 1591, and ready to settle down. In the spring of 1595, he married Eva Stalpaert van der Wiele, a wealthy and well-bred young woman from The Hague, where her father had been a burgomaster in 1584–85. The couple’s only son, Jacques III (or the Younger), was probably born in 1596. The marriage brought De Gheyn into aristocratic circles in the South Holland region and made him financially independent. He became increasingly inclined to draw and, from about 1600 onward, to paint subjects of his own choosing, and (like Goltzius) appears to have given up engraving with the dawn of the new century. The four hundred thirty prints known to have been executed by De Gheyn seem more remarkable in number than the approximately fifteen hundred drawings that have been catalogued, given the laborious nature of engraving and the fact that he was a printmaker for little more than fifteen years.

From 1596 until 1601 or 1602, De Gheyn and his wife lived in Leiden. He became acquainted there with a child prodigy from Delft, Hugo de Groot or Grotius (1583–1643), the future law scholar. Grotius’s first words in print were Latin verses appended to engravings by De Gheyn and signed *H. Grotius aet. 12* (age 12). The relationship lasted for years and drew De Gheyn into a learned world of humanists, mathematicians, and scientists. He remained extremely productive as an engraver, working both after his own designs and after drawings by Van Mander (*The Prodigal Son*, for example, a multitfigure outdoor party scene dated 1596). In 1598 and 1599, De Gheyn engraved a series of twenty-two prints, *The Riding School, or Exercise of Cavalry*, which was probably commissioned by Count Jan VII van Nassau-Siegen, a cousin of Prince Maurits. This was followed by the *Exercise of Arms*, a drill manual showing foot soldiers with weapons in a variety of approved positions. Publication was deliberately delayed for (in modern terms)
reasons of national security, and the first edition did not appear until 1607–8. De Gheyn’s incisive drawings for the *Exercise of Arms* are widely dispersed (although a good number are in the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich), and are prized by collectors. The prints served as patterns for Delft tile painters and other artisans until fairly recent times.⁷

Around 1600, De Gheyn started making faithful drawings of flowers and insects, inspired partly by his association with the famous Leiden botanist Carolus Clusius (for whose book of 1601, *Rariorum plantarum historia*, the artist designed a title page and a portrait in an emblematic frame), and probably also by seeing some miniatures of naturalia by Joris Hoefnagel (1542–1600). From 1591 until his death, Hoefnagel was court artist to Emperor Rudolf II, but his work was known in The Hague because his sister Susanna was married to Christiana Huygens, secretary to Prince Mauritius. (The couple’s son Constantijn Huygens became secretary to Prince Frederick Hendrick and an eminent patron of the arts.) An album of watercolor miniatures on parchment by Jacques II, described by Van Mander (1604) as in Rudolf II’s collection, is now in the Fondation Custodia, Institut Néerlandais, Paris.⁸

De Gheyn worked for the States of Holland and for the court at The Hague from 1597 onward. He therefore joined the Guild of Saint Luke in The Hague (by 1598 at the latest) as a painter and engraver; in 1615, he was listed solely as a painter. In 1603 (the date of the painting discussed below), he painted a life-size portrait of a prize Spanish horse captured at the Battle of Nieuwpoort (July 2, 1600) and presented to Prince Mauritius, who awarded the commission for the now worn canvas (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). In the same period, De Gheyn painted his first flower still lifes, which recall those of Roelant Savery (1576–1639).⁹ One of these was (according to Van Mander) purchased by Rudolf II, and in 1606 the States General commissioned a flower painting from De Gheyn (untraced) for presentation to Maria de’ Medici. Van Mander mentions a *Sleeping Venus* (with a Cupid and two satyrs) as painted “in this year, 1604.” The work is not preserved but its Mannerist style may be inferred from De Gheyn’s *Seated Venus with Cupid* (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) and *Neptune, Amphitrite, and Cupid* (Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne), both of which date from about 1609 or slightly later.⁰ These paintings and the others that survive (at least twenty-one are known) or that are recorded by documents or sale catalogues suggest that De Gheyn deliberately took on a variety of subjects, as well as works in different media and sizes. The ability to work on a miniature or monumental scale was one of several signs of virtuosity that he could have claimed.

Exactly when De Gheyn and his family moved to The Hague is not known, but it must have been in 1601 or 1602. They lived first on the Lange Voorhout (the finest avenue near the court) and from 1623 on the Lange Hoorstraat, where Constantijn Huygens was their neighbor. In 1627, the artist’s assets were valued at 40,000 guilders, making him one of the wealthier residents of a city that was known for its idle rich. But De Gheyn was active through the 1610s and 1620s, painting superb flower pieces and some less impressive devotional pictures. His own religious convictions are not clear, but they appear to have shifted gradually from Catholic beginnings to Calvinism.

The extraordinary range of De Gheyn’s interests is evident from his prints and paintings, to say nothing of the garden with grotesques that he designed for Prince Mauritius.¹¹ However, his prolific output of drawings must be studied to understand the artist’s many sides. As objects of close observation there are insects, rodents, flowers, plants, trees, native landscapes, townscapes, domestic scenes, portraits and studies of anonymous people, animals, and candid nudes. But the same artist rivaled Bosch and Bruegel by inventing impossible mountains and monsters, the latter more frightful for being informed by studies “from life” of dead birds, fish, frogs, rats, and other creatures. De Gheyn’s figure studies include drawings of young men and women in various poses and kinds of dress, and older people whose features are freakish enough for adaptation (along with his biological specimens) in his scenes of sorcery.¹² There are also allegorical compositions, including several on vanitas themes, and sketches of contemporary people on their deathbeds, one of whom is probably Karel van Mander in 1606.¹³ De Gheyn died on March 29, 1629, at the age of sixty-three or sixty-four.

2. On this point, see Van Regteren Altena 1983, vol. 1, p. 13, where it is maintained (not altogether convincingly) that Jacques I probably died in Antwerp.
3. The latter alternative is favored by Van Regteren Altena (ibid., p. 27), but E. K. J. Reznicek in *Dictionary of Art* 1996, vol. 12, p. 529, after reading all the literature, states simply that De Gheyn “remained for five years” in Goitzszo’s workshop.
4. The first known document placing De Gheyn in Amsterdam is an entry in the diary of the Utrecht humanist Arnold Bucelius (Aernout van Buchell, 1656–1641), who met the artist on April 4, 1591. See Van Regteren Altena 1983, vol. 1, p. 27.
5. For a discussion and complete catalogue of De Gheyn’s prints, see Fiedler, Kok 1990a and 1990b.
6. See Van Regteren Altena 1983, vol. 1, p. 43, where the account
makes a somewhat different impression than Reznicek’s statement in *Dictionary of Art* 1996, vol. 12, p. 129, that after arriving in Leiden De Gheyn “began collaborating with the famous law scholar Hugo de Groot.” The boy’s father was a governor of Leiden University, where his uncle Cornelis was rector.


12. See, for example, Swan 2005, pp. 163–64, fig. 63.


### 48. Vanitas Still Life

Oil on wood (single piece), 32½ x 21¼ in. (82.6 x 54 cm)

Signed and dated (on sill, below skull): JDGHEYNFEAN°

1603 [now largely illegible]; Inscribed: (on keystone of arch) HVMANA/VANA (human vanity); (lower left, on obverse of coin) IOANA.ET.KAROLVS.REGES. [ARA]GONYM.

TRUVNATORES.ET.KATHOLICIS/C A (Joanna and Charles triumphant and Catholic regents of Aragon); (lower right, on reverse of coin) IOANA.ET.KAROLVS. [EIVS.FI]LIVS.

PRIMO.GENTIVS.DE.L.GRA[C]TA. R[X]/ARAGON[V]/L S (Joanna and Charles her firstborn son by the grace of God king of Aragon) [from a coin struck in 1528]

The paint film is abraded, rendering many of the significant iconographic details difficult to discern. In addition, areas of minute cracks that appeared as the paint dried surround the skull and bubble, further marred the image. An overall warm brown imprimatur can be seen where the paint layers are thin. Passages painted with more opaque paint—for example, the coins and the figure of the philosopher at top left—are better preserved. The oak panel is made from one large piece of wood and retains the original bevel on the reverse.


This panel, dated 1603, is generally regarded as the earliest known vanitas still life to have been painted in the Netherlands. The genre flourished from the 1620s onward, as is seen, for example, in Pieter Claesz’s *Still Life with a Skull and Writing Quill*, of 1628 (Pl. 28). The influence of De Gheyn’s composition should not be overstated, since it may not have been widely known, and it differs in character from later vanitas still lifes, which find deeper meanings in plausible realities (that is, objects one might actually encounter in everyday life). Here the artist paints a more purely conceptual image, comparable to didactic prints and title pages. (The latter, in this period, were often embellished by architectural frameworks, figures, and symbolic elements.) Nonetheless, the painting was a remarkably original work when it was made. This may reflect not only the special qualities of De Gheyn’s imagination, but also his independence from the art market (as noted in the biography above). Furthermore, the possibility that the painting was intended expressly for a particular patron, such as the “Reynier Antonissen” in Amsterdam who owned a “Death’s Head” by De Gheyn in 1604 (according to Karel van Mander’s *Schilder-Boeck* of that year), would help to explain its exceptional character.

The dominant motifs in the picture are a human skull and, floating above it, a transparent sphere or bubble. These forms occupy a stone niche with a slightly pointed arch, the keystone of which is inscribed HVMANA VANA (Human Vanity). The spandrels flanking the arch are filled with sculptural figures of philosophers with books at their feet: to the left, Democritus,
who gestures toward the globe and laughs; and, to the right, Heraclitus, who points to the sphere and weeps. The sphere purposefully resembles a soap bubble, the familiar vanitas motif that suggests the emptiness and transience of human life ("Homo Bulla," as inscribed above a child making bubbles in an engraving by De Gheyn, of 1599; fig. 54). However, the two philosophers and the images reflected in the sphere identify it as the world, meaning mundane experience. Seneca, Juvenal, and other ancient authors contrasted Democritus (ca. 460–ca. 370 B.C.) with the earlier Heraclitus (ca. 540–ca. 475 B.C.), calling them the laughing and weeping philosophers because of the former's mocking and the latter's melancholic responses to the world of mankind. The theme was eagerly adopted by Renaissance writers, and often depicted from the fifteenth century onward (as in Bramante's fresco of 1477, in the Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan). The subject was especially common in Dutch art of the seventeenth century.

One of the most important antecedents of De Gheyn's composition is an engraving of 1537 by the Haarlem humanist Dirk Volkertsz Coornhert (1522–1590), after Maerten van Heemskerck (1498–1574). In the print (fig. 55), the two philosophers stand in a "world landscape" with, between them, a translucent orb draped with a fowlsca. At top center, flanked by putti holding hourglasses and resting on skulls, a plaque bears the legend REMPUS RIDENDI TEMPUS FLENDI (A time to

Figure 54. Jacques de Gheyn the Elder, Allegory of Transience, 1599. Engraving (after De Gheyn’s drawing in the British Museum, London), 18 x 13 3/4 in. (45.7 x 35.2 cm). Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

De Gheyn probably also knew the figures of Democritus and Heraclitus (with a globe) that were painted by Cornelis Ketel (1548–1616) on the exterior of his house in Amsterdam, reportedly in 1602.

In De Gheyn’s picture, two common vanitas symbols, cut flowers and smoke, rise from urns at either side of the niche. More elaborate versions of the same motifs occupy the lower corners of his engraving dated 1599 (fig. 54). The painted flowers are a red-and-yellow flamed tulip (a luxury item) and a field rose, one petal of which has fallen onto the sill (where chips and cracks also suggest the ravages of time). Contemporary viewers would have recalled biblical passages comparing mortal life with flowers and smoke: for example, “Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not” (Job 14:1–2); and, “Hear my prayer, O Lord, . . . in the day when I call answer me speedily. For my days are consumed like smoke, and my bones are burned as an hearth” (Psalms 102:1–3). Similarly, the straw beneath the skull in the painting perhaps makes reference to the words in the same Psalm, “My heart is smitten, and withered like grass” (102:4) and, “My days are like a shadow that declineth; and I am withered like grass” (102:11). Similar thoughts are found in Isaiah, in verses on the greatness of God and man’s insignificance: “All flesh is grass, and all the godliness thereof is as the flower of the field: The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: because the spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass” (Isa. 40:6–7).

Ingvar Bergström, in his essential article on the painting, was inclined to see “the ears of corn [?] and the few fallen grains lying around the skull” as an expression of the idea “that Man when dead and buried will be resurrected through the sacrifice of Christ—the grain of corn falls into the earth and a new plant grows.” De Gheyn had employed the concept earlier (as in fig. 54), but the clarity with which he referred to resurrection in other images suggests that Bergström’s discovery of a “rather concealed” allusion to the same notion in this picture, together with his claim that Democritus and Heraclitus have, like sibyls, undergone a “Christianizing process,” amounts to grasping at straws. All vanitas pictures of the seventeenth century may be considered as calls to a spiritual life and thus salvation, usually without any overt reference to Christ. It seems unlikely that one was intended here.

Bergström also published a diagram of the small images that float in the sphere, describing them as “symbols of worldly vanity and of Man’s frailty and infirmity.” His reading of these motifs evidently took place shortly after the owner of the picture had it cleaned, which probably reduced the definition of forms in an area that had been very thinly painted in the first place and that later became more transparent and ambiguous by natural aging and the use of solvents. Bergström’s imagination may also have been stimulated to some extent by the fact that he identified some symbols on the basis of comparison with motifs depicted in the border of the engraving after Van Heemskerk (fig. 55).

At present, the images on and in the sphere (fig. 56) may be described as follows. On top of the sphere, there are wavy, ambiguous forms, with at least one ball-like (or bell-like) object dangling from an appendage. This small, vague motif (not mentioned by Bergström) recalls the fooscap on the globe in the engraving, but it is now unclear. In the upper center of the sphere, just to the right of the reflected window, is an imperial crown (which is too large in Bergström’s diagram), with traces of swords at top left and right. Bergström was probably correct in describing this arrangement as a trophy comprising a crown with one pair (in his reading, two pairs) of swords, as there is some resemblance to the trophy of a crown and weapons in the border of Van Heemskerk’s design. The lower swords and plumelike shapes to either side of the crown in Bergström’s diagram are now almost invisible. The lance below the crown in his rendering remains faintly visible under magnification. Bergström’s identification of an “upturned money-bag with coins streaming out through a broken heart,” in the area above the crown, cannot, because of its poor condition, be supported (or rejected) by examination of the paint layer.

The reflected window to the upper left coincides with a grayish heart, apparently struck through with a blade or an arrow, with a flame at the top. A cascade of much less visible forms, sketched in grays and browns, descends along the highlighted left side of the sphere. They are, from top to bottom: probably a caduceus, now very faint; probably a bellows; two or three drinking vessels; to their left, a few small rectangular forms, plausibly called playing cards by Bergström; and, to the lower left, a backgammon board, with Bergström’s “dice” being quite uncertain. On the right side of the sphere, a wagon wheel, mounted on a shaft or pole, and three flaslike shapes float in a large rectangular highlight. Bergström read one of the smaller forms as a Lazarusliep (Lazarus clapper, an attribute of lepers), which is merely a possibility.

This tedious inventory of symbols that may or may not be discernible in De Gheyn’s transparent sphere is, fortunately, not difficult to interpret. All is vanity: earthly possessions, authority, pleasures, desires. The crown with swords signifies power and glory. The caduceus, if there, probably refers to
commerce, the bellows to success or good fortune (like having wind in one’s sails). Playing cards, a backgammon board, and drinking glasses would be expected attributes of pleasure and idleness. The flaming heart must symbolize earthly love, as Bergström supposed, and his reading of the wheel on the pole as the familiar Flemish instrument of torture and execution (as in the background of Pieter Bruegel the Elder’s *Triumph of Death*, Madrid) is convincing. The proximity of a Lazaruskep to a gibbet wheel would not be surprising, since leprosy was considered to result from sinful behavior.

Turning now to “the root of all evil” (1 Tim. 6:10), the money depicted by De Gheyn at the bottom of the composition, all the coins shown—except for the largest example—were used as currency in the Netherlands about 1600. The exception is the hundred-ducat goldpiece minted in Zaragoza (capital of the kingdom of Aragón) in 1528, illustrated both in obverse (lower left corner) and in reverse (lower right corner). The coin, weighing 53.0 grams, must have been rare even in De Gheyn’s lifetime; very few examples are known today, and why it was made remains a matter of speculation. The reverse bears the crowned crest of Aragón, and the obverse displays bust-length portraits of Joanna the Mad (who nominally ruled Aragón from 1516 until her death in 1555) and her son, Charles I, king of Spain (and, from 1530, Emperor Charles V), who ruled
on his mother's behalf. De Gheyn faithfully reproduces the Latin inscriptions on both sides of the coin, though he improves the modeling of the portraits.

On the sill between the vases, the following coins may be identified (from left to right): a silver taler with an image of Charles's younger brother, Ferdinand I (1503–1644; king of Hungary and Bohemia from 1526); a pile of five coins, of which the first three or four (all silver) are German talers and the gold coin to the right is an 8-real silverpiece of Philip II (minted ca. 1590); next, a gold noble (worth 6 shillings, 8 pence) of Edward IV, king of England (r. 1461–83); below, four small gold coins, of which the one to the left is a Spanish escudo; in the middle, below the skull, a Zeeland silver medal of 1602, bearing a galloping horse and a rampant lion (discussed below); beneath the medal, an unidentified silver coin with a charging boar; on top of four silver pieces, an unidentified silver medal or coin bearing a crowned shield between rampant lions; a bronze (?) pseudoantique coin, probably from the 1500s, with a head in profile; a coin with a seated antique figure, perhaps the reverse of a coin like the preceding one; below the last two coins, two others, unidentified, one showing a dog in profile.

The silver medal dated 1602 (fig. 57) commemorates the capture of a Portuguese galleon by two Zeeland merchant ships earlier that year, off Saint Helena in the South Atlantic. This was a victory in the Dutch war of independence, since their enemy, Philip III, king of Spain, ruled Portugal as Philip II, treating the kingdom as a Spanish province. The Zeeland ships and their prize sailed into Middelburg on July 7, 1602. The galleon and its precious cargo (such vanities as porcelain, spices, gold, silver, and pearls) were sold off for 1.5 million guilders, which was divided among numerous entitled parties: the Zeeland chamber of the East India Company (VOC), the States of Zeeland, the Stadholder, Prince Maurits (who received 100,000 guilders), merchants who had invested in the ships, the crew, and so on. The directors of the Zeeland VOC had the medal minted in Middelburg; silver and, reportedly, gold examples (none have been identified) were handed out to members, investors, and friends.

The reverse of the medal, not seen in De Gheyn's picture, shows the three ships sailing together (an illustration of having one's "ship come in"), with a border inscribed: POSSVNT QVAE POSSE VIDENTVR.16 MARTY.1602 (They can because they believe they can. 16 March 1602). The quote is from the fifth book of Virgil's Aeneid, in which Aeneas holds funeral rites and athletic games in honor of his deceased father. Four Trojan ships compete with one another, and the victorious sailors, who "would sell life for renown," triumph by the slimmest of margins, "because they believe they can" (1.231).

The obverse of the medal shows the Zeeland lion (in water, as on the province's crest) chasing a horse on a globe, with the inscriptions: NON SUFFICIT ORBIS (The world is not enough) and QVO SALITAS INSEQUIT (Where you go, I will follow). These inscriptions are clearly legible in the painting just below De Gheyn's signature and the skull. "Non sufficient orbis" was a personal device of Philip II, and went back, in Spanish history, to the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494), when the pope declared the world beyond Europe to be the property of Spain and Portugal. The horse must also refer to Philip II and Philip III, since their name, "Philippus" (from the Greek philipos), means "horse lover," an etymology to which the Spanish court frequently drew attention. Thus the medal of 1602 shows the Dutch Republic (or rather, one Dutch province) chasing Spain and Portugal around the globe, which they had the hubris—or vanity—to imagine as all their own.
In De Gheyn’s hands the medal takes on additional currency, since he surely knew (from his own reading, his Latinist circle in Leiden, or one of his learned friends) that “non sufficit orbis” is a quote from Juvenal’s Satires, specifically no. 10, on the vanity of human desire. In this Stoic essay concerning the ability “to distinguish true blessings from their opposites” (10.3), kings, rich men, and ordinary people praying for longevity, beauty, and so on, pass by in pitiful review, unaware that virtue, “the woes and hard labors of Hercules,” rather than the luxuries of Sardanapalus, paves “the one and only road to a life of peace” (10.360–64). “The foremost of all petitions—the one best known to every temple—is for riches and their increase, that our money-chest may be the biggest” (10.23–24). But poison comes “in a golden bowl,” and therefore, “will you not commend the two wise men, one of whom would laugh while the opposite sage would weep every time he set foot outside the door?” (10.28–30). Some twenty lines follow on the merits of Democritus, after which Juvenal turns to the great men of history and their downfall. “Few indeed are the kings who go down to Ceres’ son-in-law [Pluto] save by sword and slaughter—few the tyrants that perish by a bloodless death!” (10.110–12). Hannibal, for instance, “for whom Africa was all too small...[so that] Spain is added to his dominions: he overlaps the Pyrenees...and now Italy is in his grasp” (10.140ff.), lives his last days in exile and poisons himself. Similarly, “one globe is all too little [“non sufficit orbis”] for the youth of Pella [Alexander the Great]; he chafes uneasily within the narrow limits of the world,” but, in the end, “a sarcophagus will suffice him” (10.168–72).

It has been suggested that De Gheyn gave the Zeeland medal a prominent place in the painting because he may have been its designer, quite as, two years earlier, he had designed a medal commemorating the victory of Prince Maurits over Spanish troops at the Battle of Nieuwpoort. Scholars of De Gheyn’s oeuvre reject this idea, and historians of numismatics have proposed more plausible candidates. Nonetheless, De Gheyn was keenly interested in coins and medals, and he was the brother-in-law of Caspar Wytgens, mintmaster of West Friesland, whose brother Melchior Wytgens, as mintmaster of Zeeland at Middelburg (from 1601 until 1612), supervised the production of the 1602 medal. Melchior Wytgens was also a well-known collector of paintings (Van Mander refers to his many works by Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem), and a resident of Delft before his appointment in Middelburg.

The most likely scenario, therefore, is that De Gheyn and his patron (if the picture was commissioned) were quite familiar with the Zeeland medal, knew the source of Philip II’s device in Juvenal, and saw that this connection invited the invention of a vanitas allegory comparable to that in the Allegory of Transience, dated 1599 (fig. 34), but more strongly focused, with (as in Juvenal) the laughing and weeping philosophers featured, mundane desires condemned, and particular attention given to the vanities of money and imperial power. Philip II, at this point in Dutch history, was unlikely to be identified with such venerable megalomaniacs as Hannibal and Alexander, or with a generic emperor like the one holding a crystal orb in the vanitas print (fig. 34), but rather with the Habsburg dynasty and the Spanish kings who oppressed the Netherlandish provinces. Thus the painting is at once topical and a meditation on the nature of all mankind, with motifs bringing to mind complementary quotations from classical authors and the Bible. The medal and coins, while symbolizing the vanities of wealth and fame, also lend a sharp political edge to the picture, with Philip II’s own motto turned against him, revealed on the medal as an idle boast, and on the painting as words by which to live—and by which to die: the world does not suffice.

Van Mander’s mention of a “death’s head” by De Gheyn in the collection of one Reynier Antonissen in Amsterdam has generally been connected with the present picture (see Refs.), but has also been thought to refer to a less complex composition, in part because a probably much simpler vanitas painting by Abraham Bloemaert, in the collection of Jacques Razet in Amsterdam, was described by Van Mander as “a death’s head with other additional things, very well executed and colored.”40 It has also been suggested that De Gheyn might have painted the picture for the Middelburg mintmaster Melchior Wytgens, which is plausible, although Van Mander, as a friend of Wytgens, might have known that he owned the work in time to cite it in the Schilder-Boecx of 1604.

If De Gheyn made this unusual work for a particular patron, which seems likely, then a strong candidate would be Prince Maurits. The artist was a member of the Stadholder’s social circle in The Hague, and in the same year, 1603, was commissioned by him to paint a life-size portrait of the Spanish horse that was captured at the Battle of Nieuwpoort (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).41 Trophies of war, such as captured flags, ships, and so on, were always of keen interest to the prince. De Gheyn’s design for a medal commemorating Maurits’s victory at the Battle of Nieuwpoort (1600) was mentioned above. The horse picture has also been compared with the artist’s work on two suites of engravings, The Riding School, or Exercise of Cavalry (1598–99) and the Exercise of Arms (published in 1607–8; see the biography above), “all of them connected with the victorious army.”42 The sweetest victories were...
those that brought a large wind fall of funds, since finances were a constant problem during the struggle for independence, and taking silver, gold, or salable goods directly from the enemy (who also found the war expensive) was like doubling the advantage.14

It may be assumed that Prince Maurits received one of the Zeeland medals, or a number of them, in addition to his 100,000-guilder share of the booty seized in 1602. In addition to the Nieuwpoort medal of 1600, there were many others: in the 1590s and early 1600s, medals were minted nearly every year to celebrate army and navy victories over Spain, a number of them showing Maurits's portrait or his figure in action.15 Unfortunately, not all the circumstantial evidence in favor of Maurits as the first owner of the vanitas still life can be supported or overruled by contemporaneous documents or accounts. At the prince's death in 1625, there was no need for an inventory of his household goods, since his half brother, Prince Frederick Hendrick, was his sole heir.16 Frederick Hendrick was a major patron and a man of very different tastes, so that it is possible that a painting owned by his deceased predecessor could have left the princely collections without leaving a trace. However, there are many other possibilities. In De Gheyn's circle during the early 1600s, and in the Dutch art world as a whole, meditations on the fragility of life and the certainty of death were commonplace, in reflection of the times.

No copies of this painting are known. At least two drawings by De Gheyn relate to the composition. One depicts three flowers, dated 1601, from which the tulip is repeated here, and the other (of about 1602) represents Democritus and Heraclitus seated to either side of a small sphere.17 In the latter, the gestures are quite like those in the painting and the poses are similar, but the figures do not lean on a support and the facial types differ.

1. According to Miedema in Van Mander/Miedema 1994–99, vol. 6, p. 49, the painting cited by Van Mander is the one in New York, and "Reynier Antonissen" was "possibly the book-seller Reyer Antonis, who in 1605 made a declaration relating to two small paintings by Jacques Savery."

2. The print reproduces a drawing by De Gheyn, Allegory of Transience, signed and dated 1599 (British Museum, London). De Gheyn is traditionally assumed to have engraved his own design. See Van Regeraten Altena 1983, vol. 2, pp. 52–53, no. 204. In the print, the standing figures of a peasant and an emperor appear as corpses in the foreground, showing that all stations of mankind come to the same end. Another interesting case of the "Homo Bulla" motif is the painting of a naked child blowing a soap bubble on the back of Cornelis Ketel's round Portrait of a Man, dated 1574 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). See Haak 1967, pp. 26, 30, fig. 8, and Van Thiel et al. 1976, p. 315.

3. On the transparent sphere as a symbol of the world, see Terverent 1958–59, cols. 362–63, and Bergström 1970a, p. 153 n. 30 (with additional literature); as a vanitas symbol, see Möller 1953. Haak 1967, pp. 28–30, fig. 6, discusses Maarten van Heemskerck's Portrait of a Man, of about 1645 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), in which the sitter points to a transparent sphere that he holds in his other hand. In the sphere are images of the seasons, which, as the inscription in a cartouche suggests, fly by like light and dark, meaning day and night.

4. As discussed at length in Blankert 1967, and Lurie 1979. See also Weisbach 1928. Martin Luther, in his letter to Nicolas Arndsoff, published as an appendix to De Servo Arbitrio (The Bondage of the Will), 1525, condemns Erasmus as "a plain Democritus or Epicurus, a crafty derider of Christ."

5. See Bergström 1970a, pp. 151–52, fig. 11. Compare the engraving by Crispijn van de Passe, catalogued in Blankert 1967, pp. 115–16, no. 87, fig. 42.


7. These quotations expand upon those offered in Walsh 1974a, pp. 341–42.

8. Bergström 1970a, p. 154. See also Koozin 1989, p. 28, where the "ideas of resurrection and redemption" are said to "appear metaphorically as the fallen grains underneath the skull."

9. See Bergström 1970a, p. 154, figs. 8, 13. The first is fig. 14 here, the second De Gheyn's drawing of about 1595, Vanitas Allegory (Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; Van Regeraten Altena 1983, vol. 2, p. 53, no. 205), in which a naked child sits with a mirror and a cut flower surrounded by a skull, a smoking urn, and a cornstalk dropping seeds on the ground.


11. Ibid., p. 112, compares objects in De Gheyn's sphere with those in the engraving after Van Heemskerck, and p. 153, on objects in the sphere "which do not occur in the 1557 engraving."

12. The swords point toward the top of the crown, like minute hands pointing to the numbers 11 and 1 on a clock. The hilts differ, the one on the left having a crossbar ("guard") not indicated in Bergström 1970a, fig. 5. Of the two lower, crossed swords he detected, the only remaining trace is a faint line at ten o'clock, perhaps the point of a sword.

13. There is a small, heart-shaped blob of lead white, nearly effaced by craquelure, directly above the crown. According to Bergström (ibid., p. 152), De Gheyn repeated the motif of moneybag and crown from the lower right corner of the engraving after Van Heemskerck.

14. In Van Regeraten Altena 1983, vol. 2, p. 15 (under no. 11), the "flaming heart pierced by an arrow," considered "to belong to a category of reality different from all the other images shown inside the glass," evidently because it is (according to the writer), like the window, a reflection of something outside the sphere. Without much explanation, the heart is called a sign of Christian redemption. Bergström (1970a, p. 153) understood the burning heart as "an image of earthly love, of luxury," meaning desire, and observes that in De Gheyn's painting of a provocative Venus and an aggressive Cupid, perhaps of about 1604–15 (Rijksmuseum,

25. Bergström 1970a, p. 152. On this noisemaker, see the discussion of Jan Steen's The Dissolute Household (Pl. 196), below. Conservator Dorothy Mahon was extremely helpful in tracing the evidence of motifs in the sphere.


27. On the heart, see note 14 above. In Bergström 1970a, p. 152 n. 24, De Gheyn's engraving Three Drunken Men at a Table is mentioned because there is such a gibbet in the background. There is also an hourglass in the foreground. The point is that drinking soon leads to a bad end.


29. The obverse is illustrated in Bernhart 1919, p. 92, no. 230, fig. 22 (example in Vienna). The inscriptions on both sides are transcribed. In Van der Meer 2004, p. 27 n. 6, it is said, on another scholar's authority, that the only known example of the coin is in the Cabinet des Médailles, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, but this must be mistaken. In the same note, it is said that De Gheyn corrected a fault in the inscription on the reverse, but the present writer finds no difference from the transcription given in Bernhart 1919, p. 92, no. 230, fig. 22.

30. See Bergström 1970a, pp. 143–44, nn. 3, 4, and Van der Meer 2004, pp. 19, 26. Bergström mistakenly refers to a 10-ducat rather than a 100-ducat goldpiece, and Van der Meer describes the 8 real coin incorrectly as silver rather than gold. Dutch imitations of the English noble were common. The coin shows a primitive image of Edward IV (r. 1461–83), with a shield, in a small ship. Bergström (ibid.) wasindebted for his identification of coins and medals to a letter dated February 14, 1669, from H. Enno van Gelder, director of the Koninklijk Kabinet van Munten, Penningen en Gesneden Stenen, The Hague. Van der Meer (see 2004, p. 27 n. 9) referred to a copy of the same letter, as did the present writer (copies in Leiden, and in the Museum files). In a letter to the writer dated September 9, 2003, Van der Meer described all of the late Dr. Enno van Gelder's identifications as "still valid," and added that De Gheyn was evidently "not aiming at absolute accuracy," especially in the inscriptions.

31. For the present portion, see Van der Meer 2004, pp. 19, 24, 28 n. 12.

32. For example, on the analogy of equitation, Bernardo de Vargas Machuca (1537–1622), in the introduction to his Teoría y ejercicio de la jineta (Madrid, 1619), observes that "great princes of all nations have tresured the name of Philip as a friend of the horse."

33. Presumably, this pursuit is promised by the motto "Quo saltas inssequar," which the writer has not found in a classical source. It recalls Ruth 1:16, in which the widow Ruth expresses loyalty to her widowed mother-in-law, Naomi: "for where thou goest, I will go" (kindly brought to my attention by Frima Hofrichter). However, the use of the motto as an expression of loyalty to Zeeland or the United Provinces is not known.

34. These quotes are from Juvenal and Persius 1918, pp. 191ff. Juvenal refers specifically to Alexander's death in Babylon, after pushing his army to geographical extremes.

35. This was H. Enno van Gelder's personal suggestion to Bergström, acknowledged in Bergström 1970a, p. 143 n. 3. On De Gheyn's design of the Nieupoort medal, which was commissioned by the States General late in 1600, see Van Regteren Altena 1983, vol. 1, pp. 63–64, fig. 50 (the medal itself, which features the triumphant prince on horseback), vol. 2, p. 40, no. 149, vol. 3, pl. 157, and Amsterdam 2000–2001, pp. 218–220, no. 63.


39. For the historical circumstances, see Israel 1991, chaps. 7–12. A brief sketch of the relationship between the Netherlands and the Spanish kings is found in New York–London 2001, pp. 25–26. Left unexplained here, and by earlier authors, is the inclusion of the gold noble of Edward IV. The fifteenth-century king had no special connection with the Netherlands. Perhaps, in this case, money is merely money, or a tribute to England, allies of the Dutch. Imitations of English nobles, including this one, were made by the Dutch through the early 1600s, with inscriptions clarifying their places of origin (Van der Meer 2004, p. 27 n. 8, citing more specialized literature). It should be noted that Edward IV is shown with a shield sailing in a ship, thus suggesting a naval victory (like that of the Zeeland ships in 1602, or of the English navy over the Spanish Armada in 1588).


41. See Van der Meer 2004, p. 26, crediting M. L. Wurbain with this suggestion, and relating it to the legal claims of the Italian merchant Francesco Carletti, who had consigned valuable cargo to the seized Portuguese ship. Wurbain also discusses the possibility of Wyntgen's patronage in letters to the present writer dated May 10 and October 22, 2002.

42. Van Regteren Altena 1983, vol. 1, pp. 74–76, vol. 2, p. 17, no. 15; Amsterdam 2000–2001, pp. 234–35, no. 81. In the latter publication, pp. 144, 298, it is suggested that De Gheyn's Staatd Venus with Cupid, of about 1623–4 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), was also owned by Mauritius.

43. Van Regteren Altena 1983, vol. 2, p. 17 (under no. 15, The White Stallion). Van Mander 1604, fol. 294v, cites the horse painting commissioned by Mauritius, but not a variaus still life made for him. However, his information was almost always incomplete and what he chose to include selective, and the panel (no matter where it was) may have been painted too late in 1653 for mention in a publication of the following year.

44. The most famous case is Admiral Piet Hein's capture of a Spanish treasure fleet off Cuba in 1628. This brought in 11 million guilders, and was a tremendous blow to the Spanish crown. Large Spanish flags hung over Hein's tomb in Delft, as seen in
paintings of the 1650s. See New York—London 2001, pp. 24, 204, 442–14, no. 82, fig. 117.

35. See Amsterdam 2000–2001, pp. 214–21, nos. 49–67. A few of these medals are of special interest here: the silver-gilt medal of 1588 commemorating English and Dutch collaboration in defeating the Spanish Armada (ibid., no. 49); the silver medal of 1597 in remembrance of the Battle of Turnhout (no. 59), with an inscription noting that thirty-nine Spanish flags had been captured (and hung in the Great Hall, or Knight’s Hall, of the court buildings at The Hague); the Canary Islands’ gold medal of 1599 (no. 61), showing Mauritius as General Admiral of the Fleet, with a figure of Fortune on the reverse (a thousand Dutch were lost); De Gheyn’s Nieuwpoort medal of 1600, with an equestrian portrait of Mauritius (no. 63); the 1602 medal commissioned by the States General to mark three victories of that year (no. 64), at Grave, at Tongeren (more flags captured), and at sea (six Spanish ships sunk or captured); the medal marking the defeat of Spinola’s ships in 1603 (no. 65).

36. On this point, see ibid., pp. 142–43.


REFERENCES:
Van Mander 1604, fol. 1944, refers to a painting (possibly this one) as “een door cop die t’Amsterdam by Reynier Antonissen te zien is” (a death’s head which is to be seen in Amsterdam with Reynier Antonissen); Van Mander 1618, p. 128 (repeats Van Mander 1604); Greve 1903, p. 223, records the reference in Van Mander 1604; Van Regeraten Altena 1935, p. 24, cites the reference in Van Mander 1604; Bergström 1936, p. 161, mentions the reference in Van Mander 1604; Merrill 1960, p. 9, notes the reference in Van Mander 1604; Bergström in Stockholm 1967, pp. 47–48, no. 53 (ill. p. 50), describes the composition and mentions Van Mander’s reference to such a picture in 1604; Bergström 1970a, passim, recalls the circumstances (in 1666–67) of discovering that the work is by De Gheyn, describes the composition, identifies the symbolic motifs and several of the coins, relates earlier prints and drawings by De Gheyn, considers the painting to be the earliest dated independent picture of its kind, and notes the apparent reference to it in Van Mander 1604; Bergström 1970b, pp. 12–13, 15, fig. 3, describes the work as one of the most interesting paintings in the Leiden “Vanitas” exhibitions of 1970; Bergström in Leiden 1970, unpagd (first and third pages of his essay), refers to the tulip in the picture, and in the catalogue section, pp. 10–11, no. 12, summarizes the remarks made in Bergström 1970a; Wurfbain in ibid., unpagd (first and second pages of his essay), briefly discusses whether this is the painting cited by Van Mander in 1604; Fischer 1972a, p. 65, mentions the work in a discussion of vanitas imagery; Judson 1973, pp. 18, 38, 42 n. 17, relates the painting to De Ghayn’s drawing of Democritus and Heraclitus (see text above), and doubts that this is the picture described by Van Mander which “must have been executed prior to 1603–1604”; Popper-Voskuil 1973, p. 68, suggests that a painting by David Bailly may have been inspired by this work; Walsh 1974a, pp. 341–42, 349 n. 3, fig. 3, announces the picture’s purchase by the MMA, describes it as “the earliest developed Vanitas painting,” compares the niche in Titian’s Entombment, identifies the “straw” (Bergström) below the skull as “The grass [that] withereth” (Isa. 40:6–7), cites two other biblical sources, and in other respects follows Bergström 1970a in explaining the composition; MMA 1975, p. 95 (ill.), as “perhaps the earliest Vanitas still life,” Voskuil-Popper 1976, p. 74 n. 28, refers to the images of Democritus and Heraclitus in the picture as standing for the motto “A time to laugh and a time to weep,” sees the responses of the philosophers to the world as reflected in the division of the composition into a brighter side and a darker side, with a flower on one side and smoke on the other, and discusses the coins; Bergström et al. 1977, p. 31, refers to a print inspired by the iconography of the painting; Chastel 1978, p. 26, fig. 8, reflects on man’s mortality and illustrates a quote from Malraux with this picture; Fleezen-Stoll 1979, pp. 243–44, 250 (in English summary), fig. 16, sees De Ghayn (not David Bailly) as the originator of vanitas painting in Leiden, on the evidence of this work; Becker in Münster–Baden-Baden 1979–80, pp. 455, 458, mistakenly describes the painting as by De Ghayn’s father, and compares a later work by Pieter van Roostraeten; Klemm in ibid., pp. 194–96, 199 (ill.), 202–6, summarizes the symbolism and compares the later use of a “soap bubble or glass sphere” by Jan de Heem; Veca in Bergamo 1981, pp. 64–65, fig. 75, cites the panel as the first vanitas painting, and compares images of skulls on the backs of earlier Flemish portraits; Bergström 1982, p. 175, mentions the tulip as a symbol of transience; De Jongh in Amsterdam 1982, p. 206, fig. 41d, mistakenly as in “Stockholm, private collection”; Segal in Amsterdam–Ven Hertogenbosch 1982, p. 31, imagines that Jan Brueghel “took the idea” of coins from this painting; Welu 1982, pp. 32–34, fig. 9, discusses the picture’s meaning; Van Regeraten Altena 1983, vol. 1, pp. 84–85, 177 n. 14, describes the painting’s style and iconography, and considers it the one cited in Van Mander 1604, and vol. 2, pp. 15 no. 11, 38 (under no. 136), 130 (under no. 815), 142 (under no. 914), and vol. 3, p. 15, pl. 3, slightly refines the iconographic reading advanced in Bergström 1970a, and considers three drawings by De Ghayn, one of Heraclitus and Democritus, one of three flowers, and one of a skull, to have been adopted in the painting; Haak 1984, pp. 118, 126–28, fig. 218, cites the tulip as “a favorite emblem of human mortality,” and the picture as possibly that cited in Van Mander 1604; Der Kuijle 1985, pp. 32–33, 35, fig. 11, as “the earliest known Vanitas,” reviews the symbolic motifs, and cites the work as a likely influence on David Bailly and other vanitas still-life painters in Leiden; Rotterdam–Washington 1985–86, p. 55 (under no. 28), catalogues the drawing of Democritus and Heraclitus used for the figures in the painting; Segal in Cologne–Utrecht 1985–86, pp. 57, 64 no. 13, compares a painting by Roelant Savery dated 1603; P. Sutton 1986, p. 190, cites the picture, “the earliest vanitas in existence,” as “one of the most important if not best-preserved still lifes in the [Museum’s] collection”; Brels 1987, pp. 260–62, fig. 328, interprets the image as presenting a choice between material and spiritual values; Kuretsky 1987, pp. 85–86, fig. 3, notes the vase with a striped tulip and a rose as a symbol of mortality; Koozin 1989, pp. 28, 30, fig. 8, interprets the figures of philosophers, the bubble, and the straw beneath the skull; Segal 1989, pp. 19–20, 65, considers the work as “the basis of a great tradition,” and inexpressibly considers the “coins with portraits of the Roman Catholic couple Charles and Johanna of Aragon” to be evidence of De Ghayn’s direct contact with Antwerp; Liedtke 1990, p. 55, cites the work as a postwar acquisition; Olbrich and Möbius 1990, p. 246, pl. xxi11, begins a brief discussion of Dutch vanitas still lifes with this work; Bergström in Caen–Paris 1990–91, pp. 50–
32, fig. 6, describes the composition, diagrams the symbols in the bubble, and compares the symmetry of the image with that found in allegorical prints; Foucart in ibid., p. 36, fig. 1, in a passage rife with superficial aperçus and exclamation points, considers the picture to represent a "vanitas-type of the years 1600–10"; Tapié in ibid., p. 242, mistakes De Heem for De Gheyn as the painting's author; P. Sutton in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 104, notes the purchase; S. Alexandre 1991, pp. 54, 59 n. 23, fig. 3, describes the iconography and raises the question of whether this picture can really be described as a still life; Leistra in The Hague 1991, p. 106, fig. 1 (under no. 25), cited as the earliest independent vanitas painting; Roethlisberger 1991, pp. 22, 26 n. 14, mentions the picture as close in time to a vanitas painting by Abraham Bloemaert; Walford 1991, p. 215 n. 21, considers the meaning of the wheel seen in the sphere; Kortenhorst-von Bogendorf Rapprath in Haarlem–Worcester 1993, p. 216, mentions the tulip as a symbol of human mortality; Roethlisberger 1993, vol. 1, p. 102 (under no. 55), cites the painting in connection with Bloemaert's painting of a "skull with other motifs," which was cited by Van Mander in 1604; Amsterdam 1994, pp. 15, 17, fig. 10, suggests that the coins symbolize the material world of mankind and worldly power; Van Mander/Miedema 1994–99, vol. 1 (1994), pp. 436–37, fol. 294v, reproduces Van Mander's text of 1604 and gives an English translation; Baetjer 1995, p. 296; Cavalli-Björkman in Stockholm 1995, pp. 140, 230, "usually referred to as the earliest free-standing Vanitas composition"; Gemar-Koelepsch 1995, vol. 2, pp. 376–77, no. 135/1 (ill.), gives basic catalogue information; Hazis J. van Miegroet, "Vanitas," in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 31, pp. 881–82, fig. 1, cites the work as one of the earliest independent vanitas still-life paintings and describes the composition; E. K. J. Reznicek in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 12, p. 332, mentioned, as Allegory of Mortality; Van Mander/Miedema 1994–99, vol. 6 (1999), p. 49, fig. 41, identifies the painting called "eene doos cop" by Van Mander with the Museum's picture, describes the composition, and compares a painting of a "skull with other subsidiary elements" ("een doochoof met ander byvoegselen") by Abraham Bloemaert, which was then (1604) with the Amsterdam collector Jacques Razer (probably the composition recorded in an engraving by Jan Saenredam); Schama 1999a, p. 709 n. 15, refers to the tulip in the painting as "an emblem of both mortality and remembrance"; Amsterdam–Cleveland 1999–2000, pp. 140–41, fig. 159, compares the work with the Museum's own vanitas still life by Pieter Claesz (Pl. 28); Van der Meer 2004, pp. 17–19, 25–27, fig. 1, identifies the coins and a medal of 1602 in the painting, considers their possibly topical significance, and reviews the question of patronage in this light; Klemm in Haarlem–Zurich–Washington 2004–5, pp. 79–80, fig. 4, places the painting in a historical context, comparing works by Abraham Bloemaert and Cornelis Ketel, and summarizes the picture as "both a step forwards, towards standardizing the level of reality depicted, and a step backwards, with the whole image being presented as an emblematic theater piece instead of as a possible reality."


Jan van Goyen
Leiden 1596–1656 The Hague

Born in Leiden on January 13, 1596, Jan Josephsz van Goyen was the son of a Catholic shoemaker who took an interest in painting and drawing. According to Jan Orlers' Beschrijvinge der stadt Leydens (Description of Leiden; 1641), Van Goyen studied with four minor painters in Leiden and then for about two years with the obscure Willem Gerritsz (Gerrit Willemsz?) in Hoorn. Orlers is also the only source for the information that Van Goyen returned to Leiden (about 1614?), traveled in France for a year, and then went to Haarlem, where about 1617 he entered the studio of Esaias van de Velde (1587–1630). This influential landscape painter, draftsman, and etcher was Van Goyen's only significant teacher. In the late 1610s and 1620s, Van de Velde made chalk drawings and painted compositions that clearly influenced Van Goyen's first subjects and his early style. The tonal manner adopted by Van Goyen and Pieter de Molijn (q.v.) about 1625–27, and by Salomon van Ruysdael (q.v.) shortly thereafter, may also have been influenced by the technique's recent introduction in seascapes by Jan Porcellis (before 1584–1632).

On August 8, 1618, Van Goyen married Annaert Willemse van Raelst in Leiden, where he bought a house in 1625 (which was sold to Porcellis in 1629), and where he was often cited in documents dating from 1627 to 1632. About 1630, Constantijn Huygens, secretary to the Prince of Orange and a well-known connoisseur, mentioned Van Goyen as one of a few landscape painters with exceptional reputations. Perhaps the prospect of support from patrons like Huygens encouraged Van Goyen's move to The Hague in the spring or summer of 1632.

Except for sketching trips, Van Goyen remained in the court city for the rest of his life. He became a citizen of The Hague in 1634, and was hoofdman (headman) of the painters' guild in 1638 and in 1640. The purchase of a house on the Veerkade in 1635 and the construction of two houses on the Dune Bierkade in 1636 (Paulus Potter lived in one of them from 1649 to 1652) indicate that, as in Leiden, Van Goyen invested in property. Nevertheless, at his death on April 27, 1656, he was heavily in debt. He famously lost money in the tulipomania of the 1630s. One of Van Goyen's more successful ventures, at least financially, was the very large view of The Hague that he painted in 1650–51 for the Burgomasters' Chamber of the Town Hall.

Van Goyen traveled widely in the Netherlands, sketching views of places as distant as Cleve and Emmerich (early 1640s) as well as Antwerp and Brussels (1648), and as familiar as Haarlem, Leiden, and Delft. In August 1634, he was fined by the painters' guild of Haarlem for producing pictures locally, in the house of Isaac van Ruysdael (the brother of Salomon van Ruysdael and father of Jacob van Ruysdael); works by Van Goyen were sold at auction in Haarlem in 1634 and 1636. Paintings of the 1630s by Salomon van Ruysdael and by Van Goyen reveal many similarities, suggesting that the latter, who is often considered a Haarlem painter, maintained close contacts with landscapists there.

Van Goyen had three daughters, one of whom married Jan Steen (q.v.) and another Jacques de Claeuw (1623–1694 or later), a still-life painter from Dordrecht. About 1661–63, Steen may have portrayed Van Goyen and members of his family in a fancy interior (Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City). Gerard ter Borch (q.v.) painted a small portrait of Van Goyen around 1653 (Collections of the Princes of Liechtenstein, Vaduz), which was engraved about 1680 by Carel de Moor.

Van Goyen was an extremely prolific artist; approximately twelve hundred paintings and more than one thousand drawings by him are known. Nicolaes Berchem (q.v.) was his pupil, but his influence is more obvious in the work of some forty followers.

3. See ibid., pp. 35, 73, on chalk drawings, and pp. 32, 45, 56, 67, 74, on subjects and compositional patterns adopted by Van Goyen from Van de Velde. Wurfbain 1981, pp. 16–18, considers it possible that the landscapist Coenraet van Schilkeroort, Van Goyen's first teacher, also made an impression on him.
4. See Gudlaugsson 1965, p. 729; Gifford’s essay, “Jan van Goyen en de techniek van het naturalistische landschap” in Leiden 1966–97, pp. 70–79; Shuijt in ibid., p. 45; and Vogelaar in ibid., p. 18. On Porcelettes, see Walsh 1974b. Other marine painters are brought into consideration by Margarita Russell, in London 1986a, pp. 63–71. For literature on the question of whether market forces influenced the use of a comparatively economical technique, see Liedke 2003, p. 29 n. 12.


6. Huygens 1917, p. 73. On Huygens’s list of landscapists, see Keyes 1984, p. 13, where J. A. Worp’s dated translation from the Latin diary is used.

7. Huygens thought highly of Esaías van de Velde, who became a resident of The Hague in 1618, and died there in November 1650. Beck 1972–73, vol. 1, p. 17, repeats Vorenkamp’s implausible idea that Van Goyen may have gone to The Hague in search of religious tolerance.


11. Van Goyen is treated as a central figure in London 1986a, which is devoted to landscape painting in Haarlem and Amsterdam in 1590–1650.

12. Beck 1972–73, vol. 1, p. 18, dates the canvas to about 1650, which is impossible for several reasons. Two of the women may be Van Goyen’s daughters; his third daughter appears to have died in 1632 (see ibid., p. 25, no. 22, on Elggen van Goyen, and p. 30, doc. 11, for the record of a daughter being buried at The Hague). The painting’s subject is discussed by Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, no. 58, and in Westermann 1997, pp. 268–70. The latter suggests that the late Van Goyen and his wife (who would be the seated woman) are both shown in the prime of their lives, a convention known from other Dutch portraits. However, Dudok van Heel 2006, pp. 312–13 n. 112, maintains that Steen shows himself and four of his children with a patron, Gerrit Schouten.


49. Sandy Road with a Farmhouse

Oil on wood, 12¼ x 16¼ in. (30.8 x 41.3 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left corner): 1 V GOYEN 1627

The landscape portion of the painting is well preserved. However, the area of the sky has suffered many small flake losses throughout, and there is a series of paint losses along a scratch that extends vertically next to the trees at left, a 1½ in. (3.8 cm) vertical loss above the cottage, and a 1½ in. diagonal scratch in the lower part of the trees at left. The oak panel retains its original thickness, with bevels intact.

Bequest of Myra Mortimer Pinter, 1972–1972.25

This small panel was painted in Leiden in 1627, a year in which Van Goyen produced an impressive number of paintings and drawings, including a sketchbook. Both the subject and the compositional type, with its diagonal road and wedge-shaped repousoir, are found frequently in the artist’s oeuvre from the late 1620s to about 1640. Works by Van Goyen like the present picture influenced his contemporary Peeter de Molijn (q.v.; see Pl. 125), the slightly younger Salomon van Ruysdael (q.v.), and other landscapists in the area of Haarlem and Amsterdam.²

The rugged oak on the left is one of the painter’s standard motifs; similar survivors from the windswept dunes near the Dutch coast are placed prominently in paintings dating from his earliest years. An almost leafless tree trunk is set slightly deeper in space, framing a distant church tower. The recession through the middle ground is clarified by the comparative scale of the two resting figures and that of the man in the distance walking with a dog, while weathered farm buildings stand out in the late-afternoon sun. The dark clouds passing through the blue sky recall an observation made by Max Friedländer that a view by Van Goyen usually promises rain, whereas in scenes by Van Ruysdael the clouds have retreated, driven off by a fresh breeze.³

The Museum’s picture dates from about the time that Van Goyen first employed a tonal palette and Baroque compositional designs, as is evident from comparisons with his more
colorful but less theatrically staged works of about 1624–26. Paintings dating from 1628 through the early 1630s reveal many of the same devices, especially the division of terrain into contrasting areas. But the pattern used here was promptly transformed into subtler arrangements, usually in broader vistas with more diffused effects of light and atmosphere.

The care with which Van Goyen composed works of this type is also clear from his sketchbook of 1627, which comprises about fifty ideas for paintings (not sketches) recorded “from life.” For this type of design, the artist was indebted to his teacher Esaaias van de Velde (1587–1610), who anticipates the present picture in a drawing of about 1616 (fig. 59). However, Van Goyen eschews his master’s fondness for graceful motifs in favor of more rugged forms. Their tactile qualities are emphasized to both descriptive and artistic effect, as in the sunlit grass that flows like seaweed over the sandy ground.

Although rich in observations made out of doors, landscapes like this one are very much products of the studio. The subject of bucolic cottages flourished in Holland during the early seventeenth century and was encouraged by literature celebrating the supposed pleasures of a simple life lived on the land. While contemporary poets such as G. A. Bredero and P. C. Hooft looked back to Horace and Virgil, painters and printmakers continued a tradition that effectively began in Antwerp with artists like the Master of the Small Landscapes, whose series of fourteen landscape engravings published in 1559 is described on the title print as images of “Many and very attractive locations of various country cottages, farmsteads, fields, roads, and the like.” The Amsterdam draftsman, engraver, and publisher Claes Jansz Visscher (1587–1652) brought out an edition of the Small Landscapes in 1612, and numerous other series of landscape prints (after drawings by Visscher, Jan van de Velde, Abraham Bloemaert, and other Dutch artists) were published during the 1610s and 1620s. The contemporary appreciation of these many works of art is a complicated subject, but it is certain that pictures like Sandy Road with a Farmhouse were extremely popular in their own time and more evocative in meaning than most later viewers would imagine.

1. Beck 1987, p. 284, lists twenty-two paintings by Van Goyen bearing the date 1627. Other pictures painted in that year may be lost or not dated. Drawings dating from 1637 include those catalogued in Beck 1972–73, vol. 1, as nos. 63–88, and in Beck 1987 as nos. 62a–88.
2. See Liedtke 2003, and the extensive literature cited there in the notes.
5. Keyes 1984, no. D174, fig. 71, which the author considers a “companion piece” to D171, dated 1616.


Ex Coll.: Myra Mortimer Pinter, New York (d. 1972); Bequest of Myra Mortimer Pinter, 1972 1972.25
50. View of Haarlem and the Haarlemmer Meer

Oil on wood, 13½ x 19½ in. (34.6 x 50.5 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): VG 1646

The painting is well preserved. The sky is thinly painted, and with age the dark horizontal grain of the oak panel has become more prominent. The foreground, which is more thickly built up, has not suffered to the same degree.

Purchase, 1871 71.62

Van Goyen's sweeping view of the Haarlemmer Meer is one of the finest paintings acquired in the 1871 Purchase and remains among the most admired Dutch pictures in the Museum, not least by visitors from the Netherlands. Tributes have ranged from academic recognition of the work's place in the development of panoramic landscape painting to the patriotic verse ("my land lay still and wide") of a famous Dutch aviator who lived in New York during World War II.¹

The Haarlemmer Meer (Haarlem Sea) was an inland body of fresh water (reclaimed in the nineteenth century) that extended from near Haarlem east to below Amsterdam; south to Warmond, near Leiden; and north to the inlet IJ, which led to the Zuiderzee and the North Sea.²

On the horizon is the unmistakable profile of Saint Bavo's, the Grote Kerk of Haarlem. This familiar motif would lead one to assume that the view is to the north, and that the billowing clouds are blowing in from the coast beyond the trees in the left background. Such a panorama might have been recorded from the towers of Heemstede Castle, although the viewpoint seems even more elevated here.

In fact, Van Goyen based the composition on two of seven sheets in the Bredius sketchbook of 1644 that record panoramic views from a vantage point high in the bell tower of Saint Bavo's.³ Page 20 of the sketchbook (fig. 60) corresponds very approximately to the left two-thirds of the Museum's picture, which Van Goyen presumably painted in The Hague about two years later. In the drawing, the view is to the south and slightly southeast, just the opposite of what one might think when viewing the final work. Heemstede Castle with its two towers is visible, in the sketch, in the right background, and, in the painting, near the sailboat at right center. Like a signpost for the general area, Saint Bavo's was arbitrarily placed on the horizon (as was the church tower farther to the right).

The waterway that meanders back through the middle ground is the river Spaarne, which grew considerably wider as it flowed southward to the Haarlemmer Meer. The Meer itself appears in the background of the sketch, and more ambiguously in the painting, where the large body of water begins at the beacon breaking the horizon in the center of the view.

The entire foreground of the painting is invented. This area, which would have encompassed many houses on the south side of Haarlem, was left blank in the sketch. The windmills and smoking limekiln in the painting appear to have been inspired by similar motifs found in another drawing in

Figure 60. Jan van Goyen, Bird's-eye View of the Environs of Haarlem (page 20 of the Bredius sketchbook), 1644. Private collection, on loan to the Museum Bredius, The Hague
Figure 61. Jan van Goyen, *Two Bird’s-eye Views of the Environs of Haarlem* (page 21 of the Bredius sketchbook), 1644. Private collection, on loan to the Museum Bredius, The Hague.
the Bredius sketchbook, namely, that on the bottom half of the following page (fig. 61). In that sketch, the Spaarne recedes westward to the right edge of the composition, and then bends back toward the southeast and the distant Haarlemmer Meer. 6

As in so many pictures with more or less recognizable topography, it was the overall impression or spirit of the place that appealed to Van Goyen. Reproductions cannot convey the pleasure of viewing the painting itself, where one's enjoyment of the scenery is greatly enhanced by the imaginary foreground. A couple sits by the winding road, beyond which the land flows down to cattle and haystacks and to the water, where a few fishermen and a number of boats invite one to wander along Holland's countless waterways. The overwhelming sensation on such a journey is the experience of endless sky, to which Van Goyen devotes nearly four-fifths of the picture, despite the originally downward point of view.

Study of the Bredius sketchbook helps one appreciate the present painting's relationship to earlier panoramic views, for the full-page compositions in particular (for example, fig. 60) bear a remarkable resemblance to such pioneering works as Hendrick Goltzius's well-known drawings of 1603, which represent dune landscapes near Haarlem. 7 While the panoramic pictures of the 1640s cannot be connected directly with more distant antecedents like those by Hans Bol (see his small painting dated 1578 in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art), Van Goyen was clearly aware of many examples produced in and around Haarlem. The relevant material includes drawings and prints by artists such as Goltzius, Willem Buytewech, Esaias van de Velde, and Jan van de Velde; marine paintings by Hendrick Vroom; 6 and panoramic landscape paintings and drawings made during the 1630s by Vroom's son Cornelis. 7 Thus Van Goyen's panoramic landscapes (which date mostly from about 1638-47) were derived not only from his own sketches made from life but also from numerous predecessors in Haarlem, where a number of closely associated artists gradually transposed innovations made in drawings and prints to the generally more conservative medium of painting.

A review of Van Goyen's panoramic landscape paintings dating from the late 1630s onward reveals that the naturalistic impression made by the Museum's picture was achieved through artistic experience. In his most comparable landscapes and ice-skating scenes the artist either minimized or emphasized elements in the foreground, depending upon which aspect of the topography he wished to stress. 8 With respect to composition the most instructive comparisons with the present work include those found in an ice-skating scene dated 1641 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg); two panoramic landscapes of the same year (Staatliche Museum, Schwerin, and Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); a dune landscape dated 1642 (Museum der Bildenden Kunste, Leipzig); and panoramic landscapes dating from 1644 (Amsterdam), 1646 (Leipzig), and 1647 (Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton). 9

Several painters active in the area of Haarlem and Amsterdam must have been influenced by Van Goyen's panoramic landscape paintings. The most obvious example is Philips Koninck, whose earliest panoramic views date from two or three years later than this one (see Pls. 101, 102). 10 Van Goyen's View of Haarlem also looks forward to Jacob van Ruysdael's celebrated landscapes with the city in the distance beneath majestic clouds. 11

1. The untitled poem by Adriaan Viruly (1905-1986) is published in his collection De see en de overkant (Amsterdam, 1954), p. 203. Viruly's work was brought to the Museum's attention by Dr. H. Wernik of Nijmegen, who also clarified aspects of the view depicted by Van Goyen (letters of October 28, 1993, and June 15, 1994, in the curatorial files). While the panel is generally considered one of the artist's finest pictures, W. R. Valentiner suggested that it was painted by the young Aelbert Cuyp (oral opinion, June 19, 1931).

2. See the maps in Beck 1972-73, vol. 1, pp. 254, 265, and especially Jacob Colon's map of 1639, reproduced in Van der Wyck 1990, vol. 1, pp. 254-55. The saltwater Zuyder Zee (or Zuiderzee) corresponds to the modern IJsselmeer. The Roy is saltwater but was separated from the freshwater Spaarne River by the lock at Spaarndam, a village north of Haarlem.

3. See Buijsen 1993, pp. 39-44, where the sketch on page 20 (fig. 60 here) is mistakenly said to have served for the "right half of the panel" (p. 44).

4. Buijsen (ibid., p. 44) cites another picture (Beck 1987, no. 973A) in which part of the middle ground corresponds to the lower half of page 21 in the Bredius sketchbook; the last digit of the date, read as 1642, may have been retouched. Contemporary maps of Haarlem (for example, Balthasar Floris van Berckenrode's of 1643) confirm that there were mills and limekilns on the east bank of the Spaarne south of Haarlem (called the Zuider Buiten Spaarne, or "South Outer Spaarne," in this stretch of the river). As noted by Wernik (see note 1 above), the mill seen to the right of the smoking limekiln in the Museum's painting corresponds approximately in form and location to Het Tuchtthuis, an oilseed-crushing mill that was replaced by a different kind of mill around 1700. The mill in the left background may be De Kat; a limekiln was situated more or less in front of the mills (up the Spaarne) when viewed from Haarlem: see B. C. Siggers, ed., De Loop van het Spaarne: De geschiedenis van een rivier (Haarlem, 1987), pp. 104-14. 5. See Russell in London 1986a, p. 63, fig. 1, and Duparc in Cambridge-Montreal 1988, no. 34, with references to earlier literature. For two of the Goltzius drawings, see Amsterdam—
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New York—Toledo 2003, nos. 74.1, 74.2. Stechow 1966, pp. 31–49, remains the fullest survey of the panoramic landscape in Dutch art.

7. See Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, no. 113 (Cornelis Vroom’s Eavtary Viewed through a Screen of Trees, of about 1638, in a private collection), and p. 519, figs. 1, 3.
11. See The Hague–Cambridge 1981–82, nos. 44–46, for Van Ruysdael’s view of Amsterdam, its harbor, and the IJ as seen from the tower of the new Town Hall. See also Walford 1991, pp. 128–29, and, on Van Ruysdael’s distant view of Naarden, of 1647, in the Thyssen collection, Gaskell 1990, no. 86.

References: Decamps 1872, p. 436, mentions the picture, as “une symphonie vert tendre”; MMA 1872, no. 116, reports that the painting “belonged to the Burger collection. From the Muckemburg collection”; Harck 1888, p. 76, describes it as a “splendid picture in gray-green tones, excellent condition”; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 8 (1927), p. 146, no. 579, describes the composition, which he entitles View of a Broad Flat Landscape, and notes a “church reminiscent of the Groote Kerk at Haarlem”; Beck 1966, p. 14 n. 18, notes that pages 20 and 21 in the Bredius sketchbook (figs. 60 and 61 here) were drawn “from a similar viewpoint,” but that Saint Bavo’s appears on the horizon; Dobrzycka 1966, pp. 44 n. 17, 112, no. 169, fig. 117; Beck 1972–73, vol. 2, pp. 441–42, no. 980 (ill.), describes the composition and observes “a large church (Haarlem?)” on the horizon; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, observes that the painting “still recalls Hercules Seghers’s [sic] art”; P. Sutton in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 37, fig. 12, contrasts “Segers’s earlier panoramas”; Baetjer 1991, p. 306; Liedtke 1992a, pp. 156–57 n. 35, fig. 7, discusses the picture’s relation to the site and to the Bredius sketchbook of 1644; Liedtke in Timken Museum 1996, p. 102, notes that Saint Bavo’s is arbitrarily inserted on the horizon and compares Van Ruysdael’s approach; Dowell 2003, pp. 93–94, n. 215, fig. 63, considers it highly likely that the painting was owned by Thoré-Bürger; Baetjer 2004, p. 211, no. 116, gives provenance; Wiermann in Stuttgart 2005–6, pp. 136–38, no. 49, offers general remarks on the picture’s subject and execution.


Ex Coll.: Possibly Paris sale, April 16, 1811, no. 69 (FFr 102 to Este); Baron Henry de Muckemburg (d. 1861; not in his estate sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, March 12, 1870); probably Étienne-Joseph-Théophile Thoré (W. Bürger; sold ca. 1867?; d. 1869, Paris). [Léon Gauchez, Paris, with Alexis Febvre, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.62
51. The Pelkus Gate near Utrecht

Oil on wood, 14 ½ x 22 ½ in. (36.8 x 57.2 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right, on boat): vG 1646

The painting is well preserved. In the sky, the grain of the oak panel has become more prominent with age. There are a few flake losses in the water and along the bottom edge.

Gift of Francis Neilson, 1945 45.146.3

Pale yellows set off the tower and model the cumulus clouds in this blue and green river view, one of perhaps a dozen paintings by Van Goyen that feature some form of the once familiar Pelkus Gate near Utrecht. The surroundings and the other structures vary greatly in this group of pictures, suggesting that (as in literally hundreds of river views with imaginary architectural elements) the artist freely invented all but the main motif in each composition.¹

The Pelkus Gate, or Pellekussenpoort (erected 1371), was a freestanding tower on the towpath of the river Vecht between Utrecht and Muiden on the Zuiderzee. The villages of Zuilen and Weert were nearby. According to the text of Abraham Rademaker's Kabinet van Nederlandsche en Keulse Outhouden (Cabinet of Antique Monuments in the Netherlands and Cleve; 1732), the gate "belonged in former times to the old Pellekussen family, so that this gate is now commonly called the Pelkuspoort . . . of which nothing remains today."² In Van Goyen's time the Vecht was already what it is now, a meandering, canal-size waterway celebrated for picturesque views of old castles, country houses, and villages.

A recently published drawing by Van Goyen (fig. 62) shows the site of the Pelkus Gate from approximately the same direction as in the Museum's painting, where the building itself has been arbitrarily turned clockwise ninety degrees.³ The actual alignment of the gate tower is seen in Rademaker's prints and in an anonymous drawing of about 1580–1600 (fig. 63).⁴ The latter and Van Goyen's drawing, however different in style, were both evidently recorded from life, from different angles across the Vecht.⁵ In the present picture, Van Goyen has slimmed and simplified the gate tower, and added vertical accents to the step gable. It should be emphasized that the entire site bears little resemblance to the actual Vecht, which was narrow and lined with low buildings on both sides. Apart from a couple of houses at the water's edge (which correspond approximately to structures on the right in fig. 62), the other buildings are common types set down on sloping land (which is actually flat) where no such structures existed. The invented motifs include the farm building to the left, the church, the manor house with flying flags, and a second gate tower on the riverbank.

The earliest known paintings that show buildings based on

---

Figure 62. Jan van Goyen, The Pelkus Gate, ca. 1643–50. Black chalk and gray wash, 4 ½ x 6 ½ in. (10.6 x 16.3 cm). Private collection

Figure 63. Unidentified artist, The Pelkus Gate, ca. 1580–1600. Pen and brown ink, 9 ½ x 6 ⅞ in. (23.4 x 17.4 cm). Gemeentearchief, Utrecht
Figure 64. Jan van Goyen, River Landscape ("Pelikussenpoort near Utrecht"), 1648. Oil on wood, 23 ⅞ x 37 in. (64.8 x 94 cm). The Minneapolis Institute of Arts, Gift of Bruce B. Dayton.
the Pelkus Gate are two panels by Van Goyen dated 1640.7 These inventions may have depended upon some other artist’s rendering.8 The newly published drawing by Van Goyen (fig. 62) has been dated to about 1640 but could just as well date from about 1645, when other motifs found in the area of Utrecht begin to appear in the artist’s work. In four paintings dating from 1645, the Pelkus Gate is treated with comparative fidelity (as in fig. 65),8 but in two panels of 1648, in Schwerin and Minneapolis (fig. 64), and in two of the mid-1650s Van Goyen’s fancy is given freer rein.9 Altogether, the evidence, while undoubtedly incomplete, is consistent with the painter’s other views of well-known buildings in the vicinities of Arnhem, Dordrecht, Nijmegen, Rhenen, and Utrecht.10 His interest in medieval architecture flourished in the 1640s and was more romantic than archaeological.

It has been suggested that Van Goyen’s views of the Pelkus Gate and other “monuments of the Medieval past” were expressions of national pride during the 1640s, and that “it is no coincidence” that the Minneapolis picture was painted in 1648 when Dutch independence was recognized by Spain.11

Patriotic ideas would appear to be more relevant to printed views of Dutch castles dating from earlier in the century, and perhaps to some of Van Goyen’s views of more significant medieval monuments. The artist made such free use of the Pelkus Gate that its specific identity seems unimportant, and was probably insignificant to most of his fellow citizens in The Hague.12 Van Goyen’s small castles and towers, which he depicted by the hundreds (see Pls. 52, 53), reveal such an eye for picturesque detail that the attraction to him of the Pelkus Gate must have been principally its patchwork design and, to judge from the present painting, its suitability as a haven for birds (compare The Pigeon House, by Roelof van Vries; Pl. 215).13

A copy of the Museum’s picture, attributed to the eighteenth-century Dordrecht painter Abraham van Strij (1733–1826), was on the art market in 1982.14

1. About 1642, Aelbert Cuyp (q.v.) drew a faithful view of the Pelkus Gate and the river Vecht from nearly the same vantage point as Van Goyen’s in the present picture; see Washington–London–Amsterdam 2003–2, no. 49. A pictorial map of the actual site, dating from about 1630, is reproduced by Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 251, fig. 5. On Van Goyen’s similar approach in views of Nijmegen, see Pantus 1994.

2. The original Dutch text by Isaac Le Long is quoted in Stechow 1938a, p. 204. More information on the Pelkus Gate is provided by Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 251–52 (under no. 24), and by Kuretsky in Poughkeepsie–Sarasota–Louisville 2005–6, pp. 130–31 (under no. 10). In the latter catalogue entry, two drawings by Herman Safflen are reproduced, showing the gradual destruction of the gate in the mid-1670s.

3. The drawing in a Dutch private collection (fig. 62 here) was published in Von Oven 1991, and earlier in the privately printed catalogue: Bolten and Folmer-von Oven 1989, no. 73. Von Oven reports that Beck accepts the drawing, which he did not know before his last catalogue of Van Goyen’s work (Beck 1987) was published. Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 249, fig. 1, attributes a drawing of the Pelkus Gate in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (inv. no. Ao2947, under the name Anthonie Waterloo) to Van Goyen, but Peter Schatborn and others at the Rijksprentenkabinet do not consider Van Goyen or Waterloo responsible (letter from Schatborn dated June 14, 1994). In any case, it offers an “accurate notion” of the gate tower, as observed in Keyes 1991, p. 15, fig. 14.

4. The drawing of about 1660 was published by Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 251, fig. 3.

5. The map reproduced in ibid., fig. 5, makes it clear how much different views of either side of the gate tower would result. The Vecht bends about twenty-five degrees right at this point.


7. But not upon the drawings of 1620 and 1622 that are reproduced by Rademaker’s etchings: see Stechow 1938a, figs. 2, 3, and Keyes 1991, figs. 15, 16.


10. See the chart listing numbers of paintings by decade in Keyes 1991, p. 18.

11. Ibid., pp. 62, 64. Compare Schama 1987b, p. 76.

12. Keyes 1991, p. 64, stresses the building’s “original function, which was to regulate the flow of traffic along one of the main rivers of the northern Netherlands. The Vecht was hardly a strategic artery, and if the tower protected anything it was most likely the toll rights of the Pellekussen estate.

13. See also the drawings of Dutch castles made in 1646 and 1647 by Roelant Roghman, which are often quite as picturesque but which systematically survey “Noble Houses, Castles &c. located in Holland, Utrecht, Gelderland &c.” (Broos 1981, no. 51; Cambridge–Montreal 1988, no. 76; Van der Wyck 1990).


REFERENCES: Probably Hofsteede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 8 (1927), p. 200, no. 789, repeating information from the 1889 Leipzig exhibi-
tion catalogue (see below); Dobrzycka 1966, fig. 67 (not mentioned in text); Stechow 1966, p. 12, fig. 103, describes the composition of the “enchanting picture” and emphasizes that the date is 1646 not 1643; Beck 1972–73, vol. 2, p. 344, no. 765 (ill.), describes the subject; Beck 1987, p. 233, no. 763, records the copy sold in 1982 (see text above and note 14); De Meyere 1988, pp. 93, 95, fig. 33, mentions the painting among other views of the Pelkus Gate by Van Goyen; Le Bihan 1990, pp. 120–21, n. 7 (ill. [under no. 29]), compares the composition of the 1656 panel in Bordeaux; Baetjer 1995, p. 306; Liedtke 1995a, pp. 356–57 n. 31, fig. 6, places the picture in the context of other views of the Pelkus Gate by Van Goyen, and relates them to his one known drawing made at the site.

**Exhibited:** Probably Leipzig, Museum der Bildenden Künste, “Altere Meister aus sächsischem Privatbesitz,” 1889, no. 82 (same composition, support, dimensions, signature, and date), as lent by Count Luckner of Altfanken; Chicago, Ill., The Art Institute of Chicago, 1924 and 1926 (lent by Mr. and Mrs. Francis Neilson); Richmond, Va., Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 1947–51; Sarasota, Fla., John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, and Louisville, Ky., The Speed Art Museum, 2005–6, “Time and Transformation in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art,” hors cat. 1

**Ex Coll.:** Probably Count Luckner of Altfanken (in 1889, according to the 1889 exhibition catalogue cited above); private collection, Berlin (according to Wilhelm von Bode, who recommended the picture to Francis Neilson); [Van Diemen Gallery, Berlin, in 1921 (according to Francis Neilson in 1946)]; Francis Neilson, Chicago, Ill., 1921–45; Gift of Francis Neilson, 1945 45.146.3

1. The painting was lent in substitution for Van Goyen’s panel of 1648 in Minneapolis (fig. 64 here; Poughkeepsie–Sarasota–Louisville 2005–6, no. 10), which was unexpectedly withdrawn from the exhibition after the first venue in Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

---

*Figure 65.* Jan van Goyen, *Ice Skating before the Tower and Walls of a City, 1645.* Oil on wood, 26 x 38 ¼ in. (66 x 97 cm). Palais des Beaux-Arts, Lille
52. Country House near the Water

Oil on wood, 14 3/4 x 13 in. (37.5 x 33 cm)
Signed and dated (on boat): VG 1646

The painting is well preserved. There are a few minute flake losses and some slight thinning of the paint along the wood grain in the sky. The oak panel, which has a vertical grain, retains its original thickness and beveled edges. The irregular edges of the left side and top suggest that the panel has been slightly trimmed.

The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.6

There are three paintings by Van Goyen dated 1646 in the Museum’s collection, and three demonstrating the artist’s interest in picturesque medieval architecture (see Pls. 51, 53). The present example is well preserved, which allows one to appreciate such impressive passages as the cloudy sky and the surface of the water, where the castle, the boat, and the four figures are reflected. The twisting patches of grass, the dappled leaves on the tree to the right, and the impressionistic forms in the distance are reminiscent of the chalk drawings in Van Goyen’s sketchbooks of motifs found on Holland’s country roads and waterways.

The house is the kind of small “castle” that might have appealed to the imaginations of busy burghers in The Hague, although they would certainly have preferred something less rustic and isolated, like Constantijn Huygens’s small country house, Hofwijck. The building here was called the Castle Van der Boos near Dordrecht when Friedsam owned the painting, but any attempt to identify the structure is discouraged by a brief review of similar pictures by Van Goyen and of Late Medieval Dutch châteaux. The general form is plausible, as is seen in Anthonie van Borssom’s drawing of Castle Toutenburg (see fig. 15), but the proportions are peculiar, the adjoining façades are unexpected, and the wooden addition to the second floor (compare the one on the Pelius Gate; Pl. 51) could not function in any but an artistic way (in part because of the chimney above it). The tower is generic, as a comparison with Toutenburg or with the many Dutch castles drawn by Roelant Roghman will reveal (see fig. 29).

Similar compositions depicting yet more fanciful castles were painted by Van Goyen between the early 1640s and about 1650. Nonetheless, Wilhelm Martin, director of the Mauritshuis at The Hague, on a visit to the Museum in 1938, persuaded an earlier curator that the present composition resulted when a broader panel by Van Goyen was sawn in half. The left side of the panel has in fact been slightly trimmed, but at least half the original bevel remains, and the grain of the wood runs vertically. It is true that a few contemporary pictures by Van Goyen would, if cut in half, yield a composition like this one and a rather vacant pendant. But the proportions and structure of this design are entirely characteristic of Van Goyen in the mid- to late 1640s, as many of his immediate followers—Anthony van der Croos, Frans de Hulst, Adriaen van der Kabel, Willem Koll, and others—and also later artists such as Roelof van Vries (see Pl. 215) would have known without turning the panel over.

1. For Hofwijck, see Kuyper 1980, pp. 133–34, fig. 314. On castles as scenery to be experienced on country outings, and as images of country life, see Van der Wyck 1990, vol. 2, pp. 49–50, 71–73, with references to Van Goyen.
2. This applies not only to Van Goyen (as is clarified by the identifications of subjects in Beck 1972–74 and Beck 1987), but also to the artist’s many followers who depicted imaginary medieval architecture (see Beck 1991). “Van der Boos” is perhaps an error for “Van den Bos,” but the name sounds invented in any case.
3. See the plates in Van der Wyck 1990, vol. 1, for example no. 13 (Castle Altena near Delft).
5. According to unsigned notes in the curatorial file.
7. See Beck 1991, nos. 171, 510, 1554, 594, 706, etc.


EX COLL.: Said to have come from the collection of Leopold II, king of Belgium (d. 1900); [Galerie F. Kleinberger, Paris, before 1917]; Michael Friedsam, New York (by 1917); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.6
53. Castle by a River

Oil on wood, 26 x 38 3/4 in. (66 x 97 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left, on boat): VGOYEN 1647

The painting is remarkably well preserved, although there are passages in the thinly painted sky where the wood grain has become more prominent with age. The oak panel, constructed of three horizontal boards, retains its original thickness.

Anonymous Gift, 1964. 64.65.1

In this splendidly preserved picture Van Goyen fully exploited the hardwood surface to set off the rich textures of his paint strokes, touches, and dabs. The shadowy, overgrown wall to the right, for example, is one of the most attractive areas of the painting despite its peripheral part in the composition. The work is remarkable for the warmth of its brown and yellow tones, with rose and salmon colors throughout the cloudy sky.

The subject and composition recall Van Goyen’s many views of Nijmegen, which date from 1633 to the late 1640s,1 but the fort here, with its Romanesque bell tower, improbable portals, and asymmetrical façade, is surely imaginary.2 Three figures peer over the ramparts, like tourists at Saint-Malo, looking at the fishing boats below. In the boat to the far left, two men pay out a net before a glistening sheet of water, which recedes to a pale green profile of distant farms, trees, and sailboats on the opposite shore.

Comparison with a smaller panel of the same date in Bordeaux (fig. 66) reveals the case with which Van Goyen modified architectural motifs.3 In the Bordeaux picture, the tall tower and (curiously) the other tower and the roofs within the fort recall the Oude Kerk in Delft, as seen in a drawing by Van Goyen of about 1640–45 (Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin).4

The Museum’s picture was engraved by the amateur artist and director of the Koninklijk Museum (later Rijksmuseum) in Amsterdam, Cornelis Apostool, in his series of aquatints, Beauties of the Dutch School, Selected from Interesting Pictures of Admired Landscape Painters, London, 1792–93.

2. The Romanesque tower inevitably recalls that of the much admired Mariakerk in Utrecht, which Van Goyen drew around 1645–50 (Beck 1972–73, vol. 1, nos. 665, 746; see also the more imaginary treatment in a drawing dated 1651, Beck no. 229). Van Goyen used the Mariakerk as a point of departure for paintings dated 1643, 1649(?), and 1652(?) (Beck 1972–73, vol. 2, nos. 784, 210, respectively; see no. 742 also in Beck 1987). However, the tower of the Abbey Church at Egmond, which is seen in an undated drawing by Van Goyen (Beck 1987, no. 7278), and other Romanesque towers in the Netherlands (see Vermeulen 1928–41, part 1, pls. 12, 13, 15, etc.) are equally similar to the one depicted here. The round tower at the far corner of the fort resembles that found in paintings of 1638, 1642, 1643, etc. (see Beck 1972–73, vol. 2, nos. 698, 743, 751).


Ex coll.: Private collection, England (in 1792); [possibly Christie’s, London, April 26, 1912, no. 102, called The Castle and Town of Nimwegen, a panel, 25 3/4 x 37 3/4 in. (64.1 x 95.3 cm), signed and dated 1647, LLO30 to Pawsey & Payne; before 1965, the Museum’s picture was called River Scene Nimwegen]; Sir Samuel Hoare, London (in 1944; sale, Sotheby’s, London, November 21, 1944, no. 99, for £610 to Collings); [Galerie Sanct Lucas, Vienna, 1938–before 1938]; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Neuman de Végyár, Vienna and later Greenwich, Conn. (1938–1964); Anonymous Gift, 1964. 64.65.1
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Figure 66. Jan van Goyen, *A Castle at the Water’s Edge*, 1647. Oil on wood, 19¼ x 27½ in. (49 x 69 cm). Musée des Beaux-Arts, Bordeaux
54. View of The Hague from the Northwest

Oil on wood, 26 x 37 3/8 in. (66 x 96.2 cm)
Signed and dated (at bottom, center right): VGOYEN 1647
[VG in monogram]
The painting is not well preserved. The sky is severely abraded,
and paint has been lost along the two horizontal panel joins.
There is slight abrasion throughout the landscape, a 2 in.
(5.1 cm) vertical scratch at lower left, and a 3 in. (7.6 cm)
vertical scratch at lower right.

From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of
Rita Markus, 2003 2005.331.3

In the center of the view is the Late Gothic Grote Kerk (Great
Church) of The Hague, also known as the Jacobskerk (Church
of Saint James). Its familiar profile, with the choir rising well
above the nave, could be recognized from considerable
distances. The same may be said for the two churches of Delft,
which appear in the right background just to the right of four
windmills. The taller tower on the horizon is that of the
Nieuwe Kerk, close to which is the small tower of the Town
Hall. The Oude Kerk is visible slightly farther to the west. The
tower near the right edge of the panel is that of the Reformed
Church in the village of Wateringen.¹

To the far left (above the dog following a man in the fore-
ground), the Kloosterkerk (Cloister Church), with a small
spire, appears closer than, and to the left of, the large Ridders-
zaal (Knights’ Hall), which is in the courtyard, or Binnenhof
(Inner Court), of the court complex. Immediately to the right
of the Ridderszaal’s twin-towered façade, one sees the slightly
closer Hofkapel (Court Chapel), with a small central spire. The
tall, blocky form a little farther to the right is the Mauritshuizen
(Tower of Prince Maurits), which stands at the corner of the
Stadholder’s Quarters (remodeled in the early 1620s).² The next
large structure to the right, seen midway between the Mau-
ritshuizen and the Grote Kerk, is the Oude Hof (Old Court,
later called Paleis Noordeinde). The faintly indicated building
to the left rear of the Oude Hof may be Van Goyen’s anticipa-
tion of the Nieuwe Kerk, which was planned in 1646 but not
erected until 1649–56.³ Below this building one can make out
the sails of the Beemkolen (Brook Mill), erected in 1621. Just
to the right of the Oude Hof, one sees the modest tower of the
Engelse Kerk (English Church) on the Noordeinde, and then the
Oude Stadhuis (Old Town Hall), with its tall tower of the 1560s.

The short, square tower to the right of the Grote Kerk’s
tower (and above the coach in the middle ground) is the Huis
van Assendelft, a fine town house on the Westeinde.⁴ The dis-
tant church seen to the latter’s right is the Oude Kerk in
Rijswijk, a village halfway between The Hague and Delft.

Van Goyen moved from Leiden to The Hague in 1632. His
first known view of the court city dates from 1637,⁵ but views
of other cities, with compositions quite like that of the present
picture, date back to at least 1633, when he painted the earliest
of his several known views of Arnhem.⁶ Van Goyen’s views of
Rhenen date from as early as 1636,⁷ and from the next year
until at least 1653 he occasionally painted views of The Hague
(at least nine are known), including a very large canvas executed
in 1650–51 for the Burgomasters’ Chamber of the Town Hall
(Haags Historisch Museum, The Hague).⁸ He also painted
comparable views of Dordrecht (especially in the 1640s),
Brussels and Antwerp (1648), Delft (1654), and less well
known places.⁹ Altogether about one hundred fifty views of
cities, usually seen from a fair distance, as here, are known in
Van Goyen’s oeuvre, which amounts to an eighth of his approxi-
mately twelve hundred surviving paintings. However,
cityscapes that are similar to the present work in their attention
to actual buildings number between about seventy-five and a
hundred. As the panoramic View of Haarlem and the Haarlem-
mer Meer (Pl. 50) demonstrates, Van Goyen’s interest in actual
topography was not limited to views like the present one.

A view of The Hague from approximately the same vantage
point occurs in the background of a drawing by Van Goyen
dated 1651 (Louvre, Paris).¹⁰ The sheet appears to be a study
for another painting, rather than a sketch from life. It may
depend on the present picture or related material.

1. The church at Wateringen and the four windmills were
identified by Charles Dumas (author of Dumas 1991), who in 2005 helped
the present writer identify every building in the picture. He
describes the four mills standing together as the Westmonolens
(western mills) next to the West Singel (West Canal). From left
to right, they are: the Haanmolen (Cock Mill), destroyed
by fire in 1679, rebuilt immediately, and demolished in 1919; the
Valkmolen (Falcon Mill), replaced in 1697, demolished in 1865;
the Heremolen (Gentleman’s Mill), built before 1544, replaced in
1712, demolished in the 1860s; the Westmolen (Western Mill),
built before 1544, replaced in the late 1620s, demolished in the
1860s. The closer windmill, seen to the left of the row of four
windmills, is the Gortmolen (Grits Mill), which stood by the
West Singel.
2. See Dumas 1991, pp. 53–59 (under no. 47).
3. C. Dumas, personal communication of October 9, 2005. See
Dumas 1991, pp. 95–100 (under no. 1).
6. Ibid., no. 272. Views of Dordrecht also date from 1613 onward (Ibid., no. 390), but as one would expect in the case of that city on the Maas, these pictures are more river views than cityscapes. It is not surprising that the artist's interest in city views appears to have developed during a trip to a comparatively distant Dutch city. There are many precedents (see Amsterdam—Toronto 1977 for a survey of the genre). A well-known example is the View of Zierikzee, dated 1618, by Van Goyen's teacher, Esaias van de Velde (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin). See also New York—London 2001, nos. 89, 90, for Hendrick Vroom's two profile views of Delft, dated 1615 (Stedelijk Museum Het Prinsenhof, Delft). Views of The Hague are discussed in the introductory essay of Dumas 1991.


8. Ibid., vol. 2, nos. 324–32. For the large canvas of 1650–51 (Beck no. 332), see also Dumas 1991, pp. 508–17, no. 41.


55. A Beach with Fishing Boats

Oil on wood, 11 x 17 in. (28 x 43.2 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left, on skiff): vG 1653(?); [vG in monogram]

The painting is well preserved. The oak panel, which retains its original thickness and bevels, has been reduced in height about ¾ in. (1.27 cm).

From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2005 2005.331.2

This beach scene of the early 1650s is deftly sketched almost entirely in tones of brown, with glimpses of blue sky above the windswept clouds. The forms and movements of the clouds are described by broad and very thin brushwork, making the virtuoso execution of the sky a major part of this painterly exercise.

At seaside villages, the beach was something akin to the market square. Here, small fishing boats return from a long day on the water, and villagers gather to greet them, see the catch, buy fish, or talk among themselves. To the far left, low waves define the shoreline, which a lone boat approaches with the wind. In the right background, a church stands among houses; a windmill is close by. Below the mill, a man and his dog trudge behind a peasant cart. The figures, skiff, and barrels in the foreground are conjured by Van Goyen with minimal means, the tip of the brush used as if it were chalk or pencil. Farther back, detail gives way to dissolution in atmosphere. The figures to the left of the central boat, for example, and, farther to the left, the approaching rider with hat in hand are seen as if from a distant dune, with eyes squinting in the damp, salty air.

The scene was witnessed almost every day near the coastal towns of seventeenth-century Holland. It was recorded in many paintings by Van Goyen and others (see, for example, Salomon van Ruysdael's Market by the Seashore; Pl. 184), and in dozens of drawings by Van Goyen dating from his early years onward.1 Van Goyen's painted beach scenes date back to at least 1632. The artist returned to the subject many times during the 1630s and 1640s; he appears to have abandoned it about 1653.2 The date on the present picture (one of two Van Goyens from the Markus Bequest) has been read as 1651 (see Refs.) but appears to be 1653. Circumstantial support for this reading comes from the fact that Van Goyen drew many beach views in 1652 and especially in 1653, and because his last known paintings of beaches include works from 1649 and 1653 but none from between these dates.3 Furthermore, the Markus panel was paired in the past with a river view (with fishing boats) of exactly the same size that is dated 1653 (private collection).4 The pictures were separated in the art trade shortly after they left the collection at Kellie Castle in 1929.5 Artists and dealers in Van Goyen's day are known to have offered paintings, and particularly landscapes, in pairs, although pictures painted as, so to speak, optional pendants were also sold separately. In any case, the two paintings once at Kellie Castle work equally well as a pair and independently.

1. For example, Beck 1972–73, vol. 1, nos. 39 (1626), 131, 139, 160, 193, 199-203, 284–89 (beach sketches of 1652, some at Scheveningen), 358–72 (all dated 1653), etc.
3. Ibid., nos. 959, 960, 961–62.
4. Ibid., no. 873; vol. 3, no. 873; Leiden 1996–97, no. 50. Beck records the pictures as pendants, but the connection is not mentioned in the Leiden exhibition catalogue of 1996–97.
5. Curiously, Beck no. 873 was later in the collection of Sydney van den Bergh (see A. B. de Vries et al. 1968, pp. 56–57), with whom Markus had a close relationship.


Figure 67. Detail of Van Goyen’s
A Beach with Fishing Boats (Pl. 55)
56. River View with a Village Church

Oil on canvas, 25¼ x 38½ in. (64.8 x 97.8 cm)

The painting is in good state, although the paint surface has been slightly flattened during lining. There is some abrasion in the trees and rooftops where these overlap the sky, and in the more thinly painted reflections in the water.

Bequest of Adele L. Lehman, in memory of Arthur Lehman, 1965 65.181.11

When this painting was in the Lehman Collection it was thought to be a view of Overschie by Van Goyen, monogrammed and dated 1637.1 The inscription came off with cleaning in 1967,2 one year after a visiting connoisseur dismissed the little-known canvas from the landscapist's oeuvre.3 Shortly thereafter, Beck placed the picture among five “varying copies” after a lost painting by Van Goyen.4 At least two of these copies (one of them especially close to the Museum's picture) and other versions have been attributed in auction sales to Salomon van Ruysdael (q.v.), although Stechow in 1938 rejected that artist's or Van Goyen's responsibility for four examples of the composition.5 Van Goyen sketched out the main lines of the composition as early as 1631.6 Similar works by Van Ruysdael date from about 1632 onward.7 The formula was so successful that the two painters returned to it frequently over the course of twenty years,8 and imitators produced paintings of this type well into the second half of the century.

The pictures by Van Goyen that most resemble this one date from 1645 onward. They include a panel dated 1645 in the National Gallery, London,9 another panel of 1645 that was on the London art market in 1923,10 a version of 1648 formerly in the Argenti collection, London,11 and a panel dated 1651 in the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.12 In these versions the church steeple is central in the composition, there are more trees and some undeveloped land to the left, and a strip of land, occupied by cows and/or fishermen, fills most of the immediate foreground. Beck is probably right to consider the Museum's canvas and versions of it to have derived from another painting by Van Goyen that is now lost or unknown.13

This does not suggest that the five examples listed by Beck are all from Van Goyen's studio. Aspects of the present picture, such as the execution of the building at the water's edge and some passages of foliage, recall works by Frans de Hulst (1605/7–1661) more than the related paintings by Van Goyen.14 Nonetheless, the sheer number of Van Goyen's known followers makes any attribution to an individual artist inappropriate, especially in the case of a work most likely copied after Van Goyen himself.

The earlier identification of the church in this canvas, in the painting of 1645 in the National Gallery, London, and in similar compositions derives from the inscription “Ouderschlic” in a later hand on a sketch in Van Goyen's Bredius sketchbook of 1644.15 Brown, following Beck, rightly rejected the identification with Ouderschlic, Ouwerschic, or Overschie (all the same place, a village on the Schie between Delft and Rotterdam) because an engraving of the church published in 1680 shows a bulbous cupola on the spire.16 Van Goyen appears to have depicted the church at Overschie in three other paintings, dating from 1645, 1647, and 1651.17 More recently, Buijsen identified the drawing inscribed “Ouderschlic” in the Bredius sketchbook as a view of Oudekerk aan de Amstel, and this is confirmed by his comparisons with several images, including two paintings by Van Goyen (dating from 1650 and 1651), a drawing by Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.), and an engraving in Abraham Rademaker's Kabinet van Nederlandsche Oudheden en Gesichten (Amsterdam, 1725).18

It does not follow that the Museum's picture and related paintings show the church at Oudekerk aan de Amstel, since that structure differs in almost every detail (including its alignment with the river), except for the similar, but plimmer, spire, and the arcade on the tower. With Van Goyen's architectural subjects, one repeatedly reaches the same conclusion: Occasionally his depictions of buildings are more or less faithful to life, but generally he allowed topographical material to serve his artistic whims.

2. The monogram and date, formerly on the boat, bottom center, were found to be “in between layers of the last varnish” (condition report dated October 1967).
5. Stechow (1938) 1975, pp. 44–45, n. 32, "als kleine Apokryphenprobe." Beck 1972–73, vol. 2, no. 628b, copy III (which he notes is very similar to copy V, the Museum's picture) was offered at Christie's, London, April 1, 1960 (Van Aalst sale), no. 41, as signed by Salomon van Ruysdael and dated 1640; and at Sotheby's, London, December 10, 1986, no. 152, as attributed to Van Ruysdael.
11. Ibid., no. 554 (ill.).
12. Ibid., no. 552 (ill. in Beck 1987, p. 207). A very similar panel in the National Gallery, Prague, is said to be dated 1635 (see Tokyo–Kyoto 1990, no. 49 (ill. p. 109), as A View of Overschie), but it is not included in any of Beck’s catalogues. The work appears to have suffered, and its attribution and date are uncertain.
13. See note 4 above.
16. MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 144, referring to the print in Van Bleyswijck 1667–[80], and to a history of Overschie. The church was destroyed by fire in 1899. See also Radermaker’s print of 1725 (Buijsen 1993, fig. 18).
17. As noted by C. Brown in MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 144. All three pictures are illustrated in Beck 1972–73, vol. 1, nos. 505, 529, 264, respectively. See also Buijsen 1993, p. 76.
18. Buijsen 1993, pp. 76–79.


EX COLL.: Robert Hutcheson, Glasgow (until 1851; sale, Christie’s, London, April 4, 1851, no. 58, for £7 19s.); John Bell, North Park, Glasgow (until 1881; sale, Christie’s, London, June 24, 1881, no. 623, for £90 6s.); Sir Christopher Beckett Denison, London (from 1881); Lady C. Beckett Denison; Lord Faber (until 1913; sale, Christie’s, London, June 20, 1913, no. 66); [J. Schnell, Paris]; Adolph Lewisohn, New York (until 1938); Mr. Samuel A. Lewisohn, New York (in 1938; gift to Adele Lewisohn [Mrs. Arthur Lehman]); Mrs. Arthur Lehman, New York (1938–65); Bequest of Adele L. Lehman, in memory of Arthur Lehman, 1965 65.181.11
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ABOUT eight years younger than his brother Frans (q.v.), Dirck Hals was baptized in a Protestant ceremony in Haarlem on March 19, 1591. By that date, his parents had probably been in Holland for nearly five years (see the biography of Frans Hals below). It has been assumed that Dirck studied with his brother, and perhaps with Willem Buytewech (1591/92–1624). Frans and Dirck Hals were both members of the Haarlem chamber of rhetoric De Wijngaardranken (The Vine Tendrils) and the Saint George civic guard company (Dirck from 1618 until 1624).

Both brothers appear to have been late bloomers in the field of art. Dirck was thirty-six when he joined the Guild of Saint Luke in 1627, by which time he had been married for six or seven years (the date of the ceremony is unknown) to a woman named Agneta Jansdr. Six daughters and one son are known to have been baptized between 1621 and 1635. (Anthonie, the firstborn, became a genre painter and portraitist in Amsterdam.) A document of 1624 refers to Hals being owed 24 guilders in wages by a Haarlem engraver, which suggests that he worked for other artists before he became a master in the guild.

A number of documents concerning the painter are known, but only a few are illuminating, such as the mention of “several copies after Dirck Hals” in a Haarlem auction of 1631, and references to lotteries of paintings he co-organized in 1634 and 1635 (submitting several of his own pictures). The fact that Hals’s work was copied fairly early on, and that he is praised together with the far more famous Frans in Ampezing’s “Description of Haarlem” published in 1628, suggests that he was well regarded in the 1620s and early 1630s. This is reflected also in his collaboration with the architectural painter Dirck van Delen (1604/5–1671) in several paintings dating from the late 1620s. Hals was esteemed as a specialist in painting and drawing small figures, which is easy to understand when one examines his small panel A Young Couple, of 1624 (Collections of the Princes of Liechtenstein, Vaduz), or figure studies like those of seated gentlemen in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and the Frits Lugt Collection, Paris.

Hals and his family appear to have lived mostly in Leiden during the 1640s. He rented a house there on February 22, 1641, but his possessions were seized in June 1642 and he was told to vacate because of payments outstanding. He found himself in similar circumstances in Leiden at the end of 1649, although it is not certain that he had been living there continuously since the early 1640s. He died in Haarlem in May 1666, and was buried in the Begijnhof church.

In his colorful and painterly technique, Dirck owed a debt to Frans Hals, especially in his early oil sketches on paper. As a painter of Merry Companies, he continued the tradition of Buytewech, Esaias van de Velde (1587–1630), and David Vinckboons (q.v.). The Rotterdamer Buytewech and the Amsterdamer Van de Velde both joined the Haarlem painters’ guild in 1612 and remained in the city for several years. The importance for Dirck Hals of their stylish figures socializing in living rooms, on terraces, and in the gardens of fine estates has often been considered. Hals’s more monochromatic and atmospheric genre scenes of the 1630s, such as Woman Tearing a Letter, of 1631 (Mittelrheinisches Landesmuseum, Mainz), are remarkable for their simplicity and naturalism, an innovation comparable to that in Haarlem still-life or landscape painting during the same or slightly earlier years. The quality of the artist’s pictures dating from after 1640 is quite uneven, and their ideas repetitive, which must be the consequence of difficult financial circumstances and a competitive market. The lives of lesser talents, such as Pieter Quast (q.v.), were a constant struggle during the same period.

57. A Banquet

Oil on wood, 16 x 26 in. (40.6 x 66 cm)
Signed and dated (bottom center): Dirck hals/1628

The painting is generally abraded. The wood grain, which has become more prominent, can be seen throughout the thinned paint layers and is most disfiguring in the light passages.

Purchase, 1871 71.108

Hals usually signed his paintings DH in monogram, DHALS in block letters, or not at all (many accepted works are not signed). This picture, however, is fully signed in an elegant script and dated 1628. Examination with a microscope reveals clearly that the signature is in the original paint layer, that the third digit of the date (transcribed in the past as a 3) is certainly a 2, and that the last digit is a “lazy 8,” tilted with the top forward so that it nearly parallels the long diagonal tail of the “h” in the signature.

The painting is typical of Hals in execution, and may be described as a routine effort derived in good part from a much better work by the artist. All the figures seated at the table, with the exception of the man in a dark hat to the right, and also the wine cooler and the young servant with a pewter pitcher, are adopted from the more multfigure A Garden Party, dated 1627, in Amsterdam (figs. 68, 69). Some figures are essentially the same, but a few (like the third from the left) have been altered. The Amsterdam panel is one of Hals’s finest works, made in the year of his entry into the Haarlem painters’ guild. It is not surprising that he would repeat part of the figure group in another setting. Similar examples of recycling, and also borrowing from other artists’ compositions, are fairly common in his oeuvre.

Figure 68. Dirck Hals, A Garden Party, 1627. Oil on wood, 30¾ x 54 in. (78 x 137 cm). Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
To give the figures a different stage from that employed in the Amsterdam panel, Hals turned to his familiar shoe-box design, with light- and dark-gray tiles on the floor, a curtained bed to the left, an entrance wall to the right, a fireplace flanked by a generic seascape and landscape, and a bench. Large bottles of red and white wine stand in the wine cooler, placed, like the chairs, somewhat uncertainly on the floor. Hals was exceptional among Haarlem and Amsterdam genre painters of his generation for the frequency with which he defined interior spaces with the help of tiled floors (which were almost unknown at this date in Dutch houses). This practice may have been encouraged to some extent by his association with Dirck van Delden (see the biography of Hals above), but examples of tiled floors and boxy rooms in Hals’s oeuvre predate his collaboration with the architectural painter, and a similar approach is found occasionally in the work of North Holland contemporaries (for example, Isaac Eleya’s _Merry Company_, of 1620, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

The women to the left hold apples, while four of the men raise wineglasses, one to his lips. A large cooked fowl sits on a pewter platter in front of the smiling woman in a yellow dress. The four figures seated on this side of the table are quite well painted, with special attention paid to the vivid colors and the highlights on their clothes. (X-radiographs show how deftly Hals sketched the figures in paint, with little or no drawing beforehand.) The two women in the foreground are dressed in deep green, the man turned from the viewer in dark gray (the coat draped over his left shoulder and the enormous hat keep the rhythm of the group flowing), and the dapper gentleman to the right in brown with a mauve shirt and stockings. One could describe the scene as “A Banquet,” to repeat the title that the work was given more than a century ago, but the subject is really a drinking party with much less food than in Frans Hals’s comparably composed portrait of the officers of the Saint George civic guard company (1616; Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem), to which the Hals brothers belonged.

The painting may have been owned by Théophile Thoré (the celebrated “discoverer” of Vermeer) just before it was acquired by dealers in Paris and passed on to the Museum’s first vice president, William T. Blodgett (see Ex Coll.).

A simplified version of the composition, apparently by another hand, has been on the art market.5

1. See the catalogue section of Nehlsen-Marten 2003.
2. Conservator Dorothy Mahon and assistant conservator Isabelle Duvernois kindly brought the inscription to my attention (April 2006), with particular attention to the reading of the date in the past as “163[]” (as in Baejer 1995, p. 101).
4. As noted by Dorothy Mahon and Isabelle Duvernois (see note 2 above). On Hals’s use of a painted sketch and undermodeling on the primed support, see Kolin 2005, pp. 150–51.
5. Christie’s, London, July 9, 1999, no. 5; accepted in Nehlsen-Marten 2003, no. 81, fig. 187, with no reference to the New York or Amsterdam pictures.

References: Thoré 1868b, p. 394, refers to the picture as “mon Intérieur de maison galante,” and compares the painting of 1628 by Dirck Hals and Dirck van Delden in the Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna; MMA 1872, p. 44, no. 109, as from the collection of W. Bürger, the date read as 1633; Harck 1888, p. 75, describes the work as extremely well preserved; P. Sutoo 1986, p. 187, as “a routine Dirck Hals dated 163[]”; Baejer 1995, p. 305, as signed and dated “163[]”; Jowell 2003, pp. 92–94 n. 212, fig. 61, as probably owned by Théophile Thoré; p. 306, no. 323, as signed and dated 1636(?), and as “last” in the MMA, 1911; Haarlem–Hamburg 2003–4, p. 90 n. 8, mentions the picture in connection with the Rijksmuseum panel (fig. 68 here); Baejer 2004, p. 209, no. 129 (ill.), catalogues the work as part of the 1871 Purchase.

Ex Coll.: Probably Étienne-Joseph-Théophile Thoré (W. Bürger) (d. 1869); [Léon Gauche, Paris, with Alexis Febvre, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.108

1. As noted in Nehlsen-Marten 2003, p. 261, the author based her catalogue (which fails to meet professional standards) on the photograph files of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, and in this case did not check any published source (to say nothing of writing the Museum a letter).
Figure 69. Detail of Hals's *A Garden Party* (fig. 68)
FRANS HALS
Antwerp 1582/83–1666 Haarlem

Like many less famous Dutch painters, Hals was actually from the Spanish Netherlands. His father, Frans Hals, was a clothworker from Mechelen (Malines) who moved to Antwerp, where his first child, Frans, was born, probably in 1582 or 1583. Hals’s mother was Adriana van Geertenscyck. Both parents had lost their first spouse before the end of 1581. A second son, Joost, was born in Antwerp in 1584 or 1585, but Frans’s younger brother Dirck Hals (q.v.) was baptized in Haarlem in March 1591. How much earlier the family had left Antwerp for the northern Netherlands is not known, but it appears likely that they had done so by July 1586. Frans Hals was marked down as a Catholic in an Antwerp civic guard company, on a list intended to exclude Protestants from membership. However, his son Dirck was baptized as a Protestant. It appears likely that the family left Antwerp for both religious and economic reasons.  

Frans Hals joined the painters’ guild in Haarlem in 1610, and in the same year (or in early 1611) he married Anneke (or Annetgen) Harmensdr (1590–1615). Their son, the painter Harmen Hals (1611–1669), was baptized on September 2, 1611; two small children from this brief marriage—Anneke died in 1615—were buried in 1613 and 1616. Hals’s earliest known work, a fragmentary portrait of the Catholic clergyman Jacobus Zaffius (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem), is dated 1611. At the time, Hals was already about twenty-nine years old. According to the anonymous biography of Karel van Mander (1548–1606) in the second edition of his Schilder-Boeck (1618), the Haarlem Manierist counted among his many pupils “Frans Hals, portrait painter of Haarlem.” Such an apprenticeship could have continued until 1603 at the latest, when Van Mander left town.  

From 1612 to 1615, Hals was a musketeer in a new company of the Saint George civic guard in Haarlem, and from 1615 until 1624 he served in another company of the same civic guard. From 1616 until 1624, he was a “friend” or “second member” of a Haarlem chamber of rhetoric, De Wijngaardranken (The Vine Tendrils). Documents concerning a debt in Haarlem reveal that Hals was in Antwerp between some date before August 6 and the second week of November 1616. The fact that the artist spent more than three months in Antwerp at an ideal moment to survey in that city the work of Rubens and the styles of other Flemish painters, such as the young Jacob Jordans (1533–1678), is of considerable interest for early pictures like Merrymakers at Strovetide (Pl. 38), discussed below.

On January 15, 1617, “Frans Hals, widower from Antwerp” and Lysbeth Reyniersdr of Haarlem had their marriage banns announced. They married in Sparrndam on February 13, 1617, nine days before their daughter Sara was baptized. The names of ten other children from this marriage are known, and include four sons (in addition to Harmen, mentioned above) who became painters: Frans the Younger (1618–1669), Reynier (1627–1672), Nicolaes (1628–1686), and Jan (ca. 1620–1644).

In 1616, Hals completed the first of his large “shooting pieces,” or group portraits of civic guard companies, the Banquet of the Officers of the Saint George Civic Guard (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem). The others date from about 1627, 1633, 1634–37, and 1639. Despite these prestigious commissions, Hals had financial troubles at various times throughout his career. This is not surprising, given the large size of his family and the fact that very few Dutch portraitists were well paid. Hals supplemented his income as a portraitist by painting genre pictures, especially in the 1620s and 1630s; by occasional dealing in works by other artists; and by taking on a number of pupils, who included (in addition to his brother Dirck) Adriaen Brouwer (1605/6–1638), Adriaen van Ostade (q.v.), and Philips Wouwermans (q.v.). In his lifetime, Hals’s reputation was mostly restricted to his own city, where his patrons were “a cut or two below Haarlem’s elite”: merchants, scholars, clergy, men, artists, and so on. More than half his sitters remain unidentified. The majority of Hals’s portraits are half-length or three-quarter-length compositions. Apart from the full-length figures that appear in The Company of Captain Reynier Reael and Lieutenant Cornelis Michiels Blaesw, Amsterdam (“The Magre Company”) (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which was commissioned from Hals in 1633 but finished by Pieter Codde (1599–1678) in 1637, Hals is known to have painted only one full-length portrait, that of the wealthy Haarlem textile merchant Willem van Heythuysen, which dates from about 1625 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich). About two hundred autograph works are known, which is not a large number given the
nature of Hals's technique and a career that lasted more than half a century. Two late group portraits, depicting the male and female regents of the old men's almshouse in Haarlem (both in the Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem), date from about 1664, when the artist was about eighty-two years old.9

Hals was exceedingly adept in the use of Baroque design ideas, so that his borrowings of compositional devices from earlier Haarlem artists, Flemish painters, Utrecht Caravaggisti, and other portraitists tend to go unnoticed or unappreciated. The animation of his figures' poses, expressions, and gestures is complemented by Hals's famous brushwork, which consistently suggests three-dimensional form and convincing effects of light and atmosphere (in this regard, the frequent description of Hals's technique as "very fast" is less careful than he was).10 In the 1630s and especially the 1640s, Hals's approach to portraiture was toned down in more than one sense, with darker palettes and restrained poses responding to current taste. Even at their most reserved, however, his sitters appear accessible, and the suggestion of individuality compelling, in contrast to the uniformly engaging examples of Johannes Verspronck (q.v.).

Hals's style fell out of favor in the eighteenth century, but gained great esteem from the mid-nineteenth century onward, not least with European painters such as Courbet, Manet, and Van Gogh, and American artists such as John Singer Sargent, James McNeill Whistler, and William Merritt Chase.11 Apart from group portraits, Hals's work is strongly represented in American collections, especially those of New York and Washington. This is a legacy of the Gilded Age (ca. 1870–ca. 1915), when candid portraits of prosperous but unassuming Dutchmen struck sympathetic chords in homes that bore little resemblance to those for which they were painted.12

2. On this point, see ibid., p. 371 (under doc. 2).
3. See ibid., p. 375 (under doc. 9), and p. 379, doc. 25 (quoting from the unpaginated biography of 1618).
4. Documents relating to the details in this paragraph are given in ibid., pp. 375–78.
6. Slive in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, p. 6. This observation contrasts with the surprising remark made by Ingeborg Worm in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 14, p. 94, that "Hals's clients were the wealthiest and most influential people in the city of Haarlem." The author claims on the same page that Hals "had little ambition to extend his clientele beyond Haarlem" but then observes that "members of the Amsterdam banking family of Coymans were among his faithful customers." On Hals's clientele, see Biesboer in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, pp. 23–44.
8. Slive 1970–74 counts about 220, of which only 168 are accepted in Grimm 1972.
12. On the Gilded Age in America and the taste for Hals and other Dutch painters, see Liedtke 1990, pp. 31–14.

58. Merrymakers at Shrovetide

Oil on canvas, 51¼ x 39¾ in. (131.4 x 99.7 cm)
Signed or inscribed (on flagon): fh
The painting is in good condition, although the impasto has been slightly flattened during lining in the past.
Request of Benjamin Altman, 1913 44.40.605

Of the two famous paintings by Frans Hals in the Altman Collection (see Pl. 39 for the other), this one, against stiff competition on all counts, is the more audacious in its coloring and brushwork, the more salacious in its subject matter, and the more important for the history of Dutch genre painting in what was then its main center of activity, the flourishing city of Haarlem. The picture was probably painted about 1616–17, and is thus one of the artist's earliest surviving works.
has occasionally been misunderstood. Many of Hals's genre scenes are more loosely painted than his portraits, and apart from *The Rommel Pot Player* (which has been doubted in the past), only a few works from the same period are suitable for comparison. That Hals had visited his native Antwerp between August and November 1616 also suggests that the Altman painting's seemingly Flemish qualities—the ruddy palette, broad brushwork, and impulsive rhythms over the entire surface—may have been inspired partly by contemporaneous pictures by Jacob Jordaens (1593–1678) and other Antwerp artists. The way every available pocket of space is filled with a face, a hand, a conspicuous object, or a costume detail is reminiscent of compositions by Jordaens dating from about 1613–17, to a degree rarely found in Dutch art of the same period. However, a similar approach to grouping figures is found in some earlier and contemporary works by Haarlem artists, and there are older Dutch precedents as well. Slightly later compositions by Willem Buytewech (1591/92–1624) and Dirck Hals (q.v.)—not only those derived from this design—show that such a dense clustering of figures was a decorative principle of the time.  

Of course, the goal in Hals's painting is to suggest a carnival atmosphere, and to amuse the viewer with funny physiognomies.

Most of these observations do not preclude Grimm's opinion (see Refs.) that the picture is an old copy of a lost work by Hals. However, its manner of execution and level of quality are entirely consistent with autograph works by the artist, and reveal none of the characteristics that normally indicate replication. Close study of the strongest passages, such as the bearded man's face, shows the artist's distinctive technique, with brushstrokes that admirably model forms at the same time that they capture fleeting effects of light and shadow. Shapes and contours are invented or discovered in virtuoso bursts of activity. The deft handling of hair and lace (both visible in fig. 71) surpasses the known abilities of artists from the circle of Hals, including Dirck Hals and Buytewech.

The subject has often been described but deserves further explication. The British reference to Shrovetide, the period of three days preceding Lent, corresponds with seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Dutch descriptions of the subject as Vestenavond (Eve of Lent, or Shrove Tuesday). Known elsewhere as Mardi Gras, the occasion is celebrated with a carnival devoted to foolish behavior and popular foods such as pancakes and sausages. Slive mentions the colophon of Sebastian Brant's *Ship of Fools* (Basel, 1494), which states that the book was published "at the Shrovetide, which one calls the Fool's Festival." Also cited by Slive is the inscription on an engraving of a rommel-pot player by Jan van de Velde (1593–1641),

---

Figure 70. Frans Hals, *The Rommel Pot Player*, ca. 1616–18. Oil on canvas, 41 1/4 x 31 1/4 in. (106 x 80.3 cm). Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth, Texas

Among other paintings by Hals that date from the same decade, the most similar in execution are *Pieter Cornelisz van der Merck*, dated 1616 (Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh), *The Rommel Pot Player*, of about 1616–18 (fig. 70), and *Catharina Hooft with Her Nurse*, of about 1618–20 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin). The genre painting in Fort Worth is comparable in its packed composition as well as in its painterly handling. The crowding of faces and hands around a central figure (or couple, in the Museum's picture) and the very sketchy handling of the peripheral heads arc quite consistent in the two large canvases. There is also some resemblance in type between the central and right-hand figures in the Kimbell picture and the two most mature (so to speak) men in the Altman painting, and a much stronger similarity in the way their faces, hands, and hats are painted. In the Berlin portrait, costume details offer the closest analogies, although the maid's hand (with fingers like fresh éclairs) and the child's fist find mates in the Merry Company, to employ the term by which many pictorial descendants of the Museum's painting are known.

The picture's style requires careful consideration, since it falls somewhat out of the mainstream in Hals's oeuvre, and
which observes that on Vastenavond many fools make pennies by playing the raucous instrument. Like the “musician” in the Kimbell painting (fig. 70), the man in the print wears on his hat a foxtail, symbol of foolishness. The bearded man in the Altman painting holds a foxtail in his right hand, while with the left he paws the shoulder of the young blonde.

Slive’s suggestion that the girl is no lady but a young man in drag is supported by the hairstyle, which looks peculiar for a woman of the time. She—or he—appears to sit in her middle-aged admirer’s lap. It seems likely that, with his laurel wreath, the youth has been crowned “queen” for the day and dressed as a Flemish floozy, a city girl with more fashion sense than any other kind. Her attire is extravagant by Dutch standards of the period, but the lace collar and abundance of embroidered silk barely go beyond costumes that could have been seen in Antwerp or at the Brussels court. However, it may be that the fancy dress is simply traditional in carnival celebrations, as is suggested by prints by Jacques de Gheyn (q.v.) and others.

The central figure is flanked by two familiar characters of the comic stage: on the left, Pekelharing (Picked Herring), and, on the right, Hans Worst (John Sausage, which has the same ring as Simple Simon). As Slive and others have explained, these names (given here with modern spellings) were assigned to stock figures in satirical comedies, and were much less standardized in the Netherlands than were their counterparts in the commedia dell’arte of Italy. Farces (as well as more civilized plays) were performed by chambers of rhetoricians, or redeverigers, usually in private rooms, but occasionally in public competitions. The organizations were exclusively male, and the humor often coarse. Hals himself was a “second member” or “friend” of a Haarlem chamber of rhetoric, De Wijngaardranken (The Vine Tendrils), from 1616 to 1624. And his sitter in a portrait dated 1616, Pieter van der Morsch (1543–1629; mentioned above), played Piero the buffoon in performances staged by a Leiden chamber of rhetoric, De Witte Accoleijen (The White Columbines). Hals’s painting in New York must have been inspired by his familiarity with rhetoricians, and it was perhaps intended for a chamber of rhetoric, an individual redeveriger, or an enthusiast of bawdy plays.

In any case, the subject and symbols were too lowd for the average Haarlem household. The table is strewn with a variety of “male” and “female” forms, the most phallic of which are the bagpipe and the many sausages. The bagpipe and open tankard had been used in combination before, for example in Pieter Huys’s naughty pictures of a bagpiper and his “wife” (according to the conventional title). The latest of them, dated 1571 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), is inscribed with the bagpiper’s declaration that his purse has been emptied, and his “pipe is all piped out.” Pekelharing wears a garland of Shrovetide appetizers, of which the fish (sauced herring) and the mussel are also symbols of male and female private parts. Eggs were a sign of masculine prowess, thanks to their resemblance to testicles, but when ruptured (as here) they imply diminished capacity, especially in older men. Farmers bringing their eggs to market were a popular theme on the stage, as in “A Boor with Eggs,” written in sixty-nine lines of verse by a member of Hals’s own chamber of rhetoric. The artist’s follower (and possibly pupil) Jan Miense Molenaer (1610/11–1668) treated the subject in a painting of about 1630, The Drunken Egg Seller (art market, New York), in which a gray-bearded boor is shown losing his eggs in a crowd that finds his predicament much funnier than might be expected by the modern viewer. Eggs also suggested foolishness, since the word doer (or dooier) meant both “yoke” and “simpleton.” Peas (in a pod) may have had a similar meaning (as in “pea-brain”), but this is uncertain. A pig’s foot (or trotter) usually referred to gluttony. All the food in the picture is pleasant fare, and most of it was abundant at carnivals. Bax cites a seventeenth-century French print in which the fat figure of Carnival wears a chain of sausages draped over the shoulders, as here.

As a physical type, Hans Worst often resembles the man Hals presents here as Pekelharing. But in this picture (and in Jan Steen’s Merry Company on a Terrace; Pl. 197), Hans is identified by sausages dangling from his cap. His obscene gesture (again anticipating Steen; see Pl. 196) was once painted out. Slive correctly notes “the equally vulgar gesture” made by the man with a spoon stuck in his cap, which he calls “a familiar allusion to prodigality.” Given the spoon’s size, it probably does imply immoderate consumption, perhaps of drink as well as of food. Pekelharing’s pipe, which is lit, may also stand for overindulgence, as does the jug and (it seems) the voices raised by the sottish types in the background. But pipes were also phallic: pip was slang for penis, and the verb pippen meant (besides “to pipe,” as on a bagpipe) to copulate. In this context, the pot of hot coals (next to which another clay pipe and the bagpipe have been placed) may refer to female heat.

It has been pointed out frequently that Buitewech, Dirck Hals, and other artists borrowed the main figures or the whole of this composition for use in a number of works. A version of the entire design (adding more space at the sides and above) in the Frits Lugt Collection, Paris, is signed “DHALS 1637,” and although remarkably mediocre is generally accepted as a work by Frans Hals’s younger brother. A picture of similar quality and composition was formerly in the
Figure 71. Detail of Pekelharing in Hals's *Merrymakers at Singelide* (Pl. 38)
Metzger collection, New York. Another amplification, with the central figure transformed and other liberties taken, is now in the care of the Instituut Collectie Nederland. None of these pictures may be taken as evidence that the Altman painting was cut down. Rather, they are adjustments to a slightly later period's concept of pictorial space.

In Dirck Hals's Banquet in the Garden (Louvre, Paris), the three main figures in the Museum's picture appear in the midst of several others, except that Hans Worst has become an attentive violinist. The same painter's panel of about the same time, Merry Company (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt), sets the threesome in reverse among a greater number of banqueters, one of whom has stolen Pekelharing's attention away from the "girl" (who now reacts with a knowing sneer to Hans Worst's unseemly gesture). Dirck Hals also employed the Pekelharing type in his collaboration with Dirck van Delen (1604/5–1671), Elegant Company in a Renaissance Hall, of 1628 (Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna). Pekelharing appears more conspicuously in the background of Dirck Hals's Musical Party, in the Michaelis Collection, Cape Town.

Buytewech did bust-length drawings of both Pekelharing and Hans Worst, based loosely on those figures in the present picture. Since Buytewech moved from Haarlem to Rotterdam by August 1617, it appears likely that Hals completed the painting before that date.

1. On genre painting in Haarlem, see Franits 2004, chap. 2.
3. Most recently, by Grimm (1972, 1989). Grimm's methodology, which consists in good part of comparing isolated details of paintings against perceived norms of execution, has also led him to reject as works by Hals the Museum's Young Man and Woman in an Inn (Pl. 59), Boy with a Lute (Pl. 61), and the portraits of Petrus Scriverius and his wife (Pls. 63, 64), as well as well-known paintings by Hals in other collections.
4. The best example may be Jordaan's Adoration of the Shepherds, of about 1617 (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp; D'Hulst 1983, fig. 40), but there are many other works by him that might be compared. See also Abraham Jansen van Nuijssen's Vertumnus and Pomona, of about 1613–14 (Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, Berlin; missing since 1945).
5. Compare, for instance, the heads (likewise caricatures) filling spaces between the main figures in Hendrick Goltzius's "master-piece" engraving The Circumcision, of 1594 (Strauss 1977, vol. 2, no. 322; Amsterdam–New York–Toledo 2003–4, no. 71–44), and the piling up of heads in Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem's celebrated altarpiece The Massacre of the Innocents, of 1591 (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem; Van Thiell 1999, no. 42, pl. vii; see also pls. 2, 644, 216, 218). These examples could be described as Manierist elaborations of an Early Netherlandish scheme, as seen in Hieronymus Bosch's Christ Mocked, of about 1490–1500 (National Gallery, London), and Quentin Massys's Adoration of the Magi, of 1526 (MMA).
6. One of the most similar compositions is that of Lucas van Leyden's Fortune-Teller (Louvre, Paris), where a variety of colorful figures are arranged around a young woman seated at a table.
7. See, for example, Buytewech's drawing Interior with Dancing Couples and Musicians (Fondation Custodia, Institut Néerlandais, Paris; Haverkamp-Begemann 1959, no. 45, fig. 112), and the Museum's own painting by Dirck Hals (Pl. 17).
8. See Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, p. 34, fig. 15, vol. 3, p. 3 (under no. 5), concerning the inscription, "Vastavonts-gasten," on the verso of a drawing by Mathys van den Bergh (ca. 1617–1689), which is dated 1660 and copies Hals's composition. The 1705 sale catalogue that apparently refers to this picture also employs the term (see Ex Coll.). In July 1973, curator John Walsh changed the title of the Museum's painting from The Merry Company to Merry-makers at Shrove tide, presumably in response to the discussion in Slive's monograph.
9. Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 34, 37, fig. 19.
10. See also the figure wearing a foxtail on his hat in Hendrick Pot's Merry Company of about 1630 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam; Haarlem–Hamburg 2003–4, no. 42).
11. As noted by Nicole LaBouff, Department of Costume and Textiles, Los Angeles County Museum of Art (personal communication, February 28, 2005), who is studying carnival traditions and a group of miniatures (Netherlands, ca. 1650?) that include images of women cross-dressed, for example as ecclesiastics, and perhaps vice versa. The corresponding figure in Dirck Hals's Merry Company in Frankfurt (Neumüller 2005, pp. 135–43) looks even more male, but in a follower's version of the Altman composition formerly with the dealer D. Katz in Dieren (Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, p. 34, fig. 16, vol. 3, p. 4, no. 3; Rijksdienst Beeldende Kunst 1993, p. 129, no. 1042), the figure has become a young woman, with a more plausible costume and coiffure.
12. The couple recalls the comic theme of unequal or ill-matched lovers that flourished in Netherlandish art and literature from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. See Stewart 1977; Braunschweig 1978, no. 22; Renger 1985; and Amsterdam 1997a, no. 9.
13. A drawing inscribed "Juffrouw Brat-Haringh" (Mistress Grilled Herring), by Jan van Bouckhorst (1587/88–1631), is another example of a male actor playing a stock female part (Amsterdam and other cities 1991–92, no. 15). The present writer has not discovered whether being crowned with a laurel wreath was common in carnival celebrations or in raderijker performances. But it would hardly be surprising. On fancy female Flemish (and Spanish) dress, see Stanton-Hirst 1982, pp. 221–22, fig. 11 (a drawing of comedians by Pieter Quast [q.v.] in which an overdressed young woman is rudely offered an enormous sausage by a fool).
14. See the examples reproduced in Haarlem–Worcester 1999, p. 152,
figs. 6b, 6c. As noted in Kolf 2005, p. 99, colorful clothing was considered an affectation of young adults.


16. See Westermann 1997, pp. 138–42. The author refers her reader to Brandt and Hogendoorn 1992 and to Smits-Vreed 1991, but omits Schotel 1871. Also of interest are Van Dycke 1900–1902; Guillaumson 1945; and Dekker 1997 (or Dekker 2001). For additional literature on ridderjijfers, see P. Sutton 1982–83, p. 27 n. 3.


19. The straws by the bagpipe go with the pot of coals, and were used for lighting pipes. On sausages, see Bax 1979, p. 229. The author quotes the following lines, which refer to young maidens, from a fifteenth-century play: “They blush where sausages are displayed, for they with breasts bare do not parade” (Bax’s translation is altered here). The bagpipe was considered a peasant instrument (see Winter 1943 and Rotterdam–New York 2001, no. 99).

20. See Salomon 1998a, p. 77, fig. 64. Jan Massys used the same two motifs with a bit more variety, but the same sexual symbolism, for example in Merry Companies of 1557 (private collection) and 1564 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna); see Renger 1985, pp. 38–40, figs. 4, 5 (where the Berlin picture by Huys is also discussed).

21. For literature on fish as phallic symbols, see Westermann 1997, pp. 126 n. 29, 130 n. 66. “Fishing” as a metaphor for intercourse is discussed in Amsterdam 1997a, pp. 86–87. Herrings could also suggest impotence: see Renger 1985, p. 39. On mussels, which were eaten during both carnival and Lent, see Bax 1979, pp. 259–60. The author observes with regard to mussels, “this combination, in one and the same symbol, of Carnival food, erotic significance, and sustenance during Lent, we find also in the egg and the fish” (p. 263).


23. Haarlem–Hamburg 2003–4, no. 31. See Bax 1979, pp. 150–53, where it is suggested plausibly that drink plays a role in Pekelharing’s problem. On his love of drinking (“because his throat is always brackish”), see also Middelkoop and van Grevenstein 1980, p. 36 (under c).


25. See ibid., p. 193.

26. Ibid., pp. 260–32. Two more pig’s feet are in the plate of sausages.

27. Ibid., p. 229. The nature of one item worn by Pekelharing in Hals’s picture is unclear: the brown object hanging from his belt (just above the pot of hot coals). It may be a leather case for earing utensils. In any event, its form is less innocent than its function.

28. As noted in Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, p. 34, fig. 17, with reference to the lost Merry Wife, said to have been monogrammed and dated 1616 (formerly Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, Berlin; see also ibid., vol. 3, pp. 115–16, no. 12).

29. As described in ibid., vol. 1, p. 3 (under no. 5). A jester makes the same sign next to an amorous couple, in a Merry Company signed and dated “LIVIN da . . . pix 1906” (Sorheby’s, New York, April 11, 1991, no. 22 [ill.]).

30. Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, p. 36, for both remarks. This figure, like Hans Worp, wears a costume appropriate for carnival.

31. On spoons, see Bax 1979, p. 31, where lepelar, or “spooner,” is translated as “boozier,” and the long digression on pp. 300–301 n. 87. A large wooden spoon (or ladle) is similarly attached to the rucksack of “The Wayfarer” in Bosch’s tondo (also called The Pedlar or The Prodigal Son) in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam. See Zapnick 1973, p. 135, where (following Bax) the spoon is called “a popular symbol of self-indulgence.”


33. See Braunsweg 1978, no. 15, and Judson and Ekkart 1999, pp. 201–2 (under no. 262), in both cases discussing Gerrit van Honthorst’s painting of an amorous couple, in the Herzog Anton Ulrich Museum, Braunschweig.


35. See Nihon–Nijstad in Paris 1983, pp. 57–58, no. 34, pl. 72, as by D. Hals. Stijn Alstena, formerly curator at the Institut Néerlandais, Paris, and now curator of Dutch drawings at the MMA, supported the attribution in a personal communication dated August 1, 2006.


37. Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 34, 36, fig. 16, vol. 3, p. 4, variant no. 3 (under no. 5). This is the canvas formerly with the dealer Katz in Dieren (see note 11 above).

38. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 4, fig. 3; Nehlsen-Marten 2003, p. 268, no. 37, with inconclusive remarks on the likely date.


41. Bax 1981, no. 27 (ill.).


References: Hoet 1752–70, vol. 3 (1770), p. 457, no. 31, records what appears to be this painting in an Amsterdam sale of June 1, 1765 (see Ex Coll.). Bode 1883, pp. 49–50, 81, no. 75, considers the work to be by Hals and to date from several years before 1616; Erasmus 1909a, pp. 33–44, considers the picture a pastiche after the central group in Dirck Hals’s painting in the Louvre; Bode 1909b, pp. 128–30 (ill.), rejects the argument in Erasmus 1909a; Erasmus 1909b, pp. 334–27, repeats and amplifies the argument of Erasmus 1909a; Moe 1909, pp. 25–26, 109, no. 208 (ill. opp. p. 18), as “Scène de meures,” reports Schmidt-Degener’s opinion that the work dates from about 1625, and that one of the male figures is “le seigneur
Ramp”; Valentin in New York 1909, p. 146, no. 22a (ill. opp. p. 146), dates the picture to about 1615 and notes Dirck Hals’s adoption of figures from it in his painting in the Louvre; Cox 1909–10, p. 243, considers the painting to represent “Hals at his most irresponsible . . . an intentional caricature rather than a serious picture, but it is prodigiously, almost impudently, skillful”; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3 (1910), probably pp. 40–41, no. 157th, and p. 42, no. 141, as in B. Altman’s collection, describes the subject in detail, and notes Dirck Hals’s borrowing of figures for his painting in the Louvre (“it was not copied from Dirck”); Waldmann 1910, pp. 77–78, defends Hals’s authorship; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 50–52, no. 21, and pp. 34, 35 (under no. 23 [ill. opp. p. 30]), shows the artist “in his most jovial and rollicking mood”; Binder in Bode and Binder 1914b, vol. 1, pp. 19–20, no. 1, pl. 1, dates the painting to the early 1620s, claims that the man at right also appears in two portraits by Hals, and suggests identifying him as Dirck Hals; Kronig 1918, p. 83, sees Hendrick Pot’s “Temptresses” in Rotterdam as a worthy counterpart to this picture; Valentin 1920a, pp. 335 (ill.), 356, mentioned as one of three Halses owned by Altman; Valentin 1921a, pp. 11 (ill.), 306, dates the picture to about 1616–20, identifies it with the canvas sold in 1765 (see Ex Coll.), states that the composition originally had six heads in the background (overpainted, but recorded in copies), and agrees with Binder’s identification of the man at right with sitters in portraits by Hals but suggests that he may be the artist himself; Monod 1921, pp. 300–302, describes the man to the left as “un vieu paillard à la Jordaens,” and feels that the painting does not merit its reputation; Valentin 1923, pp. 12 (ill.), 306, repeats Valentin 1921a; W. Martin 1923, pp. 50–51, fig. 4, considers the picture to date from before 1616 to have been influenced by a lost Musical Company with Willem Buytewech (known from an old copy); Valentin 1925, pp. 152–153, 154, repeats the argument that the man at right is a self-portrait and also appears in other pictures; Poensgen 1926, p. 96, dates the painting about 1616–17, along with two drawings by Hals after the heads of the main male figures; Altman Collection 1928, pp. 63 (under no. 29), 89–92, no. 50 (ill. opp. p. 90), repeats Altman Collection 1944; Hofstede de Groot 1928, p. 45, says the author recently saw in Ireland a “smaller, sketchier version” of this composition, which includes a row of heads in the background, and observes that in the Altman picture heads in the background have been overpainted; Valentin 1928b, p. 237, calls the work mentioned in Hofstede de Groot 1928 a sketch for this painting; London 1929, p. 33 (under no. 48), finds “the same person” as one of the figures here in Hals’s Portrait of a Man Standing, in the collection of the Duke of Devonshire; Borenus 1930, p. 572, considers the version mentioned in Hofstede de Groot 1928 as “of particular interest in showing us the master’s own conception of the group in its entirety”; Düllberg 1930, pp. 48, 52, 54, fig. 13, dates the picture about 1615–20, states that the female figure also appears in Young Man and Woman in an Inn (Pl. 59), in The Merry Trio formerly in the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, Berlin, and possibly in the Marriage Portrait in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; H. Kauffmann 1931, p. 238, considers this work a later version of the painting published in Hofstede de Groot 1928, based on the altered style of the woman’s dress; W. Martin 1931, pp. 352, 449 n. 477, fig. 204, dates the picture about 1617, sees the “life-size” figures as coming straight out of Hals’s work as a portraitist, and is reminded of Manet; Valentin 1935, pp. 90, 95–96, again finds a self-portrait in the man to the right, and in other paintings where there is no such thing; Valentin 1936, p. 9, no. 3 (ill.), suggests a date of about 1616–17, sees a self-portrait to the right, and mentions overpainted figures above (as indicated by old copies and adaptations); Pletzsch 1940, pp. 7, 14 (ill. p. 20), dates the work about 1617, and observes Dirck Hals’s borrowings; Trivas 1941, p. 26 (under no. 9, the Devonshire Portrait of a Man), declares that the Museum’s picture is “not included in this catalogue”; Haverkamp-Begemann 1959, pp. 22, 58, 62, 96–97 (under no. 27), 98, 99 (under no. 28), fig. 26, discusses the stock figures, which are copied in two drawings by Buytewech, Van Hall 1963, p. 125, no. 1 (under Frans Hals), cites the man at right as a self-portrait; Slive 1963, p. 436, describes the subject as the celebration of Shrove tide, a holiday “traditionally dedicated to fools and foolishness,” and observes that old copies suggest that the canvas has been cut down on all sides; Van Regteren Altena 1961, p. 238, draws attention to two figures in a kitchen scene attributed to Frans Snyders and Jan van den Bergh that ultimately derive from the Museum’s picture and therefore suggest that it was painted before 1620 (the latest date at which Van den Bergh could have moved from Haarlem to Antwerp); J. Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, pp. 31, 36, pl. 108, dates the picture about 1615–17, observing that “the cramped composition and the over-exuberance of the details, as well as the loud, gay colours, indicate a comparatively youthful work”; Descargues 1968, p. 18, claims that this is “the only one of Hals’s pictures that might have influenced” his pupil Adriaen Brouwer; Haskell 1970, pp. 264–65, fig. 10 (Altman gallery view), reports that Altman made a special effort to ensure that this painting and other Dutch pictures were sent back from Europe in time to be included in the 1959 exhibition at the MMA; Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, pp. 7, 33–35, 37, 58, 67, 82, 94, 96, 152, identifies the man at left as “Peeckelaerharing” and the one at right as “Hans Wurst,” stock figures in contemporary Dutch farces, suggests that the central figure may be a young male actor dressed as a woman, and discusses the symbolism of the food and other objects, vol. 2, pls. 7–11, suggests a date of about 1615 (caption to pl. 8), and vol. 3, pp. 3–4 no. 5, 15 (under no. 21), 116 (under no. 12), 116, 117 (under no. 13), fig. 53 (monogram), tentatively connects the picture with the sale of 1765 (see Ex Coll.), discusses a variety of related works, and rejects the identifications of portraits in the painting; Grimm 1972, pp. 29, 41, 50–52, 199, no. 44, considers the work a copy after Hals; Pletzsch 1972, pp. 23, 26, remarks on the picture’s considerable influence, especially in the work of Dirk Hals; Grimm and Montagni 1974, p. 87 (under no. 10), fig. 10a, as a copy after Hals; De Mazia 1974, p. 12, considers the work an example of Hals being “content to treat the means as ends in themselves, for the sake of an ostentatious, dashy technique”; Rotterdam–Paris 1974–75, pp. 27, 28 (under no. 26), 28, 29 n. 1 (under no. 27), discusses Buytewech’s drawn copies after the male figures to the left and right; Hochfield 1976, p. 27 (ill. [before and after cleaning of 1951]), calls for the removal of “the dulled synthetic varnish”; Wiener 1976, p. 6, feels the painting “lacks the final touches,” especially in the background figures; Bax 1979, pp. 191, 192–93 n. 55, 193, 223, 229, 202, notes the snauses, eggs, beans, and pig’s trotter worn by the “gadabout”; Baard 1981, pp. 72, figs. 54, 55 (details), pl. 5, dates the picture about 1615, and superficially describes the subject; Stanton-Hirst 1982, pp. 223, 225, identifies Hans Worst here and in a drawing by Pieter Quast; Nihom-Nijstad in Paris 1983, pp. 57–58, discusses the copy inscribed
“DHALS 1631” in the Lucht Collection, Paris, and mentions other derivations; P. Sutton in Philadelphia—Berlin—London 1984, p. xxxiv, fig. 36, as dating from about 1615, and as a prime example of this type of genre picture (large half-length compositions); P. Sutton 1986, pp. 185–86, pl. 6, describes the subject and considers the picture to illustrate “Frans Hals’s role in the history of Dutch genre”; Grimm 1989, pp. 50–51, 56, 117, 220–21, 236, 284–85, no. 81, pls. 73, 74a, fig. 124b, as a copy of a lost Hals, revealing Flemish influence; Middelkoop and Van Grevenstein 1989, p. 17, fig. d, suggests that the “atmosphere” of redenrijke performances in Haarlem is reflected here; Slive in Washington—London—Haarlem 1989–90, pp. 1, 148, 151 n. 3, 166, 216, pl. II, remarks that the painting is missing from the 1989–90 exhibition because of the “ironclad terms” of its bequest, and compares the work with three of the exhibited pictures; Grimm 1990, repeats Grimm 1989 in translation; Liedtke 1990, p. 48, fig. 37 (Altman gallery view), describes the work as one of “two famous early genre pictures that stand quite apart from the Halses bought by Frick, Morgan, Widener, Huntington, and the Taft”; P. Sutton 1990b, pp. 67, 70, compares the Fort Worth picture (fig. 70 here) unfavorably with this one; P. Sutton in Stockholm 1992–93, p. 86 n. 5, lists several of Dirck Hals’s borrowings from the composition; Kortenhorst-von Bogendorf Rupprath in Haarlem—Worcester 1993, p. 151 (under no. 5), fig. 5d, p. 265 n. 13, sees the possible influence of this painting by Hals on Judith Leyster’s Merry Company, of about 1630 (private collection); Srukenbrock 1993, p. 153, describes the removal of overpaint in Amsterdam 1993–94a, p. 118, fig. 9, imagines that the subject may be described as “A Young Woman Prefers an Old Drunk to a Youthful Lover”; Baetjer 1995, p. 299; Slive 1995a, pp. 28–29, 37, fig. 27, dates the work to about 1615, discusses the subject and style, and compares the color scheme with that of “the so-called Tonker Ramp”; De Jongh in Amsterdam 1997a, pp. 363–64, fig. 6, in a review of sexual hand signals, describes “a whole range of ambiguous ? gestures” in this picture; Westermann 1997, p. 248 n. 88, compares a gesture in a work by Steen; Klessmann 1999, pp. 26, 28, fig. 6, compares a work by Liss with this composition, and incorrectly reports that “its attribution is not generally accepted”; De Jongh 2001, p. 22, fig. 34, in an essay on symbolic hand gestures, asks what two fingers raised to the left temple might mean (seen here to upper left); Schnackenburg in Kassel–Amsterdam 2000–2, pp. 101, 119 n. 53, fig. 8, calls the painting “a brilliant early work by Frans Hals,” which may have influenced the young Rembrandt and Jan Lievens; Ruina in Van der Ploeg, Ruina, and Van Sichelen 2002, p. 27 (under no. 3), compares a work by Abraham Bloemaert; Weller in Raleigh–Columbus–Manchester 2002–3, p. 11, fig. 3, cites the painting as the kind of work by Hals that influenced Jan Miense Molenaer; Korthals Altes 2003, p. 67 n. 42, notes that a painting by Hals, De Vastenavond–offering, purchased by Willem Lormier 1759, is not this one; Nehlsen–Marten 2003, pp. 107–8, 268 (under no. 37), fig. 85, dates the picture to about 1617, describes it incorrectly as on wood, and reviews Dirck Hals’s responses to the composition; Vergara in Madrid 2003, pp. 23, 203, fig. 13, as by Hals about 1615, sees the same vivacity and loose handling that are found in the master’s portraits, while the subject anticipates Steen; Biesboer in Haarlem–Hamburg 2003–4, pp. 180, 184, compares the figure of “Peckelhaering” in two pictures by Hendrick Pot; Von Bogendorf Rupprath in ibid., pp. 78, 88, 113 n. 11, pl. 31, fig. 91, notes the adaptation of the man to the left for a figure in Buytewech’s Merry Company, of about 1616–17 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), and of the three main figures in Dirck Hals’s Merry Company in a Palace Interior, of 1620 (private collection); Fransis 2004, p. 263 n. 24, recalls that “among Hals’s earliest genre paintings is his famed Spreuken Roesters of about 1613”; Giltaij in Rotterdam–Frankfurt 2004–5, pp. 14, 47 (ill.), compares the figure festooned with sausages in Buytewech’s canvas in Rotterdam; Neumeister in ibid., p. 52, fig. 1, discusses Dirck Hals’s repetition of the three main figures in his painting in Frankfurt; Kolf in 2005, pp. 147, fig. 126, notes Dirck Hals’s borrowing; Neumeister 2005, p. 141, fig. 120, repeats the observation made in Rotterdam–Frankfurt 2004–5.


**Ex Coll.:** Sale, Amsterdam, June 5, 1761, no. 31, for Fl 33, “een ryke Ordinariate van veel beelden halver Lyf te zien, verbeeldende een Vasten-Avond vreugd, zeer krijtig op doek, door Frans Hals: hoog 36, breedt 49 duimnen” (A rich composition of many figures seen in half-length, representing a pre-Lenten feast, very vigorous on canvas, by Frans Hals: height, 36, breadth 49 inches [presumably inverting height and width]); Monsieur Cocret, Paris (by 1874—at least 1883); [Kleinberger, Paris and New York, until 1907]; [D. S. Hess and Company, New York, 1907; sold for $89,102 to Altman]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1907–d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.605
59. Young Man and Woman in an Inn
(“Yonker Ramp and His Sweetheart”)

Oil on canvas, 41¾ x 51¼ in. (105.4 x 79.4 cm)
Signed and dated (right, above fireplace): FHALS 1623
[FH in monogram]

The condition of the painting is fairly good, although the canvas weave has been emphasized and the impasto slightly flattened during lining in the past. The crowns of the canvas weave are abraded, most severely in the area of the young man’s broad-brimmed hat and in the halftones of his face and that of the young woman.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.602

From the eighteenth century until as recently as fifty years ago, this famous genre painting by Frans Hals was known as Yonker Ramp and His Sweetheart, with the motto, “Long Live Fidelity!” added in the 1880s for clarification.¹ These titles were rather off the mark for a picture of a young man and woman who have just met and probably would not have exchanged names, or at least not their real ones. As discussed below, the subject is a brief encounter in a tavern or bordello, and not even “Fido” to the lower right could be counted on for feelings of fidelity.

“Yonker” is an English rendering of Jonker, or Jongheer, which means “Young Gentleman,” and may be translated as “master,” “squire,” or “milord.” Quite as the artist himself and his brother Dirck were once identified with the figure to the right in Merrymakers at Slovoetside (Pl. 58), the young man in the present picture was considered to resemble Pieter Ramp, the ensign in the right background of Frans Hals’s Banquet of the Officers of the Saint Hadrian Civic Guard Company, of about 1627 (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem). Wilhelm von Bode, in 1909 (see Refs.), was evidently the first scholar to connect the painting with the story of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11–32), and also to emphasize (as historians do now) that the main figure in the present picture would have been understood by Hals’s contemporaries as a modern-day type, similar to but not identical with the biblical wastrel. Nonetheless, it is quite possible that this is the painting cited simply as Een verloren zoon van Frans Hals (A Prodigal Son by Frans Hals) when it was traded between two Amsterdam merchants, Martin van de Broecke and Andries Ackersloot, as recorded in a document dated March 28, 1647.²

No other genre painting by Hals is dated,³ but this one is signed and dated 1623 on the mantel of the fireplace. In recent decades, only one critic has doubted Hals’s authorship (and that of the other two genre paintings by Hals in the Altman Collection).⁴ For all other writers, and for the great majority of specialists who have not expressed themselves in print, the canvas is one of Hals’s most important contributions to the theme of “everyday life,” meaning conventionalized descriptions of modern manners and mores.

Figure 72. Gillis van Breen after Karel van Mander, Inn Scene with Prostitutes, 1597. Engraving, 5½ x 7½ in. (13.3 x 19.4 cm). Prentenkabinet, Universiteit, Leiden
In its presentation of figures in space, and in its modeling, muted colors, and light effects, the painting is considerably more naturalistic than the *Merrymakers at Stroweitide* (Pl. 8), of six or seven years earlier. Nonetheless, the later picture still belongs to a formative phase of Haarlem genre painting, and of Hals's work in that field. In terms of style, this is evident in the way the artist combines an Early Baroque figural arrangement (reminiscent of works by Gerrit van Honthorst, such as *Merry Violinist with a Wineglass*, also of 1633; Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) with a setting that recalls Mannerist schemes, as found, for example, in one of Joachim Wtewael's kitchen scenes (see fig. 282). The result is at once striking in its immediacy and slightly contrived. In reproductions especially, some critics may discover signs of calculation in the composition, for instance the diagonal recession from the upraised glass, through the young man and his companion, to the innkeeper. The languard blue feather in the oversize hat answers the embrace of the unashamed blonde, and smooths the transition between parts of the background. The same blue occurs in the raised arm, so that the sleeve and the feather echo each other, like brackets framing the pair of smiling faces. These devices lend order and focus to the dynamic design. However, before the canvas itself (where its scale is a sizable factor), the use of a standard compositional pattern is barely noticed. On the contrary, compared with similar works by Honthorst, Hals's staging seems much more alive. The low viewpoint and placement of figures in the picture field create the impression that the viewer is extremely close to the couple, perhaps at a table or by an open door. Loose brushwork gives a sense of movement, strong shadows the impression of brilliant light, and blended tones a feeling of atmosphere, which shifts from freshness in the foreground to the haziness of the tavern interior.

In its iconography, too, the painting seems to represent an early moment in the development of Dutch genre subjects, with their entertaining descriptions of contemporary life. Scholarly debates about whether Hals depicts the Prodigal Son himself or the sort of Haarlem youth who should read the story reflect the fact that most earlier bordello pictures are clearly inspired by (or illustrate) the parable, while the pedigree is largely lost in later examples. Honthorst's *Merry Company*, of 1622 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), was catalogued as *The Prodigal Son* in 1719, but Giulio Mancini (1558–1630) in the 1620s described a very similar picture by Honthorst as *Cena di Buffonarie* (Supper of Buffoons, or Merry Company), and scholars today do not consider any Utrecht painting of this type to represent the passage in Luke. Rembrandt's large canvas *The Prodigal Son in the Tavern*, of about 1633 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), is not an exception, since it is also a portrait of the artist and his wife. It does, however, demonstrate how Dutch painters would transform the traditional story into a witty reflection of their own world.

Two prints have often been compared with the Museum's picture for the light they shed on its subject matter. An engraving dated 1597 after a composition by Hals's presumed teacher, Karel van Mander, shows a dapper gentleman embraced by two prostitutes at an inn (fig. 72). Behind them is a curtain, suggesting a bed or some private space. Two dogs lick at a morsel in the man's outstretched hand. An innkeeper and a serving boy bring food out of the kitchen in the background. Hals reduces this image to its essential elements, adding only the commonplace gesture of an upraised glass to clarify the young man's character. The print bears a legend in Italian and Dutch, which reads (to quote the catchier version) "Carezza de cani, Amor de Puttani, et invitti d'hosti: Non se po far che non vi costi" (The muzzle of dogs, the love of whores, the hospitality of innkeepers: None of it comes without cost).
The seventeenth-century viewer would not have needed to know this saying to recognize a dolled-up young woman in a tavern for what she was, or even to understand the dog as a symbol of her profession, and of libidinous behavior in general. Thehound in Hals's painting was evidently borrowed from an engraving by Jan Saenredam after Hendrick Goltzius (The Sense of Smell, showing a romantic couple with a basket of flowers), but dogs routinely appear in earlier Netherlandish brothel scenes. The other print (in addition to the one after Van Mander) that has been connected with the present painting serves as an illustration on the title page of Willem Dircksz Hooft's play entitled Heden-daghsche Verlooren Soen (Present-day Prodigal Son), which was performed in Amsterdam on February 3, 1630, and published the same year (fig. 73). Slive observes that "Hooft's play was moralistic in intent and if Hals's picture was meant to illustrate an episode from scripture it was so too." What the play actually demonstrates is that the story of a modern young man who simply resembles the Prodigal Son was rich in moral content, and familiar enough to find its way onto the popular stage. This does not mean that moral instruction was the main point of Hooft's play (which was apparently an occasional piece performed around Shrove-tide), or of Hals's picture. Rather, "the viewer's knowledge of the moral was the basis of the joke"—namely, the humor found in a young man behaving foolishly, as young men have since biblical times.

1. See Ex Coll. According to Slive 1970–74, vol. 3, p. 13 (under no. 20), "the earliest known reference to the traditional title" appears in the description of an eighteenth-century drawing, no. 54 in the sale of Johannes Enschede's collection, held in Haarlem on May 30, 1786. But the painting itself, no. 87 in the Enschede sale, is described in the catalogue in the same way (as quoted here under Ex Coll.).

2. See Van Thiel-Stroman in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, p. 400, doc. 119. As noted in Slive 1970–74, vol. 3, p. 115 (under no. 11), another picture possibly identical with the one called Een verloren soen van Frans Hals in 1647 is the Banquet in a Park formerly in the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, Berlin (lost in World War II). As Slive notes, however, the painting cited in 1647 is probably identical with one described as large in 1646 (according to Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3, p. 9, no. 1; see also Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, p. 399, doc. no. 115), which would be more expected of the Altman picture. Furthermore, the Berlin painting's attribution to Hals and its representation of the Prodigal Son (among many carousing figures) are both quite uncertain.


4. See Grimm 1972 and Grimm 1989 under Refs. below. The author's opinion was anticipated by Van Dantzig (1937) and Trivas (1941). Grimm (1989) accepts Hals's authorship of the main figure in The Smoker (Pl. 60), which can hardly be considered superior to the main figures in the present painting.

5. Lowenthal 1986, pp. 148–49, no. A-84, pl. 119. See the discussion below of Pieter Weyelaert's Kitchen Scene (Pl. 225). In Grimm 1972, p. 52, the scale of Hals's "waiter" (as the innkeeper is described) and the disjunction between foreground and background space are criticized as if these qualities put the attribution in question. The same sort of extrapolation backward from mature works would cast doubt upon Vermeer's A Maid Asleep (Pl. 202).

6. The background behind the main figure is evidently meant as a curtain rather than an open door. In Dirck Hals's Merry Company, of about 1625–28 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin; Nethelen-Marten 2003, no. 70, fig. 127), five figures sit at a table in a tavern, and in the left background the space drops back abruptly into a kitchen, where an innkeeper very similar to the one in the Altman picture carries a pie past the fireplace.

7. See Kolfijn 2005, pp. 20–22, 58–60, on how the theme of the Prodigal Son in Dutch art "dissolved, as it were, into the profligate merry company" during the period about 1590 to 1610 (quote from p. 59). The same point is made by Von Bogendorf Rupprath in Haarlem–Hamburg 2003–4, p. 70 (under no. 4, Buytewech's Merry Company in the Open Air; of about 1616–17, in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin). Of course, this applies only to the Prodigal Son in a tavern, not to his departure or return. On "Early Netherlandish Bordeeltjes and the Construction of Social Realities," see Salomon 2004, chap. 7.

8. Mascini and the catalogue of 1719 are compared in Judson and Ekkart 1999, p. 220 (under no. 283, the Munich picture, reproduced as pl. 168). See also ibid., p. 231 (under no. 284, another former Prodigal Son).


10. The engraving, evidently by Gillis van Breen, is connected with earlier inn scenes in Reiger 1970, p. 130, fig. 85, and with the Museum's picture in Grimm 1972, p. 197, and in Haeger 1986, pp. 143–44. See also Kolfijn 2005, pp. 54, 263 n. 134. The print's Dutch inscription, which is quoted often in the Hals literature, reads: "Honden gosn hoeren lief weerden gasten/Sonder cost ghienert ghy niet een van drien."


12. The comparison with Saenredam's print and the observation about dogs are both made in Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, p. 73 (fig. 35 for the series of prints by Saenredam).

13. Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 73–74.

14. Slive's "it" is criticized in Haeger 1986, pp. 144–45, where it is emphasized that secular inn scenes are "as likely to admonish the viewer as the biblical." On the musical aspect of Hooft's title plate, see Lieftink 2000, pp. 67–68.

15. The quote is from Kolfijn 2005, p. 52, in a discussion of "foolish young lords" as a type in Dutch genre painting about 1580–1610. See ibid., pp. 54, 263–64 n. 155, on Hooft's play.
REFERENCES: Gonnert 1880, pp. 78–79, describes the picture’s sale in 1880, its provenance, the composition, and various members of “The very distinguished Catholic family Ramp”; Baignières 1883 (ill. opp. p. 122 [etching by H. Guérard]), p. 357, as “Vive la fidélité!”; Bode 1883, pp. 49–51, 81, no. 13, as “Junker Ramp mit seiner Liebesten,” mentioned among other early works; Paris 1883, p. 112, no. 90 (ill. opp. p. 88, etching), as “Leve de Trouw! (Vive la Fidélité!)”; Bode 1906b, p. 129, describes the subject as a bordello scene adhering to the Prodigal Son theme “so beloved” in the Netherlands during the 16th and 17th centuries, mentions similar motifs in works by Hendrick Port, Jan Steen, and Dirck Hals, and praises the execution as typical of the early Hals; Erasmus 1909a, p. 51, listed as one of Hals’s rare early works with several figures; Moe 1909, pp. 25, 109, no. 209, observes that “ce sire Ramp était probablement un type populaire des trêteaux” (a popular stage type); possibly the picture cited in Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3 (1910), p. 9, no. 1, as used by Cornelis van Lennec to pay rent on March 24, 1646, and valued at Fl 48, possibly the picture cited in ibid., no. 2, as part of a transaction between the Amsterdam merchants Martin van de Broecke and Andries Ackersloo, as recorded on March 28, 1647, and ibid., pp. 41–43, no. 130, and (under no. 140), as “Junker Ramp and His Girl,” owned by B. Altmann, cited in a “repetition” in the collection of J. P. Heeseltine, London; Mireur 1911–12, vol. 3, p. 406, gives the purchase price at the Copes van Hasselt sale as FF 37,800; Altmann Collection 1914, pp. 31–32 (under no. 21), 34–35, no. 23 (ill. opp. p. 34), as a picture “of similar type to the Merry Company,” suggests that Ramp “must have been a famous roisterer of Haarlem in his time,” and observes that despite the “bewildering” speed of execution “the brush strokes are dashed on the canvas with perfect succees”; Bode and Binder 1944b, vol. 1, p. 25, no. 2, pl. 2a, as “Junker Ramp and His Beloved”; Altmann Collection 1915, p. 79 (ill.), cited as one of Altmann’s first Old Masters; Valentin 1921a, p. 23 (ill.), notes that the title, “Junker Ramp and His Sweetheart,” goes back to the 1768 sale but cannot be original since Hals’s sister, Pieter Ramp, bears no resemblance, and suggests that the picture may be identical with a large painting of the Prodigal Son that was owned by Cornelis Lemos in 1646 and by Martin van de Broecke in 1647; Monod 1923, pp. 300–301, praises the execution, connects the subject to the redervijikers of Haarlem, and calls the smaller version mentioned in Hofstede de Groot 1907–27 a copy by an artist in Hals’s circle; Valentin 1923, pp. 21 (ill.), 307, repeats Valentin 1921a; Poensgen 1926, p. 96, no. 3, 39, compares the hat in a painting by Buytewech; Altmann Collection 1928, pp. 62–64 no. 29 (ill. opp. p. 62), 90–91 (under no. 50), repeats Altmann Collection 1914; Hofstede de Groot 1928, p. 43, concludes that names such as Jonker Ramp “serve to show that even the contemporaries of Hals perceived the strongly individual element in the single figure genre pictures, and tried to attach individual names to them”; Düllberg 1930, pp. 52, 54–56, 57, pl. 14, praises the composition and execution, sees the same woman in Merveurakers a Struwwelaar (Pl. 68) and the man to the left in a variety of other pictures, and suggests that perhaps this Merry Company in the “Haumprzeum Nordamerikas” was originally called “The Prodigal Son” (citing the 1646 inventory mentioned in Valentin 1921a); Burroughs 1931a, describes the composition; Valentin 1936, p. 9, no. 4 (ill.) (and under nos. 5 and 20), titled “A Cavalier and His Sweetheart,” considers the painting close in composition and execution to The Rommel Pot Player (fig. 70 here) and The Smoker (Pl. 60), and again cites the “large representation of the Prodigal Son” in Amsterdam collections in 1646 and 1647; Van Dantzig 1937, pp. 49 (ill.), 64, no. 46, gives various reasons for believing that the picture is a later copy; Trivas 1941, p. 61, no. App. 2, and (under no. App. 4), pl. 133, considers none of the versions to be by Hals, and erroneously states that the picture was not in the 1786 sale (confusing it with an eighteenth-century drawing after the picture, no. 54 in the same sale); New York 1952–53, p. 229, no. 120, pl. 120, offers a superficial description of the painting’s subject and style; d’Orange-Mastai 1956, pp. 114–15 (ill. [overall and detail]), considers the smaller version (formerly in London) to have been painted first by Hals, who then sold the Museum’s picture; MMA 1959, unpagd, no. 37 (ill.), repeats some of the meaningless remarks first published in Altmann Collection 1914; Plietzsch 1960, pp. 33, 26, cites the work for its handling of interior space, incorrectly giving its date as 1635; J. Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, pp. 36–37, pl. 124, finds it difficult to decide whether the painting represents the story of the Prodigal Son or is a “pure” genre scene, and compares Rembrandt’s Prodigal Son in the Tavern in Dresden; Haskell 1970, p. 262, cites the picture as one of Altmann’s first Dutch acquisitions, of 1909; Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, pp. 72–74, 75, 76, 80, 100, 141, 226, calls the picture an outstanding example of Hals as a genre painter, supports the identification with the “Prodigal Son” cited in 1646 and 1647, relates the subject to W. D. Hoef’s play of 1630, The Modern-Day Prodigal Son, compares the composition of The Smoker (Pl. 60), and finds a source for the dog in an engraving after Goltzius, vol. 2, p. 42, vol. 3, pp. 13–14, no. 20, pp. 15 (under no. 21), 115 (under no. 21), defends the attribution, discusses the picture or pictures recorded in 1646 and 1647 as possibly the same as this one, credits Valentin with properly dismissing the old title, and considers the smaller version formerly in the Heseltine collection to be a copy by another hand; Grimm 1972, pp. 29, 49, 50, 52–53, 56, 62, 63, 64, 66, 197, 200, no. 116, fig. 25, describes various supposed faults of the painting and claims that it gives only a limited idea of a lost original by Hals, compares The Laughing Cavalier and other portraits, and relates the subject to an engraving after Karel van Mander (fig. 72 here) with an inscription about the favors of whores, dogs, and innkeepers (quoted in the text above); Plietzsch 1972, pp. 23, 26, as “The Prodigal Son,” mistakenly gives the date as 1625; Grimm and Montgomery 1974, p. 89 (under no. 24), fig. 244, says that the composition is known above all from the New York canvas, which is a copy according to Trivas and Grimm, although it is included in various catalogues of Hals’s work; Wiesner 1976, p. 6, pl. 10, reveals “the development of [Hals’s] individual style”; Blankert in Washington–Detroit–Amsterdam 1980–81, p. 189 n. 8, agrees that the picture is possibly the “Prodigal Son” cited in 1646 and 1647; Baard 1981, fig. 58, as by Hals; Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 21 n. 7, notes the source for Hals’s dog in an engraving after Goltzius (see text above); Hofrichter in New Brunswick 1983, p. 41, fig. 16, “conveys all that we associate with the energy of Haarlem”; Haeger 1986, pp. 141–48, fig. 1, discusses the earlier literature (except Bode 1906b) at some length, and interprets the subject not as the biblical Prodigal Son but as “a moral exemplum,” and as an illustration of the saying that the attentions of dogs, whores, and innkeepers come at a cost; P. Sutton 1986, p. 185, fig. 262, remarkably, considers it “unclear whether the figures are portraits” or otherwise; Pocart 1987, p. 80 (ill. p. 79), compares the male figure with that in Hals’s Lute Player.
in the Louvre (ex-Rothschild collection); Liedtke 1988, p. 100, considers the picture remarkable for its observed qualities and suggestion of space perceived from a close vantage point, even if the setting remains a "clever backdrop"; Grimm 1989, pp. 51-52, 56, 224, 237, no. 84, figs. 74b, 75, 78b (overall and details), rejects the picture as by Hals, and finds the same model in Hals's Lute Player; Slive in Washington—London—Haarlem 1989-90, pp. 1, 129, 197, 224, pl. III, remarks that the painting is missing from the 1989-90 exhibition because of the "ironclad terms" of its bequest, notes that this is Hals's only known genre picture to bear a date, and states that the work "can be classified with a group of Netherlandish depictions of the Prodigal Son in a contemporary setting, wasting his substance with loose women"; Van Thielen-Stroman in ibid., pp. 399 doc. 115, 400 doc. 119, lists the document of 1646 (not yet located in the Amsterdam archives) and the document of 1647 (which survives), both of which may refer to this painting; Grimm 1990, pp. 51-52, 56, 223-24, 237, 291-92, no. 84, figs. 74b, 75, 78b (overall and details), repeats Grimm 1989 in translation; Liedtke 1990, p. 48, describes the work as one of "two famous early genre pictures that stand quite apart from the Hailes bought by Frick, Morgan, Widener, Huntington, and the Tafts"; P. Sutton 1990b, pp. 67, 70, compares the Fort Worth picture (fig. 70 here) unfavorably with this one; P. Sutton 1992, pp. 74, 76 n. 1, fig. 1, notes the motif of the raised glass here and in Hals's Merry Lute Player in the Samuel collection; Kortenhoef-Von Bogendorf Rupprath in Haarlem—Worcester 1993, pp. 133 n. 12, 155 n. 14, 203 n. 2, 244, fig. 218, compares the composition to that of The Smoker (PL. 60), and (less convincingly) to works by Leyster and Molenaer; Snijdersbroek 1993, p. 140, fig. 39, compares other genre pictures by Hals, noting that Mose in 1909 had already described the male figure as a popular type rather than the Prodigal Son; Baertjé 1995, pp. 300-101; Slive 1995a, pp. 16-37, 43, fig. 34, considers the picture not a portrait "and probably not a genre scene pur but a representation of the Prodigal Son," compares W. D. Hoot’s title page (which would lead to a different conclusion), and discusses the raised glass and the dog; I. Worm in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 14, p. 91, uses the old title and calls the painting a portrait; Klessmann 1999, p. 26, fig. 7, compares the composition of Lisa’s lost painting, Courting Couple with Cherries; Frantis 2004, pp. 24-35, 261 n. 23, fig. 10, describes the picture’s stylistic innovations and considers whether its meaning is moralistic.

Exhibited: Paris, Galerie Georges Petit, “Cent chefs-d’oeuvre des collections parisiennes,” 1883, no. 90, as “Le de Trouv! (Vive la Fidélié!)” (lent by M. le comte Edmond de Pourtalès); New York, MMA, “Art Treasures of the Metropolitan,” 1921-22, no. 120, as “Jonker Ramp and His Sweetheart.”

Ex Coll.: Possibly Cornelia Lemens, Amsterdam, in 1646; possibly Martin van de Broecke, Amsterdam, in 1647; possibly Andries Ackersloot, Amsterdam, in 1647,; Johannes Enschedé, Haarlem (until d. 1780); his estate sale, Haarlem, May 30, 1786, no. 87, as “Jonker Ramp en zijn Matres; konstig door FRANS HALS” [Jonker Ramp and His Sweetheart; artful by Frans Hals], for fl 210 to Van Gent;; Johan Adriaen Versijden van Varick, Leiden (until 1791); his estate sale, Leiden, October 29, 1791, no. 103, for fl 130 to Delfis; B. C. de Lange van Wijngaarden, Haarlem; his sister, C. E. A. Copes van Hasselt (née De Lange), Haarlem and Amsterdam (d. 1879); sale, Amsterdam, April 20, 1880, no. 1, as “Hals [Le de Trouv]: Le Chevalier Ramp et sa Maîtrese” [Long Live Fidelity: Milord Ramp and His Sweetheart]; Comte Edmond de Pourtalès, Paris (1883); [Gimpel & Wildenstein, Paris and New York, until 1905; sold for $155,840 to Altman]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1905-d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.602.


2. In Van Stekelenburg 1981, p. 137, "matres" is given in modern Dutch as "geliefde, liefde, beminde." Johannes Enschedé (1708-1780) is described on the title page of the 1786 sale catalogue as a book printer in Haarlem, and his "excellent collection" as consisting of "artful and pleasant paintings, exceptionally fine drawings, very attractive and rare prints, and fine and well-preserved bound works, as well as fine rarities." The collection was sold by 'Iako Jelgersma and Vincent van der Vinne, in the Prinsenhof, Haarlem. Enschedé was the author of Proef van letteren, welke gegeven worden in de nieuwe Haelensem Letterregister (Haarlem, 1768). His sale is cited as provenance in the 1880 Copes van Hasselt sale.

3. The painting's ownership by B. C. de Lange van Wijngaarden (secretary of the city of Haarlem) and its inheritance by his sister are reported by C. J. Gonnert (director of the Museum van Moderne Kunst, Haarlem) in Gonnert 1880.
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60. The Smoker

Oil on wood, octagonal, 18¼ x 19½ in. (46.7 x 49.3 cm)

The painting is well preserved, but the face of the smoker has been more harshly cleaned in the past than the rest of the composition. The color of the background curtain, a dull grayish green, has faded, as is evident from passages along the edge where the original blue has been protected from the light. Analysis of a paint sample by Raman spectroscopy confirms that the fading can be attributed to the painter’s use of indigo, a light-sensitive pigment. The octagonal oak panel is composed of one piece of wood with the grain oriented horizontally. It retains its original thickness and bevels on the back.

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.34

This genre picture of the 1620s, which retains its original shape, has been described by scholars as a workshop replica of a slightly different composition (on a round panel) formerly in the Museum Stadt Königsberg (Kalinigrad) and, alternatively, as an original painting by Hals. Slive (see Refs.) accepts the picture as autograph while acknowledging that the execution of the background is “slack,” but also noting that the backgrounds of the two major paintings by Hals in the Altman Collection (Pls. 58, 59) are analogous. Grimm (see Refs.), having rejected this work—and the Altman pictures—in 1972, revised his opinion in a monograph of 1989. He defends Hals’s responsibility for the main figure in The Smoker, observing that the facial features are “executed with an aplomb typical only of Hals,” and that “the laughing girl . . . must be the work of one of Hals’s students.”

An earlier Hals specialist, Valentiner (1936; see Refs.), likewise overruled himself, at a time when the issue turned (as it had since 1970) on opinions of the painting in Königsberg. That work, even if judged solely from photographs, is obviously so inferior in execution to the Museum’s picture, and so dissimilar in some respects (the faces, through no deliberate effort, seem based on different models), that it may be considered irrelevant to the question of authorship considered here.

Direct juxtaposition with Young Man and Woman in an Inn (Pl. 59) strongly supports the view that the two paintings are by the same artist. This is especially evident in the deft descriptions of hair and lace, and in the modeling of the female faces (which conform to a single type). The Smoker was probably painted more quickly, as an inexpensive work for the open market. The wood support accounts in good part for the slicker appearance of the loose brushwork, an effect the painter exploits especially in the young man’s slashed doublet and in the play of light on his face. With regard to quality, only willful effort, based on the perusal of inadequate photographs, could lead critics to consider the face, hair, and distinctive hands of the smoker’s companion to be less accomplished in execution than the corresponding passages in the Altman canvas. A virtuoso suggestion of movement, of excitement, and of an abrupt shift in focus from the couple in the foreground to the blurred figure of a serving girl in the background may be appreciated from a normal viewing distance, where the eye is attuned not to supposed inconsistencies in execution but to the intended effect of the composition as a whole. Grimm’s opinion, in 1989, that two hands are responsible for the picture seems to the present writer less rational than his earlier rejection of the work, which itself was clearly mistaken.

Among the most similar works by Hals are three circular panels from the same period, the delightful Laughing Boy, in the Mauritshuis, The Hague, and the two rondels in the Staatsliches Museum, Schwerin, Drinking Boy (Taste) and Boy Holding a Flute (Hearing). Slive dates the Mauritshuis picture broadly, to about 1620–25, and the Schwerin paintings to about 1626–28. Comparison with these pictures led Biesboer and Von Bogendorf Rupprath to date The Smoker to 1625 at the earliest. A date of about 1635 is plausible. The panel was certainly painted after Young Man and Woman in an Inn, from which the design of The Smoker to some extent derives.

In the 1620s, smoking and drinking were regarded as similar weaknesses, with the former having the added detraction of being a new fad. Prints of the period, including one of the early 1620s after Dirck Hals (q.v.), often show smokers in a tavern or bordello, and the two women in the present picture represent those businesses. The moralizing inscription on the engraving after Dirck Hals associates smoking with “indecent lovemaking,” both of which are bad for the soul, but only the former is said (in this print) to damage the body. Prints, especially with inscriptions, functioned differently from paintings in Dutch collections of the time. This panel was intended not as a small step toward the improvement of mankind but as a comic glance at his nature, and as a brisk demonstration of what a modern painter could do.

2. See the large color detail of the man’s face in Grimm 1989 or 1990, fig. 762. Druesedow (1990; see Refs.) discusses the style of the doublet.
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5. The subject of smoking is discussed exhaustively by C. Kortenhorst-von Bogendorf Rupprath in connection with The Smoker in ibid., 246–51 (under no. 21). See ibid., pp. 248–29, fig. 21d, for the engraving after Dirck Hals and a complete translation of its Dutch and Latin verses. See also Gaskell 1987 and De Jongh 2003. In Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, pp. 77–79, condemnations of smoking are discussed (one of the prominent critics was Petrus ScriEVERUS, Hal's sitter in Pl. 65), and it is suggested that the New York painting “can also be viewed as a secularized ? representation of the sense of taste.” Series of pictures depicting the Five Senses, for example by Dirck Hals (Mauritsnhsus, The Hague), are reproduced by Slive. But the complete absence of evidence for other octagonal paintings by Hals depicting one of the senses suggests that the Museum's picture was made as an independent work.

REFERENCES: MMA 1905, no. 234; Moes 1909, p. 109, no. 212, describes the picture as “Un fumeur avec deux femmes (Réplique)” ; Valentin in New York 1909, p. 21, no. 22 (ill. opp. p. 21), as by Frans Hals, describes the subject; Cox 1909–10, p. 178, noted “in the catalogue [New York 1909] but not in the exhibition”; Brock 1910, pp. 21 (ill.), 31, mentioned as in the Hudson-Fulton exhibition; Haendekke 1910, p. 201, in a brief article (reacting to Valentin 1910 and Waldmann 1910) on the version of this composition in Königsberg, considers that picture superior to the New York panel, although the author knows the latter only from reproductions; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3 (1910), p. 37 (under no. 133), calls the picture a replica of the circular panel in the Königsberg museum, noting that the main figure is worthy of Hals but the other two are inferior; Valentin 1910, p. 6, dates the picture to about 1625, and supports Hofstede de Groote's qualified attribution to Hals (see above); Waldmann 1911 (ill. p. 73), as by Hals; Altman Collection 1914, p. 20 (under no. 19), "partakes of the nature of a subject- or character-picture as well as of portraiture"; Bode and Binder 1944, vol. 1, p. 25, no. 6, pl. 48, as “The Smoker and His Girl,” by Hals, reproduces the picture next to the original in Königsberg; Valentin 1921a, p. 307 (note to p. 27), describes the painting as probably a workshop version of the original in Königsberg: Monod 1923, p. 522, considers the “original” to be in Königsberg; Valentin 1923a, p. 307 (note to p. 27), repeats Valentin 1921a; Altman Collection 1928, p. 62 (under no. 28), repeats Altman Collection 1914; B. Burroughs 1931a, p. 149, no. 116–1, notes that Moes (1909) calls it a replica of the Königsberg version; Königsberg [1914], p. 33 (under no. 57), agrees with Haendekke 1910 that the Königsberg version is the original; Valentin 1926, unpagd, no. 5 (ill.), as “A Boy Smoking and a Laughing Girl,” dates the painting to about 1625, considers both the New York and Königsberg pictures to be autographs, and finds the execution similar to that of Young Man and Woman in an Inn (Pl. 99); [n.b.: no literature for thirty-four years]; Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, pp. 76–77, 79–80, considers the painting to be by Hals about 1623–25, compares Young Man and Woman in an Inn, and discusses the meaning of the work, suggesting that it could be a moralizing genre picture, or represent the sense of taste in a series of the Five Senses, vol. 2, pl. 41, vol. 3, pp. 14–15, no. 21, notes another instance of the octagonal format in Hals’s work, reviews opinions about this work and the version in Königsberg, agrees with Valentin (1936) that the New York painting is autograph, concedes that the figure to the far right is weak but observes that “such slack passages are found in the backgrounds of other paintings by the artist [Pls. 58, 59] and in my view should not serve as the basis for excluding the work from his oeuvre”; Grimm 1972, pp. 63, 92 n. 100, 200, no. 87, calls the work a copy after a lost original, dating from 1624–26 (p. 63) or 1624–25 (p. 200); Grimm and Montagni 1974, pp. 89–90 (under no. 25), fig. 254, reviews scholarly opinions, and notes “various guaHERUS typical of followers” in the work; Grimm 1989, pp. 178, 237, 272, 284, no. 17, pls. 76a, 76b (details), revises the opinion expressed in Grimm 1972, now attributing the painting to Hals about 1623, but noting that the head of the girl is inferior in execution and must be the work of a student; Jean L. Druesedow in “Recent Acquisitions,” MMA Bulletin 48, no. 2 (Fall 1990), p. 56, compares the doublet worn by the figure to an actual doublet of about 1625 acquired by the Museum; Grimm 1990, pp. 178, 204, 237–38, 273, 291, no. 17 (ill. p. 273), pls. 76a, 76b (details), repeats Grimm 1989 in translation; Liedtke 1990, p. 36, mentions the picture as part of the Marquand bequest; Biesboer in Haarlem–Worcester 1993, p. 80, dates the painting to 1625–30; Kortenhorst-von Bogendorf Rupprath in ibid., pp. 246–51, no. 21 (ill.), in a long entry, suggests a date of slightly later than 1623–25 (based on the costume and composition), compares the execution with that of Hals’s Boy Holding a F telescope in Schwerin, and offers an excursion on the reputation of smoking in the 1620s; Baerger 1995, p. 299; Weller in Raleigh–Columbus–Manchester 2002–3, pp. 67, 68 n. 2, fig. 2, sees this type of painting by Hals as influential for Jan Mirese Molenaer, and acknowledges that the painting's authorship has been debated.


EX COLLE.: R. G. Wibberforce, London (in 1887); Henry G. Marquand, New York (until 1889); Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.34
61. Boy with a Lute

Oil on canvas, 28 1/4 x 23 1/4 in. (72.1 x 59.1 cm)

The paint surface is worn and the impasto has been slightly flattened during past lining. The stippled decoration on the collar and the lute strings over the proper left thumb are not original. There is a pentimento in the right background: a feather extending from the beret to the wineglass was painted out by the artist. Microscopic examination of a sample mounted in cross section revealed that the lute was planned from the start. The fruit was painted after the tablecloth was fully finished.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.604

The Altman Boy with a Lute was probably painted by Hals about 1625. His authorship has occasionally been doubted (see Refs.), but condition problems and clumsy restorations would appear to largely explain the picture's shortcomings (see the condition note above). The strongest passages are consistent in handling with contemporary genre paintings by Hals. The hair, the drapery folds, the highlights on the sleeve, the modeling of the face and hands, the use of stark shadows (which have been exaggerated by retouching in the hand holding the glass), and the description of the open mouth may be compared with motifs in works by Hals such as Singing Boy with a Flute (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) and The Merry Lute Player (Harold Samuel Collection, Mansion House, London), both of about 1625-27.

A large, light-colored feather originally hung from the right side of the beret and curved down to the wineglass. A similar motif is found in the Berlin picture and in Hals's Young Man Holding a Skull, of about 1626-27 (National Gallery, London). Technical examination, including a cross section of the paint layers in this area, suggests that the artist blocked out the lute in approximately its present position, and then painted it out with a brownish black layer of paint. The feather was then painted in. Although the lead white present in the feather would have dried quickly, it was not completely dry when the neck of the lute was painted in its present position. The decision to insert a curtain in the background may have come at this stage. Most genre pictures by Hals have neutral backgrounds, but a curtain was sketched into the background of The Smoker (Pl. 60), and a similar curtain is draped behind the figure in Hals's full-length portrait Willem van Heythuysen, of about 1625 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich). The orange was probably introduced at a late stage to balance the composition and to create an impression of receding space to the lower left. All this suggests that Hals had decided upon the boy's head and the arrangement of his hands and the glass from the start, but that other parts of the picture were revised in the course of work.

The Altman painting is probably identical with a canvas by Hals that was sold in Rotterdam in 1825, and was described in the auction catalogue as representing "a youth in a merry pose who lets the last drop from a glass fall on his fingernail, beautiful in coloring and execution" (see Ex Coll.). In his 1909 monograph, Moes introduced the title "Le rubis sur l'ongle" (The Ruby on the Fingernail). The Altman catalogue of 1914 observes that the young man pours "the last drops of the wine on the left thumb, indicating thereby, no doubt, that the glass is empty and that he wants it refilled." Moes's title is cited, and explained as "some slang phrase of the time." The expression was indeed current in the seventeenth century and remains familiar today. The "ruby" is a drop of red wine spilled onto the drinker's thumbnail (which, presumably, would then go into his mouth). The same subject is found in an engraving (fig. 74) by the Haarlem printmaker Theodoor Matham (1603/6-1676), after an unnamed artist (possibly Gerrit van Honthorst; Matham engraved similar images by Honthorst in 1626 and 1627). The inscription compares actual rubies to "delicious drops," which remind mankind of life's brevity. The print is signed "Theod. Matham fec. Paris," and bears the name of the Parisian publisher Charles David (Matham is thought to have worked in Paris about 1629-30). About the 1680s in Paris, the print was copied in reverse in the background of an engraving after Andries Both (1612/13-1641), The Poor Painter in His Studio, and there it is labeled "La Rubic." The saying is also illustrated in a painting of 1659, Rubis sur l'ongle, by the Mechelen artist Pierre Franchyso (1606-1654; Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels). Similarly, a painting attributed to Michiel Sweerts (1618-1664) depicts a young man in modest attire pouring the last drops from a small wineglass onto his thumbnail. Thus in a scene of mindless merriment Hals reminds viewers that all too soon the music stops: "The glass is empty. Time is up."12

Hals and his circle have not found the attribution convincing, and the present writer now considers it implausible.


3. This analysis summarizes that of Ella Hendriks, head of the Painting Conservation at the Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem, as detailed in a letter to the present writer, dated December 4, 1993.


6. Details are given on numerous Web sites. One says either “boire” or “faire rubis sur l’ongle.” Similarly, “payer rubis sur l’ongle” means to pay the last cent for something, implying complete (and usually prompt) payment.

7. See Judson and Ekkart 1999, nos. 226, 240, pls. 121, 127, and Amsterdam 1997a, p. 313, fig. 3.

8. Both the original French and the English translation are botched in Amsterdam 1997a, pp. 265, 267 n. 14. The French reads, “Tous ces Rubis que nous mettons/Au rang des pierres precieuses,/Que peuvent, comme dons de Dieu,/Rappeller des morts et les humains.” This may be freely translated: “These rubies, precious stones, what are they? Like these precious drops, gifts divine, they remind us of human mortality.”

9. See ibid., pp. 350–51, fig. 10. The Matham print, as it appears in the engraving after Both, bears the lines after the large title, “La Rubie”: “Ausz rost que jay bu/Je voudrois encorboire” (All that I have had to drink/I want to drink again). Martin Royalt-Kisch kindly recorded the inscription on the British Museum’s engraving after Both, which was published by Pierre Landry in Paris about 1680–90 (personal communication, February 27, 2006).

10. See Brussels 1965, p. 83, no. 84, where the discussion cites the use of the expression in a French play of 1704.

11. Not in Kultzen 1996. Sold at Christie's, London, December 8, 1995, no. 34, where the Museum’s painting by Hals is compared, and where Malcolm Waddingham and Lindsey Shaw-Miller are thanked for “confirming the attribution.” Waddingham proposes a date of about 1648–50, when Sweerts was in Rome. This appears consistent with the figure’s working-class attire, which includes a head scarf with an embroidered border.

12. For the quote, see the entry on Pieter Claesz’s Still Life with a Skull and Writing Quill (Pl. 28), page 129 and note 8. On the lute as a vanitas symbol, see Liedtke 2000a, pp. 69–70.

References: Cust 1907, p. 3 (ill. opp. p. 1), cites the painting as “Young Man with Mandolin,” by Frans Hals, states that it was sold for Gns 3,800 in Dublin in the autumn of 1906, and subsequently changed hands three times (see Ex Coll); Moes 1909, p. 109, no. 210, as “Le Rubis sur l’ongle” (The Ruby on the Fingernail): Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3 (1910), pp. 20, 24, no. 86, as “The Finger-Nail Test (or, The Mandoline-Player with a Wine-Glass),” describes the subject and lists provenance; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 28–29 no. 19, 31–32 (under no. 21), as “A Youth with a Mandolin,” states that the picture “partakes of the nature of a subject- or character-picture as well as of portraiture,” and concludes that the title given in Moes 1909 “must be some slang phrase of the time”; Bode and Binder 1914b, vol. 1, p. 32, no. 57, pl. 24, listed, as “A Youth with a Mandolin: The ‘Finger-Nail Test’”; Valentiner 1921a, pp. 56 (ill.), 310, dates the painting to about 1627, and finds the same model in The Merry Lute Player (Harold Samuel Collection, Mansion House, London); Momord 1923, pp. 302–301 (ill.), as “Rubis sur l’ongle,” suggests that the motif of the upturned wineglass is borrowed from one of Hals’s civic guard portraits; Valentiner 1923, pp. 59 (ill.), 310, repeats Valentiner 1921a; Altman Collection 1928, pp. 61–62 no. 28, 90–91 (under no. 50), as “A Youth with a Lute,” repeats the text from Altman Collection 1914; Dülberg 1920, p. 78, as “Nagelprobe,” describes the composition, and repeats the idea that the gesture is borrowed from one of Hals’s civic guard company portraits; B. Burroughs 1931a, p. 100, no. H16–6, as “A Youth with a Lute,” explains that the picture is “also known as Le Rubis sur l’ongle (The Ruby [last drop of wine] on the Finger Nail)”; Valentiner 1936, p. 9, no. 21 (ill.), believes the model to be one of the artist’s children, and the painting to be “a sort of companion piece” to The Merry Lute Player; Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, p. 88, sees the type as adopted from Ter Bruggghen but treated quite differently, vol. 2, pl. 47, vol. 3, pp. 16–17, no. 24, as painted by Hals in about 1623–25, suggests that the work may be identical with one in the Kamehans sale, Rotterdam, October 3, 1825, no. 47 (despite the larger size recorded there); Grimm and Montagni 1974, pp. 116 (ill.), 118, no. 310, reports that Valentiner, Slive, and other scholars have accepted the
work as by Hals, but Trivas (by excluding it from his monograph) and Grimm reject it as a work from the artist’s circle; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 83, as by Hals; P. Sutton 1986, p. 186, as by Hals, describes the “popular gesture”; Grimm 1989, p. 284, as from the circle of Hals; Hofrichter 1989, pp. 26, 57-58, no. 32, pl. 32, attributes the picture to Judith Leyster, dates it to about 1633–35, and interprets the theme as intemperance, with the lute a vanitas motif and the orange a symbol of luxury; Grimm 1990, p. 291, as from the circle of Hals; Liedtke 1990, fig. 36 (Altman gallery view); P. Sutton 1992, pp. 75, 78 n. 13, describes the painting as a work by Hals that is similar to The Merry Lute Players, but rejects Valentiner’s idea (1926) that the two pictures were intended as companion pieces; Stuckenbrock 1993, p. 248, listed as a work by Hals; Baetjer 1995, p. 303, as “Attributed to Frans Hals.”


EX COLL.: Probably J. Kamemans (his sale, Rotterdam, auctioneer A. Lamme, October 5, 1825, no. 47, as by F. Hals, “Een Jongeling in een vrolijke houding den laazen droppel uit een glas op zijnen nagel latende lopen, fraai van coloriet en behandelung, h.84d.b.64d.
D[ock]” (A Youth in a merry pose who lets the last drop from a glass fall on his fingernail, beautiful in coloring and execution,

See the following note on the painting’s size in the Kamemans sale.

The metric system was adopted in the Netherlands between 1793 and 1815. There were many local variations, but in general, as of 1820, the duim (thumb), previously equivalent to the English inch, became the term employed for a centimeter. Thus the measurements given in the 1825 Rotterdam sale catalogue are approximately 84 x 64 centimeters, about 12 x 5 centimeters larger than the painting’s present dimensions. Radiographic examination reveals substantial cupping on all sides, indicating that the canvas has not been cut down at all. It appears likely that the dimensions given in 1825 were slightly inaccurate, or that some framing element was included in the measurements. Alternatively, the canvas recorded in 1825 could have been another version of the composition, or a very similar picture by Hals.

62. Portrait of a Bearded Man with a Ruff

Oil on canvas, 30 x 25 in. (76.2 x 63.5 cm)
Dated and inscribed (right): AEFRAT 36/AN.4 1635

The impasto has been slightly flattened during lining, and the paint surface is abraded. There is significant paint loss in the lower portion of the figure and in the oval surround, particularly at the corners.

The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.34

As the original inscription indicates, the unidentified sitter was thirty-six years old when Hals painted his likeness, in 1625. The portrait’s immediacy is enhanced by vivid brushwork, the strong modeling of the head, the glance and gesture (which respond to the viewer), and the oval framing device. Hals used a similar fictive frame in his Portrait of a Man Holding a Medallion, of about 1619 (Brooklyn Museum), where the sitter’s hand extends through the frame, but the present picture appears more illusionistic, mainly because of the emphatic contrasts of light and shadow. Another example of a painted oval frame is found in Hals’s Portrait of a Man, dated 1622 (Duke of Devonshire and the Chatsworth House Trust, Chatsworth), which like the Brooklyn portrait is on a canvas of conventional size.1 Hals’s use of the oval format, which is closely related to portrait engravings by Dutch artists, is discussed in the following entry.

The feathery touch with which Hals painted the lace ruff is one of the portrait’s most attractive features. The comparatively flat treatment of the shadowy part of the ruff is typical of Hals, who took bold steps to suggest receding space as perceived from a normal viewing distance. Another instance of an effect meant to be seen from feet—not inches—away is the shadow to the side of the nose. The man’s ring, with a gray stone, draws attention to the hand, which has convincing volume and a sense of movement created by blurred contours and by the loose strokes defining the cuff of the sleeve. If Van
der Helst's Portrait of a Man (Pl. 76) is, in the words of Henry James, "The perfect prose of portraiture" (see p. 324), then Hals's portrait is neither that nor poetry, but a brief character sketch meant to delight the patron's family and friends.

The man's gesture, placing his hand on his heart, suggests sincerity, as explained by John Bulwer in 1644.2


REFERENCES: Valentiner 1923, p. ix, mentions the picture in the foreword as a newly discovered male portrait by Hals, dated 1625, with Buttery, London; Valentiner 1928b, p. 247, fig. 1, as in the Bache collection; Detroit 1935, unpaged, no. 3 (ill.); Valentiner 1935, p. 101, listed, as in the Bache collection; Valentiner 1936, pp. 8-9, no. 13 (ill.), sees the influence of Rubens, and notes the same position of the hand in other portraits by Hals; Bache Collection 1937, no. 35 (ill.), describes the composition and compares a few contemporary works; Tivis 1944, p. 30, no. 17, pl. 29, lists literature; Bache Collection 1945, no. 34 (ill.); Slive 1970-74, vol. 2, pls. 10, 70, vol. 3, p. 22, no. 34 adds Carl Thomson, about 1925, to the provenance (possibly David Croal Thomson of Barbizon House; see Ex Coll.); Grimm 1972, pp. 20-21, 87, 202, no. 35, dates the picture about 1628-32, finding evidence of overpainting and later additions, including the oval framing device and the inscription; Grimm and Montagni 1974, pp. 90 (ill.), 91, no. 37, notes that the date has been verified as original by recent conservation treatment; Grimm 1989, pp. 18, 178, 272, 284, no. 20, fig. 7, accepts the date of 1625, and reports that conservation in 1973-74 revealed the presence of Hals's hand in the execution of the head, collar, and hand; Groen and Hendriks in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989-90, pp. 117, 124, report that the hand is underpainted in a light red tone, and describe the ground color; Grimm 1990, pp. 18, 178, 273, 291, no. 20, fig. 7, repeats Grimm 1989 in translation; Baeijer 1995, p. 301.


EX COLL.: Julia, Countess of Dartrey, London; [A. H. Buttery, London, in 1923]; [Barbizon House, London, until 1922]; Julius Böhler, Munich, 1925; sold half share to Kleinberger; [Julius Böhler, Munich, and Kleinberger, Paris and New York, 1925-26; sold to Lacerne Fine Art]; Lacerne Fine Art Co., Ltd., in 1926; [Gaston Neumanns, Brussels; sold to Bache on August 30, 1926, for $121,766.50]; Jules S. Bache, New York (1926-d. 1944; his estate, 1944-49); The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.34


63. Petrus Scriverius

Oil on wood, 8¼ x 6¾ in. (22.2 x 16.5 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed (lower border of painted frame): FHF 1626 [FH in monogram]; (right center): A50

The painting is very well preserved. There is a small amount of paint loss along a vertical split that extends the length of the panel at center to the right of the sitter's left eye. A small hole at top center, now repaired, may have been caused by a hanging device.

H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.8

This small portrait and its pendant, Anna van der Aar (Pl. 64), are certainly by Hals and are each monogrammed and dated 1626. The sitters were a couple who lived in Leiden, though Hals would have painted the pictures in Haarlem, where they both had close ties (see the biographical section below).

Hals's first picture of this type may have been a portrait of the Counter-Remonstrant preacher Johannes Bogaert, who died in 1614. The painting is lost but recorded by Jan van de Velde's engraving dated 1628, which is inscribed "F. Hals pinxit." The sitter in that painting is presented half-length in an oval frame, and holds an upraised book (perhaps his Schriften fondamenten, of 1603, a critique of Catholic teaching).1 A more direct precedent is found in the artist's small oval portrait on copper (5¼ x 4½ in. [14.5 x 12 cm]; Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem) of Theodorus Schrevelius (1572-1649), inscribed, on the scholar's book, AET. 44/1617. The image is reversed in an engraving by Jacob Matham (1571-1631), which is inscribed "Fra. Hals pinxit." and dated 1618.2 As discussed below, this example of academic portraiture would not have escaped Scriverius's attention.
THE SITERS AND THEIR HAARLEM TIES

Pieter Schrijver (1576–1660), who is better known by his Latinized name, Petrus Scriverius, was born on January 12, 1576, in Haarlem. He was the eldest son of Hendrik Schrijver, an Amsterdam merchant, and of Cornelia Soop, who came from a wealthy family in Haarlem. The couple settled in the bride’s hometown, but business concerns obliged Hendrik Schrijver to move the family back to Amsterdam. Pieter, however, was left in the care of his mother’s sister, who was married to a Haarlem burgomaster, Barthold van der Nijenburg. The boy attended the Latin School in Haarlem, which was then flourishing under its distinguished rector, Cornelius Schonaeus (1540–1611). Scriverius’s thorough education and love of Latin poetry were debts to Schonaeus warmly acknowledged in later years.

At the age of nineteen, Scriverius transferred to the University of Leiden. Six years later, on May 22, 1599, he married Anna van der Aar, daughter of the City Councilman and sheriff, Willem Govertsz van der Aar (see the following entry). The young couple moved into a house next to that of Anna’s parents, on the Nieuwe Rijn in the heart of the city. Scriverius never sought a university position or public office, but spent the rest of his life in Leiden studying classical literature and the history of the Netherlands from ancient to modern times. As a Remonstrant, Scriverius would have found many doors closed to him, especially in Leiden and Haarlem. Nevertheless, he was closely associated with leading scholars of the day, including Johannes Woverius, Daniel Heinsius, Janus Douss, and the esteemed French humanist and Leiden professor Joseph Justus Scaliger (whose poems he edited). The Dutch members of this Neo-Latinist circle were great apologists for their own language, a cause advanced by Scriverius’s influential preface to Heinsius’s Nederduytse poemata (1616). Scriverius also published Dutch poems of his own composition, as well as an edition of Seneca’s tragedies (1621) and commentaries on other classical authors. He is best remembered, however, for his histories of the Netherlands and of particular provinces, including Battaria illustrata (1609), Beschryving van Oud Batavien (1612), and Principes Hollandiae, Zeelandiae et Frisiae (1620). His more popular efforts include an attack in 1616 on Dutch rednerjikers (rhetoricians), which depicts them in terms not far from those of Frans Hals (Pl. 58), and a tract against the use of tobacco (1628).

Scriverius must have been well acquainted with the slightly older Theodorus Schrevelius, the subject of Hals’s small portrait of 1617 and Matham’s engraving of the following year. Schrevelius was co-rector of the Latin School in Haarlem, under Schonaeus, whom he succeeded as rector in 1609. After sixteen years in that position, he moved to Leiden, where he served as rector of the Latin School (1623–42) and pursued his interests in Latin and Dutch poetry and the history of Dutch cities (his Harleumia, of 1648, extolls Hals’s portraits, which “seem to live and breathe”).

In May 1628, when the Utrecht art lover Aernout van Buchell (or Buchelius) visited Schrevelius in Leiden, he was shown a portrait of his host by Hals, and was given an impression of Van de Velde’s print (1626; fig. 73) after Hals’s portrait of Scriverius. The latter very likely turned to Hals in Haarlem, rather than a Leiden portraitist such as David Bailly (q.v.), because he knew the artist’s portrait of Schrevelius and the engraving after it. The six lines of Latin verse at the bottom of the print were composed by Scriverius himself. He praises the schoolmaster’s control of “wayward youths [through] the force of his eloquence and his Palladian discipline,” and describes Matham’s copperplate as the teacher’s proper reward and as a remembrance, “so that if perchance envious time should blot out his name and hide the man, his likeness may speak for him.”

The actual circumstances that brought Hals and Scriverius together were undoubtedly more complex. Both of Scriverius’s parents died in Haarlem in July 1626, which would have taken him back to his native city to settle their estate. Scriverius was also helping Samuel Ampzing with his history of Haarlem (Beschryvinge ende lof der stad Haerlem in Holland, 1628) by contributing scholarly information, a treatise on Haarlem’s supposed inventor of movable type (Laurens Coster), and inscriptions for engraved plates, such as Jan van de Velde’s print after Pieter Saenredam’s drawing of a modern printing press. Most of the illustrations in the book, including a number of oval portraits, were engraved by Van de Velde.

In providing learned (or simply literate) inscriptions for prints, Scriverius was following the example of Schonaeus, Schrevelius, and other humanists. Scholars of the time worked closely with publishers of books and prints. Schonaeus and Schrevelius were especially involved with Haarlem’s most famous artist, Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1617), and with the engravers who (like Goltzius’s stepson Jacob Matham) worked directly for him. Some of the most coveted prints of the time are embellished with verses written by Scriverius’s scholarly predecessors. Schonaeus, for example, composed the inscriptions for Jan Saenredam’s series of three engravings after Goltzius, The Worship of Bacchus, Venus and Ceres (1596), and for a dozen other prints after Goltzius by Matham and Saenredam, all dating from the second half of the 1590s.”

Schrevelius provided the Latin text for Matham’s engraving,
64. Shown actual size
dated 1598, after Goltzius’s well-known drawing *The Beached Whale near Berkhey* (the print also bears a long Dutch description by Karel van Mander), and composed inscriptions for other engravings after Goltzius.

These Latin School contacts with Goltzius might explain how Scriverius, when he was only twenty-one years old and living in Leiden, came to compose the inscription on one of the Haarlem master’s most personal prints, his original portrait engraving, dated 1597, of Frederik de Vries. Scriverius also penned a Latin poem of praise for Van Mander’s *Schilder-Boeck* of 1604. The connection with Van Mander may have been made by Scriverius’s uncle by marriage Jan Govertsz van der Aar (1544/45–1612), who was one of Haarlem’s most important patrons of the pictorial arts. He is presented as a shell collector in Goltzius’s portrait, dated 1603 (P. and N. de Boer Foundation, Amsterdam, on loan to the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), a boldly naturalistic picture which Van Mander, in the *Schilder-Boeck*, describes as a work that the artist painted for his own pleasure. Van der Aar appears in no less than eight other works by Goltzius, in a drawing and an engraving by Matham, and in two paintings by Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem (1562–1638), which suggests that he was familiar with all the leading Mannerist artists in Haarlem (who, of course, included Van Mander). Cornelisz van Haarlem shows the collector as himself in a large canvas, *Allegory of the Arts and Sciences* ("Image of Peace"), dated 1607 (Lord Sackville collection, Knole, Kent), and Goltzius cast Van der Aar in the role of Saint Luke (patron saint of painters) in a posthumous portrait drawing (dated 1614), and in another drawing, known from a print by Matham. In addition to collecting shells and pictures, Van der Aar was a merchant and a substantial investor in the East India Company (VOC). Several documents suggest that the businessman was, in effect, the Haarlem branch of the textile business that was owned in Leiden by Scriverius’s father-in-law, Willem Gouwerts van der Aar, and his brothers. Thus, Scriverius had considerable knowledge of the art world in Haarlem—painters, engravers, printers, patrons, critics, and scholarly associates—well before his portrait was painted by Hals.

**THE PORTRAITS AND THEIR PURPOSE**

Slive raises the question of whether any of Hals’s small painted portraits were “done expressly as modelli for engravers,” and answers, “probably some were.” In the case of pendant portraits of a public figure and his wife, it was normal that (as in this case) only the male portrait would be engraved. Hals’s portrait of Scriverius’s wife, Anna van der Aar (Pl. 64), thus indicates that the scholar’s portrait was not made solely as a modella for a print, but also as a personal keepsake. The scale and design of the two portraits, however, were certainly determined by the intention of having Scriverius’s image immortalized in an engraving. The fact that Van de Velde’s print (fig. 75) does not (despite its several lines of information) bear the name of a publisher implies that it was intended mainly for private distribution, a gesture common in the academic community. Examples are found right in our sitter’s milieu. One of the inducements employed by the governors of the University of Leiden to bring Scaliger from the south of France to Holland was to have Goltzius engrave his and his father’s portraits, and to send him numerous impressions of both (which were also dispatched as gifts to universities throughout Europe).
Matham's print after Hals's portrait of Schrevelius, with its inscription by Scriverius, lacks a publisher's name and was surely intended for circulation among colleagues and institutions. That the engraving of Scriverius would have served the same purpose is underscored by its "anonymous" inscription:

Here you see the face of he who, shunning public office, makes the Muses his own at personal expense.
He loves the privacy of his home, sells himself to no one, [and]
Devotes all his leisure time to fellow citizens...25

Formal precedents for Hals's composition were plentiful. Slive cites a portrait of the famous composer Jan Pietersz Sweelinck (Gemeentemuseum, The Hague), which was painted in 1606 by the sitter's brother (and Haarlem printmaker), Gerrit Pietersz (1566–before ca. 1612). The approximately life-size figure rests his right forearm on an oval frame, and through it gestures rhetorically with his left hand.26 In Hals's Portrait of a Man Holding a Medallion, of about 1615 (Brooklyn Museum), the sitter presents a miniature portrait of his beloved (presumably), extending his hand through the oval frame.27 These paintings of conventional size penetrate the plane of the framing device in a manner adopted from Mannerist prints and drawings, including portraits by Goltzius. In examples of the 1820s, including a tiny oval portrait of the artist's wife, Goltzius places the body of the bust-length figure in front of the lower part of the frame, while the head is centered within it.28 A closer precedent for Hals's portrait of Scriverius, with respect to the hand resting on the frame, is found in Goltzius's half-length portrait print of the art collector Jan Niecquet, dated 1598.29 The figure, framed simply in a rectangular field, holds gloves (the sign of a gentleman) in his left hand, while his strongly modeled right hand casts a shadow on the lower border of the engraving (which is inscribed with a Dutch and Latin text in elaborate calligraphy).

Of course, such an artistic conceit in portraiture represents a special case within a broader trend of illusionism, which was celebrated by Van Mander in connection with Hans Vredeman de Vries and other artists.30 In murals of the 1580s and 1590s, Vredeman de Vries (1526–1609) depicted (like Veronese before him) figures behind balustrades, over which they extend their hands, arms, and glances.31 Because these motifs constitute displays of artistic virtuosity, it seems appropriate that a mausoleum extends beyond the picture field (itself a riot of spatial effects) in Aegidius Sadeler's engraving after Bartholomeus Spranger's design, Memorial to the Artist's Wife, of 1600.32 The staff recalls the scythe that, together with a bare foot, thrusts beyond the lower border of Pieter van der Heyden's print Summer, after Pieter Bruegel the Elder's drawing of 1658. The invention has been said to illustrate a Dutch expression, "over de schreef gaan" (to go beyond bounds).33 Scriverius would have appreciated that these Netherlandish notions had roots in classical texts, quite as Van Mander had Pliny in mind when he praised artists for deceiving viewers.34 The patron would also have recognized that the illusion of actual existence before the beholder's eyes was particularly appropriate in portraiture, where a loved or admired person was (as Scriverius wrote of Frederik de Vries on the engraving by Goltzius) "brought to life in copper with a skillful hand, like that of Phidias."35

Or that of Hals. The painter went well beyond the limits of engraving (as is obvious in Van de Velde's print after this picture) through color and brushwork, suggesting textures, shifting highlights, a space filled not only by the figure but also with atmosphere, and a sense of movement conveyed by broken contours, busy surfaces, strands of hair, and points of lace. The different temperaments of Scriverius and his wife can be sensed from their expressions and poses, and even from the play, or comparative stillness, of light and shadow on their faces and hands. In these vivid effects, Hals may have been inspired once again by Goltzius, whose colored portrait drawings of the 1590s and slightly later seem the most immediate antecedents of Hals's small painted portraits, despite their distance in date.36

Connections with Rembrandt
Van de Velde's engraving after Hals's portrait of Scriverius (fig. 75), or the painting itself, has been said to have served as a model for one of Rembrandt's most memorable portrait prints, that of the deceased preacher Jan Cornelisz Sylvius (1565/64–1638).37 The etching of 1646 makes Sylvius look very much alive, in part by having him lean and gesture through an oval frame (his hand and face cast strong shadows on the surface of the sheet). Some influence is plausible, in part because Scriverius, beneath the illusionistic image, added two lines to the long Latin inscription by Caspar Barlaeus. However, Hals's small portrait on panel of the Haarlem theologian Johannes Acronius, of 1627 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), which was engraved by Van de Velde, and especially his small Portrait of a Man, on copper, which probably dates from 1627 as well (and is also in Berlin), develop the motif of the extended hand much further than in the Scriverius portrait of the preceding year, and come closer to Rembrandt's gesture of 1646 (and of 1642, in The Night Watch).38

In addition to his relationships with Haarlem artists, Scriverius has been identified as a likely patron of Rembrandt
in Leiden during the mid-1620s. It is thought that two large panel paintings by the artist, The Stoning of Saint Stephen, dated 1635 (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyons), and the so-called History Painting (Palamedes Protecting his Innocence?), of 1626 (Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden), are probably identical with "Two brave groote stukken van Rembrandt" ("Two fine large pieces by Rembrandt") listed as lot 3 in the auction catalogue of Scriverius's estate, dated August 8, 1663.10 Late in life, Scriverius also became the owner of another large painting by Rembrandt, The Standard Bearer (Floris Soup), of 1654 (Pl. 192). The canvas depicts the scholar's nephew, who died in 1657.45 As the bachelor's sole heir, Scriverius inherited the portrait, but he never saw it, having gone blind about four years before it was painted.

1. The engraving is illustrated and briefly discussed in Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, p. 28, fig. 16. Of course, it is possible that Van de Velde based the print on a conventional portrait by Hals.


3. On the question of whether Scriverius was born in Haarlem or Amsterdam, see Dudok van Heel 2006, p. 50 n. 124.


5. On the religious and political conflicts of the time (especially the 1620s), see Israel 1995, chap. 21.


9. Bailly was producing portrait drawings and paintings of the same type in the 1620s, for example the small oval portrait on a rectangular copper support (⅞ x ⅜ in. [18.5 x 14 cm]), Portrait of a Woman, Thought to be Maria van Rijensbergh, Wife of Hugo de Groot, dated 1626 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). See also Leiden 1976–77, pp. 40–41, nos. 11–13.


11. On Scriverius's work with Ampzing, see G. Schwartz and Bok 1990, pp. 39, 55, 56, 288, 292, no. 188. See also G. Schwartz 1985, p. 35, caption to fig. 5, citing Van de Velde's engraved portraits (after Hals and other artists) of notable Haarlem figures, and G. Schwartz and Bok 1990, pp. 40–48, figs. 43–48. In 1659, Saenredam drew a view of the Groote Markt, Haarlem, in Scriverius's album amicorum (ibid., pp. 45, 266, no. 90, fig. 42). Hals's small portrait on copper of Samuel Ampzing dates from 1660 (see Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, no. 40). In 1612, it was engraved by Van de Velde, with eight lines of Latin verse by Scriverius (G. Schwartz and Bok 1990, fig. 48). The extent of Scriverius's involvement with Haarlem printmakers and publishers remains to be explored. A broader review of inscriptions on reproductive engravings by Matham, Van de Velde, and others would be of interest. In Judson and Ekkart 1999, pp. 180 no. 226, 189–90 no. 240, pls. 119, 121, 127, it is noted that Scriverius provided the light Latin inscriptions for Matham's engraving of 1626 after Honthorst's Young Woman (Peyliss) Playing the Violin, and for Matham's engraving of 1627 after Honthorst's Merry Violinist Holding a Wingletl. The author of the entry goes so far as to wonder "whether or not these gay, outgoing and boisterous types represented by Honthorst did not come to Hals's attention through Scriverius." On this point, see the discussion of Hals's Boy with a Lute (Pl. 61). Scriverius also composed captions for the Leiden engraver Willem van Swansenburg (1850–1612; see G. Schwartz 1985, p. 43) and other printmakers.

12. As noted above, in the biography of Jacques de Gheyn, the Leiden scholar Hugo de Groot [Grotius; 1583–1645] started composing inscriptions for engravings when he was twelve years old.

13. See Reznick 1961, p. 190 (on the friendship of Schoneus and Goltzius), and nos. 10, 12, 13, 25, 106, 125, 130, 131, 133, 191–94.

14. Amsterdam–New York–Toledo 2003–4, pp. 182–84, no. 65 (drawing and print). Note that the anonymous etching of 1594, after a different drawing of a beached whale by Goltzius (ibid., p. 182, fig. 65a), bears an inscription by Schoneus.

15. See Reznick 1964, p. 316 (under no. 195), nos. 207 and 227 (both of 1617), and Amsterdam–New York–Toledo 2003–4, pp. 30–31, fig. 7b (Matham's engraving after Goltzius, Portrait of Hendrick Goltzius, 1617). Schrevelius was also familiar enough with Goltzius's former pupil Jacques de Gheyn (q.v.) and with Goltzius's engravers, Matham and Saenredam, to characterize their relationships.

16. Amsterdam—New York—Toledo 2003–4, pp. 165–66, no. 57. De Vries was a friend’s son who lived with Golziuss’s family. In this wonderfully naturalistic portrait, he is seen with the artist’s spaniel.

17. Van Mander 1604, p. 6; Van Mander/Miedema 1973, p. 47. The present writer is grateful to Marten Jan Bok for a transcription of the poem, which is mentioned in G. Schwartz 1985, p. 25, under “Scriverius and Art and/or Propaganda.”

18. Amsterdam—New York—Toledo 2003–4, no. 104. The sitter was identified for the first time and his family discussed in Nichols 1988.


20. See Reznick 1981, where it is suggested that Van der Aar “must have had a kunstkamer” (p. 212); Amsterdam 1993–94, pp. 884–85 (under no. 256); and Van Thiell 1996, pp. 43, 125, 136, 318 (under no. 61), 372–73 (under no. 203), pls. 194, 242.

21. For Golziuss’s drawing of 1614 and Matham’s print, see Amsterdam—New York—Toledo 2003–4, p. 261, no. 93, fig. 953 (p. 286, fig. 1044, for Cornelisz van Haarlem’s allegorical painting of 1607). As noted in Van Thiell 1999, pp. 43, 100, 473, a “head of friend [or old man] Govers” was listed in the 1639 inventory of Cornelisz van Haarlem’s estate.

22. See Nichols 1988, pp. 246–47, on the evidence of Jan Govers and van der Aar’s activity as a cloth merchant and his investment in the VOC. He appears to have carried on trade with English merchants. Jan Govers was first recorded in Haarlem in May 1602 (“merchant residing here about sixty years old”; see Nichols 1988, p. 246), but he could have settled there some years earlier. Van Thiell (1999, p. 43) mistakenly writes that Van der Aar “settled in Haarlem in 1602.”


25. For all eight lines, and a slightly different translation, see Washington—London—Haarlem 1989–90, p. 183. From the sentiment and syntax it would appear that Scriverius is describing himself. It will be recalled that an impression of this print was given to Van Buchell by Schrevelius.

26. Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, p. 27, fig. 9, vol. 3, p. 5 (under no. 4, the male portrait in Brooklyn, cited in the text following). For twoetchings by Pietersz, both of 1601, see Boston—Saint Louis 1980–81, nos. 9, 10.


28. See Amsterdam—New York—Toledo 2003–4, no. 15 (Grieten Jan vanha, 1602); also p. 60, fig. 35 (Portrait of Erasmus Ploosw, 1634).

29. Ibid., no. 55.


32. The print is widely reproduced, for example in Alpers 1983, fig. 38.


Esmée Quadschob observes that the expression originated in printer’s jargon.


36. For superb examples by Goltzius, see ibid., nos. 2, 3, 48–50, 51.

37. See, for example, G. Schwartz 1985, p. 232; here it is stated simply that “Rembrandt took as his model the portrait of Scriverius by Frans Hals.” Slive in Washington—London—Haarlem 1989–90, p. 185, fig. 20c, and Welzel in Berlin—Amsterdam—London 1991–92b, pp. 228–30, make the connection in a more moderate way. See also Dickey 2004, p. 64.

38. The interest of Hals’s portraits of 1627 for the Sylvius print is noted by Ackley in Boston—Saint Louis 1980–81, p. 150 n. 1, and at greater length in Dickey 2004, p. 64, figs. 43 (print of Acronius), 68 (Sylvius).


40. Van Eeghen 1971b; Van Thiell-Stroman in Washington—London—Haarlem 1989–90, p. 410 (under doc. 166). As explained by Van Thiell-Stromian, Floris Soop’s father (and Scriverius’s brother), Jan Hendricksz Schrijver (1578–1618), adopted the surname of his maternal grandfather, Jan Soop. In a personal communication (March 2006), S. A. C. Dudok van Heel kindly explained that the portrait of Floris Soop could not have been one of the two brace groote stukken sold in 1663, since such a description would never have been employed for portraits in a seventeenth-century Dutch sale catalogue or inventory.

References: Tardieu 1873, p. 219, describes the composition and reproduces the signature, date, and inscription; Eueld 1882, p. 72, mistakenly lists the Kaiser-Friedrich Museum, Berlin, as the buyer at the Wilson sale, and gives the purchase price as FF 80,000 for the pair; Bosde 1881, pp. 55, 84, no. 65, mentions the picture and its pendant as in the Secrétan collection; D. Franken and Van der Kellen 1853, p. 37 (under no. 35), lists three states of the engraving by Jan van de Velde after this portrait; possibly Van Ryn 1887, p. 311, publishes Van Buchell’s supposed reference to a portrait of Scriverius (actually a print) in the collection of Theodorus Schrevelius in Leiden; Moe 1897–1905, vol. 2 (1905), p. 370, no. 7190–2, lists the painting and its pendant as in the Wilson and Secretan sales, and as previously in the collection of M. J. Caan van Maurick at Oudewater, and identifies the picture with a portrait of Scriverius said to have been mentioned by Aernout van Buchell in 1628 as in the collection of Theodorus Schrevelius in Leiden; Hofstede de Groot 1906a, pp. 9–10 (under no. 14), identifies the picture with the portrait of Scriverius mentioned by Aernout van Buchell in 1628; Moe 1909, pp. 32, 103, no. 72, records the Havemeyer purchase at the Secrétan sale of 1889, where the pair sold for the enormous sum of 91,000
francs"; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3 (1910), pp. 67–68, no. 224, as in the Havemeyer collection, describes the composition and reviews provenance; Mireur 1911–12, vol. 3, pp. 403, 406, records the Wilson and Secretan sales; Peladan 1912 (ill. opp. p. 50), as "Un hommè; Bodde and Binder 1941b, vol. 1, p. 19, no. 106, pl. 17a, as Petrus Scriverius, owned by Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York; Valentinier 1923, pp. 306, 309 (ill. p. 10), states that the two portraits were obviously made as models for engravings, but none of the female pendant is known; Mather 1910, p. 462, praises the "largeness of stroke . . . that must be arrested within a fraction of an inch" in these "rather large miniatures"; Wethe 1910, p. 60, refers to these "small and early but brilliant portraits of Petrus Scriverius and his wife by Hals" as in the exhibition of the Havemeyer collection; Havemeyer 1931, pp. 16–17 (ill.), adds Le Roy to provenance; Valentinier in Detroit 1935, unpaged, no. 6 (ill.), notes that this portrait and its pendant are "perhaps the earliest pictures by Frans Hals to come to America"; Valentinier 1916, pp. 8–9, no. 17 (ill.), admires the "lightning-like technique" and illusionistic effect of the painted frame; K. Bauch 1960, pp. 42–44, fig. 26, suggests that Scriverius may have requested this format for his portrait, since he would have known the similar miniature portrait drawings by David Bailly, but Hals follows a pattern employed in portrait engravings, for example Jacob Matham's Portrait of Hendrick Goltzius, of 1617; Havemeyer 1961, p. 20, describes the hanging in the Havemeyer home; J. Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, p. 42, cites the work as an example of the miniature portraits that Hals painted "as modellos for engravers"; Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, pp. 58, 59, 77, describes the spatial effect, and questions whether this is the portrait mentioned by Van Buchell, vol. 2, pl. 60, vol. 3, pp. 22–23, 35, no. 36, calls the painting a modello for a print, and states that this portrait and its pendant were possibly in the collection of Theodorus Schrevelius in Leiden in 1616 (see Moes 1897–1905 above) ; Grimm 1972, pp. 29, 65, 200, no. 49, considers this painting and its pendant to be copies; Grimm and Montagni 1974, p. 92 (under no. 45), fig. 45a, records that various scholars consider this picture and its pendant as autograph works by Hals, but Trivas (by excluding them from his monograph) and Grimm view them as copies; Ekkert in Leiden 1976–77, pp. 31, 39 n. 1, fig. 3, notes that the Leiden scholar turned to a Haarlem artist; Wurff 1977, p. 111, cites the painting in connection with a supposed portrait of Scriverius by Bartholomeus van der Helst; Strauss and van der Meulen 1979, p. 61 (under doc. 1628/1), mentions the work in connection with the Buchelius account (in which the young Rembrandt is also mentioned, but not by name); G. Schwartz 1985, pp. 25, 45, reproduces Jan van de Velde's print after the painting, translates the inscription, and relates circumstances that might have brought Scriverius to Haarlem in 1626; P. Sutton 1986, pp. 183–84, mentioned; Weitenhoffer 1986, pp. 18, 77, 138, 234 (ill. p. 74 [photograph in the Havemeyer house]), records the Havemeyer purchase "for $9,000 each"; Nichols 1988, pp. 244, 252 n. 23, mentions the portraits in connection with Anna van der Aar's uncle Jan Govertsz van der Aar (Goltzius's sitter, in 1603); Grimm 1989, pp. 34, 53, 234, 284–85, no. 87, figs. 492, 123a (detail), pl. 97 (detail), as a copy after Hals; Groen and Hendriks in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, pp. 111, 155, 120, 124, report the color of the ground layer and the main pigments present in the paint layers, and note that the panels come from differing cuts of trees, one radial, one (Scriverius) tangential and close to the bark, resulting in splits; Slive in ibid., pp. 142, 185, 189, 202 (ill. p. 186), discusses the different wood supports, a few of the sitter's connections to Haarlem, Hals's illusionistic treatment of a "porthole" framing device (also found in his large Portrait of a Man, of 1622, at Chatworth), Van de Velde's engraving (the entire inscription is quoted in translation), and the question of whether the painting was made expressly as a modello for the print; Van Thiéb-Sroman in ibid., pp. 183 doc. 44, 409 (under doc. 166), mentions the portrait in connection with the print after it which Schrevelius gave to Van Buchell in 1628, and cites the picture and its pendant in connection with the estate inventory of Scriverius's son, Willem Schrijver (1608–1661) ; Grimm 1990, pp. 34, 53, 234, 291–92, no. 67, figs. 494, 123a, pl. 97, as a copy after Hals; Liedtke 1990, p. 46, mentions the portraits as part of the Havemeyer bequest; P. Sutton 1990b, p. 68, commends the findings of Groen and Hendriks (published in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90) that this picture and its pendant were painted on differing wood supports; De Baar and Moerman in Leiden 1991–92, p. 25, cite the picture while noting that Jan Lievens also painted a portrait of Scriverius; Wieland in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92b, pp. 228, 330 n. 12, compares Rembrandt's etching of Sylvia (1646); Freilinghuysen in New York 1993, fig. 30 (photograph of the Havemeyers' Rembrandt room, where the Hals portraits hung); Liedtke in ibid., p. 65, pl. 64, suggests that these pictures and the Rembrandts in Harry Havemeyer's study "established an air of propriety that somehow became the collector's own"; Stein in ibid., p. 209, describes the acquisition in Paris; Wold in ibid., pp. 348–49, no. 1320 (ill.); Havemeyer 1993, pp. 20, 310 n. 38, describes the hanging in the Havemeyer home (details of the purchase in Paris are given in the footnote); Baezter 1995, p. 301; Kleinman 1998, p. 73 n. 262, fig. 31, remarks on the adaptation of the framing device from portrait engravings; G. Schwartz in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 28, p. 309, mentioned; Carasso 1998, fig. 17, reproduces the painting as an (oddly chosen) example of Hals's work in general; Jacob and Ekkart 1999, p. 189 (under no. 240), mentions the portrait in connection with Scriverius's inscription on an engraving by Matham (1628? after a genre picture by Honthorst; Schama 1999a, p. 714 n. 3, mistakenly dates the picture to 1625; Royaltogische Kunst in Amsterdam–London 2000–2001, p. 227 n. 6, compares Rembrandt's etching of Sylvia; Van de Wetering in Kassel–Amsterdam 2001–2, p. 29, fig. 9 (detail), mentions the portrait in connection with the hypothesis that Scriverius bought paintings of 1625–26 by Rembrandt; Wheeler in Washington 2002–3, p. 79, fig. 3, cites the work as an example of Dutch illusionism; Nichols in Amsterdam–New York–Toledo 2003–4, p. 330 n. 114, mentions the Hals portraits in connection with Anna van der Aar's uncle Jan Govertsz van der Aar (Goltzius's sitter, in 1603); Dickys 2004, pp. 64, 182 n. 195, compares Rembrandt's 1646 portrait etching of Sylvia; Quodbach 2004, p. 99, fig. 7, identifies the picture in a photograph of Havemeyer's library; Dudok van Heel 2006, pp. 30–31, fig. 15, p. 261 (ill. in genealogical outline), reproduces the portrait in connection with an account of Scriverius's involvement in Remonstrant politics; G. Schwartz 2006, pp. 144, 145, mentions the portrait of Scriverius in a discussion of the scholar as a Rembrandt patron. Tuynman 2006, pp. 223–24, figs. 15c, 15d, suggests unconvincingly (based on a reading of Van Buchell's account) that both this portrait and its pendant may have been engraved by Van de Velde.

Ex Coll.: Petrus Scriverius, Leiden and Oudewater (1626–d. 1660); probably his son, Willem Schrijver (1660–d. 1661), Oudewater; Van Hoogstraten family, Willeskop (in the mid-1800s); [by descent to?] M[arie] J. Caan van Maurik, Oudewater and/or The Hague; [Étienne Le Roy, Brussels]; John Waterloo Wilson, Brussels and Paris (by 1873–81; his sale, at his hôtel, 3, Avenue Hoche, Paris, March 14–16, 1881, no. 36, for FFr. 80,000 with pendant, to Petit); [Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, from 1881]; E. Scretan, Paris (by 1883–89; his sale, Galerie Charles Sedelmeyer, Paris, July 1–7, 1889, no. 124, for FFr. 91,000 with pendant, to Durand-Ruel for Havemeyer); Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1889–d. 1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–d. 1929); H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.8

1. In Grimm 1972, all twenty-five of the small portraits by Hals (which are accepted in Slive 1970–74) are considered as copies after lost originals. The absurdity of this hypothesis is concisely explained in Bijl 2005, pp. 47–48, where Hals's authorship of the Schrevelius portrait (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem) is proven by technical evidence (pp. 52–54).

64. Anna van der Aar

Oil on wood, 8 ¼ x 6 ½ in. (22.2 x 16.5 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed (lower border of painted frame): FHF 1626 [FH in monogram]; (left center): ATO ETAT/50

The painting is very well preserved. A small hole at top center, now repaired, may have been caused by a hanging device.

H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.9

Anna van der Aar was born in Leiden in 1576 or 1577, and died there on September 9, 1636. Her parents were Willem Goversz van der Aar (1540/41–1617), the City Councilman and sheriff, and his first wife, Alijt Claesdr den Hartog (1542–1579). Anna was raised by Geertje Huijgensdr Duyck (d. 1604), who married Willem van der Aar in July 1579, four months after her first wife died. On May 22, 1599, Anna married the poet and historian Petrus Scriverius (see the preceding entry).

Anna's father, Willem, three of his brothers, and his brother-in-law, Albrecht Gerritsz van Hoogeveen, were active in Leiden's flourishing textile industry and in civic affairs. Another of Willem's brothers, Jan Goversz van der Aar (1544/45–1612), was evidently also a cloth merchant. He moved to Haarlem by March 1602 (possibly years earlier), and in 1603 was depicted as a shell collector in a well-known canvas by Hendrick Goltzius (P. and N. de Boer Foundation, Amsterdam,
on loan to the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam). 1

The role of Anna van der Aar’s uncle Jan Govertsz. in the art
world of Haarlem is also discussed above, in connection with
Schrievers.

A possible portrait of the same woman, at the age of eighteen
(1591), was painted by Isaac van Swanenburg (1537–1614). 2
Van Swanenburg was the next-door neighbor of Anna’s parents.
Schrievers wrote a long poem in memory of the artist’s son in
Jan Orlers’ Beschrijvingen der Stad Leyden (Description of the
City of Leiden), of 1614. 3

In the year of her death, 1636, Anna van der Aar’s eightieth
birthday was celebrated by an album of poetry presented by
friends. 4

The preceding biographical information on all the Van der Aars
is adopted from Nichols 1988, pp. 244–45 (with family tree).
2. See Ekkart 1968, pp. 76, 157, no. 20, fig. 68, where it is allowed
that the sitter could also be a cousin of Anna van der Aar.
However, there is a resemblance to the woman Hals painted
about thirty-one years later.
3. Ibid., p. 10.
Haarlem 1989–90, p. 185.

References: Tardieu 1873, p. 219, describes the composition and
reproduces the signature, date, and inscription; Eudel 1882, p. 72,
mistakenly lists the Kaiser-Friedrich Museum, Berlin, as the buyer at
the Wilson sale and gives the purchase price as FF 80,000 for the
pair; Bode 1883, pp. 55, 84, no. 66, mentioned as in the Sécrétan
collection; Moe 1897–1905, vol. 1, p. 2, no. 7, listed as in the Wilson
and Sécrétan sales, and previously in the collection of M. J. Caan
van Maurik, The Hague; Moe 1909, pp. 103, no. 73, records
the Havemeyer purchase at the Sécrétan sale (1889) of both portraits
for the “enormous sum of 90,000 francs”; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27,
vol. 3 (1910), p. 68, no. 225, as in the Havemeyer Collection, describes
the composition and reviews provenance; Mireur 1911–12, vol. 3,
pp. 401, 406, records the Wilson and Sécrétan sales; Péladan 1912
(ill. opp. p. 12), as “Une dame”; Bode and Binder 1914b, vol. 1, p. 39,
no. 107, pl. 578, as Anna van der Aar, The Wife of Petrus Schrievers,
owned by Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York; Valentiner 1921,
p. 109 (ill. p. 50), notes that Schrievers was a celebrated
historian and poet in Leiden; Mather 1930, p. 462, praises “the largeness
of stroke . . . that must be arrested within a fraction of an inch” in these
“rather large miniatures”; Havemeyer Collection 1931, pp. 16–17 (ill.),
adds Le Roy to provenance; Valentiner in Detroit 1935, unpagd.,
no. 7 (ill.), notes that this portrait and its pendant are “perhaps the
earliest pictures by Frans Hals to come to America”; Valentiner 1936,
pp. 8–9, no. 18 (ill.), admires the “lightning-like technique” and illu-
sionistic effect of the painted frame; Havemeyer 1961, p. 20,
describes the hanging in the Havemeyer home; Slive 1970–74,
vol. 1, pp. 58, 59, describes the spatial effect, vol. 2, pl. 61, vol. 3,
pp. 22–23, no. 37, states that this portrait and its pendant were pos-
sibly in the collection of Theodorus Schrevelius in Leiden in 1628
(see Moe 1897–1905 above); Grimm 1972, pp. 29, 63, 200, no. 120,
considers this painting and its pendant to be copies; Grimm and
Montagni 1974, p. 92 (under no. 46), fig. 46a, records that several
scholars consider this picture and its pendant as autograph works by
Hals, but Trivas (by excluding them from his monograph) and
Grimm view them as copies; Ekkart in Leiden 1970–77, pp. 35, 39 n. 1,
fig. 4, notes that the couple turned to a Haarlem artist; P. Sutton
1986, pp. 181–84, mentioned; Weizenuhoffer 1986, pp. 58, 77, 118, 214
(ill. p. 74 [photograph in the Havehuyer house]); Nichols 1988,
pp. 345, 352 n. 23, refers to the portraits in connection with Anna
van der Aar’s uncle Jan Govertsz van der Aar; Grimm 1989, no. 34,
3, 284–85, no. 88, fig. 44b, as a copy after Hals; Groen and
120, 124, report the color of the ground layer and the main pig-
mements present in the paint layers; Slive in ibid., pp. 142, 154, 181,
189, 202, no. 20 (ill. p. 187), explains why this portrait and not its
pendant (which has a split in the panel) was included in the exhib-
tion of 1989–90, and devotes most of the discussion to the male
portrait; Van Thiel-Stroman in ibid., p. 409, doc. 166, mentions this
portrait and its pendant in connection with the estate inventory
of Schrievers’s son, Willem Schrieyer (1608–1661); Grimm 1990,
no. 53, 201–92, no. 68, fig. 49b, as a copy after Hals; Liedtke 1990, p. 46,
mentions the portraits as part of the Havemeyer bequest; P. Sutton
1990b, p. 68, comments the finds of Groen and Hendriks
(published in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90) that this picture
and its pendant were painted on differing wood supports;
Freelinghuyzen in New York 1993, fig. 30 (photograph of the
Havemeyers’s Rembrandt room, where the Hals portraits hung);
Liedtke in ibid., p. 65, pl. 65, refers to these pictures as hanging with
Rembrandt portraits in Harry Havemeyer’s study; Stein in ibid.,
p. 209, describes the acquisition in Paris; Wold in ibid., pp. 148–49,
no. 439 (ill.); Havemeyer 1991, pp. 20, 310 n. 18, describes the
hanging in the Havemeyer home (details of the purchase in Paris are
given in the footnote); Baetjer 1993, p. 301; Kleinmann 1996, p. 73
n. 262, remarks on the adaptation of the framing device from por-
trait engravings; Nichols in Amsterdam–New York–Toledo 2003–4,
pp. 320 n. 114, mentions the Hals portraits in connection with Anna
van der Aar’s uncle Jan Govertsz van der Aar; Quodbach 2004,
p. 99, fig. 7, identifies the picture in a photograph of Havemeyer’s
library; Dudok van Heel 2006, pp. 30–31, fig. 16, p. 263 (ill. in
genealogical outline), illustrates the portrait and its pendant in
connection with Schrievers’s politics.

Exhibited: Brussels, Cercle Artistique et Littéraire, “Collection de
M. John W. Wilson,” 1873; Paris, Palais de la Présidence du Corps
Légaliste, “Ouvrages de la peinture exposés au profit de la colonisa-
tion de l’Algérien par les Alsatien-Lorrains,” 1874, no. 232 (lent by
Wilson); New York, MMA, “The H. O. Havemeyer Collection,” 1920,
n. 70; Detroit, Mich., The Detroit Institute of Arts, “Fifty Paint-
ings by Frans Hals,” 1935, no. 7; Richmond, Va., Virginia Museum of
Fine Arts, 1947; Palm Beach, Fla., Society of the Four Arts, “Euro-
pean Masters of the XVII and XVIII Centuries,” 1950, no. 4; Des
Moines, Iowa, Des Moines Art Center, “Masterpieces of Portrait and
Figure Painting,” 1952–53; Pensacola, Fla., Pensacola Art Center,
“Opening Exhibition,” 1955; Jacksonville, Fla., Jacksonville Art

284 FRANS HALS
65. Portrait of a Man, possibly Nicolaes Pietersz Duyst van Voorhout

Oil on canvas, 31 3/4 x 26 in. (80.6 x 66 cm)

The painting is in good condition, although the impasto is slightly flattened. The area of the hair has suffered abrasion, and there is one large area of paint loss in the hair at left. The paint surface in the background to the left of the head and the deep shadows in the costume are also abraded. Two large areas and one small area of paint loss along the brim of the hat that extend into the background.

The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.33

This brilliantly painted portrait must date from about 1636–38, to judge from the style of the costume, in particular the very broad lace collar that extends over the shoulders. Hals's description of blurred reflections on the satiny surface of the pewter-toned jacket is especially masterful.

The sitter's identity was written on the back of a panel to which the original canvas was attached until 1927. In 1920, Collins Baker (see Refs.) transcribed the Dutch inscription as "Claes Duyst van Voorhout brouwer in des Brouwerij het Zwaanschel." (Claes Duyst van Voorhout brewer in the brewery Het Zwaanschel). The Petworth catalogue of 1856 (see Refs.) misquotes the same inscription.

A Nicolaes (Claes) Pietersz Duyst van Voorhout owned a Haarlem brewery called Het Swaenshals (The Swan's Neck) in 1629, when he gave his age as twenty-nine (born ca. 1600). He was the son of the brewer Pieter Claesz Duyst van Voorhout (ca. 1569–1624) and his wife, Maria (or Martijge) Quirimansdr Acker (d. 1646). A portrait of the elder Duyst by an anonymous Haarlem artist (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem) is dated 1625, gives the sitter's age as fifty-six, and bears a crest with the necks (and heads) of three swans.

Hals's sitter could certainly be a man in his mid- to late thirties. But how reliable is the old inscription? It was evidently followed by a question mark, and it probably dates from decades after the painting itself, when the canvas needed additional support. For all we know, the inscription came with the wood panel and does not refer to the portrait at all. However, an inventory of Nicolaes Duyst (or Duijst) van Voorhout's estate, dated November 7, 1650, indicates that he was an enthusiastic collector of paintings by Haarlem and other artists, and that he owned one or two independent portraits of himself (it appears that the patron never married) and pendant portraits of his parents and of his grandparents. Hals's name is not mentioned in the inventory, but none of the nine portraits in the inventory is attributed, evidently because the notary, Nicolaes van Bosvelt, or Duyst van Voorhout's heirs were more concerned with the identity of the sitters. Of the forty-seven paintings listed in the inventory, twenty-six are ascribed to specific artists, including Rubens, Hendrick Goltzius, Jan van Goyen, Pieter Claesz, and a number of well-known marine and still-life painters.

The identification of Hals's subject as Nicolaes Pietersz Duyst van Voorhout (ca. 1600–1650) may be cautiously maintained, based on the circumstantial evidence. Slive, following Waagen's Victorian assessment of one hundred twenty years earlier, discovers in the sitter's features a fondness for alcohol, and states that Waagen's "estimate of the model's drinking habits was virtually substantiated when it was discovered that the man portrayed [was the owner of a brewery]." There is nothing in the sitter's pose or serious expression (except, perhaps, for his somewhat ruddy complexion) that justifies this subjective interpretation. Furthermore, the owners of breweries in Haarlem, Delft, and other Dutch cities were often prominent citizens, a number of whom held government
offices. For example, the Delft brewer Aper Frans van der Houwe was a wealthy collector of art and naturalia who was praised by Karel van Mander and sought out by the Utrecht humanist Aernout van Buchell (Buchelius). The widow of the Haarlem brewer Pieter Quirijnz Aker (our presumed sitter’s uncle), Belitje Ewoutsdru Schilperoorts, was the most senior regent of the Saint Elizabeth Hospital in Haarlem, as Johannes Verspronck (q.v.) makes clear in his sober group portrait of the institution’s administrators, dated 1641 (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem).  

1. A memo from Duveen Brothers, London, to the same firm in New York, dated October 18, 1927, reports that “the Frans Hals, you remember, was painted on canvas stuck on to wood, and the panel was badly split. We are having it transferred on to canvas which will take at least three weeks. Then, we shall have to restore the picture and frame it” (photocopy in curatorial files).  

2. As noted by Slive in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, p. 280, citing a letter dated May 30, 1975, from Josine E. de Bruyn Kops, curator at the Frans Halsmuseum, to research assistant Donald Rosenthal in the Department of European Paintings, MMA. The letter cites the will, dated July 23, 1629, of “Nicolaes Duyst Pietersz.” (notary Jacob Schoudt; Gemeentearchief, Haarlem, Reg. 128, fol. 211), in which the testator’s mother, “Maria Quiynsdru Aker,” is named as sole beneficiary. The same man, described as “Nicolaes Duyst van Voorhout,” appears before the same notary on April 3, 1626 (ibid., Reg. 127, fol. 39v), and on that occasion (which involved granting power of attorney) was called “brewer in the Swaenshals.” His father, “Pieter Duyst,” testified about a delivery of wheat on January 27, 1614 (notary Egbert van Bosveld; ibid., Reg. 56, fol. 141), and in that document is called “brewer in the Swaenshals.” In the same letter of 1775, De Bruyn Kops dismisses from consideration two other Claes Duyst van Voorhouts from consideration, one born about 1611 (son of Augustijn Duyst van Voorhout and Tannèke Vogel), and one born in 1618 (son of Joost Duyst van Voorhout and Geertruyd Jansdr van Napol).  

3. The date is not 1623, as recorded in old catalogues. Pieter Biesboer, curator at the Frans Halsmuseum (personal communication, March 28, 2006), kindly brought the earlier misreading of the date to my attention.  

4. Biesboer 2001, pp. 123–25, inventory no. 29. Duyst van Voorhout died on April 16, 1650. The family portraits are recorded as nos. 18 and 31 (the deceased), no. 6 (his parents; “Crijns = Quirijn”), and no. 44 (his grandparents). Biesboer (ibid., p. 123) mistakenly records that Nicolaes Pietersz was married to Guergen Augusteinsdr Steyns, who was his grandmother (kindly acknowledged by the author; see note 3 above). No evidence of a spouse is known.  

5. Ibid., pp. 123–25. Of the forty-seven entries, six refer to maps or prints, but nos. 6, 29, and 44 each refer to two paintings, and no. 42 to four, which adds up to six additional paintings.  


REFERENCES: Waagen 1854, vol. 5, p. 36, records this portrait as in the collection of Colonel Wyndham at Petworth House, is “inclined to attribute” the picture (“of great breadth, and spiritedly treated”) to Hals, and observes that the man’s eyes and cheeks reveal “many a sacrifice to Bacchus”; Catalogue of Pictures in Petworth House, Sussex (London, 1856), p. 41, no. 385, as “Portrait of Van Voorhout,” by Frans Hals, gives an inaccurate reading of the inscription on the back; Bode 1883, p. 92, no. 153, as a portrait of a middle-aged gentleman by Hals, dating from about 1630; Moes 1909, p. 101, no. 33, identifies the sitter as Claes Duyst van Voorhout; Hofstede de Groot 1907–17, vol. 3 (1910), p. 53, no. 176, as Claes Duyst van Voorhout, in the collection of Lord Leconfield, Petworth; Bode and Binder 1914b, vol. 5, p. 40, no. 114, pl. 62, as by Hals, Claes Duyst van Voorhout, “The De Zwaan’s” Brewer, erroneously as on panel; Collins Baker 1920, p. 53, no. 385 (ill. opp. p. 53), as “a latish example of fine quality,” records the identification of the sitter inscribed on the back of the panel to which the canvas was mounted; Valentine 1921a, pp. 145 (ill.), 316, dates the painting to about 1636; Valentine 1921b, p. 154 (ill.), 316, dates the painting to about 1636; Hussey 1926–26, pp. 901 (ill., with incorrect caption), 902, describes the picture as a late work by Hals, identifies the subject (citing Bode), perceives “the complexion one expects to find on a brewer,” and observes that “where another artist might have made Voorhout merely a sodden boor, there is a fine braggartly about this portrait which makes the subject, with all his beerishness, the equal of the ‘Laughing Cavalier’ as representative of the glories and weaknesses of seventeenth century Dutchmen”; Hussey 1926, pp. 38 (ill.), 39, reprints Hussey 1925–26; Valentine 1928b, p. 248, describes the picture as “one of the finest portraits painted by Hals in the middle thirties”; A. Alexandre 1929, pp. 117 (ill.), 130, “one of the greatest and liveliest” of Hals’s portraits; Bache Collection 1929, unpaged (ill.), identifies the sitter as “the proprietor of the Zwaan Brewery at Leyden”; Heil 1929, pp. 4, 27 (ill.), as “painted in 1616,” compares a portrait by Van Dyck; Witt 1929, pl. II, with no comment; Cortissoz 1930, p. 259, compares Rembrandt, and admires Hals’s “technical fireworks”; Dülberg 1930, p. 144, as in the Bache collection, subjectively interprets the sitter’s expression; Valentine in Detroit 1935, unpaged, no. 33 (ill. in introductory text), relates the sitter in this “brilliant, pompous” portrait to Shakespeare’s comic figures; Valentine 1936, pp. 77–12, no. 59 (ill.), compares Hals’s portrait of Willem Huythuysen and another male portrait; Bache Collection 1937, no. 34 (ill.), as dating from about 1636, gives provenance and lists of exhibitions and references; Van Dantzig 1937, p. 47, no. 19, as by Hals in 1636; Siple 1937, p. 93, mentioned as in the 1937 Haarlem exhibition; Duveen Pictures 1941, unpaged, no. 193 (ill.), praises the picture; Trivas 1941, pp. 45–46, no. 62, pls. 84, 85, as from about 1636, inaccurately reports that “the name of the model [is] inscribed on the reverse side of the canvas”; Bache Collection 1943, no. 33 (ill.), repeats Bache Collection 1937; Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, pp. 86–88, 122–23, suggests a date of about 1638, vol. 2, pls. 195, 197, vol. 3, pp. 63–64, no. 119, describes the composition, explains the
basis for the sitter’s identification, and dates the painting to the mid-
or late 1630s; Grimm 1972, pp. 91–94, 96, 128, 141, 155, 202, no. 73, figs. 95, 99, as from about 1635, compares various works by Hals; Grimm and Montagni 1974, pp. 99–100, no. 110, pl. xii, explains the basis of the sitter’s identification; Baed 1980, pp. 18, 122, pl. 30, suggests a date of about 1618; Pope-Hennessy in Bordeaux 1980, pp. 85, 88, no. 103 (ill.), dates the portrait to about 1650–55 and notes that the identification of the sitter is not certain; P. Sutton 1986, p. 185, fig. 261, concludes that “the identification of the limousine and non-a-
little corpulent gentleman (his girth enhanced by the low point of view), who is supposed on the strength of an old inscription to depict [bel?] Claes Duyst van Voorhout, is given added credence once we learn that Voorhout owned a brewery called ‘in den Swanenhals’”; Grimm 1989, pp. 159, 184, 277, 284, no. 81, fig. 83, pl. 59 (a much too red and oversize detail of the face), dates the painting to about 1635–36, and describes the subject; Groen and Hendriks in Washington–London–Haarlem 1980–80, pp. 119, 123 n. 64, pp. 121–27, pl. viii, fig. g (detail of paint cross section), report the color of the ground layer and the main pigments present in the paint layers; Slive in ibid., pp. xi (large detail of costume and hand), 170, 280–81, no. 52, as dating from about 1658, repeats the comments made in Slive 1970–74; Grimm 1990, pp. 138–39, 184, 282 (ill.), 291, no. 81, fig. 83, pl. 59 (detail of face), repeats Grimm 1989 in translation; Liedtke 1990, p. 52, mentions Bache’s purchase of the picture in 1928; P. Sutton 1990b, p. 69, compares Waagen’s reading of the sit-
ner’s character with Slive’s slightly more restrained approach; Ingamells 1992a, p. 138 n. 12, lists the picture as one of the works in which the low viewpoint and pose of Hals’s Laughing Cavalier are repeated; Baertje 1992, p. 301; Wheelock 1992a, p. 74, fig. 1, dates the picture to about 1618, and finds the same pose in reverse in Hals’s Portrait of a Member of the Haarlem Civic Guard, of about 1636–38 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.); Atkins 2004, pp. 297, 306 n. 80, mentions the picture as a portrait of “Nicolaes Duyst van Voorhout,” from about 1658, and notes that numerous paintings of “extremely high quality” are listed in his estate inventory of 1692; Secret 2004, p. 447, mentioned as sold by Duven; Liedtke in Martigny 2006, pp. 70–74, no. 11, dates the picture to about 1616–38, discusses the identification of the sitter, and compares the com-
position of the portrait of Peeter Stevens in the Iconography series of engravings after Van Dyck; Liedtke in Barcelona 2006–7, pp. 42–43, no. 8, repeats the entry in Martigny 2006.


1. Information given to Bache by Duvene Bros., New York.

66. *Paulus Verschuur*

Oil on canvas, 46 ¼ x 37 in. (118.7 x 94 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed (right center): *ATAT SVB 37/ ANO 1643/FH* [FH in monogram]

The painting is well preserved, but the impasto has been slightly flattened during past lining. The deep black passages in the hat and costume are abraded, and the freely brushed cast shadow of the figure in the lower right corner is damaged.

Gift of Archer M. Huntington, in memory of his father, Collis Potter Huntington, 1926 26.101.11

In this dignified portrait of 1643, Paulus Verschuur (1606–1667), a wealthy merchant of Rotterdam, is seen at the age of thirty-
seven. His father, Joost Verschueren, moved from Antwerp to Rotterdam and established a textile firm. Paulus married Maria van Berckel (d. 1654) in 1631, and three years later combined his family business with the textile manufactory of his father-in-law, Gerard van Berckel. Verschuur was also very active in civic affairs, serving as a member of the Rotterdam City Council in 1642; as a burgomaster in 1649–50, 1653–54, 1660–61, and 1667;
and as council deputy to the States of Holland in 1646, 1648–49, and on several later occasions. His other offices included churchwarden (1646–48), commissioner of the East India Company (1651), commissioner for water rights (1666), and surveyor of manufactories (1668–69 and 1662–65).

About 1700, when the Rotterdam artist Pieter van der Werff (1661/63–1722) contributed a likeness of Verschuur to a large series of portraits of past and present directors of the Rotterdam chamber of the East India Company, he evidently based his oval, half-length portrait (fig. 76) on Hals’s picture. Thirty-eight of at least forty-seven known portraits from the series survive in their original frames, which bear inscriptions identifying the directors and the dates of their appointments. It was on this basis that Gudlaugsson, in 1954, identified the subject of the present portrait.3

Verschuur’s sister Margarieta was married to a Mennonite textile merchant, Pieter Jacobsz Wynants, and lived with her husband in Haarlem. In 1638, when the couple drew up their will (leaving one hundred Flemish pounds to a Mennonite orphanage in Haarlem), Paulus Verschuur was named as one of the four executors.5 It is possible that Wynants or someone in his circle referred Verschuur to Hals, who almost certainly would have recorded the Rotterdammer’s features in Haarlem.6

In keeping with upper-middle-class preferences in the Reformed community, the costume is strictly black, apart from the lace collar and cuffs, and the beige gloves on and in the sitter’s left hand.7 The background, as often, is a dark olive tone. Even by Hals’s standards, the execution of this large portrait is remarkable for its abbreviated definitions of form and effects of light and shadow. The voluminous cloak wrapped across the lower half of the figure is broken into broad, angular planes by black slashes indicating folds. Crisscrossing brushstrokes suggest the man’s shadow on the wall to the right, and similar gestures on a small scale dispense with such necessities as describing the mustache and eyebrows. The simplicity with which Hals creates the impression of sheer fabric in the collar is extraordinary. At a normal viewing distance, however, one perceives only slight animation, rather than lessons in brushwork that would inspire painters until the end of the nineteenth century.

Valentiner (see Refs.) believed that the figure’s turn to the right implied a pendant portrait. This is entirely plausible, to judge from the compositions of other pair portraits by Hals.6 Grimm (see Refs.) suggests that a companion might be found in Portrait of a Woman (fig. 78), which measures 31½ x 35½ inches (80 x 64.1 cm) but “appears to have been cut on all four sides.”7 The painting would be quite consistent in design with Paulus Verschuur if it were the same size. Slive dates the female portrait to the first half of the 1630s, but in style and even costume (which is quite conservative) the portrait could date from as late as 1643.8 However, in the absence of technical evidence or a portrait known to be of Maria van Berckel, it is impossible to support or dismiss Grimm’s hypothesis.9

1. The couple married in a Reformed ceremony on April 22, 1631. The baptisms of four children are known: Maria, on February 10, 1632; Geret (Gerrit), on September 26, 1633; Elizabet, on March 21, 1636; and Anna, on July 29, 1639. (Jeroen Gilijauj kindly checked these details in the records of the Gemeentearchief, Rotterdam). Maria van Berckel’s burial was recorded in Rotterdam on June 21, 1654; Paulus Verschuur’s death on December 3, 1657, and burial on December 18, are noted in Engelbrecht 1973, pp. 159, 181–82, respectively (kindly brought to my attention by Friso Lammetse).


3. This information is adopted from Biesboer’s essay “The Burghers of Haarlem and Their Portrait Painters” in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, pp. 37, 44 nr. 146–49, where Gudlaugsson

Figure 76. Pieter van der Werff, Paulus Verschuur, ca. 1700. Oil on canvas, 32¼ x 20¼ in. (82 x 68 cm). Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, on loan to the Historisch Museum, Rotterdam
4. Slive (1958, and in later publications; see Refs.) suggests that members of the Coymans family may have put Verschuur in touch with Hals, but they are not known to have been the artist's patrons before 1644, and there is no clear connection between the families. On the Coymans family as patrons of Hals, see Biesboer in Washington–London–Harlem 1989–90, pp. 36–37.

5. Wheelock 1995a, p. 80, suggests that the removal of the right-hand glove may have been perceived as a welcoming gesture.


7. The quote is from ibid., vol. 3, p. 35 (under no. 97). The painting was sold at Sotheby’s, New York, May 19, 1995, no. 26, to a private collector.


9. Attempts were made to locate the putative pendant, with a view to determining, through radiography, whether it and the Museum’s picture might have been painted on supports cut from the same bolt of canvas. Perhaps this will prove possible at some future date.

REFERENCES: “A Frans Hals Masterpiece,” The Collector 2, no. 5 (January 1, 1891), p. 54, celebrates the painting’s appearance at the Durand-Ruel Gallery, New York; Moe 1909, p. 106, no. 136, listed, as in the Bösch sale (erroneously as in Vienna in 1884); Valentin in New York 1909, p. 36, no. 35 (ill. opp. p. 36), describes the subject; Cox 1909–10, p. 245, mentioned as in the Hudson-Fulton exhibition; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3 (1910), p. 105, no. 360, describes the subject and gives provenance; Waldmann 1910 (ill. p. 78); Von Frimmel 1913–14, vol. 1, p. 108, listed as in the Bösch sale of 1885; Bode and Binder 1914–15, vol. 2, p. 22, no. 275, pl. 179, listed as in Mrs. C. P. Huntington’s collection; Valentin 1921a, pp. 192 (ill.), 318, believes that the figure's presentation suggests that the portrait originally had a pendant; Valentin 1923, pp. 208 (ill.), 319, repeats Valentin 1921a; Valentin in Detroit 1935, unpaged, no. 38 (ill.), listed (with “1612” incorrectly given under “Inscribed”); Valentin 1936, unpaged, no. 74 (ill.), and (under no. 79), considers the portrait’s large size and the figure’s elegant clothing to indicate someone from “a well-to-do, aristocratic family”; Trivas 1941, p. 52, no. 85, pl. 119, lists the work, with provenance, and describes the palette; Gudlaugsson 1954, pp. 335–36, fig. 1, identifies the sitter as Paulus Verschuur based on a partial copy of the painting in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and provides biographical information; MMA Bulletin 14, no. 7 (March 1946), cover ill., text inside front cover summarizes Gudlaugsson’s discovery; Slive 1958, pp. 13–14, suggests (following Gudlaugsson 1954) that the Rotterdam sitter may have been introduced to the Haarlem artist by a member of the Coymans family, which was also in the textile business; J. Rosenberg,
Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, p. 24, mistakenly gives the date as 1642; Descargues 1968, p. 111, mentioned; Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, pp. 153, 174, fig. 187 (detail), repeats the idea of a Coymans connection (see Slive 1968) and compares the work with a portrait in Raleigh, N.C., which the author attributes to Hals's son Jan, vol. 2, pl. 247, vol. 3, p. 75, no. 144, summarizes the findings and suggestions presented in Gudlaugsson 1954; Colle 1972, p. 4 (ill. as frontisp.), calls the collar a “falling band,” and draws attention to an “under-ruff with pleated edges barely visible” beneath the sheer collar; Grimm 1973, pp. 105, 107, 204, no. 120, suggests that the painting may have a pendant in a portrait of a woman in an English private collection (Grimm no. 121, pl. 129); Grimm and Montagni 1974, pp. 98 (under no. 94), 131–4, no. 159 (ill.), proposes that Hals’s Portrait of a Woman, of 1643 (private collection, London), may be the picture’s pendant; Van Thiel et al. 1976, p. 708 (under no. A4501), describes Pieter van der Werff’s oval half-length portrait of Paulus Verschuur as a “free copy” after the Museum’s picture; P. Sutton 1986, p. 185, describes the figure as “[looking] every inch the confident image of a wealthy Rotterdam cloth merchant and burgomaster”; Grimm 1989, pp. 193, 242, 281, 285, no. 118, pl. 44, as by Hals, calls the figure energetic; Biesboer in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, p. 37, maintains that the picture must have been painted in Haarlem, and offers more information about the sitter’s family; Groen and Hendriks in ibid., pp. 115, 117, 125–27, pl. VIII, fig. f (detail of paint cross section), report the color of the ground layer and the main pigments present in the paint layers; Slive in ibid., pp. 282, 292–94, no. 56 (ill.), again acknowledges Gudlaugsson’s identification of the sitter, illustrates the portrait of Verschuur by Pieter van der Werff, and remarks on the fragility of the chalk ground used for the Museum’s picture; Grimm 1990, pp. 193, 242, 286, 291, no. 118, pl. 44, repeats Grimm 1989 in translation; Liedtke 1990, p. 37, notes that the painting was given to the Museum by Archer Huntington; Krohn in Athens 1992–93, pp. 36, 37, 306, no. 12 (ill.), describes the subject; Baetjer 1995, p. 301; Wheelock 1995a, pp. 80, 82 n. 10, fig. 3, compares the presentation of the figure to that found in Hals’s portrait of Adriaen van Ostade, of about 1646–48 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.).


Ex coll.: Adolf Josef Bösch, Döbling, near Vienna (until d. 1884; his estate sale, Kaeser, Plach, and Kohlbacher, Döbling, April 28, 1885, no. 20, as “Männliches Portrait” for Fl 14,010 to Kaiser); [Durand-Ruel, New York, in 1891]; Mrs. Collis P. Huntington, New York (by 1909–d. 1924); her son, Archer Milton Huntington, New York (1924–26); Gift of Archer M. Huntington, in memory of his father, Collis Potter Huntington, 1926 26.101.11

67. Portrait of a Man

Oil on canvas, 43 1/2 x 34 in. (110.5 x 86.4 cm)

The condition of the portrait is good, although the impasto has been slightly flattened during past lining and the whole paint surface is slightly abraded. Contributing to the diminishment of the image, particularly in the deep blacks, is the extensive network of very fine age cracks. A later canvas extending the composition along the left side is covered by the frame.

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1890 91.26.9

The finest of three pictures by Hals from the Marquand Collection, this large portrait of a fashionably attired but seemingly sober gentleman is generally agreed to date from the early 1650s.

Versions of the figure’s pose are found in male portraits by Hals dating from about 1620 onward. The earliest examples show the figure at a greater angle to the picture plane, but equally frontal presentations are found in portraits by Hals (and by Rembrandt; see Pl. 143) dating from the early to mid-1630s. As is obvious from comparisons with works such as Portrait of a Man, of about 1632–34 (Taft Museum, Cincinnati), and Tieleman
Roosterman, dated 1634 (Cleveland Museum of Art), Hals could very effectively convey character not only through facial expression but also by means of turning and tilting the head, shifting shoulders and arms, and other manipulations of posture. In a number of earlier portraits, the viewpoint is lower, creating a commanding or somewhat aloof impression (compare Pl. 66). Here, the level gaze and slightly lower placement of the head in the picture field suggest an approachable personality, despite the sitter’s serious expression and air of having little time to spare.

The latter effect is achieved through the direct glance, the cocked arm, the busy patterns in the costume, and, of course, by the presence of hat, cloak, and gloves. The hat is quite tall (its shape supports a dating to the 1650s) and is decorated with a large black ribbon. The man’s gloved left hand is partially visible above the hat, and a cloak is draped over his forearm. A second glove, its form now somewhat ambiguous, is held in the left hand. The colorful loops of ribbon tied around the waist (called a tablier de galants) and the flouncing of the sleeve above a tight cuff were fashions imported from France. These motifs, and the generous amounts of shirting that erupt from the slit sleeves and unbuttoned doublet, are exploited by Hals for dazzling displays of brushwork. The gray slashes defining folds in the breeches and other black garments are no less virtuoso, but serve as baselines to the brilliant treble of whites. In the face, the undulating strokes in the nose and mouth and in the contour on the shadowed side of the head hint at movement and maturity. As always in autograph works by Hals, a strong sense of three-dimensional form remains even in the most daring passages of brushwork. The hat’s contribution to the spatial effect of the whole must have been strongly originally, and is more discernible in good photographs than in normal gallery light.

It is clear from the design of other portraits by Hals that this picture could have stood alone, and equally well might have had a pendant. However, none has ever been identified or proposed.

A small copy on panel, arbitrarily attributed to Hals’s son Harmen, was on the art market in the early 1950s.

2. Ibid., vol. 2, pls. 131, 134. On the Taft picture, see also Liedtke in E. Sullivan et al. 1991, pp. 140–42. Tietelman Roosterman, formerly in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, was restored to the Rothschild family in 1998, and in 1999 was acquired at auction by the Cleveland Museum of Art.
5. Parke-Bernet, New York, March 14, 1951, no. 9, and March 5, 1952, no. 31, as by “Harman” Hals.

References: MMA 1901, p. 66, no. 264; Moes 1909, p. 108, no. 184, listed; Valentin in New York 1909, p. 42, no. 41 (ill. opp. p. 42), dates the portrait to about 1650, and states that it is signed with the artist’s monogram; Cox 1909–10, p. 245, praises the work as one of the finest Halses known, describes the use of paint (blacks especially), and compares works by Whistler; Breck 1910, p. 50, mistakenly calls the picture a pendant of the Marquand Portrait of a Woman (Pl. 68); Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3 (1910), p. 85, no. 297, describes the subject, and follows Valentin in New York 1909 in referring to a monogram; Péladan 1912 (ill. opp. p. 98), no comment; Bode and Binder 1914b, vol. 2, p. 216, no. 260, pl. 156, listed; Valentin 1921a, pp. 321 (ill.), 321, compares the Portrait of a Man of about 1660 (Frick Collection, New York); Valentin 1921b, pp. 266 (ill.), 322, dates the painting to about 1652–54; Dülberg 1930, p. 222, fig. 88, describes the figure, which in its pose foreshadows Napoleon; B. Burroughs 1931a, p. 149, no. 1116–2; Valentin 1936, no. 102 (ill.), “one of the artist’s masterpieces of the ‘fifties”; Pletzsch 1940, pp. 4, 16 (ill. p. 34), suggests a date of about 1650; Rousseau 1954, p. 3 (ill. p. 32), “an ancestor of the Impressionists”; Slive in Haarlem 1962, pp. 69–70, no. 61, fig. 6, describes the execution and suggests a date of about 1650–52; J. Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, p. 45, pl. 218, observes that the frontal pose is typical of Hals portraits painted after 1650, and that there are “incridibly subtle distinctions between the blacks of the man’s hat, hat, and mantle”; G. Agnew 1967, unpagd (ill.), as sold to Marquand in 1892; Descargues 1968, pp. 111, 115 (ill.), mentioned; Boston 1970, p. 41 (ill.), considers the pose “striking, though natural”; Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, p. 194 (ill. opp. p. 116 [detail]), describes the execution, which Manet would have admired, and considers the colorful ribbons unusual in Hals, vol. 2, pls. 298, 301, vol. 3, p. 99, no. 190, dates the painting to about 1650–52, detects a monogram in the lower right corner, and admires the figure as “one of Hals’ most penetrating characterizations”; Grimm 1972, pp. 23, 109, 205, no. 134, figs. 102, 166, dates the work to about 1649–50; Grimm and Montagni 1974, p. 106, no. 181 (ill.), as from about 1650; Zafra in Washington, and other cities 1975–76, p. 80 (under no. 21), compares the pose in Portrait of a Man, of about 1661 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg); Wiesner 1976, pl. 67; Fuchs 1978, p. 85, fig. 59, as from about 1650; Baard 1981, frontisp. (text), pl. 1 (detail), fig. 53, as from about 1650–52; Guératzsch 1981, pp. 139–40, pl. 113, considers the painting typical and masterly; Hofrichter in New Brunswick 1983, pp. 42, 57, no. 68 (ill. p. 96), fig. 20, considers the pose “thunderously brazen,” although the picture is seen as “a prime example of the dignity and grandeur Hals expresses in his late works”; Grimm 1989, pp. 191–96, 281, 285, no. 136 (ill. p. 282), fig. 110, pl. 70 (detail), dates the picture to about 1654; Groen and Hendriks in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, pp. 112, 113, 117, 122 no. 29, 33, fig. 4 (X-radiograph), p. 125 (S no. 190), note that at some point a narrow strip of canvas was added to the left side, and describe the color of the ground layer and the main pigments present in the paint layers; Du Mortier in ibid., p. 36, describes the tablier de galants (“an apron-like skirt made of loops of ribbon”) worn at the waist and the flounces above the cuff of the shirt sleeves, both of which were French fashions; Slive in ibid.,
68. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 39 3/4 x 32 1/8 in. (100 x 81.9 cm)

Passages of the portrait are abraded, particularly the deep blacks in the drapery, details in the lace collar and cuffs, and the coiffure. The canvas weave has been emphasized and the impasto slightly flattened during past lining. The entire background is a later construction painted over what was originally a monochrome gray green. Analysis of paint samples mounted in cross section confirms that the column in the background at left and the cityscape at right contain the pigment Naples yellow (lead antimony oxide). This pigment was generally unavailable to artists working in Holland in the seventeenth century and was not used by Hals. Naples yellow is found only rarely in paintings by Dutch artists of the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century (see Groen, De Keijzer, and Baadsgaard 1996).

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1890 91.26.10

The composition, manner of execution, and the sitter’s costume suggest that this colorful portrait by Hals dates from about 1660. The background, originally rendered in a neutral tone, was completely painted over at a later date, most likely during the eighteenth century. Except for the hair and cap, which are abraded, most areas of the figure reveal impressive brushwork, especially in the folded hands and upper portion of the skirt (the lower left part has been repainted).

Much of the scholarly literature has focused on the question of whether the Portrait of a Painter (fig. 79) is a pendant to the present picture. In earlier decades, the sitter in the Frick portrait was thought by some writers to be Hals himself, which may be dismissed on the grounds of appearance (see Pl. 70) and age (Hals was nearly seventy in 1660). No other plausible suggestion for the identity of either sitter has ever been made, which is not surprising, since the subjects of more than half of Hals’s surviving portraits remain anonymous.

That the Frick and Metropolitan Museum portraits may have been intended as a pair is more likely than it might at first appear. Slive observes that only two other female portraits by Hals, which also date from about 1660, show similarly informal poses, with the woman seated almost sideways and her right arm hooked over the back of the chair. Although the poses found in the New York pictures have parallels in independent portraits by Hals, they complement each other remarkably well. This is more evident when one eliminates all background details and reduces the size of the painter’s hat (which was enlarged at a later date, when the column was also added). The canvases are now almost identical in size; both have been slightly trimmed. The fact that at some later date, both pictures were provided with architectural backgrounds, and that the monumental columns balance each other, suggests that the pictures were together at the time. The earliest trace of the Museum’s picture is in England during the 1790s, when it was evidently not accompanied by a pendant. The first record of the Frick picture is in England, in 1876.
1. See the condition note on the use of Naples yellow in the background. The cityscape bears a vague resemblance to architectural views in Dutch portraits of the 1650s and 1660s, but the ensemble of five spires, a castle, and two rooftops seems unlikely to have been imagined by a Netherlandish artist at any date.

2. The Museum’s painting was taken to the Frick Collection for comparison on December 19, 1966. On that occasion, the Metropolitan Museum was represented by Theodore Rousseau, Elizabeth Gardner, Claus Virch, Hubert von Sonnenburg, and Philippe de Montebello, and the Frick Collection by director Harry Grier, Bernice Davidson, Edgar Munhall, Francis Richardson, and John Walsh. Later the same week, Julius Held and Seymour Slive examined the paintings together. In a memo from Virch to Rousseau summarizing the experience, the idea that the pictures were pendants was vigorously opposed. “The pose of the man is aggressive and closer to the viewer, that of the woman reserved and placed more [that is, deeper] in the picture space.” (See also Frick Collection 1968, vol. 1, p. 216). These points may actually be taken as arguments in favor of the hypothesis that Hals designed the pictures as pendants: compare Slive 1970–74, vol. 2, pls. 123, 124, 143, 144, 150, 151, 159, 170. Virch also noted that “when placed close together, the columns do not match.” Dutch pair portraits generally were not hung close together, and in any case Hals did not paint the background elements in either picture. Virch also maintains that the paintings differ in palette and execution. The present writer (and Slive, evidently) disagrees.

3. Slive in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, p. 309, with reference to ibid., nos. 63, 64, the pendant portraits in the Talt Museum, Cincinnati (on which see also the present writer’s discussion in E. Sullivan et al. 1995, pp. 142–44), and Portrait of a Seated Woman, presumably Maria Vernatt (Aurora Art Fund).

4. See Frick Collection 1968, vol. 1, pp. 211–16, on the condition and provenance of Portrait of a Painter. X-radiographs of the two paintings were examined side by side on June 13, 2006, by the present writer, Museum conservator Charlotte Hale, and Frick Collection curator Susan Galassi. It was concluded that the execution of the figures and drapery is consistent throughout the two works. The canvas supports are very similar, but were not cut from the same bolt of cloth. The Frick canvas has a slightly finer weave, about 12 x 14.5 threads per square centimeter. The weave of the Museum’s canvas is about 12 x 12 threads per square centimeter.

REFERENCES: Caffin 1902, pp. 274, 275 (ill.), describes the picture as “the wonderful portrait of his wife by Frans Hals,” and praises the figure, “an epitome of the Dutch bourgeoisie at its best”; MMA 1905, p. 66, no. 269, as “The Wife of Frans Hals,” describes the subject and gives provenance; Moes 1909, p. 109, no. 205, listed, as “Portait de femme”; Valentine in New York 1909, p. 41, no. 40 (ill. opp. p. 41), describes the composition and states that the identification of the sitter as the artist’s wife is erroneous; Cox 1909–10, p. 245, dates the painting to before 1650, and observes that...
Hals's characteristic handling is "so thoroughly subordinated to an entire realization of natural appearance as almost to escape the attention"; Breck 1910, p. 50, mistakenly calls the picture a pendant of Portrait of a Man (Pl. 67; also a Marquand gift); Hofstede de Groot 1907-27, vol. 3 (1910), p. 112, no. 287, as Portrait of a Woman, describes the subject and gives provenance; Waldmann 1910, p. 78, pens generous praise; Peladan 1912 (ill. opp. p. 68), titles the work "Inconnue (Peur-ètre Lisbeth Reyniers)" (Hals's wife); Bode and Binder 1914b, vol. 2, p. 9, no. 175, pl. 107, listed, as Portrait of a Woman; Valentin 1921a, pp. viii-ix, 120 (ill.), 314, considers the picture to be the pendant to the supposed self-portrait by Hals in the Frick Collection; Valentin 1923, pp. xii-xiii, 127 (ill.), 314-15, repeats Valentin 1921a; Valentin 1925, pp. 193-94, defends the hypothesis (based partly on the conjecture that the "Massa" double portrait in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, might depict the artist and his wife) that this picture represents Hals's wife, and that the portrait is a self-portrait of Hals in the Frick Collection is a pendant self-portrait, probably of 1645 not 1655; Dülberg 1930, p. 117, pl. 45, considers the work a pendant to the Frick picture, tentatively identifies the sitter as the artist's wife, and dates the portrait to about 1655; B. Burroughs 1931a, p. 149, no. M16-1 (pl. opp. p. 152), "erroneously called ‘Wife of the Artist’"; Valentin 1935, p. 95, describes the painting as "the companion piece to the self portrait in the Frick collection"; Valentin 1936, unpagined (under nos. 45 and 83), and as no. 84 (ill.), as "Lisbeth Reyniers, the Wife of the Artist", of about 1645, now maintains that there is no question that [the Frick and the Metropolitan Museum picture] belong together as companion pieces; and that the identification of Hals himself in the portrait "can not well be doubted"; Trivas 1944, pp. 36 (under no. 97), 57, no. 98, pl. 129, as Portrait of a Woman (the Artist’s Wife, Lisbeth Reyniers)?; considers the painting a pendant to the Frick picture, of about 1650; Vis 1965, pp. 9, 11, 82-91, 107-10, pl. 3, dates the portrait to 1645, and maintains at length that it represents Rembrandt’s onetime companion, Geertje Dircks, and that the Frick picture is nothing less than Hals’s portrait of Rembrandt; Scheller 1966, pp. 117-18, submits the entire argument of Vis 1965 to detailed condemnation; Davidson in Frick Collection 1968, pp. 215-16, rejects the identification of the sitter as Hals’s wife or Rembrandt’s companion, and suggests that the Museum’s picture and the Frick canvas were not intended as pendant portraits, but may have been dated at a later date to appear as such; Slive 1970-74, vol. 1, pp. 159, 184-85, considers the painting a pendant to the Frick Portrait of a Painter, and the architectural backgrounds in both pictures to be incongruous additions of a later period, probably "by two different hands," vol. 2, pl. 260, 266 (whole, and detail of the hands), vol. 3, p. 97, no. 187, considers the sitter unidentified, dates the painting to about 1650-52, acknowledges reasons to reject the Frick portrait as a pendant, but finds it hard "to reject categorically the notion that [the two canvases] were painted as companion pictures"; Grimm 1972, pp. 26-27, 28, 109, 205, no. 141, fig. 154, dates the picture to about 1648-50, describes the background as completely overpainted, and considers it possible that the Frick canvas is a pendant; D. Sutton in Fry 1972, vol. 1, p. 235 n. 1 to letter no. 177 of March 2, 1906, lists the painting among works in the 1906 exhibition; Grimm and Montagni 1974, pp. 105 (ill.), 106, no. 179, dates the painting to about 1650, and reviews earlier opinions; D. Smith 1982a, pp. 111, 190 n. 46, argues that the present picture and the Frick canvas are pendants, mainly on formal grounds; Grimm 1989, p. 283, no. 187, calls the picture a product of Hals’s workshop, "stylistically close to the anonymous Master of the Fisherboy:" Slive in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989-90, p. 300, compares the Taft Museum Portrait of a Seated Woman Holding a Fan, of about 1648-50, and a small female portrait of the same period as the only other female portraits by Hals in which a woman sits sideways on a chair with one arm hooked over the back, and also states flatly that the present picture is the pendant to a Painter Holding a Brush at the Frick Collection? Grimm 1990, p. 292 (under no. 187), repeats Grimm 1989 in translation; Baetjer 1995, p. 301; Dudok van Heel in Edinburgh–London 2001, p. 246 n. 47, mentions the hypothesis of Vis 1965, in connection with a brief account of Geertje Dircks’s relationship with Rembrandt.


Ex coll.: William Ponsonby, 2nd Earl of Bessborough, London, and Bessborough House, Roehampton (until d. 1793; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, February 5–7, 1801, no. 50, as "A Lady’s Portrait," for £12 10s. 6d., bought in); the Earl of Bessborough, Bessborough House (until 1847); John George Brabazon Ponsonby, 5th Earl of Bessborough, Bessborough House (until 1848; sold to Jarvis); Sir Lewis Jarvis, Middleton Towers, King’s Lynn, Norfolk (1848-90; posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, June 21, 1890, no. 35, as "Portrait of the Artist’s Wife," for £1,837 10s. to Colnaghi); [Martin Colnaghi, London, 1890; sold to Marquand for £2,800]; Henry G. Marquand, New York (1890); Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1890 91.26.10

1. Vis’s idea concerning the Frick picture was reported in an anonymous article, “Did Frans Hals Paint Rembrandt?,” The Knickerbocker 21, no. 8 (August 1959), pp. 32–33. It describes Vis as a “Netherlands jurist turned painter,” who had been “struck by artistic lightning” when looking at a photograph of the Frick canvas. After “diligent research,” he went to New York with funding from The Netherlands Organization for Pure Scientific Research.
2. On a visit to the Museum in October 1983, Grimm accepted Hals’s authorship of the painting, as he had in Grimm 1972 and Grimm and Montagni 1974.
69. Malle Babbe

Oil on canvas, 20 1/2 x 24 in. (52.4 x 61 cm)
Inscribed (falsely, right center): FH [in monogram]

The painting is in good condition. In the black passages and in the background, the priming is exposed by abrasion.

Purchase, 1871 71.76

Although this picture was one of the proudest trophies in the Museum's 1871 Purchase, it was doubted as a work by Hals as early as 1883, when Wilhelm von Bode described it as a free repetition by Frans Hals the Younger after one of his father's paintings (meaning the autograph picture, Malle Babbe, of about 1633–35, in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin). 1 Slive (see Refs.) has repeatedly dismissed Frans Hals the Younger from consideration, and considers it possible that the New York canvas is "a copy of a lost original." 2 The present writer has compared works ascribed to Hals's sons Harmen (1611–1669) and Jan (ca. 1620–1654), and to other artists in Hals's circle, and like Slive is unable to offer a plausible attribution. The picture is superficially impressive for its bold execution, but it lacks Hals's sense of form and interest in actual observation. The work would appear to date from not long after Hals introduced the subject into the art world of Haarlem, that is, from the second half of the 1630s or the 1640s.

The name "Malle Babbe van Haerlem," which could be translated as Silly Bety or Mad Meg of Haarlem, 3 is inscribed on an old piece of stretcher left in the modern one supporting the Berlin canvas. The misreading, "Hille Bobbe" (see Refs.), goes back to an 1867 sale catalogue. 4 In 1653, the Haarlem burgomasters allowed the local "[House of] correction and a charitable institution" 56 guilders to care for Malle Babbe. The document also refers to Frans Hals's mentally impaired son, Pieter, who had been confined in the same place since 1642. 5 Thus a real person served as the model for Hals's painting in Berlin and for a number of related works.

The owl (rendered much more convincingly in the Berlin picture) was a common symbol of folly in the Netherlands, despite its classical association with Minerva, goddess of wisdom. 6 It is hard to say which owl sat on Valentin's shoulder when he reported that Malle Babbe was "a well-known street figure in Haarlem, who went about among the beer shops and on account of her droll nature enjoyed special popularity." 7

2. The quote is from Slive in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, p. 238. Ibid., p. 218, notes the reference to "various copies after Frans Hals" in an auction held by a Haarlem innkeeper in 1651.
3. The former is suggested in Westermann 1907, p. 268. Babbelem, in modern Dutch, means "to babble," but "Babbe" was probably just a nickname for Barbara or a similar name.
6. On the owl as a symbol of folly, see Slive 1965.

REFERENCES: Possibly P. Mantz, "François Hals," in Blunt et al. 1864, pp. 6–7, refers to a painting by Hals of an old woman with an owl which was engraved by Cockers, and which anticipates Goyas. Théoré 1868a, p. 443, quotes Mantz (see preceding reference) and identifies the figure as "old Hille Bobbe, a sort of popular sorceress" who lived in Haarlem; Théoré 1869, p. 161, compares the painting in the Summerford collection (now Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) with the version engraved by Cockers; Von Lützow 1870, pp. 78–79, explores the meaning of the figure represented to Cockers's print, calling her "a kind of female Falstaff"; MMA 1871, pl. [1], as by Hals; Decamps 1872, p. 476, finds this version superior to that in the Summerford collection; Havard 1872, p. 221, compares the version in Dresden (on which see Slive 1970–74, vol. 3, p. 141 [under no. 1314]); James (1872) 1956, pp. 55–56, as "Hille Bobbe of Haarlem," by Frans Hals, "a masterpiece of inelegant vigour"; MMA 1872, pp. 54–55, no. 144, as "Hille Bobbe Van Haarlem," discusses the recent provenance, and maintains that "this capital chef d'oeuvre of science, color, spirit, life, and boldness would do honor to any museum"; Bode 1883, p. 103, describes the picture as a free repetition by Frans Hals the Younger after his father's work; Keitel 1884, p. 461, mentions the work as Hals's "Hille Bobbe"; Moes 1897–1905, vol. 1 (1897), p. 88, no. 748–2, listed, under portraits of "Hille Bobbe, fishwife of Haarlem," as one of three examples by Frans Hals; Caffin 1902, p. 274, describes the work as Hals's "sketchy portrait of the wicked-eyed, laughing old woman, 'Hille van Bobbe,' in which one may study the impertinency and yet faultless precision" of the artist's technique; G. Davies 1902, p. 144, lists the work as "Hille Bobbe (?), probably by Frans Hals, the son"; Moes 1909, pp. 64–65, 111, no. 261, as "Hille Babbe," a person apparently on close terms with Hals, who seems to have had the "intention to make a very exact portrait of his friend"; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3 (1910), p. 30, no. 109, as "Hille Bobbe" by Hals, and as the version etched by Cockers; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 29 (under no. 19), 34.
(under no. 23), calls the work a "subject or character-picture," and describes the figure as "Hille Babbe, the old fishwife whose jolly and dissipated personality is preserved in several famous canvases"; Bode and Binder 1914b, vol. 1, p. 34, no. 66, pl. 32a, as "Maile Babbe"; Chase 1917, p. 437, considers this one of Hals's finest pictures; Valentin 1921a, pp. 130 (ill.), 315, dates the picture to about 1635–40 and considers it a possible pendant of the Merry Drinker in the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kassel; Monod 1921, p. 102, as "une Hille Babbe de Frans Hals le Jeune (?)"; Valentin 1933, p. 141 (ill.), 316, repeats Valentin 1921a; Altman Collection 1928, pp. 62 (under no. 28), 63 (under no. 29), repeats Altman Collection 1914, but now refers to the painting as "attributed to Frans Hals the Younger"; Duille 1930, pp. 132, 134, as by Hals, and perhaps more true to reality than the version in Berlin; B. Burroughs 1931, p. 123, no. H161-1, attributes the picture to Frans Hals the Younger, noting that "most authorities, including Bode and De Groote, consider the Museum's picture the work of someone close to Hals, probably Frans Hals the Younger"; Valentin 1936, unpaged, no. 57 (ill.), as "Maile Babbe, the Witch of Haarlem," painted about 1635–40 by Frans Hals (as the writer has stated for twenty years), reports that "the woman represented was apparently a well-known street figure in Haarlem, who went about among the beer shops and on account of her droll nature enjoyed special popularity"; Van Dansz 1937, p. 103, no. 97, calls the work a later imitation; Gratama 1937, pp. 6, 7 (ill.), 15, cites the work as one of the foremost pictures lent to the Haarlem exhibition of 1937; Siple 1937, p. 90, cites the painting as "an especially fine lot of robust peasant folk painted about 1635 in Hals's freest manner," on view in the Haarlem exhibition of 1937; Trivas 1941, p. 36, no. 33b, describes the canvas as a copy by a contemporary of Hals after the painting in Berlin; Taubes 1918, p. 60 (ill.), as by Frans Hals, "an alla-prima painting which shows the use of highly polymerized (long) paint"; Slive in Haarlem 1962, p. 49, no. 31, fig. 6, as "painted c. 1630–33," considers this picture the closest of known works to the painting in Berlin, but adds that "whether it is by the master himself or a brilliant follower is debatable," and rejects the attribution to Frans Hals the Younger; Slive 1963, p. 435, calls the picture a "problematic version" of the painting in Berlin, and reviews evidence indicating that the owl was understood in Hals's day as a symbol of folly; Von Salder in New York–Richmond–San Francisco 1967, pp. 36, 71 (under no. 44), catalogues a copy by Frank Duvenecke (ca. 1873–75) after this picture; Descamps 1968, p. 64, mentioned; Herzog 1969, p. 83 (under no. 44), suggests that the painting may be one seen together with the Kassel picture by Hals in the backgrounds of two works by Jan Steen; Slive 1970–71, vol. 1, pp. 146, 151, figs. 146, 156 (detail of head), compares the Berlin version of this subject, describes how the Museum's picture is inferior in execution, and considers it "the invention of a gifted follower or a copy after a lost original," vol. 3, p. 140 (under no. D12), 141, no. D34, fig. 135, suggests that the painter may be the same anonymous artist responsible for the pictures of "fishergirls" in Cologne and Cincinnati, and rejects previous attributions to Frans Hals the Younger; D. Sutton in Fry 1972, vol. 1, p. 255 n. 1 to letter no. 177 of March 2, 1966, lists the picture among works included in the 1906 exhibition; Grün and Montagni 1974, pp. 91 (under no. 71), 119, no. 339 (ill.), places the picture among problematic works assigned to Hals in the past, and cites previous opinions; Moiso-Dickamp 1987, pp. 332–34 (under no. 81), reviews earlier suggestions that this painting and the Kassel canvas (here called Peckelhaering als Trinker) might be pendants; M. Scott 1987, p. 64 (under no. 22), records Slive's suggestion that the anonymous painter of this work may also have been responsible for the Fisher Girl in the Cincinnati Art Museum; Slive in Washington–London–Haarlem 1989–90, pp. 216 (under no. 31), 238–39 (under no. 37), fig. 376, compares the Berlin version by Hals, considers this a good painting by a lesser artist, and states that "the possibility that it is a copy of a lost original cannot be ruled out"; Liedtke 1990, p. 33, fig. 20, as by a contemporary follower of Frans Hals, quotes Henry James's appreciation of the picture, and considers it a reflection of nineteenth-century American taste; N. Hall 1992, pp. 20–21, fig. 20, cites Henry James and cites Courbet's copy of the Berlin version as "a testament to the new vogue for Hals"; Stukkenbrock 1993, pp. 138, 139, 161, 162, 163, 167, 205, 206, 250, fig. 59, observes that the beer mug seen in the Berlin painting is absent here, but notes that the owl alone can refer to drunkenness, discusses other versions of the subject, illustrates Duvenecke's copy of the Museum's picture, and describes both works as examples of the American taste for Hals, "which would reach a first high point in the 1890s"; Baetjer 1995, p. 303, as "Style of Frans Hals . . . second quarter 17th century"; Wheelock in Washington–Amsterdam 1996–97, p. 153 n. 9 (under no. 16), notes the inclusion of this picture, or a version of it, in the background of Jan Steen's Baptismal Party (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin); Baetjer 2004, pp. 173, 178–79, 182, 193 n. 67, 197, 217–18, 244–45, appendix 1A, no. 144 (ill. p. 217), figs. 30, 31 (floor plan), 34 (1946 gallery view), discusses the painting as part of the 1873 Purchase, and as a work that, "in the absence of a Rembrandt, was presented [when the MMA opened in February 1872] as one of the most important works in the collection," quotes James's description, and mentions the earlier owner, Lord Palmerston, "The Tory statesman and prime minister who died in 1865."


**EX COLL.: Henry John Temple, 3rd Viscount Palmerston, Broadlands, Romsey, Hampshire (by about 1805–d. 1869); [Léon Gauche, Brussels, 1870]; [Léon Gauche, Paris, and Alexis Febvre, Paris, 1870; sold to Bodgert]; William T. Bodgert, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Bodgert, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.76
COPY AFTER FRANS HALS

70. Frans Hals

Oil on wood, 12½ x 11 in. (32.7 x 27.9 cm)
The painting is in good condition.
The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931
32.100.8

Until 1935, this small panel from the Friedsam collection was generally considered to be a self-portrait by Hals, of about 1650. Cleaning of the version formerly in the Clowes collection and now in the Indianapolis Museum of Art (fig. 82) led Valentiner (see Refs.) and others to regard that panel as the same size as the original. The Indianapolis picture is now viewed by Slive and other scholars as the best of the known copies of a lost self-portrait by Hals.¹ Its superiority is obvious from photographs, although it is clearly not by Hals himself. In the New York version and one in a German private collection,² the sitter’s lips are slightly parted, which is not the case in the Indianapolis portrait. The Museum’s painting in particular seems less somber in expression, but it is not possible to judge from the available evidence whether this reflects Hals’s intention or that of one of his copyists.

There seems no reason to doubt that the Friedsam panel dates from the period, probably the 1650s. One might compare the considerable number of “self-portraits” that depict Rembrandt but appear to be by workshop assistants using actual self-portraits by the master as models.³ The desire of collectors to own images of famous artists evidently led to the production of more “self-portraits” than the sitter cared to paint himself.


REFERENCES: Bode 1883, pp. 85, 87 n. 1, 93, no. 77, as “Kleines Brustbild eines jungen Mannes,” by Hals, about 1650 (Warneck collection, Paris, in 1878), identifies a work in Dresden as a good copy after this picture; Hofstede de Groot in The Hague 1903, pp. 13–14, no. 34, pl. 21, questions whether this is a self-portrait, considering that the style indicates a date of about 1650, when Hals would have appeared older, and cites an old copy in the Kirchheim collection, Paris, and a version in the Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem; Moe in 1909, pp. 28, 101, no. 38 (ill. [frontis.]), considers the picture a self-portrait by Hals; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 3 (1910), pp. 46, no. 148, as by Hals, lists three supposed copies; Péladan 1912, pp. 111–12 (ill. opp. p. 110), considers this version the most authentic; Binder in Bode and Binder 1914b, vol. 1, p. 19, vol. 2, p. 15, no. 217, pl. 1398, rejects the identification of the subject as Hals; Valentiner 1921a (ill. [frontis.]), p. 305, as a self-portrait by Hals, about 1650, of which many contemporary copies are known; Valentiner 1925 (ill. [frontis.]), p. 303, repeats Valentiner 1921a; Valentiner 1925, p. 134, suggests that the work is a self-portrait by Hals, which would appear to be supported by its many copies, “but how far back this tradition goes, it is difficult to judge”; Valentiner 1928a, p. 5, dates the painting to about 1650, is inclined to consider it a self-portrait by Hals, and lists five copies; Dülberg 1930, pl. 1, as Hals’s self-portrait of about 1650, and as still owned by Jules Forges, Paris; B. Burroughs in 1932, p. 13, as “in all probability” a self-portrait; B. Burroughs and Wehle 1932,
pp. 48–49, no. 85, questions the identification as a self-portrait; W. Martin 1935, pp. 342, 448 n. 461, as the best of all versions; Valentiner 1935, pp. 89–90, fig. 5, reverses the author’s earlier position, now calling this picture a copy of the original in the Clowes collection (formerly in Dresden; now in the Indianapolis Museum of Art); Valentiner in Detroit 1935, unpaged (under no. 49), calls this one of the “considerable number of old copies” of the original in the Clowes collection; anon., “Neuentdeckungen zum Werke des Frans Hals,” *Weltkunst* 9, no. 33–34 (August 25, 1935), p. 5 (ill.), summarizes the opinion given in Valentiner 1935; Valentiner 1946, unpaged (under no. 88), cites the painting as a copy of the *Self-Portrait* in the Clowes collection; Van Hall 1965, p. 126, no. 92 (under Frans Hals), lists the work as a copy after the Indianapolis version; Slive 1970–74, vol. 1, pp. 14, 163, considers the Indianapolis picture the best of “a number of versions after a lost original” of about 1640, which would have been a self-portrait, vol. 3, p. 124, no. 135-3, fig. 96, considers this one of eight copies and variants of a lost original; Grimm and Montagni 1974, p. 107 (under no. 184), reviews earlier opinions; Baejer 1995, p. 303, as Copy after Frans Hals.

**Exhibited:** The Hague, Haagsche Kunstkring, “Tentoonstelling van oude portretten,” 1903, no. 34, as “Portrait of the Painter (?)” by Frans Hals (lent by Jules Porgès, Paris).

**Ex Coll.:** [Édouard Warneck, Paris, in 1878]; Leopold Goldschmidt, Paris; Jules Porgès, Paris (by 1903—at least 1914); Michael Friedsam, New York (by 1923–d. 1931); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.8
Adriaen Hanneman
The Hague 1603/4–1671 The Hague

Hanneman was a highly successful portraitist in The Hague, where his Dutch version of Van Dyck's manner was ideally suited to the court city's cosmopolitan patrons. He depicted members of the national government and of the House of Orange, but from the late 1640s onward he found a large part of his clientele among English residents and visitors, in particular Royalist exiles.1

The artist came from a Catholic family that filled various government posts.2 In 1619, he was apprenticed to Anthony van Ravesteyn the Younger (ca. 1580–1669), who, like his better-known brother Jan van Ravesteyn (q.v.), was a conservative portraitist in the manner of Michiel van Mierevelt (q.v.). Hanneman laboriously followed this tradition in his earliest known work, a formal portrait of a woman dated 1625.3

In 1626, Hanneman moved to London, where he remained until about 1638. He married Elizabeth Wilson in 1630; evidently she died before Hanneman moved back to Holland.4 Little is known of his work in England. He may have served as an assistant to Van Dyck once the latter settled in London in 1632.5 In any event, the few known pictures from Hanneman's English period and most of his later portraits show how profoundly Van Dyck influenced his style.6 The sophisticated Henry, Duke of Gloucester, of about 1633 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), is one of a number of paintings by the Dutch artist that were long regarded as works by his Flemish contemporary.7

Hanneman joined the painters' guild of The Hague in 1640 and the same year married Jan van Ravesteyn's daughter Maria. The son-in-law served as hoofdman (headman) of the guild in 1643 and as dean from 1645 to 1647. He bought a fine house on the Nobletstraat in 1641 and appears to have enjoyed good fortune until the late 1660s.

A large portrait by Hanneman of Constantijn Huygens and his five children, each presented half-length in a medallion (Mauritshuis, The Hague), is dated 1640 but was completed slightly earlier. As secretary and artistic adviser to the Stadholder, Prince Frederick Hendrick, Huygens must have introduced Hanneman to many clients over the next thirty years. The prince was the most important patron of art and architecture that Holland had seen in some time. Van Dyck painted portraits of him and his wife, Amalia van Solms, in 1631–32, and by 1638 not only Hanneman but also Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656), Jan Miijens (ca. 1614–1670), and Pieter Nason (ca. 1612–1688/90) were established at The Hague as fashionable portraitists.8 Hanneman was working for the princely couple by 1645, and in the following year depicted their daughter-in-law Princess Mary (1631–1660; daughter of King Charles I), who in the 1650s was one of the painter's principal supporters (as in the portrait of her son, Prince Willem III at the Age of Four, 1654; Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).9 In addition to portraits, Hanneman painted a large Allegory of Justice in 1644 (Oud Stadhuis, The Hague) and a monumental Allegory of Peace about 1664 (Eerste Kamer, Binnenhof, The Hague).10

"A child of Mr. Hanneman in the Nobletstraat" was buried in March 1654; his second wife may have died by that time.11 In November 1669, the artist married Alida Besemer, whom he evidently survived. In his last years, Hanneman declined in prosperity and health. He was buried in the Kloosterkerk on July 11, 1671.12

Hanneman was instrumental in the founding of the painters' confraternity Pictura in 1656, and was elected its first dean. He was one of the organization's principal officers throughout the 1660s, and between 1658 and 1669 had six pupils of whom Reinier de la Haye (ca. 1640–after 1699) is perhaps the best known.13 Hanneman's known self-portraits include a canvas dated 1656 in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and a panel dated 1669 in the Kremer collection.14

2. See Ter Kuile 1976, pp. 10, 29 n. 30, 32–33. Hanneman's father, Jan, served as clerk at the Court of Holland and in regional administrations.
3. Ibid., no. 1, pl. 1 (art market, 1708).
4. Ter Kuile (ibid., p. 11) suggests that Hanneman left London because his wife died.
6. See Ter Kuile 1976, nos. 2–5, pls. 2, 4, 22, 24; also Millar 1961, no. 214, pl. 93, for Hanneman's portrait of the miniaturist Peter Oliver, of about 1612–15 (Hampton Court).
7. See Wheelock 1995a, pp. 92–95.
71. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 31 1/2 x 25 in. (80 x 63 cm)

The portrait is well preserved, although the impasto is somewhat flattened. The areas of the face, hair, hands, and lace collar and cuffs are in good condition. Although there are numerous minute losses distributed throughout the background and clothing, these do not substantially detract from the painting's appearance. X-radiography reveals cusping along the lower edge, confirming that the closely cropped composition is original.

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.27

This unsigned portrait of an attractive young woman is certainly by Hanneman and has been dated convincingly to about 1633. The work is one of several portraits of upper-middle-class women in which the painter slightly varied a standard compositional scheme. His Portrait of a Woman, dated 1653, in the Pushkin Museum, Moscow, is very similar in design and even in the sitter's appearance, costume, and jewelry, although she is clearly not the same person.

Ter Kuile conjectured that the Museum's picture might have had a male pendant, and he proposed the Portrait of a Man, signed and dated 1653, in the Dulwich Picture Gallery, London. That canvas is about the same size and has a similar tonal background. The fact that the man appears closer and higher in the composition than the woman in the New York painting would seem to speak against a pendant relationship were it not for the fact that the same disparity occurs in several approximately contemporary pair portraits by Hanneman. However, the relevant examples feature a complementary play of male and female hands, whereas no hands are included in the Dulwich picture. Furthermore, a number of male portraits by Hanneman must now be unknown or unidentified.

As in similar portraits by the artist, the graceful proportions of the figure, with oval head, long neck, sloping shoulders, and tapered hands, recall Van Dyck's manner of flattering female subjects. The soft brown curls and the contours of the face also remind one of the Flemish master's images, but the modeling of the nose, the mouth, and especially the hand (which, unlike Van Dyck's version, has veins and some sort of skeletal structure) is more consistent with precedents in Hanneman's native city. The rather flat and mechanical description of lace likewise brings to mind passages in portraits from the workshop of Michiel van Miereveld (q.v.) and may indicate the use of an assistant for costume details (which were usually of considerable importance to the patron). In her costume, elegant hairstyle (with its cascade of curls), and above all extravagant display of pearls, the sitter is presented not only at her best but also as an exemplar of contemporary femininity.

1. Ter Kuile 1976, no. 24. A dating to 1654 or 1655 is also possible, to judge from the costume and coiffure, but a date earlier than 1653 is unlikely. The painting was considered to be by Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Elder (q.v.) until 1934, when curator Harry Wehle reassigned it to Hanneman. Notes in the curatorial files record the supporting opinions of F. Schmidt-Degener (1935) and L. van Puyselaer (1935).
2. Ter Kuile 1976, no. 20, pl. 42. The cropping of the hand and cuffs in the Museum's picture may seem unusual but is typical of Hanneman's female portraits: compare ibid., pls. 45, 44, 45, 49, 59, 61.
3. Ibid., p. 81 (under no. 24), n. 1, referring to his no. 32, pl. 9 (Murray 1980, no. 575). A signed pendant would account for the lack of a signature here, since Hanneman and other artists frequently signed only one of the portraits that formed a pair: for example, Ter Kuile 1976, nos. 27 (man's portrait), 30 (woman's).
REFERENCES: B. Burroughs 1922, p. 354, cites the painting as by "Janssens van Ceulen"; Ter Kuile 1976, pp. 15, 79 (under no. 20), 81, 86 (under no. 32), no. 24, pl. 10, describes the type of composition, dates the painting to about 1633, and suggests that the Portrait of a Man, of 1655, in the Dulwich Picture Gallery might be its pendant; P. Sutton 1986, p. 183; Liedtke 1990, p. 36, as a Marquand picture; Baetjer 1995, p. 308.

EX COLL.: Henry G. Marquand, New York; Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.27
Margareta Haverman

_Breda; active ca. 1713—in or after 1723 Paris?_

The artist’s dates of birth and death are unknown.1 According to Johan van Gool (1731), who did not know Haverman, she was the daughter of a schoolmaster who moved from Breda to Amsterdam.2 Her father evidently persuaded Jan van Huysum (1682–1749) to take her on as a pupil, despite the famous flower painter’s secretive nature. Haverman’s impressive approximation of Van Huysum’s style, as seen in the Museum’s painting (Pl. 72), suggests that she must have studied with him for some time.3 Van Gool reports that the pupil weathered her teacher’s ill temper with exceptional patience, but the relationship eventually dissolved.

By January 21, 1722, when Haverman became a member of the Académie Royale de Peinture in Paris, she was living there as the wife of Jacques de Mondeteguy.4 Her acceptance into the Académie was based upon a previously completed flower and fruit piece, but she was requested to produce a similar painting as her reception piece. A legend later developed that Haverman was accused of submitting a picture by Van Huysum as her own, but it may be that she simply failed to submit the required painting. In any event, she was excluded from membership in 1723. Nothing further is known of her life.

In addition to being Van Huysum’s only certain pupil and one of his first followers, Haverman may be counted among the earliest Dutch flower painters who pursued careers outside the Netherlands. Another was Rachel Ruysch (1664–1750), who lived mostly in Amsterdam, and was court painter to the Elector Palatine, Johann Wilhelm, from 1708 to 1716. In Paris, Haverman was followed (at some distance) by the brothers Gerard (1746–1822) and Cornelis (1756–1840) van Spaendonck, and by Willem van Leen (q.v.), among other specialists. While several works by Haverman are recorded in early inventories, only two signed paintings are presently known, the undated _Flowers in a Glass Vase_, in Fredensborg Castle (near Copenhagen), and the picture discussed below.

1. In Berardi 1997, p. 649, Haverman is said to have been born in 1693, without supporting evidence.
3. Most modern accounts, for example Van der Willigen and Mejer 2003, p. 101, report that Haverman was dismissed by Van Huysum after a short period. The maturity of Haverman’s work in Van Huysum’s style suggests otherwise, as noted in Berardi 1997, p. 651.
4. De Mondeteguy is usually said to have been an architect. He is presumably identical with the author of the same name who wrote _Traité de la banque d’Amsterdam_, which was published with Jean-Pierre Ricard’s _Le négoce d’Amsterdam_ (Rouen, 1723).

72. _A Vase of Flowers_

Oil on wood, 31¼ x 23¼ in. (79.4 x 60.3 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): Margareta. Haverman fecit./A 1716

The condition overall is good, although the grapes at lower right now appear flat because only fragments of the green modeling glazes remain. Throughout, the very blue appearance of the green leaves and stems suggests the use of a now faded yellow lake pigment.

Purchase, 1871 71.6

This panel is one of only two indisputable works by Haverman known to survive, and the only one to bear a date. The other picture, _Flowers in a Glass Vase_ (Fredensborg Castle, Denmark), appears to have been painted a little earlier, to judge from comparisons with works by Haverman’s teacher, Jan van Huysum.5

In the New York painting, a tall bouquet of flowers fills a gray stone niche. The footed pot, evidently of terracotta, is cast in high relief, with the back of a putto seen in the center, and the leonine head of a man (crowned by a bumblebee) extending to the right. A peach and bunches of green and purple
grapes rest on the stone ledge or pedestal, their surfaces covered with moisture and explored by a couple of ants. Flowers of many kinds are gathered around the slightly curved asent of pink and white blooms in the center of the composition. They include roses, carnations, hollyhocks, irises, marigolds, passionflowers, primulas, poppies, and tulips (the striped one at top center features waterdrops, a moth, and a fly). A butterfly is perched on a leaf to the right, and a snail makes its way up the large leaf to the lower, which is a showpiece of fragile topography, with waterdrops and small areas of discoloration adding to the visual interest. On the whole, the still life is masterful in design and description, but a bit stale and uniform in execution when compared with similar works by Van Huysum. His suggestions of volume, light, and atmosphere are not quite equaled here, although Haverman (who was probably in her twenties at the time) comes impressively close. Similarly, her handling of precise detail is extraordinary rather than astonishing, and somewhat dry. The bluish color of some leaves, which makes an artificial impression, was probably toned down originally by yellow lake (see condition note above).

