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Director’s Foreword

Rembrandt—the mere mention of his art nowadays raises the issue of authenticity. As famous paintings have been withdrawn from the canon of his autograph work, journalists have played up the sensational news with stories of fakes or lost monetary value. The public, for which the very name Rembrandt has been synonymous with the word masterpiece, may well be perplexed about the processes by which the master’s authorship can be established. The purpose of the present exhibition is to demystify the kind of research that goes on at a museum like the Metropolitan by demonstrating the different approaches that art historians and art conservators take in reaching their conclusions.

The Metropolitan Museum possesses one of the most significant groups of paintings, drawings, and etchings by the master, his pupils, and imitators—about eighteen paintings ascribed by common consent to Rembrandt, and about twenty-five that were once thought to be by him but are now recognized as works by pupils, followers, or, in a few cases, later imitators, as well as a large number of authentic drawings and etchings along with some problematic examples in these media. We have, therefore, limited the exhibition to the Museum’s holdings. This has permitted us to focus more closely upon the works presented than would have been possible with loans from other museums. The timing of the exhibition, in the fall of 1995, was determined by the availability of space in the Museum’s calendar, not by the marking of an anniversary or the coincidence with any special occasion.

As a matter of policy, the Museum weighs all arguments in its cataloguing and labeling; it does not change a traditional attribution unless serious reservations are expressed from credible quarters. The terminology employed in the summary catalogue European Paintings in The Metropolitan Museum of Art—Attributed to, Workshop of, Style of/Follower of, and Copy after—follows international usage. In the present volumes each writer has expressed his or her views with more subtle gradations and not always in agreement with one another. The differences of opinion underline the still imprecise nature of the state of knowledge today of the greatest artist of the Dutch school. Thus, the catalogue and the exhibition represent work in progress, and visitors will be able to test their own reactions by judging original works of art against the evidence of the didactic material on display.

This first volume of the catalogue was compiled by Hubert von Sonnenburg, whose observations result from decades of first-hand experience with Rembrandts. He joined the staff of the Museum in 1959 and worked here until 1974, when he left to direct the Doerner Institute in Munich, the art-science laboratory and restoration department of the vast Bavarian state paintings collections, the Bayerische Staats-
From 1987 to 1991 he also served as Generaldirektor of the Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen. In 1991 he returned to the Metropolitan Museum as Sherman Fairchild Chairman of the Department of Paintings Conservation. Throughout his career he has examined a great number of paintings by Rembrandt and by members of his circle, many of which he has treated. Not only his intimate knowledge of the physical properties of the paintings but also his substantial art-historical background inform his text.

Philippe de Montebello

*Director*

*The Metropolitan Museum of Art*
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Notes to the Reader

Authorship is indicated in the headings of the catalogue entries. The terminology used in these headings and in the texts is defined as follows: Rembrandt means by the master himself; Rembrandt (?) suggests that further examination of the picture is necessary before it can be assigned to the master with certainty; circle of Rembrandt identifies the artist responsible as an advanced pupil who probably worked closely with the master but nevertheless developed a personal style; follower of Rembrandt indicates either a pupil or an independent artist who was associated temporarily with the master and drew inspiration from him; studio copy after Rembrandt is a copy produced by a student in the master's studio; Rembrandt forgery is an imitation in Rembrandt's painting style done with the intention to deceive, with Rembrandt's signature added by the imitator.

In the headings signed and dated indicate that the signature and date are presumed to be autograph. Inscribed suggests that the signature or other information is not authentic. Doubtful signatures sometimes occur on genuine works.

The paintings entries in the catalogue section of volume II cover all of the works in the exhibition and are numbered consecutively, from 1 to 55. The entries in the present volume examine a selection of paintings in the exhibition; their numbering coincides with that in volume II and begins with 3. Figures in the text are numbered consecutively and begin with 1 in each volume. Unless otherwise noted, the figure number listed refers to the number in the volume in which it is cited. Abbreviated references to books and articles are cited in parentheses in the text; full references are given in the bibliography. The roman numerals noted in the parentheses refer to the section of the bibliography in which the reference is listed.
Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt

IN THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART

Paintings: Problems and Issues
Fig. 1. Rembrandt. *Young Girl Leaning on a Window Sill*, 1645. Oil on canvas, 30½ × 24½ in. (77.5 × 62.5 cm). Dulwich Picture Gallery, London
Illusion and Deception

Rembrandt’s art has had unrivaled appeal. His accessible and easily imitated manner encouraged many lesser painters to try their hands at his style. An unknown number, among them the more gifted ones, were trained to do so in Rembrandt’s studio. The resulting deceptions were numerous and long lived. It is unlikely that many of the problems regarding Rembrandt’s authorship will ever be solved. This ambiguity provides a stimulus for study and discussion and is therefore not altogether regrettable.

No other seventeenth-century painter has been imitated to the degree Rembrandt was from the very beginning of his career. In his portraits the postures are often modeled on traditional formal compositions invented by Raphael or Titian, but the people portrayed are astonishingly personalized. How Rembrandt, the equally inventive painter, draftsman, and etcher, achieved these profoundly human characterizations by combining the possibilities of these different techniques intellectually and practically must have puzzled and fascinated his close followers. Some tried harder than others, but the results often show that Rembrandt’s subtle means were not properly understood and were therefore only superficially captured. One can only speculate to what extent contemporaries were able to distinguish the greater subtleties in the master’s work as compared to that of his best pupils. Roger de Piles (1635–1709), the French art historian and theorist, valued genius above formalized rule, and despite his great admiration for Rubens, he appreciated Rembrandt’s qualities, especially his ability to deceive the eye. This regard is substantiated by the well-known anecdote de Piles relates in his Cours de peinture (1708). Rembrandt is said to have placed a painted portrait of his servant in a window that looked out on a street; the passersby thought they saw a real woman, and the trick was detected only a few days later. De Piles makes the story more believable by stating that he traced the painting and acquired it for his gallery. Several paintings fitting this description have survived, and it is not certain which one he actually owned. Michiel Roscam Abbé found a grain of truth in the anecdote and concluded that Young Girl Leaning on a Window Sill (fig. 1) might be one of Rembrandt’s experiments with trompe l’oeil.

The systematic purification of Rembrandt’s oeuvre in the last twenty-five years must have dealt a blow to scholars of the older generation who saw many of their idols removed from their pedestals. This upheaval was perhaps made more painful by the fact that the deattributors’ arguments were essentially based on traditional art-historical principles with only occasional use of auxiliary technical and analytical methods of examination.

Now-shattered illusions had elevated the works created by the many imitators of Rembrandt’s style who had expanded his already substantial oeuvre. Such
outstanding and popular paintings as the *Man in a Golden Helmet* (fig. 2) were no longer regarded as Rembrandt’s work. Some admirers cherish the hope that someday one or another of such alluringly deceptive works may be reinstated. The steady stream of publications focusing on attribution problems long considered closed issues testifies to the not-easily-shaken confidence of some Rembrandt scholars. Rembrandt has been studied for more than three and a half centuries, and there have been notable scrutinies of his oeuvre (for example, the first Corpus by Bode and Hofstede de Groot on the occasion of the tricentenary [1906], which was a particularly careful and scholarly effort). One may perhaps view with a certain irony the taking up of these well-examined issues again in our own time by the Rembrandt Research Project (RRP).

Some of the RRP’s apparent success—compared with that of earlier, more modest undertakings—was achieved because its investigators have been able to study literally all of Rembrandt’s works in the original (thanks to financial support from various sources and the ease of present-day travel). Moreover, the members of the RRP have had the advantage of steadily advancing knowledge about materials and techniques. Despite all of today’s conveniences, a direct comparison of the paintings under discussion in a collection or an exhibition is still the most desirable circumstance for profitable study (see fig. 3).
A most difficult and frustrating task for scholars is the search for authors of works previously believed to be by the master (this exercise is less consequential for paintings of minor importance long agreed to be school works).

Rembrandt's students looked at one another's works and sometimes formed small groups, such as the Dordrecht painters. The close resemblance of subject matter and color scheme among the pictures produced by these artists inevitably caused a great deal of confusion. A case in point is the Old Woman Cutting Her Nails (no. 36), whose authorship shifted in the 1960s from Rembrandt to Nicolaes Maes, the leading Dordrecht painter. This attribution was recently questioned by a few scholars, who put forward two other representatives of that school. For others, however, the Old Woman remains the standard reference for Rembrandtesque paintings in the style of Maes. Unanimous agreements on attributions are rare because of a lack of hard facts.

The continuing reduction of Rembrandt's oeuvre is matched by an increased effort to find names for rejected works. Werner Sumowski's monumental collection of paintings and drawings of the Rembrandt school is a welcome but seductive source for scholars in search of authors.

Photographic reproductions cannot be taken at face value. Unless they are followed up by examination of the originals, attributions based on reproductions are
most unreliable and merely express subjective evaluations. So far there are only a few firm cases where a student’s name can be given to a high-quality Rembrandt-esque work on the basis of his own signed and dated works. This is not surprising, because as a rule in their early works students under Rembrandt’s immediate influence tended to conceal their individual features. This is especially true of paintings in Rembrandt’s style from the late 1650s and 1660s. There are, however, exceptions—notably several more ambitious compositions that are now convincingly given to Willem Drost. A most remarkable student of Rembrandt, Drost has recently received well-deserved if rather modish attention because of the RRP, which seems inclined to add even *The Polish Rider* (fig. 4) to its oeuvre. (The Museum has a rare dated portrait by Drost [no. 46, vol. II].) Alfred von Wurzbach (*Niederländisches Künstler-Lexicon* [Vienna and Leipzig, 1906–11], vol. 1, p. 573) listed *The Polish Rider* as a work by Arent de Gelder, who was then considered the more prominent Rembrandt student.

The Museum’s collection has been examined for more than half a century by visiting scholars, whose opinions are diligently preserved in the archives. The increase in publications dealing with Rembrandt problems means that these resources have by now been stripped to the bone. With its great variety of Rembrandt holdings, the Museum has always supported the endeavors of outside scholars very generously, disclosing all its records and circulating technical material. The most extensive examination of the Metropolitan’s Rembrandts was made during the autoradiography project of 1976 to 1980. On that occasion a considerable number of paint samples for cross sections were taken by Dutch scientists for analysis and interpretation; Joyce Plesters, who examined the *Aristotle* (no. 11, vol. II) at that time, summarized her findings (secs. II and IV, 1982, Ainsworth et al., p. 98). The Museum’s recent reexaminations undertaken for this publication are another, not altogether conclusive attempt to squeeze a few more bits of information from material that has already been exhaustively investigated.

It is not surprising that the two major contributors to this catalogue do not necessarily agree on suggested attributions of students’ works or deattributions of paintings formerly catalogued as authentic. Of the four more or less affirmative attributions proposed by WALTER LEDTKE, two are not shared by the present writer, who in addition does not recognize the generally supported authenticity of the *Portrait of a Woman* of 1633 (no. 5) and rejects unsubstantiated doubts voiced against the authenticity of four Rembrandts.

The visitor to this exhibition should be aware that in the late 1970s both “*The Auctioneer*” (no. 32) and *Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff* (no. 37) were still unanimously accepted as by Rembrandt’s hand. Egbert HAVEKAMP-BEGEMANN first expressed doubts on stylistic grounds before the autoradiography project was underway. As useful as this new method proved in other instances, in these two cases established techniques could have been employed to complement the comparative studies.

In the past a great deal of confusion has been caused by signatures, be they genuine or spurious. Now it is more generally accepted that a Rembrandt signature is not necessarily a proof of authenticity, since the master could very well have signed students’ works and sold them under his name. The dates that accompany numerous signatures, unreliable as they might be, have a certain fascination for scholars who try to fit paintings by Rembrandt and his students alike into a tight chronolo-
gy (of course, there is an off chance that such dates may record the correct year of origin).

Of the paintings in the present exhibition, only in the case of the *Man with a Beard* (no. 42) is it possible to say with confidence that the false Rembrandt signature and date were added by the unknown painter, or rather forger. In the past many Rembrandtesque paintings of uncertain origin were believed to have been created in the eighteenth or early nineteenth century. Recently this once-fashionable conclusion had to be revised because of technical investigations, including those involving the dating of oak panels. With this reduction in the margin of error it appears that the majority of imitation Rembrandt paintings were done in the seventeenth century.

When seen close-up, Rembrandt’s paint surfaces show the most extraordinary traces of applications done with a great variety of brushes, a palette knife, and all kinds of sticks and styluses with blunt points for scratching the still-wet paint. In an obsessed way he seems to have made many haptic and optical experiments on the structure of the paint paste. He had total control of the medium, which was rarely if ever achieved by any of his followers, who certainly tried their hands at his effects. One such attempt is the often-quoted *Bust of Rembrandt* (fig. 5), which was thoroughly examined by an international commission and despite this effort deceived several experts (sec. III, 1963, Müller Hofstede, pp. 65–100). It was
offered to the Metropolitan but was turned down on the advice of the present writer in close cooperation with Theodore Rousseau, then curator of paintings.

The full effect of Rembrandt's surface textures, which as a rule vary within each painting, cannot be entirely appreciated when seen at close range (this is especially true of larger canvases). The Dutch biographer and painter Arnold Houbraken (sec. I, 1718–21, vol. 1, p. 269) believed that Rembrandt did not want his pictures examined closely because when they are seen up close, his "bad" technique is evident. He remarked that Rembrandt kept people away by telling them that "the smell of color will bother you." Houbraken praised Rembrandt and apparently appreciated the illusionary effects he created, but he did not much admire the means of achieving them, especially his impasto. He never discussed other devices Rembrandt used to enhance illusion—for example, placing the sitter's hands in the shadow zone while enlarging them as a sort of optical counterbalance. Instead Houbraken alluded only to Rembrandt's limited skills in painting hands.

The main reason for presenting a series of details of faces and their corresponding
X-ray images in this publication is to demonstrate the relevance of Rembrandt's impasto with regard to questions of authenticity. So far no other method has approached the usefulness of such juxtapositions. The details chosen should be large enough and shown in an intelligible context so that readers will maintain their visual grasp of the work of art as a whole. In this way one never loses sight of the painting's surface and stylistic qualities—in short, its final effect. How this effect was produced from the ground preparation up has to be explored by scientific analytical methods. The many forms of deception encountered during the preparation of this catalogue taught the present writer that, despite closest contact with the original works, it is an illusion to think that any exhibition will provide a definitive response to the Rembrandt/not Rembrandt question.
Fig. 6. Preparation of a cradled wood panel for X radiography.

Fig. 7. X radiograph with cradle evident. Style of Rembrandt. *Study Head of an Old Man, 1630s* (no. 39, vol. II).

Fig. 8. X radiograph with cradle minimized. Style of Rembrandt. *Study Head of an Old Man, 1630s* (no. 39, vol. II). Comparison with fig. 7 shows how the image's readability can be improved by filling the cradle's voids with acrylic resin (fig. 6).
Rembrandt’s individualistic technique continues to fascinate devotees of his works. The unparalleled variety of his paint applications—from his careful early technique to his later rough manner—was commented on even during his lifetime. The many successful imitations of his style and technique suggest that Rembrandt encouraged his students to follow his work closely and that he probably enjoyed their “deceptive” results. Ever since the master’s time, great efforts have been made to distinguish the different hands at work. About 1930, with the beginnings of a scientifically oriented approach, systematic studies of Rembrandt’s surfaces were made with a traveling stereomicroscope. These were first carried out by A. P. Laurie, professor of chemistry with the Royal Academy and author of numerous books on materials of the painter’s craft in Europe and Egypt. He reported on his work at the Rome Conference held by the League of Nations in 1930. A resolution was passed acknowledging the importance of macrophotography (magnified details) as an aid to answering questions of attribution. Two years later Laurie published The Brush-work of Rembrandt and His School (sec. II, 1932), based on his study of collections in London, Edinburgh, Paris, Berlin, Kassel, Dresden, The Hague, and Rotterdam. With the introduction of panchromatic film more accurate enlargements could be made. In his stylistic scrutiny Laurie went a step further; he overlaid details from macrophotographs of established Rembrandts with matching details from pictures whose attribution was uncertain. This manipulative and ultimately misleading use of magnified details was censured by Alan Burroughs, curator at the Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts, because he believed that the scientist Laurie had intruded into the realm of art criticism, which Burroughs considered his domain. Macrophotographs and related comparative photographs documenting paint surfaces under different light conditions remain important elements of the most recent publications. Reflecting the prevailing interdisciplinary approach, they are open to a number of individual interpretations. The same can be said about analytical data, although in a more restricted way.

The late nineteenth-century Morellian principles of distinguishing individual artists through a comparative study of eyes, ears, and hands in their paintings has been revived. High-quality color details of Rembrandt’s portraits, in particular, have been presented in Morellian terms. But such a demonstration may become an irrelevant guessing game when, for example, several pairs of eyes taken out of context are lined up. Such an argument seems to impress the reader too forcefully. It would perhaps be more useful to reproduce faces side by side in color so that they can be compared in a series; this approach is exemplified in figs. 28–71.
X Radiography

Conrad Wilhelm Roentgen made studies of paint samples as early as 1896, only a year after he discovered X rays. In the next years Topler in Dresden and Konig in Frankfurt made X radiographs of paintings. Alexander Faber, a radiologist in Weimar, did pioneering laboratory studies of X radiographs. He established an X-ray method that he patented in 1914. This patent imposed serious restrictions on the use of X radiography in other German museums, and in 1924 the Pinakothek in Munich had to shut down its newly installed equipment. The restrictions were lifted, however, the following year.

An early supporter of X-ray analysis was the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, where the first examinations were carried out in 1916 under the direction of the distinguished art historian Max Dvorak. When André Chéron presented his experiments with X radiographs to the Academy of Sciences in Paris in 1921, he overstated his case and claimed that this technique could definitively establish the approximate age of a painting and its authenticity. Asked to give his opinion in this matter, Wilhelm Bode, then general director of the Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin, stated that such a claim was pure nonsense.

Starting in 1925 with the first X-ray examinations by Burroughs, Harvard University's Fogg Art Museum took a leading role in this field. Encouraged by director Edward W. Forbes, Burroughs began an archive of X radiographs that is now among the most important in the world. Among the Europeans who were at times commissioned by Harvard University were Kurt Wehlte in Germany, Marten de Wild in Holland, Johannes Wilde in Vienna, and Walter Gräff in Munich. The aim was to collect X radiographs of notable pictures, and the two expeditions that the Fogg Art Museum sent in 1928 to the Musée du Louvre in Paris and the Kaiser-Friedrich Museum stimulated European research in this field. In the next year these studies were continued in museums in England and Belgium. Among the museums in the United States that profited greatly from this international cooperation was the Metropolitan Museum. In Burroughs's own words (sec. IV, 1938, p. viii): "The sole claim to priority that friends of the Fogg Museum can justly make about its Research Department is that it was among the first in systematizing and correlating the various scientific tools which came into use during the twentieth century." For Art Criticism from a Laboratory Burroughs (sec. IV, 1938) could choose from a library of nearly thirty-two hundred X radiographs, with Rembrandt having the greatest representation. In his chapter "The Problems in the Rembrandtesque" the Metropolitan's controversial portrait pair of 1632 (nos. 3, 4) was for the first time attributed to a student of Rembrandt. In 1938 there also appeared a groundbreaking dissertation by Christian Wolters (sec. IV, 1938) on the importance of X radiographs in art-historical research. Wolters focused on the subtle evolution of light in Early Netherlandish and German painting as recorded in X radiographs. Regrettably this frequently cited but rarely read standard reference, based on X-ray material provided by Wehlte and Wilde, has never been translated into English.

In 1931 the first X-ray apparatus designed for paintings was produced by Siemens-Reiniger-Weifa and was initially used in the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Kassel. Its Lindemann window (or beryllium window) allowed the operator to view the painting's surface during radiation before selecting a suitable area for the
actual film exposure. There were persistent rumors about alleged serious damages to paintings resulting from X rays, but in 1934 this concern was proved to be unfounded. From then on X radiography increasingly became a standard procedure for examining paintings. Since the 1950s notable archives on Rembrandt have been established by Madeleine Hours at the Louvre (for works in France) and by Stephen Rees Jones Sr. of the Courtauld Institute in London. Since the 1960s the Rembrandt Research Project (RRP) has been collecting X radiographs from throughout the world in its Amsterdam archive. The bibliography in this volume is arranged chronologically, facilitating a quick survey of the history of X radiography.

A small group of X-ray mosaics of paintings has been made for the present exhibition. Stretcher-bar images were eliminated in some cases by placing the film directly on the canvas back. The only disadvantage of this method is that the margins are not entirely recorded; however, information about scalloping or cusping along the canvas edge, the absence of which may indicate a possible reduction of the original canvas, is not always essential. When wood panels are X rayed, legibility may be decreased by cradles and other auxiliary supports. In the past their presence has been partially reduced through tomography (in this X-radiographic process the painting or the X-ray source is rotated during exposure so that theoretically only the part of the painting in closest contact with the film—the paint layers—is in focus). Greater clarity has also been achieved by filling cradle voids with materials whose rate of X-ray absorption is equivalent to that of the wood: Plasticine, metal foil, customized wood blocks, and sugar, to name a few. We use Elvacite 2046 (ICI, Wilmington, Delaware), a granular form of an acrylic resin, which is easy to apply and reusable. The resin is poured into the support, which is dammed at the edges by masking tape (fig. 6). A faint grid from the cradle can still be seen on the X radiograph, but there is a striking increase in legibility (figs. 7, 8).

**Infrared Imaging**

While infrared (IR) wavelengths are invisible to the naked eye, the images they reveal can be captured with various techniques. IR photography using sensitized film has been in commercial use since midcentury. IR reflectography is a method developed in the late 1960s that incorporates a television camera containing an IR-sensitive tube. These methods are especially good for recording graphics and underdrawings executed in carbonaceous black pigments on contrasting white or gray grounds. They prove particularly helpful in the study of Northern European panel paintings of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

During her study of Rembrandt’s paintings in the Louvre, Hours (sec. IV, 1961) stressed the usefulness of IR photography in distinguishing copies and replicas from originals. She pointed out that when the shadow zones of derivative works are viewed under infrared, they appear empty and without depth.

Because of the richness of the oil medium and of organic lakes, often used with umber, many of Rembrandt’s paintings, especially in their more shadowy passages, have darkened over time. For example, the detailed middle ground of the *Stormy Landscape* (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig) is revealed only by IR photography. In the present investigation of Rembrandt paintings IR examinations
were used in only a few instances. IR photography and reflectography revealed preliminary brush sketches, for example, in the dark middle ground of Christ and the Woman of Samaria (no. 14) and in the tree trunk behind the nude in The Toilet of Bathsheba (no. 10, fig. 127).

AUTORADIOGRAPHY

Some of the published results of a pioneering autoradiographic study of the bulk of the Museum's Rembrandt holdings have been included and reevaluated in this study. Autoradiography via neutron activation analysis was carried out from 1976 to 1980 by the Museum and the Chemistry Department of Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York. Panel paintings were excluded because of their fragility and because the paintings had to remain in Brookhaven for as long as two months. In fact, risks and inconveniences account for the reluctance of most museums to engage in such a study. The Staatliche Museum, Berlin, is the only institution continuing this research; its project, which is focused on Rembrandt, is facilitated by the proximity of a nuclear plant.

The examination process is described in detail in Art and Autoradiography: Insights into the Genesis of Paintings by Rembrandt, Van Dyck, and Vermeer (secs. II and IV, 1982, Ainsworth et al.). To summarize, nine autoradiographs are produced for each painting at specified times. The exposed films are evaluated on light boxes of the same type used to view X radiographs (fig. 9); they must, however, be read completely differently. In autoradiographs the elements of the pigments show up as dark areas; in X radiographs denser materials, particularly those paints containing lead white, will show up as white areas of varying intensity.

Of the nine autoradiographs for each painting, the eighth reveals the elements calcium and phosphorus, which are associated with bone black. This pigment was used for the initial sketch that the artist made directly on the grounded canvas or panel. Art historians likened these images to Rembrandt's independent drawings. An interpretation of the autoradiographs was used to confirm a hypothesis that Rembrandt had worked from background to foreground in his paintings. In the present exhibition the eighth autoradiographs of several paintings are shown with X radiographs of the same works; these comparisons show how Rembrandt's initial sketches differ within his oeuvre (see figs. 10, 11, 17, 18).
Fig. 9. Seminar Room. Sherman Fairchild Paintings Conservation Center, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Light boxes illuminating X radiographs and autoradiographs. Images of paintings produced by exposure to X rays and low-energy thermal neutrons are both recorded on ordinary X-ray film and can therefore be placed side by side on large illuminated screens for viewing. The disturbing light margins of the screen are masked before photographs are taken. The mosaics shown here consist of six to nine films of standard size (14 × 17 in.).
Fig. 10. X radiograph. Rembrandt. *Man with a Magnifying Glass*, ca. 1662 (no. 17, vol. II). The areas of paint containing pigments made from heavy metals (here primarily lead white), which are concentrated in the face, appear almost white. The strong light accent below the collar belongs to an early stage of the painting and is considerably toned down in the final version, as is the hand. It is, in fact, possible that two clasped hands were originally included, as Ainsworth suggests ( secs. II and IV, 1982, Ainsworth et al., p. 77). In the case of this picture more information about the costume can be obtained from the underpainted sketch as revealed by the autoradiograph than from the X radiograph. Traces of both the vertical framing element at the left and the arched one at the top with which Rembrandt experimented are visible to the naked eye.
Fig. 11. Eighth autoradiograph. Rembrandt. *Man with a Magnifying Glass*, ca. 1662 (no. 17, vol. II)
Figs. 12, 13. Left: Eighth autoradiograph. Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Woman*, 1622 (no. 4). Right: Eighth autoradiograph. Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Young Woman with a Fan*, 1633 (no. 6, vol. II). Comparison of these two autoradiographs, here published together for the first time, shows stylistic differences in the preliminary sketches that have never before been pointed out. The elaborate sketch under the costume of the so-called van Beresteyn *Woman* (no. 4) is difficult to read because it merges visually with the superimposed paint layers, which the autoradiograph to some extent records. In autoradiographs there is no clear distinction between undersketching and subsequent
sketching in the upper paint layers. Most of the meticulous detail revealed by this method of examination is lost in small reproductions. One cannot help wondering whether the tedious task of executing such minutiae—the tiny bodice buttons, for example, in the costume in fig. 12—was left to a workshop assistant. This seems entirely possible, especially in view of the contrast between the exacting execution in fig. 12 and the powerful and rigorously selective undersketching in fig. 13, which conforms perfectly with the long flowing brushstrokes in the underpainting of the dress.
Fig. 14. Detail. Rembrandt. Self-Portrait, 1660 (no. 15, vol. II)

Fig. 15. Detail. Eighth autoradiograph. Rembrandt. Self-Portrait, 1660 (no. 15, vol. II). This autoradiograph reveals a rather faint and soft image of a preparatory brush sketch made with bone black apparently directly on the light ground. As the subsequent paint applications in the face do not contain significant admixtures of bone black, this subjacent image shows no interference, in contrast to the beret, which contains considerable quantities of black pigment in all layers. A direct comparison of this autoradiograph and the actual painting shows how easily autoradiographic images can be misinterpreted. In the high collar at left most of the thin brushstrokes recorded in the autoradiograph are actually finishing touches in the topmost paint layer, as Ainsworth pointed out (secs. II and IV, 1982, Ainsworth et al., p. 99, n. 51).
Fig. 16. Detail. Eighth autoradiograph. Follower of Rembrandt: Portrait of a Man ("The Auctioneer"), ca. 1655–60 (no. 32). When the autoradiograph of the self-portrait (fig. 15) is compared to that of the imitative Auctioneer, the heads are certainly more similar than dissimilar, and both faces show the same kind of faint preparatory sketching. This particular comparison, which may slight the strength of the useful method of autoradiography, demonstrates the ease with which it can lead to false conclusions. The most convincing arguments for the imitative character of The Auctioneer are based on an examination of the technique of the paint layers that overlie the sketch. A comparative study of the heavy impasto in the face of The Auctioneer shows that it is markedly different from that of every authentic Rembrandt.
Fig. 17. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt. *Bellona*, 1633 (no. 7, vol. II)

Fig. 18. Detail. Eighth autoradiograph. Rembrandt. *Bellona*, 1633, (no. 7, vol. II). Ainsworth (secs. II and IV, 1982, Ainsworth et al., p. 46) points out that in the early stages of this composition the shield was placed in *Bellona's* right hand, with only the inside visible, and the sword was held in her left hand (information obtained from the third autoradiograph). The eighth autoradiograph shows a rough sketch that presumably was not carried out on the actual painting ground but on an intermediary layer of light tonality. The sketch covers the canceled arm and hand holding the sword.
Fig. 19. Detail. Rembrandt, Bellona, 1633 (no. 7, vol. II). A shield with the head of Medusa also appears in two representations of Minerva in Her Study, one by Rembrandt (Corpus A38; Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin) and another by a Leiden pupil (Corpus C49; Denver Art Museum). In both the facial expression of Medusa is less animated than the open-mouthed grimace seen on Bellona’s shield.
ON TECHNIQUE: CRITICAL SUMMARY WITH REFERENCE TO THE METROPOLITAN’S PAINTINGS

Supports and Grounds

For much of his career Rembrandt was typical of his time in his use of both panels and canvases. But from the late 1650s until his death in 1669, he worked exclusively on fabric supports.

An unparalleled study of Rembrandt’s canvases by Ernst van de Wetering (sec. II, 1986, “The Canvas Support”), now head of the RRP, yielded much valuable information about studio practice in seventeenth-century Holland. It was found that small groups of canvases came from the same bolt; this fabric was stored by a dealer who cut pieces, applied at least one weave-filling ground to them, and then sold them separately. It has been suggested that the first priming was as a rule applied by the dealer. But it would be surprising if this were exclusively the case. In view of the numerous representations of artists working on canvases stretched on temporary frames with cords (see fig. 20), we would have to assume that Rembrandt obtained pre-stretched and grounded canvas with the cusping already locked in place. Surely, however, the practice of preparing the ground continued to be conducted in the artist’s studio to some extent. Only two types of canvas were used in Rembrandt’s studio: most often tabby or plain weave of differing thread densities and less frequently canvas with a herringbone pattern (see nos. 17, 18, vol. II). As expected, this study of canvases had no direct relevance in establishing authenticity for paintings of this period.

In 1961 an international team carried out a detailed investigation of the controversial Rembrandt self-portrait in the Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart, which was falsely accused of being a nineteenth-century forgery and is now attributed by some specialists to a student of Rembrandt. This research initiated the efforts of Herman Kühn of the Doerner Institute, Munich, who made the first systematic study of grounds in paintings by Rembrandt and his school (in which a number of the Metropolitan’s works were included). According to Kühn’s statistical survey, double-layer grounds were often used in Rembrandt’s workshop, especially in the 1630s and 1640s (these grounds are seen in nos. 2, vol. II; 3; 4; 6, 7, 11, 13, vol. II; 20; 25, vol. II; and 41 and in a signed portrait by Willem Drost [no. 46, vol. II]). Many other contemporary painters also employed such grounds. The first layer was red ochre (an inexpensive pigment) mixed with an oil medium, which served to fill the canvas’s weave. The thin gray top layer—a mixture of more costly white lead with carbon black combined with a smaller quantity of earth and sometimes lake pigments, also in oil—was applied with a brush or a palette knife, presumably by Rembrandt or someone in his studio. This gray layer is usually quite opaque; thus a calculated effect of warm color showing through can usually be ruled out. The origins of the standard recipes for these canvas grounds are not known. They may have been introduced by painters of the Utrecht school who had spent time in Italy.

Kühn was the first to identify Rembrandt’s use of yellowish white or brownish grounds composed mainly of quartz with smaller additions of a kaolin-like white clay, which functions as an absorbent in ceramics. Earth pigments were also found in some instances. Drying oil was used as a binding medium, as it was in other types of
canvas grounds. It is still uncertain whether this priming method was employed only in Rembrandt’s workshop or whether it was used by other artists as well. No use of a brown ground containing quartz has yet been identified outside the Rembrandt circle.

The type of ground that Kühn documented was economical. Its grayish brown tint provided an ideal transitional color value, and Rembrandt sometimes left small portions uncovered. Rough to the touch, this surface is ideal for paint application and especially for dry impasto. A yellowish white ground was used for Flora, the Self-Portrait, Hendrickje Stoffels, and Man with a Magnifying Glass (nos. 12, 15, 16, 17, all vol. II). It is especially visible in the well-preserved self-portrait, but its appearance in a few abraded areas in the background and in the painter’s attire was not intended. Surprisingly the same light ground, which was suitable for the self-portrait with its relatively light overall tonality, also serves as a ground for the pronounced chiaroscuro in Man with a Magnifying Glass. Examination of damaged areas in the latter revealed, however, that Rembrandt toned down the ground before he began to paint. Another ground used by Rembrandt and some of his contemporaries contains a higher percentage of ocher and therefore imparts stronger tints ranging from yellowish brown and red brown to dark gray and gray brown.

Since Kühn’s project, many Rembrandt paintings have been examined, especially in Britain and the United States, with London’s National Gallery in the forefront.
Fig. 21. Detail. X radiograph. Follower of Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Man with a Breastplate and Plumed Hat*, ca. 1645? (no. 27, vol. II)
Fig. 22. Detail X radiograph. Follower of Rembrandt. Portrait of a Woman, ca. 1645? (no. 28, vol. II). The light areas in figs. 21 and 22 indicate lead-containing paint in the portrait pair. Their jagged edges suggest use of a palette knife or spatula. It is conceivable that the painter applied this more opaque ground to cover up previously laid-in heads and thus create a neutral base for the subsequent images.
of research. The number and variety of materials found in the ground and paint layers are steadily increasing. What was once believed to have been used exclusively in Rembrandt’s workshop is now seen to have been employed in a broader context.

Turning to panel paintings, we again have to credit the work of van de Wetering. In the first volume of the Corpus produced by the RRP he discusses the woods employed for panels and the standard sizes in which they were available (panels were sold grounded and ready to use). Panels were usually made of oak and occasionally of imported woods. A painting in the Metropolitan (no. 9) can be cited as an example of a work on imported wood, in this case Honduras mahogany. Wood panels were widely used in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and the seventeenth-century recipes for grounds were therefore based on a long tradition of craftsmanship. The most common were the carnation-toned preparations described by Karel van Mander in his Het Schilder-Boeck (1604), the most important source on the art of painting in that period.

Chalk bound in animal glue filled the grain of the oak panel and created a smooth surface. A thin imprimatura, composed of a brown or yellowish orange earth pigment and a little lead white in oil, was brushed over this. A warm beige color resulted from the combination of the tinted priming and the wood’s natural color. In his landscapes, which were always painted on panels, Rembrandt achieved an extraordinarily luminous transparency by applying red or brown lakes on the priming.

The oak supports of three paintings of uncertain origin (nos. 21, 33, 34, all vol. II) were examined in 1977 by Peter Klein, a dendrochronologist at Hamburg University. According to his results (which indicated the earliest felling dates of the trees from which the panels were cut), a plausible date of availability of these supports was established.

The so-called Rembrandt as a Young Man (no. 21, vol. II), formerly dated 1629, is now listed in the Corpus as a later imitation. Although the panel was available for use from 1616, its reuse at a later period 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. The panel of Lieven van Coppenol (no. 34, vol. II) predates the earliest possible origin of the actual painting because the work is a copy after Rembrandt’s etching of 1658 (see fig. 23). The dating method is confirmed by the X radiograph that reveals traces of the support’s earlier use (fig. 24).

The panel of Young Man in a Red Cloak (no. 33, vol. II) could have been employed any time after 1642 but is generally dated after 1662, when Rembrandt’s Jewish Bride was painted, because, as Gerson first pointed out, the male figure in the latter closely resembles the young man in the former.

Of the Metropolitan’s nine panel paintings by Rembrandt, only two (nos. 1, 8, both vol. II) are in their original condition, that is, with beveled backs, a common feature allowing a better fit in the frame (see fig. 25). The other panels (nos. 10, 14) have been reduced in dimensions and thickness in order to insert them into auxiliary panels or to strengthen them with different cradles. Such widely practiced, expensive, and often unnecessary interventions sometimes resulted in new damage to panel and paint layer. It is not advisable, however, to remove these sometimes intriguingly complex examples of cabinetwork because the reaction of the already weakened original panel is unpredictable. One Metropolitan painting is an example of a late-eighteenth-century transfer from wood to canvas (no. 22, vol. II).
Fig. 23. P.F. Basan, copy of Rembrandt’s etching *Lieven Willemz van Coppenol*, 1658, the large plate (Hind 300), 13 x 11 in. (33 x 28 cm). Private collection, New York. Here the thumbnails are delineated, which is not the case in the print by Rembrandt.

Fig. 24. X radiograph. Style of Rembrandt. *Lieven van Coppenol*, ca. 1660–80? (no. 34, vol. II). This X radiograph reveals that a would-be oil sketch of Rembrandt’s etching of Coppenol was created on a discarded panel with borders of pastose, lead-containing paint at top and bottom. A strip of wood was added on the left side to match the etching’s width; it shows no traces of a ground preparation and therefore appears black in the X radiograph. The use of a tracing of the etching is evident in the pronounced sphere-shaped border of the skullcap, which is emphasized by heavy paint application.

Fig. 25. Reverse Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Man*, 1632 (no. 1, vol. II). The oval oak panel is beveled along its back edge. This interesting feature allowed the painting to fit better into the frame’s shallow rabbet. Another example of a beveled panel is Rembrandt’s *Herman Doomer* (no. 8, vol. II).
Preliminary Sketching

Laurie (sec. II, 1932, p. 2) remarks that the underpainting of browns and blacks in a Rembrandt panel painting he studied microscopically “might have been done with bone or ivory browns and blacks [which were identified by Doerner] as umber.” On the yellowish grounds of his panel paintings, Rembrandt usually made a lay-in with translucent brown tints, where the furrows of the brush often remain visible. When van Mander and other contemporary writers used the term “dead coloring,” they were most likely describing this initial stage of the painting process. In his landscapes Rembrandt sometimes sparingly scumbled over this rough monochrome preparatory stage with somber greens that have become almost invisible with time. These passages are often mistakenly regarded as unfinished.

Autoradiography has produced by far the most readable images of first monochrome lay-ins on light gray grounds. In autoradiographs of canvases from the Museum’s collection these preliminary sketches can be observed, the revealed images ranging from abbreviated and vigorous brush sketches to more finished and detailed underdrawings. These images of the entire underlayer, as opposed to the isolated glimpses afforded by a binocular microscope or by a paint cross section, are an important help in understanding how paintings are made. With an increasing number of paintings under scrutiny, a greater variety of preliminary sketching has been recognized in Rembrandt’s works. In The Feast of Belshazzar (The National Gallery, London), a large canvas dated 1636–38, a dark underlayer was directly applied to the gray ground. This underlayer shows through the paint layer almost everywhere; it represents something more substantial than an initial sketch and may well correspond to a complete dead-colored stage executed mainly in translucent browns, as suggested by David Bomford (sec. II, 1988, Art in the Making: Rembrandt).

In pursuit of a pronounced chiaroscuro, Rembrandt’s imitators often started with a dark preparatory layer, as in Belshazzar, instead of a preliminary sketching-in. Rembrandt’s Son Titus (no. 41), for example, is painted on the very dark brown top layer that completely conceals the bright red lower layer of a double ground. Some thirty years ago analysis of a sample from this work with X-radiographic diffraction correctly recorded gypsum, which at the time was thought to indicate a southern European origin. A recently prepared cross section of a new sample surprisingly revealed the typical double ground composed largely of red ochre. Others frequently contain large amounts of impurities, gypsum among others, so the initial interpretation had to be revised. This example shows the importance of applying more than one examination method in order to place minutiae in a somewhat broader context and thus to avoid misinterpretations of analytical data.

In the so-called Rembrandt as a Young Man (no. 21, vol. II) the greenish gray background is at least partially underpainted with black, as is the entire face of the Portrait of a Young Man with a Beret (no. 40). (In the latter X radiographs have revealed an older man’s face underlying the present one [fig. 163], and the underpainting may have been done to cover the earlier composition.) Portions of the background of Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff (no. 37) show black underpaint. It is difficult to determine the extent of any underlayer solely by examining minute paint cross sections under the microscope, if only because of the excessive number of samples required.
A considerable number of samples for pigment and cross-section analysis were taken during the autoradiographic examination of the paintings by Rembrandt in the Museum undertaken from 1976 to 1980; these were needed to clarify questions concerning the interpretation of the autoradiographs. In preparation for the present exhibition a selection of samples from paintings were taken by Christopher McGlinchey of the Metropolitan’s Paintings Conservation Department in close cooperation with the present writer. The investigation of specific questions determined the choice of samples, and because of time limits most were from paintings that had not been examined before.

**Use Of Paint**

A number of innovative features in Rembrandt’s use of paint have recently been discovered by the Scientific Department of The National Gallery, London, and the Central Laboratory, Amsterdam. It was found that a cheaper mixture of lead white extended with chalk, called “lootwit” in seventeenth-century sources, was used in areas of the huge *Night Watch* (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) where thick underpaint was required. Chalk is an optically invisible ingredient when mixed with earth pigments and lakes. When mixed with an oil medium, it is virtually transparent. Even in his small panel paintings Rembrandt introduced an extraordinary variety of surfaces; both dark and light passages often resemble subtle low reliefs, serving to enhance the illusion of nearness or distance of different compositional elements. Examples are the peacocks in the lower right corner of *The Toilet of Bathsheba* (no. 10), the dark middle ground of *Christ and the Woman of Samaria* (no. 14), and the fleshy green leaves on Flora’s hat (no. 12, vol. II). Such use of paint, though rarely achieving a consistent balance of differently structured surfaces, can be observed in works by Rembrandt’s students.

Joyce Plesters of The National Gallery, London, relying primarily on her unpublished study of the *Aristotle with a Bust of Homer* (no. 11, vol. II), discovered that Rembrandt used glass particles containing cobalt and arsenic as a main component of his dark paint. This finely divided glassy material differs from the smalt that is also present (the latter is a more coarsely ground blue glass employed as a pigment or in its powdered form as a drying agent in oil paint). The ubiquitous appearance of glass particles in Rembrandt’s later paintings, including *The Standard Bearer (Floris Soop)* (no. 13, vol. II) and the *Man with a Magnifying Glass* (no. 17, vol. II), and in the imitative *Portrait of a Young Man (“The Auctioneer”)* (no. 32), has also been identified through autoradiographs and other analytical techniques.

Glass combines the desirable optical quality of transparency with the necessary capacity to effect drying. The practice of mixing colors with ground glass to aid drying was referred to in 1635 by Pierre Le Brun, a painter, in the Brussels Manuscript (sec. I, 1635). Rembrandt mixed a great deal of glass with paints that he increasingly enriched with slow-drying lake pigments. These pigments would not have aged well without the addition of this drying agent, and the use of lake pigments without added driers is rare. A paint cross section taken from the lower left of the *Aristotle* showed a remarkably large number of glass particles, which, in this
case used to excess, may have contributed to the picture's pronounced drying cracks (see fig. 75). Rembrandt's extraordinarily sophisticated use of pigments has become much better known through fine-tuned modern analytical methods.

Another observation made of paint cross sections at The National Gallery revealed Rembrandt's distinctive use of pigments: he enhanced the color and translucency of yellow and red earth pigments by adding the analogous lakes. Such admixtures of lakes are found not only in unquestioned works by Rembrandt but also in workshop pictures. An example of the latter is a red highlight in Titus's tunic (no. 41).

**Ultraviolet (UV) Examination of Lake Pigments**

*This section was written by Christopher McGlinchey, Research Chemist, Department of Paintings Conservation, Metropolitan Museum.*

Rembrandt's unconventional use of transparent red and yellow lake pigments has been well documented. Ultraviolet (UV) microscopy is one technique that clearly illustrates how he used these materials. When cross sections from dark passages are examined with normal (visible, not UV) light, the dark layers absorb so much light that it is difficult to discern all but the most reflective pigments. Transparent lake pigments actually appear much darker in cross-section samples because they transmit light down into the sample and away from the viewer (this is not unlike viewing the narrow edge of a piece of colored glass rather than its broad planar surface). Examination of the same cross section under ultraviolet is complementary to examination under visible light because the transparent lake pigments brightly fluoresce their respective colors. Paint layers containing certain proportions of lake pigments show distinct particles that fluoresce red or yellow with the frequency that reflects their concentration.

Thus, examining the dark shadow of the tablecloth in the lower left corner of *Aristotle* (no. 11, vol. II) with visible light, one sees dark layers on top of a red/gray double ground. Viewing the dark section under UV reveals that it is clearly composed of three main layers: the center portion contains a high quantity of red lake and is sandwiched between layers that contain yellow lake. At the top red/yellow interface there is a slight mixture of the two pigments that probably indicates brushwork churning the wet lower paint layer. Similarly, the dark purple cloak of the attendant in *Bathsheba* (no. 10) is made up of a complex buildup of red-lake pigment and smalt. In fact, the very first colored layer in this purple is a pure red-lake paint. This layer is revealed in an area beneath Bathsheba's heel. The robe's purple color is a mixture of red lake, smalt, and some lead white. The amount of lead white used was determined by the intended brightness, while carbon black was added to deepen the shadows.

**Paint Medium**

The traditional opinion that Rembrandt's painting medium consisted of linseed oil with admixtures of natural resin and Venetian turpentine to achieve the desired
transparency is based on eighteenth-century sources such as G. P. Mensaert’s Le Peintre amateur et curieux (1763). This belief was shared by later scholars, among them Max Doerner (sec. II, 1934), who tried to duplicate Rembrandt’s technique. Conservation scientists still have great interest in research on media. Despite the advances in available analytical methods, the long-term studies at The National Gallery, London, remain unsurpassed. In the National Gallery Technical Bulletin (sec. IV, 1994), Raymond White and Jo Kirby examine the paint media used by Rembrandt and his circle. It seems that Rembrandt’s students followed recipes given in written sources far more than did their master, who as a rule simply had his pigments ground with linseed or walnut oil. The works examined show that his students added small amounts of pine resin in the form of varnish to give greater transparency and gloss to the paint film.

Dutch scientists Kloeck and Jansen recently published an analysis of binding media in Rembrandt’s Jewish Bride in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (sec. II, 1993, “Rembrandt in a New Light”). They found that the paint used to modify the groom’s hat contains beeswax, paraffin wax, and other ingredients. The significance of this finding remains unclear. The use of this medium would be a rare exception to Rembrandt’s practice and may very well suggest a later repainting.

When Rembrandt used the slow-drying Cassel earth, a brown pigment with desirable transparency, he always mixed it with a good drier such as umber. His combination of compatible pigments gave his works a general soundness and ensured an incomparable translucency of dark passages and a painterly quality and variety of impasto. Unlike Rembrandt, Jan Lievens and Ferdinand Bol did not always take added precautions to ensure the drying of pigments such as asphaltum and pitch, an omission that resulted in shrinkage cracks and other disfiguring defects.

Rembrandt’s early critics, among them Filippo Baldinucci, Arnold Houbraken, Joachim von Sandrart, and Gerard de Lairesse, described his practices as messy or too fast or too slow. The survival of so many of his paintings in good condition has proven these statements irrelevant.

“Unfinished” Paintings

Unfinished paintings on canvas are ideal for the study of an artist’s technique. Most of the few surviving examples, however, are Italian and date from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Italian Renaissance technique relies heavily on predetermined design and thus is relatively easy to understand. At best a modest number of Rembrandt’s works have unfinished passages. But, as with every issue concerning Rembrandt, art historians are deeply divided on the question of whether or not a given work by the master is finished (although the issue is perhaps more in the domain of restorers). For example, The Concord of the State (Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam), is a grisaille painting by Rembrandt done for an etching that was not executed. The first volume of the Corpus (1982) states that it is at the dead-colored stage and therefore unfinished. This interpretation was abandoned a few years after it was published, following a restoration of the painting. The work is now convincingly regarded as a finished picture. It is hardly conceivable that a
Fig. 26. Detail X radiograph. Rembrandt, Aristotle with a Bust of Homer, 1653 (no. 11, vol. II). The initially applied mass of lead white revealed in the X radiograph served as rough and broadly sketched underpainting. This underpainting was reworked with pigment mixtures containing only small amounts of lead white to achieve effects of modeling, including shadow tints, which do not register in the X radiograph. The surface detail is distinguished from the understructure by shorter and more densely worked brushstrokes. The skeleton-like strokes in the hand visible in the X radiograph relate to its final appearance and do not suggest the “multiple changes” that cross-section analysis indicates in that area (secs. II and IV, 1982, Ainsworth et al., p. 51).

preparatory stage would have been carried out so evenly and completely over the entire surface.

Rembrandt occasionally left commissioned paintings unfinished, completing them years later, when he was pressed by a patron or when he needed money. The most notable examples of such unfinished works are several scenes of a Passion series begun for Frederick Henry, prince of Orange, referred to in seven letters written by Rembrandt between 1636 and 1639. Of course, incomplete pictures may have been included in forced sales, or they may have remained in the studio after Rembrandt’s death to be finished by someone else. The Juno (Norton Simon Museum, Pasadena) is sometimes placed in the latter category. The National Gallery, London, considers its Portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels partly unfinished, but given the painting’s informal nature, one wonders if it was ever intended to be “finished.”

It is difficult to believe that the Old Man in an Armchair (The National Gallery, London) is finished. Now thought to be by a Rembrandt follower, it shows broad and energetic brushstrokes reminiscent of Tintoretto’s work. The hands and folds, lacking
only the finishing details, seem to have been rendered in an advanced stage of underpainting. Rembrandt, however, did not carry such preparatory understructures to near completion. He never developed a systematic procedure, and he did not rely on big brushstrokes as a means of expression. Especially in his later paintings, preparatory applications with a loaded brush and lead white remain hidden in the understructure. The skeleton-like strokes under Aristotle’s left hand, for example, are revealed only in X radiographs (figs. 26, 27). In the heavy folds of the sleeve above the hand, the paint, initially applied in a crude mass, was reworked several times with shorter and more richly structured brushstrokes until the desired modeling was achieved.

The state of completion has also been an important issue in the discussion concerning the authenticity of Rembrandt’s *Polish Rider* (fig. 4). The RRP considers the somewhat damaged background unfinished and therefore not Rembrandt-like. Surprisingly they do not take into account the possibility of a condition problem, pursuing instead their theory that Rembrandt finished backgrounds first. This
and similar examples in which the degree of completion is uncertain have been interpreted in widely different ways.

Discussions of other issues concerning Rembrandt’s workshop practice have also proved ambiguous. A main area of study has been the attempt to recognize Rembrandt’s corrections of his students’ paintings. His interventions in their drawings have been much easier to distinguish. (It should be noted that an advanced pupil may have occasionally made the improvements.) Many of these student drawings were done for study purposes and were therefore executed spontaneously and without further refinements. Corrections in students’ paintings are quite a different matter. There is little information about how a painting by a pupil—especially work that had the potential to pass as the master’s own—was regarded. It is not known at what point Rembrandt may have made physical improvements or provided corrections orally. The present writer cleaned and examined the only known painting that testifies to such practices. This work is a studio copy in Munich after Rembrandt’s Sacrifice of Isaac (figs. 23, 24, vol. II), which was painted a few months earlier. The Munich picture bears an inscription at the bottom that reads: “Modified and overpainted by Rembrandt 1636.” This copy must have been made while the first version was still in the studio since the original design was transferred to the second canvas. At an advanced stage a significant compositional change was made in the position of the angel. Rembrandt’s most important interventions were in the angel’s tousled hair, where his alterations gave greater strength and vitality to the figure. He also added colorful touches to the angel’s prominent right wing and worked over Isaac’s white loincloth, imparting a rugged touch to the smoothly handled impasto.

A painter running a large studio must have an astute sense of where an assistant’s work needs improvement. The master’s changes often occur in passages in which later connoisseurs might least expect them. In large workshops the leading painter’s technique was developed to enable assistants to replicate the master’s general technique in certain steps of the production. The master would then add the finishing touches. El Greco is a good case in point. In The Adoration of the Shepherds (Metropolitan Museum), which is partly by a workshop assistant, El Greco’s own touches stand out through their sureness and brilliant color. His method, followed by assistants, consisted of loosely fitting different compositional elements together on a dark priming and leaving areas in reserve. El Greco would then elaborate, for example, adding the orange-yellow accent of fiery luminosity that enlivens the kneeling shepherd’s drapery.

Rembrandt’s technique, which is on the whole complex, nevertheless demands less conspicuous additions or corrections. There are a few notable examples of additions that can be considered to have been made by a student to a work essentially carried out by Rembrandt himself. In Portrait of Saskia (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Kassel) the subject’s rich costume and plummed and jeweled cap are rendered in Rembrandt’s familiar loose manner. But the embroidered shirt and pearls around her wrists are painstakingly detailed, sharply focused elements that were obviously painted by a different hand. This discrepancy was noted by Carl Neumann (Rembrandt [Munich, 1922], vol. 1, p. 197), who wryly described the style as “Holbein plus Rembrandt.”

It can certainly be expected that Rembrandt and an assistant cooperated in the execution of more ambitious portrait compositions, for example, the portrait of
Johannes Uyttenbogaert of 1633 recently acquired by the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. This imposing work was commissioned by a friend of the well-known preacher, who sat for Rembrandt on April 13, 1633. His hands were most likely left in reserve until a student painted them in with great attention to detail—a practice very different from that of Rembrandt.

Today’s sophisticated analytical tests help broaden knowledge of the materials and techniques employed in Rembrandt’s time. Some scholars appreciate their usefulness; others rely on them only to support their preconceived opinions. The more or less factual observations about Rembrandt’s technique are limited by their nature, often being based on pinpoint paint extractions. With few exceptions they convey only isolated glimpses of successive layer structures, not the continuous, often only briefly interrupted process of paint application. The best way to learn about the handling of painters’ matière is still by looking at the originals with curious eyes.
The Range of Rembrandt’s Individual Style:
Consistencies and Inconsistencies

Fig. 28. Detail. Rembrandt. Portrait of a Man, 1632 (no. 1, vol. II)

Fig. 29. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt. Portrait of a Man, 1632 (no. 1, vol. II).

The nervous feathery interwoven brushwork carefully explores the features of this sensitive face. The short brushstrokes are built up thickly on the forehead and cheek, where bristle marks can be seen in the paint. The paint touches are integral parts of a whole, but they are distinguishable individually. The only strong contrasts visible in the X radiographs are those created by heavy and vigorous paint applications in the collar, applications of a type frequently found in Rembrandt’s portraits. Only in Rembrandt’s panel paintings is such a high degree of perfection found.

Fig. 30. Detail. Rembrandt. Man in Oriental Costume (“The Noble Slav”), 1632 (no. 2, vol. II)

Fig. 31. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt. Man in Oriental Costume (“The Noble Slav”), 1632 (no. 2, vol. II)

Like the face in Portrait of a Man of 1632 (no. 1, vol. II), that in “The Noble Slav” is built up with rather short brushstrokes. In the latter, however, the strokes are more fluently and thickly applied and follow the form more closely. The canvas’s large size (60½ x 43½ in. [152.7 x 111.1 cm]) encouraged a greater reliance on pastose strokes of different hues that were meant to be seen from a distance. The X radiograph records a revision by the master to the left of the nose.
The execution here and in the head on the facing page is very similar but not identical. The man’s head has been given more attention. The X radiograph shows that its contour was incised into the still-wet first layer. During the painting process a rather bold revision was made with heavy impasto to strengthen the modeling and intensify the light. The light accent on the woman’s forehead (the only area of fairly thick impasto within the face) is, by contrast, not a revision but a highlight.
The paint application in this portrait follows the widely practiced formula of modeling with parallel and curved brushstrokes with the addition of a few prominent highlights on the forehead and nose. The vivid red cheeks were introduced at an early stage in the painting process. There are a considerable number of comparable portraits that vary in quality and touch. These have made the questions of attribution related to Rembrandt's activity as a portrait painter in the early 1630s extremely problematic.
The Rembrandt Research Project has suggested that this work was produced in Rembrandt’s studio about 1635, but this remains a matter of debate. An attribution to Jacob Backer, however, can be rejected (see entry for no. 23). The short brushstrokes and scribbly highlights are not dissimilar to those seen in the Altman Woman (no. 5). The essential difference here is that these dabs and strokes are applied on a fairly monochrome underpainting, resulting in a pale overall tonality. The cheeks of the Altman Woman, by contrast, are modeled with color from the first layer up.
In this frontal view the evenly lit face was carefully modeled by blending pink hues with faintly yellowish whites, creating a remarkably fresh skin color. The painting has been considerably flattened through relining procedures, but even close viewing of X radiographs reveals no traces of noticeable brushmarks. This suggests that Rembrandt deliberately avoided pronounced brushwork in describing the sitter's complexion.
Bellona is no longer considered a portrait of Saskia in the guise of the goddess of war. One theory proposes that it is a new type of portrait that had implicit political significance during a time of crisis. It might have been commissioned as a symbol of readiness for resistance, perhaps destined for civic guard quarters, as the Rembrandt Research Project and Liedtke have suggested (see entry for no. 7, vol. II). Rembrandt emphasized the plump plainness of his wide-eyed Bellona. The X radiograph shows his brush literally encircling her round face. The unusually smooth paint surface, lacking Rembrandt’s familiar brushwork, points to a deliberate generalization of Bellona’s features. That the implements of war, especially the goddess’s shield, have been perfected by the painter (see secs. II and IV, 1982, Ainsworth et al.), is in keeping with the presumed site.
Opposite page

Fig. 44. Detail. Rembrandt. Herem Doomer, 1640 (no. 8, vol. II)

Fig. 45. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt. Herem Doomer, 1640 (no. 8, vol. II)

Fig. 46. Detail. Rembrandt. Portrait of a Man Holding Gloves, 1648 (no. 9)

Fig. 47. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt. Portrait of a Man Holding Gloves, 1648 (no. 9)

These two portraits on panel show a close similarity in the lighting of the sitters' faces. On careful viewing, they differ somewhat in the texture of their paint surfaces, which is a little smoother in the Portrait of a Man Holding Gloves. In the Doomer the finish is carried further: the wrinkles around the sitter's right eye are built up to a low relief, and the highlights on his nose are carefully blended with their surroundings. The more freely handled impasto of the soft multilayered collar creates a calculated contrast and an illusion of distance and atmosphere. Its subtle creamy yellowish hue, used rather than a brighter white, softens the contrast with the flesh tints. 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 varied modes of handling paint.

Fig. 48. Detail. Rembrandt(?). The Standard Bearer (Floris Speel), 1654 (no. 13, vol. II)

Fig. 49. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt(?). The Standard Bearer (Floris Speel), 1654 (no. 13, vol. II)

The Standard Bearer is a large official portrait on canvas that was examined extensively during the Museum's autoradiography project (see secs. II and V, 1982, Ainsworth et al.). The handling of paint in the face does not closely resemble that of any other portrait in the Museum's collection. The overall flatness evident in the painting itself and in the X radiograph is not consistent with authentic works. Primarily in the X radiograph, the patchy dabs of paint stand out in isolation and could easily be misinterpreted as retouching by another hand.
This work exemplifies Rembrandt’s most freely loaded impasto with the furrows of the brush imprinted in the paint. As a rule, only his self-portraits show such spontaneity and ease of execution. They were essentially done in two stages: a first modeling with a darker preparatory flesh color provides the transitional and shadow areas; the final definition is made with a great variety of hues ranging from warm and cool pink to pale yellow and some deep red accents for the shadow. The few topmost accents of pure white are not distinguishable in the X radiograph; it does, however, clearly show how the full impasto is broken at the edges and dragged over the darker color below. Before he decided in favor of a hat, Rembrandt was wearing a simple turban like that in the Self-Portrait of 1669 (The National Gallery, London).
The handling of the heavily built-up impasto in this face is by itself a valid argument against Rembrandt's authorship. The imitator did not model with a loaded brush; instead he piled up his impasto with repeated, mostly corrective applications, producing a masklike effect. A strand of hair was scratched into the forehead's thick impasto while it was still wet. The way in which impasto is broken at the edges reflects a hesitant rather than decisive application. When focusing on the face one should keep in mind that the impasto has been almost completely leveled during relining procedures.
These details of the Aristotelian demonstrate Rembrandt’s masterful use of earth pigments (particularly yellow and red ochers as well as umber) in luminous half-shadows. Even when he excluded lead white, Rembrandt often achieved brightness that rivals areas with strong admixtures of this pigment. In X radiographs this results in a strong contrast such as that noticeable in Aristotle’s face (fig. 55). As a rule, in Rembrandt’s work the preparatory layer, which contains primarily, earth colors, extends under the heavily loaded impasto. Given the not very Rembrandt-like treatment of the face of The Auctioneer (figs. 52, 53), it is surprising how successful the unknown painter was in imitating Rembrandt’s manner in the light effects on the sitter’s left cuff (figs. 58, 59). His skill is apparent in the differently textured highlights of varying intensity. The imitator’s own style is, however, more apparent in the hand, with its marked bone structure and predominantly cool color scheme. In its present state the young man’s right cuff appears to have been less successfully painted. The white is toned down through admixture of other pigments to a light pinkish gray; this is loosely brushed on the dark brown priming, which is left uncovered here and there. The modeling of the cuff lacks definition to some extent because of the loss of glazes in the deep shadows. The impasto in Aristotle’s sleeves is considerably more heavily built up, emphasizing the compactness of the richly folded material. Usually, such passages are prepared with full impasto and then reworked with a loaded brush (also see, for example, Flora [no. 12, vol. II]). As a result the sleeve stands out unmistakably in three dimensions; this clarity is not achieved by imitators.
Opposite page

Fig. 60. Detail. Circle of Rembrandt (Dordrecht School). *Head of Christ*, ca. 1660 (no. 35)

Fig. 61. Detail. X radiograph. Circle of Rembrandt (Dordrecht School). *Head of Christ*, ca. 1660 (no. 35)

The face is painted rather smoothly on a dark brown priming. A warm pink with faintly yellowish hues is used in the light areas, and variations of optical gray are employed in the shadows. The deep black hair makes the flesh tints appear particularly pale. The color scheme is unlike that in Rembrandt’s work.

Fig. 62. Detail. Circle of Rembrandt (Arent de Gelder?). *Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff*, 1660s (no. 37)

Fig. 63. Detail. X radiograph. Circle of Rembrandt (Arent de Gelder?). *Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff*, 1660s (no. 37)

The overall appearance of the face is quite flat because of a rather opaque underlayer of light pink that serves as a smooth base for some of the features. Unlike Rembrandt, the author of this picture did not model from the start in terms of light and shadow but produced his painting by the addition of layers. The X radiograph confirms this technique and demonstrates that the approach is different than in the *Head of Christ* (Fig. 61). The absence of interaction between the lower and upper paint layers explains the general lack of transparency.

Fig. 64. Detail. Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Man*, ca. 1655–60 (no. 20)

Fig. 65. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Man*, ca. 1655–60 (no. 20)

Most of the face is in shadow and is therefore painted more thinly on a darker underlayer than the lighter areas. Many individual touches of dry impasto on the topmost surface enhance the characterization of this sensitive face with its severe gaze. The X radiograph shows an image created with great sureness and directness.
Fig. 66. Detail. Rembrandt. *Hendrickje Stoffels, ca. 1654–60* (no. 16, vol. II)

Fig. 67. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt. *Hendrickje Stoffels, ca. 1654–60* (no. 16, vol. II)

The partly abraded condition allows the layer sequence in this face to be described: the pink flesh color is placed on a gray underpainting that is applied on a dark brown priming used for the deep shadows. A few patchy dabs of paint—the most prominent in the corner of Hendrickje's right eye—are no longer integrated with the surrounding areas and could easily be mistaken for additions by another hand. In fact, it is uncertain whether the face was completed, especially given the undoubtedly finished headress and background. Sobering considerations of this kind should not, however, diminish the appreciation of this intimate and moving portrait, whose high quality has never been challenged.

Opposite page

Fig. 68. Detail. Rembrandt. *Woman with a Pink, ca. 1662* (no. 18, vol. II)

Fig. 69. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt. *Woman with a Pink, ca. 1662* (no. 18, vol. II)

Fig. 70. Detail. Rembrandt. *Man with a Magnifying Glass, ca. 1662* (no. 17, vol. II)

Fig. 71. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt. *Man with a Magnifying Glass, ca. 1662* (no. 17, vol. II)

The especially heavy application of paint in the woman's portrait suggests more reworkings than in the pendant portrait of the man. In the latter special attention is given to small adjustments of color values within the flesh tints. The woman's face seems to stand out in low relief, emphasizing the luminosity of her flesh. The X radiograph of her face shows that Rembrandt built up the thick impasto around the deep shadows where the dark priming is mostly left uncovered. In the X radiograph of the man's portrait the herringbone pattern of the canvas used for both pictures is more clearly distinguishable. In his underpainting here Rembrandt did not use vigorous brushstrokes as he did in his self-portrait (Figs. 50, 51) but instead applied his impasto in a more localized way. The final reworking includes small but richly textured accents added here and there to the rather smooth surface of the flesh. The individually applied color values remain clean and distinct.
Fig. 72. Detail of right sleeve. Rembrandt. *Aristotle with a Bust of Homer*, 1653 (no. 11, vol. II). Before cleaning in 1961. The extremely thick and discolored natural resin varnish tinted with pigments has developed contraction cracks.

Fig. 73. Detail of right sleeve. Rembrandt. *Aristotle with a Bust of Homer*, 1653 (no. 11, vol. II). After removal of most of the discolored varnish.
More often than not, our judgment about paintings is influenced by the circumstances and conditions encountered when we view them. The surrounding scenery, comments made during the presentation of the artworks, and, not least, lighting conditions are liable to have an effect. For some the weight of authoritative scholarly opinion becomes a burden: Rembrandt students may find, in paying their tribute of compliance to expert knowledge, that what is promulgated as the final word on a given work is a serious obstacle they must overcome.

Attributing and deattributing Rembrandts has become a game. This writer vividly recalls the one played by respected participants in the symposium held in Chicago in 1969 in conjunction with the exhibition “Rembrandt after Three Hundred Years.” “How many did you count?” was the obligatory question they posed, referring, of course, to the number of works each expert considered authentic.

Perhaps more important than all these factors in the assessment of pictures is the state of preservation. Here the sobering question is: “How much of the original substance is still preserved and to what degree is the appearance impaired?”

Painters, craftsmen, and restorers did to pictures what they or their patrons deemed appropriate or necessary. Generally, the interventions they carried out entailed the backing of paintings on canvas with new fabrics, the stabilizing of wood panels, and, most frequently of all, the removal of old varnishes. These operations are often damaging and unnecessary but were and still are repeated routinely in a variety of circumstances—for instance, whenever a change of ownership takes place.

The removal of degraded varnishes is frequently justified, however, for they can create significant distortions by reducing the visibility of the subjacent paint layer or by altering the original colors. These effects are produced because with age varnishes generally develop a number of deficiencies such as cracks (see figs. 72, 73) and changes in color. They cause an especially pronounced transformation in the appearance of Rembrandts and other paintings with strong chiaroscuro.

The choice of types of varnish, as well as types of finish, whether glossy or matt, is ultimately subjective and has long plagued conservators. Different kinds of varnishes have been selected for various aesthetic and practical reasons. For example, the infamous “gallery varnish,” a mixture of mastic resin dissolved in turpentine with boiled linseed oil, was used in London in the nineteenth century to protect paintings from the contaminated atmosphere. It first imparted a warm golden glow but later darkened excessively and became nearly opaque. The inevitable need to remove concoctions of this sort once they have aged and hardened confronts the restorer with a serious problem: the procedure must be carried out but should be undertaken only when means are found to accomplish it safely.
In the 1930s and 1940s numerous restorations at the Museum were effected by Stephen Picchetto, a highly respected freelance restorer. He developed a varnishing method using shellac and natural resins, which he applied in large quantities to many pictures, including several by Rembrandt and by members of his school. (The thickness of this coating on the recently cleaned *Man with a Steel Gorget* [no. 26] measured about three hundred microns, which is about ten times thicker than a typical varnish layer.) The main functions of this coating were to level any distortions in the surface and to seal off extensive retouchings, especially retouchings made over large areas of badly worn original paint, such as those in the dark background of the *Man with a Magnifying Glass* (no. 17, vol. II). Picchetto brushed, or sometimes poured, his varnish on paintings that were lying flat, and he attached raised borders around the edges of the supports in order to prevent the coating from flowing down the sides. Picchetto’s varnish is among the most difficult coatings to remove.

In the late 1940s the era of synthetic coatings began, and methylnethacrylate barnishes were used on a large scale in the Museum’s newly established conservation department. However, these coatings eventually become partly insoluble and take on a gray tonality (instead of yellowing like mastic resin). Most have had to be removed, with the result that paint surfaces have been subjected to undue stress.

During the present author’s first tenure at the Metropolitan, natural resins were gradually reintroduced at the Museum. In the 1980s John Brealey initiated a research program, conducted in the Museum’s Sherman Fairchild Paintings Conservation Department, the goal of which was the improvement of a commercially available synthetic varnish based on ketone resins, which he favored. However, natural resins
with added stabilizers were ultimately adopted, as they can be thinned gradually and removed easily, unlike synthetic varnishes.

In the context of this discussion of condition, the important role of photographs taken during restoration should be mentioned. It is sometimes not sufficient merely to make written note of damages that appear after varnish has been removed; rather, a photographic record is needed because losses and repairs of various kinds, including gesso fills made in earlier interventions, may have been exposed, and these can distract from more significant problems in the topmost paint layer. In these cases photographs can provide useful records of the stages of restoration: the conservator often retouches the more conspicuous damages until a certain level of readability is achieved, and a photograph is taken; the retouching proceeds, and a photograph is taken of the same detail at a more advanced stage of the intervention.

The function of photographs as condition records brings us back to the theme of the state of preservation of paintings by Rembrandt and his followers and imitators. During their long lives these pictures have suffered many types of loss, which may or may not be apparent to viewers. Several paintings that reveal characteristic kinds of damage have been selected for discussion here. Essentially well preserved and indisputably authentic works such as the Aristotle with a Bust of Homer (no. 11, vol. II) and the Flora (no. 12, vol. II) are not included among these examples. It is, however, relevant to mention here that at some point after the Aristotle was completed, approximately twenty-four inches (sixty cm) were removed from the height of the canvas and seven inches (eighteen centimeters) from the width (figs. 74, 75). Information on the condition of the Aristotle and the Flora, and of The Standard
Bearer (Floris Soop) (no. 13, vol. II) as well, is found in the Museum’s publication *Art and Autoradiography* (secs. II and IV, 1982, Ainsworth et al.).

Our first example is Rembrandt’s *Portrait of a Man* (no. 20), which has lost its entire background except for a few traces of dark paint on the left. The cleaned state photograph of 1951 (fig. 76) shows the gray top layer of a double ground with the red lower layer underneath (see “Methods of Examination” in this volume). The scattered remains of thickly applied whitish brush marks on this gray oil ground are all that is left of a composition that was removed with solvents or mechani-
cally, presumably to provide a base for the present portrait. The absence of stretch-
marks on all sides of the canvas indicates that the support was once larger: our portrait, then, is painted on a fragment cut from a discarded picture. (It was common practice to reuse canvases in this way in workshops of the seventeenth centu-
ry and later.)

What remains of the first paint layers on the gray ground has enough mass to appear as elevations in the surface of the portrait. These elevations led a series of
restorers to believe that there was some sort of initial design under the background paint. One of these restorers scraped paint away until he realized that such was not the case and then applied a new background. This process most likely was repeated more than once, diminishing the original substance each time. Fortunately, these interventions stopped short of the head and the body, which, in the words of the conservator who last cleaned the painting, in 1951, are “in about as good state as any Rembrandt we have in the collection . . . better than some.” We might add that the eyes are especially well preserved, whereas the surrounding areas and the light portion of the face show signs of slight wear.

A painting that reveals different kinds of damage is *The Toilet of Bathsheba* (no. 10, fig. 77), a small picture on a panel. The original state is recorded in an eighteenth-century engraving by J. M. Moreau le jeune (fig. 78), the reliability of which is confirmed by a comparison of its features with what remains of Rembrandt’s picture. The background on both sides of the figures is now badly abraded. Much detail in the trees, foliage, and shrubs has been lost.

The lack of definition in the middle ground diminishes the subtle play of light in the shadow zones; now this area no longer provides a transition to the distant background. In the cleaned state the head of the sphinxlike sculpture, which Rembrandt at some time transformed into a rock covered with greenery, stands out, isolated, whereas it once was integrated with its surroundings (figs. 79, 80). Abrasions in the brocade of the piled-up clothing and in the nude are less severe and result from changes made by the artist. The figure of the old woman and the lavish carpet are in remarkably good condition, while the face of the black servant and the upper part of her ornate dress are considerably abraded. With both sides of the composition reduced in strength, the balance of the scene has shifted, and the central figures appear more isolated than Rembrandt intended. Thus it is clear that condition problems have affected the appearance of this picture and must exert an influence, whether overt or not, on the viewer’s assessment of its quality.

Rembrandt’s *Christ and the Woman of Samaria* (no. 14, fig. 81), a panel painting of modest dimensions, shows yet another kind of condition problem. Its state of preservation is essentially very good except for the woman’s face, her left shoulder and arm above the rolled-up shirtsleeve, and most of her hand (fig. 82). In these areas numerous though small paint losses from flaking are noticeable with the naked eye and are apparent in X radiographs. Especially in the sleeve these damages have been touched up by a restorer with strokes of heavy impasto. The repaints in the woman’s face are brushed on with a sure hand but somewhat flatly, which, together with her stern expression, contributes to a distinctly modern look. Since this intervention no attempts have been made to restore the critical area, in view of the small chance of an improvement and the considerable risks involved. Even though the damage is confined to a small area of the whole paint layer, it severely diminishes the original conception, which is focused on the two figures. Moreover, the condition has had, and likely will continue to have, an influence on considerations of the panel’s attribution, an issue that is the subject of controversy.

The oval portrait *Flora* (no. 22, vol. II), attributed here to Govert Flinck, bears damages inflicted by its transfer from one support to another. An inscription on the stretcher, which Hofstede de Groot saw in 1905 and later recorded, testifies that the picture was transferred from wood to canvas in Paris in 1765 (rather an
Fig. 77. Rembrandt. *The Toilet of Bathsheba*, 1643 (no. 10)

Fig. 78. J. M. Moreau le jeune. *David et Bethsabée*, 1763. Etching and engraving, 13½ × 18 in. (34 × 45.8 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1968, 68.673.32. This engraving was made after Rembrandt’s *Toilet of Bathsheba* when that painting was in the collection of Count Brühl, Dresden.
Fig. 79. Detail. Cleaned state. Rembrandt. *The Toilet of Bathsheba*, 1643 (no. 10). This detail shows the background at left photographed after the recent removal of a heavy varnish (applied in 1938). Comparison with the same detail in an engraving of the painting by J. M. Moreau le jeune (fig. 80) shows that some definition has been lost in this area since the eighteenth century, when the print was executed. As a result of wear, the head of a sphinx, which was part of an earlier stage of the composition, has been uncovered. In the engraving it appears transformed into a rock overgrown with moss, as Rembrandt intended. The distant buildings have lost more of their original definition than has David’s palace.

Fig. 80. Detail, reversed. J. M. Moreau le jeune. *David et Bethzabée*, 1763. Etching and engraving, 13 7/8 × 18 in. (34 × 45.8 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1968, 68.673.32

early date for this procedure). This technique was practiced extensively about 1800 on numerous Italian panels that were restored for exhibition at the Musée Napoléon in Paris. (The Italian paintings were suffering from cleavage that resulted from their transportation and from climatic changes to which they had been subjected.) In the first step of such an operation several layers of paper are glued to the picture surface to prevent the loss of loose pieces of paint. The painting is then fastened face down to a tabletop. In the next stage chisels of various sizes are used to remove the original panel, generally stopping short of the ground. Once the panel is disposed of, gauzelike fabric and then one or two layers of canvas are glued to the smoothed back of the paint layer. After a period of drying the paper facing is removed from the paint layer.

The cleaned state photograph of *Flora* (fig. 83) shows evidence of its transfer. Traces of the join of the original panel’s two sections run vertically through Flora’s face.
Fig. 81. Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria, 1655 (no. 14)

Fig. 82. Detail. Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria, 1655 (no. 14). The face of the woman is almost entirely repainted. Her shirt, especially in the sleeve, shows heavy brushstrokes of a later repaint. Her hand and forearm are also reworked. The extensive restoration in this area apparently was necessitated by flake losses.
The more slanted line at left is the remnant not of a join but of a split in the wood. The more thinly applied paint of the background in particular has suffered considerably from losses inflicted during the removal of the facing paper, which apparently was pulled away too hastily.

The Rembrandt signature and the date 1633 were inscribed with a brush loaded with gray paint on an area of still-wet light gray paint. This light gray layer was applied on top of the original paint surface; it can be distinguished as a later addition because of its greater opacity, different color, and coarser brushstrokes. Signature and date are, therefore, not authentic but predate the transfer.

The portrait _Hendrickje Stoffels_ (no. 16, vol. II) was transferred from its original canvas to a new support consisting of a light gauze attached to the reverse of the paint structure with zinc white and chalk and two canvases embedded in a heavy layer of hide glue. Flake paint losses recorded in the X radiograph most likely initiated this restoration, which very possibly dates to about the mid-nineteenth century. Cleavage between the gauze and the layers of zinc white and chalk applied to

---

Fig. 83. Cleaned state. Attributed to Govert Flinck. _Flora_, ca. 1636–38 (no. 22, vol. II). The vertical line near the center is the mark left by the join of the two panel members that were removed during transfer of the paint layers to canvas in 1765. The sharp line at the left was caused by a split rather than a join in the panel.
the original ground occurred during transfer. The Museum's records refer to repeated blister treatment since 1934, and in 1952 the gauze and the two canvases were removed. Then gesso was applied to the back of the paint layer and attached to a cheesecloth. Finally, an unbleached linen with a wax-resin adhesive was ironed onto the cheesecloth. As this treatment proved unsatisfactory, the wax-resin mixture was replaced with BEVA, a synthetic heat seal adhesive.

Not surprisingly, the paint layer suffered considerably from the extensive structural intervention of the transfer, as well as from the stringent cleanings that undoubtedly followed. Most severely affected is the area of the lower part of the drapery, which includes Hendrickje's hand, where Rembrandt covered most of an application of heavy impasto with dark paint. The texture of the fabric that replaced the original canvas has been transmitted to the paint surface only in an area of the left background—not over the whole surface, as in many other transferred works. The subtle play of subdued light in the atmospheric background still functions quite well. Hendrickje's face and headdress appear to be in satisfactory condition, especially when viewed under favorable lighting conditions. Hendrickje Stoffels is notable and unusual in that its quality is still vividly conveyed, despite its problematic state. The signature and date are spurious.