In sales of 1869 and earlier, the Museum's painting was accompanied by an unsigned pendant of similar design, but with a bird's nest. 5

1. See Berardi 1997, p. 654, on the painting at "Fredenborg".

2. Berardi (ibid., p. 652) is reminded by the pendant's description of two works thought to be by Van Huysum, one in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen (no. 541), the other in the Dulwich Picture Gallery, London (no. 120). She observes that they are both on panel and the same size as the Museum's Haverman, but the significance of this information is not made clear (both "Van Huysum" were acquired in the first half of the nineteenth century). Segal in Delft–Houston 2006–7 (see Refs.) quotes the description of the pendant picture in the Amsterdam sale of April 14, 1777 (if the present painting and its pendant were indeed nos. 62 and 63 in that sale), which stresses that the flower arrangements and settings are quite similar, and that the bird's nest contains five eggs. A painting consistent with the pendant's description, on a panel measuring 31 ½ x 23 ½ in. (79,5 x 60,5 cm), was sold as by Van Huysum at the Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, May 22, 1919, no. 108 (evidently not in the catalogue raisonné, M. Grant 1944, where numerous works with nearly the same dimensions are listed). To judge from the poor photograph in the sale catalogue, there are three eggs in the bird's nest. Fred Meijer considers the panel sold in 1919 to be a good copy of the Van Huysum in Copenhagen (personal communication, October 31, 2005).

REFERENCES: Decamps 1872, p. 43, describes the painting as "superb"; James (1872) 1916, p. 65, as demonstrating "a magnificent elaboration of detail, an almost masculine grasp of the resources of high finish"; MMA 1872, p. 45, no. 112, "from the collection of M. Louis Fould," reproduces a facsimile of the inscription; anon. in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 16 (1923), p. 162, mentioned as one of three known works; Warner 1928, p. 88, pl. 39a, suggests that the date might be 1780; B. Burroughs 1934a, p. 156, gives basic information; Salingar 1950, pp. 339–60 (ill. p. 236), names the flowers depicted, and finds the "bluish unifying tone" to be "artificial though very handsome"; Mitchell 1973, p. 129, fig. 174, as "the best-known example by this rare artist"; Petersen and Wilson 1976, pp. 56, 58, fig. 44, repeats the "jealousy" Van Huysum topics as a fact, and imagines that the artist was "much maligned"; Harris in Los Angeles and other cities 1976–77, pp. 34, 36, fig. 11, considers the work to demonstrate that Haverman had by 1716 mastered Van Huysum's technique and did not need to deceive the French academy by submitting one of his works as one of her own; Bergström et al. 1977, p. 192 (ill.), with short description; P. Sutton 1986, p. 192, listed; Grimm 1988, pp. 199, 241, pl. xxxi; Baetjer 1995, p. 243; Berardi 1997, pp. 650 (ill.), 651–52, describes the composition, names the flowers, suggests loss of glazes toning down the "metallic" blues, and discusses evidence for a pendant (see Ex Coll. below); E. Klock, Sengers, and Tobé 1998, p. 144, listed; Van der Willigen and Meijer 2003, p. 101, listed; Baetjer 2004, pp. 182, 210, 244, no. 112 (ill.), notes that the work was valued at FFr 3,000 by Gauchez (see Ex Coll.), and clarifies its provenance; Segal in Delft–Houston 2006–7, pp. 313–16, no. 66, describes the subject, identifies all the flowers and insects, suggests possible provenance to 1777, and discusses eighteenth-century evidence of a possible pendant.


EX COLL.: Possibly François Ignace de Dufresne (his sale, De Winter, Amsterdam, August 22, 1770, no. 219, with a pendant, no. 210); (probably Nicolaas Nieuhoff sale, Amsterdam, Philippus van der Schley, Hendrik de Winter, and Jan Yver, April 14, 1777, no. 62, with a pendant, no. 63; sold for F1 71 to Cornelis Ploos van Amstel); Louis Fould (until 1860; his estate sale, Pillet and Laneuville, Paris, June 4, 1860, no. 5 with no. 6 for FFr 2,600); Edouard Pould (1860–69); his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, April 5, 1866, no. 7, for FFr 2,100, with a pendant sold for FFr 2,050; [Leon Gauchez, Paris, with Alexis Febvre, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnson); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871, 71.6

1. The provenance to 1777 was first proposed by Segal in Delft–Houston 2006–7, p. 313 (under no. C6).
Willem Claesz Heda
Haarlem? 1594–1680 Haarlem

Heda’s date of birth is estimated on the basis of a portrait of him dated 1678 (location unknown) by the Haarlem painter Jan de Bray (ca. 1627–1697), who inscribed the likeness “aetate 84”; and a document of 1627 in which Heda’s age is given as about thirty-one. Van Gelder reviewed a few possible ancestors in Haarlem, Utrecht, and elsewhere, but the family line has yet to be traced. The family of his wife, Cornelia van Rijck (d. 1668), is better known from documents. The couple, who were Catholic, had at least five daughters (Elisabeth, Maria, Aefje, Claesje, and Anna), and two sons, Cornelis (who became a priest) and the still-life painter Gerrit Willemsz Heda (ca. 1620–1649). All but Gerrit are named in a will that Heda and his wife made on August 11, 1661. Until recently, it was known only that Gerrit died before 1702, although some scholars assumed that the “zoon van Willem Claesz Heda” buried in Saint Bavo’s on July 31, 1649, was probably Gerrit. This must indeed be the case. Dated works by him (very much in his father’s manner) span a mere ten years, from 1637 to 1647.

The family appears to have lived a comfortable middle-class life, to judge from the house in the Groote Houtstraat that Heda owned and rented out (according to a document of 1648) and another house in Haarlem that he substantially remodeled in 1649. Although he painted a triptych with a central Crucifixion in 1626, and several still lifes date from the late 1620s, Heda joined the Haarlem painters’ guild only in 1631. He served as hoofdman (headman) in 1637, 1641, and 1651, and as dean in 1641 and 1662. Dated paintings range from 1625 or 1628 to 1665 or 1667. In addition to his son Gerrit, Heda had a few other pupils, the most important of whom was Maerten Boelema (ca. 1620–after 1664).

With Pieter Claesz (q.v.), Heda was a leading still-life painter in Haarlem, specializing in the “monochrome banquet piece” (banketje). His early works have been associated with the more additive still lifes of Floris van Dyck (1574/75–1651) and Floris van Schooten (1585/88–1656), but these comparisons are even less appropriate than they are for the slightly younger Claesz, with whom Heda (not unlike the pioneering Haarlem landscapists of the same period) explored a tonal and naturalistic manner of describing familiar motifs. Heda was especially fond of describing reflections, which may account for the virtual triumph of metalwork and glassware over foodstuffs in his pictures and his preference for glistening hams, mince pies, and oysters (which is not to say that Claesz neglected the same). Heda’s mature manner was emulated by several artists in Haarlem and elsewhere, including the Amsterdam masters Jan den Uyl (ca. 1595–1640) and Willem Kalf (q.v.).

1. See Van der Willigen and Meijer 2003, p. 103.
2. For these and other biographical details, see H. van Gelder [1941], pp. 10–12, citing documents in the Haarlem archives.
3. Heda’s mother-in-law, Annetje Pietersdr, widow of Jacob Philipsz van Rijck, was buried in Saint Bavo’s (the Grote Kerk of Haarlem) on July 31, 1649. On September 6 of that year, Heda gave the executor of his mother-in-law’s estate power of attorney to have a probate inventory made in her house, and to represent his own legal rights (as the husband of one of the heirs, who were Annetje’s four children; Oud Notarieel Archief Haarlem, 161, fol. 249v, dated September 9, 1649). The writer owes this reference and a full discussion of Heda’s immediate family to Pieter Biesboer, curator, Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem (personal communication, August 16, 2001).
4. Oud Notarieel Archief Haarlem, 317, notary J. van Gellinkhuysen, fol. 102r, dated August 11, 1661 (brought to my attention by Pieter Biesboer).
7. See Blankert 1991, p. 103, on the Vanitas Still Life (Museum Bredius, The Hague), dated 1628, which was earlier thought to be dated 1621. A panel sold in 1907 and since untraced is said to be dated 1625 (Vroom 1980, vol. 2, p. 65, no. 324), which is plausible, considering that the artist was already about thirty at the time. A drawing of John the Baptist by Heda is dated 1626 (H. van Gelder [1941], pp. 10 [ill.], 12).
to write concisely or coherently, but a few insights may be gleaned, and there are numerous illustrations. See also H. G. Dijk-Koekkoek in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 14, pp. 286–87, and Amsterdam–Cleveland 1999–2000, pp. 152–55.

12. On Den Uyl, see Bergström 1956, pp. 144–51, and, for one of his finest works, Amsterdam–Cleveland 1999–2000, pp. 150–52, no. 20 (1633). The question of Kalf’s connection with Heda requires further consideration, but see ibid., pp. 154–55, no. 22.

73. Still Life with Oysters, a Silver Tazza, and Glassware

Oil on wood, 19½ x 31½ in. (49.8 x 80.6 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): HEDA 1635

The painting is well preserved. Small paint losses are distributed throughout, and the area of the broken glass in the center is abraded. The panel, made of two boards joined in the middle, retains its original thickness but has been slightly trimmed on all sides. The absence of a bevel suggests the reduction is greater along the top edge.

From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2005–2005.331.4

This impressive picture from the Markus collection is typical of Heda’s work in the mid-1630s. On the left, empty oyster shells rest in front of a plate of oysters yet to be consumed. The ebony and ivory handle of a knife extends over the edge of the table, and a gleaming spoon artfully leads the eye to a shard of glass and other curving forms. A cut lemon, a single pit, and a paper cone of spice (probably pepper) rest on another pewter plate in the foreground. In Heda’s day, the printed paper would have been recognized as a page torn from an almanac, and perhaps as a reminder that one’s days on earth are numbered. A more obvious sign that worldly pleasures quickly pass is the wineglass that has tipped over and broken.

The pewter plates are balanced visually by the silver tazza lying on its side, which reveals the unmarred interior of the base. The way the base touches the plate and lemon peel is characteristic of Heda, as is the constellation of highlights playing over the elaborately worked surface of the tazza. Behind the tazza to the left is a glass of beer, and to the right a pewter plate and a fancy glass pitcher. An open, leather-covered knife case to the right mirrors the position of the knife to the left, and draws attention to the artist’s signature. Walnuts are scattered to the far right, and hazelnuts below the stem of the tazza and at the foot of the large roemer. In this centerpiece of the composition, Heda displays his virtuosity in describing reflections and transparency. A tall window is reflected three times in the bowl of the glass, and the beaded molding on the glass (at the top of the pruned stem) is echoed more than once in the wine. Indeed the variety of reflected light throughout the picture—while somewhat open to question on optical grounds—is extraordinary. But that has little to do with what the artist has achieved in this so-called monochrome banquet piece, or banquetje—actually an essay in silvers, greens, browns, whites, and yellows.

Heda had painted similar designs (if not motifs) by 1630, and closely related groups of objects by 1632. A panel dated 1632 in the Museo del Prado, Madrid, includes a roemer with comparable reflections (they are virtually the same in other works), a similar tazza tipped in the other direction, the same glass pitcher in the right background (but facing the other way), a plate with oysters, and a plate with a lemon shifted somewhat to the right. The same or a similar tazza, in nearly the same position, is found in a still life by Heda dated 1632 (private collection). Similar compositions and motifs were painted by Pieter Claesz. (q.v.) at about the same time.

A copy of the present picture is catalogued by Vroom (see Refs.).

2. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 57, fig. 71. For the tazza and roemer, see also the Heda of 1634 in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Gemal-Koeltzsch 1995, vol. 2, p. 423, no. 157/8; and no. 157/9 [ill.], for the roemer with very similar reflections in a painting dated 1634).
3. Compare, for example, Vroom 1980, vol. 1, p. 36, fig. 40, a panel dated 1671 in the Staatliche Kunsthalle, Karlsruhe.
REFERENCES: Vroom 1945, pp. 193, 211, no. 186, fig. 179, cites the painting as dated 1633; Vroom 1980, vol. 2, pp. 67–68, no. 359a (ill.), and p. 68 (under no. 359b), repeats the information in Vroom 1945, and describes no. 159b (ill.; art market, Amsterdam, 1969) as a “later replica” of the Museum’s painting.

EX COLL.: C. Freiherr Grote, Schloss Wedesbüttel (his estate sale, Heberle & Lempertz, Cologne, June 7 and 8, 1886, part 2, no. 93, to Galerie Oldenbourg for 2,000 marks); [Galerie Oldenbourg (sale, F. Muller & Co., Amsterdam, June 26, 1923, no. 18, probably bought in for Fl 1,300; sale, Amsterdam, F. Muller & Co., June 25, 1924, no. 131)]; Frits and Rita Markus, New York (until his d. 1996); Rita Markus, New York (1996–d. 2001); From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2005 2005.331.4
Jan Davidsz de Heem
Utrecht 1606–1684 Antwerp

The artist was born in Utrecht during the month of April 1606. His parents were David Jansz van Antwerpen, a native of Utrecht whose father had come from Antwerp, and Hilleghout Teunisdr, from Leiden. They married in 1603, after each of them had lost a spouse. David Jansz appears to have prospered (he was apparently a professional musician), but he died at an unknown age in 1613, leaving the future painter, then known as Johannes van Antwerpen, and two daughters, Margaretha and Heijltgen. In 1613, the artist's mother was married for the third time, to Johan Jacob Coornhert, a bookseller and binder from Worms. By 1623, he was in financial difficulties and, having sold two houses, moved the family to Leiden in 1625. In the same year, Johannes (who never signed himself Jan on paintings or in documents) expressed his intention of going to Italy in order to broaden his artistic education, but the plan fell through for lack of funds.¹

On November 12, 1626, the twenty-year-old painter and Aletta van Weede, from Utrecht, posted their marriage banns in Leiden. This is the first known document in which the artist signs himself De Heem.² Five children were born to the couple; the first died in infancy, and the second (David) at the age of fifteen. Their third child, Cornelis de Heem (1631–1695), became Jan de Heem's student and, like him, an exceptional painter of still lifes. A girl and a boy were born in Antwerp, in about 1635 and in 1638. The children born in Leiden were baptized in Reformed churches, but the last child, with the telling name Thomas Maria, was baptized in the Sint Joriskerk, suggesting that De Heem and his wife had converted to Catholicism. Perhaps the strict Calvinist sentiments of De Heem's middle-class milieu in Leiden encouraged him to move to the Spanish Netherlands, though there may have been some other reason.³

The year in which De Heem and his family moved to Antwerp is not known. It has been suggested that they left Leiden as early as the winter of 1631–32, but this is inconsistent with the fact that De Heem did not join the Antwerp painters' guild until 1635–36, and did not become a citizen of Antwerp until August 28, 1657. On March 1, 1636, De Heem and Adriaen Brouwer (1605/6–1638) served as witnesses for Jan Lievens (1607–1674), who was signing a pupil's contract. De Heem and his pal Brouwer play the principal parts in the latter's celebrated painting The Smokers, of about 1636–37 (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).⁶

De Heem's first wife died in March 1643. Shortly afterward, his house and possessions were valued at more than 4,000 guilders. The artist's work brought high prices, and he also had income from teaching. His several pupils included Andries Benedetti (1605/20–after 1660) and Alexander Coosermans (1627–1689). On March 6, 1644, in Antwerp Cathedral, De Heem married Anna Ruckers, a daughter of the famous manufacturer of virginals, Andries Ruckers. The artist's second wife bore him four girls and two boys between 1644 and 1647. The fourth child (and first son) became the rather obscure still-life painter Jan Jansz de Heem (1650–after 1695).

Various documents reveal that De Heem maintained close contacts with people in the northern Netherlands, including a patron in Amsterdam. He made a number of trips to his native Utrecht, and from late 1658 until 1667 he was registered there as a nonresident citizen. In the summer of 1667, he moved with his family to Utrecht, where he remained until the French invasion of 1672. De Heem's wife died in 1672, and from that year until his death in late 1683 or early 1684, he again lived in Antwerp.

De Heem's earliest works were inspired by Balthasar van der Ast (1539/94–1657), the accomplished fruit and flower painter who lived in Utrecht during the 1620s, and, from about 1628, by the Haarlem specialist Pieter Claesz (q.v.).⁷ About 1632, De Heem started painting still lifes that were more distinctive, to a degree that one scholar has described them as demonstrating "complete independence" from any other master's "composition and conception."⁸ What De Heem actually did in these pictures of the early 1630s was to adapt sections of compositions by Claesz and especially by Willem Claesz Heda (q.v.) to a vertical format, and to use contrasts of light and shadow, and lush reflections, in a manner reminiscent of his Leiden colleagues Jan Lievens and Gerrit Dou (q.v.).⁹ The influence of the Amsterdam still-life painter Jan den Uyl (ca. 1591–1642) is obvious in a canvas by De Heem dated 1635 (private collection), and also likely in pictures with pewter vessels dating from 1652–54.¹⁰ This tends to support the notion that De Heem continued to draw upon the Haarlem and Amsterdam
painters of monochrome banquet pieces until 1635, and that he remained in Leiden until about that year.

In Antwerp, De Heem soon adjusted to the local taste for opulence, producing *prunskstilleven* (still lifes of luxurious objects and delicacies) on an often larger scale, and with a brighter palette, than he had employed previously. His most important model was Frans Snyders (1579–1657), who, in addition to larders groaning with game and pictures often occupied by human figures, painted more exquisite arrangements of fruit and fancy tableware from the mid-teens onward. In such pictures as De Heem’s *Sumptuous Still Life with a Ham, Oysters, Fruits, and a Parrot*, of about 1640–45 (Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna), Snyders’s influence is clear in the sheer abundance of motifs on the large table, the Baroque structure of the busy composition, and the rich coloring, of a variety and warmth very different from the restrained tones De Heem had favored in Leiden. De Heem’s Antwerp pictures, however, even when closest to Snyders and his followers (Adriaen van Utrecht [1599–1632] was also important for De Heem), are recognizably Dutch in their finer description of physical qualities and their sense of order. From brushstrokes to broad patterns the Flemish predilection for rhythms flowing over the surface was tempered by De Heem, so that his most lavish displays reveal and invite contemplation.

In addition to *prunskstilleven*, De Heem painted fruit pieces, flower pictures, flower wreaths and garlands (of the type depicted by Daniel Seghers [1590–1661] in Antwerp), and vanitas still lifes. These last include paintings of secular books piled on a tabletop, a Leiden specialty to which the artist turned as early as 1628. De Heem’s innovations and technical virtuosity made a great impression on many Dutch and Flemish still-life painters, including Joris van Son (1623–1667) and lesser artists in Antwerp, Pieter de Ring (ca. 1615–1660 or later) and others in Leiden, and, in Utrecht, Jacob Marrell (1613/14–1681) and Abraham Mignon (1640–1679). These details are mostly adopted from the chapter devoted to the biography of Jan Davidsz de Heem and his artistic descendants by Liesbeth Helmus and Sam Segal in Utrecht–Braunschweig 1991, pp. 55–68. Important clarifications are found in Bok 1990. The artist is so well known in the literature as Jan de Heem (as he is named in Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 1, pp. 209–12) that even archivists see no point in arguing for the use of Johannes.

2. As noted by Helmus and Segal in Utrecht–Braunschweig 1991, pp. 57, 67 n. 7, the name De Heem (indeed, a deceased Jan de Heem) is mentioned earlier in Antwerp, but there is no known connection with the artist’s family. A “heem” is a farmyard or homestead. At least one of Jan de Heem’s sisters also adopted the name. It is not known why the surname Van Antwerpen was dropped in favor of De Heem, but this amounted to changing a name with an immigrant ring for something generic.


4. Ibid., pp. 61, 67 n. 20. No documents record the family in Leiden after 1631, but this hardly assures us of their absence from 1632 onward.


7. See Meijer 1988 and Bergström 1988 on De Heem’s work in the 1620s.


9. See ibid., figs. 6–9.

10. Ibid., pp. 48–49, fig. 15 (1635); see also figs. 11, 12. On Den Uyl’s influence, see also Segal in Utrecht–Braunschweig 1991, pp. 23–24, 134–35.

11. See Koslow 1995, chap. 3.


74. Still Life with a Glass and Oysters

Oil on wood, 9/4 x 7/4 in. (23.1 x 19.1 cm)
Signed (upper right): J. De Heem

The finishing glazes that contributed to the subtle color, texture, and modeling of the lemon, oysters, and grapes are damaged.

Purchase, 1871 71.78

A collector's item, this small panel was painted by De Heem early in his Antwerp years, probably during the late 1630s or about 1640. Visiting scholars have occasionally proposed other attributions, for example to Pieter de Ring (ca. 1615–1660 or later), which is understandable in view of De Heem's pervasive influence. There is no reason to doubt the typical signature in the upper right corner, and the picture, in motifs and particular passages of execution (especially the glass, the spiraling lemon peel, and the leaves), is completely characteristic of De Heem's work before the 1650s. The three leading specialists of recent decades, Ingvar Bergström, Fred Meijer, and Sam Segal, have each examined the painting on several occasions and agree that it is by De Heem.

The aesthetic appeal of this picture is wonderfully concentrated in the glass, with its white and yellow reflections suggesting bright light from a window. Graceful leaves and tendrils fairly float above the rim and descend to green grapes, which with the wine form a simple paean to Bacchic pleasures. The latter traditionally included erotic pursuits, as seen in the Museum's painting by Abraham van Cuylenburch (Pl. 30), and as hinted here by the oysters, which had a reputation in the Netherlands (as in antiquity) for stimulating sexual appetites (Jacob Cats called them "love herbs"). Artists such as Frans van Mieris and Jacob Ochtervelt (q.v.) painted "oyster meals," with smiling couples tempting each other with plates of oysters and jugs of wine. Oysters, grapes, and even lemons were delicacies in De Heem's day, so that his subject suggests a certain level of society, one in which idle hours and beautiful pictures were counted among life's rewards.

References: Decamps 1872, p. 437, mentions the painting; MMA 1872, no. 125; B. Burroughs 1932a, p. 157, no. 1161; Greindl 1956, pp. 101, 173, mentioned and listed; Greindl 1983, pp. 127, 361, no. 98, mentioned and listed; Baetjer 1991, p. 310; Luttkhuizen in Grand Rapids 1999, pp. 54–65, 103, no. 11, takes pains to make the picture's subject suit the theme of the exhibition, suggesting that "the wine likely suggests lust," and that the painting invites observers to choose between temporal pleasures and eternal gratification; Barnes in Albany 2002, p. 76, no. 24, repeats a few thoughts put forward by Luttkhuizen but concludes that the painting may be simply "a beautiful invocation of a modest number of gustatory delights that stimulate the eye and the palate . . . and perhaps the mind," and suggests the influence of Pieter Claesz; Minty in ibid., p. 7, notes the acquisition in 1871; Rose in ibid., p. 76, no. 24, observes that pictures such as this one create the impression that oysters were readily available in the Netherlands; Baetjer 2004, p. 214, no. 125, clarifies the painting's provenance.


Ex coll.: [Léon Gauchez, Paris, with Alexis Febvre, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.78
75. Still Life: A Banqueting Scene

Oil on canvas, 33 3/4 x 73 in. (85.3 x 185.4 cm)
Signed (?) (lower left, on napkin) JDH [in monogram];
inscribed (lower left): DeHeem fc

The painting is in good condition, with minor losses at the
edges and in the curtain in the left background. Infrared
reflectography reveals minor modifications that were made
during the course of execution, for example, to the height
and alignment of the chair and the shape of the column's
pedestal. Isolated passages, such as the cut lemon and the
neck of the lute, have become transparent with age and re-
veal completed forms below. The latter appear to reflect the
painter's usual working procedure rather than revision in
the composition.

Purchase, Charles B. Curtis Fund, 1912 12.195

The attribution of this large painting has presented particular
difficulties. Some scholars have suggested orally that the picture
was actually painted by one of De Heem's many pupils or fol-
lowers. Horst Gerson, visiting at an unknown date (1962-82),
doubted the "DeHeem" signature and suggested the possibility
of Pieter de Ring's authorship (see De Heem's biography above,
where De Ring and some other followers are mentioned). In
1983, Claus Grimm suggested an attribution to Jan van der
Hecke (1620-1684), while Ingegerd Bergström considered De
Heem's son Jan Jansz de Heem (1650-after 1695) a possible
candidate. The case for Jan Jansz was strengthened by Sam
Segal, who, in connection with his exhibition "Jan Davidsz de
Heem and His Circle" (Utrecht and Braunschweig, 1991),
gathered a group of works under that unfamiliar name. Fresh
from the exhibition (which was mostly an essay in connois-
seurship) and from discussions with Segal, the present writer
in 1992 (see Refs.) published the Museum's picture for the first
time as a work by Jan Jansz de Heem. In 1995, another still-life

Figure 83. Detail of De Heem's Still Life:
A Banqueting Scene (Pl. 75)
specialist, Fred Meijer, firmly rejected that hypothesis, maintaining orally and in correspondence that the painting is typical of Jan Davidsz de Heem in the early 1640s, and that “the oeuvre attributed to Jan Jansz in recent literature is a confusing amalgam,” consisting usually of compositions “of a 1640s type, which would have been rather out of vogue in the son’s lifetime.” A key work in the debate about Jan Jansz is a large banquet still life with a globe, musical instruments, and a servant (Museum van het Broodhuis, Brussels), which bears the signature “Johannes de Heem Fecit” and a date that has been read (by Meijer and others) as 1641, and, alternatively (by De Mirimonde and Segal), as 1691. Meijer also considers the only canvas catalogued in the 1991 exhibition as a work by Jan Jansz de Heem to be by his father in about 1646.

Meijer’s letter of 1995 sets out several arguments defending the traditional attribution of the New York painting to Jan Davidsz de Heem. First, he regards the monogram “JDH” to be authentic, and similar to the monograms, or to the conjoined initials found in “JDHeem” signatures, on works of the 1630s. He has not found the same monogram on pictures by Jan Davidsz de Heem dating from after 1640. The inscription, “DeHeem fc,” is considered by Meijer to have been added later, perhaps by copying the signature on a painting by Cornelis de Heem. Second, Meijer finds the composition typical of works dating from the early 1640s. In particular, the amount of space surrounding the main motifs is something the artist soon abandoned, in effect by cropping his previous designs on all sides, but especially at the bottom. Third, in execution and coloring Meijer considers the Museum’s painting to be very similar to the large canvas Un dessert, dated 1640 (Louvre, Paris; fig. 84), and to the painting of 1641 (?) in Brussels, which “stands securely” between the Louvre picture and the magnificent Prunk Still Life with Shells and Musical Instruments, of 1642 (private collection). He adds that the rendering of the
white napkin and tablecloth (which in 1992 the present writer found rather "flat and dull") comes close to that in De Heem's works of the 1630s, citing an example dated 1635. Meijer concludes that "the New York still life precedes the Paris one [of 1640], although probably not by more than a year." In a letter of 1998, Meijer expanded upon this remark, describing the Museum's picture as "without a shadow of a doubt a work by Jan Davidsz. de Heem of 1639 or 1640. It is in fact a rather important painting as it must be one of the earliest of this type."8

A final point made by Meijer deserves closer examination, namely, his claim that "the objects depicted, all except one, can be dated securely to the first half of the seventeenth century." Obviously, if any of the manufactured objects in the picture were first made in the 1670s or later, this would favor Segal's thesis that the painting may be by Jan Jansz. de Heem rather than Meijer's that it is by his father, dating from about 1619-40. In the following discussion, the question of dating receives attention as required, within a survey of all the motifs in the painting, proceeding from left to right.

The column on the left and landscape view imply that the setting is the terrace of a grand country house. A green silk curtain hangs behind the still life; its crinkly folds and shiny surface are well described. The tablecloth is also green, but of a seemingly heavier fabric. A lute lies facedown on the table, the loose ends of its strings curling like calligraphy. A similar effect is found in the grape tendrils to the left of the large fruit basket, and also in the strings of the similar lute in De Heem's painting in the Louvre.9

On the near corner of the table, a bunch of purple grapes and a pewter plate with lemons (sliced, peeled, and whole) are shown in front of a pewter spouted flagon, of a Dutch type common in the first half of the seventeenth century. The plate of lemons, the silver-gilt covered goblet, and vague impressions of a room with bright windows are skillfully reflected in the tankard (fig. 83). The tall goblet itself, with its complexly
worked stem, knobby body (giving the cup its German name, *Buckelkopf*), and a cover that mirrors the goblet’s design on a smaller scale, is typical of southern Germany and certainly dates from the first quarter of the 1600s. The play of blurred reflections of windows (suggested by bright yellow impasto strokes) and hints of the tabletop provide arresting details on the goblet’s smooth and chased surfaces. The parakeet finial is evidently a rarity, but it also occurs on the somewhat different covered goblet in the Louvre’s De Heem, and in a painting said to be signed “J. van Hecke fecit 1643.”

In front of the huge lobster, a piece of bread, a spoon, and a single lemon pit sit on a pewter plate. Behind the lobster, a smaller one, upside down, lies in front of a white pitcher with a twisted handle and curvilinear floral decoration in blue. This object and the big clock present the only problems of dating in the picture. One scholar has suggested that the pitcher is probably German stoneware, with the handle modeled on that of a glass vessel, and proposes a date before 1600. That the model might be a glass pitcher is easy to imagine when one compares the one in *Still Life with a Gilt Goblet*, of 1635, by Willem Claesz Heda (q.v.), in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Behind the pitcher is a glass tazza (probably Venetian, about 1600), containing red wine, and two very tall glass flutes, the shorter one with white wine, the other apparently empty (the curtain’s folds show through) and crowned by a fancy silver cover. The design of the flutes is typical of the first half of the century, but like the silver-gilt covered cup their scale is greatly exaggerated.

Peaches are found inside and in front of the fruit basket, which also contains green and purple grapes, a quince (?), and some very green walnuts, two with their skins partly peeled off. The chair is a Dutch *Vrouwstoel* (“lady’s chair”) from the first half of the seventeenth century, with a leather seat and back attached with big brass tacks. On the chair, some artfully placed grapes with leafy tendrils embellish the richly decorated forms of an enormous silver-gilt basin and a recumbent ewer made in the manner of Adam van Vianen (1569–1627), which would probably date from the 1620s or early 1630s. (However, the details appear to be De Heem’s own invention.) These objects were used for rinsing hands at the table in the most ostentatious households.

The large clock is a curiosity, although not in the sense employed in collector’s cabinets. One specialist considers the case “unusually primitive in its design and construction, which suggests that it is a provincial clock.” Consequently, it could date from the mid-1600s or later. Another specialist makes the same observations, noting that the bell on top, being undecorated and exposed, is somewhat unusual. This, together with “the odd case . . . the peculiar dial and chapter ring,” and other qualities, suggest “someone who knew the various components of a clock, but had no model on which to base his depiction. The general feel of the clock, however, is of one made before c. 1650.” Both authorities stress that the clock is plain and provincial, and one of them notes how out of place it looks in its grand surroundings. The effect is rather like that of a country preacher (or Benjamin Franklin) sitting down to dinner at Versailles. Of course the clock is meant to be intrusive as a vanitas motif, and is so on a much larger scale than the watches that are commonly found in banquet scenes (compare the Museum’s painting by Abraham van Beyerden; Pl. 7).

Some viewers of the period would have known that this older (weight-driven) type of clock struck the bell only on the hour, and they might have noted that the hour is nigh.

To the lower right, a red velvet pillow fills an empty space behind a green curtain with, at the bottom, elaborate brocade and fringe. A very similar curtain is found on the right of the Louvre picture, but more important, the two compositions are organized in quite the same way. The artist builds space with big forms emerging from the right background and leading into objects that fill the immediate foreground on the same side. The placement of the fruit baskets, tall flutes, covered goblet, small plates at the edge of the table, and so on, suggest the same sensibility, which does not permit spatial logic to spoil its flair for design. For example, just where the clock stands in the Museum’s picture, and how (or from what) the curtains are hung, are questions not meant to be asked. Similarly, what appears to be a giant globe in the right background of the Louvre painting is actually a circular map, framed and hung from a nail driven into what looks like a masonry gatehouse playing the role of a cabinet. In both pictures, everything not on the table, in the chair, or in the Jordaens-style wine cooler (in the Louvre canvas) has the impromptu quality of window dressing serving to foil and frame the objects on display.

The similarities of the New York painting to the Louvre picture do not strike the patient viewer as derivations, but as the somewhat less mature and less ambitious efforts of the same artist. Thus, the present writer is inclined to support Meijer’s argument that the Museum’s picture is by Jan Davidsz de Heem about 1639. Some workshop collaboration is possible, but there are no clear differences in quality suggesting a second hand in specific areas (some “weaknesses,” like the somewhat wooden handling of the white drapery, could be considered typical of De Heem at the time). Rather than later emulation,
the slightly awkward moments in design, and occasionally in execution, appear to reflect the formative stage in which this canvas was painted during De Heem's Antwerp career. Visiting connoisseurs have rightly noticed inconsistencies with the finest paintings by De Heem of this type, but have wrongly searched for solutions in his populous sphere of influence.

1. The oral opinions of these visiting scholars are recorded in the curatorial files. Many opinions of Gerson are recorded, few of them with a date. Grimm visited in October 1983, and Bergström on December 5, 1983, and at later dates.

2. See Utrecht-Braunschweig 1991, pp. 194-98. A printed addendum to the catalogue (no. 344A) added another work attributed to Jan Jansz de Heem (previously always published and sold as by J. D. de Heem). See Liedtke 1992a, p. 115 n. 9, for further details on this privately owned picture.

3. Fred Meijer, letter to the present writer dated February 13, 1995, following a visit to the Museum on January 10, 1995. Like Segal, Meijer has examined the Museum's picture on a number of occasions, both in the galleries and in storage.


5. Letter of 1995 (see note 3 above), referring to Utrecht-Braunschweig 1991, no. 34 (private collection). The work is signed “J.De heem 1640” but not dated. The painting exhibited here (no. 144A) (see note 2 above), is considered by Meijer to be either from the studio of Jan Davidsz de Heem in the second half of the 1640s or a contemporary copy.

6. Utrecht-Braunschweig 1991, no. 7. This painting made an enormous impression in the sale at Christie’s, New York, January 15, 1988, no. 127, which may have influenced viewers of the Museum’s picture.


9. This similarity was noted by Nancy Minty (research assistant, in 1988), to whom the writer is indebted for her careful review of all the motifs in the Museum’s picture.

10. The tankard and covered goblet were studied by Clare Le Corbeiller, curator of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, compared works from Nuremberg, but suggested that the vase was either invented or is now unknown (personal communication, August 2005). There is some resemblance in the decoration to Medici faience of the later sixteenth century, surviving examples of which are extremely rare.


REFERENCES: B. Burroughs 1912, p. 239, notes the acquisition of the painting, which represents a type of work in which De Heem and similar masters assembled “all manner of glittering and gorgeous articles . . . for the purpose of showing their scorn of difficulties and their skill in overcoming them”; B. Burroughs 1931, p. 157, no. 316-1, with basic description; Vorenkamp 1933, p. 45, compares other works by De Heem; Greindl 1956, pp. 103, 173, mentioned and listed; De Mirimonde 1970, pp. 283, 285, fig. 40, as by J. D. de Heem, a “belle example,” associated with a group of works dating from the 1640s; Lepper 1977, vol. 2, col. 64, no. 268, listed as by Jan Davidsz de Heem; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 84, as by Jan Davidsz de Heem; Greindl 1983, p. 124, describes this picture and others as typical compositions by Jan Davidsz de Heem; Larsen 1985, pp. 399-10, fig. 240, as by Jan Davidsz de Heem, “a good example of the sumptuousness of his style”; P. Sutton 1986, p. 190, as a “banquet piece by Jan Davidsz de Heem”; Liedtke 1992, pp. 112-15, fig. 10, attributes the painting to Jan Jansz de Heem (1650–after 1695), following the advice of Ingvar Bergström and Sam Segal, and suggests a date in the 1670s; Baetjer 1995, p. 344, as by Jan Jansz de Heem; Meijer 2003, p. 221 n. 2, as by Jan Davidsz de Heem, an important early work of about 1619; Giltaij and Meijer in Rotterdam-Aachen 2006–7, p. 72, fig. 4, as by Jan de Heem about 1619; see motifs in paintings such as this one that influenced Kalf in Paris.


EX COLL.: [Horace Butler, London, sold for £750 to MMA]; Purchase, Charles B. Curtis Fund, 1912 12.195

1. The purchase papers of September 23, 1912, note that the picture was recommended by John G. Johnson, the Philadelphia collector, who was (Museum president) J. P. Morgan's lawyer, and from 1910 until 1917 a trustee of the Museum. My thanks to Barbara File, archivist, for this reference.
One of the leading portraitists of Amsterdam's golden age, Van der Helst was born in Haarlem, the son of a merchant and innkeeper, Lodewijk van der Helst, and his second wife, Aeltgen Bartels. Bartholomeus's approximate date of birth is known only from the record that he was twenty-four years old on the occasion of his betrothal, on April 16, 1616, in the register of the Nieuwe Kerk, Amsterdam. 1 About three weeks later, on May 4, he married Anna du Pire, an eighteen-year-old Haarlem girl who lived in Amsterdam, and who had already lost her parents. The couple had at least five children, of whom one, Lodewyck van der Helst (1642–ca. 1684), became a portraitist in his father's manner. 2

Bartholomeus rapidly became a prominent artist in Amsterdam. His teacher is unknown, but Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy (q.v.) is considered a likely candidate, given his clear influence in early works, such as The Regents of the Walloon Orphanage in Amsterdam, of 1637 (Maison Descartes, Amsterdam), and his animated portrait of a seated man with an open Bible on a lectern, probably a Protestant minister (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), which is dated 1638. 3 In the following year, the artist was awarded the commission for The Civic Guard Company of Captain Roelof Bicker and Lieutenant Jan Michiel van Blaeuw (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), a monumental canvas (7 ft. 8 in. × 24 ft. 6 in. [2.33 × 7.5 m]) on which Van der Helst proves himself as capable as Frans Hals (q.v.) in creating interest throughout what amounts to a large wall filled with full-length portraits. 4 The painting (finished in 1642 or 1643) was installed over a wide fireplace in the assembly hall of the Kloveniersdoelen (Musketeers' Civic Guard Headquarters) in Amsterdam, for which Joachim van Sandrart (1606–1688) — a key figure for bringing an international style of portraiture to Amsterdam — painted a tall canvas, The Company of Captain Cornelis Bicker, in 1638 and Rembrandt painted The Night Watch, which was completed in 1642 (both in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). 5 The success of Van der Helst's composition, which is as remarkable for the confident poses of the individual figures as for the staging of the whole, led to numerous commissions for single and double portraits, 6 such as those of the burgomaster Andries Bicker and his wife, in 1642 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden). In 1648, Van der Helst painted another very large civic guard portrait, The Celebration of the Peace of Münster at the Crossbowmen's Headquarters in Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which wonderfully combines naturalistic description of individual figures and motifs with a fluid and fashionable style. 7

Exceptionally, Van der Helst secured prestigious commissions not only from members of Amsterdam society but also from important people in Rotterdam and elsewhere, including one in 1652 for a portrait of Princess Henrietta Maria Stuart, the widow of Willem II of Orange (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). 8 In the 1650s, the painter also produced four more large group portraits, and such impressive portraits of Amsterdam aristocrats as Abraham de Court and His Wife, Maria de Kaesgijt, of 1654 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam). 9 The much admired Portrait of Paulus Potter (Mauritshuis, The Hague) dates from the same year. 10

Unlike many of his contemporaries, Van der Helst remained at the top of his profession throughout his career. Late examples of the artist still setting the trend in his genre include a painting of the shipowner Daniel Bernard, dated 1669 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), 11 and the portraits of Admiral Aert van der Nes and his wife, and of Vice Admiral Johan de Liefde, each dated 1668 and with backgrounds by Ludolf Bakhuizen (1631–1708; all three in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). Apart from his son, Van der Helst had no significant pupils, but he strongly influenced a good number of portraitists, including Abraham van den Tempel (1622/23–1672).

Despite Van der Helst's high prices, he appears to have had some financial difficulties, perhaps as a result of living somewhat beyond his means. (Like Rembrandt, with whom he must have been well acquainted, Van der Helst owned a large house and a collection of paintings.) After the artist's death in December 1670, his widow was left with very little financial reserves and with various claims from creditors. 12

Van der Helst's appearance is known from a fair number of self-portraits, such as the canvas dated 1662 in the Kunsthalle, Hamburg, and that of 1667 in the Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence. 13
1. See De Gelder 1921, p. 138. Van der Helst's age was recorded as thirty-nine in 1633, and as about forty-three in 1638 (ibid., pp. 142, 143).
2. For examples of his work, see Van Thielt al. 1976, p. 270; P. Suttee 1990b, pp. 116–19; and Amsterdam 1999b, no. 11.
3. On the latter, see the discussion in Ekbert 1995, pp. 100–101, and, for the 1637 group portrait, Slive 1999a, p. 254, fig. 446.
4. In Haarlem, 1988, p. 42, fig. 17, the painting is set within the tradition of group portraits of civic guard companies. See also Slive 1999a, pp. 354–55, fig. 347.
5. For these and the other paintings in the room (Jacob Backer, Goyert Flinck, and Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy also participated), see Haverkamp-Begemann 1982 (fig. 31 for a plan of the room and its decorations). Von Sandrart's influence on portraiture in Amsterdam is discussed in Klemm 1986, and reiterated in Dickey 2004, pp. 102–3 (see p. 191 n. 107 on the Kloveniersdoelen).
9. See Ekkart in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 14, p. 374, on these works, and Ekkart 1995, pp. 106–8, on the double portrait. Two of Van der Helst's group portraits of the 1650s are in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and the other two are in the Amsterdam Historisch Museum (see Van Thielt al. 1976, pp. 268–69, and Blankert 1979, pp. 132–36). Another impressive portrait of 1644 is A Family Group (Wallace Collection, London), which is identified as Jochem van Aras and his wife and daughter, in Van Gent 2004.
13. Published in Braunschweig 1980, no. 5, and in Chiarelli 1989, pp. 179–81, respectively. The Florence picture is also discussed in Braunschweig and other cities 1988–90, pp. 150–52 (under no. 43). See also The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, no. 29, where it is maintained that a portrait of a man dated 1655 (Toledo Museum of Art) is also a self-portrait.

76. Portrait of a Man

Oil on wood (oval), 26 1/4 x 21 1/2 in. (66.7 x 54.9 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed (lower right): Aeta. 62/
B. van der Helst/1647

The painting is well preserved, with only slight abrasion
along the wood grain in the deepest black shadows on
the right side of the man's coat.

Purchase, 1871 71.73

“The perfect prose of portraiture,” observed Henry James of
this panel, when he surveyed the most noteworthy paintings
in the Museum's 1871 Purchase. The budding master of back-
handed praise was inspired by the picture to opine:

It seems almost hyperbolical to talk of Van der Helst as an artist; genuine painter as he was, his process is
not so much the common, leisurely, critical return upon
reality and truth as a bonded and indissoluble union
with it; so that in all his unmitigated verity you detect
no faintest throb of invention blossoming into style
and straggling across the line which separates a fine
likeness from a fine portrait."
Amsterdam, and the similar half-length pendant portraits of 1646 in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, all of which date from 1646.²

The placement of the sitter to the left of center, and his slight turn toward the viewer's right, suggests that the portrait was originally provided with a pendant. In 1991, Hans Buijs, who at the time was researching the Dutch and Flemish pictures in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyons, considered the possibility that Van der Helst's oval portrait of a fifty-two-year-old woman in that collection might be a candidate.³ However, the dimensions of the undated panel (26½ x 15¼ in. [67 x 40 cm]) and the placement of the figure in the picture field discouraged that hypothesis. Buijs instead suggested that Van der Helst's Portrait of a Lady Aged Fifty-four, dated 1647 (fig. 86), would be a more fitting pendant to the New York painting of the same year. The woman is placed off-center to the right, and turns slightly toward the viewer's left (her right, the traditional place of honor for husbands in Netherlandish portraiture). The Dublin painting was acquired in 1866 from a British collector, and its earlier provenance is unknown.⁴ The two portraits are entirely consistent in their careful execution, and both are signed, dated, and inscribed in the same way, in complementary locations (the lowest area of the visible background).⁵ The only difficulty is that the male portrait, although having the same proportions, is slightly smaller, 26½ x 21¼ inches (66.7 x 54.9 cm), as opposed to 28 x 23½ inches (71.2 x 59.1 cm) for the Dublin panel. However, notwithstanding the fact that the Museum's panel was cradled in 1871, it is still possible to see that it has been cut down, probably to fit a frame.⁶ It appears probable that these portraits of a man aged sixty-two and a woman aged fifty-four were painted as pendants.

The man bears a strong resemblance to the younger sitter in an oval portrait by Daniël Mijtens (q.v.), dated 1635 (location unknown; formerly Ruzicka Stiftung, Zürich). Ter Kuile, following an earlier writer,⁷ suggested that Mijtens's subject was the Leiden grain merchant Willem Burchgraeff, based on a perceived (but imperceptible) resemblance to a Rembrandt sitter who was himself incorrectly identified as Burchgraeff.⁸ The Mijtens portrait is signed and dated “D. Mytens ft. 1635,” and is inscribed “Acetatus [sic] Suæ ao 50.”⁹ which matches the age of the man in Van der Helst's portrait (sixty-two in 1647), and indicates a birth date of about 1585 (Burchgraeff was born about 1604).
1. James (1872) 1916, p. 56. James continues with, among other remarks, the suggestion that “if Nature were to give her voice, and appoint once for all her painter-in-ordinary, she would lay a kindly hand on the sturdy shoulder of Van der Helst, and say, “One must choose for the long run: this man I can trust.” Although quite of its period, James’s opinion echoes that of Constantijn Huygens, in his description (ca. 1650) of portraits by Michiel van Miereveld (q.v.): “Most [painters] who, as it were, attempt to force the truth through a disproportionate display of their own limited talent, fall into affection.... With Van Miereveld, the whole of art lies with nature, and the whole of nature in his art.” The quote is from Huygens 1973, p. 76, as translated by the present writer in New York–London 2001, p. 46.


3. The painting was ultimately not included in the relevant exhibition (Paris–Lyon 1991), but in Lyon–Bourg-en-Bresse–Roanne 1992, no. 54.

4. See Potterton 1986, pp. 60–61. It is noted there that “the date [on the Dublin portrait] has always been misread as 1641, but it is clearly 1647. De Gelder [1921, p. 63] in fact thought that 1641 was probably false and on the basis of style he placed the picture [in] 1647.”

5. See Potterton 1986, fig. 247, for a detail of the inscription on the Dublin portrait.

6. Conservator Dorothy Mahon (September 2006) confirms that the panel has been somewhat trimmed all around, as is normal when a cradle is attached. Brushstrokes on the surface and crowding of the artist’s signature indicate that the panel was originally oval.

7. Ter Kuile 1969, p. 55, no. 18, fig. 3, trusting Ruzicka in Zürich 1949–50, p. 17 (under no. 20).

8. See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, no. 277, where on p. 804 Mijtens’s portrait is used to dismiss the identification of Rembrandt’s sister as Burchgraeff! Compoundung the methodological fiasco, the authors of the Corpus also propose that Mijtens’s so-called Portrait of Willem Burchgraeff, of 1635, was painted as a pendant to Rembrandt’s Portrait of Maertgen van Bilderbeek, dated 1638 (ibid., pp. 410–12, fig. 6). Giltaij in Frankfurt 2003, p. 92 (under no. 16), uncritically restates the hypothesis.


EX COLL.: D. Vis Blokhuyzen, Rotterdam (until 1870; his estate sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, April 1–2, 1870, no. 25 [date of painting transcribed incorrectly], for FFr 4,103 to Gauchez); [Léon Gauchez, Brussels, 1870; offered in April 1870 to the Musées Royaux de Belgique for BFr 6,000; offer declined]; [Léon Gauchez, Paris, with Alexis Febvre, Paris, 1870; sold to Bollandt]; William T. Bollert, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Bollert, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.73
The Musician

Oil on canvas, 54 1/8 x 43 3/4 in. (137.4 x 111.1 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed (lower left): B. vander Helst/1662; (on sheet of music): iris; (on cover of book): Supe[r]ius

The paint surface is extensively abraded, and the texture was damaged during transfer to a new fabric support.

Purchase, 1873 73.2

In style and execution the painting is a typical work of Van der Helst's mature years, and it is reliably signed and dated 1662. The woman tunes a theorbo-lute, and a viola da gamba rests in front of her. Some scholars have considered the picture to be an allegory or personification of music, and it has been suggested occasionally that the work may be a portrait (and thus, a portrait historique). The question of portraiture is complicated, as discussed below.

Curator John Walsh, in 1973, and most later writers (see Refs.) have treated the painting as a genre scene, comparing works by Gerrit Dou, Johannes Vermeer (q.v.), and other contemporary artists. The picture is very close in date and in its main motifs to Vermeer's Woman with a Lute (Pl. 204), despite the obvious differences in scale and setting. In the Vermeer, a young woman in fashionable attire, with an enormous pearl earring (perhaps hinting of Venus), tunes a lute and eagerly looks out the window, as if expecting company. In the foreground, a chair and (on the floor) a viola da gamba await a man's arrival, to be followed by the playing of a duet (or, using the songbooks, a trio) and the pursuit of love.

As in other works by Vermeer, the viewer is not acknowledged; the most romantic interpretation would identify a male viewer as a voyeur, imagining himself in the role of the woman's suitor. No such options are offered by Van der Helst's lute player, who appears to address any male viewer in the room. The woman spills out of her dress (which justifies her characterization by Sluijter as a "scantily clad courtesan"), and the logically viola tilts precipitously toward the viewer's space. If the viewer dares enter the picture, a comfortable stool and a red velvet pillow will be provided, along with printed music in tenor and soprano parts.

It is not immediately clear that the music rests on a carpet-covered table, not a balustrade. In any case, the setting, as indicated by the large urn at left with playful putti and (at the top) reclining river gods, is the terrace of a grand country house, with a view to landscape safely distant from the critical eyes of Amsterdam society. For their sake, it might be maintained, Van der Helst shows the woman tuning her instrument, a routine task that in some pictures probably suggests (despite appearances to the contrary) temperance or moderation.

In its scale and in the type of figure, the composition recalls many genre paintings of the Utrecht school, such as Gerrit van Honthorst's Woman Tuning a Lute and Woman Playing a Guitar (both in the Louvre, Paris), which date from 1624, and by 1632 were hanging in the Stadholder's Quarters in The Hague. Large pictures of this type were more common in the first half of the century, but they were painted later as well, as in the case of Ferdinand Bol's Woman Playing a Lute, of 1654 (fig. 87).

It seems highly unlikely that a patron would have asked an Amsterdam portraitist to have herself (or, in the case of a male client, his wife) depicted as a musical seductress, rather than as a mythological, religious, or allegorical figure. However, artists did portray themselves and their wives as romantic couples, as in Hans von Aachen's portrait of himself with his wife as a lute-playing courtesan (private collection), and, evidently, as in Cornelis Bisschop's large canvas A Young Woman and a Cavalier (Pl. 8), which like Van der Helst's painting dates from the early 1660s. Thus one might ask whether the artist's wife, Anna du Pire, might have served as a model for The Musician, and whether it could have been painted together with a pendant portrait of the artist, perhaps in the guise of a courting gentleman.

Unfortunately, no certain portrait of Van der Helst's wife is known. A pair of portraits by Van der Helst, signed and dated 1660 (Národní Galerie, Prague), appear to represent the artist and his wife as the shepherd Dautilo and his beloved Persian princess, Granida, the protagonists of Pieter Cornelisz. Hooft's pastoral play Cynèida (Amsterdam, 1615). Van Gent rejects the identification, partly because Anna du Pire and the artist (as seen in his Self-Portrait of 1667, in the Uffizi, Florence) must have looked older in 1660, when they were about forty-two and forty-eight years old, respectively. She also rejects the so-called Self-Portrait, of 1662 (Kunsthalle, Hamburg), in part because of the figure's youthful appearance compared with the Self-Portrait dating from only five years later. Van den Brink maintains that in the Prague portraits Van der Helst presents himself and his wife (reflecting their roles as idealized lovers) as they appeared in earlier years. Perhaps Van der Helst's "musician" has been bathed in the same fountain of youth, one formed by artstic license and a husband's adoring eyes. But this is mere speculation, in the absence of an unquestionable portrait of Anna du Pire. And even if she does prove to
resemble the woman depicted here, it would mean no more than that the artist (like Rubens and Rembrandt before him) turned to a model close to his heart.

1. Two scholars, on visits to the Museum, voiced doubts about the attribution: Wilhelm Martin, in April 1938, and Otto Benesch, in December 1940, the latter suggesting that Abraham van den Tempel might be responsible. The Van der Helst specialist Judith van Gent examined the painting in May 2002 and accepts it as autograph, as did De Gelder in his monograph (1921; see Refs.).

2. See Refs., under Fischer 1972a and P. Sutton 1986. Van Gent (see note 1 above), in a personal communication dated July 12, 2005, writes that she is not absolutely sure whether the painting was intended as a portrait or not, but that it is "in any case an allegorical figure with portrait-like features" (that is, Van der Helst's use of a live model appears probable).

3. In addition to the discussion of Vermeer's picture below, see also that of Gerard ter Borch, A Woman Playing the Theorbo-Lute and a Cavalier (Pl. 13).


5. See Refs., under Fischer 1972b, regarding the tenor and soprano
parts. Kenneth Moore, curator in charge, Department of Musical Instruments, observes that *superius* (also called *mediaus*) is the second part in descending order of pitch, with *cantis* being higher.


7. See Blankert 1982, p. 140, no. 112, pl. 141, and p. 41, where the author discusses the Utrecht connection. The painting is also published in Stockholm 1992–93, no. 70. One of the Utrecht Caravaggiesques, Jan van Bronchorst (ca. 1603–1661), worked in Amsterdam from about 1660 onward. Flemish painters also painted lute players of this type: see, for example, *Young Woman with a Lute*, by Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert (Galerie Fischer, Lucerne, June 30, 1962, no. 2148 [ill.]), and the canvas incorrectly attributed to Nicolas Bercher, at Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, November 4, 2003, no. 37, and November 2, 2004, no. 53.

8. For references to Van Aachen’s picture, Rembrandt’s *The Prodigal Son in the Tavern*, and other relevant works, see the discussion of Bisschop’s painting above.

9. See Utrecht–Frankfurt–Luxembourg 1993–94, pp. 163–67, no. 25. At the time, the female portrait had not yet been reunited with its pendant in Prague.


11. Utrecht–Frankfurt–Luxembourg 1993–94, p. 163, citing the evidence of the Uffizi portrait. Anna du Fère was born in 1617, so in 1660 she was forty-three and Van der Helst about forty-seven.

**References:**

**Decamps 1872,** pp. 478, 479 (ill.), describes the painting as a personification of music and contrasts the Museum’s *Portrait of a Man*; Menard 1875, pp. 94, 96 (engraved ill. opp. p. 94) (French ed., pp. 95, 97), considers the picture “one of the jewels in the New York museum . . . very real, very well painted, very pretty”; Kegel 1884, p. 461, considers this picture Van der Helst’s “Hauptbild,” an allegory but also a flattering portrait of someone; Hareck 1888, p. 75, as “Lute Player,” dated 1663 or 1665; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 1 (1906), p. 672, “Porträt einer Lautenspielerin,” of 1663 or 1665; De Gelder 1921, pp. 22, 120, 123, 160, no. 17, properly identifies the instruments, sees the picture as an allegory of music, and considers the landscape to reflect the style of J. B. Weenix; J. J. de Gelder in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 16 (1923), p. 355, again notes the Weenix-style landscape; Fischer 1972a, pp. 110–12 (ill. p. 109), is uncertain whether the painting is a portrait or an allegory but favors the latter, sees “the dark clouds and sinister wave with river-gods” as threats to “euphonious harmony;” notes the inscription “Iris” (goddess of the rainbow, who “arouses virile desires”) and the “Superius” (soprano) part-book, and considers the viola to be waiting for a man, who will play “the tenor part which is shown”; Walsh 1973, unpaged, discussion of figs. 46–49, compares Vermeer’s *Woman with a Lute* (Pl. 204), observing that “Van der Helst’s voluptuous creature . . . gives us an overt invitation to play a duet with her, not only by her look but by the viola da gamba that lies waiting for us. Music serves as a metaphor for love, as it had since antiquity”; A. Hollander 1976, p. 661, fig. 9, cites the painting as an example of larger and more exposed breasts in late seventeenth-century art than in earlier images; Heding 1986, p. 100, fig. 99, discusses the “erotic connotation of playing music,” which is emphasized here by the woman’s glance and décolleté, by the putti on the vase, and by the profusely viola da gamba; P. Sutton 1986, p. 190, compares the subject with that of Vermeer’s *Woman with a Lute*, and observes that Van der Helst’s figure, which “may be a portrait, seems to address the viewer directly;” Foucart 1987, p. 82, compares the picture with Van der Helst’s painting of a nude woman emerging from drapery, dated 1653 (Louvre, Paris); Liedtke 1990, p. 36, in a survey of Dutch pictures acquired by the Museum, notes that this was the only work purchased or given after 1671 and before 1880; Baetjer 1995, p. 253; Netta 1996, p. 133, fig. 32 compares the painting with Vermeer’s *Woman with a Lute* (Pl. 204); Sluijter 2000b, chap. 7 (“On Figuriers and Meaning”), pp. 292, 294, fig. 240, compares the work with a painting by Dou and other genre scenes in which a duet between the viewer and the woman depicted is implied, referring to Van der Helst’s subject as a “scantily clad courtesan tuning her lute, a scene in which a viola da gamba lying ready for use and a tenor score almost appear to emerge from the painting and are there for the taking, as it were”; Netta 1996, p. 133, fig. 32, compares the painting with Vermeer’s *Woman with a Lute* (Pl. 204).

**Ex Coll.:** [Probably Léon Gauche, Paris, in 1872; sold to MAA]; Purchase, 1873.

1. The painting has been published previously as purchased in 1872, but it is clear from the minutes of meetings of the Board of Trustees that the work was acquired before it was placed on public view on November 18, 1872. Furthermore, a two-page Supplement in some copies (second printing?) of the Museum’s 1872 catalogue (MMA 1872), p. 67, no. 176, lists a painting titled *The Guitarist* by Van der Helst. The purchases of this painting and the next in the catalogue, no. 177, a double portrait attributed to Karel de Moor (Carel van Moor; see Baetjer 1985, vol. 1, p. 131, “Purchase, 1872,” acc. no. 73.1; deaccessioned in 1988), were approved simultaneously by the board’s executive committee, at the recommendation of its chairman (and Museum vice president), William T. Blodgett. In the same catalogue, nos. 175 and 178–80 are paintings “presented to the Museum by M. Léon Gauche,” and two pictures given by him were also placed in the galleries (with the Van der Helst and the Van Moor) on November 18, 1872. The dealer Léon Gauche, in Paris, directly or indirectly sold every one of the 174 paintings acquired by Blodgett on behalf of the Museum in the 1871 Purchase (see Baetjer 2004, pp. 161–68). It appears certain, then, that the Van der Helst also came from him.
Jan van der Heyden

Gorinchem 1637–1712 Amsterdam

Van der Heyden is best known for his views of city streets and squares and of country houses, but he also painted landscapes (about forty are known) and a number of still lifes. However, it has been said (by an art historian) that he is recognized above all as the inventor of the fire hose pump. He also designed streetlights and supervised their installation in Amsterdam, where they cast a picturesque glow over the canals and quays from 1669 until 1840. These inventions brought Van der Heyden a large income and two lucrative municipal offices, one responsible for street lighting, the other for the neighborhood fire brigades of Amsterdam (from 1670 and 1673, respectively). After these appointments, the artist appears to have painted mainly for his own pleasure, and for that of a few prominent acquaintances. At his death on March 28, 1712, Van der Heyden had at least seventy-three of his own pictures in his house, along with works by Jan Lievens (1607–1674), Govert Flinck, Anthonie van Bossum, Jacob van Ruisdael, Gerard ter Borch, Willem van de Velde the Younger (q.v.), and others. When his widow died on April 16 of the same year the couple’s estate was valued at the remarkably high figure of 84,000 guilders.

Van der Heyden was baptized in Gorinchem on March 5, 1637, as the third child of Jan Goris Claesz (1607–1651), who owned an oil mill, and Neeltje Jansdr Munster (d. 1667). The couple married on September 3, 1631, in Utrecht, where their first two children, Goris and Cornelis, were born. In 1650, the Mennonite family moved from Gorinchem to Amsterdam, where Jan Goris had registered as a grain merchant four years earlier. He died, much diminished in means, in November 1651, leaving behind his wife and eight children. The future painter’s oldest brother, Goris, became the family’s main provider by making and selling mirrors. In 1656, the Van der Heydens rented a house near the Town Hall on the Dam (main square), which is evidently where Goris had his shop and where Jan began his career as a painter.

On June 26, 1661, Van der Heyden, then twenty-four, married the thirty-year-old Sara ter Hiel. At the time, he lived on the Herengracht with his mother, and described himself as a painter. Houbraken records that the young man “learned the rudiments of art from a glass engraver” (glasschryver), which might have some connection with his brother’s mirror business in Amsterdam. Modern writers have reported that Van der Heyden studied with a “glass painter,” or have conjectured that he trained with a maker of fine cabinets (i.e., his maternal grandfather, Jan Cornelisz Munster), with the minor landscapist Jan Looten (ca. 1618–1681), or with the Gorinchem painter and draftsman of town views Jacob van der Ulf (1627–1689; see fig. 232). Curiously, Van der Ulf came from a family of glassmakers; he is described by Houbraken as “the leading glass painter of the century: so that many church windows around Gorinchem and Gelderland are embellished by his brushwork.” In 1653–54, Van der Ulf made drawings of the Dam with Jacob van Campen’s new Town Hall and the proposed tower of the neighboring Nieuwe Kerk as they would appear when finished, presumably on the basis of the architect’s wooden models. It has been supposed that this work, which resulted in a popular engraving, influenced Van der Heyden’s turn to the subject of the Town Hall and the Dam in the 1660s. However, the subject of the Dam had also been treated by artists in earlier decades and attracted a number of painters in the 1650s and 1660s.

The pictorial evidence indicates that between about 1655 and 1665, Van der Heyden essentially trained himself as a landscape painter, using an eclectic survey of readily available models. His early works bring to mind pictures by Cornelis Decker (ca. 1635–1678), Jan Looten (mentioned above), Emanuel Murant (q.v.), Paulus Potter (1625–1654), Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.), Adriaen van de Velde (1636–1672), Jan Wijnants (1632–1684), and others. Among the early landscapes are village views similar to those by Murant, who to some extent probably inspired Van der Heyden’s detailed description of brickwork. In the mid- to late 1660s, Van der Heyden expanded his repertoire to include still lifes comparable to those painted a little earlier by Gerrit Dou (q.v.), views of castles and country houses, imaginary townscapes featuring motifs found in Cologne, Düsseldorf, and Emmerich, and views of the Dam and other locations in Amsterdam. Architectural subjects (invariably exterior views) predominate in the 1670s and 1680s; no pictures are known to date from between 1684 and 1711. In the last two years of his life, Van der Heyden painted a few fancy still lifes set in
domestic interiors, which evoke the private world of a gentleman scholar.\textsuperscript{22}

The artist's first views of Amsterdam buildings, streets, and squares coincide with a great expansion of the city, which included an unprecedented investment in public buildings and other projects, and a similar boom in the construction of fine town houses along the canals.\textsuperscript{23} In the same years, views of foreign cities, seaports, palaces, and so on became popular with cosmopolitan collectors in the Netherlands, especially in the great commercial center of Amsterdam. While Van der Heyden's townscapes depicting or evoking German cities along the Rhine may have appealed to patrons who had traveled there,\textsuperscript{24} the fact that he kept a large part of his oeuvre suggests that his choice of subjects should not be linked too closely to market demand.\textsuperscript{25} Especially in his architectural fantasies—capricci in which he often modified or relocated actual buildings—the painter favored picturesque motifs (compare Van Goyen; Pls. 51–53) and attractive pictorial effects. Houbraen, in praising Van der Heyden's style, observed that although one could count the bricks and see the mortar between them in his architectural views, no hardness resulted if the paintings were examined from a normal distance. Similarly, Sir Joshua Reynolds wrote of a work by Van der Heyden, "Notwithstanding this picture is finished as usual very minutely, he has not forgotten to preserve at the same time a great breadth of light. His pictures have very much the effect of nature, seen in a camera obscura."\textsuperscript{26}

Houbraen wondered if Van der Heyden might have employed a "special device or means" in the execution of his detailed pictures, and modern writers have made claims such as "the precision and specialized visual effects in his cityscapes suggest the use of lenses, mirrors, and very possibly the camera obscura."\textsuperscript{27} On the contrary, Van der Heyden's precision and his perspective constructions indicate quite the opposite, unless "the use of lenses" refers solely to a magnifying glass.\textsuperscript{28} However, the artist often used counterproofs from copperplates engraved with minute brickwork and other patterns in order to describe masonry in extraordinary detail.\textsuperscript{29}

Van der Heyden's work was much admired in the eighteenth century, and influenced Dutch painters of architectural views such as Isaac Ouwater (1730–1793). No students are recorded. However, stylistic anomalies in some of the later pictures that have been catalogued as by Van der Heyden raise the question of whether an immediate follower such as the artist's son Jan may have been responsible for their execution. The artist collaborated both with his son and with the printmaker Jan van Vianen (1660–after 1726) on his book about "the newly discovered and patented hose fire engine," published in 1690.\textsuperscript{30} Van der Heyden was a capable draftsman and painter of figures,\textsuperscript{31} though on occasion he employed other painters, such as Johannes Lingelbach (q.v.) and Adriaen van de Velde, to supply staffage.\textsuperscript{32}
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78. The Huis ten Bosch at The Hague and Its Formal Garden (View from the South)

Oil on wood, 15⅞ x 21¼ in. (39.1 x 53.2 cm)
Signed (lower left): IVD Heijde[n]
The painting is well preserved.
Anonymous Gift, 1964. 64.65.2

This panel and its pendant, no. 64.65.3 (Pl. 79), were painted by Van der Heyden about 1668–70. At present, six autograph pictures by Van der Heyden are known to represent the Huis ten Bosch (House in the Wood) and its property; another painting, dated 1665 or 1668, depicts part of the parterre garden and one of the ivy-covered pavilions, or Groene Kabinetten (Green Cabinets), without a view of the house.¹ The Museum’s pair of paintings offers the most comprehensive views of the house and the formal garden behind it. They are also the most beautiful pictures of the subject, especially the view from the south, with its brilliant daylight slicing into the tan and gray house, and creating dense filigree patterns in the hedges and parterres. A number of figures, several barely discernible, lend scale to the scene and convey the sense of pleasure found in being outdoors under a blue sky. There are two workers and two courtly figures in the foreground, six people in the nearest garden to the left, a couple on the walkway in the right middle ground, and three figures on the pathway between the statues and the house. In the view of the garden from the east (Pl. 79), two courtiers in blue costume encounter a couple with a servant. Both pictures feature in the foreground a hedgerow cut to form a scrolling silhouette and architectural fragments on a strip of ground. The rhythm and recessions of the two compositions and the placement of the signatures make it clear that the view from the south was meant to hang on the left.

A smaller panel in the National Gallery, London (fig. 88), appears to bring the view in closer to the garden façade of the house not by actually recording it from a closer vantage point but by cropping the present composition or a version of it.² A similar relationship exists between the Museum’s painting of the house from the side (Pl. 79) and a small panel in the Hamburger Kunsthalle (fig. 91).¹ Thus, these four paintings are probably based on a single pair of drawings made at the site. Van der Heyden’s two other views of the Huis ten Bosch are entirely different. A panel in the Cannon Hall Museum, Barnsley, South Yorkshire (National Loan Collection Trust), shows the front (north side) of the house receding obliquely from a vantage point close to the northwestern corner of the building.³ Finally, Park by the Huis ten Bosch, in the Museum Wuyts-Van Campen in Lier, Belgium, may be described as a landscape painting that includes in the distance one of the garden pavilions of the Huis ten Bosch and a house that bears some resemblance to the princely dwelling as seen from the side.⁴

The Haarlem painter turned architect Pieter Post (1608–1669) designed the Huis ten Bosch about 1645 as a summer residence for Amalia van Solms, wife of the Stadholder, Prince Frederick Hendrick. The house was conceived as a villa suburbana at the eastern end of the Haagse Bos (Hague Wood), about a mile and a half east of the center of The Hague. At the prince’s death in March 1647, Amalia resolved to make the country house into a memorial of his life and career. The large central hall, which is shaped like a Greek cross (+) and is crowned by a domed cupola with windows, was decorated with an elaborate program of historical, allegorical, and mythological paintings on the walls and vaults. The subjects were conceived by the Stadholder’s secretary and artistic adviser, Constantijn Huygens, in consultation with the princess dowager. Huygens and Post referred to the entire structure as the Sael van Orange, or Oranjiezaal (Hall of Orange), in honor of the House of Orange-Nassau, but the name was later applied to the central hall alone. The painter and architect Jacob van Campen (1595–1677), whom Post had assisted in building the Mauritshuis and other projects, was appointed designer of the pictorial compositions and supervisor of a team of Dutch and Flemish painters, including himself and Jacob Jordaeus (1593–1678). The project was completed in 1651.⁵

Post also designed the gardens, in collaboration with the land surveyor Pieter Florisz van der Sailem and the Stadholder’s head gardener, Borchgaert Federic.⁶ As seen in Post’s bird’s-eye view of 1655 (fig. 90; see also fig. 89), the property as a whole was divided geometrically in a manner typical of classical gardens dating from the first half of the seventeenth century.⁷ Behind the house, each of the four parterres de broderie (one of which is shown behind the shaped hedgerow in the left foreground of the present picture) had at its center a monogram combining the initials of Frederick Hendrick and Amalia. At the crossing of the walkways, four lead statues, painted to resemble stone, were placed on tall pedestals. One of the female figures holds a cornucopia, and another an urn, which suggests that the Four Seasons were represented.⁸ The walkways were divided into broad and narrow paths by low hedgerows and lines of planting pots on
Figure 88. Jan van der Heyden, *The Huis ten Bosch at The Hague*, ca. 1670. Oil on wood, 8½ x 11¼ in. (21.6 x 28.6 cm). The National Gallery, London, Bequeathed by Sir James Morse Carmichael, Bt., 1902.

Figure 89. Jan Mathijs after Pieter Post, “Plan of the Huis ten Bosch and Its Gardens,” from Jan van der Groen, *Le jardinier hollandais* (Amsterdam, 1669). Engraving. Library of the Archiepiscopal Castle Kroměříž, Archdiocese Olomouc, Czech Republic.
Figure 91. Jan van der Heyden, *A Pavilion in the Garden of the Huis ten Bosch*, ca. 1670. Oil on wood, 8½ x 11½ in. (22.1 x 29.5 cm). Hamburger Kunsthalle, Hamburg

Figure 90. Jan Mathijs after Pieter Post, title page of *De Sael van Orange* (Amsterdam, 1655), showing the Huis ten Bosch and its property from the north. Etching, Gemeentearchief, The Hague
pedestals. Each end of the two major walkways was marked by a pair of latticework obelisks topped with reflecting balls.10

The two garden pavilions (see Pl. 79), in rectangular sections of seedbeds, were constructed of timber frameworks and probably had latticework panels behind their ivy walls. A lower chamber with doors supported the octagonal belvedere and surrounding deck, which was reached by a broad staircase facing the center of the garden. As is obvious in Van der Heyden’s view from the east (Pl. 79), the Groene Kabinettchen echoed the shape of the Huis ten Bosch’s cupola. From their vantage points, one could appreciate the design of the parterres and glimpse the surrounding countryside.11 A somewhat less elevated prospect of the garden could also be obtained from the Bezuidenhoutseweg (Southern Wood Way) at the end of the garden, where the artist, like a passerby, found this view of the most famous country house in Holland.

Beyond the trees to either side of the house, Van der Heyden shows the roofs and chimneys of the outbuildings that flank the main entranceway. The western building was occupied by the chamberlain, and the eastern one included the kitchen (see fig. 90, where these structures are shown with the horse and cow barns behind them).12 Post’s plan of the entire property shows that the distant outbuildings would appear as they do in the Museum’s picture from the artist’s off-center vantage point.13 The outbuildings, the main house, and various motifs in the garden are less meticulously observed in the London version of this composition, where the somewhat different recession of statues and obelisks would have resulted from casting the same on-site drawing into another perspective scheme.14 (It is revealing that the western sun casts nearly the same pattern of shadows on the house in both pictures.) In general, there is a shift in emphasis from an overview of the site to a closer look at the building, but less for its own sake than for its minute brickwork and as the setting for the princely party coming down the path.

Today, the Huis ten Bosch remains a royal residence and the decorations of the Oranjearaal are intact. But the exterior of the house and the gardens were altered at early dates. The parterres were redesigned in 1686, and again in 17308, when the architect Daniel Marot added two long wings to the front corners of the house.15

One can well imagine Van der Heyden turning to the subject of the Huis ten Bosch without being asked to by a patron. Views of various existing country houses were in the artist’s collection at his death,16 and he also painted imaginary estates, including a superb picture of a Dutch Palladian villa reminiscent of buildings by Van Campen and Post (An Architectural Fantasy, ca. 1668–70, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.).17 Scholars have cited genre scenes set in formal gardens and other painted parallels to Van der Heyden’s views of country estates,18 but these comparisons are not very helpful in the case of an artist who was unresponsive to market demand. However, the general interest of polite society in country homes and gardens, poems about them, and views of fine examples (whether real or imaginary) is certainly relevant to Van der Heyden’s work. The Huis ten Bosch and its gardens were considered models of modern taste, and Post’s publication of a portfolio of prints, De Sael van Orange, in 1655 (see fig. 90), did nothing to discourage that view.19

1. For the latter picture, see Wagner 1971, no. 137 (ill.), and Dumas 1991, pp. 35–26, fig. 9.
2. On the National Gallery picture, see Wagner 1971, no. 133 (ill.); Dumas 1991, pp. 35–26, fig. 6; and MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 171–74, no. 1914, pl. 185.
3. Wagner 1971, no. 136 (ill.); Dumas 1991, p. 29, fig. 26; Ketelsen 2001, pp. 121–22, no. 77. In sales dating from 1764 to 1810 the painting in the National Gallery, London (see the preceding note), was offered together with a picture said to be its pendant (see MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 173 [under “Provenance”]). The London and Hamburg panels are identical in size, but the latter appears to have a different provenance going back to 1760 (Ketelsen 2001, p. 121).
5. Wagner 1971, no. 139 (ill.), where it is noted that the house in the right background is really more similar to country houses on the river Vecht near Utrecht. Compared with side elevations of the Huis ten Bosch, the central section of the house in the Lier picture has been made taller by inserting a row of three windows below the pediment, and there are other significant differences. Jacob van Campen’s Huis ten Bosch in Maarssen (1628) is somewhat similar, but it is only two stories high (see Huisken, Ottenheim, and Schwartz 1995, pp. 161–63, fig. 134). In MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 173 n. 2, yet another painting by Van der Heyden is said to be a view of the Huis ten Bosch and its garden, but it is catalogued in Wagner 1971, no. 165 (not ill.), under “Unbekannter Laendhauzer.”
6. The essential literature on the Huis ten Bosch and the Oranjezaal includes Slothouwer 1945, pp. 179–211; Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij 1982; Terwen and Ottenheim 1993, pp. 50–70; and Huisken, Ottenheim, and Schwartz 1995, pp. 132–41.
7. See Sellers 2001, pp. 112–20, for a full discussion of the garden, with references to earlier literature and documents.
8. As noted in Dumas 1991, p. 233.
9. Sellers 2001, p. 118. The other statues visible in the present pair of paintings are apparently two of the four life-size portraits of
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Princes of Orange that were ordered in 1646 by Amalia from François Dieussart (ibid., pp. 118, 288 n. 68).

10. The latter are said to have frightened birds (Dumas 1991, p. 323).

11. A print of about 1690 (Sloothouwer 1945, fig. 72) shows a view of the then-altered garden from the deck of the eastern pavilion, and reveals the design of the waist-high railing around the deck (which is completely covered by ivy on the outside).


13. Reproduced in Sloothouwer 1945, fig. 71; in Terwen and Ottenheym 1993, fig. 71b; and in Sellers 2001, fig. 91. In 1979 the present writer received a large photocopy of Post’s plan from the late Beatrix Breninnikmeyer-de Rooij, a leading historian of the Huis ten Bosch.

14. The realignment of obelisks and statues (all Four Seasons fall into the London view) is almost negligible compared with Pieter Saenredam’s redrafting of colonnades first drawn in Dutch churches, and with Van der Heyden’s perspective manipulations of other known sites. Architectural motifs like the cupola windows are less carefully drawn in the London picture, and some details (shutter hinges, for example) are simply omitted. Van der Heyden may have referred to engravings after Post’s elevations of the house for specific details (for example, the hinges again), but those architectural renderings (see Sloothouwer 1945, figs. 64–67) were clearly not employed to depict the building without making firsthand drawings of it.


18. See, for example, Wagner 1971, p. 44. In the early 1660s, Jacob van der Croos (ca. 1630–after 1683) painted a small, rather mediocre view of the Huis ten Bosch from the south as part of a View of The Hague surrounded by twenty panels depicting locations in the general area (see Dumas 1991, nos. 18, 18q). As early as 1647 and in the 1650s, his father, Anthony van der Croos, painted some views of the Huis ten Bosch set amid trees (ibid., pp. 324, 326, fig. 5, and pp. 363–64, illustrating four pictures by Anthony, and one by Jacob dated 1656). None of these paintings anticipates any known composition by Van der Heyden, and it is doubtful that he knew them.

19. This point is made in a discussion of buitenplaatsen (country retreats) in Frijhoff and Spies 1999, p. 489. On Post’s series of prints, see Terwen and Ottenheym 1993, p. 245, under sec. III, 1635. See G. Schwartz 1983 on Van Campen, Van der Heyden, and the Huydecopers of Maarssenveen, whose house, Goudestein, “was the first true buitenplaats (country estate) on the Vecht,” and “a symbol for a gracious style of life” (ibid., p. 205). Van der Heyden painted a view of another country house in the neighborhood of the Huis ten Bosch, Huis Pasgeld on the Vijet between The Hague and Delft (Niemeijer 1960; Wagner 1971, no. 147; White 1983, pp. 49–50, no. 66, where the proposed date of about 1660 is about a decade too early; Dumas 1991, pp. 29, 54 n. 94). About the same period, 1665–70, the wealthy lawyer Jan de Bisschop (1628–1671), a close associate of Constantijn Huygens, drew views of Frederick Hendrick’s palace just south of The Hague, the Huis ter Nieuwburg at Rijswijk. The sheets were copied by Jacob van der Ulf, who is mentioned in Van der Heyden’s biography, above. On De Bisschop’s drawings and Van der Ulf’s copies, see Plomp in New York–London 2001, nos. 101, 102. De Bisschop’s drawings of the grounds of Frederick Hendrick’s other country palace, Honelaarsdijk, are also relevant (see Amsterdam 1992a, no. 8).

REFERENCES: Ozinga 1938, p. 41, pl. 504, describes the work as by Van der Heyden or his studio, compares the London version (in n. 1), and uses the painting to compare the design of the garden in the 1660s and its appearance about 1700; H. van Gelder 1956, p. 17, fig. 100; MacLaren 1960, p. 162, describes the present picture as “another, larger, version of the same view, seen from a little farther away,” as compared with the panel in the National Gallery, London (fig. 88 here); Virch 1970, pp. 9–10, describes the subject and mentions the London version; Wagner 1971, pp. 45, 97, no. 134 (ill.); P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, mentioned; Dumas 1991, pp. 325–26, 328 nn. 23, 24, fig. 7 on p. 325, describes the subject; MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 173, repeats the remark made in MacLaren 1960; Baetjer 1991, p. 340; Ketelsen 2001, p. 122, in a discussion of the Hamburg version of no. 64,65.3, calls it and no. 64,65.2 autograph “repetitions” of the Hamburg and London pictures; Sellers 2001, pp. 114–15, 229, 288 n. 62, 318 n. 48, fig. 96, pl. xiv (opp. p. 209), employs the painting as evidence for the appearance of the main parterre garden behind the Huis ten Bosch during the 1660s; P. Sutton in Greenwich–Amsterdam 2006–7, pp. 51–52, 158–59 no. 22, 162 (under no. 23), discusses the subject, reproduces Post’s design for the front (north façade) of the house and his plan of the formal gardens, suggests that the figures might be by Johannes Lingelbach (q.v.), and compares Van der Heyden’s other known views of the Huis ten Bosch.


EX COLL.: Joshua Charles Vanneck, 4th Baron Huntingfield, Heveningham Hall, Yoxford, Suffolk (d. 1915); [Asscher & Welker, London, in 1933]; [D. Katz, Dieren, the Netherlands, in 1934]; [W. E. Duits, Amsterdam, in 1935]; [Galerie Sanct Lucas, Vienna, before 1937; sold to a private collection, Vienna, with 64,65.3]; private collection, Vienna, and later Greenwich, Conn. (by 1927–64; seized in Paris by the Nazis, held at Alt Aussee, Austria [1975?], and at Munich collecting point [1968], returned to France October 30, 1946; restituted; given by owner to MMA; life interest, 1964–d. 1984]; Anonymous Gift, 1964 64,65.2
79. The Huis ten Bosch at The Hague and Its Formal Garden (View from the East)

Oil on wood, \(15\frac{3}{4} \times 21\frac{3}{4} \text{ in.} \) (\(39.1 \times 54.9 \text{ cm}\))

Signed (lower right): I.V.D. Heyden
The painting is well preserved.
Anonymous Gift, 1964 64.65.3

The main motif in the picture is one of the two ivy-covered pavilions, or Groene Kabinetten (Green Cabinets), in the formal garden behind the Huis ten Bosch just outside The Hague. See the discussion of this painting and its pendant (Pl. 78) in the preceding entry.

References: Virch 1970, p. 10, mentions the Hamburg version, which is considered to have been "painted from a position closer to the pavilion"; Wagner 1971, pp. 45, 97, no. 135 (ill. p. 157); L. de Vries 1984, pp. 31–36, fig. 21, offers an appreciation of the pavilion and other features of the garden; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, mentioned; Dumas 1991, pp. 20, 54 n. 96, 335–26, 328 n. 24, fig. 8 on p. 341, cites the picture and a painting of the Huis Pageldi near Delft as among Van der Heyden's few views near The Hague, and describes the Hamburg "variant" as recorded from a closer vantage point; Baetjer 1995, p. 340; Ketelsen 2001, p. 122, in a discussion of the Hamburg version of no. 64.65.3, calls it and no. 64.65.2 autograph "repetitions" of the Hamburg and London pictures; P. Sutton in Greenwich–Amsterdam 2006–7, pp. 31–52, 159 (under no. 22), 162–63, no. 23, describes the subject and the artfulness of the composition.


Ex coll.: This painting has the same history of ownership as its pendant. See Ex coll. for The Huis ten Bosch at The Hague and Its Formal Garden (View from the South) (Pl. 78); Anonymous Gift, 1964 64.65.3
Meyndert Lubbertsz Hobbema, son of the carpenter Lubbert Meynderts, was baptized in Amsterdam on October 31, 1638, and rarely left the city until his death on December 7, 1709. Hobbema and his younger brother and sister entered an Amsterdam orphanage in 1653. Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.), who was only a few years older than Hobbema, was his teacher during the second half of the 1650s. Early works by Hobbema show the influence of Van Ruisdael’s uncle, Salomon van Ruysdael (q.v.), and perhaps of Cornelis Vroom (1590/91–1661), but Van Ruisdael was Hobbema’s main source of inspiration, and in some paintings of the early 1660s he adopted his master’s compositional ideas. In 1663–64, Hobbema’s manner became calmer and more luminous; the space in his wooded landscapes is generally more open, and the touch more fluid, than in Van Ruisdael’s comparable works. Picturesque motifs such as waterfalls and cottages convey a sense of well-being in the countryside, which was a view favored in Amsterdam town houses.

Van Ruisdael was a witness at Hobbema’s marriage to a burgomaster’s kitchen maid, Eeltje Vinck, in 1668. In the same year, Hobbema was awarded a well-paid civic post as a wine gauger. From then on, he painted infrequently and mostly for his own pleasure, or so it seems in the famous Avenue at Middelharnis, of 1689 (National Gallery, London).

Two close associates of Van Ruisdael, Jan van Kessel (1641–1680) and Isaac Koene (ca. 1637–1713), were influenced by Hobbema, and some of their works have been confused with his.

Most of Hobbema’s work is based on art not nature, although it reveals close observation and a distinctive disposition. His landscapes are those one might encounter on walks out of town, which links him to a tradition in Amsterdam and Haarlem dating back to the first decades of the century (as seen, for example, in prints by Willem Buytewech, Jan van de Velde the Younger, and Claes Jansz Visscher). There are always houses and other signs of life, and, in an œuvre with countless clouds and trees, never an ominous shadow.

This view accorded well with the tastes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially the period from about 1790 onward. In the Netherlands, Hobbema inspired the sunny woodlands of Egbert van Driest (1745–1818), while in England the “highly appreciated landscape painter” whose pictures were in numerous collections by 1813 (the date of John Smith’s oeuvre list of Hobbema), was one of the principal sources of inspiration for artists of the Norwich school. At least two dozen paintings by Hobbema entered important American collections between the last years of the nineteenth century and about 1910. Indeed, the demand for the artist’s pictures in American, English, and Continental collections was such that very few works by him remain in the Netherlands.

1. Bredius 1915, p. 194. Van Ruisdael was a resident of Amsterdam by June 1657, but probably earlier, and he testified in July 1660 that Hobbema had “served and learned” with him for some years.
2. For example, Hobbema’s earliest dated work, the River Scene, of 1658, in the Detroit Institute of Arts (Broul hiert 1938, no. 286 [ill.]), Keyes et al. 2004, pp. 108–9, no. 43).
3. See Keyes 1975, p. 111.
4. See Walford 1991, pp. 9, 121, 123, 125–27, on the trip that Van Ruisdael and Hobbema evidently took together to the area of the German border, and ibid., p. 48, on Hobbema’s possible use of drawings by Van Ruisdael; Slive 1992b, p. 457, shows that Hobbema’s River Landscape with Fishermen, of about 1659–60 (City Art Gallery and Museum, Glasgow), closely depends upon a painting by Van Ruisdael.
5. This has often been observed, as in Walford 1991, p. 128, and by John Loughman in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 14, pp. 600–601.
7. For example, Van Kessel’s Wooded Landscape, in the Shizuoka Prefectural Museum of Art (A. Davies 1992, no. 87, fig. 87), which was acquired as a work by Hobbema. On Koene, see ibid., pp. 98–99.
8. This was precisely the observation of Robert Gilmore Jr., the pioneering Baltimore collector, who wrote from Amsterdam on July 17, 1860, “The road was lined with beautiful cottages, all enclosed in trees, and provided in actions and instances the originals of those sweet pictures of Hobbema whose charming works were ten times more pleasing to me since I have taken this ride.” Quoted in H. Clark 1982, pp. 20, 172.
10. Assen 1968.
observed that “Hobbema’s works, for their greater rarity, fetch much higher prices than those of Ruisdael” (p. 332).


80. Entrance to a Village

Oil on wood, 29 5/8 x 43 3/8 in. (74.9 x 110.2 cm)
Signed (lower right): m [Ho]bb[ema]

The tonal contrast between the sky and the landscape has increased over time. The vegetation has darkened, and the figures, particularly the three in the near foreground, have lost definition as a result of natural aging and thinning of the paint film from abrasion during past cleaning. Abrasion in the area of the sky has revealed the dark horizontal grain of the oak panel and paint loss along the horizontal wood join.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.614

This confidently painted panel in the Altman Collection probably dates from about 1665 and depicts Hobbema’s quintessential theme of quiet village life.

The small church in the right background would have been about two hundred years old in the artist’s lifetime and indicates that the modest houses, although placed according to no particular plan, form the center of a rural village. The structure with a thatched roof to the left is nearing the end of its usefulness, while the brick cottage with a tiled roof to the right, its small yard protected by a rough board fence, was probably imagined by the artist as the newest house nestled among the trees. In the distance, a walled churchyard and sun-filled meadows brighten the scene. The pen and shelter in the right foreground are probably meant for pigs.

The rather crude rendering of the staffage is typical of Hobbema, as is the suggestion of midmorning or another pleasant hour of a sunny day. In the foreground, a man walks with a sack and stick, the usual signs of a traveler (compare the man walking in Jacob van Ruisdael’s Wheatfields; Pl. 182), while a seated woman converses with two standing men (the paint in this group of figures is now very thin). A couple approaches on the pathway leading to the church, as does a woman on the road branching to the left.

In composition and execution, this panel is closely related to a group of pictures by Hobbema, a few of which are dated 1665. Two paintings bearing this date, a smaller panel (23 7/8 x 33 3/4 in. [60.5 x 84.5 cm]) in the Ruzicka Foundation, Zürich, and a canvas (38 x 48 in. [96.5 x 122 cm]) formerly in the Percy B. Meyer collection, London, were compared by Gerson with the Museum’s picture and with the undated Woody Landscape with a Road by a Cottage, in the National Gallery, London.1 MacLaren places the London panel before the very similar Zürich picture and then the Meyer painting, and concurs with Gerson that the Altman panel represents “a later development” within a brief period.2 Another panel dated 1665 that is close to the present picture in composition and execution is the Village among Trees, in the Frick Collection, New York (fig. 92); the Frick Village with Water Mill among Trees and the View on a High Road (1665), in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., further reveal how Hobbema varied motifs and shifted the emphasis within the same compositional scheme.3 Indeed, the design dated back to 1662 (as is seen in the Wooded Road with Cottages, in the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and in The Farm, in the Louvre, Paris),4 and was repeated in a looser, more spacious manner in two landscapes dated 1667, one in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, and the other (reversing the pattern) in the Indianapolis Museum of Art.5

Of all these compositions, the paintings of 1665 reveal comparatively less emphasis on a long diagonal recession from left to right. The eye tends to rest at the main group of trees, and to wander about the middle ground as one might explore such a village, at least in the imagination. The viewer has a stronger sense of participation in Hobbema’s paintings of the mid-1660s than in later works, where scenes tend to become scenery (see Pl. 81). In this regard, the Altman picture is one of Hobbema’s more memorable works.

1. Gerson 1947, p. 45; all four paintings are reproduced. See also Broulhiet 1918, no. 399 (ill.), for the Meyer canvas (formerly in the collection of Lady Canliffe-Lister), which was sold at Sotheby’s, London, December 3, 1969, no. 9.
Figure 92. Meyndert Hobbema, *Village among Trees*, 1661. Oil on wood, 30 x 44 1/2 in. (76.2 x 113.5 cm). The Frick Collection, New York

3. Frick Collection 1968, vol. 1, pp. 222–27; Broulhiet 1938, nos. 193, 196 (ill.). Of the paintings discussed here the Frick Village among Trees (fig. 92) is the most similar in technique. For the Washington picture, see Broulhiet 1938, no. 189 (ill.), and Wheelock 1991a, pp. 123–26.

4. See P. Sutton in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, no. 44, for a discussion and illustrations of the Philadelphia and Paris pictures (Broulhiet 1938, nos. 197, 192), and P. Sutton 1990a, pp. 121–23. These designs are anticipated by Hercules Segers’s etching A Country Road with Trees and Buildings, which is the unique impression in the British Museum (Rowlands 1979, p. 67; Freedberg 1980, fig. 64).

5. See Gerson in Gerson, Goodison, and Sutton 1960, p. 62, no. 49, pl. 32 (Broulhiet 1938, no. 208 [ill.]), and Indianapolis Museum of Art 1972, pp. 108–9, no. 2.108 (ill.), which is Broulhiet’s no. 101 (collection of J. Pierpont Morgan). The seemingly uniform esteem of Hobbema during America’s Gilded Age found expression in the very similar designs of the landscapes by him in the collections of Morgan, Erick, Mellon, Elkins (Philadelphia; see note 4 above), and Widener (Broulhiet 1938, no. 100).

REFERENCES: J. Smith 1839–42, vol. 4 (1833), pp. 118–19, no. 14, mentions the painting as in the collection of John Lucy (“Few pictures possess more pre-eminently the various beauties for which the master is esteemed”; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1890, p. 74, no. 60 (ill.), as in the collection of Rodolphe Kann; Bode 1900, p. xviii, pl. 41, as one of Hobbema’s most important pictures; É. Michel 1901, pp. 39–96, praises the composition; Würzbach 1906–11, vol. 1 (1906) p. 691, listed; Bode 1907, pp. xi–xii, 47, no. 46 (ill.); Nicolle 1908, pp. 198–99 (ill.), as “de toute beauté”; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 4 (1912), pp. 366–67, no. 44, as with Duvene in Paris; Monod 1923, p. 311, “Hobbema n’a mieux peint que dans cette Entrée de village”; Altman Collection 1928, pp. 72–73, no. 36, as “an example of his usual plan” and as signed “M. Hobbema”; Broulhiet 1938, pp. 289 (ill.), 428, no. 374, with provenance; Gerson 1947, p. 45, fig. 3 (see text above); Rousseau 1954, p. 3; MacLaren 1960, pp. 164–65 n. 4; Liedtke 1990, p. 48; MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 171–75 n. 4; A. Davies 1992, pp. 41, 181, fig. 24, compares a picture by Jan van Kessel; Baetjer 1995, p. 140; L. Miller, “Benjamin Altman,” in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 1, p. 731, mentioned.


EX COLL.: [Thomas Emmerson, before 1835, who according to Smith (see Refs.) imported the painting and sold it to John Lucy]; John Lucy, Charlecote Park, Warwickshire (in 1835); Baron Lionel de Rothschild, London (in 1878); [Sedelmeyer Gallery, Paris]; Rodolphe Kann, Paris (by 1822–d. 1903; his estate, 1903–7; sold to Duvene); [Duvene Brothers, Paris and New York, in 1907; sold to Altman on February 1, 1908, for $16,145.]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1908–13); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 40.40.614.

1. A letter dated January 13, 1908, from Altman to Wilhelm Bode in Berlin politely declines to cede the Kann Hobbema to the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, which Bode had requested “as a favor to the Emperor” (Altman’s letter in the Zentralarchiv, Staatliche Museen, Berlin, was kindly brought to our attention by MMA curator Julien Chapuis in August 2006). Bode had published the picture in 1910 (see Refs.).

81. Woodland Road

Oil on canvas, 37 7/8 × 51 in. (94.6 × 129.5 cm)
Signed (lower right): m. Hobbema

The painting is damaged from past lining and cleaning, as a result of which many passages of the landscape have darkened. The blue sky is marred throughout where the dark underlayer has become visible as the paint has thinned over time and from abrasion.

Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950 50.145.22

In this canvas of about 1670, a country road curves around the marsh to the left. Farmhouses are visible among the trees straight ahead and to the right, where a woman at a Dutch door appears to be looking at the travelers.

Dating the painting requires close consideration of its style. In many earlier works by Hobbema, the diversity of pathways and buildings invites the eye to wander, so that the viewer momentarily forgets the artful arrangement of the whole. The effect in the present picture is rather different. The breadth and depth of the foreground keep the viewer at a certain distance, from which the main impressions are made by the graceful massing of trees and the delicate variety of leaves. The tighter and generally more naturalistic description of trees in Hobbema’s landscapes of about 1665 is here nearly abandoned in favor of a painterly screen of foliage notable for its many different textures and colors, including bright, soft touches of blues and yellows. Cloud formations fill the remarkably blue
sky, their billowing shapes conspicuously sympathetic to the ascending branches. The tallest tree and the cumulus cloud to the left (where two birds focus attention) are the two most prominent—almost paired—motifs; while Hobbema’s descriptive qualities have diminished, his pictorial interests have become more sophisticated. This is true for many Dutch landscapists of the period—the painting looks back to Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.) and forward to Frederick de Moucheron (1633–1686)—but few other painters so successfully modified their style according to fashion as Hobbema does here.

Smith and Brouhiet dated the Museum’s painting to the mid-1660s, but Stechow placed it in a group of Hobbema’s landscapes dating from the early 1670s. Brouhiet’s dating depended partly upon his close association of the picture with a composition attributed to Van Ruisdael, but Slive sees the connection as “rather remote” and the attribution to Van Ruisdael as dubious.

A panel (24 x 33 in. [61 x 83.8 cm]) formerly in the Yerkes collection employs a very similar composition in reverse. The painting may be by Hobbema, but it is almost certainly later than the present work.

For more than a century, the Museum’s picture was in the Feversham collection at Duncombe Park, Yorkshire, where, according to Waagen, nearly all the paintings were Italian or French.
1. It is not clear in reproductions that the three figures in the left background are on the same road as the three figures in the center of the picture.

2. The motif of a figure watching from a Dutch door was familiar enough from everyday experience but also went back more than a century in Netherlandish art, for example to landscape prints by Hans Bol (see Franz 1965, fig. 19, etc.).

3. For a typical work by the contemporary Amsterdam landscapist Frederick de Moucheron, see Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, pp. 378–80.

4. J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 6, p. 121; Brouhiet 1938, p. 394. In an unpublished monograph on the artist, Christopher Wright calls the picture “a masterpiece of Hobbeina’s maturity in the mid-1660s.”

5. Stechow 1966, p. 79.


7. Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 4, no. 134, as “only ascribed to Hobbeina but ... not bad”; Brouhiet 1938, no. 131, as “suite du no. 129” (the Museum’s picture).

8. The reproduction in Brouhiet 1938, p. 167, is quite misleading; see Yerkes collection 1910, no. 48.

9. Waagen 1857, pp. 491–94, where landscapes by Jan Both and by Philips Wouwerman are also listed.


Ex coll.: Edward Coxe (sale, London, April 25, 1807, no. 64, to Charles Duncombe, for £88); Charles Duncombe, later 1st Baron Feversham, Duncombe Park, Yorkshire (d. 1844); William Duncombe, 2nd Baron Feversham (d. 1887); William Duncombe, 3rd Baron Feversham, later Viscount Helmsley and Earl of Feversham (d. 1913); his grandson Charles William Reginald Duncombe, 2nd Earl of Feversham (d. 1916); his son Charles William Slingsby Duncombe, 3rd Earl of Feversham (his sale, Christie's, London, July 18, 1930, no. 89, to Knoedler and Colnaghi, for £16,800); [M. Knoedler and Co., New York, in 1930 (invoice to Edward Harkness dated December 26, 1930)]; Mr. and Mrs. Edward S. Harkness, New York (1930–40); Mrs. Edward S. Harkness, New York (1940–50); Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950 50.143.22
Melchior d'Hondecoeter
Utrecht 1636–1695 Amsterdam

Hondecoeter represents the fourth generation of a family of painters that originally came from Flanders. His paternal grandfather, Gillis d'Hondecoeter (ca. 1580–1638), trained with his own father, Claes, and painted landscapes filled with birds and animals, similar to the Paradise pictures of Roeland Savery (1576–1639). Gillis's son, Gijsbert d'Hondecoeter (1604–1653), painted landscapes and pictures of waterfowl and barnyard birds. Melchior studied with his father in the early 1650s, and then with his uncle (the husband of his father's sister), Jan Baptist Weenix (1621–1660/61). This would have been about 1653–59, when Weenix's son Jan (q.v.) was a teenager and presumably training in the same studio. To some extent, the younger Weenix and his talented pupil Dirk Valkenberg (1675–1721) could be said to have extended the Hondecoeter family tradition of painting still lifes and landscapes featuring birds and animals into the first two decades of the eighteenth century.

Between 1659 and 1663, Hondceoeter was a member of Pictura, the painters' confraternity in The Hague. On February 9, 1663, the artist married Susanna Tradel in Amsterdam. He spent the rest of his life in that city. It has been claimed that there are pictures by Hondceoeter dated 1661 and 1663, but the first indisputable date on works by him is 1668, which is found on canvases in Karlsruhe, Kassel, London, Schwerin, and elsewhere. Only about twenty paintings by Hondceoeter are dated, and his chronology is further complicated by the repetition of motifs years or decades after they were first introduced. The early pictures, however, reveal clear debts to Gijsbert d'Hondecoeter and to Jan Baptist Weenix, and in some cases to Willem van Aelst (1627–in or after 1683) or Otto Marseus van Schrieck (q.v.). In his game pieces, Hondceoeter was influenced not only by Weenix but also by Flemish examples, in particular trophy pictures by Frans Snyders (1579–1657). The inventory of works in Hondceoeter's possession, made after his death on April 3, 1695, lists several paintings by Snyders. The Flemish connection probably explains in part how Hondceoeter arrived at one of his most distinctive qualities, namely, the dramatization of relationships between fine feathered friends and foes, ranging from minor squabbles to outright cockfights. By comparison, Gijsbert d'Hondecoeter's chickens and ducks appear to have roosted quietly while their portraits were taken. The most relevant comparisons for Melchior's paintings include hunting scenes by the Antwerp specialist Paul de Vos (1596–1678), and especially pictures of nearly audible avian concerts by Snyders and his disciple Jan Fyt (1611–1661). Concerts of birds were also part of Hondceoeter's repertoire.

The artist painted exotic birds in parklike landscapes from the late 1660s until the end of his life. Peacocks, swans, and the imported pelican were often depicted by Hondceoeter, whose use of these motifs may be considered analogous to Marseus van Schrieck's representations of curious snakes, toads, and lizards, and the study of tulips, frillaries, and so on, in seventeenth-century flower painting. Many of Hondceoeter's large canvases were not only commissioned but also made to order, that is, designed to decorate wall panels in Amsterdam town houses and palaces owned by Willem III (canvases by Hondceoeter, dating from 1674 onward, were made for the princely palaces at Soestdijk, Het Loo, and Hollandsdijk). One of the artist's most enthusiastic patrons was the merchant Adolf Visscher, who in the 1670s ordered three large canvases for Driemond, his country house at Weespersh, and at his death in 1702 owned ceiling pictures, a painted room, and easel paintings made by him. None of these ensembles survives in the Netherlands, but a good impression of their effect is found in the Hondecoeter Room of Belton House, Lincolnshire, where the Jan Weenix hunting trophy over the mantel is a sympathetic touch.

Hondecoeter must have worked with studio assistants on his larger paintings. Willem van Royen (1672–1742) was his pupil and one of his eighteenth-century followers, among whom were also significant figures such as Aart Schouman (1710–1792). Numerous copies after Hondceoeter were made by Adriaen van Oollen (d. 1694), who often signed them with his own name. Hondecoeter's least expected emulator was the Middelburg still-life painter Adriaen Coorte (1660–after 1707), who painted a version (1683; Ashmolean Museum, Oxford) of Hondecoeter's "The Menagerie," from Soestdijk Palace (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

The inventory of Hondceoeter's studio made after his death
ments fourteen canvases on which he had painted studies of birds and animals. Only one of these *modelli* is known today, a painting of seventeen birds and a squirrel in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille. Hondecoeter copied oil sketches of this type in finished pictures dating from about 1668 onward; he also repeated entire passages, or repeated compositions with minor variations. The studies themselves appear to have been painted mostly from life. However, rare birds, such as pelicans and cranes, are repeated without variation, suggesting that Hondecoeter had only one opportunity to study a live specimen, or another artist’s record of one.

Houbraeken learned from Jan Weenix that in Hondecoeter’s early years in Utrecht he was very religious, and prayed earnestly in his room every night. According to the biographer, the artist’s disposition changed from being constantly subjected to his wife’s carping criticism, so that he would routinely flee to a tavern and drink. Houbraeken is well known for his tales of drunken artists, but the story is told in greater detail than usual, and it may help to explain why the painter, although well paid for his pictures, left his daughter Isabella with substantial debts.

Hondecoeter’s portrait is seen in one of Houbraeken’s engraved plates.

2. Terwesten 1776, p. 24. Here and elsewhere in this biography, the writer has benefited from consulting Vlieger 1992, a copy of which was kindly given to the Department of European Paintings by the author.
4. A fish still life in the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig, is said to be dated 1661 (Klessmann 1983, p. 97, nos. 392, defends the date). Richard C. Mühlberger in *Dictionary of Art* 1996, vol. 14, p. 706, refers to a picture of ducks and poultry dated 1665, without giving its location. Mühlberger (ibid., p. 707 [ill.]) dates a canvas in Caen to about 1657, with no explanation. It resembles paintings of a decade later, for example, the *Poultry Yard*, in the Detroit Institute of Arts (see Kuretsky in Keyes et al. 2004, pp. 114–15, no. 45).
5. See MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 188 (under no. 1222, which was once attributed to Marsius van Schrieck).
6. See the previous note, and with regard to Van Aelst, S. Sullivan 1984, pp. 54–55.
8. See the present writer’s discussion of Fyt’s *Concert of Birds*, dated 1668 (Collections of the Princes of Liechtenstein, Vaduz), in New York 1981–86, pp. 294–95, no. 186.
9. Examples are in the Museum Snijt van Gelder, Antwerp; the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden; and the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel. Others are in private collections.
11. Vlieger 1995, p. 18, figs. 17, 18, and p. 19 on Visscher. The inventory of Visscher’s paintings is preserved in the Gemeentearchief, Amsterdam (NA533), and is reprinted in Vlieger 1992, appendix 3.
13. Bredius 1935–22, part 4, p. 1211, no. 18: “14 modellen, eenige gedoovert” (14 modelli, one with a painted ground).
18. Houbraeken 1718–21, vol. 3, pl. c, fig. 10 (opp. p. 64).

**82. Peacocks**

Oil on canvas, 74 3/4 x 53 in. (190.2 x 134.6 cm)
Signed and dated (center right): MDHondecoeter.//AN 1683 [AN in monogram]

The condition of the painting is good, although the impasto was slightly flattened during past lining and the loss of finishing glazes has caused the fruit to appear flat. The background foliage has darkened with age.

Gift of Samuel H. Kress, 1927 27.250.1

This large and splendid picture, dated 1683, is one of about twenty works that allow a tentative outline of the artist’s chronology.

The peacock’s tail, cascading like a gown in one of Van Dyck’s Genoese portraits, concentrates the colors used throughout the painting, which are dominated by greens and golden browns, with red, yellow, and blue accents. Next to the crowing peacock is his female companion, a peahen, which squawks at the
chattering squirrel and wide-eyed monkey. A crane approaches from the left, framing a view of the exotic (for this time and place) American turkey. The pile of fruit (melons, peaches, and grapes), the sunflowers, and the oversize swallow in the sky extend the rhythms of the carefully structured design, which is delineated by trees and architecture that (although the building's motifs are up-to-date) suggest a grand old country estate.

It was in such settings that aristocratic Europeans assembled rare birds and animals, quite as they cultivated unusual plants and collected shells and other naturalia. Like earlier still-life painters, in particular Otto Marseus van Schrieck (q.v.), Hondoeoter turned curiosities of nature into curiosities of art, and — on the scale seen in this painting — into elements of interior decoration. However, contemporary interest in and
knowledge of the variety of nature should not be underestimated. Even the peacock, which served as a symbol of pride in much earlier Netherlandish pictures, would have been recognized immediately as a creature from another continent, in this case southeastern Asia and the East Indies. In the confines of a room hung with paintings by Honthoet, it was easy to imagine not only the great outdoors of the Dutch countryside but also the entire world of Dutch overseas trade.

The crane was painted out at an unknown date and revealed by cleaning in 1956. The cropping of birds and animals at the sides of the composition is common in the artist's oeuvre. The crane is present in an eighteenth-century copy of the Museum's painting by an anonymous Dutch watercolorist. In 1971, the drawing appeared in a sale together with a watercolor of the same size that records a Honthoet composition depicting ducks and a pelican in a foreign landscape. This suggests at least the possibility that the New York canvas originally had a pendant. On the other hand, the watercolors could have come from a larger set or have been arbitrarily paired.

Other paintings by Honthoet (including canvases dated 1677 and 1682) show the peafowl in the same poses seen here. The crane, the monkey, the squirrel, and the swallow are also repeated in other compositions. In Honthoet's work as a whole, however, one finds peacocks, peahens, and turkeys (to say nothing of ducks and hens) studied in various poses and from different angles. An exception in his avian repertoire is the painter's pelican, which is always seen from the same vantage point and was obviously borrowed from a pictorial source.

References: J. M. L., "Accessions and Notes," MMA Bulletin 23, no. 3 (March 1928), pp. 91–92, describes the work as one of three paintings given to the Museum by Kress; B. Burroughs 1931a, p. 167, listed; C. Eisl 1977, p. 156, fig. 142, concludes that the formerly overpainted crane was hidden lest the canvas be regarded as a fragment, suggests that the picture may have belonged to a series of wall paintings, and compares the composition of Honthoet's Peacocks and Ducks in the Wallace Collection, London; P. Sutton 1986, p. 90, listed; P. Sutton 1990a, p. 128 n. 3, compares motifs in The Poultry Yard (Philadelphia Museum of Art); N. Hall 1992, p. 131, listed among paintings sold by Colnaghi; Ingamells 1992a, p. 160, notes the repetition of "the fine group of the peacock and peahen" in a few paintings by Honthoet, including the Museum's and that in the Wallace Collection, London; Ishikawa in Raleigh and other cities 1994–95, pp. 178–80, no. 27, describes the subject, noting that there is "nothing natural about their presentation," and follows P. Sutton in observing "a certain anthropomorphic quality to the postures and expressions" of the animals in the foreground; Perry in ibid., p. 19, mentioned as coming "from Contini's inexhaustible supply"; Baetjer 1995, p. 340; Vlieger 1995, pp. 21–22, fig. 23, notes the similarity of the main motif to the peacock in Honthoet's Birds on a Balustrade, of 1670 (Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam).

Referenced Materials:

2. "Fine Old Master Drawings," Sotheby's, London, November 25, 1971, nos. 7, 8 (ill. pp. 16, 57); Raleigh and other cities 1994–95, p. 180, figs. 1, 2. The painting with a pelican is not recorded.
3. As noted in Ingamells 1992a, p. 160, with regard to the same motif in the undated Peacocks and Ducks (Wallace Collection, London), where the sunflowers also reappear. See also the paintings by Honthoet sold at Christie's, New York, June 3, 1987, no. 122 (Property of Countess Schönborn), and at Sotheby's, London, July 4, 1990, no. 26.
4. The crane occurs, similarly truncated (by another bird, not the frame), in the undated Peacock and Rooster Fight (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest; see Waausau and other cities 1980–90, no. 2). The same monkey is found in Birds on a Balustrade, dated 1685 (private collection, England).


Ex Coll.: Possibly Cornelis Schille Roos, Amsterdam (his sale, Amsterdam, August 28, 1820, no. 47, to C. F. Roos for Fl 326); possibly Cornelis François Roos, Amsterdam (in 1820); [H. M. Clark, London, until 1926; sold to Colnaghi, London, on November 3, 1926, and resold to Contini-Bonacossi on the same day]; [Conte Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome, 1926–27; sold to Kress]; Samuel H. Kress, New York (1927); Gift of Samuel H. Kress, 1927 37.350.1.
Abraham Hondius
Rotterdam ca. 1637–1691 London

Hondius, as the artist signed himself, is the Latinized form of the artist’s Dutch surname, De Hout. The family may be traced back in Rotterdam to the painter’s grandfather Abraham Daniëlsz de Hout, a mason originally from Zierikzee. He married in 1603, and his second son, Daniel Abrahamsz, also became a mason. The latter married Crijningen Alewijnssdr late in 1650. It has been suggested plausibly that Abraham Daniëlsz was the couple’s first son, who by custom would have been given his paternal grandfather’s name. Furthermore, the artist’s earliest dated works, of 1651, are so accomplished that he could not have been much less than twenty years old when they were painted.1

On April 27, 1635, Hondius married a woman from Rotterdam, Geertruyd Willemse van der Eijck (d. 1681). The fact that the wedding was a civil ceremony, and that the couple later lived (from May 1665 through April 1671) in a house which incorporated a hidden Catholic church, indicates that the painter and his wife were Catholics.2 Their daughter, Geertruyd (ca. 1638–1678), married in a civil ceremony in 1675. Hondius also had a son, Abraham, who became an artist.3

It has been said that Hondius resided in Rotterdam until 1659,4 when he is described as present in Amsterdam. There is no trace of Hondius as a resident of Amsterdam, and, as noted above, he rented living quarters in Rotterdam from 1665 to 1671. Hondius was evidently still in Rotterdam when his property was sold in December 1672.5 By January 1674, when Robert Hooke mentions the artist in his diary, Hondius was established in London, where he had probably settled a year earlier.6 According to Weyerman, Hondius went to England with another man’s wife, and when she died, he married for the second time.7 Shortly before his death (he was buried in the Parish of Saint Bride, Fleet Street, on September 17, 1691), Hondius made out a will naming his wife, Sarah, and his son, Abraham.8

About 113 paintings by Hondius are known.9 The majority are hunting scenes, or fights between animals in nature, which follow the examples of Frans Snyders (1579–1657), Paul de Vos (1596–1678), Jan Fyt (1611–1661), and other Antwerp artists. How Hondius knew this tradition has been the subject of needless speculation, since Flemish art was well known in South Holland, and Antwerp was not far away.10 It is possible, as has been suggested, that Hondius was a pupil of Cornelis Salfcteven (1607–1681), and it is clear that he was influenced by Ludolf de Jongh (q.v.), especially in pictures with men and women resting during or after a hunt.11 These works, and Hondius’s more naturalistic pictures in general, date from the 1650s. In the next decade, Hondius developed a more decorative and theatrical manner, perhaps in response to Flemish history painting, and Dutch artists working in a parallel vein (for example, Abraham Bloemaert [q.v.] and Christiaen van Couwenbergh [1604–1667] in Delft). The hot nocturnal lighting that Hondius employs in his pendant panels Annunciation of the Shepherds and Adoration of the Shepherds, dated 1665 (both in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), recalls Rotterdam night scenes by Adam Colonia (1634–1685) and Egbert van der Poel (1621–1664).12 Colonia left Rotterdam for London shortly after 1670, but it is not known if this had anything to do with Hondius’s move to England.

The earliest dated religious paintings by Hondius are from 1662. Together with his mythological pictures, such as The Rape of Europa, of 1668 (formerly Semenov collection, Saint Petersburg), they remained a minor part of his work.13 Some subjects, like the Annunciation and Christ Appearing to Mary Magdalene, must have been intended for Catholic patrons, and the very large Adoration of the Shepherds, dated 1664 (Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht), may have been painted for a “hidden church” in Rotterdam, perhaps the one next to which Hondius lived from 1665 onward.14

In London, Hondius painted a view of the frozen Thames, dated 1677 (London Museum), and his dramatic picture of a ship stranded in ice (Fitzwilley Museum, Cambridge) probably dates from about the same time.15 The last dated works are from 1689 and 1690.16

1. As observed in Poyer-Verhaa 1998, pp. 151–152, with particular reference to Sportsman Outside an Italian Inn (ibid., fig. 1; sold at Sotheby’s, New York, May 16, 1996, no. 86; subsequently at the Richard Green Gallery, London). Four other pictures dated 1651 are listed in Hentsch 1994, p. 48, nos. 1–4. One of them is also discussed in Rotterdam 1994–95, no. 49.


3. In ibid., p. 151, Geertruyd is described as the only child of Abraham and Geertruyd Hondius, but Abraham (sec ibid.,
pp. 152, 156 n. 15) must also have been a child of this marriage.
The woman Hondius married late in life (according to Weyerman
1729–69, vol. 3, p. 157) could not have had a son who was old
enough to be named an artist at her husband's death.

4. For example, by Christiaan Shuckman in Dictionary of Art 1996,
v. 14, p. 709, following earlier publications.
6. See the slightly inconsistent remarks in ibid., p. 154. Payments to
Hondius dating from 1674 and 1675 indicate that he printed pic-
tures intended for rooms in the Royal College of Physicians.
7. See note 3 above. Presumably this was after Hondius's first wife
had died, in 1681. Hondius is not mentioned in her will (Peyer-
Verhaar 1998, pp. 151, 156 n. 12).
9. Ibid., p. 156 n. 23, referring to Peyer-Verhaar's own doctoral dis-
sertation on the artist (University of Utrecht, 1997).
10. Shuckman (see note 4 above) replaces implausible explanations of
the past with one of his own. Compare Fleischer 1989, pp. 45, 49.
11. See Fleischer 1989, pp. 55–57, figs. 55–57, where a connection
with the Utrecht painter Dirck Stoop (1610–1686) is also noted.
12. The Rijksmuseum paintings are discussed by Weyerman in
Rotterdam 1994–95, p. 184 (under no. 20; pls. on pp. 20–21). In
1685, they were owned by the Dordrecht apothecary and collector
Abraham Heijblom (see Loughman and Montias 2000, pp. 93–
94, figs. 37, 38). Compare Colonia's Anunciation to the Shepherds,
of 1662 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam; ibid.,
no. 11).
14. On this painting and the church in question, see Peyer-Verhaar
1998, p. 153, and Van Eck in Van Schooten and Westerfeld 2003,
pp. 228–30, no. 79. Van Eck discusses sources of the composi-
tion in prints after Rubens and Taddeo Zuccaro.
15. Hentzen 1963, nos. 66, 89, figs. 18, 19.
16. Ibid., nos. 72, 73.

83. Christ among the Doctors

Oil on wood, 13 x 19 1/2 in. (38.1 x 49.5 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): Abraham Hondius/1668

The painting is well preserved. The green robe of the child
holding the book is abraded, and there are several minor
losses in the architecture at upper left. The panel, which
retains its original thickness, is made from one piece of rad-
ially cut oak. The original bevel is present. Underdrawing is
visible in passages where the paint film is transparent, and
examination by infrared reflectography reveals more under-
drawing in the figure of Christ and the figures of Mary
and Joseph.

Gift of Dr. and Mrs. Carl F. Culicchia, 1974–1974.368

The panel, dated 1668, was painted in the artist's native
Rotterdam during the period in which he lived in immediate
proximity to a Catholic “hidden church” (see the biography
above). Hondius treated a number of New Testament themes in
the 1660s and later, some about this scale and others much larger.
On the whole, such works were obviously intended for Catholic
patrons. Although the subject of the present picture would have
had broad appeal in the Netherlands, where religious disputes
were common, the nimbus around Christ's head, the halo over
his mother's head, and the emphasis given to Mary and Joseph
may be described as Catholic iconography.

Luke (2:41–51) relates that the twelve-year-old Jesus entered
the Temple of Jerusalem and engaged its learned elders in the-
ological debate. After three days of searching, Mary and
Joseph discovered their precocious son. Like other Dutch
artists, Hondius treats the doctors as fools, a sure sign of
which is hilarious headgear. The large volumes hauled down
from the bookcase in the right background will be to no avail.

The monumental architecture is conceived in a contempo-
rary classical style like that often depicted by Bartholomeus van
Bassen (ca. 1590–1652).1 Dogs routinely appear in the foregrounds
of religious pictures by Hondius, for reasons that even Christ
and the doctors together would not have been able to explain.2

1. Compare, for example, Van Bassen's Imaginary Church with
Renaissance Arcades, of 1644 (Musum and Art Galleries, Glasgow;
Jantzen 1979, fig. 23).
2. For example, two dogs nearly upstage Christ and the woman
taken in adultery in a panel by Hondius dated 1667, which may
also be compared with the Museum's picture for its architecture
and its high priest. See “Old Master Pictures,” Christie's,
Amsterdam, May 8, 1995, no. 79.


Ex Coll.: Sale, Christie's, London, May 3, 1974, no. 173, for Gm
400 to Holland [Feigen]; [Richard L. Feigen, New York, 1974; sold
to Culicchia]; Dr. and Mrs. Carl F. Culicchia, New Orleans (1974);
Gift of Dr. and Mrs. Carl F. Culicchia, 1974 1974.368
The artist is usually considered the second most important representative of the Delft school, after Johannes Vermeer (q.v.), although the slightly older De Hooch lived in Delft only from about 1654 or 1655 until about 1660. He was born in Rotterdam on November 20, 1629. His father, Hendrick, was a mason, his mother a midwife, occupations that might be said to find reflection in De Hooch's genre scenes.

Houbraken records that the painter was "for some time" a pupil, along with his fellow Rotterdamer Jacob Ochtervelt, of Nicolaes Berchem (q.q.v.) in Haarlem. In the same passage, the biographer observes that De Hooch, "who was excellent in the painting of interior views," followed the older Rotterdamer artist Ludolf de Jongh (q.v.). De Hooch was also closely linked with another specialist in genre scenes, Hendrick van der Burch (1627–1665 or later), who was most probably the brother of Jannetje van der Burch, the woman De Hooch married on May 3, 1654. The Van der Burchs lived in Delft, while De Hooch was said to be a resident of Rotterdam at the time. However, both De Hooch and Hendrick van der Burch were recorded as residents of Delft when they witnessed a will on August 5, 1652, and they both had contacts in Leiden. In May 1653, "de Hooch, schilder [painter]," was described as in the service of Justus de la Grange (also called Justinius de la Oranje), a linen merchant who lived in Delft and Leiden, and who in 1659 owned eleven pictures by the artist.

Children born to De Hooch and his wife were baptized in Delft in February 1655 and in November 1656. He joined the painters' guild on September 20, 1655, and paid dues to the guild in the following two years. Although paintings by De Hooch have been dated as early as about 1650 and a fair number have been placed in the mid-1650s, the earliest known works to bear dates are of 1658. Several pictures by De Hooch of about 1658–60 feature details of domestic and other architecture that derive from buildings in Delft.

Like other Delft and Leiden painters in the 1650s, De Hooch moved to the flourishing art center of Amsterdam (probably in 1660, and before April 1661, when one of his daughters was baptized in the Westerkerk). Burial records of two children dating from 1663 and 1665 cite modest addresses for De Hooch and his family, but by May 1668 they were living on the more respectable Konijnenstraat. Nothing is known of their lives after the birth of their seventh child in May 1672, except that the painter was buried on March 24, 1684, and that he had died in the dolinuis (madhouse).

The pictures painted after the French invasion of 1672 are on the whole inferior to those of the previous decade but include works as accomplished as A Musical Party in a Courtyard, of 1677 (National Gallery, London). The paintings of the early 1680s are almost uniformly mediocre in execution and formulaic in design.

De Hooch is routinely credited with influencing Vermeer, which he did to some extent, but both artists benefited from earlier pictures of domestic life painted in the South Holland area and elsewhere. The two artists shared a predilection, if not the same talent, for describing effects of light and space. To a remarkable degree, these interests compensate for De Hooch's modest abilities as a figure painter. His warm colors and restful compositions create a sense of well-being about the homely and usually innocent situations in which his inarticulate protagonists find themselves. De Hooch was quickly responsive to recent trends, like the guardroom scenes of De Jongh, Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (q.v.), and Jacob van Loo (1641–1670); the use of linear perspective by architectural painters like Hendrick van Vliet (q.v.); and the fashionable themes of such masters as Vermeer, Gerard ter Borch, and Gabriël Metsu (q.q.v.). Nonetheless, De Hooch's reputation rests on what he accomplished intuitively. A passage of sunlight, an intimate corner of space, or the quiet communion of a mother and child will reveal in De Hooch's work a sympathy for everyday existence that justifies his fame as the quintessential painter of domestic life.11

2. On this point, see Fleischer 1928 and Kuretsky 1979, p. 4.
3. P. Sutton 1980a, pp. 9, 145–46 (docs. 18, 19, 21). On Van der Burch as a painter, see P. Sutton 1980b.
5. P. Sutton 1980a, pp. 9, 145–46 (docs. 13, 16, 23). The term dienaar in the document does not imply that De Hooch was a "servant"
in the usual sense, as supposed in Frantis 1989. See De Jongh 1980, p. 182.
8. See MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 196, on this point. Delft motifs in paintings of the Amsterdam period are virtually irrelevant to the
question, as the oeuvre of Emanuel de Witte (q.v.) demonstrates.
10. As discussed in Liedtke 2000a, chap. 4.
11. This biography depends primarily upon P. Sutton 1980a, pp. 9–10; P. Sutton in London–Hartford 1998–99, pp. 14–15; and

84. The Visit

Oil on wood, 26¼ x 23 in. (67.9 x 58.4 cm)  
Inscribed (above cityscape in background): POTLSJEMA/ CAR[ ]...URBS...[MPLIERUM...DOMINA][X]

The painting is in good condition despite some abrasions in the wood ceiling, in the portrait hanging at far right, and in the bed and hat at lower right. The figural group and window are well preserved, although the still life on the table is damaged. The inscription and the harbor scene on the wall hanging are very difficult to read. This is due partly to abrasion and partly to the pentimento of a portrait turned upside down, over which the present composition was painted. X-radiography reveals that the head of that portrait was tried out in two different positions. In the present painting, there are changes in the position of the hat worn by the standing man, the hat on the floor at lower right, and the kneecap back leg of the seated man.

H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O.
Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.7

The Havemeyer De Hooch dates from about 1657, when the artist was on the threshold of his mature style. In 1864 (see Refs.) and 1866, Thoré paid this “superbe tableau” the compliment of attributing it to Vermeer, although Smith in 1833 (see Refs.) had considered it “a good example” of De Hooch’s manner. The price paid by the Havemeyers at the Secrétan sale of 1889 was one of the highest for a Dutch painting during the nineteenth century.

Modern critics have mostly praised the picture, often crediting some of its quality to the influence of Vermeer. Cleaning and conservation in 1995–96 and the painting’s inclusion in exhibitions since then have increased understanding of its key position in De Hooch’s development.

Compared with almost any earlier painting by the artist, this one is more successful in its suggestion of an interior space that is established primarily by the architecture rather than by figure groups and furniture. The ceiling beams, the window, and an arbitrary seam in the floor establish main lines of recession, which are assisted by the bench and the raised shutter to the left, the nearest chair (which is aligned orthogonally), and to some extent the covered table. However, the underscaled bed and the rather sudden shift of scale within the figure group reveal that De Hooch adopted devices he had yet to master. Similarly, the watercolor view of a Mediterranean port and the conservative portrait of a man would not quite manage to define the wall plane even if the bed were hauled away. The progress in depth from the hat on the floor through the dark shadow (laid down like a rug) to the man’s coat thrown over a chair seems like a naif response to schemes Hendrick van Vliet and Emanuel de Witte (q.v.) had employed (compare the steps into space on the right in Pl. 222). Still clearly recognizable is the composition’s development from De Hooch’s inn scenes of a few years before, not only in the outline of space but in the interplay of light and shadow.

Vermeer made similar but bolder progress in constructing interior space at about the same time: the additive filling of voids found in A Maid Asleep (Pl. 202) is replaced by an illusionistic corner of space in The Letter Reader (Young Woman Reading a Letter), of about 1657 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), where the intersection of walls is handled somewhat as in the present painting. A strong recession is more precisely defined in Vermeer’s Cavalier and Young Woman (Frick Collection, New York), of about the same date. Hints that Vermeer influenced De Hooch in The Visit may be detected in
the reflection of the woman's head and red jacket in the window glass to the left (which recalls the window in the Dresden picture) and in the highlighted red jacket itself (fig. 93), which together with the woman in a yellow jacket and white scarf unexpectedly remind one of the two figures diagonally juxtaposed in the Frick canvas. The subject of the latter painting, with its intimate encounter between a man and a woman at the corner of a table, passages like the sunlight on the tabletop, and motifs such as the map on the wall and the design on the backs of the chairs (gold diamonds on black leather, with lion's head finials) suggest that De Hooch was absorbing various impressions, some of them perhaps unconsciously, from his slightly younger colleague.

As the present writer has stressed elsewhere, the contemporaneous efforts of De Hooch and Vermeer to define the space of a typical domestic interior (which, however plausible, is always invented) represent the local culmination of a development that was already well under way in the South Holland area (which includes Delft, The Hague, Leiden, Rotterdam, and Dordrecht). The Museum's domestic scene by Hendrick Sorgh (Pl. 194), for example, painted about 1645–50 in De Hooch's native Rotterdam (where he lived as late as 1654), is one of many genre interiors of the 1640s and early 1650s that anticipate the overall design and some of the specific devices that De Hooch used to construct the interior spaces of this and similar pictures. The grouping of figures and perhaps the shadowy and atmospheric space also recall paintings of courting couples by Gerard ter Borch (q.v.) that date from the early to mid-1620s, a few of which were evidently known in Delft. What remains distinctive of De Hooch himself in this picture is the importance of daylight and shadows for the sense of space, atmosphere, and mood, and also the reticent figures, which, compared with those making theatrical gestures in some of his earlier works, appear more consistent with a style based on observation.

The subject of the Havemeyer painting is as conventional as its composition. Two young women, one of whom wears a revealing bodice and a knowing smile, entertain two gentlemen whose mood is suggested by discarded items of outerwear and by their hands, which grip a clay pipe, the back of a chair, and a woman's wrist. The Delftware bowl on the table contains oysters or another delicacy; what appears to be a silver fork and a slice of lemon invite the visitors to help themselves. The harbor scene on the wall must be meant to suggest worldly sophistication, since the city resembles Venice, which had a reputation for courtesans and luxury goods. Like other pictures of the late 1650s by De Hooch, Ludolf de Jongh (q.v.), Gabriel Metsu (see Pl. 116), and other genre painters, *The Visit* represents the domestication of a social theme that had earlier been set mostly in taverns and bordellos. In slightly later works (for example, *Leisure Time in an Elegant Setting*; Pl. 87), De Hooch would depict more luxurious rooms—and superficially more polite behavior—than appear in paintings such as this important transitional work.

1. Thoré 1866, p. 316 ("je crois, sans pouvoir jusqu'ici le prouver").
2. According to Reitlinger 1961, vol. 1, p. 140, this De Hooch "achieved the record for any Dutch picture in the last century at £11,040." Esmée Quodbach kindly brought this reference to my attention, and pointed out that the Havemeyers paid more for Rembrandt's *Herman Doomer* (Pl. 148) at about the same time (see Quodbach 2004, p. 107).
3. Compare, for example, New York–London 2001, nos. 23, 24. In this entry, the present writer repeats several lines from ibid., no. 25.
7. The inscription above the cityscape in the present picture was probably never meant to be decipherable, apart from generally appropriate words such as "city" and "+year" of our lord."

**REFERENCES:** J. Smith 1839–42, vol. 4 (1833), p. 229, no. 34, calls it "a good example of the master," in the collection of Baron Delassert [sic]; Delessert Collection 1844, p. 24, no. 58, as by De Hooch, described; Thoré 1864, p. 313, overrules the De Hooch attribution in favor of Vermeer; Thoré 1866, pp. 316–17, 351, no. 14, acknowledges J. Smith's attribution to De Hooch but regards many of the painting's characteristics as "bien vermeeresque"; Blanc 1869, pp. 202–4 (ill. opp. p. 202, engraving by Ch. Couroyer), offers a long description and consideration of the attribution to Vermeer, which the writer rejects; Havard 1879–81, vol. 3, pp. 104–5, as La collation by De Hooch; Havard 1888, p. 36, no. 15, lists the picture as the Conversation by Vermeer; Bredius 1889, p. 161 n. 2, considers this one of De Hooch's finest works, and notes the price obtained in the sale of the same year, 1889; Hofstede de Groot 1892, pp. 188 no. 876, 189 no. 34, as "the famous interior" by De Hooch, now in America; Bode 1895, pp. 17 (ill.), 72, as a superior work by De Hooch in the Havemeyer collection; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 1 (1906), pp. 716–17, as an example of one of the high prices paid for a De Hooch, and calls the picture *La consultation*, a "Hauptwerk"; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), pp. 329–30, no. 192, as by De Hooch, "a
Figure 93. Detail of De Hooch’s *The Visit* (Pl. 84)
good picture, powerful and luminous in the rendering of light and colour”; Cortissoz 1909, pp. 166–67, as Mrs. Havemeyer’s “brilliant picture of ‘The Visit’”; Van de Velde in New York 1909, p. 54, no. 53 (ill.), as The Visit (first use of this title), “about 1658”; Cox 1909–10, p. 305, describes the work as “an altogether exceptional picture,” and compares it with Vermeer; Breek 1910, p. 57, as from De Hooch’s best period, 1655–65; Valentin 1910, p. 9, as the finest of six De Hooch’s in the 1909 exhibition; Waldmann 1910, p. 82, as the best De Hooch in the 1909 exhibition, dating from about 1660; Jantzen 1912, p. 24, notes the “strict division of the picture plane” as characteristic of all Dutch interior views dating from this period; De Rudder 1914, p. 105, listed; Valentin 1926, pp. 47, 61, fig. 2, dates the painting to about 1663 and analyzes the composition, which possesses “a serenity and dignity originating in Italy and France”; Brière-Misme 1927, pp. 37 (ill.), as La collection, sometimes called La courtoise, compares other works by De Hooch, and draws attention to the high prices paid for the painting in 1869, 1883, and 1889; Valentin 1927, pp. 74, 76, no. 7, as reminiscent of Vermeer’s Cavalier and Young Woman in the Frick Collection; Bredius 1928, p. 65, as Das Frühstück, a famous work; Mather 1935, pp. 474 (ill.), 462, mistakes the work for an example of De Hooch’s “later and courtly” manner; New York 1930, p. 12, no. 71 (ill.); Valentin 1930a, pp. xix, xv–xvi, 62 (ill.), 275, dates the work to about 1661, and describes it as “one of the artist’s masterpieces” and one of the most important Dutch pictures to have entered a private collection in America; Wehle 1930, p. 60, as a “beautiful work from Pieter de Hooch’s best period,” in the exhibition of the Havemeyer collection; B. Burroughs 1934a, p. 168, as The Visit; Valentin 1932, p. 317, detects the influence of Vermeer; Wüstenhofer 1937, p. 82, dates the work to about 1655–60; Havemeyer 1961, p. 19, recalls the purchase of 1889, and her husband’s favoring the painting over a Courbet as “the sort of thing to buy”; Rettinger 1960, vol. 1, p. 140, notes the very high price at which the picture sold in the Secrétan sale of 1889; P. Sutton 1980a, p. 79, no. 19, pl. 18, dates it to about 1657, compares other works, and offers a more complete reading of the (partly restored) inscription above the harbor scene; Weitenhofer 1982, pp. 109, 119 n. 24, 127, 131–33, 138, 144–45 n. 37, 149, 166 n. 7; Weitenhofer 1986, pp. 18, 66, 77 (ill. p. 224; installation photograph of the 1915 exhibition; see Exh. below), 234, recalls the picture’s history in the Havemeyer collection; Liedtke 1990, p. 40, as “De Hooch’s prototypical picture” of about 1657 in the Havemeyer bequest; Havemeyer 1991, p. 19, 191, 310 n. 37, 326 n. 268, repeats Havemeyer 1961; Liedtke in New York 1993, p. 65; Rabinow in ibid., pp. 90 (installation photograph of the 1915 exhibition; see Exh. below), 91, 95 (no. 5); Stein in ibid., pp. 209 pl. 187, 214, 212, 283; Wald in ibid., pp. 349–50, no. 326 (ill.), reviews the painting’s history in the Havemeyer collection; Baetjer 1995, p. 322; Jowell 1995, pp. 126–27 n. 29, fig. 7, quotes Thoré’s excited remark about the high price fetched in the Delessert sale; Jowell 1996, pp. 123–24, fig. 69, notes Thoré’s delight as the high price fetched by the “Delessert de Hooch,” which in his view was by Vermeer; Kersten in Delft 1996, pp. 143–45, 226, fig. 154 (photograph taken before conservation in 1995–96), describes the painting as a pioneering example of De Hooch’s “new type of interior”; Paris 1997–98, pp. 17, 34, 35 (ill.), 104, no. 6, notes the Havemeyer purchase; P. Sutton in London–Hartford 1998–99, pp. 13, 26, 28, 31, 102–3, no. 8 (ill.), suggests a date of about 1657–58, observes that the work’s “painterly technique” suited late-nineteenth-century taste, and notes that it was “handled by the famous dealer to the Impressionists, Durand-Ruel, who sold it to the Havemeyers, whose depths in Impressionism are legendary”; Liedtke 2000a, pp. 128, 144, 148, 161, 175–79, 232, 282–83 n. 156, fig. 242, pl. xii, places the work within De Hooch’s development and compares works by Ludolf de Jongh; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 16, 113, 115, 140, 156, 270, 270–72, 280, 351, 376, no. 25 (ill.); Rüger 2001, pp. 47–48, fig. 40.


**EX COLL.:** Possibly Jacob Odon, Amsterdam (his sale, Arnoldus Dankmeyer en Zoon, Amsterdam, September 6ff., 1784, no. 10; bought by Braams Pelsdinge for Fl 300); Baron François Delessert, Paris (by 1833; his sale, at his hôtel, Paris, March 15–18, 1869, no. 36, for Fr 150,000 to Narischkine); B. Narischkine (in 1869; his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, April 5, 1883, no. 16, for Fr 160,000 to Cedron); E. Secrétan, Paris (his sale, Galerie Charles Sedelmeyer, Paris, July 1–7, 1889, no. 128, for Fr 276,000 to Durand-Ruel for the Havemeyers); Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1889–1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–d. 1929); H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.7
85. *A Woman and Two Men in an Arbor*

Oil on wood, overall 17¼ x 14¾ in. (44.1 x 37.5 cm); painted surface 17 x 14¾ in. (43.2 x 36.5 cm)
Signed (lower left, largely illegible): P. [de hoogh?]

The painting has suffered severe abrasion and was restored before entering the collection. Although extensive, the restoration faithfully follows the original figures and features. X-radiography reveals that for this painting De Hooch reused a panel cut from a portrait of a woman by another hand.

Bequest of Harry G. Specter, 1971 1976.100.25

While not in good condition and a minor work by De Hooch, this panel from the Specter bequest is interesting for its place in the artist’s development. It dates from about 1657–58 and, like *The Visit* (Pl. 84), represents a transitional phase between De Hooch’s tavern scenes of the early 1650s and his domestic interiors and courtyard views of about 1658 onward. The earlier works recall Haarlem-style genre pictures in which figure groups dominate and largely define the space, and strong contrasts of light and shadow enrich a restricted palette (the Museum’s panel by Pieter Quast is a good example; see Pl. 139). In the present work, by contrast, the illumination is fairly even throughout (the paint has probably darkened with age in the shadows of the arbor), and local colors create a rich effect. The woman’s wine-red jacket, set off by the deep green foliage, is echoed by roses to the left. Other color accents include the smoker’s orange-red stockings, the woman’s blue ribbons, and the patch of blue sky.

The hostess holds a pitcher and a glass of wine. The young man, his left arm jauntily akimbo, holds a clay pipe and responds to the woman’s smile. In front of him on the table are an open packet of tobacco and a pot of coals for lighting up. The older man behind him, who appears to be reading a letter, may be serving as a chaperone for the young woman, whose attire is modest and middle-class. The young man must be stopping by briefly, since he has not removed his hat or sword (the latter, and his leather jerkin, *or kolder*, suggest that he is a soldier). The chair and cushion have been brought from inside to this cozy corner of a garden behind a private house.

De Hooch painted a similar subject in a canvas of about 1658–60 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; autograph replica in the Mauritshuis, The Hague), but there the woman is a maid. The artist’s *Woman and Child in a Courtyard*, also dating from about 1658–60 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), includes two men and a woman seated at a table under a more imposing arbor, but the principal figures are a maid and child. In a canvas of about 1663–65 in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, De Hooch depicts a more assertive young man with a pipe and a young woman with a glass of lemonade at a table in a courtyard behind a fine brick house. A smiling maid stands close by with a glass of beer and seems (to judge from her cautious conviviality) to play the role of chaperone.

The subject of the Museum’s picture may be described as innocent courtship, and in this the work differs from many of De Hooch’s amorous scenes of about the same date (Pl. 84) and earlier, and from the purely domestic pictures that he painted from about 1657 onward. Like Jacob van Loo (1614–1670) and Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (q.v.) in Amsterdam, who in the early 1650s depicted socializing couples on garden terraces (see Pl. 43), De Hooch in this painting modernizes the tradition of Merry Companies set in gardens in a way that is personal but also consistent with current trends. The ostentatious garden parties painted in the first quarter of the century by David Vinckboons (q.v.), Willem Buytewech (1603–1624), Esaias van de Velde (1617–1670), and Dirck Hals (q.v.) are recalled by the arbor, but in other respects De Hooch has brought the romantic theme of the Garden of Love down to earth in Delft.

1. On the jerkin, see Albany 2002, p. 98.
5. See Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, nos. 43, 64.

References: Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), p. 582, no. 506, cites the painting as in the Sellar sale (see below); Wilhelm von Bode, in a letter dated March 3, 1912 (curatorial files), dates it to about 1657–59, and considers De Hooch’s wife to have modeled for the woman; Valentin 1950a, pp. 37 (ill.), 370, as an excellent work of about 1656, signed “P. d. Hoogh”; P. Sutton 1980a, p. 80, no. 23, pl. 20, as “surely genuine,” from about 1657–60; Baetjer 1995, p. 332; Lokin in Delft 1996, p. 109, fig. 93, as conveying an “impression of order and peace.”

360 PIETER DE HOOCH
86. Interior with a Young Couple

Oil on canvas, 21⅜ x 24⅛ in. (54.9 x 62.9 cm)

The painting has suffered extensive abrasion and has gradually darkened overall as the thinly applied paint layers have become more transparent. Despite its compromised condition, many passages retain the sensitive fall of light characteristic of the artist’s serenely quiet interiors.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913  14.40.613

The Altman painting by De Hooch dates from the early or mid-1660s, when the artist worked in Amsterdam. The same compositional type, with an open doorway, an interior window with a curtain, an enclosed bed, and a receding wall with a window to one side, was employed by De Hooch in several paintings dating from about 1658–60, among them The Bedroom, in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., and A Mother and Child (Maternal Duty), in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.1 However, the marble floor, the gilt-leather wall covering in the background, and the awkwardly intimate figures look forward to works of a few years later, such as An Officer and a Woman Conversing, and a Soldier at a Window, of about 1665–65, in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg, and the morning-after scene of 1665 in Raby Castle, County Durham (fig. 94).2 De Hooch placed an impasto parallelogram of sunlight in several interior views of about 1665–68 (see Pl. 88), an effect that is anticipated here. The passages of light and a few cast shadows (for example, that of the chair to the right) are among the best-preserved passages of the painting (see the condition note above). Cleaning and conservation carried out in 2005 substantially improved the picture’s appearance.

The idea that the couple is married and “prêts à sortir pour la promenade” may be dismissed by comparing other interior scenes with a bed, a mirror, and a dog placed in close proximity to the figures (see the discussion of The Maidervant; Pl. 88).3 Rather, the woman’s attention to her visitor probably depends, like the dog’s, on the prospect of compensation.

De Hooch often used paintings within paintings to comment upon scenes similar to this one (see Pl. 87), whereas in other pictures they serve simply as decoration. In the Altman canvas, the painting over the doorway (a still life?) seems to have been included for formal reasons alone; indeed, it contributes to one of the artist’s most insistently rectilinear designs, in which even the figures and the dog appear to have been assigned specific places. The result in some pictures, and perhaps here, is a certain tension between social order and the natural inclinations of humanity.

1. For the Washington painting, see Wheelock 1998, pp. 133–36.

The Amsterdam canvas is discussed in New York–London 2001, no. 34. Both pictures are catalogued by P. Sutton in London–Hartford 1998–99, nos. 21, 23, where the Altman painting is compared.

2. P. Sutton 1980a, no. 55, pl. 58, and no. 69, pl. 72.

3. The quote is from Monod 1923, p. 310.

References: Hofstede de Groot 1892, p. 186, no. 71; Bode 1900, no. 14, pl. x, compares the light with Vermeer’s; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 1 (1906), p. 717, listed as in the Kanz collection; Bode 1907, vol. 1, pp. vi, 55, no. 52 (ills.); Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), pp. 496–97, no. 74, dates the painting about 1665; Nicolle 1905, p. 197, as jeune couple se préparent à sortir: Altman Collection 1914, no. 14; Monod 1923, p. 310, follows Hofstede de Groot’s dating and Nicolle’s interpretation; Lilienfeld 1924, p. 454, listed; Collins Baker
Figure 94. Pieter de Hooch, A Man with a Glass of Wine and a Woman Lacing Her Bodice, 1665. Oil on canvas, 31 x 25¼ in. (73.5 x 64 cm). The Lord Barnard Collection, Raby Castle, County Durham, England
87. Leisure Time in an Elegant Setting

Oil on canvas, 23 x 27½ in. (58.3 x 69.4 cm)
Signed (lower left, on crosspiece of chair): P. D. Hooch
Robert Lehman Collection, 1973 1973.1.144

Dutch paintings in the Robert Lehman Collection are catalogued by Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann in The Robert Lehman Collection, II (Sterling et al. 1998).

The picture is generally dated to about 1663–65. In his catalogue entry, Haverkamp-Begemann gives special attention to the gilt-leather wall covering, which De Hooch used in three other interior scenes of about the same date.¹

¹ Haverkamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, p. 162. “Gilt” leather was actually silvered and then toned with varnish, as described by H. van Soest in The Hague-Groningen 1989, pp. 13–17, and as noted in Koldewey 1996, p. 136. The Amsterdam conservator Elizabet Nijhoff Asser first brought this fact to our attention, and reports that tests indicate that silver was used invariably (personal communication, 2003).

REFERENCES (additional to those given by Haverkamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, pp. 160–63, no. 35 [ill.]): P. Sutton in London–Hartford 1998–99, pp. 45, 64, 146, 148–49, no. 28, notes that a sample of gilt leather with the same pattern is preserved in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, compares other works by De Hooch, and discusses the subject’s significance; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 133, 144–45, 270, fig. 160, cites the painting as a precedent for Hendrick van der Burch’s interior scene of about 1665 in the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and considers the Lehman picture an example of De Hooch’s increasing interest in themes of wealth and fashion during the 1660s in Amsterdam; Saunders 2002, pp. 121–22, pl. 106, discusses the gilt-leather wall hanging, and notes that the design is known from a contemporary Dutch engraving, “one of a series of published prints which seem to have been produced as advertisements for popular patterns.”


Oil on canvas, 24¼ x 20½ in. (61.6 x 52.1 cm)

The paint surface is abraded throughout, and the surface texture has been flattened by lining in the past. Along the lower edge, there are losses in the area below the maid servant and the dog. Judging from the depth of cupping visible along all edges in the x-radiograph, it is possible that the original support was made from a strip of fabric one ell, or 27½ in. (70 cm), wide, a standard width for fabrics in the seventeenth century. The painting has been extended at the top by a 1 in. (2.5 cm) canvas strip and further enlarged by a stretcher that increased its height by 1¼ in. (3.2 cm) and its width by 1 in.

The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.15

The Friedsam de Hooch is a fragment of a broader canvas that has been dated convincingly to about 1667–70. The original state of the picture was described in the catalogue of an Amsterdam auction (the De Pinto sale) in 1785:

Height 22 breadth 27 duim [inches], on Canvas. [lot] 2
This attractive Composition [Ordonnante] depicts a furnished room, on the right side a young woman [Juffrouw] lies in bed and appears to speak to her husband, who is in his housecoat [Japen] sitting on a chair, occupied with pulling on his stockings. Next to him on a table covered with a carpet is a coat with fur trim and a hat, [and] in the foreground a graceful woman servant with a washbasin and pitcher, which she carries firmly with two hands. One sees another room further back through an open doorway. Everything is wonderfully natural in handling and the reflection of sunlight against the wall is rendered cleverly, with a pleasing palette and detailed execution.

The size of the canvas as recorded in 1785 was approximately 22 x 27 inches (the duim is only .03 cm larger than an inch), which would mean that the picture has lost about 6½ inches (16.5 cm) on the right, but has gained about 2¼ inches (5.7 cm) in height. The female figure is about seven inches from the left frame; if a similar strip were added to the canvas on the right, the entire bed would probably fit within the composition and the woman would be more strongly balanced by the two figures on the right. Nevertheless, the figure was always prominent, framed in the brilliant yellow pattern of dappled sunlight and with the receding ceiling beams and dog drawing attention in her direction. De Hooch has given the woman a certain gravity of expression and pose, which is enhanced by the fall of the towel draped over her arm and the flutelike folds of her voluminous skirt.

The subject has been misunderstood from at least 1785 until fairly recently, when the visible figures were described as existential lovers who "turn away from each other and from the light and from us," and the former couple to the right were considered "quite possibly married." The so-called maid servant is actually another kind of "working girl," as her elegant attire makes clear. A purple skirt, similar to the blue one worn by the young woman, has been tossed onto the table, followed by a woman's fur-trimmed jacket and a man's hat. The motif of pulling on a stocking and that of a dog nosing about were both recognized in De Hooch's day as sexual innuendos when the context supported such readings. The two mirrors, placed over tables in each of the rooms, reflect marble floor tiles and the wisdom that all worldly pleasure is vanity. In this case, the basin and pitcher are ironic reminders of purity (compare their use in paintings by Ter Borch and Vermeer; Pls. 13 and 203).

In an earlier painting (of about 1667?), in the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow, De Hooch depicted an apparently tired cavalier pulling on his boots, while a woman makes up the bed. As in the Museum's picture, the fall of sunlight suggests a morning hour and the disconnected demeanor of the figures implies that they do not know each other well. A canvas by De Hooch dated 1665 in Raby Castle, County Durham (see fig. 94), shows a more convivial morning-after scene, with a woman threading her bodice and a man in a nightshirt offering her a glass of wine. A dog and a partly covered painting of a female nude underscore the situation. The New York painting, in its stillness and illumination, also recalls Emanuel de Witte's well-known Interior with a Woman Playing a Virginal, of about 1665–67 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), where a maid sweeps in the background, a large mirror reflects a musician, and an all-but-forgotten man (whose street clothes are on a chair in the foreground) looks with surprise at the viewer from the shadows of a covered bed.

De Hooch's variations on an amorous theme must have been appreciated in his time as cosmopolitan entertainments. If they are rarely as understated as Vermeer's scenes of courtship, they are never as obvious as those by Steen (see Pl. 193). Nonetheless, the present picture's subject was evidently too flagrant for an early-nineteenth-century owner. In a certificate
dated February 17, 1831, "the undersigned Henry Héris, expert of the Musée Royal in Brussels," describes the picture ("now in the possession of Mr. Arnold of New York") as measuring 24½ x 20½ "English inches" (its present size) and as depicting a young woman, a table with some clothing on it, and a dog. No man or bed is mentioned. In a note to Kleinberger Galleries dated March 12, 1916, the conservator H. A. Hammond Smith reported that in cleaning the picture, "to my surprise the figure of the man seated in the chair and the bed appeared, both having been entirely covered with repainting. This repainting, I take it, must have antedated 1839 when M. Héris sold the picture to Col. Brie." 

1. P. Sutton 1980a, no. 79, revising Valentin 1930a (see Refs.).
2. See Ex Coll. below. The canvas in the De Pinto sale was identified with the Friedsam picture for the first time by Brière-Misme 1927 (see Refs.).
3. F. Robinson in Saint Petersburg-Atlanta 1975, p. 44.
5. Compare the costumes of the mistress of the house (who holds linen) and the maid in De Hooch's The Linen Chest, of 1665 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which are described in Franits 1993a, p. 104, fig. 88.
6. On the stocking, see Amsterdam 1976, no. 68 (cited in reference to this painting by P. Sutton 1980a, p. 71 n. 97), and no. 64. Kous (stocking or sock) was a slang term for vagina, and feet were considered phallic. See also De Jongh in the discussion in Washington-Amsterdam 1996-97, pp. 47-49, and p. 111, where Wheelock cites the Dutch proverb "Kaart, kous en kan maakt een arm man" (Card, stocking, and jug [meaning cardplaying, womanizing, and drinking] makes many a man poor); also pp. 160, 162, nn. 1, 8. Dogs occur suggestively in too many paintings to cite, but see Amsterdam 1976, no. 51 (especially fig. 5b), and the discussion of Steen's The Loveick Maiden (Pl. 199).
7. P. Sutton 1980a, no. 15, pl. 13, proposes a date of about 1655-57. The composition may be inspired by an illustration in a racy songbook, Inogniti scriptoris nova poenata (Leiden, 1624); see De Jongh in Amsterdam 1976, p. 239, fig. 68b.
8. Which, pace P. Sutton 1980a, p. 98 (under no. 69 [pl. 72]), has nothing to do with "lovers [in the modern sense] or a married couple."
10. Original certificate in curatorial files. For Héris, see Ex Coll.
11. Original letter in curatorial files.

REFERENCES: Catalogue of the Aron de Joseph de Pinto sale, Amsterdam, Oude Zijds Heeren Logement, April 11, 1785, no. 2 (quoted in full above); Blanc 1877-78, vol. 2, p. 441, records the Paris sale of 1841; Hofstede de Groot 1927-27, vol. 1 (1907), pp. 498-99, no. 80, cites the painting both as Gentleman and Lady in a Bedroom, with a description based on that in the 1785 sale catalogue, and pp. 311-2, no. 95, as The Maid-Servant, with a description based on that in the 1841 sale catalogue; Pène du Bois 1917, p. 399 (ill.); Brière-Misme 1927, pp. 268-70 (ill.), identifies the painting as both nos. 80 and 95 in Hofstede de Groot; Valentin 1927, p. 77, listed; Valentin 1938a, unpagd, describes the composition, and records a signature on the border of the table carpet, "P.D.H.," of which no trace remains today; Valentin 1930a, pp. 127 (ill.), 284, dates the painting to about 1670-75, and misdates the De Pinto sale to 1875; Burroughs and Wehle 1912, pp. 48-49, no. 84, refers to the eighteenth-century sale catalogue and concludes that the picture was cut down; Barnouw 1944, pl. 20; F. Robinson in Saint Petersburg-Atlanta 1975, pp. 43-45, no. 30, misinterprets the subject and dates the painting to the early 1670s; P. Sutton 1980a, pp. 50, 100, no. 79, pl. 82, suggests a date of about 1667-70; Baetjer 1995, p. 331; Havercamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, p. 167 n. 14.


Ex Coll.: Aron de Joseph de Pinto (his sale, Amsterdam, April 11, 1785, no. 2, sold [bought in?] for Fl 45 to Philippus van der Schley, one of the sale's organizers); "Van Heilsleuter" collection [probably Van Eyl Shuyter, Amsterdam], according to the 1841 sale catalogue; [Henry Héris, Brussels, sold in 1839 to Col. Brie for FFr 6,000]; Colonel Brie [not Bire, as occasionally recorded], Brussels (1839-41); his anonymous sale, organized by Héris, Hôtel Rue des Jeuneurs, 16, rue des Jeuneurs, Paris, March 31, 1841, no. 12, for FFr 5,950; Mawson (until 1850), his anonymous sale, 42, rue des Jeuneurs, Paris, February 22-23, 1850, no. 31, sold for FFr 1980; Mr. Arnold, New York, in 1851 (according to Héris's certificate dated Feb. 17, 1851); H. A. Hammond Smith, New York (until 1916, according to Kleinberger's bill of sale); [Kleinberger Gallery, New York; bought from Smith on March 9, 1916, and sold to Friedsam on February 22, 1917, for $22,000]; Michael Friedsam, New York (1917-18); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.15

368 PIETER DE HOOCH
89. Paying the Hostess

Oil on canvas, 37 3/4 x 43 3/4 in. (94.6 x 111.1 cm)
Signed (upper right, on beam): P d’Hoogh

The condition of the work is good, although the paint surface has been flattened by lining.

Gift of Stuart Borchard and Evelyn B. Metzger, 1958 58.144

Of the various human comedies that De Hooch set in city taverns and country inns, the theme of settling accounts with the establishment is not the most familiar. The subject of the present picture, however, is anticipated in a painting of about 1660–55 by De Hooch’s Rotterdam colleague Ludolf de Jongh (q.v.) and in De Hooch’s own Paying the Hostess, of 1658 (private collection, London). The Museum’s painting, which dates from about 1670, does not closely resemble either earlier work, although the De Jongh features strongly receding horse stalls with a large doorway to the left, and the De Hooch includes a table with figures in a sunlit corner of the background. A few other Dutch artists depicted the motif of a disputed reckoning; the sour mood and arrangement of the figures in De Hooch’s painting of 1658 are anticipated in Adriaen van Ostade’s etching of about 1646, The Peasant Settling His Debt. The subject must have struck a chord with travelers along Holland’s busy roads and waterways, as well as travelers abroad. In 1668, Samuel Pepys (who had visited Delft in 1660) recorded a similar incident after an outing to Stonehenge: “So home to dinner [at his inn in Salisbury];
and, that being done, paid the reckoning, which was so exorbitant, and particularly in rate of my horses, and 7s. 6d. for bread and beer, that I was mad, and resolve to trouble the mistress about it.4

De Hooch enlivens the same theme in the present picture by transforming the customer (normally a more humble character) into a dandified gentleman and the proprietress into a pretty young woman with a flair for settling accounts. The figures' expressions and comparatively relaxed poses suggest that they are flirting as well as bargaining. Inn scenes often feature canine commentary (see Pl. 59), but here the dog is probably just a dog, and an effective spatial device.

Like many interiors by De Hooch this one is remarkable for its rendering of light, which may be that of late afternoon. Sunlight falls at a low angle through the doorway and through the window in the background. Various highlights draw attention to the hay, to the man's red coat with its gold lining and accents, and to otherwise mundane details like the broom in the left foreground. Silhouetted motifs, such as the wagon wheel, the woman with a baby, and the old smoker in a fur hat by the fireplace, have been handled with an eye to artistic effect. The illumination of shadowy areas—the horse stalls and hayloft, the rafters in the background—is also described with skill, enhancing the nearly symmetrical recession of the interior; the diagonal alignment of figures and objects also suggests depth. In the best works of his later career, De Hooch brought something of Delft to Amsterdam, where few painters of modern life (for example, Metsu; see Pl. 118) were as successful in creating the illusion of direct observation.

1. For the De Hooch of 1658, see New York—London 2001, no. 32, where the panel by De Jongh (art market, New York) is reproduced as fig. 256. De Jongh's painting is discussed in Fleischer 1978, pp. 60–65; P. Sutton 1980a, no. D20, pl. 182; Fleischer 1989, p. 69, pl. 80; and Fleischer and Reiss 1993, p. 668, fig. 1.

2. The painting is usually dated to the first half of the 1670s (see Refs.), but it seems strongly related to works of the 1660s in its naturalistic effects.

3. Hollstein 1949–83, vol. 15, pp. 52–55 (B.42). See also the discussion of Salomon van Ruysdael's Ferry near Gorinchem (Pl. 185). A painting by F. Jansen (active ca. 1635–40 in Amsterdam?) in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, includes similar motifs but not that of the payment of a bill. See also Jacob Duck's Soldiers in a Stable, in the same collection (Salomon 1998a, no. 90).


References: Kramm 1877–84, vol. 3 (1889), p. 734, possibly refers to this picture; Lagrange 1865, pp. 297–99, with an engraved reproduction, mistakes the man for "le propriétaire sans doute"; Havard 1879–80, vol. 3, p. 132, titles the painting La sortie du cabaret and interprets the subject correctly; Hofstede de Groot 1910–27, vol. 1 (1917), p. 153, no. 276, lists it as Officer Buying Straw from a Peasant, in the Cramer sale of 1769, and p. 314, no. 281, as Setting Out from the Inn ("the hostess is apparently wishing a gentleman a prosperous journey") in the De Morny sale of 1865; Valentinier 1926, p. 58; Brière-Misme 1927, pp. 259–61 (ill.), dates the picture to the 1670s and clears up Hofstede de Groot's confusion; Valentinier 1927, p. 76, no. 6, as Paying the Hostess; Valentinier 1910a, pp. xiv, 281 (ill. p. 105), suggests a date of about 1671–74; Fleischer 1978, pp. 58 n. 10, 64 n. 17, compares works by Ludolf de Jongh; P. Sutton 1980a, p. 81 (under no. 27), 108, no. 111, concludes that "the scale and execution link the work to the musical company series of c. 1674"; Baecjer 1995, p. 333; Haverkamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, p. 167 n. 14; P. Sutton in London–Hartford 1998–99, pp. 17, 61, 114, describes the theme as one of the artist's favorites; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, p. 287, compares earlier treatments of the subject by De Hooch and De Jongh; Quodbach 2004, p. 97, notes the disastrous price brought by the picture in the de Morny sale.


Ex coll.: J. G. Cramer, Amsterdam (until 1769; his sale, Amsterdam, November 13ff; or 1769), sale, Amsterdam, November 30, 1772, no. 15; Charles-Auguste-Louis-Joseph de Morny, Duc de Morny, Paris (possibly bought for FF 100,000 in Saint Petersburg in 1817; definitely in his collection by 1863; d. 1865; his estate sale, Palais de la Présidence du Corps Législatif, Paris, May 3ff, 1865, no. 53, as "La sortie du cabaret," sold for FF 10,000 to Demidoff); Paul Demidoff, Prince of San Donato, Florence and Saint Petersburg (from 1865); [Satinover, New York, 1922–23; sold to Borchard]; Samuel Borchard, New York (from 1923); his children, Stuart Borchard and Evelyn Borchard Metzger, New York (until 1958); Gift of Stuart Borchard and Evelyn B. Metzger, 1958 58.144.

370 Pieter de Hooch
90. A Couple Playing Cards, with a Serving Woman

Oil on canvas, 27 x 23 in. (68.6 x 58.4 cm)
Inscribed by a later hand (on wall above tiles): PDH
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975 1975.1.143

Dutch paintings in the Robert Lehman Collection are catalogued by Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann in The Robert Lehman Collection, II (Sterling et al. 1998).


Ex Coll.: See Sterling et al. 1998, p. 163.
The painter, draftsman, and engraver Samuel Dircksz van Hoogstraten was born in Dordrecht on August 2, 1627. His father, Dirck van Hoogstraten (1596–1640), was a gold- and silversmith who took up painting in the 1620s. Samuel's mother, Maaike de Coninck (1598–1643), was a silversmith's daughter who was distantly related to the landscape painter Philips Koninck (q.v.). Both parents were Mennonites, a reserved sect to which the young Van Hoogstraten seems to have been temperamentally unsuited. In the 1650s, he adopted the attributes of a worldly, indeed courtly gentleman, for example wearing a sword in public (the Mennonites were pacifists). Van Hoogstraten married a patrician young woman, Sara Baten, in June 1656, and joined the Dutch Reformed Church in January 1657.1

According to Van Hoogstraten's own account in his well-known Inleyding tot de Hooge Schoole der Schilder-keunst (Rotterdam, 1678), he trained with his father for several years before setting off at about the age of fifteen, in 1642, to study with Rembrandt in Amsterdam. He remained in the great teacher's studio until at least 1646 and perhaps until 1648.2 At the time of Van Hoogstraten's arrival, the Dordrecht painter Ferdinand Bol (q.v.) had been working with Rembrandt for several years and had just become an independent master. Carel Fabritius (1622–1654) and Philips Koninck's brother-in-law, Abraham Furnerius (ca. 1628–1654), were also Rembrandt pupils in the early 1640s; Fabritius is discussed in Van Hoogstraten's Inleyding for his expertise, shared by the author, in painting illusionistic pictures and murals. Van Hoogstraten's earliest known paintings and drawings date from about 1644–48 and strongly reflect Rembrandt's influence; they also reveal close affinities with works by Bol and two other Rembrandt disciples of the 1630s, Govert Flinck and Jan Victors (q.q.v.). The formative phase of Van Hoogstraten's oeuvre still requires convincing definition, in part by placing within it a few works long ascribed to Rembrandt himself.3

Between 1648 and May 1651, Van Hoogstraten worked in Dordrecht, where he probably painted some of his most Rembrandt-esque works, but also more fluid and fashionable pictures such as the Self-Portrait as a Draughtsman in a Window, of about 1649 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg).4 At about the same time, Van Hoogstraten began to indulge in what has been described as "self-making and self-representation," for example by associating with local literati, publishing his first book (Schoone Rosalin, 1650), writing poems friendly to the House of Orange, and putting on airs inconsistent with his recent acceptance into the Mennonite community.1

In the spring of 1651, the artist auctioned off whatever paintings he had on hand and left Holland for a four-year sojourn abroad. The biographer and painter Arnold Houbraken (1660–1719), who was one of Van Hoogstraten's pupils, records that on August 6, 1651, his fellow townsman in Dordrecht presented three pictures to Emperor Ferdinand III in Vienna, and that one of them, an illusionistic still life, earned him an imperial medalion and a gold chain.5 In addition to several other illusionistic pictures, including "letter rack" still lifes and the Bearded Man at a Window, of 1653 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), Van Hoogstraten also painted some stylish portraits of courtiers.7

In 1652, he visited Rome, where he joined the fraternity of Netherlandish artists called the Bentvougehs (Birds of a Feather) and stayed in the house of the successful still-life painter Otto Marseus van Schrieck (q.v.). During 1653 and 1654, Van Hoogstraten worked for clerical and noble patrons in Regensburg, and then went back to Vienna where evidently he remained until early 1656. He returned to Dordrecht a famous painter and poet, in good part because of the letters and verses he had sent home.

In May 1656, Van Hoogstraten secured a hereditary post on the board of the Mint of Holland and Zeeland in Dordrecht. This position, together with his marriage and entry into the Dutch Reformed Church, placed the painter advantageously in local society. He also joined the Dordrecht organization of Romanists (who dabbled in classical literature) and published Den Eerlyken Jongeling (Dordrecht, 1657), a loose translation of Nicolas Faret's L'honnête homme, ou l'art de plaire à la cour (Paris, 1630). A Christ Crowned with Thorns (Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich), a number of portraits, and the Perspective Box with Views of a Dutch Interior (National Gallery, London) date from the second Dordrecht period of 1656–62.8 In those years, Van Hoogstraten also established
himself as a teacher; Arent de Gelder (1645–1727) and Godfried Schalken (q.v.) were his pupils about 1660.9

Apparently in search of aristocratic patrons, Van Hoogstraten and his wife left for London in the spring of 1662, and remained in England until 1669.10 He became acquainted with members of the Royal Society, one of whom, Thomas Povey, installed two large illusionistic canvases by Van Hoogstraten in his London house (both now at Dyrham Park, Gloucester). These architectural views were admired by the diarists John Evelyn and Samuel Pepys,11 and were followed by at least three illusionistic views of palace colonnades now in British private collections. Other works produced in England include a number of three-quarter-length and full-length formal portraits.12

Between 1668 and 1671, Van Hoogstraten was mostly active in The Hague, where he painted portraits of patrician figures, a large Allegory of Truth and Justice (Finspång Castle, Sweden) for the wealthy merchant Louis de Geer, and other works that embody the elegant taste of the court city. He also joined the painters’ confraternity Pictura, and published Haagenaeweld (Amsterdam, 1669), a pastoral hodgepodge dedicated to two princesses of the House of Orange. However, Van Hoogstraten appears never to have regained princely favor comparable to his coup in Vienna.13

In 1671 the painter purchased a furnished house from his widowed sister-in-law in Dordrecht and lived there until his death on October 19, 1678. He served as provost of the Mint from 1673 to 1676, kept company with prominent citizens, and wrote the Inleyding, which remains indispensable to the study of Dutch art.14 In the early 1670s, Van Hoogstraten painted mostly portraits and small genre scenes, such as Two Women Admiring a Baby in a Cradle (Museum of Fine Arts, Springfield, Mass.) and The Doctor’s Visit (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).15 A number of smaller literary efforts reveal Van Hoogstraten’s ongoing concern with recognition of his own stature and that of his profession, his family, and his hometown. In the last three years of his life, the artist was reportedly ill and devoted most of his time to completing projects already in progress, especially the Inleyding, which was published shortly before his death at the age of fifty-one.16

1. The most useful source for biographical details on Van Hoogstraten is Brusati 1995, chaps. 2, 3; see, for example, pp. 16 (birth and family), 19–24 (his father as teacher and artist), 79 (marriage and break with Mennonites). See also C. Brusati in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 14, pp. 737–42. Further information about Van Hoogstraten’s life and family is found in Roscam Abbing 1987, Roscam Abbing 1991, and Thissen 1994. See also Brusati’s essay and catalogue entries (nos. 43–49) in Dordrecht 1992–93.
2. See Brusati 1995, pp. 25, 273 n. 28, and p. 46 on Van Hoogstraten’s return to Dordrecht (where he received adult baptism in 1648).
5. Brusati 1995, pp. 46–51, and chap. 3 (the title of which is quoted here).
7. See Brusati 1995, figs. 16–18, 40–41; Dordrecht 1992–93, no. 44 (the Bearded Man); Wheelock in Washington 2002–3, p. 81, fig. 8; Russell in ibid., nos. 37, 49.
14. In addition to citing many artists and discussing Rembrandt as a teacher, the book is essential for an understanding of seventeenth-century Dutch ideas on art (see Brusati 1995, chap. 6 and Czech 2000, chaps. 5–7).
15. See A. Davies 1993, pp. 49–53, on the Springfield canvas.
91. The Annunciation of the Death of the Virgin

Oil on canvas, 26 x 20½ in. (66 x 52.7 cm)
Signed (lower left): S.v.H.

The painting is well preserved. A pentimento reveals that the artist slightly shifted the position of the angel’s right forefinger and thumb.

Purchase, Rogers Fund and Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1992

In this canvas of about 1670, Van Hoogstraten depicts the comparatively rare subject of an angel’s visit to the Virgin shortly before her death. The artist’s referent was probably Jacobus de Voragine’s Golden Legend, which recounts that an angel stood by her in the midst of a great light, and greeted her with reverence as the mother of his Lord.

“Hail, blessed Mary,” he said, “receive the blessing of Him Who sent His salvation to Jacob! Behold I have brought unto thee, my Lady, a branch of the palm of Paradise! This thou must cause to be carried before thy bier; for three days thou shalt be called forth from the body, because thy Son awaits thee, His venerable mother!”

The subject has occasionally been described as the Annunciation or the Virgin of the Immaculate Conception. Adams, in dismissing the former in favor of the latter identification, correctly observes that the angel holds a palm branch not a lily. However, her discussion does not account for the gesture, expression, and very presence of the angel, or for the somber mood of the scene.

The intimacy of the conversation is enhanced by the boyish angel’s costume (which resembles a nightdress) and natural pose, with his forearms supported comfortably on clouds. Houbraken recalls how Van Hoogstraten transformed his house into a theater where his students would stage plays and also enact subjects they had been assigned as weekly exercises in composition.

The uncommon subject and comparatively small scale of the painting suggest that it was painted for a private Catholic patron rather than for an institution such as a “hidden church.” It is even possible that the picture was painted in memory of a Catholic woman named Maria. Van Hoogstraten had worked for foreign Catholics in the early 1650s and like other Protestant painters in the Netherlands, for example Hendrick ter Brugghen (q.v.), he also had Dutch Catholic clients and was capable of meeting their demands sympathetically.

The importance of Catholic patrons for seventeenth-century Dutch art has been underestimated until recently, and relevant pictures are scarce in American museums and most public collections elsewhere.

The painting certainly dates within the chronological range proposed by Sumowski: 1665–75. In its manner of execution and somewhat idealized figures, the work seems sufficiently close to two pictures dated 1670, Allegory of Truth and Justice (Finspång Castle, Sweden) and Two Women Admiring a Baby in a Cradle (Museum of Fine Arts, Springfield, Mass.), and to other paintings of about the same time to suggest a dating close to 1670—in any event, after Van Hoogstraten returned to the Netherlands from England in 1667 and before the Dordrecht portraits of the mid-1670s. None of the later religious pictures by Van Hoogstraten, such as The Education of the Virgin (location unknown), The Repentant Magdalene (location unknown), Christ Carrying the Cross (Hunterian Art Gallery, Glasgow), and the Ascension of Christ (Art Institute of Chicago), can be dated convincingly to later than 1671, when Van Hoogstraten moved back to Dordrecht from The Hague.

Like the four works just cited, which were all probably painted for Catholic patrons, the present picture may be placed generally within the tradition of “Dutch classicism,” which although traceable throughout the century was very much in the ascendant about 1670 (Gerard de Lairesse being a key representative; see Pl. 104). Many of the earlier exponents, such as Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.), Gerrit van Honthorst, Frans and Pieter de Grebber, Salomon and Jan de Bray, and Caesar van Everdingen, worked at some time for the court at The Hague or for Catholic clients. This tradition, more than any direct connection, most likely accounts for the strong similarities between the present composition and that of, for example, Van Honthorst’s Agony in the Garden, of about 1617 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), and Pieter de Grebber’s King David in Prayer, of about 1635–40 (Museum Het Catharijneconvent, Utrecht). However, the design of Godfried Schalcken’s elegant Annunciation (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles), which was painted in the early 1670s, appears to have been influenced by this or a similar work by Van Hoogstraten, who had been Schalcken’s teacher about ten years earlier.

2. A. Adams in New York 1988, p. 75, where the Virgin is incorrectly said to wear “contemporary dress.” Compare Paulus Bor’s large painting of The Annunciation, of about 1633–40 (National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa; see Dolphin 2007 in Refs.), where lilies and roses but no palms appear. The Annunciation of the Death of the Virgin is known mostly from earlier Italian art: for example, Duccio’s panel in the Maestà (Museo dell’Opera del Duomo, Siena; Orcagna’s relief in Or San Michele, Florence; and the predella panel of Filippo Lippi’s Barbadori Altarpiece (Louvre, Paris; see Rada 1993, pp. 394–96). Jean Fouquet also illustrated the subject in the Livre d’heures d’Étienne Chevalier (Musée Condé, Chantilly). Francisco Pacheco describes the story in his Arte de la pintura of 1658 (Pacheco 1656, vol. 1, p. 297). The palm occurs in some examples of the (first) Annunciation, but other symbols and the poses of the figures usually clarify the subject (see Held 1980, vol. 1, p. 441). These examples were gathered with the kind assistance of Dulce María Roman.


5. In Newark–Denver 2001–2, p. 110, Shuijer conjectures similarly that a painting of Mary Magdalene by Gerrit Dou in the collection of Francisca de le Boe Sylvius, a Calvinist physician, “may have been particularly appealing” to him because his wife’s name was Magdalena.

6. The question is discussed with regard to Ter Brugghen by Bok and Kobayashi 1985, pp. 13–14. Montias 1991, pp. 319, 336, offers statistical evidence that paintings of the Virgin “with or without the Christ child” and of the Annunciation were usually, though not exclusively, found in Catholic homes.

7. The purchase of this painting in 1992 was made with this point uppermost in mind. On Catholic patronage in the Netherlands during the seventeenth century, see Van Thiel 1990–91, esp. pp. 49–60.


9. Ibid., nos. 830, 836.

10. Ibid., nos. 829, 831, 832, 835.


13. Rotterdam–Frankfurt 1999–2000, no. 17; compare also no. 64, Adriaen van de Velde’s Annunciation of 1667 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

14. Beherman 1988, no. 2, considers the Getty picture similar in technique to Van Hoogstraten’s paintings of about 1670–75.

REFERENCES: Wegner 1967–68, pp. 52–53, 56 n. 29, compares a drawing in the Albertina, Vienna; Schaar 1968, p. 12 (under no. M13, Heraditus, by Van Hoogstraten), as a work of the “middle period”; Suomoski 1983–94, vol. 2, pp. 1292–93, no. 828 (ill. p. 131), as dating from about 1665–75; New York 1988, p. 75 no. 26, as representing the Virgin of the Immaculate Conception, with plate on p. 59 reversed; Roscam Abbing 1993, p. 90 (under doc. 12), no. 41 (ill. p. 140), finds it possible that “Een Marijn-beet van Hoogstraeten” (A picture of the Virgin by Hoogstraten) in the estate inventory of Myken Willems Bidloo, widow of Marcellis Adriaensaes Bax (Dordrecht, January 19, 1671), could refer to this painting; Baer 1995, p. 331; Brusati 1995, pp. 21, 35, 31, fig. 14, considers the figure of Mary to recall a figure in Dirck van Hoogstraten’s Virgin and Child with Saint Anne, of 1650 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Ember 1999, pp. 109, 113, fig. 80, cites the Virgin’s facial type in support of a new attribution to Van Hoogstraten; Dolphin 2007, p. 92, fig. 27, compares Paulus Bor’s large painting of the same subject (acquired by the National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, in 2003).


LUDOLF DE JONGH

Overschie 1616–1679 Hillegersberg

The artist was probably born in Overschie, near Rotterdam, in 1616.¹ His father, Leendert Leendaertsz, was a Rotterdam tanner, shoemaker, and innkeeper of some means. According to Houbraken, De Jongh studied with Cornelis Saftleven (1607–1681) in Rotterdam, with Anthonie Palamedesz (1601–1673) in Delft, and with Jan van Bijlert (1597/98–1671) in Utrecht.² The biographer specifies that Saftleven taught De Jongh drawing (a small group of figure drawings is known);³ this would have been about 1629–30. Palamedez supposedly paid his pupil little attention, but the Delft master's influence is obvious in De Jongh's genre scenes of the 1630s and 1640s, and in his portraits of the 1650s. De Jongh reportedly made rapid progress under Van Bijlert (in about 1632–34), whose work is occasionally recalled by De Jongh's Merry Company pictures of the 1640s.⁴

At some time shortly after October 11, 1635, when De Jongh was recorded in Rotterdam, he left for France with "a certain Frans Bacon," and stayed there for seven years.⁵ He was called home to Rotterdam when his mother fell seriously ill, probably arriving there in the first months of 1643. By that time, Houbraken claims, the painter was so unpracticed in his native language that his parents called in an interpreter. On February 4, 1646, De Jongh married Adriana Pieters Montagne of Schoonhoven, whose father was well connected with patrician figures in both the bride's and groom's hometowns. This relationship, Houbraken implies, led to De Jongh's appointment as a major in the civic guard, in which he served from 1652 until 1664. In 1652 the artist borrowed a total of 5,600 guilders from three prominent citizens and purchased a house on the Hoogstraat.⁶

As an officer of the civic guard (of which he painted a group portrait, now lost), De Jongh was paid by the city and had various duties to perform. From 1659 until 1661, he was also a governor of a home for the aged, and in 1665 he was appointed schout ("sheriff," or public prosecutor) in nearby Hillegersberg, where he soon moved, and where he died in 1679.

De Jongh painted some conventional and some innovative portraits; perhaps the most remarkable of the latter is the Boy with a Dog, of 1661, in the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond. The genre scenes are eclectic, but those of the 1650s are closely related to the work of Pieter de Hooch (q.v.). De Jongh, who was thirteen years De Hooch's senior, strongly influenced the Delft painter in the early to mid-1650s, but by about 1658–60 was responding to the younger artist's ideas.⁷ From about 1665 onward, De Jongh painted elegant figures in the gardens and courtyards of country houses.⁸ The aristocratic theme was also treated by Jan van der Heyden (Pls. 78, 79) and other Dutch painters but seems consistent with De Jongh's rise among Rotterdammers, who would embellish their conversation with phrases in French.

He painted a fair number of landscapes with figures and animals, most often hunting scenes with elegant riders and hounds, although mythological subjects are also known. The hunting scenes recall the work of numerous earlier and contemporary painters, including Nicolaes Berchem, Philips Wouwermans (q.q.v.), and Dirck Stoop (1610–1686), and De Jongh's younger colleague in Rotterdam Abraham Hondius (q.v.).

The artist occasionally collaborated with his brother-in-law Dirck Wijntrick (before 1625–1678), who painted animals in landscapes, and with the landscapist Joris van der Haagen (ca. 1615–1669) of The Hague.

4. See the chapters on portraiture and genre painting in Fleischer 1980. Scholten 1992, p. 51, reasonably suggests that some of De Jongh's Palamedez-like genre pictures could date from the 1650s, and rightly dismisses Fleischer's conjecture (p. 14) that De Jongh might actually have studied with Van Bijlert in the 1640s.
6. Fleischer 1980, pp. 15–16, for the details in this paragraph.
92. Scene in a Courtyard

Oil on canvas, 26½ x 32½ in. (67.3 x 82.2 cm)
The paint surface is slightly abraded throughout.
Bequest of William K. Vanderbilt, 1920 20.155.5

Although the picture was attributed in the past to Pieter de Hooch (q.v.) and to his brother-in-law Hendrick van der Burch (1627–1665 or later), it is entirely typical of the Rotterdam artist Ludolf de Jongh and may be dated on the basis of comparisons with other works by him to the early 1660s. The composition and the subject itself, with a mistress and maid in the rear courtyard of an attractive town house, are clearly indebted to paintings by De Hooch such as A Woman and Her Maid in a Courtyard, of about 1660–61, in the National Gallery, London.

The lady of the house holds the hand of her well-dressed daughter and instructs the maid, who seems wary of the greyhound’s proximity to the kitchen. A cook attends to fowl roasting on a spit in the hearth seen through the doorway to the right. A young man, presumably the mistress’s son, looks on from a window to the left. In the background, a man enters from the street or alleyway carrying what appears to be a basket of mussels. The doorway frames a view through the roofed gateway of another enclosure (which must belong to the house in the background); the sunlit area in the distance may be part of the same property or another passageway between walled courtyards and gardens.

The composition, with its planes of contrasting bricks, is so obviously derived from De Hooch’s courtyard views of about 1660 as to make the painting’s long confusion with works of the Delft school understandable. De Jongh deserves recognition for his adaptation of a particular refinement in De Hooch’s work, which is the way the young maid is caught in the sunlight, thereby focusing the viewer’s attention at the center of activity and also suggesting a moment in time. It seems to be late afternoon on a spring or summer day, when sunlight falls eastward and bathes the rear side of this row of houses. The play of brown, red, and green tones throughout the shadowy spaces is balanced beautifully on the right, where the leafy vine curves gracefully against the sun-drenched brick wall. In this rectilinear environment certain curves catch the eye, for example the pump handle’s apparent counterpoint to the vine, the maid’s silhouette, and the sinuous contours of the dog. De Jongh’s appeal often consists of his discovery of elegance in a comparatively ordinary world.

1. See Refs. for earlier attributions and suggested datings. Valentiner’s attribution of the picture to Van der Burch (1929) was supported by F. Schmidt-Degener in 1931 but doubted by W. Martin in 1938 (oral opinions recorded in the curatorial files; on Van der Burch, see P. Sutton 1980b and Delft 1996, pp. 170–77). The earliest attribution to De Jongh appears to be J. G. van Gelder’s undated annotation on a photograph at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, which was supported by S. J. Gudlaugsson (1959b). The Museum changed the attribution from De Hooch to Van der Burch in 1949, and from the latter to De Jongh in 1955. John Walsh, the Museum’s curator, reviewed the relevant material at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, in 1971 and concluded that the attribution to De Jongh was certainly correct.

2. The artist suggests a freestanding kitchen annex, which was an occasional feature of fine town houses. They were used especially in summer, when the heat of the hearth in the house itself (an important resource in colder months) was unwanted. On actual kitchens in seventeenth-century Dutch houses and the sometimes idealized depictions of them, see Corbeau 1993 (pp. 337, 372, on separate kitchens).


REFERENCES: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 9 (1842), p. 568, no. 16, cites the painting as by De Hooch, in the collection of Rev. J. Clowes, Manchester; Havard 1879–81, vol. 3, p. 101, repeats J. Smith; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), p. 561, no. 304, repeats J. Smith; Vanderbilt Bequest 1920, p. 268, suggests a date of about 1670; Brière-Misme 1927, pp. 260–62 (ill.), as by De Hooch; Valentiner 1927, p. 76, listed as by De Hooch, about 1658–68; Valentiner 1939, pp. 114, 107 (ill.), attributes the picture to Hendrick van der Burch; Valentiner 1939a, p. 252 (ill.), 296, considers “the exaggerated perspective of the house walls on both sides” and the figures to be typical of Van der Burch, and dates the work to about 1655–60; P. Sutton 1980a, p. 164, listed as by De Jongh; Fleischer 1989, pp. 72–73, fig. 86, as by De Jongh about 1660, compares the De Hooch in London (see text above); Schooten 1992, p. 52, compares De Hooch; Fleischer and Reiss 1993, pp. 676–77, fig. 15, considers the painting to demonstrate De Jongh’s “complete mastery of the Delft style by at least the start of the 1660s”; Schooten 1994, p. 147, fig. 10, compares the De Hooch in London; Baetjer 1995, p. 123, London–Hartford 1998–99, pp. 83–84 n. 70, records the private communication of conservator J. Wadum, who notes a pinhole in the canvas coincident with the vanishing point.


Ex Coll.: Rev. John Clowes, Manchester and Broughton, Lancashire (by 1842—until 1846); his nephew Rev. Samuel Bradshaw (in 1846); Mrs. Samuel Bradshaw; William K. Vanderbilt, New York (by 1920); Bequest of William K. Vanderbilt, 1920. 20.135.5
Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Elder

London 1593–1661 Utrecht

A leading portrait painter in London, Jonson worked there between about 1617 and October 1643, and in the Netherlands from 1644 onward. He was baptized in the Dutch Church at Austin Friars, London, on October 14, 1593. His Flemish parents, Cornelis Jonson and Jane Le Grand, moved from Antwerp to London (about 1668) in order to live freely as Protestants. The painter’s grandfather was Peter Jansen, originally from Cologne (Ceulen or Keulen in Dutch), so that the family also used the name Jonson van Ceulen. The artist signed his works Jonson or Janson (as well as “CJ”), sometimes adding “van Ceulen” on portraits dating from the Dutch period. The name “Janssens,” evidently introduced by De Bie (1661), is a Dutch translation that the artist appears never to have employed.

Where Jonson trained is unknown. One specialist considers it probable that he studied in the northern Netherlands, “returning to London about 1618.” Supporting evidence cited by another scholar, namely, that a portrait said to be by Jonson and dated 1617 “looks like a Dutch work and a Dutch sitter,” is rather thin compared with the visual testimony of portraits dating from 1619 until 1630. When judged against Dutch portraits of the same period, for example by Michiel van Miereveld (q.v.), Jonson’s style of the 1620s looks distinctly English, especially in its flatter handling of costume details. Given predecessors in London such as Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger (1561–1635), Paul van Somer (1576–1621), and Daniël Mijtens (q.v.), there seems little need to send Jonson elsewhere for instruction. His practice of producing not only original portraits but also copies after other artists—for example, his monogrammed replica, dated 1631 (Chatsworth, Derbyshire), after Mijtens’s Charles I, King of England, of 1629, in the Metropolitan Museum (Pl. 124)—underscores his close acquaintance with the leading portraitists in England, who were themselves either Dutch (Mijtens) or, in Van Somer’s case, Flemish with a decade of work in Holland behind him.¹

Jonson’s manner evolved gradually in the direction of Van Dyck with that artist’s arrival in London in 1632 (by April 1). This is more evident in the individual figures than in the composition of Jonson’s large and ambitious Family of Arthur, Lord Capel, of about 1659 (National Portrait Gallery, London). In single, half-length portraits by Jonson, livelier fabrics, softer modeling, and a new elegance reveal Van Dyck’s influence, if not so much as in contemporary portraits by Adriaen Hanneman (q.v.), who was also in London between 1626 and about 1638. Jonson’s main strengths were capturing a convincing likeness and suggesting character. Van Dyck’s rhetorical flourishes are toned down to suit the less public sphere of Jonson’s patrons, who were distinguished but not generally from the first circle of English society.

Jonson and his family left England for the Netherlands in 1643, at the beginning of the Civil War. In 1622, he had married Elizabeth Beck, of Colchester, whose family was Dutch. The couple had two sons, one of whom, Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Younger (q.v.), later followed in his father’s footsteps. The family went first to Middelburg, but by 1649 they were evidently living in Amsterdam. Paintings such as Magistrates of The Hague, dated 1647 (Oud Stadhuis, The Hague), and many individual and pair portraits indicate continued success. In 1652, the Jonsons moved to Utrecht, where Cornelis the Elder died in August 1661.

2. The quote is from Waterhouse 1962, p. 36.
3. A good, late example of this manner is the Portrait of a Lady, called Mary Campion, signed and dated “C.J. fecit 1630,” sold at Sotheby’s, London, March 14, 1984, no. 18 (ill.). A few typical portraits by Jonson dating from the 1620s and early 1630s are illustrated in Masion 1939 (pl. 14 actually represents Henry, 18th Earl of Oxford, not the king of Bohemia).
4. See Waterhouse 1962, chap. 4, on these “precursors of Van Dyck.” The essential article on Jonson in England is Hearn 2003 (pp. 16–18, on the question of where the artist might have trained).
5. See Hearn 2003, pp. 120–21.
93. Portrait of a Man

Oil on canvas, 40 4/8 x 31 3/4 in. (103.5 x 80 cm); painted
surface 40 4/8 x 31 3/4 in. (103.5 x 79.1 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): Cor. Jonson/fecit 1648

The painting is extensively abraded, and the surface texture
was flattened during a past cleaning.

Gift of Mrs. J. E. Spingarn, 1957 57.30.1

This portrait of a man and its pendant (discussed below; Pl. 94)
were probably painted by Jonson in Amsterdam (see the biog-
rphy above). The gentleman wears a fine black suit and cape
with a linen collar and cuffs, and holds tan leather gloves. His
pose, with his right elbow resting on a slightly chipped stone
plinth and the left arm akimbo, ultimately goes back to English
portraits by Anthony van Dyck, about which Jonson was better
informed than most Dutch artists.1 Unfortunately, there are no
dues to the subject’s identity.

1. See, for example, Van Dyck’s Sir John Borlase, of about 1648
(Bankes Collection, The National Trust, Kingston Lacy, Dorset);

References: Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 99, cites the painting as by
Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Younger; Baetjer 1995, p. 505, as by
Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Elder.

Ex Coll.: Amy E. (Mrs. Joel E.) Spingarn, New York (until 1957);
Gift of Mrs. J. E. Spingarn, 1957 57.30.1

94. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 40 4/8 x 31 3/4 in. (103.5 x 80 cm); painted
surface 40 4/8 x 30 3/4 in. (103.5 x 78.4 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): Cor. Jonson/Fecit 1648

The painting is extensively abraded, and the surface texture
was flattened during a past lining.

Gift of Mrs. J. E. Spingarn, 1957 57.30.2

This portrait of an anonymous woman is a pendant to the pic-
ture discussed above (Pl. 93). Both figures are presented before
a deep olive background and wear black, in this case apparently
velvet. A gold-colored cap with two dark jewels crowns the
woman’s fashionable coiffeur. She wears an abundance of
pearls, although the effect is not ostentatious. Her earrings
each have three large dangling pearls, she has a pearl necklace
of one strand, and a string of pearls circles each wrist three
times. Her sheer white blouse and cuffs are bordered with fine
bands of lace, and a brooch and a white feather fan with a
gilded handle complete the impression of quiet wealth. The
pose and the elegant hands are familiar from English portraits
by Van Dyck, including Princess Mary, of about 1636–37
(Museum of Fine Arts, Boston).1 A very similar portrait by
Jonson, dated 1650, is in the Centraal Museum, Utrecht, but the
sitter appears to be a different woman.2


References: Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 99, cites the painting as by
Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Younger; Baetjer 1995, p. 505, as by
Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Elder.

Ex Coll.: The painting has the same history of ownership as
its pendant. See Ex Coll. for the Portrait of a Man (Pl. 93); Gift of
Mrs. J. E. Spingarn, 1957 57.30.2
Much less is known about Cornelis II than about his father, Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Elder (q.v.). He was baptized in London on August 15, 1634. His family moved to the Netherlands in 1643, and Jonson (or Jansen, as he became known) presumably trained there with his father. In 1664, he was living with his mother in Utrecht, where he was also cited in 1670 and 1678. The notice of his marriage on November 16, 1681, describes him as a widower. On April 5, 1698, the painter, “living in Utrecht, presently here” (in Amsterdam), declared himself in debt to Hendrick Uylenbroeck, and offered a variety of minor paintings as collateral. Paintings by Cornelis II are often signed in full with the addition of “Junior” (as on the painting discussed below) or “Filius.” The mediocre quality of the artist’s later work is well illustrated by his three portraits of the Martens brothers, of 1697, in the Centraal Museum, Utrecht. Cornelis II was buried in the Jacobskerk, Utrecht, on December 20, 1715.

3. Bredius 1915–22, part 4, pp. 1901–3. The transcription is correct: this is not Uylenburg, the art dealer. I am grateful to Jaap van der Veen, at the Rembrandthuis, Amsterdam, for checking this detail in April 2005.
4. The latter occurs, for example, on a portrait of a man, dated 1664, sold at Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, May 10, 2005, no. 93.
6. Brielis 1997, p. 343. Riek van Leeuwen, of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, kindly checked the evidence for the artist’s dates of birth and death, which are often given incorrectly.

95. Portrait of a Man with a Watch

Oil on canvas, 33 x 27 1/2 in. (83.8 x 70.5 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): Cornelis Jonson/van Ceulen/Junior/1657

The portrait is well preserved. Illegible fragments of an inscription remain above the signature and date. The indigo blue in the background and tablecloth has faded a little, as is evidenced by a passage along the lower left edge where the original color is preserved.

Given in memory of Felix M. Warburg by his wife and children, 1941 41.116.3

The portrait is reliably signed by Jonson “Junior,” which is a Dutch as well as an English word and is used in signatures. Ekkart considers the painting a routine example of the younger Jonson’s manner, and proposes that it may be a replica of a portrait by his father. Cleaning in 2005 revealed that the picture has considerable quality, suggesting that it is an entirely original work. In any case, it was probably painted in Utrecht.

The anonymous sitter is dressed in black and wears a black cap. A steel-blue curtain hangs behind him. In his hand he holds an open watch with a winding key on a blue ribbon. This is a conventional symbol of transience in portraiture, but in this presentation probably suggests temperance.

2. See the discussion under Ter Borch’s The Van Moerkerken Family (Pl. 14), and note 8 in that entry.


EX COLL.: Felix M. Warburg, New York (until d. 1937; his estate, 1937–41); Given in memory of Felix M. Warburg by his wife and children, 1941 41.116.3
Willem Jansz Kalf was baptized in Rotterdam on November 3, 1619, in a Protestant ceremony. His father was Jan Jansz Kalf (d. 1625), a prosperous cloth merchant who also held offices in the city government. The artist’s mother, Machtelt Gerrits (or Geerts; ca. 1578–1638), gave birth to at least seven children. At her death, Willem, aged eighteen, and his younger brother Gouver were assigned guardians. When Gouver died in March 1642, on a VOC ship headed for the East Indies, Willem had already been in Paris for some time, perhaps from about 1639. He remained there, living in a circle of mostly Flemish artists in the neighborhood of Saint Germain-des-Prés, until 1646. He was cited in Rotterdam during October of that year, but no documents are known for the years 1647–50, and no works are known to bear dates from 1647 through 1652. On October 22, 1651, “Willem Jansz Kalf, bachelor of Rotterdam, and Cornelia Pluver [ca. 1626–1711] of Vollenhove, bachelorette both living within this city Hoorne” were married in that port on the IJsselmeer in West Friesland, not far north of Amsterdam. Kalf’s bride was an accomplished young woman, known for her poetry, calligraphy, and glass engraving, and for composing music and playing the virginal. Her aunt Margarita Pluver was married to an important merchant of Amsterdam, Johan Le Thor, and the inventory of his estate, made in July 1653, was witnessed by, among others, “Willem Kalf, cousin of the house.” This is the first mention of the painter in Amsterdam, but it is likely that he and his wife moved there shortly after their marriage. Kalf is cited again in Amsterdam on September 16, 1653, when he, Bartholomeus Breenbergh, Bartholomeus van der Helst, Philips Koninck (q.v.), and the local still-life painter Simon Luttichuys (1600–1661) authenticated a landscape painting by Paul Bril (ca. 1554–1626) on behalf of the Delft art dealer Abraham de Coote.3

Kalf must have joined the Amsterdam painters’ guild in the early 1650s, but the records for that period are lost. He is cited with Rembrandt, Flinck, Bol, Koninck, Van der Helst (q.q.v.), and other artists who spread the city’s fame, in Jan Vos’s poem “Zeige der Schilderkunst” (Triumph of Painting), of 1654.4 In later years, as in 1653, Kalf passed judgment on the authorship of pictures. In 1661, he joined Jacob van Ruisdael, Meyndert Hobbema (q.q.v.), and Allart van Everdingen (1621–1675) in rejecting an attribution to Jan Porcellis (before 1584–1632). He was part of the impressive group of artists who in May 1672 questioned the authenticity of thirteen Italian paintings owned by the art dealer Gerrit Uyleburgh. Among the others present were the still-life specialists Willem van Aelst (1627–in or after 1683), Otto Marseus van Schrieck, and Melchior d’Hondecoeter (q.q.v.), as well as Gerard de Lairesse (q.v.) and a few landscapists. In 1686, Kalf dismissed a “Titan” as a copy.5

In a Rotterdam document dated November 14, 1690, “Wilm Kalf, artful painter in Amsterdam,” gave up his part of the family grave in the Grote Kerk of his hometown in favor of a nephew. Kalf was buried in the Zuiderkerk, Amsterdam, on August 3, 1693. Later that year, Cornelia Kalf (b. 1662), “youngest daughter” of the artist, and in 1711 Cornelia, his widow, were buried in the same church. Three other children are known from baptismal records, Sophia (b. 1657), Johannes (b. 1660), and Samuel (b. 1664).6

In his early years, Kalf painted rustic interiors with still-life motifs, such as the picture discussed below (Pl. 96). These compositions derive in part from works by the Rotterdam artists Pieter de Bloot (1601–1658), Corneliis Saftleven (1607–1681), Herman Saftleven (1609–1685), and Hendrick Sorgh (q.v.), and also by François Rijckhals (shortly after 1600–1647), a Middelburg painter of peasant interiors and still lifes who has been proposed as a possible teacher of Kalf.7 About sixty works of this type and similar exterior scenes dating from the first half of the 1640s in Paris are known.8 Also dating from the Paris years are prunustilleven (still lifes of luxurious objects) that depict silver-gilt basins and ewers, silver pilgrim’s flasks and candlesticks, fancy glassware, Chinese porcelain, nautilus shells, and so on. In their dark spaces, dramatic illumination, and rich surfaces, these upright compositions could be described as the most Rembrandtesque still lifes ever painted.9

A painting dated 1653 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich) shows the Paris type of luxury still life evolved into another phase.10 The design is now simpler, more classical than Baroque, the palette cooler, and the objects described with greater attention to their own qualities rather than as essays in glitter and reflection. The objects are different as well, with Chinese porcelain,
Dutch and German glassware, silver trays and Oriental carpets playing principal roles, and with lemons, oranges, other fruits, and occasionally a pocket watch as grace notes. The second picture discussed below (Pl. 97) is typical of Kalf’s mature work, but other examples are much finer (for instance, Still Life with Nautilus Cup and Other Objects, 1662, in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid), and a few are spectacular (Still Life with the Drinking Horn of the Saint Sebastian Archers’ Guild, Lobster, and Glasses, of the early 1650s, in the National Gallery, London). Because of Kalf’s exquisite handling of light, superficial comparisons of his Amsterdam still lifes with works by Johannes Vermeer (q.v.) have been made. Works by Gerard ter Borch (q.v.) are more analogous in style and content, the latter being a luxurious level of living suggested by gleaming forms in velvety environments. With Van Aelst, Kalf was one of the most successful still-life painters to evoke the world of wealth and taste that thrived in Amsterdam beginning in the 1620s.

1. Grisebach 1974, p. 13, where some shady dealings with the Admiralty of Rotterdam are also mentioned. The entry by L. Grisebach in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 17, pp. 716–17, is disappointing, and needlessly edited. For example, it lacks the date of Kalf’s baptism, giving only his year of birth, and omits page numbers in the bibliographical entries. However, it greatly improves upon Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, p. 171, which has Kalf born in Amsterdam and, implausibly, as taught by the Haarlem artist Hendrick Pot (1580–1657). Although the report that Kalf studied with Pot is dismissed as “highly doubtful” in Grisebach 1974, p. 12 (see also pp. 16, 34–35), it is repeated in J. E. P. Leistra’s entry on Pot in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 25, p. 361. Giltaij Rotterdame–Aachen 2006–7, pp. 37–38, suggests reasonably that Houbraken (or his source) mistakenly mentioned Pot but meant Hendrick Sorgh (q.v.) in Kalf’s own city.


5. See Grisebach 1974, p. 23, on these three occasions of connoisseurship, and London–Amsterdam 2006, pp. 79–101, on the Uylenburgh affair. In 1668, Gerrit and Job Berckheyde were also present.


8. See Grisebach 1974, nos. 1–58, figs. 1–62. Several examples have come to light since this monograph appeared.

9. Except, of course, for a few by Rembrandt himself, and by one or two of his pupils. For this type of painting by Kalf, see ibid., nos. 59–70A, figs. 63–78, and Bergström 1956, figs. 218–26.

10. Bergström 1956, pp. 280–82, fig. 227, with outdated location; Grisebach 1974, no. 72, fig. 83.


13. On Kalf’s mature work, see Bergström 1956, pp. 278–85; Grisebach 1974, chap. 6; and Segal 1989, chap. 10.
Oil on wood, 10 1/4 x 12 1/4 in. (26.7 x 31.8 cm)
Signed (on chest): KALF

The painting has darkened overall, and its visual impact has deteriorated. Horizontal strokes of a warm brown imprimatur applied over the white ground are now visible through the thinned paint film. Much of the background detail, in particular the man tending the cow at left, is barely visible as the thinly applied paint layers with few opaque pigments have become more transparent with age and abrasion. The old woman and the still life at lower right retain more strength of form because they are more thickly painted. The bluish cast of portions of the still life—for example, the cabbage and the leeks—suggests the loss of a yellow glaze from fading or abrasion.

Purchase, 1871 71.69

One of the more modest items obtained in the 1871 Purchase, Kalf's so-called kitchen interior dates from about 1642–44. Although pictures like this one were a specialty of artists in his native city of Rotterdam, Kalf appears to have painted peasant interiors only during the first half of the 1640s, when he was living in Paris.¹

The interior is a country dwelling in which distinctions such as living and dining areas, and for that matter house and barn, would have been lost on the inhabitants. In the left background, a man is busy with some routine task next to a resting cow. The sky seen through the upper half of the doorway suggests that the day is nearly done. In the foreground a seated woman, looking as worn as the wooden chest beside her, scrapes out a large squash (an earthenware bowl is nearly full). At her feet are a large basket containing a cabbage and, on the ground, a pumpkin, a broken squash, a bunch of chard (or a similar vegetable) bound with a vine, and a few onions and cucumbers. An iron pot hangs over a low flame in the fireplace. On the mantel, a copper-lined cooking pot gleams in what remains of daylight, which must enter from a window or doorway out of view to the left. Two candles hang on the masonry wall next to a niche containing a glass bottle, perhaps of vin ordinaire.

The layout of the interior, with its L-shape plan, and such space-defining elements as the sturdy post and beams, the leaning beam, and, as a repoussoir to the left, a washrub and a busted basket conform to a pattern employed during the 1630s by Kalf's Rotterdam colleagues Pieter de Broot (1601–1668), Cornelis Saftleven (1607–1681), Herman Saftleven (1609–1685), and Hendrick Sorgh (q.v.); by François Rijckhals (shortly after 1600–1647) in Middelburg; and by David Teniers the Younger (1610–1690) in Antwerp.²

Little is known about the market for such inexpensive pictures in seventeenth-century Paris. Considerable speculation has been devoted to the question of who purchased the peasant scenes attributed to Louis Le Nain (ca. 1600–1648),³ but those pictures (and the scenes of street life painted in Rome by another French artist, Sébastien Bourdon) are not comparable to Kalf's peasant interiors, where the figures are ancillary to the still-life motifs. It is likely that, as in Rotterdam and Antwerp, the main appeal of such works was the way they were painted, with broad but convincing descriptions of natural forms dashed off with no apparent effort in a day or two. Kalf probably sold his Parisian products through a local dealer, to mostly middle-class buyers. At least half the known works of this type are unsigned, and, curiously, there are a good number of contemporary copies.

1. Grisebach, in his lengthy chapter on Kalf's peasant interiors (1974, chap. 4), comes to this conclusion on the basis of a few dated pictures, various motifs (including produce found in France but not the Netherlands), and the absence in seventeenth-century Dutch inventories of paintings by Kalf of this type.
2. See Heppner 1946, Klinge-Gross 1976, and James in Rotterdam 1994–95, pp. 135–41. The last essay overdoes the question of "meaning" (pp. 139–40), with the pietistic printmaker Jan Luyken (1649–1712) dragged in as reinforcement.

REFERENCES: MMA 1871, pl. 7; MMA 1872, no. 152, as Interior of a Dutch Cottage; MMA 1905, p. 90, no. 5, describes the subject somewhat inaccurately; Bode 1906a, mentioned in Kalf chap.; H. Schneider in Thieme and Becker 1907–10, vol. 19 (1926), p. 456, mentioned; B. Burroughs 1931a, p. 195, spots the cow; Bode 1951, p. 384, mentioned; Grisebach 1974, pp. 43, 71, 81, 238–39, no. 46, pl. 38, mistakenly identifies the comestibles, places the work in a group of pictures dating from about 1643–44, and surprisingly finds similarities in an early Kalf in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg; Baetjer 1995, p. 326; Baetjer 2004, p. 220, no. 152, gives provenance.


EX COLL.: [Léon Gauche, Paris, with Alexis Fevvre, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.69
97. Still Life with Fruit, Glassware, and a Wanli Bowl

Oil on canvas, 23 x 20 in. (58.4 x 50.8 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): W. KALF 1619.

With age, the entire painting has darkened, the fruits have lost local color, and the tall glass has become more transparent and lost definition.

Maria DeWitt Jesup Fund, 1953 $3,111

Of the approximately one hundred fifty paintings by Kalf that are known, about thirty are dated and half of those bear dates falling within a six-year period, 1658–63. Dated works of the Amsterdam years (ca. 1652 onward) include one canvas of 1653, one of 1656, two of 1658, four of 1659 (including the Museum's picture), three for each of the years 1661, 1662, and 1663, and only single examples from the later dates of 1669, 1678, and 1679. Thus the present painting comes from the most thoroughly documented period of Kalf's production, when his career was flourishing in the artistic capital of the Netherlands.

The composition, in its clarity, fine balance, and comparative simplicity, is typical of Kalf's style during the second half of the 1650s. The wooden tabletop, below which a baluster leg is visible, recedes to a stone wall, where an arched niche frames the off-center ensemble. As in other works by Kalf, the practical gesture of pushing back the Turkish carpet has purely aesthetic consequences, such as leading the eye into the picture with a soft cascade of folds, which, in their warm tones, furlike texture, and blurred contours, wonderfully foil the crisp edges and cool colors of the Chinese porcelain bowl. The bowl has been set at an artful angle on a superb Dutch silver tray by propping it on a piece of bread. This surprising expedient tends to support the claim made by Kalf's acquaintance Gerard de Lairesse (q.v.), who sympathetically observed that the painter would place precious objects in whatever way he wanted, without considering the logic of their encounter, or the "particular meaning" of the whole.

Between the bread and the slice of lemon, a dark passage leads diagonally from the spiraling lemon peel to the rear corner of the table, where a gleam of golden light has been cast by rays falling through the white wine in the glass. From foot to rim, the roemer is a brilliant study in reflections, including an image of the fruit in the foreground, floating near the surface of the wine. A Sevilla orange, assisted by the distinctive protuberance in its skin, sits on peaches in the bowl, and lifts two brass-colored leaves upward where they fill a void and turn attention to the tall glass. This flute, a façon de Venise import or imitation (graceful brackets flare below the cone of red wine), was often used by Kalf, as here, as a centerpost for round forms arranged within a defined compass, and for circular highlights turning in horizontal and tilting planes. Countering this sense of movement, a knife with an agate handle points toward the near corner of the table, where a lemon pit and drops sparkle on the wet surface. A few drops have spilled over the edge, toward the artist's signature.

Kalf had a predilection for depicting Chinese porcelain, and was obviously familiar with a variety of types and individual examples. The Wanli bowl represented in the New York canvas is also found in other paintings by Kalf, and at least four different Wanli bowls, with known designs inside and out, occur in approximately contemporary pictures by the artist. In other works, such as two paintings in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid, Kalf shows less common pieces, in these cases a Wanli covered bowl with Taoist figures in high relief on the exterior and a tall ewer made for the Persian market. More remarkably, the painter had an extraordinary gift for suggesting the translucent whites and blues of late Ming porcelain, which lend these hard, sharp-edged pieces their mirrorlike depth and evanescence. It has been claimed that Chinese porcelain can be impossible to distinguish from Delftware in Dutch pictures, but mistaking one of Kalf's blue-and-white vessels for earthenware from Delft would be like mistaking a mature painting by Vermeer (Pl. 205 provides the closest analogy within the Museum's collection) for a picture by Pieter de Hooch (q.v.).

1. The observation in A. Davies 1993, p. 71 n. 2, that "fewer than twenty percent" of Kalf's paintings bear dates, with half of those falling between 1658 and 1663, inspired this slightly closer look at the oeuvre catalogue in Grisebach 1974. According to that monograph, the Amsterdam pictures are dated as follows: 1653 (no. 72); 1656 (no. 85); 1658 (nos. 91, 93); 1659 (nos. 94–97); 1661 (nos. 106, 107, 109); 1662 (nos. 115–17); 1663 (nos. 122, 123, 126); 1669 (no. 131); 1678 (no. 138); and 1679 (no. 141).
3. A facsimile of the signature and date is reproduced in Grisebach 1974, p. 208.
4. As noted in ibid., p. 254 (under no. 94), referring to nos. 81, 82, 88, 89 (figs. 87, 90, 96, 98).
5. See, for example, ibid., figs. 88, 89, 102, 120. See the section “Classification of Klapmutsen,” in Rinaldi 1989, pp. 128–37. This type of shallow bowl, made for the European market, is named for a wooden cap (mut) that one would “clap” on the head.

6. See Gaskell 1990, nos. 10, 11, where the types of porcelain are described on pp. 76 and 80.

7. A. Davies 1993, pp. 68–70. The point is probably taken from the literature of Oriental porcelain. However, in New York 1976–78 (under no. 16, the Museum’s Kalf), Lerner observes that “while it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between Chinese, Delft, German, and Japanese blue and white ceramics in seventeenth-century European paintings, here the identification is almost certain.”

8. Kalf is often compared with Vermeer, for the most part as a form of praise. A few stylistic comparisons are made in Liedtke 2000a, pp. 191, 207, 209, where the discussion of Vermeer’s dark backgrounds in paintings of about 1665–67 (p. 241) might have added Kalf to the artists who are suggested as possible influences.

References: Walsh in New York 1971, p. 11 (under no. 22), praises the description of natural objects; Walsh 1973, caption to fig. 26, compares a still-life passage in Vermeer; Grisebach 1974, pp. 114, 115, 122, 130, 147, 156, 158, 254, no. 94, fig. 104, begins discussion of still-lifes painted by Kalf in Amsterdam with this picture, which is compared with other examples that have similar motifs or analogously strict designs (said to be typical of works dating from 1650–59); Lerner in New York 1976–78, no. 16 (and under no. 9), compares a Wanli bowl in the Museum’s collection; Hibbard 1980, pp. 349–50, fig. 628, shows “opulence, with some of Vermeer’s sensitivity to color and texture”; P. Sutton 1986, p. 190, mentioned; Gaskell 1990, p. 70, notes that several motifs found in the Museum’s picture and a still life of 1660 by Kalf in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid, appear regularly in his work; Baetjer 1995, p. 328; Meijer 2003, p. 227, finds similar motifs in a still life by Kalf in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, including (erroneously) “the same bowl”; Meijer in Rotterdam–Aachen 2006–7, p. 96, fig. 9, suggests the indirect influence on this painting of a composition by Simon Luttichuys of 1651.


Ex Coll.: Gräfin von Althann, Austria (?about 1725); by family descent through the eldest daughter in each generation to Martha Freifrau von Schönaus-Wehr, née Frein von und zu Merzlingen, Unterminstertal, near Freiburg im Breisgau, Baden (1917–d. 1939); her daughter Hildegard Freifrau von Kittlitz und Ottendorf, Unterminstertal (from 1939; her son Wilhelm Freiherr von Kittlitz und Ottendorf, Freiburg im Breisgau, Baden (until 1950; sale, Pfister, Freiburg im Breisgau, October 25–26, 1950, nos. 317); [Otto Wertheimer, Paris, until 1911; sold to Knoedler]; [Knoedler, New York, 1951–53; sold to MMA]; Maria DeWitt Jem赏 Fund, 1953 33.111

1. The eldest daughters of the family are listed in Grisebach 1974, p. 254 (under no. 94).
The distinguished Amsterdam portraitist Thomas Hendricksz de Keyser was a son of the great Dutch architect and sculptor Hendrick de Keyser (1565–1621). In 1591, Hendrick moved from Utrecht to Amsterdam, where Thomas must have been born. His brothers, Pieter (1591–1676), Willem (1603–1674), and Hendrick II (1613–1665), and his cousin Huybrecht Keyser (1592–1678) were all sculptors, and his sister Maria married the English sculptor and architect Nicholas Stone (1586/87–1647). When the painter married, on July 5, 1626, he was said to be twenty-nine years old.

De Keyser studied architecture with his father for two years, beginning in January 1616. It is not known with whom he apprenticed as a painter, but the most likely candidate is the prominent Amsterdam portraitist Cornelis van der Voort (ca. 1576–1624). The young artist was certainly well aware of his main competitors in the city, especially Werner van den Valckert (ca. 1580/81–ca. 1627) and Nicolaes Pickenoy (q.v.). De Keyser was the most inventive portraitist and the best painter in the group, with the result that many of the finest works by these and other portrait painters active in or near Amsterdam during the 1620s and 1630s (for example, Pl. 136) have beenoptimistically attributed to him in the past. However, portraits by De Keyser have never been confused with those by Rembrandt, who, from 1632 onward, became Amsterdam’s leading portraitist.

De Keyser is best known for small-scale full-length portraits like the one discussed below (see Pl. 100) and his muchadmired Constantijn Huygens and His Clerk, dated 1627 (National Gallery, London). (The commission to depict the Stadholder’s secretary, who lived in The Hague, may have come through the portraitist’s brother Pieter, who had projects in the neighboring city of Delft.) In 1632, De Keyser completed a large civic guard picture, The Company of Captain Allaert Cloek and Lieutenant Lucas Jacobsz Roogans, and, the following year, The Company of Captain Jacob Symonsz de Vries and Lieutenant Dirck de Graeff (both in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). Also dating from the 1630s are conventional half-length portraits and a few religious pictures.

In the 1640s, De Keyser was less active as a portraitist and, like his brother Pieter and his brother-in-law in London, became a dealer in marble and other building stone. It has been noted that many of De Keyser’s portraits from this period represent colleagues rather than patrician figures in Amsterdam. Nonetheless, De Keyser was chosen to paint a large history picture, Ulysses Beseeching Nausicaa, dated 1652, for the new Town Hall (now Royal Palace) of Amsterdam. Another somewhat unexpected development was De Keyser’s late production of equestrian portraits, possibly beginning with that of Pieter Schout, dated 1660 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; a rare case in the genre of a painting on copper), and continuing with Two Unknown Riders, dated 1661 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), and other examples. In these small versions of an art form that had earlier been reserved for aristocratic clients, the artist reveals a very good understanding of equine anatomy and horsemanship.

A number of De Keyser’s portraits, including that of Huygens and a family portrait dated 1652 (Nasjonalgalleriet, Oslo), are remarkable for their genre-like interiors. This approach was hardly unique to the artist, but he was perhaps the most skillful practitioner, especially in the 1620s. With regard to his manner of execution, A Musician and His Daughter (Pl. 100) is typical of his work in general, except, of course, for the large-scale group portraits and history pictures. De Keyser describes forms in considerable detail and with a fine eye for textures, color, and tonalities. His figures are often animated, if somewhat stiffly (their angular poses bring lay figures to mind). His enthusiasm for linear perspective is not unexpected for an architect’s son, and partly explains the apparent absence of atmosphere in the interior settings.

De Keyser was buried in the Zuiderkerk, Amsterdam, on June 7, 1667.

2. The best introduction to the city’s portrait painters is Amsterdam 2002–3.
3. De Keyser’s equestrian portraits are discussed in Oldenburg 1911, pp. 61–65, and in Liedtke 1989b, pp. 82, 101 n. 27, 258, pl. 180. The known examples are listed in Leeuwarden–k Hertogenbosch–
98. Portrait of a Man with a Shell

Oil on wood, 9½ x 6¼ in. (24 x 17.5 cm)

There is some abrasion in the man’s jacket and hat and in the upper left background, but overall the portrait is well preserved.

From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2005-2005.331.3

This picture and its pendant, Portrait of a Woman with a Balance (Pl. 99), which is catalogued below, were acquired separately by Mr. and Mrs. Frits Markus. The paintings are certainly by De Keyser and probably date from about 1625–26.

In a composition reminiscent of Italian Renaissance and Early Netherlandish portraits, the man holds a seashell in the foreground, where it appears to sit on the edge of the picture’s frame. His fingers follow the curve of the shell and precisely fill the corner of space to the lower right. The patron has had himself presented by the artist as a collector of shells, which at the time was a common pastime of gentlemen who took an interest in rarities of nature. The shell is a South African turban (Turbo marmoratus), an Indo-Pacific shell that is about three to five inches in diameter and becomes pearly white when polished. 3
Figure 97. Thomas de Keyser, *Portrait of a Man*, 1626. Oil on wood, 9½ x 6½ in. (24.3 x 17.3 cm). Private collection, Switzerland

Figure 98. Thomas de Keyser, *Portrait of a Woman*, 1628. Oil on wood, 9¾ x 6¾ in. (24.5 x 17.5 cm). Private collection, Switzerland

Figure 99. Thomas de Keyser, *Portrait of a Man with a Ruff*, ca. 1626. Oil on copper (octagonal), 9¾ x 7¾ in. (25.1 x 19.4 cm). Allentown Art Museum, Allentown, Pennsylvania, Bequest of Mrs. Eugene L. Garbáty, 1993

Figure 100. Thomas de Keyser, *Portrait of a Woman*. Oil on copper (oval or possibly octagonal), 9¾ x 7¾ in. (25 x 19.5 cm). Formerly collection of Adolphe Schloss; seized by the Nazis in 1943
There are a few immediate precedents for portraits of Dutchmen as shell collectors. The best known is the Portrait of Jan Govertsz van der Aar, dated 1603 (P. and N. de Boer Foundation, Amsterdam, on loan to the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), by Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1611). Van der Aar (1544/45–1612) was a merchant who lived in Haarlem and invested in the East India Company (VOC), the likely source for his shells. Michiel van Miereveld (q.v.), in about 1606, painted a portrait of an old man with a shell (Royal Collection, Hampton Court), where the single specimen is an Indian volute. Neptune and Amphitrite (P. and N. de Boer Foundation, Amsterdam), painted about 1616–17 by Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem (1562–1638), is said by at least one scholar to represent actual persons, and shows the sea god displaying a variety of shells like a collector in his cabinet.

Two other versions of the present portrait are known, and two other versions of its pendant. In 1997, Otto Naumann, who earlier had the Markus pictures, brought to the Museum for direct comparison another pair of portraits of the same sitters (figs. 97, 98). Those paintings are on wood panels of the same size and present the sitters in the same way, but they appear about forty percent larger in the picture field, bust-length, without hands and attributes. The man’s portrait is inscribed at the upper right, “An. 1626/AET 59,” and the woman’s portrait is inscribed at the upper left, “An. 1628./AET: 61.” Also brought in for examination on the same occasion was the third known version of the man’s portrait (fig. 99), which was given to the Allentown Art Museum in 1993. The Allentown painting, which is on an octagonal copper support, is signed “TDK” in monogram.

There was a general consensus among the two museum scholars and four art dealers present that all five paintings were probably by De Keyser himself. The execution in the Markus pictures is smoother than in the Naumann versions, which have many short brushstrokes and more vivid coloring. This appears consistent with the difference in scale of the figures, which are similar in other respects, such as their sense of volume, tonalities, drawing of contours and details (in the facial features as well as in the costumes), and so on. The group hypothesized that the Markus portraits were painted first. There is no indication that they were derived from any of the other versions, which lack the attributes. Some penitenti are visible in the Markus pictures (for example, in the woman’s bonnet and proper right shoulder). The expression of the woman appears somewhat more serious in the Markus version, and in the same woman’s portrait on copper (fig. 100; see the entry below). It also seemed to those present in 1997 that the Allentown picture and its putative pendant (which was unknown from publications at the time) probably preceded the Naumann portraits, given the more impressive quality of the painting on copper and the choice of that support. However, Ann Adams is inclined to place the Allentown painting first, in view of its characteristic signature and its closeness in execution to indisputable works. This view accords with that of Rudolf Oldenbourg in 1911 (see Refs.), who evidently knew the Allentown version firsthand (it was then in the collection of A. de Ridder, Schönberg, Cronberg, near Frankfurt am Main), and knew the Markus version (then in New York, and already separated from its pendant) only from a photograph. Of course, other versions of both portraits might be missing and preparatory drawings may have been employed. It was not unusual for Netherlandish portraitists to supply multiple versions of portraits to patrons, so that different members of their family might have them.

The dates and ages inscribed on the Naumann portraits indicate that both sitters were about fifty-nine years old in 1626. The present pair of portraits was probably painted in 1626 or slightly earlier.

1. On shell collecting in the Netherlands during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Coomans 1992. In the literature of art, shell collectors are often called conchologists, which incorrectly equates them with scholars specializing in that branch of zoology.
2. See Amsterd01992, p. 64, and Coomans 1992, p. 201, fig. 172, for a turbo of this type, engraved in the seventeenth century with four rows of sea, air, and land creatures. The shell in this painting has been incorrectly described in earlier literature as a nautilus shell (see Refs.).
4. On the painting, see White 1982, p. 74, no. 105, pl. 89.
5. Nichols in Amsterdam–New York–Toledo 2003–4, p. 330 n. 113, where the portrait by Van Miereveld is also mentioned. Neptune and Amphitrite is catalogued in Van Thiel 1999, pp. 310–21, no. 147, pl. 227, where the question of portraiture is left in the air.
6. The Naumann portraits, as they are called here, were purchased at Sothebys, London, July 5, 1995, no. 295, and sold in 1998 to Bert van Deun (d. 2004), who lived in Oberiingeri, Switzerland.
7. Bequest of Mrs. Eugene L. (Marie Louise) Garbity, 1992 (acc. no. 93.23.6). The painting was owned by the comte de Montbrison, Chateau Saint-Roch, according to the collection catalogue (Bode 1913, pl. 14) of its next owner, August de Ridder, Schönberg, near Cronberg in the Taunus (his sale, Paris, June 2, 1940, no. 35). It was later sold by Lange, Berlin, to Mr. and Mrs. Garbity, of Berlin and later New York and East Norwalk, Connecticut. See Hartford 1937, no. 26.
8. At the time of comparison it was thought that the copper support, which is cut at the corners, might have originally been rectangular. But the same shape, a tall octagonal, was used for De Keyser’s pendant portraits of a man and a woman, dated 1631.
99. Portrait of a Woman with a Balance

Oil on wood, 9 3/4 x 6 1/4 in. (23 x 17.4 cm)

The painting is well preserved, although the woman’s face is slightly abraded.

From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2005 2005.331.6

This painting from the Markus collection and its pendant, Portrait of a Man with a Shell (Pl. 98), are discussed in the entry above. It is suggested there that the portraits date from about 1625–26. A second version of the present picture (fig. 98) is inscribed “An. 1628/AET: 61,” but its pendant (fig. 97) is dated 1626. The difference in date is not exceptional in pendants by De Keyser.¹

A third version of the woman’s portrait (fig. 100), on an oval (or possibly octagonal) copper support, became known in 1968 when it was published in a catalogue of paintings missing from a French collection that was seized in World War II.² That painting appears to be the lost mate to the Portrait of a Man in Allentown (fig. 99). The relationship between the three pairs of pendant portraits is discussed in the preceding entry.

When the De Keyser specialist Ann Adams published the Markus painting in 1988 (see Refs.), its pendant and the second (Naumann) versions of the two portraits were unknown. Adams suggested a dating to the early 1630s, based on De Keyser’s small pendant portraits in the collection of the University of Stockholm (dated 1631 and 1634), and on two larger portraits in the Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels, one of which was previously said to be dated 1654. However, the women’s costumes in the Stockholm and Brussels portraits are outdated, and the evidence favoring a mid-1620s date for the Markus paintings appears to be indisputable.

The object in the woman’s hand is a balance or scale, of a type usually used for weighing gold and silver coins. That the object is only partially seen is sufficiently explained by the composition’s formal relationship to the pendant portrait. As in genre paintings of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such as Jan van Hemessen’s A Girl Weighing Gold, of about 1530–35 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), and Vermeer’s Woman with a Balance, of about 1663–64 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), the balance symbolizes the virtue of temperance.³ In Dutch pendant portraits of the period, it is not uncommon for an attribute in a portrait of a man to refer to his profession or intellectual interests, while a motif in the female portrait refers to a virtue especially expected of wives.

¹. See the preceding entry, note 8, on De Keyser’s pendant portraits in Stockholm, which are dated 1631 and 1634.
2. Schloss Collection 1998, p. 96. It is stated there that the portrait was attributed to the Haarlem school in the 1943 inventory of the Schloss collection (no. 313), but was ascribed to De Keyser in the will of Schloss's widow, Lucie. The identification of the sitter as "Mme Gracht née Broetmans" is based on a comparison with a portrait once thought to be by De Keyser (Oldenbourg 1911, no. 76, pl. XXII), and is certainly wrong. Like several other paintings seized from the Schloss collection, the De Keyser portrait was sold to a certain "Buittenweg" after 1946. It has been conjectured that the pseudonym refers either to the art historian Vitale Bloch (see discussion for Pl. 207) or, less plausibly, to J.-F. Lefranc, a French dealer and collaborator in the Nazi seizure of the Schloss collection. Bloch served as an assistant to Erhard Göpel, who was an official of Hitler's museum in Linz and his buying agent in the Netherlands (Schloss Collection 1998, p. 5 n. 5). It may be significant that Bloch left one of the Schloss pictures, Dirck van Delen's Tulip in a Chinese Vase, dated 1637, to the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam (Gemalde Kabinet 1995, vol. 2, p. 279).

3. Both paintings are discussed by the present writer in New York-London 2001, pp. 381-86 (under no. 73). P. Sutton (see Refs.) supports this interpretation, citing different precedents.

References: A. Adams in New York 1988, pp. 61 (ill.), 77, no. 28, dates the picture to the early 1630s and suggests that the balance "may allude to the ideals of restraint by which the young [1] woman leads—or would like the viewer to believe she leads—her life"; P. Sutton in Boston 1992, p. 76, no. 76, pl. 25, describes the costume, and supports the interpretation of the balance as an attribute of temperance.


100. A Musician and His Daughter

Oil on wood, 29½ x 20¾ in. (74.9 x 52.7 cm)
Signed and dated (upper right, on lintel): TDK [in monogram] 1639

The painting is well preserved. Slight abrasion has occurred in the deep black passages of the musician's costume, and there is paint loss along a vertical split in the panel extending from between the figure's legs to the floor.

Anonymous Gift, 1964 64.05.4

This picture, dated 1639, is one of several small-scale full-length portraits that De Keyser painted in Amsterdam during the late 1620s and early 1630s. In each case, the figures are set in a contemporary interior. At least four of them show a man with a child, and in two instances it is obvious that he is the child's father. The Museum's painting has been variously interpreted (see Refs.), but it is concluded here that the man is indeed the girl's father and moreover that he is an amateur musician not a professional music teacher.

The two figures are richly dressed in what might be described as the latest conservative fashion. Especially stylish are the man's shoes and white gloves, one of which is on the table. To the modern viewer it might appear that a man wearing a hat, a mantle over one shoulder, and a glove must have just come indoors, but many contemporary pictures, including De Keyser's Constantijn Huygens and His Clerk, dated 1627 (National Gallery, London), show that this is not the case. The young lady, who is perhaps ten or eleven years old, is dressed in a manner that is entirely consistent with what a wealthy woman twenty years older might wear. She is dressed in a black bodice and skirt over a green blouse and underskirt, all beautifully embroidered. Her lace collar and cuffs, the white-feathered fan, are the equal, for the late 1620s, of what one finds in Rembrandt's Portrait of a Young Woman with a Fan, dated 1633 (Pl. 146), except that the gold chain securing the fan to the girl's waist rather exceeds expectations. She wears a considerable amount of jewelry, including pearl pendants attached to her cap, a gold chain gathered below the collar, and a gold bracelet on each wrist. Her hands are oddly mature.

The interior, although spare, makes a similarly grand impression. The high room is paneled and framed in a classicist style which recalls that of the artist's father (see the biography above) but is actually more up-to-date, like Salomon de Bray's
palace designs of the same year, 1629. The faux-marble floor is extravagantly patterned and, like the more tamely “tiled” (painted) or bare wooden floors that he depicted in other portraits of the period, illustrates De Keyser's usual exaggeration of receding space. This design idea, which probably reflects the painter's early exposure to architectural drafting, complements the angular poses and arbitrary proportions (long limbs and short torsos) that he assigned to portrait patrons. The drawing of the lute (technically, a theorbo) and especially of the open lute case is also a demonstration of skill in the use of linear perspective. For historians of musical instruments the lute case is something of a curiosity, at least with regard to its lining with paper decorated with drawn or printed images. De Keyser deftly describes the case’s construction and worn leather covering. His handling of fabrics, wood surfaces, and so on suggest that he could have pursued a career as a still-life painter.

Other artists of the day, including De Keyser’s Amsterdam predecessor Cornelis van der Voort (ca. 1576–1624), set full-length portraits in contemporary interiors, a trend partly indebted to English court portraiture. However, this approach and another comparatively new concept in Northern European portraiture, that of presenting figures in transitional poses, were employed more consistently by De Keyser than by any other Dutch portraitist of the 1620s. The most striking examples include the portrait of Huygens, dated 1627 (mentioned above); the Museum’s picture and Portrait of a Gentleman Seated at a Table (art market, 2001), both dated 1629; Portrait of a Silversmith, dated 1630 (art market, 2002); and Portrait of a Gentleman and His Son, dated 1631 (Norton Simon Museum of Art, Pasadena), where both figures stand by a table.

The man in the last work was repeated by De Keyser in Portrait of a Gentleman and His Daughter (art market, New York, 1997). The room is different and the child is perched on a table, but the man and his costume are the same. The two paintings are certainly not pendants: the Pasadena picture is on canvas (25 x 19¼ in. [63.5 x 48.9 cm]), and the undated (slightly later?) portrait is on a smaller sheet of copper (19½ x 16½ in. [50 x 42 cm]). Nothing suggests that the man is a widower (his flashy costume speaks against it), and the two works together reveal that he had more than one child. Other portraits of children with their father alone were painted in the northern Netherlands. For example, a “North Holland” portrait, dated 1624, by an unknown Dutch painter (the panel is signed “M.D.W.”) shows a father walking with three children on a country road. Jan van Ravesteyn’s Portrait of Pieter van Veen and His Son and Clerk, of about 1615 (Musée d’Art et d’Histoire, Geneva), is a more important antecedent of De Keyser’s work.

In her dissertation, Adams (see Refs.) proposed a narrative that might explain the man’s action in the Museum’s picture, which she then considered De Keyser’s “strangest work.” But comparisons with approximately contemporary portraits by the artist suggest that the man’s pose is not so exceptional, and that reading any narrative into the picture may be inappropriate. As in other portraits of seated men by De Keyser, the combination of a tall chair and an accelerated perspective recession results in what looks like a nearly standing pose, but the man here is firmly seated with his right elbow resting on the table. The lute is his attribute as an amateur musician, and as a gentleman who could afford a costly instrument. The girl is probably too young to play it (smaller ones were available), and if De Keyser’s idea was a music lesson, her pose is, by his own standards, an opportunity missed. The father could be described as setting an example rather than providing instruction, through his interest in one of the liberal arts. A similar image of a father as role model rather than pedagogue is found in Jan Steen’s A Burgher of Delft and His Daughter, of 1655 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). The bust over the doorway, if it represents Minerva, would support this interpretation. The goddess was often depicted as a patroness of learning and of the arts.

1. That is, De Bray’s designs for the Huis te Warmond, which were drawn in 1629 and copied by Pieter Saenredam in 1632. See G. Schwartz and Bok 1990, pp. 103, 287, no. 176, fig. 113. Also illustrated in J. W. von Molken’s entry on De Bray (1597–1664) in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 4, pp. 701–2, where the Saenredam drawing is incorrectly captioned as by De Bray himself, and absurdly said to be for “the rebuilding of the Stadhuis, Haarlem”.

2. See the discussion of foreshortened lutes as a standard perspective problem in Liedtke 2000a, pp. 57–58.

3. A fair number of lute cases from the period survive, and are usually lined with fabric. The cheaper lining here, and the barded exterior, may indicate that De Keyser used an actual model. The theorbo is in the lute family; compare the theorbo-lute in the painting by Ter Borch in the Altman Collection (Pl. 15). Kenneth Moore, curator in charge, Department of Musical Instruments, kindly discussed the De Keyser portrait with the present writer in May 2005.

4. As in the pendant portraits of Lord and Lady Arundel (1618) by Daniël Mijtens (q.v.). See also Van der Voort’s portraits of Laurens Reael and his wife (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Portrait of a Girl, 1623, by Paulus Moreelse (q.v.; National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin; Haarlem—Antwerp 2000–2001, no. 21); Eva Weevel, 1628, by Joachim Weevel (q.v.; Centraal Museum, Utrecht; Haarlem—Antwerp 2000–2001, no. 4); and the remarkable Merry Company with a young couple’s portrait, painted in
1620 by the otherwise unknown Isack Elyas (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; Haarlem 1986a, no. 1). There is, of course, a connection with contemporary genre painting, such as the Merry Companies that Dirck Hals (q.v.) painted in collaboration with the architectural painter Dirck van Delen (1624/5–1671) during the late 1620s in Haarlem.

5. On Rembrandt's use of "fleeting posture" in the early 1630s, see the discussion of his Portrait of a Man at a Writing Desk, 1619 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), in Corpus 1982–86, vol. 2, p. 127 (under no. A 444), where the Museum's Portrait of a Young Woman with a Fan, dated 1633 (Pl. 146), and its pendant (fig. 174 here) are also cited. The authors downplay the assumption of Flemish influence, made by earlier scholars "on the evidence of Rubens' Portrait of Gevartius [Gevartius] in Antwerp," but the key figure to consider is Anthony van Dyck, as seen in the Museum's Portrait of Lucas van Uffel, which dates from the early 1620s (Liedtke 1984, pp. 36–64, pl. 26; Barnes et al. 2004, pp. 209–10, no. II.70). On this question, see also Dicke 2004, pp. 24–27.

6. Sotheby's, New York, January 27, 2005, no. 173. The man, evidently a cloth merchant, responds to the viewer as he stamps a letter or document.


10. For this work and De Keyser's full-length Portrait of a Man, dated 1634, in the same collection, see Oberlin and other cities 1989–90, pp. 8, 10, fig. 7, and pp. 66–67, no. 19. The originality of the composition by Van Ravesteyn is discussed in Haak 1984, pp. 217–18, fig. 456.

11. On a visit to the Museum in March 1971, Julius Held remarked that the man "probably is not giving a lesson" (to quote from John Walsh's note in the curatorial files). Ann Adams now considers the figures to be father and daughter (personal communication in May 2005). The man appears to reach with his right hand into a small bag or purse, which the present writer is unable to explain.

12. See the remarks about Huygens and his musical instruments in Liedtke 2000a, p. 66.

13. See New York–London 2001, no. 58. The sitter is now identified as Adolf Croeser and his daughter Catharina; see Grijzenhout and Van Sas 2006. As a portrait type, the canvas by Steen more closely resembles yet another De Keyser depicting a father and one child, his Frederick van Veurne and His Son, Dirck, dated 1660 (Amir Pakzad collection, Hannover; Devriem 1990, p. 713, fig. 40). In that painting, education is indeed an issue, since the father hands the boy a book.

14. Compare Rubens's Education of Maria de' Medici (Louvre, Paris), where Minerva teaches the princess to write and Apollo plays a viol. If the girl in De Keyser's portrait appeared to be learning something, then Minerva could be construed as her guide. But the bust over the doorway seems more of a household saint, and the sort of decoration an amateur musician might have.

REFERENCES: Oldenburg 1911, p. 73, no. 32, knows the painting ("owner not known") from its inclusion in a Berlin exhibition of 1890; Hueyge 1954, p. 235, no. 620 (ill.); Virch 1970, p. 12, gives basic information about provenance and literature; Bénizet 1976, p. 206, lists the work as in the 1935 sale (see Ex Coll.); A. Adams 1985, vol. 1, pp. 149–51, considers the picture De Keyser's "strangest work," discusses the "odd hunched over pose" at some length, concludes that it conforms to "seventeenth-century ideals of grace in deportment," and that the man with the "citron" is not the girl's father but an amateur musician, perhaps a family friend who gave the young lady lessons in playing the instrument, vol. 3, p. 51, no. 24, gives information on provenance, exhibition history, and references in literature; F. Sutton 1986, p. 184, maintains that the painting is "presumptuously titled The Musician and His Daughter"; F. Sutton in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 105, mentions the work as part of an anonymous gift made to the Museum in 1964; Tineke 1992, pp. 193, 200, fig. 66a, considers the anonymous painter of a Merry Company in Vienna to have based his interior on the type of composition represented by the Museum's picture; Liedtke in New York 1992–93, p. 103 n. 5, cites the work as "a composition that sets the Lille picture [attributed to Pieter Codde] in a broader context," with respect to the description of interior space; Baetjer 1995, p. 387; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, p. 345, compares the portrait with Jan Steen's A Burgler of Delft and His Daughter (now in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) as an image of "a commendable parent, setting an example for his child"; Van der Waals in Rotterdam 2006, p. 19, fig. 16, and frontisp. (detail), notes how prints have been used to line the lure case.

EXHIBITED: Berlin, 1890 (according to Oldenburg 1911; see Refs.).

Ex Coll.: [Nikolaus Steinsneyer, Cologne, until 1911; sold to Kleinberger]; [Kleinberger, Paris, 1912–13; sold to Knoedler for FFr 56,000]; [Knoedler, New York and London, 1912–20; sold to Antrik]; [A. B. Aziz, Stockholm, from 1920]; [Osborn Kling, Stockholm (by 1928–35); his sale, Christie's, London, June 28, 1935, for £483 to Cumming]; [Galerie Sanct Lucas, Vienna, in 1933/36; sold to private collection, Vienna]; private collection, Vienna, and later Greenwich, Conn. (1935/36–64; seized in Paris by the Nazis, held at Munich collecting point and restituted; given by owner to MMA); Anonymous Gift, 1964. 64.65.4.
Philips Koninck was born on November 5, 1619, in Amsterdam, where his father, Aert de Koninck, was an affluent goldsmith. Of the artist’s five older brothers, Jacob (ca. 1614/15—after 1690) was also a painter; Philips studied with him in Rotterdam between 1637 and the end of 1639. “Heads” (tronies) by both Jacob and Philips were listed in the inventory of their father’s estate (April 1639). History pictures, portraits, and genre scenes by Philips date from 1642—a Rembrandtesque Bathsheba Receiving David’s Letter is inscribed “Amstellendam/A n 1642”4—until 1674, when he painted two of his several portraits of the aged poet Joost van den Vondel. Most of Koninck’s known figure paintings are rather awkward and inexpressive, although the Self-Portrait with an Antique Bust, of 1661 (Uffizi, Florence), is an appealing work. Today only specialists are familiar with pictures by Koninck that represent subjects other than landscape, but Vondel, in a few poems,7 and Arnold Houbraken, in his brief remarks on the painter, mention only portraits and mythological and allegorical pictures.

On January 1, 1644, Koninck was married in Rotterdam to Cornelia Furnerius,9 sister of the young Rembrandt pupil Abraham Furnerius (ca. 1628–1654). In April of the following year the artist, already a widower, was recorded as living on the Keizersgracht in Amsterdam.10 Houbraken calls Koninck a pupil of Rembrandt’s, but it is doubtful that this was a formal relationship.11 The figure paintings dating from the 1640s are less reminiscent of Rembrandt than of minor Rembrandt followers such as Salomon Koninck (1609–1656), who was apparently Philips’s cousin or otherwise related to him.12

The earliest known dated landscape painting by Philips Koninck is the Landscape with Travelers, of 1647 (Victoria and Albert Museum, London).13 The Metropolitan Museum’s small canvas Wide River Landscape (Pl. 101) probably dates from the late 1640s, and the large Panoramic Landscape with a Country Estate (Pl. 102) is dated 1649(?). These and other early landscape paintings by Koninck reveal the influence of Rembrandt’s landscapes dating from about a decade earlier, and also that of the moody panoramas painted by Hercules Segers (1589/90—1633/8) about 1629–31. The same painters of imaginary landscapes influenced Roelant Roghman (1627–bur. Jan. 3, 1692) and Johannes Ruischer (ca. 1625—after 1675), and it seems likely that the latter artists and Koninck came to appreciate Segers’s work largely through the eight examples in Rembrandt’s collection and through Rembrandt’s eyes.14

Koninck must also have been aware of Jan van Goyen’s views of extensive lowlands that date from about 1644–47 (see Pl. 50). Van Goyen’s nearly contemporary pictures remind one that Koninck’s sweeping landscapes, however innovative, date from a period in which Dutch landscape paintings in general became more spacious, more colorful, and often more monumental, with high skies and magnificent clouds conveying the impression that the new nation’s distinctive topography had its own kind of majesty.

Koninck is not recorded in Amsterdam between 1642 and 1653,15 but in these years he obviously was in contact with Rembrandt and a number of his pupils, such as Heyman Dullaert (1636–1684; Koninck’s portrait of Dullaert is in the Saint Louis Art Museum) and Furnerius, whose family was cited several times in connection with Koninck in the 1650s and 1660s.16 On May 15, 1657, in Rotterdam, Koninck married a widow, Margaretha van Rijn, who was not related to Rembrandt.17 However, in 1667, Koninck and Gerrit Uylenburgh (the son of Rembrandt’s former agent) were recorded together as judging a work attributed to Adriaen Brouwer (1603/6–1638),18 and there are other documents indicating that Koninck was well known in Rembrandt’s circle of artists, dealers, and patrons.

Koninck had one son from his first marriage, and at least five children from his second marriage survived beyond infancy. The family lived successively in various houses on Amsterdam’s main canals and evidently prospered, probably for the most part because of the artist’s and his wife’s investments in canal boats operating between Amsterdam and other cities.19 It is not clear whether this business helps to explain Koninck’s apparent inactivity in later years; no painting by him is known to date from after 1676 (see fig. 103).20 Koninck was buried in the Nieuwe Kerk, Amsterdam, on October 6, 1688, leaving his wife (d. 1703) with many fine household possessions, including several of his landscapes and two portraits of Vondel.21 About two hundred and fifty paintings, nearly three hundred drawings,22 and seven or eight etchings are known.23
2. Jacob Koninck was paid on January 2, 1640, for instructing Philips for a half year, which Gerson considers to have been the end of his tuition (Gerson 1980, pp. 8, 84, doc. 7d; see also A. D. de Vries 1883c, p. 306). On Jacob Koninck, see Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 3, pp. 1516–17. After spending some time in Dordrecht, Jacob lived in Rotterdam (1637–45), The Hague (cited there in 1647 and 1648), Amsterdam (recorded 1612 and 1659), and Copenhagen (ca. 1676–1690 or later). Today only some landscape paintings and landscape drawings are known (see Sumowski 1983–[94], nos. 992–1001, and Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 6, pp. 2883–2943).
4. Ibid., p. 117, no. 140, as Vertumnus and Pomona (?); Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 3, no. 1002, correctly as Bathsheba Receiving David’s Letter (location unknown).
6. Both Chiarini (1989, pp. 212–14) and Langedijk (1992, pp. 55–57, no. 10) discuss the self-portrait’s composition and iconography, and emphasize that the date must be read as 1661 (this was clarified by cleaning in 1992). Previously the date was usually read as 1667, for example in Gerson 1980, p. 124, no. 207, and in Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 3, p. 1542, no. 1074 (on p. 1552, Sumowski arbitrarily describes the painting as “astonishingly weak”). P. Sutton in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 366, concludes, “the fact that his portrait was sought by the Grand Duke of Tuscany for the latter’s gallery of artists’ self-portraits is proof of his international reputation” (see Gerson 1980, p. 11, for a more temperate version of this claim). Cosimo III de’ Medici visited Rembrandt on December 29, 1667, when the publisher Pieter Blaeu also took the grand duke to the studios of Willem van de Velde the Elder and of “Scamus who does seascapes” (Strauss and Van der Meulen 1970, pp. 569–70). There is no evidence that Cosimo requested Koninck’s portrait at any date, and no reason to think that its presence in Florence (by 1707; mentioned in Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 1, p. 270), among many other artists’ self-portraits, constitutes proof of an international reputation. On the Uffizi’s encyclopedic but haphazard collection of self-portraits (which includes those of Job Berckheyde, Willem Drost, Jan Mieli, etc.), see Prinz 1979.
7. See Gerson 1980, pp. 92–95, doc. 58.
10. Ibid., p. 85, doc. 16.
11. Gerson (ibid., p. 9) rejects the idea that Koninck was Rembrandt’s pupil either prior to 1637 or after 1640. Houbraken’s remark (1718–21, vol. 2, p. 54) seems to rhetorically anticipate his observation that Koninck rejected “his teacher” Rembrandt’s dark backgrounds in favor of a more fashionable “clarity” (here Houbraken follows the criticism of his teacher Van Hoogstraten; see Fransis 1991).
12. Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 3, p. 1531, sees Rembrandt and some other Rotterdam painters as the principal influences on Koninck’s historical and genre scenes. Salomon Koninck was the son of the Amsterdam goldsmith Pieter de Koninck and was cited among other relatives in a document of 1646 concerning Philips’s stepmother (Gerson 1980, p. 86, doc. 17).
13. See Gerson 1980, pp. 15, 21, 107, no. 34, pl. 2.
14. As noted in ibid., p. 21. Compare Chong in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 487, and see p. 485, where most of the literature on Segers is cited. A fair number of works by Segers are cited in the 1640 inventory of the Amsterdam art dealer Johannes de Renialme (see Montias 2002a, pp. 141–43), and in the 1697 inventory of his estate, pictures by Segers and by Philips Koninck (landscapes and figure paintings) are cited a few times (see Bredius 1915–22, part 1, pp. 228–29).
15. Gerson 1980, p. 86, doc. 18 (Koninck, “age 13 years,” along with other Amsterdam artists, judges the authenticity of a painting by Paul Bril).
16. See ibid., pp. 87–89, docs. 23, 25, 26, 41.
17. Ibid., pp. 12, 87, doc. 26. Margarethe van Rijn was from Rotterdam, not Rembrandt’s native Leiden. In the previous year, 1666, Vondel wrote a poem praising Koninck’s portrait of her (ibid., p. 87, doc. 21, no. 11 on Koninck’s patrons in general).
18. Ibid., p. 89, doc. 38.
21. See ibid., pp. 14, 94, 96, docs. 64, 72, on the artist’s burial and on the estate of Margaretha van Rijn; the entire estate (which included a large amount of furniture, pictures, linen, and especially Chinese and European porcelain) is published in Bredius 1915–22, part 1, pp. 153–55.
23. For the etchings, see Gerson 1980, pp. 63–64, 179–80, pls. 36, 37.
101. **Wide River Landscape**

Oil on canvas, 16 1/4 x 22 3/8 in. (41.3 x 58.1 cm)

The painting is well preserved, although there is some abrasion in the figures and animals in the foreground.

Anonymous Gift, 1963 63.43.2

This small, early canvas by Koninck, who probably painted it about 1648–49, is one of his most Rembrandtesque landscapes and at the same time one of the first works in which he reveals an individual style.

In the foreground, a roadway meanders past a farmhouse in shadow, a river shimmering in sunlight, another farmhouse and a barn huddled behind a tentative fence line, and a few houses partly hidden by trees. A man in the cottage by the riverbank looks out at a little field, where a woman milks a cow; to the right are two sheep, a resting cow, and a standing calf. This area of the paint surface is somewhat abraded, and the underscaled figures and animals are no longer clearly visible. The figure seated at some distance from the milkmaid has been described in the past as a man.¹

As in Koninck’s later panoramic landscapes, the view recedes through zones of space that are approximately parallel to the picture plane. Beyond the sailboats on the river, a tilled field is bordered by a farmhouse and a broad line of trees. Further back, a typical Dutch river town stretches out in the sun. Another tributary, or another part of the one in the foreground, opens into a larger body of water in the left background. The fall of sunlight suggests an hour late in the day and in its rosy tones seems to dismiss the rival claim of rain clouds. On the whole, the organization of the picture into areas of light and shadow is even more arbitrary than in the landscapes by Rembrandt that must have inspired Koninck, and recalls the alternating patterns employed by Hercules Segers (1590/91–1633/38) in such works as *Landscape with a Lake*, of the 1620s (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam).²

*Wide River Landscape* was virtually unknown before it was given to the Museum in 1963. In 1936, Gerson catalogued four versions of the composition (see fig. 101), none of which he considered autograph.³ One of these pictures appears to be identical with a painting (support unknown, 17 x 20 in. [42.3 x 50.8 cm]) thought to be by Rembrandt when it was engraved by J. B. C. Chatelaine in 1744.⁴ Gerson saw the Museum’s painting in 1976 and was undecided about its authorship (the animals especially troubled him).⁵ No scholar other than Gerson has ever expressed doubt about the picture’s authenticity, either in print or in person at the Museum.

The painting is closely related in style to Koninck’s *Panoramic Landscape with a Village* (Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Edward William Carter, Los Angeles), which has been dated convincingly to about 1648 on the basis of comparisons with the less accomplished landscapes in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid (ca. 1645–46) and in the Victoria and

---

¹ Gerson, 1936, p. 106.
² Gerson, 1936, p. 106.
³ Gerson, 1936, p. 106.
⁴ Gerson, 1936, p. 106.
⁵ Gerson, 1936, p. 106.

---

Figure 101. Copy after Philips Koninck, *Wide River Landscape*. Oil on canvas, 17 3/4 x 23 3/8 in. (45.1 x 59 cm). Formerly Buchenhau collection, Lübeck-Niendorf
Albert Museum, London (dated 1647), and with a small panel dated 1648 (?) in the City Art Gallery, Manchester. The smaller Carter painting has a somewhat less textured appearance than the Museum’s picture, in part because of its smoother support (wood, 11 3/4 x 14 3/4 in. [29 x 36 cm]) and emptier foreground. However, the two works are conceived and executed in a very similar manner, which (as Walsh and Schneider observe) is more coherent and successful than Koninck’s contemporary landscapes made on an imposing scale (for example, the Museum’s Panoramic Landscape with a Country Estate; Pl. 102). Sumowski evidently overlooked the greater challenges posed by Koninck’s early large-scale panoramas when he dated the present picture to about 1651, which is when he believes the artist first fully developed his individual style, namely, in the canvas (24 3/4 x 33 7/8 in. [62 x 86 cm]), dated 1651, in the Sammlung Oskar Reinhart “Am Römerholz,” Winterthur. However, the small landscapes that Koninck painted about 1648–49, and a few of his panoramic landscape drawings dating from the second half of the 1640s, demonstrate that while he had created his own approach to composition before 1650, he needed another one or two years’ experience to transform his vision of nature into something grand.

1. J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7, p. 188 (under no. 197), describes the figures and animals in Charetaine’s engraving of 1744 after another version of this painting (see text below and note 3) as “two cows, a goat [the calf], and two sheep; a woman appears to be milking one of the cows, and a man sits on the ground next to her.” In the Buchenau and Perman versions of this composition (see note 3 below and fig. 1), the seated figure to the left is clearly a man wearing a hat and the animal to the far right is a calf.


3. See Gerson (1936) 1980, p. 130, nos. xi, xii-a-c. Gerson’s no. xii (canvas, 17 7/8 x 23 7/8 in. [45.5 x 59 cm]), which came from the famous collection of Charles Crews in London (sold, 1915) and was later in the collection of S. Buchenau in Lübeck-Niendorf,
was owned in 1967 by Bucenat's daughter, Mrs. Margarete Zanotti, in Barcelona (Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, RKD neg. 132623; fig. 101 here). Gerson's no. xiii (canvas, 17½ x 23¼ in. [44 x 59 cm]), from the collection of A. Charles Kiefer, Schloss Dreilinden, Lucerne, is known from a photograph in the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie (RKD neg. 132626). Gerson's no. xiiib (canvas, 16⅛ x 23⅛ in. [41 x 60 cm]), was left to the Metropolitan Museum by Theodore M. Davis (no. 30.91.295), was given by the Museum to Halloran Hospital, Staten Island, New York, in 1943. W. R. Valentiner saw the Davis version in 1931 and considered it to be a later copy, probably from the eighteenth century. Gerson lists his no. xiiic (canvas, 16¼ x 20½ in. [42.5 x 51 cm]) as in the J. Perman collection, Stockholm, but a note in the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie records that Perman himself refuted the information. Virch 1970, p. 13, lists a fifth version, "probably nineteenth century copy," as owned by F. B. Anthon, Beverly Hills, in 1967, and Virch observes that all five versions and the Chatelaine engraving differ from the Museum's picture in that they include two men fishing on the riverbank near the sailboat.


5. Horst Gerson, oral opinion, April 7, 1976. Gerson said essentially the same thing in a letter to Claus Virch, dated April 19, 1967 ("does not look so bad, but there are very weak parts in it, for instance the foreground").


References: Virch 1970, p. 13, concludes that the painting was considered highly in the past for it exists in at least five other versions; none of them autograph; Walsh in New York 1971, pp. 10–11, comments on the use of light "for drama as well as for coherence"; Walsh 1974a, pp. 344, 348–49 n. 18, pl. v, as "the original [which] came to light in Vienna in 1934"; Hibbard 1980, pp. 310–31, fig. 595; Los Angeles–Boston–New York 1981–82, pp. 68–69 n. 5, fig. 2 (under no. 16) as "especially close in structure and spirit to the Carter painting" (see text above); Sunowski 1981–94, vol. 3, pp. 1533, 1546, 1600, no. 1050 (ill.), dates the painting to about 1650, and cites other versions; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, listed; Chong in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, pp. 486–87, fig. 2 (under no. 100), as "closer to Segers' work" than to Rembrandt's; Baejer 1995, p. 251; Liedtke in New York 1996–97, vol. 2, p. 219, no. 51 (ill.), dates from about 1648–49 and as "one of Koninck's most Rembrandtsque works."


Ex coll.: T Sale, London, early 1930s, to Galerie Sanct Lucas; [Galerie Sanct Lucas, Vienna, until 1934/38; sold to a private collection, Vienna]; private collection, Vienna, and later Greenwich, Conn. (1934/38–63; seized in Paris by the Nazis, held at Alt Aussee, Austria [1981]), and at Munich collecting point [1982]; returned to France October 30, 1946; restituted; given by owner to MMA; Anonymous Gift, 1963. 64.4.2.
102. A Panoramic Landscape with a Country Estate

Oil on canvas, 56 3/4 x 68 3/4 in. (143.2 x 174.4 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): P. koninck/1649

Abrasion of the paint surface throughout the composition has exposed the dark underlayer, producing many dark spots that disfigure the cloud-filled sky. The effect of this damage is less disruptive in the landscape.

John Stewart Kennedy Fund, 1911 11.144

In this comparatively early work, one of Koninck's first large-scale landscapes, the arbitrarily high vantage point allows the viewer to survey not only extensive farmland but also three or more different rivers and four cities or towns. The highlands to the left and the hills to the right embrace a broad valley reminiscent of those in the eastern Netherlands. However, the topography and placement of motifs clearly depend more on Koninck's knowledge of earlier panoramic pictures (compare Pl. 90) than on his presumed experience of Gelderland or some other sparsely settled and wide-open place.

The complicated foreground, with its intersecting curves of shadow and terrain, is to some extent clarified by rutted wagon tracks descending past the tiny goatherd to more distant figures and a rustic wooden gate. The impressionistic triangle of water to the lower right is bordered by wooden railings and a stand of trees. There is no apparent connection
(which would justify Gerson’s title, *Landschaft mit großem Dammmweg*) between the stream or pond to the lower right and the river or canal to the left. The land drops suddenly to either side in the foreground, dividing it into angular and arching areas. Perhaps the most obvious instance of Koninck’s search for structure is the line of shadow that cuts across the road and seems continued by the nearest bank of the waterway on the left.

A small canal boat (*trekschuit*) on the same body of water is pulled by a horse on the towpath along the opposite bank. The boat passes by the tall wooden gate of an estate, surrounded by hedgerows and shaded by trees, on which stand farmhouses and a small manor house. A grassfield and grasslands extend to the light blue river in the sunny middle ground. With historical hindsight, it might be said that Koninck’s mature style of landscape painting begins in this area, although the narrow tapestry of nature just below the horizon lacks the weavelike texture found in the artist’s classic works.

In the central area of the view, a sailboat floats by a large group of farm buildings nestled among trees. To the left, a stone gateway guards a sizable town, which features an old church tower, two windmills, and red-tiled roofs. A stream winds past the town toward yet another sunlit plain, where windmills, isolated buildings, and a distant city appear. And a blanket of cottony clouds billows across the canvas, receding to the deep blue hills of the horizon.

Two aspects of this early work make it stand out in a survey of Koninck’s career. First, despite its naïve qualities, the composition as a whole brings the traditional Netherlandish “world landscape” down to earth; the impression of a map shown in perspective, which lingers even in Jan van Goyen’s *View of Haarlem and the Haarlemmer Meer* (Pl. 50), is here replaced by an environment into which one is invited to wander, and to explore beyond the limits of view. Second, Koninck’s kind of extensive landscape—called a *verschiet*, or vista, in a contemporary inventory—includes something rarely seen in earlier works, a rich visual texture of light falling on various surfaces. From the velvety grass in the foreground and the myriad sun-tipped leaves to the white threads of sunlight drawn through distant fields, motifs and surfaces draw the eye, which comes to rest in sheer pleasure with the way things have been rendered.

The leading authority on Koninck, Horst Gerson, paid this picture the apparent compliment of puzzling over its date: 1649 seemed too early to him when he saw the painting in 1976. However, the third digit of the date is unquestionably a 4, and Gerson’s study of 1936 convincingly places the picture among other paintings of about 1647–50. It also includes the observation that the canvas is very close in coloring to the masterworks of the 1650s. In Koninck’s confident use of a road leading through the foreground, an approach he more timidly attempted in compositions dated 1647 and 1648, Gerson saw a response to the young Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.), who indeed used rutted roads as boldly in a few prints and paintings dating from 1646–48. However, the hills to either side, the flat plain between them, and the small vertical accents spaced across the composition seem more reminiscent of paintings by Hercules Segers (1580/90–1633/38), in this case with little sign of Rembrandt’s having intervened.

While the painting is in fairly good condition, some areas have darkened with age and the sky has suffered from abrasion. A dusky undertone helps to establish the Rembrandtesque mood, as in the early *Wide River Landscape* (Pl. 101). In mature works, Koninck made more conspicuous use of the textures of paint and canvas (which in this case is finely woven) and of a lighter ground. To judge the painting by the standard of works executed a decade later would seem an appropriate tribute, even if this was not always the intention.

The picture has not yet been traced in England before its appearance in the Heywood sale of 1893 (see Ex Coll.). One writer observes that “Koninck’s large panoramas were much admired by British collectors during the second half of the eighteenth century and into the mid-nineteenth century.” In 1911, the English dealer Robert Langton Douglas, then a freelance agent for the Metropolitan Museum, assured the curator of paintings, Bryson Burroughs, that the Museum should buy the painting: “I follow Dr. Bode and Dr. de Groot in having the highest opinion of de Koninck as artist; and this is one of his best works.” Be that as it may, the painting holds an important place within the development of panoramic landscape views, and within the most comprehensive collection of Dutch landscape painting in America.

Formerly titled by the Museum *Landscape.*

2. The 1657 inventory of the art dealer Johannes de Renialme’s estate includes *Een verschiet van Philips Koninck,* valued at fl 130 (Bredius 1915–22, part 1, p. 238).
5. Ibid., no. 34, pl. 2, the panel dated 1647 in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, and no. 13, from the collection of
Lord Mount Temple. The latter was sold at Sotheby’s, London, December 9, 1923, no. 20.


EX COLL.: Sale, Pieter de Smet van Alphen et al., Le Brun, Paris, April 15ff., 1811, no. 82, for Fr 439 to Henri; John Pemberton Heywood, Norris Green, Lancashire, and Cloverly Hall, Shropshire (until 1893; posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, June 10, 1893, no. 54, for Gns 950 [£945] to Quiller); Harry Quilter, London (until 1906; his sale, Christie’s, London, April 7, 1906, no. 128, bought in, sold for £789 10s. to Weatherley); [R. Langton Douglas and another dealer, London, until 1911; sold to MMA]; John Stewart Kennedy Fund, 1911 11.144.

103. An Extensive Wooded Landscape

Oil on canvas, 32⅛ x 44⅝ in. (83.2 x 113.3 cm)

Signed (lower left): P. Koninck

The painting is well preserved. There are minor paint losses throughout the sky and a larger area of loss associated with a tear in the support at the top, to right of center.

Purchase, Mr. and Mrs. David T. Schiff and George T. Delacorte Jr. Gifts, special funds, and Bequest of Mary Cushing Fosburgh and other gifts and bequests, by exchange, 1980 1980.4

In this colorful late work of the 1670s, the artist’s emphasis is on elegant leisure and the picturesque. An estate with a new or remodeled house stands among the bushy trees on the far side of the river and provides an approximate center for pleasant country life. The staffage, which as usual is by Koninck himself, skillfully leads the viewer into the composition from both sides. To the lower right, a small hunting boat, or jacht (yacht), is occupied by a few figures—apparently two couples, a servant, and an oarsman. Ahead of them, a man poles a raft and a fisherman cools his feet at the water’s edge. Other male figures, a horse, and dogs make their way along the riverbank. On the high road to the left, a stylish cavalier on horseback offers a coin to a begging woman and boy. The two sides of the river are linked by a bridge, which is crossed by a horse and rider. A variety of buildings can be seen in the plain that extends to a tranquil waterway and misty brown hills.

In the hills and other parts of the picture, Koninck seems almost to conjure the image out of the warm ground layer of paint. The edge of the sky is stroked over the landscape’s contour, and rows of trees are dabbed directly on top of the brick-colored undertone.

No other work in the Museum’s extensive collection of
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Dutch landscape paintings so clearly illustrates the decorative tendency of the genre during the 1670s and 1680s, when for many artists the embellishment of fine interiors became more important than verisimilitude. Koninck never rivaled Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.) in the study of clouds and trees, but the primary importance of painterly effects in this picture is remarkably nonetheless.

The composition would seem more arbitrarily conceived than those of Koninck's panoramic views of the 1660s, and it finds an apparent counterpart in a canvas of the same dimensions (fig. 102) that was separated from the Museum's picture between 1900 and 1908. It is possible that the two paintings were designed as pendants, presumably with the Museum's picture meant to hang on the left. (In the case of landscapes there is rarely much formal interdependence between paired pictures, apart from broad outlines and mood.) The New York canvas is also very close in composition and execution to Koninck's last dated painting, the River Landscape, of 1676, in Amsterdam (fig. 103). Motifs such as the hunting boat, the country house, and the figures on the road reoccur with minor differences. Unlike the present picture and its possible pendant, the composition of the Amsterdam painting, with its horizon uninterrupted by trees, is reminiscent of Koninck's panoramic landscapes dating from the 1660s. It is possible that the design of An Extensive Wooded Landscape evolved from that of the picture dated 1676 or from a very similar design. Other paintings by Koninck with trees placed prominently to one side also date from the last years of his activity.¹

¹ The motif had been popular for some time. Compare the pleasure boats seen in Cornelis Vroom's River Landscape, a drawing of about 1622–23, and in Adriaen van de Venne's drawing Spring, of 1632, both of which are illustrated and discussed in London–Paris–Cambridge 2002–3, pp. 90–91 (under no. 13). Koninck had depicted pleasure boats for about twenty years, as in a drawing of about 1665 (Gerson 1980, no. 244, pl. 29; Cambridge–Montreal 1988, no. 49). See also the princely yacht on the canal in front of the residence of Baron Belmonte, Amsterdam, in an etching by

2. The related picture was sold from the Linda and Gerald Guterman collection at Sotheby’s, New York, January 14, 1988, no. 23. An earlier sale recorded there, that of Martin Colnaghi in 1908, actually refers to the Museum’s picture; the Guterman Koninck was not in that sale. Both pictures were sold from the Whatman collection at Christie’s, London, June 16, 1900, nos. 59 (MMA) and 60, when they were purchased by Martin Colnaghi.

3. Moiso-Diekamp 1987 has little to say about pendant landscapes (see pp. 147–53), and the question is not addressed in Loughman and Montias 2000 (but see pp. 123–34 on patterns of hanging pictures and on standardized sizes).

4. Gerson 1980, no. 2, pl. 15, discussed pp. 31, 38, 40; Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 3, no. 1072 (ill.).


REFERENCES: Gerson (1936) 1980, p. 113, no. 89, records the sale of 1900; Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 3, pp. 1534, 1535, no. 1073 (ill. p. 1623), suggests a date of about 1676; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, considers this “the finest of the three panoramas” by Koninck in the Museum; Baecker 1999, p. 325; W. S. Gibson 2000, pp. xxvii, 120, fig. 85, “offers us a veritable catalogue of country pleasures.”


A native of Liège, De Lairesse was probably a pupil of his father, Renier de Lairesse (ca. 1597–1667), and, between about 1655 and 1660, of Bertholet Flémal (1614–1673). The latter, whom Sandrart described as the “Netherlandish Raphael,” had by about 1640 worked for a few years in Rome, and was active in and around Paris about 1645. He was highly successful in Liège as a portraitist, history painter, and architect. The influence of Poussin, Charles Le Brun, and other French classicists was passed on from Flémal to De Lairesse, who first found independent work at the court of Maximilian Hendrick of Bavaria in Cologne, and at a church in Aachen. Between 1662 and 1664, De Lairesse worked in the manner of Flémal for important patrons in Liège. His prospects there were ruined in April 1664 when two women, one of whom he had allegedly promised to marry, attacked him violently. The painter fatally wounded one of them and then fled to Maastricht with a distant cousin, Marie Salme, whom he married en route. The couple soon settled in Utrecht, where their son was baptized in April 1665. The same year they moved to Amsterdam, where De Lairesse first found employment through the art dealer Gerrit Uyleburgh, the son of Rembrandt’s former dealer, Hendrick Uyleburgh. The portrait of De Lairesse by Rembrandt in the Robert Lehman Collection (PL. 160) was probably painted in 1665 or shortly thereafter.

With like-minded authors, De Lairesse founded a literary society, Nil Volentibus Arduum (Nothing Worthwhile Without Effort). French literature and theater and a classicist style of decoration had been favored at the court of the Stadholder Frederick Hendrick (1584–1647), and in the 1650s and 1660s became fashionable among the wealthy merchants and regents of Amsterdam. The Fleming Erasmus Quellinus the Younger (1607–1678), who was himself influenced by Flémal, executed two large ceiling paintings for the Amsterdam Town Hall in 1656, and Dutch artists such as Jan van Bronchorst (ca. 1603–1661) from Utrecht and Cornelis Holsteyn (1618–1618) from Haarlem painted chimneypieces in the Town Hall and other decorative pictures for Amsterdam houses. De Lairesse brought to this trend a new level of sophistication in terms of design, execution, and marketing. He etched illustrations for plays of 1668 by Andries Pels, who was Amsterdam’s answer to Cornelle and a critic of Rembrandt, and a book of 110 plates after the antique sculptures assembled by the famous collector Gerrit Reynst (1599–1658), Signorum veterum icones (Amsterdam, 1671).

About 1670, De Lairesse painted a series of eight canvases in grisaille depicting the relief-like triumphal procession of a Roman army, The Triumph of Aemilius Paullus Macedonicus (Musée de l’Art Wallon, Liège; see fig. 106), for the burgomaster Nicolaes Pancras (see the catalogue entry below), and in 1672 he completed the three-part ceiling painting Allegory of the Peace of Münster (now in the Vredespaelse, The Hague), for the home of the celebrated burgomaster Andries de Graeff. Many important commissions for decorative canvases followed, including an ensemble of ceiling paintings for the Lepers’ Asylum in Amsterdam in 1675 (on loan to the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); a number of ceiling paintings, chimneypieces, and other works for patrician homes; and (1676–82) various works for the palace of Willem III at Soestdijk. The artist’s success continued in the 1680s, when he painted a set of five large grisailles representing allegorical sculptures in high relief (ca. 1680; Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) for the foyer of Filips de Flines’s house on the Herengracht; organ shutters for the Westerkerk in Amsterdam (1686; still in situ); the illusionistic decoration of a large wooden ceiling in Paleis Het Loo, Apeldoorn (ca. 1687, with Johannes Glauber [1644–1726], his frequent collaborator in these years); and a large altarpiece, The Assumption, for the Cathedral of Saint Lambert in Liège (1687; now in the Cathedral of Saint Paul, Liège). While De Lairesse remained a resident of Amsterdam, in 1684 he joined the painters’ confraternity of The Hague, and in 1688 painted six large scenes of classical history and an Allegory of Justice for the council chamber of the Court of Justice in the Binnenhof.

Apparently the victim of congenital syphilis, De Lairesse went blind in 1690. He turned to writing and lecturing on art, and with the help of his sons published a treatise on drawing (Grondlagen der Tekenenkunst) in 1701, and the well-known artists’ manual Het Groot Schilderboek, in 1707. Both books stress the importance of drawing classes and academic art theory. De Lairesse’s deeply held belief in “the infallible rules of art” led him to condemn genre painters such as Adriaen van Ostade (q.v.), as well as Rembrandt’s late style.
104. Apollo and Aurora

Oil on canvas, 80½ x 76⅞ in. (204.5 x 193.4 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): G. Lairesse f/1671

The painting is well preserved. There is paint loss in six places where the support is torn: in the background between Apollo and the brown horse, from the proper right knee of Aurora into the salmon-colored drapery, in the clouds below Aurora, in the chest of the brown horse, in the foreleg of the white horse, and along a vertical tear that divides the last letters of the word fict from the date.

Gift of Manuel E. and Ellen G. Rionda, 1943  43.118

This large and beautiful canvas, dated 1671, is one of the earliest known examples of De Lairesse’s work as a history and decorative painter in Amsterdam. As discussed below, the picture was probably commissioned by the burgomaster Nicolaes Pancras for his monumental new town house at Herengracht 539, which was completed in 1670. The figures of Apollo, the sun god, and Aurora, goddess of the dawn, are possibly portraits of two of the patron’s children.

Apollo appears in the most brilliant part of the painting, his fiery nature suggested by bright yellow clouds, a fluttering red cape, and the molten gold convolutions of his classical armor, brocaded skirt, and windswep. Hair. Unobtrusive rays of light circle his head. Aurora wears a white dress embellished with gold stars, and is “saffron-robed,” as ancient authors specified, referring to the color of an early morning sky. Her coppery curls descend from a diadem, above which an eight-pointed “morning star” floats obeisantly. Aurora’s pearl necklace and crown recall the dewdrops that distill from her eyes.
“comme des perles liquides,” according to Baudouin’s version of Ripa, published in 1644. The basket of flowers is mentioned by Ripa and his translators; Baudouin explains that the earth’s flowers awaken at dawn.

The sun god drives a quadriga, the chariot with four horses abreast that is familiar from Roman monuments. Only the winged Pegasus is cited by Ripa in connection with Apollo, who usually appears with that creature in quite different contexts. Most Baroque painters assigned two or four horses to Apollo (or two to Aurora, in Guercino’s case; Casino Ludovisi, Rome). De Lairesse may have known Guido Reni’s and Simon Vouet’s quadrigas from engravings of the 1630s. Some echo of Reni’s Aurora is sensed in the bobbing horses’ heads, their overlapping legs, and the artificial clouds, but the pose of the nearest horse and even that of Apollo (from the waist up) bring to mind many Flemish and a few Dutch equestrian portraits of about 1625–50, including Jacob Jordaens’s Willem II on a bay horse in The Triumph of Frederick Hendrick and Jacob van Campen’s Frederick Hendrick as a Warrior, both of which are canvas murals of about 1650 in the Oranjezaal of the Huis ten Bosch at The Hague (where Van Campen’s Apollo and Aurora is painted on one of the wooden vaults). Contemporary taste is also reflected in the black leather halters and the reins and harnesses decorated with gold medallions, and in the purple velvet saddle blanket with gold silk fringe. Another sign of real rather than mythological life is the horseshoe on the nearest hoof.

The sun’s course is suggested by the faintly painted band (the “elliptic”) bearing zodiacal signs in the upper right corner of the composition. The visible signs are, from top to bottom, Virgo, Libra, and Scorpio. These signs are shown in their usual order and have no apparent connection with De Lairesse’s models or patron.

Roy considered the figure of Apollo to be a “portrait allégorique” of Prince Willem III (1650–1702), who married his cousin Mary II (1662–1694) in 1677, and in 1689 became William III, king of England. Comparison with portraits of the prince, consideration of his political position in 1671, and of who Aurora might be (not the nine-year-old Mary) reveal the hypothesis to be completely implausible.

It is almost certain that the present painting is identical with the picture sold as lot no. 2 in the sale of paintings from the estate of the burgomaster Gerbrand Pancras held in Amsterdam on April 7, 1716: “Apollo en Aurora, zynende een
Schoorsteen-stuk, van dezelve” (Apollo and Aurora, being a chimneypiece, by the same [artist]). The preceding lot, no. 1, was “Eight pieces, comprising a Roman Triumph or Victory, by Gerard Larisse, extraordinarily artfully painted,” which have been identified with the artist’s eight relief-like canvases in grisaille, The Triumph of Aemilius Paullus Macedonicus, of about 1670 (fig. 106). The series was also mentioned as belonging to “councillor Pancratius” in the 1683 Latin edition of Joachim von Sandrart’s Teutsche Academie (1675), to which a biography of De Lairesse was added.

Gerbrand Pancras (1658–1716) inherited Herengracht 539 and its contents upon his mother’s death in 1709, and occupied the house until his own death seven years later. His children sold the residence to another frequent burgomaster, Gerrit Corver, who substantially modified the façade and the main rooms before moving in. Sandrart’s remark indicates that the eight paintings now in Liége were in the Pancras residence as early as 1683, that is, at least twenty-six years before Gerbrand Pancras became its owner. Furthermore, “councillor Pancratius” must refer to the recently deceased Nicolaes Pancras (1622–1678), not his twenty-five-year-old son, who in 1683 could not have been described as a “councillor.” There seems little doubt that the Apollo and Aurora, of 1671, and the eight-part Triumph, which is dated about 1670 on stylistic grounds, were made to decorate Nicolaes Pancras’s classicist town house of 1670.

Furthermore, it appears that Apollo and Aurora may be portraits of Nicolaes Pancras’s son, the twelve- or thirteen-year-old Gerbrand, and one of his two sisters. In the same year, Gerbrand Pancras’s portrait was painted by Gerard ter Borch (q.v.; fig. 104). The sitter in that picture may be said to strongly resemble the Apollo in the present work, if one allows for the very different styles of the two artists and the transformation of the slight youth into a heroic deity. The figure of Aurora bears a family resemblance to Gerbrand’s older sister, Aletta (1649–1707), whose features were also recorded by Ter Borch in 1670 (fig. 105). But Aurora looks much too young to be a portrait of Aletta, who was moreover no longer living at home in 1671 (she married in 1667). Her sister Maria (1662–1740), however, was only nine years old in 1671. Perhaps De Lairesse lent Gerbrand and Maria a few more years, in accordance with their roles as god and goddess, and with a view to the impression that the paintings would make on viewers a few years hence.

While no independent portrait of Maria Pancras has been identified to date, support for the identification of Aurora
with Maria comes from the newly discovered fact that she and her husband owned the painting after it appeared in the 1716 sale of her brother Gerbrand's estate. It was previously known that The Triumph of Aemilius Paullus Maccandonicus was sold from the Amsterdam estate of Jacob van der Dussen on April 13, 1722, as lot no. 1. But it is evidently noted here for the first time that no. 19 in the same sale was “Een capitaal stuk, verbeeldende Aurora, door G. de Laires, h. 9 v., br. 7 v.” (A capital piece, depicting Aurora, by G. de Lairesse, height 9 Amsterdam feet, weight 7 Amsterdam feet), and that Jacob van der Dussen (1683–1750) was the distinguished son (he served as secretary of Amsterdam from 1709 to 1750) of Maria Pancras and her husband, Bruno van der Dussen (1660–1742), burgomaster of Gouda and councillor at the Court of Holland. Maria Pancras and her spouse may have acquired Apollo and Aurora (as well as the Triumph and a few other paintings) at her brother's estate sale; it was then inherited by their son Jacob after their deaths, in 1740 and 1742, respectively.

Whether or not Apollo and Aurora portrays the children of Nicholase Pancras, the painting probably refers to the burgomaster's public and private life. Apollo, dressed here as a Roman general, was associated with codes of law, cultural pursuits (he is the central figure in Jacob de Wit’s Allegory of the Arts: Pl. 219), and other interests that parallel not only those of Aemilius Paullus, but those of Nicholase Pancras as well (if not the former’s rule over Hispania, which would have struck a patriotic chord for Pancras). The victorious consul, or “councillor,” drives a quadriga into Republican Rome (see fig. 106, where two of his soldiers gesture like Aurora). The chimneypiece and the painted frieze form a parallel, not a program; they may well have been installed in different rooms (such as a salon and an entrance hall). However, the parallel recalls that drawn between the triumphal entry of Prince Frederick Hendrick, as painted by Jordens in the Oranjezaal of the Huis ten Bosch (mentioned above), and Van Campen’s Apollo and Aurora in the same room’s vaults, which symbolizes the arrival of a Golden Age with the Princes of Orange. Van Campen also intended to paint Apollo and Aurora on the lunette at the eastern end of the Burgerzaal in the Town Hall of Amsterdam. In the Burgomaster’s Chamber, a marble mantelpiece was carved with the Triumph of Fabius Maximus, Burgomaster of Rome, above which was a chimneypiece by Jan Lievens (1607–1674) depicting another Roman consul, Suessa, who in honor of his own office instructs his father, Fabius Maximus, to dismount his horse. Pancras probably knew, either from reading Plutarch or from someone’s explanation, that Fabius Maximus (like Scipio Africanus) was Aemilius Paullus's son.

Apollo and Aurora clearly demonstrates why De Lairesse was so successful in Amsterdam. Combining classical subjects, contemporary relevance, idealized portraiture, and the latest pictorial style, he gave sophisticated patrons pictures that are masterfully composed and painted, and—despite their show of learning—more accessible than the great majority of works in this vein.

Formerly titled by the Museum Apotheosis of the House of Nassau (until 1979).

1. In Ripa 1603, p. 34, and in later editions, Aurora’s dress is described as yellow, but artists took great liberties. In one of the closest Dutch precedents for De Lairesse’s picture, Jacob van Campen’s painted vault of about 1650–51 in the Oranjezaal of the Huis ten Bosch at The Hague, Apollo and Aurora are nude and the goddess holds an enormous wreath of flowers (see Huisken, Ottenheyhm, and Schwartz 1995, p. 78, pl. viii; also Peter-Raup 1980, p. 58).

2. The star is not mentioned in Ripa 1603, p. 34, on Aurora, or in the Dutch edition (Ripa 1644a, p. 331 [Morgenland]). However, the latter does describe a star above the amoroza representing Dawn (Crepuscule della Matina), calling it “Lucifer, the light-bearer,” and quoting Petrarch on the Eastern Star: “Gelijck dees lieve sterre staet, In ’t Oosten eer de Son opgaet” (p. 18; So this beloved star stands, in the East ere the Sun ascend).

3. Ripa 1644b, p. 26 (under Aurora); on p. 25, Baudouin says that the earth and its plants are aroused by Aurora’s tears. In the edition of 1677 (pp. 234–35), Baudouin writes more explicitly, “changer en perles ses pleurs.”

4. Ripa 1644b, p. 26 (see also note 3 above). Ripa 1603, p. 34, and Ripa 1644a, p. 331, specify that the basket is held in the left hand and flowers are scattered by the right. Baudouin (Ripa 1644b, p. 28) refers to “one hand” and “the other.”

5. See, for example, the etching (of ca. 1660) by Angelo Falconetto after Giulio Romano, Apollo, Papusa, and the Hippocrene Spring, which is illustrated and explained in Thompson 2004, p. 13.

6. See Pepper 1984, no. 40, and Creely 1962, no. 243, fig. 117.


8. By contrast, Van Campen himself noted that the zodiacal signs in his Apollo and Aurora (see note 1 above) referred to the planets under which Prince Frederick Hendrick was born (see Huisken, Ottenheyhm, and Schwartz 1995, p. 79).

9. A. Roy 1992, pp. 44–46, citing the half-hidden Scorpion as Willem’s sign. See Refs. for earlier suggestions along these lines.

10. As is stressed in L. de Vries 1991, p. 114.

11. Hoet 1752–70, vol. 1, p. 186. No other painting of Apollo and Aurora by De Lairesse is known or recorded in known documents.

12. A. Roy 1992, pp. 49, 236–42, nos. 53–62. In another context, Roy (ibid., p. 283) states that the series was painted “pour le bourgmestre d’Amsterdam Gerbrand Pancras” about 1670. The alleged patron was twelve years old at the time. Roy also suggests that the eight canvases now in Lièg (each of which measures
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49 x 79 cm (19¼ x 31½ in.) are actually not the Pancras paintings but oil sketches for them, since the sale catalogue of 1716 indicates that the entire series was about 11 meters (42 ft. 8 in.) in length, not 6.32 meters (21 ft.) like the Liège canvases. It is almost certain, however, that the cataloguer paced off the pictures in situ, or in any case included their frames (if the framing elements were not part of the wall surface itself). The idea of modelli on the scale and finished to the extent of the Liège paintings is inconsistent with seventeenth-century practice, to say nothing of De Lairesse’s own. Contradicting his own hypothesis, Roy gives the provenance of the Liège series as the Pancras sale of 1716 and then (unwittingly compounding the error) as the sale of Jacob van der Dussen, Amsterdam, April 12, 1752, no. 1. As discussed below, Jacob van der Dussen was the son of Maria Pancras, Gerbrand’s sister.


equals 8 feet 6¼ inches x 6 feet 6 inches (2.59 x 1.98 m). The measurements given in the 1752 sale are surely approximate. It is also possible that the height of the painting, if it was hung high on a wall or over a mantel, was merely guessed on the basis of its width. There is no clear evidence that the canvas was cut down at a later date.

19. See Elias 1903–5, vol. 1, pp. 46–69, on Bruno van der Dussen, his wife Maria Pancras (they married at Sloten on December 22, 1682), and on Bruno van der Dussen, who was an important statesman, see also Van der Aa 1832–76, vol. 4, pp. 128–29.

20. Comparing the thirty entries in the Pancras sale of 1776 (Hoet 1735–70, vol. 1, pp. 186–88) and the seventy-eight entries in the Van der Dussen sale of 1752 (ibid., vol. 2, pp. 309–13), it would appear that Maria Pancras and Bruno van der Dussen acquired comparatively little in the first sale apart from the paintings by De Lairesse: a pair of Italianate landscapes by Frederick de Moucheron, possibly a marine by Ludolf Bakhuizen and a landscape with horses by Philips Wouwermans, and perhaps a peasant scene by Adriaen van Ostade and a Merry Company by “Gerards.”


22. Ibid., pp. 142–43, figs. 112–113b.


24. As noted by the present writer in New York–London 2001, p. 400 n. 4, direct comparison of the figure of Aurora with the figure in Vermeer’s approximately contemporary Allegory of the Catholic Faith (Pl. 206) upsets preconceptions about both painters, since the classicist’s woman is considerably more naturalistic than the realist’s.

REFERENCES: Hoet 1735–70, vol. 1 (1752), p. 186, records the painting in the estate sale of burgomaster Gerbrand Pancras, Amsterdam, April 7, 1716, no. 2, sold for fl. 60, vol. 2 (1752), p. 310, records the painting in the estate sale of Pancras’s nephew, Jacob van der Dussen, Amsterdam, April 12, 1752, no. 19, sold for fl 20; Timmers 1959, p. 157, pl. 428, as De Lairesse’s Apotheosis of the House of Orange-Nassau, which has “a certain naïve pathos”; Snoep 1970, p. 214 n. 4, rejects the Museum’s title (see end of text above) and suggests that the figures of Apollo and Aurora may be portraits; Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij in Paris 1986, pp. 66–67, fig. 41, offers a general comparison with Jacob van Campen’s Apollo and Aurora in the Huis ten Bosch; P. Sutton 1986, pp. 182–83, fig. 239, cites the work as an example of the new classicism in Dutch art ca. 1670; Hendrick 1987, pp. 178–79, fig. 159, employs the Museum’s old title, but adds, “ou, Apollon et Flore,” in the caption; A. Roy 1902, pp. 71, 245–46, no. p.67, pl. 10, as an “Apotheosis of William of Orange”; J. Reid 1993, vol. 2, p. 174, listed under works depicting Apollo; Baeijer 1995, p. 341; Frants 1995, p. 407, fig. 8, and p. 415 n. 64, suggests that the painting may be “a portrait historié of an unknown husband and wife in the guise of Apollo and Aurora”; Huet in Roberts-Jones 1995, pp. 171, 195 (ill.), describes De Lairesse’s “distant idealization”; Huiskens, Ottenheim, and Schwartz 1995, pp. 78–79, fig. 64, repeats Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij’s remarks in Paris 1986; L. de Vries 1995, p. 144, rejects A. Roy’s identification of Apollo with Willem III, seeing no resemblance, and noting that “the political situation of that year [1671] makes such a ‘painted pamphlet’ all but impossible”; Haverkamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, pp. 145, 147 n. 32, as Apollo and Aurora (Apotheosis of William of Orange), calls the painting “the antithesis of Rembrandt’s later works, as exemplified by the Lehman painting” (Portrait of Gerard de Lairesse); Krempel 2000, pp. 98, 131 n. 183, fig. 462, compares a painting by Nicolaes Maes, Three Children at Ceres, Garsymeke and Diana (1675); Enklaar in Athens–Dordrecht 2000–2001, pp. 61, 186, 244, 278, 367, no. 44 (ill. pp. 13 [detail of Aurora] and 245 [plate of whole]), as Helios and Eos, suggests that the figures represent a man and wife of the Amsterdam patriciate; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, p. 400 n. 4, compares the style of this picture to that of Vermeer’s Allegory of the Catholic Faith (Pl. 206); Johnson 2004, p. 302, fig. 2; Liedtke 2004a, pp. 191–92, fig. 2, suggests that the picture was painted for Nicolas Pancras’s town house at Herengracht 350 in Amsterdam, and that Apollo and Aurora are portraits of the patron’s children, Gerbrand and Maria.


Ex Coll.: Probably commissioned by Nicolaes Pancras, Amsterdam (from 1671; d. 1678); probably his wife, Petronella de Waer (from 1678; d. 1709); their son, Gerbrand Nicolaesz Pancras, Amsterdam (probably from 1709; d. 1716); his estate sale, Amsterdam, April 7, 1716, no. 2, sold for fl 60; probably his sister, Maria Pancras (probably from 1716–d. 1740), and her husband, Bruno van der Dussen (probably from 1716–d. 1742); their son Jacob van der Dussen (1742–d. 1750); his sale, Amsterdam, April 12, 1752, no. 19, sold for fl 20; evidently purchased before 1703 by the mother (Mrs. James D. Goin, New York) or grandmother (Mrs. S. M. Pike, New York) of one of the donors, Mrs. Rionda (as reported by her in 1941 and 1944); Manuel E. and Ellen G. Rionda, Alpine, N.J. (until 1943); Gift of Manuel E. and Ellen G. Rionda, 1943; 43.118

GERARD DE LAIRESSE 421
Willem van Leen
Dordrecht 1733–1825 Delfshaven

Van Leen was one of the late-eighteenth-century flower painters who flourished in the wake of Jan van Huysum (1682–1749) and his immediate followers (who included Margareta Haverman; q.v.). He was baptized in Dordrecht on February 19, 1753, and studied there with the popular Joris Ponsense (1723–1785), a flower painter and tapestry designer; Dirk Kuipers (1733–1796); and Ponsense's pupil Jan Arends (1738–1803).¹

At the age of twenty Van Leen went to Paris, where he was closely associated with the highly successful Dutch flower painter Gerard van Spaendonck (1746–1822). He was mostly in Paris until 1789, when the French Revolution drove him back to the Netherlands. He settled in Delfshaven, by Rotterdam, and worked as an art dealer and auctioneer, as well as an artist. In addition to wall decorations, such as the one belonging to the Museum’s Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts (Pl. 103), Van Leen painted flower and fruit still lifes, many of high finish and fine quality. He was also an accomplished draftsman, watercolorist, etcher, and painter of miniatures on snuffboxes. Van Leen had a number of minor pupils.²

1. Ponsense was himself a pupil of Aart Schouman (1710–1792), an important figure in Dordrecht. On Arends, see Suer AKL, vol. 5 (1992), p. 20.

105. Flowers in a Blue Vase

Oil on canvas, arched top, 35 x 29½ in. (139.7 x 74 cm)
Signed (bottom right): van Leen F

The painting is in good condition, although the paint surface is slightly abraded throughout. A tear at the top extends from the red tulip to the leaves below.

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1906 07.225.470

The canvas was almost certainly intended to decorate a section of wall, such as a space between windows or beside a door. A spiraling arrangement of flowers ascends from a large vase, which is set on a plinth in a shallow niche; shadows fall on the curving wall to the left. Grapes and peaches, strewn about the base of the vase, spill forward, to slightly illusionistic effect. The heavy vessel, of blue-glazed stoneware, has gilt bronze moldings at the top and center, with a decorative mask. The foreshortening of the vase implies a vantage point at the level of the plinth. The overall tonality is warm, which sets off the striking color of the vase.

The form of the vase and, to some extent, the flower arrangement were inspired by an engraving after Jean-Baptiste Monnoyer (1635–1699; fig. 108), which appeared in his portfolio of prints Le livre de toutes sortes de fleurs d’après nature, of about

Figure 108. Engraving by Nicolas de Pilly after Jean-Baptiste Monnoyer, A Vase of Flowers, from Monnoyer’s Le livre de toutes sortes de fleurs d’après nature (Paris, ca. 1685). The Morgan Library & Museum, New York, Gift of Junius S. Morgan and Henry S. Morgan, 1917
1680 (Nicolas de Poilly, Paris; 1635–99). The lighter, twisting, more asymmetrical design by Van Leen could be described as a post-Van Huysum approach.

For the most part, Van Leen’s chronology is a matter of pure speculation. The present writer’s intuition is that the canvas is a Parisian product, probably dating from the 1780s. Supporting this view would be the comparatively loose execution, the warm palette, and the style of the vase, which would have better suited French taste than Dutch. Van Leen is known to have drawn designs in Paris for floral wall decorations in the palace of Pavlovsk near Saint Petersburg, built in the 1780s. However, the present painting was surely intended for a more intimate interior.

Flowers in a Blue Vase is one of many eighteenth-century decorative works given to the Museum by J. Pierpont Morgan. They include a set of six tall canvases by Hubert Robert (1733–1808), a grisaille Venus and Cupid by Van Leen’s acquaintance in Paris Piat Joseph Sauvage (1744–1818), a great variety of other French examples, and the Museum’s four canvases by or in the manner of Jacob de Wit (q.v.).


References: Salinger 1950, pp. 258, 259 (ill.), “quite probably meant to be inserted in a wall . . . full of facile grace”; Bactjer 1995, p. 343, with an inaccurate reading of the signature.

Ex coll.: Georges Hoentschel, Paris (before 1906); J. Pierpont Morgan, New York (by 1906); Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1906 07.235.470

Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts
The artist was baptized in Frankfurt am Main on October 10, 1622. His father, David Lingelbach (d. 1653), was reportedly a tailor. By the time Johannes was twelve years old, in 1634, the family had moved to Amsterdam, where his father ran the Nieuwe Doolhof (New Labyrinth), a pleasure garden with automated diversions. Johannes must have trained in Amsterdam, although no record of his teacher is known. According to Houbraken, the young painter left for France in 1642 and arrived two years later in Rome, where he remained until his departure “May 8, 1650, on Sunday.” He traveled through Germany, “and in June arrived back in Amsterdam in good health.” Apart from this account, the first document referring to Lingelbach in Amsterdam is that recording his marriage on April 26, 1653, to Tietje Hendriks Boussi, of Amsterdam. The couple had nine children; the first was baptized on December 9, 1653. Lingelbach appears to have remained in Amsterdam until his death in November 1674. He was buried in a Lutheran church.

The earliest known works that are certainly by Lingelbach are The Blacksmith (private collection, Rome) and Self-Portrait with Violin (Kunsthaus, Zürich), both of which are dated 1650. Signed and dated works from nearly every year thereafter are known. Lingelbach was a gifted figure painter, whose settings—Italianate landscapes, cityscapes, and harbor scenes—may be described as rather generalized compared with views by contemporary landscape specialists such as Jan Both (ca. 1615/18–1652). Even his drawings of specific sites have the look of stage scenery, artfully constructed with repoussoirs, layers of architecture, hills, and clouds, and strong contrasts of light and shadow. Landscape and cityscape drawings by Jan Worst (active ca. 1645–in or after 1686), whom Houbraken describes as Lingelbach’s “especially good friend” and contemporary in Rome, are distinctly more naturalistic.

In his early years, Lingelbach was influenced by the style of Pieter van Laer (1599–1642) and by emulators of Van Laer such as Michelangelo Cerquozzi (1602–1660) and the Fleming Jan Miel (1599–1664). In the Netherlands, the strongest impression on Lingelbach’s work was made by Philips Wouwermans (q.v.), and in the case of Italianate harbor scenes by Jan Baptist Weenix (1621–1660/61). Lingelbach often served as a staffager, placing figures in landscapes by Philips Koninck, Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.), Jan Hackaert (1626–in or after 1685), Jan Wijnants (1632–1684), and Frederick de Moucheron (1633–1686), among others.

The artist is most admired for his depictions of colorful street life in Italy, with scores of peasants and other types gathered in squares or on quays, and with classical porticos, tavern fronts, fountains, Baroque statues, ship masts, piles of still-life motifs, and animals spread out like props on an opera stage. The most animated scenes by David Teniers the Younger (1610–1690) are quiet and orderly by comparison. Lingelbach intensified the bustle of crowds with flickering light and local colors. For northerners who remembered or envisioned Rome as a confrontation of lofty monuments and low humanity, Lingelbach must have been regarded as the artist who brought it all to life.

1. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, pp. 145–46. Despite his specific details, Houbraken supplies the wrong birth date (1621) and admits to having no information about what brought Lingelbach to Holland or about his training. Lingelbach is documented as a resident of Rome in 1647, 1648, and 1649 (Hoogewerff 1942, pp. 118–19, 121).
2. A. D. de Vries 1883, p. 159.
5. This is most obvious in equestrian subjects, but also evident in such refined landscapes by Lingelbach as A Shepherd and Shepherdess with a Flock, of the 1660s (private collection; Montreal 1990, no. 42). The same work is compared with paintings by Karel du Jardin (1626–1678) in Kilian 2005, p. 74 n. 5.
106. Peasants Dancing

Oil on canvas, 26 1/8 x 29 5/8 in. (67.3 x 74.9 cm)
Signed and dated (lower center, on bench): J. Lingelbach
165[12]

The painting has suffered abrasion throughout, most severely in the figures.

Purchase, 1871 71.123

The last digit of the date on this canvas is very faint, but may be a 1, and the painting resembles others by Lingelbach dating from the early 1650s, such as *Marketplace in an Italian Town, with an Itinerant Toothpuller*, dated 1651 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).[1] The Museum’s picture must be one of the first painted by the artist after he settled in Amsterdam, where he is said to have arrived in June 1650, after six years in Rome.

The scene creates the impression of a Flemish festival moved to the Roman Campagna. The action centers on three couples dancing around a tree. The nearest dancer, with a hat in his hand, leads a woman with keys dangling from her belt, indicating that she is a maid or innkeeper. Music is provided by a bagpiper perched on a table to the left, and behind him a man who manages to tap a small drum and blow a flute at the same time. Two men in the center foreground urge the dancers on, one with a beer glass, the other with his hands held high. To the left of them, a couple nuzzles on the ground, their wine jug, overlapping legs, and the woman’s expression promising more private pleasures to come. Another couple sits on a bench near the musicians. To the left, a man snoozes, and a pair of peasant couples, one with an infant, bob their heads and smile.

To the far right, two boys, watched by another boy leaning on a saddle, play a lively game of morra.[2] A man relaxes on a small bay horse as it drinks water from a trough. A donkey and an ox cart with two oxen (one resting on the ground) complete the ensemble, which is arranged across the foreground like a rustic opera company on a stage (*Verdi’s Anvil Chorus* comes to mind). For scenery, a house with a thatched roof, an inn with children coming down the steps, and two suffering trees are silhouetted against a background that includes a farm and distant mountains. All the near forms are rendered in shades of brown, with a blue sky descending to pink in the hills and green in the valley.

As one of Lingelbach’s earliest dated works, the painting is important for an outline of his development, and for an appreciation of how he introduced himself into the flourishing art market of Amsterdam during the early 1650s. The artist’s debts to other painters who had been active in Rome, in particular Pieter van Laer, Jan Miel, and Michelangelo Cerquozzi (see Lingelbach’s biography above), are also well illustrated here. The most comparable pictures by Lingelbach are the Amsterdam canvas mentioned above, *The Fiddler* (formerly art market, London), and other works of the 1650s.[3] Somewhat more mature compositions in the same vein include his *Peasant Dance*, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna,[4] and the *Village Festival*, in the Castle Museum and Gallery, Nottingham.[5]

1. The Rijksmuseum picture is discussed in Kren 1982, passim, fig. 16; in Briganti, Trezzani, and Laureati 1983, p. 275, fig. 10.3; and in Cologne–Utrecht 1991–92, pp. 212–15, no. 21.

2. In the Amsterdam picture (see text above), two prominent figures play the same game, one that Pieter van Laer (1599–1642) is said to have introduced into Roman painting during the 1630s (L. Trezzani in Cologne–Utrecht 1991–92, p. 166 [under no. 12.1]). However, the game is the main subject of an Italian-period genre scene by Johann Liss (ca. 1587/1600–1661) dating from about 1621 (The Morra Game, in the Staatsliche Kunstsammlungen, Kassel; Klessmann 1999, no. 31, pl. 7). The saddle on the ground in the New York painting is of a type used on pack animals.

3. For *The Fiddler*, see Burger-Wegener 1976, no. 108; Kren 1982, p. 35, fig. 19; Briganti, Trezzani, and Laureati 1983, p. 276, fig. 10.8. In the last-named publication, compare scenes of peasants dancing by Miel and by Cerquozzi, e.g., figs. 4.18 and 5.19.


**References:** MMA 1872, p. 47, no. 117, incorrectly as “from the Broadlands collection of Lord Palmerston”; Harce 1888, p. 50, mentioned; Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 23 (1939), p. 352, listed; B. Burroughs 1931, p. 214, listed, with incorrect provenance; F. Robinson in Saint Petersburg–Atlanta 1975, p. 37, no. 24, considers “the strong, almost crude touch” of the early Lingelbach to be evident here, and compares the Amsterdam canvas (see text above); Burger-Wegener 1976, pp. 72, 279, no. 111, compares paintings by Miel and Cerquozzi, and notes the Italian (meaning stagelike) approach to composition; Dickey in Hamilton–Rochester–Amarillo 1983, pp. 16–17, no. 2, describes the picture as a work of the early 1650s, revealing close affinities with Van Laer; Baejter 1995, p. 328; Baejter 2004, p. 211, no. 117 (ill.), gives full provenance.


Ex Coll.: Abraham Delfos (until 1807; his sale, Bosboom, The Hague, June 10, 1807, no. 87); widow H. F. V. Uselino, née Tollens (until 1866; her estate sale, Roos and Engelberts, Amsterdam, January 30–31, 1866, no. 69, for Fl 69,353 sold to Enthous); [Léon Gaucher, Paris, with Alexis Fehvre, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–77; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1877; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 t1.123
Oil on canvas, 44 3/4 x 63 3/4 in. (113.7 x 162.7 cm)  
Signed and dated (lower center, on tree trunk): 1/
LINGELBACH/1671

Abrasion to the paint surface is most serious in the middle
distance at right, in the shadowed side of the building at
center left, and throughout the foreground battle scene.

Purchase, 1871 71.23

This late work by Lingelbach, like the early Peasants Dancing
(Pl. 106), is one of three paintings by the artist that were
acquired in the 1871 Purchase.¹

The subject is a pitched battle between armies from Europe
and the Middle East. Both sides have many horsemen, but the
European cavalry is greater in number and carrying the day. The
viewer is placed close to the action in the foreground, where
unpleasant vignettes interrupt the sweep of action from right to
left. European cavalry charges up the hill on the right, and will
presumably reinforce the soldiers who are fighting their way
across the bridge in the left background. The Turks—to judge
from the mass of turbaned figures—are resisting the onslaught.
The fort, its red flag flying aloft, is based upon the Castel
Sant'Angelo in Rome, but for the moment assumes the guise of
a Muslim stronghold; cannons fire from the highest ramparts.
The bridge in the center background, swarming with figures,
leads to a fort on the far bank of the river, which appears to be
in European hands.

The costumes are contemporary but generalized. Pistols and
muskets, swords, scimitars, spears, bows and arrows, and a
conspicuous mace are brandished and employed to frightful
effect (the last weapon is held by the Turk on the stumbling
white horse). While dead and wounded are depicted, the overall
impression is of a rhythmic ebb and flow, with intricate choreo-
ography in isolated groups, especially at center right, where a
heroic swordsman and a trumpeter hold forth on symmetrically
advancing horses. By this date, the compositional lineage of
groups such as this one, as well as that of the two riders to the
left, is so complex that it would be pointless to seek models in
prints after Rubens, or by such artists as Antonio Tempesta,
Jacques Callot, or Stefano della Bella. Lingelbach’s more
immediate sources of inspiration, in his comparatively few bat-
tle scenes, were paintings by Pieter van Laer (1599–1642) and
by Philips Wouwermans (q.v.). One of the most impressive
examples is Wouwermans’s large canvas Cavalry Making a Sortie
from a Fort on a Hill, of 1646 (National Gallery, London). 2

Many Dutch, Flemish, French, and Italian artists of the seven-
teenth century painted pictures of battles on land, often with
cavalry. Lingelbach’s subject, a generic battle of Turks and
Christians, is found at least as early as the canvas of 1621
(Louvre, Paris) by the Neapolitan Anielle Falcone (1607–1656),
the artist who invented the so-called battle without a hero,
and was dubbed the “oracle” of the genre in his own day.
Falcone had a good number of Italian followers, including
Salvator Rosa (1615–1673), and he painted genre scenes that
influenced Van Laer and Michelangelo Cerquozzi (1602–1660),
two of Lingelbach’s direct predecessors in Rome (see the biog-
raphy above and the preceding entry). 3 Another key figure in
Florence and Rome was Giacomo Cortese (Jacques Courtois;
1621–1673), called il Borgognone, who was friendly with Van
Laer and Cerquozzi, and who painted battle pictures for noble
patrons in Rome during the 1640s, when Lingelbach was there.
Of course the specialty, like that of Dutch guardroom scenes,
reflects the prevalence of military campaigns throughout much of
Europe during the period. Here, however, the Italianate land-
scape and the standard “crusader” subject make it clear that
the interest of the picture was essentially romantic rather than
topical. A year after the canvas was painted, France invaded the
Netherlands—and the image probably lost some of its appeal.

1. A late, weak work by the artist, A Hawking Party, was deacces-
battle scene by Van Laer, see Briganti, Trezzani, and Laureatti
1883, no. 1.42 (Assault on a Fortress, in a private collection).
3. On Falcone, see Arnauld Breaux de Lavergné in Dictionary of
Pictures and Military Scenes,” in ibid., vol. 3, p. 388. Rosa’s
major battle scenes, which feature motifs similar to Lingelbach’s
(stumbling white horses, for example), date from the 1640s
onward (see Salerno 1963, pls. 10, 248–50).

References: Kegel 1884, pp. 461–62, describes the picture as too
conventionally composed; Harck 1888, p. 76, mentioned; MMA
1924, pp. 126–7, no. 52, as Sobieski Defeating the Turks Before Vienna,
explains that the battle took place in 1683, and overlooks the
difficulty that Lingelbach died in 1674 (as noted in the same entry);
Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 35 (1929), p. 252, listed; Burger-
Wegener 1976, pp. 149–50, 338, no. 224, describes the work at
length, observing that the imaginary battle is between Turks and
Europeans, and compares compositions by Salvator Rosa; Baejter
1995, p. 328; Baejter 2004, p. 102, no. 49 (ill.), gives full provenance.

Exhibited: New York, American Federation of Arts, “Little
Masters in 17th Century Holland and Flanders” (categorizing exhibit-
ion), 1954–57, no cat.

Ex Coll.: Fürst Alois Wenzel Kaunitz, Vienna (not in his sale,
Artaria, Vienna, March 15, 1820); by descent to Martin, Comte
Cornet de Ways Ruart, Brussels (until d. 1870); [Étiene Le Roy,
Brussels, through Léon Gauchez, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett];
William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share
to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor
Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.23
Like Ferdinand Bol and Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.), before him, Maes was one of several artists who went from the South Holland city of Dordrecht to study with Rembrandt in Amsterdam, in his case between about 1649–50 and 1652–53. The second son of Gerrit Maes, a prosperous silk merchant and soap manufacturer in Dordrecht, and his wife Ida Claesdr, Maes was baptized in January 1634. According to Houbraken, the teenager learned drawing with “an ordinary master” in his hometown, and then studied painting with Rembrandt. It is not known when Maes returned to Dordrecht, but on December 28, 1653, his forthcoming marriage was announced. The bride was Adriana Brouwers (1624–1690), ten years Maes’s senior, and the widow of a preacher, Arnoldus de Gelder (d. August 1632). The ceremony took place in the Reformed Church of Dordrecht on January 13, 1654. Adriana had a son, Justus (b. 1650), from her first marriage. Her son with Maes, Conraedus, baptized in September 1654, lived only two years. He died about two weeks after the couple’s first daughter, Johanna, was baptized, which took place on April 24, 1656. Maes was hardly the only Dutch artist who depicted mothers caring for infants and young children (see Pl. 110), but the fact that the theme became common in his oeuvre from about 1654 onward (when he was in his early twenties) strikes a personal note. Two more daughters, Arnoldina and Ida Margriet, were born in 1660 and 1664, respectively.

In March 1658, Maes signed a contract to buy a house on the Steegoversloot in Dordrecht from a sea captain and merchant, Job Jansz Cuyter, for 2,650 guilders together with a group portrait of the seller’s family. This painting of Cuyter, his wife, and six children (with a few lost ones in the clouds), set on a quay by the Dordrecht harbor, is dated 1659 (North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh). A good number of single and pendant portraits, as well as a few other family portraits, date from 1655 until the mid-1660s, most of them rather conservative. About 1664–65, Maes’s portrait style became much more fashionable, in the Flemish manner, although one could also say in the style of The Hague, where Caspar Netscher (q.v.) turned in the same direction at about the same time.

In a notation dated December 10, 1673, the Reformed Community of Dordrecht recorded that Maes, his wife, two of their children, and their maid had moved to Amsterdam. The artist retained two houses in Dordrecht, one of which he rented out in 1673. A will made by Maes and his wife in 1685 names their three daughters and Maes’s stepson as beneficiaries. The painter was buried in the Oude Kerk, Amsterdam, on December 24, 1693.

The earliest dated work by Maes is the Museum’s Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael, of 1653 (Pl. 108). Here and in other works of about the same time, such as Christ Blessing the Children (National Gallery, London) and The Sacrifice of Isaac (private collection), the artist reveals his own personality when he was still close to Rembrandt, a temperament that was tender and domestic even in subjects where the Lord’s will seems harsh. Between 1654 and the late 1660s, this sentiment found its ideal métier in images of homemakers, female servants, and mothers with children, set mostly in interiors that are typical of South Holland in their orderly compositions, but Rembrandtesque in their softening shadows and gentle light. The painter’s characteristic palette of warm reds, browns, yellows, whites, and blacks draws upon Rembrandt’s but also appears to have been suited to Dordrecht taste. Maes’s conversion to a Flemish style and the nearly exclusive practice of portraiture from the 1660s onward was not as extreme as many authors have suggested, and certainly not unexpected for the time. Houbraken reports that Maes (probably in the 1660s) made a trip to Antwerp “to see the exquisite brushwork of Rubens, Van Dyck, and other high-flyers, and also to visit artists,” in particular Jacob Jordaens (1593–1678). The most Jordaens-like pictures Maes ever painted, although they are hardly similar in coloring or touch, are his portraits of infants in the guise of Ganymede, a hunter, or a shepherd—hugging their eagles, dogs, deer, and sheep while they themselves are swathed in enough silk, satin, and feathers to make a bed when playtime is done.

Houbraken names a few of Maes’s forgotten Dordrecht pupils. The painter strongly influenced Cornelis Bisschop (q.v.), Reinier Covijn (ca. 1636–1681), Abraham van Dyck (1633–1672), and, in at least two early works, Johannes Vermeer (q.v.; see Pl. 202).
108. Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael

Oil on canvas, 34¼ x 27¾ in. (87.6 x 69.9 cm)
Signed and dated (lower center, on step): MIMAES.A 1633
[first four letters in ligature]

Most of the paint surface has suffered severe abrasion, although Ishmael's costume and Abraham's red robe are well preserved.

Gift of Mrs. Edward Brayton, 1971-1971.73

The date inscribed on this canvas, 1633, is the earliest known in Maes's oeuvre, and marks a moment when he was just beginning to work independently after studying with Rembrandt for two or three years. The work could have been painted in Amsterdam or in the artist's native Dordrecht. In conception, the picture depends upon examples by Rembrandt, while the manner of execution is similar to that of other Rembrandt pupils of the late 1640s and early 1650s, such as Willem Drost (q.v.).

With the exception of one reproduction published in 1936 (see Refs.), the painting was completely unknown to scholars until it was given to the Museum in 1971. The donor was a direct descendant of the man who brought the picture to America in about 1811.

The subject, from Genesis 21:14, occurs frequently in Dutch art, especially in Rembrandt's circle. Abraham, founder of the Hebrew nation, and his wife, Sarah, lived in the land of Canaan, having returned there from Egypt. Abraham was ninety-nine, and Sarah ninety years old. They were childless except for Ishmael, a son whom, at Sarah's suggestion, Abraham had by her Egyptian maid, Hagar. The Lord appeared to Abraham, declaring that he would be the father of many nations, and that Sarah would give birth to a son, Isaac. Abraham doubted this extraordinary news, and made an appeal on behalf of Ishmael, who was then only thirteen. And God responded, promising to make Ishmael fruitful: "Twelve princes shall he beget, and a great nation," but adding, "My covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year" (Gen. 17:10-21). And so it came to pass, after Isaac was weaned, Sarah saw Ishmael mocking, much as Hagar, when she first conceived, had looked down upon Sarah (Gen. 16:4). Sarah then demanded that Abraham cast Hagar and Ishmael from their house, "for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son" (Gen. 21:10). Abraham grieved at the prospect of losing Ishmael. But God told Abraham to accede to Sarah's wishes, saying that Ishmael too would found a nation. The next morning, Abraham turned Hagar and Ishmael out of his house, giving them bread and water. And so they departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba, where God protected them. "And God was with the lad; and he grew, and dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer" (Gen. 21:20).

As Walsh and others have explained, Maes made a preparatory drawing for this picture (fig. 109) that recalls Rembrandt's etching of 1637 (fig. 110) in its upright composition and diagonal view of the doorway and steps, in aspects of Abraham's pose, and in the placement of Ishmael if not Hagar. (Hagar's headgear is also changed, to suggest her Egyptian origin.) Maes evidently followed Rembrandt in showing Ishmael's head from the back, but then made a revision, turning the boy's head to reveal his sad expression and perhaps to imply a
parting glance at the dog. There is general agreement that Maes himself modified the figure of Ishmael, as opposed to Rembrandt’s suggesting an alternative to his nineteen-year-old disciple.

Walsh and other scholars have also compared two drawings of the subject that have traditionally been accepted as by Rembrandt, one in the British Museum, London (fig. 111), and the other in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam. The latter, however, has been doubted recently, and associated with a “Drost group,” which raises the possibility that Drost or another Rembrandt pupil was responding to the master’s example about the same time as Maes, or perhaps slightly earlier. In the London drawing, the arrangement of the three figures more closely anticipates Maes, who at the same time recalls Rembrandt’s etching in that Abraham’s hand is stretched toward Ishmael without touching him. Perhaps Maes combined these or similar precedents to create the impression of an intended blessing that falls short. Hagar steps forward in the drawings by Rembrandt and Maes (figs. 109, 110); in the painting, Maes has her stand still and turn her face away from Abraham. The result is a figure of great dignity, reminiscent of Early Renaissance painting and sculpture. Hagar’s pose and expression, and those of Ishmael as well, strike one as heartfelt responses to Abraham’s ineffectual words. His expression has been considered as one of “doting anxiety,” but for some viewers it might seem suggestive of something less sympathetic, such as an attempt to explain that the matter is out of his hands. Hagar would have had no idea of how true this was.
It has often been said that Rembrandt assigned subjects like this one to his students, expecting them to imagine the figures’ behavior for themselves. In any event, Maes has arrived at his own solution, and in terms of expression achieved something more affecting and profound than Rembrandt did in his etching (fig. 110). There, Hagar weeps as if following stage directions, and Ishmael’s feelings are conveyed (if at all) by body language alone. The key figure in the print is the patriarch, caught between the outcasts and the smug figures of Sarah in the window and Isaac at the door of the house. Maes shifts the emphasis to Hagar, whose earlier pride is symbolized by the peacock on the balustrade above her. She is barefoot, suggesting humility. In this handling, the dog may be meant as a reminder of fidelity, a trait more consistently found in his species than in humankind.

In a broad view, Maes’s painting is related not only to Rembrandt’s oeuvre but also to a Netherlandish tradition of depicting this subject and other Old Testament themes. In the conception of his etching, Rembrandt had in mind Lucas van Leyden’s engraving of 1516, and his teacher Pieter Lastman’s painting of 1612 (Kunsthalle, Hamburg). In some instances, Rembrandt’s followers responded to Lastman’s example as well as to that of Rembrandt, as in paintings by Jan Victors (q.v.) dating from 1644 (Richard L. Feigen, New York) and later, and in a canvas of the early 1650s by Barent Fabritius (q.v.; Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco). Other artists in Rembrandt’s circle who treated the subject include Gerbrand van den Eeckhout and Govert Flinck (q.q.v.), in paintings of the early 1640s; Ferdinand Bol (q.v.), in a picture perhaps of the early 1650s; and Karel van der Pluyt (1625–1672), in a panel probably dating from the mid-1650s. Of course, the story was also depicted outside Rembrandt’s sphere, for example by Gabriel Metsu (q.v.), who shows Abraham evicting Hagar as if she were a tenant behind on the rent.

The story of Hagar and other episodes in the life of Abraham are among the Old Testament subjects that are cited fairly frequently in seventeenth-century inventories of paintings owned by Reformed collectors in the Netherlands. The Protestant emphasis on individual study of the Bible, and applying its message to everyday experience, is strongly borne out in Rembrandt’s approach and in his teaching. Insofar as it concerned the interpretation of religious themes. It has been suggested that Abraham’s expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael and his later willingness to sacrifice Isaac are subjects that absorbed Rembrandt both because of their currency in Protestant theology and because of his “recurrent interest in problematic relationships between fathers and sons.” The complexity of human relationships in the story of Hagar’s dismissal is reflected in the diversity of conceptions found in Rembrandt’s circle. Maes’s early painting is one of the simplest and most poignant interpretations, in good part because Hagar is given such a dominant role, comparable to that of Susanna and Bathsheba in other pictures by Rembrandt and his followers. Here, however, the emotions involve not desire but rejection, a more hurtful thing to bear.


2. In a personal communication dated March 18, 2005, Martin Royalton-Kisch described the drawing in the British Museum (Benesch no. 524; fig. 111 here) as probably but not unquestionably by Rembrandt. His entry in London 1993, p. 106 (under no. 41), concludes that the sheet should be “retained under Rembrandt’s name only with misgivings,” and “if by Rembrandt, should be dated to around 1642–6.” In the same communication, Royalton-Kisch doubts that the Amsterdam drawing (Benesch no. 976; Walsh 1972, pp. 108–9, fig. 5; Amsterdam 1984–85, no. 70) is by Rembrandt, and is “not so sure that it doesn’t belong to what is best termed the ‘Drost group.’ This would be close in time to the Maes, and in fact the figure of Abraham is not so far away in pose.” Peter Schatborn, by contrast, considers the Amsterdam drawing to be by Rembrandt, and doubts the London drawing (personal communication, April 14, 2005). Both drawings are discussed as by Rembrandt in D. Smith 1985, p. 298, figs. 20, 30.


4. See, for example, Hamann 1936, p. 357; Walsh 1972, p. 108; Amsterdam 1984–85, pp. 12–13, 84–91; and Liedtke 1999b, p. 19.

5. On the print, see Ackley in Boston–Chicago 2003–4, pp. 19–20, 132–34 no. 66, 214. Ackley (ibid., p. 133 n. 3) notes that Rembrandt was supposed to turn over to a patron the copperplate and all but two or three impressions of the etching, but that he evidently retained more impressions than those to which he was entitled. This tends to support the notion of the print’s use in Rembrandt’s studio.


7. See Manuth in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, pp. 380–81, figs. 814, 815, 816, and 817; A. Tümpe in Amsterdam 1991–92, p. 23, fig. 10; C. Tümpe in ibid., pp. 67–68, figs. 13, 14; and Steeves in Hamburg 2006, no. 15. A. Tümpe in Amsterdam 1991–92, p. 24, fig. 11, and p. 30, fig. 17, illustrates paintings of the subject by two other artists in Lastman’s circle, Claes Moeijert (“before 1624”) and Jan Pynas (1613), respectively. See also Solomon de Bray’s painting dated 1633 (location unknown; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 6, p. 3522 [ill. p. 3543]).


9. Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, no. 81, as dating from
References: Hamann 1936, pp. 536–37, fig. 94, as in a private collection in New York, compares the painting and Maes’s preparatory drawing to earlier drawings by Rembrandt and by one of his pupils; Sumowski 1957–18, p. 237, no. 6, listed; Walsh 1972, reviews the known provenance of the painting (based on the donor’s family records), describes its rediscovery and the importance of the date, compares Maes’s drawing and Rembrandt’s etching (figs. 109, 110 here) and drawings of the subject, and relates other works by or attributed to Maes; Walsh 1974a, pp. 347–48, 349 n. 20, pl. vi, as Maes’s earliest dated work, describes the picture’s stylistic and expressive qualities; Bader in Milwaukee 1976, pp. 26–27, no. 8, as “of great art historical importance”; B[ender] N[icolson] in a review of current exhibitions, Burlington Magazine 118 (1976), pp. 330, 339, fig. 103, remarks upon the picture’s inclusion in the Milwaukee exhibition and claims that it solves some problems of connoisseurship; Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 51 n. 12, compares the artist’s later concerns with space and geometry; Paris 1983, p. 79 (under no. 47), mentions the work in the context of a speculative attribution to Maes; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 3, pp. 1951, 1952, 2006 no. 1313 (and under no. 1314), 2007 (under no. 1316; ill. p. 2041), discusses the picture as Maes’s earliest dated work, painted in Dordrecht, and compares his Sacrifice of Isaac (private collection) and other early paintings; Haak 1984, p. 420, fig. 917, considers Rembrandt’s influence evident, and Maes’s own direction as well; McVinish in Kingston 1984, p. 48, compares the painting with Maes’s Sacrifice of Isaac (then in the Bader collection) and suggests a somewhat later date for the latter; W. Robinson 1984a, pp. 540, 544, fig. 7, compares the newly discovered Sacrifice of Isaac by Maes (private collection) with the Museum’s picture, noting similarities in color, execution, and costume; Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 8 (1984), pp. 1964–65 (under no. 1764), catalogues the sketch by Maes in Berlin as a preparatory drawing for the Museum’s picture; P. Sutton in Philadelphia—Berlin—London 1984, p. 111, mentioned as Maes’s earliest dated work; Amsterdam 1984–85, pp. 87–88 (under nos. 71, 72), describes Maes’s drawing in Berlin (fig. 109 here) as a preliminary study for the present painting; P. Sutton 1986, p. 183, “lovely”; Bruyn 1988b, p. 329, considers the work to reveal Maes as a fully developed artist; Gilij 1988, p. 220 (under no. 111), considers a drawing of the same subject in Rotterdam to be by Maes and to predate the Museum’s picture; MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 242–43, maintains convincingly that Christ Blessing the Children (National Gallery, London) is by Maes ca. 1652–53, based partly on comparison with the present picture; Huys Janssen in The Hague 1992a, pp. 218, 238, fig. 103, considers the painting to support a similar date for Maes’s Young Woman with Three Children (private collection), where the same female model appears to have been employed; Inagamé 1992a, p. 189, cited in the biography of Maes as his earliest dated work and as “Rembrandt-esque”; Chong and Wieseman in Dordrecht 1992–93, pp. 25–26, fig. 23, cited as Maes’s earliest dated work; Wieseman in ibid., p. 228, compares Maes’s Christ Blessing the Children (National Gallery, London), and suggests a date of about 1652–53 for that picture, and p. 232, compares Maes’s Sacrifice of Isaac and (following W. Robinson 1984) suggests a somewhat later date for that work; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 6 (1994), p. 3627 (under no. 1314), adds literature dating from 1688–92; Baertj 1995, p. 117; Wheelock 1995a, p. 163 n. 11, notes the use of a “striped headdress” (?) in this picture and in other works by Maes; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 6, 19, 30, 126, 146, 149–50, no. 52, describes Rembrandt’s influence and Maes’s distinctive qualities as seen in this work, mentions other treatments of the subject by Rembrandt pupils, and suggests that in expressive terms the painting is superior to Rembrandt’s etching of 1657; William W. Robinson in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 20, p. 78, cites the work as an example of Maes’s “precocious originality in the interpretation of the sacred text and iconographic tradition,” and refers to the figure of Ishmael as “a prematurely embittered outcast”; Plomp 1997, p. 231 (under no. 250), relates a sheet of studies probably by Maes, which are “presumably related to Maes’s painting of the subject of 1653 . . . even though all three figures are posed differently”; Krempel 2000, pp. 28, 42–43, 45, 46, 61, 110, 113 n. 14, 117 n. 27, 123 nn. 13, 14, 125 n. 54, 279, no. A2 (and under no. A1), fig. 1, p. 1, catalogues the painting as Maes’s earliest dated work, notes the type of signature (used 1653–56), considers it quite possible that Maes painted the picture while still in Amsterdam, describes the arrangement of the figures and the expressive effects, discusses the painting’s style in comparison with that of Rembrandt and with other early works by Maes, and notes that the work may be identical with a picture in an anonymous sale in Dordrecht of 1810; Dickey 2002, p. 216 n. 79, compares the flat hat worn by Hagar to one seen in Rembrandt’s etching, Studies of Sack and Other Women of 1636; Sullin 2003, pp. 200–201, fig. 4, describes how Hagar and Ishmael are treated in an original manner; Heilmann in Copenhagen 2006, p. 326, cites the picture as a document revealing how early Maes was working independently.

109. Young Woman Peeling Apples

Oil on wood, 21¾ x 18 in. (54.6 x 45.7 cm)

The painting is in good condition although there is slight abrasion overall, most apparent in the figure and the wall behind her. Still-life elements—the basket of apples, tablecloth, and bucket—are better preserved. A small amount of paint loss has occurred along the central vertical panel join.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.612

The Altman picture by Maes was painted about 1655, in Dordrecht. A date of about 1657 has also been proposed, but in its soft effects of light and shadow, warm, blended coloring, and simplicity of space, the painting is still strongly evocative of Maes's study under Rembrandt, which continued until 1652 or 1653. Dated pictures of similar subjects by Maes, such as A Woman Scrapping Parsnips, with a Child Standing by Her (National Gallery, London), of 1655, support the earlier dating. During the mid-1650s, Maes adopted the regional stylistic tendency (found in Delft, The Hague, and Rotterdam as well as in Dordrecht) to clearly articulate interior space by means of tiled floors, receding walls and windows, and a variety of rectilinear elements. Accompanying this development in Maes's work was an inclination toward descriptive detail and more localized coloring. While not the most obvious example, the Museum's other genre painting by Maes, The Laachemaker (Pl. 110), shows this direction in his approach to domestic settings. Maes did not abandon altogether his preference for velvety shadows, but in works dating from after 1655 he tends to sweep them toward the corners of his interiors. Here, by contrast, the shadows surround the young woman in a comforting, intimate manner, and the warm sunlight that falls on her seems almost a metaphor for the satisfaction she finds in her work. This expressive quality was evidently a product of Maes's own personality, as well as a reflection of his admiration for the domestic religious scenes that Rembrandt painted during the 1640s, such as The Holy Family with Angels, of 1645 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg).

The concentration of the figure (probably a maid) is conveyed by that of the composition, and of course by Maes's affectionate description of her face. A basket of apples sits on the carpet-covered table, and one by one they make their way to the girl's apron, to her hands, and to the bucket of water at her feet. The oil lamp hanging on the wall provides a sense of balance to the composition and further enhances the mood of the painting, which is entirely positive. Sumowski's remark (see Refs.) about apples and worldly temptation has more to do with academic fashions of the 1970s and 1980s than with the seventeenth-century Dutch appreciation of home life and honest work.

Paintings of women peeling apples, scraping parsnips, and otherwise preparing simple foods were one of several ways—the writings of Jacobs Cats were another—in which the Dutch endorsed an ideal of womanhood in middle-class society. The image of a homemaker, content with her modest and diligent life, had moral and religious overtones, but it is only in Maes's pictures of old women bent over work, praying, or dozing over a Bible that a didactic impression is made. Gerrit Dou (q.v.) painted a picture of an old woman peeling apples in about 1650 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), but it was not until the 1650s that the motif and similar domestic subjects became fairly commonplace. Examples by Maes (Old Woman Peeling Apples,
also in Berlin), Gabriel Metsu (see the discussion of A Woman Seated at a Window, Pl. 117, below), Pieter de Hooch, and Cornelis Bisschop (q.v.) are well known.8

The Altman panel appears prominently next to a tondo by Raphael in a painting by Pieter Christoffel Wonder (1780–1822), dated 1826, which shows three connoisseurs and the artist in an imaginative picture gallery. Wonder included the painting again in the very center of his most ambitious gallery view, Sir John Murray’s Art Gallery, dated 1830 (private collection, England).8 The Dutch artist went to London in 1823 and probably saw the Maes at the Christie’s sale of the following year (see Ex Coll.). His friendship with the Dordrecht painters Abraham van Strij (1733–1826) and his brother Jacob (q.v.) may have encouraged him to place a painting by Maes in exalted company.9 This pictorial fiction became fact when the work entered the collections of the Duke of Sutherland, Rodolphe Kann, and Benjamin Altman (see Ex Coll.).10

3. On this development in the South Holland region, see Lieftink 2000a, chap. 4 (pp. 162–65).
4. The undated Old Woman Spinning (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) is no exception, although it appears to be in Krempel 2000, fig. 48 (reproduced next to the present picture), since the caption reads simply “1697.” But in the catalogue entry for that work (ibid., p. 355, no. 85), one finds a tortuous argument for proximity to a work dated 1618 (Old Woman Reading by a Spinning Wheel, location unknown; ibid., no. 132, fig. 49), on the grounds of subject matter and a dismissal of the “older signature type” on the canvas as the sort of exception one encounters occasionally (no examples are cited).
5. Themes of domestic virtue in Dutch genre painting, and in the publications of “Father Cats,” are very well described in Frantis 1993a (see especially pp. 19, 89–92, 181–83, for the Altman painting’s subject).
6. See Frantis 1993a, figs. 70 (Metsu, in the Louvre, Paris), 161 and 162 (Dou and Maes in Berlin). The meaning of De Hooch’s A Woman Peeling Apples, with a Small Child, of about 1663 (Wallace Collection, London), is sensibly described in P. Sutton 1980a, pp. 49, 95, no. 61, pl. 65. On Bisschop’s Apple-Peeler, of 1667 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), see Dordrecht 1992–93, no. 5.
7. See Herrmann 1972, fig. 28. On Wonder’s relationship with General Sir John Murray, his patron and one of the men in the painting, see Frans Grijzenhout’s article in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 1, pp. 322–23.
8. See “Display of Art,” in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 5, p. 17, fig. 5 (the four figures from the painting of 1826 reappear here on the left).
10. For articles on these three collectors, and further literature, see Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 1, pp. 730–31 (Altman), vol. 17, p. 777 (Kann), and vol. 19, pp. 270–71 (George Granville Leveson-Gower, 1st Duke of Sutherland).


Ex Coll.: Possibly Mrs. Thomas Gordon, Bully Hill, Rochester (her sale, Christie’s, London, April 2, 1808, no. 46, as by Dirck Maes, for £3 13s. to Michael Bryan); D. van Dijl, Amsterdam (sale, Vinkeles, Amsterdam, January 10, 1814, no. 102, sold for £160 to Willem Gruyter Sr.); Ralph Bernal, London (his sale, Christie’s, London, May 8, 1824, no. 11, for £63 to Zachary or Farley); Michael Zachary, London (his sale, Phillips, London, May 31, 1828, no. 37, for £147,
to the Duke of Sutherland; Duke of Sutherland, Stafford House, London (1828–d. 1833); Duchess of Sutherland, London (1833–46); [George Morant, London, in 1846]; [Emery, Rutley & Co., London]; [John Smith, London; sold to Morland for £130]; G. H. Morland, London (his sale, Christie's, London, May 9, 1863, no. 101, for £173 5s. to Woodin for John Walter; John Walter, Bearwood, Berkshire (1863–d. 1894); Rodolphe Kann, Paris (by 1900–d. 1905; his estate, 1905–7; cat., 1907, vol. 1, no. 54; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, Paris, sold to Altman for $80,355]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1908–d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.612

1. George Morant (1770–1846), a framemaker in London, was presumably acting as an agent.

I10. The Lacemaker

Oil on canvas, 17 3/4 x 20 3/4 in. (45.1 x 52.7 cm)
Signed (on base of child's chair): N. MAES.
The paint surface is slightly worn throughout from past cleaning.
The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.5

A fine genre picture by Maes is one of the many things Michael Friedsam had in common with his friend and business partner, Benjamin Altman. The present work, which Friedsam purchased in 1917, is a slightly later painting than the Altman Young Woman Peeling Apples (Pl. 109), and may be dated about 1656–57.1 The rectilinear arrangement of the composition is typical of Maes's domestic scenes dating from this period.

The painting represents a young mother seated next to her child, who wears a satijnedjing (fall hat, with a protective bumper) and sits in a substantial high chair. The baby holds an object in each hand, perhaps a pacifier and a ball. A ceramic porringer and spoon have been set down on the floor, while the silver beaker and spoon appear to have arrived there spontaneously. (Silver objects like these were often given as presents on the occasion of an infant’s baptism.)2 A white jug with a pewter lid sits on the table. A portrait engraving, perhaps of some public figure, has been neatly hung on the wall. The woman makes lace, working on top of a sewing cushion (naaiplaid), which was a padded box with drawers or compartments.3 A small scissors hangs on a string, casting a shadow on the apron. The warm palette of red, green, and brown, the bright sunlight, and the balance of simple shapes lend the scene a tranquility suited to its subject. The painter also provides the viewer with the pleasure of dwelling on the specific qualities of things (silver, wood, glazed faience, wool, and so on), and on momentary effects like the shadow cast by the window onto the wall.

Sewing, spinning, and the more meticulous craft of lacemaking were appreciated at the time as examples of diligence, and of feminine virtue. Joachim Wtewael (q.v.) celebrated the skill and character of his daughter Eva in a sober portrait dated 1628 (Centraal Museum, Utrecht), which shows her working on an intricate piece of lace.4 The theme of lacemaking flourished in genre paintings of the 1650s and 1660s, together with other images of conscientious homemaking.5 A comparatively straightforward survey of “Women at Domestic Chores” was engraved in five prints by Geertruydt Roghman (1625–1651) about 1650, and included scenes of sewing and spinning.6 A fair number of lacemakers were depicted by Leiden artists, such as Quirijn van Brekelenkam, Gabriel Metsu, Pieter van Slingelandt (q.v.), and Adriaen van Gaasbeek (1621–1650).7 But no Dutch artist returned to the subject of lacemaking as frequently as did Maes during the 1650s, both in paintings and in drawings.8 The popular theme appears to have struck a personal chord.

1. Krempel 2000, p. 360 (under no. D29), favors a date of about 1660, and notes that the type of signature suggests a date “probably after 1655.” In the early 1970s, Willem van de Watering told curator John Walsh that paintings by Maes signed with “AE” in ligature date from 1651, and those signed “N. MAES,” as here, begin in 1656 (undated note in curatorial files).
2. A similar beaker of 1650 is in the Museum’s collection; see Newark–Denver 2001–2, pp. 170–71, no. 33. Compare the objects on the floor in front of the high chair in Hendrick Sorgh’s The Family of Ewouwe Puits, 1661 (Historisch Museum, Rotterdam; ibid., p. 139, fig. 185).
3. On sewing cushions and baskets, see Schipper van Lotrum 1975.
5. For numerous examples and insights, see ibid., pp. 21–29, 46–48, 76–80 on Caspar Netscher’s Lacemaker, of 1663, in the Wallace Collection, London, pp. 83, 156–58 on teaching needlework, and
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7. On the two less familiar artists, Van Gaesbeek and Van Singelandt, see the discussion of the latter’s Young Mother with Two Children in Leiden 1988, no. 66.


REFERENCES: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. g (1842), p. 579, no. 13, records the canvas in the Labouchère collection; Waagen 1854, vol. 2, p. 431, no. 2, in the Labouchère collection, reveals “a masterly hand and an astonishing power of colour”; Thoré 1857, pp. 355–56, as in the Manchester exhibition of 1857, anticipates “le bonheur de Chardin”; Thoré 1866, p. 315, cites among other works by Maes of a type that influenced Vermeer; G. Veth 1890, p. 141, notes Thoré’s reference to the painting; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 2 (1910), p. 90, listed; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 496, no. 75, repeats information from J. Smith 1842 and Waagen 1854; M’Cormick 1924, p. 257, mentioned; Valentin 1928a, p. 10, as from “the master’s best period, when he was under Rembrandt’s influence, about 1655”; Hibbard 1980, pp. 318, 344, fig. 611, “early 1650s?,” offers a few derivative remarks; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 3, pp. 1954, 1916, 1957, 2016, 2073, no. 347, as dating from about 1655, compares other works by Maes, and records a copy;1 Burn 1984, p. 22 (ill.); P. Sutton 1986, p. 188, mentioned; Liedtke 1990, p. 52, mentioned as part of the Friedsam bequest; Baetjer 1994, p. 358; Franits 1995, pp. 391–96, fig. 1, uses the work as an example of the style Maes left behind in the 1660s; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 151, mentioned; Krempel 2000, pp. 33, 34, 61, 360, no. 329, fig. 41, as datable to about 1656, and showing a lower viewpoint than in earlier works; Newark–Denver 2001–2, pp. 65–67, 178, no. 49, fig. 97, as dating from about 1656, and featuring a high chair, ceramic porringer, a small silver beaker, and a “white jug with pewter lid, whose broad neck identifies it as a beer pitcher”; Salomon 2004, p. 97, fig. 81, compares this type of genre picture with the somewhat different domestic scenes of Adriaen van Ostade.


EX COLL.: Hon. Henry Labouchère, later 1st Baron Taunton, Taunton, Somerset, and Stoke, near Windsor (by 1842, until d. 1869); this eldest daughter, Hon. Mary Dorothy Labouchère, later Mrs. Edward James Stanley, Cross Hall, Lancashire (from 1869); [Scott & Fowles, New York, until 1916; sold for $25,000 to Kleingerber]; [Kleingerber, New York, 1916–17; sold to Friedsam for $27,500]; Michael Friedsam, New York (1917–d. 1931); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.5

1. The copy reappeared as a work by Reinier Covij at Christie’s East, New York, November 8, 1984, no. 60. Curator John Walsh noted photographs in the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, recording “another version, in upright format, minus the table,” sold at Christie’s, London, June 20, 1913, no. 127, later with Douwes, Amsterdam (panel, 22 x 17¾ in. [56 x 44 cm]), and a copy on canvas (19¼ x 24¼ in. [48.6 x 61.5 cm]), with Rothmann, Berlin, in 1929.
III. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on copper (oval), 4⅓ x 3⅓ in. (11.7 x 8.6 cm)
Signed and dated (at right, above ruff): MAES /1657

The painting is well preserved.

Gift of Lila and Herman Shickman, 2004 2004.392

This small, bust-length portrait on copper is a very rare instance of Maes's working as a miniaturist.1 There is no doubt about his responsibility for the painting: the execution is quite consistent with that of figures in his portraits and genre scenes dating from the 1650s, and the signature on the brown background is intact and typical. The reversal of the N in the inscription is also found on three pictures by Maes dating from 1633–55, including the Museum's Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael (Pl. 108), and the S is reversed, as here, on a genre painting dated 1657.2

The sitter, who appears to be a woman in her fifties, has light brown hair and blue eyes, and wears quite conservative attire, with a millstone ruff dating from the 1630s. The costume, as well as a superficial resemblance, may have encouraged Wilson's identification of the subject with Margaretha de Geer (1583–1672), wife of the wealthy Dordrecht merchant Jacob Trip (see Refs.). Her much older appearance is known from portraits by Jacob Gerritsz Cuyp (1651; Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam);3 by Rembrandt (ca. 1661; National Gallery, London);4 and by Maes himself at a later date (1669; Dordrechts Museum, Dordrecht).5

1. Krempel 2000, p. 288, refers to four other examples in Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6, pp. 350, 563, 571, nos. 287a, 287d, 362, 409. The first two are untraced miniatures of William III and Mary, last seen in an 1892 sale. The last is a bust-length portrait 9⅜ inches (24.1 cm) high, and thus not a miniature at all. The evidence for Maes's authorship is unknown in these three cases. Hofstede de Groot's no. 162 is a miniature portrait of a man in the John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art, which is not accepted in the modern literature as a work by Maes. Krempel (2000, p. 375, doc. 31) cites a document of 1665 in which Maes gives a receipt for payment for copies of two portraits painted by him on small silver supports.

2. Krempel 2000, nos. A2, A3, A6, and A25, kindly brought to my attention by the author. He saw the painting on February 18, 2005, and considered it entirely typical of Maes's early portrait style.

3. See Dordrecht 2002, no. 38, and also p. 196, fig. 372, for the same artist's portrait of the same sitter in 1649.


References: Wilson in Sarasota 1980–81, unpagd, no. 44, discusses the painting as a portrait of Margaretha de Geer in her mid-seventies; Sumowski 1983–84, vol. 3, pp. 1957–58, 2027, 2177, no. 1991, as a portrait of an elderly woman, rejecting Wilson's identification of the sitter with Margaretha de Geer; W. Robinson 1993, p. 104, cites the painting as one of six portraits by Maes that are dated 1657, and as "Maes's only early portrait on the scale of a miniature"; Krempel 2000, pp. 287–88, no. A28, fig. 91, as a portrait of an elderly woman, noted as one of the few miniatures by Maes that are known or recorded.


III. Shown actual size
112. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 44 x 35½ in. (111.8 x 89.5 cm)

The condition of the painting is good, although there is slight abrasion in the hair and eyes and in the deep blacks of the headdress and dress. A large paint loss has occurred where the hands cross. The red lake glazes applied to the background curtain, upholstered chair, and tablecloth have faded to such an extent that these fabrics now appear almost completely gray.

Rogers Fund, 1906 06.1325

The reputation of this picture has slipped somewhat since curator Roger Fry, in 1906, wrote to his wife of the "superb Maes portrait of an old woman which I found here," and since the Evening Post applauded the purchase, together with Goya's Don Sebastián Martínez y Pérez (06.280) and a kitchen scene said to be by Jan Steen (actually, by Peter Wtewael; Pl. 223)." The condition of this picture in the second half of the 1660s is likely, considering the style of the woman's collar and sleeves, and the use of this kind of background in dated portraits by Maes. W. R. Valentiner and A. Burroughs (see Refs.) suggest that the painting reveals the influence of Jacob Jordaens (1593–1678), who, according to Arnold Houbraken, was visited by Maes on a trip to Antwerp in the 1660s (see the biography above). While it is true that Jordaens painted generally similar portraits (seated, three-quarters-length, similarly posed, with agitated drapery and a glimpse of landscape in the background), so did many other Flemings and, by the 1660s, quite a few Dutch artists active in Amsterdam, The Hague, and elsewhere. The oeuvres of Bartholomeus van der Helst (q.v.) and Abraham van den Tempel (1622/23–1672) offer too many examples to cite.

The attribution of the Museum's painting has never been doubted. A pendant portrait has never been proposed, and probably never existed. The great majority of male pendants were placed to the viewer's left, that is, to the right of the female sitter, who would be turned in that direction or otherwise acknowledge the presence of her mate.

1. See Refs. (Fry 1972).
2. See Krempel 2000, figs. 137, 138, 130, etc.

REFERENCES: American Art News 4, no. 23 (March 17, 1906), [p. 6], applauds the purchase from the Ehrich Galleries, and reports that Mr. Ehrich "obtained the canvas when abroad last summer"; ibid., no. 35 (September 15, 1906), [p. 1 (ill.)], suggests that the work reveals Rembrandt's influence but gives a foretaste of Maes's later manner; MMA Bulletin 1, no. 5 (April 1906), pp. 73–74, reveals the "sinister influence" of the artist's wealthy patrons in his departure from Rembrandt's influence in favor of "the peculiar cold and polished tones of Maes's later style"; Fry 1906, pp. 136–37 (ill.), illustrates the transition between Maes's two styles of painting; Cary 1909, pp. xxv–xxvi (ill. p. lxi), praises the composition; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 3 (1911), p. 112, listed as in MMA; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 580, no. 461; Valentiner 1924, p. 66, pl. 66, as dating from the 1660s and influenced by Jordaens; A. Burroughs 1938, p. 104, considers the portrait "Jordaens-like"; Fry 1972, p. 251, letter of R. Fry to his wife dated February 18, 1906, refers to his purchase of a superb Maes portrait of an old woman which I found here"; D. Sutton in ibid., p. 26, quotes an editorial in the Evening Post of April 25, 1906, applauding Roger Fry's demonstration of "standard museum values" by purchasing this picture, a Goya, and other "masterpieces," and p. 253 n. 1, included in a list of pictures shown in the "Temporary Exhibition in Gallery 24" of the MMA during April 1906, Spalding 1980, p. 91, listed among masterpieces acquired during Roger Fry's first year at the Museum; Baertje 1995, p. 339; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 151, as "ca. 1660?"


EX COLL.: [Ehrich Galleries, New York, 1905–6, bought abroad; sold to MMA]; Rogers Fund, 1906 06.1325
Admiral Jacob Binkes

Oil on canvas, 17¼ x 12¾ in. (43.8 x 32.7 cm)
Signed (lower right): MAAS
The painting is well preserved.
Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1911 11.149.2

This portrait of Jacob Binkes (or Binckes; ca. 1640–1677) and the pendant portrait of his fiancée, Inguna Rotterdaam (see below and Pl. 114.), were painted in 1676 by Maes in Amsterdam, where the artist frequently made portraits on this smaller scale. The identification of the sitters, which is given in the 1908 sale catalogue (see Ex Coll.) and in Hofstede de Groot’s catalogue (see Refs.), depends upon labels stuck on the canvases’ stretchers and inscribed in what appears to be an eighteenth-century hand. The label on the back of the present picture states: “Jacob Binkes/Commandeur van den Vloot/Bruidegom van Inguna Rotterdaam” (Jacob Binkes/Commander of the Fleet/ Bridegroom of Inguna Rotterdaam). The label on the back of the pendant picture states: “Inguna Rotterdaam/[Brui]dik van Jacob Binkes, dewelke voor de/voitrec[kking] van dit huwelijk overleden sijnde, is/zij naderhand getroet met Pieter D’Orville./Obiit tot Amsterdam den 20. Januari 1704.” (Inguna Rotterdaam/ Bride of Jacob Binkes, who died before the performance of this marriage/She later married with Pieter D’Orville./Died in Amsterdam, January 20, 1704).

No other portraits of the sitters are known, but the information on the labels is completely in accord with their known biographies, and with the fact that the portraits conform to the convention for portraits of betrothed couples: the fiancée is on the man’s right (the viewer’s left), rather than the arrangement commonly observed for married couples (where the husband is placed to the wife’s right). The portraits commemorate the couple’s engagement in 1676. It was not unusual for marriages to be formally announced as much as a year in advance, and in Binkes’s case a long engagement was only to be expected.

Binkes was one of the most capable and courageous naval officers of the 1660s and 1670s. His date of birth is unknown, but he reportedly came from the village of Koudum, near the port of Stavoren on the west coast of Friesland. His father was Ninke Binckes, burgomaster of Stavoren. Binkes began his career early in the Admiralty of Amsterdam; in 1666, when he was probably about twenty-six years old, he was in command of the United Provinces, a forty-eight-gun warship in the squadron of the celebrated admiral Maarten Harpertsz Tromp. He took part in the Saint James’s Day Fight of August 4, 1666, when the English navy inflicted heavy losses on the Dutch. Under Admiral Michiel de Ruyter, Binkes was captain of the Essex, with fifty guns, when the Dutch fleet sailed up the Thames in June 1667, burning five ships of the Royal Navy and towing away their flagship, the Royal Charles. The gold chain and medallion worn by Binkes in the present portrait (valued at 500 florins at the time) was presented to him in 1670 for his destruction or capture of three privateers.

After service in the Mediterranean and elsewhere in Europe, Binkes sailed with four ships to the West Indies, departing Holland in April 1673. For years the English, the French, and the Dutch had contested colonies in the Caribbean, and Binkes provided some of the more dramatic moments. He attacked ships in Martinique, Guadeloupe, and elsewhere, took Saint Eustatius, and then sailed for Virginia. On the James River, he encountered about thirty English ships, seven of which he left in flames. Provoked by an agreement between England and France to destroy Dutch trade routes, the States General dispatched Binkes’s small fleet to New York, which he captured in September 1673. He then installed a new government and left a garrison to protect “New Orange,” which survived as such until the winter of 1674. After a highly eventful trip, Binkes arrived in Amsterdam during the summer of 1674. In the following year, he was sent to strengthen the fleet of the king of Denmark.

On March 16, 1676—shortly after his engagement, presumably (the date is unrecorded)—Binkes set off again for the West Indies, this time with eleven ships and hundreds of troops. In early May, he seized the island of Cayenne (French Guiana) and, after other engagements, sent part of his fleet under Jan Bont to protect the Dutch colony of Tobago (“New Walcheren”). Binkes’s ships attacked the French in Santo Domingo and then sailed to Tobago, which Bont had abandoned. The island had been in Zeelander hands between 1628 and 1637, and since 1654. Binkes rebuilt the fortifications in Rockly Bay and prepared for the arrival of a large French fleet commanded by Vice Admiral Jean d’Estrees. The French attack on March 3, 1677, resulted in horrific losses of men and ships on both sides. With no French vessel left undamaged (the flagship Glorieux exploded with 445 crew on board), D’Estrees withdrew, and returned with a new fleet in early December. He landed fifteen hundred men and exchanged cannon fire with the fort. On December 12, a French fireball hit the fort’s powder magazine, above which Binkes and his staff were having lunch. Half the garrison was killed in the explosion, and the fort was overrun.1

In Maes’s portrait, the admiral appears in full armor, his hand resting on a plummed helmet, with a pistol cocked and his
finger on the trigger. A frigate sails in the background. The original carved and gilded frame was probably inspired by grander examples, such as that on Ferdinand Bol's large portrait of Admiral De Ruyter of 1667 (Mauritshuis, The Hague). At the top, between winged putti, Neptune rides a horse with webbed hooves. Similar steeds occupy the bottom corners. The trophy-like arrangement to the left consists of a drum and arms and armor, including spears and ramrods. To the right, spears, cannon equipment, and a cross-staff are clustered around a globe. At the bottom, the now rather worn decoration is completed by anchors, a basket of cannonballs, and a mortar (the type of cannon that cost Binkes his life).

1. This biography is adopted from that in Van der Aa 1852–76, vol. 1, pp. 171–72, with historical details checked against recent accounts.
2. See Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, pp. 42–46, no. 5. Binkes must have known this version of Bol's portrait of De Ruyter, since it was made for the Admiralty of Amsterdam.


Ex Coll.: Mrs. F. Lemker (née Muller), Kampen and Oldenbroek (her sale, organized by F. Muller & Co. of Amsterdam, Kampen, July 7, 1908, no. 26; [Frank T. Sabin, London, 1928]; J. Pierpont Morgan, New York; Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1911 II.149.2

114. Ingena Rotterdam, Betrothed of Admiral Jacob Binkes

Oil on canvas, 17 1/4 x 13 in. (43.8 x 33 cm)
Signed (lower right): Maes/1676
The painting is well preserved.
Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1911 II.149.3

As discussed in the entry above, the subject of this portrait is identified by an old sticker on the back of the stretcher. The pendant pictures celebrate Ingena Rotterdam's engagement to Jacob Binkes, which presumably was announced in the winter of 1675–76. Binkes sailed for the West Indies in March 1676, never to see the Netherlands or his fiancée again. Nine years later, in 1685, she married Pieter d'Orville in Amsterdam. She died there on January 20, 1704.

The blonde sitter wears impressive pearls and a mauve wrap over her white dress. Dark trees and a sky at sunset fill the background. The original frame, made to match that on the pendant portrait in its general design, is crowned by the worn figure of a goddess. She wears a wreath of flowers and appears to hold another, so that she is probably Flora, not Venus or Neptune's spouse, Amphitrite. Roses and other flowers and tendrils embellish the frame, which also features putti to the right and left, and two doves on each of the four sides. The larger doves on the bottom of the frame kiss above a bunch of flowers.

1. Their wedding was celebrated in a poem by the Dutch poetess Katharina Lescaultje: Grabowsky 2000, pp. 72–73.
REFERENCES: Anon., “London Letter,” American Art News 6, no. 33 (August 15, 1908), p. 2, as at Sabin’s Gallery; Dickey in Hamilton-Rochester–Amarillo 1983, pp. 18–19, no. 3, describes the subject and offers a few biographical details; Baetjer 1995, p. 339; Van Thiel and De Bruyn Kops 1993, p. 179, fig. c, describes the frame as a late example of its type; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 151, mentioned; Krempel 2000, p. 316, no. A173, fig. 258, remarks that the commission must have been given on the occasion of the couple’s engagement, as the man died before their marriage, and that placing the male sitter to the viewer’s right also indicates betrothal not marriage.


Ex Coll.: The painting has the same history of ownership as its pendant. See Ex Coll. for Admiral Jacob Binkes (Pl. 113); Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1911 11.149.3
The artist was born in Nijmegen in 1619 or 1620. The first known use of the double surname Marseus van Schrieck or Marseus de Schrieck occurs on a still-life dated 1655, when the painter was in Italy. He was known there as Ottone Marcelis (or "Ottavio Marsaus, pittore," in a census of 1652); the addition of the Netherlands surname Van Schrieck probably dates from an earlier period, or was intended for a Northern European customer. When his brother's forthcoming marriage was registered at the Town Hall of Amsterdam in 1661, he gave his name as Evert Marseus, and his landscape paintings (usually signed "E.M.") are listed as by Evert Marseus in contemporary inventories. In the inventory of Otto Marseus's estate (compiled in June and July of 1678), his unmarried sister is identified as Johanna Marseus, and his brother as Evert Marseus van Schrieck, but the latter signed the document "E. Marseus," and a landscape by Evert Marseus is listed in the inventory. In 1669, "Otto Marseus, Constbider," and his wife, "Margaretha Gysels," made a will, and when the artist sold a parcel of land in 1674 the notary recorded his name as Otto Marseus. He is described as the late "Uncle Otto Marseus" (with reference to Evert's children) in a document dated August 6, 1678. The mention of "A Maria with the baby Jesus by Otto Marseus" in a Dordrecht inventory dated 1674 is unexpected only for the picture's subject. On the basis of these and other documents, it may be considered certain that the artist's name was Otto Marseus, and that references to him in scholarly literature as "van Schrieck" (or worse, "Schrieck") are ill-informed.

Nothing is known of Otto Marseus's career before he went to Italy (ca. 1650), except for Houbraken's report that "Otto Marcelis" worked in England and for the "Queen Mother" in France. The information was obtained directly from Marseus's widow, "who after him outlived another two husbands [and is] now [1718] still alive" (at about the age of seventy-four). The royal patron must have been Anne of Austria, wife of Louis XIII, who reigned on behalf of her son Louis XIV between her husband's death in 1643 and 1661. Perhaps it was in Paris that Marseus first met the Delft-born still-life painter Willem van Aelst (1627–in or after 1683), who lived in France between 1643 and 1649, when he went to Florence and entered the service of Ferdinando II de' Medici. It is occasionally claimed that Marseus and Van Aelst traveled to Italy together, and that "according to Houbraken" Marseus went to Rome in 1648. What Houbraken actually reports, in his biography of Matthijs Witchoos (1627–1703), is that Witchoos and another pupil of Jacob van Campen (1595–1657), Hendrick Grauw (ca. 1627–1693), went with Marseus and three other, unnamed artists to Rome, and that one of them died on the way, "some" remained in Italy, and "Otto and Matthias came back after they were there two years, in the year 1650." However, the usual inference that Marseus and Witchoos traveled to Italy in 1648 would appear doubtful, considering that in 1652 both artists were still in Rome (Witchoos was back in the Netherlands by February 1653), and that Marseus did not return to the Netherlands until sometime in 1656 at the earliest (he is first recorded there in 1663).

Marseus and Witchoos joined the fellowship of Netherlandish artists in Rome, the Schildersbent, in which Marseus was called "The Ferret," in reference to his forest floor still lifes (see Pl. 115). When Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.) passed through Rome in 1652, he was Marseus's houseguest. In 1678, the writer observed, "But surely our Ortho Marseus (alias Snuffelaer [Ferret]) has made his particular aptitude in art, and the part [thereof] to which he is inclined, clear enough, for when in the year 1652 I was with him in Rome I was amazed at the number of monsters he kept and fed, and how he understood their nature quite as wonderfully as he vividly depicted their forms." Marseus evidently enjoyed the support of at least one great patron in Italy, Cardinal Leopoldo de' Medici (1613–1679). According to Houbraken, Marseus was also "long in service to the Grand Duke of Florence," namely, Leopoldo's brother, Ferdinando II de' Medici. His successor, Cosimo III de' Medici, visited Marseus in Amsterdam during the winter of 1667–68, and purchased three paintings by him for 500 guilders.

Houbraken writes that Van Aelst was a "disciple" of Marseus in Italy, and "returned with him" to the Netherlands, but in another passage Van Aelst (with no mention of Marseus) is said to have "come back to his fatherland in the year 1656." He is recorded in Amsterdam in 1657. Perhaps Van Aelst, who was in his early twenties at the time, studied Marseus's work in Rome,
but he would not have been the older artist’s pupil.\textsuperscript{18} That Houbraken, on an earlier page, has Marseus and Witchoos returning to the Netherlands in 1650 suggests that he mixed up scraps of information (and missed Van Hoogstraten’s remarks). It appears possible that Marseus did not arrive in Holland until the early 1660s,\textsuperscript{19} which would be consistent with the fact that he did not marry until 1664 (a number of Netherlandish artists married shortly after they returned from years abroad).

The French diplomat and connoisseur Balthasar de Monconys (1611–1655), who in 1663 visited Cornelis Bischop, Johannes Vermeer (q.q.v.), and the Middelburg artist and naturalist Johannes Goedaert (1617–1668), went to see “Otho et ses tableaux” on August 20 of the same year. The artist’s house, Waterrijck, was outside Amsterdam to the southeast, near the village of Diemen. De Monconys admired Marseus’s butterflies, and also a “Calm” painted by Willem van de Velde the Younger (q.v.). On the same day, Marseus, De Monconys, and his son visited a “Mr. Hudde,” who made “small microscopes with single lenses,” and a “Mr. Rentre Heent” (Dr. Roetert Ernst?), who had a cabinet of curiosities with splendid shells, “des ouvrages du Japon,” and many other things. On August 25, De Monconys again went to Marseus and “accepted a second Marine by ‘Vandrevell’” and “another [painting] by M. Otho.” He also met a “Mr. Borry,” who had operated successfully on Marseus’s eye. Two days later, De Monconys was again “chez Otho,” where he saw “admirable pieces that he had made as studies [pour son estude] in Rome.”\textsuperscript{20} The scores of paintings by other Dutch artists (and dozens of his own) that are listed in the inventory of Marseus’s estate—mostly landscapes, seascapes, still lifes (a few by Van Aelst), and genre scenes—indicate that he dealt in works of art.\textsuperscript{21}

The house that De Monconys visited, “Ottaer riek” (Waterrijck), had at least six rooms on two floors, with enough space to show or store about two hundred paintings. (A cistern, a lute, “real and false diamonds,” many coins, gold pieces, a large chest containing mounted insects, other rarities of nature and art, and lots of clothing are also listed in the inventory of 1678.) Marseus also owned a little garden house (one of two under a single roof) on a plot of lowland outside the Muiderpoort of Amsterdam, where he kept a small boat, some fishing nets, and a bed.\textsuperscript{22} The artist’s widow told Houbraken that he went there daily to care for his creatures, and that he also kept some of them in “a pen behind his house.”\textsuperscript{23} The latter must refer to Marseus’s proper residence, where he had his studio.

In his early years, Marseus painted flower pieces, evidently turning to his \textit{sotto-bosco} nature studies when he moved to Rome. In the past, his work has been regarded as a surrealistic subcategory of “still life” painting,\textsuperscript{24} but he is now seen as a prominent figure among European artists who took a serious interest in the study of plants, animals, and other forms of natural life. Marseus owned a copy of Rembert Dodoens’s herbarium (\textit{Cruydt-boeck van Rembertius Dodoens}) and surely consulted other books, but his actual collecting and study from life of some of the less familiar fauna and flora amounted to field biology. He was an important influence on a few Italian artists (especially Paolo Porpora; 1617–1679/80) and numerous northerners, including Van Aelst, Witchoos, Rachel Ruytsch (1664–1730), Elias van den Broeck (1657–1708), Abraham Mignon (1640–1679), Nicolaes Lachtropius (active 1656–in or after 1700), and Frans, James, and Karl Wilhelm de Hamilton.\textsuperscript{25} His patrons, ranging from Medici dukes to Dutch amateurs such as Agnes Block, were scholars of nature as well as patrons of the arts.\textsuperscript{26} Marseus was buried on June 22, 1678, in the Nieuwezijds Kapel, a Protestant church in Amsterdam. His address is given as the Nieuwe Prinsengracht. His portrait appears in one of Houbraken’s plates, accompanied by a snake curled up under a plant.\textsuperscript{27}

1. A. D. de Vries 1883, p. 167, first published the document that provides the only known evidence for the artist’s place and approximate date of birth. When his marriage banns were announced in Amsterdam on April 25, 1664, he was described as “Otto Merceis of Nimwegen [Nijmegen], painter, 44 years old ... living near Diemen.” His twenty-year-old bride, Margrita (Margaretha) Gijzel, from Amsterdam, appeared with her father, Cornelis Gijzel, who was a stonecutter specialized in carving crests (\textit{wapens}).

2. According to Steenma 1999, pp. 11, 13, referring to the author’s catalogue, no. 81.23. The still life (Uffizi, Florence; no. 5218) is signed “OTTO MARSEVS/DER SCHRIECK Fecyt in Roma/1655 Ly io aug ... 7.”

3. The former is more likely. According to Steenma 1999, p. 102, no. A1.2, fig. 2, \textit{Flower Still Life} (location unknown) is signed and dated “Otto Mareus de S. 1647,” and is conspicuously inscribed with a vanitas inscription in Dutch. This would appear to confirm that Marseus was already known as Marseus de Schriech in 1647, and that he spent at least part of that year in the Netherlands rather than France.

4. Bredius 1916, pp. 710–11, where we learn that the mother of Evert and Otto was named Maria van Til, and that Evert was from Gennep, slightly to the south of Nijmegen. Testaments of 1657, 1660, 1668, and 1681 (deathbed), and inventories of paintings dating from 1646, 1671, 1680, 1682 (2), and 1718, give the landscape’s name as Evert Marceus. In an Amsterdam inventory of 1649, a “Landscape with waterfall” is listed as by E. Marcielis. In 1661, Evert Marseus gave his age as forty-four, and in 1668 as
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fifty-one, indicating that he was born about 1617 (earlier testaments giving his age as "about twenty-five" and "about forty-six" appear less reliable). He died in December 1681. For all these documents, see Bredius 1916, pp. 710–12.
5. Ibid., pp. 697, 710.
6. Ibid., p. 709.
7. Ibid., p. 708.
8. The perpetrators are never Dutch. In Steensma 1999, a printed dissertation on "Schriek" comprising a monograph and catalogue raisonné, the author speculates (p. 11) that the name may reflect the reaction of viewers to the painter's pictures ("Schriek!"). She also counters Riegl's suggestion that the name may refer originally to a village by observing that the artist was from Nijmegen not "from Schriek" (p. 10). The inventory of the estate of an Otto van Schriek in Amsterdam is dated December 30, 1646, and includes numerous paintings (none attributed), one of which is a portrait of the owner, his wife, and children (Bredius 1916, p. 708). Whether he is related to Evert and Otto Maraeus is unknown. One of several possible explanations for Otto Maraeus's adoption of "van Schriek" would be that he wanted to clearly distinguish himself from his brother, whose name was known on the Amsterdam art market from the 1640s onward.
12. See Steensma 1999, p. 13 n. 82 (on Withoos), and pp. 16–17.
14. The artist's Florentine patrons are discussed in Franchini Guelfi 1977.
15. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 1, p. 318. The statement has been questioned on the grounds that no works by Maraeus can be traced back to Ferdinando's collection (Steensma 1999, p. 16). But the author's claim that Houbraken meant Cosimo III (see text following) is unconvincing, since Maraeus was never at his service for more than three meetings in Amsterdam. Presumably, Leo- poldo was Maraeus's patron in Italy, while Ferdinando shared the artist's interest in natural science.
18. Van Aelst was an apprentice of his uncle Evert van Aelst and became a master in the Delft painters' guild on November 9, 1643.
19. Known provenances and signatures do not resolve the question, although it is curious that a still life in Braunschweig (Steensma 1999, no. 81.33) is signed OTTO/MARSEO. and dated 1662.
20. On De Monconys's visits with Maraeus, see ibid., pp. 18–19.
22. Bredius (ibid., p. 707 n. 1) and some later writers must be mistaken to identify this structure with "the house 'in 't Waterrijk' . . . in which Monconys visited the artist in 1662." Had Bredius actually read De Moncony's journal entries, he would have realized that the camping shack was no place to keep paintings and serve lunch to a diplomat and his entourage.
24. The most egregious example is found in Habicht 1923–24.
25. See Berardi 1987–88, p. 13 n. 11, for a more complete list. Maraeus is the main figure discussed in Bel 1982a, where some of the artists he influenced are also reviewed (pp. 378–81).
26. According to Douglas Huldebrecht, who wrote a dissertation on Maraeus at the University of Michigan (2004), the artist's watercolors representing rare plants cultivated by Agnes Block at her country estate "Vijverhof" (on the river Vecht near Utrecht) are preserved in Braunschweig but have not been studied or published.

115. Still Life with Poppy, Insects, and Reptiles

Oil on canvas, 26 7/8 x 20 3/4 in. (68.3 x 52.7 cm)
Signed (lower left, in red): otho Maraeus/van Schriek fecit

The painting is in good condition, although it has darkened with age. There is some abrasion in the deep green shadows of the poppy leaves and in the stone wall behind. Abrasions in the sky at the upper right have revealed the dark underlayer of paint.

Rogers Fund, 1953 53.155

This sottobanco, or "forest floor," picture must have been painted about 1670, to judge from dated works by the artist that are similar in composition, manner of execution, and some details of subject matter. The main motif is a flourishing poppy plant, with large leaves and buds (the one on the right has begun to open), and at the top a red flower in full bloom. Small groups of mushrooms share the moss-covered ground with a lizard, a
snake, and a pair of snails. As often in Marseus's work, the
snake's attention is keenly focused on a moth. Another snail
and a butterfly are perched on leaves, and an overscaled
dragonfly hovers at the left. Higher up, a colorfully patterned
butterfly is shown in flight, though it resembles a specimen in
a display case. The base of a ruined monument or building sets
off the teeming life in the foreground and suggests civilization
overcome by nature. A few large trees and a cloudy sky in the
right background offer slight relief from the deliberately claustrophobic atmosphere of the composition. Despite the acrobatic
ascent of the poppy plant, attention is drawn downward to the
lacelike tendrils of moss, the reptiles and snails, and the crum-
bling block of stone, which lies next to a broken tree stump.
Contemporary viewers would have noticed contrasting signs of
growth and decay, and may have recalled that the butterfly is a
symbol of the soul. But vanitas themes in Marseus's work, if
intended at all, are quite secondary to his interest in specific:
kinds of flora and fauna. Several authors have noted that the
term "still life" is inappropriate for such a picture, which might
be called a "nature study" or "nature piece."

While not a fine example of Marseus's work, the authorship
of the Museum's picture has not been doubted by any specialist.
Ingvar Bergström in particular admired the painting.1

1. For example, Steensma 1999, no. B1.66, fig. 89, dated 1670, and

2. This point is stressed in Douglas Hildebrecht's doctoral disserta-
tion, "Otto Marseus van Schrieck (1619/20–1678) and the Nature

3. Bergström's oral opinion was recorded on visits of December 5,
1983 ("fine example"), and of November 17, 1986. On the second
occasion, the present writer pressed the question of authorship.

REFERENCES: Linke 1970, p. 12, no. 16, identifies the reptiles as a
lizard and a snake; Bergström 1974, p. 29, describes some of the
motifs; Fahy 1982, pp. 99, 209, describes the "opium poppy" (which
is seen from behind) as the principal subject of this "sinister paint-
ing"; Dicke in Hamilton–Rochester–Amarillo 1983, p. 20. no. 5,
notes the accuracy with which each creature and plant is depicted,
and suggests that some motifs may be symbolic; P. Sutton 1886,
p. 190, mentioned; Baetjer 1995, p. 325; Steensma 1999, pp. 143–44,
no. B1.69, fig. 91, and p. 150 (under no. B1.86), identifies the plants
and insects, notes that a few motifs occur in other paintings by the
artist, and mentions two pictures as "variants."

EXHIBITED: North Salem, N.Y., Hammond Museum, 1971;
Hamilton, N.Y., Colgate University, Picker Art Gallery, Rochester,
N.Y., The Memorial Art Gallery of the University of Rochester, and
Amarillo, Tex., Amarillo Art Center, "Dutch Painting in the Age of
Rembrandt from The Metropolitan Museum of Art," 1983, no. 5.

EX COLL.: Graaf van Limburg-Stirum, Rijksdorp, the Nether-
lands; Herr Schäfer, Düsseldorf (until 1953; sale, Lempertz, Cologne,
May 6, 1953, no. 95, to Kleinberger); [Kleinberger, New York, 1953;
sold to MMA]; Rogers Fund, 1953 33.155
Gabriël Metsu
Leiden 1629–1667 Amsterdam

In his survey of Dutch painters (1718–21), Houbraken regrets knowing so little about Metsu’s life, apart from the erroneous information that he was born in Leiden in 1615. The biographer reports in other passages that Metsu died in 1658 and that Michiel van Musscher (1645–1705) had “seven lessons” with the master in 1665. Houbraken was on firmer ground when he praised the “famous” artist’s rendering of fine materials, and of female faces and hands. The latter “could not be better if they had been painted by van Dyck.”

Almost certainly a native of Leiden, Metsu (also spelled Metzu and Metsue in documents) was the son of a Flemish immigrant painter, Jacques Metsue (ca. 1588–1629), and a midwife, Jacquetemijntje Garniers (1589/93–1651).2 If the archival records may be trusted, the artist was probably born in the second half of October or in November 1629 (not January 1629, the previously accepted date).3 In a notarial record dated October 16, 1657, Metsu gave his age as twenty-seven.4 When Metsu’s betrothal to Isabella de Wolff was announced on April 12, 1658, in Amsterdam, he claimed to be twenty-eight.5 The two documents together indicate that Metsu was born between October 16, 1629, and April 12, 1630. However, Jacques Metsue was buried on March 6, 1629,6 so that his posthumous son presumably would have been born before December of the same year.

In March 1648, the eighteen-year-old Metsu became one of the founding members of the painters’ guild in Leiden. He was probably trained there between about 1643 and 1648. Some authors have assumed that he studied with Gerrit Dou (q.v.), but there is no such indication in the early sources.7 Metsu’s juvenilia do not reveal the influence of any Leiden artist.8 Scholars have considered two Utrecht painters, Nicolaes Knüpfer (1603 or ca. 1609–1655) and Jan Baptist Weenix (1621–1660/61), to have been important for Metsu’s early development.9 It seems likely that Metsu worked with Knüpfer in Utrecht, probably in 1651.10 However, he was evidently living in Leiden in January 1654 and may have been there two years earlier.11 In July 1657, neighbors of Metsu offered testimony at his request, and mentioned that he was currently living on the Prinsengracht in Amsterdam.12 He appears to have remained in Amsterdam until October 1667, when he was buried in the Nieuwe Kerk.13 Metsu was an exceptionally talented, if eclectic, painter of genre scenes and, in much smaller numbers, of history pictures, portraits, and still lifes. His genre paintings, which treat themes that were popular in Leiden and Amsterdam, are executed in manners variously reminiscent of Gerard ter Borch, Pieter de Hooch, Nicolaes Maes, Jan Steen, and Johannes Vermeer (q.q.v.). About 13 of the approximately 140 known paintings by Metsu are dated.14 This fact and a brisk exchange of ideas among genre painters of the 1650s and 1660s make it difficult to date many of Metsu’s pictures. His most distinctive characteristics include demonstrative gestures (see Pl. 116) and, in his less theatrical pictures, tenderness (for example, in The Sick Child; Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

Paintings by the artist were highly prized in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially in France and England. The high prices paid for works by Metsu encouraged attributions to him of pictures by other Dutch genre painters, including the (at the time) less well-known Vermeer.

2. On Metsu’s mother, who was widowed four times, and on aspects of Metsu’s youth, see Stone-Ferriéer 2000, pp. 230, 249–53, and Waiboer 2005, p. 80.
3. MacLaren 1960, p. 241, deduced the date of January 1629 (which is repeated in F. Robinson 1974, p. 12, MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 231, and many other places) from the documents of 1657 and 1658 (see text following), and a document dated January 11, 1654 (see Bredius 1907a, p. 201). On that date, Metsu was described as a voljaerde jongman, meaning that he was at least twenty-five years old. The declaration released Metsu (an orphan since 1651) from the supervision of his legal guardians. It seems possible that the age requirement was waived, or that Metsu added a year to his age. If he really was twenty-five in January 1654, it would mean that he subtracted a year from his age in the declarations of 1657 and 1658. In Waiboer 2005, p. 80 n. 2, it is deduced that Metsu was born between November 1629 and about December 14, 1629.
5. Kramm 1837–64, vol. 4, p. 1106. The twenty-six-year-old bride was accompanied by her mother, Maria de Grebbner (ca. 1622–1680), who was also an artist (see Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, pp. 122–23). Her father was the Haarlem painter Frans Pietersz
116. A Musical Party

Oil on canvas, 24 1/8 x 21 1/4 in. (62.2 x 54.3 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left, on sheet of music): G.Metsu./1659 [G.M. in monogram]; inscribed (upper right, on top of map): NOVISSISSIMA HOC . . .

The painting is in fairly good condition, with slight abrasion throughout that is most apparent in the thinly painted background. Examination of the surface with a binocular microscope reveals that gold leaf underlies portions of the composition in the top left corner below the green curtain and extending to the right, as well as in passages along the center right edge behind the seated male figure.

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1890 91.26.11

This canvas in the Marquand Collection was painted by Metsu in 1659, when he was living in Amsterdam (on the much discussed date, see below). The painting represents the front rooms of a fine, if not palatial, town house (compare Pi. 118). A lady dressed in orange satin entertains two male visitors. She casually holds a large lute and hands a songbook to the moustached man by the window. Other songbooks spill from the chest on the floor, and two more threaten to fall off the table. The three main figures are fashionably dressed, especially the man to the left, whose lavish ensemble is completed by a walking stick and a red-feathered beret. The gentleman at the right, who tunes a viola da gamba, sits on his coat and has set down his sword and bandolier on a tapestry-covered cushion. A maid approaches from the other room with a wine jug and tray. Three flowers, probably carnations, are visible just above the tilted tray, suggesting that it supports a decorated pie. The map, on which the mouth of the Maas River and the southern part of the Province of Holland are seen (with the west at top), is based on the 1651 or 1656 revised edition of Balthasar Florisz van Berckenrode’s map of Holland and West Friesland (first published by Blaeu in 1620).¹

The date of 1659 on the sheet of music to the lower left was questioned by Gudlaugsson, who detected a difference in color between the signature and the date. Taking up Plietzsch’s idea that the picture seems closely connected with works by Metsu of a few years earlier, Gudlaugsson claimed that the costumes and the manner of execution supported a slightly earlier date, and suggested that the painting was finished or inscribed by the artist a couple of years after it was begun.² Other scholars have come out for or against this hypothesis,³ not realizing that the inscription was simply reinforced in a

¹ de Grebber (1573–1649). Metsu and his fiancée married in her native Enkhuizen on May 19, 1658. 6. Bredius 1907a, p. 198. 7. MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 253, states that “according to Houbraken, he was a pupil of Gerrit Dou,” but this information cannot be found in Houbraken 1718–21 (nor in MacLaren 1960, p. 241). The error goes back to Hooft 1907–27, vol. 1, p. 233 (kindly pointed out to the writer by Adriaan Waiboer). In Waiboer 2001, pp. 89–90, it is suggested that Dou’s influence on Metsu is evident for the first time in a panel of about 1654–55, Public Notary (private collection). 8. Compare F. Robinson 1974, p. 15, where it is claimed that Metsu began his career as a follower of Dou. 9. See Gudlaugsson 1968, pp. 15–23; F. Robinson 1974, pp. 12, 18–19; Marijke van der Meijs-Tolstra in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 21, p. 380; and (on Knupfer and Metsu), Saxton 2001, pp. 40–41. 10. The death of Metsu’s mother in September 1651 may be relevant. In Waiboer 2001, p. 86, the period in which Metsu could have been with Knupfer is said to fall between October 1650 and the end of 1651. See ibid., pp. 83–87, on Metsu’s relationship with Knupfer. In a personal communication dated November 29, 2002, Waiboer explains that the annotation in the Leiden guild records, to the effect that Metsu left town after 1650 (as reported by Bredius in Obrecht 1877–90, vol. 5, p. 206, and in Bredius 1907a, pp. 197–98), was only added about 1659. 11. See Bredius 1907a, pp. 202–2. As noted in Waiboer 2001, p. 86, Metsu paid dues to the painters’ guild of Leiden on January 2, 1652, and claimed to be living in the city at that time. 12. See Bredius 1907a, p. 202, and F. Robinson 1974, p. 12, where the document is misinterpreted. Adriaan Waiboer (see note 10 above) kindly clarified the matter in 2003. 13. A. D. de Vries 1883a. See Leiden 1966, pp. 17–19, for this and other documents. 14. According to Adriaan Waiboer (see note 10 above). C. Brown in MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 253, counts nineteen dated works, while Wheelock (1995b, p. 164) knows of a “sizeable number.”
slightly different color at a later date.\textsuperscript{4} Costumes like those seen here cannot be used to argue for a close dating within a period of two or three years.\textsuperscript{3} Similarly, a dating based on the picture's style assumes a linear development, for which there is little evidence in Metsu's oeuvre.

The animation of the figures, especially the unstably seated woman, have reminded some viewers of figures by Nicolaes Knipfer (1603 or ca. 1609–1659), for example the bare-breasted beauty in his \textit{Brothel Scene}, of about 1650 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).\textsuperscript{6} A more obvious response to that or another painting by Knipfer is found in Metsu's own \textit{Brothel Scene} (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), which probably dates from about 1653–54.\textsuperscript{7} The figures in the New York painting (where the setting is not a brothel or an inn) are more restrained than in the earlier picture by Metsu and recall slightly earlier works by Frans van Mieris the Elder (q.v.), such as \textit{The Doctor's Visit}, of 1657 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), \textit{The Duet}, of 1658 (Staatliches Museum, Schwerin), and the \textit{Inn Scene}, of 1658 (Mauritshuis, The Hague). Naumann suggests plausibly that the figure of the seated man is derived from the one in the foreground of Van Mieris's \textit{Inn Scene}, and that the setting was influenced by that of \textit{The Doctor's Visit}. The two figures on the left are similarly reminiscent of types found in Van Mieris's work of about 1657–59. The arrangement of the curtain, the window, and objects in the left foreground recalls motifs in Van Mieris's \textit{The Artist's Studio}, of about 1655–57 (formerly Gemälde galerie Alte Meister, Dresden), and in contemporary works by Gerrit Dou (q.v.).\textsuperscript{8} It should be noted, however, that Nicolaes Maes (q.v.) and other genre painters of the 1650s were also introducing spatial devices such as the curtain, the open window, and stairs leading to other rooms.\textsuperscript{9}

The subject of elegant musical gatherings flourished during the decade of the 1650s, for example in the work of the Amsterdam painters Gerbrand van den Eechhout (q.v.) and Jacob van Loo (1614–1670).\textsuperscript{10} A lute, a viol da gamba, and songbooks are often combined (see Pl. 204, where a viol on the floor awaits a male visitor). Entries in Samuel Pepys's diary, written in England and Holland during the 1660s, reflect the contemporary enthusiasm for singing and playing stringed instruments as a form of socializing among members of polite society.\textsuperscript{11} New songs, many of them amorous, were eagerly circulated among amateurs.

That the sens or heartstrings might turn into fetters is hinted at by the atlantes figure in the fireplace of the second room.\textsuperscript{12} Metsu used the same sculpture in \textit{A Woman Seated at a Table and a Man Tuning a Violin}, of about 1658 (National Gallery, London),\textsuperscript{13} whereas Vermeer, with his usual obliquity, placed the back and bound arms of a nude male figure (Cimon, in a mostly invisible painting of Roman Charity) next to the man in \textit{A Lady at the Virginial with a Gentleman} (Royal Collection, London).\textsuperscript{14} As a moral buttress, the sculpture in \textit{A Musical Party} does not seem intended to carry much weight.

References: Descamps 1733–54, vol. 2, p. 243, mentions this picture (?) as "un Concert" in the collection of the marquis de Voyer; Buchanan 1824, vol. 2, pp. 53–54, no. 69, as coming from one of the finest collections in Holland, "where it was always considered to represent the portraits of the painter himself, his wife, and Jan Stein [sic]" and as in the Robit sale and "now again in Paris"; J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 4 (1833), p. 90, no. 53, describes the composition, compares the execution to that of Van Dyck, and records Smith's own sale of the painting to Zachary (see Ex Coll.); Bode 1895, p. 18, as from the Perkins collection, "ein etwas liebloses, noch an [Jacob] Duck

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{1} Welu 1977, p. 64 n. 24, as noted by P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, p. 253.
\bibitem{2} Gudlaugsson 1968, p. 14.
\bibitem{4} Dorothy Mahon, technical examination, March 1993. The musical notes on the page appear to be in the same color as the date.
\bibitem{5} F. Robinson (1974) never raised the question of the date, probably because curator John Walsh, with whom he had many contacts, told him it presented no problem. A note to this effect was written by Walsh on a student's paper of 1976.
\bibitem{7} San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, no. 45.
\bibitem{8} See F. Robinson 1974, p. 22, figs. 16, 17.
\bibitem{9} For the Van Mieris, see Naumann 1981, vol. 2, no. 19.
\bibitem{11} As noted by P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, p. 253, with references to no. 43 (Van den Eechhout) and no. 64 (Van Loo) in the same catalogue.
\bibitem{13} The sculpture is not a caryatid, as is often claimed. Compare the herms supporting a mantel in Claes Jansz Visscher's engraving \textit{Saying Grace}, of 1609 (Liedtke 2000a, fig. 192). Foot warmers often serve as sexual symbols (see Amsterdam 1976, pp. 96–97, and Chapman 1993, p. 143), but the woman here is probably using hers (without a pot of coals) simply to raise one knee, as is usual when playing a lute.
\bibitem{15} See White 1982, pp. 144–45 (under no. 210), and Washington–The Hague 1995–96, no. 8, with an implausible interpretation of Cimon and Pero in this context (p. 132).
\end{thebibliography}
erinnernes Werk”; Hofstede de Groote 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), p. 104, notes that Jan Steen, Metsu, and his wife were once thought to have served as models; Valentiner in New York 1929, no. 63, as signed and dated 1659; Cox 1909–10, p. 305, mentioned as in the MMA “Hudson-Fulton Celebration,” a picture with many admirable qualities; Breck 1910, p. 57, as “presque trop fougueux”; Errera 1920–21, vol. 1, p. 294, listed under works dated 1659; Gerson 1930, p. 440, listed among dated works; Plettsch 1936, pp. 5, 9, as still related to the youthful works, but already resembling pictures of 1661 in its painterly manner; Gowing 1912, p. 155 n. 142, compares the pose of the woman to that of the figure in Vermeer’s Allegory of the Catholic Faith (Pl. 206); New York 1932–33, p. 229, no. 118; De Mirmonde 1966–67, p. 281, fig. 32, notes “la caricature de la femme.” As symbolic; Gudlaugsson 1968, pp. 13–15, 24–25, fig. 5, suggests that the date of 1659 was added one or two years after the picture was painted, and sees the influence of both Leiden and Amsterdam artists; Schneede 1968, p. 47, places the picture in the first of three chronological groups, which are defined according to the form of signature; F. Robinson 1974, pp. 37, 49, 54, 59–60, 64, fig. 68, compares the styles of Dou, De Hooch, and Vermeer, and distinguishes the work from paintings by Metsu of the early 1660s; Wheelock 1976, p. 458, states that the picture “may indeed date ca. 1657,” given the color of the date on the painting and elements that are “stylistically reminiscent of Knüpfer”; Welu 1977, p. 64 n. 24, identifies the map (see text above); Naumann 1981, vol. 1, pp. 51–52, 55–56, fig. 44, describes the influence of Van Mieris, and dismisses Gudlaugsson’s and Wheelock’s comments on the date; C. Brown 1984, pp. 119 (ill.), 137, describes the subject; P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, no. 72, pl. 66, describes the composition and its sources, and finds “no reason to doubt” the date of 1659; Heding 1986, p. 118 n. 129, fig. 81, regards the map as an unusual motif in this kind of scene; P. Sutton 1986, pp. 184, 187–88, fig. 267, considers the portrait of Metsu, his wife, and Steen “unconfirmed”; Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 337, observes that “the formal language of his later works is much more sober” than here; Ingamells 1992a, pp. 198, 201, attempts to date works by Metsu in the Wallace Collection by comparing the present picture as a work of about 1657; Jaksch-Schöchmann 1994, pp. 98, 100, fig. 100, describes the subject; Raëter 1995, p. 331; Düchting 1996, p. 57 (ill.), compares the painting with Vermeer’s approach; Edwards 1996, pp. 155, 156 (ill.), 302 (under no. 69), records the picture in the Robit sale of 1801; Marijke van der Meij-Tolusma in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 21, p. 351, mentioned; Luntshuijzen in Grand Rapids 1999, pp. 30 (detail ill.), 37, 72, 73 (ill.), 104, no. 15, discerns “numerous allusions to the excesses of love and romance throughout” the work; Vergara in Madrid 2003, no. 20, compares De Hooch’s palette and organization of space.


**EX COLL.:** Possibly the marquis de Voyer, Paris (in 1754; see Refs. under Descamps 1733–44); Elizabeth Vlckenier-Hooft, Amsterdam (until 1796; sale, Amsterdam, August 31, 1796, no. 23, to Fouquet for Fr 1,005); Pierre Fouquet, Amsterdam, in 1796; “Coquility” to [Dalac] for Fr 7,200; [Dalac; sold to Robit for Fr 10,000]; Robit, Paris (until 1801; sale, Paris, May 11–18, 1801, no. 69, sold to Hypolite Delaroche [not on behalf of Michael Bryan, London, as previously assumed] for Fr 4,500); [Hypolite Delaroche and Alexandre Paillet, organizers of the Robit sale, 1801–3 (sale organized by Delaroche and Paillet, Paris, April 18–25, 1803, no. 568, as “Un sujet de Concert: par G. Metsu,” bought in]); anon. sale, Paris (Delaroche and Paillet), June 26ff, 1809, no. 29; anon. sale (Paillet), Paris, March 14, 1810, no. 8; [John Smith, London (until 1825; sold to Zachary for Gns 400)]; M. M. Zachary, London (1823–28; his sale, Phillips, London, May 31, 1828, no. 45, bought in for Gns 50); Frederick Perkins, Chipstead Place, Seven Oaks, Kent, England (by 1832; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, June 14, 1890, no. 9, to Colnaghi for £609); [Martin Colnaghi, London, in 1890]; Henry G. Marquand, New York (1890); Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1890 91.26.11

1. According to J. B. P. Le Brun’s annotation “Coquility [?] le vendy a daluc—7200 qui le vendi a robie—10000 le tableau est mediocre,” in a copy of the Robit sale catalogue in Geneva (this information and other corrections were kindly supplied by Burton Fredericksen, the Getty Art History Information Program, in a letter dated December 15, 1995).

II7. A Woman Seated at a Window

Oil on wood, 10 3/4 x 8 3/4 in. (27.6 x 22.5 cm)
Signed (bottom center): G. Metsu

The painting is well preserved, although the flesh tones, particularly in the face, have been overcleaned in the past. The blue leaves on the vine at upper left suggest the use of a yellow lake pigment, now faded.

The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982. 1982.60.32

The Linsky Metsu depicts a woman about to peel apples while seated at an arched stone window. This kind of framing device, called a niestuk or venstermis (niche-piece or window-niche) in the seventeenth century, was popularized in Leiden by Gerrit Dou (see Pl. 37). He and his followers often rendered their signatures or the date as if they were carved in the stone, as Metsu does here.¹

It has been maintained that this painting and Metsu’s panel A Huntsman, dated 1661 (fig. 112), were probably painted as pendants.² The pictures are virtually identical in size and appear to be complementary in composition and subject matter. A Huntsman was one of the forty-one paintings in the collection of Govert van Slingelandt (chief tax collector at The Hague) that were bought en bloc by Willem V in 1768.³ The Linsky picture cannot be traced before 1842, when Smith (see Refs.) recorded that it had been brought into England from Copenhagen. Van Slingelandt is known to have methodically restricted the size of his collection and to have steadily improved its quality. It is possible that he sold the present painting, or that it was separated from its supposed pendant at an earlier date.

Similar figures—a successful hunter just returned from the field and a woman occupied with some domestic task—occasionally encounter each other in single Dutch paintings of about the same time. Some of them obviously illustrate the belief, expressed by ancient authorities such as Aristotle and Xenophon or by contemporary moralists like Johan van Beverwijck (1639), Jan van Marconville (1647), and Petrus Wittewrongel (1655; 1661), that a man’s work took him out of doors, while a woman’s place was in the home.⁴ He is the good provider, while she guards and feathers the nest.⁵

In some Dutch pictures, a hunter who brings a dead bird or hare to a woman has sex in mind: “birding” and “hunting hares” were slang expressions for making love to women in one sense or another.⁶ As in The Hunter’s Gift by Metsu (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), the figures usually interact in a way that makes the man’s desire and the woman’s caution clear.⁷ The Linsky and Mauritshuis pictures also have been interpreted along these lines.⁸ However, the figures do not interact with each other, but gesture to the viewer in cordial acknowledgment. In her dress and demeanor, the woman seems a model of middle-class respectability, while the man, to judge from his fancy hunting horn and good manners, might be interpreted as a gentleman hunter who “brings home the bacon” as a gallant gesture and is rewarded with a glass of wine.⁹

A stronger objection to an amorous reading of the panels is Waiboer’s argument that they are not pendants at all. He notes that at least eight other genre paintings by Metsu have dimensions nearly identical to those of the Linsky picture, suggesting that he may have purchased panels of a standard size. Furthermore, the compositions of the two paintings are not as complementary as they might at first seem. The man is presented in a significantly smaller scale; nor does his deeper placement in space seem to fully account for the different impressions that the figures make. Finally, the stone windows are not as consistent in shape, coloring, cropping, and the point of view from which they are seen (compare the receding right sides of the

Figure 112. Gabriël Metsu, A Huntsman, 1661. Oil on wood, 11 x 9 in. (28 x 22.8 cm). Mauritshuis, The Hague
windows) as one would expect in pictures meant to be recognized as a pair.

Considered on its own, *A Woman Seated at a Window* may be appreciated as a tribute to distaff virtue. The closed birdcage, the hearth, and perhaps the sense of confinement in the interior convey the notion of contained domesticity.\(^1\) Metsu's contemporaries would have recognized the grapevine as a symbol of fidelity and marriage, best known from the description of a man's spouse in Psalm 128 as "as a fruitful vine by the sides of thine house."\(^2\) Peeling apples is a sign of domestic virtue, familiar from works by Dutch artists such as Dou and Nicolaes Maes (see Pl. 109), and is found in another picture by Metsu, *Woman Peeling an Apple*, in the Musée du Louvre, Paris.\(^3\) Given the biblical metaphor of the vine, it seems possible that the apples in the Museum's picture refer to chastity (they recall the Virgin as the New Eve) as well as to wifey duty, and that the colorful butterfly to the lower left and the muted one among the vine leaves are reminders of the soul.\(^4\) The book on the windowsill may be religious or secular but must, in this context, speak well of the woman's character.\(^5\) These iconographic embellishments would have increased the painting's appeal in Metsu's day, for the Dutch liked to recognize in books and pictures beliefs to which they already subscribed.

1. See Fransits 1993a, pp. 80, 318 n. 77.
4. See Fransits 1993a, pp. 68–69, 215 n. 36, on these writers, and pp. 87–89, fig. 67, on Hendrick Sorgh's *Portrait of Jacob Bieren and His Family*, of 1663 (Instituut Collectie Nederland), where the husband and wife play roles comparable with those of Metsu's figures. On Van Beverwijck, see also Van Gemert 1994.
5. Fransits 1993a, p. 90, on hunting equipment that alludes to the "husbandly role of providing for the family."
6. The classic article on the erotic meaning of birds and "birding" is De Jongh 1968–69; see De Jongh 2000, pp. 32–16, for the most relevant pages in English translation. See also Amsterdam 1976, no. 13; Braunschweig 1978, no. 25; Leiden 1988, nos. 41, 91; and Amsterdam 1980–90, nos. 48–50.
8. F. Robinson 1974, p. 29, describes details in the paintings as "laden with erotic allusions that have been discussed by De Jongh." E. J. Sluijter (orally, in 1984) supported this view, in response to the discussion in Linsky Collection 1984, p. 93.
10. Most of these points were made by Adriaan Waibroe in an undated letter to the present writer (Fall 2003), and are also presented in his dissertation (see the bibliography above, note 10).
11. On the birdcage as a symbol of domesticity, see Fransits 1993a, pp. 80–82.
14. For a conspicuous use of butterflies as symbols of the soul, see Joris Hoefnagel's *Allégorie of Life's Brevity (Dipych with Flowers and Insects)*, in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille (New York 1992–93, no. 8). Compare Godfried Schalken's placement of a butterfly on the edge of a stone window in *An Old Woman at a Window Scouring a Pot* (National Gallery, London), which is discussed as a vanitas symbol in Fransits 1993a, pp. 172, 242 n. 32, fig. 149.

**References:** J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 9 (1842), p. 328, no. 41, describes the picture as in the collection of Edmund Higgensson, having been previously "imported by Mr. Chaplin, from Copenhagen;" Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), p. 324, no. 211, records the sales of 1846 and 1904, and the owner (in 1907) as M. Kappel, Berlin; Bode 1914, p. 16, no. 16 (ill.), considers the composition typical of Metsu's "mature period"; F. Robinson 1974, pp. 28–29, 78 n. 48, fig. 30, discusses the meaning of the picture, and tentatively suggests that *A Huntsman* (Mauritshuis, The Hague) might be its pendant; Liedtke in Linsky Collection 1984, pp. 92–94, no. 32, maintains that the Mauritshuis picture must be a pendant and discusses the iconography of both pictures; Baertjers 1995, p. 331; Sluijter in Dordrecht–Enschede 2000, p. 122, fig. 179, as "present location unknown," compares the woman's display of an apple to a similar motif in a painting of 1818 by Abraham van Strij; Fransits 2004, pp. 182–83, fig. 168, discusses the picture's meaning, and considers *A Huntsman* its pendant.


**Ex Coll.:** Mr. Chaplin, Copenhagen, later England (according to Smith in 1842); Edmund Higgensson, Saltmarsh Castle, Herefordshire (by 1842–46; his sale, Christie's, London, June 4, 1846, no. 95, for £46); Mr. Duval (until 1904; her estate sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, November 28, 1904, no. 9, for FF 27,000 to Kleinberger); [Kleinberger, Paris, from 1904]; Marcus Kappel, Berlin (by 1906–30; his sale, Cassirer & Helbing, Berlin, November 25, 1930, no. 11); Mr. and Mrs. Jack Linsky (until 1980); The Jack and Belle Linsky Foundation, New York (1980–82); The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.32
118. The Visit to the Nursery

Oil on canvas, 30 1/2 x 32 in. (77.5 x 81.3 cm)
Signed and dated (at left, above door): G. Metsu 1661

The painting was transferred from its original canvas support to another canvas before it entered the Museum’s collection. The image of the original support is visible in the X-radiographs. The surface has been badly abraded throughout.

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.190.20

Celebrated in its own day, this picture was almost certainly painted by Metsu expressly for its first known owner, the Amsterdam alderman Jan Jacobsz Hinlopen (see below). Jan Vos (1610–1667), who served as a “house poet” to the Hinlopen family, included a poem about the painting in the 1662 edition of his collected works. The title of the poem—“Op de Schildery van een Kraamvrouw, in de zaal den E. Heer Scheepen Jan Jakobsen Hinlopen, door G. Moetsz geschildert” (On the Painting of a Lying-in Woman in the Salon of the Honorable Alderman Mr. Jan Jakobsen Hinlopen, Painted by G. Metsu)—identifies its distinctively Dutch subject as a kraambezoek, or “lying-in visit,” a social ritual also depicted in the Museum’s painting by Matthijs Naiveu (Pl. 128). A kraamvrouw is a woman in confinement, either shortly before or shortly after giving birth.

In Metsu’s painting, the gesturing woman with a closed fan and fashionable attire is an invited guest. She is greeted by the new mother and her hat-doffing husband. The maid to the left brings a side chair and a foot warmer, the latter for use as a footrest while holding the baby (compare the painting by Naiveu; Pl. 128). The old woman seated beside the luxuriously draped wicker cradle must be a bader, or dry nurse. The furred robe that she wears would probably have been provided by the parents, with a view to the infant’s comfort as well as the woman’s own.

The scene is set in an imaginary zaal or voorkamer (front or reception room) of a magnificent town house, like those built on the Bane of the Herengracht in Amsterdam from about 1660 onward. The extraordinary size of the room, which is suggested by the marble fireplace and the seascape above it, exceeds what would have been found in almost any private house in a Dutch city during the period, with the possible exception of a very few new houses in Amsterdam, such as the Joan Poppen House by Philips Vingboons, built in 1642 on the Kloveniersburgwal, and the Trip House (Trippenhuis) by Jostus Vingboons, erected on the same canal in 1660–62. In fact, Metsu employed an even grander model for the room’s main features: the fireplace with red marble columns and a frieze with putti, the black-and-white marble floor, and even the doorway revealed by drapery are derived from the burgomasters’ council chamber in the new Town Hall (now the Royal Palace) of Amsterdam, designed by Jacob van Campen (the room was in use from 1655; the fabric on the walls was purchased in 1658). Pieter de Hooch (q.v.) shows the same chamber in a painting in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid, where the fireplace is more precisely described, although the view through the doorway in the background is as fictitious as Metsu’s is here. It is unlikely that Metsu was influenced by De Hooch’s canvas, considering that it is usually dated somewhat later than 1661, and that Metsu’s patron was directly connected with the council chamber of the Town Hall.

Metsu’s interior has been described as unrealistic not only in its architecture but also in its inclusion of such a stately bed, chairs placed in the middle of the room, and a Persian carpet on the floor. However, the painting does not represent a grand living or reception room of about 1660 but the artist’s idea of an extremely luxurious kraamkamer, or lying-in room, which in the finest homes might well feature an extravagant bed, a cradle, an armchair, and other items intended for display on this special occasion (compare Naiveu’s later pictures, Pl. 128 and fig. 117). One might compare Metsu’s imaginary room, in its distance from everyday custom, to the silver layette basket that was created in 1666–67 by Adriaen van der Hoecck for the new parents Willem Adriaen van Nassau and his wife, Elizabeth van der Nisse (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston). Silver brandy bowls, porridge bowls, and rattles were among the objects given as gifts or purchased to celebrate the birth of a child.

The impressive silver bowl on the table probably contains some confection, but exactly what kind is unclear. The silver pitcher and the covered glass goblet must contain kandeel, a drink usually consisting of wine, lemon juice, sugar, and a spice such as cinnamon. Two silver trays are partially visible to either side of the bowl.

The refinement of customs and objects pertaining to childbirth may be considered a reflection, in part, of the fact that mothers and especially infants often did not survive the experience. At the same time, the theme of childbirth in the Netherlands is only one aspect of a much larger subject, that of the family and the various roles—especially those of women—played within it. Dutch authors, in particular Jacob Cats,
and Dutch artists such as Nicolaes Maes (see Pl. 110) devoted close attention to the virtues and responsibilities of motherhood.

The area of the painting over the fireplace is now very worn but shows plainly enough a small ship (to the lower left) tossed in a stormy sea. Scholars have mentioned Ludolf Bakhuysen (1631–1708) and Allart van Everdingen (1623–1675) as the authors of similar works, but the canvas is most reminiscent of marines by Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.) that date from about the early 1660s. The image of a boat or ship on a stormy sea has various meanings in Dutch art but certainly refers here to the journey of life that has just begun for the infant, and to the role that fate will play. The same sort of image occurs in the Museum’s painting by Naiveu (Pl. 128, in the right background).

In the present picture and others of the 1660s, Metsu was influenced by Gerard ter Borch (q.v.) in his handling of fine materials and furnishings, and in his observation of gestures, expressions, and poses (compare the two figures on the left to those in Pl. 13). Houbraken, in 1721, recalled the Museum’s painting as the largest and finest work by Metsu he had ever seen. He describes the subject from memory as “a lying-in visit of ladies and gentlemen” (“een Kraambezoek van Juffrouwen en Heeren”); praises the execution, especially of the costumes; and admires “the particular placements and movements of the figures, so that it is easy to see what each one is saying in their encounter.” Similarly, in Vos’s poem of 1661–62, the picture is praised for its lifelike description of different substances (“flesh and blood; yea, silver, wool and silk”) and for its dramatic effect (Vos was director of the Amsterdam Theater). The elegant visitor “seems to express herself respectfully with face and lips.”

Metsu’s superb family portrait in Berlin (fig. 113) is now known to depict the original owner of The Visit to the Nursery, Jan Jacobsz Hinlopen (1626–1666), his wife Leonora Huydecoper van Maarseveen (1631–1663), their four children, and a maid. The sisters were identified only in 1998, partly on the basis of the portrait’s description in the will made by the Hinlopes on October 16, 1663. In 1995, the costume historian Irene Groeneweg dismissed an earlier identification of the sisters as members of the Valkenier family by noting elements of their clothing to about 1662 and by noting the resemblance between the couple in the family portrait and the proud parents in the Museum’s picture. She concluded that the Berlin picture is not a portrait but a genre scene in which Metsu depicted types familiar from his contemporary scenes of everyday life. This implausible interpretation of the Berlin painting is rejected by Van Thiel, who adds that “the one in New York is not a straightforward genre scene” but “may well turn out to be a genre-like portrait.” Westermann also suggests that the New York canvas may be “a genre-like portrait of the Hinlopes themselves, who had been married in 1657 and may have had a new birth to celebrate with a family portrait.” Indeed, the Hinlopes produced a son and three daughters between 1658 and 1662.
While there is a general resemblance between the parents in the family portrait and those in *The Visit to the Nursery*, it is not strong enough to qualify the painting as a "genre" portrait of the Hinlopen. The couple’s third child was born in 1660; older children would not necessarily have been present during a lying-in visit, but they might well have been (as in Pl. 128). The Museum’s picture must have been regarded by the Hinlopen as a "conversation piece" that came close to home, a work that evoked their world but did not portray it literally.25

Part of that world was the Town Hall of Amsterdam, which Hinlopen’s father-in-law, the wealthy burgomaster Joan Huydecoper van Maasspeveen, considered to a great degree his own creation.26 Both Huydecoper and before him his father-in-law, the Flemish banker Balthasar Coymans, built Amsterdam mansions in the classicist style: the Coymans house (1625) on the Keizersgracht is Jacob van Campen’s first known commission, and Huydecoper’s house (1639–42) on the Singel was an influential early work by Philips Vingboons.27 The house on the Nieuwe Doelenstraat that Hinlopen rented from 1656 onward was built about 1633 in the Dutch Renaissance manner of Hendrick de Keyser (1564–1622).28 The interior’s appearance is unrecorded, but it is worth noting that the doorframe and fireplace in the Hinlopen family portrait (fig. 113) recall De Keyser’s style.29
As for Jan Vos, he rarely missed an opportunity to celebrate the Huydecopers and the Hinlopen. The first edition of his collected works is dedicated in its entirety to Joan Huydecoper and includes seventy-six poems for or concerning Huydecoper himself and about ten members of his immediate family. Vos treated such subjects as “their [new] houses in Amsterdam and Maarssen, their marriages and deaths, their gifts from foreign dignitaries, and the attentions they bestowed upon the poet.” As Schwartz notes, it was with Huydecoper’s help during the 1640s that Vos advanced from his activities as a humble glazier and amateur poet and playwright to municipal posts in both fields. Thus the poet who commemorated the inauguration of the Town Hall in 1655 also saw to it that the windows were finished on time.11

Occasionally, doubt has been expressed about whether the Museum’s painting is identical with the braamkamer by Metsu that was in the famous collection of Gerret Bramcamp (1699–1771) in Amsterdam.12 In the incomplete and celebratory catalogue compiled in 1766 by Jean François de Bastide, the picture is said to be on wood (the dimensions are given with the abbreviation “B.” for bois). This information was repeated in the Bramcamp sale catalogue of 1777. No record of the support is given in the sale catalogues of 1706 and 1749. Smith (1833) describes the composition carefully, mentions two of its colors, and identifies the support as canvas. Examination of the painting and of the X-radiograph indicates clearly that the paint film and ground were transferred from their original support at some unknown date (which could be much later than Smith’s description) and that the original support was canvas not wood. Since many paintings by Metsu are on panel, and because even his canvases usually have a smooth surface (the present picture’s comparatively thick ground layer contributes to that effect), it would not be surprising if de Bastide mistakenly made the notation “B.” when looking at the painting on the wall during his room-to-room survey of pictures in Bramcamp’s house.13

When Houbraken saw the painting it was owned by “the art-lover Jan de Wolff,” who is said to have since parted with it (by 1721). Jan de Wolff (1681–1735) was the grandson of the better-known Hans de Wolff (1613–1670), an Amsterdam silk merchant whose uncle was the famous poet Joost van den Vondel, and whose second wife was the amateur of art and botany Agnes Block (1639–1704). It is not clear how the picture was transferred from the Hinlopen to De Wolff, but the families were related and often involved with each other.14

Hofstede de Groot lists a few copies after the Museum’s painting, and another was mentioned by Lagrange. A picture listed in an Amsterdam sale of May 18, 1706, as an exceptionally fine work by Metsu depicting a woman with a child on her lap and other figures in a room may have been the present painting, an autograph replica, or a copy.15

1. Vos 1662, p. 614; Vos 1726, vol. 1, p. 388. The poem is quoted in full and translated into German in G. Weber 1991, pp. 173–74. The Dutch text is also given in Van Gent 1998, p. 134 n. 20. In a letter to the present writer dated September 4, 2001, Gregor Weber helpfuly emphasized that the poem was included in Vos’s collected works at “the last moment shortly before printing in 1662, thus shortly after the date 1661 on the painting itself.” Frants 1993a, p. 227 n. 16, mistakenly claims that the poem is not in the 1662 edition of Vos’s works, and inaplicably adds that therefore the picture may have been painted after that date.

2. Two other paintings of this theme, a panel attributed to Quirijn van Brekelenkam (q.v.) in the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden (Laitsus 1992, no. 149, pl. 44), and a canvas of 1664 by Eglon van der Neer (q.v.) in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, are connected with the Museum’s picture in Gudlaugsson 1968, p. 30 n. 35. Neither work is similar to Metsu’s in composition, although in each case the couple with a baby are on the right and receive a standing female visitor. The subject was also treated by Anthonie Palamedesz. (1601–1673): Wijck en Oltihs 1996, pp. 159–87, 161 n. 37, notes five examples by him recorded in the photograph files of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, one of which is dated 1650 (art market; ibid., fig. vi on p. 157).


4. Esmée Quadbach kindly brought our attention to the term baken and convincingly suggested that the old woman in the painting must be such a servant rather than a family member.

5. See Van Eeghen et al. 1976, pp. 120–28, 633–34. The principal architect of such houses was Philips Vingboons, about whom see Kuyper 1980, chap. 12. P. Sutton in Amsterdam 1997b, p. 28, mistakenly states that Jan Vos’s poem “identifies the scene as taking place in the chambers of alderman Jan Jakobsen Hinlopen,” thereby taking the word zaal to mean Hinlopen’s office (presumably in the Town Hall). However, the term occurs frequently on the original plans of contemporary town houses; see, for example, Fock et al. 2001, pp. 26, 31, 90, for rooms inscribed zaal or saal (on p. 31, Fock illustrates Joan Huydecoper’s sketch for the arrangement of chairs in “de sael” of his house on the occasion of his daughter Leonora’s marriage to Jan Jacobz Hinlopen).

6. On the Poppen House, see Kuyper 1980, pp. 112–13, fig. 19a. The State Room measured 24 x 40 feet (7.3 x 12.2 m) and had a large central fireplace. On the Trip House, see Meischke and Reeser 1983. Curiously, the famous collector Gerret Bramcamp bought the Trip House (where he lived from 1750 to about 1758) and the present painting at about the same time (see Ex Coll.).

7. Fremanie 1959, pp. 70 n. 1, 71 n. 6; see also Gaskell 1990, pp. 286, 288.

8. P. Sutton 1980a, pp. 31–32, 97, no. 66, pl. 71, dates the Thyssen painting to about 1664–66; Gaskell 1990, no. 62, suggests a date of about 1661–70. Metsu also used the fireplace in A Young
Woman Composing Music (Mauritshuis, The Hague; see Rotterdam—Frankfurt 2004–5, pp. 219–20, no. 61). For a plan of the council chamber, see Gaskell 1900, p. 289. Detail photographs of the friezes over the chamber’s two fireplaces are published in Fremante 1999, figs. 75, 76 (see pp. 69–71 on the room). Of course, the cavorting putti suit the subject of a newborn child.

9. Fock et al. 2001, p. 134. See also Fock in Newark–Denver 2001–2, p. 91, where the author dismisses the impression given by the Metsu canvas, to the effect that “Turkish carpets were customary floor coverings,” on the basis of a few inventories. However, she also cites an inventory of 1685 (that of “an extremely wealthy banker of Amsterdam, Joseph Deutz, who lived on the most prestigious canal, the Herengracht”) as listing a Turkish carpet on the floor rather than on a table. Like Fock, E. Goossens (in Amsterdam 1997b, p. 79) fails to consider that Metsu had good reason to evoke the grandeur of the new Town Hall on behalf of Hinlopen and his wife, a Huydecoper (see below).

10. See Lunsingh Scheurleer 1971–72, p. 302. As noted in Wijnenbeeck-Olthuis 1987, pp. 156–57, and in Loughman and Montias 2000, p. 85, “lying-in rooms” are not identified as such in inventories, probably because other rooms temporarily served the purpose. Loughman and Montias (ibid., fig. 32) illustrate the rather grand example in Petronella Oortman’s doll’s house (begun 1686–90) in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

11. Newark–Denver 2001–2, no. 75, fig. 95.

12. Ibid., p. 65, nos. 72–74.

13. See the discussion under Naiveu (q.v.). The food historian Peter Rose helped identify these special refreshments in 1999. I am also grateful to my former research assistant, Elis Vlieger, for exploring the subject of the kranenboeck. One English equivalent of kandeel is negus, named for Francis Negus (d. 1713). The goblet in the present picture is crowned by a figure too indistinct (partly because of wear) to be described. And each of the finials above the Solomonic bedposts is surmounted by what appears to be a pair of naked figures, although these were probably never meant to be identified.

14. On the definition of roles within the Dutch family, see Haks 1985. See also Duranti 1983 on the child in Dutch art, although her appendix on the subject of the newborn child is not helpful for pictures such as the Museum’s Metsu and Naiveu. Dutch child-rearing practices are discussed in B. Roberts 1998, where on p. 146 visits to see newborn children in (as it happens) the Huydecoper family are described.


17. See Goede 1980, p. 156. In another work of the early 1660s by Metsu, the Musical Party, in the Mauritshuis, The Hague, a different stormy seaport (over a version of Van Campen’s fireplace) suggests the turbulent emotions that threaten in affairs of the heart (see Hoetink et al. 1985, no. 56, and Goede 1989, p. 116).


24. Dudok van Heel 1996, p. 166 n. 13, and Van Gent 1998, pp. 128, 134 n. 10, list the Hinlopen children as Jacob (1658–1661), Joanna (1659–1706), Sara (1660–1749), and Geertuyt (1662–1661). See Amsterdam 1988, p. 30, for an incomplete family tree of the Hinloopen (or Hinlopen) family, where Jan Jacobsz and his older brother Jacob (1621–1679) may be written in beneath Jacob Hinlopen (182–1629) and his wife Sara de Wale (1591–1652). The Hinloopen were related by marriage to many distinguished figures in Dutch society, including members of the Pauw and Six families, as well as the Huydecopers, the authors Jacob Cats, Pieter C. Hooft, and Joost van de Vondel, and the celebrated collectors Gerard and Jan Reymst (on the latter, see A. M. Logan 1979). G. Schwartz 1985, pp. 136–37, offers a chart of “One Hundred Related Dutchmen” that suggests how many of Rembrandt’s patrons (such as Jan Jacobsz Hinlopen and his father-in-law, Joan Huydecoper) were closely interconnected. On the two families, see also Elias 1903–5, pp. 309–20, 384–91, 507, 518–20, and Kooymans 1997, pp. 112–95 (cited in Van Gent 1998, p. 134 n. 9); and on Hinlopen’s collection, see Dudok van Heel 1969, pp. 233–37. As noted in Van Gent 1998, pp. 130, 134 n. 19, Jan Vos also wrote poems about other paintings in Hinlopen’s collection (including works by Rembrandt and Jan Lievens, and a “Venus in a Cloud Filled with Cupids,” said to be by Rubens) and in that of Joan Huydecoper (1599–1665). The latter married Maria Coymans (1603–1647) in 1624. For their portraits by Bartholomeus van der Helst (q.v.), see E. Goossens 1996, p. 33, pls. I and II.

25. Van Gent 1998, pp. 131, 134–35 n. 21, suggests that the family portrait in Berlin (fig. 113 here), which is similar in composition and dimensions to the Museum’s picture, may have been made as “a kind of pendant” to it. However, the author considers “an iconographic concept for the combination of the two pictures [to be] problematic.”


28. See Dudok van Heel 1998, pp. 17–18, on the house that Hinlopen rented from Pieter Carpentier, governor-general of the East India Company (kindly brought to my attention by Judith van Gent). The house is visible in an anonymous drawing of about 1616 (Gemeentearchief, Amsterdam; see Dudok van Heel in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–2000, p. 55, fig. 70; the drawing is attributed to A. Beerstraten in Dudok van Heel 1998, fig. 2); it stands just to the right of the large house with two chimneys.

29. Compare, for example, the central elements of the façade on De Keyser’s Town Hall in Delft (New York–London 2001, p. 4, fig. 2).
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31. See ibid., on Vos’s career, and Fremantle 1939, p. 203, on his “Inwending van het Stadhuis” Amsterdam.

32. On the collection itself, see Bille 1961.

33. See Bille 1961, vol. 2, p. 29, correctly reporting the information in Bastide 1766, p. 99. However, on the same page Bille records “P” for panel under Hoet 1753 (see Refs.), which gives no indication of the support.

34. Bille 1961, vol. 2, p. 29, no. 124, “Verbeeldeende een Kraamkamer,” with the support given as H. 29, br. 33 d. P. 1. (height 29, breadth 33 duim on panel). The Amsterdam inch, or duim, was equal to about 2.37 centimeters, whereas the English inch is approximately 2.54 centimeters.

35. See Ex Coll. below. The painting had previously been assumed to have been in the 1791 Amsterdam sale of the dealer Pieter Oets, who bought the picture at the 1771 Braamcamp sale. Wouter Kloek kindly checked the copy of the rare Oets sale catalogue at the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and found no Metsu listed (letter of October 1, 1996).

36. J. Smith 1839–42, vol. 4, p. 82, no. 19, with dimensions and “C.”

37. Conservator Dorothy Mahon and the present writer, in September 1996. The same conclusion was reached, with reference to the X-radiograph, by F. du Pont Cornelius in his conservation report dated June 17, 1946.

38. Bastide 1766, p. 99, locates the picture as on the first floor, first room to the right, in Braamcamp’s house at 402 Heerengracht. Like the Trip House (see text above and note 6), the next house owned by Braamcamp (which was built for Guillaume Sweeden-ryck between 1665 and 1671) was an Amsterdam mansion from the same decade as Metsu’s picture. See Bille 1961, vol. 1, p. 222, and Van Eghen et al. 1976, p. 560.


40. For example, Jan Jacobsz Hinlopen’s wealthy cousin Catharina ("Catalina") Hinlopen (1614–1681), who with her sister Anna was the subject of a Vodol poem dating from 1646, remembered Agnes Block in her will (see Amsterdam 1988, pp. 31, 35).

41. Hofstede de Groote 1907–27, vol. 1, p. 285 (under no. 110); Lagrange 1865, p. 294, citing a copy in the Hermitage, Saint Petersburg. Hofstede de Groote’s nos. 110a and 110b may record a single Visit to the Nursery (panel, ca. 23 x 30 in. [69.3 x 76.2 cm]), while his no. 110c, The Young Mother (8 x 7 in. [20.3 x 17.8 cm]), must be another composition. Apparently none of the copies is known today, including the one formerly in the Hermitage.

42. Recorded in Hoet 1753–70, vol. 1, p. 94, no. 2 (sold for Fl 43).

References: Jan Vos, “Op de Schildery van een Krwamvrouw, in de zaal van den E. Heer Scheepen Jan Jakobsen Hinloopen, door G. Moesens getalschildert,” in Vos 1662, p. 654, praises the painting’s descriptive and expressive qualities; Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 3, p. 41, describes the subject, praises the composition and execution, and notes that the painting was formerly owned by the art-lover Jan de Wolf” (see text and Ex Coll.); Vos 1736, vol. 1, p. 388, repeats the verse published in 1662; possibly Hoet 1753–70, vol. 1 (1752), p. 94, no. 2, as in an anonymous Amsterdam sale of May 18, 1706, vol. 2 (1752), p. 240, no. 24, as in the sale of the art dealer David Ietswaart, in Amsterdam, April 22, 1749; Descamps 1753–54, vol. 2, p. 245, mentions the "très-beau Tableau" in Braamcamp’s collection; Bastide 1766, p. 99, catalogs the picture in Braamcamp’s collection, recording the support as wood (see text above); J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 4 (1833), p. 80, no. 19, describes the composition, records the support as canvas, and notes the sales of 1742 and 1771; Nieuwenhuys 1834, pp. 206–97, quotes Houbraken, records the eighteenth-century provenance (following "memoranda . . . written by Peter Fouquet, who bought a great number of the paintings of the Braamcamp collection"), and speculates about the picture’s state of preservation; Blanc 1866, vol. 1, p. 470, quotes the entry from the Braamcamp sale catalogue of 1771; Lagrange 1863, pp. 293–94, with engraved reproduction opp. p. 292, interprets the subject novelistically, praises the picture as “une des oeuvres les plus exquises de Metsu,” and mentions a copy in the Hermitage which was considered the original; Lagrange 1864, p. 320, compares a painting by Fleuret Willems (1823–1903); Chronique des arts, no. 105 (June 18, 1865), p. 217, notes that the duchesse de Morny acquired the picture at the sale of Morny’s collection; Hofstede de Groote 1894, pp. 144, 469 (note p. 104), mentions Vos’s poem, cites eighteenth-century owners, and locates the picture in the collection of the duchesse de Sesto (see Ex Coll.); Selandeay Gallery 1895, p. 30, no. 25 (ill.); Bode 1900, p. 113, ill.; Glück 1900, p. 91, mentioned; É. Michel 1901, pp. 392–93 (ill.), describes the subject and setting; Marguillier 1903, no. 14, pp. 20 (ill.), 24, mentioned; Bode 1907, vol. 1, pp. vi, 16, no. 35 (ill. opp. p. 56); Hofstede de Groote 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), pp. 284–85, no. 110, gives description, early references, and provenance (with Duvene, London, in August 1927); Nicolle 1908, p. 197 (ill. opp. p. 196), as a "tableau bien connu"; Kronig 1909, pp. 93, 94, 217 n. 1, as from the Kann collection, and as acquired by Morgan; Valentin in New York 1909, p. 65, no. 64 (ill. opp. p. 65), lent by Morgan, the seascape in Van Everdingen’s style; Cox 1909–10, p. 305, offers a long description and comparison with Vermeer; Breck 1910, p. 58; Waldmann 1910, pp. 82–83 (ill.), criticizes the colors; Gowan 1912, p. 22 (ill.); Morgan Gift 1918, pp. 16–17 (ill.), listed; Errera 1920–21, vol. 1, p. 301, listed; Gerson 1930, p. 440, mentioned as a masterpiece of the 1660s; W. Martin 1936, p. 224–25, fig. 113, as an example of Metsu’s fijnkasten style after about 1662; Ploetz 1936, p. 9 (ill.), as a famous work; DUvEn Pictures 1941, no. 212; MMA Bulletin, n.s., 2, no. 9 (May 1944), text inside cover (ill. and cover ill. [detail]); Gerson 1912, p. 35, fig. 99, as Metsu’s masterpiece; Gudlaugsson 1939–60, vol. 2, p. 148 (under no. 139), sees the influence of Ter Borch; Bille 1961, vol. 1 (ill. after p. 32), vol. 2, pp. 29–30, no. 124, and p. 104, records the picture in the Braamcamp collection and sale, and lists earlier owners; Gudlaugsson 1968, pp. 14, 30, as a major work poorly preserved, and notes the fireplace’s source; Schneede 1968, pp. 47, 50, figs. 1, 3 (detail of signature), discusses the form of signature and considers Ter Borch’s influence possible; F. Robinson 1974, pp. 52, 53–54, 55, 56, 59, 69, 79 n. 59, 83 n. 92–94, fig. 130, broadly reviews the picture’s subject and style; Welsh 1974b, p. 657 n. 21, relates the painting over the mantelpiece to the “familiar topics in literature and art” of life as a fragile vessel; Buitenjank 1975, p. 27, discusses Vos’s poem about the picture; Wheelock 1976, p. 458, sees the influence of Ter Borch and Pieter de Hooch; Hibbard 1980, p. 344, fig. 619, mentioned; P. Sutton 1980a, pp. 30, 31, fig. 27, as possibly influencing De Hooch’s Amsterdam interiors; Thornton 1984, p. 46, fig. 50, appears to consider the picture as a reliable representation of “a grand Dutch bedchamber”; F. Robinson 1985, fig. 8, mentioned; Spicer 1988, pp. 577–79, fig. 6.
employs the Museum’s picture to date the family portrait by Metsu in Berlin (fig. 113 here); Goossens 1996, pp. 156, 238 n. 97, fig. 114, describes the seascape as “a symbol of the tribulations of the voyage of life”; Gaskell 1990, pp. 288–89, follows Gudlaugsson in noting the fireplace’s derivation from one in the Town Hall of Amsterdam; Liedtke 1990, p. 40, mentions the painting as in J. P. Morgan’s collection; Welu in Minneapolis–Toledo–Los Angeles 1990–91, p. 54, fig. 41, supports Walsh’s suggestion (in MMA curatorial files) that the marine painting over the mantelpiece “probably serves as a reminder of the fragility of human life”; G. Weber 1991, pp. 12 n. 10, 173–74, 210, fig. 21, discusses Vos’s poem about the painting; Lastius 1992, p. 31, paints a painting of the same subject by Van Brekelenkam; Frant 1993a, p. 237 n. 16, states incorrectly that Vos’s poem was not included in the 1662 edition of his collected works; Jäkel-Scheilgmann 1994, p. 12, fig. 27, describes the subject; Baetjer 1991, p. 331; Groeneweg 1995, p. 203, fig. 5, mistakenly interprets Metsu’s family portrait in Berlin (fig. 113) as a genre scene, in part by comparing figures in the present picture; Dedok van Heel 1996, p. 165, cites the work among important pictures in Hinlopen’s collection; L. de Vries in Washington–Amsterdam 1996–97, p. 73, compares the composition with that of Steen’s family portrait in Kansas City; E. Goossens in Amsterdam 1997b, pp. 77–79, no. 20 (ill.), inappropriately criticizes Metsu’s use of a room in the Town Hall of Amsterdam as a model for “such a simple, domestic scene”; P. Sutton in ibid., pp. 27–29, discusses the subject and setting, and (n. 19) repeats the error found in Frant 1993a; Van Thiell 1997, pp. 242–41, rejects the argument in Groeneweg 1995, and suggests that the Museum’s painting “may well turn out to be a genre-like portrait”; Westermann 1997, pp. 117, 168–69, fig. 68, compares Steen’s approach in pictures such as his Childhood Celebration of 1664; Fock 1998, p. 209, fig. 22, describes the use of a “Turkish” carpet on the floor as exceptional for the period; Van Gent 1998, pp. 127, 129, 130–31, 134–35 no. 20–21, fig. 2, considers the painting as “a sort of pendant” to the family portrait in Berlin (fig. 113), which the author identifies for the first time as depicting the Hinlopen; P. Sutton in London–Hartford 1998–99, pp. 142, 144, fig. 1 (under no. 26), maintains that the Museum’s painting “may depict the family of Jan Jacobsz Hinlopen,” although the Berlin portrait (fig. 113) is considered to represent the Valkeniers; Strouse 1999, p. 568, as A Visit to the Baby, owned by Morgan; Lokin in Osaka 2000, p. 38, discusses the interior decoration; Wheelock in ibid., pp. 18, 21 n. 1, 112–15, no. 26, fig. 11, interprets the painting as a family portrait and a “public statement,” detects “Christian allusions” in the mother and child, and mistakenly assumes that “archival research has not yet been undertaken to confirm that Hinlopen and his wife had a newborn child in 1661” (see note 24 above); Strouse 2000, p. 31, fig. 34, notes the lavish setting; Fock et al. 2001, p. 114, fig. 88, considers the bed and floor carpet unrealistic but notes that side chairs would indeed have to be brought out from the wall; Fock in Newark–Denver 2000–2001, p. 91, considers the use of a Turkish carpet on the floor to be misleading as evidence of contemporary practice; Westermann in ibid., pp. 64–65, 182, no. 57, fig. 91, speculates that the painting might have been “a particularly expensive example of the fine birth gifts made for these occasions” (lying-in visits) and that it might be “a genreliek portrait of the Hinlopen themselves”; Vergara in Madrid 2003, no. 21, as Retrato de grupo, concludes that the painting “is a family portrait” of the Hinlopen; Frants 2004, pp. 183–85, 209, 233, 290 no. 46, 50, fig. 170, fully discusses the subject, Hinlopen’s ownership, Vos’s poem, and other details (partly on the basis of an early draft of the present catalogue entry), and compares the treatments of the subject by Steen and Naiveu; Quodbuch 2004, p. 96, describes the circumstances under which the duchesse de Morny purchased the picture in her husband’s estate sale; Liedtke 2005a, p. 192, mentions the picture in a review of Dutch paintings made for specific patrons or locations; Zandvliet 2006, p. 345 (ill.), describes the work as perhaps identical with the painting described in Vos 1662 as in Hinlopen’s collection.


**Ex coll.:** Jan Jacobsz Hinlopen, Amsterdam (by 1662, according to Jan Vos’s contemporary poem [see Refs.]); probably Jan de Wolff (1681–1735; according to Houbraek in 1721, “the art-lover Jan de Wolff” owned but had parted with the picture); [David Ietswaart, Amsterdam (until 1749; his sale, Amsterdam, April 22ff., 1749, no. 24, for Fl 850 to Daalens for Bramcamp)]; Gerret Bramcamp, Amsterdam (1749–d. 1771; his estate sale, Amsterdam, July 31, 1771, no. 124, for Fl 1,200 to Oets); [Pieter Oets, Amsterdam, from 1771]; Charles-Auguste-Louis-Joseph de Morny, Duc de Morny, Paris (until d. 1865; his estate sale, Palais de la Présidence du Corps Législatif, Paris, May 31–June 12, 1865, no. 18, bought in for Fr 10,000 by the duchesse de Morny); Princess Sophie Troubetzkoi, duchesse de Morny, later duquesa de Sexto, Madrid (1865–at least ca. 1883); [Sedelmeyer, Paris, in 1893]; Rodolphe Kann, Paris (by 1900–d. 1903; his estate, 1903–7; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, London and New York, 1907; sold for £11,000 to Morgan]; J. Pierpont Morgan (1907–d. 1913; his estate, 1913–17); Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.190.20
COPY AFTER GABRIËL METSU

119. Tavern Scene

Oil on wood, 14½ x 12½ in. (36.5 x 32.1 cm)  
Inscribed (on table leg): G Metsu. [initials in monogram]  
The painting is in good condition.  
Bequest of William H. Herriman, 1920. 21.154.5

The picture appears to be a good copy after a lost painting by Metsu. The panel support and the execution suggest a late-seventeenth-century date. Another version of the composition, on a panel of about the same size, is known from a color reproduction published in 1947. The two works differ slightly in details, and the drawing of the architecture and the furniture in the other version is somewhat more rectilinear overall. In a few passages—for example, the man’s collar, his hair, and perhaps the faces of both figures—the present painting appears to be superior, insofar as the other version may be judged from an old color illustration. The open cupboard door in the left background of the New York picture does not occur in the latter, where the back of the chair is also slightly different; chalk marks appear on the slate tablet; and a man’s portrait in an octagonal frame hangs from the mantelpiece (here, the frame is round and the image is indecipherable). While one would prefer to base a judgment upon direct confrontation, it seems likely that both versions are old copies of an otherwise unknown painting. The original probably was painted in the mid-1650s, when Metsu was still in his native Leiden. His pupil in Amsterdam, Michiel van Musscher (1645–1705), is not a plausible candidate as copyist.

The subject is too familiar from other Dutch paintings of the period to require discussion here. A few motifs, however, might be explained. The man is a customer, the woman a servant in a tavern. Dutch inns had a reputation for offering personal services of the kind that seems implied here. Other vices are catalogued for the viewer: the man lights a clay pipe in a pot of hot coals (a used pipe lies on the floor); three cards, including a queen of hearts, have fallen from the table; the pewer pitcher and the slate with a lump of chalk in front of it suggest that more than one drink will be tallied. The large box with a clasp and, at the corner, a ring for hanging is the tavern’s backgammon board (for another example, see Pl. 196). The fiddle on the wall falls into another category of standard diversions available in such an establishment. The other objects are functional or decorative (the triangular form to the right of the pitcher is the corner of a pillow on the chair).

The suggestion that Metsu and his wife served as the models for the man and woman goes back at least to Smith (1833) and is unconvinving, although there is a slight resemblance to the unidealized self-portrait and its pendant in the Speed Art Museum, Louisville.

Formerly catalogued by the Museum as by Gabriel Metsu.

1. According to Hubert von Sonnenburg, who considers the work to be a late-seventeenth-century copy with a false signature (orally, June 1994). Both Von Sonnenburg and Otto Naumann (orally, 1994) have noted that the execution is very like Metsu’s own in parts, for example in the hands and in the pewer can.


4. A number of these items were listed (along with about sixty paintings) as contents of the large inn owned by the father (Isack, d. 1620) of Rembrandt’s pupil Isaack Jouderville (1612/13–1643/48); see Bredius 1915–22, part 6, p. 1947 (“verschiedene Tricktrankspiele”)

5. See Liedtke 2000a, pp. 67–68, on musical instruments in Dutch taverns.

6. F. Robinson 1974, figs. 43, 44. On portraits of Metsu and his wife, see Renckens and Duyvetter 1999.

References: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 4 (1833), p. 102, no. 93, as a picture of the artist and his wife in a room, owned by Mr. Oppenheim; Waagen 1864, p. 329, as a Metsu “of his best time, warm and transparent,” in the Oppenheim collection; Blanc 1857–58, vol. 1, p. 236, records the sale of 1773 and correctly describes the subject; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1898, pp. 108, 109 (ill.), no. 91; Moe 1897–1905, vol. 2 (1903), pp. 94–95, listed as nos. 2 and 8 (under no. 530); Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), pp. 308–9, no. 178, records the provenance, and ignores J. Smith’s identification of Metsu and his wife as models; H. B. Wehle in MMA Bulletin 16, no. 12 (December 1921), p. 263, notes the bequest, and considers the work...
to be “painted with less vivacity than the two pictures by Metsu which the Museum already owned”; Gerson 1930, p. 440, listed as “Young Man and Young Woman”; B. Burroughs 1931a, p. 243, as “The Artist and his Wife”; Anon., “Gabriel Metsu,” Apollo 45 (1947), p. 128, considers the Museum’s picture to be one of two autograph versions; Gudlaugsson 1968, p. 26, as from the beginning of Metsu’s Amsterdam period, and influenced by Ter Borch; Schneede 1968, p. 47, as probably dating from the second half of the 1650s; Eckhardt 1971, pl. 24, as depicting Metsu and his wife; F. Robinson 1974, pp. 69–70, 204, fig. 173, as possibly an inferior work by Metsu himself, but probably not by him, and (p. 73 n. 15) as “at best a copy of an original composition by Metsu”; Baert 1980, vol. 1, p. 123, as by Metsu; Baert 1995, p. 350, as by Metsu; Marijke van der Meij-Tolma in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 21, p. 352, as by Metsu, including a table he depicted elsewhere.


Michiel van Miereveld
Delft 1567–1641 Delft

Karel van Mander (correcting his own account) reports that Michiel Jansz van Miereveld (or Mierevelt) was born in a house on the market square of Delft on May 1, 1567. His father was a prominent goldsmith, Jan Michielts van Miereveld (1538–1612), and his mother was the daughter of a glass painter. The biographer cites two early teachers of Van Miereveld in his native city, the obscure Willem Willemsz and “a pupil of [Anthonie] Blocklandt, Augustijn, in Delft, whose spirit greatly overflowed with invention.” At about the age of fourteen (presumably in 1581), the artist, who already excelled in writing, drawing, and engraving, went to study “for two years and three months” in Utrecht with Anthonie Blocklandt (1533/34–1583), who had been a highly regarded history painter in Delft during the 1550s and 1560s. Four designs constituting a Judgment of Paris, engraved in 1609 but inscribed “M. Mierevelt invent. 1588,” recall nudes of the 1580s by Blocklandt, Bartholomeus Spranger (1540–1611) and Hendrick Golzius (1558–1611). Van Mander records that Van Miereveld also painted “kitchens with all sorts of things from life” and that “his preference very much inclines towards compositions and figures” (i.e., history pictures). But it was for his portraits that he was preeminently in demand. As the most prominent portraitist in Delft, Van Miereveld succeeded Jacob Willemsz Delf (ca. 1575–1601), whose son Willem Jacobsz Delf (1580–1638) made many fine engravings after Van Miereveld, and married his daughter in 1618.

In 1587, Van Miereveld joined the painters’ guild in Delft, he served as hoofdman (headman) in 1589–90, and again in 1611–12. In 1607, he became court painter to Prince Maurits, and effectively began his career as the leading portraitist of aristocratic figures in The Hague, Delft, and other cities. It must have been in order to continue in this capacity that the artist joined the painters’ guild of The Hague in 1625, but his membership became unnecessary when he was named court painter in the same year by Maurits’s successor, Frederick Hendrick. Numerous Dutch courtiers, foreign diplomats (such as Sir Dudley Carleton), and patrician patrons sat for Van Miereveld, who met the enormous demand with the help of several assistants. The latter generally painted subordinate motifs, such as costume details, and also workshop replicas (often in modified format, for example copying a bust-length portrait from a three-quarter-length model).

Success made Van Miereveld a wealthy man. At his death, on June 27, 1641, he owned two houses (one valued at more than 2,000 guilders), ten parcels of land that were rented to farmers, various bonds and other interest-bearing assets, and 5,839 guilders in cash on hand (at the time, a skilled laborer might earn 300 guilders per year). In his will, he left several thousand guilders to a wide range of Protestant charities.

Van Miereveld married twice, in 1589 and in 1633. His sons Pieter (1596–1623) and Jan (1604–1633) were among his many pupils, but they predeceased their father, and after his death the studio was inherited by his grandson Jacob Willemsz Delf the Younger (1619–1661). Van Miereveld’s most important pupils were Paulus Moreelse (q.v.), Willem van Vliet (ca. 1584–1642), and Anthonie Palamedesz (1601–1673). He also influenced Jan van Ravesteyn and Daniël Mijtens (q.v.). With the rise of the court portraitist and history painter Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656) in the 1630s, Van Miereveld fell out of fashion, but not out of favor with distinguished figures in Delft—such as Jacob van Dalen, discussed below.

7. For Van Miereveld’s portraits of the princes dating from 1607 and about 1610 (Stedelijk Museum Het Prinsenhof, Delft), see New York–London 2001, nos. 43, 44.
8. Joachim von Sandrart claimed that Van Miereveld painted ten thousand portraits (Felzner 1925, p. 171), but Ekkart more reasonably estimates that he turned out “at least a thousand portraits with the help of his assistants, of which several hundred are extant” (Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 21, p. 486).
9. On Van Miereveld’s estate, see Montias 1982, p. 129; pp. 124, 126 for similar information, and p. 154 on his will.

120. Portrait of a Woman with a Lace Collar

Oil on wood, 29¼ x 23¼ in. (74.6 x 60.3 cm)
The paint surface has suffered slight abrasion along the vertical grain of the oak panel.
Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, 1915 30.95.257

The portrait has been described by Rudolf Ekkart as a “characteristic work by the painter,” which does not imply that it is entirely by his hand. Van Miereveld is probably responsible for the face alone, which is remarkable for its suggestion of both friendliness and reserve. The execution of the collar, dress, and even the jewelry appears routine, by comparison, when examined firsthand.
The hairstyle and dress, in particular the layered lace collar, suggest a date of about 1632–35. Lace collars varied considerably within certain patterns, and were prized possessions (they are often listed in inventories of estates). The one depicted here was probably the sitter’s own.

2. Van Miereveld’s ability to suggest character as well as to record physiognomy is frequently underestimated, and quite extraordinary remarks have been offered in explanation of his and his sitters’ reserve (see, for example, Wheelock 1954a, p. 170, on Neo-Stoicism). With regard to the history of taste, it is interesting to compare conservative portraits, both painted and photographic, from the 1890s, when this picture was acquired by Theodore Davis. Two years earlier, Harry Havemeyer purchased Rembrandt’s Herman Doomer (Pl. 148), and also the pair of less emotive Van Beresteyn portraits by Rembrandt (Pls. 143, 144). The present writer considers Havemeyer’s taste and temperament in New York 1991, pp. 62–65.
4. On August 6, 1641, a former maid to the Leiden painter Isaack Joudivere (1612/13–1645/48) testified that a shoemaker had lent his lace collar to the artist so that it could be depicted in a portrait. (Bredius 1915–22, part 6, p. 1963; mentioned by Van de Wetering in Amsterdam–Groningen 1981, p. 60.)

REFERENCES: Anon., “Pictures in the Fourth Gallery,” Boston Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin 1 (1903), pp. 30–31, suggests that the painting may be by the younger (i.e., Pieter) Van Miereveld; B. Burroughs 1931b, p. 16, listed; Bactier 1999, p. 297.


EX COLL.: Count Potocki, London; M. Barres, Paris; [Durand-Ruel, New York, sold in March 1897 to Davis]; Theodore M. Davis, Newport, R.I. (1891–1915); Theodore M. Davis Collection, Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, 1953 30.95.257
121. Jacob van Dalen, called Vallensis

Oil on wood, 27½ x 23 in. (69.0 x 58.4 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed (left): \textit{\AE}tatis.69./A." 1640./
M. Miereveld. Arms (upper left) of the Van Dalen family.

The painting is well preserved. With age, the thinly painted beard has become more transparent and the vertical grain of the oak panel more prominent.

Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 25.110.13

This portrait and its pendant (Pl. 122) are late works by Van Miereveld, dated 1640 and 1639, respectively. The difference in dates is not unusual in Dutch pair portraits, and probably indicates that the commission was executed in the winter months.

The family crests allowed Moes (1897) to identify the sitters as Jacob van Dalen (or Dalen; 1570–1644) and his wife, Margaretha van Clootwijk (ca. 1580/81–1662); Van Dalen was the personal physician of the Dutch Stadholders Prince Maurits (1567–1625) and Prince Frederick Hendrick (1584–1647). The same eminent doctor appears in a group portrait painted twenty-three years earlier, \textit{The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Willem van der Meer} (Oude en Nieuwe Gasthuis, Delft), which is dated 1617 and bears a Latin inscription to the effect that Van Miereveld drew the composition and his son Pieter carried out the painting.

Jacob van Dalen, professionally known by the Latinized form of his name, Vallensis, was born in Speyer, Germany, on November 21, 1570. His father was a preacher, Theodorus van Dale, and his mother was Maria van Wassenaer Hancops. Vallensis studied medicine at the University of Leiden from 1589 to 1593. He moved to Delft and soon became the personal physician of the Stadholder in the neighboring city of The Hague. The doctor died in Delft on February 14, 1644, and was buried in the Oude Kerk. The gravestone of Vallensis and his wife bears the same crests as the paintings in the Metropolitan Museum.

The 1641 inventory of Van Miereveld's estate records that "Dr. Valentius" was to receive the "four large and two small portraits of him and his wife" that remained in the artist's house. The other versions of the present pictures are now unknown, and it is difficult to say whether the Museum's panels are the small pendants or one of the larger pairs. The document also suggests that Van Miereveld's grandson and heir to his studio, Jacob Willemisz Delff the Younger (1619–1661), painted the costumes in the present pictures.

The provenance below was reconstructed by Rudolf Ekkart. The sitter's son and heir, Dr. Theodorus Vallensis (1612–1673), graduated from the University of Leiden as doctor of medicine in 1634. His marriage to the burgomaster's daughter Agatha van Beresteyn (1625–1702) brought him into the regent class of Delft, where he held several civic offices. He is certainly "the art-loving late Dr. Valentius" in whose house Carel Fabritius (1622–1654) painted an illusionistic mural, as recorded by Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.);

2. New York–London 2001, no. 45; all nineteen figures are identified in Delft 1981, fig. 125.
3. The information in this paragraph was kindly provided by Rudolf Ekkart in a letter dated August 2, 1997. Van Beresteyn 1993, p. 49, records Van Dalen's gravestone as no. 54, fig. 24.
4. For this item in the painter's estate, see Bredius 1908, p. 8. The inventory was compiled by Van Miereveld's son-in-law, the notary Johan van Beest. It mentions the group of Valentius portraits "and one of his mother, in which Jacob Delff also painted." It is not clear from the Dutch whether Delff's collaboration is specified for all the Valentius portraits or just that of the doctor's mother. Elsewhere in the inventory Delff is indicated as the painter of costumes in recent portraits by Van Miereveld (for example, "De conterfeitseis van den Pensionaris Brouckh ende syn huysvrouwe, daervan by Jacob Delfff de klederen syn gemaeckt"); see Bredius 1908, p. 11. Delff was Van Miereveld's principal assistant after his sons died (see the biography above). Given Van Miereveld's age and Delff's importance in his studio when these late portraits were painted, it would be reasonable to assume that Delff did execute the costumes.

REFERENCES: Moes 1897–1903, vol. 1 (1897), p. 217, no. 1886 (Van Dalen), item no. 2 (the present portrait), as in the collection of J. Ovens in Baarn; Montias 1982, p. 55, fig. 3; Liedtke in Linsky Collection 1984, p. 85, compares the style of the Museum's portrait by David Bailly (Pl. 3); P. Sutton 1986, p. 183, mentioned; F. Schwartz 1989, p. 91, fig. 1, as a typical example of Van Miereveld's work; Baxter 1995, p. 297; Liedtke 2000a, pp. 64, 104, mentioned as an example of a Dutch artist working from an original painting (prime version) when producing replicas, not from a drawing; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 43, 47–48, 55, 316, fig. 453, on the sitter at court and at an auction, and on the picture as possibly one of the portraits of Van Dalen in Van Miereveld's estate.


Ex Coll.: Jacob van Dalen (in 1641–d. 1664); his wife, Margaretha van Clootwijk (d. 1662?); their son Dr. Theodorus Vallensis, Delft (by 1662; d. 1673); his son, Jacob Vallensis (1673–d. 1723); his daughter Catharina Maria Vallensis (1723–d. 1745), wife of Ewoud.
van der Dussen (d. 1729); their son Nicolaes van der Dussen (1745–d. 1770); his son Jhr. Jacob van der Dussen, lord of Zoutemeer (1770–d. 1839); [sold by his heirs through the dealer A. Praetorius in the sale of C. Kruseman, J. van der Dussen van Zoutemeer, and others, Amsterdam, February 16, 1858, no. 129; bought back by Praetorius]; J. Ovens, Baarn (before 1897); Collis P. Huntington, New York (until d. 1900); life interest of Mrs. Collis P. (Arabella D.) Huntington, later (from 1914) Mrs. Henry E. Huntington (d. 1944); life interest of her son, Archer Milton Huntington, New York (1924–terminated in 1925); Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 25.110.13

122. Margaretha van Clootwijk, Wife of Jacob van Dalen

Oil on wood, 27¾ x 22½ in. (70.5 x 58.1 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed (right): Aetatis.36./A.° 1639/
M. Miereveld. Arms (upper right) of the Van Dalen and Van Clootwijk families

The painting is well preserved.

Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 25.110.12

The painting is discussed above, with the pendant portrait. Margaretha van Clootwijk (ca. 1580/81–1662), Jacob Van Dalen’s second wife, was the daughter of Matthijs van Clootwijk, a burgomaster of Geertruidenberg (North Brabant), and Henrica van Drimmelen. She died on July 30, 1662, and was buried in the Oude Kerk, Delft.

REFERENCES: Moes 1897–1901, vol. 1 (1897), p. 181, no. 1587, as in the collection of J. Ovens in Baarn; Montias 1982, p. 55, fig. 3; P. Sutton 1986, p. 183, mentioned; Baezijr 1995, p. 297; Lidertke 2000b, pp. 64, 104, cited as an example of a Dutch artist working from an original painting (prime version) when producing replicas, not from a drawing; Lidertke in New York–London 2001, pp. 47–48, 316, fig. 45b, as possibly one of the portraits of the sitter in Van Miereveld’s estate.


EX COLL.: The painting has the same history of ownership as its pendant. See Ex Coll. for Jacob van Dalen, called Valckenis (Pl. 121); Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 25.110.12
The artist was presumably born in Leiden in April 1635, as reported in Weyerman’s *Levens-beschrijvingen* (1729) and in the second edition of Houbraken’s *Grote Schouburgh* (1753). His father, Jan Bastiaensz (d. 1650), and his two uncles were goldsmiths. Van Mieris trained in the same profession under his cousin, Willem Fransz, from about 1645–46 onward. According to Houbraken, his father then sent him to study with the glass painter and drawing master Abraham van Toorevliet (ca. 1620–1692); this must have been about 1649–50. He soon went on to the studio of Gerrit Dou (q.v.), probably about 1650–51, and then to Leiden’s most successful portraitist, Abraham van den Tempel (1622/23–1672). Finally, Van Mieris returned to Dou, whom he deemed “the Prince of his pupils.” This often quoted remark seems justified by comparisons of autograph works by the artist, including those dating from as early as about 1653–57, with even the finest efforts of Godfried Schalcken and Matthijs Naiveu (q.q.v.). In such paintings as the *Jan Scene*, of 1658 (Mauritshuis, The Hague), and *The Oyster Meal*, of 1659 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), Van Mieris might be considered to have surpassed his famous master in ways that recall contemporary works by Gerard ter Borch and Johannes Vermeer (q.q.v.).

In March 1657, Van Mieris married a somewhat older woman, Cunera van der Cock (ca. 1630–1700). He joined the painters’ guild in Leiden on May 14, 1658, although he had already placed his signature (“F v Mieris” or “F van Mieris”) on a number of pictures. The artist remained in Leiden throughout his comparatively short life (he died at the age of about forty-six). He served as hoofdman, or headman, of the guild in 1663 and 1664, and as dean in 1665. Van Mieris was paid nearly unprecedented sums for his paintings by some of Leiden’s leading citizens and by such distinguished connoisseurs as Duke Cosimo III de’ Medici and Archduke Leopold Wilhelm. Nonetheless, notarial records reveal that the artist was persistently in debt during the 1660s and 1670s; they also confirm Houbraken’s claim that the artist had a drinking problem. He died on March 12, 1681, and was buried in the Pieterskerk. The family belonged to the Remonstrant community.

Van Mieris is mostly known for elegant genre scenes and for small portraits, including a number of self-portraits, although he also painted historical subjects (which are occasionally obscure). He employed an eccentric cast of characters, with strong and sometimes grimacing expressions, and demonstrative gestures suggestive of the stage. His most distinctive works seem self-consciously sophisticated and introduce a note of courtly decadence into familiar domestic environments. Among the painter’s most remarkable qualities are his descriptions of light effects (including nocturnal illumination), reflections, and the changing colors of shiny satins and silks. His manner was imitated but never equaled by his sons Jan (1660–1690) and the more gifted Willem (1662–1747), and by Willem’s son, Frans van Mieris the Younger (1689–1765).

1. It is commonly reported that Van Mieris was born in Leiden on April 16, 1635, and that the source of this information is Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 3, p. 2 (see, for example, Naumann 1981, vol. 1, pp. 131, 159). However, Van Mieris’s date of birth is not found in the (already posthumous) third volume of Houbraken’s *Grote Schouburgh* but is the subject of a new sentence added to the revised second edition of 1733 (vol. 3, p. 2): “Deze [Van Mieris] is geboren tot Leiden in den jare 1635 op den 16 van Grasmaand.” The author of this line, presumably the biographer Johan van Gool, was certainly aware that in Weyerman 1729–39 (vol. 2 [1729], p. 341) Van Mieris is said to have been born “op den tiende van de Grasmaand, des jaars duizent seshondert vyfendertig” (on April 10, 1635; see Horn 2002, p. 79, on Van Gool’s relationship to Houbraken and to Weyerman). The change in date from April 10 to April 16 may be a correction based on another source of information or a misreading of handwritten notes.

The question is not immediately resolved by the inscription on Van Mieris’s *Self-Portrait* in the National Gallery, London, which reads: “ETAT 34;” and, on a second line, “AD DOM 1674.” In MacLaren 1900, p. 353, it is noted that “the date of the present portrait, 13 April 1674, is three days before Van Mieris’s thirty-ninth birthday”; this statement is repeated in MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 266, where the inscription is reproduced in fig. 52. But does the date “4/13” refer to the completion of the painting and not to the sitter’s date of birth (or baptism)? If Van Mieris turned thirty-eight on April 10 or April 13, 1674, then he was born in 1636.

There are two other pieces of documentary evidence for the year of Van Mieris’s birth. He was said to be “aged about twelve” when he formally became his cousin’s apprentice on December 2, 1647 (Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 160). At the time
Van Mieris was about four months short of his twelfth or thirteenth birthday, depending on whether he was born in 1635 or 1636. However, the first edition of Houbraken (1718–21, vol. 3, p. 9) claims that the artist "died on the 12 of March 1681, barely 46 years old" ("naaulyks 46 jaren out"). It is not clear whether "naaulyks 46" should be taken to mean that Van Mieris was "only 46" or "nearly 46" when he died. But if he was already forty-six years old in March 1681 (that is, since April 1680), then he was born in 1634. This conflicts with the document giving his age as "about twelve" in December 1647; he would have been thirteen and eight months old if he were born in April 1634. Van Mieris must have been born in 1635, and probably on April 16, as stated in Houbraken 1753.


5. See Naumann 1981, vol. 1, pp. 23, 164. The documents cited by Naumann indicate that the couple had their first child, Christina, shortly before they married.
6. See ibid., vol. 2, nos. 1–20 (the two versions of no. 20 are dated 1857). As Sluijter explains in Leiden 1988, p. 127, the guild's normal activities of collecting dues and taking in new masters appear to have been interrupted in the mid-1650s.
7. See Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 24, on Leopold Wilhelm, whose offer to Van Mieris of a large income and a post in Vienna was refused, pp. 24–37 on his Leiden patrons, and pp. 27–30 on Cosimo.
10. For biographies of and works by all four Van Mierises, see Leiden 1988, pp. 127–68. See also Amsterdam 1989–90, pp. 66–128, for works by Frans the Elder and by Willem.

123. The Serenade

Oil on wood, arched top, 5½ x 4¾ in. (14.6 x 11.1 cm)

The painting is in good condition, although there is slight abrasion along a network of fine cracks in the deep shadows of the background at left, in the masked figure, in the child holding a torch, and on the building between the two central figures. The modeling of the woman's iridescent silk skirt is disrupted.

Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1959 60.71.3

This small panel was little known before its publication in the early 1980s and its frequent display from that period onward. The picture was evidently taken to America by the celebrity Lola Montez (1821–1861), whose lover King Ludwig I of Bavaria (1786–1868) is said to have owned it before her. ¹ This would have made the painting unknown to the leading connoisseurs of Dutch art who flourished in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, until one of them, Cornelis Hofstede de Groot, was consulted somewhat before or in connection with the New York sale of 1927. His certificate endorsing the picture's attribution to Gerrit Dou (q.v.) was not overruled until Naumann included the work in his catalogue raisonné of paintings by Dou's most accomplished pupil, Frans van Mieris. ² The picture's style and figure types (especially the woman) are entirely consistent with Van Mieris's later work. Naumann convincingly dates the painting to about 1678–80. ³

The night scene is illuminated mainly by the large torch carried by a boy in fancy dress. He leads the way for three figures, an elegant woman playing a lute and two men in theatrical costumes (at least one of whom is masked). As in Van Mieris's The Old Lover, of 1674 (Uffizi, Florence), light from a full moon allows the sky, the murky silhouette of a landscape, and the outline of a building to be barely discerned. The low placement of the torch results in strange shadows on the figures, enhancing their bizarre appearance. Candlelight cast from below similarly adds a sense of mystery or menace in other night scenes by Van Mieris. ⁴ Another function of the torchlight in the present picture is to create the flaring reflections on the nearest figure's red garment, a passage that may be said to serve as a kind of signature for the artist in this unsigned work.

Naumann suggests plausibly that The Serenade is identical with a painting by Van Mieris listed in the inventory of the Diego Duarte collection, compiled in Antwerp and dated July 12, 1682. ⁵ The Duarte picture is described as "Een nacht met vier figuren, een keerslicht en lanternelicht, maenschyn, seer curieus" (A night [scene] with four figures, a candle torch and a lantern light, moonlight, very curious). ⁶ Hofstede de Groot cited this document in 1928 (see Refs.) but evidently missed its connection with the "Dou" he had seen somewhat earlier.

Naumann compares the work with Jan Steen's Serenade, of
about 1675–78 (Národní Galerie, Prague), noting compositional as well as thematic similarities in the two torchlit scenes. The painting by Van Mieris’s close associate in Leiden shows costumed figures (including one wearing a turban and another a mask) ringing the doorbell of a stately town house and scurrying the secluded occupants. The subject, with specific commedia dell’arte players, is known from earlier French prints. The figures in Van Mieris’s painting must also be actors making nocturnal rounds from house to house. The change from loud revelers on a Dutch sidewalk in Steen’s picture to the rather disturbing personages in the Museum’s shadowy scene is typical of Van Mieris. A source in Molière has rightly been discounted. A contemporary copy was on the art market in 1995.

Formerly attributed by the Museum to Gerrit Dou.

1. See Ex Coll. An excellent sketch of Lola Montez’s life is found in Fiona MacCarthy, “Star” (review of Bruce Seymour, Lola Montez: A Life), New York Review of Books 43, no. 8 (June 20, 1996), pp. 7–9. Montez was the king’s mistress in Munich from 1846 until his abdication in 1848.

2. See Refs. The connoisseur Daan Cevat, on a visit to the Museum in 1666, considered the picture a “good Dou, very Elsheimer-esque.” The present writer recataloged the painting in 1986, after consultation with Otto Naumann.

3. Among the most similar works by Van Mieris are A Sleeping Courtesan, of 1660(?), and The Old Lover, of 1674 (both in the Uffizi, Florence); and A Woman Turning a Lute, of about 1682 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). See Naumann 1981, vol. 2, nos. 75, 98, and 119 respectively.

4. For example, in A Young Man with an Owl, of 1675 (copy in the Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna; see ibid., no. 104), and in The Old Lover, mentioned above (see note 3).


6. Dogger 1971, p. 212, no. 98, valued at Fl 400 (not no. 89, and not Fl 401 as stated in other publications). The entry is misquoted in F. Muller 1870, p. 400, no. 89, and therefore also in Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 188. The original manuscript is in the Bibliothèque Royale Albert Ier, Brussels. The reference to “lantern light” is probably an understandable misreading of the reflection on the cuirass worn by the figure to the right, and perhaps of the sword hilt in the same area.


8. See Gudlaugsson 1975, pp. 52–54, fig. 56.


10. Sotheby’s, London, October 18, 1995, no. 67, as Studio of Frans van Mieris the Elder. Also at Sotheby’s, New York, May 20, 1993, no. 314, as Attributed to Willem van Mieris, with erroneous provenance.

References: Probably F. Muller 1870, p. 400, no. 89, as in the 1682 inventory of Diego Duarte’s collection (see text above and notes 5 and 6); probably Hofstede de Groot 1907–28, vol. 10 (1928), p. 63, no. 224, where the preceding reference is cited; probably Dogger 1971, p. 212, no. 68, where the entry in the inventory of Duarte’s collection is transcribed; probably Samuel 1976, pp. 314, 319, where a “Lus de Laterna” by “Marinis” is listed as one of the unsold works in Diego Duarte’s house in early 1693, and as being offered for sale by his heir, Manuel Levy Duarte, for Fl 600; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 48, as by Dou; Naumann 1981, vol. 1, pp. 83–84, vol. 2, pp. 122–23, no. 117, pl. 117, as by Van Mieris about 1678–85, possibly the picture in the inventory of Duarte’s collection; P. Sutton 1986, p. 187, supports Naumann’s attribution; Behrman 1988, p. 307, no. 313, rejects an old attribution to Schalcken (photograph files of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague); Hocht in Amsterdam 1989–90, p. 213 n. 4, notes the display of various light effects in the picture, for which it was considered “very curious” in the 1682 inventory of Duarte’s collection; Baetjer 1995, p. 339, as by Van Mieris; The Hague–Washington 2005–6, p. 238, no. 117, included in a complete list of known works by Frans van Mieris.

Ex Coll.: Probably Diego Duarte, Antwerp (d. 1691; inventory of his collection, July 12, 1682, no. 98 [see text and notes 5 and 6 above]; his executor and heir, Manuel Levy Duarte, Amsterdam and Anwerp, 1691–early 1693 or later); King Ludwig I of Bavaria, Munich (according to 1927 sale catalogue); Lola Montez (also Eliza Gilbert, Maria Dolores de Porrís y Montez), presumably in Munich about 1846–48, in New York (where she died), and elsewhere (according to 1927 sale catalogue); Mrs. Dana, Boston, Mass. (according to 1927 sale catalogue); Dr. Reuling, Baltimore, Md. (according to 1927 sale catalogue); Dr. John Edwin Stillwell, New York (until 1927; sale, Anderson Galleries, New York, December 1–3, 1927, no. 235, as by Gerrit Dou); Mr. and Mrs. William R. Timken, New York (1927–49); Mrs. William R. Timken, New York (1949–59); Bequest of Lilian S. Timken, 1959 60.71.3
Shown actual size
A native of Delft, Mijtens was the son of a saddle-and coachmaker to the Prince of Orange, Maerten Mijtens (1551–1628), who came from Brussels. Maerten’s brother, Aert Mijtens (1541–1603), was active as a portrait and history painter in Italy, where he died. 1 Daniel probably studied under one of the two most important portraitists in the South Holland region, Jan van Ravesteyn (q.v.) in The Hague or Michiel van Miereveld (q.v.) in Delft. In 1610, he joined the painters’ guild in The Hague. Gracia Cletcher, of The Hague, became Mijtens’s wife in 1612. 2 No paintings from this early Dutch period are known. 3

By 1618, Mijtens was in London, writing to Sir Dudley Carleton in excellent English, 4 and painting life-size portraits of the great collector Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, and his wife Alathea, Countess Arundel, who are shown seated in front of idealized views of the sculpture and portrait galleries in Arundel House, London (National Portrait Gallery, London; on loan to Arundel Castle, Sussex). 5 In these stately pictures, as Ekkart remarks, “Mijtens can already be seen combining stylistic elements from his Delft–Hague background with certain formal aspects of the Elizabethan and Jacobean tradition of English court portraiture,” one of which is a predilection for large full-length portraits. 6

Mijtens evidently was presented to James I about 1619, and by May 1620 was receiving payments for portraits ordered by the Crown. Upon the death of Paul van Somer (1576–1621), Mijtens succeeded as court painter and was soon producing portraits of James I and Prince Charles (payments for which date from 1623). It has been observed that the pension of fifty pounds per annum awarded Mijtens by James I on July 19, 1624, “on condition that he do not depart from the realm without a warrant from the King or the Council,” reflects the memory of Anthony van Dyck’s failure to return after his brief stay in London in the winter of 1620–21. 7 In fact, Mijtens remained until 1634, by which time Van Dyck’s presence in London (since at least April 1632) had cost the Dutch painter his position as the preeminent portraitist in England.

The portrait of Charles I that is catalogued below (Pl. 124) is typical of Mijtens’s achievement from about 1627 to 1633. The majority of his paintings were large full-length portraits of the king or of distinguished noblemen and combine stateliness with naturalistic description and a certain ease of pose and expression. The latter quality was hardly the equal of Van Dyck’s approach, but must have made the Fleming all the more welcome in England.

A widower, Mijtens remarried in 1628. His second wife, Susanna Droeshout (dates unknown), was a painter of miniatures. The couple moved to The Hague in 1634, where Mijtens worked as an art dealer as well as a portraitist. He remained active as one of Arundel’s collecting agents. Ekkart reports that only four portraits are known to date from this second Dutch period of Mijtens’s career, all of them bust length. 8 No pupils are identified, but the artist’s nephew and later son-in-law, Jan Mijtens (ca. 1614–1670), may have been his apprentice in the mid-1630s, after initial training elsewhere. 9

Ter Kuile catalogues three self-portraits by Mijtens, the best of which is the panel of about 1630 at Hampton Court. 10 In addition, Anthony van Dyck included a portrait of Mijtens (engraved by Paul Pontius) in his Iconography. 11

1. See Ter Kuile 1969, pp. 18–19, for a family tree. Mijtens’s mother, Anneke Tijkmakers, died before November 1611, when his father remarried.

2. Gracia Cletcher is called the “sister of the goldsmith Thomas Cletter the elder” by Rudolf Ekkart in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 21, p. 508, but Thomas was a wine merchant. His son, Thomas Cletter the Younger, was jeweler to Prince Frederick Hendrick (as correctly recorded in The Hague 1998–99, p. 394, in the biography of the painter Daniel Cletter, who like Thomas II was Gracia’s nephew).

3. See Ter Kuile 1969, pp. 40–42, for an overview of signed and dated works by Mijtens, and of works attributed to him or by his workshop; ibid., pp. 43–99, for a catalogue of paintings.


10. Ter Kuile 1969, pp. 82–83, nos. 70–72, figs. 1, 55.

11. See Dickey 2004, pp. 27, 173 n. 26, fig. 32.
Charles I, King of England

Oil on canvas, 78¾ x 55¼ in. (200.3 x 140.7 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed: (lower right) Piuixt Daniel Mytens; (right, on column base) CAROLVS DEI G[RAVIT] MAGN[I] BRITANNIE FRANCIE/ET HIBERNIE REX/FIDEI DEFENSOR./ÆTAT. 25/ANNO 1629 (Charles, by the grace of almighty God, king of Britain, France, and Ireland. Defender of the Faith. Aged 29. In the year 1629)

The painting is not well preserved. The support has suffered damage in many places, and there is paint loss throughout. Tears in the background to the right of the figure extend from his collar to the floor and between the legs. Abrasion along the edges of the extensive crack pattern and along the crowns of the weave is most significant in the face, background, and floor. The green glazes in the tablecloth and background curtain are severely abraded. The top of the composition was altered in the past to an arched shape and then returned to its original rectangular format. There is an added strip 3¼ in. (8.9 cm) wide along the bottom.

Gift of George A. Hearn, 1906 06.1289

The New York portrait of Charles I (1600–1649; r. 1625–49) by Mijtens is generally agreed to be the prime version of one of the standard types of royal portraits that the artist painted in London between the king’s accession to the throne in 1625 and Mijtens’s departure from England in 1634. The canvas is signed and dated 1629, and despite condition problems is clearly consistent in execution with autograph works of the period, such as the impressive full-length portrait James, Duke of Hamilton, also of 1629 (Duke of Hamilton, on loan to the National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh). The modeling of the figure, the sense of space around it, the suggestion of textures, the delicate handling of costume details, and a few pentimenti (for example, in the contours of the lace collar) leave little room for doubt about Mijtens’s authorship (fig. 114).2

Mijtens painted full-length portraits of Charles as Prince of Wales in the early 1620s. Ter Kuile considers the example at Parham Park, Sussex, to date from as early as 1621, and the one at Hampton Court is dated 1623. In these images and in the portrait of a more mature-looking prince dated 1624 (National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa), Charles is turned in a three-quarters view to the right (in the direction opposite to that seen here).3 The very large canvas dated 1626 and 1627 in the Galleria Sabauda, Turin, which has an elaborate architectural setting by Hendrick van Steenwyck the Younger (ca. 1580–1649), shows the king from the same angle but in a more authoritative pose, with his right hand extended straight to a cane and his left arm akimbo.4 In 1628, Mijtens repeated the Turin-type figure of the king in a full-length portrait at Windsor Castle, where the setting is reduced to a tiled floor and a pillar and curtain flanking a balustrade (suggesting a balcony or terrace) with a view of landscape.5 Autograph replicas of the Windsor version are in Milton House, Northamptonshire, and in Hartfield House, Hertfordshire.6

A new series of royal portraits begins with the Museum’s picture of 1629, where the king is turned in a three-quarters view to the left. Again his right arm extends to the top of a cane, but it is not cocked in the commanding manner found in the Turin and similar portraits. The left arm also has been relaxed, and rests lightly on the hilt of a rapier. The king no longer seems to insist on his majesty, but simply stands next to its symbols on the table: the orb, scepter, and crown. He is dressed in red with silver embroidery and wears tan gloves and boots, and gold spurs. The blue sash and blue ribbon (the latter falling from behind the left knee) represent the Order of the Garter.

A workshop replica, unsigned but dated 1629, was formerly in the Spencer-Churchill collection at Northwick Park.7 Another unsigned version, dated 1631, is in the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich.8 The copy of the Museum’s painting in the Devonshire Collection at Chatsworth, Derbyshire, is monogrammed by Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Elder (q.v.) and dated 1631, which suggests that either the artist worked in Mijtens’s studio (with other assistants, to be sure) or that about 1631 he was specially engaged to help satisfy demand.9 In addition, an unsigned version of the present composition, but with the figure in a dark gray costume with different details and no embroidery, is dated 1631 (National Portrait Gallery, London).10

A third type of full-length portrait of Charles I by Mijtens presents the king in the ceremonial robes of the Order of the Garter. The prime version, dated 1633, is in Milton House, Northamptonshire.11 Much as this (most likely) last image of the king by Mijtens was adopted and improved by Van Dyck in his Charles I in Robes of State, dated 1636 (Windsor Castle), the same artist’s Charles I at the Hunt (“Le roi à la chasse”), of about 1636 (Louvre, Paris), draws upon both earlier types of Charles I with a cane, and yet gives the impression that the king himself created the dashing pose.12

Stoops, in 1910, published two references in royal account books of the period, one of which probably is to the Museum’s painting. The more promising of the two entries is the first, dated April 2, 1630: “bill for Daniell Mittens . . . viz. £60 for his Majesty’s picture at large with a prospect, and the Crown and the Sceptre, in a scarlet embroidered suit.” On June 29,
1631, the artist was credited “£50 for his Majesty’s picture at large, with a prospect and the Crown and Sceptre, in a scarlet embroidered suit, delivered by special command unto the Lord Bishop of London in April, 1631.”

A biography of Charles I is not required here. However, it should be noted that the reference to France in the inscription on this canvas was earned through the king’s marriage, in 1625, to Henrietta Maria (1609–1669), youngest child of Henry IV of France and Marie de Médicis.

1. Ter Kuile 1969, no. 13, fig. 32; Waterhouse 1962, p. 35, pl. 31.
2. In his report to the Museum dated November 3, 1988, Rudolf Ekkart described the Museum’s picture by Mijtens as “a very good work of the English period of the painter. Nothing to add to Ter Kuile’s article of 1969” (see Refs.).
4. Ibid., no. 24, fig. 20. Both artists signed the work, Van Steenwyck with the date 1626 and Mijtens with the inscription, “Ad Vivum dep. D. Mytens p. Regius A. 1627.”
5. Ibid., no. 25, fig. 21; Millar 1965, no. 118, pl. 48.
6. Ter Kuile 1969, nos. 26, 27, fig. 22 (Hatfield; the photograph is mistakenly reproduced over the caption of fig. 23, for the Museum’s picture, which is reproduced above the caption for the Hatfield canvas).
8. Ter Kuile 1969, no. 30. For reasons that remain unclear, Ter Kuile (ibid., p. 59) specifies that the Greenwich canvas is a copy.
of the Spencer-Churchill version, as opposed to being a studio replica of the New York painting. In some aspects, for example the subtler highlights in the curtain and table cover, the Greenwich picture is closer to the Museum's painting than is the Spencer-Churchill canvas.

9. See ibid., pp. 59–60, no. 31, "fig. 24," but reproduced above the caption for fig. 25. (Jonson's version of the Museum's picture includes a view of Windsor Castle in the left background, and a dog in the right foreground.) Ter Kuile (ibid., pp. 59, 89, no. 86, fig. 41) mentions another copy by Jonson after Mijtens, namely William Herbert, Third Earl of Pembroke, signed "C. Johnson/ pinxir" (Penshurst Place, Kent). The latter is not "dated 1620," as Ter Kuile records, but is inscribed with the information that the sitter died on April 10, 1630. On Jonson's copy of the New York canvas, see also Refs. in this entry.

10. Ibid., no. 32, fig. 24; see also p. 58 (under no. 28). A version of the latter, with no signature or date, was formerly owned by the Marquess of Waterford (ibid., no. 33). Other workshop replicas or old copies, with the king in red or gray costume, are known to exist.

11. Ibid., pp. 61–62, no. 34, recording various copies (one ill. as fig. 26); Waterhouse 1962, p. 35, pl. 32.

12. See Waterhouse 1962, p. 35, pls. 32, 33, for the first comparison, and for both Van Dycks, see Barnes et al. 2004, nos. iv.50, iv.51.

13. Stropes 1910, p. 162. See also Ter Kuile 1969, pp. 58–59 (under no. 28), for slightly different and evidently more accurate quotations.

REFERENCES: Probably Stropes 1910, p. 162, which publishes a document from the royal accounts, dated April 2, 1630, which may refer to this picture (see text above); probably Collins Baker 1912, vol. 1, pp. 42–43, which refers to three versions of Mijtens’s portrait of Charles I, each "in a scarlet embroidered suit," with a crown and scepter, and "with a prospect" (view), one paid for on April 2, 1650, and two paid for on June 29, 1651; Kelly 1920, pp. 84, 89, and pl. IIb, on p. 87, considers this portrait as possibly the one paid for on April 2, 1630, and finds it "rather the more sympathetic, despite the gaudy dress," when compared with the version in gray costume, dated 1631 (National Portrait Gallery, London); Kelly 1930 (ill. opp. p. 214); Thieme and Becker 1907–10, vol. 25 (1931), p. 316, listed; Millar 1948, p. 322, notes that only the Museum’s picture, of versions dated 1629 or 1631, is signed by Mijtens, and observes that the version at Chatsworth is signed and dated C.J. fest./1631, and is by Cornelis Janson (van Ceulen the Elder, q.v.); Bénédit (1945–55) 1976, vol. 7, p. 613, listed; Waterhouse (1913) 1962, p. 35, describes the New York version, which represents one of the “types” of portraits of the king by Mijtens, as “a signed and dated original of 1639”; Held 1918, p. 148, observes the king’s early adoption of the fashion of carrying a cane, as depicted in the Museum’s painting, where royal attributes and riding boots are also seen; Piper 1961, p. 6t (under no. 1246), mentions the picture as “a signed and dated version, 1639, in red with a falling ruff,” and as representing a type of royal portrait by Mijtens that “was popular between 1629 and 1631,” of which the canvas dated 1631 in the National Portrait Gallery, London, is a version, probably from Mytens’s studio; Ter Kuile 1969, pp. 11, 14, 58–59, no. 28, fig. 23 (image switched with that of fig. 22), and pp. 59–60 (under nos. 29, 31, and 32), refers to the copy by Cornelis Janson van Ceulen, considers the pose more confident than in earlier paintings of Charles I by Mijtens, and describes the picture as the “prototype” (prime version) of a series of portraits of Charles I, listing a few workshop replicas, two copies, and two variants; Chapman 1990, p. 143 n. 53, discerns the “wearing [of] a lovelock over one shoulder” in this portrait; Baecker 1995, p. 181; Rudolf Ekkart in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 7, p. 645, refers to the copy of this painting by Cornelis Janson; Rudolf Ekkart in ibid., vol. 21, p. 509, describes the Museum’s picture as “the original portrait painted and signed by Mijtens himself,” and mentions the copy by Cornelis Janson; Gordenker 2001, p. 102 n. 70, mistakenly refers to the New York painting as a copy of the picture by Mijtens in the National Portrait Gallery, London; Hearn 2003, p. 119, refers to the version of this painting by Cornelis Janson van Ceulen the Elder (q.v.).


EX COLL.: George A. Hearn, New York (until 1906); Gift of George A. Hearn, 1906. 06.1289

1. In a personal communication dated May 2, 1909, Emilie Gordenker describes the word “copy” as an error. She meant to say “version.”
Pieter de Molijn (or De Molyn) was baptized in London on April 6, 1595. His father, also named Pieter (profession unknown), came from Ghent, and his mother, Cathalijne van der Bossche, was from Brussels. The first record of De Molijn in Holland dates from 1616, when he was enrolled as a master in the Guild of Saint Luke in Haarlem. In 1624, he joined a civic guard company and the Dutch Reformed Church in Haarlem, and in the same year he married a local woman, Mayken Gerards. The couple had at least seven children between 1625 and 1639.1

De Molijn’s earliest known dated paintings are from 1625: the Nocturnal Street Scene, in the Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels; a wooded landscape in Raby Castle, County Durham; and a panel in the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin, depicting the Dutch princes riding out to hunt.2 The last painting especially is indebted to Esaias van de Velde (1587–1630), who influenced De Molijn’s colleague Jan van Goyen (q.v.) at about the same time.3 De Molijn himself, in the Dune Landscape of 1626 (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig), was an innovator in the tonal manner of landscape painting that is especially associated with artists in Haarlem, in particular Van Goyen and Salomon van Ruysdael (q.v.).4 Although the importance of individual artists and specific pictures can at times be exaggerated, it is clear that as a painter, draftsman, and etcher, De Molijn was a leading figure in the development of naturalistic landscape in the Netherlands between 1625 and 1631.5

In the 1630s, when De Molijn painted comparatively few pictures, and during the more prolific decade that followed, his landscapes depended mostly on the examples of Van Goyen, Van Ruysdael, and the young Jacob van Ruisdael (q.v.).6 In this period, De Molijn was very busy on behalf of the painters’ guild: he was visder; or foreman, in 1631, 1637–38, 1645, and 1649, and dean in 1632–33, 1638, and 1646.7 Gerard ter Borch (q.v.) studied with him in 1634–35, and, according to Houbraken, Allart van Everdingen (1621–1675) was also his pupil.8

De Molijn was more active as a painter and a draftsman in the late 1640s and 1650s. His late landscapes (which are much better known from the art market than from currently available literature) recall contemporary compositions by Van Goyen and Van Ruysdael, but also the distinctive qualities of his own early work. In general, he favored richer colors, closer description, and more structured designs than did Van Goyen, and he imparted a strong sense of rhythmic flow from one form to the next. De Molijn’s masterful drawings, of which about five hundred are known, combine detailed observation with energetic technique.9

The artist was buried in Saint Bavon’s, Haarlem, on March 23, 1661. When his widow sold the house that the couple had lived in for at least thirty years, it brought a substantial sum.10

1. For biographical documents, see E. Allen 1987, chap. 3; and Van Thiel-Stromon in Biesboer et al. 2006, pp. 246–49.
2. For these pictures see, respectively, Stechow 1966, p. 173, fig. 349; Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 375, fig. 1; London 1986a, no. 51; and Potterton 1986, pp. 96–97, fig. 168.
3. See Stechow 1966, p. 23. Keys 1984, p. 73, stresses the importance of Van de Velde’s first chalk sketchbook of about 1618–20 for the fluid landscape drawings that were made by De Molijn, Van Goyen, and other Haarlem landscapists.
5. For a critical view of individual contributions, see Liedtke 2003 and the extensive literature cited there.
7. See Miedema 1980, p. 110 (index), for references to these and other records of De Molijn’s activity in the guild. On the artist’s role in the organization, see Taverne 1972–73; and G. Schwartz and Bok 1990, pp. 102, 172–73. That De Molijn was a prominent member of the guild tempers Taverne’s hypothesis that more academic artists and Catholics were in control (see also Montias 1990, p. 370).
10. See E. Allen 1987, p. 31, for the document of February 13, 1662.
125. Landscape with a Cottage

Oil on wood, 14¼ x 21¼ in. (37.5 x 55.2 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): P Molijn/1629 [PM in monogram]

The painting is well preserved. Concentrated in the upper sky at center are small flake losses along the horizontal wood grain.

Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1895  95.7

This panel, dated 1629, is one of the most accomplished pictures of De Molijn's early period (1625–31). As in the celebrated Dune Landscape, of 1626 (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig), and paintings of 1627–28, the artist's subject is a rugged road through countryside near the Dutch coast. The route recedes from the lower left to a sunny area behind the shadowy rise on the right, and then winds past farm buildings and over a hill, where three travelers make their way. The figures (one with a walking stick) lead the eye into the distance, toward the mastlike beacon on the horizon to the right (compare the beacon in the left background of Jacob van Ruisdael's Wheatfields; Pl. 182). Another man works on the side of the barn, next to a stack of poles probably intended to hold down roof thatching (compare Pl. 49). The very low roof to the right is the top of a hayrick, which protects hay from rain and can be raised or lowered on corner posts.

De Molijn's contemporaries would have recognized at a glance the rolling dune landscape west of Haarlem, where trees and bushes stubbornly survive in the sandy soil. Turning the distinctive terrain to artistic advantage, De Molijn compares the dense vegetation to the left with the smooth, swirling patches of grass and barren earth in the middle ground. The contrasts of textures and of green and tan tones are skillfully rendered, and the whole surges to a crest like a wave at sea.

While inspired by the environs of Haarlem, celebrated by writers and printmakers of the time, the picture conveys less topographical fact than poetic evocation. Comparison with De Molijn's etchings dating from 1626 and slightly later, with Van Goyen's Sandy Road with a Farmhouse, of 1627 (Pl. 49), and with other compositions of about 1627–29 by De Molijn, Van Goyen, and Salomon van Ruisdael (q.v.) reveals that the pattern employed here is an example of an early Baroque scheme repeatedly imposed upon the local landscape during a brief period of three or four years. Although these Haarlem colleagues found inspiration in woodcuts by Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1617), drawings by Esaias van de Velde (1587–1630), and engravings after artists such as Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.) and Claes Jansz Visscher (1587–1652), they may be credited with defining some of the most durable conventions of landscape painting in the 1620s and 1630s.

As discussed in the entry for Van Goyen's Sandy Road, pictures of peasant cottages flourished in the Netherlands during the early seventeenth century, especially in Haarlem, Amsterdam, and Utrecht. Of the values that have been cited in connection with this development—local and national pride, esteem of God's Creation, admiration of life on the land—the last sentiment, which ultimately derives from classical poetry, seems among the most relevant to images of this kind. In 1597, a Dutch translation of Virgil's Bucolics and Georgics by the Haarlem artist and author Karel van Mander (1548–1606) was published with the folksy subtitle Oosten-stal en Land-swerk (Ox Stall and Land Work). De Molijn's idea of "land work" falls
within the same tradition of depicting agrarian occupations from a distant, indeed urban, point of view.  

Infrared reflectography (fig. 115) reveals careful underdrawing throughout the composition, except in the sky. All the main lines of the landscape are indicated, while the buildings are merely outlined. The trees and bushes are most completely described. No departures from the sketched composition are evident.  

1. See the biography above, note 4.  
2. This structure appears frequently in Dutch landscapes; see Beck 1991, pls. xlvii and li for examples raised to different heights.  
3. See Leeuwarden 1998, which refers to further literature.  
4. On the set of four etchings dated 1626, see Freedberg 1980, pp. 38–39, figs. 37–39; London 1986a, no. 53; and Amsterdam 1993, no. 28. The composition of De Molijn's panel is very similar to that found in his etching of the late 1620s. A Peasant on Horseback, Followed by Two Horses, Riding over a Hill (Hollstein 1949– , vol. 14, p. 71, no. 6).  
6. The literature on this subject is reviewed in Liedtke 2003.  
9. See ibid., p. 24, fig. 6, comparing underdrawing in paintings by Esaia van de Velde, Van Goyen, and Van Ruysdael. Similar underdrawing is found in De Molijn's Landscape with an Open Gate, of about 1630 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), except that there is some outlining of clouds, and the trees are less fully described (see Wheelock 1995, pp. 178–80, fig. 2).  

REFERENCES: T. H. Fokker in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 25 (1931), p. 49, lists the painting; J. Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, p. 149, describes the work as "equally original" as the artist's compositions of 1626; Stechow 1966, p. 26, fig. 25, considers the painting rare for its minimal staffage, and as "distinguished by a much more unified sweep than the Berlin picture" of 1628; P. Sutton 1986, p. 190, as "beautifully understated"; E. Allen 1987, pp. 115, 118, 134, fig. 79, suggests that Roelant Savery (1576–1639) may have influenced De Molijn, with regard to the palette employed here; P. Sutton in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 376, fig. 3, as "somewhat tighter and more controlled" than the Braunschweig painting of 1626; New York 1988, p. 97 n. 3, compares a later landscape by Jacob van Moscher (active ca. 1653–55); Liedtke 1990, p. 36, mentions the picture in the context of Marquand's collection; Baecker 1995, p. 308; Van der Ree-Scholtens et al. 1995, p. 290, fig. 12.24, cites the work as typical of naturalistic landscape painting in Haarlem; Goedde 1997, pp. 134–35, fig. 84, cites the work in connection with a thesis relating the rise of monochrome landscape painting to land reclamation projects of the period; M. Holland 2002, pp. 36–37, fig. 16, describes the work as an example of a new approach to composition and pictorial space, as compared with Mannerist landscape paintings; Liedtke 2003, pp. 23, 30 n. 25, fig. 3, compares the painting to contemporary works by Van Goyen and Van Ruysdael with regard to conventions of style and meaning, and methods of underdrawing.  


EX COLL.: F. T. Robinson, Boston, Mass.; Henry G. Marquand, New York (until 1893); Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1895 95.7
With Abraham Bloemaert and Joachim Wtewael (q.q.v.), Moreelse was one of the leading masters of the Utrecht school during the first decades of the seventeenth century. His father, Jan Jansz Moreelse (ca. 1544–ca. 1593), a cooper from Louvain, moved to Utrecht by 1568, when he married Jannichen Mertensdr in the local Jacobskerk. According to Van Mander in 1604, Moreelse “trained with Michiel van Miereveld [q.v.] for two years and is an excellent portrait painter.” This must have been in Delft during the late 1580s. Moreelse then went to Italy, where he painted portraits and probably gained some knowledge of Italian architecture. He designed the Katharijnepoort (Saint Catherine’s Gate; 1621–25), the first classicist structure in Utrecht.

Moreelse returned to Utrecht about 1593 and in 1596 joined the saddlers’ guild, to which painters belonged. In 1602, he married Antonia van Wyntershoven, the daughter of a bailiff in the provincial court. From 1603 until his death in 1638, Moreelse and his wife lived in De Hooen, a house on the Boterstraat in the center of Utrecht. The artist became dean of the saddlers’ guild in the spring of 1611, and in September of the same year he became the first dean of the newly established Guild of Saint Luke. This organization of professional painters and sculptors must have been in good part Moreelse’s idea; he served again as dean in 1612, 1615, and 1619. Moreelse was also a key figure in the founding of an “academie” for the study of drawing in Utrecht, which probably opened in 1612. Bloemaert and Moreelse appear to have been the principal teachers, and together they had dozens of pupils. Moreelse’s most important student was Dirck van Baburen (ca. 1594/95–1624), who was in his studio from 1611 to about 1614.

To judge from Van Mander’s account, Moreelse soon established himself as the leading portraitist of Utrecht society. He also painted a commanding portrait of the Amsterdam Archers’ Civic Guard Company in 1616 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). He was a good friend of the influential humanist scholar Arnold Buchelius (Aernout van Buchell; 1569–1641) and shared his Calvinist ideas. However, it would appear to have been political opportunism rather than religious conviction that led Moreelse, along with Wtewael and other citizens, to successfully request that the Stadtholder, Prince Maurits, dismiss the Utrecht city council in 1618. Moreelse became a member of the new government and remained on the city council for the rest of his life. He appears to have played prominent, if not universally appreciated, parts in many aspects of civic life, including the founding of a university in Utrecht (1636) and a plan to enlarge the city (implemented in 1663 by his son Hendrick, who was a burgomaster and law professor).

Moreelse’s public life must have served him well in his already successful career. He painted portraits of fellow city councillors and their wives, such as those of Philips Ram and Anna Ram-Strick, dated 1625 (Centraal Museum, Utrecht). In April 1627, the States of Utrecht presented the new Stadholder, Prince Frederick Hendrick, and his wife, Amalia van Solms, with pastoral genre pictures by Moreelse, A Shepherd (Staatliches Museum, Schwerin) and A Shepherdess (location unknown), and by the early 1630s the prince also owned three other paintings by the artist. These were not the first works by Moreelse to enter princely collections. In 1611, he was commissioned to paint portraits of Count Ernst Casimir of Nassau, the new lieutenant governor of the Province of Utrecht, and his spouse, Sophia Hedwig, and in 1619 her brother, Duke Christian of Brunswick, was depicted by Moreelse in a portrait that evens the Van Miereveld model. In 1621, the painter, with remarkable flair and gravity, portrayed Sophia Hedwig as Charity, with her three sons (Rijksmuseum Paleis Het Loo, Apeldoorn).

In addition to his many portraits in various formats, the more modest of which include images of himself (Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum, Hannover; Mauritshuis, The Hague), as well as of Bloemaert and of Buchelius (both in the Centraal Museum, Utrecht), Moreelse painted mythological scenes and a few religious subjects, including the Allegory of the Protestant Faith, of 1619 (Museo de Arte de Ponce). Worldly temptations, which are trumped in the Allegory, accompany one of the artist’s erotic beauties in the Allegory of Vanity, dated 1627 (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge).

Moreelse was buried in Utrecht’s Buurkerk (where he had been a churchwarden) on March 6, 1638. He and his wife (who died in 1643) had at least ten children, including the short-lived painter Benjamin Moreelse (ca. 1635–1649). Another
son, Johannes, a painter of great promise, died in the plague of 1634.  

1. According to Domela Nieuwenhuis in Braunschweig 2000, p. 46. Between 1577 and 1582, Jan Moreelse bought three houses in the center of Utrecht. He remarried in 1588.  
4. See no. 29 on the plan of Utrecht in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, pp. 88–89, and p. 386 for M. J. Bok’s biography of Moreelse. A more comprehensive biography by the same Utrecht archivist and art historian is in Amsterdam 1993–94, pp. 311–12, from which many details are adopted here.  
6. As noted by Domela Nieuwenhuis in Braunschweig 2000, p. 48, twenty-eight pupils registered with Moreelse between 1611 and 1624. Most of them did not become professional artists, but were interested in learning to draw.  
9. See Beckman in Amsterdam 1993–94, p. 204 (under no. 264), where the 1611 portraits are also discussed. On the portrait of Christian of Brunswick, see also Braunschweig 2000, pp. 9–13, 69, no. 1.  
11. See Braunschweig 2000, pp. 76–77 (under no. 3), and especially Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, pp. 180–83 (under no. 41), on the known self-portraits.  

STYLE OF PAULUS MOREELSE

126. Portrait of a Young Boy

Oil on wood, oval, 23 x 19½ in. (58.4 x 49.8 cm)

This portrait is thinly painted and, although rigorously cleaned, remains in fair condition. There are minor losses, scratches, and abrasions distributed across the surface. The originally rectangular oak panel was refashioned in the past into its present oval shape and cradled. Microscopic examination reveals remnants of a red lake glaze in the slits of the sleeves, suggesting that these touches and the decorative bows at the waistline that now appear a dull brown were originally more colorful. The decoration on the doublet was created by painting the black pattern on top of an even application of gold leaf. Microscopic reflectography reveals underdrawing beneath the eyes, along the side of the child’s proper right cheek, at the corners of the mouth, and marking the top of the shoulders. The eyes were not painted over the underdrawing but placed a bit higher.

Bequest of Alexandrine Sinzheimer, 1918  59.23.17

This charming portrait certainly represents a young boy, to judge from his attire. The collar follows adult male fashion of about 1657, a date consistent with the style of lace on the collar and cuffs (the lace on the cap is old-fashioned, suggesting that it was made about 1640). The doublet is decorated with gold passementerie; brownish gold bows and silver aglets surround the waist. The aglets were used to lace breeches to the doublet, or were merely symbolic of boyhood, when the child had not yet graduated from skirts to pants.  

The painting was listed as an attribution to Moreelse in De Jonge’s 1938 monograph (see Refs.). Rudolf Ekkart considered the picture to be by Moreelse himself when he studied the work at the Museum in 1988. However, Eric Domela Nieuwenhuis, in his dissertation on the artist, considers the painting to be neither by Moreelse nor from his workshop, and not even from the artist’s city of Utrecht. In the present writer’s opinion,
which is shared by Ekkart,3 the picture was probably painted in Utrecht and may be from Moreelse's studio.4

The panel is unusually broad for an oval support of the 1630s. This impression, examination of the edges, and the uncomfortable truncation of the figure suggest that the work was originally rectangular.

Previously catalogued by the Museum as by Paulus Moreelse and titled Portrait of a Child.

1. The Dutch costume scholar Marieke de Winkel kindly identified all the elements of costume, in a personal communication sent under the heading, "It's a boy!" on December 21, 2006.
4. The condition of the paint layer hinders judgment of quality, but the execution of the head appears to be by a better hand than the one responsible for the flat and rather mechanical execution of the doublet, face collar, and cuffs. See Domela Nieuwenhuis in Braunschweig 2000, p. 48, on the known members of Moreelse's workshop. The artist is especially admired for his portraits of children. Perhaps the finest is the Portrait of Two Young Girls in Pastoral Dress, of 1622 (Instituut Collectie Nederland, on loan to the Centraal Museum, Utrecht; see Helmus 1999, vol. 1, pp. 147–49, and Haarlem–Antwerp 2000–2001, no. 30).

A full-length portrait of a four-year-old boy with a wolf stick is in the Michaelis Collection, Cape Town (Fransen 1997, no. 42). Other portraits of children by Moreelse are catalogued and illustrated in De Jonge 1958. See also Haarlem–Antwerp 2000–2001, on Dutch and Flemish portraits of children, where Moreelse's impressive Young Girl ("The Princess"), of about 1620 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), is discussed on pp. 127–29 (under no. 18).

REFERENCES: “Der Kunsthistoriker," Der Gartner 10 (1918), p. 260, records the painting's sale in Amsterdam (see Ex Coll.). Hirschmann 1933, p. 130 (ill. p. 131), describes the picture, "of charming naivety," as one of the Dutch portraits in the Preyer collection; Comstock 1927, p. 43 (ill. p. 43), erroneously reports that "the portrait remained in the family of the sitter until 1918 when it was purchased by A. Preyer of The Hague"; De Jonge 1938, pp. 112–13, no. 224, fig. 146, as attributed to Moreelse, datable about 1630–35, "from Castle Biljoen"; Burn 1984, p. 28 (ill.), notes the fine details and sweet expression; P. Sutton 1986, p. 184, mentioned; Baetjer 1995, p. 398, as by Moreelse.

Ex Coll.: Biljoen Castle, Velp, Gelderland (until 1918; sale, Frederik Muller, Amsterdam, May 28, 1918, no. 174, for Fl. 12,100 to Preyer); A. Preyer, The Hague (1918–at least 1926); [Knoedler, New York, 1926–at least 1927]; Alexandra (Mrs. A. L.) Sinshheimer, New York (until 1948); Bequest of Alexandrine Sinshheimer, 1958 39.23.17

1. This assumption appears to be based on the fact that in the Amsterdam sale catalogue of May 28, 1918 (see Ex Coll.), the work is listed in section I, "L'ancienne collection du Chateau de Biljoen." But this castle is not even in the Province of Utrecht, and has changed hands a number of times since 1661. Members of the Lifs family have owned the castle since 1872.
Until recently, the main source of information on Murant's life was the account in Houbraken's *Grote Schouburgh* (Great Theater) of Netherlandish painters, published in 1718–21. The details appear to have come from the artist's brother, David, and are largely consistent with newly published documentation. A literal translation reads:

Herewith Emanuel Murant, born at Amsterdam in the same Year [1622], on the 22nd of December, takes the Stage. His disposition led him to the depiction of Dutch Village and Landscape views, and in particular to the depiction of dilapidated peasant sheds and cottages, which he depicted in such a detailed way that one could count the bricks in the masonry; from which it certainly may be estimated that he did not bring a large number of Paintings into the world; considering that such a manner of painting takes a lot of time. His Brother David Murant, in Amsterdam, owns the greater part of his artworks that are in the country, for he [the painter] travelled for many Years in France and elsewhere. His art is desired especially in Friesland; where he took himself to live. He died at Leeuwarden in the Year 1700. He was a pupil of Philip Wouwerman.²

The date of Emanuel's birth must be correct, since he was baptized in the Oude Kerk, Amsterdam, three days later, on December 25, 1622.² He is documented as in Leeuwarden between July 1670 and 1680, and was still a resident there, “aged 74 years,” in 1696.³ Murant's burial is not recorded, but Houbraken's reference to the very day of his birth suggests that the report of his death in 1700 is probably reliable.

The artist's parents were Esaias Davidsz Meurant (1588–1664), of Amsterdam, and Margartha Meulemans (ca. 1593–1666 or later), of Antwerp. They married in Amsterdam on March 7, 1622. From November 1, 1628, until January 18, 1630, the couple rented a house on the Koestraat (a short street east of the Dam), which they then purchased for 2,660 guilders. The house was one of four built about 1600 by the city of Amsterdam next to the Old Side Latin School, where Esaias Meurant (as he spelled his surname) started teaching in 1622.⁴ He was also the author of several poetry collections, one of which (*De verzen van Murant*, now lost) was condemned about 1626 by Joost van den Vondel for its sympathy with the orthodox Calvinist Franciscus Gomarus.¹ This prepossession is not surprising, considering that Meurant attended the University of Geneva (Calvin's city), where he enrolled on September 9, 1614.

The artist probably attended the New Side Latin School, to which his father was transferred in 1614. Houbraken's statement that Murant studied with Philips Wouwermans (q.v.) is plausible; this must have been in the early 1640s, shortly after the slightly older Haarlem artist joined that city's guild. Murant's “many years in France and elsewhere” may tentatively be dated between about 1642 and 1648, when he is completely undocumented. On October 8, 1649, he acted as a witness for his father in Amsterdam.

The earliest known painting by Murant appears to date from 1652.⁵ About that year he was also employed by the Amsterdam Admiralty, evidently as secretary of a fleet commanded by Spieke Fockes (who was killed early in 1653). Murant refers to his experience as “onetime writer for the fleet” in the *album amicorum* of Jacob Heybiocq (1623–1690), a poet in Latin and Dutch and teaching colleague of Esaias Meurant.⁷ Emanuel contributed two drawings and four amusing lines of Latin verse to the album.

On September 4, 1664, “Emanuell Meurant of Amsterdam, age 32 years, Painter, asst. by his Father Esaias Meurant, [who] lives in the Koestraat,” married Elisabeth Aswerus [also Assuerus; ca. 1633–before 1670], 31 years, no parents, also Koestraat.” The couple had at least two children, Esaias (b. 1656) and Catharina (b. 1658), one of whom (probably the newborn) died in 1658. Murant’s wife evidently died between 1665 and 1670.

Emanuel was the oldest of six children. His brothers Vincent and David became merchants, his sisters Beatrix and Elisabeth married during the 1650s, and his sister Catharine apparently never married. Several documents suggest that Emanuel was not the most successful or responsible member of the family. This probably accounts for his leaving Amsterdam by 1665, when the inventory of his father's estate describes him as living in Naarden. His move there must be connected with the fact that his aunt Anna (Esaias Meurant's sister) lived in Naarden with her husband, Jan Marcus. However,
from no later than 1670 onward Murant lived in Leeuwarden. He married there, for a second time, on October 16, 1670, three months after he and Berberke Willems (b. 1629) posted their marriage banns. Daughters were born to the couple in 1671, 1673, and 1676.

Emanuel may have been drawn to Leeuwarden by family connections. His brother Vincent’s aunt by marriage, Catrina Valckenier, had a brother Daniel who was mintmaster of the States of Friesland, in Leeuwarden. It is also possible that Emanuel’s move to Leeuwarden had something to do with the innkeeper, art dealer, and painter Casparus Hoomis (1630–1677), who grew up on the Koestraat in Amsterdam but is recorded in Leeuwarden from 1665 until his death. When Casparus was nine, his mother married the accomplished landscape painter, topographical draftsman, and etcher Anthonie Waterloo (1609–1690). Murant would have taken an interest in Waterloo, who made large, detailed topographical views of Amsterdam sites between 1650 and 1653.

Murant’s early paintings of cottages and barns in rural landscapes are reminiscent of Wouwermans, Paulus Potter (1625–1654), and the Haarlem artists Cornelis Decker (ca. 1615–1678) and Roelof van Vries (q.v.). Works of the 1650s already reveal detailed passages of brickwork, which anticipate the more minute descriptions found in paintings such as the one discussed below and pictures by Jan van der Heyden (q.v.). The latter artist also lived on the Koestraat, but only from 1680 to 1681. Nonetheless, the painters must have been aware of each other through the Amsterdam painters’ guild and other art-world connections. It has been suggested that Murant influenced Van der Heyden’s work, which is plausible, but Van der Heyden may also have returned the favor, and other artists, for example Daniel Vosmaer (1622–1669/70) and Pieter de Hooch (q.v.), shared their interest in picturesque passages of masonry.10

2. Gemeentearchief Amsterdam, Oude Kerk, 6/36. All the details in the present biography come from the more comprehensive account of Murant’s life published in Liedtke and Bakker 2006. That article superseded and occasionally corrects the information published in Bredius 1937a. Piet Bakker combed the archives of Amsterdam on the writer’s behalf and checked details recorded in Leeuwarden.
3. Bakker transcribed the document, which is preserved in the Historisch Centrum Leeuwarden, Informatieboeken, 06, fol. 16/17, March 11, 1696. It records “Emanuel Murant, art-painter [living] on the Grachtswal outside this city, age 74 years,” as discovering the suicide of an acquaintance. Klaas Zandberg of the HCL kindly brought this document to my attention.
6. See Liedtke and Bakker 2006, fig. 1 (location unknown). The article concludes with a list of paintings by Murant in public collections. A reliable list of dated paintings is provided in Krempel 2005, p. 196 n. 2.
7. For the contributions of both Murants to Heyblocq’s album amicorum, see Thomassen and Gruys 1998, pp. 30, 117–19, 122–24.

498 EMMANUEL MURANT
127. The Old Castle

Oil on wood, 15 1/8 x 21 1/8 in. (39.7 x 53.6 cm)

The painting is in good condition, although the foreground has darkened over time, making details less distinct. Portions of the hexagonal tower are worn, and a network of fine cracks in the castle developed as the paint dried. The sky is very well preserved.

Theodore M. Davis Collection, Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, 1935 30.95.260

Although not signed, the painting is entirely consistent in execution with works by Murant that bear his usual inscription, “E.M.” Few of his pictures are dated, and his small known oeuvre allows little more than chronological conjecture. The subject, composition, and comparisons with works by other Dutch artists, especially Jan van der Heyden (q.v.), suggest a tentative dating between about 1665 and 1680.

The painting depicts part of a ruined Late Medieval castle of a type common in the Netherlands. The stair tower is crowned by a weather vane, but there are no signs of recent habitation. (Many Dutch castles were ruined in the late sixteenth century, during the war with Spain.) A farmhouse nestles near a stand of trees in the center of the composition. To the left, a woman with a large basket of washing on her head comes down a pathway. A man on the grass points in the direction of the traveler over the hill to the right. In the center foreground, a woman plays with a dog, and a boy behind her also points in the approximate direction of the wayfarer. Each male figure carries a stick. The tower of a church and a glimpse of a few other buildings appear beyond the sunlit field in the right background.

The artist has achieved a balanced composition by arranging motifs parallel to the picture plane and by using the left side of the panel like a buttress. Each section of the painting is
executed in a carefully routine manner. The clouds in the blue sky are evoked by a patchwork of impasto touches, the grass by scumbling green and brown blotches on the warm ground layer (an area crudely reminiscent of the young Jacob van Ruisdael; see Pl. 179), and the trees reveal a systematic pattern of strokes and dabs. Most remarkable—and meant to be recognized as such—is the minute description of brickwork on the castle, relieved here and there by metal braces, isolated outbreaks of foliage, and various apertures (fig. 116). Examination with a microscope reveals that all the masonry was painted freehand with a tiny brush, probably with the help of a magnifying glass. The irregular horizontal bands are hatched by vertical ticks, many of them white or white and dark gray together, which creates the impression of daylight catching the edges of bricks.

A similar painting by Murant is a view of a village bordered by a stream and pastureland, with a narrow brick house at the left. The panel, close in size to this one, was on the art market in 1968. There are a few broadly comparable compositions by Van der Heyden, for example, the undated *Houses at the Edge of a Town* (formerly Los Angeles County Museum of Art), and *A Pavilion near Gouda on the Vecht*, dated 1666 (art market, 1937). As discussed in the biography above, Murant painted impressive passages of brickwork before Van der Heyden did the same, but the meticulous degree to which he defined the masonry in the Museum's picture strikes one as a response to Van der Heyden's seemingly obsessive standard.

In more general terms, the subject does not recall works by Van der Heyden but of artists who painted picturesque fragments of medieval architecture in country settings. Jan van Goyen's *Pelkis Gate near Utrecht* (Pl. 57) and Roelof van Vries's *Pigeon House* (Pl. 21) are good examples; in the discussion of the latter painting, works by Claes Molenaer (1628/29–1676) and by Cornelis Decker (ca. 1615–1678) are also mentioned. The subject of ruins in Dutch art has recently been explored. In Murant's picture, a contemporary viewer might have discovered evidence that while man's most durable monuments pass away in time, life goes on. But the same viewer would have come to these conclusions on a walk in the country, and that common pleasure, both here and in his work overall, is Murant's essential subject.

1. Julius Bölling, Munich. The undated panel measures 16½ x 19½ inches (42.2 x 49.3 cm). A color image, clipped from an unidentified German art magazine, is in the Sperling photograph files, Department of European Paintings.
2. Wagner 1971, nos. 115, 120. The Los Angeles panel was sold at Christie's, New York, January 14, 1993, no. 46.


EX COLL.: [Durand-Ruel, Paris and New York; sold to Davis on May 6, 1892, for $600]; Theodore M. Davis, Newport, R.I. (1892–d. 1913); Theodore M. Davis Collection, Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, 195 30.55.260
Matthijs Naiveu
Leiden 1647–1726 Amsterdam

The son of a wine merchant from Rotterdam and a woman from Leiden, Naiveu was baptized in the Hooglandse Church in Leiden on April 16, 1647. Two brothers (baptized in 1649 and 1651) and evidently a daughter were also born there.

Houbreken records that Naiveu studied drawing with Abraham van Toorvenliet (ca. 1620–1692) and then painting with Gerrit Dou (q.v.). Receipts for tuition confirm that Naiveu was instructed by Dou between 1667 and 1669. In 1671, he became a member of the Guild of Saint Luke in Leiden, to which he paid dues through 1677. He was hoofdman (headman) of the guild between 1677 and 1679.

Naiveu married a widow, Agatha van Strichtenhuyse, on January 4, 1675. A son, Matheus, was baptized on October 6 of the same year, and a daughter, Susanna, on December 1, 1677. The family moved to Amsterdam in the second half of 1678 or in 1679. When Naiveu and his wife made out their will in December 1691, they were said to be living on the Prinsengracht near the Spiegelgracht.

In 1696, Naiveu was appointed inspector of hops in Amsterdam. Houbreken, writing about 1720, notes that despite this position and his advanced years, Naiveu still painted with pleasure every day. Naiveu’s wife died in 1722, and the artist died at the age of seventy-nine on June 4, 1726.

Naiveu is known for portraits and genre scenes. He also painted allegorical and religious pictures; Houbreken describes a painting of The Seven Acts of Mercy as the artist’s most important work. Naiveu’s style recalls that of Willem van Mieris (1662–1747) in its decorative details, but the dryness of his descriptive manner is generally more reminiscent of followers of Dou such as Quirijn van Brekelenkam, Pieter van Slingelandt (q.v.), and Dominicus van Tol (after 1630–1676).

A painting that is almost certainly an early self-portrait, signed and dated 1670, was recently on the market. The composition derives from the Museum’s Self-Portrait by Dou (Pl. 37) or from some closely related picture.

1. See Leiden 1988, p. 186, for a reliable biography in Dutch that cites a number of original documents. The Hooglandse Church was Dutch Reformed.
4. This date and other details, which correct earlier accounts (for example, the biography in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, p. 267), are published with documentation in Leiden 1988, p. 186.
5. Houbreken 1718–21, vol. 3, p. 228. This must be the large panel, signed and dated 1705, that was sold at Sotheby’s, London, April 10, 1986, no. 13. The tower of the Westerkerk in Amsterdam appears in the background. A few still lifes are also known (see Gemar-Koeltzsch 1995, vol. 3, p. 727).
128. *The Newborn Baby*

Oil on canvas, 25 1/2 x 31 1/2 in. (64.1 x 80 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): M. Naiveu F./1675

The painting is in good condition, although there is slight abrasion in the torsos and heads of the mother and the nurse-midwife.

Purchase, 1871 71.160

The picture celebrates the arrival of a newborn baby and was painted in 1675, the year in which the artist himself married and became a father for the first time. However, the subject was traditional and popular in the 1660s, to judge from paintings by Gabriel Metsu (Pl. 118), Jan Steen, Eglon van der Neer (q.q.v.), and others. In slightly later years, the theme flourished in art and literature, for example with paintings by Naiveu of about 1700 such as *The Lying-in Room*, in Leiden (fig. 117), and plays such as Thomas Asselijn's *Kraem-bedt* (Birthbed), of 1683. The Amsterdam genre painter Cornelis Troost (1666–1750) followed Naiveu in presenting the scene as if it were set on a stage. The present picture's composition, the more theatrical look of the painting in Leiden, and Naiveu's other representations of theatrical subjects underscore the connection with popular plays.

Compared with Metsu's description of the same social ritual—a *kraambezoek*, or "lying-in visit"—Naiveu characteristically takes a more literal approach. The convalescent mistress of the house is attended by an old nurse-midwife, who serves a bowl of porridge; it may be flavored with anise, which was thought to encourage the flow of mother's milk or to relieve cramps. A visiting lady, elegantly turned out, holds the tightly swaddled infant on her lap. A pot of hot coals has been placed in the foot warmer. The luxurious fabrics covering the wicker cradle, the table, the bed, and the mother herself were special features of a *kraamkamer*, or birthing room, which was usually set up temporarily in a town house.

The covered glass goblet on the table contains *kandeel*, a drink usually made with wine, sugar, cinnamon, and other spices. A cinnamon stick, lemon slices, and probably egg white (on the bottom) complete the concoction, which was intended for guests. On the plate is a little bowl of bread or pastry filled with *muisjes* (little mice), sugar-coated caraway seeds or cinnamon sticks made as treats for children. Another bowl of *muisjes* delights the little girl.

The Steen-like vignette in the background shows the new father smoking a pipe and celebrating with four male companions. A maid hands around another goblet of *kandeel* while the father is toasted with a glass of wine. As in Metsu's picture (Pl. 118), a large stormy seascape reminds one of life's
uncertainty. The sculpted cupid that swings aloft at top center is an uncommon motif in this context but probably refers to the newborn.

1. On Steen's *Celebrating the Birth, 1664*, in the Wallace Collection, London, see Ingamells 1992a, pp. 310–11; Wierstmann 1996, pp. 120–22, compares the Naiveu in Leiden (fig. 117 here). Van der Neer's *Visit to the Nursery*, also of 1664, is in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp. A painting of the subject by Hieronymus Jansens (1624–1691) is known from an Amsterdam sale of 1891; see Lunsingh Scheurleer 1971–72, p. 302, fig. 4b (incorrectly attributed to Gonzales Coques), and Worcester 1983–84, pp. 70, 71 n. 7, fig. 18d. Case studies of child-rearing practices in the Netherlands are considered in B. Roberts 1998.

2. See Leiden 1988, no. 58, on Naiveu's canvas in Leiden, and p. 190 n. 6 on Asselijn's play. Another painting of the subject by Naiveu, from shortly after 1700, was at Christie's, New York, January 11, 1989 (no. 31), and May 31, 1990 (no. 47).


4. As noted by the Dutch food historian Peter Rose in Albany 2002, p. 94.

5. Lunsingh Scheurleer 1971–72, pp. 315, 318, fig. 14, discusses the swaddling clothes of the time and illustrates an anonymous painting of 1621 depicting quadruplets, three of whom survived and are bundled up in the same way.


7. Peter Rose first described these details in a visit to the Museum in 1993, and treats them more fully in Albany 2002 (under nos. 33 and 40). On the rusklike bowl of bread, which is variously known as a *kindermaanstok*, *kindermaanstuk*, or *kottinnheckeen*, see Schotel 1868, pp. 29–30, and Albany 2002, p. 94.

8. See Schotel 1868, p. 27, on the customary drinks.


10. Barnes in Albany 2002, p. 94, states that the Cupid signifies "that this child was conceived in love." The sentiment is modern and finds little support in seventeenth-century sources. The figure recalls Hansje in de Kelder (Little Hans in the Cellar), who occasionally took the form of a little Cupid (see Lunsingh Scheurleer 1971–72, pp. 208–209, figs. 1–3). Silver and porcelain cups that are known by this name have a miniature figure inside a central stem or mound, the "cellar." When the cup is filled with wine the figure pops up, which in the proper context stands for the birth of a child. Cupids also occur as helmsten on little ships, a motif that was engraved on glass goblets meant to celebrate childbirth (ibid., p. 101). Some examples are inscribed with the saying, "Het wel afloopen van het Scheepje," meaning "[Here's to] a good start for the little ship." The term *scheepje* relates to the seascape as a symbol for the course of life.

REFERENCES: MMA 1872, no. 102, as *The Invalid*, P. Sutton 1986, p. 188, mentioned; Leiden 1988, pp. 72, 190, fig. 64, compares the Museum's picture with an illustration in an instruction book for midwives published in 1591; Baetjer 1993, p. 342; Gaskell 2000, p. 242 n. 31, compares the Cupid motif with its use by Vermeer; Barnes and Rose in Albany 2002, p. 94, describe the subject and various motifs; Baetjer 2004, p. 208, no. 102, gives provenance; Frantis 2004, pp. 233, 298 n. 62, fig. 215, observes that the picture dates from 1675, "the year of the artist's own marriage and of the birth of his first child."


EX COLL.: [Léon Gauchez, Paris, with Alexis Febvre, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.160
AERT VAN DER NEER

Gorinchem 1603/4–1677 Amsterdam

The landscape painter Aert (Aenout) van der Neer was probably born in or near Gorinchem in 1603 or 1604.¹ He was the son of Egerom (or Igrom) Aertsz van der Neer, a major (steward or estate manager) at Fort Suikerberg in Klundert (North Brabant), and his wife, Aeltje Jansdr (they married on December 29, 1602). According to Arnold Houbraken, the artist also served as a major in his youth, for the lords of Arkel, who had an estate in the village of Arkel just north of Gorinchem.² The city (also called Gorkum or Gorkum; see Pl. 18) is on the river Waal, to the east of Rotterdam and south of Utrecht.

It is not known where or when Van der Neer trained as an artist. However, his certificate of marriage, issued on March 16, 1629, in Amsterdam, describes him as a “painter, 25 years old.” Two weeks later, he married the twenty-year-old Lijsbeth Govaertsdr, of Bergen op Zoom.³ The ceremony took place in the Nieuwe Kerk, where the Reformed couple’s sons Pieter (1640–before 1648) and Pieter II (1648–before 1683) and daughters Cornelia (1642–1683) and Lijsbeth (1645–before 1675) would later be baptized.⁴ The birth dates of two other sons, Eglon (q.v.) and Johannes (1637/8–1665), are not recorded. Johannes is known as his father’s assistant and imitator. Eglon van der Neer (q.v.) enjoyed great success as a genre painter.

Van der Neer was strongly influenced by the work of two landscapists from Gorinchem, the brothers Rafael Goevertsz Camphuysen (1598 or 1626–1657) and Jochem Goevertsz Campshuysen (1601–1659).⁵ Jochem moved to Amsterdam around 1621 and Rafael about a year later.⁶ Van der Neer and Jochem collaborated on a landscape painting dated 1633.⁷

As one might expect of an artist who moved from a small city to Amsterdam, Van der Neer gleaned ideas from a variety of sources. The influence of the Flemish immigrant Alexander Keirincx (1600–1652) is evident in his work of about 1635, while Gillis van Coninxloo (1544–bfr. Jan. 4, 1607), Roelant Savery (1576–1639), and Gillis d’Homecoeter (ca. 1580–1638) have also been cited in connection with the painter’s early style.⁸ His trees, often shaped like broccoli en branches, and his tunnel-like recessions derive from the Flemish tradition of these artists, all of whom worked at some time in Amsterdam,⁹ inspiring Van der Neer’s eclecticism and turning his eye to the picturesque.¹⁰

Van der Neer’s more empirical interests, by contrast, depended upon the pioneering efforts of Dutch painters and printmakers such as Willem Buytewech (1591/92–1624) and Esaias van de Velde (1587–1630; see the discussion under The Farrier, Pl. 129), and upon his own considerable powers of observation. Haarlem painters such as Van de Velde, Jan van Goyen, and Pieter de Molijn (q.v.) provided examples of compositional schemes and subjects such as river, winter, and nocturnal views.¹¹ Van der Neer himself must be credited with the naturalistic qualities of light, color, and atmosphere, and with the panoramic sweeps of space (enhanced by curved horizons), that lend his paintings their distinctive and sometimes experimental appearance.

In the painter’s later years, poverty went hand in hand with low prices, high volume, repetition, and diminished quality. Van der Neer was cited as a taverner on the Kalverstraat in 1639 and in 1662. Late in 1662, he went bankrupt and became a widower. From then on he lived and worked in a state of considerable hardship, until his death on November 9, 1677.

1. See Bredius 1900, p. 71. The most reliable biography is found in Schulz 2002, pp. 9–15, where it is said that “later documents allow us to establish with some certainty” that the artist was born in 1604 (p. 9). However, a birth date in the last quarter of 1603 would also be consistent with those documents (he was twenty-five in March 1629, and forty-three in July 1647; ibid., pp. 10, 11), and with the marriage of Van der Neer’s parents at the very end of 1602.
3. See Schulz 2002, pp. 10, 21, which corrects the present writer’s suggestion (in New York 1985–86, p. 255) that she was probably the sister of the Gorinchem landscapists Rafael Govertsz and Jochem Govertsz Campshuysen.
129. The Farrier

Oil on wood, 19 x 24½ in. (48.3 x 61.3 cm)
Signed (lower left): AV DN [AV and DN in monogram]
The painting has suffered slight abrasion overall.
Purchase, 1871 71.60

This dark painting represents a blacksmith's shop at the edge of a river, with a wooded area at the opposite side. The moon is low in the sky, which is brighter above; it must be late in the day. The smithy hammers at an anvil next to a flaming forge. A horse stands in an exterior stall, where a man, presumably the horse's owner, seems to huddle in the cool evening air. To the right, a man and two boys warm themselves by a blazing fire. Logs lie side by side in the foreground; the large basket nearby may have been used to gather kindling.

Nocturnal landscapes were a popular subject of Dutch painters and printmakers from about 1620 onward, and were inspired in part by the well-known engravings of Hendrick Goudt (1583–1648) after Adam Elsheimer (1578–1610).¹ The Flight into Egypt, Goudt's print dated 1613, anticipates this and similar paintings by Van der Neer in its virtuoso study of various light sources, including the moon and a campfire.²

Nocturnes were depicted only occasionally between 1620 and about 1645, by painters such as Esaias van de Velde (1587–1630) and Pieter de Molijn (q.v.).³ The works of these and other Haarlem artists, which include the influential engraving Ignis (Fire), by Jan van de Velde (1593–1641) after Willem Buytewech (1591/92–1624),⁴ are often remarkable for their observation of unusual light effects, and seem free of obvious schematization (unlike nocturnal compositions by Caravagesque contemporaries). In the 1640s, night scenes in both interior and exterior settings flourished in such different fields as religious paintings, architectural views, and landscapes.⁵ Among the most familiar examples in Van der Neer's field are works by Jan Asselijn (ca. or after 1610–1652), Nicolas Berchem, Jan van Goyen, and Rembrandt (q.q.v.).⁶

Most Dutch nocturnes were painted in the area of Haarlem and Amsterdam, and it was in the latter city that Van der Neer and Rafael Gouwertsz Camphuysen (1598 or 1606–1657) each produced a series of moonlit landscapes during the second half of the 1640s and later.⁷ There is evidence that Camphuysen

painted this kind of picture some years earlier than Van der Neer, but the two artists appear to have had a reciprocal relationship around midcentury, with Van der Neer devoting far more time to night scenes. His nocturnes are also much subtler in their observation of light effects and in the use of light and shade to create an expansive sense of space. In this regard, Van der Neer seems very much a painter of the 1660s and a contemporary of Pieter de Hooch, Emanuel de Witte, and Aelbert Cuyp (q.v.).

Van der Neer painted more than a hundred night scenes, about two dozen of them with burning buildings or villages. The motifs vary greatly, and none of the other known pictures closely resembles the present one. In both subject and scale, the smithy is exceptional in Van der Neer's oeuvre, and pertinent reveal that the structure was considerably modified in the course of work. Other Dutch artists painted farrier's shops at about the same time (for example, Paulus Potter's panel of 1648; fig. 118), but few of them reveal a comparable interest in effects of light.  

Schulz (see Refs.) dates the Museum's painting to the early 1650s. The work is clearly mature; the comparatively broad handling of the trees and sky differs from the more conventionalized description found in most works of the 1640s. At the same time, the quality of execution and structured design of the picture would dissuade one from placing it about 1660 or later. The work probably dates from the early to mid-1650s.

2. Boston–Saint Louis 1980–81, no. 44; Stechow 1966, chap. 10 on "Nocturnes," and fig. 345 for Goudt's print. The composition is similar to that of The Farrier in the area of the river and trees.
5. See Milwaukee 1992–93 for examples by Leonaert Bramer and others. Liedtke 1982a, figs. 109 and 110, for nocturnal church interiors by Anthony de Lorme (ca. 1610–1673) and Daniel de Blecic (ca. 1630–1673).
8. See Bachmann 1980, p. 34, and Bachmann 1982, p. 82.

REFERENCES: MMA 1872, no. 156, as "from the collection of the Marquis Maison"; Harck 1888, p. 76, as a good, signed example; Valentiner in New York 1909, no. 67 (ill.), describes the subject; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 7 (1921), p. 385, no. 244, as Moonlit Landscape with a Smithy, describes the scene in some detail; New York 1934, p. 16, no. 21, comments on the muted tonality; New York 1973, p. 11, no. 24, as datable to about 1660; Baelert 1995a, p. 310; Schulz 2002, pp. 22, 242, no. 446, pl. 169, as Forge on a Forest Edge by Moonlight, dating from about 1650 or the early 1650s; Baelert 2004, p. 220, no. 156, gives provenance.


EX COLL.: Marquis Maison (not in his estate sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, June 10–12, 1869); [Léon Gauchez, Paris, with Alexis F黏vre, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.60
130. Landscape at Sunset

Oil on canvas, 20 x 28½ in. (50.8 x 71.4 cm)
Signed (lower center): AV DN [AV and DN in monogram]

Slight abrasion throughout the paint surface is most apparent in the deep brown passages of the foreground and the trees in the middle ground at left.

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.190.11

This colorful canvas from the collection of J. Pierpont Morgan represents a river at sunset, with boats, cows, and travelers enlivening the landscape. A village with a church appears on the left, while farmhouses and a tower are visible in the right background. A sailboat full of people and a barge full of cows move over the still surface of the water. The dead tree on the right frames the view and carries the eye up to the brilliantly colored clouds. In this wide panorama, the river seems not only to recede but also to flow forward and out of the composition to the right. As in similar works by the artist, the picture includes motifs that bring the eye back to the center, to the gently curved horizon, and to the frequent discovery of picturesque or painterly effects.

Van der Neer’s optical interests are strikingly evident in the sky and less assertively so in the water. The dark vertical strokes next to the boat by the shoreline, the reflections by the boats on the right, and the transition from a shadowy to a shiny surface in the river are instances of Van der Neer’s understated sensitivity to observed and aesthetic effects.

As Schulz maintains, these qualities support a later dating than that suggested in earlier literature (see Refs.). Van der Neer’s sunset scenes and other landscapes of the 1640s are by comparison almost naïve in their treatment of light, space, and certain motifs, such as trees. The standardized foliage of the trees to the left in the Museum’s picture also occurs in paintings by the artist dating from midcentury, but these works already reveal the special interest in light effects that comes to fruition here. River views of approximately this composition
are common in the early 1650s and often feature beautiful skies. A variety of stylistic considerations incline the present writer to favor a dating in the 1650s rather than the early 1660s, as Schulz tentatively suggests.

It has been observed that a drawing in the Albertina, Vienna, corresponds closely in design if not motifs to the left three-quarters of the present composition. The sheet may be regarded as another invention of the 1650s that demonstrates Van der Neer's gift for recycling ideas.

Formerly titled by the Museum Landscape.

1. Compare Bachmann 1982, figs. 60 (dated 1647), 65–69, 70, 71 (1653), 72–76. The remark in Schulz 2002, p. 241 (under no. 445), to the effect that the present writer “recently dated the work around 1650/3,” refers to an earlier draft of this entry.

REFERENCES: Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 7 (1923), p. 345, no. 62, as from the Morgan collection and on loan to the MMA since 1911; Dickey in Hamilton–Rochester–Amarillo 1983, pp. 22–23, no. 6 (ill.), as probably dating from the 1640s; New York 1985, no. 8 (ill.), as probably from the 1640s; Baetjer 1995, p. 210; Schulz 2002, pp. 421–42, no. 445, pl. 211, pl. 61, as “possibly created in the early sixties,” and as in a “mediocre state of preservation” (compare the condition report above).


EX COLL.: [Duveen, Paris, London, and New York, until 1907; sold for £9,500 to Morgan]; J. Pierpont Morgan, New York (1907–d. 1913; his estate, 1913–17); Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.190.11

131. Sports on a Frozen River

Oil on wood, 9¾ x 13¼ in. (24.2 x 34.9 cm)
Signed (lower left): Av[D]N [Av and DN in monogram]
The painting has suffered extensive abrasion.
The friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.11

The small, delicately painted panel in the Friedsam Collection is a mature example of Van der Neer's ice-skating scenes, and probably dates from about 1660.

In this luminous picture, the sun sets over one of Holland's inland waterways. The icy landscape is described mostly in tones of rose and gray. Houses crowd the shoreline at either side. The towers of two village churches mark the recession on the left, which terminates at an overscaled windmill. A small sailboat is moored by the simple, snow-traced crane at the left edge of the composition. A few of the scattered skaters practice their game of colf.

The great majority of Van der Neer's wintersjies (little winter scenes), which number more than two hundred, depict figures on a frozen river or canal. These mostly panoramic compositions are structured by receding riverbanks and vertical accents, and in general recall the designs of Hendrick Avercamp (1616–1634) rather than those of the younger painters who were active in the area of Haarlem and Amsterdam. This conservatism is a legacy of Van der Neer's training in Gorinchem (see the biography above), which did not, however, discourage his describing optical effects such as the sun's reflection, shadows cast by boats, and the sense of light and space infusing cloudy skies. Especially impressive in this picture is the way in which the brilliance of the sunset is diffused throughout the landscape. These qualities may be considered the artist's main concern, whereas predecessors such as Avercamp usually concentrated on the figures. For Van der Neer, humanity seems to represent not so much society as another aspect of nature.

Some of the painter's winter scenes of the 1640s are dated, but very few later examples are inscribed with a year. The undated examples are difficult to place chronologically; they reveal a remarkable lack of repetition, and pentimenti suggesting much invention ad libitum. The present picture, however, is consistent in style with a group of small skating scenes that date from the late 1650s and early 1660s.
1. The game is not *kolf*, as is often said in connection with similar scenes (e.g., in *Los Angeles–Boston–New York* 1981–82, p. 70, in regard to Van der Neer’s painting of about the same date in the Carter collection). *Calf* resembled golf, not ice hockey, in that the goal was to hit a ball at a small target. The game was played on land (mowed greens and holes were used as early as 1500) and, in winter, on the ice. For a history of the game, the *calf–kolf* distinction, and a variety of examples in Dutch art, see *Bergen op Zoom* and other cities 1982.

2. On winter scenes in Dutch art, see Stechow 1966, chap. 11, figs. 162–96; *Van Straaten* 1977b; Schulz 2002, pp. 66–81; and various entries in *Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia* 1987–88, e.g., nos. 5–7 (Hendrick Avercamp), 18 (Jan van de Cappelle), 60, 61 (Van der Neer), 77 (Rembrandt), 95 (Salomon van Ruysdael), 104 (Adriaen van de Velde), 107 (Esaias van de Velde), 109 (Adriaen van de Venne), and 111 (David Vinckboons). A good survey of skating in Dutch art is sketched by Laurinda Dixon in *Cincinnati* 1987.

3. On this point, see *De Bruyn Kops* in *Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia* 1987–88, p. 385. On Avercamp, see C. Wecker 1979, where the ice scene that seems to look forward to Van der Neer more than any other (no. 565, pl. IV A, a canvas in the New-York Historical Society) is not by Avercamp.

4. See Schulz 2002, pls. 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, winter scenes bearing dates in the 1640s, and pl. 50 (1663), passim.


EX COLL.: Possibly P. Calkoen sale, Amsterdam, September 10, 1781, no. 99, for fl 61 (see Refs.); possibly Jan Danser Nijman (see Refs.); Sir A. Robertson, Chatham, England (see Refs.); [Kleinberger Galleries, New York (according to a note in the curatorial files)]; Michael Friedsam, New York (by 1917–1931); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.11
EGLON VAN DER NEER

Amsterdam 1633/36–1703 Düsseldorf

This polished painter of genre scenes, who is also known for portraits and for classical landscapes with biblical or mythological figures, was the son of the landscapist Aert van der Neer (q.v.). According to Houbraken, Eglon Hendrick van der Neer was born in Amsterdam in 1633 and died in May 1703, having painted until his seventieth year. From this inconsistency (if Houbraken’s dates were correct, the artist would have died in his sixtieth year) and other evidence (on January 7, 1662, the artist gave his age as twenty-six), it has been concluded that Van der Neer was born in 1634 or 1635/36, not about nine years later.¹

Because he wanted to paint figures, Houbraken explains, Van der Neer turned from his father’s tutelage to that of Jacob van Loo (1614–1670), who at the time (ca. 1651–52) was a successful portraitist and genre painter in Amsterdam. Van der Neer then went to southern France and was supported by Count Friedrich van Dohna, the Dutch governor of the principality of Orange from about 1655 to 1658. He returned to the Netherlands before his marriage in Rotterdam on February 20, 1659, to Maria Wagensvelt, daughter of a secretary at the judicial court of Schieland in Schiedam. Houbraken says that this union brought the artist lots of money and sixteen children (the first of whom was baptized in Amsterdam on February 15, 1660), but that he lost much of his wealth in lawsuits.²

Van der Neer is recorded in Rotterdam between 1663 and 1678, although he also did business in Amsterdam and The Hague. He joined Pictura, the painters’ confraternity of The Hague, in 1670. In December 1677, his wife died in childbirth. Van der Neer moved to Brussels by January 1679, and in 1681 he married the miniaturist Marie Du Chastel (1632–1692), daughter of the portrait and genre painter François Du Chastel (1623–1694).³ Houbraken mentions nine children from this marriage, of whom six are recorded in documents. The biographer also states that Van der Neer’s second wife died in Brussels, where, sick in bed, she made out a will in July 1692.⁴ In 1697, Van der Neer married for a third time, in Düsseldorf, where he remained until his death on March 3, 1703. His last bride was the forty-one-year-old portraitist Adriana Spilberg (1656–after 1721), daughter of the painter Johannes Spilberg (1619–1690).⁵ It is not known when Van der Neer settled in Düsseldorf; he appears to have remained in Brussels for some time after his second wife’s death. His appointment as court painter to Charles II of Spain, in July 1687, evidently did not necessitate his leaving Brussels.⁶

Van der Neer’s patrons and the time-consuming refinements of his most impressive pictures (for example, the Liechtenstein panel of 1665; fig. 120) are among the many indications of his considerable success. His self-portrait of 1666 (Uffizi, Florence), which was sent to Cosimo III de’ Medici, shows the artist in a fashionable wig and costume, with the gold chain and medallion of the grand duke’s son-in-law Johann Wilhelm, and with one of his own classical landscapes.⁷

Dated works by Van der Neer are known from most years between 1662 and 1702. As a genre painter, he was strongly influenced by Gerard ter Borch (q.v.), and he obviously admired the work of Gabriël Metsu and Frans van Mieris (q.q.v.).⁸ Houbraken reports that a painting by Van Mieris was borrowed by Van der Neer so that his pupil, Adriaen van der Werff (1659–1722), could copy it (this he did well enough to deceive several Leiden connoisseurs).⁹ Van der Werff is the only pupil mentioned by Houbraken. He is thought to have studied with Van der Neer in Rotterdam about 1671–76.¹⁰

1. See Prins 2000, p. 205. Eddy Schavemaker, the author of a doctoral dissertation on Eglon van der Neer (Utrecht, 1999), kindly sent me a copy of Prins’s article, and offered a number of helpful comments.
2. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 3, pp. 172–73. See Prins 2000, p. 206, where it is noted that only eleven children can be traced in known documents. Van der Neer’s family was Reformed, and his wife’s Lutheran, but their children were baptized as Remonstrants (Prins 2000, p. 207).
3. For a miniature portrait by Marie Du Chastel, of about 1690, of Amalia van Anhalt-Dessau (1666–1726), wife of Hendrik Casimir II, prince of Nassau-Dietz, see Van Thiel et al. 1976, p. 754. The Du Chastels were Catholic, and Van der Neer converted to their religion (see Prins 2000, p. 207).
5. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 3, p. 46, records that Adriana Spilberg was previously married to the painter Willem Breekvelt (1658–1687). The year of her birth is often given as 1652, but Prins 2000, p. 212, corrects the date to 1656. On Spilberg, a Düsseldorf native who studied with Govert Flinck (q.v.) in Amster-
dam, see The Hague 1992a, pp. 287–92. Further literature on
Van der Neer’s contact with the Elector is cited by Schavemaker
tions the picture in passing, and in vol. 3, p. 313, cites the artist
as “the excellent painter of small landscapes.” See his Tobias and
the Angel, 1690, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
64–65, 67–68.

132. The Reader

Oil on canvas, 15 x 11 in. (38.1 x 27.9 cm)
Inscribed (lower right): GTN [in monogram]
The painting is well preserved.
The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931
32.100.9

From its first known appearance in a Rotterdam sale of 1750
until its bequest to the Museum in the Friedsam Collection
(1931), this painting was considered to be by Gerard ter Borch
(q.v.) and the awkward monogram was not questioned. F.
Schmidt-Degener, on a visit to the Museum in 1935, suggested
an attribution to Eglon van der Neer, but later in the same year
curator Harry Wehle catalogued the canvas as by an “Imitator of
Ter Borch, 17th century.” Another curator, Elizabeth Gardner,
accepted the attribution to Van der Neer in 1949. His author-
ship has been challenged occasionally, for example by A. B. de
Vries, who in 1952 considered the picture to be a copy or “com-
pletion” after Ter Borch, possibly of a later date.1 However,
the present writer and other scholars concur with Gudlaugsson’s
conclusion that “the execution points decisively to Eglon van
der Neer,” and that the work, while clearly inspired by Ter
Borch, does not necessarily record a lost composition by him.2

Gudlaugsson observed that motifs in the present picture,
such as the inkwell, the table, and the door in the background,
differ from the precise forms that Ter Borch usually employed.
Naumann describes the “tight, boxy” arrangement of the com-
position as typical of Van der Neer.3 Ter Borch’s genre scenes
of the 1650s reveal nothing quite like the architectonic design
of this composition; his slightly angled furniture and more
atmospheric spaces, relaxed postures, textured materials, and
convincingly thoughtful expressions all contribute to a sense of
naturalism that is quite distinct in style from Van der Neer’s
work in the same vein.4

Whatever the connection with Ter Borch, his former pupil
Caspar Netscher (q.v.) may have served as an intermediary.
The most comparable pictures by Ter Borch were painted
when Netscher was in his Deventer studio. Van der Neer may
have known a few of Netscher’s versions of Ter Borch com-
positions, or some similar inventions by Netscher dating from
the early 1660s.5

In 1665, Van der Neer painted two pictures that are closely
related to this one. Execution in the mid- rather than early
1660s is consistent with their more elaborate motifs (including
costlier costumes), more refined technique, and greater dis-
tance from Ter Borch. One of the paintings, signed and dated
1665 (fig. 119), on a canvas of about the same size as the
Museum’s picture but with rounded corners at the top, depicts
a very similar woman in slightly more fashionable attire.6 She
gestures to the open book in front of her. The writing set and
candlestick on the table in the New York painting have been
replaced by a silver box and brush, a fancy knife or letter
opener, and a mirror in a gold frame. A tapestry in the back-
ground represents an apparently wounded man, perhaps
Adonis. In the other painting dated 1665 (fig. 120), evidently
the same woman as the one in the Friedsam canvas appears
with her head uncovered, an exceedingly stylish dress, and a
pearl necklace and bracelet as well as earrings.7 She holds not a
book but a plate of oysters, and the objects on the table (a
wineglass and pitcher on a silver tray) similarly suggest elegant
entertainment rather than reading, writing, or vanity. The cov-
ering pushed to the back of the table has evolved from the
brown material (velvet?) in the Museum’s painting and the
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satin or silk in the second picture to a Persian carpet. The woman’s eyes seem more focused now that her thoughts have turned from literature to an offstage or imaginary companion.

Whether the woman in the Museum’s picture pauses in her reading in order to reflect or because of some distraction is difficult to say. The theme of interrupted reading was already well established; the main point is usually that the figure is absorbed in thought, which suggests a degree of cultivation. In contrast to the books in Titian’s Empress Isabella (Prado, Madrid) and Anthony van Dyck’s Portrait of a Woman, called the Marchesa Durazzo (MMA), those in the present painting and the version dated 1665 (fig. 119) are obviously secular. The silver writing set (with a piece of sealing wax) is another sign of literacy raised to the level of social grace. The extinguished candle may be regarded as a conventional vanitas symbol, as is the mirror in the other painting with a book. It seems likely that virtue is implied by the act of reading, especially if the illustrated volumes are meant as emblem books or as one of the edifying treatises by Jacob Cats. In the paintings dated 1665, however, virtue seems suggested in the one for form’s sake and in the other not at all.

1. A. B. de Vries, oral opinion, February 1952. The note in the curatorial files makes it clear that De Vries was focused on the question of whether or not the painting is by Ter Borch. J. G. van Gelder, oral opinion, February 1954, suggested calling the picture a copy after Ter Borch rather than a work by Van der Neer; and Daan Cevat, on a visit to the Museum in January 1966, pronounced the picture a copy after Ter Borch of the mid-eighteenth century.

2. Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 2, p. 161 (under no. 147b). Otto Naumann, who had been preparing a book on Eglon van der Neer, discussed the painting with the writer in 1996. He believes emphatically that it is an early work by the artist, probably of about 1662-64. H. Gerson, oral opinion (n.d.; 1960s?) also accepted the Museum’s attribution to Van der Neer.

3. See the preceding note. In addition to the works by Van der Neer discussed below, compare also A Lady Drawing, of about 1664/65, in the Wallace Collection, London (Ingamells 1992b, pp. 239–18).


5. See Wieseman 2002b, pp. 53–58.

6. The painting was with Richard Green, London, in the late 1970s. It appears to be identical with the picture cited by Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 2, p. 161 (under no. 147; pl. XVI, fig. 3).
as in the N. M. Matthews sale in New York (American Art Association), February 17–18, 1914, no. 90; as later with Knoedler, New York; and as not in Hofstede de Groot. However, it is cited as Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 5, p. 488, no. 47; the nineteenth-century English provenance given there was correctly combined by Green with references to Nicholas M. Matthews of Baltimore and the estate of Mrs. Charles Hentschel (sale, Sotheby Parke Bernert, New York, January 22–23, 1976, no. 22). See also P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, pp. LVIII, LXVI n. 127, fig. 110.


8. On the Titian and the Van Dyck, see Liedtke 1984a, pp. 34–56, pl. 25, fig. 10.


REFERENCES: Hocquart 1732–70, vol. 1 (1732), p. 238, no. 83, and p. 459, no. 10, as by Ter Borch, in the 1730 Van Bélé and 1736 de Neuville sales; Bode 1913, unpagd, pl. 20, as by Ter Borch; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1913), p. 40, no. 103, as by Ter Borch, with extensive provenance; Valentine 1929a, p. 15, as by Ter Borch; B. Burroughs and Wehle 1932, p. 48, no. 81, as by Ter Borch, signed G T B; Gudlaugsson 1950–60, vol. 1, p. 304, fig. 147b, vol. 2, p. 161, no. 147b, rejects the monogram, considers the execution typical of Eglon van der Neer, and dismisses the idea that the painting could come from Ter Borch’s studio on the basis of motifs; Liedtke in New York 1985–86, p. 272 (under no. 174; fig. 120 here), defends the attribution to Van der Neer, but considers the picture a copy of a lost painting by Ter Borch; D. Smith 1987, p. 418 n. 45, suggests that the painting, even “though not a portrait, seems entirely innocent in meaning”; Hecht in Amsterdam 1989–90, p. 130, fig. 25c (under no. 21), relates the picture, which he considers “anonymous,” to the Liechtenstein panel; Schenkeveld 1991, dust jacket and p. iv (ill.); Ingamells 1992a, p. 237 (under no. 234), compares A Lady Drawing by Eglen van der Neer in the Wallace Collection to the Museum’s picture, which is mistakenly said to be dated 1665; Werche in Frankfurt 1993–94, pp. 236–27, no. 60 (ill.), suggests that the book may be an emblem book, compares works by Ter Borch, and suggests a date of about 1665; Baeijer 1995, p. 339; Luijten in Amsterdam 1997a, pp. 304–1, fig. 6, as an “anonymous canvas” attributed to Eglin van der Neer, cites the work as a rare example of a Dutch painting depicting someone reading for pleasure; Frantis 2004, p. 360 n. 39, calls the picture “a possible copy by van der Neer after a ter Borch painting.”


EX COLL.: Josua van Belle (until 1730; his sale, Rotterdam, September 6, 1730, no. 83, for fl. 32); Robbert de Neufville (until 1756; his sale, Leiden, March 15, 1756, no. 10, for fl. 38); [possibly J. Wijtsman et al. sale, Amsterdam, November 24, 1828, no. 172]; [J. Bloedel, Utrecht; sale, Utrecht, May 6, 1839, no. 342, for fl 2,000 to Engelberts]; Messchert van Vollenhoven (until 1892; sale, Amsterdam, March 29, 1893, no. 4, for fl 4,300); [Sedelmeyer, Paris, in 1898; cat., 1898, no. 217 (ill.), as “Lecture interrompue,” by Ter Borch]; Max Wassermann, Paris (in 1898); [Kleinberger, Paris, in 1910]; August de Ridder, Schönberg, near Kronberg im Taunus (until d. 1911; on loan to the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt am Main, in 1913; sale of his sequestered property, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, June 2, 1924, no. 82, for FF 128,000); Michael Friedsam, New York; The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.9

516 EGLON VAN DER NEER
Although famous in his day, this painter of sophisticated genre scenes and fashionable portraits can barely be traced before 1662, when he joined the confraternity Pictura in The Hague. Houbraken gives his birthplace as "Heydelberg, in 't jaar 1639," and records that the artist's parents were Johannes Netscher, a stone sculptor originally from Stuttgart, and Elizabeth Vetter, daughter of a Heidelberg burgomaster. Widowed, the mother, three sons, and a daughter were driven by the Thirty Years' War to a besieged castle (where the two older sons died of starvation), and then to Arnhem, when Netscher was about two years old. A wealthy member of the Tulleken family (which filled many civic offices in Arnhem) later sent the boy to Latin school, where, in Houbraken's words, he "covered every piece of paper he could come by with figures and animals." Caspar was then placed with "the painter Koster," namely Hendrick Coster (act. in Arnhem 1642–59), who is known for Caravaggesque genre subjects, still lifes, and portraits such as the Portrait of a Woman, signed "H Coster, fec./In Arnhem/Ao. 1642" in the Museum Breëius, The Hague. "After that [Netscher was sent to study] with Gerard Terburgh, painter and burgomaster of Deventer, through the [connection made by] Mr. Wynants [Willem?] Everswijn, who was a cousin of Terburgh." Houbraken's detailed description of Netscher's earliest years has recently been disputed, and an obscure "Johannes Nescher, painter," proposed as the artist's father, but no concrete evidence conflicts with the biographer's account.

Netscher most likely worked with Gerard Ter Borch (qv.) in Deventer from about 1654 until 1658 or 1659. He produced copies of paintings by his master, some of which are signed and even dated (for example, the copy signed "C. Netscher fecit 1653," in Schloss Friedenstein, Gotha, after Ter Borch's Parental Admonition, in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin). Small pendant portraits of a man and woman, signed and dated 1656 (private collection, The Hague), are independent works by Netscher, but derive from Ter Borch's Everwijn portraits of about 1653 (private collection, New York). The fact that Netscher signed these appealing portraits and some copies after Ter Borch suggests that the master allowed the pupil an unusual degree of independence. Ter Borch also employed Netscher as a model, most notably as the suitor in *The Suitor's Visit*, of about 1658 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.).

In 1658 or 1659, Netscher (probably encouraged by the well-traveled Ter Borch) sailed for Italy, but disembarked at Bordeaux and married there on November 23, 1659. His wife, Margaretha Godijn, was the daughter of an engineer from Liège. A son, Theodoor (1661–1728), was born in Bordeaux and later became his father's collaborator and then an independent painter. In 1662, the family moved to The Hague, where Netscher was recorded nearly every year until his death on January 15, 1684. He became a citizen of the city and joined one of the civic guard companies in 1668. The Netschers had eleven more children between 1663 and 1679, nine of whom lived to adulthood. Constantijn (1668–1733) succeeded his father as a portraitist in The Hague.

Houbraken reports that Netscher, who died in his early forties, suffered from gout and other illnesses. Nonetheless, he was a prolific painter and draftsman, and also an art dealer. He was visited by collectors such as Pieter Teding van Berckhout and Cosimo III de'Medici. In 1668, Cosimo III bought four paintings, one of which is the portrait of the artist with his wife and two sons, dated 1664, in the Uffizi, Florence.

From 1662 to about 1664, Netscher painted genre scenes that are both original and impressively reminiscent of Ter Borch, such as the *Chaff Cutter with a Woman Spinning and a Young Boy* (John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art), and the celebrated *Lace Maker*, of 1662 (not 1664; Wallace Collection, London). About 1665, Netscher turned to scenes of stylish social life, such as the *Musical Company*, dated 1665 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), and the painting discussed below. At the same time, his technique and palette became more arbitrarily refined, with an emphasis on fancy fabrics that recalls works by Frans van Mieris (qv.). Netscher's oeuvre dating from about 1667 onward is composed mostly of elegant portraits in a manner reminiscent of Adriaen Hanneman (qv.) and Jan Miijten (ca. 1614–1670), and of contemporary works by Nicolaes Maes (see Pls. 113, 114). In routine examples, Netscher's participation was often limited to the heads, with the rest left to his sons or other members of his studio. All of his paintings, which include some history pictures, are com-
paratively modest in size. Netscher is considered a key figure in bringing an international style (often described as French, but in good part Flemish) to the northern Netherlands, which was elaborated by younger artists such as Adriaen van der Werff (1659–1722).16


5. Wieseman (2002, pp. 23–24) tentatively advances the figure of Johannes Nescher, a painter who was betrothed in Amsterdam in 1632. As Wieseman notes, Houbraken’s account cannot be supported by known documents, but the records of the Reformed Church in Heidelberg were destroyed in 1693, and students of the Latin school in Arnhem are listed only from 1665 onward (ibid., p. 24 n. 7, 11). Bredius (1887, p. 264) considered Houbraken “very well informed” about Netscher, partly on the basis of corresponding documents, such as “een boekje daerin C. NETSCHER heeft geteijjcket tot Arnhem sijnde,” which was in his widow’s estate (ibid., p. 273; Wieseman 2002, pp. 24 n. 9, 143 [under doc. 99, item 1]). The surname “Netscher,” which the painter used on his earliest pictures, and versions of the name are common in northern Germany (Wieseman 2002, p. 23 n. 3, mentions a “Philipp Netscher, steinhauer,” who married in Heidelberg in 1610). It seems highly unlikely that “Johannes Nescher, painter,” had he actually been Caspar Netscher’s father, would have escaped the attention of Houbraken and Van Gloot. The latter (Van Gloot 1702–31, vol. 1, pp. 567–70) claims to have received his information from Netscher’s son Theodoor, who, with his brother Constantin, was Van Gloot’s main concern. On this author’s reliability and art criticism, see L. de Vries 1983. I am grateful to Dr. Wieseman for critically reviewing this biography and this note in particular. She is certainly correct in drawing attention to Johannes Nescher in the absence of conclusive documentary evidence.


8. See Wheelock 1995a, p. 28. “Netscher’s signed copy” of the Ter Borch in Washington, D.C. (ibid., p. 28 n. 9; Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 2, p. 148, no. 159, copy a, pl. xi, fig. 2) is rejected as his work in Wieseman 2002, no. 82. Paintings by Ter Borch in which Netscher appears are listed in ibid., p. 25 n. 14.


10. See Wieseman 2002, pp. 119–20, on Netscher’s artistic sons.


15. See Blankert 1966.


133. The Card Party

Oil on canvas, 19¼ x 17½ in. (50.2 x 44.1 cm)

Signed and dated (on stretcher of stool): CNetsc[er]/[1]66[ ]

There is abrasion throughout. The surface of the paint that defines the yellow skirt of the woman at left has suffered to an extreme degree. The little dog and the red silk skirt of the woman holding the cards are well preserved.

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.6

Netscher’s scenes of fashionable figures in luxurious interiors date mostly from the mid-1660s. This one has been placed convincingly about 1665.1 The subject of courting couples, the figure types, the attention to fine fabrics, the arrangement of the furniture (especially the matching stool and chair), and the dog are all indebted in some degree to the artist’s teacher, Gerard ter Borch (compare Pls. 13, 17). As in The Suitor’s Visit, of about 1668, by Ter Borch (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.),3 Netscher himself appears to have served as a model for one of the suitors here, the seated man.

Although not involved in the card game, the tall beauty to the left may be described as the center of attention. She is addressed by a male companion but concentrates on the fluffy lapdog. The love triangle of mistress, suitor, and spaniel recalls that in Frans van Mieris’s Teasing the Pet, of 1660 (Mauritshuis, The Hague), which influenced a number of contemporary painters.3 In the present picture, the color of the dog’s coat, his
earnest eyes, and perhaps the pointing nose and floppy ears underscore a comparison with the young lady's other plaything. Some comment on the male visitors also may be detected in the seated woman's smile at the viewer.

Netherlandish images comparing courtship with cardplaying and other games of chance date back to the first half of the sixteenth century. In older examples, various transgressions are symbolized, but here the cards, like the theorbo and songbook on the chair to the left (the instrument's case, now nearly invisible, is behind the couple to the right), and the wine decanter and glass on a tray on the table, are mere props in a scene that is understood almost entirely in terms of gestures, expressions, and poses. No one surpassed Ter Borch in observing social behavior, but Netscher was sometimes a worthy follower.

The subjects of the simulated reliefs on the back wall, which in the Netherlands would likely have been grisaille on canvas (compare Pl. 221), have not been identified previously. The oval composition depicts a victorious rider with a fallen figure beneath a rearing horse. This motif descended from Roman coins and Renaissance designs for equestrian monuments to seventeenth-century sculptures and prints. The other relief is nearly indecipherable, but appears to represent a scene of sea gods, perhaps the Triumph of Venus. It is likely that both images suggest the subjugation of men.


2. See Wheelock 1995a, p. 28.


4. See the discussion of the approximately contemporaneous Cardplayers by Cornelis de Man (1621–1706), at Polesden Lacey, Surrey, in Amsterdam 1976, no. 35.


6. In the Mauritshuis painting cited in note 1 above, Netscher placed a relief of a classical abduction scene (with Helen) behind the figures.


EX COLL.: Johan van Schuylenburg, Haarlem (until 1735); his sale, The Hague, September 20, 1735, no. 36, for Fr 400; Pierre Louis Paul Randon de Boisset, Paris (until 1777; his estate sale, Rémy & Julliot, Paris, February 27ff., 1777, no. 141, for Fr 2,800); Philip Hill (in 1811; his sale, Christie's, London, January 26, 1811, no. 36, bought in for £84); Colonel Hugh Baillie, Tardadale, Jedburgh, Roxburgh, Scotland (by 1829–38; his sale, Christie's, London, May 15, 1858, no. 10, as by Eglon van der Neer, for £161 14s. to Nicuwenhuys); [C. J. Nicuwenhuys, London (until d. 1883); his estate sale, Christie's, London, July 17, 1886, no. 80, as by Netscher, for £278 15s. to Colnaghi); [Colnaghi's, London, 1886]; [Sedelmeyer Gallery, Paris, 1886; sold to Marquand]; Henry G. Marquand, New York (by 1886–89); Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.6

1. Wieseman 2002, figs. 53, 54 (on p. 113, Wieseman's fig. 52 is said to reproduce the verso of the Paris sheet, but it is the more important recto that is illustrated, as fig. 53).
Jacob Ochtervelt
Rotterdam 1634–1682 Amsterdam

A Rotterdam painter of fashionable genre scenes, Ochtervelt was baptized in the city’s Reformed Church on February 1 (?), 1634.¹ His father, Lucas Hendricksz, was a bridgeman of very modest means. The artist’s two brothers died as sailors, one in the East Indies and the other returning from that part of the world. He also had three sisters, one of whom married a sailor. Houbraken reports that Ochtervelt and Pieter de Hooch (q.v.), who was also a native of Rotterdam, studied with Nicolaes Berchem (q.v.) in Haarlem at the same time. Reasonably enough, the biographer describes De Hooch as a painter of kamergezichten (views of rooms) with figures, and Ochtervelt as an artist who depicted figures “without using much perspective in his backgrounds.”²

Ochtervelt was more than four years younger than De Hooch, and probably began his training under Berchem somewhat earlier, perhaps about 1649–50. His earliest known dated work, Hunters and Shepherds in a Landscape, of 1652 (Städtische Kunstsammlungen, Chemnitz), has been compared with paintings by Berchem, Jan Baptist Weenix (1621–1660/61), and Ochtervelt’s predecessor in Rotterdam, Ludolf de Jongh (q.v.).³ Presumably, the eighteen-year-old painter returned to Rotterdam about the time he painted this picture, or slightly later, but the earliest record of his being back in the city is the posting of his marriage banns on November 28, 1655. Ochtervelt and Dirckjen Meesters, also of Rotterdam, were married on December 14 of the same year. Apparently the couple had no children, but the artist served as guardian for the orphaned children of his brother Jan (d. 1666).

It is not known when Ochtervelt joined the painters’ guild in Rotterdam. However, he stood (unsuccessfully) as a candidate for office in the organization during October 1667. From May 1 of that year, he leased a house on the Hoogostraat in Rotterdam, for the comparatively modest rent of 190 guilders a year. Ochtervelt and his wife witnessed a baptism in Rotterdam on July 10, 1672, but by 1674 they had moved to Amsterdam (his group portrait Four Regents of the Lepers’ Asylum in Amsterdam [Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam] is dated 1674). They lived at a few different addresses in Amsterdam until Ochtervelt’s death in the spring of 1682 (he was buried on May 1). His widow returned to Rotterdam and died there in 1710.

In the 1650s, Ochtervelt’s Merry Companies were set in ambiguous tavern interiors or on garden terraces. The figures, strongly lighted from the side, nearly fill the compositions. During the 1660s, Ochtervelt placed his enthusiastic young women and their suitors in more fully described interiors, based on compositions adopted mainly from Frans van Mieris (q.v.), but also from De Hooch, De Jongh, and other genre painters in the South Holland area. With his tendency to employ exaggerated gestures in triangular figure groups, Ochtervelt might have depicted martyrdoms, but the mood is almost invariably light-headed in his courtship scenes. The drama subsides somewhat during the Amsterdam period, in works recalling contemporary pictures by De Hooch, Gerard ter Borch, and, more broadly, Gerard de Lairesse (q.q.v.). From the mid-1660s onward, Ochtervelt also painted scenes set in the foyers or entrance halls of fine town houses, with a view to the street and with visiting merchants or entertainers at the threshold. His arrangements have parallels in the oeuvres of De Hooch, De Jongh, and others, but Ochtervelt’s type of composition (usually focused on a frontal and fairly close doorway) is distinctive, and allows for attractive contrasts of light and shadow. Street Musicians at the Door, dated 1665 (Saint Louis Art Museum), is one of the most impressive examples, with its marble-tiled floor, satin-clad mistress, excited child and maid, and receding row of houses outside. Some market scenes, family portraits, and other subjects (including the very late Last Testament, in Jagdschloss Grünwalde, Berlin) also date from the artist’s late years. The uneven quality and eclectic style of Ochtervelt’s work reflect the realities of the art market at the time, which encouraged the conflicting demands of conformity and innovation. About one hundred paintings by Ochtervelt are known.

1. The specific day is not clear in the church records. See Kuretsky 1979, pp. 4, 8 n. 7, 220.
134. **The Love Letter**

Oil on canvas, 36 x 25 in. (91.4 x 63.5 cm)

The surface is abraded throughout. Loss of the finish is particularly severe in the figures and background. The carpet on the table is better preserved.

Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Mendelsohn, 1980 1980.203.5

This unsigned canvas first came to light in 1980. Susan Donahue Kuretsky, whose monograph on Ochtervelt was published the year before, examined the work prior to its accession by the Museum and confirmed its authorship. Peter Sutton (see Refs.) reasonably suggests a date in the early 1670s.

The subject is a pretty woman at her toilet, wearing a white satin housecoat over a coral-colored skirt. She gestures with enthusiasm as she reads a letter that must be from a suitor. A maid (whose head has been simplified by abrasion) threads a string of pearls through her mistress’s hair. A second servant leaves the room (a doorway is dimly indicated in the center background) carrying a silver basin and pitcher. A canopied bed stands in the right background. To the near right is a table covered with an Oriental carpet and a chair upholstered in a silver fabric, apparently silk. A fine silver box is on the seat, and a lapdog lies near the lady’s delicate foot.

In style and subject, the picture responds to works by Gerard ter Borch (q.v.), the Museum’s Curiosity (Pl. 17), for example, and The Letter (Royal Collection, Buckingham Palace, London), both dating from the early 1660s. Although the present composition is original, the shadowy interior, with a bed and table forming a corner, figures grouped closely together, and a young woman whose satin garment glitters in the light are all features typical of Ter Borch, whose work was admired by other artists active in South Holland, such as Caspar Netscher in The Hague and Johannes Vermeer in Delft (q.q.v.), as well as by Ochtervelt in Rotterdam. Both a seated woman reading a letter and a maid dressing a young woman’s hair are motifs found in paintings of the early 1660s by Ter Borch.

The pitcher and basin perhaps refer here to purity, as is suggested also for Ter Borch’s A Young Woman at Her Toilet with a Maid (Pl. 13). In this instance, however, the motif is less conspicuous; Ochtervelt was not one to dwell on didactic ideas. The most important motif in the picture could be described, literally, as material, namely, the satin garment, one of the finest examples in the artist’s oeuvre.

1. On Ochtervelt’s interest in Ter Borch, especially about 1670–72, see Kuretsky 1979, pp. 15–20, 23–24. Given its suggested dating, the Museum’s picture could also have been painted in Amsterdam (see Ochtervelt’s biography above). However, the style represents was employed by the artist long before he moved.


3. P. Sutton (see Refs.) finds the “same ewer and basin” in five other paintings by Ochtervelt (Kuretsky 1979, figs. 87–91), and discusses the notion of purity at some length.


EX COLL.: Mr. and Mrs. Walter Mendelsohn, New York (by the 1960s—until 1980); Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Mendelsohn, 1980 1980.203.5

1. The Mendelsohn children recall the painting in their parents’ home at least as early as the 1960s. No family member was able to say when or where the picture was acquired. According to a New York Times obituary published on October 16, 1995, Mr. Mendelsohn died four days earlier at the age of ninety-eight. A graduate of Yale, in 1921 he joined the law firm of Proskauer Rose Goetz & Mendelsohn in his native New York, and was the last surviving name partner of the firm. His wife predeceased him.
Adriaen van Ostade

Haarlem 1610–1685

van Ostade was the son of a weaver, Jan Hendrixcx van Eyndhoven, and Janneke Hendricksd. Baptized on December 19, 1610, he was the third of eight children, who included the short-lived genre painter and landscapist Isack van Ostade (1621–1649). Houbraken reports that Adriaen van Ostade and Adriaen Brouwer (1605/6–1638) were contemporary pupils of Frans Hals (q.v.), which would have been in the second half of the 1620s. However, Brouwer’s influence on Van Ostade’s early style and subjects is much easier to discern than Hals’s influence on either artist. Van Ostade’s prolific career as a painter, draftsman, and etcher was pursued entirely in Haarlem, where he married a local woman, Macheltje Pietersdr, on July 25, 1658. She died in 1642, and on May 26, 1657, Van Ostade married a well-to-do Catholic woman, Anna Ingels, of Amsterdam. He probably assumed her religion, and certainly shared in her prosperity until she died in 1666. The widower was left with a substantial inheritance, which helped support the couple’s daughter and his sister Maeyken’s five children and, from 1668, the children of his brother Jan. The artist’s industrious output also contributed to his material comfort, which is suggested by his several changes of address (in Haarlem, although he moved temporarily to Amsterdam during the French invasion of 1672–73). Van Ostade was also active in the painters’ guild, which he joined by 1634 at the latest. He was buried in Saint Bavo’s, Haarlem, on May 2, 1685. On July 3 and 4 of that year, the contents of his studio were auctioned off. His daughter’s announcement in the Haarlem Courant of June 23 and 28, 1685, mentions “over two hundred works from his hand and a great number by various masters, all his engraved plates as well as a great number of engravings, drawings, etc., by him and other masters.”

A fuller discussion of this familiar figure’s oeuvre would be inappropriate here, since the Museum does not have any work by him in the collection, and Schnackenburg’s review in the Dictionary of Art is especially complete. The several hundred paintings by Van Ostade that survive have yet to be properly catalogued. About fifty engravings and some four hundred drawings and watercolors are also considered autograph. He had many imitators, in addition to at least three gifted pupils: his brother Isack, Cornelis Bega (1631/32–1664), and, very late in the master’s life, Cornelis Dusart (1660–1704).

It has been maintained convincingly that a superb portrait by Hals in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., represents Van Ostade and dates from the late 1640s.

2. On Van Ostade’s early work, see Schnackenburg 1970.
5. Jan Steen (q.v.) and Michiel van Musscher (1641–1705) have also been said to have studied briefly with Van Ostade.

Style of Adriaen van Ostade

135. Man with a Tankard

Oil on wood, 10 3/4 x 8 5/8 in. (25.7 x 21.6 cm)
The paint surface is badly abraded.
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.198

The execution of this painting, being looser than expected for Adriaen van Ostade, reminded A. B. de Vries and Horst Gerson of Isack van Ostade (see biography above). However, the work’s quality is entirely inconsistent with that of either brother’s work. Adriaen van Ostade painted this type of small picture in the
1650s and 1660s, when he was at the height of his abilities and a master of close observation. The Havemeyer panel is a seventeenth-century imitation of a work by Van Ostade or, quite possibly, a copy of an unknown work.  

1. Oral opinions, 1932, and an unknown but later date, respectively.  
2. For an autograph work of this type, and on this subject, see the present writer's discussion in E. Sullivan et al. 1995, vol. 1, pp. 149-50. Curator John Walsh gave the Museum's picture its present title in 1972.  
3. The present writer changed the attribution to Style of Adriaen van Ostade in 1988. Various scholars, including the Van Ostade specialist Hiltraut Doll, have examined the work in storage and concurred with the present attribution. For signed and autograph works of this type, see Sotheby’s, New York, January 14, 1988, no. 28, and Christie’s, London, December 11, 1992, no. 95.


EX COLL.: Possibly Édouard Warneck, Paris (until 1887); [possibly Durand-Ruel, Paris, in 1889]; Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (possibly by February 1892–until 1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–39); H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Request of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1939 29.100.198

526 STYLE OF ADRIAEN VAN OSTADE
Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy was the son of Elias Claesz Pickenoy, an armorial stonemason from Antwerp. The painter was baptized in Amsterdam on January 10, 1588. He was probably trained by the formal portraitist Cornelis van der Voort (ca. 1576-1624), whose parents had also emigrated from the Spanish Netherlands. Pickenoy and another possible pupil of Van der Voort’s, Thomas de Keyser (q.v.), were the main portraitists of Amsterdam society until Rembrandt established himself there. Until fairly recently, an important group portrait, *The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Sebastiaen Egbertsz de Vrij*, of 1619 (Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam), was thought to be by De Keyser, but is now generally agreed to be by Pickenoy.¹

In 1621, Pickenoy married a woman named Levinia Bouwens. They had ten children, only one of whom lived to adulthood. The artist flourished in the 1620s and 1630s, painting large civic-guard pictures as well as single and pendant portraits of prominent citizens.² Among these are nearly life-size full-length portraits, a type previously common at European courts but not in the circle of patrician figures such as Cornelis de Graeff and his wife, Catharina Hooft, whose portraits of 1636 by Pickenoy are in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin.³ Attempts at animation are found in civic-guard portraits of 1639, 1642, and 1645 (all in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), but compared with pictures of this type by Frans Hals and Rembrandt (q.q.v.) they look a generation out-of-date. No single or pair portraits by Pickenoy are known from after 1640.⁷ The comparatively rare religious paintings by this artist are, not surprisingly, conservative and dignified.⁵

Between 1637 and 1645, Pickenoy owned the corner house on the Saint Anthonisbreestraat, next to the house that Rembrandt bought in 1639.⁶ It is not known when he died, but his wife was described as a widow in October 1616. Bartholomeus van der Helst (q.v.) may have been his pupil. The portrait discussed below is entirely typical of Pickenoy in style, and rather typical of him in that it has been attributed to De Keyser and to Werner van den Valckert (ca. 1580-1585–ca. 1627). The latter was from The Hague, but by 1614 he had abandoned the realm of Michiel van Mierevelt and Jan van Ravesteyn (q.q.v.) for Amsterdam, another quite competitive place.⁷

2. See Van Thiel et al. 1976, pp. 317–18, erroneously under Eliasz, “called Pickenoy.” As explained in Dudok van Heel 1985, the family name is Pickenoy.
3. On this point and for these pendant portraits, see Dudok van Heel in Amsterdam 2002–3, pp. 44–45, 50, 118–19, nos. 21a, 21b.
5. See Van Schooten and Wüstefeld 2003, no. 53.
7. In Schama 1999, pp. 439–40, Pickenoy’s house is mistakenly placed on the other side. The studio with north light had previously been occupied by Cornelis van der Voort (until his death in 1624) and then by Rembrandt’s dealer Hendrick Uyleburgh (ca. 1584/85–1661).
Oil on wood, 41 1/2 x 30 in. (104.8 x 76.2 cm)
Dated and inscribed (upper right): Åratais-Suá./Anno 1624.

The painting is well preserved. The original oak panel is composed of three joined wooden boards with vertical grain. It has been thinned to 1 mm and laminated to a custom-made composite panel, cradled. There is a small amount of paint loss extending the entire length of the left panel join and along the upper and lower 10 in. (25.4 cm) of the right panel join. Infrared reflectography reveals adjustments to the placement of the hand on the globe and a few lines of the preliminary sketch that define the white ruff.

Bequest of Harry G. Sperling, 1971 1976.100.22

The opinions that have been expressed about the authorship of this dignified Amsterdam portrait are more consistent than they might at first appear. In 1911, Oldenbourg (see Refs.), following the advice of Hofstede de Groot, catalogued the painting as by Thomas de Keyser (q.v.). As noted in Pickenoy's biography above, an important Anatomy Lesson, dated 1619, has only recently been recognized as a work by Pickenoy rather than the much better known De Keyser. Van Thiels suggestion, in 1983, that the Museum's portrait was probably painted by Werner van den Valckert (ca. 1580/85–ca. 1627) places the work directly in the Amsterdam milieu of De Keyser, Pickenoy, and their predecessor Cornelis van der Voort (ca. 1576–1624), although no one has seconded Van Thiels particular candidate. At least two scholars, Bruyn and De Bruyn Kops, immediately rejected the attribution to Van den Valckert, and Bruyn maintained firmly that the painting is by Pickenoy, "one of his earliest known works." After firsthand examination in 1988, the Dutch portrait specialist Rudolf Ekkart concluded, "There is no doubt that this excellent painting is a work by Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy."

The more conservative Dutch portraitists of the seventeenth century have received closer attention in recent decades than ever before, a trend that reflects greater concern with iconography, social context, and the art market. The Museum's picture has become known only during this period, although it is in storage more often than not. In contrast to visiting scholars, or those who know the work only from photographs, the present writer has had the advantage of viewing the painting frequently, and of having it clearly in mind whenever similar pictures are encountered. For example, the Portrait of a Man with a Lay Figure, which is also dated 1624 (Speed Art Museum, Louisville), is convincingly ascribed by Van Thiel to Van den Valckert, but reveals differences of quality and style in comparison with the New York portrait that go well beyond the few that Van Thiel acknowledges (he describes the latter painting as being "much better worked out" in the head and in the hand resting on the globe). Indeed, the smooth, masklike modeling of the woodcarver's face in the Louisville portrait, as well as his puppetlike movement, suggests a distinctly different sensibility than that found in Man with a Celestial Globe, where the description of passages such as the figure's blond hair, facial features, ruff, elegant black costume, and globe reveal a genuine interest in observation rather than clever artistic conceits. Comparison with signed works by Van den Valckert, such as the male portraits dated 1616, 1617, 1620, and 1622 (a group portrait) in Boston, Amsterdam, Châteauroux, and Berlin, respectively, leads to the same conclusion.

Unfortunately, Pickenoy rarely signed his paintings. Nonetheless, male portraits considered typical of the artist strongly support his authorship of the present picture. These works include the Portrait of a Man, dated 1632, inscribed in the very same manner as here (art market, 1994); the portraits of Maerten Rey and of Jochem Hendricksz Swartenhont, both dated 1627 (both Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); and the Portrait of a Man Aged Twenty-seven, dated 1629, and the presumed Self-Portrait, dated 1627, again with the same style of inscription (both Louvre, Paris). It is worth noting that despite the generally similar hands depicted in portraits by Van der Voort, Van Miereveld, and other Dutch artists, the precise form of the proper right hand in Man with a Celestial Globe, with its swelling back, tightly bent fingers, and shape recalling a lobster claw, is characteristic of Pickenoy.

The hand-colored engravings of the celestial globe were published in 1603 by Willem Jansz Blaeu (1571–1638). In 1990, the Museum purchased a globe by the same publisher. The globe may refer to the man's profession, or to an amateur interest in astronomy. It was presumably this attribute that, about a century ago, led to the identification of the sitter with the 9th Earl of Northumberland (see Ex Coll.), that is, Henry Percy (1564–1632), who was known for his knowledge of astronomy and navigation.

2. J. Bruyn, letter to the present writer, dated November 9, 1983; C. J. de Bruyn Kops, of the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, studied the portrait in New York on January 12, 1984. He had doubts about an attribution to Pickney, but said that Van den Valckert was certainly not responsible. Albert Blankert, on a visit to the Museum in 1988, considered the portrait undoubtedly by Pickney. The Museum's attribution was changed from Dutch Painter, Unknown, to Pickney in 1990.


4. See, for example, Haarlem 1986a; Blasse-Hegeman et al. 1990; and Amsterdam 2002–3.

5. Van Thiel 1983, p. 165, figs. 42, 43. The Louisville portrait, acquired in 1963, was previously on the art market as a De Keyser.

6. For the portraits in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; the Musée-Hôtel Bertrand, Châteauroux; and the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin, see ibid., figs. 33, 34, 38, 40.

7. Sotheby’s, New York, January 14, 1994, no. 21; previously at Sotheby’s, London, April 20, 1988, no. 46. The pendant female portrait is in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles.

8. Inventory numbers r.f. 2134 and r.f. 1213, respectively. The Louvre’s Portrait of a Man, which bears no inscription (inv. no. r.f. 1753), is also similar in execution to the Museum’s painting.

9. See Van der Krogt 1993, p. 159, fig. 4.20. The book has not been identified.


REFERENCES: Oldenbourg 1911, p. 83, no. 93, as by De Keyser, Portrait of a Man, probably the 9th Earl of Northumberland, crediting Hofstede de Groot with the attribution to De Keyser. Graves 1913–15, vol. 3, p. 1170, listed as a Rubens in the 1907 Royal Academy exhibition; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 51, as by a Dutch Painter, Unknown, in 1624; Van Thiel 1983, pp. 165–66, 180, no. 14, fig. 43, attributes the work to Werner van den Valckert and compares works by that artist; Ekkart in Amsterdam 1993–94, p. 306 n. 5 (under no. 268), cites the work, “which Van Thiel . . . wrongly attributes to Van den Valckert,” in support of another attribution to Pickney; Baetjer 1995, p. 305, as by Pickney.


EX COLL.: Hon. Mrs. Ethel Mary Trollope, Crowcombe Court, near Taunton, Somerset (by 1907–d. 1934; as “The Earl of Northumberland” by Rubens, later as by Thomas de Keyser); her grandson Maj. Thomas Fleming Trollope-Bellew, Crowcombe, Taunton (from 1934); [Martin Asscher, London, until 1967]; [Kleinberger, New York, 1967–71; bequeathed by Harry G. Sperling, last surviving partner of the firm, to MMA]; Bequest of Harry G. Sperling, 1971 1976.100.22
Frans Post
Haarlem 1612–1680 Haarlem

The artist's father, Jan Jansz Post (ca. 1575–1614), was a stained-glass painter from Leiden. Although he is praised in Samuel Ampzing's 1628 "Description" of Haarlem, only one drawing by him, dated 1612, is known today. In 1604, he moved to Haarlem and married Francijntje Pieters Verbraak (1581–1666). Their first child, Pieter Post (1608–1669), trained as a painter, but is better known as one of the most important Dutch architects of the century. The next child, Anthoni (1610–after 1657), pursued a legal career. Frans was the couple's third child, baptized on November 17, 1612. His sister, Johanna (1614–1672), married a Haarlem merchant in 1645. Following the death of Jan Jansz in 1614, Frans's mother remarried in 1620, and later divorced.

Pieter Post became a member of the Haarlem painters' guild in 1623, and by the late 1620s was an independent master. In the early 1630s, he painted cavalry engagements similar to those by Esaias van de Velde (1587–1630), and a few views of local landscape that are generally consistent with developments in Haarlem as represented by Van de Velde, Pieter de Molijn (q.v.), and Cornelis Vroom (1590/91–1661), but are also distinctive in a manner that anticipates paintings by his brother Frans. Presumably, Frans studied with his older brother in the late 1620s and early 1630s.

By the mid-1630s, Pieter had turned his attention to architecture and was working with Jacob van Campen (1595–1657) for Constantijn Huygens, secretary to the Prince of Orange. It must have been through this connection that Frans was made known to the prince's cousin Johan Maurits, Count of Nassau-Siegen (1604–1679), who in 1633 commissioned Van Campen to design his house, the Mauritshuis, in The Hague (Pieter Post supervised the construction). In 1636, the West India Company named Johan Maurits governor of the Dutch colony in northeast Brazil, where between 1637 and 1643 he built towns and fortifications, and devoted great attention to studying the land's native people, flora, and fauna. A small team of specialists accompanied the count at his own expense, and included the geographer, cartographer, and natural scientist Georg Marcgraf (1610–1643/44); the court physician and scholar of tropical diseases Willem Pies (1591–1678); and the artists Frans Post and Albert Eckhout (ca. 1610–1665/66). Eckhout is best known for his large paintings of Brazilian "Indians," and he also made hundreds of drawings of fish, reptiles, plants, and whatever curious living creature he saw in South America. Post, too, was active as a draftsman, mainly of landscape views. Only seven landscape paintings, dating from 1637 to 1640, are known from his Brazilian period (four are in the Louvre, Paris; Johan Maurits presented over thirty paintings by Post to Louis XIV in 1679). The earliest, The Island of Itamaracá (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, on loan to the Mauritshuis, The Hague), is dated 1637 1/3.

Post returned to the Netherlands in 1644 and settled in Haarlem, where he is first mentioned in September of that year. He joined the painters' guild there in 1646 and, in 1650, married Jannetje (or Janneke) Bogaert, a granddaughter of the architect Lieven de Key (ca. 1560–1567), in nearby Zandvoort. The couple apparently had nine children, seven of whom died at a young age. When she died in 1664, Jannetje left the artist with three children, born 1655, 1656, and 1660. In 1645, Post made drawings for the thirty-three etched views of Brazil (and ships off the coast) in Caspar van Baerle's Rerum per octennium in Brasilia gestarum historia (Amsterdam, 1647). Until at least the end of the 1660s, he painted views of Brazil based on drawings and from memory. His pictures follow Haarlem landscape conventions but feature plausible topography and many exotic details, as seen in the figures, plants, and animals found in the painting discussed below. It has been observed that works dating from after the mid-1650s are more stylized, which is hardly surprising, considering the artist's increasing distance from the extraordinary experience he had in his late twenties and early thirties. About one hundred fifty paintings are known today.

Post was buried in Saint Bavó's, Haarlem, on February 17, 1680. A small portrait of him was painted by Frans Hals (Worcester Art Museum).

1. Ampzing 1628, p. 366.
2. See Terwen and Ottenheim 1993, from which some of the details about Post's family are taken (p. 9).
3. For the most reliable biographies of Frans and Pieter Post, see Van Thiel-Stroman in Biesboer et al. 2006, pp. 268–72.
4. See Duparc 1980, pp. 78–80, nos. 766, 766, and 970, for two
cavalry scenes of 1631 and a dune landscape of 1633 (all in the Mauritshuis, The Hague), and Terwen and Ottenheym 1993, pp. 12–24, 246, for a description and list of paintings also by or attributed to Pieter Post. The topographical flavor of Pieter Post’s Landscape with Bleaching Fields, of 1631 (Fondation Custodia, Institut Néerlandais, Paris; see Paris 1983, pp. 104–5, no. 63, pl. 13), is especially interesting for his brother’s early work.

5. According to F. J. Duparc in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 25, p. 325, Frans “probably received his early training from his father,” although the latter died when the boy was about two years old.

6. On Johan Maurits, see B. Brenninkmeyer de Rooij in ibid., vol. 22, p. 356, and the literature listed there (and also that cited in note 1 of the entry below). He and his scientific team are concisely described in the now standard work on Eckhout, The Hague 2004 (pp. 131–33, 134–35, on the colony in Brazil).

7. As they are quaintly called, by B. J. P. Broos in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 9, p. 703. The term is still commonly employed in the Netherlands when referring to native North and South Americans.

8. See Sousa-Leão 1973, nos. 1–6; Duparc in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 25, p. 326; and Paris 2005–6. Duparc’s tally of “only six known paintings made in the New World by Post” was true at the time of writing. As he observes, a sketchbook with nineteen views made by Post on the voyage to Brazil (the ship sailed on October 25, 1636) and upon arrival in January 1637 is in the Nederlands Scheepvaartmuseum, Amsterdam (see Sousa-Leão 1973, pp. 143–48).


12. Opinions appear to differ on whether these drawings were all made in Holland or in Brazil. Compare Sousa-Leão 1973, p. 37 (pp. 133–36 for illustrations of all the drawings), and Duparc in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 25, p. 327.


137. A Brazilian Landscape

Oil on wood, 24 x 36 in. (61 x 91.4 cm)
Signed and dated (right, on papaya tree): F POST/1650

The painting is well preserved. There is a small amount of paint loss in the sky along the horizontal panel join.

Purchase, Rogers Fund, special funds, James S. Deely Gift, and Gift of Edna H. Sachs and other gifts and bequests, by exchange, 1981 1981.318

This large painting by Post is remarkable for its excellent state of preservation and for its exceptional quality. It was painted in the artist’s native Haarlem in 1650, about six years after he returned from his long stay in northeast Brazil, where he was employed by the governor of the Dutch colony, Johan Maurits (see the biography above).

The picture’s effect overall and its many diverting details are difficult to appreciate in reproductions. The sky is filled with a subtle and complex cover of clouds, and the gradual undulation of terrain from the foreground to the horizon is wonderfully naturalistic. Perhaps most impressive is the middle ground, where scattered bushes, stands of trees, and shifting colors in the grasses convey a highly convincing impression of actual countryside closely observed. The overgrown islands in the river and the hills and plains in the distance delight the searching eye with their remarkable detail, despite the entirely successful suggestion of atmospheric perspective. A small village can be made out among the dozen palm trees on the far distant hill, seen in the hazy light of the central background. Immediately below, in the river, two native sailboats are visible; a third can be seen by the spit of land to the right (in the area of water above the cactus in the foreground). The roofs of three houses emerge from low trees beyond the hill to the right.

At least a dozen different plants are carefully described in the repoussoir of vegetation that fills the right foreground, providing refuge for an iguana. A naturalist would be required to identify all the varieties, apart from the cactus, the bird of paradise (with orange flowers), and the papaya tree (on which the artist’s signature and date appear as if carved). Such a specialist, Georg Marcgraf (1610–1643/44), was the painter’s companion on expeditions, and their mutual interests are recorded in many pictures by Post. (The inclusion of an iguana, anteater, or armadillo in the foreground is common in his oeuvre.) Marcgraf collected numerous plants and animals in
Brazil, and these were described for the first time in a posthu-
mous publication (he died on his return journey to Europe) coa-
authored by Willem Piso, *Historia naturalis Brasiliae* (Amsterdam, 1648). Marcgraf also made a superb map of the
goastal area controlled by the Dutch, with detailed renderings of the
rivers leading into the interior. The river valley in the
Museum’s painting probably corresponds with a view that Post
recorded in a drawing, but it would be difficult to identify the
location today.¹

A good number of Post’s pictures show native Brazilians
traveling on foot, occasionally in the company of Europeans.
In this painting, there are seven women, six children, and six
men, all natives (fig. 121). The women bear rectangular baskets
on their heads and backs, the latter supported by straps slung
from the forehead. At least two of the women have dead birds
in their hands. The second and third women from the left
carry infants. The young woman sitting on the ground has evi-
dently lost control of her basket, to the irritation of the
woman on the right. Four of the men carry bows and long
arrows, while two of them shoulder muskets and wear car-
tridge belts. Similar details are included in paintings of
Brazilian natives by Albert Eckhout (ca. 1610–1665/66), in
woodcuts published in the *Historia naturalis Brasiliae*, in the
illustrated journal of the German soldier Caspar Schmalkalden
(who was in Brazil and Chile between 1642 and 1645), and in
other contemporary sources.²

For Post, a painter of sweeping vistas, the timing of his
return to Holland could hardly have been better. As discussed
above in the entries for panoramic landscapes by Jan van
Goyen and Philips Koninck (see Pls. 50, 101, 102), the second
half of the 1640s was the beginning of a golden age for this
kind of view. Post must have had some knowledge of works by
these artists, but his descriptive style and coloring are more
reminiscent of a much admired master from Haarlem, Cornelis
Vroom (1590/91–1661). In the late 1630s and early 1640s, Vroom
painted compositions similar to this one, with panoramic
views extending from a gentle rise and with a few trees to the
side. A parallel between Vroom’s drawings of the early 1630s
and Pieter Post’s landscape paintings of the same period has
also been observed.³

1. There is extensive literature on Marcgraf and Piso, and on their
work for Johan Maurits. Among the most relevant publications
are Van den Boogart, Hooftink, and Whitehead 1979 (see espe-
cially Whitehead’s essay, “Georg Marcgraf and Brazilian Zoology,”
pp. 424–71); Whitehead and Boeseman 1989 (see pp. 178–93 on
Post, and pl. 80 for Marcgraf’s map of Brazil); and Siegen 2004.
2. See Whitehead and Boeseman 1989, pp. 58–80 (on Schmalkalden
and Eckhout), pls. 4, 36–46. For Eckhout’s oeuvre, see The
3. See Chong and P. Sutton in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia
1987–88, p. 319 (under no. 113), Vroom’s beautiful *Estuary Viewed
through a Screen of Trees*, of about 1658 (private collection). See
also Keyes 1975, vol. 2, pp. 181–87, no. 225, fig. 49, the *Panorama
with Dunes*, of about 1640–42 (Stichting Hannema-de Steurs,
Kasteel “het Nijenhuis,” Heino).

REFERENCES: Sousa-Leão 1948, pp. 46 (ill.), 99, no. 11, lists the
work as in the Marcondes Ferreira collection; Guimarães 1957, p. 256,
no. 69, as in the Marcondes Ferreira collection; Larsen 1962, p. 187,
no. 13; Sousa-Leão 1973, p. 65, no. 14 (ill.), sees the landscape as “an
unusual setting for Post”; W. Liedtke in MMA, *Notable Acquisitions,
1981–82* (New York, 1981), pp. 41–42 (ill.), describes the subject and
Post’s work in Brazil; Liedtke 1982b, pp. 350–51 (ill.), describes the
picture’s subject, style, and condition (“superb”); P. Sutton 1986,
p. 191, mentions the “new acquisition” as a “major work”; Baetjer 1995,
the picture one of the most successful compositions of the period
shortly after Post returned from Brazil; Corrêa do Lago in Paris
2003–6, pp. 23, 25, fig. 10 (incorrectly as on canvas), mentions the
work in a brief survey of Post’s oeuvre; Krempe in Munich 2006,
pp. 78–79, no. 8, describes the composition and identifies the natives
as Tupi, who were allies of the Dutch; Corrêa do Lago and Corrêa
do Lago 2007, pp. 128 (ill.), 129 (detail), no. 13, catalogues the picture
as one of “the most successful and original pictures of Post’s second
phase.”

EXHIBITED: Rio de Janeiro, Museu de Arte Moderna, “Os Pintores
de Maurício de Nassau,” 1968, no. 17; Munich, Haus der Kunst, “Franz

EX COLL.: Popper, Prague (in 1946); E. Kellner, Rio de Janeiro (in
1947); E. Rais, Rio de Janeiro (1948); Octaves Marcondes Ferreira,
São Paulo (to at least 1973); [Noortman & Brod, New York, until
1981; sold to MMA]; Purchase, Rogers Fund, special funds, James S.
Deely Gift, and Gift of Edna H. Sachs and other gifts and bequests,
by exchange, 1981–1982, 318
JACOB PYNAS
Amsterdam 1592/93—after 1650 Amsterdam?

Jacob Symonsz Pynas and his older brother, Jan (1583/84–1631), were from a patrician Catholic family in Alkmaar. In 1590, their father, Symon Janz Brouwer (1555/60–1624), became a citizen of Amsterdam, the hometown of their mother, Oude Neel (Old Nellie) Jacobsdra van Harencarspel. The name Pynas (pynas, meaning “pinnacle,” a light sailing ship often used as a tender) was adopted from a property that Symon Brouwer bought in 1594, At the Sign of the Pinnacle, on the Nieuwendijk in the center of Amsterdam.¹

Jan Pynas was reportedly in Italy with Pieter Lastman (1583–1633) from about 1605 until 1607, when they both returned to Amsterdam. It has been supposed that Jacob trained under his brother and that he also went to Italy, but at a later date. Jan himself evidently went again to Rome in 1616–17,² but it is very doubtful that Jacob ever made the trip.³ Among the earliest known dated paintings by Jacob are Nebuchadnezzar Restored to His Kingdom, of 1616 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), and The Adoration of the Magi, which appears to be dated 1617 (Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford).⁴

The Pynas brothers belonged to a group of Amsterdam history painters that are now known as the Pre-Rembrandtists. They include Lastman, Claes Moeyaert (1591–1635), François Venant (1591/92–1636), and the Pynas’s brother-in-law Jan Tengnagel (1584–1635).⁵ The anachronistic name of the group, which would be better described as the Lastman circle, pays tribute to the considerable influence they had on Rembrandt in the 1620s, and on a number of his pupils in later decades. Rembrandt’s high regard for the Early Baroque history pictures of Adam Elsheimer (1578–1610), the German artist who worked in Rome from 1600 onward, was adopted from Lastman and his Amsterdam associates. Especially in his landscapes with small figures, Jacob Pynas was inspired by Elsheimer, in part through engravings by Hendrick Goudt (1583–1648).⁶

After Jan Pynas died in December 1631, Jacob moved to Delft, where he joined the painters’ guild on November 12, 1632. He appears to have worked in Delft until about 1640 and then returned to Amsterdam.⁷ Patrons in Delft and in the neighboring court city of The Hague were interested in cabinet-size history pictures, for example, by the Delft painters Hans Jordaens the Elder (1535/60–1630) and Leonaert Bramer (q.v.), and by Utrecht artists such as Cornelis van Poelenburch (1594/95–1669).⁸ It is not known whether the art market or personal circumstances motivated Pynas to move to Delft. He appears to have had at least one enthusiastic supporter in Amsterdam, Aris Hendricksz. Halewet, whose inventory of 1645 included seven paintings by Pynas.⁹

4. A. Tümpel in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 25, p. 758 (and in Sacramento 1974–75, p. 68), reports that the Hartford picture is dated 1613 or 1617, and adds—with some exaggeration—that “the style is already so mature that it seems reasonable to suppose that there were earlier works.” In Haverkamp-Begemann 1978, p. 175, and other sources, the painting is said to be dated 1617, with no suggestion of uncertainty. A Stoning of Saint Stephen, dated 1617 (formerly private collection, Budapest), is illustrated in K. Bauch 1935–37, p. 79, fig. 1.
6. On Elsheimer and the Pynas brothers, see Oehler 1967. The notion that Jacob Pynas was a key figure for spreading Elsheimer’s landscape style in the Netherlands is dismissed in Dudok van Heel 2006, pp. 134–35.
7. See Dudok van Heel 2006, p. 137.
138. Paul and Barnabas at Lystra

Oil on wood, 19 x 28% in. (48.3 x 73.3 cm)
Inscribed (bottom center, on step): PL [in monogram, over traces of an original monogram, apparently reading IACP f]

The paint surface is abraded throughout. Concentrated in the right half of the composition are numerous small blisters and losses that seem to be the result of exposure to heat. Extensive underdrawing is visible in many passages beneath the thin paint layers.

Gift of Emile E. Wolf, 1971 1971.255

This painting, which unfortunately has suffered considerably (see condition note above), is certainly by Jacob Pynas and may be dated to the late 1620s, partly on the basis of comparison with the artist’s different rendering of the subject, dated 1628 (fig. 122). At some late date, the monogram PL was painted on top of Pynas’s own, in order to pass the picture off as a work by the more important Amsterdam artist who strongly influenced Pynas, Pieter Lastman (1583–1633).¹

The subject is taken from Acts 14:6–18. Paul and Barnabas, having been driven out of Iconium by both the Gentiles and the Jews, flee to Lystra, in Lycaonia (Asia Minor), where they preach the Gospel. When Paul heals a cripple by commanding him to walk, the locals “[lift] up their voices,” declaring that Jupiter and Mercury “are come down to us in the likeness of men.” A statue of Jupiter stands before the city (Pynas shows the statue to the upper right), and the high priest of the temple has the people bring garlands and sacrificial oxen (in the painting, the procession, with two garlanded oxen, approaches from the left background). In frustration, the apostles tear at their clothes, crying, “We are also men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God” (who, as Paul, pointing upward, indicates in the painting, is in heaven, not present as a graven image). Pynas depicts the priest in a white robe and surrounded by excited celebrants, some with torches and one with a tambourine. Behind him, the bearded man with bare feet must be the former cripple; a worshipful woman lifts his tunic and gestures at his healed legs. On the steps, Barnabas twists around and rends his garment, attracting curious spectators.²

Lastman had treated the subject at least twice in the previous decade, in a painting of 1614 (location unknown) and in a canvas dated 1617 (Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam).³ Except for the gesturing Paul in the earlier picture, the later work is closer to the Pynas, both in composition and in the placement of key figures such as the apostles and the priest. The idea of adding a rooster to the sacrifice may also come from Lastman’s panel of 1617. Pynas’s picture of 1628 (fig. 122) presents the action more clearly, in a less crowded arrangement, than does the present work or either painting by Lastman.⁴ This might be taken to suggest that the present picture was painted slightly earlier than the version in Amsterdam, but other evidence may now be lost, and a survey of known works by Pynas does not suggest a linear development.

Figure 122. Jacob Pynas, Paul and Barnabas at Lystra, 1628. Oil on wood, 25⅞ x 44⅜ in. (64 x 115 cm). Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
1. The modification of the monogram is described by Walsh (see Refs.), who credits a seminar paper by John Mortensen. In a letter to the owner, Emile Wolf, dated January 10, 1961, the scholar Otto Benesch wrote that the picture was not by Lastman (Wolf had mentioned that painter’s signature and the date 1607) but by Pynas, adding, “I suspect that the signature was originally that of Jacob Pynas and may have been later changed to that of Lastman.” Wolf gave the picture to the Museum as a work by Pynas.

2. On the interpretation of this subject in seventeenth-century Dutch art and literature (the poet Joost van den Vondel wrote a poem about one of Lastman’s pictures), see C. Tümpe in Sacramento 1974–75, pp. 127–28; Golahn 1996; and Westermann 1996, p. 44, where it is observed that “the story of Paul and Barnabas could serve as a potent example of early Christian resistance to idolatry, the worship of more than one god or of images of God. This issue was central to Reformed theologians who attacked Catholic rituals involving images, relics, and incense as idolatrous.”

3. See Amsterdam 1991–92, pp. 73, 106–7, no. 11, fig. 20. On the panel of 1617, see Reinhardt in Hamburg 2006, no. 11. In Blankert 1979, p. 171, the “preoccupation” of Lastman, Pynas, and others with this subject is credited to the influence of a painting by Elsheimer in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt, but that work is by the Antwerp master Adriaen van Stalbemt (Sander and Brinkmann 1995, p. 53, pl. 132).

4. For the Pynas in Amsterdam, see Van Thiel et al. 1976, p. 459, citing earlier literature.

REFERENCES: C. Cunningham 1959, p. 11 n. 8, fig. 7, as “extremely close” to Jacob Pynas, but attributed to Lastman on the basis of the monogram, which “appears genuine”; Walsh 1974, pp. 342–44, 349 n. 6, figs. 5, 6, shows in a drawing how Pynas’s monogram was modified to “PL” for Lastman, dates the work to the 1620s, and describes it as “typical of Pynas’s classicizing stagecraft, the expressive stretchings and twistings of his actors and the broad, thin technique of painting”; A. Tümpe in Sacramento 1974–75, pp. 29, 70–71, no. 10, discusses the manner of execution, reproduces a facsimile of Pynas’s monogram, dates the work to the 1620s, compares Lastman’s painting of the subject dated 1614 (location unknown), and notes Pynas’s different treatment of the subject dated 1628 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); C. Tümpe in ibid., pp. 137, 149 n. 74, considers the iconography; MMA 1975, p. 92 (ill.); Blankert 1979, p. 171, in a discussion of Lastman’s painting of the subject in the Amsterdam Historisch Museum, Amsterdam, notes that the New York picture was previously considered to be by the same artist but was rightly reattributed by Walsh; Haak 1984, p. 193, fig. 395, reveals an affinity to Lastman in composition and subject matter; P. Sutton 1986, p. 180, cited; A. Tümpe in Amsterdam 1991–92, p. 20, fig. 6, incorrectly as dated 1617, notes the influence of Lastman’s painting in the Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam; Baetjer 1995, p. 303, mentions only the monogram PL.


EX COLL.: [Leslie Haad, London, ca. 1933, as by Lastman; sold to Wolf]; Emile E. Wolf, New York (by 1939–71); Gift of Emile E. Wolf, 1971 1971.235
Pieter Quast gave his age as twenty-six when his marriage banns were published on June 29, 1632. At the time, he lived on the Molensteeg in Amsterdam, where he was most likely born. Nothing is known of his parents or of his life before his marriage, which took place on December 19, 1632, in Sloten, a village near Amsterdam (see Pl. 4). His bride was Annetje Splinter (dates unknown), who at least in the 1640s was active as a flower painter. Annetje was from The Hague, and the couple settled there before Quast joined the painters' guild in 1634. A daughter, Constantia, was baptized in the Kloosterkerk on July 1, 1639, with the local landscapist François van Knibbergen (1596/97–after 1664) attending as a witness. Another child (name unknown) was baptized on August 2, 1641. From the beginning of 1640 until sometime in the first half of 1643, the family lived in a house on the Groene Burchwal, in the neighborhood on the southeast side of The Hague where Jan van Goyen (q.v.) and other artists resided.

Quast failed to flourish in The Hague, which was an expensive place to live. His debts to a shopkeeper in 1640, to an innkeeper in 1641, and to a carpenter in 1642 were the subject of court cases. Of the 1,700 guilders Quast owed for the house on the Groene Burchwal, it would appear that he never gave a down payment of more than 100 guilders. In January 1644, he transferred ownership of the house to his wife, who paid 1,000 guilders toward the old debt in May 1648. Later that year, she filed a claim against a Colonel Brant (presumably of The Hague) for 60 guilders he was said to have owed her late husband (Quast had died the year before) for two paintings acquired in 1640.

Quast fared no better in Amsterdam, where he and his family were living by June 1, 1643. On that date, Annetje was entertaining a clergyman from Utrecht in the kitchen of the house the family was living in on the Kalverstraat. The subject turned to prostitutes, many of whom, according to the hostess, the visitor had patronized. The offended guest slashed her face with a glass roemer—at which her husband rushed in and held the pastor at knifepoint. Other documents suggest that the Quasts did not move in the upper circles of Amsterdam society. In February 1644, two men, whom Annetje knew by name, entered the house and damaged a portrait by smearing it with paint and scratching it with knives. Rent was another nuisance. Quast owed 235 guilders in April 1644, and two years later at another address (the Nes, in a bad neighborhood) he refused to pay rent until certain repairs were made. Quast's last resting place was the Nieuwe Kerk, where he was buried on May 29, 1647, having lived for forty-one or forty-two years. His widow and two children withdrew to The Hague, where in May 1649 Annetje gave two paintings to her landlord in lieu of 23 guilders in rent. She is last recorded on May 8, 1650, when she married Jacob van Spreewen (b. 1611), a Rembrandt-esque genre painter from Leiden.

Quast is best known as a painter of peasant scenes and Merry Companies, such as the one discussed below, although he also painted portraits, religious and historical pictures, and other subjects. During his years in The Hague, at least two living artists made an impression on his work, Adriaen van de Venne (1589–1662), the prolific painter, print designer, and from 1639 to 1641 dean of the painters' guild, and Anthonie Palamedesz (1601–1673), who lived in the neighboring city of Delft. The former influenced Quast's pictures of low life and the comic stage, the latter his scenes of nominally polite society. Also important for Quast's wittier imagery were actual stage performances in The Hague and theatrical characters etched by Jacques Callot (1592–1635), in particular the Balli di Sfessania, of 1621, and Varie figure di Gobbi, of 1622. This interest continued in Amsterdam, with paintings of comic actors on stages very like that of the Amsterdam Schouwburg (Playhouse), and with numerous drawings. Quast was a prolific draftsman and made many sheets as finished works of art. He also copied "naer het leven" drawings by Roelant Savery (1576–1639), perhaps for that artist's nephew Salomon Savery, a printmaker and publisher in Amsterdam. The latter published prints after other drawings by Roelant Savery in 1638, and had earlier published engravings after two series of drawings by Quast (The Five Senses and The Life of Peasants; the first is dated 1633). The strongest influence on Quast's paintings of Merry Companies and some similar pictures was the Amsterdam artist Pieter Codde (1599–1678), to whom the Museum's picture was previously attributed.
1. This announcement followed Quast’s breach of promise and legal proceedings lasting two months. The best biography of Quast to date, especially with respect to the accurate citation of documents, is the “archival study on Quast” published as an addendum to Stanton-Hirst 1982, pp. 234–37. The author corrects mistranscribed dates given in Bredius 1902, and cites previously unpublished documents. Despite this effort, some recent publications give the artist’s date of birth simply as 1606, report that he was married in June 1622 (for example, MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 317), or repeat other morsels of misinformation.


5. See Bredius 1915–22, part 1, pp. 273–74, on pictures owned by Quast in 1632; his Christ on the Cross, dated 1633 (ill. opp. p. 274); and an inventory of 1673 citing paintings by Quast of the Raising of Lazarus and the Holy Women at the Sepulcher. A Descent from the Cross is in a private collection in Germany (Grevenbroich 1993, no. 25). Quast also made terracotta reliefs of genre subjects. One, dated 1629, is in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (see Leeuwenberg 1966), and another is in a private collection, New York.

6. The importance of these two paintings for Quast is mentioned by J. E. P. Leistra in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 35, p. 797. For a very Palamedes-like Elegant Company by Quast, dated 1639, see Worcester 1979, no. 28 (and no. 27 for his goatie Peasants in an Interior), or Boston 1992, no. 117. The painting was offered at Sotheby’s, New York, May 20, 1993, no. 32, and at Christie’s, London, December 3, 1997, no. 146.

7. Both subjects are discussed in Stanton-Hirst 1982.

8. Ibid., pp. 216–22.


139. A Party of Merry-Makers

Oil on wood, 14⅝ x 16½ in. (37.5 x 49.5 cm)
Signed (right, on man’s shirt): PQ [in monogram]

The painting is well preserved. There are minor paint losses and abrasions throughout. Past cleaning exposed part of an earlier composition behind the male figure at left, which was repainted by the restorer to vaguely resemble a cloak gathered in the man’s proper left arm. During conservation treatment at the Museum in 1995, the damaged passage was retouched and the intended composition restored.

Bequest of Josephine Bieber, in memory of her husband, Siegfried Bieber, 1970 1973.155.1

This colorful Merry Company by Quast was painted in the mid-to late 1630s, to judge from broad qualities of pictorial style, such as the arrangement of space and lighting, and from the more fashionable articles of clothing. At the time, the artist lived in The Hague. His previous knowledge of Pieter Codde’s work in Amsterdam (see the biography of Quast above) is obvious in this picture, which was attributed to Codde from 1929 (see Exh.; on that occasion, the monogram was read as PC), and perhaps much earlier; the Museum recatalogued the work in 1990. Even after the painting’s bequest to the Museum in 1970, it was little known, and was rarely exhibited before conservation treatment in 1995–96. In 1986, Sutton (see Refs.) suggested that Quast was probably responsible for the picture, and, in response to the present writer’s inquiry in 1989, Justus Müller Hofscede (who has studied Codde’s circle in Amsterdam) agreed with the attribution to Quast and proposed a date in the later 1630s.1 Quast’s usual PQ monogram, painted in red on the shirt (just below the closed buttons) of the singing young man, became legible with cleaning in 1995. The X-radiograph made at that time reveals that the painting underwent many transformations.

The subject hardly requires explanation. Three young women entertain three men who may be described as out on the town. That they are just visiting, for as long as they feel entertained, is indicated by the hat and cloak thrown casually aside, or carried and worn in the case of the man with the fancy sword belt. One of the women has unfastened her lace collar; her scruples were loosened sometime before. Her shiny yellow dress with its big slashed sleeves seems in harmony with the
silk doublet worn by her impromptu companion—perhaps more so than the tune that they sing. A man seated behind the carpet-covered table accompanies the couple on a lute. The woman on the left, in a blue dress and a cape lined in red, places her hand on the arm of a man who raises his glass, looking into his face as though to focus his attention on some proposition. Another woman walks out through an open door, perhaps on her way to the kitchen, although her actual purpose is to create a clear recession on the left side of the composition. The same function is served by the fireplace on the right, where the satyrlike atlantes figure (compare the fireplace in Gabriel Metsu’s *Musical Party*; Pl. 116) provides the only commentary in the picture on the company’s character. But that, in Quast’s day, would have been understood at a glance, from the frizzy hairstyles and showy shoes of the women to the central figure’s wanton position on the table, facilitating glances at her leg and décolletage. This is hardly furniture for comfort—though such surely beckons in other rooms.\(^2\)

Two copies of this picture are known from old photographs.\(^3\)

Formerly attributed by the Museum to Pieter Codde.

2. For earlier pictures with similar subjects by Pieter Codde and Dirck Hals, see Rotterdam–Frankfurt 2004–5, nos. 4, 12.
3. Photocopies in the curatorial files record images at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague. One copy, attributed for no particular reason to Herman Doncker, was in the collection of K. M. von Wolf about 1900, and appears to be from the seventeenth century. The other copy, with the art dealer D. Katz, Dieren, about 1933, introduces a landscape view in the left background, and must date from after 1700. The notice “A. Palamedesz?” is an inappropriate compliment.

**REFERENCES:** P. Sutton 1986, p. 187, suggests that the painting is probably by Quast; Jean L. Druesedow in “Recent Acquisitions,” *MMA Bulletin* 48, no. 2 (Fall 1990), p. 56, on the purchase of a silk doublet dating from about 1631, compares the similar garment worn by the figure on the right in the Museum’s picture (then still attributed to Pieter Codde); Baetjer 1995, p. 310, as by Quast.

**EXHIBITED:** Berlin, Galerie Dr. Schäffer, “Die Meister des holländischen Interieurs,” 1929, no. 20, as by Pieter Codde; Luzerne, Kunstmuseum Luzern (date unknown).\(^1\)


1. A stamped sticker on the back of the panel reads “Kunstmuseum Luzern KH 214.” The Kunstmuseum was unable to identify the exhibition (letter from curator Cornelia Dietz, dated December 12, 2000). However, a date in the early 1920s is likely, considering that the probable owner, Siegfried Bieber, emigrated to America in 1934.
2. This firm and Smith’s previous ownership are mentioned on the mount of an old photograph at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague. Paintings and drawings owned by B. C. Smith of Whiteleigh, Paisley, were included in an auction at Christie’s, London, July 11, 1924, nos. 87–103 (drawings), 104–42 (paintings). All these works date from the 1860s to 1921. Sarah Christie of the Paisley Museums and Art Galleries kindly confirmed that Smith’s first name was Benjamin, that his house on Stanley Road in Paisley was called Whiteleigh, and that his business, Smith Brothers & Co., manufactured textiles (personal communication, May 2005).
Jan van Rasteyn

Culemborg? ca. 1572–1657 The Hague

In his brief review of “Netherlandish Painters Still Alive,” Karel van Mander mentions “a very good painter and portraitist in The Hague called Rasteyn who has a beautiful, good working manner.” The artist’s father, Anthonie van Rasteyn, was a glass painter “living in Culemborch” (Culemborg in Gelderland) in 1593, when he delivered three windows decorated with the arms of the Generality to a patron in The Hague. The family probably moved to the court city within the next few years. In October 1597, Jan Anthonisz van Rasteyn was cited as a witness by a notary in Delft, which together with a broad assessment of his later style has led some writers to report implausibly that he was a pupil of Michiel van Miereveld (q.v.).

Van Rasteyn joined the painters’ guild in The Hague on February 17, 1598; his younger brother Anthony (ca. 1580–1669) became an apprentice in the same year.

In January 1604, “Jan van Rasteyn Antonisz. Schilder” and Anna Arents van Berendrecht were married. This notice, recorded in the Town Hall rather than a church, indicates that the artist was Catholic. He is also cited in later years as present at baptisms and marriages in the Catholic church in the Oude Molsstraat, where he resided from 1608 until at least 1646. Van Rasteyn’s wife died in 1640. In 1654, the artist was living in the Nobelstraat next to his daughter Maria and her husband, the portraitist Adriaen Hanneman (q.v.), while his son Cornelis, a lawyer, remained at the earlier address. In 1641, another daughter, Agnes, married Willem van Culemborch, whose name may suggest that he came from the same town as his in-laws.