The extremely worn condition of The Sibyl (no. 29, vol. II; fig. 84), attributed to Willem Drost, is to a great extent due to the fact that it is painted on a discarded
composition. The first design, which is clearly visible in the X radiograph (fig. 85), was turned upside down when it was covered over. Most likely the same artist was responsible for both paintings: the head of the young woman in the earlier effort closely resembles that of the figure in the present painting, except that her eyes are downcast and her curly hair is more loosely arranged (fig. 86). These details and the cave at the right suggest that she may be a penitent Magdalene. The painter covered the first design with a light reddish brown priming and proceeded to lay in extensive shadow areas consisting of lake pigments on a large part of the surface. He then scumbled over this very dark and translucent preparation with more opaque muted colors to model the draperies and other details in this shadow zone, and he rather softly blended warm ochreous values in the face. Next he applied very thick impasto to the drapery on the woman’s shoulder and added highlights to her turban and also a few sketchy strokes in the dark passages below them to indicate flickering light effects on the ridges of the folds.

After the old restorations were removed from The Sibyl, so many distracting damages were revealed that it was almost impossible to distinguish any detail in the picture (fig. 84). The damages were therefore considerably reduced by retouching. This important first step in the new restoration, which was documented in color, contributes to the understanding of the painter’s technique. The white highlights on the turban stood out rather prominently and contrasted crudely with the sur-
Fig. 87. Rembrandt. Man with a Magnifying Glass, ca. 1662 (no. 17, vol. II)

Fig. 88. Detail. Cleaned state. Rembrandt. Man with a Magnifying Glass, ca. 1662 (no. 17, vol. II). Under the right tip of the white shirt collar a fragment of the black undersketching is visible.
rounding warm colors, giving rise to suspicions that they might have been added after the painting was completed. Now, however, it is obvious that originally these damaged highlights were less striking because they were scumbled over with an orange-colored ocher, and the equally abraded shadow zones were glazed with red lake. Most of what now appears yellow in the pastose drapery covering the shoulder was once orange and less conspicuous as well. A photographic detail of the abraded condition is shown in the exhibition next to the restored painting.

*Man with a Magnifying Glass* (no. 17, vol. II; fig. 87) and its pendant, *Woman with a Pink* (no. 18, vol. II), underwent strenuous glue paste relinings in 1934, when the original herringbone canvases were backed with two strong lining fabrics. Apparently, excessive moisture from the adhesive combined with mechanical pressure exerted during that procedure contributed to the extreme flattening of the original paint surfaces. The texture of the canvas has been pressed into the paint layer of each picture to a noticeable degree, for the most part in the thinly painted areas. The thickly built-up varnish in both paintings was applied primarily to level the abused surfaces. Solvent action and friction that occurred in past restorations have worn the paint layer down almost to the ground in the man’s portrait in areas of the collar, the hair, and the background (figs. 88–90). These damages reveal the structure of the paint layers and provide a glimpse of the preliminary sketch in bone black on the light quartz ground, evidence that corresponds to the findings of the autoradiography project carried out at the Museum in the late 1970s. The most
important parts of the portrait, including the face and the exceptionally rich costume, are in a very good state of preservation.

The upper part of the left sleeve, however, remains a somewhat puzzling passage. At the very top it matches the red right sleeve, but the section immediately below is different, changing into what seems to be a brassard, or armet, of cylindrical shape held by two straps extending to the elbow, at which point the red sleeve appears again and extends down to the left hand. The base color of the armet is a continuation of the same warm grayish umber tone of the background immediately behind it. The detail was applied directly over this base; all of it, except for the remains of the straps and two yellow ochre dots that once may have functioned as highlights, is now worn away. Nothing is left to indicate the material of the armet, which may have been metal, as some have suggested, or more likely leather.

Due to Rembrandt's pronounced chiaroscuro and unified color schemes, abrasions of the sort that occur in the man's sleeve are often not very disturbing in his work: reason enough for the restorer to exercise restraint. The last example in this discussion of condition, Man with a Magnifying Glass, shows how intricately the state of preservation, whether visibly deficient or not, affects almost every aspect of our judgment of paintings.
Rubens and Rembrandt: A Comparison of Their Techniques

The following is a summary comparison of the working procedures and studio practice of the great Dutch master Rembrandt (1606–1669) with those of Rubens (1577–1640), his Flemish counterpart of an earlier generation. It is pursued in an attempt to define more clearly certain individual features of Rembrandt’s methods. Despite marked differences in their overall production—such as the periodic emphasis on portraits in Rembrandt’s oeuvre that is particularly evident in the Museum’s collection—the extraordinary range of both artists’ accomplishments makes this comparison fruitful.

As a young man Rubens worked systematically to further his career. He traveled widely, spending eight years in Italy (from 1600 to 1608), painting in the service of the Gonzaga court in Mantua. From the Gonzaga court he undertook diplomatic missions to the king of Spain. He received important commissions to paint altarpieces not only for the Jesuits in Rome but also for churches connected with the papal court in Italy and the south of France. His extensive collection of drawings, made after ancient models, served as a valuable source of references for him. His interest focused increasingly on monumental painting of Christian, mythological, and above all allegorical subjects in the service of the glorification of the ruling houses of France, Spain, and England. His creative powers and imagination were never seriously challenged, and he held an absolutely unique position among his fellow artists.

Rubens was inspired by Tintoretto (ca. 1518–1594) and above all by Titian (1487–1576), whose works he studied throughout his life. During his sojourns in Spain he made lifesize copies of Titian’s monumental works. Such formidable efforts were never undertaken by any other great artist, and they represent an extraordinary homage to Titian. Rubens also made copies after other Italian and Flemish masters and painted commissioned copies in Italy for Emperor Rudolf II. He studied the methods of contemporary Italian artists and adopted their use of colored grounds on canvas. For the majority of his canvases he used a two-layer system, not unlike that employed in many of Rembrandt’s works.

Rubens had planned to stay in the south, but when his mother died, he was persuaded by city officials to take up residence in Antwerp. After his return from Italy he went back to using the traditional Flemish panel support. His characteristic streaky gray priming in an aqueous medium, which breaks the monotony of a white chalk ground, creates an illusion of space and imparts a vibrating luminosity to the overlayers.

Rubens used what he had learned in Italy to create a series of immense works, including The Raising of the Cross, the triptych on panel in the cathedral in
Antwerp. To master the challenges posed by paintings of such dimensions, he designed a lofty studio adjacent to his palatial house; from its mezzanine gallery he and his high-ranking visitors could survey the activities of his often numerous assistants. In addition to his studio assistants Rubens also employed independent specialists under short-term contracts, such as Jan Brueghel the Elder and Frans Snyders, who contributed to his series of huge canvases and ceiling programs and to the elaborate, though temporary, sets for triumphal entries that had to be carried out quickly by a large number of collaborators. To meet these challenges, Rubens developed a painting technique that could be understood and replicated by his collaborators. This technique was rooted in the Flemish tradition, and its principles remained essentially unchanged during his career. Rubens, however, systematized the various steps taken in the actual production of his large panels and canvases in an unprecedented way. Some aspects of his method had their origins in Italy, where artists (going back to Raphael) had, in principle, long been expected to produce preliminary full-size cartoons that were transferred to the final supports.

Federico Barocci (ca. 1526–1612), whose method Rubens studied, introduced separate oil sketches of chiaroscuro effects (bozzetto per i lumi [study of lights]) and colors (bozzetto per i colori [color study]). His oil studies do not, however, have the spontaneity and creative qualities so characteristic of Rubens’s oil sketches; in fact, in no other artist’s work do oil sketches play such an important role as in the Flemish master’s oeuvre. An oil sketch by Rubens was a guide for his assistants and allowed the patron to approve or to request changes in the composition, costumes, and related details. For several canvases in the Marie de Médicis series, Rubens provided a second revised sketch instead of correcting the first one. For the scene showing the betrothal of Marie de Médicis, which involved elaborate court protocol, Rubens made four successive oil sketches for the Parisian court.

Sometimes Rubens used an oil sketch as the first draft of a composition, but as a rule he began the creative process with a quick pen sketch on paper or perhaps a very small abbreviated grisaille sketch in oil on panel (for example, his design for the Jesuit church in Antwerp). Rubens frequently used the Italian term disegno colorito (colored design) for the colored oil sketch. Primarily because of their function, these oil sketches were also referred to as modelli in the seventeenth century. It is safe to assume that during production Rubens would either make an updated and enlarged version based on his initial sketch or entrust this task to an assistant. This version was important in transferring Rubens’s final concept to a large canvas. The variations of sketchiness in drawing and color in Rubens’s finished works as well as in his studies have proved troublesome to connoisseurs. In the seventeenth century, for example, the academically oriented Roger de Piles mistook *The Battle of the Amazons* (Alte Pinakotheek, Munich) for a modello because he thought this autonomous work’s color scheme lacked unity.

The primary role of Rubens’s students was to replace the master’s hand at certain stages in the production of the final version. The large drawings used for transfer were often done directly after the model with remarkable economy, great clarity, and precise attention to detail. They played an important part in the process directed by the master in which necessary improvements were by his own hand. Rubens’s highly inventive rationalization of paint application allowed him and his well-trained assistants to cope with the monumental canvases they produced. The infrequency
of delays testifies to the speed of execution, and the excellent preservation of most works to the soundness of the methods and materials employed.

A great effort was made to give the large finished picture an authentic touch, but the quality of this touch ultimately depended on the extent of Rubens’s own participation. For the Battle of Martin d’Eglise (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), one of the huge canvases of the partly finished series representing the history of Henry IV, Rubens probably employed Pieter Snayers, a specialist, to paint the top half with a bird’s-eye view of the battle. Rubens subsequently added large foreground figures, including the king on horseback. These figures are very sketchily painted in a Titianesque manner, and some scholars believe that they are unfinished. Surprisingly, despite the difference between top and bottom halves, the composition has a unity and certainly fulfills the function of such scenes, which were meant to be seen from a distance.

As a rule, Rubens touched up only those areas that bordered his own portion of the work—for example, in a painting in which Jan Brueghel the Elder added a floral wreath to a Madonna and in the Metropolitan’s Feast of Achelous, in which the master added figures to Brueghel’s detailed background. The contribution of his students, with the exception of van Dyck, remains on the whole visually anonymous—Rubens’s workshop methods did not encourage their individual inclinations.

Nude figures are prominent in Rubens’s paintings, and he eventually rationalized flesh painting to a point at which his assistants could carry out such passages largely or entirely on their own. His palette was based on the lighter values used in flesh tones by the Venetians and by Barocci. Rubens achieved a “mother-of-pearl” flesh by combining pink, yellow, and bluish tints in an enamel-like application of greatly varying thickness. The broad and rather smoothly finished impasto was combined with thin shadows. In Cupid Carving His Bow (Alte Pinakothek, Munich) Rubens carried his experiments in flesh painting to full perfection. He used the turbid medium effect in his half-shadows, which, although distinctly bluish, often do not contain blue pigment. There is evidence that Rubens systematically employed the three primary colors and that he might have exchanged ideas on optics with contemporary scientists.

In his Dialogue sur le coloris (sec. I, 1673) de Piles remarked on Rubens’s innovative approach, stating that he exaggerated color and light to make things seem more real and to achieve transparency in the flesh tones. Hans Sedlmayr (Festschrift für Hans Sedlmayr, Munich, 1962) described Rubens’s treatment of flesh as “the utmost glorification of the human body in its coloristic appearance” and thus the “embodiment of light” (present writer’s translation). In a March 16, 1636, letter to his friend Peiresc in Paris, Rubens mentioned De lumine et colore, his now-lost treatise.

Unlike Rubens, Rembrandt did not paint copies after Titian or other masters; he did, however, make drawings after paintings by earlier Italian masters and by his teacher Pieter Lastman. He collected reproductive prints after most of Titian’s works. Although he made good use of Titian’s wealth of compositional ideas, there is no evidence of the extent to which he was able to study original works by the Venetian master.

Rembrandt’s production of portraits in the early 1630s was not comparable to Rubens’s vast and varied entrepreneurial work, but it does throw some light on his
approach as a teacher and employer (see fig. 91). His technique, unlike that of Rubens, was not standardized—that is, it was not based in a fixed procedure. The individual hands of assistants are equally difficult to identify in the works of both masters. In Rubens’s case distinctions are mostly restricted to those that can be drawn between master or workshop. Individual traits in paintings from Rembrandt’s workshop have always aroused curiosity regarding authorship—the master gave students freedom in painterly execution as long as their overall approach was in keeping with his manner. The consistency of Rembrandt’s attitude to his students explains why the actual technique—the layer structure from the ground up—of many of the workshop paintings is different from that of the master’s authentic works.

The many surviving drawings from the Rembrandt workshop clearly demonstrate how readily Rembrandt’s students adapted his style. Much evidence documents the master’s interest in stimulating his students’ creativity. Groups of related drawings of very different quality dealing with the same subject, such as the Good Samaritan, give vivid insight into everyday studio activities (see figs. 92–99). These activities were closely related to Rembrandt’s own projects, which were reflected in his students’ copies after his own drawings.

No such exercises are found among the drawings from Rubens’s workshop, which include a great number of students’ copies after his preparatory studies for paintings. Rembrandt’s students worked on commissioned copies, and he encouraged them to familiarize themselves with his technique in other ways. The young Gerbrand van den Eekhout’s exercises included a painted copy (fig. 100) after Rembrandt’s print Christ and the Woman of Samaria of 1634 (fig. 102). There is evidence that at least three students made copies of a Rembrandt self-portrait that shows him drawing in his sketchbook, perhaps at the same time he was executing it. As a result of this profusion of material, none of the versions, including one that is in Dresden, are considered authentic. The same ambiguity about authenticity applies to appealing subjects created by the master that inspired his students to paint versions of their own. There are numerous examples of this phenomenon: the different renderings of the Head of Christ (no. 35), the many single figures of apostles and evangelists, including the Museum’s Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff (no. 37) and Man in Armor (Man?) (no. 31, vol. II), probably prompted by Rembrandt’s Alexander the Great (Glasgow Museum and Art Galleries), which inspired a whole group of school works, including the magnificent Man in a Golden Helmet (Man?) (fig. 2).

Both Rubens and Rembrandt had a good grasp of their compositions from the start. Rembrandt, however, never used a colored oil sketch for more ambitious or oversize projects. His few grisaille studies in oil belong to a category of their own, being almost exclusively done in preparation for etchings. Rembrandt did make numerous small drawings, sometimes elaborate and in a variety of techniques that often suggest the finished portrait quite vividly. These works might be considered Rembrandt’s modelli, since they fulfilled the required functions of preliminary studies. The highly calculated use of graphic means, combined with the painterly washes suggesting the play of light on figure and background, is occasionally enhanced by red chalk.

Rembrandt’s few monumental paintings were apparently prepared only with initial compositional drawings, probably done on the site for which they were
intended (for example, the Claudius Civilis [Nationalmuseum, Stockholm] and possibly the Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Deyman [Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam], which was summarily sketched). Only a few figure studies survive for the Syndics of the Amsterdam Draper's Guild (fig. 64, vol. II) but Rembrandt almost certainly made additional ones that resemble them. Not a single reliable study drawing remains for the Night Watch (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which originally measured 12 feet 9 inches by 15 feet 9 inches (3.88 × 4.79 meters) and which was apparently painted entirely by Rembrandt’s hand, as were the Syndics and the Claudius Civilis. These important commissions must have challenged Rembrandt to produce his best work without any help from his assistants.

Rubens left little to chance. Rembrandt, however, was not a systematic planner; he relied on a more intuitive approach that allowed him to realize his conception through the actual act of painting, at times making radical compositional changes during the process. In fact, van de Wetering (1982, sec. II, p. 42) suggests that the study drawings for figures in The Syndics were made during rather than before the picture’s execution.

None of the works in Rembrandt’s early Amsterdam style reflect Rubens’s manner. Rembrandt never met Rubens and he never visited Flanders. He was, however, impressed by Rubens’s monumental Descent from the Cross, an altarpiece in Antwerp, which he knew through Lucas Vorsterman’s engraving. This engraving prompted him to execute The Descent from the Cross (no. 98, vol. II), one of his largest etchings, which reproduces his painted version in the Munich Passion series (Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Alte Pinakothek, Munich).
This small group of drawings treating the same subject juxtaposes works from Rembrandt's hand with the kind of student exercises carried out in his workshop and encouraged by this dedicated and unorthodox teacher. Such works include copies (see figs. 94, 95, 97) of the master’s interpretations of biblical themes (see figs. 92, 93, 98) and variations on them (see fig. 96). Beginners (see fig. 94) and more accomplished students alike were taught to draw spontaneously in Rembrandt’s manner, primarily using pen and bister. The use of a pencil in preparation for pen work, which was not approved of, occasionally helps to identify copies.
Fig. 98. Rembrandt. *The Good Samaritan Attending to the Wounded Man*, ca. 1648–49 (Benesch 621). Pen and wash and bister, $5 \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ in. (12.6 $\times$ 12.3 cm). Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam

Fig. 99. School of Rembrandt. *The Good Samaritan Attending to the Wounded Man*. Pen and brown ink, $4\frac{7}{8} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ in. (11 x 13.5 cm). Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Most likely a copy after a lost Rembrandt; attributed to Philips Koninck by Gerson

Fig. 100. Gerbrand van den Eeckhout. *Christ and the Woman of Samaria*, signed and dated 16[...] Oil on wood, $25\frac{1}{4} \times 20$ in. (65 $\times$ 48 cm). Private collection, New York. Copy after Rembrandt's etching of 1634 (fig. 102). This picture is the only work that documents van den Eeckhout's presence in Rembrandt's workshop in the 1630s. Made when van den Eeckhout was still in his teens, this modest oil painting shows his early predilection for impasto and textured surfaces. Van den Eeckhout also based the composition of a later version of the subject (fig. 101) on Rembrandt's etching but reversed it and added some other changes. The scale of this miniature-like painting is close to that of the etching.

Fig. 101. Gerbrand van den Eeckhout. *Christ and the Woman of Samaria*, signed and dated 16[...]. Oil on wood, $8\frac{1}{8} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. (21.7 $\times$ 11.4 cm). David M. Roeter, Zurich

Fig. 102. Rembrandt, *Christ and the Woman of Samaria*, 1634 (Bartsch 71). Etching, $4\frac{1}{8} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ in. (12.1 $\times$ 10.6 cm). First state of two. Private collection, New York
This print was an ambitious experiment, executed when he was still struggling with a medium that was relatively new to him. He mastered it to perfection, introducing technical innovations to satisfy his highly individual demands, and succeeded in "representing painting in etching's own language" (Christopher White, *Rembrandt* [London, 1984]). Rubens, however, never learned this graphic art but instead had the most skilled engravers make reproductions of his compositions. His many designs for engraved frontispieces were sources of additional income.

Both Rubens and Rembrandt admired Titian's art, as did almost every great colorist, including El Greco and Velázquez. Rubens based his technique on that of earlier works by Titian. He adapted and modified the older master's method of painting thinly on a light ground (this is, in fact, a variant of the Flemish technique). Rembrandt, however, developed a strong chiaroscuro in his early works, influenced by his teacher Lastman, who can be considered a convert to the school of Caravaggio. He increasingly combined dramatic light effects with very dark backgrounds, and especially in his late portraits such as *Woman with a Pink* (no. 18, vol. II) the faces are sometimes thrown into high relief. Such textured paint layers were described for the first time by Laurie (sec. II, 1932). Rembrandt's manipulation of the picture's surface had its origin in the practice of fourteenth-century painters who molded and embossed their gesso to achieve the effect of light reflected from uneven and broken surfaces. This *pastiglia* technique was still used in the fifteenth century, when Van Eyck employed it for the brocade hangings behind the Virgin and Saint John in the Ghent Altarpiece.

The combination of chiaroscuro and loaded impasto in Rembrandt's large paintings shows an affinity with the method of the late Titian, who was the first to use thickly applied and dragged impasto. Titian's late brushwork was unlike that of his earlier practice and was referred to as his blotchy or rough manner by Vasari (*Le vite* [1568]), who acknowledged, however, that Titian's paintings appear perfect when looked at from a distance. In terms of the general development of painting, Titian's innovation marked the replacement of the painterly means used for direct representation with a method of suggestion and illusion.

El Greco, Hals, and Velázquez were masters of the new impasto technique, based on Titian, which they modified to suit themselves. These painters, however, did not have any important seventeenth-century followers or imitators. El Greco and Velázquez clearly carried on the Venetian tradition and developed the calculated use of highlights. Velázquez in particular achieved an extraordinary degree of illusion in his paintings, whose representation becomes meaningful when they are viewed from the optimal distance. It is not clear to what extent, if any, Rembrandt's creative and individual use of loaded impasto was influenced by Venetian art, in particular that of Titian.

Van de Wetering (sec. II, 1991, "Rembrandt's Manner and Technique in the Service of Illusion," p. 21) has recently analyzed the alterations made during the painting process by Titian, Velázquez, and Rembrandt to introduce his hypothesis that a figure of Rembrandt's stature modeled his artistic biography, so to speak, on that of Titian, whose "liberal use of the repentir, or alteration made while painting," must have been apparent in Rembrandt's own day. Here van de Wetering attempts to use Velázquez's established ties with Titian's innovative procedures to score a point for a desired association of Rembrandt with Titian.
In fact, the canvas texture plays the same role in Velázquez’s many large paintings that it does in Titian’s work; however, it never assumes this role in Rembrandt’s pictures. In addition, Carmen Garrido Pérez (Velázquez: Técnica y evolución [Madrid, 1992]) observes that in Velázquez’s works the uneveness of surface is more deliberate than accidental and results from highly individualized ground applications. She also points out the numerous sweeping changes with paint of generally light tonality that Velázquez made over large expanses of his thinly painted compositions. For Velázquez more than for any other artist a change in composition is a continuation of a creative idea that reaches the paint surface gradually or through a well thought-out but sweeping revision. Since the traces of the initial stages of a composition are often still visible from certain angles after its completion, the viewer can appreciate the uniqueness of an original painting by Velazquez’s hand.

The complexity and variety of Rembrandt’s surfaces set him apart from Titian and exemplify a basic difference between Netherlandish and Italian painting. Separately applied color values remain clean and distinct and can still be seen from a normal viewing distance, as they do in the flesh painting of the Man with a Magnifying Glass (no. 17, vol. II), down to the subtle accent of pink between the eyebrows. Here finishing dabs of orange yellow are placed next to fresh pinks on the cheek and forehead. A blackish underlayer is visible in minute crevices in the corner of the right eye and elsewhere.

The many late reworkings in his portraits testify to Rembrandt’s attention to detail and to his intense interest in the study of the human face, including his own. Such close observation recalls de Piles’s remark that Titian and Rembrandt knew that some colors should not be overmixed but rather should be agitated as little as possible with the brush. De Piles praised Rembrandt for his flesh colors, which are “not less true less fresh nor less exquisite than Titian’s” and remarked that “his way of using colour is unique” (Abregé de la vie des peintres . . . , 2nd ed., Paris, 1715). We may conclude by noting that Rembrandt’s flesh tones are closer to life than are those of Rubens.
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One of a new type of commissioned knee-length portraits with undefined backgrounds (see figs. 103–107), the so-called van Beresteyn Portrait of a Man (no. 3, fig. 107) is most closely related to Rembrandt's great imaginary representation of a man in Oriental costume (no. 2, vol. II). It is possible that this very striking figure in exotic garb painted at the beginning of Rembrandt's Amsterdam period awakened the desire of the man shown in the present portrait to be depicted in a similar posture. The juxtaposition of these two paintings in the exhibition emphasizes the different realities to which the figures in them belong. The predominantly warm color scheme in the Man in Oriental Costume ("The Noble Slave") contrasts with the cool palette of the formal portrait. In each picture the atmospheric background is treated differently according to its color scheme. In the van Beresteyn Portrait of a Man Rembrandt achieved an extraordinary realism by contrasting and setting off flesh tones with variations of gray, black, and white, coloristic principles he had developed in small self-portraits and fanciful portrait busts of the Leiden years. While The Noble Slave appears to us in an entirely undefined space, the Dutch burgher is positioned in front of a wall, which is suggested by the cast shadow in the lower right corner of the composition.

X radiographs (see fig. 35) and autoradiographs (see fig. 12) of the van Beresteyn Woman (no. 4, fig. 108) that show numerous changes confirm that this picture posed more of a problem to the painter than the male portrait did. This is not surprising, as there are a number of comparable cases in which the woman's portrait was adapted to the pendant of the spouse. More often than not these adaptations were made during the painting process, although Rembrandt executed a number of preparatory drawings for portraits that would have obviated such alterations.

The subject in our Woman was first composed in a free-standing position, more in accordance with the man in the pendant, with her left arm hanging free and the hand extending farther down. A stronger light emphasized the entire right contour of the figure, and the skirt was exposed down to the bottom edge. The atmospheric background was originally unified and uninterrupted but was subsequently obstructed by the introduction of the corner of a table on which the woman's hand now rests. The extremely foreshortened ornate cornice in the upper right corner strikes a somewhat discordant note in the otherwise undefined background, and one wonders whether the
painter might have added this distracting element as a concession to his client's demands.

There is no valid reason to doubt that this portrait pair was at least conceived by the same painter. Autoradiography shows that a sketch with bone black was made directly on the gray ground preparation of each picture, but that this drawing is more detailed under the woman's more elaborate costume and less apparent in the male portrait. It should be pointed out, however, that the style of these preliminary graphics varies considerably, even among the Museum's few portraits of the early 1630s, as is demonstrated by a comparison of the van Beresteyn Woman underdrawing with the much more strikingly vigorous handling of the underdrawing in the Portrait of a Young Woman with a Fan (no. 6, vol. II). (For further discussion of autoradiography, see "Methods of Examination" in this volume.)

As to the inevitable question of the authenticity of the van Beresteyn pictures, this writer considers them to be outstanding examples of what Rembrandt himself could achieve in a big studio production; he is, however, disinclined to dismiss altogether the possibility that an assistant participated occasionally, at whatever point, particularly with regard to the woman's portrait. Nevertheless, like any borderline paintings of high quality, they need to be distinguished clearly from undisputed works in the Museum's collection, such as Man in Oriental Costume, that are entirely from Rembrandt's hand. Rembrandt's contribution, which includes the compositional concept of both canvases, is dominant in the portrait of the man, where it is condensed in the head. As mentioned above, the van Beresteyn Man figures prominently within the development of what was for Rembrandt a new type of commissioned knee-length portrait, and if only for this reason it is hardly conceivable that it would have been delegated to a studio assistant.

It is more difficult to ascertain the extent of Rembrandt's intervention in the woman's portrait than in the man's, but his contribution appears to be sufficient to at once discard the suggestion that an assistant was entirely responsible and to justify an attribution of the pair to the master himself. The Rembrandt Research Project's conclusion that only the left hand in the Portrait of a Woman (fig. 110) has a claim to authenticity has been published as an established fact in the Rijksmuseum's Kunsthistorische Tijdschrift 5 (1991–92). The effect of publicizing the committee's opinion in this manner has been to foreclose further argument.

In the black costume of the man the paint film is rather seriously abraded in large areas where there was little to no admixture of lead white, in contrast to the woman's outfit, which contains a fair amount of this material and therefore has proved to be considerably less vulnerable to cleanings. The damage does not seriously restrict the ability of the connoisseur to judge the subtle play of light in the man's still remarkably unified dark costume, for this remains tolerably readable. Nor does the execution of the woman's elaborate dress, which looks sharper because of its better state of preservation, produce a sense of discord between the two paintings.

Fig. 105
Fig. 106
Fig. 107
Fig. 108. Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Woman*, 1632 (no. 4)

Fig. 109. Detail, right hand. Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Woman*, 1632 (no. 4). A distinct difference in the quality of the execution is evident in the woman's right hand, which holds a fan, and her left hand, which rests on the corner of a table (fig. 110).
Objections to ascribing the pair to Rembrandt based primarily on the grounds of X-radiographic study were initiated by Burroughs and later picked up by the RRP. However, comparisons of the van Beresteyn X radiographs with X radiographs of portraits that are indisputably by Rembrandt, such as the *Portrait of a Young Woman with a Fan*, contradict the categorical arguments that they are incompatible. The present author believes that the X-radiograph images of the van Beresteyn *Man* and *Woman* are essentially similar. This supports the idea that both were painted by Rembrandt or under his supervision and that the heavy paint application on the nose, forehead, and temple of the man are reworkings rather than underpainting that is incompatible with that in the picture of the woman. After all, this is the side of the bullet-shaped bare head that receives the strongest light, so that it emerges with full impact from the atmospheric background. (See “The Range of Rembrandt’s Individual Style: Consistencies and Inconsistencies” in this volume.)

Fig. 110. Detail, left hand. Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Woman*, 1632 (no. 4)
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Inscribed lower left: Rembrandt f. / 1633.
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.625

Surprisingly, it has escaped notice until now that an area of the chalk ground left of center at the very top of the picture is barely washed over with a reddish brown priming layer. The brush marks in this area are curved at the outer edge of the panel, confirming the fact that the portrait was originally oval (fig. 111).

The face of the appealing sitter is painted in a distinctly dry manner, with the modeling described by brushstrokes that mostly follow parallel curves. A stroked highlight is placed horizontally in the center of the forehead, and other highlights appear on the nose: a single stroke on the ridge and a dab of pure white on the tip. Such details recur frequently in authentic Rembrandts and workshop paintings alike. The execution of both the white cap and ruff is uninspired and somewhat pedantic. Especially along the outer edges the linen lacks transparency and subtle light effects. Background and costume are thinly painted throughout, so that the vertical grain of the wood remains quite visible.

The simple painting process can be reconstructed as follows: first the reddish brown priming layer was loosely and rather broadly brushed over parts of the whitish chalk ground that included the area of the black dress, but the face, the starched cap, and the ruff were left in reserve; subsequently the priming layer was brushed over sparingly with faintly greenish tinged gray paint in order to give the background some modulation. Curiously, the painter did not bother, or perhaps forgot, to apply this gray background color on the open space between the woman's right arm and her dress.

The very cursory treatment of the background and the lean consistency of the paint layer account for what the Rembrandt Research Project characterizes as the picture’s “rather lifeless appearance” (Corpus, II [1986] p. 413).

Fig. 111. Detail. Copy after Rembrandt. Portrait of a Woman, 1633 (no. 5). This shows the top edge of the panel painting which was originally oval and was not cut down from a rectangle, as most observers believed until recently. Such changes in format were often effected after paintings were completed, usually in order to make up pairs of portraits.
Indeed, the dress does look like a lifeless cutout, owing to its lack of modeling and substance.

The RRP cites similarities between the Portrait of a Woman and Rembrandt’s painting of Maertgen van Bilderbeecq of 1633 in Frankfurt in support of its opinion that the Museum’s picture is genuine; however, the Bilderbeecq portrait is ill suited to the committee’s argument because of its much more detailed execution, higher degree of finish, and greater unity of figure and background. Nor do the other portraits that the RRP considers comparable reveal a technique as abbreviated as that seen in the Museum’s picture.

It is possible to judge the Portrait of a Woman despite restorations in the face that cover flake losses caused by shrinkage of the panel across the vertical grain of the wood. The background and the black dress, which are more thinly painted than the face, have not been marred by such flaking, nor have they suffered from abrasions or loss of glazes. It is, therefore, unrealistic for my colleagues to deplore the lack of “any sense of atmosphere” in the background or the diminished sense of space in the lower part as the result of losses (for these never occurred) in an attempt to explain away an apparent lack of quality and to upgrade the picture. As a rule a considerably more substantial buildup of layers is seen in genuine Rembrandts, and the use of an abbreviated, literally cheaper technique here suggests a studio copy. The picture bears an inauthentic signature (fig. 112), which, according to the Corpus, “may have been copied from an authentic signature of 1633.” Furthermore, the X radiograph does not reveal any noteworthy revisions or sureness of handling. The very appealing face of the sitter, rather than the manner of painting, is the strongest feature of this portrait.

A reference made by Liedtke in volume II to the considerable range of quality found in Rembrandt’s formal portraits of the early 1630s, which he uses in support of assigning this picture to the master, strikes this examiner as an argument that ignores inconsistencies in the technique; these are entirely uncharacteristic of Rembrandt, whose approach as a painter was always consistent and uncompromising. Just how rigorous and unwavering this approach was has been convincingly shown by Brown in his entry on the Portrait of Philips Lucas (sec. II, 1988, Art in the Making, Rembrandt, no. 4), which Rembrandt painted under extreme time pressure.

Opposite page

Fig. 115. Detail. Rembrandt. Portrait of a Man, 1632 (no. 1, vol. II). In this portrait Rembrandt kept a perfect balance in the subtle play of light and shadow and most successfully combined attention to detail with a strong sense of volume. He faithfully depicted some signs of wear along the seams where the picot has worn off, thus individualizing the sitter’s clothing. The ornate buttons are applied with heavy impasto, which emphasizes their three-dimensionality. From close up they look thickly painted coins slanting toward the shadow side. Such details take on their intended appearance when viewed under conditions of illumination similar to those depicted — in this case, when the light falls from the left as it does in the portrait. The subdued light striking the sitter’s back brightens up the inner contour of his left arm, permitting a glimpse of the background. Figure and background form a unity. Both the black of the costume and the light gray of the background are richly laid on, and the adjoining contours are carefully adjusted and varied. The Portrait of a Woman (no. 5) has none of these painterly qualities.

Rembrandt devoted the same degree of effort to both light and shadow areas. Even when the lighting conditions are not ideal, the darkness is enriched by the temporarily concealed elaborate detail. There is no reason to assume that the doublet has noticeably darkened with time, as other passages may have in Rembrandt’s works (for example, those painted primarily with lake pigments). Rembrandt’s etchings, which are not subject to darkening, demonstrate his interest in the study of dark interiors and strong contrasts.

In an overall photograph Rembrandt’s very pronounced chiaroscuro can be captured only at the expense of either the dark or the light areas. The overall color reproduction of the present Portrait of a Man successfully records the general color scheme but does not do justice to the black doublet. The detail of the doublet was photographed separately in daylight, not straight on but at an angle to reduce reflections. Artificial lighting would have caused more glare on the numerous globules and tiny lumps in the paint layer as well as on the occasional hair fragment from the artist’s brush and the imperceptible dust deposits on the surface.

Fig. 112. Detail. Copy after Rembrandt. Portrait of a Woman, 1633 (no. 5). This detail, in comparison with the corresponding detail of Portrait of a Man (fig. 115), testifies to the inferior workmanship of the copy.
Fig. 113. Copy after Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Woman*, 1633 (no. 5)

Fig. 114. Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Man*, 1632 (no. 1, vol. II)

Fig. 115
9 Portrait of a Man Holding Gloves

1648
Oil on wood, 31 1/2 x 26 1/2 in. (80.6 x 67.3 cm)
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913  14.40.620

The highly speculative argument in favor of dating this portrait to the 1650s cannot be sustained reasonably in view of what actually survives of the third number in the painting’s date (fig. 116): namely the bottom of the vertical stroke of a 4 and quite obviously not, as the Rembrandt Research Project proposes, of a 5. The last number close to the cropped right edge of the panel clearly reads as an 8. It is hardly surprising that the members of the RRP, who are determined promoters of a new attribution to Jacobus Leveeq, a truly minor artist, question the authenticity of both the signature and the date. Nevertheless, the present writer considers the date 1648 (authentic or not) perfectly convincing in view of the existence of compatible portraits of the 1640s from Rembrandt’s studio; in these portraits cast shadows similarly suggest that figures are placed rather close to light background walls against which they are silhouetted. A case in point is the duke of Westminster’s Portrait of a Man dated 1644 or 1647. The fact that the hat and flat collar of our sitter are fully in keeping with the fashions of the 1640s also tends to confirm the accuracy of the date. The changes made in the position and outlines of this hat as revealed in the X radiograph (fig. 117) by no means support the contention of the RRP that the final version of the hat was painted by an artist different from the one responsible for the rest of the picture. On the contrary, the execution of the hat as it appears now is perfectly consistent with the handling of the black costume.

The hand holding the gloves is to a large extent a modern repaint made to compensate for losses, and there are two larger patches of pastosed paint above it that are visible only in the X radiograph. These patches seem to be part of a cuff that probably helped to integrate a now rather isolated passage with the rest of the figure. The wooden support has been trimmed on both sides, where numerous paint losses are found. This support consists of two boards identified by specialists from Hamburg University as Cedrela odorata, a rather expensive type of Central American mahogany that is now frequently used for cigar boxes.
Another panel made of this species of wood was used for Rembrandt's *Descent from the Cross* in Munich, which is generally dated 1634.

Placed next to the portrait of Herman Doomer (no. 8, vol. II), whose excellent condition is rivaled in works in the Museum's collection only by the Ellsworth *Portrait of a Man* (no. 1, vol. II), the present picture holds its own, despite abrasions in the face that have weakened the modeling of the nose in particular and 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.

The strength of the *Portrait of a Man Holding Gloves* is condensed in the face of the sitter, whose personality is very different from Doomer's. The level of detail in the present picture is also different from that in the *Doomer*: Rembrandt apparently appreciated the skills of the master craftsman Doomer to such an extent that he carried his portrait to a somewhat higher degree of finish than usual, bringing to the fore the qualities of his own craftsmanship in homage, as it were, to his subject.

---

**Rembrandt**

10 *The Toilet of Bathsheba*

1643

Oil on wood, 22½ × 30 in. (57.2 × 76.2 cm)

Signed and dated lower left: Rembrandt f / 1643

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 / 14.40.651

Gerson was the first to point out that the old servant in *The Toilet of Bathsheba* "is in the Leiden manner." He considered the stylistic discrepancy between this figure and the rest of the picture sufficient reason to suggest that it might be a "reworking by Rembrandt of some earlier painting by a student." This hypothesis implies that Rembrandt corrected his pupil's paintings, a premise for which there is very little visual evidence. (Numerous student drawings revised by Rembrandt do, however, exist.)

The servant first appeared in the form of a bepectacled old woman in an earlier treatment of the Bathsheba theme that is preserved only in a copy (fig. 118). Unlike the servant in the present painting, in this early composition and in the large *Bathsheba* of 1634 in the Louvre (fig. 122) in which she recurs, she is only marginal. The mere fact that a motif or figure such as this character—which is, after all, indispensable for the story being told—resurfaces in somewhat modified form in a work of a later period is hardly enough reason to antedate that work and demote it to what is essentially the status of a student effort. Moreover, technical examination provides evidence of a very consistent execution throughout the composition from the ground up.

The X radiograph (fig. 123) clearly reveals reworkings of Bathsheba's face and body and also of the arrangement of the clothes piled on the stone bench. These reworkings are organically fused with the previous paint applications and thus contribute to a uniform overall image. Changes, made quite apparent by overcleansings (see "On Condition" in this volume), were executed in the landscape to the left.

The technique is characterized by a relatively high finish and much attention to details such as the richly textured brocades. A paint cross section of the old woman's gown shows an unusually complex buildup of a pure red lake beneath several layers of purple paint (fig. 125).

The IR reflectogram of a detail of a tree trunk above the precious water vessel (fig. 126) reveals a few fluid brushstrokes of the initial sketch. It also records a broken brushstroke that was applied at the end of the painting process in order to define the bark, which is visible in a detail of the same surface that was photographed in daylight (fig. 127). Comparison of these kinds of details seen under different lighting conditions is instructive and helps to counter the confusion and misinterpretation in discussions about technique and ultimately about attribution.

This examiner, who recently cleaned the *Bathsheba*, is unable to find any compelling evidence to support Gerson's view—which has been endorsed unequivocally by a number of scholars who apparently did not understand that his opinion was based primarily on the stylistic discrepancies he felt existed in the painting. Even less convincing than Gerson's opinion for this contributor is an attribution to
Ferdinand Bol, whose landscapes are more loosely painted and more densely crammed with detail than the present work. Most important, there is nothing in Bol’s established œuvre that rivals the quality of the Museum’s Bathsheba. Variations on the theme of the Toilet of Bathsheba and an example of the related subject of Susanna are reproduced in figs. 118–122.

The story of David and Bathsheba is told in 2 Samuel 11:2–27. It happened, late one afternoon, when David arose from his couch and was walking upon the roof of the king’s house, that he saw from the roof a woman bathing; and the woman was very beautiful. And David sent and inquired about the woman. And one said, “Is not this Bathsheba, the daughter of Eliam, the wife of Uriah the Hittite?” So David sent messengers, and took her; and she came to him, and he lay with her. . . . And the woman conceived and she sent and told David, “I am with child.” [David eventually wrote to Joab, Uriah’s commander:] “Set Uriah in the forefront of the hardest fighting, and then draw back from him, that he may be struck down and die.” . . . When the wife of Uriah heard that Uriah her husband was dead, she made lamentation for her husband. And when the mourning was over, David sent and brought her to his house, and she became his wife, and bore him a son.
Fig. 118. Copy after Rembrandt. Bathsheba. Oil on wood, 9¼ x 8¼ in. (24.5 x 20.6 cm). Musée des Beaux-Arts de Rennes

Fig. 119. Rembrandt. Susanna and the Elders, 1636. Oil on wood, 16¼ x 15¼ in. (47.2 x 38.6 cm). Museum Mauritshuis, The Hague

Fig. 120. Pieter Lastman. Bathsheba, 1619. Oil on wood, 16¼ x 24¼ in. (41.5 x 61.5 cm). The Hermitage, St. Petersburg

Fig. 121. Rembrandt. The Toilet of Bathsheba, 1643 (no. 10)

Fig. 122. Rembrandt. Bathsheba, 1654. Oil on canvas, 56 x 36 in. (142 x 142 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris
Rembrandt grants prime importance to the female nude in his almost interchangeable representations of Susanna and Bathsheba. In his earliest treatment of either subject (see fig. 118), however, Bathsheba is only partly disrobed. She is attended by a crouching bespectacled old servant who is completely absorbed in the examination of her mistress’s left foot. Rembrandt’s lost original presumably dates from before his early Amsterdam period, which began in 1631.

Pieter Lastman, Rembrandt’s teacher, treated both subjects in his Susanna and the Elders of 1614 in Berlin and Bathsheba of 1619 (fig. 120) in the oblong format he favored. Rembrandt admired these: not only did he copy the Susanna in a drawing of about 1635, but he also took inspiration from both pictures for his own versions of the same themes, as the authors of the catalogue that accompanied the major Rembrandt exhibition of 1991–92 in Berlin, Amsterdam, and London have pointed out (sec. II, 1991, Bruyn et al.).

In the Susanna and the Elders of 1636 (fig. 119) Rembrandt emphasized the nakedness of his female figure by making her artfully piled-up clothes a focal point. The carefully studied arrangement of the clothing, with the dangling sleeve, is directly inspired by the related passage in Lastman’s Bathsheba. Rembrandt again drew upon his teacher’s inventions in the Museum’s Toilet of Bathsheba of 1643, choosing an oblong format and also borrowing the arrangement of Bathsheba’s legs; moreover, as the X radiograph (fig. 123) reveals, his original conception of the cast-off garment was adopted from his own Susanna of 1636, which, we have seen, had been taken in turn from Lastman. He reintroduced the old servant from his first Bathsheba in the Museum’s picture, showing her whole figure—she was only partially visible in the earlier version—and giving her more prominence, in keeping with the stylistic conventions of this later period. When Rembrandt interpreted this subject for the last time, in a large square canvas of 1654 (fig. 122), he again included the old servant, clothing her in yet another inventive costume; only part of her body is visible, echoing his first Leiden-period Bathsheba composition. The way this last Bathsheba’s hand rests on her piled-up clothing distinctly recalls the same detail in the Museum’s picture. Both elements testify to the sequence of recollections involved in Rembrandt’s creative development of a theme over the years.

Fig. 123. Detail. X radiograph, Rembrandt. The Toilet of Bathsheba, 1643 (no. 10). The X radiograph (taken during restoration in April 1995) reveals changes in the position of Bathsheba’s head and her right arm. It also shows her piled-up shirt on the corner of the stone bench, a detail that was subsequently covered over with the ornate gown. (The foreshortened white pins belong to the panel cradle, and the white blemish to Bathsheba’s left is a depression on the back of the panel that has been leveled with dense filling material.)
Fig. 126. Detail. Infrared reflectogram. Rembrandt. *The Toilet of Bathsheba*, 1643 (no. 10). The tree trunk to the left of Bathsheba in which the brushstrokes of the preliminary undersketching are revealed.

Fig. 127. Detail. Rembrandt. *The Toilet of Bathsheba*, 1643 (no. 10). The same detail shown in fig. 126 photographed in daylight.
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Fig. 125. Detail. Rembrandt. *The Toilet of Bathsheba*, 1643 (no. 10). The purple gown worn by the attendant is composed of an elaborate buildup of paint layers. The first color is a pure red lake on top of which successive veils of a purple paint mixture composed of smalt and red lake were applied. The opaque pigments black and white were added in varying amounts to provide darker and lighter shades needed to model the drapery. For this passage the purity of the purple color is assured because the addition of the black and white pigments has been kept to a minimum. The use of pure red lake as an underlayer is somewhat unconventional since it is normally employed as a transparent glaze over more opaque pigments. In an area beneath the heel of Bathsheba the top layer is worn off, and the pure red lake underlayer is clearly visible.
14. Christ and the Woman of Samaria

1655
Oil on wood, 25 × 19 ¾ in. (63.5 × 48.9 cm)
Signed lower center, on step: Rembrandt. / f 1655.
Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1959 60.71.14

Rembrandt's etchings and paintings of the Samaritan Woman reflect the influence of an early sixteenth-century composition (fig. 129). Now attributed to Moretto da Brescia, in Rembrandt's time this work was believed to be by Giorgione. A large version of it was jointly owned by Rembrandt and Pieter la Tombe and is listed in the inventory compiled on the occasion of Rembrandt's insolvency.

In 1968 Gerson accepted the Museum's Christ and the Woman of Samaria as an autograph work along with two other paintings of the subject in Berlin (fig. 133) and St. Petersburg (fig. 134). In so doing he rejected Sumowski's judgment of 1957 referring to our picture as a “compilation by a pupil.” The present author agrees with Gerson's opinion that the painting is a genuine Rembrandt.

John 4:3-15: [Jesus] left Judea and departed again to Galilee. He had to pass through Samaria. So he came to a city of Samaria called Sychar, near the field that Jacob gave to his son Joseph. Jacob's well was there, and so Jesus, wearied as he was with his journey, sat down beside the well. It was about the sixth hour. There came a woman of Samaria to draw water. Jesus said to her, “Give me a drink.” For his disciples had gone into the city to buy food. The Samaritan woman said to him, “How is it that you, a Jew, ask a drink of me, a woman of Samaria? For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans.” Jesus answered her, “If you knew the gift of God, and who it is that is saying to you, ‘Give me a drink,’ you would have asked him and he would have given you living water.” The woman said to him, “Sir, you have nothing to draw with, and the well is deep; where do you get that living water? Are you greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well, and drank from it himself, and his sons, and his cattle?” Jesus said to her, “Every one who drinks of this water will thirst again, but whoever drinks of the water that I shall give him will never thirst; the water that I shall give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life.” The woman said to him, “Sir, give me this water, that I may not thirst, nor come here to draw.”

Fig. 128. X radiograph. Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria, 1655 (no. 14). The X radiograph shows that Christ's right sleeve originally was wider; Rembrandt had to reduce it when he enlarged to their present size the figures of the apostles in the background (which are clearly distinguishable because of their strong outlines). He also canceled a strong light effect below the group of apostles, changed the base of the well, and increased the height of the tower.
Fig. 129. Moretto da Brescia. Christ and the Woman of Samaria, ca. 1520. Oil on canvas, 15⅜ x 12⅞ in. (38.9 x 31.2 cm). Accademia Carrara, Bergamo. Rembrandt was partly owner of a version of this painting, which in the seventeenth century was believed to be by Giorgione. He first drew inspiration from it about 1614. His renewed interest in the subject of the Samaritan Woman in the 1650s is reflected in paintings, drawings, and an etching, as well as in works that testify to the creative participation of his pupils.

Fig. 130. Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria, 1655 (no. 14).

Fig. 131. Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria, dated 1658 (Bartsch 70) (first incomplete state dated 1657). Etching, 4⅜ x 6¾ in. (12.5 x 16 cm). Third state of three. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Henry Walters, 1923, 23.51.9

Fig. 132. Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria, 1654 (Bartsch 71). Etching, 4⅜ x 4⅕ in. (12.1 x 10.6 cm). First state of two. Private collection, New York

Fig. 133. Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria, 1659. Oil on wood, 18⅛ x 16 in. (48 x 40.5 cm). Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin. The dark areas are quite thin, transparent, and smoothly painted. The light background was laid on with a heavily loaded brush and contrasts sharply with the figures, which were left in reserve.

Fig. 134. Attributed to Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria, 1659. Oil on canvas, 23¾ x 29½ in. (60 x 75 cm). The Hermitage, St. Petersburg. The gesture of Christ recalls that in Rembrandt’s etching of 1654 on the theme, and the architecture of the well closely relates to the same detail in his drawing Hagar by the Fountain of about 1644–45 (Benesch 560) in the Musée du Louvre, Paris. The child peeking over the top of the well is also included in the Berlin Christ and the Woman of Samaria (fig. 133).

Fig. 135. Attributed to Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria (Benesch 612). Pen and bistre, slightly rubbed with finger, on paper, 8⅜ x 7⅝ in. (20.7 x 18.7 cm). Barber Institute of Fine Arts, Birmingham, United Kingdom

Fig. 136. Circle of Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria (Benesch 978). Pen, bistre, and some wash on paper, 3¾ x 3½ in. (9.6 x 14.2 cm). Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. The first figure of Christ was covered over with white body color and then corrected, possibly by Rembrandt. Among Rembrandt’s treatments of the subject, this drawing is closest to the painting in Berlin.

Fig. 137. Circle of Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria (Benesch A100). Pen and bistre with some wash on paper, 4⅛ x 6¾ in. (11.8 x 15.5 cm). Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich

Fig. 138. Follower of Rembrandt. Christ and the Woman of Samaria, ca. 1653 (Benesch A80). Pen and bistre, slightly washed, 7⅛ x 11⅜ in. (19 x 28.5 cm). Szépművészeti Museum, Budapest
The essential component of the biblical story is interpreted most emphatically in the Museum’s version, which focuses on the dialogue between the two principals. By contrast, the Berlin picture is concerned primarily with showing the Samaritan Woman lowering her bucket, and the Hermitage painting frames and separates the two figures with architectural elements. In the present work the two protagonists are posed almost parallel to the picture plane in front of a rich and atmospheric dark landscape. The landscape, punctuated by a massive tower to the left and a palm tree to the right, is, in turn, silhouetted against a light sky in motion. These meaningful compositional elements are rendered with clarity and simplicity.

The painterly technique is extremely rich and shows a great variety throughout, as is typical of Rembrandt. It ranges from characteristic low-relief applications of the most luminous transparency in the deepest blacks and red browns of the landscape to the complex buildup of highlighted areas such as the well. Here a glowing, translucent orange red brushed directly over the ground provides a luminous base for subsequent applications of semitransparent color and of more opaque paint mixed with lead white, which display an infinite variety of textures created with the bristles of the brush. This rich color scheme, reminiscent of that in Venetian paintings, is enhanced by the woman’s multihued dress, which, unlike her impaired face and arm, is well preserved (see “On Condition” in this volume).

There are no panel paintings on biblical themes whose quality rivals that of the Museum’s Christ and the Woman of Samaria among the numerous products of Rembrandt’s workshop; most, in fact, are quite mediocre by comparison. Liedtke’s recent tentative attribution of our painting to Constantijn van Renesse (see entry for no. 14, vol. II) strikes this contributor as absolutely untenable. The Good Samaritan in the Louvre, a painting upon which he partially bases his contention, is not really comparable to the Museum’s picture; it is on canvas and at 44⅜ × 53⅝ in. (114 × 135 cm) is considerably larger than our panel, and in any event is attributed to Renesse only by a few scholars. Moreover, the two drawings he cites in support of his proposal at best reveal only vague similarities to the Museum’s painting. That most scholars agree that this Christ and the Woman of Samaria is a pupil’s work is, of course, hardly a reason to reject an attribution to Rembrandt. Indeed, what this exhibition demonstrates is that no opinion should remain unexamined and that in any case the most rigorous methods of documentary, stylistic, and technical examination must be brought to bear on all our judgments.

Comparative material is presented in figs. 128–138.

19 Gerard de Lairesse

1665–67
Oil on canvas, 44⅜ × 34⅝ in. (112.7 × 87.6 cm)
Inscribed lower left: Rembrandt
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975 1975.1.140

The surprisingly large single brushstroke slashed along the right side of the nose (fig. 139) can hardly have been executed by anyone other than Rembrandt himself. Apparently he first painted the deformed nose in a manner more true to life—its actual appearance is recorded in a number of engravings (see fig. 140)—and subsequently corrected it in the final stage of the painting process; in so doing he covered up a feature that might have been even more disturbing than it is now to the eye of the viewer and perhaps of the sitter as well. The X radiograph reveals clearly how the nose looked before it was altered (fig. 141). Lairesse also appears with a corrected nose in a self-portrait in the Uffizi, to which Haverkamp-Begemann drew my attention.

Owing to abrasion, at its top the bold corrective brushstroke lacks a bit of the shading necessary to integrate it with the surrounding areas, especially near the bridge of the nose and the adjacent eye socket. Old published photographs in books such as Abraham Bredius’s Rembrandt Gemälde of 1935 record this passage in a more satisfactory state.

The sitter’s left hand shows many small paint losses, particularly above the fingers. In the X radiograph (fig. 142) the light appears to be strongly focused on the fingers due to the presence of brushstrokes loaded with lead white, and as a result the hand looks more three-dimensional than in the actual painting.
Fig. 139. Detail. Rembrandt. *Gerard de Lairesse, 1665–67* (no. 19)
Fig. 140. Detail. Stone Bust of Gerard de Lairesse. Engraving from Arnold Houbraken, De grootste schouburgh der Nederlandsche konstschilders en schilderessen (1718–21)

Fig. 141. Detail. X radiograph. Rembrandt. Gerard de Lairesse, 1665–67 (no. 19)

Fig. 142. X radiograph. Rembrandt. Gerard de Lairesse, 1665–67 (no. 19)
20 Portrait of a Man

Ca. 1655–60
Oil on canvas, 32 ¼ × 25 ¼ in. (83.5 × 64.5 cm)
Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1890 91.26.7

The subject facing the spectator in this bust-length portrait has never been identified successfully. A middle-aged man with a small, partly shaven mustache and long dark brown hair, he wears a broad-brimmed hat with a low crown and a flat white linen collar with a little tassel. His forehead and the left side of his face are in the shadow, giving his eyes, which peer searchingly at us, a faraway look. Visible now are portions of his two hands emerging one above the other from embroidered cuffs and thrust in the folds of his black cloak.

Apparently, when the picture was started, it was to have included the sitter’s hands—they are very roughly sketched in with a loaded brush and left unfinished. But, like the hands in a number of other Rembrandt portraits, they were
subsequently covered over with black paint by the artist. They must have remained concealed until an early cleaner rediscovered them, and this initiated a sequence of restorations familiar in the history of Rembrandt’s work. The hands were not mentioned while the painting was in the Lansdowne collection, from at least 1854, but Hofstede de Groot referred to them in 1916, after they were exposed. There are no reliable records that relate to further interventions until 1951. The problematic state of the picture’s preservation, which should preclude rash judgments on quality and attribution, is discussed further in “On Condition” in this volume.

Among scholars whose connoisseurship can be taken seriously, only Bruyn, who gave his opinion verbally in 1976, has questioned Rembrandt’s authorship of this canvas. In the earlier literature the portrait is generally dated to the middle 1660s, possibly on the basis of Hofstede de Groot’s reference to a false signature and date of 1665 that have long since been removed.

The X radiograph (fig. 143) conveys an extremely sure image that captures the essentials of appearance. The under-painting is not quite as broadly handled as it is in many of Rembrandt’s portraits of about 1660, in which faces sometimes tend to acquire an almost relief-like plasticity because they are more fully lighted than that of our sitter. As a result the flesh paint in the former works is of a rather even thickness. In our portrait the shadows are treated differently, painted more thinly over a darker underlayer. Many individually applied touches of oil impasto on the topmost surface enhance the characterization of this sensitive face with its severe gaze. The fine quality of what survives of the original paint layer testifies to the considerable variety of handling that marks Rembrandt’s portraits of about 1660.

23 Portrait of an Old Woman

17th century
Oil on wood, 28 x 24 in. (71.1 x 61 cm)
Inscribed lower right: Rembrandt / f. 1640; upper left:
ÆT • SV • E • 87
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 29.100.2

The portrait is painted on a single piece of oak with the grain running horizontally instead of vertically, which is unusual for a seventeenth-century panel. The only explanation for the horizontal grain here must be that the artist had to turn the board sideways to provide a surface with the height he required. Prior to its use, the panel was carefully repaired with a long wedge-shaped strip of wood at the middle of the left side. The configuration of the wedge indicates that the panel has not been cut down on this side. As Émile Michel first noticed in 1894, the present picture is a copy of a three-quarter-length panel painting measuring 40% x 34½ in. (102.5 x 87.5 cm) in the Yarborough Collection, London, thought to be by Jacob Backer (1608–1651), that shows the same woman (fig. 67, vol. II). The unknown painter was obviously hard put to fit his subject into the almost square proportions of his panel, and thus he produced what is essentially a partial copy.

The painting has an exceptional provenance, which apparently inspired numerous conflicting attributions, ranging from Backer about 1636 to 1638 to a copyist of the eighteenth or early nineteenth century. Although the composition is typical of Backer, neither the style nor the execution is, in this writer’s opinion.

This very well preserved picture is, in fact, no more than a copy by an unknown painter of the seventeenth century; it most likely deceived viewers when it was still obscured with a yellow varnish. The poorly faked Rembrandt signature and the date 1640 placed inconspicuously at the very bottom of our panel near the right corner appears to be contemporary with the painting. It has so far been impossible to prove when they were inscribed, however, and some doubts about their origin linger.

The diligent but blatantly labored paint application of the present work (fig. 144) bears no resemblance to
Fig. 144. Detail. Partial copy after Jacob Backer. Portrait of an Old Woman, 17th century (no. 23)

Fig. 145. Detail. X radiograph. Jacob Backer. Portrait of a Man. Oil on wood, 30 × 19 in. (66 × 48 cm). Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich

Fig. 146. Detail. X radiograph. Jacob Backer. Portrait of a Woman. Oil on wood, 30 × 19 in. (66 × 48 cm). Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich

Fig. 147. Detail. Style of Rembrandt. Old Woman in a Armchair, 1634? (no. 24, vol. II)

Fig. 148. Detail. X radiograph. Style of Rembrandt. Old Woman in an Armchair, 1634? (no. 24, vol. II). Neither the detail of the face in normal light nor the X radiograph show brushwork with any resemblance to Backer’s own. Excellent details of a female portrait by Backer in the Wallace Collection, London (fig. 68, vol. II), are illustrated in Laurie’s publication on Rembrandt’s brushwork (sec. II, 1932, fig. 123).

Fig. 149. Style of Rembrandt. Old Woman in an Armchair, 1634? (no. 24, vol. II)

Fig. 150. Detail. X radiograph. Copy after Jacob Backer. Portrait of a Man. Oil on wood, 30 × 19 in. (66 × 48 cm). Private collection, Munich. Backer’s very characteristic fluid brushwork is clearly readable in the X radiograph. The workshop copy closely imitates the master’s touch but is a little coarser in execution.
Backer's fluent technique. His use of large rough accents in the modeling are visible to the naked eye and are even more apparent in X radiographs (figs. 145, 146). In the context of this discussion, it seems pertinent to refer here to the Old Woman in an Armchair (no. 24, vol. II; fig. 149). Wisely, Liedtke and Ekkart only tentatively attribute this picture to the twenty-six-year-old Backer, for the characteristic fluidity of Backer's style, or more specifically of his brushwork, is not to be discovered in the portrait. This observation need not be elaborated in words for the interested reader; rather, it is clearly confirmed by a close-up illustration of the face and a corresponding X radiograph (figs. 147, 148), which reveal the use of short brushstrokes that follow the form and are accented by small applications of loaded impasto.

Even copies produced in Backer’s workshop very closely resemble his originals, differing from them only in that they are of more modest quality. This is convincingly demonstrated in the Portrait of a Man in a Munich private collection (fig. 150), an oval copy on a panel, which the present author examined at the Doerner Institute in Munich together with the original.

---

**CIRCLE OF REMBRANDT**

*GOVERT FLINCK?*

---

**26 Man with a Steel Gorget**

Ca. 1645–50?

Oil on canvas, $37\% \times 30\%$ in. (94.3 × 77.8 cm)

Inscribed lower left: Rembrandt / F 1644

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913

14.40.601

The canvas was not initially rounded at the top to enhance the illusionistic effect, as others have maintained. Picchetto, a restorer who worked at the Museum in the 1930s and 1940s, for example, suggested in the treatment record that an original painted oval was covered over, but this is erroneous: it never existed. In 1969 Gerson voiced doubts that the picture was painted in the seventeenth century and proposed dating it later, suggesting the eighteenth century. Recent pigment analysis, however, confirms the use of azurite, vermilion, and lead-tin yellow in the paint layer and the presence of quartz in the ground, which are perfectly consistent with a seventeenth-century date. The gloved left hand covers a fully executed bare hand; a cross section shows that the glove is part of the original paint layer and must, therefore, have been added by the author of the painting.

This contributor does not support Liedtke's suggestion that Gerbrand van den Eekhout may be responsible for the present painting (entry for no. 26, vol. II); his proposal is based on comparative photographic material that seems neither specifically nor convincingly related to the picture and is, therefore, subject to debate. As an alternative to the evidence Liedtke cites, a detail of the face and X radiographs of the face and hands of the man with a gorget showing highly individual brushwork closely related to that of Govert Flinck are reproduced here (figs. 151–153). These are shown with an illustration and an X radiograph of an undisputed Flinck (figs. 154, 155). This illustrative material, with the support of additional evidence, might serve as the basis for a focused attempt to establish an attribution to Flinck.
Fig. 151. Detail. Circle of Rembrandt (Govaert Flinck?). *Man with a Steel Gorget*, ca. 1645–50? (no. 26)
Fig. 152. Detail. X radiograph. Circle of Rembrandt (Govaert Flinck?). *Man with a Steel Gogget*, ca. 1645–50? (no. 26)

Fig. 153. Detail. X radiograph. Circle of Rembrandt (Govaert Flinck?). *Man with a Steel Gogget*, ca. 1645–50? (no. 26)

Fig. 154. Govaert Flinck. *Bearded Man with a Velvet Cap*, 1645? (no. 49, vol. II)

Fig. 155. X radiograph. Govaert Flinck. *Bearded Man with a Velvet Cap*, 1645? (no. 49, vol. II)
One of the notable differences between imitations and genuine late Rembrandts is that the former lack the saturated and vivid color values seen in the flesh tones of the latter. Consequently, one often encounters pale complexions in inauthentic pictures. Such is the case in “The Auctioneer,” in which the effect is somewhat enhanced by a faint overall greenish tinge in the background and the deep black of the beret. A fairly light pink extends over the strongly lit portions of the face. The imitator built this up in two stages, beginning with a relatively thin, uniform surface of brownish pink that leaves the eye sockets in reserve; with a second application he enhanced forehead, cheekbone, and nose with heavy impasto of rather fluid consistency. A masklike appearance is produced, mainly because the lower lid of the young man’s right eye lacks definition. The painter did, however, define the face with shadows and transitional half shadows by scumbling and glazing with warmer umber tones, which have fallen victim to abrasive treatments, especially above the eyebrows and temple and on the cheek. Undoubtedly, the resulting damage has intensified the contrasts so that they are more powerful than intended. The richer and more softly blended shadows of the eyes and left side of the face strongly suggest the original, gentler effect.

The painting of the right hand deserves a close look. Even though the hand is badly abraded, the bone structure can still be felt, and enough coloristic variety remains to reveal it as one of the picture’s more successful passages; it is a tribute to the individual style of the unknown artist rather than to Rembrandt’s way of painting hands. Right next to this hand, however, beneath the folded pages in the auctioneer’s grasp, is the most Rembrandt-esque detail in the painting: the depiction of the play of light on the left cuff.

The portrait is painted on a medium-brown ground that was left uncovered here and there and in other areas toned down considerably with dark glazes in preparation for the application of deep shadows. The sleeve was prepared by brushing on opaque paint, ranging from brownish to slightly greenish umber tones to orange yellow highlights. The finishing touches include glazing of these applications, with brown, red, and yellow lake pigments, deepening shadows, enriching the final effect, and perhaps suggesting gold thread woven into the material of the sleeve.

Despite a generally successful attempt to approximate Rembrandt’s style, there is an imbalance between excessively transparent passages, in parts of the sleeve, for example, and more heavily built-up areas, such as the face. More important, the manner is, overall, suggestive rather than descriptive when compared with the works of the master. The painting 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. Extended study of The Auctioneer made it increasingly apparent that this picture was far less closely linked to Rembrandt’s studio activity than such other Rembrandt-esque works as the Head of Christ (no.35) and the Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff (no.37), which themselves do not explicitly follow the master’s technique. In view of this perception, a recently suggested attribution to Willem Drost can be ruled out.

By far the closest imitations of Rembrandt’s late painting technique are found in copies that the master assigned to his pupils as learning experiences; among these the Bust of Rembrandt in Stuttgart (fig. 5), one of many student exercises on this theme, has been examined more carefully than other comparable copies. However, with all its subtleties, this painting technique was probably never fully understood by Rembrandt’s followers and imitators; it must have left them puzzled, just as his printmaking technique remained a complete mystery even to Houbraken, who was himself an etcher (sec. I, 1718–21, p. 271).
35 **Head of Christ**

Ca. 1660
Oil on canvas, original dimensions, 16½ x 13½ in. (42.5 x 34.3 cm); with additions, 18¾ x 14¾ in. (47.3 x 37.1 cm)
Mr. and Mrs. Isaac D. Fletcher Collection, Bequest of Isaac D. Fletcher, 1917 17.120.222

There can be little doubt that this painting on canvas is a fragment and that its original dimensions are indicated by a second, complete and considerably larger version on panel in a private collection (fig. 156). A comparison of the two works confirms that all the details correspond closely, strongly suggesting that the sizes once matched as well. Moreover, an almost vertical shadow under the lock of hair in the lower left corner in the smaller picture is difficult to interpret but makes sense in the more complete one, indicating that the former work was once part of a larger composition. The picture in a private collection includes part of Christ’s left arm, with the hand inserted in the opening of his doublet. When or why our picture was cut down is not known; the only plausible explanation is that it was damaged.

Before our **Head of Christ** came to this country from Europe it was fitted into the sort of Louis XIV frame favored by Parisian dealers. To accomplish this, the picture was lined with a fabric slightly larger than the original canvas, and a 1¼-inch-wide (3-centimeter-wide) strip cut from an old painting was added at the bottom; the three remaining margins needed smaller extensions, which were provided by gesso fills. In pursuit of a better integration of the marginal additions, about 1940 the fragment endured another relining, which further contributed to the flattening of the paint surface caused by the previous lining. Recently the Piccheto varnish (see “On Condition” in this volume) was removed, and as a consequence the original color scheme was recovered.

Most scholars have considered that the present painting belonged to a series of bust-length heads of Christ. However, our picture is distinguished from the series in a number of respects: it is a fragment; it is painted on canvas and is considerably larger (of the works in the series six are painted on oak panels that do not exceed about 9¾ x 9 in. [25 x 23 cm]); and the technique is more finished (in fact, the spontaneous execution of the panels identifies them as studies). Nevertheless, the Museum’s **Head of Christ** relates to these studies, for like most of them it is a student picture that reflects student participation in Rembrandt’s effort to create a new image of Christ using a young Jew as a model.

Two of the small oak panels in the **Christ** series (one in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the other in Berlin) recently have been dated to about 1656 by means of dendrochronology. As a result scholars no longer could maintain the direct association of the entire series with Rembrandt’s **Supper at Emmaus** of 1648 (Musée du Louvre, Paris), in which there is a similar Christ type; they have linked it instead to a group of three-quarter-length views of Christ of about 1660, one of which is perhaps our **Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff** (no. 37), related to a late series of apostles that includes several authentic Rembrandts.

In view of the fact that at least two of the heads of Christ on panel are generally accepted as authentic,

![Fig. 156. Rembrandt. Head of Christ. Oil on panel, 24½ x 19½ in. (62 x 49 cm). Private collection. The white lines indicate the part of the composition preserved in the Museum’s fragmentary Head of Christ.](image)
it is somewhat surprising that by 1969 only Gerson still believed the Museum’s fragment to be a genuine Rembrandt. In fact, the rather smooth handling of the flesh areas, which was exaggerated when the canvas was over-pressed during a relining procedure, is uncharacteristic of Rembrandt. The viscous, broadly applied paint shows hardly any traces of brush marks; the exceptional areas, on the forehead and nose, are moderately impasted as a result of the covering over of pentimenti. The light enamel-like flesh color is applied over dark brown underpainting and contrasts with the deep black hair. In part because of the worn condition, there is little detail in the beard, except for a few rather prominent scrawls that were scratched into the wet paint and reveal the whitish ground.

This head is of fine quality: a larger, more ambitious, and more finished rendering of the Christ type seen in various poses in small, coloristically related Rembrandtesque studies of the Dordrecht school.

FOLLOWER OF REMBRANDT (NICOLAES MAES?)

36 Old Woman Cutting Her Nails

Ca. 1660
Oil on canvas, 49 3/4 x 40 3/4 in. (126.1 x 101.9 cm)
Inscribed lower left: Rembrandt / 1648
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.609

The picture is painted on a fairly fine canvas that clearly shows a horizontal seam. The ground (chalk with additions of ochre and lead white) is of a sandy hue. In most areas, however, it was toned down with umber to make it more suitable as a priming for the shadows. It was left uncovered in small portions, especially in the flesh tones. The main color scheme is established by the subdued reds and red browns of the fur-lined cloak, which displays a copper shade in the light parts and in a few highlighted ridges consisting of thickly applied bright yellow paint scumbled over with red ochre. Accents of strong red are restricted to small areas at the figure’s wrists where they border on the white shirt.

Unlike the hands, the face is painted in a highly individual technique, with patches of different colors applied separately: cool gray for the shadows, pink for the half shadows, yellowish tints for the lighter areas, and finally almost pure white for accents. The painter unified these different patches by scumbling (not glazing) over them with a reddish yellow. The deep shadows are dense and almost blackish. There are only a few accents of cool pink on the most prominent parts of the face, the intensity of which is subdued in some areas, such as the right nostril, with a dab of bluish gray. The artist seems to have made an effort to show that the most intense light hits only the tip of the nose by adding his brightest pink accent there (fig. 157). This paint handling in the face could not differ more from Rembrandt’s technique, which makes it unlikely that the picture was even painted in his workshop, not to mention by the master himself.

Fig. 157. Detail, Follower of Rembrandt (Nicolaes Maes?). Old Woman Cutting Her Nails, ca. 1660? (no. 36)
The pale yellow kerchief is underpainted with a thick impasto of white that was scumbled over and subdued in the half shadows and shadows. It contrasts with the white cap that covers part of the old woman's forehead and in the light parts displays cool (pink and violet) and warm (pale ivory) values of limited variety and a rather dull grayish quality. The white shirt with its light bluish gray shadows appears to have been finished already when it was rather roughly accented with brushstrokes of thickly applied paint of creamy consistency. The bristles of the stubby brush that was used produced curiously peaked fringes in the impasto. Highlights on the fur to the left and right of the shirt are similarly crude and equally unrelated to the rest of the paint layer (fig. 159). It is extremely unlikely, therefore, that they are part of the original layer; probably they were added to make the smoothly painted passage look more Rembrandtesque.

The paint surface on the whole is smooth and its consistency rather viscous. Indeed, the artist seems to have attempted to conceal rather than display his brushstrokes except in a heavy application of white with a dragged brush on the woman's right wrist. The quality of the impasto in this area contrasts markedly with that in the highlight on the shirt but is very much in keeping with the viscous character of the medium. With respect to its lack of modulation, the technique is quite comparable to the manner of the Dordrecht painter Nicolaes Maes. It is certainly different from the execution of Karel van der Pluym and Abraham van Dijck, two other Dordrecht artists frequently referred to as possible authors of this picture; the few works reliably attributed to them generally display considerably more pronounced brushwork, especially in the flesh tones.

Our painting has been ascribed to Maes, in part based on its resemblance to the Apostle Thomas in Kassel, which has been attributed to him by this author and others. Unfortunately, the Old Woman Cutting Her Nails was not included along with the Apostle in the Rembrandt exhibition of 1991–92 in Berlin, Amsterdam, and London, and an opportunity to compare the two works was missed. Nevertheless, 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.

For some time, and in particular recently, much attention has been focused on attributing this rather imposing but not flawless composition. This search for a convincing name exemplifies a tendency to compensate for the increasing number of pictures left authorless by deattributions from Rembrandt. In view of their very problematic oevres, it is highly questionable whether the minor masters, let alone the third-rate painters who on rare occasions produced unusually ambitious works, provide answers to the problems posed by deattributions.

This writer cannot accept the attribution of the Old Woman Cutting Her Nails to van Dijck (first suggested orally by Schmidt-Degener in 1935), which on grounds of insufficient and incidental evidence was recently called the ultimate resolution to the problem. He therefore proposes to exhibit it as by a follower of Rembrandt (Nicolaes Maes?). A related drawing by a member of Rembrandt's school is shown in fig. 158.
Fig. 159. Detail. Follower of Rembrandt (Nicolaes Maes?). Old Woman Cutting Her Nails, ca. 1660s (no. 36)
37 Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff

1660s
Oil on canvas, 37½ × 32½ in. (95.3 × 82.6 cm)
Inscribed right center: Rembrandt f. 1661
The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.37

The paint layer is quite dense throughout and lacks transparency in comparison with Rembrandt’s works of the 1660s, which this picture to some extent resembles. Paint was applied in larger areas than in authentic Rembrandts and rather uniformly in terms of thickness and color value. The artist initially achieved some definition of these surfaces by applying details rather densely with a loaded brush, as in the column. Most of these details are kept in a subdued color range that closely relates to the tonalities of the underpainting: dark gray and reddish brown in the background and reds, oranges, and red browns in the figure, the familiar palette of the Dordrecht school, which play against one another.

Only too conspicuous is this artist’s predilection for scratching into the still-wet paint, a device often used by Rembrandt and his circle (most frequently by the late pupil Arent de Gelder, who employed it to describe textiles). The author of Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff exploited it for decorative effect rather than as a guideline for the design in areas—in the hair, for example—as Rembrandt did. Our painter scratched vigorously on the shoulder of Christ but worked more subtly on the hem of the shirt, where he brushed paint on and then divided it into two fine lines (fig. 160). The interested viewer will find that the same delicate effect was created on the clasp below the hat in the authentic Flora (no. 12, vol. II). Such parallels of detail are merely coincidental reappearances of the minutiae of workshop practice and do not carry any weight in arguments about attribution.

As a characteristic feature of his technique, our artist defined the larger forms and planes with sweeping
brushstrokes of transparent black or dark brown pigment during the final stages of the painting process. Without these final accents the folds of the cloak and the checkerboard pattern of the garment emerging from it would lack clarity, and the base of the column would seem flat. Undeniably, this painter thought more in terms of flat surfaces treated rather graphically than of volumes, an approach that sets him apart from Rembrandt, whose forms are powerfully modeled with chiaroscuro.

In the present picture figure and background are not unified, and the curiously fuzzed-out left contour of Christ's form in particular makes the body look a bit flat. Other soft and blended effects, which seem to be hallmarks of this painter's style, are visible in the hands, where the fingertips turn slightly sideways, recalling de Gelder's manner. Blended brushstrokes appear also in the face, the execution of which is quite tentative, especially in comparison with the decisive treatment in the white shirt—a contrast that is even more pronounced in the X radiographs.

This author rules out the possibility that the picture results from a collaboration between Rembrandt and a pupil not because of deficiencies of style but primarily on the grounds of individual features of technique that differ from those of the master and are quite consistent throughout. Furthermore, this writer sees no resemblance between the execution here and that in Rembrandt's Risen Christ in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, although others have found similarities.

The observations made here are supported by a comparison of the present picture, which is surely a school work, with the Saint Bartholomew in the Timken Museum of Art, Putnam Foundation, San Diego, a painting of irresistible authenticity. The painter of the Christ with a Pilgrim's Staff seems to have been inspired by the handling of large areas of drapery and the sweeping finishing strokes Rembrandt displayed in the Saint Bartholomew and similar works. But he did not provide counterparts for Rembrandt's modeling and vivid sense of space or his enrichment of surfaces with an infinite variety of paint applications, which, like his balanced control of opacity and transparency of paint layers, is inimitable.

The Christ in our picture wears a transparent black veil with a red fringe, which is not noticeable immediately because it sits toward the back of the head. H. M. Rotermund ("Wandlungen des Christus-Typus bei Rembrandt," Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch 18 [1956], p. 230) has suggested convincingly that with this detail, the staff, and the massive column the painter identified the figure as a Jewish pilgrim visiting a synagogue.

FOLLOWER OF REMBRANDT

40 Portrait of a Young Man with a Beret

17th century
Oil on canvas, 29½ × 24¼ in. (75.9 × 62.9 cm)
Gift of Charles S. Payson, 1975, 1975.273

The use here of a double ground (see "Methods of Examination" in this volume) is consistent with familiar seventeenth-century methods practiced in the Rembrandt circle. There is evidence of interventions involving the support that include the removal of a 7-to-8-inch (17.8-to-20.3 cm) strip from the top of the canvas and its later replacement, the temporary fitting of the painting on a smaller stretcher, and its subsequent folding out on another stretcher.

An X radiograph and a series of autoradiographs (fig. 162; see fig. 163) reveal the portrait of an old man with a goatee and an open collar under the present painting in exactly the same position as the young man. The Young Man with a Beret is bound to remain the subject of debate because it is a reworking of a discarded portrait; however, recent cleaning and laboratory tests, as well as close comparisons to similar paintings in the Museum's collection, clearly 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. After removal of nineteenth-century repaints that excessively enlarged the beret (so that it bulged at the top) and completely covered the badly abraded black cloak and part of the background where a false signature had been added, the portrait can now be judged with more assurance (figs. 161, 164, 165). (The color plate seen here shows the painting after the most disturbing paint losses were retouched.)