Van Rasteyn appears to have served as dean of the painters’ guild in 1617 but to have held no office in later years. About a dozen pupils are recorded, mostly between 1612 and 1624. In 1656, the eighty-four-year-old artist broke with the guild to become a founding member of the rival confraternity, Pictura. He was buried on June 21, 1657.

Van Rasteyn was exclusively a portrait painter. The earliest known example of his work, an intimate portrait of the child prodigy Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), dated 1599 (Fondation Custodia, Institut Néerlandais, Paris), is less reminiscent of pictures produced in the area of Delft and The Hague than of a pair of circular portraits by Pieter Pietersz (1539/41–1603) of a man and a woman, dated 1597 (Mauritshuis, The Hague). By 1585, Pietersz had moved from Haarlem to Amsterdam, where he painted portraits of prominent citizens. Van Rasteyn’s teacher has not been identified, but it seems possible that he studied with Pietersz or was at least influenced by him. About 1630, Constantijn Huygens, secretary to Prince Frederick Hendrick, who must have been well acquainted with Van Rasteyn, wrote in his diary that the portraitist’s “splendid and fresh manner of painting” derived from his experience of Italy, but that later on “he faded a little,” by adding to his art “something of his native land, the old leaven so to speak.”

Indeed, Van Rasteyn’s mature style is typical of South Holland and responds to Van Miereveld, as may be seen in the slightly younger artist’s twenty-five portraits of military officers dating from 1611 onward (Mauritshuis, The Hague). The commission for the series probably came from Prince Maurits, who was captain general of the Dutch army. Van Rasteyn painted many distinguished figures during the 1610s, including Prince Frederick Hendrick (Dutch Royal Collection); officers of the Orange Company civic guard, and the city magistrates together with officers of the four civic guard companies of The Hague (both in the Haags Historisch Museum, The Hague); and, most memorably, the amateur Pieter van Veen with his son and clerk (Musée d’Art et d’Histoire, Geneva).

Van Rasteyn’s approach to portraiture was more fluid and more flattering than Van Miereveld’s, who nevertheless enjoyed greater favor from members of the Dutch court and an international reputation. From about 1641 (when Van Miereveld died), Van Rasteyn seems to have virtually ceased production. The immediate future of portraiture in The Hague was left to his son-in-law Hanneman, who, despite competition from Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656) and others, enjoyed a quarter century of success comparable to that of his father-in-law.

2. In 1602, Anthonie van Rasteyn was recorded as making another sale in The Hague, with no mention of living elsewhere; see Bredius and Moes 1893, p. 41.
3. For example, in Haak 1984, p. 217, where it is also recorded that “Rasteyn was a native of The Hague,” although there is no
known connection between the artist's family and that city during the first two decades of his life.

4. For the details in this paragraph and their sources, see Bredius and Moes 1892, pp. 42–44.
5. See ibid., p. 43, noting that the Van Ravesteyn who was dean in 1617 could have been Jan's brother Anthonie.
6. Ibid., p. 44, lists their names, none of which is familiar. See also The Hague 1998–99, p. 140, where Hanneman is mistakenly added to the list.
7. However, see the artist's Commemorative Portrait of Adriana van Maassijlbroeck and Anna Elant, 1618 (Museum Het Catharijne-convent, Utrecht), in which the patron and his late wife, accompanied by their name saints, kneel in a chapel before a painting of Christ on the cross; see Van Schooten and Wüstefeld 2003, no. 40.
10. Huygens 1711, p. 75; see Buijs in The Hague 2002, pp. 149, 216 n. 20, noting that Van Ravesteyn's trip to Italy is otherwise undocumented.

140. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on wood, 267/8 x 227/8 in. (68.3 x 58.1 cm)
Signed and dated (upper right): Anno 1635/JVR F.
[JVR in monogram]

The painting is in good condition, although the face is slightly abraded, most noticeably in the lips and jaw. There are a few small losses in the face and collar.

Gift of Henry Goldman, 1912 12.202

The authorship of this comparatively late work by Van Ravesteyn has never been questioned. The effect of the woman's stern expression and somewhat outdated millstone ruff is softened by her small lace collar and delicate lace cap, and perhaps as well by the artist's brushwork. Van Ravesteyn was usually more attentive than Michiel van Miereveld or Paulus Moreelse (q.v.) to visual effects, seen here in the textures of costume, face, and hair, in the moistness of the sitter's eyes, and in the diaphanous plane of the cap. Details of dress in Dutch formal portraits are usually faithful reflections of the sitter's own clothing; an item such as the cap would have been lent to the artist if both parties found it convenient.

The portrait may have had a pendant (compare the composition of Pl. 122), but no trace of one is known.
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A prolific painter, draftsman, and etcher, Rembrandt Harmensz van Rijn is generally regarded as the greatest artist of Holland’s Golden Age. He was born in Leiden on July 15, 1606, the son of Harmen Gerritsz van Rijn (ca. 1608–1630) and Cornelia (Neeltgen) Willemsdr van Zuytbrouck (1658–1640). The couple married in 1589 and had ten children, three of whom died in infancy. Rembrandt was the second youngest child. His father came from a long line of millers, and from the year of his marriage onward was half owner of De Rijn (The Rhine) mill, from which he took his surname. Rembrandt’s mother was the daughter of a successful baker. Both parents appear in Rembrandt’s early work, but not nearly as frequently as was supposed by early specialists such as Wilhelm von Bode and Abraham Bredius.¹

As a boy, Rembrandt went to a city school and then to the local Latin school. In 1620, he enrolled in the University of Leiden, but from about 1619 until 1622 he was evidently apprenticed full-time to the socially prominent figure painter Jacob van Swanenburgh (1571–1638). The Leiden burgomaster and historian Jan Jansz Orlers, in his description of the city published in 1644, wrote of Rembrandt’s academic prospects that he had “no desire or inclination whatsoever in this direction because by nature he was moved toward the art of painting and drawing.”² Van Swanenburgh was Catholic, as were Neeltgen van Zuytbrouck’s relatives. However, Rembrandt’s parents apparently belonged to the Reformed Church. Throughout his life, the artist was connected with patrons of various religions, including prominent Catholics, Jews, Calvinists, Mennonites, and Remonstrants.

About 1624, Rembrandt studied with the respected Amsterdam artist Pieter Lastman (1583–1633), who had worked in Rome and was the leading figure in a circle of talented history painters.³ His brief training in Amsterdam largely determined his style and choice of subjects and made him aware of developments in other cities, such as Antwerp and Rome. During his Leiden period (ca. 1625–31), Rembrandt shared artistic ideas with the slightly younger Jan Lievens (1607–1674), an eclectic artist whose eager responses to stylistic innovations (like those of Caravaggesque painters in Utrecht) seem to have encouraged Rembrandt’s own.⁴ At the same time, however, he independently studied realistic appearances and expressions, using live models, including himself. This program of empirical observation was to some extent a Leiden tradition, but it was also a personal preoccupation that continued throughout his career. Despite extraordinary transformations of style in the later work, Rembrandt’s constant concern for convincing effects of light, space, atmosphere, modeling, texture, and psychologically penetrating descriptions of behavior may be traced back ultimately to the foundation of his Leiden years.⁵

The artist’s earliest known paintings, for example, The Stoning of Saint Stephen, of 1635, in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyons, follow Lastman’s example in their bright coloring, strong contrasts of light and shadow, dramatic action, and focus on the main protagonists. The congestion of figures and background details and the effective compositional device of placing the nearest figures in a plane of shadow are characteristics adopted less from Lastman than from artists in his circle, such as Jacob Pynas (q.v.), and from Adam Elsheimer (1578–1610), a German painter in Rome admired by Lastman and by such major artists as Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640). Rembrandt knew Elsheimer’s work mainly through the excellent reproductive engravings of Hendrick Goudt (1583–1648). The luminosity of the Lyons picture and the shadowy interiors that Rembrandt painted during the next few years, as in Simeon in the Temple, of about 1627–28 (Kunsthalle, Hamburg), reveal a sympathetic study of Elsheimer’s more intimate scenes.⁶

Rembrandt’s work in Leiden was prolific (about fifty paintings and many etchings are known) and remarkable for its accelerated development. In his progress from ambitious multfigure history pieces in the Lastman manner to pictures of one, two, or a few biblical figures usually set in shadowy interiors, Rembrandt benefited from an increasingly broad survey of artistic sources and from his own vivid imagination. As many drawings reveal, the
young artist had an exceptional ability to visualize characters and human situations, so that the most theatrical stories were cast into compellingly realistic terms. This capacity suited Rembrandt’s professional goal of being a history painter, but his figural works, which range from formal portraits to sketches of the poor and elderly, also demonstrate a profound interest in humanity for its own sake.

Although nor Rembrandt’s student, Lievens produced pictures that were mistakenly for works by Rembrandt within a few years of their execution (for example, Bust of an Old Woman, of about 1630), in the Royal Collection, Windsor Castle). Rembrandt’s influence overwhelmed several of his pupils and followers, but his method of teaching, which resembled the way he had taught himself, had the effect of setting gifted disciples on independent paths that were consistent with their own personalities. One of the most striking examples is Rembrandt’s first formal pupil, Gerrit Dou (q.v.), who studied with Rembrandt between 1628 and 1630.

The artist moved to Amsterdam about 1632. He was probably brought there by commissions for portraits, such as The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp, dated 1632 (Mauritskuis, The Hague), and works comparable to those discussed below (see Pls. 141, 143–45). A key figure for Rembrandt’s rise in the 1630s was the Mennonite art dealer Hendrick Uylenburgh (ca. 1584/89–1661), whose cousin Saskia van Uylenburgh (1612–1642) became the painter’s wife in June 1634. The couple lived in Uylenburgh’s house for about a year, and then rented a fine residence in the Nieuwe Doelenstraat (1635–38). Rembrandt’s assumption of patrician attributes, which included art collecting, may have been encouraged by his wife’s social position (she was the daughter of a former burgomaster of Leuwarden) as well as the example of Rubens, the northern European model of the artist as gentleman and courtier. Rubens strongly influenced Rembrandt’s style during the 1630s, as seen in the series of Passion pictures that were painted for the Stadholder, Prince Frederick Hendrick, and in individual works such as Belonia (Pl. 147), The Holy Family, of about 1634 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), and The Blinding of Samson, of about 1636 (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt).

Rembrandt’s high standing in the Amsterdam art world of the 1630s is evident not only from his many commissions for portraits and (to a lesser extent) for history pictures, but also from his authority as a teacher. Gifted artists such as Govert Flinck, Ferdinand Bol, Gerbrand van den Eeckhout, and Jan Victors (q.v.) studied with him in the second half of the decade. In 1639, Rembrandt bought a grand house on the present Jodenbreestraat, which survives as the Museum Het Rembrandthuis (Rembrandt House Museum). The artist exudes confidence and urbanity in his Self-Portrait at the Age of Thirty-four, dated 1640 (see fig. 150), which was inspired by Raphael’s famous portrait of Baldassare Castiglione (ca. 1514–15; see fig. 196) and by Titian’s Portrait of an Unknown Man (“Ariosto”) (fig. 151).

Despite these outward signs of success, Rembrandt’s life was not easy. He worked intensively and suffered personal hardships. Saskia gave birth to children in 1635, 1638, and 1640, none of whom survived more than two months. Their son Titus, born in 1641, would live until 1668, but Saskia herself died at the age of twenty-nine in June 1642. Care of Titus was assigned to a nurse, Geertje Dircks, who became Rembrandt’s companion until the late 1640s. The relationship appears to have been unhappy as well as illicit. Geertje sued for breach of promise in 1649 and was awarded a small income, but a year later she was placed in a house of correction at the artist’s expense. A minor transgression—Geertje pawned some of Saskia’s jewelry—enabled Rembrandt to rearrange his domestic affairs.

In the same period, Rembrandt’s knowledge of artistic traditions deepened and contributed to a gradual change in the tenor of his work. His response to Titian, as seen in the self-portrait of 1640, the portrait of Herman Doomer, dated 1640 (Pl. 148), the Flora, of about 1654 (Pl. 153), and a number of solemn scenes from the life of Christ, may be considered idiosyncratic for a Dutch artist, especially with respect to Rembrandt’s interest in Titian’s expressive as well as technical qualities. Rembrandt studied a greater variety of past masters than did any other Dutch painter. To some extent, his sources in Mantegna, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian, and so on could be said to compensate for the tenuous relationship to the Italian Renaissance that pertained in Leiden and other cities of the northern Netherlands. In this regard, Rembrandt’s drawing of about 1633–35 after Leonardo’s Last Supper (as it appeared in a reproductive engraving) is a revealing work (Robert Lehman Collection, MMA). A first draft in delicate lines was decisively revised in emphatic, angular strokes, so that much of the dramatic effect of Leonardo’s original composition was recovered and transformed into the visual language of the seventeenth century. As in the corrections Rembrandt made to student drawings, his modifications
of *The Last Supper* underscore the dramatic moment of the subject. From the late 1630s onward, Rembrandt appears to have assigned his students biblical stories as essays in dramatic presentation. Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.) and Carel Fabritius (1622–1654) studied with Rembrandt during the early 1640s, while Nicolaes Maes and Willem Drost (q.v.) entered the studio about 1650.

The most important commission of Rembrandt's career, *The Night Watch* (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), was completed in 1642. The artist employed many dramatic and illusionistic devices that were developed mostly from his earlier religious scenes. Unlike all other artists who treated this kind of group portrait, Rembrandt devoted half the huge canvas to the setting and used the fall of light to accentuate faces and a few key elements (including symbols of Amsterdam and the civic guard company). The artist realized that if the immediate purpose of such a picture was to document members of an organization, its lasting function was to decorate a large public room. Thus, the work most comparable in his oeuvre is not another group portrait but a canvas mural, *The Conspiracy of Julius Civilis*, painted in 1661–62 for the Town Hall of Amsterdam (the central part is preserved in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm).

During the 1640s, a few of Rembrandt's former pupils (especially Bol and Flinck) and other Amsterdam artists, such as Bartholomeus van der Helst (q.v.), became more fashionable than Rembrandt by adopting an elegant manner inspired by Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641). Rembrandt's unconventional private life probably cost him some patrons as well. In 1647, he hired Hendrickje Stoffels (see Pl. 154), a young servant who would become his common-law wife and closest companion until her death in 1663. Their daughter, Cornelia, was born in 1654, and Hendrickje was censured by the Calvinist church. By that year, the artist was having trouble paying for his house and other expenses, and in 1666 he was forced to surrender his property to the Chamber of Insolvency Estates. His stock of paintings and his art collection were inventoried and dispersed at various auctions; the house and its contents were sold in early 1658. Shortly thereafter, Rembrandt set up an art dealership in which he was the sole employee of Titus and Hendrickje. The more polite members of Amsterdam society would have distanced themselves from the artist because of these embarrassments, but he remained famous and appreciated by a discerning clientele.

Among the major commissions of Rembrandt's later years are *Aristotle with a Bust of Homer*, of 1653 (Pl. 151), the *Anatomy of Dr. Joan Deyman*, of 1656 (fragment in the Amsterdam Historisch Museum), and *The Syndics of the Amsterdam Drapers' Guild*, dated 1662 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). In the same years, he painted a number of imposing portraits, among them those of the wealthy merchant Jacob Trip and his wife Margaretha de Geer (National Gallery, London), and pendant portraits such as those in the Altman Collection, discussed below (Pls. 158, 159). The canvas known as *The Jewish Bride*, of about 1665 (see fig. 219), probably represents a Dutch couple in biblical guise. The sheer volume of Rembrandt's production during the 1660s suggests that he was supported by a fair number of patrons until the end of his life. Exhausting labor and the loss of loved ones may explain the painter's frail appearance in the few years before his death, at the age of sixty-three, on October 4, 1669.

In addition to about three hundred paintings and hundreds of drawings (difficulties of attribution discourage counting the latter), about three hundred fifty etchings by Rembrandt survive. They prove him to have been the most inventive printmaker of the century. He not only etched but also scratched and gouged the copperplate in unsystematic patterns, extending the medium's capacity to suggest various kinds of illumination and painterly effects such as evocative veils of darkness. Some compositions, including *The Three Crosses*, of 1653, were radically revised in design and expressive effect. As in paintings and drawings, an important if small part of Rembrandt's etched oeuvre was devoted to poetic views of the Dutch countryside and other landscape themes.

In modern times, Rembrandt has been paid the tribute of subjective analyses ranging from romantic ideas about his being a failed genius to academic conceptions of the artist as a product of social forces or as a self-promoter. These appropriations are to some extent confused by the complexity of Rembrandt's character, insofar as it may be judged from his biography and his art. However, his appeal to successive generations would appear to derive in part from his many moments of honesty, if one may so describe his bold revisions of traditional subjects (he often isolates an individual pondering a moral problem), the frank love with which he depicted a few members of his family, and his unprecedented number of candid or at least unflattering self-portraits (see Pl. 157). The monumental *Self-Portrait* of 1658 (see fig. 191) is not the most
obvious example, but even in that work the painter's expression and appearance (at the age of fifty-two) suggest that the majestic pose and costume are attributes assumed momentarily. Rembrandt's approach to self-portraiture was the result of a lifelong inclination to judge the fictions of humanity against fact.

1. The question of family members appearing in Rembrandt's work is discussed in Leiden 2003–6. Bredius 1935 includes a large section devoted to Rembrandt's parents, his brother, his wife and son, and his companion Hendrickje Stoffels (nos. 63–113). Binstock 2006 presents evidence that Rembrandt was actually born in 1607, but it does not suffice to overrule the date of July 15, 1606, given in Omer 1644, p. 375.
2. The translation is borrowed from Westernmann 2000, p. 24. The book is one of the best short introductions to the artist's life and work. For an extended encyclopedia article on Rembrandt, see Broos 1996b.
3. On the question of when Rembrandt was in Lastman's studio, see Broos 1996b, p. 152.
8. The date and circumstances of Rembrandt's move to Amsterdam are variously described. He may have worked in both Amsterdam and Leiden for some time. Compare Bros 1996b, p. 155, with Dudok van Heel 2006, pp. 7, 199, 201.
9. On Rembrandt's connection with Uyleburgh and his marriage to Saskia, see Dudok van Heel in Edinburgh–London 2001, pp. 21–23, or Dudok van Heel 2006, pp. 199–207. On Uyleburgh and his business in Amsterdam, see London–Amsterdam 2006, chaps. 1 and 3. In ibid., p. 16, Saskia is called Uyleburgh's niece, which is a hasty translation of nicht (niece or female cousin).
10. Rembrandt's pupils are surveyed in Liedtke 1999b, and are listed (with dates of tutelage) in Liedtke 2004b, p. 68.
12. See Logan in New York 1991–96, vol. 2, no. 56, where the important contribution of Ganttner 1964 should have been cited.
15. The two Amsterdam paintings are discussed in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92, nos. 44, 48.

141. Portrait of a Man

Oil on wood (oval), 29½ x 20⅛ in. (75.6 x 52.1 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed: (center right) RHL van Rijn [initials in monogram] / 1632.; (center left) AET.40.

The painting is remarkably well preserved. The oak panel retains its original thickness, with bevels intact.

Gift of Mrs. Lincoln Ellsworth, in memory of Lincoln Ellsworth, 1964. 64.126

In the Metropolitan Museum's impressive collection of portraits by Rembrandt, the oval portrait of an unidentified man from the Ellsworth collection, while one of the less ambitious, is, because of its early date, very high standard of execution, and exceptionally fine state of preservation, nevertheless one of the more important examples. The tall oak panel, made of three boards joined vertically, retains its original shape and dimensions. The large and rather crude inscription at left center, "AET.40." (age 40), must be by another hand, and could date from a later period.2

During his first two years in Amsterdam, in 1632 and 1633, Rembrandt produced a remarkable variety of formal portraits in nearly every format then current. Even the newly fashionable oval support (which had precedents in portrait engravings and much smaller paintings; see pls. 63, 64, and fig. 75) was treated by the artist as an experimental form. The figure's scale, placement in the field, and angle to the picture plane, as well as the direction of his glance, are played against backgrounds painted in diverse tones, both with shadows and without, and against illumination of different intensities coming from several sources. These various means were employed by Rembrandt not only to convey objective physical effects, such as volume and space, but also subjective ones, such as impressions of
remoteness or intimacy. In the Ellsworth portrait, candor and reserve seem implied, on the one hand, by the frontal face and steady glance, and, on the other, by the apparent distance of the sitter from the picture plane (compare Pl. 145) and his closeness to the wall behind him. This is one of the earliest instances of Rembrandt’s placing a cast shadow on the wall to set off a bust-length or half-length portrait; he appears to have planned the effect from the earliest stage of execution.3

The man’s expression is as subtly observed as are the distinct textures of his skin, hair, beard, ruff, and jacket. The viewer is greeted with a slight smile, but also with a faint air of skepticism, or so it seems from the slant of an eyebrow and the pull of muscles to one side of the mouth, both on the more strongly lighted side of the face. The sense of character and the extraordinary transitions of light and shadow in the head and ruff ultimately reflect the young painter’s intensive study, during his formative years in Leiden, of individuals (especially himself, in a mirror) and of physical appearances. As noted by Hubert Von Sonnenburg, who cleaned the painting in 1993, short, often feathery brushstrokes are built up thickly in the more illuminated parts of the face, while “heavy and vigorous” strokes describe the linen layers of the collar. As he often did in Leiden, the artist fully exploited the potential for achieving rich effects with oil paint on a hardwood surface. “Only in Rembrandt’s panel paintings is such a high degree of perfection found.”4

Specific qualities such as the detail and depth found in and around the eyes, and other descriptive effects that were esteemed by contemporary critics, are readily discernible in reproductions. But the actual painting must be seen in good light to appreciate what the artist accomplished in the black tones of the costume: the convincing sense of volume, the gradations of light, and such fine details as the row of closely spaced, half-round buttons and the piping down the front of the jacket and on the shoulder. Where the sleeve joins the shoulder, the piping is shown to have suffered some wear, so that even in the man’s garment, as in his lined face and graying hair, one finds traces of personal history.5

Since the 1860s, when Théophile Thoré admired this portrait in the Parisian residence of baron de Sellière, it has been highly regarded by historians of Dutch art.6 One of the highlights of Wilhelm von Bode’s visit to Chicago in 1893 was his study of this picture in the home of James Ellsworth (who acquired the work by 1889).7 Before the 1990s, the painting’s comparative inaccessibility and, for some decades, its thick layer of yellowed varnish must have encouraged writers to confine their remarks to the question of a possible pendant. The Altman Portrait of a Woman (Pl. 145; see Refs.), which is dated 1633, probably never would have been proposed were the pictures not both in America at early dates and well known to the enthusiastic pendant-spotter Wilhelm Valentiner. In 1973, Josua Bruyn (see Refs.) suggested that the Ellsworth panel and the Portrait of a Thirty-nine-Year-Old Woman, dated 1632 (Nivaagaards Malerisamling, Nivå, Denmark), might be pendants, presumably on the basis of the fact that they were sold as such in the Tolozan sale of 1801. However, Bruyn and the other authors of the Rembrandt Corpus concluded (in 1986) that a later marriage of the pictures had probably been arranged, “a very common practice in the 18th century.” They emphasize the smaller scale of the woman’s figure, and its quite dissimilar placement in the picture field. The inscriptions of the sitters’ ages, “appendix in the same, rather unusual manner,” could be taken as evidence against rather than in support of the hypothesis that the pictures were painted as a pair.8

Comparison with other Rembrandt portraits of the 1630s suggests that the Portrait of a Man, with its poise of figure and space, was intended to stand on its own.

1. See Von Sonnenburg in New York 1991–96, vol. 1, pp. 28–29, fig. 25, for a photograph of the back of the panel and a brief discussion. The mention of two planks in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3, p. 240, is an error, and is inconsistent with the authors’ own observation in ibid., p. 262.

2. See the discussion in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 262, on the similar inscription on the Portrait of a Thirty-nine-Year-Old Woman, dated 1632, in the Nivaagaards Malerisamling, Nivå, Denmark, which in 1801 was sold as a (probably false) pendant to the Ellsworth portrait. Van der Veen 2003, p. 55, fails to consider the question of the inscription’s authenticity when entertaining the notion that the Museum’s “Portrait of a 40-year-old man” (as it is called in Corpus 1982–89, no. 459) might be a portrait of Pieter Sijen (ca. 1592–1652).

3. As noted in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 7, 240, where the painting is described as providing “perhaps the first instance of a cast shadow planned from the outset (i.e. with a reserve left for it in the light grey paint of the adjoining background)” (p. 7).

4. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1991–96, vol. 1, p. 38, in the caption to figs. 28 and 29, a detail and an X-radiograph of the man’s head. See also the remarks under “paint layer” and “varnish” in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3, p. 240. Von Sonnenburg’s description echoes that of the 1801 sale catalogue, in which it is observed that, “Tout ce que l'art peut produire de merveilleux, est porté, dans cet ouvrage, au plus haut degré de perfection.”
REFERENCES: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 105, no. 283; records the painting (almost certainly this work) in the sales of 1801 and 1802; Mertz 1874, p. 292, cites the work as a "tableau exceptionnel" in the collection of the princesse de Sagan; Vosmaer 1877, pp. 493, 495, catalogues male portraits of 1632, either of which could be this picture (the first with the Collot and Seillière provenances, the second with the Sagan provenance), and rejects the identification of the sitter as Dr. Nicolaes Tulp; Bode 1883, pp. 399, 397, no. 309, lists the picture as an oval portrait of a man, dated 1632, owned by the princesse de Sagan; Dutuit 1884, pp. 11, 18, 32, 62, 66, no. 247, records the portrait in the Tolszain sale without giving a current location, and identifies the ex-Collot picture with that in the Sagan collection; Wurzbach 1866, text vol., no. 322; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 13, as "Portrait of a young Man," erroneously called Dr. Tulp, from the Collot and Sagan collections, lists the work among portraits recently acquired by American collectors; Bode 1895, p. 576, mentions the portrait as in the collection of James Ellsworth, Chicago (where Bode saw it in 1893); Bode 1897–1906, vol. 7 (1902), pp. 32, 43, no. 81, pl. 81, as "Bust of a Man of Forty," lists previous owners as Tolszain (1801 sale), Robit, Monteale, Collot, Seillière and Sagan; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 177 (ill.), 26, listed, as owned by James W. Ellsworth, New York; Moses 1897–1905, vol. 2 (1905), p. 484 n. 1, rejects the identification with Dr. Tulp; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 67 (ill.), 395, records the inscription; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 82 (ill.), 532, records the inscription; Valentine in New York 1909, p. 75, no. 78 (ill.), catalogued as an anonymous loan, lists earlier collections; Cox 1909–10, p. 183, as in the MMA "Hudson-Fulton Celebration," lent by an anonymous owner; Hofstede de Groot 1907–37, vol. 6 (1916), p. 357, no. 761, as "A Middle-Aged Man, once mistakenly called Nicolaes Tulp," gives the essential details of provenance, exhibitions, and literature; Van Dyke 1923, p. 37, cited in the Ellsworth Collection, New York, as "an excellent early Rembrandt"; Downes 1923, p. 663, mentioned as in the Ellsworth collection; Valentine 1926, p. 3 (ill. following p. 4), calls the sitter a cleric; Valentine 1927, unpaged, note to no. 36, suggests that the Altman Collection's Portrait of a Woman, of 1633 (Pl. 144), might be a pendant to this picture, observing that "the lady might well be the wife of a preacher, as the model in the Ellsworth painting seems to be" (a preacher, not the wife of one); Bredius 1935, p. 7, no. 160, pl. 160, cites Valentine's 1921 proposal of a pendant; K. Bauch 1966, p. 19, no. 375, pl. 375, as a pendant to no. 462 (the Altman Portrait of a Woman, of 1635); Gerson 1968, pp. 265, 494, no. 122, as "probably the companion piece" to the Altman Portrait of a Woman, but the execution of the latter is weaker and its "tribute to Rembrandt is not wholly convincing"; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 136 (ill.), 560, 576, no. 160, repeats Gerson 1968; Lecadre 1969, pp. 98, 99 (ill.), no. 98, parrots Gerson 1968; J. Bruyn in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 34, suggests that the Portrait of a Thirty-nine-Year-Old Woman, in Nivå, Denmark, is possibly this picture's pendant; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 177, no. 117 (ill.), with no comment; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 81, cites the picture as a "document" of the year 1632; G. Schwartz 1985, p. 115, fig. 146, feels that the Altman Portrait of a Woman is not this picture's pendant; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2 (1986), p. 9, n. 9, pp. 3–6, 7, 8, 22, 23–24, 261–62, 417, 765, 866, 865, no. 695, figs. 1–4 (overall, details, and X-rayograph detail), as "originally oval," and as revealing "perhaps the first instance of a cast shadow planned from the outer (i.e. with a reserve left for it in the light grey paint of the adjoining background)" (p. 7), rejects the Altman portrait as a pendant, but suggests that this picture may be assumed to have had a mate, and that the oval Portrait of a Thirty-nine-Year-Old Woman in Nivå, Denmark, is perhaps the companion piece; C. Tümpel 1986, p. 428, no. 679 (ill. p. 89), as by Rembrandt's workshop ("schwächere die sicheren Porträts"), considers the Altman portrait a probable pendant; Grimm 1991, p. 13, fig. 15, feels that the optical impression is not matched by psychological insight; Sl Tâyes 1992, p. 246, no. 153 (ill.), as "treated with great expressive force," rejects the proposed pendants as implausible; W. Liechte in "Recent Acquisitions," MMA Bulletin 19, n. 2 (Fall 1993), p. 34 (ill.), 35, observes that the Altman panel has erroneously been assumed to be a possible pendant, and that "no companion piece has ever been convincingly proposed"; C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 89 (ill.), 431, no. 679, repeats (from C. Tümpel 1986) the astonishing opinion that this picture is "weaker than the certain portraits," and considers it probably the companion piece to the Portrait of a Woman of 1631 (Pl. 145); Baertelier 1995, pp. 310–11 (full-page ill.), Liechte in New York, 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 40–42, 47, 50, 58, 60, no. 1 (ill), fig. 49 (detail), describes the work as setting "a standard of quality by which approximately contemporary works by or attributed to Rembrandt may be judged," notes the excellent state of preservation, considers the expression to be "ultimately the product of Rembrandt's intensive study of expression and character during the Leiden years," and reports that the signature is genuine, while the inscription of the sitter's age is old but not by Rembrandt; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 28, 29, 38, 90, 94, figs. 23 (detail of the panel back), 38 (detail), 29 (X-rayograph detail), 114, 115 (detail), precisely describes the execution of the face and costume, and observes that "only in Rembrandt's pastel paintings is such a high degree of perfection found" (p. 38); Edwards 1996, pp. 168 (ill.), 169, 297 (under no. 96), 311 (under no. 130), records the sales at Paillet, Paris, in 1801 and 1802; Blanknet in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, p. 114 n. 1 (under no. 8), listed as one of "nine pictures of august gentlemen" by
Rembrandt to date from 1631 or 1632; Wright 2000, p. 188, fig. 172, considers the Nîve portrait possibly a pendant; Van der Veen 2003, pp. 55, 58, 59 n. 56, fig. 3, reviews the question of whether the Altman or Nîve female portraits might be this picture's pendant, entertains the notion that the sitter may be Pieter Sijen (ca. 1592–1653), but considers it more likely that Sijen is the subject of Rembrandt’s portrait of a forty-one-year-old man dated 1635 (Norton Simon Museum of Art, Pasadena); Quodbach 2004, pp. 94 n. 13, 98, listed among Rembrandts admired by Thoré in the collection of the banker Achille de Seilière; Scallen 2004, pp. 187, 318 n. 19, as seen by Bode in Chicago in 1893; Bøgh Rasmussen in Copenhagen 2006, pp. 184, 283 n. 5 (under no. 8), doubts that this picture and the Nîve portrait were conceived as pendants; Van der Veen in London–Amsterdam 2006, pp. 144–45, revisits (see Van der Veen 2005) the questions of whether the sitter could be Pieter Sijen and whether the portrait had a pendant.


EX COLL.: Claude Toloran, Paris (until d. 1796; his estate sale, Paillet and Delaroche, Paris, February 23–24, 1801, no. 96, for FrF 4,001 to Naudou for Roëtiers de Montaleau); Alexandre-Louis Roëtiers de Montaleau, Paris (until 1802; his sale, Paillet and Delaroche, Paris, July 19–20, 1802, no. 130, for FrF 8,000 to “Colo”); J.-L. Collot, Paris (1802–35; sale, Hôtel des Ventes, Paris, May 25–26, 1832, no. 26, as a portrait of Nicolaes Tulip, bought in; his estate sale, Hôtel des Ventes Mobilieres, Paris, March 29, 1835, no. 22, as a portrait of Nicolaes Tulip, for FrF 16,000 to his son); Baron Achille de Seilière, Paris (until d. 1873); his daughter Jeanne Marguerite de Seilière, princesse de Sagan, Paris (1873—at least 1885; sold to Ellsworth); James W. Ellsworth, Chicago and New York (by 1889–d. 1923); his son Lincoln Ellsworth, New York (1923–1951); his widow, Mrs. Lincoln Ellsworth, New York (1951–64; life interest, 1964–d. 1993); Gift of Mrs. Lincoln Ellsworth, in memory of Lincoln Ellsworth, 1964 64.126

1. The portrait is described as owned by Ellsworth in the New York Times, September 11, 1889. Esmée Quodbach kindly brought this reference to our attention.

142. Man in Oriental Costume
(“The Noble Slav”)

Oil on canvas, 60½ x 43¾ in. (152.7 x 111.1 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): RHL van. Rijn/1632
[RHL in monogram]
The painting is very well preserved.
Bequest of William K. Vanderbilt, 1920 20.135.2

The majestic picture once known as The Noble Slav was painted by Rembrandt in 1632, when he was twenty-six years old and eager to make an impression on potential patrons in Amsterdam and at the court of The Hague. In its exotic subject, dramatic style, and splendid execution, the canvas—one of the artist's first paintings on that support—was intended for the appreciation of connoisseurs. One measure of Rembrandt's ambition is the picture's size, which significantly exceeds that of any work by the artist dating from before 1632 (the imposing Portrait of Nicolaes Ruts, of 1631 [Frick Collection, New York], would cover three-fifths of this canvas) and is larger than any of his single-figure paintings dating from throughout the 1630s (for example, Pls. 143, 144, 146, 147), with the exception of a few full-length portraits.1

Representing historical (or historicized) figures on a grand scale, as did such internationally esteemed artists as Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640), Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), and Gerrit van Honthorst (1590–1656), was considered the profession's highest calling. This notion evidently inspired two young painters in Rembrandt's immediate circle, Jan Lievens (1607–1674) and Jacob Backer (q.v.), to produce large history pictures somewhat earlier than he did, partly under the influence of Honthorst and other Caravagggesque artists. An example by Backer of comparatively modest size (37 x 25½ in. [94 x 64 cm]) is Hippocrates Visiting Democritus in Abdara, of about 1630–32 (Alfred and Isabel Bader, Milwaukee), in which the model for the standing physician must have been the same man who appears in Rembrandt's picture as the Oriental potentate (and probably the one presented as the Apostle Peter in Rembrandt's canvas, also of 1632, in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm).2 The model is found again in a drawing and
a few bust-length portraits by Backer, all dating from the early 1630s (fig. 123). In his Leiden works especially, Rembrandt was inclined to dwell upon the physical traits of old age and long experience, but here he transforms the stooped and rather weary figure known from Backer's oeuvre into a man of impressive vigor and authority. Many lines in the face have been smoothed away and those that remain—with the set lips and earnest eyes—suggest determination and resolve (fig. 124). One has the sense that in dealing with this venerable despot, it would be wise to try diplomacy before launching a crusade.

The Subject
The use of a Dutch model makes it clear that the subject was intended as a type of "Oriental" character—Turkish or Persian—rather than a historical personage. The mention of a "Sultan Soliman by Rembrandt" in the 1707–19 inventory of Honselaardijk Castle might lead one to the opposite conclusion. However, the subject was described as "The Great Turk" in the 1694–1702 inventory of the same collection, and in about 1630, when Constantijn Huygens, the Stadholder's secretary, saw the painting "in my Prince's house," he wrote in his diary that it depicted "a sort of Turkish ruler ["Türcici quasi Duci"], done from the head of some Dutchman." The work in question was not painted by Rembrandt, but is known to have been Lievens's large Oriental, of about 1629 (fig. 125). As noted below, Huygens and his prince, Frederick Hendrick, had direct knowledge of Turkish dignitaries, and they must have seen more convincing representations of Ottoman autocrats such as Süleyman the Magnificent (r. 1520–66), for example, in portrait prints by the Danish court artist Melchior Lorck (1526/27—after 1588), and in the various costume books that were published in the second half of the sixteenth century (fig. 126, where Süleyman is on the left). Lievens's model has also been identified as Rembrandt's father and is familiar from works by both artists and by Gerrit Dou (q.v.).

"The Noble Slav," a title first employed in print by Wilhelm Bode (see Refs., 1897), is not so fanciful as many of the names that were assigned to Rembrandt figures in nineteenth-century catalogues. In that period, numerous inhabitants of Slavic lands such as Serbia still wore flowing robes and turbans, a custom that caught the notice of northern European travelers. The Germanic features of Rembrandt's model and perhaps his heavily fur-lined cloak would have prompted Bode to reject Middle Eastern identifications (Vosmaer's Oriental debut, for instance; see Refs., 1877) in favor of Middle European nomenclature. However, Bode's resounding formulation leads one astray, for there is abundant artistic and historical evidence (in addition to the documents cited above) supporting the conclusion that Rembrandt's dignified old man, with his voluminous garment of figured silk (or damask, named for Damascus), his bejeweled turban and multicolored scarf, his pearl earrings, and a large pendant bearing a Turkish or "Saracen" crescent, would have been recognized in the 1630s as a Turkish "prince" or sultan, despite the familiarity of his face.

As several scholars have mentioned, a copy after Rembrandt listed in the 1637 estate of Backer's teacher, Lambert Jacobsz (ca. 1598–1636), was said to depict "a fine young Turkish prince," and an Amsterdam inventory of 1646 refers to "een turcke tronie van Rembrandt gedaen" (a Turkish tronie done by Rembrandt). The Museum's painting itself is probably the work offered as "Een Turkse Vorst of Primo Vizier, door Rembrant konstig en kragtig geschildert" (A Turkish Prince or Grand Vizier, artfully and forcefully painted by Rembrandt) in the 1739 sale of the estate of Govert Looten (1668–1727), grandson of
Figure 124. Detail of Rembrandt's *Man in Oriental Costume* ("The Noble Slave") (Pl. 142)
the wealthy Amsterdam merchant Marten Looten (1583–1649), whose portrait by Rembrandt also dates from 1632 (Los Angeles County Museum of Art).9

Pictures of “Orientals” by Rembrandt, Lievens, and artists in their circle, such as Gerrit Dou, Govert Flinck (q.v.), Isaack Jouderville (1612/13–1645/48), and Willem de Poorter (1608–after 1649),10 are often placed in one or more of the following contexts: history paintings by Rembrandt’s teacher Pieter Lastman (1583–1633) and other Pre-Rembrandtists, such as Jacob Pynas (q.v.); character heads, or trompies, painted and etched by Rembrandt, Lievens, and others, which include Oriental figures (but rarely a foreign facial type);11 and contemporaneous contacts between the Dutch Republic and the Ottoman Empire, which presumably sparked the imaginations of artists and collectors. These seemingly disparate categories would have been linked together in Rembrandt’s mind by the (from his perspective) sensible notion that Middle Eastern dress of the present and recent past was a reliable reflection of what was worn in the Holy Land in biblical times.12 Lastman certainly held this view and passed it on to his pupils and followers. The older artist adopted Turkish and Persian costumes from various sources, none of which have been carefully explored but which must have included northern European prints dating from the preceding hundred years, and paintings by Venetian artists such as Gentile Bellini, Titian, and Tintoretto.13 It has been observed that “Oriental figures are convincing enough in the paintings of Pynas and Pieter Lastman,” and that Rembrandt was less inclined than they to distinguish Turks from “other Oriental types, Jews, Poles, Indian Mohammedans, Kalnus, Persians, etc.” (to quote Goetz’s curious list, of 1938).14 Nonetheless, Lastman’s figure types as well as his compositional patterns were important for Rembrandt’s early pictures of Old Testament themes, such as David with the Head of Goliath before Saul, of about 1627 (Öffentliche Kunstsammlung Basel), David Playing the Harp to Saul, of about 1630 (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt), and Daniel and Cyrus before the Idol Bel, of 1633 (fig. 127).15 Not only attributes such as jeweled turbans, ample robes, pendants, and staffs but also the commanding pose struck by the figure in the Museum’s picture may be traced back to Lastman, who however never attempted, as did Rembrandt, to create the impression of a real person standing before the viewer.16

In this regard, the Man in Oriental Costume extends the study of expressions and physiognomy found in Rembrandt’s Leiden paintings, for which elderly models posed as Simeon, Jeremiah, Peter, and Paul. As for Oriental dress, examples occur in the artist’s earliest known works, of 1625–27, for the most part in response to Lastman, although prints after Rubens were also
influential. Lievens depicted Oriental costumes in the same years, for instance the spectacular outfit worn by Ahasuerus in The Feast of Esther, of about 1625 (North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh). The earliest sign that Rembrandt was perusing specifically Turkish or Persian sources dates from 1626, in the Musical Allegory (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), where the cellist with a long drooping moustache wears a turban, a silk caftan, and a Turkish dagger in the sash at the waist. While hardly a study from life, the figure is exceptional in Rembrandt’s oeuvre for recalling earlier representations of actual Turks, such as the drawings made in Constantinople about 1479–80 by Bellini.

It may be of interest for the “Turkish” musician in Rembrandt’s painting of 1626 and his Oriental tronies of the next few years (such as the Old Man with a Turban, of about 1627, in the Kremer collection) that a diplomatic mission from Persia visited the Netherlands between February 1626 and March of the following year. Musa Beg, ambassador of Shah Abbas the Great in Isfahan, was accompanied by an entourage in national costume, and by a Dutch painter, Jan Lucas van Hasselt (dates unknown), who had served the shah for several years. After spending some time in Amsterdam, the visitors passed through Haarlem to The Hague, where they were welcomed by Frederick Hendrick and dignitaries in thirty-six carriages. Gifts from Persia were presented to the Stadholder and the States General. During the summer, Musa Beg went hunting with the king of Bohemia (who lived in comfortable exile at The Hague) and various noblemen from the court, to which he returned after reviewing Dutch troops in Emmerich and other towns occupied by the Dutch.

The main reasons for friendly relations between the Dutch Republic and the Ottoman Empire were commerce and politics. The latter amounted to mutual hatred of Spain, which led the Moroccans in 1609–10 and the Turks in 1614 to seek an anti-Habsburg alliance with the United Provinces. One popular expression of this sentiment was a medal of about 1570 worn by the Sea Beggars (the maritime branch of the Dutch rebellion), which is shaped like a half-moon and inscribed, “LIVER TVR CX DAV PAYS” (Rather Turk than Pope). It would be imprudent to leap from such an isolated instance of sympathy for the Turks to the conclusion that the Man in Oriental Costume was a political statement; the many more trivial Oriental tronies that date from the period of the Thirty Years’ War (1618–48) and comments of the time (like the one by Huygens quoted above) do not encourage such an interpretation. But it would also be misguided to regard paintings of this type as no more than fashionable exotica, considering that Dutch consulates, offices of the East India Company (VOC), and communities of
Dutch merchants were established in cities such as Constantinople, Isfahan, and Aleppo. Significantly, there was no parallel production of Oriental tronies in the Spanish Netherlands, although tronies in general are usually said to have been made in Antwerp by Frans Floris (1519/20–1570), and Oriental figures are frequently encountered in Flemish history pictures. Moreover, Rubens and Van Dyck painted portraits of Europeans in Oriental dress because the sitters had strong ties to Turkey and Persia.

These considerations raise the question of who might have purchased the greatest Oriental tronie ever painted, which dates from the year in which (as discussed in the following entry) Rembrandt was working for important patrons in The Hague as well as in Amsterdam. Perhaps he was challenged by Lievens's Oriental (fig. 125) to produce something more impressive in the same vein, with Frederick Hendrick or another court patron in mind (Lievens's panel may well be the one he was painting "at the request of the Prince of Orange" in the spring of 1629). However, the canvas could also have been acquired by a merchant involved with the Middle East (it is not known if Marten Looten qualifies), or by anyone who wanted an outstanding work of art.

**Style and Technique**

In design and execution, the Man in Oriental Costume was a milestone in Rembrandt's career. The fluid brushwork in the costume, the scintillating light on the scarf, and the rugged relief of short brushstrokes in the face
and turban make the picture one of the earliest examples of the artist’s painterly approach on a large scale. At the same time, the work could be described as a culmination of techniques and devices that Rembrandt had developed in the Leiden years, although no earlier painting compares with this one as a demonstration of such effects as dramatic lighting, the evocation of volume and space, and an extraordinary variety of textures (those of fur, hair, skin, silk, metal, and so on). A remarkable aspect of the picture’s execution is how the application of paint becomes looser and thinner as one examines the surface from the head downward. The dense, rather slick, finely detailed folds of the turban contrast with the rougher topography of the face and neck; then the most skillful transition is made through the transparent scarf into the brightly illuminated part of the robe. Here, dabs, scratch-es, and strokes suggest the silk’s pattern and weave, while broader areas of brown and yellow follow the flow of the garment over the arm and chest. In the shadowy passages of fur and cloth to the lower right (nearly half of the figure), Rembrandt went over the canvas with minimal amounts of black and brown, in a sketchy manner that many Dutch painters would not have seen before. Rich shadows and half-lights create the look and feel of fur, and a sense of recession toward the bent elbow of the left arm (the entire contour of the figure on that side was revised to turn the torso more emphatically). The contrast of light and dark in the body re-creates that in the head on a monumental scale, except that the device of extending the right hand and staff into an area of shadow intensifies the impression of forms leading back from the picture plane to the background. The background itself is filled with subtle brushwork, suggesting a wall and void. What Rembrandt achieves by setting the highlighted side of the figure against shadow and the shadowed side against light could serve as a lesson to Lievens (fig. 123), who, however, would never learn it, since his use of pictorial schemes was based mainly on paintings by other artists, and, to a much lesser degree than in Rembrandt’s work, independent observation.39

With respect to composition, the Man in Oriental Costume is anticipated to some extent by the portraits of Nicolaes Ruts and Marten Looten, mentioned above, and the Portrait of Joris de Caullery, of 1632 (see fig. 130), which also employs strong shadow on the near forearm and a diagonal recession to an illuminated wall. But the light falling on the Oriental figure is stronger and more theatrical than in any formal portrait by Rembrandt of approximately the same period, while the colors are richer (if less localized) and the brushwork bolder. A similar freedom of execution is found in a large tronie, the Old Man in a Gorget and Black Cap, of 1631 (Art Institute of Chicago; oil on wood, 327/8 x 291/4 in. [83.5 x 75.6 cm]), where the bulky torso of the aging warrior is made to twist energetically with minimal means (essentially, the shaping of the contour and the manipulation of light).30 Meaningful comparisons may be made with small works as well, such as the Self-Portrait (Tronie with Rembrandt’s Features), of 1629 (see fig. 202), and the Old Man in a Fur Cap, of 1630 (Tiroler Landesmuseum Ferdinandum, Innsbruck), where the model is the same as in the large tronie of the following year.31 That Rembrandt’s tronies in particular, regardless of size, reveal strong similarities in execution is not surprising, since their purpose, in addition to depicting curious characters, was to show off the artist’s powers of description and his virtuoso technique.

Rembrandt cast himself as a dashing pasha in The
Art in Oriental Costume with a Poodle at His Feet, of about 1631 (fig. 128). In that picture, the figure is presented full-length in an interior, with the left hand propped imperiously on a staff, and the right arm akimbo. The dog was added by Rembrandt after a fairly short interval of time (during which Jouderville copied the composition). It is possible that Rembrandt’s etching The Persian, of 1632 (fig. 129), played an intermediary part between the Paris panel and the New York canvas by reversing the figure in the process of printing, and by allowing the artist to consider a different model and dress (the fur-lined cloak drapes over the ample “Persian” quite as it does on the “Slav”). Of course, Rembrandt was experimenting with similar figures in other prints, as well as in drawings. In the constant stream of invention, one aspect of the artist’s talent should not be neglected: his gift for choosing models from his own world who could be convincingly transported in the studio to another time and place.

An Excursus on Tronies
One of the most important distinctions between tronies and the figure paintings of other types that they most resemble—portraits and history pictures—is that the latter carry a considerable burden of meaning or associations, whereas tronies were intended more exclusively as works of art, collector’s items in which the artist’s powers of invention and execution are, in good part, the import of the painting or print. Live models were usually employed, and in this regard the artist resembles a portraitist, but in his representation of intriguing types, diverse expressions, and curious costumes, he shares expertise with painters of historical themes. Indeed, the practice of painting an independent picture of a head, a face, or an expression (the alternative meanings of tronie, which is derived from the Middle French tronie or tronque, and of half-length or full-length figures of similar type, developed largely from the use of painted “study heads” as models for history pictures in the workshops of Frans Floris, Rubens, Van Dyck, Jacob Jordaens (1593–1678), and other Antwerp artists.

Some of Rembrandt’s early self-portraits and paintings of single figures recall characters in his contemporary history paintings, but never in the close way that Rubens’s study heads do (a good example is the Museum’s Study of Two Heads by Rubens, of about 1609, which the artist used as the basis for heads in a few of his history paintings, a book illustration he designed, and a print representing Plato). From the first, Rembrandt appears to have intended his painted and printed tronies as comparatively inexpensive works of art, produced on speculation. A large picture such as Man in Oriental Costume, however, would have brought a commensurate price.) Pupils of Rembrandt painted tronies based on his pictures, or on live models (in some cases themselves or other students), and in this function as a training exercise there is a parallel to that particular use of study heads in Rubens’s studio. Rembrandtesque tronies by pupils and followers date from the early 1630s onward; an example is Govert Flinck’s A Young Woman as a Shepherdess (“Saskia at Flora”) (Pl. 46). Such a picture would have been sold either from Rembrandt’s workshop or from Flinck’s (if he was independent at the time), or through a dealer such as Hendrick Uyleburgh.

Tronies by or after Rembrandt are often cited in inventories dating from about 1630–1700. The term is often modified by a terse but revealing adjective, such as antique (implying outdated or fanciful costume), foreign, Oriental, or Turkish, or by a stylistic designation such as roughly painted or shadowy. Often the model is described as an old man, an old woman, a soldier, or (rarely) in more specific terms, such as “a tronie of an old man, being a portrait of Rembrandt’s father,” or “a small tronie of an Oriental woman, the portrait of H. Uyleburgh’s wife, after Rembrandt.” In some inventories, a tronie might be described inaccurately (usually by a notary) as a portrait (contrfeitsel) or vice versa. Revealingly, there is little sign of confusion between tronies and single-figure genre pictures (for example, Frans Hals’s Boy with a Lute; Pl. 61).

1. These works include the pictures of Flora in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg (1634), and the National Gallery, London (1633), and the Minerva (1635) and The Standard-Bearer (1636) in private collections. The Sophonisba, of 1634 (Prado, Madrid), with two subordinate figures, is as wide as the Museum’s canvas is tall: the main figure is similar in scale. Samson Threatening His Father-in-Law, of 1635 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), with marginal figures, is painted on a slightly taller and wider canvas, but the main figure is smaller in scale.

2. That the same model might appear in the New York and Stockholm pictures is not mentioned in Corpus 1882–89, vol. 2, p. 142 (under no. 446), despite the formal comparisons made there. The notion was advanced by Cavalli-Björkman in Stockholm 1992–93 and repeated in Cavalli-Björkman 2005 (see Refs.). Schnackenburg in Kassel–Amsterdam 2001–2, p. 114, observes that Rembrandt “used the type” in both paintings and in the Bust of an Old Man with Golden Chain (Gemäldegalerie Alte
Meister, Kassel), which he considers to be by Rembrandt. De la Fuente Pedersen in Copenhagen 2006, p. 170, simply states that the model seen in the Museum's painting "also appears" in the Stockholm and Kassel pictures. Comparison of the faces in the New York and Stockholm canvases, with particular attention to the pattern of creases in the brow and below the eyes, does suggest that the same model was employed.


4. For the remark in Huysen's diary, see Worp 1891, p. 128; Kan 1971, p. 81; and Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 156 (with the original Latin). The last reference also cites the Honslaardij inventories, which were published in Drosaers and Lunsingh Scheurleer 1974–76, vol. 1 (p. 446, no. 26, for "The Great Turk," and p. 450, no. 177, for "Sultan Soliman by Rembrandt"). In the same spirit, an etching by Richard Gaywood (ca. 1650–1680) after a bust-length Oriental figure said to be by Rembrandt was provided with the title "Mahomet" (Globe 1983, no. 417, pl. 166).

5. On Loeck, see Erik Fischer in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 19, pp. 661–63. On costume books showing Middle Eastern dress, see Breukink-Peze 1899a, pp. 111–12, and Roding 1890, pp. 65–66. The sources available to Rembrandt and his contemporaries included the series of woodcuts Ces mocov e fisioni de fare de Turis (1533) by the celebrated Antwerp master Pieter Coecke van Aelst (1502–1552); Hans Weigel, Habitus praecipuum populum (Nuremberg, 1577); the book by De Bruyn (first ed., Cologne, 1577) from which a plate is reproduced here (fig. 126); Cesare Vecellio, Habitum antichi, et moderni di tutto il mondo (Venice, 1598); and a number of other publications. At least later on, Rembrandt owned prints illustrating Turkish life, by Loeck and by Coecke van Aelst (see Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 373, no. 234 (under doc. 1656/12), in the 1656 inventory of Rembrandt's possessions). See also De Winkel 2006, p. 260, where it is concluded that "no convincing borrowings from these works [by Coecke van Aelst and Loeck] can be established in Rembrandt's paintings."


7. As noted in Pavlovich 1962, p. 326, citing (without giving the page) C. B. Elliott, Travels in the Three Great Empires of Austria, Russia and Turkey (London, 1838). At about the same time, "Miss Pardoe" (as her name appears on the title page of The City of the Sultan; and, Domestic Manners of the Turks in 1836 (London, 1837)) provided "figures for the population of Belgrade in 1836: 80,000 Turks and Jews and 12,000 Serbs, which more or less tally with other contemporary estimates" (ibid., p. 124).

8. On silk scarfs and sashes and similar items as studio paraphernalia, see R. van Gelder and J. van der Veen in Van den Bergert et al. 1999, p. 73, and De Winkel 2006, p. 255 (where it is noted that silk scarfs and shawls were never worn around the neck in the East but were used as sashes around the waist). While Ottoman silks were exported to Europe and Russia, Turkey also imported silks and velvet from Italy, and fur which was used to line luxurious robes. The fur-lined robe of the "Noble Slav," however, is much heavier and looser than Ottoman outer garments.

9. See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 156–57 (under no. 448), for all the documents cited in this paragraph, and pp. 197–98 (under no. 452, the portrait of Marten Looten, dated January 11, 1632), on Looten and his grandson. It is noted there that while the New York canvas "cannot have been inherited [by Govert Looten] from his grandfather via his father, there is the possibility that he inherited it from another member of the family and thus that it did in fact come from the possessions of Marten Looten."

10. See the list of "Orientalen" in Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 5, p. 3444. Jouderville's Portrait of Rembrandt in Oriental Costume (private collection, New York) was derived from Rembrandt's The Artist in Oriental Costume, Jacob van Hooft at His Feast, of 1631 (fig. 128 here); see Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, p. 381, fig. 7, vol. 3, p. 17; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 2, pp. 1438, 1447 (ill.), no. 948; London The Hague 1999–2000, no. 298; and, for a related work, Corpus 2005, pp. 182–83, fig. 147. For a painting by De Poorter that appears to have been strongly influenced by Rembrandt's Man in Oriental Costume, see the sale catalogue of Christie's, New York, January 11, 1889, no. 18.

11. One of the very few examples of a foreign facial type among Oriental trompe by Dutch painters is Dou's Portrait of a Moor (A Young Moor in Oriental Dress), of the early 1620s (Nieder-sächsisches Landesmuseum, Hannover). See Braunschweig 1979, pp. 240–41, no. 88, and Wegener 2000, pp. 135–36, no. 42.


14. Goetz 1918, p. 281 (Rembrandt's inclination to arbitrarily embellish what he would have seen in Lastman and other sources is also mentioned in De Winkel 2006, pp. 255, 258). Surprisingly, three other publications by Goetz are cited in the bibliography of Stalits 1983 (Rembrandts and Persia), but not the more relevant article of 1938, nor are Goetz's contributions mentioned in the text.


16. Compare the pose and attributes of the king in Lastman's David and Jonathan, of 1620 (Pushkin Museum, Moscow), and in Jan Pyas Joseph Distributing Corn in Egypt, of 1618 (art market, 1964); see Amsterdam 1991–92, pp. 31, 34, figs. 18, 22. Of course, the pose was not restricted to Oriental rulers.

ibid., p. 134, fig. 7 (under no. 49), and p. 380, fig. 6 (under no. 440), for Rembrandt’s apparent borrowings of two different kings from one of Rubens’s representations of the Adoration of the Magi. On Rembrandt’s responses to Lastman’s and Rubens’s Oriental figures, see also Bahre 2006, pp. 129–33.


19. Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, no. 87. In Breukink-Peeze 1989a, p. 114, the cellist is described as “a Turk depicted in complete costume,” including a blue entari (caftan). The woman’s costume is considered more Persian than Turkish. (De Winkel 2006, p. 264, comments solely on the decorative border of the woman’s garment, which derives from Anatolian carpets.) On caftans, see Washington 2003–6. Compare the head of Rembrandt’s cellist with those seen in woodcuts by Jost Amman (1516–1591). These first appeared in Giovanni Antonio Menavino (Heinrich Müller, trans.), Turcische Chronica . . . (Frankfurt am Main, 1677), and were adopted in several later publications (see Berlin 1989, pp. 740–41, no. 8/4, for a drawing of about 1600 after twelve of Amman’s Turkish heads, by the Rubens disciple Deodat Delmont [1582–1644], and for a useful discussion).

20. See Boston–London 2003–6, pp. 98–109, and De Winkel 2006, p. 261. Rembrandt’s actual source would have been sixteenth-century prints (see notes 5 and 19 above). There is some resemblance to Turkish tunics in Rembrandt’s Balsam and the As, of 1626 (Musée Cognacq-Jay, Paris; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, no. A2), where the fasteners on the man figure’s robe are similar to those seen in sixteenth-century prints of Oriental court figures (see Roding 1989, figs. 30, 33, 42).

21. For the Old Man with a Turban, see Kassel–Amsterdam 2001–2, no. 75; Van der Ploeg, Romania, and Van Suchten 2002, no. 28; Frankfurt 2003, no. 4; and Leiden 2005–6, no. 36.

22. On the mission of Musa Beg, see Slates 1983, pp. 40–41. Fine “robes of honor” (biyâr) often served as diplomatic gifts from Ottoman courts.

23. See Slot 1989, pp. 9–12, and Israel 1993, pp. 403–7, both citing more specialized literature.

24. See Westerink 1989. The medal is sometimes called the “half-moon of Boisot,” after Louis de Boisot, admiral of Zeeland (d. 1576), who liberated Leiden from the Spanish siege of 1574. The device actually consists of a quarter-moon and a face in profile, and does not resemble the Ottoman crescent.

25. This aspect is stressed, to a reasonable degree, in Bahre 2006, pp. 156–41.


27. See Barnes et al. 2004, pp. 203–5, nos. II.6a, II.6b, for Van Dyck’s full-length portraits, of 1622, depicting Sir Robert Shirley and his noble Circassian wife, Teresa Khan (Egremont Collection, Petworth House, Sussex). Shirley lived in Persia from 1598 until 1607, and represented Shah Abbas on commercial and diplomatic missions to Europe in 1607–13 and 1617–1626/27. For Ruben’s Portrait of Nicolaes de Respainge, of about 1618–20 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel), see Schnackenburg 1996, p. 262 (citing earlier literature), pl. 39, and, on the costume, Breukink-Peeze 1989a, p. 112, fig. 81. De Respaigne was an Antwerp merchant who lived in Venice for many years and traded in the Levant. His Turkish clothes, Turkish rarities, and Turkish portrait are listed (using those terms) in the 1647 inventory of his estate. De Respainge’s pose has occasionally been compared with that of the “Noble Slav.” The similarity is sufficiently explained by Rembrandt’s reference to prints after Ruben’s paintings of the Adoration of the Magi and other subjects, in which Oriental figures are posed in much the same way (see Rome 1977, nos. 126, 221, 348, 371). On this point, see Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, p. 380, vol. 2, p. 156; Vogelaar in Leiden 2001–6, pp. 155, 157 n. 8; and De Winkel 2006, pp. 260–61. What appears to be a portrait (rather than a tronie) of a man in Oriental dress, dated 1637/38, by the Antwerp-born Adriaen van Niculandt (1587–1658; see Christie’s, London, May 18, 1990, no. 146, or De Maere and Wabbes 1994, vol. 3, p. 900) was probably painted in Amsterdam.

28. See Vogelaar in Leiden 2005–6, p. 154 (under no. 37). Rembrandt’s painting is most recently compared with Lievens’s Oriental in Bahre 2006, pp. 112–13, where it is conjectured (following Gubrard 1996, pp. 283–87) that the Lievens dates as late as 1631. Some of the remarks in this paragraph elaborate those made by the present writer in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 44. A more detailed description of the paint surface is offered in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 151, 155, somewhat to the neglect of broad effects. These are seen in simplistic terms in ibid., p. 8, where it is claimed that Rembrandt employs (and even invents) “the use of a narrow beam of light that falls only on the head and shoulders, leaving everything that is located further to the front and downwards lost in shadow.” Such an impression can only be gained from photographs with too much contrast, or by looking at the painting in poor light.

29. To paraphrase the comments in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, p. 596 (under no. A42), where the Museum’s picture is compared.

30. See ibid., p. 395, nos. A20, A29; Corpus 2005, pp. 173, 176, fig. 138, where the self-portrait is called a tronie and the Museum’s picture is mentioned; and, on the very small Innabrack, Korevaar in Leiden 2005–6, no. 41.


32. See note 20 above.

33. Two drawings of about 1631–32 are mentioned in connection with the Paris painting in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, p. 379. One of them, the Polish Officer (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), is reproduced in Van Straten 2005, p. 201, fig. 359. For other related etchings by Rembrandt, see G. Schwartz 1977, 8141–42, 8151, 8262–63.

34. As noted in L. de Vries 1990, p. 191, in a rather general discussion comparing tronies, studies of heads, portraits, genre figures, and so on. The best article on the etymology and early use of the term tronie (also spelled trony, tronje, etc., in seventeenth-century documents) is Hirschfelder 2001.

35. See Liedtke 1984a, pp. 168–69, pl. 64. Studies of heads by Rubens are also discussed, and some examples catalogued, in Held 1980, pp. 597–614.

36. See Van der Veen 1997, p. 71, for a brief statistical survey.
38. Ibid., p. 72.
39. For these two examples, see ibid., p. 79 no. 15, 16, citing Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 240, doc. 1644/3, and p. 144, doc. 1677/4, respectively; the *tone* of an Oriental woman was listed in the estate of Uylenburgh's business partner in Leeuwarden, Lambert Jacobsz (ca. 1598–1636), who was also the teacher of Finck and Jacob Backer (q.q.v.).

REFERENCES: Hoet 1752–70, vol. 1 (1752), p. 333, no. 7, records the sale of a painting, possibly this one ("A Turkish Prince or First Vizier," by Rembrandt) in Amsterdam in 1729 (see Ex Coll.); Dodsley 1761, vol. 3, p. 83, as a portrait of a Turk by Rembrandt, in the collection of Paul Methuen, London; [Martin] 1766, vol. 2, p. 19, as a portrait of a Turk by Rembrandt, in the collection of Paul Methuen, London; Britton 1806, p. 38, no. 52, as "A Turk's Head, half length," by Rembrandt, in the Methuen collection, gives the dimensions (with frame) as 64 x 51 in. (162.6 x 129.5 cm); J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 105, no. 285, as "A Jew Rabbi," gives the dimensions as 48 x 38 in. (121.9 x 96.5 cm), cites an anonymous mizzontint after the composition, and reports that a picture corresponding to Smith's description (based on the print) is in the collection of Paul Methuen at Corsham; Waagen 1838, vol. 3, p. 101, as "An old Rabbi in a turban, dressed in the fantastic manner which Rembrandt is fond of. Marked 1632. A knee-piece; in a warm but subdued tone, and of great effect," at Corsham House; Voormaer 1877, pp. 116, 494, as *Oriental début*, "un portrait de fantaisie," sold for Fr 4,500 to Nieuwenhuys in the 1850 estate sale of Willem II, observes that the model is well known from Rembrandt's paintings and etchings and from works by his followers and imitators; Dunnot 1881, pp. 18, 45, 66, no. 365, as *Homme vif d'un costume oriental*, lists the work under "unknown owners and lost or doubtful pictures," but notes that it is possibly identical with the painting in the 1850 estate sale of Willem II; Wurzach 1886, text vol., no. 450; Bode 1895, p. 73, describes the picture as an unusually large and superb early work by Rembrandt, formerly at Orwell Park and currently owned by Mr. H. Twombly, a stepson of Vanderbilt; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 2 (1897), p. 170, no. 145, pl. 145, as "The Noble Slav (formerly called The Turk with the Stick)," in Mr. McK. Twombly's collection, New York; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 83 (ill.), 395, 425, 435, as "Portrait of an Oriental," in the Twombly collection; Schmidt-Degener 1906, p. 97, imagines Early Netherlandish sources for this Oriental figure, "avec son expression de despote et son accoutrement d'une somptuosité barbare"; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 120 (ill.), 53, 569, 589, as "Portrait of an Oriental," owned by William K. Vanderbilt, New York; Valentin in New York 1909, p. 80, no. 79 (ill.), as "The Noble Slav," describes the subject and lists collections; Cox 1909–10, p. 183, cited as in the "Hudson-Fulton Celebration," one of Rembrandt's "fantastic exercises, done from friends or models posed in studio trappings, of which the artist never tired"; Breck 1910, p. 34, as in the "Hudson-Fulton Celebration," notes the apparent joy with which Rembrandt indulged his pure fantasy in such works; Waldmann 1910, p. 73, calls the painting "eine Hauptattraktion" of the 1909 exhibition; Granberg 1916, p. 106, mentioned as in Vanderbilt's collection; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 198–99, no. 349, as "A Turkish Nobleman," aged about sixty, records two old copies of the head; Vanderbilt bequest 1920, pp. 268, 269 (ill.), as "The Noble Slav" thinks that the model resembles Rembrandt's father; Valentine 1921b, p. 124, updates the painting's location, and claims that the last digit of the date might be a 1; B. Burroughs 1922, p. 249, suggests that the artist's father probably posed for the picture; Meldrum 1923, p. 191, pl. cxxxvi, as "Study of an Oriental"; Van Dyke 1923, p. 114, pl. xxv, fig. 97, attributes the painting to Salomon Koninck; A. Burroughs 1923, pp. 269 (ill.), 270, calls Van Dyke's (1923) attribution of such a great work of art to Salomon Koninck "startling, to say the least"; Valentine 1930b, p. 3, mentioned as "the Turk of 1631 in the Vanderbilt collection (now in the Metropolitan Museum)"; B. Burroughs 1931a, pp. 294–95, as dated 1632, again suggesting that "Rembrandt's father probably posed for this painting"; Valentine 1931, unpagd, no. 15, pl. 15, considers the picture to mark the beginning of Rembrandt's interest in Oriental figures and costumes, and of his dramatic style of the mid-1630s; Bredius 1935, p. 8, no. 169, pl. 169, as "Bildnis eines vornemhnen Orientalen," signed and dated 1632; Held 1944, pp. 12, 14 (ill.), finds the figure of "a Dutchman in Persian dress" bombastic and unsuccessfully modeled; Ivins 1944a, p. 3, listed; Ivins 1944b, pls. 1, 2 (detail of face, actual size); J. Allen 1945, p. 73, describes the figure as "a wrinkled old man who strongly resembles Rembrandt's father," here in a painting "labeled The Noble Slav"; Münz 1953, p. 173, questions the identification with Rembrandt's father, who died in 1620; J. Rosenberg 1964, p. 345 n. 1, observes that Rembrandt "conceivably used the type of his father ... two years after the old man's death"; K. Bauch 1966, p. 9, no. 141, pl. 141, as by Rembrandt in 1632; Gerson 1968, pp. 256, 257 (ill.), 493, no. 105, briefly discusses whether or not the model was Rembrandt's father; Schaar 1968, p. 19 (under no. 998), catalogues a copy of the figure's head, in the Mittelheim-Museum, Koblenz; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 144 (ill.), 561, no. 169, repeats Gerson 1968; Haak 1969, p. 80, fig. 115, considers this the most impressive of Rembrandt's "fanciful portraits of richly garbed, turbaned figures"; Lecaldano 1969, p. 98, no. 82 (ill.); J. Bruyn in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 38, admires the description of the eyes, "rendered with the utmost clarity and economy"; Faly 1973, p. 317 (under no. 12), compares this painting with Vermeer's *Study of a Young Woman* (pl. 205) and other works, as "fancy dress pictures"; Bolen and Bolen-Renmet 1977, p. 178, no. 120 (ill.); Broos 1977, p. 40, notes the obscure source cited in Schmidt-Degener 1906; Jacob in Braunschweig 1979, p. 98 (under no. 31), compares Jan Lievens' *Portrait of a Young Man* in the National Museum of Scotland, Edinburgh; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 83, listed as a work of 1632; Lowenthal 1981, pp. 8–9, pl. 1, considers the play of empirical description and imagination in this painting; Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 41, pls. 23, 24–26 (X-radiograph and autoradiographs), observes that "parallel hatching and multidirectional strokes" are used to create tonal variations in the background; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1 (1982), pp. 223, 306 (under nos. 420 and 443), compares the use of light in Rembrandt's *SelfPortrait* of 1629 (Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston), and the modeling in *Old Man in a Gorget and Black Cap*, of 1631 (Art Institute of Chicago); Sunowski 1983–94, vol. 3, p. 1795 (under no. 1236), and vol. 5, p. 5299 (under no. 2082a), compares the Lievens *An Oriental* in Potsdam (fig. 134 here) and Govett Flink's half-length painting of an Oriental potentate (private collection); G. Schwartz 1985, p. 199.
fig. 217, discusses the popularity of the subject in Rembrandt's day, citing several documented examples; *Corpus 1982–89*, vol. 2 (1986), pp. 8, 26, 38, 97, 100, 101 (fig. 7, detail of signature and date), 142, 144, 151–57, 197–98, 204, 330, 381, 587, 652, no. A82 (ill., with details and X-radiograph), as "Knee-length figure of a man in oriental dress," concludes that the picture is "an outstandingly well preserved and characteristic work, reliably signed and dated 1632," describes the subject, support, ground, execution ("paint layer"), and signature in detail, considers the use of light as an innovation of 1632, finds the palette "extremely sober" (presumably meaning restrained) and the composition monumental, considers several approximately contemporary works by Rembrandt and Lievens's _An Oriental_ (fig. 123 here) notes that the same model appears in paintings by Jacob Backer, cites early references to works of this kind, suggests that the picture may have been owned by a Rembrandt sitter of 1632, Marten Looten, and provides technical information, such as the canvas's thread count (p. 26); Guillaud and Guillaud 1986, fig. 323; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 186 (ill.), 187, 406, no. 132, borrows the brief comments found in Gerson 1968; *Corpus 1982–89*, vol. 3 (1989), pp. 6, 420, 644, discusses (for the fourth time in three volumes) the use of light and color in order to lend "convincing form to the bulk of a lifesize figure set in a surrounding space felt as atmospheric"; Hinterding and Horsch 1989, pp. 32, 86, no. 91, fig. 130, records that the painting was acquired by Willem II from Nieuwenhuyis in October 1845; Liedtke 1990, p. 40, mistakenly states that Mrs. Lincoln Ellsworth lent the painting to the exhibition of 1909; P. Souten 1990a, p. 183 n. 9, cites the pictures in connection with Lievens's _Portrait of a Man in a Turban_, of about 1629 (Philadelphia Museum of Art); Buijsen in _The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91_, p. 60, fig. 1, recalls that the canvas "disappeared to England" when the collection of Willem II was auctioned off; Capane 1991, p. 146, no. 23 (ill.); Grimm 1991, p. 120, pl. 47 (detail), fig. 212, praises the fall of light on the figure; Van Thiel in _Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a_, pp. 148–49, no. 9 (ill.), describes the composition, notes the use of canvas as typical of Rembrandt in Amsterdam, compares the Lievens in Potsdam (fig. 123 here), and maintains that the New York picture "very probably belonged to the Amsterdam merchant Marten Looten, whose portrait Rembrandt painted in the same year"; C. Brown 1992, p. 271, compares the Lievens in Potsdam; Slatch 1992, pp. 342–43, no. 230 (ill.), compares the Lievens in Potsdam, connects the subject with Persian diplomats who toured the Netherlands in 1626–27, detects the influence of Peter Paul Rubens and Adam Elsheimer, considers it possible that Marten Looten owned the picture, and (oddly enough) calls it a "trial piece in which various elements that make their appearance in both portraits and history paintings are utilized"; White 1992, p. 265, as one of the pleasures of the 1991–92 exhibition; Cavalli-Björkman in _Stockholm 1992–93_, p. 190, fig. 544 (under no. 54), describes the model in _The Apostle Peter_, of 1632 (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm); C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 186 (ill.), 187, 409, no. 132, as "Oriental Nobleman," borrows the brief comments found in Gerson 1968; Kohayashi-Sato in _Yamaguchi and other cities 1994–95_, p. 23, fig. 7, and English supplement, p. 13, cites the pictures in a general discussion of _trompe_ by Rembrandt and artists in his circle; Barthol 1995, pp. 312–13; Liedtke 1995c, p. 460, compares the Museum's painting and the _Man in a Gorget and Plumed Cap_ (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles) in order to demonstrate that the latter is also by Rembrandt; Wheelock 1995a, p. 218, fig. 2, compares the composition and scale of Rembrandt's _Man in Oriental Costume_ (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.); Liedtke in _New York 1991–96_, vol. 2, pp. 40, 42–45, 47, 50, 55, 56, 126, 132, no. 2 (ill.), describes the work as one of the paintings by Rembrandt that are "indisputably authentic even though they were not documented in his lifetime," compares earlier pictures by Rembrandt and Lievens, and discusses their use of fancy dress and contemporary interest in this kind of subject; Von Sonnenburg in _ibid._, vol. 1, pp. 24, 38, 82, 83, figs. 30 (detail), 31 (X-radiograph detail), 106, describes the brushwork in the face and the warm palette overall; Broos 1968b, p. 156, considers the pose that Rembrandt used in _The Portrait of Juris de Cassilly_, also of 1632 (fig. 130 here), to be "copied" in this picture, "where it is unclear whether the main subject is the individual or his exotic clothing"; Gutbrod 1996, pp. 284, 287–88, compares the Lievens in Potsdam, considers its supposed influence on Rembrandt's painting and the *Corpus* (1986) comparison with a print after Rubens convincing, and suggests instead a connection with "[Pieter] Lastman's _David and Jonathan_ in St. Petersburg" (actually in the Pushkin Museum, Moscow); Julian Hochberg, "Perception," in _Dictionary of Art 1996_, vol. 24, p. 377, fig. 2, describes the effects of chiaroscuro in the painting; Broekhoff and Franken 1997, p. 81, mentions the work as one of the Metropolitan Museum's masterpieces by Rembrandt; Van de Wetering 1997, pp. 97, 102, 124, reports that the canvas has a fine weave, and gives thread counts; Blankert and Blokhuis in _Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98_, p. 106 (under no. 7), compares the style and expressive quality of _The Apostle Peter_ in Stockholm; Goor tenker 1999, pp. 92, 102 n. 21, fig. 4, describes the costume, which is vaguely Turkish or Persian, and did not at the time specify national origin but signified exoticism and a generally Eastern character; Schama 1999a, p. 133 (ill.), considers Rembrandt, in paintings like this one, to have been "consciously engaged in dismantling the barriers separating the genres"; Wright 2000, p. 248, fig. 244; Chong in _Boston 2000–2001_, pp. 80, 123, cites the picture as one of the comparatively few early works by Rembrandt in the United States before World War I; Liedtke in _New York–London 2001_, p. 230, compares the exotic costumes in a biblical scene by Leonaert Bramer; Schnackenburg in _Kassel–Amsterdam 2001–2_, pp. 112, 114, 115, fig. 25 (detail of head), compares the figure's face with those in _The Apostle Peter_ (Stockholm) and in _The Bust of an Old Man with a Golden Chain_ (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel); Manuth and De Winkel 2002, p. 2, fig. 1, observes that Rembrandt began to paint life-size historical figures after he left Leiden; Zell 2002, p. 52, cites the work as an example of a _trompe_ by Rembrandt; Giltaij in _Kyoto 2002–3_, p. 82, fig. 1, compares the design and execution of Rembrandt's _Man in Oriental Costume_ (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.); Giltaij in _Frankfurt 2003_, p. 104, fig. 22a, compares the design and execution of Rembrandt's _Man in Oriental Costume_ (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.); Rassieur in _Boston–Chicago 2001–4_, pp. 94, 100 n. 2, mentions the painting among Rembrandt's various "head studies and fantasy portraits"; Scallen 2004, p. 318 n. 17, mentions the reference in Bode 1895; Van de Wetering in _Vienna 2004_, p. 35, fig. 16, cites the painting as an early example of Rembrandt's casting the nearest part of a figure in shadow, thereby creating a "reposeur" effect; Cavalli-Björkman 2005, p. 405 (ill.), considers _The Apostle Peter_ (Stockholm) to be similar in execution, and observes that the model "appears to be the same"; Fahy in _Fahy et al. 2005_, 566
p. 132 (under no. 37), cites the work as an example of a tronie, in connection with Vermeer's *Study of a Young Woman* (Pl. 203); Groen in *Corpus* 2005, p. 326, fig. 5, pp. 662–63, reports that the first ground contains red earth andumber, and the second ground leadwhite, a little red ochre, and lampblack, resulting in a light yellowish color; Van de Wetering in ibid., pp. 176, 358, 631, 644, discusses the artist's use of a dark repoussoir within the figure, compares the execution of *Self-Portraits in a Flat Cap* (Royal Collection, Windsor Castle), and compares the pigments used in *Bust of a Young Woman in a Cap*, of 1632 (private collection, Switzerland); Van Straten 2005, pp. 233–24, fig. 400, as purchased by Marten Looten; Vogelaar in *Leiden* 2005–6, pp. 159–57, fig. 111, finds the same model in Rembrandt's *Man with a Gorget*, of about 1631 (Art Institute of Chicago), and considers the *Man in Oriental Costume* "an artistic attempt to surpass Lievens's *Oriental* [fig. 123 here] of three years previously in conception, size and subject”; Bahre 2006, pp. 131–34, 136, 143 n. 14, fig. 3, in an essay on Oriental motifs in Rembrandt's work, compares Lievens's *Oriental* and similar figures by Rubens; De la Fuente Pedersen in *Copenhagen* 2006, pp. 178–79, 260, 286–87, no. 5 (ill.), discusses the subject and style, finds the same model in *The Apostle Peter* (Stockholm) and in the *Bust of an Old Man with a Golden Chain* (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel), and compares *A Moor Wearing a Turban and Armour* by Karel van Mander III (Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen); Korthals Altes in *Kassel* 2006, p. 30, fig. 5, in a review of 18th-century Dutch auctions, mentions this picture in the Govert Looten sale of 1729; Van der Veen in *London--Amsterdam* 2006, pp. 139, 178 n. 175, fig. 73, frontisp., suggests that Martin Looten was probably the painting's first owner, since it dates from the same year as Rembrandt's portrait of Looten and was later owned by Looten's grandson, and comments on the possibility that the same model was used by Jacob Backer for a slightly later painting; Tüshae 2006, p. 107, fig. 2, considers the painting "one of the major highlights of the exhibition" (London--Amsterdam 2006); De Winkel 2006, p. 235, fig. 158, describes the scarf as an Eastern accessory, of a type imported by the East India Company in great quantities.

**Ex Coll.**: Govert Looten (until 1729; his sale, Amsterdam, March 31, 1729, no. 7, as "Ein Turkse Vorst of Primo Visier" by Rembrandt, for Fl 71); Ralph Palmer, London (until d. 1755; his estate sale, Prestage, London, April 11, 1755, no. 32, as "A Turkish Bashaw," for £28.17 to Methuen); Sir Paul Methuen, London (1755--d. 1757); his cousin Paul Methuen, Corsham Court, Chippenham, Wiltshire (1757--d. 1793); his son Paul Cobb Methuen, Corsham Court (1795--d. 1816); his son Paul Methuen, 1st Baron Methuen, Corsham Court (1816--at least 1818); [Chrétiens J. Nieuwenhuys, London, until 1845; sold in October 1845 to Willem II; Willem II, king of the Netherlands (1843--d. 1849); his estate sale, De Vries, Roos & Brondgeest, The Hague, August 12, 1850, no. 91, for Fl 4,500 to Nieuwenhuys]; [Chrétiens J. Nieuwenhuys, London, from 1852]; George Tomline, Orwell Park, Ipswich; [Charles J. Wertheimer, London, until 1882--85; sold to Mrs. Vanderbilt]; Mr. and Mrs. William K. Vanderbilt, New York (probably from 1882--85 until 1893); William K. Vanderbilt, New York (1895--d. 1920); Bequest of William K. Vanderbilt, 1920 20.155.2
143. Portrait of a Man, probably a Member of the Van Beresteyn Family

Oil on canvas, 44 x 35 in. (111.8 x 88.9 cm)  
Signed and dated (lower right): RHL van Rijn [initials in monogram] / 1632

The painting is well preserved except for the black costume, which is badly abraded. There is an area of loss at the top edge above the head and a series of small losses in a vertical line along the left and right edges that may correspond to an earlier stretcher.

H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.3

This canvas and its companion (Pl. 144), from the Havemeyer Collection, were probably among the first dozen or so formal portraits that Rembrandt painted after he moved from Leiden to Amsterdam, following the Portrait of Nicolaes Rut (Frick Collection, New York) and Man at a Writing Desk (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), both dated 1631; Marten Looten, dated January 11, 1632 (Los Angeles County Museum of Art); and, most likely, The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp, of 1632 (Mauritshuis, The Hague). Both Havemeyer pictures are signed and dated 1632, as are a number of other portraits by Rembrandt, including the Ellsworth Portrait of a Man (Pl. 144). The place of these large pair portraits in the artist’s oeuvre is especially close to that of the Portrait of a Man Trimming His Quill (Gemäldegalerie, Schloss Wilhelmshöhe, Kassel) and its presumed pendant, the Portrait of a Woman Seated (Gemäldegalerie, Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna), both of which are signed and dated 1632, and to that of the Portrait of Joris de Caullery, dated 1632 (fig. 130). 2

Opinions differ as to whether Rembrandt painted the New York pictures entirely on his own or whether some passages were assigned to assistants. The argument presented below suggests that the male portrait was probably painted exclusively by Rembrandt, and that a collaborator could have played a minor role in the execution of the female portrait. The question of authorship is in this case closely connected with that of the sitters’ identification, which requires discussion at some length.

Identification of the Sitters

The paintings are commonly referred to as the Van Beresteyn portraits because they first came to light at the estate sale of Jonkheer Gijsbert van Beresteyn (1804–1884), which was held in October 1884 at Maurick Castle, the family seat at Vught, near ’s-Hertogenbosch (Den Bosch, in North Brabant). The owner’s eldest son, Jacob (1832–1898), described the portraits as depicting family members. In 1888 (about a year after he sold the pictures to a Paris dealer), Jacob van Beresteyn more specifically identified the sitters as “Christiaan Paul van Beresteyn Bourgemestre (maire) de la ville de Delft seigneur du Château de Maurick et sa femme Volkera Nicolai Knobbert,” which is a slightly inaccurate reference to the rich and influential founder of the Van Beresteyn dynasty in Delft, Paulus Cornelisz van Beresteyn (1548–1625), and his wife, Volkera Claesdr (Nicolaesdr, or Nicolai) Knobbert (1554–1634). 3 Their much older features were frequently recorded by Michiel van Miereveld (q.v.) and his studio during the second decade of the seventeenth century.

The 1941 study of Van Beresteyn iconography by the archivist and historian E. A. van Beresteyn (1876–1948) identifies the sitters in a good number of portraits dating from the first half of the seventeenth century, but the author was unable to connect the Havemeyer pictures with specific members of the family. He notes that in an 1891 issue of the weekly magazine Eigen Haard (Own Hearth), a wood engraving of the Portrait of a Man was printed with the caption, “Christiaan Paul van Beresteyn, Burgemeester van Delft”; the gentleman of that name, however, lived from 1705 to 1758. 4 The print was cited earlier by Moes (1897–1905; see Refs.) in his magnum opus, Iconographia Batavia, but he provisionally changed the identification to “Cornelis [Paulusz] van Beresteyn, Heer van Middelharnis (1638).” Moes also lists a Van Miereveld portrait on panel of the same sitter, dated 1622, as sold (along with other Van Beresteyn family portraits) in Amsterdam on February 16, 1838, from the estate of Jacob van der Dussen, Lord of Zouteveen (1770–1839). Van der Dussen was a descendant of Dr. Theodoor Vallensis (1612–1673), who in 1643 married Agatha van Beresteyn (1625–1702). 5 Her father, Cornelis van Beresteyn (1586–1638), was indeed a (fractional) Lord of Middelharnis and a burgomaster of Delft. Moes may have based his identification of Rembrandt’s sitter on a comparison with the Van Miereveld portrait, but this is unknown, as is the panel’s present location. 6 No other portrait of Cornelis van Beresteyn has been identified. 7
So far as is known, all the portraits once at Maurick Castle represented members or relatives of the Van Beresteyn family. Nonetheless, Van Beresteyn (1941) supposes that the Rembrandt portraits may actually depict members of the family of Hendrick Heym, the last owner of Maurick Castle before 1680, when it came into Van Beresteyn hands. The suggestion is highly implausible. Heym fled his ancestral home when the Stadholder, Prince Frederick Hendrick, established his army headquarters there in 1629. In the same year, 's Hertogenbosch (which had been held by Spain since 1598) capitulated to the Dutch, after which the Catholic Heym regained his property but not his public offices. In those difficult circumstances, and at a considerable distance from Amsterdam (about three times farther than Utrecht), it is hard to imagine that Heym would have come into contact with anyone in Rembrandt's circle, such as Hendrick Uylenburgh (ca. 1584/80–1661), the art dealer who appears to have been the artist's main source of portrait commissions in 1632.

As for historical connections with the Van Beresteyn family, there are a number of possibilities. From the circumstances of the estate sale in 1884, it is clear that the Rembrandt portraits came from the late Gijsbert van Beresteyn's side of the family, not his wife's, and that they had been in Maurick Castle, unidentified and unappreciated, for many years. Most of the family portraits in the sale date from before 1700, and none from that period is attributed. In the unhelpful auction catalogue, numbers 8–14 were said to be "all from the 17th century, very fine and by famous masters," and numbers 17–46b were summarized as "portraits on canvas and panel, all from the 17th century and mostly by famous masters." By this description, the executor of the estate (see Ex Coll.) did not mean masters as famous as Rembrandt, whose signature was discovered by potential buyers at the sale. Frans Hals's superb portraits of the Haarlem lawyer Paulus van Beresteyn and his third wife, which date from about 1620, did not come from Maurick Castle but were sold from the Hofje van Beresteyn in Haarlem to the Musée du Louvre, Paris, in 1885. The finest portraits in the Maurick sale included several works from Van Miereveld's studio, and a three-quarter-length portrait of Paulus Cornelisz van Beresteyn by Jacob Willemsz Delff (ca. 1550–1601), dated 1592, when the sitter was forty-four (fig. 131). The pendant portrait of Volckera Claesdr Knobbert (fig. 132) had been in Maurick Castle until 1835, when it was carried off (along with other female portraits) by a daughter of the family and placed into her husband's (as it turned out) slippery hands. Perhaps the fact that large pair portraits of Paulus van Beresteyn and his wife had long been at Maurick Castle accounts for Jacob van Beresteyn's supposition in 1888 that they were the sitters portrayed by Rembrandt. There may also have been family papers identifying portrait sitters, but not (or not always) the artists who depicted them.

The link between Delft and Maurick Castle was made in the first instance by Jacqueline Brouart (1627–1691), a native of The Hague who in 1645 married Christiaan Prins van Beresteyn (1616–1680) of Delft, the son of Maria Prins (1587–1667) and Gijsbert van Beresteyn (1576–1644), who was Paulus van Beresteyn's son. In 1641, Christiaan assumed the office of pensionary in 's Hertogenbosch, and shortly after his death there in June 1680 his widow bought Maurick Castle from the States of Brabant. It may have been during the 1680s that Delft's portraits of Paulus van Beresteyn and his wife, a few Van Miereveld-style portraits of Gijsbert van Beresteyn and Maria Prins, and other portraits of Van Beresteyns from Delft entered Maurick Castle. However, seventeenth-century portraits could also have come to Maurick at later dates, and might represent ancestors of spouses as well as Van Beresteyn family members. For example, in 1693 Jacqueline Brouart's son Thomas van Beresteyn (1647–1708) married Dina Cornelia Tromp (1657–1699), a wealthy granddaughter of the famous admiral Maarten Harpertsz Tromp (1598–1653), a portrait of whom is listed in the 1884 Maurick sale. After Dina Cornelia's death, her younger sister Alida Tromp (1671–1703) moved in with the Lord of Maurick, and two weeks before she died gave him an illegitimate son (who was baptized in Amsterdam as Paulus Gijsberti). In 1704, Van Beresteyn married again; his bride was Johanna Catharina de Groot (1664–1729), granddaughter of the famous jurist from Delft, Hugo de Groot or Grotius (1583–1645). Another relative, the connoisseur and burgomaster Pieter Teding van Berkhout (1643–1713), when he was not visiting Johannes Vermeer or Cornelis Bisschop (q.q.v.), "spent a good deal of his time maintaining contact with the other Delft descendants of Paulus van Beresteyn, a group that by his day had grown to include 'a veritable legion of cousins, nieces, and nephews.'"

The Van Beresteyns that Rembrandt might have portrayed in 1632 were far less numerous. The male sitter seems to be about forty or a few years older, and probably
could not have been much younger. The woman appears to be younger than her husband, perhaps about thirty, but she could have been several years younger or older. Thus, the man may have been born about 1590, and the woman closer to 1600 or 1605. Of the fourteen known children of Paulus van Beresteyn and Volckera Claesdr Knobbert, all the girls were born too early to be the woman in Rembrandt’s portrait (and in at least three of six instances their features are known to differ). Gijsbert van Beresteyn, the father-in-law of Jacqueline Brouart (first Lady of Maurick), was also too old and his identification in a Van Miereveld–style portrait inscribed “Aetatis 38 Ao. 1614” (Museum Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerp) appears secure. Paulus van Beresteyn’s sons Nicolaas (1578–1603), Paulus (1592–1610), and Dirk (1594–1625) all died well before 1632, and the youngest son, Arnold (or Arent; 1595–1652), bore no resemblance to Rembrandt’s sitter, to judge from portraits by Van Miereveld and his workshop (fig. 135).18

The only possible candidate in the direct male line of descent is thus Cornelis van Beresteyn (1586–1638), who on October 6, 1613, married the well-born Jannetje Pietersdr Berckel (or Berckels; 1592–1613; fig. 136) in her native Sommelsdijk, a village next to Middelharnis, south of Delft. She died on January 1, 1615, a few weeks after losing her only child, Paulus, on December 5, 1614, two weeks after he was born. On July 3, 1616, Jannetje’s younger sister Elisabeth (1599–1666) married Cornelis’s brother Dirk, in Delft. And on October 20, 1619, Cornelis was back in Sommelsdijk, where he married a seventeen-year-old cousin of the Berckel sisters, Corvina van Hofdyck (or Hoffdijck; 1602–1667). In 1592, Corvina’s grandfather Corvinus Hofdyck bought the manor of Middelharnis, of which Cornelis van Beresteyn gained a one-eighth share in 1620. He had already inherited property from his first wife’s family, but his net worth at the time of his second marriage (14,400 guilders) was considerably less than that of his new bride (35,491 guilders).19

Could the “Van Beresteyn” portraits represent the forty-five-year-old Cornelis van Beresteyn and his second wife, Corvina van Hofdyck, who was thirty in 1632?20 And if so, how would the Rembrandts have arrived at Maurick Castle? The archivist Van Beresteyn asserts that they would not have been inherited by Cornelis’s brother Gijsbert (and then by his son and daughter-in-law, the first Van Beresteyns of North Brabant).21

That particular route to Maurick was hardly the only one, but it should not be dismissed from consideration. Cornelis van Beresteyn and Corvina van Hofdyck had six children, of whom the first two are of immediate interest: Paulus (1621–1636) and Zacharias (1623–1679). When their father died on August 13, 1638, Zacharias, the oldest of the five surviving children, was fifteen years old. Corvina (who outlived her husband by twenty-nine years) may well have kept the portraits in her own house, but it is conceivable that the then-senior member of the Van Beresteyn family in Delft, Gijsbert, would have taken possession of them, especially if he had Delft’s portraits of his parents (figs. 131, 132) and other family portraits, forming a dynastic ensemble. After Gijsbert died on October 30, 1641, the portraits he owned would possibly have remained with his widow, Maria Prins (who like Corvina died in 1667), but eventually they would have been passed down to his oldest son, Christiaan.22

However, there is a more likely line of inheritance, which is that proposed by the archivist Van Beresteyn (but not extended to the Van der Dussen sale of 1858).23 When Paulus van Beresteyn died in 1625, his grand house on the Oude Delft (the most prestigious address in Delft) became the property not of his oldest surviving son,
Gijsbert, but of Cornelis.\textsuperscript{24} The reasons for this arrangement are unclear, but it apparently reflects Cornelis's greater stature in the community. From his marriage in 1606 onward, Gijsbert, a merchant, lived in a house on the Turfmarkt that had been his father's in earlier years (1577–93).\textsuperscript{25} In 1625, Cornelis succeeded to his father's position on the distinguished Council of Forty, a group of "the wealthiest, most honorable, most prominent, and most peace-loving" citizens of Delft who ran the city government, serving life terms.\textsuperscript{26} Gijsbert never held any civic or honorary offices, but Cornelis served on the municipal court (he studied law at Leiden University 1604–8), as a burgomaster (1631, 1632, 1635, and 1636), and as a governor of charitable institutions.\textsuperscript{27} The parental home came with all its furnishings, including, presumably, Delft's portraits of 1592 and other family portraits. The house was left by Cornelis to his son Zacharias, who in the 1670s rented it out, as did his widow, Agneta Deutz (d. 1692).\textsuperscript{28} Zacharias's estate was not divided until after his only child, Cornelis, had died in 1689, and then there were difficulties between Agneta and Zacharias's sister Agatha (d. 1702), widow of Theodoor Vallens. In 1690, the house on the Oude Delft was sold and the property divided; precisely how is unimportant since it all descended, with the death in 1716 of Cornelis van Beresteijn's and Corvina van Hofdyck's son Cornelis—the last of the Delft Van Beresteijns—to Agatha's surviving children, Jacob and Corvina Maria Vallens.\textsuperscript{29} It appears likely that in or shortly after 1690, or after Cornelis's death in 1716, the portraits by Delft, Van Miereveld, and Rembrandt that had presumably been in the Delft house went to Thomas van Beresteijn's sons (Jacqueline Brouart's grandsons), Maarten Cornelis van Beresteijn (1695–1734), and Christiaan Paulus van Beresteijn (1705–1758), both Lords of Maurick, the new ancestral home.\textsuperscript{30}

In any event, the large collection of Van Beresteijn portraits at Maurick Castle reflects the family's intention to form a dynastic ensemble, which became (following princely and noble precedents) a fashionable practice among wealthy patrons during the 1620s and 1630s. In those years, series of family portraits were usually begun by commissioning painters to record members of the present generation, in some cases with the requirement that they conform approximately to the compositional model of parental portraits (it was rare at the time to have family portraits from more than one preceding generation). In later decades, the formation of dynastic ensembles depended

more on collecting ancestral portraits from various places, as well as having portraits of contemporaries made.\textsuperscript{31} Van Beresteijn (1641) conceded that given the date of 1632, the Havemeyer Portrait of a Man could indeed depict Cornelis van Beresteijn, who, according to that hypothesis, would "have set off for Amsterdam in order to let himself be immortalized by Rembrandt."\textsuperscript{32} This is, in effect, what the famous Remonstrant minister Johannes Wtenbogaert did the following year,\textsuperscript{33} though for Delft patrons in 1632 the trip would probably not have been necessary. In that year, Rembrandt was in the neighboring city of The Hague to paint a portrait of the Princess of Orange (Princess Amalia van Solms; Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris) as a pendant to Gerrit van Honthorst's portrait of Prince Frederick Hendrick, dated 1631 (Stichting Historische Verzameling van het Huis Oranje-Nassau, The Hague).\textsuperscript{34} Van der Veen recently observed in connection with the princess's portrait that "in the same period Rembrandt painted the portraits of at least four other persons who lived in The Hague, in all probability producing these pieces there."\textsuperscript{35} These pictures are the portrait of Constantijn Huygens's older brother Maurits, dated 1632 (Kunsthalle, Hamburg); the pendant portrait of their friend Jacques de Gheyn III, dated 1632 (Dulwich Picture Gallery, London); the large portrait of a civic guard officer in The Hague, Joris de Caullery, dated 1632 (fig. 130); and, more conjecturally, a small portrait of Rembrandt himself, dated 1632 (private collection).\textsuperscript{36}

Considering the place of the Van Beresteijn portraits in the recent history of Rembrandt connoisseurship (see Refs. from 1980 onward), it is interesting to read Van der Veen's closing remark about the artist's stay in the court city: "The portraits that Rembrandt executed in The Hague are without exception wholly autograph works. In the brief time that he worked there, Rembrandt would have had no assistant at his disposal."\textsuperscript{37} It is well known that the social, political, and artistic worlds of The Hague and Delft were intimately related, and not only because the two cities are only three miles (five kilometers) apart. That Rembrandt, while working at The Hague, would have accepted a commission from a client in Delft was in practical terms no more unlikely than the fact that the court's leading portraitist, Van Miereveld, lived and worked in Delft (as did the prince's personal physician, Jacob van Dalen; see Pl. 121).\textsuperscript{38} From the patron's point of view, it would have been enough said that Rembrandt was the Princess of Orange's portraitist.
Figure 131. Jacob Willemsz Delf, *Portrait of Paulus Cornelisz van Beresteyn*, 1592. Oil on wood, 45 5/8 x 32 1/2 in. (115 x 82.5 cm). Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

Figure 132. Jacob Willemsz Delf, *Portrait of Volckern Claesdr Knobbert*, 1592. Oil on wood, approx. 45 5/8 x 32 1/2 in. (115 x 82.5 cm). Location unknown

Figure 133. Rembrandt, *Portrait of a Man, probably a Member of the Van Beresteyn Family* (Pl. 143)

Figure 134. Rembrandt, *Portrait of a Woman, probably a Member of the Van Beresteyn Family* (Pl. 144)
Figure 135. Michiel van Miereveld, Portrait of Arnold (? van Beresteyn, 1617. Oil on wood, 44 3/8 x 32 1/4 in. (112 x 83 cm). The Holland Museum, Holland, Michigan.

Figure 136. Michiel van Miereveld, Portrait of Jannetje Berckel, First Wife of Cornelis van Beresteyn, 1614. Oil on wood, 44 3/4 x 34 3/4 in. (113.5 x 87 cm). Location unknown.

Figure 137. Michiel van Miereveld, Portrait of Cornelis Briel, 1615. Oil on wood, 44 3/4 x 32 5/8 in. (112 x 83 cm). Location unknown.

Figure 138. Michiel van Miereveld, Portrait of Cecilia van Beresteyn, Wife of Cornelis Briel, 1615. Oil on wood, 44 3/8 x 32 7/8 in. (112 x 83 cm). Location unknown.
Another possibility has been suggested, by the Dutch portrait specialist Rudolf Ekkart, who posits that Cornelis van Beresteyn would probably have gone to Van Mierseveld for portraits, and that it is unlikely that portraits of Cornelis and his wife would have descended not to his children but to descendants of his older brother Gijsbert (this assumes that the portraits went to Maurick at an early date). He also raises the possibility that the sitters could be the parents of Jacqueline Brouart, Thomas Brouart (1584–1635) and his wife Johanna van Clootwyck (dates unknown; they married in 1624). Thomas Brouart was Prince Frederick Hendrick's treasurer, but little is known about his family, apart from the fact that he and his wife evidently had three daughters and no sons. Secure portraits of the couple are not known. Nonetheless, the forty-eight-year-old Thomas Brouart and his presumably younger wife (she would not have had her first children when in her forties) must be considered plausible candidates as the sitters in Rembrandt's portraits, which he would have painted in The Hague in 1632.39

The Question of Authorship
From the moment of their discovery to their inclusion in Bredius's catalogue of 1925, no doubts were expressed about the authenticity of the Van Beresteyn portraits. Then in 1938, Burroughs (see Refs.), introducing readers to "art criticism from a laboratory," while admitting that the execution of the paintings was "close to what is characteristic of Rembrandt," suggested that, on the basis of X-radiographs, the portraits were probably painted by Jacob Backer (q.v.), at a somewhat later date. In a review of Burroughs's book, Held (1940; see Refs.) not only defended the pictures as works by Rembrandt but also exclaimed, "One would expect the portraits to form cornerstones of any critical study." This came to pass in the 1980s, but in a way that Held would not have anticipated.

In 1986, the Rembrandt Research Project (Corpus; see Refs.) published the Van Beresteyn portraits as works largely by an assistant in Rembrandt's Amsterdam studio. The question of whether Rembrandt had such a workshop in 1632 has since been disputed at length but is irrelevant here because the consensus of scholarly opinion over the past twenty years is that the portraits were painted mostly or entirely by Rembrandt himself.40

Support for the pictures as autograph works by Rembrandt has depended mainly on judgments of their style and quality, which have received much closer scrutiny than in earlier years because of the debate about workshop collaboration. The issue is complicated by what has been described as "the far from ideal state of preservation" in the Portrait of a Man, a remark that in its emphasis might more appropriately have been applied to the head in the Portrait of a Woman.41 In the female figure's hair and face (especially on the right side), the modeling has been diminished by overcleaning in the past, so that the encounter of the head with the enormous millstone ruff now appears even more awkward than it would have originally. The description of the ruff itself, with its delicate foliage of lace and tunnel-like folds, is a tour de force in the handling of light and shadow. The treatment of luxurious fabric in the black dress, the lace cuffs, silken belt, and jewelry is entirely consistent with that in the Portrait of a Young Woman with a Fan (Pl. 146), although more has been made of reflections and spatial effects (for example, in the curling of the cuff to the right) in the slightly later picture. Even the authors of the Corpus admire the lively modeling of the left hand in the Van Beresteyn Portrait of a Woman, which (as the eighth autoradiograph reveals; fig. 139) initially hung at the sitter's side, without the support of a table. Of course, the raising of the hand did not necessarily require the insertion of a side table and with it the receding wall defined by a cornice; nor are these elements balanced by motifs in the pendant picture. Nevertheless, the table was added. A possible reason for its introduction is suggested below.

The male portrait has always been regarded as a stronger picture. Gerson (1968; see Refs.), who is often cited in these pages for rejecting "Rembrandts," described the picture as "a painting of extraordinary richness of nuance in color and design." For Haverkamp-Begemann, in 1986 (see Refs.), the manner of execution recalled that of Rembrandt's Portrait of Joris de Cauville (fig. 130), which, as discussed above, was probably painted in The Hague in 1632. The handling of light and especially the rich textures in the man's face, his hair, and the parchment-like surface of the ruff have often been admired, and were found to be remarkably similar to passages in the Portrait of a Scholar, of 1631, when that painting was lent in 1988 by the State Hermitage Museum to the Metropolitan Museum.42

Even the Corpus, in pages intended to sow doubts, repeatedly praises the "very Rembrandt-like features" in the Portrait of a Man, such as "the sensitive shading on the forehead [which] achieves an effect regularly used by
Rembrandt,” the tonal values and cast shadow in the background (the Ellsworth Portrait of a Man [Pl. 141] is compared), and “the treatment of the clothing (which can no longer be properly assessed in the black part of the cloak).” On the whole, the costume is considered, “in its rendering of form largely by means of animated contours, very like that commonly found in Rembrandt.” Technical evidence reveals that “the artist devoted a great deal of attention to this [delineation of contours], as usually did Rembrandt.” It is no wonder, then, that the now-senior member of the Rembrandt Research Project, Ernst van de Wetering, considers the Portrait of a Man to be “about 98% by Rembrandt,” which given normal conservation treatment would be well ahead of the norm.44

What the authors of the Corpus find less characteristic of Rembrandt in the Van Beresteyn portraits are, for the most part, the proportions, “internal cohesion,” and sense of volume (or lack thereof). In the Portrait of a Man, “the projecting areas on either side of the body seem overdone,” although autoradiographs show that the sharp bulge to the right was deliberately enhanced by the artist and one finds a similar contour in the contemporaneous Portrait of Joris de Caullery (fig. 130). In addition, “the body seems disproportionately massive in relation to the head,” and both figures seem to lack the “suggestion of plasticity and spatial differentiation” that one finds in most Rembrandt portraits of the early 1630s. Also noted is the “relatively fine detail in the lace of the cuffs,” which contrasts with the handling of other areas, and, in a broad view, some inconsistency in the impression made by the two portraits, which “must be seen as the outcome of a certain eclecticism, and of the differing ideas or prototypes that the artist had in view.”46

A possible explanation for the proportions, outlines, lack of volume (which is overstated in the Corpus), precision in costume details, and overall look of eclecticism is that Rembrandt may have been adjusting his composition and style to a dynastic ensemble of Van Beresteyn portraits, with particular attention to Delft’s portraits of the founders, Paulus van Beresteyn and Volckera Knobbert (compare figs. 133, 134, with figs. 131, 132). Allowing for the fact that the young Rembrandt was a very different artist from Delft, working forty years later, there are striking similarities, and even shared peculiarities, between the male portraits on the one hand, and, more obviously, between the female portraits on the other. The large, angular, silhouetted bodies and small heads in Delft’s portraits find sympathetic (although more naturalistic) counterparts in Rembrandt’s pictures. There is an analogous play of conspicuous hands, especially in the female portraits, where each woman (at the end of a rather short arm) holds in her right hand a luxury item (in the Rembrandt, an ostrich-feather fan) dangling from a gold chain, and rests her left hand on the corner of a table. As noted above, Rembrandt’s woman did not originally have a table to lean on, but was given one through substantial repainting in the lower right corner. The use of tables in knee-length Van Beresteyn portraits, not only by Delft but by Van Miereveld (figs. 135–138), appears to have been fairly standardized.

If Rembrandt did design his companion pictures to suit an ensemble of earlier portraits, he may have welcomed an opportunity to give the female figure a smaller millstone ruff and less voluminous sleeves. But these fashionable items, which would have been found among very few luxurious alternatives in the woman’s clothing chest, came with the commission, and portraitists did not advise clients to try on something else. Rembrandt does achieve an effect similar to that in Delft’s portrait of Volckera Knobbert,
which is that (to put it plainly) of an egg balanced upon or suspended slightly above a large plate, and crowned with an aureole of linen or hair. If our identifications are correct, one might also wonder whether Knobbert and Van Hofdyck women tended toward a similar facial type, with a conical cheek and jawline, long narrow noses, small mouths, and inexpressive eyes. Or was Corvina made to fit in (which would have been an honor)? If Rembrandt was inviting comparison between portraits of Cornelis van Beresteyn and his wife with those of Cornelis's parents, presumably in one large room of the house on the Oude Delft, then the artist must have been encouraged to do so by the patron, who was the immediate successor to his father in most respects, if not his oldest son.

Supporting the notion that the Van Beresteyn portraits were made to fit into a dynastic ensemble is the fact that the panels by Delft, the Van Beresteyn portraits of similar format by Van Mierveeld, and Rembrandt's canvases are all very nearly the same size. The standard dimensions for the presumed series would be about 44½ x 32½ inches (112 x 83.5 cm). Delft's panels are 1½ inches (3 cm) higher, Van Mierveeld's portrait of Cornelis van Beresteyn's first wife (fig. 136) is 1½ inches (3.5 cm) wider, and Rembrandt's canvases are 2½ inches (6.5 cm) wider, all of which are insignificant differences that could not be detected once the paintings were framed. By contrast, there are no other pictures of the same format among Rembrandt's formal portraits or single-figure paintings dating from 1631–33, with the exception of the Nicolaes Rust, of 1631 (45½ x 34¼ in. [116 x 87 cm]). There have been specialized studies of standard canvas and panel sizes in different Dutch cities, but they do not explain why a pair of large canvases used by Rembrandt in Amsterdam should conform to a panel format employed in Delft. The provenance of the Havemeyer portraits, however, offers an explanation.

There is no mention in the Corpus of what might be found remarkable by many observers of the Van Beresteyn portraits, particularly when they are seen in the same gallery with the vivacious sitter in the Portrait of a Young Woman with a Fan (Pl. 146). The pendants are exceptionally reserved in expression and lacking in animation, compared with the pendant, double, group, and several of the single formal portraits that Rembrandt painted during the early 1630s. In a field of figures that rise from their chairs, gesture to each other, and look at the viewer with enthusiasm or even surprise, the couple in the Havemeyer portraits seem no more forthcoming than the most important sitters ever painted by Delft or Van Mierveeld. By Rembrandt's standards—and even by Amsterdam standards—they are stiff and isolated. But by the standards of Delft, they are stately and dignified. A few other early portraits by Rembrandt are similarly understated, but they are smaller works of more intimate character (except for the 1632 Portrait of Princess Amalia van Solms, which conforms to the conservative model of another artist). Rembrandt evidently took on a similar assignment in 1634, when he painted a pair of standing full-length portraits (something unprecedented in his oeuvre) representing Martens Soolmans and his wife, Oopjen Coppit (private collection, Paris). It has been suggested that these tall canvases conform to examples by Cornelis van der Voort (ca. 1576–1624) and Wybrand de Geest (1592–ca. 1662), thereby extending what is perhaps an analogous ensemble of dynastic family portraits.

1. As discussed below, there is some question as to whether the Havemeyer portraits were actually painted in Amsterdam. In Dudok van Heel 2006, pp. 7, 204, it is suggested that Rembrandt maintained a workshop in Leiden until about 1633, but this is irrelevant to the matter at hand.

2. For the portraits cited here, see Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, nos. 443, 444, 457–58, 459.


4. Van Beresteyn 1941, p. 156. As discussed below, it was the widow of another “Christien,” Christiaan Prins van Beresteyn, who bought Maurick Castle.

5. See Van Beresteyn and Del Campo Hartman 1954, p. 259, and Ex Coll. under Van Mierveeld's Jacob van Dalen, called Vallenste (Pl. 121). The Van Beresteyns and the Van der Dussen were already related through the brief marriage in 1650 of Cornelis van Beresteyn's sister Catharina (1579–1600) and Nicolaas Bruyns van der Dussen (1561–1642), whose mother was a Van Groenewegen (see note 12 below).

6. For Van Beresteyn portraits from the Van der Dussen sale, see Moe 1897–1905, vol. 1, pp. 62–63. Van Mierveeld's portrait of Cornelis van Beresteyn was perhaps inscribed on the back with the information given in ibid., p. 62 (under no. 312–1). The painting is listed in Van Beresteyn 1941, p. 45, no. 91, as on panel, 28 x 24 in. (71 x 61 cm), location unknown, and mentioned in Van Beresteyn and Del Campo Hartman 1914, p. 160, as untraced. The Van der Dussen sale is listed in Lugt 1938–64, vol. 2, no. 21994. E. W. Moe (1864–1912) was an assistant archivist in Rotterdam (1886–90), a librarian at Amsterdam University (1890–98), assistant director (from 1898) and then director of the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam, and from 1893 until his death co-editor (with Abraham Bredius) of Oud Holland.

7. Pendant portraits by Van Mierveeld and his studio were acquired in 2002 by the Holland Museum, Holland, Michigan.
as portraits of Cornelis van Beresteyn and his first wife, Jannetje Beerekel (who are discussed in the text following). The female pendant is a version (with no inscription) of a Van Miereveld portrait of Jannetje Berckel dated 1614 (Van Beresteyn 1941, no. 92, fig. 28; fig. 136 here), while the companion picture, inscribed (reliably?) “AEatis 30 Ao 1617,” is the painting published in Van Beresteyn 1941 (nos. 108, fig. 35; fig. 135 here) as a portrait of Arnoldus van Beresteyn (1596–1632). That identification was based on comparison with a bust-length portrait of (evidently) the same man, which is inscribed on the back with the sitter’s name and public offices (formerly Maurick Castle; Van Beresteyn 1941, no. 109, fig. 36). Not only do Van Beresteyn’s identifications appear convincing, but the portraits in Michigan do not appear to be true pendants. The male portrait is considerably superior to the female portrait in execution, and the figures are presented at different distances from the picture plane. More important, Jannetje Berckel died on the first day of 1615, so that a portrait of her dating from that year or later—namely, 1617, like the “pendant”—is unexpected. It may be assumed that a portrait of her husband, Cornelis van Beresteyn, was painted by Van Miereveld in 1616 (to commemorate the couple’s marriage on October 6, 1613), and is now untraced or improperly identified.

8. The only other paintings in the sale, in the total of fifty (Lugt 1928–64, vol. 3, no. 44251), were two items connected with famous in-laws: a Tromp family crest and Willem van de Velde the Elder’s pen painting, Episode from the Four Day Battle at Sea, of 1668 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, no. 8840). In that event of 1666, also known as the “Battle of the Downs,” Lieutenant-Admiral Cornelis Tromp (1629–1691) assisted Admiral Michiel de Ruyter as commander of the Dutch rear squadron. Tromp’s niece Dina Cornelia married Thomas van Beresteyn, Lord of Maurick, in 1693 (see text following).

9. Van Beresteyn 1941, p. 136. No other information about Heym is given in Van Beresteyn 1941, or in Van Beresteyn and Del Campo Hartman 1954 (on p. 213, the sale of 1681 is mentioned again). Hendrick Heym (ca. 1595/6–1679 or 1680) was Lord of Maurick from the death of his mother, Maria Heym, in 1624, until 1679. On December 20 of that year, all his possessions were seized by the States of Brabant because he was insolvent, and they were sold off on August 1, 1680 (there is no indication that Maurick Castle and all its contents were sold together). Heym was married to Johanna van Malsen van Ossenoot en Nieuwkuik and had one younger brother, Gijsbrecht (b. 1623). The present writer is extremely grateful to Paul Huys Janssen for providing this information, which is drawn mainly from Juten 1912, pp. 103–4, and from Schoolkate 1995, pp. 10–11.


11. According to Van Beresteyn 1941, p. 5, “it is a known fact” that the Rembrandt portraits were used to collect soot from the chimneys, and in the summer to dry beans.


13. The story is told in Duit 1985 (see Refs.) and appears essentially reliable.

14. Slive 1970–74, vol. 2, pls. 27, 28, vol. 3, nos. 12, 13. Paulus van Beresteyn (1588–1616) was the son of Arent van Beresteyn (1556–1612), brother of the Delft burgomaster Paulus van Beresteyn (1548–1633). Their father was the Haarlem scholar, author, and art lover Cornelis van Beresteyn (1557–1595). The Delft dynasty of Van Beresteyns began with the older Paulus’s marriage (1574) to Volckera Knobbert of Delft. He would become a highly successful merchant in madder and wine, a director of the East India Company (VOC), and a wealthy landowner. He served as a burgomaster of Delft between 1601 and 1608. On these members of the family, see Van Beresteyn and Del Campo Hartman 1954, pp. 89–100 (Cornelis I), 105–108 (Paulus I), 133–38 (Arent), and 219–22 (Paulus III).


16. Van Beresteyn 1941, pp. 23–24 (under no. 42, the pendant Delft), explains that after the death of another Jacob van Beresteyn in 1855, his son Gijsbert took most of the male family portraits and his daughter the female portraits, which went with her to Col. Woortman Spandaw. In need of money, Spandaw sold them to another party and they were finally auctioned off in Amsterdam on October 30, 1885.


18. For portraits of Gijsbert and Arnold van Beresteyn, see Van Beresteyn 1944, figs. (“no.”) 15, 16, 35, and Craft-Giepmans 2006, no. 77 (Gijsbert). Two sons named Nicolaas died in infancy, in 1574 and 1575. Also taken into account in preparation for this entry (and, no doubt, in Van Beresteyn 1944) were Van Beresteyn cousins of approximately the same age as the man and woman in the Rembrandt portraits (see the family tree in Van Beresteyn and Del Campo Hartman 1954, pp. 64–67, especially generation VII, nos. 59–71).


20. In 1632, Cornelis was forty-five, not forty-six, as he was born on December 31, 1586. There is a supposed portrait of Corvina van Hofdyck at the age of sixteen, from Van Miereveld’s studio, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Van Beresteyn 1941, p. 48, no. 94, fig. 29; Van Thielt et al. 1976, p. 386). The sitter (who looks a few years younger than sixteen) is identified by an inscription on the verso; the front is dated 1618 and inscribed “AEat. 16.” The identification is conceivable, but doubtful, considering that Corvina may never have visited Delft (that is, Van Miereveld’s studio) until after her marriage, in Somsmeldijk on October 20, 1619.


22. It may or may not be relevant that when Christiaen van Beresteyn married Jacqueline Brouart in 1645, his uncle Cornelis’s oldest son, Zacharias, was twenty-two, three years short of his majority.
23. See the text above, at note 5.


25. Ibid., p. 146.


27. See Van Beresteyn and Del Campo Hartman 1954, p. 165. After his university years, Cornelis traveled through France and Switzerland to Venice, returning to the Netherlands through Germany in 1611. He practiced law in Delft and reportedly defended Grotius (presumably in 1621–22; see Israel 1991, p. 514).

28. For clarification, the surviving children of Cornelis van Beresteyn and Corvina van Hofdyck were: Zacharias Cornelisz van Beresteyn (1623–1679), who in 1676 married Agneta Deutz (1631–1692) of Amsterdam; Agatha van Beresteyn (1625–1702), who in 1649 married Dr. Theodorus Jacobsz Vallensis (1612–1673), the son of Jacob Vallensis (see Fl. 121); Dirk van Beresteyn (1627–1651), who in 1652 married Magdalena van Adrichem (1630–1684; in 1664, she married Harbert Maartenz Tromp van Voorburg, son of Adm. Maarten Harpertz Tromp); and two sons who never married, Cornelis (1629–1716) and Jacobus (1635–1669).


30. See ibid., pp. 293–95, 311–44.

31. For examples of dynamic portrait ensembles in the northern Netherlands, see Dudok van Heel in Amsterdam 2002–3, pp. 46–61, and Dudok van Heel 2006, chap. 7, esp. pp. 345–58. A significant sideline in the genre was the creation of imaginary portraits (sometimes called icons) of distant ancestors, which also tended to conform to compositional patterns established in the seventeenth century. This occasionally results in the curious appearance of Van Eyckian costume in Van Dyckian pictures, as in Hendrick Bloemaert’s full-length portrait of Pieter van Tuyl van Serooskerken (in his own time known simply as Pieter Hugen Reynersz), which is inscribed “aetat 26. 1436” although the canvas dates from about 1670 (see Amsterdam 2002–3, fig. 73; Dudok van Heel 2006, p. 311, fig. 182; and Roethlisberger 1999, vol. 1, pp. 500–501, no. HIII77). The painting is part of a series of six ancestral portraits and one contemporary portrait of male members of the Van Tuyl van Serooskerken family, and they remain in the family seat, Zuilken Castle, just north of Utrecht.

32. Van Beresteyn 1944, p. 136. The author makes only two arguments against the identification of the Havemeyer Rembrandts as Van Beresteyn portraits, and in the context of his professional study they are surprisingly amateurish. He clearly reviewed the question of which Van Beresteyn might be depicted, and whether there was any record of Cornelis’s appearance that spoke against the identification (none was known to him). As his first objection, he asks how the Rembrandts wound up at Maurick Castle rather than descending to the Van der Dussen sale of 1858 (mentioned in the text above, p. 568). He never asks how the Rembrandts could be anything else but Van Beresteyn portraits, considering that all the portraits sold at Maurick Castle in 1888 depicted family members. As a second objection, Van Beresteyn (ibid., p. 131) tells the story of how, back in 1905, he had the luck to buy two small copies (on wood, 13 x 9¼ in. [33 x 24.5 cm]) of the Havemeyer portraits; the male pendant bears a “typical Brabant crest.” It is implausible that such small copies of large Rembrandt portraits would have any documentary value, a point that the addition of a Brabant crest simply underscores (to the present writer’s knowledge, there is no such thing as a Rembrandt portrait bearing a family crest).

33. See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 308 (under no. A80). The painting was acquired by the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, in 1992. Wensborgaert (1557–1644) lived in The Hague from 1626 onward, but Rembrandt recorded his features in Amsterdam when the preacher was spending some time there in April 1633.

34. Ibid., vol. 2, no. A61.

35. Van der Veen in London–Amsterdam 2006, p. 131. He supports this view by recalling that Rembrandt, in one of his letters to the stadholder’s secretary, Constantijn Huygens, states that the lighting conditions in the princely gallery at The Hague will favor the series of Passion pictures then in progress.


37. Van der Veen in London–Amsterdam 2006, pp. 135–36. It appears that Bruyn (1879a; see Refs.) sent Rembrandt’s Leiden pupil Isaac Joudeville in the wrong direction.

38. It took an hour on foot or by trebuchet (canal barge) to travel from one city to the other; round trips in a morning or afternoon were routine. On the proximity of The Hague and Delft, see Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 3–8, pp. 48–49 on Van Miereveld’s patrons in the two cities, and pp. 43–44 on one of Van Dalen’s visits to The Hague. Given Rembrandt’s place in this milieu, it is probably insignificant that Cornelis van Beresteyn’s uncle, Coenraet, who died on December 25, 1632, in Amsterdam, was a recent convert to the Mennonite community in that city (Van Beresteyn and Del Campo Hartman 1954, p. 127).

39. R. Ekkart kindly read a draft of this entry and offered these valuable suggestions in December 2006.

40. See Refs. On the question of Rembrandt’s workshop during the early to mid-1630s, see Liedtke 2004b.

41. The quote is from Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 747. It appears that after decades of neglect and perhaps even mistreatment (see note 11 above), the newly discovered Rembrandts were spruced up for the auction held in June 1887 (see Van Beresteyn 1944, p. 6, stating that the “conservation” was carried out for the seller, Jacob van Beresteyn).


43. All these remarks are found in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 747.

44. The remark was made in the Amsterdam “Rembrandt” symposium of May 26–27, 2002, and was previously quoted in Liedtke 2004b, p. 72 n. 82. See also Hochfeld 2004, in the Refs. below.

45. On Rembrandt’s modification of the man’s left sleeve, see Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 29, pls. 13, 14.

46. The quotes in this paragraph are from Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 747–49.


REFERENCES: Dutuit 1885, pp. 51, 62, 66, no. 248 (with MMA 29.100.4), describes this painting and its pendant as portraits of unknown sitters, in the “Beresteyn” collection, and relates the story of the 1884 auction of the G. van Beresteyn estate (reported earlier in the “Indépendance Belge”), according to which the Rembrandt signatures were discovered shortly before the sale; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 344 (with MMA 29.100.4): “The Rembrandt Portraits,” The Studio, n.s., 4, no. 3 (February 1880), p. 1 (ill.), as recently brought to America by Cotterell & Co., purchased by Henry Havemeyer, and lent to the MMA; É. Michel 1894, vol. 1, pp. 118–19, mentions the pair portraits (which the author had not seen) as sold to an American collector; Bode 1895, p. 71, cites them as “a pair of statuette pictures from the Beresteyn family,” purchased by Havemeyer; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 2 (1897), pp. 6, 44, 46, no. 82, pl. 82 (with the pendant) as portraits of a gentleman and a lady of the Van Beresteyn-Vucht family, stating that “they purport to be . . . Christian Paulus van Beresteyn and . . . his wife, Volkeria Nicolai Knobbertt; but that the actual identity of the sitters is unknown, and that the man “may have been a Van Beresteyn, or a collateral in the female line”; Moes 1897–1905, vol. 1 (1897), p. 62, no. 312-a, as by Rembrandt, listed with a question mark as a possible portrait of Cornelis van Beresteyn, sold at Maurice Castle in 1884; Bell 1899, pp. 61, 84, briefly cited as portraits of Christian Paul van Beresteyn and Volkeria Nicolai Knobbert, dated 1624; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 58 (ill.), 399, 408, reports that the identification as members of the Van Beresteyn family stems from the provenance of the pictures, in Kasteel Maurick, Vught, until 1884; Valentinier in A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 74 (ill.), 551, 568, paraphrases A. Rosenberg 1906; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 2 (1910), pp. 451–56, lists the pair, Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 301, no. 624, as “A Man of the Van Beresteyn-Vucht Family,” describes the composition, casts doubt on the identification, and reports that the picture “has suffered from heavy pressure in its transference to a new canvas”; Meldrum 1923, p. 31 n. 2, p. 188, pl. lxxx, as “Portrait of a Man (Van Beresteyn)”; Mattair 1920, pp. 452, 464, opines that “the robust but hard and insensitive portraits of Beresteyn and his wife are excellent examples of Rembrandt’s faithful workmanship before he had really learned to paint”; Valentinier 1920b, p. 4 (ill. with pendant on plates following p. 4); Wehle 1930, p. 60, as depicting Christian Paul van Beresteyn and his wife, among six Rembrandt portraits in the exhibition of the Havemeyer collection; Burroughs 1931a, p. 296, as “Christian Paul van Beresteyn (A burgomaster of Delft)” and his wife, “Volkeria van Beresteyn”; Havemeyer Collection 1931, pp. 20–21 (ill.); Valentinier 1931, unpagged, no. 23, pl. 23, as a gentleman of the Beresteyn-Vucht family, stating that the sitter is so identified only because the picture was acquired from the Van Beresteyn family; Benesch 1932a, p. 232, listed; Bredius 1935, p. 8, no. 167, pl. 167, notes that it has not been determined which members of the “Van Beresteyn-Vucht” family are depicted here; A. Burroughs 1938, pp. 168–71, figs. 71 (detail of Pl. 143), 72 (X-Radiograph detail), states that while these portraits come “close to what is characteristic of Rembrandt,” they were probably painted by Jacob Backer somewhat later than 1625; Held 1940, pp. 41–42, reviewing A. Burroughs 1938, defends the attribution to Rembrandt (“one would expect the portraits to form cornerstones of any critical study”); Van Beresteyn 1941, pp. 5, 6, 46, 131–37, no. 267, fig. 140 (with the pendant, no. 268, fig. 141), does not believe that the sitters are members of the Van Beresteyn family, but suggests that they could be members of the family of Hendrik Heym, Lord of Maurick, whose castle and estate were sold to a member of the Van Beresteyn family in 1681 (actually 1680); J. Allen 1945, p. 73, erroneously as “the Burgomaster of Delft, Christian Paul van Beresteyn, and his spouse Volkeria,” claims that “the Van Beresteyn family treasured these likenesses of their ancestors for two hundred and fifty years”; Rousseau 1952, pp. 82, 84, remarks upon the “meticulous and precise” brushwork; Van Beresteyn and Del Campo Hartman 1954, p. 170 n. 66, states that the painting does not represent Cornelis van Beresteyn, and p. 387, in a brief review of items sold from Maurice Castle in 1884, claims that the Rembrandt portraits were sold private after the sale for £20,000; Havemeyer Collection 1958, p. 17, as “Cornelis van Beresteyn?”; Havemeyer 1961, p. 19, as portraits of “Nicholas and Volkeria van Beresteyn,” in the Havemeyer house; K. Bauch 1966, p. 19, no. 360, pl. 360, as by Rembrandt, notes an added strip at the bottom of the canvas; Gerson 1968, pp. 261 (ill.), 494, no. 120, as by Rembrandt, “a painting of extraordinary richness of nuance in color and design”; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 142 (ill.), 561, no. 167, and p. 576 (under no. 331), as by Rembrandt, noting that “identification as a Beresteyn family portrait rests only on the fact that the picture (and its companion, Br. 331) were bought from the van Beresteyn-Vucht family”; Lecaldano 1969, p. 98, no. 83 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Walsh in New York 1971, p. 10, no. 18, tentatively identifies the sitter as “Cornelius van Beresteyn”; H. von Sonnenburg in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 91, suggests that the uneven quality of this picture and its pendant indicates that Rembrandt may have signed works done partly or entirely by pupils; Von Sonnenburg 1976, p. 21, repeats the remark made in Art Institute of Chicago 1973; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 177, no. 116 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, “Portrait of a Man”; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 83, listed as paintings of 1612; Havercamp-Begemann 1980, p. 205, considers the execution of the portraits to be “parallelized” by that of Rembrandt’s Portrait of Joris de Cuavert, of 1612 (fig. 130 here); Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 29, pls. 11, 12 (X-radiographs), 13, 14 (autoradiographs), notes the opinions of Von Sonnenburg (1976) and Gerson (1968 and in Bredius 1969), but concludes that “close examination of the brushwork and working procedure of these paintings reveals Rembrandt’s characteristic technique in both”; G. Schwartz 1985, p. 163, fig. 159, as by Rembrandt, discusses the results of autoradiography; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2 (1986), pp. 26, 38, 74, 74–11, 757–59, no. 646 (ill., including X-radiograph, autoradiographs, and details), attributes both portraits to a single artist working in Rembrandt’s workshop, but considers an attribution to Isaac Jouderville highly unlikely, “given the degree of plasticity achieved especially in the man’s portrait”; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 82 (ill.), 428–29, 431, no. 481, as from Rembrandt’s workshop, with no discussion as to why; Weitenhoffer 1986, pp. 47, 53, 54, 254, 261 n. 9 (to chap. 4), fig. 11 (ill. p. 74; photograph taken in the Havemeyer residence), cited as the works with which Henry Havemeyer started his collection of old masters; Bruyn 1987, pp. 9–11, concludes that the painting is by Isaac Jouderville; White 1987, p. 810, is not persuaded by the rejection of the portraits as works by Rembrandt in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2; Alpers 1988, p. 123 n. 19, fig. 4.31 (with the pendant, fig. 4.32), summarizes the dispute about authenticity, stating that “the Metropolitan itself (understandably) waffled on this matter”; Jeromack 1988a, pp. 103–8 (ill.), reviews the recent debate about authorship, noting that in future catalogues of the Museum.
in the course of work than the pendant male portraits; Lloyd Williams in Madrid 2002, p. 32 n. 16, repeats the remark made in Edinburgh–London 2001; Quodbach 2002, p. 82 n. 69, as the first two Rembrandts acquired by Havemeyer; Hochfeld 2004, pp. 88–90 (ill.), discusses the debate over the pair portraits, and quotes Van de Wetering (interviewed in fall 2003) on the question of how the Corpus (see 1982–89 above) went too far in assigning the pictures to a workshop assistant; Liedtke 2004b, pp. 49, 50, 59, 66 (no. 658), 72 n. 82, figs. 1, 6 (gallery view), in a critique of the “workshop hypothesis” advanced in Corpus 1982–89, observes that the painting is now almost universally accepted as by Rembrandt; Quodbach 2004, p. 99, fig. 7 (photograph of Havemeyer library), mislabeled as by Isaac Jouderville; Scallen 2004, p. 187, 188 n. 14, as seen by Bode in Havemeyer’s house; Quodbach 2005, pp. 73, 305 n. 37, 45, refers to Havemeyer’s purchase of the portraits only five years after they were discovered in a private Dutch collection; Groen in Corpus 2005, p. 324, figs. 3, 4, pp. 662–63, reports that on both canvases the first ground consists of two layers of red, and the second ground lead white, charcoal black, yellow, and a little red ochre, resulting in a gray color; Van de Wetering in ibid., pp. 27, 202, compares the signature and the man’s cuff with those found in contemporary works by Rembrandt and notes that the lace cuff on the right is overlapped by the cloak, as is seen in few other Dutch portraits; Bogh Ramberg in Copenhagen 2006, p. 99 n. 17, misleadingly reports that the portraits are among works by Rembrandt “that seem to be generally accepted today as the result of collaboration between the master and a student.”


EX COLL.: By family descent to Jonkheer Gijsbert van Berestijn, Maurick Castle, Vught, the Netherlands (until d. January 26, 1884; his estate sale, Maurick Castle, Vught, October 22–23, 1884, probably among nos. 17–46b, bought in with pendant for Fl 75,000 by the heirs; their sale, L. G. N. van Dullemen [executor], Casino, ’s Hertogenbosch, June 28, 1887, with pendant, sold for Fl 12,000 to Jacob van Berestijn); Jacob van Berestijn, Gossel, the Netherlands (1887; sold in October 1887, with pendant, possibly for Fl 202,000 to Gérard); [Félix Gérard, Paris, 1887–88; sold in May 1888, with pendant, to Cottereau]; [Cottereau & Co., London and New York, 1888; sold on December 8, 1888, with pendant, for $60,000 to Havemeyer]; Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1888–his d. 1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–d. 1929); H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929.29.100.3
1. See Dutuit 1885, p. 53, whose description of the sale held on October 24, 1884, is borrowed from "une correspondance adressée à l'Indépendance Belge." The first sale is reported to have taken place "au château de Maurick" in Vught, which is just south of 's-Hertogenbosch. This is confirmed in Van Beresteyn 1941, pp. 36, 66, 135, etc. In a handwritten deposition dated "Bois-le-Duc ['s Hertogenbosch] 19 Novembre 1888," the 's-Hertogenbosch notary I. G. N. van Dullemen, "exécuteur testamentaire de feu Monsieur G. van Beresteyn, marquis de Bourgemestre," testifies that Mr. J. van Beresteyn became the owner of the two portraits at a (second) public sale conducted on behalf of the heirs by Van Dullemen in 's-Hertogenbosch on June 28, 1887, and that the son of the deceased (Jacob van Beresteyn was Gijbbert's eldest son) declares that the sitters "sont des ancêtres de la famille van Beresteyn, ayant appartenus à la magistrature par les Rembrandt, et signés R. van Ryn 1612." Below this declaration, Jacob van Beresteyn, resident of Gorssel (which is east of Apeldoorn in Gelderland), wrote that in October 1887 he sold the two family portraits to Félix Gérard of 21 Boulevard Montmartre, Paris, and that "L'homme représente Christen Paul van Beresteyn Bourgemestre (maire) de la ville de Delft seigneur du Château de Maurick et sa femme Volkeria Nicolai Knobbert qui était regente de différentes fondations, ils appartenaient par conséquent à la magistrature à l'époque du Stadhouders du Prince Maurice d'Orange." This is signed "Gorselle 19 Novembre 1888." On November 21, 1888, in Paris, Gérard signed a declaration that he had sold the two portraits to D. Cortier of London in May 1888. On November 22, 1888, Daniel Cortier of Cottier & Co., London, declared that he had sent the Rembrandt portraits to Cottier & Co. of New York "on June 23 last" and that the accompanying documents refer to those pictures. It would appear that in November 1888 Gérard was obliged by Cortier to obtain documents concerning his acquisition of the pictures. An English translation of the declarations by Van Dullemen and Jacob van Beresteyn is written on the letterhead of Cottier & Company, New York. All these papers are preserved in the Department of European Paintings.

2. In Van Beresteyn and Del Campo Hartman 1954, p. 387, it is stated that after the sale at Maurick Castle the Rembrandt portraits were sold privately for Fl 202,000.

144. Portrait of a Woman, probably a Member of the Van Beresteyn Family

Oil on canvas, 44 x 35 in. (111.8 x 88.9 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): RHL-van Rijn [initials in monogram] 1612

The painting is well preserved. There is a series of small losses along the bridge of the nose and on the proper left cuff extending into the pearl. A few minor areas of loss occur along the lower edge of the skirt. Small losses distributed throughout the background are concentrated at left and along the top edge above the head.

H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.4

This painting is the pendant to Rembrandt's Portrait of a Man, probably a Member of the Van Beresteyn Family (Pl. 143), and is discussed in the entry immediately above.

REFERENCES: (See Refs. in the preceding entry, where unless otherwise specified the Portrait of a Woman and its pendant are cited as a pair. The following references pertain solely to the present picture.)
Bode 1897-1906, vol. 2 (1897), pp. 6, 44, 46, no. 81, pl. 83; not listed in Moes 1897-1903; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 59 (ill.), 394, 408; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 75 (ill.), 311, 368; Holstede de Grooth 1927-27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 301-2, no. 625; Meldrum 1923, p. 51 n. 2, p. 188, pl. XXXI, as "Portrait of a Woman (Van Beresteyn)"; Valentinier 1931, unpaged, no. 23, pl. 23, as a lady of the Beresteyn-Vught family, stating that the sitter is so called only because the picture was acquired from the Van Beresteyn family; Bredius 1935, p. 14, no. 321, pl. 321; Ivins 1942a, pp. 3, 6 (ill. p. 1); Ivins 1942b, pls. 3, 4 (detail); Havemeyer Collection 1958, no. 18, as "The Wife of Cornelis van Beresteyn"; K. Bauch 1966, p. 24, no. 439, pl. 459, as by Rembrandt; Gerson 1968, pp. 265 (ill.), 494, no. 121, as by a different and weaker hand than the pendant by Rembrandt ("in technique and expression it is totally dissimilar"), suggests that the signature was copied from that on the pendant; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 262 (ill.), 561 (under no. 167), and p. 576, no. 331, repeats the opinions expressed in Bredius 1968, and states that "the obvious conclusion is that the female portrait was painted by another artist of less originality and power"; Lecaldano 1969, p. 98, no. 84 (ill.), summarizes Gerson 1968; Von Sonnenburg 1976, p. 21, as partly by a pupil; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 177, no. 104 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, "Portrait of a Young Woman"; Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 29, pls. 15, 16 (X-radiograph), 17, 18 (autoradiographs), concludes that autoradiographs reveal a technique and procedure that are consistent with works by Rembrandt, but notes that the greater number of pentimenti in the female portrait indicate "some degree of indecision"; G. Schwartz 1985, p. 163, figs. 160, 161 (autoradiograph), as by Rembrandt, concluding that the changes in the course of execution confirm the observations of Gerson (1968) on "the differences in expression between Rembrandt's male and female portraits, but [disprove] his theory that the woman of this and other pairs should therefore be assigned to other artists"; Corpus 1982-89, vol. 2 (1986), pp. 36, 38, 73-74, 740, 742-43, 747-59, no. C69 (ill., including X-radiograph, autoradiographs, and details), attributes the portrait to a workshop assistant, although Rembrandt may have intervened to paint the woman's left hand; Meyer 1986, p. 57, fig. 116, describes
the cut of the woman's sleeves; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 83 (ill.), 429, 431, no. 1103, as from Rembrandt's workshop, based on the remarks in Gerson 1968 and in the Corpus; Bruyn 1987a, pp. 9–11, figs. 9, 10–11; (X-ray and autoradiograph), concludes that the painting is by Isaac Jouderville; C. Brown 1989, pp. 8, 9 (ill.), rejects the attribution to Jouderville suggested in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2; Liedtke 1986, pp. 325–26, 328–31, 372 nn. 26, 28, 30–31, 35, 36–16, 59, pl. II, fig. 2 (autoradiograph), defends the attribution to Rembrandt and rejects the concept of a large Rembrandt workshop already active in 1632, as assumed in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2; Grim 1991, pp. 48, 81, pl. 31 (detail), figs. 67, 153 (detail), as by Rembrandt; Bruyn 1992, pp. 11–16, fig. 5, attempts to explain why the portrait is by Isaac Jouderville, who is assumed to have been active in Rembrandt's workshop; Slatakas 1992, pp. 208–9, no. 117 (ill.), defends the attribution to Rembrandt; C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 83 (ill.), 429, 431, no. 1103, as by Rembrandt's workshop, observes that "the technique differs from that of the pendant," and claims that "it emerges clearly here that the Rembrandt workshop was still experimenting with the characterization of the female face, in which it had less experience than in its male portraits"; Baeijer 1995, p. 313; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 15–16, 40, 46–50, 60, 96, 103, no. 4 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, with the possible help of an assistant; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 12, 18–19, 24, 40, 82–87, no. 4 (ill.), and figs. 12 (autoradiograph), 34 (detail), 35 (X-ray graph detail), 108, 109–10, is "dissatisfied to dismiss altogether the possibility that an assistant participated occasionally [in the execution of paintings by Rembrandt], . . . particularly with regard to the woman's portrait," and describes how the composition was altered in the course of work; Kremel 2000, p. 130 n. 169, comments on the woman's hairstyle; Gordenker 2001, p. 100 n. 27, describes the collar; Liedtke 2004b, pp. 59, 65 (no. 569), fig. 6 (gallery view), in a critique of the "workshop hypothesis" advanced in Corpus 1982–89, reports that most scholars now defend an attribution of the picture to Rembrandt himself, while a number of them allow for the possibility of studio assistance.


Ex Coll.: The painting has the same history of ownership as its pendant; see Ex Coll. for Portrait of a Man, probably a Member of the Van Beresteyn Family (Pl. 141); H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.4.
Oil on wood, oval, 26¼ x 19¼ in. (67.9 x 50.2 cm)
Signed (or inscribed; lower left): Rembrandt f. 1633.

The black dress and background are well preserved. Along the vertical wood grain in the face and white collar are numerous small flake losses of both paint and ground.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.625

The inscription on this portrait in the Altman Collection has been described as “so hesitant and irregular that it is hard to accept its authenticity,” but at the same time so similar to genuine Rembrandt signatures “that one is almost forced to assume that it was copied from an authentic prototype.” The authors of the Corpus, in 1986 (see Refs.), conclude that the inscription was probably copied from a signature on a pendant male portrait (now presumed lost) or, if the present picture was cut down from an originally rectangular format, from a signature that was removed during that unfortunate process (which was not unusual in the course of eighteenth-century interior decoration). It is quite unlikely, however, that the oak panel has been altered in shape. Von Sonnenburg notes that brushstrokes in the priming layer of paint follow the curved edge of the panel to the upper left, suggesting that the oval format is original. Furthermore, the shape of the support and the relationship of the figure to the picture field are consistent with other Amsterdam portraits of the 1630s, including several by Rembrandt. Expanding the portrait to a rectangular format would result in an unwonted amount of featureless space around the figure.

The alternative idea that the inscription was copied from the signature and date on a pendant portrait is plausible (pair portraits with only one signature are not rare), but is also open to question for at least two reasons. First, it is far from certain that Rembrandt did not sign this painting himself, however “hesitant” the signature (or rather, the b and the d) might be. Close comparison with “Rembrandte” signatures of 1633, which according to the Corpus “present a disturbing range of variations,” could easily strengthen rather than weaken faith in the inscription here. Second, a survey of similar portraits by Rembrandt suggests that the sitter in the Altman picture, who is placed slightly off-center (literally, “by a nose”) and turned a bit to the viewer’s left, may have had a companion but could just as well have been without one. The Ellsworth Portrait of a Man, of 1632 (Pl. 141), once assumed (illogically) to be this picture’s pendant, probably never had a mate, and the Portrait of a Young Man, also of 1632 (on long-term loan to the Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum, Aachen), almost certainly never had a pendant and is very similar to the present painting in composition.

In recent years, Rembrandt’s authorship of this portrait has been questioned, especially by Von Sonnenburg in the catalogue of the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition of 1995–96 (see Refs.). He observes that “the face of the appealing sitter is painted in a distinctly dry manner,” using conventions that “recur frequently in authentic Rembrandts and workshop paintings alike.” The cap and ruff are considered “uninspired and somewhat pedantic” in execution, while the background received “very cursory treatment” and the black costume resembles a “lifeless cutout, owing to its lack of modeling and substance.” These remarks have considerable merit, but the impatience with which the positive opinions of the Rembrandt Research Project are dismissed seems unjustified. They note that a considerable amount of local paint loss as a result of blistering impedes an assessment of the head, but that it nonetheless reveals “a method of working wholly in keeping with that of Rembrandt in the early 1630s.” Especially impressive are the “subtly-drawn eyes, with grey-brown irises and crisp catchlights,” the “strikingly-modelled mouth area,” and the “successful suggestion of plasticity that has been achieved in exactly the same manner in comparable paintings—especially in the Frankfurt Portrait of Maergen van Bilderbeek of 1633” (fig. 140). A strong sense of three-dimensional form is also detected in other parts of the head (presumably meaning the forehead, with its delightful highlight) and in the cap, leading to the conclusion that “there is thus every reason to regard the painting as an authentic Rembrandt.” The background and the dark costume are considered rather uneventful (“all but even” in execution) but consistent with passages in similar works (here one would not refer to the Frankfurt portrait, which has admirable detail in the costume, especially on the near shoulder and sleeve). Finally, X-radiographs of the Altman picture are said to reveal “a distinct picture of the brushwork and a distribution of light and shadow that was clearly conceived from the outset: the X-ray of the 1633 Portrait of Maergen van
Bilderbeecq (no. A82) offers such a strong resemblance that it can provide a clinching argument for the attribution and date. This argument is entirely convincing, although the black costume in the Altman portrait, and perhaps even the white ruff and cap, are possibly by a collaborator (it is suggested in the Corpus that the cap in the Frankfurt picture, or the lace on the cap, may have been completed by a studio assistant). Nevertheless, the description of the cap, with its threadlike highlights, is not unlike the more elaborate headgear seen in the Portrait of an Eighty-three-Year-Old Woman (Aechje Claeszdr Pesser), of 1634 (National Gallery, London). The woman’s face speaks for itself, except in the shadowy part to the right where thinning of the paint layer and a visible wood grain diminish modeling and the interplay of light and shadow. In sum, this is an attractive but routine formal portrait, entirely or essentially by Rembrandt, most probably dating from 1635.

A copy of the head and shoulders only, on canvas, was on the English art market in 1986.

1. The quotes are from Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 413, 417.
2. Cradling prevents inspection of the back. The three boards making up the panel have proved impossible to date, according to J. Bauch’s report dated November 30, 1977, and Peter Klein’s report dated January 25, 1991.
3. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 88, fig. 111 (detail), where in the caption it is stated that the panel “was not cut down from a rectangle, as most observers believed until recently.” There is no evidence in the literature, however, that such a supposition was widespread.
4. The inscription could have been copied from yet another source, and there are other possibilities.
5. See Bruijn in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, chap. 5, especially pp. 102–3 (quote from p. 103). One of the options allowed in Bruijn’s convoluted and occasionally circular argument (doubted pictures bear doubtful signatures which encourage doubts about the painting in question) is that signatures may have been imitated or copied by assistants in Rembrandt’s studio. On earlier signatures by Rembrandt (or not), see Bruijn in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, chap. 4, and Lieberke 1995, p. 461.
6. Female portraits by Rembrandt of similar design include a few approximately contemporary works that certainly or probably had pendants (Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, nos. A63 [assuming it has not been cut down], A82, A87, A103), and at least one that probably did not (A104).
7. See Refs. under Valentin 1931, Bredius 1935, K. Bauch 1966, and Gerson 1968. In those publications, the only ones that refer to this picture during a period of about forty-five years (following Van Dyke 1923), the sole issue considered is whether the Altman and Ellsworth portraits were intended as pendants, and the hypothesis (launched by Valentin on completely subjective grounds) progresses from speculation to established fact with its second repetition.
9. In part because the authors of the Corpus are accused of holding views they never expressed. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 90, considers it “unrealistic for my colleagues [RRP] to deplore the lack of ‘any sense of atmosphere’ in the background or the diminished sense of space as the result of losses (for these never occurred).” The quote is invented, and what is said in the Corpus (vol. 2, pp. 413, 417) is that during a skillful restoration “the original tonal values were to a large extent preserved.” Compare also what is said about the present writer’s remarks in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 90, with what is actually written in vol. 2, p. 52.
10. The quotes and other remarks are from Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 413, 417 (under “Paint layer” as well as “Comments” and “Summary”).
11. Ibid., p. 410. The Frankfurt picture is extensively discussed in Neumüster 2005, pp. 380–94 (p. 388, fig. 371, on the lace trim of the cap). On several occasions, the present writer has seen the New York and Frankfurt portraits on successive days, and has invariably been struck by how similar they are in the description of the faces. For excellent details of both, see New York 1995–96, vol. 1, fig. 37, and Frankfurt 2003, p. 91.
REFERENCES: Bredius 1897, p. 197, reports seeing the previously unknown portrait by Rembrandt in the Lachnicki collection; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 8 (1906), pp. 36–37, 84, no. 361, pl. 361, records the work as a Rembrandt (signed and dated 1633) in the collection of "His Excellency von Lachnicki, Warsaw"; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 98 (ill.), 352, as by Rembrandt in 1633; Altman Collection 1914, p. 9, no. 11, reports that the painting "was in the collections of the Princess Radziwill at the Castle of Nieszowie, Lithuania, and of Von Lachnicki in Paris and Warsaw"; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 397–98, no. 867, describes the sitter, and cites the 1867 Paris sale (see Ex Coll.); Valentin 1921b, p. 124, listed; A. Burroughs 1923, p. 272, finds a "sense of inherent conviction" lacking; Monod 1923, pp. 302–3, discusses the work as little known, but a "chef-d'oeuvre de caractère," rather in the manner of Michiel van Mierevelde, "glacée comme une miroir, mais palpante de vie"; Van Dyke 1923, p. 47, pl. V, considers the work (like various others newly attributed by the author) to be by Jacob Backer; Valentin 1931, unpagd. no. 36, pl. 36, considers it perhaps a pendant to the male portrait in the Ellsworth collection (which came much later to the Museum; pl. 141), evidently because the man looks like a preacher and the woman a preacher's wife, and remarks that the dating of pair portraits a year apart is not unusual in Rembrandt's oeuvre; Bredius 1935, pp. 7 (under no. 160), 14, no. 335, pl. 335, cites Valentin's notion that the Ellsworth portrait might be this picture's pendant; K. Bauch 1966, pp. 19 (under no. 166), 24, no. 452, pl. 462, states the pendant relationship to the Ellsworth portrait as a simple fact; Gerson 1968, pp. 265 (ill.), 494, no. 123, assuming that the pictures are pendants, observes that the execution is weaker than in the Ellsworth Portrait of a Man, and remarks that "the attribution to Rembrandt is not wholly convincing"; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 265 (ill.), 560 (under no. 160), 576, no. 335, repeats Gerson 1968, but now the execution is "far inferior" to that of the Ellsworth portrait, which is described as "perhaps a companion picture" on one page, and "probably" so on another; Lecaldano 1969, p. 99, no. 101 (ill.), repeats Gerson 1968; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 180, no. 154 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 95, listed as a painting of 1633; G. Schwartz 1985, p. 155, fig. 147, reproduces the portrait next to the Ellsworth Portrait of a Man, but concedes that "they have distinct histories, and something in the way they interact tells me that they are not companion pieces"; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2 (1986), pp. 6, 243, 437–17, 861, 865, no. 883 (ill., with X-radiograph and details), describes the painting as by Rembrandt, records that it is "locally not too well preserved," states that it is certainly not a pendant to the Ellsworth portrait, considers it uncertain whether the format was originally oval, and suggests that the signature and date, which appear hesitant and irregular, may have been copied from an authentic inscription that was lost when the panel was cut down; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 89 (ill.). 431, no. 8035, catalogues the picture as by a pupil of Rembrandt (citing Gerson's opinion of its quality), and notes that the Ellsworth portrait has a different provenance and is not the same size; Liedtke 1990, fig. 36 (Altman gallery view); Slatkes 1992, p. 282, no. 183 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, reports that the picture was not made as a pendant to the Ellsworth portrait, and that according to the Corpus the present panel may have been altered in shape and the original inscription copied; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 50–52, 126, no. 5 (ill.), as attributed to Rembrandt, briefly reviews recent opinions about authorship; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 5, 42–43, 88– 91, no. 5 (ill.), figs. 36 (detail), 37 (X-radiograph detail), 111–12 (details), 113, regards the work as a copy after Rembrandt, with an inauthentic signature on a panel that retains its original format, remarks that in the 1650s the artist painted "a considerable number of comparable portraits that vary in quality and touch," which makes questions of attribution "extremely problematic," but nonetheless maintains that the manner of execution here is uncharacteristic of Rembrandt; Lank 1996, p. 123, cites the picture as an instance of diverging opinions in the New York exhibition of 1995–96; Van der Veen 2003, pp. 55, 58, fig. 4, rejects the notion that this picture and the Ellsworth portrait (pl. 141) might be pendants; Scallen 2004, pp. 131, 350 n. 9, 356 n. 118, 375 n. 40, as seen by Bredius in Warsaw in 1897; Corpus 2005, p. 650, reports that the panel cannot be dated by dendrochronology.


Ex Coll.: Prince Radziwill, Nieszowie Castle, Lithuania; His Excellency von Lachnicki, Warsaw (by 1857—at least 1906; his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, June 15, 1867, no. 24, for FFr 9,000, bought in); [Kleinberger, Paris, until 1909; sold to Altman on December 6, 1909, for $60,000]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1909–d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.625
146. Portrait of a Young Woman with a Fan

Oil on canvas, 49½ x 39½ in. (125.7 x 101 cm)
Signed (inscribed?) and dated (lower left): Rembrandt-ff/1633

The painting is in good condition despite some abrasion and flattening of surface texture. Detail has been lost in the lace collar, and the sash and bows that decorate the sleeves are badly abraded. A combination of abrasion, small flake losses, and wear along the edges of a network of minute cracks make it difficult to distinguish the black feather fan from the surrounding costume.

Gift of Helen Swift Neilson, 1943 43.123

This large portrait of a vivacious young woman is the pendant to the Portrait of a Man Rising from His Chair (fig. 141), in the Taft Museum of Art, Cincinnati, which is signed and dated 1633. The paintings were separated before 1793, when the present picture appeared alone in the estate sale, in Paris, of Vincent Donjeux.¹ That the portraits were painted as a pair is not proven by known documents, but can hardly be doubted. The canvases are the same size and were probably cut from the same bolt of cloth.² The portraits are also entirely consistent in style (as has been seen in direct confrontations)³ and impressively complementary in composition, and in the pictorial effect of such motifs as lace collars and cuffs, and conspicuous ribbons. It should also be noted that the sitters are well suited to each other in their youth and enthusiasm, and in their willingness to appear in two of the boldest formal portraits by any Dutch artist of the period.

The Taft portrait and its companion have often been considered as key works within Rembrandt’s development as a portraitist during his first few years in Amsterdam, from about 1632 to 1634. In the famous group portrait The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp, of 1632 (Mauritshuis, The Hague), and in the double portrait The Shipbuilder Jan Rijcksen and His Wife, Griet Jans, of 1633 (Royal Collection, London), the young artist drew upon his earlier experience as a history painter, and on the latest innovations in portraiture by the Amsterdam artists Thomas de Keyser and Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy (q.q.v.), in order to lend dramatic focus and psychological intensity to the potentially routine task of recording human likenesses. In Holland, the design of single and especially of pendant (or pair) portraits had remained conservative through the 1620s, in part drawing on the heritage of Spanish court portraiture, and in part on the more recent influence of formal models from England.⁴ In the Van Beresteyn portraits of 1632 (Pls. 143, 144), Rembrandt was obviously working for a client who preferred the traditional approach. By contrast, the New York and Cincinnati portraits of the following year represent his strongest departure from the conservative norm.

The painter’s experiments in this vein were partly inspired by Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), the international court portraitist who (following Titian and Lotto) had breathed new life into the genre, most recently at The Hague.¹ The Taft portrait brings to mind Van Dyck’s Lucas van Uffel, of about 1622–23 (MMA), and other portraits by the Flemish master in which the glance and a gesturing hand contribute to an animated pose.⁵ It is doubtful, however, that Rembrandt knew the Lucas van Uffel as early as 1633 (he seems to have borrowed the pose of the sitter later on),⁶ and, in any event, Van Dyck’s and Rembrandt’s portrait innovations were part of a broader development. In the Taft picture, the glance and gesture both appear to respond to the viewer, as in genre paintings of the 1620s (for example, Frans Hals’s Merry Drinker, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), and in earlier Netherlandish portraits such as Adriaen Key’s Portrait of a Man, dated 1574, in the Museo de Arte de Ponce, Puerto Rico.⁷ A more likely source for Rembrandt is the gesturing father (who refers to the central panel of a triptych) in De Keyser’s donor portraits of 1628 in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin.⁸

And yet the most immediate precedents are found in Rembrandt’s own work. The pose in the Museum’s portrait of a woman has been compared with that of the uppermost figure in The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp, a similarity that might be dismissed were not the pose of the next highest figure in that group portrait so analogous to that of the sitter in the Taft picture.⁹ The woman’s pose also recalls that of the troubled potentate in Rembrandt’s David Playing the Harp to Saul, of about 1629–30 (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt), where the similarities are remarkable considering the different circumstances (although both figures cope with alarming characters to the left).¹⁰

Rembrandt van Rijn 589
Figure 141. Rembrandt, *Portrait of a Man Rising from His Chair*, 1633. Oil on canvas, 48 1/2 x 38 1/4 in. (124 x 98.5 cm). Taft Museum of Art, Cincinnati
In Rembrandt's oeuvre, the present picture and its pendant follow at least two other pairs of large portraits in which the figures are presented to the viewer and connected with each other in inventive ways: Portrait of a Man Seated and Portrait of a Woman Seated, of about 1632 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), and Portrait of a Man Trimming His Quill (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel) and Portrait of a Young Woman Seated (Gemäldegalerie, Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna), both signed and dated 1632. Anecdotal dramatization had already been employed in Amsterdam portraiture, as seen in De Keyser's A Musician and His Daughter, of 1629 (Pl. 100), but the approach was probably encouraged in pair portraits by the fact that they often hung at some distance from each other, and in the comparatively small rooms of the period (even in upper-middle-class houses) might be separated by a doorway or piece of furniture. The man in the Taft portrait rises suddenly from his chair, as if in spontaneous response to a visitor. His movement and gesture lead the eye from left to right (he is placed to the “heraldic right” of the woman, which implies that they are married rather than betrothed). The man's impetus is answered and to some extent resolved by the slow rise and steadier pose of the woman. Corresponding curves are described by the contours of the outer arms and shoulders, so that together the figures form a broad arch- or lunette-like shape buttressed by the supporting hands. When seen side by side, the portraits also convey the impression of two distinct and complementary personalities, and one wonders whether the artist's characterizations are faithful or fanciful. In pose and expression, the woman offers a calm, even reassuring counterpoint to her seemingly excitable mate. Her portrait is so evocative that an earlier curator, Harry Wehle (1944; see Refs.), wrote at some length about the woman's frequently tested patience, and in the process forgot or, more likely, never considered in the first place who would have ordered the portraits and approved the painter's ideas.

For the patron, one of the most important considerations would have been the description of luxurious costume details, which in this picture, and no less so in the male pendant, have been given profuse and, in some passages, virtuoso attention. The highlights and suggestion of pattern in the weave of the silk dress must have been all the more remarkable before the black passages darkened with age. Rembrandt also skillfully described the delicate, leaflike layers of Flemish lace, which in the collar curl up and in the cuffs (especially the cuff to the right) curve forward illusionistically. The most extraordinary aspect of these passages is not in their detail but the subtlety of light and shadow, which is also evident in the strings of pearls and coral beads, and in the waist- and armbands, with their purple rosettes. Another sign of high style and prosperity is the black ostrich-feather fan in the woman's right hand, which once surpassed the left hand in its spatial effect. Because of strong abrasion in this area, the fan no longer seems to arch forward, thus casting a soft shadow onto the woman's fingers (and providing a quiet answer to the husband's outstretched hand). Autoradiographs (fig. 142) clarify the fan's intended shape, and show that the hand holding it was completed as a fully lighted form before the shadow was added. Also visible in the autoradiograph reproduced here are one corner of the back of the chair (to the right) and a trace of the chair's left armrest, originally grasped by the woman's hand. The carpet-covered table was inserted by Rembrandt at a later stage in the course of work, and another bow (at the bottom center of the lace collar) was painted over. The brushing in of broad folds in the skirt

Figure 142. Eighth autoradiograph of Rembrandt's Portrait of a Young Woman with a Fan (Pl. 146)
and left sleeve reveal how the artist created volume and rhythms before attending to details.  

The sitter's attire and her frizzy coiffure (which has become fuzzier with wear) conform to the most recent feminine fashions, which were influenced by those then in vogue in France. Nonetheless, the correspondence between the costume and the hairdo in this portrait and that in Rembrandt's half-length Portrait of a Young Woman, also dated 1633, in the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, is exceptionally close, and the sitters' faces (allowing for their distinct expressions and angles of view) are very similar. It appears possible that Rembrandt painted two quite different portraits of this woman, or of the same couple (if a half-length male portrait is missing), possibly for the man and wife and for his or her parents. It would have been more common for workshop assistants to paint replicas of portraits for other members of the family (see the discussion under Michel van Miereveld's portrait of Jacob van Dalen; Pl. 121), but Rembrandt is not known to have had such a studio as early as 1633.  

A gold watch and key, hung on chains, gleam against the black silk of the woman's skirt. Timepieces usually refer to mortality or temperance in Dutch portraits. Here the object is also a luxury item, and perhaps another echo of the male portrait, where gold aglets dangle at the waist.

1. See Ex Coll. and note 1 under Ex Coll. below. Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 376–77 (under no. 51, the Taft picture), refers to the foreword of the Ashburnham sale catalogue, Christie's, London, July 20, 1850, which states that the paintings in the collection (which included the Cincinnati canvas, but not the Museum's picture) had been acquired in the mid-eighteenth century by John, 2nd Earl of Ashburnham (1724–1812).  

2. As noted in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 380 (under "Support"). See also table C in ibid., p. 38. Circumstantial evidence that the pictures are pendants is also found in doubts about the signature on the female portrait. First, if there was no original signature, this might be taken to suggest that the portrait had a pendant upon which the artist's signature could be found (which is not rare in pendant portraits). Second, it has been suggested that, if added later, the signature on the woman's portrait could have been copied from the male portrait (see ibid., p. 390 [under "Signature"]). Third, the date on the male portrait has a diagonal line below it, a feature found on four other Rembrandt portraits of 1632–34 (see ibid., p. 382 [under "Signature"]), including the Portrait of a Young Woman, in the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, which appears to represent, in the same year, the same woman as in the Museum's painting.

3. First in the Detroit exhibition of 1930, followed by the "Dutch Couples" exhibitions, of 1973–74, and "Great Dutch Paintings from America," in 1991 (The Hague and San Francisco). The Taft painting was also conserved at the Metropolitan Museum in 1985 (at which time the woman's portrait was brought to the conservation studio), and lent to the Museum from December 2001 through July 2003. The New York picture hung in the Taft Museum of Art from October 2001 through January 2006.  


7. See Liedtke 1984a, pp. 57, 60 n. 8 (citing S. Barnes).

8. For the latter, see Held, Taylor, and Carter 1984, pp. 160–62 (ill.).

9. Oldenburg 1911, pp. 38–39, pl. XI.

10. See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 382, where the woman's pose is said to have been "repeated faithfully" from the Anatomy Lesson. The comparison with two figures in the group portrait was previously made by the present writer in E. Sullivan et al. 1995, vol. 1, p. 162, and in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 54.


12. Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, nos. A45 and C80, the latter, unconvincingly, as a "workshop" picture.

13. Ibid., nos. A54, A55.

14. This reading of the autoradiograph follows that in Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 29, pl. 22.

15. See De Winkel in Edinburgh–London 2001, pp. 57–59. As is evident from De Winkel's discussion of Rembrandt's Portrait of Oogens Coppit, of 1634 (Rothschild Collection, Paris), the woman's attire in the Museum's picture would be more precisely described as an open gown (the lines of which are more clearly seen in the autoradiograph; fig. 142) worn over a bodice and petticoat of the same material.

16. As noted in Gilboa 2003, p. 79. The Houston panel, which was formerly in Santa Barbara, is discussed in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 418–21, as no. A84.

17. As discussed in Liedtke 2004b.

References: Waagen 1854, vol. 3, p. 41, recalls seeing this portrait, said to be by Rembrandt, at Petworth, "hung too high to permit of an opinion, though at that distance giving the impression of being a Ferdinand Bol"; Bode 1883, pp. 459, 591, no. 235, cites the painting as by Rembrandt, dating from about 1630–41, and praises its execution; Duitt 1885, pp. 46, 62, 67, no. 285, as at Petworth, not seen, "signala par M. Bode"; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 217; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 236, listed as at Petworth; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 2 (1897), pp. 8–9, 82, no. 101, pl. 101, as painted about 1633, correctly identifies the picture as the pendant to a male portrait in the Pourtales collection in Paris (now in the Taft Museum of Art, Cincinnati; fig. 141 here); Times (London), December 31, 1898, correctly states that the painting lent by Lord Leconfield to the "Winter
Exhibition" of 1899, no. 55, is dated 1633 (with no reference to different readings), and that it represents "one of the few beauties ever painted by Rembrandt; she is, in fact, probably the most comely creature in the whole range of Dutch art"; Bell 1899, p. 154, as "Portrait of a Lady," at Petworth, follows the 1899 exhibition catalogue (or another source) in erroneously recording the date as 1631; H. Cook 1899, p. 206, reports on the rarely seen picture's appearance in the London exhibition of 1899, mentions Bode's (1897) identification of the pendant, and describes the woman's portrait as "l'un des ouvrages les plus délicats et les plus raffinés de l'artiste"; von Schleinitz 1899, col. 196, celebrates the picture's presence in the 1899 London exhibition, credits Bode (1897) with identifying the pendant, and describes the woman's portrait as depicting "one of the prettiest, most interesting, and most alluring personalities that Rembrandt ever painted"; A. Rosenberg 1906, p. 91 (ill.), captioned as dating from about 1633; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 97 (ill.), 352, reproduces the picture opposite the Portrait of a Man, of 1631, then in the Poutale's collection, to which this picture is "probably the pendant"; Wurzbach 1906-11, vol. 2 (1910), p. 403, as dating from about 1633, and as "apparently the pendant" to the Poutale portrait; Hofsche de Groot 1907-27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 346, 403, no. 88, as "A Young Lady with a Fan," of about 1633, "possibly" the pendant to the Poutale picture; Collins Baker 1920, p. 101 (ill. opp. p. 100), cites literature, and records the inscription as "REMBRANDT ft. 1633"; Meldrum 1921, pp. 31, 72, 180, pl. XXXIX, as dating from about 1633, identifies the pendant as the "man's portrait belonging to Mr. Charles Taft" (formerly in the Poutale's collection); Hussey 1921-26, p. 903, mentioned; Hussey 1926, p. 40, mentioned; Borenius 1928, p. 213, cites the pendant, and observes that, given the date of 1633, "we are thus here confronted with Rembrandt right at the beginning of his career as a successful portrait painter in Amsterdam; but there are few works belonging to this stage of his evolution in which he has achieved as ample and effective a rhythm of design as in the present picture"; New York 1928, no. 8, in the text of the entry, corrects the date from 1633 to 1633, but in the heading misprints it as 1665; A. H., review of Knoedler exhibition, "Panorama 1 (May 1928)," pp. 270, 271 (ill.), listed; "Rembrandt Sold by Scott & Fowles," Art News 28 (April 12, 1930), p. 1 (ill.); "Rembrandt's Lady with a Fan" Bought by Mrs. Nielson (ill), Art News 28 (April 19, 1930), p. 17; F. Schmidt-Degener in Valentin 1920c, unpagd., no. 51 (ill.), as dated 1633, and erroneously as on wood, praises the composition; Valentin 1930b, p. 4 (ill.), mentioned as in the Nielson collection; Valentin in Detroit 1930, pp. 7-8, no. 17, as painted about 1633, pendant to the Taft portrait of a man ("how capable and self-conscious their feminine counterparts appear"); Heil 1930, p. 380, describes the picture and its pendant as "now after almost 300 [?] years of separation" hanging together (in the Detroit exhibition of 1930); Valentin 1931, unpagd., no. 35, pl. 35, "probably painted in 1633"; Bredius 1935, p. 14, no. 341, pl. 341, notes the remains of a signature and date; Taft Museum 1939, p. 59 (under no. 275), as "the companion piece" to the Taft picture (text repeated in later editions); Barnbouw 1944, pl. 2; Wehle 1944, pp. 177, 179 (ill.), 185, discusses the recent gift of the painting to the Museum, illustrates the portrait together with its pendant, and analyzes the woman's response to her "foppish husband," who springs into action under the impulse of an idea, "one of an endless succession of ideas, few of them interesting. ... One would say that she has ideas of her own, but in order to hold on to them, and indeed in order to preserve her very sanity, she has been obliged to construct a barrier of stubborn inattention"; J. Allen 1944, p. 73, mentioned as "charming"; Rousseau 1953, p. 82, observes "how effectively [Rembrandt] reveals the strong and sensual character that lies behind the homely and awkward appearance of the young Lady with a Fan"; H. van Gelder 1957, p. 16, reports that J. Q. van Regeren Altena thought that the picture's pendant might be a portrait of Constantijn Huygens, so that the Museum's painting (mistakenly cited as in Chicago) would be the (at the time) only known portrait of Huygens's wife, Susanna van Baerle; Raleigh 1959, p. 128 (under no. 71), mentioned as companion piece to the Taft painting; K. Bauch 1966, pp. 19 (under no. 366), 24, no. 469, pl. 469, listed, as signed and dated 1633; Haeverkamp-Begemann 1966, col. 921, mentioned among Rembrandt portraits revealing the influence of De Keyser; Gerson 1968, pp. 277 (ill.), 494, no. 141, "covered by a thick varnish, which conceals the delicate design of face and head"; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 268 (ill.), 562 (under no. 172), 376, no. 341, pl. 341, repeats the remark made in Gerson 1968; Lecaldano 1969, pp. 100, 101 (ill.), no. 126, rejects the identification made in H. van Gelder 1957; Walsh in New York 1975, introduction, describes the picture and its pendant as the "two paintings by Rembrandt that have suffered most from separation," and notes how they adopt "the active-passive convention dramatically, even theatrically"; Bolten and Bolten-Reemp 1977, p. 180, no. 158 (ill.), Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 91, listed among Rembrandt's paintings dated 1633; Hibbard 1980, p. 316, fig. 378, "the fashionable sitter wears lace of the finest punto in aria on a dress of black silk damask"; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 29, 46, pls. 19, 20-22 (X-radiograph and autoradiographs); reveals that Rembrandt originally painted the woman's left hand resting on the arm of her chair, but then inserted the table, and also made smaller adjustments to the design; D. Smith 1982a, pp. 125-26, considers Rembrandt's Suspensio, of 1634 (Prado, Madrid), to derive from this picture, which, with its pendant, is described as probably "his first attempt at this kind of composition, and perhaps for that very reason they show more movement than later examples"; D. Smith 1982b, pp. 266 n. 28, 268-69, 273, fig. 18, repeats the remarks made in D. Smith 1982a; D. Smith 1982b, pp. 49-50, interprets the action as a wife being abruptly introduced to the viewer by her husband, and claims (mistakenly) that she "seems to have stood up just as quickly"; Dickey in Hamilton-Rochester-Amarillo 1983, pp. 24-35, no. 7, prints a long list of references and exhibitions, and misinterprets the sitter's movement ("the woman looks as though she has just risen from a chair or walked into the room"); G. Schwartz 1983, p. 165, fig. 167, misreads Ainsworth et al. 1982, on "the addition of the fan," and wonders if Rembrandt's "wife" Saskia (they married in 1634) might have modeled for the pose; Corpus 1982-89, vol. 2 (1986), pp. 3-9, 10, 27, 38, 69, 71, 73, 380, 381-91, 420, 357, 820, no. 679 (with detail, X-radiograph, and autoradiographs), and fig. 11 on p. 69 (detail of left hand), as "Portrait of a Woman in an Armchair," makes inconsistent remarks about the signature and date of 1633 ("doubtful," but "in themselves inspire confidence"), notes the attention given to the costume, analyzes the weave of the canvas, describes the dramatization of portraiture represented by this work and its pendant, extensively describes the composition of the paint layers and the evidence of X-radiographs and autoradiographs, and concludes that
this is certainly an authentic work by Rembrandt in good condition, despite wear caused by overcleaning in some areas, such as the neck, collar, and fan; Guillaud and Guillaud 1986, fig. 160; Kingzett 1986, p. 19, fig. 1, regrets that the pendant was not also lent to the Atlanta exhibition of 1986; P. Sutton 1986, p. 60, perceives the Appalachian Mountains between this picture and its pendant; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 87 (ill.), 415, no. 232, no comment; Jeromack 1988b, p. 16, recalls this canvas and its pendant in the New York exhibition of 1973; Moore in Norwich 1988, pp. 6, 70 n. 21, suggests that this portrait and its pendant may be identical with pictures owned by Samuel Colby, Yarmouth, in 1772; White 1988, p. 938, notes the suggestion made by Moore in Norwich 1988; Liedtke 1989c, pp. 328–39, fig. 6, compares the painting of the woman’s eyes with that found in the Van Beresteyn Portrait of a Man (Pl. 143 here); Liedtke 1990, p. 46, mentioned in connection with Charles Taft’s Dutch pictures; Broos in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 121, 377, 179–80, 838–86, no. 52 (ill. pp. 377 [detail], 382), discusses the provenance, describes the costume, and considers the picture and its pendant to somehow foreshadow The Night Watch (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Russell 1990, p. 416, mentioned as “happily reunited” with its pendant in the exhibition of 1990–91; Grimm 1991, p. 64, figs. 121, 123 (detail), misreads the modeling as “flat and vague”; Van de Wetering in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, pp. 98–99, figs. 122, 123–24 (autoradiographs), 125 (X-radiograph), describes at length how Rembrandt modified the support under the woman’s left hand; Bruyn 1992, pp. 12–13, fig. 6, uses this example to demonstrate how Rembrandt’s vision differs from what is found in the Van Beresteyn Portrait of a Woman (Pl. 144); N. Hall 1992, p. 131, listed as a picture handled by Coltraghui; Slates 1992, pp. 210–11, no. 119 (ill.), considers how the kind of animation seen in this portrait and its pendant grew out of the Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp, of 1632 (Mauritshuis, The Hague), and the “quasi-anchledal” double portrait, The Shipbuilder Jan Rijksen and His Wife, Griet Jans, of 1633 (Royal Collection, London), and also sees the influence of works by Van Dyck such as the Museum’s Luca van Uffel; Van Thiel 1992, p. 38, mentions the picture as the pendant to the Taft portrait, which was seen alone in the 1986 Amsterdam exhibition of paintings by Rembrandt; C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 87 (ill.), 418, no. 232, no comment; Baejer 1995, p. 314; Groen 1995, p. 90, figs. 3, 5 (paint cross section), reveals that the ground layers of this painting and of Haman before Esther (National Museum of Art, Bucharest), from Rembrandt’s workshop, are virtually identical; Liedtke in E. Sullivan et al. 1995, vol. I, pp. 132–54, 154 n. 10 (ill.), in a full discussion of the pendant picture, covers many of the points made in the present entry; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 47, 50, 52–55, 81, 107, no. 6 (ill.), discusses the picture and its pendant as “among the most inventive examples of formal portraits by Rembrandt dating from his first few years in Amsterdam,” reviews their critical history, recalls the direct juxtaposition of the portraits in 1845 (in the MMA conservation studio), describes the woman’s costume, and notes the similarities between the woman’s and her husband’s poses with those of two figures in Rembrandt’s Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp, of 1632; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. I, pp. 18–19, 24, 44, 83, 87, figs. 13 (autoradiograph), 40 (detail), 41 (X-radiograph detail), describes the “powerful and rigorously selective undersketching” visible in an autoradiograph of this picture, observes how “Rembrandt deliberately avoided pronounced brushwork in describing the sitter’s complexion,” and compares the execution of the Van Beresteyn Portrait of a Man (Pl. 144); Broos 1996b, pp. 156–57, notes the unusual degree of action in the figures, who are “probably newly married”; Schama 1999a, pp. 376–77 (ill.), offers a vivid account of the woman’s action and expression; Gordenker 2001, p. 100 n. 27, notes the “broad, flat collar pinned at the throat”; Lloyd Williams in Edinburgh–London 2001, pp. 84, 245 n. 16, 253 n. 8 (to no. 17), compares the movement found in pendant portraits of the previous year, Giliat in Kyoto 2002–3, pp. 74–75, no. 19 (ill.), and in Frankfurt 2003, pp. 13, 94–97, no. 17 (ill.), praises the picture, describes the fashionable costume and hairstyle, identifies the Taft portrait as “probably” the pendant, suggests that the couple are engaged or just married, and notes the compositional innovations and modifications; Gilboa 2003, pp. 78–79, 196 n. 58, interprets the pose, relationship with the pendant male figure, and costume details, and asks whether the same woman might appear in the half-length Portrait of a Young Woman, also dated 1633 (Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, no. 184; now in the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston); Middlekoop in Nakamura 2004, p. 106, figs. 20a, 20b, cites the pictures for their “freedom of composition” and as examples of Rembrandt’s “tendency to experiment”; Van der Veen in London–Amsterdam 2006, pp. 149–50, fig. 94, suggests that the unusual animation and subtext of execution found in this portrait and its pendant explain why Rembrandt was so successful with patrons, who in this case (to judge from their clothing) clearly “belonged to the wealthier Amsterdam bourgeoisie.”


Ex Coll.: Vincent Donieux (his estate sale, Paris, Paillot, April 29ff., 1793, no. 147, for 1,600 livres to Le Brun);2 George O'Brien Wyndham, 3rd Earl of Egremont, Petworth House, Sussex (by 1832–d. 1837); his natural son Col. George Wyndham, later 1st Baron Leconfield, Petworth House (1837–d. 1869); Henry Wyndham, 2nd Baron Leconfield, Petworth House (1869–d. 1901); Charles Henry Wyndham, 3rd Baron Leconfield, Petworth House (1901–28; sold to Colnaghi); [Colnaghi, London, 1928; sold to Knoedler]; [Knoedler, London and New York, 1928; sold to Scott & Fowles]; [Scott & Fowles, New York, 1928–30; sold to Neilson]; Helen Swift (Mrs. Francis) Neilson, Chicago (1930–43); Gift of Helen Swift Neilson, 1943 43.125

1. It seems quite unlikely that the "small full-lengths" said to be Rembrandt portraits owned by Colby are identical with our painting and its pendant, neither of which can be linked with an English collection before the nineteenth century.

2. The entry in the 1793 sale catalogue is quoted in full in Corpus: 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 291 (under "Provenance"), and the description of the painting leaves no doubt that it refers to this work.

147. Bella \[n\]

Oil on canvas, 50 x 38\(\frac{3}{8}\) in. (127 x 97.5 cm)

Signed and dated (lower left): Rembrandt f/ 1633; inscribed on bottom of shield: BELLON

The painting is well preserved, although there is slight abrasion in the shadowed side of the face and a few minor flake losses distributed across the paint surface. The impasto was flattened during past lining.

The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.23

Rembrandt's Bella, an unquestionably autograph painting of 1633, has served as something of a touchstone in the history of Rembrandt connoisseurship and, more simply, taste. The worst lapses date from the 1960s, when distinguished scholars such as Clark (1966), Gerson (1969), and Haak (1969) found it sufficient to emphasize how little they liked the picture, Gerson going so far as to dismiss it from Rembrandt's oeuvre on those grounds.3 In earlier decades, the painting was often considered to depict Rembrandt's fiancée, Saskia, serving as a model in his studio, which, it is assumed, was already stocked with armor and exotic clothes. Writers who employed the title "Portrait of Saskia as Bella" evidently never felt obliged to explain why an unmarried young woman from the provinces (like Joan of Arc) should be cast in the role of Mars's sister, the goddess of war.4

Recent critics have observed that the painting is not a portrait of any kind, and that Saskia van Uylenburgh bore no more than a slight resemblance to the woman seen here (she appears considerably slimmer and prettier in the famous silverpoint portrait drawing made by Rembrandt on June 8, 1633 (Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin).5 In stressing that the work is a history picture, the authors of the Corpus (1986) take Gerson to task for "an anachronistic view of what constitutes ideal beauty and decorum," and connect the painting with a Rubensian "idea of female beauty" as well as with the likely influence—in their view, perhaps through Jacob Backer (q.v.)—of Rubens's style.6 The comparison is appropriate in that Rubens, in contemporary mythological works, favored an ideal of feminine beauty that was partly inspired by the features of his young second wife, and because Rembrandt, at this early moment in his Amsterdam career, was just beginning to paint large history pictures in an international style somewhat analogous to that of Rubens (but also to that of Gerrit van Honthorst, Lambert Jacobsz, and others).7

However, the concept of ideal beauty appears misplaced when set on Bella's shoulders.8 Rubens would have been the first to point out that Bella never competed with Venus, Juno, and Minerva for Paris's golden apple, but since ancient times was shown with disheveled hair, full armor, weapons (often a bloody lash), and an unregretting expression.9 Moreover, the young Rembrandt would be miscast in the role of Paris, Apelles, or Zeuxis (who blended the belles of Croton), given his practice of treating mythological figures in anticlassical terms, for example the fat, plain-faced goddess in Diana at the Bath, his provocative etching of about 1631.10 Although this
approach has been seen as a conscious deviation from that of Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1617) and his circle,\(^9\) it shares his sense of humor and aesthetic distance when dealing with ancient deities. And Goltzius himself, in his paintings dating from about 1590–1616, represents mythological and biblical figures as if they were Netherlandish folk. One of his women, Venus Pictoria (Venus posing as Pictura; fig. 143), with a slightly wry smile and a more balloonish body type, could be our Bellona’s older sister.\(^10\)

The similarity is underscored by Bellona’s pearl earring and necklace, as if Venus had decided to forestall Mars by raiding his wardrobe.

These comparisons draw attention to the fact that Rembrandt’s Bellona, despite the Medusa’s head on her shield, is presented as a friendly and familiar figure, like a big sister watching over boys at play. This departure from the norm (as found in sixteenth-century prints) leads one to a conclusion that might also be reached by other means, namely, that the picture was not an image made for international or even broad public consumption, but a decoration commissioned by someone who felt that Bellona was on their side, protective, capable, and confident.\(^11\)

Schwartz associates the painting with Prince Frederick Hendrick and others who, in 1633, favored continuing the war with Spain rather than offering a truce.\(^12\) The contemporary political climate is relevant, but the painting did not serve as a pamphlet; the patron and the intended viewer were essentially the same. The picture could have been made to hang in one of the prince’s palaces, an army headquarters, a civic guard house, or the home of anyone with patriotic views as well as artistic sophistication.\(^13\)

It has been suggested that the use of local types as models in paintings of Bellona and Mars was meant to suggest the new Dutch nation and its readiness to defend itself.\(^14\) Support for this idea is found in an exactly contemporary painting of Bellona by Paulus Moreelse (q.v.; location unknown), which, apart from the costume, looks like a portrait of a difficult huisvrouw, and in Jacob Backer’s allegorical figure of the Dutch Republic (fig. 144), in which the well-armed young woman is a Rosie the Riveter type.\(^15\) A nationalistic tenor is also intimated in the present picture by the Dutch rather than Latin spelling of the inscription on the shield: BELLON.\(^16\)

Backer’s large canvas was painted about 1644–45 for the Stadholder, Frederick Hendrick, who ordered it for Buren Castle in Gelderland.\(^17\) It is possible that Rembrandt painted the Bellona for someone at the Dutch court, but it could also have been made for a doeien (civic guard headquarters) in Amsterdam or another Dutch city. The new one in Delft, built in the second half of the 1650s, had a figure of Bellona with a spear and shield (presumably a relief) over the main doorway.\(^18\) The background in the Bellona, with its masonry archway, stack of spears, and chair to the right, suggests the interior of such a building. The foreshortening of the archway and of the figure (which is bottom-heavy partly for this reason) and abrupt recession imply a low, close vantage point, which would be suitable to a chimneypiece in a room of normal size.

Apart from politics, there are other reasons to think that the painting might have some connection with The Hague, where Rembrandt is thought to have worked for a period in 1632.\(^19\) One of his patrons in the court city was Joris de Caullery, who served there in a civic guard company.\(^20\) Perhaps that contact led to a commission for the Bellona in the following year. A less conjectural observation is that the painting’s style and mood—this must be the least bellicose Bellona of the seventeenth century—recalls the rather playful history pictures by Van Honthorst and Rubens that were installed in Frederick Hendrick’s palaces about 1632.\(^21\) Whether or not the Bellona was made for someone at the Dutch court, it reflects the artist’s contact with that cultural milieu.
After paintings such as The Artist in Oriental Costume with a Poodle at His Feet, of about 1631 (fig. 128), and the Museum’s Man in Oriental Costume (“The Noble Slave”), of 1632 (Pl. 142), both of which anticipate Bellona’s pose, it is obvious that in the present picture Rembrandt was attempting something new and struggling in the process. Indications that the painter kept one eye cocked toward contemporary connoisseurs are found in the showy light effects (reminiscent of still-life displays by Willem Claesz Heda and Jan Davidsz de Heem; see Pls. 73, 75); the strong local colors and elaborate costume details; the attempted spatial effects of the shield and the foreshortened arms and shoulders; and the choice of such motifs as the Negroli-style helmet, the bejeweled bandolier, and, of course, the intended tour de force of a Medusa’s head. Several of these elements cost Rembrandt more trouble than he perhaps anticipated. The breastplate appears to have been considerably revised in the course of execution. In an earlier stage of work, a different shield, seen from the inside only, was held in the right hand, and the left hand rested on the hilt of a sword, which stood tip to the ground and tilted toward the viewer (fig. 145). This swaggering pose was not infrequently employed in pictures of potentates and military men of high rank.

While other explanations are possible (would a left-handed Bellona have been frowned upon?), it seems likely that Rembrandt switched the sword and shield because he or his patron decided upon a Medusa’s head while the painting was in progress. The motif occurs in earlier prints that Rembrandt would have known, for example Lucas van Leyden’s engraving of Pallas Athena (ca. 1530); Jan Saenredam’s engraving of 1596 of the same goddess, as drawn by Goltzius (fig. 146); and Leiden University’s emblem showing Minerva, with a Medusa shield, reading a book. Actual shields with Medusa heads and decorative examples painted on wood were made in the sixteenth century. But the most intriguing possibility is that Rembrandt’s attention was drawn to the copy of Rubens’s famous Head of Medusa (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) that at the time was in the collection of Amsterdam merchant Nicolaes Sohier. The Stadholder’s secretary, Constantijn Huygens, described the work in his diary.
(1629–31) as so horrific that it was usually covered by a curtain. The screaming face on Bellona’s shield, however, bears no resemblance to Rubens’s staring severed head, but follows the type shown in Saenredam’s print after Goltzius. A round version of the Medusa shield also occurs in the background of Rembrandt’s _Minerva_, of 1635 (private collection).

The painting has been in a few distinguished collections. It was recommended by one of Rembrandt’s great admirers, Sir Joshua Reynolds, to George Temple-Nugent-Grenville, 1st Marquess of Buckingham. It was later owned by the baron de Beurnonville and, of course, by Col. Michael Friedsam. His bequest to the Museum helped to form a group of seven Rembrandts dating from 1632 and 1633 that reveal the artist’s extraordinary range in those transitional years.

2. The title “Bellona” was introduced in A. Rosenberg 1909 and finds its last echo in the literature in 1966, unless one counts the extraordinary statement in Haak 1969 (repeated in Alpers 1988) that on this canvas Rembrandt intially painted his fiancée in the nude. The period during which scholars called the picture “Saskia as Bellona” coincides with the decades in which the American male would occasionally refer to his wife as a battle-ax.
5. On Jacobsz., see the biography of Jacob Backer above.
6. This point is made somewhat differently by Kobayashi-Sato in Yamaguchi and other cities 1994–95; (see Refs.).
7. Rubens’s oil sketches of a smiling “Maria de’ Medici as Queen Triumphant” in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg, and in the Stiftung Kunsthais Heyshof, Worms (Held 1980, nos. 32, 33, pls. 54, 55), are occasionally identified as “Maria de’ Medici in the Guise of Bellona,” but this is inaccurate. Rembrandt would have known Jan Muller’s engraving after Bartholomeus Spranger, _Bellona Leading the Emperor’s Army to Victory over the Turks_, of 1600 (Bartsch no. 75).
8. The etching is compared with the Bellona in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 36, fig. 56, and is discussed in numerous essays, for example, those in Edinburgh–London 2001, pp. 30–31 (De Jongh), 38–39 (Stuige), and 78 (Lloyd Williams).
11. Compare, in this regard, Rubens’s “Queen Triumphant,” cited in note 7 above.
13. G. Schwartz 1985, p. 125, names such a person in connection with the painting, “François van Aersten, Constantijn Huygens’s patron.” But this is a nearly random choice, and a vague description of Van Aersten (1572–1641), who was one of Prince Maurits’s inner circle before he was marginalized in Venice and then brought back to prominence in the States of Holland by Frederick Hendrick (see Israel 1990, pp. 452, 466, 480, and esp. 524).
15. For the painting by Moreelse, see De Jonge 1958, p. 122, no. 283, fig. 181. For Backer’s canvas, see Sunowski 1981–84, vol. 1, pp. 197, 232, no. 29. Rosie the Riverer was a muscle-flexing female featured on an American poster of 1942 (J. Howard Miller’s _We Can Do It!),_ which urged young women into factory jobs such as riveting and welding to support the war effort. A different Rosie was painted by Norman Rockwell for the cover of the May 29, 1943, issue of the _Saturday Evening Post_.
16. Like the Latin, this is pronounced with a long e. The inscription has often been miscad (as Bellona or Belloona) or regarded as an error. Rembrandt’s use of Dutch rather than Latin is anticipated in the writings of Leiden poets and historians (see the discussion of Frans Hals’s _Petrus Scriverius_; Pl. 62) and in the treatise on

17. See The Hague 1997–98a, pp. 40–47, on the Studholme's decoration of Buren Castle, and no. 30b for Backer's painting.

18. Delft 1881, vol. 1, p. 143. Similarly, a relief over the main door of the Armamentarium (or Wapenhuys van Holland) in Delft bears a relief with Pallas Athena in the center, a decorative arrangement of weapons, the Dutch Lion, and the date of completion, 1602 (Berends 1967, fig. 4).


21. For example, Rubens's *Rosanne Crowned by Alexander* (Schloss, Wörlitz), and Van Honthorst's *Meleager and Atalanta* (Bildergalerie Potsdam-Sanssouci); see The Hague 1997–98a, p. 37, fig. 3 (Rubens), and no. 11 (Van Honthorst). Also of interest, at least as a reflection of court taste, is Jan Lievens's archly amusing *Copy Fortune-Teller* of about 1631 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), which the following year was recorded in the inventory of Noordeinde Palace, The Hague (ibid., no. 17).

22. The self-portrait in Paris is said to anticipate Bellona's pose in G. Schwartz 1983, p. 125. The similarity was more obvious when Bellona, as initially sketched by Rembrandt, rested her left hand on the sword, which stood with its point to the ground (see fig. 145). The Paris panel is thought to have been painted firstly in 1631 and revised about 1633, mainly by adding the poodle (as discussed in *Corpus* 1982–89, vol. 1, pp. 173–82, no. 440). See ibid., vol. 2, p. 330, comparing the *Man in Oriental Dress*, and concluding that the *Bellona* (when compared with Rembrandt's slightly later paintings of goddesses) "has to be seen as a first attempt, and not a particularly successful one."

23. See Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 46, for the observation that the bottom of the breastplate was brought lower than originally intended, over the skirt. In *Corpus* 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 331, it is conjectured that initially the breastplate "probably was not present at all," but this seems quite uncertain.

24. See, for example, the emperor in Gaspar de Crayer's *Meeting of Alexander the Great and Diogenes; Luditias Sigismundi IV, King of Poland*, from Rubens's workshop; and Copy after Justus Sustermans, *Ferdinando II de Medici as a Boy*, all in (the De Crayer) or formerly in the Metropolitan Museum (Liedtke 1984a, pls. 16, 83, 96). A more familiar example would be Rubens's *Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel* (Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston).


26. See P. Sutton's discussion in Boston–Toledo 1993–94, pp. 245–47, no. 12, of Rubens's painting, Medusa shields, and the copy once in Amsterdam; the copy is also mentioned by Lloyd Williams in Edinburgh–London 2001, p. 100. Both authors cite the source in Huygens.


---

References: *Stowe* 1797, p. 34, records the painting as in the dining room at Stowe, "Rembrandt's wife, in the character of Minerva, painted by him"; Dunüt 1885, p. 17, as "La Femme de Rembrandt représentée en Minerve." At the Stowe sale of 1848; Eudeel 1885, pp. 405–6, records the sale of June 3, 1884; Eudeel 1886, p. 199, records the sale of January 30–31, 1885; Sedefmeyer Gallery 1902, no. 32, "The Wife of the Painter, as Bellona," signed and dated 1635; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 8 (1906), pp. 37, 100, no. 169, pl. 160, describes the subject as "Saskia as Bellona," in the collection of Sir George Donaldson, London, noting the inscription on the shield; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 153 (ill.), 354, 570, calls the picture "Portrait of Saskia as Bellona," in the Donaldson collection; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 132, no. 196, as Rembrandt's "Bellona," with Duveen Brothers, New York, describes the subject and gives provenance information; H. Kauffmann 1926, p. 80, notes that the picture's subject is also encountered in Dutch literature; Meldrum 1923, pp. 41, 69, 192, pl. CLXXXVI, as "Saskia (?) as Bellona," describes the picture as "classical merely in a cloak-and-dagger sense—exercises with new studio properties"; M'Cormick 1924, p. 115, mentions "the imposing figure of 'Saskia as Bellona'" in a review of Friedsam's collection; Valentine 1928a, p. 28, catalogues the picture as "Saskia as Bellona," claims that the inscription reads "BELLONA," suggests that the date is possibly 1635, and imagines that the shield is "very likely the one which is mentioned in Rembrandt's inventory as a work executed by Quinrin Matsys"; Valentine 1931, unpagd, no. 28, pl. 28, as "Bellona," dated 1635; B. Burroughs and Wehle 1932, pp. 46, 46, describes the subject and the "thin, smooth surface" of the paint, adding that "the picture is given to Rembrandt without reservation by Bode, Hofstede de Groot, and Valentine"; Bredius 1935, p. 19, no. 467, pl. 467, as "Bellona," observes that "according to Valentine Saskia served as model"; Kieser 1941–42, pp. 137–38, 139, mentions the painting briefly, but dwells on other examples of "Rembrandt's relationship with antiquity"; J. Allen 1945, p. 74, considers Saskia to have posed "in unlikely, ornate armor as Bellona"; Rousseau and Pease 1947, pp. 49–53 (ill., overall and details), reports on a recent cleaning, reproduces a detail of the signature and date, describes the style, considers the work "the most remarkable of Rembrandt's portraits of Saskia," and suggests that the artist "first painted Saskia's head and then piled up a group of his studio trappings" to depict Bellona in, as it turned out, an angular and graceless manner; J. Rosenberg 1948, p. 43, "disguises his young wife as 'Bellona';" Slive in Indianapolis–San Diego 1981 (under no. 7), describes the work as an allegorical portrait, "composed in a theatrical fashion from the artist's supply of studio props"; Fletcher 1964, p. 372, pl. 3, states that the Gorgon's head on Bellona's shield identifies her as the goddess of war; J. Rosenberg 1964, p. 72, repeats J. Rosenberg 1948, Kraft 1964, pp. 19, 20, cites the painting in a discussion of the Lisbon "Pallas";
K. Bauch 1966, p. 14, no. 257, pl. 257, as “Bellona,” misquotes the inscription on the shield, and states that Saksia obviously served as the model; K. Clark 1966, pp. 137–38, fig. 129, sees “the slightly ludicrous, almost touching, discrepancy between the clothes [and the figure as] after all, due to a failure of unifying imagination”; Haverkamp-Begemann 1966, col. 92a, listed as one of Rembrandt’s “portraits in disguise”; Carter in Montreal–Toronto 1969, p. 30, reprises the Rousseau and Pease (1947) and K. Clark (1966) theme of “certain awkwardnesses in the exotic blend of studio armor and wifely countenance”; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 378 (ill.), 592, no. 467, considers the painting “too dull in expression and too awkwardly composed to be by Rembrandt himself”; Haak 1969, p. 101, fig. 150, erroneously states that X-radiographs reveal that Rembrandt originally painted Saksia nude, calls the pose clumsy and graceless, and concludes that “few of Rembrandt’s paintings are so little attractive”; Locatello 1969, p. 131 (ill.), includes the picture among works of doubtful attribution; Snoeck 1969, pp. 104–11, criticizes Haak’s (1969) subjectivity, as demonstrated in his appraisal of this work; Kuznetsova in Locwinson-Lessing 1971, unpagd (under no. 7), compares Rembrandt’s Flora of 1634, in the Hermitage, which “conveys the same understanding of Antiquity”; Anson 1973, pp. 594, 596, fig. 42, reports that the 1st Marquess of Buckingham acquired the painting on the advice of Sir Joshua Reynolds, and that by 1827 it was one of four Rembrandts that hung alone in the duchess’s dressing room; Sumowski 1973, p. 94; quotes and criticizes the remarks in Haak 1969 as subjective and insufficient; Pigler 1974, vol. 2, p. 54, lists the painting among representations of Bellona dating from the 17th century; A. Levy 1976, pp. 36, 38 (ill.), in an article on the Rembrandt Research Project, quotes Bruyn to the effect that they overrule Gerson (in Bredius 1969) and accept the painting as by Rembrandt; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 179, no. 138 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 95, listed among works dating from 1613; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 46, 103, pls. 27–30 (ill., with X-raygraph and autoradiographs), describes how the composition was “altered numerous times,” for example, by moving the shield from Bellona’s right arm (where the shield was seen from the inside) to the left, where it replaced a sword, and also notes the considerable care Rembrandt took in formulating the costume; Haverkamp-Begemann 1982, p. 104, fig. 78, suggests that the masonry arch is a city gate; D. Sutton 1982, p. 382, credits Anson (1973) for noting that the 1st Marquess of Buckingham acquired the painting on the advice of Sir Joshua Reynolds; G. Schwartz 1985, pp. 6, 124–25, 127, fig. 117, draws attention to the similar pose in Rembrandt’s panel of about 1651, The Artist in Oriental Costume with a Poodle at His Feet (fig. 128 here), and observes that the political figures who favored war with Spain in 1631 would have been more likely patrons than many of Rembrandt’s usual clients in Amsterdam; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2 (1986), pp. 20, 38, 42–43, 452–53, 456, 459–59, 509, 897, no. 470 (ill.; overall, details, X-radiographs and autoradiographs), and fig. 27, considers the work as “a reasonably well preserved and authentic painting, reliably signed and dated 1653,” describes the execution in detail, reports on the analysis of nine paint samples and the evidence of X-radiographs and autoradiographs, examines the subject, dismisses the opinion of Gerson (in Bredius 1969) as “an anachronistic view of what constitutes ideal beauty and decorum,” stresses that the picture is not a portrait but a history picture and that this is relevant to its style (which recalls Jacob Backer and, through him, Rubens), sees the general influence of Rubensian female types here and in similar works by Rembrandt, strongly doubts that Saksia served as model, gives the thread count of the canvas (pp. 26, 38, 321), and describes the gray color of the ground; Kelch in Kelch et al. 1986, p. 24, notes that Rembrandt often painted fancy helmets, as here; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 172 (ill.), 179–80, 402, no. 103, admires the execution (in particular the description of armor), recalls that Bellona played a large role in political allegories of the period, rejects the opinion of Gerson (in Bredius 1969), and repeats Haak’s (1969) misinformation that the figure was originally nude; Broun 1987, vol. 1, pp. 44, 117 n. 5, vol. 2, p. 71, no. 44, repeats the information that Sir Joshua Reynolds recommended the painting’s purchase by the 1st Marquess of Buckingham; White 1987, p. 809, “wholeheartedly concur[s] with the acceptance of the Bellona as an entirely genuine work” in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2; Alpers 1988, pp. 56, 139 n. 57, appears willfully ignorant of the fact that the ideas of Saksia as model and a nude underneath the finished painting have been discredited in the literature; Linnik in New York–Chicago 1988, p. 48 (under no. 22), feels that the Hermitage Flora “fits perfectly into that [mythological] body of Rembrandt’s work inspired by Saksia,” another example of which is this picture; Mee 1988, pp. 125, 130 n. 14, offers an amateur’s assessment of the “shabbily done” work; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3 (1989), pp. 8, 9, 465, compares other Rembrandt paintings of female figures dating from the first half of the 1610s, seeing in this one “the first signs of a new approach”; Chapman 1990, pp. 37, 40, fig. 52, observes that this “hefty, Rubensian Bellona” recalls images of the Nederlands maagd (personification of Dutch liberty) and that it “presumably had political significance”; Liedtke 1990, p. 52, cites the work as an example of Friedsam’s collecting; Bal 1991, pp. 319–22, 334, 340, 352, 416 n. 38, 449 n. 48, fig. 8.12, employs the “less than fiery” figure as the vehicle for a self-indulgent “psychoanalytic” screed; Van Grevestein, Groen, and Van de Wetering 1991, p. 66, fig. 10 (detail), discusses this figure as an example of the facial type in Rembrandt’s oeuvre that has been identified with Saksia, noting that the features do not actually match those in known portraits; Grimm 1991, p. 61, figs. 106, 119 (detail of the eyes), places the picture among other female types painted by Rembrandt during the 1630s; Van Thiel in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, p. 190 (under no. 21), considers the figure here and in other works an “idealised type which Rembrandt was using at this time for his portrayals of mythological, biblical and historical women”; C. Brown in Tokyo–Chiba–Yamaguchi 1992, pp. 66, 68, 223, 224, compares the work with Rembrandt’s Flora of 1634 (Hermitage, St Petersburg) and Minerva, of 1635 (private collection); Slakes 1992, pp. 164–65, no. 89 (ill.), discusses the subject, reviews the history of the picture’s connoisseurship, praises the execution, and places the work among other mythological images of the 1610s; Podro 1991, p. 699, mentions the picture in a review of the psychobabel in Bal 1991; C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 172 (ill.), 178–79, 405, no. 103, describes the composition, notes earlier opinions, and misquotes the inscription; Van de Wetering 1993b, p. 148, figs. 8, 9 (autoradiograph), discusses Rembrandt’s isolated use of certain pigments, in a manner quite unlike that of Jozef Israëls; Kobayashi-Sato in Yamaguchi and other cities 1994–95, p. 23, and English supplement, p. 12, remarks that in figure types such as this one Rembrandt was not so much “idealizing” as “sacrificing conventions that usually accompany a portrait, such as a fixed gaze, respectability, and seriousness, in order to present
the work as a history painting”; Baetjer 1995, p. 313, as “Bellona”; Groen 1995, pp. 89–90, cites the picture for the technical light it sheds on the Human before Esther in the National Museum of Art of Romania, Bucharest; Van de Wetering 1995, p. 201, figs. 2, 3 (autographic), elaborates on the remarks made in Van de Wetering 1995b; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 40, 47, 50, 55–58, no. 7 (ill.), criticizes the remarks of Gerson (in Bredius 1969), Haak (1969), and others who have disliked the painting, discusses the work with regard to shifting standards of connoisseurship, compares Rembrandt’s Sophonisba, of 1634 (Prado, Madrid), and examples of Rembrandt’s depicting mythological figures in anticlassical terms, and notes that a Dutch-looking Bellona would have been a suitable symbol in a civic guard house; Van Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 22–23, 24, 41, figs. 17, 41 (X-radiograph details), 18 (autographic details), 19, 42 (details), describes the autographic evidence revealing that Rembrandt originally depicted the shield (with only the inside visible) in Bellona’s right hand and the sword in the left, supports the notion that the picture could have been made as a symbol of Dutch readiness to resist foreign powers, and observes that the face reveals an unusually smooth paint surface for Rembrandt, who generalized the figure’s features; Van de Wetering 1997, pp. 103, 124, 130, 149–50, figs. 169 (paint cross section), 183 (overall), 186 (autographic), republishes information (from Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2) about the canvas weave and the ground; Giltaj in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, p. 137, fig. 11c (under no. 15), cites the work as one of Rembrandt’s several “curiously arriere martel figures with helmets,” which allowed the artist to employ studio props to create “a mysterious, mythological world of his own”; Schaap 1999a, p. 367, describes the figure as a “completely different model” than Saskia, who is also seen in the London Flora of 1635 and a few other works; Berger 2000, fig. 49, resurrects the Saskia-as-model theme to order to advance an anachronistic observation about Rembrandt, making her “a partner in his project of revisionary allusion”; Wright 2000, pp. 58, 60, fig. 44, calls the subject Rembrandt’s first isolated mythological figure; Chong in Boston 2000–2001, p. 80, erroneously states that Friedsam bought the painting in 1903; Lloyd Williams in Edinburgh–London 2001, pp. 14, 90, 92, 98, 100–102, 104, 123 n. 16 to no. 20, p. 254, no. 26 (ill.), considers the play between perceived and imagined features in a number of female figures by Rembrandt, comparing most examples of the early to mid-1630s with this one, which is seen as an attempt to emulate Rubens (whose Head of Medusa, 1610–17, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, may have inspired Bellona’s shield); Dickey 2002, pp. 23, 215 n. 68, recalls that the painting “was long considered to be Saskia in disguise . . . but is now recognized as a stouter, blonder type”; Liedtke 2002, pp. 47–48, comments the use of the painting in the Edinburgh–London exhibition of 2001, where it helped “to illuminate numerous issues involving public and private works of art . . . the presentation of types as opposed to live models,” and so on; Lloyd Williams in Madrid 2002, p. 23, fig. 11, cites the painting in a discussion of figure types, terreurs, and history pictures; Manuth and De Winkel 2002, pp. 3, 5, 12, 17 nn. 2, 13, fig. 2, describes the picture as the first in a group depicting goddesses and heroines of antiquity, painted by Rembrandt between 1633 and 1635; Gilboa 2003, pp. 29, 155–56, 212 n. 25, places the painting in the context of various female mythological figures by Rembrandt, and observes that here Bellona is characterized “only through the symbolism of the armour, which appears in stark contrast to the figure’s dreamy gaze and passive posture”; Golubay 2003, pp. 39, 244 n. 11, fig. 5, suggests that Rembrandt based his depiction of Bellona on a verse by Elias Herckmans; Sokolova et al. in Dijon 2003–4, p. 84 (under no. 1), finds a similar “ideal of beauty” in the Flora of 1614 (Saint Petersburg) and approximately contemporary paintings by Rembrandt; Scallen 2004, p. 356 n. 118, lists the picture among the few authentic works by Rembrandt that were published as paintings by him in Bode 1897–1906, vol. 8; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 662–63, reports that the first ground contains red earth, chalk and quartz, and the second ground lead white, a little ochre orumber, and lampblack, resulting in a fawny gray color; Van de Wetering in ibid., p. 217, mentions the light effects on the helmet as typical of Rembrandt in execution; Bomford et al. 2006, p. 89, cites the picture in connection with the Saskia as Flora, of 1635, in the National Gallery, London; M. de Winkel in Berlin 2006, p. 274 (ill.), compares the Minerva, of 1635 (private collection).


**Ex Coll.:** George Temple-Nugent-Grenville, 1st Marquess of Buckingham Stowe, Buckinghamshire (by 1797–d. 1811); his son Richard Temple-Nugent-Chandos-Grenville, 1st Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, Stowe (1811–48); his sale, Christie’s, at Stowe, September 15, 1848, no. 424, as “the wife of the painter, as Minerva,” by Rembrandt, for £3311 to Roe; R. Roe, Cambridge (from 1848); William W. Pearce, London (until 1872); his estate sale, Phillips, London, April 23, 1872, no. 105, as “A Portrait of a Lady as Minerva”; comme de l’Espine, Brussels; Étienne Martin, baron de Bournonville, Paris (until 1885); his sale, Paris, June 3, 1884, no. 294, as “La Femme de Rembrandt, représentée en Pallas,” bought in for FFr 20,000 by Féal; his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, January 30–31,
148. Herman Doomer

Oil on wood, 29⅜ x 21¼ in. (75.2 x 55.2 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): Rembrandt f. 1640

The painting is exceptionally well preserved. The oak panel is made from one piece of heartwood and retains its original thickness.

H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.1

This portrait of the Amsterdam ebony worker Herman Doomer (ca. 1595–1650) is reliably signed and dated 1640, and is cited in a will made by the sitter's widow, Baertje Martens (ca. 1596–1678), on July 13, 1634. In that testament and in revisions dated May 23, 1662, and September 3, 1668, Martens declares that “her son Lamber[t] Doomer shall receive and keep the portrait of her, the testatrix, and of her husband, made by Rembrandt van Rhijn, provided that he will provide each of his brothers and sisters with copies of the same at his expense.” A pair of copies painted by Lambert Doomer (1624–1700) is in the Devonshire collection at Chatsworth, and an inventory of Lambert’s estate, made shortly before his death, lists “two portraits of the deceased’s father and mother, painted by Rembrandt van Rhijn and bequeathed to Hermanus Voster,” who was Lambert’s nephew. These records and other evidence place the portrait of Herman Doomer and the pendant portrait of Baertje Martens (fig. 148) in a select group of pictures by Rembrandt that are documented as autograph in his lifetime. Of all the Rembrandt paintings in the Metropolitan Museum, only *Aristotle with a Bust of Homer* (Pl. 151) is similarly authenticated by contemporaneous accounts.¹

Herman (or Harmen) Doomer was born in Anrath, Germany, near the Dutch border at Venlo. At about the age of eighteen he went to Amsterdam, where on November 11, 1618, he married Baertje (also Baertje, Baartjen, Baertjens) Martens, in the Nieuwe Kerk. At the time, Herman was twenty-three and his bride twenty-two. She had come to Amsterdam from her native Naarden about ten years earlier, evidently to work as a maid in a house on the Herengracht. In the record of the couple's marriage, Doomer is described as an *ebbenhoutwerker* (ebony worker), a specialist in a craft that had been only recently developed. The production of comparatively large objects veneered with the dense black hardwood, such as picture frames and cabinets, had been made possible by its importation (mainly from southern India) after the founding of the East India Company (VOC) in 1602. In 1626, the small group of *ebbenhoutwerkers* in Amsterdam was assigned its own subdivision in the Guild of Saint Joseph, to distinguish these artisans from ordinary *kistenaars* (cabinetmakers). From that date onward, they were required to submit two trial, or “master,” pieces in ebony, a picture frame and a *kas* (chest or cabinet). The term *ébéniste*, French for cabinetmaker, dates from the early seventeenth century, when craftsmen in Paris as well as in Antwerp and Amsterdam started making ebony cabinets. Ironically, Herman Doomer, one of the pioneer *ébenistes* in the original sense of the term, was in the early nineteenth century “styled Le Doreur de Rembrandt” (according to Smith in 1836; see Refs.), and his portrait was called “Rembrandt’s *Gilder*” when the *New York Times* of February 19, 1883, announced its arrival at the local customshouse (“valued at $100,000!”). There is no evidence that Doomer ever gilded anything, as did countless framemakers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In his day, gilders belonged to the Guild of Saint Luke, which he never joined. And it could be said that Doomer had better things to do, to judge from the superb quality of the collector's cabinet (fig. 149) that a decade ago was convincingly identified with “a large ebony *kas* inlaid with

1. Kaufmann compares a reference to Bellona in *Facies Augustae*, by Caspar van Baerle (Casparus Barlaeus), evidently not realizing that the publication (1643) is a free Latin verse translation of Jacob Cats’s *Trouw-ringen*, of 1637.
mother-of-pearl [worth] 300 ducats [or] f[lorins] 945" in the estate inventory of Baertje Martens (February 23, 1678). Doomer prospered well enough to support his wife and seven children, and to purchase two houses located conveniently close to those of potential clients on the grander canals of Amsterdam. In December 1624, he bought a house on the Benningenstraat (the present Gasthuismolensteeg 11–13), between Singel and Herengracht, and in 1637 the family moved to a house in the nearby Hartenstraat between Herengracht and Keizergracht. (The first house was retained, presumably as rental property.) After Doomer's burial in the Nieuwezijdskapel on March 14, 1650, his widow was able to live in the Hartenstraat house for the rest of her life, and to continue the business with some help from her sons Lambert and Matheus (1619–1670). In 1641, Matheus and his father applied together for a patent on a method of pressing whalebone into reliefs, which was an inexpensive alternative to carving ebony. Lambert's own "ebony mirror frame, the [deceased] party's trial frame" (proeffijst) and ebony-working tools are listed in an inventory of his possessions compiled in 1677.

Shortly after his marriage in 1668, Lambert moved to Alkmaar, taking his tools with him. As early as the
mid-1640s, however, he was busy as a draftsman, traveler, and collector, which was made possible by his father's success. Lambert is best known for topographical drawings, including views of French cities and châteaux (1646) and records of a Rhineland journey (1665). It is thought that he trained as a draftsman in Rembrandt's studio about 1644; his early figural drawings and painted copies after Rembrandt's portraits of his parents tend to support the hypothesis. It seems likely that a professional and perhaps a personal relationship between Herman Doomer and Rembrandt led to the twenty-year-old Lambert's association with the master, after he had apprenticed with his father as an ebony worker. That Herman Doomer made frames for Rembrandt is often stated but not known for a fact, though one would imagine that Rembrandt's portraits of Doomer and his wife were originally framed by the master craftsman.

The pictures were called "A Man's Head" and "A Woman's Head, its Companion" in the 1750 London sale of Anthony Cousin's estate. A mezzotint reproducing the portrait of Herman Doomer when it was in Cousin's collection imagines the sitter as "Rembrandt's Father," but in the Amsterdam sale of 1757 the sitter is called "the painter Domer," and a mezzotint of 1769 reproducing the "Original Picture" in the Duke of Ancaster's collection identifies the subject as "Rembrandt's Frame Maker." (Perhaps a label or an inscription on the back of the panel or frame once gave the sitter's last name.) The portrait of Baertje Martens appears to have gone from the London...
sale of 1750 to the Paris collection of Jean de Julienne. In
the de Julienne estate sale of 1767, the painting (which
was purchased for Catherine II of Russia) is described as
"un Portrait de femme." The picture was first identified
as a portrait of Baertje Martens, "wife of the framemaker
Doomer," by Neumann in 1903 (see Refs.), who in a
delightful footnote credits Bredius for his discovery that
"the famous 'doreur'" is actually Herman Doomer,
observes that the dimensions of the two panels are nearly
the same and that the woman's age is about right, and
considers the similarity in the sitters' expressions
significant, "as is often found in old married couples, on
whose faces the many years of living together and shared
experience result in an increasing resemblance."7

It has been suggested occasionally that the very high
standard of execution in the *Herman Doomer* may have
been a personal tribute on Rembrandt's part. Whether or
not the painter and the framemaker were friends, it must
have occurred to Rembrandt that he was producing a
portrait for one of the best craftsmen in Amsterdam, and
that meticulous workmanship, on a wood panel, would be
appropriate. The picture's descriptive qualities may be
described to have developed from those in the *Ellsworth Portrait of a
Man* (Pl. 141) and other works of the 1630s, but even in
Rembrandt's finest portraits it is rare that very close study
of a sitter's face and costume details is so rewarding as it is
in this unusually well preserved painting. What appear
merely as passages of paint in pictures inspired by this one,
such as Lambert Doomer's copy and Govaert Flinck's
*Portrait of a Man*, dated 1640 (Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza,
Madrid),8 is here something more complex: execution in
accord with acute perception. The handling of the linen
ruff, for example, varies from the exceptionally tactile
treatment at the near edge to fluid strokes at the right,
with the result that the collar becomes an essential element
in suggesting the figure's volume. The hat and ruff recede
in space, but the face seems to turn forward into the light,
which throughout the composition works in quiet collabora-
tion with an extraordinary variety of textures. Brushwork
on the illuminated area of the near sleeve suggests the
material of the jacket, but strokes are less evident in the
shadowy area of the receding torso (the hand in the cloak
assumes the task of conveying volume). The play of light
overall could hardly be called a pattern but is used incon-
spicuously to emphasize the upper part of the figure and to
set the head and shoulders off from the wall. The illumina-
tion of the wall is convincingly naturalistic and yet
adjusted precisely with an eye to the light and shadow on
the figure, an approach that creates quite a different tonal
arrangement in the pendant picture. Perhaps the most
remarkable passages of the Doomer portrait are in the
near side of the face, where the description of forms as
different as the cheek (lifted by smile lines), the bristly
moustache and beard, the slightly wrinkled lower lip, the
shiny nose, the reddish wrinkles around the eyes, the
moist lower eyelids (achieved with soft white dots), and
the gently arching eyebrow to the left deserve the most
patient attention, in recognition of Rembrandt's own.9

Some critics have maintained that the modest scale
and simple compositions of the *Doomer* portrait and its
companion, when compared with Rembrandt's "patrician
portraits" of about the same date, underscore the fact that
the sitter was "nothing more than a competent crafts-
man."10 Such unconscious echoes of Karl Marx should be
muted in the future by Baarsen's observation that when
Doomer and his wife had themselves "painted by Rem-
brandt, then at the height of his fame," the commission
"set them apart from their peers."11 Portraits of approxi-
mately the same composition and size had been painted by
Michiel van Mierevelt (q.v.), whose sitters were com-
petent people like the Princes of Orange and their per-
sonal physician, Jacob van Dalen (see Pl. 121). The specific
pose that Rembrandt assigned to Doomer placed him in a
peerage of gentleman artists, as Rembrandt defined him-
self in the *Self-Portrait at the Age of Thirty-four*, of 1640
(fig. 150), and as his followers (such as Flinck and
Ferdinand Bol) also did when they adopted a similar pose
in self-portraits dating from the next few years.

The influence of Titian's *Portrait of an Unknown Man
("Aristo"), of about 1515 (fig. 151), and Raphael's *Portrait
of Baldassare Castiglione*, of about 1514-15 (see fig. 196),
seems evident not only in Rembrandt's famous self-
portrait but also in the portraits of Doomer and his wife,
where the sources could be described as less synthesized.
One assumes that the self-portrait was painted first, but
execution of the pendant portraits might have progressed
at about the same time. The composition of the *Herman
Doomer* comes close to that of Rembrandt's well-known
drawing after Raphael's canvas, dated 1659 (fig. 152), while
the pose in the *Baertje Martens* (if not the expression and
stillness) is more reminiscent of the Raphael than the
Rembrandt self-portrait.12 Rembrandt did not, however,
intend to suggest that Doomer and his wife were compar-
able to Castiglione and the courtly figures he wrote
about. He simplement understood that the conventions of Renaissance portraiture could be used to convey the couple’s steadfastness, and his own respect.


An old copy of the New York portrait, more faithful to the original composition than the Chatsworth version, is in the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig. The authors of the *Corpus* (1882–89, vol. 3, p. 388) doubt the seventeenth-century origin of the Braunschweig copy, but it is close to Lambert Doomer’s work in style, traceable since 1737, and probably from the collection of Anton Ulrich, who died in 1714 (see Klessmann 1983, p. 173, no. 216 [ill.]; Schulz 1972, vol. 1, p. 121 n. 61).

2. For the attribution of this *kast* and, more tentatively, two other cabinets and a mirror frame to Herman Doomer, see Baarsen 1996, where Baertje Martens’ estate inventory is printed in the original Dutch on p. 749. The same excellent article amplifies and makes more accessible the biographical information published in Van Eghen 1966, and, less reliably, in Schulz 1972, pp. 9–12. On the arrival of “Rembrandt’s Gilder” in America, see Quobach 2004.


4. The literature on the question of if and when Lambert Doomer was a pupil of Rembrandt is summarized in Bikker 2005, pp. 9–10.

5. The seventeenth-century black ebonized frame now on Doomer’s portrait falls well below his level of work. When Havemeyer owned the painting it was in a gilded frame (see New York 1993, p. 95, fig. 10). For Lambert Doomer’s work as a draftsman, see Schulz 1974. His small oeuvre of paintings is reviewed in Schulz 1978 and in Sumowski 1981–94, vol. 1, pp. 461–91.

6. For these details, see *Corpus* 1882–89, vol. 3, pp. 387, 388 (under “Graphic reproductions,” nos. 2, 3), 389, 394 (under “Provenance”).

7. Neumann 1923, pp. 250–51. See, under Refs., É. Michel 1894 and Bode 1897–1906, vol. 4 (1900), which both refer to Bredius’s discovery. In *Corpus* 1982–89, vol. 3, p. 387, Neumann’s contribution is played down and it is mistakenly claimed that “the correct identification of [Herman Doomer] followed when Hofstede de Groot discovered Baertje Martens’ will.” Presumably, the title given to the male portrait in Wurzbach’s *Rembrandt-Galerie* of 1886 (see Refs.), “Porträt des Malers Doomer (Genannt Rembrandt’s Frame-Maker),” was also helpful.


9. Some of these observations are repeated from the present writer’s entry in New York 1985–96, vol. 2, p. 60. Close description, more in the style of an autopsy report, is found in *Corpus* 1882–89, vol. 3, pp. 388–86, where the overly warm color detail of the face and collar, reproduced actual size, is informative.

10. Rembrandt’s “patrician portraits” are said to feature “much larger size, rich clothing and occasional inclusion of architectural elements” in *Corpus* 1882–89, vol. 3, p. 383, whereas “portraying this enuine worker and his wife gave no reason to adopt such features.” The characterization of Doomer as a “competent craftsman” is blankert’s in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, p. 174.


12. The paintings by Titian and Raphael, Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait, and his sketch of the *Castiglione* (which was auctioned in Amsterdam) are widely discussed and illustrated, for example, in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, pp. 127–29, no. 13, figs. 12b–13d. Also of interest is Reiger van Persijn’s engraving after Joachim van Sandrart, of about 1640, which reverses Raphael’s design (see Dickey 2004, pp. 100–101, fig. 107).

References: J. Smith 1832–42, vol. 7 (1836), pp. 106, 121, records the painting three times: as no. 288, “A Gentleman,” 27 x 20 in. (68.6 x 50.8 cm), sold for Fr 5,007 (200 livres) in the sale of 1822, as no. 334, “Portrait of a Man, styled Le Dorure de Rembrandt,” dated 1646 (i. e.), 29 x 23 in. (73.7 x 58.4 cm), in a private collection, Paris, cited a mezzotint by J. G. Haid, and as no. 335, “A Portrait, entitled ‘Rembrandt’s Frame Maker,’” engraved by Diaz when in the collection of the Duke of Ancaster; Galerie Lebrun 1834, pp. 8–9, as sold by Mme Gentil de Chavagnac in her last years, and now in the collection of the duc de Morny; Lagrange 1865, pp. 592–93 (ill. opp. p. 592; etching by L. Flameng), as “Portait du Dorure,” dated 1640, erroneously reports that the picture remained in Doomer’s family until it was bought by the person who sold it to the duc de Morny, and suggests that Rembrandt painted the work in exchange for framing services; “Mouvement des arts et de la curiosité: Vente de la galerie Morny,” *Chronique des arts et de la curiosité*, no. 109 (June 18, 1865), p. 217, records that the “Dorure de Rembrandt” was bought at the duc de Morny sale by the duchesse de Morny; Vosmayer 1877, pp. 205, 355, suggests that the sitter may be the painter (Lambert) Doomer, observing implausibly that the title “Dorure” might be a corruption of “Doomer”; Bode 1883, pp. 464, 596, no. 291, as in the collection of Mme Cassin, Paris, states that she bought it from the duchesse de Sevso (Sesto) in 1882, and disputes the identification with Lambert Doomer (see Vosmayer 1877) since he would have been about twenty years old in 1640; Paris 1883, p. 113, no. 95 (ill. opp. p. 84; etching by Mordant); as “Le Dorure”; Dutuit 1885, pp. 11, 20, 32, 62, no. 288 (ill.), as “Portrait d’Homme, dit le Dorure de Rembrandt,” gives slightly erroneous provenance details and notes that the painting was recently sold to an American; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 295, as “Porträt des Malers Doomer (Genannt Rembrandt’s Frame-Maker),” C. Cook 1887, pp. 107–11, reports on a press viewing of the painting in the gallery of William Schaus, on December 27, 1886, praises the picture’s craftsmanship and fidelity to appearances at length, reviews the literature, discusses the title, expresses the hope that the “canvas” will remain in the country, and that it will be exhibited in the Metropolitan Museum where “it
would make it forevermore impossible in such a presence to say a word in defence of the rubbish that now encumbers the walls of the Museum"; Bredius 1890, p. 108, admires the exceptional qualities of
description and expression in the portrait, which is described as "the so-called Doore (Doomer?)"; É. Michel 1894, vol. 1, p. 270, vol. 2,
pp. 247–48, states that a document recently discovered by Bredius refer
to the sitter as Paulus (sic) Doomer, who was Lambert
Doomer's father and Rembrandt's framemaker; Bode 1895, p. 71,
cites the picture as the most important Rembrandt portrait acquired
by Havemeyer in the short space of about three years, "der
berühmteste sogenannte 'Doreur'... ein Wunderwerk in der enzaiarti-
gen Lenchkraft und Durchbildung, in dem klaren, blonden Ton des
Fleisches"; Moes 1897–1905, vol. 1 (1897), p. 238, no. 2074–1, identifies
the sitter as the painter Jan (sic) Doomer, and mentions a
copy in the Duke of Devonshire's collection; Bell 1899, pp. 71, 184,
erroneously refers to the sitter as Paul and Paulus Doomer;
Knackfuß 1899, pp. 82–83, fig. 101 (mezzotint by Dixon), considers
the picture "one of the true masterpieces of portrait-painting by
Rembrandt," and a record of "the gilder who supplied Rembrandt
with frames for his pictures"; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 4 (1900), pp. 30–
31, 142, no. 275, pl. 275, on the basis of "a recent discovery made by
Dr. A. Bredius in the archives," identifies the sitter as Herman
Doomer ("not Paulus as stated in the introduction") and records
that his widow, Baartjen Martens, bequeathed the portrait to her
son Lambert Doomer on the condition that he have it copied for
each of his five siblings, and lists copies in the Duke of Devonshire's
collection, in the museum at Braunschweig, and with a dealer "a few
years ago"; Neumann 1905, vol. 1, pp. 250–31 n. *., identifies the por-
trait of Baartjen Martens (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg) as this pic-
ture's pendant; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 181 (ill.), 398, as "Herman
Doomer," in the Havemeyer collection; W. Martin 1909, pp. 126–29,
fig. 10, determines that all the copies of this picture are by Lambert
Doomer and therefore must derive directly from it; A. Rosenberg
1909, pp. 514 (ill.), 557, repeats A. Rosenberg 1906; Stephenson
1909, pp. 167, 170, considers the picture "one of the most exquisitely
finished of that highly finishing period of Rembrandt's painting
career," and mistakenly identifies the sitter as "an artist named
Dorner"; Valentiner in New York 1909, p. 89, no. 88 (ill.), as "The
Gilder Herman Doomer," cites the pendant in the Hermitage and
gives basic catalogue information; Cox 1909–10, p. 182, as in the
"Hudson-Fulton Celebration," "the unapproachable Gilder of 1640,
rent by Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, the great masterpiece of this kind of
painting"; Brock 1910, p. 54, mentions the picture among Rembrandts
in the Hudson–Fulton exhibition; Bredius 1910b, pp. 2–3, publishes
the text of Baartjen Martens's will, and feels that the portrait of her
in the Devonshire collection is not a copy of Rembrandt's painting
in the Hermitage but was done from life under the master's influence;
Waldmann 1910, pp. 74–75, finds the picture "not of the first
rank" because it is "a little hard and dry"; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 2
(1910), p. 405, offers a brief summary of the known information
about this picture and its pendant; Bredius 1915–22, part 1 (1915),
pp. 76, 88, no. 38, publishes Lambert Doomer's estate inventory,
in which this portrait and its pendant are listed as left to Hermanus
Voster; Hofsteede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 328–9,
no. 642, repeats all the known information and adds that a copy is
in the collection of Dr. E. Kulenkampff, Bremen; Downes 1923, p. 665,
lists the picture among Rembrandts not doubted in Van Dyke 1923;
Meldrum 1923, pp. 85, 109, 190, pl. CXXVI, observes that the sitter is
"painted as Rembrandt painted his friends"; A. Burroughs 1920, p. 334
(ill.), compares the composition of a Cézanne portrait; Mather 1930,
pp. 445, 463, 464, 470 (ill.), considers the picture "not quite a first
class Rembrandt, but it is a strong and dignified characterization full
of vitality and very distinguished in execution"; Valentiner 1930b, p. 4
(ill.), mentions the work as a masterly example of Rembrandt
employing a "clair obscur of finest nuances of transition from light
to shadow"; Welhe 1930, pp. 59 (ill.), 60, as "the grandly solid por-
trait of the gilder, Herman Doomer (1640)," among six Rembrandt
portraits in the exhibition of the Havemeyer collection; B.
Burroughs 1931a, p. 295, no. 828–29, as "Herman Doomer, The
Gilder"; Havemeyer Collection 1931, pp. 24–25 (ill.), gives basic
information; Valentiner 1931, unpagd, no. 71, pl. 71, as "Herman
Doomer, Known as The Gilder"; A. Burroughs 1932a, pp. 385, 390,
391, figs. 2, 7 (X-radiograph detail), uses the work to establish that
Flinck not Rembrandt painted the Portrait of Eleanor Swaimius
(Korinklisk Museum, Amsper); A. Burroughs 1932b, p. 453, compares
this painting with the Portrait of a Man with a Breastplate and Plumed
Hat (Pl. 164), doubting that the latter is by Rembrandt; Benesch 1935a,
p. 264, listed; Bredius 1935, pp. 10, 15, no. 217, pl. 217, describes the
sitter solely as the father of the artist Lambert Doomer, and details
the terms of Lambert's mother's will; Ivins 1942a, p. 3, listed; Ivins
1942b, pls. 5, 6 (detail of face, actual size); J. Allen 1945, p. 73, sup-
poses, with this assistant curator's usual gift for uninformed specula-
tion, that "the painting was done in payment for some of the carved
and gilded frames which are such a necessary expense to portrait
painters"; Van Eeghen 1956, pp. 133, 154 (ill.), reviews the terms of
Baartjen Martens's will, discusses the separation of the Museum's pic-
ture and its pendant and the loss of their sitter's names, and sketches
biographies of Herman Doomer and the members of his immediate
family; Havemeyer 1961, pp. 19, 24, recalls the portrait "over the
broad chimney place" in Havemeyer's library; K. Bauch 1966, pp. 20,
23 (under no. 499), no. 385, pl. 385, as "The Framemaker Herman
Doomer," incorrectly gives the sitter's dates as 1600–1654; Haverkamp-
Begemann 1966, col. 924, sees the portrait as one of the first by
Rembrandt in a more serious vein, which "represent the sitters with
unprecedented immediacy"; White 1966, pp. 41–42 (ill.), feels that
the sitter's "honest simplicity could not be more eloquently expressed";
Gerson 1968, pp. 322, 333 (ill.), 407, no. 230, gives basic information,
adding that of the known copies "the pair at Chatsworth [Devon-
shire collection] is signed (Doomer) and the female portrait is dated
as well (1654)"; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 176 (ill.), 565–66, 577
(under no. 357), no. 217, repeats Gerson 1968, but the date of
Lambert Doomer's copy at Chatsworth is corrected to 1644; Haak
1969, p. 166, fig. 259, offers a chatty biography based on Van Eeghen
1965; Lecaldano 1969, pp. 108–9, no. 210 (ill.), states that Doomer
was a framer and gilder in Amsterdam; Kuznetsov in Loewinson-
Lessing 1971, unpagd, no. 12 (ill.), refers to the painting in a brief
discussion of the pendant, which originally showed the sitter with a
crumpled handkerchief in her hands; Schulz 1972, vol. 1, pp. 26–27,
120–21 n. 61, vol. 2, p. 450 (under no. 415), describes the painting
as the only dated "commission" of 1640, and discusses the known
copies and eighteenth-century provenance; Schulz 1974, p. 9, cites
the portrait as evidence of Lambert Doomer's close relationship to
Rembrandt, and praises its qualities of execution and expression;
F. Robinson in Saint Petersburg-Atlanta 1975, p. 39 (under no. 26),
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mentions the portrait in an entry on a painting by Lambert Doomer; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 188, no. 292 (ill.); Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, pp. 184, 188, 319 (ill.), 497, 579, publishes the wills of Baerje Mertens dated July 13, 1614, May 23, 1662, and September 3, 1668, leaving the portrait and its pendant to Lambert Doomer, with conditions stipulated; Lowenthal 1981, pp. 9–10, pl. 6, describes the sitter and the picture’s style; Klessmann 1983, p. 173 (under no. 256), catalogues the copy in Braunschweig as after Rembrandt, with a tentative reference to Lambert Doomer; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 1, p. 469 (under no. 231), catalogues Lambert Doomer’s “free partial copy” at Chatsworth, mistakenly referring to the original as in the Hermitage; G. Schwartz 1985, pp. 216–18, fig. 236, as “one of Rembrandt’s first known portraits of a professional associate,” briefly describes his relationship with the Doomer family; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2 (1986), p. 10, cites the work as representative of one stylistic alternative in Rembrandt’s work about 1640; Guillaume and Guillaud 1986, p. 378; De Jongh in Haarlem 1986a, pp. 24–35, fig. 15a, refers to the picture, its pendant, and their copies as examples of portraits intended as family heirlooms; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 211 (ill.), 215–16, 411, no. 207, detects the influence of Hals; Weitzenhoffer 1986, pp. 53–54, 68, 209, 224, 254, fig. 12, discusses the import duty of $12,500 paid by William Schaus, and quotes early praise of the painting in the American press; Duparc in Cambridge-Montreal 1988, p. 91, mentioned in a brief biography of Lambert Doomer; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3 (1989), pp. 36, 52, 84, 382–89, 391, 397, no. AI40 (ill.; overall, details, and X-radiograph detail), fig. 3 (detail), describes the execution (“the atmospheric effect is heightened by a sophisticated interpolay of rather unsharp brushstrokes”) and “the slender and even elegant script” of the signature (ill. as fig. 5), gives a detailed account of the composition and painting technique, reviews the earlier literature, the provenance, the evidence of five eighteenth-century prints after the painting and the copies by Lambert Doomer, and concludes that the painting is “a well preserved and authentic work, reliably signed and dated 1640”; Chapman 1990, p. 77, fig. 109, notes that the sitter’s pose is nearly identical to that in Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait of 1642 (fig. 150 here); Gaskell 1990, p. 132 (under no. 24), notes the very similar composition of Flinck’s Portrait of a Man, of 1640, in the Thyssen-Bornemisza collection; Liedtke 1990, pp. 40, 46, cited in an account of the 1909 exhibition; D. Smith 1990, p. 664, in a review of Chapman 1990, comments on the pose; Cabanne 1991, p. 149, no. 15 (ill.); Grimm 1991, p. 108, fig. 194, pl. 61 (detail), mentioned in passing; Bruyn in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, pp. 77, 79, fig. 91, describes the painting’s influence on Flinck and other Rembrandt pupils; Van de Wetering in ibid., p. 90, fig. 109, notes that this and three other pictures by Rembrandt dating from about 1643–44 were painted on panels cut from the same oak tree; Slates 1992, pp. 227–28, no. 136 (ill.), reviews the essential information, and discusses the modest simplicity with which Rembrandt presents sitters of his own social class; Havemeyer 1992, pp. xii, 19, 24, 143, 300, 310 n. 37, 311 n. 48, 324 n. 200, repeats Havemeyer 1961, with editorial clarifications; Liedtke in New York 1993, p. 62, pl. 63, mentioned in a review of the Havemeyer Rembrandts; Rabinow in ibid., pp. 91, 95, fig. 10 (gallery view); Stein in ibid., pp. 207, 214, 215, 260, records the Havemeyer purchase on March 7, 1896, and later loans of the painting from the Havemeyer collection; Tinterow in ibid., pp. 36, 39, 49, reports that Havemeyer bought the painting for between $70,000 and $200,000, that Mrs. Havemeyer left instructions that the work was to be obtained at any cost, and that in this case her adviser Mary Cassatt was not consulted; Wold in ibid., pp. 372 (ill.), 373, no. 4449; C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 212 (ill.), 216–17, 416, no. 207, detects the influence of Hals, discusses the social class of the sitter, claims that the handling here is looser than in “portraits of the noble and rich” by Rembrandt, and cites the will of Doomer’s wife, in which this picture and its pendant are mentioned; Baetjer 1995, p. 314; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 58–61, 61, 84, 94, 103, no. 8 (ill.), reviews the history of the portrait and its pendant, notes their listing in the will of Doomer’s wife, describes the composition and execution in detail, suggests that the work’s high quality was perhaps a personal tribute to the sitter, and considers the painting as an example of Havemeyer’s taste; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 28–29, 47, 94, figs. 44 (detail), 45 (X-radiograph detail), notes the original bevel on the back of the panel, and compares the execution of the Altman Portrait of a Man Holding Gloves (Pl. 150); Raassen 1996, p. 739, fig. 24, refers to the portrait in an article on Herman Doomer as an ebony worker; Broos 1996b, p. 163, compares the simplicity of presentation with portraits by Rembrandt that “exude social prestige”; L. Campbell, “Portraiture,” in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 25, p. 277; Edwards 1996, pp. 70, 73 (ill.), 308–9 (under no. 145), records the sale of the picture at Paillet, Paris, in 1822; Lank 1996, p. 124, cites the portrait as “beautiful and well preserved,” in a discussion of the Altman Portrait of a Man Holding Gloves (Pl. 150); W. Schulz in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 9, p. 149, mentioned in a discussion of Lambert Doomer; Brockhoff and Franken 1997, p. 78, notes that only this portrait and the Aristotle with a Baa of Homer (Pl. 151), among Rembrandts in the Metropolitan Museum, were reliably documented as by him in seventeenth-century sources; Blankert in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, pp. 174, 177 n. 7, fig. 258 (under no. 25), refers to the sitter’s comparatively simple attire and his modest social station, which is condescendingly described as that of “nothing more than a competent craftsman”; Tinterow in Paris 1997–98, pp. 27, 107, fig. 8, cited in a survey of the Havemeyer collection; Havercamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, p. 151 n. 10 (under no. 32), compares the hat to that in the Lehman Portrait of a Man Seated in an Armchair (Pl. 163); Schama 1999a, pp. 474–76, 521 (ill., overall, and detail), finds evidence here that Rembrandt knew “exactly how to lend grandeur even to the most modest image”; Krempel 2000, p. 125 n. 67, lists works by Rembrandt pupils that are similar in composition; Rabinow in Atlanta–Minneapolis 2001, p. 37, fig. 3, mentioned as an example of H. O. Havemeyer’s “passion for Rembrandt portraits”; Buvlot and Buissé in The Hague 2002, pp. 122, 210 n. 9 (under nos. 19, 20), mentions the picture in connection with the common practice of producing replicas and copies of family portraits; Gilboa 2003, pp. 80–81, observes that Doomer and his wife would not normally have had their portraits painted, were it not for Doomer’s personal connection with Rembrandt; McQueen 2003, p. 271, discusses Walmer’s etching (1884) after the painting; Nadler 2003, pp. 119–20, compares the beard with those of men in other Rembrandt portraits; Sokolova in Dijon 2003–4, p. 41, cites the work in a review of Rembrandts (including this painting’s pendant) in the Hermitage; Dickey 2004, pp. 120, 127 n. 4, calls the portrait a product of “collegial associations”; Quodbach 2004, pp. 90, 94–100, 102, 103, 104–7, fig. 1, reviews the picture’s provenance from the 1865 sale onward.
describes in detail the circumstances of its arrival in New York, where it was "probably America's very first authentic Rembrandt," quotes numerous contemporary appreciations of the work, and sets it in the context of the international and especially the American taste for Rembrandt in the late nineteenth century; Scallen 2004, pp. 187, 358 n. 14, as seen by Bode in Haverney's house; Duparc in The Hague-Schwerin 2004-5, p. 37, fig. 29, observes that the pendant half-length portraits attributed to Care Fabritius (or Rembrandt) in the Duke of Westminster's collection are similar in composition to this picture and its pendant; Bikker 2005, pp. 9, 10, 164, mentions the painting in connection with Willem Drost's brother (who, like Doomer, was an ebony worker), and with a lost portrait by Drost of Doomer's son Lambert; Klein 2005, pp. 34–35, notes that the panel was cut through the center of the tree; Klein in Corpus 2005, p. 652, reports the probable felling date of the tree used for the panel as 1629, and that panels from the same tree were used for four other paintings by Rembrandt; Van de Wetering in ibid., pp. 247, 248, 361, 369, fig. 250 (detail of face), compares the brushwork in the London Self-Portrait (1640) and in the Thyssen Self-Portrait (ca. 1640), and notes that the panels on which the latter work and Herman Doomer were painted came from the same tree; Quodbach 2005, pp. 70–71, 73, 301 n. 39, 42, fig. 3, discusses the portrait as "the first authentic Rembrandt that came to the United States," and reviews the circumstances of its acquisition by Havemeyer, Franken in Van de Wetering et al. 2006, p. 167, fig. 183, mentions the painting in connection with Lambert Doomer's copies and the seventeenth-century demand for copies of portraits; Kelch in Berlin 2006, pp. 266–267, no. 29, covers the usual information, stressing that the sitter's proud bearing was borrowed from Titian; Plomp 2006b, pp. 23, 37, fig. 30, observes that the high standard of execution suggests a personal tribute; C. Tümpeil and A. Tümpeil 2006, pp. 172 (ill.), suggests that Hals's compositions of the 1620s are adopted in this portrait and its pendant; Wuestman 2006, p. 74, notes that the painting was reproduced in 1769 as "Rembrandt's framemaker."

EX COLL.: The sitter (1640–d. 1644); the sitter's wife, Baertje Martens, Amsterdam (1644–d. 1678); her son Lambert Doomer, Amsterdam (1678–d. 1700); his nephew Herman Voster, Amsterdam and Schoonhoven (from 1700); Anthony (Antoon?) Cousin, London (by 1730–5/1750; his estate sale, Langford, London, February 8, 1750, probably no. 53, as "A Man's Head," for £55 13s., together with pendant, no. 54, "Rembrandt. A Woman's Head, its Companion," which was sold for £43 15s.); H. Wolters, Amsterdam (until 1757; sale, May 4, 1757, no. 61, as "Het Portrait van de Schilder Domer, ynde een Borsstukk levensgrote, door Rembrandt" [Portrait of the painter Domer, being bust-length life-size, by Rembrandt], without the pendant); Peregrine Bertie, 3rd Duke of Ancaster, Grimsthorpe, Lincolnshire (by 1769–d. 1778); his widow, Mary, Dowager Duchess of Ancaster, Grimsthorpe (1778–91; her sale, Christie's, London, May 16–18, 1791, probably no. 84, as "A Portrait," for £49 7s. to Tanpant); Van Eyl Suyter, Amsterdam (until 1802; sale, Heebelut, Sale, Paris, January 21, 1802, no. 145, for FFr 5,005 to Unique);² sale, Paris, 1836 (bought by Chavagnac); Mme Gentil de Chavagnac, Paris and Geneva (before 1854; sold for FFr 16,000 to de Morony); Charles-Auguste-Louis-Joseph de Morony, duc de Morony (by 1854–d. 1865; his estate sale, Palais de le Présidence du Corps Légitimist, Paris, June 2, 1865, no. 68, for FFr 155,000 to Salamanca for the duchesse de Morony); his widow, Sophie Troubetzkoi, duchesse de Morony, later duquesa de Sexto, Madrid (1865–82, sold to Mme de Cassin for FFr 210,000);⁴ Mme de Cassin, Paris (1882–83); Charles-Auguste de Morony, 2nd duc de Morony, Paris (1883–84; sold on November 19, 1884, for FFr 210,000 [then $42,000] to Schaus); [William Schaus, New York, 1884–89; sold to Havemeyer on March 7, 1889, possibly for $80,000];¹ Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1889–his d. 1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–d. 1929); H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.1

¹ The same information was conveyed in J. Bauch's letter to the Museum dated November 30, 1977, and in P. Klein's letter to the Museum dated January 25, 1991.
² As noted in Schulz 1973, vol. 1, p. 27, Herman Voster made out a will on December 11, 1726, in which neither this portrait nor its pendant is cited. Herman (or Hermanus) Voster (d. 1726) and his sister Geertje (1650–1716) were the children of Maria Doomer (ca. 1637–before 1682), Lambert's sister. No other grandchildren of Herman Doomer and Baertje Martens were alive when Baertje died in 1678. By leaving the Rembrandt portraits to the oldest (and in this case, only) son of his late sister, Lambert was adhering to the terms of his mother's will of 1668 (and, undoubtedly, of her last will, dated June 30, 1677, which does not survive). See Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 579.
³ See the catalogue's effusive description of the work, quoted in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3, p. 389 (under "Provenance").
⁵ See Quodbach 2004, p. 104 on Schaus's career as a highly respected dealer in Paris and New York and p. 107 on the price supposedly paid by Havemeyer.
149. The Toilet of Bathsheba

Oil on wood, 22½ x 30 in. (57.2 x 76.2 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): Rembrandt f./1643

The foreground and the figures of the old woman and Bathsheba are well preserved; the head and the torso of the servant are badly worn. Severe abrassion in the background on both sides of the figures has resulted in an overall darkening and loss of detail in the landscape, trees, and foliage, as a result of which the tonal balance has shifted and the figural group now appears isolated within the composition.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.651

The Altman panel of 1643 is one of several finely painted cabinet pictures that Rembrandt made during the 1640s, undoubtedly as rather expensive collector's items. One of these paintings, The Woman Taken in Adultery, of 1644 (National Gallery, London), was valued in 1657 at the remarkably high figure of 1,500 guilders.1 Other examples include The Visitaton, of 1640 (fig. 156); The Holy Family with Painted Frame and Curtain, of 1646 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel); and Susanna and the Elders, of 1647 (fig. 161). The last-named picture and Rembrandt's Susanna, of 1636 (fig. 160), are the most obviously comparable as erotic pictures based on biblical stories. Such themes allowed the artist to draw edifying (or diverting) parallels between the presumed male viewer of the painting and the voyeur depicted (in the present picture King David, who somehow espies Bathsheba from the distant palace).3 The subject of Bathsheba was common in northern European art from the early sixteenth century onward, appearing frequently in prints and even in Books of Hours, as well as in paintings intended for private homes.4 It has been observed, on the basis of archival surveys, that "the most popular Old Testament and mythological subjects painted in the Northern Netherlands of the seventeenth century were ones which prominently featured female nudity and usually voyeurism: the Bath of Diana, Susanna and the Elders, Lot and his Daughters, and the Bathing Bathsheba seen by David."

The landscape settings in which Bathsheba and Susanna are discovered—not unlike Diana and her nymphs in Rembrandt's painting of about 1644 (Museum Wasserburg, Anholt)—tend to enhance the sense of exposure, if not always vulnerability (to judge from Bathsheba's expression and unconvincing show of modesty in the present picture). The bright light of day also intensifies the naturalism of Rembrandt's nudes, which in this case is seductively offset by luxurious fabrics, costly vessels, and other motifs that contribute to the exotic atmosphere: the peacocks in the foreground, the (badly abraded) statue of a sphinx or camel in the left middle ground, and the richly dressed attendants, one black and oriental, the other elderly and businesslike. In contemporaneous paintings of Bathsheba, an old woman is often characterized as a procuress, acting and sometimes speaking on behalf of the king.7 David will lie with Bathsheba, give her an ill-fated child, and arrange for the death of her husband, Uriah (2 Samuel 11). The consequences of his desire are not intimated in Rembrandt's oeuvre (he also painted the subject about 1632) until the grand and tragic Bathsheba of 1654, in Paris (fig. 162).8

The Altman painting's quality and even its original design have been obscured by damage inflicted in the past. Condition problems and misconceptions about Rembrandt's style in the 1640s—Gerson (1968; see Refs.) raised the first doubts about authorship when he described the old woman as painted "in the 'Leyden manner'"—have led some critics to consider the picture as essentially a student's work, with, perhaps, some retouching by Rembrandt after an interval of time.9 Except for one or two early supporters of this hypothesis, however, most critics have abandoned it as a consequence of the panel's cleaning in 1995 and reassessment during the "Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt" exhibition of the same year.10

An appreciation of the picture's original appearance can be gained from a comparison of its present state with that recorded in an etching dated 1763 (fig. 153; reproduced here in reverse). As Von Sonnenburg reports, "The background on both sides of the figures is now badly abraded. Much detail in the trees, foliage, and shrubs has been lost."

The description of the vegetation to the right as part of the "background" is perhaps an unconscious reflection of how much has been lost, since that area once clearly advanced from the servant (whose shadow falls on the foliage immediately behind her) to a large tree with branches extending to the left and forward, and from there to the strongly silhouetted pair of peacocks on a leafy bank. The relief of paint in their plumage adds to the impression that they are near at hand.12

It is typical of Rembrandt that a conventional scheme of lighting used to create spatial recession can barely be
recognized as such: that is, the alternation of shadowed zones with bands of light, the main one striking the richly textured base of the tree behind the peacocks. The sunlight falling on the figures from a low point to the left also washes over the shrubs in the middle ground, strikes the tree trunk behind the glittering basin and ever (the silhouette of which echoes that of the more prominent peacock), and—in the engraving—is seen to continue as an area of illumination behind the standing attendant.¹³ These devices, of a sort that would be obvious in most Caravagesque pictures painted in the Netherlands, are lent innumerable nuances by Rembrandt’s handling of light and shadow on the deliberately varied fabrics, such as the pedicurist’s scarf and purple silk robe (itself a technical marvel),¹⁴ the Oriental carpet that undulates languidly from the bench down the steps, and the white chemise and golden gown which radiate, like a less than angelic aureole, around the ample hips of the blonde and bare Bathsheba. In Bathsheba’s figure and that of the old woman, in motifs such as the metal bowl with a sponge, or the hairdresser’s ivory comb and gold bracelet, and in the piled-up drapery and curving steps that descend into the pool of water, one need not refer to the print to see what the painter achieved in the delicate highlights and transparent shadows, which are at least as evocatively veil-like as the gauzy strip of cloth caught under the heroine’s foot.

In Rembrandt’s handling, light and shadow serve psychological as well as physically descriptive purposes. By casting the old woman’s craggy features into shadow, the artist subtly encourages the sort of comparison between her and Bathsheba that viewers of his time would have been inclined to make, which would be to discern what the young woman will eventually become, as her lustrous charms diminish and her fortunes fade.¹⁵ But for now she is proud as a peacock, and brazenly pleased with the sensations her body arouses in men. There may have been personal feelings involved in the subject, as stated (rather too strongly) by Held (1942; see Refs.). This is suggested not by the naturalism of the nude—which is quite idealized compared with earlier nudes by Rembrandt, such as the etching Diana at the Bath, of about 1631—but by Bathsheba’s resemblance to the artist’s wife, Saskia, as she appears, for example, in the romanticized portrait in Washington of several years earlier (figs. 154, 155).¹⁶ The comparison underscores the fact that Bathsheba’s face cannot be considered prettified, especially by the standards of Rembrandt’s ravishing Danaë, of about 1636–43 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), or the cute girl seemingly surprised by paparazzi in the Susanna and the Elders, of 1647 (fig. 161).

Moreau’s engraving cannot convey how in the painting light so tantalizingly falls on Bathsheba’s body, which must have immediately caught the eye in rooms like those

---

Figure 153. Jean Michel Moreau the Younger (after Rembrandt), The Toilet of Bathsheba, 1765. Etching (reproduced in reverse), 13 3/8 x 18 3/4 in. (34.5 x 47.5 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Transfer from the Library 62.695.125
occupied by Rembrandt, Willem Six, the comte de Brühl, Sir Thomas Lawrence, the barons Steengracht, and the other connoisseurs who owned the panel before Altman briefly possessed it (see Ex Coll.). By contrast, the effect of space originally found in the picture is very much clarified by the print. While the impression now is of a relieflike figure group set against a murky backdrop, the engraving shows the figures as occupying three planes in the middle ground, their recession from the seated to the standing servant running counter to the main progression into space, from the peacocks and the steps to the hilly landscape with David’s palace. From there, the artist’s extravagant version of Jerusalem leads the eye toward the horizon but also back to Bathsheba. The development of the scene in depth is as complex, and must have been as successful, as in the somewhat earlier Visitation (fig. 156) and in The Woman Taken in Adultery, of the following year, where steps in the foreground are similarly employed to skillfully link both forms distributed across the stage and motifs close to the viewer (including peacocks, in The Visitation) with those in the distance.

Finally, the engraving illustrates how much detail in the painting has been lost throughout the background, even to the right (where traces of paint correspond to leaves, bark, and branches in the print), but especially throughout the middle ground and background to the left. The general form, if not the details, of the palace are still legible (the print reveals that the structure already needed major repairs in David’s day). However, the rooftops in the city, the broken obelisk, and the Colosseum-like building can hardly be comprehended in the painting without reference to the eighteenth-century reproduction. The trees and bushes leading back to the palace have completely lost definition; cleaning in the past was sufficiently aggressive in this area to completely remove the rock that was painted (by Rembrandt, according to
Von Sonnenburg) on top of an earlier rendering of a sculpted sphinx's or, more probably, camel's head and neck. This motif was inspired by the water-sprouting sphinx in Pieter Lastman's Susanna and the Elders, of 1614 (fig. 158). But the ghostlike muzzle of Rembrandt's animal does not look human, nor does its body serve as a garden seat. That Rembrandt himself painted out the camel's head is plausible, since it would have distracted attention from the old woman and Bathsheba. The standing servant's face bears an odd resemblance to the camel's in that her features (and details of her costume) have been nearly obliterated by solvents and abrasion. In the print, she appears to be another person from a different part of the world, and yet there is sufficient correspondence in details of the headgear and in light and shadow to indicate that the engraved figure is reasonably faithful to the figure painted by Rembrandt.

It has long been recognized that the composition has numerous sources, in paintings by Lastman, in Italian art (at least with regard to the nude figure), and in Rembrandt's own work. Not only the peacocks and aspects of the setting in The Visitation (fig. 156) but also two of the women in that painting anticipate motifs in the Bathsheba, in a manner suggesting rich imagination rather than repetition or borrowing. The similarities, such as they are, show how layers of invention and experience intervene between the Altman panel and its most general model, Lastman's Toilet of Bathsheba, of 1619 (fig. 159). There is some similarity between Bathsheba's poses in the paintings by Lastman and Rembrandt, but the latter's example corresponds more closely with the nearly nude bride in an engraving after Raphael, Alexander and Roxane, where the beauty covers her breast with genuine modesty and two putti take the approximate positions of Bathsheba's attendants. For the type of figure holding the young woman's foot, Rembrandt remembered his own Bathsheba, of about 1632 (known from copies), Lastman's Susanna and the Elders, of 1614 (fig. 158), which Rembrandt copied in a drawing of about 1635–36 (Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin), appears to have been the most important source for the landscape setting in the Altman picture, with its terrace, sculpted creature (already more camel-like in the drawing), recession of trees from the right foreground, and peacock in profile (in Lastman's composition, to the upper right). In his drawing, Rembrandt started revising his former teacher's theatrical staging, suppressing gestures, and making the poses more restrained. That process continued in Rembrandt's Susanna, of 1636 (fig. 160), and in the Altman Bathsheba. What Lastman seems to intend for spectators seated in the last
row of a theater becomes addressed by Rembrandt to a single viewer at the edge of the stage.

In its synthesis of sources and in revisions made in the course of work, the Museum’s picture reveals a creative process that extends what Rembrandt had done earlier and at the same time constitutes a fresh departure, an effort to achieve something distinctive in a crowded field. The painting is unavoidably overshadowed by the Bathsheba of 1654 (fig. 162), a monumental work in which Rembrandt had expressive intentions more comparable with those of Flora or even Aristotle (Pls. 153, 151). In the present work, of 1643, he vastly improves upon the cheeky eroticism of Lastman’s version (fig. 159) and nearly every invention known through prints, such as Maerten van Heemskerck’s didactic and anemic illustration of the story, and the Commandment, “Thou shalt not commit adultery.” Rembrandt’s Susanna of 1636 (fig. 160) similarly breathes new life and lends unprecedented concentration to a subject that Lastman and other predecessors had seemingly exhausted. The two works share not only ideas adopted from Lastman (whose reputation lingered long after his death in 1633) but also aspects of composition and execution that are entirely Rembrandt’s own. A repetition—of Susanna’s chemise with a dangling sleeve, draped behind the figure—is seen in X-radiographs of the Altman panel. The same technical evidence reveals changes in the positions of Bathsheba’s head and right arm. As summarized by Von Sonnenburg, “[these] elements testify to the sequence of recollections involved in Rembrandt’s creative development of the theme over the years.” Sluijter concurs in his most recent discussion of the Altman panel: “Considering Von Sonnenburg’s technical arguments, my own observations and my view of the way in which Rembrandt developed the theme of the seated nude with great consistency—from his first etchings, via his first Bathsheba composition, his Susannas and up to the Bathsheba of 1654—I am also inclined to accept this painting as wholly by Rembrandt’s own hand . . . [and] that it originated in his imagination.”

The different opinion of the Rembrandt Research Project goes back to at least 1990 and remains unmoved by the arguments of Von Sonnenburg and others. With regard to quality, the authors (Franken and Van de Wetering) compare only two works of the 1640s, The Visitation and Susanna and the Elders (Figs. 156, 161). Despite their acknowledgment of “drastic restoration coupled with substantial overcleaning” in the Altman panel, they consider a “want of pictorial cohesion” and of “the unity of atmosphere achieved in the Detroit painting” (which, however, “affords all sorts of correspondences in terms of motifs”) to be indications not of damage but of student work. Bathsheba’s legs are excepted as autograph, following Gerson’s suggestion that the master may have intervened in this area. Other changes in the course of execution are taken as “signs of original invention” but are immediately explained away as a pupil’s borrowing from Rembrandt’s Visitation and (despite its inscribed date of 1647) Susanna and the Elders. In their simplistic description of the Bathsheba’s evolution, the authors of the Rembrandt Research Project rehearse one of their favorite themes: “aspects of Rembrandt’s studio practice that have yet to be sufficiently acknowledged.” The manner in which students derived motifs and designs from Rembrandt is demonstrated by comparing the Museum’s picture with X-radiographs and a drawing (implausibly attributed to Barent Fabritius; q.v.) recording an earlier state of the Susanna and the Elders, which, following an old theory, is said to have been begun by Rembrandt in the second half of the 1630s and finished by him only in 1647. But what the comparison between

Figure 156. Rembrandt, The Visitation, 1640. Oil on wood, 22% x 18% in. (56.5 x 47.9 cm). The Detroit Institute of Arts
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the New York and Berlin paintings actually demonstrates is that they are by the same artist, one whose fascination with female beauty, male desire, and the endless possibilities of artistic creation did not diminish in midcareer.

1. The London panel is discussed in MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 328–30 (n. 25 on its appraisal). As noted by Montias (2002b, pp. 142, 235 n. 86), a Rembrandt painting of Susanna (usually assumed to be the Berlin picture; fig. 161 here) was recorded in 1647 as costing Fl 100.

2. On the Detroit panel, see Kurcisky in Keyes et al. 2004, no. 71, and literature cited there. The Berlin Susanna was most recently considered by Kelch in Berlin 2006, no. 55, and in Sluiter 2006, pp. 131–39.

3. On the Mauritshuis picture, see Broos 1993, pp. 262–68. The male viewer and the theme of voyeurism are considered at length in Sluiter 2006 (chap. 12 for Rembrandt’s Bathsheba), which, with regard to the New York painting, expands on Sluiter 1998b (see Refs.).


5. Loughman and Montias 2000, p. 49.


7. On the old woman as procurer in Dutch paintings of Bathsheba, see Slakey 1983, p. 49, and Sluiter 2006, pp. 337–41. Both quote Philips Angel (1642, p. 50), who, in describing a now unknown painting by Jan Lievens (1607–1674), says that David’s messenger “should be an old woman, well experienced in the art of love, or a Procuree as we call them, to serve as they are commonly used” (Slatske’s translation). The procurer eagerly speaks to Bathsheba on David’s behalf in two paintings by Jan Steen (q.v.), Bathsheba Receiving David’s Letter, of about 1659 (private collection), and Bathsheba after the Bath, of about 1665–70 (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles). For both, see Washington–Amsterdam 1996–97, pp. 133–34 (under no. 11).

8. The Paris painting is discussed by several authors in A. Adams 1998 (where the canvas is variously titled) and in Sluiter 2006, pp. 352–58. Rembrandt’s Bathsheba of about 1612 is known only from copies, the best being a small panel in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rennes (Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 191–94, no. 641). A canvas in the National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, painted by Rembrandt about 1632–33, has been identified in the past (see, for example, G. Schwartz 1985, p. 168, fig. 173) as a representation of the Toilet of Bathsheba (seen, unusually, fully clothed), but this is not convincing (as discussed in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 271–75 [under no. 641]).

9. In addition to Gerson (1968, 1969; see Refs.), C. Tümpel (1986 and 1993; see Refs.) considers the picture (which he has not seen in twenty-five years) as a workshop product. See New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 64, on the opinion of the Rembrandthaus Research Project (J. Bruyn, 1976; E. van de Wetering, 1995), which is simply repeated by M. Franken (2006; see Refs.).

(see note 2 under Refs. below) is one of several specialists whose judgment of the painting changed after its cleaning (oral opinion, November 17, 1995). Firsthand viewing by scholars who have not seen the picture in a number of years often elicits surprise at the quality of some passages, and occasionally at the panel's scale (which is larger than expected by some visitors, a point of interest for the reading of the old woman as Leiden-like, meaning Rembrandt's manner up to 1632). In Golahny 1983, p. 671, the panel is called "diminutive," although it is 32 inches (76.2 cm) wide.

11. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 61. The draft of an entry on the Altman panel, by members of the Rembrandt Research Project (received in February 1998), notes that the engraving by Moreau (fig. 133 here) largely agrees with a print by August Claude Simon Le Grand, which dates from somewhat later. However, an etching by John Burnet, dated 1815, shows the backround in approximately its present state, indicating that the painting had been drastically overcleaned in the intervening years. The Museum is grateful to the Rembrandt Research Project for sharing their evolving analyses of the painting.

12. On this use of paint relief to emphasize nearness, in the peacocks here and in other pictures by Rembrandt, see ibid., p. 31.

13. In the engraving, the treatment of clouds, with the sun apparently behind them, is probably the printmaker's embellishment.

14. See ibid., p. 32, on the "complex buildup of red-lake pigment and smalt [and lead white]" in this passage, on top of pure red-lake paint.

15. On the vanitas significance of the old woman in pictures of Bathsheba, see Sluijter 2006, p. 344.


17. Even allowing for exaggeration, one is struck by the terms in which the painting's palette and light effects were described by writers of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (see Refs.). Valentinier, in 1914, goes so far as to exclaim, "never has

Figure 160. Rembrandt, Susanna, 1636. Oil on wood, 18⅞ x 15⅝ in. (47.2 x 38.6 cm). Koninklijk Kabinet van Schilderijen Mauritshuis, The Hague

Figure 161. Rembrandt, Susanna and the Elders, 1647. Oil on wood, 30½ x 36½ in. (76.6 x 92.8 cm). Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin

Figure 162. Rembrandt, Bathsheba, 1654. Oil on canvas, 35⅝ x 35⅝ in. (92 x 92 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris
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the play of light on a human body been more brilliantly rendered, never has such a body been more magically enveloped in tremulous air.” As G. Schwartz (1998; see Refs.) has suggested, responses to the Bathebeba reflect changes in taste as well as in the picture’s condition.

18. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1991–96, vol. 1, p. 63, figs. 79, 80, reproduces a detail of the left background next to the same area (reversed) in the engraving.

19. See ibid., pp. 61, 63 (caption to fig. 79), on this revision.

20. Before the painting was cleaned in 1995, this area was so obscure that the camel’s neck and head could be supposed to emerge from the bench, as stated in Golany 1983, p. 673. However, Rembrandt’s Bathebeba sits on a piece of furniture more reminiscent of the artist’s studio than the ancient Middle East.

21. See ibid., pp. 673–74, fig. 5, and p. 673 n. 4 on the engraver (Giovanni Jacopo Caraglio) and copies after the once-famous but now lost drawing. In Sluijter 1998b, p. 65, and in Sluijter 2006, p. 346, Rembrandt’s Bathebeba in the Altman picture is called “the unversed mirror-image” of the seated woman in his own Old Testament Heroine at Her Toilet, of about 1632–33 (National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 266–75, no. 464), which is true enough, but the connection with Raphael’s model is stronger.

22. See note 8 above, citing the panel in Rennes. That painting is compared with the Altman picture in Sluijter 2006, p. 345.

23. On Rembrandt’s drawing after Lastman, see Bevers 2006, pp. 82–85, no. 18, where the Mauritshuis Susanna is considered. To the literature cited there may be added Broos 1993, pp. 262–68.

24. Valentine’s repeated references to Tintoretto (1905, etc.; see Refs.) have long since been replaced by the recognition that in Holland alone images of Bathebeba were pouring out of the studios of Willem Buytewech (1591/2–1624), Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem (1562–1638), and other artists, as is suggested (without any attempt at an inventory) in Sluijter 2006, chap. 12. See especially Cornelisz van Haarlem’s Bathebeba at Her Toilet, of 1617, in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin (Van Thiel 1999, no. 26, pl. 320).


28. A draft of the Rembrandt Research Project’s latest entry was kindly sent to the present writer in December 2006. See also Van de Wetering in Berlin 2006, pp. 233–36.

29. That is, by specialists who have been reading about them in Rembrandt Research Project pages for many years. The quote comes from the opening paragraph of the Rembrandt Research Project entry for the Altman picture (version received in 1998). See C. Brown 2007 for sensible remarks on “satellites” and other student works derived from paintings by Rembrandt.

30. See Kelch in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, pp. 236–37 (under no. 37), referring to H. Kauffmann 1924, and to a draft of a Rembrandt Research Project entry on the Berlin panel dating from July 1990. See also Kelch in Berlin 2006, pp. 350–53 (under no. 55). The evidence adduced for a dating of the Berlin picture’s conception in about 1638 is exceedingly thin, having mainly to do with an undated drawing, Old Man in a Turban (National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne), which relates to the elder grabbing Susanna, and which “is executed with pen and a special ink (gall-nut ink) on paper prepared with a yellowish coating, a technique Rembrandt used in the years around 1638” (Kelch in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, p. 236). The original reasons for dating the Susanna and the Elders to about 1635 (according to H. Kauffmann) onward were its connection with Rembrandt’s Susanna of 1636 (fig. 160) and preconceptions about the artist’s stylistic development. See now Sluijter 2006, pp. 313–38.

REFERENCES: Hoet 1752–70, vol. 1 (1752), p. 413, no. 56, lists the painting ("De Historie van Badseba, door Rembrandt van Ryn") as sold for Fl 265 in the Willem Six sale of May 12, 1734, vol. 2 (1752), p. 24, no. 130, as sold for Fl 310 in the Van Zwieten sale of April 12, 1731 (sic; 1741); Basan 1781, p. 15, no. 84, publishes an engraving after the picture by Le Grand, and refers to an engraving by Moreau (fig. 153 here); J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 13, no. 33, as engraved by Moreau and etched by Burtet, describes the composition, observes that “this brilliant and highly-finished picture [by Rembrandt] is dated 1643,” and lists sales, with prices, from 1734 to 1832; Blanc 1857–58, vol. 2, p. 441, as engraved by Schmidt [Smith], erroneously records that the painting was in the collection of William IV, king of England (sic; Willem Six); Thoré 1896, p. 59, mentioned as in the Steengracht collection; Gower 1875, p. 57, describes seeing the picture in the Steengracht collection and considers it “infinitely to be preferred to [Rembrandt’s] ‘Suzanna’ in the Mauritshuis [sic], for, in this picture of Bathebeba he has not only given the wonderful flesh tints we see in the other, but the figure seems to be alive and (how rare a thing in Rembrandt!) she has a beautiful face; the attitude is also more graceful”, Vosmaer 1877, pp. 250–52, 255, 312–33, 586, reports that this "morceau de première qualité" in the Steengracht collection was earlier owned by the comte de Brühl, describes the composition and painterly qualities in detail, and suggests that Rembrandt may have known Willem Buytewech’s engraving of Bathebeba; Steengracht Gallery 1880, pp. 153–54, singles out Sir Thomas Lawrence among the picture’s distinguished owners and praises its quality, observing that “the chief glory of the work lies in the magic of the colouring, the effect of light, and the marvellous flesh-painting of the naked figure”; Rode 1883, pp. 451–52, 559, no. 16, compares the Danse in Saint Petersburg and the Susanna in The Hague, finding “the handling, especially in the naked body, if possible still more delicate and masterful”; Dutuit 1885, pp. 2, 8, 16, 54, 68, no. 28, cite the painting as formerly in the Willem Six collection, considers it probably the same as the one in the Van Zwieten sale of 1741, and lists later collections through "Baron Steengracht"; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 311; Woltmann and Woermann 1879–88, vol. 3 (1888), part 2, p. 699, mentions the “precious” work as one of Rembrandt’s small history pictures of the 1640s; Van Someren [ca. 1893], publishes an engraving of the picture by Steellink; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 243, lists the panel as in the Steengracht van Duivenvoorde [sic] collection; Hofstede de Groot 1896, p. 240, observes that Lastman’s Toilet of Bathebeba (fig. 159 here)
seems to have been the “prototype” for this composition; Hofstede de Groot 1898, unpublished, no. 14 (in text section), and no. 36, pl. 14; Lafenestre and Richteneberger [1898], p. 159 (ill. opp. p. 158), describes the subject and quotes the appreciative lines of É. Michel and “Wosmaë”; Nicolle 1898, pl. 148 (ill. opp. p. 540), compares the Bathsheba of 1654 (fig. 162 here) and admires the modeling and lighting of the nude figure in the earlier picture; Bell 1899, pp. 76, 176, cites the work as “the only signed subject of the year” (1643); t’Hooft 1899, unpaged (ill.); Nicolle 1899, p. 26 (ill.), repeats Nicolle 1898; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 4 (1900), pp. 12–13, 82, no. 246, pl. 246, as “The Toilette of Bathsheba After the Bath,” describes the erotic subject, and declares that “the picture shows a perfection, a truth and delicacy of drawing, a cleanliness of modelling, a fusion of the luminous tints, a clearness and enamelled brilliance of the colours in the light, and a refinement of chiaroscuro achieved in very few other works of this period”; Geffroy [1904], pp. 128–29 (ill. p. 128), suggests that in this painting, “de la qualité la plus rare,” Rembrandt’s [late] wife Saskia might be the model for Bathsheba, who appears “fin et doux, un peu maladif”; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. xxviii, 152 (ill.), 259, 266; Neumann 1905, vol. 1, pp. 213, 304, fig. 71, and vol. 2, p. 436, draws attention to various motifs, in particular the peacocks and the nude figure, and regards the painting as a “wonder of coloristic magic”; Valentiner 1905, pp. 83–84, suggests that Rembrandt’s source for the old woman providing a pedicure may have been a print after Tintoretto’s Susanna and the Elders (Louvre, Paris); A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 209 (ill.), 400; J. Veh 1906a, p. 58, cites the work among biblical pictures by Rembrandt in which the landscape plays an important role; Bode 1908, col. 59, discusses the influence of Lastman’s Toilet of Bathsheba on this “exceptionally accomplished” painting; Freise 1909, pp. 306–11, 313, fig. 4, compares Lastman’s Toilet of Bathsheba at length, finding Rembrandt’s painting far superior in expression and in its observation of “life and nature,” and then compares Rembrandts Bathsheba, of 1654 (fig. 162 here), remarking that the earlier work “has virtually no local coloring,” and what there is is subsumed within a “dark brown overall tone”; Valentiner in A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 228 (ill.), 356, suggests that the composition reveals knowledge of Tintoretto’s Bathsheba (see; Susanna and the Elders) and of Lastman; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 2 (1910), p. 400, lists and concisely describes the picture, and cites four prints after it; Freise 1911, pp. 150–51, 251, 253–57, compares Lastman’s Toile of Bathsheba, repeating much of Freise 1909; Mireur 1911–12, vol. 6 (1912), pp. 157, 159, 160, 161; Steenracht Gallery 1912, p. 522, counts the painting among the masterworks in the Steenracht collection, which will be sold; Dacier 1913, pp. 354–55 (ill. p. 355), praises the “long famous” picture and reviews the remarks of earlier scholars; Dell 1913, p. 238, records the picture’s purchase at the 1913 sale, by Duveen for Altman; Friedlander 1913, p. 351, comments on the very high price brought at the sale in 1913, thanks to Dutch attempts to secure the painting; Lilienfeld 1913, pp. 327 (ill.), 328–29, considers the picture “ein Hauptwerk” because of its richness of composition and execution, although with regard to Rembrandt’s development it looks back to The Visitation, of 1640 (fig. 156 here), rather than forward to later works; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 15–18, no. 9, naïvely describes the subject (“there are all sorts of glittering things nearby” Bathsheba) and gushingly reviews the painting’s reputation in earlier centuries and the prices it has brought (all listed); Schawinsky 1914, pp. 25–30 (ill. between pp. 26 and 27), compares Lastman’s painting in the Hermitage and pictures of similar subjects by Palma Giovane and Gerrit Dou; Valentiner 1914b, pp. 356–17, praises the picture’s conception (like a Leiden painting, and like “a dream from the Arabian Nights”) and its descriptive qualities (“never has the play of light on a human body been more brilliantly rendered, never has such a body been more magically enveloped in tremulous air”), and notes the influence of Tintoretto; Altman Collection 1915, p. 81, mentions the work in a review of the Altman Rembrandts; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 44–45, no. 40, lists sales, collections, and prints after the painting, and describes the subject, including “the palace of King David; from its topmost battlements the king looks down on Bathsheba”; W. Martin 1918, pp. 114, 235, fig. 65, comments on the high price fetched by the work in 1913; Errera 1920–21, vol. 1 (1920), p. 326, lists it as a painting dated 1643; Graves 1918–21, vol. 2 (1921), pp. 170, 180, cites the sales of 1844 and 1850; A. Burroughs 1923, pp. 263 (ill.), 270, observes that “here nothing is hesitant, nothing tentative . . . Bathsheba’s large hands and masculine forearms are as clear evidence of the master’s vision as the illumination throughout the panel is evidence of his idealism”; Jantzen 1923, pp. 60, 62, compares Rembrandt’s Bathsheba of 1654, where he rejects this picture’s “copious depiction of the situation that makes the figures look like accessories”; Meldrum 1923, pp. 10 n. 4, 88, 110–11, 113, 197, pl. CCXII, finds the echoes of Lastman “still louder” here than in Rembrandt’s Susanna, of 1636 (fig. 160 here); Monod 1923, pp. 303–4, perceives “pure poesie” in the work; Breitd 1926, p. 110 (ill.), uses the painting to illustrate the biblical text; Weisbach 1926, pp. 244, 247–48, 429–30, 612 n. 6 to chap. 8, fig. 65, compares Lastman’s Toilet of Bathsheba (fig. 159 here), finding that work academic in composition, whereas here “geht die Bewegung in barockem Tempo” and there are mysterious light effects; Valentiner 1931, unpaged, no. 75, pl. 75, considers the theme and design derived from Venetian art but the manner of execution entirely different; Benesch 1933a, p. 264, considers the composition typical of Rembrandt’s work in the early 1640s; Bredius 1935, p. 22, no. 513, pl. 513, as signed and dated 1643; Held 1942, pp. 11 (detail of Bathsheba), 14, 28 (ill.), senses in this picture “a last farewell to Saskia . . . all the light is assembled alluringly on the soft forms of the supple body while two servants merge anonymously with the shadows of a wooded landscape”; Ivens 1942a, pp. 3, 6, finds the painting “lovely”; Ivens 1942b, pls. 7, 8 (detail of Bathsheba); Breuning 1944, p. 6 (ill.); J. Allen 1945, p. 77, as “a superb example of Rembrandt’s subject painting [and] a scene of rich beauty”; Hamann 1948, pp. 328–30, 333, 337, 364, fig. 237, offers an extended analysis of the picture’s formal and expressive qualities, emphasizing that the coloristic and reflective qualities of various motifs can only be appreciated in the original; J. Rosenberg 1948, vol. 1, pp. 195, 202, vol. 2, pl. 237, describes the painting’s “airy transparency” as typical of works dating from the 1640s, when Rembrandt sought “harmonious tonal unification”; Branssen 1950, p. 128, sees the Louvre Bathsheba (fig. 162 here) as “a direct descendant of the New York picture,” although the later work “is distinguished by its greater simplicity”; Rousseau 1952, pp. 84, 85 (ill.), suggests that “the dark and threatening sky . . . seems to foretell the tragic events which followed this poetic beginning”; Knuttel 1955, pp. 421–24, fig. 2, presents a painfully naïve analysis of a Rembrandt-school picture in Glasgow featuring a similar nude figure, which is seen as the master’s own “exact study from nature” in preparation for the Altman painting.
(the thesis elaborates a casual remark made in Monod 1923, p. 304); Sumowski 1957–58, p. 237, draws attention to a similar composition attributed to Sybilla; Knuttel 1962, p. 97 n. 1, compares the price brought by the painting in 1913 with that fetched by a Brouwer; Kunoth-Leifels 1962, pp. 64, 69–71, 87–88 nn. 141–43, 146–47, fig. 56, in a study of Bathsheba in European art, compares the earlier ideas of Lastman and Tintoretto, noting that the motif of a servant trimming torches is also found in a print after Van Heemskerck, and concludes that what really connects Rembrandt’s picture with Venetian representations of erotic themes is the focus on the female nude and its emphasis by painterly means; J. Rosenberg 1964, pp. 221, 310, 321, fig. 257, repeats J. Rosenberg 1948; K. Bauch 1966, p. 2, no. 25, pl. 25, as by Rembrandt in 1643, notes that King David is visible; Kahr 1966, p. 236, simplistically concludes that “the similarities between Rembrandt’s 1643 ‘Bathsheba at her Toilet’ and the Tintoretto ‘Susanna’ demonstrate the fact that their common source is the ‘Toilet of Venus’ motif”; Gerson 1968, pp. 321 (ill.), 496, no. 213, maintains that “the style of the work is not uniform over the whole surface; the old servant, for example, is in the ‘Leyden manner’ and therefore implies that the picture ‘is a reworking by Rembrandt of some earlier painting by a student’; Gerson 1969, p. 782, as perhaps “an example of a pupil’s picture reworked by Rembrandt;” but the case is “still hypothetical”; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 425 (ill.), 489 (under no. 416), 600, no. 213, repeats Gerson 1968; Localdino 1969, pp. 110 (ill.), 111, no. 250, as by Rembrandt; Rilkin 1969a, pp. 26, 64, rejects Gerson’s opinion, describing the work as “realized masterfully;” and “the general setting and handling of the figures” as typical of Rembrandt in the 1640s; Stechow 1969a, p. 161, as by Rembrandt, who for this composition “leaned heavily on Lastman’s picture of the same subject in Leningrad painted in 1619;” C. Tümpel 1969, pp. 167–68, as by Rembrandt, considers the treatment of the theme here and in the Louvre painting of 1644 (fig. 162 here); Haskell 1970, pp. 276–78, fig. 18, reviews in some detail the circumstances of Altman’s purchase of the picture, through Duvenet, at the Steengraacht sale of 1913; Foucart in Paris 1970–71, p. 182, cites a document recording Delacroix’s copy of this picture or Rembrandt’s Bathsheba in the Louvre; Fowles 1976, pp. 76–77, recalls Altman’s acquisition of the painting in 1913, for “one million francs: the greatest price so far paid for a picture sold at a French auction”; Broos 1977, p. 54, as by Rembrandt, lists formal sources suggested by earlier authors; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 327, listed as a Rembrandt painting of 1643; C. Brown 1981, p. 26, follows Gerson (1968) in describing the painting as “probably the work of a student partially repainted by Rembrandt;” C. Eidler 1983, pp. 85–88, fig. 3, stresses the importance for this composition of Rembrandt’s drawing after Lastman’s Susanna and the Elders, of 1614 (fig. 158 here; both in Berlin), and rejects Gerson’s opinion (1968), concluding that Rembrandt reworked an earlier picture not by a student but by himself; Golahn 1983, pp. 671–75, fig. 1, suggests that Bathsheba’s pose is borrowed from a lost Raphael drawing of Alexander and Roxane, which is known from an engraving; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 4, pp. 2877–78, 2885 n. 56, relates the picture to A Painter and His Model by a Rembrandt follower (Art Gallery and Museum, Glasgow), noting Gerson’s (1968) suggestion, vol. 3, pp. 3567, 3407, indexed under location and subject, as by Rembrandt; G. Schwartz 1986, pp. 226, 228, 234, fig. 245, acknowledges Gerson’s doubts (1968) and weaknesses, but claims that Rembrandt’s “authorship is supported by outside evidence, such as the fact that it was copied by Gijsbert Sibilla”; Flomp 1986, p. 121, in a discussion of Bramer’s drawing recording Lastman’s Toilet of Bathsheba of 1619 (fig. 159 here), notes that Hofstede de Groot (1895b) was the first to make the connection with Rembrandt’s painting of 1643; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 287–88, 419, no. 41 (ill.), as by a pupil, following Gerson (1968); Alpers 1988, p. 75, fig. 3.39, as by Rembrandt, compares the Rembrandt-school Painter and His Model in Glasgow, and claims that in the New York picture “a model is shown preparing, as it were, to play the role of Bathsheba;” Liedtke 1990, p. 48, mentions the picture as one of Altman’s genuine Rembrandts; Buijsen in The Hague—San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 71–72, fig. 14, discusses the Dutch loss of this picture to an American collector in 1913, and reproduces a satirical print of Rembrandt, “now a millionaire,” contemplating the Paris auction from his perch in heaven; Bal 1991, pp. 168–69, fig. 4.13, discusses the voyeurism invited by the picture, where “the nakedness of the woman, emphasized by her passivity, is the real subject matter”; Rand in Conisbee, Levkoff, and Rand 1991, p. 187 (under no. 48), as by Rembrandt, compares Mercury and Argus by Carel Fabritius (Los Angeles County Museum of Art); Keck in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92, pp. 244, 245 n. 6, as attributed by C. Tümpel (1986), “rightly, to the Rembrandt workshop”; C. Tümpel in Amsterdam 1991–92, pp. 81–82, suggests implausibly that in Rembrandt’s famous Bathsheba of 1644 (fig. 162 here), “he borrows the main group from a work [this picture] done in his studio in 1643;” C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 287, 288 (ill.), 422, no. 41, as by a pupil of Rembrandt; Wedel 1994, pp. 33–34, 35, fig. 11, as from the circle of Rembrandt, compares Lastman’s Toilet of Bathsheba of 1619 (fig. 159 here); Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 24, 64–65, no. 10 (ill.), defends the attribution to Rembrandt, and associates the work with paintings by the master that show him continuing “to employ a precisely descriptive technique in the 1640s when it seemed appropriate to the subject or to the intimate scale of the work;” Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 14, 28, 31, 32, 61, 62–63, 94–99, no. 10 (ill.), figs. 77, 121, 124 (whole), 79, 125, 127 (details), 123 (X-radiograph detail), 126 (infrared reflectogram detail), explains the painting’s condition and conservation (1995), finds “evidence of a very consistent execution throughout the composition from the ground up” (p. 94), dismisses Gerson’s opinion (1968), and defends the attribution to Rembrandt; Broos 1996b, p. 167, as “unconvincingly attributed” to Rembrandt; Leja 1996, p. 121 n. 2, mentions the work among paintings of nude women by Rembrandt; L. Miller 1996, p. 731, cites it as an Altman acquisition; Breckhoff and Franken 1997, pp. 78, 80, fig. 1, in a review of New York 1995–96, claims that “borrowings” of motifs from pictures by Rembrandt, such as the peacocks in The Vestitation (fig. 156 here), indicate that the picture is by a pupil, who also lifted ideas from the Susanna and the Elders in Berlin (fig. 161 here), which although dated 1647 “had a very long period of creation, probably going back to 1638;” M. Franken 1997, pp. 71–72, fig. 4, discusses the supposed derivation of the composition from an earlier state of the Susanna and the Elders in Berlin (fig. 161 here); Alpers and Carroll 1998, pp. 154, 156, 159 n. 2, as by a Rembrandt pupil, compares the figure’s pose in the Louvre Bathsheba (fig. 162 here); G. Schwartz 1998, pp. 181–82, 187–88, 191–93, 201 nn. 39, 40, p. 202 nn. 43, 44, describes the reputation of the picture on the art market between 1814 and 1913 and in the scholarly literature of the late nineteenth century and of the late twentieth century, reports sophomorically
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that the Museum “had the painting cleaned for its 1995 exhibition” because the institution was “alarmed” that some scholars had doubted the work, and states (p. 202 n. 44) that these negative reactions “represent a difference in taste between Rembrandt [the picture’s author, in Schwartz’s opinion] and some twentieth-century scholars”; Slijter 1998b, pp. 65–66, 69–70, 81, 82, 84, 86, 93 n. 31, 94 nn. 36, 38, fig. 17, as conceived by Rembrandt but perhaps not entirely by his hand, places the picture in the context of the artist’s various nude female figures, Susannas and Bathshebas, notes the debt to Lastman, and observes that “any suggestion of vulnerability [in the figure of Bathsheba] is dissipated by the self-confident way in which she looks out of the picture, exhibiting her body openly for the beholder” (p. 69); Wright 2000, p. 100, fig. 86, as by Rembrandt, exhibits an “ambiance tendre et sentimentale”; Slijter in Edinburgh–London 2001, p. 247 n. 18, agrees with the connection (made in Golahn 1983) to Raphael’s representation of Alexander and Roxane; Golahn 2002, p. 89, as by Rembrandt, suggests that the artist “referred to Raphael’s primacy in portraying ideal feminine beauty,” and that the nude figure “derives from Roxane in Caraglio’s engraving Alexander Holds the Crown to Roxane”; Gilboa 2003, p. 147, as from Rembrandt’s workshop, describes the scene, remarking that “Bathsheba expresses no sense of shame, but touches her breast in a sign of affirmiative sexuality”; Quodbach 2004, p. 103, cites the picture as one of eight Rembrandts in Dutch private collections, according to Bode (1881); Secret 2004, pp. 117, 478, as an “enchanting Rembrandt,” toward which “Altman launched himself” in June 1913; Klein in Corpus 2005, p. 657, reports that the wood used for the panel is oak and is not datable by dendrochronology; Ball in Amsterdam 2006, p. 121, fig. 36, as attributed to Rembrandt, compares the Louvre Bathsheba (fig. 162 here), observing that in the New York picture “the erotic implications are clear, and the viewer is invited to share David’s voyeuristic enjoyment” of the naked figure; Duco 2006, p. 41, fig. 32, as by a pupil of Rembrandt, without explanation; M. Franken in Berlin 2006, pp. 159–60, fig. 36, as by a member of Rembrandt’s workshop, considers the picture a variant of Rembrandt’s Susanna and the Elders in Berlin (fig. 161 here), which is dated 1647 but said to have been begun about 1638–42 and later altered by Rembrandt; Kelch in ibid., p. 333, in a discussion of Rembrandt’s Susanna and the Elders, alludes to Franken’s idea (2006); Van de Wetering in ibid., pp. 233–36, figs. 8, 10 (detail of the figures), claims that the supposed derivation of the composition from Rembrandt’s Susanna and the Elders (fig. 161 here) and the painting’s execution (except the heroine’s legs, which reveal “autograph retouches” by Rembrandt), indicate that the picture is by an unknown pupil; Van de Wetering in Copenhagen 2006, pp. 120, 122, fig. 26, describes the picture as a “free workshop variant” of Rembrandt’s Susanna and the Elders, of 1647 (“the variant is based on the Susanna in an earlier state, which explains the date 1643 on the painting”); Korthals Altes in Kassel 2006, p. 31, fig. 8, in a review of 18th-century Dutch auctions, mentions this picture in the Willem Six sale of 1734; Slijter 2006, pp. 21, 132, 136, 248, 326, 345–48, 352–55, 361, 363, 404 n. 33, 412 n. 76, 415 nn. 41, 43, 45, 50, p. 416 n. 75, fig. 346 and colorpl. on p. 65, as by Rembrandt (see quote in text above), rejects the views of Franken (1997) and Van de Wetering (2006), discusses the subject at length, and places the picture in the context of Rembrandt’s images of the female nude dating from the early 1630s onward; C. Tümpel and A. Tümpel 2006, pp. 232, 233 (ill.), as by a pupil; Vogelaar in Kassel–Leiden 2006–7, p. 58, figs. 53, 54 (detail of left background), as by Rembrandt, notes the large circular building in the background, which “seems to refer to the Temple of Jerusalem where King David held court.”


EX COLL.: Willem Six, Amsterdam (until 1734; his sale, Schoemaker... ten Brink, Amsterdam, May 12, 1734, no. 56, for Fl 265 to Hoogenbergh); Heer van Zwieten (until 1741; his sale, The Hague, April 12, 1741, no. 130, for Fl 350 to De Hond); comte de Bruhl, Dresden (in 1763); Poullain, Paris (until d. 1780; his estate sale, Le Brun, Paris, March 15–21, 1780, no. 37, for 2,400 livres to Le Brun); [Le Brun, Paris, 1780–at least 1791; his sale, Paris, April 20, 1791, no. 33, for 1,000 livres, bought in]; Alexandre Delahante, London (until 1814; his sale, Phillips, London, June 3, 1814, no. 23, for £105 to Geddes); Sir Thomas Lawrence, London (until d. 1830; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 15, 1830, no. 120, for £157 10s. 10d. to Smith); [John Smith, London, 1820; sold to Vernon]; G. J. Vernon (until 1830–31; his anonymous sale, Christie’s, London, April 16, 1831, no. 48, for £260 13s. to Emmerson); Thomas Emmerson, London (1831–32; his sale, Phillips, London, June 16, 1832, no. 135, for £252 10s. [or bought in by] Wilson); [Phillips, London, from 1823]; Colonel de Brée, Brussels (until 1841; his anonymous sale, organized by Héris, Hôtel Rue des Jeuneurs, 16, rue des Jeuneurs, Paris, March 25, 1841, no. 6, for FF 7,880); Baron Steengracht van Oosterland, The Hague (by 1859–d. 1879); his grandson Baron H. A. Steengracht van Duivenvoorde, The Hague (1875–d. 1912; his estate sale, Georges Petit, Paris, June 9, 1913, no. 61, for FF 1,000,000 [plus FF 100,000 fee to Duveen]; [Duveen, Paris, 1913; sold for $213,621.50 to Altman]; Benjamin Altman, New York (d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.651

2. Christopher Brown, in the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition, revised this opinion, stating that he regarded the painting as entirely by Rembrandt, based on examination after cleaning (oral opinion, November 17, 1993).
150. Portrait of a Man Holding Gloves

Oil on wood (Honduran mahogany), 31¾ x 26¾ in. (80.6 x 67.3 cm)

Overall abrasion has weakened the modeling of the nose, ears, and jawline. The hand is almost entirely reconstructed.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.620

The signature and date on this sensitive portrait of an anonymous gentleman are not indisputably reliable, but the painting’s quality (which has been compromised by cleaning in the past), its strong similarity with Rembrandt portraits of the 1640s, the type of composition, and costume details support the conclusion that the picture was painted by Rembrandt in the second half of the 1640s. The date of 1648 is probably correct.1

In the nineteenth century, when the portrait was in distinguished French and English collections, an inscription at top (presumably the upper right corner) read “Portrait de Janssenius, père d’une nombreuse famille, mort en 1638, âgé de 53 ans.” At the time, the date (the same as that which partially remains) was read as 1661. Despite the patent implausibility of Rembrandt’s producing a posthumous portrait of Cornelius Jansenius (1585–1638), bishop of Ypres, writers such as Smith took pains to point out that the prelate’s progeny was not a “nombreuse famille,” or big family, in the usual sense, but “doubtless alludes to his being the spiritual father of many converts.” In 1890, Bredius (see Ref.) rejected the identification (as other scholars had recently) and wrote that in the London exhibition of that year, the portrait, which was “certainly painted from life,” made the immediate impression of a Rembrandt dating from about 1645: “The face is so carefully modeled, so precisely described, entirely as in the so-called Gilder (Doomer?) which is dated 1640 [Pl. 148]. . . . The lively expression of the eyes [and] the life that the whole portrait radiates are indescribably beautiful.” However, Bredius thought that the hand holding gloves looked very odd. Von Sonnenburg describes the motif as “to a large extent a modern repainting.” X-radiographs reveal “two large patches of pastosed paint” above the hand, which appear to have been “part of a cuff that probably helped to integrate a now rather isolated passage with the rest of the figure.”2

Bredius’s analysis, and the description of the painting in 1847 (see Ref.) as “treated in a fine golden manner, and brilliantly luminous,” suggests that more than the “Jansenius” inscription came off when the work was cleaned (probably between 1907 and 1909, when it was on the market).4 After minor treatments in 1914, 1927, and 1931, conservator Stephen Pichetto, in 1941, turned in a report that reads in full, “Varnished. Dulled surface.” The now notorious Pichetto varnish, which incorporated thick layers of shellac and natural resins, “is among the most difficult coatings to remove,” according to Von Sonnenburg.5 In 1951, conservator Gerhard Wedekind was sent the Altman panel for cleaning, but found that “a thorough examination of the paint film was not possible because of several layers of varnish obscuring its actual condition. Magnification and ultra-violet light seemed to show a great amount of flaked losses scattered all over the paint film. This was confirmed when an area in the right-hand lower corner was cleaned. Numerous flaked losses and abrasions were found.” Treatment was postponed; the painting was eventually cleaned and restored by Hubert von Sonnenburg in 1962.6

The same conservator, in 1993, compared the picture with the unusually well preserved Herman Doomer (Pl. 148), observing that the Altman portrait “holds its own, despite abrasions in the face that have weakened the modeling of the nose in particular and that of the ear. There are also disfiguring retouchings in the area of the jawline and in the white collar, the readability of which is diminished by deposits of yellow varnish. Legibility is reduced as well in the background, where changes in the position of the hat made it susceptible to abrasions.”7

There are very few unquestionable Rembrandt portraits from the period about 1645–50. The comparison with the Herman Doomer, made by Bredius in 1890 and by Von Sonnenburg over a century later, must allow for considerable differences in date and condition, and for the fact that in the portrait of his colleague Doomer, Rembrandt described the face more precisely than in most of his portraits of about 1640, let alone those of nearly a decade later. Furthermore, the sitter in the Man Holding Gloves is a different sort of person than the ebony worker—older, with finer features and smoother skin, and a seemingly more reserved manner. Both portraits are painted on panel, but the Altman painting, quite exceptionally, was executed on Cedrela odorata, an expensive hardwood from Central America. This may indicate that the painter or the patron attached special importance to the commission. Rembrandt’s Descent from the Cross, of 1633
(Alte Pinakothek, Munich), the first of the Passion pictures that Rembrandt painted for the Prince of Orange, is on the same kind of Central American or "Spanish" cedar. 4

The present writer has placed the *Herman Doomer* and the *Man Holding Gloves* side by side on several occasions, and agrees with Bredius and Von Sonnenburg that they are strikingly consistent in key passages, for example, the jawline and cheek, and the skin around the eyes, where the drawing and modeling reveal the same extraordinary ability to suggest structure and softness at the same time. The undersides of the noses are identically defined, with brown arcs around the darker apertures. The eyes on the illuminated sides of the faces are very similar, with the same intimation of moisture to the lower left of the pupil.

And the shadows on the brows and on the darker sides of the faces are handled in nearly the same way. The shadows cast on the wall cannot be compared, since the shadow to the right of the man with gloves is obviously worn, retouched, and unreliable. That the portraits are analogous as well in their understated suggestion of character and subtle description of physical effects will be manifest to impartial observers.

Schmidt-Degener's suggestion, in 1935, that the present painting might be attributed to Jacobus Levecq (1654–1675) was a surprisingly philistine notion coming from the organizer of the Rembrandt exhibitions presented in Amsterdam in 1932 and 1935. 5 The Rembrandt Research Project's still unpublished opinion (1990) that the same minor Rembrandt pupil might be responsible for the Altman portrait goes back to Josua Bruyn's fleeting impression in 1976 ("does not appear good enough for Rembrandt") and conforms to the committee's hypothesis that a number of Rembrandt or Rembrandtesque portraits of the late 1640s and early 1650s are actually by assistants in the master's studio. 6 What appears to be Levecq's finest known work, *Portrait of a Man Holding a Pair of Gloves*, of about 1654–55 (private collection, Europe), was compared with the *Man Holding Gloves* in the catalogue of the "Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt" exhibition of 1995–96, and was considered by both organizers to remove the Dordrecht artist from the realm of competent imitators of Rembrandt, let alone the rank of painters capable of producing a work such as this. In pleading Levecq's case, Bruyn and his colleagues were also obliged to argue that the Museum's portrait dates no earlier than 1653, when the nineteen-year-old was in Rembrandt's workshop. The style of the hat is similarly assigned by them to the 1650s, but the barest reference to a representative sample of portraits, for example in the oeuvre of Johannes Verspronck (q.v.), reveals that hats like this one (with the same size brim and height in the crown) were worn from 1645 onward. Moreover, nearly all scholars in the past, including several faced with a false date of 1661, placed the portrait in the 1640s on stylistic grounds.

The differences as well as the similarities between this portrait and the portrait of Herman Doomer are distinctive of Rembrandt. The early identification of the man with gloves with an intellectual churchman like Janssenius was undoubtedly encouraged not only by a slight physical resemblance (to judge from portrait prints of the bishop) but also by Rembrandt's evocation of a particular disposition through little more than the description of the sitter's eyes. Museum curator Wilhelm Valentin, in 1914 (see Refs.), discovered in the face both physical and spiritual qualities, "the mellowness of the atmospheric envelope, the suppleness of the modeling, and the delicate characterization of a dignified, reticent, modest, well-bred personality," who is assumed to possess "a peaceful contemplative attitude toward life." Eighty years later, Von Sonnenburg's close analysis of technical aspects in the two portraits, which he compares with the aid of large details of the faces and corresponding X-radiographs, concludes with the remark that "the *Man Holding Gloves*, the more formal of the two portraits, represents a sitter of higher social standing and dissimilar personality. Rembrandt's observation of such differences is reflected in his various modes of handling paint." What matters in the present context is not that these responses to an anonymous sitter may not be accurate but that the artist makes them inevitable.

1. On the physical evidence of the inscription, see especially Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 92, fig. 116 (detail of signature and date). As noted in Lank 1996, p. 124, with reference to this picture, such inscriptions are "difficult, or impossible, to differentiate technically by even the closest examination." However, as Von Sonnenburg observes, "the last number close to the cropped right edge of the panel clearly reads as an 8," and the digit reveals no sign of modification or reinforcement.

2. Meaning converts to the Roman Catholic church in the Spanish Netherlands. The quote is from J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7, p. 108 (under no. 297). The unsigned writer in the *Art-Union* of April 1, 1847 (see Refs.), p. 123, evidently misquotes Smith, so that Janssenius becomes the spiritual father of "several converts."

4. The Sedelmeyer catalogue of 1911 (see Refs.) makes no mention of the long inscription, and reads the signature and date as "Rembrandt f., 1641." The Altman catalogue of 1914 (see Refs.) reports simply that the inscription identifying Jansensius "has since been removed," and states (assumed!) that "a false date of 1661 followed the inscription."

5. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 58, where it is noted that Pichetto would brush or pour on varnish until it was as much as ten times thicker than normal.

6. The original of Wedekind's report to Theodore Hobby (curator of the Altman Collection), dated March 23, 1951, is in the curatorial files.


8. See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 278, no. 294, under "Support," citing J. Bauch and Eckstein 1981, p. 234. J. Bauch studied the Museum's Rembrandt panels in July 1977, and reported the results to conservator John Brealey in a letter dated November 30, 1977 (copy in the curatorial files). He identifies the two boards making up the panel of the Altman portrait as Cedrela odorata, notes that it was imported to the Netherlands in the seventeenth century, mentions the Munich Désert as on the same type of support, and adds that "this species is dendrochronologically not datable."

9. F. Schmidt-Degener, oral opinion, recorded by curator Harry Wehle on April 15, 1932. The Dutch visitor referred Wehle to the "Burlington House Exhibition," probably meaning the great "Exhibition of Dutch Art, 1450–1900" held at the Royal Academy of Arts, London, in 1929. Number 368 was Leveco's Young Man with a Hat, of 1654 (National Trust, Polesden Lacey, Surrey), at the time (and now) one of the only known signed works by the artist (see Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 3, pp. 1746, 1749, no. 1183).

10. Bruyn's oral record was recorded at the Museum on June 24, 1976. In 1995, Ernst van de Wetering kindly sent a draft of the Rembrandt Research Project's long entry on the Man Holding Gloves, which is dated August 1990 and credited to Bruyn and Van de Wetering. For examples of the Rembrandt Research Project hypothesis, see Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3, nos. 297, 3106, 3107, and 3114, all belonging to "a group of works attributable to Carel Fabritius." Van de Wetering, visiting the Museum on November 21, 1989, was reminded of Fabritius by the background of the Man Holding Gloves, but favored Schmidt-Degener's suggestion of Leveco.