Quite obviously, the young man's shoulder-length curly hair has suffered severely from excessive solvent action, so that the underlayers are exposed through numerous gaps in the upper paint layer. The dark reddish brown revers are sprinkled with particles of yellow ocher, a curious but not unfamiliar sight in abraded old paint surfaces. The lips are retouched with a few short strokes ranging from dark...
crimson and red ocher to a light pink on a gray-brown underlayer that was left partly uncovered. The corner of the mouth at left is shaded with a now partly abraded shadow of translucent brown. There is another area of reworking on the lit side of the face below the eye and leading up to the bridge of the nose. These and other interventions suggest that the face was subjected to more than one change, and the consistent crack pattern supports the premise that the reworkings originated in the seventeenth century with the painting’s author. No attempts have been made to reconstruct or retouch any of the abraded or repainted areas because of the many changes undertaken by the painter.

Especially in this country, where a number of would-be Tituses have found homes, a sentimental affection for Rembrandt’s young son developed. The Payson portrait was long thought to represent him and may well have been modeled on the likeness of Titus executed by Rembrandt and his circle; however, the artist, like several scholars who never tired of arguing about the identity of the sitter, apparently was unaware that Titus did not have a cleft chin. In the 1927 catalogue of the Holford collection, Benson listed the picture correctly for the first time, as a portrait of a man with a cleft chin, and considered it an earlier version of a painting in the Louvre (Bredius 292).

The picture is traceable back to 1854, when Waagen, the director of Berlin’s Königliche Gemäldegalerie saw it in the Holford collection in London and wrote: “A strictly frontal male portrait with a gold chain, [it] is of extraordinary power and depth of tone, though less pleasing in feeling.” It did not change hands until it was sold through Knoedler’s to Charles Payson. Surprisingly, Rembrandt’s authorship was never seriously doubted before it was challenged on stylistic grounds by Haverkamp-Begemann in 1976 and on technical grounds by the members of the Museum’s autoradiography project of 1976 to 1980. During the late 1970s it was still quite usual to assign problem pictures in Rembrandt’s style to imitators of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and the Museum 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.

Rembrandt criticism has advanced at high speed recently; by contrast with today’s scholarship, Rembrandt connoisseurship at the Metropolitan in the late 1970s seems outdated indeed, especially in view of the fact that the now-deattributed Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff (no. 37) and the Portrait of a Man (“The Auctioneer”) (no. 32) were then considered authentic by the Museum and set a standard against which the present portrait was judged.

Fig. 161. Before restoration. Follower of Rembrandt. Portrait of a Young Man with a Beret, 17th century (no. 40).

Fig. 162. Detail. X-radiograph. Follower of Rembrandt. Portrait of a Young Man with a Beret, 17th century (no. 40).

Fig. 163. Eighth autoradiograph. Follower of Rembrandt. Portrait of a Young Man with a Beret, 17th century (no. 40). This autoradiograph, published here for the first time, records under the present picture the portrait of an older man with an application of black paint across his forehead that may relate to an early concept of the beret. The present face is painted on top of this. Clearly distinguishable on the left side of the face that is visible in the autoradiograph is the open collar of a shirt most likely worn by the older man; the portrait of the older man is also revealed in the X radiograph (fig. 162). The autoradiograph simultaneously records paint applications that presumably are close to the ground preparation as well as some at the surface—for example, the false Rembrandt signature near the left margin. This method of examination, therefore, is susceptible to misinterpretation.

Fig. 164. Cleaned state. Follower of Rembrandt. Portrait of a Young Man with a Beret, 17th century (no. 40).

Fig. 165. Detail. Cleaned state. Follower of Rembrandt. Portrait of a Young Man with a Beret, 17th century (no. 40).
41 Rembrandt’s Son Titus

Second half of 17th century
Oil on canvas, 31⅛ × 23¼ in. (79.1 × 59.1 cm)
Inscribed upper left: Rembrandt. f. 1655.
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 14.40.608

The very conspicuously placed and overly large signature does not seem to be of much later date than the paint layer. There is no proof, however, that is was added by the author of the portrait. The picture is executed on a relatively coarse canvas, which to some extent explains why the artist used the kind of heavy double ground that appears in many other paintings of Rembrandt’s time (see “Methods of Examination” in this volume). Prominent horizontal cracks in the ground have been transmitted to the paint layer. Numerous minute losses, now retouched, once exposed the red ground that fills the pores of the canvas.

A heavy dark gray tonality predominates overall. The sparse detail of the tunic was underpainted locally with black, onto which accents of dark yellow and reddish ocher were sketchily brushed. Black was also used in the deep finishing shadows. Violet hues in the lighter parts of the tunic enliven the generally somber color scheme. The black cap is painted on top of a medium brown underlayer. A few pentimenti are visible on the figure’s temple and the adjacent forehead. The artist added finishing highlights on the lower lip and at the center of the upper lip, a dull pink stroke to the left of the tip of the nose, and, immediately above it, two white strokes. These touches, more delicate than others in the picture (fig. 166), were not noticeable until recently, when a few repaints were removed from the face. (Some retouches remain above the left eye.)

There is no reason to doubt that this picture originated in the seventeenth century, as McGlinchey’s pigment analysis (see section on UV examination of lake pigments in “Methods of Examination” in this volume) indicates. Pending further study, it will have to be added to the group of works painted by nameless Rembrandt followers, possibly during the master’s lifetime.

Fig. 166. Detail. Follower of Rembrandt. Rembrandt’s Son Titus, second half of 17th century (no. 41)
42. **Man with a Beard**

Last quarter of 17th century  
Oil on canvas, 28½ × 25½ in. (73.3 × 64.1 cm)  
Inscribed lower left: Rembrandt / f. 1665  
Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889  89.15.3

The weave of the 2-inch (5.1-cm) strip of canvas at the top of the picture differs from that of the rest of the support; this strip was added before the painting was started. The ground is chalk with an upper layer of grayish white, which provides luminosity for the paint layer. 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. The artist built up almost the entire composition with glazes, employing little substantial underpainting. In the lower left corner near the false signature, which clearly is contemporary with the paint layer, there is evidence of the use of a palette knife.

The color scheme is nearly monochromatic, with the predominant brown moving toward grayish brown in the background. The lighter areas of the jacket near the left shoulder are painted with red and yellow ochre tones and more densely than other parts of the composition. Here the brushstrokes are slanted and applied in strictly parallel fashion, recalling a comparable passage in Rembrandt’s self-portrait of 1660 (no. 15, vol. II, fig. 167). Light falls from the top of the composition and strikes the subject’s right cheek, leaving the rest of his face in shadow: undoubtedly, the imitator had looked at Rembrandts of the period of the self-portrait that show faces illuminated from above and on only one side. It appears that he was not very familiar with the kind of collar pictured, for he left its arrangement unclear; indeed, the forms in this pastiche are in general undefined and insubstantial by comparison with genuine works.

A discoloration of the medium accounts for the slightly yellowish tinge of the creamy lead whites, which are unlike the crisp and opaque whites usually seen in Dutch paintings of the seventeenth century. Equally surprising is a layer of lead-tin yellow discovered beneath the brown paint of the garment. This yellowish layer might have been intended as underpainting or perhaps represents an initial color choice that the painter canceled. In any event, the presence of lead-tin yellow is a criterion for dating a painting prior to about 1700, when the pigment went out of use. In view of the appearance of this material in our forgery, which was first recorded in an engraving of 1764, a dating to the last quarter of the seventeenth century is suggested here.

The case of *Man with a Beard* demonstrates the persistent power of deceptive images (the painting’s authenticity was still supported by a notable scholar in the 1960s); it also underscores the necessity to explore thoroughly the material aspects of pictures to support critical analysis of style in pursuit of balanced and realistic attributions.

---

Fig. 167. Detail. Rembrandt. Self-Portrait, 1660 (no. 15, vol. II)
Glossary

**Charlotte Hale**

The list is restricted to terms used in this volume.

**Asphaltum** Also called bitumen, a naturally occurring tarry compound. Mixed with oil it produces a rich, semitransparent, warm brownish black that has been used by painters since ancient times. Asphaltum never fully dries and can cause disfiguring cracks, particularly if used thickly. When properly prepared and handled, as by Rembrandt or Rubens, its inherent problems can be minimized.

**Beveling** On a panel support, the paring down of the back edges to an angle to facilitate fitting the finished painting into its frame. Since this was a common practice in Rembrandt’s time, the absence of a bevel on one or more sides can indicate that the work has been cut down.

**Cartoon** A full-size preparatory drawing for transfer to a painting. The word derives from the Italian cartone, the heavy paper on which such designs were made.

**Chiaroscuro** From the Italian chiaro (light) and oscurt (dark), the depiction of light and shadow in paintings. The term is generally associated with dramatic effects, as exemplified in the work of artists such as Caravaggio, Georges de La Tour, and Rembrandt.

**Cross section** A sample used in the examination of materials and layer structure of a given point on a painting. These minute paint samples (typically ½ mm across) are embedded in resin. Once solidified the composite is ground down to expose the paint stratigraphy and examined with reflected light under a microscope. Magnification is generally 100-300x. Cross sections can also be examined under ultraviolet reflected light (see Fluorescence). In addition to providing a view of the buildup of the paint, cross sections sometimes allow for the identification of pigments optically or by using various instruments for elemental analysis.

**Dead coloring** The preliminary blocking in or underpainting that establishes the tonal values of a picture and serves as the base for overlying paint layers. The process is described in Karel van Mander’s highly influential *Het Schilder-Boeck* of 1604. (See Lay in and Underpainting)

**Dendrochronology** A method of dating wooden objects, including panel supports used for paintings, based on examination of the annual growth rings of trees. The width of these rings varies according to climate and other conditions that determine growth. When compared with established chronologies of tree rings, the sequence of the rings in a given board indicates the felling date of the tree from which it was taken and thus provides at least the earliest possible date of its use. This terminus post quem assists in placing a painting in an artist’s oeuvre.

**Fluorescence** Certain materials—media, varnishes, and a few pigments such as organic lakes—emit visible light, or fluoresce characteristic colors and intensities, when excited by ultraviolet (UV) light (q.v.). When the surfaces of paintings are examined under illumination from UV lamps in darkened rooms, additions or retouchings can sometimes be observed since these often appear dark in relation to paint layers and varnish, both of which can fluoresce more strongly with age.

**Glaze, glazing** A layer or layers of translucent paint applied over an opaque and generally lighter underlayer, which acts like a colored filter to modify and enrich color and/or create a sense of depth. The glazing technique is best exploited in oil painting, where the transparency of the paint permits the production of a wide range of tone and hue. The terms apply to both the paint film and the technique. (See Lake pigments)

**Ground** The overall preparatory layer or layers of material applied to a support as a structural and coloristic base for subsequent painting. Rembrandt and painters of his circle frequently used so-called double grounds applied in two layers, often of different colors.

**Haptic** Relating to or based on the sense of touch. In Rembrandt’s paintings the term can be used to describe the creation of textures of extraordinary tactility through the use of variegated brushwork and scratching into paint. (See Impasto)

**Impasto** Paint applied in thick or heavy strokes that stand out in relief.

**Imprimatura** Also called priming, a thin paint layer applied over the ground either generally or locally to modify its color or tone in preparation for subsequent painting.

**Infrared reflectography** An analytical imaging method that uses infrared (IR) radiation for the study of underlayers and underdrawings invisible to the naked eye (infra is Latin for below). Infrared wavelengths are just longer than those of the visible light spectrum. IR radiation penetrates certain colors and reveals images that arise from the contrast between materials that absorb IR—such as carbon-based pigments used in painting and underdrawing materials—and materials that reflect IR—such as white pigments often used in grounds. While IR photography using sensitized film records images derived from the near infrared, IR reflectography uses a video system incorporating an IR tube and is sensitive to a longer wavelength of radiation that can better penetrate the upper paint layers. IR imaging techniques are particularly well suited to the study of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Northern European panel paintings. Their application for works of Rembrandt and his school is generally limited to panel paintings, for which they have been used to clarify darkened shadow areas.
Lake pigments  Pigments made by precipitating a dyestuff onto an inert base such as aluminum hydroxide. Until organic dyestuffs were synthesized in the nineteenth century, the coloring material of lake pigments was derived from various natural sources, both vegetable and insect; rose madder, for example, is made from the herbaceous perennial Rubia tinctorum. Lake pigments are translucent, particulary in oil, and are often used for glazing. (See Glaze, glazing)

Lay in  A preliminary rough blocking in or underpainting (q.v.)

Macrophotography  The technique used to photograph details of paintings, either one-to-one or enlarged, using a camera with a short-distance focusing lens. Macrophotographs provide a very precise record of a picture's surface, showing brushwork, crack systems, and other minutiae and are invaluable tools for the study and documentation of technique and condition.

Microphotography  The technique used to photograph details of a painting using a microscope and thus always larger than one-to-one. Microphotographs record features too fine for the naked eye to discern, such as the size and distribution of pigment particles, minute damages, and retouches over cracks.

Modello  Italian for model, used to describe a small preliminary version of a painting. A modello can be either very sketchy or highly finished; it often served as a demonstration piece for a patron or as a working model for assistants.

Morellian  The term applied to the quasiscientific approach to connoisseurship invented by the Italian art critic Giovanni Morelli (1816–1891). Morelli's method of attribution concentrates on the characteristic manner in which different artists depict certain secondary features (such as hands or earlobes).

Neutron activation autoradiography  A method of generating images from the chemical elements that make up the various pigments and other materials used in paintings. The painting is irradiated with lower energy thermal neutrons in a nuclear reactor, creating faint, transient radioactivity of its materials. The emitted radiation of the different elements is recorded on a series of photographic films placed in close contact with the painting for predetermined periods of time over a number of weeks. Blackened areas that appear on the film when it is processed show elements emitting radiation at specific times, determined by their half-life. For example, four days after irradiation, calcium and phosphorus, elements of bone black pigment, are the principal generators of the autoradiographic images shown in this catalogue. Since the distribution of pigments results from the painting process, neutron activation autoradiography provides a unique insight into an artist's working methods and also provides information about condition. However, the superimposition of imaged emissions from different layers can make the radiographs difficult to interpret.

Panchromatic film  Panchromatic emulsions, used in film for both black and white and color photography, are sensitive to all visible wavelengths (pan is Greek for all). Silver halides, which were used in the earliest photographic emulsions, are mainly sensitive to the blue-violet end of the spectrum. Dyes were added to extend the range of sensitivity to all visible wavelengths—to green light in the 1880s and to red in 1905; further refinements followed. The introduction of panchromatic film brought about a great improvement in the quality of illustrations.

Primary colors  In painting these are the three colors red, yellow, and blue, from which all others can be made, according to a theory first recorded in print in the seventeenth century. The secondary colors orange, green, and purple are made by mixing two of the three primaries. An individual pigment reflects a portion of the spectrum and absorbs the rest. Therefore mixtures of paint conform to a subtractive system whereby the perceived brightness of the reflected light is progressively diminished with each addition; a mixture of all three primaries creates a muddy brown. In colored light, on the other hand, the primaries are red, green, and blue. Mixtures of colored light conform to an additive system; superimposition of red, green, and blue light produces white light. The difference between additive and subtractive primaries was not fully understood until the early nineteenth century.

Priming  (See Imprimatura)

Principals  The archaic Dutch term for portraits done from life that served as the models for copies made for members of the sitter's family. Seventeenth-century Dutch inventories indicate that the production of such portraits, which were generally of high quality, was a common practice in the Netherlands.

Pentimento  An artist's alteration—literally "change of mind"—to an already painted area. Pentimenti sometimes become more apparent with age, and they also can be revealed through X radiography (q.v.), neutron activation autoradiography (q.v.), or infrared reflectography (q.v.).

Quartz  A naturally occurring form of crystalline silica, SiO₂. Silica is one of the most commonly found minerals on the earth's surface and is a relatively inexpensive material. It was used as a filler component in grounds (q.v.) by Rembrandt and members of his circle.

Retouching  Traditionally, artists' final touches or revisions. The term is also used to describe a procedure in the restoration of pictures in which areas of old loss or damage are inpainted to a greater or lesser degree to make them less obtrusive and less distracting to the viewer. In modern conservation, guidelines dictate that such retouching or inpainting should be reversible and limited to the area of loss. Although the need to observe these strictures may seem obvious, in the past restorers have taken considerable liberties in the form of retouching over original paint. Within modern guidelines different philosophies operate, and latitude regarding the extent of retouching is left to the individual conservator, who determines what is appropriate in a given situation. Most conservators aim to render loss or damage invisible with retouching, but there are other approaches, including the use of a neutral tone or applying retouching that is visible at close quarters but indiscernible from normal viewing distance.

Scalloploping  Also called cupping, garlanding, and stretchmarks, these are the local wavy distortions at the canvas edge caused by the initial stretching of the canvas. In Rembrandt's time this stretching was generally done by lacing the canvas within a loom or framework. Scalloploping is sometimes easier to discern in an X radiograph than on the actual picture surface. The absence of scalloploping on one or more edges can indicate that the support is a section of a larger prepared canvas or that the finished work was cut down.

Scumble  A thin semiopaque paint layer applied over a darker underlayer; the two layers combine optically to create a cool, hazy
or subdued effect. The term can also be used as a verb, indicating the technique.

Sketch A freely executed study, drawn or painted, either functionally related to a finished work or an end in itself. The term is also used for the rough underpainting stage of a more finished painting.

Strainer A wooden framework with fixed corners for stretching canvas

Stretcher A wooden framework with expandable corners for stretching canvas. Wedge-shaped keys are inserted into slots in the inner corners to expand the stretcher in order to make a slackened canvas taut again. Keyable stretchers were introduced in the mid-eighteenth century. Until then canvas was usually stretched on strainers (q.v.).

Tacking edge The margins of a canvas that are folded around and tacked to the edges of a stretcher or strainer

Tomography A technique of X radiography that shows details in one plane in focus and blurs those in adjoining planes

Transfer A procedure in which a picture’s original support is separated from the paint and ground and replaced with a new support. In the process the original ground may also be removed. This radical intervention is seldom undertaken in modern conservation practice.

Tronie Archaic Dutch term meaning head or face or facial expression. Tronies are not portraits but representations of imaginary subjects.

Turbid medium effect An optical effect whereby, according to Rayleigh’s law, light objects seen through a turbid medium, that is, a semiopaque layer or veil, appear warm (for example, the light of the setting sun seen through the earth’s atmosphere) and, conversely, dark objects seen through a turbid medium appear cool (for example, distant mountains seen through mist). By extension, the same translucent paint film appears warm over a light underlayer and cool over a dark underlayer. Painters have long exploited the effect. (See Scumble)

Ultraviolet The more energetic portion of the electromagnetic spectrum just beyond the visible region. (See Fluorescence)

Underpainting A paint layer or layers applied in anticipation of subsequent layers. It can take many forms, indicating the composition as well as the tonal and color values or serving as the base for glazes and scumbles.

X radiography An analytical method used in the examination of the structure, technique and condition of paintings. X-ray sensitive film is placed in contact with a painting. Low-voltage X rays pass through the painting and then through the film. The processed film, which is called an X radiograph, shows an image that reveals the degree to which the X rays have penetrated or have been blocked by the materials present, depending on their density and distribution. Viewed on a light box, the denser elements appear light and those less dense appear dark. It is generally possible to read both the paint and ground layers in traditional paintings because of the ubiquitous use in them of lead white as well as other pigments derived from heavy metals and to a lesser degree of pigments made from iron earths. Because light areas on the painting containing lead white also appear light on the X radiograph, a close correlation between the two images is often observed, but since all layers are superimposed X radiographs require careful interpretation and direct comparison with the subject.

X-ray diffraction analysis (XRD) A technique for identifying materials of crystalline structure, which include many pigments. A beam of X rays targets a microscopic sample in a type of camera housing. The crystalline structure of the sample deflects the X rays and creates a diffraction pattern on photographic film, which is compared to known standards. Since crystalline pigments have a clearly identifiable structure the results obtained from XRD are unambiguous.
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Director’s Foreword

This second volume of the catalogue accompanying the exhibition “Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt in The Metropolitan Museum of Art” is written by Walter Liedtke, Curator in the Department of European Paintings, and by Carolyn Logan and Nadine M. Orenstein, Assistant Curators in the Department of Drawings and Prints, and Stephanie S. Dickey, Chester Dale Fellow. The three curators are responsible for the Museum’s collections of Northern Baroque paintings, drawings, and prints, respectively, and, together with their fourth colleague, they bring to this project a strong art-historical approach. All contribute original research but at the same time record and evaluate the opinions of earlier scholars. As will be evident to the reader, the volumes of the catalogue complement each other in a way that reflects the interdependence of curatorial and conservation work.

Rembrandt was a gifted teacher, and he exerted an enormous influence on contemporary Dutch artists both within and outside his studio. From the late 1620s until at least the mid-1660s almost three dozen painters, usually at an early point in their careers, attempted to work in a manner that emulated Rembrandt’s and that might be mistaken for it in later times. The idea of an exhibition that examines the work of the master and artists under his sway in terms of issues of authenticity comes up frequently in collegial conversation and indeed is a natural extension of ongoing research on the collections. Thus, when the opportunity arose on short notice, it was possible to produce such an ambitious publication. Nonetheless, the results have exceeded expectations, and I am grateful for the eagerness with which the authors immersed themselves in this task.

Philippe de Montebello
Director
The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Acknowledgments

The opportunity to present this exhibition in the fall of 1995 came up rather suddenly, in December 1994. It had long been recognized, by past and present curators at the Metropolitan and by numerous scholars elsewhere, that the Museum’s collection of Dutch paintings included a particularly revealing group of works by Rembrandt pupils and followers as well as an outstanding representation of the master’s own achievement. A few members of the staff, in particular Hubert von Sonnenburg, Sherman Fairchild Chairman of Paintings Conservation, had pursued problems of Rembrandt connoisseurship for some time, focusing especially on several of the works discussed in these pages. Nonetheless, preparing the present catalogue for the printer in six months was a challenge that made all those involved experience, among other emotions, more than the usual sense of gratitude for the immediate help of friends and for the support of colleagues within the Museum.

Director Philippe de Montebello set this project in motion and kept it going in a manner reminiscent partly of Jupiter hurling thunderbolts. However, Solomon, Seneca, and, appropriately enough, Aristotle also come to mind. The exhibition’s curators are more grateful for the Director’s leadership and moral support than we have hitherto led him to imagine.

Encouragement came at crucial moments from Mahrukh Tarapor, Associate Director for Exhibitions; from Everett Fahy, John Pope-Hennessy Chairman of the Department of European Paintings; and from George R. Goldner, Drue Heinz Chairman of the Department of Drawings and Prints. John P. O’Neill, Editor in Chief and General Manager of Publications, demonstrated not only a captain’s concern with every aspect of his ship but also a princely magnanimity toward authors. The greatest burden connected with the catalogue was that assumed by Carol Fuerstein, Senior Editor. In her work the highest standards of professionalism were merely the prix d’entrée and the rest—patience, diplomacy, common sense, and an unreasonable number of hours—was volunteered with a rare blend of stoicism and grace. The complexities of this volume were such that three other editors were called upon for special services: Cynthia Clark worked on the texts for drawings and prints; Jayne Kuchma made the footnotes and the substantial bibliography reliable to the last detail; and Ellen Shulz, Editor, clarified my essay. Gwen Roginsky, Chief Production Manager, and Jay Reingold, Production Manager, tended to every permutation of the book’s production, which was expedited with exceptional efficiency by Barbara Cavaliere. Bruce Campbell devised a design that is not only handsome but also serves the material extraordinarily well.

The most valuable assistance provided by an individual who does not belong to the Museum’s staff came from Professor Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, a major figure in the realm of Rembrandt studies, coordinator of the Robert Lehman Collection catalogue and a contributor to forthcoming volumes in the series. Two of the paintings and eleven of the drawings presented here belong to the Robert Lehman Collection and are the subjects of soon-to-be-published catalogue entries by Professor Begemann, which he made available to me and to Carolyn Logan, Assistant Curator. The prospect of being preempted and possibly even disputed in advance of publication is one from which many scholars would understandably recoil, but Professor Begemann, as his numerous present and former students at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, will attest, can be faulted only for his excess of generosity. We are indebted to him not only for his enlightening manuscripts but also and above all for the perceptions and information that he has transmitted over the years. We are also exceedingly grateful to Laurence B. Kanter, Curator, Robert Lehman Collection, for making several important works available on this special occasion.

In the Department of Drawings and Prints interns Jan Leja, Eleonore de Montesquieu, Juliette-Jo Saxton, and Diana Widmaier aided Carolyn Logan, Assistant Curator, Nadine M. Orenstein, Assistant Curator, and Stephanie S. Dickey, Chester Dale Fellow. In the Department of European Paintings Emilie Gordenker, Professor Begemann’s doctoral student, offered indispensable help with everything from photographic orders and captions to analyses of specialized articles, providing gentle suggestions for my essay as well. Dorothy Kellett, Suzanne McDermott,
and the departmental technicians coped with many demands connected with photography and display, and with my unconnected phone.

It is not possible to thank all those from outside the Museum who promptly supplied photographs, information, advice, and candid opinions, no matter how many times we troubled them. However, we wish to mention in particular Christopher Brown at The National Gallery, London; Ben Broos and Director Frits Duparc at the Mauritshuis, The Hague; Ger Luijten, Wouter Kloek, Peter Schatborn, and Erik Hinterding at the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; Martin Royalton-Kisch at the British Museum, London; Shelley Fletcher and Arthur Wheelock at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; Christian Schuckman of the Hollstein Project, De Meern; Volker Manuth, and, last but by no means least, Ernst van de Wetering of the Rembrandt Research Project, Amsterdam.

Finally, we express our sincere gratitude to the New York branch of Rabobank Nederland for its support of our project.

Walter Liedtke
Curator, Department of European Paintings
The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Notes to the Reader

This exhibition and publication include every painting by Rembrandt in the Metropolitan's collection, as well as all the Museum's pictures once thought to be by the master but now recognized, generally or at least by the writer, as works by pupils, contemporary followers, or later imitators. A selection of the Museum's drawings and prints by Rembrandt and these other artists is also presented. In addition there is a section devoted to a number of the Museum's paintings by the master's former pupils that have always been recognized as independent works.

Authorship is indicated in the headings of the catalogue entries by the following designations: the artist's name, signifying certainty or a firm conviction that the individual cited executed the painting, drawing, or print, or was primarily responsible for its execution; attributed to, meaning that the writer considers the artist's authorship probable, but that some uncertainty or lack of consensus exists; style of Rembrandt, suggesting that the work was executed by a contemporary of the master; follower of Rembrandt, indicating that the artist responsible was probably a pupil or former pupil of the master or someone otherwise directly associated with him; imitator of Rembrandt, implying that the work was produced after Rembrandt's lifetime by someone who was not a member of his circle.

In the headings signed and dated indicate that the signature and date are presumed to be autograph. In the paintings headings inscribed suggests that the signature or other information is not autograph. Doubtful signatures sometimes occur on genuine works. In the drawings and prints headings inscribed denotes material added in the artist's hand, and annotated refers to text added in another hand.

Unless otherwise noted, figures cited in the text are reproduced in the present volume.

Abbreviated references to books and articles are used in the endnotes of essays and entries and in the literature sections of the entries. Full titles are given in the bibliography.

Oral opinions, correspondence, memorandums, and reports cited in the notes are preserved in the appropriate curatorial department's files.

Scholars are listed by last names only when their full names are listed in the bibliography.

Citations of literature and exhibitions are selective in all the entries, and the listings in the ex. coll. sections of the paintings entries are reduced to the earliest known reliable reference in order to focus on the principal concern here, which is connoisseurship, or the authorship of paintings, drawings, and prints.
Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt

IN THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART

Paintings, Drawings, and Prints:
Art-Historical Perspectives
Fig. 1. Rembrandt. *Two Scholars Disputing*, 1628. Oil on wood, 28 3/4 x 23 3/4 in. (72.3 x 59.5 cm). Signed: RL. National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, Felton Bequest, 1934.
Not Rembrandt, he term in the title of this exhibition, has the virtue of neutrality. As a category it would hardly be suitable for a painting's wall label, but it serves our present purpose: to ask what it means when a work once thought to be by Rembrandt (as were all the pictures catalogued under numbers 1 through 42 in this volume) is now considered to be possibly or definitely by another hand. The issues are complicated and firm conclusions are often impossible, so that one may forgive such ambiguous designations as attributed to Rembrandt or style of or follower of Rembrandt, which are found in books and museums. Other formulas are less defensible. School of Rembrandt, for example, could be imagined as a tighter circle than Dutch school, but the requirements for admission to the former category are less well defined. Should the painter actually have studied under Rembrandt or merely reveal his influence? What of the several Rembrandt pupils who worked very much in his manner and then adopted a different style shortly after becoming independent artists: at what point do they drop out of the Rembrandt school? The term workshop is also problematic, as the exhibition presented in Berlin, Amsterdam, and London in 1991–92 seemed inadvertently to demonstrate. "Rembrandt: The Master and His Workshop" included a few paintings attributed to artists who never worked in his studio, several pictures that were painted after the artist in question had set up a studio of his own, and no paintings done by the master and his workshop—that is, in collaboration, although the controversial idea that Rembrandt, in some ways like Rubens, ran a busy studio was given a great deal of attention in the catalogue.

Perhaps this recent exhibition intended to suggest, as we would, that a work made by someone in the immediate circle of Rembrandt can be considered a credit to the master as well as to the actual painter. Unfortunately, the installations in Berlin, Amsterdam, and London reinforced the traditional distinction between works that are accepted or rejected by consigning the pictures no longer thought to be by Rembrandt to their own ghettolike gallery. In the present exhibition paintings by Rembrandt and those not by Rembrandt are interspersed to some extent in what is hoped are revealing juxtapositions. In some cases the main point might be how well the work of his colleague stands up to Rembrandt's own.

This essay is concerned mostly with Rembrandt's pupils and followers during the years they produced works in his style. One of the many ironies in the history of Rembrandt connoisseurship is that most of the works mistakenly thought at later dates to be by the master (including some celebrated pictures) were not painted by well-established rivals of the time, nor by skillful imitators in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but rather by young artists who were just beginning their careers. Few collections of paintings by Rembrandt and not by Rembrandt illustrate this point as well as that of the Metropolitan Museum.

The Reattribution of "Rembrandts"

The subject of this exhibition is Rembrandt connoisseurship, the determination of which paintings are by Rembrandt and which are not. The Metropolitan Museum owns between fourteen and twenty-one paintings by Rembrandt, in the opinion of recent critics (most would say about eighteen), and between nineteen and twenty-five paintings that earlier in this century were thought to be by Rembrandt but are now recognized as works by contemporary pupils or followers (almost all the Museum's works that are no longer considered Rembrandts fall into this category), copies of uncertain date, or later imitations.

This proportion of reattributions (to employ the current but infelicitous term for pictures that have been deleted from Rembrandt's oeuvre) corresponds to that found in twentieth-century catalogues of the master's work. In the decades around 1900, when photography, travel, art books, the art market, and art history as an academic subject were all on the rise, the number of known paintings by Rembrandt
increased steadily, from 377 works in Wilhelm von Bode’s eight-volume corpus of 1897–1906, to 538 in the 1906 edition of Adolf Rosenberg’s catalogue, to about 606 in Wilhelm Valentin’s edition of Rosenberg published in 1959. Valentin, a champion of rediscovered Rembrandts (who from 1907 to 1914 was a curator at the Museum), found another 99 of them by 1921, about eleven of which are accepted today. The total number of paintings by Rembrandt remains very much a matter of opinion, but there is some consensus for an oeuvre of about 300 works.

Most museums with significant holdings of Rembrandt and Rembrandt-esque pictures—in Amsterdam, Berlin, London, Munich, New York, Paris, St. Petersburg, and Washington, D.C.—have made similar adjustments in cataloguing. While it may be, to judge from an initial survey, that older collections, especially that of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, have retained more Rembrandts than other institutions, there is no clear pattern, apart from the fact that collections formed rapidly in the nineteenth or the early twentieth century have been obliged to reattribute the largest percentage of works. The most striking example is the Wallace Collection in London, in which (according to the director himself) eleven of the twelve “Rembrandts” acquired by the third and fourth marquesses of Hertford between 1803 and 1868 “are now considered to be the work of the master’s pupils or imitators.”

The reduction in Rembrandt’s oeuvre has allowed (not to say achieved) a more focused and reliable view of his work, in terms of both form and content. It may also be said that our image of Rembrandt has changed less as a consequence of reattributions than as a result of fluctuations in taste and intellectual trends. A more remarkable shift has occurred, for these and other reasons, in our view of Rembrandt’s pupils and followers. One of the revelations of recent connoisseurship is that seventeenth-century artists appear to be responsible for a much larger proportion of all paintings “not by Rembrandt” than scholars of the 1950s, 1960s, and even the 1970s would have supposed: several of the pictures discussed in this catalogue have been routinely dismissed as eighteenth- or nineteenth-century imitations but are probably seventeenth-century works.

Since the exhibitions of 1956 and especially 1969, there has been increasing interest in Rembrandt’s pupils and contemporary followers as individuals and as a collective phenomenon. Some but not all of the most accomplished painters in his circle were familiar to connoisseurs and collectors in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; Ferdinand Bol, Gerard Dou, Govert Flinck, and Arent de Gelder are probably the best examples. Of course, it was the artists who most distinguished themselves and the pictures that were the least reminiscent of works by Rembrandt that earned independent reputations. This is still largely true today: it is not deattributed Rembrandts that have most enriched our understanding of his pupils but study and publication of their more independent works. In general, each of their oeuvres has grown outward from a core of long-accepted pictures to embrace paintings formerly ascribed to Rembrandt. Such deattributed paintings usually find new places in the follower’s early years, either when he was actually Rembrandt’s pupil or in the first decade thereafter. There are many exceptions: minor pupils whose styles hardly developed or who borrowed from Rembrandt and others sporadically, and more gifted ones who diverged from Rembrandt so quickly or were so accomplished in their student years that their early works only recently have been identified (or hypothesized) among paintings formerly thought to be by Rembrandt, without much benefit from comparison with their previously recognized pictures. Examples of such early works are Carel Fabritius’s Mercury and Argus (fig. 33), which Fragonard copied as a Rembrandt, and Haman Recognizing His Fate (fig. 2), which this writer has suggested was painted by Samuel van Hoogstraten in the late 1650s, shortly after he left Rembrandt’s studio.

Rembrandt and his contemporaries are discussed below. In these introductory pages it is important to comment upon the public perception of pictures not by Rembrandt. Imitations made after Rembrandt’s lifetime (see fig. 45) were often honest essays in Rembrandt’s style, painted as

Fig. 2. Attributed to Samuel van Hoogstraten. Haman Recognizing His Fate, ca. 1647–48. Oil on canvas, 50 × 45½ in. (127 × 115.9 cm). Inscribed: Rembrant. The Hermitage, St. Petersburg
learning experiences, as homages to the admired master, or as works otherwise inspired by Rembrandt (ranging from routine copies to witty capriccios). Such pictures were meant to be appreciated for what they really are. Alternatively, an imitator might have been made to sell as an autograph or authentic Rembrandt, in which case the term fake or forgery is justified. In many cases, however, the imitator's intent is now unknown, or the object's place and date of origin are uncertain, so that the term fake is inappropriate. A picture painted by a Rembrandt pupil in the 1640s or 1650s with a “Rembrandt” signature added later (see no. 28) is not a fake, regardless of whether it was sold as a Rembrandt by the person who added the inscription or by someone who genuinely thought the work was by Rembrandt. Only the signature is false (which can be difficult to determine); the picture remains an authentic work by one of Rembrandt's close associates. Some of them—Dou, Flinck, and Bol, for example—were among the most respected and successful Dutch painters of the seventeenth century.

Words like fake and authentic are strongly charged but are employed indiscriminately in everyday conversation and occasionally in the popular press. To cite just one example, when a few paintings formerly catalogued as by Rembrandt in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., were reassigned to Rembrandt pupils in 1993 (after long consideration), this change was reported accurately in a national newspaper but under the boldface heading “Master Art Fakes.”8 As with eighteenth- and nineteenth-century misattributions, it is hard to know whether the editor's label was deliberate misinformation or simply a matter of ignorance.

It was certainly neither when in earlier years the National Gallery assigned the paintings to Rembrandt. As discussed in several essays, the general tendency to remove pictures from Rembrandt's oeuvre reverses a three-hundred-year history of assigning too much to him.9 In this process museum labels should be one of the most conservative sources of information. Quite apart from the concerns of donors and their descendants, photographic services, central cataloguing, and public expectations conditioned by decades of reference to the old labels, art books, and other publications, there is the problem that labels simply cannot convey the complexities of the issues at hand.

Labels that reattribute pictures formerly thought to be by Rembrandt also do not reveal what has been gained by the institution and the public. One can have sympathy for the small collection that has lost its only work by the master but not for a great repository of Rembrandts that, “with sadness,” reassigned a painting to Carel Fabritius.10 This is an important point for art lovers who use the name “Rembrandt” as a qualitative distinction or even as a slang term for masterpiece.11 Labels change and opinions change, but pictures remain the same (although conservators would qualify this remark). The painting once thought to be by Rembrandt and now recognized as by one of his pupils is a tribute to the master as teacher, to the actual artist, and to the culture that sustained not only the career of Rembrandt but also the careers of some forty artists who occasionally produced works in his style. One need hardly be a rabid revisionist to appreciate the pleasure of discovering a painting by Flinck, Fabricius, or another associate of Rembrandt in the permanent collection of a museum that hopes to present a balanced view of Dutch art. Notwithstanding the poetic interpretation of Rembrandt as an artist who transcended his time, who belongs to all (or some of Western) humankind, it now appears that from about 1630 to about 1670 in the Netherlands there was a fairly widespread interest in the master's approach to the Bible, mythology, history, nature, and humanity. It appears as well that this sympathetic response to his vision was satisfied—as always, in any culture, on different levels of quality and meaning—by at least three dozen painters over a period of about forty years.

Rembrandt's style in Aristotle with a Bust of Homer (no. 11) serves well to convey a notion of his approach, quite as the image of a “wine-dark sea” does for Homer. The forms convey meaning and values and seem wonderfully well suited to that end. If one focuses on the expressive purpose of Rembrandt's style, then it is easier to appreciate the consistency with which it evolved from the exacting manner of the Leiden years (see fig. 1) to the bold summaries of the last decade (see fig. 43).

Of course, this kind of criticism can be applied to any artist (if not always to his or her advantage), and it should be extended to Rembrandt's pupils and followers and to the artists who influenced him. For example, Rembrandt's only significant teacher, Pieter Lastman (see fig. 3), and his Amsterdam colleagues Jan and Jacob Pynas and other so-called Pre-Rembrandtists (the term is often disparaged but is not an inappropriate compliment) anticipated and then paralleled Rembrandt's approach in their emphasis on gestures and facial expressions, their compositions that concentrate on the arrangement of a few figures and the dramatic use of light, and their isolation of one or two figures at a moment of moral crisis or in some situation that, like a powerful sermon, allows ethical conclusions to be drawn.14 One should not set too much baggage down at their doorstep, but it is true that in some pictures by Lastman, Jan Pynas, and others in their circle, the legacy of Adam Elsheimer and ultimately of Caravaggio is much in evidence, and the comparison with Rembrandt is well deserved.
Similarly, as Rembrandt’s former students developed individual styles, they often retained strong impressions from his studio. In Nicolaes Maes’s *Young Girl Peeling Apples* (no. 53), for example, the sense of dignity, even solemnity, that the composition and light lend to the scene can be traced back to Rembrandt’s paintings of the Holy Family in domestic settings (see fig. 41), quite as Maes’s paintings of old women praying or dozing over a Bible (see fig. 77) recall the pictures of “Rembrandt’s Mother” from the Leiden years (see fig. 8). These inconspicuous recollections of Rembrandt are not surprising when one considers how conspicuously the master’s ideas were adopted in Maes’s earliest dated independent work (no. 52).

The conclusion one can draw from these and many other examples is not merely that Rembrandt made a lasting impression on his disciples but also that the Rembrandtsque style, as it might be narrowly defined by his most familiar works and by his contemporaries’ closest imitations, shares some essential qualities with works that are not Rembrandtesque. This is evident in numerous biblical pictures by artists such as Flinck and Gerbrand van den Eeckhout and in paintings by Jan Victors (fig. 4), despite the fact that Victors diverged from Rembrandt in a manner that might be described as a Lastman revival. In some compositions by Victors, the staging, the gestures and glances, and the narratives are so explicitly presented that one imagines text balloons emerging from the figures or at least the kind of captions that appear beneath seventeenth-century didactic prints. Yet there are many works by Victors in which the message is stated more softly and the protagonists interact quietly and in which it is clear that the artist learned a great deal from Rembrandt after all.

A comparison of the of art from within and from outside Rembrandt’s immediate circle underscores the statement made above to the effect that the Rembrandtsque style was an integral part of Dutch culture and not a tale of genius and its dim reflections, much less a matter of Rembrandt marketing his own image and student pictures in his style.15 What Rembrandt owed to his background in contemporary Dutch society and what his patrons and public (the latter is the appropriate term for the audience of many of his paintings and for nearly all his prints) gained from the artist were relationships in which pupils and followers took part on many levels. These levels ranged from superficial fashion (which is significant in its own way) to values that, no matter how well or poorly conveyed by a painter, deserve to be taken seriously.

Rembrandt connoisseurship is not now what it was, for the most part, to nineteenth-century critics, whose aim was to place the master, or the right picture, on a pedestal. In Haverkamp-Begemann’s wise formulation, which is meant as a warning, the connoisseur’s goal today is twofold: in the case of Rembrandt’s oeuvre, to purify, and in that of his pupils, to reconstruct.16 As the statement implies, one can go too far in either direction, as some scholars feel the Rembrandt Research Project’s deattributions and Sumowski’s
reattributions have done. But in a more sympathetic light these efforts support worthy causes and take place in an area in which several approaches to art history intersect. It may not be essential, in a broad view, to know whether a picture was painted by Fabritius or Flinck, or even by Rembrandt or Bol, but it is important to realize that Rembrandt’s achievement was part of a larger social phenomenon.

Rembrandt and His Circle

There have been several surveys of Rembrandt pupils and followers since 1981, when the exhibition “The Impact of a Genius” was shown in Amsterdam and Groningen and when Sumowski’s Gemälde der Rembrandt-Schüler (Paintings by Rembrandt pupils) began its long march to the sixth and final volume, which was published last year. Sumowski’s pendant corpus, Drawings of the Rembrandt School, begun in 1979, has now reached ten volumes with more to come. A biographical sketch and stylistic analysis precede each section of photographs in the volumes devoted to paintings by Rembrandt associates. (Sumowski goes well beyond the master’s formal students.)

In the catalogue The Impact of a Genius, two of the authors strive to distance themselves from the discredited concept of the title. Blankert outlines the comparatively restrictive criteria by which works were selected for exhibition and offers fleeting sketches of Rembrandt pupils. Broos discusses the effect of Rembrandt’s fame on later notions of his “School.” Then (with the help of a chart) he carefully surveys just which artists appear to have been pupils; the historical evidence for their relationship to Rembrandt, apart from their paintings; and, in general terms, what these artists did when they were with Rembrandt (for example, make drawings from life of standard subjects, paint copies, or produce student works for sale). He also examines which direction they pursued immediately afterward (for example, Maes, who, according to Arnold Houbraken, “soon departed from that manner of painting, the more so when he devoted himself to producing portraits and realized that young ladies in particular found white more pleasing than brown”).

Broos’s essay is the best short introduction to the subject of Rembrandt’s pupils, and no attempt is made to match it here. That task was attempted in Rembrandt’s Academy, the catalogue of a 1992 exhibition at The Hague, in which Huys Jansen discusses the drawbacks of the terms school and workshop and then recommends the misleading concept of an “academy.” He reviews useful information but repeats recent conjectures as if they were documented facts: for example, “When Rembrandt moved to Amsterdam, he brought with him at least one pupil from Leiden, namely Isaac Jouderville,” who became one of the “co-workers and assistants [in] the functioning of the Academy.” Huys Jansen continues, “This situation is very close to that of Rubens in Antwerp [and was] necessary for Rembrandt,
partly because of the many commissions he received. [All this] indicates a commercial approach to his artistic activity. In my view, every element of this passage is an uncritical simplification of controversial hypotheses that have been advanced recently by two members of the RRP.

Nonetheless, *Rembrandt’s Academy* is a valuable reference work. Most of Rembrandt’s pupils and some nonpupils—the latter ranging from close associates such as Jan Lievens and Jacob Backer to the completely irrelevant figure A. J. van Marienhof—are surveyed. Sumowski emphasizes some now-neglected issues, such as the difference between a disciple merely adopting Rembrandt’s style and effecting “the marriage of style and content that was Rembrandt’s goal.” He also suggests that Rembrandt’s method of teaching set his most promising students on their own feet, “proffering principles, standards and methods which remained valid when a pupil, in search of himself, chose his own motifs and painted in his own manner.”

These are important observations, although a phrase such as “in search of himself” is now deemed inadmissible in academic texts. Sumowski restates the time-honored question central to connoisseurship as it might be practiced today, of what style, what meaning, and what relationship between form and content make a painting typical of Rembrandt, or of a particular pupil, or of an imitator working in a later period. An attempt is made herein to consider these issues, without in any sense treating them exhaustively.
Rembrandt and His Colleagues in Leiden

The first known comparison between Rembrandt and a fellow artist is a celebrated piece of art criticism, written about 1630 by the cosmopolitan secretary of the prince of Orange, Constantijn Huygens (see fig. 6). The following lines of a long passage in that work are among the most relevant:

In this review [of Dutch artists Huygens has known] I have deliberately refrained from mentioning a pair of young and noble painters from Leiden. . . .

They owe nothing to their teachers and everything to their talent. Had they never received any tuition but had been left to their own devices . . . I am convinced they would have risen to the same heights. . . .

The first, whom I described as an embroiderer's son, is called Jan Lievens; the other, whose cradle stood in a mill, is Rembrandt. Both are still beardless and, to judge from their faces, are more boys than men. I only wish that they would do what I wanted of Rubens, to compile an inventory of their works, describing their paintings. Each of them should provide a straightforward account of his method, indicating how and why (for the admiration and benefit of later generations) they had designed, composed, and worked out each painting.

I can only venture an offhand judgment, that Rembrandt, in discernment and powers of expression, surpasses Lievens, but that the latter excels in grandeur of invention and in bold designs and forms. Everything that his young spirit yearns to embrace must be lofty and splendid. He prefers to paint his subjects lifesize or even larger.

Rembrandt, by contrast, absorbed entirely in his own work, prefers to concentrate on a smaller picture, and to achieve an effect in a discrete passage that one would vainly seek out in the largest pieces by others. [Lievens's own Feast of Esther (fig. 5), painted about 1625—26, when he was in his late teens, could have served Huygens as an example. The large picture's long acceptance as a Rembrandt makes one wish, with Huygens, that the young men had kept a catalogue of their works.] I will mention the painting of the repentant Judas returning to the high priest the silver pieces which were the price of our innocent Lord [fig. 7]. Let all Italy and everything impressive and awesome since the most ancient days be placed by its side. The gesture of that one desperate Judas—to say nothing of the many admirable figures in this single work—that one Judas who raves, moans, begs for forgiveness, for which he dares not hope or show any sign of expecting in his face; the wild gaze, the torn hair, the rent garments, the twisted arms, the hands clenched until bleeding, as he falls to his knees in blind emotion, and his body contorts in pitiful misery. This as a whole I would set next to all the beauties brought forth through the ages [Huygens then assails those writers who always favor antiquity] . . . I maintain, namely, that no Protogenes, Apelles, or Parrhasius ever had a notion, or for that matter could conceive, if they came back to life, the many emotions that—and I am struck dumb as I say this—a youth, a Dutchman, a beardless miller has combined in one figure and expressed all at once.52

Fig. 7. Rembrandt. Judas Returning the Pieces of Silver, 1629. Oil on wood, 31 1/4 × 40 5/8 in. (79 × 103.3 cm). Signed and dated: RL [monogram]. 1629. Private collection, England
Rembrandt and Lievens had both studied with Lastman in Amsterdam and then worked together closely in Leiden. What Lievens gained from Lastman was essentially a command of composition, with clearly structured figure groups, conspicuous gestures and glances, strong contours and colors, and dramatic light. To some extent Lievens’s palette and his designs also derived from Utrecht, especially from Gerard van Honthorst, and this is obvious in the arrangement of figures around a table in The Feast of Esther.

Lievens was capable of suggesting strong and occasionally subtle thoughts and feelings and of conveying character. In this regard he comes closest to Rembrandt and was apparently influenced by him. But Lievens favored theatrical, and sometimes melodramatic or even comical effects (as in The Raising of Lazarus of 1631 in Brighton, and The Soothsayer of about 1631 in Berlin, respectively). He also employed a “broader, coarser and more vigorous” technique than Lastman’s, a description one could almost apply to his work in general.

Lievens’s style derived mostly from paintings by other artists and was less responsive than Rembrandt’s manner to direct observation. As a consequence, his descriptions of light and space tend to look arbitrary and to depend upon the figure groups. This distinction can be decisive when one considers the authorship of works such as the Old Woman in Windsor Castle (fig. 8) that show an approach close in style to Rembrandt. In Volume I of the Corpus the painting’s traditional attribution to Rembrandt (which dates back to 1639) was maintained, but it was overruled in Volume II. A gray tonality and paint “painstakingly [applied] in small touches” are now seen as typical of Lievens. Possibly more characteristic than the technique is its effect: the relief-like mapping of surfaces; the figure consisting of shallow planes, with flat surfaces on the nose and forehead, in the shirt, and inside the scarf; and a background that seems to extend around but not behind the contour. The skin, which resembles wrinkled leather, is perhaps a Rembrandtesque passage, but it lacks the impression of pliability, softness, and moisture that, in Rembrandt’s rendering of older faces (see fig. 9), contributes to the suggestion of reflecting sunlight and enveloping atmosphere. Lievens may have been capable of producing such effects, but he was not likely to achieve them even when studying Rembrandt, who combined close observation of actual
models and exceptional patience, both conditioned by personality.

The factor of personality was mentioned by Huygens about the time the Old Woman was painted:

*I believe that I already mentioned Lievens’s character in passing . . . My only objection is his stubbornness, which derives from an excess of self-confidence. He either roundly rejects all criticism or, if he acknowledges its validity, takes it ill. This bad habit, harmful at any age, is absolutely pernicious in youth . . . .

Seeing the maker [fig. 10] beside his paintings, it is scarcely credible that such a meager sapling can produce so much fruit. In painting the human countenance he creates miracles. One would be rendering him a good service by endeavoring to curb this vigorous, untamable spirit whose bold ambition is to embrace all nature, and by persuading the brilliant painter to concentrate on that physical part which miraculously combines the essence of the human spirit and body. In what we are accustomed to call history pieces, the artist, notwithstanding his astounding talent, is not likely to equal Rembrandt’s invention.*

The importance of observation to Rembrandt is also evident in his understanding of human behavior and character, which in some early works seems to have matured even before his ability to render physical effects. Rembrandt’s Tobit and Anna of 1626 (fig. 11) was inspired by a print after Willem Buytewech and by Lastman’s school of acting, which in some pictures seems intended for the last row in the audience. Both the borrowed setting and the narrative have become more realistic and are more effectively arranged in the Tobit and Anna than in its sources.* The old man reacts in despair to what he wrongly suspects is his wife’s transgression—the theft of a young goat. The poverty of their home and clothing compounds the sense of shame, for Tobit thinks that mere necessity drove his wife to abandon her trust in God. Of course, Tobit’s blindness is metaphorical, but Rembrandt compares it poignantly with the astonished, angry, and hurt stare of the old woman. The sad dog is likewise a symbol. At the same time it is touchingly like Anna who, although less intelligent than her husband (Rembrandt conveys this through her expression alone), knows and loves him more than he knows anyone, including himself. As the dog suggests Anna’s fidelity, so the kid indicates her innocence as never before

Fig. 10. Jan Lievens. Self-Portrait, ca. 1627. Oil on wood, 20½ × 16 in. (52 × 40.5 cm). Signed: IL [monogram]. Den Kongelige Maleri-og Skulptursamling, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen

Fig. 11. Rembrandt. Tobit and Anna, 1626. Oil on wood, 13⅞ × 11⅝ in. (39.5 × 30 cm). Signed and dated: RH 1626. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
in art. There are useful footnotes in the scene, such as the keys and the yarn winder to either side of Anna—reminders of her household duties and of the spinning (an important cottage industry in Leiden) with which she earned the kid. But nothing interrupts the flow of feelings and the sense, implied by pose and expression, that the old people depend on each other’s every move. The viewer is also reminded—by the many textures, the colors, and the light—of Tobit’s piteous blindness and more so of the contemporary conviction that moral and spiritual matters take place in the present, in the mundane and familiar world.34

_Tobit and Anna_ is an extraordinary achievement for an artist who was twenty years old at the time he painted it. About two years later, in the small _Simeon in the Temple_ (fig. 12), Rembrandt’s interpretation of a biblical story was made even more compelling by its setting in a more realistic environment. The viewer seems to stand in the shadows near a group of figures gathered in the last sunlit corner of a large church like the Pieterskerk in Leiden. Local colors are more diminished and light is more diffused than in the _Tobit and Anna_ and in paintings by Lastman, whose influence on the figure of the prophetess Anna is as conspicuous as that of Honthorst on the figure of Joseph in silhouette. These supporting characters have rediscovered their original purpose, which is to concentrate attention on the emotional center of the scene (more effectively than in Lievens’s work, as the _Feast of Esther_ [fig. 5] reveals). The priest, his feelings contained by maturity, counsels the young mother, whose eyes stare in wonderment. She seems less the woman who had participated in the Annunciation and the Nativity and more some simple and good-hearted person the artist had seen in church.

This picture may be the panel that was listed in 1632 among the contents of Prince Frederick Hendrick’s cabinet, as “a painting in which Simeon, being in the Temple, holds Christ in his arms, made by Rembrandt or Jan Lievens.”35 If so, one can appreciate the tribute to Lievens, for the painting’s most obvious formal devices are reminiscent of his. The signature, “Rembrandt. f.”, is a form Rembrandt used only later, but almost every other aspect of the painting tells us that it belongs among his finest Leiden works.

The singling out of an artist who could so skillfully imitate another that his works deceived buyers and connoisseurs constituted one of the more conventional forms of praise in seventeenth-century commentaries. Thus, Hendrick Goltzius, according to Karel van Mander’s account of 1604, passed off his engraving _The Circumcision_ as an unknown Dürer at the Frankfurt fair. “When the question was raised [by an accomplice] as to whether or not Goltzius could have made the engraving, some critics said he was far from able, and he could not make such an engraving in a whole lifetime; and that this was the best print by Dürer they had ever seen” (which is no wonder, since it reflects the taste for Dürer in their own period).36 By the end of the century the same kind of story reportedly could be heard from the niece of a minor Rembrandt pupil, Heyman Dullaert, one of whose paintings was said to have been sold as a Rembrandt in Amsterdam.37 Similarly, when Orlers (1641) cites an example of how Lievens’s “consummate skill astounded numerous connoisseurs,” he recalls how the “mere stripping of twelve or scarcely any older . . . copied two outstanding pieces by the excellent Master Cornelis Ketel of Haarlem, a Democritus and a Heralcitius. He did this so well that those with an understanding of art could not distinguish the originals from the copies. The paintings were sold as originals from the estate of Mr. Boudewijns and sent [like Goltzius’s print] to Germany.”38

It is intriguing that no contemporary critic ever praised Rembrandt in this way. He and Lievens “owe their teachers nothing,” and, to Huygens’s regret, “neither has found it necessary to spend a few months [like Lastman] travelling through Italy.” As one reads in every book on Rembrandt, he and Lievens told Huygens that they did not have time and that in any case some of the best Italian paintings “can
be found in abundance and even in surfeit here.” Huygens continues, “The validity of this excuse is a moot point. I feel it incumbent upon me to state that I have never observed such dedication and persistence in other men, whatever their profession or age.”

The matter might be debated (by wounded experts), but it appears that the work of no other colleague of Rembrandt ever came as close to his own as that of Lievens did in 1630 and 1631. For a brief period the two artists had comparable interests and probably a friendly rivalry as well as (pace Huygens) a common debt to Lastman and to the traditions of the Leiden School. At any later date Rembrandt’s pupils (and Lievens was never one of his students) were younger than their master, were usually from another town, and in any event would have lacked his foundation in self-training and independent observation. Indeed, they sought out Rembrandt, often after studying with someone else. In this respect, the reports by van Hoogstraten, Houbraken, and others about Rembrandt’s disciples could not be more different from Huygens’s dismissal of Rembrandt’s and Lievens’s instructors (who “would feel just as abashed as those teachers who gave Vergil his first lessons in poetry”) or from Orlers’s account of 1641 (Rembrandt “stayed with [Lastman] for about six months, but then decided to engage in and practice the art of painting entirely on his own”).

Even in the same period (1628 to 1631), a different relationship with Rembrandt’s style than that reflected in Lievens is found in the work of Gerard Dou (1613–1675), who was not quite fifteen when he enrolled with the twenty-two-year-old master in 1628. In his early paintings of old women and men, which date from about 1630, Dou followed Rembrandt closely. But the results are often more like Lievens’s, as can be seen in the large canvas in the Getty Museum depicting a Palatine prince and his tutor (fig. 13), which was intended (perhaps for Orlers) as a pendant to Lievens’s Prince Charles Louis and His Tutor in the same museum. The thoughtful mood in Dou’s picture may have been inspired by either Lievens or Rembrandt, but the scale, coloring, light, and to some extent the smooth application of paint suit the pendant portrait by Lievens and (like the young man’s costume) recall his “Oriental” figure in Potsdam (fig. 50).

For Dou and Lievens, in their different ways, Rembrandt’s style appears to have been an alternative, a manner that, like his subjects, might be emulated rather than imitated. Orlers’s story about Lievens aping the very different style of Cornelis Ketel is actually consistent with his report that the versatile teenager “usually [invented] his own compositions and ideas to boot.” Like a latter-day Orlers, Brown is right to emphasize that “what is new in Dou’s painting [of which fig. 14 is a good example], as he seeks to establish

Fig. 13. Gerard Dou. Prince Rupert of the Palatinate and an Older Man (Possibly His Tutor) as Elia and Samuel, ca. 1631. Oil on canvas, 40 1/2 × 34 1/2 in. (102.9 × 88.3 cm). The J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu

Fig. 14. Gerard Dou, A Man Writing in an Artist’s Studio, ca. 1631. Oil on wood, 12 1/2 × 9 3/4 in. (31.5 × 25 cm). Signed: GD [...] [monogram]. Private collection, Montreal
his own independent style, is the use of bright colour... [and] the interest in still life, a genre in which Dou was to work.”

Dou’s obsessively smooth and detailed rendering of every object in a tidy, hermetic space could be described broadly as Early Netherlandish painting brought up-to-date with the help of Rembrandt’s approach to composition and daylight. But this formulation hardly conveys how original Dou was with respect to Rembrandt and local tradition. By the mid-1630s his subjects and style were distinctive and fashionable, earning him great patrons (such as Queen Christina of Sweden) and the longest line of followers in the history of Dutch art.

In a brief survey of Rembrandt’s most significant disciples one need not assign much space to “the extremely minor, even trivial [Isaac] Jouderville,” an artist of “such overpowering mediocrity” that the direct comparison of his panel in Dublin (fig. 15) with paintings by Rembrandt “confirms doubts about the whole ‘cluster’ of works grouped around this distinctively incompetent figure in Volume II of the Corpus.” After studying with Rembrandt in 1630–31, Jouderville appears to have emulated Lievens (who went to London in 1632) and then perhaps Dou, but he abandoned painting within a few years. There is no evidence whatsoever indicating that Jouderville followed Rembrandt to Amsterdam, as has been proposed and parroted.

The most convincing account of his activity is the latest, by Sumowski, who sees Jouderville as “stuck in imitation, an imitation which failed to attain its goal.” Apart from his “mediocre gifts,” a reason for Jouderville’s inadequacy is that he never comprehended the importance of studying emotions in order to render physiognomy, a crucial component in Rembrandt’s art and teaching. Jouderville merely skimmed the surface, typically “exaggerating the expression to the point of grimace” in his pictures (such as the Young Man Laughing in the Museum Bredius, The Hague) and treating anatomy as if he were carving lay figures in wood.

Another artist in Leiden, Jacques des Rousseaux, deserves more attention on the grounds of quality, but he is not a documented pupil of Rembrandt’s. Additions to his small oeuvre are deflected by its sheer eccentricity.

Rembrandt and His Pupils in Amsterdam (about 1632 to 1642)

When Rembrandt went to Amsterdam in the fall or winter of 1631, he was well prepared to work on his own and to flourish. It was not unusual to be a mature artist at the age of twenty-four, as the prodigy van Dyck and the late-bloomer Rubens could have testified. But Rembrandt had an exceptional capacity to absorb new ideas, and he had extraordinary technical facility. His style and expressiveness were at once new to Amsterdam and, in the history paintings, extensions of Lastman’s ideas.

In his studies of faces and other aspects of physical appearance; in his experiments with etching, drawing, and painting techniques; and in his habit of rethinking not only how to present subjects but also what they essentially meant, Rembrandt had built upon whatever his parents, teachers, and other early influences had instilled in him. In so doing he had made himself into a person who (despite our current inclinations to the contrary) cannot easily be compared with other artists of his time and place. Huygens remarked upon this repeatedly, to the point of fretting over Rembrandt’s and Lievens’s health: “I have often wished that these excellent young men would practice moderation and consider their constitutions, which a sedentary occupation has already rendered less vigorous and robust.”

Recent writers have emphasized a different side of Rembrandt’s activity in the 1630s—namely his strong connections with important members of society. Dutch painters of this period, including Rembrandt, were usually from middle-class families, reasonably well educated, and accepted into parts of patrician society. In addition to Huygens and other figures at court, Rembrandt’s contacts included the Remonstrant preacher Johannes Wtenbogaert (whose portrait of 1633 by Rembrandt is now in the Rijksmuseum) and clients of other denominations and faiths; high officials in the East India Company such as Philips Lucasz and his brother-in-law Jacques Specx (who

Fig. 15. Isaac Jouderville. Bust of a Young Man, ca. 1630. Oil on wood, 18½ × 14½ in. (48 × 37 cm). Signed: Jouderville; inscribed: GDOU [GD in monogram]. National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin
owned Rembrandt’s early Saint Paul, The Rape of Europa of 1632 [fig. 16], Christ on the Sea of Galilee of 1633, and the portraits of Lucasz and his wife, dated 1635); and also a fair number of merchants and professional men (see fig. 54).

The most important person for Rembrandt’s career during his early years in Amsterdam was the prominent art dealer Hendrick Uylenburgh (1587–1661), through whom the artist must have received many of his commissions for portraits (such as nos. 3, 4). Uylenburgh was Dutch but had grown up in Cracow, where his father and brother were, respectively, cabinetmaker and painter to the king of Poland. A painter himself, Uylenburgh came from a family of Mennonites (a conservative branch of the Anabaptists), who emphasized study and personal interpretation of scripture and individual responsibility for one’s own salvation. This is obviously interesting for our understanding of Rembrandt, who if not actively a Mennonite was deeply involved with their community. In Amsterdam, where Uylenburgh had arrived some time between 1610 and 1620, the Mennonites were supported by several of the city’s regents (who in a few cases were related to shareholders in Uylenburgh’s firm). Rembrandt’s sitters Nicolaes Ruts (see fig. 103, vol. I), Marten Looten (see fig. 104, vol. I), the preacher Cornelis Anso (depicted with his wife in a large portrait of 1641 in Berlin), and the calligrapher Lieven van Coppenol (see no. 34) were Mennonites. So were Rembrandt’s early colleague in Amsterdam Jacob Backer (see no. 24) and Rembrandt’s pupil Govert Flinck (see nos. 2, 49).13

A generation ago Uylenburgh was known for little more than being the older cousin of Rembrandt’s wife, Saskia.14 Saskia had grown up in Leeuwarden, where her father, Rombertus Uylenburgh (d. 1624), had been the mayor and a pensionary of the court of Friesland. In Amsterdam Saskia was close to another older cousin, Aaltje Uylenburgh, who was married to the prominent Calvinist minister Johannes Cornelisz. Sylvius (see fig. 70). However, Rembrandt and Saskia lived with Hendrick Uylenburgh for about a year after their wedding, which took place on
June 22, 1634 (they had become formally engaged on June 5, 1633).\textsuperscript{33}

Lately Uylenburgh has become a key figure in debates about the authorship of Rembrandt paintings dating from his early years in Amsterdam. The RRP suggests that in the art dealer’s “academy” (as Baldinucci called it in 1686), Rembrandt found a considerable number of young painters who not only collaborated with him but, largely on their own, also actually executed a number of Rembrandt’s formal portraits and other figure paintings of the period that traditionally have been considered autograph works by the master. Apart from the authors of the RRP, most Rembrandt scholars now consider this hypothesis a drastic exaggeration of what happened in Uylenburgh’s firm.\textsuperscript{32}

In June 1631 Rembrandt lent Uylenburgh one thousand guilders, perhaps as an investment, and he moved into his house by the end of the year. Uylenburgh had a large stock of Dutch and other European paintings. These were evidently copied by young students who paid him tuition and whose inexpensive works the dealer sold. He must have secured commissions for Rembrandt who, like Uylenburgh himself (perhaps until Rembrandt joined him), tutored art students and amateurs. Uylenburgh also published etchings, and he probably offered appraisal and restoration services.

There is positively no evidence, however, that Uylenburgh employed any other artist in the period between 1631 and 1635 who was capable of painting the pictures by Rembrandt that, a decade ago, were described by the RRP as products of his workshop (for example, nos. 3, 4). The theory was conceived to account for the somewhat uneven quality of Rembrandt’s figure paintings of the 1630s and was accompanied in the Corpus by “new standards of authenticity... far more stringent than those previously applied to any other artist’s oeuvre.”\textsuperscript{18} Huygens, Uylenburgh (who clearly offered products at various prices), and no doubt many contemporary artists could have provided a commonsense explanation of what went on, as Brown did recently: “Traditionally—and far more consistent with the evidence of the early life of Rembrandt—it has been thought that Rembrandt simply worked very hard in the early years in Amsterdam when he was the most sought after portrait painter in the city—and that it is this fierce pace of work [and presumably other interests, such as his fiancée] that explains the variations in quality among the portraits of the 1630s.”\textsuperscript{19}

Apart from anonymous pupils and amateurs, two painters who might have been associated with Uylenburgh’s “academy” in the early 1630s are the Haarlem artists Willem de Poorter (1608–after 1648) and Jacob de Wet (active 1632–d. 1675 or later).\textsuperscript{20} Their earliest known dated works are from 1633 and 1632, respectively, and depend upon Rembrandt’s later works and early Amsterdam history pictures.\textsuperscript{21} De Wet, Lastman’s colleague Nicolaes Mooeyaert, and Rembrandt were among the artists to whom Uylenburgh owed outstanding debts in January 1640.\textsuperscript{22}

More certain and much more important associates of Rembrandt and Uylenburgh in the 1630s are the talented young painters Jacob Backer (1608–1651) and Govert Flinck (1615–1660). Backer grew up in Amsterdam, but his family was from Harlingen, near Leeuwarden, where he went sometime between 1625 and 1627 to study with Lambert Jacobsz (ca. 1598–1636). Jacobsz himself was a Mennonite preacher, as well as a painter and art dealer. From Amsterdam he had moved to Leeuwarden after his marriage in 1620. Although Jacobsz’s teacher is not known, his work strongly recalls Lastman and the Utrecht Caravageque painters, which is especially interesting given that in their work of the Leiden years Rembrandt and Lievens referred to the same artists. It was apparently on a preaching tour that Jacobsz met Flinck’s Mennonite parents in their native Cleves (southeast of Arnhem) and persuaded the skeptical father to let Govert, at the age of about fourteen, about 1629, begin training as a painter in Leeuwarden.\textsuperscript{23}

Rembrandt may have met Jacobsz when he married Saskia in Leeuwarden, but he surely knew of him in Amsterdam. At sometime in the 1620s Jacobsz’s studio became the Leeuwarden branch of Uylenburgh’s firm, which sent him copies and other cheap pictures for sale in
the provincial city. More than fifty unsold paintings were listed in the October 1637 inventory of Jacobsz’s estate, including “An old man’s face [tronie] by Rembrandt himself” and five tronies specified as copies after Rembrandt, including a “Turkish prince” and “another small Oriental woman’s tronie, the portrait of H. Ulenburgh’s wife, after Rembrandt.”

Backer (see fig. 17), who was about seven years older than Flinck, was in Amsterdam by 1633 (he probably arrived about 1631 or 1632) and worked as an independent painter. In an accomplished early picture of 1633 (fig. 18) he combined Jacobsz’s grand forms with Rembrandtesque figure types and lighting. Notwithstanding some sober single-figure pictures and religious scenes, Backer became a cosmopolitan painter of portraits (see fig. 19) and mythological works. His success made an impression on Rembrandt’s disciple of the late 1630s Ferdinand Bol, which reminds one that many of the ideas absorbed by Rembrandt’s pupils actually came from other pupils and followers of the master.

Flinck may have remained in Leeuwarden until the summer of 1636, when Jacobsz and his wife died of the plague. His earliest dated works are from 1636, when he was twenty-one. By March 1637 he was living in Uylenburgh’s house, where he also may have been one or two years earlier. One of the paintings dated 1636 is a small full-length portrait of Flinck’s Mennonite cousin Dirck Leeuw, which still belongs to the Amsterdam Mennonite community.

The Museum’s early Flora (no. 22) has been attributed plausibly to Flinck and probably dates from between 1636 and 1638. Unlike Lievens and Dou, the young Flinck was first an imitator of Rembrandt (perhaps even before he met him) and then his apprentice (about 1635 to 1636?). He came to Rembrandt with considerable facility in a manner influenced by Jacobsz and by Backer, which is evident in his use of rhythmic contours and smooth, broadly brushed areas (see fig. 20), with a kind of artistic light that looks flashed from the front even when it comes over the shoulder. These qualities are not evident in the so-called Bust of Rembrandt (fig. 21), which recently has been reassigned unconvincingly from Rembrandt to Flinck and given the indefensibly early date of about 1633. The panel’s vigorous technique and in particular its description of natural light and other physical effects are characteristic of Rembrandt and continue the concerns of his Leiden works in a more painterly style.

Houbraekken (who was a friend of Flinck’s son) wrote that the young artist “found it advisable to study with Rembrandt for a year [because] at that time Rembrandt’s manner was widely praised.” In no time at all, Houbraekken reports, “a number of his pieces were considered to be and were sold as genuine paintings [ege penseelwerken] by Rembrandt. But after that he gave up this way of painting with great effort and difficulty; since before the death of Rembrandt true connoisseurs opened the world’s eyes to the influence of the Italian manner, and the bright style came back into fashion.”

Fig. 18. Jacob Backer. John the Baptist, Herodes, and Herodias, 1633. Oil on canvas, 53 ½ × 67⅜ in. (136.5 × 172 cm). Signed and dated: Debacker/A 1633. Fries Museum, Leeuwarden
Flinck’s early role as an imitator of Rembrandt (if he did, as seems likely, serve Jacobsz and Uylenburgh in that capacity) was followed by his apprenticeship at a time when Rembrandt was at the height of fashion. During this period Rembrandt painted the most spectacular picture in the Passion series for Prince Frederick Hendrick, The Ascension of 1636 in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, and such theatrical works as The Blinding of Samson of 1636 in Frankfurt, The Sacrifice of Isaac (fig. 23) and the Danae of about 1636 in St. Petersburg, The Rape of Ganymede of about 1635 and The Prodigal Son of about 1635 in Dresden, and Belshazzar’s Feast of about 1636–37 in The National Gallery, London. In their emulation of Rubens and Titian (among other great painters), and in their horrific, hysterical, rapturous, or at least sensual moods, these pictures (which no reasonable writer would hesitate to call Baroque) are very different from Rembrandt’s religious paintings of earlier years. In several respects, then, the master’s influence on Flinck and a few other artists in the mid- to late 1630s was quite unlike the impression he had made on Lievens and on Dou.

This influence was not only a matter of style and content but also of training—or rather, of the example that Rembrandt set. His method of teaching, to judge from

---

**Fig. 19.** Jacob Backer. Boy in Gray. 1634. Oil on canvas, oval, 37 x 28 in. (94 x 71 cm). Signed and dated: J. Debacker 1634. Museum Mauritshuis, The Hague

**Fig. 20.** Govert Flinck. Rembrandt (?) as a Shepherd, 1636. Oil on canvas, 29 1/2 x 23 1/8 in. (74.5 x 64 cm). Signed: G. Flinck f. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

**Fig. 21.** Rembrandt. Self-Portrait ("Bust of Rembrandt"), ca. 1636. Oil on wood, 22 x 18 1/8 in. (56 x 47 cm). Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin
written sources and student drawings (see fig. 22), was broadly consistent with his own program of study in Leiden: sketching live models and treating standard subjects. (Rembrandt apparently assigned his students certain themes, such as Christ and the Woman of Samaria [see no. 14 here and no. 14 and figs. 129–138, vol. I] and the Dismissal of Hagar [see nos. 48, 52, figs. 79, 80].)\textsuperscript{70} The assignments were intended essentially as problems of interpretation and expression; compositions were modified accordingly (see fig. 38). With regard to his own work, however, Rembrandt’s way of learning had entered a different phase: he was rapidly assimilating the influences of other artists and, in effect, editing them. Rembrandt had done this earlier in terms of the compositions of Lastman (whose ideas he continued to borrow and to alter substantially).\textsuperscript{71} Now, in the 1630s, he was critically revising the inventions of Rubens, Titian, and Leonardo; no master was too great an authority. In a sense, Rembrandt treated these artists as if they were his pupils: Constantijn van Renesse (or another pupil) was shown how to stage the Annunciation (fig. 38), and some suggestions for the Last Supper were drawn over Rembrandt’s copy of Leonardo’s idea (no. 56).

It was one thing to be Rembrandt, with his background, experience, personality, and past mastery of the program he would assign his students, and another to be someone like Flinck, working for a peer of Rubens and Titian and watching the artist review tradition and challenge it. “When I once pestered my master, Rembrandt, with too many ‘whys’ and ‘wherefores,’ he answered me very well,” wrote van Hoogstraten in 1678. “First learn to use what you already know in your work, and the secrets about which you ask will be discovered soon enough.”\textsuperscript{72} That practice had benefited Rembrandt, but few of his students were so diligent and none was so discerning (as Huygens had observed). Had any of Rembrandt’s pupils possessed these qualities, and something like his genius, it still would have been hard for them to follow his advice, to be patient and grow gradually. This was Amsterdam, not Leiden, during those years in which private fortunes, the art market, and the city’s concentric canals were expanding like rings around an object thrown into a pool. To teenage painters who knew little more of the world than their families and their new profession, Rembrandt must have seemed suddenly at center stage: even they could grasp the significance of the fact that this painter to the prince and to some of the leading families in the city was only thirty years old.

Another method of learning from Rembrandt, painting copies after his works, also differed substantially from the master’s own practice, in this case, his habit of drawing free variations after artists such as Lastman and Leonardo. It was probably Flinck (in any event, a Rembrandt apprentice in 1636) who copied The Sacrifice of Isaac dated 1635 (fig. 23) in the canvas inscribed “Rembrandt. verandert. En overgeschildert. 1636” (Rembrandt revised and repainted 1636) (fig. 24).\textsuperscript{73}

The changes made in the copy (a new angel and a ram added at the left and foliage in the right background) were evidently determined by Rembrandt after the design of 1635 was transferred with the help of a cartoon (which
shifted slightly in the process), as von Sonnenburg has explained.24 The few “decisive and characteristic corrections by Rembrandt himself [include] final corrective brushstrokes enhancing and more clearly defining the modeling [of Isaac];” some rugged strokes added to his otherwise smoothly painted loincloth, and lively touches on the angel’s hair and proper right wing. Thus, the inscription, which has been debated by academics, is considered by a conservator to “convincingly sum up what actually meets the eye.”

It might seem from the observations made above that becoming a self-sufficient artist under Rembrandt’s tutelage was a hopeless endeavor, and the oeuvres of two pupils of the 1630s, Gerrit Horst and Reynier van Gherwen, offer little to dispel this impression.25 However, stronger talents, such as Bol and Carel Fabritius, learned much from Rembrandt’s emphasis on the fundamentals and to some extent studied other masters and responded to trends quite as he did. Flinck’s style developed as Houbraken suggested, but one cannot say that it matured.26 In his more independent works Flinck was most successful when charming or clever—as in his portraits of children and in paintings of sleeping cupids and come-hither goddesses or shepherdesses. Portraits such as the pair of 1646 in Raleigh (figs. 26, 27) help one understand why in the 1650s Flinck was the most sought-after artist in Amsterdam. In the early Isaac Blessing Jacob (fig. 25), by contrast, he remains an impressive follower of Rembrandt. Parts of the picture, such as the “best garments of Esau” (with which the Old Testament tells us the deceitful Rebecca had clothed her second son), are broadly and beautifully painted, although this is not the main point of the work. The composition is formed upon meaningful gestures and expressions, which are effectively described. The interpretation of the same theme by van den Eeckhout (no. 47) does not stand up well to comparison; it is as if all he learned from his teacher was to adopt ideas from Lastman and to light the main figures in an otherwise shadowy space.

Van den Eeckhout was only twenty-one when he painted the Museum’s Isaac Blessing Jacob. Like Backer, he came from a Mennonite family in Harlingen, near Leeuwarden, but grew up in Amsterdam. In 1633 his father (see fig. 69),
Fig. 25. Govert Flinck. *Isaac Blessing Jacob*, 1638. Oil on canvas, 46½ × 55½ in. (117 × 141 cm). Signed and dated: G.Flinck 1638. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Fig. 26. Govert Flinck. *Portrait of a Man*, 1646. Oil on canvas, 49 × 37 in. (124.5 × 94 cm). North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh, Purchased with funds from the State of North Carolina.

Fig. 27. Govert Flinck. *Portrait of a Woman*, 1646. Oil on canvas, 49 × 37 in. (124.5 × 94 cm). North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh, Purchased with funds from the State of North Carolina.
a goldsmith, married his second wife, who was the daughter of a wealthy official in the East India Company. Thus, van den Eechhout was one of the “führende Kinder” (prominent or patrician youngsters), who, according to Joachim von Sandrart’s much discussed account, studied with Rembrandt. This must have been between 1635 and 1638–39; a previously unpublished picture by him with a familiar Rembrandt school subject (fig. 100, vol. 1) is signed and dated 163[?]. Houbraken describes van den Eechhout as a Rembrandt pupil who “stuck with the same way of painting to the end of his life,” except that in many works he made the background “somewhat clearer or brighter.”

The same author mentions in passing that van den Eechhout, like the landscapist Roelant Roghman, was Rembrandt’s “great friend.”

Van den Eechhout died a bachelor in a fine house on the Herengracht. He was often called upon to value paintings but seems otherwise to have had little contact with patrons. Fashionable portraits are a minor part of his oeuvre, which is remarkably varied in subject and to a lesser extent in style. In the period 1646 to 1648 he depicted rustic interiors that stand between those of Rembrandt (see fig. 41) and of younger followers such as Barent Fabritius and Maes; in the early to mid-1650s, along with Jacob van Loo, he was an innovative painter of elegant genre scenes (for example, the Museum’s Musical Party). Van den Eechhout’s few landscapes, his designs for gold- and silversmiths, and his poetry complete the impression of an eclectic artist who was more concerned with invention and style than with the choice and interpretation of subjects.

Nonetheless, the largest part of van den Eechhout’s oeuvre consists of biblical scenes (see no. 47), for which Rembrandt’s work was either a strong influence or a point of departure. Like a graduate student unable to move beyond his dissertation, van den Eechhout produced numerous variations of standard Rembrandt school themes, some of which have an all-purpose look of seriousness without achieving anything profound. However, his religious pictures of the 1660s include works that appear to have been more deeply felt (for example, The Dismissal of Hagar and Ishmael of 1666 in the North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh). The light touch with which the artist often treated Roman history and mythology seems suited to the cosmopolitan spirit of Amsterdam in the period from about 1655 to 1670.

Van den Eechhout’s facility in a Rembrandtesque manner (which ebbed and flowed willfully in his work) and his distinctive gifts as a colorist deserve appreciation. He is of interest here, however, mainly as an example of the typical Rembrandt pupil or follower who rarely came close to him in both substance and style. There were many good reasons for this, the most obvious of which is that each artist revealed his own character and abilities. Broader considerations, such as differences between generations and changes in values and taste, become clear when one studies the full range of Dutch art and architecture and the views of Rembrandt’s earliest critics.

Questions of form and content are also relevant to Jan Victors, who has often been discussed together with van den Eechhout as a Rembrandt pupil of the late 1630s, as a painter of biblical scenes (see no. 52) and as a Lastman enthusiast. He was not the same sort of man, however, as van den Eechhout: Victors came from a poor family, married at the age of twenty-three in 1642, was a widower with seven children in 1661, and died while caring for the sick in the Dutch East Indies in 1676 or 1677. Most of his paintings depict religious subjects, all of them from the Old Testament and from an orthodox Calvinist perspective.

Fig. 28. Pupil of Rembrandt. Studio Interior with a Couple Posing for Their Double Portrait, ca. 1645–55. Pen and brush with brown ink on two pieces of paper pasted together, 6 9/16 x 9 3/8 in. (17.5 x 23.4 cm). Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris
What he learned from Rembrandt seems, on balance, to be the means to an end, which is not something one would say about van den Eeckhout. Sumowski writes that Victors’s portraits benefit from “the diligent exactitude which detracts from the painter’s history pieces.” This statement suggests that the styles of Victors and Rembrandt diverged from the 1640s onward and that even the younger artist’s earliest works reveal a distinctive manner.

No modern writer would praise a biblical painting by Victors (see fig. 4), or for that matter Flinck (see fig. 25), by saying that it could pass for a Rembrandt. Even if it could, one is now more concerned than were van Hoogstraten and Houbraken with what sets artists apart. In portraiture conventions of expression, propriety, and fashion were leveling factors for these early observers, as well as for later ones, who also must contend with abrasion, varnish, dirt, and the attributions of dealers. Many students of Dutch art are able to distinguish the manners of execution and of interpretation in even the early religious pictures by Bol, Flinck, van den Eeckhout, and Victors, but the same scholars can barely begin to differentiate those artists’ first efforts in portraiture. Rembrandt’s own work as a portraitist was at its most fashionable when these painters were his pupils. Thus, it is not surprising that Rembrandtesque portraits of the 1640s exhibit considerable uniformity, that even Victors’s early efforts (including nos. 27 and 28, if they are indeed by Victors) might look like those of Flinck and Bol (and, to later eyes, like Rembrandts), and that compositions and motifs made the rounds like gossip in Amsterdam studios (see fig. 28). All this must have been much more obvious once than it has been ever since: for example, that a figure by van den Eeckhout, if he did paint the Man with a Steel Gagot (no. 26), recalls the captain in The Night Watch, in which—as anyone in Rembrandt’s milieu would have known—van den Eeckhout’s uncle Jan Leijdecker appears.

Another of the master’s “führende Kinder” is Leendert van Beyerens (ca. 1620–1649). In 1637, when he was still a teenager, he had the means and interest to buy a costly collection of prints by Lucas van Leyden at an Amsterdam sale. When his father, a wealthy timber merchant, died in 1638, four triomies by Leendert after Rembrandt were listed in the inventory of the estate. A signed portrait from the 1640s by van Beyerens resembles self-portraits by Bol, van Hoogstraten, and other Rembrandt pupils, although it is not comparable in quality.

On the verso of a sheet of paper that Rembrandt used to copy a painting by Lastman, fragmentary notes in his hand record: “a Flora sold... 4.6...”; “sold a work by fardynandus...”; “Sold Leendert’s Flora 5...” (see no. 22). Ferdinand Bol (1616–1680), the son of a Dordrecht doctor (and thus another well-to-do youth), signed himself “Ferdinandus bol, painter” in a document drawn up in his native city in December 1634. He probably began training with the leading local painter, Jacob Gerritsz Cuyp, and then went to study with Rembrandt about 1636. In January 1638 Bol’s sister married an Amsterdam doctor; a portrait of their father (d. 1641) by Rembrandt was listed in Bol’s collection (which included six other Rembrandts) when he remarried in 1669.

These and other facts indicate that Bol was a close associate of Rembrandt’s from about 1636 until 1642, when he signed and dated his earliest known independent works (such as no. 43). Blankert persuasively suggests that Bol served as a studio assistant, but what this means is described ambiguously: “Rembrandt undoubtedly made many of his paintings without any assistance [for example, The Night Watch, although only such a large project would justify Blankert’s remark that “the situation was comparable to that in Rubens’ studio’]. But for an even greater number of works he provided the design, sketched in the composition with oil paint, and/or assisted and advised in the execution.” This is precisely the Rubensian model of workshop production, but the only concrete example that Blankert cites is the Flinck in Munich (fig. 24), which Rembrandt
modified and retouched locally, carefully noting on the canvas itself his participation. Far from making this picture "an excellent example of a work painted by Rembrandt in collaboration with one or more assistants," as Blankert claims, the inscription distinguishes Rembrandt's role in the pupil's replica of a major work, which the master had painted without assistance during the previous year.29

In the same passage Blankert's reader is advised to "forget the notion of Rembrandt's hyper-individual artistry." It may be that Rembrandt's former pupils were still strongly influenced by him "long after they had started working independently. This is evinced by signed and dated paintings by Flinck, van den Eekhout, De Gelder, and others [for example, Bol's own Self-Portrait of about 1647 (fig. 29)]. In Rembrandt's studio, [however,] where everyone worked under his direct supervision, there was even less scope for a personal approach."91

This view appears to have been fashionable in Dutch academic circles about fifteen years ago. Similar opinions were expressed in the 1982 volume of the Corpus and in the 1983 exhibition catalogue on which Blankert and an author of the Corpus collaborated.92 Characteristically, the most extreme statement of the thesis was made by another author of the Corpus who, in two essays on Rembrandt's "studio production," maintains that "the master let a work executed by an assistant go under his own name."93 Again the sole example cited is like a check drawn upon a bankrupt account: the Anna and the Blind Tobit in The National Gallery, London, which the authors of the Corpus assign to Dou and to which Rembrandt is alleged to have given his name in "a nearly contemporary etching inscribed 'Rembr van Rijn inventit.'"94 Who let what be signed with his name is a moot point now that the painting is again considered to be by Rembrandt.95

All this is more relevant than it might seem to Bol's role in Rembrandt's studio, since what that role was is a matter of academic debate. In my view Bol was Rembrandt's student and perhaps at some point became his assistant, but there is no evidence that he collaborated with Rembrandt or with another pupil or assistant on any single work, nor is there any indication that a painting by Bol or by a comparable artist left the studio with a genuine Rembrandt signature or with a signature meant to imply the master's responsibility.96 There is, however, evidence of contrary facts, including the document that states "sold a work by fardynandus," and works reliably signed by Rembrandt,97 and pictures by pupils that are not signed at all, and many paintings that are described precisely in inventories (of the estates of pupils' parents and of dealers such as Lambert Jacobsz) as "after Rembrandt." This is just what one would expect given Rembrandt's great reputation at the time and the care taken by other artists of the period (for example, Rubens) to distinguish their works from those of assistants, pupils, and copyists. Rubens's monumental projects are not comparable to Dutch "studio production," but even if they were, the analogy would break down: like The Night Watch and other large group portraits, the mural decorations of the Huis ten Bosch and of the Amsterdam town hall are all canvases painted by individual artists (Bol, Flinck, and Owens [see no. 54] in the latter building). Perhaps the effort made in this period to distinguish "principals" (as originals were called) from such works as "Leendert's Flora" reflects the fact that Dutch artists were still trying to establish themselves as inventors and as worthy individuals (in their view, gentlemen, not craftsmen) comparable to the kind of Italian Renaissance master who went by his first name (this is a good part of the message in Rembrandt's celebrated Self-Portrait at the Age of Thirty-four [fig. 31], and in his students' responses to it [see fig. 29]).98 In any case, three centuries would pass before Dutch critics found it necessary to reject the "notion of Rembrandt's hyperindividual artistry," along with many other ideas about Rembrandt that are only a hundred years old.

To discuss Bol in connection with Baroque works by Rembrandt and Flinck (see figs. 23, 24) is to underscore how little that style suited his temperament. As Sumowski observes, Bol emulated Rembrandt through the 1640s in gradually turning to compositions of quieter mood (see the master's Bathsheba [no. 10]); even Bol's interior scenes such as The String of Pearls (fig. 32) (probably a double portrait) have an Arcadian flavor evoked by Rembrandt-esque light.99 Bol's inclination to let eyes, lips, and hands, rather than arms and torsos, articulate can already be seen in the early Jacob's Dream of about 1642 (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden); the effectiveness of his approach is perhaps made clear by a comparison with van den Eekhout's generally similar interpretation of the subject in the Warsaw canvas dated 1642.100 By 1644, when Bol painted works such as Judah and Tamar in Boston, The Rest on the Flight in Dresden, and Vertumnus and Pomona in Cincinnati, his manner of expression and execution (at least in history pictures) had become unmistakable.101 The artist remained, to some extent, a member of the Cuyp family circle (which he left only at the age of twenty) and drew upon the most sympathetic tendencies of Rembrandt's studio. One almost could have predicted in the mid-1640s that Bol's bombastic mural of 1656 for the Amsterdam town hall, Pyrrhus Shows Gaius Fabritius Lucinus His Elephant, would succeed only as comedy,102 or that his later paintings of Venus and Adonis would be among the best in Netherlandish art.103

Confusion between Bol and Rembrandt in later centuries has usually involved portraits and other single-figure
Fig. 30. Govaert Flinck. Self-Portrait at the Age of Twenty-four, 1639. Oil on wood, 25¼ × 21¼ in. (65.8 × 54.4 cm). Signed and dated: G. Flinck/1639. The Trustees of The National Gallery, London.

Fig. 31. Rembrandt. Self-Portrait at the Age of Thirty-four, 1640. Oil on canvas, 36¾ × 31¼ in. (93 × 80 cm). Signed and dated: Rembrandt f 1640. The Trustees of The National Gallery, London.

Fig. 32. Ferdinand Bol. The String of Pearls, 1649. Oil on canvas, 36¼ × 70¼ in. (143.3 × 178 cm). Signed and dated: F. Bol Fecit 1649. Philips Electronics NV, Eindhoven.
pictures of the 1640s. The most persistent example is the *Portrait of Elisabeth Bas* (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), which was long famous as a Rembrandt, then was attributed to Bol (by Bredius in 1911), was reassigned to Rembrandt by Blankert in 1976, and was shown convincingly to be by Bol on the basis of firsthand comparisons in the exhibition of 1991–92. Apart from some other formal portraits from the 1640s, the paintings that most resemble Rembrandts depict artistic types, including Bol himself (fig. 29). In these compositions imitation was meant as homage.

*Rembrandt Pupils of the 1640s and Later*

About the time that Bol became independent, a nineteen-year-old artist whom van Hoogstraten called “our Fabritius, my co-pupil” started his apprenticeship with Rembrandt. Carel Fabritius’s tenure probably lasted from late 1641 until about April 1643, when his wife died and he moved back to his native Midden-Beemster, about twenty miles from Amsterdam. Van Hoogstraten himself stayed with Rembrandt from 1642–43 until 1646–47. Their different experiences complemented and perhaps were determined by their individual artistic personalities; Fabritius never painted a work one would now mistake for a Rembrandt, whereas recently pictures have been removed from Rembrandt’s oeuvre and assigned to that of van Hoogstraten from about 1645 to 1650 (see figs. 2, 37).

Fabritius’s earliest known work, *The Raising of Lazarus* of about 1643 in Warsaw, recalls Flinck’s and Bol’s most Baroque responses to Rembrandt. The picture could not be mistaken for another follower’s work, however, in part because it adopts some of the least conventional aspects of *The Night Watch*, such as the seemingly spontaneous arrangement of figures in a crowd, the dramatic but convincing daylight, and the densely applied brushwork. The Warsaw canvas already reveals the painterly approach and priorities of light and shade that occur in Fabritius’s pictures of about 1644 to 1647: the *Mercury and Argus* (fig. 33), the *Hermes and Aegauros* in Boston, and perhaps (if Sumowski is right) the *Venus and Adonis (Diana and Endymion)* in Vaduz. These mythological works recall Baldinucci’s reference to scenes from Ovid that were supposedly supplied by Rembrandt to an Amsterdam magistrate.

The pictures just cited, in this author’s opinion, fall stylistically between the Warsaw canvas and *The Beheading of John the Baptist* in Amsterdam (fig. 34), which (whether Fabritius is the author or not) must date from the period 1645 to 1650. In the *Beheading*, figure types reappear from *The Raising of Lazarus* and other pictures, as do the transparent shadows on faces and the device of brightly illuminating the backs of hands. The Amsterdam canvas may well be the “St. John’s Beheading by Fabritius” that was sold in Amsterdam in 1687 and 1696.

The Rotterdam *Self-Portrait* (fig. 35) must have originated in the second half of the 1640s, perhaps about 1648, while the *Portrait of Abraham Potter* (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) is dated 1648 or 1649. It is possible that the *Beheading* was painted even later, about 1649–50; no other figural works

![Carel Fabritius. *Mercury and Argus,* ca. 1645–47. Oil on canvas, 29 × 41 in. (73.5 × 104 cm). Signed: Carolus Fabritius. Los Angeles County Museum of Art](image)
by Fabritius on a similar scale date from before 1654 (when the Self-Portrait in London was painted),116 the year of the artist's sudden death.

Fabritius deserves close consideration in this essay because his oeuvre of the 1640s has lately been the target of explosive attributions (whether right or wrong) and because he is one of very few artists in Amsterdam who learned some essentials from Rembrandt and then immediately went his own way. The clearest examples that reveal Fabritius's development are the two self-portraits; although very different from each other and from contemporary works by Rembrandt, both exhibit sophisticated painting techniques in the service of vivid description and a sense of how not only discrete passages but also the whole image can resemble life. (The Rotterdam Self-Portrait, were it more famous, could be called the Juan de Pareja of the Netherlands.) The pictures have in common optical effects achieved through complexly layered touches, which Velázquez and Rembrandt learned partly from Titian.117

Fabritius and van Hoogstraten shared an enthusiasm for illusionism and for Rembrandt's technique; but the younger artist—van Hoogstraten (see fig. 36) was only fifteen when he went from Dordrecht to Rembrandt's studio in 1642–43—adopted both artistic alternatives without
considering the emphasis on perception and the limits of representation that intrigued Fabritius.\textsuperscript{118} Van Hoostraten had surprising facility, the kind of brilliance that makes a prodigy or a courtier (in his case, both). His work has been confused with that of Rembrandt, Drost, Maes, Metsu, and others, and it went through Amsterdam, Dordrecht, Leiden, The Hague, and international phases almost at will.

Most or all of van Hoostraten's close approximations of Rembrandt's style appear to date from 1647, his last year in Amsterdam, and from 1648 and 1649, when he was in Dordrecht (in May 1651 he left his native city for Vienna and spent five years there, in Rome, and in Regensburg).\textsuperscript{119}

Van Hoostraten's early self-portraits and monies of 1644–45 recall works by Bol, Flinck, and Victors.\textsuperscript{120} He depended more directly upon Rembrandt in the \textit{Young Woman at a Half-Door} in Chicago and especially in the \textit{Young Girl with a Broom} (fig. 37), which for several reasons can be dated to 1646–47.\textsuperscript{121} The smaller figures in the \textit{Adoration of the Shepherds}, signed and dated 1647 (fig. 106), show the same Rembrandtesque manner less effectively employed.\textsuperscript{122} In the \textit{Portrait of a Young Man} in a private collection, the \textit{Seated Man with a Stick} in London, and \textit{Haman Recognizing His Fate} (fig. 2),\textsuperscript{123} van Hoostraten still retained a love of reflective materials, jewelry, and other details that echoes Victors's manner. Yet in pictures such as these of about 1647–48 he also developed a scumbling technique and strong contrast of light and shadow that superficially resemble effects in works by Rembrandt and Fabritius (see fig. 35) of about the same time. The \textit{Seated Man} and the \textit{Haman} were first doubted as Rembrandts fairly recently (about 1960), as were a number of van Hoostraten's most Rembrandtesque drawings.

Other paintings attributed to van Hoostraten, of about 1647 to 1648, could be cited here, but it is more important to observe that he promptly developed a more fluid and fashionable manner in works such as the \textit{Portrait of an Inventor} of 1650 (location unknown) and the \textit{Self-Portrait as a Draftsman in a Window} of about 1649 in St. Petersburg.\textsuperscript{124} Not surprisingly, at the court in Vienna he was first doubted as Rembrandts fairly recently (about 1960), as were a number of van Hoostraten's most Rembrandtesque drawings.

It is impossible to review the most Rembrandtesque paintings by artists such as van Hoostraten without referring to works and issues that mainly interest specialists. However, any reader will recognize that scholars are just beginning to clarify (and sometimes confuse) the early years of a few of Rembrandt's best pupils and that in the process a few long-admired "Rembrandts" have come into question. One of these is the \textit{The Mill} in Washington, D.C., which has been ascribed to Bol and connected with van Hoostraten's copupil under Rembrandt (and
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Philips Koninck's brother-in-law) Abraham Furnerius (ca. 1628–1654).\textsuperscript{126} The latter candidate can be neither defended nor dismissed, since no paintings by him are known. However, four landscapes were cited in a family member's estate (in 1673), and landscape drawings, some with silhouetted mills, have been attributed to him on the basis of comparisons with sheets bearing early furnerius or similar inscriptions.\textsuperscript{127}

Nearly as uncertain is the oeuvre of Constantijn van Rensse, another young man of good family and an amateur who took lessons from Rembrandt in 1649 and was influenced by him in a few minor pictures of the early 1650s.\textsuperscript{128} Among the excessive number of drawings that have been attributed to him are some that were corrected by Rembrandt (see fig. 38).\textsuperscript{129}

Willem Drost (1633–1663 or later), a schoolteacher's son, studied with Rembrandt from about 1649–50 to 1652 or 1653, when he signed and dated his first independent works (see fig. 39, no. 46). What little is known of Drost's life was reviewed recently by the archivist Dudok van Heel;\textsuperscript{130} much uncertainty remains and has been compounded by problematic attributions to him, including that of \textit{The Polish Rider} (fig. 4, vol. I).\textsuperscript{131} Apparently reacting to conjectures of this kind, van Heel insists that Drost was in Italy from about 1653 to about 1662 (Houboken writes that he was long in Rome) and suggests that the artist may have succumbed to the plague in Amsterdam in 1663. It is
equally possible that Drost was in Italy for a shorter period of time, perhaps from 1656 to 1660, and that he lived longer. However, the pictures Drost painted in Italy (such as the *Mercury and Argus* in Dresden and the *Self-Portrait* in Florence) strongly recall contemporary works in Venice, where he went with Johann Carl Loth (Carlotto). Drost’s last dated picture, *Hillegorda van Beuningen* of 1663 (private collection), conforms to the contemporary fashion in Amsterdam, as found in canvases by Bol and by Ovens (see no. 54).133

The most Rembrandtesque works by Drost must date, then, to about 1650 to 1655, when he was between seventeen and twenty-two years old. The earliest known paintings, of 1651 to 1653, include two portraits dated 1653 (see no. 46) and such awkward but promising biblical pictures as *The Vision of Daniel* in Berlin and the *Ruth and Naomi* in Oxford.133 It is with these pictures, which look like typical student exercises, that one would be compelled to include *The Polish Rider* if it were by Drost. Even in its present state, however, *The Polish Rider* appears to be the work of a far more experienced master: in my view, Rembrandt, about 1660.134

Two canvases signed by Drost and dated 1654, the *Bathsheba* (fig. 40) and the dashing *Seated Man in a Feathered Beret* (formerly Rothschild Collection), are strongly modeled with bold contrasts of light and shadow.135 The smooth, somewhat simplified forms of Bathsheba’s face and body are set off by the subtly described folds of her fallen chemise. The seductive *Young Woman* in The Wallace Collection (fig. 62) is a variation on this formal theme; the Museum’s *Sibyl* (no. 29) and the *Young Woman* in Dresden (fig. 74) are more painterly throughout.136 Images of male figures that are plausibly attributed to Drost about 1654–55 include the *Bearded Man* in Dublin, the *Man with a Red Cap* in Dresden, and the *Man in Armor* in Kassel.137 Published reproductions do not do these pictures justice and have increased the confusion between Drost and van Hoogstraten.138 Drost’s skillful handling of light, textures, and drapery in works dating from about 1654–55, when these are studied in the original, reveals that he was capable of painting a picture as impressive as *The Unmerciful Servant* (The Centurion Cornelis?) in The Wallace Collection.139

The ease with which Drost developed an Italian Tenebrist manner in the late 1650s is revealing in several respects. Like Bol and van Hoogstraten, Drost found in Rembrandt’s work a style that could be adjusted to various moods and imaginary figures. This was essentially the way Rembrandt was appreciated in eighteenth-century Venice, and to some extent also in Paris, London, and elsewhere (see the Postscript below). Thus, the later taste for Rembrandt was both stimulated and satisfied in part by his pupils’ pictures: works in which Rembrandt’s manner and themes had already been adjusted to temperaments very different from his own.
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Fig. 38. Constantijn van Renesse with corrections by Rembrandt. *The Annunciation.* Pen and wash in brown ink over red chalk with white body color, 6¼ × 9½ in. (17.3 × 23.1 cm). Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin

Nicolaes Maes (1634–1693) is one of the best examples of a Rembrandt pupil who revealed his own personality even in early works. He was less than a year younger than Drost and worked in Rembrandt’s studio at about the same time (1649–50 to 1652). His first dated picture (no. 52), painted at the age of nineteen in 1653, is among his most Rembrandtesque and is perhaps the most affecting interpretation of the biblical episode it depicts of the many made in Rembrandt’s milieu. Maes managed to discover tenderness in a remarkable variety of subjects: for example, in Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael (no. 52), Christ Blessing the Children of 1652–53 (The National Gallery, London), Young Woman at a Window of about 1654 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), and a number of small genre scenes painted about 1655 (see fig. 42 and no. 53). Several writers have observed that this type of handling of domestic situations was inspired by Rembrandt paintings of the mid-1640s such as the Holy Family (fig. 41), The Adoration of the Shepherds in London, and the Young Girl Leaning on a Window Sill (fig. 1, vol. 1); one scholar even deduces from this that Maes must have been Rembrandt’s pupil at the age of twelve. It is more plausible that Maes was drawn to particular works by Rembrandt, which happened to date from a slightly earlier period than that of his studio.
Maes was back in his native Dordrecht by December 1653. His Young Woman at a Window mentioned above has less to do with Rembrandt than with van Hoogstraten, while the genre scenes of about 1655 and the large paintings of old women (see fig. 77) are the works of a remarkably self-sufficient twenty-one-year-old, who already had a wife and at least one child. In later years Maes’s appealing sense of intimacy was rarely sustained. His genre paintings, often populated with precious young women and children, became didactic or humorous. Stylish portraits constitute almost all his oeuvre after 1660.

Rembrandt’s pupils of the 1640s and early 1650s seem to have had less trouble than Flinck and artists of his generation in moving away from Rembrandt’s style.143 They were, of course, increasingly younger than the master, and his manner must have seemed more dated as the years passed. This view is hard to appreciate after 350 years, but in the mid-1650s, when Amsterdam became the capital of the Netherlands and was rapidly expanding (with mansions on the Herengracht in the latest style), Flinck and Bartholomeus van der Helst were the most sought-after artists in the city.

Rembrandt also had serious financial problems from about 1653 onward and, partly as a result, a badly diminished position in Amsterdam society. Another primary cause of Rembrandt’s eclipse as a teacher was the pregnancy of his companion, Hendrickje Stoffels, in 1654. Hendrickje was condemned by the Calvinist church and had no prospect of marrying Rembrandt. Young artists from patrician families, and probably most youths from humble homes (whether Mennonite, Calvinist, Catholic, or whatever), were not likely to be placed in such a household when Flinck and numerous well-connected teachers were available. By early 1658 Rembrandt had lost his house and most of his personal effects, including his impressive art collection.144

Taking into account paintings such as the Aristotle, Flora, and The Standard Bearer (nos. 11–13), and Rembrandt’s Portrait of Jan Six of 1654, The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Joan Deyman of 1656, and later works such as The Syndics of the Amsterdam Drapers’ Guild (fig. 64),144 one might find it hard to view these years as a decline, let alone to believe the old story of Rembrandt’s even earlier fall from favor—that is, after The Night Watch was painted in 1642.145 Several of Rembrandt’s greatest works and many of exceptional quality, such as the Saint Bartholomew of 1657 (fig. 43), were painted in years of adversity. The Aristotle, for example, is the only work dated 1653, when Rembrandt’s house was undergoing large-scale structural repairs against his will.146 In practical terms this isolated commission for a foreign client had nothing to do with attracting students and customers. As far as is known, Rembrandt had almost no pupils of consequence after Drost, Maes, and minor figures such as Abraham van Dijck (see no. 36) and Renesse, who were with him from about 1648 to 1652.

The exception is Arent de Gelder (1645–1727), who was in several respects a special case. His father was a successful merchant who held a number of civic offices in Dordrecht. The son was van Hoogstraten’s pupil about 1660 and later (perhaps in 1662, when van Hoogstraten moved to London for five years) went to study with Rembrandt for “two full years.” This information is provided by Arnold Houbraken (1660–1719), van Hoogstraten’s younger pupil, who in the same sentence says specifically that de Gelder joined Rembrandt in “the year 1645.”147 This misprint may accidentally repeat de Gelder’s birthdate, which is given on the previous page, but perhaps the intended date was 1665. De Gelder’s earliest known works date from the 1670s (the first is the Ecce Homo, 1671, in Dresden) and are based upon Rembrandt etchings of the 1640s and 1650s and upon small biblical pictures by van Hoogstraten such as The Adoration of the Shepherds of 1647 (fig. 106).148 His leisurely pace as a pupil and indeed throughout his career is explained by the fact that de Gelder never pursued painting as a profession. His brother Jan (the two would qualify as “führbare Kinder,” in Sandrart’s view)149 spent the years 1668 to 1673 at law school in Leiden and lived lavishly until 1687, when his father had to

Fig. 43. Rembrandt, Saint Bartholomew, 1657. Oil on canvas, 48 3/4 x 39 1/2 in. (123.7 x 99.5 cm). Signed and dated: Rembrandt f. 1657. Timken Museum of Art, San Diego
pay off his debts. Arent never married and resided in his parents’ imposing house. He socialized with painters such as Houbraeken and Godfried Schalcken, and with amateurs. His patrons appear to have been relatives and personal friends; few of his pictures (see fig. 44) are cited in early Dordrecht inventories, but 70 of them (among 190 paintings) were listed in the 1727 inventory of his own estate.150

From this reading of de Gelder’s biography it would appear possible that the Pilate Washing His Hands (no. 38) could be a student work by him from about 1665 (when the artist was twenty) or from any time between 1663 and 1667. The hypothesis that de Gelder ever served as Rembrandt’s workshop collaborator, especially before 1665, is unlikely on several counts.

This conclusion may be discouraging for scholars who, following the conjectural model of the RRP, might wish to place de Gelder at the end of a long line of studio assistants. We are left with no identified artist who could have worked on paintings of the quality of “The Auctioneer” (no. 32) or the Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff (no. 37) between about 1653 and 1669, the year of Rembrandt’s death.

Rembrandt’s son Titus van Rijn (1641–1668) was an artist, but how good a painter he was is unknown. According to Sandart in 1675, the younger van Rijn was “said to be likewise well versed in art.”151 A few completely implausible attributions to Titus have been advanced lately by Bruyn: the horse in Rembrandt’s Equestrian Portrait of Frederick Rihel of 1663(?), in the National Gallery, London, and two fragmentary pictures of drastically lesser quality.152 These red herrings distract one from the fact that there is no visual evidence whatsoever for the oeuvre of Titus van Rijn; two drawings attributed to him by Welcker also must be firmly rejected.153

The 1656 inventory of Rembrandt’s estate lists three works by Titus: “298 Three dogs from life by Titus van Ryn / 299 A painted book by the same / 300 A head of [the Virgin] Mary by the same.”154 The artist was at most fourteen years old when he painted these unidentified pictures.

Titus’s only known profession was his service from 1660 (at age nineteen) until his death in 1668 as a partner, with Hendrickje Stoffels, in an art dealership that represented only Rembrandt. In 1665 Titus was in Leiden trying to secure a commission for a book illustration by his father.155 Thus, apart from de Gelder (about 1665?) and possibly one or two anonymous pupils, it appears that Rembrandt and Titus were the only people involved in the master’s business during the last decade of their lives.

No attempt is made here to suggest that Titus painted any particular example among the Rembrandtianque pictures of the 1660s that seem close to the master’s in style. It bears repeating that there is no visual evidence for Titus’s work as a painter—but that is the point. Lodewijk van der Helst (born in 1642, son of the celebrated Amsterdam portraitist Bartholomeus), Willem van Honthorst, Pieter Neefs the Younger, and indeed a fair number of Dutch and Flemish painters’ sons and nephews had no independent artistic existence until their masters died, but Rembrandt outlived his son by a year. In the 1660s, when Rembrandt had little money, no useful pupils that are known, and a few large commissions, what was the otherwise unemployed Titus, a man in his twenties, doing in Rembrandt’s house? For the moment only one answer is appropriate: connoisseurs know far less about artists who might have imitated Rembrandt during the 1660s than about those active during the subsequent one hundred years.

---

Fig. 44. Arent de Gelder. Edsha Enteacting Tobias with Sarah, 1690s. Oil on canvas, 44½ x 60½ in. (113 x 154 cm). Signed: AD [monogram] Gelder f. Otto Naumann, Ltd., New York.
Postscript: Literature on the Rembrandt Style after 1700

No one has written—or could write at this time—a history of Rembrandt imitators active in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. One can only discuss the taste for Rembrandt among critics, connoisseurs, collectors, and artists and thus gain some understanding of where, when, and why Rembrandt imitations might have been painted. As mentioned at the beginning of this essay, it is often impossible to know whether a picture made in Rembrandt’s manner after his lifetime was intended as an homage to the master, as a study exercise, as an eclectic gesture (see fig. 47), or as a forgery.

These questions need not be pursued in this publication—first because they are largely irrelevant to the Museum’s collection, which evidently includes no paintings formerly attributed to Rembrandt that date from later than about 1700; and second because there is a substantial body of literature on the subject. Probably the most convenient introduction to the relevant books and articles is Boogaard and Scheller’s essay “Survey of Rembrandt Criticism,” although it includes a number of vague generalizations. Insightful remarks about the taste for Dutch painting and for Rembrandt are included in Haskell’s Rediscoveries in Art, which concentrates on England and France from about 1790 to about 1870. Essential reading on art theory is Slive’s Rembrandt and His Critics and Emmens’s book on Rembrandt and the “Rules of Art” (which is in Dutch but has a long English summary).

Gerson, appropriately enough (given his many attributions to Rembrandt imitators of later periods), reviews the appreciation of Rembrandt’s work outside Holland during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and occasionally the nineteenth century, within the broader context of describing the dissemination and influence of Dutch painting in several European countries. For example, he cites Rembrandt paintings and especially etchings collected in Paris, pictures by Rembrandt or said to be by him (see fig. 8) in the collections of Charles 1 and others in England, and Rembrandt pictures in Italy—all executed within or shortly after the master’s lifetime. Gerson’s survey of the taste for Rembrandt in eighteenth-century France (as demonstrated, for example, by the artists Jean Raoux and Alexis Grimou; see fig. 46), and in England and parts of Germany (see fig. 47), offers intriguing glimpses of where some Rembrandt imitations might have come from. Painters as important as Drouais and Fragonard copied and imitated pictures by Rembrandt, as did many lesser artists. The results often look to be as much products of their own period as do Grimou’s original inventions, but other eighteenth-century imitations have deceived connoisseurs for more than two centuries.

An example of the kind of imitation produced in France during the first half of the eighteenth century is found, in my opinion, in what was formerly considered to be a self-portrait in The Taft Museum (fig. 45). Rembrandt’s authorship of this work was doubted for the first time by Gerson in 1968, although he did not propose a date after the master’s lifetime. In bright light it is clear that the canvas was very thinly painted, with a palette (red smoldering through a simple scheme of charcoal and brown) and feathery brushwork that are alien to Rembrandt’s circle (including even de Gelder) and most reminiscent of painting in Paris about the time of Watteau and Grimou. Rembrandt’s Young Girl Leaning on a Window Sill of 1645 (fig. 1, vol. I) and his Self-Portrait of 1652 in Vienna may have served as models; the Young Girl was taken from Amsterdam to Paris in the 1690s by Roger de Piles and remained in France until the 1770s. A dating after about 1720 is discouraged by the presence of azurite, which was largely replaced as a pigment in European paintings of later dates by Prussian blue.

The catalogue of an exhibition held at the Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, in 1983, Rembrandt in Eighteenth Century England, supersedes other essays on the subject. Sir Joshua Reynolds’s imitation and collecting of Rembrandt
paintings (he owned no. 13) represent only the most familiar chapter in a story that some consider the most important episode in the taste for Rembrandt after his death. This view is chauvinistically disputed in Cailleux’s article on the contemporary appreciation of Rembrandt in France,\textsuperscript{163} which is balanced by Starkey’s essay on the taste for Rembrandt drawings.\textsuperscript{164} Robinson’s article on Rembrandt’s influence in eighteenth-century Venice complements Gerson’s observations on the general appreciation of Rembrandt in Italy, which was rarely the source of deceptive pictures.\textsuperscript{165} A more detailed account than Gerson’s of eighteenth-century German followers of Rembrandt is available in Keller’s dissertation.\textsuperscript{166}

Fig. 46. Alexis Grimou. The Toper, 1720s. Oil on canvas, 40\% × 32 in. (102 × 81.1 cm). Worcester Art Museum, Worcester, Massachusetts, Museum purchase

Fig. 47. C.W.E. Dietrich. Christ Healing the Sick, 1742. Oil on canvas, 21\% × 28\% in. (54.9 × 73 cm). Signed and dated: Dietric\textsuperscript{y} pinxt: 1742. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of William H. Webb, 1885 85.9
Rembrandt’s critical fortunes in the nineteenth century are the main focus of Boomgaard and Scheller’s essay, cited above. French artists of the period who admired Rembrandt have been discussed by Chu.67 By the middle of the nineteenth century (and perhaps somewhat earlier), the newly made painting that could be mistaken for a Rembrandt at the time or later was probably much more likely than in the previous century to have been produced as a forgery. Earlier examples are known, however; a painting that was unquestionably meant to deceive, the Warrior in Braunschweig, is traceable since 1776. It was painted over a conservative Dutch portrait about the 1620s, which in the 1970s was partially revealed (fig. 48). This is one of many known instances in which an old picture was sacrificed so that a potentially more lucrative imitation would appear to have been painted on an appropriate support—in this case an oak panel.68 The main technical means of discovering this kind of falsification is, of course, X radiography, which was invented in 1895 and first used on a painting the following year. In the case of the Warrior, the general acceptance of the picture in Rembrandt literature before and including Michel’s monograph of 1893–94 was overruled when the signature and implausible date, “Rembrandt f 1638,” came off with cleaning in 1897.

Collectors in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries relied upon the knowledge and integrity of dealers and experts. This was not inadvisable, considering that the popular view of Rembrandt was far more romanticized in this era than it had been earlier. However, in the same period (which in America is known by a name evocative of Rembrandt, “The Gilded Age”), connoisseurship was also influenced more than ever before by material matters such as sudden wealth, conspicuous consumption, and the development of an intercontinental art market. The demand for paintings, drawings, and prints by Rembrandt was met by various forms of supply. Perhaps the main question for collectors such as Altman, Havemeyer, Marquand, Huntington, and Vanderbilt, who gave paintings by Rembrandt and not by Rembrandt to the Metropolitan Museum, was not what the artist actually had accomplished but what they wanted from him.

Fig. 48. Detail. Imitator of Rembrandt. A Warrior painted over a Portrait of a Woman (partially uncovered). Portrait, ca. 1620s; Warrior, probably ca. 1700–50. Oil on wood, 32 3/4 x 26 1/2 in. (83 x 67.5 cm). Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig
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1. Valentiner 1921.
2. Current catalogues do not reflect this consensus, although Slatkes 1992 comes close (315 entries, some with reservations expressed). Schwartz 1985 (330 works) is not a catalogue raisonné, while Tümpel 1986 (265 works) is essentially an iconographic study in which the opinions on authorship are borrowed and in some cases confused.
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5. See the brief summaries under Literature in each entry. According to Schwartz (unpublished paper kindly sent to the present author in February 1995), of the 122 paintings rejected (as C pictures) in the Corpus, I–III (1982–89), 92 are “from the same period as the Rembrandt paintings they most resemble,” 18 are from later in the seventeenth century, 8 are from about 1700 or later, and 4 could not be dated by the Rembrandt Research Project. As Schwartz observes, this is a remarkable reversal of the opinion advanced in 1969 by the RRP’s most prominent member, Josua Bruyn: “I should like to emphasize, however, that the majority of rejected pictures, which till now tended to be relegated more or less automatically to his school, do not belong there. Even Dr. Gerson, in his recent edition of Bredius’ catalogue, resorts too often, in my opinion, to attributions to Flinck, Van den Eckhout and Jan Victors, even though, in other cases, he considers rejected Rembrandt pictures later copies or imitations. I think that in these latter cases he is generally right. I also think that these later imitations, whether they are innocent pastiches or conscious fakes, are responsible for many more mistaken attributions than the school–pieces” (Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 36).
6. Rembrandt’s birth (in 1606) and his death (in 1669) were commemorated by these events, which usually addressed the theme of Rembrandt as teacher. See Leiden 1956; Raleigh 1956; Chicago, Minneapolis, Detroit 1969–70; Montreal, Toronto 1969.
7. The most familiar results are Amsterdam, Groningen 1983; Sumowski 1983–94; The Hague 1992; as well as the monographs cited in those publications.
10. The Cincinnati picture (fig. 45) is discussed by the writer in The Heidelberg Museum 1995, I, pp. 157–59. On Rembrandt imitators in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, see the Postscript in this essay.
12. See Chicago, Minneapolis, Detroit 1969–70, p. 65, no. 56, The Heeding of John the Baptist (fig. 34).
15. The last idea is argued in Alpers 1988.
21. Ibid., pp. 25, 27.
22. See Liedtke 1996.
24. Ibid., p. 38.
25. The translation is the present writer’s, using the Dutch translation from the original Latin given in Kan 1971 and checking it against the Dutch and English versions given in Leiden 1991–92, pp. 128–34.
32. The translation is from Leiden 1991–92, p. 133, with minor changes.
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41. See Brown 1983.
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1888–89, pp. 52–57, where the RRP’s opinion is rightly questioned, but the Saint Peter in Prison of 1631 in a private collection is wrongly said to have been owned by Speck.

53. See Schwartz 1985, chap. 20. For a more specialized study of Rembrandt’s Mononite associates, see Dudok van Heel 1980. In Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, I, p. 54, Saska is wrongly called Uylenburch’s niece, which in Dutch (nieu) is also the word for cousin.
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73. Van Thielen’s statement (in Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, I, p. 182), that “the only serious contender [as copyist] appears to be Ferdinand Bol” is not the majority view. See also Corpus, III (1989), no. A 108, where it is assumed without evidence that throughout 1636 Flink was already an independent painter (p. 107). In Corpus, III (1989), p. 112, the inscription, which is reproduced, is said to “have some similarity to Bol’s earliest signatures”; this is untrue and reflects a slipshod approach to connoisseurship. Compare Sumowski 1983–94, II, no. 611, as by Flink, including an argument for an attribution to him and against one to Bol.
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94. See Liedtke 1996, n. 40, which records that the curator responsible, Christopher Brown, now considers the painting to be “an authentic work by Rembrandt painted in about 1670” (to quote his label in The National Gallery).

95. On this point, see Corpus, III (1989), p. 55: “We have not so far come across an unmistakably authentic inscription on any of the non-authentic paintings [but we have in fact got the impression that workshop assistants marked their productions with the master’s name, written more or less as he did himself].” This statement is followed by an attribution of the inscription on the Munich Sacrifice of Isaac (fig. 24) to Ferdinand Bol (see Corpus, III [1989], p. 55, figs. 20, 21, comparing a Bol signature of 1643). In comparing the forms of these signatures (which hardly look similar in any case), Bruyn has forgotten their content.
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104. For these details, see Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, I, no. 63.
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112. See Duparc 1986, p. 802.
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125. See the Portrait of Count Ferdinand von Werdenberg of 1652 on the art market (ibid., VI, no. 2301). As in no. 26 here, the gesture recalls the captain’s in The Night Watch.
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1 Portrait of a Man

1632
Oil on wood, oval, 29½ x 20½ in. (75.6 x 52.1 cm)
Signed and dated center right: RHL [monogram]
von Ryn /1632; inscribed center left: AET. 40°
Gift of Mrs. Lincoln Ellsworth, in memory of
Lincoln Ellsworth, 1964
64.126

In the latter part of 1631 Rembrandt left his native Leiden
for Amsterdam, where prominent citizens immediately
pressed him with commissions for formal portraits. Two
superb pictures of Mennonite merchants, Nicolaes Rut’s
(fig. 103, vol. I) and Marten Looten (fig. 104, vol. I), were
begun late in 1631 and are dated 1631 and January 11, 1632,
respectively. Rembrandt’s famous group portrait of Dr.
Nicolaes Tul’s and other members of the Surgeon’s Guild
(fig. 54) was completed a little later in 1632. These pictures
are among the earliest of some fifty portraits Rembrandt
painted during his first four years in Amsterdam, when he
was in his late twenties and was gaining his initial recognition
outside a small circle of artists and connoisseurs.

About two dozen biblical and mythological pictures and
fancy portraits (tronies) date from the same period
(see nos. 2, 7).

In Leiden Rembrandt had produced small biblical pic-
tures, several self-portraits, and a few paintings of his mother
and other models in historical guise. The larger scale and
comparatively conservative qualities of formal portraiture,
and the experience of dealing with clients, were new to
Rembrandt when he settled in Amsterdam. Nonetheless, in
1632 and 1633 alone he produced remarkably innovative
eamples of formal portraiture in almost every format,
ranging from group portraits, double portraits (The Shipbuilder
Jan Rijksen and His Wife Griet Jans, 1633, in Buckingham
Palace, London), and several pairs of pendants (see nos. 3, 4)
to small half-length images on rectangular or oval supports.
The Museum lacks a Leiden-period picture by
Rembrandt; however, the seven single-figure paintings dat-
ing from 1632 or 1633 in this collection and the Nicolaes
Ruts in the Frick Collection make New York the most
important place in which to study the master’s early develop-
ment as a painter of portraits and closely related works.

The Ellsworth Portrait of a Man, with the very different
Man in Oriental Costume (no. 2), sets a standard of quality
by which approximately contemporary works by or attrib-
uted to Rembrandt may be judged. It is also exceptionally
well preserved. Rembrandt used the newly fashionable oval
format in several portraits of the 1630s and employed it

with unprecedented variety. The figure’s scale, placement
in the field, angle to the picture plane, and direction of glance
are played against different backgrounds (painted in diverse
tones, with shadows or without) and against light of differ-
ent intensities issuing from different sources. Not only the
objective physical effects, such as the suggestion of volume
and space, but also subjective ones, such as impressions of
remoteness or intimacy, were determined by these means.²

In all his decisions about such elements Rembrandt bal-
anced descriptive and aesthetic concerns. The unevenly lit
background, the shadows on the face, and the various tex-
tures of hair, skin, and clothing all add to the general impres-
sion of richness in this portrait and others of the period.
Whether these refinements were fully appreciated by his
patrons or comprehended by his pupils are important and
difficult questions. Would Rembrandt make less of an effort
for an unimportant, insensitive, or impatient client? To
what extent could an assistant, even the most talented,
emulate Rembrandt’s effects?³

The reason Rembrandt’s paintings of the 1630s remain
unique is that many of their distinctive qualities grew
directly out of the artist’s own previous experience, which
amounted in good part to a program of self-training in
Leiden. The present sitter’s expression, which seems to regi-
ster reaction to the viewer in the slightly skeptical slant of
one eyebrow and the corresponding pull of muscles to one
side of the mouth, is ultimately the product of Rembrandt’s
intensive study of character and expression during the
Leiden years (see fig. 9). Similarly, the emphasis on realistic
description in Rembrandt’s work of the 1630s, on a level
not previously witnessed in Amsterdam, developed from
his preoccupation with observation in his Leiden studio.
Every formal inflection in this portrait seems optically
plausible, which is hardly something one would say of
works by other great portraitists of the time, such as Hals

Fig. 49. Detail, no. 1
2. Man in Oriental Costume ("The Noble Slav")

1632
Oil on canvas, 60⅜ × 43⅜ in. (152.7 × 111.1 cm)
Signed and dated lower right: RHL [monogram] van. Rijn / 1632
Bequest of William K. Vanderbilt, 1920
20.155.2

Several pictures dating from Rembrandt’s Leiden and early Amsterdam years (about 1625 to 1635) were documented as works from his hand shortly after they were painted (for example, Judas Returning the Pieces of Silver [fig. 7]). However, one of these, the Bust of an Old Woman (commonly called Rembrandt’s Mother [fig. 8]), which was listed as by Rembrandt in about 1639, is now considered to be probably by his young Leiden colleague Jan Lievens. The majority of early Rembrandts were not documented in the period, and scholars remain uncertain about who was responsible for a number of paintings from that time.

The Man in Oriental Costume differs from those works in that it may be counted among paintings by the young Rembrandt (he was twenty-six, when it was executed) that are indisputably authentic even though they were not documented in his lifetime; the pictures in this category are so remarkable in conception, so exceptional in quality, so distinctive of Rembrandt at a particular moment, and so different from works by even his closest colleagues at that time (for example, fig. 50) that the question of authorship has never reasonably been raised—except when it has been used to show that a given picture sets a standard by which others can be judged.

The composition of the Man in Oriental Costume was developed from a few of Rembrandt’s Leiden pictures, although the scale is unprecedented. As early as 1627 Rembrandt presented old men of great character in interiors with evocative lighting, for example, in the Saint Paul in Prison in the Staatsgalerie Stuttgart. Slightly later works, such as Saint Paul at His Writing Desk of 1629–30 (Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg), and Jeremiah Lamenting the Destruction of Jerusalem of 1630 (Rijksmuseum,
Amsterdam), are somewhat more painterly and atmospheric, although they are still rather small. In a few self-portraits (for example, the one of 1629 in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston), in the very small Bust of an Old Man in a Fur Cap (commonly called Rembrandt's Father) of 1630 in Innsbruck, and in the Old Man in a Gorget and Plumed Cap of about 1631 (fig. 9), Rembrandt depicted various characters in fancy dress, half-length and somewhat off center, in each case using dramatic contrasts of light and shade to model the figure, emphasizing a range of textures (such as those of fur, cloth, skin, hair, and metal), and suggesting the presence of a bare wall behind the subject. A single model may have been used for the Innsbruck picture and the Old Man in a Gorget and Plumed Cap, and also for the similar half-length figure in An Old Man in a Gorget and Black Cap in The Art Institute of Chicago, which is on a larger panel (83.5 x 75.6 cm) and which, it is generally agreed, dates from late in 1631. In the last work Rembrandt boldly introduced a twisting pose, broad highlights, and an undulating contour to suggest volume and movement. He used similar devices in the Portrait of Nicolaes Ruts (fig. 103, vol. I) and in the present picture, which probably date from late in 1631 and from the first half of 1632, respectively. In these two paintings the scale is enlarged again and once again (the Museum's painting is one of Rembrandt's first major works on canvas). More of the figure is shown in each picture, the compositions are increasingly successful, and the suggestion of character is extraordinary in both.

In the Man in Oriental Costume and in the portrait of Joris de Cauier, also of 1632 (fig. 105, vol. I), various devices, such as the strong shadow on the near forearm, are used to establish volume and a diagonal recession in quite the same way. Nonetheless, Rembrandt's painting of an imaginary figure (whether or not the model is real) differs from his picture of de Cauier and from his other formal portraits of about the same time in that the light in it is stronger and more theatrical, the execution is looser throughout, and local areas (even the face) are treated more colorfully. The fluidity of brushwork in the costume, the scintillating light on the scarf, and the rugged relief of short brushstrokes in the face and turban make Man in Oriental Costume one of the earliest examples of Rembrandt's painterly approach on a large scale.

Especially characteristic of Rembrandt's manner in single-figure paintings of this period is the use of contrasting textures and tonalities to achieve effects that are realistic—and often dramatic at the same time. The most intensely illuminated surfaces of the figure are richly textured and in parts detailed, while the shadowy areas are summarily treated, as if they were perceived only peripherally. Similarly, the progression in the torso from dark to light to dark, from the torso to the lighter background, and in and around the head from the lightest area of the picture to shadow and then to the lighter but unevenly lit wall is a pictorial subtlety that reflects a keen interest in optical experience.

As Rembrandt knew well, communicating a sense of such experience is not quite the same as reproducing actual appearances but is a matter of inventing parallels in paint. A dark-light-dark layering of zones in depth in some of Rembrandt's later Leiden works (for example, The Supper at Emmaus of about 1629 in the Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris) was obviously borrowed from Utrecht Caravagggesque painters such as Gerard van Honthorst; such layering is even more clearly derived from Honthorst in a few pictures by Lievens. But by 1632 Rembrandt had made this convention into something more complex and visually compelling, an approach distinctly his own. When artists in his immediate circle employed similar devices, as did Lievens in his Oriental (fig. 50) and Isaac Jouderville in the highlights and shadows of the Bust of a Young Man (fig. 13), the results seem schematic and superficial. This is not only because they are less accomplished painters but also because their effects were based upon pictures by Rembrandt and not, or not largely, upon independent experience.
In his journal of about 1630 Constantijn Huygens described the Lievens Oriental as follows: “There is, in my Prince’s house, a picture of a so-called Turkish potentate, done from the head of some Dutchman.” The same painting was listed in the 1694–1702 inventory of the princely palace of Honselaardijk as “the Great Turk” and in that of 1707–19 as “Sultan Soliman by Rembrandt.” Like the citation of the Bust of an Old Woman mentioned above, this is an example of unreliable attributions to Rembrandt in early inventories.

As Huygens’s description and the additional sources imply, the pictures of Turkish, Persian, or otherwise “Oriental” princes that were painted by Rembrandt and artists in his circle were not portraits but imaginary subjects. In Dutch inventories of the seventeenth century such a painting is often called a tronie, an archaic term meaning “head” or “face” or “facial expression.” The figure may be invented, borrowed, or real (that is, painted from life). The model here has also been recognized in a few works from about the same time by Rembrandt’s Amsterdam colleague Jacob Backer.  

3. The following pictures, for example, have been doubted or rejected by the Rembrandt Research Project, although the present writer and other critics consider them to be by Rembrandt: Man in a Gorget and Plumed Cap in The J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu (Corpus, I [1982], no. B 4, as uncertain; Liedtke 1995 as by Rembrandt in 1653); Tohit and Anna in the National Gallery, London (Corpus, I [1982], no. C 3, and Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, I, no. 55, as attributed to Gerrit Dou; now labeled as by Rembrandt); Half-Length Figure of a Man in Oriental Dress in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (Corpus, II [1986], no. B 8, as uncertain, but by Rembrandt, as one member of the RRP insists); the van Beresteyn pictures (nos. 3, 4 here) and other formal portraits of about 1632–35 (see Liedtke 1989b; Liedtke 1996)
4. Van Dyke (1983, p. 114) thought Salomon Koninck might be responsible for the Man in Oriental Costume. He does not cite but may have known the reference to “een Turkx Tronie nae Rembrandt” (a Turk’s Head after Rembrandt) in the 1639 inventory of the estate of Aert Coninx, father of the painters Jacob Koninck and Philips Koninck (Strauss and van der Meulen 1979, no. 1639/4; first published by Hoefste de Groot 1906b, no. 72). Jacob and Philips were probably related to Salomon Koninck but how is unclear (see The Hague 1992, p. 205).
5. In 1983 the RRP concluded that the present painting is “an outstandingly well preserved and characteristic work, reliably signed and dated 1632” (Corpus, II [1986], p. 151).
8. Ibid., no. A 42. See also Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, I, p. 93, fig. 113 (color).
12. Worp 1891, p. 128; Kan 1971, p. 81. The Latin is given in ibid., no. 9, with a slightly looser translation. See also Schneider and Ekkart 1973, no. 152.
14. On the model in Backer, and on Rembrandt’s source in Rubens, see ibid. Other Northern sources are mentioned in ibid., pp. 345–49, no. A 73. Rembrandt’s Bust of a Man in Oriental Dress of 1633, in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich.
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3 Portrait of a Man

1632
Oil on canvas, 44 × 35 in. (111.8 × 88.9 cm)
Signed and dated lower right: RHL [monogram] van Rijn / 1632
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.3

4 Portrait of a Woman

1632
Oil on canvas, 44 × 35 in. (111.8 × 88.9 cm)
Signed and dated lower right: RHL [monogram] van Rijn / 1632
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.4

The van Beresteyn portraits, so called because they were said to come from the Dutch family of that name in 1884, have stood at the center of an academic debate about the quality and authenticity of Rembrandt portraits dating from the 1630s. The controversy began when these two canvases and a fair number of single and pendant portraits were questioned by the Rembrandt Research Project in its second volume, which was published in 1986 and covers the years 1631 to 1634. Numerous Rembrandt scholars have since defended the van Beresteyn pictures. In our view, both paintings are largely by Rembrandt, although an assistant certainly may have participated in their execution (see entry by Hubert von Sonnenburg, vol. 1).

The paintings play a key part in the RRP’s hypothesis that suddenly, when he established himself in Amsterdam in 1631–32, Rembrandt had at his disposal a number—“perhaps even a considerable number”—of very capable but mostly now untraceable assistants who helped him work on formal portraits in particular. The “Rembrandt Workshop” envisioned by the RRP differs from the sort of establishments most scholars consider would likely have been maintained by Dutch artists such as Rembrandt, Gerard van Honthorst, Michiel van Miereveld, and other portraitists and history painters of their period, whose commissions did not require the kind of large workshops that Rubens and Jordaens supervised. Complicating the RRP’s hypothesis is the opinion of one member that a single painter within Rembrandt’s new workshop was primarily responsible for the execution of the van Beresteyn portraits. However, there is no indication that the artist in question, a minor pupil of Rembrandt’s in Leiden named Isaack Jouderville, ever went with his master to Amsterdam, and there is documentary and circumstantial evidence that he remained in Leiden during the early 1630s.

The question of authorship here will never be fully resolved unless new documentation is discovered. The seven letters known to have been written by Rembrandt contain nothing like the phrase “entirely by my hand,” with which Rubens reassured one patron. Nonetheless, the van Beresteyn portraits should remain of interest as a case study in the history of Rembrandt connoisseurship and in particular as an example of how subjective judgments of quality and authenticity (and even the actual visual experience of pictures) are influenced by preconceptions about historical events.

Rembrandt’s reputation for expressiveness often seems irrelevant to the study of composition and execution in his formal portraits dating from the 1630s, some of which are reserved to the point of seeming to modern viewers, vacuous. Yet the factor of expressiveness may influence one’s view of whether or not a portrait is characteristic of Rembrandt. Rembrandt seems to have varied not only the expressiveness but also the composition and standard of

Fig. 51. Rembrandt. Portrait of a Woman, 1632. Oil on canvas, 36 ½ × 28 in. (92 × 71 cm). Signed and dated: RHL [monogram] van Rijn 1632. Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der Bildende Künste in Wien, Vienna
execution according to his interest in the sitter (see nos. 2, 6). Furthermore, the choice of reserved poses and expressions in portraits of this period may sometimes have been determined by the status, faith, or intellectual interests of the sitter (as in Velázquez’s paintings of Philip IV; Miereveld’s picture of the Remonstrant minister Johannes Uyttenbogaert, 1632, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; and Jan Lievens’s portrait of Constantijn Huygens [fig. 6]). A broad survey of Dutch portraiture of about 1620 to 1640 reveals how exceptional were Rembrandt’s most animated examples, which must have been conceived with at least the acquiescence of the client.

Since the van Beresteyn portraits were purchased by the Havemeyers in 1888 (for the then near-record price of sixty thousand dollars), their critical history has been mixed. However, no one seriously doubted Rembrandt’s responsibility for both pictures until 1968, when Gerson considered the man’s portrait to be “a painting of extraordinary richness of nuance in color and design” and the woman’s portrait to be “in technique and expression . . . totally dissimilar.” According to Gerson, “the obvious conclusion is that [the latter] painting was made to match the Rembrandt painting of the spouse, but by a far weaker hand.”

A comparison of isolated parts of the pictures, such as the hair and broader planes of the faces, may seem to support Gerson’s view. But his conclusion is far from “obvious” if one compares the black and gold passages of the woman’s dress with the man’s costume and especially with the dress in the Young Woman with a Fan (no. 6). The tonal values and brushstrokes, for example on the sleeves, occur almost identically in the pictures of the two women. The lace cuffs on the sleeves are not equally striking accessories but are quite similarly treated—in a way that brings out their starched surfaces, translucency, and an illusionistic curve of the cuff on the left arm of each sitter, where highlights catch the edge of the lace. The collars are completely different in type and thus in execution. However, both are impressively painted; the handling of light and shade in the lace tunnels of the millstone collar seems to this observer a tour de force. Time-consuming secondary passages such as lace collars and cuffs are precisely the kind of assignment often given to assistants in other Dutch portraitists’ workshops, with mechanical results resembling the clothing of neither woman in these portraits by Rembrandt.

Even the harshest critics concede that there are “a number of very Rembrandttlike features” in the Portrait of a Man, for example “the handling of light in the head, where particularly the sensitive shading on the forehead achieves an effect regularly used by Rembrandt and where in general the distribution of light and shade is in line with his habits.” Among further fine points, even the “pronounced cast shadow to the right of the figure” has been considered a typical innovation, “something that Rembrandt did use (for the first time?) in a bust from 1632” (no. 1 here).

That the authors of the Corpus and other Rembrandt scholars have admired the van Beresteyn Portrait of a Man more than its pendant appears understandable if one compares the heads, if not the costumes and backgrounds. The woman’s head sits somewhat awkwardly on her enormous millstone collar; this item of fashion, like the costume’s seemingly pneumatic sleeves, must have been a challenge for Rembrandt, whose characteristic weaknesses in this period include rather inelegant contours, clumsy hands, and awkwardly foreshortened arms (see nos. 2, 7). It would be hard to discover, by contrast, anything in the facial features that is inferior to those of the Young Woman with a Fan (no. 6), the secondary figures in the Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Tulp (fig. 54), or another Portrait of a Woman signed and dated 1632 (fig. 51). The last picture is remarkably similar to the van Beresteyn Woman in the modeling of the face and hands.

The same kinds of parallels were drawn, especially with regard to the rendering of facial features, when in 1989 Rembrandt’s Portrait of a Scholar of 1631 (fig. 52), on loan from The Hermitage, was placed next to the van Beresteyn Portrait of a Man in the Museum’s galleries. The identically described eyes, the pink lower eyelids, the textured foreheads and upper cheeks, the mustaches and beards, the shadows beneath the brows and noses, and the summarily
sketched ears are remarkably consistent. Very similar strokes of paint were used for the parchment-like textures of the ruff in the Museum’s portrait and the edge of the book in the Hermitage picture.

In making such comparisons one must always take into account differences in condition, support, and viewing circumstances and must examine one’s own assumptions about the stylistic and qualitative range of the artist. These assumptions must be judged on the basis of direct and recent experience of a fair number of paintings. The present group of seven works dating from 1632 and 1633 (nos. 1–7) conveys only a fragmentary idea of Rembrandt’s style in those two years; nonetheless, most observers will be able to find many differences in quality or stylistic characteristics (for example, the way an eye, a mouth, a hand, or a costume detail is painted) within this sequence, despite the fact (or unaware of the fact) that the majority of present-day Rembrandt scholars considers all seven paintings to be typical of Rembrandt. In some ways the oval Portrait of a Man (no. 1) is considerably superior to the van Beresteyn Man and—for this writer—even more superior to the Altman Woman (no. 5), while the van Beresteyn Woman is not the equal—just why is complex—of either Bellona (no. 7) or the Young Woman with a Fan (no. 6).

The faces of the Man in Oriental Costume (no. 2) and the Bellona are painted very differently, more so than one would expect even allowing for the gender and age of the subjects, and this may bear upon the dating of the van Beresteyn portraits. It is quite possible that the Man in Oriental Costume dates from early in 1632, shortly after the Leiden period, and that Bellona dates from late in 1633 and thus anticipates—as it appears to—Rembrandt’s more Flemish-seeming manner in such paintings as the Munich Holy Family of about 1634,10 the Madrid Sophia nobis of 1634 (fig. 55), and the Tokyo Minerva of 1635.11 In view of these conjectures and comparisons with other portraits, the writer would be inclined to place the van Beresteyn pictures closer to 1633 than to 1631. The point for this exhibition, is not an art-historical nicety but that two pictures dated a year apart may have actually been painted one month or nearly two years apart within a period of brisk stylistic development. Of course, it cannot be assumed that Rembrandt’s style evolved in a consistent manner: he may well have worked in somewhat different ways at about the same time.

1. See Corpus, III (1986), nos. C 68, C 69; van Beresteyn 1941, II, p. 131, stating that the sisters are not members of the family.
4. See Corpus, II (1986), pp. 79–80, acknowledging that Jouderville enrolled in Leiden University in April 1632 and that his guardians paid rent for him in Leiden in the early 1630s. See also the present writer’s discussion, in New York 1992–93, pp. 102–6, of a painting attributed to Jouderville.
6. Gerson 1968, nos. 120, 121.
9. See the photograph of the paintings together in Liedtke 1989b, pl. III.
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Dutuit 1885, pp. 59, 62, 66, nos. 248, describes the rediscovery of the paintings; Bode 1897–1906, II, nos. 82, 83, as “very stately portraits” by Rembrandt, influenced by Moreelse de Keyser; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, nos. 624, 625, states that the identity of the sitters is uncertain and stresses that the man’s portrait has suffered from lining; Bredius 1935, nos. 167, 331; Burroughs 1938, p. 168, as by Backer about 1634, although “unquestionably close to what is characteristic of Rembrandt himself”; van Beresteyn 1941, II, pp. 135–37, rejects the identification of the subjects with members of the van Beresteyn family; Gerson 1968, nos. 120, 121, praises the man’s portrait, considers the woman’s to be “by a far weaker hand”; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 28–48, considers both pictures to be by Rembrandt, on the basis of the presentation and its scenes, and by comparing with other works; Corpus, II (1986), pp. 26, 38, 740–59 (nos. C 68, C 69), as “by an assistant in Rembrandt’s workshop in 1632”; Bruyn 1987, p. 11, attributes the woman’s portrait to Jouderville on the basis of a comparison with the painting by him in Dublin; White 1987, p. 810, defends Rembrandt’s authorship; Brown 1989, p. 8, considers “these large and impressive portraits [to be] painted entirely in Rembrandt’s early Amsterdam manner”; Bruyn in Corpus, III (1989), pp. 31–34, considers both pictures to be by Jouderville; Liedtke 1989b, supports Rembrandt’s authorship on the basis of comparisons with accepted works; Slates 1991, p. 73, dismisses attribution to Jouderville; Slates 1992, nos. 116, 117, as by Rembrandt; Liedtke 1996, figs. 1, 2, as by Rembrandt, rejecting the workshop idea.
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5 Portrait of a Woman

1633
Oil on wood, 26¼ × 19¾ in. (67.9 × 50.2 cm)
Inscribed lower left: Rembrandt f./1633.
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.625

For most Rembrandt critics this frank portrait of an unengaged and unexciting sitter dated 1633 is a typical, if modest, work by the master. The members of the Rembrandt Research Project accept the picture (as no. A 83), although
they wonder whether it was originally rectangular, and they question the signature. Condition problems are supposed to account for a certain lack of subtlety in the face and dark dress, if not for the unusually even background. Thus the doubts of Gerson (see Literature below) were overruled; his displeasure with the portrait had been encouraged by assuming mistakenly that it was made as the pendant to no. 1 here, which he judged superior.

Rembrandt’s portraits of the early 1630s reveal a considerable range of quality. It must be admitted, however, that the picture’s inconsistent strengths and weaknesses could be considered to support my colleague Hubert von Sonnenburg’s conclusion, which is that the Altman panel is a good period copy of a lost portrait by Rembrandt (see entry, vol. 1).

**REMbrandt**

### 6 Portrait of a Young Woman with a Fan

*1613*

Oil on canvas, 49 ½ x 39 ½ in. (125.7 x 101 cm.)

Signed and dated lower right: Rembrandt • f(eci)?: / 1613

Gift of Helen Swift Neilson, 1943

43.125

This painting and its pendant, the *Portrait of a Man Rising from His Chair* (fig. 53), are among the most inventive examples of formal portraits by Rembrandt dating from his first few years in Amsterdam. In this respect, and in the features of “the young lady herself, blondish and by no means ill-favored,” the picture offers strong competition to the van Beresteyn *Portrait of a Woman* (no. 4) that dates from a year, or possibly much less than a year, earlier. Despite differences in quality, the portraits of the two women have much in common, especially in the rendering of detail and highlights in the black costumes; in the modeling of the eyes and mouths; in the contrast between the rather flat modeling of each hand with a fan and the more illusionistic treatment of each near hand and the cuff above it; and in the use of the table, which Rembrandt placed in each canvas.

The *Woman with a Fan* has never been doubted as a work painted entirely by Rembrandt, except in what amounts to its first mention by an art historian. In 1854 the peripatetic Dr. Waagen cited the picture in his description of the collection at Petworth: “*Rembrandt...? Hung too high to permit an opinion, though at that distance giving the impression of being a Ferdinand Bol.*”

Later scholars had no trouble recognizing Rembrandt’s authorship but could not see the date. In 1883 Bode placed the picture about 1640; this dating was followed by other writers until Bode himself, in 1897, suggested a date of about 1633 on the basis of his proposed connection of it to the *Man Rising from His Chair*, dated 1633, then in the collection of Count Edmond Portalès in Paris. The two paint-

---
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Bode 1897–1906, VIII, no. 561; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 867, with provenance; Van Dyke 1923, p. 47, pl. V, fig. 16, as by Backer, “assignment tentative”; Valentiner 1931, no. 36, as perhaps the pendant to the Ellsworth *Man* (no. 1 here); Bredius 1935, no. 335; Bauch 1966, no. 462, as a pendant to no. 1 here; Gerson 1968, no. 123, observing that “the execution is weaker than in the male portrait [no. 1 here]. The attribution to Rembrandt is not wholly convincing”; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 570, no. 335, as “far inferior” to no. 1 here; *Corpus*, II (1986), pp. 6, 242, 413–17 (no. A 83); Tümpel 1986, no. A 105, as by a pupil, not a pendant to no. 1 here; Slater 1992, no. 183, as by Rembrandt.

**Ex. Coll.**

See *Corpus*, II (1986), no. A 83 (traceable since the 1860s).

---

**Fig. 53.** Rembrandt, *Portrait of a Man Rising from His Chair*, 1633. Oil on canvas, 48 ½ x 38 ½ in. (124 x 98.5 cm). Signed and dated: Rembrandt. f / 1633. The Taft Museum, Cincinnati
ings had been separated since the eighteenth century and were rarely seen until they were briefly reunited in Valentine's Rembrandt exhibition of 1930 at The Detroit Institute of Arts. That the pictures are indeed pendants is now considered a certainty on the basis of size, date, composition, execution, and the Rembrandt Research Project's conclusion that "similarities in thread density and weave structure suggest that the canvases of [the two paintings] come from the same bolt of cloth." The man's portrait was examined next to the woman's in 1985, and their consistency in such characteristics as coloring, rendering of illumination and atmospheric space, and the description of fine materials impressed several observers.

The portraits conform to a type that was often commissioned on the occasion of a betrothal or marriage. The gesture of introduction made by the man is also conventional; even the conservative portraitist Michiel van Miereveld employed the device and showed his sitters regarding the viewer in approximately the same way that they do in Rembrandt's pictures. However, Rembrandt dramatically restaged his presentation in terms that recall his early historical scenes and *The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp* (fig. 54). In the group portrait the poses of the uppermost figure and the next highest resemble those of the Woman and the Man, respectively (the latter's gesture, given the other connections with *The Anatomy Lesson*, may be said to echo Dr. Tulp's). If the results of these recapitulations seem a bit exaggerated in pendant portraits, one must allow that Rembrandt's subsequent inventions of the type were more restrained and consider that Dutch portraits on this scale were often separated in seventeenth-century interiors by some distance, and perhaps by a cabinet or fireplace. Thus the interplay of the two figures and the viewer would have been very different in the original setting than it is in museums today. Not only the action but also the light, the space, and the reproduction of expensive costume details (this last very important to the patron) would have seemed at once subtler and more illusionistic when seen in a seventeenth-century home.

1. Wohl 1944, p. 177.
2. Waagen 1854, III, p. 41.
3. Corpus, II (1986), p. 380, under Support. See also Table C in ibid., p. 38.
5. Compare Corpus, II (1986), p. 382, on these relationships.
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Waagen 1854, III, p. 41. "hung too high" to give an opinion, but perhaps by Bol; Bode 1883, no. 253, as by Rembrandt about 1640; Bode 1897–1906, II, no. 101, identifies the pendant and suggests a date of about 1633; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 881, as about 1633, refers to the possible pendant; Valentiner 1913, no. 35, with pendant no. 34; Bredius 1935, no. 341; Wohl 1944, pp. 177, 179–80; Gerson 1968, no. 141; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 29, 37–40, 46; Smith 1982, pp. 268–70, 273, fig. 18; Corpus, II (1986), pp. 3, 10, 27, 38, 69–71, 373, 380, 382, 384–91 (no. A 79); Liedhe 1984, pp. 328–29, fig. 6, compares the van Beresteyn pictures (nos. 3, 4 here); The Hague, San Francisco 1990–91, pp. 125, 377, 379, no. 52; with discussion of provenance and costume; and doubts the inscription; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, I, pp. 98–99, on results of autoradiography.
**EXHIBITED**

**EX COLL.**

---

**REMBRANDT**

7 *Bellona*

1633
Oil on canvas, 50 x 38 3/4 in. (127 x 97.5 cm)
Signed and dated lower left: Rembrandt f / 1633; inscribed on bottom of shield: BELLOON[A]
The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 32.100.23

The conception rather than the execution of Rembrandt's *Bellona*, his representation of the goddess of war, has surprised some viewers (especially those unfamiliar with paintings such as the *Sophonisba* [fig. 55]) and has caused a few critics to accuse him of ineptness. The most striking example of this response is Gerson's comment of 1969: "Although accepted as far as I can see by all Rembrandt scholars, the picture seems to me too dull in expression and too awkwardly composed to be by Rembrandt himself." Another scholar, Bob Haak, wrote at the same time: "Few of Rembrandt's paintings are so little attractive.... Her pose is clumsy and graceless. Her sword arm dangles strangely, her cuirass is indifferently painted.... In this unequivocally genuine Rembrandt painting, the only thing that can excite us is the fact that, underneath the present picture, the artist originally painted his future wife in the nude, as X-ray photographs have revealed." Both the suggestion that the model was Rembrandt's fiancée, Saskia, and the information that radiographs reveal a nude figure under the armor are utterly groundless. So are doubts about Rembrandt's authorship, although the Museum itself recorded the work as "attributed to Rembrandt" when it received the Friedsam Collection in 1931. In the October 1947 Metropolitan Museum Bulletin curator Ted Rousseau and conservator Murray Pease discussed the radical transformation in the painting's appearance after the removal of discolored varnish, which led them to conclude that the signature and date were "an integral part of the original paint structure" and that cleaning had "revealed the Bellona to be, if not one of Rembrandt's great works, a good, representative example of his early style." This opinion falls somewhere between that of Sir Joshua Reynolds, who recommended the painting to the first marquis of Buckingham, and that of the collector and connoisseur Daan Cevat, who, on a visit to the Museum in 1966, called the picture "certainly a genuine Rembrandt, but hideous." In a review of the book in which Haak expressed the opinion cited above, Snoep quotes his description of Bellona's apparel as an example of "vague terminology, the last remnant of an obscure and subjective jargon in which art historians habitually express themselves." Gerson's rejection of the painting drew similar criticism from Sumowski: "In general one has to say that Gerson is satisfied with [this sort of] subjective judgement, whether he decides positively or negatively." The entry on the *Bellona* in the Corpus volume of 1986 studiously avoids the appearance of subjectivity by conceding at the outset that the cumbersome costume and stumpy right arm might "give the modern viewer an impression of awkwardness" and by characterizing Gerson's opinion as "anachronistic view of what constitutes ideal beauty and decorum [which should not] play a part in assessing the authenticity of the work." The figure here is imaginary and evidently not based on a live model (as is the subject in no. 2), which "makes the broader approach to the head [than that found in formal portraits] rather more understandable." A similar approach is found in the *Sophonisba* and in contemporary works by Rembrandt.

In discussing other stylistic qualities of the *Bellona*, the members of the Rembrandt Research Project also find analogies in a variety of approximately contemporary paintings.
by Rembrandt (our no. 2 is comparable “in its stance”),
and they explain why there are certain weaknesses here:
Rembrandt was trying something new (“has to be seen as a
first attempt”), absorbing fresh influences (Rubens and Jacob
Backer), revealing some of his own oddities (stubby arms),
and drastically changing the composition as he worked.13
Critics have been divided on whether the armor is painted
“beautifully” (Slatkes 1992) or “indifferently” (Haak 1969).14

The RRP demonstrates quite effectively that paintings
such as the Bellona must be considered with a certain
degree of latitude in regard to stylistic attributes. In its eval-
uation of formal portraits, by contrast, the committee has
been extremely restrictive, accepting a much narrower
range of qualities as typical of Rembrandt and in some
cases citing features quite like those found in the Bellona
and similar pictures (perceived inadequacies of modeling,
anatomy, and internal cohesion) as evidence of workshop

collaboration. The present exhibition should allow viewers
to compare the actual handling of paint in approximately
contemporary pictures (for example, nos. 1–7 of 1632 and
1633) without assigning them beforehand to different
categories, each with its own set of rules.15

The old notion that Bellona represents Rembrandt’s
fiancée, Saskia, has been convincingly dismissed, and the
influence of Rubens’s figure type has been noted.16 It should
be recalled that other Roman heroes and heroines were
characterized by Rembrandt in anticlassical terms (see
fig. 56).17 In the case of Mars (see no. 31) and his sister,
Bellona, the use of local types was probably intended to

suggest the new Dutch nation and its readiness to fight.18
Rembrandt may have been underscoring this point when
he used vernacular spelling—“Belloon[a]”—on the
shield.19 The picture would have suited a civic guard hall
or almost any patriot’s home.20

1. Corpus, II (1986), A 94. See also the Menera of 1635 (Corpus, III
2. Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 592, no. 467. This kind of remark is
typical of Gerson, although he identified many romantic mis-
attributions to Rembrandt.
3. Haak 1969, p. 101. As recently as seven years ago Alpers (1988,
p. 56) seized upon this misinformation (see note 4 below) in sup-
port of her notion that “in his depictions of Saskia, Rembrandt
was playing with the performative nature of modeling.” The
woman here is not Saskia but a type bearing some resemblance
to her. One doubts that the “performative nature of modeling”
included nude sessions with Mennonite fiancées.
4. See Corpus, II (1986), pp. 323 (X-ray), 324–28 (discussion of
X-ray), 331 (“the figure then probably wearing a bodice of a cloth
material” and rejecting Saskia as the model, comparing the
famous silverpoint drawing of Saskia dated 1631 in Berlin).
5. Rousseau and Pease 1947, p. 49.
6. Ibid., pp. 49, 50. A color reproduction on the cover of the
Bulletin shows the painting half cleaned.
8. Cevat, oral opinion, January 1966. Was Bellona at odds with 1960s
taste?
10. Sumowski 1973, p. 94.
12. See ibid., referring to the St. Petersburg Flora of 1634,
    the London Flora of 1635, and the Tokyo Minerva of 1635
8 Herman Doomer

1640
Oil on wood, 29/12 × 21 1/2 in. (75.2 × 55.2 cm)
Signed and dated lower right: Rembrandt / f 1640
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.1

This unusually well-preserved painting on panel represents the Amsterdam ebony worker Herman Doomer (ca. 1595–1650). The pendant portrait of Doomer’s wife, Baertje Martens (ca. 1596–1678) (fig. 57), was surely executed by Rembrandt at about the same time he painted the present work, but it is not dated and appears to be falsely signed. However, the handling of paint is entirely consistent in the two pictures, and no one has reasonably doubted either of them as Rembrandt’s work. Indeed, the standard of execution in these unassuming portraits almost seems a personal tribute by the artist, although their descriptive qualities can be considered to have developed from those in the Portrait of a Man of 1632 (no. 1) and a number of intervening works. Nevertheless, it may be said that rarely, even in Rembrandt’s best portraits, is a close study of the sitter’s face and some of the costume details (in this case, the ruff) so rewarding as it is in this panel from the Havemeyer collection.