References: J. Smith 1839–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 108, no. 297, based on an inscription formerly on the picture, describes it as a portrait of Cornelius Jansensius, reads the date as 1661, and gives provenance information, including the fact that Smith himself acted for Tallyrand in selling the work to Alexander Baring, 1st Baron Ashburton; "Visit to Private Galleries," Art-Union 9 (April 1, 1847), p. 123, as "Portrait of Jansen;" in Baron Ashburton's collection, describes the painting as "treated in a fine golden manner, and brilliantly luminous;" and quotes the inscription identifying the sitter; Vosmaer 1877, p. 362, as "Jansensius," dated 1661, records the painting as in Ashburton's collection; Bode 1883, p. 585, no. 190, concisely restates the usual information; Dutuit 1888, pp. 12, 42, 70, no. 340, as "Portrait d'un Vieuxillard, dit Jansensius," questions the identification with Jansensius; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., p. 56, no. 146, says that the identification with Jansensius is probably erroneous; Cook 1887, Bredius 1890, p. 108, calls the portrait "the pearl" of the Rembrandts exhibited in London in 1890, states that it looks more like a work of about 1645, and that its execution is entirely consistent with that of Rembrandt's so-called Gilder (Doomer)? (Pl. 148; see also text above); É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 162–64, 234, believes the inscription is false and the date of 1661 suspicious, and (with credit to Bredius) proposes a date of about 1645–48; Bell 1899, pp. 83, 143, discusses the "mimicked Jansensius" among works of 1661; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 4 (1900), p. 31, no. 377, pl. 277, as "An Elderly Man with a Pointed Gray Beard Holding His Gloves in His Left Hand, erroneously called the Portrait of Cornelius Jansensius," dates it about 1642; A. Rosenberg 1906, p. 190 (ill.), as "Portrait of a Man," about 1642; A. Rosenberg 1909, p. 264 (ill.), as "Portrait of a Man," about 1642; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1911, p. 34, no. 28 (ill.), as "Portrait of an elderly Man with a pointed gray Beard," signed and dated 1641; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 35–36, no. 24, notes that the old inscription and false date have been removed, and that the picture's style is of the 1640s; Valentiner 1914b, pp. 355–56, fig. 2, reads the date as 1641, and praises the portrait's suggestion of physical effects and character (quoted in the text above); Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 355–56, no. 757, as "An Elderly Man with Grey Whiskers," painted about 1642, formerly signed and dated 1661 by a later hand, and left by Altman to the Metropolitan Museum; Valentiner 1921b, p. 125, updates the location; A. Burroughs 1923, p. 272, maintains that "the sense of inherent conviction . . . seems lacking;" Meldrum 1923, p. 194, pl. CXXXIV, mistakenly as "Portrait of a Man (wrongly called Jan Six)," dating from about 1642; Monod 1923, p. 304, as dated 1640–42 ("the last digit effaced"); compares Rembrandt portraits of 1641 and 1647, and suggests that the sitter might be a lawyer, given his "intelligence froide et aggressive;" Valentiner 1933, unpagd, no. 73, pl. 73, dates the picture about 1640–42; Bredius 1935, p. 10, no. 221, pl. 221, as "Männliches Bildnis," notes that the old inscription and the date of 1661 have come off; K. Bauch 1966, p. 20, no. 387, pl. 387, tentatively reads the date as 1643; Gerson 1968, pp. 341 (ill.), 498, no. 245, dates the painting to the second half of the 1640s and considers its execution "rather weak;" Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 179 (ill.), 166, no. 221, repeats Gerson 1968; Lecaldano 1969, p. 112, no. 264 (ill.), dates the work about 1645; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 190, no. 322 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; signed and dated 1641–42; C. Tümpel 1986, p. 209 (ill.), 413, no. 209, as from about 1641, describes the portrait as "certainly better than no. 291 [the ex-Thysen Portrait of a Man; Bredius no. 222], about which Gerson expresses no reservations;" Liedtke 1990, fig. 36 (Altman gallery view); Cabanne 1991, p. 150, no. 6 (ill.); C. Tümpel 1993, p. 209 (ill.), 416, no. 209, repeats C. Tümpel 1986, but adds "Rembrandt?" in the caption; Baetjer 1995, p. 314; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 61–63, no. 9 (ill.), reviews the opinions of connoisseurs, dismisses an unpublished suggestion that the painting may be by Jacobus Levecq, compares the Museum's portrait of Herman Doomer (Pl. 148), reports that technical examination of the date indicates that it reads 1648 and considers this consistent with the picture's style; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 28, 47, 92–94, no. 9 (ill.), figs. 46 (detail), 47 (X-radiograph detail),
116 (detail of signature), 117 (X-radiograph), notes that the panel is made of “Honduran mahogany,” observes how Rembrandt’s handling of paint reflects his attention to physical characteristics, personality, and social standing, and considers the date of 1648 to be convincing, whether or not it was inscribed by Rembrandt himself; Lank 1996, p. 124, in a review of New York 1995–96, compares the views of the authors with those of the Rembrandt Research Project, stressing the uncertainty of signatures and dates; Ketelsen in Hamburg 2000–2001, vol. 2, pp. 32, 40 n. 144, fig. 15, considers the work typical of Rembrandt portraits dating from the late 1640s, noting that the costume and the type of composition help place pictures like this one in chronological order; Scallen 2004, p. 373 n. 49, as doubted in A. Burroughs 1933; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 660–61, reports that the first ground contains chalk, and the second ground lead white and ochre or umber; Klein in ibid., p. 616, identifies the wood used for the panel as Cedrela odorata; Liedtke 2006, p. 129 n. 35, feels that the duke of Westminster’s Portrait of a Man, attributed to Rembrandt, is very similar in execution to this picture.


**Ex Coll.:** Duc de Valentincois, Paris; 1 Monsieur de Séréville, Paris (until 1812; his sale, Paillet, Paris, January 22, 1812, no. 19, for FF 5,071 to Le Brun, for Talleyrand); Prince Talleyrand (1812–31; sold for 500 livres through Smith to Ashburton); Alexander Baring, 1st Baron Ashburton, London (1831–d. 1848); the Barons Ashburton, London and The Grange, Alresford, Hampshire (1848–89); Francis Dzenil Edward Baring, 5th Baron Ashburton, London and The Grange (1889–1907; sold to Sulley); [Sulley and Co., London, from 1907]; [Sedelmeyer, Paris, until 1909; sold to Altman on October 8, 1909, for $125,000]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1909–d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913

1. See Rembrandt, Self-Portrait (Pl. 157), Ex Coll., note 2 (p. 692)
151. Aristotle with a Bust of Homer

Oil on canvas, 56⅜ x 33⅞ in. (143.5 x 136.5 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left, on base of bust): Rembrandt f/1653

The painting is well preserved. There is a small loss in the mustache to the left of the philosopher's mouth. The only damage of significance is in the tunic, which now appears completely black and formless where large areas of the paint are severely abraded. A portion of a selvage is visible along the left border, which suggests that the original support was made from a piece of fabric 2 ells (5½ in. [140 cm]) wide, a standard seventeenth-century Dutch strip-width. X-radiography reveals the presence of deep cupping around the perimeter, which confirms that the painting is close to, if not exactly, the original dimensions.

Purchase, special contributions and funds given or bequeathed by friends of the Museum, 1961 61.198

Rembrandt's Aristotle with a Bust of Homer, the most important Dutch picture in America, was painted in 1653 for the Sicilian nobleman Don Antonio Ruffo (1610/11–1678) and sent from Amsterdam to his palace in Messina during the summer of 1654. The canvas made a less hazardous voyage by sea (one of at least four in its history) when Joseph Duveneck had it shipped from Paris to New York in 1907. It was purchased that year by Arabella Huntington (d. 1924), widow of one of the Metropolitan Museum's early benefactors Collis P. Huntington (d. 1900). In 1925 and 1926, their son and heir, Archer, presented the Museum Rembrandt's Flora and Hendrickje Stoffels (Pls. 153, 154), Vermeer's Woman with a Lute (Pl. 204), and more than thirty other paintings. However, he retained the Aristotle, selling it back to Duveneck in 1928. Alfred Erickson bought the picture at the end of that year, returned it to Duveneck after the stock market crash of 1929, and retrieved it shortly before his death in 1936. At the sale of his widow's estate, on November 15, 1961, the Aristotle became the only painting by Rembrandt (or thought to be by Rembrandt at the time) that the Museum ever acquired by purchase rather than by gift or bequest.

The familiar former title, "Aristotle Contemplating the Bust of Homer," was introduced by Brcdius in 1936 (see Refs.) but gained currency only when it was employed in the 1961 sale catalogue and then by the Museum. A precedent is found in the 1824 collection catalogue of Sir Abraham Hume, where the figure in the painting, then identified as the Dutch poet and historian Pieter Cornelisz Hooft (1581–1647), is presumed to be "in the act of contemplating the Genius of Homer." For Hooft ("the Dutch Homer") and his contemporaries, there was no greater commentator on the Iliad and the Odyssey than Aristotle (384–322 B.C.). And yet for decades after the philosopher was revealed to be the picture's subject (in Hoogewerff 1917; see Refs.), the Hellenistic head was construed by most scholars simply as an attribute, not unlike the Roman bust in the Rembrandt-school Portrait of a Man ("The Auctioneer") (Pl. 173). Those who assigned more significance to the sculpture did so ambiguously, as with Neumann's notion of a "silent dialogue" between ancient authors, or erroneously, as when the antiquity was said to be visually scrutinized by the savant.

Such misinterpretations and instances of misinformation—for example, that Ruffo commissioned a painting of a philosopher from Rembrandt—are corrected in Julius Held's classic article of 1969. He notes that the shadowy eyes of the figure do not appear to focus on anything, but with the arrested pose suggest a person lost in thought (as in the artist's early paintings of Saint Paul). According to Held's interpretation, Aristotle compares "two sets of values": on the one hand (literally, one might say), everything that he admired in Homer—gravity, humility, "unequalled diction and thought"—and, on the other, wealth and worldly honor, as embodied by the gold chain given to Aristotle (in Rembrandt's imagination) by his royal pupil, Alexander the Great (356–323 B.C.). This reading is supported by Held's erudite remarks on what the two Greek authors (the one some five hundred years in the other's past), the gift of gold chains, and princely patrons meant to seventeenth-century artists, and by his impressions of what such themes as blindness, inner vision, material rewards, mortality, and lasting fame would have meant to the painter. There is much to contemplate in Held's essay, which is summarized below, generally supported, and somewhat amplified. It was with Held's article in mind that curator John Walsh, as early as 1972, gave the picture its present title, which in its lack of specificity allows the viewer to appreciate the range, if not precisely the content, of what Aristotle might have in mind.

The text following is divided into three sections: Early History (on the commission, the patron, related works in Ruffo's collection, and its dispersal); The Subject and Its Significance; and closing remarks on Form and Content.
Early History
Ruffo inventories published in 1914–18 and in the past few years document the Aristotle from shortly after it was made and allow its history to be traced through later periods almost without interruption. The first mention of the painting in Antonio Ruffo’s collection is a record in his inventory: “1654 a 1 settembre—Rembrandt—Palmi 8 e 6—Mezza figura d’un filosofo qual si fece in Amsterdam dal pittore nominato il Rembrandt (pare Aristotle o Alberto Magno)” (1654 on 1 September—Rembrandt—palmi 8 x 6—half-length figure of a philosopher made in Amsterdam by the painter named Rembrandt [it appears to be Aristotle or Albertus Magnus]). As discussed below, the Aristotle and two other paintings that Ruffo ordered from Rembrandt, Alexander the Great, of 1660–61 (now lost), and Homer, dated 1663, in the Mauritshuis, The Hague (fig. 163), remained in the Ruffo family until at least 1783; the Aristotle and the Homer may have been in Sicily until as late as about 1802, or in any event until not very long before their sale in London in 1810 (see Ex Coll.).

Don Antonio Ruffo, 1st Prince of Scalaetta (from 1672), came from one of the great aristocratic families of southern Italy. His father, Carlo I (1566–1610), 1st Duke of Bagnara, died a few months before Antonio was born. His mother, Antonia Spadafora (d. 1619), moved from Bagnara (near Catania, in Sicily) up the coast to Messina, where she commissioned a majestic palace. It was finally completed in 1646, and from that year onward Don Antonio purchased paintings in considerable numbers (he had 364 at his death), as well as silver, coins and medals,
and tapestries (two of which were after designs by Rubens). The prince was mainly interested in pictures by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century masters, including artists then in the middle or later parts of their careers.\textsuperscript{10} The first inventory of Ruffo’s collection, made in 1648, indicates that in addition to works by Matthias Stom (q.v.) and other painters active in Sicily, the prince had quickly acquired pictures by important artists who worked in Naples (including Ghezeppe de Ribera, Artemisia Gentileschi, and Massimo Stanzionale), in Rome (Giovanni Lanfranco, Nicolas Poussin, Andrea Sacchi, Simon Vouet, among others), and in Bologna (Guercino and Guido Reni).\textsuperscript{11} Nearly all of Ruffo’s collecting was done through agents or with the help of family members such as his brother in Rome, the abbot Flavio Ruffo (d. 1656), and his nephews Tommaso Ruffo in Bologna and Fabrizio Ruffo in Naples. Don Antonio rarely left Messina, where his knowledge of contemporaneous painters would have been gained mostly through correspondence and conversations with artists and cognoscenti.

Apart from the exceptional pace of acquisition between 1646 and 1648, the Ruffo inventory covering that period reveals a few preferences of interest for the \textit{Aristotle}. The prince supported local artists but went out of his way to purchase works by famous masters. The variety of names and frequent reference in the inventory to their city or country suggests an intention to represent different schools. Thus, we read entries such as: (entry no. 1) “\textit{quattro [i.e., \textit{quadro}, a painting] Mezze Figure di. Gios.pe Ribera di Napoli}” (which is further specified as one of four half-length pictures of male saints by Ghezeppe de Ribera); (2) “\textit{quattro Mezze figure di Pietro Novelli Monrealese}” (one of four half-length religious pictures by Pietro Novelli of Monreale); (3) “\textit{uno quadro di Ant.o Vandijck fam.go}” (a painting by the Fleming Anthony van Dyck, which is the Museum’s \textit{Saint Rosalie Interceding for the Plague-Stricken of Palermo}, of 1624); (4) “\textit{dii Mezze figure, Ritratti dal Naturale di Mano di Monsù Vuet francese}” (two half-length portraits from life by the hand of the French master Vouet); (7) “\textit{uno quadro Maddal.a Mezza figura di p.mi 2 è 3 di mano di Guido Reni Il Bolognese}” (a half-length picture of the Magdalene of 2 x 3 \textit{palmo} by Guido Reni, the Bolognese); (8) a mythological work “\textit{di Mano del Pussino francese, comp.to In Roma}” (by the Frenchman Poussin, bought in Rome); (55) “\textit{due teste di Mano di Matteo Stom fam.go}” (two heads by the Fleming [meaning Netherlander] Matthias Stom); and (62) a large \textit{Fable of the Satyr and Boors} by “Giordano di Anversa” (Jordaens of Antwerp), which is described as sent from Antwerp to Messina.\textsuperscript{12}

The last entry is significant for Ruffo’s slightly later approach to Rembrandt, because in the second half of the 1640s, Jacob Jordaens (1593–1678) was recognized as the greatest living master in the Spanish Netherlands, and Ruffo apparently sent a request to Antwerp for a painting by him (and, as it happens, received one of his most typical works). The 1648 inventory lists paintings by other Netherlandish artists, but they were acquired in Palermo (the Van Dyck and works by Stom), in Rome (a few pictures by one Giovanni de Hollander, sent by Flavio Ruffo), or right in Messina, where Ruffo evidently commissioned several large canvases (including two pairs and a set of four) by the Dutch marine painter Abraham Casembroot (before or in 1593–1658).\textsuperscript{13}

It is obvious from the Ruffo entries quoted above (which are fairly representative of the 1648 inventory as a whole) that the collector purchased a good number of works depicting single figures in half-length, and that he often bought paintings in pairs and sets. Many of the paired pictures do not appear to have been true pendants but were simply works that balanced each other well. It was customary in Italian palaces of the period to display paintings in symmetrical arrangements, ascending from a normal viewing height to the ceiling. This conspicuously expensive form of interior decoration (and display of connoisseurship) is known to have been adopted by Ruffo.\textsuperscript{14} Thus, the size and broad outlines of a composition (for example, a half-length figure turned to one side) must often have been stipulated when Ruffo sought paintings on the market or commissioned new works. An example of the former would appear to be number 21 in the 1648 inventory, a portrait of a man wearing gloves “di Mano di Titiano” (but, implausibly for Titian, on a panel only one \textit{palmo} [about 10½ in., or 25.8 cm] high), which is paired with a male portrait “di Mano fam.ga Antica” (by an old Flemish master). An example of the latter—a commissioned work of a certain size and design—is well known from discussions of the \textit{Aristotle}, that is, Ruffo’s request in 1660 for a pendant picture from his favorite artist, Guercino (1591–1666; another instance of Italian and Northern works being juxtaposed). Guercino’s painting, \textit{A Cosmographer}, is lost, but its approximate composition is known from a drawing in Princeton (fig. 169), to which we will return.
Based on a close study of the documents and Ruffo's method of collecting, Giltaij (1999; see Refs.) concludes that the prince probably instructed his agent to ask Rembrandt for a picture of any subject he chose, but preferably one of a certain size and perhaps depicting a “mezza figura” of some sort. Had Ruffo actually “ordered from Rembrandt for his library a portrait of Aristotle,” as Benesch reports, the collector would presumably not have recorded the work shortly after receiving it as either a representation of Aristotle or, as an unexpected substitute, a portrait of a philosopher who lived sixteen centuries later, namely Albertus Magnus (Saint Albert the Great; 1206–1280).15 There is no evidence whatsoever that Ruffo requested a painting of a philosopher, as is often stated,16 nor is he known to have collected pictures of philosophers before the 1660s. It remains possible that Ruffo or a middleman attended to a suitable subject beforehand, but it appears much more likely that, as Held insists, the choice was left entirely to Rembrandt.17

To place the order, Ruffo employed an agent in Messina, Giacomo di Battista, who did business with a wealthy Amsterdam merchant, Cornelis Gijsbrechtsz van Goor. In a letter dated June 19, 1654, Van Goor, who traded in the Middle East and Italy, wrote in Italian to Di Battista about cargo going to Naples on the ship San Bartolomeo that would include in the captain’s care a crate containing “la pittura p.il vostro Amico” (the painting for your friend). Van Goor then lists amounts due, beginning with FL 500 “for the painting by Rembrandt as per invoice,” and five routine charges for crating, local transport, loading on shipboard at Texel, and so on. The back of the letter bears the inscription, “1654 a 20 Luglio / Amsterdam del Cvangao / di 19 . . . .” (1654 on 20 July / Amsterdam from C. van Goor / of 19 . . . .) and the address, “Al mag.co S.rj giacomo di Battista / Messina.” Giltaij describes July 20 as the date the letter was sent and, on another date, as the date it arrived in Messina.18 Perhaps Van Goor simply misdated the back of his folded letter “20 Luglio” rather than “20 Giugno” (one day later than the date inside). In any case, the ship did not reach Sicily in July. Beunen (1995; see Refs.) quotes a letter dated September 16, 1654, from Abraham Casembroot, Dutch consul at Messina (from 1649 to 1658), to the States General in The Hague, reporting “the arrival here from Naples of skipper Pieter Heijnse, with his ship named S. Bartholomeus on 19 August last, having been loaded in Amsterdam with freight for Naples, Messina, and Ancona.”19 This is the same Casembroot who painted nine pictures listed in the Ruffo inventory of 1648.20 Perhaps he was helpful in transferring the Aristotle from the ship to Ruffo’s palace, where it was recorded thirteen days later. A more intriguing possibility is that it was Casembroot, as Dutch consul, an artist, and presumably something of a connoisseur (he came from a distinguished family), who proposed to Ruffo that he order a picture from Holland’s greatest painter. It appears, however, that the commission was not sent through diplomatic channels but through Ruffo’s “amico” Di Battista and through Van Goor, who was a respected member of Amsterdam society.21

The entry in Ruffo’s inventory recording the “Aristotle or Albertus Magnus” on September 1, 1654, is accompanied on the same page by an entry dated January 8, 1657, listing expenses for mirrors, frames, and similar items, including “3 ounces [of gold] for a frame of the painting of Albertus Magnus.”22 Evidently, the painting remained unframed for more than two years, or it was thought to be unsuitably framed. The description of the subject as Albertus Magnus is probably no more than a shorthand repetition of the adjacent entry dated 1654. The name appears again in the Ruffo inventory dating from 1668–77, where the painting (with the Alexander and the Homer cited as companions) is said to depict “un Aristotile o sia Alberto Magno che tiene la man dritta sopra una testa” (an Aristotle or an Albertus Magnus who rests his right hand on a head).23 In a 1783 inventory of Ruffo pictures, the subject is described simply as “Alberto Magno” (again in the company of Alexander and Homer).24 It seems safe to say that any reference to “Alberto Magno” in Ruffo inventories dating from the entry of 1654 does not represent further thinking on the matter but the compiler’s reference to earlier inventories when making his own.25

Ruffo’s later dealings with Rembrandt need concern us only insofar as they bear on the subject or the history of the painting in New York. There is no evidence to suggest that the artist or the patron envisioned complementary pictures of Homer and Alexander at any time during the 1650s. Ruffo’s request for a companion picture by Guercino, to which the painter responded in a letter dated June 13, 1660, indicates that the collector was more concerned with a decorative than an intellectual scheme. Referring to “the half-length figure by Rembrandt that has come into Your Excellency’s hands,” Guercino agrees to do a companion piece “in my first broad manner . . . according to your orders.” He asks for the measurements.
and “a small sketch of Rembrandt’s painting, done by some artist, so that I might see the arrangement of the half-length figure. . . I shall also wait for the subject that I am to represent so that I may conform most closely with the wishes of Your Excellency.”26 In a letter to Ruffo dated August 18, 1660, Guercino writes, “as for the subject that I should depict to accompany that of Rembrandt of which Your Excellency has allowed me to see a sketch, to be honest I have not yet applied myself to it but will think of something.” Indeed he did, for less than two months later Guercino had “finished both the copper panel [a small painting for Ruffo] and the figure in half-length” (letter of October 6, 1660). Regarding the latter, made “to accompany Rembrandt’s which I judge to represent a Physiognomist, I thought it most fitting to make a Cosmographer as in fact I have.”27 Guercino’s canvas was recorded in Messina on February 6, 1661, as “Cosmographer with a turquise turban on his head who considers a map of the world held with his left hand above a small table and who gestures toward it with his right hand.”28 The only known visual record of the Cosmographer is Guercino’s drawing in Princeton (fig. 169), where the “map of the world” is a globe. Obviously, the bust of Homer in Rembrandt’s painting was not recognized (or recognizable) as such in the sketch Guercino received.

It is not known whether Ruffo asked Rembrandt for a companion picture before, after, or at about the same time as he approached Guercino. An invoice dated “Amsterdam 30 July 1661,” written in Italian by an unnamed party, begins with the entry, “bill for a painting titled Alexander the Great made by the hand of the painter Rembrandt van Ryn for the account of Messina for which I have already paid as per agreement made with the painter . . . f 500.” The next line records Fl 18 paid “p[er] la tela del Alessandro e Humero” (for the canvas of the Alexander and the Homer), that is, for the bolt of canvas used for the supports on which the Alexander and the Homer were painted.29 The list of other expenses, such as framing (the modest price of Fl 7.10 suggests a travel frame), crating, customs, and insurance, is followed by a note in Italian stating that the painting is being shipped on the Groot Croenenburgh and that “the painter Rembrandt reminded me that Homer must be further painted, which he will do for Fl 500 in such a manner that he will make an arch at the top of the canvas, so that it will stand well next to the other one in order to put the Alexander in the middle if that is what you want let me know.”30 This remark may be somewhat mistaken, since one would expect the painting in the middle, if any, to have an arched top, and the one opposite the Aristotle to share its rectangular format (which is certainly original).31

On November 1, 1662—more than a year after he would have received the Alexander and the unfinished Homer—Ruffo addressed a letter to the Dutch consul in Messina, Giovanni Battista Vallembro (Van den Broeck), “upon his arrival in Amsterdam.”32 It asks the diplomat to inform “Isach Just” that the patron finds “little satisfaction with the painting of Alexander which he commissioned,” and which has cost him more than he paid for the “Aristotle” some years earlier. Here, in a letter rather than an inventory, is Ruffo’s own reference to the Museum’s painting simply as a representation of Aristotle, which (as Held suggests) was probably clarified for him once Rembrandt had been asked for companion pictures.33 The letter also refers explicitly to Giacomo di Battista and Cornelis van Goor as the gentlemen who conveyed the first commission. As for the Alexander, the collector complains that it was painted on four pieces of canvas sewn together and that there is no such thing in the “two hundred paintings of the best subjects in Europe that the said person owns.” By contrast, “un altro d’homero mezzo finito sopra tela bella e nova” (another [picture] of Homer half finished on fine and new canvas) will be returned to Rembrandt in order to be completed.34 This familiar story continues with the unfinished picture going back to Amsterdam during the autumn of 1662, the Alexander remaining in Ruffo’s collection (it was entered into the inventory on November 20, 1662), and the Homer (which is dated 1663) arriving back in Messina on May 20, 1664.35

The recently published inventory of 1783, made immediately after a major earthquake, proves that the three paintings by Rembrandt were still together and were considered an ensemble (each picture is valued at onze 210 and is accompanied by the notation, “sono tre” [there are three]).36 Thus, Rembrandt’s Man in Armor (Art Gallery and Museum, Glasgow), which was in England by 1764, cannot be Ruffo’s Alexander, as some scholars have assumed.37 The Homer, which was described in 1824 (see Refs.) as ruined by “exposure to the sun,” was probably damaged by fire at the time of the earthquake.38 The last member of the Ruffo family who owned the Aristotle and the Homer (and, for all we know, the Alexander) was Don Giovanni, 7th prince of Scalella, who died in 1802.39
How and precisely when the Aristotle and the Homer were transferred to England are details that remain to be discovered. It seems very probable that the two pictures are identical with Rembrandt's "Portrait of a Sculptor with a Bust," and "The Companion, a Schoolmaster with his Pupil," which brought high prices in the Vaughan sale at Christie's, London, on February 17, 1810 (see Ex. Coll.). By 1815, the Aristotle was in the collection of Sir Abraham Hume, and its history is clear from that point onward.40

The Subject and Its Significance

It has been more than three hundred and fifty years since Ruffo received the picture in Sicily, and a century since scholars debated whether its subject is Ariosto, Tasso, Virgil, an imaginary man of letters, a philosopher or "savant," or an actual scholar or poet of the painter's time (see Refs. 1877–1917). Like the early nineteenth-century identification of the figure with Pieter Cornelisz Hooft, most of the suggestions made between about 1895 and about 1915 depended on the bust of Homer being recognized as such. The costume would have encouraged the identification with Torquato Tasso (1544–1595); in the 1800s, the flowing white gown's derivation from Venetian paintings (compare Flora's chemise in Pl. 153) did not forestall suggestions that the figure might be Hooft or another of Rembrandt's contemporaries. Shortly before the publication of Ruffo inventories (in 1914 and 1916), the Museum's curator William Valentiner, in the catalogue of the 1909 "Hudson-Fulton" exhibition, dealt with the costume question by describing the subject as "more probably an ideal portrait of Virgil" than of Tasso.41 In 1917, when Hoogewerff connected the newly published Ruffo documents with the painting in New York, he excused recent misinterpretations by observing that the "fantastic costume would indeed not easily lead one to think of Aristotle" as opposed to Tasso or another historical figure.

This remark sheds a revealing light on Ruffo's response to the painting in 1654. Less than two weeks after seeing the canvas for the first time, the collector described its subject as a "half-length figure of a philosopher [who] appears to be Aristotle or Albertus Magnus." According to Held, Ruffo's "ignorance of, and apparent indifference to, the actual subject of the work" is one of the oddest aspects of the story.42 And yet, with the help of Held's contribution, it is now possible to see that the first name entered into Ruffo's inventory was correct and that the other name was the best second guess ever made. If ignorance played any part, it was that Ruffo, like Guercino, did not recognize Homer in the features of the bust. This made his speculation about Albertus Magnus possible and his recognition of Aristotle—despite the costume—all the more remarkable.

Held's analysis of the subject was briefly summarized above. According to his widely accepted hypothesis, Aristotle weighs the merits of worldly success, of status and wealth, as opposed to the spiritual rewards of literature, art, and knowledge. The more lasting values are represented by Aristotle's great hero Homer, and temporal concerns by the medallion bearing an image of Alexander and by the cascading strands of gold. Whether or not a portrait of Alexander may be discerned in the sketchy relief of the medallion has been debated but is a moot point, since the image obviously represents a man in antique armor, the type conforms to idealized Renaissance portraits of Alexander, and it was fairly common knowledge (gained from Plutarch and other sources) that Aristotle, at the request of King Philip of Macedon (ca. 382–336 B.C.), served as the young prince's tutor until his succession to the throne and departure for Asia in 335 B.C.43 Inspired by Aristotle's teaching, Alexander had the highest regard for Homer, and carried a copy of the Iliad in a casket taken from the spoils of victory over Darius, king of Persia.44

To what extent Rembrandt knew the circumstances of Aristotle's life cannot be deduced from the picture. Held draws attention to Plutarch's report (in Alexander, chap. 54) that Aristotle fell out of favor with the prince, and he relates this detail to the melancholic mood of Rembrandt's philosopher. But the same disposition was considered dé rigeur for thoughtful men of the 1600s (a sentiment to which Constantijn Huygens subscribed), on the authority of Renaissance writers such as Marsilio Ficino and a text attributed to Aristotle.45 In any case, Rembrandt presents Aristotle at or near the peak of his career, with books and a bust defining the setting as a scholar's study. (As in seventeenth-century libraries, a curtain, perhaps of velvet, protected the folios; its folds were probably discernible in the right background as well, before aging and interventions took their toll on the dark layers of paint.) Held reviews the belief that it was Aristotle who formed the first library, the claim (in Pliny) that Asinius Pollio, a friend of Julius Caesar's, started the literati custom of embellishing studies with busts of great men (especially Homer), and the tradition that in the Renaissance and
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Baroque periods, “any man of learning or at least of intellectual pretensions” would do the same.\textsuperscript{46}

In scholar portraits painted by Rubens and artists in his circle, it is made clear, as Held observes, that “a special bond links the living personages and the bust.”\textsuperscript{47} But Held also distinguishes the Aristotle from conventional portraits of scholars and dilettantes (compare Pl. 173) by discerning a vanitas significance in the bust and in the gesture of resting a hand on the head (as if it were a skull). At the same time, the bust, as a work of art and as a monument to a man’s memory, symbolizes immortality or, at least, lasting fame.\textsuperscript{48}

One of the most admirable passages in Held’s article is his discussion of the gold chain, which, with its “almost barbaric splendor,” is set off to brilliant effect against the black apron.\textsuperscript{49} The ancient custom of awarding gold chains to honor exceptional service was revived in the Renaissance and flourished in the seventeenth century. Titian’s portrait of Jacopo Strada, of about 1567–68 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), shows the architect, author, linguist, and curator of Habsburg collections with a gold chain falling in four loops on his chest and supporting an imperial medallion. Rubens’s portrait of the scholar Jan-Gaspar Gevaerts (Gevartius), of about 1628 (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp), is noted by Held firstly for its inclusion of a bust of Marcus Aurelius and secondly for the gold chain and medallion that was added in an engraving of about 1644. The print (by Paulus Pontius) must have been made to commemorate Gevartius’s appointment as “Counsellor and Historiographer” to Emperor Ferdinand III (as the office is described below the image). Of course, Rembrandt was especially conscious—or self-conscious, to judge from how often gold chains are featured in his self-portraits (see fig. 202)—of great painters who, unlike himself, received gold chains from princes, as did Titian, Veronese (whose chain Vasari called a “prize of honor”), Rubens, Van Dyck, and, about two years before the Aristotle was painted, Rembrandt’s former pupil Samuel van Hoogstraten (see his biography above).\textsuperscript{50}

The gold chain is central to Held’s interpretation, which though persuasive has a period flavor, especially with regard to its assumption that the picture may be understood to some extent as the painter’s own manifesto. Noting that Andrea Alciati, in his Emblemata (1551), refers to the “golden shackles by which courtiers are tied to their princes,” Held claims in the last line of his essay that Rembrandt was an artist “who never compromised, who never permitted himself to be burdened with a chain of honor, and fiercely maintained both the integrity of his art and his freedom as a man.”\textsuperscript{51} In another Dutch context (for example, one similar to De Gheyn’s vanitas picture; Pl. 48), this might be a plausible idea, but in this case the patron—as Rembrandt surely realized—would have considered gold chains solely as signs of wealth and honor, and was in a position to hand them out.

This does not undermine Held’s notion of opposing values, represented by the bust and the chain. Aristotle’s hand on the bust of Homer, who wears a “modest ribbon” around his neck,\textsuperscript{52} is an unforgettable gesture, reminiscent of that in Rembrandt’s Jacob Blessing the Sons of Joseph, of 1656 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel). Here, however, the hand rests steadily, whereas the left hand seems distracted to touch or stroke the chain (the left arm is not supported). It is known from technical analysis that Rembrandt modified the position of the left hand, the precise location of the medallion, and the draping of the right sleeve.\textsuperscript{53} The latter links the great head of Homer (which is larger than Aristotle’s) with the miniature image of Alexander, and the sleeve’s curve is echoed by the chain’s descent to the left hand. It appears likely that the main purpose of the gold ring on Aristotle’s finger is to catch the eye, to draw attention to the left hand, which without the accent could not compete with the right hand as a focus of attention. Aristotle’s arms might be compared with those of a scale, and, like the balance held by Saint Michael in Netherlandish scenes of the Last Judgment, it is the item in the lower pan (in those pictures, a soul) that is found wanting. Writers have often observed that the bust of Homer seems insubstantial, less like marble than a mortal or an immortal man. Perhaps Held goes too far when he refers to the “age-old pictorial conventions” of placing the “right” hand, favored in theology, symbolism, and ceremonial, on the bust of Homer, and raising that hand into the light, whereas the left (sinister) hand falls into shadow.\textsuperscript{54} One wonders what Ruffo would have made of such an explanation had he received it in writing (it seems certain that it would never have occurred to him otherwise). And yet, these pictorial means are powerful in their expressive effect, in ways that cannot easily be put into words.

As in other great works of art, the picture’s meaning becomes more apparent and more profound over time. But to have this experience one must know the subject in
The first place. The literature summarized below reveals almost no understanding of the painting before its subject was identified (Grant, in 1908, deserves honorable mention), very few perceptive remarks for the next fifty years, and a history of appreciation conditioned by the writers’ own cultural circumstances. Ruffo’s world was one steeped in classical antiquity, the monuments of which informed famous paintings such as Raphael’s School of Athens (1510–11; Stanza della Segnatura, Vatican), where Aristotle bears little resemblance to Rembrandt’s philosopher, especially in his costume. Can Ruffo have realized that Rembrandt (unlike Rubens in the Achilles series of tapestries that Ruffo owned) had in this case taken a far from archaeological approach to describing ancient dress? How is it possible that in Messina (as opposed to Amsterdam) this image of a scholar, with his leather-bound volumes, his Venetian shirt, and vaguely outdated tunic, was recognized as a thirteenth-century churchman or as a figure from the fourth century B.C.? The facial features, the long hair and beard, and the costume’s costliness if not its apparent date would have strongly favored an identification with Aristotle rather than Albertus Magnus, who appears as a clean-shaven cleric in the series Famous Men (Louvre, Paris) by Joos van Gent (active ca. 1460–80) painted for the studiolo of the Palazzo Ducale, Urbino, about 1475. Ruffo probably did not know that imaginary portrait, or the minor prints that show Albertus as a beardless and balding bishop or monk. Aristotle in Van Gent’s series (fig. 165) is richly dressed, displays a surprising amount of jewelry, and extends his right hand (all cited in ancient sources). This physical type of Aristotle was more widely known from Italian busts, reliefs, and medallions of the early 1500s, and from prints such as Enea Vico’s engraving of 1546 (fig. 164). It seems very likely that the bust of Aristotle recorded in the 1656 inventory of Rembrandt’s household effects was a cast after an Italian sculpture, whereas the bust of Homer listed on the preceding line must have
been a Hellenistic type (very similar to the bust in the painting). Ruffo also owned a bust of Aristotle, which was bronze and therefore almost certainly the North Italian model from which Vico’s portrait print derives.\footnote{18}

Apart from the costume’s apparent date, there were two points in favor of an identification with Albertus Magnus. By far the stranger was the legend that he had invented a talking statue or head, which was destroyed by his pupil Thomas Aquinas (ca. 1225–1274). A staple of the literature on automata (much more so than Leonardo’s mechanical lion), the story circulated in publications such as Gustavus Selenus’s Cryptomystica et cryptographiae (1624), in which the second book opens with a discussion of hidden speaking tubes. “So it is recorded that Albertus Magnus constructed a talking head.”\footnote{19} But is the man in Rembrandt’s picture listening thoughtfully to a talking head, as if he did not quite comprehend his own invention?

The second point in favor of Albertus Magnus is one of the few he shares with Aristotle. And this distinction may explain how Aristotle, despite the costume and the fact that Ruffo did not recognize Homer in the bust, came to be linked with Albertus Magnus in the collector’s inventory. Albertus (who was beatified in 1622) wrote thousands of pages of commentary on Aristotle and was especially well known, like his source of inspiration, for comparisons of the human senses, in particular touch and sight. It is not difficult to imagine that Ruffo or someone in his cultivated circle would have perused Rembrandt’s painting and decided that touch and sight were the pressing concerns. In early pictures of the Five Senses by Ribera, which were probably painted about 1613–15 in Rome, Touch (fig. 166) is represented by a blind man (who bears a curious resemblance to the Renaissance Aristotle) exploring with his fingers the features of a classical head. A painting of a bust-length figure lies on the table, stressing the limits of the sense of touch. Ribera’s \textit{Sight}, in the same series (Museo Franz Mayer, Mexico City), depicts a man holding a Galilean telescope by a window; a mirror and spectacles lie before him. The thoughtful figure does not look at anything, but with wide, unfocused eyes
appears to reflect upon what he has seen. The main issue, as Ribera appears to have understood, is which sense is superior in gaining an understanding of the natural world. The senses of hearing, taste, and smell in his series are represented by earthier, less cognizant types who are accompanied by items intended solely for gratification.  

Painters in several parts of Europe produced variations on this theme. Ribera’s series could be described as a departure from complex allegories like those by Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568–1625) and as an anticipation of many Netherlandish and Italian examples. Two series of the Five Senses were painted in the 1650s by the Flemish artist Gonzales Coques (1614/18–1684). In one series (National Gallery, London), *Sight* shows a painter with a palette and brushes; *Touch* illustrates a man letting blood.
from his arm. 65 In the other series (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp), Touch depicts a man sharpening a pen, while Sight unexpectedly represents a spectacled sculptor carefully finishing a statuette, the latter taking clever advantage of the role of sculpture in contemporary illustrations of the sense of touch (as in fig. 166) to suggest that sight is more important no matter what the object perceived.

The first known representations of the Five Senses as human figures are found in thirteenth-century Latin translations of Aristotle’s De sensu et sensato (On Sense and Sensible Objects). 62 In the same period, Albertus endorsed Aristotle’s ranking of the senses by explaining that sight provides the most immediate, comprehensive, and discriminating knowledge of the physical world. Through sight, Albertus observes, humans discover and create, while they teach and learn through hearing. Aquinas expanded on his mentor’s remarks, noting that animals face the ground, but man stands erect, “in order that by the senses, and chiefly by sight, which is more subtle and penetrates further into the differences of things, he may freely survey the sensible objects around him, both heavenly and earthly, so as to gather intelligible truth from all things.” 63

Rembrandt’s appreciation of Aristotle would have focused on questions of observation, and with respect to painting the artist must have been impressed by the philosopher’s opinions of the senses as cited in the ongoing paragone debate. Renaissance comparisons (paragoni) of painting and sculpture extended the parallels drawn between painting and poetry in two classical sources, Horace’s Ars poetica and Aristotle’s Poetics. 64 The latter treatise was especially important for the visual arts, since its subject is not poetry per se but imitation (mimesis) in any form, including poetry, drama, painting, sculpture, music, and certain nonartistic activities (children’s play, for example). 65

For painters, the paragone debate was crucial to the claim that their profession was a form of intellectual activity rather than manual labor (the case for sculpture, in their view, was not so clear). In De pictura (1435), Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1472) declares that painting is a liberal art; for Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519), it was a form of natural philosophy. Through Baldassare Castiglione’s Il libro del cortegiano (Venice, 1528) and many other publications, the issue flourished, especially in Italy; not only writers such as Vasari but artists such as Jacopo da Pontormo (1494–1557) and Michelangelo (1475–1564) played active parts. 66 The argument that artists were intellectually comparable to men of letters lent moral support to the founding of art academies, guilds of professional painters (which in the Netherlands
Figure 171. Detail of Rembrandt's *Aristotle with a Bust of Homer* (Pl. 151)
had recently seceded from craft guilds; see the biography above of Paulus Moreelse), and more high-minded organizations, such as the confraternity Pictura in The Hague (founded in 1656).

If Rembrandt intended to comment on the stature of painting in the Aristotle, it can have been only a secondary concern, an aside addressed to the astute collector. The characterization of Aristotle is so fully realized in the picture that the choice of subject surely came first, as opposed to, for example, a decision to praise Pictura in an unexpected way. But in thinking, reading, or hearing about Aristotle, Rembrandt must have realized that he had come to the very source of the concept that painting is a noble art, namely, the philosopher's insistence on the primacy of sight as a means to acquire knowledge.

In this, Rembrandt would have been following artists such as Leonardo, who echoed Aristotle in declaring that "the eye embraces the beauty of the whole world," and that "its sciences are the most certain." In the same passage of the Treatise on Painting (first published in Paris in 1631), Leonardo praises "most excellent painting, above all other things created by God." In another section, Leonardo pokes his finger in the eye of more conventional theorists by placing painting even higher than poetry, since the former originates in the clear light of nature, whereas the latter emerges from the "occhio tenebroso" (obscure eye) of the imagination.67

It is noteworthy that Rembrandt's primary source for his figure of Aristotle was a piece of sculpture, which he evidently improved upon by employing a live model: the same features are found in A Bearded Man in a Cap (fig. 167), on which the date has been read as both 1653 and 1657.68 The bust of Homer in Rembrandt's studio became in the painting (among other things, to be sure) a reference to the art of sculpture and to the sense of sight (compare fig. 166). Except for the motif of blindness, one finds an analogous conceit in Titian's early portrait of a woman, called La Schiavona (fig. 168). The lady looks at the viewer and rests her hand on a parapet, on which her own image appears in profile. The parapet, with its flattering portrait all'amica, was added by Titian in the course of work. He evidently realized that he could compare painting with sculpture by showing another view of the sitter as if carved in relief. Other Venetian artists had painted simultaneous views of a single figure in response to one of the standard arguments made on sculpture's behalf.69

That Rembrandt would allude to the senses in a portrait of the most renowned authority on the subject seems all the more probable when one considers the comparisons of sight and touch, painting and sculpture, that had been drawn in recent works by his most successful pupil, Gerrit Dou (q.v.). Not only did that painter to princes set plaster heads and stone reliefs next to everything that his own art could describe more convincingly (as in Pl. 37), but his pictures were also praised as the apogee of imitation in Philips Angel's "Lof der Schilder-konst" (Praise of Painting), an oration presented to the painters' guild of Leiden in 1641 and published there in the following year. The "far-famed Rembrandt" is honored in the same text for his close reading of history, but it is "the perfect and excellent Gerrit Dou" who puts both sculptors and poets to shame, partly on the Aristotelian grounds that "the eye is the noblest of the five senses" and that "the art of painting is far more general because it is capable of imitating nature much more copiously."680

Aristotle is a very different subject than those treated by Dou, whose main concerns were merely subthemes for Rembrandt. Rembrandt's insight into historical subjects may be described as one aspect of his broader ability to convey the essence of a story or character. The same virtue is discussed repeatedly in the Poetics. In his chapter on tragedy, for example, Aristotle stresses the importance of character, noting that the painter Polygnotus surpassed Zeuxis in this regard. And in passages praising Homer, one can almost imagine that it is Rembrandt rather than Aristotle explaining how to compose a historical scene. Aristotle tells poets not to draw attention to themselves: "After a brief preamble Homer introduces a man or woman or some other character—and none of them are characterless" (10.4). Furthermore, one should place a character in a single situation, letting it stand for the greater whole. "When Homer composed the Odyssey he did not include everything that happened to Odysseus . . . ; instead, he constructed the Odyssey about a single action" (5.3).67 Aristotle could be describing one of Rembrandt's most haunting history pictures, such as the Bathsheba of 1654 (fig. 162).

To conclude, one might say that Rembrandt created a compelling portrait of Aristotle by emulating Homer: he concentrates on the figure's character and presents him in a revealing moment, touching without feeling, seeing without looking, his senses suspended by thought. In this, Aristotle resembles Homer, whose inner vision (or
imagination) seems suggested by the fluid brushwork on
the bust and its illumination. Much as Homer is the central
figure in the Poetics, he is, as Aristotle’s touchstone, the
psychological center in Rembrandt’s painting. How to
explain this more precisely is left to the viewer, but it
seems likely that Rembrandt was thinking of Homer’s
words, and perhaps thought of Aristotle as remembering
them, hearing Homer’s verses in his mind. In the later
painting for Ruffo (fig. 163), Homer speaks while (in the
original state) two disciples listen. When Rembrandt
decided that Homer was the appropriate subject to treat
in the album amicorum of Jan Six, he made the well-known
drawing Homer Reciting His Verses, of 1652 (Six Founda-
tion, Amsterdam). The composition derives from Raphael’s
Parnassus (as known from engravings), but the crowd lis-
tens with the same concentration as in Christ Preaching
(“The Hundred Guilder Print”), of about 1643–49.74 If
Rembrandt read (or heard) Aristotle’s remarks on the
sense of sight, he might have come upon the philosopher’s
opinion of hearing, which in certain circumstances “makes
the largest contribution to wisdom. For the spoken word,
which is responsible for all instruction, is heard. . . .
Consequently, of those who have been deprived of one
sense or the other from birth, the blind are more intelligent
than the deaf and the dumb.”75

Form and Content

Rembrandt’s Aristotle is brilliantly painted, a virtuoso dis-
play of the artist’s abilities intended for a discerning
patron. The texture, volumes, and rhythms of the white
gown are more impressive than almost any other passage
of drapery in the artist’s work of the 1650s. The dark
apron has suffered, but still serves its primary formal pur-
purpose of setting off the chain, with its impasto links and
highlights (as elsewhere, Rembrandt has made one of the
most significant motifs in the picture the most salient in
artistic terms). A brown cloak, edged or lined in fur, is
thrown over the philosopher’s shoulders, and eases the
transition from the brightly illuminated sleeves to the
shadowy surroundings. Originally, the painting must have
been more illusionistic, with the figure standing in a corner
of space between the curtain and the foreshortened table.
The illusion is optical rather than tactile, in a manner more
reminiscent of Velázquez than painters such as Dou.

Essential to any great work of art is the relationship
between form and content, or, differently expressed, the
suitability of style to meaning. As so often in Rembrandt’s
paintings, the most evocative device in this composition
is the use of light and shadow. The fall of light on the
head of Homer recalls religious pictures by the artist and
lends the bust an entrancing aura, as if it were a vision or
a memory. The shadow cast onto the philosopher’s sleeve
is visually an illusionistic device and psychologically the
long shadow of history, or of influence, or of whatever
the viewer who shares Aristotle’s esteem of Homer might
make of it. An even more significant shadow is cast by
the large brim of the hat, which, parallel to Aristotle’s
arm, extends forward and to the left.76 The play of light
and shadow over his brow and eyes seems, given the still-
ness of the features, a metaphor for the mobility of
thought. The most impressive aspect of Aristotle with a
Bust of Homer, and the reason that it is a monument of
Western culture, is that Rembrandt represents the figure
not as a sage from whom wisdom emanates, but as a
man who contemplates ethical problems and puzzles
them out for himself.77

1. The voyage from Amsterdam (via the island of Texel; see Haak
1969, p. 240) to Sicily was made frequently by Dutch cargo
ships but could be perilous. The painting went to London in
the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century (see Ex Coll.),
and in 1894 it was shipped to Paris, where it entered the famous
collection of Rodolphe Kann.

2. As reported in Norton 1984, p. 174, Alfred Erickson was co-
founder of the McCann-Erickson Advertising Agency. “After
the Wall Street Crash, he sold the picture back to Duvene; a year or
so later he reacquired the painting, at a net cost to himself of
more than $1 million.” The figures given under Ex Coll. below
indicate that Erickson’s loss was actually $2,100,000 in 1930, and
$90,000 between 1910 and 1916 (which may be considered
interest charged for a secured loan of $500,000). For a sympa-
thetic character sketch of “Eric” Erickson, see Kalmus 1933,
pp. 86–89. “I believe that Eric’s paintings played a part in his
life closest to the ecstasy of grace experienced by those who seek
meaning in spiritual values and a religious life” (p. 89).

3. As in the catalogue of the “Art Treasures Exhibition” at Christie’s,
writes not only of a “still Zweispürche” but also of Aristotle
“dessen Blick so dumpf auf der Bürste des alten Poeten ruht.”
Schmidt-Degener (1915; see Refs.) has a melancholy poet looking
into Homer’s eyes, and Kieser (1941–42; see Refs.) makes a simi-
lar remark. See Held 1969, p. 4. The paperback edition of Held
1969 (Rembrandt Studies, Princeton, 1991) is a photomechanical
reprint with different pagination. In the present entry, references
to passages in Held 1969 (chap. 1, “Rembrandt’s Aristotle”) may
be found in the 1991 edition by adding 14 to the page number given.

4. See Refs. Backer 1921 appears to be the first publication to
report that Ruffo commissioned such a subject. The same infor-
mation is given in Kieser 1941–42, Darby 1962, Wright 1975 (on
the basis of “surviving documentation”), and London 1976.
Ruffo ordered a portrait of Aristotle, according to Benesch 1959 and Russell in Washington—Paris 1982–83 (see Refs.).
7. The present title echoes those of the 1930s: for example, "Aristote with the Bust of Homer," as the subject was described in the Chicago exhibition of 1933 and the Worcester exhibition of 1936. The popular title still appears frequently in scholarly literature (see Refs.) as well as in the press, cartoons, and so on.
9. Giltaj 1999, pp. 44, 126 (under no. 111). The entry was made in the addenda to the 1648 inventory of Ruffo's collection, which is why the charge for framing the painting, dated January 8, 1657, is recorded on the same page. Many expenses are recorded in the "Addenda to the first inventory" (ibid., pp. 122–23), which, however, is not a running "account book" (as it is called, for example, in Held 1969, p. 12).
11. Ibid., p. 18. Some of the specific works are identified in ibid., chap. 3.
12. For these entries, see Giltaj 1999, appendix A, pp. 117–18, 121, with translations into Dutch on pp. 126–27, 137.
13. Ibid., pp. 117–18, 121, nos. 3, 5, 6, 11, 30. As noted by Giltaj (ibid., p. 127), the pictures by Casembroot included two works measuring 50 1/4 x 71/4 in. (129 x 180.6 cm) each, two measuring 40 3/4 x 50 3/4 in. (103.2 x 129 cm), a set of four canvases (each 40 3/4 x 61 in. [103.2 x 154.8 cm]), and a small picture. One of these paintings has been identified: the View of the Harbor of Messina, of 1640 (Museo di San Martino, Naples), which now measures 45 3/4 x 70 7/10 in. (116 x 179 cm) and bears the Ruffo family crest (ibid., p. 25, fig. 4).
15. See Refs. under Renes 1959 (whose arbitrary idea of a library is repeated in Vels Heijn 1989) and under Van De Wetering 1998, where the point about Ruffo's uncertainty is probably borrowed from Giltaj's dissertation (Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, 1997).
17. See Held 1969, pp. 12–13, where the author considers it "of the highest importance to remember that Rembrandt, not Ruffo, was responsible for the choice of subject."
18. Giltaj 1999, pp. 44, 161. See also Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, pp. 315, 317 (a poor reproduction of Van Goor's letter), where Van Goor is denoted to "shipping agent."
19. Beunen 1995, p. 47. Reporting news of Dutch ships was a consular duty. Beunen (ibid., p. 51 n. 83) notes that the sea voyage from Texel via Naples to Messina could not have taken "just one short month."
21. See the text below and Giltaj 1999, pp. 44, 52, on the evidence of Van Goor's role, to which Ruffo refers in a letter dated November 1, 1662 (ibid., pp. 161–65, for the Italian and a Dutch translation; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 528, for a version in English). On Van Goor, see G. Schwartz 1985, pp. 380, 301, and Lammertse in London—Amsterdam 2006, p. 279. In 1674, Van Goor (d. 1675) was taxed on assets of fl 600,000; his son, Gijsbert van Goor, had assets worth fl 65,000. An inventory of Gijsbert's property, dated May 11–12 and July 22, 1675, lists numerous paintings without attributions; according to deeds dating from 1673, he owned works by Jacopo Bassano, Van Dyck, Lotto, Mola, Murillo, Reni, Ribera, and Titian, as well as paintings by Rembrandt, De Heem, and a few Italianate landscapes. Lammertse (ibid., pp. 279–80) suggests that some of these pictures came from the collection of Gerrit Reymst in Amsterdam. Perhaps others had originally been acquired by or through the elder Van Goor.
23. De Gennaro 2003 (see Refs.).
24. De Gennaro 2001 (see Refs.).
25. Even the entry in the inventory of 1668–77, which describes the figure in some detail and reflects Guercino's idea of a physiognomist (Aristote or Alberthus Magnus is said to study "la fisionomia" of the bust), repeats the identifications of 1654 (De Gennaro 2003; see Refs.).
26. See Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 457, for the Italian and a slightly different translation; Giltaj 1999, p. 167, for a more reliable transcription of the Italian and a translation into Dutch.
27. Giltaj 1999, p. 198. In Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 460, the translation is poor and the "Fisionomista" becomes a "Philosopher." Schama 1999a, p. 590, mocks Guercino's supposition that Rembrandt depicted a physiognomist. However, the explanation found in Held 1969, pp. 6–7, could be considerably amplified. Physiognomy and cosmography were both respected forms of natural philosophy in the seventeenth century, with deep roots in Aristotelian texts (as was kindly clarified for the writer by David Summers, in correspondence dated November 16, 1995).
28. In Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 461, "un turbante turchino" (Ruffo 1916, p. 102 n. 2) becomes "a Turkish turban." Compare Giltaj 1999, p. 169.
29. See Giltaj 1999, p. 162. One of the more egregious errors of translation in Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979 is that of "panel" for "quadro [nominato Gran Alessandro]" (p. 484). In Broos 1991, p. 271, "p Fondo di Messina" is translated as "on the account of the Count of Messina," thus allowing conto to do double duty for account and Count (sonte). Giltaj 1999, p. 50 suggests that the author of the letter was possibly Isaack Just, who is named (correctly) in Ruffo's letter complaining about the Alexander dated November 1, 1662 (Giltaj 1999, p. 163; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, pp. 506, 508). In 1666, the
dealer Gerrit Uylenburgh (1625–1679) married Elisabeth Juyst (called Juste in a poem marking the occasion), who was one of the seven children of the wealthy merchant Hendrick Juyst (1607–1627). Her brothers were named Hendrick, Willem, and Johannes. Johannes (ca. 1637–after 1676) owned a good number of paintings, according to inventories dated 1659 and 1661. See Lammertse in London–Amsterdam 2006, pp. 73–76 (with particular attention to p. 75 nn. 103, 104), and the family tree on p. 292.

30. Giltaij 1999, pp. 164–66. A very different transcription of the Italian is given in Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 484, where the note about the ship and Rembrandt needing to complete the Homer is simply omitted.

31. The remark about placing the Alexander in the middle is considered “inexplicable” in Broos 1993, p. 276, and as “puzzling” in Giltaij 1999, p. 50. A drawing thought to be by Rembrandt, Homer Dictating to a Scribe (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm), is on a broad sheet of paper (5½ x 6½ in. [14.5 x 16.7 cm]) rounded off at the top corners. Broos (1993, pp. 274, 276, fig. 6) suggests that Rembrandt may have sent this “preliminary drawing [to Ruffo] to give an idea of the proposed rounding of the canvas.” Giltaij (1999, pp. 69–71, fig. 18) is more cautious about the drawing’s authorship, purpose, and rounding at the top, but he nevertheless takes its proportions to suggest that the Homer was originally painted in a broad format (p. 74). However, this is contradicted by Rembrandt himself, in a note sent together with the invoice dated July 30, 1661. The artist observes that “als ider stuk 6 palmen breedt is en 8 hoogh sullen goeda foormae by zyn en de prijs aengaende en sullen den Heer niet overschat-ten” (as each piece [the Alexander and the Homer] is 6 palmi wide and 8 high they shall be of good proportions and the price should not be overestimated by the lord). By this, Rembrandt means that Ruffo should not regard the price as too high (Giltaij 1999, p. 165). Petria Noble, who in 2004–06 carried out extensive conservation work on the Homer, found no evidence to suggest that it once had a broad format. See also Noble, Potasch, and van der Plage 2006, p. 22.

32. See Giltaij 1999, pp. 163–65, and (with caution) Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, pp. 506–8. Presumably the letter in the Ruffo archives is a copy of the one actually sent. It is written on the recto and verso of a page, and is not addressed on the exterior. The phrasing suggests that the original was dictated.

33. Held 1969, p. 12. The letter of November 1, 1662, is accompanied in the Ruffo archives by a copy of the invoice dated June 19, 1654, that was sent by Van Goor to Di Battista (Giltaij 1999, p. 164). However, while the original invoice refers only to “the painting by Rembrandt,” the version of 1662 is entitled “Copia del costo e spese del quadro dell’Aristotle fatto dal Pittore Rembrant il Sr. Cornelio Elsber van goar d’ordine del fì Giacomò di Battista per conto del Sr. Don Antonio Ruffo di Messina” (copy of the cost and expenses for the painting of Aristotle made by the painter Rembrandt [paid by] Cornelis Elsbart van Goor by order of the late Giacomo di Battista for the account of Don Antonio Ruffo of Messina). The total, as before, is Fi 353. Also with the letter of 1662 is a copy of the invoice for the Alexander, which although it also cost Fi 500 involved expenses bringing the total to Fi 633 and 2 stuivers.

34. Giltaij 1999, pp. 163–65. The content, if not the phrasing, of Ruffo’s letter is given in English in Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 508.

35. See Giltaij 1999, pp. 52–55. In the letter of November 1, 1662, Ruffo states that if he is satisfied when Rembrandt completes the commission, more orders will be placed, and he asks that the artist send sketches of proposed compositions. In the event, Ruffo went on to order paintings of related subjects from Mattia Preti, Salvator Rosa, and Giacinto Brandi. In the case of Brandi’s painting it was not clear to Ruffo whether the subject was a philosopher or (the studious) Saint Jerome. See ibid., pp. 89–94, and Liedtke 2004a, pp. 76–77.

36. See De Gennaro 2001, p. 214, nos. 59 (Alessandro Magno), 63 (Alberto Magno), 76 (Omero), and p. 212 for comments on the values and the remark, “sono tre?” Guerrino’s Camerographer is also listed (no. 79).

37. See C. Brown and Roy 1992, where the picture is considered to be Ruffo’s Alexander; and Giltaij in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, pp. 134–37 (under no. 13) for one of several recent rejections of the hypothesis (see also Refs.). The Glasgow canvas has added strips on all sides, measuring between 1¼ in. (4.5 cm) and ½ in. (1.3 cm) wide. In the letter of November 1, 1662, Ruffo complains that the Alexander was “painted on four pieces of canvas sewn together” and that “at the start [the subject] was nothing more than a Head on a single canvas,” which Rembrandt transformed into a half-length figure (Giltaij 1999, pp. 163, 164, for the Italian and a Dutch translation; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 508, for the passage in English). However, the central piece of canvas in Glasgow measures 4½ x 3½ ft. (116 x 90 cm) and includes a complete half-length figure within its borders (as noted in Held 1969, p. 9). This is hardly conclusive, but together with the evidence of the abraded date on the canvas (which has been read as 1635 or 1659), the description of Alexander as seated, in a Ruffo inventory dated July 6, 1678 (Ruffo 1916, p. 318; C. Brown and Roy 1992, p. 286), and especially the provenance, it would appear that Ruffo’s Alexander cannot be the Glasgow Man in Armor. The present writer agrees with C. Brown and Roy (1993, p. 288 n. 18), Giltaij (1999, pp. 60–62, fig. 14), and numerous other scholars that the Figure in Armor (the subject is variously identified as Alexander, Pallas Athena, etc.) in the Museo Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon, is by a follower of Rembrandt and could not possibly be the painting sent to Ruffo.

38. As noted in a lecture given by Petria Noble at the Musée du Louvre, Paris, in June 2006. See also Giltaij 2005, which is quoted under Refs. below.

39. See note 3 under Ex Coll. below.

40. The entry in Broos 1993, p. 269, under “Provenance,” suggests that the Homer might have remained in the Ruffo family until about 1848 (?) and observes that “it found its way [to London] by about 1883.” At the time, Dutch scholars were unaware of the Vaughan sale of 1810 and the Hume catalogue of 1824 (see New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 68 n. 16).

41. In his review of the exhibition, Kenyon Cox (1969–70, p. 184), revealing an art-for-art’s-sake impatience with scholarship, declared that “the attempt to make a portrait of this or that learned person out of this Rembrandt-esque fantasia is useless [since] such a costume was never worn outside the painter’s studio, and the model was, likely enough, some old beggar picked up out of the streets.”
Aristotle would have considered this point of view an example of misologia (misology, an antipathy to argument or reasoning). Held 1969, p. 12.

42. See ibid., pp. 30–31, on the identification of Alexander on the medallion, which is questioned in Giltaij 1999, p. 49 (but compare ibid., p. 81).

43. A small book or box on a silver tray, seen behind the bust of Homer, aids recession to the lower left. Whether it could itself be or (if a box) contain the copy of the Iliad that Aristotle annotated for Alexander is now impossible to say. Held 1969, p. 2 n. 71, is emphatically against the idea, on historical rather than artistic grounds.

45. See Held 1969, p. 31 on melancholy and Aristotle, and pp. 39–40 on his estrangement from Alexander. The temperament is expressed, surely at the sitter's request, in Jan Lievens's Portrait of Constantijn Huygens, of about 1628–29 (Musée de la Chartreuse, Douai, on loan to the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; Braunschweig 1979, no. 17), and in the portrait of Huygens engraved by Paulus Pontius after Van Dyck in the 1630s (see fig. 28).

46. Held 1969, pp. 22–23. The scholarly setting, the figure's apparent age (Aristotle was fifty when his service to Alexander ended), and nearly every convention for depicting Alexander's painter Apelles argues against Crenshaw's idea (2006; see Refs.) that he is Rembrandt's subject, to say nothing of all the documentary evidence.

47. ibid., p. 23.


49. ibid., pp. 32–39, on the chain (quote from p. 33).

50. The examples are all drawn from ibid., which does not, however, mention the timing of Van Hooft's award. Held (ibid., p. 36), without citing the source, notes that the story about Veronese was repeated by Van Mander.

51. ibid., pp. 35 (citing Alciati 1551, emblem 86), 44.

52. ibid., p. 33.

53. Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 11–12; Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 34, fig. 26. The changes in the sleeve and repositioning of the medallion are apparent on the canvas surface (as noted by conservator Dorothy Mahon).


55. See, for example, Neumann 1924 and Kieser 1941–42. Held 1969 is also an example: see Liedtke 2004a, quoting Willibald Sauerländer's obituary of Held in the Süddeutsche Zeitung, January 22, 2003, p. 13.

56. See Liedtke 2004a, pp. 76, 84–85 nn. 19, 20, for a more detailed account of Aristotle in Renaissance art, and for the relevant literature.

57. See Held 1969, pp. 13 (on Rembrandt's bust of Aristotle), 17–18, fig. 14 (Homer). For the busts in the 1665 inventory of Rembrandt's effects, see Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 365, nos. 169 ("een Homerus") and 164 ("een Aristoteles"). Busts of Socrates and various Roman emperors are listed on the same page. The base of the bust in the painting was modified in the course of work.

58. See Giltaij 1999, pp. 19–20, 141, no. 59 ("Una Testa di Bronzo d'Aristotele con la cornice di legno dorato"). The bust was acquired in Rome, probably before Ruffo's brother Flavio died in 1616.


60. See New York 1993, nos. 2–5.


63. See Summers 1987, p. 56, for this translation of a passage from Aquinas's Summa theologiae. Albertus' extensive writings on the senses are concisely reviewed in Steneck 1980.

64. See Lee 1957, pp. 5–7.

65. Heath in Aristotle 1996, pp. xii–xv, defends "imitation" (as opposed to "representation") as the closest approximation of what Aristotle meant by mimésis, and outlines his philosophical argument.


67. See Summers 1987, pp. 38, 71, for these quotes, their sources, and further literature.

68. MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 335, suggests that the late date is "more acceptable on stylistic grounds." One might expect that this painting and the Aristotle would date from the same year. The works of later date featuring the same model (see ibid., p. 335) are of uncertain attribution.

69. See Hecht 1984, pp. 152–57. Perhaps the first printing of Aristotle's Poetics (Venice, 1508) contributed to Venetian interest in the paragone theme. On Titian's La Schiavona (The Slavic Woman, which she is not), see Wethey 1969–75, vol. 2 (The Portraits), no. 95.

70. On Dou and Angel's paragone of painting with sculpture and with poetry, see Sluijter 2000b, pp. 210–24, 335 n. 96. Sight is also described as the noblest sense, on Aristotle's authority, in Rips 1644, p. 446.

71. The quotes are from Aristotle 1996, pp. 15, 40.

72. On the Homer drawing made for Six, see Held 1969, p. 20; Broos 1993, pp. 271, 273, fig. 4; and Zell 2004, p. 358, fig. 33. G. Schwartz 1985, p. 302, plausibly suggests that Six may have been helpful to Rembrandt in arriving at this "carefully thought-out invention [which] betrays the hand [?] of an author well-versed in the classics."


74. The spatial effect of the hat has been diminished by wear and old retouchings. The traces of gold in the hat belong to an earlier idea of ancient headgear, which was taller and appears to have been decorated by gold bands and ribs.

75. Another monument in the same tradition is Aristotle's Ethics, where he explains that knowledge gained through contemplation is more worthy than information gathered by the senses, and that intellectual pursuits are to be placed above all others, including those of kings. See D. S. Hutchinson in Jonathan Barnes, ed., The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 204–5.

References: Untitled catalogue of an exhibition at the British Institution, London, 1815, p. 15, no. 19, lists the painting as by Rembrandt, lent by Sir A. Hume, and describes the subject as "Portrait
of Peter Cornelius Van Hooft, a celebrated Flemish [sic] Historian, and a friend of Rembrandt; he is said to have translated Homer; Nicol 1824, pp. 36–37, no. 116, extensively describes the subject of the painting (of which the “light measure” is given as 54 x 53 in. [137.2 x 132.1 cm]), then in the Hume collection, as a “Portrait of Cornelius Van Hooft” (the Dutch poet and historian Pieter Cornelisz Hooft), who “appears to be in the act of contemplating the Genius of Homer,” and who wears “a very rich chain of gold, from which a medal with a head on it is suspended; probably intended to represent the insignia of the Order of St. Michel, conferred upon him by Louis XIII,” but otherwise “the whole costume seems to have been made up from Rembrandt’s motley wardrobe, or collection of antiquités, as he is said to have christened them,” and reports that the canvas “was brought into this country [England] about the year 1814, from Naples, together with its companion; the subject of which was Homer dictating his poems, but, from exposure to the sun had been entirely spoiled”; J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 110, no. 302, as “Vander Hofd,” in the collection of Sir Abraham Hume, a “capital portrait [which] is of the highest excellence,” representing the “celebrated Dutch Historian and Poet” at about the age of sixty-five, with his hand on a bust of Homer; Waagen 1838, vol. 2, p. 205, in a review of works in the collection of Sir Abraham Hume (who was then in his late eighties), considers it “seldom that Rembrandt has risen to such a grand and noble conception as in the portrait of a stately man already advanced in years, whose right hand rests upon a bust of Homer,” and observes that Hooft died in 1647, six years before the date on the picture; Waagen 1854, vol. 2, pp. 315–16, as in Earl Brownlow’s collection, repeatsverbatim the remarks made in Waagen 1838; Vosmaer 1877, p. 351, lists the painting under works dated 1653, calling it a portrait of a man in his sixties who is called Hooft; Bode 1883, pp. 501, 578, lists the picture as a male portrait in Earl Brownlow’s collection, which the author has not seen; Dutuit 1888, pp. 43, 63, 69, no. 316, as a portrait of a man, called Hooft, makes the same point as Waagen (1838); Würzbach 1886, text vol., no. 199; catalogue of the “Winter Exhibition” at the Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1893, p. 29, no. 125, as “Portrait of a Man,” by Rembrandt, “said to be that of Peter Cornelius Van Hooft, the celebrated poet and historian, a friend of Rembrandt,” gives Hooft’s proper dates (1581–1647), describes the composition, and cites the inscription; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 235, listed in Lord Brownlow’s collection as “Portrait of a Man,” adding that it is “erroneously called a Portrait of Hooft”; Bredius and Hofstede de Groot 1895, p. 338 (under no. 584), sees first thoughts for the Homer (fig. 163 here) in this portrait of a man in the Rodolphe Kann collection, Paris; Six 1897, pp. 4–6, fig. 7, as in the Rodolphe Kann collection, one of Rembrandt’s masterworks in conception and execution, suggests that the subject is Torquato Tasso, considering that the costume recalls the sixteenth century and paintings by Titian, that the figure “cannot be other than a poet,” and that identifications with Ariosto and Virgil appear implausible; Bell 1899, pp. 80, 138–39, incorrectly as still in the Brownlow collection, observes that this is Rembrandt’s only known painting dated 1653; Bode 1900, p. iv (ill. p. xii), as “Portrait of a Scholar”; Glück 1900, p. 89, mentioned as a portrait of a Dutch poet or scholar, earlier in the Brownlow collection; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 5 (1902), pp. 31, 183, no. 583, pl. 583, as “A Bearded Man with a Bust of Homer” in the Rodolphe Kann collection; Marguillier 1903, pp. 19–20 (ill. p. 19), praises the picture, which does not represent Hooft but one of those ideal figures of a poet or scholar that Rembrandt liked to depict throughout his life; Neumann 1905, p. 506, fig. 156, as “Man with the Bust of Homer”; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. xxvi, 113 (ill.), 261, 269, as “Portrait of a Scholar,” draws attention to the fact that Rembrandt owned a bust of Homer; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 282 (ill.), 402, 415, 426, 432, as “Portrait of a Man of Letters” and “Portrait d’un savant”; Bode 1907, vol. 1, p. 66, no. 65 (ill.), as “Portrait of a Savant,” describes the figure and lists earlier references, exhibitions, and collections; J. Grant 1908, pp. 5–6 (ill. opp. p. 3), in a survey of Mrs. Collis P. Huntington’s collection, credits Bode with the conclusion that the picture (which “takes rank with the master’s greatest creations”) is not a portrait but “an ideal conception of the philosopher or student—a theory which is certainly justified by the serious concentration of the expression, the deep, penetrating, meditating look as of a person oblivious of the things of this world, and absorbed in abstract speculation”; C. Holmes 1918, pp. 297–98 (ill. opp. p. 193), employs the picture to make lofty (and windy) remarks on the use of imagination as opposed to observation; Nicolle 1928, pp. 194, 195 (ill.), admires the expression and the “entente remarquable de la couleur et du clair-obscure”; Kruse 1909, pp. 224–25 (ill.), agrees with Six (1897) that the subject is probably Tasso; Valentinier in A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 426 (ill.), 562, 576, 598, 597, as perhaps an idealized representation of Virgil; Valentinier in New York 1909, p. 98, no. 97 (ill.), as “The Savant,” and as “more probably an ideal portrait of Virgil” than of Tasso; Coox 1909–10, p. 184, declares that “the attempt to make a portrait of this or that learned person out of this Rembrandt-esque fantasia is useless [since] such a costume was never worn outside the painter’s studio, and the model was, likely enough, some old beggar picked up out of the streets”; Waldmann 1910, pp. 75 (ill.), 77, states that the figure more probably represents Virgil than Tasso, and (for the first time in print) remarks that the painting is not perfectly preserved; Graves 1913–15, vol. 3 (1914), pp. 1205, 1206, 1207, 1213, records the painting in London exhibitions of 1815, 1828,1846, and 1893; Ruffo 1914, p. 338, records three paintings by Rembrandt in the Ruffo collection, “Ariostel che tiene la mano sopra una statua” (Ariosto resting a hand on a statue), “Alessandro Magno seduto” (Alexander the Great seated), and “Omero seduto che insegna a due disciepoli” (Homer, seated, instructing two pupils); Schmidt-Degen 1915, pp. 19–21 (ill.), describes the figure as a poet, perhaps Virgil or Tasso, who suffers melancholy thoughts “as he looks into the eyes” (!) of the “marble” Homer; Hofstede de Groot 1927–28, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 221–22, no. 413, as “A Bearded Man Before a Bust of Homer,” manages to find in the picture a “bronzed bust of Homer,” a Smyrna carpet, and “a white cloak of thin material with loose sleeves,” worn half-open “over [!] his black coat”; Ruffo 1916, pp. 100–102, 127–28, 165–66, 238, 318, publishes letters from Guercino and documents dating from 1654 onward that refer to this painting then in the collection of Antonio Ruffo; Hoogewerff 1917, pp. 153–54, 144, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139–40, 140, 141, 144, 145, 146, 147 (ill. opp. p. 137), on the basis of documents published in Ruffo 1914 and Ruffo 1916, for the first time identifies the Artista in New York with the painting of Aristotle cited as in the Ruffo collection in 1654 and at later dates, remarks that the “fantastic costume would indeed not easily lead one to think of Aristotle” as opposed to Tasso or another historical figure, transcribes the texts of Guercino’s letters referring to the picture and of
the relevant Rufio documents, quotes from them at length (in Dutch), and discusses the possible arrangement of Rufio's three paintings by Rembrandt, representing Aristotle, Homer, and Alexander the Great; Ricci 1918, pp. 8–15 (ill. p. 15), discusses and reprints, with additions and corrections, the documents published in Rufio 1916; H. Schneider 1918, pp. 69–72, summarizes the revelations of Rufio (1916), Hoogewerff (1917), and Ricci (1918); Rufio 1919, pp. 35–36, discusses a Rufio document of 1637 referring to a frame for the painting of "Alberto Magno," and clarifies that this is the *Aristotele*; Meldrum 1923, p. 199, pl. CCC.LI, as "Portrait of a Man of Letters"; Neumann 1924, pp. 534–35, 535–36, fig. 161, notes that the subject is surely Aristotle, "doch will das nicht viel sagen," because of the mysterious nature of all Rembrandt portraits, which in this case is underscored by Guercino's misinterpretation of the picture; Backer 1925, pp. 53 (ill.), 53–54, reports that Rufio commissioned from Rembrandt a painting of a philosopher, namely, the *Aristotele*; Freund 1929, pp. 461–65 (ill. p. 465), describes the canvas as hanging in the music room of A. W. Erickson, who bought the painting from Duveneck toward the end of 1928, reviews the circumstances of the commission, and suggests that in the figure's face Rembrandt blends Jewish and Italian types; Valentin 1928a, p. 4 (ill. opp. p. 4), incorrectly cites the work as painted in 16311; Valentin 1931, unpagd, no. 113, pl. 135; Hind 1932, p. 135, pl. CXIII, confesses that the picture "typifies for me the search that formed the central motive of Rembrandt's life, the art derived from a world of dreams, yet based on realities expressed by no other painter with greater power"; Van Rijckevorsel 1932, p. 15, fig. 12, states that the plaster bust of Homer in Rembrandt's collection appears here "as a still life"; Schmidt-Degener in Amsterdam 1933, pp. 13, 44–45, no. 26, remarks that Rufio obviously wanted to decorate his library with portraits of famous men, and so he ordered this painting, which includes among more familiar motifs a "golden box" on the table in which Alexander carried his copy of the *Iliad* (which Aristotle edited); *Art Digest*, May 15, 1933, p. 20 (ill.), as in the "Century of Progress" exhibition; *Art News* 31, no. 35 (May 27, 1933), p. 8 (ill.); Benesch 1935b, p. 32, briefly discusses the painting's style and meaning; Bredius 1935, p. 20, no. 478, pl. 478, as *Aristoteles*, owned by Duveneck; Tietze 1935, p. 337, pl. 177, as *Aristoteles (Virgil)*; owned by Duveneck; Bredius 1936, no. 478, pl. 478, in the English edition of Bredius 1935, introduces the title, "Aristotele Contemplating the Bust of Homer"; Schmidt-Degener 1936, pp. 48–49, fig. 7, describes the costume as medieval, and "la fameuse cassette d'or" on the table as the one in which Aristotle's edition of Homer was kept; Kieser 1941–42, pp. 133–36, 144, claims that in 1651 Rufio ordered a painting of a philosopher from Rembrandt, in which Homer is depicted in a manner faithful to antiquity, whereas Aristotle, by contrast, is modeled on a Jew who appears in two other works by the artist (paintings in London and San Francisco), and he wears a cloak in which Jewish liturgical features may be traced; Borenius 1942, pp. 14–15, pl. 60, incorrectly tells the Rufio story, with particular attention to Guercino, who when asked to paint a pendant to the *Aristotele* responded sympathetically, "Very well, I will paint a picture in my early manner"; J. Rosenberg 1944, pp. 129–34, fig. 2, recounts the Rembrandt, Rufio, and Guercino story, drawing attention (for the first time) to the Italian artist's drawing in Princeton (fig. 169 here);Mahon 1947, pp. 101–6 n. 178, considers at length what Guercino meant by offering to paint a pendant to the *Aristotele* in his *prima maniera*; J. Rosenberg 1948, vol. 1, pp. 165–68, vol. 2, pl. 243, concludes from the history of Rembrandt's work for Rufio that "the Dutch master's reputation had spread [leapt!] to the southernmost tip of Europe during a period when, at home, his popularity was on the decline"; Von Einem 1952, pp. 187–95, fig. 167, refers to the busts of Aristotle and Homer in the 1656 inventory of Rembrandt's possessions, and examines the types of both that were known at the time and Renaissance conventions for depicting Aristotle; Slive 1955, pp. 59–64, 81, 87, 107, 147–48, fig. 20, in a study of Rembrandt's contemporary reputation, reconsidered the Rufio commission and the Guercino pendant, raises the question of whether the latter is faithfully reflected in the Princeton drawing (fig. 169), wonders if Aristotle's hat might be overpainted, and rejects the notion that this painting is the subject of an epigram in Elsom 1750; Benesch 1956, p. 359, sees Rembrandt's representations of Aristotle and Saint Paul as similar ("men of the same mental ground"); J. G. van Gelder 1956 (see below under Breos 1971); Leymarie 1956, p. 137 (ill.), states that Homer's gaze "seems to fix itself [despite his blindness]" on something infinitely remote"; Benesch 1957, pp. 91–93, 96, 144, discusses the "philosopher lost in meditation," quoting relevant thoughts of the celebrated educator Johannes Comenius (1592–1670); Mayor 1957b, p. 108 (ill.), shows the painting in Huntington's library; Saxl 1957, vol. 1, pp. 199–200, pl. 216, commenting on Rembrandt's choice of subject matter (in a lecture first delivered in 1941), recalls that Aristotle's *Poetics* had been rediscovered in the early sixteenth century, and that the philosopher was highly regarded in Holland; Valentin 1957b, pp. 66–68, fig. 10, supposes that Rufio's three Rembrandts would have hung together and that the collector may have suggested including images of Homer and Alexander within the painting of Aristotle in anticipation of the ultimate ensemble; Benesch 1959, p. 328, erroneously reports that Rufio "ordered from Rembrandt for his library a portrait of Aristotle"; Goldscheider 1960, pp. 175–76, pl. 77, incorrectly concludes that the picture "has been considerably cut down on all sides" (p. 176 n. 64); Frankfurter 1961, p. 27, reports the Museum's purchase of the picture "for the record price of $2,300,000"; Darby 1962, p. 303, states that in 1632 "Rufio commissioned Rembrandt to make him a [painting of a] Philosopher"; Rousseau 1962, pp. 149–62 (cover ill.), surveys for Museum members the story of the commission, suggesting that "it is best to think of the work as a collaboration between the Sicilian nobleman and the Dutch painter"; Haskell 1963, pp. 209–10, pl. 312, in an account of "the provincial scene" in Italy, offers a brisk account of Rufio's patronage of Rembrandt and Guercino; Held 1964, p. 29, in an essay on the Book of Tobit and "the old man's blindness," mentions the bust of Homer in the *Aristotele*; J. Rosenberg 1964, pp. 278–83, 317, fig. 242, repeats the discussion in J. Rosenberg 1948; White 1964, p. 104 (ill.), sees the picture as a sign of a happy relationship between the artist and the patron; Kraft 1965, pp. 7–9, suggests that the medallion represents Athena not Alexander; K. Bauch 1966, p. 12, no. 207, pl. 207, as "Aristoteles mit der Rüste Homers"; K. Clark 1966, p. 78, fig. 71, feels that the bust of Homer had a particular significance for Rembrandt, who "turned again and again to the theme of blindness"; Haverkamp-Begemann 1966, cols. 329–350, observes that "the magic light seems to indicate the bond between poetry and philosophy"; Leporc 1967, pp. 62–63 (ill. pl. 63), finds this a "thought-provoking symbolic painting"; Emmens 1968, pp. 196–97, 203–5, fig. 51, suggests that the trio of Homer, Aristotle,
and Alexander could have been intended to correspond, respectively, with "ingenium" (inborn talent), "ars" (the science of art), and "exercitatio" (practical training); Gerson 1668, pp. 111 (ill.), 138, 139, 370 (ill.), 499, no. 286, restates the usual information and surveys the essential literature, with particular attention to Emmens 1668; Gerson in Bredius 1669, pp. 386 (ill.), 594, no. 478, describes the circumstances of the commission and mistakenly concludes (following Kraft 1965) that the image on the medallion "is an Athena with helmet, not an Alexander"; Haak 1969, pp. 240–43, 311, fig. 403, gives detailed accounts of the painting's shipment to Sicily and of Ruffo's request for a pendant by Guercino, and describes the difficulties Rembrandt experienced in satisfying the patron with companion pictures of Homer and Alexander; Held 1969, pp. 3–44, frontis., figs. 1, 33 (detail), in the fundamental study of the work's iconography, reviews the painting's early history and various interpretations of its subject (including Guercino's), discusses the later companion pictures representing Homer and Alexander, concludes that in 1653–54 "there was no plan for an enlarged program involving two other paintings" (p. 12), infers from the original measurements of "8 x 6 palmi (or c. 192 by 144 cm.)" that the New York canvas has lost about 33 cm. of its height, calls attention to "Ruffo's ignorance of, and apparent indifference to, the actual subject of the work" (p. 12), reviews the imaginary portraits (that is, Renaissance notions) of Aristotle and Alexander and the Hellenistic bust of Homer that were known to Rembrandt (who owned casts of busts representing Aristotle and Homer), and considers the picture's meaning at length, taking into account the contemporaneous reputations of Aristotle and Homer and the significance of busts and gold chains, concluding finally that the artist's theme was "two sets of values, the more enduring ones symbolized by the bust of Homer, and the mere secular and transitory awards exemplified by the chain" (p. 40); Lecaldano 1969, pp. 114–15, no. 316 (ill.), pl. XXXVII offers a fairly long account of Ruffo's patronage for the benefit of Italian readers and implausibly finds the same model in four other pictures said to be by Rembrandt; Levi 1969, p. 6, sees Aristotle as "a sort of mediator between the spectator and Homer"; Scheller 1969, p. 128, in an article on Rembrandt's art collection, mentions the picture in connection with the busts of Homer and Aristotle that he owned; Van Thiel in Amsterdam 1969, pp. 64–67, no. 11, appears aware of Held 1969 but does not cite it, gives the picture different titles in Dutch and English (see "Exhibited" below), endorses Emmens 1968, and suggests that Aristotle's pose is "characteristic of 17th and 18th century Venetian portraits of antique collectors and sculptors.

Rembrandt may have decided to give his painting a—supposedly—Italian touch"; C. Cunningham in Chicago–Minneapolis–Detroit 1969–70, p. 18, mentioned; V. Bloch 1970, pp. 45–46, remarks inanely that the picture is "not altogether free from melodrama and rhetoric redolent of Italian taste, which naturally impressed the Sicilian collector"; Haskell 1970, p. 261, notes that Altman missed the possible acquisition of this picture when Duveen obtained it from the Kann collection; Foucart in Paris 1970–71, p. 182 (under no. 178), compares the stately composition of Rembrandt's Bathsheba of 1654 (fig. 162 here); Bialostocki 1971, pp. 370–73, in a thoughtful review of Held 1969, approves of his interpretation, seeing Aristotle as (like Hercules in his old age?) a "greiser Philosoph am Scheidewege"; Broos 1971, p. 177, quotes J. G. van Gelder (De Gêde 1968), pp. 408–9), who mentions the painting in connection with an Aristotelian interpretation of the Kenwood Self-Portrait; Linink in Loevinson-Lessing 1971, unpaged (under no. 27), sees the same model in the Portrait of a Man, of 1661 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), who therefore "was one of Rembrandt's friends and of long standing, at that"; Held and Posner 1972, p. 248, fig. 259, describes Aristotle as "negligently touching the golden chain, symbol of princely favor"; Fahy 1973, p. 116, cites the work in connection with Guercino's willingness to supply a painting in his early manner; Gilleo and Mégret 1973, p. 19 (ill.); Held in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, pp. 53, 57, 63, in a lecture on "Rembrandt and the Classical World," comments on the bust of Homer, feels that Rembrandt recognized in the blind poet "an inner light, the light of poetic, artistic, and, in the last analysis, religious inspiration," and describes as a "wrong guess" Ruffo's reference to Albus Magnus as the picture's possible subject; Slive in ibid., pp. 124–25, considers Aristotle to be depicted in a manner consistent with a seventeenth-century Dutch appreciation of his philosophy, which emphasized imagination and experience (for example, in the form of practice and "catharsis") rather than theory; Hendy 1974, p. 198, in a biography of Rembrandt, cites this picture, the Homer, and "probably Alexander" (in Lisbon) as painted for Ruffo; Pigler 1974, vol. 2, pp. 323–24, listed under representations of Homer; Salinger 1975, pp. 202–4, fig. 52, remembers Museum plans to secure the painting, which went back at least to 1953 when "the curators and other scholars invited to drink tea in her [Mrs. Erickson's] library with Aristotle and Homer came away spellbound"; Wright 1975, pp. 76, 84, pl. 60, erroneously reports that "it is known from the surviving documentation that Don Ruffo [sic] only asked for a [representation of a] half-length philosopher"; C. Brown in London 1976, p. 75 (under no. 93), in a discussion of Rembrandt's Man in Armor in Glasgow, mistakenly states that Ruffo ordered from the artist a "portrait of a philosopher 8 x 6 'palmi' in size" and "rounded at the top," and that the Museum's picture is "cut down"; Fowles 1976, p. 40, recalls Mrs. Huntington, at a cost of $2,500,000, "reserving most of the fine furniture, and a number of works of art, including Rembrandt's Aristotle," which Duveen had obtained from the Kann collection; Rosenfeld 1976, p. 387, imagines Salvador Rosa coming across the picture "in the Roman [sic] collection of Don Antonio Ruffo da Messina [sic] which he had commissioned from Rembrandt in 1654 [sic]", Wiener 1976, pl. 65; Bolten and Bolten-Rempf 1977, pp. 135–36 (ill. p. 131), 151, 194, no. 406, repeats the misinformation that Ruffo "commissioned Rembrandt to paint a 'philosopher half-length'"; Broos 1977, p. 48, lists "formal sources" that scholars have proposed; Gibbons 1977, vol. 1, p. 98 (under no. 256), on Guercino's drawing of a cosmographer, briefly recalls its relationship to this painting; A. Bailey 1978, pp. 105, 171, 202, 209, mentions the picture with regard to Rembrandt's "money troubles" and other personal concerns; K. Clark 1978, p. 102, fig. 110, cites the painting in support of the author's belief that Rembrandt "bought antique busts in competition with really rich men" (although his bust of Homer must have been a case); Robb 1978, p. 46, refers to the picture as probably the best known in Kann's collection; A. B. de Vries et al. 1978, pp. 170–72, 174, 176 n. 3, pp. 222–23, fig. 141, in a discussion of Rembrandt's Homer, reviews the Ruffo history, and observes that the classical source in which Aristotle, Homer, and Alexander the Great are discussed together is Plutarch's Life of Alexander; Wright 1978, p. 167, mentioned as Rembrandt's "most important commission.
from abroad" (was there another?); A. Logan 1979, p. 106, suggests a relationship between Rembrandt's figure of Aristotle and a supposed portrait of him on top of a "Funerary Chest of Aristotle" which was then in the Reyma collection in Amsterdam; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, pp. 293, 315, 316–17 (ill. and detail), 320, 345, 438, 460–61, 485, 490–91, 494, listed under works (the only painting) dated 1633, prints extract from Ruffino documents of 1634, 1660 (Guercino correspondence), and 1661 (letters from Mattia Preti); C. Brown in London 1980, pp. 9, 10 (ill.), suggests that Rembrandt may have seen the bust of Homer depicted here in the collection of the Reyma brothers in Amsterdam; Platt 1980, pp. 68–74 (ill. p. 70), in an essay punctuated by platitudes, commends Held 1969 but nonetheless reports that Ruffino commissioned a "philosopher" from Rembrandt, and compares studying the picture with car repair; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 51–52, 98–99, 99–101, pls. 31, 32–34 (X-radiograph and auroradiographs), and pls. E, F, on p. 100 (photomicrographs), reports that technical analysis has shown that although the composition was not modified in the course of work, Rembrandt altered the costume (especially in the shoulders and sleeves), the position of the medallion in the book in the background; Foucart 1982a, p. 59, compares the composition of Rembrandt's Battle of the Bean (1654 [fig. 162 here]; Russell in Washington–Paris 1982–83, pp. 463), claims that "Ruffino's classical interest accounts for his ordering from Rembrandt depictions of Aristotle," etc. (the printing of "Aristotle" in italics is typical of Washington editing); Blankert in Amsterdam–Groningen 1981, p. 26, cites the picture as an example of the important commissions Rembrandt continued to receive in his later years; C. Brown 1983, p. 669, suggests, "on an analogy" with this painting, that the two figures in Lieven's Prince Charles Louis of the Palatinate with His Tutor Walrad von Plessen in Historical Dress, of 1651 (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles), might be identified with the young Alexander and his tutor Aristotle; White in New Haven 1983, pp. 37, 44, no. 80 (and under no. 43), suggests that Joshua Reynolds's Self-Portrait as Doctor of Civil Law, of 1773 (?) (Royal Academy of Arts, London), which features a bust of Michelangelo, may have been inspired by this composition; Carroll 1984, pp. 35–56, figs. 1, 9 (detail), revives the notion that Rembrandt's Aristotle is contemplating the bust itself, finds evidence in the sculpture, in the gold chain (an attribute of Pictura, especially when accompanied by a pendant "mask"), and in the mirror (?) on the table to suggest that the artist was alluding to himself as an encyclopedic collector and was informing viewers that "the contemplation of art is in itself a philosophical activity" (p. 50), and defends the identification of the figure as Aristotle while at the same time rejecting the image of the medallion as a portrait of Alexander; Haak 1984, p. 65, fig. 68, reports erroneously that in designing this picture and the later works done for Ruffo, Rembrandt was "following his patron's written instructions"; Norton 1984, pp. 174, 175 (ill.), recalls the purchase of the picture in 1661 and public reaction (see also note 2 above); Hoetink and Sluijter-Setijeff in Hoetink et al. 1985, p. 270 (under no. 76), in a discussion of Rembrandt's Homer, of 1663, notes that Homer and Alexander the Great are already represented in the Aristotle, Luijten 1985, pp. 379, 406 no. 1, 29, reveals that in the early 1930s (when Schmidt-Degener was director) and in 1961 the Rijksmuseum wanted to purchase the Aristotle, but never formulated a realistic financial plan; G. Schwartz 1985, pp. 280, 301–5, 308, 316, 348, fig. 334, describes the circumstances of the commission, noting that the Dutch intermediary Cornelis van Goor was a wealthy merchant in Amsterdam, that Rembrandt was free to choose the subject of the painting, and that he probably consulted Jan Six regarding the significance of Homer, whose bust Aristotle is "founding"; Ferrari 1986, pp. 108, 110, 128, considers the significance of Guercino's painting of a cosmographer as a pendant to this picture; Guillaud and Guillaud 1986, pp. 28–29, fig. 20, sees the confrontation of Aristotle and Homer as one "laden with meaning between the world of logical, verified knowledge and that of inexplicable revelation"; Mannings in London 1985b, p. 166, fig. 48 (under no. 4), compares Reynolds's profile portrait of his father (d. 1745), which was probably painted posthumously, with the bust of Homer in this picture; P. Sutton 1986, pp. 179, 182, fig. 238, repeats the misinformation that Ruffo specified "a philosopher, half figure," as Rembrandt's subject; C. Tümpein 1986, pp. 187, 237, 260 (ill.), 261, 361–64, 368, 402, no. 108, supplies a secondhand summary of Rembrandt's work for Ruffo; Held in Yokohama–Fukuoka–Kyôto 1986–87, pp. 27, 31–32, in an essay on Rembrandt and the Book of Tobit, surveys the artist's representations of the blind Homer; Vlieghe 1987, p. 115, agrees with Held 1969 that the Pontius engraving after Rubens's portrait of Gevartius must have influenced this composition; Alpers 1988, pp. 22, 25–26, 81, 86, 91, 97, 104, 113, 129 no. 24, p. 147 n. 67, pls. 2, 3 (details), fig. 120, stresses the importance of the sense of touch in the painting, and (penning an appreciation of Rembrandt's technique, evidently as studied in photographs) asks the reader to "notice the raised ridges of pigment that define the chain (or is it meant as a ring?) which loops over the little finger of [the figure in] the Aristotle in New York" (p. 22); Gregory and Zdanowicz 1988, pp. 60, 74, no. 20, cites the picture in a review of contemporaneous encomia devoted to Rembrandt's late manner; Mee 1988, pp. 238–47, in a popular biography of the artist, concludes that "Ruffo, not knowing whether he had a painting of Aristotle or of Albertus Magnus, hardly got Rembrandt's message" (p. 241); London 1988–89, p. 15, fig. 13, listed in a chronological outline of the painter's life; Chapman 1989, p. 170, compares the shading of the figure's face and eyes with the same device in one of Rembrandt's early etched self-portraits; Esterow 1989, p. 134 (ill.), quotes Everett Fahy's explanation of the picture's subject (which is consistent with that of Held 1969); Perlow in Dearborn 1989, pp. 10, 31, relates the picture's comparison of "fame, social ambition, and wealth," on the one hand, with "Homer's spiritual integrity, blindness to externals," etc., on the other, to contemporaneous writing on ethical issues; Vels Heijn 1989, no. 31 (ill.), discusses the subject, claiming mistakenly that Ruffo asked Rembrandt to paint a portrait of a philosopher for "a series of portraits of famous men in his library"; Chapman 1990, pp. 28, 31, 93, endorses Held's suggestion that Rembrandt "characterized Aristotle as a somber melancholic deep in thought," and repeats the point about shading the face made in Chapman 1989; Liedtke 1990, pp. 36, 40, 48, 55, mentions the painting in an essay on the American taste for Dutch art; Starcky 1990, pp. 31, 106, 107 (ill.), briefly rewrites the Ruffo story and concludes that in this painting one finds "Philosophy paying its respects to Poetry"; P. Sutton in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 104, refers to the "famous purchase" as an exception to the pattern of donations made to the Metropolitan Museum; De Boer in The Hague 1991, pp. 80–81 (under no. 13), fig. 1, cites the work in an entry on Rembrandt's Homer, which Bredius purchased in 1894; Brilliant 1991, pp. 80–82.
fig. 32, claims, without citing evidence, that “it is usually assumed that the Aristotle exemplifies a kind of Rembrandtian make-believe in which the artist coyly intervenes [?] to create a deliberately ambiguous portrait of the Greek philosopher”: Cabanne 1991, p. 14 (ill.); Dudok van Heel 1991b, p. 4, explains that artistic activity in Rembrandt’s house during the year this picture was painted (1635) was greatly restricted by structural repairs to the residence; Held 1991, pp. 17–18, 191–93, reprints the essay on this painting in Held 1969, adding a postscript that dismisses the contribution of Carroll 1984 as unconvincing and that of Alpers 1988 as unoriginal and shallow; MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 335, notes that the same model occurs in A Bearded Man in a Cap (fig. 167 here); C. Brown (uncredited) in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, pp. 218, 260–61 (under no. 43), discusses the commission with respect to Rembrandt’s Man in Armor (Glasgow), which is considered as quite possibly identical with Ruffo’s “Alexander”; Kelch in ibid., p. 250 (under no. 41), fig. 414, suggests that Rembrandt recalled this work when painting the slightly later Flora (Pl. 113 here); M. Bailey 1992, p. 35, cites the picture in connection with the Glasgow Man in Armor, here called Alexander the Great; C. Brown and Roy 1992, pp. 286, 288, 291, 293, 296–97, fig. 10 (paint cross section), reviews the circumstances of the commission, in an article maintaining that the Glasgow Man in Armor is Ruffo’s Alexander the Great; N. Hall 1992, p. 22, mentions the canvas as an instance of the Ericksen’s “great discernment”; Kirby 1992, p. 298, concludes that measurements of paintings given in the Ruffo archives are not exact but were meant to serve only as guides; Langedijk 1992, p. 57, suggests that the composition of Philips Koninck’s self-portrait in the Uffizi, Florence, was inspired by this work; Sluteski 1992, pp. 171–76, no. 95 (ill.), reviews the literature, favoring Held 1969, repeating the misinformation that Ruffo ordered a “filosofo, a mezza figura”; Cavalli-Björkman in Stockholm 1992–93, p. 174 (ill.), noted in a chronological outline; Broos 1993, pp. 269–71, 277, fig. 1, retells the Ruffo tale in an entry on Rembrandt’s Homer (where the Vaughan sale of 1820 and Hume catalogue of 1824 [see Ex Coll. below] are not brought into consideration); Kulski 1993, p. 89, mentions the painting in a character sketch of his previous owner, Alfred Erickson; C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 287, 357, 360 (ill.), 361, 63–64, 658, 405, no. 108, reproduces a misleadingly murky colorplate, and supplies a secondhand summary of Rembrandt’s work for Ruffo; L. Braun 1994, pp. 29, 164, 181 (ill.), reflects that “la tête d’Aristote ressemble étrangement à celles dont l’artiste gratifiait ses contemporains”; Baetjer 1995, p. 315; Beuken 1995, pp. 34, 47–48, reveals that the painter Abraham Casembroot played a consular role in the arrival of the painting in Messina, on August 19, 1634; Broos 1995b, p. 72, fig. 10, cites the picture in connection with the cast of a bust of Homer that was in Rembrandt’s collection; G. Schwartz 1995, pp. 54–55, 57 (ill.), lists the picture as one of three paintings in the Museum that “were documented as Rembrandts during the artist’s lifetime”; Wheelock 1994a, pp. 244, 310, fig. 1, surprisingly discovers the same model’s features in various works by Rembrandt and one “possibly by Willem Drost”; Gilijay in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 66, 68, reviews the history of the Ruffo commission, concludes that based on its measurements in his inventory the canvas has been cut down “by as much as 18 centimeters in width and 60 centimeters in height,” and rejects an identification with “A Portrait of a Sculptor with a Bust” in the Vaughan sale of 1810; Liedtke in ibid., vol. 2, pp. 5, 31, 65–70, 72, 115–16, no. 11 (ill.), considers the relationship between style and content in the painting, summarizes Held’s interpretation, observes that passages appear to have been intended for connoisseurs, and concludes that none of Rembrandt’s close associates ever produced a picture of comparable quality; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 6, 24, 31–32, 34–35, 50, 56–57, 59, figs. 26–27, 54–57, 73–75 (details before and after cleaning, X-rayograph details, and “reconstruction”), cover (detail), explains the advantages of Rembrandt’s use in the dark paints of glass particles, describes the evidence of X-radiography, notes the masterful use of earth pigments to achieve luminous half-shadows in the face, discusses the picture’s condition, and concludes on the basis of Ruffo’s measurements that the canvas has been cut at the sides and bottom (which has since been disproved); Broos 1995b, p. 164, asserts that the artist “no doubt consulted a Classical scholar, such as his friend Jan Six,” in formulating the subject; Fransis 1995b, p. 16, fig. 10, suggests that Rembrandt’s style in this picture “must have seemed incredibly old-fashioned” to some of his contemporaries; Lank 1996, p. 124, in a review of New York 1995–96, draws attention to the painter’s use of finely ground glass particles and transparent lake pigments for greater translucency; W. Liedtke in Timken Museum 1996, pp. 89, 93, describes the use of light and shadow, and observes that here and in Rembrandt’s Saint Bartholomew, of 1657 (Timken Museum of Art, San Diego), “there is a strong sense of pondering an ethical problem”; Watson 1996, pp. 6–10, offers a professor of philosophy’s analysis of the subject, which is helpful for its discussion of Aristotle’s thoughts on imitation and his admiration of Homer, and for the author’s conclusion that Rembrandt achieved a good likeness of Aristotle and even of his thinking; Brockhoff and Franken 1997, pp. 78, 81, in a review of New York 1995–96, cites the work as documented in the seventeenth century; Liedtke 1997, pp. 126–27, fig. 85, compares formal qualities of this painting and a work by Vermeer (Pl. 203 here) to emphasize the importance of style in Dutch art; Wiecezorek 1997, pp. 18–31, fig. 15, discusses the subject at some length, explaining how the work, “in its form and content, ranks with the greatest achievements in Western painting”; Blankert in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, pp. 40, 51, n. 28, draws attention to an apparent mention of this picture in Elsam 1700 (the connection is convincingly rejected in Slive 1993, pp. 147–48); Blankert and Blokhuis in ibid., pp. 171, 172 n. 17 (under no. 24), notes that “the same model (or type?)” has been identified in Rembrandt’s Man with a Falcon (Göteborgs Konstmuseum, Göteborg); Blokhuis in ibid., pp. 27–28, 30 n. 74, fig. 8, mentioned in a biography of the artist; Broos in ibid., p. 378 (under no. 97), cited in an entry on Rembrandt’s drawing of about 1660, Homer Dictating to a Scribe (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm); Gilijay in ibid., p. 134 (under no. 15), refers to the picture in an entry on Rembrandt’s Man in Armor in Glasgow, which is rejected as Ruffo’s “Alexander”; P. Sutton in ibid., p. 318 (under no. 71), cited in an entry on Arent de Gelder’s Homer Dictating to Scribes, of about 1700–1710 (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston); A. Adams 1998, p. 5, incorrectly cited as an instance of a work commissioned from Rembrandt for which the subject was “dictated” by the patron; Alpers and Carroll 1998, p. 132, makes the curious claim that only the records of the commission clarify “that in this case the painting is not a portrait”; Liedtke 1998a, pp. 313, 316, cites the Glasgow Man in Armor as “possibly Ruffo’s Alexander, the companion” to this picture; Liedtke 1998b, p. 55, repeats the remark in Liedtke 1998a; G. Schwartz 1998, p. 203 n. 49, calls for an investiga-
tion into whether Aristotle is depicted here "as an Aristotelian, flawed hero"; Van de Wetering 1998, pp. 32, 41-42, reasonably states that Ruffo's "confusion" about the subject "may be taken as proof that he did not order a painting with a given subject"; Giltaij 1999, pp. 10, 43-51, 60, 61, 67, 73, 76-87, 89-94, 97, 103-4, 106-8, 111, 114, 135-26, 176 nn. 126-28, p. 177 n. 147, p. 180 n. 308, fig. 10, in the most complete and most scholarly account of Rembrandt's work for Antonio Ruffo, surveys earlier literature, details the known circumstances of the commission, considers Ruffo's uncertainty about the subject, concludes that the patron probably asked for a painting with a half-length figure and that the artist chose the theme, agrees with Von Sonnenburg (see New York 1995-96) and others that the canvas was cut at the bottom, discusses the costume and attributes, thoroughly reviews the history of Rembrandt's Homer and Alexander and related pictures ordered by Ruffo from Italian artists, suggests (revising Giltaij in New York 1995-96) that the Aristotle and the Homer were in the Vaughan sale of 1810 (see Ex Coll.), and pursues the question of meaning, opting for a less intellectually ambitious interpretation than that advanced in Held 1969 (which is considered too subjective and somewhat vague), which imagines the artist simply aping a figure of a classical subject and settling upon the figures of Aristotle and Homer (p. 81); Schama 1999a, pp. 567, 582-91, 594, 720 nn. 18, 21, 23, 29, 32 (ill. p. 385), refashions the whole history, with elaborate embellishments and casual errors, and borrowing (from an unpublished paper by Paul Crenshaw) the notion "that the identity of the subject may well be Apelles" (p. 520 n. 18); Schama 1999b, p. 14, fig. 6, expresses even firmer faith in the Crenshaw hypothesis than that confessed in Schama 1999a; Freedberg 1999, states that Schama 1999a "pushes the available evidence much too far in his efforts" to reidentify Aristotle as Apelles, which is one instance of several "attempts [in the book at] some radical rereading of a painting"; Strouse 1999, p. 568, considers it surprising that in 1907 J. P. Morgan did not seize upon this picture for himself, although he had given Duveen half of what the dealer paid to the Kahn estate, in exchange for the right of first refusal; Van den Boogert in Amsterdam 1999-2000, pp. 77, 119, fig. 78, relates the painting to the busts of Homer and Aristotle in Rembrandt's collection; London--The Hague 1999-2000, p. 80, listed in a chronology of Rembrandt's life; Berger 2000, pp. 510, 610 n. 24, quotes Gerson 1968 in which the composition is compared with that of Rembrandt's Self-Portrait as Zeuxis Laughing (Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne); Binstock 2000, p. 365, considers Schama's (1999a) transformation of the Self-Portrait as Zeuxis Laughing into a portrait of Democritus "a proposal outdone in implausibility only by his renaming the painting in the Metropolitan Museum 'Apelles Contemplating a Bust of Homer'"; Calabrese 2000a, p. 20, describes Ruffo's purchase of this painting and two others from Rembrandt and of the related work by Guercino; Calabrese 2006, p. 204, quotes the Ruffo inventory of 1689 in which Rembrandt's "Aristotle con la mano dritta sopra una testa" and his paintings of Alexander and Homer are cited as a set of three pictures of the same size and format ("tre quadri di palmi sei ed ottro mezzo figure grandi al naturale"). Luijten 2000, p. 23, cites the picture while quoting Guercino on the subject of Rembrandt etchings; Westermann 2000, pp. 241-45, 247, 251, 277, 391, fig. 159, in a general study of Rembrandt's work, supports Held's interpretation, noting that "Aristotle's sallow face and weary eyes" are appropriate because the philosopher "attached special significance to melancholy as the privileged condition of the greatest intellects" (p. 243); Wright 2000, pp. 68, 70, fig. 35, makes a number of superficial observations about the picture, which has become "un véritable tableau érotique"; Chong in Boston 2000-2001, p. 119 (under no. 16), compares an early painting by Rembrandt of an old man in a contemplative pose; Moormann in Athens--Dordrecht 2000-2001, p. 32, fig. 10, mentioned in an account of classical figures in Dutch art; Crenshaw 2001, pp. 177, 178, 196-97 n. 68, 70, considers it "clear that the choice of subject was left to the artist," and warns the reader that in a future study the author will question Ruffo's identification of Aristotle in the painting, which has been followed by "modern scholars"; De Gennaro 2001, publishes an inventory of 172 paintings in the Messina collection of Don Giovanni Ruffo, 7th Prince of Scaletta, made shortly after the earthquake of February 5, 1783, which includes Rembrandt's Aristotle (no. 63, as "quadro di Alberto Magno, del Rembrant, palmi 5½ [high]"), the Homer (no. 76), and the Alexander the Great (no. 59); Liedtke in New York--London 2001, pp. 381, 385, 396, 438 n. 9, observes that Rembrandt may have been comparing the arts of painting and sculpture in this picture; Baez in Boston 2002, pp. 42, mentioned; Ford 2002, p. 125, inappropriately considers Guercino's identification of the figure as a physiognomist as an indication that "seventeenth-century spectators could be remarkably slack about the meaning of pictures"; Golabny 2002, pp. 86, 87, cites the picture among examples of Rembrandt's interest in Homer and imagines that its "composition is based upon a Venetian portrait of a man in his study" (see Held 1969, fig. 22) with no explanation of how Rembrandt could have known the work; Giltaij in Kyöto 2002-3, pp. 127 (detail ill.), 202-13, no. 29 (ill.); De Gennaro 2003, pp. XXXII, XXXVII, 81 (no. 371), 107 (no. 452), 129 (no. 599), publishes references to the painting in Ruffo inventories dating from 1660, 1668, and 1677 (in the last entry Rembrandt's three paintings are listed together as a set, each measuring 8 by 6 palmi, and the Aristotle is described as follows: "il meglio è d'un Aristote e sia Alberto Magno che tiene la mano dritta sopra una testa che sta sul boffettino, considerando la fisionomia, vestito di bianco e nero a guisa di monaco, et una catena al collo con la sua medaglia, et uno anelletto al dito, l'alta mano alla centora" [the best is an Aristotle or an Albertus Magnus, who rests his right hand on a head that stands on a side table, wearing the facial features, clothed in white and black in the costume of a monk, and a chain around the neck with a medallion, and a ring on the finger and the other hand at the waist]); Giltaij in Frankfurt 2003, p. 159, mentioned as a masterwork and as evidence that Rembrandt's fame had "pressed on" to Messina; Nadler 2003, p. 5, associates the fact that this is the only painting by Rembrandt dated 1653 with the renovations being made to his house in that year (see Dudok van Heel 1991b, above); Rutgers 2003, pp. 10, 11, 18 n. 75, fig. 7, describes the Ruffo commission, and states as a fact that the Aristotle and Homer were in the Vaughan sale of 1810 (see Ex Coll.); 1 Giltaij 2004, p. 62, observes that the Aristotle and the Homer appear to have been together in England by 1810, summarizes the findings of De Gennaro 2001 and 2003, and notes that the height given for the Aristotle in the 1783 Ruffo inventory, 5½ palmi, is very close to the painting's height today; Liedtke 2004a, pp. 73-87, fig. 1, reviews earlier interpretations of the painting's subject (especially that in Held 1969), discusses the significance of Ruffo's description of the subject as Aristotle or Albertus Magnus,
and suggests that the artist intended the secondary theme (in addition to that described in Held 1969) of a comparison, or paragone, of Touch and Sight, and of Sculpture and Painting; Scallen 2004, pp. 197, 204, 207, 208, 361 n. 18, 363 n. 99, fig. 48, notes various moments of appreciation between about 1900 and 1914; Sekrest 2004, pp. 71, 77, 120, 278–80, 476 (ill.), traces the painting from the Kann collection through Duvene to Arabella Huntington (who first saw the picture “in the Duvene galleries on the Place Vendôme”), noting that in the mid-1930s Duvene tried to sell it to Andrew Mellon before Erickson purchased it for the second time; Christiansen 2005, p. 41, fig. 39; Fahy et al. 2005, p. 27, mentioned in a short biography of Guercino; Giltaj 2005, pp. 47–49, fig. 1, reports the discovery of the Ruffo inventory of 1668–77 (published in De Gennaro 2003), quotes the entry for Ruffo’s three Rembrandts in the original Italian and in Dutch translation, describes the account of the same pictures in the Ruffo inventory of 1781, concludes that on the basis of the measurement given there for the height of the Aristotle (5% palmi) it has not been cut down since 1781, considers it highly unlikely that the canvas was cut down before that date, states that the Aristotle and the Homer “were perhaps sold in 1810 in London,” and notes that the Aristotle “seems to show traces of fire damage, perhaps as a result of the earthquake of 1783, while recent cleaning of the Homer has revealed quite large areas of damage by fire”; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 325, 327, fig. 16 (paint cross section), finds the same ground here and in the portrait of Nicholas Brumming, of 1562 (Gemäldesammlung Alte Meister, Kassel); Van de Wetering in ibid., pp. 63, 263, 406, 468, refers to the gold chain in connection with those found in Rembrandt self-portraits, sees the use of sixteenth-century dress as an allusion to the distant past, and compares the “pictorial coherence” of self-portraits from the same period; Liedtke 2005a, pp. 192, 202 n. 4, in a review of Dutch paintings intended for specific locations, mentions this picture en passant; Quodbach 2005, pp. 74, 101 n. 46, describes the painting as the centerpiece of the Kann collection and as one of the many outstanding works by Rembrandt that entered the United States within a short period; P. Sutton in Washington-Los Angeles 2005, pp. 73, 130 (under nos. 1 and 17), notes that the same model appears in A Bearded Man in a Cap, of 1632 or 1637 (fig. 167 here), and also finds him in The Apostle Paul, of about 1657 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), and in the Saint Bavo (Man with a Falcon), of about 1662–65 (Göteborgs Konstmuseum, Göteborg); Wheelock in ibid., p. 76, fig. 3 (under no. 2), finds the same model in The Apostle Paul (Washington, D.C.), Wheelock in San Diego 2005–6, p. 16, fig. 6, repeats Wheelock in Washington–Los Angeles 2005; Bogh Remberg in Copenhagen 2006, p. 101 n. 68, finds the same model in this picture and in other works by Rembrandt (Göteborg, London) or erroneously thought to be by him (Copenhagen, Saint Petersburg); Van de Wetering in ibid., pp. 45–46, mistakenly gives the date as 1654 and feels that it was mainly Rembrandt’s fame that inspired Ruffo’s commission; Bomford et al. 2006, p. 197, fig. 165, in a discussion of A Bearded Man in a Cap (fig. 167 here), notes that the same model “may well have served” for the Aristotle and other paintings by or formerly attributed to Rembrandt; Bull in Amsterdam 2006, pp. 20, 22, fig. 20, revives the misconception that Aristotle “gazes at the bust of Homer” and concludes that Rembrandt, not unlike Caravaggio, “achieves the impossible: the pictorial expression of minds commuting across the ages”; Crenshaw 2006, pp. 125, 128, 148–52, 170 n. 25, p. 189 nn. 64–66, 68, p. 190 n. 71, p. 192 nn. 26, 31–13, fig. 27, reviews Rembrandt’s difficulties with Ruffo, titles the picture Aristotle (or Apelles) Contemplating the Bust of Homer, defends the identification with Apelles by noting that the youthful painter embodied artistic success and by citing various superficial connections between Apelles and Homer, and maintains at length (with no reference to De Gennaro 2001 and 2003 or to Giltaij 2004 and 2009) that the Glasgow Man in Armor is Ruffo’s “Alexander”; Hochfield 2006, pp. 156 (ill.), 157, cites the work in a comparison between Rembrandt’s reputation today and the opinion of Ruffo’s dismissive correspondent Abraham Breugel; Lammerse in London–Amsterdam 2006, p. 279 n. 350, mentions the picture in a discussion of the wealthy merchant Cornelis Gijsbrechtsz van Goor, who served as middleman between Ruffo and Rembrandt; Noble, Pottasch and Van der Ploeg 2006, pp. 15, 22, fig. 14, discusses technical evidence for the original sizes of the Homer and the Aristotle, concluding that the latter has retained its original width but may have been somewhat taller; G. Schwartz 2006, pp. 218–22, figs. 367, 370, notes that the subject was left to Rembrandt and that Ruffo was uncertain about the identity of the main figure and did not identify Homer, considers the identification of Alexander on the medalion “speculative,” and observes that in this painting and its companions Rembrandt attempts “the depiction of thought processes, reflection and poetic creation”; C. Timpel 2006, pp. 131–33, 161 n. 117 (ill. p. 132), sketches the Ruffo history; C. Timpel and A. Timpel 2006, pp. 312, 260–62, 265 (ill.), briefly reviews the history of the commission; De Winkel 2006, pp. 169, 210, 216, 311 n. 154, fig. 104, observes that the gold chain worn by Aristotle is similar to the “chains of honour” that princes gave to artists such as Rubens and Van Dyck, which usually consisted of “several” strands worn diagonally across the chest and were often accompanied by a medal bearing the likeness of the patron, suggests that the “shirt-like undergarment sufficed as a reference to classical drapery” and that to dress the figure in the shirt alone would have been “against the contemporary standards of decorum” (p. 216), and discusses the subject in general and such specifics as the books, the ring and earring, and the extended right arm as based on classical literature.

**Exhibited:** London, British Institution, 1815, no. 39, as “Portrait of Peter Cornelius Van Hooft, a celebrated Flemish Historian, and a friend of Rembrandt” (lent by Sir A. Hume); London, British Institution, 1818, no. 12, as “Portrait of Cornelius Van Hooft, the translator of Homer into Dutch” (lent by Viscount Alford); London, British Institution, “Portraits of Illustrious and Eminent Persons in History, Literature and Art,” 1846, no. 73, as “Cornelius Van Hooft, the translator of Homer into Dutch, died 1647” (lent by Viscount Alford); London, Royal Academy of Arts, “Winter Exhibition,” 1891, no. 125, as “Portrait of a Man” (lent by the Earl Brownlow); New York, MMA, “The Hudson-Fulton Celebration,” 1909, no. 97, as “The Savant” (lent by Mrs. Collins P. Huntington, New York); London, Olympia, “The Daily Telegraph Exhibition of Antiques and Works of Art,” 1928, no. X42, as “A Savant with the Bust of Homer” (lent by Sir Joseph Duvene); Detroit, Mich., The Detroit Institute of Arts, “Thirteenth Loan Exhibition of Old Masters: Paintings by Rembrandt,” 1930, no. 51, as “Aristotle” (lent by Mr. A. W. Erickson, New York); London, Christie’s, “Art Treasures Exhibition,” 1929, no. 155, as “Aristotle” (lent by Sir Joseph Duvene);

Ex Coll.: Don Antonio Russo, 1st Prince of Scalaletta (principe della Scalaletta), 2nd Messina, Sicily (1654–d. 1678); probably his widow, Alfonsina Gotha (1678–d. 1689); their son Don Placido Russo, 2nd Prince of Scalaletta, Messina (1689–d. 1776); his son Don Antonio Russo II, 3rd Prince of Scalaletta, Messina (1710–d. 1739); his son Don Calogero Russo, 4th Prince of Scalaletta and 3rd Prince of Fioresta, Messina (1739–d. 1748); his estate, ca. 1743–50; his uncle Don Giovanni Russo e La Rocca, 5th Prince of Scalaletta, Messina (ca. 1753–d. 1755/56); his son Don Antonio Russo, 6th Prince of Scalaletta (1755/56–d. 1778); his son Don Giovanni Russo, 7th Prince of Scalaletta, Messina (1778–until d. 1802; inventory of 1783). 3 A Vaughan (until 1810); sale, Christie’s, London, February 17, 1810, no. 113, as by Rembrandt, “A Portrait of a Sculptor with a Bust,” for £79 16s., to Barnett [no. 114, as by Rembrandt, “The Companion, a Schoolmaster with his Pupil” (fig. 163 here), sold for £31 11s.). 4 Sir Abraham Hume, Ashridge Park, Berkhamstead, Herts. (by 1813–d. 1838; cat. 1824, no. 116, as “Portrait of Cornelius Van Hooff” [the Dutch poet and historian Pieter Cornelisz Hooff, who] “appears to be in the act of contemplating the Genius of Homer,” and as “brought into this country [England] about the year 1814, from Naples, together with its companion; the subject of which was Homer dictating his poems”). 5 His grandson John Hume Cust, Viscount Alford, Ashridge Park (1838–d. 1851); his son John William Spencer Brownlow Cust, 2nd Earl Brownlow, Ashridge Park (1851–d. 1869); his brother Adelbert Wellington Brownlow Cust, 3rd Earl Brownlow, Ashridge Park (1867–d. 1884); Rodolpho Kann, Paris (by 1894–d. 1905; his estate, 1905–7; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, Paris and New York, 1907; sold to Huntington]; Mrs. Collis P. Huntington (later Mrs. Henry E. Huntington), New York (1907–d. 1924); her son, Archer M. Huntington, New York (1924–28; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, New York, 1928; sold for $750,000 to Erickson]; Alfred W. Erickson, New York (1928–50; sold for $500,000 to Duveen); [Duveen, New York, 1950–56; sold for $900,000 to Erickson]; Alfred W. Erickson, New York (d. 1956); his widow, Mrs. Alfred W. Erickson, New York (1946–d. 1961; her estate sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, November 15, 1961, no. 7, to MMA); Purchase, special contributions and funds given or bequeathed by friends of the Museum, 1961. 61.98

1. Rutgers 2003, p. 18 n. 75, mistakes the prices paid for the pictures (which are penned into the copy of the sale catalogue preserved at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague) for their dimensions, recorded in some mysterious form of English measurement (thus “A Portrait of a Sculptor with a Bust” is said to be 79’/16 high, which “comes close to the original height of 8 palmi for the Aristotle”).

2. Scalaletta is a town on the east coast of Sicily, a short distance southwest of Messina.

3. According to Giltaij 1999, p. 110, and earlier literature (following Ruffo 1916), Giovanni Ruffo died in 1802. Several genealogical Web sites give his date of death in Messina as April 11, 1808, but this is certainly an error for the same day in 1823 (personal communication dated March 15, 2007, from M. C. Calabrese, author of Calabrese 2004 and 2006b).

4. J. Giltaij in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 68 n. 16, rejects the identification of the companion pictures in the Vaughan sale with Rembrandt’s Aristotle and Homer, but in Giltaij 1999, pp. 45–46, 67, 176 n. 126, he agrees with the present writer’s suggestion (personal communication, 1999) that the pictures are probably those in the Vaughan sale. In the Christie’s catalogue, sizes and supports are not indicated and the compositions are not described. However, it would seem an extraordinary coincidence if two “companion” pictures by Rembrandt said to represent a sculptor with a bust (Aristotle’s black gown could have been taken for a sculptor’s apron; compare Rembrandt’s etching The Goldsmith, of 1655) and a schoolmaster with a pupil (Rembrandt’s Homer included two pupils before it was damaged) were on the London market shortly before Hume (the next owner cited here) acquired the Aristotle and the Homer. If the subjects are correctly identified in the Vaughan sale, then the two pictures make no sense as pendants and they cannot be identified with other known works by Rembrandt. The only basis for the assumption that Hume imported the Aristotle and the Homer from Naples about 1814 is the remark in Nicol 1824 (see Refs.), which does not say that Hume himself was involved in bringing the pictures to England. The statement may be based on a misunderstanding or dissimulation; or perhaps “1814” is simply a typographical error for 1804 or another date. Attempts to identify Vaughan have not yet proved successful. He may have been a member of the family that produced the Earls of Lisburne, who are known as patrons and collectors. The question was explored on my behalf by Burton Fredericksen, who notes that the buyer of Rembrandt’s “Portrait of a Sculptor with a Bust” in 1810, “Barnett,” has a name that appears in numerous British sales of the period. One of the lots in the Vaughan sale went to “T. Barnett,” who, according to Fredericksen, may be the auctioneer Thomas Barnett. Fredericksen also notes that the two Rembrandts were by far the most expensive items in the Vaughan sale (personal communications, February 2007).

5. See the preceding note on the 1824 catalogue of the Hume collection.

654 Rembrandt van Rijn
Oil on canvas, 55\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 45\(\frac{3}{4}\) in. (140.3 x 114.9 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): Rembrandt f 1654

Significant portions of the composition are well preserved, while the costume, hat, and deep passages in the background are abraded and have darkened with age. There is a tear in the support on the sitter’s proper right hip, small losses distributed at right between his figure and the standard, and losses around the perimeter of the painting.

The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.35

The white-haired gentleman in this quietly commanding portrait is almost certainly the fifty-year-old Floris Soop (1604–1657), a wealthy bachelor and ensign, or standard-bearer, in a civic guard company of his native Amsterdam. The large painting’s impact has been diminished by abrasion and darkening, but it remains obvious that Rembrandt made a special effort to satisfy the patron by conveying a strong sense of character and by displaying extraordinary skill in various passages. These include the vigorously modeled face, the thick hair, and (evidently) two white feather plumes in the hat, all of which reveal remarkable effects of light and shadow; the fringed, gilded, and heavily tooled baldric, or sword belt (Soop’s own chain of Alexander, as it were; compare Pl. 151); the polished wooden pole that extends from the nearest space in the picture to the curtainless cascade of the company flag behind the sitter’s head and torso; and such details as the gleaming sword hilt, the gloves (one worn, the other held), and the more than forty brass or silver-gilt buttons that reflect spots of white and red like coals in a fireplace. A green sash is draped across the ensign’s chest and wound around his waist. The rough stone wall suggests a city gate and, thus, Soop’s role as a protector of Amsterdam.

Soop lived in a large town house called the Glashuys (Glass House) on Kolveniersburgwal (No. 105), next door to Jan Six (1618–1700), whose magnificent portrait (Six Collection, Amsterdam) was painted by Rembrandt in the same year as this canvas, 1654. Like Six, Floris Soop was a regent of the Amsterdam theater, and the cultivated neighbors must have been acquainted for quite some time before Rembrandt painted their portraits. At his death three years later, Soop owned about 140 paintings as well as many books, a lute and three violas da gamba, and about a hundred pieces of fine glassware, coins, and other collectibles. It must have been Six, however, who inspired Soop to commission a major portrait by Rembrandt, for the younger man had been involved with the artist since the 1640s (the famous etching of Six reading by a window dates from 1647) and in the early 1650s he had bought other paintings from Rembrandt and lent him money.

Soop was baptized in the Nieuwe Kerk, Amsterdam, on January 20, 1604. The story of how he and his distinguished uncle, Petrus Scribe rius (portrayed by Hals in 1626; Pl. 63), came by their different surnames goes back two generations to Pieter Thijsz, a surgeon, and his wife, Marie Jansdr Schrijver (Scribe rius, in Latin). The couple had two sons, Thijs and Hendrick, who after their father’s early death took their mother’s surname. Marie remarried, and with her second husband, Dirck Jansz van Reuningen, she had two more sons. In 1575, Hendrick Jansz Schrijver married Cornelia (Cornelisgen Jansdr) Soop, who came from a prominent family in Haarlem. The couple settled on the Dam in Amsterdam, where Hendrick sold dairy products. They had three sons, Pieter (Petrus Scribe rius; 1576–1660); Jan Hendricksz (1578–1638), who adopted his maternal grandfather’s surname, Soop; and Daniel, about whom little is known except that he died a bachelor.

Floris Soop’s parents, Jan Hendricksz Soop and Barbara Carel, married in 1598. She was the daughter of a wealthy Amsterdam entrepreneur, Jan Jansz Carel, who in 1601 purchased and expanded an Amsterdam glass factory that had been founded four years earlier by an Italian merchant. This was the future Glashuys, where in 1610 Barbara Carel died in childbirth, leaving Jan Soop with five (soon only four) children. The Glashuys gradually went out of business during Jan Soop’s lifetime, but his own sons were rather well off, thanks to income inherited from their mother’s side, and perhaps also from their paternal grandparents.

Jan’s oldest son was Jan Soop the Younger (1602–1655), who like his maternal grandfather, Jan Carel, became a captain in an Amsterdam civic guard company. It is not known when Jan the Elder’s second son, Floris, joined a civic guard company, but it must have been long before this portrait was painted. As a bachelor from a respected family, Floris qualified to serve as an ensign. In earlier times, standard-bearers were not expected to survive very long and were therefore chosen from the ranks of unmarried men.
Van Eeghen's article of 1971 (see Refs.), which identifies Soop as Rembrandt's "Standard-Bearer," was essentially the first useful study of any kind devoted to the picture and fulfilled Bode's prediction (1901; see Refs.) that archival research would eventually reveal the sitter's name. Special mention should be made of Louise de Ranitz, a curatorial assistant at the Museum, who in 1970 wrote to the city archives in Amsterdam, observing that ensigns of civic guard companies were obliged to relinquish office if they married, and that Rembrandt's patron was therefore probably one of the eldest ensigns in the city during the early 1650s. Ms. Ranitz was informed by I. H. van Eeghen, adjunct archivist, that at the time there were sixty-seven ensigns in Amsterdam, of whom thirteen were newly appointed and undoubtedly young, and that all but nine or ten of the remaining fifty-four could be more closely investigated through known documentation. The process of elimination is concisely described in Van Eeghen's subsequent publication, which explains that most ensigns were between twenty-five and forty years old and that only three are known to have been sufficiently senior to invite further consideration. Two of the three left no inventories, and neither had any apparent link to Rembrandt. Floris Soop, however, the elder statesman of standard-bearers in 1654, was a neighbor and colleague of Jan Six, whose portrait Rembrandt had painted that year.

Furthermore, an inventory of Soop's estate survives and is more detailed than many documents of its kind. Soop died intestate, which in the absence of surviving parents, siblings, spouses, or children brought his nephews, Willem Schrijver of Amsterdam and Hendrick Schrijver of Oudewater (on behalf of the nearest surviving relative, Petrus Scriverius, who was eighty-one years old and blind), as well as members of the Carel family, to the Glashuys on May 3, 1657. (Soop appears to have died not long before, outside Amsterdam, since his burial is not recorded there.) By the end of the year, no will had been found and a thorough inventory of Soop's estate was compiled (the document is dated December 21, 1657). In addition to the Glashuys and the furniture and various collections it contained, Soop owned several houses in Haarlem, two gardens outside the Regulierspoort (one of the city gates), some property in Hoon, and land near Soest, where he and his late brother Jan II had a country house called Crachtwijk. Once every possession was valued (down to a doll made of glass, and tack for Soop's horses and carriage) and debts were discounted, it was decided that the Carel family would walk away with a cash payment of 4,200 guilders from an estate worth (or, more likely, underestimated to be worth) 36,600 guilders. Everything else belonged to Petrus Scriverius, including some 140 pictures that he could not see.

The great majority of the works of art listed in Soop's estate are not attributed to any artist. He owned drawings by Pieter Quast (q.v.), which presumably reflected his interest in the Amsterdam Schouburg (Playhouse). The only attributed paintings were a seascape by Hendrick Vroom (1562/63–1640), a gamepiece by Elias Vonck (1605–1652), a landscape by Jan van Goyen (q.v.), and a landscape by Hercules Segers (1589/90–1639/38), a painter for whom Rembrandt had a high regard. In the voorhuis (the most important room in the house) hung portraits of "old Captain Soop" (Jan I) and his sons Jan II and Pieter. When these same three paintings were listed in the inventory of Willem Schrijver's estate (October 26, 1661), each one was described as "door Hals gedaen" (done by Hals, which could only have been Frans; q.v.).

In the same room was "een conterfeyt sel van capiteyn Soop met een hondt" (a portrait of Captain Soop [Jan I] with a dog), and "idem noch van Floris Soop soo groot als het leven" (another [portrait], of Floris Soop, as large as life). Rembrandt's portrait of a standard-bearer shows the figure life-size, on a canvas somewhat larger than the Portrait of Jan Six (44⅝ x 40⅜ in. [113 x 102 cm]). That paintings by Vonck and Vroom are attributed in the inventory (which was compiled by a notary) and those by Hals and Rembrandt pass without their names has to do with conspicuous signatures rather than reputations. Two other unattributed portraits of Floris Soop were in the house, one in the voorhuis and one in the music room.

In the "captain's room," many more weapons could be found than are depicted in The Night Watch (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which incidentally hung about two minutes' walk from Soop's house in the Kloveniersdorpen. Soop owned, or at least stored, dozens of muskets, pistols, swords, pikes, and other weapons, as well as "2 vaendels" (two company flags). A chest in the bedroom contained items similar if not identical to those worn by Rembrandt's patron, including a strap embroidered in gold, a black plume, and a cloak with fourteen large and twelve small silver buttons. Among the objects in a sideboard were "39 silvere knopen" (thirty-nine silver buttons). There are at least two reasons that one might not find precisely the same items in the inventory and in
Rembrandt's painting. The baldric, sash, and flag were probably owned by the civic guard company. And the artist would not have hesitated to give Soop whatever color feathers best set off his hat and face, and to turn buttons from silver to gold.

The Standard-Bearer dates from the declining years of a long tradition of portraits of individual ensigns and paintings of civic guard companies in which the ensign is usually assigned a prominent place. One of the grandest Amsterdam schuttersstukken (shooters' pieces) of earlier years is The Company of Captain Jan Jansz Carel and Lieutenant Thijs Pietersz Schrijver, which was painted by Gerrit Pietersz (1566–before ca. 1612) in 1604 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). Floris Soop's maternal and paternal grandfathers, Jan Carel and Hendrick Schrijver, and Hendrick's brother Thijs sit in the foreground, flanking the standing ensign. Hendrick's sons Daniel Schrijver and Jan Soop (Floris's father) sit on the other side of the table.

Formal if not family precedents for the portrait of Floris Soop are well known. The most memorable include the small full-length Portrait of Loot Fredericks, of 1626, by Thomas de Keyser (q.v.; Mauritshuis, The Hague), and the large and exquisitely colorful Portrait of Andries Stille, of 1640, by Johannes Verspronck (q.v.; National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.). A full-length, life-size portrait of an ensign by Evert Crijnsz van der Maes (1577–1666), dated 1617, is in the Gemeentemuseum, The Hague.

Of all the imaginary standard-bearers that were drawn, engraved, or painted by Dutch artists from Hendrick Goltzius (1538–1617) onward, nothing need be said here except that the greatest of them all is the swaggering hero of Rembrandt's large canvas dated 1636, also titled The Standard-Bearer, in the Rothschild collection, Paris. But none of these earlier pictures prepare one for Rembrandt's portrait of Floris Soop, which apparently presents the sitter simply as he was, a proud old soldier of Amsterdam.

1. Specifically, the company of precinct 14, under Capt. Gillis Valkenier. Soop had earlier served in the company of precinct 15 under his father's cousin Capt. Dirk Geurtsz van Beuningen (d. 1648). See Van Eeghen 1971b, p. 179, in the article that first identified the sitter. Unless otherwise specified, all biographical details given in the present entry are drawn from that publication.
2. As noted in Postma 1995, p. 93, on October 28, 1633, Soop, Six, and the poets Joost van den Vondel and Jan Vos were present at a banquet of directors and former directors of the Amsterdam theater.
3. For a glimpse of the items in Soop's estate, see Dudok van Heel 1993, p. 21.
4. Six's patronage of Rembrandt need not be detailed here. (However, see the discussion above of Paulus Bor's The Distilled Medea [Pl. 12], which is related to Rembrandt's etching for Six's tragic play Medea, of 1648.) For Six's interest-free loan of Fl 1,000 to Rembrandt on March 7, 1638, see Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 302, doc. 1638/11.
5. Van Eeghen 1971b, p. 178. In addition to Floris and Jan II, who are discussed in the present text, Jan Soop had a son Pieter (1609–1664) and a daughter, Emmerentia, who was probably about nineteen or twenty years old when she died in 1633. The anonymous biography of Karel van Mander published in the 1618 edition of Het Schilder-Bock records that "at this very time [about 1602], for Jan Hendrck Soop, master and supervisor of the glassworks at Amsterdam, he made a large piece in which the god-forsaken children of Israel dance around the raised calf in a godless and licentious manner." This must be Van Mander's Worship of the Golden Calf, dated 1602, in the Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem. See Van Mander/Miedema 1994–99, vol. I, p. 29, for the quote, and vol. 2, p. 78, on Jan Soop and the Glassuys, where an article on "Venetian glass from Amsterdam" is cited.
10. See the map of Amsterdam in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, p. 59, top right, where Soop's house and the Kloveniersdoelen are identified. On the military items in Soop's house, see Van Eeghen 1971b, p. 180, and Dudok van Heel 1993, p. 21.
12. Roos and Van Suchtelen 2004, no. 32.
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(not of May 3, as stated there) but not in that of Willem Schrijver (dated October 26, 1661); Liedtke 1990, pp. 40, 52, in a review of Rembrandts owned by American collectors, mentions the picture's ownership by Gould and Bache, and its inclusion in the 1909 "Hudson-Fulton" exhibition; Dudok van Heel in Berlin- Amsterdam- London 1991-92a, p. 59, lists the painting next to a map showing the location of Soop's house in Amsterdam; Van Thiel in ibid., p. 200, fig. 26a (under no. 26), in an entry on the Rothschild Standard-Bearer, compares the New York picture in order to stress that the earlier painting is not a portrait; Slatkis 1991, p. 237, no. 163 (ill.), reviews the evidence supporting the identification of Soop; Dudok van Heel 1993, pp. 20-21, fig. 8, as "The Ensign Floris Soop," discusses the effects included in the sitter's inventory of 1675, including a strap decorated in gold, and a black feather or "plume"; C. Tümpel 1993, p. 280 (ill.), 416, no. 213, credits Van Eeghen (1971b) with the identification of the sitter; Baetjer 1995, p. 115, as "The Standard-Bearer (Floris Soop)"; Liedtke in New York 1995-96, vol. 2, pp. 31, 34, 72-74, 115, no. 13 (ill.), discusses questions of quality and condition, the sitter, and his costume; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 24, 31, 47, 59-60, figs. 48 (detail), 49 (X-raygraph detail), labels the work "Rembrandt?" and observes that "the overall flatness evident in the painting itself and in the X-raygraph is not consistent with authentic works," but also (p. 31) regards the presence of glass particles in the dark paints as typical of Rembrandt's later works; Broos 1996b, p. 161, mentioned as a late portrait commission; Brockhoff and Franken 1997, p. 78, finds it "amazing that Von Sonnenburg does not employ his category "Rembrandt (?) at all" in New York 1995-96, except for the caption to this picture; Schaarenburg 1999a, p. 602, illogically feels that the way Rembrandt "tried to distill something universal out of the particular" in this case was by focusing on "the wood grain, purely polished birch, on Floris Soop's flagpole"; Berger 2000, pp. 315-17, 372-73 no. 123, 126, 128, 131-32, pl. 16, allows ignorance of the honorary office of ensign to encourage anachronistic reflections about the work; Kremepel 2000, p. 125 n. 64, compares the light in a portrait by Nicolaes Maes; Westermann 2000, pp. 238-39, fig. 136, cites the painting as an example of Rembrandt's regaining "his position as a sought-after portraitist of Amsterdam's elite," and observes how the "meticulously rendered wood-grain on the pole," contrasted with the "broadly indicated fabric of the banner," helps to create a convincing sense of space around the figure; Wright 2000, p. 222, fig. 214, admires the portrait of Soop, who is incorrectly said to be "a businessman prospering in the glass industry"; Seccrest 2004, p. 477, misses the chance to cite Duveen twice under "provenance"; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 666-67, reports that the first ground contains red ochre, and the second ground lead white, charcoal black, and a little brown, resulting in a gray color; Liedtke 2009a, p. 192, mentions the portrait in a review of Dutch paintings made for specific locations; Liedtke in Martigny 2006, pp. 82-88, no. 13, publishes an abbreviated version of the present entry; G. Schwarz 2006, p. 208, states that Soop had Rembrandt depict him as an ensign, and incorrectly calls Soop's heir, Petrus Schriverius, his half brother.


Ex Coll.: The sitter, Amsterdam (1664-1657); probably his uncle Petrus Schriverius (Pieter Schrijver), Oudewater (1657-1660); probably his son Willem Schrijver (1660-1661); possibly his son, Willem Schrijver the Younger (1661-1673); Sir Joshua Reynolds, London (by 1769-1792); his estate sale, Christie's, London, March 17, 1795, no. 56, bought in by Offley for £57 16s.; Reynolds's estate sale,
153. Flora

Oil on canvas, 39⅜ x 36⅜ in. (100 x 91.8 cm)

The headgear, hair, and lifted portion of the skirt are well preserved. The face, most of the blouse, and the skirt have lost much of their original surface in past restorations. There are losses and abrasions along the vertical canvas join at the left side and a series of pinpoint restorations on the neck.

Gift of Archer M. Huntington, in memory of his father, Collis Potter Huntington, 1926 26.101.10

Rembrandt's late Flora was probably painted about 1654. The facial features recall Rembrandt's wife, Saskia (d. 1642; see fig. 173), and to a lesser extent presumed representations of his companion, Hendrickje Stoffels (Pl. 154), but there was certainly no intention of depicting either woman. The figure is an ideal type that goes back to earlier pictures by Rembrandt.¹

As noted in the condition report above, the painting has suffered from linings and abrasion. The trace of horizontal threads in the paint layer is especially pronounced to the right in the bust and sleeve. Modeling is diminished in the head and neck. The background is quite thin; an early repainting of the background, noted by Bode in 1901, was removed in the 1970s.² The intended wall plane, with various textures and light effects, is now only vaguely discerned.³

The voluminous sleeves of the Venetian chemise, which with other elements of the design bring to mind Rembrandt's slightly earlier Aristotle with a Bust of Homer (Pl. 151), have lost a degree of the gracefulness and much of the substance they once had. X-radiographs (fig. 172) give some idea of the billowing volumes and flowing forms that were originally found in the blouse, skirt, and apron, creating a vivid impression of space filled by a figure with arms extended toward the viewer as well as to the side. Rembrandt surely intended the broad cascade of almost tangible drapery (and, in a different way, the branch of cherry blossom on the hat) to be appreciated as a masterful essay in brushwork. In this regard, the Flora may be said to have been painted as a reprise of the Aristotle in a lighter key, one appropriate to the tenderness and femininity of the subject. If the grand painting of an ancient philosopher concerns the workings of the mind, then Flora conveys what the heart knows without effort—love, the coming of spring, the sad passage of time.

It is often observed that in this picture Rembrandt emulates Titian, in particular his beautiful painting of Flora (fig. 173), which until 1641 was in Amsterdam for a few years.⁴ The same canvas has been connected, unconvincingly, with Rembrandt's Flora of 1654 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg) and, more plausibly, with his Flora of 1653 (National Gallery, London).⁵ The subject of Flora and the closely related theme of Arcadian shepherdesses flourished in the artist's circle during the 1630s (see Flinck's A Young Woman as a Shepherdess ["Saskia as Flora"; Pl. 46], and the New York picture may be described as a mature restatement of an image that had attracted Rembrandt when he was in his late twenties and newly married ("the close connection between Venus and Flora has always been recognized").⁶
This constellation of meaning adds to the impression that two portraits of Saskia seem especially important for the late Flora, namely, the Saskia as Flora, of 1641, in the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden (fig. 174) and the profile portrait of Saskia in a luxurious version of Northern Renaissance costume, in the Gemäldegalerie, Kassel (fig. 175), which is thought to have been begun about 1634, finished about 1642, and sold to Jan Six in October 1652. Not long before Rembrandt parted with the Kassel picture, it was freely copied by a gifted follower; that version, in Antwerp (fig. 177), which is on canvas not (like the original) on wood, comes closer than the Kassel portrait to the New York figure of Flora in the facial features, the expression (more of a smile, and perhaps more awareness in the eyes), the open neck of the blouse revealing a string of pearls, the more casual coiffure, details such as the dark stroke of the eyebrow and the shape and size of the ear, the simpler pearl earring, and the more painterly execution, which one would expect in any case but is significant in the hat. Flora’s extravagant chapeau, which once (as is visible to the naked eye) sat farther forward on her head, derives in its form from the fussy velvet tellerbaret (platter beret) in the Kassel portrait, but its shape and leafy decoration (flowers alone would have sufficed for Flora) are closer to the hat and the broadly brushed feather in the Antwerp canvas. Of course, the hat also evolved from the “antique” headgear of Aristotle (Pl. 151) and in part—the gold strokes under the brim at the back—echo the shape of the philosopher’s hat before it was revised.

Titian’s influence on the Dresden Saskia as Flora (fig. 174) is likely in view of the similar pose and gesture (which may also owe a debt to Lorenzo Lotto [ca. 1480–1556]). The “portrait” (for which Saskia modeled) dates from 1641, when Rembrandt must have known Titian’s Flora, then in the collection of Alfonso Lopez (1582–1649), Cardinal Richelieu’s agent in the Netherlands. About 1640, Joachim von Sandrart (1606–1688), then also in Amsterdam, engraved Titian’s Flora with a Latin verse, which reads:

In Springtime, warmed and nourished by soft showers,  
When Zephyr’s gentle breeze brings forth sweet flowers,  
Then Flora, in the mantle of Spring,  
Enamours Titian, and tempts others’ hearts to sing.  

The offer of a carnation in the Museum’s Flora may be traced back in Rembrandt’s oeuvre mainly to his silverpoint
drawing of Saskia dated “the third day of our betrothal, the 8th of June 1633” (Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin), and to the Dresden Saskia as Flora, of 1641. Although carnations and roses, like any flowers, were attributes of Flora, they also had a long history in art and literature as signs of love and marriage (see the discussion of Rembrandt’s Woman with a Pink; Pl. 159). Rembrandt seems to recall that Netherlandish tradition as well as Renaissance images of the goddess “in the mantle of Spring,” scattering flowers from her folded gown. Here, Flora’s hand is filled with delicate flowers, and many more are gathered in her apron or overskirt. The repoussoir of the overscaled left hand and silhouetted drapery (with sunlight glowing in the fabric and escaping to the right) is a less obvious use of the analogous device in the London Flora, of 1635 (the similarity in composition is more evident if the earlier painting is cropped at the bottom to just below the hand, and slightly on the other sides). However, the late Flora’s more frontal and more open pose, by which the viewer might feel acknowledged or even welcomed, and the luminosity and broad handling throughout, are fond memories of Titian’s painting, which left the country in 1641.

Rembrandt’s sympathy with Titian in this picture has often been interpreted more plainly as a case of influence. But particularly with regard to formal qualities, this brushes over the complexities of how personal styles develop, and ignores the parallels found in the work of contemporary Dutch artists (Carel Fabritius [1622–1654], for example), who were less concerned with great painters of the past. In a broad view—broad enough to embrace Rubens and other Netherlandish artists—the legacy of Venetian art in a picture such as this one is its treatment of an imaginary figure in terms of real experience. Here and especially in Rembrandt’s Bathsheba of 1640 (see fig. 162), works that have often been perceived as reflections of the painter’s private life, one finds no confiding (let alone confessing) about personal affairs, but rather images of women from the mythological and biblical past that have a sensual and emotional immediacy rarely achieved before. Of course, Rembrandt’s study of human expression and behavior had begun in Leiden nearly thirty years earlier. But here it is more subjective and more sensitive. In the same period, Gerard ter Borch (see Pl. 13) and other painters of contemporary life began to describe women, and occasionally men, as if their private worlds were seen by a hidden
observer, or by someone who knew them all too well. Rembrandt's last Flora is neither Saskia nor Hendrickje; but they must have been the reason that she is not the carefree Flora of twenty years before. The faint smile, restrained pose, and almost hesitant gesture make the customary promise of Spring seem uncertain, as if the goddess had learned that, like flowers, youth, beauty, and love do not last.

1. This point is stressed by the present writer in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 69–70, and is discussed more fully by Lloyd Williams in Edinburgh–London 2001, pp. 14, 208. She notes that the artist “had already depicted a face akin to this in his Susanna and the Elders of 1647, before Hendrickje is recorded as being in Rembrandt's household.” A review of the figure's identifications as Saskia or, far more frequently, as Hendrickje, in literature over the past century is offered below, under Refs. Valetiner (in A. Rosenberg 1909) introduced the notion that the painting is a portrait historié of Hendrickje Stoffels, an idea for which Bode and evidently Hofstede de Groot had no use (Bode is falsely accused of introducing the title “Hendrickje as Flora” in Kelch's inconclusive discussion of the question, in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, p. 252). Bredius (1935) gave the identification currency; Kieser (1947–48), Sluijes (1992), De Jongh (in Edinburgh–London 2000), and Crenshaw (2006), among others, have associated the picture with events in Hendrickje’s life. Her appearance is undocumented, and the figure here does not even conform to the Hendrickje type (as insisted in Sluijter 1998b, p. 96 n. 52).

2. These remarks are based on a memo written by John Walsh on April 9, 1976, recording his conversation with conservator John Brealey in front of the Flora. For Bode, see Refs. under Bode 1897–1906.

3. See Ainsworth et al. 1983, p. 62, pl. 41 (autoradiograph revealing brushwork, scratches, and other marks made by Rembrandt to suggest the surface of a wall).


6. The quote is from Held 1961, p. 203 (see also p. 208). Much of this valuable article is devoted to Flora the courtesan, which is Titian’s essential subject. For a sensible word on the question of personal significance in the Flora of 1635 (whether or not it was commissioned), see Lloyd Williams in Edinburgh–London 2001, p. 116.


8. The similarity of the Antwerp Saskia to the New York Flora was, to the present writer’s knowledge, first pointed out by him in New York 1955–95, vol. 2, p. 70. This and other contributions by scholars working outside the immediate circle of the Rembrandt Research Project are overlooked in Copenhagen 2006, pp. 106–22, where the Kassel Saskia and the version in Antwerp are illustrated together in color (p. 117, figs. 15, 16). Jeroen Gilijau is studying the Antwerp painting, which has been cleaned and reminds him of works by Carel Fabritius. If such an attribution proves plausible, one would look forward from the Antwerp canvas to the painting of a young woman in profile, with a pearl earring (casting a conspicuous shadow) and a feathered beret, in the Niedersächsische Landesgalerie, Hannover (discussed in Sumowski 1988–94, vol. 2, no. 668, and in Liedtke 2006 as by Carel Fabritius).

9. See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3, pp. 400–401, where the possible influence of Lotto’s Portrait of Andria Odoni, of 1527 (Royal Collection, Hampton Court), is also noted. The Lotto is cited as one of the great Italian paintings in the Amsterdam collection of Gerrit Reynst (1999–1668) in London–Amsterdam 2006, p. 68, fig. 32. There are several reasons to assume that Rembrandt, through some intermediary, would have seen Lopez’s pictures. The collector bought Rembrandt’s Balthasar and the As of 1625 (Musée Cognacq-Jay, Paris), directly from the artist in the late 1630s or about 1640 (see Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, p. 81). This and other details about Lopez’s stay in Amsterdam were clarified in a seminar paper by Deborah Roldán presented at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, in 1996.


12. See Held 1961, p. 204, fig. 2.

REFERENCES: Dibdin 1822, vol. 1, p. 277, mentions the painting as “A Woman’s Head, by Rembrandt,” located in the South East Angle bedroom at Althorp, and observes, “She is fantastically dressed. A very beautiful picture”; J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 173, no. 544, lists the work among paintings by Rembrandt, “A Young Lady, represented in a profile view, wearing a hat decked with a bunch of flowers,” etched by A. Pond, owned by the Earl Spencer; Hofstede de Groot 1898, no. 106 (ill.), as “Young Woman with Flowers,” painted about 1660, compares pendant pictures by Frans Hals and suggests that it may have had a pendant; Bell 1899, p. 138, reports that the work was “rejected, with justice, by M. Michel”; Nicolle 1899, p. 67 (ill.); Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1902), pp. 10–11, no. 432, pl. 420, as “Flora,” by Rembrandt, about 1656–58, states that the background has been repainted; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 213 (ill.), 202, calls the picture a “female portrait” of 1656–58; Voss 1905, p. 158, discusses its relationship to Titian’s Flora in the Uffizi (fig. 173 here), noting that the compositions differ but the “general artistic character” is similar; Pierre-Marcel 1906, pp. 2 (ill.), 10, observes that the painting recalls the Saskia in Kassel (fig. 175 here); A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 306 (ill.), 416, 419, 432, as “Weiβbeilches Bildnis (Flora),” about 1656–58; Valentin in A. Rosenberg 1905, pp. 382 (ill.), 377, 382, 601, changes the title to “Hendrickje Stoffels as Flora,” and dates the work to about 1656; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 135, no. 202, as “Flora,” describes the subject, reports that “the background has been repainted,” and dates the painting to about 1656–58; “Pictures Lent for the Fiftieth Anniversary Exhibition,” MMA Bulletin 15, no. 8 (August 1920), p. 192, relates Bode’s opinion that the subject is “Flora, not painted from [Rembrandt’s] first wife”; Meldrum 1923, p. 200, pl. 33 (ed.), as “Portrait of a Lady (Flora),,” dates the picture about 1671; Monod 1923, p. 307, discusses the work among possible portraits of Magdalena van Loo (the wife of Titus van Rijn), and suggests a date of about 1657 (when she was fifteen years old); B. Burroughs 1923b, p. 249 (ill. on cover), as “Flora,” with the features of Hendrickje Stoffels; M. Eiser 1927, p. 58, offers a brief formal analysis and mention of Titian; Valentin 1931, unpaged, no. 124, pl. 124, as “Flora,” of about 1656, suggests that the picture reflects the more modest personality of Hendrickje Stoffels than that of Rembrandt’s wife, Saskia; Benesch 1935a, p. 266, as strongly related to Titian in spirit; H. Alten 1942, p. 4, no. 114, pl. 114, “Hendrickje Stoffels as Flora,” no date proposed; Duveen Pictures 1941, unpaged, no. 198 (ill.), as “Flora,” reports that “the general consensus of opinion is that the model was some person entirely unknown”; Kieser 1941–44, pp. 138–39, 135, compares figures on Roman coins, and suggests that the picture may have served in the defense of Hendrickje Stoffels after she was condemned by the church council; Ivins 1942a, p. 3, listed as “Flora”; Ivins 1942b, pls. 13, 14 (detail of right hand), “painted about 1650”; J. Allen 1945, p. 74, refers to the figure as “possibly Hendrickje” in the guise of Flora; B. Bloch 1946, pp. 184–86, fig. 1, relates the picture to Titian’s Flora (fig. 173 here), which Rembrandt would have seen when it was in the Lopez collection in Amsterdam between 1638 and 1641; J. Rosenberg 1948, pp. 54–55, 164–65, fig. 240, considers the subject to be Hendrickje presented as Flora (as elsewhere “something of [her] personality is always revealed”), and claims that Rembrandt reveals “too close a dependence upon the model” of Titian in this instance; Von Einem 1952, p. 191, cites the influence of Titian’s Flora, which was in Amsterdam at the time; J. van Gelder 1951, p. 38, claims that the figure has the same profile as the “Pallas Athena” in the Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon, and wonders if the two pictures were pendants or part of a larger series; Rousseau 1954, p. 31 (ill.); J. Rosenberg 1956, p. 389, believes that cleaning has resulted in “too harsh a contrast between the lights and the darks”; Valentine 1956, p. 396, notes the “very thorough cleaning”; Mayor 1957b, p. 108 (ill. photograph of Huntington’s library); Held 1961, p. 218 n. 93, describes the tradition of depicting Flora, observes that Hendrickje Stoffels may have posed for the painting,
compar es Titian, and rejects the reading of the image advanced in Kieser 1941–42; J. Rosenberg 1964, pp. 97, 277, fig. 240, repeats J. Rosenberg 1948; Kühn 1965, p. 195, reports that the painting has a yellowish white ground; K. Bauch 1966, p. 15, no. 282, pl. 282, as “Flora,” with the features of Hendrickje Stoffels, about 1657. K. Clark 1966, p. 137, fig. 128, describes the picture as Rembrandt’s last “Flora,” painted about 1656, and observes that “the areas of light and dark are similar to those of Titian”; Gimpel 1966, pp. 116–17, in an entry dated November 12, 1919, quotes Widenstein’s gossip that a certain restorer “cleansed Spencer’s Flora. She made the yellow flowers on the hat disappear.”1 Havercamp-Begemann 1966, col. 928, as “Woman in Arcadian Costume,” rejects the identification with Hendrickje Stoffels; Gerson 1968, pp. 372, 499–500, fig. 288, “Hendrickje as Flora,” compares the Saskia in Kassel, and rejects the hypothesis of Kieser 1941–42 (see above); Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 103 (ill.), 157, no. 114, “Hendrickje Stoffels as Flora,” repeats Gerson 1968; Lacladano 1969, p. 118, no. 353 (ill.), as “Portrait of Hendrickje in the Guise of Flora”; Standen in Boston 1970, p. 43, as “Flora,” compares Titian, and says of the figure, “She seems a real person—modest, gentle, and good—and this is perhaps a likeness of Rembrandt’s first wife, Saskia”; Foucart in Paris 1970–71, p. 173 (under no. 172), cites the work in a review of Rembrandt portraits in profile; Kuznetsov in Lowenheim-Lessing 1971, unpaged (under no. 7), maintains that Rembrandt kept Titian’s example in mind “in 1656, when Hendrickje Stoffels posed for a new Flora”; Gallego and Mégret 1973, p. 14, as “Hendrickje Stoffels as Flora,” about 1653; Wright 1975, pp. 93–94, pl. 78, “Hendrickje Stoffels as the Goddess Flora,” about 1657; Zafran in Washington 1975, p. 70 (under no. 18), fig. 13, sees the New York picture as a “homage to his second great love, Hendrickje Stoffels”; Fowles 1976, p. 116, listed among Duveen purchases of 1919; Bolton and Bolton-Rempt 1977, p. 198, no. 467 (ill.), “Hendrickje Stoffels as Flora,” about 1657; Broo 1977, p. 39, lists scholars who have cited Titian as a source; Kettering 1977, p. 19 n. 2, omits this painting from a “complete list of Rembrandt’s pastorals” because the artist “here intended a straight representation of the ancient goddess of flowers, in the manner of Titian’s Flora in the Uffizi, without the shepherdess reference important in the three earlier ‘portraits’ of Saskia”; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 149, as “Flora”; C. Brown in London 1980, pp. 10 (ill.), 11, observes that Titian’s Flora, “engraved while in Lopez’s ownership [in Amsterdam], may have influenced Rembrandt’s treatment of the same subject, painted in about 1654”; Lowenthal 1981, pp. 12, 17 n. 12, pl. 12 (cover ill.), cites Titian’s Flora as a source, sees “classic simplicity” here, and observes that “it is possible that the model was his second, common-law wife, Hendrickje Stoffels, but that is uncertain”; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 62, 87, pls. 39, 40–42 (X-radiograph and autoradiographs), analyzes the evidence of autoradiographs, which show the hat farther forward, and reveal the artist’s working procedure after sketching the design in bone black; G. Schwartz 1985, p. 293, fig. 322, as “Hendrickje as Flora,” about 1654, calls the picture “a re-creation, in a more relaxed mode, of the painting of Saskia [in Kassel] that Jan Six contracted to buy in 1652”; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2 (1986), pp. 163, 430, sees Rembrandt’s profile presentation as Italian in origin, as is “most evident in the last painting in which he used this formula, the Flora in New York”; Guillaud and Guillaud 1986, fig. 388, “Flora, c. 1654”; C. Tümppel 1986, pp. 273 (ill.), 402, no. 111, “Hendrickje as Flora,” about 1657, combines the composition of the Kassel Saskia with Titian’s and Rembrandt’s own Flora imagery; Linnik in New York–Chicago 1988, p. 48 (under no. 22), writes that Rembrandt had Titian’s Flora in mind “when, in 1656, he used Hendrickje Stoffels as the model for his new Flora”; Chapman 1990, pp. 93, 94, states that “for Hendrickje as Flora he again looked to Titian’s Flora in the Lopez collection, on which he had earlier based his Saskia with a Flower” (the Kassel picture); Liedtke 1990, pp. 36, 37, cites the work as an example of the American predilection to collect portraits or pictures of single historical figures by Rembrandt; Cabanne 1991, p. 111, no. 18 (ill.); Pächt 1991, p. 65, pl. 62, “Hendrickje as Flora,” about 1657; Keel in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, pp. 250–53, no. 41 (ill.), as “Flora,” from about 1654–55, offers a full discussion of the subject, composition, motifs, and possible interpretations, compares Rembrandt’s Saskia (Kassel) and Aristotle and Titian’s Flora, and considers Hendrickje to have modeled both for this picture and the Louvre Bathsheba (“could be twin sisters”); Van Thiel in ibid., p. 190, emphasizes that the figure is an ideal type and cannot “be taken as a portrait of Hendrickje”; C. Brown in Tokyo–Chiba–Yamaguchi 1992, pp. 91, 229 (under no. 22), calls the painting “Portrait of Hendrickje as Flora” and cites it among pictures in which Rembrandt used a “profile format”; Slates 1992, pp. 440–50, no. 297 (ill.), as “Hendrickje Stoffels in the Guise of Flora,” from about 1656, compares the Kassel Saskia, sees the influence of Titian as “marginal,” and concludes that the picture must date from after about October 1654, when Hendrickje’s daughter was born; Van Thiel 1992, pp. 42, 43, 44, 90, no. 106 (ill.), figs. 37, 38 (gallery views), records the painting as in the 1898 Amsterdam exhibition, and states that the organizers must have seen Saskia in the picture, since they placed it between portraits of her son Titus; White 1992, p. 265, considers the painting “beautiful but sadly damaged”; Krohn in Athens 1992–93, pp. 26, 36–37, 306, no. 13 (ill.), sees Saskia as the model in earlier “Floras” by Rembrandt and Hendrickje as the model here; V. Romani in Paris 1993, p. 416 (under no. 49), detects Titian’s influence in this “ultime réincarnation” of about 1665 [1]; C. Tümppel 1993, pp. 273 (ill.), 426–6, no. 111, as “Hendrickje as Flora,” about 1657, repeats C. Tümppel 1986; Welz 1994, pp. 120–21, fig. 31, compares Titian’s Flora, from which Rembrandt is said to have adopted mainly the voluminous blouse and the hand holding flowers; Baetjer 1995, p. 314, as “Flora”; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 31, 66, 69–71, 78, 80, 84, 116, no. 12 (ill.), as from about 1654, describes the painting’s style, quality, state of preservation, and subject matter, and compares the facial features to those in Rembrandt’s Saskia (Kassel) and especially in the Antwerp version of that composition, concluding that “any resemblance of Flora to Saskia or to Hendrickje thus appears to be simply the consequence of derivations from other pictures, a point that its close connection with the Aristotle underscores”; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 25, 31, 10 (in the caption to fig. 59), 59, 126, reports that the painting has a yellowish white ground, notes the effect of low relief in the leaves on Flora’s hat, and describes the execution of the sleeve; Broos 1996b, p. 164, says that Hendrickje served as model; Blankert in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, p. 160 (under no. 21), cites the picture as one of the Rembrandt troilles in which women are seen in profile; Havercamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, p. 145 n. 1 (under no. 31), relates the canvas used here to others found among Rembrandt’s late paintings; Sluijter 1998b, p. 56 n. 52, discusses the facial type and sees it as very different from the one usually associated
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with Hendrickje; Aria Bonel 1990, pp. 149, 151 (ill.), 152 n. 40, connects the painting of the picture with the birth of Hendrickje's daughter Cornelia; Rosand in New York 2000, pp. 12, 13, 68, no. 1 (ill.), sees Hendrickje as the model, claims that "the viewer was, of course, in the first instance, her creator, the painter himself" and indulges in some late-1600s-style formal analysis ("paint identifies at once as imitated substance and as its own substantial self"); Westermann 2000, pp. 245, 247, fig. 162, compares the composition of Rembrandt's Aristotle, and suggests that the artist "created his flesh-and-blood goddess by grafting the facial features and large hands of a live model, perhaps Hendrickje, on to Titian's timeless ideal"; Wilkin 2000, p. 50, compares this "ravishing Flora" with Titian's, finding here "neither pagan goddess nor Venetian courtesan, but rather a charming young Dutch woman rather fancifully gotten up for the occasion in a slightly extravagant but rustic hat"; De Jongh in Edinburgh–London 2001, p. 31, connects the birth of Hendrickje's daughter Cornelia with "Flora in her role as the goddess of fertility"; Lloyd Williams in ibid., pp. 14, 208–9, 222, 219, no. 110 (ill), sees the figure as a variation on a type, "distancing the contemporary viewer from direct—and potentially embarrassing—identification," places the painting in the context of Rembrandt's various "Floras," compares Titian's Flora in some detail, draws attention to Sandrart's engraving of the latter, and compares the pictures of Saskia in Kassel and Antwerp; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, p. 388, fig. 284, compares the subject with that of Vermeer's Girl with a Red Hat (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.); Van de Wetering 2001, p. 21, figs. 8, 9 (X-radiograph detail), reports that the canvas support comes from the same bolt as the Rembrandt-style "self-portrait" in the National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne; Crenshaw 2002, p. 167, mistakenly suggests that Hendrickje served as a model for the figure of Flora; Liedtke 2002, p. 47, quotes Sluiter's (1998) complaint that Hendrickje is found here and in pictures of different female types; Lloyd Williams in Madrid 2002, pp. 15, 23, 24, 28, fig. 5, notes that both Saskia and Hendrickje have been seen as the model for the figure of Flora, which is actually a variation on an ideal type; Gilboa 2003, pp. 148–49, describes the painting as a representation of "Hendrickje as Flora, almost a copy of the profile painting of Saskia holding a small branch, made more than twenty years before," and concludes that "with this painting Rembrandt illustrated both a melancholy remembrance of his first wife as well as the acceptance of his new partner, Hendrickje"; S. Reed and Ackley in Boston–Chicago 2003–4, pp. 293–95, no. 204 (ill.), compares Rembrandt's earlier paintings of Flora, noting how different this one is in style and expression, mentions the influence of Titian, and discusses the question of whether the figure's features resemble those of Rembrandt's wife, Saskia, or his companion, Hendrickje; K. Harper and Rassieur in ibid., pp. 331–32, give basic catalogue information; Dicke 2004, p. 192 n. 90, notes the influence of Titian's Flora, "possibly via Sandrart"; Secret 2004, pp. 176, 476, includes the picture among Duveneck acquisitions of 1919; Groen in Corpus 2005, p. 332, fig. 29 (paint cross section), illustrates the quartz ground, and pp. 668–69, 672–73, reports that the first ground contains quartz, clay minerals, a little brown ochre and black, and a little chalk, resulting in a light brown color; Van de Wetering in ibid., p. 127, figs. 63, 64 (X-radiograph detail showing the weave of the canvas), and pp. 128, 532, fig. 4 (X-radiograph detail), reports that the canvas support comes from the same bolt as the Rembrandt-style "self-portrait" in the National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, and that both paintings have a quartz ground distinctive of Rembrandt's workshop, and p. 536, adds that the Rembrandt-style "self-portrait" in the Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, is also on a canvas cut from the bolt used for the Flora and the Melbourne "self-portrait"; D. Smith 2005, pp. 15–16, fig. 20, as "Hendrickje Stoffels as Flora," compares the painting of 1635 in London (here called "Saskia van Uylenborch as Flora") and considers the New York Flora more serious, "a more genuinely pastoral image of humility and simplicity," and also a key example of Rembrandt's late style, which reveals his "increasingly abstract aesthetic sophistication, his preoccupation with his formal means and with the picture as object"; Wethelex in Washington–Los Angeles 2005, p. 103, revives the use of a profile view from earlier years; Baetjer in Martigny 2006, p. 18, mentions the work among Huntington bequests; Bomford et al. 2006, p. 90, considers the influence of Titian on this painting more plausible than in the case of the London Flora, of 1635; Creagh 2006, pp. 137–38, 139, imagines that "it does not seem a stretch to propose that Hendrickje's pregnancy provided Rembrandt's inspiration to paint her as Flora"; Sluiter 2006, p. 350, fig. 116, notes the resemblance to the heroine's face in Rembrandt's Bathsheba of 1644, and incorrectly states that the subject of the Museum's picture "has been invariably regarded as Hendrickje"; C. Timpel 2006, p. 113 (ill.), titles the picture "Hendrickje Stoffels als Flora" and dates it about 1646–48; C. Timpel and A. Timpel 2006, p. 220, 221 (ill.), persists in calling the picture "Hendrickje als Flora"; Van de Wetering in Copenhagen 2006, p. 116, observes that the painting is "usually, erroneously, referred to as Hendrickje Stoffels als Flora."

154. Hendrickje Stoffels

Oil on canvas, 30 7/8 x 27 1/8 in. (78.4 x 68.9 cm)
Inscribed (at right): Rembrandt / 1660

The surface texture is damaged from past relining as well as from the process of transferring the original canvas support to a new canvas. The overall abrasion has most seriously affected the modeling in the jawline and neck, the costume, chest, and hand. There is a loss above the head and a series of losses extending diagonally from the right shoulder to the lowest point of the neckline.

Gift of Archer M. Huntington, in memory of his father, Collis Potter Huntington, 1926 26.101.9

That Rembrandt painted this canvas from the Huntington collection has never been reasonably doubted. However, the awkwardly placed signature and date of 1660 must have been added during a later period. As discussed below, the work probably dates from the mid-1660s.

Over the past hundred years, the picture has been given many subjective, even fanciful interpretations, which are mostly based on the assumption that the features of an actual person, Hendrickje Stoffels (1626–1665), are here faithfully transcribed. No indisputable image of her has been identified, although the present painting—in contrast to the Museum's etching with the text “Hendrickje as Flora” (Pl. 153)—is considered a plausible example of the Hendrickje type. The daughter of an army sergeant, Hendrickje Stoffels advanced in Rembrandt's household from servant (by 1649) to mistress, presumed model, and common-law wife, as well as stepmother to the artist's son Titus (1641–1668) and mother of his daughter Cornelia (1654–1685).

These biographical details and the picture's supposed date of 1660 encouraged the persistent misconception (see Refs.) that it was probably intended by Rembrandt as a pendant to his Self-Portrait of 1660 in the Altman Collection (Pl. 157). Although the paintings are now about the same size (the Huntington canvas has been enlarged on the left), the figures differ in scale, presentation, and execution, and the works were (so far as is known) never in the same building before 1925. Moreover, the idea that Rembrandt would have presented himself and his mistress in companion portraits raises questions of propriety that modern scholars have for the most part simply ignored. The normal inhibitions to such a pictorial statement would have been considerably enhanced by Hendrickje's pregnancy in 1664, for which she was called before the council of the Reformed Church in Amsterdam and banned from taking communion.

Hendrickje is thought to have modeled for three comparable paintings by Rembrandt: Hendrickje Stoffels (?), perhaps of about 1653–54, in the Musée du Louvre, Paris; Hendrickje Stoffels (?), probably of the mid-1660s, in the National Gallery, London; and Woman at an Open Door, of about 1665, in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin. The order in which the four pictures (figs. 178–181) were painted, their dating in general, and the degree to which each of them reflects the appearance of Hendrickje at a particular time are all matters of conjecture. However, the faces in the New York and Berlin paintings (the two that most closely resemble each other) seem to reveal more age...
than the apparently prettified features in the London and Paris pictures.

While there are noteworthy differences as well, the similarities of composition, figure type, costume, and expression in this series of canvases shed light on how the Huntington picture was originally understood. X-radiographs of the painting have been said to indicate that Rembrandt first rendered the figure in “a Titianesque pose with her left hand at her breast,” which recalls a lost picture of the repentant Magdalene by Titian (known from many versions, copies, and an engraving, of 1566, by Cornelis Cort). The present writer concluded in 1995 that the technical evidence does not prove “that Rembrandt originally intended to represent the Magdalene, or Hendrickje Stoffels as the Magdalene, but it is possible.” Two scholars have recently extended this idea to the painting in its final state, although the repentant Magdalene is most often dressed in humble (if not always modest) attire, she looks up to heaven or back at her forsaken world, and she may have an attribute such as an ointment jar or skull. The novel notion that Rembrandt probably “conceived his image as a Sorrowing Virgin (Mater Dolorosa)” may be dismissed on the grounds of costume alone.

The figure’s fancy dress caught the eye of early critics and has perhaps become less conspicuous through the darkening of earth pigments, the use of solvents, and other interventions (the fuzzy effect of the hand and the brown material all around it was caused by overcleaning, probably in the 1950s). Hofstede de Groot (1916; see Refs.) imagined Hendrickje as if shuffling from a bedroom to the studio, holding with one hand “her loose dark brown morning robe, which is trimmed with reddish fur.” He notes the nearly sheer “chemisette” with an embroidered top that clings to her chest. Despite the early hour, Hendrickje sports a pearl earring and “a greenish-brown cap embroidered with gold and adorned with a gold chain and jewels.” Bode (1901) compares Hendrickje’s attire in the Berlin painting (fig. 181), where she seems to greet the new day at the front door. In the Huntington picture, “Rembrandt’s faithful friend and companion appears to us in a similar attitude, and with the same expression, save that she is looking down.” She wears “a similar careless morning dress: a fur-trimmed mantle, thrown over a thin under-garment that leaves the square cut chemisette visible.” The scholar’s gaze lingers on the flesh tones of the face and throat, which “gleam out from the deep warm browns of the costume, in which the subdued glimmer of reds and yellows on the fur and the cap sparkle like jewels on dark velvet.” Virginia Budny notes that Hendrickje is more prepared for company than Bode implies. The fur-trimmed mantle is worn over “a brown long-sleeved outer dress” as well as the white chemise. The cap, or decorative band used to hold the hair back in a knot, “closely compares with the coiffure in Rembrandt’s picture of a young woman at her toilette in the Hermitage.” That panel, which is dated 1654(?), may be identical with a painting by Rembrandt listed as “A Courtesan Doing Her Hair” in the 1656 inventory of his possessions.

It appears quite likely that the London, Paris, Berlin, and New York pictures were intended to be understood as images of courtesans, comparable with those painted by Venetian artists, especially Palma Vecchio (1479/80—1558). The costumes in the Dutch versions are perhaps more northern European, but they are also of another time and place, no matter who the model might be. As in a courtesan picture by Paris Bordone (1500—1571) that was evidently in Amsterdam at the time, three of Rembrandt’s women cast friendly glances at the viewer and are dressed suggestively, with attention drawn to the ease with which more could be revealed. Drost’s Young Woman in a Brocade Gown, of about 1654 (see fig. 42), is one of the boldest variations on the theme, but it seems restrained compared with a painting by Palma Vecchio that was also in Amsterdam about the middle of the century. In another one of Palma’s pictures (fig. 182), by contrast, the courtesan glances down and to the side, and, as in the case of Titian’s Flora (see fig. 173), this makes her more intriguing, less confident and direct, and therefore more accessible to the male voyeur. A brocaded or otherwise luxurious gown, a light chemise, and a hand gently keeping loose garments from falling open or (in the Venetian pictures) farther down are conventional motifs in paintings of this type. If it is true that in an earlier stage the figure in the New York painting wore “a blouse open at the breasts” or, at least, a more revealing costume, and she had a thinner face, then the resemblance with contemporary Dutch images of courtesans and with the Italian prototypes would be all the more obvious. One could read something personal, and probably too much, into the fact that Rembrandt revised the painting. Whatever the circumstances, it appears likely that the work was begun about 1654—55, when pictures of courtesans appear to have flourished in Amsterdam (perhaps with the help of an art dealer, such as Gerrit Uyleburgh).
Figure 178. Rembrandt, *Hendrickje Stoffels(?)*, ca. 1653–54. Oil on canvas, 29¾ x 24 in. (74 x 61 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris

Figure 179. Rembrandt, *Hendrickje Stoffels(?)*, probably ca. 1654–56. Oil on canvas, 42½ x 33 in. (101.9 x 83.7 cm). The National Gallery, London, Bought with a contribution from the National Art Collections Fund, 1976

Figure 180. Rembrandt, *Hendrickje Stoffels* (Pl. 154)

Figure 181. Rembrandt, *Woman at an Open Door*, ca. 1656. Oil on canvas, 34¾ x 26¾ in. (88.5 x 67 cm). Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin
The final stage of painting could have been carried out after a brief interval, or within one or two years.

1. The most predictable exception being Van Dyke (1923; see Refs.). His attribution to Willem Drost (q.v.) may have inspired F. Schmidt-Degener’s suggestion of the same name to curator Harry Wehle, on April 15, 1931.

2. On Hendrickje, see Ruessink 1989; Dudok van Heel in Edinburgh–London 2001, pp. 24–27; and Lloyd Williams in ibid., pp. 12, 206. The latter (ibid., p. 222) gives a sympathetic account of Sir C. J. Holmes, who in an article and a small book (1908 and 1911; see Refs.) started the cottage industry of Hendrickje as tragic muse.

3. Lloyd Williams in Edinburgh–London 2001, p. 206, describes the Hendrickje type in Rembrandt’s work as “a woman with darkish hair drawn off her forehead, large dark eyes, almond-shaped rather than round, and an oval face with defined cheekbones. However, it should be mentioned that within these parameters, there is a wide amount of variation, just as with Rembrandt’s earlier works purporting to represent Saskia.” In a seminar paper prepared for the present writer in 1990, Virginia Budny analyzed Rembrandt’s presumed use of Saskia and Hendrickje as models, and observed that the common traits found in the Museum’s picture and the “Hendrickje” paintings in London and Berlin (figs. 179, 181 here) “include brown hair; a dome-shaped forehead; large, heavy-lidded dark-brown eyes; widely-set cheekbones; a slightly upturned nose with a small, somewhat bulbous tip; shapely lips; prominent pockets of flesh at each side of the mouth; and a small chin.”

4. See B. Burroughs 1923b, pp. 258–59, which reports the brief loan of this picture and four others to the Museum. The author makes no mention of the Altman Self-Portrait, which hung in another room.

5. This point was stressed, evidently for the first time, by Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 78, and repeated by Lloyd Williams in Edinburgh–London 2001, p. 220, with regard to a different marriage of paintings thought to depict Rembrandt and Hendrickje. Another pairing, “sous preuves concrètes,” is proposed in Foucart 1982a, p. 64.


7. See Edinburgh–London 2001, nos. 125, 126, for the London and Berlin paintings, and, on the latter, Kelch in Berlin 2006, no. 66. See ibid., pp. 218, 222, fig. 153, and Foucart 1982a, pp. 63–64, for the Paris picture. None of these works bear authentic signatures. The Paris canvas was studied by the present writer and other specialists at the Louvre in June 2006 and considered to be by Rembrandt, but it appears to have serious condition problems that remain to be explored. Left out of consideration here are works for which Hendrickje may have served as model but that are dissimilar in subject matter, for example A Woman Bathing in a Stream, dated 1654 (National Gallery, London).

8. Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 72. The print by Cort is compared with the Museum’s picture in Frankfurt 2003, p. 190, fig. 36b.


10. Lloyd Williams in Edinburgh–London 2001, p. 222, and Giltay in Frankfurt 2003, p. 192, each citing the present writer’s suggestion as if it had referred to the painting as it now appears.

11. Wheelock in Washington–Los Angeles 2005, p. 86, where it is also conjectured that the painting may have been made as a pendant to The Resurrected Christ (Alte Pinakothek, Munich).


13. These quotes are from the introductory text of Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6, p. 16.


15. Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 335, doc. 1665/32, item no. 39. See Gerson in Bredius 1909, p. 380, no. 387; Loewenson-Lessing 1971, no. 24 (reading the date as 1657); and G. Schwartz 1985, p. 244, fig. 272.

16. As noted in L. de Vries 1990, p. 197, Gerard de Lairesse (q.v.) complained that Dutch painters used their wives, maidervants, and family members as models in such a way that their features were recognizable in the finished work of art (De Lairesse 1740, vol. 1, pp. 173–74). De Vries’s concluding observations (1990, pp. 198–99) are interesting for the present picture.

17. See Bikker 2005, p. 71, fig. 8a.

18. Ibid., pp. 69–72, no. 8.


20. The quote is from Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 72, describing an autograph (ibid., pl. 49).

that Uylenburgh sold the collection of Andrea Vendramin, which included Venetian paintings of this type. See also London–Amsterdam 2006.

References: Bode 1900, pp. 113 (ill.), vi, no. 8, considers the painting a portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels; Glück 1900, p. 90, admires the picture, “of 1660,” as a beautiful image of a young woman who has been thought to represent Hendrickje Stoffels, and compares the supposed portrait of her in the Louvre (fig. 178 here) which “surely depicts another person”; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1901), pp. 16, 108, no. 438, pl. 438, as “Hendrickje Stoffels in a Brown Mantle Looking Down,” observes that “the subdued glimmer of reds and yellows on the fur and the cap sparkle like jewels on dark velvet”; M. Zimmermann 1901, p. 141, notes that this “besonders geeignet” work of 1660 is said to represent Hendrickje Stoffels; Marguillier 1903, pp. 20, 25 (ill.), describes the painting as representing “la bonne Hendrickje” at about the age of thirty-five; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 219 (ill.), 262, as “Portrait of Hendrick Stoffels,” 1660; Moes 1887–1905, vol. 2 (1905), p. 426, no. 7663–6, as a portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels; Valentinier 1905, p. 45, lists the work among many supposed portraits and other images of Hendrickje Stoffels; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 344 (ill.), 404, 417, 426, as a portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels; Bode 1907, vol. 1, p. 70, no. 69 (ill. opp. p. 70), catalogued as “Portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels,” signed and dated 1660, describes the composition; J. Grant 1908, p. 6, pl. II, as a “Portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels” in Mrs. Huntington’s collection; C. Holmes 1908, p. 191 (ill.), 198, as recently acquired by Mrs. Huntington and depicting Hendrickje when “she has lost the bloom of youth which distinguishes the early portrait in the Louvre,” so much so that the portrait betrays “an indescribable pathos, a premonition of death;” Nicolle 1908, p. 196, calls the picture a study of Hendrickje with “une expression de jeunesse charmante;” Valentinier in A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 411 (ill.), 626, based on the similar dimensions and inscribed dates, supposes that the picture may have been intended as a pendant to Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait of 1660 (Pl. 157); Valentinier in New York 1909, p. 104, no. 105 (ill. opp. p. 104), as “Hendrickje Stoffels,” 1660; Breek 1910, p. 53, states that the picture probably represents Hendrickje Stoffels; Waldmann 1910, p. 74 (ill.), 76, calls the picture “a real portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels,” to which Rembrandt gave such fine quality and expression that “one imagines feeling how good she was to him”; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 2 (1910), p. 407, lists as “Hendrickje in a brocade mantle, leaning forward, as if looking out a window;” C. Holmes 1911, pp. 154–55, pl. xvi, repeats the remarks in C. Holmes 1908; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 339, no. 720, as “Hendrickje Stoffels,” who holds together “her loose dark brown morning robe, which is trimmed with redish fur,” and wears a “greenish-brown cap embroidered with gold and adorned with a gold chain and jewels;” “Pictures Lent for the Fiftieth Anniversary Exhibition,” MMA Bulletin 15, no. 8 (August 1920), p. 192, as a portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels a few years before her death, the pose showing weariness; Meldrum 1922, pp. 137, 198, pl. cccxxix, as a portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels that “seems to discover her in a decline,” possibly from Holland’s “scourge of pluotis”; Van Dyke 1923, p. 64, as probably by Willem Drost, “a sketchy portrait (with variations) of the model in the Louvre and Wallace Collection pictures by Drost” (fig. 42 here); B. Burroughs 1926b, pp. 258–59, believes that Hendrickje here looks older than her age; B. Burroughs in MMA Bulletin 21, no. 7 (July 1926), pp. 164–66 (ill.), records the painting’s donation to the Museum; Valentinier 1931, unpaged, no. 147, pl. 147, as “Hendrickje;” signed and dated 1660; Benesch 1935b, p. 65, sees Hendrickje’s death intimated here, and supports the suggestion made in A. Rosenberg 1909 that the picture may have been intended as a pendant to Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait of 1660 (Pl. 157); Bredius 1935, p. 5, no. 118, pl. 118, as “Hendrickje Stoffels,” 1660; Duvene Picture 1944, unpaged, no. 200 (ill.), as “Portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels,” quotes flattering lines from Bode 1901; Held 1942, pp. 14 (ill.; detail of face), 28, sees in this painting “the woman who redecorates herself constantly to the one destiny of self-effacing, unreserved devotion to the beloved;” Ivins 1942a, pp. 3, 6, 10 (ill.), 12–13, listed as one of the Museum’s “twenty-five paintings which are now attributed to Rembrandt;” Ivins 1942b, pls. 21, 22 (detail); Stechow 1942, pp. 141, 144, fig. 1, sees the influence of Titian’s Flora (fig. 173 here) in this painting of Hendrickje, “one of the greatest miracles wrought by the hands of the aging master,” and a “most glorious example of painting the beauty of a soul;” J. Allen 1945, p. 73, as a portrait of Hendrickje who “broods lovingly in her warm cloak;” J. Rosenberg 1948, vol. 1, p. 31, 220 n. 17, vol. 2, pl. 86, considers it possible that the portrait was intended as a companion piece to Rembrandt’s self-portrait of the same year; Amsterdam 1952, p. 72 (under no. 147), as a portrait of Hendrickje, mother of Cornelia, describes the fancy mantle and cap decorated with pearls and a gold chain; Slive 1953, p. 35 n. 4, quotes Stechow 1942 regarding the impression made by Titian’s Flora on Rembrandt, and the “sublime transmutation of this influence” here; Rousseau 1954, p. 3, calls the painting unfinished, and thus an example of the “unsurpassed economy of means which he used to represent a maximum of spiritual feeling;” Benesch 1956, pp. 341–42, considers the picture one of Rembrandt’s “most moving and deeply human portraits;” Duvene 1957, pp. 322–33, quotes “Uncle” (Joseph Duven) saying that here Rembrandt “painted a soul” as well as a portrait; Mayor 1957b, p. 108 (ill., photograph of Huntington’s library); MacLaren 1960, pp. 313–14 n. 17 (under no. 34), considers it possible that the painting depicts the same model as the one represented in “A Woman Bathing in a Stream” (National Gallery, London); Gaya Nuño 1964, p. 34, no. 176, records the picture as formerly in the collection of the Coroner family in Palma de Mallorca; J. Rosenberg 1964, pp. 98, 348 n. 17, fig. 86, repeats J. Rosenberg 1948; White 1964, p. 177 (ill.), as “Hendrickje aged about thirty-five,” showing one-third of that “indivisible trinity [Titus receives equal credit] bound together by mutual love;” Kühn 1965, p. 191, observes a yellowish white ground layer; K. Bauch 1966, pp. 26, no. 532, pl. 532, “Hendrickje Stoffels,” 1660; Gerson 1968, pp. 431 (ill.), 503, no. 382, repeats the long-standing suggestion that the picture might be a pendant to the Museum’s Self-Portrait (Pl. 157), and considers the face the best-preserved part of the paint surface; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 106 (ill.), 557, simply states that this is the companion picture to Rembrandt’s self-portrait in the Museum; Held 1969, p. 96, fig. 8, as “the last generally accepted portrait of Hendrickje . . . possibly painted as a companion piece to Rembrandt’s self-portrait” in the same museum; Lecladano 1969, p. 120, no. 382 (ill.), as a portrait of Hendrickje; Benesch 1970, p. 196, repeats Benesch 1956; V. Bloch 1970, pp. 57, 67, observes on one page that the portrait “seems to carry a long-distant echo of Titian’s Flora,” and on another that “no
one would think of Titian any more” when looking at the work; Von Sonnenburg in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 86, reports that a dab of red on the cheek has been mistaken for a retouching because of “the worn condition of the paint layers”; Valdivieso 1973, pp. 28–29, 334, records the picture’s provenance in Palma de Mallorca, in a review of Rembrandts that have left Spain; C. Brown in London 1976, p. 75 (under no. 91), cites the work as a “portrait” of Hendrickje Stoffels and repeats the notion that “it is a companion picture to a Self-Portrait of 1660, also in the Metropolitan”; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 200, no. 100 (ill); C. Brown and Pletser 1977, p. 288, as the portrait of Hendrickje closest in style to the one in the National Gallery, London; Robb 1978, pp. 45–46, notes that the painting and Rembrandt’s Portrait of a Young Jew (Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth) were both in the Cottoner and Rodolphe Kann collections; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 454, listed among pictures dated 1660; Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 72, pls. 47, 49–50 (X-radiograph and autoradiographs), considers the work possibly unfinished, notes that “Rembrandt’s attention was on the face, which he reworked to achieve its poignant expression,” and (based on technical analysis) describes a thinner face and a left hand in the bone-black sketch on the canvas, and “a blush open at the breasts and a necklace pulled over and tucked into the garments at the right side”;
C. Brown 1982, p. 35, pl. 26, as a portrait of Hendrickje three years before she died, and “looking ill and pinched in the face”; Foucart 1982a, p. 64, compares the “Hendrickje” in the Louvre; G. Schwarzs 1985, p. 294, fig. 327, doubts that the painting was intended as a pendant to Rembrandt’s self-portrait of 1660 (Pl. 157), and speculates implausibly as to whether its condition might have something to do with Hendrickje’s daughter taking the canvas to the Dutch East Indies (for which there is no evidence); Guillaud and Guillaud 1986, fig. 394; C. TümpeI 1986, pp. 323 (ill.), 411, no. 189, as “Hendrickje Stoffels,” signed and dated 1660, doubts the picture is a pendant to Rembrandt’s self-portrait of 1660 because they come from different collections and become the “Hendrickje” is superior, “despite its ruinous condition”;
C. Brown in Yokohama–Fukuoka–Kyōto 1986–87, pp. 136, 155 (under no. 13), mentions the picture among Rembrandt portraits of Hendrickje; London 1988–89, cites the picture under works and events of 1660, and repeats the misconception that the “portrait” is a pendant to the Museum’s Self-Portrait by Rembrandt; Liedtke 1990, p. 37, 40, mentions the work among huntington gifts to the Museum; Cabanne 1991, p. 173, no. 10 (ill); C. Brown in Tokyo–Chiba–Yamaguchi 1992, pp. 74, 225 (under no. 9), recycles C. Brown in Yokohama–Fukuoka–Kyōto 1986–87; C. TümpeI 1993, pp. 323 (ill.), 414, no. 189, repeats C. TümpeI 1986; Baetjer 1995, p. 315, as “Hendrickje Stoffels,” signed and dated 1660; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 69, 76–80, no. 16 (ill), questions the signature and date, places the picture between about 1654 and 1660, explains why it is not a pendant to the Self-Portrait of 1660, compares Venetian paintings of courtesans, and suggests that the subject may also be “an imaginary portrait (whoever the model) of a courtesan or of some historical figure with a similar reputation”; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 25, 54, 65–66, figs. 66 (detail), 67 (X-radiograph detail), mentions the yellowish white ground, describes the execution of the face, considers the head possibly unfinished, explains the unfortunate consequences of lining and relining in the past, and states that “the signature and date are spurious”; Schama 1999a, p. 659, states that “in 1660 Rembrandt painted Hendrickje,” presumably on the basis of this picture; Lloyd Williams in Edinburgh–London 2001, pp. 14, 218, 222–23, 260, no. 127 (ill.), as “Hendrickje Stoffels (?)” from about 1654–60, considers the artist’s possible use of Hendrickje within “a range of artistic variations on a facial theme,” compares other paintings thought to depict Hendrickje and pictures of similar figures by Titian, Palma Vecchio, and Drost, and supports the suggestion that the subject might be the repentant Magdaleine; Manuth in ibid., p. 50, as among Rembrandt’s “numerous paintings of Hendrickje”; Giltaij in Kyōto 2002–3, pp. 146–49, no. 18 (ill), and in Frankfurt 2003, pp. 189–92, no. 36 (ill), as “Half-Length Figure of a Woman (Hendrickje Stoffels),” describes the costume, reviews details of Hendrickje’s life, cites other presumed portraits, recommends caution in adopting this identification in any work, considers some religious meaning possible, notes that the painting’s “bad state” has been exaggerated, and finds the idea of execution over a long period (1654–60) implausible, preferring a date of about 1660; Scallen 2004, pp. 208, 363 nn. 98, 99, fig. 54, cited as one of R. Kann’s Rembrandts, and as revealing condition problems; Bikker 2005, pp. 71–72, fig. 8c, compares Drost’s Young Woman in a Brocade Gown (fig. 42 here), associates both with Venetian paintings of courtesans, and finds the analogy with Titian’s Repentant Magdaleine somewhat forced; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 666–69, 672–73, reports that the first ground contains quartz, clay minerals, a little brown ochre, very little bone black and chalk, resulting in a yellowish brown color; Van de Watering in ibid., pp. 521, 544, fig. 7, reviews the history of the mistaken notion that this picture was painted as a pendant to Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait of 1660 (Pl. 157), in particular C. TümpeI’s unique view that the female “portrait” is autograph and the “pendant” not; Krempel 2005, pp. 147–48, fig. 108, compares the so-called “Hendrickje Stoffels” by a Rembrandt follower, in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt; P. Sutton in Washington–Los Angeles 2005, pp. 117–18, 120 (under no. 14), compares the pose with that in Rembrandt’s The Virgin of Sorrows in Epinmal; Wheelock in ibid., pp. 16, 85–88, 133–34, no. 5 (ill), erroneously states that the picture is signed and dated 1660, and considers “the Sorrowful Virgin” a more probable interpretation of the subject than the Magdaleine; Beegh Ronse in Copenhagen 2006, pp. 69, 198–99, 210, 285–96, 294 n. 4 (under no. 41), no. 15 (ill), reviews recent opinions of the subject matter, the inscription, and possible dating, and compares the Rembrandt school Young Woman with a Carnation (Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen); Bomford et al. 2006, pp. 138, 146, 113 n. 6, 149, fig. 147, mentions the work among paintings by Rembrandt thought to represent Hendrickje Stoffels, and incorrectly assumes that the picture offers evidence of her appearance in 1660; Plomp 2006b, p. 24, fig. 34, mentioned; Sluiter 2006, pp. 330, fig. 314, considers whether or not Hendrickje served as model for this picture “in the tradition of the Venetian courtesan portrait.”

155. Portrait of a Man

Oil on canvas, 32⅞ x 23¼ in. (83.5 x 64.5 cm)

The condition of this painting has made it difficult for scholars to judge and to place chronologically (see Refs.). In the past, the date given in a false inscription to the lower left (no longer visible) was read by some as 1664, while others favored a dating to the early 1660s or about 1665. Most recent critics have accepted Rembrandt’s authorship for the portrait and have suggested a date between 1655 and 1660. The style of the sitter’s hat and collar is neither helpful for nor inconsistent with this dating. Smaller collars and hats with taller crowns had come into fashion by the mid-1650s (as seen in Rembrandt’s Floris Soop; Pl. 152), but portraits byNicolaes Maes (q.v.) and other Dutch artists dating from about 1655–60 show costume details similar to those in the present picture, and also, in many cases, sitters with equally sober expressions.

After Van Dyck’s predictably negative opinion of 1923 (see Refs.), only Josua Bruyn, visiting the Museum in 1976, and C. Tümpe(l 1986; see Refs.) have doubted Rembrandt’s authorship, on grounds no more closely argued than that the execution “does not appear good enough.” It is clear from Von Sonnenburg’s analysis of 1995 that only the face and collar can be considered in an assessment of the work’s quality, and then only with the help of X-radiographs and a condition report. The black passages are worn and sunk, and the entire background is lost. The hands and cuffs now consist of abraded fragments that the artist roughly sketched in and then covered with black paint (they were mistakenly unmasked by a restorer, probably between 1854 and 1976). Comparison of the face with that of Floris Soop, and of the corresponding X-radiographs, reveals essentially the same treatment overall and in details, including highlights on the upper lip, the suggestion of careworn folds around the eyes, short strokes of facial hair, and so on. But the fall of daylight on the anonymous sitter’s face is meant to be more muted; accordingly, the artist employed less assertive contrasts and thinner applications of both dark and light passages. Nonetheless, close scrutiny “testifies to the considerable variety of handling that marks Rembrandt’s portraits of about 1660.”

The picture has rarely been seen in public since the 1950s. However, it has a place of honor in the history of the Museum as the first autograph Rembrandt in the collection, and as an acquisition that made trustee and donor Henry Marquand especially proud. “The pleasure of owning such a work,” he wrote to the American painter J. Alden Weir, “is very great.”

1. See, for example, Krempel 2000, figs. 61, 67, 69, 71–73, 75–77, etc.
4. Ibid., p. 110.

REFERENCES: Waagen 1854, vol. 2, p. 131, records the painting as a Rembrandt in the library at Lansdowne House, London, a “male


EX COLL.: Cotoner family, Palma de Mallorca; Nicolas Cotoner y Allende-Salazar, and Marqués de la Cenia, Palma y Mallorca (probably until d. 1897); Rodolphe Kann, Paris (by 1900–d. 1905; his estate, 1905–7; sold to Duvene); [Duvene, Paris and New York, 1907; sold for $135,000 to Huntington]; Mrs. Collis P. (Arabella D.) Huntington, later (from 1913) Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, New York (1907–d. 1924); her son, Archer Milton Huntington (1924–26); Gift of Archer M. Huntington, in memory of his father, Collis Potter Huntington, 1926 26.101.9
portrait with a wide ruff [sic], and very dark shadows; but hung too high for me to pronounce an opinion on it”; Bode 1883, pp. 320–31, 388, no. 222, as a portrait of a man in his mid-thirties, dating from the early 1660s; Duduit 1885, pp. 46, 63, 70, no. 339, as a portrait of a man aged about thirty-six, dating from about 1660–62; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 259, listed; Harck 1888, p. 75, as a “generic work” by Rembrandt; E. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 247, dates the picture to about 1640; MMA 1894, p. 19, no. 37, “painted, according to Dr. Bode, about 1640” Bell 1899, p. 184, no. 277, as painted about 1640; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 7 (1902), pp. 5, 52, no. 495, pl. 495, as “A Pale Young Man with Long Hair and a Broad-Brimmed Hat, His Left Hand in His Coat,” the sitter aged about forty, the painting to 1665 in the caption and between 1663 and 1666 in the text; Caffin 1902, p. 276, as painted in 1664, a work of “gracious melancholy,” in which Rembrandt “has recorded somewhat of his own sadness and brave struggle”; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 382 (ill.), 405, 579, accepts Bode’s date of about 1665; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 507 (ill.), 579, listed as from about 1665; Valentin in New York 1909, p. 105, no. 107 (ill.), as from about 1665; Waldmann 1910, p. 75 (ill.), as “Der junge Haarling [Pieter Haringh, of whom Rembrandt did a portrait etching in 1655; see fig. 199], from about 1665; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 354, no. 749, as “A Pale Man with Long Dark Hair,” signed and dated 1664; A. Burroughs 1923, p. 270, states that “though unsigned, one recognizes it as a Rembrandt”; Meldrum 1925, p. 203, pl. CCCXXXVI, as signed and dated 1664; Van Dyke 1923, p. 132, pl. xxxviii, cites various characteristics that “all speak for Maes” as the author; Downes 1923, p. 665, notes that the work is assigned to Maes in Van Dyke 1923; Zwirner 1929a, p. 19 (ill. opp. p. 18), as “Portrait van Don Miguel de Barrios,” sees the same sitter in The Jewish Bride (fig. 219 here); Zwirner 1929b, p. 12 (ill. opp. pp. 12, 23, detail), finds the same man in The Jewish Bride, and attempts to identify him as Miguel de Barrios, an Amsterdam poet; Valentin in unpaged, no. 161, pl. 161, as probably painted in 1664, reporting that it was formerly dated 1664; Bredius 1935, p. 12, pl. 277, as “Portrait of a Pallid Man,” notes that the signature mentioned in Hofstede de Groot 1907–27 is no longer visible; Ivins 1942a, p. 3, listed; Ivins 1942b, pls. 9, 10, as “Portrait of a Man,” dated 1645; J. Allen 1945, pp. 73, 74 (ill.), as painted about 1651, one of those “hauntingly introspective human documents in the painting of which Rembrandt was unrivaled”; D. Young 1960, pp. 159–60, quotes letters from J. Alden Weir to members of his family, and correspondence with Marquand concerning the picture’s purchase; K. Bauch 1966, p. 22, no. 445, pl. 445, as probably from about 1658–60; Gerson 1968, pp. 405 (ill.), 501, no. 338, agrees with Bauch’s dating “around 1660,” and observes that the picture “has gained allure through its recent cleaning”; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 212 (ill.), 571, no. 277, repeats Gerson 1968; Lecaldano 1969, p. 120, no. 387 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, about 1660; D. Sutton in Fry 1972, vol. 1, p. 253 n. 1 to letter no. 177 (March 2, 1906), listed among works in the 1906 exhibition; Von Sonnenburg in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 86, reports that the face is in good condition, “contrary to the rest of the picture, especially the background, which is almost entirely gone,” and notes that the hands were “originally not visible” because the artist painted them out; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 199, no. 483 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, about 1658–60; G. Schwartz 1982, p. 338, fig. 393, as by Rembrandt, about 1660; C. Tümpe 1986, pp. 336 (ill.), 430, no. 496, attributes the picture to an unknown pupil of Rembrandt, about 1660; Cabanne 1991, p. 152, no. 13 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, about 1660; C. Tümpe 1993, pp. 336 (ill.), 433, no. 496, repeats C. Tümpe 1986; Baerelt 1995, p. 317, as by Rembrandt; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 88–89, 113, 126, no. 20 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, about 1655–60, observes that scholars such as C. Tümpe (1986) and J. Bruyn (oral opinion of 1976), in doubting Rembrandt’s authorship, do not appear to have understood the painting’s condition; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 24, 34, 60–61, 108–10, no. 20 (ill.), figs. 64 (detail), 65 (X-radiograph detail), 76 (cleaned state), 143 (X-radiograph), as from about 1655–60, observes (in the caption to figs. 64 and 65) that in the execution of the face, “many individual touches of dry impasto on the topmost surface enhance the characterization of this sensitive face with its severe gaze,” describes the condition of the face (“signs of slight wear” in the light areas, while “the eyes are especially well preserved”), reports in detail on how the original background is almost entirely lost, and notes that the sitter’s hands were “very roughly sketched in with a loaded brush and left unfinished,” then “covered over with black paint by the artist,” and mistakenly revealed at a much later date; Lank 1996, p. 123, mentions the unsatisfactory state of preservation; Brockhoff and Franken 1997, p. 78, notes that pictures in “poor condition,” like this one, make it difficult to “arrive at an attribution”; Ketelsen in Hamburg 2000–2001, pp. 30, 40 n. 128, fig. 10, as from about 1660, uses this conjectural date to place a work formerly attributed to Rembrandt; Quodbach 2002, p. 64, quotes Weir’s remark that with Marquand’s purchase of this portrait, “now we will have one very remarkable picture of which the country will be proud”; Quodbach 2004, p. 102, cites an apparent allusion to the painting in a New York Times article of 1838 (“one of the supposedly genuine works the newspaper referred to”); Scallen 2004, pp. 181, 337 nn. 3, 11, as accepted by Bode in 1881 and by Harck in 1888; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 666–67, reports that the first ground contains red earth, and the second ground lead white, chalk (?), a little charcoal black, and yellow ochre, resulting in a gray color.


This panel is most probably Rembrandt’s oil sketch made in preparation for his etching known as the “Large Coppenol,” of 1658 (fig. 183). From 1969 onward, conservator Hubert von Sonnenburg maintained, on the basis of quality and technical evidence, that the painting was a copy of the print, an opinion which prevailed in the literature (and in the Museum) for more than twenty years. Reconsideration of the work’s authorship began during the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition of 1995–96, when scholarly visitors, above all Christopher Brown, expressed the view that parts of the picture, such as the near hand and sleeve, the quill pen, the sheet of paper, and the collar, seem quite characteristic of Rembrandt’s work on a smaller scale, as seen, for example, in A Woman Bathing in a Stream, of 1654 (National Gallery, London). Since then, several authors have defended the attribution to Rembrandt, usually noting that retouches in the face complicate the issue.

That Rembrandt painted a portrait of the well-known calligrapher Lieven Willemsz van Coppenol (ca. 1599–1671 or later) is mentioned in a contemporary verse by the famous Amsterdam poet Joost van den Vondel (1587–1679) and in a poem, of 1662, by Jan Vos (1610–1667; see Refs.). Although the panel is not signed, the names of the artist and the sitter (if not the latter’s profession) were known to Guattani in 1808 (see Refs.), when he described the work in Lucien Bonaparte’s collection as “il ritratto del Coppenhol, celebre storico Olandese, di mano del Rembrandt, in piccolo” (a portrait of Coppenol, famous Dutch historian, from Rembrandt’s hand, small scale). From Buchanan, Smith, and Waagen in the early nineteenth century to Bredius in 1890 and 1925 (see Refs.), the painting was often praised, related to the corresponding etching, and (in the catalogue of the Amsterdam Rembrandt exhibition of 1935) compared with the much smaller panel (7/8 x 5/8 in. [19 x 15 cm]) Portrait of Ehrasm Bueno, of about 1647 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), as a preparatory study for a portrait print. One ominous note is Waagen’s reference, in 1838, to the “deep brown glow of the tone” in the Van Coppenol painting, which was surely not original and suggests that a fair amount of varnish had to be removed at a later date. To judge from reproductions published shortly after 1900, this operation had been performed in recent years, and the patient emerged with more detail in the face, hands, and costume than he had ever had before. In Bredius’s catalogue of 1935, the picture looks more painterly, if still somewhat more finished in the face than one would expect of Rembrandt. Conservation—or rather, restoration—appears to account for the “pedantic” detail that bothered Von Sonnenburg in 1969, which was conceivably added, as Van de Wetering suggests, by using the Large Coppenol print as a guide.

Van de Wetering’s discussion of the panel in 2000–2001 (see Refs.) is speculative in some passages and too assertive in others (for example, in the claim that X-radiographs reveal “some ten penimenti”), but it effectively refutes Von Sonnenburg’s declaration that the oak panel (which was ready for painting from about 1651 onward) had been recycled from some earlier use and that “the pronounced sphere-shaped border of the skullcap” may be taken as a sign of tracing from the etching. Von Sonnenburg’s view of the painting as an early imitation must have been encouraged by his conclusion, in 1970, that it is in “good condition overall.” Van de Wetering, by contrast, reports “strong indications that the paint-surface has suffered so extensively from over-cleaning that it has [to have] been retouched—in actual fact, repainted—on a considerable scale, in particular in the head.” The colorplate published in the Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt catalogue shows the picture in a cleaned state, and suggests that Van de Wetering’s analysis is only slightly exaggerated.

Before further discussion of the portrait, we should consider the personality it represents, since the sitter was not Rembrandt’s (or anyone’s) typical patron. In his extensively documented study of Van Coppenol and his family, Wijnman (1933) describes the aging writer as a well-to-do “half-wit” who would persistently solicit poets and artists for testimonials to his extraordinary penmanship. Dickey has shown that a more nuanced interpretation is appropriate.

Van Coppenol’s family was originally from Tiel, near Ghent. His grandparents, the Mennonite merchant Willem Jansz Coppenol and Magdalena van der Kerckhove, fled the Spanish Netherlands and settled in Haarlem about 1579. Their son Willem Willemsz, Lieven’s father, was about eight years old at the time. About twelve years later, he
married Engelte Willemsdr in Haarlem, and by 1599 the couple were living in Leiden, where Lieven was born. The family moved back to Haarlem by 1604. Willem’s brothers went into business, while Willem became a schoolmaster and calligrapher. Of his and Engelte’s own children (they had at least seven), the eldest son, Willem, sold books in Amsterdam, Pieter was a merchant in the same city, and Lieven followed not only in his father’s pedagogical footsteps but also the calligraphic flourishes of his hand.

A primer illustrating examples of Lieven’s penmanship was published as early as 1618. The most important model book of Dutch calligraphy had come out not long before, the 1605 edition of Spiegel der Schrijfkonste (Mirror of the Art of Writing), by Jan van de Velde (1560–1623), with etchings by Simon Frisius (ca. 1515–1629) after the original manuscript. Through the influence of Netherlandish schoonschrijvers (“beautiful writers”) such as Van de Velde, and hundreds of teachers in “French schools” (which specialized in languages, writing, and business skills suitable to international trade), the use of a flowing script (called an Italian hand) replaced Gothic lettering in the Netherlands within a few decades. Van Coppenol appears to have taken part in the development at every level, from schoolboy competitions to publishing, teaching, corresponding with peers, and finally striving, obsessively, to be recognized as the greatest calligrapher in the land. He was far from achieving that distinction, although he had considerable skill.13

By 1619, Lieven was living in Amsterdam, where on February 10 of that year he married a widow, Mayke (Maria) Theunisdr. She was twenty years older than her Mennonite groom, who gave his age (falsely?) as twenty-two. It appears from documents that Mayke, the mother of four (including two teenage girls), was the mistress of the French school in which Van Coppenol found employment and comfortable accommodations. A son, Pieter, was born to the newlyweds in 1619, and another, Lieven, arrived four years later. Through his marriage, Van Coppenol gained a professional position for three decades and relationships with prominent Mennonites, including Vondel (who converted to Catholicism in 1641) and a number of wealthy merchants. Mayke Theunisdr owned various properties in Amsterdam; her brother, who lived next door, had a net worth of Fl 34,000 in 1631, when Van Coppenol’s own was estimated at Fl 1,000.13

At Mayke’s death in 1643, she left her schoolteacher husband with five underage children and a mere sixth of her estate. But he married well again the following year, a widow named Marguerita (Grietje) Andriesdr, who had houses on both the Keizersgracht and the Haarlemmerstraat. Marguerita was related to Vondel and to influential Mennonite merchants and preachers, including the sitters in Rembrandt’s famous double portrait of 1641, Cornelis Anso and Aeltje Schouten (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin).14

A turning point came in 1650, when Van Coppenol fell ill and for a time was so irrational that he had to be tied down to a bed in a friend’s house. He recovered, but the attack evidently cost him his ability to teach and to manage his financial affairs (for which his son Lieven assumed responsibility). During the next decade, Van Coppenol practiced calligraphy with a passion and exploited connections to bring himself fame. He went as high as one might imagine, sending examples of his penmanship to Constantijn Huygens, secretary to the Prince of Orange at The Hague, which in 1655 brought the polite response of a few flattering verses.15 In addition to posting samples of his writing to enthusiasts and poetical luminaries, Van Coppenol literally took his act on the road, traveling in a horse-drawn cart with a box he called his boomgaard (orchard).26 His

Figure 183. Rembrandt, Lieven Willemzn van Coppenol (the “Lange Coppenol”), 1658. Etching and drypoint, 13 5/8 x 11 5/8 in. (34 x 29 cm). Fourth state of six. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Felix M. Warburg and his family, 1941 44.1.35
reputation suffered a slight setback when in 1656 the deacons of the Waterlander Mennonite church twice requested the opportunity to discuss his alleged habit of frequenting bordellos, to which Van Coppenoel failed to respond. After his second wife died, in 1661, Van Coppenoel employed the Rembrandtesque expedient of living with a maid, Jannetje Block, who became pregnant and sued him over the course of five years for breach of promise to marry her (she received a cash settlement in 1669). Van Coppenoel was still alive on May 18, 1671, when his son Lieven testified that he took care of his father's needs, and wished to provide for his future in the event of his own death (which followed twelve days later). The date and place of the calligrapher's death have not yet been discovered.

Rembrandt's involvement with Van Coppenoel came in one of the best years of the writer's life and in one of the artist's worst, 1658, when his house, its furnishings, and his art collection were sold off to satisfy creditors. The considerable amount of time and patience Rembrandt devoted to the intrepid self-promoter have been perceived as reflections of friendship or financial need, but it is more likely that the minor client's connection with people who were important to the painter made him inescapable. The first commission was probably for the portrait print of modest size, the "Small Coppenoel" (fig. 184), which shows the portly writer at his desk, pen poised above a perfect circle. His expression could be taken to suggest either contemplation or vacuity; the young man who looks on has been identified as the calligrapher's grandson Antonius. Rembrandt evidently drew a compositional study for the etching, which then went through major revisions in several states. Apparently it never pleased the patron, nor was the slightly earlier portrait engraving of him by Cornelis Visscher (1629–1668; fig. 185) accepted as a sure route to immortality, although it is splendid and far more flattering than the Rembrandt prints.

Rembrandt therefore, or so it would appear, proceeded to make the larger etched portrait of Van Coppenoel, also of 1658 (fig. 183). It is the artist's largest portrait print, although it is about the same size as many of the period, such as Jan Lievens' etched portraits of Vondel and Ephraim Bueno, which date from a few years earlier. For the Large Coppenoel, Rembrandt did not draw but
painted a preliminary sketch, which in the course of work
was modified in some details and increased in size. Van
de Wetering offers an elaborate yet trivial explanation for
the addition of the wooden strip at the left side of the
panel and for the apparent extension of the painted
surface from a large part to the whole of the support
(fig. 186). In his view, the cropping of the corner of the
paper in the sitter's hands was too much to bear. But a
more plausible reason for the expansion of the format
would be that the patron wanted to be presented in a
print that was monumental in scale and composition, like
Lievens's portraits of Vondel and Bueno, and Visscher's
prints of Vondel and Van Coppenol himself. In dramatic
contrast to the Small Coppenol, the grander engraving
(figs. 184, 185) shows the writer as a commanding pres-
ence who largely fills the space, which in its stagelike sim-
plicity compares with the settings given to Aristotle and,
later, De Lairesse (Pls. 151, 160). Under the circum-
cstances, it is no wonder that (in contrast to Rembrandt's earlier
oil sketch and etching of Ephraim Bueno) the panel and
the print are about the same size, although Van de
Wetering suggests that the coincidence in scale "does
raise the question of whether another hand might have
been involved in making this print." The remark flies in
the face of print scholarship, which describes in detail
how Rembrandt "worked on the plate almost without
interruption up until the fifth state," and records that
even the incomplete first state, in which "the desired
expressiveness has yet to be achieved," is known from
seven impressions on Japanese paper, which were evident-
ly intended for "collectors who were keen to get their
hands on such oddities." The subtlety, force, and excep-
tional finish of the etching (rivaling the polish of portrait
engravings) suggest that the oil sketch, even if it was
originally closer to the etching in the facial expression (if
not in the sitter's posture) was essentially an essay in
composition, not character. The comparison also suggests
that the late nineteenth-century restorer who added detail
to Van Coppenol's overcleaned face did not follow
Rembrandt's etching, with its intense expression, but
referred to the engraved copy of about 1789 by Pierre-
François Basan (1723–1797) or to another one of the
pedestrian reproductions that were run off by eighteenth-
century printmakers. In sum, the present picture is
Rembrandt's oil sketch for the Large Coppenol etching,
in which the composition is reversed, placing the pen in
the calligrapher's right hand.

Figure 186. X-radiograph of Rembrandt's Lieven Willemz van
Coppenol (Pl. 156)

1. See Refs. For Von Sonnenburg, see Art Institute of Chicago 1973
(records of a symposium held in 1969), p. 88; Von Sonnenburg
opinion that the panel copies the print was advanced earlier by
Daan Cever, during a visit to the Museum on January 4, 1966.
Curator John Walsh, in a memo dated March 28, 1977, recom-
mended that the attribution be changed to Imitator of Rem-
brandt, based entirely on Von Sonnenburg's argument. Walsh
proposed a date in the first half of the eighteenth century, and
suggested that "the painting was made fraudulently, to produce
a work that would pass as a 'sketch' for the well-known etching."
2. On Brown's oral opinion, see note 5 under Ex Coll. below.
When Seymour Slive, during the exhibition of 1995–96, was
informed that the Coppenol had attracted some positive remarks,
said he that he had never doubted it in the first place.
3. Amsterdam 1935, p. 54 (under no. 21). On Rembrandt's painted
and etched portraits of the Jewish physician and author Ephraim
Bueno (1599–1665), see Zdanowicz in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–
98, pp. 410–11, no. 109; Van de Wetering in Amsterdam–London
2000–2001, p. 18, figs. 24–26; and Dickey 2004, pp. 137–38,
figs. 150, 151.
4. See Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1901), pl. 456, or the crisper repro-
ductions in A. Rosenberg 1906, p. 326, and in A. Rosenberg
1909, p. 444.
where it is observed, "this would explain why the striking
correspondence between the painting and the print, precisely in the head, coincides with such an un-Rembrandt-esque execution in these very areas." (The "striking correspondence" is further considered below.) See Refs. for the other authors mentioned in the text.

6. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 29, caption to fig. 24 (X-radiograph), essentially repeating Von Sonnenburg 1976, pp. 20–21. J. Bauch, in a letter to conservator John Brealey dated November 13, 1977, reported dendrochronological analysis indicating a youngest heartwood ring of 1658 and a felling date not earlier than 1648. In 1991 and 1999, these statistics were refined by Peter Klein, who reported a youngest heartwood ring of 1654, a likely felling date between 1647 and 1653, and, after a minimum of two years’ seasoning, use of the panel “plausible from 1651 upwards” (letters to the Museum dated January 25, 1991, and October 2, 1995).

7. “Record of Painting Examination and Treatment,” signed by Von Sonnenburg and dated June 1970, with no other comments on condition.

8. Van de Wetering in Amsterdam–London 2000–2001, p. 60. By “on a considerable scale” (an unfortunate choice of words with regard to the sitter’s facial features), the writer certainly meant “to a considerable extent.” His entire essay is poorly edited, or rather, not edited at all, to judge from the draft kindly sent to the present writer and to Von Sonnenburg on April 6, 2000.


10. Dickey 2004, pp. 159–58. In Wijnman 1933, the term “halfwijk” is used repeatedly but there is no evidence that Coppenol was dim-witted, as opposed to eccentric and self-possessed.


13. See Wijnman 1933, p. 128.


17. As Lloyd Williams notes in London 2001, p. 214 (under no. 123), Rembrandt had painted a large formal portrait of Van Coppenol’s niece Catrinna Hooghsaet in 1657 (Penrhyn Castle, Gwynedd, Wales).

20. On the perfect circle as a sign of artistic or calligraphic virtuosity, see Broos 1971 (pp. 162–77 on the Small Coppenol).

21. As observed in Dickey 2004, pp. 149–50, the composition recalls that of many “scholar portraits,” with the supporting figure of a messenger or assistant. The boy also brings to mind Van Coppenol’s career as a schoolmaster. Antonius, the son of Lieven Lievensz van Coppenol, was thirteen years old in 1658.


23. See Dickey 2004, pp. 150–51. Visscher’s portrait of Coppenol, finished a few days before the engraver’s death on January 16, 1658, may itself have been inspired by his portrait print of Vondel, which is inscribed “C. de Visscher ad vivum deli er sculp” (C. de Visscher drawn from life and engraved). See ibid., p. 135, fig. 149. Both of Visscher’s engravings are also illustrated in Sarasota 1980–81, nos. 116, 117. Broos 1971, pp. 173–75, reviews a few of the reasons that Van Coppenol might have been unhappy with Rembrandt’s first print, ranging from Wijnman’s idea that the calligrapher’s eyes make him appear to be just what he was, a “vain half-wit,” to contemporary readings of the perfect “O” as a reference to the writer’s waistline.

24. For the portraits prints by Lievens, see Dickey 2004, pp. 136, 137, figs. 147, 152.

25. Van de Wetering in Amsterdam–London 2000–2001, p. 61 ("apparently, the composition in its original conception (?) was considered unsatisfactory, and it was decided to incorporate the whole piece of paper that Coppenol is holding into the sketch").

26. Ibid., p. 60. Singer (1906; Refs.) made the same suggestion, without consequence.


REFERENCES: Joost van den Vondel, in the inscription (added later) on a portrait of Van Coppenol engraved by Cornelis Visscher in 1657–58, observes of the sitter that “the noble Rembrandt painted him with his worthy brush”; Vos 1662, p. 161, publishes a poem entitled “Meester Lieven van Koppenol Vermaart Schrijver. Door Rembrandt van Rijn geschildert” (Master Lieven van Coppenol, Famous Writer. Painted by Rembrandt van Rijn), in which the verses are devoted entirely to Van Coppenol’s talents as a calligrapher;1 Guattani 1808, vol. 1, p. 77, no. 42, catalogues the work in Lucien Bonaparte’s collection as “il ritratto del Koppenol, celebre storico Olandese, di mano del Rembrandt, in piccolo”; Buchanan 1824, vol. 2, pp. 285–86, 292, no. 135, records Baring’s purchase of the picture from the collection of Lucien Bonaparte; J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 112, no. 307, catalogues the picture of the “eminent writing master” as in the collection of Lord Ashburton, describes the composition, and observes that “this admirable portrait was painted in Rembrandt’s best period, and is one of the very few pictures etched by the artist”; Waagen 1838, vol. 2, p. 273, in a survey of Lord Ashburton’s collection, maintains that “this portrait, which was etched by Rembrandt himself, is, for animation, impasto, and the deep brown glow of the tone [presumably from varnish], one of his
best works"; Rathgeber 1844, col. 211, listed as in Ashburnton's collection; anon., "Visits to Private Galleries," Art-Union 9 (April 1, 1847), p. 123, as in the collection of Lord Ashburnton, Bath-House, Piccadilly, borrowed remarks from J. Smith (1836); Waagen 1854, vol. 2, p. 103, repeats Waagen 1838; Blanc 1839–61, vol. 2, pp. 54–55, cited in the Ashburnton collection as "une des plus belles peintures du maître"; Vosmaer 1877, pp. 114, 147, listed under works of 1660, possibly from the [Saint-Julien] collection; Bode 1883, pp. 352–33, 58, no. 193, lists the "Portrait of Coppelen" as in Lord Ashburnton's collection, dates it about 1661, and suggests that it was no doubt painted slightly before Rembrandt made the etching (fig. 183 here), for which it was probably a study; Dutuit 1883, vol. 2, p. 47, amid other confused observations, mentions the work as one of at least three portraits of Van Coppelen that Rembrandt painted; Dutuit 1885, pp. 8, 42, 61, 70, no. 207, as in the 1784 sale of baron de Saint-Julien's collection; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., p. 56, no. 147, as in Lord Ashburnton's collection; Bredius 1890, p. 108, exclaims that one cannot imagine a portrait more full of character, despite its small proportions, and suggests that it must date some years later than 1652; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, pp. 135–36, 234, dates the picture about 1658 and erroneously states that it is signed; Moes 1897–1905, vol. 1 (1897), p. 197, no. 1704–1, records the work among portraits of Van Coppelen; Bell 1899, p. 142, as not signed or dated, but painted about 1650 or (according to É. Michel) 1686; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1901), pp. 33, 144, no. 456, pl. 456, as in the De Bosch sale of 1769, bought by "Fouquet;" a study (incorrectly said to be on paper) of about 1658 for the Large Coppelen etching; A. Rosenberg 1906, p. 326 (ill.), 404, as in the Ashburnton collection, painted about 1658, etched by Rembrandt; Singer 1906, pp. 276–77, note to p. 337, doubts the etching as Rembrandt's work, but not the painting; anon., "Ashburnton Collection Sold," American Art News 6, no. 1 (October 19, 1907), p. 6, reports that the picture is said to have been retained by Lord Alfred de "Rotheschild" to secure interest on a loan made to Lord Ashburnton; Valentinier in A. Rosenberg 1909, p. 443 (ill.), 563, as in the collection of Alfred Rotheschild, London, erroneously as on paper, considers the work a study of about 1658 for the etching, which Singer (1906) mistakenly doubts; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 306, no. 636, as in the Tijler sale of 1799, incorrectly as on paper, about 1658, "etched in reverse, of the same size, by Rembrandt himself;" Hind 1923, vol. 1, p. 118 (under no. 500), "no doubt used as the basis of the etching;" Valentinier 1931, unpaged, no. 137, pl. 137, incorrectly as on paper, probably painted in 1658 as a study for the etching; Wijnman 1933, pp. 150, 152–153, 155–56, fig. 9, as in Lady Carnarvon's collection, considers the painting to follow the Small Coppelen etching and to be a preparatory study for the Large Coppelen print, both of 1658, speculates on the circumstances that led Van Coppelen to offer the commission to Rembrandt and that encouraged the artist to accept it, and observes that Catrina Hooghsaet, of whom Rembrandt painted a portrait in 1647 (Penrhyn Castle), was a niece of Van Coppelen's wife; Amsterdam 1934, pp. 44–55, no. 21, catalogues the panel as an oil sketch for Rembrandt's etching known as the Large Coppelen, of 1658, and compares the small oil study of Ephraim Bueno (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) that Rembrandt painted for his etched portrait of 1647; Bredius 1935, p. 13, no. 291, pl. 291, incorrectly as on "paper on wood," as by Rembrandt, a study for his etching; Slive 1953, pp. 53, 74, draws attention to Jan Vos's poem of 1662 (see Vos 1662 above), and states that Vos probably refers to the painting "now in the Edward S. Harkness Collection," which "is generally accepted as a study for the famous large Coppelen etching, (Bartsch. 283), dated 1658"; Amsterdam–Rotterdam 1956, p. 69 (under no. 118), observes that the Large Coppelen etching by Rembrandt closely follows this painting by Rembrandt; K. Bauch 1966, p. 22, no. 424, pl. 424, as by Rembrandt, a study for the etching, incorrectly as painted on paper; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 221 (ill.), 574, no. 291, incorrectly (in the entry) as on paper, states that the work is "claimed to be the oil sketch for the etching" of 1658, but "the execution of the picture is, however, too weak to be attributed to Rembrandt;" Lecaldano 1969, p. 131 (ill.), among works of doubtful attribution; White 1969, text vol., p. 147, erroneously as on paper, describes that painting as "almost certainly the preparatory study for the large etching" of Van Coppelen; White and Boon 1969, p. 135 (under no. 8283), describes the painting as "now rejected, as not by Rembrandt;" Brooks 1971, p. 166 n. 29, in a substantial discussion of the sitter and Dutch calligraphy, describes the work as "the apparent preliminary study" for the Large Coppelen etching; Von Sonnenburg in Art Institute of Chicago 1975, p. 88, largely on the basis of the "sharp line between the cap and the forehead," concludes that the painting "is a copy after rather than a sketch for the etching;" Von Sonnenburg 1976, pp. 17 (ill., with X-radiograph), 20–21, claims that it may be concluded from technical evidence that the unknown painter of this work based it upon the Large Coppelen etching; Boltel and Boltel-Remp 1977, p. 198, no. 471 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 433, considers the poem by Vondel (see first Ref. above) to refer to Rembrandt's painting not Visscher's print; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 131, as "Style of Rembrandt, 1st half XVIII century;" Wilson in Sarasota 1980–81, unpaged (under no. 114), listed, as by Rembrandt, among portraits of Van Coppelen; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2 (1986), p. 210, states that this portrait is not the one cited in Vos 1662 because "it cannot be attributed to Rembrandt;" and incorrectly gives Van Coppelen's date of death as 1662; Baetjer 1995, p. 320, as Style of Rembrandt, 17th century or later; Dicke in New York 1993–96, vol. 2, p. 226 (under no. 97b), maintains (because of the faulty conclusions of her collaborators) that "on one occasion this etching [fig. 183 here] served as the direct basis for a painted portrait;" Liedtke in ibid., vol. 2, pp. 15, 22–22, no. 34 (ill.), follows Von Sonnenburg (1970) in rejecting Rembrandt's authorship, and attempts to rationalize why such a copy would have been made and why it reverses the design of the print; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 28–29, fig. 24 (X-radiograph), claims that the panel had some earlier use because an X-radiograph reveals a ground preparation on three sides, and that "the pronounced sphere-shaped border of the skullcap" constitutes evidence of "the use of a tracing of the etching;" Broekhoff and Franken 1997, p. 80, complains that despite a dating of the wood support to about 1650, Liedtke (in New York 1993–96) suggests a dating of the painting to 1660–80, and that the same scholar "has not reconsidered the question of an attribution to Rembrandt himself or to a workshop assistant;" Luijten in Amsterdam–London 2002–2001, pp. 318, 360 n. 9, fig. b (under no. 89), considers the work Rembrandt's oil sketch for his etching of Van Coppelen, observing that "although the assessment of this painting is hampered by later overpainting, its authenticity has now been accepted" (which is a reference to the following); Van de Wetering in ibid.,
pp. 57, 58, 59–62, figs. 27, 29 (X-radiograph), disputes Von Sonnenburg’s technical analysis of the work, notes that X-radiographs reveal numerous *pensamenti*, maintains that “the execution of the painting, as far as may be judged given its worn and partly over-painted condition, also indicates that it should be reattributed to Rembrandt,” and suggests that the face, having been overcleaned, was restored using the Large Coppoenol etching as a guide; M. Bailey 2001, p. 24, summarizes Van de Wetering’s argument in Amsterdam–London 2000–2001; White 2001, p. 94, considers Van de Wetering (in Amsterdam–London 2000–2001) correct to reinstate as a work by Rembrandt; this “recently doubted oil sketch,” Ackley in Boston–Chicago 2003–4, refers to the oil sketch as by Rembrandt; Baer in ibid., pp. 38, 44 nn. 62, 64, fig. 35, describes the work as Rembrandt’s oil sketch “made in preparation for the artist’s last and largest portrait etching” notes *pensamenti* and the fact that the artist counted on the reversal in the print to make Van Coppoenol hold the pen in his right hand, and concludes that the evidence argues “for the authenticity of the sketch, even while the condition makes it qualitatively difficult to ascribe to Rembrandt”; Bisanz-Praekken in Vienna 2004, pp. 218–19, no. 94 (ill.), summarizes recent arguments concerning the picture’s authorship, favoring those in support of an ascription to Rembrandt; Dickey 2004, p. 150, 203 n. 58, 205 n. 100, fig. 166, observes that this “poorly preserved painting . . . may be a modello [for the Large Coppoenol etching], similar to the oil sketch of Ephraim Bueno”; Groen in Corpus 2009 pp. 662–65, reports that the first ground contains chalk, and the second ground lead white and a little ochre orumber; Klein in ibid., p. 666, reports the earliest possible felling date of the tree used for the panel as 1643.


**Ex coll.:** J. Tijler, widow of Lucas van Beek (until 1759; sale, De Leth & De Bosch, Amsterdam, April 30, 1759, no. 2, for Fl 65 to De Bosch); [Jeronymus de Bosch, Amsterdam, 1759–67; sale, Amsterdam, October 5, 1767, no. 8, to Fouquet]; baron de Saint-Julien, Paris (by 1784–at least 1785; sale, Le Brun, Paris, June 21ff., 1784, for 1,500 livres, bought in; sale, Saubert, Paris, February 14, 1785, no. 37, 1 pied 1 pouce x 10 pouces [14 x 10% in.];) Prince Lucien Bonaparte, Rome, later London (by 1808–1814; his sale, William Buchanan, London, 1814, no. 135, to Baring); Hon. Alexander Baring, later 1st Baron Ashburton, The Grange, Alresford, Hampshire, and London (1834–d. 1848); the Barons Ashburton, The Grange and London (1848–89); Francis Denzil Edward Baring, 5th Baron Ashburton, The Grange and London (1889–1907); Baron Alfred Charles de Rothschild, London and Halton (1907–d. 1918); Almina, Countess of Carnarvon, London (1918–at least 1922); [Knoedler, London and New York, until 1924; sold to Harkness]; Edward S. Harkness, New York (1924–d. 1940); Mrs. Edward S. (Mary Stillman) Harkness, New York (1940–d. 1950); Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950 50.145.33

1. In 1734, Valerius Röver, in Delft, acquired a picture that he considered to be “the portrait of the famous writer Lieve van Coppoenol, sitting at a table cutting a pen, [shown] to the knees, lifesize, forcefully and artfully painted by Rembrandt van Rijn, 2 feet 9 inches wide, 3 feet 6 inches high . . . f 120” (Moes 1911, p. 23). This large canvas, Rembrandt’s Portrait of a Man *Trimming His Quill,* of 1632 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel), cannot have been mistaken for a portrait of Van Coppoenol by Jan Vos, who like other poets of the time was solicited by the calligrapher for verse celebrating his skill (see Dickey 2004, p. 31). In the entry on the Kassel painting in Corpus 1988–89, vol. 2, p. 210 (under no. 454), it is reasoned that the small panel in New York “cannot be considered for identification with the painted portrait referred to by Vondel and Vos, since it cannot be attributed to Rembrandt, and must be seen as a copy done after his etching” (Von Sonnenburg in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 88, is cited). The authors go on to dismiss the Kassel picture from contention as well and conclude that the portrait of Van Coppoenol that was painted by Rembrandt and cited by Vos “has been lost” (p. 211).

2. Bauch visited the Museum on September 24, 1962, and on that occasion stated that, despite some weaknesses, the picture was probably painted by Rembrandt, in preparation for the print.

3. On a visit to the Museum in April 1976, Gerson suggested that the picture probably dated from the nineteenth century. The painting was excluded from Gerson 1968, which possibly influenced Von Sonnenburg’s negative opinion, expressed at the Chicago symposium in October 1969 (published in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 88).


5. Brockhoff and Franken evidently forgot that the present writer, in the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition space on November 28, 1995, enthusiastically described to them Christopher Brown’s oral opinion, expressed a few weeks earlier, that the painting might well be by Rembrandt, and that they were receptive to the revised opinion.
157. Self-Portrait

Oil on canvas, 31⅝ x 26½ in. (80.3 x 67.3 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): Rembrandt / f 1660

The painting is generally well preserved, although abrasion has exposed the light grayish brown ground in the thinly painted passages of the costume at right and of the proper right shoulder, the collar, and the background.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.618

Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait in the Altman Collection bears an autograph signature and date of 1660.1 In the summer of that year, the artist turned fifty-four years old. The painting is in good condition, especially in the face, which reveals remarkable quality and candor. Originally, the bust and hat must have imparted a stronger sense of volume, consistent with that still found in the head. An early description of the picture’s overall effect, printed in the catalogue of the Radstock sale, London, in 1826, is of interest in this regard:

Portrait of Rembrandt, by himself. An admirable Picture. A black Hat or Cap, placed obliquely on the head, gives a very brilliant relief to the countenance, which is lighted up with rich effect. The flesh exhibits every variety of tint, harmoniously blended: —a true representation of nature.

The hat now sets off the “relief” of the face but also somewhat diminishes the sense of space around the head. Rembrandt painted the hat over a smaller cap. The flat impression now made by the hat is not, however, the consequence of that repainting (which occurred at an early moment in the course of work) but of natural darkening in the area. Some indications of folds and other modeling in the hat are discernible in autoradiographs.2 In the coat or “gown,” a garment perhaps similar to that in the tall Self-Portrait, of 1652, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (fig. 187), the gray ground shows through in areas and there are signs of heavy overcleaning in the brown paint layer. Thus, what might be taken as a very sketchy handling of the bust, leaving it “superficial and incoherent,” is misleading. While the painter’s work clothes were indeed broadly brushed, with many strokes of color suggesting local highlights, the bust as a whole would have appeared well-rounded, with a consistent fall of light from the upper left, lending substance to the loose folds descending from the shoulders. The fullness of the material suggests a long gown, worn over a doublet with a turned-up collar and a red waistcoat.3

Of the approximately forty painted self-portraits by Rembrandt known today, the three-quarter-length standing self-portrait in Vienna, dating from eight years earlier, could be considered the first in which he presents himself in work clothes and, at the same time, with a forthright (and confident) expression that evokes no other role than that of an artist in his studio.4 Variations on this theme followed during the 1650s, with those most analogous to the Altman picture being the so-called Small Self-Portrait, of the mid- to late 1650s, also in Vienna (fig. 188), which is probably cut down; the Sutherland Self-Portrait, of 165(9?), in Edinburgh (fig. 189); the Mellon Self-Portrait, dated 1659, in Washington D.C. (fig. 190), and, despite its more inclusive composition, the Self-Portrait at the Easel, dated 1660 (Louvre, Paris).5 The canvas in Washington

Figure 187. Rembrandt, Self-Portrait, 1652. Oil on canvas, 44⅝ x 32⅝ in. (112 x 82.5 cm). Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna
has been described as possibly one of the first works Rembrandt painted “in the small house on the Rozengracht in the painters’ quarter of Amsterdam where he had moved when his fortunes and his prospects were at a low ebb.” The commanding Self-Portrait of 1658 in the Frick Collection, New York (fig. 191), cautiously avoids associating the artist’s day-to-day concerns with his self-portraits, although even in that large canvas, where Rembrandt appears as if enthroned, his serious face is studied in a straightforward manner and the expression has not lost all traces of the anxiety seen in the Small Self-Portrait. It may be that the unembellished self-portraits of Rembrandt’s later years reflect something of his new circumstances and surroundings, in which his time (to his relief, one would imagine) was more exclusively than it had been for some years devoted to hard work and sober observation. The Self-Portrait as Saint Paul, of 1661 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), and the grand and assertive Self-Portrait, of about 1665(?), in Kenwood House, London, are very different pictures that nonetheless sustain the impression of evidence examined in a mirror and not altered for public view.

Unlike the treatment in the Paris and Washington self-portraits, the execution of the face in the Altman picture
is carefully descriptive, revealing close attention to tactile effects, which are contrasted with the textures of fabric and hair. The painter pulls forms forward—the brow, the bulbous nose, the sagging cheeks, and hooked tip of the moustache—and he carves others back, as in the hollows and wrinkles around the eyelids. He records uneven tones of aging skin ranging from ruddy to pale, the personal topography of furrows and creases above the tired eyes, their wetness, and the filmy surface of soft flesh shining like worn leather in the light. The gradual transition from the brightest part of the forehead to the shadowy recession of the opposite cheek and jaw is the result of a few hours’ work and thirty years’ experience. The eyes differ, the one in light steady and direct in its gaze, the other weaker and hesitant. The dichotomy comes from comparing an image in a mirror with another on an easel (as seen in the Paris Self-Portrait of the same date) and has an expressive effect that the painter could easily have modified. The mouth, too, has a firm and a less resolute side. In his early self-portraits, Rembrandt tried on expressions at will, and for decades thereafter imagined himself in the guise of dramatic characters. Late in life he was still learning how much could be written in a face when simply its physical qualities were transcribed.

1. A photograph of the signature and date is reproduced in Corpus 2005, p. 521, fig. 4.
2. See the detailed discussion under “Radiography” in ibid., p. 521, fig. 3 (eighteenth autoradiograph).
4. See Corpus 2005, pp. 410–17, no. 118, on the Vienna Self-Portrait. Van de Wetering in ibid., p. 143, counts about forty painted self-portraits, about thirty etched examples, and “some five drawings.” He emphasizes, however, that many more portraits of Rembrandt were made in his workshop, usually by producing variants of autograph self-portraits rather than sitting the master down as model. The “self-portraits” that were not actually painted by Rembrandt himself and the multiple impressions of self-portrait prints suggest a large demand for images of the famous artist, at different levels of expenditure.
5. Ibid., nos. IV13, 15, 18, 19.
8. Ibid., nos. IV24, 26.

REFERENCES: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 86, no. 210, catalogues the painting (“Rembrandt, when upwards of fifty-eight years of age”) as in Lord Ashburton’s collection, “engraved by [G. F. J.] Schmidt,” admires the “expressive and strongly-marked countenance,” refers to the reddish brown cloak (Smith knows the picture in the original) but not the signature or date; “Visits to Private Galleries,” Arts-Union 9 (April 1, 1847), p. 123, in an account of Lord Ashburton’s collection in London, describes the “excellently painted picture” as representing Rembrandt “about fifty years old, and plainly attired”; Waagen 1854, vol. 2, p. 102, no. 2, lists the picture in Lord Ashburton’s collection as Rembrandt’s “portrait of himself at an advanced age,” and as “painted in a masterly manner”; Bode 1883, pp. 545, 585, no. 189, reports that the canvas is dated 1660, according to the personal communication of Dr. J. P. Richter; Dutil 1885, pp. 42, 61, 70, no. 168, lists the work as signed and dated 1660; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., p. 56, no. 145, signed and dated “Rembr. . . . 1660”; Bredius 1890, p. 108, as from about 1668, praises the “head sculpted in paint”; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 234, “painted about 1668”; Bell 1899, pp. 82, 143, as at The Grange, Alresford, erroneously cited among unsigned works of about 1668; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1908), p. 13, no. 429, pl. 429, as “Bust of Rembrandt in a Greenish Coat” (p. 13) and as “Rembrandt in a Brown Coat” (no. 429), “painted about 1669” when the artist was “aged about forty-five” (!); É. Michel 1903, pp. 337–38, 431, repeats É. Michel 1894; Moe 1897–1905, vol. 2 (1905), p. 315, no. 6659-01, listed among portraits of Rembrandt, this one “by Rembrandt ca. 1683”; A. Rosenberg 1906,
p. 388 (ill.), captioned as in Lord Ashburton’s collection and as dating from about 1659; Valentin in A. Rosenberg 1909, p. 411 (ill.), 382, as with Sedelmeyer, Paris, now as signed and dated 1660, and as possibly the pendant to Hendrickje Stoffels in the Huntington collection (Pl. 154 here); Sedelmeyer Gallery 1911, p. 30, no. 24 (ill.), “Rembrandt in a brown Coat,” aged fifty-four, the canvas signed and dated “Rembrandt f., 1660”; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 26–27, no. 17, as “Portrait of the Artist,” observes that this is “a dated picture of 1660 when, though he appears older, he was but fifty-four” and describes the expression at some length; Valentin 1914b, p. 361, interprets the work as “a momentary expression of a passing mood affected, apparently, by the little cares and anxieties of daily life,” but then claims for Rembrandt “an understanding of all such as suffer in body or in mind”; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 277, no. 582, as “Portrait of the Painter” in the Metropolitan Museum, signed and dated 1660, lists all known collections, incorrectly placing Sedelmeyer before Sulley; Valentin 1921b, p. 126, updates location; A. Burroughs 1923, pp. 270, 271 (ill.), 272, considers the picture to reveal “a compelling freedom of style and manner which must be as fine in any of the single portraits from Rembrandt’s hand,” maintains that “the signature is undoubtedly real,” and criticizes the omission of the work from Van Dyck 1923; Meldrum 1923, p. 109, vol. cxxxi, listed as by Rembrandt in 1660; Monod 1923, p. 306, sees in this self-portrait “l’un des quinze effigies où Rembrandt nous a laissé la tragique autobiographie de ses dernières années”; Glück 1928, p. 328, observes the prominent “wrinkles of age”; A. Burroughs 1931, p. 10, pl. II-A, draws attention to the strong brushwork and notes changes made by the artist in the course of work; Valentin 1931, unpagd, no. 145, pl. 145, gives basic information; Benesch 1932b, p. 65, describes the Hendrickje Stoffels (Pl. 114) as this picture’s supposed companion; Bredius 1935, p. 4, no. 34, pl. 54, as fully signed and dated 1660, with no further comment; A. Burroughs 1938, p. 155, declares the painter’s “concern for the interplay of weights, shapes and movements” essentially the same as in a work of thirty-two years earlier, despite the differences in technique; Held 1942, p. 14 (detail ill.), 28, mistakenly refers to this canvas and Hendrickje Stoffels as pair portraits in the Altman Collection; Ivins 1942a, p. 3, listed (cover ill.); Ivins 1942b, pls. 19, 20 (detail, actual size); Pinder 1943, pp. 98, 100, 102 (ill. p. 100), compares the picture with other self-portraits by Rembrandt, and interprets them as autobiographical; Bremmer 1944, pp. 5–6, finds in the painting a “broken, old man at fifty-four harassed by poverty and misfortune” despite his artistic greatness; J. Allen 1945, pp. 73, 76 (ill.), reveals “powerful insight”; Bax 1952, p. 32, records a smaller copy of this portrait in the Phllimore Museum in Stellenbosch, South Africa (present whereabouts unknown); Rousseau 1952, pp. 83 (ill.), 86, mentioned as “in the current Rembrandt exhibition”; Rousseau 1954, pp. 3, 32 (ill.), observes “the unsurpassed economy of means which [Rembrandt] used to represent a maximum of spiritual feeling”; J. Rosenberg 1964, p. 98, explains why the Hendrickje Stoffels might have been intended as this picture’s pendant; K. Bauch 1966, p. 17, no. 332, pl. 332, “nach Benesch [1932b] Gegenstück zu Nr. 52a”; Erpel 1967, pp. 51, 186, no. 99, pl. 99, pens a brief appreciation of the proud but withdrawn expression; Gerson 1968, pp. 435 (ill.), 593, no. 381, considers the picture “probably a companion piece” to the Hendrickje Stoffels; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 50 (ill.), 551, no. 54, repeats Gerson 1968; Held 1969, p. 96, fig. 7, “possibly painted as a companion piece” to the Hendrickje Stoffels; Lecaldano 1969, p. 119, no. 381 (ill.), and p. 120 (under no. 382), follows Gerson 1968; Held and Posner 1972, p. 268, pl. 42, sees this and other late self-portraits as attempts in self-exploration; Walsh in New York 1972, p. 11, under no. 8, observes that “the composition and pose are simple, but through the contracted brows and wrinkled forehead Rembrandt shows himself to be troubled”; C. Kauffmann 1973, p. 316 (under no. 293), catalogues the seventeenth-century copy of this painting in the Victoria and Albert Museum; Valdivieso 1973, pp. 29, 354, mistakenly records that the picture was sold out of Spain around 1900; A. B. de Vries et al. 1978, p. 186, compares the Self-Portrait of 1669 (Mauritshuis, The Hague); Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 444, listed among paintings dated 1660; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 70, 101, 183, 44–46 (X-radiograph and autoradiographs), describes the preliminary sketch revealed by autoradiography, compares contemporary self-portrait drawings, and observes that the hat was modified into “as many as four shapes,” ranging from a painter’s “turban” (1) to a broad velvet hat with tassel; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1 (1982), p. 239 (under no. 421), credits Seymour Slive with the observation that the early Self-Portrait in the Mauritshuis, The Hague, is very similar to this one in lighting and expression; Wright 1982, pp. 32, 54, no. 50, pl. 90; Bonafox 1985, pp. 116 (ill.), 151 (no comment); G. Schwartz 1985, fig. 411 (no comment); Kelch et al. 1986, p. 27, figs. 20, 21 (X-radiograph), observes that Rembrandt’s liberal use of lead white in later works is obvious in radiographs; C. Timpel 1986, pp. 368 (ill.), 428, no. 473, catalogued as from “Rembrandt’s circle,” with no explanation; Chapman 1990, pp. 87–88, fig. 125, remarks that Rembrandt, in this “monumental half-length painting,” presents himself as a working artist in a “prosaic studio smock”; Liedtke 1990, pp. 48, listed among Altman Rembrandts; Cabanne 1991, p. 152, no. 9 (ill.), Giltaij in Tokyo–Chiba–Yamaguchi 1992, pp. 161, 252 (under no. 92), compares the very small self-portrait drawing in Rotterdam, which is similar in composition; Slotes 1992, p. 400, no. 266 (ill.), dismisses the notion that this is a companion to the Hendrickje Stoffels, and claims that the work is not in good condition; C. Timpel 1993, pp. 368 (ill.), 431, no. 473, as from Rembrandt’s circle, with no explanation, and uncritically repeats Benesch’s idea (1932b; actually Valentin’s in 1909) that the Hendrickje Stoffels is a pendant; Christopher White, review of C. Timpel 1993, Burlington Magazine 135 (1993), p. 767, criticizes Timpel for his assignment of the painting to Rembrandt’s circle, and for his failure to mention the autoradiographs published in Ainsworth et al. 1982, “which to my mind prove the picture’s authenticity”; Baecker 1995, pp. 316 (ill.), 317, as by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1660; Fransis 1995, p. 429, fig. 9, uses the work to illustrate the “dark and painterly manner” that De Lairesse disliked; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 76–78, 86, 89, no. 15 (ill.), reviews earlier opinions (overlooking C. Timpel 1986 and 1991), discusses the portrait’s style and authenticity, observing that “Rembrandt here reveals an extraordinary ability to describe physical qualities (which presumably were studied in a mirror) and simultaneously to suggest character”; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 20–21, 25, 48, 54, 134, figs. 3 (the painting seen on an easel in the MMA conservation studio), 14 (detail), 15 (autoradiograph detail), 50 (detail), 51 (X-radiograph detail), 167 (detail), interprets the evidence of autoradiography, observes that the yellowish white ground is especially visible in this “well-preserved self-portrait, but its appearance in a few abrasied areas in the background and in the [Rembrandt van Rijn] 591
painter’s attire was not intended,” and remarks that only Rembrandt’s self-portraits “show such spontaneity and ease of execution”; Lank 1996, p. 124, approves of Von Sonnenburg’s careful reading of technical evidence (as presented in New York 1995–96); Buijsen in London–The Hague 1999–2000, pp. 202, 208, 211–12, 212 n. 210, no. 80 (ill.), observes how the face was “laid in with impasto brushstrokes, but these were subsequently covered with smoother painted layers and fine strokes,” notes that the manner of execution and changes made in the course of work “refute the doubts that have recently been expressed concerning its authenticity,” and finds the facial expression strikingly similar to that in Self-Portrait as the Apostle Paul, of 1661 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); De Winkel in ibid., pp. 65, 66, considers it “odd that [Rembrandt] chose to show himself in his working clothes, especially given his contemporaries’ propensity for displaying themselves at their casels clad in costly silk and lace collars,” and describes the hat as unnecessary to working in the studio, noting that Dutchmen (according to travelers of the time) often wore hats indoors; Binstoff 2000, p. 362, in a defense of the early Self-Portrait in the Mauritshuis, expands on Slive’s comparison with this picture (see Corpus 1982–89), without acknowledging it; Wright 2000, p. 330, figs. 337 (detail), 342, refers to a recent cleaning as considerably clarifying the background; Van de Wetering 2001, p. 21, maintains that the “self-portrait” in the Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, derives from this work; Quodbach 2004, p. 104, mentions the work among the “numerous renowned ‘British’ Rembrandts” that were sold to Americans in the period about 1900; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 668–69, reports that the first ground consists of chalk and a little brown ochre, and the second, light grayish ground of chalk, a little ochre and umber, and very little lampblack; Van de Wetering in ibid., pp. 109, 110, 111, 116, 127, 129, 130 (fig. 67, large detail of face), 151, 189, 244, 289 (fig. 299), 290, 291–92 (ill. as fig. 306 on p. 291), 293 (fig. 311, large detail of face), 294, 295 (fig. 313), 410, 513, 517–21 (no. IV20), 516, 581, 582, dismisses the unexplained opinion expressed in C. Tümpel 1986 (from “Rembrandt’s circle”), considers the face “remarkably finely executed” by Rembrandt, with “the more pastose brushwork evident . . . below the surface” which is covered with “locally finely blended paint layers at the surface” (p. 111), sees the Fogg “self-portrait” as derived from this picture (see detail ill. pp. 110, 111), remarks upon the “great differences in style and conception” (p. 244) between this picture and the Self-Portrait with an Easel, also of 1660 (Louvre, Paris), observes “how seriously Rembrandt must have been preoccupied with the problem of a light hierarchy” and how the head “has been worked in fine detail with keen attention to the plastic continuity of the face as a whole” (pp. 291, 294), describes the canvas support, ground, paint layer, condition, and technical evidence in considerable detail, corrects Ainsworth et al. 1982 on the number of hats (there was only one other, a “flat cap”), allows that the Rembrandt Research Project was mistaken in concluding that the bust was not painted by Rembrandt, and that with a better understanding of the picture’s condition “there appears to be no reason to doubt the unity of the work’s genesis” (p. 524); De Winkel in ibid., pp. 31, 38, repeats De Winkel in London–The Hague 1999–2000.


Ex Coll.: Jacques I François Léonor de Goyon, prince de Monaco, duc de Valentinois (in 1738); possibly Honoré III, prince de Monaco (d. 1792);2 probably chevalier Férelot de Bonnemain (his sale, Paris, July 15–17, 1802, no. 43);3 Adm. William Waldegrave, 1st Baron Radstock, London and Mayfield (until d. 1825; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 13, 1826, no. 31, for £399 5s. to Baring); Alexander Baring, 1st Baron Ashburton, London (1826–d. 1848); the Barons Ashburton, London and The Grange, Alresford, Hampshire (1826–89); Francis Denzil Edward Baring, 3rd Baron Ashburton, London and The Grange, Alresford, Hampshire (1880–1907; sold to Sulley?); [Sulley and Co., London]; [Sedelmeyer, Paris, until 1909; sold to Altman]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1909–d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.618

1. C. Tümpel’s consignment of the painting to Rembrandt’s circle is dismissed at length in Corpus 2005, pp. 291, 294, 517, 526, and by other authors (see Refs.). His opinion requires no discussion here, given that it did not benefit from direct study of the painting itself during the past twenty-five years, or from the technical evidence published in Ainsworth et al. 1982 (as noted by White in 1994; see Refs.). H. Gerson, in April 1886, called the face very good and the rest of the picture bad. Two months later J. Bruyn announced that only the face is by Rembrandt.

2. The catalogue of the Radstock sale, Christie’s, London, May 13, 1826, no. 31, states that the Rembrandt Self-Portrait came from the collection of the duc de Valentinois. On the back of an old lining canvas (removed from the picture in 1944?), a painted inscription reads “Portait de Rimbart peint par luy mesme noce Ducc de Valentinouis 1738.” Jacques François Léonor de Goyon, duc de Valentinois, comte de Matignon et de Thorigny, duc d’Estouville (1689–1751), became prince of Monaco at the death of his wife, Louise Hippolyte Grimaldi, princesse souveraine de Monaco, on December 29, 1731. In 1733, Jacques I abdicated in favor of his thirteen-year-old son, Honoré (1720–1799), who for sixty years ruled as Honoré III, prince of Monaco. He became duc de Valentinois upon his father’s death.

3. See Corpus 2005, p. 525. The 1802 sale catalogue states that the painting came from the collection of the late duc de Valentinois (kindly noted by Esmée Quodbach).
158. Man with a Magnifying Glass

Oil on canvas, 36 x 29 1/4 in. (91.4 x 74.3 cm)

The face and the costume are well preserved, although there is abrasion in the hair, collar, and proper left arm above the elbow. Pressure from past lining has flattened the impasto and revealed the texture of the canvas in the more thinly painted passages.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.621

The conception and execution of this portrait and its companion (Pl. 159) are so completely consistent with Rembrandt's work in the first half of the 1660s that the authorship of the paintings, although they are unsigned, has never been doubted, and other datings (invariably later still) have been proposed solely on the basis of mistaken identifications of the sitters, not on considerations of style.

With the Self-Portrait of 1660 (Pl. 157), the pendants are the finest Rembrandts to come from the collection of Benjamin Altman (who had thirteen, according to most connoisseurs of the time). Previously, the portraits were shared by the famous Parisian collector brothers Maurice and Rodolphe Kann, and they were briefly in the possession of their nephew Édouard before they were purchased by Joseph Duveen in 1909 (see Ex Coll.). Apart from an appreciation of Rembrandt's achievement in these evocative works, three issues require discussion: the costumes and other aspects of presentation; the attributes held in each sitter's right hand; and the identity of the couple, who also appear in pair portraits by Jan Victors (q.v.) dating from ten to twelve years earlier (figs. 194, 195).

The man wears an imaginary version of early sixteenth-century dress, which is lent an Italian flavor by its rich coloring and voluminous sleeves. The sitter's pose and costume broadly resemble those of Rembrandt in the London Self-Portrait at the Age of Thirty-four, of 1640 (see fig. 150), while the pose alone may be traced back to one of the artist's sources for that influential painting, Raphael's Portrait of Baldassare Castiglione (fig. 196), after which Rembrandt made a drawing in 1639 (see fig. 152). The familiar comparison is worth mentioning again because X-radiographs and autoradiographs of the Man with a Magnifying Glass (fig. 197) reveal that the sitter's hands were originally sketched on the canvas as joined together in front of him, and the near sleeve was fuller, so that the arrangement of the body, if not the position of the head and the direction of gaze, came close to that of Castiglione's (in reverse). The placement of a small pillow on the ledge and the elegant draping of the cloak over the arms also appear to look back to the London picture, while other self-portraits by Rembrandt are brought to mind by the gold chain.

The jewelry in the Altman paintings—the man's necklace and earring and the woman's luxurious display of gold and pearls—adds to the impression of a storied existence in the past, perhaps as lived in a Roman or Venetian palazzo. Much as the male portrait is comparable to the most romantic self-portraits by Rembrandt, the female pendant recalls pictures of the women in the artist's life, Saskia and Hendrickje (or beauties resembling them), in the guise of Renaissance “Floras” or courtesans. The Dresden Saskia as Flora, of 1641 (see fig. 174), has occasionally been related to the Woman with a Pink because of the proffered flower; one may also compare the more modest woman's chemise, her flowing red gown, and abundant jewelry (including the jeweled band and string of pearls in her hair) with the costume in the Dresden picture.

Of course, Rembrandt gave similar costumes to historical figures, such as Asenath in Jacob Blessing the Sons of Joseph, of 1636 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel), and the presumed Rebecca in The Jewish Bride, of about 1665 (see fig. 219). This parallel and the implausible notion that the same couple appears in the Amsterdam canvas have encouraged the suggestion that the present pictures may be historicized portraits. Speaking against the hypothesis, however, are the attributes of a pink (or carnation) and a magnifying glass, the former familiar from Renaissance and later portraits as a symbol of faithful love and marriage, the latter not familiar at all, but clearly suggestive of the man's modern-day occupation (discussed below). Also dimming the aura of Roman or biblical history is the painting on the wall behind the woman, a Rembrandtesque landscape in a contemporary frame. The motif's function was (to judge from technical evidence) never to be comprehensible as a scene, but to visually strengthen the bond between husband and wife.

Portraits of real people in imaginary dress are found elsewhere in Rembrandt's oeuvre and in portraits by his followers (see Pls. 164, 165). The woman and children (and less clearly, the man) in Rembrandt's Family Portrait, of the late 1660s (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig), wear what contemporaries would have called
Figure 192. Rembrandt, *Man with a Magnifying Glass* (Pl. 158)

Figure 193. Rembrandt, *Woman with a Pink* (Pl. 159)

Figure 194. Jan Victors, *Portrait of a Man*, 1631. Oil on canvas, 31¼ x 28½ in. (79.5 x 72.5 cm). Private collection

Figure 195. Jan Victors, *Portrait of a Woman*, 1631. Oil on canvas, 31¼ x 28½ in. (79.5 x 72.5 cm). Private collection
“antique” dress, although their costumes are less exotic than those in the Altman paintings. (Michel’s notion that the same sitters appear in the Braunschweig picture seems even more unlikely than in the case of The Jewish Bride.) Nonetheless, it is not surprising that some scholars distinguish the pendants from “commissioned portraits in the usual sense,” maintaining that they must represent friends or relatives of the artist or colleagues from his immediate milieu. Rembrandt’s son, Titus, was thought by Valentiner (1903, etc.; see Refs.) to be the man with fiftyish features, although Titus died in 1668 (the year he married) at the age of twenty-seven. (The magnifying glass is explained away as a ring; whether for his wife’s finger or the nose of a large animal is not said.) Goekoop-de Jongh (1915; see Refs.) thought the man must be the lens-grinding philosopher Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677), who inconveniently bore no resemblance to the sitter and never married. Frits Lugt (1942; see Refs.) more sensibly imagined that the man with the magnifying glass might be the silversmith and printmaker Jan Lutma the Younger (1624–1689), who also turns out to have been a bachelor. The resemblance to Lutma casts doubt on the conclusions of those critics who feel that the male sitter, at least, looks Hispanic, Jewish, or both.

In Dudok van Heel’s recent study (2006) identifying the sitters with the Catholic merchant Balthasar Schouten (1618–1680) and his wife Geertruyt Moyaerts (1621–1670), the couple’s fancy dress is taken to suggest that they were already acquainted with the Amsterdam art world and approved of the new trend in portraiture. Geertruyt’s father was the Pre-Rembrandtist history painter Claes Moevaert (1591–1655), who occasionally painted histori- cized portraits. The inventory of Schouten’s possessions made on April 22, 1682, lists a fair number of paintings, including examples by Frans Floris (1518/20–1570), Matthijs Withoos (1627–1703), “Colijns” (probably David Colijns; 1582–after 1668), Moeyaert (about twenty pictures, including a portrait of his family), and a variety of works for which two appraisers, the Amsterdam history painter Johannes Voorhout (1667–1723) and the Amsterdam glass painter Gerard van Houten (d. 1706), could not come up with any names. Among the last is “Het conterfijsel van
den overleden en zijn huysvrouw” (the portrait of the deceased and his wife), which, like a single portrait by Moeyaert, is valued at a mere twenty guilders.39 Dudok van Heel maintains that “Het conterfijtje” (not “twee” or “drie conterfijtjes,” as we read in other lines) is nothing other than the Altman pair portraits by Rembrandt (as opposed to one double portrait by an unidentified artist). Rembrandt is not named anywhere in the inventory, nor is Victors, as one might expect had he painted two fully signed portraits of the “deceased and his wife.” Portraits of Schouten and his wife are otherwise unknown. A remote connection between the Moeyaert and d’Oultremont families (see Ex Coll.) lends little support to Dudok van Heel’s hypothesis.40

It has been said that no sitters were identified when the Rembrandt portraits appeared in the d’Oultremont sale of 1889.41 However, under no. 7 (Rembrandt’s “Portrait d’homme”) in the sale catalogue it is stated that “ce personnage serait un nommé Harrings, fils du geôlier de la prison des Insolubles d’Amsterdam.” And under no. 8 (the pendant), it is noted that “ce merveilleux portrait . . . serait, d’après nos recherches, celui de Mme Harrings.” What sort of “research” this might have been is unknown; no reference to “Harrings, son of the jailer of the debtors’ prison in Amsterdam” is found in literature on the Man with the Magnifying Glass dating from before the sale (see Refs.). Either there was some record of “Harrings” as Rembrandt’s sitter in the d’Oultremont family archives or, less likely, the expert working on the “Catalogue de douze tableaux importants” from the d’Oultremont col-

---

Figure 198. Rembrandt, Pieter Harringh, 1655. Etching, drypoint, and burin, 7 1/4 x 3 1/2 in. (19.3 x 14.6 cm). First state. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.107.30

Figure 199. Details of Jan Victors’s Portrait of a Man (fig. 194), Rembrandt’s Pieter Harringh (fig. 198; reproduced here in reverse), and Rembrandt’s Man with a Magnifying Glass (Pl. 118)
of Thomas Jacobsz Haringh, concierge of the Desolate Boedelskamer (Chamber of Insolvent Estates) in Amsterdam. The familiar distinction between “young Haringh” and “old Haringh” derives from the fact that Rembrandt etched what may be called pendant portraits of the cousins in or about 1655 (only the print of Pieter is dated); they are the same size and very similar in composition and execution.19

The etching dated 1655 is the only known portrait certainly of Pieter Haringh. To properly compare the male sitter in the portraits by Victors and Rembrandt with Haringh as he appears in the print, the face in the latter should be reversed, to see him as the artist did when recording his features (fig. 199). The similarities with the face in the portrait by Rembrandt and especially in the one by Victors (which is closer to the etching in date) are obvious enough. Particularly noteworthy are the sitter’s hairline; the shape of the eyebrows; the shapes of the eyes and eyelids (the eye to the left has a more conspicuous fold over the upper lid than does the other eye); the shape of the nose, which is slightly indented below the bridge and creased at the narrow tip; the shapes of the mouth, mustache, and small patch of hair below the lower lip; and the narrow jaw and small chin, which is slightly creased.19

What little is known about Haringh’s life does not discourage consideration of him as the sitter in the portraits painted by Victors and Rembrandt. In 1641, he married Elisabeth (Lysbet) Jansdr Delft (ca. 1620–1679).20 Three pairs of pendant portraits (one pair in watercolor) are listed in the will made out on September 5, 1707, by one of their sons, Jacob Haringh (1650–1725), and his wife, Barbara Elsevier. As is often the case in such documents, the painters of these portraits are not named. Neither are the sitters, which is somewhat less common. However, in Jacob Haringh’s will made out five years later, on October 15, 1712, the sitters depicted in a pair of oil paintings in black frames are identified as the testator’s parents.21

Pieter Haringh was a lawyer from Utrecht and an auctioneer of estates in Amsterdam. Apart from his etched portrait, he is best known for having been the auctioneer of paintings from the estate of Lucas van Uffel (d. 1638), which was sold on April 9, 1639, and included Raphael’s portrait of Castiglione.22 If Rembrandt’s Man with a Magnifying Glass depicts Pieter Haringh, its similarity to Raphael’s composition might have been seen by the artist and his patron as a recollection of the famous sale.

It has been supposed that the younger Haringh, as receiver for the Amsterdam Weeskamer (Orphan’s Chamber), was in contact with Rembrandt during the mid-1650s, in connection with auctions benefiting that institution and with the transfer of the title of the artist’s house on the Sint Anthonisbreestraat (now the Jodenbreestraat) to his son Titus, on May 17, 1656.23 Rembrandt’s involvement with Thomas Haringh is better known, since he supervised the various sales of Rembrandt’s property, including his art collection, from 1656 until at least 1659.24 Old Haringh died the following year, and it seems likely that his cousin remained helpful to Rembrandt in the 1660s.

A more conclusive identification of the “man with the magnifying glass” with Pieter Haringh may be possible in the future, probably on the basis of further discoveries in family inventories. Haringh’s presentation as an artistic figure reminiscent of Renaissance cognoscenti and courtiers would not be unexpected, given his responsibilities as connoisseur and auctioneer in service to the city of Amsterdam. As noted above, the magnifying glass and the confident arm akimbo replaced a first sketch of joined hands in the manner of Castiglione. It may have been thought that some attribute should answer the woman’s offer of a flower, thus giving the man a more demonstrative pose than he had originally. Van der Veen’s suggestion (1992; see Refs.) that the magnifying glass could be a thread counter for judging the quality of cloth samples may have captured the spirit if not the letter of the unusual attribute’s meaning. As an auctioneer of estates, Haringh must have dealt with works of art, jewelry, coins, silver and gold vessels, lace and fine fabrics, written testaments, and other items for which the occasional use of a magnifying glass would have been necessary. The sitter’s gold chain, his wife’s jewelry, the painting behind her, and even the costumes seem to reinforce the association with luxury goods. It is tempting to think that the man who sold one of the finest paintings ever to pass through Amsterdam, Raphael’s portrait of Castiglione, also commissioned two of Rembrandt’s most expressive and beautiful portraits.

The head of a child, evidently looking upward, was sketched directly on the ground layer of the canvas in the lower left corner, and was painted out at an early or intermediate stage in the course of execution.24 It is possible that the small figure was originally intended to allude to the woman’s role as mother, or that it had nothing to do with the portrait at all.26
1. With regard to the question of authorship, the sole exception in the literature—that of Van Dyke 1923 (see Refs.)—may be considered insignificant. Very few oral comments about the paintings have been recorded. F. Schmidt-Degener, in 1935, stated that these pictures could be counted among the ten finest Rembrandts. Daan Cevat (1966) thought that the woman’s nose and forehead had been repainted, that her hands were not well executed, and that the lower left corner had been worked over by someone other than Rembrandt.


3. See Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 77, pls. 53–54. The influence of Castiglione’s pose has also been noted in connection with Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait of 1659, in Washington (fig. 190 here; Wheelock 1995a, p. 262).

4. That Raphael’s composition corresponds in reverse to that of Man with a Magnifying Glass (not to ignore the obvious differences) brings to mind Reiner van Persijn’s engraving after Joachim von Sandrart (1606–1688), which reverses Raphael’s design and adds a considerable amount of space around the figure (see Dickey 2004, pp. 100–101, fig. 107). Rembrandt may have referred to the print, but the Altman portrait is closer to Raphael’s painting in the way the figure fills the frame.

5. As explained in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 3, p. 392 (under no. A442), the headdress in the Dresden picture was originally more elaborate.


7. For example, in Slakes 1992, p. 237. A large detail of the faces in The Jewish Bride, in C. Tümpel 1993, p. 350, confirms that the models there are different and distinctly younger people. Small reproductions with stronger contrast create a misleading impression.

8. As noted by Fahy (1982; see Refs. under Pl. 190) and many other commentators, Fahy observes that in Italian Renaissance portraiture either the man or the woman might hold a carnation, whereas in northern Europe the motif was mostly restricted to women (however, see Hans Holbein the Younger’s Simon George, ca. 1535 [Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt], and Portrait of a Young Man with a Carnation, of 1535 [Upton House]; London 2006–7, nos. 33, 42). Fahy illustrates the Museum’s Young Woman with a Pink, attributed to Hans Memling about 1481–90; see Sprinzen de Jesús’s discussion of that painting in New York 1988–99, p. 174.

9. See Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 82, pl. 57. The man’s near arm does not gesture but nonetheless leads the viewer’s gaze (as does the sitter’s left elbow) toward the woman, who without the glimmering motif of the frame would seem more isolated. In the foreground of each picture is a small pillow on a ledge. As discussed in ibid., pp. 77, 82, pls. 53, 57, Rembrandt sketched in an arch-shaped frame on each canvas, with vertical elements on the outside edges only (i.e., at the left edge in the male portrait, and at the right edge in the female portrait). A curtain and gold frame in the background of the female portrait, the foreground elements, and of course the woman’s pose and tilted head are among the inconsiderant means that the artist employed to link the compositions together.

10. As noted in Dickey 2002, pp. 33, 36, portraits in fancy dress, “in which clothing and other attributes depart picturesquely from the everyday without reference to a specific [historical or biblical] character,” were already popular in The Hague during the 1640s.

11. E. Michel 1894, repeated in Haverkamp-Begemann 1966, and P. Sutton 1986 (see Refs.).

12. The quote is from Bruikerm 1997, p. 40 n. 74. Weisbach (1926, p. 545) first reasoned that the sitters were probably acquaintances or relatives of Rembrandt, and notes the “poetic” presentation of the woman.

13. For Jan Lutma the Younger’s self-portrait engraving of 1681, see Boston–Saint Louis 1980–81, no. 195. That Lutma never married was noted in I. Allen 1944 (see Refs.) and is confirmed by genealogical websites. On the identification with Sephardic or other Jewish figures, see Zwarts 1929a or Zwarts 1929b, and J. Rosenberg 1948.

14. See Dudok van Heel 2006, pp. 281–82, 287, 312 n. 108. The connection would be circumstantially interesting if the identification with Geertuyt Moyearts proved to be correct, but from the 1640s onward Amsterdam patrons did not need a father in the business to appreciate fancy dress in portraiture.

15. See Bredius 1911–22, part 1, p. 259, no. 39; Dudok van Heel 2006, p. 296.

16. See Dudok van Heel 2006, p. 287. In letters of 1977 and 1978, Charles comte d’Outremont explained the circumstances of the sale in 1889 (see Ex Coll.) and archival evidence for when the Rembrandts entered his family’s collection. They “may have come from Simon de Neuf’s collection in Antwerp by [through] the marriage of his elder daughter with Charles d’Outremont. This would mean entering the family just before 1800. . . . A more likely date would be in 1706 when Marie-Isabelle of Bavem Schagen married Jean-[Baptiste-] François Court d’Outremont. The archives mention a boat load of paintings and furniture arriving by canals and the Maas river from Holland in the late 18th century” (letter to Lucy Oakley, research assistant in the Department of European Paintings, July 25, 1978). In an earlier letter, comte d’Outremont wrote, “Your two Rembrandts were in the possession of Florent from 1875 (death of his parents) to his death in 1889. . . . Florent was a bachelor, younger brother of my grandfather. . . . These paintings were a part of my family’s collection since at least the middle of the 18th century. The archives attest to this. I cannot actually trace them earlier with certitude” (letter to Lucy Oakley, June 14, 1977). A family tree sent with Charles d’Outremont’s second letter shows that Jean comte d’Outremont Wéginmond (d. 1784; son of J.-B.-F. d’Outremont) married “Anna de Tiarck” (d. 1811) in 1752. This information corresponds approximately with that given in Dudok van Heel 2006, p. 299: Maria Jacoba Joanna ("Anna") Tjärck (1729–1802) married Jean Baptiste François Georges d’Outremont de Wéginmond (1751–1872) in her native Leiden on April 20, 1790. Dudok van Heel suggests (ibid., p. 287) that Schouten’s collection of paintings went into its entirety “through the Schoutens, Van Bree, and Tjärck families to the Belgian counts of ‘Outremont,’” but this is not documented in any way, and in any case there is no reason to think that Schouten or his descendants and their spouses, including Maria Tjärck, ever owned portraits by Rembrandt (or Vectors).

18. See Dickey 2004, pp. 100, 107, 111, figs. 161, 162.
19. The comparison of the faces in Victor's portrait and in Rembrandt's etching and painting was made by the present writer at the symposium "Rembrandt—Wissenschaft auf der Suche," held at the Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen, Berlin, on November 4–5, 2006, and was considered convincing by a good number of specialists in the audience. No one present expressed doubts, except for Dudok van Heel, who stated that he was convinced that the man in Victor's portrait and in Rembrandt's etching were the same, but that the "man with the magnifying glass" seemed to him different than Victor's sister. The latter judgment appears to be unique among Rembrandt and Victor scholars writing since Yury Kaznetsov first made the connection in 1982 (see D. Miller 1984, p. 117 n. 5).
20. Gemeentearchief Amsterdam, DTB 455, p. 159, deed of betrothal dated April 4, 1641, where Elisabeth Delf's age is given as twenty-one. For this document and other archival information about Pieter Haringh and his family, the writer is indebted to Jaap van der Veen of the Rembrandthuis, Amsterdam (personal communications dating from October through December 2006).
21. To summarize, the will dated September 3, 1707, is preserved in the Gemeentearchief Amsterdam (GAA), notary A. Taczew, NA 7598, akte 16, pp. 1003–46. The inventory includes "een vrouwenpoutrait / een manspoutrait / nog een vrouwenpoutrait / nog een mannenpoutrait" (that is, two pairs of portraits; p. 1016); "een vrouwenpoutrait, waerover een dito manspoutrait" (a pair of portraits in watercolor; p. 1016); and "eenige prenten sijnde het portraet van mijn vaeder / een kopper plaatje sijnde het portraet van mijn vaeder" (some prints being the portrait of my father / a copper plate being the portrait of my father; p. 1010). One would think that the painted portraits would also be described as depicting one or both of the testator's parents if that was the case. However, in Jacob Haringh's will dated October 15, 1712 (GAA, notary A. Taczew, NA 7590, pp. 227ff.), a pair of portraits in watercolor (probably the same as those cited in 1707) are described as representing Jan Pieters Delf, "the testator's [wife's] grandfather," and "the testator's [wife's] mother." In the same will of 1712, Jacob Haringh leaves to his nephew (or cousin) some porcelain (of which there appears to have been a fair amount) and "een vrouwenpoutrait met een zwarte lijst zijnde des teusturers moeder, een manspoutrait met e[n] zwarte lijst sijnde des teusturers vader" (a woman's portrait with a black frame being [depicting] the testator's mother, a man's portrait with a black frame being the testator's father). Van der Veen suggests exploring the surviving inventories of various families related by marriage to the Haringhs—Indischerven, Sarragon, Waterkamp, and so on—for connections with the d'Oultremont family. Pieter Haringh and Elisabeth Delf had at least two other sons in addition to Jacob: Isaac, who probably married Margaretha van Wijk in 1675, and Johannes, who married Anna Maria Waterkamp in 1668 (personal communications, Jaap van der Veen, November 27–28, 2006).
22. See Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 177.
23. Cremshaw 2006, pp. 62–64, 68. See also Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 342, doc. no. 1625/6. Gerrit Jacobsz Haringh, brother of Thomas, was also an auctioneer of the Weeskamer (see Montias 2002a, pp. 24, 28, 59, 158).
25. See Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 82, pls. 56–58.
26. There is some resemblance, in reverse, to the arrangement (in full-length, however) in Rembrandt's Portrait of Joan Pellincorne and His Son Cages, of 1633 (Wallace Collection, London; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 710–20, no. 265). Compare also the peculiar placement of a child's head between Christ and the woman of Samaria in the Rembrandt-school pictures of that subject in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin, and the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg. If a child was initially intended to be included in the Woman with a Pink, it would be misguided to assume (as in Slates 1992) that the couple depicted in the Altman portraits had only one child and that he died while the pictures were in progress. The use of a single child to indicate motherhood or family succession is found, for example, in Rubens's portrait of himself and his wife (MMA), although they certainly had two or more children at the time the picture was painted (see Liedtke 1984, pp. 176–87, and Fahy in Fahy et al. 2005, pp. 117–22, no. 34).

References: Bode 1883, pp. 351, 359, 560, no. 23, reports that this "Portrait of an Elderly Man" and its pendant (Bode no. 24) were lent by Comte Florent d'Oultremont to the "Exposition néerlandaise," Brussels, in 1882, but (erroneously) lists the pictures as in the Brussels collection of "Comte Ferd. d'Oultremont," and (on the advice of Bredius) describes them as outstanding works of the 1660s; Dunuit 1885, pp. 52, 63, 70, no. 347, repeats information from Bode 1883, listing the owner as "Ferd. d'Oultremont" and as "F. d'Oultremont"; Wurzbach 1885, text vol., no. 6; E. Michel 1994, pp. 182–84, 239, dates this picture (then owned by Maurice Kann) and the pendant (owned by Rodolphe Kann) about 1666–68 (in text) and about 1662–65 (in catalogue), and considers the sitters similar in appearance to the couple in the Family Portrait by Rembrandt (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig); Sedelmeyer Gallery 1898, pp. 174, 175 (ill.), no. 153; Glück 1900, p. 90, mentioned as in Maurice Kann's collection, and refers to the pendant owned by Rodolphe Kann; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 7 (1902), pp. 26–27, 132, 134, no. 355, pl. 351, dates the painting and its companion to about 1662–65, despite similarities to pictures of the late 1660s; Marguillier 1903, p. 22, mentioned in connection with the pendant; Valentin 1905, p. 56, identifies the sitters in this painting and the pendant as Titus van Rijn and his wife, and finds the same models in The Jewish Bride (fig. 219 here); A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 373 (ill.), 405, dates the paintings about 1662–65, disputes the identification with Titus van Rijn (who was twenty-seven at his death in 1668), and describes the object in the sitter's hand as a magnifying glass; Valentin in A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 482 (ill.), 564, reasserts the identification of the sitters as Titus van Rijn and his wife, citing Bode in support, and observes that the portraits cannot date from 1662–65 since Titus married only in 1668; Valentin in New York 1909, p. 148, no. 107A (ill.), as "Titus, the Son of Rembrandt ("The Man with a Magnifying-Glass");" of about 1668, from the Altman collection, sees the same man in The Jewish Bride (fig. 219 here); Breeck 1910, p. 53, observes that L'homme à la loupe, in the Altman collection, "shows us Titus, Rembrandt's son," and the pendant Titus's wife; Waldmann
1910, pp. 75–76, doubts the identification with Titus and his wife, and suggests a date of about 1662 based on comparisons with other Rembrandts, including The Syndics of the Amsterdam Drapers’ Guild (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Altman bequest 1913, pp. 254–55 (ill.), 256, listed; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 57–58, 60, no. 4 (ill. opp. p. 8), as “The Man with a Magnifying-Glass,” accepts Valentine’s identification of the sitter with Titus van Rijn, even though “there is even a greater difference in this case [as opposed to that of the pendant] between the apparent age of the sitter and that of the person it is said to represent,” accordingly dates the pictures to the summer of 1668, and claims that the sitter holds a ring not a magnifying glass; Valentine 1914b, pp. 255–56, fig. 2, considers the portrait to date probably from the summer of 1668, and maintains that the sitter, Titus van Rijn, holds a ring; Goekoop-de Jongh 1915, pp. 55–56, identifies the sitter as Banach Spinoza, who polished lenses; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 354–55, 358, no. 755, as “A Man with a Magnifying-Glass in His Right Hand,” dates the painting to about 1662–65 and lists earlier owners; Van Lieburg 1921, p. 128, observes that Goekoop-de Jongh’s (1915) identification of the sitter as Spinoza is untenable because Spinoza never married; A. Burroughs 1921, pp. 268, 271 (ill.), refutes criticism of the portraits with remarks such as the observation that they “seem to cry out the name Rembrandt”; Meldrum 1923, pp. 130, 203, pl. CCCXXXIII, claims that “the man is not Titus, even if Titus sat for it,” and dates the painting to about 1662–65; Monod 1923, pp. 306–7, considers the picture and its pendant to be late works, but questions whether they represent Titus and his wife, and, therefore, whether the paintings are as late as Valentine maintains; Van Dyke 1923, p. 41, argues that the picture and its pendant “have not the precision or certainty of Rembrandt in either drawing or handling,” calls them “good shop portraits,” and dismisses the identifications with Titus and his wife; Weisbach 1926, pp. 445, 593, suggests that the sitter and his wife were acquaintances or relatives of Rembrandt, which might account for the “poetic manner in which the woman is presented, with a dreamy expression, an imaginary costume, jewelry, and (as often before in the master’s work) the offering of a flower; M. Eiser 1927, pp. 103–6, dates the portraits to about 1668 and states that the female sitter is not necessarily the “partner” of the man; Glück 1928, p. 317, describes the sitters as patrician people who (unlike Titus) surely would have paid Rembrandt for these portraits; B. Burroughs 1911a, p. 294, as “Man with Magnifying Glass,” rejects the identification with Titus, and erroneously lists Comte Ferdinand d’Oulonremont in the provenance; Valentine 1931, unpagd, no. 173, pl. 173, defends his identification of the sitter as Titus van Rijn, claiming that Rembrandt was inclined to show his sitters as older than they actually were; Bensush 1934, p. 257, mentions the pictures as late works; Bredius 1935, p. 14, no. 326, pl. 326, rejects the identification of the sitter with Titus but finds the same man in The Jewish Bride (fig. 210 here); Daxen Pictures 1941, unpagd, no. 204 (ill.), as dating from 1662–65, quotes the opinions of Bode and Valentine; Held 1942, p. 28 (detail ill. on cover), describes the sitter as “the gaunt, early grayed Man with a Magnifying Glass whose tired, hollow glance spreads gloom over the rich trimmings of his costume and belies the gayety of his earrings”; Ivins 1942a, p. 3, listed; Ivins 1942b, pls. 27, 28 (detail); Lugt 1942, pp. 174, 177–78, figs. 1, 3 (detail), identifies the sitter as the silversmith and printmaker Jan Lutma the Younger (1625–1689); J. Allen 1945, p. 73, cites the pictures among the Museum’s “twenty-one paintings which may be called out-and-out portraits” by Rembrandt; Landsberger 1946, pp. 53–54, rejects the identification of the sitter with the bachelor Spinoza, and notes that Jan Lutma the Younger has been suggested (see Lugt 1942) “upon much better grounds”; J. Rosenberg 1948, vol. 1, pp. 203, 219 n. 10, and vol. 2, figs. 75, 266 (detail), incorrectly states that Zwarts 1929a (see Refs. for the pendant, no. 159) identifies the sitters with “the distinguished Portuguese Jew, Miguel de Barrios [who did not settle in Amsterdam until 1654], and his wife,” and allows that while this has been doubted (Lugt 1942 is cited), “it seems probable that here are represented Jewish people of the upper class”; Rousseau 1952, p. 82, offers a subjective reading of the sitters’ expressions; Salinger 1956, p. 68, no. 2 (ill. p. 70), reviews the various identifications of the sitter, noting that Lutma never married, and finds the connection with The Jewish Bride “cogent, though it attaches no names to the subjects”; Valentine 1957a, pp. 230, 232–33, fig. 3, continues to maintain that the sitters are Titus van Rijn and his wife, claiming that in the fifty years since this suggestion was first made (in Valentine 1905) no one has had a better idea; J. Rosenberg 1964, pp. 86, 322–23, figs. 75, 266 (detail), repeats J. Rosenberg 1948; K. Bauch 1966, p. 23, no. 447, pl. 447, “painted about 1668 (?).” notes that the sitter was earlier regarded as Titus van Rijn or Spinoza; Havercamp-Begemann 1966, col. 934, considers the sitters to be the same as in The Jewish Bride, while “the lady probably recurs in the Family Portrait” in Braunschweig; Gerson 1968, pp. 432, 453 (ill.), 504, no. 477, reviews the proposed sitters, offering no opinion; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 254 (ill.), 575, no. 316, and p. 582 (under no. 401), repeats Gerson 1968, adding doubts about the resemblance to the couple in The Jewish Bride; Haak 1969, p. 326, fig. 547, as from about 1668, considers the sitters unidentified; Held 1969, p. 9, notes the earing, in connection with the earring worn by Aristotle (see Pl. 311 here); Lecaldano 1969, p. 124, no. 445 (ill.); Haskell 1970, pp. 266, 270, fig. 6, recalls Altman’s acquisition of the picture; Gallego and Megret 1973, p. 22, as a late work of uncertain date; Havercamp-Begemann in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 47, observes that the ground is left visible in parts of this picture and its pendant, which J. Bruyn had declared “unusual for Rembrandt and even for the seventeenth century” (p. 46); C. Brown 1976, p. 219 n. 4, notes that the identifications of the sitters with Titus and his wife have not found any support; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 203, no. 568 (ill.); Hibbard 1980, p. 144, repeats the notion that “the faces and costumes suggest that the couple were wealthy Portuguese Jews . . . [who] may well have posed for the famous Jewish Bride (Amsterdam) a few years earlier”; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 77, 82, 99 n. 57, 100, 102, pls. 31, 32–34 (X-radiograph and autographriographs), discusses the sketch painted in bone black on the prepared ground of the male portrait, notes that originally the man’s hands were joined and then a pillow was added on the ledge and the left arm was moved back, and reproduces autographriographs revealing that the artist considered using arch-shaped framing devices in both compositions; Klessmann 1983, p. 169 (under no. 228), in a catalogue entry on the family portrait in Braunschweig, notes that the man and woman in that painting have occasionally been identified with the sitters depicted here; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 4, p. 2617 (under no. 1814), discusses Jan Victors’ portraits of the same sitters, dated 1651 (figs. 194, 195 here); D. Miller 1988, pp. 84, 117–21, agrees with Yury Kuznetsov’s observation (recorded in a Christie’s sale catalogue of
that Rembrandt's sitters are also depicted in Victors's portraits of 1651, reviews the previously proposed identifications of Rembrandt's sitters, and convincingly dismisses all of them; G. Schwartz 1985, p. 343, pp. 403, citing autodiographic revelations, claims that "with so many changes to go on, the identification of these intriguing sitters can only be a matter of time"; P. Sutton 1986, p. 19, observes that the same sitters "seem to have posed" for The Jewish Bride and for the Braunshweig Family Portrait; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 320-321, dates the portraits to about 1655 and considers the sitters unidentified, but supposes that the magnifying glass refers to a profession such as silver- or goldsmithery; Alpers 1988, p. 81, fig. 3.65, perceives in the portraits "a kind of painted immediacy combined with a calculated indeterminacy of clothing and setting"; Liedtke 1990, p. 48, fig. 36 (Altman gallery view); D. Smith 1990, p. 664, sees the continued influence of Raphael's Portrait of Baldassare Castiglione (fig. 196 here) in the composition; Cabanne 1991, p. 133, no. 22 (ill.); Stlatke 1992, pp. 236-37, no. 144 (ill.), reviews identifications and dates that have been proposed, considers the painted-out child to indicate the child's probable death and that the woman had been married before, and concludes from the costumes (the man's "generically sixteenth-century Italian," the woman's "Mogul or at least Eastern in type") that the pictures are, like The Jewish Bride, possibly historicized portraits; Van der Veen in Bergvelt and Kistemaker 1992, p. 247, fig. 231, suggests that the man holds a magnifying glass that functioned as a thread counter (for examining the fineness of cloth), and that he may have been a cloth merchant; C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 330 (ill.), 417, no. 223, suggests that the sitter was probably a gold- or silversmith; Baertje 1995, p. 317; Breen 1995, p. 105, draws attention to the portraits of the same sitters by Jan Victors; Wheelock 1995a, p. 278 n. 1, cites the portraits among works by Rembrandt that are painted on canvases with a herringbone weave; Liedtke in New York 1995-96, vol. 2, pp. 81-86, 115-116, no. 17 (ill.), dates the portrait and its pendant to about 1652, and identifies the sitters with the couple depicted in pair portraits by Jan Victors (figs. 194, 195 here); Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 16, 24, 25, 31, 94, 98, 69-70, 79, figs. 10 (X-radiograph), 11 (autodiograph), 70 (detail), 71 (X-radiograph detail), 87, 88-90 (details), reports that Rembrandt originally experimented with an arched top and may have given the man joined hands, describes the yellowish white ground, the execution of the faces (in the caption to figs. 70, 71), the effects of retouching and damages, and the artist's use of "separately applied color values [which] remain clear and distinct and [which] can still be seen from a normal viewing distance"; Broos 1996b, p. 169, describes the pictures as "anonymous persons"; Broekhoff and Franken 1997, p. 81, counts the portraits among the masterpieces by Rembrandt in the Metropolitan Museum; Bruinck 1997, pp. 12 n. 9, 40 n. 74, 52-53, comments on the type of canvas, declares the flower in the female portrait to indicate that these pictures "have nothing to do with commissioned portraits in the usual sense," detects a reminiscence, at least, of Rembrandt's son and daughter-in-law, believes that the figures (especially the woman) resemble those in The Jewish Bride, and compares the Braunshweig Family Portrait; Wright 2000, p. 324, fig. 227, considers the portraits to date from about 1665, and the sitters to be unidentified ("as is often the case in the last portraits by Rembrandt"); Dickey 2002, p. 213 n. 43, notes the carnation as a symbol of love that goes back to classical times; Gilboa 2003, pp. 92-93, compares the man's appearance in the portrait by Victors (1651) and describes the magnifying glass as "a symbol of his profession, that of a goldsmith or cloth-merchant"; Scallen 2004, p. 161 n. 99, as owned by M. Kann and Altman; Secrest 2004, p. 477, listed among works handled by Duveen; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 668-69, 672-73, reports that the first ground of the male portrait contains quartz, a little red and yellow ochre, and black, and the first ground of the female portrait, quartz, chalk, umber, a little red ochre and black, resulting in a yellowish and a light brown color, respectively; Van de Wetering in ibid., pp. 308, 309, figs. 326, 277, observes that "the facial skin of the man seems to show intentionally more and livelier traces of the brush's bristles than that of the woman"; Bogh Rasmussen in Copenhagen 2006, p. 294 n. 12 (under no. 41), compares the paintings to the Rembrandt-school Young Woman with a Carnation, in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, for which a comparable pendant has not been found; Dudok van Heel 2006, pp. 287, 296, 303, 312 n. 128, fig. 138, unconvincingly identifies the sitter as Baltasar Schouten (1618-1680), and claims to find the picture listed (with no attribution and a very low value) in the inventory of his estate (see text above); Amsterdam 2006-7, pp. 28, 29 (ill.), notes that the sitter was once thought to be Spinoza.


**Ex coll.:** Pieter Gerritz Haringh (d. 1685); his son Jacob Haringh (d. 1715); d'Oultremont family (until 1875); Comte Florent d'Oultremont, Brussels (1875-1889); his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, June 27, 1889, no. 7, for FF 45,000 to Sedelmeyer for Kann; Maurice Kann, Paris (1889-1906); his nephew Édouard Kann (1906-9; reportedly sold, with the pendant, for $625,000 to Duveen); [Duveen, New York, 1909; sold to Altman on October 14, 1909, for $262,980]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1909-1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913. 14.40.621

1. The 1882 exhibition is mentioned in Bode 1883 (see Refs.).
159. **Woman with a Pink**

Oil on canvas, 36 7/8 x 29 1/2 in. (92.4 x 74.6 cm)

The figure is well preserved, although pressure from past lining has flattened the impasto. The background above the head and at the top left corner are slightly abraded. In the lower left corner is a large area of abrasion that exposes the herringbone weave of the canvas.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.622

This portrait and its pendant (Pl. 158) are discussed in the preceding entry. The paintings are dated to the first half of the 1660s, and the sitters are tentatively identified as Pieter Haringh (1609–1683) and his wife, Elisabeth Jansdr Delft (ca. 1620–1679). They married in 1641. The same couple appears in conventional portraits, dated 1651, by Rembrandt's former pupil Jan Victors (q.v.; see figs. 194, 195).

The pink, or carnation, was a traditional symbol of faithful love.

References: (See Refs. in the preceding entry, where, unless otherwise specified, the present picture and its pendant are cited as a pair. The following references pertain solely to Woman with a Pink.)

Listed in Bode 1883, pp. 351, 359, 360, as no. 24; Duruit 1885, pp. 50, 63, 70, no. 348; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 7; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1808, pp. 174, 175 (ill.), no. 154; Bode 1900, pp. 111 (ill.), 111, 117, no. 10, catalogues the picture as in the collection of Rodolphe Kann (brother of Maurice Kann, who at the time owned the male pendant); Bode 1897–1906, vol. 7 (1902), pp. 26–27, 112, 114, no. 536, pl. 536; Marguiller 1903, pp. 22, 23 (ill.); A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 243 (ill.), 263, as from about 1662; Valentiner 1905, p. 76, identifies the sitter as Magdalena van Loo, wife of Titus van Rijn, Rembrandt’s son; A. Rosenberg 1906, p. 370 (ill.), rejects the identification advanced in Valentiner 1905; Valentiner in A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 481 (ill.), 564, as depicting Magdalena van Loo; Valentiner in New York 1909, p. 149, no. 1078 (ill.), as a portrait of Magdalena van Loo, about 1668, from the Altman collection; Altman bequest 1913, pp. 215 (ill.), 236, as “Lady with a Pink”; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 1–7, no. 2 (ill. opp. p. 6), as a portrait of Magdalena van Loo, painted just after 1668; Valentiner 1914b, pp. 395–96, fig. 3, as “Portrait of Magdalena van Loo”; Hofstede de Groot 1909–77, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 354, 358–99, no. 869, as “Woman with a Pink in Her Right Hand,” painted about 1662–65; Meldrum 1923, pp. 139, 203, pl. cccxxi, as “Portrait of a Lady”; Monod 1923, pp. 306–7 (ill. opp. p. 305); Weisbach 1926, pp. 545, 593, fig. 179, considers the poetic costume an indication that the sitter came from Rembrandt’s circle of acquaintances; M. Eisler 1927, pp. 103–6 (ill. opp. p. 106), states that the sitter is not necessarily the “partner” of the man in the pendant picture; Zwarts 1929a, p. 17 n. 2, dismisses Valentiner’s identification of the woman in The Jewish Bride (fig. 219 here in this painting; Zwarts 1929b, pl. xi n. 2, repeats Zwarts 1929a in translation; Valentiner 1931, unpaged, no. 174, pl. 174, considers the sitter obviously the same model as the woman in The Jewish Bride, and suggests that she is probably Magdalena van Loo; Bredius 1935, p. 16, no. 401, pl. 401, rejects the identification of the sitter as Magdalena van Loo but does find the same woman in The Jewish Bride, Derenle Pictures 1941, unpaged, no. 205 (ill.); J. Allen 1941, pp. 73, 75 (ill.); A. Rosenberg 1948, vol. 1, pp. 49, 204, 319 n. 10, and vol. 2, figs. 76, 269 (detail); Rousseau 1952, pp. 82, 84, 86 (ill.); Salinger 1956, p. 68, no. 3 (ill. p. 70), reviews the various identifications of the sitter; Valentiner 1971, pp. 330, 331–33, fig. 4, as Magdalena van Loo; J. Rosenberg 1964, pp. 86–87, 326, figs. 76, 269 (detail), as “Portrait of a Lady with a Pink”; K. Bausch 1966, p. 26, no. 529, pl. 529, as “Woman in a Richly Decorated Costume with a Pink”; Levey 1967, p. 245 (ill.); Gerson 1968, pp. 432, 433 (ill.), 504, no. 418; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 312 (ill.), 575, 582, no. 401, refers to the painted-out head of a child; Haak 1969, p. 326, fig. 548, as painted about 1668; Lecaldano 1969, p. 124, no. 446 (ill.); Haskell 1970, pp. 266, 279, fig. 7; Gallego and Méquret 1973, pp. 22, 23 (ill.); Von Sonnenburg in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 87, notes the painted-out child; Fowles 1976, p. 40, as an Altman acquisition; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 203, no. 571 (ill.); Hibbard 1980, p. 344, suggests that the child, having been painted out, presumably died, and therefore the pink “probably does not signify betrothal”; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 77, 83, 102, plz. 51, 56–58 (X-radiograph and autoradiographs), discusses changes in the composition, especially the removal of the child’s head which was painted directly on top of the ground, and identifies the painting in the background of this portrait as “a barely discernible landscape”; Fahy 1982, pp. 46, 47 (ill.), identifies the pink as a symbol of faithful love; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 4, p. 2617 (under no. 1816), considers

![Figure 200. Rembrandt, Woman with a Pink (Pl. 159)](image-url)
the same woman to appear in the portrait by Victors dated 1661 (fig. 193 here); G. Schwartz 1983, p. 343, fig. 404, as "Woman with a Pink," of about 1662; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 331 (ill.), 416, no. 249, as from about 1665; Alpers 1988, p. 83, fig. 3.6, makes anachronistic observations; Cabanne 1981, p. 153, no. 23 (ill.); Slatkes 1992, pp. 236–37, no. 145 (ill.); C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 331 (ill.), 419, no. 249, cites the X-radiograph; Baetjer 1995, p. 327; Liedtke in New York 1991–96, vol. 2, pp. 81–85, no. 18 (ill.), as from about 1662; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 24, 54, 69, 78, figs. 68 (detail), 69 (X-radiograph detailed); Brückner 1997, pp. 12 n. 9, 40 n. 74, 52–53, 55, 59; Wright 2000, p. 228; Gilboa 2003, pp. 92–93, pl. viii, compares the earlier portrait by Victors, doubts that the woman is mourning for a lost child (the one revealed in the X-radiographs), and doubts that she appears in other paintings by Rembrandt; Scallen 2004, pp. 207, 208, 163 nn. 96, 99, fig. 52, as owned by R. Kann and Altman; Dudok van Heel 2006, pp. 287, 296, 301, 312 nn. 108, fig. 140, unconvincingly identifies the sitter as Geertruyt Moyaerts (1621–1670), and claims to find the picture listed (with no attribution and a very low value) in the inventory of her husband's estate (see text above).


Ex Coll.: Pieter Gerritsz Haringh (d. 1685); his son Jacob Haringh (d. 1725); d'Outremont family (until 1875); Comte Florent d'Outremont, Brussels 1875–d. 1889; his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, June 27, 1889, no. 8, for FFr 45,000 to Sedelemeyer for Kann; Rodolphe Kann, Paris (1889–d. 1903); his brother Maurice Kann, Paris (1903–d. 1906); his nephew Edouard Kann (1906–9; reportedly sold, with the pendant, for $625,000 to Duveen); [Duveen, New York, 1909; sold to Altman on October 14, 1909, for $262,980]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1909–d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.623.
160. Gerard de Lairesse

Oil on canvas, 44 ¾ x 34 ½ in. (112.7 x 87.6 cm)
Inscribed (lower left): Rembrandt

Robert Lehman Collection, 1975 1975.I.140

Dutch paintings in the Robert Lehman Collection are catalogued by Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann in *The Robert Lehman Collection, II* (Sterling et al. 1998).

This strangely engaging portrait of the young painter Gerard de Lairesse (q.v.; 1641–1711) is a characteristic late work by Rembrandt, dating from about 1665–67. Houbraken records that De Lairesse, who came from Liège, arrived in Amsterdam about 1665 and immediately found work with the art dealer Gerrit Uyleburgh.¹ A date on the Lehman canvas was once read as 1663 or 1665 but is no longer visible, and the signature is probably by a later hand. However, a date of about 1665 or slightly later is consistent with the sitter’s apparent age and with the manner of execution, which recalls Rembrandt’s *Portrait of a Man* (National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne) and *Portrait of an Elderly Man* (Mauritshuis, The Hague), both of which are dated 1665.²

As Haverkamp-Begemann notes, this is the only known formal portrait of De Lairesse apart from his *Self-Portrait* of about a decade later (Uffizi, Florence). The young artist’s features reportedly shocked colleagues when they first encountered him in Amsterdam, according to Houbraken, who mentions his misshapen nose and relates that he was born with his deformities. Medical experts have suggested that De Lairesse suffered from congenital syphilis, which could have caused his sudden blindness in 1690 as well as his disfigurements.³

Rembrandt’s modifications to the composition (chiefly in the collar, the papers, and the position of the right hand) are discussed and illustrated in Haverkamp-Begemann’s entry. These typical changes in the course of work did not alter the overall design or the sitter’s presentation, which is at once candid and suggestive of the elegant manners for which De Lairesse was known. For about two decades before blindness ended his chosen career, De Lairesse was a fashionable painter of history pictures and large-scale decorative works (see Pl. 104). He then turned to art theory, publishing the *Groot Schilderboek* in 1707. In one passage of this academic tract, he strongly criticizes Rembrandt’s late style, and in another he recommends that portraitists minimize their subjects’ physical defects.⁴

After forty years, De Lairesse’s memory of this portrait was perhaps less positive than it should have been.

2. The Mauritshuis portrait is identical with the Cowdray Park picture, cited by Haverkamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, p. 144. It was purchased by the museum in 1999, and is catalogued in Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004 as no. 49.
3. For example, Johnson 2004, pp. 301–3.

REFERENCES (additional to those given by Haverkamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, pp. 139–47, no. 31): Van der Ploeg 1999, p. 9, fig. 3, cites the painting as an example of Rembrandt’s walking “a fine line between honesty and flattery” in his late portraits; Schama 1999a, pp. 697–99 (ill. p. 698), spins a Romantic tale about the picture; Amsterdam 2000, pp. 219, 342, no. 150, suggests that “Rembrandt made no attempt to flatter his model,” and then contradicts this statement; Wright 2000, p. 233, fig. 224, observes that De Lairesse looks older than he was at the time; Baer in Boston 2002, p. 48, records that in about 1930 the painting was offered to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, for $50,000, but was turned down because the director presented it to the trustees as “a portrait of a syphilitic”; Bisanz-Praekken in Vienna 2004, p. 204 (under no. 86), dates the work 1665–67, and notes that despite the sitter’s physical deformities, Rembrandt captures his “cultivated elegance”; Dickey 2004, p. 120, mentions the painting among Rembrandt’s portraits of colleagues; Johnson 2004, pp. 301–3, fig. 1, confirms that, on the basis of the symptoms evident here, De Lairesse had congenital syphilis, and discusses other symptoms; Van de Watering in *Corpus* 2005, pp. 296, 299, believes that Rembrandt’s *Self-Portrait as Zeuxis Laughing* (Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne) is earlier, and that therefore Blankert’s interpretation of that painting cannot be upheld; Kelch in Berlin 2006, p. 203, fig. 1, describes the conception and execution; Van de Watering in ibid., p. 375, cites the picture in order to date the *Young Man Reading* (Vienna) to the mid-1660s; Kelch in Van de Watering et al. 2006, p. 209, fig. 238, describes the composition, which presents the sitter “as a ‘pictor doctus’ (learned painter)”; Lammertse in London–Amsterdam 2006, pp. 217–18, fig. 160, reports that De Lairesse’s disfigurement, as seen in this portrait, “obviously shocked Uyleburgh’s assistants”; Van der Veen in ibid., p. 15, fig. 2, sees the high quality of the portrait as one example of the standard maintained by painters employed in Hendrick and Gerrit Uyleburgh’s workshop.