Were the visual evidence not so compelling—for example, if Doomer’s portrait had been lost and his wife’s badly

---

Ex Coll.

Fig. 57. Rembrandt, Portrait of Baertje Martens, 1640. Oil on wood, 29/12 × 22 in. (75.1 × 55.9 cm). Inscribed: Rbrandt / f The Hermitage, St. Petersburg
damaged—we would still have Baertje Martens's will (made in Amsterdam and dated July 15, 1654; May 23, 1662; and September 3, 1668) in support of the two paintings' authenticity. She made various provisions to keep the pictures in the family, including the instruction of 1662 "that her son Lambert Doomer shall take and keep the portraits of her, the testatrix, and of her husband, made by Rembrandt van Rhijn, provided that he shall supply each of his brothers and sisters with copies thereof at his expense." Lambert Doomer (1624–1700), a fine draftsman and an average painter, was probably Rembrandt's pupil from about 1640 to 1644. In the inventory of Doomer's estate, made shortly after his death on July 2, 1700, no. 38 records: "Two portraits of the deceased's father and mother, painted by Rembrandt van Rhijn and bequeathed to Hermannus Vorster [Doomer's nephew]." Vorster or his wife sold the two portraits, which were separated by 1757. Their later histories are well known. A pair of free copies (without hands) by Lambert Doomer is in the Devonshire Collection, Chatsworth.

The qualities of Herman Doomer are not easily described but are evident when one compares approximately contemporary paintings in the Museum such as the Lehman Portrait of a Man Seated in an Armchair (no. 25) or Flinck’s Bearded Man with a Velvet Cap (no. 49). What appear as little more than passages of paint in those pictures are in the Doomer something more complex: an execution in accord with acute perceptions. The handling of the starched linen ruff, for example, varies from an exceptionally tactile treatment at the near edge to the fluid strokes on the right, with the result that the collar becomes a key element in suggesting the figure's volume. The hat and the ruff recede in space, but the face seems to turn forward, into the light, which throughout the composition works in quiet collaboration with textures. Thus, brushwork in the illuminated area of the near sleeve suggests the jacket's material, but strokes are less evident in the shadowy receding torso (the hand in the cloak creates more volume where volume might otherwise diminish). The play of light overall could hardly be called a pattern but is used inconspicuously to emphasize the upper part of the figure and to create the surface of the wall. Perhaps the most extraordinary passages are in the near side of the face, where the description of areas of such varied character as the cheek, the mustache and beard, the lower lip, the end of the nose, the wrinkles around the eye, the moist lower eyelid, and the slightly arched eyebrow deserve patient appreciation.

One could list a number of the painter's priorities, such as creating space, controlling light, suggesting textures and volumes, and showing the sitter as if he were quietly reacting to the viewer. A list of this sort was in effect the program for Rembrandt's closest followers of about 1640 (see fig. 30), who pursued it one step at a time, but not for Rembrandt, who achieved all these goals simultaneously. In this regard, it might be proposed that the Doomer depends upon Rembrandt's earlier efforts such as the Portrait of a Man of 1652 (no. 1) and even upon some of the Leiden works (see fig. 9), because the qualities evident here could be realized only with the benefit of extensive experience.

The composition might also be said to have evolved from earlier Rembrandt portraits, but the more dramatic, even gestural arrangements of the near arm and the head in these have been modified here to suggest steadiness and perhaps dignity. As is well known, the pose varies from that of Rembrandt's Self-Portrait dated 1640 (fig. 31), which was inspired by Titian's Portrait of a Man ("Ariosto") (The National Gallery, London) and by Raphael's Portrait of Baldassare Castiglione (Musée du Louvre, Paris). Chapman suggests that the Doomer is closer to the Castiglione than is the Self-Portrait, but the composition of the Doomer comes closer still to the drawing Rembrandt made after Raphael's painting (Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna) at its sale in 1639. There is also some reminiscence of the Castiglione in the portrait of Doomer's wife, especially in her left arm and in the calmly joined hands.

A special kind of connoisseurship was exercised when Harry Havemeyer paid seventy thousand dollars for this painting in March 1889, which was ten thousand dollars more than he had paid for both van Beresteyn portraits (nos. 3, 4) a few months earlier.

References:
1. A. B. de Vries, oral opinion, 1951 or 1952, wondered whether the Doomer might be one of the stipulated copies by Lambert Doomer (see below) and also mentioned van den Eeckhout as its possible author.
3. All these details are given in Corpus, III (1989), pp. 382–94 nos. A 140, A 141; the Chatsworth pictures are reproduced on p. 388. The portrait of Baertje Martens is said to be dated 1644, when Lambert Doomer was Rembrandt's twenty-year-old pupil. Sumowski (1983–94, I, nos. 230, 231) rejects the date of 1644 on the basis of the will, but Schulz (1972, nos. G 14, G 15) thinks that the canvases are early works.
4. However, to say simply that "the pose . . . was used in Rembrandt's workshop as early as 1635" (Corpus, III [1989], p. 386) seems heedless of the different effect attained here.
5. Brown (in London 1980, pp. 5–6) considers the Titian to have been much more important than the Raphael for Rembrandt's Self-Portrait.
7. Ibid., fig. 103.

Literature
Smith 1829–42, VII, nos. 288, 334, 335, states that "this is a picture of uncommon brilliancy of colour, and is in every respect of first-rate quality."
merit”; Bode 1897–1906, IV, no. 275, identifies the subject (following Bredius) as Herman Doomer, mentions his wife’s will, and observes that taste has recently moved toward Rembrandt’s more painterly pictures; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 642, with many reliable details; Martin 1969; Burroughs 1932a, pp. 385–86, 389, 391, uses this picture to reject Rembrandt’s responsibility for another portrait; Bredius 1925, no. 217; Gerson 1968, no. 230, mentions the will of 1662 and that several copies are known; Klessmann 1983, p. 173, on the copy in Braunschweig; Sumowski 1983–94, I, no. 231, for the Chatsworth copy; Haarlem 1986, p. 24, on the will; Corpus, III (1989), pp. 382–89 (no. A 140), 393–94; van de Wetering in Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, I, pp. 90–91, on this panel and others coming from the same tree.

**REMBRANDT**

9 Portrait of a Man Holding Gloves

1648

Oil on wood, 31/8 × 26/6 in. (80.6 × 67.3 cm)

Signed and dated lower right: Rembrandt / f. 16[4]8

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913

14.40.620

The attribution of the *Man Holding Gloves* to Rembrandt has never been rejected in print, although Gerson (1968) considered the picture’s execution “rather weak,” and Bruyn (1976), on behalf of the Rembrandt Research Project, remarked during a visit to the Museum that the work “did not appear good enough for Rembrandt.” Among earlier connoisseurs who viewed the picture at the Museum, only Schmidt-Degener (1935) doubted Rembrandt’s authorship and suggested that the painter might be Jacobus Levecq (1634–1675), a minor Dordrecht artist who is documented as Rembrandt’s pupil in 1653. This idea was recently adopted by the RRP. In my view an attribution to Levecq can be dismissed out of hand. His finest portrait, the *Man Holding a Pair of Gloves in His Left Hand* of about 1654–55 (fig. 58), is obviously influenced by Rembrandt portraits like the present one but differs from it far more than reproductions suggest. The costume in Levecq’s picture, with its sharp contours and flat folds, is less fully modeled than the garment of the Altman *Man*, even though the latter painting is much less well preserved. The heads, despite their superficial similarities, bear almost no resemblance to each other in terms of the application of paint. Only a few of Rembrandt’s pupils and followers occasionally achieved anything approaching the textures, light, and other physical qualities described in the Museum’s picture, and most of them, like Levecq, never tried to.

Exhibited


Ex Coll.

See Corpus, III (1989), no. A 140 (in the possession of the sitter’s wife from 1650 to 1662 and traceable since then).

In order to support Bruyn’s impressions, the members of the RRP were obliged to argue that the Altman painting dates no earlier than 1653, when Levecq was Rembrandt’s nineteen-year-old disciple. They consider the style of the hat to be typical of those worn in the early 1650s and maintain that the last two digits of the date, which are damaged, can be read as 53. One or two hats in pictures by Levecq are compared, but the barest reference to an even slightly larger sample of works, for example the oeuvre of the Haarlem portraitist Johannes Verspronck, reveals that hats like this one (with the same size of the brim and height of the crown) were worn from 1645 onward. And close examination of the inscription under infrared light indicates that the date on the picture is 1648. Moreover, almost all scholars in the past dated the portrait to the 1640s on stylistic grounds.

The picture in the Museum that most closely resembles the Altman *Man* is Rembrandt’s portrait of Herman Doomer, dated 1640 (no. 8). In comparing the two pictures one must allow for the considerable differences in their dates and conditions and for the fact that in the *Doomer* Rembrandt described the face more precisely than in most of his portraits of about 1640, let alone those of nearly a decade later. The subject in *Man Holding Gloves* is also a different sort of person than Herman Doomer, older, with finer features and smoother skin. Nonetheless, the two pictures share striking similarities, especially in such passages as the jawline and cheek, as well as the flesh around the eyes, where the drawing and modeling show the same exceptional ability on the part of the artist to suggest structure and softness at once. Visitors to the exhibition might compare the parallel
treatment of individual eyes, the use of shadow on the face, and details such as the nostrils (each with a brown arc shaping the underside of the nose). Levecq’s portrait has its own virtues, but the modeling around the eyes, the jawline, and elsewhere in the face seems at once fussy and incompetent measured against the present picture. Comparisons of the Altman Man with the Herman Doomer and other portraits by Rembrandt suffice to establish his authorship.

There is no need to bring into the discussion more gifted Rembrandt pupils such as Govert Flinck and Carel Fabritius, since each had a distinctive style.

It is not surprising, given their knowledge of past opinions, that connoisseurs today mistrust subjective impressions, including their own. Almost all of the RRP’s several hundred words on the Herman Doomer read like an autopsy report, without a line on the sitter’s expression, the physical and psychological immediacy of the portrait, and the level of quality throughout. Thus the modern reader might think that Valentiner’s 1914 description of the Altman Man Holding Gloves would not be worth reading, except for the satisfaction of seeing how far we have come: “It is unobtrusive in pose and simple in contour. The interest is concentrated upon the mellowness of the atmospheric envelope, the suppleness of the modeling, and the delicate characterization of a dignified, reticent, modest, well-bred personality.” In the next sentence Valentiner goes too far in his psychological interpretation, and his prose is dated but suggests what is most impressive about this picture and how it relates to the Doomer and other portraits by Rembrandt.

WJ

3. A draft of their long entry, dated August 1990 and credited to Bruyn and van de Wetering, was kindly sent by van de Wetering to the present writer in March 1995. Because the Rembrandt Research Project rejects Rembrandt’s authorship and reads the date of the Altman portrait as 1653, the painting is not slated for inclusion in volume IV (to appear in late 1995?) but for volume V of the Corpus.

L I T E R A T U R E

Smith 1829–42, VII, no. 297, identifies the sitter as Cornelius Jansenius, following an inscription formerly on the painting; Bode 1883, no. 190, as a portrait of Jansenius, signed and dated 1617; Michel 1894, pp. 161–64, rejects the inscription and date, suggests 1645–48; Bode 1897–1906, IV, no. 277, as about 1642; Hoëstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 757, with provenance; Valentiner 1914, pp. 355–56; Valentiner 1931, no. 73, as close in style to the Doomer; Bredius 1935, no. 221; Bauch 1966, no. 387; Gerson 1968, no. 245, as by Rembrandt but “rather weak,” from the second half of the forties; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 576, no. 221, repeats Gerson 1968; Tümpel 1986, no. 209, as a Rembrandt of about 1641, misquotes Gerson (execution “very weak”).

E X C O L L.

First recorded in a Paris sale of 1812.

Fig. 38. Jacobus Leveq, Portrait of a Man Holding a Pair of Gloves in His Left Hand, ca. 1654–55. Oil on wood, 35 × 27½ in. (89 × 70 cm). Private collection, Europe
10 *The Toilet of Bathsheba*

1643
Oil on wood, 22 1/2 x 30 in. (57.2 x 76.2 cm)
Signed and dated lower left: Rembrandt f / 1643
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.651

Rembrandt’s *Toilet of Bathsheba*, *The Visitation* in The Detroit Institute of Arts, and *The Woman Taken in Adultery* in The National Gallery, London (fig. 59), are dated 1643, 1640, and 1644, respectively; with other paintings of the period they demonstrate that the artist continued to employ a precisely descriptive technique in the 1640s when it seemed appropriate to the subject or to the intimate scale of the work.1 Nonetheless, Bruyn in 1976 (echoing Gerson 1968) reported that the Rembrandt Research Project was inclined to doubt Rembrandt’s responsibility for the Museum’s picture on the basis of its “finicky technique” and “weak parts,” especially(!) the old woman.2 The present writer finds these reservations unconvincing and supports the opinion of Hubert von Sonnenburg (see entry, vol. I).

2. Bruyn, oral opinion, June 24, 1976. Bruyn added that the members of the Rembrandt Research Project had reacted similarly to *The Woman Taken in Adultery* of 1644, but they were “slowly turning around” from that view. In March 1995 van de Wetering suggested to the present writer that the RRP still regards the Museum’s picture as mostly by a pupil.
Fig. 59. Rembrandt. The Woman Taken in Adultery. 1644.
Oil on wood, 33 × 25½ in. (83.8 × 65.4 cm). Signed and dated: Rembrandt. f. 1644. The Trustees of The National Gallery, London
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First recorded in the Willem Six sale, Amsterdam, May 12, 1734, no. 56.

REMBRANDT

11 Aristotle with a Bust of Homer

1653
Oil on canvas, 56½ × 53½ in. (143.5 × 136.5 cm)
Signed and dated on base of bust: Rembrandt. f. / 1653.
Purchased, special contributions and funds given or bequeathed by friends of the Museum, 1961
61.198

This painting is one of Rembrandt’s greatest achievements, a work that would not be connected with any other artist even if the circumstances of its creation were unknown. However, the Aristotle is also one of a small number of pictures that can be demonstrated to be indisputably by Rembrandt on the basis of independent documentary evidence. As discussed by Jeroen Giltaij in the second section of this entry, Rembrandt received a commission for the work from the Sicilian collector Antonio Ruffo in 1652 or 1653. No other painting by Rembrandt is dated 1653, evidently because his house underwent structural repairs during the first eight or nine months of that year, making it difficult for him to work. Execution of the Aristotle in the fall of 1653 is consistent with its documented receipt in Messina in the summer of 1654. The painting is traceable from Ruffo’s collection and until 1661, when it became the only painting by Rembrandt ever purchased by the Metropolitan Museum.

Rembrandt’s financial situation in 1653 was precarious to a degree he had not experienced previously. This could have influenced his treatment of the theme, but that is all one can say on the subject. As Held shows in a classic article, Aristotle contemplates both spiritual and material values, opposing realms represented by the bust of the blind poet Homer (who lived three centuries earlier than the
philosopher) and by the magnificent gold chain. A medalion depicting Alexander the Great, who as a youth was tutored by Aristotle, hangs from the chain. Thoughtfully, the philosopher touches the bust with one hand and the medallion with the other. (Autoradiographs reveal that Rembrandt revised the position of the left hand, to which the gold ring draws attention). The light and shadow that fall across Aristotle's eyes and forehead seem to suggest mobility of thought.

The subject of Aristotle and Rembrandt's interpretation of it would have been rich in meaning for the artist's more cultivated contemporaries: the painting's themes of blindness, mortality, the golden bonds of patronage, and perhaps of the vanity of learning were familiar in seventeenth-century Dutch art and literature, and Dutch philosophers, literary figures, and art critics of the period such as Samuel van Hoogstraten routinely discussed Aristotle himself.

There are also passages of painting in the picture intended for the sophisticated viewer. The white gown is a virtuoso performance inspired by Titian (see also no. 12), and the chain is possibly the most extraordinary of the motifs that Amsterdam cognoscenti would have recognized as Rembrandt signatures. A powerful sense of illusionistic space—another hallmark of Rembrandt's work evident at this date—remains to some extent; unfortunately, however, it has been diminished by the loss of about two feet of canvas at the bottom and by abrasion in some places. The curtain, for example, originally would have set off the figure— with its folds and also by clearly defining the limits of the background. (The sole purpose of the silver object—a tray?—at the left side appears to be to enhance depth in that area.)

This painting sets standards by which other works by Rembrandt and by his followers may be judged. In the opinion of many critics, none of Rembrandt's close associates ever produced a picture that approaches the *Aristotle* in terms of either its style or content.

**Antonio Ruffo and Rembrandt's *Aristotle***

At his death the Sicilian nobleman Antonio Ruffo (1610/11–1678) had a collection of 364 paintings, mainly by contemporary Roman and Neapolitan artists. However, there were also works by or thought to be by famous sixteenth-century painters such as Dürer, Lucas van Leyden, and Titian and a considerable number of pictures by Sicilians who are for the most part unfamiliar today. Only a few of Ruffo's paintings can be identified now, but certainly among them were Rembrandt's *Aristotle*, van Dyck's *Saint Rosalie* in the Metropolitan Museum, Giuseppe Raggi Giovanni Maria Moroni's *Erminia* and the *Shepherds* (The Minneapolis Institute of Arts), and Salvador Rosa's pendant pictures devoted to the life of Pythagoras (Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, and the Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth).

Ruffo's *Aristotle* is undoubtedly the canvas in the Metropolitan Museum. The earliest known document concerning the painting is dated June 19, 1654. It is a letter from the exceptionally rich Dutch merchant Cornelis Gisbertsz van Goor (ca. 1600–1673), who traded in the Levant, to a Giacomo di Battista in Messina. Battista apparently was van Goor's business contact in Sicily and also Ruffo's representative. The back of the letter is dated July 20, 1654, which is probably when it was received. The letter states that van Goor had consigned "a square crate with the picture for your friend" to the captain of the ship *San Bartolomeo* bound for Naples. Contained in the letter is a bill for all costs, including the fee "for the painting by Rembrandt as per invoice 500." On September 1, 1654, the canvas was entered in Ruffo's inventory as a "half-length figure of a philosopher made in Amsterdam by the painter Rembrandt (it appears to be Aristotle or Albertus Magnus)." In the Ruffo papers there is a letter from the collector dated November 1, 1662, concerning a painting by Rembrandt representing Alexander the Great; a copy of a receipt from a Captain Rol of the ship *Airon*, noting that a third Rembrandt painting, depicting Homer, was to be returned to Amsterdam; and an undated copy of the bill for the *Aristotle*. Why the copy of the bill is included among the other documents is unknown; in any case it states that van Goor had ordered the *Aristotle* from Rembrandt at the request of the now deceased Battista. A bill for the *Alexander the Great* is dated July 30, 1661. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the copy of the bill for the *Aristotle* dates from sometime between 1661 and 1662.

When the present picture was entered in Ruffo's inventory, in 1654, whether the figure represented Aristotle or
Albertus Magnus was unknown. Indeed, a note of January 1657 regarding its framing refers to the painting of "Albertus Magnus." Evidently, the subject was not clear to Ruffo; in fact, his inventory indicates that he was similarly unsure about other works in this collection, such as a picture recorded as a "philosopher or Saint Jerome." It appears, therefore, that Ruffo ordered a painting of a philosopher from Rembrandt without specifying his identity and that Rembrandt considered it appropriate to depict a figure from classical antiquity.

An important issue is the painting's size, which was acknowledged by Rembrandt in a note of July 1661 to Ruffo as 8 by 6 palmi. The Sicilian palmo was equivalent to 25.8 centimeters, which is confirmed by comparing Ruffo's measurements in palmi as recorded in his inventory against the measurements of known pictures such as van Dyck's Saint Rosalie. Comparison of the dimensions listed for the Aristotle in Ruffo's catalogue with the painting's present size suggests that it was at some point cut down by as much as 18 centimeters in width and 60 centimeters in height.

Ruffo apparently was well satisfied with the Aristotle, for it inspired him to commission a series of half-length figures of philosophers from various painters. In 1660 Guercino (mistaking Rembrandt's subject from a sketch) supplied a Cosmographer; in 1661 Rembrandt sent Ruffo an Alexander the Great, which evidently is lost; pictures of philosophers, now lost, were painted by Mattia Preti in 1662, Salvator Rosa in 1668, and Giacinto Brandi in 1670; and in 1663 Rembrandt executed a Homer, which survives as a fragment in the Mauritshuis, The Hague. The Aristotle, the Alexander the Great, and the Homer were originally the same size but may not all have shared a vertical format.

Ruffo's hundred best pictures remained in his family and were listed in inventories of 1678, 1689, 1703, 1710, and— the last— of 1739. The collection was probably dispensed in the middle of the eighteenth century. It appeared in Naples about 1750. The next known owner of the Aristotle was Sir Abraham Hume, who traveled through Italy sometime between 1786 and 1800. A catalogue of Hume's collection reveals that the Aristotle "was brought into [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." Hume did not buy the Homer, which, however, stayed in England until Bredius purchased it in 1894. The Aristotle remained in Hume's family until the 1890s, when it was purchased by Rodolphe Kann in Paris, from whose sale in 1907 it went through Duveen Brothers to Mrs. Collis P. Huntington, New York.

5. This section by Jeroen Giltaij, Curator of Old Master Paintings at the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam, is based upon his forthcoming dissertation, "Ruffo and Rembrandt: A Sicilian Collector of the Seventeenth Century Who Ordered Paintings from Rembrandt," Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.
7. As Hoogewerff 1917 was the first to conclude.
8. The Ruffo documents were first published by a descendant in Ruffo 1916 and Ruffo 1919.
10. Ibid., p. 320.
11. Ibid., p. 485.
12. Kirby, who investigated the issue of the Sicilian palmo, notes that "the measurements in Ruffo’s catalogue are suspiciously tidy;" but concludes that about 25 centimeters would be an appropriate estimate for the size of a palmo (1992). The sizes of Ruffo pictures other than the Aristotle are not considered by Kirby, but comparisons with surviving works such as the Guercino in Minneapolis support a measurement of 25.8 centimeters.
13. Held 1969, pp. 5–7, fig. 2; Strauss and van der Meulen 1979, pp. 460–61.
14. On the Homer, see most recently Broos 1993, no. 33.
15. Ricci 1918, p. 43. The source of this information is not revealed by Ricci.
16. I am grateful to Walter Liedtke for drawing my attention to A Descriptive Catalogue of a Collection of Pictures ... Belonging to Sir Abraham Hume, 1824, no. 116, where these remarks appear. Hume’s catalogue has not been cited heretofore in relation to the Aristotle. Liedtke also brought to my attention the Vaughan sale at Christie’s, London, on February 17, 1810, in which the following are cited: Rembrandt, A Portrait of a Sculptor with a Bust (no. 112) and The Companion, a Schoolmaster with His Pupil (no. 114). In my view these pictures are not the Aristotle and the Homer.
17. The later history is well known: Alfred Erickson of New York bought the painting from Duveen in 1928–29, and it was in his wife’s collection between 1936 and its sale at Parke-Bernet, New York, November 15, 1961.

Literature
Smith 1829–42, VII, no. 302, as a portrait of Vander Hooff (P. C. Hooff), the Dutch poet; Waagen 1838, II, p. 205, doubts Hooff, esteems the picture; Bode 1897–1906, V, pp. 31, 180, no. 585, as A Bearded Man with a Bust of Homer; Six 1897, pp. 4–6, "Torquato Tasso?"; Rosenberg 1906, p. 402, no. 282, recalls the bust of Homer in Rembrandt’s collection; Hofste de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 413; Valentiner in New York 1909, no. 97, as The Savant; Valentiner in Rosenberg 1909, p. 562, no. 426, might depict Virgil; Ruffo 1916, publishes documents concerning the picture’s purchase in 1654; Hoogewerff 1917, p. 130, identifies the Ruffo documents with this painting; Valentiner 1931, no. 115, as Aristotle; Bredius 1915, no. 478; Busch 1966, no. 207; Emmens 1968, pp. 169–76, 203–5, suggests that Homer, Aristotle, and Alexander might correspond with the concepts of inborn talent, learning, and training; Gerson 1968, no. 286; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 594, no. 478, thinks Athena is on the medallion; Haak 1969, pp. 240–41, on the documents; Held 1969, pp. 3–44, the classic study of the picture’s meaning; de Vries, Töth-
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12 Flora

Ca. 1654
Oil on canvas, 39 1/8 × 36 1/8 in. (100 × 91.8 cm)
Gift of Archer M. Huntington, in memory of his father,
Collis Potter Huntington, 1926
26.101.10

This painting of the goddess of spring or flowers is not signed, but Rembrandt’s authorship has never been doubted in print.1 Flora is usually dated to about 1654 on the basis of formal resemblances to the Aristotle (no. 11), the Bathsheba of 1654 (fig. 60), and other paintings by Rembrandt.2 The picture is not in an excellent state, and its quality was not originally comparable to that of the Aristotle (which was an important commission). Nonetheless, the white garments of the figures in the two works are remarkably similar in their cascading brushstrokes and billowing folds. The execution throughout the Flora is typical of Rembrandt, and aspects of the design—for example, the shadowy apron, held up to the picture plane by an oversized hand—are so distinctive as to be without parallel in the efforts of any pupil or follower. The almost horizontal flood of light, which escapes from the flower-filled apron to the lower right, the nearly profile view of the face with the far eye barely visible, the flowers dashed off atop the hat, and the drastic revision of the headgear’s position represent the sort of daring ideas that Rembrandt had been introducing for twenty years and that are generally found only in the work of completely self-assured artists.

Much has been written about the subject and about Rembrandt’s model, in my view inconclusively. The painting is often called Hendrickje as Flora, and the sitter is often compared to the naked model (presumed to be Hendrickje Stoffels [see no. 16]) in the Bathsheba. There is some facial resemblance, not least in terms of expression, but to say that the figures “could be twin sisters” and are “based on the same model” goes too far.3 Each face is idealized by Rembrandt’s standards, and there is no documented portrait of Hendrickje in any case. Flora’s face looks slimmer, the brow stronger, and the lips thinner than Bathsheba’s. With

Ex Coll.
Commissioned by Antonio Ruffo of Messina, Sicily, in 1652 or 1653 and received by him in 1654.

exhibited
respect to these facial qualities the figure in Flora recalls the Portrait of Saskia in Kassel, which Rembrandt sold to Jan Six about 1652. The similarities between these two pictures have often been mentioned, but a version of the Saskia in Antwerp (fig. 61), which the Rembrandt Research Project assigns to Rembrandt’s studio about 1650, is closer still to the Flora in the facial features (this Saskia’s nose and chin, however, have been refined), the loose shirt, the earring and necklace, the more relaxed coiffure, and the manner of execution. 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.

Scholars have suggested recently that Titian’s Flora (which was in Amsterdam during the 1630s) influenced the present painting, Rembrandt’s Flora of 1635 (The National Gallery, London), and his Portrait of Saskia as Flora of 1641 (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden), although they have doubted its importance for the Flora of 1634 (The Hermitage, St. Petersburg). Kelch considers the Titian especially significant for the Museum’s picture even though “nothing seems to remain of Titian’s conception of Flora the courtesan.” Our Flora’s faint smile and hesitant glance, as well as her restrained pose and gesture, make the usual offer of pleasure ambivalent, as if she were aware that flowers, youth, beauty, and love do not last. This comparatively chaste and serious figure differs markedly from Rembrandt’s happy and sensual Floras of earlier years.

The flower goddess’s mood and her former association with Saskia make one reluctant to dismiss the traditional notion that this is in some way a work with personal meaning for the artist. However, the subject was exceptionally popular (see no. 22), and it seems unlikely that Rembrandt would have foregone a sale during this period of his career, when he was in financial straits.

WI

1. Schmidt-Degener (“not to be quoted”), in 1933, suggested that it might be by Barent Fabritius. In 1966 Daan Cevat thought the picture was only partly by Rembrandt, but in 1973 he dismissed it as an imitation of Reynolds’s time. Grimm later supported this view. Oral opinions, the last undated.


5. Ibid., I, pp. 432, 438, copy no. 4.

6. See Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, I, nos. 23, 41, where these pictures and Titian’s painting are reproduced.
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In the collection of the Earl Spencer, Althorp House, Great Brington, Northamptonshire, by 1822.
13 The Standard Bearer (Floris Soop)

1654
Oil on canvas, 55 3/4 x 45 3/4 in. (140.3 x 114.9 cm)
Signed and dated lower left: Rembrandt f 1654
The Jules Bache Collection, 1949
49-7-35

This impressive portrait dated 1654 does not retain its original quality, especially in the background and in the dark parts of the costume. However, radiographs and autoradiographs give some idea of Rembrandt's brushwork in these damaged and darkened areas.¹

The picture has been well known since the late eighteenth century, when it was owned by Sir Joshua Reynolds. A mezzotint after the painting, by William Pether, is dated 1769. In Reynolds's sale of 1795 the sitter was called "an officer of state," and he was later described variously as a burgomaster, as Admiral Tromp, and (by Michel in 1894) as a model whom Rembrandt dressed up for a fancy picture. In the 1890s the correct title, The Standard Bearer, was established, and the date that appears on the canvas, 1654, was published for the first time.²

Every catalogue of Rembrandt's work published in this century includes this painting as an autograph work. As several scholars have noted, the treatment of the face is very similar to that in Rembrandt's Portrait of Jan Six, which is also dated 1654 (Six Collection, Amsterdam). Bode (1901) considered the exceptional quality of The Standard Bearer to denote a portrait "painted to order."³ This view was widely held even before 1971, when Isabella van Eeghen, the former city archivist of Amsterdam, identified the subject as Floris Soop (1604–1657), ensign of Precinct XV in the Amsterdam civic guard.⁴ The rank of ensign was reserved for bachelors from prominent families. Soop was also a board member of the Amsterdam theater and the owner of 140 paintings at his death three years after the present portrait was completed. His house, called the "Glass House" because he operated a glass and mirror factory, was at 105 Kloveniersburgwal, Amsterdam, next to Jan Six's residence at number 103.⁵

The costume depicted here has nothing to do with Soop's, or Rembrandt's, interest in the theater or with the world of artists' studios. The plume in the hat and the tooled leather baldric belong to the regalia of the office of ensign; the gold strap, although reminiscent of the chain in Aristotle with a Bust of Homer (no. 11) and other impasto feats by Rembrandt, was probably meant to be recognized as the one Soop actually wore.

In 1976 Bruyn, on behalf of the Rembrandt Research Project, reported to the Museum that The Standard Bearer was "not by Rembrandt, not even the face."⁶ Evidently his point of view was taken seriously, for in 1978 the Amsterdam archivist Dudok van Heel noted the opinion in an article on a Rembrandt patron who, like Soop, was a Remonstrant.⁷ The present members of the RRP, however, are inclined to consider this picture to have been painted by Rembrandt in 1654.⁸

2. Paris, Sedelmeyer Gallery, Illustrated Catalogue of the Third Series of 100 Paintings by Old Masters (1896), no. 30. In scholarly literature the proper date was first adopted by Bode 1897–1906, V (1901), p. 150, correcting Bode 1883, pp. 338–39, where the picture is dated about 1662–64.
5. See the map of 1652 and captions by Dudok van Heel identifying these houses in Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, p. 39 (the Glashuys is named as such by the mapmaker). Soop inherited his house from his father, Jan.
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Smith 1829–42, VII, no. 279, as The Halberdier; Bode 1883, pp. 338–39, as about 1662–64; Michel 1894, p. 181, as depicting one of "those old men he loved to paint, because they fell in submissively with his fancies, and allowed him to pose and accoutre them as he pleased"; Bode 1897–1906, V, p. 26, no. 376, as dated 1654, the subject being "evidently the standard bearer of one of Amsterdam's shooting-guilds"; Hofsteede de Groot 1906–27, VI, no. 269, with provenance; Valentiner in New York 1909, no. 98; Valentiner 1911, no. 117; Bredius 1935, no. 272; Bauch 1966, no. 408; Gerson 1968, no. 317, as "likely the ensign in one of Amsterdam's militia companies" and as close in style to the Portrait of Jan Six of 1654; van Eeghen 1971 identifies the sitter as Floris Soop; Dudok van Heel 1978, p. 168, n. 4, considers it possible that this picture was among the 140 paintings Soop had in his house at 105 Kloveniersburgwal, Amsterdam; Strauss and van der Meulen 1979, p. 406, records a life-size portrait of Soop in his estate; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 57–61, on the condition and "original characteristics" recovered by autoradiography; Schwartz 1983, pp. 137, 208, 267–68, discusses the picture and biographical details; Tümpe 1986, no. 213; Slueters 1992, no. 163.

Exhibited
14. Christ and the Woman of Samaria

1650s
Oil on wood, 25 × 19 ¼ in. (63.5 × 48.9 cm)
Inscribed lower center, on step: Rembrandt. / f 1655.
Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1959
60.71.14

A number of authors (see literature below) and connoisseurs who have viewed our picture on visits to the Museum have doubted that it was painted by Rembrandt. The work’s condition, in particular in the figure of the woman (see “On Condition” by Hubert von Sonnenburg, vol. 1), has to some extent altered its appearance, but its qualities of style and expression can nevertheless be judged inconsistent with an attribution to Rembrandt himself. It would also have been uncharacteristic of Rembrandt to have derived the seated figure of Christ and especially the two most prominent disciples from his own etching of 1634 (fig. 132, vol. 1). Even more troubling is the fact that Christ in the present picture is a less compelling individual than he is in this early print and in another etching by Rembrandt of 1657 (fig. 131, vol. 1). The latter vividly evoke the insistent words recorded in John 4: “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.” To judge from Christ’s gesture here and his inattention to Jacob’s well, he might be telling the woman that the drinking was better at the last watering hole. The description of Christ’s drapery is also disappointing, although his figure is perhaps the strongest part of the picture. It is surprising that the weary traveler, unlike Christ in the earlier etching, is shown with his bare feet covered by his garment; indeed, one wonders how he walked to the city of Sychar in such a long robe.

My tentative association of this painting with Constantijn van Rennesse, Rembrandt’s informal pupil of about 1650, is not without problems, as Sumowski gently points out. No painting attributed to the little-known artist is quite this good. There are vaguely similar figures, and an analogous arrangement of them and of the setting into planes, in *The Good Samaritan* in the Louvre, which is attributed to Renesse by Sumowski; and, as he concedes, architecture, foliage, and a sky reminiscent of these elements in the Museum’s picture appear in another canvas assigned to Renesse, *Peasants Dancing by an Inn* in The Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. Furthermore, the bottom-heavy figure of the Samaritan woman, with her columnar skirt, recalls the woman in a drawing of the same subject (Prentenkabinett, Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden) that is signed and dated “C. A. Renesse, 1649, 12 Sept. 1649.” A second drawing signed by Renesse, *Daniel in the Lion’s Den* (Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam), is inscribed on the back, “the first drawing [of this composition] shown to Rem Brant in the year 1649 the 1 october, it was the second time that I had been to Rembrant.”

Perhaps Renesse painted the present picture some years after he made these drawings, between about 1653 and 1660. In any case, there are no comparable small-scale figurative works indisputably by Rembrandt dating from the 1650s, and most scholars agree that this is a pupil’s work. Slutes suggests that the picture may have been painted by a pupil in Rembrandt’s studio and strengthened by the master. The hypothesis calls to mind the drawing of the Annunciation in Berlin, which is generally considered to be by Renesse with emphatic improvements by Rembrandt (fig. 38). It must be stressed, however, that the argument, in favor of attributing this painting to one of Rembrandt’s pupils of the 1650s is not based primarily upon the little we know about them but upon what we know of Rembrandt.

Ex Coll.

Apparently the painting cited in the inventory of Floris Soop’s estate (May 3, 1657) as “another portrait of Floris Soop, as large as life.” Engraved in 1769, and in Sir Joshua Reynolds’s collection somewhat later (sold, Christie’s, London, March 17, 1795, no. 56). In the collection of the second earl of Warwick by 1801.

1. Bruyn, on behalf of the Rembrandt Research Project, oral opinion, June 24, 1976; seconded on several recent occasions by van de Wetering Held, oral opinion, October 12, 1980, “must be by a pupil.”
2. See Liedtke 1993, pp. 136–37; Sumowski 1983–94, VI, p. 3524, for his criticism, and IV, nos. 1658, 1658a, for the Paris and Washington pictures.
3. For the two drawings, see Amsterdam 1984–85, nos. 63, 65.
Rembrandt

15 Self-Portrait

1660
Oil on canvas, 31 5/8 × 26 3/8 in. (80.3 × 67.3 cm)
Signed and dated lower right: Rembrandt / F / 1660
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.618

Rembrandt's self-portraits have inspired numerous subjective remarks but none so fanciful as Bruyn's observation that in this picture "only the face is by Rembrandt." Tümpel evidently depended upon Bruyn's opinion when he recently catalogued the canvas as a painting from Rembrandt's circle. No other scholar has ever doubted the authenticity of the work, which will be classified as entirely autograph in a future volume of the Corpus. The complexity and confidence of execution are characteristic of Rembrandt and occur similarly in approximately contemporary pictures such as the Self-Portrait as the Apostle Paul of 1661 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). Particularly impressive are the strokes of paint defining the eyes and furrowed brow; strong modeling is maintained despite the looseness of touch, which is used to suggest light and atmosphere. As in other portraits by Rembrandt the head-gear was substantially revised during the painting process.

In the course of four decades Rembrandt painted, etched, or drew about seventy-five self-portraits, which constitute one of the most personal, or "internally motivated," parts of his oeuvre. These works inspired pupils, followers, and later imitators (see fig. 45) to paint portraits of Rembrandt (as well as similar portraits of themselves and of colleagues), some of which were later regarded as typical and even searching self-studies. The most successful imitations were generally derived from Rembrandt's more conventional self-portraits, that is, those that project a public rather than a private, more introspective image. The Altman painting, however, is clearly a personal work that in several respects would have been difficult for another artist to reproduce. As in other late self-portraits, Rembrandt here reveals an extraordinary ability to describe physical qualities (which presumably were studied in a mirror) and simultaneously to suggest character. Thirty years of experience made this achievement possible.

2. Tümpel 1986, no. A 71. It is well known that many of the deattributions in Tümpel's catalogue are based upon the unpublished opinions of the RRP, to the point that some scholars use his book as a forecast of future entries in the Corpus.
3. According to van de Wetering, in conversation with the writer, November 15, 1994.
4. Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 70, concluded that the hat was altered twice and that autoradiographs reveal Rembrandt's original sketch on the canvas; however, both points are questioned by van de Wetering (see n. 3 above) and by von Sonnenburg (see entry, vol. I).
6. See, for example, London 1992b, nos. 8, 9.
pendant to no. 16 here; Valentinier 1914, p. 361, describes the sitter as “ravaged by the tragedy of human life”; Valentinier 1931, no. 145; Brodskis 1935, no. 54; Burroughs 1938, p. 155, the “bold modeling and solid structure” are consistent with Rembrandt’s approach from about 1630; Bauch 1966, no. 322; Gerson 1968, no. 381, as “probably a companion piece” to no. 16 here; Enrique Valdivieso, Pintura holan-
desa del siglo XVII en España (Valladolid, 1973), p. 354, wrongly places this picture with no. 16 in the Cotter collection in Palma de Mallorca and makes no reference to the actual provenance before 1900; Ainsworth et al. 1982, pp. 67–71, wrongly discovers a “prelimi-
nary sketch”; Tümpel 1986, no. A 73, as “Rembrandt Circle”; Chapman 1990, pp. 87–88, notes that Rembrandt is depicted in an artist’s smock and beret; Slakes 1992, no. 266.
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In the collection of the duke of Valentinois, Paris, in 1738; acquired by the first Baron Ashburton, London, in 1826.

REMBRANDT

16 Hendrickje Stoffels

Ca. 1654–60
Oil on canvas, 30¾ × 27¾ in. (78.4 × 68.9 cm)
Inscribed at right: Rembrandt / f 1660
Gift of Archer M. Huntington, in memory of his father,
Collis Potter Huntington, 1926
26.101.9

Apart from Van Dyke, who in 1923 made the peculiar assertion that the picture is “probably by Drost,” no one has questioned Rembrandt’s authorship. Many writers, following Valentinier’s unreliable lead (in Rosenberg 1909), have supposed that the painting is a pendant to the Altman Self-
Portrait (no. 15); their opinions evidently are based on the size of the Huntington canvas (which, however, has a strip added on the left), its date (which is spurious), the subject (which is uncertain), and its location in the same museum. The two paintings have no shared history, so far as is known. The figures differ in scale and, to the degree that the damage to the present work allows an assessment, in manner of execution. Finally, even if the Huntington picture was intended as a portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels, the idea that Rembrandt would have presented himself and his mistress in pendant portraits raises questions of propriety that no scholar has considered. As is well known, Hendrickje was called before her Calvinist church’s council in 1654 for having “sinned” with Rembrandt (she was pregnant at the time) and was denied communion and ordered to repent.¹

However erroneous, Van Dyke’s attribution to Willem Drost was inspired by an astute observation, namely that the Young Woman in The Wallace Collection (fig. 62), which may represent a courtesan and was painted by Drost about 1654, is very similar to the Museum’s picture in subject and composition. The comparison brings up the issue of who or what Rembrandt initially intended to represent.

The inscription on the Hendrickje Stoffels is awkwardly placed and doubtful. The picture could have been painted several years earlier than 1660; it may also have been left unfinished in the drapery and the hand and worked on at different intervals. Thus it is possible, if only hypothetically, to associate the canvas more closely with works of about 1654, such as the Drost mentioned above, Rembrandt’s Bathsheba (fig. 60), Flora (no. 12), and A Woman Bathing (Bathsheba?) in The National Gallery, London.² These

Fig. 62. Willem Drost. Young Woman in Fancy Dress, ca. 1654. Oil on canvas, 24¾ × 19¾ in. (62.4 × 49.8 cm). The Wallace Collection, London
his young woman in "a Titianesque pose with her left hand at her breast," as in Titian’s *Mary Magdalen*. This would not necessarily mean that Rembrandt originally intended to represent the Magdalen, or Hendrickje Stoffels as the Magdalen, but it is possible. A few pictures by Rembrandt pupils of the late 1640s or early 1650s depict the repentant sinner in half length, with the same downcast gaze. However, the comparison only serves to underscore how Rembrandt’s mature and late paintings, unlike works by his followers, often resist an interpretation that can be expressed in a few words.

1. See Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, 1, pp. 60 (where the church document condemning her is wrongly translated as “given herself over to harlotry”), 268.
2. On *A Woman Bathing (Bathsheba)*, see ibid., no. 40; Kelch considers an identification with Bathsheba on p. 249.
3. Ibid., pp. 245, 252.
4. Ibid., pp. 249, 270.
6. Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 72, not citing any particular work by Titian. The same publication interprets autoradiographs as showing “a thinner face,” a higher hand, and “a blouse open at the breasts and a necklace pulled over and tucked into the garments.” These readings are highly conjectural and cannot be used as a basis for associating the *Hendrickje Stoffels* with the Droste in The Wallace Collection or any other paintings.
7. See Sumowski 1983–94, II, nos. 1322, 1383, both categorized as works by Maes, with other versions cited.
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In the collection of the Cotoner family (marquesa de la Cenia), Palma de Mallorca, by the 1880s.
17 Man with a Magnifying Glass

Ca. 1662
Oil on canvas, 36 × 29½ in. (91.4 × 74.3 cm)
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.621

18 Woman with a Pink

Ca. 1662
Oil on canvas, 36½ × 29½ in. (92.1 × 74.6 cm)
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.622

Neither of these canvases is signed, but both have been accepted universally as characteristic late works by Rembrandt. Dates ranging from about 1662 to about 1668 have been proposed, the early 1660s being the most plausible suggestion. Among portraits by Rembrandt that are very similar in execution are The Syndics of the Amsterdam Drapers’ Guild of 1662 (fig. 64). However, it is difficult to compare the figures because the conservative clothing worn by the syndics did not encourage painterly description to the extent that the imaginary attire of the Altman man and woman did.

The sitters have been variously identified: for example as Titus van Rijn (who died in 1668 at the age of twenty-seven) and his young wife, as the couple in The Jewish Bride (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), as the bachelor Baruch Spinoza and, presumably, a passing flame, as Portuguese or “upper-class” Jews, and as other unlikely people. The unattractive child’s head that was revealed by X rays to have once been in the lower left corner of the woman’s portrait has played a role in some scholars’ interpretations. However, the head was sketched and painted out at such an early stage that one wonders whether it had much to do with the sitters.²

Most important for an understanding of the subject of these pictures is the fact that the same couple had formal portraits of themselves painted by Rembrandt’s former pupil Jan Victors in 1651, about ten or twelve years before they sat for Rembrandt (compare figs. 65, 66 with nos. 17, 18, pp. 84–85).³ Victors’s sitters are dressed in contemporary rather than imaginary dress, but the costumes are remarkable for their fine fabrics and lace and, in the woman’s picture, for the amount of jewelry (compare the abundant pearls in the Woman with a Pink). The man’s gloves and the woman’s fan are, by contrast, conventional signs of gentility often found in Dutch marriage portraits (see nos. 6, 28). The paintings by Victors may well have been commissioned at the time of the couple’s marriage or shortly thereafter.

It seems likely that Rembrandt knew the Victors portraits. The four paintings reveal various similarities of composition such as the arched shapes at the top of each canvas (in the Rembrandts these are visible only in autoradiographs).⁴ For his part Victors posed the sitters in a way that

---

Fig. 64. Rembrandt. The Syndics of the Amsterdam Drapers’ Guild, 1662. Oil on canvas, 75⅞ × 109⅛ in. (191.5 × 279 cm). Signed and dated: Rembrandt f.1662. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (on loan from the city of Amsterdam)
recalls Rembrandt portraits such as the Herman Doomer and its pendant (no. 8, fig. 57). This may have inspired Rembrandt to refer again to one of the sources that influenced the design of the Doomer pendants and other portraits he painted during the early 1640s. That source was Raphael's Baldassare Castiglione (Musée du Louvre, Paris), which Rembrandt sketched at an auction in 1639. The pose in Man with a Magnifying Glass is similar to that in the Castiglione (in reverse) and was even closer when the hands of Rembrandt's sitter were joined on a ledge (as autoradiographs reveal). Another feature that links the Altman man with the Raphael is the motif of the arm resting on a pillow; Rembrandt first used this idea in his etching Self-Portrait Leaning on a Stone Sill of 1639 (Bartsch 21), which probably derived from the Castiglione as well as from the more immediate source of Titian's Portrait of a Man ("Ariosto") in London.

The Woman with a Pink does not recall any particular composition, but in the pose and expression there is perhaps some reminiscence of Rembrandt's portraits of Saskia and of one or two pictures for which Hendrickje supposedly modeled, such as the Flora (no. 12) and the Bathsheba of 1654 (fig. 60). The offer of the pink, or carnation, which symbolizes marriage, and the gold picture frame, which is juxtaposed with the woman's head at eye level, are among the compositional devices that subtly link the two sitters.

The man holds what appears to be a small magnifying glass in a circular frame. Such an attribute must stand for his profession, which observers have reasonably conjectured to be that of a goldsmith or silversmith. However, it has been suggested recently that this kind of magnifying glass or loupe is a thread counter (tradenteller), a lens used to examine the weave and quality of cloth, and that the man may have been an Amsterdam cloth merchant. This hypothesis regarding the sitter's occupation deserves further investigation in the Amsterdam archives, especially in view of the fact that Rembrandt painted the officials of the Amsterdam drapers' guild in 1662.
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2. Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 82.
4. The portraits will be discussed by Nancy Minty in the forthcoming catalogue of the collection of Saul P. Steinberg.
5. Chapman 1990, pp. 72–78, figs. 102, 103.
Chapman 1990, p. 75, fig. 101. This motif was adopted by a few of Rembrandt's pupils in the 1640s; in Ferdinand Bol's *Self-Portrait of 1643* in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (Chapman 1990, fig. 141) the arrangement is very like that in the *Man with a Magnifying Glass*, although no direct connection is likely.
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**Exhibited**


**Ex Coll.**

In the d'Oultremon family, Brussels, by 1750.
This strangely engaging portrait of the young painter Gerard de Lairesse (1640–1711) has been regarded as a characteristic late work by Rembrandt in all the standard catalogues of his oeuvre. It will be fully discussed by Haverkamp-Begemann in a forthcoming catalogue of paintings in the Robert Lehman Collection, and the following observations depend almost entirely upon his manuscript.¹

Houbraeken records that Lairesse, a native of Liège, arrived in Amsterdam about 1665 and immediately found work with Gerrit Uyleburgh, the son of Rembrandt’s former dealer.² A date on this picture was once read as 1663 or 1665, but it is no longer visible, and the signature is probably by a later hand. However, a date of 1665 to 1667 is consistent with the sitter’s apparent age, the time of his move to Amsterdam, and the manner of execution, which recalls Rembrandt’s Portrait of a Man of 1667 in the National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, and other portraits of the 1660s (see no. 17).³

The Lehman canvas is the only formal portrait painted of Lairesse apart from his Self-Portrait of about a decade later (Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence), upon which a few prints depend. Lairesse’s features shocked colleagues when they first encountered him in Amsterdam, according to Houbraeken, who mentions his misspelled name and relates that he was born with his deformities. Medical experts have suggested that Lairesse suffered from congenital syphilis, which could have caused his sudden blindness in 1690 as well as his disfigurements.

Radiographs and autoradiographs reveal that Rembrandt revised the composition in the course of his work (see figs. 141, 142, vol. I). His typical modifications did not alter the overall design or the candor and elegance of the sitter’s presentation. (Lairesse was characteristically elegant, according to the Liège painter Louis Abry).⁴ The picture is exemplary of Rembrandt’s late portraits, which were mostly of personal acquaintances and like his late self-portraits (see no. 15) reveal little inclination to flattery. This approach and Rembrandt’s dark and painterly style differ conspicuously from that of most successful contemporary portraitists in Amsterdam and in other European art centers. Van Dyck’s subjects (contemporary reports reveal), and no doubt those of most of the painters he influenced, never looked as attractive in life as they do in art.

Lairesse worked for twenty years as a fashionable painter of history pictures and large-scale decorative scenes. After he went blind, he turned to art theory. In one passage of his academic tract, the Groot schilderboek of 1707, he strongly criticized Rembrandt’s late style, and in another he recommended that portraitists minimize their subjects’ physical defects.⁵ Such an accomplished and disadvantaged artist as Lairesse must have viewed his portrait by Rembrandt with mixed emotions.

1. The organizers of the present exhibition are grateful to the Trustees of the Robert Lehman Collection and to Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann for allowing them to use his material in this entry and in no. 25.
3. For the Melbourne painting, see Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, I, no. 50. Haverkamp-Begemann also cites the similarities to figures on the right in The Syndics of 1662 (fig. 64).
5. Lairesse 1707, II, pp. 324–25, on Rembrandt, and pp. 10–14 on idealization in portraiture; both passages are cited by Haverkamp-Begemann.

Literature

Exhibited

Ex Coll.
First recorded in an Amsterdam sale of 1802; purchased by Robert Lehman in 1945.
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20 Portrait of a Man

Ca. 1655–60
Oil on canvas, 32¾ × 25¼ in. (83.5 × 64.5 cm)
Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1890
91.26.7

This portrait of about 1655 to 1660 may be the first painting by Rembrandt to have entered the Museum’s collection. However, Bruyn, on behalf of the Rembrandt Research Project, suggested that it “does not appear to be good enough for Rembrandt,” and Tümpel classified it as by an unnamed Rembrandt pupil. It is not clear that these scholars understand the picture’s condition (see “On Condition” and entry by Hubert von Sonnenburg, vol. I).

The American artist J. Alden Weir bought the canvas in 1883 at Agnew’s in London, on behalf of Museum trustee Henry Marquand. Weir wrote to his parents on the day of the purchase, “Now we will have one very remarkable picture of which the country will be proud.”


21 Portrait of Rembrandt as a Young Man

Ca. 1660 or later
Oil on wood, 8¾ × 6¾ in. (21.9 × 16.5 cm)
Inscribed at right: RL [monogram]
Bequest of Evander B. Schley, 1952
53.18

Through sheer neglect, apparently, this modest homage to Rembrandt remained in catalogues of his work until and even after Gerson wrote in 1969 that he was “not convinced” of the young artist’s authorship. The panel has hardly ever been on view in the Museum since it was accessioned in 1953.

There are autograph early pictures, such as Rembrandt’s Father, 1630–31 (Collection of Isabel and Alfred Bader, Milwaukee), and the grisaille Bust of an Old Man of 1633 (private collection, New York), in which Rembrandt used a painterly technique on a small scale. However, the execution here resembles that of Rembrandt-esque works dating from at least three decades later (see no. 33 and compare Rembrandt’s own technique in no. 15).

An earlier curator assigned the painting to the eighteenth or nineteenth century but did not offer a substantial explanation for doing so. Also questionable are the supposed relationship of the present portrait to an early stage of the Bust of Rembrandt in the Louvre, which was mentioned in an addendum by the Rembrandt Research Project, and the committee’s view that an engraving dated 1790 necessarily reproduces the Museum’s picture.

4. Ibid., I (1982), pp. 652–53, fig. 3. The left contour in our painting suffices to suggest that the print could be after another version.

STYLe OF REMBRANDT

LITERATURE
Bode 1883, pp. 530–31, 588, no. 222, as ca. 1660–62; Michel 1894, p. 247, about 1640[?]; Bode 1897–1906, VII, no. 495, as 1664–66; Holste de Groote 1908–27, VI, no. 754, as signed and dated 1665; Valentin in New York 1969, no. 107, as about 1665; Van Dyke 1923, p. 132, qualities of style “all speak for Maes”; Valentin 1931, no. 163, probably 1664, no trace of inscription visible; Bredius 1933, no. 277; Bauch 1966, no. 425, ca. 1658–60; Gerson 1968, no. 338, agrees with Bauch; von Sonnenburg in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 86, on the condition; Schwartz 1985, fig. 393; Tümpel 1986, no. A 96, as by a Rembrandt pupil about 1660.

EXHIBITED

EX COLL.
First recorded in the collection of the third marquess of Lansdowne, London, in 1854, thence by descent until Marquand purchase in 1883.


**Literature**

Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 564, signed “R H L,” about 1628; Valentiner in New York 1909, no. 74, as a Self-Portrait of about 1628; Hofstede de Groot 1912, p. 188, fig. 12, praises the picture; Valentiner 1921, no. 5; Valentiner 1931, no. 2; Bauch 1933, p. 161, fig. 183; Bredius 1935, no. 10; Pinder 1943, pp. 13, ill., 27, as about 1630; van Gelder 1948, pp. 6, 10, as about 1630; “melancholic”; Valentiner in Raleigh 1956, no. 2; Bauch 1966, no. 293, as by Rembrandt about 1629; Erpel 1967, no. 13; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 547, no. 10, is “not convinced”; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, no. 60, as a self-portrait; Arpino and Lecaldano 1978, no. 31, as a signed self-portrait; Baetjer 1980, I, p. 151, as “Style of Rembrandt, XVIII/XIX century”; Corpus, I (1982), pp. 650–53 (no. C 38); Wright 1982, no. 10; Corpus, II (1986), p. 855, as an imitation from well after 1630.

**Exhibited**


**Ex Coll.**

Wrongly said to be recorded in 1790; first certain mention is in the collection of Leopold II, king of the Belgians (d. 1909), Brusseh.
Flora, the goddess of spring, was a subject rich in meaning for earlier artists such as Titian and for Rembrandt in his more personal interpretations of the theme (see no. 12). However, in the seventeenth century the figure of Flora became exceedingly familiar, appearing in decorative forms and contexts such as garden sculpture, furniture, and embroidery that sometimes diluted its significance. In some Dutch homes the image of Flora in a print or painting would have been connected with an enthusiasm for gardening or flowers, while in others it might barely have been distinguished from the figure of any attractive young woman in fancy dress (for example, a “shepherdess” by Paulus Moreelse).

Rembrandt and his dealer Hendrick Uylenburgh evidently took advantage of Flora’s popularity in the Netherlands. A number of contemporary copies after Rembrandt’s Flora of 1634 (The Hermitage, St. Petersburg) and of his Flora of 1635 (The National Gallery, London) are known; a copy of part of the figure in the former painting (showing the subject from flower-crowned head to waist) on an oval canvas (private collection, The Hague) is especially interesting for the close relationship of its composition to the design of the Museum’s picture. Even closer to our Flora in design is Rembrandt’s Bust of a Young Woman, dated 1633, in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, an oval panel depicting a figure resembling Saskia. Rembrandt must have assigned the subject of Flora to his students: his undated sketch, Susanna at the Bath (Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbezirk, Berlin), after Pieter Lastman’s painting in Berlin, is drawn on the back of a sheet bearing fragmentary records of sales: “his standard bearer [for] 15. - . - / a Flora sold [for] 4.6. - / sold a work by fardynandus [Bol] / and another of his / the Abraham and Flora / Sold Leendeert [van Beyeren]'s Flora 5. - . - ”

Here, on the reverse of a drawing, which has been dated about 1637, are references to inexpensive pictures of Flora, apparently by three different pupils of Rembrandt. Another painting of Flora has been assigned by Sumowski to Rembrandt’s Leiden disciple, Issack Jouderville.

As is discussed in “Rembrandt and the Rembrandt Style in the Seventeenth Century” in this volume, Flinck
probably painted copies and versions of compositions by Rembrandt in the Leeuwarden workshop of Uylelenburgh’s partner, Lambert Jacobsz, even before the young artist became the master’s apprentice in Amsterdam about 1635 or 1636. Given these circumstances and the number of similar female figures Flinck painted in the second half of the 1630s and in the early 1640s, one might have wondered, until recently, where his own picture of Flora could be.

1. Bode 1906, p. 9, first published the picture and wrote that it had long been in the collection of Meyer von Stadelhofen at Schloss Hermance near Genf.
2. Sumowski 1983–94, II, no. 665, with previous literature. Von Sonnenburg recalls seeing the Harrach panel and considers the Flora very similar in style.
3. Ibid., nos. 656, 659, 662, and VI, no. 2279 (Fuji Art Museum, Tokyo).
4. About 1636 Poussin designed marble herms in the guise of Flora and other appropriate mythological figures for the gardens at Vaux-le-Vicomte (now at Versailles). When the Dutch artist Willem Schellinks visited London in 1661 he made note in his diary of an embroidered figure of Spring (supposedly made by Mary Queen of Scots) above the king’s throne at Westminster (Schellinks 1661–63, p. 60). The Museum has a French armoire (no. 25.181), perhaps from the late sixteenth century, with an elaborately framed figure of Flora or Spring (based on an engraving by Adrian Collaert after Maerten de Vos) painted on the inside of a door panel (information kindly supplied by Danielle O. Kislik-Grosheid of the Museum’s department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts). Daniel Seghers and Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert also depicted a decorative ensemble in a painting of 1644, Flowers Decorating a Stone Niche with a Bust of Flora, in the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam.
5. On these interrelated subjects, see Kettering 1983, chap. 4; on Moreel’s paintings of shepherdesses, see de Jonge 1938, figs. 169–72, 175, 179–80, etc.
7. Corpus, II (1986), no. 42, where the figure is described as “a tronie of a young woman in archaic clothing” (p. 360).

LITERATURE

Bode 1906, p. 9, publishes the picture (as by Rembrandt) for the first time; Hoostede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 204, as Flora, “with the features of Saskia”; Rosenberg 1909, p. 138, as Portrait of Saskia as Flora, about 1634; Martin 1921, as authentically signed but not by Rembrandt; Hoostede de Groot 1922, p. 16, does not understand Martin’s doubts; Valentin 1931, no. 32; Bredius 1935, no. 98; Bauch 1966, no. 236; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 555, no. 98, notes the condition problem, rejects Rembrandt; suggests Flinck is perhaps the painter; Kettering 1983, pp. 47, 61, 78–79, fig. 41, as attributed to Rembrandt, and (trusting the inscribed date) as “the first of Rembrandt’s pastoral compositions”; Sumowski 1983–94, V, no. 2081, as by Flinck ca. 1637–40.

EXHIBITED


EX COLL.

Possibly Destouches sale, Paris, March 21, 1794, no. 15 (sold to Jean-Baptiste-Pierre Lebrun). The first indisputable mention of the painting was made when it was in a Swiss private collection in 1906; however, the back of the canvas bears an inscription recording the painting’s transfer from a wood support in 1705.

COPY AFTER JACOB BACKER

23 Portrait of an Old Woman

17th century
Oil on wood, 28 × 24 in. (71.1 × 61 cm)
Inscribed lower right: Rembrandt / f 1640;
upper left: /ÆT· SVÆ· 87
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.2

This portrait inscribed “Rembrandt / f 1640” was in several distinguished collections before Harry Havemeyer bought it in 1891 (for fifty thousand dollars). Bode considered the picture “full of life” and called the version then in the Yarborough Collection (fig. 67) an excellent copy. Valentiner concurred, noting that the three-quarter-length-format of the Yarborough panel indicates that the Havemeyer painting has been cut down. Michel was closer to the mark when he wrote in 1894 that the present picture, “which we once saw in a collection in Paris . . . appeared to be an old copy [of the Yarborough painting]. Another copy, probably by J. Backer, was sold by auction in London in March, 1889.”

There was no such opinion in print when the painting changed hands between 1868 and 1891. Moreover, publications of 1877 and the 1880s had reviewed the picture’s impressive provenance (Countess de Robiano, Prince
Demidoff, Prince Narischkine, Baron de Beurnonville, Rodolphe Kann). Havemeyer himself would have seen the work as similar in type, date, size, and perhaps quality to his portrait of Herman Doomer (no. 8), which had cost him twenty thousand dollars more two years earlier. The panel was hanging over the fireplace of Havemeyer’s library, or Rembrandt Room, so that he faced it when he was at his desk.  

Michel’s connection of our painting to Jacob Backer has been echoed several times in the past century (on Backer’s relation to Rembrandt, see “Rembrandt and the Rembrandt Style in the Seventeenth Century” in this volume). Van Dyke (1923) assigned the picture to Backer because a canvas by him in Berlin (lost in 1945) appeared to represent the same sitter in the same costume and style. Sixty years later Sumowski came to the same conclusion and dated both our portrait and the one formerly in Berlin to about 1636–38 by comparing them to Backer’s Portrait of Johannes Uyttenbogaert, signed and dated 1638 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).  

Bauch (1926) and Martin (1938) considered Backer a possibility. However, scholars of the 1950s thought our picture might be a copy made in the eighteenth or nineteenth century.  

Conservative Dutch portraits present many problems of attribution because those of certain periods and local schools are often more consistent in type and style than works of any other genre. In addition, family portraits were copied frequently in the seventeenth century, both in full-size and reduced versions, either immediately after they were painted or at a somewhat later date, for various relatives (see the discussion under no. 8). Copies made in later centuries are probably less common but they certainly are not unknown. These difficulties are compounded in modern times by a lack of interest in conservative portraiture and by the fact that the relevant pictures usually can be found only in museum storerooms or in Dutch private collections.  

Rudi Ekkart, a leading expert on such portraits, was invited to the Museum in 1988 to survey works in the field. He concluded that the Old Woman “has all the characteristics of a copy and must be an old copy after Jacob Backer.”  

This opinion is supported by comparing our picture with the Yarborough version, which—to judge from the photograph—is an old copy, poorly preserved. The composition is typical of Backer, which suggests that there was (or, less likely, still is) an original of this design. The Dutch workshops that reproduced family portraits maintained a high technical standard; indeed, assistants must have contributed to many originals (called principals in old Dutch inventories), and the master occasionally would have improved the appearance of a workshop replica.  

1. New York 1993, p. 182, fig. 30, and see also fig. 10, where the Old Woman and the Doomer form pendants in the suffrage exhibition held at Knodeller’s in New York in 1915.  


5. The standard works on Backer and on Bartholomeus van der Helst date from the 1920s, and those on Nicolas Eliasz, Michiel van Miereveld, and others were published even earlier.  

6. R. E. O. Ekkart, report submitted to the Museum, November 3, 1988, following a week’s study of Dutch portraits in the collection. Ekkart had earlier imagined that our picture was comparable to the three-quarter-length portraits of women by Backer in the Koninklijk Museum, Antwerp, and in The Wallace Collection, London, but on examination he found it much harder and drier in execution than those examples. For the Antwerp and London pictures, see Bauch 1926, nos. 193, 200, pls. 25, 28; Sumowski 1983–94, I, nos. 59, 63.  

Literature  

Vosmaer 1877, pp. 23–24, with full provenance; Dutuit 1885, p. 20; Michel 1894, p. 208, n. 1; suggests this is a copy; Bode 1895, p. 71, as executed with extreme care; the Yarborough version a copy; Bode 1897–1906, IV, no. 278; Rosenberg 1906, p. 186; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 870; Valentine in New York 1909, no. 89; Van Dyke 1923, p. 47, as possibly by Backer; Bauch 1926, no. 195, “by Rembrandt (Backer?)”; Mather 1930, p. 455, as perhaps by van der Pluym, in any case “too feeble for the label it bears”; Valentine 1931, no. 70; Sumowski 1983–94, I, no. 61, as by Backer.

Fig. 67. Attributed to Jacob Backer. Portrait of an Old Woman, 1638. Oil on wood, 41 × 35 in. (104.1 × 88.9 cm). Location unknown
Exhibited
New York, MMA, “The Hudson-Fulton Celebration,” 1909, no. 89;
New York, MMA, “The H. O. Havemeyer Collection,” 1930, no. 96;
New York, MMA, “Splendid Legacy: The Havemeyer Collection,”
1993, no. 11, as Style of Backer.
Ex Coll.
First appeared in an Amsterdam sale of 1827.

Attributed to Jacob Backer

24. Old Woman in an Armchair

1634?
Oil on canvas, 50⅝ × 39⅜ in. (128 × 99.4 cm)
Inscribed upper right: Rembrandt f. 1633;
upper left: ET-SEVE/70-[3?]-4/[3?]-VE [in monogram]
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.603

This canvas was included in standard catalogues of
Rembrandt’s work through Bauch’s of 1966. If the picture
were newly discovered today, however, Rembrandt’s name
would barely be brought into discussion.

A few early critics considered this painting to be by
Rembrandt at a moment when his style came close to that
of Hals.1 A resemblance to portraiture of the Haarlem school
has also been mentioned recently by van den Brink;2 and
by Bruyn.

In 1988 Ekkart thought the picture might be by Jacob
Backer or that it “may also be a copy after a lost original”
by him (on Backer’s relationship to Rembrandt, see
“Rembrandt and the Rembrandt Style in the Seventeenth Century” in this volume).3 Backer’s portraits reveal closer
connections with the work of artists in Haarlem than do
Rembrandt’s portraits of any date. The present picture’s
execution recalls that of portraits of women painted by
Backer during the 1630s, such as the canvases in Antwerp,
Copenhagen, and London (fig. 68).4 However, the con-
tours and folds of the drapery, and perhaps the woman her-
sel, seem in our picture somewhat agitated by comparison.
In certain areas, for example in the opaque shadows
between the fingers, the style seems less fluid than Backer’s
and superficially closer to that of the circle of Hals. Perhaps
for these reasons, Bruyn, a member of the Rembrandt
Research Project, suggested in 1976 that the painting was
“probably not by Backer, but possibly by a Haarlem
painter.”5

In view of Bruyn’s position, it is surprising to find the
work included in the Corpus as probably from Rembrandt’s
studio in 1635 and “possibly by the same assistant who did
the Portrait of Antonie Coopel [no. C 108],” a panel dated
1635 in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.6 This opinion
was apparently reconciled with Bruyn’s and with the visual
evidence by assuming that “because of the close correspon-
dences . . . to a work such as the Portrait of an Eighty-three-
Year-Old Woman [the oval portrait of 1634 in The National
Gallery, London] it is not unlikely that it was done by a
workshop assistant trained elsewhere [Haarlem].”7 It seems
unnecessary to bring in commuters from other towns such
as Leiden (see nos. 3,4) or Haarlem when the Amsterdam
circle of Rembrandt and Backer offers enough alternatives
for possible authors.

At the upper left the painting is inscribed with the sitter’s
age (70) and below that with what appears to be a fraction:
24 or 34 over a line and another number (37). These last

Fig. 68. Jacob Backer. Portrait of an Old Woman, ca. 1638. Oil on
canvas, 46⅝ × 36⅜ in. (118.8 × 92.5 cm). Inscribed: Rembrandt
f. 1632; Aet.69. The Wallace Collection, London
numbers in fact indicate the year and month of execution; the year must be 1634, considering the picture’s style and the woman’s costume. Backer was in Amsterdam by 1634 and must have had business (such as portrait commissions) with Rembrandt’s dealer, Hendrick Uyleburgh. If the portrait is by Backer or from his shop, it would date from at least two or three years earlier than the portraits in Antwerp, Copenhagen, and London against which its style and quality have been judged. This writer, with Ekkart, favors a tentative attribution to the twenty-six-year-old Backer.

Literature
Lagrange 1863, p. 292; Bode 1897–1906, III, no. 224; Hoefstede de Groot 1898, no. 6; Hoefstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 868; Bredius 1912, pp. 339–40; uses the picture to argue that the Elizabeth Bas is not by Rembrandt; Valentine 1914, pp. 354–55, as by Rembrandt; but reminds one of Hahl; Van Dyke 1923, p. 167, under “pictures by Hahl”; Valentine 1931, no. 34, as painted by Rembrandt “when he comes nearer to Frans Hals than at any other period”; Burroughs 1932a, p. 391, as by Rembrandt; used to question another picture; Bredius 1935, no. 348; Burroughs 1938, pp. 160–61, as typical of Rembrandt even when he “essayed a Hals-like brilliancy of tone and breadth of style”; Bauch 1966, no. 382; Gerson 1968, no. 185, as from Rembrandt’s “Amsterdam circle”; Corpus, III (1989), pp. 699–704 (no. C 112), “may well have been produced in [Rembrandt’s] studio in 1633, probably by the same assistant who was responsible for no. C 108” (p. 702).

Exhibited
Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, “Rembrandt: Schilderijen bijeengebracht ter gelegenheid van de inhuldiging van Hare Majesteit Koningin Wilhelmina,” 1898, no. 35.

Ex Coll.
Hoefstede de Groot (1908–27, VI, no. 868), cites eighteenth-century sales, but the first certain mention of the picture is in the duc de Morny sale, Paris, May 24, 1852.

Attributed to an Amsterdam artist

25 Portrait of a Man Seated in an Armchair

Ca. 1640
Oil on canvas, 42 1/4 × 31 3/4 in. (107.3 × 82.6 cm)
Inscribed upper right: Rembrandt F / 1638
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975
1975.1.139

The style of this portrait and of the sitter’s fashionable clothing suggests a date of about 1640. The resemblance to Rembrandt portraits of the period is slight; presumably scholars would have questioned his authorship earlier than 1969, when it was first rejected, if the picture had been in a public collection.

Haverkamp-Begemann discusses the painting’s condition, the likelihood that it had a pendant, and its attribution in the forthcoming catalogue of paintings in the Robert Lehman Collection.¹ On stylistic grounds one can say little more than that the painter was probably active in Amsterdam.² The most closely comparable known work

Fig. 69. Gerbrand van den Eeckhout, Portrait of Jan Pietersz van den Eeckhout, 1644. Oil on wood, 26 1/4 × 22 1/4 in. (67 × 58 cm). Signed and dated: G. V. eekkout F/A 1644. Musée des Beaux-Arts, Grenoble
from Rembrandt’s circle would appear to be Gerbrand van den Eekhout’s portrait of his father, dated 1644, in Grenoble (fig. 69).\(^1\) The manner of execution seems consistent in the faces and hands, and the sleeve in the Lehman portrait recalls the curtain in the Grenoble picture. However, this evidence offers little that is helpful, and nothing of a more relevant date is available for comparison: no portraits by van den Eekhout of about 1640 (when he was nineteen), or indeed before 1644, are known.

1. The organizers of the present exhibition are grateful to the Trustees of the Robert Lehman Collection and to Egbert Havercamp-Begemann for allowing them to use his material in this entry and in no. 19.

2. The Rembrandt Research Project did not consider it necessary to include the work even among rejected pictures in *Corpus,* III (1989), which cover the years 1635–42.

3. See the colorplate in Sumowski 1983–94, II, no. 520. In his entry Havercamp-Begemann credits the present writer with making this comparison a few years ago and notes that other colleagues also have considered that Eekhout might be the author of the Lehman picture.

**Literature**

Bode 1897–1906, IV, no. 273; “Old Masters at Burlington House,” *Times* (London), January 21, 1902, p. 15; anonymous critic, states that “the weak and timid painting of the black coat bears no relation whatever to the style and handling of the master”; Hoftede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 768, with provenance; Rosenblum 1909, p. 252; Bredius 1935, no. 215; Bauch 1966, no. 383; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 565, no. 215, as not by Rembrandt but related to the early work of Bartholomeus van der Helst.
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Probably in an Amsterdam sale of 1797; bought by the earl of Mansfield in London about 1818; sold to Philip Lehman in 1911.

---

**Follower of Rembrandt**

### 26 Man with a Steel Gorget

*Ca. 1645–50?*

Oil on canvas, 37 1/2 x 30 1/2 in. (94.3 x 77.8 cm)

Inscribed lower left: Rembrandt / f. 1644

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913

14.40.601

Some eighty years ago this picture seemed the fulfillment of a dream that has distracted several Rembrandt scholars: Rembrandt’s portrait of Constantijn Huygens rediscovered.\(^2\) Jan Lievens successfully pressed Huygens to sit for a portrait (fig. 6),\(^3\) but Rembrandt never had the honor of painting him, nor did any of his pupils, so far as is known.

Not only Huygens’s features but also his pose and expression in every known portrait of him are more refined than this figure’s. The lack of reserve and apparent lack of character here are anomalous for both Huygens and Rembrandt in the 1640s, when the picture—whichever its author is—must have been painted. In the 1630s Rembrandt made a few rakish self-portraits and at least two formal portraits (Portrait of a Man Rising from His Chair [fig. 51] and *Marten Soolmans* of 1634 in a private collection, Paris) that anticipate this work in gesture or expression. However, even the most demonstrative portraits of the 1640s by Rembrandt are entirely different in mood and meaning, as is made evident by comparing the figure here with the preacher Anslo in the double portrait of him and his wife of 1641 (Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin); with the gesturing captain in *The Night Watch* of 1642 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); and with the Calvinist clergyman Sylvius in his etched portrait of 1646 (fig. 70). The gesture, the angle of the head, and the expression of the last subject bring him closest to the man in a gorget. However, this effect in the portrait of Sylvius notwithstanding, the etching is not necessarily important for the painting’s conception and date, for such clever formal devices circulated quickly in Rembrandt’s milieu.\(^4\)

Like many other pictures, the *Man with a Steel Gorget* was said to be by Rembrandt as recently as the 1960s but was often doubted in earlier decades. Nicolaes Maes, Govert Flinck, and Willem Drost have been mentioned as possible authors, only Flinck sensibly so.\(^5\) Gerson dismissed it, as he did others, as “an 18th century imitation.”\(^6\)

Close consideration of the picture’s technique lends no support to suspicions of a date later than the seventeenth century (see entry by Hubert von Sonnenburg, vol. I), but the painting’s present appearance makes it hard to place precisely. In all respects, however, the work is typical of Rembrandt’s immediate circle in the 1640s. Every plausible candidate was out of the nest by this time: indeed, the degree of finish and firmness of modeling recalls the class of the 1630s—Ferdinand Bol (see no. 43), Flinck (see no. 49), Gerbrand van den Eekhout, and Jan Victors—rather than
1640s the artist might have posed and dressed a figure and set him into a shallow space and shows as well how he might have given a sitter an ingratiating expression.

The facial types in our painting and van den Eckhout’s portraits of himself and his father are dissimilar, but there is a family resemblance between the subject in the Man with a Steel Gorget and a fair number of other figures in his oeuvre. Nearly the same face was given to the main protagonists in Joseph and His Brothers of 1657 in Skoklosters Castle, Sweden, and in Alexander and the Wives of Darius of 1662 in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich.9 The type is even related to sitters for portraits such as the children of the Tolling family in van den Eckhout’s canvas dated 1667 (location unknown).10 Whatever its sources, the gesture of the man in the Museum’s painting was favored by van den Eckhout, as two figures in the Levite and His Concubine (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.) and other characters in his history pictures demonstrate.11

Whether this is a portrait or an imaginary subject is impossible to determine because Rembrandt and his pupils presented themselves, their colleagues, and other models in studio costumes that included berets, gorgets, gold chains, and (in the 1640s) slashed doublets, as here. In general, gloves and chains gave a figure the look of a gentleman, while the gorget lent him a martial air.12

Samuel van Hoogstraten, Maes, Drost, and the other young artists who were Rembrandt’s pupils between about 1640 and the early 1650s.

The only other hints of possible authorship come from the facial type and the gesticulating hand. Each occurs several times in the oeuvre of van den Eckhout. In 1992 Slive mentioned that van den Eckhout might be responsible when this writer suggested that the brushwork (not the gesture) of the hand seemed distinctive.6 Comparison with van den Eckhout’s history pictures does not support or speak against Slive’s intuition. However, van den Eckhout’s portrait of his father, dated 1644 (fig. 69), is similar in the modeling of the face and hand (especially in the textured treatment of the latter), the drawing of the eyes and mouth, the planar effect of the costume, and the hand conspicuously placed to enhance the figure’s physical presence.7 The execution of van den Eckhout’s supposed Self-Portrait (on a small panel) in the Galleria dell’Accademia Carrara, Bergamo, is not as close, but the figure wears what seems to be the same pendant, a steel gorget, and a beret.8 A self-portrait drawing in Paris (fig. 71) offers another indication of the way in the

Fig. 70. Rembrandt. Portrait of Johannes Cornelis Sylvius, 1646. Etching, 11 × 73/4 in. (27.8 × 18.8 cm). Signed and dated: Rembrandt 1646. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Sylmaris Collection, Gift of George Coe Graves, 1920. 20.46.19

1. Schmidt-Degener 1914, pp. 221-23. On similar attempts to find a portrait of Huygens in Rembrandt’s oeuvre, see Slive 1953, p. 18, n. 2.

2. For Huygen’s own account of this, see Schwartz 1985, p. 76.

3. See, for example, van den Eckhout’s drawing of an elderly man in an illusionistic oval frame of 1649 in the Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (Sumowski 1979-82, III, no. 616).

4. Oral opinions: Benesch, 1940 (Maes); de Vries, 1952 (Finck); Daan Cevat, 1966 (Drost).

5. On a visit to the Museum in 1976 Gerson suggested that the painting was either by Bol or by an eighteenth-century imitator of Bol.


7. See the colorplate in Sumowski 1983-94, II, no. 520.

8. Ibid., no. 524. His date of ca. 1650 seems too late.

9. Ibid., nos. 467, 446. The Swedish picture was exhibited at the Nationalmuseum in Stockholm (see Stockholm 1992-93, no. 81).


11. Ibid., no. 425 (formerly in the collection of Emile Wolf, New York).
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EX COLL.
First recorded in the Radstock sale, Christie’s, London, May 12, 1826, no. 23 (sold to Lord Ailesbury).

FOLLOWER OF REMBRANDT

27 Portrait of a Man with a Breastplate and Plumed Hat

Ca. 1646?
Oil on canvas, 47⅛ × 38⅞ in. (121.3 × 98.4 cm)
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.102

28 Portrait of a Woman

Ca. 1646?
Oil on canvas, 47⅛ × 38⅞ in. (121.3 × 98.1 cm)
Inscribed at left, on chair: Rembrandt f / 1643
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.103

Like the van Beresteyn portraits (nos. 3, 4) and Herman Doomer (no. 8), these pictures in the Havemeyer collection reflect an American enthusiasm for Rembrandt portraits—or portraits that were thought to be by Rembrandt in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.1

In their present state the paintings appear deceptively smooth. Their manner of execution and quality are hard to judge in the original and hard to imagine from photographs. Most scholars in recent decades have considered these pictures (once known as “The Admiral and His Wife”) to have been produced by an immediate follower of Rembrandt in the 1640s. Several artists in Rembrandt’s circle painted portraits that are generally similar and that recall compositions such as his Portrait of a Young Woman, Probably Maria Trip of 1639 (on loan to the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) and his pendant portraits of 1641, Nicolaes Bambreck (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts, Brussels) and Agatha Bas (Buckingham Palace, London).2 Because of Rembrandt’s success with the genre and his authority as a teacher from the mid-1630s onward, many portraits of the period from about 1635 to about 1650 present problems of connoisseurship.

In the early twentieth century Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol were the routine recipients of paintings rejected from Rembrandt’s oeuvre. Van Dyke (1923) gave these pictures to Flinck, and Burroughs (1932) assigned them to Bol “at a precise moment,” 1643.3 Valentin (1931) and Bredius (1935) retained the attribution to Rembrandt, while Bauch (1966) admitted that the paintings might be “perhaps especially successful works” by Bol.4

Dutch scholars of the 1950s came to similar conclusions. On visits to the Museum van Gelder (1954) suggested Rembrandt’s workshop, about 1645–50; de Vries (1952) thought “not Maes, nor Flinck, nor Bol—Victors?”; and
S. J. Gudlaugsson (1956) said “close to Victors.” Gerson, about 1965, proposed “Bol, maybe Victors” in conversation but wrote “certainly by F. Bol” in his edition of Bredius (1969). In 1973 Sumowski considered the last opinion to be one of the few convincing attributions to a pupil Gerson had made, but he soon rescinded his kindness in favor of an ascription to the obscure Rembrandt follower Reymier van Gherwen.

An attribution to Bol has been rejected by the author of the standard monograph on his work. It seems likely that our painter, if he was not Bol himself, was quite familiar with works by Bol such as his Self-Portrait in Springfield, Massachusetts, and similar compositions (see figs. 29, 72). A number of portraits of this kind by Bol show poses, gestures, fancy costumes, accessories, and props quite like those in our pictures, although these elements also appear in works by Gerbrand van den Eeckhout, Flinck, Jan Victors, and other artists.

Bol’s usual figures have softer modeling and more convincing light and volume than do the man and woman depicted here. The more linear rendering of the face in the Havemeyer Man (compare his eyes and eyebrows to those in figs. 29, 72) and his stringy hair and the simply shaded hands and pedantically described costume of the Woman are among the features that seem less successful than the corresponding passages in portraits indisputably by Bol. Nonetheless, the Museum’s paintings are sufficiently close to the work of Bol to leave open the possibility that they were produced in his workshop or otherwise under his direct influence, especially since their condition does not allow for the drawing of fine distinctions.

A few of the scholars cited above, and more recently Manuth (now a member of the Rembrandt Research Project), have proposed an attribution to Jan Victors. He was an accomplished portraitist by 1640, to judge from his lovely Young Woman at a Window of this date in the Louvre. The figures in the Havemeyer paintings bring to mind a number by Victors; the “Admiral,” for example, recalls Joseph in Joseph Interpreting the Dreams of the Baker and the Cup Bearer (fig. 73) in the facial features (most notably in the long eyebrows) and oily hair. There are portraits by Victors in which the facial features resemble those of the Havemeyer couple, and yet they clearly depict other people. A peculiar V-shaped indentation like a horse’s hoof in the palm of the Havemeyer man’s outstretched hand is employed again in Victors’s Young Man in Fancy Dress of 1654 in the Musée de Toulon.

Both of the Museum’s pictures recall paintings by Victors of the 1640s in their angular or otherwise ungainly outlines, their petty costume and jewelry details, and their fussy reflections on garment folds. They share with them as well a more localized use of color and light and shadow than one finds in contemporary pictures by Bol, who was three years older than Victors and worked in Rembrandt’s studio at about the same time.

This writer favors an attribution to Victors about 1643 to 1648, when he worked independently in Amsterdam. At the time he was “plagued by dramatic and inexplicable fluctuations in quality,” which along with the presence of borrowed ideas and damage would tend to obscure the evidence of his authorship.

For most visitors to the present exhibition these pictures will be interesting because of their connection not with Bol or Victors specifically but with the neglected activity as portraitists of Rembrandt’s pupils in general. Portraiture was an important and often the most dependable line of their work. It was also an area more subject to conventions, both social and artistic, than were other kinds of figure painting. Even specialists find it difficult to detect the hand of the same artist in formal portraits and imaginary subjects such as nos. 29, attributed to Drost, and 46, by Drost. However, it was common for portraitists (not least beginners) to borrow and slightly modify each other’s ideas. Rembrandt’s own activity as a portraitist declined in the 1640s, but his Self-Portrait of 1640 (fig. 31) influenced the “Admiral” and dozens of other pictures, while his Agatha Bas
left its mark on the Havemeyer Woman. Finally, the gesture of introduction shown in the Man with a Breastplate is one that Rembrandt himself had borrowed and modernized at least a decade earlier (see no. 6 and its pendant, fig. 53).

3. Burroughs 1932b, p. 459. See also Burroughs 1938, p. 157, claiming that the woman’s face was repainted in the eighteenth century; “if one dare judge by the type of beauty and the crackle of the pigment.” One may not dare on both counts.
5. Oral opinions; Gerson in Bredius 1969, pp. 566, 578, nos. 223, 364, citing Burroughs and Bauch.
10. Manuth, in conversation, 1991. In a letter to the writer dated August 6, 1992, Manuth emphasizes that he has “never been fully convinced” by his intuition. Miller (see Miller 1985) read an early draft of the present entry and concluded: “While I wouldn’t discount Victors completely, I do see at least as many indications of Bol’s hand” (letter to the writer, March 15, 1993).

12. Ibid., no. 1788a.
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**Exhibited**


**Ex Coll.**

First recorded in Paris during the 1880s.
There has been general agreement for some time, and now more than ever, that *The Sibyl* was painted by Rembrandt’s former pupil Willem Drost, probably between about 1654 and 1656. This view was first advanced in 1923 by Van Dyke on the basis of comparisons of the picture with the *Young Woman in Fancy Dress* in The Wallace Collection (fig. 62), which was acquired in 1872 as a Drost despite its Rembrandt signature, and with Drost’s *Bathsheba* in the Louvre (fig. 40), which is signed and dated 1654. The same model seems to appear in the present canvas and the Wallace picture; the female type and the approach to drawing facial features in both are characteristic of Drost. These hallmarks are evident even in Drost’s painting of another figure, his *Portrait of a Woman*, signed and dated 1653, in the Museum Bredius, The Hague, which is a pendant to our *Portrait of a Man* (no. 46). The original version of the Museum’s *Young Woman with a Pearl Necklace* (see no. 30 and fig. 74) is also close to *The Sibyl*, not only in the figure type but also in the drawing and shading of the face, in the loose treatment of the garment, and to some extent in the pose, with its circular arrangement of arms and shoulders.

The costume in *The Sibyl* is more broadly painted than the garments in most otherwise similar pictures by Drost. Although there are differences in technique, the execution still recalls that in the cloak of the *Young Woman* in The Wallace Collection and in the drapery of other figures by Drost, such as the *Virgin Annunciata* in Prague. The most conspicuous passages of impasto in the Museum’s painting have led scholars to echo or revive Bode’s opinion (1902) that this was “one of Rembrandt’s few sum- marily executed pictures,” painted about 1667. Despite Valentine’s uncharacteristically persuasive arguments against an attribution to Rembrandt and in favor of Drost (1939), Harry Wehle, curator at the Museum, concluded in 1942 that comparison of the present picture with the newly acquired *Portrait of a Man* (no. 46) eliminated Drost from consideration: “The Museum’s glorious Sibyl, long ascribed to Rembrandt . . . was recently for a few years labeled Drost, largely on the basis of a picture in the Wallace Collection; but now with such an excellent opportunity to study Drost’s style . . . the Museum takes this occasion in all mod- esty to reattribute its Sibyl to Rembrandt himself.”

This optimistic opinion endured on the catalogue cards of the Museum’s European Paintings Department until Haverkamp-Begemann overruled it in 1980. The unusual swath of drapery that is stroked, indeed almost smeared, over the near shoulder has troubled some critics. As Hubert von Sonnenburg explains (see “On Condition,” vol. I), glazes originally made the cloak less conspicuous. The handling is not inconsistent with Drost’s painterly experiments of about 1654 to 1660.

For Borenius this canvas demonstrated that “Rembrandt must have been acquainted with one of the many varia- tions on this motif by Domenichino.” There are actually but a few comparable works by Domenichino (the most similar being *The Cumaean Sibyl* of 1616–17 in the Galleria Borghese, Rome); the graceful arrangement of arms in them does, however, seem to have been emulated in *The Sibyl*. The subject is rare in Northern European art; indeed, isolated Sibyls are seldom found outside paintings of the Bolognese circle of Domenichino and Guido Reni. Few, if any, of these pictures were engraved before the eighteenth century. It seems plausible, then, that *The Sibyl* was painted by Drost in Italy, where he worked from about 1655 until at least about 1660.
COPY AFTER WILLEM DROST

30 Young Woman with a Pearl Necklace

Ca. 1655 or later
Oil on canvas, 33⅜ x 24½ in. (84.1 x 62.2 cm)
Inscribed lower right: [illegible]
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.629

Very few pictures in the exhibition have fallen so precipitously as this canvas identified as a Rembrandt and christened Hendrickje Stoffels by Hofstede de Groot when he published it for the first time in 1909. He placed it in the master’s “ripest period,” close to the Woman at an Open Door (Hendrickje Stoffels?) of about 1656 in Berlin (fig. 63), and considered the version in Dresden (fig. 74) to be merely a copy.1 Hofstede de Groot’s discovery soon became a “Duveen” and an Altman Rembrandt, one of six portraits of a personal nature in the collection, according to Valentiner in 1914.

Van Dyke (1923) assigned the painting to Barent Fabritius on the basis of its “Fabritius red” and “Fabritius mood.” In one of his rare reversals, Valentiner (1939) accepted this view and used it to clarify the differences in style between Fabritius and Drost. He described the Altman painting’s simplifications and perceptively compared the Dresden canvas to The Sibyl (no. 29) and to Drost’s racy Batsheba in the Louvre (fig. 40). The same model depicted in the present work (not likely Hendrickje) evidently appears in the Paris and Dresden pictures.

The attribution to Barent Fabritius is understandable given that his technique, like this anonymous copyist’s, is superficial compared with Drost’s. Nonetheless, neither red nor mood but only a few shadows recall Fabritius here.


Fig. 74. Willem Drost. Young Woman with a Pearl Necklace, ca. 1654. Oil on canvas mounted on wood, 30⅜ x 24½ in. (78 x 62.5 cm). Gemäldegalerie, Dresden
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EX COLL.
First appeared in the London trade [Lesser], about 1909; [Duveen Bros., London]; Benjamin Altman, New York.
31 Man in Armor (Mars?)

1650s
Oil on canvas, 40¾ x 35¼ in. (101.9 x 90.5 cm)
Purchase, 1871
71.84

This canvas depicting an old man in armor, possibly Mars, was most likely painted by a Rembrandt pupil or follower in the 1650s. The composition, in its rather shallow space, nearly frontal figure, and contrasts of light and shadow, recalls paintings by Rembrandt dating from the early to mid-1650s, as well as many Rembrandtesque works of that period.1 The production of that decade presents seemingly countless problems of connoisseurship: pictures once thought to be by Rembrandt are now routinely attributed and then reattributed to figures of the 1650s such as Willem Drost (see no. 29), Barent Fabritius, Gerrit Willemsz. Horst (d. late 1652), Salomon Koninck (d. 1656), Nicolaes Maes, and Karel van der Pluym.

A well-known example is the Man in a Golden Helmet (Mars?) (fig. 2, vol. 1) which Bode bought from Colnaghi's in 1897 and which long remained unquestioned as a Rembrandt. Like a Prussian Mona Lisa, the picture was ubiquitous, appearing not only as the frontispiece of the Phaidon monograph in 1942 but also as decoration on objects of popular culture.2 As recently as 1969 Gerson, while rejecting the old identification of the model as Rembrandt's brother, Adriaen van Rijn (who was also thought to have been discovered in the present picture),3 said no more about the style than that “the contrast between the thickly painted helmet (like the uniform of the lieutenant in The Nightwatch) and the thinly painted face adds to the richness and variety of the conception.”4 Not a single scholar in the field would now defend the Berlin painting as a Rembrandt. Van der Pluym and Heyman Dullaert have been mentioned as possible authors, but the curator in Berlin wrote reasonably in 1986 that “the discussion of this has just begun.”5

The Museum's Man in Armor was catalogued from its acquisition in 1871 until 1949 as a work by Arent de Gelder (1643–1727). Apart from some pictures of the 1680s with vaguely similar faces, de Gelder never painted anything like this work.6 Valentine, at the Museum in 1946, said he thought Carel Fabritius was probably the author; however, in his exhibition of 1956, “Rembrandt and His Pupils,” he favored an attribution to Dullaert (a poet and minor Rembrandt pupil from Rotterdam) because Houbraken (1721), supposedly on the authority of the artist’s niece, records that a “War God Mars in Shining Armor” by Dullaert was once sold in Amsterdam as a painting by Rembrandt.7 This is extremely thin evidence, given that the subject was common in Rembrandt’s circle8 and that an entirely different picture with the same theme by Dullaert may have existed. Nonetheless, Sumowski placed the canvas among seven figure paintings by Dullaert on the strength of Valentiner’s suggestion, but “only as a hypothesis,” in view of the “striking stylistic changes” in Dullaert’s work.9

The last remark must be inspired by a comparison of Dullaert’s two signed figure compositions (there are two signed still lifes as well), the Doctor in His Study in Groningen, which recalls the small genre pictures of Quiringh van Brekelenkam, and a mediocre (and ruined) Cimor and Iphigenia in Épinal that has some relation to the late mythological scenes of Ferdinand Bol and Jacob van Loo.10 Thus, visual and documentary evidence supporting an attribution to Dullaert is virtually nonexistent.

Fig. 75. Karel van der Pluym. An Old Scholar in His Studio, ca. 1655–60. Oil on canvas, 28 x 20 in. (71.1 x 50.8 cm).
Signed: Karel.van d[...]. Formerly private collection, Chicago
It was apparently at the suggestion of Lugg that the Museum’s curator Harry Wehle changed the attribution from de Gelder to van der Pluym in 1949. In 1954 van Gelder thought van der Pluym was “perhaps the best name,” but he was “not quite convinced.” In a letter of 1956 Valentiner rejects van der Pluym as “a very mediocre artist,” adding that “the many attributions of Bredius to van der Pluym are very questionable, which is also the opinion of the Dutch critics with whom I talked at the Leyden Exhibition last summer.” On a visit in 1969 Blankert went much further, dismissing any Dutch name in favor of some English imitator “near Reynolds.” More recently, however, Speelman supported the attribution to van der Pluym, as did Grimm, who regarded Dullaert as a “wild guess.”

The cataloguing of van der Pluym’s oeuvre was in no way advanced by Henry Adams’ article of 1984, in which the author adds some famous former Rembrandts to three of Bredius’s attributions to the artist. Adams’ arguments for assigning pictures to the oeuvre involve similarities in physiognomy and generalized descriptions of brushwork, which together suffice only to show that most of his “Pluym” can be attributed to any one of four or five Rembrandt followers active during the 1650s and 1660s.

A distant cousin of Rembrandt’s, van der Pluym (1625–1672) was a founding member of the Leiden painters’ guild in 1648 and served as its headman and dean between 1652 and 1655. He was also on the Leiden town council, held the office of municipal plumber (which does not mean that he fixed faucets), and once had received a substantial inheritance. In 1661 he declined to pay outstanding dues to the painters’ guild on the grounds that he had left the profession. In his will dated 1662 he left three thousand guilders to each of Adriaen van Rijn’s children and the same amount to Rembrandt’s son, Titus.

If van der Pluym ever studied with Rembrandt, he would probably have done so from about 1645 to 1648. His few signed works and those plausibly attributed to him recall Rembrandt in a few motifs and in style bring to mind Barent Fabritius (in the small interior scenes), Joachim von Sandrart, Abraham van Dijck (see no. 36), and Willem Drost (see no. 29). Paintings by these artists often look alike in photographs (not to mention the mezzotints and other prints upon which early Rembrandt connoisseurship was often based). Firsthand experience of the works in the present exhibition, however, should make it clear that the painter of the Man in Armor is not the painter of the Sibyl (no. 29) or of the Old Woman Cutting Her Nails (no. 36). It is partly a process of elimination and partly the evidence of one signed work by van der Pluym, a canvas formerly in Chicago (fig. 75), that have encouraged an attribution of the Museum’s picture to him. In these two pictures the handling of paint appears similar in the blotchy descriptions of fur, the stroked-on beards, the buildup of light on the hands, and perhaps in the sketchy but labored drapery folds. Both canvases demonstrate an ability on the part of their author, or authors, to create volume through contrasts of light and dark. Hands and faces are effectively modeled, but details such as the eyes are weak; the artist, if indeed it was a single individual, was neither a gifted draftsman nor a careful student of anatomy. Textured and reflective surfaces are highlighted in both pictures by impasto dragged across the surface. Finally, in both the Chicago picture and our own, as in other works assigned to van der Pluym, the creation of a sense of space depends entirely on the figures and objects, which fail to free themselves completely from the background. It is not clear whether our man in armor has lost his left arm in the struggle with his surroundings, but he surely appears to have bumped his head.

It would be incautious to consider the attribution of the present painting to van der Pluym as anything more than a possibility. Too little is known of Rembrandt’s distant relative, and the oeuvres of his known contemporaries are in some cases no more precisely defined than his own. In the past the appearance of one painting signed by a previously unrecorded name, or by a name connected with Rembrandt in documents but never before seen on a picture (for example, Jacob van Dorsten), resulted in the rethinking of another minor artist’s oeuvre, and this could perhaps happen again with regard to the Man in Armor.

1. There are antecedents, of course. Compare the more dynamic version of the pose in our painting in a drawing by Flinck of about 1635–40 in Berlin (Amsterdam 1984–85, no. 52).
2. Metal trash cans, for example. The Phaidon monograph is Borenius 1942.
3. In 1954 the title was changed from Portrait of a Man in Armor to Adriaen van Rijn in Armor. The latter title somehow survived until 1987.
5. Kelch 1986, p. 27.
6. This point was made in a letter from Humphrey Ward to the Museum in 1910. On de Gelder, see van Moltke 1994.
10. Ibid., I, nos. 343, 344. See the entry on van Loo’s CIMON and IPHIGENIA (private collection) in The Hague 1992, no. 29.
11. Notes on the back of an old photograph include the sentence, “FL suggests F. Bol or C. v.d. Pluym.” A line appended to the latter name reads, “HW 1948 thinks as near as anything yet.”
13. Letter, November 12, 1936, from Valentiner to Josephine Allen, who was in charge of loans at the Museum. Valentiner is referring to Bredius 1931 and Leiden 1936.
14. Blankert, oral opinion, describing the color and craquelure as “wrong for the 17th century.”
15. The late Edward Speelman, dealer and distinguished connoisseur, at the Museum on November 15, 1982.
19. Van der Pluym’s Old Fish and Vegetable Seller, signed and dated 1648 (Sumowski 1983–84, IV, no. 1592a), recalls the Twelve Months of 1642–43 by Sandrart (Klemm 1986, nos. 35–48).
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Ex Coll.
Unknown before its purchase in Paris, 1870.

Follower of Rembrandt

32 Portrait of a Young Man (“The Auctioneer”)

Ca. 1655–60
Oil on canvas, 42 3/8 × 34 in. (108.6 × 86.4 cm)
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.624

Among the works in the Museum’s collection formerly considered to be by Rembrandt, the so-called Auctioneer is one of the most impressive in quality. The picture represents a scholar in his study and appears to have been painted by a close follower of Rembrandt between about 1655 and 1660. This hypothesis may be tested in the exhibition by direct comparisons of the canvas with several indisputable Rembrandts, such as the Aristotle (no. 11), which also depicts a scholar in his study, the The Standard Bearer (no. 13), the Man with a Magnifying Glass (no. 17), the Marquand Portrait of a Man (no. 20), which displays a similar use of light and shadow in the face, The Sibyl attributed to Willem Drost (no. 29), and other apparently contemporary paintings.

Rembrandt’s authorship of The Auctioneer has been doubted in print only recently, although in conversation in 1933 Schmidt-Degener proposed an implausible attribution to Jan Lievens, on the basis of perceived similarities with Lievens’s Self-Portrait of about 1638 in The National Gallery, London.1 In 1976 Bruyn, on behalf of the Rembrandt Research Project, admitted that the painting had “puzzled the committee but it now seems all right to them.”2 Benjamin Altman, who paid Duveen Brothers $262,980 for the canvas in 1909, would have been relieved to learn this, had he still been alive.

Apparently the first rejection of Rembrandt’s authorship in print is that offered in the Museum’s Art and Autoradiography of 1982. The authors of this publication find that autoradiographs of the painting show that “the usual clear painted sketch” seen in most pictures by Rembrandt is lacking here. The autoradiographs also reveal an unconvincing definition of form in the “broad brushstrokes and palette-knife markings of the cloak” and an “absence of the characteristic buildup of brushwork for lighting effects in the background.”3 While all this may be true, there are equally important stylistic qualities that are obvious on the picture’s surface about which the authors are curiously reticent. For some readers the most interesting revelation of the autoradiographs may be that the broken column (a common vanitas motif in portraiture), which is sketchily indicated in the left background, may have replaced the first traces of a window. Such a change seems to indicate an iconographic program less carefully conceived than the one devised, for instance, for the Aristotle.

More conspicuous shortcomings include the execution of the young man’s entire costume, especially the sleeve and cuff, which are fashioned of painterly passages brushed out with little thought for texture, modeling, the underlying anatomy (where is the elbow?), or complexities of the
behavior of light. Comparisons with the broadly rendered sleeves in the Aristotle and in the Flora (no. 12) and with the costume in the Man with a Magnifying Glass show that the painter of The Auctioneer imitated the surface effects of Rembrandt’s late manner but not its descriptive qualities. Similarly, schematic reproductions of the master’s ideas are revealed when the head in the Altman picture, with its flat effect of hair framing the face, its opaque stroke of shadow below the hat, and the abrupt division of the face into light and dark areas, is measured against the head in the Aristotle or in the Man with a Magnifying Glass. The awkward alignment of the nose with the brow and the inaccurate placement of the eyes with respect to the eyebrows in The Auctioneer indicate that the painter thought more in terms of additive elements than of fundamental concerns such as the head’s structure or the actual behavior of light. In the articulation of the near hand, however, the sense of form and the impression of natural light are stronger than elsewhere and are reminiscent of Rembrandt’s approach.¹

That the Altman painting as a whole lacks volume and clarity in its suggestion of space is also demonstrated by comparison with the Aristotle (despite the latter picture’s abraded background). The curtain to the upper right in The Auctioneer and the bust below it (which looks off center on its pedestal) appear to have been inserted into whatever area remained to the right of the figure. The sculpture itself, to judge from known Roman busts with covered heads, seems to be imaginary and evidently was included simply as a conventional attribute of a scholar or writer. A bust with a covered head appears with two other busts in a drawing of what is thought to be Rembrandt’s studio (fig. 22), where they complemented the nude model as recommended subjects for students of draftsmanship. In the inventory of Rembrandt’s household made in 1656 “3 or 4 antique heads of women” are listed right after “A Vitellius” and “A Seneca.”² Virtually all the antique busts that are included in scholar portraits of the seventeenth century are identifiable, representing appropriate sages such as Socrates, Seneca, or Marcus Aurelius.³ The generic nature of the bust in The Auctioneer, the absence of books in the background (the usual purpose of a curtain in such a setting was to protect a bookcase), and the intrusive column suggest that the artist considered his picture not as a contribution to the tradition of scholar portraits but merely as an essay in fashionable portraiture.

When failures of form coincide with failures of content, as they do here, the connoisseur stands on fairly firm ground in proposing deattributions. Vosmaer’s now merely amusing idea (which he adopted from the Viennese dealer von Lippmann) that the present picture may be a portrait by Rembrandt of Thomas Jacobsz Haeringh, the auctioneer of the artist’s property in 1658,⁴ is a misreading encouraged by the actual painter, who himself trivialized well-established conventions of portraiture. Of course, the false signature and date, which are unexpectedly located on the folio (or supposed sale catalogue) encouraged the identification with Haeringh. Perhaps the person who gave the picture its traditional title, based on a confused reference to a portrait etching by Rembrandt,⁵ also conceived the inscription.

1. Schmidt-Degener, oral opinion, recorded by the Museum’s curator Harry Wehle, April 15, 1933. Wilhelm Martin, by contrast, called the picture “a great and unmistakable Rembrandt” on a visit to the Museum in 1938.
3. Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 87, citing Haverkamp-Begemann’s doubts, expressed orally in 1979. The present writer’s proposal of an attribution to Willem Drost as “so more than a working hypothesis” (Liedtke 1993, pp. 123–25) is in line with the picture’s likely date and its level of quality but cannot be supported by comparison with paintings securely attributed to Drost. Drost’s most Rembrandtesque pictures date from before he went to Italy about 1655 and reveal only some superficial similarities in style to The Auctioneer.
4. Von Sonnenburg made this observation in conversation with the writer early in 1995. We also admired the light catching the index finger of the other hand and the cuff behind the book.
5. Strauss and van der Meulen 1979, p. 335, nos. 331–33; no. 334 is “another 4 different heads.”
6. For typical examples, see Held 1969, figs. 15–18.
8. The sitter bears a slight resemblance to “Young Haring” in Rembrandt’s etching of 1655 (Bartsch 275), but his father, “Old Haring,” whose portrait Rembrandt etched about the same time (Bartsch 274), was the auctioneer of the artist’s possessions in 1658.

LITERATURE

Vosmaer 1877, p. 356, accepts the identification with “Haring”; Bode 1883, p. 34, is inclined to accept the identification with Haring, which the bust in the picture supports (as an item on the auction block); Bode 1897–1906, VI, no. 415, doubts the Haring identification because of his age; Valentiner 1905, p. 51, says Titus was the model; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 756, with provenance; Valentiner in New York 1909, no. 104B; Valentiner 1931, no. 135, as “Titus?”, Bredius 1935, no. 294, as Young Man with Manuscript; Bauch 1966, no. 422, as a portrait of a writer; Clark 1966, p. 77, finds the bust “disturbingly animated”; Gerson 1968, no. 340; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 572, no. 294, as a “beautiful portrait”; Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 87, finds technical features uncharacteristic of Rembrandt; Tümpel 1986, no. A 94, as “Rembrandt Circle,” noting doubts expressed in recent literature; Liedtke 1993, pp. 123–25, as by a follower of Rembrandt.

EXHIBITED

New York, MMA, “The Hudson-Fulton Celebration,” 1909, no. 104B.

EX COLL.

First recorded in an Amsterdam sale of May 23, 1798.
Young Man in a Red Cloak

1650s?
Oil on wood, 15 3/4 x 12 7/8 in. (38.4 x 31.1 cm)
Inscribed lower right: Rembrandt / f· 1659 (?)
The Jules Bache Collection, 1949
49.7.3

The taste for painterly pictures and psychological interpretation enhanced appreciation of this modest work in the first half of the twentieth century. Valentiner and others thought the sitter was Rembrandt's son, Titus (see also nos. 40, 41), whose early death may have moved Benc ges to describe the model here as "one of those consumptive figures that the late Rembrandt liked to portray."1

Remarkably, Rembrandt's authorship was rejected for the first time by Gerson in 1969. In 1976 the panel reminded Bruyn of Reynolds's studio; in the 1970s the Museum followed the then routine displacement of brushy pictures to the eighteenth century.2 The modeling of the head is, however, typical of Dutch artists in the second half of the seventeenth century, and there is nothing distinctive of a later period about the work.

Sumowski recently attributed this small picture to Willem Drost about 1652 to 1655 (see nos. 29, 30, 46), on the basis of its resemblance in style and composition to an even smaller supposed self-portrait signed "DF" (for Drost fecit).3 The similarity is impressive but hardly decisive.

It was often observed in the past that the subject in our painting looks very much like the man in The Jewish Bride of about 1662 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). This may be a coincidence, as only the faces are similar, although the eyes are very different, and the man in Rembrandt's large canvas appears to be five or ten years older than the young man here. Moreover, the composition of the small study conforms to an arrangement of the head and shoulders that was used variously by Ferdinand Bol (see fig. 72) and other Rembrandt pupils of the 1640s and early 1650s, including Drost—something one would not expect if it were derived from The Jewish Bride. The downward glance occurs several times in Rembrandt's oeuvre of about 1652 to 1654.4

These considerations are all circumstantial but tend to support the view that the picture is by a Rembrandt pupil or former pupil who painted it at sometime between the early 1650s and the early 1660s. Drost is one possibility.

1. Benesch 1956, p. 352, where he continues, "because they enabled him to demonstrate the beauty of the soul outliving the decay of the body." Such a remark might have been written in the 1880s.
4. For example, in the portraits of Jan van de Cappelle (?), Jan Six, and Nicholas Bruyninckh (Schwartz 1985, figs. 298, 301, 304).

Literature
Bode 1883, no. 98; Michel 1894, p. 239; Bode 1897–1906, VI, no. 459, as fully signed and dated 1659; Valentiner 1905, p. 51, as a portrait of Titus by Rembrandt, influenced by Raphael; Hofscde de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 411, with provenance; Valentiner 1931, no. 142, as Titus, fully signed; Bredius 1935, no. 296, same man as in The Jewish Bride; Rosenberg 1964, pp. 88, as a fine oil sketch, same man as in The Jewish Bride; Bauch 1966, no. 426; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 572, no. 296, rejects the attribution to Rembrandt; Sumowski 1983–94, V, no. 2038, as by Drost ca. 1652–55.
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Ex Coll.
First mentioned as in the Weber Collection, Hamburg, in the 1880s.
Lieven van Coppenol

Ca. 1660–80?
Oil on wood, 14⅞ × 11⅞ in. (36.5 × 28.9 cm)
Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950
50.145.33

This small painting is a more interesting subject for Rembrandt connoisseurship than its boring brushwork would indicate. Technical evidence, the picture’s style, and information about the sitter suggest that it is probably a seventeenth-century copy, in reverse, after Rembrandt’s large Coppenol etching of 1658 (no. 97a).

The work is classified consistently as an original Rembrandt in literature dating from 1808 to 1969. Praised in the nineteenth century for its quality, the painting (which is often said to be on paper) has been described more recently as “no doubt” a study for the etching. This view may have been encouraged by the existence of a few known examples of studies Rembrandt painted for his etchings, such as the grisaille Ecce Homo of 1634 (The National Gallery, London) and the small sketchy portrait Ephraim Bueno of 1647 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). However, the quality of the Museum’s picture is not at all comparable to those works, as Gerson and von Sonnenburg noted in 1969.

In an article of 1976 von Sonnenburg published an X-ray that reveals that an oak strip (two centimeters wide) was added to the already-primed oak panel. He concludes that this was done to match the format of the print. Von Sonnenburg also demonstrates that the painting was traced from the etching, that its tonalities suggest a reference to the print, and that the execution is typical of a copyist.

Despite these conclusions and a dating of the oak panel to about 1650, the Museum changed the attribution in 1980 from “Rembrandt” to “Style of Rembrandt, 1st half XVIII century.” It seems more likely that the picture dates from the 1660s or slightly later; it appears as well that Rembrandt and his immediate circle had nothing to do with its execution.

The sitter’s identity also defends these hypotheses. Coppenol was a schoolmaster who, after some kind of physical illness or mental breakdown in 1650, devoted himself exclusively to calligraphy (his second wife provided financial security). By 1650, for at least a half-century in the Netherlands, spectacular examples of handwriting in autograph and printed forms had encouraged the development of connoisseurs of calligraphy and created celebrities in the field. Coppenol aspired to be one of the latter by sending samples of his work to a number of poets, from whom he requested eulogies. He also engaged Rembrandt (whom he knew through Mennonite relatives) and Cornelis Visscher to make portrait prints of him (see no. 97a). Below these Coppenol himself inscribed panegyrics solicited from cooperative writers. In 1661 he published a pair of broadsides with his portrait of 1658 by Visscher and twenty-seven eulogies celebrating the image or Coppenol’s personmanship. The poets who supplied these encomiums included such famous figures as Jacob Cats, Constantijn Huygens, Anna Maria van Schuurman, and Joost van den Vondel.

Thus in the 1660s portraits of Coppenol were much in supply and perhaps in demand. Given his relentless self-promotion, one might perhaps suggest that Coppenol himself had this painted copy made, but there is one problem with this hypothesis (assuming the sitter was rational). Visscher’s print and the two by Rembrandt show Coppenol as right-handed—a detail that presumably mattered to the calligrapher. A tracing from the print could have been used as the basis for a painted version facing in either direction. However, the copyist—perhaps assuming that the etching reversed Rembrandt’s original design (and possibly intending to pass the copy off as that design)—reversed it, thus making what Coppenol might have called (with no justification) the most famous hand in Holland hold the paper rather than the pen.

1. Quoting from Hind 1923, no. 300. See Literature below for similar opinions.
2. On the grisaille, see London 1988–89, no. 2; on the Bueno, Schwartz 1985, p. 259, fig. 299.

Literature
Guattani 1808, no. 42; Smith 1829–42, VII, no. 307; Michel 1894, pp. 135–36, as a “little masterpiece’ made for the etching; Bode
35 Head of Christ

1650s
Oil on canvas, original dimensions, 16 3/4 x 13 1/2 in. (42.5 x 34.3 cm); with additions, 18 x 14 1/2 in. (47.3 x 37.1 cm)
Mr. and Mrs. Isaac D. Fletcher Collection, Bequest of Isaac D. Fletcher, 1917
17120.222

This picture is one of about ten known bust-length images of Christ in a number of poses painted in Rembrandt’s style of about 1650. The paintings may all ultimately represent the same model, perhaps in some cases through intermediate material (other paintings, and possibly drawings, that presumably are lost). At the same time, the type of Christ recalls that found in Rembrandt’s Supper at Emmaus of 1648 (Musée du Louvre, Paris) and in his famous etching The Hundred Guilder Print of about 1649 (no. 91). One author even suggests that a small panel in the group, the Head of Christ in the Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts, was used by Rembrandt as his model for the figure of Christ in the print. Almost all scholars now consider the Fogg painting and all but one of the similar pictures (the best known of which are in The Detroit Institute of Arts and in the Museum Bredius, The Hague) to be by Rembrandt pupils of the 1650s. The exception is the panel in the Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museum Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, which is perhaps by Rembrandt, to judge from its strong modeling, impasto highlights, and the immediacy of the figure’s expression. The inventory of Rembrandt’s household effects made at the time of his insolvency in 1656 includes three paintings of this subject: numbers 115 and 118, each listed as a “Christ’s face tronie” by Rembrandt,” and 326, which is not attributed to any painter but is revealingly described as “A Christ’s face done from life” (Een Christus tronie nae’t leven). 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.

The existence of the group of bust-length paintings of Christ with figures variously posed suggests that Rembrandt assigned the subject to a few of his students in the early to mid-1650s. At least two or three hands can be distinguished, but attributions to known pupils are impossible to assign. It is intriguing that small bust-length studies of Mary Magdalene by Rembrandt pupils also date from this period and that a “Head of the Virgin” by the young Titus van Rijn is listed in his father’s inventory of 1656.

The Museum’s painting is larger than the panels from the group in Berlin, Cambridge, Detroit, The Hague, Philadelphia, and formerly in Tilburg, all of which measure about 25 x 20 cm. The present picture is the only one in the series that is on canvas; this support was cut down and mounted on a slightly larger canvas at some early date. Originally the painting may have been about the same size as the panel in a private collection measuring 62 x 49 cm (fig. 156, vol. I). The heads are so similar in the picture in New York and the one in the private collection that they can be considered versions of the same composition.

The picture’s condition notwithstanding, it is obvious that the execution is weaker in numerous respects than in contemporary heads by Rembrandt (as well as in the Berlin Head of Christ attributed to Rembrandt): in the drawing of the eyes and other details; in the lack of convincing three-dimensional form in the nose, the cheekbones, and the oddly dented forehead; and in the way the composition is constituted of adjacent areas that have no coherent relationship in space (the paint at the left in the face, for example, appears to spread toward, rather than recede into, the hair and beard).

It should be said that the Rembrandtesque pictures of Christ are on the whole appealing and in some cases compelling images despite their shortcomings. In its original
state the present example must have been one of the most successful studies of the type. Such paintings illustrate a fortunate coincidence in the seventeenth century between methods of artistic training and demand for popular and inexpensive images. Even more than a tronie of Flora (see no. 22), one of Christ, based on a live model, evokes the values of Dutch society in Rembrandt’s time. In this regard, what matters is not so much Rembrandt’s authorship of any particular Head of Christ but his conception of the project. The intention was to bring biblical figures to life and to foster that approach in the work of his students.


5. Sumowski 1983—94, III, nos. 1322, 1383, both listed as by Maes, with other versions cited.


7. Tümpe 1986, no. A 21, with previous literature. There is no reason to think that the Museum’s picture was ever as large as the half-length Christ on canvas (108 x 89 cm) in The Hyde Collection, Glen Falls, New York (Bredius 1969, no. 628; Tümpe 1986, no. A 22, listed as from Rembrandt’s “workshop”).
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Bode 1883, no. 295, as by Rembrandt about 1656; Bode 1897—1906, VI, no. 414, as about 1659; Hofstede de Groot 1908—27, VI, no. 160, with provenance; Valentiner 1931, no. 101, as about 1648; Bredius 1935, no. 626; Bauch 1966, no. 196, calls it Young Jew (as Christ); Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 614, no. 626, as “a genuine picture which has suffered”; Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 97, n. 5, as “missing the characteristic buildup of paint layers seen in autoradiographs of seventeenth-century Dutch paintings”; Tümpe 1986, no. A 20, as “Rembrandt Circle” about 1655—60.

EXHIBITED

Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, “Rembrandt: Schilderijen bijeengebracht ter gelegenheid van de inhuldiging van Hare Majesteit Koningin Wilhelmina,” 1898, no. 199.

EX COLL.

First appeared in an Amsterdam sale of September 4, 1759.

FOLLOWER OF REMBRANDT

36 Old Woman Cutting Her Nails

Ca. 1660?

Oil on canvas, 49 3/4 x 40 1/4 in. (126.1 x 101.9 cm)

Inscribed lower left: Rembrandt / 1648

Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913

14.40.609

Once well known as a Rembrandt, this canvas from the Altman collection was attributed alternately to Nicolaes Maes (see fig. 77) and to Karel van der Pluyman (see no. 31) by a few scholars between the 1920s and the 1980s. It is suggested here that the painting may be by a close associate of Maes, Abraham van Dyck (ca. 1635—1680). Sumowski, who recently published the picture as a van der Pluyman, agreed enthusiastically in 1992: “You have found the final solution: not by Karel van der Pluyman, as I thought (cat. no. 1395), not by the early Maes, as it has been called lately, but actually ABRAHAM VAN DIJCK!”

In 1836 Smith listed the work as a Rembrandt, stressing that he knew it from the mezzotint of 1764 by J. G. Haid, which identifies the subject as the artist’s mother. The first Rembrandt scholar to see the actual picture was probably Michel, who in 1894 described it as “the magnificent study of an old woman . . . recently bought by M. Rodolphe.”

Fig. 76. Abraham van Dyck. Old Prophetess, ca. 1655—60. Oil on canvas, 14 3/4 x 14 1/4 in. (37.5 x 36.5 cm). Museum der Bildenden Künste, Leipzig
Kann in Russia.” Hofstede de Groot gave the painting extravagant praise during the Rembrandt exhibition of 1898 in Amsterdam. He declared that not only the earthy subject, unshrinking rendered, but also the “strength of various tones, the exceptionally delicate harmony, the expression of the face emerging through everything and above all the imposing posture of the whole figure in this handsome painting [make it] one of the most powerful and most splendid that Rembrandt painted.” (Readers familiar with paintings of old women by Joseph Israels [1824–1911] will be able to place this opinion in the context of its time.) Bode, too, considered the mundane image typical of those painted by Rembrandt (although he might have said Millet with equal truth), who shows us “what an ideal and artistic effect might be achieved thereby.”

The attribution to Rembrandt was maintained by Valentiner and other connoisseurs during the 1920s and 1940s. No scholar doubted the inscription, which was misread as “Rembrandt f. 1658,” until 1921, when Bredius suggested an attribution to van der Pluym. Van Dyke, an early and avid Rembrandt debunker (see nos. 2, 3, 20), thought that the picture was probably painted by Maes when that artist was in Rembrandt’s studio, “learning the broader, darker manner of the shop, which he has here exaggerated... The handling is hasty, heavy, ineffective, and the drawing is not correct.”

By the 1960s the only issue was which pupil painted the work. Thomas Hoving, then the Museum’s director, was willing to concede: “It’s probably Nicolaes Maes. The label says, ‘Signed and dated Rembrandt, 1658.’ There are subtleties in the museum business, let me tell you.” One of the subtleties would be the Museum’s debt to the donor, Altman, who paid Duveen $148,535 for the painting in 1908.

The attribution to Maes, one of Rembrandt’s most gifted pupils of the 1650s, has depended mainly on opinions about another picture, the Apostle Thomas in Kassel. In 1988 Bruyn and in 1991 Kassel curator Schnackenburg maintained that the two paintings are by the same author, namely the early Maes. However, before they came to this conclusion, both scholars had pondered whether the picture might have been painted after 1700 (Bruyn raised the possibility in 1972, Schnackenburg in 1989). Moreover, in 1986 Schnackenburg wrote a note to himself in the Altman galleries, observing that the Old Woman “strongly departed from the Apostle Thomas,” and in 1988 the present writer put the same opinion into his notebook at Kassel.

Ascribing both pictures to the early Maes (before 1653, presumably, when he painted no. 52) would appear to represent a triumph of academic hypotheses over impressions gained in the galleries. Robinson, who is writing a dissertation on Maes, is inclined to reject the Kassel picture as a product of this artist’s hand and suggests that the Altman painting “seems even further from Maes.” In the view of von Sonnenburg (see entry, vol. I) and the present writer, the Apostle Thomas may be by Maes, but this has little bearing on the authorship of the Old Woman.

The attribution of the Altman canvas to van Dijck is supported by comparing it to several pictures (mostly of old women) that are signed by him or that are close in execution to them. In subject and style these paintings obviously depend upon Maes, which probably places them within a small circle of artists active in Dordrecht during the 1650s and 1660s, when Maes worked there. An Old Woman with a Book, a panel in Buckingham Palace, which is much smaller than our canvas, is signed and dated “A.V. Dijck F. 1665” and reveals similar modeling (allowing for differences in scale and support) in the face and hands. Distinctive of van Dijck, or so it seems from a study of this panel as well as other works signed by or attributed to him, is the distorted anatomy—in particular the exaggerated knuckles—of the hand that holds the scissors in the Old Woman Cutting Her Nails. Closely related to the queen’s picture is a small canvas in Leipzig (fig. 76), where the painterly description of the garment (with red and white strokes at the wrists) and the articulation of the hands also recall the Altman picture.
Useful in this context is a review of Sumowski’s reconstruction of van Dijck’s oeuvre, referring especially to the paintings in Milwaukee (a large canvas, signed), Amsterdam, Hannover, Leipzig, Gotha, Sigmaringen (signed), London (signed), and The Hague (signed). Comparing these works to the Old Woman Cutting Her Nails suggests that van Dijck may have painted the Museum’s picture in the late 1650s or early 1660s. One finds many isolated similarities between our picture and the range of works Sumowski cites, but the paintings of like quality are mostly small, and the modeling is rarely as emphatic as here. The artist has used localized contrasts of light and shadow to sculpt the face and drapery as if he were working clay; the results are unpleasant in some passages (one observer referred to the drapery folds as ropey and intestinal) and impressive in others (for example, the sleeve to the right). Weighing these considerations, the present writer tentatively agrees with John Walsh, an earlier curator of Dutch painting at the Museum, who concluded that the painting “may be an unusually ambitious work by Abraham van Dijck.”

The subject and the unexpected scale on which it is rendered are unusually relevant to the attribution because they are so characteristic of the work of Maes and his circle in Dordrecht (see fig. 77). The old woman apparently has turned from her sewing (the dark form under the drapery seems to be a sewing box) in order to trim a fingernail, which has perhaps impeded her work. This homely detail recording an act of personal hygiene is emblematic: it is consistent with the act of sewing (and recalls depictions of old women combing lice from children’s hair and similar subjects favored in Dutch painting) in that they both suggest domestic virtue, especially in widowhood. The importance of this feminine virtue in Dutch art and literature (by Jacob Cats, for example) explains why Maes and a few other Dutch painters occasionally treated it in large-scale works. In pictures of old women, mortality and piety are often suggested and, it seems, are almost always implied.

To speak with Sumowski of a “final solution” to the question of the present painting’s authorship, one would want to know more about van Dijck. In 1704 his brother, the Dordrecht notary Hugo van Dijck, recorded “two large portraits of him the testator and his late first wife by his brother Abraham van Dijck and by Nicolaes Maes.” An Abraham van Dijck in Amsterdam gave his age as twenty-five in 1661; he may be the man of the same name who was buried in the Westerkerk in Amsterdam in 1672. However, an “Abram van Dijck, bachelor painter” was buried on August 27, 1680, in Dordrecht, where he lived on the same street as Maes. Houbraken, who was himself a Dordrecht painter, records an Abraham van Dijck working in England (as Anthony van Dyck did). The most interesting aspect of the debate surrounding the attribution of the Old Woman Cutting Her Nails may be the consensus in favor of Dordrecht, the town from which Rembrandt’s pupils Ferdinand Bol, Samuel van Hoogstraten, Jacobus Levecq, Maes, van Dijck, and Arent de Gelder came. No other local school outside Amsterdam responded so strongly to Rembrandt, who, at whatever distance, inspired this painting’s monumentality and seriousness.

1. Letter from Sumowski to the writer, October 13, 1992; the original German is quoted in Liedtke 1993, p. 134. Sumowski 1983–94, VI, p. 3012, no. 1595, publishes this revised opinion.
2. Michel 1894, p. 131, ill.
3. Hoftede de Groot 1898, no. 32.
5. Van Dyke 1923, p. 132.
8. Bruyn, oral opinion recorded by Walsh, June 9, 1972; both remarks referred to in a letter from Bernhard Schnackenburg, to the writer, April 18, 1989.
12. See Franits 1993, pp. 168–71, 175–94, with many examples by Maes and several variations on the sewing theme. The subject of men trimming their nails is known also; see Bredius 1915, p. 238, Ein nagelzorter by Lievens, cited in the 1617 inventory of the Amsterdam art dealer Johannes de Renuelse; Sumowski 1983–94, III, no. 1107, Old Nail-Cutter by Salomon Koninck in Rennes.
13. On the document and for Abraham van Dijck’s biography, including the details given below; see Dordrecht 1992–93, p. 226, n. 3.
15. The warm reds, oranges, and reddish browns in the painting recall several Dordrecht artists, such as Bol, his pupil Cornelis Bisschop, Arnold Boonen, de Gelder, and Maes (see Dordrecht 1992–93).

LITERATURE

Smith 1829–42, VII, no. 180, as by Rembrandt, with the present title; Michel 1894, pp. 130–32, 239, as a magnificent “portrait,” signed and dated 1658, and newly acquired by Rodolphe Kann; Bode 1897–1906, VI, p. 28, no. 477, remarks on the “trivial theme” being treated “on monumental lines”; Amsterdam 1868, no. 101; Hoftede de Groot 1898, no. 32, praises subject and execution; Hoftede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 308, with description and provenance; Bredius 1921, p. 148, attributes the picture to van der Pluym; Van Dyke 1923, p. 132, fig. 108, as by Maes, noting weaknesses of execution; Rosenberg 1964, pp. 245, 314, 364, n. 88, “a striking work of Rembrandt’s early maturity” (1948 text reprinted), acknowledges in the note that the picture is doubted; Judson in Chicago, Minneapolis, Detroit 1969–70, p. 46, under no. 27, as close in style to the painter of the Apostle Thomas; Sumowski 1979–, IX, under no. 2133, as probably by van der Pluym; Sumowski 1983–94, IV, no. 1593, as by van
The painting is by van Dyck; Adams 1984, pp. 435–37, as by van der Pluym, with the *Apostle Thomas*; Bruyn 1988, p. 331, fig. 6, as by Maes, with the *Apostle Thomas*; Bernhard Schnackenburg in Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, I, p. 371, fig. 79b, as by "Maes (?)"; Liedtke 1993, pp. 131–34, rejects Maes, attributes the picture to van Dyck, not the same hand as in the *Apostle Thomas*.

**Exhibited**
Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, "Rembrandt: Schilderijen bijeengebracht ter gelegenheid van de inhuldiging van Hare Majesteit Koningin Wilhelmina," 1898, no. 101.

**Ex Coll.**
First traceable in nineteenth-century collections.

---

**Follower of Rembrandt**

**37 Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff**

1660s
Oil on canvas, 37½ × 32½ in. (95.3 × 82.6 cm)
Inscribed right center: Rembrandt f. / 1661
The Jules Bache Collection, 1949
49.7–37

Paintings of such impressive quality as *Christ with a Pilgrim’s Staff* pose the most difficult problems of connoisseurship. In 1976 Bruyn, one of the first scholars to question the attribution to Rembrandt, suggested that the work might be by Rembrandt “with studio intervention.” The authors of the Museum’s *Art and Autoradiography* of 1982 went further, concluding that their new technical means “indicate a style close to Rembrandt’s but show certain variations that belie an attribution to Rembrandt himself.” A leitmotif of the Museum’s publication is that autoradiographs answer questions that traditional connoisseurship and older technical aids such as X rays have failed to resolve. In 1986 Brown pointedly referred to X rays of the *Christ*, which he asserted reveal Rembrandt’s “usual procedure in his late works,” and concluded that “the composition, the use of light, and the entirely characteristic, confident handling preclude such a revision of the traditional attribution.” While sympathetic to this view, I agree with Hubert von Sonnenburg (see his entry in vol. 1) that the painting is not by Rembrandt but in some respects stands close to his work in the 1660s.

The painting’s subject is relevant to the discussion of attribution. Most writers have described the figure as Christ, but Bode in 1901 and recently Tümpel have suggested that the picture may represent an apostle, Saint James the Less. This saint’s appearance and symbols vary considerably in Renaissance and Baroque art; he often carries a book and/or a staff or fuller’s club (a bat used to pound wool), the last being the instrument of his martyrdom. Tümpel has maintained categorically (and inconclusively) that the object on which the figure rests his hands is such a club. In late paintings that clearly depict apostles Rembrandt displayed his subjects’ attributes conspicuously and showed every one of the figures deep in thought or prayer. The figure here is utterly different from Rembrandt’s characteristic apostles in temperament and completely consistent in type and expression (if not execution) with his *Risen Christ* of about 1661 in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich.

It remains possible that this painting was part of an intended series of apostles, a kind of cycle that in the seventeenth century often included an image of Christ. In the case of such a large project, which may well have been intended for export to a Catholic patron, the idea that Rembrandt worked with a collaborator appears plausible.

**1.** Bruyn, on behalf of the Rembrandt Research Project, oral opinion, June 24, 1976. One of the few critics to question the picture earlier was the dealer and collector Daan Cevat, who in 1966 said that the painting was “not entirely by Rembrandt.” Oral opinion. Cevat’s connoisseurship of Rembrandt made a strong early impression on one member of the RRP, Haak (see Kroon 1987, p. 2).

**2.** Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 92, crediting Haverkamp-Begemann as “the first to voice doubt” about this painting (n. 62).

**3.** Brown in Yokohama, Fukuoka, Kyoto 1986–87, p. 154, no. 12, referring to the Museum’s autoradiography project.

**4.** Tümpel 1986, no. 86, as by Rembrandt. Brown (see n. 3 above) wrongly refers to “the Tau-shaped stick of the pilgrim.” The horizontal form above the hands is not part of the staff but a fastener on the garment.

**5.** See Tümpel 1986, pp. 340–44, where the Munich canvas and the apostle pictures are all reproduced.

**6.** Various authors have attempted to reconstruct one or two incomplete series of apostles by Rembrandt about 1660. See Tümpel 1986, no. 83.
Followed of Rembrandt

Pilate Washing His Hands

1660s
Oil on canvas, 51 1/2 x 63 1/4 in. (130.2 x 167 cm)
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.610

The early Rembrandt catalogues included this picture as an authentic work of about 1655. Apart from Van Dyck’s wild attribution of the painting to the workshop of Salomon Koninck, Rembrandt’s authorship was first rejected in print by Held (1942). Held and most later writers suggest that the painting is by a Rembrandt pupil of the 1650s or 1660s who was probably following the master’s design or idea. In this connection the name of Rembrandt’s last pupil, Arent de Gelder, has often come up in conversation. Only Bruyn supposed that the work might date from later than the seventeenth century.

The drawing and coloring of the boy and soldiers might suggest a date in the 1650s, but the composition as a whole and the areas of loose brushwork recall (at a great distance in quality) paintings by Rembrandt of the early 1660s. De Gelder was virtually the only pupil in Rembrandt’s studio during that decade (see “Rembrandt and the Rembrandt Style in the Seventeenth Century” in this volume), and the two older men in the Altman picture are reminiscent of figures in de Gelder’s work in their types and in their manner of execution. Unfortunately, the only known paintings by which one can judge an attribution to de Gelder date from at least fifteen years later than the period of his apprenticeship. No picture has been identified convincingly as a de Gelder of the 1660s, and the few known works of the 1670s by him have very small figures. The artist was financially independent and did not have pupils, so far as is known. Thus the only plausible way in which the painting can be associated with de Gelder is as a work made during the “full two years” (between about 1663 and 1667) that, according to Houbraken’s report, he was with Rembrandt. A few drawings attributed to de Gelder, including the Pilate Washing his Hands in the British Museum, perhaps support the ascription of this painting to him, but his graphic oeuvre is far from well defined.

1. Held 1942, p. 28. The attribution to Rembrandt was doubted orally by Schmidt-Degener in 1935 (van den Eekhout?); by Wilhelm Martin in 1938 (Drost?); and by Benesch in 1940 (recalls Barend Fabritius).
2. Jules Zeitner (1947), Haak (1971), and many later scholars who visited the Museum. Van Gelder (1961, p. 151) states that the picture has often been attributed to de Gelder but cites no examples.
3. Bruyn, on behalf of the Rembrandt Research Project, oral opinion, June 24, 1976, on the grounds that “elements are so heterogeneous.”
4. Compare, for example, the Judah and Tamar of 1681 in the Collection of Isabel and Alfred Bader, Milwaukee (von Moltke 1994, pl. VII). A superficial resemblance between the figure of Pilate in the Altman picture and an old man painted by the obscure Jacob van Dorsten about 1630 regrettably intrigued the present writer on an earlier occasion (Liedtke 1993, pp. 135–36).
6. Sumowski 1979–88, V, no. 1077. To judge from Sumowski’s attributions, the jumble of figures in the left background of the Museum’s painting appears consistent with de Gelder’s early efforts in composition.

Literature
Bode 1883, no. 145, as by Rembrandt about 1650; Bode 1897–1906, VII, p. 24, no. 532, accepts the unsigned picture as by Rembrandt but
notes a number of qualities that make it “a somewhat abnormal work”; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 129, as by Rembrandt about 1665; Valentiner 1914, p. 351, as datable 1666–69; Van Dyke 1923, pp. 113–14, as “all in [Salomon] Koninck’s manner” but not up to his standard, “to say nothing of Rembrandt’s”; Valentiner 1931, no. 166, and introduction [p. 7], thinks that Rembrandt gave Pilate his own features; Bredius 1935, no. 595; Held 1942, p. 28, as not by Rembrandt but based on “the master’s idea”; Bauch 1966, p. 49, Bredius no. 595, as by a pupil following Rembrandt’s design of about 1666; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 611, no. 595, considers it “almost incomprehensible that this empty picture” was ever attributed to Rembrandt and wonders “whether the picture was really executed in the Rembrandt circle”; Sumowski 1983–94, IV, no. 1957, as by an anonymous pupil of the 1660s (“the notion of early de Gelder must be rejected emphatically”).

Ex coll.
First recorded in the collection of Henry Temple, second Viscount Palmerston, Broadlands, Hampshire, in 1794.
39 Study Head of an Old Man

1630s
Oil on wood, 8½ × 6½ in. (21 × 17.5 cm)
Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1959
60.71.16

This small panel has had virtually no place in the Rembrandt literature, although Bode and Hořtede de Groot provided certificates of authenticity for it in 1924. Another was supplied by Valentiner in 1930 as a favor to Mrs. Timken about the time she bought the painting. Gerson (1976) considered the picture "definitely an 18th or 19th century imitation." In 1980 the Museum changed the attribution from "Attributed to Rembrandt" to "Style of Rembrandt, of uncertain date."

Despite Gerson's opinion, the painting is very probably an Amsterdam product of the 1630s. The panel is said to come from an oak tree felled in the "Baltic/Polish region" between about 1626 and 1632. Although a later artist could have used an old panel for this work, the dating of the picture to the 1630s is consistent with its style, which derives from Rembrandt's paintings of old men dating from about 1630 to 1632 (see no. 2).

A fair number of small pictures of this type survive and were evidently inspired by painted studies by Rembrandt such as the Head of an Old Man of about 1630 (Collection of Isabel and Alfred Bader, Milwaukee), a work etched by van Vliet in 1634. The existence of other contemporary prints in a similar vein by or after Rembrandt and by Lievens suggests that there was a demand for this kind of subject about 1630 to 1635. The dealer Hendrick Uyleburch (see "Rembrandt and the Rembrandt Style in the Seventeenth Century" in this volume) may have been involved in the trade of such paintings and prints, but Rembrandt's own pupils were not necessarily involved in their execution.

A version of this composition in Richmond (fig. 78) differs slightly in the costume, beard, and mouth but is otherwise remarkably similar; indeed, almost the same pattern of brushstrokes was used in key passages such as the eyes. This close resemblance suggests that the two paintings had a common prototype. The model was not the larger (58 × 46.5 cm) and finer painting of a bareheaded and slightly different old man in the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kassel, which the Rembrandt Research Project discusses convincingly as an imitation of uncertain date ("well before the end of the 17th century") and as broadly related to small studies such as our own and the one in Richmond. Another large panel (67.4 × 55.9 cm) in Kassel represents a fourth old man in a beret and an otherwise different costume. These figures, which look like they may have been quadruplets, are posed identically and have essentially the same expression. Perhaps Uyleburch or another dealer organized the production (by a few or several painters) of pictures conforming to a popular type, and this accounts for the close family resemblance of the four men.

The warm reds, browns, and yellows of the present picture, like the brushstrokes themselves, exaggerate Rembrandt's style in paintings of similar characters. The painter does not come close to Rembrandt in his grasp of form and other realistic effects, but the volume of the head and hat and the generally descriptive rather than decorative function of even the loosest brushwork in the face are typical of the seventeenth century. The recent dating of the picture to the eighteenth or nineteenth century is remarkable.

Fig. 78. Style of Rembrandt. Portrait of a Bearded Old Man. Oil on wood, 8½ × 6½ in. (21 × 17.1 cm). Inscribed: Rembrandt/1643. Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond
in the face of this strong stylistic evidence: only a generation ago almost anything Rembrandtesque that Fragonard might have admired stood a good chance of being assigned to Fragonard's own time.

1. These were "photo certificates," meaning handwritten endorsements on the backs of photographs of the painting. Hofstede de Groot's is dated 1924 in The Hague and inscribed "Nr. 2484" (84th certificate of 1924). Bode's certificate, now in the files of the Museum's department of European Paintings, is undated, but both photographs were made by A. C. Cooper, London, suggesting that an English seller solicited the two opinions in 1924.

2. Report of Michael M. Thomas, curatorial assistant, December 8, 1959. Lilienfeld told Thomas that Valentin wrote the certificate after years of hesitation and that Mrs. Timken had not paid a Rembrandt price.


5. Corpus, I (1982), no. C.22, where van de Wetering hesitates to reject the attribution to Rembrandt (p. 580). See also Haverkamp-Begemann in New York 1995, no. 13, as by Rembrandt, correctly in my view. For similar works of the period that are not by Rembrandt, see Corpus, I (1982), nos. C.24, C.25, and C.31.


7. Christian Huygens, the sixteen-year-old son of Constantijn, wrote to his brother in 1645 that he had made a copy in oils of an old man's head by Rembrandt and that it could hardly be distinguished from the original (Sive 1953, p. 41).


10. All the Flora paintings (see no. 22) and trompe (see no. 2) that date from the seventeenth century suggest that this was common practice. Watteau worked in this manner when he first arrived in Paris in 1702. According to Gersaint, 'I knew St Nicholas by heart;' he told me one day, 'and had no need of the original' (Malcolm Cormack, The Drawings of Watteau [London, 1970], p. 7).

**Literature**

Corpus, II (1986), pp. 652-53, fig. 5 (reversed), as one of a group of "superficial pastiches," apparently of the seventeenth century.

**Ex Coll.**
First recorded in 1924.

---

**Imitator of Rembrandt**

40 **Portrait of a Young Man with a Beret**

Last quarter of 17th century
Oil on canvas, 29¾ x 24½ in. (75.9 x 62.9 cm)
Gift of Charles S. Payson, 1973
1975.373

This picture's attribution to Rembrandt was never doubted in print until it was listed in the Museum's summary catalogue of 1980 as "Style of Rembrandt, 1st half XIX century." However, Haverkamp-Begemann had argued against Rembrandt's authorship in 1976, and the painting has never been placed on public view in the Museum prior to the present exhibition. As Hubert von Sonnenburg maintains in volume I, the work must date from after Rembrandt's lifetime but not nearly as late as the Museum's staff supposed fifteen years ago.

**Literature**

Waagen 1854, II, p. 200, lists it in the Holford Collection, as having "extraordinary power"; Michel 1894, p. 236, as a portrait of Titus, about 1660; Bode 1897-1906, VI, pp. 18, 122, no. 445, as "hastier in execution, and slightly monotonous"; Hofstede de Groot 1908-27, VI, no. 703; Valentin 1931, no. 134, as Titus whose features already betray suffering; Bredius 1935, no. 292, doubts Titus as subject; Bauch 1966, no. 417, about 1636, not Titus; Gerson 1968, no. 328, not Titus; Brown 1976, p. 219, not Titus; Bolten and Bolten-Rempt 1977, no. 450; Arpino and Lecaldano 1978, no. 347; Baetjer 1980, 1, p. 151, as "Style of Rembrandt, 1st half XIX century"; Tümpel 1986, no. A 102, as by a Rembrandt pupil about 1663.

**Exhibited**

**Ex Coll.**
In the collection of R. S. Holford, Dorchester House, London, by 1854.
41 Rembrandt's Son Titus

Second half 17th century
Oil on canvas, 31 3/4 × 23 3/4 in. (79.1 × 59.1 cm)
Inscribed upper left: Rembrandt f. c. 1655.
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.608

The subject resembles Rembrandt's son, Titus van Rijn (1641–1668), but his features have been considerably prettified. Titus appears younger in Rembrandt's portrait of him in the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam, which is dated 1655 (the false date here), and he looks older in the canvas of about 1658 in The Wallace Collection, London. Other portraits by Rembrandt in which Titus has been convincingly identified are in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (ca. 1656), and the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (1660), and one is on loan to the Rijksmuseum from the Louvre (ca. 1660). Several works by Rembrandt and not by Rembrandt (including no. 40) have been implausibly described as portraits of Titus. The superficial manner of execution is derived from late works by Rembrandt, but the picture seems to come from outside his circle. A single source in Rembrandt's oeuvre or in that of an immediate follower is not known. The composition resembles that of Rembrandt's Self-Portrait of 1652 in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, but there are many similarly presented figures in paintings of the Rembrandt school. The feathered beret and the arrangement of the shirt and mantle recall the Portrait of a Boy in the Norton Simon Museum, Pasadena, although the shirt may have been adapted from a female figure such as the so-called Hendrickje Stoffels on loan to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (both works are attributed to Rembrandt). The expression seems a sweeter version of that found in Rembrandt's Young Girl Leaning on a Window Sill of 1645 (fig. 1, vol. I) or in related works such as van Hoogstraten's Young Girl at a Half-Door of about 1646–47 in The Art Institute of Chicago and the same artist's Young Girl with a Broom in Washington, D.C. (fig. 37; see "Rembrandt and the Rembrandt Style in the Seventeenth Century" in this volume). In other words, this Titus could easily be two painters, as well a few decades, removed from Rembrandt.

1. Schwartz 1985, figs. 359, 360; Rotterdam 1988, no. 22; London 1992b, no. 3.
2. Schwartz 1985, figs. 331–33.

LITERATURE
Bode 1883, no. 206; Bode 1897–1906, VI, no. 442; Hofstede de Groot 1898, no. 89; Rosenberg 1906, p. 265; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 706, with provenance; Altman 1914, no. 6; Van Dyke 1923, p. 78, as attributed to Barent Fabritius; Valentiner 1931, no. 120; Bredius 1935, no. 121; Bauch 1966, no. 412; Gerson in Bredius 1969, p. 558, no. 121, "certainly an 18th or 19th century imitation"; von Sonnenburg in Art Institute of Chicago 1973, p. 89, could date from the seventeenth or eighteenth century; Ainsworth et al. 1982, p. 97, n. 5, "missing the characteristic buildup of paint layers."

EXHIBITED
Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, "Rembrandt: Schilderijen bijeengebracht ter gelegenheid van de inhuldiging van Hare Majesteit Koningin Wilhelmina," 1898, no. 89.

EX COLL.
From the Podlatsky Collection, Bohemia, about the 1870s.
42 Man with a Beard

Last quarter of 17th century
Oil on canvas, 28 3/8 × 25 1/8 in. (72.3 × 64.1 cm)
Inscribed lower left: Rembrandt / f. 1665
Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889
89.15.3

In the second annual report of the Museum it was noted that a Rembrandt was lacking among the 174 mostly Dutch and Flemish pictures in the founding purchase of 1871.¹ Henry Marquand, a railroad financier and a principal supporter of the Museum from its inception, attempted to rectify the situation with the gift of this painting in 1889. The work was accepted and often praised as a late Rembrandt (unfinished, in Rosenberg’s view), until Bauch (1966) considered it an eighteenth-century imitation (‘‘perhaps in England’’), and von Sonnenburg (1976) more substantially argued that it was an “old forgery” executed somewhat after Rembrandt’s lifetime. The vagueness of content as well as of form place the picture well outside Rembrandt’s circle. The painting was reproduced in an engraving by William Baillie dated 1764.

² Rosenberg, oral opinion, 1936; Rosenberg 1940, p. 204.

Literature
Bode 1897–1906, VII, pp. 5, 54, no. 406, criticizes the light as too harsh and the handling as careless; Rosenberg 1906, p. 383; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VI, no. 744; Valentiner 1931, no. 165; Bredius 1935, no. 317; Rosenberg 1940, p. 203, fig. 4, as unfinished, which explains the flatness; Bauch 1966, no. 317, as probably eighteenth century, perhaps English; von Sonnenburg 1976, pp. 17–19, as an old forgery, the inscription contemporary with the picture.

Exhibited

Ex Coll.
Traceable since 1764 (engraving by William Baillie); in the collection of Sir William Knighton, London (d. 1836).
Independent Works by Painters in Rembrandt's Circle

The following section of the catalogue, which includes only basic information, covers paintings in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum that are by Rembrandt's former pupils and that have always been recognized as such. These pictures serve as reference works for the present project, which is mainly concerned with paintings by Rembrandt or previously considered to be by him. Some of the independent works are on view in the exhibition space, and others are placed in the Dutch galleries of the permanent collection.
FERDINAND BOL (1616–1680)

43 Portrait of a Woman

1642
Oil on canvas, 34 3/8 × 28 in. (87.3 × 71.1 cm)
Signed and dated left center: f. Bol fecit / 1642
Theodore M. Davis Collection, Bequest of Theodore M. Davis, 1915
30.95.269

The son of a Dordrecht doctor, Bol studied and worked with Rembrandt from about 1636 until about 1641. Bol’s earliest independent pictures include some exceptionally well-conceived and well-crafted portraits such as this one of 1642 (not 1643, as has been said). The richly dressed young woman may be a newlywed; the presentation of the figure strongly suggests that there was a pendant male portrait (now unknown), meant to be placed to the viewer’s left. Rembrandt’s Portrait of Agatha Bas of 1641 in Buckingham Palace, London, must have influenced this painting, but it is immediately recognizable as a work by Bol.

The Museum also has a later portrait by Bol, Young Girl with a Basket of Fruit of 1657 (57.68), in which no trace of Rembrandt’s style remains.

Literature
GERARD DOU (1613–1675)

44 An Evening School

Ca. 1655–60
Oil on wood, arched top, 10 × 9 in. (25.4 × 22.9 cm)
Bequest of Lillian M. Ellis, 1940
40.64

Gerard (or Gerrit) Dou was Rembrandt’s pupil in Leiden from February 1628 until late in 1631. The small scale, meticulous execution, and representation of light in this picture ultimately depend upon Rembrandt’s example. Dou treated this theme in several pictures that date from slightly later and are better preserved (for example, The Night School in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). The teacher sharpens his pen, which stands for the concept of practice, and the candles (one is lit by a student) represent the light of learning that is passed on.

LITERATURE
GERARD DOU (1613–1675)

45 Self-Portrait

Ca. 1665
Oil on wood, 19 3/4 x 15 3/8 in. (48.9 x 39.1 cm)
Signed at left, on ledge: GDO[U] [GD in monogram]
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.607

Dou presents himself as a learned painter, consulting a large book and wearing scholarly attire. The cracked flowerpot is probably meant as a symbol of transience, which art overcomes. Dou painted a fair number of self-portraits; other outstanding examples are in Amsterdam, Kansas City, and Paris. In this picture, which was famous in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the pose and presentation of the artist as a gentleman recall Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait of 1640 (fig. 31), but Dou’s technique and pedantic approach set him apart from his former master and from most of Rembrandt’s followers in Amsterdam.

LITERATURE
Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, I, no. 283.

143
WILLEM DROST (1633–1663 OR LATER)  

46 Portrait of a Man

1653
Oil on canvas, 34¼ × 28½ in. (86.7 × 72.4 cm)
Signed and dated lower left, on paper: Wilhelm. Drost f / Amsterdam / 1653
Given in memory of Felix M. Warburg by his wife and children, 1941
41.116.2

The pendant to this picture, Portrait of a Woman, signed and dated "Drost f / 1653," is in the Museum Bredius, The Hague. The signature on the Museum's painting imitates the address on a letter that appears to have been tucked into the picture's frame. Very few signed works by Drost are known (fig. 40 is another rare example). He studied with Rembrandt from about 1649 or 1650 until about 1652 or 1653.  

LITERATURE
Sumowski 1983–[94], l, no. 335; The Hague 1992, no. 5.
47 Isaac Blessing Jacob

1642
Oil on canvas, 39 1/2 x 50 1/2 in. (100.6 x 128.3 cm)
Signed and dated lower center: G V eeckhout / A’ [monogram] / 1642
Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900
25.110.16

Van den Eeckhout, one of Rembrandt’s many Mennonite associates, studied with the master between about 1635 and about 1638. The subject of this canvas, painted when the artist was twenty-one, occurs rather frequently in the work of Rembrandt followers from the mid-1630s onward. Examples include paintings by Gerrit Willemsz Horst of about 1636–37 and 1638 (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, and Dulwich Picture Gallery, London), pictures by Govert Flinck of about 1637 (Leeuwarden) and 1638 (fig. 25), and a work of about 1650 by Jan Victors (fig. 4). The Museum also has one of van den Eeckhout’s fashionable genre scenes of the early 1650s, A Musical Party (26.260.8).

48 Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael

1658
Oil on wood, 19 1/2 x 14 in. (49.5 x 35.6 cm)
Signed and dated bottom center: BFabritius [BF in monogram, with B reversed] / 1658
Bequest of Harry G. Sperling, 1971
1976.100.23

Barent was the younger brother of Carel Fabritius (1622–1654), who was Rembrandt’s pupil about 1642 to 1643. There is no evidence that Barent ever studied with
Rembrandt, but the Rembrandtesque nature of his earlier *Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael* (fig. 79) and a few other pictures suggests that he was closely associated with followers of the master in the late 1640s and in the 1650s. He was cited as living in Amsterdam in 1647 and in 1652, but by about 1656 until his death he was mostly active in Leiden. Although it is not among Fabritius’s finer works, the present picture is interesting as a curious variation on one of the most common Rembrandt-school themes (see no. 52), not least for its sentimental notion of Hagar’s behavior.

**Literature**


Fig. 79. Barent Fabritius. *Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael*, ca. 1659–60. Oil on canvas, 42⅜ × 42⅜ in. (107.5 × 107.5 cm). M. H. de Young Memorial Museum, The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, Anonymous gift 50.34
GOVERT FLINCK (1615–1660)  

49 Bearded Man with a Velvet Cap

164[5?]
Oil on wood, 23 3/4 x 20 3/4 in. (60.3 x 52.4 cm)
Signed and dated left center: G. flinck f. 164[5?]
Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900
25.110.27

Flinck entered Rembrandt's studio at some moment between about 1633 and about 1635 (see "Rembrandt and the Rembrandt Style in the Seventeenth Century," note 65, in this volume); his first known independent paintings are dated 1636. The young artist probably knew and perhaps copied imaginary portraits (tronies) by Rembrandt even before the two painters were directly associated. Bust-length pictures of fanciful figures, especially mature men with beards, berets, and often a gold chain and pendant, remained in Flinck's repertoire in the 1640s. Similar subjects were painted by the Rembrandt follower Salomon Koninck and perhaps by Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (see no. 26).

LITERATURE
Sumowski 1983–[94], II, no. 682.
SAMUEL VAN HOOGSTRATEN (1627–1678)

50 The Annunciation of the Death of the Virgin

Ca. 1670
Oil on canvas, 26 × 20¼ in. (66 × 52.7 cm)
Signed lower left: S.v.H.
Purchase, Rogers Fund and Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1992
1992.133

Van Hoogstraten was Rembrandt’s pupil in the early 1640s and one of his closest imitators between about 1645 and 1650 (see figs. 2, 37). In later decades this eclectic and learned artist followed several fashions in Dutch art, including a classicist current that had appeared intermittently in the Netherlands and was on the rise in the early 1670s (the Museum’s Apollo and Aurora, painted by the Rembrandt critic Gerard de Lairesse in 1671 [43.118], also reflects this trend). In this private Catholic picture of about 1670 the former follower’s style is very different from Rembrandt’s late manner, but the Rembrandtesque contrast of light and dark and the reflective expressions remain legacies of van Hoogstraten’s student years.

LITERATURE
PHILIPS KONINCK (1619–1688)  

51 Wide River Landscape

Ca. 1648–49
Oil on canvas, 16¼ × 22¼ in. (41.3 × 58.1 cm)
Anonymous Gift, 1963
63.43.2

Philips Koninck studied with his older brother, Jacob, between 1637 and 1639 and in 1641 married a sister of Rembrandt’s pupil Abraham Furnerius. Koninck’s figure paintings of the 1640s recall works by minor Rembrandt followers such as Salomon Koninck. However, his early landscapes, which date from 1647 onward, were influenced by Rembrandt’s landscape paintings of about a decade earlier and by the moody panoramas painted by Hercules Segers from about 1625 to 1635 (eight pictures by Segers were in Rembrandt’s collection). The Wide River Landscape of about 1648–49 is one of Koninck’s most Rembrandt-esque works; another version was engraved as a Rembrandt by J. B. C. Chatelaine in 1744.

Wl

Literature
Sumowski 1983–94, III, no. 1030, as about 1651.

NICOLAES MAES (1634–1693)  

52 Abraham Dismissing Hagar and Ishmael

1653
Oil on canvas, 34½ × 27½ in. (87.6 × 69.9 cm)
Signed and dated lower center, on step: NMAES.
1653
Gift of Mrs. Edward Brayton, 1971
1971.73

This painting is the earliest known dated work by Nicolaes Maes, who studied with Rembrandt from about 1649–50 to 1652. The subject was treated in numerous drawings and paintings by Rembrandt pupils and followers, among them Ferdinand Bol’s picture of about 1637 in St. Petersburg, Govert Flinck’s of 1640 in Budapest, Jan Victors’s of 1650 in Jerusalem (exhibited in Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, no. 69), and Barent Fabrittius’s compositions of the 1650s (see no. 48, fig. 75). Various biblical subjects, such as this one and Christ and the Woman of Samaria (see figs. 136–138, vol. 1),
were apparently assigned by Rembrandt to his pupils as essays in staging and expression. Van Hoogstraten adopted this pedagogical method and required students who turned in unsatisfactory solutions to read the biblical verses aloud (see von Moltke 1994, pp. 3–4).

Rembrandt usually addressed a subject in a painting or print before his disciples worked on it. Maes depends in this picture upon Rembrandt’s etching of 1637 (fig. 80) but surpasses it in the effectiveness of the expressions and poses of the rejected mistress and her son Ishmael. In its coloring and chiaroscuro the painting is more reminiscent of contemporary pictures by other Rembrandt pupils and followers (for example, Willem Drost) than of Rembrandt’s subtle effects in works of the early 1650s.