The following eighteen paintings (Pls. 161-178) are discussed under the general heading “Style of Rembrandt.” These works, presented in approximate chronological order, include pictures that appear to be by pupils, apprentices, or followers of Rembrandt. The first two terms imply a painter active in the master’s workshop, while a follower would be an artist outside Rembrandt’s studio who adopted characteristics of his style. Such a follower might be a former pupil, such as Ferdinand Bol, Gerbrand van den Eeckhout, or Govert Flinck (q.v.), or an independent painter who was influenced by Rembrandt or by someone working in his manner (such as the author of Old Woman Cutting Her Nails; Pl. 169). A follower might also be an imitator, but that term makes allusion more precisely to the object (for example, Man with a Beard; Pl. 178) than to its maker. In contrast to “imitator,” the designation “follower” becomes increasingly inappropriate with distance in time from Rembrandt, but as it happens the Museum has no works in the artist’s style that date from later centuries. It also has no painting that would be properly catalogued as a copy after Rembrandt.

An entry for a picture in the Style of Rembrandt may propose an attribution to a particular painter, but the evidence is considered insufficient to justify placing the work under that artist’s name. Thus, speculation is permitted and inconvenience avoided (along with hubris and embarrassment); in the preferably conservative pages of a standard collection catalogue one does not wish to discover under works assigned to, for instance, Willem Drost (q.v.) a picture that after some years is widely agreed to be by Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.) or about which there is no consensus at all (apart from a general designation such as Style of Rembrandt). For a few paintings in the collection, however, the argument in favor of an attribution appears so strong that their previous ascription by the Museum to Follower of Rembrandt or Style of Rembrandt has been set aside: the panel formerly titled Saskia as Flora (Pl. 46) is catalogued under Flinck, The Sibyl (Pl. 39) under Drost, and Lieven Willemsz van Cappelen (Pl. 156) under Rembrandt.

The last picture and two others were until recently intended for a section titled “Attributed to Rembrandt.” In the course of research, the present writer’s reservations about each painting’s execution by Rembrandt seemed too slight for such a category. That perfectly acceptable designation “Attributed to” as well as “Style of” are employed elsewhere in this catalogue, for example under Jacob Backer (where two pictures once thought to be by Rembrandt are discussed; Pls. 1, 2).

Finally, it should be noted that some of the following entries describe paintings as coming from Rembrandt’s workshop, especially when it seems likely that they were produced under his supervision (whether by a pupil, apprentice, or assistant) or that he contributed in a limited way to their execution. The term “Workshop of Rembrandt” has been extensively used and misused in scholarly literature since the 1980s (see Liedtke 2004b in the bibliography), often for paintings that were probably made by Rembrandt disciples after they left his studio, and occasionally for works ascribed to artists who evidently had no direct involvement with the master at any time (for example, Barent Fabritius; q.v.). The category Style of Rembrandt may be comparatively broad, but it acknowledges the complexity of historical circumstances and the limits of our knowledge.
161. Rembrandt as a Young Man

Oil on wood, 8/9 x 6/8 in. (21.9 x 16.5 cm)  
Inscribed (right, falsely): RL [monogram]  

The painting is in good condition.  
Bequest of Evander B. Schley, 1932. 53.18

This small, fluidly painted portrait of Rembrandt in his early twenties was generally accepted as a self-portrait until Horst Gerson doubted its authenticity in 1969. In the 1970s, three Museum specialists suggested that the work is an imitation from a later century, while a fourth, John Walsh, favored an attribution to a seventeenth-century follower, and proposed that the painter referred directly to Rembrandt’s self-portrait of 1629 in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston (fig. 202). The members of the Rembrandt Research Project, in 1982, felt that the facial type comes closer to the presumed early self-portrait in the Mauritshuis, The Hague (their no. A21), and yet “the use of colour and technique do not however show any really thorough acquaintance with Rembrandt’s early work.” They found the imitation “difficult to date, but it must have been produced well after 1630 and definitely before 1790.” However, in the second volume of the Corpus (1986) the RRP added that the painting was perhaps “derived from the Bust of Rembrandt in [the Louvre] Paris (Br. 29) before the latter was drastically changed by extensive overpainting,” an operation that is now thought to have consisted essentially of Rembrandt’s modifying one of his own self-portraits of about 1635 to reflect his appearance some five or six years later.4

Two tentative conclusions may be drawn from these observations and the visual evidence (which includes an X-radiograph of the Paris self-portrait). First, the resemblance to three or more self-portraits (and versions of them) suggests that an even closer prototype by Rembrandt might have existed. Second, the connection with the Gardner Self-Portrait remains the most compelling. The relationship of the face to the picture plane is virtually identical, which is especially clear from the right contour of the nose, the shape of the nostrils, and the low angle from which the tip of the nose is seen (the bottom of the nose is quite different in the Mauritshuis portrait). Both the Boston and New York heads are quite slim, with the eyes set fairly close together. The nose in each picture is narrow and angular, compared with the fleshier forms of the Mauritshuis head and the underlying version of the Paris portrait. The eyebrows are more finely drawn and the lips more pouty in the Boston painting and here. Some passages in the Museum’s picture appear to carefully follow details in the Gardner portrait: the shape of the moustache (or the shadow of one); the drawing of the eyes; the wedge of light just below the eye to the right; the line of the hat against the brow (although the hat itself is different). The diagonal pocket of shadow to the right of the nose on the small panel appears copied from the Boston portrait. Of course, the expressions are not identical; the distracted eyes and closed mouth of the figure in the Museum’s picture imply little or no interaction with the viewer.

In its conclusion of a quarter-century ago, the RRP maintained that in Rembrandt as a Young Man, “the rather aberrant use of colour and the quite free brushwork (especially in the hair) suggest a date well after 1630.” Hubert von Sonnenburg and the present writer tentatively concurred with this view in the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition of 1995–96, suggesting a date in line with Rembrandt’s late style (assumed to have been imitated here) and qualifying the dendrochronological evidence as follows: “Although the panel was available for use from 1616, its reuse at a later date cannot be ruled out, especially in view of compelling stylistic arguments and the lack of scientific proof that paint layer and panel are approximately contemporary.” However, the panel was not reused (as is clear from X-radiographs) and the stylistic arguments for a later date are far from convincing, considering that the RRP’s description of free brushwork and “aberrant” color could just as well be applied to Rembrandt’s Laughing Soldier, of about 1629–30 (Mauritshuis, The Hague), and a loose or “rough” manner is now recognized as an option favored by Rembrandt in some early pictures (the Mauritshuis “self-portrait” is now catalogued by the RRP and most scholars as a workshop version of the more broadly painted Trompe with Rembrandt’s Features, of about 1629, in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg).7

While later use “cannot be ruled out,” it would be far more expected for an oak panel ready for use in 1616 to be used for the first time by about 1630 (or by 1620, which is impossible given the subject here), and quite exceptional for it to be picked up by a painter only decades later (the common reuse of small panels like this
Walsh that he considered the Museum's painting an imitation, not of the seventeenth century. In 1977, conservator John Brealey also suggested a later origin: "It may very well be English, and late 18th century" (memo dated September 30, 1977, in the curatorial files). At the time, Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann agreed, suggesting "Imitator of Rembrandt, 18th or 19th century" (memo from Mimi Harris, Department of European Paintings, to the director, dated September 28, 1977). By contrast, John Walsh, in a memo dated March 2, 1977, favored "Follower of Rembrandt, 17th century," and in a short draft of a catalogue entry (dated February 1977), suggested that the picture was a "free copy" of the Gardner Self-Portrait, noting that in the latter, "the artist appears thinner and wears tightly curled woolly hair."


4. See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, p. 855 (under no. C38); ibid., vol. 3, pp. 498–505, no. 810 (the Bust of Rembrandt in Paris), and Corpus 2005, p. 603 (under no. P1640). Examination of the Paris panel by the present writer and a number of Rembrandt specialists at the Louvre in June 2006 tends to support this conclusion. The architectural background and other modifications are of much later date.


7. See Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, no. 31, and Corpus 2005, pp. 89, 91, 173–75, 597–98, figs. 135, 136. For the Laughing Soldier, see Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, pp. 427–30, no. 86 (it designates a work of uncertain attribution); the painting is enthusiastically discussed as by Rembrandt in most recent publications, for example Kassel–Amsterdam 2001–2, no. 79, and Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, no. 46.

8. Vermeer's Girl with a Red Hat, of about 1665–66 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), on a panel of about the same size (9½ x 7½ in. [23.2 x 18.1 cm]), is painted over a bust-length portrait broadly comparable with this one. See Wheeldon 1993, pp. 385–86, fig. 3. Such recycling of supports is frequently encountered in the work of Rembrandt and his followers.


10. As noted in G. Schwartz 1985, p. 141, when Hendrick Uylenburgh's business associate Lambert Jacobsz (discussed above in the biographies of Jacob Backer and Govert Flinck) died in 1616, "he owned one painting by Rembrandt and six copies after him."

11. See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, pp. 219, 221, fig. 2 (X-radiograph), and Corpus 2005, p. 176, fig. 177, on the "remarkably hybrid" character of the Gardner Self-Portrait, its experimental qualities, and the "alien element" of the cap.

**References:** W. Roberts 1909, p. 207, describes the work as "Head and Shoulders of a Young Man," by Rembrandt about 1638, and notes the recent sale to Kleinberger; Stephenson 1909, pp. 170, 171 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, "a small sketch of himself . . . painted in 1628"; Valentine in New York 1909, p. 75, no. 74 (ill. opp. p. 75), as a self-portrait by Rembrandt, painted about 1628; Brock 1910, pp. 91 (ill.), 92, follows Valentine in observing that the style of the picture

---

**Figure 202.** Detail of Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait (Tronie with Rembrandt’s Features), 1629. Oil on wood, 3¾ x 2½ in. (89.3 x 73.5 cm). Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston

one underscores this point. There is also nothing about the painting’s execution that requires a date later than the early to mid-1630s, as is attested by many small tronies by Rembrandt followers. The hypothesis that a portrait of the young Rembrandt would for some reason (certainly not demand for the subject) be painted in something like the late Rembrandt’s style is illogical.

In conclusion, this small panel was probably painted by someone in Rembrandt’s immediate circle about 1630–35. It appears to follow the face in the Gardner Self-Portrait or a very similar picture, but to substitute conventional clothing. There is a remote possibility that the figure also corresponds to some extent with the one that was painted on the Gardner panel before the final paint surface was applied. 

---

1. In Bredius 1969 (see Refs.). Visiting the Museum in 1976, Gerson made the baffling suggestion that this might be a later picture (perhaps by David Bailly [q.v.]) repainted to look like a Rembrandt. The collector Daan Covat, in 1966, rejected Rembrandt’s authorship, stating that a better version might turn up.

161. Shown actual size
indicates a date of 1628; Hofstede de Groot 1913, p. 188, fig. 12, claims to publish the painting for the first time; Valentinier 1914, p. 242, as "Portrait of the Artist," about 1628, listed among works by Rembrandt in American collections; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 277–78, no. 304, as "Portrait of the Painter," about 1628, signed "R. H. I."); Valentinier 1914(b), pp. 135, 136, as by Rembrandt about 1628–29; Bredius 1921, p. 148, "Sich imminent Selbstporträt," which can hardly be appreciated from the miserable photograph in Valentinier 1921(b); Valentinier 1931, unpagd, no. 2, p. 2, as "Self-Portrait (Study)," by Rembrandt, probably dating from 1628, connects it with a pen drawing in the British Museum; K. Bauch 1933, p. 161, fig. 183, as a Rembrandt self-portrait, describes the spatial effect of the tightly framed figure; Bredius 1933, p. 3, pl. 10, "Selbstbildnis," no date given; Pinder 1943, pp. 13 (ill.), 21, as by Rembrandt, considers the picture to date from about 1630; H. van Gelder 1948a, pp. 6, 8 (ill.), 10, sees melancholy in this self-portrait of about 1630; J. Rosenberg 1948, vol. 1, p. 224, indexed; Valentinier in Raleigh 1966, p. 18, no. 2 (ill.), as a self-portrait of about 1628–29, "probably a very exact likeness of the subject, shows the heavy features of the miller's son in all his roughness and naive self-confidence"; Indianapolis–San Diego 1972, no. 1, pl. 1 (cover ill.), "Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man," of about 1628, "probably the earliest self-portrait known in North America," sees intensity in this "forthright and unsparing portrait," and compares a somewhat similar self-portrait recently acquired by the National Museum, Stockholm; K. Bauch 1966, p. 16, no. 293, pl. 293, "Selbstbildnis," monogrammed, about 1629–30; Eirpel 1967, pp. 18, 143, no. 13, pl. 10, follows earlier authorities in cataloguing the work as a self-portrait of about 1629; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 9 (ill.), 547, no. 10, is "not convinced that the attribution to the young Rembrandt is correct"; Lecaldano 1969, p. 94, no. 31 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, signed "RHL"; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 174, no. 60 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, about 1630; Baeijer 1980, vol. 1, p. 131, as Style of Rembrandt, 18th or 19th century; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1 (1982), pp. 650–53, no. 438 (ill.), as "Bust of a young man (commonly called a self-portrait of Rembrandt)," with X-rayograph, considers the work an imitation, probably datable well after 1630; with an "IL" monogram entirely uncharacteristic of Rembrandt, as are the brushwork and coloring; Wright 1982, pp. 21 (ill.), 40, no. 10, pl. 18, describes the picture as a typical early self-portrait, but reports that the Museum has recently discovered that in their opinion the painting is much later in date than Rembrandt's lifetime"; Bonafous 1985, pp. 16 (ill.), 144, as by Rembrandt and of 1610; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2 (1986), p. 855 (under no. 438), as possibly derived from the "Bust of Rembrandt" in Paris "before the latter was drastically changed by extensive overpainting"; Jeromack 1988a, pp. 108–9 (ill. actual size), notes that the Museum considers the work a much later imitation; Baetjer 1995, p. 320, as Style of Rembrandt, 17th century or later; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 89–90, no. 21 (ill., too bright and warm), catalogues the picture as Style of Rembrandt, about 1660 or later, and questions the conclusions of Corpus 1982–89 regarding the picture's possible relationship to an overpainted Rembrandt self-portrait in Paris, and to an engraving of 1790 by J. F. Schröter; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 28, 30, cites the dendrochronological report by Peter Klein, and concludes that "although the panel was available for use from 1616, its reuse at a later date cannot be ruled out" (see text above); Scallen 2004, p. 361 n. 65, listed as one of three paintings ascribed to Rembrandt in the Hudson-Fulton exhibition that were not catalogued in Bode 1897–1906; Klein in Corpus 2005, p. 653, reports the probable felling date of the tree used for the panel as 1614.


EX COLL.: Possibly Gottfried Winkler, Leipzig (between 1768 and 1790); Leopold II, King of the Belgians, Brussels (until 1909; sold to Kleinberger); [Kleinberger, Paris, 1909; sold to Morgan]; J. Pierpoint Morgan, New York (1909–d. 1917); his son J. P. Morgan, New York (1913–d. 1943; his estate, 1943; sold to Knoedler); [Knoedler, New York, 1943; sold to Pinakos]; [Pinakos, Inc. (Rudolf J. Heinemann), New York, 1943–at least 1944]; Evander B. Schley, New York (until d. 1952); Bequest of Evander B. Schley, 1952 53.18

1. An engraving by Johann Friedrich Schröter, reproducing this or a similar picture in reverse, is dated 1790 and is inscribed, "Das Original ist in dem Cabinet des Herrn Hauptmann Winklers." See Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 622–53, under Graphic Reproductions and Provenance, and fig. 3. That the "original" was certainly the Museum's picture is questioned by the present writer in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 89 n. 4, where it is observed that "the left contour in our painting suffices to suggest that the print could be after another version."
162. Study Head of an Old Man

Oil on wood, 8 3/4 x 6 7/8 in. (21 x 17.5 cm)
The painting is in good condition.
Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1959 — 60.71.16

This small, mediocre study head, or tronie, was probably painted in Amsterdam during the 1630s by a minor pupil of Rembrandt or by a less closely connected follower, perhaps a painter turning out hackwork for Rembrandt's dealer, Hendrick Uyleenburg. Whether or not such a picture served as a training exercise, it would have been sold for a few guilders, probably to a customer more interested in the subject than in questions of authorship. The present example brings to mind an entry in a Paris inventory of 1653 listing "deux têtes de vieillards, manière de Rembrandt." Closer to home, a Leiden inventory of 1657 refers to two "old antique tronies by a pupil of Rembrandt," which was probably not a matter of record but an educated guess. Each of these works featuring "antique" figures—meaning in fancy dress, like the subject in Man in Oriental Costume ("The Noble Slave") (Pl. 142)—was valued at eight guilders, at a time when a comparable picture by Rembrandt (such as the Bader Head of an Old Man in a Cap, of about 1630, in Ontario) probably would have sold for at least ten times as much.

The Museum's picture was little known to scholars before it was accessioned in 1960, and was first published in 1969 (see Refs.), as a dubious attribution to Rembrandt. The experts who originally broadened our view of the master to include this work were the longtime collaborators Wilhelm von Bode and Cornelis Hofstede de Groot, both of whom provided "photo certificates" of authenticity when the painting came to light in 1924. The next professional comment dates from 1950, when William Valentiner provided a certificate as a favor to Lillian Timken, evidently in connection with her purchase of the panel from the Van Diemen–Lilienfeld Galleries in New York.

In 1962, curator Claus Virch noted in Museum records that "our painting quite likely was copied from the Fisher portrait," namely, the so-called Portrait of a Bearded Old Man (fig. 203), crudely inscribed "Rembrandt/1643." The two versions are remarkably similar in some respects, such as the pattern of brushstrokes used on the nose and in the eyes and eyebrows. However, the figures wear different hats, and the old man in Richmond has a neater beard, a gold chain and pendant, and a slightly less anxious expression. The most likely explanation is that the two panels depend on a common prototype, which would have resembled the Bust of an Old Man with a Gold Chain, signed or inscribed "RH. van Ryn/1622" (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel). That picture (which is much debated as a Rembrandt) shows a similar figure more frontally, without a hat, and a wilder beard and hair.

In any event, the existence of similar faces elsewhere in Rembrandt's oeuvre (including that of The Apostle Peter, in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, and "The Noble Slave," both of 1632) suggests that a more similar model by him may once have been known. Moreover, similar tronies by other pupils or followers demonstrate that the Museum's panel and the somewhat superior Richmond version belong to a group of pictures which altogether represent several layers of derivation, that is, versions and copies of works that are themselves derived from paintings by Rembrandt and his pupils. Two of the better by-products of Rembrandt's preoccupation with this particular face (or with one seemingly from the same family) are the Rembrandt workshop Apostle Paul, of the mid-1630s (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), and a panel plausibly attributed to Govert Flinck (q.v.), of about 1642 (art market, 1992). A version of the presumed Flinck is found in a second panel in Kassel, and other pictures of similar figures are known.

A date in the mid- to late 1630s is consistent with the evidence of dendrochronology; the oak panel comes from a tree felled in Baltic or Polish territory between about 1626 and 1632.

1. On Uyleenburg, see London–Amsterdam 2006. Paintings by Rembrandt were also copied by amateurs, such as the sixteen-year-old Christiaan Huygens, who in 1645 wrote to his brother that he had made a copy in oils after an old man's head by Rembrandt, adding the remark (familiar from art literature of the time) that it could hardly be distinguished from the original (see Slive 1993, p. 44).

2. These examples and the relevant documents are cited in Van der Veen 1997, pp. 72, 79 nn. 10, 11. The Bader tronie (see Kassel–Amsterdam 2001–2, no. 80, and Berlin 2006, no. 11) was given in 2003 by Alfred and Isabel Bader to the Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.


4. The expertise, dated May 10, 1970, is penned on the photo mount inside the booklet compiled by the Van Diemen–Lilienfeld Galleries. Valentiner writes, "The painting here reproduced is in my opinion an original work by Rembrandt, painted about 1643."
and representing the same old man as the one in the painting of the Alfred Fisher Collection (formerly Bromberg Coll.), reproduced Bredius [1935, fig.] 232" (the Fisher panel is now in the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts [fig. 203 here]; see the following note). Bound in the same booklet are Bode's and Hofstede de Groot's photo certificates, the latter dated November 1924. Michael M. Thomas, curatorial assistant, interviewed Lilienfeld on December 8, 1959, and recorded details about various pictures in a memo preserved in the curatorial files: "The little Rembrandt was certified by Valentini only after years of hesitation. Another version was in the Bromberg Collection, Hamburg, and Valentini considered it the superior version. Timken did not pay a Rembrandt price for it. Why Valentini certified it is peculiar (MMT) but Mrs. Timken considered it the 'kindness of an expert to give her a certificate,' and felt that 'Mr. Valentini was such a nice man that he couldn't deny her a certificate.'"

5. Bredius 1935, fig. 232; K. Bauch 1966, no. 181, as the best of several versions; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 367, no. 232, as "not very convincing as a Rembrandt"; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 652–55, fig. 4 (under no. 633), as "Manner of Rembrandt" (the New York version is reproduced as fig. 3, unfortunately in reverse); New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 123, fig. 78, as "Style of Rembrandt." When Gerson visited the Museum on April 7, 1976, he did not mention the Richmond version (fig. 203 here) in connection with the present panel, which he described as definitely an imitation of the eighteenth or nineteenth century.


8. See Schnackenburg in Kassel–Amsterdam 2001–2, pp. 116–17, fig. 30, for the "Flinck" (also in Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 6, pp. 3708, 3869, no. 2275b), and pp. 117–18, fig. 32, and pp. 388–91, no. 87, for the Vienna canvas.


10. For example, Bust of an Old Man, in the Musée Central, Metz (Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2, pp. 641–47, no. 622, as "an old copy perhaps done in Rembrandt's circle and possibly after a detail from a larger composition by him").


REFERENCES: Leclalcino 1969, p. 131 (ill.), includes the painting among works of doubtful attribution; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 151, as Style of Rembrandt, "of uncertain date"; Corpus 1982–89, vol. 2 (1986), p. 653, fig. 5 (reversed), cites the work among Rembrandt-esque pictures "showing a closely similar head seen at a slightly different angle [compared with that in the Rembrandt-style Bust of an Old Man with a Gold Chain, in Kassel] and wearing a cap, which belong to a fairly large group of apparently also 17th-century, superficial pastiches"; Baetjer 1995, p. 320, as Style of Rembrandt; Liedke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 112–14, no. 39 (ill.), as Style of Rembrandt, concludes that the painting is "probably an Amsterdam product of the 1650s," and compares it with a version of the composition in the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts (fig. 203 here), and with similar works; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 2, p. 13, figs. 7, 8 (X-radiographs), uses the cradled panel to demonstrate advances in radiographic technology; Schnackenburg in Kassel–Amsterdam 2001–2, p. 121 n. 125, cites the work as one of "two small variations of the Kassel head," which the author attributes to Rembrandt (see ibid., no. 81); Klein in Corpus 2005, p. 614, reports the earliest possible felling date of the tree used for the panel as 1622.


Figure 203. Style of Rembrandt, Portrait of a Bearded Old Man. Oil on wood, 8 1/4 x 6 3/4 in. (21 x 17.1 cm). Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond
163. Portrait of a Man Seated in an Armchair

Oil on canvas, 42¼ x 32½ in. (108.3 x 82.6 cm)
Inscribed (upper right): Rembrandt f/1638
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975 1975.1.139

Dutch paintings in the Robert Lehman Collection are catalogued by Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann in The Robert Lehman Collection, II (Sterling et al. 1998).

The style of the portrait as well as that of the sitter's fashionable costume suggest a date in the early 1640s. Until 1969, the painting was generally regarded as by Rembrandt, although it was rarely subjected to critical scrutiny. As observed by Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, while the painter of the Lehman canvas was obviously aware of the master's innovations as a portraitist, Rembrandt's autograph works of the same period differ substantially from this one.¹

One of the closest works known from Rembrandt's circle is The Goldsmith Jan Pietersz van den Eechhout, dated 1644, by the sitter's son Gerbrand van den Eechhout (q.v.; fig. 204).² Haverkamp-Begemann considers the two portraits quite comparable in their level of quality, manner of execution, and in the definition of the head, face, and hands. However, no portraits by Van den Eechhout of about 1640 (when he was nineteen years old) or, indeed, from before 1644 are known. Therefore, the picture is ascribed in the Lehman catalogue to an anonymous Amsterdam artist. The present writer is somewhat more confident of Van den Eechhout's responsibility than Haverkamp-Begemann appears to be, but the realm of Amsterdam portraiture during the second quarter of the seventeenth century is full of surprises and unknowns.³


Figure 204. Gerbrand van den Eechhout, The Goldsmith Jan Pietersz van den Eechhout, 1644. Oil on wood, 29⅜ x 22⅝ in. (76 x 58 cm). Musée de Grenoble

3. A good example of an unexpected work in the area of North Holland portraiture is the Portrait of a Woman with Embroidered Gloves, dated 1633, by Jan Miense Molenaer (1610/11–1668; private collection); see Raleigh–Columbus–Manchester 2002–3, no. 15.

References (additional to those given by Haverkamp-Begemann in Sterling et al. 1998, pp. 148–51, no. 32): Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 664–65, reports that the first ground contains red earth and the second, lead white, fine charcoal black, and a little red and yellow ochre, resulting in a gray color.

164. Portrait of a Man with a Breastplate and Plumed Hat

Oil on canvas, 47¼ x 38⅞ in. (121.3 x 98.4 cm)

The condition of the painting is poor.

H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.102

This portrait and the pendant Portrait of a Woman (Pl. 165) from the Havemeyer Collection were painted by an artist in Rembrandt’s immediate circle in Amsterdam, mostly likely during the mid- to late 1640s. When owned by “Harry” Havemeyer and, between 1907 and 1929, by his widow, Louise, the paintings were almost universally admired as among Rembrandt’s “most charming portraits” (as Bode described them in 1895; see Refs.). Mary Cassatt (1844–1926), the American painter who, with Mrs. Havemeyer, was devoted to modern French painting, wrote to the latter in 1892 that she saw nothing on her recent trip to Italy “more beautiful than the Rembrantrts Mr. Havemeyer has just bought,” referring to these canvases. “What a marvel the woman’s portrait is! Duret saw it with me and said he had never seen a finer picture.”

In 1923, the Rembrandt dealer John Van Dyke tentatively proposed that Godert Flinck (q.v.) was responsible for the Havemeyer pictures, which placed them in the right church if the wrong pew. On the basis of his radiographic investigations, Alan Burroughs, in 1932 and 1938, favored an attribution to Flinck’s contemporary Ferdinand Bol (q.v.). A number of scholars have taken up this suggestion, including Berens (1940), Bauch (1966), Gerson (1969), and Sumowski (1973). However, Albert Blankert, author of the standard catalogue of Bol’s oeuvre (1982), dismissed that painter as a candidate.

The name of Jan Victors (q.v.) has been put forward a number of times: by De Vries (1952), Gudlaugsson (1956), Gerson (about 1965), and the present writer. Presumably, the Dutch scholars had specific portraits by Victors in mind (see figs. 194, 195), or an early painting such as the Young Woman at a Window, of 1640 (fig. 205), rather than one of the stale religious pictures that are more common in his oeuvre (see Pl. 209). At least three considerations complicate the matter. First, the Havemeyer paintings are now darkened and discolored by old varnish, and are depressively smooth, so that their qualities are hard to judge in normal light. Second, X-radiographs reveal opaque patches of lead-bearing paint in and around the areas of the heads, perhaps indicating that previously sketched or painted heads (of which no evidence is retrievable) were covered up with a neutral base on which the present heads were painted, possibly by an artist other than the one responsible for most of the execution. Third, the resemblance to works by Bol suggests, if not his participation, then his considerable influence. In style, composition, and some elements of the costume, the male pendant is strongly reminiscent of pictures by Bol such as The Falconer, of 1647 (fig. 206). The most prudent attribution would be to an Amsterdam artist influenced by both Rembrandt and Bol, probably about 1645–48. Schmidt-Degener, in 1935, called the pictures workshop products, probably based on Rembrandt designs, but there is no evidence to suggest that the painter, if he was ever Rembrandt’s pupil or assistant, was not working independently when the Havemeyer portraits were made. Despite the possibility that the heads were revised, nothing about the execution indicates more than one hand at work. Furthermore, the handling of the

Figure 205. Jan Victors, Young Woman at a Window, 1640. Oil on canvas, 36½ x 30¼ in. (93 x 78 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris
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heads and the costumes alike suggests that an attribution to Victors (who may have trained with Rembrandt about 1637–39, when Bol was in the studio) is worth further consideration. In comparable single-figure paintings of the 1640s, like the Young Woman at a Window (fig. 205) and Hannah in the Temple, dated 1643 (Dordrechts Museum, Dordrecht), Victors describes garments as if he were hanging curtains on windows, with folds suggesting gravity rather than human form. He likes rich textures, but does not distinguish clearly between wool, velvet, and fur. His treatment of the bodice and neck is usually rich in fussy detail, with a particular weakness for pearls and other jewelry or elements of decoration rendered as small repetitive shapes. Victors’s faces reveal a similar attention to parts rather than to general impressions. Eyebrows are often penciled as smooth arcs, and are rather dark. Mouths are carefully drawn, with a thin dark line between the lips and slight ticks at the corners. In many portraits, shadows—on one side of the nose, sculpting a nostril, or between the lower lip and chin—are overworked. Hands are composed of units, as on a palm-reading chart. The odd V-shaped indentation, like a horse’s hoof, on the palm of the sitter’s outstretched hand in the Havemeyer portrait is found in some male hands by Victors, for example the hand at the waist in the Young Man in Fancy Dress, of 1654 (Musée de Tournon). In general, when compared with Bol’s softer touch and more convincing light and volume, the execution in indisputable works by Victors of the 1640s tends to be niggling and linear. Prevalent among his patrons is stringy or oily hair. Finally, compared with Bol’s flowing contours, Victors’s outlines tend to be awkward or angular. Highlights and shadows are distributed by area and do little to set figures in space. Nonetheless, Victors’s best paintings of the 1640s prove him a competent emulator of Bol, and “charming” when it suits the character or story (as in the entertaining Feast of Esther, of 1642, in the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig).9

1. M. Cassatt in Havemeyer 1993, pp. 286–97, quoting from a letter dating from the fall of 1892. The art critic Théodore Duret may have had particular reasons for his enthusiasm.
2. See Refs. Otto Benesch suggested Bol when visiting the Museum on December 20, 1940. On September 24, 1952, Kurt Bauch told curator Claus Virch that he accepted the Havemeyer portraits as by Rembrandt, comparing the Man with a Steel Goblet (Pl. 166; K. Bauch 1966, no. 393, as by Rembrandt) in their defense. In his Rembrandt catalogue, Bauch (1966, nos. 389, 504) amended his view in favor of a tentative attribution to Bol. In the mid-1960s, Gerson thought the portraits were by Bol or maybe Jan Victors (q.v.), but emphatically opted for Bol in his commentaries to Bredius 1969.
3. A. Blankert, letter to curator John Walsh, dated January 19, 1974: “About the ‘Bol’ portraits, formerly Rembrandt, in the Met, they are no Bol.”
5. For the Young Woman at a Window (fig. 205 here), see Sumowski 1981–94, vol. 4, pp. 2610, 2685, no. 1785, where early references to the painting by Gerson are cited.
8. F. Schmied-Degener, visiting the Museum on April 9, 1935.
9. For the paintings cited in this paragraph, see Sumowski 1981–94, vol. 4, nos. 1739 (Braunschweig), 1785 (Paris), 1786 (Dordrecht), 1788a (Toulon). In a letter dated March 15, 1985, Debra Miller...
(author of Miller 1985), wrote that she “would not discount Victors completely” as the author of the Havemeyer portraits, but sees “at least as many indications of Bol’s hand.” She also notes that “there are so many stylistic and compositional similarities among [the oeuvres of Rembrandt]’s pupils, and so many inconsistencies of quality within each of them, that it is indeed very difficult to be convinced of any attribution of this pair of portraits.”

References: Vosmaer 1877, pp. 235-16, 534, lists the picture with its pendant as in the “de Seillieres” collection in 1861, and doubts that the male sitter was an admiral; Bode 1895, pp. 457-59, 398, no. 308, with the pendant, no. 307, as Rembrandts of 1643. “Portrait of a young man and his wife, in dark imaginary costumes,” owned by the princesse de Sagan; Dutuit 1881, pp. 52, 68, no. 101, with the pendant, no. 102, dubiously proposes that the pictures appear to come from the Érard sale of 1832 (the descriptions in that sale catalogue refute the idea); Wurzbach 1866, text vol. 341 (both pictures); É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 248, lists the portraits among Rembrandts recently acquired by American collectors; Bode 1895, pp. 71, 72 (ill.), 73 (ill. of pendant), as in the Havemeyer collection, considers the pictures to rank among Rembrandt’s “most charming portraits”; Bell 1899, pp. 76, 135-86, erroneously lists both pictures (called “The Dutch Admiral and His Wife”) as signed and dated 1643; Bode 1897-1906, vol. 4 (1900), pp. 27, 124, 126, no. 266, pl. 266, with the pendant, no. 267, pl. 267, as Rembrandts in the Havemeyer collection, does not identify the man as an admiral, and notes correctly that only the woman’s portrait is signed and dated; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 131 (both ill.), 299, accepts the date of 1643 on the woman’s portrait for both pictures; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 209 (both ill.), 399, repeats A. Rosenberg 1904; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 271 (both ill.), 389, repeats A. Rosenberg 1904 and 1906; Hofstede de Groot 1907-27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 359, no. 765, as “A Young Man . . .” describes the composition, refers to the pendant (no. 871), and omits the Érard sale from the provenance; Van Dyke 1923, p. 87, tentatively attributes the two portraits to Govert Flinck, and notes that the works are “probably” companion pieces; Havemeyer Collection 1931, pp. 28-31 (both ill.), as Rembrandt’s portraits of an admiral and his wife, adds “Érard” to provenance; Valentiner 1931, unpaged, no. 77, pl. 77, with the pendant, no. 78, pl. 78, calls the sitters “A Gentleman” and “A Young Lady”; A. Burroughs 1932b, pp. 45, 457-60, figs. 2, 6, with the pendant, figs. 3, 7, 10 (ill. and X-radiographs), considers the portraits “perhaps by Bol,” based on comparisons of X-radiographs; Bredius 1935, p. 10, no. 225, pl. 225, as “Bildnis eines Admirals (i);” by Rembrandt in 1643; A. Burroughs 1938, p. 157, maintains that “the vagueness and flatness of the underpaint relate these portraits to the work of Ferdinand Bol, and it would be rash to assume that Bol could not have painted them”; Havemeyer 1961, pp. 19-20, recalls the works when they were in the Rembrandt Room of the Havemeyer home; K. Bauch 1966, p. 20, no. 189, as perhaps an especially successful work by Bol; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 181 (ill.), 166, no. 223, “certainly by F. Bol”; Lecaldano 1969, p. 131 (both ill.), included among works of doubtful attribution to Rembrandt; Sumowski 1973, p. 97 n. 50, considers the attribution to Bol convincing; A. Levy 1976, pp. 40 (ill.), 41 (ill. of pendant), 42, quotes Bruyn regarding long-standing doubts about Rembrandt’s responsibility for these pictures; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 190, no. 318 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, pp. 150-51, as Style of Rembrandt; Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 4, pp. 2876-77, 2884 n. 40, 2906 (ill.), 2907 (ill. of pendant), assigns the paintings to an anonymous Rembrandt pupil under Bol’s influence, during the 1642-45, mentions Reynier van Gherwen, and considers it uncertain whether the pictures were originally portraits; Weitzenhoffer 1986, pp. 65, 256, describes how in June 1692 Durand-Ruel bought the paintings from the princesse de Sagan, “for which she was asking $100,000”; Liedtke 1990, p. 46, as Havemeyer Rembrandts that “would have been considered authentic by any scholar of the period”; Havemeyer 1993, pp. 19-20, 286-87, 294, 310 n. 38, 343 n. 443, repeats Havemeyer 1961 and adds an extract from Mary Cassatt’s letters (1892 not “1890”), in which she observes, “I saw nothing there [on a recent trip to Italy] more beautiful than the Rembrandts Mr. Havemeyer has just bought”; Liedtke in New York 1993, p. 63, recalls Durand-Ruel’s pursuit of the pictures on Havemeyer’s behalf, and notes that Bol is no longer considered the painter; Stein in ibid., p. 213, pl. 192, with the pendant, pl. 193, as Style of Rembrandt, describes the purchase from the princesse de Sagan, and notes that Cassatt saw the pictures in early July 1892, at Durand-Ruel, Paris; Wold in ibid., pp. 374-75, no. 1477 (ill.), with the pendant, no. 1478, lists provenance and essential references; Baetjer 1995, p. 310; Liedtke in New York 1995-96, vol. 2, pp. 23, 103-7, no. 27 (ill.), reviews critical opinions, notes that the condition of the portraits makes them hard to judge, considers the resemblance to works by Bol, and favors an attribution to Victors, about 1643-48; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 26-27, figs. 21 (X-radiograph detail), 22 (X-radiograph detail of the pendant), reports that an opaque ground was laid on with a palette knife or spatula to “cover up previously laid-in heads and thus create a neutral base for the subsequent images”; Quodbach 2004, pp. 93-99, figs. 2, 3 (both ill.), discusses the portraits as “Rembrandts” in the Seillière, Sagan, and Havemeyer collections; Scallen 2004, pp. 185, 358 n. 13, 378 n. 64, notes the purchase by Havemeyer and the attribution to Bol made in A. Burroughs 1932b; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 664-65, 672-73, reports that the first ground contains quartz, clay minerals, ilmenite, a little red and brown ochre, and very little black and chalk, resulting in a yellowish brown color.

165. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 47 3/4 x 38 3/4 in. (121 x 98.1 cm)
Inscribed (at left, on chair): Rembrandt f / 1643

The condition of the painting is poor.

H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.103

This picture is the pendant to Portrait of a Man with a Breastplate and Plumed Hat (Pl. 164), and is discussed in the preceding entry.

References: (See Refs. in the preceding entry, where unless otherwise specified the present picture and its pendant are cited as a pair. The following references pertain solely to Portrait of a Woman, no. 29.100.103). Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 399–400, no. 871, as “A Young Woman . . . ,” signed and dated 1643, pendant to no. 765; Bredius 1915, p. 15, no. 364, pl. 364, as by Rembrandt, dated 1643; K. Bauch 1966, p. 25, pl. 504, as perhaps an especially successful work by Bol; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 285 (ill.), 578, no. 364, states that the picture has a “faked signature,” and that it is the “companion portrait to Br. 223, and also by F. Bol—as A. Burroughs and Bauch had already supposed”; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 189, no. 314 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 237, listed as a Rembrandt dated 1643, but noting Gerson’s rejection; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 5, 23, 81, 101–7, no. 28 (ill.), favors an attribution to Victors, about 1643–48; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 664–65, 672–73, reports that the first ground contains quartz, calcite, clay minerals, a little brown and red ochre, and bone black, resulting in a light yellowish brown color.


Ex Coll.: Baron Achille de Sellière, Paris (by 1861–d. 1873); his daughter Jeanne-Marguerite de Sellière, princesse de Sagan, Paris (1873–92; sold to Durand-Ruel for Havemeyer); [Durand-Ruel, Paris, 1892; sold to Havemeyer on September 7, 1892]; Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1892–his d. 1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer (1907–d. 1929); H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.103
166. Man with a Steel Gorget

Oil on canvas, 37⅞ x 35⅞ (94.3 x 77.8 cm)
Inscribed (lower left): Rembrandt f. 1644

Additions of canvas have returned the painting to its original rectangular format from a later, altered format with an arched top. A 1 in. strip was added at the bottom, and there are many paint losses around the perimeter. The painting is severely abraded in the background, in the hat and hair, and in the deep black parts of the costume. At right, the face, hand, and brown cloak draped over the arm are fairly well preserved.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.601

There is now general agreement among scholars that this canvas from the Altman collection was painted by someone in Rembrandt’s immediate circle between about 1645 and about 1650. The most plausible attributions have been to Govert Flinck and to Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (q.q.v.). Although the figure is quite individualized, the subject is most likely a tronie, or imaginary character, in this case a gallant military man. The attributes of a floppy beret, a steel gorget, an outmoded jacket, and a gold chain with pendant were commonplace in Rembrandt’s circle during the 1640s, as were various kinds of demonstrative gestures (compare Pl. 164). For the latter, however, the painter probably had in mind Captain Banning Cocq’s commanding gesture in The Night Watch (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which was completed by Rembrandt in 1642, and probably also the rhetorical gesture of Johannes Sylvius in Rembrandt’s portrait etching of 1646. In the latter, the sitter’s right hand extends illusionistically through the fictive frame.

The title employed today goes back to Bode in 1900 (see Refs.). Early descriptions of the sitter as “Le Connétable de Bourbon” and as Constantijn Huygens were repeated, if at all, only as a matter of convenience. Two of the more independent critics of their day, John Van Dyke and Alan Burroughs, both came out against the attribution to Rembrandt in 1923 (see Refs.). Doubts about the painting were often expressed during the following decades. As in many other cases, Bauch in 1966 and Gerson in 1969 (see Refs.) went too far in opposite directions, the former sounding the last gasp in favor of Rembrandt, and the latter tossing the picture into the murky realm of eighteenth-century imitations.

In the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” catalogue of 1995–96, conservator Hubert von Sonnenburg dismissed the notion of a later origin, citing pigments containing azurite, vermilion, and lead-tin yellow, and the presence of quartz in the ground. He also reported that the gloved hand “covers a fully executed bare hand,” and that the repainting was performed by the original author. Von Sonnenburg was attracted to the possibility of an attribution to Flinck, based on comparisons of the “highly individualized brushwork” (revealed mainly in X-radiographs) with that found in Bearded Man with a Velvet Cap (Pl. 47). There is perhaps no more similar picture by Flinck in his known oeuvre, and the resemblance in style and, to a lesser extent, figure type is obvious. However, the modeling of the hand (as distinct from its “individualized” brushwork) and of the face is unlike Flinck’s smoother and more elegant handling, and other aspects of the figure—the expression, the drawing of the mouth and eyes, the planar effect of the bust, the sense of movement (as opposed to Flinck’s usual containment in the torso and arms)—come closer to works by Van den Eeckhout dating from after 1645. Two works cited by the present writer in 1995–96, Van den Eeckhout’s portrait of his father, dated 1644 (see fig. 204), and the small, supposed Self-Portrait dating from a little later (Accademia Carrara, Bergamo), have been studied by him recently and still seem similar to the Man with a Steel Gorget in execution.

Nonetheless, the question is very difficult to judge for several reasons. First, the Altman painting has suffered in the past from lining, cleaning, retouching, and the application of varnish about ten times thicker than that normally employed. Second, Van den Eeckhout was a highly eclectic artist, whose accepted portraits and tronies reveal remarkable variety in conception and execution. Third, Rembrandt’s pupils, former pupils, and other followers of the 1640s could be described as more numerous, more closely interrelated, and at the same time more diverse than those of any other period. It would therefore be inappropriate to propose an attribution more specific than that to a comparatively experienced associate of Rembrandt in the period about 1645–50. Such a painter would probably have studied with the master about a decade earlier, as did Flinck, Van den Eeckhout, Ferdinand Bol, Jan Victors (q.q.v.), and others.

724  STYLE OF REMBRANDT
1. On this type of figure, which in some cases was given a patriotic air, see Chapman 1990, pp. 34-41, 61.
2. See also the Rembrandt-school Young Girl Holding a Medal in the Cincinnati Art Museum (M. Scott 1987, no. 39; Sumowski 1983-84, vol. 5, no. 2135, as by Johannes Spilberg).
3. See New York 1995-96, vol. 2, p. 100, fig. 70. The hand in the present painting could be described as a synthesis of Sylvius’s hand and its shadow. The combination of a turned head and direct glance recalls a number of earlier Rembrandt self-portraits and works derived from them.
4. Oral opinions recorded at the Museum: Wilhelm Martin, 1938, as not by Rembrandt or a “direct pupil” of him; F. Schmidt-Degener, 1940, considered the work to be by Rembrandt, and recommended relining and cleaning; Otto Benesch, 1940, as possibly a fine early Maes; A. B. de Vries, 1951 and 1952, doubted Rembrandt, suggested Flinck “or possibly possibility of 18th C” (according to the curator’s memo); Daan Cevat, 1966, close to Drost, or possibly Bol; Julius Held, 1971, doubts Rembrandt; Horst Gerson, 1976, either Bol or an eighteenth-century imitator of Bol; Seymour Slive, 1992, was reminded of Van den Eckhout by the execution of the gesturing hand.

References: J. Smith 1829-42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 109, no. 300, titles the work “A Gentleman, styled Le Connaissable de Bourbon,” by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1644, formerly with Lord Radstock, and records it as exhibited at the “British Gallery” in 1821 (sic); Vosmaer 1877, p. 336, repeats J. Smith’s information; Bode 1883, pp. 495, 598, no. 313, “Portrait of a Man,” known as the “Connaissable de Bourbon,” mentions the work as recently having entered the Secrétan collection; Dumit 1885, pp. 53, 63, 68, no. 306, as in the Secrétan collection; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 328; Redford 1888, vol. 2, p. 318, as “Le Connaissable de Bourbon,” by Rembrandt, sold by Lady Ailesbury to Davis for £850 los. in 1881; É. Michel 1894, vol. 1, p. 303, vol. 2, p. 243, as “no doubt a portrait of some friend of the artist’s,” compares the figure’s pose with that of Banning Cocq in The Night Watch, and reports that the work was bought at the Secrétan sale by “Mr. Thieme [sic],” who lent it to the Exhibition of Old Masters held at Berlin in 1890 (however, the picture is not listed in the catalogue of the Secrétan sale); Sedelmeyer Gallery 1898, pp. 150, 151 (ill.), no. 154, as engraved by Ch. Koepping, and as in the collection of “Lady Ailesbury” in 1881 and now owned by Adolph Thiem, San Remo; Bell 1899, pp. 77, 171, as “fancifully named Nameable of Bourbon,” and erroneously as in the collection of Alfred Thiem, Leipzig; Bode 1897-1906, vol. 4 (1900), p. 154, no. 271, pl. 271, as “A Man in a Steel Gorget and a Wide Cap with Outstretched Hand,” in the Thiem collection, San Remo, formerly in Berlin, considers the identification of the sitter as the Connaissable de Bourbon “wholly unaccountable,” and lists exhibitions inaccurately; A. Rosen-berg 1906, pp. 213 (ill.), 400, as “Portrait of a Man,” by Rembrandt, 1644; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 273 (ill.), 358, repeats A. Rosenberg 1906; Altmann Collection 1914, p. 30, no. 20, as “Man with a Steel Gorget,” reports that Thiem paid FF 25,000 for the picture in 1889; Schmidt-Degener 1914, pp. 231-23 (ill.), as a presumed portrait of Constantijn Huygens, in the “B. Altmann” collection, New York; Altmann Collection 1915, p. 79, mentioned as one of Altmann’s first “Old Masters”; Hofstede de Groot 1907-27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 356, no. 758, as “A Man with a Steel Gorget and a Broad Hat,” lists basic literature and provenance; A. Burroughs 1923, p. 272, questions the attribution to Rembrandt, given that “the sense of inherent conviction, to which ‘positive’ attributions owe their existence, seems lacking”; Meldrum 1923, p. 105, pl. CCXXI, as “Portrait of a Man” by Rembrandt; Monod 1923, p. 304, discovers in this painting by Rembrandt, which repeats a gesture from The Night Watch, “la matutine, le calme dans la contemplation et le rêve, comme dans la possession de la réalité solide”; Van Dyke 1924, pp. 195-60, as by an unknown pupil of Rembrandt; Valentin 1931, unpaged, no. 87, pl. 87, as by Rembrandt, “Portrait of Constantijn Huygens (!),” but as “Man with a Steel Gorget” in the caption; Bredius 1935, p. 10, no. 234, pl. 234, as “Mann mit Halberste,” by Rembrandt, 1644, Slave 1953, p. 12 n. 2, cited as one of the Rembrandt paintings in which scholars have attempted to recognize Constantijn Huygens; K. Bauch 1966, p. 21, pl. 393, as by Rembrandt; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 186 (ill.), 367, no. 234, calls the painting an 18th-century imitation; Lecaldano 1969, p. 1 (ill.), includes the canvas among works of doubtful attribution; Haskell 1970, p. 262, as attributed to Rembrandt, purchased by Altmann in 1903, as one of the first two Dutch pictures still remaining in the collection; Bolten and Bolten-Reemt 1977, p. 190, no. 311 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Liedtke 1990, p. 49, fig. 26 (Altmann gallery view); Liedtke 1993, pp. 125-28, 139 n. 16, figs. 4, 5 (X-radiograph detail), as by a follower of Rembrandt about 1644-50, perhaps Gerbrand van den Eckhout, describes the condition and past treatments by conservators, and notes that the gesture recalls that of the captain in The Night Watch and of Johannes Sylvius in Rembrandt’s etching of 1646; Liedtke in New York 1995-96, vol. 2, pp. 23-103, 147, no. 26 (ill.), as by a follower of Rembrandt about 1645-50, reviews past attributions and considers one to Van den Eckhout; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 58, 114-15 (ill.), no. 26, figs. 131 (detail), 132, 133 (X-radiograph detail), laments the liberal use of varnish by Picchio, observes that the composition was not originally rounded at the top, and suggests an attribution to Govert Flinck; Ketelsen in Hamburg 2000-2001, vol. 2, pp. 33, 40 n. 149, associates the picture with a large group of portraits in the manner of Rembrandt; Scalien 2004, p. 375 n. 49, as doubted in A. Burroughs 1923; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 664-65, 672-73, reports that the first ground contains quartz, clay minerals, ilmenite, brown ochre, a little red ochre and chalk, resulting in a light yellowish brown color.


Ex Coll.: Rt. Hon. Admiral Lord Radstock, London (by 1822-
167. Man in Armor (Mars?)

Oil on canvas, 40¾ x 35¾ in. (101.9 x 90.3 cm)

The painting is slightly abraded throughout. Darkening and increasing transparency of the paint have resulted in a loss of form in nonreflective portions of the metal breastplate.

Purchase, 1871 71.84

There is a consensus among scholars that this canvas was painted by a follower of Rembrandt (not necessarily one of his pupils) during the 1650s. Karel van der Pluym (1625–1672), a second cousin of Rembrandt's, has occasionally been mentioned as the possible author, and the Museum catalogued the picture under his name from 1949 until 1995. Rather more rash was the change of title in 1954, from Portrait of a Man in Armor to Adriaen van Rijn in Armor; in reference to the artist's older brother, who in the past was discovered in an improbable number of Rembrandt-school pictures.1 In 1987, the present writer proposed the title now employed, which recognizes that some Dutch images of men in old-fashioned armor depict a local-looking Mars (as if the Roman god retired near the North Sea), while others are simply ironies depicting models with studio costumes and props. Given the scale of this painting, the watchful expression, the firm grip of the right hand, and perhaps the apparent loss of the left arm, it would appear that Mars (like Bellona, in Pl. 147) is indeed cast in a Dutch guise, in order to suggest that the new nation would always be prepared to defend itself.

From its acquisition in 1871 until 1949, the Museum’s Man in Armor was catalogued as by Arent de Gelder (1645–1727). But apart from a few pictures of the 1680s that feature vaguely similar faces, De Gelder never painted anything like this work, which in its frontal figure, shallow space, and contrasts of light and shadow recalls paintings by Rembrandt dating from the early to mid-1650s, as well as many Rembrandtesque pictures of the same period. In 1948, Valentin suggested that Carel Fabritius (1622–1654) was probably responsible, but in his exhibition of 1956, “Rembrandt and His Pupils,” he favored an attribution to Heyman Dullaert (1636–1684), a poet and mediocre artist who may have studied with Rembrandt about 1651–53.2 As noted by Valentin, Houboken (1721), supposedly on the authority of the painter’s niece, reported that a “War God Mars in shining Armor” by Dullaert was once sold in Amsterdam as a picture by Rembrandt.3 This is extremely weak evidence, considering that Mars and similar subjects were common in Rembrandt’s circle, and that an entirely different painting with the same theme by Dullaert may have existed.4

It was evidently Frits Lugt who, on a visit to New York in 1948, first suggested an attribution to Van der Pluym.5 The Museum’s subsequent attribution to that artist was tepidly supported by some critics, rejected by others, and passed over in silence by Henry Adams, whose 1984 article on Van der Pluym did not improve upon the information published by Bredius in 1931.6 Although he was a founding member of the Leiden painters’ guild in 1648, and served as its hoofdman (headman) and dean between 1652 and 1655, Van der Pluym did not pursue a career as a professional artist. His father held the evidently profitable office of municipal plumber and slate roofer. In 1661, Karel declined to pay dues to the painters’ guild, and from 1664 onward he sat on the City Council. It has been conjectured that Van der Pluym studied with Rembrandt from about 1645 to 1648, but this is not documented. However, they certainly were acquainted. Van der Pluym’s maternal grandfather was Cornelis van Zuytbroeck, Rembrandt’s uncle (his mother’s brother).7 And in a will dated 1662, Van der Pluym left the substantial sum of 3,000
guilders to each of Adriaen van Rijn's children, and the same amount to Rembrandt's son, Titus.8

An attribution of the Museum's picture to Van der Pluym seems possible when one compares An Old Scholar in His Studio (fig. 207), which is signed "Karel. van d . . . ?" and probably dates from about 1635-38.9 The handling of paint appears similar in the blotchy treatment of fur, the textured stroking of the beards, the modeling of hands, and so on, but the comparison is far from conclusive. By contrast, the Old Fish and Vegetable Seller, a large canvas (51 x 38¼ in. [129.5 x 98.5 cm]) said to be monogrammed “Cvdp” and dated 1648 (private collection, Sweden), and Old Scholar in His Study, a small panel (21¼ x 16½ in. [55 x 42 cm]) signed and dated “cvdPluym. 1643,3,” (initials in monogram; Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden), have essentially nothing to do with Rembrandt or with the Man in Armor.10 However, two canvases of comparable size, Heraclitus and Democritus (formerly J. Goudstikker, Amsterdam) and Old Man with Harness, Helmet, and Shield (“Mars”) (Collections of the Princes of Liechtenstein, Vaduz) are attributed plausibly to Van der Pluym and are consistent with the present picture in style and to some extent in their figure types.11 To these three paintings and the signed canvas in Chicago, Bikker adds as an attribution to Van der Pluym one of the most debated

Figure 207. Karel van der Pluym, An Old Scholar in His Studio, ca. 1635-38. Oil on canvas, 28 x 20 in. (71.1 x 50.8 cm). The Art Institute of Chicago, Bequest of Chester D. Tripp

Figure 208. Attributed to Karel van der Pluym, The Centurion Cornelius. Oil on canvas, 69¼ x 85¼ in. (176.5 x 216.2 cm). The Wallace Collection, London
pictures of the Rembrandt school, *The Centurion Cornelius*, in the Wallace Collection, London (fig. 208). He observes that "the loose, unstructured execution of the Metropolitan *Man in Armor*’s face is closely analogous to that of the soldier and the middle servant in *The Centurion Cornelius*: highlights, instead of defining form, appear to float freely above underlying darker passages." Bikker compares the rendering of drapery, hands, highlights, and other aspects of the London and New York pictures, and notes that they alone appear to share the pointed helmet with ear flaps, fur trim, brass studs, and engraving. Finally, he sees the "brother Adriaen type" in the Museum’s
painting and in the leftmost servant in the Wallace picture. Curiously, here is a case of Rembrandt's brother being associated with an artist who knew him and who lived in the same city. But whether he ever modeled for a picture is uncertain, and whether he was alive (he died in October 1652) when this one was painted is doubtful. To judge from works attributed to Van der Pluym and paintings by other occasional followers of Rembrandt, this picture probably dates from somewhat later, perhaps about 1655–58. As for the attribution, Van der Pluym may be described as the front-runner in a race entered by an unknown number of participants.

The breastplate (with an impressively expansive array of scratches and reflections) is North German or in that region's style, and would date from between about 1540 and about 1590. However, the marks at the top corners are products of the artist's imagination. The helmet is Italian, probably from the last quarter of the sixteenth century. The sword is Japanese. Stuart Pyhrr, the Museum's curator in charge, Department of Arms and Armor, feels that these trappings alone would suffice to give the figure a look of antiquity, and that even the sword would not speak against the identification of the figure as Mars or the suggestion of nationalistic sentiment. Pyhrr also supports Bikker's observation that the helmet here and the one in the Centurion Cornelius are based on the same actual model. If the attribution to Van der Pluym is correct, that helmet would probably have been found in his studio or elsewhere in Leiden, rather than in Rembrandt's workshop or another location in Amsterdam.

A weak copy of the painting was formerly in Schloss Wernigerode, Saxony-Anhalt, Germany.

1. On the Leiden miller Adriaen van Rijn (1597–1632) and his supposed appearance in paintings by Rembrandt and his pupils, see Leiden 2005–6, pp. 205–17. His features are unknown, and his presence in Amsterdam is unrecorded.

2. W. R. Valentiner, oral opinion, recorded at the Museum in 1946. See also Refs. (Raleigh 1956) and Exhibited.


4. Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 5, pp. 3440–41, lists various pictures of Mars by Rembrandt and followers. The most relevant paintings of the 1650s include: Rembrandt's own Man in Armor, dated 1655 (City Art Gallery and Museum, Glasgow); Ferdinand Bol (q.v.), Old Man in a Golden Helmet, about 1655–57 (Museum Narodowe, Warsaw; Blankert 1982, no. 75, pl. 83); Willem Drost (q.v.), Standing Man in Armor, about 1654–55 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel; Bikker 2005, no. 13); Barent Fabritius (q.v.), A Warrior (Mars?), dated 1657 or 1659 (location unknown; Pont 1958, no. 35, fig. 13); attributed to Carel Fabritius, Man in a Helmet (Groninger Museum, Groningen; C. Brown 1981, no. 3, pl. 1; The Hague–Schwerin 2004–5, no. 13); attributed to Karel van der Pluym, Old Man with Harness, Helm, and Shield ("Mars") (Collections of the Princes of Liechtenstein, Vaduz; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 4, no. 192b; Leiden 2005–6, no. 69, erroneously dated 1648); and unknown Rembrandt pupil, Man in a Golden Helmet (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin; Kelch et al. 1986; Leiden 2005–6, no. 70).

5. Notes on the back of an old photograph in the curatorial files include the remark, "FL suggests F. Bol or C.v.d. Pluym." A line next to the last name reads, "HW [curator Harry Wehle] 1948 thinks as near as anything yet."


8. Bredius 1931, p. 253. In H. Adams 1984, p. 433, the will is erroneously said to date from 1652. For the relevant extract, see Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 498.


14. Sumowski 1957–58, p. 271, fig. 97; see also Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 1, p. 653 (under no. 345), where the dimensions of the canvas are given as 28 x 21 1/2 inches (71 x 54 cm).

References: MMA 1872, no. 114; cites the painting as by "Aart" de Gelder, "Portrait of a Dutch Admiral," reports that the picture is "from the collection of Mr. W. Burger," and that it was "formerly sold as a Rembrandt, for 28,500 francs"; Kegel 1884, p. 461, mentioned in passing; Harck 1888, p. 75, as De Gelder; Bode 1891, p. 18, as by De Gelder; Lilienfeld 1914, pp. 71, 185, 204, no. 180, refers to the picture ("the so-called 'Admiral' ") as attributed to De Gelder, stresses that the author has not seen it, suggests that it could be an early work by that artist, but notes that Hofstede de Groot (oral opinion) considered it a pastiche; J. Allen and Gardner 1954, p. 78, as Adrian van Ryn in Armor, by Karel van der Pluym; Valentiner in Raleigh 1916, pp. 38, 116–17, no. 21a (ill.), as by Heyman Dullaert, dates the painting to about 1658, and considers it possibly identical with a picture of Mars by Dullaert, which Houbraken (1721) describes as "so much like a Rembrandt that it was sold under his name"; Sumowski 1957–58, p. 236, claims that the Man in a Golden Helmet in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Berlin (considered by the author to be by Rembrandt), served as a model for school works, and that an example is this Mars (variously attributed to Bol, Van der Pluym, and De Gelder), which may probably be connected with the picture by Dullaert that is known from documents; Schone 1973, p. 38, fig. 7, notes the tentative association with Dullaert in Sumowski 1957–58.
and says that the “missing” left arm was replaced by an artificial limb; Bætjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 144, as Adrian van Byn in Armour; by Karel van der Pluym; Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 3 (1980), p. 1243, notes that the picture, “merely because of the subject,” has been connected with Houbraken’s story about a work by Dullaert; Grimm 1982–83, pp. 249–50, fig. 18, considers the Berlin Man in a Golden Helmet more likely to be by Dullaert than is the “rather prosaic work on exhibit in New York” which has also been attributed to Van der Pluym; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 1, pp. 653, 657 (ill.), no. 345, describes the picture as a school work of the mid-1650s that is dependent on the Man in a Golden Helmet, and observes that the attribution to Dullaert can only be considered hypothetical given his “striking stylistic changes”; Kelch in Kelch et al. 1986, p. 22, fig. 15, notes that the picture has been connected with Houbraken’s reference to a painting by Dullaert; Foucart in Paris 1988–89, pp. 104 (ill.), 106, as by Dullaert, cites the picture in a brief account of works once said to represent Rembrandt’s brother Adriaen; Foucart in Caen–Paris 1990–91, p. 65, fig. 15, as by Dullaert, about 1666–69, one of a number of Rembrandt-school “personifications of Mars or not”; [C. Brown] in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, p. 261 (under no. 43), as by Dullaert, one of a number of similar subjects from the circle of Rembrandt; Bætjer 1995, p. 319, as Style of Rembrandt; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 112–15, 124, no. 31 (ill.), as by a follower of Rembrandt in the 1650s, reviews previous opinions, considers an attribution to Van der Pluym as no more than a possibility, and compares the subject of Bellona (see pl. 147); Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, p. 74, suggests that this picture and the Man in a Golden Helmet in Berlin are works by pupils, “probably prompted by Rembrandt’s Alexander the Great” (meaning A Man in Armour, in the City Art Gallery and Museum, Glasgow); Jowell 2003, pp. 93 n. 214, fig. 62, 94 n. 217, as probably owned by Thoré-Bürger; Bætjer 2004, pp. 169, 197, 210, no. 114 (ill.), fig. 55 (gallery view, 1940), clarifies the provenance; Bikker 2005, pp. 137–38, 159, 187 n. 24 (under no. 81), fig. 86b, considers the Rembrandt-school Centurion Cornelius and this picture to be possibly by the same artist, and suggests that both may be by Van der Pluym; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 664–65, 672–73, reports that the first ground contains quartz, clay minerals, ilmenite, brown ochre, a little red ochre, and chalk, resulting in a brown color. Blankert in Paris 2007, p. 97, fig. 54, considers Groen’s (2005) discovery of a quartz ground to suggest that the picture may have come from Rembrandt’s workshop.


Ex coll.: Probably Étienne-Joseph-Théophile Thoré (William Bürger), Paris (until d. 1869); [Léon Gauchez, Paris, with Alexis Febvre, Paris, until 1870, as by Aert (Arent) de Gelder, Portraits of a Dutch Admiral; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.84

168. Christ and the Woman of Samaria

Oil on wood, 25 × 19¼ in. (63.5 x 48.9 cm)
Inscribed (lower center, on step): Rembrandt. / F 1655.

The painting is well preserved. There are small flake losses on the woman’s sleeve above the elbow. The landscape has darkened with age, increasing the contrast between the dark and the light passages. Abrasion and significant fading of a red lake pigment have contributed to a diminishment in the modeling and color of Christ’s robe. X-radiography shows several alterations in the figures, and infrared reflectography reveals a dome-shaped building beneath the present tower. The gray passages in the sky at upper left are the result of pentimenti associated with these changes. The oak panel has been thinned to ¾ in. (.48 cm) and attached to a cradled oak panel ¾ in. (.32 cm) thick, and strips of wood ¾ in. wide were added to both sides.

Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1959 60.71.14

The authorship of this panel from the Timken collection was questioned the first time it was published, by Veth in a review of the Rembrandt exhibition held in Leiden in 1906. Veth proposed that the painting was begun by the master but finished by another hand, an idea echoed a hundred years later by Van de Wetering.1 Bredius, in 1907, considered the work overpainted at a later date, but accepted the attribution to Rembrandt as well as the authenticity of the signature and the date of 1655. The other leading experts of the early twentieth century—Bode, Hofstede de Groot, Rosenberg, and Valentin—followed suit; negative remarks were rare until Hamann (1948) described the composition as additive and obvious, and Sumowski (1957–58) concluded that the picture’s “compilation” of Rembrandt motifs could be regarded as proof of “student work.” Gerson (1968, 1969) strongly objected to this opinion, in subjective terms unexpectedly reminiscent of Valentin (1907, 1931) and Rosenberg (1939–40, 1948). Tümpel (1986, 1993) catalogued the picture as from
Rembrandt’s circle, an attribution that Slatkes (1992) reconciled with Gerson’s sentiment by maintaining that the work must have been begun by a pupil and then improved by the master. The dichotomy of critical opinion was reflected in the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition of 1995–96, when Von Sonnenburg insisted that the painting’s technique is “extremely rich and shows a great variety throughout, as is typical of Rembrandt,” whereas the present writer, subscribing to the majority view, assigned the panel to a pupil of the 1650s.²

In the discussion that follows, it is suggested that the picture was conceived and in good part executed by an unknown student of the early to mid-1650s, but that Rembrandt significantly improved several passages. Circumstantial support for this hypothesis is found in the 1656 inventory of Rembrandt’s possessions, which lists “een schilderij van een Samaritaan door Rembrandt geretoukeert” (a painting of a Samaritan retouched by Rembrandt).³

Although the painting is well preserved (see condition note above), later retouchings have occasionally been cited to explain perceived anomalies. Von Sonnenburg for example, excused the flat, stern, and “distinctly modern look” of the woman’s face as a restorer’s intervention, which “severely diminishes the original conception.”⁴ Twenty years earlier, however, conservator John Brealey and curator John Walsh concluded, on the basis of microscopic examination, that only the “woman’s mouth has some retouches, but evidently not enough to affect its shape (expression) appreciably.” In Christ’s face, they found no traces of restoration, except in the proper “right eye [which] has some retouches of black in the pupil. Strangely, the pupil, which appears to overlap the upper lid, is [mostly] original paint and lies very low in the [paint] strata.” Brealey and Walsh also reported that the picture’s overall “effect has been altered by darkening of the darks, eliminating value-contrasts and thereby the volumes of the background objects,” and that “a good deal of inpainting has been added in the background to darken the areas of thin brown that have become translucent. In general the paint is very well preserved, however.”⁵

In his estimate of the painting’s quality, Von Sonnenburg is more generous than most scholars have been. He finds “the most luminous transparency” in the blacks and browns of the landscape, and a “complex buildup of highlighted areas such as the well,” where the “applications of
semitransparent color and of more opaque paint . . . display an infinite variety of textures." Consistent with this praise is Von Sonnenburg's attribution to Rembrandt of two other versions of the subject, both inscribed with the master's name and (somewhat uncertain) dates of 1659. These well-known pictures are the smaller panel (19 x 16 1/4 in. [48.4 x 41 cm]) in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin, and the larger canvas (23 1/4 x 29 1/4 in. [60 x 75 cm]) in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg. Gerson admired the "Venetian spirit" of the same three paintings, but most specialists now group them together as works by students who were probably assigned the subject by Rembrandt (as in the case of the Head of Christ [Pl. 172] and similar studies). The Museum's picture is clearly superior to the paintings in Berlin and Saint Petersburg, which appear to be by two other artists. There are some obvious similarities in execution between the New York and Berlin panels, but firsthand comparison of them in 2006 did not even raise the question of whether they might be by the same hand. Although the date on the Berlin picture has been read as 1659 (but by Bredius, Gerson, and others as 1653), it may have been painted at about the same time as the panel in New York, which bears a plausible (and seemingly original) date of 1659. Both compositions are inspired to some extent by Rembrandt's etching of the subject dated 1634 (fig. 209), whereas the Saint Petersburg canvas, apparently dated 1659, owes more to Rembrandt's broad etching of about 1637–38. The Hermitage picture's poor condition does not prevent an assessment of it as a somewhat amateurish exercise.

Changes made in the course of work on the Museum's picture have been variously interpreted. Von Sonnenburg regarded the fact that most of the architecture in the left background was added on top of sky and (apparently) lower buildings, and that Christ's right sleeve, the masonry below his left leg, and the step in front of the Apostles were modified, as normal signs of the master searching for solutions. Van de Watering, by contrast, considers the radiographic evidence to reveal a complicated genesis from an initial composition by Rembrandt to a finished painting almost entirely executed by a pupil. Thus, the bare feet of Christ that are visible in the X-radiograph (fig. 210) are thought to have been indicated generally by Rembrandt but found too challenging by his collaborator; a hypothesis that Van de Watering supports by observing that the woman's slippered feet do not appear to have been painted by a pupil but must be by Rembrandt himself.

It would be much more consistent with what is known about Rembrandt's relationship to his pupils (whose work he often corrected) and with the physical evidence to assume that an artist-in-training designed and painted most of the present composition, which was then improved by the master in some passages. The area to the left of the ungainly towers was at one stage scraped down to the wood. This is not the sort of revision one finds in autograph works by Rembrandt, to say nothing of a student departing from the master's idea. The original placement of a domed building in the background (see condition note) and the low position of the apostles appear to have derived from Rembrandt's etching of 1634 (fig. 209), where however the spatial effect is more successful, given the emphatic recession from left to right and the oblique arrangement of the ruined building in the foreground. The etching also reveals a possible source for the idea of raising one of Christ's bare feet onto a step (a low step was painted out of the Museum's picture; see fig. 210).

While the present writer and Van de Watering agree on many aspects of the picture's execution, we differ in the interpretation of changes made in the course of work. These generally impoverish the "conception" of the picture, in Van de Watering's view. Thus, the changes made to the apostles, the step in front of them, the bottom of Christ's robe, the wall behind the woman, and the architecture in the left background are evidently (to judge from Van de Watering's argument as a whole) considered to weaken the design. The picture's content—specifically, the moment in the story that might be represented—is left unexplained by Van de Watering, which is not surprising since the artist's intention is unclear. Ambiguous narrative would not be expected if the composition had been conceived by Rembrandt in the first place. Furthermore, a number of pentimenti, such as the extension of Christ's right arm, the clustering of apostles under it, the covering of his (presumably distracting) feet, and perhaps some modification of the wall to the right, were evidently intended to give the design greater concentration, with a stronger focus on Christ's face and gesture. The impression of a dialogue was probably strengthened, although it remains weaker than in the face-to-face exchange seen in Rembrandt's etching of twenty years earlier.

Whether or not particular passages of painting are skillful, or characteristic of Rembrandt, will never be a matter of complete agreement. Van de Watering is quite critical of Christ's robe, with its zigzag pattern of folds in the
right sleeve and unsuccessful suggestion of recession from the knees to the waist. He is also dissatisfied with the faces of the main figures, seeing in the “modern look” of the woman’s head a simple failure of modeling that is original and consistent with the handling in other areas. Even the apostle to the far left (presumably Peter), who holds a staff and gestures with his other hand, is considered clumsy in execution, whereas the present writer is impressed by the dramatic and logical way light and shadow fall across his body. The other apostles are sketchier but not inferior.

Conservator Dorothy Mahon considers the apostles, the entire figure of Christ, the woman’s skirt (as well as her feet), the vegetation, the middle ground (where two small figures move up a hill), and all the masonry to the right to be consistent in handling and characteristic of Rembrandt. She draws attention to the light passage on the wall to the right, which effectively sets off the woman’s contour (a large saucer-shaped hat is tied around her hips), much as the impasto touches on the side of the fountain enhance the impression of rounded form. In the present writer’s opinion, Rembrandt may have added strategic highlights, shadows, and textures in these areas, and perhaps in parts of the foliage. In addition, the woman’s pearl earring is beautifully rendered, on top of an awkward shadow. Mahon nevertheless resists the suggestion of two hands.

On balance, the picture’s most accomplished features do not outweigh its shortcomings. Both the main figures lack volume in their torsos and heads, and in their proportions reveal little thought for anatomy. Christ seems to have suffered a stroke on his left side but remains an imposing figure, as would be clarified (along with whatever he sits on) if he stretched to full height and stood next to the woman. The woman’s body (apart from the muscular forearm) is hard to imagine on the basis of her bulky clothes; the heavy skirt is bound like a bale of cotton and made no less monolithic by the apron slashing at an angle to her feet. In substance and posture, she bears a resemblance to seventeenth-century dolls, except for her annoyed expression. One might imagine that Christ (to judge from his gesture and inattentiveness to Jacob’s well) is telling her that the drinking was better at the last watering hole.

Rembrandt’s purpose in having students treat narrative themes, and in particular biblical stories, was to teach them the importance of effective composition, poses, gestures, and expressions. From Rembrandt’s early etching, the painter of this picture has retained some of the focus on the protagonists and the responsive pose of the woman, with head tilted forward and hand set down firmly on the well. But Christ’s pose has lost its intensity, as if the objective (or the source) was courtly contrapposto rather than gestures that emphasize the meaning of his words.

There must have been a ready market for images of Christ and the Woman of Samaria, to judge from the numerous prints and comparatively minor paintings that are either known or recorded in seventeenth-century inventories. The subject flourished in the late 1500s and early 1600s both in Italy and in the Netherlands, partly because of its association with baptism. The story is told only in John 4. On the way from Judea to Galilee, Jesus passes through Samaria, where he pauses at a well and asks a woman for water. She questions him, observing that “the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.” Jesus answers that if the woman knew to whom she spoke, she would ask him for “living water,” for “whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again: But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.” The woman asks him for water, but Jesus tells her to call her husband. “I have no husband,” she says. And Jesus replies, “Thou hast well said,” reminding the stranger that she has had five husbands and is not married to the man with whom she now keeps company. “Sir,” she answers, “I perceive that thou art a prophet. Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.” And Jesus responds, telling her that “the hour cometh, and now is” when true worshipers shall worship “neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem” but shall worship “the Father in spirit and in truth.” The woman sees that she is speaking to the Messiah, of whom she has heard. And Jesus confirms, “I that speak unto thee am he.” At that moment, the Apostles return from the city, and marvel at what they have just heard.

The painter of the Museum’s picture appears to conflate the time of the apostles’ return with the moment that Christ refers to the woman’s “husband,” or to places of worship. The apostles, as well as the woman, respond to Jesus’ words. But in this staging, as Bredius (1907) observed, the Samaritan’s part is overlaid. On the basis of this impressive but immature work, it is hard to envision the last part of the story, when the woman goes into the city and asks of the people, “Is not this the Christ?”
In conclusion, the Timken panel must be rejected as an autograph work by Rembrandt for several reasons. If one compares such paintings as the *Aristotle*, of 1632 (Pl. 151), or the *Bathsheba*, of 1644 (see fig. 162), this history picture, dated 1655, seems far too inferior in conception and execution to be by the same hand. The possible rejoinder that Rembrandt (whether as inventor or executor) had no intention of rising to the level of his great history paintings in this small and minor work draws attention to the fact that there are no comparable paintings certainly by Rembrandt during the 1650s. However, the picture is closely related to the student works in Berlin and Saint Petersburg, and like them depends on a Rembrandt etching. Finally, there is the reference in Rembrandt’s inventory of 1656 to a painting of this subject that was “retouched by Rembrandt” (the description is almost certainly the master’s own). It seems likely that the work in question is the Museum’s picture, or was a similar painting that no longer survives.

1. Van de Wetering (2005, 2006; see Refs.), whose hypothesis differs in that he suggests such a collaboration was intended from the outset. All the names and dates in this paragraph refer to published opinions, which are briefly summarized under References below. Oral opinions of visitors to the Museum include those of Daan Cevad (1966; “studio work, especially in the background”), A. B. de Vries (1971; found the sky “a little disappointing”), Julius Held (1989; “must be by a pupil, Barent Fabritius or someone”), and, speaking for the Rembrandt Research Project, Josua Bruyn (1976; “they don’t believe this is by Rembrandt”).

2. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, pp. 131–4, no. 13. Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 333 (under doc. 1665/12), no. 33. The document was overlooked during preparation of the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition, and to the present writer’s knowledge was first connected with the Timken panel in Liedtke 2004b, p. 57. The reference to “a painting of a Samaritan” in a Dutch inventory of the period would have been routine shorthand for a representation of Christ and the Woman of Samaria. A rare instance of the Samaritan woman depicted alone appears to be found in a panel attributed to Nicolaes Maes (q.v.) and dated to the early 1650s (Russell collection, Amsterdam; Kempel 2000, p. 316, no. 19, fig. 6).

3. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 61. Ibid., p. 64, fig. 82, a detail of the woman’s head and torso, is said to illustrate that the face “is almost entirely repainted,” and that the shirt, especially in the sleeve, shows heavy brushstrokes of a later repaint. [The woman’s] hand and forearm are also reworked.

4. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 61. Ibid., p. 64, fig. 82, a detail of the woman’s head and torso, is said to illustrate that the face “is almost entirely repainted,” and that the shirt, especially in the sleeve, shows heavy brushstrokes of a later repaint. [The woman’s] hand and forearm are also reworked.

5. J. Walsh, handwritten report dated April 19, 1976, in the curatorial files. Von Sonnenburg’s conclusion that the woman’s face was overpainted at a later date is rejected in the entry on the Timken panel in the Rembrandt Research Project’s forthcoming volume 5 (a draft dated January 3, 2007, was kindly sent to the present writer). Van de Wetering and other members of the Rembrandt Research Project studied the painting (with the help of infrared photographs, X-radiographs, and a stereomicroscope) in the Museum’s conservation studio in May 1991 and November 1991.


7. Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 150–1, nos. 588, 589, 592a. Apart from Von Sonnenburg, G. Schwartz (1985, p. 322, figs. 370–72) was among the last scholars to publish all three pictures as by or attributed to Rembrandt. They are rejected by C. Timpel (1986, 1993, nos. A24, A11, A3) and more later critics. For the Berlin painting, see Kleinert in Berlin 2006, pp. 364–65, no. 61 as “Rembrandt Workshop”.

8. To judge from the comments of several Rembrandt scholars who were at the Berlin exhibition during the symposium of November 4–6, 2006 (see Berlin 2006, nos. 60, 61).

9. According to Walsh and Bresleby in 1976 (see note 5 above), the inscription on the Museum’s picture, which they describe as “elegant and neat, belongs to the original paint layer.” In the Rembrandt Research Project entry of 2007 (see note 3), the inscription is described as “uncertain” in execution and untrustworthy. The present writer agrees. The date on the Berlin panel is read as 1655 (in Bredius 1931, no. 588, and is not questioned by Gerson in Bredius 1969). However, the date is read as “[1]69” in Berlin 2006, no. 61.

10. As noted by Linnik in Loewinson-Lessing 1971, unpaged, no. 23, where the later etching is illustrated and the signature (and date, presumably) on the Saint Petersburg canvas is said to be “authentic, though restored at a later date.” Kleinert in Berlin 2006, p. 364, compares the Berlin panel with the etching of 1654. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 102, figs. 130–34, reproduces the three paintings and the two etchings on one page. On the etchings, see Ackley’s discussion in Boston–Chicago 2003–4, pp. 291–92, nos. 202, 203.

11. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 101, fig. 128, where the X-radiograph is discussed in the caption. Conservator Dorothy Mahon has pointed out in X-radiographs that Christ’s gesturing hand was extended (his raised arm was originally about one hand shorter), his left forearm was originally raised to waist level (with the elbow evidently resting on the well), and the Apostles were a head shorter in an earlier phase of work.

12. Van de Wetering in Berlin 2006, p. 362. The question is treated in greater detail in the Rembrandt Research Project entry of 2007 (see note 3 above). While that discussion includes numerous helpful observations concerning quality and modifications made to motifs in the course of work, the conclusions ultimately drawn seem to the present writer based not only on objective analyses of technical and stylistic evidence but also on a priori hypotheses. The pattern of argument is familiar from other entries written by the Rembrandt Research Project. In this case, it is assumed that on a number of occasions Rembrandt began minor paintings with the intention of leaving the execution (including some alterations in design) largely to pupils or assistants (compare ibid., nos. 48, 49). In other words, a picture’s level of quality declined in the course of work.
13. The scraping was noted by Breailey and reported by Walsh (see note 3 above).

14. Rembrandt Research Project entry of 2007 (see note 5 above), under “Comments,” in a rebuttal of the argument presented in Slatkes 1993 (see Refs.).


16. The writer is grateful to Dorothy Mahon for several illuminating conversations in front of the painting, which were clarified by X-radiographs, microscopic examination, and reviews of earlier reports. Her view of the picture’s authorship is stated in a memo dated December 20, 2006.

17. Comparison with Italian antecedents, such as Moretto di Brescia’s painting of the subject, of about 1520 (Accademia Carrara, Bergamo; New York 1905–06, vol. 1, p. 103, fig. 129), and Agostino Carracci’s engraving of about 1580 after a print of 1568 by Cornelis Cort (Rembrandt Research Project entry dated 2007; see note 5 above) underscore the genrily Renaissance look of Christ in the Timken picture and also how it fails to suggest a dramatic exchange between the Messiah and his conversant. Van de Watering (in the forthcoming show) also notes an intriguing similarity between the gesturing Christ in the present painting and the female figure in Joseph Accused by Potiphar’s Wife, dated 1655 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), by a member of Rembrandt’s workshop (Wheelock 1995a, pp. 314–21; Berlin 2006, no. 61).

18. Fock 1990, p. 20, reports that the subject is one of the most frequently cited New Testament themes in Leiden inventories of the seventeenth century. Von Sonnenberg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, pp. 77, 193, figs. 100, 101, 135–38, illustrates some Rembrandtschool drawings of the subject and two paintings attributed to Gerbrand van den Eekhout (q.v.). The one in a private collection (fig. 100) is an anonymous copy after Rembrandt’s etching. The other (fig. 101) was made during the first half of the 1640s and is now in the Mauritshuis, The Hague. Numerous Rembrandtschool drawings of the subject are known. For a drawing by Maes in the 1650s, see Plomp 1997, p. 233, no. 257, and compare Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 8, no. 1942. Schama 1999, p. 639, mentions a “Samaritan’s Well” with plaster figures in an Amsterdam fairground begun during the late 1630s.


21. A possible exception (depending on what is considered “comparable”) is Rembrandt’s Philemon and Basiotis, dated 1658 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; Wheelock 1995a, pp. 247–52). Despite its poor state of preservation, the small panel is clearly a much superior work.

References: J. Veth 1906b, p. 90 (ill. opp. p. 89), suggests that this recently discovered picture might have been left unfinished by Rembrandt and was perhaps completed by another hand, and finds a distracting variety of colors in the background, perhaps as a result of damage; Bredius 1969, unpaged, pl. 5, considers the woman as “almost playing the main role,” and regrets that the work is much overpainted; Valentin 1907, pp. 233, 234, 236, fig. 11, as by Rembrandt in 1655, revealing Venetian influence; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 379–80 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1655; Bredius 1912a, pp. 197–98, notes that a Rembrandt painting listed in the 1678 estate inventory of Herman Becker could be identical with this “beautiful piece” or with either the Berlin or Saint Petersburg picture of the same subject; Bode 1914, p. 4, no. 25 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, describes the subject of the painting, which was then in the Kappel collection; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 80–81, no. 101, as in the Kappel collection, lists earlier owners, and describes the composition; W. Martin 1918, fig. 106 (Kappel gallery view); Errera 1920–21, p. 283, listed as a work of 1655; Meldrum 1923, p. 201, pl. ccxxcv; Weinsch 1926, pp. 422, 460, in this “not very important piece” by Rembrandt, detects Italian influence, especially in the figure of Christ; Valentin 1910b (ill. following p. 4), as by Rembrandt, in the Timken collection; Valentin 1931, unpaged, no. 159, pl. 119, describes the picture as “perhaps the most beautiful” of Rembrandt’s interpretations of the subject; Benesch 1935b, p. 53, comments on the restful composition; Bredius 1935, pp. 25, no. 580, pl. 589, as by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1655; J. Rosenberg 1939–40, fig. 5 (detail of the woman), finds good examples of Rembrandt’s technique in “the dragged impasto, the fusion of the tones, and the application of interrupted areas of color”; H. van Gelder 1948b, pp. 45 (ill.), 48–49, feels that the landscape functions not merely as a backdrop but as a continuous space throughout the picture; Flamm 1948, pp. 482–83, fig. 260, compares the Berlin and Saint Petersburg pictures of the same subject, and criticizes the composition, with Christ appearing to point toward the background and isolated motifs such as the trees and the tower being too prominent, and the whole seeming “too loud” and obvious; J. Rosenberg 1948, vol. 1, p. 203, vol. 3, fig. 263 (detail), considers the technique characteristic of Rembrandt; Reddick 1956, p. 18, fig. 5 (detail), sees the influence of Michelangelo in the female figure; Rotermund 1956, pp. 224–35, discusses the facial type of Christ; Benesch 1954–57, vol. 5 (1972), p. 281 (under no. 978), compares a drawing in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; Sumowski 1957–58, p. 231, calls the work a compilation by a student; MMA Bulletin, n.s., 19, no. 2 (October 1960), p. 34 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, celebrates the picture’s bequest by offering a ponderous description of its subject; K. Bauch 1966, p. 6, no. 87, pl. 87, as by Rembrandt, who is said to have revised the tower in the course of work, making it much taller; Havercamp-Begemann 1966, col. 528, mentioned, as by Rembrandt; Gerson 1968, pp. 108, 110, 362 (ill.), 499, nos. 273, as “the Rembrandt painting that most clearly embodies the Venetian spirit,” admires its passages of “unrealistic abstract” painting, and rejects Sumowski’s opinion (1957–58); Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 496 (ill.), 610, no. 589, as by Rembrandt; a powerful interpretation of the subject; Lecaldano 1969, p. 117, no. 360 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Rifkin 1969, p. 32, questions the figures in the background, but feels that in the main figures the “precision of color modeling and sure handling of drapery is not student work”; Linnik in Loevinson-Lessing 1971, unpaged (under no. 23), compares the painting of the same subject in Saint Petersburg, and suggests that in the New York picture Christ gestures toward “the building on the hill,” thus illustrating the biblical passage, “Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father”; Mayor 1979, p. 18 (ill. opp. p. 19), describes the subject and Rembrandt’s interpretation; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 324, lists the painting as a work by Rembrandt.
dated 1655; D. Sutton 1979, pp. 373–74, 382 n. 18, fig. 23, discusses Kappel's purchase of the picture from Douglas; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 149, as by Rembrandt; Lowenthal 1981, p. 10, pl. 7, as "an example of Rembrandt's maturity" and his use of continuous narrative; Tokyo 1982, unpaged, introduction and (under no. 8), fig. 18, compares the Saint Petersburg picture; G. Schwartz 1985, p. 412, fig. 372, as by Rembrandt; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 357 (ill.), 421, no. A13, as from the circle of Rembrandt; C. Brown in Yokohama–Fukuoka–Kyōto 1986–87, pp. 156, 154, no. 9, as by Rembrandt, compares The Tribute Money, an alleged Rembrandt of 1655; Alpers 1988, p. 71, as among works "only marginally related to Rembrandt's hand"; C. Schneider 1990, p. 235 n. 102, considers the attribution to Rembrandt doubtful, Cabanne 1991, p. 15, as by Rembrandt; Slätke 1992, p. 128, no. 65 (ill.), as by a pupil and retouched by Rembrandt, considers the inscription doubtful, and the composition derived in various ways from the painting of the same subject in Berlin; Liedtke 1993, pp. 156–57, fig. 10, agrees with van de Wetering (oral opinion) that the picture is probably by a Rembrandt pupil of the 1650s, and sees similarities with The Good Samaritan (Louvre, Paris), recently attributed to Constantijn van Rensse (1626–1680); C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 357 (ill.), 424, no. A13, as from the "Rembrandt Circle"; misses the date in the inscription as 1665, and mentions Gerson's defense of the picture (in Bredius 1959); Sumowski 1985–94, vol. 6 (1994), p. 3324, 3325 n. 62, 3328 (ill.), as tentatively ascribed to Constantijn van Rensse, but considers the similarities to his work insufficient to support the attribution; Baetjer 1995, p. 318, as attributed to Rembrandt; Liedtke in New York 1991–96, vol. 2, pp. 19, 74–76, no. 14 (ill.), as by a Rembrandt follower of the 1650s, possibly Constantijn van Rensse (but quite uncertain), and as an example of the kind of theme the master assigned to his pupils; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 14, 28, 31, 61, 64, 100–104, no. 14 (ill.), figs. 81, 130, 82 (detail), 128 (X-radiograph), defends the attribution to Rembrandt, discusses the condition, and compares versions of the subject by Rembrandt (according to Von Sonnenburg), attributed to Rembrandt, or by artists in his circle; Brockhoff and Franken 1997, pp. 77–78, in a review of New York 1995–96, compares Von Sonnenburg's categorical declarations in favor of Rembrandt's authorship with Liedtke's discussion of the picture's weaknesses and borrowings; Krempp 2000, p. 123 n. 27, mentions the picture in connection with Nicolaas Maes's Samaritan Woman at the Well, of about 1655 (Willem Russell, Amsterdam); Zell 2002, pp. 146–47, 235 n. 54, fig. 97, as probably not a Rembrandt composition, but one of three "adaptations of his reflections on this biblical theme," considers which moment of the story is depicted; Bisanz–Prakken in Vienna 2004, pp. 286–87, no. 133 (ill.), as by a Rembrandt pupil of the late 1650s, reviews recent critical opinions; Liedtke 2004b, p. 57, fig. 5, suggests that no. 33 in the 1650 inventory of Rembrandt's possessions, "a painting of the Samaritan, retouched by Rembrandt?," could be the Museum's picture "or a similar student work"; Klein in Corpus 2005, p. 698, reports that the wood used for the panel is oak and that it cannot be dated by dendrochronological analysis; Van de Wetering in ibid., p. 265, cites the picture among a few works that the author thinks were begun by Rembrandt but “finished by another hand in the 1650’s (by painting over them more or less completely)"; P. Sutton in Washington–Los Angeles 2005, p. 137 n. 8 (under no. 12), compares Christ's "reddish-blonde" hair in this work, "a painting by one of Rembrandt's followers," with the hair in Corbis with a Staff (Pl. 176 here); Van de Wetering in Berlin 2006, pp. 362–65, no. 60, and 364 n. 1 (under no. 60), as by "Rembrandt and Workshop" (but described in the text as one of a few works by Rembrandt pupils done in his studio in the mid-1650s), analyzes the supposedly complicated development of the composition, and suggests that Rembrandt started the picture with the intention of leaving its completion to a pupil, whose execution covers everything that the master did except in the woman's left foot; Van de Wetering in Van de Wetering et al. 2006, p. 54, fig. 27, considers the painting to have been begun by Rembrandt and finished by a pupil.


2. According to Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6, p. 80 (under no. 101), which cannot be verified.
169. Old Woman Cutting Her Nails

Oil on canvas, 49⅝ x 40⅝ in. (126.1 x 103.9 cm)
Inscribed (lower left): Rembrandt/1648

The painting is in good condition, although there are small areas of abrasion distributed throughout the figure, table, and fabric at lower left. The face is marred where many small areas of the dark underlayer are revealed. In the hands, abrasion to the thinly painted shadows exposes the crowns of the canvas weave.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.609

This large canvas in the Altman Collection was once celebrated as a mature work by Rembrandt, in which the master (not unlike Courbet or Millet) treated humble subject matter “as if to show what an ideal and artistic effect might be achieved thereby” (according to Bode in 1901; see Refs.). In the 1920s, comparisons with Michelangelo’s Sibyls on the Sistine Ceiling became almost routine. When John Van Dyke, in 1923, described the picture as a weak work by Nicolaes Maes (q.v.), the outcry went beyond the limits to which he had quickly grown accustomed.1 Today the painting’s authorship is still debated, but within the strict parameters of Maes’s immediate circle in Dordrecht during the 1650s. As discussed below, the most plausible attribution is to Maes’s colleague Abraham van Dijck (ca. 1632–1680), who about 1655–60 painted a number of pictures of solitary old women in domestic settings inspired by those of Maes.

In 1664, the painting was engraved in mezzotint by Johann Gottfried Haid (1710–1776), and published in London with the title “Rembrandt’s Mother,” and the inscription “From the Original Picture painted by Rembrandt. In the Possession of Mr. Ingham Foster.”2 Smith (1836) knew the composition only from the print but did not adopt its title, which has never been employed in the literature. The attribution to Rembrandt and an inscription read as “Rembrandt f. 1658” were accepted by scholars beginning in 1893 with Émile Michel (who was evidently the first specialist to see the painting itself) and effectively ending with W. R. Valentiner in 1931.3 Bredius excluded the work from his standard catalogue of 1935. Visiting the Museum that same year, F. Schmidt-Degener told curator Harry Wehle that the picture was by Van Dijck, and that one should compare the signed Old Man Asleep in the Mauritshuis, The Hague.4 The connoisseur Frits Lugt, viewing the work in December 1941, suggested Van Dijck and Karel van der Pluym (1625–1672) as possible authors. In the same period, Wilhelm Martin and Jakob Rosenberg still considered the painting to be by Rembrandt, but no serious critic seconded their opinion after the war.5

The occasional reference to Van der Pluym is not unexpected (see the discussion under Man in Armor (1637); Pl. 167), but the attribution has never been supported by anything more than passing allusions to vaguely analogous works, and may be dismissed out of hand.6 A slightly more substantial argument has been made for Maes, beginning not with Van Dyke in the 1920s but with Josua Bruyn in the 1980s. In 1972, Bruyn doubted that the picture originated in Rembrandt’s circle or even his century,7 but in 1988 (see Refs.), he rejected Sumowski’s suggestion of Van der Pluym in favor of Maes. The sole basis for this attribution was Sumowski’s misinformation that a somewhat similar canvas in Kassel, The Apostle Thomas (fig. 211), was originally signed and dated “N. Maes A 1656.”8 The discovery was surprising, Bruyn observed, given that in 1656 Maes was not painting such “pathetic” figures but rather “uncomplicated representations of old women and mothers with children.” However, if one looks about for works that are more comparable, with dramatic contrasts of light and shadow and a similar palette, one finds as “a first candidate” the Old Woman Cutting Her Nails.9 Bruyn later conceded that there is no evidence of a Maes signature having once been on The Apostle Thomas, and allowed that Bernhard Schnackenburg, in the catalogue of the exhibition “Rembrandt: The Master and His Workshop” (1991–92), emphasized the stylistic differences between the pictures in New York and Kassel.10 Schnackenburg’s conclusion was not, as one would expect, that the religious and domestic subjects were painted by different followers of Rembrandt, but that they came from separate phases of Maes’s career. The comparatively “naive” qualities of the New York picture are said to be “more easily explained if one imagined that the painting were the work of an artist aged about 16,” that is, Maes as a beginning pupil (about 1650) whose “type of picture, and of face [in the present painting], anticipate [!] the individual figures of old women from the artist’s best period” (for example, fig. 213).11

That the subject and style of the Old Woman Cutting Her Nails might have been derived from independent works
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by Maes is not considered by Schnackenburg, nor does he mention Van Diick.

In an unpublished report on the Altman picture, dated February 16, 1968, Museum conservator Hubert von Sonnenburg describes Maes as “the main source of works of this subject” and concludes that “as of now it is not possible to attribute this work convincingly to any particular artist, such as Abraham van Diick as has been suggested verbally by visiting scholars.” Years later, in the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition of 1995–96, Von Sonnenburg assigned the painting to a “Follower of Rembrandt (Nicolaes Maes?)” and observed that, “with respect to its lack of modulation, the technique is quite comparable” to that of Maes, to whom he also attributed The Apostle Thomas. “It is apparent that the handling of the considerably abraded face of the apostle is much smoother than that of the old woman’s face. Too little is known about the early work of Maes, however, to dismiss his authorship of the present picture.”

On the contrary, the evidence of Maes’s earliest known dated work, Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael, of 1653 (Pl. 108), and of pictures convincingly placed in the same period, such as The Sacrifice of Isaac (private collection) and Christ Blessing the Children (National Gallery, London), both dating from about 1653, suggests clearly enough that he did not paint Old Woman Cutting Her Nails two or three years earlier in Rembrandt’s studio. The representation of similar subjects on a large scale (as in fig. 213) was introduced by Maes in Dordrecht about 1655, and the theme, with its “moralizing character” (discussed below), “has no direct prototype in Rembrandt’s paintings or in those of his other pupils and followers from the late 1640s and early 1650s, when Maes was in Amsterdam.” Arthur Wheelock underscores this indisputable statement by observing that Maes married a preacher’s widow in January 1654, and that the city of Dordrecht, with its strong Calvinist tradition, may have provided a “ready market” for works of this kind. Be that as it may, genre paintings of this type, style, and scale were essentially a Dordrecht phenomenon dating from about 1655 to the early 1660s.

The two leading scholars of Maes’s work, William Robinson and Léon Kremfel, find no place in his oeuvre for the Altman picture (Robinson also doubts The Apostle Thomas). Several scholars, by contrast, have (like Schmidt-Degener) independently suggested that the painting is by Van Diick. Leonard Slatkes (1973) defended this attribution by drawing attention to “the ‘dry’ surface, the palette, and the often blurry treatment of drapery and fur” one finds in the artist’s work. Horst Gerson (1976) felt that the execution was like Van Diick’s, but on a larger scale than usual. Curator John Walsh (1977) tended to agree that the picture “may be an unusually ambitious work by Abraham van Diick.” In a letter of 1992 to Sumowski, who had tentatively assigned the picture to Van der Pluyjn, the present writer described it as “absolutely consistent with similar subjects by Abraham van Diick even if they are generally on a smaller scale.” This overstatement was answered with another. “You have found the final solution: not by Karel van der Pluyjn, as I thought . . . not the early Maes, as it is called lately, but actually Abraham van Diick!” Arguments in favor of this conclusion were published in 1993 and 1994. In recent years, scholars who have dealt with similar Rembrandt-school problems have supported this attribution.

In 1704, Hugo van Diick, a Dordrecht notary, recorded “two large portraits of him the testator and his late first wife by his brother Abraham van Diick and by Nicolaes
Maes. When "Abram van Dijck, bachelor painter," was buried in Dordrecht on August 27, 1680, his address was given as the Steegoversloot, the street on which Maes owned a house (see Maes’s biography above). On the basis of style, scholars have conjectured that Van Dijck studied with Rembrandt about 1650. However, he could just as well have absorbed his most Rembrandtesque concepts from Maes, who was back in Dordrecht by 1653, or from Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.), who worked there between 1648 and May 1651. Another Dordrecht painter, Cornelis Bisschop, is recorded as a pupil of Ferdinand Bol (q.q.v.), which must have been during the second half of the 1640s in Amsterdam. By 1653, Bisschop had settled in Dordrecht, where he was strongly influenced by Maes. A large painting of a seated old woman with a Bible (formerly Spencer collection, Althorp), broadly comparable in style to the Altman picture, is recorded as signed and dated “C. Bissch . . . 165,” and a similar picture, in the Kunsthalle, Hamburg, has been attributed to both Bisschop and Van Dijck. The comparison with Bisschop underscores the point that paintings like Old Woman...
Cutting Her Nails come from the immediate circle of Maes in Dordrecht and required little or no direct knowledge of Rembrandt's work.

Van Dijck's activity as a painter is also documented by signed and in some cases dated pictures. Three works are signed and dated 1655, and their variety of style presents a sobering prospect to the connoisseur. They are (with Sumowski numbers): Simeon in the Temple (357; formerly collection of Sidney van den Bergh, Wassenaar), which recalls the most Rembrandtesque biblical scenes that Salomon Koninck (1609-1656) painted during the 1640s; Old Man with a Beard (388; formerly collection of Paul von Schwabach, Berlin), a small canvas somewhat similar in style (to judge from a poor photograph) to the Museum's picture; and Portrait of a Woman (2267; collection of Alfred Bader, Milwaukee), which is in the manner of Maes's portraits dating from the same period. Two small genre scenes on panel, An Old Couple by a Fireplace, dated 1657 (383; formerly dealer S. Nystad, The Hague), and The Herring Seller, dated 1669 (386; location unknown), understandably remind Sumowski of Quirijn van Brekelenkam (q.v.), although the connection with genre scenes by Maes and his Dordrecht follower Reinier Covijn (ca. 1636-1681) is obvious. Two signed canvases with elegantly dressed figures, The Finding of Moses and Merry Company in an Interior (366 and 2256; both location unknown), could be described as rather stiff responses to the type of genre scenes Van Brekelenkam (see Pl. 24) and Caspar Netscher (Pl. 133) painted during the 1660s, and must be approximately contemporary with them. The small signed Family Prayer, probably of the late 1650s (385; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm), derives from Maes-like pictures by Bisschop and Covijn. Van Dijck's Adoration of the Shepherds (360; formerly Douwes Fine Art, London) and The Widow of Zarephath and Her Son (362; collection of Alfred Bader, Milwaukee) relate mainly to paintings by Bisschop.

The attribution of the Altman picture to Van Dijck depends not on this eclectic group of works but on at least three signed, comparatively small paintings of seated elderly figures, all plausibly dated by Sumowski to the second half of the 1650s: An Old Woman Sleeping (376; collection of the Princes of Hollenzollern, Sigmaringen); Old Woman with a Book (377; Royal Collection, Buckingham Palace, London); and Old Man Asleep (378; Mauritshuis, The Hague). Based on comparisons with these pictures, Sumowski and others have convincingly ascribed paintings of similar subjects to Van Dijck, the most important of which, in the present context, are three images of old women with books, probably the Bible (367, 370, 372, each called Old Prophetess; Hermitage, Saint Petersburg, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and Museum der Bildenden Künste, Leipzig [fig. 214 here], respectively); the small Old Woman Saying Grace, in the Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum, Hannover (371); and a canvas (42¼ x 35 in. [109 x 89 cm]) depicting a similar figure on a larger scale, the so-called Old Prophetess in the Schlossmuseum, Gotha (375). The seated old woman in the large Hermitage canvas (367; 52½ x 42½ in. [133 x 107 cm]) is on the same scale as the figure in the Altman painting. A century ago, Valentiner reproduced the two pictures side by side, as Rembrandts of the same type. It is only after all the paintings cited above have been distinguished from more conjectural attributions to Van Dijck that two conclusions may be drawn. First, that Van Dijck painted pictures in the 1650s and especially in the 1660s which would lead one to think that he had nothing to do with the Altman canvas. And second, that between 1655 and about 1660, Van Dijck produced a number of Maes-inspired pictures of old women that support the attribution of Old Woman Cutting Her Nails

Figure 215. Style of Rembrandt, Old Woman Cutting Her Nails. Pen over pencil, 4¼ x 3¼ in. (12.1 x 9.5 cm). Nationalmuseum, Stockholm
to him. In general, these works reveal strong modeling in the faces, with emphatic contrasts of light and shadow that create a masklike or faceted effect (as if the artist was working in clay). A liberal use of lead white lends rather leaden relief to passages of drapery, heads, and hands, but setting the figure convincingly in space (rather than on a plane) is achieved not so much through illumination as by restricting the palette throughout to blacks, muddy brown, and brick or rusty reds. Maes, by contrast, managed to carry the concern for space, atmosphere, modeling, and detail (with a subtle use of drawing) that one finds in his small early Rembrandtesque pictures (see PIs. 108, 109) onto the larger pictorial fields of such works as An Old Woman Asleep (fig. 211) and An Old Woman Dosing over a Book (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.). Bisschop, too, is generally subtler in modeling, more successful in suggesting space, and more attentive to local coloring and detail than Van Dijck. The former follower of Maes treats contours and drapery folds with a slightly awkward elegance, whereas Van Dijck’s figures tend to have blunt silhouettes (as if he cut them out of cardboard), and his unpleasant folds of fabric look unlaundred, waxen, ropey, and (as in the nail cutter’s lap) intestinal. As Slatkes noted, Van Dijck drags paint over surfaces to dry and blurry (or blotchy) effect; Von Sonnenburg observes “fringes” of impasto and crude highlights (as on the fur lapels in the Altman picture) that fail to blend fully with the underlying paint layer. At a certain distance, these qualities make a powerful impression, which ironically can be more reminiscent of Rembrandt than are the intervening works by Maes. But the resemblance with Rembrandt’s work of the 1650s is literally superficial, a manner emulated with little understanding of its descriptive and expressive effects. The intimate and contemplative treatment of Maes, which he learned in good part from Rembrandt, was exaggerated by Van Dijck so that his subjects seem pointlessly theatrical or even ominous.

Several motifs in the Altman picture seem typical of Van Dijck. A similar head scarf, with wooden folds, weights down the old woman seen in the Saint Petersburg painting (which is alike in composition and includes grayish white material on a table as an attribute of domestic toil). Van Dijck’s distaff head coverings usually frame the face with heavy pockets of shadow, enhancing the gauntness of the features. His old people are often afflicted with unequal arms and with crippled hands, the knuckles of which suggest gout and reveal an inadequate study of anatomy. Bent figures in Maes (fig. 213) convey age without cruelty. Compared with Maes’s benign widows and spinsters, Van Dijck’s crones discourage pecks on the cheek. His ancient types include one favorite, the model seen in the Leipzig picture (fig. 214), and a few other lonely individuals, at least two of whom have broad, bony cheeks, an outcropping chin and nose, and cavernous eye sockets comparable to those of the old woman cutting her nails. Nevertheless, our knowledge of Van Dijck, and of other secondary artists in Dordrecht, does not allow a definitive attribution. That there is a consensus of opinion in favor of that city, however, is significant. No other local school outside Amsterdam responded so strongly to Rembrandt, who, at whatever distance, inspired this painting’s monumentality and seriousness.

The subject has been associated implausibly with one of the Fates (Atropos), the sense of touch, Old Testament prophetesses, and Jewish purification rituals. Sumowski attributes a painting of an old man cutting his nails (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rennes) to Salomon Koninck about 1640, and considers it “perhaps an allegory of touch”; a painting of the same subject by Jan Lievens (1607–1674) is recorded. Pictures of this type, especially in Dordrecht, are consistent in theme, and relate domestic virtue to salvation. In the Altman canvas, the old woman has evidently turned from sewing (the form of her sewing box is clarified in Haid’s print) in order to trim a fingernail with her shears. This act recalls ritual purification (see, for example, Deut. 21:12), but more immediately reflects Dutch attitudes toward household duties and personal hygiene. In Pieter Twissch’s Vroost-brief der weduwen (Consolation Letter of Widows; Hoorn, 1630), the Mennonite author recommends to the widow “moderation not only in food, in the care of her body, in her clothing, demeanor, and behavior but also with regard to her family.” Paintings of old women saying grace by Maes, Van Dijck, Van Brekelenkam, and others are brought to mind, as are representations of women combing lice from children’s hair and similar subjects. Bibles and other signs of faith are frequently shown in Dutch pictures of elderly women, as in Van Dijck’s canvas in Leipzig (fig. 214) and Old Woman Praying, by Matthias Stom (Pl. 198). But old age itself is sufficiently evoked ideas of death and piety, much as such humble tasks as sewing (or lacemaking; fig. 213 and Pl. 110) and grooming implied a pure soul.
A small drawing in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (fig. 213), is very similar in composition, although the woman leans more heavily on her elbow, which appears, in this summary sketch, to be supported by a table.\textsuperscript{44} There is some resemblance to pen drawings by Maes, and none to drawings provisionally attributed to Van Diijk.\textsuperscript{42} The fact that pen was used over preparatory lines in pencil complicates the matter; the drawing may copy another that is now unknown. It appears quite possible that the sketch was made as a quick record of the Altman painting rather than as a preparatory study for it or a similar work.

1. J. C. Van Dyke, “Who Painted This Old Woman?,” New York Times, December 16, 1923, pp. 3, 15: “To the majority the picture has become something of an idol and the suggestion that it has feet of clay is not welcome. In fact, I find myself so roundly abused for my opinion about this picture that I shall have to defend myself by dragging the picture once more into the limelight and telling some plain truths about it.”

2. See Leiden 2005–6, p. 41, fig. 36. Ingham Foster (d. 1783) was a London merchant and collector. His portrait, by Henry Robert Morland, was reproduced in mezzotint by John Raphael Smith (1784).

3. “Effectively,” because the attribution to Maes in Van Dyke 1923 was generally rejected at the time (see Refs., 1923 through 1931). Michel’s book on Rembrandt (1894) was first published in 1893 in Paris, where the painting had just become known. E. Michel 1894, p. 131, explains in a note that the picture “was brought to Russia by M. Bibikoff, and was for some time at Moscow, in the possession of M. Massaloff [Mossoloff], the father of the well-known engraver.”


5. Oral opinions, W. Martin (April 1938) and J. Rosenberg (January 1942). W. R. Valentiner (letter of 1952) and Julius Held (oral opinion, March 1971; compare Refs., 1942) revised their earlier views, the latter guessing “Van der Pluym?” Kurt Bauch saw the picture on September 24, 1963, and rejected both Rembrandt and Maes (“too good” for the latter).


7. According to curator John Walsh’s memo in the curatorial files, dated June 9, 1972, Bruyn was “inclined to suspect a much later origin.” A similar opinion (“foreign to Rembrandt”) was expressed by Bruyn during a visit to the Museum on June 24, 1976.

8. Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 3, p. 2009 (under no. 1324), citing Von Sonnenburg 1978, p. 238, fig. 21. Von Sonnenburg actually points out that a short name before “A 1656” on The Apostle Thomas was removed with the application of a powerful solvent, possibly acid, and that “Maes” is one name that would fit in the space. As noted in Schnackenburg 1996, p. 176, the occasion for Von Sonnenburg’s investigation of the inscription was his restoration of the Kassel painting after the canvas was attacked with acid in 1977. See also Weber in Kassel 2006, pp. 100, 102 n. 11.


11. B. Schnackenburg in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, p. 371. The attribution of the Kassel picture to Maes is maintained in Schnackenburg 1996, p. 176. The Brussels painting (fig. 213 here) was included in the exhibition of 1991–92 (as no. 78) in order to test the attribution to Maes of The Apostle Thomas.

12. Copy in the curatorial files. This report appears to be the only foundation for director Thomas Hoving’s gauché remark to John McPhee (1968; see Refs.), and for Von Sonnenburg’s own statement twenty-seven years later, that the “authorship [of the Old Woman Cutting Her Nails] shifted in the 1960s from Rembrandt to Nicolaes Maes” (New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 5). In a detailed memo dated January 4, 1973, curator Charles Moffett summarized a conversation he had had with Von Sonnenburg about the picture: “He favors an attribution in the direction of Nicolaes Maes,” but also “agrees that too little is known about A. van Dyck and painters such as van der Pluym and Drost to make any firm attributions to them.” Von Sonnenburg was reluctant to clean the picture, because the result might be “disappointing in comparison with the effect of the picture now.” Furthermore, “he enjoys the picture as a stumbling block and doesn’t really want the problem solved.”

13. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 124. The mention of “early work” would appear to follow Schnackenburg (see text and note 11 above). Van der Pluym and Van Dyck are dismissed by Von Sonnenburg on the grounds that “the few works reliably attributed to them generally display considerably more pronounced brushwork, especially in the flesh tones.”

14. On these pictures, see the biography of Maes above, and Refs. for Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ithmaar.

15. Wheelock 1991a, pp. 162–63, in a discussion of Maes’s An Old Woman Dazing over a Book, of about 1635 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.). In the same entry, Wheelock illustrates and discusses the Brussels canvas (fig. 213 here) and An Old Woman Praying by Maes, another large canvas of about 1635 (Worcester Art Museum).

16. Krempel 2000, pp. 34, 366, no. 14, fig. 428. Robinson, in a letter to the present writer dated November 6, 1991, was inclined to reject the Kassel canvas, and suggested that the Altman painting “seems even further from Maes.” Krempel (ibid., pp. 283–84, no. 215) supports the attribution of The Apostle Thomas to Maes.

17. L. Slarke, oral opinion, January 2, 1973, as quoted in a memo by Charles Moffett.

18. H. Gerson, oral opinion, recorded April 7, 1976. He probably had in mind the Old Man Asleep, in the Mauritshuis (see note 4 above), and pictures like the small canvas in Leipzig (fig. 214 here).


words are, “Sie haben die endgültige Lösung gefunden: nicht von Karel van der Pluym, wie ich dachte (Kat.-Nr. 159), nicht der frühe Maes, wie es neuerdings heisst, sondern tatsächlich

ABRAHAM VAN DIJK."  
22. For example, J. Bikker, visiting the Museum on February 22, 2000, and David de Witt, e-mail dated December 15, 2004. De Witt sent his opinion unsolicited, and at the time he was unaware of the publications cited in the previous note. He observes, “Your painting appears to have a few characteristics linking it to the mature Van Dijk: shallow space, monumental pyramidal composition, strong chiaroscuro, and a contemplative mood.” He compares Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 1, nos. 363, 364, and 366.  
23. The last picture, *An Elderly Woman Lighting a Pipe* (oil on wood, 29⅞ x 24¾ in. (75 x 62.3 cm)), was sold at Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, May 13, 2003, no. 70.  
28. Ibid., pp. 670, 677, nos. 365, and vol. 6, pp. 3705, 3814, no. 2266.  
31. Ibid., pp. 672, 698, 691–92, nos. 376–78.  
32. Ibid., pp. 671–72, 698, 691–92, 696, nos. 367, 370–72, 375. For the Hannover panel, see also Wegener 2000, pp. 133–34, no. 41, as by Van Dijk. Possibly belonging to this group is the damaged *Portrait of an Old Woman* (canvas, 20⅞ x 24⅞ in. [53 x 62 cm]) in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen (inv. no. 388); Bredius 1935, no. 384; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 299 [ill.], 380, no. 384, observing that “what remains of the original painting points to a 17th-century picture of the school of Rembrandt.” See the *Old Woman with a Staff* (Hoogsteder & Hoogsteder, The Hague; Sumowski no. 390), which is also attributed to Van Dijk: The Hague 1902a, no. 7, and especially Bikker 2005, pp. 145–46, no. 813.  
33. Valentin in A. Rosenberg 1909, p. 444.  
34. This is Von Sonnenburg’s impatient conclusion in New York 1993–95, vol. 1, p. 124, where it is noted that an attribution to Van Dijk “on grounds of insufficient and incidental evidence was recently called the ultimate resolution to the problem.” No work by or attributed to Van Dijk is brought into consideration.  
35. See note 11 above.  
36. Slates is cited in the text above. See Von Sonnenburg in New York 1993–95, vol. 1, p. 124, with a large color detail of the nail cutter’s head and torso (fig. 159).  
37. For Atropos (who cuts the thread of life, not her nails), see J. Allen 1945. Sumowski (as noted in the text) and others (see Tokyo–Chiba–Yamaguchi 1992, no. 31) have discovered biblical prophetesses whose dwellings and dress are Dutch. The idea of Jewish ritual was discussed in a seminar paper by Yael Even, written under curator John Walsh’s supervision in 1976 (copy in the curatorial files).  
38. See Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 3, pp. 1646, 1681, no. 1107. For the Lievens (*Benn nagatorier*), which is listed in the 1673 estate inventory of the art dealer Johannes de Renialme, see Bredius 1915–22, part 1, p. 238.  
39. The passage is quoted in translation in Franits 1993a, p. 176; see pp. 168–71, 175–94, citing examples by Maes and several variations on the sewing theme.  

References: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7 (1836), p. 75, no. 180, catalogues the work as by Rembrandt, “An elderly Woman cutting her Finger Nails,” which is known to the author from the mezzotint by J. G. Haid, “under the title of *Rembrandt’s Mother*”; Vosmaer 1877, p. 144, as a “beau tableau” by Rembrandt of about 1645–50, in the “Massoloff (père) collection, Moscow; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., p. 89, no. 425, as by Rembrandt, owned by M. Massoloff, père, Moscow; É. Michel 1891, pp. 448–50 (ill.), as very recently acquired in Russia by R. Kann; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, pp. 110–12 (ill. p. 121), describes the “portrait” as dating from 1658 and as a “magnificent study of an old woman, engaged in the prosaic task of cutting her nails, recently bought by M. Rodolphe Kann in Russia”; Hofstede de Groot 1908, no. 32, pl. 32, as “De Nagelknipster,” praises the subject and execution; Bell 1899, pp. 82, 158, as signed and dated “Rembrandt f. 1658,” describes the figure as “undoubtedly a model” because in 1658 “patrons seem to have held severely aloof”; Bode 1900, p. III, no. 4 (ill.); Glück 1900, p. 90, as a Rembrandt of 1658 in the Kann collection, shows how far the master stood above all his pupils and followers; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1901), pp. 27–28, 186, no. 477, pl. 477, as a Rembrandt of 1658, in the R. Kann collection, Paris, observes that the artist “chose the realistic action deliberately, as if to show what an ideal and artistic effect might be achieved thereby”; M. Zimmermann 1901, p. 141 (ill.), admires the picture as “a genuine Rembrandtesque wonder of art” in which one does not notice the contrast between sublime handling and the prosaic subject matter; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 210 (ill.), 262, as by Rembrandt, dated 1658, in the Kann collection; Neumann 1905, vol. 2, p. 403, discusses the remarkable phenomenon of Rembrandt treating a “representation of trivial content” in his late manner, with its “spiritualism”; Hofstede de Groot 1906b, p. 375 (under no. 170), relates the picture to a drawing of a similar figure (now in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm); A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 320 (ill.), 403, 416, as signed and dated 1658, in the Kann collec-
tion; Bode 1907, vol. 1, p. 68, no. 67 (ill. opp. p. 68), as signed and dated “Rembrandt f. 1658,” describes the composition, mistaking the material in the left background for a bed; Nicolle 1908, pp. 194–95, describes the “study or portrait” as unique in Rembrandt’s oeuvre; Valentinier in A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 444 (ill.), 565, 578, as signed and dated 1658, in the “Altman” collection; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 3–4, no. 1, pl. 1, catalogues the canvas as a Rembrandt with a “somewhat abraded” date of 1658, claims that the work “manifests the breadth and beauty of his painting at what seems to us today his greatest period,” in which the artist suffered “the forced sale of his precious collection” of works of art, “stuffed animals, bric-à-brac, and the like”; Valentinier 1914b, p. 351, mentioned as one of the late Rembrandts in the Altman collection; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 180–81, no. 308, as Rembrandt’s picture of a woman who is “sixty or seventy years of age,” signed and dated 1658, gives provenance details; Kruse 1920, p. 48 (under no. vi–1), fig. 56, publishes the Stockholm drawing (now attributed to the school of Rembrandt) as “clearly a study for” the painting owned by “Herrn Henry Altman, New-York,” which despite its subject occupies the same plane as the Sibyls of Michelangelo; Valentinier 1921b, p. 127, ref. to p. 444 (right), updates location; P. Markthaler in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 15 (1922), p. 481, lists the work among images engraved after Rembrandt by J. G. Haid, about 1763–57; Meldrum 1923, p. 201, pl. ccclxxxiii, as by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1658; Van Dyke 1933, p. 132, pl. xxviii, fig. 108, as by Maes, probably when he was “in Rembrandt’s shop and learning the broader, darker manner of the shop, which he has here exaggerated,” with results that are characteristic of him (as is the model) and “hasty, heavy, ineffective,” mannered (the hands) and incorrect (in drawing); A. Burroughs 1923, p. 270, cites the attribution to Maes made in Van Dyke 1923, and defends Rembrandt as the painter (“the woman’s dignity is superb; her form is imposing”); Downes 1923, pp. 662 (ill.), 665, describes the commotion caused by this and other attributions made by Van Dyke (1923); Monod 1923, p. 306, responding to Van Dyke 1923, says that Maes does not have this grandeur of style, which resembles that of a “Sibyl descended from the Sistine vaults”; John C. Van Dyke, “Who Painted This Old Woman?” New York Times, December 16, 1923, p. 3 (ill., with detail), 15, attributes the work to Maes, citing examples, and maintains that any differences in handling are the result of clumsy repainting, “probably done many years ago”; Burroughs 1924, pp. 16–17, rejects Van Dyke’s opinion that the painting was badly restored, and states that the signature and date are old, “intact and unified with the original surface”; Neumann 1924, vol. 2, pp. 511–12, 580, fig. 149, as by Rembrandt, observes that the subject recalls Dutch genre scenes but that the master lends the figure “sibyl-like force”; Weisbach 1926, p. 552, fig. 184, feels that in this work Rembrandt raises an everyday subject to the lofty plane of Michelangelo; M. Eisler 1927, p. 57, pl. 21, as by Rembrandt, who treats the subject with unflinching expressed inner truth; Connoisseur 84 (November 1929), pp. 303 (ill.), 329, as by Rembrandt, “one of the most brilliant examples of that master’s work in the Metropolitan Museum”; Valentinier 1931, unpagd, no. 130, pl. 139, as by Rembrandt, an “extraordinary painting, which shows the ability of the artist to transform a homely motif into a work of great poetic charm,” considers the Stockholm drawing as a study for this picture; [not in Bredius 1933]; Tietze 1935, p. 337, pl. 180, as by Rembrandt, but reminiscent of Carol Fabritius; W. Martin 1936, p. 86, pl. 46, as by Rembrandt, recalls a Michelangelesque Sibyl; Downes Pictures 1941, unpagd, no. 199 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, quotes praise from Bode 1907; Held 1942, pp. 13–14 (ill., details of hands), as by Rembrandt, credits Louise Burroughs of the MMA with “the important observation that the date on this canvas should be read 1648 instead of 1658”; Ivins 1942a, p. 3, listed as by Rembrandt; Ivins 1942b, pls. 11, 12 (detail of hands); Bresdin 1944, p. 6, considers the subject “a concrete figure with an universal significance”; Pene du Bois 1944, pp. 239 (ill.), 220, sees the subject as typical of Altman’s collection, that of a bourgeois merchant who owned nothing “aristocratic and fanciful”; J. Allen 1945, p. 74, reports that “to many the majestic Old Woman Cutting Her Nails suggests Atropos with her scythe”; J. Rosenberg 1948, vol. 1, pp. 148, 166–97, vol. 2, fig. 261, describes the painting as “a striking work of Rembrandt’s early maturity” and as “a well-known but rare example of a genre subject by Rembrandt in the oil technique,” approves the new reading of the date as 1648, and points out the comparative weaknesses of Maes; Taubes 1958, p. 60 (ill., detail of hands), detects the “use of highly polymerized oil”; Bensch 1963, p. 83, has the impression that the same hand painted the Rembrandt-school Manon’s Sacrifice in Dresden; J. Rosenberg 1964, pp. 245, 314, 364 n. 8b, repeats J. Rosenberg 1948, but acknowledges in the note that recent investigation at the MMA “has shown that the signature and date are not authentic, and that the attribution to Rembrandt is not fully convincing”; Kuhn 1965, p. 203, records the color of the ground as a yellowish white; Knobler 1967, p. 102, figs. 80, 81 (detail), as by Rembrandt, dated 1648, remarks on “the use of thick paint”; McPhee 1968, p. 48, quotes Thomas Hoving (“It’s probably Nicolaes Maes. The label says, ‘Signed and dated Rembrandt, 1648’; There are subleties in the museum business, let me tell you”); Lecaldano 1969, p. 131 (ill.), among doubtful attributions; Riffkin 1969a, p. 27, attributes the painting to the “Adriaen Master,” who is “someone related to Van der Pluym”; Riffkin 1969c, p. 90, considers the work “related to” The Apostle Thomas in Kassel “although Maes is not the author” of the New York picture; Judson in Chicago–Minneapolis–Detroit 1969–70, p. 46 (under no. 27), as close in style to the painter of The Apostle Thomas in Kassel (Schnackenburg 1996, p. 176, as by Maes); Haskell 1970, p. 263, fig. 10 (Altman gallery view); Horsley 1971, pp. 47–48, notes the new attribution to a Rembrandt pupil, and quotes B. Burroughs and Walsh at length; Baecker 1980, vol. 1, p. 150, as Style of Rembrandt, 17th century; H. Adams 1984, pp. 436–37, includes this picture and The Apostle Thomas (fig. 211 here) among a variety of indiscriminate attributions to Karel van der Pluym; Sumowski 1979–95, vol. 9 (1983), p. 4788 (under no. 2133), as probably by Van der Pluym, with the drawing in Stockholm seen as “a copy of the concept for the painting”; Sumowski 1985–94, vol. 4, pp. 2352, 2355, 2377 (ill.), 2879, no. 1591, as by Van der Pluym, possibly an allegory of Touch; Broun 1988b, p. 331, fig. 6, rejects Sumowski’s attribution to Van der Pluym, and considers this picture and The Apostle Thomas to be by Maes; Jeromack 1988a, p. 106 (ill.), claims that the picture is considered to be an eighteenth- or nineteenth-century copy (which was J. Broun’s oral opinion in 1972); Liedtke 1990, pp. 48, 58 n. 166, fig. 37 (Altman gallery view); B. Schnackenburg in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92a, p. 371 (under no. 77), figs. 77b, 77c (detail), as “Maes (?),” calls the painting the “proud achievement of a gifted but still unpractised beginner” who might be the very young Maes; Van Thiel 1992,
pp. 30, 44, 89, no. 101, figs. 35–37 (gallery views), as in the 1898 Amsterdam exhibition, notes the doubts raised by G. H. Veth (in a review of the exhibition) and Bredius,1 Liedtke 1993, pp. 131–34, 140 n. 42, p. 141 n. 45, fig. 8, rejects the attribution to Maes, ascribes the picture to Abraham van Dijck, and maintains that it is not by the same hand as The Apostle Thomas; Sawomski 1983–[94], vol. 6 [1994], p. 363 (under no. 1993), agrees with Liedtke 1993 that the painting is by Abraham van Dijck, and observes that the work is certainly by the same hand as the so-called Old Prophetess (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg); Baetjer 1995, p. 319, as Style of Rembrandt; Bruyn 1995, pp. 101, 110 n. 4, admits reasons to doubt the attribution to Maes advanced in Bruyn 1988b; Wheelock 1995a, p. 319, fig. 2, rejects Maes as the artist, describes the picture (which is dated 1648 in the caption) as “generally attributed to Van der Pluym,” and cites the work in support of a tentative association of the heavily restored Old Woman Plucking a Fowl (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.) with Van der Pluym; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 31, 114, 124–28, 151, no. 36 (ill.), as by a follower of Rembrandt, “ca. 1660?”; reviews past opinions and attributes the picture to Abraham van Dijck; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 5, 122–25, no. 36 (ill.), figs. 137, 139 (details), as by a “Follower of Rembrandt (Nicolaas Maes?),” describes the technique as “quite comparable to the manner of the Dordrecht painter Nicolaes Maes,” and claims that “it is certainly different from the execution of Karel van der Pluym and Abraham van Dijck [who] generally display considerably more pronounced brushwork”; Krempen 2000, pp. 34, 166, no. 94, fig. 428, as attributed to Abraham van Dijck, reviews recent literature; Ketelsen in Hamburg 2000–2001, p. 66 (under no. 11), rejects Van Dijck as the author of Old Woman Reading in Hamburg, partly on the basis of comparison with the New York picture; Ketelsen 2001, p. 50, repeats the remark made in Hamburg 2000–2001; Scallen 2004, pp. 141, 208, 352 n. 36, 363 nn. 97, 99, fig. 32, notes that in 1898 Veth doubted Rembrandt’s authorship; Bijker 2005, p. 128 (under no. 81), fig. 812, cites Bencesch 1965 and likewise sees similarities between this painting and the Rembrandt-school Manouah’s Sacrifice in Dresden; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 666–69, 674–75, reports that the first ground contains chalk, a little red ochre, umber and quartz, resulting in a yellowish brown color; Korevaar in Leiden 2005–6, p. 44, fig. 45, cites J. G. Haid’s mezzotint of 1764 after the picture as an example of the various identifications of Rembrandt’s mother in the past; Vogelaar in ibid., p. 213, erroneously refers to the painting as “now attributed to Karel van der Pluym.”


Ex coll.: Ingham Foster, London (by 1764; d. 1781); Serge Bibikoff, Saint Petersburg; Semyon Fedorovich Mosoloff, Moscow (by 1875—at least 1886); his son Nikolai Semyonovich Mosoloff, Moscow (probably until 1892 or 1893);1 [Kleinberger, Paris (1892 or 1893)];2 Rodolphe Kann, Paris (by 1893–d. 1905; his estate, 1905–7; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, Paris and New York, 1907; sold to Altman on February 1, 1928, for $148,535]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1927–d. 1931); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1931 14.40.609

1. The painting is not included in Bredius 1935, but Bredius did not reject the picture in 1922 (as stated in Van Thiel 1993, p. 44) or in 1921 (as reported by the present writer in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 126, 127). The error appears to go back to Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 4, p. 2165 (under no. 1993. A possible source of confusion is A. Bredius, “Ein letztes Wort an Dr. Valentiner,” Kunstmärz, March 17, 1922, p. 394, where a former Rembrandt, Old Woman with a Book (Frick Collection, New York), is attributed to Van der Pluym.

2. In 1875, the owner’s son, Nikolai Mosoloff (1847–1914), made an unpublished mezzotint after the painting. The younger Mosoloff produced volumes of etched plates such as Les chefs d’œuvre de l’Ermitage Impérial de Saint-Pétersbourg and Les Rembrandts de l’Ermitage Impérial de Saint-Pétersbourg, both published by W. Drugulin, Leipzig, in 1872. Irina Sokolova, curator of Dutch paintings at the State Hermitage Museum, reports that the Altman picture appears in the background of a photograph of the elder Mosoloff (personal communication, June 2006).

3. E. Michel 1893 (see Refs.), mentions the picture’s recent arrival in Paris. A letter sent by F. Kleinberger to the Museum, dated January 17, 1924, explains that he bought the painting from "the engraver Mosoloff [sic] . . . in Moscow" at some time in the 1890s, and that he sold it to R. Kann.
170. Young Woman with a Red Necklace

Oil on wood, 8¼ x 6⅞ in. (21 x 17.5 cm)

The painting is overall in good condition.

From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2005 2005.331.7

In the 1950s, when this small panel was in the well-known collection of Sidney van den Bergh, it was frequently exhibited as a Rembrandt, as it had been in the celebrated Amsterdam exhibition of 1898. Since its sale in 1979, the picture has rarely been seen by scholars, which has not prevented them from debating which Rembrandt pupil of the 1640s might be responsible for the work. Its inclusion in the Markus bequest of 2005 makes the painting accessible within a collection of works by Rembrandt pupils and followers, including at least three other examples of study heads: the Study Head of an Old Man (Pl. 162), which dates from the 1650s, and the Man in a Red Cloak and the Head of Christ (Pls. 171, 172), both of which are probably from the 1650s. None of these broadly comparable pictures can be said to approach the Markus panel in condition and quality.

Not surprisingly, John Van Dyke’s iconoclastic volume Rembrandt and His School (1923; see Refs.) was the first publication to remove the work from the canon and assign it to a pupil.1 The attribution to Rembrandt was maintained by the old guard of cataloguers until the 1960s, when De Vries, followed by Bauch and Sumowski, assigned the study to Carel Fabritius (1622–1654). In hindsight, this amounts to little more than an appreciation of the actual artist’s textured application of paint and use of a comparatively light palette. Gerson’s allusion to Barent Fabritius (q.v.) represents a dampening of enthusiasm rather than an alternative view.2

The nature of this material and the present state of scholarship tend to discourage attributions to specific artists, who were in many instances simultaneously imitating the famous painter’s manner, gradually formulating their own, and responding to fellow students (assuming the work in question came from Rembrandt’s workshop). Nonetheless, in recent literature two names—those of Nicolaes Maes and Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.)—have been advanced in connection with the Markus panel and with similar works, such as the Head of a Girl (private collection),3 A Woman Weeping, in the Detroit Institute of Arts (fig. 216),4 and Study of a Young Girl, formerly in the collection of Jane Taft Ingalls (fig. 217).5 In his corpus of paintings by Rembrandt pupils, Sumowski attributed all three panels (which are very nearly the same size) to Maes, but in the corrugenda and addenda of the last volume (1994; see Refs.) he accepts Bruyn’s suggestion of Van Hoogstraten as the teenage author of the Detroit and Markus paintings.6 The Maes specialists William Robinson and Léon Krempel agree that these pictures are not by their man.7 Whether the Detroit and Markus pictures are by the same hand is uncertain. Viewing the latter in 2006, Van de Wetering suggested that they are not.8

In judging the matter, one must allow for the derivation (whether direct or not) of A Woman Weeping from the figure of the repentant Magdalene in Rembrandt’s The Woman Taken in Adultery, of 1644 (National Gallery, London).9 By contrast, the Markus and Ingalls pictures give the impression of a live model depicted from life. The girl (who does not resemble the more mature figure in Detroit) wears the same distinctive headgear and necklace in both pictures, but in the Ingalls study she is dressed in an ordinary jacket and a white blouse buttoned up to the neck. The figure is seen at a slight angle to the picture plane, with her head held nearly erect. Her expression could be described as a demure smile, in contrast to the sadness suggested in the present work, where it appears that the same artist has painted the same young woman in a pose recalling images of the sorrowful Magdalene (compare Van Dyck’s Study Head of a Young Woman, of about 1618; MMA).10 In this respect, the treatment of the figure comes closer to that of the Detroit picture (fig. 216), but without sentimentality, and without adopting such concessions to the biblical subject as the plunging neckline and outmoded head scarf and robe.

As noted in the Rembrandt exhibition of 1935, the model represented in the Markus and Ingalls paintings strongly resembles the slightly older and apparently prettified figure in Young Woman at an Open Half-Door (Art Institute of Chicago).11 Her features, hairstyle, and attire (the last evidently distinctive of North Holland) are similar to those of the Ingalls figure, where the red strands around the neck could be artistic shorthand for a coral-bead necklace like the one in the Chicago picture. The latter is now ascribed to Van Hoogstraten (about 1645) by a number of scholars.12

In 1988, Bruyn (see Refs.) attributed the Markus and
Detroit studies (which for him “are clearly by one hand”) to Van Hoogstraten, largely on the basis of comparisons with two of that artist’s earliest secure works, the Self-Portrait with Vanitas Still Life (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam) and the Self-Portrait with a Beret and Ermine Collar (Museum Bredius, The Hague), both of which were painted in 1644.13 “The somewhat treacly handling of paint, which is most pronounced in the Young Woman with a Red Necklace, is found again in a remarkably similar manner in the self-portrait of 1644 in the Museum Bredius ([Sumowski] volume II no. 847), and rather summary thin brown transparencies like those found in A Woman Weeping form a dominant feature of the Vanitas in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, which is also dated 1644 (no. 849). For the present there are sufficient reasons to suppose that both small trompes belong to the earliest works of the 17- or 18-year-old Hoogstraten.”14

The comparison between the Markus panel and the two Van Hoogstratens dated 1644 appears convincing to the present writer. In execution and expression (compare also the Ingalls panel) these young faces, with their parted lips and slightly puffy eyes, reveal a number of similarities. And the shaping of eyelids and eyebrows, and modeling of features—nose, mouth, chin, and jawline—is quite consistent. In both the present study and the Bredius self-portrait, the underside of the nose is rendered as a yoke of brown shadow, above which a red line runs along the ridge of the nostrils and tip of the nose, setting off the upper surface, with its pasty, shimmering highlights.15 The warm palette is rather reminiscent of Maes, or, perhaps, of painters from Dordrecht. With respect to the composition as a whole, the artist takes care to emphatically model the face, as if he were molding a mask, but the sense of three-dimensional form diminishes as soon as the head recedes into shadow and the bust curves slightly forward, without any indication of corresponding volume in back, or of space between the figure and the wall plane. These characteristics, which seem those of a gifted but still inexperienced painter, tend to support an attribution to Van Hoogstraten about 1644–45. However, considerable caution is appropriate, considering that Rembrandt pupils appear to have occasionally worked side by side, studying the same paintings by the master, or the same live models.
In addition to being used for training, paintings of this type often provided artists with a stock of convincing types that could be adopted in history pictures. In many cases, it would be inaccurate to say that a study head was a study explicitly for a figure in a more ambitious work. At the same time, the artist may very well have anticipated the type of character or situation for which a particular face or expression might serve. Admirers of the young Rembrandt know his "Saint Paul" type, which was clearly based on a live model, much as they see the reflections of his early expression studies (often of his own face) in figures witnessing the Raising of Lazarus or some other dramatic event. The Markus study may have been made with a Magdalene, the Virgin, or some other biblical figure in mind. The expression on the same model in the Ingalls study suggests a happier story in the Bible, as is evident from a drawing of the Visitation, dated 1646 (Fodor Collection, Gemeentemuseum, Amsterdam), by Van Hoogstraten, where the Virgin's pose and tender expression are similar.17

1. Van Dyck 1923, p. 160, places the picture in a category entitled, "Unknown Pupil—Group III." The group includes the Ingalls (ex-Delfau) Study of a Young Girl and the Young Woman at an Open Half-Door (Art Institute of Chicago), discussed below.
2. In Bredius 1969, see Refs. Gerson cites "the manner of G. van den Eechkout" and "the circle of Barnard Fabritius," which are scholar commitments consistent only in that they distance the scholar from commitment.
3. Gerson in Bredius 1969, no. 375, and Bob van den Boogert in Berlin 2000, no. 47, both suggesting that the picture is a student derivation from the Virgin's head in The Holy Family, of 1645 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg). Van den Boogert plausibly suggests an attribution to Van Hoogstraten.
5. See Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 3, p. 1025 (under no. 1383), where it is noted that the panel was previously in the collection of Baron Delfau de Fontbalba, Sculis, and then in the collection of Baron Max von Goldschmidt-Rothschild, Frankfurt. The work is said to be in a private collection, England, in Bredius 1969, where (as no. 374) it is illustrated adjacent to the Markus picture (pp. 292–93). The pictures were seen together in 1916 (see Amsterdam–Rotterdam 1996, nos. 52, 53).
8. E. van de Watering, oral opinion, January 26, 2006. The same scholar, in Van de Watering et al. 2006, pp. 198–200, fig. 227, and in Berlin 2006, no. 42, maintains that the Detroit panel is by Rembrandt and that it served as an oil sketch for the much smaller figure of the Magdalene in The Woman Taken in Adultery (see text following). The present writer finds this implausible on both counts. Brown 2007, p. 107, concurs.
10. Liedtke 1984, pp. 77–79, pl. 32.
11. Amsterdam 1935, p. 50 (under no. 13, where she is simply called "the same young woman").
14. Bruyn 1988b, p. 330, in his review of Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 3. In the same section on Maes, Bruyn not only removes two implausible attributions to that artist but also adds two, the Museum's Old Woman Cutting Her Hair (Pl. 169) and The Annunciation in Prague (Bikker 2003, pp. 38–39, no. 3, as by Drost).
15. A large color detail of the face in the Bredius Self-Portrait is found in Bijlston 2001, p. 36.

References: Hofstede de Groot 1898, unpagd, no. 91, catalogues the picture in the 1898 exhibition as Rembrandt's "Studie naar een jong meisje" of about 1655, lent by Baron A. von Oppenheim, Cologne; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 5 (1901), pp. 188–99, no. 374 (ill.), as "A Girl in Distress Looking Aside," by Rembrandt about 1650, in the collection of Baron Albert von Oppenheim, Cologne; Molinier 1904, pp. 13–14, no. 31, pl. xxix, as by Rembrandt, "Portrait d'une jeune femme," in the Oppenheim collection; A. Rosenberg 1909, p. 324 (ill.), as by Rembrandt, "Study-head of a girl," about 1650, in the collection of Feibert Albert von Oppenheim, Cologne; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 353, 236, no. 501, as "A Girl of About Twenty," by Rembrandt about 1650, in the Oppenheim collection, Cologne, finds the same model in the Ingalls (ex-Delfau) picture (fig. 217 here); Van Dyke 1921, p. 160, fig. 143, as by an anonymous pupil of Rembrandt, and the same hand who painted the Study of a Young Girl (fig. 217 here) and the Young Woman at an Open Half-Door (Art Institute of Chicago, now generally attributed to Samuel van Hoogstraten); Valentin 1931, unpagd, no. 114, pl.
114, as “Hendrickje Stoffels” by Rembrandt, in the collection of Julius H. Haass, Detroit; Amsterdam 1935, p. 50, no. 13, as by Rembrandt, about 1645, “Study of a young woman, perhaps Hendrickje Stoffels,” finds the same model in Young Woman at an Open Half-Door; Bredius 1935, p. 16, no. 373, pl. 373, “Study Head,” by Rembrandt; Bremen 1936, no. 52 (ill.); Amsterdam–Rotterdam 1916, p. 109 (under no. 52), and pp. 110–11, no. 53, as by Rembrandt about 1645, finds the same model, possibly Hendrickje Stoffels, in “Study of a Young Girl in a Costume of North Holland,” then in the collection of Mrs. Jane Taft Ingalls, Cleveland (ibid., no. 52; fig. 217 here); A. B. de Vries 1964, p. 352, fig. 12, as perhaps by Carel Fabritius; K. Bauch 1966, p. 48, as an outstanding work by Carel Fabritius; Kuznetsov 1967, p. 232, fig. 6, as a study of Hendrickje, by Rembrandt about 1645; Van Regteren Altena 1967, p. 70, as by Rembrandt; Sumowski 1968, p. 283 n. 15, as by Carel Fabritius about 1633, perhaps depicting his sister Aeltje; A. B. de Vries et al. 1968, pp. 86–87 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 291 (ill.), 379, no. 373, rejects attributions to Carel Fabritius, describes the work as “probably a school picture, in the manner of G. van den Eekhout,” but also (p. 379 [under no. 374]) as belonging “to the circle of Barend Fabritius”; Kuznetsov 1970, p. 66 (ill.), as by Rembrandt about 1642; C. Brown 1981, p. 133, no. 89, fig. 67, lists provenance, literature, and exhibitions, reviews opinions, and concludes, “certainly not by Rembrandt or Carel Fabritius”; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 3, pp. 2008 (under no. 1222), 1910–11 (under no. 1326–28), and pp. 1957, 2025, 2109 (ill.), no. 1383, as attributed to Maes about 1640–50; Bruyn 1988, pp. 239–30, argues at some length for an attribution of this picture and A Woman Weeping in Detroit (fig. 216 here) to Samuel van Hoogstraten when he was seventeen or eighteen; Van Thiel 1992, p. 87, no. 91 (ill.), listed as in the 1986 Amsterdam exhibition; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 6 (1994), p. 3629 (under no. 1383), revises his earlier opinions, and accepts Bruyn’s attribution to Van Hoogstraten; Liedtske in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 124 n. 5, cites the work as a “Mary Magdalene” type of tronie, in comparison with the Museum’s Head of Christ (Pl. 172); Krepel 2000, p. 368, no. F14, fig. 434, “location unknown,” rejects Maes as the artist, and provides details of provenance and literature; Keyes et al. 2004, p. 180, in connection with A Woman Weeping (fig. 216 here), discusses a small group of Rembrandt-esque study heads, including the Museum’s picture (cited as Bredius no. 373 and as Sumowski no. 1383), concludes that they are by “one or more artists active in Rembrandt’s studio during the mid- to late 1640s,” observes with specific reference to the present example and the Ingalls panel (Bredius no. 374; fig. 217 here) that their “emphasis on capturing expression suggests the picture[s] might have fulfilled an assignment set down by the master for his pupils,” and (in n. 12) reviews the suggestions of Liedtske, Sumowski, and Wheelock concerning the Detroit picture, stating that “these specialists concur with Bruyn [1988b] in seeing the close connection to the Bust of a Young Woman (Bredius 1935, 373)” (the present picture).

**Exhibited:** Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, “Schilderijen bijeengebracht ter gelegenheid van de inhuldiging van Hare Majesteit Koningin Wilhelmina,” 1928, no. 91, as by Rembrandt (lent by Baron A. von Oppenheim, Cologne); Detroit, Mich., The Detroit Institute of Arts, “Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century,” 1925, no. 18, as by Rembrandt, about 1650 (lent by Mr. Julius Haass, Detroit; Detroit, Mich., The Detroit Institute of Arts, “Old and Modern Masters,” 1927, no. 43; Detroit, Mich., The Detroit Institute of Arts, “Paintings by Rembrandt,” 1930, no. 48, as “Hendrickje Stoffels” (lent by Mr. and Mrs. Julius Haass, Detroit); Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, “Rembrandt tentoonstelling ter herdenking van de plechtige opening van het Rijksmuseum op 13 July 1885,” 1935, no. 13 (lent by Mrs. Lilian Haass, Detroit); Basel, Katz Galerie, “Rembrandt-Ausstellung,” 1948, no. 20, as “Studienkopf eines Mädchen” (lent from a private collection, Switzerland); Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, “Drie eeuwen portret in Nederland,” 1952, no. 143, as “Studie van een jong meisje,” by Rembrandt about 1645 (lent by S. J. van den Bergh, Wassenaar); Zürich, Kunsthaus, “Holländer des 17. Jahrhunderts,” 1953, no. 113; Rome, Palazzo delle Esposizioni, “Mostra di pittura olandese del seicento,” 1954, no. 113; Milan, Palazzo Reale, “Mostra di pittura olandese del seicento,” 1954, no. 116; Rotterdam, Museum Boymans, “Kunstschatten uit Nederlandse verzamelingen,” 1955, no. 101, as “Jonge vrouw,” by Rembrandt about 1645 (lent by Mr. and Mrs. S. J. van den Bergh, Wassenaar); Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, “Rembrandt,” 1956, no. 25, as by Rembrandt about 1645 (lent by Mr. and Mrs. Sidney J. van den Bergh, Wassenaar); Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, and Rotterdam, Museum Boymans, “Rembrandt tentoonstelling ter herdenking van de geboorte van Rembrandt op 15 July 1606,” 1966, no. 33 (lent by S. J. van den Bergh, Wassenaar); Laren, Singer Museum, “Kunstschatten: Twee Nederlandse collecties schilderijen,” 1959, no. 66; Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, “17de eeuwse meesters uit Nederland particulier bezit,” 1965, no. 34.

**Ex coll.:** [Bourgeois, Cologne]; Freiherr Albert von Oppenheim, Cologne (by 1868–d. 1912; his estate sale, Berlin, Lepke and Helbing, March 13, 1918, no. 31); Chillingworth collection, Lucerne (sale, Fischer et al., Lucerne, September 5, 1922, no. 341); Mr. and Mrs. Julius Haass, Detroit (by 1925); Mrs. Lilian Haass, Detroit (until 1935 or later); [D. Katz, Dieren]; H. E. ten Cate, Almelo; Mr. and Mrs. Sidney J. van den Bergh, Wassenaar (by 1921; sale, Christie’s, London, May 30, 1979, no. 126, as attributed to Rembrandt); [G. Cramer, The Hague]; Frits and Rita Markus, New York (until his d. 1996); From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2005-2005.331.7
Oil on wood, 15/4 x 12/4 in. (38.4 x 31.1 cm)
Inscribed (lower right): Rembr[andt] / f. 1659[?]

Other than some slight abrasion in the head and hat along the wood grain, the painting is well preserved.

The Jules Bache Collection, 1949  49.7.36

In the literature dating from 1883 until 1966 (see Refs.), this small picture from at least three important collections (Weber, Maurice Kann, and Bache) was accepted as by Rembrandt, and occasionally praised for its dashing brushwork, psychological insight, or soulfulness. Despite the fact that the painting was on exhibition in the Museum throughout the years 1944–49, 1954–63, and 1965–69, its authenticity was never questioned until Horst Gerson expressed his doubts in 1969 (see Refs.). From that moment on, the work was considered to be at best a minor picture by Willem Drost (q.v.)—the only Rembrandt pupil ever suggested—and at worst an eighteenth-century imitation. But nothing about the picture suggests that it dates from later than Rembrandt’s lifetime. The oak panel was cut from a tree felled in the Baltic-Polish region during the 1640s, with actual use of the support considered plausible from 1648 onward. This is consistent with the impression made by the work’s style, which is that it was painted by a minor Rembrandt pupil or follower (one less gifted than Drost) during the 1650s or the early 1660s.

Bredius and other scholars who considered the picture to be by Rembrandt were of the opinion that the same model was used in the great canvas The Jewish Bride, of about 1665 (figs. 218, 219). Rosenberg (1948; see Refs.), who believed that the same Amsterdam couple, slightly older, appears in the Museum’s Man with a Magnifying Glass and Woman with a Pink (Pls. 158, 159), also observed that “Rembrandt had portrayed the [same] man alone at an earlier date (1659) in the fine oil sketch (Br. 296) of the Bache Collection, now also in the Metropolitan Museum.” The Jewish Bride is now considered by many scholars as a portrait historié of an actual couple, which speaks against the notion that the man was available as a model in Rembrandt’s workshop. That the figure has also been thought to be Titus van Rijn and described as both a teenager and a man of about forty-five years old (see Refs.) reveals that these perceived resemblances might be more convincingly explained by a geneticist than by art historians. However, it is possible that the Bache panel dates from as late as the early 1660s and is a pupil’s tronie derived from the man’s head in The Jewish Bride. Apart from the resemblance between the faces, there are specific formal similarities, such as the placement of the hat (which Rosenberg erroneously regarded as the very same hat) high on the head, the lock of hair separated from the rest of the coiffure above the figure’s proper right eye, the fold of flesh and abbreviated eyebrow above the same eye, the sunken areas (which presumably led to Benesch’s diagnosis of “consumptive”) in the cheek and brow, the shapes of the chin and nose, and perhaps the expressions (although the eyes and mouth are not the same). The superficial manner in which the brown and red cloak has been brushed in, with the hint of a hand (borrowing a pose used frequently by Ferdinand Bol, Govert Flinck, and other Rembrandt disciples), contrasts with the more strongly modeled execution of the face and hair. This inconsistency could be interpreted as evidence in support

Figure 218. Detail of Rembrandt’s The Jewish Bride (fig. 219)
of the hypothesis that the man’s head is based on that in The Jewish Bride, while the rest of the figure is a formulaic invention dashed off to complete the picture as a tronie of an artistic type (the hat has become a floppy beret). Of course, some intermediary work or other relevant material may now be lost, and the resemblance may be more coincidental than is suggested here, given the way motifs circulated in Rembrandt’s studio, and lingered in the imaginations of artists under his sway.

1. Josua Bruyn, examining the picture on June 24, 1976, was reminded of Sir Joshua Reynolds’s studio. In 1980, the Museum’s attribution was changed from Rembrandt to Style of Rembrandt, probably eighteenth century, at the suggestion of curator Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann.


References: Bode 1883, pp. 334, 571, no. 98, as a Rembrandt in the Weber collection, Hamburg, discovers similarities with Portrait of a Man (“The Auctioneer”) (Pl. 173); Dumont 1885, pp. 42, 63, 70, no. 326, as by Rembrandt, Portrait d’Homme, 1659, of unknown provenance; É. Michel 1894, vol. 1, p. 239, listed as by Rembrandt, in the collection of Maurice Kann; Sedelmayer Gallery 1898, pp. 138, 159 (ill.), no. 140; Bell 1899, pp. 83, 157, as “A Man in a Red Cloak,” signed “Rembrand” and dated 1659; Nicolle 1899, pp. 39 (ill.), 42, as in the M. Kann collection, “bien caractérisée”; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1901), pp. 23, 150, no. 459, pl. 459, as “Small Portrait of a Man Turning to the Spectator,” describes the model as “aged about forty-five, standing, in profile,” and in other inaccurate terms; Valentiner 1905, p. 51, as a portrait of Rembrandt’s son, Titus (who was eighteen or nineteen at the time), the pose perhaps influenced by Raphael or Palma Vecchio; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 38 (ill.), 414, 417, as by Rembrandt, portrait of a man; Marguillier 1909, p. 76, considers “l’arrangement extrêmement décoratif, la coloration riche et vigoureuse . . . un magnifique morceau”; Valentiner in A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 419 (ill.), 562, 578, as a portrait of Titus; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 224, no. 411, as “A Man Turning His Head Round on His Shoulder,” with Gimpel and Wildenstein,
New York, gives provenance, and borrows Bode's (1901) description; Meldrum 1923, p. 201, pl. CCLXV, listed as "Portrait of a Man ("Titus")"; Bache Collection 1929, unpagd, (ill.), as "A Young Man with a Black Cap," considers the model about twenty-five years old; Cortissoz 1930, p. 259, shows Rembrandt "swiftly recording an impression from life"; Valentiner 1931, unpagd, no. 142, pl. 142, as "Rembrandt's Son, Titus"; Hind 1932, p. 18, states that the sitter is the same as in another portrait, possibly of Titus; Van Rijckevorsel 1932, p. 150, suggests that Giorgione's (actually, Titian's) so-called Ariosto (fig. 151) here served as a source for the pose; Schmidt-Degener in Amsterdam 1935, p. 37, no. 25, finds the same man in The Jewish Bride (fig. 219 here); Bredius 1935, p. 13, no. 266, pl. 266, agrees with Schmidt-Degener (1935) that the same man is found in The Jewish Bride; Scheyer 1935, pp. 292 (ill.), 294, mentioned among American loans to the Amsterdam exhibition of 1935; Bache Collection 1937, unpagd, no. 37 (ill.), repeats Bache Collection 1929, with added bibliography; Bache Collection 1944, unpagd, no. 36 (ill.), repeats Bache Collection 1937, with added bibliography; J. Rosenberg 1948, vol. 1, p. 49, calls the picture a "fine oil sketch" of the sitter who later appears in The Jewish Bride; Rousseau 1952, p. 88 (ill.), as "A Young Man with a Black Cap," Berosch 1956, p. 332, feels that the model was "one of those consumptive figures that the late Rembrandt liked to portray because they enabled him to demonstrate the beauty of the soul outliving the decay of the body"; J. Rosenberg 1964, p. 88, repeats J. Rosenberg 1948; K. Bauch 1966, p. 22, no. 426 pl. 426, as by Rembrandt, "Young Man in a Red Cloak," 1619; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 228 (ill.), 572, no. 296, questions the signature, and observes, "although probably the same model as the male figure in The Jewish Bride (Br. 416), the attribution of this study to Rembrandt is not convincing"; Lecaldano 1969, p. 131 (ill.), included among works of doubtful attribution; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 199, no. 489 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Broos 1977, p. 42, records that Giorgione has been cited as a source; Baertier 1980, vol. 1, p. 135, as Style of Rembrandt, probably eighteenth century; Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 5, pp. 3090, 3109 (ill.), no. 2038, attributes the work to Drost, about 1622–55; Jeromack 1988a, p. 106 (ill.), as now thought to be perhaps an eighteenth-century copy; Liedtke 1990, p. 52, notes that Bache bought the picture in 1919 for $40,000; Van Thiel 1992, pp. 48, 49, 89, no. 103 (ill.), fig. 45 (gallery view), records the painting as in the 1898 Amsterdam exhibition, and considers its later attribution to Drost "not very convincing"; Liedtke 1991, p. 125, cites the work as an example of Drost being "used as a dumping ground for Rembrandt-esque pictures of the 1650s"; Baertier 1995, p. 319, as Style of Rembrandt, third quarter seventeenth century; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 89, 118–19, no. 33 (ill.), as by a follower of Rembrandt (possibly a pupil or former pupil), reviews the critical history; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, p. 28, observes that the wood panel could have been employed at any time after 1642, but that the picture is generally dated after 1662 because of the supposed connection with The Jewish Bride (fig. 219 here); Scallen 2004, p. 363 n. 99, as owned by M. Kann and Bache; Bikker 2005, pp. 170–71, 189, no. 219, dismisses the attribution to Drost, mainly on the grounds of quality, and describes differences in technique between this picture and Drost’s most similar work, a small Self-Portrait (location unknown); Klein in Corpus 2005, p. 616, reports the earliest possible felling date of the tree used for the panel as 1640.


Ex coll.: Consul Eduard Weber, Hamburg (by 1883—at least 1885); [Sedelmeyer, Paris]; Maurice Kann, Paris (by 1894–d. 1906; his estate, from 1906; sold to Gimbel & Wildenstein); [Gimbel & Wildenstein, Paris and New York, by 1916–19; sold for $40,000 to Bache on December 1, 1919]; Jules S. Bache, New York (1919–d. 1944; his estate, 1944–49); The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 457.36
172. Head of Christ

Oil on canvas, 16 1/2 x 13 1/2 in. (42.5 x 34.3 cm); with added strips, 18 1/2 x 14 1/2 in. (47.3 x 37.1 cm)

This painting is a fragment. The face, beard, and hair are slightly abraded; the background is severely damaged.

Mr. and Mrs. Isaac D. Fletcher Collection, Bequest of Isaac D. Fletcher, 1917 17.120.322

This is one of about ten known bust-length pictures of Christ that were evidently painted by Rembrandt pupils during the 1650s. It is larger than the panels in Berlin, Cambridge (Fogg Art Museum), Detroit, The Hague, Philadelphia, and elsewhere, and is the only example on canvas. The support was cut down and mounted on a slightly larger canvas at an early date. Originally, the painting must have been about the same size as the panel formerly in the collection of Harry John, Milwaukee (fig. 220), which measures 24 x 19 inches (61 x 48.3 cm) and shows nearly the same figure in a view including the shoulders and chest, with one hand tucked into the jacket.

During the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition of 1995–96, the Milwaukee panel was brought to the Museum and compared with the present canvas. Three members of the Rembrandt Research Project were present: Ernst van de Wetering, Paul Brockhoff, and Michiel Franken. It was agreed that the New York version was distinctly superior, and that both paintings probably depended on a common prototype (too many differences were evident for one picture to have been copied from the other). The Museum’s painting was considered more successful in its suggestion of volume, textures, a consistent fall of daylight, and perhaps in expression. It was felt that the canvas came closer to Rembrandt’s own style, although it cannot be said to approach his work in quality. Even allowing for the painting’s damaged condition, its weaknesses are obvious in the drawing of the eyes and other details; the lack of three-dimensional form in the nose, cheekbones, and oddly dented forehead; and the lack of convincing spatial

Figure 220. Style of Rembrandt, Head of Christ, probably ca. 1655–60. Oil on wood, 24 x 19 in. (61 x 48.3 cm). Formerly collection of Harry John, Milwaukee

Figure 221. Style of Rembrandt, Head of Christ, 1650s. Oil on wood, 9 3/4 x 8 1/4 in. (25 x 21.5 cm). Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin
relationships between parts of the head, such as the ear, beard, and cheek to the left.

Most of the Rembrandtesque paintings of this type appear to represent the same live model, in some cases probably through intermediate material such as other paintings that are now untraced. At the same time, the type of Christ recalls that found in Rembrandt's *Supper at Emmaus*, of 1648 (Louvre, Paris), and in his famous etching *The Hundred Guilder Print*, of about 1649.5

The panel in Berlin (fig. 227)—because of its comparatively convincing modeling, impasto highlights, and immediacy of expression—is the only work of this kind generally thought to be by Rembrandt.6 The attribution seems rather optimistic, however, while the recent restitutions to Rembrandt of the panels in Detroit and The Hague are less supportable still.7

That Rembrandt himself painted heads or bust-length figures of Christ is suggested by the inventory of his household effects made in 1656. It includes two paintings (nos. 115, 118) listed as a “Christ's face [tronie] by Rembrandt,” and another (no. 326) that is unattributed and described as “A Christ's face from life.”8 It has long been assumed that Rembrandt found a model or models for his figures of Christ—as he did for other subjects—in the Jewish quarter of Amsterdam.9

The existence of various bust-length paintings of Christ suggests that Rembrandt assigned the subject to students. At least two or three hands can be distinguished, but attributions to known pupils have not proved possible. Despite their shortcomings, these pictures are for the most part appealing and in some instances compelling religious images. Paintings such as these illustrate the fortunate coincidence in the seventeenth century between methods of artistic training and popular demand for inexpensive and meaningful works of art. In this regard, Rembrandt's execution of any particular *Head of Christ* is less significant than his conception of the project. His intention was to bring biblical figures to life and to foster that approach in the work of his followers.

The John collection version was sold at Sotheby's, New York, January 11, 1996, no. 261.

3. The comparison was made on November 27, 1995, in collaboration with Sotheby's (see the previous note).

4. See Refs. for critical opinions, which in the literature supported the attribution to Rembrandt until the 1980s. However, F. Schmidt-Degener, visiting the Museum on April 15, 1935, suggested to curator Harry Wehle that the painting might be by Willem Drost (q.v.). Hoist Gerson, on April 7, 1936, felt that this example was inferior to those in Berlin, Detroit, and elsewhere, but was probably by Rembrandt, and perhaps overly restored. In the same year, Josua Bruyn, on behalf of the Rembrandt Research Project, stated that the committee doubted both this and the Milwaukee version, and accepted only the panel in Berlin. On May 15, 1936, Seymour Slive confirmed his faith in the Berlin, Cambridge, New York, and Philadelphia paintings.


6. See C. Tümpel 1993, pp. 342 (ill.), 401, no. 78, as from about 1656; Kleinert in Berlin 2006, no. 57, as by Rembrandt. C. Tümpel (1993, no. 79) also accepts the panel in Cambridge.

7. See the interesting discussion by Keyes in Keyes et al. 2004, pp. 177–79, maintaining that the Detroit picture would stand or fall together with the version in the Museum Bredius, The Hague (Blanckert 1911, no. 135, as by Rembrandt).


REFERENCES: Bode 1883, pp. 522–23, 597, no. 205, considers the painting (then in the collection of Maurice Kean) to be by Rembrandt, dates it about 1656, describes it as damaged, and says that it is probably not identical with a picture seen by Thoré in the de Sauley collection, Paris; Dutuit 1885, pp. 51, 60, 69, no. 78, as in the Kain collection, repeats the remarks made in Bode 1883; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 301; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 239, as in the Kain collection, by Rembrandt about 1656; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1898, pp. 168, 169 (ill.), no. 149; Hofstede de Groot 1898, no. 109, as painted by Rembrandt about 1660; Bell 1899, pp. 84, 137, erroneously as “from de Sauley collection”; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1901), pp. 8–9, 60, no. 414, pl. 414, dates the picture to about 1659; A. Rosenberg 1906, p. 331 (ill.), as from about 1659; A. Rosenberg 1909, p. 391 (ill.), as from about 1659; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 2 (1910), p. 414, listed as in the M. Kain collection; Bode 1911, p. 8, mentions the work and states that Rembrandt did a half-dozen similar pictures at about the same time, each more expressive than the other; W. Martin 1911b, p. 104, mentioned as owned by Kleinberger; W. Martin 1911c, p. 173, cited in passing; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1911, pp. 74, 75 (ill.), no. 59, lists publications; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 117, no. 160, as in the Fletcher collection, New York.
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painted about 1699; Valentiner 1921b, p. 126, offers the outdated information that the painting is "now" owned by Isaac Fletcher; Hofstede de Groot 1922, p. 41, as by Rembrandt; A. Burroughs 1923, p. 272, calls the picture "sentimental and empty"; Meldrum 1923, p. 203, pl. CCCCVIII, as from about 1699; Valentiner 1930d, p. 3, considers the work "connected with the [Rembrandt school] Lamentation Over Christ in the Ringling Collection"; Valentiner 1931, unpag., no. 101, pl. 101, as by Rembrandt, dates the painting to about 1648, suggests that it represents the same model as a picture in the Johnson collection, and states that the same model appears in Lord Melchett's version; Bredius 1935, p. 27, no. 626, pl. 626, as by Rembrandt, with no comment; Ivins 1942b, pls. 25, 26 (detail), "painted about 1660"; J. Allen 1945, pp. 76–77 (ill. on cover), notes that the work has been cut down and mounted on another canvas, accepts a dating to the second half of the 1650s, and suggests that the Melchett (later Milwaukee; fig. 220 here) version was copied from this one when it had its original dimensions; Valentiner in Raleigh 1916, unpag. (under no. 20; Milwaukee), calls this "a similar study from the same model"; Rotermund 1916, pp. 220–21, fig. 174, repeats the information in J. Allen 1945; K. Bauch 1966b, p. 11, no. 196, pl. 196, as "Young Jew (as Christ)"; by Rembrandt about 1648, erroneously records the support as wood; Gerson 1968, pp. 347 (ill.), 498, fig. 258, describes the painting as a Rembrandt that has suffered, and suggests a date later than Bauch's (1648); Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 327 (ill.), 614, no. 626, repeats Gerson 1968; Localsano 1969, p. 114, no. 296 (ill.), as an autograph work of about 1670; Judson in Chicago–Minneapolis–Detroit 1969–70, p. 39 (under no. 18), compares the version in the John collection (fig. 220 here); Panofsky 1973, p. 100, fig. 22, describes the picture as representing Rembrandt's idea of Christ, which he arrived at by studying the type repeatedly; Wright 1975, pp. 61, 67, pl. 51, considers this an "excellent example" of Rembrandt's studies of Christ, although it "verges on the sentimental"; Bolten and Bolten-Remp 1977, p. 191, no. 376 (ill.), as by Rembrandt about 1648–50; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 150, as attributed to Rembrandt; Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 97 n. 5, claims that the picture is "missing the characteristic buildup of paint layers seen in autoradiographs of seventeenth-century Dutch paintings"; Foucart 1982a, p. 32, as by Rembrandt, sees the same model here as in the "Stupper Enthniaus in the Louvre; Dickey in Hamilton–Rochester–Amarillo 1983, p. 26, as attributed to Rembrandt, probably from about 1619, a fragment, notes that the Rembrandt Research Project considers only the Berlin version to be by Rembrandt; Guillaud and Guillaud 1986, p. 538, fig. 626, as by Rembrandt in 1690; C. Tümpel 1986, pp. 344, 345 (ill.), 422, no. 320, as from Rembrandt's circle, about 1635–60; Jeromack 1988a, p. 108 (ill.), as hard to judge because of its condition; Slates 1992, p. 126 (under no. 63; Berlin), observes that all works of this type other than that in Berlin are considered to be by pupils or followers; C. Tümpel 1991, pp. 245 (ill.), 245, no. 420, as from Rembrandt's circle, about 1655–60; Baetjer 1996, p. 318, as attributed to Rembrandt; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 122–24, no. 35 (ill.), as by a follower of Rembrandt during the 1660s, covers many of the points discussed in the present entry; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 55, 74, 118, 120–22, no. 31 (ill.), figs. 10 (detail), 11 (X-radiograph detail), as by an artist in Rembrandt's circle who was also a member of the Dortrecht school, considers the color scheme and the "smooth handling of the flesh areas" foreign to Rembrandt himself, and compares the version formerly in the John collection, Milwaukee (fig. 220 here); Blankert and Blokhuis in Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, pp. 197, 198 n. 7 (under no. 31), mentions the painting as one of "six extant heads of Christ […] [that] were until recently unanimously accepted by twentieth-century connoisseurs as authentic Rembrandts"; Scallen 2004, pp. 296, 303 n. 99, 375 n. 49, as owned by M. Kann, and as rejected in A. Burroughs 1923.


EX COLL.: Jan Wandelaar, Amsterdam (until d. 1759; his estate sale, September 4, 1759, no. 13, for fl. 5,10 to Enschedé); Johannes Enschedé, Haarlem (from 1759); Maurice Kann, Paris (by 1883–d. 1906); his nephew Édouard Kann, Paris (1907–10; sold to Kleinberger); [Kleinberger, Paris and New York, 1919–22; sold for $35,000 to Fletcher]; Isaac Dudley Fletcher, New York (1921–his death 1917); Mr. and Mrs. Isaac D. Fletcher Collection, Bequest of Isaac D. Fletcher, 1917 17.120.222

173. Portrait of a Man ("The Auctioneer")

Oil on canvas, 42\% x 34 in. (108.6 x 86.4 cm)

The surface has suffered abrasion throughout; most seriously affected is the modeling of the face and hands. The impasto is flattened from lining.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.624

Like a good number of Rembrandt-school pictures that were painted in the 1650s or 1660s, including works of considerable quality, this ingratiating portrait of an unidentified young man has not been convincingly attributed to any particular pupil or follower of Rembrandt. The picture probably dates from the second half of the 1650s to the early 1660s, to judge from its similarity in style (if not technique) to Rembrandt paintings ranging from Aristotle with a Bust of Homer (Pl. 151) to the Portrait of a Young Man ("Titus"), of 1665 (Dulwich Picture Gallery, London).

One of thirteen "Rembrandts" left to the Metropolitan Museum by Benjamin Altman, the so-called Auctioneer was never doubted in print as a work by the master until 1982, when the Museum's own publication, Art and Autoradiography, considered the preparatory work on the canvas, as revealed by autoradiographs, to be inconsistent with that found in authentic pictures by Rembrandt. It has been emphasized, however, that these findings merely underscore what is obvious from an examination of the painting's surface, namely, that the work is an impressive but superficial adaptation of Rembrandt's mature style.

The manner of execution, according to Von Sonnenburg's detailed analysis, suggests that the portrait may be a "brilliant one-time exercise by an independent artist rather than an imitation by a pupil working in Rembrandt's studio." Considering how little is known about the artist's immediate circle from the mid-1650s onward, it would be unwise to insist on an origin outside his workshop. However, the bravura with which passages of the painting have been dashed off bears little resemblance to the studious approach found in pictures such as the Head of Christ (Pl. 172). Contemporaneous imitation at some remove from the master seems all the more plausible in the case of fashionable portraiture.

Perhaps the most conspicuous differences from the effects Rembrandt achieved are found in the costume, which is boldly brushed out with little regard for texture, modeling, anatomy (where is the elbow of the long right arm?), or consistent illumination. Comparison with the left sleeve in the Aristotle reveals some similarity at the shoulder (where Rembrandt himself favors fleeting impressions over a sense of form) and almost none lower down: the material billowing back from the philosopher's left hand is clearly lighter in weight and more voluminous but it nonetheless has far more substance than the "auctioneer's" coat and cuff, and suggests the underlying forearm. And yet the near hand in the Altman picture is strongly articulated, more so than in most figures by Rembrandt of about the same time. The way light catches the hand, the edges of paper, the index finger of the other hand, and the left cuff are Rembrandtesque touches worthy of admiration.

Von Sonnenburg describes the "heavily built-up impasto" in the face of the "auctioneer" as "by itself a valid argument against Rembrandt's authorship." He observes that "the imitator did not model with a loaded brush; instead he piled up his impasto with repeated, mostly corrective applications, producing a masklike effect." The conservator also notes that the impasto in the face has been flattened by lining and relining of the canvas, and that shadows and half shadows in the face (achieved by scumbling and by glazing with warm umber tones) have been largely lost through abrasive cleaning procedures in the past. Thus, the flatness of the face and its division into dark and light areas have become more exaggerated than they were originally. Nevertheless, the modeling of the facial features was always schematic compared with the subtle observations that may be discerned in Aristotle's face, or in Rembrandt's in the Altman Self-Portrait (Pl. 157).

The notion that the sitter was an auctioneer evidently goes back to Joseph Ritter von Lippmann-Lissingen, the Viennese owner of the canvas in the early 1870s. He noticed a resemblance (slight though it is) between the figure in his painting and the subject of Rembrandt's etching Pieter Harmigh, of 1655 (see fig. 198), and evidently confused that auctioneer with another Haringh, Thomas (Pieter's cousin), a much older man who was one of the Amsterdam officials involved in the liquidation of Rembrandt's possessions in 1658 (see discussion of the Man with a Magnifying Glass; Pl. 158). That date was inscribed by a later hand on the book or folio in the Altman painting, which (with help from the bust on the table) might be taken for a sale catalogue. The hypothesis was adopted.
by Vosmaer in 1875 and 1877 (see Refs.), dismissed by Bode in 1901 (on the grounds that Thomas Haringh was too old at the time), and then in 1911 refined by Bode in favor of the younger Haringh (who had nothing to do with Rembrandt's bankruptcy sales). From 1905 until at least 1931, Valentiner (see Refs.) entertained the idea that the Altman painting was a portrait of Titus van Rijn (1641–1668), Rembrandt's son, who, to judge from Valentiner's many sightings, was a master of disguise. For Hofstede de Groot, in 1916, and Bredius, in 1935 (see Refs.), the sitter was an anonymous man with a manuscript; Bode (1901) had originally suggested that he was probably an amateur of art and literature.

The sitter was most likely a scholar or writer with an interest in classical antiquity, as indicated by the antique bust. Nearly all such busts in scholar portraits of the seventeenth century are identifiable, representing sages such as Seneca, Socrates, Marcus Aurelius, and so on. Here the bust, which is possibly female and certainly imaginary, is probably a modish accessory rather than a sign of expertise or sympathy with a specific school of thought. The note of contemplation intended by the broken column in the background (a conventional vanitas motif) is considerably offset by the figure's stylish haircut and mustache, the oversize beret, and the "Japanese" housecoat, which appears to be made of silk, fur, gold threads, and something like molasses. An autoradiograph reveals that the column replaced the motif of a window receding from the upper left side of the composition. The column, the curtain, and the bust appear to have been inserted into whatever space was available around the man and his reading material. That the artist had in mind Rembrandt's 1647 etching of Jan Six reading at a window is suggested by the folded-back book, the relaxed pose, and the erstwhile window, but the composition is closer to that of Rembrandt portraits dating from the 1650s, insofar as it resembles his concepts at all.

2. See Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 6, crediting Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann for expressing "doubts on stylistic grounds before the autoradiography project was under way" (his oral opinion was first recorded in 1970); ibid., pp. 49, 50 (in captions to figs. 16, 51, 59), 118; Liedtke in ibid., vol. 2, pp. 155–156. F. Schmidt-Degener, in April 1935, orally attributed the painting to Jan Lievrens, suggesting that one compare his Self-Portrait, of the 1640s, in the National Gallery, London. Wilhelm Martin, in April 1938, pronounced the picture a great and unmistakable Rembrandt. On June 24, 1976, Josua Bruyn, on behalf of the Rembrandt Research Project, admitted that the painting had puzzled the committee but it "now seems all right to them." In October 1983 C. Grimm considered the picture not by Rembrandt but of the period.
4. See Von Sonnenburg's incisive remarks on the "auctioneer's" face in ibid., pp. 49, 50, 118 (quotations from p. 49). Liedtke in ibid., vol. 2, p. 116, mentions "the awkward alignment of the nose with the brow and the inaccurate placement of the eyes with respect to the eyebrows" as indications that the artist "thought more in terms of additive elements than of fundamental concerns such as the head's structure or the actual behavior of light."
5. See Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 177 (on Pieter, who ran the auction of Lucas van Uffel's estate in April 1649, when Rembrandt sketched Raphael's Portrait of Baldassare Castiglione; fig. 152 here); ibid., pp. 391, 402, 417, 422, 435–36 (Thomas Haringh's receipts and sales of items owned by Rembrandt, in 1666, 1657, and 1658).
6. See Held 1969, pp. 23–24, figs. 15–18. Speaking of early-seventeenth-century examples, Held observes, "it is axiomatic in this type of portraiture that a special bond links the living personages and the bust" (ibid., p. 23).
7. In a letter dated January 11, 1973, Peter Blachard (?), Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, wrote to curatorial assistant Charles Moffett that the bust here is imaginary and departs from Roman practice in several respects. A bust with a covered head appears with two other busts in a Rembrandt-school drawing of a sketching class held in an imaginary version of the master's studio (see Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 18–19, 116, fig. 22). The 1606 inventory of Rembrandt's possessions includes "A Virellius" and "A Seneca," followed by "3 or 4 antique heads of women" (Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 285, nos. 331–33).
8. See Ainsworth et al. 1982, pl. 62.

References: Münderl (1895–98) 1985, p. 193, entry for May 4, 1877, reports seeing the picture in the collection of the Cavalierè Odone, whose asking price was FFr 60,000, states that it "comes from Duca Paolo Inverva," and describes the work as "a remarkably fine and original portrait of a man," signed by Rembrandt and dated 1653; Vosmaer 1877, p. 310 (ill. opp. p. 318, etching by W. Ungerer), as "The Auctioneer, by Rembrandt," in the collection of Joseph Ritter von Lippmann, Vienna, offers a detailed description of the subject and the manner of execution, and considers it probable that the painting represents "Thomas Jacobsz Haringh[h]... whose portrait Rembrandt etched in 1653," and who was involved in the sale at auction of Rembrandt's possessions after his bankruptcy; "Ventres prochaine: Collection Lissinger," Chronique des arts, March 11, 1876, p. 91, mentions the painting, "of exceptional importance," as coming up in the Lippmann sale of March 16, 1876, and notes that it is much talked about; Vosmaer 1877, pp. 316, 359, relates that Lippmann himself (the picture's owner) identifies the sitter as Thomas Jacobszoon Haringh[h], and finds the hypothesis plausible; Eudel 1882, pp. 70–71, gives a blow-by-blow account of the bidding for the painting at the 1881 sale, and asks whether, at the last offer of FFr 200,000, "Est-il vendu ou retiré,—That is the question."; Bode 1883, pp. 534, 598, no. 315, accepts the identification with Thomas Haringh, and
sees the same subject in Man in a Red Cloak (Pl. 171), which was then in the Weber collection, Hamburg; Dutuit 1885, pp. 21, 22, 53, 62, 69, no. 215, records the picture as in the Lissingen and Wilson sales, and notes ("von cros") the identification with Thomas Haringh; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., pp. 76–77, no. 331, catalogues the work as in the Wilson sale, with the usual information; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1901), p. 23, no. 458, pl. 458, as "A Young Man Holding a Notebook in Both Hands, said to be the Auctioneer Haringh," in the collection of Maurice Kann, gives later provenance as Wilbrennick collection, The Hague, and Boussood, Valadon & Cie, Paris, finds the age of the sitter incompatible with the Thomas Haringh identification, and suggests that the notebook and bust may indicate that the sitter was an amateur of art and literature; Valentine 1905, p. 51, refers to the painting as "the so-called young (?) Haringh with Kann," and suggests that Rembrandt's model was his son, Titus; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 327 (ill.), 417, as a portrait of a young man, in the M. Kann collection; Valentin in A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 417 (ill.), 562, tentatively identifies the subject as the artist's son, Titus; Margailler 1909, pp. 14 (ill.), 16, as a portrait of "le commissaire-présieur Haringh le Jeune (?)" but notes that Valentin favors an identification with Titus; Valentin in New York 1909, p. 147, no. 1048 (ill.), doubts the identification with Thomas Haringh, and considers the subject more likely to be Titus van Rijn; Bode 1911, p. 8, calls the sitter the younger [cousin Pieter] Haringh; Frimmel 1913–14, vol. 2, pp. 545, 548, no. 35, records the work in the Lippmann collection and sale, and cites recent literature; Altman Collection 1914, p. 18, no. 10, as "Portrait of a Young Man, Known as Thomas Jacobz [sic] Haring, or The Auctioneere," briefly discusses the possibility that the subject is Titus; Valentin 1914b, p. 351, as "a portrait of Titus (the so-called portrait of Haringh)"; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 355, no. 750, as "A Young Man with Papers in his Hands," lists all known collections and some literature, rejects the identification with "Haringh, the auctioneer," and does not mention Titus; Valentin 1920a, p. 261 (ill.), as a portrait of Titus van Rijn; A. Burroughs 1923, p. 270 (ill.), praises the execution, especially in the "lower half of the picture"; Meldrum 1923, p. 200, pl. CCCLXXI, as "Portrait of a Young Man," by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1658; Monod 1923, pp. 305 (ill.), 306, as "Le Commissaire-Présieur, par Rembrandt"; Compte-rendu 81 (April 1928), p. 223 (ill.); Valentin 1931, unpaged, no. 135, pl. 135, as "Young Man with a Notebook in His Hand," maintains that Titus most likely served as a model for "a composition which probably had an imaginary meaning which is now difficult for us to determine"; Bredius 1935, p. 13, no. 294, pl. 294, as "Junger Mann mit Manuskript"; Held 1942, pp. 12 (ill.), 28, finds "a profound and enigmatical figure" and "enmobilized frailty" in the subject; Ivens 1942a, p. 3, listed; Ivens 1942b, pls. 17, 18 (detail of right hand and papers); J. Allen 1944, p. 73, discovers "powerful insight" in the picture; Benesch 1956, pp. 340–41, fig. 5, calls the painting a portrait of a middle-age man holding a pamphlet, dated 1677 (sic), in which we see that "Rembrandt imbued even [such an example of] the commissioned portrait with a spirituality which elevated it to the sphere of the religious attitude"; Kühn 1965, p. 198, identifies the compositions and colors of the ground layers; K. Bauch 1966, p. 22, no. 422, pl. 422, as by Rembrandt, perhaps a portrait of a writer; K. Clark 1966, p. 77, finds all the sculpture depicted in Rembrandt's work "disturbingly animated," as here, where "the bust . . . seems to be speaking to us behind the sitter's back"; Haverkamp-Begemann 1966, col. 933, as "Man Holding a Manuscript," lists the work among Rembrandt portraits of unidentified sitters; Gerson 1968, pp. 405 (ill.), 501, no. 540, as "A Man Holding a Manuscript," a "beautiful portrait" by Rembrandt; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 224 (ill.), 272, repeats Gerson 1968; Lecaldano 1969, p. 119, no. 268 (ill.), as "Portrait of a Writer," by Rembrandt; Haskell 1970, p. 266, applauds the acquisition by Altman; Julius S. Held in Art Institute of Chicago 1971, p. 52, mentions the bust in connection with Rembrandt's interest in classical antiquity; A. B. de Vries 1973, p. 350, fig. 8, as "Portrait of a Young Man," compares the right hand and the garment with the same motifs in the Rembrandt-school Saul and David (Mauritshuis, The Hague), seeing Rembrandt's execution in both; Bolten and Bolten-Remp in 1977, p. 199, no. 484 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; A. Bailey 1978, p. 180, claims that Rembrandt, "turning to use all his ups and downs," painted this portrait at the time his possessions were being auctioned off; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1970, p. 408, lists the work as a Rembrandt painting of 1658; Baetje 1980, vol. 1, pp. 149–50, as by Rembrandt; Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 87, pls. 59, 60–62 (X-radiograph and autoradiographs), considers the technique inconsistent with autoradiographs by Rembrandt dating from the 1650s; C. Tümpel 1980, pp. 316 (ill.), 430, no. 694, as by an artist in Rembrandt's circle; Jeroomack in 1988a, p. 103 (ill.), notes that the attribution to Rembrandt has been put in doubt by the Museum; Liedtke 1990, p. 48, as "the doubtful 'Auctioneer';" fig. 36 (Altman gallery view); Cabanne 1991, p. 152, no. 2 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Liedtke 1993, pp. 123–25, fig. 3, notes that all scholars accepted the work before 1982, except for unpublished opinions offered by Schmitt-Degen in 1935 ("an audacious attribution to Lievens") and by Haverkamp-Begemann in 1979, rejects the painting as by Rembrandt, comparing its technical qualities with those of the Aristotle, and "favors an attribution to Willem Drost, but at the moment this is no more than a working hypothesis"; Baetje 1995, p. 318, as by a follower of Rembrandt; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 32, 171–72, no. 32 (ill.), discusses the picture as a fashionable portrait of a scholar in his study by a follower of Rembrandt about 1655–60, describes weaknesses in the execution, and reviews the critical history; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 6, 31, 49–50, 118, 119 (ill.), 130, no. 32, figs. 3 (in conservation studio), 16 (autoradiograph detail), 52, 58 (details), 53, 59 (X-radiograph details), emphasizes the limited usefulness of autoradiographic evidence in this case, as opposed to characteristics such as the heavy impasto in the face which "is markedly different from that of every authentic Rembrandt," and suggests that the work "can be considered a quite brilliant one-time exercise by an independent artist rather than an imitation by a pupil working in Rembrandt's studio"; Lask 1996, p. 134, comments approvingly on the remarks made by Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96; Brockhoff and Franken 1997, p. 76, notes that the picture was demoted only recently; Wright 2000, p. 226, fig. 218, observes that the attribution is contested; Scallen 2004, p. 363 n. 99, as owned by M. Kann and Altman; Secrest 2004, pp. 280, 476, mentions the picture as one of the many Rembrandts that "went through Duveen's hands," and notes that it is now catalogued as "Follower of;" Groen in Corpus 2005, p. 331, fig. 34, illustrates a cross section of the quartz ground, and pp. 666–67, 672–73, reports that the first ground contains quartz, a little red ochre, black, and a little chalk, resulting in a light yellowish brown color.

EX COLL.: Sale, Amsterdam, May 23, 1798, no. 166, for Fl 450 to Roos; Marchesa d’Vrea, Genoa; Cavaliere Domenico Odone, Genoa and Vienna (by 1875—before 1875; sold through H. O. Miehike, Vienna, to von Lippmann-Lissingen); Joseph Ritter von Lippmann-Lissingen, Vienna (by 1875—76; his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, March 16, 1876, no. 35, for FF 175,000 to Wilson); John Waterloo Wilson, Brussels and Paris (1876—at least 1886; his sale, Paris, March 14—16, 1881, no. 91, for FF 200,000, bought in); Wilbrenninck, The Hague; [Boussod, Valadon & Cie, Paris]; Maurice Kann, Paris (by 1901-c. 1906; his estate, 1906-9; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, Paris, 1909; sold for $62,980 to Altman]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1900—1913); Request of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.624

1. See Dickey 2004, pp. 139, 203 n. 41, figs. 161, 162, for Rembrandt’s 1655 portrait etchings of Pieter Haringh (see fig. 108) and his older cousin Thomas Haringh. The so-called Auctioneer’s resemblance, if any, is to Pieter Haringh, but it was the aged Thomas who was involved with Rembrandt’s bankruptcy.

174. Christ with a Staff

Oil on canvas, 37 1/4 x 32 1/2 in. (95.3 x 82.6 cm)
Inscribed (right center): Rembrandt f/1661

The painting is well preserved. There is a repair to the tip of the little finger on the proper left hand, and small losses are distributed along the lower edge of the composition.

The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.37

In recent years not only the authorship but the subject of this canvas from the Bache Collection has been disputed. Most scholars now reject an attribution to Rembrandt, whose responsibility for the painting was first doubted in the Museum’s publication of 1982 Art and Automation.1

The picture has usually gone by the title Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff since Bode’s catalogue of 1901 (see Refs.), where, however, the figure type, clothing, and staff are said “rather to indicate a study of the Saviour’s brother James.” Saint James the Minor (or “the Less”), who like Saint James the Major (or “the Great”) is traditionally named as one of the twelve apostles,2 has been considered the painting’s subject by several scholars, usually in connection with attempts to reconstruct one or two series of Apostle pictures thought to have been painted by Rembrandt (possibly with assistants) in or about 1661.3

In the present entry, it is concluded that the Bache canvas was most likely painted by a close follower of Rembrandt (perhaps working for him on a series of pictures) and that its subject is probably Christ.

The painting has considerable quality and is painted in a manner reminiscent of Rembrandt’s about 1660. The execution of the figure, however, with the possible exception of the face, is for the most part superficial rather than brilliantly abbreviated, with failures of form uncharacteristic of Rembrandt even when working quickly on a large scale. The hair and cloak fall in flat planes embellished by numerous scratch marks, the descriptive purpose of which is unclear. The quiltlike pattern on the near arm and other passages of drapery do not read successfully as modeling, which is not even attempted at the contours of the figure.

As Von Sonnenburg observes, the painter “thought more in terms of flat surfaces treated rather graphically than of volumes, an approach that sets him apart from Rembrandt.”4 Von Sonnenburg also regards the figure as poorly related to the background, which is evidently what Ainsworth, Brealey, and Haverkamp-Begemann meant when stating that “space defines the figure, rather than vice versa.” They are particularly insistent on the point that “the background area was reworked in an unusually large number of layers to approximate those effects that Rembrandt could achieve with an economy of means.”5 Some critics consider the face as stronger and closer in technique to faces certainly painted by Rembrandt, although Von Sonnenburg dismisses the handling of the features (and the notion of collaboration) as an additive exercise carried out on a “rather opaque underlayer of light pink that serves as a smooth base. . . .” Unlike Rembrandt, the author of this picture did not model from the start in terms of light and shadow.6

The present writer is somewhat more sympathetic to the possibility that Rembrandt might have improved upon an assistant’s efforts in the face.7 It is also conceivable
that a few highlights and shadows in the drapery were added by the master, but this is mere speculation. The hypothesis of collaboration is especially plausible in the case of a commission for a series of sizable pictures. To categorize the Museum's painting as a workshop product, however, would beg the question of whether that term is appropriate for Rembrandt's studio about 1661, and would ignore other possibilities, such as a collaboration of painters orchestrated by an art dealer.8

The most impressive defense of the Bache picture against its detractors has been that advanced by Brown (see Refs., 1986–87), with weapons boldly seized from their own arsenal. He maintains that "Christ's head, his features, hair and headress are all painted with great attention to detail," and that an "X-ray reveals that, as was his usual procedure in his late works, the basic structure of [Christ's] head was laid in on the canvas with broad strokes of lead-white with holes left for the eyes and then the surface was built up with the succession of skillfully applied glazes." But the masklike image that emerges from the X-radiograph (which is discussed by Von Sonnenburg in the "Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt" catalogue) cannot be considered consistent with the more powerfully modeled faces by Rembrandt that are seen in X-radiographs of indisputable works.9 However, the impression that the face has, if not subtle glazes, at least some of the quality and characteristics that one associates with the late Rembrandt should not be rejected on technical grounds alone. In contrast to such works as the Portrait of a Man ("The Auctioneer") (Pl. 173), the present painting still elicits spirited debate about whether Rembrandt's hand can be detected in any part of it.10

Bode’s suggestion (1901) that the picture’s subject might be Saint James the Minor was occasionally echoed but not explained until Tümpel (1986, 1993; see Refs.) catalogued the work under the title James the Younger. He sees the "crutch" on which the figure rests his hands as a reference to the fuller’s club with which James was beaten to death. However, Tümpel’s comparative illustration, an engraving of the saint by Anton Wierix (ca. 1555/59–1604) after Marten de Vos (1532–1603), shows a full-bearded figure with a large book and a Herculean club.11 A book, a club or a tall staff, and a face quite unlike Christ’s are commonly found in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century images of James, but in the Bache picture a book is absent and the staff is inconspicuous. It is true that in the thirteenth-century Legenda aurea by Jacobus de Voragine, James’s sobriquet, Brother of the Lord, is said “to come from the fact that he was so like our Lord in his features that more than once he was mistaken for Jesus.” However, it is also observed in the same description of James that “no scissors touched his head, nor did he anoint himself with oil, nor thought it needful to bathe.” Furthermore, “all his life he wore only a simple hempen garment.”12 The figure in the Museum’s picture looks rather dapper by comparison, with his well-trimmed beard and moustache, his gold-bordered chemise, a discreet necklace, and a comfortable robe with a large fastener.

As is well known, Rembrandt tended to favor pictorial sources over texts, except for his close reading of the Bible. Whether or not the figure here is consistent with the late Rembrandt’s usual type of Christ may be answered—as have several scholars—in the affirmative,13 and considered a secondary (if not moot) point if the painter is not Rembrandt. The fair-haired Christ in this picture (with darker hair falling on his shoulders) resembles the type found in Rembrandt’s Supper at Emmaus, of 1648, in the Musée du Louvre, Paris, and in The Resurrected Christ, of 1661, in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich. The figure in the Munich picture has been described as an idealized version of the “young Jew” seen in bust-length paintings by followers of Rembrandt (for example, Pl. 172),14 but it is possible that a different live model served for that image, and likely that another model inspired the features in Christ with a Staff.

Pilgrim’s staffs are usually longer than the one depicted here, and why Christ should be depicted as a pilgrim is far from obvious. Perhaps the staff suggests no more than his early wanderings. In Mark’s account of his arrival in Galilee (1:14–22), Jesus gathered the first apostles (Simon, Andrew, James the Major, and John) and together “they went into Capernaum; and straightway on the sabbath day he entered into the synagogue, and taught. And they were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one that has authority, and not as the scribes.” In the Museum’s picture, a synagogue is suggested by the ancient architecture (a curving wall is indicated in the left background) and by the veil on the back of Christ’s head; a covering was required of men and especially of preachers in synagogues.

As a result of Christ’s preaching, “immediately his fame spread abroad throughout all the region” (1:28). And he went with the apostles to other towns; “he preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee, and cast out devils”
(1:39). The story of Christ’s mission with his “fishers of men,” as described by Mark (and more briefly in Luke 4), would seem the probable inspiration for a series of paintings depicting Jesus and the apostles, especially in Rembrandt’s Amsterdam, where preaching was the central form of church service.

1. Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 92. Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann doubted Rembrandt’s authorship a few years earlier, as acknowledged by Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 6. Like Museum conservator John Brealey (oral opinion, 1987), Von Sonnenburg (ibid., pp. 53, 120–28, no. 57) was firmly against an attribution to Rembrandt on the grounds of style and technique. His tentative attribution to Arent de Gelder was anticipated by Edward Speelman (oral opinion, November 13, 1982), much as Josua Bruyn’s suggestion of Rembrandt with studio collaboration (oral opinion, June 24, 1976) was consistent with the conclusion of Daan Cevat (oral opinion, January 4, 1966). Claus Grimm (late 1980s; undated note in the curatorial files) also considered an attribution to De Gelder plausible.

2. See Metzer and Coogan 1993, p. 339, under “James, Son of Alphaeus,” and “James, Brother of Jesus.”

3. As discussed below, C. Tümpe (1986 and 1993; see Refs.) offers the main argument in favor of Saint James the Minor, largely on the basis of identifying the staff as a “crutch” or club. As discussed by Wheelock in Washington–Los Angeles 2005, pp. 20–21, the idea of an apostle series (which could include an image of Christ) goes back to Schmidt-Degener 1919, and was adopted by Valentinier (1920b, 1931, 1916; see Refs.) and others.


5. The quotes are from Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 92. Haverkamp-Begemann (see note 1 above) continued to see the execution as uncharacteristic of Rembrandt when he discussed the painting with the present writer and other colleagues in Berlin on November 6, 2006.


7. This was essentially Gregor Weber’s view when the painting was discussed by a group of specialists in Berlin, on November 6, 2006.

8. See Lammerzec in London–Amsterdam 2006, pp. 230–31, on the arrangements young painters had with the dealer Gerrit Uyleburgh, who in 1661 took over the business of his father, Hendrick. No known pupil or assistant can be placed with certainty in Rembrandt’s studio during the early 1660s, although his son, Titus, who is named as a painter in documents, may be considered a candidate. Gottfried Kneller (1646–1723) may have been Rembrandt’s pupil in the early to mid-1660s. Arent de Gelder was with Rembrandt in the mid-1660s, and his name has come up in connection with this painting (Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, pp. 126, 128), but the teenager must have been in his native Dordrecht at the time. That pictures approximately in the style of the Bache canvas could have been painted outside Rembrandt’s workshop hardly requires argumentation. Nonetheless, one might compare the Young Man with Feathered Beret, signed and dated 1660 by the German artist Christophe Paudiss (ca. 1630–1666; Národní Galerie, Prague; Szymowski 1983–94, vol. 4, no. 1790), who was active in Vienna about 1660–62. See New York 1995–96, vol. 1, figs. 45, 47, 49, 51, 55, 63, 85, 71.

9. Van de Wetering’s recent resurrection of Christ with a Staff as a work entirely by Rembrandt (2005 and 2006; see Refs.) is not supported by his methodology, which combines highly subjective impressions with convoluted arguments. He declares that “it can scarcely be doubted” that the same artist also executed two of Rembrandt’s most admired late works, The Evangelist Matthew and the Angel (Louvre, Paris) and the Self-Portrait as the Apostle Paul (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), as well as The Apostle Bartholomew (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles), The Apostle Simon (Rutizka Stiftung, Kunsthau, Zurich), and the unpleasant Apostle James the Major (art market, New York), all of which have painted or scratched framing strips at the edges of the composition and are signed (inscribed) and dated 1661 (Berlin 2006, pp. 96–97, nos. 76, 77, figs. 1–4). For the same six paintings, see Washington–Los Angeles 2005, nos. 7–12, where P. Sutton sees the Bache “Apostle” as the odd man out (“large expanses of unmodulated form go flaccid, especially in strong light, and in the shadowed areas we detect weak, even unintelligible parts”). The circumstantial evidence of strips around the edges hardly proves that the pictures are all from one series, or that such a series would have been painted without an assistant’s help. Saint Matthew depicted as an Evangelist would not be placed in an Apostle series, as Volker Manuth has observed on several occasions (and in a personal communication, February 28, 2005). A painted black border is found earlier in Rembrandt’s oeuvre, on The Woman Taken in Adultery, of 1644 (National Gallery, London; see Bormfort et al. 2006, p. 128).


11. The quotes are from Jacobus de Voragine 1969, pp. 262–63.

12. P. Sutton, for example, favors an identification with James “because of the figure’s physical resemblance to Rembrandt’s traditional Christ-type” (Washington–Los Angeles 2005, p. 112).

13. Wheelock in Washington–Los Angeles 2005, p. 91 (under no. 6, the Munich canvas).

References: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 7 (1836), pp. 32–33, no. 78, catalogues the painting as “The Saviour,” by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1661, a work of transcendent merit in the collection of Sir Bethel Codrington; Vosmaer 1877, p. 452, as “Jesus,” sold from the “Mecklenbourg” collection in 1814, for £Fr 13,000; Bode 1883, p. 532, compares pictures of about the same date that are thought to be by Rembrandt; Dunuit 1885, pp. 58, 60, 70, no. 80, listed as “Christ,” 1661, present owner unknown; Bell 1899, p. 85, briefly mentions the work as in the collection of Count Raczynski, Poznai; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1901), p. 9, no. 417, pl. 417, as “Christ (?) with a Pilgrim’s Staff” in the Raczynski collection, questions whether the painting represents Christ rather than “the Saviour’s brother James,” supposes that a model [was] chosen in the Jewish quarter of Amsterdam,” and detects the influence of Venetian artists as well as Leonardo; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 224 (iii.), 262, as “Christ”; Marguillier 1909, p. 16, calls the picture “une simple étude, largement
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brossée, d’un *Pélerin en prière*, le meilleur de tout un groupe curieux de figures de moines ou de pèlerins peint par Rembrandt à cette époque*”; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 454 (ill.), 578, as “Christ”; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 118–19, no. 164, as “Christ,” describes the composition, including the “pilgrim’s staff,” and lists collections; Errera 1920–21, vol. 1 (1920), p. 502, as “Christ en pèlerin,” dated 1662; Valentinier 1920b, p. 211, suggests that Rembrandt painted a series of six pictures representing the four evangelists, with paintings of the Virgin and Christ in the center, and that the picture of Christ could be identical with this work or one or two others; Meldrum 1933, p. 202, pl. CCCXIII, as “Christ”; Weisbach 1926, pp. 498–99, considers the figure an unusual type of Christ, presented as a pilgrim, with big eyes, following an inner voice; M. Eister 1927, p. 50, pl. 18, in the text, describes the figure as a pilgrim, but as Christ in the caption to the plate; Brandus 1928, pp. 189 (ill.), 192–94, as “Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff”; W. Gibson 1928, p. 320 (ill.); A. Alexandre 1929, p. 122, mentions the picture as a Bache loan to the Royal Academy exhibition of 1929, and describes the figure of Christ as “ironic and benevolent, almost malicious,” and as doubtless modeled on “a young rabbi of the Jewish quarter” in Amsterdam; Bache Collection 1929, unpagd (ill.), as “Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff”; Heil 1929, pp. 4, 21 (ill.), feels that “this Saviour is Dutch and in his human warmth and emotional appeal could only have been conceived by a man of the North”; *Illustrated London News*, January 12, 1929 (cover ill., drawing by C. E. Turner), shows the painting in the Dutch exhibition at Burlington House, with the queen visiting; Cortissoz 1930, pp. 236 (ill.), 239, knows of “no nobler Rembrandt than this, none more interpenetrated by tragic dignity, none more haunting”; Valentinier 1930b, p. 3 (ill.); Valentinier 1930d, p. 3, as “the Resurrected Christ, in the Bache collection”; Valentinier 1931, unpagd, no. 151, pl. 151, as a picture of “the resurrected Christ,” connected with other portraits of pilgrims and other religious figures painted in 1661; Bredius 1935, p. 27, no. 629, pl. 629, as “Christus”; Bache Collection 1937, unpagd, no. 38 (ill.), as “Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff”; *Duvene Pictures* 1941, unpagd, no. 202 (ill.), as “Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff”; Bache Collection 1943, unpagd, no. 37 (ill.), as “Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff”; J. Allen 1945, pp. 75, 77 (ill.), observes that “in 1661 Rembrandt experimented with a blond Christ, as seen in the Bache half-length”; Rousseau 1952, p. 84, mentioned; Bensch 1956, p. 351, fig. 14, calls the figure “Christ the teacher in the Synagogue,” claims that the garment is that of an Eastern pilgrim, and titles the work “Christ or an Apostle” in the caption; Rotermund 1956, p. 330, fig. 182, identifies the figure as a Jewish pilgrim and states that the column in the background is reminiscent of the Portuguese synagogue in Amsterdam; Valentinier 1956, p. 4200, revises the author’s earlier hypothesis (see Valentinier 1920b), now seeing the subject of the Museum’s picture as probably an apostle; K. Bauch 1966, p. 13, no. 241 (and under no. 235), pl. 241, as “Christus,” possibly belonging to a series of Apostle paintings; Gerson 1968, pp. 420 (ill.), 502–3, no. 369, agrees with Valentinier (1956) that “this vision of Christ is the one most likely to have crowned off a traditional series of holy figures”; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 330 (ill.), 615, no. 629, as “Christ,” observes that “if Rembrandt had in mind a complete series (of the kind Rubens had painted in his youth) the inclusion of the Saviour would have been highly suitable”; Lacaldano 1969, pp. 120, 121 (ill.), no. 397, as “Cristo,” also seen as a pilgrim or apostle; Von Einem 1972, p. 338, fig. 10, considers the subject the resurrected Christ on the way to Emmaus; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 201, no. 329 (ill.), as “Christ”; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 480, listed among Rembrandt paintings dated 1661; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 150, as “Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff,” by Rembrandt; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 92, 98 n. 29, 99 nn. 62–65, 101, pls. 63, 64 (X-radiograph), 65 (auroradiograph), based on the evidence of auroradiographs, doubts the attribution to Rembrandt, for example by observing that “the background area was reworked in an unusually large number of layers,” and that the figure, with its “unaltered contour,” reveals an uncharacteristic “lack of inner definition of the form”; Simpson 1986a, p. 209, reports that Duvene convinced Bache to buy the picture solely on the basis of a photograph, for $300,000, which the dealer “had persuaded Count Eduard Raczyński to part with for exactly half that price”; Simpson 1986b, p. 127, repeats Simpson 1986a; C. Tümpel 1986, p. 342 (ill.), 400, no. 86, as “Jakobus der Jüngere” (James the Less), by Rembrandt, identifies the staff as “crutch,” and associates this motif with the fuller’s rod that was used at the saint’s martyrdom; Brown in Yokohama–Fukuoka–Kyōto 1986–87, pp. 68–69 (ill. and detail), 136, 154, no. 12 (cover ill.), as “Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff,” by Rembrandt, dismisses the remarks made in Ainsworth et al. 1982, considers the broad handling in the background and in the figure to be characteristic of Rembrandt, as is the “great attention to detail” in the head, and observes that Christ “wears the headdress and carries the Tau-shaped stick of the pilgrim” (thus mistaking the cloak’s fastener for the top of the staff); Jeromack 1988a, p. 103 (ill.), reports that the picture has been described as an early work by Arent de Gelder; Liedtke 1990, p. 52, mentioned as a Bache picture “which is still attributed by some scholars to Rembrandt”; Cabanne 1991, p. 152, no. 19 (ill.), as “Le Christ,” by Rembrandt; C. Tümpel 1993, p. 342 (ill.), as “James the Younger,” by Rembrandt, repeats C. Tümpel 1986; Baetjer 1995, p. 318, as “Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff,” by a follower of Rembrandt; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 32, 228–30, no. 37 (ill.), as “a follower of Rembrandt,” reviews recent opinions of authorship, defends the identification of the figure as Christ, and concludes that the picture could have been part of a series representing Christ and the apostles; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 6, 30, 74, 118, 120, 126–28, 130, no. 37 (ill.), figs. 62, 160 (details), as “Circle of Rembrandt (Arent de Gelder?),” describes in detail how the execution of this painting differs from that of Rembrandt, although aspects of his manner are imitated, and approves the suggestion of Rotermund (1956) that the figure (wearing a transparent black veil with red fringe) is a Jewish pilgrim visiting a synagogue; Liedtke 1998a, p. 313, compares The Apostle James the Major (private collection) as a picture that is comparable “superficial in execution and interpretation”; Wright 2000, pp. 172, 176, fig. 156, as by Rembrandt, favors the identification of the figure as James the Less; Secret 2004, p. 327, reports that in January 1929, Duvene wrote to Bache telling him about the drawing reproduced in the *Illustrated London News* (1929; see above) showing Queen Mary admiring this picture; Groen in Corpus 2008, pp. 668–69, 674–75, reports that the first ground contains chalk and a little red ochre, and the second ground lead white, a little umber, red ochre, and charcoal (?) black, resulting in a yellowish color; Van de Wetering in ibid., pp. 547, 548, as “the so-called Christ” or “St James Minor (or Christ),” cites Schmidt-Degener’s opinion that the canvas was intended as part of a
series, describes studying the work (during the Washington exhibition of 2005) among “five other Apostle paintings, all of which are dated 1661 and all executed in the same remarkably swift manner as the present painting,” and coming to the conclusion that “all six paintings were painted by the same hand, by Rembrandt”; P. Sutton in Washington—Los Angeles 2005, pp. 111—13, 120—22, no. 12, as “School of Rembrandt,” rejects recent arguments in favor of Rembrandt’s authorship, favors an identification of the figure as the apostle James the Minor, and reviews earlier interpretations of the subject (incorrectly implying that the title employed by the MMA goes back to Benesch 1956 rather than to Bode 1897—1906, and mistakenly reporting that the figure is interpreted as the Risen Christ by Liedtke in New York 1995—96); Wheelock in ibid., p. 110, notes that the picture’s dimensions and painted border occur similarly in four other “religious portraits” by or said to be by Rembrandt, “all of which date to the same year”; P. Sutton in San Diego 2005—6, pp. 41—45 (ill. p. 40), repeats P. Sutton in Washington—Los Angeles 2005; Van de Wetering in Berlin 2006, pp. 96—97, no. 77, maintains that because of “correspondences in temperament” evident in the manner of execution, this picture and five others of about the same date must be by the same hand, and “it can scarcely be doubted that this artist must have been Rembrandt” because two of the pictures in the supposed series are never doubted as masterpieces by him; C. Brown 2007, p. 107, describes the painting as “signed and dated 1661” and as accorded the attention it deserves by being included in the Berlin exhibition of 2006.


**EX COLL:** Sir C. Bethell Codrington, Bt., Dodington Park, Gloucestershire (by 1846—d. 1843; his estate sale, May 12, 1843, no. 169, for £252 to Nieuwenhuys); [C. J. Nieuwenhuys, London, from 1843]; Baron de Mecklembourg, Paris (d. 1854; his estate sale, Paris, December 22, 1854, no. 15, for Fr. 15,000 to Raczyński); Count Edward Raczyński, Rógalin, Poland (1854—1927; sold for $500,000 to Duveen); [Duveen, London and New York, 1927; sold for $500,000 to Bache]; Jules S. Bache, New York (1927—d. 1944; his estate, 1944—49); The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.37

175. **Pilate Washing His Hands**

Oil on canvas, 51 ¼ × 65 ¼ in. (130.2 × 167 cm)

The painting is abraded throughout. Passages most seriously affected include the hair of the boy in the left foreground and the figure with turban in the background. There is paint loss along the horizontal canvas join that extends through the middle of the composition.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.610

About a century ago, this large canvas was generally considered one of the treasures that distinguished two great collections of the time, those of Rodolphe Kann and Benjamin Altman. The New Yorker acquired the canvas in 1907 for approximately the price of a Manhattan townhouse. The major Rembrandt authorities of the day—Bode, Hofstede de Groot, Rosenberg, Valentiner, and others—evidently had no doubts about Rembrandt’s authorship, but two perhaps more independent critics, Gustav Glück (1900) and Alfred von Wurzbach (1910), were inclined to reject it from its oeuvre, in Glück’s view as the work of a gifted pupil.1 Van Dyke (1923; see Refs.) placed the painting in one of his most capacious dustbins, that of Salomon Koninck (1609—1666) or his workshop. Scholarly visitors to the Museum, from 1935 onward, have proposed attributions to Gerbrand van den Eekhout (q.v.), “Fabritius” (presumably Barent; q.v.), and Arent de Gelder (1645—1727).2 Held’s opinion (1942 and 1944; see Refs.)
that the picture is by a Rembrandt pupil, but "clearly based upon a characteristic idea of the master himself," was shared by curator John Walsh (and others) in the 1970s, despite Gerson's suggestion of an origin outside the artist's circle. In his extensive survey of Rembrandt pupils and followers, Sumowski (1983–[94]; see Refs.) concluded that the work is by an unknown student of about 1650–55, and he stressed that De Gelder had no part in its execution. But Sumowski has not studied the canvas in the original, at least not in the past twenty-five years. Furthermore, a dating to the early 1650s is discouraged by the passages of superficial brushwork and by the type of composition, which appears inspired by the poised designs Rembrandt employed in paintings such as Jacob Blessing the Sons of Joseph, of 1660 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel), and The Denial of Peter, of 1660 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

Pending the discovery of additional evidence, it seems hasty to dismiss the idea that the painting might be an early work by De Gelder, that is, when he was a pupil of Rembrandt's (about 1662–64) or slightly later. Unfortunately, the earliest known dated paintings by De Gelder, such as the Judah and Tamar, possibly of 1667 (private collection), and the multitfigure Ecce Homo, of 1671 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), offer little basis for comparison, although the Judah and Tamar is, like many later De Gelders, a biblical picture focused on a few half- or three-quarter-length figures, with a protagonist in profile, sketchy highlights on the fabrics, and loose brushwork in large areas of the composition.5 In the artist's history paintings of the early 1680s, one finds similarly arranged compositions, with (as here) comparatively smooth areas of color, often green and brick red, relieving the overall execution in a range of browns. Faces much like Pilate's, similar hands, costumes, and rather vague settings are also found in paintings by De Gelder dating from the 1680s, such as the Judah and Tamar of 1681 (Bader collection) and the Sarah and Abrahaum, of about 1683 (formerly art market, Germany).6 The crudely described soldiers in the left background of the Altman canvas do not resemble figures by De Gelder, but one wonders whether the subordinate scene might have been filled in by a painter other than the one responsible for Pilate and his retainers.5

Of course, Pilate Washing His Hands could have been painted by an unknown pupil or an artist working outside Rembrandt's workshop. De Gelder himself was financially secure and had no pupils, so far as is known.

The subject is described in Matthew 27:15–28, similarly in Mark 15:6–15, and somewhat differently in Luke 23:13–21. Pontius Pilate was procurator (governor) of Judaea from A.D. 26 to 36. Pressed by the Jews to condemn Christ, he evaded responsibility by proposing to free a prisoner on the occasion of Passover. After the populace of Jerusalem chose the murderer Barabbas over Christ, Pilate washed his hands, a Jewish rite symbolizing innocence. Rembrandt treated the related subject of Christ Presented to the People (Ecce Homo; John 19:13–16) in two prints, an etching of 1635–36 and the famous drypoint of 1635. The theatrics of the first and the tragedy of the second appear to have made no impression on the painter of the Altman canvas.

References: Bode 1883, pp. 580–81, 579, no. 145, considers the painting "a characteristic and especially attractive" work by Rembrandt of about 1650, in the collection of Lord Mount Temple at Broadlands; Durrieu 1885, pp. 47, 60, 69, no. 73, lists the picture, following Bode's information; Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 224; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, pp. 106, 239 (ill. opp. p. 106), places the painting close to the Denial of Saint Peter (then in Saint Petersburg; now Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which the author dates to about 1656; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1894, pp. 39–40, no. 32 (ill. opp. p. 40), describes the subject in detail, and records that the painting was acquired by the 2nd Lord Palmerston from a Parisian dealer in 1794; Bell 1899,
pp. 82, 162, mentioned as with Sedelmeyer; Bode 1900, p. III, no. 11 (ill.); Glück 1900, p. 90, calls it a splendid picture that is hard to place in Rembrandt's oeuvre, and suggests that it might be by one of his most gifted pupils; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 7 (1902), pp. 23–24, 126, no. 552, pl. 552, regards the painting as a “somewhat abnormal work” by Rembrandt, of about 1665, and mentions a copy of Pilate’s head by C. W. E. Dietrich; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 248 (ill.), 263, as by Rembrandt about 1665; Neumann 1905, vol. 2, p. 528, note *, as a splendid Rembrandt in the R. Kann collection, comments on the physiognomy and general effect; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 379 (ill.), 426, as by Rembrandt about 1665; Bode 1907, vol. 1, pp. v, 69, no. 68 (ill. between pp. 68 and 69), as by Rembrandt about 1665, observing that “the master has achieved the summum of the effect he desired by a few broad, bold strokes of a nervous brush, a few energetic and luminous tones”; Nicolle 1908, p. 197, as the latest Rembrandt in the Kann collection; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 468 (ill.), 588, as by Rembrandt about 1665; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 2 (1910), p. 407, considers Rembrandt’s authorship “extremely questionable”; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 7–9, no. 3, refers to Valentine’s (evidently unpublished) interpretation of the picture as one of “predominantly tragic emotions, a speechless brooding”; Valentine 1914b, p. 311, mentioned as in Altman’s collection; Altman Collection 1915, p. 81, mentioned; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), pp. 99–100, no. 129, as by Rembrandt about 1665, describes the subject and lists collections; Saxl 1921, p. 323, fig. 2, considers this “Italianate type of composition” typical of the late Rembrandt; Valentine 1921b, p. 127, updates the location and mentions a somewhat earlier version of the composition in the collection of Dr. F. Güterbock, Berlin; A. Burroughs 1923, p. 172, rejects the picture as “a fumbled, weightless enormity” by a pupil; Meldrum 1923, p. 204, pl. cccxlexvi, as by Rembrandt about 1665; Monod 1923, pp. 307 (ill.), 308, offers effusive praise of the profound picture; Van Dyke 1923, pp. 113–14, attributes the work to a pupil of Rembrandt, suggesting that it is by Salomon Koninck (“one of his pretentious but hastily painted
176. **Man in a Beret**

Oil on canvas, 29 7/8 x 24 1/4 in. (75.9 x 62.9 cm)

The painting has suffered severe abrasion throughout. A strip 3 1/2 in. (8.9 cm) wide was added along the top of the canvas.

Gift of Charles S. Payson, 1975 1975.373

When this picture was given to the Museum in 1975, it was described in a confidential memorandum as an “undisputed portrait” by Rembrandt and as the fortieth painting by or attributed to him in the collection. Both statements were believed to be true at the time, although curatorial files reveal that several works ascribed to Rembrandt would soon be recatalogued in light of recent research.

The present picture was mostly inaccessible to scholars after the Amsterdam and Rotterdam exhibition of 1956 (see Exhibited), and its condition was unknown. Indeed, the only question ever raised in the specialized literature prior to the 1980s was whether or not the painting portrayed Titus van Rijn (proposed dates followed accordingly; see Refs.). The identification with Rembrandt’s son...
was doubted as early as 1898, and routinely dismissed from the 1920s onward (except by W. R. Valentiner, who at one time or another discovered Titus’s features in four other “Rembrandts” in the Museum’s collection; Pls. 113, 171, 173, 177).

Within weeks of its accession, the picture was discounted as a Rembrandt by two authorities, Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann and Seymour Slive. Between 1976 and 1980, the painting was also rejected on technical grounds by members of the Museum’s autoradiography project (including Haverkamp-Begemann, Maryan Ainsworth, and conservator John Brealey). The work was never placed on public view in the Museum until the “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition of 1995–96. On that occasion, Von Sonnenburg explained that “during the 1970s it was still quite usual to assign problem pictures in Rembrandt’s style to imitators of the eighteenth or early nineteenth centuries, and the Museum [in Baetjer 1980; see Refs.] described this portrait as a product of the nineteenth century. This classification was, of course, untenable on the basis of stylistic, let alone technical, reasons.” The judgment is accurate but slightly harsh, considering that until 1995, when Von Sonnenburg treated the picture, it had extensive areas of nineteenth-century repainting, including a much enlarged beret, the entire cloak, part of the background (where a false signature had been added), and parts of the face. To complicate the matter, “the young man’s shoulder-length curly hair has suffered severely from excessive solvent action,” and the face reveals not only later retouchings but also “reworkings [that] originated in the seventeenth century with the painting’s author.” Finally, the visible head was painted directly on top of a head of an old man with a beard wearing a different beret and a different costume (fig. 222).

The present writer agrees with Von Sonnenburg’s conclusion that technical evidence and the painting’s manner of execution (which includes the handling of lead white in the underlying portrait) “favor a dating to the last quarter of the seventeenth century, and an association with the taste for Rembrandt’s manner that still prevailed at that time.” In both main phases of work, the picture appears somewhat closer to Rembrandt’s circle than paintings such as Rembrandt’s Son, Titus and Man with a Beard (Pls. 177, 178), but it cannot be plausibly associated with any of the master’s known followers.

1. Department of European Paintings report to the vice director for curatorial affairs, dated December 31, 1975. The same report states that the painting required conservation work and further evaluation.

2. In Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, pp. 148–49, 23 paintings in the Museum’s collection are said to be by Rembrandt, 1 is attributed to him, and 16 are catalogued as Style of Rembrandt or otherwise.

3. Haverkamp-Begemann felt that Rembrandt’s impasto had simply been imitated by another hand. His opinion, expressed orally in February 1976, is recorded in a memo from associate curator Charles Moffett to curator John Walsh, dated March 9, 1976. When Slive first studied the painting on January 7, 1976, he suggested that a face by Rembrandt “may have existed in sketch form” (according to an unsigned memo in the curatorial files), but that the rest of the picture was finished by another hand. Horst Gerson visited the Museum on April 7, 1976, but no comment is recorded.

4. As noted by Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 130. The project’s findings on this picture were not published in Ainsworth et al. 1982.

5. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, pp. 128, 130, referring to photographs of the painting before restoration and in a cleaned state, as well as an X-radiograph and an autoradiograph. He suggests (ibid., p. 30) that a layer of black underpainting may have been employed to cover the old man’s face before the present figure was begun.

6. Ibid., p. 128.
REFERENCES: Waagen 1854, vol. 2, p. 200, cites the work as a male
portrait in the Holford collection, "of extraordinary power and depth
of tone, though less pleasing in feeling"; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2,
p. 236, as a portrait of Titus van Rijn, from about 1660; Hofstede de
Groot 1898, no. 107, as "Portret van een jong mensch, ook gehouden
voor Titus van Rijn," painted about 1652; Bell 1899, pp. 84, 147, as
"Captain Holford's portrait of a grave young man supposed to be
Titus," dating from about 1660; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1901),
pp. 18, 122, no. 444, pl. 445, as "Titus in a Black Cap with a Budding
Moustache," in the Holford collection, dates the painting to about
1618 (p. 122) or about 1659–60 (p. 18), and considers it "indifferent
in expression, so much so that the identity of the sitter has been
wrongly called into question"; Moes 1897–1903, vol. 2 (1903),
p. 318, no. 6694-4, as a portrait of Titus van Rijn, from about 1660;
A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 337 (ill.), 404, 417, as a portrait of Titus,
from about 1658–60; J. Veth 1906a, fig. 42, as "Jonge Man met zwarte
mut," 1618; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 418 (ill.), 562, as "Titus," about
1618; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 333, no. 703, as
"Titus," about 1618, mentions a copy attributed to Ferdinand Bol
(private collection, New York); Meldrum 1923, p. 199, pl. cccxlviii,
as "Portrait of Titus," by Rembrandt, about 1661; Benson 1924, p. 81,
no. 93, pl. cxxxi and frontisp., as "Portrait of a Young Man," by
Rembrandt, about 1622–54, states that the sitter cannot be Titus, but
is probably an earlier portrait of the man who is also depicted in a
Rembrandt portrait of 1658 (Louvre, Paris); De Rici 1929, pp. 40–
41, suggests that this picture and two portraits in the Louvre all rep-
resent Titus; Benson 1927, vol. 2, p. 22, no. 129, pl. cxvi, as
"Portrait of a Young Man with a cleft chin," repeats the observations
made in Benson 1924; W. Gibson 1928, p. 222 (ill. opp. p. 200),
reviews the scholarly debate concerning the sitter’s identity and the
date; Valentin 1931, unpaged, no. 134, pl. 134, as a portrait of Titus,
"probably painted in 1638"; Bredius 1935, p. 13, no. 293, pl. 293,
as "Junger Mann," doubts that the picture represents Titus; Valentin
in New York 1939, pp. 144–49, no. 305, as "Titus, Son of Rembrandt;
"by Rembrandt, about 1658; Pach in New York 1940, pp. 63 (ill.), 64,
as "Portrait of a Young Man with a Cleft Chin," by Rembrandt,
probably dating from 1612–38; K. Bauch 1966, p. 22, no. 417, pl. 417,
dates the work to about 1656, and dismisses the identification with
Titus; Gerson 1968, pp. 398, 399 (ill.), 501, no. 328, as "A Young Man
with a Beret," by Rembrandt, observes that the picturesque treatment
is similar to that found in portraits of Titus dating from the late
1650s, although he is not the sitter here; Gerson in Bredius 1969,
pp. 223 (ill.), 572, no. 293, by Rembrandt, repeats the remarks made
in Gerson 1968; Lecaldano 1969, p. 118, no. 347 (ill.), as "Portrait of
a Young Man with Large Beret," by Rembrandt; C. Brown 1976,
p. 219 n. 4, in a list of paintings formerly thought to portray Titus,
follows Gerson 1968; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, p. 197, no. 450
(ill.), as "A Young Man with a Beret," by Rembrandt; Baetjer 1980,
vol. 1, p. 151, as Style of Rembrandt, first half 17th century; C. Tümpel
1986, pl. 410, 411 (ill.), no. A102, as "A Young Man with Beret," by
a Rembrandt pupil, about 1653; Cabanne 1991, p. 131, no. 13 (ill.), as
by Rembrandt, in 1656; C. Tümpel 1993, p. 433, no. A102, repeats C.
Tümpel 1986; Baetjer 1995, p. 218, as by a follower of Rembrandt,
second or third quarter 17th century; Liedtke in New York 1995–96,
vol. 2, pp. 119, 134–36, no. 40 (ill.), as "Portrait of a Young Man
with a Beret," by an imitator of Rembrandt working in the last
quarter of the 17th century, concurs with the following; Von
Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 30, 128–31, no. 40 (ill.), figs. 161
(before restoration), 162 (autograph detail), 163 (autogra-
diograph detail), 164 (cleaned state), 165 (detail), as by a follower
of Rembrandt, discusses the double ground (which is "consistent with
familiar seventeenth-century methods practiced in the Rembrandt
circle"), the underlying portrait of an old man with a goatee, alter-
ations of the canvas support, nineteenth-century repaints and their
removal, and changes apparently made by the original painter, who
probably executed this picture during the last quarter of the seven-
teenth century; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 666–67, reports that the
first ground contains red earth, chalk, and a littleumber, and the
second ground, lead white, fine bone black, a littleumber, and yel-
low ochre, resulting in a gray color; Bogh Rønning in Copenhagen
2006, p. 293 n. 6 (under no. 38), mentions this picture as one of the
"Tituses" that are most closely linked to the Rembrandt-school
Young Man in a Pearl-Trimmed Cap (Statens Museum for Kunst,
Copenhagen).

EXHIBITED: London, British Institution, untitled, 1862, no. 15, as
"Portrait of a Dutch Gentleman," by Rembrandt (lent by R. S.
Holford); London, British Institution, untitled, 1867, no. 75, as
"Head of a Man," by Rembrandt (lent by R. S. Holford); London,
Royal Academy of Arts, "Winter Exhibition," 1893, no. 50, as
"Portrait of the Painter's Son, Titus," by Rembrandt (lent by Captain
G. L. Holford); Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, "Schilderijen
bijeengebracht ter gelegenheid van de inhuldiging van Hare
Majesteit Koningin Wilhelmina," 1898, no. 107, as "Portret van
een jong mensch, ook gehouden voor Titus van Rijn" (Portrait of
a young man, also regarded as Titus van Rijn) (lent by Captain
Holford); London, Royal Academy of Arts, "Winter Exhibition,"
1899, no. 82, as "Portrait of Titus," by Rembrandt (lent by Captain
G. L. Holford); Paris, Musée de l’Orangerie, "Exposition hollan-
daise: Tableaux, aquarelles et dessins anciens et modernes," 1921,
no. 42, as "Titus" (lent by Sir George L. Holford); London,
Burlington Fine Arts Club, "Pictures and Other Objects of Art
Selected from the Collections of Mr. Robert Holford," 1921–22,
no. 31, as "Portrait of Titus van Rijn," by Rembrandt; London,
Royal Academy of Arts, "Exhibition of Dutch Art 1450–1900,"
1929, no. 125, as "Portrait of Titus van Rijn, Son of the Artist"
(1641–68) (lent by M. Knoedler & Co.); Detroit, Mich., The
Detroit Institute of Arts, "Paintings by Rembrandt," 1930, no. 61,
as "Rembrandt’s Son Titus," by Rembrandt (lent by Mrs. Charles S.
Payson, New York); New York, New York World’s Fair, "Masterpieces of Art," 1939, no. 305, as "Titus, Son of Rembrandt," by
Rembrandt (lent by Mrs. Charles S. Payson, New York); New York,
New York World’s Fair, "Masterpieces of Art," 1940, no. 87, as
"Portrait of a Young Man with a Cleft Chin," by Rembrandt (lent
by Mrs. Charles S. Payson, New York); New York, Duveneck
Galeries, "Paintings by the Great Dutch Masters of the Seventeenth
Century," 1942, no. 48, as "Titus, Son of Rembrandt," by
Rembrandt (lent by Mrs. Charles S. Payson, New York); New
York, Wildenstein & Co., "Loan Exhibition of Rembrandt," 1910,
no. 19, as "Portrait of a Young Man" (lent by Mrs. Charles S.
Payson); New Haven, Conn., Yale University Art Gallery, "Pictures
Collected by Yale Alumni," 1916, no. 15, as "Portrait of Titus
(Young Man with Cleft Chin)" (lent by Mr. and Mrs. Charles S.
Payson); Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, and Rotterdam,
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Museum Boymans, “Rembrandt tentoonstelling ter herdenking van de geboorte van Rembrandt op 15 Juli 1606,” 1936, no. 79, as “Portret van een Jonge Man” (lent by Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. Payson, New York); New Haven, Conn., Yale University Art Gallery, “Paintings, Drawings, and Sculpture Collected by Yale Alumni,” 1960, no. 13, as “Portrait of Titus” by Rembrandt (lent by Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. Payson); New York, Wildenstein & Co., “Masterpieces: A Memorial Exhibition for Adele R. Levy,” 1961, no. 19, as “Portrait of Titus,” by Rembrandt (lent by Mrs. Charles S. Payson); New York, MMA, “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt in The Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 1995–96, no. 40, as “Portrait of a Young Man with a Beret,” by a follower of Rembrandt (Von Sonnenburg) or by an imitator of Rembrandt (Liedtke).

Ex Coll.: Robert Stayner Holford, Dorchester House, London (by 1854–d. 1892); his son Sir George Lindsay Holford, Westonbirt, Tetbury, Gloucestershire (1892–d. 1926; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 17–18, 1928, no. 33); [Knoedler, London and New York, 1928; sold for $44,825 to Payson]; Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. Payson, New York (1938–her d. 1973); Charles S. Payson, New York (1973); Gift of Charles S. Payson, 1973 1973.573

177. Rembrandt’s Son, Titus

Oil on canvas, 31 1/2 x 23 1/4 in. (79.1 x 59.1 cm)
Inscribed (falsely, upper left): Rembrandt. f. 1655.

The paint surface is slightly worn throughout along the crowns of the coarse canvas. There are small paint losses and some severe abrasion in the lower portion of the figure and around the edges of the painting.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.608

In the early days of Rembrandt connoisseurship, this painting was esteemed as an affecting portrait of Rembrandt’s son, Titus van Rijn (1641–1668), and as one of the late Rembrandts that passed from the famous collection of Rodolphe Kann in Paris to that of Benjamin Altman in New York (who paid $148,100 for the picture in 1908). Horst Gerson, in 1959, thought he was the first to doubt the painting in print, a claim that was actually staked in 1923 by John Van Dyke (see Refs.), the American professor who turned many of his country’s golden Rembrandts into lead (in this case, by attributing the work to Barent Fabritius; q.v.). Gerson and most later scholars supposed that the canvas was painted in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, but conservator Hubert von Sonnenburg found no reason to doubt a seventeenth-century origin, based mainly on analysis of the pigments employed and the “typical double ground composed largely of red ochre.” He tentatively placed the picture in “the group of works painted by nameless Rembrandt followers, possibly during the master’s lifetime.”

The present writer would favor a dating between about 1670 and 1700, in view of the painting’s superficial manner of execution and its transformation of Titus into a pretty and rather too sweet pubescent boy. A slightly later date cannot be excluded. However, the materials employed, the modeling of the face, and the brushwork in the costume, which is inspired by Rembrandt’s mature style (compare Pl. 157), are consistent with a date in the last few decades of the seventeenth century.

Von Sonnenburg also noted that “the very conspicuously placed and overly large signature does not seem to be of much later date than the paint layer.” Whether or not the inscription is by the painter of the portrait cannot be determined. The long accepted date of 1655 was most likely chosen with Titus in mind, since he would have been about thirteen or fourteen at the time.

From a survey of possible prototypes in the oeuvres of Rembrandt and his immediate followers, it would appear that a single source is not known. There are, however, intriguing similarities with several earlier works. The close correspondence of the frontal pose with arms akimbo to Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait of 1652 (see fig. 187) was mentioned a century ago by Wilhelm von Bode. The same maternal influence would explain Titus’s direct glance at the viewer, and the choice of hat (if not the feather). A similar presentation of the figure is also found in Rembrandt’s etching of Titus, which is usually dated about 1656. Both the print and Rembrandt’s painted portrait of Titus of about 1657, in the Wallace Collection, London, which show the sitter full-face at about the age of fifteen, reveal how the painter of the Altman picture idealized the young man’s features by straightening the nose, enhancing the lips, and slimming the entire head. The resulting expression, and, curiously, the pose, recall the Rembrandt-school Young Woman at an Open Half-Door (Art Institute of Chicago), which several scholars have
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attributed to Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.), about 1646–47. While the costume in the New York canvas bears a general resemblance to that in Rembrandt’s late Portrait of a Boy (“Titus”), of about 1655–60, in the Norton Simon Museum, Pasadena, it comes closer to female attire, as seen in the Chicago picture and especially in the Rembrandt-school Young Woman (“Hendrickje Stoffels”), on loan to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

When Frederick Schmidt-Degener (then director of the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) visited the Museum in 1935, he told curator Harry Wehle that he did not consider the Altman picture to be a portrait of Titus. The evidence discussed above suggests, however, that, on the contrary, the painter did indeed intend the sitter to be recognized as Rembrandt’s son. The many instances in the scholarly literature of misinterpretation (and “misappreciation”) have no doubt been encouraged by the assumption that the master was responsible for the work in question.

2. See the detail in ibid., fig. 166.
3. Ibid., p. 132.
4. Bode 1907, vol. 1, p. III. On the Vienna Self-Portrait, see Corpus 2005, pp. 410–17, no. 105. The similarity in composition was originally closer. As noted in ibid., pp. 412 (under “Support”), 414, the self-portrait was cut down on the left side and trimmed slightly at top and bottom, at some time between 1675 and 1720.
5. Barsch no. 11; G. Schwartz 1977, no. 811 (ill.). The fall of light and off-center placement of the figure suggest that if the painter referred to the print at all, he reversed it in a mirror or by other means.
8. For the pictures previously thought to represent Hendrickje Stoffels and Titus, see Bredius 1969, nos. 112, 119 (ill. pp. 100, 107). They are also reproduced (side by side) in G. Schwartz 1985, figs. 347, 348. In an article on the Norton Simon canvas, C. Brown (1976, p. 219 n. 4) lists pictures once said to portray Titus.
9. Oral opinion, recorded in the curatorial files, April 15, 1935.
10. A good example is Homan Recognizes His Fate (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg; Bredius no. 531), the meaning of which was debated by scholars who never questioned its authorship. The picture was rejected for the first time in Liedtke 1989a, pp. 157–59, where it is concluded that the subject is somewhat ambiguous because it was insufficiently realized by the Rembrandt pupil who conceived the work.

REFERENCES: Bode 1881, pp. 312, 397, no. 296, describes the canvas as “Portrait of a Boy” dated 1675, by Rembrandt, and states that it depicts the same model as in the “Singing Boy” in the Belvedere, Vienna (i.e., Titus, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum; Br. no. 122); Dutuit 1883, pp. 51, 63, 69, no. 324, lists the picture as in the collection of Rodolphe Kann, and erroneously identifies it with a portrait of Titus in the sale of King William II of Holland in 1850 (now Wallace Collection, London); Wurzbach 1886, text vol., no. 303, as by Rembrandt; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, pp. 66, 239 (ill. opp. p. 66), as Rembrandt’s portrait of his son, Titus, in the Kann collection, reads a great deal into the Hamlet-like figure, including a “loving, sensitive character” (which benefited from “Saskia’s sweetness”) and a “weakness of constitution,” which prevented the “gentle and dreamy” young man from amounting to much as an artist; Tourneux 1897, p. 458, maintains (or rather, “repeats, after a hundred others”) that this portrait of Titus is one of the indisputable masterpieces of Rembrandt’s maturity; Hofstede de Groot 1898, no. 89, pl. 27, compares the “Titus Reading” owned by the Earl of Crawford (Titus at His Writing Desk, of 1615, now in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), noting that in the present picture all generic-like motifs are left behind, so that the viewer’s glance is answered simply by the “big, innocent eyes” of the thirteen- or fourteen-year-old boy, and observes that “something of the father’s love for the son carried over into the careful handling, the pure expression of the features,” and so on, and reminds the reader that this love for “his own flesh and blood” was answered later, during the most difficult days of Rembrandt’s life; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1898, pp. 157–58 (ill.), no. 139, as “Portrait of Rembrandt’s son Titus,” signed and dated 1635, lists literature and provenance, A., “The Rembrandt Exhibition,” Art Journal, December 1889, p. 338, considers the painting to reveal “the highest quality, although perhaps the portrait of the same boy, from the Earl of Crawford, was a picture of still more exalted character”; Bell 1896, pp. 81, 159, erroneously as “probably the picture formerly in the William II and Brongeest collections”; Bode 1900, p. III, no. 2 (ill.), as “Portrait of Rembrandt’s Son Titus,” in the Kann collection; Glück 1900, p. 89, mentioned as in the Kann collection; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 6 (1901), p. 18, no. 442, pl. 442, as “Titus Standing His Hands on His Sides,” lists provenance, including Count Podstazsky, Bohemia; Friedländer 1901, pp. 156 (ill.), as a portrait of Titus by Rembrandt, painted in 1655; Marguillier 1901, pp. 20, 21 (ill.), mentioned as in the Kann collection; “The Dutch Exhibition at the Guildhall: Article I — The Old Masters,” Burlington Magazine 2, no. 4 (June 1903), p. 51, describes the picture as “of the Dutch master’s last and finest manner — it is dated 1655 — it has all the pathetic realism of his unsubdued genius,” and compares the work with the portrait of Titus in the Wallace Collection, London; A. Rosenberg 1904, pp. 230, 226 (ill.), 261, approves the sensitive prose of É. Michel (1894), in particular his characterization of the figure as “some northern prince, a youthful Hamlet”; Moe 1897–1905, vol. 2 (1901), p. 317, no. 6694–4, as a portrait of Titus van Rijn, by Rembrandt; Valentiner 1905, p. 50, compares Titus in this work, and in those in Vienna and in London (Wallace Collection), with the figure in the Rembrandt-style Portrait of a Man in Copenhagen (Statens Museum for Kunst, no. 570; Br. no. 287); A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 265 (ill.), 426, 434, as “Rembrandt’s Son Titus,” of 1655, in the Kann collection; J. Veth 1906a, p. 128, pl. 36, as “Titus van Rijn,” 1655; Bode 1907, vol. 1, pp. II–III, 67, no. 66 (ill).
compares the presentation of the figure with that in Rembrandt's *Self-Portrait of 1632* (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna); Nicolle 1908, p. 194, admires the portrait, which has been "vulgarized" by reproduction in an engraving; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 413 (ill.), 562, as "Titus, the son of Rembrandt," 1635, owned by "B. Altman," New York; Altman Collection 1914, pp. 11-12, no. 6, as "The Artist's Son Titus," dated 1635, describes the figure and cites previous owners; Valentin 1914a, p. 247, no. 65, listed as "Portait of Titus," in the Altman Collection; Valentin 1914b, pp. 351, 356, as one of the later Rembrandts in the Altman Collection; Hofstede de Groot 1907-27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 334, no. 706, as "Titus van Rijn," 1635, describes the subject, and lists literature, exhibitions, and provenance; Valentin 1921b, p. 126, updates location; Meldrum 1923, pp. 138, 199, pl. 120, as by Rembrandt, refers to the "feminine look" of the sitter, "a delicacy that was to cut him off in his flowering"; Monod 1923, pp. 303 (ill.), 304, wallows in sentimental adjectives while praising the picture, the last by Rembrandt that reflects any trace of happiness; Van Dyck 1923, p. 78, pl. 7, attributes the work to Barent Fabritius; A. Burroughs 1923, p. 272, citing Van Dyck 1923, questions Rembrandt's authorship because of the painting's "unrealistic, dreamy quality," and the "thoughtless composition"; B. Burroughs 1931a, p. 292, following earlier MMA catalogues, maintains the traditional attribution and identification; Valentin 1931, unpagd, no. 120, pl. 120, considers this portrait of Titus "one of the most beautiful of the few children's portraits which Rembrandt painted"; Bredius 1935, p. 6, no. 121, pl. 121, as by Rembrandt, erroneously identifying it as Hofstede de Groot's (1916) no. 702 rather than no. 706; *Duveen Pictures 1941*, unpagd, no. 197 (ill.), catalogues the work as an erstwhile "Duveen"; Kieser 1941-42, p. 157 n. 12, compares the frontality of Rembrandt's *Juno* (Armand Hammer Museum of Art, Los Angeles), with a view to its possible date; Held 1942, p. 28, cites the work as an example of the "warmth and intimacy" Rembrandt lent to his portraits of the 1630s; Ivens 1942a, p. 3, lists the picture among "twenty-five paintings which are now attributed to Rembrandt" in the MMA; Ivens 1942b, pls. 15, 16 (detail); Hamann 1948, p. 112, pl. 80, as "Titus," by Rembrandt, reproduces the Hamlet comparison, without crediting its source in E. Michel 1894; K. Bauch 1966, p. 22, no. 412, pl. 412, as "Titus van Rijn in Feather Beret," by Rembrandt; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 109 (ill.), 358, considers the painting "certainly an 18th or 19th century imitation"; Lecaldano 1969, p. 111 (ill.), includes it under doubtful attributions; Haskell 1970, p. 263, as one of the late works by Rembrandt ("or in some cases, what were thought to be") that Altman bought from the Kann collection; Foucart in Paris 1970-71, p. 192 (under no. 184), approves of Gerson's deattribution (in Bredius 1969); Gerson 1973, p. 216, mentions Rembrandt imitations of the nineteenth century and allows that this picture could be older; Gerson in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 27, calls the picture a "forthright imitation of a later period"; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., p. 89, observes that the "color scheme does not relate to a single established Rembrandt," but that technical analysis does not exclude a seventeenth-century origin; C. Brown 1976, p. 219 n. 4, states that "Gerson is surely correct in thinking this portrait to be a recent imitation" (which is not what Gerson said); Fowles 1976, p. 40, remembers the picture as "the wonderful portrait of the artist's thirteen-year-old son Titus," which Duveen sold to Altman; Bolten and Bolten-Remp 1977, p. 196, no. 440 (ill.), as by Rembrandt; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 324, lists the painting among works dated 1635, and notes that it is not accepted by Gerson; Baejer 1982, vol. 1, p. 151, as Style of Rembrandt, of uncertain date; Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 97 n. 5, finds the picture "missing the characteristic buildup of paint layers seen in autoradiographs of seventeenth-century Dutch paintings"; Liedtke 1990, pp. 48, 58 n. 156, cites it as one of the "once-impressive works signed 'Rembrandt'" that Altman acquired; E. van de Wetering in London 1990, p. 130, in a discussion of imitations dating from the nineteenth or early twentieth century, calls the work "a faked portrait of Rembrandt's son Titus"; Ingamells 1992a, p. 282 (under no. 152), erroneously as formerly in the Hermitage, Saint Petersburg, compares the Wallace Collection *Titus*; Baejer 1995, p. 320, as Style of Rembrandt, 17th century or later; Liedtke in New York 1995-96, vol. 2, pp. 119, 136-37, as Style of Rembrandt, second half 17th century, considers the "superficial manner of execution [to have been] derived from late works by Rembrandt," by some artist outside his immediate circle; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 5, 30, 32, 122-33, no. 41, figs. 3 (view in conservation studio), 166 (detail), as by a follower of Rembrandt active in the second half of the 17th century, describes the painting's technique and materials in detail, and reports (p. 30) that the "typical double ground composed largely of red ochre" also includes a trace of the impurity gypsum, which "some thirty years ago...was thought to indicate a southern European origin"; Scallen 2004, pp. 353 n. 99, 374 n. 28, 375 n. 49, as owned by R. Kann and Altman, and as rejected in Van Dyck 1923; Secrest 2004, p. 77, mentions "the enchanting portrait of Titus" and three other "Rembrandts" that Altman bought from Duveen; Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 666-67, reports that the first ground contains red earth and chalk, and the second ground lead white, brown ochre, and bone black, resulting in a gray color.


**Ex coll.:** Count Theodor Podstakstzy, Bohemia; [art market, Vienna]; E. Secrétan, Paris; [Sceclemeyer, Paris]; Rodolphe Kann, Paris (by 1883-1903; his estate, 1903-7; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, Paris and New York, 1907-8; sold to Altman on February 1, 1908, for $148,100]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1908-1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.4.0.608
178. Man with a Beard

Oil on canvas, 28 3/4 x 25 1/4 in. (73.3 x 64.1 cm)
Inscribed (falsely, lower left): Rembrandt/1665

The painting is in poor condition. Abrasion is particularly severe in the right half of the garment. The proper right side of the cheek, the nose, and the white collar and tassels are well preserved.

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.3

This canvas came to the Museum in 1889 as part of the Marquand Collection, and was treasured at the time as the institution’s first work by Rembrandt. All the early Rembrandt cataloguers concurred, although Frederick Schmidt-Degener, who, as director of the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, organized Rembrandt exhibitions there in 1932 and 1933, told curator Harry Wehle in 1935 that the painting was by an eighteenth-century imitator of Rembrandt, and that the figure’s collar was not Dutch.1 The first echo of this opinion in print was that in Kurt Bauch’s Rembrandt corpus of 1966, where the picture is described as probably painted in the eighteenth century, “perhaps in England.”2 The suggestion of an English origin was probably inspired by two prints after the picture, both of which were published in London in 1764: John Greenwood’s mezzotint, which identifies the subject as “Rembrandt’s Father,” and an engraving by William Baillie. Commenting on Bauch’s idea of an English imitation, Horst Gerson, in 1969, observed that Baillie’s print of 1764 “only proves that the portrait must have been in existence before that date.”3

In the catalogue of the Museum’s “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt” exhibition of 1995–96, Hubert Von Sonnenburg (see Refs.) offers a detailed description of the painting’s technical qualities and condition. The presence of lead-tin yellow implies a dating earlier than about 1700, since the pigment went out of use at about that time. The signature and date are contemporary with the original paint layer, suggesting the artist’s intention to deceive. The execution is bold but superficial, with a nearly uniform brown tonality employed throughout much of the picture. The failure to achieve a convincing sense of form and space is especially conspicuous in the torso, where sketchy lines and parallel brushstrokes lamely emulate the manner of execution found in passages by Rembrandt such as the jacket in the Altman Self-Portrait, of 1660 (Pl. 157).4 The use of a wide-brimmed hat to cast a shadow over the eyes and on one side of the face is a Rembrandt device found in pictures such as the Marquand Portrait of a Man (Pl. 155), but comparison with even that damaged work is highly unflattering to Man with a Beard. When set beside paintings by close followers of the late Rembrandt, such as Christ with a Staff (Pl. 174), the picture’s vividness of style and expression becomes evident.

That the collar seems to misrepresent Dutch models might be taken as an indication that the picture was painted outside the Netherlands. But one would have been just as hard pressed to purchase the article of clothing in England, France, or elsewhere. The motif might be described as an ambiguous compromise between mid-seventeenth-century linen collars (see Pl. 148) and the broad scarfs that became fashionable after 1660 (for example, that found in Rembrandt’s Portrait of Frederick Ribel on Horseback, of 1663, in the National Gallery, London).5 The tassels hanging beneath the collar also recall male attire of the 1660s (see Pl. 160). A similar jacket and hat in Rembrandt’s oeuvre have already been mentioned, if for other reasons (see Pls. 155, 157). And they underscore the point that the most likely source for any motif in the painting will be found not in the imitator’s own time and place but in works by Rembrandt. The face alone, framed by flowing hair and beard, strikes one as a cleaned-up version of the figure (made of sterner stuff) in Rembrandt’s Saint Bara (“The Falconer”), of about 1662–65 (Göteborgs Konstmuseum, Göteborg).6 Perhaps that is where the man with a beard came by his unmatched eyes, arching eyebrows, strong nose, and upturned moustache, and where the painter found an example of Rembrandt’s working mostly with a palette of mid-brown tones.

The present writer is inclined to attribute the Marquand painting to a Dutch imitator working between about 1680 and 1710. In a broad view, the manner of Rembrandt’s late pupil Arent de Gelder (1643–1727) sets the apparent forgery in context, that of continuing interest in the famous master’s work and of artists who were mainly inspired by Rembrandt’s style of the 1660s.7 The more specific context for this canvas, the Museum’s Man in a Beret (Pl. 176), and such works as Rembrandt Leaning on a Windowsill, in the Taft Museum of Art, Cincinnati, is the art market in the decades following Rembrandt’s death in 1669.8
1. E. Schmidt-Degener, oral opinion, recorded by Harry Wehle at the Museum on April 15, 1935. The Dutch scholar was in the United States to consider paintings by Rembrandt for possible inclusion in the Rijksmuseum exhibition (July 13–October 13, 1935). Jakob Rosenberg, visiting the Museum on June 8, 1936, thought the work (in the words of an anonymous memo) “more offhand than is customary with Rembrandt when he is doing a portrait in official [?] dress, but thinks that it can be only Rembrandt, late, and not finished. Remarks on the grandeur of the portrait and on its expression.” For Otto Benesch, in the Museum on December 20, 1940, the painting was by Rembrandt, although he allowed that “very late works are sometimes baffling.”

2. K. Bauch 1966, p. 48 (under no. 317), where he reports that the picture was (on view) “im Metropolitan Museum nicht mehr als Rembrandt.” When visiting the Museum on September 24, 1962, Bauch suggested that the canvas was an eighteenth-century copy, perhaps after Fabritius, presumably meaning Carel not Barent (q.v.).

3. Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 574 (under no. 317). In fact, the activities of Baillie and Greenwood in 1765 could be taken as circumstantial evidence in favor of a Dutch not English origin. The American-born John Greenwood (1727–1792) moved from Surinam to the Netherlands in 1758 and by 1763 had settled in London, where he became a prominent auctioneer. While in Amsterdam, he helped to reopen the city’s art academy, and he began buying Dutch paintings for English collectors (see Richard H. Saunders, in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 15, p. 634). The Irish printmaker and art dealer William Baillie (1723–1810) went to The Hague in 1765 in order to purchase pictures for James Lowther, 1st Earl of Lonsdale (Elizabeth Miller, in ibid., vol. 3, p. 74). One impression of Greenwood’s print (which was actually made in the fall of 1763; see New Haven 1983, pp. 51, 58, no. 104) bears an undated note in pencil on the back: “Rembrandt’s father J. Greenwood fecit 1764, from original in the possession of W. Baillie” (Weitenkampf 1927, p. 12 [under no. 30]). Perhaps Baillie owned or, more likely, dealt with the picture, but it also possible that the annotator inferred his “possession” of it from Baillie’s own print after the picture.

4. Von Sonnenburg in New York 1995–96, vol. 1, p. 134, supports this point impressively by reproducing a detail of the self-portrait (fig. 167) next to a plate of Man with a Beard. As he notes, “the right side of the man’s undefined attire in particular has suffered severely from cleaning, and as a result larger areas of the light ground are exposed here than in the rest of the picture.”


6. See Frankfurt 2003, no. 42, where the color plate and color detail hint at the work’s impressive quality, although the actual painting is less red and has much stronger texture in the face. The New York and Göteborg pictures are reproduced on facing plates in Bredius 1969, pp. 244–45. In Bredius 1935 (nos. 317, 319), they are placed together with The Crusader (Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen), a canvas that a late-seventeenth-century painter derived from the picture in Göteborg (in Bogh Rembrandt and Wadum 2006, the Copenhagen picture is hopelessly reassigned to Rembrandt).


REFERENCES: Nagler 1835–36, vol. 5 (1837), p. 332, catalogues a mezzotint by John Greenwood as “Rembrandt’s Father from the original Painting belonging to W. Baillie,” the original possibly this picture; E. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 247, listed as “Portrait of an Old Man,” by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1665, in the MMA; MMA 1894, p. 72, no. 377, as “Portrait of a Man,” by Rembrandt, describes the composition, and notes that the former owner Sir William Knighton (1st Baronet) was physician to George IV, his personal friend, and “his principal advisor in the formation of the collection of Dutch pictures at Buckingham Palace”; Bell 1899, pp. 86, 88, no. 274, listed as by Rembrandt, signed and dated 1665, in the MMA; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 7 (1902), pp. 5, 54, no. 496 (ill. opp. p. 54), compares the Marquand Portrait of a Man (Pl. 135), finding them both harsh in light and careless in handling; A. Rosenberg 1906, pp. 183 (ill.), 403, as “Portrait of a Man,” by Rembrandt, 1665; A. Rosenberg 1909, pp. 506 (ill.), 565, repeats A. Rosenberg 1906; Valentine in New York 1909, p. 107, no. 106 (ill.), gives basic catalogue information; Breck 1910, p. 33 (ill. opp. p. 32), comments that the picture reflects the sadness of Rembrandt’s last years; Waldmann 1910, pp. 74 (ill.), 75, mentioned as in the 1906 exhibition; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 6 (1916), p. 354, no. 754, as “A Man with a Long Dark Beard and Long Hair,” signed and dated 1666, describes the sitter as “about forty-five”; A. Burroughs 1921, pp. 268, 270, calls the painting unfinished, but maintains that “one sees power in the rough, impetuous drawing in decisive paint,” and cites Giovanni Morelli in making the point that the work is not by a lesser artist (“already the head has depth; the eyes a haunting glow”); Meldrum 1923, p. 203, pl. CCCVCCCVII, listed as a Rembrandt of 1665; Connoisseur 79 (December 1927), p. 199 (ill.), with no comment; Valentine 1931, unpaged, no. 165, pl. 165, observes that “the complete ‘en face’ position of the head and bust, with the eyes shaded by the brim of the hat, is characteristic of Rembrandt’s late style”; Bredius 1935, p. 13, no. 317, pl. 317, as signed and dated 1665; J. Rosenberg 1939–40, p. 203, fig. 4, erroneously claims that “the Rembrandt literature makes no reference to its incomplete state,” and notes that “the ponderation which we usually find in Rembrandt’s chiaroscuro is not yet achieved”; Ivins 1942a, pp. 3, 11 (ill.), listed as one of the Museum’s “twenty-five paintings which are now attributed to Rembrandt”; Ivins 1942b, pl. 29, 30 (detail of face, actual size); J. Allen 1945, p. 73; Rousseau 1952, pp. 82, 84, considers the picture to reveal “evidence of the same powerful insight” that we find in Rembrandt’s earlier, “hauntingly introspective human documents”; Mayor 1972a, p. 106, reveals “deep black thought in the eye and the breathing emergence of the head”; K. Bauch 1966, p. 48, no. 317, rejects the attribution to Rembrandt, suggesting that the work was painted in the 18th century, perhaps in England; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 244 (ill.), 374.
remarks that the picture was “rightly deleted from Rembrandt’s works by Bauch”; Lecaldano 1966, p. 131 (ill.), includes the work among doubtful attributions; D. Sutton in Fry 1972, vol. 1, p. 255 n. 1 to letter no. 177 (March 2, 1906), lists the picture among works in the 1906 exhibition; Von Sonnenburg 1976, pp. 17–19 (ill.), observes that the abrupt contrasts of light and dark and the effect of flatness produced by parallel brushstrokes indicate that the picture is a forgery; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 151, as Style of Rembrandt, of uncertain date; Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 97 n. 5, observes that the canvas is “missing the characteristic buildup of paint layers seen in autoradiographs of seventeenth-century Dutch paintings”; D. Alexander in New Haven 1983, pp. 51, 58 (under no. 104), catalogues John Greenwood’s mezzotint after this painting, which he made in 1773; Baetjer 1995, p. 321, under “Style of Rembrandt, 17th century or later”; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, pp. 138–39, no. 42 (ill.), as by an imitator of Rembrandt, suggests a date in the last quarter of the seventeenth century; Von Sonnenburg in ibid., vol. 1, pp. 7, 134–35, no. 42 (ill.), calls the picture a Rembrandt forgery from the last quarter of the seventeenth century, notes that the inscription “clearly is contemporary with the paint layer,” and discusses the painting’s technique and condition; Lank 1996, p. 123, sees inconsistency in the labels “forgery” and “imitator,” as employed in New York 1995–96; Scallen 2004, pp. 185, 357 n. 11, as accepted by Bode in 1893 (i.e., Bode 1893); Groen in Corpus 2005, pp. 668–69, 674–75, reports that the first ground contains chalk and brown ochre, resulting in a brownish color; Korevaar in Leiden 2005–6, pp. 41, 51 n. 49, discusses Greenwood’s mezzotint after this painting, entitled “Rembrandt’s Father.”


1. The evidence for Baillie’s “possession” of the painting is described above in note 3.
One of the most celebrated landscape painters of all time, Jacob Isaacksz van Ruisdael was born in 1628 or 1629. His father, Isaack van Ruisdael (1599–1677), was a framemaker, art dealer, and painter. Isaack and his slightly younger brother, Salomon van Ruysdael (q.v.), moved to Haarlem from Naarden sometime after their father, Jacob de Goyer, a Mennonite carpenter, died in 1616. The younger Jacob probably studied with his father and also with his well-known uncle, both of whom were closely associated with Jan van Goyen (q.v.). The five or six landscapes that have been convincingly attributed to Isaack van Ruysdael in recent years are comparable with some early works by Jacob in terms of composition and attention to descriptive detail. The tranquil woodland and river views that were painted in Haarlem by Cornelis Vroom (1590/91–1661) also impressed Van Ruisdael at about the time he joined the painters’ guild in the same city (1648). Vroom must have helped the young artist to move away from the tonalist tradition in Haarlem and toward his own more colorful and poetic style.

Among Van Ruisdael’s earliest paintings are fifteen dated 1646 (for example, Pl. 179) and nineteen dated 1647. The artist’s Dutch horizons were expanded in 1650, when he traveled through the eastern provinces of the Netherlands to Westphalia, almost certainly in the company of his occasional collaborator and “great friend” (according to Houbraken) Nicolaes Berchem (q.v.). Not only the castle of Bentheim (one of Van Ruisdael’s most memorable subjects), but also the border region’s rugged, rolling hills, rich in rocks, trees, and fast-flowing streams, captured the Haarlemmer’s imagination, which was always responsive first to nature, however much it was informed by earlier and contemporary works of art.

Van Ruisdael moved from Haarlem to Amsterdam about 1616, or perhaps somewhat earlier. At a time when landscape painting in general became increasingly popular in Amsterdam, Van Ruisdael’s views of topography very different from the lowlands of North Holland found an appreciative clientele. To some extent, his woodland views rejuvenated a local tradition of imaginary forest scenes by Flemish immigrant artists such as Gillis van Coninxloo (1544–bur. Jan. 4, 1607), Roelant Savery (1576–1639), and Alexander Keirincx (1600–1652). Van Ruisdael’s interest in foreign (but always northern European) motifs was also encouraged in Amsterdam by the paintings and prints of Allart van Everdingen (1621–1675), a Savery pupil who went to Norway and Sweden in 1644 and introduced Scandinavian views in Haarlem and Amsterdam a few years later. Van Ruisdael also continued to paint dune and river landscapes and, in the 1660s, depicted distinctly Dutch views of extensive plains that recall the panoramic landscapes of Philips Koninck (q.v.) but at the same time remain personal explorations of local terrain. The artist’s extraordinary inventiveness and expressive powers are also seen in such evocative images as his severe winter scenes, stormy seascapes, distant views of Haarlem, and a few views of Amsterdam.

About seven hundred paintings, more than one hundred thirty drawings, and thirteen early etchings by Van Ruisdael are known. Meyndert Hobbema (q.v.) was his pupil in the later 1650s, and both Hobbema and Jan van Kessel (1604–1677) were greatly influenced by his work. Other followers included Cornelis Decker (ca. 1615–1678), Roelof van Vries (q.v.), and Van Ruisdael’s cousin Jacob Salomonsz van Ruysdael (1629/30–1681). Van Ruisdael painted the figures in many of his landscapes, but he also collaborated with a number of staffage specialists, among them Berchem, Adriaen van de Velde (1636–1672), Johannes Lingelbach, and Philips Wouwermans (q.v.).

A lifelong bachelor, Van Ruisdael died in Amsterdam but was buried in Saint Bavo’s, Haarlem, on March 14, 1682.

1. See Walford 1991, chap. 10, for Van Ruisdael’s critics from De Lairesse (1707) and Houbraken (1718–21) to scholars of the 1980s; Walford 1991, p. 4, for Houbraken’s text in English; and ibid., pp. 191–92, on Goethe’s famous essay “Ruisdael als Dichter” (1816).
2. See Walford 1991, chap. 1, for full biographical details, and Slive 2001, pp. 1–3, for a chronology of the painter’s life and documentation. Walford (1991, pp. 5–6) plausibly favors a birth date in the second half of 1628 because the painter would have been twenty years old when he became a master in the Haarlem painters’ guild in 1648. Slive (2001, p. 3 n. 1), by contrast, considers it “reasonable to conclude” that Jacob was born to Isaack van Ruysdael’s second wife, Maycken Cornelis, whom the widower married on November 12, 1628. It seems more probable that Jacob was the son of Isaack’s first wife, whose name and dates of birth and death are unknown. She may have died in
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childbirth or shortly after Jacob was born. Bearing in mind that on June 9, 1661, Jacob said that he was thirty-two years old (so that he was presumably born by the same day in 1629), Walford (1991, p. 9) allows that Jacob's expected birth could have been the cause of Isaac's second marriage. While not unknown (see the biography of Emanuel de Witte below), such marriages were hardly the norm in seventeenth-century Dutch society, particularly in Mennonite families (see the text following). Compare Van Thiel-Stroman in Biesboer et al. 2006, p. 281.

3. On Isaac's connection with Van Goyen, see Walford 1991, pp. 6, 50–51.

4. For Isaac's paintings, see ibid., pp. 50–55, figs. 25, 28, 30, 31, 41; Giliaert 1992; and Slive 1997.


7. See Walford 1991, pp. 4 (Houbraken), 7, 74, 208 n. 27.

8. On Van Ruisdael's trip to Benthem and for a catalogue of the relevant paintings, see Slive 2001, pp. 23–42.

9. Compare Slive in The Hague–Cambridge 1981–82, p. 31 (“about 1656 or 1657”), with Walford 1991, p. 97 (“he may well have been in Amsterdam by about 1653–54”). Van Ruisdael was cited as living in the Beursstraat (now the Rokin) near the Dam when he joined the Reformed Church on June 14, 1657.


11. Keirincx was active in Amsterdam through the 1640s and his dramatic woodland views (e.g., Landscape with a Deer Hunt, 1650, in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, Haak 1984, fig. 641) anticipate the compositions of mature paintings by Van Ruisdael, such as Marsh in a Forest, of about 1665 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg; The Hague–Cambridge 1981–82, no. 36; Slive 2001, no. 414, citing Savery).


15. All these works are catalogued in Slive 2001; representative examples in each medium are catalogued in The Hague–Cambridge 1981–82. On the drawings, see also Giliaert 1980; and on the etchings, Keyes 1977.

16. See A. Davies 1992 for a substantial monograph on Van Kessel, who may also have been Van Ruisdael's pupil.


179. Landscape with a Village in the Distance

Oil on wood, 30 x 43 in. (76.2 x 109.2 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): JVvR[i]sdal/1646 [JVvR in monogram]

The painting is very well preserved.

Bequest of Adele L. Lehman, in memory of Arthur Lehman, 1965 65.181.10

This ambitious picture is one of the earliest known works by Van Ruisdael, who was about eighteen years old when he painted the fifteen known landscapes that are dated 1646.1 While the present painting is consistent in execution with contemporary works by the artist, its bold composition and loose handling of such passages as the entire foreground make a rather rash impression compared with that of pictures like Landscape with a Windmill (Cleveland Museum of Art) or Landscape with a Cottage and Trees (Kunsthalle, Hamburg), both also of 1646.2 In his youthful works, Van Ruisdael's tendency to exaggerate dramatic effects occasionally produced awkward results. Here, for example, the silhouetted trees and rough terrain in the foreground seem somewhat contrived, in contrast to the view of a village in the left background. The source of the stream that runs along the bottom center of the composition and splashes the artist's signature is not entirely clear. Apparently the water branches off from the river in the middle distance, but the diagonal leading from the left side of the painting to the lower right corner also suggests a narrow road. The routes available to the wayfarer in the center of the view could never have been obvious.

In the past, scholars explained the picture's unresolved qualities by assigning it to one of Van Ruisdael's followers. In 1912, Hofstede de Groot attributed the work to Gerrit van Hees (ca. 1625–1670);3 Stechow, in 1938, more plausibly proposed Van Ruisdael's cousin Jacob Salomonsz van Ruysdael.
When the panel was owned by Nathaniel Thayer in Boston (by 1912), it was considered to be by Meyndert Hobbesma (q.v.) on the basis of a false signature. Broulhet accepted this attribution in 1938. Cleaning in 1935 removed the Hobbesma inscription and revealed Van Ruisdael's own. Nonetheless, curator John Walsh (in 1971) and other scholars continued to express doubts, although Claus Virch (1965) confidently catalogued the work as by Van Ruisdael, and in 1971 Seymour Slive was inclined to support this view.

The painting was cleaned again in 1981. In 1988, it was placed next to Van Ruisdael's Dune Landscape, a large canvas signed and dated 1646 (fig. 223). Passage for passage, comparisons were made by the present writer and Seymour Slive, and these revealed the same hand in every area. In both pictures, the handling of the foreground is remarkable for its blotchy areas of paint enlivened by brush-handle scratches suggesting grass. (This approach makes a bolder and perhaps cruder impression in the Museum's picture because it is executed on a wood panel not on canvas.) Also similar are the areas of foliage, allowing for the very different lighting of the trees in the New York composition, and the dark, almost black strokes of paint that broadly define branches. Other works signed by Van Ruisdael and dated 1646 are also quite consistent in execution with the present picture, although they vary considerably in subject, condition, and scale (four of them are much smaller). In addition to supporting these conclusions, Slive notes that the great oak in the painting is closely related to an oak in a drawing by Van Ruisdael which is dated 1646. 

3. Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 4, p. 6, comparing a painting signed by Van Hees and dated 1659 (Bernet 1970, vol. 2, no. 301, in the Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem). That picture is based on Van Ruisdael similar to the Museum’s picture but otherwise bears little resemblance to it. Van Hees appears to have been attracting attention about the time that Hofstede de Groot’s volume appeared, to judge from articles such as Bredius 1912 and Cohen 1931.
4. See Stechow 1975, p. 58; his suggestion is borrowed in P. Sutton 1986, p. 191. Jacob Salomonz’s manner is wooden compared with that of his famous cousin, from whom he derived compositions and motifs but not his typical cows and sheep (for five examples of the artist’s work, see Bernet 1970, vol. 3, nos. 996, 997; Stechow 1975, figs. 80, 82; Van Thiel et al. 1976, p. 486). The painting of 1650 by J. S. van Ruysdael in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg, may be compared with the Van Ruisdaels of 1646 and 1647 in the same collection.
5. Broulhet 1938, p. 443, no. 507, following the attribution given in the 1935 sale catalogue (see Ex Coll.), where no signature is mentioned.
6. According to a note in the Frick Art Reference Library (FARL 3171-3), the present signature was “overpainted and replaced by a forged signature of ‘Hobbesma.’” One of the two dealers who bought the painting at the 1935 auction, Karl Loevenich, telephoned the Museum’s curator Claus Virch on April 18, 1969, to say that he had had the picture cleaned in 1935 and discovered Van Ruisdael’s signature. In a letter dated April 9, 1937, the same information was given to Adele Lehman (see Ex Coll.) by the then owner, Silberman Galleries (“the restorer, Riportella,” is named). Silberman adds that W. R. Valentiner saw the painting at the time and “declared it to be one of the finest pictures by Jacob Ruysdael he has ever seen.” Valentiner’s “original certificate” (as Silberman describes it), dated May 11, 1935, is written on the back of a photograph that is now in the Museum’s files (see Virch 1965, p. 50, for the text).
7. Walsh, in a memo to the curatorial files dated April 2, 1971, concluded that the author was an “imitator c. 1650.” Dan Cevat, visiting the Museum on January 4, 1966, considered the picture typical of Guillam Dubois (ca. 1623–35–1680); A. B. van der Vries (oral opinion) shared Walsh’s doubts in May 1971. Charles Moffett, in an undated draft of a catalogue entry written for Walsh (curatorial files), attributed the picture to the “Circle of Jacob van Ruysdael, possibly Gerrit van Hees or Isaacvan Ruysdael.” The painting is not mentioned in Walford 1991, which does not, however, attempt to discuss every known work by Jacob van Ruisdael.
8. Virch 1965, p. 50. A longer draft of Virch’s entry (curatorial files) mentions the Hermitage picture of 1646 (fig. 223 here) and states that it “compares very favorably with our little known panel.”
11. Also catalogued in The Hague–Cambridge 1981–2, pp. 32–33, no. 3; Slive 2001, no. 615; Hamburg–Haarlem 2002, no. 13; and Los Angeles–Philadelphia–London 2005–6, no. 3. The examination of 1988 was previously reported in Liedtke 1980a, p. 160. Considerable allowance must be made for the fact that the Hermitage painting is on canvas and is covered with yellowed varnish.

References: Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 4 (1912), p. 6, as in the Thayer collection, Boston, and as by Gerrit van Hees; Cleveland 1916, p. 96, no. 240, pl. 1v, as by Jacob van Ruisdael; Broulhet 1938, pp. 333 (ill.), 443, no. 507, as by Hobbesma; Stechow (1938) 1975, p. 58, as by Jacob Salomonz van Ruysdael; Montreal 1952, no. 30 (ill. p. 21), as by Jacob van Ruysdael; Virch 1965, pp. 50, 51 (ill.), as by Jacob van Ruysdael; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, suggests that the painting may be by Jacob Salomonz van Ruysdael; Liedtke 1980a, pp. 160–61, 168 nn. 41, 42, fig. 9, as by Jacob van Ruysdael, reports the direct comparison with the Hermitage canvas of 1646; Baeuer 1995, p. 331; Slive 2001, pp. 5, 428–29, no. 609, and p. 432.
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Figure 223. Jacob van Ruisdael, *Dune Landscape*, 1646. Oil on canvas, 41⅜ x 64⅜ in. (105.5 x 163 cm). State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg
180. The Forest Stream

Oil on canvas, 39 1/4 x 50 5/8 in. (99.7 x 129.2 cm)
Signed (lower right, on rock): JvRuisdael [JvR in monogram]

The painting is well preserved. Several minor losses are distributed throughout the landscape and sky, and there is one area of serious abrasion in the trees at center in the middle distance. Passages of the foreground vegetation and water that are thinly painted over brown underlayers have darkened with age.

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.4

Van Ruisdael’s wooded landscapes of the 1650s and 1660s are remarkable for their rich patterns of textures and colors, seen here in the deep browns and greens that predominate in this canvas of about 1660. The blues of the water and the lighter greens and reddish browns of the rocks in the center effect a gradual transition from the shadowy foreground to the sunlit cliffs in the right background and the rosy clouds in the brightest area of a mostly blue sky. On the grassy hill in the background, sheep are herded by three figures—clearly a family—a man, a woman on a donkey or pony, and a boy.

The painting demonstrates the artist’s mastery of composition and his sensitivity to mood. The view is framed by groups of trees that have weathered many seasons, much as the rugged hills, the massive boulders, and the descending stream suggest a geological history more varied than the one traceable in the area of Amsterdam. Van Ruisdael’s customary placement of ordinary figures in such a setting shifts the emphasis from the dramatic to the picturesque, for while his landscapes vary considerably within this range, they were always made accessible to the inhabitants of the domestic world for whom they were intended. The 1660s, in Dutch painting and especially in the art world of Amsterdam, could be described, for the most part, as a period of calm seas, country houses, and Mediterranean vistas. One has the impression that the Dutch burgher would let his imagination run to distant places so long as he was sure of returning home.

This type of landscape, with rocky hills, expansive trees, and a flowing stream, is often said to have been inspired by the Scandinavian views of Allart van Everdingen (1621–1675), who wandered through Norway and Sweden in 1644, settled in Haarlem in 1645, and in 1652 moved to Amsterdam. That Van Ruisdael was strongly influenced by the Alkmaar artist during
the second half of the 1650s and later is clear from his usually vertical compositions that feature cascading water and distant thrusts of rock (the Museum’s *Mountain Torrent* [Pl. 181] is a late and comparatively tame example, once thought to be by Van Everdingen himself). Here, however, only the rocks, with their broad strokes of sienna, have much to do with Van Everdingen; the composition as a whole is consistent with Van Ruisdael’s landscapes of the early to mid-1650s, which follow upon his trip to Westphalia. The way the trees fill the composition is also reminiscent of forest views painted by earlier artists, mostly Flemings active in the area of Amsterdam, such as Gillis van Coninxloo (1544–1607), David Vinckboons (q.v.), Alexander Keirincx (1600–1652), and especially Roelant Savery (1576–1639), whose twisted trees and shady pools are often cited as antecedents of Van Ruisdael’s woodland views, for example, the celebrated *Marsh in a Forest*, of about 1665 (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg).5

These various influences were combined by the artist and transformed by his distinctive response to nature. Paintings like the Marquand canvas are at once the outgrowth of a long development in Dutch art and landscapes never seen until they took shape in Van Ruisdael’s fertile imagination.

1. Note the similar opinions of Simon (1930) and Slive (2001), cited below under Refs.
2. Van Ruisdael’s paintings appear to have sold for moderate prices in his lifetime, to judge from the few examples cited by P. Sutton in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, pp. 5, 58 n. 28.
4. See, for example, Slive 2001, no. 243, and Walford 1991, chaps. 4, 6, on works of the 1650s. Compare also the *Forest Scene* in the
181. **Grainfields**

Oil on canvas, 18½ x 22½ in. (47 x 57.2 cm)

Signed (lower right): JvRuisdael [JvR in monogram]

The paint surface has suffered extensive abrasion and flattening from past cleaning and lining. Throughout the composition, along the edges of the cracks and the crowns of the canvas weave, are passages where the dark ground preparation is exposed.

The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931

32.100.14

"Niedriger Wasserfall," Simon 1920, p. 63, suggests a date of about 1660; Liedtke 1990, p. 36, cites the canvas as a Marquand picture; Walford 1991, p. 226 n. 17, as "Hilly Woodland with Waterfall," compares a Van Ruisdael in Vienna; Baetjer 1995, p. 311; Slive 2001, p. 218, no. 241, as "datable to the late 1660s."


**Ex Coll.:** [Sedelmeyer, Paris, until 1886; sold to Marquand]; Henry G. Marquand, New York (1886–89); Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.4

In this small and much admired painting, Van Ruisdael depicts a rugged road through sandy, rolling landscape, with a field of corn or wheat to the right. A man with a stick and sack slung over his shoulder is accompanied by a dog, while a couple walks in the same direction farther along the road. A large windmill and a farmhouse rise above the trees on the left, and in the distance is a church that suggests, by its size, a town of local significance. Bright sun and blue sky appear above the storm clouds, which sweep forward briskly with the wind.

Most of Van Ruisdael's views of grainfields have been dated to the 1660s and early 1670s. Slive suggests that the Museum's picture dates from a few years later than the closely related composition in Basel (fig. 224), which may be placed fairly confidently in the first half of the 1660s. Thus, the present painting would probably date from the mid- or late 1660s.

The Basel picture shows a road and sandy bank aligned more or less as they are here, a similar grainfield, a different hill with trees more centrally placed, and a view of the sea in the left background with no mill or church in the distance. Comparison of the two pictures reveals how effortlessly Van Ruisdael composed remarkably realistic landscapes along artful lines, as if the trees, grasses, and other motifs, so finely described on this intimate scale, were so many well-chosen words in a verse of a certain meter. It should be emphasized,
Figure 224. Jacob van Ruisdael, *Grainfield near a Road*, early 1660s. Oil on canvas, 18 1/4 x 22 1/4 in. (46 x 56.5 cm). Kunstmuseum, Öffentliche Kunstsammlungen, Basel.
however, that the studio process was informed by drawings from nature, and that Van Ruisdael's landscapes, especially those that are recognizably Dutch, never stray beyond the realm of plausibility. The views of grainfields, for example, are quite consistent in their dune-like topography, types of trees, and frequent glimpses of an inland sea not unlike the Haarlemmer Meer or the Zuider Zee. Similar views were to be found a few miles outside Amsterdam.

In recent years, many of Van Ruisdael's landscapes have been assigned full programs of iconography, despite the fact that the scale, the exquisite effects, and the serenity of pictures like this one were obviously intended for private appreciation. It is true that grainfields had often been depicted by Netherlandish artists during the hundred years preceding Van Ruisdael's interest in the subject, and that their association with the seasons, sustenance, labor, and different levels of society (for example, landowners and field workers) made them rich in traditional meanings. Also relevant is Chong's discussion of grain cultivation and trade in the northern Netherlands, where, after 1650, local production of corn and wheat had become a new (or renewed) and important factor in the national economy. That such an image was complexly evocative, in aesthetic, folkloric, and topical ways, is one of the reasons that their narrow interpretation along ethical lines is inappropriate. The contemporary viewer would have understood immediately that the scene is Dutch, and that the mill, the grainfields, and the rain clouds benefit humankind, which, like nature, is God's creation. There was no need to look for further meaning in such a meaningful work of art.

It appears likely from a description in a sale catalogue of 1838 that this picture was in the collection of Sir Joshua Reynolds. The canvas is identified by Broun as one of a pair bought by the artist in 1756. In the 1820s and 1830s, this type of composition by Van Ruisdael was so obviously borrowed by Norwich painters like James Stark that complaints appeared in the press.

The painting was engraved by Maxime Lalanne (1827–1886). Slive records an anonymous copy.

1. Slive in The Hague–Cambridge 1981–82, p. 97; Slive 2001, p. 124 (under no. 100). In his entry on the Basel canvas, Slive (2001, p. 113, no. 82) mistakenly states that "a slightly earlier [sc., later] variant" is in the Metropolitan Museum. Compare also the compositions of Slive's nos. 96 and 98, both of which he places earlier than the Museum's picture.
4. On this tradition, see Chong in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 446. For one of Van Ruisdael's first views of a cornfield, an etching of 1648, see Amsterdam 1993–94a, no. 42.
6. On this question, see Walsh 1991a, pp. 110–11, and Bakker in Amsterdam 1993–94b, p. 32.
7. Broun 1987, vol. 2, pp. 74–76, quoting from the 1838 sale catalogue (see Ex Coll.): "A landscape, with the effect of a Showery Day. On the right is a Field of Standing Corn, protected by a broken Bank from a Public Road, on which a Peasant with his Dog are travelling towards a Mill; in the Distance is seen a Village Church." In both the 1756 and 1838 sale catalogues, the dimensions are given as 18 x 22 inches (45.7 x 55.9 cm).
8. In London Magazine, December 1825, it is observed, "We must object to his [Stark's] iteration of subject; a practice which shows he is more conversant with Hobberma and Ruisdael [Ruisdael] than with nature" (quoted by Moore in Norwich 1988, p. 134 [under no. 9]; compare ibid., no. 93, also by Stark, with Van Ruisdael's Grainfields).

References: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 6 (1835), p. 28, no. 73 or 74, as one of two landscapes by Van Ruisdael sold from the collection of Sir Joshua Reynolds in 1795; Blanc 1861, vol. 1, p. 130, as in the Viador collection; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 4 (1912), p. 50, no. 141, as sold at the 1890 Rothaus sale for FFR 24,000; J. Rosenberg 1928a, pp. 77, 116, no. 87, as in the Friedsam collection; Valentijn 1928a, p. 11, gives provenance and records the engraving by Lalanne; B. Burroughs 1932, p. 13; New York 1940, pp. 66 (ill.), 67, no. 90; Stedman 1966, p. 29, fig. 37, as from the 1660s, offers an appreciative description of the composition and considers it a moment of supreme harmony between the baroque drama of Ruisdael's youthful work and the exhaustion that makes itself felt in his later works"; The Hague–Cambridge 1981–82, pp. 94, 96–97, no. 31 (ill.), as dating from a few years later than the Basel picture, "an autograph variant of the early 1660s; Broun 1987, vol. 1, p. 133, vol. 2, pp. 74–76, identifies the work as in the collection of Sir Joshua Reynolds, and provides the provenance prior to Viardon; Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, pp. 8, 31, 445–48, no. 83, pl. 9a, as of the 1660s, with an analysis of the subject; Liedtke 1990, p. 52, discussing Friedsam as collector; Smits 1991, vol. 1, p. 328, vol. 3, fig. 325, as an example of a compositional type that influenced Corot; Walford 1991, pp. 148–49, fig. 154, as "Country Road with Cornfields," dating from the 1660s, "a landscape such as the poets loved for peaceful country walks and quiet contemplation"; P. Sutton 1992, pp. 170, 172 n. 6, "employs the same design as the Basle [in] painting"; Baertj 1995, p. 332; Luek Bos in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 27, p. 327, as an example of Van Ruisdael's innovation of "depictions of cornfields"; Hochstrasser 1998, p. 220 n. 81, mentions the picture in connection with a discussion of "the protection and sustenance which God provides" (p. 212); Slive 2001, pp. 113 (under no. 82), 124, no. 100 (ill.), as dating from a few years later than the Basel picture (fig. 224 here) of the early 1660s; Slive in Los Angeles–Philadelphia–London 2005–6, pp. 26, 263 n. 58, fig. 31, cites the
182. Wheatfields

Oil on canvas, 39 3/8 x 51 3/4 in. (100 x 130.2 cm)
Signed (lower right): JvRuisdael [JvR in monogram]

The painting is well preserved, although there is slight abrasion overall, most evident in the sky. At some point in the past, the top third of the canvas beneath the sky area was folded over, resulting in a small amount of paint loss along the crease. Minor paint losses have occurred along the lower edge of the painting.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.623

The Altman Wheatfields is generally considered to be the “most imposing treatment of the subject” among Van Ruisdael’s twenty-seven known views of various grainfields. Rosenberg and Slive, the two leading authorities on the artist’s work, concur in dating the picture to about 1670. The sweeping space flows abruptly away from the viewer, who is drawn into the landscape by the rapid recession of a sandy road. Wagon tracks lead in from the lower right corner, while a pathway (or traces of an earlier road) draws the eye from the repousse of a log and stunted trees in the lower left to the woman with a boy at the nearest bend in the road. It seems that in the vast cathedral of nature the viewer has just entered the nave, with the vault of heaven suggested by clouds rising to immeasurable heights. Despite the composition’s obvious structure, it conveys the natural sensation of walking in the Dutch countryside, with its lasting impression of terrain extending in all directions under an endless sky.

In realizing such a grand staging of an everyday scene, the painter did not neglect its specific details. The gently rolling wheatfields are divided by rows of shrubbery and windblown trees. In the left background, sheep graze on a hillside and a beacon marks the shoreline of a large body of water, presumably an inland sea like the Zuiden Zee (just west of Amsterdam). Four boats are visible, the two nearest the land with lowered sails. In the center background, an estate is partly hidden among the trees and a man herds sheep on the road. The modestly scaled figures and animals in the picture are for the most part favored by sunshine, though areas of shadow drift across the


Ex Coll.: John de Pesters (until 1736; his sale, Prestige, London, April 1, 1756, no. 10 or 11, both to Reynolds); Sir Joshua Reynolds, London (1756–d. 1792; his estate, 1792–95; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, March 17, 1795, no. 46, a pair, to Hardman for Gns 50); William Hardman (from 1795); Thomas Hardman (until 1838; his sale, Winstanley and Sons, Manchester, October 19, 1838, no. 54, to “Edwards” for Gns 87); John A. Beaver, Manchester (his sale, Winstanley and Sons, London, April 15–18, 1840, no. 96); Louis Viardot, Paris (until 1865; sold privately before the public sale of April 1, 1865); Gustave Rothan, Paris (until 1890; his estate sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, May 29, 1890, no. 95, for Ffr 24,000 to Albert Lehmann); Albert Lehmann, Paris (1890–1923; his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, June 12, 1925, no. 282, for Ffr 210,000 to Kleinberger); [Kleinberger, Paris and New York, from 1925] Michael Friedsam, New York (by 1928–d. 1931); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.14
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land. Van Ruisdael's combination of details and broad effects occurs in the palette as well, with the overall scheme of blue, yellow, and brown embellished by brownish reds and greens, in the foreground applied with vigorous brushwork. This triangular area, while serving an illusionistic purpose, also allowed the artist to display what were called schilderachtig, or painterlike, qualities, such as the artful variety of textures and tones. The grassy road enriches the lower part of the composition rather like the way table carpets are employed in Dutch still lifes for both spatial and decorative effect.

As might be expected, the painting is comparable in design and motifs to a few other views of grainfields by the artist. However, the composition stands apart to an extent that one is tempted to speculate about the painting's original placement. In its size, proportions, and centralized design, it would have served well as a schoorsteenstuk (chimneypiece) above a mantel in a Dutch house (as does the seascape in the idealized drawing room depicted by Gabriel Metsu in The Visit to the Nursery (Pl. 118)).

Rosenberg, in his enthusiasm for Van Ruisdael's invention, suggested that it inspired Meyndert Hobbema's famous late work The Avenue at Middelharnis (National Gallery, London). Both pictures are thus seen in isolation from compositions by less celebrated artists. Hobbema's canvas recalls several avenue scenes with receding ranks of trees (the scheme may be traced back to the beginning of the century), while the rather different use of a road leading into the landscape in Wheatfields may be considered an extension of ideas found in prints and drawings by earlier Dutch artists such as Claes Jansz Visscher (1587–1652) and Willem Buytewech (1591/92–1624; fig. 225). A parallel to the Van Ruisdael road that recedes steeply from the bottom of a wide-angle view is found in Philips Koninck's first panoramic landscapes (see Pl. 102, although it is not the best example). Many pictures by Van Ruisdael dating from the 1660s and 1670s carry the viewer's glance abruptly through the foreground; beaches, ponds in woodlands, and bleaching fields function as the road does here. Less dramatic instances of roads leading into the picture are common in works by Van Ruisdael and by Hobbema.

The first recorded owner of the Wheatfields is Pierre-Louis-Jean-Baptiste Colbert, marquis de Laplace, who probably acquired it after having served at the French embassies in Washington, D.C. (1864), and Saint Petersburg (1866). In the 1880s and early 1900s, while he had various roles in the French government, Colbert continued to work for the interests of agriculture and distilleries. And in the period 1908–10, "the great Ruysdael [sic]" was one of several magnificent Dutch paintings that Benjamin Altman purchased from Joseph Duveen, who had acquired them from the estate of Maurice Kann. The three Dutch landscapists most admired by Gilded Age collectors in America were Van Ruisdael, Hobbema, and Aelbert Cuyp. Altman's homage to them (see Pls. 34, 80) could hardly have been improved.

1. The quote is from Slive 2001, p. 125 (under no. 101).
3. On the term, see Bakker 1995.
4. See Slive in The Hague–Cambridge 1981–82, pp. 94–97, where the Museum's Grainfields (Pl. 181) and the similar composition in Basel (fig. 224 here) are compared. Slive's remark that the "principal motif" of the Sanlitz Grainfield on the Bank of a Coast (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam) is incorporated into the right side of the Altman picture (ibid., p. 94, and also Slive 2001, p. 128) seems to overstate the similarity. On the Rotterdam painting, see also Hamburg–Haarlem 2002, no. 35.
5. See Stechow 1960, which, however, is not entirely reliable. The painting by Eglon van der Neer in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, which shows a "signed" painting by Van Ruisdael over the fireplace (ibid., fig, 11, discussed at length on p. 181), has had this later addition removed. See also Loughman and Montias 2000, pp. 107–8, noting Gerard de Laire's criticism of landscapes hanging above fireplaces.
6. See C. Brown in MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 178, rejecting the idea, which was first suggested in J. Rosenberg 1927, pp. 50–51.
7. Compare Visscher's Road to Leiden, a drawing of 1607 (Amsterdam 1993–94, no. 342). On the Buytewech etching reproduced here (fig. 225), see Rotterdam–Paris 1974–75, no. 135, and Amsterdam 1993–94, no. 342. A similar approach is found in Jacob de Gheyn II's drawings of canals and of a furrowed field (see Judson 1973, figs. 25, 29, 30), and in many prints and drawings by Esaias and Jan van de Velde (see Keyes 1984 and J. van Gelder 1933, respectively).

9. Compare the Thysen Grainfields near the Zuider Zee (Gaskell 1990, no. 87, as dating from the early 1660s; Walford 1991, p. 177, fig. 181, as from the 1670s), and the beach scene from the Von Pannwitz collection (J. Rosenberg 1928, fig. 123).

10. The other pictures include the Cuyp, the Hobbema, two Rembrandts, and the Vermeer in the Altman Collection (Pls. 14, 80, 155, 157, 202). The "great Ruysdael" is from Samuels 1987, p. 91, quoting Bernard Berenson's letter about Altman written to his wife, Mary, on September 11, 1909. See Liedtke 1990, p. 48, on Altman's Dutch paintings.

References: Sedelmeyer Gallery 1905, p. 40, no. 30 (ill. opp. p. 40), as "The Cornfields," from the "Collection of the Comte de Colbert-Laplace"; "Kann Pictures Bought by Duveen Bros.,” American Art News 7 (September 20, 1909), p. 3; Marguillier 1909 (ill. p. 32), as "The Coup de soleil"; Cox 1909–10, p. 306, as Altman's "Cornfield (Un Coup de Soleil)" in the "Hudson-Fulton Celebration," describes the palette and technique; Waldmann 1910, p. 80, as an astonishing wonder from the Kann collection, and as newly acquired by Altman; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 4 (1912), pp. 43–44, no. 119, with description and provenance; Valentin 1920a (ill. p. 363); Monod 1921, pp. 311–12 (ill.), as a view near Overveen, and as Van Ruisdael's most "majestic poem of solitude and space"; J. Rosenberg 1927, pp. 150–51, fig. 21, suggests that the composition influenced that of Hobbema's Avenue at Middelharnis; Altman Collection 1928, pp. 67–69, no. 32; J. Rosenberg 1928, pp. 38–39, 77, 116, no. 86a, fig. 122 on pl. LXXXIV, with an enthusiastic description, compares the Grainfield in Rotterdam; Simon 1930, p. 54, dates the painting to about 1670, and compares the Rotterdam picture; Gerson 1934, p. 79, as a late work, using the “earlier motive” of a prominent roadway; New York 1932–33, p. 229, no. 115, pl. 115, as “justly celebrated”; MMA Bulletin, n.s., 11, no. 7 (March 1951), cover and “Notes” inside front cover; Rousseau 1954, p. 3 (ill. p. 34); J. Rosenberg in J. Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, p. 158, fig. 136 (rev. ed., 1972, p. 275, fig. 220), as dating from about 1670 and influencing Hobbema; Levey 1967, p. 107 (ill.), with
a vivid description of the "wunderful" sky; New York 1970–71, p. 238, no. 277 (ill. pp. 54, 288); Gállego and Méret 1973, p. 34, mentioned; Hibbard 1980, pp. 194–199, figs. 1, 3, 6, 12, 13, 17 (detail on p. 239); Slive in The Hague–Cambridge 1981–82, p. 94 (under no. 30), fig. 42, as adopting the trees from the Rotterdam painting; Walsh and Schneider in Los Angeles–Boston–New York 1981–82, pp. 84, 86 (under no. 21), fig. 3 on p. 87, compares the Carter and Rotterdam pictures; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191; Samuels 1987, p. 91, quotes Berenson's letter of 1909 mentioning "the great Ruysdael"; Chong in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 446, compares the "roughly contemporaneous" Grainfield (Pl. 18); Liedtke 1990, pp. 48, 58 n. 154, on Altman's purchase, without Berenson's advice; MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 178, dismisses J. Rosenberg's idea that the composition was borrowed by Hobbema; Walford 1991, pp. 146–47, 149, 177, fig. 133, compares paintings by Van Ruysdael and by Pieter van Santvoort (1621), and details the picture's descriptive and expressive qualities; P. Sutton 1992, pp. 170, 172 n. 5, considers the painting "the most grandly conceived of Ruysdael's cornfields [sic]"; Baetje 1995, p. 352; Slive 1995a, p. 205, fig. 277; L. Miller 1996, p. 317, mentioned; Hochstrasser 1998, p. 201, fig. 12, implausibly considers the composition of a landscape print by Joris Hoefnagel (1542–1601) to be a possible source; Slive 2001, p. 125, no. 101 (ill.; details on p. 112 and on slip-case), as "dateable c. 1670," describes the composition and the painting's conservation history; Nadler 2003, p. 210, pl. 17, cited as an example of the artist's work; Secciet 2004, p. 117, mentions the picture as part of the Altman bequest.


Ex Coll.: Pierre-Louis-Jean-Baptiste Colbert, marquis de Laplace, Paris; [Sedelmeyer, Paris, in 1905]; Maurice Kann, Paris (until d. 1907; his estate, 1907–9; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, London, 1909; sold to Altman on October 14, 1909, for $194,800]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1909–1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.623

183. Mountain Torrent

Oil on canvas, 21¼ x 16½ in. (54 x 41.9 cm)

The sky and the middle distance are well preserved. Extensive abrasion in the foreground has exposed the crowns of the canvas weaves throughout the dark passages.

Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 35.110.18

This unsigned canvas is a late work, dating from the 1670s. Van Ruysdael originally developed this type of landscape in response to the Scandinavian views of Allart van Everdingen (1621–1675), although the picturesque approach employed here is immediately recognizable as Van Ruysdael's own. A surging stream descends from right to left through a gorge, while a smaller stream cascades from higher ground on the left. Three sheep are herded over a rustic bridge to an inviting pasture in the middle ground, where more sheep and a conversing couple are seen near a timber and earthen-wall building. The large door indicates that a good part of the structure serves as a barn. Higher up, a house on the hill is surrounded by twisted, hardy trees. The view is crowned by a small mountain and culminates in the circular rise of cumulus clouds. Birds soar in the sunny sky.

Mountainous landscapes by Van Everdingen and Van Ruysdael, and earlier views by Roelant Savery (1576–1659), offered residents of Amsterdam a refreshing view of nature of a kind they could actually experience only by going abroad. Two very different Amsterdam writers, the moralizing poet Jan Luyken (in 1708) and the artist's biographer, Arnold Houbraken (1721), used descriptions of roaring water (ruis, or noise) in a valley (dal) to play on Van Ruysdael's name, which in a way documents the delight to the senses such a painting was meant to be. The shepherd hears only the water, and perhaps the creaking of wood.

The attribution of the Museum's picture was changed from Van Ruysdael to Van Everdingen in 1914, and back to Van Ruysdael in 1972. A review of Van Everdingen's stormy seascapes and Scandinavian scenes, with their seething waters and dangerous rocks, reveals a very different response to nature from Van Ruysdael's, not to mention a different painting technique. Even in Van Ruysdael's earlier, wilder waterfall scenes, a few of which have as much hydraulic force as those by Van Everdingen, one sees the gap between Van Ruysdael's imagination and Van Everdingen's experience, long remembered, of thundering cascades in the mountains of Norway.
Martin's opinion (1938) that the Museum's picture is a German imitation of about 1820–40 was a confused tribute to the Romantic taste for this kind of Van Ruisdael?


2. See Gilijai in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 451, for both writers' remarks in Dutch (nn. 8, 9) and in English. On the actual origin of Van Ruisdael's surname, see the biography of his uncle Salomon van Ruysdael below.

3. This is certainly not one of the waterfalls in Van Ruisdael's oeuvre that might have been read, at least by Dutchmen of Luyken's disposition, as a symbol of transitoriness (see Bruny 1976, p. 99, and the sensible remarks in Slive 2001, p. 154).

4. The rickety footbridge is a motif familiar from Savery's "Tirolean" views, for example, the Mountainous Landscape with Woodcutters, of 1610, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Cologne–Utrecht 1988–86, no. 11 [ill. p. 71]).

5. John Walsh (memo in curatorial files dated June 4, 1971) concluded decisively that the painting is by Van Ruisdael on the basis of photographs at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague. Seymour Slive's letter to Walsh, dated February 11, 1971, states that the picture "looks like a very late authentic Ruisdael, not a work by Van Everdingen." Alice Davies, the author of the standard monograph on Van Everdingen (A. Davies 2001), wrote to Walsh on April 7, 1972, that her study of the artist "lends no support to such an attribution for your painting." She elaborates on this opinion in A. Davies 2001, p. 178.


7. W. Martin, 1938, oral opinion recorded in the curatorial files. See Norwich 1988, pp. 150, 148, for brief remarks on the fashion for Van Ruysdael at the same time in England (Benjamin Robert Haydon, in 1812, refers to "capricious connaisseurs with Raphael in their mouths and Ruisdael in their hearts"). See also Walford 1991, chap. 10 ("Ruisdael's Critics").

REFERENCES: Valentiner in New York 1909, no. 118 (ill.), as by Van Ruysdael in the 1665os; Breck 1910 (ill. opp. p. 60); Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 4 (1912), p. 88, no. 267, as by Van Ruysdael, in the collection of Mrs. Collis P. Huntington; B. Burroughs 1925a, p. 142 (ill. p. 148), confuses the artist with Salomon van Ruysdael; J. Rosenberg 1928, pp. 85, 117, no. 215; J. Allen and Gardner 1944, p. 34, as Mountain Torrent in Sweden by Van Everdingen; Hamilton–Rochester–Amarillo 1983, pp. 10, 28–29, no. 9 (ill.), as by Van Ruysdael, probably from the 1670s; P. Surton 1986, p. 191, as by Van Ruysdael in the 1670s; Baetjer 1995, p. 352; A. Davies 2001, pp. 178–79, fig. 203, reflects upon the changing attributions of the painting, considers the composition similar to that found in some works by Van Everdingen, but regards the sense of space, the structure of trees and other forms, and the harmony of colors in the New York canvas as typical of Van Ruysdael; Slive 2001, p. 218, no. 242 (ill.), as "a characteristic waterfall of the artist's late phase"; Liedtke in Martigny 2006, pp. 96–98, no. 15, publishes an abbreviated version of the present entry; Liedtke in Barcelona 2006–7, pp. 54–55, no. 11, repeats the entry in Martigny 2006.


EX COLL.: Collis P. Huntington, New York (until d. 1900; life interest to his widow, Arabella D. Huntington, later [from 1913] Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, 1900–d. 1924; life interest to their son, Archer Milton Huntington, 1924–terminated in 1925); Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 25.110.18
Salomon van Ruysdael became a member of the painters’ guild of Haarlem in 1623, when his name was recorded as Salomon de Gooyer (“from the Gooi,” an area east of Amsterdam). His date of birth, probably about 1600–1603, is inferred from his likely age when he joined a guild for the first time. He and his brother the painter Isaac van Ruysdael (or Ruysdael) presumably adopted their surname from the Castle Ruisschendael, or Ruisdael, near their father’s hometown of Blaricum in Groningen. Salomon and Isaac probably were born in nearby Naarden, to which their father, the carpenter Jacob de Goyer (ca. 1560–1616), moved in early 1590. Each brother named a son after their father. Salomon’s son, Jacob Salomonsz van Ruysdael (1629/30–1681), was a competent painter in the manner of his father and of his famous cousin, Jacob Isaaksz van Ruysdael (q.v.). Salomon spelled his name Ruisdael and, occasionally, Ruijsdael or (about 1628–31) Ruysdael, but like his brother never signed “Ruisdael.”

The earliest known dated painting by Van Ruysdael is the *View of the Horse Market at Valkenburg*, of 1626. Two years later he was described as “Salomon Rustdael . . . goed in landschap” by the Haarlem historian, Samuel Ampzing. Van Ruysdael’s teacher has not been identified, but the artist was obviously familiar with landscape paintings by Esaias van de Velde (1587–1630), Pieter de Molijn, and Jan van Goyen (q.v.). In the late 1620s, De Molijn and Van Goyen, both of whom were about five years older than Van Ruysdael, were joined by him in creating the tonal manner of landscape painting that is generally considered one of the most original achievements of Dutch art.

Van Ruysdael seems to have rarely left Haarlem. However, his views incorporating the architectural monuments of nearby cities, such as Leiden, Beverwijk, and Alkmaar (see Pl. 187), and of more distant places, such as Utrecht, Rhenen, Amersfoort, Arnhem, Deventer, Emmerich, Nijmegen, and Dordrecht, certainly depended upon firsthand experience as well as secondhand sources.

As a Mennonite, Van Ruysdael would not have served in a civic guard company, but he was otherwise active on behalf of the Haarlem community. Between 1659 and 1666, for example, he held the office of *mijmeester*, or neighborhood warden. He was dean of the Guild of Saint Luke in 1648, and *vinder* (foreman) in 1647, 1663–64, and 1669–70. In addition to his son, Van Ruysdael’s pupils included Hendrick de Hont (in 1638) and Cornelis Decker (ca. 1643–46). In 1636, Van Ruysdael helped run a lottery of paintings in which three of his works were sold (as were four by De Molijn and three by Van Goyen), and in 1640 he and his brother ran an auction.

The date of Van Ruysdael’s marriage to Mayckken Willems Buyssse (d. 1666) is not recorded but may be placed in the 1620s, before the birth of the couple’s only known son. Stechow traced three daughters, one of whom died in 1650, and another before 1660. In 1644, Van Ruysdael became the guardian of another three girls, daughters of his brother Pieter de Goyer, a successful linen merchant in Alkmaar who had died in that year. Similar responsibilities were assumed by Van Ruysdael in Haarlem during the 1650s and 1660s.

The resemblance between Van Ruysdael’s and Van Goyen’s early landscapes, especially the river views of the 1630s, has often been noted. Nonetheless, they seem to have had dissimilar personalities—Van Ruysdael was the steadier and perhaps more prosaic of the two—and they approached their subjects differently. Van Goyen sketched almost incessantly and his paintings resemble oil sketches. Very few drawings by Van Ruysdael are known, and while some must be lost, their scarcity seems consistent with his practice in the 1630s of designing painted compositions in fairly careful underdrawings. The absence of underdrawing in later pictures suggests that Van Ruysdael’s studio practice became more streamlined. A tendency toward routine production is also evident in the artist’s concentration on specific themes: the river, the ferry, ice-skating, a coach ride in the country, the halt at the inn, and so on. However, works of exceptional quality, rich in observation, date not only from the late 1620s and the 1630s but also from the middle of the century and from the last two decades of Van Ruysdael’s prolific career.

2. See the biographies of the two Van Ruysdaels and of Van Ruysdael in MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 379–80, 400–402, and Walford 1991, pp. 4–7, passim (see index), on Isaac van Ruysdael, and other members of the family.
184. Market by the Seashore

Oil on wood, 16 x 26½ in. (40.6 x 59.4 cm); height, with added strips, 16½ in. (41.6 cm)
Signed and dated (right center, on fence): SvR 1637 [VR in monogram]

The painting is in good condition overall, although cleaning in the past has thinned the foreground and exposed underdrawing in the middle ground. Pentimenti are clearly visible in the figure of the horseman. Infrared reflectography reveals the presence of underdrawing throughout the composition. Except in the case of the rider, however, the underdrawing was followed only approximately (for example, the sail of the boat at left was originally positioned an inch farther to the right).