**Literature**

NICOLAES MAES (1634–1693)

53 Young Girl Peeling Apples

Ca. 1655
Oil on wood, 21 1/2 × 18 in. (54.6 × 45.7 cm)
Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913
14.40.612

Rembrandt's teaching, and perhaps his own example, encouraged his best pupils to pursue distinctive styles and interpretations. No one adopted Rembrandt's style of the 1640s and also his sympathetic approach to domestic life (including that of the Holy Family [see fig. 41]) so successfully as did Maes in Dordrecht during the mid-1650s in his scenes of everyday life. His achievement made a strong impression on local colleagues such as Abraham van Diick (see no. 36), Reynier Covijn (ca. 1636–1682), and Cornelis Bisschop (1630–1674; see the Museum's Young Woman and a Cavalier of the early 1660s in the Linsky Collection [1982.60.33]). Vermeer's Young Woman Asleep of about 1656–57 in the Altman Collection (14.40.611) represents the Delft artist's brief but important response to Maes. The Museum's collection also includes other pictures by Maes: a slightly later genre painting, The Lacemaker of 1655–56 (32.100.5), the large Portrait of a Woman, ca. 1660? (06.1325), and a pair of splendid small portraits, Admiral Jacob Binnckes (11.149.2) and its pendant, Ingea Rotterdam (11.149.3), the later dated 1676.

Literature
JÜRGEN OVENS (1623–1678)

54 Portrait of a Woman

1650
Oil on canvas, 49⅞ × 37⅞ in. (125.4 × 95.9 cm)
Signed and dated lower left: J. ovens, f.a. 1650, 11 Maig
Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889
89.15.28

The biographer Arnold Houbraken records that Ovens, who was from Schleswig-Holstein, was Rembrandt’s pupil. This must have been about 1640; his earliest dated picture is a portrait of 1641. He remained in Amsterdam until 1652, became a court portraitist in Holstein, and then worked again in Amsterdam between 1657 and 1663. Ovens rapidly distanced himself from Rembrandt’s manner and followed closely the most fashionable aspects of Flinck’s style. However, his Simeon’s Song of Praise of 1651 (Kunsthalle zu Kiel) is strongly Rembrandesque, although it dates from about the same time as the present typical Ovens portrait. Ovens completed Govert Flinck’s enormous Oath of the Batavians under Claudius Civilis after the latter’s death in 1660 and the rejection of Rembrandt’s replacement (fragment now in Stockholm). The final work, with its effects of nocturnal illumination, is one of the most disastrous decorations in the Netherlands.

Literature
Sumowski 1983–[94], III, no. 1522.
JAN VICTORS (1620–1676)

55 Abraham’s Parting from the Family of Lot

Ca. 1670
Oil on canvas, 58 × 65 1/2 in. (147.3 × 165.4 cm)
Signed at right: Jan Victors
Purchase, 1871
71.170

Victors studied with Rembrandt during the late 1630s. In his history pictures and portraits of the 1640s Rembrandt’s influence is discernible, but a drier version of Govert Flinck’s style soon replaced it. The unambiguous staging of Victors’s narratives reflects his admiration for Rembrandt’s teacher, Pieter Lastman. Despite its clarity of presentation, the Museum’s painting has borne the wrong title, *Jacob and Laban*, since its acquisition in 1871. Here Victors, a devout Calvinist, illustrated not this episode in Jacob’s story but the far less familiar subject of Abraham departing for Canaan, while his nephew Lot, his family, and herdsmen set off for Sodom (Genesis 13).

Literature
Sumowski 1983–94, IV, no. 1780, noting that Manuth identified the proper subject.
Drawings by Rembrandt differ so much in function, style, and technique, and he so rarely signed or inscribed his sheets that it has proven difficult to form a clear picture of his work in this medium. In addition, so successfully did Rembrandt teach young artists to draw in his own manner that as early as the seventeenth century his sketches were confused with those by his pupils and followers. In an article of 1930–31 devoted to the Rembrandt drawings in the Havemeyer bequest to the Metropolitan Museum, Valentinier noted that there were scarcely more than forty sheets by Rembrandt in American collections, compared with about seven hundred paintings, due predominantly to collectors’ uncertainty regarding the authenticity of the works on paper.¹

This confusion persists. The six-volume catalogue raisonné compiled by Benesch and published between 1954 and 1957 presented what appeared to be a coherent chronicle of the artist’s development as a draftsman, ordering the entries by date rather than by collection or by subject matter.² It had its flaws. Benesch used the chronology he established as a means to authenticate these works without formulating a critical method by which to judge their attribution, and he included more drawings than he should have, as reviews made evident.³ Yet his book remained the standard reference on the subject for over a generation.

Drawings scholarship has been revitalized only within the past decade. Sumowski has identified the work of Rembrandt’s pupils and followers in catalogues of both drawings and paintings, and a younger greatly more of curators, notably Schatborn, Giltaij, Starcky, and Royalton-Kisch, have started to recatalogue some of the major European repositories of Rembrandt and Rembrandt school drawings.⁴

Unlike the study of Rembrandt’s paintings and prints, the reevaluation of the artist’s drawings has not been much affected by technical research. Although greater attention is now given to the analysis of supports, including the measuring of chain lines and the recording of watermarks, and to the investigation of inks, such studies remain at a nascent stage and have rarely provided conclusive evidence for determining attribution.⁵ Curators and connoisseurs continue to rely mainly on traditional means of arriving at such judgments, considering stylistic and iconographic factors in a more rigorous and systematic manner than in the past but introducing a subjective component nonetheless.

A core group of about seventy drawings is generally thought to be of certain attribution. These sheets were either signed or inscribed in Rembrandt’s hand, or they served directly as preparatory studies for undisputed etchings or paintings. To this body of work, other groups of drawings have been related stylistically. In each case, however, decisions about attribution are based on such additional considerations as the way in which the artist interpreted the subject matter; the function the drawing fulfilled; medium and technique; graphic idiosyncrasies; overall quality in the handling of lines and washes and in the rendering of space and light, expressions and gestures; and, most importantly, the manner in which these and other aspects interrelate.⁶ Rembrandt’s corpus as it is being formed today is smaller and more precisely defined than ever before.

In America there have been no studies devoted exclusively to this subject since, first, the exhibition of 1960, “Rembrandt Drawings from American Collections,” and, second, the section composed of drawings in the more inclusive presentation of 1969–70, “Rembrandt after Three Hundred Years.”⁷ This portion of the present catalogue thus represents the first critical reassessment of Rembrandt’s drawings undertaken in this country in many years. Of the thirty Metropolitan Museum sheets selected for this exhibition (ten of the Museum’s examples attributed to Rembrandt or his school were not included either because of their inferior quality or poor state of conservation), Benesch catalogued twenty-two: nineteen of these as by Rembrandt, two as attributed to Rembrandt, and one as a copy after Rembrandt. In the present catalogue only eleven
drawings are now considered to be by the artist, five are provisionally attributed to him, and the remainder are called anonymous, reflecting a trend indicative of the restrictive tendencies that characterize not only Rembrandt drawings scholarship in Europe but also the decisions of the Rembrandt Research Project on paintings.

The certainty with which one can attribute the works in this exhibition to Rembrandt or his pupils varies widely. The presence of signatures on nos. 56 and 60, among other factors, permits us to assign these drawings to Rembrandt with confidence. But the lack of authentic drawings with which to compare nos. 61 and 62, for example, makes their ascription to Rembrandt somewhat less secure. As for nos. 67 through 71, their weak execution raises enough doubt to warrant an attribution qualified by a question mark, despite the subjectivity of that measure.

As the number of drawings firmly attributed to Rembrandt decreases, the number of studies assigned to pupils and followers grows. It has been possible in the case of no. 84 to attribute the sheet to a known pupil, Samuel van Hoogstraten; most of the examples, however, must at present remain anonymous. Too little is currently known, for instance, about the stylistic development of such pupils as Willem Drost and Arent de Gelder, artists with whom no. 81 has been associated. As we understand more about

the way in which the students drew and learned from the master—from creatively adapting his etchings (see nos. 74, 77, 79), to sketching from models in the studio (see no. 73), to inventively composing subjects he assigned (see no. 85)—the better we will be able to define the work of Rembrandt as well.2

56 The Last Supper, after Leonardo

1633–35
Red chalk, 14¾ × 18¾ in. (36.2 × 47.5 cm)
Signed in red chalk lower right: Rembrandt f. inscribed in red chalk lower center: Wt [. . .]
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975
1975.1.794

When Rembrandt copied an engraving after Leonardo's renowned fresco in Milan (fig. 81), he did not attempt to create a faithful reproduction but rather executed a free interpretation. After making a light first sketch that deviated from the model in a few details, he introduced more changes, redrawing the figures and the setting with strong, angular strokes in chalk to emphasize the response of each disciple to Christ's statement, calmly delivered, that one of them would betray him (John 13:23). He thus magnified a sense of individual personality in each figure. In addition, Rembrandt projected the figures into the fore-
center behind Christ. Rembrandt very rarely signed or inscribed a drawing, but he may have chosen to do so here both to acknowledge his source and to indicate his authorship of a new invention.²

Rembrandt used red chalk for other copies he made, mainly after paintings by his teacher Pieter Lastman (1583–1633), as well as for model sheets and composition sketches for his own paintings and etchings of about 1635.³ The present work also dates from this time.⁴ In all these drawings Rembrandt handled chalk much as he would have a pen, creating lines of varying density without exploiting its capacity to shade form smoothly.

The Last Supper is not the hesitant effort of a young artist learning to draw by copying but a sophisticated commentary on a canonical work of art that profoundly influenced the compositions of Rembrandt’s later works, from The Wedding of Samson of 1638 in Dresden to the Conspiracy of Claudius Civilis of about 1661 in Stockholm.⁵

1. Schaborn (1985b, p. 186, n. 5, under no. 87) proposed that the drawing may be the work of a student corrected by Rembrandt, but he no longer subscribes to this theory (letter to the author, March 16, 1995).

2. Wt, meaning “from,” written at the bottom of the sheet, may be the first letters of an inscription indicating the source that Rembrandt intended to record. Rembrandt made two other copies after Leonardo’s Last Supper, both of which he signed. One, in red chalk in the British Museum, London (Benesch 444; London 1992a, no. 14), focuses on the grouping of the figures, recasting Leonardo’s design to form pyramidal clusters of three. The second, in pen and ink in the Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (Benesch 445), regroups the figures yet again. These include, among others, Studies of Women and Children, British Museum, London (Benesch 421, 422; London 1992a, nos. 16, 17); Susanna and the Elders, after Lastman, Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (Benesch 448; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 11); Paul and Barnabas at Lystra, after Lastman, Musée Bonnat, Bayonne (Benesch 449).

4. Whether Rembrandt executed the second drawing immediately upon completion of the first sketch or after considerable time elapsed has been the subject of much dispute. The Rembrandt Research Project (Corpus, III [1989], p. 254, under no. A 123) has adopted the position that a moderate period of time separates the two elements, dating the initial sketch 1633 and the reworking 1635.

5. Ibid., no. A 123; Bredius 1969, no. 482.
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EX COLL.
Friedrich August II of Saxony, Dresden (Lugt 971).

REMBRANDT ⊕

57 Two Studies of a Woman Reading
1635–40
Pen and brown ink, 6⅛ × 5⅛ in. (17.3 × 15 cm)
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.932

Rembrandt drew studies of the human figure in order to explore ways in which he might express both the physical and psychological aspects of the model, in this case the sitter’s rounded features, her intense expression, and her absorbed state of mind. As was his practice, Rembrandt sketched the figure more than once, from different angles and in somewhat varied poses. He thus introduced a timeless element to a nonnarrative theme, enlivening the sheet by conveying a sense of the movement of his subject as she shifted her weight in the chair while reading.

It is possible that Rembrandt’s wife, Saskia, served as the model for these studies, which in type and technique resemble others thought to represent her.³ All are similarly sketchy in execution yet accurate in detail and are drawn in the same medium, an iron-gall ink that has tended to corrode the support. They have been assigned to the second half of the 1630s, a date supported by the close parallels between the present studies of a woman reading and Rembrandt’s etchings with head studies that he dated 1636 and 1637 (see fig. 82).²
Rembrandt did not refer directly to studies of this kind to prepare his paintings, although they informed his finished work in a general way. He seems, however, to have made such sketches available to his pupils for study. Two anonymous drawings, previously attributed to Rembrandt, are known, each of which copies one of the figures in the present work. Thus the Museum’s drawing may have been used in Rembrandt’s studio according to the traditional function suggested by its subject matter and composition. The seemingly random yet well-spaced disposition of similar motifs recalls the pages from artists’ model books produced for study and reference in the studio since medieval times.  

1. However, Valentiner (1923, p. 279), followed by others, identified the model in the present drawing as the nurse who attended Saskia during her illness. She appears in a similar pose in other drawings (for example, Fondation Custodia, Paris [Benesch 426]). Another drawing that may show Saskia is in the Museum Boymans–van Beuningen, Rotterdam (Benesch 250); Saskia’s identity, however, is confirmed only in Rembrandt’s inscribed portrait of her in metalpoint of 1633 (Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin [Benesch 427]).

Fig. 82. Rembrandt. *Three Heads of Women, One Asleep*, 1637. Etching, 5 × 4 in. (12.7 × 10.3 cm). Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
2. Bartsch 365, 367, 368. Schatborn (1935b, under no. 92) and Royalten-Kisch (in London 1992a, under nos. 28, 29), also date the figure studies in pen to the second half of the 1630s.
3. Formerly Oppenheim, London (Benesch 194); Städelisches Kunstinstitut und Städtische Galerie, Frankfurt (Benesch 252).
4. Bruyn 1983, p. 54, also suggested drawings by Rembrandt may have served as didactic examples for the pupils.

**Literature**

**Exhibited**
Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, and Rotterdam, Museum Boymans, "Rembrandt tentoonstelling: Ter herdenking van de geboorte van Rembrandt op 15 juli 1606," 1956, no. 56, as ca. 1635–39; New York, The Pierpont Morgan Library, and Cambridge, Massachusetts, Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, "Rembrandt Drawings from American Collections," 1960, no. 34, as ca. 1635–39; The Art Institute of Chicago, The Minneapolis Institute of Arts, and The Detroit Institute of Arts, "Rembrandt after Three Hundred Years: An Exhibition of Rembrandt and His Followers," 1969–70, no. 102, as mid-1630s.

**Ex Coll.**
William Mayor, London ( Lugt 2799); Sir Francis Seymour Haden, London and Arlesford (Lugt 1227; sold, Sotheby and Co., London, June 15, 1891, no. 582); Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1891–1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–29).

**Rembrandt**

58 Old Man Leaning on a Stick

1635–40
Pen and brown ink, original dimensions, 5¼×3¼ in. (12.9×7.8 cm); with additional strips of paper at upper left corner and top margin, 5¼×3¼ in. (13.5×7.8 cm)
Annotated in pen and brown ink lower left: Rinbrant. Robert Lehman Collection, 1975 1975.1.796

In this study Rembrandt depicted an old man in the act of listening. The figure supports his weight against his walking stick, not just to ease his fatigue, it seems, but also to enable him to lean farther forward, the better to hear the unseen speaker's words as he gazes upward with an expression of rapt attention. As a young artist in Leiden, Rembrandt drew at least three studies in red chalk of similar old men, one of which he used subsequently for a grisaille sketch now in Amsterdam showing the figure of Jacob listening intently to the young Joseph recounting his dreams. During the 1630s he also made numerous etchings of standing beggars who lean on their sticks in a comparable way (see fig. 83), modest types influenced by Callot's Les Gueux.

The close cropping of the Museum's drawing at the upper left corner and along the top edge suggests that it is a fragment cut from a larger sheet that may have shown several studies of the same figure. Rembrandt made such studies throughout the 1630s and 1640s. The execution of the present drawing is comparable to studies of the later 1630s in which Rembrandt first sketched the figure lightly

160
in pen and then redrew certain contours with stronger strokes for accent and added weight. In redrawing this example Rembrandt straightened the hat and enlarged the sleeves he had given the old man in his first sketch, endowing him with a more distinguished appearance. He did not devise this study in preparation for a specific work but rather as a way of working out ideas for any number of

\[\text{Fig. 83. Rembrandt. Peasant in a High Cap, 1639. Etching, 3\frac{3}{4} \times 1\frac{1}{4} \text{ in. (8.3} \times 4.5 \text{ cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Georgiana W. Sargent, in memory of John Osborne Sargent, 1924 24.63.95}\]

inently listening old men who play important supporting roles in his paintings and etchings of biblical subjects such as Christ Preaching ("La Petite Tombe") and in his representations of blind Tobit as well. 6

1. Collection Alain Delon, Paris (Benesch 20); Teylers Museum, Haarlem (Benesch 40); Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (Benesch 41).
3. For example, Bartsch 133. See Halewood 1993.
4. Such a sheet would have resembled those in the British Museum, London (Benesch 327, 688, 679; London 1992a, nos. 8, 36, 45).
5. For example, Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts (Benesch 143); National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne (Benesch 157); Victoria and Albert Museum, London (Benesch 235); Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris (Benesch 237; Paris 1988–89, no. 22).

**Literature**
Benesch 1954–57, II, no. 260, fig. 277, as ca. 1635.
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**Ex Coll.**
Rodolphe Kann, Paris; Mrs. A. Hamilton Rice, Newport; Dr. A. Hamilton Rice, New York; Mr. and Mrs. Louis H. Silver, Chicago.
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**Rembrandt**

**59 Two Cottages**

1635–40
Pen and brown ink, corrected with white gouache, 5\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 7\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (14.9 x 19.1 cm)
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975
1975.1.801

In this study of two rural cottages Rembrandt recorded the details and textures of his subject with such immediacy and bravura that it seems he could only have made the sketch with the subject before him. He contributed further to this impression by leaving the foreground cottage incomplete, as though an adjacent structure blocked his view.

Rembrandt composed and executed this drawing with careful consideration, despite its unstudied character. He first lightly sketched the two cottages along a diagonal line, establishing the structure of the buildings and a sense of recession in space. From the start he also thought to include the unhitched cart in order to secure the foreground plane. Then with broader lines he redrew certain elements, emphasizing the closer cottage to bring it forward and to suggest the materials with which it was constructed.

Passages that did not suit him, notably in the upper story of the foreground cottage, he covered up with white gouache.

This is one of five drawings so closely related in subject matter and execution that they must have been made about the same time. 1 Whereas their attribution has never been
disputed (Rembrandt treated the subject of rural cottages similarly in numerous etchings that he signed), their dating has been much debated.\(^4\) Scholars have proposed a wide range of possibilities, between 1633 and 1650—an issue that is difficult to resolve due to the absence of securely dated comparable material.\(^5\) However, the technique of the landscapes parallels that of the figure studies of the second half of the 1630s, and they therefore could plausibly be assumed to date from that time. As such, these drawings could be considered precursors to the landscape etchings of the early 1640s.\(^6\)

1. The others are in the Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna (Benesch 794); Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (Benesch 793); The J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu (Benesch 796); Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris (Benesch 797).

2. For a signed etching of the subject, see Landscape with a Cottage and a Large Tree, signed and dated 1641 (Bartsch 226).

3. Schneider (in Washington 1990, p. 75, under no. 2) suggested the earlier date; Kruse and Neumann (1920, no. VII, 1) the later.

4. Schatborn 1983b, no. 15, regarding Benesch 393.
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(Sold, Sotheby and Co., London, June 30, 1948, no. 147); [Colnaghi, London]; [Schaeffer Galleries, New York]; [Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York, 1963].
60 Cottage near the Edge of a Wood

Pen and brown ink, brush and brown wash, and black chalk, over traces of red chalk, 11 1/2 x 17 1/2 in. (29.8 x 44.9 cm)
Signed and dated in pen and brown ink lower left:
Rembrandt f. 1644
Foxed throughout
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975
1975.1.792

For a painter whose primary concern was the human figure, Rembrandt drew and etched a remarkable number of landscapes. This view of a cottage near the edge of a wood, although characteristic in subject matter, is exceptional for the fluidity of its line, extensive use of wash, and large scale. Departing from the tradition of sixteenth-century landscape prints to which Rembrandt often adhered, it is more a portrait of a cottage than a sketch of a country vista featuring rustic houses.

In spite of these anomalies, we can be certain of the authorship of this drawing since it is signed and dated 1644 in the same pen and ink used to lightly outline the main elements of the scene. Although Rembrandt’s signatures on his drawings have not been studied in a systematic manner, they can be reliable indicators of authenticity; it is usually possible to establish whether they are in a medium original to the drawing and to compare them with documents signed by the artist. This work thus represents a stylistic signpost for the attribution of other drawings from the mid-1640s.

It is likely that Cottage near the Edge of a Wood was stored along with other landscapes in one of five portfolios that the artist Lambert Doomer (1624–1700) acquired at the sale of Rembrandt’s studio effects in 1658. Even though the scene bears his signature, Rembrandt does not seem to have accorded it any greater status than he gave his other landscapes.

1. See, for example, Amsterdam 1987–88, nos. 35, 41. For documents signed by Rembrandt, see Straus and van der Meulen 1979.
2. Doomer copied this work three times, once faithfully and twice in a more interpretative manner (Fondation Custodia, Paris;
Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris; private collection, Hilversum [Szmowski 1979—II, nos. 441x, 465x, 479x, ill.]). Although van Regteren Altena (in Rome, Florence 1951) has suggested that Rembrandt and Doomer made sketches of the cottage on the same occasion, Schatborn (1977) on stylistic grounds thought it more likely that Doomer made his copies in the later 1630s, after his acquisition of numerous Rembrandt drawings, a view supported by Starcky (in Paris 1988–89).

**Literature**
Benesch 1954—57, IV, no. 815, fig. 965; Schulz 1974, p. 11, and under no. 1; Schatborn 1977, p. 48; Szmowski 1979—II, under nos. 441x, 465x, 479x; Paris 1988–89, under no. 103; London 1992a, under no. 44, fig. 44A (detail).
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Jonathan Richardson Sr., London (Lugt 2184); Arthur Pond, London (Lugt 2037); John Barnard, London (Lugt 1420); Benjamin West, London (Lugt 419); William Esdaile, London (Lugt 2671); Sir Thomas Lawrence, London (Lugt 2445); Barron Grahame, London; John Postle Heseltine, London (Lugt 1507); sold, Frederik Muller and Co., Amsterdam, May 27, 1913, no. 24; Otto Gutekunst, London; J. Hirsch, New York.
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**61 Satire on Art Criticism**

1644?
Pen and brown ink, laid down, 6½ x 7½ in. (13.6 x 20 cm)
Inscribed in pen and brown ink lower center: den tijt 1647
Annotated in pen and brown ink on the critic’s platform: dees . . .
van kunst / is sotting gunst; and on the framed painting: . . .
and Houdlous . . . i.ind. dat; lower left: Rembrandt.
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975
1975–799

This drawing is so atypical in both subject and style of works by Rembrandt that it is not surprising its attribution has been questioned. In *Satire on Art Criticism* Rembrandt ridicules ignorant art critics by depicting a connoisseur commenting on painted portraits brought before him. The composition depends on the lost *Calumny of Apelles*, a subject Rembrandt knew from a drawing by Mantegna (fig. 84) (which he copied about 1656 [British Museum, London]). In Mantegna’s drawing the beautiful Calumny, urged on by Treachery and Deceit, drags an innocent youth who is the victim of slander before a judge with the ears of an ass; the judge is flanked by Ignorance and Suspicion, and Repentance and Truth linger in the background. Here Rembrandt has reduced the number of personifications and transformed them into onlookers in contemporary dress. He substituted two painted portraits for the victim receiving judgment.

The inscriptions on the critic’s platform and on the framed painting cannot be read easily, nor are they surely in Rembrandt’s hand. The date is unclear as well and could be 1604 or 1644. Read as 1604, it perhaps refers to Karel van Mander’s *Schilderboeck*, the first volume of which consists of a didactic poem on artistic theory and practice that was published in that year. Read as 1644, it would indicate when the drawing was made. Among the few drawings by Rembrandt that closely resemble this satire is the *Venus and Mars Caught in the Net of Vulcan* of about 1643 (fig. 85), a work generally accepted as authentic. Its subject also derives from a classical source, in this case Ovid, and its composition is also based on an engraving, in this case one made after Raphael’s fresco in the Villa Farnesina. In addition, the *Venus* and the *Satire* show a similar compact massing of figures and a fluidity in the lines that is almost uncontrolled in some of the faces and limbs. The sharing of these characteristics may be a function of Rembrandt’s reliance on Renaissance models for both works; however, these traits are also evident in his drawings from the mid–1640s.

---

1. The relationship to the *Calumny* was first pointed out in Emmens 1968, pp. 130–34. For Mantegna’s drawing, see Popham and Pouncey 1950, no. 158, pl. CXVIII; London 1992a, fig. 53a. For Rembrandt’s copy (Benesch 601); see London 1992a, no. 53.
2. Benesch (A 354) thought that the inscription at the bottom was by Rembrandt but that the others were not. Interpretations of the inscriptions are offered by van Regteren Altena in New York, Cambridge 1960; Emmens 1968; Roscam Abbing 1993a; van de Wetering 1993b.
3. Compare the date on the *Cottage near the Edge of a Wood* (no. 60).
5. The *Gods on Mount Olympus*, either the engraving by Master B after Michiel Coxie (Bartsch 1803–21, XV, p. 223, no. 68) or by G. B. Caraglio (Bartsch 1801–21, XV, pp. 89–90, no. 54).
6. The present work is not close in style to any drawings of the 1640s that are securely attributed to Rembrandt. However, it is similar to a number of others, such as the *Three Women and a Child by a Door* in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Benesch
Fig. 84. Andrea Mantegna. *Column of Apelles*, ca. 1505. Pen and brown ink, touches of white gouache, 8½ × 15 in. (20.7 × 38 cm). British Museum, London.

Fig. 85. Rembrandt. *Venus and Mars Caught in the Net of Vulcan*, ca. 1643. Pen and brown ink, 8½ × 11¼ in. (21.1 × 28.9 cm). Amsterdam Historisch Museum.

407; Schatborn 1985b, no. 27), accepted as by Rembrandt based on their close relationship to the securely attributed group.

Literature
Hofstede de Groot 1906a, no. 303, as 1604; Freise, Lilienfeld, and Wichmann 1925, no. III, as not by Rembrandt; Valentiner 1925–34, II, no. 619, ill., as by Rembrandt 1644; Benesch 1954–57, IV, no. A 35a, fig. 1037, as by a pupil, although inscription at bottom is by Rembrandt; van Gelder 1959, p. 308, as by Rembrandt; Rosenberg 1959, p. 116, as by Rembrandt; van Gelder 1961, p. 130, as probably by Rembrandt; Haverkamp-Begemann 1961, p. 90, as by Rembrandt; Sumowski 1961, p. 24, as possibly by Flinck; Emmens 1968, pp. 150–54, 201, fig. 28; Schatborn 1982, p. 253; London 1992a, p. 114, n. 4, under no. 44, generally accepted as authentic; Boscam Abbing
62 The Wedding Night of Tobias and Sarah

1640s
Pen and brown ink, touches of brown wash, and traces of white gouache, 6⅞ × 9⅜ in. (17.6 × 23.8 cm)
Annotated in William Esdaile’s hand on verso: 1798 Sr Jos Reynolds colln W.E. P 84 Rembrandt
Rogers Fund, 1906
06.1042.2

When Rembrandt depicted biblical scenes, he emphasized the emotional and moral aspects of the stories represented. In this light pen sketch we see the moment in the apocryphal Book of Tobit (8:1–4) in which Tobit’s son Tobias, on his wedding night, makes an offering to God of the heart and liver of a great fish to cast out the devil Asmodeus, who had killed Sarah’s seven previous husbands before the marriages could be consummated.

Rembrandt based his sketch on a painting of 1611 of the same subject by his teacher, Pieter Lastman (1583–1633) (fig. 86). He introduced compositional changes that stress not only the relationship of Tobias and Sarah but also their piety. The demon, no longer wrestling with the angel, departs from the bedchamber, and the figures of Tobias and Sarah are reversed to face each other as they fervently pray.

Drawings of the 1640s are difficult to ascribe, as few from that decade are documented. Although the attribution of this sheet has been questioned, it compares closely with other drawings considered authentic, such as The Healing of Blind Tobit (fig. 87) and the Holy Family in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. All three are characterized by fine pen strokes scratching across the surface of the paper to broadly outline the forms: heavier, rounded lines to suggest the weight or proximity of forms; short, straight strokes to indicate facial features; and broad, cursory lines to intimate the setting. In addition to these stylistic factors, the way in which Rembrandt transformed Lastman’s painting, enhancing the emotional power of the scene, further supports an attribution to the pupil.

Rembrandt rarely drew preparatory studies for paintings, but he did use his sketches as references, in a general sense, for other works. The Museum’s drawing, for example, may subsequently have served Rembrandt as he formulated his painting of 1645 of a young woman in bed pushing back the curtain (National Gallery, Edinburgh)—a subject that was recently interpreted as Sarah awaiting Tobias, the biblical story distilled to its most essential image.

2. Tümpel (ibid.) and Royalton-Kisch (letter to the writer, March 17, 1993) questioned the attribution of this drawing. Regarding the Healing of Blind Tobit, see Benesch (547); Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 18. The Holy Family (Benesch 569) relates to the painting of the Holy Family with Angels of 1645 in The Hermitage, St. Petersburg (Bredius 1969, no. 570).
Fig. 87. Rembrandt. *The Healing of Blind Tobit,* ca. 1642–44.
Pen and brown ink, and white gouache, 8¾ × 7 in. (21 × 17.7 cm).
The Cleveland Museum of Art, J. H. Wade Fund, 1993, 69.69

no. 36. Sumowski (in Bauch 1966, no. 266) first suggested this subject.

**Literature**

Benesch 1954–57, III, no. 633, fig. 767, as ca. 1648–50; Sumowski 1961, p. 13, as by Rembrandt, and relates it to a copy in the Museum Boymans–van Beuningen, Rotterdam; Held 1969, pp. 111–12, fig. 18, as by Rembrandt ca. 1650; Tümpel 1969, pp. 176–78, fig. 56, as a copy; Schatborn 1987, pp. 34–36, 62–63, ill., as by Rembrandt ca. 1650; Giltaij 1988, p. 270, under no. 145, fig. 2, as by Rembrandt.
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Sir Joshua Reynolds, London (Lugt 2364); William Esaie, London (Lugt 2617).
REMBRANDT

63 Cottage among Trees

1648–50
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown washes on paper washed with brown, 6½ × 10¾ in. (17.2 × 27.6 cm); including vertical strip, 6½ × 1½ in. (17.2 × 3.2 cm) added by the artist at right margin
Annotated in pen and brown ink lower left: WE [monogram of William Esaile]
Watermark: fragment of crowned shield
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.939

Among Rembrandt’s sketches of rustic farmhouses and cottages, this drawing is unusually finished in execution and formal in composition. Rembrandt drew the scene with fine pen lines of fairly even width. He applied wash sparingly and rendered the texture of the thatch roof with heavily inked strokes reminiscent of a drypoint burr. In so doing he created a work related in feeling to his etchings. Rembrandt situated the cottage parallel to the picture plane and framed it symmetrically by adding at the right of the original sheet a strip of paper on which he extended the tree branches, the fences, and the distant horizon.

Furthermore, he placed the fences and the ditch in front of the cottage along orthogonal lines that converge at a focal point just to the left of the doorway, thereby composing the scene in perfect accord with Albertian one-point perspective.

Fig. 88. Rembrandt. Cottage with White Paling, 1648. Pen and brown ink, brown wash, white gouache, 6½ × 10 in. (17.1 × 25.5 cm). Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
As he did in the *Cottage with White Paling* of 1648 (fig. 88), Rembrandt suggested the windblown branches with an interplay of loops and hatchings in pen and ink and the strongly sunlit fences by leaving the paper in reserve. Yet the *Cottage among Trees* is more finely executed throughout than the *Cottage with White Paling* and may date from somewhat later. It shows touches of brush and brown wash to indicate details in the foliage similar to those in drawings from about 1650 such as the *Farm with a Dovecote* (Collection P. Russell, Amsterdam). In its reinterpretation of Italian Renaissance principles of composition, this drawing also reveals parallels with paintings Rembrandt made about the same time, most notably the *Supper at Emmaus* of 1648 (Musée du Louvre, Paris).

1. *Cottage with White Paling* (Benesch C 41; Schatborn 1985b, no. 30) is the only known preparatory study for an etching. The etching has been dated 1648 (Schatborn 1985b, p. 69, under no. 30).

**Literature**

Benesch 1954–57, VI, no. 1249, fig. 1475, as ca. 1650–51; Washington 1990, p. 109, n. 1, under no. 18, and p. 135, n. 2, under no. 28.
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J. Pe. Zomer, Amsterdam; Sir Thomas Lawrence, London (Lugt 2443); S. Woodburn, London; William Esaile, London (Lugt 2617; sold, Christie’s, London, June 17, 1840, no. 119); J. H. Hawkins, London (sold, Sotheby and Co., London, April 29, 1850, no. 1022); Sir Francis Seymour Haden, London and Arlesford (Lugt 1227 [on old backing now removed]; sold, Sotheby and Co., London, June 15, 1891, no. 587); Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1891–1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–29).

64 **Houses by the Water**

Ca. 1652
Pen and brown ink, 3 3/4 x 6 3/4 in. (9.8 x 15.6 cm)
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.918

Rembrandt favored bucolic scenery as the subject for his landscape drawings, but on occasion he drew views of cities and towns. This work is one of a group depicting wooden buildings of a type found in North Holland. These travel sketches are small and summarily drawn with
a fine pen that skips over the surface of the paper. In the present work Rembrandt, characteristically, did not sacrifice detail to the abbreviated technique, for he rendered with great clarity tiny incidents that enliven the scene: a woman pushing her child in a sleigh and a man standing and looking toward another man, who, in turn, gazes over the water. He also conveyed a sense of the cold, still air, the even light, and the glassy water, using brownish oatmeal paper to enhance the atmospheric effects.

The widely spaced, predominantly vertical and horizontal parallel hatchings suit the architectural theme. Rembrandt’s sketch the Rain of the Old Town Hall in Amsterdam in 1652, which is inscribed and dated 1652 (fig. 89), is similarly small in scale, rectilinear, and sketchy, although it is drawn mainly with brush and wash.² It serves as a reference point for the attribution and dating of the Museum’s drawing.²

1. Others in the series are in the Devonshire Collection, Chatsworth (Benesch 1308); and the Kopenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen (Benesch 1308a).
2. Benesch 1278.
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Benesch 1954–57, VI, no. 1397, fig. 1337, as ca. 1652–53; Schatborn 1983, p. 78, no. 2, under no. 35, fig. 35b, as ca. 1652; Washington 1990, p. 231, no. 2, under no. 70.
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Jonathan Richardson Sr., London (Lugt 2183); Sir Joshua Reynolds, London (Lugt 2364); Sir Francis Seymour Haden, London and Arlesford (Lugt 1227), sold, Sotheby and Co., June 15, 1891, no. 573; Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1891–1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–29).

REMBRANDT

65 Elsje Christiaens Hanging on the Gibbet

1664
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown wash, on Japan paper, laid down, four corners trimmed, 6¾ × 3¾ in. (17.2 × 9.0 cm)
Annotated in pen and brown ink lower left: WE [monogram of William ESAILE]
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.937

66 Elsje Christiaens Hanging on the Gibbet, in Three-quarter Profile

1664
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown wash on Japan paper; 6¾ × 3¾ in. (15.8 × 8.1 cm); laid down, corners made up
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975
1975.1.803

Rembrandt rarely made drawings of contemporary events. When he made this record of a young Danish woman who had been executed for murder in the gallows field of the Volewijk he approached the subject in much the same way he did when he drew from models in the studio in sketches of the 1630s. He focused exclusively on the figure—which is hanging with an ax, the instrument of the crime—disregarding the setting, and he sketched the form close up from two different vantage points, on different sheets of paper.

The technique, however, is one Rembrandt employed later in life, especially in portraits. The combination of fine pen lines and rich brown washes seen here occurs also in Rembrandt’s copies after Mughal portrait miniatures and in his study of Jacob van Loon (Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) made for his painting The Syndics of the Amsterdam Drapers’ Guild of 1662 (fig. 64).¹
A similar use of abbreviated scratchy, angular pen strokes also appears in his Self-Portrait in Full Length (fig. 90).²

Indeed, the self-portrait is marked by the same kind of
directness and intense scrutiny evident in the drawings of Elsje Christiaens. The self-portrait, as well as the copies after Mughal miniatures, date from the second half of the 1630s, whereas the drawings of Christiaens were made later, in 1664, the year she was executed. We thus can conclude that Rembrandt employed the same technique and approach for certain subjects for almost a decade.

Anthonie van Borssom (1631–1677), who was influenced as a draftsman by Rembrandt but was not verifiably one of his pupils, also drew Christiaens hanging in the Volewijck. But Borssom recorded her from so distant a perspective that his drawing (Rijksprentenkabinet,
Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) seems reportorial and lacks the shocking forthrightness of Rembrandt’s image.

1. One example of Rembrandt’s copies after Mughal miniatures is Four Orientalis Seated under a Tree, ca. 1656–61, in the British Museum, London (Benesch 1187; London 1992, no. 62). For the drawing of van Loon, see Benesch (1179); Schatborn 1985b, no. 36; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 40; for the painting, Bredius 1969, no. 415.


4. Sumowski 1979–81, II, no. 201, ill. Benesch (ad 1103) published an anonymous contemporary copy (Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts) after no. 10, and Valentinus (1930–31, fig. 12) mentioned an eighteenth-century forgery after the same drawing in Munich (not in Wegner 1973).

For number 66
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Benesch 1954–57, V, no. 1106, fig. 1325, as ca. 1654–56; van Eeghen 1969, pp. 73–78, ill., identifies subject and date, 1664; Schatborn 1985b, under no. 67, and p. 147, n. 4, under no. 68; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, under no. 37.
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Possibly J. de Vos, Amsterdam; Sir Thomas Lawrence, London (Lugt 2445); William Esdaile, London (Lugt 2617); Sir Francis Seymour Haden, London and Arlesford (Lugt 1227; sold, Sotheby and Co., London, June 15, 1891); Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1891–1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–29).
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G. C. (Lugt 1143); Flury-Héraud, Paris (Lugt 1015, no. 434); P Mathey, Paris; Rodolphe Kann, Paris; Mrs. A. Hamilton Rice, Newport; Dr. A. Hamilton Rice, New York; Mr. and Mrs. Louis H. Silver, Chicago.

Rembrandt ( )

67 Old Man in Profile

1635–40

Pen and brown ink, 6¼ x 4¼ in. (16.1 x 11.7 cm)

Annotated in pen and brown ink lower right: Rembrandt.

Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Janos Scholz, 1932

52.214.2

Bearded old men were a type favored by Rembrandt throughout his life for representations of biblical personages, beggars, or simple folk. Stylistically, this drawing resembles figure studies from the later 1630s in which Rembrandt sketched the subjects with great clarity, first lightly and then again with greater emphasis on certain details, using iron-gall inks that have tended to eat away at the paper (see no. 57).

In spite of the skill with which the facial features of this bearded man were rendered, the blocky character of the form and the breadth of the lines set the drawing apart from the securely attributed studies of the 1630s. The second, heavier sketch is limited to the contours, and there is almost no hatching. Furthermore, the splitting of the thick lines suggests that they may have been made with a reed pen, a tool Rembrandt used with frequency only in the mid-1640s.
The anomalies of style and technique in this drawing create uncertainty concerning its attribution, and this is fueled by some details: the muddled rendering of the old man's right arm, the unsteady lines defining his pate, and, along the side of the head, the too-regular hatchings that taper off, uncharacteristically, to fine points.

1. Rembrandt used a reed pen, for example, in such works as *Three Studies of Old Men Standing and Walking*, ca. 1643–48, in the British Museum, London (Benesch 679; London 1992a, no. 45).

**Rembrandt (?)**

68 *Seated Man with a Flat Cap*

1635–40
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown wash, corrected with white gouache, 5 1/2 x 5 1/2 in. (14.6 x 13.8 cm)
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.935

Rembrandt made studies of isolated figures in pen and ink in order to explore the way in which pose and expression convey interior states of mind (see no. 57). But, for the purpose of characterizing specific types, such as actors or young women and children, he also drew more elaborate studies in pen and wash of figures within summarily indicated settings. This drawing, which belongs in the second...
defined in the round, and the hatchings that shade the actor’s right hand are too regular. Ferdinand Bol (1616–1680), who worked with Rembrandt as a pupil and an assistant from about 1635 to 1640, adopted this manner. But the present drawing is not sufficiently close to Bol’s work to warrant a change in attribution.


2. An Actor in His Dressing Room (Benesch 120); the same figure also appears in drawings in the Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (Benesch 141; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 7); Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rouen (Benesch 230); Victoria and Albert Museum, London (Benesch 233); École Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts, Paris (Benesch 299).


4. For example, in the drawings cited in n. 1 above. As Royalton-Kisch has pointed out (letter to the author, March 17, 1995), the rendering of the mouth in the present work is similar to that in Rembrandt’s Jewish Bride in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (Benesch 292; Stockholm 1992–93, no. 138), a preparatory drawing for the etching of 1635 (Bartsch 349).

5. Haverkamp-Begemann (in conversation with the present writer, May 1995) believes the attribution to Rembrandt should be retained.

6. See, for example, Bol’s Woman Nursing a Child in the Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris (Benesch 359; Sumowski 1979–80, I, no. 96, ill.; Paris 1988–89, no. 86).
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Benesch 1954–57, II, no. 324, fig. 374, as ca. 1636.
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New York, The Pierpont Morgan Library, and Cambridge, Massachusetts, Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, “Rembrandt Drawings from American Collections,” 1960, no. 25, as ca. 1636–38; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, “Rembrandt 1660/1669,” 1969, no. 48, as ca. 1638, an actor at an entr’acte(?).
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Sir Joshua Reynolds, London (Lugt 2364); Sir Thomas Lawrence, London (Lugt 2443); S. Woodburn, London; William Estaiile (Lugt 2617; sold, Christie’s, London, June 17, 1840, no. 12); Sir Francis Seymour Haden, London and Arlesford (Lugt 1227; sold, Sotheby and Co., London, June 15, 1891, no. 584); Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1891–1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–29).

Fig. 91. Rembrandt, An Actor in His Dressing Room, ca. 1638. Pen and brown ink. 7¼ × 5½ in. (18.3 × 15.0 cm). Devonshire Collection, Chatsworth

category, emphasizes the mass of a man who sits heavily upon a small bench on a stool, next to the cape he has carelessly thrown aside. He supports his great weight with his left arm, the sleeve of which buckles.

Rembrandt drew this corpulent individual, with his heavy jowls and round paunch, on several occasions. In one instance, in An Actor in His Dressing Room (fig. 91), he appears in the same pose as in the present drawing, seated with his toes turned out and resting the back of his right hand on his knee, pinkie finger extended. The model may have been the actor Willem Ruyters (1587–1639), who performed in Joost van den Vondel’s play Gijsbrecht van Amstel, which opened in Amsterdam in 1638.

Seated Man with a Flat Cap displays hallmarks of Rembrandt’s drawings of about 1635: a great variety of delicate lines offset by broad strokes of translucent wash applied with a dry brush to suggest shadows. In spite of the characteristic technique and subject, however, the lines are set down more hesitantly than one would expect in a drawing by Rembrandt. The limbs are not sufficiently
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REMBrANDT (?)  ⊗

69 Group of Farm Buildings

Ca. 1648–52
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown wash, corrected with white gouache, on paper washed with brown, 4 × 6¼ in. (10.2 × 17.5 cm)
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.100.936

Rembrandt made numerous sketches in pen and brush of cottages and farm buildings around Amsterdam. These works vary little in technique and often show similar graphic mannerisms. In several drawings dated about 1648–50, for example, Rembrandt used broad zigzag lines to denote tall grasses in the foreground and loose parallel hatchings for thatch roofs. He also rubbed the thin washes with his finger for greater transparency and texture and made corrections by covering the washes with white gouache. He often prepared the paper with a light brown wash to give these studies a warm tonality.

This drawing displays many such Rembrandtesque characteristics, yet it lacks clarity in the details and in the definition of space. Too frequently we cannot decipher what the lines are meant to represent; the foreground plane is ill defined, and the proportions are awkward (apparent especially in the figure, which seems too small in relation to the architecture). Even though the interpretation of these qualitative aspects is subjective, it should not be dismissed regarding the attribution of this landscape, which at present should be only provisionally attributed to Rembrandt.

1. Devonshire Collection, Chatsworth (Benesch 1282; Washington 1990, no. 12, as 1648–50); Collection A. Alfred Taubman, New York (Benesch 1228; Washington 1990, no. 15, as ca. 1650).
2. The success that students achieved in copying Rembrandt's landscapes is illustrated by the comparison between an authentic drawing in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (Benesch 1227; Washington 1990, no. 22) and a copy after it in a private collection (Benesch ad 1227).
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Sir Francis Seymour Haden, London and Arlesford (Lugt 1227; sold, Sotheby and Co., London, June 15, 1891, no. 390); Mr. and Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1891–1907); Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, New York (1907–29).
Rembrandt investigated the range of human emotion by representing figures in dramatic contexts, often in scenes taken from the Bible. This sketch depicts a decisive moment in the life of David when the prophet Nathan censures the king for having sent Bathsheba's husband, Uriah, to his death in war in order to wed Bathsheba himself and resolve their adulterous liaison (2 Samuel 12:1–14). The artist expressed David's remorse by placing the figure's head on his hand in a traditional gesture of melancholy and stressed David's weakness and humanity by letting his feet dangle rather than placing them solidly on the floor. Similarly, he emphasized Nathan's cerebral nature by rendering the lower half of his body cursorily.

Such interest in expressive form at the expense of anatomical accuracy is typical of Rembrandt's drawings from the early 1650s, many of which illustrate scenes from the life of David. Yet a number of the lines here seem hesitantly set down (for example, those in David's turban and left sleeve), and others fail to impart the requisite sense of weight (as in Nathan's right sleeve). The coarse, rounded pen strokes that suggest not only the fringes of David's cloak but also the massive column and the undefined background have no parallels even in the most broadly drawn of Rembrandt's sketches from this time. The figure of Nathan derives from Rembrandt's etching the Presentation in the Temple (fig. 92), with which it is roughly contemporary. The drape of Nathan's mantle recalls that of Mary's clothing in the print, and Nathan's
face is similar in type to that of the man presenting Christ. An additional source for this drawing may have been Jan Lievens’s painting the Presentation in the Temple (fig. 93), to which Rembrandt referred for his etching. The expression of the church father (here used for Nathan), the expansive treatment of David’s cloak, and such details as the purse hanging at David’s side especially reflect this relationship. The pastiche-like character of the drawing, like aspects of its technique, casts doubt upon its attribution to Rembrandt. The profuse hatching and uneven lines constructing the figures in this scene can also be found in sheets ascribed, somewhat tenuously, to Willem Drost (active 1650–60), who was Rembrandt’s pupil from about 1650 to 1653. So little is known about Drost, however, that this drawing should remain unquestionably attributed to Rembrandt.

1. See, for example, Christ in Gethsemane, Kupferstichkabinett, Kunsthalle, Hamburg (Benesch 896), a study for the etching of the same title dated 165[–] (last digit illegible; Bartsch 73); Jerome Reading in a Landscape, Kupferstichkabinett, Kunsthalle, Hamburg (Benesch 886; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 25), a study for the etching of the same title dated to the first half of the 1650s (Bartsch 104). In the Museum’s drawing Carrive and Shelley (1982, pp. 298–99) detect titanium white, a twentieth-century pigment, in Nathan’s beard and in the arms of David’s chair, suggesting that these may be areas of undocumented restoration.

2. Bartsch 50.


4. A tentative attribution to Drost was suggested by Schatborn (1985a, p. 108, n. 48) and Royalton-Kisch (letter to the author, March 17, 1995). Drost is little understood as a draftsman; only one drawing (Kupferstichkabinett, Kunsthalle, Bremen [Sumowski 1979–], III, no. 546, ill.) is attributed with certainty to him. This work, however, compares closely with others given to Drost, for example, Sumowski 1979–, III, nos. 557X, 558X, ill.
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REMBRANDT (?) ∞

71 The Entombment, after Mantegna

1655–60
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown and gray wash, with touches of white gouache, over red chalk on Japan paper, original dimensions, 10 1/4 x 14 1/4 in. (25.4 x 37.8 cm), including a strip 1 3/4 in. (2.8 cm) high added by the artist at top (arched), laid down on a sheet, 10 1/8 x 13 1/2 in. (26.6 x 39 cm)
Inscribed in pen and brown ink on sarcophagus: PIO ET INMO[R] / TAL. IESU / DEO; annotated on margin of mount lower left (partially cut off): And Mantegna; on verso of mount, lower right: The original drawing / which has also been / engraved by Andreas Mantenga [sic] / Given me by Dr. Douglas. Bequest of Walter C. Baker, 1971
1972.118.285

This drawing after Mantegna's engraving the Entombment (fig. 94) focuses exclusively on the principal figures. The landscape background of the print has been omitted, as have two individuals and numerous details. The expressions and gestures are less histrionic here than in the engraving, and the folds of the clothing have been quieted, with the result that the mourners' grief is conveyed with greater dignity. When Rembrandt made his etching Madonna and Child with the Cat of 1654, inspired by another Mantegna engraving, he reinterpreted the model in a similar vein, concentrating on the figures and reducing extraneous features to achieve a heightened sense of grandeur.
Whereas the changes introduced in the present copy are in keeping with Rembrandt's approach to such Italian quattrocento sources, the technique is not. The use of pen and brown ink with brush and rich brown washes on Japan paper, which Rembrandt employed to great effect in his copies of Mughal miniatures, here seems incongruous for a work after an engraving. Furthermore, the execution of the drawing is weak. The penmanship lacks control, notably in the figure of the Magdalene, in which the rounded lines of the face, hair, and sleeve seem merely to imitate Rembrandt's free flourishes. The fine, feathery hatchings, which in Rembrandt's drawing after Mantegna's Calumny of Apelles (no. 61, fig. 84) suggest the Italian artist's pen technique, here are uneven in weight and distribution and do not have the same light, scratchy feeling. In addition, the lines with which the main contours are redrawn are stiff and out of balance with the underlying sketch.

Consideration of the execution of this work thus justifies the doubts raised by Benesch, Haverkamp-Begemann, and others about its attribution to Rembrandt. The reinterpretation of the model, however, is so much in keeping with Rembrandt's approach to Italian Renaissance sources that it is imprudent at this time to reject this copy unconditionally from his oeuvre.

1. For Mantegna's Entombment, see Bartsch 1803–21, XIII, p. 239, no. 3. For Rembrandt's Madonna with the Cat, see Bartsch 63 and Mantegna's Madonna and Child, ca. 1480–85, Bartsch 1803–21, XIII, p. 232, no. 8.
2. Rembrandt also changed the inscription in his copy. Rosenberg (1964a) pointed out the association between these changes and the Mennonite doctrine with which Rembrandt was familiar.
3. Rembrandt made numerous copies after Mughal miniatures, for example, Four Orientals Seated under a Tree, ca. 1536–61, in the British Museum, London (Benesch 1187; London 1992a, no. 62). See also nos. 65, 66 here.

Literature
Hind 1948, p. 12, under no. 2, as Rembrandt, after Mantegna; Benesch 1954–57, VI, no. A 105a, fig. 1700, as attributed to Rembrandt; Rosenberg 1956a, p. 153, fig. 2, as by Rembrandt ca. 1636; Rosenberg 1959, p. 118, as by Rembrandt; Corpus, III (1980), p. 98, under no. A 107; London 1992a, p. 124, under no. 53, and p. 143, n. 3, under no. 62, as attributed to Rembrandt.
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Peter Lely, London (Lugt 2092); Sir Michael Sadler, London (sold, Christie's, London, May 25, 1945, no. 29); V. Koch, London.

School of Rembrandt

72 Seated Woman Reading

Ca. 1635–40
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown wash, 2⅛ × 3⅛ in.
(6.7 × 8.9 cm)
Verso: fragment of a sketch in pen and brown ink by another hand
Rogers Fund, 1926
26.208

This drawing expresses the intense concentration of a woman reading her book. Both the approach to the subject matter and the technique are characteristic of Rembrandt's work. The main contours of the figure are rendered with summary strokes in fine pen, and the shadows are indicated with a dry brush and translucent washes. But the execution is weak, raising questions about the attribution, doubts first articulated by Rosenberg though not shared by Benesch. The pen lines are unusually even; they give no sense of the weight of the forms, nor do they appear to be set down in Rembrandt's usual fashion in which a light first sketch was
worked over with stronger lines to correct and accent the forms. The washes function independently of the lines and fail to indicate a consistent fall of light. They describe forms, such as the chair’s backrest, in a manner atypical of the artist. Furthermore, the face is a generic one, conveying little sense of individual physiognomy.

Another drawing of the same woman reading, known only through an engraving, exhibits many of these graphic abbreviations, including the line that loops once to indicate the edge of the book’s pages. Whether the engraving reproduces a lost sheet by Rembrandt or a copy after the original that served as the model for this drawing cannot be determined. One can conclude, however, that the original must have been of a type comparable to Rembrandt’s drawings of young women and children of about 1635.¹

CL

SCHOOL OF REMBRANDT

73 Beheading of Prisoners

1640s
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown and gray wash, 7¼ × 5¾ in. (18.1 × 13.2 cm)
Watermark: [fragment]
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975
1975.1.791

This gruesome scene poses intriguing questions of both authorship and content. The central figure group here is related to that in Rembrandt’s etching the Beheading of John the Baptist, dated 1640 (fig. 93). A pen and ink drawing by Rembrandt, Beheading of Prisoners, now in the British Museum is also connected (fig. 96). There the executioner, victim, and crouching figure supporting the condemned man in the Metropolitan’s drawing are seen from a different angle, with the addition of a decapitated corpse and another victim being led to his death.¹ While the British Museum drawing, with its acute observation of character, is clearly autograph, the attribution of the Metropolitan’s sheet has recently been called into question.² In the latter the lack of volume, the schematic treatment of shadows, and the weak handling of anatomy in the forms defined by pen lines indicate the work of a pupil. The light brown wash, notable especially on the crouching figure, appears to be original; however, the gray wash that defines the arched space, the executioner’s torso, and the bloodstained earth in the foreground most likely was added by a later hand.

The two drawings under discussion may reflect a practice described in Samuel van Hoogstraten’s treatise on the art of painting published in 1678. Van Hoogstraten worked in Rembrandt’s studio during the 1640s (see no. 84), and his instructive comments often seem to recall lessons learned there. In one instance he advises that artists working together can assist one another in composing historical scenes by acting out the principal figure groups. It is probable that these two sheets record such a kamerspel (chamber play) as viewed simultaneously by Rembrandt and another artist in his atelier.¹

In both works the severed heads in the foreground indicate that the subject is not John the Baptist but the decapitation of several victims.⁴ Considered in the context of his activities about 1640, Rembrandt’s interest in themes of execution may have been stimulated by his contact with the Mennonite preacher Cornelis Claesz Anslo, whom he portrayed twice in 1641.⁵ (Van Hoogstraten and several other colleagues of Rembrandt’s were also Mennonites.) Mennonite martyrologies record the persecution of their Anabaptist forebears in the sixteenth century and chronicle numerous instances of multiple beheadings in Amsterdam and elsewhere, drawing parallels between those events and the death of early Christian martyrs such as John the

1. Oral opinion, 1942.
2. Seated Young Woman Reading, location unknown. Benesch (1853, fig. 439) illustrates an engraving by Carl Ludwig Sieglitz that, according to its inscription, reproduces a drawing by Rembrandt in Leipzig. The same subject is also taken up in an etching attributed to Rembrandt (Bartsch 345).
3. One such example is in the Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (Benesch 401).

Literature
Benesch 1954–57, II, no. 385, fig. 440, as ca. 1639–40; Sumowski 1961, p. 6; Sumowski 1979–85, under no. 1263x.

Ex Coll.: W.W. Knighton; John Postle Heeseltine, London (Lugt 1507); A. de Robiano (sold, Muller-Mensing, Amsterdam, June 15–16, 1926, no. 443).
Fig. 96. Rembrandt. Beheading of Prisoners, ca. 1640. Pen and brown ink, white gouache, 6 × 8 3/4 in. (15.3 × 22.6 cm). British Museum, London

Fig. 95. Rembrandt. Beheading of John the Baptist, 1640. Etching, 5 × 4 in. (12.8 × 10.3 cm). British Museum, London
Baptist. The Metropolitan and British Museum sheets may represent an attempt to envision the Anabaptist sufferings with an eye to producing prints or paintings for a Mennonite audience. The only finished result of this preoccupation, however, is the etched Beheading of John the Baptist, a more traditional and widely marketable subject.5

1. Benesch 479; London 1992a, no. 35. For other related drawings, see Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 15; London 1992a, p. 97, nn. 3–6, under no. 35. See also the drawings in the Rijs- prentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, attributed to Gerbrand van den Eekhout by Schatborn 1985a, p. 96, fig. 4 (related to the right-hand group in Benesch 479); Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, attributed to Barent Fabritius (Sumowski 1975–98, IV, no. 899xx, ill.); Biblioteca Reale, Turin, attributed to van Hoogstraten (Sumowski 1977–99, V, no. 1227xxx, ill.).

2. First doubted by Schatborn 1985b, p. 43, n. 6, under no. 19. Royton-Kisch (in London 1992a, pp. 96, 98, n. 3, under no. 35), tentatively suggests Bol. An attribution to van den Eekhout might also be considered; compare, for example, Joseph Being Sold and Thespias and Achilles, The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York (Sumowski 1975–98, III, nos. 807xx, 809xx, ill.).

3. Van Hoogstraten 1678, p. 192; Konstam 1977 and 1978 (suggests that clay models were posed); Amsterdam 1985–86, pp. 28–37; Alpers 1987, pp. 24–45, figs. 2.16, 2.17; Schatborn in Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, pp. 74, 126, 156–58; London 1992a, p. 97, n. 3, under no. 35. The drawing in Turin (see note 1 above) may have been made at the same time.

4. Benesch (478) suggests The Beheading of the Tarquinian Conspirators. See also London 1992a, p. 96, under no. 35. However, the details of the scene do not accord specifically with the account in Livy, II, 5, Loeb Classical Library, I (1925), pp. 230–35 (see Dickey 1996).


**SCHOOL OF REMBRANDT**

74 Saint Jerome Praying in His Study

1640s

Pen and brown ink and brush and brown and gray washes, with touches of red chalk and white gouache, laid down, arched at top, 10 1/8 x 8 1/8 in. (25.9 x 21.1 cm)

Given in memory of Felix M. Warburg by his wife and children, 1947. 41.21.3

When Rembrandt took up the subject of Saint Jerome for his etching of 1642 (fig. 119), he cast the scene in near darkness, with only a thin light filtering through a window to illuminate the saint, his bible, and a crucifix. The handling of light in this drawing clearly depends on Rembrandt’s print and has a similar symbolic meaning, investing it with religious significance, although the saint is represented not at study, as he is in the master’s work, but in prayer.

Rembrandt used wash profusely in many drawings of religious subjects in the 1640s to endow their settings with a spiritual presence. Although this sheet displays a comparable profusion of wash, the loose handling of the pen, particularly in the crucifix and the chair, as well as the angular rendering of the saint’s facial features, are characteristic not of Rembrandt but of his talented pupil and assistant from 1636 to 1642, Ferdinand Bol (1616–1680).1

Scenes from the life of Saint Jerome do not often appear in seventeenth-century Dutch art. The subject seems to have intrigued Bol, as the saint appears in his etching of 1644 (no. 101) as well as in a number of his drawings.2 This work, however, lacks the delicate, fluid, even loopy quality of line one associates with Bol’s studies and thus may be by an artist influenced by him.

1. Bartsch 105; Stechow 1914, p. 337.
2. See, for example, The Holy Family in the Carpenter’s Workshop, ca. 1645, British Museum, London (Benesch 516; London 1992a, no. 43); The Supper at Emmaus, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (Benesch C 47).
3. This drawing was tentatively ascribed to Bol by Valentinier (oral opinion, 1941) and Lugt (oral opinion, 1941 and 1943). Royalton-Kisch (letter to the author, March 17, 1995) has maintained the attribution to Bol as does Schatborn (letter to the author,
March 16, 1995), although he questioned whether the drawing could be given to the school of Bol.


LITERATURE

EX COLL.
Unknown
The Meeting of Jacob and Rachel at the Well

1640s
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown wash, corrected with white gouache, laid down, 6 3/8 x 10 3/4 in. (16.7 x 26.6 cm)
Annotated in pen and brown ink lower right corner of mount:
WE [monogram of William Esdaile]
Rogers Fund, 1906
06.1042.10

The meeting of Jacob and Rachel at the well where Rachel watered her father's sheep (Genesis 29:1) is the subject of this drawing. To earn Rachel in marriage, Jacob served her father for seven years, only to be tricked at the last moment into marrying her older sister, Leah; because of his deep love for Rachel, Jacob agreed to work yet another seven years so that he could wed her. The story of Jacob and Rachel held little interest for Rembrandt and his school, although Jan Tengnagel (about 1584/85–1635), an artist working in the circle of Rembrandt's teacher, Pieter Lastman (1583–1633), did make a painting of this scene in 1615.3

With good reason the attribution of this sketch to Rembrandt has never been accepted fully. Whereas the combination of broad pen strokes and wash, corrected in some areas with white gouache, is Rembrandtesque, the forms are too crudely described to be by Rembrandt's hand. Recently this study was related to a group of drawings in Amsterdam by an anonymous pupil. 3 Among those works it is most comparable to the Adoration of the Shepherds (fig. 97), particularly in the rendering of the animals with thick, rounded contours and the use of profuse hatchings, although the Museum's drawing is the weaker in execution of the two. Schatborn associated this group with Carel Fabritius (1622–1654), a pupil of Rembrandt's in the early 1640s, but this link remains tentative as there are no authentic drawings by Fabritius known to us.
1. The subject was identified as Eliezer and Rebecca in a copy after the drawing, location unknown (Joseph Baer and Co., Frankfurt, sale cat., May 3, 1921, no. 3, ill.), but in the copy the man kneels and does not hold a water jug.

2. Palmer Collection, Beaconsfield (Sacramento 1974, p. 22, fig. 17). There are two drawings of this subject ascribed to Ferdinand Bol: Graphische Sammlung, Albertina, Vienna (Sumowski 1979–, II, no. 255x, ill.); formerly Collection Robert Lehman, New York (Sumowski 1979–, II, no. 260x, ill.).
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William Esaile, London (Lugt 2617).
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**School of Rembrandt**

**76 Studies of Two Men and a Woman Teaching a Child to Walk**

1645–50
Pen and brown ink, 6⅞ × 5 ⅞ in. (16.0 × 12.9 cm)
Bequest of Harry G. Sperling, 1971
1975.131.154

This study sheet bears the collector’s mark of the earl of Dalhousie, a Scottish connoisseur who owned an album of drawings by Rembrandt and his school, most of which were executed by Nicolaes Maes (1634–1693), an apprentice in Rembrandt’s studio from about 1648 to 1652. Because so many drawings by Maes bear Dalhousie’s mark, Valentiner ascribed the Museum’s example to this artist as
well, an attribution supported by the domestic subject matter, frontality of the figures, and broad, rounded lines, all characteristic of Maes's graphic style.\(^1\) Compared with authentic works by Maes, however, the lines in the Museum's drawing are too undifferentiated, the facial features are undefined, and the interior modeling of the forms is unclear. Although we can identify other studies by the same hand that derive stylistically from Rembrandt's drawings of the mid-1640s (see fig. 98), we cannot at present identify this artist by name.\(^2\)

Rembrandt and his pupils often took up the motif of a mother teaching her child to walk.\(^3\) In Rembrandt's etching of two male nudes, for example, the presence of a child in a walker toddling toward its mother has been interpreted as a metaphor for the artist learning through practice.\(^4\)

1. Valentinier 1924, Benesch (200) subsequently attributed the drawing to Rembrandt and dated it to the 1630s, but his point of view found little support, for the drawing lacks the defined facial features and fine detail typical of drawings by Rembrandt from that time (see nos. 57, 58).

2. Benesch 732a, Schatborn 1983b, no. 103; the other sheets most likely by the same hand include those in the Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden (Benesch 483); formerly Collection C. R. Rudolf, London (Benesch 531); Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris (Benesch 661); Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna (Benesch 662); Museum Bredius, The Hague (Benesch 732); Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich (not in Benesch; Wegner 1973, no. 1285, pl. 350). These depend on drawings by Rembrandt of a type similar to the Dismissal of Hagar, ca. 1642–43, in the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam (Benesch 190; Giltaij 1988, no. 16).

3. See, for example, Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna (Benesch 308); Fondation Custodia, Paris (Benesch 391); British Museum, London (Benesch 421, 422; London 1992a, nos. 16, 17); Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (Benesch 706; Stockholm 1992–93, no. 147).


**Literature**

Valentinier 1924, pp. 59–60, fig. 71, as by Maes; Benesch 1954–57, II, no. 200, fig. 215, as by Rembrandt ca. 1612–13; Rosenberg 1956b, p. 68, as by Rembrandt ca. 1640; Sumowski 1961, p. 5, as by Maes ca. 1655; Haverkamp-Begemann 1974, pp. 33, 37, no. 4, as by Maes; Sumowski 1979–80, VIII, no. 1970X, ill., as by Maes ca. 1648; Paris 1988–89, p. 36, under no. 24; Robinson 1988, p. 586, as neither by Rembrandt nor by Maes.
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Earl of Dalhousie (Lugt 7172a); [Colnaghi, London (1924)]; [Cassirer, Berlin]; private collection, Berlin.
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**School of Rembrandt**

77 **Abraham and Isaac before the Sacrifice**

Ca. 1645–50

Pen and brush and brown ink, 6¾ × 5⅞ in. (15.5 × 14.4 cm)

Robert Lehman Collection, 1975

1975.1.790

The story of Abraham and Isaac (Genesis 22:1–19) chronicles God's test of Abraham's faith by asking him to sacrifice his only son, Isaac. An angel appears at the critical moment to stop the sacrifice and declares Abraham a God-fearing man who will be amply rewarded. Rembrandt, in his etching of 1645 (fig. 99), depicted not the dramatic instant when the angel stays Abraham's knife but the poignant moment before the attempt, when Abraham makes known his intentions to Isaac, who accepts his fate unequivocally.\(^5\)

Rembrandt's interest in human emotions attracted him to this particular vignette, which was narrated at length in Flavius Josephus's *Antiquitates Judaicae*, a source Rembrandt consulted on a number of occasions.\(^6\)
The Museum’s drawing is closely related to Rembrandt’s etching. The poses of the protagonists and their relationship to the landscape setting are almost identical. In the sketch, however, physical contact replaces the visual exchange between father and son in the print, and Abraham’s gesture of pointing upward, which in the etching serves the dual purpose of emphasizing his grim message and of indicating its divine source, is eliminated, diluting the emotional intensity of the moment.¹

The crude execution and diminished expressiveness indicate that the drawing cannot be by Rembrandt’s hand.⁴ The rectilinear contours, parallel hatching, and unresolved spatial relationship between the figures are stylistic traits common to a group of studies that have been ascribed to Willem Drost (active ca. 1650–60), a pupil of Rembrandt’s about 1650.³ Although it is not possible to attribute this drawing definitively, its relationship to the master’s etching

Fig. 99. Rembrandt. Abraham and Isaac, 1645. Etching, 6⅛ × 5⅛ in. (15.7 × 13 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929—29.107.26
demonstrates one way in which students learned from him, reinterpreting Rembrandt’s compositions in their own creative copies.  

1. Bartsch 34.
3. Two paintings by Jan Victors (ca. 1619–20–after 1670), a pupil of Rembrandt’s in the second half of the 1630s, depicted Abraham and Isaac in this same unusual pose, formerly K. and V. Waterman, Amsterdam (Sumowski 1983–[94], IV, no. 1743, ill.); private collection (Sumowski 1983–[94], VI, no. 2464, ill.).
5. See no. 70, n. 4.
6. For other examples of drawings by pupils based on Rembrandt etchings, including works by Ferdinand Bol (1616–1680), Nicolaes Maes (1634–1693), and Constantijn van Rensse (1626–1680), see Amsterdam 1984–85, nos. 42, 47, 50, 62, 63.
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Rodolphe Kann, Paris; Mrs. A. Hamilton Rice, Newport; Dr. A. Hamilton Rice, New York; Mr. and Mrs. Louis H. Silver, Chicago.

**School of Rembrandt**
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**78 Saint Peter and Saint John Healing the Paralytic**

Early 1650s
Pen and brown ink and brush and light brown wash, 8 3/8 × 6 1/2 in. (21.1 × 16.4 cm)
Watermark: double C surmounted by a crown
Rogers Fund, 1911
11.85

The Acts of the Apostles (3:1–10) tells of the miracle performed by Peter, accompanied by John, when he healed a paralytic beggar outside the gates of the temple with the words, “I have no silver and gold, but I give you what I have; in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk.”

The attribution to Rembrandt of this study depicting the moment of that cure was not questioned in print until 1985, when Schatborn connected it with an anonymous Rembrandt school drawing of the mid–1650s (fig. 100).  

Comparison with works securely ascribed to Rembrandt from that period supports Schatborn’s research, for the short angular lines and light hatching that define the figures here are neither as descriptive nor as confidently set down as are those in Rembrandt’s authentic drawings.  

The interpretation of the text is unimaginative. Although Peter’s message is underscored by his gesture of taking the cripple by the hand, no indication is given of whether the cripple will be able to rise. Furthermore, the setting appears to be more like the modest entrance to a stone building than the beautiful gates to a monumental temple.

The artist may have referred to a number of Rembrandt’s etchings in creating this composition. Peter’s stance, for example, is based loosely on that of Abraham in the master’s *Abraham Casting Out Hagar and Ishmael* of 1637, and the bearing of both the cripple and the onlooker in the doorway and some portions of the setting may derive from his *Abraham Entertaining the Angels* of 1656.  

The proportion of the figures in relation to the setting is similar in all three works.

---

1. Schatborn 1985b, p. 156, n. 2, no. 71. A. P. A. Vorenkamp (oral opinion, 1934) and Schmidt-Degener (oral opinion, 1935) both had
previously rejected the drawing in the Metropolitan Museum but
did not publish their opinions. Haverkamp-Begemann (in conver-
sation with the author, 1995) has since the late 1980s rejected the
attribution of this drawing.

2. For comparison, see Rembrandt’s Homer Reciting Verses, signed and
dated 1652, in the Six Collection, Amsterdam (Benesch 913;

3. Bartsch 40, signed and dated 1637; Bartsch 29, signed and dated
1656 (although this may postdate the drawing). Rembrandt’s two
etchings of this same theme from Acts of the Apostles (Bartsch 94
and 95 [signed and dated 1659]) have no formal relationship to
this drawing.

LITERATURE
Benesch 1954–57, III, no. 619, fig. 731, as by Rembrandt ca. 1648–49;
Rosenberg 1973, p. 109, as by Rembrandt; Schatborn 1985b, p. 156, n.
2, under no. 71, as Rembrandt school early 1650s; Robinson 1988, p.
383, as Rembrandt school.
**SCHOOL OF REMBRANDT**

**79 Two Studies for Blind Tobit**

*Early 1650s*

Pen and brown ink and brush and brown and gray washes, over traces of black chalk, 8 3/4 x 10 3/4 in. (21.1 x 26.2 cm)

Robert Lehman Collection, 1975

1975.1.802

---

In the Dutch Bible, the Book of Tobit (11:1–19) recounts the return home of Tobit's son Tobias after his long journey and describes how the blind father bumped against the door in his haste to greet his son. In 1651 Rembrandt made this moment the subject of an etching into which he...
incorporated such telling details as Tobias's little dog, which had accompanied him on his travels, pulling at Tobit's robes and an overturned spinning wheel, a casualty of Tobit's awkward rising at the sounds of his son's arrival (fig. 101).  

Although the elderly character at left in this drawing is similar in pose to the figure of Abraham in Rembrandt's print Abraham Casting Out Hagar and Ishmael of 1637, the presence of the dog identifies both him and the old man at right as blind Tobit.  

The existence of two studies for the same figure incorporated into a unified setting is without precedent among known sketches by Rembrandt, suggest-
corrected the way the body hangs. Both studies emphasize the physical effort of the men who raise the cross. Yet the presence here of the dominating figure on horseback, a repoussé motif that appears frequently in Rembrandt's oeuvre, indicates that the student may have looked to other models as well. An almost identical figure, though in reverse, appears in Rembrandt's etching *The Baptism of the Eunuch* of 1641. The younger artist thus seems to have invented his own composition by synthesizing motifs found in various works by his teacher.

1. *The Raising of the Cross* (Benesch 1036). This connection was also noted by Schatborn (letter to the writer, March 16, 1993). Haverkamp-Begemann (unpublished manuscript, 1990) attributes the Lehman Collection drawing to the school of Rembrandt. Bartsch 98.
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Valentiner 1925–34, II, no. 349, ill., as by Rembrandt, ca. 1653; Benesch 1954–57, VI, no. C 102, fig. 1639, as a copy after an unknown original of about 1660.

**Exhibited**


**Ex Coll.**

Sir Francis Seymour Haden, London and Arlesford; Rodolphe Kann, Paris; Mrs. A. Hamilton Rice, Newport; Dr. A. Hamilton Rice, New York; Mr. and Mrs. Louis H. Silver, Chicago.
81 Man Leading a Camel

1650–60
Pen and brown ink, with traces of brown wash, 8½ × 7¼ in.
(20.6 × 18.8 cm)
Rogers Fund, 1908
08.227.36

To imbue his religious scenes with a sense of realism and veracity, Rembrandt made studies from life of exotic animals, notably lions, elephants, and camels.¹ He used one such sketch of two camels’ heads for his Hundred Guilder Print of about 1647–49 (no. 91). The Museum’s camel is similar in conception to that of the beast in an anonymous copy after a lost Rembrandt original.²

When the Museum acquired this drawing in 1908, its attribution to Rembrandt had never been questioned. Benesch, however, rightly recognized it to be the work of a good pupil.³ Willem Drost (active about 1650–60), a student of Rembrandt’s in the early 1650s, has been suggested as the artist because the drawing displays regular

Fig. 103. Willem Drost, Ruth and Naomi, ca. 1650–52. Pen and brown ink, white gouache, 7½ × 9½ in. (18.7 × 23.5 cm). Kunsthalle, Bremen
parallel hatchings characteristic of his style. But the forms here are less geometric and rectilinear, the outlines more continuous, and the penwork drier than in Drost's confirmed work (see fig. 103). The sketch has also been ascribed to Arent de Gelder (1645–1727), who was apprenticed to Rembrandt in the 1660s. The overall linearity, the variation in thickness and weight of the somewhat rounded strokes of the pen, and the isolation of the principal subject against a bare background are typical of de Gelder's style (see fig. 104). De Gelder included camels in his painting Engagement of Isaac and Rebecca. Unfortunately, both Drost and de Gelder are so little known as draftsmen that it is not yet possible to resolve the issue.

1. See, for example, Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna (Benesch 438; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 13); Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris (Benesch 1214; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 26).
2. The anonymous sketch is in the Kupferstichkabinett, Kunsthalle, Bremen (Benesch 453, as by Rembrandt; Rosenberg 1936b, p. 69, as a copy).
4. This tentative attribution was suggested by Royalton-Kisch (letter to the writer, March 17, 1995).
5. Schatborn (letter to the author, March 16, 1995) tentatively proposed that the sketch was by de Gelder. Engagement of Isaac and Rebecca is in the Stedelijk Museum, Brussels (Sumowski 1983–94, II, no. 721, ill.).

LITERATURE
- Hofstede de Groot 1906a, no. 1069, as by Rembrandt; Benesch 1954–57, IV, no. A 44, fig. 1048, as school of Rembrandt; Sumowski 1961, p. 25, as a copy; Rosenberg 1973, p. 111, as a copy.
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SCHOOL OF REMBRANDT

82. Zacharias and the Angel

1660s
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown and gray wash, over black chalk, 10¾ x 7½ in. (26.2 x 19.9)
Annotated in pencil on verso: I bought this drawing at J. de Vos sale Oct. 30, 1833 / J.V
Rogers Fund, 1907
07.282.5

The birth of John the Baptist is announced in the gospel of Luke (1:8–20), which describes how the angel Gabriel appeared to the priest Zacharias at the temple while he was offering incense and told him that a son would be born to him and his childless wife. Because he did not believe Gabriel, Zacharias was rendered mute until the child was named. Rembrandt took up this subject in a painting now known only through copies: a painting dated 1632 by an anonymous pupil and a drawing of about 1635 by Ferdinand Bol. However, the present study, along with those of other Rembrandt pupils who depicted the theme, was composed independently of Rembrandt's model.

In its composition and the poses of its figures this drawing reinterprets Rembrandt's etching The Raising of Lazarus of about 1632. The bearing of the angel Gabriel, shown making his announcement, recalls the figure of Christ, who in Rembrandt's print declares that Lazarus will rise from the grave. Zacharias, hands uplifted in surprise, resembles the woman at right in Lazarus, who enacts a similar gesture of astonishment.
The drawing is thought possibly to be by Arent de Gelder (1645–1727), Rembrandt’s apprentice in the 1660s. *Zacharias and the Angel* is certainly by the same hand that produced the drawing *David Taking Leave of Jonathan*, also provisionally ascribed to de Gelder. Yet the execution of our example is very weak in comparison to de Gelder’s *Group of Orientals* (see the discussion under no. 81 and fig. 104). Consider the imbalance in the weight of the lines, which are overly thin in the angel and awkwardly heavy in Zacharias’s cloak, and the lack of definition of Zacharias’s facial features and Gabriel’s hands. Accordingly, it seems prudent to place this sketch among the anonymous works of the Rembrandt school.

1. The painting is in the Staatliches Museum, Schwerin (Sumowski 1983–94, I, p. 11, ill.); the drawing is in the Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris (Sumowski 1979–81, I, no. 124x, ill.; Paris 1988–89, no. 84).
2. One such example is a drawing, ca. 1642–43, in the Collection C. P. van Eeghen, The Hague (Sumowski 1979–81, III, no. 703x, ill.).
3. Bartsch 73.
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Sumowski 1979–81, V, no. 1085xx, ill., as by Arent de Gelder.