Bequest of Rupert L. Joseph, 1959 60.35.4

On a beach like that at Zantvoort (near Haarlem) or Scheveningen (by The Hague), small fishing boats are hauled up onto the sand and fishermen unload their catch. Clusters of onlookers and potential customers gather around the baskets of fish. In the foreground, a horse and rider make their way toward the village, passing by a pole with an illegible notice at the top.

The date on this panel, which has been celebrated for its “very advanced stage of tonality” at an early point in the development of Dutch landscape painting, has often been published as 1629. However, examination of the inscription under ultraviolet light and magnification reveals that the date is certainly 1637 (fig. 226). Furthermore, the picture’s “austere hues” are considerably exaggerated by the loss, through abrasion, of paint layers in the grassy dunes, which partially makes visible the ground layer and

5. The signature “S. W.[r] RYVESDAEL” is found on a panel in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (no. 6972; Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, no. 90), and the recently discovered Landscape with a Farmhouse is signed “S.v.Ryvesdael/1628” (Liedtke 2003, fig. 1). For facsimiles of Van Ruysdael’s signatures and the periods during which each form was used, see Stechow 1975, p. 49.

4. Stechow 1975, no. 1364, fig. 1; Christie’s, London, June 29, 1979, no. 88. Another painting said to be dated 1626 (see P. Sutton in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 35, fig. 48) was considered to be signed and dated “S. v. Ruysdael 1629” by a recent owner, the art dealer Kurt Müllenmeister (Solingen, Germany). On this picture, see also J. van Gelder 1976, p. 136, and Liedtke 2003, p. 29 n. 16 (doubling the date of 1626 and suggesting a date of about 1628).

5. According to Stechow 1975, p. 11, where the page in Ampzing 1628 is not cited.


8. Miedema 1980, pp. 615–17, 613, 672, and 673, respectively.

9. Ibid., pp. 435 for De Hont, and 601 and 103 for Decker.

10. Ibid., pp. 194–95, 493.

11. See Stechow 1975, pp. 11–12. It appears that none of Van Ruysdael’s daughters have been confused with one of De Goyer’s. The latter’s daughter Grietjie married Van Ruysdael’s son, Jacob, in 1664, when she was twenty-six.

12. The River Scene with Boats attributed to Van Ruysdael in the old master drawings sale at Sotheby’s, London, July 4, 1994, no. 84 (with a discussion and references to four other attributed sheets), was purchased by the Museum (acc. no. 1994.290).

13. See Liedtke 2003, p. 24, and sources cited in the notes indicated there. An example of Van Ruysdael’s underdrawing (fig. 227) is discussed below.

underdrawing (fig. 227). Thus, the painting cannot be considered a pioneering example of the Haarlem style that is found in pictures like Jan van Goyen’s *Sandy Road with a Farmhouse*, of 1627 (Pl. 49), and—less monochromatically—in Pieter de Molijn’s *Landscape with a Cottage*, of 1639 (Pl. 123), but is, on the contrary, a comparatively late instance of Van Ruysdael’s stylistic continuity in the period of about 1628 to the end of the 1630s. Significantly, the picture most like this one in the artist’s oeuvre is the *Coastal Scene*, dated 1636 (art market, 1988), followed by a panel with a different composition but the same theme, dated 1637. Most of Van Ruysdael’s paintings of about 1636–37 are river views that are not closely related to the present picture. Indeed, Stechow’s comparison of the “simple diagonal structure” in this picture and in De Molijn’s well-known *Dune Landscape*, of 1626 (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig), remains interesting, even if Van Ruysdael’s design dates from eleven, not three, years later. A survey of early works by Van Ruysdael himself (for example, *Dune Landscape with a Horse and Rider on a Road*, 1628; art market, 1988) reveals that they are not dissimilar to the seaside views of 1636–37 in their brushwork and coloring. Nonetheless, the landscapes of the mid-1630s are more carefully described, especially in their fairly numerous figures and objects, but also in passages such as grassy dunes. It should also be noted that no beach scenes of this type are known to have been painted by Van Ruysdael or by any of his Haarlem colleagues during the 1620s. The earliest work that bears comparison with the Museum’s picture would appear to be Van Goyen’s *Fish Market on the Beach at Scheveningen*, dated 1632 (Museum der Bildenden Künste, Leipzig).
Schama places the “rather misleadingly titled Market by the Seashore” in the context of paintings and drawings dating from the early 1630s that depict fishing villages such as Scheveningen, Katwijk, Noordwijk, and Beverwijk. He recalls that in the late 1620s, many Dutch herring boats were seized by Flemish ships and privateers in the service of Spain. As a result, Schama suggests, the Dutch developed “an idealized version [vision?] of villages like Scheveningen and Katwijk as embodying the kind of modest indomitability that humanists liked to believe was characteristic of the nation as a whole.” Whether or not these thoughts may be applied to Van Ruysdael’s coastal scenes dating from a few years later, it is true that images of Dutch dunes and villages sometimes suggested more to contemporary urban viewers than the pleasure of excursions in the fresh air.

The theme of selling fish at the seashore is also found in the work of later Dutch artists such as Philips Wouwermanns, Jan Steen (q.q.v.), and the Van Goyen follower Willem Kool (1608/9–1666); it continued in picturesque views dating into the eighteenth century.

1. See Refs. below. In response to an inquiry from Wolfgang Stechow, curator John Walsh wrote to him on April 27, 1973: “Some time ago I transcribed the first three digits as 162, but was not certain about the fourth; the other day, using raking light from several directions, I could see that the last digit could only be a 9.” In a letter dated May 5, 1973, Stechow responded that he “had always considered a 9 for the last digit as the most convincing reading in every way.”
2. Technical examination was conducted by conservator Dorothy Mahon in June 1994.
3. The quote is from Schama 1987, p. 77, in reference to this picture and others like it. Compare the underdrawing of a painting by Van Ruysdael dated 1631 (National Gallery, London, no. 1439), which is discussed by Bomford in London 1986a, pp. 52–54, figs. 8, 9. He reports that another work by Van Ruysdael in the National Gallery (no. 1846, dated by Stechow to about 1632–33) “has a wilder, more rudimentary drawing” (p. 54), which could be said also of the Museum’s picture. The View of Rhenen, of 1643, in the National Gallery, is a panel with no underdrawing at all (London 1986a, pp. 53, 158, no. 57).
4. Canvas, 28¾ x 30½ in. (72.5 x 100 cm), sold at Sotheby’s, New York, April 7, 1988, no. 127, pl. iv, with the full title A Coastal Scene with Boats Drawn Up on the Sand with Fishermen Unloading Their Catch; Stechow 1975, no. 267 (with wrong dimensions).
5. Wood, 23¾ x 37¼ in. (60 x 96 cm); Stechow 1975, no. 267a (on the European market 1965–72). See also the coast with Fishermen, of 1633(?), published in Stechow 1966, p. 103, fig. 202, and in Stechow 1975, no. 266c.
7. Sotheby’s, New York, June 3, 1988, no. 48; Stechow 1975, no. 226.
8. See Stechow 1966, p. 103, fig. 201, where the Leipzig picture (Beck 1972–73, no. 923) is considered to have been “actually preceded... in a very Molijn-like” way by the Museum’s painting.
The subject is reviewed in Liedtke 2003.

Wouwerman's *Selling Fish on the Shore*, of the 1630s (Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 2, p. 577, no. 980), was with the dealer Johnny Van Haeften, London, in 1994. Steen's *Fisherman Selling Their Catch on the Dunes of Scheveningen*, of about 1630 (K. Braun 1980, p. 88, no. 15 [ill.]), was with the London dealer Rafael Valls in 1986. Kool's *Fishmongers on the Beach near Egmond aan Zee* (Beck 1991, p. 260, no. 713 [ill.]) was sold at Christie's, Amsterdam, November 17, 1994, no. 146 (ill.). Among later examples of the subject are *La marchande de poissons*, by Jean-Louis Démarche (1744/54–1829), sold at Sotheby's, Monaco, December 2, 1994, no. 99.

**References:** Stechow 1966, pp. 103, 206 n. 10, describes the picture as "a very Molijn-like but almost entirely brown-grey beach scene" in which Van Ruysdael reached "a very advanced stage of tonality" in 1649; Stechow 1975, p. 108, no. 266B, fig. 7, as dated 1629; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, as a tonal work, not well preserved; Schama 1987b, pp. 76–77, fig. 9, as dated 1629 (caption) but "from the early 1630s" (text), compares the "relentlessly moralizing verses of Jacob Cats"; Baetjer 1995, p. 309; Liedtke 1995a, pp. 154, 157 nn. 1, 5–6, fig. 1, reveals the date to be 1637 not 1629; Liedtke 2003, p. 29 n. 9, cites the picture as an example of a Dutch landscape painting that has been erroneously dated on the basis of a misread inscription.


**Ex Coll.:** Colborne; [Mortimer Brandt, New York, until 1940/41; sold to Joseph]; Rupert L. Joseph, New York (1940/41–d. 1959); Bequest of Rupert L. Joseph, 1959 60.35.4

---

### 185. Ferry near Gorinchem

Oil on canvas, 41¼ x 52½ in. (106.4 x 133.4 cm)

Signed and dated (lower center, on boat): S.v.Ruysdael 1646 [VR in monogram; the second 6 is fragmentary but traceable under magnification]

The condition of the painting is good, although the paint surface is slightly abraded throughout. Wear is most evident in the sky, where the crowns of the weaves are exposed. There is paint loss along two small tears in the upper right quadrant of the canvas where the clouds meet the sky. In the foreground, the abrasion has caused a darkening of the riverbank and water and a diminishment of the figures.

Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup, from the collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1914 15.30.4

In this typical example of Van Ruysdael's river views dating from the middle years of the century, the majestic Sint Jans Tower of the Grote Kerk in Gorinchem (also Gorkum or Gorkum) is framed by foliage and buttressed visually by the chimney and roofline of a small country inn. The tower is seen from the south. The smaller spire, just to the right and behind the main spire, crowns the stair tower on the north side of the bell tower. The three-story tower was built in the 1400s, though not completed until 1517 with the erection of the eight-sided spire, which brought the total height to 197 feet. Van Ruysdael shows most of the top two stories. The original church (pulled down in 1844 and replaced in 1846–51) rose no higher than the western tower's first story (compare figs. 228 and 229), and is screened by trees in Van Ruysdael's picture. The artist faithfully describes such distinctive features as the octagonal base of the spire, the louvered openings of the belfry, the telescoping ascent of the corner buttresses, and one of the clocks, which indicates that it is shortly before ten or eleven in the morning.

The entire foreground of the picture is devoted to vignettes of local travel. Two boats have pulled up at a steep bank, which is provided with a ladder. In the boat with two large fishing baskets astern, the owner gestures with hat to heart, as if swearing that the price he quoted was 50, not 15, stuivers. His Van Ostade-like companion rests while two standing male customers, a woman, and a girl listen uncomfortably. At the inn, a rider addresses local folk at the door, a man (?) sits on a bench under the simple arbor, and two horses munch at a trough while travelers in the wagon wait. In the right background, riders, pedestrians, and another coach (?) make their way around earthen ramparts (these largely survive today), which are surmounted by two cannon and a standard mill.

---

**Salomon van Ruysdael** 805
Despite Van Ruysdael's reputation for fanciful topography, all the buildings in the right background correspond to Gorinchem's south side, where the river De Merwede is joined by the smaller Linge at the Waterpoort (gateway to the Lingehaven, a canal in the heart of the city where ships unloaded freight and fish). Van Ruysdael's fidelity to the actual site accounts for the ungainly arrangement of building blocks behind the quay. The artist's viewpoint was on the spit of land called the Buiten de Waterpoort. In a view of Gorinchem painted by Allart van Everdingen (1621–1673; fig. 230), Van Ruysdael's fishing-cum-ferryboats may be imagined next to the two sailboats by the steep bank at center left. A drawing said to be by Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (q.v.; fig. 229) brings the same view much closer, so that one can make out the balconied Tolhuis (Toll House, 1908). The same structure appears behind the man feeding the horses in Van Ruysdael's picture.

The rendering of the architecture in the area of the mills and ramparts (fig. 231) seems equally faithful, to judge from a panoramic drawing of Gorinchem from the south-southeast made (ca. 1665–70) by the well-connected local artist Jacob van der Ulf (1627–1689; fig. 232). Van Ruysdael's vantage point was somewhat out of Van der Ulf's view to the left. The mill to the far left in the drawing is probably the nearest one in Van Ruysdael's view. The small house on lower ground in the drawing coincides with the roof and lantern seen to the right of Van Ruysdael's horse and rider on the quay. The two small towers that are seen sharply receding beyond the low house in the painting (this is clear only from a firsthand examination of the abraded canvas) are corner towers on a fortified wall, the one to the right of the house in the drawing. The tallest house above the fortress in the drawing is the one with the dark roof and near chimney in the painting; the two adjoining buildings look very different from the painter's low position some seventy degrees west of Van der Ulf's. Finally, the more distant mill in the painting (just to the left of the nearest fortress tower) must be that on the right in the drawing. The castle seen in the haze upriver is Loevestein, which is just east of Gorinchem where the Waal and the Maas rivers meet.

At least one other view of Gorinchem was painted by Van Ruysdael, a small marine of 1650 in which a sailboat in the left foreground and the Sint Jans Tower in the right background are the only forms rising much above the horizon. The view is from the east and shows Gorinchem as the artist might have seen it on the way back from Nijmegen, the fortified city up the river Waal, which he made the subject of some memorable paintings dating from about 1647–52. Pictures by Van Ruysdael dated 1643 and 1644 incorporate motifs from the castle of Loevestein. These South Holland locations were places that would have attracted any Dutch artist with an interest in picturesque views or national history. Van Ruysdael was part-owner of a mill in Gorinchem, but this is less certain evidence that he visited the city than are paintings like the present one.

A smaller version of this composition, on panel, recently came to light (fig. 233). Monogrammed and dated 1649, the picture simplifies the topography and adjusts the view to a broader format.
1. Among the many river views that are recorded in Stechow 1975, those with “ferries” (Stechow applies the term to any boat with passengers) are catalogued as nos. 321–434. Compare especially ibid., figs. 32–34, 37–40, with the composition of the Museum’s picture. Similar works are also illustrated and discussed in the following: Niemeijer 1959, figs. 1, 2, 8, 10–12; London 1966, no. 58 (1649); Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, nos. 93–94 (1645, 1649; see especially p. 473, fig. 2, for the composition of Van Ruysdael’s *River Landscape with Ferry*, of 1649, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Gaskell 1990, no. 74 (1645); and The Hague 1991, no. 17. On the subject of the ferryboat in Netherlandish landscapes, see P. Sutton 1992, p. 182.


3. For a photograph of the tower (with clock) from the opposite side, see Vermeulen 1928–41, part 1, pl. 233.

4. Standard mills, the oldest type in the Netherlands, were widely used for grinding corn (see Stokhuyzen 1962, pp. 25–31).

5. This view is advanced in Niemeijer 1959, and is questioned in Liedtke 1992a. See also Tokyo and other cities 1992–93, p. 176, on Van Ruysdael’s “topographical nonechalance,” Stechow 1975, p. 121 (under no. 349), mentions only “a great church tower (Gorcum?)” with reference to the buildings in the present picture.

6. See Tissink and De Wit 1987, pp. 12 (pictorial map of 1600), 14 (the Waterpoort in 1603). As noted in A. Davies 2001, p. 67, “Merwede” is the name of the short river where the Waal and Maas rivers join.


8. The subject of the drawing in Paris (fig. 229) is carefully described by Carlos van Hasselt in Brussels and other cities 1968–69, no. 48, and in Paris 1974, no. 34. Alice Davies first published the painting by Van Everdingen (fig. 230) and discussed the Paris drawing in connection with a canvas probably based on the latter and tentatively assigned by her to Jan van Kessel (A. Davies 1992, pp. 126–28, no. 18, pl. 18 and colorpl. III). Davies is certainly right to dismiss Jan Meerhout (d. 1677) as the author of her no. 18, but his name was not proposed earlier “merely because he was a native of Gorinchem” (p. 127, following Van Hasselt). Several views of Gorinchem were painted by Meerhout: see Tissink and De Wit 1987, p. 81 (ill.), for a painting in a private collection, New York (view from the east; a variant
Figure 230. Allart van Everdingen, *View of Gorinchem*, ca. 1670. Oil on canvas, 37 x 31¼ in. (94 x 131.5 cm). Private collection, the Netherlands.

Figure 231. Detail of Van Ruysdael’s *Ferry near Gorinchem* (Pl. 185).
was formerly in the collection of Arthur Kay, Glasgow); a naïve
view from Van Everdingen’s angle was with Cramer, The Hague,
in 1777, a view from the southeast, dated 1661, was sold at
Lempertz, Cologne, November 17, 1966, no. 81.

9. On Van der Ulft, see Tissink and De Wit 1987, chap. 4; pp. 42–
43, 47, on this drawing; and pp. 48–49 on his drawing of the
tower (fig. 228 here).

10. Van der Wyck 1990, vol. 1, p. 257, bottom center, shows the
castle on Jacob Colom’s map of 1619; see also p. 260, top right
of map, and nos. 109 and 110 for Roeland Roghman’s drawings
of the castle and site.

11. A panel, 16 ⅞ x 14 ⅞ inches (42 x 37 cm), monogrammed
The painting was catalogued in Stechow 1975, no. 57, with no men-
tion of the date; ill. in Grötzel 1955, p. 77.

12. Stechow 1975, nos. 70; 340A (1647); 354, fig. 31 (1648; Fine Arts
Museums of San Francisco). A version of the latter picture, dated
1652, was in the Guterman sale at Sotheby’s, New York, Janu-
ary 14, 1988, no. 33.

13. Stechow 1975, nos. 283 (1643), 432A (1644; fig. 26), and 453A
(1644).

14. Ibid., p. 12, citing a document dated November 20, 1657 (recording
part-ownership, not the purchase).


REFERENCES: Valentinier in New York 1909, p. 120, no. 119 (ill.
opp. p. 120), as Canal Scene, reads the date as 1640; Breck 1910,
p. 59, mentioned; B. Burroughs 1915, pp. 88, 91 (ill.), as Haarlem,
Holland, reads the date as 1640; Stechow (1938) 1975, p. 121, no. 349,
describes the composition, mentions the “great church tower
(Gorcum?),” and reads the date as (in translation) “1646? (last digit
uncertain; also wrongly read as 1640)?”; Stechow 1919, p. 264 n. 12,
compares the composition to that of Van Ruysdael’s View of the Town
of Alkmaar; also in the Museum’s collection (Pl. 187); Allentown 1969,
pp. 62, 58 (ill.), no. 70, as dated 1645; Baetjer 1995, p. 309; Liedtke
1991a, pp. 153–55, 157 n. 18, fig. 4, describes the artist’s fidelity to the
actual site.

EXHIBITED: New York, MMA, “The Hudson-Fulton Celebration,”
1909, no. 119 (lent by Mrs. Morris K. Jesup, New York); Allentown,
Pa., Allentown Art Museum, “Seventeenth Century Painters of
Haarlem,” 1969, no. 70.

EX COLL.: E. Secrétan, Paris (until 1889; his sale, Galerie Sedelmeyer,
Paris, July 1889, no. 161, as “The Banks of the Meuse,” for
FFr 1,500 to Sedelmeyer); [Sedelmeyer, Paris, from 1889]; Morris K.
Jesup, New York (until d. 1928); Mrs. Morris K. (Maria DeWitt)
Jesup, New York, 1928–d. 1914; Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup,
from the collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1914.

Figure 232. Jacob van der Ulft, View of Gorinchem from the South-Southeast
(left half of a panoramic composition), ca. 1665–70. Pencil and brown wash,
7 ⅜ x 28 ⅛ in. (19.7 x 72.3 cm). Stadsarchief, Gorinchem

Figure 233. Salomon van Ruysdael, A Distant View of Gorinchem from the Merwede River, 1649. Oil on wood, 17 ⅞ x 26 ¼ in. (45.9 x 66 cm).
Private collection, Boston
Oil on canvas, 38\% x 52\% in. (98.7 x 134.3 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): S.v.Ruysdael/1648 [vR in monogram]

The sky has suffered extensive abrasion, and there are large areas of paint loss concentrated in the upper right quadrant. The landscape and human and animal figures are well preserved.

Rogers Fund, 1906 06.1201

In the center of this quietly colorful canvas, a coach and a wagon filled with travelers slowly make their way past a farmhouse. The roof on the rear half of the dwelling is tiled; its brick color (echoed in two of the cows) contrasts attractively with the foliage of the trees and of the arbor covering the thatched roof. Smoke wafts up from the chimney, suggesting that someone is inside cooking on this springlike day. Two riders and a dog approach the low bridge over the canal or stream; beyond them (in the area below the chimney), the mast of a small sailboat is visible. A freestanding dovecote is seen slightly farther to the left. Two cowherds, one of them on horseback, and a large dog accompany eight cows on the road leading to the right, where the view of a meadow and a distant village creates a sense of continuity with the immediate area and the more expansive countryside.

The extent of space is sensed especially in the sky, where sweeping clouds complement the gentle arcs of the taller trees, the bend in the road, and the curve of the bridge and small tree on the right. The surface is filled with passages of painterly interest, and the composition is artfully centered on the bridge as a focus of formal elements and of unhurried human activity. As in many Haarlem landscapes, the painter seems to have followed Karel van Mander's advice: "But above all do not forget to put small figures under tall trees. . . . Make the countryside, the town, and the water full of activity, the houses inhabited, and the roads travelled."

The composition is typical of the late 1640s in Van Ruysdael's oeuvre and in works from his artistic circle. Broadly similar designs were employed about 1647–50 by Jacob van Ruysdael (q.v.), Isaac van Ruysdael (1599–1677), and Pieter de Molijn (q.v.). Several pictures by Van Ruysdael seem to anticipate this one by a few years, for example Travelers Halting before an Inn, of 1644 (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles). In the late 1650s and early 1660s, Van Ruysdael appears to have recalled this composition in a number of pictures that often show travelers stopping at an inn.

2. See Walford 1991, figs. 22, 23, 40, passim.
3. See ibid., fig. 25 (Country Road, in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm).
6. See P. Sutton 1990a, pp. 282–83, for three examples, including Landscape with Cattle and an Inn, of 1661, in the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

REFERENCES: Valentinier in New York 1909, pp. 120–21, no. 120 (ill.), notes that the painting is signed and dated 1648; Breck 1910, p. 59, mentions the picture as in the Hudson-Fulton exhibition; Stechow (1938) 1975, pp. 24–35, 98, no. 196, describes the composition; Stechow 1939, pp. 258, 260, 264 n. 13, fig. 4, places the picture "on the borderline" between two phases of Van Ruysdael's style; D. Sutton in Fry 1972, vol. 1, p. 273 n. 2, in letter 203 (dated November 12, 1906) from Roger Fry to his wife, mentions the Museum's purchase of the painting, along with other works; Spalding 1980, p. 94, describes Fry's recommendation of the picture to the MMA in a report sent from Europe in October 1906; P. Sutton 1990a, p. 282, fig. 98-1 (under no. 99), follows Stechow in comparing the composition with that of the Philadelphia canvas dated 1661; Baecker 1995, p. 309; Liedtke 1995a, pp. 154, 157 n. 2, mentions recent conservation.


EX COLL.: Sale, Amsterdam, April 17, 1809, no. 81, for Fl 20; Salomon Goldschmidt, Paris (until 1898; his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, May 14–17, 1898, no. 96, as "Payage et animaux," for FFr 8,000); Sedelmeyer, Paris, in 1899; cat., 1899, no. 49 (ill.), as "Landscape with Animals"; [Frederik Muller, Amsterdam, until 1906; sold to MMA]; Rogers Fund, 1906 06.1201
187. View of the Town of Alkmaar

Oil on wood, 20⅝ x 33 in. (51.4 x 83.8 cm)

The painting is in good condition, although there are small losses throughout. In numerous places where the thinly applied paint layers have grown transparent, the dark lines of the wood grain have emerged. As the paint darkened with age, form has diminished in the riverbank and water at lower left.

Purchase, 1871 71.135

The painting, although now unsigned, is certainly by Van Ruysdael. It combines a view of Alkmaar from the west with an invented river view, and may date from somewhat earlier than the period suggested in Stechow's monograph (the mid-1650s); in design and execution, it recalls river scenes of the late 1640s and early 1650s.¹

Views of Alkmaar have often been confused with views of Haarlem because of the general resemblance between the two cities' Grote Kerken and because Dutch painters frequently modified the proportions and details of architectural monuments for artistic reasons.² However, the Museum's picture was already called a view of Alkmaar by Van Ruysdael when it was acquired in the 1871 Purchase, and Stechow (in 1938) considered the church depicted here “similar to the one in Alkmaar,” partly on the basis of views of the city painted by the artist in the 1650s (see below). The profile of the Late Gothic Grote or Sint Laurenskerk (built 1470–1512) presented in the New York panel is perhaps somewhat misleading, since the view from the west shows the west or main entrance façade in front of the western elevation of the transept. The long nave is almost completely obscured as it recedes behind the west façade, and of course the choir is invisible. In a view from the north, as in Van Ruysdael's View of Alkmaar with the Sint Laurenskerk from the North, dated 1644 (fig. 234),³ one gains a more complete idea of the church as a whole, with the choir to the left, the nave to the right, and the northern transept arm playing a subordinate part in between. Comparisons with the Laurenskerk today must also take into account that a taller crossing tower with a carillon was built in the 1680s.⁴

The spire seen to the right in the present painting is that of the Grote Kerk's freestanding bell tower.⁵ The two smaller churches visible just to the left, one with a round or onion-shaped crown on its bell tower and the other with a simple spire, no longer exist, but they were identified by the Regionaal Archief in Alkmaar as belonging to monasteries closed in the late sixteenth century.⁶ The small churches are seen from a very different angle in the painting dated 1644, and in a version of that composition, dated 1647, in the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin.⁷ Visible to the far right on the riverbank are a standard mill (similar to one that actually existed) and what would appear to be (and should be, given the location) the city's southern gate, called the Kennemerpoort (built in 1631–32), and an adjacent gabled house with a slim tower.⁸

Plans of Alkmaar show that canals, or sengels (“girdles”), on the west side of Alkmaar do recede diagonally to the right in

---

Figure 234. Salomon van Ruysdael, A View of Alkmaar with the Sint Laurenskerk from the North, 1644. Oil on wood, 24⅝ x 36⅝ in. (62 x 93 cm). Private collection
views from the west (as here) and from the north-northeast (as in fig. 234). However, these actual waterways bear no resemblance to the rivers seen in Van Ruysdael’s various views of Alkmaar. Similar riverbanks are found frequently in his œuvre, with both real and imaginary buildings beyond them.9

The panel dated 1644, the Dublin version of 1647, and the present picture are probably the earliest views of Alkmaar painted by Van Ruysdael, who returned to the subject in the 1650s and 1660s.10 The city was a fairly short trip to the north of Haarlem, where the artist lived, and it is possible that he went there a number of times. Van Ruysdael is known to have visited Alkmaar in 1644 because of the death of his brother Pieter de Goyer early in that year (he was buried in the Grote Kerk on January 28, 1644), and his subsequent appointment as guardian of De Goyer’s three daughters.11

While Van Ruysdael’s views of Alkmaar may be placed among his many river scenes with old forts, castles, churches, and so on, his contemporaries would have associated the cityscape with certain historical events. The Grote Kerk, for example, was the burial place not only of the artist’s brother but also of Count Floris V of Holland (d. 1296), the nobleman from whom the most prominent Catholic family in Haarlem, the Van Haarlem van Berkenrode, received Berkenrode Castle.12 Alkmaar was more generally known for withstanding the siege of 1573 by the Spanish troops that had captured Haarlem. The deliberate flooding of the land around the ramparts of Alkmaar turned the tide in Holland’s war of independence against Spain.

1. See Refs. below. Compare Stechow 1975, figs. 32–38. The picture may have lost an inscription in one of the horizontal strips of flaking.
2. For example, Van Ruysdael’s view of Alkmaar dated 1616 (Stechow 1975, no. 9, as For Alkmaar [art market, London, in the 1950s]) was called “Winter Near Haarlem” by Valentin in New York 1909, no. 122. Similarly, Anthony Jansz van der Croos’s slightly fanciful view of Alkmaar from the northeast, a panel dated 1653 (when he lived in that city), is identified as “A Capriccio View of Haarlem seen from the north east, with the Bovorkerk prominent” in the sale catalogue of Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, November 16, 1994, no. 15. The subject was more cautiously described in Beck 1991, p. 88, no. 193, as “Stadt mit Kirche und Schloss hinter Ufermauer links.” On the subject of fanciful or accurate topography and architecture in paintings by Van Ruysdael, see Niemeijer 1959 and Liedtke 1959a.
4. See Fockema Andreae, Ter Kuile, and Ozinga 1948, pp. 231–37, fig. 39 (plan), pl. 72 (photo of the exterior from the southeast).
5. The bell tower in Alkmaar was square in plan and built of wood on a stone base about fifteen feet high (only the upper part is visible in the Museum’s picture). It was constructed in 1501 and demolished in 1857. A drawing of the tower and adjoining houses by Cornelis Pronk, dated 1729, is in the Regionaal Archief, Alkmaar. This information and a photocopy of the drawing were kindly sent by Victoria Wijnekes of the Regionaal Archief, Alkmaar, in a letter dated December 4, 2003.


7. The Dublin picture (Stechow 1975, no. 21), a winter view with numerous figures on a frozen river in the foreground, is discussed in Potterton 1986, p. 118 (under no. 27), pl. 147, and in S. de Vries et al. 1997, p. 43, fig. 45.

8. A standard mill, the classical Kennemerpoort, and the adjacent house are seen (with the Grote Kerk in the background) in a drawing of about 1735 by Abraham Rademaker (Regionaal Archief, Alkmaar).

9. In Liedtke 1995a, p. 155, the present writer overstated the case by maintaining that the topography depicted here and in the panel dated 1644 (fig. 234) “corresponds approximately to the site itself.” The claim is gently corrected in S. de Vries et al. 1997, pp. 43, 51 n. 103, with reference to the picture dated 1647 in Dublin (see note 7 above).

10. See Stechow 1975, nos. 9 (1656), 21 (1647), 75 (ca. 1650), 143 (1664), 176 (1657), and 131 (1660).

11. See ibid., p. 12. In a letter dated February 10, 1995, V. Wijnekes of the Regionaal Archief, Alkmaar, noted that Pieter de Goyer made out his will on January 22, 1644, and was buried six days later. Van Ruysdael became the guardian of the three daughters—Neeltje, Geertrje, and Trijnntje—born to De Goyer’s second wife, Marijje Claes Pruy (document in the Weeskamerarchief Alkmaar, inv. no. 88, box G.3).

12. See G. Schwartz and Bok 1990, p. 41, fig. 33, on the castle (p. 290, no. 183, for the long inscription below the etching after Saaenredam in Samuel Anpzing’s Beschryvinge ende lef der stad Haarlem in Holland, 1628), and pp. 232-33, 252-33 (no. 7, fig. 247, for Saaenredam’s drawing of the count’s tomb (1665).

References: Decamps 1872, p. 433; James (1872) 1916, pp. 59, 61, mentions the picture; MMA 1872, no. 131; Harck 1888, p. 76, considers the work unimportant but genuine; Stechow (1918) 1975, p. 131, no. 401, dates the painting to the mid-1640s and considers the church “similar to the one in Alkmaar”; Stechow 1919, pp. 255, 258, 264, fig. 5, n. 11, as “painted undoubtedly in the early fifties”; Baetjer 1995, p. 109; Liedtke 1995a, pp. 155, 157, fig. 2, describes the topography and compares the painting of 1644 (fig. 234); S. de Vries et al. 1997, p. 51 n. 103, compares Van Ruysdael’s view of Alkmaar dated 1647 (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin), which is described as an imaginary view with recognizable motifs; Baetjer 2004, pp. 181, 219, clarifies the provenance.

Ex Coll: Maximilian I, king of Bavaria (until d. 1829); [his estate] sale, E. A. Fleischmann, Munich, December 5, 1826, no. 3, as by Jacques Ruysdael (“un paysage dont la perspective offre l’aperçu d’un pays plat; une église occupe le milieu du tableau”); [Leon Gauchez, Paris, with Alexis Febvre, Paris, until 1870, sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870-71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.133

188. Marine

Oil on wood, 13 1/8 x 17 7/8 in. (34.6 x 43.4 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right, on board): Svr1660
[vR in monogram]

The painting is very well preserved, and the oak panel support retains its original thickness, with bevels intact.

Purchase, 1871 71.98

“A sloop tumbles across a bay; and the toss of the boat, the pulse of the water, the whistle of the breeze, the moist gray light, seem to generate a kind of saline aroma.”

Henry James’s description in 1872, and Louis Decamps’s of the same year—“chef d’oeuvre de finesse et du mouvement, si délicatement accentué”—beautifully convey the appeal of this small picture and a number of similar views painted by Van Ruysdael about 1650. The subject is transport on a river (not a bay), with a village on the left bank. To the right of the church (a Late Gothic structure of a type common in Holland) are a cluster of houses and two sailboats at the water’s edge. On the right bank, a boat with lowered sails is moored by a farmhouse; nearby sheep graze in a meadow. The church with a central tower in the right background resembles Saint Bavo’s in Haarlem, which suggests that the river is perhaps meant to recall the Spaarne on the city’s south side (see Pl. 50).

The sailboat in the foreground, flying the Dutch flag, is a schoon, one of a few types of shallow-draft vessel that were used to ship goods and occasionally passengers between towns on the inland waterways. Similar boats round the bend in the
distance. The expanse of space is indicated both by the boat in the middle ground and by the transition from the shadowed, rippled water in the foreground to the smooth, glistening surface upriver. The vertical motif of the schouw and the long recession from it to the boats in the right background are echoed softly in the billowing clouds, subtly enhancing the sweep of wind throughout the entire scene. The keystone of the composition, the boat is crowned by a high patch of white cloud embellished with seagulls flying aloft. On the painted surface, the thin green line of landscape, which resembles piping on a satin jacket, gains depth from the firm white streaks just above the horizon. These contrast with the gray blue strokes that suggest dark shadows under the closer clouds.

Comparable river views, filled almost entirely by sky and water, were painted by Jan van Goyen (q.v.) beginning in the late 1630s. The choppy water and other features found in Van Goyen’s early pictures suggest that he was inspired by Jan Porcellis (before 1584–1632), to whom he sold a house in 1629. This type of composition became especially common about 1650 in the work of Van Goyen, Van Ruysdael, and their minor followers, such as Willem van Dijst (before 1610—in or after 1668) and his son Jeronimus van Dijst (1634—in or after 1677) at The Hague.

As noted by Stechow, these river scenes have a “marine appearance”; for New York or New England viewers, such topography resembles the shorelines of Long Island Sound. The title, Marine, was given to the Museum’s picture in the 1871 Purchase and is retained here in deference to early admirers such as Henry James.
189. **Drawing the Eel**

Oil on wood (cradled), 26½ x 41½ in. (74.9 x 106 cm)
Signed and dated (lower center, below barrel): SvRuys . . . /164(?) [r in monogram]

The picture is exceptionally well preserved. There is paint loss in the sky along a panel join. Examination by means of infrared reflectography reveals that the human figures, horses, and log at lower left were constructed with a very bold, calligraphic, and broadly brushed application of dark paint (fig. 235). In many places, this dark underpainting served as the first stage in the modeling of the forms. A few figures in the crowd were sketched but not painted in.

Purchase, 1871 71.73

One of the finest paintings acquired by the Museum in the 1871 Purchase, **Drawing the Eel** illustrates a village entertainment on a crisp, clear winter day. So many details divert the eye that the sky might almost be overlooked, although it fills about three-quarters of the picture surface and includes, in its wonderfully well-preserved paint layer, lovely passages of blue streaked by fair-weather clouds and reflected sunlight.

The unfortunate creature (it could be something other than an eel) is strung on a rope that extends from one of the delicately silhouetted trees at left to the upper window of the inn. The establishment’s sign shows a half-length portrait of a man with a sash (suggesting that the inn is called The Prince); a flag announces the festival; and the smoking chimneys allude to comfort within. On the side of the roadway, what appears to be the entire local population has assembled as spectators. In the foreground, ice sleds stuffed with straw serve as improvised box seats. The woman who sits alone in a sled and the red-skirted matron in conversation to the far right wear fur muffins over their hands, but no one seems to mind the cold. To the left, three sleds, two of them horse drawn, and a dozen skaters glide over the ice and their own reflections. The low horizon and long arc of the road at water’s edge evoke countless villages in Holland, many with churches like the one in the central background.

Van Ruysdael’s cartoonish horses are surprising in this great age of equestrian portraiture, but they suit his lumpy proletariat and middle classes. Seven decked-out couples ride double on...
well-groomed and bridled mounts, with team colors visible in two instances. The yellow ribbons that decorate the halter of the white horse to the right are matched by the yellow sashes and ribbon of its riders. The couple on the horse behind them wears green.

Social historians have yet to document the history of *palingstreken* (eel pulling) and its doltish variations, such as riding at the herring and pulling the cat. These amusements were depicted by Philips Wouwermans (q.v.) and other artists at about the same time. Van Ruysdael himself painted the subject in 1653 or 1655 (fig. 236), employing a composition that anticipates the general design of the present work. The latter’s taller format and more colorful palette, however, are hallmarks of the 1650s and 1660s.

The signature and date are now barely visible at the bottom center of the picture, below the bent figure and barrel. In 1973, the date was read as [16]50. However, in 1990 Valentiner recorded the date as 165[0]5, which is precisely what is legible now (with no trace of the last digit) at the lower right of the incomplete signature. A date of about 1650 or the early 1650s is completely expected within the context of the artist’s oeuvre.

1. The title was proposed by Hofstede de Groot on a visit to the Museum in September 1908 (note in curatorial files).
4. As reported by Curator John Walsh, in a letter to Wolfgang Stechow dated April 27, 1973. Stechow answered (May 5, 1973), “I am very glad to see the 50 accepted.”
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6. The light gray paint of the inscription is easily traceable with the aid of strong light and a magnifying glass.

REFERENCES: Decamps 1872, p. 435, describes the painting as "Kermesse hollandaise pendant l'hiver"; James (1872) 1916, pp. 59, 61–62, as "A Kermesse," offers a delightful description ("these stolid little mannikins—well-waddled burghers, mounted on sturdy nags with buxom wives and sweethearts en couple"); MMA 1872, no. 110, as A Dutch Kermesse, mistakenly as from the private collection of King Maximilian I, of Bavaria; Kegel 1884, p. 460, describes the work; Harck 1888, p. 76, mentions it as an "excellent, multfigured picture"; Valentiner in New York 1909, p. 122, no. 121 (ill. opp. p. 123), as "Winter Scene," erroneously as on canvas, reads the inscription as "S v R 165-"; Brock 1910, p. 59; Stechow (1938) 1975, pp. 25, 68, no. 5, fig. 46, as "Palingtrenken" and mistakenly as fully signed and dated 1650, considers the work to revive the winter scene in Van Ruysdael's oeuvre; Stechow 1939, pp. 356, 358–59, 264 n. 16, fig. 6, says the painting represents "a popular game played on a nice winter day of the year 1650 somewhere in the surroundings of Haarlem"; Stechow 1966, p. 59, as "basically a genre scene" of 1650; Van Straten 1977b, p. 117, fig. 154, describes the game briefly; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, as "a mature work in pristine state by Salomon dated 1650"; P. Sutton in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, pp. 329–31, fig. 1 (under no. 120), as similar in subject and composition to Wouwerman's Riding at the Herring, of about 1650, and as dated 1650(?); Baetjer 1995, p. 309; Runia in The Hague 2001–2, pp. 126–27, 164, no. 26 (ill.), as Eel-Pulling, dates the painting to about 1650–55, and compares two works by Wouwerman; P. Sutton 2002, p. 208 (under no. 44), as dated "1650[?]", compares the Van Dedem Winter Landscape, of 1653; Baetjer 2004, pp. 181, 209, no. 110, fig. 38, clarifies the picture's ownership in 1870–71.


Ex Coll.: Johan van der Linden van Slingeland, Dordrecht (until 1785; his sale, Dordrecht, August 22ff., 1785, no. 350, for Fl 33 30 fr. to Reynst); sale, J. Dintl et al., Vienna, November 23, 1869, no. 141, bought in at Fl 3,000;[5] Léon Gauchez, Paris, with Alexis Febvre, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.75

1. According to Stechow 1938b, p. 68.
2. Ibid.
190. *Fishing Boats on a River*

Oil on wood (cradled), 14¼ x 21¾ in. (37.5 x 55.6 cm); painted surface, 14¼ x 21¼ in. (36.2 x 54 cm)
Signed (left, on the boat’s leeboard): SVR [monogram]

The painting is in good condition. The oak panel has been thinned to ¾ in. (.16 cm) and adhered to a plywood panel ¼ in. (.64 cm) thick that has been cradled.

From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2005 2005.331.8

Stechow dated this striking picture from the Markus collection to the 1660s (see Refs.). The same form of monogram seen on this painting (fig. 237) has been found on pictures dating from 1659 to 1668.¹

The work wonderfully suggests a view from on or at the edge of the water, which seems almost to roll away from the viewer to the subtly curved horizon. Clouds and patches of sky are reflected in the river, which has a sheen like polished pewter. Also mirrored in the water’s gently rippled surface are the two fishing boats at left and the rowboat to the right, where two men haul in a net and another busies himself with a line.

At least ten sailboats can easily be counted, and half a dozen more are suggested by strokes in the center background. The entire horizon is filled by a trace of land, indicating that the scene is set in a wide stretch of river. Birds skim the surface and soar overhead, and four cows are visible in the right background, recalling Cuyp in the space of a thumbprint.

The panoramic composition, with its main motif strongly silhouetted, brings to mind paintings by Jan van Goyen (q.v.), especially those of the 1650s.² Van Ruysdael had been painting similar views since the early 1640s, some of them even closer to the present work than the Museum’s panel dated 1650 (Pl. 188).³
The bold pattern of the Markus picture is, however, more characteristic of the early 1660s, to judge from a few dated works.  

4. See ibid., nos. 294, 295, pls. 57, 58.

References: Stechow 1938a, pp. 27, 104, no. 316, pl. 31, fig. 43, as an extraordinary late work (from the 1660s) in an English private collection; Stechow 1975, pp. 27, 115–16, no. 316, pl. 41, fig. 56, adds provenance dating from after 1938 (erroneously citing O. rather than D. Birnbaum).

Exhibited: New York, Duveen Galleries, "Paintings by the Great Dutch Masters of the Seventeenth Century," 1942, no. 57 (lent by Mr. and Mrs. D. Birnbaum); New York, Knoedler Gallery, 1945, no. 15 (erroneously as on canvas, and with incorrect dimensions).

Ex coll.: [W. E. Duits, Amsterdam, in 1929]; Dr. O. Hirschmann, Amsterdam, private collection, England; [Van Diemen, London]; Mr. and Mrs. D. Birnbaum-Ten Cate, New York (by 1942); Frits and Rita Markus, New York (by 1975); From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2001. 2005.331.8

1. The owner is Otto Heinrich Hirschmann (b. 1889), an art historian known for his book Hendrick Goltzius als Maler (1916), and for his collaboration on Abraham Bredius's Künstler-Inventare (1915–22).
2. According to Stechow 1938b.
Godfried Schalcken

Made 1643–1706 The Hague

This refined genre, history, and portrait painter was born in Made, a village near Breda in North Brabant. His father, Cornelis Schalckius from Heusden, served as parish minister at several villages in the area, and his mother, Aletta Lydis, came from a distinguished family of clergymen in Dordrecht. In 1654, the couple and their six children moved to Dordrecht, where Schalckius became rector of the Latin school. According to Houbraken, who knew Schalcken in later years, the young man was a good student of languages but preferred painting, becoming a pupil of Samuel van Hoogstraten in Dordrecht and then of Gerrit Dou (q.v.) in Leiden.1 Schalcken's tenure with Dou, which is confirmed by an inscription beneath his etched portrait of the famous *fijnschilder*,2 probably began in 1662 after Van Hoogstraten left for England.

Schalcken is not documented again until 1675 (not 1665), when he became the ensign of a civic guard company in Dordrecht.3 He was the city's most fashionable portraitist after Nicolaes Maes (q.v.) left for Amsterdam in 1673.4 In October 1679, Schalcken married Françoise (or Françoisia) van Diemen (1661–after 1720), a Breda beauty half his age. The artist's pendant portraits of himself and his new fiancée or wife (the exquisite paintings on copper could celebrate either their engagement or their marriage) are in the collection of the Princes of Liechtenstein.5 The couple had seven children; only one, Françoisia (baptized on June 28, 1690), lived to adulthood.

Schalcken is cited a few times in Dordrecht between 1679 and 1691.6 He is described as a Dordrecht resident in a document recorded at The Hague in November 1691, but on February 28 of the same year he joined the painters' confraternity, Pictura, in the court city. In May 1692, he and his wife went to London,7 little is known of Schalcken's activity in England, although Houbraken writes that he was very successful there.8 His self-portrait of 1695 (Uffizi, Florence) was sent from London to Cosimo III de' Medici in Florence, evidently at the artist's own suggestion.9

Schalcken was in The Hague by June 1698,10 and on August 31, 1699, he was described as a citizen upon being excused from civic guard duties.11 In September 1700, he was commissioned to paint portraits of the Princes of Orange for the Admiralty in Rotterdam.12 Recorded at The Hague in 1702 and in 1704, he was evidently active in the interim at the court of the Elector Palatine, Johann Wilhelm, in Düsseldorf.13 Various documents trace the painter's efforts to place his personal affairs in order between February 1704 and his death in November 1706.14

Houbraken compares Schalcken's brushwork, palette, and description of materials to those of Adriaen van der Werff (1659–1722), but—with a nod to the French critic Roger de Piles—he faults the artist's drawing.15 Schalcken's indebtedness to Dou has often been noted, but the many night scenes for which he was praised by contemporaries owe more to Frans van Mieris (see Pl. 123).16 As a portraitist, Schalcken recalls less the Leiden painters than Maes in Dordrecht and Caspar Netscher (q.v.) in The Hague. His pupils included Arnold Boonen (1669–1729) and Carel de Moor (1656–1718).17

1. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 3, p. 175. Recent biographers, including Beherman 1988, p. 24, maintain that, according to Houbraken, Schalcken studied with Van Hoogstraten between 1666 and 1662. This information does not go back to Houbraken but to a conjecture in G. Veth 1892, p. 2.
4. See Jansen in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 28, p. 49, where Schalcken's Portrait of Pieter de la Court the Younger, of 1679 (Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden), and an elaborate preparatory drawing for the picture are mentioned. See also Jansen 1992, pp. 74–77, fig. 1.
5. Beherman 1988, nos. 52, 53. See Lichtke in New York 1981–85, nos. 172, 173, where the sitters are identified for the first time. Beherman's posthumous book gives Françoise van Diemen's date of death as “after 1706” (p. 130), but two documents concerning her affairs in 1720 are cited on p. 418. Later pendant portraits of Schalcken and his wife, attributed to his pupil Arnold Boonen, were catalogued in a Christie's, Amsterdam, sale of December 2, 1987, no. 57, as depicting anonymous sitters.
6. See G. Veth 1892, p. 3.
7. See White 1982, p. 116 (citing Vertue's remark that Schalcken had made an earlier visit to London), and Beherman 1988, pp. 25–26.
8. A few English portraits are known: the Portrait of James Bruce, 1st Duke of Chandos is dated 1697 (Beherman 1988, no. 81), and the candlelit Portrait of William III (1650–1702), in the Rijks-
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museum, Amsterdam, must date from the 1690s (ibid., no. 84, with incorrect dates of birth and death). A Self-Portrait, signed “G. Schalcken pinxit hanc suam effigiem Londini A 1694,” is in the Washington County Museum of Fine Arts, Hagerstown, Maryland (ibid., no. 55, incorrectly transcribing the inscription. The form given here was kindly communicated by Amy Metzger in April 2002).


11. G. Veth 1892, p. 4. This document too has been misread, for example, in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, p. 299, where Schalcken’s date of birth is twice given as 1614.


13. Ibid., p. 5; see Beherman 1988, pp. 27, 418.

14. See G. Veth 1892, p. 6. Veth gives Schalcken’s date of death as November 13, 1706, but Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 3, p. 170, writes that the artist died at The Hague on November 16, 1706, at the age of sixty-three.

15. See Jansen 1992, which refers to earlier literature on Schalcken drawings.


191. Cephalus and Procris

Oil on canvas, 25 1/2 x 31 1/4 in. (64.8 x 79.7 cm)
Signed (upper left): G. Schalcken

The painting is well preserved, and the figures, which are painted more opaquely, retain their original strength of form. The landscape, painted thinly over a medium gray ground, has darkened over time. The hand-loomed lining fabric and the hand-forged nails securing the tacking edges to the stretcher suggest that the lining may date as early as the late eighteenth century.

Purchase, Rogers Fund, 1974-1974.109

In his mythological and religious pictures, Schalcken strongly favored subjects that should or could be rendered as night scenes. His reputation for nocturnal illumination appears to have been established early on, in the 1660s, when he was influenced by his second teacher, Gerrit Dou, and by Dou’s leading disciple, Frans van Mieris the Elder (see Pls. 36, 123). Schalcken also specialized in paintings of attractive young women in various states of undress and distress or incapacity. These aspects of form and content must have pleased the patron and princely patrons who supported the artist in The Hague and London. However, the present picture probably dates from the 1680s, when Schalcken worked in Dordrecht.1

The subject is taken from Ovid’s Metamorphoses (7.694–865). Cephalus, a handsome hunter from Athens, is married to Procris, “sister of the ravished Orithyia,” but herself “more worthy to be ravished away.” Inflamed by Cephalus, the goddess Aurora (who is recalled by the dawning light in the landscape) sweeps him away, but her amorous mood is spoiled when Cephalus describes his wedding and even his nuptial night. Aurora dismisses him, exclaiming, “Keep your Procris . . . you will come to wish that you had never had her.” On his way home, Aurora’s example makes Cephalus suspicious of his wife. This leads to unwarranted accusations, a trial separation, and eventual reconciliation, when Procris presents her husband with the gift of a spear that never misses its mark. After many years of happiness, problems resurface. One day, Cephalus is hunting in the woods. Sweaty from slaughtering animals, he begs a local breeze named Aula to cool “the heat with which I burn.” An eavesdropper overhears these sensual entreaties and reports them to Procris, who jealously spies upon her husband during the next day’s outing. When again he calls out to Aula, there is a groan and a rustling in the brush. Cephalus hurds the spear (seen here, blood-tipped, on the right) and, a moment later, hears the cry of his mortally wounded wife. Parting words are spoken as Procris sinks in her husband’s arms.

Dozens of Dutch artists depicted the story of the ill-fated couple, often less effectively than here.2 In Schalcken’s day, viewers still drew edifying conclusions from mythological tales, as did Karel van Mander in his influential Wijngaerden op de metamorphosen (Interpretation of the Metamorphoses; 1604).3 The main appeal of Schalcken’s interpretation, however, was
probably its literary flavor and sophisticated style. Some contemporaries would also have recognized that a tree entwined with ivy, like that highlighted on the right, was a symbol of marital fidelity.

1. Beherman (1988, nos. 28, 44) dates the present picture and the comparable Nymphe Spied by a Satyr (Wadsworth Athenaeum, Hartford) in the period 1685–90, but his reasons are unclear. See also his nos. 42, Venus and Cupid (Národní Galerie, Prague), and 50, Diana and Her Companions (private collection), both of which he dates to 1680–85. The forest setting in the Diana is similar to that in the Museum's painting.

2. The less impressive examples include Willem Verschoor's large canvas (1679) in the Centraal Museum, Utrecht, and Arie de Vos's panel (1671) in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm. For Joachim Wtewael's painting of about 1595–1600 (Saint Louis Art Museum), see Lowenthal 1986, no. A-11, pl. 16. See also Sluijter 2000a, pp. 84, 261 n. 181 on Cephalus and Procris (fig. 289 for Verschoor's painting), and I. Lavin 1954 on the subject in seventeenth-century Rome. A long list of mostly non-Netherlandish artists who treated the subject is found in J. Reid 1993, pp. 295–300; see also Pigler 1974, vol. 2, pp. 56–58. There is some resemblance between Schalken's composition and Paulus Moreelse's rhythmic grisaille of the same subject (1616; Louvre, Paris), which was engraved by Crispijn de Passe (see De Jonge 1938, nos. 191, 19b, figs. 16, 17, and note 3 below). Schalken's design also bears a general resemblance to Italian compositions like Caravaggio's Eustay of Saint Francis (Wadsworth Athenaeum, Hartford), and to a few works by Gerard de Lairesse.

3. The Wilgenbohe is the concluding section of Van Mander 1604; see Miedema in Van Mander/Miedema 1975, vol. 2, pp. 506–9, for an introduction. Lowenthal 1986, p. 89, translates Van Mander's commentary on Cephalus and Procris: "Ardent Procris, who so fearfully sought that [deception] which she had not wanted to find, shows that neither wife nor man should pursue such a thing, so as not to have to suffer a mortal wound from the prick of conscience, by letting himself be seduced so foolishly through guilefulness, to which blind ardent love is so inclined." Similar sentiments were penned by Aernout van Buchell for the inscription beneath Crispijn de Passe's engraving of the subject after Paulus Moreelse: see Veldman 2001, pp. 221–24, fig. 120.


5. Lowenthal (1986, p. 89) makes this observation in connection with the painting by Wtewael in Saint Louis (see note 2 above). She cites Andrea Alciati's emblem (1534) depicting a grapevine wound around a dead tree, which is entitled "Amicitia etiam post mortem durans" (Friendship lasting even after death). Cesare Ripa (see Ripa 1644a) and other writers discuss vines clinging to living trees as symbols of marriage, a notion that goes back to Psalm 128, which describes a wife as a fruitful vine at the side of a man's house. See De Jongh in Haarlem 1986a, pp. 126–27, in the entry on Frans Hals's Married Couple in a Garden (Isaac Massa and Beatrix van der Laen?), of about 1622 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

REFERENCES: A. Young 1770, p. 391, mentions the painting as in the dressing room of Temple Newsam House; Neale 1823, unpaged, lists the work as at Temple Newsam, Yorkshire. Anon., "Notable Works of Art Now on the Market," Burlington Magazine 115, no. 89 (December 1973), supplement, unpaged, pl. xiv, as a ravishing work at the Hatzlett Gallery, London; Beherman 1988, pp. 111–13, no. 28 (ill.), suggests a date of about 1685–90; Bactjier 1995, p. 341; Sluijter 2000a, p. 261 n. 181, cites the work as a late Dutch example of the subject.


Pieter Cornelisz van Slingelandt, a mason's son, was baptized on November 4, 1640. He appears to have spent his entire life in his native Leiden, where he joined the painters' guild in 1661 and is recorded as a member throughout the 1660s and 1670s. In 1690, he served as hoofdman (headman), and in 1691 (until his death on November 7) as dean of the guild. No marriage is recorded.

Van Leeuwen describes the artist and Frans van Mieris the Elder (q.v.) as "reared by" Gerrit Dou (q.v.), and calls the latter "their master." Van Slingelandt's close dependence on Dou's style and subject matter suggests that he was indeed trained by the famous painter and was, in any event, one of his most faithful followers. His dry manner (which Houbraken considered "somewhat stiffer" than Dou's) and his variations on themes employed earlier by Van Mieris and Gabriel Metsu (q.v.) have given Van Slingelandt a reputation as one of the less inspired practitioners of the Leiden fijnischilder school. Nevertheless, his portraits often reveal an impressive sense of character, and his genre scenes have consistent charm. The latter quality and Van Slingelandt's meticulous technique earned him considerable acclaim in the eighteenth century. His paintings were also highly valued in his lifetime (an early work drew the usual complaint about price from de Monconys). However, Houbraken's account and a lawsuit brought by the artist against the secretary of the city of Leiden indicate that his expensive pictures cost him great investments of labor and time.

5. See Ekkart 1984, on the lawsuit, which involved Van Slingelandt's Family Portrait (Frans Mierman and His Family), of 1668 (Louvre, Paris).

192. Johan Hulshout

Oil on wood, 14½ x 11¼ in. (36.8 x 29.8 cm)
Signed (lower left): P • V • Slingelandt • fecit

This portrait is exceptionally well preserved. The oak panel has been thinned to ½ in. (~1.2 cm).

Purchase, 1871 71.70

This panel and its pendant in the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin (fig. 238), were separated at the Amsterdam auction of the Daniël Hooft collection in 1860. According to the auction catalogue, the paintings "had passed from the family of Van Slingelandt to that of Hooft."m On the basis of this information and genealogical research, Ekkart, in 1992, identified the sitters and traced the pictures' continuous descent to the Hooft sale.

Johan Hulshout (1623–1687) was the son of Wouter Hulshout, a wine merchant in The Hague, and Margrietje Rottermond. The younger Hulshout studied law at the University of Leiden and, in 1650, became secretary to the Hoogheemraadschap van Rijnland, which supervised the regional system of canals, dikes, and dams. He held the post until his death in 1687 and was succeeded by his eldest son, Johannes Hulshout (1652–1713). In 1650, Hulshout married Anna Splinter (ca. 1630–1694), the daughter of a pharmacist and burgomaster in The Hague, Pieter Splinter, and his wife, Catharina van Onderwater. During the 1650s, the young couple lived in a rented house (now no. 3) on the Rapenburg in Leiden. In 1668, Hulshout purchased property from the city and built an imposing town house (now Rapenburg 8), which was probably designed by the prominent architect Pieter Post (1608–1669).
The portraits may be dated on the basis of costume and hairstyles to the first few years of the Hulshouts' residence in the new house, that is, about 1670 or slightly later. Especially fashionable for the time is the man’s elaborate lace collar in *gros point de Venise*. The collar and cuffs are extraordinarily detailed, with countless eyelets visible under magnification, and a painstaking use of highlights and shadows to suggest the relief of the lace pattern. These passages, which probably represent
treasured items of the sitter's own attire, recall Houbraken's remark that Van Slingelandt would work for four to six weeks to describe a single band of lace.⁶

The garden architecture in both portraits bears a general resemblance to Post's designs; the archway in the present picture recalls Van Slingelandt's admiration for the Renaissance architect Sebastiano Serlio (1475–1553/35).⁷ The dog in the woman's portrait probably stands for fidelity.⁸

1. See Potterton 1986, pp. 142–43, no. 267. The present writer first proposed that the panels were painted as pendants during a visit to the National Gallery of Ireland in 1983.

2. Catalogue de quelques tableaux principalement de l'école ancienne des Pays-Bas . . . provenant de la succession de feu Mr. Daniel Hooff, Amsterdam (Hooft residence), October 30, 1860, pp. 4–5 (under nos. 2, 3). The "printed description in French" mentioned by Potterton (see note 1 above) as on the reverse of the Dublin panel was clipped from this catalogue. Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 5, records the Dublin picture as follows: pp. 467–68, no. 166, Hooff sale, Amsterdam, October 30, 1860, no. 3 (Fl 915 to Nieuwenhuys [this is confirmed by annotated copies of the catalogue]), and p. 465, no. 161, C. J. Nieuwenhuys sale, London, July 17, 1886 (sold to the "Irish National Gallery, Dublin").

3. Ekkart 1992a. See Ex Coll. below, which is based on Ekkart's information.


5. See 1998 on the high relief and other qualities of this kind of relief. Collars of very similar shape and occasionally material are found in portraits of the late 1660s and the early 1670s by, for example, Gerard ter Borch: see Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, figs. 232 (the Self-Portrait in the Mauritshuis, The Hague), 247–49, 259.


7. See Terwen and Ottenheym 1993, p. 143, fig. 172, reproducing one of the designs for a monumental gateway published in Serlio's Libro estranumino (1551).

8. A dog is also placed on the distaff side in Van Slingelandt's Family Portrait (Franz Meinraum and His Family), of 1668 (Louvre, Paris; see Ekkart 1984 and Ekkart 1992b, p. 27, fig. 17), and in his Jan van Muschenbroek and His Wife, of 1688 (Sotheby's, London, November 25, 1970, no. 31).

REFERENCES: MMA 1872, no. 67, as "from the collection of Daniel Hooff." Harck 1888, p. 76, mentioned; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 5 (1923), pp. 466–67, no. 144, as in the MMA, and p. 464, no. 156, recording the picture in the sales of 1860 and 1861; Standen 1958, p. 160 (detail ill.), describes the lace collar; Potterton 1986, pp. 142–43 (under no. 267), fig. 215, as the pendant to the Portrait of a Lady in the National Gallery of Ireland; Sutton 1986, p. 184, mentioned; Ekkart 1992b, pp. 92–98 (ill. p. 92), identifies the sitter and full provenance for the first time; Ekkart 1992b, p. 27, fig. 18 (with pendant), mentions the work as a typical full-length portrait by Van Slingelandt, of about 1670; Baetjer 1995, p. 341; Baetjer 2004, pp. 203–4, no. 67, clarifies the picture's ownership in 1870–71.

EX Coll.: Johan Hulshout, Leiden (commissioned about 1670–d. 1687); his son Johannes Hulshout, Leiden (in 1687–d. 1713); his daughter Anna Hulshout, Leiden (in 1713–d. 1766); her daughter Elisabeth Dorothea de Raet, Leiden (in 1766–d. 1780); her husband, Baron Nicolaes van den Boezelaer, Leiden (in 1780–d. 1790); their daughter Magdalena Anna Elisabeth van den Boezelaer, Leiden (in 1796–d. 1808); her daughter Baroness Diederica Catharina van Slingelandt, Leiden (in 1808–d. 1818); her husband, Daniel Hooff, Leiden (in 1818–d. 1860; his estate sale, Roos, Amsterdam, October 30, 1860, no. 2, for Fl 445 to Brack [according to Hofstede de Groot]); J. P. Gilkinet, Liège (until 1863; his sale, Paris, April 18, 1863, no. 38, for FFr 700 [according to Hofstede de Groot]); [Étienne Le Roy, Brussels, through Léon Gaucher, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.70
ATTRIBUTED TO PIETER VAN SLINGELANDT

193. Portrait of a Man

Oil on copper, ¾ x 2½ in. (8.6 x 6.4 cm)

The portrait miniature is well preserved. There is a tiny scratch on the forehead above the subject’s proper right eye, and there are small flake losses and abrasions around the perimeter of the image.

Bequest of Rupert L. Joseph, 1959 60.55.1

This fine small portrait on copper was considered to be by Frans van Mieris the Elder (q.v.) until Naumann rejected the attribution and observed that the painting’s manner of execution is close to that of Van Slingelandt’s signed and dated (1678) miniature portraits of a husband and wife in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.¹ Rudolf Ekkart, a specialist in Dutch portraiture, agrees that the picture is not by Van Mieris “but may be by Pieter van Slingelandt.”² Comparable portraits by Van Mieris and by Gerrit Dou (q.v.) are softer in drawing and modeling, with a more convincing description of light and shadow and, consequently, atmosphere.³ The Museum’s portrait is exceedingly skillful, but harder in its description of forms; the use of shadow on the face, for example, results in a chiseled appearance. The hair, skin, and fabrics are less successfully differentiated in their textures than in works by Dou, Van Mieris, and Godfried Schalcken (q.v.).⁴ The architectural background does nothing to dispel the precise and airless look of the whole.

Comparison with the Museum’s signed Johan Hulsoot by Van Slingelandt (Pl. 192), which is similar in scale, supports the attribution of the present picture to him, although the wood support and discolored varnish of the other painting make judgment difficult. Nonetheless, it would appear that the bust-length portrait on copper is a finer work by the same hand. Comparisons with figures in the artist’s securely attributed genre paintings and other portraits, and a review of plausible alternatives, also tend to support an attribution to Van Slingelandt. In the Portrait of a Man with a Watch, of 1688 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), for example, the crisp drawing and careful shading of the eyes, nose, and mouth are quite similar.⁵ Van Slingelandt’s undated Portrait of a Young Man (Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden), where the full-length figure is depicted on about the same scale, is also painted in the same manner.⁶

Like the young man in the Leiden picture, the present sitter wears a “Japanese robe.” These garments, which were usually made of Chinese or Indian silk, were imported mostly from Japan to the Netherlands by the East India Company (VOC).
and are shown fairly often in fashionable portraits of men, and in genre interiors (the robes were used primarily as elegant housecoats) dating from about 1665 onward. An almost identical robe and scarf are seen, for example, in the Chess Players, of about 1670 (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest), by Cornelis de Man (1621–1706).

The style of the Museum’s picture and the sitter’s dress and coiffure suggest a dating of about 1680.

Formerly attributed by the Museum to Frans van Mieris the Elder and titled Jan Rijswijck.

1. Naumann 1981, vol. 2, p. 185, no. 193, noting that the portrait is also “close in conception” (the composition, hairstylle, dress, and age of the sitter are similar) to a pen drawing in the Albertina, Vienna, which may be by Willem van Mieris (see Naumann 1978, p. 34). For the Rijksmuseum miniatures, see Van Thiel et al. 1976, p. 514, no. A1983, and especially Leiden 1988, no. 68 (compare also no. 24, Van Mieris’s small oval Self-Portrait in a private collection).

2. Rudolf Ekkart, letter to the writer dated December 17, 1988 (curatorial files). See also note 6 below.


4. See, for example, Schacken’s small portraits of himself and his wife of about 1679–80 in Vaduz, Liechtenstein (New York 1985–86, nos. 172, 173), and other examples catalogued in Beherman 1988.

5. Leiden 1988, no. 67. Compare also Van Slingelandt’s chalk drawing of a young man in a landscape, signed and dated 1673, sold at Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, November 13, 1991, no. 293 (ill.).


7. On “Japanese robes” (the contemporary Dutch term) in the Netherlands during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Lubberhuizen-van Gelder 1947 and Breukink-Peeze 1986.


REFERENCES: Naumann 1981, vol. 2, p. 185, no. 1193, as not by Frans van Mieris the Elder, and as similar in execution to Pieter van Slingelandt’s miniature portraits of a man and woman in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (no. A1983); Baetjer 1995, p. 341, as Attributed to Pieter van Slingelandt.


Ex Coll.: Rupert L. Joseph, Beaulieu, France (d. 1959); Bequest of Rupert L. Joseph, 1959 60.55.1
Hendrick Martensz Sorgh may be described as a middle-class artist, businessman, and city official in Rotterdam, where he spent his entire life. His date of birth is unknown, but is placed about 1610–11 on the basis of a rather formal self-portrait (private collection) dated 1645 and inscribed “age 34.” In a deposition given in April 1646, Sorgh is said to be “about thirty-seven years old,” which would mean that he could have been born in 1609. However, this document would seem to be less reliable than the inscription on his portrait.

Sorgh’s father was Maerten Claesz Rochusse (or Rokes), who ran a ferry service between Rotterdam and Dordrecht. According to Houbraeken, the skipper was so dependable in handling goods that he was given the nickname Sorgh (Care). His son took over the barge line and the adopted surname, which was not a bad choice for a painter.

Both of Sorgh’s parents had been married before and brought children from their first unions into the family. Two daughters are known from Rochusse’s first marriage, and Lijsbeth Hendricks, whom he wed in 1606, had five children, and a fair amount of property.

Houbraeken reports that Sorgh “was a pupil of Dav. Teniers, as is clear to see in his earliest brushwork, and of Wilm Buitenweg who painted companies of young women [and] men and peasant pictures.” No independent confirmation of this claim is known. Sorgh was only about thirteen when Willem Buytewech (1591/92–1624) died in Rotterdam, but it is possible that he had introductory lessons with that master. The teenager is not recorded in Rotterdam or anywhere else between 1624 and 1630. He made out a will in February 1630 (perhaps because he was about to leave the city for some time), and he is recorded in Rotterdam from January 1633 onward. However, the idea that he studied with David Teniers the Younger (1610–1690) is implausible because the latter joined the painters’ guild in Antwerp only during the year 1622–23. By “pupil” (leerling), Houbraeken may have meant simply that Sorgh studied works by Teniers, who is often associated with the Rotterdam genre painters Pieter de Broot (1601–1658), Cornelis Saftleven (1607–1681), and Herman Saftleven (1609–1685).

On February 20, 1633, Sorgh married Ariaentge Pieters Hollaer, the daughter of a merchant in Delfshaven (next to Rotterdam). Ariaentge’s older sister was married to the Rotterdam painter and art dealer Crijn Volmarijn (ca. 1601–1645). In 1636, Sorgh bought a house on the Steiger, near the market square of Rotterdam and close to the landing stage for cargo barges bound for Dordrecht. He appears to have prospered in the 1630s, probably because of his part in the shipping business. Sorgh and his wife had five children, whose birth dates are not known (baptismal records of the Reformed Church in Rotterdam, to which the family belonged, date from 1650 onward). Two children died early. “The child of Hendrick Maertens Sorgh” was buried in January 1652, and a daughter named Elisabeth was buried in the summer of 1654. Their daughter Ingetje married in 1665, and Maria in 1669. Their son Marten became a silk merchant in Amsterdam.

It is not known when Sorgh joined the local painters’ guild, but he appears to have had a pupil in 1636. His career as an artist flourished in the 1640s. Appointments to civic offices (bread weigher in 1657, fire deputy in 1659) reflect his connections with prominent citizens, such as Christian and Eewout Prins. He painted a genre-like portrait of the latter’s family in 1661 (Historisch Museum, Rotterdam). His impressive group portrait Jacob Bieren and his Family, of 1663, is set in a large kitchen and shows to advantage his skill as a painter of market scenes.

In 1666, Sorgh and his family moved to a much finer house on the Steiger. In August 1669, he bought a garden just outside the city. He was appointed hoofdman (headman) of the guild in October of the same year, but died less than a year later. He was buried on June 28, 1670. For the next twenty years, his widow ran a linen shop in the family home. She died in 1693 and was buried next to her husband in the Grote Kerk.

Sorgh’s barn and kitchen interiors of the 1640s elaborate a development begun in the previous decade by Teniers, De Broot, and the Saftleven brothers. His outdoor market scenes, which place busy people and piles of vegetables in city squares, date from the early 1650s onward and are noteworthy for their naturalistic sense of space. Like Quirijn van Brekelenkam (q.v.) in Leiden, Sorgh began painting more fashionable genre.
scenes about 1660, for example, *The Late Player* (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) and *Musical Company* (private collection), both of 1661. Sorgh also depicted biblical subjects (his *Adoration of the Shepherds*, of about 1640, is, unsurprisingly, another barn interior) and a number of marine pictures. Like his slightly younger colleague in Rotterdam, Ludolf de Jongh (q.v.), Sorgh was remarkable for his versatility.

1. See Rotterdam 1994–95, p. 24, fig. 7 (with the pendant portrait of the artist’s wife), or Rotterdam–Frankfurt 2004–5, p. 117, fig. 1. The half-length self-portrait (which is similar in style to the Museum’s *Portrait of a Man*, by Abraham de Vries; Pl. 214) is mentioned in Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, p. 90, and was the basis for the portrait engraving of Sorgh in ibid., pl. c4.


3. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, p. 89. In artistic and literary circles, the name Sorgh must have had a special resonance because of the popular figure of Sorgheloos (Careless), a Prodigal Son–like wastrel who for a century had appeared in *redervijder* plays and in series of prints. See Renger 1970, pp. 42–65, and Armstrong 1990, pp. 19–34.

4. As noted in Schneeman 1982, pp. 21, 35 n. 4, the widow had three girls and two boys, all of whom used the family name Van Haemstede.


6. As suggested in Havekorn van Rijswijk 1892, p. 242.

7. It is highly unlikely that Houbraken meant David Teniers the Elder (1610–1690), given the fame of the younger Teniers in the early eighteenth century. It is also possible that he was mistaken by someone, for example, Sorgh’s grandson Hendrick (b. 1666), whose collection Houbraken saw in Amsterdam (Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, p. 90; Schneeman 1982, p. 29; Horn 2000, pp. 115, 353–54). On the same page, Houbraken records that Sorgh died at the age of sixty-one in 1682. The year is wrong, but the age would be correct if Sorgh was born in 1609 or 1610.


11. Ibid., pp. 26–27. The pupil was the Amsterdam artist Pieter Nys (1624–1681). His *Kitchen Interior*, dated 1641 (with Trafalgar Galleries, London, in 1985), is strongly reminiscent of pictures by Sorgh like the one discussed below.

12. Rotterdam 1994–95, p. 229, no. 52 (pl. on p. 75).


14. Not in 1619, as stated in Havekorn van Rijswijk 1892, p. 29, and by P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, p. 302, where the date that Sorgh bought his first house is also misstated.

15. See Sorgh’s pendant *Vegetable Market* of 1651 and *Fish Market* of 1654 (both Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel), Schnackenburg 1996, p. 281, pl. 155; *Vegetable Market* of 1654 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), discussed in Lammertse 1998, no. 54 (as *The Groete Markt in Rotterdam*), and by Giltaij in Rotterdam–Frankfurt 2004–5, no. 26; and the *Vegetable Market* of 1665 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), discussed in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, no. 101, and in Rotterdam 1994–95, no. 54. Compare the style of Ludolf de Jongh’s painting of (curiously enough) a canal boat station, which probably dates from about 1650 (see Fleischer 1989, pp. 64–65, fig. 73, and Potterton 1986, pp. 71–72, no. 148, fig. 82). Other artists, for example, Sybrand van Beest (ca. 1610–1674), Quirijn van Brekelenkam, Gabriel Metsu, and Emanuel de Witte (q.v.), started painting market scenes at about the same time (see Stone-Ferrier 1991; Lammertse 1998, pp. 15–16, 161, 201; and Fransis 2004, pp. 190–91). The cost of producing pictures of this type, with particular attention to Sorgh, is considered in Bayer 1991, pp. 25–26.

16. For the Rijksmuseum picture, see Rotterdam 1994–95, no. 53, and Fransis 2004, pp. 191–93, fig. 177. *Musical Company* is discussed by P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, no. 100. The remark made there (p. 304), that “Sorgh may have gained his interest in more complex spaces from paintings produced in nearby Delft,” is a dated concept that ignores interiors depicted right in Rotterdam during the 1640s (see Liedtke 2000a, pp. 159–62).

17. See Rotterdam 1994–95, no. 50, for this panel in the Hamburger Kunsthalle, Hamburg.

194. A Kitchen

Oil on wood, 20½ x 17½ in. (52.1 x 44.1 cm)

The two women and some elements of the foreground still life are fairly well preserved. Details in the background have become less distinct as the thinly applied paint has grown thinner with age and suffered abrasions along the wood grain. Infrared reflectography reveals three separate single-point perspective schemes drawn on the prepared panel; their vanishing points fall on a nearly horizontal line above the head of the woman cleaning fish on the overturned tub. The figure of a man entering at right has been painted out.

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.7

This typical domestic scene by Sorgh dates from about 1643, when he painted a number of similar subjects. The background was quite thinly painted, and has become more transparent with age and with overcleaning in the past. Technical examination and conservation treatment in 2004 helped to clarify the composition, and permitted study of various changes made by the artist in the course of execution.

Two kitchen maids work in the bright light of a tall window. Ivy and an open shutter are seen outside. The standing maid, a fair young woman in green and white, is busy peeling apples, while the kneeling maid, in green and mauve, cleans fish on an overturned tub. The apple peeler's smile may be a response to private thoughts, to the cat inspecting fish fillets in the pot on the right, or to words spoken by the couple at the fireplace. These amorous figures, which Sorgh borrowed from another painting (fig. 239) and squeezed in between the maids, have become less distinct in the course of time. They were not painted out by the artist and then revealed at a later date.

Sorgh used a door, some plates on a shelf, and a few hanging objects (one of which is a grilling rack) to define the sun-washed surface of the rear wall. A spiral staircase in the right background once played an important part in suggesting interior space. The two forms that hang from the rafters would also have enhanced the impression of depth. The dead game bird on a hook close to the window is suspended from the nearest visible beam, and a birdcage with a parrot (?) hangs at a distance that is two beams farther back. These markers in space complement the recessions of the wall on the left, the ceiling boards, and the floor tiles. The tiles are based on a perspective scheme drawn on the prepared panel and then revised.

Sorgh devoted close attention to the still-life motifs on the cabinet by the window and across the foreground. In a passage recalling Vermeer's Milkmaid, of about 1657 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), the surface below the window is filled with earthenware pots and comestibles, in this case a game bird and apples. The bird (probably a goose) is plucked and beheaded, but still has wings. The tall pot, topped with a tilted bowl, is nicely silhouetted, which allows the jug on the stool in the immediate foreground to be treated as a subtle essay in indirect light. On the floor, a large pot with a forward-curving handle, a shiny copper pan, a wooden tub, and a red-glazed colander compete with one another in creating volumes of space. The fish on the floor and the kneeling woman have curved contours that converge toward the copper-lined cooking pot (a standard showpiece in pictures like this one), which with the ladle and the overflowing container of fish foils the recession of the empty floor.

At an earlier stage of the composition, a man in a cap stood in the area just beyond the cat, bent over a large round object that he holds in his hands (fig. 240). Such a figure is familiar from contemporary works by Sorgh (fig. 241), where a young man comes into the kitchen with a basket of fish for sale. This may have been the original object of the kneeling woman's glance, and perhaps even the reason for her pretty companion's smile. Kitchen maids had a reputation for entertaining male visitors, and the offer of fish or fowl was often meant as an erotic metaphor. Phallic and seemingly feminine forms, like ladles and pots, and the inclusion of a birdcage might underscore the message. It appears that Sorgh initially intended to describe a more suggestive situation, which he then confined to the awkwardly placed couple in the background. In a much less significant change, the woman by the

Figure 239. Hendrick Sorgh, A Barn Interior with an Amorous Couple, ca. 1640–42. Oil on wood, 18¼ x 26¼ in. (46.5 x 68 cm). Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam
window was moved slightly, as the dark zone along her left contour suggests. The object on the wall by the window is an iron candleholder, and the dark lines over the mantel are rotisserie spits.

The simple title by which this painting has been known for more than a century is, unusually, completely in accord with seventeenth-century descriptions. Works ranging from large, complicated compositions by Pieter Aertsen (1507/8–1575) to pictures by Sorgh and by followers of Gerrit Dou (q.v.) were commonly listed in inventories as “a kitchen” (een keuken). 3

1. In addition to the Winterthur picture (fig. 241), which came up at Christie's, London, April 19, 1985, no. 89, see also Sorgh's Kitchen Interior of 1643, in the Museum Narodowe, Warsaw (Braunschweig and other cities 1988–90, no. 35; Liedtke 2000a, fig. 207).

2. See De Jongh 1968–69, pp. 31–33, 48–12; Leiden 1988, pp. 202–4; and Amsterdam 1997a, no. 10. A birdcage could symbolize virginity or its loss, depending on the context, and had a few less common meanings. The Warsaw kitchen scene by Sorgh (see note 1 above) is given an erotic interpretation by Maciej Monkiewicz in Braunschweig and other cities 1988–90, no. 35.

While his analysis goes too far, its dismissal in Frantis 2004, p. 291 n. 12, is misguided.

3. As noted in Fock 1990, p. 23, on the basis of a survey of Leiden inventories.

REFERENCES: Aspinwall catalogue 1860, p. 23, no. 31, as “Dutch Interior” by Zorg, in the Large Gallery (with no other details); MMA 1894b, p. 6, no. 8; MMA 1901, p. 161, no. 244, as “A Kitchen” by Sorgh; Liedtke 1988, pp. 102, 135, fig. 5–20, suggests a date of about 1645; Liedtke 1990, p. 36, mentioned as a Marquand gift; Baecker 1995, p. 321.


EX COLL.: W. H. Aspinwall, New York (by 1860—d. 1875); (his estate, 1875–86; his estate sale, American Art Association, Chickering Hall, New York, April 6, 1886, no. 12, for $600 to Marquand); Henry G. Marquand, New York (1886–89); Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.7
Jan Steen
Leiden 1626–1679 Leiden

Jan Havicksz Steen gave his age as twenty when he enrolled in Leiden University in November 1646. This testimony and the fact that his parents, a Catholic grain merchant and brewer, Havick Steen (1602–1670), and Elizabeth Capiteyn (whose father was the city clerk of Leiden), married in November 1635 support a birth date of 1626. The Steen family had been in Leiden for at least two centuries and may be described as upper middle class. The artist’s father benefited from the prosperity of the brewing industry during the 1620s and 1640s.1

Steen was the eldest of at least eight children. He appears to have been given a good education in primary and Latin school, but his enrollment in the university probably had more to do with its privileges (exemption from civic guard service and from duties on wine and beer) than with plans for a career.

He registered as a master in the painters’ guild in Leiden on March 18, 1648. His teacher is not recorded, but Weyerman’s biography (1729–69), based on information provided orally by Steen’s friend Carel de Moor (1636–1738), relates that he was apprenticed to Nicolaes Knupfer of Utrecht (1603 or ca. 1609–1615), and then to the Haarlem painter Adriaen van Ostade (q.v.). According to Houbraken (1718–21) and Weyerman, Steen also studied with Jan van Goyen (q.v.) at The Hague. On October 3, 1649, he married Van Goyen’s daughter Margriet. It has been plausibly suggested that Steen was the landscapist’s assistant, not his pupil, in the late 1640s.2

Steen’s first child, Thaddeus, was baptized in a Catholic church at The Hague on February 6, 1651. A daughter, Eva, was born in 1653. Records of sales of paintings by Steen date from 1650 and 1651. One of these pictures, the Winter Landscape, in Skokloster Castle, Sweden, strongly recalls the work of Adriaen van Ostade’s brother, Isack van Ostade (1621–1649).3 In March 1654, Steen joined a civic guard company in The Hague, and in July 1654 he leased a brewery—The Snake—in the nearby city of Delft. His father evidently contributed the capital while the artist managed the business. Steen must have moved to Delft by the fateful autumn of 1654, when (on October 12) the explosion of the arsenal destroyed a large section of the city and claimed many lives. At the time, the art market was depressed and the brewing industry in Delft was in decline. In July 1657, Steen described himself as a former brewer, and by the spring of 1658, he had briefly resided in Leiden and moved to the nearby village of Warmond.4

In 1660, the artist and his family moved to Haarlem, where a son, Havick, was born in the summer of that year, and a daughter, Elizabeth, was baptized in September 1662. Steen joined the local Guild of Saint Luke in 1661 and in the same year rented a large house. The mid-1660s were financially strained because the Second Anglo-Dutch War affected the art market (as had the first “English” war in 1653–54). Steen was still settling debts in Delft in 1667. By 1669, his circumstances appear to have improved, but his wife died in the spring of that year. The artist’s mother died in September 1669 and his father in March 1670, leaving their Leiden house to Steen, who moved there with his children and rejoined his native city’s guild in 1670. He held offices in the guild during the next few years, becoming dean in 1674. Yet another war, with the French in 1672, disrupted the art market, and Steen opened a tavern called The Peace. On April 22, 1673, he married Maria van Egmond, who had two children and a number of debts. The couple’s son, Theodorus, was born in the summer of 1674.

Steen died less than five years later, at the age of fifty-three. He was buried in the Pieterskerk, Leiden, on February 3, 1679. According to Houbraken and Weyerman, his last years were in good part devoted to drinking in the company of Frans van Mieris (q.v.) and other artist friends. Steen’s wife died in 1687, and his children lived brief or unsuccessful lives. Two sons became painters, and Theodorus worked as a sculptor at German courts. Steen’s daughter Catharina married the marine painter Jan Porcellis (1661–1718) in 1684.5

Although Steen used himself, his two wives, and his children as models for figures in his genre paintings, the circumstances are in no way a reflection of his personal life. Steen’s success as Holland’s most amusing critic of ordinary society was achieved though a sharp appreciation of comic theater, popular literature, and sympathetic artistic sources ranging from Lucas van Leyden (ca. 1494–1533) and especially Pieter Bruegel the Elder (ca. 1525–1569) to Jacob Jordens (1593–1678) and contemporary Dutch painters such as Van Mieris.6 Steen’s compositional schemes and manner of execution are also remarkable for their variety.
and responses to other artists, who included those cited above and such diverse talents as Adriaen Brouwer (1605/6–1638), Gerard ter Borch, and Gabriel Metsu (q.v.).

The great majority of Steen’s paintings are genre scenes, but the artist also made landscapes, portraits, and a considerable number of history pictures. Altogether, about four hundred paintings are known, of which about forty are dated. Steen’s only known pupil was Richard Brakenburg (1650–1702).

1. For the most reliable and comprehensive biographies of Steen, see Bok in Washington–Amsterdam 1996–97, pp. 25–37, and Van Thiel-Stroman in Biesboer et al. 2006, pp. 311–13.
5. Ibid., pp. 32–33, on Steen’s family in the 1670s and later.

195. The Lovesick Maiden

Oil on canvas, 34 x 39 in. (86.4 x 99.1 cm)
Inscribed (lower right): I STEEN

The painting is well preserved, although some parts have suffered abrasion. These include the overskirt of the old woman, the blue velvet jacket worn by the maiden, the hat and jacket of the doctor, and the chair at right. Objects in the lower left corner are well preserved except for the cloth, which is badly abraded, and the handle of the brazier where it passes over the cloth. Darkening of the paint has contributed to a loss of detail in the background (the chandelier, for example, is now barely visible).

Bequest of Helen Swift Neilson, 1945 46.13.2

The subject, which Steen depicted at least nineteen times, might be considered a Leiden specialty: Gerrit Dou, Frans van Mieris, and Gabriel Metsu (q.v.) are among the other local artists who depicted quack doctors attending dispiritied women in paintings dating from the mid-1650s through the 1660s. Steen’s treatment of the theme falls within the same period; the present example has been dated convincingly to about 1660. Artists from other cities, such as Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.), Michiel van Musscher (1643–1705), and Jacob Ochtervelt (q.v.), also addressed the subject, which had been featured on the comic stage for well over a century. The popularity of doctors as figures of amusement, however, must also reflect—in addition to the perennial plague of charlatans—the prominence of the medical faculty at Leiden University, where doctors from all over the Netherlands as well as from other countries received their training.

In the Museum’s picture, a doctor dressed in outmoded attire has been summoned to diagnose a young woman’s mysterious malady. Her maid’s ministrations, which are suggested by vessels on the table and a bedside chair, have proved ineffective. The pretty patient wears a revealing bodice and a look of bewildered lethargy. She touches her forehead and rests an elbow on her knee, which is raised with the help of a foot warmer. The doctor chuckles as he takes the lady’s pulse, and the maid smiles knowingly, despite her solicitous pose. Evidently the two older and slightly wiser characters have seen young women in this condition before.

As in other, even more explicit pictures by Steen, the
woman suffers from lovesickness. Several of his paintings, for example, the panel featuring essentially the same trio in the Taft Museum of Art, Cincinnati (fig. 242), include a book or a sheet of paper inscribed with the rhyme “hier baet geen medicijn, want het is minnepyjn” (No medicine is useful here, for it is lovesickness). This pronouncement is amplified by visual clues, such as the painting of Venus and Adonis on the wall in the Cincinnati picture, the lute hanging next to it (lute was indecent slang for female parts), and the motif of a leaning (“erect?”) bed warmer. The bed warmer and the basket to the lower left in the New York canvas were probably meant to be similarly understood, although a somewhat more sophisticated reading (described below) may also have been intended. A more traditional symbol is the statuette of Cupid over the doorway, who, like a little Zeus, is about to hurl an arrow in the young woman’s direction. Versions of this sculpture are found in other “Doctor’s Visits” by Steen, and the figure comes to life in another picture (Wellington Museum, London) as a boy with a bow and arrow. A more explicit reference to the lady’s affliction is the pair of dogs copulating in the foyer, a motif possibly borrowed from Frans van Mieris’s Inn Scene, of 1658 (Mauritshuis, The Hague).

In a work of such obvious meaning, one does not expect to discover signs of higher learning or allusions to great works of art. Nonetheless, Steen probably intended some viewers (or the first owner of the picture, with whom the matter might have been discussed) to appreciate the resemblance between the lovesick maiden and Albrecht Dürer’s famous personification of Melancholia (fig. 243). That the painter is referring to the print is suggested not only by the woman’s pose and expression (which become more comical in the comparison) but also by his inclusion of a Cupid and a sleeping dog. Of course, Dürer’s Melancholia I is more complex in meaning than even the cleverest painting by Steen, but the two images have in common a familiar idea that in each case is conveyed by a woman’s restless eyes and languid posture, by a busy Cupid or putto, and by a canine companion (dogs were traditionally associated with melancholy because they, more than other animals, seem dejected at times).

As many of Steen’s contemporaries would have realized without Dürer’s help, the lady’s distress is a form of melancholy induced by an imbalance of the four humors. Erotic melancholy was detected by feeling the pulse, which revealed the state of the heart, while uroscopy (the visual examination of
urine) was employed to discover the same disorder or pregnancy. Urinalysis was practiced by respected physicians in the seventeenth century, but quacks, who were occasionally referred to as *piskijkers* (piss lookers), used flasks of urine like crystal balls. In the present picture, the bottle in the lidded basket at the lower left must be intended for a urine specimen.

Various scholars have maintained that a motif found in several of Steen’s paintings, including this one, represents a so-called ribbon test for pregnancy: quack doctors supposedly took a ribbon from the woman’s clothing, placed it on a brazier, and made their diagnosis on the basis of the patient’s reaction to the smell. This reading is dismissed by Dixon, who reexamined the evidence and concluded that smoldering ribbons were used like smelling salts to revive a swooning patient. The same author discusses foot warmers and bed warmers in connection with “uterine furies.” The use of a charcoal burner beneath a lady’s skirt was believed to aggravate an ailment—namely, an overheated womb—that was thought to be prevalent in spinsters and other women inclined to amorous reverie. Oddly enough, another effect of the female furnace was chilled skin and extremities, for which bed warmers were prescribed.

For melancholy itself, music was considered beneficial by some authorities. It is probably for this reason that Steen shows a woman playing a harpsichord in *The Doctor’s Visit*, of about 1660 (John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art). In the Museum’s picture, a nude male figure playing a violin—Apollo, no doubt—is the only discernible form in the abraded area of the tapestry immediately above the doctor. Apollo is associated with medicine as well as with the fine arts, poetry, and music, but the fiddle (which Apollo plays in Raphael’s *Parnassus*) makes it clear that Steen is thinking of music as a cure. Thus, Cupid and Apollo form a discordant chorus in the background, in a decorative mode of commentary typical of Steen.


2. See Sumowski 1983–94, vol. 1, nos. 277 and 288 for Dou’s paintings in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen (a panel of the early 1650s), and in the Musée du Louvre, Paris (*the Depictical Woman*, of 1665). One of the earliest known examples is Dou’s *The Doctor’s Visit*, of 1655, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; see Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, pp. 299–300, fig. 2, in the discussion of Godfried Schalcken’s *Visit to the Doctor*, of 1669 (private collection, on loan to the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne), and Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, pp. 57, 116 (under no. 26, the Copenhagen Dou). Frans van Mieris’s *The Doctor’s Visit* exists in two versions, both dated 1677; the example in the Art Gallery and Museum, Glasgow, is considered an autograph replica of the picture in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Naumann 1981, vol. 2, nos. 20–1, 20–11; see also Amsterdam 1989–90, no. 11). Metsu’s canvas, *The Doctor’s Visit* (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), dates from the early to mid-1660s, according to F. Robinson 1974, p. 57, fig. 138 (see also New York–Chicago 1988, no. 18, and Madrid 2003, no. 22). Quirijn van Brekelenkam’s interpretations of the subject from about 1665 were clearly inspired by Steen (see Lastius 1992, nos. 209, 210, pls. 65, 68; Louvre, Paris, and location unknown). See also the pair of panels by Schalcken discussed in Amsterdam 1976, nos. 38, 59.

3. Lyckle de Vries, on several visits to the Museum in the 1980s, suggested a date of about 1660, rejecting the dating to about 1665–69 in K. Braun 1980, p. 127, no. 289.


6. The full subject is surveyed in Van Andel 1981; see also Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, p. 116. Dixon 1995, p. 6, considers it “very possible that physicians who studied and taught at the Leiden medical school were the major patrons for these paintings.” The suggestion, which might have been tested against known inventories (for example, in Lingsingh Scheurleer, Fock, and Van Dissel 1986–93), coincides with Dixon’s hypothesis that many of the doctors in seventeenth-century Dutch genre paintings are not satirical figures (“an interpretation attributable to popular twentieth-century bias”), and with her broad conclusion that “every detail of these paintings points to the existence of a serious medical condition familiar to a large number of physicians and widely afflicting their female patients in the seventeenth century” (both quotes from p. 7). In the present writer’s view, none of this has much to do with Steen’s sources or sense of humor.

7. The maid’s role in the picture is in good part simply to react, as a cue to the viewer. This stage device occurs frequently in Steen and is also found in the work of such earlier genre painters as Jan Miense Molenaer (see the young woman in *The Dentist*, of 1629, in the North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh; Raleigh–Columbus–Manchester 2002–3, no. 4).

8. See my discussion of the Taft picture in E. Sullivan et al. 1995, vol. 1, pp. 172–73, and P. Sutton 1982–83, p. 21, which refers to other examples. Bcaux 1975, pp. 28–30, fig. 15, discusses Steen’s painting in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam (K. Braun 1980, no. 241), where the doctor writes out a prescription and the same rhyme (but with *suete pijn*, “sweet pain,” instead of *minnepij*) may be read on a sheet of paper that has
fallen on the floor. Bedaux observes (p. 28 n. 20) that the couple is adapted from Propertius, *The Elgesti* 2.1.57.


11. Naumann 1981, no. 23 (pl. 28b for the dogs); see also Hoetink et al. 1985, no. 57, where it is noted that “As the dog, so the mistress” was a well-known saying of the time. In Johan van Daha’s *Saphena saya*na (Amsterdam, 1668, p. 99), Venus, Cupid, and a similar pair of dogs are featured in an illustration accompanying a piquant poem about women and oysters (see Amsterdam 1976, p. 204, fig. 5b, where the poem is connected with Jacob Ochterveld’s *Oyster Eaters*, of about 1666–69, in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid [Gaskell 1990, no. 16]; the man’s cittern and the woman’s open jug may be compared with similar motifs in Steen’s oeuvre).

12. See, however, Washington–Amsterdam 1996–97, pp. 79 on a motif borrowed by Steen from Maerten van Heemskerck, 227 on his reference to a Rembrandt etching, and 240 on Raphael’s School of Athens as a compositional model for Steen’s *Wedding Feast at Cana*, in the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin. There are other examples of old master sources in Steen, who usually found them through prints.

13. See Panofsky 1945, pp. 156–71, on the iconography of Diirer’s print (p. 156 on dogs). No other lovesick maiden in Steen’s oeuvre has such intent eyes, nor are still-life motifs tucked into the lower left corner of the composition quite as they are here and in *Melancholia I*.


16. Baskets and bottles of this type served as attributes of doctors on signs for apothecary shops; the same motif identifies the court physician at The Hague in an album of colored drawings made in 1626 by Adriaen van de Venne (1896–1866). See Royalton-Kisch 1968, pp. 212–13 (fol. 76: n. 1 on apothecary shops). The bottle alone serves as an attribute of “The Doctor” in Amman and Sach’s 1668, pl. 11 (reproduced in Bedaux 1975, p. 22, fig. 8, as “German, first half 17th century”).

17. See, for example, P. Sutton 1982–83, pp. 22, 24 n. 10, with previous literature, especially Van Gils 1920.


19. See Dixon 1995, pp. 102–6, where reference is made to women “wearing fur-lined jackets while other occupants of their sickrooms are normally dressed” (p. 103). Jackets of this type were in fact only trimmed with fur, which was usually not real ermine. The lovesick maiden in the present picture is not dressed more warmly than the other figures. Similar clothing is found in a great variety of genre scenes by Dutch artists (see Pl. 85).


22. On the fiddle in Raphael’s fresco, see Winternitz 1967, pp. 197–98.


196. The Dissolute Household

Oil on canvas, 42½ x 35½ in. (108 x 90.2 cm)
Signed (lower right): I. STEEN
The painting is well preserved.
The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.31

The Linsky canvas dates from the 1660s, when Steen lived in Haarlem. During that decade, the artist painted this subject and works with closely related themes in a steady stream of variations. Some of them bear inscriptions, which provide—in striking contrast to most Dutch genre paintings of the period—titles that were given in the artist’s lifetime, often by the painter himself. Steen placed the unnecessary notice Bedarfse huissch (Disorderly Household) on a picture with a different composition but the same subject as here that is now in the Wellington Museum, London. 5

Arnold Houbraken, in the first biography of Steen, described a work like the Linsky and London paintings as “an emblem of [the artist’s] disorderly household.” 5 Steen encouraged this unflattering characterization by using members of his immediate family as models. The central figure in the present painting is a self-portrait; the features and expression resemble those in Steen’s Self-Portrait as a Lutenist, in the Musco Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid. 3 The mistress of the house, relaxing with a fop, strongly resembles Margriet van Goyen, Steen’s first wife. 4 The couple’s sons, Thaddeus (born 1661) and Cornelis (probably born 1660), may have modeled for the unruly boys to the left and for similar youths in approximately contemporary pictures. 5 The apparent ages of these figures would be consistent with a date of about 1663–64, which is a plausible dating of the picture on stylistic grounds.

The painting represents an upper-middle-class family that for the moment enjoys all the comforts of a well-appointed home, not the least of which is gastronomic gratification. Like a skillful stage designer, Steen manages to suggest prosperity with just a few props—the canopied bed, the (faux?) marble column, and the stone window with leaded glass and a glimpse of a good neighborhood. The wife, who seems almost to toast her next glass of wine, is fashionably attired. The maid who serves her also services her husband, or so the viewer is given to understand by the obscene gesture they make behind the wife’s back (Hans Wurst makes the same sign in Frans Hals’s Merry Makers at Sbrovetide; Pl. 58).

Steen’s canvas may be said to concisely catalogue many of Holland’s favorite faults. 6 The sin of Sloth (embodied by Grandma to the left), along with Lust and Gluttony (the latter concerns any comestible, including tobacco), is at home with seemingly lesser offenses, such as sacrilege (the trampled Bible), gambling (the backgammon board), personal vanity (the father figure wears foppish ribbons on his hat and sleeves), and, of course, poor parenting skills (one of Steen’s standard subjects). These diverse violations lead to the supreme sin (in Holland) of a “disorderly household,” a form of discord (the strings of the lute have snapped) that in Dutch genre paintings is confirmed by litter on the floor and cats having carte blanche in the larder. 7

The timely warning of a pocket watch lies on the floor, with a conspicuous key on a ribbon. Like the same motif in compositions by still-life painters such as Jan de Heem (q.v.), who seems recalled by the Wanli bowl of fruit on the table, the watch with a key probably adds to the usual reminder of mortality a plea for “regulation” or temperance. 8

The family’s fate literally hangs overhead in the form of a basket bearing an odd assortment of attributes. The sword and switch are instruments of justice and punishment. The crutch and metal can forecast a life of beggary; sticks of straw, like matches today, were sold for a pittance in the street. The
wooden clapper on the left, called a *Lazarusklep* (Lazarus clapper), was a warning device assigned to lepers and the plague-stricken. The jack of spades signifies bad luck. The flag to the upper left might suggest that the boy with a sword will wind up in the army, which was the last refuge of young men whose families had fallen on hard times.

That the same youth repels a beggar from the door adds an ironic touch. Like the *Lazarusklep*, the encounter recalls the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31), in which a beggar is turned away from the banquet of a wealthy man. The latter eventually roasts in hell while the beggar goes to heaven. In an added twist, Steen’s rich man will probably become a beggar before he goes to hell.

On the windows in the background are painted decorations that represent a boar (or bear?) marching with a musket and a lion holding a staff. Many broadsheets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries show animals taking on human roles, often in concert with serventwise people. Steen refers to the popular theme of a *Verkeerde Wereld* (The World Upside Down), and suggests that this particular *Bedoorg inwisbow* is but one corner in that topsy-turvy realm.10

Several early copies are catalogued by K. Braun.11

1. K. Braun 1980, no. 197; C. Kauffmann 1982, pp. 130–31, no. 64. Paintings by Steen with similar subjects, in each case bearing his inscription, include *Easy Come, Easy Go*, of 1661, in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam; *In Luxury Beware*, of 1663(?), in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; *As the Old Sing, So Pipe the Young*, of about 1665–68, in the Mauritshuis, The Hague; and *Wine Is a Mock*; of about 1668–70, in the Norton Simon Museum of Art, Pasadena (see Washington–Amsterdam 1996–97, nos. 15, 21, 23, 38, respectively). The translation “dissolute,” rather than “disorderly,” household has apparently been inspired in the literature by the paintings themselves.


6. For a defense of this location, see Schaia 1987a.


8. See the discussion of the watch in Ter Borch’s *Van Moorikerken Family* (Pl. 14), n. 9. On the theme of temperance in still-life painting, see Segal 1989, chap. 2.


11. K. Braun 1980, p. 121 (under no. 25); see also Berlin 1929, no. 85, pl. 31. Further information may be found in the curatorial files.

**References:** J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 4 (1833), pp. 12–13, no. 29, cites the painting as “The Dessert” in the Tak sale of 1781; *Le cabinet de l’Amateur et de l’Antiquaire. Revue des tableaux. . .*. (Paris) 4 (1843–46), p. 282, no. 226, reports the picture’s sale from the collection of Cardinal Fesch in Rome; Westeene 1856, p. 153, no. 291, records the sale of 1785; and the buyer, Mr. Hoogeveen, and notes another version in the Dauner Nyman sale of 1797, and p. 168, no. 473, records the Fesch sale of 1845; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), p. 41, no. 113, with provenance; Frankfurter 1937, p. 26, compares eighteenth-century English conversation pictures; Trautschold 1937, p. 51, lists the painting as at the Katz gallery in Dieren; Wüttheringer 1917, pp. 91, 94, pl. xxiii, discusses the theme; C. de Jonge 1939, pp. 28–30 (ill. p. 27), dates it to 1660, identifies Steen’s self-portrait, describes the canvas as the first of a series representing the “Dissolute Household,” and discusses the symbolic motifs; Hannema 1955, vol. 1, p. 17, no. 13, vol. 2, pl. 4, describes the composition, records the support incorrectly as wood, and lists the literature, exhibitions, and earlier collections; K. Braun 1980, pp. 120–21, no. 211, describes the composition and lists other versions; Liedtke in Linsky Collection 1984, pp. 89–92, no. 31, dates the picture about 1665, discusses the subject, and records the known literature, exhibition records, and provenance; Liedtke in MMA, *Notable Acquisitions, 1893–1984* (New York, 1984), pp. 54–55; P. Sutton 1986, p. 186, fig. 264 (mistakenly illustrated); Salomon 1987, p. 317, explains the boar in the stained-glass window, and notes the hanging basket here and in two other paintings by Steen; P. Sutton 1990a, p. 105, mentioned; Chapman 1993, pp. 131, 143, fig. 6, explains how Steen “implicates his own family members”; Baert 1995, p. 352; Liedtke in E. Sullivan et al. 1995, vol. 1, p. 171 n. 8, praises the execution of the drapery; Chapman in Washington–Amsterdam 1996–97, p. 168, fig. 1 on p. 166, compares the painting with In *Luxury Beware* (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), where the same necklace with a ring as worn by the seated woman here is erroneously said to identify the central figure “as a loose woman, probably a prostitute”; W. Klock in ibid., p. 106, considers the beggar driven from the door to be “patently derived from *The Fat Kitchen*,” of about 1650, by Steen (private collection); Westermann 1997, pp. 235, 237, 231 n. 130, fig. 132 on p. 226, discusses the “narrative structure,” misreads it (“plying the object of his attentions with wine”), and praises the still life on the table; Chapman 2001, p. 231, fig. 10, compares the behavior of the figures with the lack of narrative in Vermeer’s *Milkmaid* (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Haarlem–Hamburg 2003–04, p. 212 n. 1, mentions the painting in connection with In *Luxury Beware*; Salomon 2004, pp. 44, 127 n. 27, cites the bear carrying a rifle as a rare instance in Steen’s work of “topsy-turvy inversion.”

**Exhibited:** Paris, Musée du Louvre, Galerie du Jeu de Paume, “Grands et petits maîtres hollandais,” 1911, no. 151 (lent by Jules Porgès); Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, “Jan Steen,” 1926, no. 73 (lent by H. E. ten Cate); Arnhem, Gemeentemuseum, “Tentoonstelling van Schilderijen van 17e eeuwse Nederlandsche

Ex Coll.: Jan Tak, Leiden (his estate sale, Soeterwoude, the Netherlands, September 3, 1781, no. 19, to Hoogevest); Van Helstereur [probably Van Eyk Sluyter], Amsterdam (until 1802; his sale, Paris, January 25, 1802, no. 164, for FFr 1,800 to Simon); Cardinal Joseph Fesch, Rome (until d. 1839; his estate, 1839–45; his estate sale, Palais Rucci, Rome, March 17–18, 1845, no. 226, for FFr 6,335 to Preston); Jules Porgès, Paris (in 1911); [N. Beets Galleries, Amsterdam, according to Hannema 1955; see Refs.]; H. E. ten Cate, Almelo, later De Lutte (near Oldenzaal), the Netherlands (by 1926; until at least 1977); Mrs. Myrtil Frank, New York (until 1946; sold to Linsky through the New York Hanseatic Association); Mr. and Mrs. Jack Linsky, New York (1964–80); The Jack and Belle Linsky Foundation, New York (1980–82); The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982

197. **Merry Company on a Terrace**

Oil on canvas, 55⅞ x 51⅛ in. (141 x 131.4 cm)

Signed (lower right): [Steen [JS in monogram]

The painting is well preserved. The delicate yellows on the iridescent blue blouse worn by the woman in the center foreground are abraded. Disruption of the green paint layers in the background foliage and right foreground, which now appear blanched and bluish, is due to the effects of strong solvents and possibly also to the artist's use of fugitive yellow lake pigments.

Fletcher Fund, 1938 58.89

In this comparatively late work, which probably dates from about 1670, Steen wittily blends a variety of established symbols and themes—child rearing, the dissolute household, the Garden of Love—into an original creation. The picture's style is also eclectic; in a broad view, the artist seems to combine oil and water by mixing the manners of Gerard ter Borch (q.v.) and the Flemish master of similar festivities, Jacob Jordaeus (1593–1678).

As in the latter's scenes of revelry (usually set indoors), Steen's gathering of figures is surprisingly well organized. A barmaid or hostess (to judge from her apron) poses provocatively and is surrounded—like Carmen staged by Raphael—by a cast of characters symmetrically arranged. Although united in spirit, they represent three or four generations and at least two levels of reality, with the women in various manner of contemporary dress and most of the men in slit sleeves, outdated collars, oafish hats, and other costume details familiar from the commedia dell'arte. The setting, too, suggests both the theater and modern life. The figure group is presented frontally in a shallow space, as in the stagelike compositions of Frans Hals's early genre scenes (see Pl. 58), but the impressive pergola, lush garden, and classical architecture bring to mind the garden terraces on which younger artists such as Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (see Pl. 43) and Jacob van Loo (1614–1670) placed courting couples. All these Merry Companies have common antecedents in paintings and prints of about 1600, which treat subjects such as the Prodigal Son and Mankind Awaiting the Last Judgment as outdoor banqueting scenes. In most respects, Steen's painting seems as distant from these sources as does any image of about 1670, but it remains reminiscent of them in its arrangement (if not the class) of the cavoring figures and in the garden setting.

Despite their accessibility, Steen's comic pictures require considerable explanation. The artist made sly use of conventions that were far more familiar in his time than in later centuries. The overdressed boy in the foreground, for example, irrevocently recalls Dutch portraits of children in which a trained or at least tethered domestic animal suggests proper upbringing. Obedient dogs are among the most frequent attributes, but even horses are shown in the care of well-groomed young boys. Equestrian associations were encouraged.
by the contemporary prestige of riding, and more pointedly by
the comparison in Plutarch's treatise on education (which was
still highly regarded in the seventeenth century) between train-
ing horses and teaching children, as well as by the frequent use
of a bridle as a symbol of temperance (i.e., self-discipline). All
of this, and perhaps also the pretentiousness of society portrai-
ture, is parodied by Steen: the boy is obnoxious, the horse is
just a toy, and the dog seems less obedient than annoyed. The
trio serves as a marginal note on the adults' behavior, a new
swist on the proverb that Jordaens and Steen often illustrated,
"As the old sing, so pipe the young."4

The humor is amplified by the artist having cast himself in
the role of innkeeper; the portly man wearing an apron seems
to laugh with the viewer, as in a Shakespearean aside to the
audience.5 It has been suggested that the young woman in the
center was probably modeled on the woman Steen married in
1673,6 but portraits of her are unknown and the picture may
have been painted somewhat earlier. The innkeeping couple's
relationship is characterized by sexual innuendos such as the
man's jug and the woman's empty glass, her pearls and roses
(symbols of Venus), and her boudoir disarray. The friendly
way she leans on the young musician is typical of body language
in works by Steen. The cittern's shape and position suggest that
the strapping fellow probably has more to offer the maid than
does the man with a little jug in his lap.7

Most of the other figures form a kind of Greek chorus,
either one that has retired to a post-performance bash. Hans
Wurst, whose usual sausage dangles indecently from his cap,
tantalizes a sexy waitress with his tongue and leering fool's
stick. She is also entertained by a flutist with (in Steen's work)
his famously phallic instrument. The jolly old man behind the
bread, ham, and mustard pot (which look like leftovers from
Hals; see Pl. 38) offers wine to a little girl, while the teenage
boy on a ladder cuts down a bunch of grapes. The boy and
his young companions have venerable antecedents in Dutch
and Flemish art, for example the figures on the far right in
Joachim Wtewael's The Golden Age (Pl. 224), but here their
harvesting merely adds to the bacchanalian mood of the party.8

The unusual architectural motifs in the left background have
been inserted as critical commentary: the sphere is a symbol of
Fortuna (fate or instability), the broken column behind it a
symbol of mortality.9 In the right foreground, the tankard and
pot of coals (for lighting pipes like the one on the balustrade)
score the theme of intemperance and serve also to draw
attention to the artist's signature. The drooping hollyhocks in
the cachepot reminds one that sensual pleasures pass swiftly
away.10 And the owl overhead stands for folly, not wisdom, as
it generally does when perched in a tavern (see Pl. 69) or in
any setting where the standards of a "Jan Steen household" are
maintained.11

1. Chapman in Washington—Amsterdam 1996–97, no. 48, suggests a
date of 1673–75. In a catalogue entry prepared for a seminar given
by the present writer in 1989, Mariet Westermann argued for a
dating to about 1668–70, rather than the usual placement in the
1670s, on the basis of comparisons with works of the 1660s. She
refers specifically to "the virtuoso description of stuffs" (compare
the Lansky Steen of about 1663–64; Pl. 196), "the robust, large
figures and their casual but coherent linking through gestures
and glances." These observations are compelling, though Steen's
chronology is too problematic for precise datings. In the present
text, "about 1670" implies the period 1668–72.

2. On these buitenpartijen, see P. Sutton's essay in Philadelphia—

3. See Frantis 1990, and the chapter "Discipline for Innocence: 
Metaphors for Education in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting,"
in Bedaux 1990, p. 112, fig. 68 (p. 112 on Plutarch's De libertis 
educandis, which is also mentioned in Haarlem—Antwerp 2000—
2001, p. 118 [under no. 14]). Compare Chapman's discussion of the
boy in Washington—Amsterdam 1996–97, p. 255, where
Bedaux 1990 and Frantis 1991a (pp. 148–60) are cited.

4. See Washington—Amsterdam 1996–97, no. 23. The annoyed dog
in the foreground recalls the dog in Jan Miense Molenaer's
painting The King Drinks, of about 1635, in the Collections of
the Princes of Liechtenstein, Vaduz; see New York 1983–86, no.
19, or Raleigh—Columbus—Manchester 2002–3, no. 19.

the figure with "the presenter or narrator in theatrical and picto-
course, the innkeeper also recalls other paintings in which the
artist casts himself as a dissolve character, for example, Adriann
Brouwer's The Smokers, in the Metropolitan Museum (Liedtke
1984a, pp. 5–10).


7. Compare the use of the cittern in Jacob Cats's erotic panel
The Oyster Meal (Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid; discussed
in Amsterdam 1976, no. 31).

who implausibly sees in the group on the right "one more send
up [sic] of the convention of family portraits" (in which grapes
sometimes symbolize "fertility sanctioned by marriage").

9. Broken columns commonly occur in portraiture (see Pl. 172).
On the sphere, see Tervarent 1998–99, vol. 51, and De Jongh

10. In Jacob Cats's Emblemata moralia et aeconomica (Rotterdam,
1627), emblem no. 11, "Vita Rosa Est," compares wilting holly-
hocks with the loss of youthful beauty, love, and life. On roses in
Netherlandish still-life painting, see Amsterdam—3 Hertogenbosch
1982, pp. 15–18.

11. On the meaning of owls in Netherlandish art, see Slive 1970–74,
vol. 1, pp. 147–52. An owl that (according to the Dutch proverb)
"simply refuses to see" is found in Steen's riotous School for Boys
and Girls, also of about 1670, in the National Gallery of Scotland,
Edinburgh (Washington-Amsterdam 1996–97, no. 41; see p. 213). Westermann (see note 1 above) has observed that stone globes in garden settings, like the one near the owl, may refer to the precarious fortunes of revelers (see Kelch in Philadelphia-Berlin-London 1984, p. 330). This suggestion is supported by the sphere’s juxtaposition with a column, which can symbolize constancy, fortitude, or virtue in general (especially when compared with Fortunia, who usually balances on a sphere: see Tervarent 1948–59, cols. 106–7).

References: J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 4 (1833), p. 35, no. 109, describes the work as a “capital picture,” sold for Fl 2,469 at the Schimmelpenninc sale of 1819; Immerzeel 1842–43, vol. 1, p. 111, as in the Schimmelpenninc sale; Wessethene 1836, p. 153, no. 296 (location unknown); Widener 1885–1900, vol. 2 (1900), no. 256 (ill.), as “The Merrymakers”; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), p. 116, no. 443, as in the Paris auction of 1889; Valentine in New York 1909, p. 128, no. 127 (ill.), as “The Merrymakers” (lent by P. A. B. Widener, Philadelphia); Hofstede de Groot and Valentine 1913, no. 44 (ill.); Antal 1923, p. 116, fig. 6, as “The Jesters,” reminiscent of Jordans but “more interesting and original”; Hanema 1929, p. 9, as lent by Goudriaan to the Boymans Museum, and as dating from about 1674; Trautscholdt 1937, p. 312, as in the Goudriaan collection; Salinger 1959, pp. 124–31 (ill. inside front cover, and seven details), dates the picture after 1669, when Steen’s first wife died, and suggests that his second wife may have modeled for the woman in the center; A. B. de Vries 1959, p. 31, as from the 1670s; Banks 1977, p. 193, fig. 130, as probably from the mid-1660s; K. Braun 1980, pp. 9, 14, 142–43, no. 374 (ill.), identifies four of the figures with members of Steen’s family, considers parts of the picture to perhaps be by one of his sons, and dates the work to 1677–79; P. Sutton 1986, pp. 186–87, with wrong reproduction, considers the picture “rather blurry” and “disagreeably outskilled”; Liedtke 1990, p. 55, on the purchase; Chapman 1993, pp. 143, 144, fig. 7, “capitalizes on the painter’s second occupation as brewer and innkeeper”; Baer 1995, p. 120; Liedtke in E. Sullivan et al. 1995, vol. 1, p. 171 n. 8, notes the painting’s broad and brilliant effects; Washington-Amsterdam 1996–97, pp. 112, 12, 19–20, 61, 113, 166, 231, 253, 254–56, 259, no. 48 (ill.), as dating from about 1673–75, with a detailed discussion; Westermann 1997, pp. 93–94, 113, 115, 203, fig. 32, characterizes the figure of the innkeeper as “a jester of the Falstaffian genus [and] a Silen, pot-bellied drunk,” describes expressions and gestures as prompts to laughter, and comments on the function of the painter’s likeness in the picture; W. Kloek 1998, p. 24, fig. 3 on p. 15, as one of the paintings by Steen in which his family members may be recognized; Quodbach 2002, pp. 52–53, 54 n. 19, fig. 7, as one of the early Widener acquisitions now in the MMA; Berger 2007, p. 35, fig. 6, suggests that painterly virtuosity saves pictures like this one from being comic to a fault.


Ex Coll.: Gerrit Schimmelpenninc, Amsterdam (his estate sale, Roos, Amsterdam, July 13, 1819, no. 112, for Fl 2,499 to Brondegeest); [Albert Brondegeest, Amsterdam]; [Watkins, London (in 1834; for sale); David P. Sellar, London (by 1888–94; his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, June 6, 1889, no. 70, bought in; sale, Christie’s, London, March 17, 1894, no. 123, for £67 to Colnaghi); [Martin Colnaghi, London, from 1894]; P. A. B. Widener, Ashbourne, later Lynnewood Hall, Elkins Park, near Philadelphia (by 1900–1913); his son Joseph E. Widener, Lynnewood Hall (1915–at least 1923); [Douws Brothers, Amsterdam, by 1927–28]; A. J. M. Goudriaan, The Hague (at least 1917; on loan to the Boymans Museum, Rotterdam); Mrs. J. M. A. Roosenburg-Goudriaan, Rotterdam (by 1921, on loan to the Boymans Museum, Rotterdam; sent to the United States in 1938); [Schaefler Galleries, New York, 1958]; Fletcher Fund, 1958 (8.89
Matthias Stom
Amersfoort? ca. 1599/1600—after 1652 in Italy?

A Dutch painter whose entire known career took place in Italy, Stom was possibly born in Amersfoort, near Utrecht. The earliest published document of his life dates from 1630 and records his residence in the Roman parish of Santa Nicola in Arcione. He is called “Mattheo Stom, fiamengo pittore, d’anni 31.” His age at the time, thirty-one, indicates a birth date of about 1599/1600, while the term fiamingo (fiammingo, or Flemish) was Italian shorthand for Netherlanders in general. At the time of this census, Stom was sharing with a minor French painter a house that the Amersfoort artist Paulus Bor (q.v.) had occupied several years earlier. This connection to Amersfoort is slimmer than the artistic evidence of Stom’s exposure, during the 1620s, to the Caravagggesque painters of Utrecht, in particular Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656) and Dirck van Baburen (ca. 1594/95–1624), both of whom had returned from Rome at the beginning of the decade.

Stom appears to have stayed in Rome through 1633. He then moved to Naples, where he remained until about 1640 and was influenced by the style of the highly regarded Jusepe de Ribera (1591–1652). Among Stom’s most important works in Naples was a series of Passion scenes for Sant’ Efigenio Nuovo. From about 1641 to at least 1649, the painter was mostly in Palermo, producing pictures for churches in nearby Caccamo and Monreale, and in Messina. In the last city, the great collector Antonio Ruffo, who later ordered paintings from Rembrandt (beginning with Aristotle with a Bust of Homer; Pl. 151), bought three works by Stom between 1646 and 1649. In 1652, the artist was paid for a large altarpiece, The Assumption of the Virgin with Three Saints, which was commissioned by the Church of Santa Maria Assunta, Chiuduno, near Bergamo (still in situ). This may suggest that Stom spent his last years in northern Italy. It is not known when he died.

Perhaps the only known painting by Stom to predate his years in Italy is Old Woman and Boy by Candlelight (Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery), which is on oak panel, the only work by the artist on wood. Only one picture by Stom bears a date, Saint Isidore of Seville, of 1641, which he painted for the Agostinian church in Caccamo (in situ). His development over a little more than twenty years is more easily arranged in chronological order on the basis of provenance than of style. The nocturnal illumination of his dramatic religious and history pictures derives mainly from the works that the Utrecht followers of Caravaggio painted in Rome. Baburen’s style presents the closest analogy, given the strong gestures and often strenuous postures of his figures, and his use of fragmented contrasts of light and dark. The relative consistency of Stom’s manner and, presumably, his insistently rugged surfaces (flesh and fabric like distressed leather) led one of his great admirers, Benedict Nicolson, to declare that “a full-scale Stom exhibition would be a catastrophe.” However, it would also be a revelation, for as Nicolson has shown, the artist’s eccentricities, considerable variations, and theatrical impact can be appreciated only when confronting original works, especially those on a large scale.

If Stom was “the quintessential international Caravaggist,” it was in good part because his success was so much that of a northerner in Italy, not because his appeal was universal. The artist’s progress from Rome to Naples, and then to Palermo and provincial Messina, was probably practical, in that it carried a style of the 1620s to places where it had not quite arrived.

1. The evidence for Amersfoort is uncertain: see Bok in Utrecht—Braunschweig 1986–87, p. 331, especially nn. 5, 7. Stom’s parents may have been from the Spanish Netherlands, where the name was more familiar. In Dutch, Stom means “mute” or “without speech,” but this has nothing to do with the artist. Until fairly recently, he was called Stomer in art historical literature, but he appears never to have used that name on pictures or in documents. Scholarship on the painter effectively began with Pauwels 1953 and Pauwels 1954.
4. On the Neapolitan period, see Nicolson 1977, pp. 230–31. Ribera, from Valencia, spent a formative period (1613–16) in Rome, where he was influenced by the Caravagggesque painters from Utrecht, and then worked in Naples for the rest of his life. His influence on Stom is discussed by Slatkes in Utrecht—Braunschweig 1986–87, p. 340 (under no. 77).
5. Aspects of the Sicilian period are discussed in Fischbacher 1993.
8. Nicolson 1977, p. 230. In the article cited, Nicolson describes the modeling in Stom's late works as resembling baked clay, and attempts to distinguish Neapolitan from Palermitan pictures.

9. See, for example, Nicolson 1979, figs. 163–65; fig. 166, instructively, is a studio work, purchased in 2005 by the Phoenix Art Museum.


198. Old Woman Praying

Oil on canvas, 30\% x 25\% in. (77.8 x 63.8 cm)

The painting is in good condition. The surface was slightly flattened when the canvas was lined in the past. There are many small paint losses along the edges of an extensive network of cracks, three large losses in the upper right corner, and a concentration of minor flaking in the lower right corner.

Gift of Jan Woodner, 1981 1981.25

Stom's mature works, and in particular his genre scenes, are difficult to place chronologically, but this work, and a fair number of similar pictures by him, were probably painted in the late 1630s, when the artist was in Naples, or during the early 1640s in Palermo. Benedict Nicolson, a leading scholar of Stom's oeuvre who also owned this canvas at one time, said of the paintings that depict women praying, counting coins, or admiring their possessions, “On balance I incline towards Sicily, but without real conviction.” In support of a dating to Stom’s Palermitan period, Nicolson cites two similar pictures of male figures, “which may be assumed to have been in Sicilian collections for numerous generations,” and also Stom’s Old Woman Telling Beads by Lamplight with a Skull and Book (Muzeul Brukenthal, Sibiu, Romania), which has “the same clay-like consistency in the modeling of the face and hands.

The usual problem of dating works by Stom, which is discussed in the biography above, becomes more complex in the case of subjects like this one, which ultimately derive from the artist's association with the Caravagesque painters of Utrecht during the 1620s. What is presumed to be his earliest known picture, Old Woman and Boy by Candlelight (Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery), is similar in type and style, if not execution. Nicolson considered it comparatively easy to “define the stylistic changes between the known Neapolitan (after 1632) and Palermitan (early 1640s onwards) pictures,” although the half-length candlelit genre scenes provide exceptions to the rule.

The provenances of paintings comparable to this one may be traced back to Naples (where Jusepe de Ribera [1591–1652] was the most important contemporary master) as well as to Palermo and elsewhere in Sicily. It might be wondered whether the whereabouts of this canvas before 1954, when it was first attributed to Stom, are obscured by an ascription to Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656), Ribera, or some other artist of the time.

The tight space of the present picture is quite reminiscent of that of Utrecht painters such as Dirck van Baburen (ca. 1594/95–1624) and Hendrick ter Brugghen (q.v.), as seen, for example, in the latter’s Old Man Writing by Candlelight, of about 1620–28 (Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton). Here, the effect is intensified by the diagonal repoussé of supporting beams to the left, which box the old woman's small table into a close corner of her undoubtedly modest home. However, a certain dignity rather than poverty is suggested by the fur-lined robe with blue piping at the bust and (in a V shape) on the lower sleeve. The woman wears a red garment underneath, which accords well with the flood of yellow light that casts her face and neck into an unflattering relief. Her reflective expression seems as sincere as the surfaces seem physical: for this experienced person, the efficacy of prayer and of counting rosary beads is as certain as the sound of knocking on wood.

In other paintings by Stom, a similar character examines coins by candlelight, failing to see what must be clear to the woman in the Museum's picture, that she is the sole actor in a vanitas scene. Both subjects go back to Honthorst and other Utrecht artists during the 1620s. The closest known antecedents include Honthorst's Old Woman Examining a Coin by Lantern Light (private collection, the Netherlands) and Old Woman Holding a Candle and an Empty Purse (location unknown), both of which date from the early 1620s. The latter was engraved by Cornelis Bloemaert (ca. 1603–1692), with an inscription asking which burdens the mind with greater worries, a purse that is empty or one that is bursting with
gold. The theme of avarice was similarly depicted by Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.), in a painting known only from an engraving of 1625 by his son Cornelis, who also engraved An Old Woman Praying (with rosary beads) by his famous father (location unknown; the print probably dates from 1623–30). The engraving is inscribed in Latin, “What the toy hoop is to the child, the hunting spear to the youth, the sword to the mature man, such the weapon of piety is to old age.”

In their compositions and in the type of old woman, the two images engraved by Cornelis Bloemaert are analogous to the present work, but come much closer to Stom’s Old Woman Praying by Candlelight (Pushkin Museum, Moscow) and Old Woman Counting Coins by Candlelight (art market, 1996). That Stom appears to have been familiar with Cornelis Bloemaert’s prints is not surprising, since in 1633 the two Dutch artists were both in Rome, where Bloemaert worked for Joachim von Sandrart (1606–1688) and important collectors. The German painter, who described Cornelis as his fellow pupil under Honthorst in Utrecht (in the mid-1620s), reported that the printmaker received from his father “a whole crate of drawings, so that he might engrave them” in Rome, and that the younger Bloemaert (who never left Italy) “was widely loved for his quiet and good behavior.”

Sandrart himself painted a vanitas picture of an old woman with a candle, a skull, and an hourglass as December in his series of canvases The Twelve Months of the Year, dated 1642 and 1643 (Schloss Schleissheim, Schleissheim). The fur-lined robe worn by the wizened woman, and by the old man warming himself in the painting January of the same series, is a conventional attribute of people who are in the winter of their lives.

The figure in the New York painting is sufficiently individualized to have been based on an actual model, a woman who was presumably Italian. The same woman evidently was used for the praying figure (facing to the right) in Stom’s painting in Sibiu (mentioned above), and in versions of that work.

1. Nicolson 1977, p. 239, fig. 20 (Sibiu), comparing nos. 137 and 138 in the appendix, p. 245.
2. Starkes 2000, pp. 182–81, fig. 77.
3. For the quote, and this point, see Nicolson 1977, p. 233.
5. See Nicolson 1979, p. 96, for a list of examples. For a good number of what might be called figural vanitas pictures, see Caen–Paris 1990–91.
6. Judson and Ekkart 1999, pp. 181–82, nos. 228, 229, pls. 129, 130. See also Honthorst’s Penitent Magdalene (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg; version in a private collection, London; ibid., no. 84, figs. 41, 42, pl. XIX), which features a dark repoussoir rather like that employed by Stom in the New York canvas.
9. Ibid., p. 312 (under no. 486). The same print is connected with Rembrandt’s (?) Old Woman at Prayer, of about 1629–30 (Residenzgalerie, Salzburg), in Corpus 1982–89, vol. 1, pp. 273–74, fig. 2 (under no. A27), and in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92, p. 140, fig. 6a (under no. 6).
10. The latter work was at Sotheby’s, New York, January 11, 1996, no. 77 (ill.).
13. The theme of old age was richly interpreted in the Netherland, where it flourished in literature as well as in the visual arts. See Bruyn 1988a, Frantitz 1993a, pp. 167–80 (p. 168, fig. 146, for Sandrart’s December), and Frantitz 1993c. In the last publication (p. 78), it is noted that Cicero and Plato praised the virtues of old people, such as wisdom and tenacity, whereas Juvenal, Terence, and Aristicot belabored their faults. Classical topoi would probably have occurred to some of Stom’s patrons in Italy.
14. See Nicolson 1977, p. 245, no. 143. Another version (or the same picture?) was at Christie’s, London, April 4, 1986, no. 161 (ill.).


850 MATTHIAS STOM
Jacob van Strij and his brother Abraham (1753–1826) grew up in the workshop of their father, Leendert van Strij (1728–1798), whose business in Dordrecht undertook everything from house painting to painted wallpaper and other forms of interior decoration, but probably not easel pictures. In 1750, Leendert married Catharina Smak (1728–1792), who appears to have been his cousin. The family Bible records the couple’s first three children as Elizabeth (born in 1751), Abraham, and Jacob (born on October 2, 1756). Two more boys, Jan and Gerrit, were born in 1759 and 1762, respectively. The family lived in a house on the Grotekerksbuurt, the street’s name reflecting the fact that it is situated just behind the Grote Kerk in the center of the city.1

Like Jacob de Wit (q.q.v) before them, the Van Strij brothers attended the Royal Academy of Antwerp, but not until they were late in their teens, Abraham in 1772–73 and Jacob in 1774–76. According to Jacob’s own account, he studied with the academy’s director, Andries Cornelis Lens (1739–1822), a noted Neoclassical painter.2 Upon returning to Dordrecht, the two brothers helped run their father’s firm and, in the late 1780s, took it over completely. A contract spelled out precisely how their work would be divided, how their apprentices would be supervised, and how their parents’ comfortable retirement would be assured. It appears that by delegating all of the less skilled forms of painting to assistants, the brothers found ample time to produce independent drawings and pictures.3 Both were exceptional draftsmen.

On December 26, 1786, Jacob married Magdalena Cornelia van Rijndorp, who was from Nijmegen. The couple had six children between 1787 and 1798, two of whom died when they were very young. Jacob was reportedly quite well read, and he was active in organizations that promoted education, especially for poor and lower-middle-class families. He gave the occasional lecture to his colleagues in Pictura, the Dordrecht drawing society that his brother helped found in 1774. One of these lectures praised Dutch artists and their ability to imitate nature. A portrait drawing of Jacob, made by Abraham in 1803, shows him thoughtfully pausing as he works on a landscape painting. Pendant portraits of the Van Strj’s painted in 1812 by Pieter Christoffel Wonder (1780–1852; Dordrechts Museum, Dordrecht) show Jacob looking less well preserved than his older brother. He is known to have suffered from severe attacks of gout, especially in his hands, which explains the sling supporting his middle finger in Wonder’s candid record of a man who had less than three years to live (Jacob died on February 4, 1815, at the age of fifty). Two months before his death, in a letter to Wonder, Jacob wrote that nothing in life was more satisfying than work.4

Abraham was a society portraitist and a very good genre and still-life painter. He also painted landscape and marine views, decorative pictures of birds, and wrijes, grisaille chimney-pieces and overdoors in the manner of De Wit (see Pl. 221). He is admired especially for his genre paintings, which continue the tradition of seventeenth-century masters such as Pieter de Hooch, Nicolaes Maes, and Gabriel Metsu (q.q.v.). In these charming pictures, costumes and details of interior decoration suggest either the Golden Age or the artist’s own time.

Jacob van Strij was almost exclusively a landscapist, although he also painted a few seascapes and history pictures. His concentration on landscape painting and his emulation of forerunners such as Jan Both (ca. 1615/18–1652), Nicolaes Berchem, Meyndert Hobbema, Jacob van Ruisdael, and, above all, Aelbert Cuyp (q.q.v.) appear to have been encouraged initially by the Amsterdam collector Jan Danser Nijman (1735–1797), who is known mainly from posthumous sales of his 146 mostly seventeenth-century Dutch paintings and of his huge collection of prints and drawings. Van Strij himself referred to Danser Nijman’s importance for his career, but it is not known how they came into contact.5

While numerous landscapes were conceived as well as painted by Van Strij, he also made copies and versions of pictures by his hometown hero Cuyp, and by Both, Hobbema, Paulus Potter (1625–1654), and Jan Wijnants (1632–1684), among others.6 Both the copies and the independent works include woodland, winter, Italianate, and Netherlandish views, depending upon the artistic source. His personal approach to landscape favors pastoral views around Dordrecht, with brilliant daylight, saturated colors, and impasto touches. The execution of the work discussed below, although it long passed as a painting by Cuyp, is typical of Van Strij. However, many of
his best landscapes are more original, and suggest real experience as well as reverie about the past.

1. These details are adopted from De Graaf’s biography of Abraham and Jacob van Strij, in Dordrecht–Enschede 2000, pp. 9–23 (p. 9 on the immediate family, the house is seen in fig. 2). For a family tree, see Erkelens 1976, p. 198.

2. See De Graaf in Dordrecht–Enschede 2000, pp. 10–11, fig. 4 (a mythological painting by Lens).
3. Ibid., pp. 15–16.
4. See ibid., pp. 15 (marriage), 17–21 (character, illness, etc.), figs. 18, 23, 24 (portraits of Jacob and Abraham).
5. Ibid., pp. 11–12.

199. Landscape with Cattle

Oil on wood, 31¼ x 42¼ in. (80 x 107.3 cm)
Inscribed (lower right, falsely): A. Cuyj.
The painting is well preserved.
Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1890 91.26.8

Until the early 1980s, this picture from the Marquand Collection was generally considered to be by Aelbert Cuyp (qv.), although there was effectively no serious discussion of the work in earlier decades. The first person to doubt the attribution was evidently the Dutch landscape specialist Wolfgang Stechow, who, on a visit to the Museum in 1954, rejected Cuyp’s authorship and suggested that the then curator look into Van Strij. The painting was apparently not on view at the time, but it was in the galleries from 1958 to 1965, from 1973 until about 1982, and occasionally thereafter. It has never hung near the Altman Cuyp (Pl. 34), as paintings from the Altman bequest must be exhibited together. If it had, the question of attribution would probably have been raised much earlier. In September 1984, the panel was recatalogued as by Jacob van Strij, at the present writer’s suggestion, which reflected the opinion of scholarly visitors and his own study of indisputable Van Strij in various collections.

The styles of Jacob van Strij and his brother Abraham (see the biography above) have become much better known in the past twenty years, especially through the exhibition at Dordrecht and Enschede in 2000. And the Marquand painting has attracted scholarly attention (see Refs.). Comparisons with signed works by Jacob van Strij leave no room for doubt that the New York panel was painted by him. There are four signed pastoral landscapes by Van Strij (all on wood) in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and one signed panel, Resting Cows by a River, in the Amsterdams Historisch Museum. At least one of the landscapes by Van Strij in the Dordrechts Museum is comparable, although a signed canvas, Landscape with Horseman and Cattle, in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, is more analogous in composition as well as execution. A number of similar works by Van Strij have been seen at auction in recent years. One of the most relevant, since it includes the very same group of cows and boy lying in the grass as are found in the Museum’s painting, is unfortunately unsigned but is typical of the artist (fig. 244). Van Strij used the same cows and resting boy in a panel in the National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa (fig. 245), which was also formerly considered to be by Cuyp.

Qualities characteristic of Van Strij in the Marquand picture are the saturated colors (especially the green of the grass), the dense application of paint throughout, the impasto highlights and isolated suggestions of texture in the cattle, and the pasty and rather decorative handling of the clouds. The painter set up a repousoir of branches, twigs, and grass across the entire foreground, with V-shaped marks, ticks, and dots suggesting highlights on foliage, but with no sense of actual plant forms. In similar areas, Cuyp himself (see Pl. 34) also reveals an artistic touch, but takes pains to describe vegetation convincingly. The lighting on his animals, whether cows or horses, models form and at the same time conveys the sense of daylight bathing the entire scene. The greens of his grass are subtle and translucent, giving the impression, as in the distance and in the sky, that atmospheric perspective transforms the appearance of everything.
As Sluijter describes in detail, Van Strij achieved Cuyp-like effects with very different means, which are always denser, flatter, and often fustier. "He did this with great refinement, but could not overcome—and perhaps did not wish to— the fact that his works lack the spatial and synthetic atmospheric effects that are so pronounced in many seventeenth-century landscapes." In other words, Van Strij reveals an eighteenth-century master's sensibility, which especially in Holland contrasts with the descriptive preoccupation of earlier painters in allowing the artist's materials to speak for themselves.

As has often been noted, the right background of the present picture (fig. 247) derives from the right half of Cuyp's *Equestrian Portrait of Pieter de Roovere* ("Salmon Fishing"), of about 1650 (fig. 246). The two houses in that painting, the sailboat, the fishermen with a net, a version of the man leading a horse, and the dog in the foreground were borrowed and slightly rearranged into a more compact vignette. Precisely the same arrangement of three standing cows seen in profile is found in a panel by Cuyp, *A Herdsman Seated on a Hillock with Six Cows Nearby*, of about 1650 (art market, 1997). Furthermore, six of the eight cows in Cuyp's *River Landscape with Cows*, of about 1648–50 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), correspond approximately with cows in the New York painting, although their positions differ somewhat, and Van Strij has introduced a reclining cow seen directly from the back (similar cows occur elsewhere in Cuyp's oeuvre). The tower in the left background is based on the ruined Huis te Merwede, which still stands by the river Merwede on the northeast side of Dordrecht. Cuyp included the castle in a number of works. The sleeping boy is also borrowed from one or another painting by Cuyp, for example, *A Distant View of Dordrecht, with a Sleeping Herdsman and Five Cows* ("The Small Dort"), of about 1650 (National Gallery, London). Drawings with a similar figure by Van Strij are known.

Jacob van Strij's authorship of the Museum's painting and its relationship to one or more paintings by Cuyp appear to have been recorded in the 1816 sale catalogue of pictures from the artist's own estate and from the collection of Pieter van den Santhevel van Driel, of Dordrecht. Number 101 in that auction, which took place in Dordrecht on April 24, is described as "the same [J. van Strij], after the same [A. Cuyp]," meaning that the preceding lot was also a copy or pastiche by Van Strij after Cuyp. The support is given as panel, and the measurements as 31 duimen high by 40½ duimen wide, which is very nearly the same size as the present work. The description reads, "In this excellent picture one sees in the foreground some lying and standing cows. Next to the same a sleeping herder with a dog. In the distance some fishers, busy with salmon fishing; as by A. Cuyp." Broos concludes that the New York picture "was auctioned from Van Strij's estate as an authentic work by Van Strij himself, 'painted as if by A. Cuyp.' It is not certain which paintings in the sale came from Van Strij's estate and which from Van den Santhevel van Driel's collection, but the title page of the sale catalogue explains that the pictures are "partly" from the latter "but largely" from Van Strij, who was also the painter of a large number of works in the auction.

Many works by Cuyp were still in Dordrecht collections when Van Strij painted this picture, probably about 1800. The *Equestrian Portrait of Pieter de Roovere* was at the time in the Dordrecht residence of Jonkerheer Ocker Repelaer, Lord of Driel (1759–1832). Drawings by Cuyp must have been accessible as well; in 1767, more than eighty were sold at auction in Dordrecht.

A replica of the Museum's picture, most likely also by Van Strij, was on the art market in Salzburg in 1951.

1. Unsigned note in the curatorial files, dated December 14, 1954. The collector Daan Cevat, by contrast, offered the oral opinion (April 1966) that this is a very fine Cuyp, better than anything in the Rijksmuseum.
2. Christopher Brown (November 3, 1980) defended the attribution to Cuyp, but Eric Jan Sluijter (October 28, 1980) thought that Van Strij deserved consideration. Edward Speelman wrote to John Pope-Hennessy on April 19, 1981, arguing for Van Strij. Pope-Hennessy answered (April 23, 1981), "I well remember your earlier condemnation of this painting as a work of Van Strij, . . . [but] there is, however, quite a firm consensus view that it is Cuyp." At the time, there was actually no "firm consensus" of any kind, and the attribution to Cuyp was falling out of favor. On November 15, 1982, Speelman orally repeated his opinion to the present writer, who remembers that his explanation in front of the picture was quite compelling. Frits Duparc, who had already referred to the work in print as by Van Strij (Duparc 1980, p. 24), visited the Museum on January 24, 1982, and advanced an impressive argument in favor of Van Strij, noting the painting's saturated colors and other qualities that are unlike Cuyp's. Rüdiger Klessmann, in a letter dated December 23, 1982, also maintained that the picture is not by Cuyp, "but an imitation by another hand." He referred especially to the execution of the plants in the foreground, the "routine" highlights on the cows, and the fact that other "signed" works by Cuyp are questionable. It should also be noted that the picture was considered to be by Van Strij when it was sold in 1889 (see Ex Coll.).
Figure 244. Jacob van Strij, A River Landscape with Cattle and a Herdsman Conversing with a Girl. Oil on wood, 31\(\frac{3}{8}\) x 44\(\frac{3}{4}\) in. (81 x 113.5 cm). Art market, New York, 1989
7. Of particular interest for the Museum’s picture are the following: A Wooded River Landscape with Cattle, at Christie’s, London, May 8, 1987, no. 10; Peasants with Cattle on the Banks of a River, signed “J van Strij,” at Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, November 14, 1990, no. 71; An Extensive River Landscape with Shepherds and Their Cattle, signed “J van Strij,” at Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, November 6, 2001, no. 14; and A River Landscape with Shepherds and Their Cattle, signed “J van Stry,” at Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, May 14, 2002, no. 95. See also the picture sold by Christie’s (date not given) in Marius 1973, p. 44 (ill.).


9. Hofsteede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 2, p. 135, no. 444; later in the collection of Alberto Pani, Mexico (his sale, Kende, New York, December 17, 1943, no. 18). The dog in the Ottawa picture (fig. 245) and in the painting cited in the previous note is not the same as the one in the Museum’s picture, which (as mentioned in the text below) is borrowed from the painting by Cuyp in The Hague (fig. 246). However, the last noted picture provided Van Strij with models for the horse and (to a lesser extent) for the rider in the Ottawa painting.

10. Cuyp used a variety of greens and a complex of pigments to achieve the effects he desired. His earth colors often change with time. Van Strij’s palette differs considerably. On Cuyp’s pigments and color changes in his work, see Marika Spring’s essay in Washington–London–Amsterdam 2001–2, pp. 65–73.


12. See Refs., and especially Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, p. 73, in a full discussion of the Mauritshuis painting. The horse and mounted figure in the same picture, the dog, and a version of the fisherman in the foreground served as models for the figures, horse, and dog that Van Strij placed in an entirely different landscape (oil on wood, 37 3/4 x 46 1/4 in. [95.4 x 117.4 cm], signed by Van Strij, sold at Christie’s, London, December 17, 1985, no. 115, and at Christie’s, London, May 19, 1989, no. 124). Broadly speaking, Van Strij borrowed the background of the Mauritshuis painting for use in the New York panel, and the foreground of the Mauritshuis picture for the river view on the art market in 1985 and 1989. The present writer saw the Van Strij at the 1985
sale and considered it to be by the same hand as that responsible for the Museum's painting.


300, fig. 2 (under no. 22).

16. See MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 93 (under no. 962), pl. 79, where it is noted that "the sleeping cowherd reappears with variations" in another picture by Cuyp, formerly in a private collection, Rijksmuseum. In addition, under "Copy," there is a reference to an untraced copy after no. 962, "attributed to Abraham van Strij." See also the boy in the lower right corner of Cuyp's Piping Shepherd (pl. 31).

17. See Van Strij's drawing in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt (no. 172; Dordrecht–Enschede 2000, p. 172, fig. 231, where the Huys te Merwede also appears).

18. The writer is grateful to Ariane van Suchtelen of the Mauritshuis, The Hague, for sending him the exact wording (in Dutch) of entry no. 101 in the Dordrecht sale catalogue dated April 24, 1876.


20. Ariane van Suchtelen kindly checked a copy of the sale catalogue in The Hague and, in a personal communication dated February 10, 2005, quotes the title page: "gedeeltelijk nagelaten door [Heer van Driel], doch grootendeels door den kunstschilder Jacob van Strij." The sale was held in the house of Van Strij's widow, Van Strij and his brother Abraham had guaranteed a large debt incurred by their brother Jan, which necessitated the 1876 sale. See De Graaf in Dordrecht–Enschede 2000, pp. 18, 23 n. 37, citing further literature. The curious fact that the Museum's painting was exhibited as a Cuyp in 1876 but sold at auction in 1889 as by Van Strij suggests that some information came with the picture itself, for example an inscription or pasted catalogue entry (like the one of 1876) on the back of the panel. Our panel was cradled and sealed with wax at some time in the first half of the twentieth century.

21. As noted in Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, p. 73.


23. The panel (34 1/2 x 44 1/2 in. [88 x 114 cm]), said to be signed "A. Cuyp," was exhibited as a Cuyp in the summer show of the Galerie Weiz, Salzburg, in 1951, and reproduced in Weizmann 1951, no. 16 (August 15, 1951), p. 8. Alan Chong kindly brought this picture to my attention (personal communication, January 2005).

REFERENCES: MMA 1898, p. 91, no. 296, cites the painting as by Cuyp; MMA 1905, p. 33, no. 260, as by Cuyp; Hofstede de Groot 1957–75, vol. 2 (1959), pp. 70–71, no. 211, as a signed Cuyp in the MMA; B. Burroughs 1926, p. 74, no. 699-1, as by Cuyp; J. Holmes 1930, pp. 166–67, 177, 182, no. 17, fig. 6, considers the subject, style, and repetition of the landscape in the Mauritshuis picture (fig. 246 here) as typical of Cuyp; B. Burroughs 1931a, p. 80, no. 999-1; Walsh in New York 1971, p. 11, no. 25, as by Cuyp, cites the work as an example of his treatment of light; Reiss 1975, p. 206, listed by Hofstede de Groot number (211); Baertel 1980, vol. 1, p. 39, as by Cuyp; Duparc 1980, p. 24, notes the "same staffage" in Cuyp's Equestrian Portrait of Pieter de Roovers (fig. 246 here) and in the Museum's painting, which the author believes is by Van Strij (though catalogued as Cuyp), and mentions the drawing by Van Strij in the Verbeek collection, 's Hertogenbosch, which "can be a preparatory study or a repetition"; Broos in Paris 1986, p. 184, fig. 1, and p. 187 n. 6, states that the painting was always considered to be by Cuyp until Duparc (1980) recognized Van Strij's authorship, observes the derivation of the right background from Cuyp's Equestrian Portrait of Pieter de Roovers, and supposes that the group of cows is derived from a composition by Cuyp that is now unknown; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, records that the picture "has recently been reattributed correctly" to Van Strij, Van Tilborgh in Haarlem 1986b, pp. 11, 13, fig. 3, refers to Van Strij's "more or less overt citation" from a famous picture by Cuyp; Baertel 1991, p. 343, as by Jacob van Strij; A. Chong in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 29, p. 774, as an example of Van Strij's work, and as one of several pictures formerly attributed to Cuyp that are "evidently pastiches and rendered in much thicker paint than Cuyp used"; Broos in Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, pp. 73, 76 n. 3–5, fig. 12a, as by Jacob van Strij, notes the borrowing from Cuyp's Equestrian Portrait of Pieter de Roovers, suggests that Van Strij saw that painting in the house of its then owner, Jhr. Ocker Reepelaer, and identifies the Museum's picture with a painting sold from Van Strij's estate on April 24, 1816 (no. 101), as by Van Strij, "painted as if by A. Cuyp."


EX COLLECTOR: Probably Jacob van Strij (his estate sale, together with the collection of another Dordrecht resident [see text above], Dordrecht, April 24, 1816, no. 101, as by Van Strij after Cuyp or as if by Cuyp); John Fairfax Jesse, Bathfarnam Hall, Ruthin, Denbighshire, Wales (in 1876; sale, Foster, London, May 15, 1889, no. 196, as by Van Strij, sold for £ns 233); Henry G. Marquand, New York; Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1890 91.26.8

JACOB VAN STRIJ 857
Lodewijk Tieling

Recorded in Amsterdam in 1696

The artist registered as a citizen of Amsterdam in 1696. No more than about twenty pictures are known by or attributed to him. The majority are landscapes in which northern European trees (broadly reminiscent of Jacob van Ruisdael and Nicolaes Berchem; q.q.v.) frame views of Italianate valleys, hills, and buildings. A small panel, The Flight into Egypt (art market, 1991), bears a conspicuous signature, "L. Tieling f.1" and a number of signed landscapes with cattle, sheep, goats, and herders are known through sale catalogues, and, to a lesser extent, in museum collections (Latvian Museum of Foreign Art, Riga; Hermitage, Saint Petersburg; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm; Worcester Art Museum).  

200. The Ark

Oil on canvas, 46 1/4 x 61 1/4 in. (117.5 x 155.6 cm)

The painting is in good condition despite some local surface abrasion concentrated along the bottom of the composition and many tiny losses at the intersections of an extensive crack pattern. The foliage has darkened and discolored somewhat with age. The birds in flight are badly rubbed, and the branches of the large tree are worn. There is a repair below the two goats at center (3 1/2 x 9 in. [8.9 x 22.9 cm]) and another to the right (2 1/2 x 6 in. [6.4 x 15.2 cm]), which includes the reconstructed head of the stork bending down to drink. A compound tear through the male swan at lower right has caused large losses in the neck and tail. 

Gift of James DeLancey Verplanck and John Bayard Rodgers Verplanck, 1939 39.184.20

This large Dutch landscape, which hangs in the American Wing, was catalogued as "Dutch School, late seventeenth century" until curator Elizabeth Gardner changed the attribution in favor of the Deventer history painter Jacob Hogers (1664--after 1655). In 1977, the attribution was changed back to "Dutch Painter, Unknown, 3rd quarter XVII century," although one specialist had proposed a date of about 1700. In January 1995, Fred Meijer (Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague) examined the picture and, in a subsequent letter, wrote that the artist must be, as he had expected, the little-known Lodewijk Tieling. This conclusion is based not only on comparisons with known works by the artist (see the biography above), but also on the apparent reference to this painting in a Leiden auction of April 6, 1787: no. 93 as "F. Tieling" (a common misreading of his signature, as is "Fieling"), "Hoog 46 en breed 61 duym. Dk." (Height 46 and width 61 inches. Canvas). The subject is described as "Noach met zyn huysgezin; voorts een grote menigte van alderhande Beesten, na de Arke gaande. Alles zeer nauwlyk Geschildert." (Noah and his family; in the foreground a large assembly of all kinds of animals, going to the Ark. All painted very naturalistically.)

There is no trace of an inscription on the paint surface, so the reference to Tieling in 1787 may have been based on recorded information, on an inscription on the back of the original canvas (which is lined), or on some other source. In any case, comparison of the figures, animals, and landscape with similar motifs in signed works by the artist strongly supports the attribution. The cows, horses, sheep, and goats appear to be especially characteristic.

The composition, however, was inspired by another artist, Cornelis Snellinck (ca. 1605--1669), who was evidently active in Rotterdam. By a fortunate coincidence, a Noah's Ark by
Figure 248. Cornelis Snellinck, *Noah’s Ark*. Oil on canvas, 36 7/8 x 61 1/4 in. (92.1 x 156.8 cm). Art market, New York, 2006.
Snellinck (fig. 248) came up at auction in New York in 2006, allowing the present writer and Meijer to examine that canvas with the Museum's painting fresh in our memory. Tieling's picture is not a copy but a version of Snellinck's, and it reveals not only a different hand but also a different sensibility. Meijer notes that another version of the subject by Snellinck, with cows that appear similar to those in a work by the Rotterdam painter Cornelis Saftleven (1607–1683), was on the market in 1970. And he concludes that "perhaps both Snellinck and Tieling based their composition on a (missing) Saftleven or some other common source."5

The story of Noah and the Ark is related in Genesis (6:3–8:14). God, seeing that the wickedness of man is great and there is evil in his heart, advises Noah that he will destroy "both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me I have made them" (6:7). But Noah finds grace in the eyes of the Lord, who tells him, "But with thee will I establish my covenant; and thou shalt come into the ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee. And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female" (6:18–19).

In the Museum's canvas, Noah appears on the left, with his wife behind him and a son and daughter-in-law to the right. The patriarch instructs two younger, well-dressed women (one has pearls in her hair), who carry earthenware vessels (fig. 249). The painter took God at his word, pairing male and female. From left to right, he included turkeys, camels, mice and rats, a rooster and hen, dogs, cats, and hares; to the right of the tree are harnessed and laden donkeys, resting sheep, a cow and a bull, cranes, ducks, geese, swans, herons and storks, and behind them water buffalo, leopards, horses, lions, and foxes. In the background, elephants, pigs, bears, jackals (?), deer, and unicorns gather obediently. Things are a bit less organized in the tree, where there are monkeys and peacocks, six or seven pairs of other birds (counting one in the sky), and a lone owl at the top. In his list of survivors, the Lord specified birds of the air "by sevens," meaning pairs of seven various kinds. He also provided Noah's carpenters with clear plans for the ark: gopher wood construction, three hundred by fifty cubits and thirty high, three floors, a window, a door in the side, and pitch applied inside and out. Here the ark looks like a Dutch double-ender with a peasant barn on top, an old-fashioned dormer window, two chimneys, and an enormous gangplank (which two couples ascend). The ark was built in a sunny plain reminiscent of the Roman Campagna, despite the pointed church towers visible in two small cities. The sky is blue, and the sun (behind the hill to the left) casts a golden glow over the valley. After seven days, it will rain—for forty days and forty nights—but in this idyllic setting, Noah must have taken the gloomy forecast on faith.

To the untutored eye, the painting might bring to mind the "Peaceable Kingdom" pictures that the Pennsylvania artist Edward Hicks (1780–1849) painted by the score. But in fact it is much more accomplished in execution and sophisticated in design than any nineteenth-century picture painted for a rural market and, indeed, strikes one as a distinctively Amsterdam product of about 1700. A century of Dutch and Flemish design ideas informs not only the rhythmic arrangement of hills and trees, but also the way the central tree and clouds embellish the area of the sky and the manner in which the ark is artfully framed at the center of the view. Perusing the birds and animals, it seems that what has lately been described as "intelligent design" comes not so much from God as from Roelant Savery, Jan Brueghel the Elder, Paulus Potter, Nicolaes Berchem (q.v.), Gijsbert d'Hondecoeter, Melchior d'Hondecoeter (q.v.), the Saftlevens, and a number of other masters with whom an Amsterdam artist would have been familiar through the art trade. Of particular interest for this menagerie are the Paradise pictures of Brueghel and Savery, and Frans Snyders's paintings of avian symphonies, for example, the Concert of Birds (The Owl's Sermon to the Birds) (location unknown), once owned by the pioneering Baltimore collector Robert Gilmor Jr. (1774–1848). 6

The earliest known record of The Ark is the reference to "1 Dutch Painting" in the 1861 estate inventory of Samuel Verplanck's house, Mount Gulian, in Fishkill, New York. The 1879 estate inventory of household goods owned by his widow, Mary Hobart Verplanck, describes the same picture as "Ark after Deluge." The couple had traveled in Europe, and it is possible that they brought the picture to America. It is also possible that the painting was purchased in the eighteenth century. An earlier Samuel Verplanck (1739–1820) went to Amsterdam to study business with his uncle Daniel Crommelin, and there married a cousin in 1761. In 1765, the couple moved into the Wall Street house that Samuel had inherited from his father, Gulian, and filled it with fashionable furnishings and several pictures.7

1. For three works by Hogers, see Van Thiel et al. 1976, p. 281.
3. Letter from F. Meijer to the present writer, dated February 13,
1991, citing the T. Helling sale, Leiden, April 6, 1778 (Lugt 1938, no. 2826).

4. On this little-known painter, see Rotterdam 1994–95, p. 298.

5. Personal communication, January 31, 2006. Meijer adds that Tieling's apparent dependence on Snellinck is not surprising, "since his work in general is quite derivative (of such artists as Berchem [q.v.], [Adriaen] van de Velde, and [Hendrik] Mommers)." Snellinck's Noah's Ark (fig. 248) was at Sotheby's, New York, January 27, 2006, no. 245. The other version, mentioned by Meijer, is illustrated in Weltkunst 40, no. 14 (July 1970), p. 890.


7. An unpublished report on the historic furnishings in Mount Gulian, which was destroyed by fire in 1931, is in the files of the Department of American Decorative Arts. It was submitted by Jacquetta M. Haley, an independent scholar, in December 2004.

The house was named for Gulian Verplanck, who had it built about 1740.

References: Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 52, as by a Dutch Painter; Unknown, 3rd quarter XVII century; Baetjer 1995, p. 325, as the same.

Ex Coll.: Samuel Verplanck, Fishkill, New York (until d. 1861); his widow, Mary Hobart Verplanck, Fishkill, New York (1861–d. 1879); by descent to James DeLancey Verplanck and John Bayard Rodgers Verplanck (until 1939); Gift of James DeLancey Verplanck and John Bayard Rodgers Verplanck, 1939 39.184.20

American Decorative Arts

Figure 249. Detail of Tieling's The Ark (Pl. 200)
Willem van de Velde the Younger

Leiden 1633–1707 London

This famous marine painter was the grandson of a Flemish seaman and the son of a celebrated draftsman of ships, both of them named Willem van de Velde. The eldest Willem came from Oostwinkel, near Ghent, and was registered as a portman of Leiden in 1592. In 1622 his son, known as Willem van de Velde I or the Elder (Leiden 1611–1693 London), sailed with his father to Grave, on the Maas in North Brabant; Houbraken mentions other seafaring experience before the young man turned to art. His older brother Gerrit followed his father’s career. In 1631, Willem I married Judith Adriaensdr van Leeuwen, also of Leiden. The couple had a girl in 1632 and a boy, Willem, in 1633 (he was baptized in the Protestant Hooglandse Kerk on December 18). Willem I's younger son, Adriaen van de Velde (1616–1672), was a subtle landscape and staffage painter during his brief career in Amsterdam.

Willem II (the Younger) trained initially with his father, from whom he acquired an extensive knowledge of ships and great skill in drawing them. About 1650, he studied with Simon de Vlieger (q.v.) in Weesp, near Amsterdam. The young artist could hardly have found a more suitable complement to his father’s meticulous manner than de Vlieger’s tonalist approach to suggesting effects of daylight and atmosphere and the infinite spaces of sea and sky. Willem II was less fortunate in finding a wife in Weesp; the teenagers were divorced (following testimony by de Vlieger’s daughter and her husband) a year and a few months after their marriage on March 23, 1662. On December 23, 1656, Van de Velde, “living in Leiden, aged 34 [sic] painter, assistant to his father Willem van de Velde in Corte Coronastraat (in Amsterdam),” married Magdaleentje Walravens, “aged 21.” Six children from this union are recorded, three of them sons who worked obscurely in their father’s wake.

Willem II worked in Willem I’s studio until the latter’s death in 1693. In addition to assisting his father (who until his late years produced only drawings and grisaille “pen paintings”), Van de Velde independently made oil paintings signed with the studio signature, “W.V.V.” Paintings by Willem II date from as early as 1651, but no drawings securely by him are known to date from before 1666. He appears to have remained in the workshop using drawings by his father, who was frequently on-site sketching ships and recording important events. In the sympathetic Portrait of Willem van de Velde the Younger in His Studio, painted by Michiel van Musscher (1645–1705) about 1665–67 (Collection of Lord Northbrook), the artist is shown preparing colors on his palette, with drawings of ships like those by his father spread out on the floor.

In 1672, the Van de Velde family moved to England (Adriaen died in January of that year). The French had invaded the Netherlands, and the art market collapsed. Willem I was present at the embarkation of Charles II from Scheveningen to Dover in June 1660 and appears to have sailed over with the fleet, possibly making the acquaintance of future patrons on this occasion. He also recorded English ships in the Medway in 1661. Willem I was frequently employed by Charles II and his brother James, Duke of York, in 1672 and 1673, and in February 1674 the king "thought fit to allow the salary of One Hundred pounds per annum unto William Vandeveld the elder for taking and making of Draughts of Sea Fights, and the like Salary of One Hundred pounds per annum unto William Vandeveld the younger for putting the said Draughts into Colours for Our particular use." The Van de Velde were given a house in Greenwich and studio space in the Queen’s House; this continued until 1691, when the family moved to Westminster, London. In April 1707, Willem II was buried next to his father in the Saint James’s Church, Piccadilly.

Willem the Younger’s most admired pictures are those of calm waters dating from the mid-1650s to the mid-1660s, when he brought crystalline refinement to the manner he had adopted from de Vlieger. Demand for representations of the Four Days’ Battle of June 11–14, 1666, a Dutch victory, and for paintings of naval engagements and ceremonial events in England altered the tenor of the artist’s work, which especially after 1682 increased in scale and included dramatic and decorative effects reminiscent of Ludolf Bakhuizen (1631–1708). Willem II occasionally accepted important commissions from Dutch clients, such as the superbly panoramic canvas The Gouden Leeuw on the River IJ at Amsterdam, of 1686 (Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam), which was evidently painted for the Commissioners of the Harbor Works. Views of vessels on high and stormy seas also date from the 1670s and later. In the 1690s, the younger Van de Velde assumed to some extent
the father’s former role, appearing officially at maritime events of interest to the English Admiralty. He made oil sketches that served as models for members of his studio; these included his sons Cornelis and Willem, Isaac Sartemaker (ca. 1633–1721), Jacob Woutersz Knijf (1640–1681), and Peter Monamy (ca. 1684–1749).\(^\text{12}\)

1. Most of these details are adopted from Friso Lammersteijn’s biography of Willem van de Velde I and Jeroen Giltaij’s biography of Willem van de Velde II in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, pp. 333–34, 411–12. The authors cite Haverkorn van Rijkewijk’s several articles on the Van de Veldes published in Oud Holland from 1898 to 1902. David Cordingly also provides useful entries on the two artists in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 32, pp. 141–44, but his claim that by 1611 Willem I “had moved to Leiden” (p. 141) takes one by surprise. A long and frequently digressive biography of the Van de Veldes is provided in M. Robinson 1990, vol. 1, pp. ix–xxvi.

2. Giltaij in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, p. 333, gives a detailed account of the circumstances. Scholars such as Keys (Minneapolis–Toledo–Los Angeles 1990–91, p. 421) and P. Sutton (1992, p. 225) record that Van de Velde’s witness on June 20, 1659, was De Vlieger himself, although he died about three months earlier.

3. A. D. van der Vries 1886, p. 217, and quoting the Dutch. The artist’s age was incorrectly recorded, either in the document or by De Vries. 4. Keys and P. Sutton (see note 2 above) and other writers give the date of Van de Velde’s second marriage as 1666, although the couple’s daughters Maria and Judick were born in 1658 and 1663, respectively, and their daughter Sara was married in 1671. Willem van de Velde III was baptized on September 4, 1667. The other sons were named Peter and Cornelis. A Marine signed “C v Velde” is reproduced in Bol 1973, p. 244, fig. 249.


7. See Russell in Washington 1983–85, p. 373 (under no. 303). His suggestion that the sitter might be Adriaen van de Velde and not Willem II is implausible, since the younger brother made only incidental use of his father’s drawings.


9. Ibid., pp. xx and pp. xvi–xxi on the move to England and first few years there.


11. See, for example, ibid., no. 83; Minneapolis–Toledo–Los Angeles 1990–91, no. 48; and Bol 1973, figs. 244, 245. “Gales, Dutch and English," are catalogued in M. Robinson 1990, vol. 2, chap. 7.

12. A painting by Monamy, formerly attributed to Van de Velde, is in the Museum’s collection (60.94.2; Baeijer 1905, p. 183).

---

**201. Entrance to a Dutch Port**

Oil on canvas, 25¾ x 30½ in. (65.7 x 77.8 cm)
Signed (lower left): w.w.v.

The boats, figures, and water are well preserved; the sky is abraded throughout.

Bequest of William K. Vanderbilt, 1920 20.155.6

This canvas from the collection of William K. Vanderbilt represents a panoramic view of Dutch boats and ships just outside a harbor; the wooden breakwater (or groin) to the left would help protect the channel from surf on a less tranquil day. Robinson plausibly dates the work to about 1665, and considers it “a good example of [Willem van de Velde] the Younger’s work in the last few years before he left Holland.” In defense of that artist’s sole responsibility for the execution, Robinson cites the accurate drawing in all the vessels, the deft hand in the rigging, the complete mastery of scale and perspective in the receding ships (“something Van de Velde did not always achieve before about 1665”), and the fact that “the figures may be his own work” (as they certainly appear to be to the present writer), whereas figures in earlier works were often painted by his slightly younger brother, Adriaen van de Velde (1636–1672).\(^1\)

The boat on the left is a *kaag*, a cargo vessel used mostly on inland waterways, but also to supply slooping ships at anchor. Here the mainsail is “boomed out” to provide shade over part of the deck. Behind the *kaag* is a *weyschinrt*, a small fishing boat meant for use close to shore. Boats of this type existed in many versions and were powered by oars or in
some cases a sail, as here. To the far right is a spoon-bowed fishing boat, its spitsail set; the narrow leeboard (which was lowered to resist drift) is typical of craft that worked offshore (in contrast to the kaag). The vessel being rowed by about six oarsmen in the center of the view appears to be a state barge (compare the one in Van de Cappelle's painting; Pl. 26), with another one astern. Nine or ten ships are anchored farther out, their distance from one another allowing for changes in wind and tide. They face out to sea, so the tide is coming in, and the breeze, as seen in the flags, is too light to swing the ships. The largest vessels are East Indiamen, heavily armed cargo ships named for their service in the East India Company (VOC). The most prominent ship has a painting of a country house on its taffrail, which is surely a visualization of the ship's name, as in the case of the Huiz te Oosterwijk (Oosterwijk House), a warship well known to the artist and his father in the mid-1660s.6

Dutch flags fly on the wachts, on the state barges, and on the anchored ships. The flag on the kaag, with blue horizontal bands top and bottom and a white band in the middle, could be that of Diemen, Muiden, or Weesp, towns just southeast of Amsterdam (Weesp is where Van de Velde worked with Simon de Vlieger; see the biography above).3

No painter did more in the 1650s and 1660s to answer the Dutch demand for views like this one: calm waters, sunny skies, rewarding work, and ships that have come safely home.

References: Nieuwenhuys 1834, pp. 154–55, no. 61, describes and praises the picture, and states that it was "formerly (1803) in the collection of M. F. Pauwels at Brussels, and afterwards (1827) in that of De Heer Gerrit Muller, of Amsterdam, where I bought it for 6,476 guilders. Now in the possession of Captain Harcourt." J. Smith 1829–43, vol. 6 (1835), pp. 154–55, no. 125, as in the Pauwels, Muller, and Nieuwenhuys sales (gives hammer prices); Immerzeel 1842–43, vol. 3, p. 161, records what may be this picture as a "kapitaal schip" formerly in the Muller collection, sold for Fl 6,029 in the 1827 sale, and now owned by Captain Harcourt, London (see Ex Coll.); Vanderbilt bequest 1920, p. 268, as "characteristically alive with craft from little market boats to high-stemmed ships of war"; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 7 (1923), p. 79, no. 218, adds to the above information that the painting was in the J. B. Horion sale, Brussels, September 1, 1788, no. 170 ("196 florins, Pauwels"), and that it was also in the sale of Richard Foster of Clever Manor, London, June 3, 1876 (£2,062.10, to Samuels); M. Robinson 1990, vol. 1, pp. 417–19, no. 29 (ill.), as A kaag alongside a yeme with other ships near the shore, and as "painted probably entirely by [Willem van de Velde] the Younger for the Van de Velde studio; cf. 1663," with extensive and inconclusive comments on provenance; Baehtj 1991, p. 337.


Ex Coll.: Possibly J. B. Horion (his sale, Brussels, September 1788, no. 170, sold for Fl 196 to Pauwels [according to Hofstede de Groot; see Refs.]); possibly François Pauwels, Brussels (his sale, Brussels, August 22, 1803, no. 111, sold for Fl 3,313 [according to Nieuwenhuys and Smith; see Refs.]); possibly Gerrit Muller, Amsterdam (his sale, April 2, 1827, no. 73, sold for 6,476 guilders to C. J. Nieuwenhuys [according to Nieuwenhuys; see Refs.]); possibly C. J. Nieuwenhuys, Brussels (in 1827, his sale, Christie's, London, May 10 [11], 1835, bought in for Gn 770 [according to Smith; see Refs.]); possibly Capt. Octavius Henry Cyril Vernon Harcourt, London (according to Nieuwenhuys; see Refs.);2 Edmund Foster (d. 1863), Clever Manor, near Windsor, Berkshire (according to Smith ms.; see Hofstede de Groot 1921 [see Refs.]); Richard Foster, Clever Manor (his sale, Christie's, London, June 3, 1876, no. 11, as A Calm, with a reference to Smith no. 125; sold for £2,062.10 to Samuels, according to Hofstede de Groot [see Refs.]);8 William K. Vanderbilt, New York;5 Bequest of William K. Vanderbilt, 1920, 1920.155.6

2. The provenance up to this point depends upon J. Smith's identification of the Nieuwenhuys painting, his no. 125, with a picture "Now in the Coll. of Edmd Foster Esqr," which is Smith's own marginal note next to no. 125 in his copy of the catalogue (see M. Robinson 1990, vol. 1, p. 417 [under no. 29]), and Hofstede de Groot 1907–28, vol. 7, p. 79.)
3. That the painting was in this sale would appear to be confirmed by old chalk marks on the stretcher, which read "June 3/76" (as noted in M. Robinson 1990, vol. 1, p. 417).

4. On an original typescript of "Paintings bequeathed to the Metropolitan Museum of Art by William K. Vanderbilt" (MMA Archives), the Van de Velde (no. 12) is identified with Smith no. 125, is said to come "from the Cleve Manor Collection," and is given a value of £6,000, evidently the price Vanderbilt paid for it.
JOHANNES VERMEER

Delft 1632–1675 Delft

This celebrated painter of exquisite genre scenes is better represented in the Metropolitan Museum than anywhere else in the world, a fortune that reflects the great admiration of the artist among American collectors between 1887, when Henry Marquand bought Young Woman with a Water Pitcher (Pl. 201), and 1919, when Henry Clay Frick, in the year of his death, bought his third painting by Vermeer, Mistress and Maid, ca. 1666–67 (Frick Collection, New York). Nine autograph works by the artist (and a few erroneously attributed to him) entered American collections during that period, of the thirty-six currently accepted.¹

Johannes Vermeer (he never used the more common name Jan) was baptized in Delft on October 31, 1632, as a Protestant. His father, Reynier Jansz (ca. 1591–1612), from Delft, was a tailor's son who trained in Amsterdam as a caffù worker, or weaver of fine silks and satins. On July 19, 1615, in Amsterdam, Reynier married Digna Baltens (or Balthazars; ca. 1595–1670), and the couple settled in Delft shortly thereafter. As late as 1645, Reynier was still referred to as a “master caffù worker,” but in the 1630s he became an innkeeper and an art dealer (as such, he joined the Guild of Saint Luke in Delft, on October 13, 1631). The two professions often went together in the Netherlands, where opportunities to display paintings for sale were limited.

In the mid-1620s, Reynier Jansz adopted the surname Vos, but by 1640 he (like his brother before him) chose the surname Vermeer, which is a contraction of Van der Meer (From the Lake).² In the spring of 1641, the family, which could be described as lower middle class, moved into the Mechelen, a house and inn right on the Markt (the main or market square) of Delft. “Reynier Jansz. Vermeer alias Vos,” as he was described in a document dating from 1640, put down 200 guilders in cash and assumed 2,500 guilders of debt in the form of two mortgages, which his widow was still paying off when she tried to sell the Mechelen at auction in 1669.³

These financial obligations, and the death of his father in October 1652, probably prevented the artist from training with an important master in Delft or in another city. As a widow's only son, he must have helped his mother and his sister Gertruy (or Geertruyt; 1630–1670) run the inn. In any case, the identity of Vermeer's teacher is unknown, and the question is relatively unimportant.⁴ From his earliest known pictures, it is clear that the young artist effectively taught himself, absorbing lessons from a wide range of recent and contemporary painters. (Those commonly mentioned include Leonaert Bramer, Hendrick ter Brugghen, Nicolaes Maes, and Rembrandt [q.q.v.], as well as Anthony van Dyck [1599–1641] and other artists who were admired at the nearby court in The Hague.)⁵

Vermeer joined the painters’ guild in Delft on December 29, 1653. Earlier that year, on April 20, he married Catharina Bolnes (ca. 1631–1688), the daughter of a wealthy Catholic woman, Maria Thins (ca. 1593–1680).⁶ About 1641, Maria moved with her two daughters (one of whom died in 1643) from Gouda to Delft, where her cousin Jan Thins (d. 1647) had purchased a house on the Oude Langendijk in April of that year. This was probably the same house (it faced the Markt from across a canal) into which Maria Thins moved, followed by Vermeer and his wife shortly after their marriage.⁷ Before he wed, Vermeer converted to Catholicism. There are various indications that the artist took his new religion seriously, and shared his mother-in-law's association with Jesuits in Delft. Two of his sons, Franciscus and Ignatius, were named for the two great saints of the Jesuit order. Vermeer’s twenty-two-year marriage, which ended with his death in 1675, produced three sons (Johannes was named for his father), seven daughters, a child whose name is not recorded, and other children who died young and whose names are unknown.

The front room on the top floor of the Thins house had northern light and served as Vermeer’s studio. It would have borne little resemblance to the rooms that he depicted in his genre paintings or in the famous The Art of Painting (see fig. 214); like other Dutch artists treating the theme of contemporary life, Vermeer invented the settings. It appears that the artist was never joined by a pupil, an assistant, or anyone else in his workplace, aside from rare visits by colleagues and connoisseurs. He worked slowly and with great care, using commercially available materials and, in the case of more expensive pigments such as ultramarine, paints that he would have prepared himself.⁸ Vermeer probably painted no more than forty-five or fifty pictures during his entire career. Conservators are
inclined to support the inference that a typical painting by Vermeer required three or four months to produce.

This investment, and the extraordinary skill and judgment that Vermeer brought to his work, would lead to the expectation that his paintings sold for high prices and were bought almost exclusively by discerning connoisseurs. When the French diplomat Balthasar de Monconys visited Delft in 1663, the artist had nothing on hand to show him. But a master baker named Hendrick van Buyten allowed the Frenchman to examine a single-figure picture for which 600 guilders had reportedly been paid. For the same sum, one could have bought a small house, employed a skilled craftsman for about a year, or purchased an important picture by Gerrit Dou (q.v.).

Despite this occasional income, and the housing that he and his increasingly large family received from his mother-in-law, Vermeer must have struggled to meet daily expenses. Shortly after his death, Maria Thins testified that she regularly gave and sometimes lent money to her daughter and son-in-law.

In 1657, Vermeer was lent or advanced 200 guilders by a Delft collector, Pieter Claesz van Ruijven (1624–1674). Between the late 1650s and about 1670, as much as half of the artist’s production appears to have been acquired by Van Ruijven, who owned either the majority or all of the twenty-one paintings by Vermeer that were sold in an Amsterdam auction on May 16, 1696. Among the earliest works in the Van Ruijven collection were two pictures of about 1657, A Maid Asleep (Pl. 202) and Cavalier and Young Woman, among about 1657 (Frick Collection, New York), and The Milkmaid, of about 1657–58 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). Van Ruijven also owned A View of Delft, of about 1660–61 (Mauritshuis, The Hague) and other well-known paintings by the artist. Other distinguished patrons and admirers are known, although they would have owned only one, two, or, in the case of Van Buyten, three works. With a few exceptions, Vermeer was known only to a fairly small circle of art lovers in Delft and The Hague, and to the contemporary painters of Delft, including Branner, Pieter de Hooch, and Hendrick van Vliet (q.v.). He surely admired the work of Carel Fabritius (1622–1654), and he owned a few pictures by the short-lived (and short-term) Delft resident (as well as two trompe by Fabritius’s sidekick in Rembrandt’s studio, Samuel van Hoogstraten [q.v.]).

From Vermeer’s service as hoofdman (headman) in the painters’ guild (in 1662, 1663, 1670, and 1671), it may be concluded that he was a respected member of the local artistic community. Nevertheless, despite several sources of income, including some activity as an art dealer, Vermeer and his wife had little to live on in their later years. According to his widow in 1677, the burden of supporting their children and the death of income drove her husband to such a frenzy that “in a day and a half he had gone from being healthy to being dead.” He was buried in the Oude Kerk, Delft (see Pl. 222), on December 16, 1675, at the age of forty-three.

The nature of Vermeer’s work is too familiar and too complex to consider at length here. The artist created a world more perfect than any he had ever witnessed, adopting themes and artistic conventions that were current in Dutch painting (Gerard ter Borch [q.v.] was one of his sources of inspiration), and reinventing them in the light of his personal sensibilities and an intense preoccupation with actual appearances. Vermeer must have taken an interest in some of the optical qualities that could be observed in the camera obscura, but its importance for his style has been greatly exaggerated by a few writers.

The artist’s “rediscovery” in the 1830s and 1860s by the French critic Théophile Thoré (pseudonym, W. Bürger; 1807–1869) is one of the more curious episodes in the history of taste and commerce.

1. On the collecting of Vermeers in America, see Liedtke 1990, pp. 36–45, especially pp. 42–43.
2. For a fuller discussion of Vermeer’s father, his names and professions, see Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 146–47, where the writer (in the notes on p. 581) frequently credits the archival information published by the late John Michael Montias (mostly in Montias 1989).
3. See Montias 1989, p. 70, for Reyneri’s name in 1640, and pp. 72–73, on the Mechelen, which was named for the Belgian city (Malines, in French).
4. On this point, see the present writer’s remarks in New York–London 2001, p. 147, where earlier conjectures that Vermeer trained in Utrecht or Amsterdam are considered implausible. Vermeer probably had a brief period of training in Delft, perhaps with one of his father’s artist friends (the innkeeper could have offered goods and services rather than monetary payment).
6. The difference in the last names of Vermeer’s fiancée and his mother-in-law reflects the fact that the latter was formally separated from her abusive husband, a prosperous brickmaker in Gouda named Reyner Bolnes (d. 1673). Maria Thins’s wealth was gradually inherited from her parents and from her mother’s second husband, Gerrit Camerling (d. 1637), a prominent citizen of Delft. See New York–London 2001, pp. 147–49, and the sources cited in notes on p. 581.
7. As seen on the plan of Delft in ibid., pp. 62–63, nos. 64, 65, the Mechelen and the Thins house faced each other across the Markt, close by the façade of the Nieuwe Kerk. See ibid., p. 149, on the question of Vermeer’s acceptance into the Thins family (overruling Montias 1989, p. 132).
8. Apart from technical studies, the most thorough account of Vermeer’s technique and materials is found in Wheelock 1995b.
202. *A Maid Asleep*

Oil on canvas, 34½ x 30⅛ in. (87.6 x 76.3 cm)  
Signed (left, above the figure’s head): I-VMeer  
[VM in monogram]

The painting is in good overall condition, although the still life on the table at lower left is abraded and the cushion at lower right has lost definition.

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913  14-40.611

The early painting by Vermeer in the Altman Collection is regarded as one of his most important works, mainly because it appears to have been the artist’s first effort in the field to which he devoted nearly all of his mature career: scenes of domestic life, usually with a young woman’s personal surroundings and immediate feelings as the essential theme. The picture probably dates from 1656 or 1657, following *Diana and Her Companions,* of about 1653–54 (Mauritshuis, The Hague), *Christ in the House of Mary and Martha,* of about 1655 (National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh), and *The Procuress,* which is dated 1656 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden).

The last painting is also a genre scene, but of a conventional type with stock characters (even if the artist himself modeled for one of them), similar to those found in Caravagggesque works dating from the 1620s onward. In *A Maid Asleep,* by contrast, Vermeer adopted a new and more topical kind of genre picture, which, as in slightly earlier and contemporary paintings by Gerard ter Borch and Nicolaes Maes (see Pls. 13, 15, 109, 110), represents plausible moments in the private lives and society of ordinary people.

Another example by Vermeer of this fashionable type of picture, the slightly smaller *Letter Reader (Young Woman Reading a Letter),* of about 1657 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), is placed by most scholars shortly after *A Maid Asleep,* and shares with it a scale that is grander than expected for genre scenes of the 1650s (works by Ter Borch and Pieter de Hooch might be compared) but similar to that of Vermeer’s earliest works. As in the present picture, a carpet-covered table and a Chinese porcelain (Wanli) bowl filled with fruit are placed in the immediate foreground, and together with another element (here a chair, there a curtain) help to establish a sense of recession to the figure in a deeper plane. It is often noted that Vermeer’s use of physical “barriers” in the foreground also has a psychological effect, enhancing the viewer’s sense of intrusion into a private world or situation.

In the Altman painting, the downward view of the tabletop and the large wedge of carpet pushed up onto the nearest corner of the table recall the table carpet filling even more of the foreground in *The Procuress,* while the view to another room is reminiscent of the narrow space seen through a doorway in the background of *Christ in the House of Mary and Martha.* Vermeer employed and to some extent struggled with rather
obvious spatial devices in his early works. In pictures dating from the next year or two, such as the *Cavalier and Young Woman*, of about 1657 (Frick Collection, New York), *The Milkmaid*, of about 1657–58 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), and *The Glass of Wine*, of about 1658–59 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), the painter gradually mastered the description of interior space as an entity much less dependent on overlapping and interlocking forms. The refinement with which formal elements of this kind fit together in the Museum’s picture may be said to promise the exquisite designs dating from a few years later, like that of *Young Woman with a Water Pitcher* (Pl. 203).

*A Maid Asleep* is probably one of the earliest works by Vermeer to have been acquired by the contemporary Delft collector Pieter Claesz van Ruijven (1624–1674), who owned all or at least the majority of the twenty-one paintings by the artist that were sold from the estate of Van Ruijven’s son-in-law, Jacob Dissius, on May 16, 1696.² It is quite possible that Vermeer’s relationship with the young art lover and his wife—they lent or advanced the painter 200 guilders in November 1657—began with this picture, although it could also have been purchased at a later date.³ In the Amsterdam auction of 1666, no. 8 is listed as a painting of “Een dronke slapende Meid acn een ’Tafel” (A drunken, sleeping maid at a table), which is a somewhat coarse description of the subject, meant to serve for the day’s transaction, not posterity.⁴ The previous entry refers to “Een Juffrouw die door een Meyd een brief gebracht word” (A young lady who is brought a letter by a maid), thus noting the social distinction between the two figures in Vermeer’s *Mistress and Maid* in the Frick Collection, New York. A few writers have attempted to promote the woman in *A Maid Asleep* to “mistress of the house,”⁵ but the overwhelming majority of commentators, ranging from the seventeenth-century cataloguer to recent writers on Dutch costume and social customs, agree that the figure is a dozing and probably somewhat tipsy maid.

Household servants in the Netherlands were frequently criticized for overdressing. A sumptuary law passed in Amsterdam in 1681 explicitly forbade them from wearing (as here) silk garments and jewelry.⁶ The open neckline and the beauty patch seen to the right of the young woman’s lowered eyelids depart
conspicuously from the decorum maintained by middle-class homemakers of the time. These roles were more standardized in Dutch art than in reality, so that not only the woman’s clothing but also her pose and the circumstances (described below) make it as clear as in pages of Jane Austen that the scene centers upon a character from “below stairs,” even if the setting is the finest room in the house (the Dutch rookkamer).

The Altman painting has often been compared with Maes’s well-known panel of 1655, Interior with a Sleeping Maid and Her Mistress (“The Idle Servant”) (National Gallery, London), where the maid is found in more customary attire and in her proper place, a kitchen located downstairs from the front room (some visitors sit stiffly at the table). In several other works by Maes, all of which date from 1655 to 1657, the maid neglects her duties because a male visitor makes advances to her. Each of these pictures shows the mistress of the house (or, in one case, the master) in the foreground, with finger to lips and a smiling face turned to the viewer. Vermeer reveals a very different temperament from that of Maes in A Maid Asleep and later works, where the viewer is not addressed, but is himself cast in the role of eavesdropper or voyeur. In some instances, the male viewer could also imagine himself as the suitor who has just arrived or just left, or who is eagerly awaited (as in Woman with a Lute; Pl. 204).

It is known from technical examinations of A Maid Asleep that Vermeer included a male visitor in an earlier state of the painting. An X-radiograph (fig. 251) shows a man standing or walking in the rear room, his head coincident with the mirror (which, like the table below it, was painted in at a later stage). The man’s face appears to be seen in profile, and two different hats were tried on his head. The larger one (isolated in an autoradiograph; fig. 250) was shown from the front, indicating that at one stage the man was coming toward the viewer (compare the standing man in The Visit [Pl. 84] by Pieter de Hooch). A dog stood in the foyer or hallway between the two rooms, looking at the visitor. When the dog was painted out, Vermeer placed the chair in the right foreground, which leads the eye to the deeper space, and also implies (along with the open door and the disorderly arrangement on the table) that someone has recently left the room. One might be tempted to conclude from the fact that the chair faces away from the maid (a brown pillow, with gold piping, sits on the chair seat) that it was shoved aside, or that a man (as only a man would) sat on it backward. But aesthetic reasons suffice to explain the chair’s position, which allows the lion’s head finials to seesaw between rectangular areas of wall and floor that would otherwise look empty and flat, and which enabled the artist to animate a potentially lifeless part of the composition with the pattern of gold lozenges and brass studs on the leather back of the chair.

The still life on the table was also substantially revised, and this, together with later abrasion, has made some of its components ambiguous. Completely painted over is a sprig of grape leaves extending to the right of the Wanli bowl, as in earlier still lifes by Delft painters such as Willem van Aelst (1627—in or after 1685) and Gillis de Bergh (ca. 1600—1669). The small wineglass must have been added when the leaves were painted out, providing a less elliptical sign that the maid, in her modest way, is a modern-day bacchante. The tipped-over roemer in the left foreground was added at a later stage and was partially effaced by the use of solvents in the past. To the right of the glass, a fancy knife and spoon lie tip-to-bowl. The white form to the left of the spoon’s silver handle is the belly of a short ceramic jug, the open mouth of which appears as a dark oval shape under the gauzy material. Beneath the same veil (which has been made more transparent by cleaning), a smaller Chinese bowl fills the space between the lidded pitcher and the jug. At one time, an empty plate, now completely invisible, sat on the table in the area of the maid’s fingertips and what appear to be fragmentary nutsheil.

The painting on the wall above the maid was initially smaller in size. In the final version, the viewer sees the chubby little leg of Cupid and a theatrical mask. The same or a similar painting appears, but without the mask, in the artist’s Young Woman Interrupted at Music, of about 1659—60 (Frick Collection, New York), and in his Young Woman Standing at a Virginal, of about 1670—72 (National Gallery, London). It was also included, and then painted out, in the Dresden Letter Reader (Young Woman Reading a Letter), which was mentioned above as a work probably painted shortly after A Maid Asleep. A painting of Cupid (or Amor) is listed in the 1676 inventory of the artist’s estate. It seems likely that Vermeer owned the picture as early as about 1657. And it appears plausible that the mask was assigned to Cupid solely in the Museum’s painting to suggest that Love is here unmasked. The woman’s amorous emotions, revealed by sleep and warmed by wine, are written on her sweetly smiling lips, and account for her languorous behavior on a sunny afternoon (to judge from the artist’s extraordinary study of daylight).

In the Altman gallery of Dutch paintings, A Maid Asleep has hung in recent decades between a slightly earlier painting of a maid by Maes and a slightly later courtship scene by Ter Borch (Pls. 159, 15). The arrangement reveals the strong resemblance of this particular early work by Vermeer to Maes’s
genre pictures of the mid-1650s, which is seen especially in the warm palette (rich in reds and browns), the use of shadows, and the figure's embrace within a precise and almost protective pattern of rectilinear elements (which is more developed in other paintings by Maes). At the same time, Vermeer's greater emphasis on observation—as seen in the modeling and detailing of objects, the reflection of light on fabrics, and the sympathetic attention to the woman's features and expression—demonstrates qualities more suggestive of the artist's admiration of Ter Borch than of Maes. A different picture by Maes (like the one with the "idle servant" mentioned above), or perhaps a painting by Jacob Duck (q.v.), would more effectively illustrate Vermeer's progress from conventional themes and didactic motifs toward the kind of understatement and sensitivity to human behavior one finds in Ter Borch's work. Of course, no such outline can describe the complex evolution of this "transitional work," but the comparisons do clarify the purpose of Vermeer's revisions and refinements as he worked on the painting.

There is no indication in the technical material that the woman ever had a different pose or expression. Thus idleness, or sloth (the vice that leads to others, in works by Netherlandish artists ranging from Hieronymus Bosch to Maes and Duck), denoted by the woman's pose, is shown by Vermeer to result in lost innocence (the man coming in through an open doorway), sensual delights like wine and fruit (the latter recalling Eve), a love of luxuries such as satin and pearls, and the sin considered worst of all in many Dutch homes, the general disorder of the furniture and tableware (which is contrasted with the neatness of the background, in the picture's final state). Other signs of negligence include the open doors (including, perhaps, the front door of the house in the hallway, as is suggested by the brilliant streaks of light), and possibly by the key, if that is what it is, left in the lock on the other side of the door (household keys were often chained to the waist, and symbolized domestic responsibility). The open door itself implies that not only household but feminine virtue has been left unprotected. In a plainspoken Netherlandish print of about 1640, the indelicacy of leaving doors wide open, as if one worked at an inn or worse, is illustrated by a woman warming her thighs at the fireplace, and saying to a man in the doorway, "Compt vry inne" (Come right on in)—or better, in this bilingual example—"Entre hardement Pierre."

In the final state of A Maid Asleep, Vermeer drew a veil over the symbols and formal conventions that he had adopted from numerous sources, and trusted to actual experience. Details of subject matter become like fleeting thoughts, fragments of memory, or objects glimpsed in the corner of the eye. The mirror in the background touches upon the vanity, the ephemeral nature of mundane life (as if it were a dream). In a sense, these passing moments are what Vermeer represents. A man was present—we know from the roemer, the chair, the signs of hospitality and love—but now he is gone, like an hour of the day, and like the highlights, the shadows, and the warm flood of light on the floor, all of which will vanish in an instant or another hour. Like the light, the space—the sudden jumps in depth, the relationship of one line to another—will change with the slightest shift in viewpoint, something one experiences constantly, but never senses in the paintings by other artists that Vermeer appears to have seen. Vermeer's great gift for transforming art into something that looks like reality begins with this picture, which in its genesis and subtlety proves itself to be only art after all.

1. Vermeer's first four works were exhibited together in "Vermeer and the Delft School," the Metropolitan Museum's exhibition of 2001 (see New York—London 2001, nos. 64–67). It was often remarked at the time, by art historians and conservators, that the four pictures (which had probably never been in the same space before) were more similar in execution than expected, despite Vermeer's exploration of quite different stylistic alternatives as he moved from one work to the next. In the "Johannes Vermeer" exhibition of 1995–96 (see Washington—The Hague 1995–96, nos. 1–3), this was not nearly as apparent, since The Procuress and A Maid Asleep were absent (the latter because Altman pictures may not be lent), and the Saint Procedis (Barbara Piascck Johnson Collection Foundation) failed to find a place in the artist's oeuvre (according to the overwhelming majority of scholars).


3. In New York—London 2001, pp. 151–52, the present writer raises the question of whether Van Ruijven may have directed Vermeer toward the subjects and style for which he is best known. The answer given there is a qualified "no," based on sentiments found in Vermeer's earlier pictures, and the fact that the vogue for scenes of modern manners was already so widespread that the Delft artist would have followed suit on his own.


5. "To judge from the costume and pearl earrings, the woman ... is not a maid, but mistress of the house" (Wheelock 1995b, p. 40). See De Winkel 1998, p. 328, where this picture is connected with the document.

6. Wheelock (1981, p. 74, fig. 65) and other authors have made this comparison, and also that with an engraving of Acedia (Sloth; ibid., fig. 64). As Wheelock notes, "a similar pose also signified Melancholy," but this is hardly the disposition indicated by the woman's expression. Nonetheless, in Wheelock 1995b, p. 39, A Maid Asleep is seen as "a solution for the most vexing problem that he [Vermeer] posed for himself: how to convey the melan-
cholic moods of his history paintings [is that their “mood?”] in scenes drawn from daily life.” See also note 24 below.

8. See W. Robinson 1987 and Krempel 2000, figs. 15, 18, 19, 39, 44.

9. See Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 18–26, which refers to the earlier contributions of Von Sonnenburg (1973) and Kahr (1972).

10. The same dog, to judge from its markings, sits quietly in Diana and Her Companions (Mauritshuis, The Hague).

11. As noted in New York–London 2001, p. 122, the pillow with gold trim on the chair seems to have come from the same shop as the brown coat with gold buttons thrown on top of the table carper in The Procuress. Among the motifs that were eliminated from A Maid Asleep was some blocky form, perhaps a side table or chair, which was set against the lower part of the wall at the right edge of the composition (see Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 18, pl. 8).

12. See the brief description in Von Sonnenburg 1973, text by fig. 88.

13. For the autoradiograph revealing Vermeer’s grape leaves, see Ainsworth et al. 1982, pl. 10a. Comparable motifs by Van Aelst and De Bergh are found in New York–London 2001, nos. 2, 8.

14. Before the added drapery partly covered these “male” and “female” forms, their encounter must have been suggestive, as similar objects often are in pictures by Jan Steen (q.v.). Vermeer himself, in The Procuress, had just juxtaposed a glass and the erect neck of a lute to clarify the consequences of dropping a coin into the young woman’s outstretched hand (see New York–London 2001, p. 366). In A Maid Asleep, the alignment of the knife and spoon is, in formal terms, awkward and surprising, unless one allows for their intended symbolism in an earlier state of the composition.

15. These white glazed faience vessels were made in Delft. For a similar wine pitcher with a pewter lid, see Newark–Denver 2001–2, no. 65.

16. See Ainsworth et al. 1982, pl. 8, where the plate appears in an autoradiograph.


20. The image of Cupid and a mask on the ground is probably adored, as several writers have noted (following Kahr 1972), from illustrations in Otto van Veen’s Amorum emblemata (Antwerp, 1608). In one emblem, Cupid steps on the mask and holds up a ring, to show that “love requires sincerity.” In another, an image of Cupid with a discarded mask is elucidated in a quarran that begins, “Love in what’er he doth, doth not disguise his face” (see Nash 1991, p. 61). It is possible that the mask was meant as a cautionary note in A Maid Asleep, but the mood remains amorous. The emphasis on melancholy found in Wheelock 1999b, chap. 3, seems to the present writer wide of the mark, and requires the strained interpretation of the dog that was painted out as “a traditional symbol for fidelity” (p. 41). The dog in Frans Hals’s Young Man and Woman in an Inn (Pl. 59), or in The Suitor’s Visit, by Ter Borch (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), would have been a better guide; see Wheelock 1999a, pp. 26–29, where the little playing is left unexplained. The dog as a symbol of Luxuria (lust) is mentioned in Kolfin 2001, p. 50, and is seen in ibid., figs. 44, 53, 61 (Dutch engravings). On the dog in Vermeer’s picture, where it “implied a romantic partner,” see Salomon 1998a, p. 100. On the mask, see also ibid., p. 101.


23. As it is reasonably described in Wheelock 1981, p. 370.


26. The ringlike motif is identified as the handle of a key in Donhauser 1993, where the implications are fully explained. See also Fransis 1992a, pp. 69–70, and, for the kind of belt on which keys were sometimes worn by Dutch women, Newark–Denver 2001–2, p. 166, no. 24.

27. Salomon 1998b, pp. 316–19, fig. 11.

28. Nash 1991, p. 57, offers perceptive remarks on this “almost stereoscopic” quality, noting that the scene would appear three-dimensional precisely because of “the discrepant views afforded by two eyes and the shifts of perspective discovered by slight shifting of the head,” but then “the two-dimensional harmonies would vanish.”

REFERENCES: Hoct 1752–70, vol. 1 (1752), p. 34, no. 8, records the Amsterdam sale of May 16, 1696, in which the painting is described as “Een dronke slappe en Meyd een Tafel”; Blanc 1861, vol. 2, p. 4 (within the section on Van der Meer), lists as in the 1696 sale; Thoré 1866, pp. 142 (no. 8), 162 (no. 18), mistakenly identifies no. 8 in the Amsterdam sale of 1696 with a work in the author’s own collection (later attributed to Esaias Bousse); Livre 24, part 1 (1881), p. 267 (ill. opp. p. 264, engraving by Charles Courtry), announces the Wilson sale, and describes the subject as a sleeping maidservant; Havard 1888, pp. 98, no. 48 (ill. p. 21, engraving), lists the work in a catalogue of paintings by Vermeer, as La Dormeuse, formerly in the Wilson collection; Perrot 1890 (ill. p. 175, engraving), no comment in text; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1898, p. 104, no. 88 (ill. p. 105), as in the Rodolphe Kinn collection, Paris; Bode 1900, p. III, no. 13 (ill.); E. Michel 1901, p. 393, describes the subject as Jeune fille endormie; Marguiller 1903, p. 24 (ill. p. 28), briefly mentions the work as in the Kinn collection; “The Dutch Exhibition at the Guildhall: Article I—The Old Masters,” Burlington Magazine 2, no. 4 (June 1903), p. 55 (ill. p. 50), as “The Cook Asleep,” an authentic work by Vermeer, although “there is little of his characteristic technique displayed in the treatment of the accessories”; Rinder 1904, p. 357, remarks that the painting was long “on offer to the authorities of the Cassel Gallery at a relatively small sum,” but is now in the Kinn collection; Bode 1907, vol. 1, pp. 91, 90, no. 89 (ill. opp. p. 90); Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), p. 289, no. 16, as “A Girl Asleep,” with Duveen Brothers in London (August 1907), describes the composition and gives provenance; W. Martin 1907, p. 21 (ill. opp. p. 22), mentions the painting in connection with the Girl with a Flute; Nicolle

supports Slive’s interpretation, and identifies the picture with a work in the Amsterdam sale of 1737 (see Ex Coll.); Amsterdam 1976, pp. 81 n. 4, 146, fig. 33b, compares *The Idle Servant* by Maes; Fowles 1976, p. 40, cites the work among Altman’s important purchases from Duveneu; Wright 1976, pp. 8, 23, 75–76, 81–83, pl. 4 (detail ill. p. 23), claims that “modern museological propriety has prevented the picture’s real title being used,” citing as the real title the auctioneer’s description in 1696; Van Straaten 1977a, pp. 21, 27, figs. 25, 38, places the work among other Dutch paintings depicting sleep: Blankert 1978b, pp. 13, 28–29, 73, 76 n. 46, pp. 156, 167, no. 4, pl. 43, 45 (details), pl. 4, repeats Blankert 1975a in translation; Zafar 1978, p. 207, supposes that Cézanne’s *Young Italian Girl* derives from this painting, which was known to the artist when it was in Parisian collections in the 1880s and 1890s; Snow 1979 (see Snow 1994); Hibbard 1980, p. 348, fig. 622, as probably from 1677; Seth 1980, pp. 19, 37 n. 13, p. 38, fig. 3, rejects interpretations of the picture as a warning against sloth or drunkenness, suggesting that the young woman is dreaming of love; Hauser 1981, p. 195, fig. 10 (detail), observes how the artist dwells over details of the table carpet’s pattern; Naumann 1981, vol. 1, pp. 31 n. 11, 33 n. 25, describes the work as contemporaneous with De Hooch’s courtsey scenes of 1668; Slates 1981, pp. 24, 25 (ill.), describes the painting as a transitional work, treating the themes of idleness and intemperance; Wheelock 1981, p. 74, pl. 6, dates the picture to about 1677, describes the subject, notes changes to the composition, and concludes that the “girl” languishes in a melancholic state; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 18–25, 102, pls. 6, 7, 7a (X-radiograph and details), 8–10 (autoradiographs), 8a, 10a (details of autoradiographs), describes changes (mostly in the choice of motifs) that were made by the artist in the course of work; Mayer-Meintschel 1982, p. 98 n. 14, cites the work among those by Vermeer including the painting of Cupid in the background; D. Smith 1983, p. 698 n. 11, criticizes Naumann 1981 on the question of who painted a white pitcher first, and implausibly concludes that “Van Mieris had much more to learn from Vermeer than the latter did from him”; C. Brown 1984, p. 26 (ill.), 48, speculates insightfully on the real meaning of the picture; Pops 1984, pp. 21, 41–42, 68, 96, 98–99, 103 n. 31, figs. 12, 13 (diagram), considers the subject self-indulgence, and offers a highly subjective reading of the composition and motifs; P. Sutton in Philadelphia-Berlin-London 1984, p. liv, comments on the suggestion of space; Aillaud, Blankert, and Montias 1986, pp. 40, 51, 72, 90, 92–93, 172–73, 208, 224, no. 4, pl. IV, fig. 50 (detail), repeats comments and catalogue information from Blankert 1978b; Hedinger 1986, p. 94, notes how a motif like the table carpet in this painting is modified in other pictures by Vermeer; P. Sutton 1986, pp. 199, 192, fig. 260, briefly describes the subject and its description in the 1696 sale; Schama 1987a, p. 208, as seen here, “drunken sleep became a standard *topes* in Dutch genre painting towards the middle of the seventeenth century”; Wheelock 1987, p. 410, reports on how autoradiography has revealed substantial revisions in the course of painting this picture; Reuterswärd 1988, pp. 51, 58–59, fig. 1, disputes the moralizing reading of this painting (as in Slive 1968 and Kahr 1972); Montias 1989, pp. 124–35, 145, 149–52, 182, 191–92, 248, 265, fig. 25, calls the painting “Vermeer’s first true genre picture,” describes its subject and composition, notes the respectable price it fetched in the 1696 sale, and suggests that the painting and a few others of about the same date may have helped to repay the loan that Vermeer received from Pieter van Ruyven in 1675; Raphael 1989 [not seen, summarized in Greub 2004]; Liedtke 1990, p. 48, fig. 36 (Altman gallery view); Nash 1991, pp. 24, 46, 54, 56–62, 79, 125–26 (ill. pp. 18–19, 55, 57 [overall and details]), as “possibly the first piece that Pieter van Ruyven acquired from Vermeer,” discusses the subject in detail, and describes the composition (with particular attention to space) in what is perhaps the best formal analysis in print; Wheelock in Krakow 1991, p. 17, figs. 14, 15 (overall and detail of X-radiograph), imagines the same woman to have modeled for the figure here and in the *Saint Praxedes*: Liedtke 1992d, pp. 96, 99–101, 103 nn. 50, 52, 53, 55, fig. 5, places the painting in the context of Vermeer’s early stylistic development; Broos 1993, p. 313, fig. 6, sees the work as “a logical transition [from Vermeer’s three earlier works] to the remainder of his oeuvre,” and dates it to “shortly after 1656”; Brusati 1993, unpagd, pp. 3, suggests that “Vermeer uses the woman sleeping as a device for gazing at her,” and that he was “less concerned with making a moral judgment” than with “the unmasking of her amorous dreams”; Donhauser 1993, pp. 83–101, figs. 1, 2 (X-radiograph), detects a key in the door, which was often a symbol of domestic duty, and might also have a sexual connotation; Arasse 1994, pp. 17, 29–31, 33, 36, 60, 63, 66, 109 nn. 8, 15, 118 nn. 2, 6, fig. 13, considers the work “a veritable exercise in the construction of space,” and reviews various interpretations of the “picture [of Cupid unmasked]—within-the-picture,” suggesting that Vermeer meant “to hold meaning in suspense”; Snow 1994, pp. xii, 40, 51, 57–58, 60–61, 91–92, 103–4, 123, 146, 150, 152, 186–88 nn. 20, 21, 24, 192 n. 8, 198 n. 14, 208–9 n. 5, 212–13 nn. 13, 17, 26, pls. 25, 26 (detail), 56 (detail), 71 (X-radiograph detail), maintains that the painting “maps complexities between viewer and subject, space and psyche, the image and its other,” and that it conveys a strong sense of “male absence”; Baert 1995, p. 334; M. Bailey 1995, pp. 13, 14, 42–43, no. 6, describes the work as Vermeer’s first carefully composed interior, and explains the subject, which “displays some of the ambiguity which characterizes Vermeer’s later work”; Wheelock 1998b, pp. 27, 31, 39–47, 55, 59–60, 164, figs. 20, 21 (X-radiograph), 27, 28 (details), no. 45, reviews the changes to the composition, compares works by Maes and Carel Fabritius, perceives melancholy in the figure’s pose, and discusses aspects of the painter’s technique; Blankert in Washington–The Hague 1995–96, pp. 35–36, compares earlier sleepers in Dutch genre painting and defends the 1696 sale catalogue’s reference to the figure as a maid; Broos in ibid., pp. 58–59, 65 nn. 87–89, refers to Paillet’s purchase of the painting in a Paris sale of 1811; Wadum in ibid., pp. 74, 77, comments on the awkward perspective, and notes the use of gold leaf on the studs of the chair; Wheelock in ibid., pp. 19–20, 24, 29 n. 44, 88, 108, 180, fig. 6, detects “brooding melancholia” in the figure of the maid and in the “dark, rather claustrophobic corner” where she sits, claims that the high horizon reinforces “the pervasive sense of melancholy” (which no other writer has felt), sees the figure as “an almost mirror image of Saint Praxedes” (in a painting by Felice Ficherelli), and anachronistically suggests that De Hooch inspired the view through the doorway; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, vol. 2, p. 191, cites the picture as Vermeer’s “brief but important response to Maes”; Broos 1996a, pp. 21–26, claims that Le Brun (see Ex Coll.) was “highly taken by the effective manner of painting” in this picture; Francis 1996a, pp. 262, 267, cites the painting as “Vermeer’s first *genre pur*” of about 1657, and describes the genesis of its composition; Hertel 1996, pp. 57, 109, fig. 27, notes how the white pitcher is transformed in other pictures, and draws
attention to Proust’s reference (see Proust [1908] 1976); Larsen 1996, pp. 13, 31, 39 (ill.), 95, no. 1, dates the work remarkably early, to about 1653–54; L. Miller 1996, p. 731, cited among Altena’s purchases from the Karm collection; Nettia 1996, pp. 121–22, mentioned as a very early work; Randol 1996, p. 39, fig. 2, willfully claims that Vermeer merges “the iconicographic indicators of home and brothel” in this picture; De Rook 1996, p. 392, fig. 1, notes the Delft pitcher and identifies the Wanli bowl as Delftware; L. de Vries 1996, p. 201, doubts Wheelock’s (1991b) claim that the young woman is melancholy, not tipsy; Jane ten Brink Goldsmith in S. Muller 1997, p. 411, as inspired by Maes; Luijten in Amsterdam 1997a, pp. 370–71, fig. 6, cites the work as a representation of sleep induced by drinking; Wheelock 1997, pp. 8, 16, pl. 5, fig. 15 (X-radiograph), concludes that the viewer “is allowed great latitude in interpreting the scene”; Costras 1998, pp. 157, 156, 167, discusses Vermeer’s use of small, azure, and ultramarine in the painting; Gaskell 1998, p. 14, introduces Salomon 1998b; Gaskell 1998b, pp. 229–30, discusses Vermeer’s various uses of the painting of Cupid (here in fragmentary form); Levy-van Halm 1998, p. 140, considers where Vermeer obtained his pigments and gold leaf; Nash 1998, p. 59, dates the work slightly before The Letter Reader in Dresden; Salomon 1998a, pp. 83, 98–103, 105–6, figs. 94, 95 (X-radiograph detail), compares Jacob Duck’s Sleeping Courtesan, suggests that Vermeer’s painting “continues the project of refinement begun by the earlier master,” and convincingly describes the meaning of various motifs and of the different stages of the composition; Salomon 1998b, pp. 209, 216–18, figs. 2, 10 (X-radiograph), relates the open doorway and the woman’s pose to the Netherlandish tradition of bordello scenes; Slapkes 1998, p. 88 n. 5, notes the repeated use of the Cupid picture; Wadam 1998, pp. 204, 213–14, 222 n. 61, fig. 3, dates the painting too late (1658–59) in order to justify a comparison with an analogous composition by Samuel Van Hoogstraten, and suggests that it was slightly trimmed; De Winkel 1998, p. 238, fig. 1 (detail), observes that “the servant . . . is shown in a silk jacket, a black cap called a tichel, and earrings,” and, most remarkably, wears a black patch on her left temple, “the height of fashion”; Strouse 1999, p. 611 n., cites the work as one of the five Vermeers in the Hudson-Fulton exhibition of 1909 that are still ascribed to the artist; Gaskell 2000, pp. 50–51, 177, fig. 11, describes Vermeer’s use of the Cupid picture; Liedtke 2000a, pp. 37, 51, 148, 161, 170, 176, 188–89, 191, 194, 201–5, 209, 211, 219, 235–36, 268–69 n. 75, 286 nn. 96, 97, 100, 287 n. 103, 288 nn. 14, 15, 291 n. 113, pl. xx, figs. 161, 262 (detail), discusses the work’s style and subject in the context of Vermeer’s early development, and remarks how the artist, “in almost every instance of adaptation . . . makes shared conventions appear uniquely his own”; Osaka 2000, no. 5, in an illustrated list of all paintings by Vermeer; A. Bailey 2001, pp. 83–86, 97 (ill. p. 84), describes the subject and its “slight air of suspense”; Beaujean 2001, pp. 150–51, 168, discusses the painting on the wall and the composition in general; Chapman 2001, pp. 269 n. 22, 370 n. 47, comments on Vermeer’s simplification of the composition; Fransis in Fransis et al. 2001, pp. 12, 14, 185 n. 16, 187 n. 77, pl. 5, considers the painting to “reflect Vermeer’s response to the innovative formal and thematic developments that began to exert an impact upon Dutch genre painting around 1650”; Hertel 2001, p. 152, discusses “the motif of the pushed-back rug,” meaning the table carpet; Liedtke 2001, pp. 32, 34, 37–38, pl. 5, reprints Liedtke 1992d; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 17, 117, 125, 151–52, 155, 156, 157, 166, 220, 228, 362, 366, 369–71, 372, 377–78, 384, 386 n. 13, 399, no. 67 (ill.), fig. 280 (X-radiograph detail), places the picture in the context of Vermeer’s early work, of painting in Delft, and of contemporary patronage; Nevitt 2003, pp. 203–4, 38, 159, comments on the painting of Cupid and its derivation from Van Veen; Steadman 2001, pp. 62, 168–69, notes that the layout of the interior is less “standardized” than in other paintings by Vermeer; Vergara 2001, p. 68, describes the work as Vermeer’s “first essay of this kind,” and as bought by Van Ruijven; Wheelock and Glass 2001, p. 168, cites the work as in the Hudson-Fulton exhibition of 1909; B. Wolf 2007, pp. 150–51, 274 n. 6, fig. 56, “reveals how, from the very beginning of his career, Vermeer conceives of genre painting in terms different from his peers,” essentially by minimizing “their interest in narrative and emblematic meanings”; M. Hollander 2002, pp. 97–102, 214–15 nn. 60, 69–71, pl. 4, fig. 45 (autoradiograph), discusses the consequences of Vermeer’s revisions, stresses that “an implied male presence” remains, and overinterprets the mirror on the rear wall; Hertel 2003, pp. 611, 614, 615, reviews remarks made about the painting in Gaskell 2000, B. Wolf 2001, and M. Hollander 2002; Vergara in Madrid 2003, pp. 30, 56 n. 16, 206, 216 n. 16, fig. 18, describes what is borrowed and what is distinctive about the painting, and concludes that by reducing (in the course of work) aids to interpretation, Vermeer shifted the emphasis from anecdote to “the psychological state of the figure depicted”; Westermann in ibid., pp. 73, 79, 87, 224, 227, 231, implausibly connects this picture to the camera obscura; P. Sutton in Dublin–Greenwich 2003–4, p. 186, compares The Love Letter by Vermeer in its use of “a doorkijkje, or view to an adjoining space”; Greub 2004, pp. 13–24, 28, 101, 116, 125, 160, 162, 164, 180, 181, 195, 196, figs. 1–7 (X-radiograph detail), reviews the picture’s iconography, with particular attention to Kahn’s (1972) interpretation, and discusses the formal analysis of Raphael 1998; Salomon 2004, pp. 108, 112–13, figs. 92, 93, compares Duck’s Sleeping Courtesan, observing how Vermeer already “softened the sexual narrative” in his painting’s initial stage; Secrest 2004, pp. 77, 498, listed among works sold by Dvoozen; Westermann 2004, p. 18, fig. 11, admires the synthesis of “an older pictorial tradition of high-life ladies in a drunken stupor with Maes’s clever paintings of dozing maids”; Neumeister in Rotterdam–Frankfurt 2004–5, p. 178, fig. 2, compares the subject of Ter Borch’s Woman Drinking Wine in Frankfurt; D’Adda 2005, p. 84, finds the “condition of the girl” hard to define; Huerta 2005, pp. 54, 98, notes the painting on the wall as “a kind of visual key unlocking a doorway into the psychological world of the young woman” (p. 98); Krempel 2006, p. 66, does the same; Liedtke 2005a, p. 192, mentions the picture in a review of Dutch paintings made for specific patrons or locations; Van der Ploeg and Rania 2005, p. 24, illustrates the picture as one of the works in the 1666 Dissius sale; Kobayashi-Sato 2006, p. 216, describes the spatial effect of the doorframe.

EX COLL.: Probably Pieter Claesz van Ruijven, Delft (until d. 1674); probably his widow, Maria de Kruydt, Delft (1674–d. 1681); probably their daughter, Magdalen van Ruijven, Delft (1681–d. 1682); her widower, Jacob Abrahamsz Diasius (1662–d. 1695; his estate sale, Amsterdam, May 16, 1696, no. 8, as “Een dronke slappeene Meyd en een Tafel,” for fl 62; probably Amsterdam (auctioneer V. Posthumus), December 19, 1737, no. 37, “Een Slapent Vrouwtje, van de Delfse van der Meer” (“A sleeping woman, by the Delft van der Meer”), sold to Carpi for 8 guilders, 5 stuivers; [probably J. B. P. Le Brun, Paris, in 1811]; Smith van Alphen et al., sale, Paris (Le Brun), April 14th, 1811, no. 150 (FFr 60 to Paillet); [Alexandre-Joseph Paillet, Paris, in 1811]; John Waterloo Wilson, Paris (after 1873–1881; his sale, Paris, March 14–16, 1881, no. 116, to Sedelmeyer); [Sedelmeyer, Paris, 1881; sold to Kann for FFr 12,000]; Rodolphe Kann, Paris (1881–d. 1905; his estate, 1905–7; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, London, 1907–8; sold to Altman]; Benjamin Altman, New York (1908–d. 1913); Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.611

1. Published for the first time by Broos in Washington–The Hague 1995–96, p. 65 n. 87. In a letter dated August 23, 2005, Burton Fredericksen noted that the painting (which is fully described in the sale catalogue) was most likely consigned by the art dealer and auctioneer J. B. P. Le Brun. On Paillet, see Edwards 1996, where three other paintings by Vermeer are discussed (pp. 161–64).

203. Young Woman with a Water Pitcher

Oil on canvas, 18 x 16 in. (45.7 x 40.6 cm)
The painting is exceptionally well preserved.
Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.21

This painting of about 1662 is one of Vermeer's most beautiful works, a picture in which passages of extraordinary observation are poised within a classic composition. The canvas was the first of eight paintings by Vermeer to enter American collections in the course of a quarter century. In 1887, Henry Marquand, the Museum's trustee, treasurer, and future president, purchased the picture (for $800) from the Paris dealer Charles Paillet, and two years later it became the first Vermeer to enter a public collection in the United States, as part of Marquand's gift of thirty-seven paintings to the Museum.1

The picture's exceptional appeal could be said to derive from its careful distillation of qualities found in other works by Vermeer, with respect to both subject and style. The focus on a single figure recalls that in The Letter Reader (Young Woman Reading a Letter), of about 1657 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), and in The Milkmaid, of about 1657–58 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). In each case, a woman is discovered standing alone near a window in the corner of a room, next to a table supporting a superbly painted still life of household objects. The Letter Reader represents a lovely young lady who is absorbed by words that have been confided to her, while the "milkmaid" (actually a kitchen servant) concentrates on an apparently pleasant moment in her daily routine. The Young Woman with a Water Pitcher is one of a small group of paintings dating from about 1662–65 in which isolated women also appear, but are more idealized, as mistresses of their private domains. Among the other pictures of this type, one would include the Woman in Blue Reading a Letter in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (fig. 252), Woman with a Pearl Necklace (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), Woman with a Balance (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), and perhaps A Lady Writing (also in Washington), but not Woman with a Lute (pl. 204), given its air of eager romance. The woman in the Marquand canvas finds her closest counterpart in the Amsterdam letter reader, who is presented in a pose quite like that of the fashionable beauty in Dresden, but seems nonetheless a model of domestic virtue.

As if to stress their analogous subjects, the Woman in Blue Reading a Letter and the Young Woman with a Water Pitcher have similar compositions: an immobile figure is placed in a middle zone of space and in the middle of the picture field, and is embraced by geometric forms. In abstract terms, the design consists of a conical figure framed by three rectangular
of light and shadow, atmosphere, and the indistinct merging of forms. Gowing dared to describe the Marquand picture as "the most primitive of its type," by which he meant that it was more obviously composed, with contours, shapes, and colors carefully balanced, rather than blended together in a more muted and seemingly effortless design. To express Gowing's thought in less eccentric words, the painting is one of the first examples of Vermeer's mature style.4

The picture's exquisite sense of order and harmony was achieved by balancing positive and negative shapes, carefully aligning contours, restricting the palette mostly to whites and values of the three primary colors, and suspending animation through an intense study of light effects. The impression of equilibrium is also embodied in the woman's pose, which coincidentally resembles that employed in Rembrandt's Aristotle with a Bust of Homer (Pl. 131) and in other works by artists who drew upon the classical tradition. The admirable but rather deliberate doveretailing of motifs that one finds in earlier compositions by Vermeer, such as The Glass of Wine, of about 1658–59 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin), continues here in the way the woman's left arm extends the contours of the pitcher, and the manner in which the bar of the map tucks into the angle of her shoulder and head. Such calculations become evident with time, but their immediate effect is one of grace and tranquillity.

These refinements of design are perfectly suited to Vermeer's subject, which is an idealized view of feminine beauty and virtue. It has been suggested that the serenity of this work is such that "any recognizable narrative" is hard to discern.5 While it is true that most contemporary genre painters defined everyday situations more explicitly, it is also likely that a discerning critic of the period would have recognized that in Vermeer's picture a moment of real experience had been artfully transformed. The head and shoulder coverings were worn during a woman's toilet, an occasion indicated more clearly by the basin and pitcher. The woman has just taken the pitcher by the handle, as the servant does in Gerard ter Borch's A Young Woman at Her Toilet with a Maid (Pl. 13). The familiar ritual would end with her putting on jewelry; a strand of pearls on a blue ribbon is draped over the edge of the jewelry box. That she opens the window does not disturb, but enhances, the sense of unselfconscious activity. The woman is alone in the room, although a maid or two would be expected in such a house. The interior is spare but reveals several signs of luxury: the silver-gilt basin and pitcher, the antique jewelry box, the pearls, the table carpet, the varnished map, and the leaded-glass window. The woman's dress completes the impression of a comfortable and quietly elegant life.
Vermeer was the least didactic of Dutch artists who were concerned with domestic subjects, so that the basin and pitcher’s traditional symbolism of purity functions here as a naturalistic attribute, rather than as a key to meaning. A literate amateur might have observed, as several scholars have, that the jewelry box and the map hint at vanity and worldliness—of which the woman in this picture would never be accused.6

The artist’s preoccupation with the appearance of natural light intensified in the 1660s. Here the modulation of light on the rear wall, on the figure, and on the table carpet contributes greatly to the sense of actual space. A few shadows suggest distance, such as that of the lion’s head finial on the chair to the right; but subtle contrasts and transitions of light and shadow do more to create a sense of volume in the room in its entirety, and on surfaces like that of the woman’s skirt. Although every effect is subordinated to the whole, individual motifs and passages are turned into virtuoso performances of perception and description. The woman’s hands and forearms are rendered as if their anatomy were unknown, in blurred shapes suggesting slight movement and the intensity of daylight. The milky glass of the window casts a subdued and shifting band of light onto the edge of the window sash, utterly transforming a streak of daylight that might otherwise have resembled those on the edge of the doorway in A Maid Asleep (Pl. 202). Light filters through the woman’s white linen coverings, so that the shapes of her head and neck and the top of her jacket are more or less revealed, depending on the directness of light from the window. Her face is illuminated and abstracted by the flow of light, which is mostly filtered through the veil of material resting against the right side of her head. Of course, the most conspicuous instance of illusionistic description is found in the basin and pitcher. The former gleams with sunlight on the interior and reflects the table carpet on the exterior, turning the fabric pattern into flecks of color like those cast by stained glass.7 Below the dazzling highlight on the pitcher’s handle, the blue and red streaks on the right side of the vessel mirror the blue garment on the back of the chair and the red fabric inside the lid of the jewelry box.

Some of the technical means by which Vermeer achieved his optical and other effects—namely, the choice of imprimatura tones, of pigments, and of applications such as the overlapping of thin layers of paint to produce blurred contours like those of the woman’s skirt—have been ably discussed by scholars and conservators in recent years.8

See Broos in Washington–The Hague 1995–96, pp. 148–50, on the picture’s history (p. 150 n. 14 for this clarification, which was kindly corroborated for me by Esnée Quodbach).

2. The map was first identified in Wels 1975, pp. 534–75.

3. The changes made in both paintings during the course of work are described in Wheelock 1987, pp. 390–91, 398–99, figs. 1, 2, 10–12.

4. Gowing 1970, p. 131, for the quote. Gowing’s description of the picture is also discussed in Liedtke 2000a, pp. 226–27. It will be recalled that the term “primitive” had more positive associations in Gowing’s day. The picture’s design is further described in Wheelock 1981, pp. 114–16, and by the present writer in New York–London 2001, pp. 379–81.

5. Wheelock in Washington–The Hague 1995–96, p. 146. See, for example, Nash 1991, p. 96; Liedtke 2000a, p. 228. In Wheelock 1995b, pp. 107–8, the map is read more closely, so that the woman is suspected of having “an absent loved one” south of the border.

7. A large color detail of these motifs is reproduced in Washington–The Hague 1995–96, p. 149.
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as about 1658–60, describes the subject; Gerson 1967, col. 742, proposes a date before 1660; Koningsberger 1967, pp. 16, 17 (ill.), 26, 27 (detail), 147–48, as from about 1665, admires various details and compares Chardin; Norman 1970, p. 199 (ill.), compares a work by Edward Hopper; Standen in Boston 1970, p. 45, perceives "ineffable timelessness and serenity"; Tomkins 1970, p. 74, "the first Vermeer to enter an American museum"; New York 1970–71, p. 261, no. 283 (ill. pp. 56, 261), "a very typical work by Vermeer," who is "rivaled only by Leonardo in the rarity of his authentic works"; Fry 1972, vol. 1, p. 255 n. 1, listed, and, pp. 254–55, letter no. 191 (June 16, 1906), thanks Robert de Forest for defending him (Fry) against the accusation that the painting by Vermeer had been overcleaned by him; Gallego and Mégret 1973, pp. 49, 58, asks any questions about the work; Mistel 1973, unlined (ill.), dates the picture about 1662–63; Nordenfalk 1973, p. 247, fig. 21, sees a "silent dialogue between interior and exterior"; Von Sonnenburg 1973, figs. 80 (detail), 81 (detail, before conservation), 91 (X-radiograph detail), discusses the paints employed to achieve various effects in this "extremely well preserved" work; Walsh 1973, unlined (ill. and fig. 7), dates the painting to the early 1660s and finds "optical truth" in how the woman's hands and arms are described; Grimm 1974, pp. 54, 56, 105, no. 18 (ill. and frontisp.); as from about 1662–63; Blankert 1974a, pp. 59–60, 62, 109, 146–47, 159, no. 12, pl. 12, dates the picture about 1662 and reviews its provenance, mistakenly stating that Marquand bought the picture as a De Hooch; Welti 1975, pp. 314–35, fig. 5, identifies the wall map of the Netherlands as one published by Huysck Allart; Wright 1976, pp. 11, 39, 79, 82–83, pls. III and IV, considers the work one of Vermeer's best, and "most carefully thought out"; Menzel 1977, pp. 35, pls. 39–41 (details and whole), observes the dominant blue tonality, the light filling the room, and the woman's reflective expression, Van Straaten 1977a, pp. 41, no. 8, "classic," with nothing anecdotical; Welti 1977, vol. 1, pp. 43–44, no. 2, vol. 2, fig. 56, identifies the wall map of the Netherlands as one published by Allart; Blankert 1978b, pp. 62, 73, 119–60, no. 12, pl. 12, repeats Blankert 1975a in translation; Fuchs 1978, p. 50, fig. 40, "of 1660–65," and the subject is tranquility itself; Perl 1979, pp. 118–21 (ill.), describes the picture at length (without actually saying much) and relates it to the then current "New Realism" movement; Hibbard 1980, pp. 144–45, fig. 1, an "absolute masterpiece"; Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 68, approves Blankert's dating (about 1665); Stalke 1981, pp. 50, 51 (ill.), as from about 1662, tentatively connects the figure's immobility with "the requisites of the camera obscura"; Wheelock 1981, pp. 44, 48, 114, 116, pl. 26, 27, dates the picture about 1664–65, and describes its composition and the technical means by which the artist achieved some of his effects; Mayer-Meintschel 1982a, p. 93 n. 15, finds the same costume in other works by Vermeer; Pops 1984, pp. 8, 15, 15, 18, 26, 29, 41, 46, 53, 55, 89, 95, figs. 5–7 (overall and diagrams), describes how Vermeer "affirms and subverts the indices of perspective" in a work such as this one; P. Sutton in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, p. LV, fig. 100, compares Ter Borch and Frans van Mieris, and observes that the balance and restraint found in this and similar works are "scarcely the result of influence"; Attiland, Blankert, and Montias 1986, pp. 47, 50, 108–9, 112, 180–81, no. 13, fig. 38 (detail), pl. XI, notes that the painter's mother-in-law owned a silver-gilt pitcher, sees the influence of Van Mieris, and questions what the woman is doing; Hedinger 1986, pp. 94–95, 98–99, 102–3 (cover ill. and as fig. 91), claims that the picture contemplates a "moral-political
theme”; P. Sutton 1986, p. 189, fig. 270, “one of a series of four compositions”; Heding 1987a, p. 159, fig. 11, offers a completely implausible interpretation of the map, the pitcher, and its supposed reflection in the window; Heding 1987b, pp. 53 (ill.), 57, repeats the lines in Heding 1987a; Wheelock 1987, pp. 381, 390–91, 412 n. 15, figs. 1, 2 (reflectogram details), describes Vermeer’s changes to the composition in the course of work; Montias 1989, pp. 190, 266, fig. 45, notes the use in two other works by Vermeer of a window with the same pattern of lead millons as in the present picture, and observes that the painting is not cited in known inventories of the seventeenth century; Liedtke 1990, pp. 17, 36, 40, fig. 1, considers Marquand’s acquisition in a broad historical context; Nash 1991, pp. 26, 28, 31, 94, 96–98 (ill.), mentions the old attribution to Metsu and the supposed attribution to De Hoogh, discusses qualities in the painting suggesting the use of the camera obscura, and describes the work’s style and subject; Boone 1991–92, pp. 52, 68, fig. 2, emphasizes the work’s prominence among the thirteen paintings by Vermeer that have entered American collections; Liedtke 1992d, pp. 92, 102–3, fig. 9, describes the picture as an example of Vermeer’s mature work; Hamlyn 1993, p. 193 (cover ill.), assumes that Robert Vernon inherited the painting from his father in 1801, or from a close relative; Arasse 1994, pp. 50, 64, 113 n. 17, fig. 29, imagines a male figure outside; N. Schneider 1994, pp. 35 (detail), 62, 64 (ill.), 67 (detail), as dating from about 1664–65, the woman “torn between conflicting desires” of vanity and moderation; Snow 1994, pp. xi, 61, 104, 116, 139, 161, 164, 168 n. 5, 183 n. 16, 212–13 nn. 11, 22, pl. 6a, analyzes a “series of female subjects inaugurated by” this picture, and perceives the woman here as “a barely embodied, almost weightless presence holding in place a world created by light”; Baetjer 1995, p. 334 (ill. p. 335); M. Bailey 1995, pp. 14, 80–81, no. 24, describes the action, the light, and the map; Wheelock 1995b, pp. 104–11, figs. 75, 76 (infrared reflectogram), 77, 78, 79 (details), A19, as dating from about 1664–65, the “purest” of Vermeer’s pictures in which narrative is suspended in favor of contemplation or abandonedness; Wheelock 1996c, p. 273, detects the borrowing of the silver basin in a modern forgery of a Vermeer; Blankert in Washington–The Hague 1995–96, p. 40, wonders what the woman is doing; Broos in ibid., p. 61, cited as the first Vermeer in America; Broos and Wheelock in ibid., pp. 140, 146–51, 166, no. 11 (ill., overall and detail, and on back cover), fig. 2 (infrared reflectogram), sees the artist working here “in a Neo-platonist manner,” and considers the room and its furnishings to reveal “nature’s underlying order”; Wheelock in ibid., p. 25, fig. 11 (detail), shows how Vermeer described the contour of the blue skirt with a diffused stroke of paint; Buvelot 1996, p. 18, fig. 7, briefly describes the compositional changes that Vermeer made in the course of work; Dücking 1996, pp. 133–37 (ill. and two details), dates the painting to about 1664–65, and confines comments to the subjects of light and especially the palette (with special attention to ultramarine); Frants 1996a, pp. 261, 265, fig. 2, describes the two ground layers, and the chair that was painted out; Larsen 1996b, pp. 18, 33, 98–99, no. 9 (ill. pp. 98–60), feels that the picture, with its absence of symbolism and “oriental immobility,” is of interest for Buddhist philosophy; Netta 1996, pp. 131, 148–55, fig. 31, describes the map, discusses the composition with particular attention to effects of space and light, and questions Heding’s (1986) interpretation; Westermann 1996, pp. 39, 83, fig. 21, speculates about effects in this picture that might indicate Vermeer’s use of the camera obscura; Zandvliet in The Hague 1996a, p. 71 (ill. opp. p. 75 [detail]), feels that the map on the wall is there because maps were a common form of interior decoration at the time; Alpers 1997, pp. 66–67, fig. 41, reminds fellow academics that the painting is small; Liedtke 1997, pp. 126–27, in a discussion of style and expression, compares the composition with that of Rembrandt’s Aristotle; Wheelock 1997, p. 38, pl. 17, dates the picture about 1664–65, and suggests that Vermeer found “in such quiet moments of contemplation . . . a window into an individual’s spiritual nature”; Costaras 1998, pp. 150, 155–56, 157, 161, 167, discusses the picture’s size in relation to other works by Vermeer, its ground layers and their importance for final color effects, and the use of ultramarine in the window; Netta 1998, p. 263, considers the figure self-absorbed; Wadum 1998, pp. 205, 209, observes that Vermeer employs overlapping contours and colored shadows in this picture, to optical effect; De Winkel 1998, p. 329, describes the woman’s nachtwacht (nightgown), and hoofdcape (head scarf), which were worn in bed, when getting dressed, or as informal wear during the day; Strouse 1999, pp. 563, 565, mentions Marquand’s gift of the painting to the Museum, and its inclusion in the Hudson-Fulton exhibition; Gaskell 2000, p. 177, describes the usual hanging of the picture; Liedtke 2000a, pp. 18, 132, 191, 202, 207, 213, 217, 220, 226–28, 233, 238, 242, 259 n. 64, pl. xxvi, fig. 282, discusses the painting’s probable dating at length (suggesting about 1661–62), compares other compositions by Vermeer, explains why Gowing (1970) considered this work “the most primitive of its type,” considers various passages of observation and Vermeer’s rivalry with other painters, and concludes that the image would not have been seen in its own day as “timeless” but as “a moment of real experience artfully transformed”; Liedtke 2000b, p. 243 (ill.), characterizes the figure as seemingly “less the bearer of bad tidings about material riches than the very (male) image of domestic tranquility”; Osaka 2000, p. 201, no. 17, in an illustrated list of all paintings by Vermeer; A. Bailey 2000, pp. 111, 133, 145 (ill.), notes that some scholars suggest the influence of De Hooch; Beugense 2001, p. 104, identifies the map by Allart; Chapman 2001, pp. 238, 251–52, 254–55, 257, 265–65, 267, fig. 15, discusses the woman’s social position and the type of interior, compares the figure and setting in The Milkmaid, and concludes that the woman with a water pitcher evokes thoughts of “innocence, purity, and cleanliness,” and thus becomes “virtually the personification of these fundamental feminine domestic virtues”; Frants in Frants et al. 2001, p. 21, pl. 18, describes some of the means by which Vermeer attains “an unprecedented level of refinement” in this picture; Hertel 2001, p. 153, compares the orderly table carpet with that in Vermeer’s Geographer; Leider 2001, pp. 99 (ill.), 100, admires in this work the “simple unclouded sincerity with which the Dutch bourgeoisie elevated their everyday lives to a status that was almost holy”; Liedtke 2001, pp. 30, 39, pl. 18, reprints Liedtke 1992d; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 112, 117, 156, 158, 161–62, 164–65, 162, 165, 170–81, 383, no. 71 (ill.), discusses the picture as typical of Vermeer’s mature work in the 1660s, notes similarities with Carol Fabritius and Emanuel de Witte, observes how Vermeer used his sources in a highly selective way, and how “the painting’s design exquisitely suits its subject, which is an idealized view of feminine beauty and virtue”; Netta 2001, p. 30 (ill.), with no comment; Rüger 2001, pp. 59–60, fig. 30, describes some of the formal means by which Vermeer created this “timeless image of virtue and domesticity”; Steadman 2001, pp. 133, 168–69, 193–94 n. 8, fig. 28c (diagram of
window), concedes that the author’s hypothesis that Vermeer traced scenes with a camera obscura is frustrated by a lack of floor tiles in this picture (and in actual Dutch homes); Wheelock and Glass 2001, pp. 167, 168, 216 n. 21, recalls Marquand’s gift of the painting to the Museum, and its admiration in the Hudson-Fulton exhibition of 1909; B. Wolf 2001, p. 71, fig. 28 (detail), sees the lion’s head finial as “a miniaturized version of the male spectator”; Vergara in Madrid 2003, pp. 170–71, 172, 174, 233–34, n. 34 (cover ill. [detail]), dates the painting to about 1662–63, comments on the picture’s subject and style, and compares approximately contemporaneous works by the artist; Westermann in ibid., pp. 82, 83, 87, 228, 230, 231, describes the setting as “a space for polite social ritual and introspective quiet,” and the figure as contemplative and elegant; Franks 2004, pp. 170, 172, 233, 238 (ill. [detail]), 287 n. 75, 288 n. 85, fig. 156, observes how Vermeer’s smooth technique suits the painter’s primary interest in light, and how his suppression of narrative establishes “an air of reticence and introspection”; Greub 2004, pp. 125, 176, 177, 178, 181, 195, 196, fig. 74, noted among unsigned works by Vermeer, and recycles tired observations concerning the viewer’s gaze; Korthals Altes in Rotterdam–Frankfurt 2004–5, p. 248, compares Woman with a Lap (Pl. 204), with a view to dating; D’Adda 2005, p. 112, finds the figure thoughtful; Huerta 2005, pp. 89, 94, 95, 98, 110, considers the description of the fingers behind the window glass an instance of the artist’s “almost uncanny sensitivity to optical laws” (p. 89), and discusses the behavior of light on the woman’s headress; Van der Ploeg and Rumia 2001, p. 12 (under no. 3, ill.), as from about 1664–65, reveals “an aura of serenity and reverie”; P. Rosenberg 2006, p. 118 (ill.).


Ex Coll.: Robert Vernon, Hatley Park, Cambridgeshire, and London (1801–d. 1849; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, April 21, 1877, no. 97, as “Interior, with a lady at a table covered with a carpet, on which is an ever and dish, opening a window” by Metsu, for £404.5 to Colnaghi); [Colnaghi, London, 1877–78; sold (as by Metsu) for £600 to Wingfield]; Mervyn Wingfield, 7th Viscount Powerscourt, Powerscourt, near Enniskerry, County Wicklow, Ireland (1878–87; as by Vermeer); [Agnew, London]; [Bourgeois Frères, Paris]; [Charles Pilet, Paris, 1887; sold to Marquand, reportedly for an amount equivalent to $800]; Henry G. Marquand, New York (1887–89); Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 89.15.21

204. Woman with a Lute

Oil on canvas, 20\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 18 in. (51.4 x 45.7 cm)
Inscribed (on map): EUROPA

The painting has suffered from abrasion throughout, especially in the foreground, where the paint has also darkened with age.

Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 25.110.24

This canvas from the Collis P. Huntington bequest was probably painted about 1662–63, almost certainly a little later than Young Woman with a Water Pitcher (Pl. 203). The arrangement of the table and the silhouetted chair in the foreground, the use of a curtain to cast interesting shadows in the corner by the window, and the greater role of shadows throughout the composition would appear to indicate that the picture was made within a year or so of the Woman with a Pearl Necklace (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) and the Woman with a Balance (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), both of which may be dated about 1663–64. Gowing, with his gift for concise comment and a painter’s view of progress, observed of this work that “henceforward each picture forms a broad and definite pattern of tone.” This is true for the majority of Vermeer’s paintings that date from about 1663 to about 1670, and is especially evident in the so-called pearl pictures, which include the two just cited and A Lady Writing (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.). Each of these paintings has a more muted palette than Vermeer employed in earlier works, and uses shadows and soft contours in an evocative manner. In the same decade, other artists whose work would have been known to Vermeer, among them Pieter de Hooch, Gabriel Metsu, Frans van Mieris, and Emanuel de Witte (q.q.v.), achieved similar atmospheric effects, which tend to create an impression of intimacy or contemplation.

Of pictures painted by Vermeer in the early to mid-1660s, this one is comparatively obvious in its subject matter and conventional in design. The placement of the woman in the composition invites the viewer into the scene, in a manner more assertive than that found in Young Woman with a Water Pitcher or Woman in Blue Reading a Letter (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; see fig. 253). The lively lute player sits at the focus of orthogonal lines, and completes a triangle with the receding tabletop. The map bar presses in upon her, and precisely defines the space in which the lute is held.

The chair in the foreground recalls those in Cavalier and Young Woman, of about 1657, and Young Woman Interrupted at Music, of about 1659–60 (both in the Frick Collection, New York). Here the silhouetted lion’s head finial (which overlaps the lute player’s vivid yellow sleeve) seems to presage the arrival of a suitor, whom the young woman eagerly awaits. The placement of a viola da gamba in the foreground (here, in the worn area to the lower right) had been a common strategy—one that tempts the male viewer—for at least half a century, and is found in contemporary works by artists of less restrained temperament, such as Gerrit Dou (q.v.) and Bartholomeus van der Helst (Pl. 77). The flow of songbooks across the tabletop and onto the floor reinforces the impression that the lutenist anticipates a romantic duet.

In this context, the adjustment of the tuning peg must refer discreetly to temperance, a virtue addressed in other paintings by the artist. The enormous pearl earring and the pearl necklace (which, like the ermine-trimmed jacket, were luxuries not worn every day) identify the lady as a modern Venus in search of an Adonis or Mars. The map of Europe, with ships at sea, may underscore the gentleman’s absence.

Like the canvas from the Marquand Collection (Pl. 203), this one is traceable only from the early nineteenth century. In recent decades, the painting’s condition and, on one occasion, its attribution have been the subject of exaggerated remarks (see Refs.). Despite the wear it has suffered, especially in the shadowy area of the foreground, the painting is entirely typical of Vermeer, who allowed a greater number of demonstrative actors onto his tranquil stage than critics such as Proust have acknowledged.

2. For a review of these pictures, mostly with regard to style, see Liedhe 2000a, pp. 226–42.
3. See the comparison with Hendrick van Steenwyck the Younger’s Lute Player, of about 1615 (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm), in ibid., pp. 232–33, figs. 288, 289.
5. As noted by the present writer in New York-London 2001, p. 383; Naumann in Philadelphia-Berlin-London 1984, p. 140, draws a parallel with an emblem in a book by Jacob Cats that compares sympathetically resonant strings to the strings of a lover’s heart. The viol in Vermeer’s painting, however, is not prominent enough to suggest this notion.
6. Swillens (1960; see Refs.) and other scholars have identified this picture as possibly one that was sold in 1676, or in the 1696
Amsterdam auction of paintings by Vermeer. Neither connection is likely, and the latter picture ("Een speelende Juffrouw op een Guitert") has been convincingly identified with The Guitar Player (Iveagh Bequest, Kenwood, London). See, for example, Van der Ploeg and Runia 2005, pp. 24–25, where a copy of the actual sale catalogue is reproduced.

7. On Marcel Proust’s interest in Vermeer, see Hertel 1996, chaps. 6, 7, and other pages referenced in the index.

References: Hofstede de Groot 1909c, pp. 5–7, no. 43, pl. 43, as "Young Woman Playing the Mandoline"; Stephenson 1909, pp. 168 (ill.), 172, as "Lady with a Lute" and "Lady with Guitar," comments on the light; Valentiner in New York 1909, no. 135, as "Lady with Lute," and mistakenly as from "an English collection," describes the composition, and records a signature (Meer) on the wall beneath the table; Cox 1909–10, p. 246, "a perfect work in perfect condition of the most perfect painter that ever lived"; Breck 1910, p. 37, considers
this a youthful work, influenced by Rembrandt; Fietzsch 1911, pp. 61, 128, no. 30, dates the painting to the second half of the 1660s, on the basis of its amorous undertones; Hale 1931, pp. 178, 258–60, 373 (ill. opp. p. 124), dates the picture to the same period as Young Woman with a Water Pitcher (Pl. 203) and similar works; Gallatin 1917, pp. 389–90, no. 23, as “Lady Playing a Lute,” an “excellent Vermeer”; Johansen 1920, pp. 197–98, tentatively dates the work to about 1665–67; MMA Bulletin 15, no. 8 (August 1920), p. 184, mentions the work as in the 1920 exhibition; Lucas [1922], p. 37, “was enchanted by its quality”; Hansteen 1924, p. 23, pl. 8, tersely compares other works by Vermeer; B. Burroughs 1925a, pp. 142–44 (ill.), notes the arrival of the painting in the MMA; Vansype 1925, p. 87, pl. 39; Wethe 1925, p. 180, compares the placement of the map with that in Young Woman with a Water Pitcher but is cautious as to whether this indicates closeness in date; Chantave 1926, pp. 36–37, 48, 76, 83, 100, dates it to the 1660s and employs various titles, including the incorrect Guitarsitter; Valentinier 1924, p. 324, suggests a date of about or after 1660; Hale 1937, pp. 113–15, pl. 12, as possibly in the 1696 Amsterdam sale of paintings by Vermeer (thus confusing the picture with the Kenwood Vermeer); Fietzsch 1939, pp. 50, 60, no. 19, fig. 30, comments on condition; A. B. de Vries 1939, pp. 47–48, 88, no. 27, fig. 51, dates the picture to about 1663–64 and notes that it has more action than most Vermeers; Trautscholdt 1939, pp. 268, 270, listed as “Gitarrespielerin”; MMA Bulletin, n.s., 1, no. 2 (October 1942), text inside front and back covers (ill. inside front cover, and detail on cover), quotes an appreciation by the American painter Charles Sheeler; Breuning 1944, p. 26, cited among rhyming “treasures”; Blum 1945, p. 33, describes Thore’s attempts to date Vermeer’s pictures according to the hairstyles represented, placing this work in a middle group; E. Gardner 1948, pp. 77 (ill.), 78, observes that the picture “was quite unknown until Mrs. Collis P. Huntington lent it to the Hudson-Fulton Exhibition in the Museum”; A. B. de Vries 1948, pp. 40, 89, pl. 20, repeats A. B. de Vries 1939 in translation, and suggests a date of about 1663–64; Swillens 1990, pp. 31, 52, 67, 72, 79, 80–81, 83, 84, 87, no. 6, pl. 6, as The Guitar-player; possibly the picture of “a person playing the cittern” sold by Vermeer’s widow in 1676 to the baker Hendrick van Buiten, and possibly no. 4 in the 1666 Amsterdam auction of works by Vermeer, identifies various motifs; Gowing 1952, pp. 132–34, no. XVI, pl. 40, states that the painting “forms a broad and definite pattern of tone,” unlike earlier works, and considers it a ruin; Malraux 1952, pp. 16, 18 (detail), 68, 70 (ill.), 71, no. XV, places the work slightly later than Woman with a Balance in Washington, D.C., and The Concert in Boston; V. Bloch 1954, p. 34, pl. 52, as about 1665, maybe the “Sonnatrice di chitarra” sold in 1666; Rousseau 1954, p. 3, a “first-rate” work with a “romantic mood”; Walter 1956, pp. 34, 35, pl. 31; Goldschieder 1958, pp. 5, 38, 197, no. 18, pl. 46 (before cleaning), p. 47 (detail), as about 1664, discusses the cleaning of 1944; Gowing 1961, p. 22, no. 66, pl. 66, “unluckily in poor condition”; De Mirimonde 1961, pp. 37–38, fig. 2, identifies the instrument as a lute, noting that the woman tunes it and waits for a partner who will play the viol; Bianconi 1967, pp. 92 (ill.), 93, no. 27, pls. XV, XLI, as about 1663–64; Gerson 1967, col. 743, dates the picture late in the 1660s; Kooningsberger 1967, pp. 117, 170 (ill.), detects spatial distortion comparable to that occurring in photographs; Faby 1973, p. 316 (under no. 32), fig. 5 (detail), considers the model the same as in Study of a Young Woman (Pl. 203); Von Sonnenburg 1971, figs. 89, 90, compares the previously overpainted and the cleaned state; Walsh 1973, fig. 46, cites earlier paintings of female musicians with erotic significance; Grimme 1974, pp. 77, 106, 107 (ill.), no. 26, fig. 17, dates the picture about 1663–64, and also about 1666 or later; Blankert 1975a, pp. 162 (under no. 28), 166, no. 81, pl. 81, rejects the picture on the peculiar grounds that it is damaged; Welu 1975, pp. 535–36, fig. 7, identifies the map as one by Jodocus Hondius that was published about 1613, or the second state, printed by Joan Blaeu in 1619; Wright 1976, pp. 12, 48 (ill.), 79, 84–85, fig. 22, as unsigned, in poor condition, but “Vermeer’s spirit, nevertheless, shines through”; Gerson 1977, p. 289, makes remarkably ill-informed comments about the condition of this picture and the authenticity of others; Menzel 1977, pp. 52–53, pl. 38, describes the accord of blue and yellow, discusses the simple composition and the cleaning of “1944” (1944); Blankert 1978b, pp. 169 (under no. 28), 171, no. 81, as much damaged, and (wrongly) as bequeathed to the MMA in 1897; C. Brown 1980, p. 66, rejects Blankert’s doubts about the picture; Hibbard 1980, p. 348, mentioned in passing as “damaged”; Slonaker 1981, pp. 60, 61 (ill.), as from about 1662–65, defends the work’s authenticity; Wheelock 1981, pp. 112, 161 n. 81, pl. 23, dates the picture about 1664, discusses the composition, imagines that Vermeer “may well have used some perspective aid here,” and acknowledges Blankert’s reservations; Naumann in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, pp. 340–41, no. 117, pl. 107, as from the mid-1660s, describes the subject and composition, identifies the songbook, notes the romantic theme, and (in contrast to most earlier authors) gives a reliable account of the painting’s condition, based upon H. von Sonnenburg’s report, of 1964, in the Museum’s files; Pols 1984, pp. 35, 98, figs. 33, 34 (diagram), “recounts the ambiguity of moral status”; Aillaud, Blankert, and Montias 1986, pp. 167 n. 55, 170 n. 98, 196, 199, 224, no. 81, pl. 81, considers the picture problematic, and dates it 1662–63; Hedinger 1986, pp. 99, 103–4, fig. 98, offers an impossible literal interpretation of the lute and map; P. Sutton 1986, pp. 189–90, compares Van der Helst’s Musician (Pl. 77); Hedinger 1987a, p. 162, fig. 12, repeats Hedinger 1986; Hedinger 1987b, p. 57, fig. 10, repeats the same; Montias 1987, p. 73, discusses the question of whether this picture could be identical with the “person playing on a cittern” by Vermeer in a seventeenth-century Delft collection (Van Buiten); Liedtke 1988, p. 101, fig. 5–12, compares earlier Netherlandish pictures with regard to pictorial space; Montias 1989, pp. 191, 217, 250, 265–66, finds the “yellow satin mantle trimmed with white fur” cited in the inventory of Vermeer’s estate in this picture and in five other paintings by Vermeer, and repeats Montias 1987 on the question of Van Buiten’s ownership; Liedtke 1990, pp. 37, 40, on Huntington’s bequest and the 1909 exhibition; Nash 1991, pp. 22, 23 (detail), 25, 26, 76 (ill.), 78, 101, considers it possible that this is one of the pictures owned by the baker Hendrick van Buiten, mistakenly associates the work with a tronie in the 1666 sale, and compares the painting briefly with others by Vermeer; Liedtke in Stockholm 1992–93, pp. 102, 316–18, no. 128 (catalogue entry in Swedish, superseded here); Arasse 1994, pp. 50, 64, 115 n. 32, 118 no. 2, 6, dates the picture 1662–64, mentions the “imagined presence” of someone the woman sees or anticipates in “the exterior world,” and compares the surface of the map with that in other Vermeers; Jäkel-Schieglmann 1994, p. 97, fig. 99, mentioned in connection with the lute’s popularity; N. Schneider 1994, pp. 35 (detail), 45 (ill.), 46, 58 (detail), as dating from about 1664, describes
the subject; Snow 1994, pp. 183 n. 16, 211 n. 11, fig. 69, imagines not only the woman but the lion's head finials in the foreground to be hearing things; Baetjer 1995, p. 334; M. Bailey 1995, pp. 14, 16, 78–79, no. 24, briefly considers the subject and defends the picture's authenticity; Wheelock 1992a, p. 378, notes that the woman's yellow jacket occurs in other pictures by Vermeer; Wheelock 1995b, pp. 149–50, fig. 218, compares The Guitar Player in Kenwood; Wheelock in Washington–The Hague 1995–96, p. 156, notes that the woman's yellow jacket occurs in other pictures by Vermeer; Duicht in The Hague 1996a, pp. 102–4 (ill.), praises the rendering of space, which recalls the camera obscura; Frankish 1996a, p. 260, notes that the authorship is debated; Larsen 1996, pp. 33, 118, no. A6, maintains that the much damaged picture could be just a copy and that it or the original would date from about 1666–77, not later as most scholars suggest; Netta 1996, pp. 98, 130–37, fig. 20, notes Blankert's (1975a) negative opinion, and discusses the type of composition and the subject, with attention to the theme of music in Vermeer; Zandvliet in The Hague 1996a, pp. 64 (large detail), 75, considers the map more interior decoration; Wheelock 1997, p. 40, pl. 18, as about 1664, detects a "distant lover" and resonant heartstrings; Costaras 1998, pp. 147, 152, 166, 167, discusses the canvas's size, thread count, and the ground layer of paint; Netta 1998, p. 262, considers the figure self-absorbed; Strouse 1999, pp. 563, 611 n.*, erroneously reports that Collis Huntington gave the painting to the MMA in 1900, and notes that it was in the 1909 exhibition; Gaskell 2000, p. 177, remarks on how the picture is hung in the MMA; Liedtke 2000a, pp. 69, 107, 108, 226, 228, 232–33, 237, 266, 290 nn. 93, 96, fig. 288, as dating from 1662–63, compares the "missing" figure with the one in Carel Fabritius's View in Delft, compares Hendrick van Steenwyck the Younger's Flower Still Life, of about 1615, and interior views by Adriaen van De Veen, places the painting in a small group of pictures by Vermeer dating from 1662–64, observes that this is one of the first interiors by Vermeer in which he employs large areas of shadow and a more muted palette than before, compares works by other artists and by Vermeer, and considers the romantic theme; Wheelock in Osaka 2000, pp. 12, 20, 32 (large detail), 45, 140, 178–81 (pl. and detail), no. 32, fig. 17, and p. 201, no. 18 in a list of works by Vermeer, dates the picture to about 1664 and suggests that it may have been influenced by De Hooch, although Vermeer, like a poet, finds "the inner harmony in everyday life" within domestic interiors; A. Bailey 2001, pp. 114 (ill.), 115, 130, on the yellow jacket, and the map's role in making the interior look like "a real, lived-in space"; Hertel 2001, pp. 141, 146, 149, 159–60, pl. 16, observes that "the musician may just be daydreaming and tuning her instrument," although she has been said to look out the window while awaiting a musical companion, and comments on George Deems's appropriation of the interior in Seven Vermeer Interiors, of 1999; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 149, 161, 181–83, no. 72, as dating from about 1662–63, notes that a yellow jacket like the one worn by the woman was listed in the painter's estate, describes the style of the work in relation to other pictures by Vermeer, considers it as perhaps more conventional in meaning than similar subjects conceived by him, suggests that the tuning of the lute hints at moderation, and cites a number of earlier artists who treated this or similar themes; Netta 2001, pp. 61, 65 (ill.), erroneously describes the map as one of the "seven northern provinces"; Steadman 2001, pp. 91–92, 106, 132–33, 168–69, 171–75, 189 n. 14, 192 n. 19, fig. 28 (diagram of window), wrongly claims that the picture "has suffered extensive repainting" and that the sizes of instruments such as the viol in the foreground do not vary much in reality, and measures the map, chair, table, window, and floor in an unconvinced attempt to prove that Vermeer had this actual scene before his eyes and traced it in a camera obscura; Wheelock and Glass 2001, p. 168, erroneously states that Mrs. Huntington acquired the work in 1897; Vergara in Madrid 2003, pp. 33, 174, 207, 254 (under no. 36), discusses the work as an example of Vermeer's seemingly effortless achievement of "harmony and ease" through refinements of composition; J. Sutton in Dublin–Greenwich 2003–4, p. 183, fig. 3, notes the use of the same yellow jacket in this and other works by Vermeer; Greub 2004, pp. 93, 125, 154, fig. 40, discusses the use of color; Korthals Altes in Rotterdam–Frankfurt 2004–5, pp. 246–48, no. 68, describes the idealized nature of the subject, notes that harmony in love and in music were often compared in contemporaneous literature, and reports that the painting "is reasonably well preserved"; D'Adda 2005, p. 108, exaggerates condition problems; Huerta 2005, p. 98, notes the prominent map; Steadman 2005, states that the map on the wall is depicted close to its actual scale ("within 1%"); Baetjer in Martigny 2006, p. 18, fig. 8, mentions the work among Huntington bequests.


Ex Coll.: Estate sale, Philippus van der Schley and Daniel du Pré, auctioneers Roos, De Vries, and Brongeest, Amsterdam, December 22, 1817, no. 62, for Fl 65 to Cockers; [art market, Paris, before 1900; sold for Fr 2,000 to Huntington]; Collis P. Huntington, New York (until d. 1900; life interest to his widow, Arabella D. Huntington, later [from 1913] Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, 1900–d. 1924; life interest to their son, Archer Milton Huntington, 1924–terminated in 1925]; Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 25:110:24.
205. Study of a Young Woman

Oil on canvas, 17½ x 15¼ in. (44.5 x 40 cm)
Signed (upper left): IVMeer. [IVM in monogram]

The painting is well preserved, although an extensive network of cracks has diminished the form on the proper right side of the face. The ultramarine blue glaze on the shawl is abraded.

Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, in memory of Theodore Rousseau Jr., 1979 1979.396.1

This haunting picture from the Wrightsman Collection dates from about 1666–67, the period in which two similar works were painted by Vermeer, Girl with a Red Hat, in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., and Girl with a Pearl Earring, in the Mauritshuis, The Hague (fig. 253). The latter is on canvas and nearly identical in size to the Study of a Young Woman, while the Washington painting is on a wood panel and about one-fourth as large (9¼ x 7½ in. [23.2 x 18.1 cm]).

Until recently, the Wrightsman Vermeer was titled Portrait of a Young Woman. Nobody would dispute A. B. de Vries’s observation that the picture is “the most portrait-like painting of Vermeer’s to have come down to us.” However, it is also certain that Vermeer’s bust-length pictures of young women were not intended as portraits per se, even if (as seems certain in this case) a live model was employed. In contemporary inventories, including that of Vermeer’s estate, paintings of this type are called tronies, a now defunct term that could be translated as heads, faces, or expressions (see the excursus on tronies in the entry for Pl. 142). Many such works were painted by Rembrandt and his followers (for example, Man in a Red Cloak; Pl. 171), but they were also popular elsewhere in the Netherlands, including Utrecht and Delft. At his death, Vermeer owned two tronies by Carel Fabritius (1622–1654) and two by Samuel van Hoogstraten (q.v.), and his Girl with a Red Hat was painted over a tronie by another artist.

As in Rembrandt’s ambitious Man in Oriental Costume (“The Noble Slave”) (Pl. 142), a Dutch model was often dressed up in a distinctly foreign or imaginary costume. Almost any costume with a bolt of fancy material thrown over the shoulder or wrapped around the head could suggest “antique” attire (which meant simply outdated), as in the painting by Vermeer listed as “Een Tronie in Antique Klederen, ongemeen konstig” (A tronie in antique dress, uncommonly artful), in the 1696 Amsterdam auction of paintings owned by Jacob Dissius, the son-in-law and heir of the artist’s Delft patron Pieter van Ruijven. This description could apply to any one of Vermeer’s three known pictures of this type, even though the most conventionally attractive of the figures he depicted wears a Dutch jacket of the 1660s. Her famous pearl earring is probably as false as her occasional identification as Vermeer’s daughter or maid, since “pearls” of that size could only be had from Venetian glassblowers or a similar source. The pearl in the Museum’s picture is a more plausible bauble, but such an expensive item was probably not to be found in the artist’s home.

The young women in the Washington and New York paintings are draped in shiny blue lengths of fabric, arranged to appear as if they might have sleeves. However, these garments and the headcoverings (simply a scarf in the present picture) in Vermeer’s three tronies are imaginary articles of clothing that one would not expect to see in a house or on the streets of Delft in the seventeenth century. The enchanting distance between these figures and real life is measured by Clio, the muse of history in Vermeer’s The Art of Painting (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; see fig. 254), who has thrown on a silky blue wrap the size of a bedsheets to go with her attributes of a book, a trumpet, and a laurel wreath.

The painting of fine fabrics like silk, satin, velvet, and

Figure 253. Johannes Vermeer, Girl with a Pearl Earring, 1665–67. Oil on canvas, 17½ x 15¼ in. (44.5 x 39 cm). Koninklijk Kabinet van Schilderijen Mauritshuis, The Hague
damask (the caffa that Vermeer’s father used to weave) was considered by critics of the period to be one of the most challenging tests of a painter’s technical abilities. Gerard ter Borch, Frans van Mieris (q.q.v.), and other artists whom Vermeer certainly admired were known for their virtuoso descriptions of luxurious materials that changed tones and colors with the play of light. The materials depicted in the Wrightsman painting are not secondary but essential motifs, intended for the connoisseur’s eye and imagination. The pale tones of the young woman’s skin and lips accord well with those of the yellow and light blue fabrics, while the gradual transition from light to shadow in the head is sympathetic to the subtle colors of the drapery. In that pyramid (or iceberg) of fabric, highlights are either muted (as in the dent of folds to the lower right) or glisten like a glass mosaic, the staccato pattern of which suggests an unusual weave.

In its lighting and palette, Study of a Young Woman is very different from Girl with a Pearl Earring, which employs primary colors in discreet passages and a more emphatic contrast of light and shadow. Perhaps one of these pictures is the “version [weerge] of the same,” namely, the tronie by Vermeer that was catalogued in the Dissius sale of 1696 (see Ex Coll.). If this is the case, not only the similar subjects and sizes of the Metropolitan and Mauritshuis pictures but also their complementary formal qualities would indicate that they might have been meant as a pair.

When Vermeer died, he had eleven children, seven or eight of whom were girls. The oldest, Maria, was born in 1654 or 1655. It was maintained recently that the girl with the pearl earring “looks at least 15 years old,” but in the present writer’s opinion she could well have been twelve and simply dressed up to look older. The young woman in the Wrightsman picture could be a bit younger or older, but the “girl (?) in the red hat” seems more mature. Whether Vermeer chose family members as models or found them elsewhere in Delft is irrelevant to the appreciation of his paintings, but the question is raised by what some viewers have considered to be unattractive or even abnormal features of the figure in the present picture. Comparison with Girl with a Pearl Earring might be taken to underscore this view, while juxtaposition with the somewhat androgynous figure in Girl with a Red Hat reminds one that the point of tronies was in good part their “curiosity.” Moreover, the broad and somewhat flattened features of the friendly face in the Wrightsman painting are much affected by the young woman’s shaved eyebrows and raised hairline, fashions then in vogue. Framing the main features of the face yields a different impression, and reveals one of the most inviting personæ in the artist’s oeuvre.

Two aspects of the picture are less exceptional. First, the model’s pose (as well as that in the Girl with a Red Hat) recalls the Renaissance form of presentation employed in Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait of 1640 (National Gallery, London; see fig. 150) and in the many works influenced by that famous picture. Here, the forearm rests on the picture frame, not a parapet, and the hand, or rather wrist, represents one of Vermeer’s willful elisions of what is known (in this case, anatomy) in favor of what might be seen. The touch of flesh tone also enhances, as an echo, the concentration on the face, and gives the composition a hint of instability—that is, animation—which would otherwise be denied by the geometric sense of order.

Second, the dark background, both here and in the Mauritshuis picture, brings to mind works by contemporary artists such as Van Mieris, Karel du Jardin (1626–1678), and Michiel Sweerts (1618–1664). In 1656, Sweerts published a series of engravings representing bust-length figures, a few of which in composition and by the inclusion of “antique” costumes resemble Vermeer’s studies of young women. Sweerts also painted a number of tronies during his Amsterdam residence (1660–61), including some that are remarkable as studies of expression and character. Unclassical features, curious expressions, and meaningful glances (whether or not their meaning is clear) are among the elements that appear distinctive in Vermeer’s oeuvre and yet place his paintings in a broader context. His taste was extraordinary; it was also of its time.

1. The Hague–Paris 1966, unpaged (under no. 31; under no. 31 in the French ed.).
4. See Wheelock 1991a, pp. 88–96, fig. 3; Wheelock 1995b, pp. 126–27, figs. 89a, 89b; and Wheelock in Washington–The Hague 1991–96, pp. 162–63, figs. 3, 4, where the underlying picture is implausibly attributed to Fabritius. The image is called a “bust-length portrait of a man,” but the very small scale suggests a tronie. The present writer in New York–London 2001, p. 389 n. 8, somewhat hastily referred to the figure as “a conventional portrait,” based on the format.
6. As is emphasized in Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, p. 239.
7. Ibid., p. 239.
9. The Metropolitan and Mauritshuis paintings are reproduced as.
facing plates in New York–London 2001, pp. 390–91. It is curious that two portraits each by Fabritius and by Van Hoogstraaten were recorded in Vermeer’s estate (see note 3 above), in both cases as a single entry, as if they were pairs.

10. Broos and Van Suchtelen 2004, p. 219, rejecting Malraux’s idea (1952) that the girl with the pearl earring was Maria.

11. See Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, nos. 13 (the Rembrandt) and 45 (an example by Ferdinand Bol).

12. See the comparison of Vermeer’s Mistress and Maid, of about 1666–67 (Frick Collection, New York), and Sweerts’s Clothing the Naked, of about 1660–61 (MMA), in New York–London 2001, p. 393, figs. 286, 287. Compare also Van Mieris’s Picture, dated 1661 (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles; Naumann 1981, no. 37, pl. 37); a similar comparison is made by Wheelock in Washington–The Hague 1996, p. 166, fig. 1 (under no. 15).


References: Hoert 1752–70, vol. 1 (1752), p. 36, lists nos. 38–40 in the 1696 Dissius sale (see Ex Coll.), one of which is probably this picture; Arenberg Collection 1839, p. 10, no. 53 (ill.; lithograph); Thoré 1859a, pp. 31, 34–36, 140, no. 35, cites the work among six known Vermeers, reproduces a facsimile of the signature, and describes the subject as exotic, mysterious, melancholy, and so on; Waagen 1860, vol. 2, p. 532, praises the work among the few known pictures by Vermeer, describing it as “modeled in a cold tone, in a delicate fumage, and with the most harmonious effect”; Blanc 1861, vol. 2, p. 4 of the section on Vermeer, listed among known works; Thoré 1864, pp. 313, 314, cited among known works; Thoré 1865, pp. 299, 343, 545, repeats purple passages from Thoré 1859a, and suggests that the painting may be identical with no. 38 in the Dissius sale of 1666, and with no. 92 in the Luchtmans sale of 1816 (see Ex Coll.); Gower 1880, pp. 67, 111, “worthy of Rembrandt”; Havard 1888, pl. 35, no. 2, listed in the “catalogue sommaire des oeuvres de van der Meer”; Hofstede de Groot 1899, pp. 20, 22–24, describes the work as “magical” and closely related to the Girl with a Pearl Earring; Fruell 1906, p. 181, dates the painting, along with several others, between 1660 and 1675; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), p. 601, no. 42, identifies the work with no. 39 in the 1696 sale, and “possibly” with no. 92 in the 1816 sale; Van锌pote 1908, pp. 10, 41, 42, 53, 67, 66–67 (ill. opp. p. 96), offers a rapturous description, and suggests that the painting represents one of Vermeer’s daughters; Bode 1909a, p. 97, dates the painting about 1666 or a little later, and concludes that “more perfect and true studies of plein air cannot be imagined” ; Hofstede de Groot 1909c, pp. 21–23, 28, 30, 29, places this picture and the similar one in The Hague between the early paintings with large figures and later works with figures on a smaller scale; Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 2 (1910), p. 776, listed as in the Arenberg gallery, Brussels; Pletzsch 1911, pp. 57–58, 115, no. 11, pl. xv, places the picture shortly before the Mauritshuis canvas; Wrangel 1911, p. 8 (ill. opp. p. 10), pens Romantic praise; Dreyfous 1912, p. 29, listed among known works; Hale 1913, pp. 18, 240, 242, 333–34, 371, 372 (ill. opp. p. 232), identifies the work as no. 39 in the 1696 auction, and considers this and the Mauritshuis picture as late works, probably portraying Vermeer’s daughters; G. Wolf 1915, pp. 70 (ill.), 73, calls the work an “expression study,” and a “wonder work of color”; M. Eisler 1916, pp. 240–41, remarks upon the freedom of the figure in space, as opposed to figures by Vermeer in precisely described interiors; Bode 1917, p. 74, describes the light and colors as qualities of the artist’s fully developed style; Gallatin 1917, pp. 188–90, no. 18, “not as fine in quality” as the similar painting in The Hague; Johansen 1920, pp. 195, 197, 198, reproduces the signature, and considers this picture and Girl with a Pearl Earring as pendants, dating them to about 1666–67; Vanzyne 1921, pp. 7, 31, 67, 69, 71, pl. XXXII, as in Schloss Meppen (see Ex Coll.), perhaps portraying a daughter of Vermeer, and presumably the picture in the Luchtmans sale of 1816; Lucas [1922?], pp. 26, 31, 41, identifies the painting as no. 39 in the 1696 sale, and suggests that the figure—“dressed in the same Eastern trappings, a girl with a strangely blank forehead and eyes widely divided”—might represent the sister of the “Girl with a Pearl Earring”; Hausestein 1924, pp. 24, 27, pl. 23, as later than the Mauritshuis picture; Bode 1926, p. 251, compares it to a painting no longer considered to be by Vermeer (see National Gallery of Art 1941 below); Chantavoe 1926, pp. 36, 44, 47, 59, 103, suggests that this was a study for one of Vermeer’s genre scenes, such as Woman with a Lute (Pl. 204); Valentiner 1932, p. 324, dates the painting to shortly after 1658; A. Alexandre 1933, p. 164, considers this and the Mauritshuis picture to probably represent Vermeer’s daughters, giving “l’amour intense avec lequel elles ont été caressées”; Hale 1937, pp. 101, 106, 134–35, 182, 227, pl. 41, repeats Hale 1913; Pletzsch 1939, pp. 28, 62, 64, no. 35, fig. 27, places the picture later than that in The Hague, which the author dates about 1665; Van Thielen 1939, p. 26 (ill.), no comment; A. B. de Vries 1939, pp. 9, 42–43, 84, no. 18, pl. 44, as from about 1660, “only a weak echo of the piece in the Mauritshuis”; National Gallery of Art 1941, p. 209, no. 55, compares The Smiling Girl (now considered a modern imitation); Blum 1941, pp. 60, 61, 120, 140, 138, no. 2, pl. 19, considers the painting more a study than a portrait, dating from about 1660; A. B. de Vries 1948, pp. 13, 38, 86, pl. 15, as from shortly after 1660, and “wanting in charm and refinement,” although “the handling of light is very effective”; Swillens 1960, pp. 62, 105–8, 114, no. 29, pl. 29, sees this as a late work, heavily restored, of dubious quality and uncertain authorship, and questions whether it was intended as a portrait; Gowing 1962, pp. 17–78 nos. 4, 6, 144, 158, no. xvii, pl. 41, as possibly in the 1696 sale, admires the drapery folds (“one of the very few deliberately rhetorical passages of drawing in the painter’s work as we know it”); Malraux 1952, pp. 119–20, no. 1 (ill.), lists it as one of Vermeer’s “tableaux dispersus et tableaux dont l’attribution à Vermeer est aujourd’hui écartée,” and reviews previous opinions; V. Bloch 1954, p. 33, pl. 46, dates it 1660–65; Larsen 1951a, p. 56, as now on view in the MMA, previously thought to have been lost; Larsen 1951b, pp. 102–4, fig. 1, discusses the work’s reappearance after many years out of public view, considers it “an uncontested technical masterpiece,” and “in marvellous shape,” the figure “dissolve yet strange, almost alien,” and revealing “striking points of resemblance with the Gupta ideal, such as was transmitted [to Holland] by Javanese art”; Comstock 1956, pp. 307, 308 (ill.), as lent to the MMA for a few months, offers a glowing description; Walicki 1956, p. 27, pl. 21, briefly mentioned (in Polish); Wolskun 1956, no. 5 (March 1, 1956), p. 7 (ill.), as sold to an “oil millionaire” in Texas for “$350,000”; Connolly 1957, pp. 108, 122 (ill.), shows the painting hanging in the Wrightsman home in Palm Beach; Goldscheider 1958, pp. 37, 39, 141–42, no. 33, pl. 76, as from about 1671 (“usually dated much too early”), rejects identifications with nos. 38–40 in the 1696 sale; Frankfurter
1919, p. 42 (ill.), "$350,000 in 1919"; Gowing 1961, pp. 33, 81 (ill.); Seligman 1961, pp. 240–45, recalls the circumstances of arranging the sale in 1915, and mentions a "light cleaning"; Seymour 1964, p. 329, identifies the painting with no. 38 in the 1666 sale; Descargues [1966], p. 132, listed as in the Wrightsman collection; Nicolson 1966, p. 397, sniffs that the picture is "damaged [and] disagreeable, but authentic"; J. Paris 1966, p. 88, fig. 7, sees the young woman "tourner vers nous une face enigmatique, obstinément fermée"; A. B. de Vries in The Hague–Paris 1966, unpagd, no. vi (ill.; French ed., no. vii (ill.)), calls this "the most portrait-like painting of Vermeer's to have come down to us," from about 1665–68; Bianconi 1967, pp. 91 (under no. 21), 92, no. 23 (ill.), pl. XXXIV, reviews some of the literature; Geison 1967, col. 743, "there is no clear delimitation of space; the colors are incredibly pure and the soft skin is unbelievably delicate"; Koningsberger 1967, pp. 124–25, 154 (ill.), mentions the price reportedly paid in 1935 for the "portrait," which depicts a girl with a "moon-pale face looking so affecting" at the viewer; A. B. de Vries 1967, pp. 22–23, pl. 22, "the only portrait Vermeer painted," of about 1667–68; D. Sutton 1960, pp. 230–31 (ill.), "a masterpiece of enigmatic understatement"; Gowing 1970, pp. 77–78, 134, 138, pl. 41, concudes that the author previously placed the picture too early; Pink 1971, pp. 493, 498, 502, in a search for evidence of the camera obscura, concludes that "the plane of focus is probably to be found immediately behind the girl's head"; Fahy 1973, pp. 310–21, no. 32 (ill.), figs. 1 (detail), 8 (X-Radiograph), describes the picture in detail, reviews the entire provenance, relates the painting to other works by Vermeer, compares Leonardo (following Thoré) and Michiel Sweerts, considers the date ("toward the end of the 1660s") and the question of whether one of Vermeer's daughters is depicted, and compiles an exhaustive list of references; Mitter 1973, unpagd, no. 35 (ill.); J. Walter in Fahy 1973, pp. 8–9, recalls his role in persuading the Wrightsmans to buy the picture; Grimm 1974, pp. 61, 109, no. 34 (ill. p. 100), fig. 23, considers this a late work, of about 1671; Walker 1974, pp. 262, 264 (ill. p. 263), repeats J. Walter in Fahy 1973; Blankert 1975a, pp. 88, 164, no. 30, pl. 30, as from 1672–74; Wright 1976, pp. 12, 44, 75, 78, 81, 82, 83, no. 8, pl. 8, observes that the condition is better than has been stated; Menzel 1977, p. 69, pl. 67, as a late work, strange, inferior to the Girl with a Pearl Earring; Blankert 1978b, pp. 59, 170, no. 30, pl. 30, as from 1672–74, "a variant of an earlier painting," but "painted in the schematizing style of the late period... Perhaps in these needy years Vermeer accepted a portrait commission?"; K. Baetjer in Notable Acquisitions, 1979–80 (New York: MMA, 1980), pp. 41–42 (ill., and cover ill.), describes the subject and Thoré's enthusiasm, reviews the provenance, and rejects the suggestion (in Fahy 1973) that the model is the same as in Woman with a Lute (Pl. 20–4); Hibbard 1980, p. 148, mentions the work in passing as "damaged"; Slates 1981, p. 104–5 (ill.), wonders whether Vermeer intended this [figure] as a sibyl or perhaps some biblical character; Wheelock 1981, p. 132, pl. 35, dates the picture about 1666–67, and concludes on the basis of the young woman's appearance that "this appears to be a portrait whereas the other two [women by Vermeer] are idealized studies"; Pops 1984, pp. 75, 107 n. 12, fig. 46, offers a few incomprehensible remarks; Hoetink and Sluiter-Seiffert in Hoetink et al. 1985, p. 314 (under no. 98), as in the 1696 auction; Allad, Blankert, and Montias 1986, pp. 142, 197, 235, no. 30, pl. XXVII, as from about 1672, with financial need proposed as an explanation of why Vermeer painted this "portrait"; P. Sutton 1986, p. 190, "here there is a greater refinement and fragility" than in the Mauritshuis picture; Wheelock 1988, p. 102 (ill.), repeats Wheelock 1981; Montias 1989, pp. 196–97, 221, 266, fig. 32, suggests that this may be a portrait of Vermeer's eldest daughter, Maria, and if so, Blankert's dating (1672–74) "must be closer to the truth" than Wheelock's (about 1666–67); P. Sutton in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, p. 105, mentions the Wrightsman gift; Nash 1991, p. 19, calls the picture a portrait; A. Davies 1992, p. 23, mentions the work in a review of seventeenth-century prices; Arasse 1994, pp. 17, 73, 107 n. 27, 121 n. 43, fig. 41, describes the picture as "the only portrait Vermeer painted," but also as "a real variation of the 'ideal' head (tronicie) of Girl with a Pearl Earring"; N. Schneider 1994, pp. 70 (ill.), 72, as from about 1666–67, wonders if the scarf is a bridal veil; Snow 1994, p. 19, pl. 8, suggests that the picture persuades the viewer into "loving acceptance of what is flawed"; Wadum 1994, p. 74, 74 n. 6, fig. 6, places the picture a "few years later" than the one in The Hague; Baetjer 1995, p. 316; M. Bailey 1995, pp. 14, 16, 98–99, no. 34, as from about 1666–67, "might represent Vermeer's eldest daughter, Maria," although there is no evidence for this; Wheelock 1995b, p. 123, on the pose; Wheelock 1995c, p. 273, recalls the comparison made with a Vermeer forgery, The Smiling Girl, in Bode 1926 (see above); Wheelock in Washington–The Hague 1995–96, p. 27, considers this an example of Vermeer's classicism, and with respect to Girl with a Pearl Earring states that the "softly diffused features are comparably executed"; Dichtling 1996, pp. 141 (ill.), 143, prefers the Girl with a Pearl Earring to this picture, which is portraitlike ("a direct commission cannot be excluded here"); Larsen 1996, pp. 13, 102, 104, no. 16 (ill. p. 69), as from about 1665–67, discovers "un ideale di bellezza che appariene all'oriente" but drops the Gupta comparison offered in Larsen 1953b; Netta 1996, p. 101, as unusual for its subject in Vermeer's oeuvre; Wheelock 1997, p. 56, pl. 26, as from about 1667–68; Brooks 1998, pp. 22–23, refers to the picture as a Thoré "sensation"; Costaras 1998, pp. 150, 165, 167, comments on the canvas size; Groen et al. 1998, p. 169, notes that this is the only painting by Vermeer with a background like that of Girl with a Pearl Earring; Jowell 1999, pp. 47, 55 n. 54, fig. 20, mentions Thoré's publication of the picture in 1860; Wadum 1998, pp. 205, 213, observes that Vermeer here avoids having the color of one form touch another, in order to achieve soft transitions, and comments on the psychological effect of the deliberately unfocused foreground; Gaskell 2000, pp. 31, 119–20, 121, fig. 41, credits Thoré for his praise of the picture; Liedtke 2000a, pp. 239, 241, 242–45, 256, fig. 30, as from about 1665–67, compares the painting with works by Sweerts, suggests that it reveals "a finer, more mature regard for humanity" than Vermeer's earlier pictures of young women, and concludes that the figures here and in the picture in The Hague were based on live models but neither work was intended as a portrait; Osaka 2000, p. 204, no. 26, in an illustrated list of all paintings by Vermeer; A. Bailey 2001, pp. 116, 142 (ill. p. 143), suggests that the model is perhaps one of Vermeer's older daughters; Fransens in Fransens et al. 2001, p. 23, with no comment; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 166, 284, 388–9 (under no. 74), 389–90, no. 75 (ill.), makes most of the points presented in the text above; Steadman 2001, p. 199, describes the viewer's perception of contours, "because of our prior knowledge and our reading of the shape of the shadow"; Brooks and Van Suchtelen 2004, p. 259, as Tronicie of a young woman, compares Girl with a Pearl Earring as a similar work
of the 1660s; Greub 2004, p. 62, fig. 30, mentioned; D’Adda 2005, p. 124, imagines the sitter as Vermeer’s wife (?) or daughter; Fahy in Fahy et al. 2005, pp. 131–35, discusses the condition as “relatively well preserved,” and the subject as a *tronie* based on a live model; Van der Ploeg and Runia 2005, pp. 25, 62, illustrates the picture with other paintings that were in the Dissius sale of 1696.


**EX COLL.:** Pieter Claesz van Ruyven, Delft (until d. 1654); his widow, Maria de Knuijt, Delft (1674–d. 1681); their daughter Magdalena van Ruyven, Delft (1681–d. 1682); her widower, Jacob Abrahamsz Dissius, Delft (1682–d. 1693); his estate sale, Amsterdam, May 16, 1696, no. 38, “Een Tronie in Antique Klederen, ongewoonens konstig” [A *tronie* in antique dress, uncommonly artful], sold for Fl 36; or no. 39, “Nog een dito Vermeer” [another of the same by Vermeer], sold for Fl 17; or no. 40, “Een weerge van denselven” [A version of the same], sold for Fl 17; De Luchtmans, Rotterdam (until 1816); his anonymous sale, Rotterdam, April 20–22, 1816, no. 92, as “Le portrait d’une jeune personne,” by Vermeer, 17 x 15 in., for Fl 3; Auguste Marie Raymond, prince d’Arenberg, Brussels (by 1829–d. 1833); Arenberg family, Brussels and Schloss Meppen, Germany (1833–1949); Engelbert-Marie, 9th duc d’Arenberg, Brussels, Schloss Meppen and Schloss Nordkirchen, Germany (1875–d. 1949); Engelbert-Charles, 10th duc d’Arenberg (1949–55; sold through German Seligman to Wrightsman, for $35,000); Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, New York (1955–79); Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, in memory of Theodore Rousseau Jr., 1979–1979.1096.1

1. At the outbreak of World War I, the Arenbergs took the painting to Schloss Meppen for safekeeping. It was evidently left there for several decades and remained unseen by outsiders.

206. Allegory of the Catholic Faith

Oil on canvas, 45 x 35 in. (114.3 x 88.9 cm)

The painting is in good condition. There are minor abrasions on the figure of the woman and areas of more serious abrasion in the painting in the background that depicts the Crucifixion.

The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.18

Painted about 1670–72, this allegorical picture is like no other work by Vermeer, despite its similarity in composition to his celebrated canvas *The Art of Painting*, of about 1666–68, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (fig. 254). The Museum’s picture, from the Michael Friedsam Collection, differs fundamentally in purpose from the Vienna painting, which, although nominally an allegory, was intended as a virtuoso display of the artist’s powers of invention and execution, staged in an imaginary version of his studio (where the work remained). By contrast, *Allegory of the Faith* (the title often employed), or, preferably, *Allegory of the Catholic Faith*, treats the concept of the painter’s adopted religion, and was probably made expressly for a private Catholic patron or for a *scheulerk* or hidden church (as was *The Crucifixion with the Virgin and Saint John*, by Hendrick ter Bruggen; Pl. 21).

While Vermeer devoted extraordinary care to descriptive passages in *The Art of Painting*, and to the illusionistic impression made by the picture as a whole, in the religious painting he shifted his late style (which already tended in this direction) toward a more classicist and schematic manner. Many scholars, from Abraham Bredius (who bought the picture in 1899) to writers of recent decades (see Refs.), have failed to appreciate the exceptional nature of the Friedsam painting, judging its style and even its subject in terms suitable to one of Vermeer’s genre scenes. The artist’s consistency and small oeuvre might explain, to some extent, this distortion of historical perspective. No critic would complain that a comparable allegorical picture, Gabriel Metsu’s large canvas *The Triumph of Justice*
(Mauritshuis, The Hague), lacks the warmth, wit, intimacy, or naturalism of his genre paintings dating from the same period, the late 1650s (see Pl. 116). One of the revelations of Allegory of the Catholic Faith is that Vermeer’s usual approach, with its intense focus on optical qualities, was less an obsession (however much he was preoccupied with light) than an artistic preference from which he could depart when it seemed appropriate.

Several motifs in the present picture suggest that a patron or adviser helped in the conception of its iconography. De Jongh concluded that the painting was commissioned by the Jesuits in Delft because Vermeer evidently referred to a Jesuit emblem book for one of his symbols (discussed below), and because his mother-in-law was sympathetic to that religious order. Montias, on the other hand, maintains that the Jesuits would probably have specified a more conventional theme, which is plausible, given the devotional or inspirational nature of most Jesuit art. The fact that by the 1690s the painting was in a private collection (that of a Protestant postmaster, Herman van Swoll) also makes institutional patronage appear unlikely.

For the allegorical figure of the Catholic Faith, Vermeer must have turned to Cesare Ripa’s Iconologia (Rome, 1603), in the Dutch translation by Dirck Pietersz Pers (Amsterdam, 1644), although the artist, rather than simply adopting, instead adapted images from that influential volume. Vermeer merged Ripa’s explanations of “Christian Faith” and “Catholic Faith,” each of which is offered in two versions. One of the entries describes white as a symbol of purity because it is a “color” purified of colors. Another text cites blue as the hue of heaven. A hand raised to the heart indicates the source of living faith. In the foreground, Vermeer follows Ripa by showing the “cornerstone” of the church (Christ) crushing a serpent (the Devil).

The nearby apple, which has been bitten, stands for original sin. The chalice on the table refers to the Eucharist and is, as Ripa notes, a symbol of the Christian church.

The table is transformed into an altar by being raised on a platform and provided with a crucifix, a chalice, and a Bible or missal. The long silky cloth, in green with gold fringe, is perhaps meant as a priest’s stole. The open book is often called a Bible, but its immediate juxtaposition with the chalice, the crucifix, and the unexpected motif of a crown of thorns suggests that the volume is essential to the Mass (missa). The Missale Romanum includes every word spoken in a celebration of the Mass, and directions for the ceremony. Masses of various kinds (for example, wedding, requiem, and votive) are now familiar, but a Mass in Vermeer’s day was understood as the celebration of the Eucharist, a service reenacting the sacrifice of Christ. It has been maintained that Vermeer “replaces” Ripa’s specification of a secondary scene, namely, the Sacrifice of Isaac (which prefigures that of Christ), with a painting of the Crucifixion, “a change that reflects the central importance of Christ’s sacrifice to the Jesuits.” However, Ripa also recommends the Crucifixion for representations of Faith, and the meaning of the Eucharist was emphasized by every order of the Catholic church during the Counter-Reformation. Paintings placed over altars where Mass is celebrated usually depict the Crucifixion, the Assumption of the Virgin, or the Adoration of the Magi, of which the first has by far the most obvious connection to the Eucharist, and to the purpose of the sacrament, which is redemption from sin.

Some critics of the Museum’s painting have described the setting as if it were an ordinary Dutch interior, in which Vermeer unwisely placed a histrionic figure and a freshly killed snake. References in the inventory of the artist’s estate to “a large painting of Christ on the Cross” and “about seven ells of gold-tooled leather on the wall” in the “interior kitchen,” and to “an ebony wood crucifix” in the “great hall,” have occasionally encouraged the notion that we have discovered Faith, like other women by Vermeer, in a domestic space. However, the height of the ceiling, the marble floor, the various embellishments, and especially the

Figure 244. Johannes Vermeer, The Art of Painting, ca. 1666–68. Oil on canvas, 47 ¾ x 39 ¾ in. (120 x 100 cm). Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna
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altar and the altarpiece (based on a painting by Jacob Jordaens) imply that the room was meant to be recognized as a private chapel or schuilkerk. A few motifs strengthen the impression of a chapel provisionally installed within a large house or some other secular building. For example, the dais on which the altar (or covered table) has been placed resembles, in its modest proportions, the wooden platforms (vlonders) that were used in Dutch homes to raise furniture above cold floors (see Pl. 42 for an odd example), and it is covered with a decorative tapestry that was not intended as carpeting. The gilt leather behind the crucifix sets it off to splendid effect, but as a wall covering looks improvised (compare Pl. 87).

In the foreground, a side chair with a blue pillow and a common type of hanging tapestry (dating from the late sixteenth century) appear to have been borrowed from an upper-middle-class household. Tapestries were hung in many Catholic places of worship (for example, Rubens's cycle The Triumph of the Eucharist, which remains in the convent of the Descalzas Reales, Madrid), and their use in the clandestine churches of the Netherlands would also be expected. In the Friedsam picture, however, the tapestry does not face the sanctuary, and the relevance of its subject matter is uncertain (the motif of a mounted camel might suggest the Old Testament, here yielding to the New). In any event, the hanging separates the sacred space from that of the viewer, as if it were a vision, or an idea. It is also possible that Vermeer intended to evoke the actual circumstances of the Catholic church in the Dutch Republic, where "Popish" signs and ceremonies were restricted from public view. The modern viewer may see the tapestry as a conventional repoussoir or an illusionistic element (as in The Art of Painting, where the front of the tapestry faces the artist and his muse). But viewers of the time would also have recognized the tapestry as part of a very large hanging in the room they (fictively) occupy, and as drawn aside to reveal a normally secluded space.

The choice and interpretation of imagery would have been discussed by the artist and his patron. It is not surprising that Vermeer chose such a specific globe (published in 1618 by Jodocus Hondius) to illustrate Ripa's verbal description of Faith with "the world under her feet," given the painter's interest in cartography and his use of the same globe in a slightly earlier picture, The Geographer, of 1666 (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt). The visual idea may have inspired by Riba's two representations of Truth, a naked young woman who rests one foot on a terrestrial globe and eagerly regards the symbolic sun (or "light of truth") in her upraised hand. Rubens as well probably referred to Riba when he placed a globe (on a stand) next to his energetic figure of Catholic Faith in one of the modelli (ca. 1625–28) for The Triumph of the Eucharist. Riding on a parade wagon, she holds aloft a chalice, which is juxtaposed with a large wooden cross that is steadied by an angel. Like the chalice, a cross (usually a large one) is an attribute of Catholic Faith.

Comparison with the Rubens and other Flemish treatments of the triumphant Catholic church underscores the deliberation with which Vermeer chose a "domestic" setting; the usual Triumph, set outdoors, was simply less appropriate for Catholicism in Holland than the image of Faith sustained in secluded spaces. There is also some affinity with Early Netherlandish pictures that place holy figures in contemporary homes. As in those paintings, supernatural motifs are here kept to a minimum. In this regard, the exception of the snake and stone might be compared with the small figure of a soul with a cross in Robert Campin's Annunciation, of about 1425–30 (the Merode Altarpiece; Cloisters Collection, MMA). As in that work, the attributes of Faith are present without seeming out of place. The symbol of Saint John the Evangelist (behind Faith) is a chalice with a snake, so in this picture "the chalice is shared by John and Faith" at the same time that it denotes the Eucharist.

Given the subject's complexity, Vermeer managed to achieve remarkable economy of form and content. Faith's pose is echoed meaningfully in those of the Virgin and Saint John (whose cloaked hand is raised to his heart). His figure, and Christ's outstretched arm, lift the viewer's gaze to the glass sphere, which is also the culmination of a process from sin and mundane matter (in the foreground) to Faith and a world without end. There can be little doubt that, in this context, the sphere may be understood as a symbol of heaven or God. Like a soul compared with the body, the transparent object contrasts with the physical world represented by the globe under Faith's foot. As in the case of Hondius's globe, Vermeer has chosen a known (if not commonplace) household object as a symbol. Glass and mirrored glass spheres like this one were a decorative item and a curiosity, usually hung on ribbons as here. The motif is most familiar from Dutch still-life paintings, such as an early work by Willem Kalf (q.v.; fig. 255), and various pictures by Simon Luttichuys (1610–1661) and by Pieter van Roestraeten (1630–1700). Like the brass orbs featured in Dutch chandeliers (including the one in The Art of Painting), glass spheres were evidently admired for their reflection of everything around them in microscopic form. In still lifes, the sphere puts the "vanities" of humankind (and the painter's studio) into what might be called cosmic perspective,
and more generalized than allegorical figures painted by artists such as Guido Reni (1575–1642) and Gerard de Lairesse (q.v.). The female figure in the latter’s Apollo and Aurora, of 1671 (Pl. 104), is far more a creature of flesh and blood, with drapery enlivened by light and wind. In Vermeer’s picture, the shadows of the folds in the figure’s drapery suggest no more substance than do the gray blocks of text in the book on the table. The volume and texture of the tapestry, however, seem more naturalistic (if not illusionistic, as in The Art of Painting), and a schematized version of Vermeer’s pointillé technique for describing the sparkle of daylight is sprinkled over the fabric surface like grains of salt. The reflections of light on the chair, the globe, the chalice, and the glass sphere reveal the painter that some critics have lamented not finding throughout the work. The sense of recession in the picture is stronger than suggested by photographs, especially since it was placed in a fine reproduction of a seventeenth-century ebonized frame (similar to that on the canvas behind Faith) shortly after the Museum’s exhibition “Vermeer and the Delft School,” in 2001. On that occasion, the Allegory of the Catholic Faith and The Art of Painting were seen in the same room, evidently for the first time since Vermeer painted the religious picture with the other canvas at hand in his studio. And it was obvious to many visitors that the two works, despite their intriguing similarities, had profoundly different goals and, indeed, achieved a balance—emblematic of Vermeer—between the senses and the intellect.

as does the main motif in Jacques de Gheyn’s Vanitas Still Life (Pl. 48). But Vermeer gives the sphere divine not earthly significance, which is made clear by its lowly counterpart, the terrestrial globe.

For this conceit, Vermeer may have been advised by his Jesuit neighbors, which is not to say (as some writers have) that the painting has a specifically Jesuit program. De Jongh compared Jesuit prints showing Divine Love triumphing over the earth, beneath a sphere symbolizing heaven. He and several later writers have also referred to an emblem by the Jesuit author Willem Hesius (1636) illustrating a winged boy (symbolizing the soul) holding up a glass sphere in which the sun is reflected. The emblem’s verse compares the sphere’s reflection of the universe with the mind’s ability to comprehend God. The turn of phrase fits uncomfortably with Vermeer’s image, but the main idea—the contemplation of God—is essentially the same. The Catholic Faith turns our thoughts from earth to heaven, where we will be received once absorbed by the sacraments.

To return to the picture’s style, it may be said to suit the subject, and to reflect the classicizing tendency of Dutch painting from about 1670 onward. The figure of Faith is crisply modeled,

2. Catalogued in Broos 1993, no. 25, where it is stressed that the painting “is an allegory, and is, therefore, unique in Metsu’s body of work” (p. 209).
3. In New York–London 2001, pp. 402–3, the present writer discusses the technical differences between Young Woman Standing at a Virgin and Young Woman Seated at a Virgin, Vermeer’s pendant pictures of about 1670–72 in the National Gallery, London. A few critics have placed the second painting at a qualitative and chronological distance from the first, making no allowance for how Vermeer could modify his style to expressive ends.
6. An introduction to this subject is provided by Ten Brink Goldsmith’s article on Jesuit iconography in Milwaukee 1991, pp. 16–21.
7. However, the pose of Theology (if not her attributes) is similar to that of Vermeer’s Faith, as noted by Wheelock in Washington–The Hague 1995–96, p. 192, fig. 3.
10. On this point, see ibid., pp. 128, 212 n. 128.
12. As noted in Hertel 1996, p. 211.
13. See Gla2 1977, p. 28.
14. Discussions of atonement, communion, grace, redemption, the sacraments, salvation, and so on go beyond our topic. However, it may be useful to recall that not only the doctrine of transubstantiation but also the broader concept of grace attained through “merit” and the sacraments were defended by the Counter-Reformation church and rejected by the Protestants.
15. See, for example, Vergara 1998, p. 247 (quoted under Refs.). On these and other objects in Vermeer’s estate, see New York–London 2001, p. 400 n. 14, citing Montias 1989, pp. 339–44 (doc. 364). The interior kitchen was not a working space comparable to three other rooms listed in the inventory of Vermeer’s estate, the “cooking kitchen,” the “washing kitchen,” and the “little back kitchen.”
16. See entry for Pl. 25, note 1. The painting by Jordaens may be identical with the large painting of (presumably) the same subject in Vermeer’s estate, where the artist’s name is not given (see note 15 above). A few versions of Jordaens’s composition are known, and an engraving after one version by Schelte à Bolswert (see De Poorter in Antwerp 1993, vol. 1, p. 112 [under no. A 27], a canvas in a private collection). Vermeer’s version corresponds fairly closely with the print in reverse, but in a few details (for example, John’s head, Mary’s hands) is closer to other versions. Vermeer may have slightly modified the composition of the version he knew. See also Hertel 1996, pp. 211–17.
17. As noted by Westermann, in Newark–Denver 2001–2, p. 29, but with the misleading information that marble floors were “fairly typical” of the Dutch voorhuis.
18. Ruben’s designs for the Madrid tapestries are discussed in Held 1980, pp. 137–66. On tapestries in Dutch hidden churches, see Hedquist 2003, p. 128 (where altar curtains and raised altars are also discussed).
19. See Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 399, 400–402 n. 18, for further remarks on the tapestry, and on the hypothesis put forward in Knauer 1998 (see Refs.). In Hertel 1996, p. 224, the scene on the tapestry is said to be “courtly or chivalric,” but the animal is certainly a camel not a horse (despite the Northern European landscape). Curator Thomas P. Campbell, the Museum’s tapestry specialist, considers Vermeer’s tapestry comparable with one made in Oudenaarde, Journey of Jacob and His Family to Egypt, of about 1660–80 (Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle, County Durham, England; Oudenaarde 1999, no. 30).
20. See the present writer’s remarks on tapestries placed at the threshold between two rooms, in New York–London 2001, p. 397 (figs. 15, 177, for doorways covered by tapestries).
21. See Wheelock in Washington–The Hague 1995–96, pp. 170, 175 n. 7, 190, 195 n. 7, where the globe is first said to be by Jodocus Hondius (as it is) and then Hendrick Hondius. See also Zandvliet in The Hague 1996a, p. 71.
22. See Hertel 1996, pp. 197, 220, figs. 42, 43.
23. See Held 1980, vol. 1, p. 130 (under no. 102), vol. 2, pl. 13. The same modello (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels), and Otto van Veen’s Allegory of the Catholic Church, of about 1600–20 (Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Schloss, Bamberg), are related to Vermeer’s painting in Hertel 1996, pp. 207–11, figs. 45, 46. The latter (ibid., pp. 220–21, fig. 50) also compares Rubens’s oil sketch, Christ Triumphant over Sin and Death, of about 1628–30 (MMA), which shows Christ on a globe, crushing a serpent and a skeleton, and holding a chalice with host in his upraised hand.
25. The quote is from Hertel 1996, p. 217. The author writes effectively of “other separations and doublings of motifs.” John the Evangelist was ordered to drink a cup of poisoned wine by the emperor Domitian. When he lifted the cup, the wine flowed from it in the form of a serpent.
26. In Schelte à Bolswert’s engraving after a version of The Crucifixion by Jacob Jordaens, the Virgin also raises a hand to her breast (see Hertel 1996, fig. 48). Vermeer may have known the print as well as a painting.
27. See De Jongh 1975–76, p. 74, figs. 4, 5, showing illustrations from Tipus mundi, an anonymous Jesuit book of 1627, and from a revised translation published in 1643 (both in Antwerp). In each case, a figure (a Cupid-like Divine Love and Ignatius of Loyola) stands on an earthly globe and looks up to a heavenly sphere.
29. For two examples each by Luttichuys and by Van Roestren, see Gemar-Kocitzsch 1991, vol. 2, nos. 219/1, 219/2 (ill. p. 616), and vol. 3, nos. 332/1, 332/8 (ill. pp. 827, 830). Another example by Luttichuys is in a private Dutch collection (ill. in Van Straten 2000, p. 219, fig. 419).
32. A few authors have used the glass sphere as a crystal ball designed for academics. For example, in Arasse 1994, p. 85, it is considered “less easy to explain the omission of the reflection of the cross, called for by the emblem of Father Hesius,” than is the omission of the painter’s own reflection.” In fact, the omission simply underscores the more general meaning of Vermeer’s motif. The sole purpose of the reflections in the sphere (also an issue for Arasse) would appear to be formal: to convincingly suggest the nature of the object, and to make it a salient motif. An interior is vaguely indicated, with a window to the left on the viewer’s side of the curtain. This hint of the artist’s studio is perhaps typical of Vermeer, but it also occurs routinely in Dutch still-life painting (see Pl. 7), and it is hard to imagine how else the task might have been handled.

References: Hoeft 1752–70, vol. 1 (1752), pp. 48, 210, 438, records the picture as an allegory of the New Testament by Vermeer, in the Herman van Swol collection, Amsterdam, April 22, 1699, no. 25, sold for £400; as in an Amsterdam sale, July 13, 1718, no. 8, sold for £300; and as in an Amsterdam sale, April 19, 1735, no. 11, sold for £400.
Fl 33; ibid., vol. 2 (1752), p. 248, records the picture in the sale "of the art dealer David Jetswaert," Amsterdam, April 24, 1740, no. 152, sold for Fl 70; Thoré 1858–60, vol. 2 (1860), pp. 84, 85, 86, listed in the 1669, 1718, and 1731 sales; Thoré 1866, p. 166, no. 41, reviews the picture's record in sales of 1699 to 1749, draws attention to its unexpected scale, and declares the work "à retrouver"; Havard 1888, p. 38, no. 46, lists the work as in the sales of 1699, 1718, and 1735, but "elle a disparu depuis"; Flugi van Aspermont 1899, p. 34, briefly mentions the work as by Vermeer, "a specimen of Old-Dutch ultra-realism," in a discussion otherwise devoted to Bredius and Rembrandt; Rinder 1904, pp. 256 (ill.), 257, as Vermeer’s “New Testament Allegory,” on loan to the Mauritshuis from Bredius, "a feast of beauty, save for the clumsy posing of the figure"; W. Martin 1905, p. 14, suggests that the interior may be Vermeer's studio, with its windows reflected in the glass sphere; Hofstede de Groot 1907–27, vol. 1 (1907), pp. 82–83, no. 2, as by Vermeer, "Allegory of the New Testament," describes the composition, identifies the painting in the background as by Jacob Jordaeus (the original "now in the École Téirack, at Antwerp"), and gives full provenance, including the sale "by the dealer Wächtcher, Berlin, to A. Bredius (for 700 marks) as a work of E. H. van der Neer"; W. Martin 1907, p. 21, cites the picture while proposing a late date for Girl with a Flute (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.); Vanzype 1908, pp. 19, 90 (ill. opp. p. 80), as found by Bredius in Moscow; Hofstede de Groot 1909, pp. 35–36, 29, pl. 2; J. Veth 1910, pp. 113–14 (ill. p. 104), compares The Art of Painting, noting similarities and differences, and asks, "Was this work a commission, and did Vermeer make it contra-oeuvre?"; Pletzsch 1911, pp. 83–84, 117, no. 20, pl. XXXII, considers the work's "painterly qualities" of far greater concern than questions of meaning; Deyrolle 1912, pp. 12–13, 29, as Vermeer's "Nouveau Testament... d'une très curieuse conception"; Voss 1912, pp. 79, 82, sees the painting as an instance of Vermeer's coming to grief ("shipwreck") when he paints subjects other than scenes of daily life; Hale 1913, pp. 46, 135, 243, 304–7, 373 (ill. opp. p. 204), as rediscovered by Bredius in Berlin, the figure "rather funny," her drapery "extremely bad," and the conception of the whole "not Vermeer's forte," but the picture is technically accomplished; Barnouw 1914, pp. 50–54 (ill.), identifies the subject as an allegory of the Catholic faith, citing Peter’s edition of Ripa’s Iconologia (1644, pp. 147–48) as a source; Mauritshuis 1914, pp. 406–7, no. 625, as Représentation allégorique de la Foi, describes the composition, gives provenance and cites literature, with particular attention to Barnouw’s contribution; G. Wolf 1915 (ill. p. 66), as "Allegorical Representation of the New Testament"; M. Eisler 1916, pp. 254, 276–77, 279, fig. 35, dates the picture later than The Art of Painting; Bode 1917, pp. 73–76, mentions the work as an "isolated" case in Vermeer’s oeuvre; Gallatin 1917, pp. 389, 399, no. 33, "one of the least interesting of Vermeer’s paintings," although "the still-life and accessories are marvelously well painted"; W. Martin 1918, p. 38, fig. 19, approves Bredius’ attribution of the picture to Vermeer; Johansen 1920, pp. 193, 194, 197, 198, as Allogéne du Nouveau Testament, reveals "la décadence définitive," Lucas 1922, pp. 23, 29–30, as probably painted "to order," a work of no charm but "a masterly dexterity that not only leaves one bewildered but kills all the other genre painters in the vicinity"; Hausenstein 1924, p. 25, pl. 37, "full of virtuosité"; Chantavoine 1926, pp. 37, 39, 43, 48, 51, 61, 67, 76, 79–82, 83, 88 (ill. p. 89), cites the picture as a late work, revealing Vermeer’s variability, and mentions a few motifs (the tapistry especially); Wilenski 1929, pp. 277, 278, 284, pl. 122, as Allegory of the Faith, includes the work in a list of Vermeer’s “most characteristic pictures”; B. Burroughs and Wehle 1932, pp. 44–46, no. 78 (ill. p. 47), regards the painting as “alien in its subject matter” but in quality “entirely typical of Vermeer,” remarks, "for what institution, if any, the Allegory was ordered we do not know,” and reviews most of the motifs, suggesting that the glass sphere represents “the frivolity and superficiality of the world”; A. Alexandre 1933, pp. 166–67 (ill. p. 162), "une allégorie beaucoup plus compliquée, et sans nécessité"; Claudel 1935, pp. 46–48, as Allogéne évangélique, another picture that Holland will eternally regret having lost; de Hevesy 1935, p. 366, draws attention to the painting by Jordaeans; Terrasse 1935, p. 8, mentioned; Hale 1937, pp. 29, 75, 111–17, pl. 11, outdoes Hale 1931 in disliking the picture, in which “Vermeer passed from the sublime into the ridiculous”; Pletzsch 1939, pp. 36–37, 52, 57, fig. 40, describes the subject and its derivation from Ripa, and notes that the painting appears in the background of a double portrait by Waldmüller, dated 1824; A. B. de Vries 1939, pp. 51, 94, no. 40, fig. 63, dates the picture about 1669–70, and observes, “extremely sober and devoid of imagination,” this picture was probably “a commission [Vermeer] discharged without love”; Knipping 1939–40, vol. 1, pp. 27–28, suggests that the apple of Paradise has rolled out of the serpent’s mouth, and that the glass sphere probably derives from a Pauline text according to which the pious Christian on earth can only see “through a glass, darkly” (1 Cor. 13:12); Trautschold 1940, p. 269, stresses that the work is an “Allegory of Faith” and does not represent the “New Testament”; Blum 1945, p. 180, no. 41, p. 198, no. 36 (ill. between pp. 176 and 177), quotes Thoré 1866; Claudel 1946, pp. 25–26, repeats remarks made in Claudel 1935; E. Gardner 1948, pp. 76, 78 (ill. p. 75), credits the contributions of Thoré and Barnouw; A. B. de Vries 1948, pp. 43–44, 94, pl. 29, repeats A. B. de Vries 1939 in translation; Zijlerveld 1949, p. 117 n. 1, credits Barnouw 1914; Swillens 1950, pp. 50, 60, 72, 84–86, 96–99, 102, 116, 118, 135, no. 24, pls. 24, 46, 73 (overall, details, and diagram), reviews motifs that occur here and elsewhere in Vermeer’s oeuvre, and maintains that the painting should be titled “The Faith,” following Ripa’s description of that allegorical figure; Berendsen in Delft 1953, pp. 216–17, no. 324, fig. 53, discusses Vermeer’s use of Ripa for the iconography; Gowing 1952, pp. 57–78, 71 n. 17, 153–35, no. XXXIII, pls. 71–73 (overall and details), considers this figure by Vermeer to be “perhaps the only one of his maturity which was not painted largely from life,” notes the source in Ripa, compares an allegorical painting by Metsu, and considers the painting “not the most memorable” of the artist’s works; Malraux 1952, pp. 166–8, no. XXXI (ill.), reviews what some other scholars have said, especially Claudel; V. Bloch 1954, pp. 23, 37–38, pls. 79, 80, dates the painting after 1670; Rousseau 1954, p. 3, “one of his two religious compositions”; Slive 1956, pp. 8, 14 n. 15, fig. 2, reviews the comments of Barnouw and Swillens, who maintain that the figure represents the Catholic Faith, not Faith in general; Walicki 1956, pp. 36, 53, pl. 43, describes the picture as a realistic allegory; Grimschitz 1957, p. 286 (under no. 199), catalogues the Waldmüller portrait of 1824 (see Ex Coll., note 1) in which this painting or a copy of it appears in the background; Goldscheider 1958, pp. 39, 142–43, no. 36, pls. 83, 84, briefly covers the usual ground, concluding that this painting of about 1672 "was perhaps commissioned by a patron who might have given Ripa’s description to Vermeer"; Virch 1968, p. 228, "supports the the--
ory of Vermeer’s Catholicism”; Gowing 1961, p. 34, no. 88, pl. 88, listed; J. Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, p. 132, “hardly adds to Vermeer’s fame”; Bianconi 1967, p. 97, no. 42 (ill. p. 97), pls. xli–lxxiv, reviews the remarks of other writers; Gerson 1967, coll. 743, pl. 339, concludes that “the artist stressed the Catholic interpretation” of Ria by including the painting of the Crucifixion; Koningsberger 1967, pp. 150, 162–61 (ill.), claims that this painting is usually considered to be Vermeer’s “last work”; Slive 1968, vol. 1, pp. 453–54, vol. 2, pl. excxiv, fig. 3, agrees with the argument that the painting represents “Catholic Faith,” and that “The Faith,” and finds here an exception to the “adage about the value of a picture [being] over one thousand words”; Eink 1971, pp. 493, 498, 502, concludes from the “treatment of highlights as circles of confusion” that the rear wall was “the principal plane of focus” (meaning that the writer imagines this scene has before Vermeer’s eyes); Berger 1972, pp. 244–52, 264, considers the picture to illustrate Vermeer’s “technique of conspicuous exclusion,” and suggests that religious devotion is here “the subject of parody”; Ehy 1973, p. 310, mentions the painting as an example of Vermeer’s late style; Gallego and Mérét 1973, p. 53, observes that the picture has many symbolic motifs; Mader 1973, pp. 37, 39, 48, no. 31 (ill.), considers the painting’s “mediocrity” to originate with its theme; Von Sonnenburg 1973, unpagd, fig. 87 (detail), observes that in this work “Vermeer leaves out transitional tones so that things are defined by dim contrasts of height and shadow”; Walsh 1973, unpagd, fig. 63 and back cover (detail), alludes to “the literary content, against which people have long been prejudiced”; Grimm 1974, pp. 80, 82, 109, no. 35 (ill.), fig. 24, as a late work, “probably for an iconographically firmly commissioned”, Hendy 1974, p. 284, as “an anachronistic [?] piece of iconography which he must have been commissioned to transcribe into painting”; Knipping 1974, vol. 1, p. 24, pl. 13, repeats Knipping 1939–40 in translation; Blankert 1975a, pp. 11, 88, 111 n. 2, 162–64, no. 29, pl. 29, suggests that the allegory was commissioned by a wealthy Catholic patron, who probably asked for a composition similar to that of The Art of Painting by Vermeer, and remarks that the two works are very different in execution; Maunzer 1975, p. 113, compares the rock crushing a serpent to a similar detail in Manet’s The Dead Christ and the Angels (MMA); Welu 1975, pp. 341–44, figs. 13, 14, identifies the globe as the second edition (dated 1618) of a design by Jodocus Hondius; De Jongh 1975–76, pp. 69–73, 91, figs. 1, 2, discusses the string of pearls and other motifs as symbols of religious faith, and relates the glass sphere to an emblem published by Hessius in 1636; Wiesner 1976, p. 12, “leaves the beholder cold”; Wright 1976, pp. 13, 15, 71–76, 81, 84–85, pl. 34 (detail ill. p. 67), wrongly places the picture in the “Oostenvijk” collection in 1824 (“Oostenrijk” is Dutch for Austria); Menzel 1977, pp. 70–71, pls. 68, 69 (detail and whole), discusses among late, “cold,” works, wonders if the artist was being sincere or ironic in conceiving the picture, in which the best passage is the tapestry; Montias 1977, p. 280 n. 62, suggests that such a commission “would have been placed with a practicing Catholic”; Van Straaten 1977a, p. 79, figs. 19, 99, uses the painting to provide Dutch readers with the misinformation that being Catholic “in Protestant Holland” was “rather unusual”; Welu 1977, vol. 1, pp. 52–53, 126 nn. 62, 65, p. 138, no. 91, vol. 2, figs. 70, 71, identifies the globe as the second edition (dated 1618) of a design by Jodocus Hondius; Blankert 1978b, pp. 10, 58–59, 75 n. 2, 169–70, nos. 29, 29a, 29b, repeats Blankert 1979a in translation; Hibbard 1980, p. 348, fig. 624, describes the subject as “Catholic symbolism in a grandiose Dutch home”; Montias 1980, p. 58, suggests that the iconography reflects Jesus tenets and constitutes the only evidence of contact between Vermeer and that religious order; Blankert in Washington–Detroit–Amsterdam 1980–81, pp. 29, 33 n. 82, comments on the inadequate title used in the sales of 1699 and 1718; Hauser 1981, pp. 190, 202 n. 20, notes the globe, which is also found in The Geographer by Vermeer; Slates 1981, p. 106–9 (ill.), dates the picture to about 1672–74, and describes its symbolism; Wheeldon 1981, p. 148, pl. 43, dates the picture about 1671–74, and (echoing Hale 1913) considers this picture Vermeer’s “one mistake,” which, although “beautifully painted,” is a failure as a work of art; Salomon 1983, p. 218, suggests that this painting and Vermeer’s Woman with a Balance may have been painted for patrons of similar tastes and religious beliefs; D. Smith 1983, p. 698, compares “the mixture of grandiloquence and prose in this late painting” with “the same forces” in a work by Frans van Mieris; Gaskell 1984, pp. 58, 161 n. 32, refers to the pearls as a possible symbol of faith; Haak 1984, p. 411, fig. 900, finds the work “disappointing primarily because Vermeer’s magisterial control of light seems to have failed him”; Paps 1984, pp. 68, 71, 74, 76, 93, 107 n. 11, fig. 45, calls the picture “that large hallucinative pastiche,” and finds the blood on the floor inconsistent with the “notoriously clean” Dutch households; Aillaud, Blankert, and Montias 1986, pp. 10, 12, 45, 51, 54–55, 64, 142, 191, 196–97, 225, no. 29, pl. xxxi, figs. 37, 41 (details), repeats the points made in Blankert 1975a and Blankert 1978b; Hedinger 1986, pp. 114–15, fig. 121, cites the description of this picture in 1699 (“met meer betrekkenisse”) as license to overinterpret The Art of Painting; P. Sutton 1986, pp. 180–81, fig. 256, briefly describes the iconography; Welu 1986, pp. 264–61 nn. 8, 9, refers to the globe by Hondius, here with “a combination of elements found only in the 1618 edition”; Montias 1987, pp. 73–74, suggests that the picture was painted for a private patron and not the Jesuit order in Deift, in part because it was in the Van Swol collection not long afterward; Montias 1989, pp. 140, 155, 188–89, 191–92, 202, 215, 237, 266, fig. 39, discusses the painting of The Crucifixion, the globe, and the ebony crucifix, and concludes that the Museum’s picture “could only have hung in a Catholic chapel or in a devout Catholic home,” strongly favoring the latter alternative (p. 202 n. 94); Liedtke 1990, p. 32, cites the work as part of Friedsam’s bequest, and calls it “remarkably undated”; The Hague 1991, p. 110, n. 6, listed as a Bredius loan to the Mauritshuis; Nash 1991, pp. 19, 21, 25–26, 28, 30, 31–36, 41, 44, 49, 82, 100, 104, 106, 108, 120, 123, 135 (ill. p. 109), offers numerous isolated remarks, but never comes to grips with the work, concluding with complaints about its manner of execution; Liedtke in Baum and Liedtke 1992, p. 24, notes the picture as one of the major Dutch paintings owned by Michael Friedsam; Broos 1993, p. 27, fig. 19, reports that when Bredius sold a “most unpleasant Vermeer” (in Bredius’s opinion) to an American collector in 1939 (sic), no Dutch connoisseurs were concerned; Brusati 1993, unpagd, pl. 15, no comment; D’Hulst and De Poorter in Anwerp 1993, vol. 1, p. 20, list a painting in Vermeer’s estate inventory of February 20, 1676, which is probably identical with the version of Jordaeus’s Crucifixion seen in the background of Vermeer’s picture; De Poorter in ibid., p. 112, fig. A27b, suggests that Vermeer modified Jordaeus’s composition when he placed a version of his Crucifixion in the background of Allegory of the Faith; Arasse 1994, pp. 17, 18–19, 20–21, 22, 24–25, 36, 41, 83–86, 91, 93, passim.
implausibly about the private feelings expressed in this “public”
ally; Costeras 1998, pp. 111, 135, 166–67, places the canvas’s size
and preparation in the context of other works by Vermeer; Gaskell
1984, pp. 13–14, considers the subject as one the Catholic artist
might take more seriously than others; Huys Jansen 1998, p. 123
(under no. 59), fig. 42, compares the work with Van Bijlert’s Mary
Magdalen Turning from the World to Christ; Knaack 1998, pp. 66–76,
fig. 1, identifies the subject of the tapestry as Elicer and Rebecca;
Stokes 1998, p. 91 n. 66, notes that Vermeer omitted figures from
the painting by Jordaens; Vergara 1998, p. 247, oddly maintains that
motifs in the picture such as the ebony cross, the gold-tooled leather,
and the large Crucifixion scene, even the situation depicted . . .
exemplify Vermeer’s practice of painting what he met with daily”;
Wadam 1998, pp. 208–9, 222 n. 37, stresses the schematic manner
in which objects are depicted, and concludes that the painting was
“meant to be seen from some distance, hanging relatively high on
the wall”; G. Weber 1998, p. 307 n. 33, draws a parallel between
Mary looking at Christ on the Cross and the figure of Faith raising
her eyes to the glass orb; Gaskell 2000, pp. 45, 177, submits the
work as evidence that “Vermeer’s paintings form a far from homoge-
neous group”; Hedquist 2000, pp. 333–64, fig. 1, imagines that in
this painting Vermeer depicted “Mary Magdalen as a richly dressed
courtesan” (p. 335); Liedtke 2000a, pp. 72, 191, 252, 254, 260–62,
281 n. 48, 293 n. 218, 295 nn. 272, 275, fig. 315, describes the use
of patterns and treatment of light as more abstracted than in earlier
works, considers the classicist style suited to the subject, and largely
approves of Hertel’s (1996) reading of the allegory; Osaka 2000,
p. 207, no. 34, in an illustrated list of all paintings by Vermeer; A.
Bailey 2001, pp. 66–66, 179–81, 200, 212, 216 (ill. p. 178), consi-
ders Vermeer’s Catholicism to have come out “in a sickly, melo-
dramatic way” in this picture; Beaucamp 2001, pp. 148, 171–73,
fig. 108, reviews the iconography with particular attention to
Jordaens’s painting of the Crucifixion in the background; Chapman
2001, p. 263, “Vermeer may have been aware that he was painting
ideas”; Fransis in Frantis et al. 2001, pp. 5, 10, 21, 25, pl. 32, urges
caution in interpreting Vermeer’s Catholicism; Hedquist 2001,
pp. 119, 123–30, 212 nn. 118, 122, pl. 32, fig. 47 (detail), relates the
altar, the objects on it, and the painting of the Crucifixion to con-
temporary liturgical practice; Liedtke in New York–London 2001,
pp. 149, 150, 164, 167–68, 397–402, 408, no. 77, considers the style,
content, and modern reception of the picture, and compares works
by De Lairesse, Du Jardin, Metsu, and others; Netta 2001, pp. 10, 11
(ill.), 25, 31, asserts, without providing evidence, that the painting
“was a commission from Delft’s Jesuit Order”; Steadman 2001, pp. 62–64,
n. 5, 195 n. 23, figs. 23 (diagram of ceiling), 24 (diagram of floor
tiles), 33 (detail and diagram of mirrored sphere), 65 (scale diagram),
struggles to make the picture conform to the author’s thesis con-
cerning the camera obscura; Warffemius 2001, p. 76, notes that the
marble floor is a “negative” version of the usual pattern that Vermeer
employs after 1664; Leonhard 2001, figs. 7, 23 (details of the glass
sphere), discusses the possible symbolism of the suspended orb;
Westermann in Madrid 2003, pp. 88–90, 211–32, fig. 16, offers a
double reading of the glass sphere, and mistakes Vermeer’s unusual
interior for an “apparent likeness of his (or someone’s) home”; P.
Sutton in Dublin–Greenwich 2003–4, p. 184, notes the same
leather wall covering in The Love Letter; by Vermeer (Rijksmuseum,
Amsterdam); Greub 2004, pp. 16, 62, 84, 89, 125, 126, 156, 173–74, 181, fig. 4, mentions the painting of Christ on the Cross as possibly that in the inventory of Vermeer’s estate, notes the use of the tapestry as a repoussoir, and cites the first known owner, Salomon 2004, p. 15, sees the painting as a “precedent” for Catholic iconography in Vermeer’s *Woman with a Balance*; D’Adda 2005, p. 142, regrets the “cold and mannered tone”; Fahy in Fahy et al. 2005, p. 131, mentioned; Huerta 2005, pp. 81, 89, 94, 98, 111, 114, 115 (ill.), sees the marble floor here and in other pictures as “the fundament for the universal geometry of [Vermeer’s] private chambers” (p. 81); Steadman 2005, pp. 300 n. 13, 301 n. 15, 302 n. 20, 304–9, fig. 11, imagines that Vermeer staged the entire scene and recorded it with a camera obscura; Plomp 2006c, p. 376, fig. 1, considers whether the painting by (or after) Jordans in the background was actually in Delft; Rosenberg 2006, pp. 188, 199 (ill.), believes that by setting the subject “in a room of his home,” Vermeer achieved a “personal tone.”


**EX COLL.:** Herman Stoffelsz van Swoll, Amsterdam (until d. 1698; his estate sale, Amsterdam, April 22, 1699, no. 25, as “Een zittende Vrouw met meer beteekenisse, verbeeldende het Nieuwe Testament” [A seated Woman rich in meaning, representing the New Testament], sold for fl 400); sale, Amsterdam, July 13, 1718, no. 8, for fl 100; sale, Amsterdam, April 19, 1735, no. 11, for fl 53; [David Ietswaart, until 1749; sale, Amsterdam, April 22, 1749, no. 152, as “Een Dame in haar Kamer, in haar devote, met veel uitoerig bijwerk, door de Delfse van der Meer, zo goed als Eglon van der Neer,” for fl 70 to Ravensberg]; possibly in a private collection, Austria (in 1824); Dmitri Shchukin, Moscow (1899; probably as by Eglon van der Neer); [Wächter, Berlin, 1899, as by Eglon van der Neer; sold for 700 marks to Bredius]; Abraham Bredius, The Hague (1899–1928, as by Vermeer, on loan to the Mauritshuis, The Hague, 1899–1923, and to the Museum Boymans, Rotterdam, 1923–28; sold to Kleinberger); [Kleinberger, Paris, 1928; sold to Friedsam for $300,000]; Michael Friedsam, New York (1928–d. 1931); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.18

1. This is conjectured on the basis of the appearance of part of Vermeer’s painting in the background of Ferdinand Georg Waldmüller’s *Portrait of a Cartographer and His Wife*, of 1824 (Westfälisches Landesmuseum, Münster); see Grünwitz 1957, p. 286 (under no. 129), and Broos in Washington–The Hague 1999–96, p. 194, fig. 4. It is possible that * Allegory of the Catholic Faith* was included in the portrait only to signify the sitters’ religion. However, in Pflüger 1939, p. 57 (under no. 3), it is noted that Wächter, the Berlin art dealer from whom Bredius bought the painting in 1899, said that he had acquired it in Austria (kindly brought to my attention by Estée Quodbach).

---

**IMITATOR OF JOHANNES VERMEER**

**207. A Young Woman Reading**

Oil on canvas, 7½ x 5½ in. (19.7 x 14.6 cm)

The fabrication of this painting is atypical of the seventeenth century. Pigment analysis, X-radiography, and examination with the binocular microscope reveal that it was constructed in the following manner: A small piece of medium-coarse, plain weave, hand-loomed fabric was glued to a larger piece of cheesecloth and primed with zinc white (ZnO) in a water-soluble binder. (Zinc white was not widely used as an artists’ material until the end of the eighteenth century.) After the painting was completed, the support was manipulated to induce cracks. It was then lined to linen with an aqueous adhesive and stretched onto a traditional keyable stretcher that is ¼ in. (.64 cm) larger all around than the primary support. The extended borders were filled and painted to match. A finely divided black material (possibly ink) was rubbed into the cracks, and the surface was distressed and retouched in an attempt to simulate an old paint film. The pigment used for the plaster wall and the girl’s white blouse is calcite. Preliminary analysis indicates that the medium is not water-soluble but possibly egg tempera or an egg-in-oil emulsion.

The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.40
207. Shown actual size
As a forgery painted in the Netherlands about 1925–27, this small canvas in the Bache Collection might well be excluded from the present catalogue, but it is of considerable interest for the history of taste in America, an aspect of which was the ambition of Gilded Age collectors (Bache was born in 1861) to possess works by “Rembrandt, Hals and Vermeer, the three prime immortals of their school” (as the New York art critic Royal Cortissoz expressed it in 1930; see Refs.). When Jules Bache started assembling his “Collection of Masterpieces” in the 1920s, Vermeer was the most desired member of Dutch art’s holy trinity and the rarest on the market.¹ Bache would have known, as a Wall Street investor, that when demand for a manufactured commodity increases, so does supply. Or price, when supplies are limited: in 1928, Bache paid Wildenstein $134,800 for this picture, somewhat more than he had paid in 1926 for Hals’s Portrait of a Bearded Man with a Ruff (Pl. 62).

The price might have been acceptable for an important work by Vermeer, considering that nearly all his known pictures were either in museums (for example, the Altman, Marquand, and Huntington Vermeers; Pls. 202–204) or owned by families not likely to part with their treasures (those of Frick, Mellon, Morgan, Rothschild, and Widener). Joseph Duveen probably made this point when, in 1929, he sold Bache a purported Vermeer, Portrait of a Young Boy (now attributed to Sébastien Bourdon [1616–1671]; fig. 216), for $175,000. Old pictures that could (at that time) have plausibly been attributed to the Delft master were eagerly sought by art dealers of the period, some of whom presumably maintained a hopeful faith in their rediscoveries. The limits of the artist’s oeuvre were still far from clear (and remained hazy, for some scholars, until as recently as the 1990s). It was nearly a decade later, in 1937, that Christ at Emmaus, the famous forgery by Han van Meegeren (1889–1947), was published as an early Vermeer by Abraham Bredius and purchased by the Boymans Museum in Rotterdam.²

When the Bache painting was first published, by Vitale Bloch in June 1928 (see Refs.), the author drew attention to the similarity between the head of our letter reader and that of another young woman, in Vermeer’s The Letter Reader, of about 1657 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), and he noted that the seascape hanging on the wall also occurs in The Love Letter (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). These comparisons must have been reassuring to collectors. The eminent W. R. Valentiner, in an article of two months earlier (April 1928), conceded that “to hear almost every year of a newly discovered Vermeer may cause suspicion.” Mistakes had been made, he observed, because critics imagined the painter departing from his usual path, whereas he had actually “used a very small number of models, and repeated certain details like costumes, curtains, pillows, windows, mantelpieces, and even the paintings hanging on the wall so often that newly discovered works by him frequently seem like puzzle pictures composed of pieces taken from different groupings in known paintings by him.” Such “rediscovered” Vermeers include the two discussed as autograph works in Valentine’s article, The Smiling Girl and The Lacemaker (both in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), which are now universally recognized as fakes of about 1925–26, perhaps by the Hague dealer and restorer Theodorus van Wijngaarden (1874–1952), or by Van Meegeren.³

In an article on the Washington imitations, Arthur Wheelock relates that The Smiling Girl was “discovered” in a private collection on the Lower Rhine, and in March 1926 taken to Wilhelm von Bode, director of the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum in Berlin. Bode declared the picture genuine and published it the same year, and in short order it was purchased by Duveen. The Lacemaker turned up in 1927, in the “collection” of Harold Wright, an English paint manufacturer who lived in Bremen. Bode certified the painting and placed it on exhibition in his museum during the autumn of 1927, after which it went to Duveen. Wright and Van Wijngaarden were acquainted, seeing each other occasionally at Van Meegeren’s home in The Hague.⁴ The two Dutch painters had known each other since at least 1923, traveled to England together (where Van Wijngaarden found a pair of previously unrecorded genre paintings by Hals), and shared certain secrets of the trade.⁵

Much of this history is best left for future publications; Jonathan Lopez, who has been most helpful in exploring the likely origins of the Bache picture, is completing a thorough study of Van Meegeren and his associates. But it is important to mention here a letter that Lopez found in Bode’s papers in Berlin, from Dr. G. A. Rademaker, a physician in The Hague and the supposed owner of the present picture at the time of its discovery. On September 27, 1927, Rademaker wrote (in English) to Bode, “As Your Excellency certainly has heard from Dr. Bloch, I have sold my little Vermeer, the pearl of my collection. When they came to take the picture away I felt very miserable.”⁶ Bode had indeed received the news—and the painting itself, which, according to the Berliner Tageblatt of September 21, 1927, had been brought to the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum for his inspection. The discoverer of the picture was “the Dutch [originally Russian] art historian Dr. Vitale Bloch,” who came across the Young Woman Reading in a private collection. The newspaper notes the resemblance between the woman’s head and that in the Dresden Vermeer.⁷ As is well
known, Bloch was a dealer as well as an art historian. In the former capacity, he became a Nazi collaborator and an “Honorary Aryan”; in the latter, he wrote a book on “all the paintings of Vermeer of Delft” (1954) which does not mention this one.\(^8\)

Conservator Dorothy Mahon has studied the paint composition of the Bache picture, and has determined that the medium is not water-soluble (see condition note above). From this, Lopez concludes that neither Van Meegeren nor Van Wijngaarden is likely to have painted the work, as both those forgers used a gelatin-based (water-soluble) medium in the 1920s. Lopez wonders if the Belgian forger Joseph van der Veken (1873–1964) might have been responsible, since he employed an egg-in-oil medium, and because Rademaker appears to have owned a fake Jan van Eyck.\(^9\) Van der Veken’s son-in-law, Albert Phillipot, was also in the business. The present writer, though unfamiliar with the dramatic personae, is inclined to keep Van Meegeren in mind, since little is known of his and Van Wijngaarden’s technical experimentation during the 1920s; the Young Woman Reading, in its awkward rectilinearity, overly emphatic shadows (especially the double shadow to the left of the seascape’s frame), dependence on profiles, and mannequin-like modeling, is possibly an early effort by the same painter who made the Woman Reading a Letter, of about 1935 (fig. 257). That picture was one of the forgeries found in Van Meegeren’s studio in France after his death in 1947, and turned over to the Rijksmuseum by the Amsterdam district court.\(^10\)

1. The quote is from Bache himself, as recorded in L. Levy n.d., p. 2. On the taste for Vermeer in America, see Wheelock and Glass 2001.
2. See Blankert 1978b, pp. 70–71, fig. 49, and Van den Brandhof 1979 (nicely titled “An Early Vermeer of 1935?”).
3. The quotes in this paragraph are from Valentin 1928c, pp. 274–75. The passage is quoted at greater length in Wheelock 1995c, pp. 272–73, in an article on the two Vermeer forgeries in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., which Wheelock attributes to Van Wijngaarden.
5. Van den Brandhof 1979, pp. 61, 67–68, 76. Van Wijngaarden’s own descendants recently reported (to Jonathan Lopez, who conveyed the information to the present writer on March 8, 2006) that he was the “brains” of a forgery business, with Van Meegeren as the main talent and Wright as a straw man. Wright was employed by Theodore William Holzapfel Ward, the German-English owner of an international paint business, best known to art historians for donating (in 1938) a collection of Dutch and Flemish still lifes to the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, in the name of his wife, Daisy Linda Ward. Van Meegeren painted Ward’s portrait in 1928 (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; Meijer 2003, pp. 12–13, fig. 5), and was remembered in 1997 by one of Ward’s sons (letter to J. Lopez) as staying “for about ten days on the first visit” to Ward’s London house, and for being quite amusing. Ward’s older brother Albert and younger brother Rudolf ran a picture gallery called the Art Collectors’ Association, on Duke Street, Saint James’s, London. They bought (for £14) and in 1922 sold to the National Gallery, London, Gerrit van Honthorst’s Christ before the High Priest, of
about 1647–18 (see ibid., p. 13, and MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 191, 192 n. 42), but most of their stock was modest (for example, the Museum’s Pieter Quast; Pl. 139).


7. Copies of this and contemporary news reports about the painting were kindly provided to Jonathan Lopez by Wildenstein and Co., New York, in 2006.

8. Wisely enough, since the painting is not mentioned in any standard monograph on Vermeer. See V. Bloch 1954, and, on the Nazi protection Bloch received in 1942, Nicholas 1991, p. 101.

9. Van der Veken is best known for replacing the “Just Judges” panel on Jan van Eyck’s Ghent Altarpiece after it was stolen in 1934. On February 23, 1954, a visitor to the Metropolitan Museum, David Roëll, suggested to a member of the curatorial staff that the Bache picture was a fake by Van der Veken. At present, Lopez considers this suggestion worthy of further investigation (personal communication, January 16, 2007).


References: V. Bloch 1928, pp. 359 (ill.), 360, in a transparently dishonest essay, in which all but the last paragraph consists of general remarks about Dutch painting, the author notes that the model’s head in this small canvas (published here for the first time, with gratitude expressed to Messrs. Wildenstein of Paris and New York) resembles that (in reverse) in The Letter Reader by Vermeer (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden), that the seascape in the background is the same as the one seen in The Love Letter (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), and that the type of composition and granular painting technique speak for an early dating, close to The Letter Reader and The Milkmaid (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Bache Collection 1929, unpagd (ill.), as by Vermeer, lists (under “Collections”) Dr. Rademaker and Wildenstein, and (under bibliography) press reports of September 21 and October 4, 1927, and V. Bloch 1928; Hofstede de Groot [1929], pp. 5–6, pl. 52; Cortissoz 1930, p. 359, notes that in the Bache collection, “Rembrandt, Hals and Vermeer, the three prime immortals of their school, are all here, Vermeer having two interesting pieces in the collection” (the other was Portrait of a Young Boy, now attributed to Sébastien Bourdon; fig. 356 here); Hale 1937, pp. 130–131, pl. 20, describes the picture as “attributed by some critics to Jan Vermeer of Delft” (only Hofstede de Groot is mentioned), criticizes the composition, and concludes that if the picture is by Vermeer, “it is not a very good example”; Bache Collection 1937, unpagd, no. 41 (ill.), erroneously as on panel, lists collections, exhibitions, and three references (those by Bloch, Hofstede de Groot, and Hale, with no mention of the last author’s negative opinion); Bache Collection 1943, unpagd, no. 40 (ill.), repeats Bache Collection 1937, adding one minor reference (exhibition notice in Art News, February 23, 1929, p. 1); Wehle 1943, pp. 288, 290, observes that this painting and the other Bache Vermeer (see Cortissoz 1930 above) reveal “such an obvious relationship to the style of Vermeer’s master Carel Fabritius as strongly to suggest that Vermeer, when he painted them, could not have long been separated from his teacher”; L. Levy n.d., p. 16, records that Bache purchased the picture from Wildenstein on January 9, 1928, for $14,800, noting that Duveen did not like the painting and even had some doubts as to its authorship; Bianconi 1967, p. 99, no. 68 (ill.), lists the picture (erroneously said to have been exhibited at the Reinhardt Galleries, New York, in 1926 rather than 1929) among works attributed to Vermeer that most critics reject, noting that Hale (1937) was the first to cast doubt; Minneapolis 1973, unpagd, no. 81 (ill.), describes the painting as a pastiche, citing the repetition of two motifs from other pictures by Vermeer (the same noted in V. Bloch 1928, which is not cited) as evidence against Vermeer’s authorship, and criticizing the style of chair, the “thick dabs” of paint on the woman’s shoulder and hair, and especially the treatment of space (“the chief element enabling the viewer to see this painting as a fake”), which is “shallow and unequivocal of any kind of mood”; Gerson 1977, p. 289, suggests that fakes like this one should be studied to determine their age, perhaps assigning “groups of them to special artistes,” and asks “where can we place . . . the Reading Girl in the Bache collection and the other girl-paintings?”; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 447, as Style of Johannes Vermeer, first quarter 20th century; Liedke 1990, p. 52, notes that in 1928, after acquiring masterpieces by Van Dyck, Rembrandt, and other famous European artists, Bache bought “his second fake Vermeer, the Young Woman Reading, from Wildenstein (135,000 dollars; worth 5,000 dollars today)”; Baetjer 1995, p. 337, as Style of Johannes Vermeer, first quarter 20th century; Larsen 1996, p. 126, no. 62 (ill. p. 128), catalogues the picture among “works erroneously attributed to Vermeer,” crediting Hale 1937 and repeating the misinformation (from Bianconi 1967) that the canvas was exhibited in New York in 1926.


1. The Museum’s attribution was changed from Vermeer to “fraudulent imitation of Vermeer (1st quarter 20th century)” on April 18, 1974, on the recommendation of curator John Walsh.
Johannes Cornelisz Verspronck, the second most accomplished portraitist in seventeenth-century Haarlem, was born in that city about twenty years after the birth of Frans Hals (q.v.), and worked exclusively there until he predeceased Hals in 1662 (he was buried in Saint Bavo's on June 30).

Early training was probably provided by Verspronck's father, Cornelis Engelsz (Gouda ca. 1575–1618 Haarlem), who is known mainly for two large group portraits of civic guard companies dating from 1612 and 1618 and a few kitchen still lifes with biblical figures. Verspronck may also have studied with Hals for a short period before joining the Haarlem painters' guild in 1632. He never married, and lived most of his life in his parents' house. The artist appears to have made a good living, to judge from his steady stream of upper-middle-class clients and several signs of prosperity, such as the expensive residence on the Jansstraat that he purchased in 1656. Like a number of Haarlem artists, including the De Grebbers and the De Brays, Verspronck evidently remained faithful to the Catholic church. Many of his sitters were prominent Catholics, although Calvinist patrons often sat for the painter as well.

About one hundred portraits, a few genre pictures, and one still-life painting by Verspronck are documented; no drawings by Verspronck are known. Dated works range from 1634 to 1658. As has often been observed, the artist relied on a few standard compositional patterns, with variations in the arrangement of arms and hands, in the fall of light in the background, and in the usually restrained tonality of the whole. Colorful exceptions to Verspronck's customary palette are found in the celebrated *Girl in Blue*, of 1641 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), and in the extraordinary *Portrait of Andries Stilte as a Standard Bearer*, dated 1640 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.). In these pictures and many others, the painter's masterful use of broad and thin but carefully placed brushstrokes enlivens luxurious fabrics and the play of light over skin and hair.

Despite the obvious sobriety of the artist and his typical patrons, his portraits are always accessible, and occasionally memorable for the sitter's expression. Verspronck invariably drew a preliminary sketch of the subject's head and collar on the primed support. His underdrawings began in an exploratory manner, with revisions ranging from shifting placements of the figure in the picture field to minute refinements of contours. He appears to have worked swiftly from life, and then progressed to finer details. In applying his finished paint layers Verspronck closely followed the underdrawing, a process that contrasts with Hals's much more direct approach and with that of most contemporary Dutch portraitists.

Verspronck flourished in the 1640s, when he painted dozens of single and pendant portraits and two group portraits of governesses of charitable institutions (1641 and 1642; both Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem). Some very fine, if staid, portraits also date from the early and mid-1650s, but in the last few years of his life Verspronck worked very little, if at all. Apparently he never had a pupil, and the question of workshop assistance is never raised.

1. For biographies of Engelsz and Verspronck, see now Van Thiel-Strooman in Biesboer et al. 2006, pp. 146–48, 323–24, respectively.
2. Haarlem 1979, pp. 11–20, for these and other biographical details and all the relevant documents.
5. The latter was acquired in 1998. See Haarlem 1979, nos. 19, 33; also Amsterdam 2000, pp. 166–67, no. 113, for the *Girl in Blue*. Some of Verspronck's finest works are cited by the leading authority, R. E. O. Ekkart, in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 32, p. 376.
Oil on canvas, 31¾ x 25¾ in. (79.4 x 64.1 cm)  
Signed and dated (lower right): J VSPronc[k] [VS in monogram] a[nn]o° 1645  
The head, hat, collar, and hand are well preserved. There is extensive abrasion in the costume and damage to the tonal gradation of the background at upper right. The signature is worn but legible. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals that the placement of the eyes, nose, mouth, and contours of the face were indicated by brushed underdrawing. The nose and mouth were underdrawn slightly to the right of their final placement. Adjustments to the height of the hat and changes in the collar described below are revealed by infrared reflectography and X-radiography.  
Bequest of Susan P. Colgate, in memory of her husband, Romulus R. Colgate, 1936  36.162.1

In this portrait of an unknown sitter, dated 1644, the artist employs one of his standard compositional patterns of the 1640s. The design is similar to that of the Portrait of a Man, dated 1643, which has a pendant (both in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston),¹ and to the arrangement of several male portraits for which no pendant is known.² The costume was badly damaged by overcleaning in the past, and early conservation efforts were hindered by misreading of the artist’s own revisions. As noted in the biography above, Verspronck usually followed a careful underdrawing (which is evident here as well) from which he rarely deviated while working up the paint layers. In this case, however, he modified the collar and perhaps a few other costume details, presumably at the patron’s request. A lace collar with scalloped edges, which had covered more of the shoulders, was replaced by the present collar (through which the front of the lace collar is partly visible). This change in fashion is known from many Dutch portraits of the mid-1640s.  
The man’s right hand and cuff were completely overpainted at some point before the work was exhibited in 1909.³ Cleaning in 1954 revealed a more complicated arrangement, but the artist’s intentions in the sleeves of the jacket, the cuffs, and the hands remained ambiguous until 2003–4, when the additions of 1954 (overpaint and synthetic varnish) were removed and a faithful restoration became possible.⁴  
The sleeves, open at the outer seams, are lined with a closely spaced row of small buttons, as is the front of the jacket. The opening at the sitter’s right elbow reveals a purple lining, which is also visible at his right wrist where the sleeve is turned back under the lace cuff. The scalloped edge of the cuff folds down at the corner, and the edge of the tan glove turns down as well, showing a white lining inside. The cloak worn over the man’s shoulder drapes snugly over his left arm, and is turned over at both edges to reveal a purple lining which matches that of the jacket. Two other costume refinements of the 1640s are the bow of black silk ribbon on the tall hat (the height of which was somewhat adjusted in the course of work) and the square collar (resembling a short cape) on the back of the cloak, which is bordered with black scalloped lace. As usual in Dutch dress of this period, the overall impression is one of understated luxury. Apart from the dark purple passages and the tan gloves, coloring is restricted mainly to the pinkish tones of the face, which is enlivened by the sitter’s loose brown curls, a few streaks of shadow, and the merest hint of a smile.  
A survey of Verspronck’s half-length portraits of men demonstrates that the posing and foreshortening of the figure’s arms frequently conform to a desired silhouette rather than to anatomical logic. In this picture and others, the hand or hands appear to have some invisible support, possibly an implied sword hilt under the cloak or the slinglike draping of the cloak itself.

1. Haarlem 1799, nos. 50, 51.  
2. Ibid., nos. 53 (ca. 1643–45), 61 (1645), 62 (ca. 1644), 65 (1646); the last picture is in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, the others in unknown locations (no. 53 was at Christie’s, New York, January 27, 2000, no. 171).  
3. See the photograph in New York 1909, no. 140.  
4. This was carried out by Karen Thomas at the Metropolitan Museum. The writer is grateful to her and to conservator Dorothy Mahon for discussing the course of conservation on various occasions.

REFERENCES: Valentiner in New York 1909, no. 140, reproduces a photograph of the portrait with the sitter’s right sleeve and much of the costume overpainted; L[ouise]. G. B[urrells], in MMA Bulletin 32, no. 3 (March 1937), p. 75, reports the picture’s bequest to the MMA and reproduces the canvas in its overpainted state; Ekkart in Haarlem 1979, pp. 48, 101, no. 60 (ill. p. 174, the painting in its post-1954 state), remarks on the use of a standard compositional design, and suggests that the work may be identical with a picture of this size and description in a Le Brum sale in Paris of April 14, 1784, no. 92; Bactier 1995, p. 307.


EX COLL.: Wilhelm Funk, New York (1909); [French and Co., New York]; Susan P. Colgate, Sharon, Conn. (by 1934–d. 1936); Bequest of Susan P. Colgate, in memory of her husband, Romulus R. Colgate, 1936  36.162.1
Jan Victors
Amsterdam 1619—after January 1676, East Indies

Victors is best known for biblical pictures like the one discussed below, but he also painted portraits, trompe, and genre scenes, the last usually with tradesmen, quacks, or peasants. He was baptized “Hans” in the Oude Kerk, Amsterdam, on June 13, 1619, as the seventh child of humble parents, Louis Victors and Stijntje Jaspers. The painter’s father and grandfather were carpenters, although Louis Victors became a city messenger in 1625. Victors’s training is not documented, but it is thought that he may have studied with Rembrandt about 1637–39, when Ferdinand Bol and Gerbrand van den Eckhout (q.v.) were in the master’s studio, and another Rembrandt pupil, Govert Flinck (q.v.), was painting his first independent works in Amsterdam. In any case, Victors was close to Rembrandt’s circle and appears to have been influenced by Flinck in particular, and by Rembrandt’s own teacher, Pieter Lastman (1583–1633). As an orthodox Calvinist, Victors was a conservative artist who stressed meaning more than style, as may be seen by comparing his large Isaac Blessing Jacob, of about 1650 (Louvre, Paris), with Van den Eckhout’s more Rembrandtesque handling of the same story (Pl. 42). One may equally imagine the canvas by Victors transformed into a tomb monument or an illustration in a religious tract, the latter with a caption explaining precisely what the figures are saying and thinking. As in the work of Lastman, explicit gestures and glances convey content with didactic emphasis, an approach that in Victors can seem simultaneously stale and sincere.

In 1642, Victors married Jannetje Bellers, who at her death in 1661 left nine children. The artist was especially productive from the mid-1640s to the mid-1650s, as a painter of Old Testament subjects and of affectionate glimpses of provincial life (the latter look somewhat like Steens done over by Maes). Occasionally, Victors was commissioned to paint formal portraits, the most impressive of which depict a couple who were later portrayed by Rembrandt (see figs. 194, 195; Pls. 158, 159).

Two sympathetic portraits of the female regents of the Reformed Church Orphanage in Amsterdam, feeding and clothing groups of orphans and fatherless or motherless girls (Amsterdams Historisch Museum), have been dated to the early 1660s, when Victors was himself probably in need of the institution’s help. He often suffered financially, especially in later years, and appears to have abandoned his profession shortly after 1670. In 1673, he became a medical orderly and lay preacher on trading ships owned by the East India Company (VOC). Victors left Amsterdam for the East Indies early in 1676; he died later that year or early in 1677.

3. See also Liedtke 1996b, p. 6, figs. 1, 2, for a comparison of the Victors in the Louvre with a work by Lastman.
4. For another pair of portraits by Victors, see Melbourne–Canberra 1997–98, nos. 50, 51.
209. Abraham's Parting from the 
Family of Lot

Oil on canvas, 68 x 65 1/2 in. (174.3 x 166.4 cm) 
Signed (at right): Jan Victors

Although slightly abraded throughout, the painting is in 
good condition. There is minor paint loss along three areas 
of damage that extend nearly the full width of the composi-
tion: across the chin of Abraham, the face of Lot, and the 
face of the young girl in the foreground at lower left.

Purchase, 1871 71.170

For at least one hundred twenty years, this late work by Victors 
was thought to represent Jacob and Laban. Its far less familiar 
subject, first identified by Munuth in 1987 (see Refs.), is actually 
Abraham’s departure for Canaan, leaving Lot and his family, 
who will set off for Sodom (Gen. 13). Victors’s Old Testament 
pictures can require close reading, occasionally because of free 
interpretation, but more often because of unexpected subject 
matter. It seems likely that the artist’s orthodox Calvinist 
beliefs, and like-minded patrons, directed him to certain biblical 
passages, much as they required him to avoid others.¹
Abraham and his nephew Lot (whose father, Haran, has died) have journeyed from Egypt to the plain of Jordan, where there is a dispute between their respective herdsmen about grazing land. Abraham generously tells Lot to choose whatever territory he would prefer:

Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, and between my herdmen and thy herdmen; for we be brethren. Is not the whole land before thee? separate thyself, I pray thee, from me: if thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left. (Gen. 13:8, 9)

In the painting, Lot’s well-known strain of weakness is written plainly on his face and in his posture. Like his daughters, who will eventually seduce him (Gen. 19:31–35), Lot sits idly at the dinner table (not mentioned in the Bible), while Abraham, in a fur-lined robe, gestures with Mosaic decisiveness. Lot’s wife, who later becomes the pillar of salt, appears to smile at the patriarch’s largess. In the background, herdsmen debate the issue, while sheep as thick as cotton graze the land that was “not able to bear them” (Gen. 13:6).²

Victors’s late work reveals little stylistic development, although there is a falling off of quality at the end. This canvas, which is characteristically oversize, probably dates from about 1655–65.

2. As noted in Manuth 1987, pp. 112–13, the biblical account refers to both cattle and sheep, and specifically to “strife between the herdsmen of Abram’s cattle and the herdsmen of Lot’s cattle” (Gen. 13:7).

REFERENCES: MMA 1872, no. 51, as Jacob and Laban; Harck 1888, p. 76, mentioned as a good painting by Victors; D. Miller 1985, pp. 97, 193, no. 43, as a late work depicting Jacob and Laban; Manuth 1987, pp. 131–33, no. 2, fig. 110, identifies the subject as Abraham departing from the family of Lot; Sumowski 1981–94, vol. 4, pp. 2609, 2680, no. 1780, as Abram trennt sich von Lot, dates the work to the “Spätzeit (um 1655–1676),” a broad category adopted from D. Miller 1985; Baejer 1991, p. 326; Liedtke in New York 1995–96, p. 133, no. 55, dates the painting to about 1670 and comments briefly on its style and “clarity of presentation”; Baejer 2004, pp. 183, 203, no. 51, gives provenance.


EX COLL.: By descent to Martin, Comte Cornet de Ways Ruart, Brussels (until d. 1870); [Étienne Le Roy, Brussels, through Léon Gauchez, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.170
DAVID VINCKBOONS

Mecelen 1576–before January 12, 1633, Amsterdam

Vinckboons (also spelled Vinckeboons, Vinkboons, and Vingboons in contemporary sources) was a successful painter and prolific draftsman in Amsterdam during the first three decades of the seventeenth century. His Flemish origins are strongly reflected in the two subjects for which he is best known, landscapes (mostly woodland and valley views) and genre pictures that continue the tradition of Pieter Bruegel the Elder's peasant scenes and anticipate those of Haarlem and Amsterdam artists such as Adriaen van Ostade (q.v.) and Jan Miense Molenaer (1610/11–1668).

The artist was baptized in Mechelen (Malines) on August 13, 1576. His father and teacher, Philip (or Philips) Vinckboons (d. 1601), a native of the city, joined the Mechelen painters' guild in 1573 and practiced the local specialty of making large canvas wall hangings painted with watercolors. He and his wife, the previously married Cornelia Carré, moved with their young children to Antwerp by 1580, and in 1586 the Calvinist family fled from that beleaguered city to Middelburg. On March 8, 1591, Philip Vinckboons, "painter of Malines," acquired citizenship in Amsterdam, where he died ten years later.2

According to the 1604 biography by Karel van Mander, who evidently got his information from Vinckboons himself, the artist "began to work first in watercolor with his father and never had another master. Afterwards he kept entirely to oil paint and dedicated himself principally to working on a small scale, making very subtle little figures which look excellently good." Van Mander goes on to describe a few of Vinckboons's patrons and his various subjects, which include a "Peasants' Fair" and a "Peasants' Wedding," and two religious subjects set in landscapes. In addition, "various landscapes with contemporary figures and other things are drawn by him and engraved by Nicolaes de Bruyn [1571–1666] who has a very good manner in the engraving of landscape" (see fig. 280). Furthermore, "David dedicated himself from the start to working in gouache and miniature," depicting animals and other things from life; he also managed "to work successfully on glass paintings which look lively, and he does as well in handling the burin [engraving] and etching in copper so that it is astonishing that he does so much without instruction, although he does not do this as his principal work: that he does painting in oils."3

On October 8, 1602, Vinckboons married Agneta ("Niesgen") van Loon (d. 1668), the daughter of a prosperous notary in Leeuwarden. The wedding took place in that city, but the couple apparently never lived there. Of their ten children, six sons and four daughters, born between about 1603 and about 1630, five eventually became prominent in their fields of endeavor: the classicist architect Philips Vingboons (1607/8–1678), the mapmaker and architect Justus Vingboons (1620/21–1698), and the mapmakers Pieter, Johannes, and David Vingboons.4 From 1611 onward, the family lived in a house in the Sint Anthonisbreestraat. Several other painters lived quite nearby, including, between 1613 and 1619, the Flemish landscapist Roelant Savery (1576–1659).5

Many of Vinckboons's drawings (about ninety are still known) were reproduced by engravers.6 Mainly through the same medium, he would have had an extensive knowledge of Flemish landscape imagery from the time of Bruegel onward. Imaginary landscape compositions by the prolific Mechelen artist Hans Bol (1534–1593) were obviously familiar to Vinckboons; Bol had also moved to Antwerp (ca. 1572–84) and then settled in Amsterdam. However, the greatest influence on Vinckboons's work as a landscape painter and draftsman was the Flemish artist Gillis van Coninxloo (1544–bur. Jan. 4, 1607), who arrived in Amsterdam in 1593 (when Vinckboons was nineteen) and died there, probably during the last days of 1606.7 Vinckboons attended the celebrated sale of Van Coninxloo's estate on March 1, 1607, where he purchased a good number of drawings by the Antwerp émigré.8

Among Vinckboons's low-life genre paintings, a few of which come close to works by Pieter Brueghel the Younger (1564/65–1637/38),9 his most original contribution is generally considered to be the pictures devoted to the pendant themes of Peasant Joy and Peasant Sorrow.10 Vinckboons painted peasant scenes throughout his career, but he was also a pioneer in the fashionable subgenre of buitenpartijen, or outdoor Merry Companies, in which stylish young couples pursue romantic, musical, and other sensual delights.11

On January 12, 1633, Vinckboons's widow made an obligatory appearance before the regents of the Amsterdam orphanage. Her husband probably died in the last weeks of 1632.12
1. The authors of the brief biographies of David Vinckboons in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, pp. 346–49, and in Amsterdam 1993–94, pp. 322–23, give 1545 as Philip Vinckboons’s date of birth, but it appears to be unknown. In the Amsterdam catalogue (ibid., p. 348), the writer has him marrying a widow when he was about fifteen years old, and his son David as studying oil painting with another master (thus overruling Van Mander, as quoted in the text following). One of the same author’s other errors, that David was "born" on August 13 (actual birth dates are rarely known), is repeated by P. Sutton in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, p. 507, and elsewhere.
2. See Van Mander/Miedema 1994–99, vol. 6, p. 113, for this information and the proper sources.
3. Ibid., pp. 454, 457 (fol. 290r–v); a few spellings have been standardized to American usage here.
4. See the list of family members in Amsterdam 1989, p. 1, which is based on Van Eeghen 1953, pp. 230–31. As is evident from the records cited in K. Goossens 1977, p. 4, all the Vinckboons (as David’s children spelled their name) were buried in the Oude Kerk, Amsterdam, except Pieter, who died in Ceylon.
7. See the present writer’s comments on Van Coninxloo’s (sometimes exaggerated) importance for the development of Dutch landscape painting in New York 1983–86, pp. 282–83, no. 179, the much admired Forest Landscape, of 1958, in the collection of the Princes of Liechtenstein. See also Peter Sutton’s discussion of Van Coninxloo and Vinckboons in Amsterdam–Boston–Philadelphia 1987–88, pp. 21–22, 509.
10. On Vinckboons’s genre scenes of all types, see K. Goossens 1977, chap. 3. Peasant scenes by Bol, Vinckboons, and their contemporaries and followers are discussed in Briesl 1987, pp. 116–49. For “Peasant Sorrow and Peasant Joy in the Art of David Vinckboons,” see Fishman 1982, chap. 3.
12. See K. Goossens 1977, p. 5. Vinckboons’s burial is not recorded, so far as is presently known.

210. **Forest Landscape with Two of Christ’s Miracles**

Oil on wood, 22 1/2 x 37 1/2 in. (57.8 x 94.6 cm)
Signed (left foreground, on tree): DvB [in monogram]

Abrasions throughout, the paint film has been extensively restored and the artist’s monogram strengthened. The oak panel was thinned to 1/8 in. (.16 cm) and is adhered to a plywood panel 1/4 in. (.64 cm) thick that has been cradled. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals that the trees, foliage, and buildings were freely sketched with a dry drawing material on the prepared panel. The figures and animals are not underdrawn but entirely realized in paint.

A small dog to the left of the couple standing on the bank above the fisherman was painted out by the artist.

Bequest of Harry B. Sperling, 1971 1976.100.20

The artist used very nearly the same composition, with different figures but similar buildings, in his Forest with a Hunt, of 1602 (formerly Perman collection, Stockholm), and in the somewhat later (ca. 1607) Forest with Elegant Couple (formerly Kaiser-Friedrich Museum, Berlin; destroyed in World War II). Slightly different versions of the design are found in the Landscape with Hunt (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), the Forest Scene with the Baptism of the Eunuch, probably of about 1603 (formerly Semenov-Tian-Shansky collection, Saint Petersburg), and the Forest with Abraham and the Angels (Museum Wiesbaden). The panel of 1602 is the earliest known “forest interior” by Vinckboons, and, as Goossens and others have noted, it responds strongly to forest scenes by Gillis van Coninxloo (1544–bur. Jan. 4, 1607), who worked in Amsterdam from 1595 until his death.1
The biblical subject was identified by curator John Walsh (see Refs.) shortly after Harry Sperling left the painting to the Museum. Vinckboons illustrates the story of Jairus’s daughter and the woman who touches Jesus’ garment, which is told in Matthew 9:18–26, in Mark 5:21–43, and in Luke 8:40–56. The artist appears to have consulted Mark and/or Luke. In both these accounts, Christ and the Apostles have crossed over the Sea of Galilee (enduring the great storm described in all three Gospels) to the land of the Gadarenes.

And when Jesus was passed over again by ship unto the other side, much people gathered unto him; and he was nigh unto the sea [indicated in the painting by the two distant sailboats in the central background].

And, behold, there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name [in the turban on the left]. . . . And besought him greatly, saying, My little daughter lieth at the point of death. (Mark 5:21–23)

And so Jesus sets off to Jairus’s house. Among the crowd of people who follow him is “a certain woman” who has had “an issue of blood twelve years.” The woman touches Jesus’ garment and is immediately healed. “Knowing that virtue [has] gone out of him,” Jesus asks his disciples to make known to him who it was who touched him. And when he is told, he says to the woman, “Thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague” (Mark 5:25–33).

The miracle of the woman’s healing is shown on the left (fig. 258). “While he yet spake, there cometh one from the ruler of the synagogue’s house, saying to him, Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Master” (Luke 8:49; similarly in Mark 5:35; not included in Matthew). Vinckboons shows the messenger running across the bridge. There is no allusion to the rest of the tale, in which Jesus, in Jairus’s house, commands his daughter to rise, whereupon “she arose straightaway.”

The Netherlandish church in the background is more likely a reference to the Christian faith of the future than to Jairus’s synagogue. Like Van Coninxloo’s forest scenes, paintings like this one were collector’s items, but their frequent inclusion of biblical figures signifies more than an effort to provide mere staffage. Contemporary writers and inventories usually refer to pictures of this type by describing what the figures represent (for example, Van Mander mentions “a landscape [by Vinckboons] with Christ healing the blind on the road”), and evidently, considerable effort was made in the search—in the Bible or in pictorial sources—for suitable subject matter. Based on his survey of seventeenth-century Amsterdam
inventories, Montias concludes that “Reformed collectors had a relative preference for episodes in the life of Christ (such as the pilgrims going to Emmaus, the woman at the well [see Pl. 168], the story of the lepers, etc.), the history of Saint John the Baptist [see Pl. 22], and the parables.” As is well known, Old Testament subjects were also popular with Protestants, though less so with Catholics, who “tended to collect the post-evangelical saints.” As a Calvinist—and as a successful artist in Amsterdam—Vinckboons was well aware of these considerations.¹

1. See K. Goossens 1977, pp. 21–26, figs. 8–10, for the paintings formerly in Stockholm, Saint Petersburg, and Berlin. The Stockholm panel (which was sold at Sotheby’s, London, December 7, 1988, no. 87) is discussed and compared with the Dresden and Wiesbaden pictures (not in K. Goossens 1977) in Philadelphia–Berlin–London 1984, pp. 508–9, no. 110, pl. 2. The entry, by Peter Sutton, does not mention the Museum’s picture (also not in P. Sutton 1986). In May 1973, Curator John Walsh (see Ref.) reviewed similar compositions in the photographic files of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, and considered Landscape with the Good Samaritan (Bechstein sale, Wertheim, Berlin, December 11, 1930, no. 69) to be among those closest to the present work (note in curatorial files).


5. In the same decade that Vinckboons was painting the landscapes discussed above, he provided drawings of biblical subjects that were used to decorate the borders of “Bible maps” (that is, of the Holy Land, etc.). See Bennett 1989.

References: Walsh 1974a, pp. 342, 349 n. 5, fig. 4, describes the biblical subject and the “knobby and quirky actors [who] compete for attention with the vigorous tangle of trees,” and observes that Vinckboons painted a very similar composition in 1602; Baeijer 1985, vol. 1, p. 193; Baeijer 1995, p. 208, offers a brief description of the subject.


Figure 258. Detail of Vinckboons’s Forest Landscape with Two of Christ’s Miracles (Pl. 210)
The influential marine painter Simon Jacobsz de Vlieger was probably born in or near Rotterdam; his marriage there to Anna Gerritsz van Willige, on January 10, 1627, is the earliest known record of his whereabouts. The artist's date of birth is estimated on the basis of a document dated May 16, 1648, when he testified in Amsterdam on behalf of his colleague Willem van de Velde the Elder (1611–1693) and declared himself to be about forty-seven years old. De Vlieger and his wife are cited in Rotterdam until May 1, 1634, when he leased a house in Delft for a period of three years. He joined the painters' guild in Delft on October 18, 1634. At the end of 1637, De Vlieger purchased a house in Rotterdam for the modest sum of 900 guilders; the owner, Crijn Volmarijn (ca. 1601–1645), an art dealer and Caravagesque painter, agreed to credit the seascape with 31 guilders a month from January 1, 1628, onward, in exchange for one large or two small pictures per month, "of the same good quality he usually made for other people."

De Vlieger lived briefly in another house in Delft before moving to Amsterdam (by July 1638), where he became a citizen on January 5, 1643. Apparently, he provided two designs for the entry of Maria de' Medici into Amsterdam on August 31, 1638. Over the next few years, important commissions came from his earlier places of residence. The burgomasters of Delft ordered tapestry designs (presumably naval engagements) for their chamber in the Town Hall; payments were made in 1640 and 1641. Between 1642 and January 5, 1645 (when he was paid 2,000 guilders), De Vlieger also painted "David and other appropriate figures" on the shutters of the new organ in the Laurenskerk of Rotterdam. In 1648, he was offered 6,000 guilders to design and execute a stained-glass window in the Nieuwe Kerk, Amsterdam.

On January 13, 1649, De Vlieger paid 2,500 guilders for a house in Weesp, a town on the Vecht east of Amsterdam that was favored as a retreat by well-to-do Amsterdamers. His daughter Cornelia (b. 1610), a poet, married the painter Paulus van Hillegaert the Younger (1611–1658) in Weesp on October 6, 1631. The artist was described as a widower when he was in Rotterdam on February 28, 1632. He died about the beginning of March, 1633; the cost of his funeral was recorded by the Reformed Church in Weesp on March 13 of that year.

Although the greater part of his oeuvre consists of maritime views, De Vlieger was remarkably varied as an artist, producing history paintings, portraits (which are known from engravings), genre scenes, wooded landscapes, and studies of animals. His talent as a draftsman may be appreciated today from the small percentage of his prolific production that has survived; his follower Jan van de Cappelle (q.v.) owned more than thirteen hundred drawings by De Vlieger (most of which probably came from the artist's estate). The known marine drawings represent ships sailing near rocky coasts and in Dutch estuaries. In addition to large chalk drawings of woodlands, a few topographical views are preserved, among them a sketch of figures and horses on the frozen ice by the Rotterdam Gate in Delft. Twenty etchings are known, comprising landscapes, beach scenes, and a series of ten prints depicting domestic animals.

De Vlieger's teacher is not recorded, but his early works were inspired partly by the innovations of Jan Porcellis (before 1584–1632), who worked in Rotterdam, Antwerp, and Haarlem. Works by Adam Willaerts (q.v.) and the highly regarded Haarlem marine painter Hendrick Vroom (1562/63–1640) also influenced De Vlieger, whose style has been described as "a synthesis of Hendrick Vroom's brightly coloured, illustrative approach and the atmospheric tone-in-tone renderings of Jan Porcellis." The crystalline quality of works like the great "parade" painting (a type of ship picture that was in good part De Vlieger's creation) The Disembarkation of Prince Frederick Hendrick of Orange on the Merwede at Dordrecht, dated 1649 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), is reminiscent of landscapes by Hendrick Vroom's gifted son Cornelis (1590/91–1660), and in general De Vlieger's place in the history of Dutch marine painting may be considered a parallel to that of the most celebrated landscapists of the younger Vroom's generation, Jan van Goyen and Salomon van Ruysdael (q.v.; compare the latter's Marine; Pl. 188, with the painting discussed below).

De Vlieger's most important followers were Jan van de Cappelle and Willem van de Velde the Younger (q.v.); he also influenced a fair number of other artists.
1. Haverkorn van Rijswijk 1891, p. 222. It was customary to marry in the bride's hometown.

2. Bredius 1915–22, part 1, p. 356.

3. The date of May 1, 1634, given frequently in the literature (for example, by Kelch in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, p. 181) is the traditional moving day, when De Vlieger and his wife began renting the house (called Krakenbruch, on De Vlouw) for three years. De Vlieger signed the contract with the owner, Crijn Jansz van der Linden, on February 26, 1634 (see Montias 1982, p. 87 n. 18; kindly confirmed by Bas van der Wulp of the Gemeentearchief, Delft [personal communication, January 31, 2007]). For the location of the house in Delft, see New York–London 2001, p. 162 (map section 1), no. 66.

4. See Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, p. 181, where Kelch gives further details. Considering that De Vlieger never occupied the Rotterdam house (which he sold in 1644), it seems possible that he was acting on behalf of his younger sister, Neeltje, who appears to have been a still-life painter in Rotterdam (see ibid., p. 181, and Ketelsen 2001, pp. 297–98).

5. See Kelch in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, pp. 181–82. The window, which represented Emperor Maximilian I conferring the imperial crown on the arms of Amsterdam, has not survived.

6. Cornelia, as poet and as wife of Van Hillemaert, has been confused in the literature with De Vlieger’s sister Neeltje (see note 4 above), for example in Gemar-Koelzsch 1995, vol. 3, p. 1055, and in Ketelsen 2001, p. 297.


8. A large landscape of the early 1650s is in the Cleveland Museum of Art. See Cleveland Museum of Art 1982, pp. 284–85, where other landscapes by De Vlieger are cited.


11. As noted by Keyes (see note 9 above), who also surveys De Vlieger in Minneapolis–Toledo–Los Angeles 1990–91, pp. 184–91, 263–64. For one of the landscape etchings, see Amsterdam 1993–94, no. 59.


211. Calm Sea

Oil on wood, 14⅜ x 17⅞ in. (37.5 x 44.5 cm)

The thinly painted sky has become more transparent with age and abrasion, and, as a consequence, the grain of the oak panel has become more pronounced. The original oak panel has been thinned and set into a cradled oak panel.

Rogers Fund, 1906 06.1200

Although there is no trace of a signature on this panel, it is certainly autograph, and may be dated to after 1640 (perhaps about 1645–50) on the basis of its simple but carefully poised composition, the expansive sky, and restricted palette, which consists entirely of pale blues and grays, except for the light brown sail and, above, the Dutch flag.1 The play of light in the slightly choppy water, the reflections of the boats, and the minimally described but convincing recession to the horizon are typical of the artist’s maturity.

On the right, two knoeg are tied up at a mooring. A small skiff with two men floats behind them, and to the right is a weyschuit (an open fishing boat) with two men and a large fish basket on board. One man struggles to haul in another basket (they were used to store the day’s catch in the water); other baskets are in the nearest knoeg and by its bow in the water. To the left in the distance is another fishing boat and, much farther away, a square-rigged ship like a fluyt (which, like the knoeg, was used for both cargo and fishing).2 The sails of two other vessels are visible in the center background and help create the impressive effect of distance.

The horizon line was made with a straightedge and is slightly incised into the wood panel. This is an unusual feature, but not entirely unexpected in the case of De Vlieger, whose use of basic linear perspective schemes to place ships at
different distances is known from his sheet of ten demonstration drawings in the British Museum. 3

1. In a letter to the writer dated May 6, 1980, Jan Kelch, the author of the standard dissertation on De Vlieger’s oeuvre, mentions the painting’s inclusion in his forthcoming monograph. He does not suggest a date. Works in a similar style include the two De Vliegers in the National Gallery, London, both of which are dated to the 1640s (see MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 473–44), a panel in the Frits Lugt Collection, Paris (Paris 1983, no. 93, pl. 49), and a canvas in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam (no. 1923; see Bol 1973, pp. 188–90, fig. 191–92).

2. See Akveld’s illustrated glossary of ships in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, pp. 25, 28, 31, for the vessels mentioned here. Fluits and boatships were used for whaling.


References: Valentin in New York 1909, pp. 141–42, no. 141 (ill.), describes the subject; Breck 1910, p. 60, mentioned as in the Hudson-Fulton exhibition, and as an example of how the Dutch “habitually” painted calm seas; Fry 1972, p. 273 (under letter 203), curator Roger Fry’s letter to his wife dated November 12, 1906, in which he mentions the picture’s purchase by the MMA; Spalding 1980, p. 94, mentions the painting as one of Fry’s purchases for the MMA in 1906; P. Sutton 1986, p. 191, “lovely”; Baerji 1988, p. 310.


Ex Coll.: [Frederik Muller, Amsterdam, in 1906; sold to MMA]; Rogers Fund, 1906 06.1200

1. In a list of “those pictures selected by the curator of paintings as desirable acquisitions,” sent to the Museum’s assistant director on October 25, 1906, Roger Fry mentions the painting as with “F. Muller. Price $770. An exquisite example of the painter who is at present underestimated.” Fry cabled Muller on November 9, 1906, “Museum buys Ruysdael [Pl. 186] and deVlieger despatch immediately.” See also Refs. above.
HENDRIK VAN VLIET

(Delft 1611/12—1675 Delft)

According to Dirck van Bleyswijck's "Description of Delft" (1667—[80]), Hendrick Cornelisz van Vliet was a native of that city and a pupil of his uncle Willem van Vliet (ca. 1584—1642).1 Van Bleyswijck lists portraits, mythologies, and histories "both in day and night lighting," and perspective as the younger Van Vliet's areas of expertise. The artist joined the painters' guild on June 22, 1632, and for the most part worked as a portraitist in his uncle's style for the next twenty years (the influence of Anthonie Palamedesz [1601—1673] is also evident in the portraits of the 1640s and 1650s). One of Van Vliet's most important commissions was a large portrait of a wealthy Catholic family of Delft, Michael van der Dussen, His Wife, Wilhelmina van Setten, and Their Children, dated 1640 (Stedelijk Museum Het Prinsenhof, Delft).2 A genre-like biblical picture and an imaginary Roman landscape are also known.3

Probably about 1651, Van Vliet painted his first pictures of "modern or contemporary temples," by which Van Bleyswijck refers to Gothic churches in current use, as opposed to views of imaginary architecture (which Van Vliet evidently never made). When he painted them "at his best," Van Bleyswijck observes, "they are very well foreshortened and illusionistic, as well as colored naturally." From the first, Van Vliet patterned his architectural views on compositions introduced in 1650—51 by Gerard Houckgeest (ca. 1600—1661); he also adopted motifs from contemporary pictures by Emanuele de Witte (q.v.).4 Van Vliet's earliest known dated work in the genre is a view of the Pieterskerk in Leiden, dated 1652 (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig).5 In addition to that church and the Oude Kerk and Nieuwe Kerk in Delft, Van Vliet depicted the major churches in Gouda, Haarlem, The Hague, and Utrecht.6 After 1652, he had the field mostly to himself in Delft, except for the far less numerous church interiors of the 1660s and 1670s by Cornelis de Man (1621—1706), which were clearly inspired by Van Vliet's example.7 Van Vliet's most impressive architectural views date from the 1650s, although exceptional works of the 1660s are also known. His influence is obvious not only in De Man's oeuvre but also in views of churches painted by Anthonie de Lorme (ca. 1610—1673) in Rotterdam, Daniël de Blieck (ca. 1630—1673) in Middelburg, Job and Gerrit Berckheyde (1630—1693; 1638—1698) in Haarlem, and Johannes Coeckermans (act. 1660s) in Delft.8

Van Vliet's fidelity to the actual sites varies considerably; he routinely stretches columns and archways vertically and increases the viewer's apparent distance from the scene. His palette, even in bright interiors, arbitrarily favors cool colors, including greenish tones that suggest dampness and the chill of shadows and stone. Van Vliet painted his own figures and frequently included dogs, groups of children, and people in conversation, occasionally next to a freshly dug grave.9 Late in the artist's career, his compositions became formulaic and his execution stilted; not unlikely, he employed an assistant. Ambitious works alternate with small souvenirs of the Delft churches that must have been produced in a day or two.

Delft's most prolific painter of Protestant churches was himself probably a Catholic. In 1653, he was said to be living opposite the Begijnhof, in a Catholic neighborhood. He and his wife, Cornelia van der Plaat, had a daughter named Catharina, who received from her mother a pitiful inheritance in 1681.10 An otherwise unknown pupil, Floris de la Fée, is recorded in a document of 1646, which describes the young man's rebellious outbursts at the painter and his wife.11

1. Van Bleyswijck 1667—[80], vol. 2, p. 852 (and for the quotes in the text following). Nothing is known of Cornelis van Vliet, Hendrick's father and Willem's brother. As noted by the present writer in New York—London 2001, p. 407 n. 1, Van Vliet was not the only living Delft artist discussed by Van Bleyswijck, as stated in earlier publications. The discussion of Willem and Hendrick van Vliet occurs at the end of the second volume of Van Bleyswijck's book (usually bound as one volume), which does not bear a date but is known to have appeared in 1680.
3. Ibid., p. 65, fig. 70, and p. 86, fig. 99.
6. For a list of views of identified churches by Van Vliet, see Liedtke 1982a, pp. 103—13.
7. On De Man as a painter of church interiors, see ibid., pp. 118—24;
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212. Interior of the Oude Kerk, Delft

Oil on canvas, 32½ x 26 in. (82.6 x 66 cm)
Signed and dated (in foreground, at base of column):
H. van vliet/1660

The painting is well preserved.
Gift of Clarence Dillon, 1976 1976.23.2

This canvas of 1660 is a fine example of Van Vliet's mature work as an architectural painter. By this date he had been painting interior views of actual church interiors for eight or nine years and had mastered the recycling of compositions and motifs that allowed him to create new pictures mainly on the basis of drawings and earlier paintings.

This kind of diagonal arrangement, which emphasizes height, depth, and the impression of space expanding away from a close point of view, was first employed by Gerard Houckgeest (ca. 1600–1661) in 1650–51.1 Van Vliet adopted Houckgeest's schemes but not his careful fidelity to specific views in the Oude Kerk and Nieuwe Kerk in Delft. Here, for example, the proportions of the architecture vary somewhat from those found at the site: the arches are elongated, but the columns' shafts are shortened and the figures are underscaled.

However, the view is generally faithful to the interior of the Oude Kerk as surveyed from the south aisle looking northeast (see fig. 272). On the left is the north nave elevation and the unusually wide north aisle. The figures in the left background animate the north transept, which was added in 1522–23 to the nave and choir of about 1350–1450. When the transept was constructed (without a southern counterpart), the corner between it and the choir (finished in 1410, and partially visible in the right background) was filled by the barrel-vaulted Mariakoor (Mary's Choir; also called Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekoor, or Choir of Our Lady) and the square Joriskapel (Chapel of Saint George).2 The tomb of Admiral Maarten Tromp (1598–1653), designed by Jacob van Campen (1599–1677), was installed in 1648 on the east wall of the Joriskapel, and is impressionistically rendered just to the left of the two men in the central background.3 Tombs of other well-known figures are in the Oude Kerk but are not featured in the present picture, where the artist's attention has fallen upon the fresh grave in the foreground and the Renaissance pulpit (1548) on the column to the right.4 This pulpit at the side of the nave was the center of Protestant worship; in the main choir one would have found (and finds today) little more than the tomb of Admiral Piet Hein (1578–1629).5 The rectangular and diamond-shaped escutcheons or hatchments mounted on columns and walls bear the family crests (wapens in Dutch) of members of the congregation who have been interred beneath the stone floor.6 Psalm 19, inscribed on the pulpit, celebrates the Lord but cannot be related more specifically to the church or to Van Vliet's several reminders of life after death.

The Museum's painting by Emanuel de Witte (Pl. 222) represents a similar view in the Oude Kerk, recorded from a vantage point about two bays farther to the east in the south aisle. De Witte omitted the pulpit, and also the red bricks that, until the church's restoration in the 1950s, were such a distinctive feature of the archway framing the Mariakoor.7

2. For detailed information and a plan of the Oude Kerk, see Rijkscommissie voor de Monumentenbeschrijving 1969, pp. 392–94.
3. Van Vliet's *Interior of the Oude Kerk, Delft, with the Tomb of Admiral Maerten Harpocras Tromp, 1658* (Toledo Museum of Art), includes a detailed representation of the monument. See New York–London 2001, no. 83, where the tomb's design and execution are more fully described.

4. On the pulpit, see ibid., p. 32, fig. 34.

5. Hein's tomb and much of the choir are visible in the background of the Toledo picture, cited in note 3 above.

6. There are a few known instances in which a hatchment or memorial tablet in a picture of this kind actually existed in the church and may be connected with the original owner of the painting (see, for example, New York–London 2001, no. 83). However, the most prominent example in the present picture could not be identified and is also considered an implausible creation. According to Karen Schaffers Bodenhauen of the Iconografisch Bureau at The Hague, it would be highly unusual for an actual family crest to be divided into two fields of the same color (information kindly communicated through Edwin Buijsen of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, in November 2003).

7. See Wijbenga 1990, pp. 71–83, on the fire of 1921 and restoration, which did not begin until 1949.

References: Hibbard 1980, pp. 331–34, fig. 602, notes the bareness of Calvinist churches; Liedtke 1982a, pp. 64–65, 67, 107 no. 68, fig. 50, pl. VII, places the work in the context of Van Vliet's development as a whole, and cites similar compositions; Liedtke 1982c, pp. 64–65 (ill.), discusses Van Vliet's influence on Cornelis de Man and distinguishes their styles; Liedtke 1986, pp. 802, 804, fig. 27, as an example of Van Vliet's recycling compositional patterns after about 1658; Roding in The Hague–San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 468–71 no. 69 (ill.), compares similar views of the Oude Kerk found in paintings by Van Vliet dated 1658 and 1659, and mistakenly discusses the donor's son as donor of the painting to the MMA; Trnek 1992, pp. 394 n. 8, 400, compares the composition to that of two Oude Kerk views by Van Vliet in Vienna (Akademie nos. 685 and 716); Bactier 1995, p. 321.


Ex coll.: [Babcock Galleries, New York, ca. 1931]; Clarence Dillon, Far Hills, N.J. (ca. 1931–76); Gift of Clarence Dillon, 1976 1976.23.2
Jacob Vosmaer
Delft ca. 1584-1641 Delft

The still-life painter Jacob Woutersz Vosmaer came from "the good family of time-honored Vosmaers," as Reiner Boitet, the city historian of Delft, described them in 1729. Several members of the Protestant family were artists or artisans, including Jacob's brother, the goldsmith Arent Woutersz Vosmaer (d. 1654), and Arent's three painter sons, Abraham, Daniel, and Nicolaes. The best known of the Vosmaers today is Daniel (1622-1669/70), who painted cityscapes in the 1650s and 1660s. However, Jacob Vosmaer must have been a more prominent figure in his own time. His father, Wouter Vosmaer, was a gold- and silversmith. Another member of that profession, Gillis van Couwenbergh, married Wouter's daughter Adriantje, and their son—Jacob Vosmaer's nephew—was the successful history and genre painter Christiaen van Couwenbergh (1604-1667).

According to the biography of Vosmaer by Dirck van Bleyswijk, which appeared in 1680, the artist "visited Italy in his youth, and returned from there to his native city in the year 1608 (he was then twenty-four years old)." On March 16, 1608, "Jacob Woutersz. Vosmaer, Painter, bachelor living in the Choosstraat, [was married] to Annetje Jans van der Graef, bachelorette living on the Oude Langendijk." In September 1625, Annetje died, leaving the painter a widower with five girls aged about four to seventeen, and three boys aged about nine, eleven, and fifteen. Four years later, on December 30, 1629, Vosmaer (who was then living on the Oude Delft) married a widow, Maria Wolphertsdr van den Berch.

Vosmaer probably began training as a painter shortly before 1600. His teacher has not been identified. Van Bleyswijk reports that he started out as a landscapist and only later turned to still life. No landscape paintings by Vosmaer are known today. A view of rocks and ships (i.e., a coastal scene) by "Jacob Wouters," with figures by Hans Jordens the Elder (1555/60-1630), was cited in a Delft collection in 1626. Since Jordens painted the same kind of picture, as well as Flemish-style landscapes with biblical staffage, it is possible that Vosmaer studied with him. A landscape drawing by Vosmaer, dated 1641 but in a style of the 1620s, is in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. And "a landscape [painting] by the Major Vosmaer" (a reference to the artist's service as "captain major" of a civic guard company) was cited in 1653 as in the collection of the Delft burgomaster Joost van Adrichem.

It was not unusual, in the early seventeenth century, for painters to produce flower pieces and landscapes at the same time, at least in the circle of artists working in the Flemish manner. The best-known practitioners include the Flemings Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568-1625) and Roelant Savery (1576-1639), but other Dutch painters, among them Christoffel van den Berghe (q.v.) in Middelburg, combined the same areas of expertise. The two fields were connected not only by the description of plant forms but also by the more general interest in the natural world that flourished in this period. The Delft flower painter Elias Verhulst (d. 1601), in a composition known from an engraving made in 1599 by Hendrick Hondius (see fig. 260), shows a naturalistic landscape behind an elaborate Mannerist pot filled with an extraordinary variety of flowers, and, on the sill below, two kinds of birds, three different insects, and a tortoise, a lizard, a centipede, and a snail. When the Utrecht art lover Aernout van Buchell (Arnold Buchelius; 1565-1641) went to Verhulst's Delft residence in 1598, the artist's wife showed him "pictures painted by him from life of almost all types of flowers." The diarist adds, "He also is given to expressing the form of shells and animals by the same technique, in very vivid color" (the term "animals" would have referred to all the creatures seen in Hondius's engraving after Verhulst)."}

Verhulst would appear to be another candidate as Vosmaer's teacher, but in any case must have been an influence. Vosmaer's trip to Italy would have been made after Verhulst's death in 1601 (whether or not there is any connection), and before his marriage in 1608. Traveling to Italy was expensive, and had "an uncertain pay-off," which indeed cannot be detected in Vosmaer's work or that of a few contemporary Delft artists who went south. Probably of greater importance for the still-life painter's development was the presence nearby in The Hague of Jacques de Gheyn the Elder (q.v.), who by about 1600 was drawing detailed studies of flowers and insects, and by 1603 was painting flower pictures comparable to those by Savery. (De Gheyn is also well known for his landscape drawings, which range from imaginary mountain
scenes to naturalistic views of beaches, fields, and trees). Vosmaer's paintings of bouquets set in stone niches, like the one discussed below, and another in a Brussels collection, are known to date from 1613 and later, and adhere to a type found in Savery's oeuvre from 1603 onward (although they flourished in the next decade) and in De Gheyn's from 1612 at the latest. De Gheyn's success with court patrons (discussed in his biography above) would have attracted Vosmaer's attention, but it is doubtful that Vosmaer studied formally with De Gheyn, who belonged to another guild (where Vosmaer is unrecorded), and who had no need of income from teaching.

No more than about ten flower pieces by Vosmaer are known. However, works by him are cited fairly frequently in Delft inventories dating from the 1620s onward. In 1614, the artist was permitted to raffle off "a few pieces of painting," provided that he donate 24 guilders, a fair amount, to the Chamber of Charity. According to Van Bleyswijck, the artist was highly successful, and this is supported by records of prices (as much as 130 guilders for larger works). He served as a bofitman (headman) of the painters' guild in 1633. The first record of him as a master is in a list dating from 1613, but he must have joined some years earlier. When Vosmaer's own collection of drawings and paintings was offered at auction after his death, there were 104 pictures, including 9 said to be by him, and at least another 13 paintings of flowers, all or most of which would have been by him. From this inventory, it would appear possible that Vosmaer was also active as an art dealer.

4. Van Bleyswijck 1667--[82], vol. 2, p. 848. The line is repeated in Houbraken 1728--29, vol. 1, p. 91.
5. Bredius 1915--22, part 7, p. 270.
6. Ibid., p. 271, for documents recording the burial of Vosmaer's first wife, the names and ages of his children (in December 1629), and his second marriage.
8. See Briel 1987, p. 316, fig. 400, for a landscape by Jordaens, and p. 411, citing a lost beach scene of 1598. Jordaens, a Lutheran, was the most important history painter in Delft between about 1590 and 1630. See Liedtke in New York--London 2001, pp. 54--56, fig. 54, for a landscape with John the Baptist preaching, of about 1605.
10. Ibid., p. 500, citing Bredius 1915--22, part 4, p. 1440.
12. One other flower painter is known to have worked in Delft during the early seventeenth century, Harmen Arentsz van Bolgersteyn (ca. 1585--1641). See Montias 1982, pp. 145, 334, and New York--London 2001, p. 91. No works by Van Bolgersteyn are known.
14. New York--London 2001, fig. 102. The style of the vase in this panel of about 1615 recalls the vessel in Hendrick Hondius's 1599 engraving after Elias Verhulst (see fig. 260).
17. For these details, see ibid., pp. 193 (estate auction of April 9, 1642), 197 (prices), 199 (raffle), 354 (1613 guild list), 370 (bofitman).
213. A Vase with Flowers

Oil on wood, 33⅛ x 24⅛ in. (83.1 x 62.5 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): Vosmaer 1613[?]

Despite a significant alteration to the composition, the remaining flowers and other elements of this still life are very well preserved. The last two numbers of the date are illegible. The panel was cut down at some time before 1870 about 10 in. (25.4 cm) at the top and about 4 in. (10.2 cm) on both sides. In addition, flowers and areas of the background were almost completely scraped away and repainted to create the rounded bouquet seen in photographs taken before the conservation treatment in 1992. Only fragments remain of the crown imperial, the double hollyhock at left, and the blue iris at right. A very old, thin layer of repainting on the ledge makes the slate a slightly darker and cooler gray than it was originally. There are minor losses along a vertical split that extends the length of the panel left of center and insect damage along the left side. X-radiography reveals a minor change in the composition: the snake's head fritillary above the white rose has been painted over what appears to be an anemone. In structure, the painting compares very closely to a floral still life in a Dutch private collection (fig. 259), and the two panels are of tropical wood cut from the same tree. In 1992, the lower portion of the crown imperial was restored using as a model the flower that appears in the related composition.

Purchase, 1871 71.5

In this early example of flower painting in the Netherlands, a bouquet of rare flowers is arranged in an earthenware pot that is set into a large stone niche. As described in the condition note above, and more fully in conservator Dorothy Mahon's article of 1991–94 (see Refs.), the panel has been trimmed on both sides, and cut down at the top by nearly a quarter of the composition's original height. The picture's design was originally quite similar to that of Vosmaer's Still Life of Flowers with a Fritillary in a Stone Niche, in a private collection in Amsterdam (fig. 259), which shows an ample volume of space around the pot of flowers and the curved wall of the niche advancing in sunlight to the chipped edge of a wall on the right. This frontal element, the worn stone sill at the bottom, and the strong shadows cast by flowers on the pot and by the bouquet on the background create a sense of illusionistic space to a degree rarely found in contemporary Dutch or Flemish flower pictures.

In the Museum's painting, by contrast, flowers nearly fill the upper half of the picture field, and the crown imperial at the top (which was restored by referring to the painting in Amsterdam) is abruptly cut by the frame, all of which tends to emphasize the panel's surface rather than recession in space. In addressing this problem, a virtue was made of necessity when the picture was provided with a seventeenth-century red tortoiseshell frame, which pulls the colorful whole together as a decorative ensemble. But the effect at a normal viewing distance is surely quite different from that intended by the artist. In a domestic interior of the period, the Amsterdam panel, with its life-size motifs flooded by a consistent fall of light, must have created the impression of a real bouquet filling an actual niche in the wall.

Although the arrangements in the Amsterdam and New York paintings are hardly identical, a number of flowers are repeated in the same positions, such as the five largest flowers at the bottom of the bouquet, and the flame tulip and crown imperial (a kind of fritillary) at top center. In the present picture, a lizard occupies the lower right corner, a different petal curves over the edge of the sill, and a fallen sprig to the left replaces the mouse seen in the Amsterdam painting.

The wood supports of the two pictures are more intimately related than are the images they bear. X-radiographs indicate that the central boards of tropical wood—vertical planks about 24 inches (61 cm) wide—match precisely in grain and knots. This means that a single board about ½ inch (1.27 cm) thick was split to make two thin boards. Narrow strips of oak were added to the lateral sides of the central board to make each panel. At some later date (perhaps in the eighteenth century), the New York panel was cut nearly to the join of the oak strip and central panel on the right, slightly into the tropical wood on the left, and by as much as 10 inches (25.4 cm) at the top.

That two closely related compositions were painted on wood panels crafted at the same time suggests that the pictures must have been executed either simultaneously or in immediate succession. Until its recent conservation, the Amsterdam panel was said to be dated 1618, but the most likely reading (according to the conservator responsible) now appears to be 1613. The last digit of the date on the New York painting was read in the past as a 5 (see Refs., beginning with Decamps in 1872, who mistook the support for copper). The digit is now illegible. The numbers 3 and 5, as inscribed on seventeenth-century Dutchish pictures, have often been misread by modern viewers. In any case, it appears probable that both pictures were completed in or about 1613.

The two paintings were hung side by side in the New York venue of the exhibition "Vermeer and the Delft School" in 2001. They appeared entirely consistent in style and quality, allowing for their very different states of preservation. In the
exhibition's catalogue, the present writer suggests that the paintings may have been made as pendants, considering that their fictive niches would have complemented each other in an architectural ensemble, and that the specially made panels might have been intended for a particular patron. However, in the absence of documentation it seems equally or indeed more plausible that Vosmaer, like other still-life painters of the period, was simply producing versions of a successful design in an efficient manner. Greater variety in the bouquets, and in the type or presentation of the heavy pot (which is probably German stoneware), would be expected if the panels were meant to be seen as a pair.

The painter may never have seen a few of the flowers that are depicted here, but would have relied on printed sources such as Rembert Dodoens’s *Stirpium historiae pemptades sex* (Antwerp, 1583) or representations by other artists. Dodoens illustrates one fritillary and describes another (imported from “Eastern parts”) that he had seen seven years earlier in the garden of Emperor Maximilian in Vienna. The other flowers were cultivated in the Netherlands, or, in the case of the striped and flame tulips and the pink double hollyhocks (partly preserved at top left), had only recently been introduced from abroad. Vosmaer also includes roses, irises, a red anemone (just to the left of the butterfly on the flame tulip at bottom center), and, to its left, a type of fritillary commonly called a snake’s head. The colors of some of the flowers are reflected in the shiny surface of the pot, where the white rose casts an emphatic shadow.

As discussed in the biography above, other artists preceded Vosmaer in painting this type of composition. Roelant Savery (1576–1659), from no later than 1605 onward, set similar bouquets in stone niches, with lizards, insects, and fallen petals on a sill, and by 1613 (if not earlier) was producing looser arrangements in more spacious settings, rather as in the original state of the Museum’s picture. Comparable works were also painted by Jacques de Gheyn the Elder (q.v.), as seen in a painting of flowers in a glass vase dated 1612 (Gemeentemuseum, The Hague). Vosmaer also recalls De Gheyn in his comparatively fluid manner of execution. The two artists lived no more than
an hour apart (by boat or on foot), in Delft and The Hague, respectively. The Delft flower painter Elias Verheulst (d. 1621) was also presumably important for Vosmaer, to judge from Hendrick Hondius’s engraving after his design (fig. 260). The sheer variety of flowers and the apparent originality of the open-arched composition (which evidently anticipates designs by Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder [1573–1621]) suggest that Verheulst was an influential figure in the area of Delft and The Hague.

Cut flowers and chipped stone intimate that all things pass away, no matter how fresh or durable (see the discussion of De Gheyn’s Vanitas Still Life; Pl. 48). But the main interest of Vosmaer’s painting for his contemporaries would have been not symbolism but botany and, more broadly, the wonders of nature, where God creates forms that humankind can only catalogue and imitate.


2. The book by Dodoneus (Dodonaecus) is cited by B. Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij in Amsterdam 1993–94a, p. 606 (under no. 278). See also Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij 1990.

3. The same illusionistic motif in the Amsterdam picture was mistaken for a “bad dent” by Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij in Amsterdam 1993–94a, p. 606.

4. See Mullermeister 1988, no. 270, of 1603 (private collection, New York), and no. 278, of 1615 (location unknown). Compare also the quite similar composition of Ludger von Ring the Younger’s Vase of Flowers in a Niche, dated 1615 (Westfälisches Landesmuseum, Münster; Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij 1996, p. 30, fig. 24).


References: Decamps 1872, p. 437, as the only known work by Vosmaer, on copper, dated 1615; Warner 1928, pp. 226–27, pl. 108d, has not seen the painting; B. Burroughs 1934a, p. 85; Vorenkamp 1933, p. 118, cites the work as dated 1615; Thieme and Becker 1903–50, vol. 34 (1940), p. 560, mentioned; Salinger 1960, pp. 389–92 (cover ill.), as dated 1615, and depicting peonies, tulips, roses, and irises; Bergström 1916, p. 54, as dated 1615, and revealing that Vosmaer was a close follower of De Gheyn; Bernt 1962, vol. 4 (under no. 298), as dated 1615; Pavière 1962, p. 65, listed; Clifford 1963, p. 112 (ill.); Mitchell 1973, pp. 254, 257, fig. 376, as Vosmaer’s earliest known work, dated 1615; Bergström et al. 1977, p. 219 (ill.), as dated 1615; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 194, as dated 1615; Bol 1981–82, p. 262, as dated 1615; Bol 1982a, p. 89, as dated 1615; Bol 1982b, p. 43, as dated 1615, one of three signed and dated works by Vosmaer; Faly 1982, pp. 82–83 (ill.), “a laboriously painted composition of roses, tulips, and irises, crammed into a brass pitcher”; Montias 1982, p. 253, fig. 14, as dating from 1615; Van der Ploeg in The Hague 1992b, p. 104 (under no. 27) (ill.), conjectures that the top of the panel was cut, resulting in a “restless” design; B. Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij in Amsterdam 1993–94a, p. 606 (under no. 278), mentions the painting as an “autograph version” of the Amsterdam picture, and cites a “third version, also slightly reduced”; Mahon 1991–94, describes the picture’s fragmentary state and its restoration, reviews the flowers and their possible symbolism, and reproduces color details of some of the best-preserved passages; Baetjer 1995, p. 303, as dated 1618; Gernsheim-Koelmans 1995, vol. 3, pp. 1067–68, no. 422/1 (ill.), as dated 1615; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 91, 423–26, fig. 300, notes the “comparative fluidity” with which the picture is painted, considers this and the similar painting in a private collection, Amsterdam, to be the earliest known paintings by the artist, and suggests that the two works are pendants; Van der Willigen and Meijer 2003, p. 211, claims mistakenly that the inscription “has recently been established as apocryphal”; Baetjer 2004, p. 204 (under no. 69), fig. 15, clarifies the provenance.


Ex Coll.: By descent to Martin, Comte Cornet de Waes Ruart, Brussels (until d. 1870); [Étienne LeRoy, Brussels, through Lén Gauchez, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871, 71.5

1. The panel (31 1/8 x 22 5/8 in. [80 x 57 cm]), on the Amsterdam art market in 1984, appears to be a later derivation from the still life in a private collection, Amsterdam (fig. 219 here), of lesser quality and uncertain authorship (photograph in the Museum’s curatorial files). Sam Segal, in a letter to the present writer dated May 1, 1984, states that he considers the picture to be “a study” by Vosmaer, although he originally thought it was a copy.
Abraham de Vries
The Hague? ca. 1590—1649/50 The Hague?

The peripatetic portraitist Abraham de Vries is a difficult figure to pin down, with regard to both biography and stylistic qualities. He worked in three countries and in Dutch cities with quite different traditions of portraiture. In the literature, it has long been said that De Vries was born in or near Rotterdam, but the fact that he paid the reduced fee required of native sons when he joined the painters' guild of The Hague in 1644 strongly suggests that he was from that city.¹

De Vries was probably in Lyons as early as 1613, to judge from the inscription on a landscape drawing, but all other traces of the artist in France date from the 1620s or later.² He was in Rotterdam in 1617, in Aix-en-Provence in 1623 and 1624, and then in Toulouse and Montpellier (1625), Bordeaux (1626), Paris (1627—29), and Antwerp (for a few months in 1628, and perhaps in 1632).³

According to the inscription on the Portrait of a Man, dated 1628 (location unknown), De Vries was then working in Antwerp; the lively and emphatically modeled half-length figure recalls portraits painted by Rubens several years earlier.⁴ He evidently worked in Paris between about 1629 and 1631.⁵ In 1633, De Vries painted an impressive group portrait of the regents of the city orphanage in Amsterdam (Amsterdams Historisch Museum), a commission that must have been secured through a personal connection.⁶ Another stay in Paris is documented by a portrait of 1634, when De Vries was also active in Antwerp (he joined the painters' guild there in July 1634). In 1635, he painted a dashing Flemish-style portrait of the Antwerp artist Simon de Vos (1603—1670; Museum Maagdenhuis, Antwerp).⁷ It must have been another portrait, "par un Hollandois nommé Abraham de Vries, qui retournoit freschment de Paris," that was seen in Antwerp by the governor of the Spanish Netherlands, Cardinal Infante Ferdinand, on April 20, 1635. This led to an invitation to work in the court city of Brussels, where De Vries was ranked "par dessus Vandick."⁸ A half-length portrait of a man is inscribed "Vecit Bruxella/A. de Vries/Anno 1636."⁹

Similar inscriptions are often the only records of De Vries's activity in a particular place. For example, male portraits bear the artist's signature, the inscription "Rotterdam," and the dates 1639 and 1640.¹⁰ The painting catalogued below is inscribed as painted in The Hague in 1644. De Vries joined the painters' guild of The Hague in 1644 and made his will in that city in 1648. He probably died in 1649 or 1650.¹¹

In his self-portrait of 1621 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), De Vries presents himself as a learned painter, and his acquaintance with the distinguished humanist Peiresc in Aix-en-Provence lends the notion credibility.¹² His early portrait style recalls contemporaries in Amsterdam and The Hague, such as Thomas de Keyser and Jan van Ravesteyn (q.q.v.). Nothing else by De Vries compares with the Simon de Vos for Van Dyckian animation, but the textured description of skin and soft handling of hair in his portraits dating from the mid-1630s onward must reflect an appreciation of artists working in Antwerp. De Vries's synthesis of Dutch and Flemish qualities bears a resemblance to that of artists working in The Hague (for example, Adriaen Hanneman; q.v.) even before he finally settled in that city.

1. See Ekkart 2006, p. 551, where the evidence for the artist's death in 1649 or 1650 is also discussed.
3. As discussed in Foucart 1982b, pp. 130, 132, De Vries's whereabouts in France are known mainly through his correspondence with Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580—1657), and from portraits that are inscribed with the place and date of execution. The evidence is summarized in Ekkart 2006, p. 352, where it is suggested that the Latin inscription on De Vries's Self-Portrait (1621; see text) makes it likely that he was in Italy at the time. One could just as well argue for Leiden (the university city), The Hague (the court city), or Aix (the learned Peiresc's city) on the same basis. Latin inscriptions (see the following note) remain the norm on De Vries's portraits throughout his career.
4. Ekkart 2006, p. 355, fig. 2. The panel is inscribed "Vecit An[twe]r[piac: A. de Vries Hollandus Anno 1628]."
5. Ibid., pp. 552—53, where portraits of a Parisian merchant and his wife (dated 1631 and 1630, respectively) are cited.
6. Haak 1972, fig. 26; Blankert 1979, pp. 355—56; Ekkart 2006, pp. 555—57, fig. 3, comparing a group portrait by Thomas de Keyser (q.q.v.). A Portrait of a Man by De Vries, dated 1633, is also a plausible Amsterdam product (Ekkart 2006, pp. 557, 559, fig. 5; Sotheby's, New York, January 12, 1979, no. 135; later with the Alfred Brod Gallery, London).
8. See Paris–Lyons 1991, pp. 148, 150 n. 2. The quotes are from Philippe Chifflet’s “Diare des choses arrivées à la cour de Bruxelles depuis la fin de l’an 1653 jusques a l’an 1656.” Ferdinand’s triumphal entry into Antwerp took place on April 17, 1635, amid spectacular decorations designed by Rubens (see Held 1980, pp. 22–25).


10. See Bonhams, London, July 10, 2002, no. 301, for the portrait of a man dated 1639, and the Portrait of David de Moor, of 1640, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. The evidence of De Vries’s activity in Rotterdam, where a conservative style of portraiture was favored, is discussed briefly in Ekkart 2006, p. 361.

11. See note 1 above. The portrait cited in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 34, p. 572, as dated 1650, is actually dated 1640.

12. See note 3 above. Art historians are familiar with Peiresc as the frequent correspondent of Rubens.

**214. Portrait of a Man**

Oil on wood, 23 3/4 x 21 in. (64.1 x 53.3 cm)

Signed, dated, and inscribed (right): fecit Haage Comitis/ A. de Vries anno 1643.

The painting is in good condition but has suffered a large area of paint loss that extends from the sitter’s hair at lower right into the collar.

Purchase, 1871 71.63

According to the inscription on this engaging portrait, it was painted in The Hague in 1643. The same inscription, De Vries’s signature, and the date 1644 are found on the artist’s portrait of Hans van Loon (1577–1658) in the Museum Van Loon, Amsterdam.

It was probably the sitter’s pose and expression that led A. B. de Vries to wonder whether this painting might be a self-portrait.1 The features and hairline of the figure in the artist’s Self-Portrait, dated 1621 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), suggest that this is possible, although the earliest image of twenty-two years earlier does not make for an ideal comparison. Two speculative considerations may be put forward, given that so little is known about De Vries’s career in Holland, and that this picture contributes to our knowledge of his whereabouts (see the biography above). First, the artist should not have been producing portraits in The Hague (and announcing the fact) before he joined the painters’ guild there in 1644. Second, it was not unusual for an artist who was seeking commissions for portraits in a place where he had recently arrived to paint a self-portrait as a carte de visite.

REFERENCES: MMA 1871, pl. 10 (etched by Jules Jacquemart); Decamps 1872, pp. 479, 480, mentions the inscription; James (1872) 1956, p. 36, mistakenly as by “Aadrian de Vries”; Kegel 1884, p. 461, calls the picture the best portrait in the collection, describes the sitter, and quotes the inscription; Harck 1888, p. 74, quotes the inscription in full; Baerjer 1995, p. 323; Baerjer 2004, pp. 166, 167, 173, 177, 183, 197, 222 no. 172, figs. 7, 31; Ekkart 2006, pp. 361, 364 n. 38, fig. 9, detects the influence of Honthorst.


EX COLL.: [Léon Gauchez, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.63
A native of Haarlem, Roelof Jansz van Vries was said to be twenty-eight years old on October 11, 1659, when his marriage was witnessed in Amsterdam. In 1613, he became a member of the painters’ guild in Leiden, and four years later he joined the Haarlem guild. He was last recorded in Amsterdam in 1681.

Van Vries was a prolific, if not inspired, landscape painter, to judge from the frequent appearance of his pictures on the art market and the number of museums that have one or more examples of his work. Although rarely dated, his paintings are often signed, most commonly “R. vries” or “R. v. vries.”

Jacob van Ruisdael’s influence on Van Vries is obvious in two types of compositions: broad-format views of rural landscape, often with farmhouses among trees, and a few small, tall-format sous-bois scenes, perhaps the best of which are the pendant pictures in the Detroit Institute of Arts. Paintings of the mid-1660s by Meyndert Hobbeina (q.v.) were clearly Van Vries’s source of inspiration for such landscapes as The Mill in the Forest, in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, and the Forest Landscape, in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt. More familiar is the type of subject represented by the Museum’s painting, in which a peasant cottage, the remains of a medieval fortification, or a picturesque synthesis of the two stands beside a river or a country road. These pictures strongly recall and probably depend upon even more rustic scenes by Cornelis Decker (ca. 1615–1678), a somewhat older Haarlem painter, who must himself have admired the river views of Jan van Goyen and Salomon van Ruysdael, as well as the modest dwellings described by Adriaen van Ostade (q.q.v.) and Isaac van Ostade (1621–1649). Other Haarlem landscapists with whom Van Vries is closely aligned are Claes Molenaer (1628/29–1676) and Salomon Rombouts (1635—before or in 1702).

1. A. D. de Vries 1886, p. 298.
3. See the facsimile signatures in Wurzbach 1906–11, vol. 2, p. 832, where the reference to a painting signed and dated 1642 is certainly erroneous. There appear to be no reliable signatures or documents supporting the name “De Vries,” as the artist is often called today, although the surname is very common. The painter’s signature was often modified to “Ruisdael” in the past.
4. See Van Thiell et al. 1976, p. 592, no. 4495; Bernt 1970, vol. 1, no. 1356 (private collection, Bremen); and the panel of 1653 sold at Sotheby’s, New York, November 5, 1986, no. 99 (ill.).
7. Decker was cited as a member of the Haarlem guild in 1643 and 1661. MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 97–98 (correcting MacLaren 1960, p. 94), notes that the earliest known dated work by Decker is from 1649.

215. The Pigeon House

Oil on wood, 14½ x 12 in. (36.8 x 30.5 cm)
Signed (lower right): [R1] VRIES

The painting is well preserved, and the panel retains its original thickness and beveled edges on the reverse. The bevel along the left is half the thickness of the others, suggesting that the panel was trimmed on that side.

Purchase, 1871 71.116

This signed panel is typical of Van Vries, and also of the Dutch landscapes that constitute part of the Museum’s 1871 Purchase. The painting depicts an ensemble of dilapidated buildings nestled at a turn in a tranquil waterway. The humble residence on the right was built against a medieval wall and a gate tower that recalls Jan Van Goyen’s versions of the Pelhus Gate near Utrecht (see Pl. 51) and similar structures. The rickety shed
perched perilously on the riverbank is either a privy or a run-in stall for animals. Four rustic male figures animate the scene, which seems set at the end of a typical working day in an unprosperous part of the countryside. The man in the boat struggles with a fish trap; a second large, urn-shaped basket has been hauled into his vessel, and a third rests in the boat to the left. The man in an apron on the shoreline who appears to be speaking holds a basket of fish and a walking stick. On the pathway, a shepherd follows his little flock, while a man looks on from the cottage doorway.

The picture probably takes its nineteenth-century title from the wooden shelter with a slanted roof on the tower, and from the birds fluttering about. Smaller birds may have nested inside the earthenware jugs mounted sideways on the chimney of the house. In northern Europe, small birds such as sparrows and finches would have attracted innocent admiration but pigeons were kept for food.2

Similar towers, usually attached to the remains of a fortified wall, occur in a number of paintings by Claes Molenaer (1628/29–1676) and Cornelis Decker (ca. 1615–1678).3 Van Vries himself often depicted tall, square towers, some as parts of city gates, others as church towers, but most of them are attached to ruined castles or river forts. The artist occasionally came close to repeating himself, but on the whole he built anew each time, following standard patterns, not unlike masons in earlier centuries.

In all Van Vries's paintings of this type, walls of bricks are featured for the pictorial interest of their colors, textures, and accidental effects. This taste flourished in the 1650s and 1660s, as is seen also in the work of artists such as Daniël Vosmaer (1622–1669/70), Jan van Kessel (1641–1680), Jan van der Heyden, Pieter de Hooch, and Emanuel Murant (q.q.v.; see Pl. 127).6 Assigning dates to pictures by Van Vries is mere guesswork, but the style and composition of the Museum's picture are most consistent with landscape conventions of the 1660s.

1. See James (1872) 1916, and Liedtke 1990, pp. 33-34. Two other pictures attributed to Van Vries, The Hunt and Courting, were acquired in the 1871 Purchase; they were sold at Parke-Bernet, New York, March 27, 1956, nos. 47, 48.

2. See Rose 1989, pp. 54–55, on preparing pigeons, and p. 87 on finch-paste. Pigeon is still served in many parts of Europe. In several paintings by Claes Molenaer, a large dovecote is attached to an inn; see, for example, the picture sold at Christie's, London, July 10, 1987, no. 52. Jan Steen's painting in the Frits Lugt Collection, Paris (Paris 1983, pp. 132–33, no. 81, pl. 77), shows pigeons being gathered from a dovecote while a market woman waits. The dovecores or "pigeon houses" mounted on poles in paintings by Salomon Rombouts (1655–before or in 1702) and other Dutch artists are usually meant for a farming family's culinary use. On the uncertain distinction between doves and pigeons, see the entries in The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed. (Cambridge and New York, 1910–11), vol. 8, pp. 451–52, and vol. 21, pp. 595–96.

3. For example, the Molenaer sold in 1987 (see note 2 above), and Decker's Town with Bastion and Towers, Fischer sale, Lucerne, November 28, 1964, no. 1710. In the latter picture, the form of the tower is very close to that in the present painting, but as usual Decker shows the structure in a more ruinous state.


5. For example, the subject of a canvas sold at Sotheby's, London, February 18, 1981, no. 73, is very similar to that of a picture sold at Sotheby Parke Bernet, New York, January 7, 1979 (ill. in Burlington Magazine 121 [January 1979], p. vii; a pigeon is perched above the dovecote).


REFERENCES: MMA 1872, no. 74; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 194, incorrectly records the support as canvas; Baetjer 1995, p. 337, incorrectly as on canvas; Baetjer 2004, p. 204, no. 74, incorrectly as on canvas, clarifies provenance.

EX COLL.: By descent to Martin, Comte Cornet de Wuyts Ruatt, Brussels (until d. 1870); [Étienne Le Roy, Brussels, through Léon Gauchez, Paris, until 1870; sold to Blodgett]; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (1870–71; sold half share to Johnston); William T. Blodgett, New York, and John Taylor Johnston, New York (1871; sold to MMA); Purchase, 1871 71.116
Jan Weenix
Amsterdam ca. 1641–1719 Amsterdam

According to Houbraken, the painter's father, Jan Baptist Weenix (1621–1660/61), set off for Italy when he had been married for four years and his son ("who is still living") was fourteen months old. It is known that the elder Weenix married Justina d'Hondecoeoter on August 7, 1639, so his departure would have taken place in 1643 and, as one scholar has calculated, "Jan Weenix would have been born in June of 1642." However, Houbraken does not say that Jan Baptist, the future Italianate landscape and genre painter, left town on his wedding anniversary; in any event, it is known that he arrived in Rome late in 1642 or early in 1643 and stayed there for four years. The report that his son was fourteen months old is quite specific, as is the correct statement on the same page that Jan Baptist "at age 18 married the daughter of the landscape painter Gillis Hondokoeter [Gillis d'Hondecoteer; ca. 1580–1638], the grandfather of Melchior Hondokoeter" (Melchior d'Hondecoteer; q.v.). Accordingly, it may be tentatively assumed that Jan Weenix was born about 1641 and that the remark about his father's four years of marriage (recorded eighty years after the fact) was off by one year. Other indications of Jan's date of birth appear much less reliable. When he married "Pietermelle Backer, of A[msterdam], aged 20 years," on October 7, 1679, "Johan Weenix, of A[msterdam], painter," was said to be thirty years old, suggesting that he was seriously misled as a child, or that he preferred to be considered about eight years younger than he actually was. In 1677, he gave his age as about thirty, so perhaps he had been content with that figure for some time.

In 1649, Jan Baptist—or Giovanni Battista, as he signed himself—and his family moved to Utrecht, and in 1657 to a nearby country house, the handsome Huis ter Mey. The teenage Jan must have studied with his father, and by 1660 or 1661, when Jan Baptist died "at the age of 39 years," he had adopted many of the features of his father's work. This is illustrated by Jan's earliest known dated painting, Shepherds in an Italian Landscape (location unknown), which is signed and dated "J Weenix 1660." The picture conveys, somewhat awkwardly, the sunlight, monuments, and hilly terrain of Italy, but it is by an artist who had never been there and, indeed, did not have to leave home any more than Aelbert Cuyp (q.v.) did in order to capture impressions of the Roman countryside.

Weenix continued in the same Italianate manner through the 1660s, and probably in the 1670s as well (imaginary Mediterranean views by Weenix also date from after 1700). He usually painted with more precision than did his father, and employed a subtler palette, distinctions that suited his more delicate figures, who appear too refined to have descended from Giovanni Battista's robust types. Nonetheless, paintings of the 1660s by Jan have been mistaken fairly recently for works by Jan Baptist, such as An Italian Courtyard, of 1666 (?)(National Gallery, London). The picture is characteristically signed "J Weenix," in contrast to the "Gio Batta Weenix" that Jan's father employed.

Weenix is recorded in Utrecht in 1664 and 1668. At some later date he moved to Amsterdam, where the first known reference to his residence there is that made on the occasion of his marriage in 1679. Very little is known about the artist's life and work during the 1670s, although some flower paintings and fruit and flower pieces date from that decade. It seems likely that Weenix was drawn to the flourishing art market of Amsterdam at least in part by the presence there of his cousin Melchior d'Hondecoteer, who had trained with his uncle Jan Baptist Weenix during Jan's teenage years (ca. 1653–59).

The earliest dated gamepiece by Weenix appears to be a hunting trophy of dead birds from 1679 (Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna), which conforms to a type that Willem van Aelst (1627– in or after 1683) had been painting since the early 1650s and producing in Amsterdam since about 1657. Hondecoteer painted similar still lifes, set in stone niches, at about the same time as Weenix. Piles of dead game, large urns and statues, and idyllic landscape views occur regularly in Weenix's Italianate views of the 1660s, so that early on he was already well versed in the components of the type of picture he became famous for in the 1680s and later (see pl. 216). One of his earliest trophies set outdoors is the Still Life with a Dead Hare, of 1682 or 1683 (Staatliche Kunsthalle, Karlsruhe), which includes small game birds, a musket, and other hunting equipment. The still life of sportsman's accoutrements, together with the parklike setting in the background, brings to mind the estate of a gentleman of leisure.

Jan Weenix
937
Weenix’s career coincided with a swelling of aristocratic pretensions in Holland’s upper middle class. Much as his Italianate landscapes and harbor views imply an observer on the grand tour, his “hunting trophies” hint at large tracts of property and exclusive hunting rights. Most of Weenix’s customers were not in that strata of society, but from about 1702 until 1714 he was court painter to the Elector Palatine, Johann Wilhelm, in Düsseldorf. In the last few years of that service, Weenix painted twelve large canvas murals to decorate three rooms of Schloss Bensberg, near Cologne. The young Goethe recorded his great admiration of the Bensberg murals in 1774. Large hunting trophies, more comparable to the Museum’s picture, were also painted for or purchased by Count von Schönborn to decorate Schloss Weissenstein, Pommersfelden (built 1711–23). Similar works by Weenix were intended for town houses in Amsterdam, and the Dead Swan (Mauritshuis, The Hague) comes from a civic guardroom in the same city.

Weenix also painted a few portraits, among them that of Abraham van Bronckhorst, dated 1688, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. His only known pupil, Dirk Valkenburg (1675–1721), continued the tradition of painting gamepieces in the manner of his teacher and of Hondecoeter; he also supplied series of mural-size hunting trophies to princely patrons.

1. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, p. 78. In his life of Melchior d’Hondecoeter (q.v.), Houbraken (ibid., vol. 1, p. 71) refers to information obtained directly from Weenix’s “own mouth.”
3. See Schloss 1983, p. 94 n. 8, 16, for the sources of these various documents. Jan Weenix had one sibling, his brother Gillis, who was named for his maternal grandfather. As was often the case for firstborn sons, Jan was named for his paternal grandfather, the architect Johannes Weenix.
4. Ibid., p. 70, fig. 27 (a drawing of the house in 1738).
5. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 2, p. 81. The next sentence reads, “he left two sons behind, of which the eldest was 16 years [old] and is still living and working as an artist.” This misinformation must be the source of Van Gool’s report (1750–51, vol. 1, p. 82) that Jan Weenix was seventy-five when he died in 1759. Both statements indicate a birth date of about 1644, a year or more after Jan’s father went to Italy.
7. See ibid., p. 93, fig. 26 (Seaport, of 1704; Louvre, Paris), and Eikemeier 1978.
9. See, for example, Ingamells 1992a, pp. 412–13, no. P102 (Flowers and Fruit, of 1676; Wallace Collection, London), and Meijer 2003, pp. 322–23, no. 92.
11. As noted in ibid. (under no. 133), the Weenix in Vienna. The author illustrates a comparable picture by Van Aelst and refers to two similar works by Hondecoeter (S. Sullivan 1984, figs. 147, 148).
13. See Eikemeier 1978. One enormous canvas (11 ft. 4 in. x 18 ft. 5¼ in. [3.45 x 5.62 m]), dated 1712, and two smaller canvases from Schloss Bensberg are in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich.
17. See the present writer’s discussion of the four large canvases painted by Valkenburg for Prince Johann Adam von Liechtenstein in 1698–99, in New York 1983–86, pp. 296–99, nos. 188, 189.
216. Gamepiece with a Dead Heron
(“Falconer’s Bag”)

Oil on canvas, 52⅞ x 43⅞ in. (134 x 111.1 cm)
Signed and dated (upper right): Jan Weenix Fecit A. 1695

The painting is well preserved. There is paint loss in the sky at upper left where the support is torn.
Rogers Fund, 1950 50.55

This canvas of 1695 is a fine example of a hunting trophy, a type of gamepiece for which Weenix was especially admired in his own time. He appears to have painted his first gamepiece in the late 1670s and to have composed his first trophies set in parklike landscapes shortly thereafter. Hunting trophies and pictures of live birds and animals on the grounds of grand estates were painted during the same years (the early 1680s) by Weenix’s first cousin and former copupil, Melchior d’Hondecoeter (Pl. 82). As discussed in the biography above, the two artists adopted motifs and design ideas from Willem van Aelst (1627–in or after 1683), who also worked in Amsterdam, and from their teacher Jan Baptist Weenix (1621–1660/61), who was Weenix’s father and Hondecoeter’s uncle. The cousins also influenced each other, with the slightly older Hondecoeter initially playing a somewhat greater role. However, it was the hunting trophies by Weenix, which are usually more delicate in their descriptive qualities and more naturalistic in their light and sense of space, that came to dominate the genre in the 1690s and during the first two decades of the eighteenth century.

The main feature of the Museum’s picture is a dead heron, arranged with an eye for graceful curves and a fountainlike display of feathers. The other motifs on the ground are laid out in deference to the large bird, which is indeed the prize catch in this fanciful ensemble. The two ends of a long hunting horn, with red tassels from its chord, frame the heron’s wings. An elegant bandolier with an elaborate buckle is attached by a metal clip to a falconer’s bag lying flat to the far right, with a yellow falcon’s hood on top of it. Another falcon’s hood with a plume has been set down on the heron, and like the finches in the foreground is colored (blue) to complement its mate. The object in the left foreground is a hunting whistle, consisting of leather bellows and a lobster claw. The bellows were inflated by blowing through a hole in the claw, and then tapped to emit a peeping sound that would attract birds.

Flourishing leaves and red flowers embellish a large urn or jardiniere, which is decorated with an antique-style relief of infants cavorting by an altar, a tall herm with a head of (most likely) Pan, a Bacchus type of figure riding on a goat, and to the right a reclining woman, perhaps Ceres, goddess of agriculture. The relief refers to fertility, lending the still life a lightly learned tone. Weenix repeated the relief in other pictures, and included different imitations of Roman reliefs, for example one with dancing nymphs and satyrs.

Behind the birds, a pile of netting effects a soft transition to the lake, where the eye is led past a fountain (a jet of water is visible) with a statue in an archway to a palace flanked by a classical entrance gate. The entire body of water is bordered in stone, as if a valley with a lake had been landscaped by André Le Nôtre, the designer of the gardens at Versailles. In the left background, a tall gate crowned by a bust in a lunette introduces an allée of cypress trees. A man walking a dog, a landing stage with urns and statues, two swans, and streaks of sunlight complete the picturesque tableau. Farther back, a courtly couple, attended by a page, consider a boatman’s offer to be ferried about, like tourists on Lago Maggiore.

The falconer’s bag (which previously gave this picture its title) recalls many much more conspicuous examples in paintings by Van Aelst, where the luxurious sportsman’s attribute, with its metalwork and leather bandolier, allowed the artist to demonstrate his extraordinary skill in describing different materials and reflections. Still lifes by Van Aelst also could have suggested to Weenix the idea of representing the hunting horn so that only the ends are shown emerging from among other motifs. The various birds give the impression of having been studied from life, however artful their lifeless poses may appear. Like many Dutch painters active in the last decades of the seventeenth century, Weenix managed to maintain a fine balance between beautiful decoration and close observation. In a manner rather like that described by Goethe when he visited the hunting murals by Weenix in Schloss Bensberg, the viewer of the New York canvas approaches the picture, steps back, and approaches again, struck, at each distance, with admiration for what the artist has achieved.

Previously titled by the Museum Falconer’s Bag.

1. This kind of lure is discussed in Meijer 2003, p. 150.
2. See Refs. under P. Surton 1992a; for an urn with nymphs and satyrs, Amsterdam–Cleveland 1999–2000, no. 76.
3. See, for example, Van Aelst’s Still Life with Hunting Equipment.
of 1664, in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (Münster-Baden 1979-80, p. 238, fig. 140), or his Still Life of Game and Hunting Gear of 1668, in the Staatliche Kunsthalle, Karlsruhe (S. Sullivan 1984, fig. 103).

4. "Man nähere, man entferne sich mit gleichem Erstaunen." This line and a longer passage from Goethe's Dichtung und Wahrheit are quoted by P. Eikemeier in Eikemeier et al. 1981, pp. 559-60.

REFERENCES: J. Allen and Gardner 1954, p. 102; Bergström et al. 1977, p. 219 (ill.), mentioned; S. Sullivan 1980, pp. 242-43, fig. 9, explains that the equipment and game are arbitrarily combined (for example, the heron and finches required different methods of capture); Dickey in Hamilton-Rochester-Amarillo 1983, p. 32, no. 11, describes the arbitrary combination of motifs, making "the scene an emblem of wealth and leisure rather than a naturalistic still life"; P. Sutton 1986, p. 190, mentioned; G. Weber 1989, p. 39, fig. 344, cites the painting as an example of Weenix's depicting a classical relief with Pan, Priapus, Silenus, or similar gods; B. Brown 1990, p. 603, claims that the "overblown still life" reveals "how overpowering the urge to exalt was at the end of the century"; Duparc in Montreal 1990, p. 210, no. 70, offers brief and general remarks; Liedtke 1990, p. 55, mentions the work among the Museum's more significant purchases of Dutch art since World War II; P. Sutton 1990a, p. 319, fig. 111-12, notes the repetition of the relief on the jardinière in a similar painting by Weenix, dated 1700, in the Philadelphia Museum of Art; Baetjer 1995, p. 341; Lillie 2003, p. 1018, no. 424, listed in the 1939 inventory of artworks owned by Alphonse Rothschild.


EX COLUM.: Baron Nathaniel Mayer Rothschild, Vienna (until d. 1925); his nephew Baron Alphonse Mayer Rothschild, Vienna and (from 1926) Paris (until d. 1942 [seized by the Nazis; held at Alt Aussee, Austria (2377), and at Munich collecting point (3639)]); his widow, Clarice, Baroness Rothschild, New York (returned to Austria March 15, 1948; restituted until 1950; sold to Rosenberg & Stiebel); [Rosenberg & Stiebel, New York, 1950; sold to MMA]; Rogers Fund, 1950 30.33

Adam Willaerts (or Willarts) was born in Antwerp in 1577. He was thus an exact contemporary of Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640), though he outlived the Flemish master by nearly a quarter of a century. He married a young woman of Utrecht, Maeyken Adriaensdr van Herwijk, on May 21, 1605, in that city and at the time was described as a bachelor of London. It has been plausibly suggested that Willaerts’s family, as Protestants, fled to England about the time Antwerp fell to the Spanish (August 17, 158). The artist is first documented in Utrecht on August 14, 1602, when he and the perspective painter Salomon Vredeman de Vries (1556–1634) signed a contract to paint an organ case in Utrecht Cathedral. In 1611, Willaerts was a founding member of the painters’ guild in Utrecht; he went on to serve at least thirteen terms as dean during the 1620s and 1630s. From 1611 to 1613, he registered ten of his own pupils with the guild. He soon became a well-connected figure in Utrecht, counting among his friends the prominent portraitist and city councillor Paulus Moreelse (q.v.), and the art-loving lawyers (and strict Calvinists) Aernout van Buchell (Arnold Buchelius; 1565–1641) and Karel Martens (1602–1649). Willaerts contributed a meticulous drawing of a Dutch warship fighting a Spanish galley to Van Buchell’s album amicorum, of about 1615–20. The landscapist was also familiar with the work of Joachim Wtewael (q.v.), Balthasar van der Ast (1593/94–1657), Cornelis van Poelenburch (1594/95–1667), and many other Utrecht artists, especially that of Roelant Savery (1576–1639), whom Willaerts visited daily in the early 1620s and who greatly influenced his fellow Fleming and contemporary.

Despite these relationships and a few prestigious commissions, Willaerts was not one of the more successful artists in Utrecht (where the competition, not least in landscape painting, was considerable). His various pupils, who for the most part studied drawing, were a means of raising additional income but would have cost—not saved—the painter time. In the 1630s and later, Willaerts’s “trees folios pictores” (as Van Buchell described them in his diary), Cornelis (ca. 1603–1666), Isaac (ca. 1620–1693), and the more talented Abraham (ca. 1608–1669), would have been helpful in their father’s studio. This must have been in the house on the Annastraat (also called, unpleasingly, the Vuilsteeg) that Willaerts owned between 1612 and 1654. During the last decade of his life, the painter, who was described as old and infirm in 1653, received a small annual allowance from the city council, and lived rent free in the convent of Saint Agnes. In addition to his three sons, Willaerts had at least three daughters: Abigael, who died before 1653 and left children in her father’s care; Hester, who in 1668 married the still-life painter Jacob Gillig (ca. 1616–1701); and Maria, who married the still-life painter Abraham Mignon (1640–1679) in 1675.

Willaerts’s earliest known painting appears to be A Fleet of the East India Company (Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam), which is dated 1608 or 1609 and strongly recalls the manner of Hendrick Vroom (1562/63–1640), the highly regarded marine painter who worked in Haarlem beginning in the early 1590s. Vroom continued to be Willaerts’s main source of inspiration during the second decade of the century for works depicting ships in perilously stormy seas (like the panel of 1614 in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) or anchored off rocky coasts. A beach busy with figures often forms the foundation of a continuous repoussé or framing an extensive view over the water. In some pictures, the figures are Dutchmen exploring or hunting in foreign terrain. Willaerts used similar settings for biblical subjects, as in Christ Preaching from the Boat, of 1621 (private collection, Turin).

The artist also depicted important historical events, in some cases surely on commission. They include several marine paintings involving the crossing over from England to the Dutch Republic of the Elector Frederick V of the Palatinate (Stadholder Prince Maurits’s nephew) and his new bride, Elizabeth Stuart (daughter of James I), in May 1613. The earliest picture appears to be The Elector Frederick V of the Palatinate and Princess Elizabeth Waiting to Leave Margate in 1613, a canvas painted by Willaerts in 1619 (Nederlands Scheepvaartmuseum, Amsterdam). His paintings of the couple’s embarkation and departure, both dated 1623, are in the Royal Collection, Windsor Castle, and in the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, respectively. In the view of Margate, Willaerts, despite his youthful experience of England, inserted Bohemian motifs, including Prague Castle, which were borrowed from
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drawings by Saver. As in other works by Willaerts,14 these motifs, which also included peasant figures, cottages, craggy rocks, and fir trees, were intended to convey the notion of a foreign country to the contemporary Dutch viewer, and even, through their specificity, the impression of a place or event recorded at firsthand.15 Savery settled in Utrecht in 1618, and his landscape paintings and drawings were the main influence on Willaerts’s work from that point on, especially during the 1620s.16

Other paintings by Willaerts of historical subjects include two views of the Battle of Gibraltar (1607) in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (one dated 1659), a picture of the 1639 naval Battle of the Downs (now lost), for which he paid 800 guilders by the States of Utrecht in 1649,16 and The Departure of the Pilgrims from Delfshaven, of 1620 (private collection).17 He was also one of several Utrecht painters commissioned in the late 1630s to decorate Kronborg Castle, near Copenhagen, with scenes illustrating the history of Denmark.18 The artist’s enormous canvas (5 ft. 11 in. x 21 ft. 11 in. [1.8 x 6.7 m]) View of Dordrecht (Dordrechts Museum, Dordrecht) was painted in 1629 for the Town Hall of Dordrecht and, while no more advanced than Vroom’s two earlier views of Delft (1613; both in the Stedelijk Museum Het Prinsenhof, Delft), is a key monument of townscaping in the Netherlands.19

Willaerts died at the age of eighty-seven. He was buried in Utrecht on April 4, 1664.

1. The year is given in De Bie 1661, p. 111, under the portrait engraving of Willaerts, and is supported by documents giving his age as twenty-six in 1604 and seventy-eight in 1655. These details are given in the most fully documented biography of Willaerts in print, which is by Bok in Amsterdam 1991–94a, pp. 323–26 (see Bok’s note 1). Gitaij in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, p. 15, notes that the artist spelled his name “Willaert” (for example, on the paintings discussed under nos. 12 [of 1622] and 13 [of 1631]). In the document of 1602 cited in note 3 below, the artist is referred to both as “Adam Willaerts” and as “Adam Wylliaerts,” but he signed himself “Wielars” and “Vielars.”

2. Bok in Amsterdam 1991–94a, p. 323; see also ibid., p. 326 n. 1, on the possible London connection between the artist’s family and that of his wife (who were also Protestant). The family of Frans Hals (q.v.), who was about five years younger than Willaerts, fled Antwerp during the same period. Margarita Russell claims of Willaerts that “during his early years in Antwerp he was impressed with the colourful paintings of the Fleming Jan Breughel the elder” (Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 33, p. 193), but this is implausible on both biographical and stylistic grounds.

3. Willaerts is often named alone in connection with this commission, but Salomon Vredeman de Vries, the now obscure son of the famous artist and architect Hans Vredeman de Vries (1526–1609), was clearly the dominant figure. He was a generation older than Willaerts, and the contract (quoted nearly in full in Lengo–Antwerp 2002, p. 37 n. 111) specifies that the interior of the organ shutters would represent “a church in perspective” with, “on the floor of the church,” life-size figures of David with his harp and Saint Cecilia with an organ. The exterior of the organ case was to be decorated with painted grotesques, which like perspective views had long been a specialty of the Vredeman de Vries workshop. Inside the smaller doors of the organ a “landscape with ruins and some cottages” was to be painted, presumably by Willaerts. Bok in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, p. 95, states that Willaerts would have painted the large figures as well as the landscape, but too little is known of Salomon Vredeman de Vries’s abilities to count him out. The latter artist never lived in Utrecht, so far as is known (his father and his brother Paul lived in Amsterdam), and the commission of 1602 cannot be considered conclusive evidence of residence in Utrecht for Willaerts either, as it has been (for example, in Spicer 1998, p. 24).


6. On Willaerts’s connections with these artists, see Bok in Amsterdam 1991–94a, pp. 315, 321–26. Savery’s influence on Willaerts is most closely considered in Spicer 1998.


9. See Bok in Amsterdam 1991–94a, pp. 323–26 (n. 6 for Van Buchell’s remark), and, on Abraham and Isaac Willaerts, Russell in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 33, pp. 194–95. De Bie 1661, p. 247, gives 1613 as Abraham’s date of birth, but he joined the painters’ guild in Utrecht in 1624 and was probably nearly twenty at the time (see Giltaij in Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, p. 125). Cornelis joined the guild in 1622 (see ibid., p. 113). One of Abraham’s finer marine paintings is discussed in ibid., pp. 123–28, no. 16. A male portrait (1644) and an Annunciation to the Shepherds (1643) by Abraham Willaerts are in the Centrale Museum, Utrecht, where there is also a marine by his brother Isaac.

10. For this address and Willaerts’s much more remote location in the Agnietenconvent (from 1641 until his death), see the map in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, pp. 88–89, nos. 37, 38. “Vuilsteeg” can be translated as Fool Alley.

11. See Bok in Amsterdam 1991–94a, pp. 323–26, no. 20, on Willaerts’s old age and his possible service as a sort of curator.


13. Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, no. 55, where a similar painting in the Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle, is also illustrated, and the
Flemish precedents are discussed. One of the finest secular examples of this compositional type is Hunting Chamois on the Coast, of 1620 (Kunsthalle, Hamburg; Minneapolis–Toledo–Los Angeles 1990–91, no. 12).


15. See Spicer 1998 on Willaerts’s adaptations of Savery motifs, and ibid., pp. 35–43, on the paintings commemorating the princely sailing of 1613 (a related painting in a private collection is discussed in Minneapolis–Toledo–Los Angeles 1990–91, pp. 204–6 [under no. 54]). Vroom (in 1623) and his follower Cornelis Claesz van Vianingen (ca. 1573–1633) depicted the arrival of Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart in Vlissingen; see Rotterdam–Berlin 1996–97, no. 4 (Vroom), and Minneapolis–Toledo–Los Angeles 1990–91, no. 53 (Van Vianingen).

16. On these battle scenes, see Bok in Amsterdam 1991–94, p. 326 n. 18.

17. The Hague 1995, no. 31. The painting is discussed at length in Bangs 1999, which concludes that the work places the pilgrims “in the wider context of the growing activities of European colonial expansion.” The article might have benefited from a reading of Spicer 1998, and from a consideration of Willaerts’s place in the conservative Calvinist community of Utrecht.


---

217. River Scene with Boats

Oil on wood, 18¼ x 33¼ in. (46.4 x 85.4 cm)
Signed and dated (at left, on building): A.W./1643

The paint surface is abraded throughout, and there are numerous flake losses in the sky along the grain of the oak panel.

Gift of George A. Hearn, 1906 06.1303

This picture of routine quality dates from comparatively late in Willaerts’s career. The artist was sixty-six in 1643, and was probably assisted in paintings like this one by one of his sons, Abraham, Cornelis, or Isaac (see the biography above). The general design of the composition dates back at least twenty years in Willaerts’s oeuvre and was, with the subject of shipping on a river, standard issue in the large circle of Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568–1625). Some of the most similar examples are by or attributed to Jan Brueghel the Younger (1601–1678) and date from between about 1625 and 1640. The motifs of sailboats, fisherfolk, a landing stage, and the occasional ferry are common in these Flemish works.¹

In this landscape, colored in blues, greens, and tans, it is the details that were meant to entertain the viewer. To the far left, a man relieves himself against the shadowy wall that, a bit higher up, bears the artist’s initials and date. The resting travelers, one with a beer jug, make it clear that the building is a pub. One horseman adjusts his saddle, while another, mounted, offers a coin to a beggar woman accompanied by a crippled man. A fisherman is watched by a woman and boy. In the middle ground to the left, a small cargo boat (a smalschip) departs from a landing stage bordered by a rustic cottage of the type Willaerts borrowed from drawings by his friend Roelant Savery (1576–1659).² The boat (which flies the Dutch flag) joins a file of similar vessels leading the eye down the
river to the distant eye stopper of a church. To the far right, men in a rowboat work with three men at the shoreline to drag a large seine through the water. Behind the standard mill on the hill, an awkwardly rendered church tower fills in space. Two cottages on the right bank recede toward a smoking kiln and a moored boat. In the middle of the river, an underscaled barge is propelled by two oarsmen toward the landing stage. The seven seated and two mounted passengers have been joined by a half-dozen sheep.

When compared with contemporary pictures of similar subjects by an artist such as Salomon van Ruisdael (see Pl. 188), Willaerts’s coastal and river views look like outmoded works by a painter who rarely left his studio. However, Dutch inventories and sale records of the first half of the seventeenth century, and of course local production, indicate that Flemish-style landscapes were popular, especially in Utrecht and in the area of Delft and The Hague. 3

2. See the biography above, and Spicer 1998, pp. 31–32. In May 2004, Spicer confirmed the present writer’s impression that the building in this painting was probably adopted from Savery’s drawings of Bohemian cottages.
3. On the types of landscapes that were favored in Delft and The Hague, see New York–London 2001, pp. 83–86. Those cities shared with Utrecht strong ties to the artistic traditions of Antwerp.


Ex Coll.: Cardinal Howard (Edward Henry Howard, 1829–1892), according to two old labels on the back of the frame; George Arnold Hearn, New York (until 1906); Gift of George A. Hearn, 1906. 06.1303
Jacob de Wit, the most successful decorator and religious painter in the Netherlands during the eighteenth century, was baptized in a Catholic church in Amsterdam on December 19, 1695. His father, Christiaen de Wit (1652–1715/24), from Gorinchem, trained as a shoemaker and his mother, Annetje Sloomans (1659–1702), who was illiterate, came from a German family of pinnakers. After his marriage, in 1785, Christiaen de Wit ran a pub and sold wine, as had his father in Gorinchem. Two of Christiaen's brothers became wine importers in Antwerp, and one of them, Jacob (or Jacomo; ca. 1650–1721), who was also a prominent art dealer, took the future painter under his wing.1

Between the ages of nine and thirteen, Jacob studied with the Amsterdam artist Albert van Spiers (1666–1718), who had spent a decade in Rome and Venice (1687–97). Inspired by Raphael, Domenichino, Veronese, and other great muralists, Van Spiers specialized in decorating the walls and ceilings of Amsterdam canal houses. De Wit served as his assistant, learning painting techniques and elements of Italian design. In 1709, the thirteen-year-old apprentice, sponsored by his uncle Jacomo, went to study in Antwerp with the staid history painter Jacob van Hal (1672–1750). After two years, he moved on to drawing lessons at the Royal Academy of Antwerp (1711–13), and then to membership in the same city's Guild of Saint Luke (1713–14). During this period, De Wit became a skilled draftsman after live models; he also systematically studied in Antwerp churches the works of Peter Paul Rubens and Anthony van Dyck and their followers. Especially important, both for De Wit and posterity, were his spirited sketches of 1711–12 after Rubens's ceiling paintings (executed by Van Dyck, among others) in the Jesuit Church of Antwerp, which were destroyed by fire in 1718. A second set of drawings by De Wit, evidently made later in Amsterdam after the Antwerp sketches, were reproduced in thirty-six engravings by Jan Punt (1711–1779).2

The War of Spanish Succession (1701–14) left Antwerp with a poor economy and local artists with little hope of a satisfactory career in their own country. De Wit returned to Amsterdam (in 1713?), where, according to the biographer Jan van Gool, he was flooded with commissions for portraits (though only a few portraits by the artist are known).3 As a religious painter, De Wit found an important patron in Aegidius de Glabbaia, a priest in the Roman Catholic schuilkerk (hidden church) of Moses and Aaron.4 At least thirteen paintings commissioned by that small house of worship and an altarpiece, The Baptism of Christ, made for the schuilkerk Het Hart (now the Museum Ons' Lieve Heer op Solder, Amsterdam, where the large canvas remains in situ), date from about 1716.5

The timing of De Wit's arrival in Amsterdam was fortuitous. His great predecessor Gerard de Lairesse (q.v.) had died in 1711; Lairesse's former co-worker Johannes Glauber (1646–1726) and Van Spiers were on their last legs; and the only potential competitor as a muralist, Isaac de Moucheron (1667–1744), treated the very different subject of idealized landscapes. (De Moucheron would eventually become De Wit's occasional collaborator.) Commissions from Catholic churches and their parishioners flowed to De Wit throughout his life. A fair number of altarpieces and drawings for them survive.6

On November 24, 1724, De Wit married Cornelia Eleonora van Neek (1704–1752), who came from an old Catholic family of merchants and regents in Amsterdam. In 1741, the couple purchased adjoining houses on the fashionable Keizersgracht, near the Leidsegracht (they lived in the larger house, No. 385, and rented out No. 385).7 De Wit set up a spacious studio facing the garden in back, and used one of the main rooms in the house to display his collection of paintings (about two hundred were in his estate, along with some eight hundred mostly Flemish and Italian drawings). He owned sixteen pictures by or attributed to Rubens, four each by Van Dyck and Jacob Jordaeus (1593–1678), and individual works by his own contemporaries Jan van Huysum (1682–1749) and Cornelis Troost (1696–1750). Neither of those highly regarded artists earned as much as De Wit did annually; in 1742, his income of 4,000 guilders exceeded Van Huysum's by 1,000 guilders, and quadrupled that of Troost.8

Although De Wit worked mostly for Catholics in Amsterdam, he also received commissions from Protestant clients and painted mythological, allegorical, and religious works for patrons in other cities of the Dutch Republic, including Leiden, The Hague, Delft, Rotterdam, and Utrecht. His first secular projects (apart from untraced portraits) were executed
in 1717 and 1718 for the wealthy Catholic Jacob Cromhout, who, after a trial painting was executed on the ceiling of his country house, commissioned from De Wit a set of ceiling pictures representing the gods on Olympus and the signs of the zodiac for the salon of his town house at Herengracht 366 (the canvases are now in the Bijkelsmuseum, Amsterdam). The main sources of inspiration for this ensemble of cloudborne figures seen from below are ceiling paintings by Rubens, Jordaens, Pietro da Cortona (1596–1669), and the fashionable Venetian artist Giovanni Antonio Pellegrini (1675–1741). Pellegrini had worked in England, Germany, and Antwerp before 1717, when he painted a ceiling for the magnificent house at Herengracht 359 in Amsterdam that had just been acquired by the burgomaster Gerrit Corver. Pellegrini had been strongly impressed by Rubens’s ceiling paintings in London and Antwerp, and his work provided an ideal model for De Wit’s Rococo version of a tradition that extended from Antwerp back to Venice and Rome.

Unlike Pellegrini, De Wit remained a national, not a European, phenomenon. One of his most prestigious commissions, the enormous canvases (17 x 41 ft. [5.2 x 12.5 m]) Moses Choosing the Seventy Elders, completed in 1737 for the Town Hall of Amsterdam (now the Royal Palace, where the painting remains in the Council Chamber, or Moses Hall), was understandably condemned in 1797 by Sir Joshua Reynolds as a “poor performance” — although the same critic considered De Wit’s trompe-œil relief over one of the doorways in the same building “not only one of the best depictions I have seen, but the boys are well drawn.” De Wit’s wijze, as his “white,” or grisaille, paintings were called, imitated stone and stucco reliefs, and were popular throughout and long after his lifetime, their high quality reflecting the artist’s sound training as a draftsman in Antwerp and his study of Flemish Baroque sculpture. De Wit’s illusionistic grisailles, brunailles, and rosailles, which feigned figural sculpture in stucco, white or red marble, lindenwood, and oak, were often copied or emulated by contemporary and later artists (see the discussion below for Children Playing with a Goat; Pl. 221). His oil sketches, three of which are catalogued here, and his preparatory drawings were not sold but remained in his studio until they were dispersed in an estate sale of 1755. (In later decades, some of the oil sketches were sold with attributions to François Boucher and other famous names.) A proper estimate of the impression De Wit made in his own time is hindered by the fact that many of his canvas ceiling paintings were removed from their original locations during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, especially in the case of private residences (see, for example, Apollo Surrounded by the Nine Muses and its four grisaille corner pieces made in 1743 for Rapenburg 48, Leiden; in the Mauritshuis, The Hague; and in the Mauritshuis, The Hague, since 1910). 14

1. Unless otherwise stated, the biographical details given here are drawn from Dudok van Hool’s essay on De Wit in Amsterdam—Weert 1999–96, pp. 15–33.
2. The complicated circumstances are reviewed in J. Martin 1968, pp. 46–51. Punt’s engravings date from 1747 until as late as 1759 (1765 in the case of the frontispiece). See also Van den Hout’s essay, “Jacob de Wit en de internationale barok,” in Amsterdam—Weert 1999–96, pp. 95–121 (95–97 on the sketches after Rubens).
6. De Wit’s religious paintings and the related drawings are catalogued by Schilleman in ibid., pp. 139–55.
7. See Dudok van Hool in ibid., pp. 23–24, fig. 5, on the two houses, and Van den Hout in ibid., pp. 115–16, fig. 72b, on De Wit’s studio.
8. See Dudok van Hool’s list of artists’ incomes in ibid., p. 27.
13. See, for example, Rotterdam—Braunschweig 1985–84, no. 28, for one of the two ceiling sketches in the Musée Jacquesmart-André, Paris, that bear false Boucher signatures.
218. Allegory of Government: Wisdom
Defeating Discord

Oil on canvas, 20 5/8 in. x 15 5/8 in. (51.1 x 39.1 cm)
Inscribed (bottom center, on shield): TUBET & PROBAT
(to command & to approve); (bottom center, on book):
IN LEGIBVS SALVS (prosperity under law)

The painting is well preserved. Grid lines used to transfer the composition can be seen in a few places through the thinly applied paint layers. These are revealed to a greater degree, though not entirely, when the painting is viewed by means of infrared reflectography. A trace of the top half of a signature at lower right indicates that the painting was trimmed.

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1906 07.225.296

This oil sketch is a modèle for a canvas ceiling painting that De Wit executed in 1738 for the Aldermen's or Sheriffs' Hall (Schepenzaal) in the new wing of the Old Town Hall (Oud Stadhuis) in The Hague. The central painting was removed (evidently because of its poor condition) in the late (mid?) nineteenth century, but the four corner pieces that De Wit painted in grisaille, each depicting putti in illusionistic relief, remain in their original setting (figs. 261, 262). The Museum's picture is apparently the only visual record of the lost canvas.

The Old Town Hall was completed in 1665. Between 1733 and about 1735, a large addition, designed by Daniel Marot (1661–1752), was built onto the rear of the Renaissance building, so that a grand façade confronts the choir and north side of the Grote Kerk (also called the Jacobskerk). A very tall and elegant hallway extends down the entire length of the Marot wing, leading from the back of the old building to the new entrance at the other end. The former Aldermen's Hall is the central room on the ground floor, with windows facing southwest. It has a flat ceiling, about 14 feet 8 inches (4.5 m) in height, with simple wood moldings framing the oval field and corner compartments. The four grisaille canvases (which are actually terracotta, or rosaille, in color) are also framed in carved wood cartouches, which enhances the impression that the cavorting putti are in sculpted relief.

A few years after the young De Wit established himself in Amsterdam, he provided a canvas ceiling painting for a building by Marot in The Hague, the splendid mansion at Lange Vijverberg 8, begun in 1715 for Cornelis van Schuylenburgh. The oval picture, The Ripening of Wine, Watched Over by Benevolence, was installed in 1720, and is surrounded by leafy stucco decoration by Giovanni Baptista Luraghi (ca. 1675–1736). Marot must also have been familiar with a number of De Wit's ceiling paintings in Amsterdam town houses, and with his extensive work on the Council Chamber, or Moses Hall, of the Town Hall (now the Royal Palace) of Amsterdam. The huge canvas still in situ on the long wall, Moses Choosing the Seventy Elders, was completed in October 1737, and De Wit went on to paint thirteen grisaille canvases (imitating stone reliefs) for the end and window walls, including appropriate Old Testament subjects and still lifes representing Religion, Civic Concord, Commerce, and Navigation. Finally, a very tall grisaille canvas, The Spirit of Holland ("The Holland Maid"), painted in 1738, shows the female figure dressed as Pallas Athena, goddess of wisdom. The goddess resembles Pallas in the Museum's painting, and two other motifs present here—the tables of the law, and the bundle of arrows—are also found in Religion and Civic Concord, respectively. The ceiling of the Council Chamber already featured at its center a large allegorical painting of the City of Amsterdam executed in 1656 by Erasmus Quellinus the Younger (1607–1678). However, a watercolor design by De Wit, Amsterdam Attended by Virtues (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt), is inscribed on the verso, "Blaffon vervaardigt tot de Raaktamer te Amsterdam" (Ceiling for the Council Chamber in Amsterdam), suggesting that the city fathers considered extending the artist's decorative program into the vaulting. In the event, De Wit's next major ceiling painting was made not for the Town Hall of Amsterdam but for the Town Hall in The Hague.

The iconography of that canvas is known from a description in the artist's own hand, which was apparently delivered to the city government together with his invoice, dated October 2, 1738, for the completed project. The invoice specifies "a ceiling with four corner pieces for the chamber of the Honorable Messrs. Aldermen of The Hague," and lists "a Ceiling depicting that Wisdom divides virtue from vice . . . f 800:--:-: for the four corner pieces in grisaille depicting freedom, industry temperance & Fortitude @ 100:--: [per] piece . . . 400:--:-: [paid] in advance as per additional invoice and notice— to the widower Hermanus van de Velde . . . 91:--:-: Total f 1291:--:-:" (In March 1738, Van de Velde had supplied primed canvases for the ceiling directly to De Wit in Amsterdam). On October 10, 1738, the city treasury of The Hague authorized a payment of Fl 1,291 "aan den Konstschilder Jacob de Wit, voort schilderen van het Blaffont met de vier hoeken in scheepen kaemer" (to the art painter Jacob de Wit for the painting of the ceiling with the four corner pieces in the aldermen's chamber).
The description appended to the invoice of October 2 reads, in translation: "Significance of the Ceiling in the Chamber of the Honorable Messrs. Aldermen of the Hague—painted [in] 1738 by Jacob de Wit art painter in Amsterdam. The central piece represents,—that through Wisdom will virtue and vice be divided—Wisdom [is] represented by Pallas, who casts envy, Personal Gain, ignorance and Deceit out of Heaven, while Friendship and Concord, are being crowned with Roses and Laurel, In the view of Law who is accompanied by religion and contemplation [aendaghe][;] The crest of the Hague is also shown there with the legend Jubet & Probat—The Figure of the law [is] shown [with] an open book in which [the words] stand—In Legibus Salus[,] The four Corner Pieces in grisaille are the following [depicted] emblematically as—Freedom, industry, temperance & fortitude."

In his monograph of 1918, Staring quoted this description and expressed the hope that the oil sketch would eventually be rediscovered and acquired by a museum in The Hague. He was unaware that a modello corresponding closely with the ceiling's description had been given, along with two other oil sketches for ceilings by De Wit, to the Metropolitan Museum
only the figures but also the two inscriptions and the crest of The Hague occur in the oil sketch, as they do in the 1738 description of the actual ceiling. The shield inscribed JUBET & PROBAT, held by a figure seen beneath the raised arm of Law, also bears a faint drawing of a stork. A stork with an eel in its beak appears on the crest of The Hague.¹³

According to the contemporary description, the four tumbling figures to the left in the oil sketch should be Envy, Personal Gain, Ignorance, and Deceit. The topmost figure, just beneath the spear of Pallas Athena, must be the female figure of Envy, identified by the snakes in her hands and hair.¹⁴ At least one of the three male figures, the one whose head is seen in profile to the right in the group beneath Envy, also has snakes in his hair and is presumably intended as Deceit.¹⁵ Only the lowest male figure holds an attribute, namely a rake, which must signify graft, greed, or “Personal Gain.” The remaining figure, in red, may be Ignorance. Below the fallen vices, De Wit has placed a mask (symbol of Deceit), a pole-like object probably meant as a whip (an attribute of Envy),¹⁶ one or two seemingly metallic objects, and two tablets with rounded tops. (The tablets, recalling Moses, could suggest laws being broken, but the meaning is unclear.) “Friendship” and “Concord” rest on clouds to the right. The wreaths held over their heads by a victory figure are composed of green leaves (the “laurel”) with white and pink flowers (the “roses”). A dog nestles in Friendship’s arms, and a bundle of arrows appears over Concord’s shoulder (perhaps suggesting that they are held in her right hand).

De Wit also painted a canvas overdoor for the Aldermen’s Hall, depicting an enthroned female figure (probably meant as Justice) between opposing groups of putti, one with a sheep (presumably the plaintiff) and the other with a hound (fig. 263).¹⁷ The woman’s glance and gesture lend emphasis to the legal principle inscribed below, AUDI & ALTERAM PARTEM (Listen also to the other side). The painting, signed and dated 1739, is still in situ.¹⁸ The overdoor and the ceiling are both described and considered “proof pieces” of De Wit’s abilities in Jan van Gool’s celebratory review of Dutch painters, published in The Hague in 1750–51.¹⁹

The decorations of the Old Town Hall in the 1730s and their relationship to earlier decorations in the sixteenth-century rooms deserve closer attention than they have received to date. De Wit’s ceiling, for example, is not the first one in the building to treat the theme of law or justice as a cloud-borne assembly of allegorical figures. In 1682, Theodoor van der Schuer (1634–1707) painted his Justitiae Oculum (Eye of Justice), complete with a stork, hovering putti, and female Virtues, on the flat wooden
ceiling of the Burgomasters’ Chamber (now the messengers’ office). Between that room and the Aldermen’s Hall, in the Burgomasters’ Withdrawing Room (Burgemeesteren-vertrek), Mattheus Terwesten (1670–1777) depicted an allegory of good government on the wooden ceiling, with groups of female figures shown di sotto in sù on each side of the approximately oval composition. In the grisaille corner panels, the Four Elements are represented by appropriate creatures of nature. Terwesten’s ceiling dates from 1736; the Burgomasters’ Withdrawing Room was completely renovated during the expansion of the Old Town Hall between 1733 and 1739. It remains to be considered whether the old and new ceilings, overdoors, chimneypieces, and other decorations that were commissioned for or absorbed into Marot’s project can be said to represent a coherent program, and, if so, who supplied the ideas.

1. Herpel 1975–79, vol. 1, p. 443, records that the central painting was “in a bad state” when the room was redesignated the Trouwzaal (Marriage Hall, now also called the Blue Room) in 1834. In 1892, Georg Sturm (1835–1923) was commissioned to paint a new ceiling decoration; the saccharine image of a marriage made in heaven was replaced in 1960 by a slightly undersize, anonymous eighteenth-century painting of Flora and Zephyr with putti, in the manner of De Wit (see ibid., vol. 1, fig. 384, for the Sturm, and vol. 2, fig. 899, for the Rococo substitute). The present writer is grateful to Charles Dumas of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, for kindly bringing Herpel’s study to his attention, for help in interpreting the documents of 1738, and for corresponding at length about various aspects of De Wit’s work in the Town Hall.

2. See Herpel 1975–79, vol. 1, p. 404, fig. 376, for a ground plan of the entire building, and p. 410, fig. 382, for good photographs of De Wit’s corner paintings set in their wood cartouches, which are in turn framed by the simple wood moldings of the entire ceiling.

3. On the house, see Ottenheim et al. 1988, pp. 24–28, and Van Zoest and Van Eck 1988 (figs. 28, 67, for views of De Wit’s painting in situ; the entire ceiling is also shown in Bredelveld Boer 1991, p. 82, fig. 183). See also Boonstra and Van den Hout 2000, pp. 10–11, figs. 6, 7.


5. Amsterdam 1986, pp. 50–58, figs. 42 (The Spirit of Holland) and 43 (pen drawings for the still lifes representing Religion and Civic Concord).


7. See Staring 1958, pp. 131–32, fig. 112, and Amsterdam 1986, p. 33, fig. 22. There is also an item listed in the sale catalogue of De Wit’s estate suggesting that the burgomasters may have contemplated replacing the large chimney paintings by Govert Flinck (1658) and Jan van Bronchorst (1659) with canvases by De Wit (see Amsterdam 1986, p. 38: “Justice, allegorically displayed; being a study for a chimney painting for the Town Hall of Amsterdam”).

8. Gemeentearchief, The Hague, doc. 1865 (“Documenten tot de Rekening van de Kist, met Catharina [November 25] 1738, tot 1739”). I am grateful to Marieke Kroonen, archivist, for sending photocopies of the most important documents relating to De Wit’s decoration of the Old Town Hall, as well as a letter (dated January 14, 2004) and e-mail (February 26, 2004) offering helpful interpretations.

9. Van de Velde’s invoice, dated March 8, 1738, is made out to the burgomasters of The Hague “per order Mr. Jacobus de Wit,” and lists a primed canvas measuring 18 x 14¼ feet (5.48 x 4.43 m), priced at Fl 68:10:04; “a canvas of 4 squares” (meaning the length is four times the width), 20 x 5 feet, priced at Fl 10; and chalk priming material priced at 18 stuivers. Under the total of Fl 79:8:4, two more expenses are added next to the heading “October,” the first for shipment to The Hague together with a servant’s travel expenses and wages (Fl 9 1/2), the second for a packing case (Fl 2 1/0). Under the grand total of Fl 91 0:0:4, De Wit (evidently) has written “the above debts [payments] received from the hands of Jacob de Wit—Amsteld 7 octbre 1738”; this is followed by the signatures of Maria van Tinneher, “widow,” and Harmanus van de Velde, “widower.” The document, preserved in the Gemeentearchief, The Hague, as no. 1864, is accompanied by a small “Notitie voor de Hr. de Witt,” listing travel expenses, two days’ wages, and “one night’s sleep” (four stuivers) for a servant, plus freight charges to The Hague, totaling Fl 9. Herpel 1975–79, vol. 1, pp. 411-12, 441 n. 279, inaccurately quotes Van de Velde’s invoice and cites a secondary source, Wildemann 1896, without giving page numbers (Wildeman 1896, pp. 147–48, referring to “notes that are preserved”).

10. Gemeentearchief, The Hague, doc. 1738, p. 23, of the “Rekening wegens de Administratie van de Kist, met Catharina [November 25] 1737, tot Catharina 1738.” The date of October 10, 1738, is not specified in this ledger, but occurs in each of the two authorizations of payment written on De Wit’s invoice of October 2, 1738. The reference in Bredius 1915–22, part 7, p. 293, to an entry in the “Thesauriersrekeningen” actually bearing the date to October, 1738, and referring to De Wit’s “blaffont met de vier hoekstukken in schepenen vertrekamer” (sic!), must be his inaccurate quotation of the line given here in the text. A thorough search in the Gemeentearchief, The Hague, found no such entry in any ledger (kind communication of Marieke Kroonen, March 31, 2004).

11. For the original in Dutch, see Staring 1958, p. 82.

12. Ibid.

13. See Van Lit 2001. The earliest known example of the crest dates from 1541. Evidently, storks were common in the Binnenhof and Groenmarkt areas (sites of the national and city governments, respectively), and were welcome because they kept the fish markets clean. The symbol also occurs in the windowlight above the main entrance to the 1733 wing of the Town Hall (see Herpel 1975–79, vol. 1, figs. 322, 344, 347), in an interior windowlight above the doorway between the old and new wings, and on the city crest decorating a canopy of 1671 in the Vierschans (Hall of Justice) in the old building (ibid., vol. 1, fig. 196, and vol. 2, fig. 864, for both interior motifs, and vol. 1, fig. 213, for the crest). These and many other examples of The Hague’s stork of about 1650–1750 are illustrated in Van Lit 2001, pp. 40, 54, pas-
sim. A painting of three storks above the fireplace of 1735 in the Aldermen's withdrawing Room (see Herpel 1973–79, vol. 1, pp. 416–17, fig. 389) may date from somewhat earlier (quite as a painting by Adriaen Hanneman [see note 17 below] was incorporated into the decorations of the adjoining Aldermen's Hall).


15. See Rapa 1611, p. 186, under Fraude, citing a figure in Dante's Inferno. See also J. Hall 1979, pp. 97, 161, under Deceit and Innocence, respectively.

16. In a print of 1549 by Heinrich Aldegrever, a whip of the same kind (now called a lung whip) serves as an attribute of Invidia (Envy), who holds a snake in her other hand. See Hollstein 1949–, vol. 1, p. 57 (the ninth image, "Invidia"; noted in Tertullian 1956–59, vol. 1, col. 195).

17. The painting is listed in Staring 1918, p. 150, and on p. 83 it is noted (without citing the source) that De Wit was due 350 guilders for the overdoor on April 24, 1739. De Wit's invoice of that date is included in doc. 1865 of the city archives of The Hague (see note 7). He charges Fl 310 "for the painting of a piece over the door in the chamber of the Hon. Messrs. Aldermen in the Town Hall representing audi & alteram partem," plus Fl 310 for the canvas support. Below this, he lists Fl 150 "for the restoration [verhoeteren] of a Chimney Piece in the same chamber painted by . . . Hanneman—representing justice." De Wit's total of Fl 503:10 was evidently considered somewhat excessive by the burgomasters, for his invoice is authorized for payment of only "four hundred and fifty guilders" on June 27, 1739. De Wit signed the invoice for that amount on the same day. The payment of Fl 450 is also recorded in the "Rekening . . . van de Kist" for November 25, 1738, to November 25, 1739 (Gemeentearchief, The Hague, doc. 1739). On Adriaen Hanneman's Allegory of Justice, 1644, which remains over the fireplace in the Aldermen's Hall, see Ter Kuile 1970, no. 7, pl. 20; and Herpel 1973–79, vol. 1, p. 499, fig. 381, vol. 2, fig. 897 (the room after its restoration in the 1970s).


19. Van Gool 1710–51, vol. 2, pp. 230–31, describes De Wit's paintings in the Schepens-Kamer as "een Zolderstuk, en vier gruwelijke Basrelieven in de hoeken, verbeeldende Kindertjes, benevens een Deurstuk; die alle om 't kunstigst behandelt syn" (a ceiling piece and four gray bas-reliefs in the corners, depicting putti, together with an [over]door piece, all of which are executed in the most artful manner).


REFERENCES: Baetjer 1995, p. 342; J. E. P. Leistra in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 33, p. 261, suggests that the picture may be a modello for De Wit's lost ceiling decoration painted for the Old Town Hall of The Hague in 1728; Boonstra and Van den Hout 2000, p. 57, fig. 19 on p. 60, cites the picture as an example of the style and usual scale of De Wit's modelloi for ceiling paintings, and dates it about 1735; Liedtke 2001, pp. 199–201, fig. 5, describes the sketch as the modello for, and only surviving visual evidence of, De Wit's lost ceiling painting made for the Old Town Hall of The Hague.

EX COLL.: Jacob de Wit, Amsterdam (1738–d. 1754; his estate sale, Amsterdam, March 10, 1755, no. 126, as a sketch for a ceiling painting in the Stadhuis in The Hague ["Een ditto (Blafonstukje), op het Stadhuis in 's Hage"]); Georges Hoeenschel, Paris (until 1906; sold to Morgan); J. Pierpoint Morgan, New York (1906); Gift of J. Pierpoint Morgan, 1906 07.225.296
219. Allegory of the Arts (Sketch for a Ceiling Painting)

Oil on canvas, 18⅞ x 23¼ in. (47.9 x 59.1 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): J.d.Wit/.1742

This painting is abraded, and pressure from the lining has enhanced the texture of canvas on the surface. There are pinpoint losses along the crowns of the canvas weave. In a few places, grid lines used to transfer the composition can be seen through the thinned paint. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals a partial view of the grid.

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1906 07.225.298

This canvas, dated 1742, is a study for a ceiling decoration representing Pictura (the Art of Painting) and other Arts protected by various deities. No large-scale work of this design is known. As discussed below, it is likely that De Wit considered painting such a ceiling in his own house, at Keizersgracht 385 in Amsterdam, which he purchased in 1741.

The subject of the Museum’s picture was not recognized until the 1970s, and its iconography is more complicated than usual for a ceiling design by De Wit. This in itself suggests that the composition was intended for a place where the artist might acknowledge his own erudition, rather than the learning or particular interests of a private patron.

Apollo presides in the center of the sketch, surrounded by other gods and goddesses, of whom Venus and Cupid to the left and Minerva (Pallas Athena) with her shield and spear are the most obvious. Below Apollo, Father Time (with his usual scythe) and Poesia (who, like Apollo, holds a lyre) glance in different directions, the former at a maiden who dips his wing, the latter toward Architectra, who holds a miniature temple high above the oblivious Ceres’ head. The goddess of summer holds a sickle, and another lies beneath her beehive, which suggests Industry. Between Poesia and Ceres, Pictura appears with her attributes, a mask held by one putto, a brush and palette by another. Near Architectura, Sculptura hammers away at a statue, which stands behind and above the dusky figure of a shepherd wearing a wreath and holding panpipes and a staff. He may allude to Drawing, as does the shepherd who traces with his staff in a trompe-l’oeil relief beneath a statue of Pictura on one of several doors De Wit made for collector’s cabinets. Finally, on the left, Musica and attendants holding a flute and what seems to be an awkwardly drawn violin perch above a muscular male figure with wings who, leaning downward, blows air into the viewer’s space.

Taken all together, it would appear that two different sets of allegorical figures hover beneath Apollo, who therefore should be recognized as ruler of the Seasons as well as ruler of the Arts. As the Sun God, Apollo supervised the progress of the year, whether it was divided into months (as indicated by the zodiacal belt in Gerard de Lairese’s Apollo and Aurora; Pl. 104) or into seasons. The latter are shown as figures of different ages in the ceiling canvas Apollo and the Four Seasons, which De Wit painted in 1750 for the house of burgomaster Harmen Hendrik van der Poll at Herengracht 440. The artist often combined themes and mixed traditional forms of interpretation, as if inviting his patrons (or visitors) to request an explanation.

Presumably, he would have identified the Flora-like figure with flowers and a vessel spilling water as a representation of Spring. The morning star on her head, more familiar as a symbol of dawn or Aurora (see Pl. 104), may suggest that with her season a new year begins. (Thus Spring’s attendant, also holding flowers, clips the wing of Father Time, whose age signifies the year’s end.) A cornucopia, symbolizing fruitfulness or abundance, is held by a putto, and Poesia, like Spring to other seasons, serves as a source for other Arts. Ceres stands for Summer, while the shepherd, recalling Bacchus, must take the place of Fall. The winged male below Musica would be Boreas, the north wind, in the role of Winter. By juxtaposing Apollo with Father Time, De Wit compares temporal pursuits with eternity. The transcendence of art over time is familiar from self-portraits by Dutch artists (especially Gerrit Dou; see the discussion of Pl. 37), which would support the notion that the Allegory of the Arts is about the painter himself.

As mentioned in the biography above, De Wit and his wealthy wife bought two houses on the Keizersgracht in 1741. They lived in No. 385, which had eighteen rooms and a spacious studio facing a garden at the back. One of the main rooms was used to display part of De Wit’s collection of paintings, which featured works by Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) and his Flemish contemporaries. The style of the present oil sketch could be described as sympathetic to that painter, whose illusionistic ceiling pictures were especially prized by De Wit. The artist’s decorative works of the 1740s are generally more Rococo than this one, with pastel colors, less strongly modeled figures, and lots of open sky. It may be that De Wit adjusted his palette, lighting, and type of composition (with its pyramidal figure groups) so that the intended ceiling would harmonize with the seventeenth-century paintings in the same room.
Two drawings by De Wit representing Pictura and Poesia as statues standing in niches (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels) are each inscribed on the verso “Painted in my Garden House” (no doubt as grisaille decorations). Poesia, like the present Allegory, is dated 1742. This evidence supports the idea that the Museum’s picture (in which Pictura and Poesia are key players) was painted as a sketch for a ceiling in the artist’s residence. However, it is almost certain that the artist never found time to execute the final work. No such canvas is listed in the painter’s estate, and the most likely location for it, the studio or salon, no longer survives. The room was certainly suitable, since it measured more than 23 x 26 feet (7 x 8 m), was about 14 feet 8 inches (4.5 m) high, and had five tall windows. Of course, De Wit could have been planning an allegory of the arts for some well-rounded dilettante who happened to be decorating his house at the same time the artist was decorating his own. But that sort of project probably would have been completed and would have stood a good chance of surviving or remaining known.

1. Curator John Walsh introduced the present title in 1974, rejecting the previous (and preposterous) reading of the subject as an allegory of time triumphant over the labors of man. The painting was unknown to Staring (1918).
2. For this painted door panel of 1750, Pictura and Symbols of Painting (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), see Hautekeete in Boonstra and Van den Hout 2000, pp. 18–19, fig. 8. The shepherd as draftsman (known from Vasari and Van Mander) is mentioned in Lunsingh Scheurleer 1973, p. 233.
4. See Amsterdam–Weert 1995–96, pp. 23–24, fig. 9, and pp. 115–16, fig. 73b, on the houses and studio, respectively. De Wit’s house and collection are also discussed in Boonstra and Van den Hout 2000, pp. 88–94.

6. If so, there was a precedent in the designs that De Wit drew in 1726 for a ceiling painting in the house of his occasional collaborator Isaac de Moucherón (1667–1744), who moved into his new home (the present Prinsengracht 794) that same year. See Amsterdam 1990–91, no. 71, and Fock et al. 2001, p. 220, fig. 220.

7. As noted in Boonstra and Van den Hout 2000, p. 91. The proportions of the painted frame in the oil sketch are about six to seven.

References: Pératé and Brière 1908, vol. 3, p. 23, describes the subject as “une assemblée de divinités de l’Olympe au milieu des nuées”; Baertje 1995, p. 342; Liechte 2009, pp. 197–99, fig. 4, discusses the subject and suggests that the sketch was made for a ceiling canvas that the artist intended to install in his own house.


Ex coll.: Probably Jacob de Wit, Amsterdam (1742–d. 1754; his estate sale, Amsterdam, March 15, 1755, as a sketch for an unknown ceiling painting ["Een dior (Blaffonstukje), onbekend"]; Georges Hoentschel, Paris (until 1906; sold to Morgan); J. Pierpont Morgan, New York (by 1906); Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1906 07.223.298

220. Flora and Zephyr
(Sketch for a Ceiling Painting)

Oil on canvas, 207/8 x 24 7/8 in. (53 x 63.2 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): J.d.wit./1743

The thinly applied paint is abraded throughout along the crowns of the canvas weave. A few grid lines used to transfer the composition are visible. Examination by infrared reflectography reveals the numbers 4 and 5 on the right border and many grid lines in the borders; only fragments of the grid are visible in the more thickly painted portions of the central composition.

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1906 07.223.301

De Wit made this oil sketch as a modello for the ceiling canvas that he completed in 1744 for the grand canal house of Gerrit Hooft (1708–1780) at Herengracht 609–11, Amsterdam. The contents of the house were sold at auction in 1928. The original ceiling canvas is now installed in the Huis te Manpad near Heemstede, while the four corner pieces that framed the central composition (fig. 265) are now in Keizersgracht 319, Amsterdam.

Hooft was a wealthy merchant and eight-time burgomaster between 1766 and 1779. He purchased the two houses at Herengracht 609–11 in 1741 and had them completely rebuilt behind a single façade. De Wit’s decoration of the ceiling in the main reception room or salon (just off the entrance hall) consisted of seven canvases in wood moldings (fig. 265); the large Flora and Zephyr was surrounded by monochrome compositions painted in imitation of stucco relief. The four corner pieces show putti working in a garden or displaying flowers. The round images resemble classical medallions and depict a male and a female head in profile. These idealized figures, which appear to have flowers in their hair, may be intended as Flora and her husband Zephyr, the west wind of springtime.

In the Museum’s picture, Flora is one of the least conspicuous figures, the woman in pink and white on a cloud in the bottom center of the composition. She gestures dramatically and looks up at Zephyr, who at first can barely be differentiated from his own cloud. On close inspection, however, his head, shoulders, arms, and a bit of fluttering drapery appear clearly enough, immediately above Flora’s attendant with a bluish green mantle in her hands. In the ceiling painting itself, Zephyr appears in the same position, leaning over the edge of the cloud above Flora, who has gained a second attendant to the right.

In addition to the ceiling ensemble in Hooft’s salon, De Wit painted two tall grisaille overdoors depicting putti holding medallions with mythological subjects, and a broad overdoor representing a pair of frolicking putti and, behind them, a greyhound. These three canvases are now installed as overdoors in Herengracht 438, for which they were purchased by the art dealer Jacques Goudstikker in 1928. Drawings for the
Figure 265. Jacob de Witt, Flora and Zephyr and six smaller ceiling canvases formerly in the salon of the Gerrit Hooft House (Herengracht 609-11), Amsterdam, 1744. Ensemble measures 15 ft. 6 in. x 27 ft. 3 in. (4.75 x 8.3 m); central canvas 12 ft. 3 in. x 18 ft. 6 in. (3.75 x 5.65 m)
pair of overdoors with medallions are in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (figs. 266, 267); each is inscribed by De Wit to the effect that it is a design for an overdoor (akstuk) that was painted in 1744 for Gerrit Hoof’s salon. The mythological subject in one of the medallions is clearly Narcissus admiring himself in a woodland pond. The subject of the other medallion appears to be Apollo with a lyre on a cloud, above a reclining female figure who is probably Pictura (she holds a brush or pen in her hand). Pictura and Narcissus are both concerned with imitation, as Leon Battista Alberti explained in his treatise De Pictura (1435): “...I used to tell my friends that the inventor of painting, according to the poets, was Narcissus, who was turned into a flower” (and thus entered Flora’s realm).

De Wit probably also had a hand in selecting the sculptors, Bernardus and Mathijs (or Thijs) de Wilde, who carved the Rococo mantelpiece and the overmantel, Venus at the Forge of Vulcan, in Hoof’s salon. The tall marble relief, dated 1745, is now in the Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh. Not much is known about the De Wildes, but they were closely associated with the sculptors Ignatius van Logteren (1685–1732) and his son Jan (1709–1743). De Wit collaborated with the latter.

Variations on the theme of Flora were common in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; paintings by Poussin, Rembrandt (see pl. 153), and Tiepolo are among the best known (Tiepolo’s Triumph of Flora and Zephyr, in the Ca’ Rezzonico, Venice, dates from 1734–35). De Wit celebrated the goddess of flowers—with and without Zephyr—in oil sketches for ceiling paintings dating from the early 1720s until the year of his death. The earliest known example is the Study for Zephyr and Flora, of 1723 (Toledo Museum of Art), which was made for the Surmont van Vlooswijk house at Amstel 216, Amsterdam. The design of a ceiling painting representing Flora and Zephyr, made in 1735 for the house of Cornelis Wittert on the Delfse Vaart in Rotterdam, is known from a drawing in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam. The Tribute to
Flora, of 1729, in Herengracht 168, Amsterdam, is mentioned above. In 1735, De Wit painted a ceiling canvas, Flora and Zephyr, for the house next door, Herengracht 170, the new occupants of which were Nicolaas Hasselaer and his wife, Anna Pancras. An oil sketch of the same subject (fig. 268), signed and dated 1738, has yet to be connected with a commission; the composition to some extent anticipates that of the Museum’s sketch. In 1740 and 1743, De Wit painted two canvas ceilings, Flora and Zephyr and Bacchus and Ceres, for the newly renovated house of Cornelis Munter, at Herengracht 468. Oil sketches for ceilings depicting Flora and Zephyr, dated 1735 and 1754, are also known. It is not necessary to compare these paintings closely in formal terms; De Wit employed various compositional schemes almost irrespective of subject matter. Designs similar to that of the Museum’s oil sketch date from as early as about 1738, but its airy distribution of figures is more typical of the 1740s.

In eighteenth-century Amsterdam, a ceiling painting devoted to Flora suggested that the patron liked flowers, no more. However, it is worth noting that a large garden behind Hooft’s house on the Herengracht could be seen through tall windows at the back of the salon, much as real flames appeared occasionally beneath the relief of Venus visiting Vulcan’s forge.

It should be noted that J. Pierpont Morgan’s gift to the Museum of three oil sketches by De Wit, and a trompe-l’œil picture attributed to him (see the entry below), did not reflect a particular appreciation of the painter or of eighteenth-century Dutch art. The canvases were part of a much larger group of decorative paintings, many of them by anonymous French artists of the eighteenth century, which Morgan purchased together with tapestries, furniture, sculpture, wall panels, and so on from the collection of the Parisian architect, interior decorator, ceramicist, and collector Georges Hoentschel (1835–1915).

Previously titled by the Museum Atonement of Flora.

1. For the ceiling, see Staring 1958, p. 152, fig. 75. The author was unaware of the Museum’s oil sketch. Hooft is also known as Gerrit Hooft Gerritsz, to distinguish him from his father, Gerrit Hooft (1684–1767), who held similar civic and commercial offices (see Van der Aa 1825–76, vol. 6, p. 319).

2. Frederik Muller & Co., Amsterdam, June 20, 1928, no. 1, “Grand plafond de salon peint sur toile par Jacob de Wit, composé d’un panneau central, de quatre écoinçons et de deux médaillons,” signed and dated 1744, the whole ensemble measuring 15 feet 6 inches x 27 feet 3 inches (4.72 x 8.38 m), the central painting 12 feet x 18 feet 6 inches (3.65 x 5.64 m). One of the three copies of the sale catalogue in the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, has marginal annotations. No. 1 sold for Fl 17,000 to “v. Buuren tegen Goudstikkert” (van Buuren against Goudstikker, the latter being the underbidder). The ceiling was next installed in Huize Dennenoord, Laren, from which the contents were sold on June 21, 1942 (according to Staring 1958, p. 152). The house is now part of a geriatric hospital (kind communication of Emke Raassen of the Singer Museum, Laren, in March 2004).

3. Information kindly provided in March 2004 by Edwin Buijsen of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, where a survey of interior decoration in the Netherlands is in progress. See Harmann 2003, pp. 13, 18 n. 23, where the ceiling canvas now in the Huis te Manpad, or Manpad Manor, is mistakenly said to have been sold at F. Muller, Amsterdam, June 10, 1968, no. 1 (the author meant to refer to the Muller sale of 1928; see note 2 above). On the Huis te Manpad (1723), see Joustra 2003 (p. 141, fig. 97, for De Wit’s ceiling painting as it appears in a recent photograph taken from an oblique angle). Mandle 1975, p. 12, reported that the ceiling painting was destroyed in World War II, but the author acknowledges that this information was based on a misunderstanding of the provenance given in Staring 1958, p. 152 (personal communication, March 2004).


5. Curator John Walsh must have missed the figure of Zephyr in April 1974, when he changed the title of the present picture from The Triumph of Time over the Labors of Man to Atonement of Flora.

6. On the house, which was Goudstikker’s from 1927 until 1940, see Van Eeghen et al. 1976, p. 318 (under no. 448). The broad overdoor and one of the tall canvases are illustrated in Tullenen 1989, pp. 66–67. This publication was kindly brought to my attention by Richard Harmann, who also provided a photograph of the third overdoor (with Narcissus). In the Muller sale of 1928 (see note 2 above), no. 2 is the pair of overdoors representing “amours tenant entre aux médaillons circulaires à sujets mythologiques,” each measuring 52 x 43 inches (132 x 109 cm), and signed and dated 1744. They were sold to Goudstikker for Fl 2,000. No. 3 is the third overdoor, 35¾ x 72⅞ inches (96 x 184 cm), “Deux amours s’ébattant, derrière eux, un lévrier,” signed and dated 1744, sold to Goudstikker for Fl 1,500. None of the overdoors is illustrated in the sale catalogue. Staring (1958, p. 152) erroneously refers to two overdoors in the salon, only one of which he finds in the Muller sale catalogue.


8. Alberti 1972, p. 61 (II. 26). Alberti goes on to call painting “the flower of all the arts” and to describe it as “the act of embracing by means of art the surface of a pool.” On Alberti’s discussion of Narcissus as the inventor of painting, see Cranston 2000, pp. 107–8, 127–30. De Wit would probably have known the text through a French translation (see P. Michel 1930, pp. 21–32). The usual source for the story of Narcissus was Ovid’s Metamorphoses 4.402ff.

9. See note 11 below. Owlsley 1970, p. 75, mentions that in 1703 Bernardus de Wilde was baptized in the Church of Moses and Aaron. This Catholic institution was De Wit’s first major client.
in Amsterdam (see the biography above). On the Van Logterens, see Fischer 1972b, pp. 397–99 (figs. 6, 7, for the stucco ceiling of Herengracht 168); ibid., p. 400, on the De Wilde (fig. 8 for the marble relief in Pittsburgh).

10. On Flora in Renaissance and later painting, see Held 1961; examples are listed in Pijler 1974, vol. 2, pp. 272–73. De Wit’s interest in the theme is set in a broader context in Leiden 1985, pp. 250–61 (under no. 99). For example, it is mentioned that Gerard de Lairesse (q.v.) thought the subject of Flora and Zephyr suitable for a summer house.

11. Mandle 1975, pp. 7–9, fig. 5. The ceiling painting is said to be lost.

12. Ibid., pp. 10–11, fig. 8, where the reference to Witteveen’s “house between Delft and Rotterdam” is a misreading of the information in Staring 1918, p. 146 (“pand aan de Delftse Vaart te [at] Rotterdam”). Mandle 1975, pp. 11–12, fig. 10) published an oil sketch of the same subject (art market, Paris, 1923) that evidently was intended for a different ceiling of about 1725. The same author (p. 12, fig. 11) understandably mistook the large canvas ceiling of 1725 in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen as depicting Flora and Zephyr rather than a larger group of deities with many flowers. See Staring 1918, p. 145, figs. 61, 64, and Boonstra and Van den Hout 2000, pp. 70–71, fig. 14, where it is incorrectly stated that the large canvas (147 x 249 in. [373 x 632 cm]) from a house at Nieuwe Haven 17 in Rotterdam lacks the four grisaille corner pieces. On the commission and subject matter (Allegory with Hercules at the Crossroads), see Rotterdam–Breanischweig 1983–84, no. 28.

13. Boonstra and Van den Hout 2000, pp. 62–65, fig. 1; listed in Staring 1918, p. 147 (under 1728), with reference to a drawing bearing that date. See also ibid., pp. 147, 149 (under 1730 and 1734).


15. The painting, which is apparently published here for the first time, was with Nootman Master Paintings, Maastricht, in 2003–4.


17. Mandle 1975, p. 13, fig. 13 (1754; art market, 1974).

18. For example, the oil sketch Aurora Chasing the Night, dated 1735, in the Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels (Staring 1918, p. 149, fig. 43).

19. On Hoentschel, see Hoentschel et al. 1999.

REFERENCES: Pétrat and Brière 1908, vol. 5, p. 23, mentioned as a ceiling sketch “des nymphes et des amours répandant des fleurs”; Mandle 1975, p. 12, fig. 12, as an oil sketch for the ceiling painting in Gerrit Hoef’s house at Herengracht 609, Amsterdam; Baetjer 1995, p. 342; Liedtke 2003a, pp. 195–97, fig. 3, describes the subject, the commission, and related works.

EX COLL.: Probably Jacob de Wit, Amsterdam (1743–d. 1754; his estate sale, Amsterdam, March 10, 1756, as a sketch for an unknown ceiling painting ["Een dito (Blafoumenskie, onbekend]"); Georges Hoentschel, Paris (until 1906; sold to Morgan); J. Pierpont Morgan, New York (1906); Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1906 07.225.217

STYLE OF JACOB DE WIT

221. Children Playing with a Goat

Oil on canvas, 26½ x 41 in. (67.9 x 104.1 cm)
Inscribed (lower left): de Wit

The painting is in good condition, although the surface is slightly worn. Some paint loss occurs in association with small tears above the goat’s neck, in the torso of the climbing child at left, and in three places along the lower edge of the composition. The painted gold border is not original.

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1906 07.225.217

This wijze, as De Wit’s “white,” or grisaille, paintings were known, is in his style but falls well below his level of quality.1 His own imitations of stucco and stone reliefs are very well modeled, with crisp, elegant outlines and a handling of light and shadow that skillfully achieves the illusion of actual sculpture. The soft, swelling forms and the anatomy of rambunctious infants were areas in which De Wit excelled. By comparison, the many shortcomings in this ensemble of crudely formed figures could be employed to emphasize the virtues not only
Figure 269. François Duquesnoy, *Children Playing with a Goat*, 1626. Marble bas-relief, 24 1/2 x 34 1/2 (62.5 x 87.5 cm). Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome.
of De Wit’s work in this vein but also that of his better imitators. The latter include Quirijn van Briemen (1693–1774), Marten Jozef Geeraerts (1707–1791), Jan Stolker (1724–1785), and Dirk van der Aa (1731–1803). 2

The composition is based on a marble bas-relief of 1626 by François Duquesnoy (1597–1643; fig. 269) in the Galleria Doria Pamphilij, Rome. 3 As discussed above in connection with Gerrit Dou’s Self-Portrait (Pl. 37), where a version of the relief appears below the window ledge, many casts, sculpted copies, and pictorial records of the original circulated in European studios. 4 Later Leiden painters, such as Willem van Mieris (1662–1747), repeated the motif well into the eighteenth century. 5 In Dutch pictures, a mask symbolizes either deception or Painting (Pictura), who triumphs over Sculpture in creating the illusion of reality. 6 The motif suits this trompe-l’oeil painting of a relief, which was probably intended as an overdoor or similar decoration, obviously with a window to the left.

De Wit painted numerous overdoors and friezes featuring putti. 7 An autograph version of the present composition is not known, although one may have been made. 8 It should be stressed, however, that the heading Style of Jacob de Wit is used here in a broad sense. The painting does appear to be Dutch, and to date from the eighteenth century. French and other artists also imitated Duquesnoy’s relief during the same period. 9 In the original, and in nearly every imitation, the putto in the right foreground is seen from the back, not in profile.

2. See Van der Aa’s grisaille overdoors depicting the Four Continents (Paisis Het Loo, Apeldoorn), in Rosa de Carvalho-Roos 2003, pp. 146–47, figs. 29–31b. See Geeraerts, see Van Dessel 1981, and Lamoree et al. 1984, pp. 200–205, figs. 15, 16, 18. Stolker is discussed in Benisovich 1946, where De Wit is described as “son peintre favori” (p. 194). A grisaille chimneypiece depicting putti and two rampaging goats, signed by Van Briemen and dated 1763, was sold at Christie’s, Amsterdam, March 6, 1998, no. 132. Abraham van Strij (1731–1826) and Jacob van Strij (q.v.) also painted overdoors and chimneypieces with caviotting putti; see Dordrecht–Enschede 2000, pp. 76–84, figs. 100–109, 123.
3. See Šafářik and Torselli 1982, p. 33, pl. 37; Boudan-Machuel 2003, no. 0664b, fig. 54.
5. For example, Van Mieris’s Poultry Shop, of 1714 (Instituut Collectie Nederland, Amsterdam; see Leiden 1988, no. 41).
6. Compare the two putti holding a mask in Gerard de Lairesse’s Allegory of the Arts, of about 1680 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; see Broos 1981, pp. 162–65, fig. 31 [under no. 45]).
7. See, for example, Staring 1958, figs. 61, 123, and Amsterdam 1986, p. 52, figs. 40, 41. A pair of overdoors with putti (Winter and Summer), which De Wit painted for a garden pavilion in 1733, was sold at Sotheby’s, London, July 4, 1990, no. 27. As a decorative form in Holland, the frieze of putti goes back at least a century, for example to Pieter Post’s designs for chimneypieces in the Stadhoudier’s Quarters at The Hague (see Terwen and Orenhemt 1993, p. 37, fig. 32).
8. No example is found in publications or in the photographic files of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague. However, De Wit did paint, in 1748, two conventional paintings of children cavorting with goats (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg; see Staring 1958, p. 133, fig. 101). See also the painting after Duquesnoy’s relief sold at Christie’s, London, December 12, 2003, no. 112, as Circle of Jacob de Wit.
9. Examples by Desportes, Watteau, and Chardin are well known. See also the painting by Boilly, illustrated with the ivory copy after Duquesnoy in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, in Amsterdam 1989–90, p. 49 (under no. 6). A painted version dated 1748 by Simon Michel Légeois was sold at Sotheby’s, Monaco, December 2, 1994, no. 22.

REFERENCES: Pétrat and Brière 1908, vol. 3, p. 23, pl. xcvii, as by De Wit, offers a brief, general discussion of works of this type; Baeijer 1995, p. 342.

Ex COLL.: Georges Hoentschel, Paris (until 1906; sold to Morgan); J. Pierpoint Morgan, New York (by 1906); Gift of J. Pierpoint Morgan, 1906 07.225.257
Accordt to Arnold Houbraken, De Witte learned geometry from his father, Pieter de Wit, a schoolmaster, and studied painting with the Delft still-life specialist Evert van Aelst (1602–1657). In 1636, De Witte joined the painters’ guild in his native Alkmaar. He was next recorded in Rotterdam, in 1639 (when he gave his age as twenty-three), and in 1640. He had a daughter, who was baptized in Delft in October 1641; he married her mother, Geertgen Arents, about one year later. The artist joined the Delft guild on June 23, 1642. The family lived in modest quarters on the Choorsstraat in exchange for training the landlord’s nephew, Pieter van der Vin (d. 1655), as a painter. A few documents trace De Witte’s life in Delft between February 1646, when a second daughter was baptized, and March 1650, when he rented an inexpensive house on the Nieuwe Langendijk for one year.

A debt to De Witte was recorded by an Amsterdam notary in January 1652, though it is not certain that he had moved to that city from Delft. No other pertinent documents are known from 1652 to 1655; his paintings of Amsterdam subjects date from 1653 onward. De Witte appraised paintings in Haarlem in April 1655, together with the artists Cesar van Everdingen (ca. 1617–1678) and his brother Allart (1621–1675), Jan Miense Molenaer (1610/11–1668), and Pieter Soutman (1593/1601–1637). In September of the same year, “Emanuel de Wit from Alkmaar, painter, widower of Geertje Adriaens [sic] van de Velde, living on the Bloemmarkt” in Amsterdam, was married to Lysbeth Lodewyck van der Plass, who three years later was convicted of robbery and banned from the city for six years.

During his forty years in Amsterdam, De Witte led a difficult life, to judge from various documents and Houbraken’s report. His death, based on Houbraken’s story of his supposed suicide, is often placed in the winter of 1691–92. However, a painting in a private collection is evidently signed and dated 1692.

The artist began his career as an unpromising figure painter, as may be seen in the Vertumnus and Pomona, of 1644, and a pair of small portraits dated 1648 (all in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam). His Jupiter and Mercury in the Hut of Philemon and Baucis, of 1647, and the Rembrandtesque Holy Family, of 1650 (both in the Stedelijk Museum Het Prinsenhof, Delft), preage his treatment of architectural interiors predominantly in terms of light and shadow, and—in their casual drawing, comparatively broad brushwork, and uncertain articulation of space—are stylistically consistent with his earliest views of church interiors, such as The Nieuwe Kerk in Delft with the Tomb of William the Silent, of about 1651 (Stiftung Jacob Briner, Winterthur). That panel is based directly on church interiors of 1650–51 by Gerard Houckgeest (ca. 1600–1661); indeed, De Witte’s earliest efforts in the genre are generally indebted to Houckgeest’s compositional ideas.

From the first, however, De Witte’s imagination seems to have responded more to the great spaces than to the structure of Dutch Gothic churches, to the interplay of luminous walls and shadowy corners, and to the people who visited and worshipped in these communal and spiritual environments (the idea of having another painter fill in the figures, a common practice at the time, is unthinkable in De Witte’s work). In a field that had always been the specialty of perspectivists, he gave unprecedented importance to effects of sunlight and atmosphere; geometric forms (when not reinforced by later restorers) are outlined softly, and even when diagonally receding appear to be arranged in layers parallel to the picture plane. It has often been said that De Witte approached architecture like a landscape painter, and indeed there is no essential difference in style between his mature pictures of church interiors and his occasional subjects set out-of-doors, such as the Small Fish Market, Amsterdam, of 1678 (Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford), or the Harbor at Sunset, of about the same date (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

De Witte’s earliest church interior with a clearly legible date, The Oude Kerk in Delft during a Sermon, of 1651 (Wallace Collection, London), is obviously not his first essay in the genre. Such pictures, often called “Sermons” in seventeenth-century inventories, place more emphasis upon humanity and mood than can be found in works of a comparable type by any other artist. As might be expected of a painter with such an intuitive grasp of the subject, De Witte passed without hesitation from “portraits” of actual churches to paintings of imaginary buildings, many of which freely incorporate elements of
Amsterdam's main churches and the new Town Hall (now the Royal Palace). In contrast to Houckgeest and Hendrick van Vliet (q.v.), De Witte frequently omitted intrusive columns or entire elevations, and rendered such details as capital carvings with a brief twist of the brush.

The quality of De Witte's work varies considerably, partly as a result of his unstable temperament, which often provoked the domestic and financial difficulties to which Houbraken refers. Nevertheless, even minor works by the artist are distinguishable from closely related Delft views by Van Vliet or views of Amsterdam churches by De Witte's only pupil, Hendrick van Streeck (1659–after 1719).7

1. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 1, p. 283, and pp. 223, 282–87 on De Witte's career, one of the most colorful accounts penned by the biographer.

2. Haverkorn van Rijswijk 1890, pp. 213–14. The approximate date of De Witte's birth is deduced from the document of 1639 and others giving his age.

3. These documents and their sources are listed in Manke 1965, pp. 63–64. See also Giltaij in Rotterdam 1991, p. 181.

4. Manke 1965, pp. 65–66. See also Liedtke 2000a, pp. 121–22, for details, and the suggestion that De Witte probably moved from Delft to Amsterdam (possibly with an interim period in Alkmaar) between 1651 and 1653.

5. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 1, pp. 286–87, writes that De Witte was buried “in the year 1692” after spending eleven weeks in a frozen canal with a rope around his neck. On this account, see Liedtke 1982a, p. 76, and Horn 2000, p. 331, where the long passage is given in English and the “chilling detail” of the twenty-six-year-old story is taken at face value. The painting dated 1692 is catalogued in P. Sutton 2002, no. 60.


222. Interior of the Oude Kerk, Delft

Oil on wood, 19 x 13½ in. (48.3 x 34.5 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): E-De-Witte A 165[?]

The painting is well preserved.


This well-preserved painting on panel is one of the three or four finest architectural pictures that De Witte made during his years in Delft. He had been in the city since about 1641, but turned from figure paintings to the subject of church interiors only in 1650, when he was about thirty-four years old. This was a direct response to the carefully observed views of Delft's Nieuwe Kerk and Oude Kerk that the experienced perspective Gerard Houckgeest (ca. 1600–1661) began painting in 1650. De Witte moved to Amsterdam at some unknown date between the spring of 1651 and 1653, when he painted his first views of Amsterdam churches and the courtyard of the Amsterdam Beurs (Exchange). He also continued to paint views of Delft church interiors during his four decades of activity in Amsterdam.1

The last digit of the date in the lower right corner of this picture is indecipherable, although the fragment that survives appears to have a rounded rather than a straight or angular shape. The most plausible reading of the date would be 1650 or 1652, given that the picture is clearly a De Witte of the early 1650s. When the painting was exhibited in London in 1879, and when it was auctioned in London in 1931, the date was given as 1650 without any qualification. Hans Jantzen, who closely considered the relationship of Houckgeest, De Witte, and Hendrick van Vliet (q.v.) in his 1910 survey of Netherlandish architectural painting (see Refs.), found no reason to doubt the date of 1650. Manke's claim (1963; see Refs.) that the date may be read as 1654 was evidently not based on technical examination, and was one of several willful conclusions about chronology and authorship that she employed in support of her opinion that De Witte, not Houckgeest, introduced the
Figure 270. Emanuel de Witte, *The Oude Kerk in Delft during a Sermon*, 1651. Oil on wood, 23 1/4 x 16 3/4 in. (59 x 43 cm). The Wallace Collection, London.

Figure 271. Gerard Houckgeest, *The Oude Kerk in Delft with the Tomb of Piet Hein*, ca. 1650. Oil on canvas, 26 1/2 x 22 in. (68 x 56 cm). Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 272. Photograph of the interior of the Oude Kerk, Delft.
practice of depicting interior views of churches in the city of Delft (Pieter Saenredam [1597–1665] and Houckgeest's teacher Bartholomeus van Bassen [ca. 1590–1612] had done the same in other Dutch cities as early as the 1620s). De Vries, in 1975 (see Refs.), supported Manke's reading of the date not because he had seen it, but because he was inclined to agree with one aspect of Manke's argument, that De Witte must have experimented with views of actual architecture before Houckgeest in 1630 revolutionized the genre in Delft. If the Museum's painting by De Witte dated from 1650, it would appear to contradict not support this hypothesis, because (as discussed below) its composition was inspired by Houckgeest's example. In a generous concession to the present writer's study of 1982 (see Refs.), De Vries allowed that the idea "that the greatest artists [such as De Witte] were also the most innovative is a persistent misconception." It is now generally recognized that De Witte's impressionistic approach to evoking not only the forms but also the great spaces of Gothic church interiors, while completely new to the genre in 1650, was precisely what made him an unlikely pioneer in the geometric discipline of architectural painting, and his paintings an improbable model for the linear constructions of Houckgeest and Van Vliet. To the contrary, in early works like this one De Witte skillfully adopted and modified Houckgeest's pictorial patterns to his own more painterly and more optical mode of naturalistic representation.

The view was recorded from the south aisle in the Oude Kerk, looking to the northeast. To the left is the pavement of the nave, which, near the man conversing with a woman and child, turns in to the large space of the north transept arm. (There is, exceptionally, no south transept arm in the Oude Kerk; as seen on the right in the painting, the south aisle continues eastward into what would normally be that open space.) The archway in the upper left corner of the composition is part of the east wall (or, more properly, elevation) of the north transept, and it frames the broad Mariakoor (Mary's Choir), which is covered by wood vaulting and aligned parallel to the slightly deeper but much taller main choir of the church. The doorway on the left in the choir screen leads into the Mariakoor, and the grander doorway on the right, surmounted by a pediment and an obelisk, is the central entrance
to the main choir. The two choirs are separated by an arcade, two columns and one archway of which are visible here in the right background, beyond the columns in the foreground. In the left background, the bright space framed by two archways is the Joriskapel (Saint George's Chapel), where in 1648 the large tomb of Admiral Maerten Tromp was installed against the bare white wall.4

Despite the general impression of fidelity to the site, De Witte has eliminated some major elements from the corresponding view in the Oude Kerk itself, has modified others, and has altered the overall effect of space. His painting of 1651 in the Wallace Collection, London (fig. 270), is more faithful to the actual proportions of the church (fig. 272), and shows the pulpit (a famous piece of church furniture dating from 1548) that De Witte in the Museum's picture simply omitted from the nearest column, along with the large balustrade surrounding it. In De Witte's lifetime, the archways in the transept were lined with red brick, which are included at the upper left in the Wallace painting but not in the present picture. The artist thus harmonized the shapes of all the visible arches and anticipated the restoration of the transept in the early 1930s (fig. 272). Comparison with the painting of 1651 and with photographs also reveals how De Witte deliberately diminished the impression of receding space in the Museum's picture, and elongated the columns and other architectural elements. His own subjective sense of space, which he made into an essential aspect of his personal style, was to render architectural elevations as if they were diaphanous veils parallel to the picture plane, and to suggest space largely in terms of light and shade rather than by overlapping forms. The convincing impression of daylight and atmosphere is enhanced by De Witte's textured touch, blurred contours, and soft definition of forms throughout, but especially in the distance. A sort of metaphor for his treatment of the entire scene is found in the translucent glass of the windows, where the darker areas below, the coral color stroked diagonally, and the silvery haze above suggest buildings outside, with red-tiled roofs slanting below bright but cloudy skies.

As described in detail elsewhere, De Witte adopted this type of tall, obliquely receding arrangement of architecture from Houckgeest's original compositions of 1650 and 1651. So far as is known, the older painter never depicted this particular view in the Oude Kerk. But in about 1650, he did record a very accurate view from the Joriskapel, through the Mariakoor to the main choir, in a canvas in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (fig. 271). (In other words, Houckgeest glanced obliquely from the space in the left background of De Witte's picture to the space in the right background and beyond the right edge of the same composition.) De Witte's design bears a curious resemblance to Houckgeest's in reverse; indeed, this kind of relationship is typical of his response to the more experienced artist. The two boys drawing a figure on the whitewashed column and the open grave in the immediate foreground, the careful placement of other figures in depth, and perhaps even the streaks of sunlight on the floor may have been suggested to De Witte by motifs in Houckgeest's painting. The resemblance between the choir screen doorway framed between the receding columns on the right in De Witte's composition and the Tomb of Piet Hein in the left background of Houckgeest's canvas is essentially a coincidence discovered at the actual site, and an instance of serendipity encouraged by studying how Houckgeest framed and focused interesting views in the complex architectural interior.

When De Witte dropped the pulpit from the column in the foreground he replaced it with a hatchment, or "grave board," which bears the family crest (unidentified) of someone recently or about to be buried beneath the stone floor, and a marble cartouche embellished by a winged putto and scrolls and crowned by a skull. This is the epitaph of Johan van Lodensteyn and his wife, Maria van Bleyswijck, which dates from 1645 and actually hung in the choir, on a column between that space and the Mariakoor. Its proper location is shown by Houckgeest, on the column in the right background of his Oude Kerk view (fig. 271). De Witte moved the sculpture at will in his early views of the church, and altered its design. The epitaph still survives and has on either side two putti, embracing a shield with an inscription, another putto at the top, and a skull at the bottom.5

The epitaph, the various grave boards, and especially the freshly dug grave remind one that everyday life is fleeting, while the church itself, meaning the faith for which it stands, promises life after death. The two dogs draw attention to the grown men, one obviously aged; between them and the innocent youths, a lifetime may be measured (fig. 275). The irreverent dog spotlighted by a column is meant to be amusing (sextons routinely chased them out of churches throughout the Netherlands), but it may also suggest that mundane matter, even the physical fabric of the church, is to be scorned in comparison with the spiritual world that the building represents.6 In any case, the image as a whole, which was originally displayed in a private home, implies belief in the local church as a way to salvation. This type of picture is, in a sense, a Protestant form of religious art, which for some contemporary viewers would have brought back memories, or at least stories,
of the days in which the formerly Catholic churches of Holland were whitewashed throughout and stripped of “Popish” decoration. The only embellishments permitted in De Witte’s day were family crests, monuments to national heroes, brass chandeliers, and flags representing the nation, the city, and civic organizations. The kind of artwork that was added by schoolboys, which both Saenredam and Houckgeest also included in views of church interiors, was undoubtedly discouraged by Calvinist ministers, but regarded affectionately by painters who were themselves once budding draftsmen.

Since its acquisition by the Museum in 2001, the panel has been subjected to technical examination. Infrared reflectograms reveal a few perspective lines and, more surprisingly, a network of vertical and horizontal lines. Such a grid system was usually employed to transfer a design from another surface, such as a preparatory drawing. De Witte could be described as the last Dutch or Flemish architectural painter one would expect to have used such a method: no preparatory material by him is known, and he appears to have developed (and frequently revised) his designs directly on the support. X-radiographs of the present picture (fig. 274) provide a likely explanation. These show the bust-length image of a woman that fills virtually the entire composition. She appears looking downward in near profile, facing to the left, with her head covered and her right hand raised to shoulder height. De Witte probably painted this figure out when he decided to reuse the panel, but the recycling may have encouraged him to add a step to his customary process. The X-radiograph also shows a man standing to the left, slightly deeper in space than the nearest column. He appears to look at the boys, and would (as in other early works by De Witte) have had the effect of holding the viewer’s eye in the foreground.7 Evidently, De Witte decided to strengthen the sense of recession to the right, removing the man and probably only then adding the small figures in the
right background (which the former figure slightly overlaps). The artist also shortened the flagstaff, so that the pennant floats more comfortably within the pattern of archways in the background. There is no evidence that the panel itself has been more than very slightly trimmed.


3. L. de Vries 1984b, p. 137.

4. See Van Vliet’s Interior of the Oude Kerk, Delft, with the Tomb of Admiral Maerten Harpertsz Tromp, dated 1658 (Toledo Museum of Art; New York–London 2001, no. 82), where the view is to the southeast from the Joriskapel through the Mariakoor to the main choir. The comparison clarifies the architectural spaces in the background of De Witte’s painting.

5. See the photograph of the monument in Worcester 1979, p. 118.

6. On this point, see Braunschweig 1978, no. 40.

7. Compare the similar figure in the foreground of De Witte’s Oude Kerk view formerly in the Van Duyn collection, Rotterdam, and datable about 1651–52 (Liedtke 1982a, fig. 77). The composition includes a comparatively faithful rendering of the Van Lodensteijn epitaph, but on yet another column.

REFERENCES: London 1879, p. 20, no. 89, as “Interior of a Church,” lent by Samuel Sanders, and as signed and dated “E. DE WITTE, 1650”; Jantzen 1910, p. 175, no. 614, listed as “Kircheninnehmer,” signed and dated 1650, lent to the 1879 London exhibition; Von Moltke 1939, p. 318, pl. 75; E. Trautscholdt in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 36 (1947), p. 124, notes the 1931 sale of the painting; Manke 1963, pp. 16, 31, 40, 82, no. 18, fig. 21, reads the date as 1654; L. de Vries 1975, p. 14 n. 29, agrees with Manke’s reading of the date as 1654; The Hague 1982, p. 236, no. 97, as dated “165(?);” Liedtke 1982a, pp. 82–83, 115, no. 244, fig. 75, considers a date of 1650 plausible, notes the derivation from a composition by Gerard Houckgeest of about 1650, describes the arch in the background and the capitals differ from those in the actual church, and how the pulpit was replaced by the Van Lodensteijn monument on the nearest column, mentions the various reminders of mortality, and observes a general similarity to compositions by Hendrick van Vliet; Lokin in Delft 1996, pp. 60–61, 86 n. 26, 224, fig. 45, accepts Liedtke’s dating to 1650; Liedtke 2000a, p. 126, fig. 159, pl. X, as dated “1650 (?),” describes the work as one of the finest pictures of De Witte’s Delft period, and as a remarkable transformation of the view that is more faithfully rendered in the artist’s painting of 1651 in the Wallace Collection, London; Liedtke in New York–London 2001, pp. 32, 83, 103, 137, 235, 258, 272, 342, 370, 452–54, 968 n. 59, no. 91 (ill.), dates the painting to about 1650–52, compares works by Houckgeest, Carrel Fabricius, Pieter de Hooch, and Adam Pynacker, and makes many of the observations that are offered above; Netta 2001, p. 19 (ill.), with no comment; W. Liedtke in “Recent Acquisitions,” MMA Bulletin 60, no. 2 (Fall 2002), p. 21 (ill.), dates the picture to 1650–52.


EX COLL.: Samuel Sanders, London (by 1879); his daughter Mrs. Thornton-Lawes, London (until 1921; sale, Christie’s, London, June 12, 1931, no. 46, for £399 to Partridge); Dr. C. J. K. van Aalst, Hoewelaken, the Netherlands (by 1939); his grandson (until 1983; sold to Cramer); Cramer Oude Kunst, The Hague, from 1982; [Galerie Hoostede; The Hague, until 1983; sold to Hornstein]; Mr. and Mrs. Michal Hornstein, Montreal (1983–2001; sold through Otto Naumann to MMA); [Purchase, Lila Acheson Wallace, Virginia and Walter C. Klein, The Walter C. Klein Foundation, Edwin Weis Jr., and Frank E. Richardson Gifts, and Bequest of Theodore Rousseau and Gift of Lincoln Kirstein, by exchange, 2001 2001.403
the Haarlem artist Philips Wouwermans was highly regarded in his own time and especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries for his Netherlandish and Italianate landscapes, which often feature skillfully painted horses and a fair number of figures. The eldest son of a minor history painter from Alkmaar, Pauwels Joostens Wouwermans (ca. 1580–1642), he was baptized in Haarlem on May 24, 1639. Two of his brothers, Pieter (1623–1682) and Jan (1639–1666), were also painters. Wouwermans was extraordinarily prolific, possibly producing well over six hundred pictures in thirty years (his earliest known dated work is from 1639). His oeuvre has been newly defined by Birgit Schumacher (2006), who accepts 571 works as autograph.

Wouwermans was probably trained by his father, for whom no visual evidence survives. De Bie (1661) remarks in passing that the landscapist “learned with Frans Hals who is also still living and resident in Haarlem.” Wouwermans is also said to have worked briefly during 1638 or 1639 in the studio of Evert Decker (d. 1647) in Hamburg, where he married a Dutchwoman, Annetje Pietersz van Broeckholf. The couple had seven children, each of whom inherited respectable sums of money after their mother died in 1670.

Wouwermans joined the painters’ guild in Haarlem on September 4, 1640, and bought houses there in 1645 and 1647. He appears to have remained close to home for the rest of his life. As in the case of Nicolaes Berchem (q.v.), his early work was strongly influenced by Pieter van Laer (1599–1642), a Haarlem landscape and genre painter who, after a dozen years in Italy, returned to his native city about 1636. Van Laer’s scenes of Italian peasants and Roman street life frequently include horses and other domesticated animals. Borrowings of motifs from Van Laer are found in Wouwermans’s Attack on a Coach, dated 1644 (Collections of the Princes of Liechtenstein, Vaduz). The older artist would remain a source of inspiration over the next few years.

Notwithstanding the importance of equine imagery in Wouwermans’s oeuvre (a white horse is considered his signature motif), the most remarkable aspect of his development is his originality as a landscapist beginning in the late 1640s. The artist must have closely studied the actual environment as well as the achievements of other painters. Among those who impressed Wouwermans after Van Laer were younger Italianate landscapists such as Jan Asselijn (ca. or after 1610–1652), who worked in Amsterdam from 1647 onward. There is no evidence that Wouwermans himself ever went to Italy, but like Aelbert Cuyp (q.v.) in the same period, he so effectively absorbed the achievement of artists who had recently roamed the Campagna that historians have often imagined him at their side. However, the artist’s comparatively cool color harmonies, sense of spaciousness, and atmospheric effects seem very much those of a painter from the region of Haarlem and Amsterdam.

It has been suggested that “to think of Wouwerman [the s is often dropped from his name] primarily as a painter of genre scenes, mostly with horses and horsemen (cavalry battles, camps, hunting parties, stables, smithies, riding schools and so on) is justified in terms of quantity rather than quality.” From the late 1650s onward, Wouwermans offered an alfresco version of fashionable modern life, showing well-dressed hunting parties, “horseback courtship à la mode,” and other upper-class pursuits. His mastery of figure painting is nearly as noteworthy as his drawing and modeling of horses, so that it not surprising that he occasionally contributed staffage to landscapes by other artists. Wouwermans’s pupils included his brothers, Barend Gael (ca. 1650–1698) and other minor painters, and probably Emanuel Murant (q.v.). Along with Berchem, he also made a great impression on Adriaen van de Velde (1636–1672).

Wouwermans died on May 19, 1668, and was buried in the Nieuwe Kerk in Haarlem.

3. As noted in Duparc’s publications (see preceding note). The Liechtenstein panel is also discussed by the present writer in New York 1988b, pp. 257–58, no. 162. The connection with Van Laer is treated as a recent discovery in Stechow 1966, pp. 193.
223. **A Man and a Woman on Horseback**

Oil on wood, 12 1/4 x 16 3/4 in. (30.8 x 41.3 cm)
Signed (lower left): PHILS W [PHILS in monogram]

The painting is well preserved.

Purchase, Pfeiffer Fund, Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, and Gift of Dr. Ernest G. Stillman, by exchange, 1971 1971.48

It is generally agreed that this well-preserved picture by Wouwermans is a comparatively early work, dating from about 1633-54. The setting is a towpath along a Dutch canal. A gentleman on a handsome white horse and an elegant— if somewhat overdressed—woman sitting sidesaddle on a sorrel mount are out riding for pleasure. They have come upon a bay horse harnessed to pull the canal barge on the left. A man in green, with a fur cap, glances soberly at the running boy who appears to beg for a coin. The smiling young man behind the draft horse is probably attempting to align the animal for hooking up and trudging onward. The bay leans forward, resisting, which is unsurprising given the raw wound that the harness has rubbed into his side. A man in red hauls a heavy sack to the barge, which is already loaded with freight and at least three male passengers (a boy and an old man by the mast, and an apparently young man sitting in the bottom of the boat). In front of the barge, a naked youth stands hip high in the water, and another, slightly covered, sits on the bank. Across the canal, two boats, perhaps a wachtsboot (with the blue flag) and a small kaag, are tied up in front of an inn or farmhouse. Each boat is attended by a bargeman.

All these details and many more (the delicately described trees, for example) are carefully rendered by the artist, who gave close attention to the expressions of the figures, not least that of the gentleman rider, who looks with apparent concern to the side, though what, specifically, draws his attention is difficult to say. Clearly, however, Wouwermans intended to contrast the haves and have-nots.

All three horses are described with extraordinary fidelity, considering their small scale (fig. 276). The white horse, with his head held high and nostrils slightly flared, seems to have noticed the viewer. The white hair on the horse’s head convincingly follows the shape of the skull, and has texture that becomes more even convincing under magnification. Each horse wears a different bridle, suitable to the degree of its spirit or resignation.

Wouwermans painted many fashionable couples passing by inns, pausing at watering places, and so forth. In many, mostly later pictures, the subject has an air of romance and literary derivation. Here, more meaning is found in simple observations, of the kind made when out riding—or sailing down a canal.

1. As suggested in Walsh 1974a, p. 349 n. 19, where the painting is considered similar in style to Peasants on the Shore, dated 1613 (Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Sweat, Wayzata, Minnesota; New York–Toledo–Toronto 1954–55, no. 92 [ill.]). E. J. Duparc, the author of a monographic article on Wouwermans (Duparc 1991), suggested that the work was “early, about 1654” (oral opinion, January 14, 1982).
2. For these boats, see the descriptions under Willem van de Velde the Younger’s Entrance to a Dutch Port (Pl. 201).
3. This is discussed, not altogether lucidly, in Franits 1992.

recording the Mergenbaum sale of 1846, and pp. 352–53, no. 337, recording J. Smith's no. 479, considers the painting possibly identical with the author's no. 334, and (mistakenly) as almost certainly identical with his no. 330, offers an accurate description, notes the 1889 exhibition, and adds to J. Smith's provenance the London sale of 1907 and L. Koppel, Berlin; Walsh 1974f, pp. 345, 348, 349 n. 19, pl. 14, considers the work to have been “probably painted around 1651,” and to be “perfectly preserved”; MMA 1975, p. 89 (ill.); Baetjer 1995, p. 334; Schumacher 2006, pp. 318–19, no. A474, pl. 344, as from the beginning of the 1650s, considers Hofstede de Groot's nos. 334 and 337 to refer to this picture, gives provenance details based mainly on Hofstede de Groot (but introducing inaccuracies), and erroneously places the painting in the Stillman collection (misunderstanding the meaning of “by exchange”; see Ex Coll.).

**EX COLL.** D. de Vries (until 1825; sold for £2,900 to Emmerson); (?Thomas) Emmerson, London (from 1825); Ludwig I, King of Bavaria (in 1829); Freiherr Carl von Mergenbaum (until 1846); estate sale, Hofgute Nikkheim, near Aschaffenburg, July 13–24, 1846, no. 176, for 2,300 marks to Lee); Hon. W. E. B. Massey-Mainwaring, London (by 1889–1907; sale, Christie's, London, March 16, 1907, no. 35, for £315 to Colnaghi); [Colnaghi, London, from 1907]; Leopold Koppel, Berlin (in 1909); Schaeffer Galleries, New York, by 1970–71; sold to MMA); Purchase, Pfeiffer Fund, Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, and Gift of Dr. Ernest G. Stillman, by exchange, 1971, 1971.48

1. According to J. Smith 1829–42, vol. 1, p. 342, no. 479 (“bought by Mr. Emmerson, of Mr. D. de Vries, 1825, for 2900 f 30,”). In Schumacher 2006, p. 318 (under no. A474), first names are added and the order is switched: “with Theodore Emmerson, London; sold to Jeronimo de Vries in 1825.” The latter was an auctioneer.
in Amsterdam, but evidence for his buying or selling the picture is not given. Schumacher (loc. cit.) also includes the Rémond estate sale, at Remy, Paris, July 1st, 1778, in the provenance for the Museum's picture, based on J. Smith's no. 149 and Hofstede de Groot's no. 330. But Smith's description of the Rémond painting does not match our composition in all details, and his record of the work as on panel ("P") and as sold for FF 1,501 or 60 livres does not match the information in the annotated copy of the sale catalogue in the printroom of the British Museum. Lot 30 in the Rémond sale is described as two pictures by Wouwermans on canvas, and both, evidently, represent horsemen pausing by tents. The pair sold for 150 livres. Martin Royalton-Kisch kindly provided these details (personal communication, February 8, 2007).

2. According to J. Smith (see preceding note). This must be Thomas Emmerson (d. 1833), who was a London collector and amateur dealer. The Museum's great equestrian portrait by Aelbert Cuyp (Pl. 33) was in Emmerson's large sale at Phillips, London, May 1-2, 1829, as were two fine paintings by Wouwermans, but not the present one.

3. According to J. Smith 1839-42, vol. 1, p. 342, no. 479 ("now in the collection of the King of Bavaria").
A near contemporary of the great Utrecht artist Abraham Bloemaert and five years older than Paulus Moreelse (q.v.), Joachim Anthonisz Wtewael was born in Utrecht in 1566, the second son of a glass painter, Anthonis Wtewael, and Antonia van Schayck. He was named for his maternal grandfather, Joachim van Schayck (d. 1592), who was also a painter. According to Van Mander, Wtewael followed his father’s profession until the age of eighteen but then went to study painting with Joos de Beer (act. 1575–d. 1591) for about two years. (This would have been in the mid-1580s, a few years after Bloemaert’s brief tuition with the same master.) Wtewael then went to Italy, where he entered the service of Charles de Bourgneuf de Cucé, bishop of Saint-Malo. Van Mander reports (probably on the basis of the artist’s own account) that this arrangement lasted for two years, followed by two years in France, and that “during this time Wtewael painted many things for the Bishop and all from his imagination, after his own invention.”

Most Dutch artists who went to Italy in this period came from families that could afford the considerable expense and deferred income. The Wtewaels had belonged to the educated middle classes for generations. One of the artist’s uncles earned a doctorate in law; another uncle and Joachim’s older brother Johan were notaries. The latter became a burgomaster in 1628.

By 1592, Wtewael was established as a master painter in Utrecht, with a nobleman named Melchior Proeys as his pupil. In 1594 or 1595, he designed a stained-glass window for the Saint Janskerk in Gouda, representing Freedom of Conscience, with allegorical figures placed before a Corinthian archway.

Aernout van Buchell (Arnold Buchelius; 1561–1642), the Utrecht humanist, lawyer, and canon, recorded in a diary entry of May 1595 the artist’s recent marriage to Christina van Halen, the daughter of a shoemaker. The following year, Wtewael bought a large house on the broad Oudegracht, near the Werder Gate on the north side of the city walls. It was also in 1596 that the couple’s first child, the painter Peter Wtewael (q.v.), was born. A son, Jan (or Johan), was born in 1598, and daughters Antonietta and Eva were born in 1603 and 1607, respectively.

Wtewael was a shrewd businessman, to the regret of his high-minded contemporaries. In 1604, Van Mander wondered that “our Pictura is so well disposed [toward the artist], given that she is held or exercised by him only in second place, whenever commerce, which comes first, tolerates it or allows him the time.” Perhaps, he mused, the artist would become hopelessly tangled up in his flax business, “just as Arachne became stuck and entangled in her web through the wrath of Minerva.” In a similar vein, Van Buchell complained that the “excellent and famous painter” practiced his profession in a “nonchalant and desultory way.” The remark seems rather harsh considering the painter’s extraordinary dedication to quality in such works as The Golden Age (Pl. 224), which, if anything, makes the care with which he invested well over 25,000 guilders in his lifetime all the more understandable. When the East India Company (VOC) was formed in 1602, Wtewael and his brother each bought 900 guilders’ worth of shares, which brought exceptional returns (twenty-five percent per annum in the early 1620s). In 1614, the painter purchased five small houses behind his own, and in 1619 and 1625 he acquired, as investments, various other properties on the Oudegracht.

Wtewael certainly made much more money from his business ventures than he ever could have by selling pictures, expensive though they must have been. Van Mander mentions several important patrons who had “excellent and subtle” works by the painter, such as a “clever kitchen piece” in Gouda, a Lot and His Daughters with life-size figures “in Antwerp, with some Italian or other,” a Mars and Venus owned by the well-known Melchior Wyntgis of Middelburg, and the “many small pieces of excellent precision and neatness by him” that were to be found in collections like that of “Mr. Joan Ycket” (Jan Nicquet) in Amsterdam. However, Wtewael evidently retained a good many of his works. In 1669, his granddaughter Aletta owned thirty paintings by the artist, the majority of which probably were passed down to her by his son Peter or his daughter Antonietta (Aletta’s mother). A little more than a hundred paintings are known today.

Like Moreelse, Wtewael was involved with the formation of the Utrecht painters’ guild in 1611, and with local politics. In 1618, he was part of the delegation that petitioned Prince
Maurits to dissolve the City Council, which resulted in his own lifetime membership in the municipal government. He was also active in the Reformed Church and in charitable organizations. But unlike Moreelse, Wtewael never held office in the painters' guild and he taught only a few minor pupils.

Wtewael's wife died in 1629, his brother Johan in 1630, and his daughter Eva in 1635. Peter Wtewael took his father's place on the City Council in October 1636. It has been suggested that ill health rather than a preoccupation with financial affairs may account for the fact that no painting by Wtewael is known to date from after 1628. ¹¹ He died on August 1, 1638, at about the age of seventy-two, and was buried in the Buurkerk on August 7. In addition to Peter, Wtewael's son Jan may have been a painter, since he paid a fee to the Guild of Saint Luke in order to take over his father's studio in 1639. ¹²

Wtewael could be described as the most consistently Mannerist painter active in the northern Netherlands, although the naturalistic qualities found even within some of his most stylized compositions (including The Golden Age, discussed below) lend the works a distinctive flavor. One often has the sense of seeing flesh-and-blood figures in bizarre circumstances, rather than fantasies tinged by observation. In his progress from northern Italy to Rome, Paris, and Fontainebleau, Wtewael gained a sophisticated understanding of an international style, which had been brought up-to-date in Utrecht by Bloemaert and by the example (well known through engravings) of the Haarlem Mannerists, in particular Hendrick Goltzius (1538–1617) and Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem (1562–1638). The leading scholar of Wtewael cites his tempering of extravagant designs about 1600 (as in the case of the Haarlem artists), but then refers to the Utrecht painter's "especially sophisticated use of Mannerist contrivance" during the 1620s. ¹³ Both remarks are true enough in regard to what might incautiously be described as Wtewael's development, which has left historians with some surprising dates. ¹⁴ Subjects that call for more naturalistic handling, such as Wtewael's portraits of himself and his wife, dated 1601, and those of their children Peter, Jan, and Eva, dated 1628 (all in the Centraal Museum, Utrecht), ¹⁵ as well as his market and kitchen scenes, may be even harder to place chronologically when they are not dated by inscriptions or documents. ¹⁶

Wtewael's elegant drawings present problems of authenticity, dating, and function as intricate as their designs. ¹⁷ The artist's sculptures, which, according to Van Buchell, "won the highest praise from the great and highest intellects," require less discussion as none are known. ¹⁸

1. This biography is based on Lowenthal 1986, chap. 2, and Bok in Amsterdam 1993–94a, pp. 326–27. See also Anne Lowenthal's entry in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 33, pp. 417–18. On the seemingly conclusive evidence for Wtewael's year of birth, see Lowenthal 1986, pp. 26–27. In the seventeenth century, the artist's name was also spelled Utenwaal, Uytewael, and Wtewael. As explained in Van Mander/Miedema 1994–99, vol. 6, p. 77, the first W in Wtewael stands for a double-U and was pronounced in some places like a German ü, but more commonly like the modern Dutch dipthong ui. Wtewael or Wtewael is a contraction of "uit de [from the] waal," a waal being a pool behind a dike.


3. See Lowenthal 1986, p. 28, fig. 12.


5. See Van Mander/Miedema 1994–99, vol. 1, p. 446 (fol. 297r), and (for both writers' remarks) vol. 6, p. 82.


10. Ninety-eight authentic works and nine "problematical attributions" are catalogued in Lowenthal 1986. A number of previously unknown pictures have appeared in the past twenty years, including the two discussed below. Bloemaert's known oeuvre is much larger, but the comparison is inappropriate, since he rarely worked in the meticulous manner of Wtewael's small paintings on copper, and he was active about twenty years longer.


12. See Bok in Amsterdam 1993–94a, p. 327. Further details concerning Wtewael's last years and his family are given in Lowenthal 1986, pp. 16–17.


14. For example, The Baptism of Christ, in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg, dated by Lowenthal (1986, no. A-80, pl. 111) to about 1618–24, proved upon cleaning to be signed and dated 1607 (as reported in Liedtke 1989a, p. 160).


16. Thus, the Kitchen Scene with the Parable of the Great Supper, dated 1609 (Bodemuseum, Berlin; Bok in Amsterdam 1986, no. A-38, pl. X), is a somewhat misleading example of Wtewael tempering his style "around 1600" (Lowenthal in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 33, p. 419).

17. See, for example, the discussion in Amsterdam 1993–94a, p. 360 (under no. 231).

Oil on copper, 8⅞ x 12 in. (22.5 x 30.5 cm)  
Signed and dated (bottom center, on rock): IOACHIM, WTE/ WAEL FECIT/AN 1605

The painting is very well preserved.

Purchase, The Edward Joseph Gallagher III Memorial Collection, Edward J. Gallagher Jr. Bequest; Lila Acheson Wallace Gift; special funds; and Gift of George Blumenthal, Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, The Collection of Giovanni P. Morosini, presented by his daughter Giulia, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Nathaniel Spear Jr., Gift of Mrs. William M. Haupt, from the collection of Mrs. James B. Haggins, special funds, gifts, and bequests, by exchange, 1993 1993.333

Wtewael is known especially for his small paintings on copper, among which this spectacular picture of 1605 is one of the finest examples in terms of conception, execution, and state of preservation. The work first came to light in the 1980s (see Ex Coll.). Previously, no painting by Wtewael of this subject was known, although there are three references to such a picture, or to more than one, in old inventories. There is strong circumstantial evidence, detailed below, that the present work is identical with "Ein tafel auf cupfer, Aurum seculum von Wtewael" (a panel on copper, the Golden Age by Wtewael) that is cited in the 1619 inventory of the imperial Kunstkammer in Vienna,7 which would mean that the painting was probably acquired not long after it was made, by one of the greatest collectors in Europe, Emperor Rudolf II, in Prague.

The theme of the Golden Age (Aetas aurea) was taken from the opening pages of the Metamorphoses, by the Roman poet Ovid (43 B.C.−4 A.D. 18), which was the primary source of mythological subjects in Netherlandish art from the late sixteenth century onward. Illustrated editions in translation or with vernacular paraphrases of the poem were widely available, beginning with a small book published in Lyons in 1557. This influential volume featured woodcuts by Bernard Salomon (ca. 1508−1561), illustrating 178 episodes in Ovid's fifteen books (or chapters), each of which is accompanied by French or Dutch verses concisely summarizing the particular tale. The second edition of a Dutch translation by Johannes Floranius, published in Antwerp in 1566, is illustrated with 178 woodcuts after Virgil Solis (1514−1562), who had freely copied Salomon's illustrations (thus reversing them) for use in two German editions of 1563. Various editions and series of engravings followed, including fifty-two prints after Hendrick Goltzius (1538−1617; the first forty engravings were published in 1589 and 1590), and a series of 132 prints by Crispijn de Passe (1564−1637; published in 1602, and as a book in 1607).8

The relevant passage in the Metamorphoses (1.89−112) follows the first eighty-eight lines describing the creation of heaven and earth, water and air, animals and mankind, and reads in full:

In the beginning was the Golden Age, when men of their own accord, without threat of punishment, without laws, maintained good faith and did what was right. There were no penalties to be afraid of, no bronze tablets were erected, carrying threats of legal action, no crowd of wrong-doers, anxious for mercy, trembled before the face of their judge: indeed, there were no judges, men lived securely without them. Never yet had any pine tree, cut down from its home on the mountains, been launched on ocean's waves, to visit foreign lands: men knew only their own shores. Their cities were not yet surrounded by sheer moats, they had no straight brass trumpets, no coiling brass horns, no helmets and no swords. The peoples of the world, untroubled by any fears, enjoyed a leisurely and peaceful existence, and had no use for soldiers. The earth itself, without compulsion, untouched by the hoe, unfurrowed by any share, produced all things spontaneously, and men were content with foods that grew without cultivation. They gathered arbute berries and mountain strawberries, wild cherries and blackberries that cling to thorny bramble bushes: or acorns, fallen from Jupiter's spreading oak. It was a season of everlasting spring, when peaceful zephyrs, with their warm breath, caressed the flowers that sprang up without having been planted. In time the earth, though untilled, produced corn too, and fields that never lay fallow whitened with heavy ears of grain. Then there flowed rivers of milk and rivers of nectar, and golden honey dripped from the green holm-oak.9

Two drawings by Wtewael appear to represent initial and nearly final stages in his development of this composition. The earlier drawing, in the Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich (fig. 277), usually described as unfinished, is mainly concerned with a scheme for framing the view, with naked couples, gnarled tree trunks, and Cupid-like children sinuously bracketing the sides of the composition, and in the center the entertaining motif of one boy helping another to mount an agreeable goat. The lovers to the right, the posturing pair farther back, the figure of Saturn overhead, and to a lesser extent the triangular group of figures to the left and the goat at center stage are elements partly inspired by an engraving after Goltzius of the same subject, dating from about 1589 (fig. 278).10
Wtewael's second drawing, in the Kupferstich-Kabinett, Dresden (fig. 279), is quite dissimilar, and very close in design to the painting. However, there are reminiscences of the earlier sketch in the overall plan and in individual motifs. An infant holding fruit aloft again fills the lower right corner. The bearded man plucking grapes on the right takes the place of a passionate woman in the earlier drawing, who with her companions anticipates the grape-picking beauty and buttressing bodies beneath the arbor in the Dresden design. Below her, the woman reclining at the stone table and nuzzling a child, and perhaps also the pose of her male partner, seems to have developed from the female figure to the lower left in the Munich drawing. The climbing youth to the left in that composition and of course the boys with a goat have echoes in the later study (the youth in reverse). So does the disposition of masses and voids in the first design, where the pair of thick, shadowy trees to the left and the washed-in ground plane show how Wtewael intended the left foreground to dominate. In the Dresden drawing, this scheme is more extensively realized, with help from a dog and children drinking from a spring to the lower left, the new but not unexpected arrangement of the arbor and trees, and the pyramidal reconfiguration of the nude ensemble. An older man bearing fruit serves not only as a waiter but also as the formal equivalent (like a close parenthesis) of the boy mounting a goat. A similar sort of metamorphosis in abstract or artistic terms happens in the middle ground, where the distaff side of the striding lovers in Munich (who look like Apollo and Daphne reconciled) anticipates the intertwined trunks and feminine limbs of the trees in the second drawing, which still attract the attentions of a male figure, and find visual support from the goat and its inexperienced rider and groom. Even Saturn on his cloud is given equal measure in foliage, which in the painting surrounds the sky-high figure of a man picking berries in a treetop.

In this complicated process of transformation, Wtewael appears to have crossed the threshold from one stylistic phase to another, or to have at least shifted his stance between the Mannerism of the preceding decades and the tentative Baroque tendencies of the early 1620s in Utrecht and Haarlem. Of course, the Dresden drawing and the Museum’s painting remain rooted in the late sixteenth century; the preparatory work is to some
Figure 279. Joachim Wtewael, *The Golden Age*, ca. 1604–5. Pen, brown ink, and gray wash, 9 x 11¼ in. (23 x 30 cm). Kupferstich-Kabinett, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden
extent a reflection of Goltzius's design (to judge this properly requires looking at the print in a mirror, as Wtewael probably did, thus seeing what his famous predecessor had actually drawn). But there is a considerable gain in volumes and depth, consistent lighting and space, and the dramatic massing of figure groups in Wtewael's second study when compared with his first drawing and with his source in Goltzius. One measure of this, and a cause for wonder, is the surprising resemblance in composition between the left side of Wtewael's drawing in Dresden and one of the greatest monuments of the new age in the Netherlands, Peter Paul Rubens's *Raising of the Cross*, of 1610–11, in Antwerp Cathedral.

Although some reservations concerning the Dresden drawing have been expressed in the past (it bears a false signature and the implausible date of 1695), there can be little doubt that it is Wtewael's preparatory study of about 1604–5 for *The Golden Age*. In the painting, a few motifs have been modified or newly introduced: two more young men pick fruit in and behind the tree to the left, and one of the youths to the upper left in the Dresden drawing has become an older man with a beard; the artist has added a parrot perched on a branch, the man at top center, a flying stork, and, to the lower right, a cat and a turkey; different figures animate the right background; the goat's rider is finally balanced; and a second goat, which is easy to miss in the tree to the upper right in the drawing, is now more noticeable amid the twisting branches and dangling bunches of grapes.

Wtewael departed from the drawing in Munich not only in terms of design but also in his approach to the subject. The first composition, with three couples embracing and the other figures scrambling onto goats, trees, and clouds, suggests that the Golden Age was mostly an epoch of sex and exercise. The erotic element, which like the figure of Saturn went back to Goltzius, was toned down in the final composition, where the subject is no longer a saturnalia but Ovid's vision of men and women pursuing healthy, idyllic lives in complete harmony with nature and each other.

For the most part, Wtewael based this interpretation on Ovid's text, but he also must have admired the treatment of the theme by his Utrecht colleague Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.) in a masterful drawing of 1603 (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt), and the superb print after it (fig. 280), dated 1604, by the Antwerp engraver Nicolaes de Bruyn (1571–1656). In fact, Bloemaert's composition, by far the most impressive version of the story by a Netherlandish artist up to that time, probably inspired Wtewael's turn to the subject in the first place. It has been noted that, compared with earlier representations of the theme, "amorous activity is subdued" in Bloemaert's rendering, and naturalistic details are emphasized, as seen in the handling of the figures, the overflowing flora and fauna, and the description of the landscape itself (for which Bloemaert presumably chose De Bruyn, a specialist in the engraving of forest scenes). Bloemaert's own reference to the engraving after Goltzius is obvious when one compares his drawing to the print, so that the dominant group of figures and trees is to the right in both compositions. The similarities include the motif of Saturn on a cloud, the inclusion of puffy-faced Zephyr (greatly diminished
in the later work), and the use of two main allées of view into the background. However, Bloemaert also spared no effort to create an original work, and to surpass the Haarlem master in ways that are more faithful to Ovid as well as to nature. The overall impression is distinctly Northern, in a tradition descending from Dürer's *Adam and Eve* engraving, of 1504, to Goltzius's drawing of the same subject (engraved by Jan Saenredam in 1597) and to Roeland Savery's Paradise pictures of forests teeming with animals. Unclassical figures, ancient trees, and abundant plants and animals are also found in a set of six prints after Bloemaert, *The History of Adam and Eve*, engraved and published in 1604 by Jan Saenredam. In the *Temptation*, where, of course, Adam and Eve take fruit from a tree, one corner of the foreground is filled with gourds and leafy branches, as in Bloemaert's *The Golden Age* and Wtewael's drawing in Dresden (figs. 280, 279), while the other corner is occupied by a cat and a turkey, the odd couple that replaced vegetation to the lower right in Wtewael's painting.

Many of the figures in Wtewael's small masterpiece are reminiscent of nudus found in earlier works by Goltzius and the Haarlem artists in his circle, by Bloemaert, and by Wtewael himself. However, there are no conspicuous instances of borrowing, and this is not surprising, considering that the Dutch Mannerists shared an extensive stock of motifs and placed a premium on constant invention. Within this single composition, certain poses are echoed, reversed, and modified, with a discriminating eye to silhouetting effects, rhythms over the surface, forms that counterbalance each other, and so on. The use of color is also remarkable, with flesh tones ranging from ivory to terracotta set against intense blues and greens. The spatial effect of warm and cool tones together with darks and lights has been enhanced by the actual low relief of the paint surface, and by the subtlest suggestions of texture, smoothness, hardness, softness, and moisture.

While Wtewael found inspiration in the work of his like-minded colleagues in the Netherlands, he was also aware of the larger cultural realm in which they existed, that of Rome, Florence, Fontainebleau, Prague, and other capitals of Late Renaissance painting and sculpture. Indeed, compared with Bloemaert (fig. 280), Wtewael turned back from the woods to the studio, where displays of artistic erudition were at home. As in contemporary works by Rubens (especially *The Baptism of Christ*, in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp), *The Golden Age* is rich in references to the great masters both of the past and of Wtewael's time. For example, the group of figures on the left, crowned by the curvaceous woman reaching up to the arbor, recalls sculptural ensembles by the Flemish-born Giambologna (1529–1608) and by his Dutch follower Adriaen de Vries (ca. 1545–1626). Here and elsewhere, one would not speak of quotation, except perhaps in the case of the boy standing behind the fruit-strewed table, whose pose is close to that of Apollino statuettes made in Giambologna's workshop. The male figure to the far right brings to mind bronzes like Giambologna's *Bacchus* (before 1562; Borgo San Jacopo, Florence) and a free variation of the same type by Willem van Tetrode (ca. 1524–1580), who collaborated with Benvenuto Cellini (1500–1571) in Florence and worked in Rome before returning to his native Delft in 1566–67. Wtewael may also have known one or more of the many Hellenistic sculptures that represent satyrs holding grapes in their upraised hands (Goltzius drew one of them in 1591 during his stay in Rome). Finally, the female grape picker to the left (fig. 281) is very similar in reverse to a figure in a large sketch by Bartholomeus Spranger (1546–1611), *Diana and Actaeon* (MMA), which is considered to date from the early 1580s. It was drawings by Spranger like this one that were brought to Haarlem in 1583 by Karel van Mander and that made a great impression on Goltzius and other artists. In this fertile era of invention, the resemblance between figures dating some twenty years apart in the oeuvres of Spranger and of Wtewael may be considered simply as a sign of the Dutch painter's fluency in a stylistic language that spread from Florence and Rome to Prague, Vienna, and other court cities in northern Europe, and then to Haarlem, Amsterdam, and Utrecht.

*The Golden Age* is a quintessential cabinet picture in its extraordinary refinement of execution (much of which requires magnification to properly appreciate), its classical theme, its references to other works of art, and its minute study of naturalistic details, in particular the various shells—they themselves collector's items—which suggest (unlike the trees) that the mythological paradise was to be found somewhere in the East Indian Ocean. A parallel may be found in the Museum's large panel by Rubens and Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568–1625), *The Feast of Achelois*, which dates from about 1614–15, illustrates a story told by Ovid, recalls classical sculpture in a few of the nude figures, and describes an ancient landscape, fruits and other bounty, birds, shells, and other attractions with delightful delicacy. There is no counterpart in Wtewael's painting to Jan Brueghel's description of exquisitely manufactured objects, such as silver-gilt tazzas and ewers, since these treasures and the heroes' weapons date from later times, Ovid's declining ages of silver, bronze, and iron. However, there does seem to be an allusion to the days of creation just before the Golden Age, so that when man arrived each region already had its
“appropriate inhabitants,” water affording “a home to gleaming fishes” (two men use a net to catch them in the right background), while “earth harboured wild beasts, and the yielding air welcomed the birds.” Wtewael may even have had in mind Ovid’s notion that “whereas other animals hang their heads and look at the ground,” the Creator, “or else Prometheus . . . made man stand erect, bidding him look up to heaven,” no doubt sensing that he had been fashioned “into the image of the all-governing gods.”

In every respect, this painting seems the perfect Rudolfine image, given the emperor’s love of erotic mythologies, forest scenes, naturalia, and precious works of art. It is also probable that Rudolf II would have recognized in his own reign “The Golden Age Restored,” to quote the title of Ben Jonson’s masque of 1615 celebrating the Stuart era in England. The symbolic portrait by Giuseppe Arcimboldo (1527–1593) of about 1591, Rudolf II as Vertumnus (Skokloster Castle, Sweden), combines a year’s cycle of fruits and vegetables to present the emperor as god of the seasons, suggesting that “the eternal spring of the new Golden Age is to come with his rule.” Wtewael would have been familiar with this sort of political analogy, since Ovid’s description of the Golden Age had just been presented as a metaphor for beneficent rulership in Van Mander’s “Interpretation and Explanation of the Symbolism in Ovid’s Metamorphoses,” a section of the Schilder-Boeck, published in 1604.

Van Mander rarely missed an opportunity, in the preceding section of the book, “The Lives of Famous Netherlands and High German Painters,” to note when one of them had made a particular work for a great prince or an important collector. His biography of Wtewael mentions several paintings by him in private collections, including a small copper Mars and Venus “recently delivered to Mr Joan van Weely.” This fresh information, and details of Wtewael’s early career, was evidently obtained directly from the artist. It therefore seems very likely that a painting by Wtewael which had been sold to Rudolf II before about 1603–4, and which happened to treat a theme of particular interest to Van Mander, would have been mentioned by him in his comparatively detailed discussion of the artist. In the foreword of the Schilder-Boeck, Van Mander calls Rudolf II the greatest connoisseur of painting in the world, and in the various “Lives” specific works by Spranger, Hans von Aachen (ca. 1532–1615), Golzius, Bloemaert, Jacques de Gheyn the Elder (q.v.), and other living masters are mentioned as in the emperor’s collection.

It is also likely that the “panel on copper, Golden Age by Wtewael,” cited in the inventory made in 1619 after the death of the emperor’s heir, Emperor Matthias (see Ex Coll.), came to him upon Rudolf’s death seven years earlier. The nature of the inventory has been debated, but it appears that the most Rudolfine works listed in the Vienna document of 1619 usually came from the imperial collection in Prague. Matthias was a minor patron by comparison, with quite different tastes. These considerations, together with the evidence (or lack of it) in Van Mander’s “Life” of Wtewael, suggest that The Golden Age recorded in 1619 was painted by the artist between about 1603–4 and 1612. Of course, the inspiration of Bloemaert’s example in 1604 (fig. 280), which treated Ovid’s story not as part of a print series but as an independent work of art, also suggests that Wtewael did not treat the subject of the Golden Age before 1604.

A painting of this subject by Wtewael is also cited in an Amsterdam auction of June 27, 1752 (“No. 155. Een de guilde Eeuw, van Joghenn Uytweaual;” with no dimensions or other details), and in an Amsterdam auction of April 15, 1778. It is very probable that the same picture appeared in both sales, considering that they were held in the same city about one generation apart. In the second sale, the painting is said to be on copper, “hoog 6 duim, br. 8 duim,” or about 6 x 8 inches (15 x 20 cm). Assuming that this information (to say nothing of the attribution) is reliable, the painting sold in Amsterdam in 1778 was not the present picture, but a work less than half its size. The proportions, however, are the same, about 3 to 4 in a landscape format. Since Wtewael is known for repeating compositions in different sizes, it is possible that The Golden Age sold in Amsterdam in 1778 was a replica of the New York picture.

How a painting by Wtewael would have made its way from Utrecht to Rudolf II’s collection in Prague is no mystery. The most likely intermediary was Count Simon VI zur Lippe (1554–1613), called “Graef van der Lip” by Van Mander, who served as the emperor’s agent in the Netherlands, buying or attempting to buy important works of art by major Dutch artists ranging from Lucas van Leyden (ca. 1494–1533) to Golzius and Bloemaert. The count made use of artists, collectors, merchants, city officials, court figures, and even the Prince of Orange to obtain paintings that were especially desired by Rudolf II or suited to his taste. One of his main contacts was the Haarlem engraver Jan Muller (1571–1628), who worked closely with Golzius, made prints after Bloemaert as well as the Haarlem Mannerists, and maintained contacts with Spranger, Adriaen de Vries, and other artists in Prague. In 1602, Lippe wrote that the Middelburg "maître de la monnaie," Melchior Wyntgis, might have paintings for sale (Van Mander cites Wynigis as owning a Mars and Venus by Wtewael), and
Figure 281. Detail of Wtewael's The Golden Age (Pl. 224)
the count purchased four major pictures from the estate of the Amsterdam collector Jan Nicquet (1539–1608), who according to Van Mander was one of the collectors of Wetewael’s "small pieces of excellent precision and neatness." Lippe tried to buy Lucas van Leyden’s Last Judgment triptych with the help of Prince Maurits, but (as Muller wrote to Lippe in November 1602) Goltzius and Van Mander had advised against the sale. In June 1603, the count bought a painting on copper by Goltzius, *Christ on the Cold Stone with Two Angels* (1602; Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence), from the master’s stepson and collaborator Jacob Matham (1571–1631). It was through Lippe, according to Van Mander in 1604, that the emperor acquired a Slaving of the Niobids "made recently by Bloemaert"; and the emperor and the count each owned a Banquet of the Gods by the same artist. Lippe went to Prague in 1601, 1603, and 1607, each time bringing pictures to Rudolf II, but paintings could also have been sent with other couriers, or through the Brussels court of the emperor’s brother Archduke Albert of Austria, regent of the Spanish Netherlands.

A large, crude copy of the present composition, apparently dating from the seventeenth century but not close to the work of Joachim or Peter Wetewael (q.v.), was on the German art market in the early 1880s.

1. The document is listed in Lowenthal 1886, p. 212.
2. The details in this paragraph are drawn from Sluijter 2000b, chap. 2, "‘Metamorphoses’ in Prints by Hendrick Goltzius and His Circle," pp. 23–27. See also Sluijter 2000a, pp. 194–95, for an outline of the influence of the Salomons woodcuts on Netherlandish illustrations of the *Metamorphoses* to about 1700 (p. 333, fig. 6, for De Passe’s engraving of the Golden Age, which employs a Banquet of the Gods format).
4. The connection with the engraving after Goltzius is noted in Bolten 1984, p. 39 (pp. 33–37 on Goltzius’s illustrations to Ovid), and in Lowenthal 1997, p. 51.
5. Goltzius’s original drawing is lost, but a copy of it, perhaps by the young Jan Muller (1617–1628), is in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (Reznick 1961, p. 474, no. 354, fig. 454).
6. This comparison is considered more fully in Liedtke 2000b.
7. In Lowenthal 1997, p. 51, it is concluded that the Dresden drawing "seems to be a well-developed preparatory study" for the painting in New York, and a comparison is made with a preparatory drawing in the Nasjonalgalleriet, Oslo, for Wetewael’s painting *The Judgement of Paris*, dated 1602, in the Cleveland Museum of Art. See Lowenthal 1986, pls. 32, 34, for the Oslo drawing and the Cleveland painting, and pls. 5, 6, for the drawing in the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, that was made in preparation for Wetewael’s *Wedding of Pelus and Thetis*, of the 1900s or about 1600 (Alte Pinakothek, Munich). See also Lowenthal 1997, p. 32, n. 13, on a copy after the Dresden drawing, in the Kunstmuseum, Düsseldorf. The authenticity of the Dresden drawing was convincingly defended before the corresponding picture was discovered, in Vienna–Dresden 1978–79, no. 82 (entry by Christian Dittrich).
8. The quote is from Roethlisberger 1993, vol. 1, p. 116 (under no. 70, catalogue entry for the engraving), where this point about De Bryn is also made. The author convincingly overrules the suggestion made in Bolten 1984, p. 38, that Bloemaert’s drawing may not have been made expressly to be engraved, which is contradicted by the inclusion of the cartouche with putti in the drawing, and by all the evidence of the artist’s career as a designer, and of the art market in the Netherlands at the time. See also Frankfurt 2000, pp. 40–41, no. 11 (agrees with Roethlisberger).
9. As noted in Bolten 1984, pp. 37–38, where too much is made of the fact that the engraving after Bloemaert bears the same anonymous lines of Latin verse as the print after Goltzius. Such borrowings were common among print publishers.
10. Spicer in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, p. 334, says of Savery’s Paradise paintings that “these fantasies can best be thought of as avian equivalents of Wetewael’s *Golden Age*,” and reminds the reader (without knowing that the emperor may have owned the present picture) of Rudolf II’s famous menageries. For Goltzius’s drawing of Adam and Ewe, with a goat, a cat, and a dog in the foreground, see Reznick 1961, pp. 238–39, no. 10, fig. 288.
12. That Wetewael referred to Bloemaert’s *History of Adam and Eve* is also suggested by the strong resemblance between the couple in the background in the Munich drawing (fig. 277) and Adam and Eve in *The Tree of Knowledge*, the second print in the series.
13. The three reclining figures in the foreground of *The Golden Age* have immediate antecedents in Wetewael’s *Wedding of Pelus and Thetis* (Hertog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig) and his *Judgement of Paris* (Cleveland Museum of Art), both of 1602 (Lowenthal 1986, figs. 31, 32). The Braunschweig painting also features children riding goats and a man pouring wine (in the lower right corner) who is very similar in reverse to the figure at the upper left in the Dresden drawing (fig. 279). The Cleveland picture includes a crouching dog, as well as reclining male figures that look forward to *The Golden Age*. The seated woman to the lower right recalls a repoussoir figure in Jan Saenredam’s engraving after Goltzius, *The Discovery of Callisto’s Pregnancy*, dated 1599 (see Sluijter 2000b, fig. 51, and the detail of this figure on p. 22), and another in Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem’s drawing of about 1588, *Olympic Games* (Van Thiels 1999, fig. 29), while the reclining woman in the left foreground of Wetewael’s painting is similar to the woman on the left in Cornelisz van Haarlem’s panel of about 1597, *Depravity of Mankind before the Flood* (location unknown; Van Thiels 1999, fig. 133). These comparisons do not reveal sources but parallels, of which there are many others.
14. A good sense of this can be gained from reviewing Sluijter 2000a, figs. 3–60.
15. Lowenthal 1997, p. 50, offers a fine description of these effects, and makes the point about the relief-like application of paint.
18. See Amsterdam–New York 2003, p. 119, no. 14 (the version in
the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg), where the bronze statuette of 1662–65 is called “a free variation on a familiar Florentine theme,” in which Van Tetrode was “preceded by major artists such as Michelangelo, Sansovino and Giambologna.” The latter’s Bacchus is illustrated in ibid., p. 32, fig. 8.

19. See Reznick 1961, nos. 243, 246, figs. 182, 183, after the satyr in the Villa Albani, which is seen in a later state in Bieber 1961, fig. 568 (see also fig. 573 for another marble sculpture of a satyr holding grapes over his head, in the Vatican Museums). Carlos Picón, curator in charge, Department of Greek and Roman Art, kindly brought this category of works to my attention. He also mentioned the numerous examples of children with goats in Greek sculpture, but it does not appear that Witewael had a specific example in mind.


22. For example, the cat, viewed under a microscope, is shown to be rendered in almost countless threadlike lines of paint, many of which are red, thus lending warmth to the gray tabby coat of fur.

23. Compare the display of shells, birds, and sea creatures in Ferrante Imperato’s illustration of his own collection of naturalia in Dell’historia naturale, libri XXVIII (Naples, 1599), which is discussed in Hanover and other cities 1997–98, p. 214–35, no. 14 (detail on p. 12).


25. The quotes are from Ovid 1951, p. 31, in the two paragraphs immediately preceding the description of the Golden Age. Renaissance and Baroque artists would have approved of this passage because it supports the familiar argument in paragone debates that the most superior sense is that of sight (see the discussion of Rembrandt’s Aristotle with a Bust of Homer, Pl. 151). Thomas Aquinas wrote that human beings walk upright because their senses seek out knowledge and beauty, not just mere necessities. Animals face the ground, but man stands erect, “in order that by the senses, and chiefly by sight, which is more subtle and penetrates further into the differences of things, he may freely survey the sensible objects around him, both heaven and earth, so as to gather intelligible truth from all things” (Summers 1987, p. 36, for this translation of a passage in the Summa theologica).


27. This Jacobean mask is related to the iconography of Rubens’s ceiling for the Banqueting House, Whitehall, in Donovan 2004, pp. 112, 122.

28. Kaufmann 1988, p. 171 (under no. 2.22). Patronage on this princely level might help to explain why Witewael turned to the theme of the Golden Age, which “was relatively uncommon then, in comparison with festivities and amorous exploits of the gods” (Lowenthal 1997, p. 31). However, this remark must have been made specifically with Dutch paintings in mind; the earlier prints illustrating Ovid’s passage may be counted among those supporting Sluijter’s observation (in Sluijter 2000, p. 25) that Dutch artists first demonstrated an interest in mythological subjects by treating “countless scenes that were never [or very rarely] represented in painting.” Some sixteenth-century Italian painters who depicted the Golden Age are reviewed in Boiten 1984, pp. 26–27. Jacopo Zucchi’s The Golden Age, one of three panels representing The Ages of the World (Uffizi, Florence), has been interpreted as a political allegory celebrating justice under Medici rule (ibid., p. 27, figs. 6–8, citing Fillips 1974, pp. 12–13, pl. 8, and Puttfarken 1980).

29. Van Mander 1604, book 5, fol. 31v. A useful summary of the six sections of the Schilder-Buch is offered by E. K. J. Reznick in his article on Karel van Mander I, in Dictionary of Art 1996, vol. 20, pp. 245–66, where we are reminded that Goltzius worked on his illustrations to the Metamorphoses in close collaboration with Van Mander. Lowenthal (1997, pp. 31–52) connects Witewael’s picture with Van Mander’s interpretation of the Golden Age, and observes that “such sentiments are more likely to represent the views of a patron than of Witewael, in view of his later pro-Orange sympathies.” Here the author has in mind the possible “pactist implications” of the subject, which assumes that the enlightened ruler in question would have been Dutch.


32. This opinion was expressed by Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, in a personal communication to the present writer dated June 29, 2004. See Kaufmann 2001, pp. 24–31, for a list of publications dealing with the various inventories of the imperial collections in Prague and Vienna, and for brief synopses of each author’s contribution.


34. Lowenthal 1986, p. 212.

35. Here the writer draws a conclusion different from that implied in Lowenthal 1997, p. 50, where the Amsterdam painting is described as “slightly smaller than the Metropolitan Museum’s example.” With a surface area equal to 43.7 percent of the larger one, the smaller picture could be laid down twice on the New York painting, leaving an inch to spare across the top or bottom.

36. For example, the two versions of Witewael’s Battle between the Gods and the Titans, of about 1600–1605 (Lowenthal 1986, nos. A-23, A-24, pls. 31, 36), are on copper 8 1 x 8 inches (21 x 28 cm; private collection) and 6 5 x 8 inches (15.6 x 20.3 cm; Art Institute of Chicago), or about the same sizes as the two paintings under discussion. See also Lowenthal 1986, pls. 8–10, 32, 33, 37, 38, with dimensions given in the captions.


43. As noted in Roethlisberger 1993, p. 61. On Lippe and his Netherlandish agents, see Fusenig 2002.

44. Lippe is discussed at somewhat greater length in the present
writer's article on this picture: see Liedtke 2002b, p. 101.

The canvas, 35/4 x 43/4 inches (90 x 116 cm), was with Galerie Füssli & Jakob, Munich, in 1980–81. Anne Lowenthal rejected the picture in a letter to the gallery dated January 22, 1981. A color photocopy is in the Museum's curatorial files.

REFERENCES: J. Agnew et al. 1992, pp. 66, 76, pl. 72, as in the Ortiz Patiño collection, "arguably the finest of the small copperns [by Wtewael] which have appeared on the market" during the period 1982–92; Historians of Netherlandish Art Newsletter 11, no. 1 (April 1994), p. 12 (ill.), notes the Museum's acquisition; W. Liedtke in “Recent Acquisitions,” MMA Bulletin 52, no. 2 (Fall 1994), pp. 26–27 (ill. and large color detail of upper left area), suggests that it would be tempting to compare Annibale Carracci's frescoes on the ceiling of the Farnese Palace in Rome with the present painting as examples of early seventeenth-century style were the latter not so distinctly Netherlandish in various qualities; Baezter 1995, p. 206; Bowron 1995, pp. 9–10, 18 n. 2, fig. 1, describes "the crisp, detailed handling and enamelled perfection" of the painting as typical of fine works on copper dating from this period; Lowenthal 1995, pp. 72, 80 n. 124, cites the picture as an example of "erotic currents" in the artist's work; Liedtke 1997, p. 117, figs. 73, 73b (detail), compares the picture's naturalistic qualities with those found in works by Jan Brueghel the Elder; Lowenthal 1997, passim, discusses the Museum's new acquisition as the only known surviving painting by Wtewael of this subject, considers the source in Ovid, compares Bloemaert's interpretation as seen in de Bruyn's engraving of 1604, and relates the painting to drawings by Wtewael (in Munich and Dresden); Spicer in San Francisco–Baltimore–London 1997–98, pp. 30–31, 44, 334, fig. 9 on p. 31, describes "Ovid's characterization in the Metamorphoses of the harmony and eternal spring of the Golden Age" as beautifully evoked in this painting, which may also be seen as having a zoological counterpart in Paradise paintings by Roelant Savery; Bowron 1998, p. 9, fig. 1, repeats the remarks in Bowron 1995; Franits 2004, p. 66, fig. 58, mentions the picture as an example of the "fashionable Mannerist style" in Utrecht; Liedtke 2002b offers a longer version of the present catalogue entry, with greater attention given to the question of Rudolf II's patronage.

The German painter Joachim van Sandrart (1606–1688) visited Joachim Wtewael (q.v.) in 1626 and recalled later that "one of his sons practiced this profession [of painting] also, and came along far in it, and also would have achieved a great high learning in this art, if he had earnestly remained active in it, but they became too smitten with the flax business and made a fine fortune in it."  

Peter, born on June 5, 1596, was the elder of Joachim Wtewael's two sons. He appears to have studied only with his father, and also shared his business concerns and interest in politics. In September 1635, at the age of thirty-nine, he joined the Reformed Church, which allowed him to assume his aged father's position on the City Council in October 1636. In 1642, he took over his deceased brother-in-law's seat as a court magistrate and served for many years. He also became a deacon and elder in his church.  

Like his slightly younger brother, Jan (1598–1652), Peter Wtewael evidently remained a bachelor, and lived in his parents' house on the Oudegracht in Utrecht. Jan registered in the painters' guild in 1639, a year after his father's death, but Peter never bothered to do so. All of Peter's known paintings (of which there are less than two dozen) date from the 1620s or early 1630s, so he may have turned his attention entirely or mostly to other affairs by the time his father died.  

Joachim Wtewael had left his children with a variety of investments in real estate, the East India Company (VOC), and other interests, which Peter must have managed carefully. In 1639, a new façade in the Dutch classicist style was added to the family house, and other signs of prosperity precede that of Peter Wtewael's impressive estate, which was inventoried following his death on January 16, 1660. Numerous works by his father, some by himself, and pictures by a few other Utrecht artists were in his collection.  

Joachim Wtewael's circular portraits of his sons, dated 1628, passed from Peter's estate to a long line of descendants, one of whom bequeathed them to the Centraal Museum, Utrecht, in 1972. Peter is depicted as a painter and Jan as a humanist.  

The artist closely followed his father's style, which he probably first absorbed by making copies. In the 1620s, however, he also responded to recent works by Abraham Bloemaert (q.v.) and Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656), thus achieving "a distinctive amalgam of old and new."  

1. This translation modifies the one offered in Lowenthal 1986, p. 30, which is based on the German passage in Sandrart 1675–79, part 2, book 3, chap. 25, p. 289 (reprinted in Pelzner 1924, p. 154, and in Lowenthal 1986, p. 185). Sandrart's complaint about the flax business borrows from Van Mander's biography of Joachim Wtewael (see his biography above, text and note 5).  
3. For paintings by or attributed to Peter Wtewael, see Lowenthal 1974a and Lowenthal 1986, pp. 173–81 (nos. D1–D21).  
225. **Kitchen Scene**

Oil on canvas, 44¼ x 63 in. (113.7 x 160 cm)
The painting is in good condition.
Rogers Fund, 1906 06.288

When this painting was purchased by the Museum with the enthusiastic support of curator Roger Fry, it was called *Cook Shop,* "a Jan Steen of exceptional beauty and importance" (see Refs.). By 1914, curator Bryson Burroughs had attributed the work to the Amsterdam painter Adriaen van Nieulandt (1587–1658), following advice in an undated letter from Abraham Bredius. Hella Robels, an authority on Frans Snyders (1579–1657), the Antwerp painter of still lives and kitchen and market scenes, observed in a letter of 1974 that the picture must be Dutch not Flemish. Nonetheless, drafts of a catalogue entry written in 1976 maintain that "recent cleaning of the Museum's painting has disclosed a light, bright color scheme that seems more typical of the Flemish school."  

In response to letters from the present writer, Pieter van Thiel (then director of the paintings department at the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) and Keith Moxey (a specialist on the market scenes of Pieter Aertsen and Joachim Beuckelaer) independently reported in 1980 that they were strongly reminded of works by Joachim Wtewael (q.v.). The picture was subsequently brought to the attention of the Wtewael specialist Anne Lowenthal, who soon published it as a new attribution to Wtewael's son Peter.  

Peter Wtewael's responsibility for the work can hardly be doubted. Lowenthal describes the "hearty figures," facial types, robust naturalism, and "a preference for convex forms" as typical of the artist. In his *Adoration of the Shepherds* (Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne), which is signed "Peter wte wael" and dated 1624, the faces of the Virgin and of two of the shepherds (with their ski-jump noses and jawlines) recall the features and, oddly enough, the jovial expressions of the couple depicted here. The kitchen maid also resembles the figure in Peter Wtewael's *A Shepherdess with a Lamb*, of the late 1620s (location unknown), where the lopsided grin similarly suggests a saucy attitude. The bucolic picture is one of a pair that demonstrates the painter's particular manner of rendering drapery, fur, feathers, and so on.  

The composition may be considered a 1620s remodeling of older designs, like Joachim Wtewael's *Kitchen Scene with the Parable of the Great Supper,* of 1605 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) and the same artist's *Kitchen Scene with the Supper at Emmaus,* of about the same date (private collection, Germany), and also paintings by contemporary artists such as Cornelis Jacobsz Delf (1571–1643). Transitional works, in terms of design, were painted in Haarlem by Pieter Cornelisz van Rijck (1567/68–in or after 1635), Floris van Schooten (1585/88–1656), and Cornelis Engelz (1574/75–1610). Another source of inspiration for Peter Wtewael's painting was his father's *Kitchen Scene with Christ, Martha, and Mary,* of about 1620–25 (figs. 282; compare fig. 283), a composition that (gracefully revising a Beuckelaer design) is largely filled by a comely kitchen maid jamming plucked fowl onto a roasting spit.  

Young men from the farm flirting with maids in kitchens or in the marketplace is a theme that descends from Pieter Aertsen (1527/8–1575) and his Antwerp pupil Joachim Beuckelaer (1533–1573) to a fair number of Dutch and Flemish painters. The earlier works in this tradition convey religious and ethical ideas while entertaining the viewer with scenes of human comedy and abundant displays of naturalistic representation. Dutch authors such as Erasmus (1466–1536) and Dirck Volkertsz Coornhert (1522–1590) compared food and sex as sensual pleasures and also condemned (in Coornhert's words) "the most contemptible occupations which serve the appetites, such as fishmongers, butchers, cooks, pastrycooks, perfume-sellers, dancers, and all manner of gamesters." The list expands upon one that was already secondhand with Cicero: "Least respectable of all are those trades which cater to sensual pleasures: 'fishmongers, butchers, cooks, and poulterers, and fisherment,' as Terence says."  

Two aspects of Wtewael's painting are less reminiscent of Aertsen and his followers than of erotic subjects that were painted in Utrecht during the 1620s by Gerrit van Honthorst (1592–1656): the direct encounter of an amorous couple in the immediate foreground, and the frank sexuality of their gestures and of several motifs. Such candid indications of carnality are also found in contemporary works produced in other cities (Frans Hals's *Merrymakers at Shrove Tide,* Pl. 58, is one of the best examples), but they appear to have been especially popular in Utrecht from about 1620 onward (thus coinciding with Van Honthorst's return from Italy).  

In the present picture, the kitchen maid's skewering of a chicken, the young man's offer of a bird (a duck, in this case), and his handling of an open jug with, for good measure, an extended middle finger are clear allusions to sexual intercourse. "Hunting the hare" was a euphemism for lovemaking, but here the dead hares probably stand for fertility, as does the basket of eggs (which were also considered an aphrodisiac). The various meats (ribs, or flesh) refer to carnal desire, and
draw a parallel between gluttony and lust. The hanging cock and almost any form that appears phallic (especially the pestle in a mortar) amplify the humor, and also demonstrate the artist's powers of invention and description.

Some objects may require identification if not decipherment. The shelf to the upper left supports a brass cooking pot, a tankard with a pewter top and handle, and some similar vessel; a big stein and two other tankards hang from the side. Among the visual diversions in the foreground are a flayed sheep's head, a pair of snipe, and a knife that, like the dangling twine and dead game, assists the corner of the table in its thrust toward the viewer's space. Above the hearth in the background, to the right of the shelf displaying tankards, pewter plates, and candlesticks, a long shallow pan hangs on hooks and is framed by a small roasting spit on slim supports. The figures' costumes are quite conventional, although the maid's lace collar and cap could suggest that she expected someone to drop in. The man's fur hat is familiar from peasant pictures going back over fifty years.17

In the opinion of Gerard de Lairesse (q.v.), the proper place to hang "kitchen pieces" was in the kitchen.18 However, Loughman and Montias have surveyed the subjects of Dutch paintings as they hung room by room in Dutch houses, and discovered that collectors in the period 1600–1679 did not anticipate De Lairesse's advice. Of seventy-two kitchen pieces described as in specific rooms in Amsterdam inventories, only one was in a kitchen, and three were in the "inner hearth." In Antwerp during approximately the same period, about half the paintings of this type were found in the kitchen, if their location was noted at all. The kitchen and inner hearth in Dutch homes tended to be more private spaces; family portraits were often hung there and in other back rooms.19 A picture such as this one had much broader appeal, although it was surely not to everyone's taste.
In 1979, Curator Katharine Baeck, on the advice of consulting curator Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, changed the attribution from Adriaen van Nieulandt to Unknown Flemish Painter, first quarter of the seventeenth century. This opinion was incorporated in Baeck 1980 (see Refs.).
3. P. J. J. van Thiel, letter dated August 20, 1980, and Keith P. F. Moxey, letter dated October 15, 1980, both in the curatorial files. Van Thiel wrote, “My first thought was: Joachim Wtewael . . . although I cannot point out a Wtewael painting for direct comparison.” Moxey wrote that “the style of the work reminds me quite strongly of Joachim Wtewael,” and he reviewed other possibilities, suggesting that an attribution to the elder Wtewael was slightly off the mark.
4. See Refs. The painting was little known to scholars in the early 1980s. It was never exhibited, it was stored somewhat remotely among Flemish pictures, and for some time it was covered in tissue paper.
6. Ibid., no. D-2, pl. 162. In Lowenthal 1974a, p. 458, it is noted that “the odd smiles are slightly disquieting.”
7. For these two canvases, see Lowenthal 1986, pp. 178–79, nos. D-12, D-13, pls. 174, 175, pls. xxvi, xxvii. The paintings were sold at Christie’s, London, July 4, 1997, no. 25.
9. As noted by the present writer in New York–London 2001, p. 72, kitchen scenes painted by Delft artists such as Cornelis Jacobsz Delf and the young Michiel van Mierisveld (q.v.) depend mainly upon precedents in Antwerp and Utrecht.
(Cicero) and 221 (Coornhert), where the original Latin and Dutch are also given. The classical sources of Aertsen’s kitchen and market scenes are more thoroughly considered in M. Sullivan 1999.

14. See, for example, Judson and Ekkart 1999, pls. 1, 57, 111, 112, 113, 116, 174, etc. These examples include pendant pictures of single half-length figures.

15. “To skewer a chicken” (een tijden speeten) was vulgar slang given pictorial form by a number of sixteenth-century Flemish artists; see Bax 1979, p. 125. On the jug as a uterine symbol, see L. Wuys in Ghent 1986–87, pp. 32–33. The same motif and the erotic significance of vogelen (“to bird,” meaning to supply poultry or to copulate), a bird (penis), hens (loose girls), skewering, and so on are discussed in De Jongh 1968–69.


17. See Beuckelaer’s Poultry Seller, of 1644 (Toledo Museum of Art), which is discussed in Wallen 1979.


19. For these details, see Loughman and Montias 2000, p. 42. In the 1671 estate inventory of Peter Wtewael’s niece Hillegorde Pater, “a kitchen piece by Wtewael” was “in the bedroom or green room” along with a beach scene, a few genre pictures, and a “Paul and Silas” (Lowenthal 1986, p. 198, under fol. 23v).

References: B. Burroughs 1914, p. 198, no. 855, as by Adriaen van Nieulandt; B. Burroughs 1931a, no. 355-1, as by Adriaen van Nieulandt; D. Sutton in Fry 1972, vol. 1, pp. 251 (in letter 172), 255 (in letter 177), and 265 (in letter 191), publishes Roger Fry’s brief reference to letters to his wife dated February 18 and March 2, 1906, and to Museum director Robert De Forest dated June 16, 1906; ibid., p. 26, quotes an editorial in the Evening Post, dated April 23, 1906, describing the painting as “a Jan Steen of exceptional beauty and importance”; ibid., p. 265 n. 1, quotes Charles M. Kurtz, Academy Notes (Buffalo Fine Arts Academy) 1, no. 12 (May 1906), who criticizes Fry’s purchase of a “stupid big Jan Steen”; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 57, as Flemish, 1st quarter 17th century; Lowenthal 1986, p. 178, no. 10, pl. 171, pl. xxv, attributes the painting to Peter Wtewael; Klock in Amsterdam 1993–94, p. 603 (under no. 275), observes that Joachim Wtewael’s kitchen scenes are “imitated” in this work; Baetjer 1993, p. 307, as by Peter Wtewael; Barnes in Albany 2002, p. 148, no. 60 (ill. p. 149), discusses the objects and types of food in the painting, and its various “sexual allusions”; Rose in ibid., p. 26, describes the cooking pot to the upper left, and p. 148, no. 60, suggests how the meats depicted in the painting would have been prepared and how the eggs might have been used.


Ex coll.: Baron van Loo, Ghent (in 1906; sold to the Museum through the dealer George S. Sedgwick, London, for £3,500 or about $17,000); Rogers Fund, 1906 06.288
Dutch Painter

*Active 1630s*

226. Sara de Peyster at the Age of Two and a Half

Oil on canvas, 38⅝ x 24⅗ in. (97.3 x 61.3 cm)
Dated and inscribed (upper left): Sarra Depeyster ætatis 30. Maenden 23 Mei 1631

The paint surface is severely abraded throughout.

Gift of Livingston L. Short and Anna Livingston Jones, 1961 61.154

This anonymous Dutch portrait, dated May 23, 1631, and its pendant (fig. 284) depict Sara (or Sarra) de Peyster (1628/29–1646) and her brother Jacques (1629/30–1676). His portrait is dated May 21, 1631. The dates undoubtedly refer to the portraits’ dates of completion. The girl’s age is given on the canvas as thirty months, the boy’s as seventeen months. Sara died at the age of seventeen or eighteen years. Jacques died when he was about forty-six, three months after he married, leaving no issue.

Sara and Jacques were the first two children of at least nine who were born to Jacques de Peyster (1596–ca. 1655), a native of Ghent who became a banker in Rouen and later in Amsterdam. His wife, Catherine de Lavoye (d. 1646), was the daughter of Josse de Lavoye and Sara de Wannemaker of Antwerp. The Dutch style and inscriptions on the portraits of the couple’s children indicate that they had settled in Amsterdam or elsewhere in North Holland by 1631.

Jacques’s niece Catharine de Peyster (1665–before 1714) married a prominent New Yorker of Dutch descent, her second cousin Abraham de Peyster (1657–1728). Her parents were Jacques’s brother Pierre (1639–1710), a banker in Utrecht and Amsterdam, and his first wife, Gertruid van Dijk (d. 1666). Catherine and Abraham’s wedding took place on April 5, 1684, at Sloterdijk, just outside of Amsterdam, and the couple arrived in New York on September 13 of the same year. It is not known if the portraits of Sara and Jacques were brought to America at that time or with another family member at a later date.

The provincial style of the portraits is typical of Friesland and West Friesland, that is, the so-called Northern Quarter of the Province of Holland. The later presence of the family in Amsterdam, as well as the particular style of the paintings, suggests an origin not far north of the great mercantile capital, for example in Enkhuizen or Alkmaar. The portraits are reminiscent of those painted in Enkhuizen by Jan Claesz (dates unknown), by whom several dozen portraits dating from 1593 to 1618 survive. Claesz, however, was a more accomplished master, and he invariably painted on wood. The Museum’s canvas and its pendant are presumably by a younger artist working in the same tradition.

Figure 284. Dutch painter, *Jacques de Peyster at the Age of Seventeen Months*, 1631. Oil on canvas, 39⅝ x 25 in. (99.3 x 63.5 cm). Lent by Tobias de Peyster to The Metropolitan Museum of Art L.42.5.3

992 DUTCH PAINTER
A conspicuous display of wealth is made by the abundance of finely worked lace, lengths of gold chain, and pieces of jewelry worn by the children. Both Sara and Jacques have a red coral and pearl bracelet on each wrist. Sara also wears a gold band set with jewels and pearls in her hair, a double strand of pearls at her neck, and a jeweled brooch and gold chain on her chest. She carries a fan and a red-striped tulip (the latter referring to the bloom of youth, and probably also its fragility). Jacques holds a sprig of cherries (a symbol of spring, youth, or fecundity), and a silver-gilt rattle with a rock crystal teether (coral and rock crystal were thought to ward off evil). Rattles of this type, called a rinkelbel in Dutch and (by some historians) a tinkle bell in English, became common in the late sixteenth century and often appear in Netherlandish portraits of children. Hundreds of silver rattles are preserved in the Fries Museum, Leeuwarden, and a gold rattle similar to that held by Jacques de Peyster has been on loan to the Metropolitan Museum, together with his portrait, since 1942. 1

1. The preceding genealogical information is adopted from De Peyster 1939, pp. 33–34.

2. See Belknap 1916, pp. 1–4, on the first generation in New York.

3. On Friesian portraits, by painters such as Adriaen van der Linde (d. 1609; active in Leeuwarden and Bolsward), Wybrand de Geest (1592–ca. 1662; active in Leeuwarden), and Harmen Willem Wieringa (active 1622–30 in Leeuwarden), see Wassenbergh 1967.

4. Other members of the same branch of the De Peyster family had settled earlier in the neighboring city of Haarlem: see De Peyster 1939, p. 322. It was not unusual for Alkmaar and Enkhuizen artists to find patrons in Haarlem or Amsterdam.


References: Worcester 1935, p. 165, cites the work as a “generic prototype” for seventeenth-century American portraits; Davis 1968, p. 4 (ill.), 5, reproduces the painting together with the pendant portrait of Jacques de Peyster, also of 1631, which has been on loan to the Museum (from another branch of the same family) since 1942 (not 1924, as stated); Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 52, erroneously gives the title as Jacques DePeyster; Liedtke 1990, p. 20, fig. 4, hastily assigns the portrait to a Dutch artist active in America and criticizes scholars of American art for invoking names like “Vermeer” in connection with the floor tiles shown in this kind of picture; Baetjer 1995, p. 297.

Ex Coll.: Livingston L. Short and Anna Livingston Jones, New York (until 1961); Gift of Livingston L. Short and Anna Livingston Jones, 1961 61.154
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Active 1630s

227. A Young Woman in a Landscape

Oil on wood, 26 x 19¼ in. (66 x 50.5 cm)
Dated and inscribed (lower right): AO 1616/STA.32

The figure and sky are well preserved; abrasion in the landscape is concealed by a toned varnish. The inscription and date are in good condition. Microscopic examination reveals that the woman was painted first and that the background was carefully filled in around the figure. Given the sequence of painting and the absence of adjustments that would have better integrated the figure and the landscape, it seems most likely that the portrait and the setting were painted by different artists.

The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931. 32.100.10

Numerous names have been proposed in connection with this attractive portrait of a woman in quietly elegant attire, and it has been noted convincingly that the landscape must have been painted by another hand.¹ Such a collaboration was fairly common during the 1630s and 1640s, especially in Haarlem and nearby. For example, in a painting of the mid-1640s in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen (inv. 883), the full-length portrait of a couple attributed to the Amsterdam figure painter Simon Kick (ca. 1617–1668) was provided with a broad landscape background by Salomon van Ruysdael (q.v.).² A small portrait of a woman in the Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels (inv. 3692), by an unknown artist, is set in a rustic landscape attributed to the Haarlem painter Jacob van Moscher (active ca. 1635–55).³ Other portraitists, including Herman Doncker (act. 1633–50) and his colleagues in Enkhuizen, accepted the challenge of adding the landscape setting themselves.⁴ The decision appears to have been ill-advised in most cases, but the alternative in this West Friesian location was to leave town in search of a suitable specialist.

The leading authority on Dutch portraiture, Rudolf Ekkart, studied the Museum’s picture in 1988, and subsequently, at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, reviewed the oeuvres of artists who worked in a comparable manner. He is unable to suggest an author, and of course it is quite possible that the portrait was painted by an artist who is unrecorded or not identified with any known work.⁵ The general similarity to portraits by Doncker is intriguing, but his figures are usually less well modeled than this one, and his costumes less finely described.⁶ For now, the painter of this portrait must remain anonymous, although he or she probably worked in the area of Amsterdam and Haarlem, to judge from the styles of both the figure and the landscape.

When the painting was in the celebrated collection of Charles Crews and in that of Michael Friedsam, it was considered to be by Thomas de Keyser (q.v.), the first artist many students of Dutch art would mention in regard to small, full-length portraits painted in Holland during the first half of the seventeenth century. In December 1935, curator Harry Wehle changed the ascription from Attributed to Thomas de Keyser to Isaak Luttichuyts (1616–1679), evidently in response to Schmidt-Degener’s oral opinion given at the Museum several months earlier. Wilhelm Martin agreed with the attribution to Luttichuyts when he saw the work in 1938, but Otto Benesch, visiting in 1940, rejected the idea and cited a similar portrait by Govert Flinck (q.v.).⁷ The case for Luttichuyts was dealt a stronger blow in 1946, when William Valentiner, who had published a monographic article on the artist, dismissed the attribution, maintaining that the work was too early to have been made by him.⁸ A year later, Julius Weitzner and “an English dealer” orally ascribed the picture to “one Donck,” according to a note in the curatorial files. The suggestion probably was inspired by a painting now in the National Gallery, London, A Family Group (Jan van Hensbeeck and His Wife, Maria Knech, with an Infant?), signed “GDonck.”⁹ That panel depicts a Dutch family of the 1630s, full-length on a similar scale, and set in a landscape (which differs considerably in style from that in the present picture). Although Donck remains nearly unknown to the present day, the Museum’s attribution was changed to Gerard Donck in 1949.¹⁰ For reasons left unexplained, curator John Walsh reassigned the portrait to Luttichuyts in 1973. Ekkart’s rejection of that artist in 1988 was sufficiently compelling to change the attribution in the same year.¹¹

The woman wears an underbelt (onderwier) to which a decorative cord and tassels are attached.¹² Her yellow “purse” is actually a wicker basket, of a design that was especially popu-
lar in the mid-1630s. In Donck’s double portrait in London (mentioned above), such a basket is open on the ground and filled with fruit. Of course, Donck was less concerned with demonstrating the container’s utility than with the woman’s fertility, as demonstrated also by her small child.\textsuperscript{13}

Some landscape settings in Dutch portraiture include symbolic motifs,\textsuperscript{14} while others appear to have none. In the present picture, many scholars would see the broken tree on the left as nothing more than a picturesque motif, while others might consider it a reminder of transience and its new leaves as a symbol of immortality.\textsuperscript{15} It is possible that a pendant male portrait existed, perhaps with some telling motif in the background.\textsuperscript{16} However, the great majority of Dutch portraits of couples with landscape backgrounds are single pictures, not pendants, and it seems likely that the Friedsam panel never had a mate.

1. For example, by Stechow (see Refs.), and by Stephanie Dickey when she was a research fellow at the Museum (memo dated December 12, 1983).

2. Stechow 1975, p. 21 n. 7, accepts the attribution to Van Ruysdael, but erroneously describes the picture (on wood, 29/4 x 41/4 in. [76 x 106.5 cm]) as dating from the mid-1630s. Both the male and female costumes indicate a later date.

3. Beck 1901, p. 332, no. 918. The woman’s costume suggests a date in the 1640s.


5. In Lunsingh Scheurleer, Fock, and Van Dissel 1986–92, vol. 52, p. 11, Willemijn Fock refers to 445 painters included in Leiden inventories of the seventeenth century, of whom “many” are now almost or completely unknown. As noted in Goosens 2001, p. 19, the list of local figure-painting specialists runs to fifteen pages in the description of Haarlem published by Schrevelius in 1648.


7. These opinions are recorded in notes in the curatorial files. For a work of this type by Flink, dated 1646, see Haarlem 1986a, no. 28, and Rotterdam 1988, no. 8.

8. W. R. Valentiner, in a letter to the Museum, dated April 12, 1946. See Valentiner 1938. Among the most comparable portraits by Luttichuys are a pair of 1644 in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (ibid., figs. 19, 20). There is little resemblance in execution.

9. MacLaren/Brown 1991, pp. 104–5, pl. 89. See also the portrait of a couple in a landscape signed “GDonck,” in the Landesmuseum, Mainz, which is reproduced and discussed in Snakenbroek 1997, pp. 132–33.

10. Note on the catalogue cards, dated June 8, 1949, and initialed by curator Elizabeth Gardner. A handwritten note on the back of an old photograph in the curatorial files reads that “HBW & MS [Harry Wehle and Margaretta Salinger] think this [Donck] seems pretty good. Mr. [Horst] Gerson agrees Donck is near.”

11. Rudolf Ekkart, report dated November 3, 1988. In addition to Luttichuys, Donck, and Doncker, the following artists, and others too dissimilar to mention, have been considered in connection with the Museum’s painting: Pieter van den Bos or Bosch (ca. 1613–after 1665), Pieter Duyfhuysen (1608–1677; see Van de Watering 1987), Isaac van Hooren (d. 1651/52; see Rencrks 1953), and Jan Olis (ca. 1610–1676). See also Haarlem 1986a, p. 33, figs. *20a and *20b (by Hendrick Pot [1580–1657]), and nos. 25, 26, 49, 51. In Washington–Detroit 2004–5, pp. 7, 52–54, 77, some of the better-known artists who painted this type of small portrait are cited in connection with Gerard ter Borch (q.v).

12. Compare the example with more useful attachments discussed in Newark–Denver 2001–2, no. 24.

13. See MacLaren/Brown 1991, p. 105, on this point and for the most relevant literature.

14. See, for example, Haarlem 1986a, nos. 20, 25.


16. As in the pair of portrait drawings, with discontinuous landscape settings, signed by Guilliam de Heer and dated 1634 (Groninger Museum, Groningen; Haarlem 1986a, no. 23).

REFERENCES: Valentiner 1928a, p. 6, as by Thomas de Keyser, “shows the artist at his height,” while the landscape reveals the influence of Van Goyen; F. Robinson in Saint Petersburg–Atlanta 1975, p. 30 (under no. 15), as by Luttichuys, notes the similar costume in a portrait attributed to Pieter van den Bos; Stechow 1975, p. 21 n. 7, considers the landscape in this picture “Ruysdael-like” but too awkward to be by him; Baejter 1980, vol. 1, p. 111, listed as by Luttichuys; P. Sutton 1986, p. 184, mentioned, as by Luttichuys; Baejter 1995, p. 208, as by Dutch Painter, dated 1636.


EX COLL.: Charles T. D. Crews, London and Billingbear Park, Workingham, Berkshire (until 1915; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, July 1–2, 1915, no. 41, as by Thomas de Keyser, to the London dealer Horace Buttery); [Ehrich Galleries, New York, until 1977; sold to Kleinberger]; [F. Kleinberger, New York, 1947; sold to Friedsam on June 9, 1917, for $8,000]; Michael Friedsam, New York (1917–d. 1931); The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.10
DUTCH PAINTER

Probably second quarter of the 17th century

228. Two Musicians

Oil on canvas, 39 x 48% in. (99 x 123.5 cm)

Dutch paintings in the Robert Lehman Collection are catalogued by Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann in The Robert Lehman Collection, II (Sterling et al. 1998).

The late Leonard Slatkes, a leading scholar of the Caravagesque movement in the Netherlands, and especially of Dirck van Baburen (ca. 1594/95–1624), stated flatly in his 1965 monograph on the artist that “this painting has nothing whatsoever to do with Baburen.” Nonetheless, the old attribution was maintained by the Museum until as recently as 1995. Haverkamp-Begemann concluded that the picture was painted by a Utrecht Caravaggist “who was particularly impressed by Baburen’s work.”

Slatkes and others have also described the well-known Flute Player, of 1621 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel), by Hendrick ter Brugghen (q.v.) as a direct model for the figure on the left. Although the similarity is obvious, so are the numerous differences, to the point that it may be doubted that the artist had Ter Brugghen in mind. There are a great number of similar figures in works by Utrecht painters, and in some by artists active in other Dutch cities. The composition could depend on a work or works now unknown: a painting with two or more figures, a pair of single-figure pictures, or unrelated single-figure paintings. In expression as well as style, the picture is strongly reminiscent of Baburen, who was inclined to confront figures abruptly, as here. Thus, Slatkes’s dismissive remark may be considered an exaggeration, focusing on the question of actual execution. The painting is by a Dutch artist working in the style and spirit of Baburen, probably during the second quarter of the century.

4. Ibid., p. 126, considers the figure “freely copied” after the Flute Player, which is reproduced by Haverkamp-Begemann as fig. 28.1. See also ibid., p. 128, text and n. 4.


229. A Young Woman in an Interior

Oil on wood, 17 x 13½ in. (43.2 x 35.2 cm)

The painting is in good condition. Triangular pieces of oak have been attached to the corners, returning the panel to a rectangle.

Bequest of Annette B. McFadden, 1971 1971.186

Despite this small picture's reputation as a Rembrandt in the era of Wilhelm Bode (see Refs. and Exhibited below), the work is by a minor master of the Leiden school whose identity will probably never be discovered. A number of predictable attributions have been proposed in the past—for example, to Herman Doncker (act. 1633–50)—but none have proved convincing or even plausible. The portrait specialist Rudolf Ekkart concurs with this view, and has raised the question of whether the painting might be a copy of a better work. The hypothesis would be consistent with the apparent gap in time between, on the one hand, the style of the woman's costume and of the painting itself and, on the other, dendrochronological dating of the wood support. The stylistic evidence suggests a date of about 1632–35, while the physical evidence indicates use of the panel in the 1640s or later. It would not, however, be unusual for the figure's costume to be a decade out of date. Nor would it be surprising that a style recalling Rembrandt and his circle in the early to mid-1630s (for example, Rembrandt's Portrait of a Couple in an Interior, dated 1633, in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston) would still be employed by a lesser artist in Leiden during the 1640s. In the present writer's opinion, the picture is probably a somewhat old-fashioned portrait painted in the 1640s.

While the popularity of small full-length portraits in the Netherlands need not be addressed here (see the preceding entry, and that for De Keyser's A Musician and His Daughter; Pl. 100), it should be noted that genre-like portraits were fairly common in Leiden during this period. In the Museum's picture, the young woman appears to have just entered the room (the curved paneling seen through the doorway suggests a circular staircase), and pauses before a table on which there is an open vanity box. The Gardner Rembrandt, mentioned above, has a similar sense of a private moment interrupted, and an analogous setting. Similar works were produced in the circle of Gerrit Dou (q.v.) during the mid-1630s.7

1. On Bode and his protégés, see Scallen 2004, chaps. 1–3.
2. On Doncker, see the preceding entry. The artist was mentioned in 1680 by visiting curators from England and Holland, but in a speculative manner that discourages naming them here.
4. Dendrochronological report by Peter Klein, October 2, 1995. A darkened area to the right of the head and collar might suggest that the figure was revised. However, technical examination (in 2005) has revealed that this is not the case.
7. See, for example, Sunowski 1991–94, vol. 1, nos. 298, 299. The Dou specialist Ronni Baer agrees with the present writer that neither of these two paintings can be accepted as by that artist.

References: Dutuit 1885, p. 19, lists the painting as Une Jeune Hollandaise by Rembrandt in the 1681 Leroy d'Etiolles sale (see Ex Coll.); Bode 1890, p. 207, as one of the rare small full-length portraits by Rembrandt in the Berlin exhibition of 1890, revealing Thomas de Keyser's influence, and notes the special interest of the young artist in problems of illumination; É. Michel 1893, pp. 142, 531–52, as by Rembrandt about 1633–34, owned by James Simon in Berlin; É. Michel 1894, vol. 2, p. 243, as by Rembrandt, Portrait of a Young Lady, about 1654, owned by James Simon; Bode 1897–1906, vol. 1 (1897), p. 138 (under no. 52), p. 140, no. 55 (ill.), as by Rembrandt about 1650, and suggests the model may be the same as in the bust-length Portrait of a Young Girl in the collection of A. Bredius, The Hague; A. Rosenberg 1909, p. 52 (ill.), as by Rembrandt about 1651; Baetjer 1980, vol. 1, p. 52, as by a Dutch painter, unknown, second quarter of the seventeenth century; Van Thiel 1992, p. 74, no. 13 (ill.), as in the 1898 Amsterdam exhibition, location now unknown; Baetjer 1995, p. 298, as by a Dutch painter, second quarter of the seventeenth century.

Ex coll.: Six collection, Amsterdam (until 1828; sale, 1828, as by Rembrandt); Dr. Leroy d’Étiolles, Paris (until 1861; his estate sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, February 21–22, 1881, no. 95, as “Une jeune Hollandaise,” by Rembrandt, for FFr 1,828); [Sedelmeyer, Paris, until 1872; their sale, Künstlerhaus, Vienna, December 20–21, 1872, no. 140]; [Alexander Posony, Vienna; Dr. James Simon, Berlin (by 1890—at least 1909)]; [A. B. Antik, Stockholm, by 1919–20; sold to Knoedler]; [Knoedler, New York, 1920–26; sold to McFadden]; Philip G. McFadden, New York (1926—at least 1950); Annette B. (Mrs. Philip G.) McFadden, New York (until d. 1971); Bequest of Annette B. McFadden, 1971 1971.186

1. On Simon as collector, see Girardet 1982.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Gift or Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>Jacob Vosmaer, A View with Flowers</td>
<td>Margaretta Haverman</td>
<td>Gift of George H. Heura, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>Pieter Coen, The Parrot</td>
<td>Jacob van der Heyden</td>
<td>Rogers Fund, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.19</td>
<td>Johannes Lingelbach, Battle Scene</td>
<td>Aert van der Neer</td>
<td>Gift of George H. Heura, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.23</td>
<td>Jan Davidsz. de Heem, Still Life with a Glass and Oysters</td>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Rogers Fund, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.34</td>
<td>Style of Rembrandt, Man in Armor (Armet?)</td>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Rogers Fund, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.98</td>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael, Marine</td>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Rogers Fund, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.108</td>
<td>Dirck Hals, A Banquet</td>
<td>Willem van Leen</td>
<td>Gift of George H. Heura, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.110</td>
<td>Quirijn Brekkenkam, The Seamstress</td>
<td>Willem van Leen</td>
<td>Gift of George H. Heura, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.115</td>
<td>Koelof van Vries, The Pigeon House</td>
<td>Willem van Leen</td>
<td>Gift of George H. Heura, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.127</td>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael, View of the Town of Alkmaar</td>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Rogers Fund, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.160</td>
<td>Matthys Naive, The Newborn Baby</td>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Rogers Fund, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.170</td>
<td>Jan Victors, Abraham's Parting from the Family of Lot</td>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Rogers Fund, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.149.2</td>
<td>Adrian van Hennon, Portrait of a Woman</td>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Rogers Fund, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.1203</td>
<td>Simon de Vlissing, Calm Sea</td>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Rogers Fund, 1906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Index of Paintings by Accession Number**

The accession number appears in the left column, followed by the plate number, the artist's name, and the painting's title.
1930
Theodore M. Davis Collection, Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, 1930.
30.09.257 170
Michiel van Miereveld, Portrait of a Woman with a Lace Collar
30.09.260 127
Emanuel Murant, The Old Castle
30.09.268 39
Willem Drost, The Sibyl
30.09.269 10
Ferdinand Bol, Portrait of a Woman

1932
Style of Rembrandt, Head of Christ
Mr. and Mrs. Isaac D. Fletcher Collection, Bequest of Isaac D. Fletcher, 1932

1933
Nicolae Marcu, The Lacemaker

Girolamo Pierpont Morgan, 1937

Gerard ter Borch, A Young Woman at Her Toilet with a Maid
Aert van der Neer, Landscape at Sunset
Gabriel Metsu, The Visit to the Nursery

1934
Bequest of William K. Vanderbilt, 1920

32.134.5 119
Copy after Gabriel Metsu, Tavern Scene
Bequest of William H. Herriman, 1920

1936
Attributed to Adriaen van Ostade, Man with a Tankard

1939
Lodewijk Tieling, The Ark
Gift of James DeLancey Verplanck and John Bayard Rodgers Verplanck, 1939

1940
Gerrit Dou, An Evening School
Bequest of Lillian M. Ellis, 1940

1941
Given in memory of Felix M. Warburg by his wife and children, 1941

1943
Gerard de Lairesse, Apollo and Aurora
Gift of Samuel H. Kress, 1937

1944
Gift of Samuel E. and Ellen G. Rionda, 1943

1945
Rembrandt van Rijn, Portrait of a Woman with a Fan, 1553
Gift of Helen Swift Neilson, 1943

1946
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
Rembrandt van Rijn, Herman Doomer
1945 45.146.3 31 Jan van Goyen, *The Pelvis Gate near Utrecht* Gift of Francis Neilson, 1945

60.71.35 46 Govert Flinck, *A Young Woman as a Shepherdess* ("Sackia as Flora")

60.71.16 152 Style of Rembrandt, *Study Head of an Old Man*

1946 46.11.3 195 Jan Steen, *The Leverick Maiden* Bequest of Helen Swift Neilson, 1945

61.154 226 Unidentified Dutch Painter, *Sara de Peyster at the Age of Two-and-a-Half* Gift of Livingston L. Short and Anna Livingston Jones, 1961

61.198 151 Rembrandt van Rijn, *Aristotle with a Bust of Homer* Purchase, special contributions and funds given or bequeathed by friends of the Museum, 1961

1949 The Jules Bache Collection, 1949

49.7.33 65 Frans Hals, *Portrait of a Man, possibly Nicolaus Pietersz. Duyst van Voorhout*

49.7.34 62 Frans Hals, *Portrait of a Bearded Man with a Ruff*

49.7.35 152 Rembrandt van Rijn, *The Standard Bearer (Floris Sopo)*

49.7.36 171 Style of Rembrandt, *Man in a Red Cloak*

49.7.37 174 Style of Rembrandt, *Christ with a Staff*

49.7.38 17 Gerard ter Borch, *Curiosity*

49.7.40 207 Imitator of Johannes Vermeer, *A Young Woman Reading*

49.107 28 Pieter Claesz, *Still Life with a Skull and Writing Quill*

Rogers Fund, 1949

1964 64.5.1 53 Jan van Goyen, *Castle by a River* Anonymous Gift, 1964

64.5.2 78 Jan van der Heyden, *The Huis ten Bosch at The Hague and Its Formal Garden (View from the South)* Anonymous Gift, 1964

64.5.3 79 Jan van der Heyden, *The Huis ten Bosch at The Hague and Its Formal Garden (View from the East)* Anonymous Gift, 1964

64.5.4 100 Thomas de Keyser, *A Musician and His Daughter* Anonymous Gift, 1964

64.5.5 141 Rembrandt van Rijn, *Portrait of a Man* Gift of Mrs. Lincoln Ellsworth, in memory of Lincoln Ellsworth, 1964

1950 50.35 216 Jan Weenix, *Gamepiece with a Dead Heron* ("Falteron's Bag") Rogers Fund, 1950

50.145.22 81 Meyndert Hobbema, *Woodland Road* Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950

50.145.33 156 Rembrandt van Rijn, *Lienen Willemus van Copenbol* Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950

50.178 469 Willem Kalf, *Still Life with Fruit, Glassware, and a Winebowl* Maria DeWitt Jesup Fund, 1953

53.115 115 Orms Marsenas van Schrieck, *Still Life with Poppy, Insects, and Reptiles* Rogers Fund, 1953

1955 53.118 161 Style of Rembrandt, *Rembrandt as a Young Man* Bequest of Evander B. Schley, 1952

53.111 97 Willem Kalf, *Still Life with Fruit, Glassware, and a Winebowl* Maria DeWitt Jesup Fund, 1953

53.155 115 Orms Marsenas van Schrieck, *Still Life with Poppy, Insects, and Reptiles* Rogers Fund, 1953

1956 56.228 25 Hendrick ter Brugghen, *The Crucifixion with the Virgin and Saint John* Funds from various donors, 1956

56.228 25 Hendrick ter Brugghen, *The Crucifixion with the Virgin and Saint John* Funds from various donors, 1956

1957 57.20.1 91 Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Elder, *Portrait of a Man* Gift of Mrs. J. E. Spingarn, 1957

57.20.2 94 Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen the Elder, *Portrait of a Woman* Gift of Mrs. J. E. Spingarn, 1957

57.68 11 Ferdinand Bol, *Petronella Eliau with a Basket of Fruit* Purchase, George T. Delacorte Jr. Gift, 1957


58.144 89 Pieter de Hooch, *Pouring the Hostess* Gift of Stuart Borchard and Evelyn B. Metzger, 1958

1959 59.22.17 156 Style of Paulus Moreelse, *Portrait of a Young Boy* Bequest of Alexandrine Sinsheimer, 1918

1960 60.35.1 95 Attributed to Pieter van Slingelandt, *Portrait of a Man* Bequest of Rupert L. Joseph, 1959

60.55.1 184 Salomon van Ruyssdael, *Market by the Seashore* 1959

Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1959

1966 60.71.1 123 Frans van Mieris the Elder, *The Serenade*

60.71.14 168 Style of Rembrandt, *Christ and the Woman of Samaria* Bequest of Josephine Bieber, in memory of her husband, Siegfried Bieber, 1970

1970 70.33.13 139 Pieter Quast, *A Party of Merrymakers*

1971 70.35.7 32 Axelbert Croy, *Landscape with the Flight into Egypt*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Jacques de Gheyn the Elder, Vanitas Still Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1974.109</td>
<td>Godfried Schalcken, Cephalus and Proserpina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1974.368</td>
<td>Rogers Fund, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1974.368</td>
<td>Abraham Hondius, Christ among the Doctors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gift of Dr. and Mrs. Carl F. Cuticchia, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Lehman Collection, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975.1.321</td>
<td>228 Unidentified Dutch Painter, Two Musicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975.1.139</td>
<td>103 Style of Rembrandt, Portrait of a Man Seated in an Armchair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975.1.140</td>
<td>160 Rembrandt van Rijn, Gerard de Lairesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975.1.141</td>
<td>18 Gerard ter Borch, Sergeant Master Jan van der Nuren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975.1.142</td>
<td>19 Gerard ter Borch, Margaretha van Haeckelen, Wife of Jan van der Nuren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975.1.143</td>
<td>90 Pieter de Hooch, A Couple Playing Cards, and a Servant Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975.1.244</td>
<td>87 Pieter de Hooch, Leisure Time in an Elegant Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975.3.77</td>
<td>176 Style of Rembrandt, Man in a Beret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gift of Charles S. Payson, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hendrick van Vliet, Interior of the Oude Kerk, Delft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gift of Clarence Dillon, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bequest of Harry G. Sperling, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976.100.20</td>
<td>210 David Vinckboons, Forest Landscape with Two of Christ’s Miracles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976.100.22</td>
<td>136 Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy, Man with a Celestial Globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976.100.33</td>
<td>45 Barent Fabritius, Abraham Dyinging Hagar and Ishmael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976.100.45</td>
<td>84 Pieter de Hooch, A Woman and Two Men in an Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979.396.1</td>
<td>205 Johannes Vermeer, Study of a Young Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, in Memory of Theodore Rousseau Jr., 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1980.4</td>
<td>103 Philips Koninck, An Extensive Wooded Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase, Mr. and Mrs. David T. Schiff and George T. Delcoort Jr. Gifts, special funds, and Bequest of Mary Cushing Fosburgh and other gifts and bequests, by exchange, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980.203.5</td>
<td>154 Jacob Ochtervelt, The Love Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Mendelssohn, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1981.23</td>
<td>198 Matthias Stom, Old Woman Praying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1981.239</td>
<td>Gift of Ian Woodner, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1981.239</td>
<td>Jan Eetels the Younger, Conversation Piece (The Sense of Smell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1981.317</td>
<td>Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Bertram L. Pedell, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1981.317</td>
<td>Frans Post, A Brazilian Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase, Rogers Fund, special funds, James S. Deely Gift, and Gift of Edna H. Sachs and other gifts and bequests, by exchange, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1982.317</td>
<td>205 The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1982.317</td>
<td>144 Attributed to David Bailly, Portrait of a Man, Possibly a Botanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1982.317</td>
<td>14 Gerard ter Borch, Van Meterkerken Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1982.317</td>
<td>106 Jan Steen, The Domestic Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1982.317</td>
<td>117 Gabriel Metsu, A Woman Seated at a Window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1982.317</td>
<td>8 Cornelis Bisschop, A Young Woman and a Cavalier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bartholomeus Breenbergh, The Preaching of John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase, The Annenberg Foundation Gift, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel van Hoogebergen, The Annunciation of the Virgin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase, Rogers Fund and Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joachim Wtewael, The Golden Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase, The Edward Joseph Gallagher III Memorial Collection, Edward J. Gallagher Jr. Bequest, Lila Acheson Wallace Gift, special funds; and Gift of George Blumenthal, Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, The Collection of Giovanni E. Morosini, presented by his daughter Giulia, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Nathaniel Spear Jr., Gift of Mrs. William M. Haup, from the collection of Mrs. James B. Haggins, special funds, gifts, and bequests, by exchange, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emanuel de Witte, Interior of the Oude Kerk, Delft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004.393</td>
<td>111 Nicolaas Maes, Portrait of a Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gift of Lila and Herman Shickman, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>From the Collection of Rita and Frits Markus, Bequest of Rita Markus, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005.331.1</td>
<td>6 Christoffel van den Berge, A Winter Landscape with Ice Skaters and one Imaginary Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005.331.2</td>
<td>45 Jan van Goyen, A Beach with Fishing Boats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005.331.3</td>
<td>14 Jan van Goyen, View of The Hague from the Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005.331.4</td>
<td>73 Willem Claesz. Heda, Still Life with Oysters, a Silver Tazza, and Glassware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005.331.5</td>
<td>98 Thomas de Keyser, Portrait of a Man with a Shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005.331.6</td>
<td>99 Thomas de Keyser, Portrait of a Woman with a Bagace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005.331.7</td>
<td>170 Style of Rembrandt, Young Woman with a Red Neckless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005.331.8</td>
<td>190 Salomon van Ruysdael, Fishing Boats on a River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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