**Ex Coll.**

GERBRAND VAN DEN ECKHOUT  
(1621–1674)

83 **David's Promise to Bathsheba**

Ca. 1642–43  
Pen and brown ink and brown wash, over black and red chalk,  
7 1/8 x 10 1/2 in. (18.8 x 27.0 cm)  
Watermark: Foolscap  
Gift of Robert Lehman, 1941  
41.187.4

Bathsheba pleads with King David to name their younger son Solomon as his successor in this scene from I Kings (1:15–21). The figures, in pen and brown ink, appear in an elaborate, stagelike setting, the pictorial feeling enhanced by the combination of black and red chalk and the flowing pen lines that describe the richly ornamented brocades. The composition, dramatic lighting, and proportion of the figures in relation to the setting are more reminiscent of Rembrandt's paintings than of his drawings, which rarely are so highly finished.  

---

Fig. 105. Gerbrand van den Eekhout. David's Promise to Bathsheba, 1646. Oil on canvas, 5 3/4 x 6 5/8 in. (14.3 x 16.3 cm). Národní Galerie, Prague
The attribution of this work to van den Eckhout, who studied with Rembrandt from about 1635 to 1640/41, has never been questioned. The sketch relates stylistically to a number of van den Eckhout’s drawings, some of which are signed and dated. All display the influence of Rembrandt’s teacher Pieter Lastman (1583–1633), whose style of painting exhibits the same liquid, calligraphic qualities and loopy lines seen in van den Eckhout’s pen strokes. This influence may have been exerted through Rembrandt at the time van den Eckhout was in the master’s studio: about 1637 Rembrandt sketched a number of copies after Lastman’s paintings that testify to his renewed interest in the work of his teacher.\footnote{1}

Van den Eckhout executed this drawing about 1642–43; its composition is close to that of his painting Isaac Blessing Jacob of 1642 (no. 47). Considering the high degree of finish, this scene was probably conceived as an independent work, to which van den Eckhout must have referred later for his painting of the same subject (fig. 105).\footnote{4}

1. See, for example, Joseph Telling His Dreams, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Corpus, II [1986], no. A 66); Daniel and Cyrus Before the Idol Bel, The J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu (Corpus, II [1986], no. A 67); Dæan, The Hermitage, St. Petersburg (Corpus, III [1989], no. A 119).

2. These include two versions of Gideon’s Sacrifice, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig (Sumowski 1979–, III, nos. 601, 602, ill.); The Dismissal of Hagar, Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbezts, Berlin (Sumowski 1979–, III, no. 604, ill.).

3. Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna (Benesch 446, 447); Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbezts, Berlin (Benesch 448); Musée Bonnat, Bayonne (Benesch 449).

4. Sumowski 1983–[94], II, no. 403, ill.

\textbf{Exhibited}


\textbf{Ex Coll.}

Valerius Röver (Lugt 2984c); Johann Goll van Franckenstein (Lugt 2987b); D. Marshag (sold, Amsterdam, October 30, 1775, portfolio M, no. 792); Jacob de Vos Jbnz. (Lugt 1450; sold, Amsterdam, May 22–24, 1883, no. 169); V. Everit Macy, New York (sold, American Art Association, New York, January 6–8, 1938, no. 80).

\textbf{Samuel van Hoogstraten (1627–1678)}

\textbf{84 Adoration of the Shepherds}

1641–42

Pen and brown ink and brush and brown wash, over black chalk, arched at top, 2 3/4 x 4 1/8 in. (7.3 x 10.6 cm)

Given in memory of Felix M. Warburg by his wife and children, 1941 41.21.2

When this tiny rendering of the Adoration of the Shepherds entered the Museum’s collection in 1941, it was ascribed to Rembrandt. Its composition is similar to the artist’s painting of 1646 of the same subject (The National Gallery, London). Yet the small scale of the drawing combined with the expansive setting of the scene and such stylistic elements as the blocky rendering of forms, the minimal presence of detail, and the broad pen lines and profuse washes are characteristic not of Rembrandt’s drawings but of those by his pupil Samuel van Hoogstraten.\footnote{2}

Van Hoogstraten worked in Rembrandt’s studio from about 1641/42 to 1648. This sheet is an early study by the pupil, based on Rembrandt’s painting in London, which van Hoogstraten in turn used in preparation for his own painting Adoration of the Shepherds of 1647 (fig. 106).\footnote{3} The Museum’s drawing and a second, more complete study (Kupferstichkabinett, Kunsthalle, Hamburg), which is signed and dated 1646, show how van Hoogstraten transformed Rembrandt’s vertical and highly asymmetrical composition of a dark, claustrophobic, crowded barn interior into a more open horizontal, stagelike setting that invites the viewer to participate in the sacred event.\footnote{4}

Additional studies by pupils based on Rembrandt’s painting are known.\footnote{5} In his manual for artists, Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst, published in 1678, van Hoogstraten recommends to young artists the traditional
practice of copying in order to train their hands and develop their abilities in composition. This advice most likely reflects the custom in Rembrandt’s studio as van Hoogstraten experienced it; it had, however, appeared in artists’ manuals since the time of Leonardo.

1. Bredius 1969, no. 575.
2. As Rosenberg recognized in 1942 (oral opinion). Compare van Hoogstraten’s very similar preliminary sketch Bileam Blessing the Israelites for an unknown painting in the Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (Sumowski 1979–V, no. 1100, ill.). There is a second, more finished sketch, signed and dated 1646, in the British Museum, London (Sumowski 1979–V, no. 1101, ill.).

4. For the Hamburg study, see Sumowski 1979–V, no. 1102, ill.
   There may be additional studies for this painting; see Sumowski 1979–V, nos. 1135x, 1136x, ill.
5. One such sketch is in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (not in Benesch; see Schatborn 1983b, no. 62); for other studies of the Adoration by pupils, see Schatborn 1983b, p. 134, n. 2, under no. 62.
6. Van Hoogstraten 1678.
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Sumowski 1979–V, no. 1137x, ill., with further references;
Sumowski 1983–[94], II, under no. 823.

EX COLL.
Unknown

CONSTANTIJN VAN RENSESE
(1626–1670)

85 Judgment of Solomon

1649
Pen and brown ink and brush and brown wash, with white gouache, over black chalk, laid down, red chalk added by a later hand to the sword of the executioner, 9¼ × 12¾ in. (23.1 × 32.7 cm)
Annotated in pen and brown ink at lower right: Rembrandt; inscribed on verso (backing partially removed to reveal inscription): tweede ordinate Bij RemBrant 1649
Robert Lehman Collection, 1975
1975.1.806

In this dramatic encounter from I Kings (3:16–27), Solomon demonstrates his great wisdom by resolving a dispute between two women—one the mother of a stillborn child—each of whom claimed the same healthy child as her own. This drawing, with the extensive preliminary sketch in black chalk to map out the composition, the use of brush and wash to impart volume to the figures, and the touches in pen to define the features, is typical of the work of Constantijn van Rennesse.1

A town clerk of Eindhoven beginning in 1653, Renesse was also an amateur artist who studied informally with Rembrandt from the late 1640s to the mid-1650s. A number of sketches he made are clearly corrected by Rembrandt, who reworked them with broad lines in pen and brown ink, a practice the artist Samuel van Hoogstraten (1627–1678) mentioned in his treatise on art published in 1678 (see no. 84).2
Renesse’s purpose here was not simply to emulate the style of Rembrandt’s drawings but also to create a composition to communicate the biblical narrative effectively. The inscription, which translated reads “second composition shown to Rembrandt 1649,” suggests that Rembrandt may have assigned the subject to his student. Although Renesse successfully conveyed through gesture Solomon’s recognition of the true mother from her response to the threatened execution of her child, the composition and facial expressions contribute little to the emotive content. The king’s countenance is stony and blank, and the mother’s anguish is barely visible, for her head is turned away, blocking our view of her surely terrified child. Renesse may have been working without a model, for unlike his study Daniel in the Lions’ Den (Museum Boymans–van Beuningen, Rotterdam)—on which he wrote, “The first drawing shown to Rembrandt in the year 1649 the first of October / it was the second time that I went to Rembrandt”—the Judgment of Solomon does not relate to any known drawing by Rembrandt.\(^3\)

1. Labbé and Bicart-Sée (1987) established that the collector’s mark on the Museum’s drawing, Lugt 2951, is that not of Pierre Crozat but of Antoine-Joseph Dezallier d’Argenville (1680–1765).  
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**EXHIBITED**


**EX COLL.**

Antoine-Joseph Dezallier d’Argenville, Paris (Lugt 2951 with no. 2088); Charles de Valori, Paris (Lugt 2500; sold, Roblin, Paris, November 25–26, 1907, no. 198, as Rembrandt school); Cornelis Hoftede de Groot, The Hague (Lugt 161; sold, Boerner, Leipzig, November 4, 1931, no. 119, as by van Hoogstraten; [Neubay, Vienna]; H. S. Reitlinger, (sold, Sotheby and Co., London, June 22, 1954, no. 693, as by van Renesse); C. R. Rudolf, London.
PRINTS

Rembrandt’s Prints and the Question of Attribution

NADINE M. ORENSTEIN

“A proofprint from this plate designed and etched by Benjamin Wilson, was sold as a very fine Rembrandt to one of the greatest Connoisseurs for Six Shillings, the 17 April 1751.” The etching bearing this inscription, Village with Two Gabled Cottages on a Canal (fig. 107), was based on a print by Philips Koninck that at the time was attributed to Rembrandt. Wilson created it to deceive the British collector Thomas Hudson (coincidentally in the same year the first catalogue raisonné of Rembrandt’s prints appeared, which, had Hudson been aware of it, might have helped him identify the fake). Since Hudson’s day the state of Rembrandt print connoisseurship has evolved so that few connoisseurs would now mistake this print—even without its inscription—or the Koninck etching on which it was based for a Rembrandt. Yet some questions of attribution still linger.

Rembrandt’s graphic works were greatly admired during his lifetime, and his lasting influence can be seen in the numerous copies and imitations his prints inspired well into the eighteenth century. Many attempts have been made to weed these out from his true oeuvre; indeed, seventeen catalogues of Rembrandt’s prints have been compiled since 1751. Early compilations assembled about 375 etchings; more recent studies have narrowed the group to approximately 300. In 1879 the discussion even turned contentious, when the etcher Francis Seymour Haden accused Reverend Charles Henry Middleton of publishing as his own finding Haden’s deattribution of several so-called Rembrandt prints.

Despite all this work, the attribution of the prints is one of the issues least discussed in the scholarship on Rembrandt connoisseurship. Two major Rembrandt exhibitions of 1969–70, one American, the other European, included no prints at all; the exhibition of 1991–92 in Europe did feature some of the artist’s secure graphic works but completely avoided the display or consideration of problematic prints and etchings by Rembrandt’s followers. The current exhibition presents a selection from the Museum’s substantial holdings of etchings by Rembrandt and his school to highlight not only a number of the master’s finest prints but also various characteristic aspects of his printmaking technique; in addition it compares prints of questionable attribution as well as examples by students and collaborators.

Fig. 107. Benjamin Wilson. Village with Two Gabled Cottages on a Canal, 1751. Etching and drypoint, 2 3/8 × 6 1/2 in. (6.1 x 17.3 cm). Second state of two. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1917 17.3.2841
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In general, the persistent questions of attribution center around etchings produced primarily when Rembrandt was beginning to etch and was working closely with two artists, Jan Lievens and Jan van Vliet, who were not pupils. *The Descent from the Cross and Christ before Pilate* (nos. 98, 99) suggest that even prints signed by Rembrandt may have been produced with the help of a professional engraver. The etchings depicting numerous small heads of old men and women and figures of beggars (see nos. 109, 110), whose authorship has long been in doubt, indicate that someone in Rembrandt’s studio may have been reworking his plates and that several artists, possibly in his circle, were creating little etchings in imitation of the master.

The solutions to the puzzles posed by such possibilities rely in part on our perception of Rembrandt during his early years. Was he a master printmaker in control of the medium, teaching others from an early period, or was he an artist learning a new medium, experimenting with various techniques and depending on more experienced etchers for instruction? Would he only have traced the basic design on a plate such as the *Descent* and then handed it to an assistant to finish, or would he have worked the plate heavily himself, covering over more spontaneous lines for fear they would not print well? In his earliest efforts we see both Rembrandt the master etcher and Rembrandt the student. Between 1628 and 1631 he quickly became proficient in the technique. Yet we should not assume that the masterly command of the medium that he displayed by the 1650s had existed in the 1620s and 1630s. Rembrandt also produced some unsuccessful etchings, several large ones in particular, and he had little patience for the niceties required to produce a professional-looking print. Clearly it was in order to make just such a sheet that he engaged van Vliet early in his career.

The close interaction between Rembrandt and his pupils that took place during the process of creation of the master’s paintings and drawings does not seem to have occurred when his prints were produced, but the issue of such collaboration deserves further study. As far as we know, not many of the artist’s pupils or assistants were themselves prolific etchers, and only an occasional early Rembrandt print shows any obvious signs of collaboration. Ferdinand Bol was one of the few students to emulate his teacher’s style and subject matter closely in etching and to use the master’s graphic works as sources for his own prints. Jacob and Philips Koninck, Willem Drost, Samuel van Hoogstraten, and Constantijn van Rennesse created prints in a style related to Rembrandt’s, while other followers, among them Nicolaes Maes, Govert Flinck, and Arent de Gelder, apparently never took up the etching needle. Moreover, artists such as Pieter de With, Michael Willemsens, and Nicolaes Flinck, not considered to have been Rembrandt pupils, made prints that were close enough stylistically to Rembrandt’s work to have at one time been taken for his efforts.

Because Rembrandt’s copperplates were in circulation long after he died, scholars have also been faced with problems of attribution that go beyond whether or not he etched a specific plate himself. Did someone rework the master’s original etching in a later state, for example? In the late 1640s and 1650s Rembrandt was extremely particular about how he printed impressions of his etchings; the fact that an individual outside his studio may have printed a plate raises the issue of whether such impressions can be considered authentic.

Recent discussions of attribution have relied on both stylistic and technical determinations. Stylistic assignment predominantly involves comparing prints of a similar period and relating them to Rembrandt’s secure work. The often numerous states—changes in the plate made between printing impressions—of Rembrandt’s etchings have provided another area for stylistic investigation. Over the years a great deal of research has been devoted to identifying the differences among the states; the attribution of these changes has been developed by comparing early and late states of the same print and judging which types of additions Rembrandt might have made to a plate with those a later publisher might have made to strengthen the plate once it had become worn.

Fig. 108. Beta radiograph of Strasbourg Bend watermark from Rembrandt. *The Three Crosses*, 1653 (no. 94b)
Technical inquiry is currently focused on the study of watermarks, which are photographed by means of beta radiography and X radiography (see fig. 108). This research has shown that certain watermarks are generally associated with prints from an early period, while others are representative of prints executed at a much later date. Examples of early prints pulled on paper with watermarks typical of later dates indicate that at various times during his career Rembrandt reprinted plates on paper that he kept in his studio in limited quantities. Further collection of watermark data from the prints of artists associated with Rembrandt, including van Vliet, Lievens, and Bol, could provide insight into how closely their printmaking activities were connected with those of Rembrandt. Moreover, a study of the papers used by other printmakers active in Amsterdam at the time the master worked would provide a context for the Rembrandt watermarks.

Although Rembrandt’s prints have been studied for two centuries, many aspects of his printmaking practices remain unexplored. Not only the technical issues mentioned above but also certain facets of Rembrandt’s printmaking technique need to be studied. Among questions for future research are how did he achieve the areas of speckled tone, often called sulfur tinting or porous ground, that appear in such prints as the Landscape with Three Trees (no. 89) and to what extent did he involve members of his studio in the printmaking process. Finally, a better understanding of the stylistic qualities of the printed work of Rembrandt’s followers could resolve some of the seemingly arbitrary attributions proposed in the past and could clarify the nature of the relationship between the artist and those in his circle.

1. Gersaint 1751. The elaborate hoax is described in New Haven 1983, p. 92, no. 153. The Koninkx print on which it was based, Two Cottages with Pointed Gable (Hollstein, IX, 8), was rejected, from Rembrandt’s oeuvre quite early by Middleton 1878, rej. no. 2.
2. As early as 1635 Wenceslaus Hollar produced etchings after Rembrandt’s prints (see Pennington 1982, nos. 603, 1650).
3. Gersaint (1751) catalogued 341 etchings by Rembrandt, while Bartsch (1777) widened the group to 375; Clausin (1824 and 1828) attributed a number of Bartsch’s prints to Ferdinand Bol, Pieter de Wieh, Philips and Jacob Koninck, and others. In 1969 White and Boon (in Hollstein, XVIII) narrowed the number of prints by Rembrandt to 297 and cited 6 more as tentatively attributed to Rembrandt. Perhaps the most iconoclastic of the catalogers was Singer, who in 1910 accepted only 161. The varied attributions were diagrammed in Biörklund (1933).
4. Middleton 1878; Haden 1879; Middleton 1879.
6. The Good Samaritan of 1632 (Bartsch 90) has also been brought up in this context.
7. Rembrandt’s unsuccessful large prints include Saint Paul in Meditation (Bartsch 149); Peter and John at the Gate of the Temple (Bartsch 95); Saint Jerome Kneeling; Large Plate (Bartsch 106).
8. Stephanie Dickey will deal with this subject in her forthcoming Commentary volume on Rembrandt for The Illustrated Bartsch publications.
9. One such example is Bol’s etching Study for the Large Jewish Bride (Hollstein III, 21) after Rembrandt’s etching of the same subject (Bartsch 340).
10. Ash and Fletcher have assembled by means of beta radiography a large group of watermarks from Rembrandt prints in American collections (Ash 1986; Ash and Fletcher forthcoming). In Holland a similar project was undertaken by means of X radiography (Laurentius et al. 1992). Erik Hintending in Amsterdam is collecting further watermark material relating to later states of Rembrandt prints as well as watermarks on Rembrandt prints in European collections. I am grateful to Shelley Fletcher for the photograph shown as fig. 108.
86 Studies of the Head of Saskia and Others

1636
Etching, 6 x 5 in. (15.1 x 12.6 cm)
Only state
Signed and dated lower center: Rembrandt f 1636
Watermark: Eagle, Ash and Fletcher 17 A.a.
Bequest of Julie Parsons Redmond, 1939
60.534.28

Only one state of this etching is known. The Museum’s example can be identified as an early impression by the light, accidental scratches on the profile face in the lower register. In later impressions these scratches have worn away.¹

Here Rembrandt treated the copperplate like a sketchpad, recording a spontaneously executed but beautifully balanced cluster of female heads. The practice of sketching several motifs on a single sheet was common among draftsmen in Rembrandt’s milieu and was used especially in preliminary studies for a painting or other work of art. In printmaking, however, it was most often associated with artists’ model books such as the series of engravings by Frederick Bloemaert after designs by his father Abraham (see fig. 109). Students were expected to learn from these prints by copying not only the motif but also the manner of drawing.³

One eighteenth-century source suggests that Rembrandt too assembled some of his prints into a model book.³ Although such a collection was never formally published, the present work, as well as two other etchings of women’s heads and several studies from the nude, may be related to Rembrandt’s methods of training students in the close observation of the human form.⁴ In this sheet, as in Bloemaert’s engraving, the juxtaposition of finished and lightly sketched figures provides its own lesson in drawing
figure, in fact, is a likeness of Rembrandt’s wife, Saskia van Uylenburgh, who was twenty-four years old in 1636 and frequently served her husband as a model. She appears here as a radiant bride, her gauzy veil secured by a string of pearls. Ranged around her are a series of faces based more or less on hers but altered to reflect the progress of age and time. A young lady in a fanciful broad-brimmed hat (perhaps a mother like the woman in an etching by Ferdinand Bol [no. 104]), a buxom middle-aged woman, a widow, hooded and holding a handkerchief to her lips, and a wizened old crone—they are gathered by Rembrandt to trace the transitory life of female beauty.

1. Hollstein, XVIII, B 365. The watermark on the paper is consistent with the date of the signature.
4. These include Three Heads of Women, One Lightly Etched (Bartsch 367); Three Heads of Women, One Asleep (Bartsch 368); The Artist Drawing from a Model (Bartsch 192); the studies from the nude (Bartsch 193, 194, 196–202); and a large number of related drawings by Rembrandt and his pupils. Several other etchings presenting different studies on one plate are more like random sketches than didactic examples (Bartsch 361, 366, 369, 370, 372–374). See also Emmens 1968, pp. 205–20; Boston, Saint Louis 1980–81, no. 106; Amsterdam 1984–85, pp. 28–37; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, drawings, nos. 3, 38, 48–51, and prints, nos. 5, 12, 15, 21.
5. Compare the etching of Saskia with Pearls in Her Hair (Bartsch 347), dated 1634, and two portrait drawings in the Museum Boymans–van Beuningen, Rotterdam (Bensch 341, 410).
6. This was a common theme in Dutch popular literature and art of the period, as seen in the widely read Houweylck by Jacob Cats, first published in 1625. See Frantis 1993.
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Bartsch 365; Hind 145; Hollstein, XVIII, B 365.

REMBRANDT

87 Death of the Virgin

1639
Etching and drypoint, 16½ x 12½ in. (40.7 x 31.2 cm)
Second state of three
Signed and dated lower left: Rembrandt f.1639
Bequest of Ida Kammerer, in memory of her husband, Frederic Kammerer, M.D., 1933
33.79.14

This most baroque of Rembrandt’s prints unites the divine spectacle of angels among billowing clouds with the naturalistic detail of earthbound figures crowded around the Virgin, each expressing a different level of recognition and sorrow. Rembrandt looked to various sources for the elements of the scene. His own studies of about 1635 and 1639 of the bedridden Saskia served as models for the Virgin. The
general composition derives from a stained glass by Dirk Crabeth in the Oude Kerk in Amsterdam, and details were borrowed from woodcuts in Dürer’s Life of the Virgin series, which Rembrandt had purchased at auction in 1638.\footnote{1}

This plate marks the first time Rembrandt employed drypoint to execute considerable portions of a print: the angels were created entirely with drypoint, and many of the lower shaded areas were strengthened with it. The use of drypoint enabled him to quickly rework small areas that had not etched to his satisfaction.\footnote{2} Traces of Rembrandt’s initial rapid sketch onto the plate are visible throughout the print. His original placement of the book farther to the right can be seen within the volume’s pages, and his impulsive preliminary outline of the staff’s finial protrudes faintly from the finished version. As usual, Rembrandt neither strictly adhered to nor completely removed the evidence of his germinal idea.

Rembrandt’s students often used the master’s prints as sources for their own works. The doctor testing the Virgin’s pulse here, for example, was copied in an etching attributed to Willem Drost (active ca. 1650–60), a pupil of Rembrandt’s in the early 1650s.\footnote{3}

\footnote{1} It has been suggested that this particularly un-Protestant subject may have been made for Catholic collectors in Amsterdam (Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, p. 203, no. 14).
\footnote{2} Drawings such as Benesch 281–83, 289, 290, 404, 413, 425, 426 and an etching (Bartsch 366). See Schatborn 1985b, p. 28, no. 12.}
3. For the stained-glass source, see Brom 1926, p. 113; White 1969, pl. 39. For the influence of the Dürer woodcut series, see Hofstede de Groot 1906b, no. 56; in particular The Death of the Virgin (Bartsch 93) and The Birth of the Virgin (Bartsch 80) have been cited as models (White 1969, p. 45).

4. The second state, shown here, differs from the first in the etched chair at lower right, which was reworked in drypoint to set it apart from the central scene.

5. Physician Feeling the Pulse of a Patient (Bartsch 155), attributed to Rembrandt; listed in Hollstein (XVIII, p. 177, B 155) under “Prints by Unknown Pupils of Rembrandt” with a likely attribution to Drost.
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REMBRANDT

88 Old Man with Divided Fur Cap
1640
Etching and drypoint, 3 3/4 x 5 3/8 in. (15 x 13.7 cm)
First state of two
Signed and dated upper left: Rembrandt f 1640
Watermark: Fools cap
Gift of Douglas Dillon, 1983
1983.1140.3

Although this richly costumed old gentleman cannot be identified as a specific historical personage, he recalls the patriarchal types, such as Abraham, that appear frequently in Old Testament scenes depicted by Rembrandt and his pupils. As a young artist Rembrandt developed an interest in drawing, painting, and etching vivid half-length figures ranging from bearded old men to delicate girls in pastoral attire. This inclination was shared by his young Leiden
accidental stroke that runs across the figure’s left cheek.\footnote{2} Since there was no deliberate revision of the plate by Rembrandt, this scratch could more accurately be viewed as a clue distinguishing later from earlier impressions than as a mark that differentiates states. The Museum’s impression is an early one, lacking the scratch and retaining touches of drypoint burr, especially on the hand, the position of which Rembrandt changed by burnishing and redrawing.

The lively treatment of the figure shows Rembrandt’s typical combination of carefully crafted heads and facial features (in this case the fur hat has received special attention) and broadly sketched torsos.\footnote{1} Although Gersaint praised the “lightness and spirit” of this etching, not all eighteenth-century connoisseurs found its uneven finish so appealing. One owner or publisher had the plate completed in mezzotint (fig. 110), thus producing the true second state of the print long after the artist’s death.\footnote{4}

White and Boon describe two states of this print in Hollstein. Yet the only difference between the states is an accidental stroke that runs across the figure’s left cheek. Since there was no deliberate revision of the plate by Rembrandt, this scratch could more accurately be viewed as a clue distinguishing later from earlier impressions than as a mark that differentiates states. The Museum’s impression is an early one, lacking the scratch and retaining touches of drypoint burr, especially on the hand, the position of which Rembrandt changed by burnishing and redrawing.

The lively treatment of the figure shows Rembrandt’s typical combination of carefully crafted heads and facial features (in this case the fur hat has received special attention) and broadly sketched torsos. Although Gersaint praised the “lightness and spirit” of this etching, not all eighteenth-century connoisseurs found its uneven finish so appealing. One owner or publisher had the plate completed in mezzotint (fig. 110), thus producing the true second state of the print long after the artist’s death.

White and Boon describe two states of this print in Hollstein. Yet the only difference between the states is an accidental stroke that runs across the figure’s left cheek. Since there was no deliberate revision of the plate by Rembrandt, this scratch could more accurately be viewed as a clue distinguishing later from earlier impressions than as a mark that differentiates states. The Museum’s impression is an early one, lacking the scratch and retaining touches of drypoint burr, especially on the hand, the position of which Rembrandt changed by burnishing and redrawing.

The lively treatment of the figure shows Rembrandt’s typical combination of carefully crafted heads and facial features (in this case the fur hat has received special attention) and broadly sketched torsos. Although Gersaint praised the “lightness and spirit” of this etching, not all eighteenth-century connoisseurs found its uneven finish so appealing. One owner or publisher had the plate completed in mezzotint (fig. 110), thus producing the true second state of the print long after the artist’s death.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{1.} Bartsch 286–89. See Amsterdam 1988–89, nos. 21–31; Leiden 1991–92, pp. 75–76.
\item \textbf{2.} Hollstein, XVIII, B 265. Hind (170) makes the same distinction.
\item \textbf{3.} Compare the drawings of similar figures in the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam (Benesch 170), and the Fodor Collection, Amsterdam (Benesch 346; Broos 1981, no. 7).
\item \textbf{4.} Gersaint 1751, no. 245: “beaucoup de légèreté et d’esprit.”
\end{itemize}

Mezzotint rework, catalogued by Hind (170) as a third state, attributed in Hollstein, XVIII, B 265, to Captain William Baillie. Hinterding (1993–94, p. 269) associates it with the Amsterdam engraver Pieter Louw (1720–ca. 1800). The plate is now lost.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Literature}
\item Bartsch 265; Hind 170; Hollstein, XVIII, B 265.
\end{itemize}

---

\textbf{REMBRANDT}

89 \textit{Landscape with Three Trees}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{1643}
\item Etching, drypoint, and burin, 8% \times 11 in. (21.2 \times 27.8 cm)
\item Only state
\item Signed and dated lower left: Rembrandt f. 1643
\item Watermark: Foolscape with five-pointed collar, Ash and Fletcher 19 A.a.
\item H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
\item 29.107.31
\end{itemize}

The \textit{Three Trees} is by far Rembrandt’s largest and most striking etched landscape. In it the artist builds drama by setting the group of trees between a foreground cast in deep shadow and a bright but turbulent sky. His ingenious delineation of this spacious vista by means of a masterly combination of techniques, including drypoint, engraving, varied depths of etched lines, and a speckled tone (sometimes referred to as sulfur tinting), creates an impression of shifting light, a symbol of the power of nature in flux. Although the view is imaginary, the small urban panorama in the background was probably based on Amsterdam as it would have appeared from the dikes outside the city.

The landscape is remarkable for the number of details...
Rembrandt secreted within it: the tiny figure of an artist sketching atop a hill at right, the little houses visible to either side of the middle tree, and the fisher couple at lower left. More difficult to discern are the elements hidden in the darkened foreground at right, such as the amorous couple in the bushes and, farther left, a goat.  

The exceptional cloud-filled sky in this print has traditionally been interpreted as a depiction of a coming storm. It has also been suggested that several of the unnatural cloud formations at left center represent Rembrandt's attempt to cover over a sketch of the Death of the Virgin, which he quickly abandoned before he made the final larger plate of 1639 (no. 87). By turning the image so that the left side serves as the upper edge, one can distinguish lightly etched lines that cut across the center and perhaps once delineated a canopy and bed curtains. Four years after he finished his Death of the Virgin, Rembrandt may have considered that these marks could equally well define the outlines of clouds.

1. White 1969, p. 200; Boston, Saint Louis 1980–81, p. 199, no. 133. The print has also been given a religious interpretation: the forceful presence of nature has been seen as a symbol of the power of God, with the three trees as the three crosses of the Crucifixion (Washington 1990, p. 241, no. 75).

2. The view may depict Amsterdam from the Diermedijk (Lugt 1920, p. 146) or the Haarlemmerdijk (Campbell 1980, p. 16).

3. Both can be seen as erotic components of the scene (Washington 1990, p. 241, no. 75).


**Literature**

Bartsch 212; Hind 205; Hollstein, XVIII, B 212; White 1969, pp. 198–201; Campbell 1980.
90 *Self-Portrait at a Window*

1648
Etching, drypoint, and burin, 6¼ x 5¼ in. (16 x 13 cm)
Fourth state of five
Signed and dated upper left: Rembrandt f. 1648
The Sylmaris Collection, Gift of George Coe Graves, 1920
20.46.12

In this print, etched when he was forty-two years old, Rembrandt abandoned the fantasy of earlier aristocratic self-portraits (see fig. 121) for an appealingly matter-of-fact image of the artist in contemporary attire, seated at a desk before a window. The nature of his activity has been debated: is he drawing or etching or writing? The sheets of paper beneath his hand appear to rest on a small writing desk that is propped up by a thick book (fig. 111). The presentation follows the visual convention of the scholar in his study (see no. 100) and conveys a sense of intellectual engagement.

The development of this etching progressed over five states, the last of which reflects the effort of a later printer to refresh the worn-out copperplate. In the first state Rembrandt laid down delicate underdrawing and broad areas of tone, then defined form more accurately with drypoint, attending particularly to the shadowy folds of his jacket. This method of work would become increasingly prevalent in Rembrandt’s etchings of the 1650s (see no. 95). In the second and third states, we see additional details, including the signature and date in a banderole in the window. In the fourth state, exhibited here, drypoint enhances
the jacket, the window frame, and other areas, and a landscape appears in the window, camouflaging a pattern of craquelure produced during the biting of the plate in the acid.

Some cataloguers have attributed this fourth state to a later hand. However, the variety and inventiveness of the drypoint (seen, for example, in the striated pattern added to the coat) are consistent with Rembrandt’s work in the previous states and with his approach in general: the technique is used not just to revive old lines but also to create and redefine. As for the lightly etched scene beyond the window, the hilly terrain and Italianate architecture suggest a view that the Rembrandt himself might never have seen, adding a note of imaginative fantasy to this mundane self-image. In its rectilinear economy, the handling of the vista recalls some of Rembrandt’s landscape prints from about 1650, indicating that for this state the master may have taken up this self-portrait again after an interval of a few years.4

2. He is usually described as drawing, following Gersaint’s lead (Gersaint 1751, no. 27, “Rembrandt dessinant”); van Gelder (1943, p. 34) and Chapman (1990, p. 82) suggest that he is preparing an etching plate. Welzel (in Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 25), following Chapman, posits a symbolic allusion to diogeno.

3. Hind 229: “questionable … though the landscape is quite in his manner”; Boston, New York 1969–70, no. III, fourth state (doubtful); Hollstein, XVIII, B 22, fourth state: “the work added in the fourth and fifth states was probably not done by Rembrandt”;
White 1969, p. 134, n. 34; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 25 (the landscape probably a later addition). Clausin (1824, no. 22) and Rovinski (no. 22) describe additional states; according to White and Boon (in Hollstein, XVIII, B 22), these can be explained as variations in the printing of the first state. Nowell-Usticke (1967, no. B 22) describes reworking of the plate by later hands and attributes the fifth state (his fourth) to Watelet. The heavily reworked copperplate is now on the art market (Hinterding 1993–94, p. 288).

4. The similarity of handling among the landscapes is especially apparent in the lightly etched backgrounds, for example in Canal with an Angler and Two Swans of 1650 (Bartsch 235) and Landscape with a Cow of about 1650 (Bartsch 237).

LITERATURE
Bartsch 22; Hind 229; Hollstein, XVIII, B 22.

91 The Hundred Guilder Print

Finished 1649
Etching, drypoint, and burin, 11 x 15½ in. (28 x 39.4 cm)
Second state of two
Watermark: Strasbourg Lily, Ash and Fletcher 36 D' a.
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.107.35

The Hundred Guilder Print, greatly admired in the artist’s day, displays the full range of Rembrandt’s mastery as a printmaker. The scene combines several episodes from the Gospel of Saint Matthew (19:1–30): Christ healing the sick, receiving the children, rebuking the apostles, and answering the Pharisees. Rembrandt fused these stories into a single complex composition dominated by the surge of diverse characters toward the central figure of Christ.

The velvety depths of shadow make this print one of Rembrandt’s most sumptuous. Blackness engulfs the scene as it progresses to the right, and Christ stands as a luminous beacon between dark and light. The large number of drawings Rembrandt produced in preparation for this etching shows the careful consideration he gave to each part of the composition. After the scene was etched onto the plate, he continued to reposition many of the details, among them Christ’s eyes (see fig. 112), hands, and feet.
Rembrandt may have worked on the plate over a period of ten years, from an initial effort in the late 1630s to a stage of reworking in the 1640s. Some scholars liken the delineation of the Pharisees to that of figures in the master’s *Death of the Virgin* of 1639 (no. 87) and the deep shadows to those of his *Jan Six of 1647.* Although Rembrandt’s etching technique does appear to have undergone a stylistic change during his involvement with this print, recent dating of the preliminary drawings indicates that the time span was considerably briefer, from about 1647 to 1649.

Captain William Baillie acquired the copperplate about 1775 and crudely reinforced the image; he then cut the plate apart and reprinted the fragments (see fig. 113). The stiffness of his marks completely undermines the subtlety Rembrandt had originally achieved.

1. The print was so expensive and desirable during Rembrandt’s lifetime that by the early eighteenth century it had acquired its title, which is based on a story that Rembrandt himself had paid one hundred guilders at auction to buy back just one impression. For further sources for the title, see White 1969, p. 55, n. 29.
2. Ibid., pp. 56–57.

**Literature**

Bartels 74; Hind 236; Hollstein, XVIII, B 74; White 1969, pp. 55–56.

**Ex Coll.**

Franz Rechberger, Vienna, 1808 (Lugt 2133); Jan Gijssbert Verstolk van Soelen, The Hague and Soelen (Lugt 2490); Richard Fisher, Hill Top, Midhurst (Lugt 2204).
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**REMBRANDT**

92 **Clement de Jonghe (?)**

1651

Etching, drypoint, and burin, 8 1/2 x 6 1/2 in. (20.7 x 16.1 cm)

Signed and dated lower right: Rembrandt f. 1651

(a) First state of six

Watermark: Initials, countermark RC, Ash and Fletcher 264

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

29.107.2

(b) Fifth state of six

Watermark: Seven Provinces, initials BM below, Ash and Fletcher

34 A. a

Gift of Henry Walters, 1917

17.37.73

James Abbott McNeill Whistler (1834–1903), whose own printmaking style was deeply influenced by the work of Rembrandt, found this etched portrait to be “beautiful as a Greek marble or a canvas by Tintoret.” A comparison of the early and late states of the print provides an opportunity to trace the evolution of character and presence that so impressed Whistler. In the first state (no. 92a) Rembrandt recorded the figure with architectonic clarity. The tiny strokes and stipules that define and shade the facial features contrast with the broad, open hatching used in less sensitive areas, such as the cloak. Additional work in successive states refines the facial expression and adds volume to the figure. At the same time an unusual combination of tech-
niques creates a spatial context. The blank upper background is enlivened by horizontal scratches, resulting from rough burnishing of the plate, and by a faint streaky tone, possibly fixed in the plate by sulfur tinting. By the third state these patterns show signs of wearing away, and Rembrandt began to develop the background wall.

The fifth state (no. 92b) reveals that Rembrandt revised and amplified many passages with needle and burin, enhancing the play of shadow across the face, modulating texture and volume, and creating a rusticated arch behind the figure.

This fastidious and repeated refinement of the design, chronicled in multiple impressions pulled in successive states, is a characteristic of Rembrandt's approach unmatched by other printmakers. Well over a dozen impressions of the first state of this portrait are still in existence. It is likely that Rembrandt pulled these proofs not just to check the progress of his work but also to produce prints that he could sell. Early collectors prided themselves on acquiring complete sets of the states of Rembrandt's prints. Thus, the artist may well have intended his subtle series of transformations to be read and appreciated sequentially, as we are doing here.

The subject of this portrait is traditionally identified as
Clement de Jonghe (1624/25–1677), an Amsterdam print dealer whose estate inventory included seventy-four copperplates by Rembrandt. Yet it is difficult to relate this imposing figure to what is known about de Jonghe, who was only twenty-six years old when this etching was made in 1651 and who is not documented as a print publisher before 1656. Enveloped in cloak, hat, and gloves, as if he had just come in from outdoors, the man appears pensive and relaxed, at once simple and dignified. The quiet confidence of the portrayal, uncluttered by attributes or action, suggests that this is a man Rembrandt knew well. Perhaps he is one of several connoisseurs and literati whose contacts with the artist in the 1650s are well established, such as the poet Jeremias de Decker (1609–1666), who composed a sonnet praising Rembrandt’s *Christ Appearing to Mary Magdalene* of 1651 (Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, Braunschweig), and who remained a lifelong friend. A conclusive identification awaits the discovery of further documentary evidence.

1. Inscribed by Whistler on an impression now in The Art Institute of Chicago (New York, Toronto 1984, pp. 112–13). The perceptive reference to Tintoretto anticipates art historians’ recognition of

2. The pale tone appears at first to be the result of uneven wiping of ink before printing but is identical in different impressions of the first state. Compare, for example, first state, The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York (Boston, New York 1969–70, figs. 31, 32), and Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (ill. in Hollstein, XIX, B 272/I), with the present impression. A similar combination of scratches and tone appears in Landscape with a Cow of about 1650 (Bartsch 237; Washington 1990, no. 37). See also Rembrandt’s Jan Comelisz Sylvius of 1646 (Bartsch 2).

3. For states, see Boston, New York 1969–70, no.VIII; Hollstein, XVIII, B 272; White 1969, pp. 135–38. Münz (1952, no. 72) and Hind (251) considered the work in the fifth and sixth states to be by a later hand; White (1969, pp. 135–38) questioned only the sixth state. The copperplate was purchased by Waterlet at the de Haan sale in 1767, went through several later printings, and is now in the Amsterdam Historisch Museum (Hollstein, XVIII, B 272; Hinterding 1993–94, pp. 300, 312).


6. Voûte (1878) suggested that the sitter is Jan Six, but if he were the plate would surely have remained with the Six family, as did Rembrandt’s well-known etching from 1647 (Bartsch 283). See also Amsterdam 1986–87, p. 13; Hinterding 1993–94, p. 257. There is no documented association with de Jonghe apart from his estate inventory of 1679. For de Decker (forty-two years old in 1651), see Strauss and van der Meulen 1979, nos. 1660/23, 1660/26, 1667/17; Klessmann 1983, no. 235; Schwartz 1985, pp. 340–43; Dickey 1994, pp. 47–49.

LITERATURE
Bartsch 272; Hind 251; Hollstein, XVIII, B 272.

REMBRANDT

93 Landscape with a Haybarn and a Flock of Sheep

1652
Etching, drypoint, and burin, 3⅛ x 6⅛ in. (8.2 x 17.5 cm)
Second state of two
Signed and dated lower left: Rembrandt f. 1652 [d reversed]

(a) On light gray prepared paper (restored along top edge)
Alfred W. Hoyt Collection, Bequest of Rosina H. Hoppin, 1965
65.690.2

(b) On Japanese paper
The Sylmaris Collection, Gift of George Coe Graves, 1920
20.46.2

(c) On ivory laid paper
Watermark: [fragment]
H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929
29.107.19

As was often his practice, Rembrandt printed this landscape on a variety of papers, with subtly different results. The Museum is fortunate to possess early impressions on laid paper colored before printing with a light gray wash, on Japanese paper, and on ivory laid paper. Rembrandt’s choice of prepared paper (no. 93a) was probably inspired by the work of the Dutch painter and etcher Hercules Segers (1589/90–ca. 1638). Its use produces a more uniform background than does the selective wiping Rembrandt sometimes employed to modulate tonal contrasts. Here the gray tone suggests a cool, misty sky in contrast to the brighter effect achieved with the bare ivory paper (no. 93c). Japanese paper, smooth, absorbent, and golden in tone, creates a warm effect and causes the lines to print softly, heightening the velvety appearance of the drypoint burr (no. 93b).¹

The first state of this print shows a scene already well defined; the second state, which is represented here, adds a distant landscape at left, and many areas appear further enriched with shading in drypoint.² A patch of tiny speckles can be seen at right, extending from the middle of the sky down onto the grassy bank. This stippled effect occurs in several of Rembrandt’s etchings and has sometimes been ascribed to a deliberate use of sulfur tinting.³ In the present case, however, there seems to be no logic to the use of stippling in the location in which it appears; it may well have resulted accidently from applying a slightly permeable ground before the plate was bitten in the acid.

This etching belongs to a group of prints and drawings representing rural scenes in the vicinity of Amsterdam, which Rembrandt produced during the 1650s. Similar farms with round haybarns can be seen in several of the artist’s sketches of the countryside along the Dierderik. Here Rembrandt provided no church tower or other landmark to identify the site. Instead he enlivened the scene with quick, vivid depictions of farm folk and animals,
shifting the emphasis from a record of a specific place to an atmospheric evocation of bucolic life. Although such details as the huddled flock of sheep and the horse rolling gleefully on its back lend a sense of immediacy to the subject, the composition may well represent a blend of direct observation and fantasy, assembled in the studio on the basis of studies from life.\(^4\)

Rembrandt’s bosky views of the Dutch countryside have been much admired by artists, connoisseurs, and imitators (see fig. 107). Many of Rembrandt’s pupils shared his interest in drawing the local terrain, but only a few adapted this concern to the medium of etching: Jacob Koninck (1610/15–1680) and Philips Koninck (1619–1688), as well as such secondary followers as Pieter de With (active ca. 1650–60), continued to etch Rembrandtesque country views throughout the century. Early cataloguers attributed many of their works to the master himself. *Landscape with Canal and Palisade* of 1659 (fig. 114), attributed to de With, but given by Bartsch to Rembrandt, clearly illustrates how followers adopted Rembrandt’s rustic motifs but failed to equal his command of form and technique.\(^1\) Later admirers continued Rembrandt’s landscape tradition in terms of their own means. Although the plate for the present etching, like those for most of Rembrandt’s rural subjects, disappeared long ago, copies were made in the eighteenth century by William Baillie, Claude-Henri Watelet, and other amateurs.\(^6\)

---

1. White 1969, p. 15; Washington 1977, p. 50. In no. 93a here, the top third of the sheet and the lower corners have been restored. No. 93b is cited in Hollstein, XVIII, B 224; Washington 1990, no. 24; Dickey 1993, p. 182, ill.
4. The etched *Landscape with a Milkman* (Bartsch 213) and a drawing

5. Bartsch 247, as by Rembrandt; accepted by Rovinski (who owned an impression) as "un des plus graceux paysages du grand maître" (Rovinski, no. 247); first rejected by Middleton (1878, rej. no. 5); attributed to Pieter de With by Hind (†138), Börlund (1955, rej. no. 36), Hollstein (XVIII, B 247), de Groot (1979, no. 134).

See also de Groot 1979, nos. 130–38; Amsterdam 1984–85, pp. 44–51.

6. Hollstein, XVIII, B 224. An example of Baillie’s album, with prints after the present etching, Landscape with Three Trees (no. 89), and others (see no. 91), is in the Museum’s collection. See also Hinterding 1993–94, pp. 271–73.

**Literature**
Bartsch 224; Hind 241; Hollstein, XVIII, B 224.

**Exhibited**
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**REMBRANDT**

94 *Christ Crucified Between Two Thieves,* called The Three Crosses

1653
Drypoint and burin

(a) Second state of five
On vellum
15 x 17¼ in. (38.1 x 43.8 cm)
Gift of Felix M. Warburg and his family, 1941
41.1.31

(b) Third state of five
On laid paper
15¾ x 17½ in. (38.5 x 45.6 cm)
Signed and dated lower center: Rembrandt f. 1653
Watermark: Strasbourg Bend, Ash and Fletcher 35 D’A.
Gift of Felix M. Warburg and his family, 1941
41.1.32

(c) Fourth state of five
On laid paper
15 x 17½ in. (38.1 x 44.5 cm)
Gift of Felix M. Warburg and his family, 1941
41.1.33

*The Three Crosses* represents the culmination of Rembrandt’s virtuosity as a printmaker and stands as one of his finest works in any medium. The level of artistry attained in both the original state and its dramatic reworking in the fourth state was never equaled by Rembrandt’s contemporaries.

The Museum is fortunate to own impressions of the second, third, and fourth states of the print, which constitute the three main phases of its transformation and epitomize the repeated rethinking of images that characterized Rembrandt’s working process. Rembrandt inked the copperplate variously, handling the medium as if he were

---

Fig. 115. Detail, no. 94a
painting, and chose different types of supports to produce unique versions of the same image within each state. He executed *The Three Crosses* primarily in drypoint, a technique that allowed him to make angular lines reminiscent of those in his reed pen drawings of the same period. His forceful strokes take full advantage of the burr, the velvety areas created by the copper that is turned up along the drypoint line as it is cut. In early well-inked impressions large areas of burr appear as tone rather than as fine lines.

Some impressions of the first two states of *The Three Crosses*, including the Museum’s print of the second state (no. 944), were made on vellum, the tan color of which infuses the composition with a warm light. The vellum, less absorbent than paper, holds ink on the surface, softening lines and enhancing the richness of the burr. In a number of the early states Rembrandt left a good deal of ink on the plate as he printed impressions. With this plate tone he heightened the contrast between dark and light and clarified spatial relationships. In the Museum’s impression of the second state, a light veil of ink sets John and the figures beside him apart from Mary and the individuals surrounding her, who are set in an area where the plate has no surface tone (fig. 115).
The Museum’s impression of the third state (no. 94b) is typical: all the lines are visible, and the scene is bathed in brilliant light, the plate having been wiped clean and the image printed on white paper. The contrast to the second state, with its preponderance of dark, murky areas, is extreme.

In the fourth state (no. 94c) Rembrandt completely transformed his earlier work, which represents the Centurion’s conversion after Christ’s death, to focus on the figure of Christ in the final moments of his life as he cries: “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” (Matthew 27:46). He redrew Christ’s face, now showing his mouth open and eyes half closed. In reinterpreting the subject, Rembrandt scraped away and burnished out large portions of the original composition (including the date and signature), some of which are still visible underneath the hatching. He reconceived the sky by covering it over with strong parallel lines that veil the remaining figures on the right and left. The resulting image is more direct than the earlier version but equally powerful.

1. Most of these unique impressions made before the state bearing his signature must have been produced by Rembrandt for collectors of his work. The fact that many of these were printed on expensive vellum supports this assumption.
2. According to Hollstein (XVIII, B 78), ten impressions of the first state were printed on vellum; the Museum's impression is apparently the only one of the second state on vellum.

3. Rembrandt signed and dated the plate in the third state. According to White (1969, p. 79), Rembrandt chose to wipe the impressions of the third state and print them on white paper in order to achieve the greatest possible brilliance. However, such impressions are less individualized than the artistically inked proofs of the first and second states, indicating less attention on Rembrandt's part to the way they were printed. This suggests that Rembrandt could have signed the third-state plate and then handed it over to an apprentice or even a professional printer to run off impressions for him.

4. Several scholars have dated the changes in the fourth state to about ten years after the work on the early states, based on resemblances between the last version and Rembrandt's Claudius Civilis (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm [Bredius 1969, no. 482]), completed in 1661 (see ibid., p. 99, n. 38). The representation of the Centurion's conversion was based on Luke's description of the Passion (Luke 23:44–48; ibid., pp. 76–77).

5. This new conception is based on the accounts in Matthew and Mark (White 1969, p. 100).

Literature
Bartsch 78; Hind 270; Hollstein, XVIII, B 78.
95 Saint Jerome Reading in an Italian Landscape

Ca. 1653
Etching, burin, and drypoint, 10 1/2 x 8 1/2 in. (26.1 x 21.3 cm)
Second state of two
Gift of Felix M. Warburg and his family, 1941
41.1.17

Rembrandt’s interpretation of the theme of Saint Jerome changed over the years, ranging from his early depictions of the man as a repentant hermit (see no. 107) to the scholar meditating outdoors in this print etched about 1653, his final treatment of the subject.1 Sandals off, the saint here is absorbed in his reading, as the lion, the single traditional symbol included to identify Jerome, stands guard.

The abbreviated manner in which the artist delineated the figure of Saint Jerome and other details led Gersaint to consider the print unfinished.2 Rembrandt’s use of varying degrees of finish, however, was intentional. It produces the effect of bright light dissolving forms into mere outlines; it also would have appealed to contemporary collectors with a taste for the non finito (unfinished), who assembled numerous proof states of Rembrandt’s prints.3

Although this etching’s somewhat sketchy quality makes it appear spontaneous, the more polished areas were in fact heavily worked even before the first state was printed. The darkness at left is composed of several layers of etching, and the lean-to within that area was created by burnishing away some of the lines cut earlier.4 Late in this process Rembrandt went over the lion’s mane, the tree trunk, and the landscape with drypoint, which left striking traces of burr. The coarse gray cardoes (cartridge paper) on which this impression is printed gives the etching a cool tone and suggests that it originated in Rembrandt’s studio rather than in the workshop of a later publisher. Such sheets were rarely used by printmakers other than Rembrandt, who was always interested in the various results he could achieve with different papers.5

During the early 1650s Rembrandt returned to etching landscapes, which had preoccupied him in the previous decade; he also became keenly interested in Venetian art.6 In the present Saint Jerome these two concerns unite. The group of buildings with a tower in the background of the landscape, the repeated parallel hatching, and the pervasive light recall Venetian sources, in particular graphic work by Titian and Campagnola (see fig. 116).

3. The same effect appears in the first versions of The Three Crosses of the same period (nos. 94a,b). On prints considered unfinished, including The Artist Drawing from a Model (Bartsch 192) and the signed first state of Saint Francis Praying beneath a Tree (Bartsch 107), see Scallen 1992.
4. Rembrandt’s preliminary sketch (Kupferstichkabinett, Kunsthalle, Hamburg [Benesch 886]) shows that he originally intended to include greater detail in that dark area. A close inspection of the etched lines reveals that some of the marks indicated in the drawing were etched onto the plate and then were covered over with layers of arched hatching.
5. White 1969, p. 14; this type of sheet is also known as oatmeal paper. The plate was acquired by Clement de Jonghe, who must himself have pulled impressions (Hinterding 1992–94, p. 265).
6. During the early 1650s Rembrandt copied Titian’s drawing Mountainous Landscape with a Horse (Devonshire Collection, Chatsworth); see Winner 1980, pp. 221–24. Northern prints have also been cited as sources for this work, among them Saint Jerome in the Desert after Pieter Bruegel (Bastelaer 1908, no. 7).

Literature
The Entombment demonstrates the combination of firm, rectilinear draftsmanship and evocative tone that Rembrandt achieved in his graphic work of the 1650s. While some of Rembrandt’s prints rely heavily on drypoint (see no. 94), here he worked almost entirely with the etching needle, manipulating content and chiaroscuro by varying the inking and printing techniques of individual impressions.

A dramatic change takes place between the first and second states. In the first state (no. 96a) Rembrandt modeled quickly delineated figures and setting with an open web of hatching. Torchlight flickers in the cavernous tomb where Christ’s body is laid to rest by a somber band of mourners.

The Museum’s impression of this state is printed on Chinese paper, which softens the linear effect of the etched strokes.
In the second state (no. 96b) Rembrandt built up layers of strokes to submerge the scene in a shadowy gloom and to focus attention more closely on the central figures. He also modified his printing technique for each impression, leaving a selectively wiped film of ink on the plate to enhance the dusky atmosphere. In this example he reduced the light to a dim glow emanating from Christ's lifeless form.

Rembrandt most likely produced this undated print in 1654, the same year in which he etched the Supper at Emmaus and the Descent from the Cross on copperplates of similar size and format.1 While the Supper at Emmaus takes place in a revelatory blaze of light, the Descent, like the Entombment, is enveloped in darkness. Together with a suite of scenes from Christ's youth, these etchings mark a highly productive period in Rembrandt's printmaking career and a moment of intense engagement with the imagery of Christ's life and passion.

1. Bartsch 87, 83. On states, individual impressions, and the relationship of this work to other etchings, see Boston, New York 1969–70, no. XVIII; Hollstein, XVIII, B 86; White 1969, pp. 80–84 (compares technique to that of Mantegna); Boston, Saint Louis 1980–81, no. 167; Berlin, Amsterdam, London 1991–92, II, no. 37. The copperplate is lost, and no late editions are known.

Literature
Bartsch 86; Hind 281; Hollstein, XVIII, B 86.
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97a *Lieven Willemsz van Coppenol*

1658
Etching, drypoint, and burin, 13¾ x 11½ in. (34 x 29 cm)
Fourth state of six
Gift of Felix M. Warburg and his family, 1941
41.1.55

PIERRE-FRANÇOIS BASAN (1723–1797) 

97b *Lieven Willemsz van Coppenol*

Ca. 1789
Etching and engraving, 13 x 11¼ in. (33.1 x 28.1 cm)
Gift of Georgiana W. Sargeant, in memory of John Osborn Sargeant, 1924
24.63.1743

Rembrandt etched two portraits of the schoolmaster and calligrapher Lieven van Coppenol (1599–after 1667), both datable to about 1658. The smaller of these prints (fig. 117) represents Coppenol in his study, accompanied by his grandson Antonius; the elder Coppenol has just drawn a perfect circle, a testament to his calligraphic skill. The so-called Large Coppenol, exhibited here, is simpler in composition and highlights a different aspect of Coppenol's talent. With quill pen in hand, Coppenol holds up a blank sheet of paper, a calligrapher's equivalent of the tabula rasa, the blank canvas that in artists' portraits often alludes to the intellectual power of creative invention that precedes the craftsmanly practice of art.

In both its impressive scale and its highly finished technique, this etching challenges the accomplishments of professional portrait engravers such as Cornelis Visscher, who also depicted Coppenol in 1658. Using multilayered passages of finely modulated croshatching, Rembrandt demonstrated that the etching medium can equal or even surpass engraving in creating painterly effects of texture and tonality. On one occasion this etching served as the direct basis for a painted portrait (no. 34).
Rembrandt composed his image of Coppenol by first establishing the figure, then adding the background. As was his usual practice, he reserved the most delicate modeling for the face. Although the composition was essentially complete by the second state, the artist continued through three more states to refine forms and soften contrasts of light and dark, often increasing the tonal impact of individual impressions by varying his printing procedures, either by leaving a film of ink on the plate or by printing on absorbent Japanese paper. In the sixth state the plate was cut down to a bust-length portrait, possibly because Rembrandt’s subtle network of lines had become too worn for printing.1

Dutch portrait prints typically included inscriptions giving biographical data and eulogizing the sitter. Like most of Rembrandt’s etchings, however, the portraits of Coppenol were published without text. For the egocentric calligrapher this was not satisfactory. In 1658 he commissioned poems in praise of his artistry from Constantijn Huygens, Joost van den Vondel, and other leading writers; sometimes he copied these verses onto impressions of the prints, a practice continued by later owners (see fig. 117).4

Rembrandt’s imposing likeness of Coppenol was copied by the eighteenth-century connoisseurs Vivant-Denon and Pierre-François Basan, as well as by other printmakers. Basan’s copy, shown here, illustrates the difference between the confident variety of Rembrandt’s line and the more mechanical efforts of pedestrian admirers.5

**Fig. 117.** Rembrandt. Portrait of Lieven Willemsz van Coppenol with His Grandson, 1658. Etching, drypoint, and burin, annotated in pen and brown ink, 10 ⁹⁄₁₆ x 7 ¹⁵⁄₁₆ in. (25.8 x 19 cm). Fifth state of six. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Felix M. Warburg and his family, 1941 41.1.47

---

1. See, for example, Bartholomeus van der Helst’s Paulus Potter of 1654 in the Museum Mauritshuis, The Hague, as well as such portraits of scholars as Rubens’s Caspar Gevuurs of about 1628 in the Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, and Rembrandt’s Man with a Quill Pen of 1632 in the Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kassel (Corpus, II [1986], no. A 54), once thought to portray Coppenol. See also Bros 1971.


3. For states, see Hollstein, XVIII, B 283. A related drawing is in the Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest (Benesch 766; White 1969, p. 148, and n. 31). The copperplate is in the Fondation Custodia, Paris; Hinterding 1993–94, p. 301.


5. The print dealer and collector Basan played a pivotal role in the posthumous reworking, copying, and disseminating of Rembrandt’s etchings (Hinterding 1993–94, pp. 276–79). The present copy was included in Basan 1789.

**Literature**

Bartsch 283; Hind 300; Hollstein, XVIII, B 283 (no. 97a here); Biörklund 1955, under no. BB 38–F; Hollstein, XVIII, under B 283 (no. 97b here).
The Descent from the Cross
(the second plate)

1633
Etching and burin, 20⅞ x 16¾ in. (52.1 x 41 cm)
Third or fourth state of five
Watermark: Grapes, Ash and Fletcher 21 A.a.
Gift of Henry Walters, 1917
17.37.69

The similarities of size and finish as well as the related subject matter in The Descent from the Cross and Christ before Pilate
(no. 99) suggest that Rembrandt conceived of the two prints
as a pair.1 In producing these etchings he was emulating
Rubens’s practice of publishing his own paintings for a
wide audience by translating them into dramatic engrav-
ings.2 The grand scale and heavy finish of both etchings,
which stand apart from Rembrandt’s characteristically
small, loosely drawn prints of the 1630s, reflect this pur-
pose. Rembrandt chose an important commission to pro-
mote in this way: the Descent reproduces the painting
(Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Alte Pinakothek,
Munich) he executed for the stadholder Frederik Hendrik
of Orange.3 The artist made two attempts to etch the
Descent. His first plate, unevenly bitten by the acid, was a
complete failure; only four impressions from that damaged
plate exist. The present etching represents Rembrandt’s
second, successful effort.4

Scholars have questioned the attribution to Rembrandt
of the Descent and of the Pilate and proposed that a profes-
sional engraver, Jan van Vliet, participated in the produc-
tion of both.5 Clearly the Descent was etched in several stages;
successive layers of drawing, hatching, and redrawing are
visible throughout. Certain passages of hatching have been
mechanically applied, while others, which can frequently
be discerned underneath the heavy layers of hatching, display
the spontaneity typical of Rembrandt’s lines. Large areas of
the sky and the buildings in the left background, for example,
are covered with repetitive diagonal hatching done with the
burin, the tool of the professional engraver.6 The original
execution of the buildings underneath the hatching, however,
is lively and loosely sketched with thin etched lines, a sty-
listic characteristic associated with the master.7 Elsewhere
thin lines are retraced with thicker, heavy-handed etched
ones, such as those of the outlines of the brocaded cloak on
the ground in the center. And strokes too uniform for
Rembrandt’s hand are in evidence in other parts of the com-
position: for example, the parallel lines that define the shin-
merging tunic of the man standing to the left of the ladder.

This alternately spontaneous and mechanical handling
and rehandling can be explained only if the etching is
considered the result of a series of interchanges between
Rembrandt and another artist.8 Rembrandt must initially
have sketched much of the composition onto the plate, but
another hand seems to have filled in and reworked many
areas under his direction. Rembrandt, in turn, and his
engraver-collaborator, in turn again, may have gone over
some passages. Whether the other engraver was in fact van
Vliet has yet to be proven. Van Vliet seems a likely can-
didate because we know Rembrandt engaged him to pro-
duce engravings after some of his other paintings at the
time the present print was made. However, the parts of the
Descent that are atypical of Rembrandt are also atypical of
van Vliet (see nos. 107, 108), leaving the identity of the
master’s collaborator open to question.

1. In addition, both prints are the only etchings by Rembrandt to bear
the inscription cum privile or cum privelig, used to denote that a privi-
gle, a sort of copyright, had been acquired for them; however, he
does not specify who awarded him the privilege. The lower margin
in the Museum’s impression has been cut so that the privilege is no
2. Rembrandt’s composition for the Descent was in fact based on
such an engraving by Lucas Vorsterman after Rubens’s Descent from
the Cross of 1612 in Antwerp Cathedral (Hollstein, XLIII, 31).
Research Project believe that the etching illustrates the painting in
an intermediary state, before certain compositional elements were
4. Bartsch 81; Hollstein, XVIII, B 81(f). The impressions from the
first plate (Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; British
Museum, London; Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna; and
Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris) indicate that Rembrandt
un成功地 attempted to reuse the original copperplate by
scraping away the failed image. The compositions of the first and
the second versions of the Descent differ slightly. White (1969,
p. 34) considers these changes an indication that Rembrandt him-
self was entirely responsible for both etchings.
5. Royalton-Kisch (1984a and 1984b) attributes the Descent to van Vliet
under Rembrandt’s supervision; Schuckman (in Hollstein, XLI,
p. 223, B 81), sympathizes with White’s attribution of the entire
print to Rembrandt (see n. 4, above).
7. The handling is similar to that of the architecture in the etching
The Ship of Fortune of 1633 (Bartsch 111).
8. Much of this interaction must have occurred before the first state was
finished, because the image is more or less complete in the first state.

Literature
Bartsch 81; Hind 103; Hollstein, XVIII, B 81 (II).
99 Christ before Pilate

1635–36
Etching and engraving, 21⅝ x 17½ in. (54.9 x 44.8 cm)
Fourth state of five
Signed and dated below image: Rembrandt f 1636 cum privile
Watermark: Strasbourg Lily, Ash and Fletcher 36 C.c.
Gift of Henry Walters, 1917
17:37:75

This etching’s attribution to Rembrandt has long been questioned by scholars. The stiff rendering overall and the variation in handling between foreground and background suggest that, like The Descent from the Cross of two years earlier (no. 98), it was either partially or entirely etched by someone other than Rembrandt.¹ The Pilate and the Descent show certain similarities of surface articulation (as in the short strokes that define Christ’s body); however, a greater proportion of the Pilate stands out as the work of an assistant. The treatment of the whole central figure group here, for example, is mechanical and awkward. Yet some details, such as the virtuoso lines of the background figures and architecture, as well as the sloppy scratched margin along the bottom edge of the print, are typical of Rembrandt’s work.

Not only elements of style but also aspects of the print’s development deviate from Rembrandt’s norm. There exist in Amsterdam (Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum) and London (British Museum) impressions of an early proof state in which the central section has been left blank. These indicate that the composition was not freely drawn on the copperplate but rather transferred to it in sections from an oil sketch (The National Gallery, London) by Rembrandt. Rembrandt made changes in one of these proof impressions by retouching it with brown oil paint (fig. 118). These bits of evidence involve procedures that depart from Rembrandt’s usual working methods and suggest that he stopped etching the plate before the central portion of the print was completed. He appears to have done so in order to assess the development of the print, to correct certain problems, and to give further instruction to another artist who finished the work. Recently it has been proposed that Rembrandt set down much of the basic composition himself, returning to it later only to add and strengthen details with the dry-point needle after an assistant, Jan van Vliet, completed most of the print according to his instructions.²

An assistant undoubtedly participated in etching much of this unusual work. The peculiar appearance of the Descent, like that of the Pilate, surely must be a consequence of an interaction wherein Rembrandt began the work on the plate, turned it over to an assistant, worked on it again, and had his collaborator finish it. Whether van Vliet was that assistant is still open to question.³ The handling in van Vliet’s signed engravings, such as the Saint Jerome (no. 107), is generally much tighter and more tentative than that in the Pilate. The delineation of fur, drapery, and the frequently cited flimsy hand of the Pharisee farthest to the left find few equivalents in van Vliet’s known work. However, the short flicked strokes in the hands of the Pharisee at center who grasps the rod recall van Vliet’s approach elsewhere, although in other instances they are more abundant and function to define shaded areas rather than texture. An attribution to van Vliet is possible only if it is presumed that he altered and broadened his engraving style as he closely followed Rembrandt’s instructions.

Fig. 118. Rembrandt, with Jan van Vliet (?) Christ Before Pilate, 1635–36. Etching and engraving, retouched with brown oil paint, 21⅝ x 17½ in. (54.9 x 44.7 cm). First state of five. British Museum, London
1. The British etcher and enthusiastic admirer of Rembrandt’s prints Francis Seymour Haden wrote in 1879 that *Christ before Pilate* "is no more than an able copy largely touched upon by Rembrandt and published by him solely for commercial purposes" (Haden 1879, p. 29).

2. Royalton-Kisch 1984a; Royalton-Kisch 1984b.

3. In the recent compilation of van Vliet’s prints (Hollstein, XLII, p. 222, B. 77), Schuckman claims not to be convinced that van Vliet was involved in making this print. The evidence for his participation is primarily circumstantial and based on the fact that he was the only printmaker known to have worked with Rembrandt in the 1630s. Bober (1981, p. 13) suggests that van Vliet remained in Leiden when Rembrandt moved to Amsterdam in 1631 and had little to do with the painter after that. He also proposes that the prints dated 1633–34 after Rembrandt’s paintings (Hollstein, XLII, 19–24) were engraved after works that remained in Leiden.

**Literature**
Bartsch 77; Hind 143; Hollstein, XVIII, B 77; Royalton-Kisch 1984a; Royalton-Kisch 1984b.
100 Student at a Table by Candlelight

ca. 1642
Etching and burin, 5¼ x 5½ in. (14.7 x 13.3 cm)
Only state
Signed (indistinctly) lower right: Rembrandt
Bequest of Harry G. Friedman, 1966
66.521.17

The invention of the mezzotint technique in the 1640s attests to a widespread interest in manipulating the print medium to rival the tonal effects of painting. Rembrandt achieved a similar look in his "black prints" of the 1640s and 1650s by using etching and drypoint to cover the copperplate in an impenetrable network of hatching, relieved only by a few strong accents of light. Etchings such as his Saint Jerome in a Dark Chamber of 1642 (fig. 119) influenced later printmakers, including Rembrandt’s own pupil Ferdinand Bol (see no. 164), and were admired internationally.¹

Student at a Table by Candlelight is roughly contemporary with the Saint Jerome and shares its stylistic aims. The Student at a Table was quickly sought after by collectors of Rembrandt’s etchings; the French connoisseur P.J. Mariette owned an impression as early as 1646.² Its reception and attribution, however, have been complicated by the existence of a deceptive copy, which appeared as a representation of Hermes Trismegistus, “the light of Wisdom in a dark age,” in an anthology of biblical prints compiled by the Mennonite publisher Jan Philipsz Schabaelje in 1654.³ Cataloguers initially mistook the copy for later states of the original, whose authorship has remained problematic. It has been proposed that the plate for the original was begun by a pupil, possibly Bol, and finished by Rembrandt.⁴ That the reverse is true now seems more likely.

Although the density of the work makes an assignment based on handling extremely difficult, it is plausible to suggest that the busy master would have delegated the completion of the mechanical and laborious crosshatching to another hand. A number of Rembrandt’s graphic works
from the 1630s resulted from a comparable collaborative procedure (see nos. 98, 99). Furthermore, the figure of the scholar here has a blocky, leaden character, with outlines laid in rather coarsely over flat passages of hatching, qualities inconsistent with the subtleties of authentic works by Rembrandt, such as the Saint Jerome, in which the definition of contour and modeling evolve organically. Rembrandt's contribution to the Student at a Table probably consisted of an initial sketch, now hidden, that was later completed by one or more assistants. An almost indecipherable signature buried under shading in the lower right corner may indicate the preliminary, autograph stage.

Only one state of this print is currently described by cataloguers, but variations among impressions are apparent as the velvety black of the background loses strength. A defect in the biting of the plate in the acid produced a spatter of pale spots around and below the candle flame; these spots are more pronounced in later examples, including the present one, which is printed on very thin, grayish paper, possibly from the eighteenth century.

1. On the taste for ‘‘zwarte prenten,’’ see Boston, Saint Louis 1980–81, pp. xix–xxvi, xlvi–xxvi, nos. 99, 100. Bartsch (148) describes Student at a Table by Candlelight as ‘‘dans le goût de la manière noire [mezzotint].’’ See also no. 96 here.


3. Jan Philipsz Schabaelje, Den grooten emblemata sacra bestaande in meer dan vier honderd bijbeliche figuren (Amsterdam, 1654), composed mainly of second-hand plates by a variety of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century artists, with commentary by Schabaelje; see Six 1909, pp. 87–89; Münz 1952, no. 260; Visser 1988; Schuckman 1990. It is possible that the ‘‘Hermes Trismegistus’’ was made for Schabaelje by Salomon Savery, the Mennonite printmaker who produced copies of several other Rembrandt etchings (see Dickey 1994, pp. 331–36).

4. Bartsch (148), Rovinski (148), and Hind (202) fail to mention the copy and describe multiple states. Von Seidlitz (1895, no. 148), who considers the etching not by Rembrandt, lists the illustration in Schabaelje’s anthology as a second state. Hollstein (XVIII, B 148) credits O. H. Barnard as the first to separate the copy from the original (Craddock and Barnard, sale cat., 1935, no. 31). Münz (1952, no. 260, pl. 23) suggests that the plate was begun by Bol and finished by Rembrandt. In the copy the bottom of the figure’s chin is equidistant from the top and bottom plate marks. See also Nowell-Usticke 1967, no. B 148.

5. A similar claim has been made for the highly finished Goldweigher of 1639 (Bartsch 281; see, for example, Hind 167; Münz 1952, no. 259). The handling of that plate, however, shows greater variety and spontaneity (see Dickey 1994, pp. 237–45). The hatching in the Student at a Table is finer and denser than is typical of Bol’s manner, as seen in the Holy Family in an Interior (no. 104 here). Rembrandt’s preliminary underdrawing is clearly visible in a number of prints, including The Artist in the Studio (Bartsch 192). See also no. 95 here.


Literature
Bartsch 148; Hind 202; Hollstein, XVIII, B 148.

FE RDIN AN D B OL (1616–1680)

101 Saint Jerome

1644
Etching, 11 1/2 x 9 1/2 in. (28.5 x 24.5 cm)
First state of three
Signed and dated on stone, lower right: F Bol fe 1644
Watermark: Strassbourg Bend
The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1963
63.631.8

The strong stylistic and iconographic influence Rembrandt exerted on his student Ferdinand Bol in the 1630s and 1640s is visible in the present etching. Bol would have been familiar with the four prints of this penitent saint that Rembrandt had etched by 1644; the impact of the master’s arched composition Saint Jerome Praying is obvious here in Bol’s similarly arched format. Additional sources may have included Rembrandt’s supposed painting of Saint Jerome, or the etching after it by Jan van Vliet (no. 107), from
which Bol may have derived the brick-lined cave in his rendering. The saint’s intense concentration on the crucifix and the hat hanging against the wall suggest that Bol was also aware of Jan Lievens’s print of the subject (no. 105). All of these graphic works were probably available to Bol in Rembrandt’s studio.  

Stylistically this scene resembles Rembrandt’s etchings of the 1640s, such as his Old Man with Divided Fur Cap (no. 88). Areas of great detail contrast with passages sparingly defined to create an effect of intense light. Bol’s shading of the hermit’s legs and delineation of his beard recall Rembrandt’s use of line in the Old Man, yet the pupil’s strokes are more wispy and slightly frenetic.

Bol appropriated some of Rembrandt’s technical methods as well. A porous etching ground, which Bol used in the present print, where it left a pattern of fine dots on Jerome’s chest and throughout the background, was employed by Rembrandt in such works as the Three Trees (no. 89). In addition, in its ragged border line, its scattered scratches, and its long diagonals (at upper right) that, mistakenly etched, were burnished away where they broke through the image, Bol’s Saint Jerome reflects the slapdash approach to technique seen in many Rembrandt prints. However, unlike Rembrandt, who often left excess ink on the plate to create dark passages, Bol here overwiped the plate in the area of the saint, to produce a pale brownish tone that casts the figure in ethereal light.

1. Bartsch 101; also Bartsch 100, 102, 106.
2. Rembrandt’s inventory of 1656 listed albums of prints by van Vlijt after Rembrandt as well as prints by Lievens (Strauss and van der Meulen 1979, p. 377, nos. 274, 277).
3. Boston, Saint Louis 1980–81, p. 148, no. 96; in the work of both artists, this dot effect does not appear to have always been intentional; although this pattern is sometimes considered to be produced by sulfur tinting, it often appears to be the unanticipated result of the use of a porous etching ground.

**Literature**
Bartsch 3; Rovinski Élèves, col. 17, no. 3; Hollstein, III, 3.
102. The Hour of Death

Ca. 1644
Etching and drypoint, 5 1/4 x 3 7/8 in. (13.3 x 9 cm)
Third state of five
Gift of Harry G. Friedman, 1962
62.635.410a

This small allegorical scene passed as the work of Rembrandt until it was correctly attributed to Ferdinand Bol by Claussin in 1824. The attribution is confirmed by the relatively uniform handling of line, the lacy patterning of foliage, and the abrupt tonal transitions in shaded passages such as the trees at upper left, characteristic features visible in Bol’s Holy Family (no. 104).1

Five states of this etching are recognizable, although only four are catalogued by Hollstein.2 The Museum’s impression is from the third state, in which a block of stone at lower left has been replaced by a cartouche bearing a moralizing Latin inscription; this can be considered the last proof state before the etching reached its definitive form.3 In the fourth state, not listed in Hollstein, additional hatching, with touches of drypoint, has been added to the background foliage and architecture, the woman’s dress, the cartouche, and other areas. This state was published in 1644 in Pampiere Wereld, a book of plays and poems by Jan Hermansz Krul, in which it illustrates a morality play, De Christelyke Hoveling (The Christian courtier). The second edition of the book, dated 1681, contains the fifth state, heavily reworked by another hand, an example of which is in the Museum’s collection (fig. 120).4 Krul was an important figure in Amsterdam theatrical and literary circles; Rembrandt painted his portrait in 1633 (Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kassel).5

This is the only etching by Bol included in Krul’s Pampiere Wereld; the other illustrations are anonymous engravings. The question has been raised whether Bol’s print was designed specifically for Krul’s book or simply reflects the artist’s interest in such moralizing themes as the encounter of beauty and death, which Rembrandt depicted in his etching Death Appearing to a Wedded Couple of 1639. (The latter print is the probable source for Bol’s skeleton holding an hourglass.) The traditional title of Bol’s print, The Hour of Death, dates back to Gersaint, whose interpretation of the image as an allegory of vanity has persisted in subsequent accounts.6

It appears, however, that the scene constructed by Bol actually follows Krul’s play quite closely. The seated figure with his books, broad-brimmed hat, and gardener’s tools is the “Christian courtier” Felix, who has forsaken the decadent

Fig. 120. Ferdinand Bol. The Hour of Death, ca. 1644, from Pampiere Wereld ofte Wereldsche Offeninge, Amsterdam, 1681. Etching and drypoint, 5 1/4 x 3 7/8 in. (13.3 x 9 cm). Fifth state of five.
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1963 63.55.3
pleasures of the court for the simple life of the country. He has not moved very far away; camped in the garden of the palace (visible in the background), he encounters two other courtiers, who themselves will later be converted to lives of virtue. Bol depicted the first of these, the courte-
san Florentina, who tempts Felix by recalling the sensual delights he enjoyed at court as well as by proffering her own considerable charms. But, as Krul observes in his text (fig. 120), the Christian soul remains firm in righteousness, even though it is difficult to imagine a heart too cold to be enflamed by such beauty.7 The skeletal figure of Death, a grisly reminder of the transitory nature of earthly pleasures, is Bol’s addition to the scene.

1. Clausnin 1824, no. 19; see, for comparison, Rovinski Éléves, col. 21, no. 18; Hollstein, III, 18. Six (1909, pp. 86–87) assigns it to Rembrandt in the early 1630s; see also Hind 4110. A reverse Bol signature on the spade has been burnished out. The female figure is related to a drawing of a shepherdess attributed to Bol in the Rijkssprentkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Sumowski 1979–81, I, no. 179x, ill.).


3. In the first state, the blank square in the lower left corner was apparently intended for an inscription; in the second state (ill. in ibid.), croshatching is added to the scythe. The quatrain in the third state reads, “You who see this image, reject mortal things for in such an abode every man is buried.” It was probably inscribed by a professional calligrapher.

4. Jan Hermansz Krul, Pampiere Wereld oft Weerdliche Oeffeninge, Wuer in begrepen zijn meest alle de Rijmen, en Werken (Amsterdam, 1644), pp. 11; 2nd ed. (Amsterdam, 1681), p. 11. An example of the 1644 folio edition with the fourth state is in Butler Library, Columbia University, New York. An impression of the fourth state without text is in The Pierpoint Morgan Library, New York. See also Louttit 1973, fig. 78. In the octavo edition of 1681 (examples of which are housed at Butler Library as well as in the Metropolitan Museum) many of the illustrations are either reworked or replaced by copies.


6. Gersaint 1751, no. 108, “L’heure de la mort”; see also Bartsch 108 (the first to connect it with Krul’s book); Hollstein, III, 18; Tsurtiani 1974, pp. 20–21; Lawrence, New Haven, Austin 1983–84, no. 37 (suggests that the seated man is a fortune teller).

On Rembrandt’s etching (Bartsch 109), see Filedt Kok 1972, no. B 109.

7. Krul, Pampiere Wereld (1644), pp. 9–23, esp. p. 11. Furthermore, the format and size of Bol’s print, with small type on either side, match the illustrations to Book III of Krul’s volume.

LITERATURE
Bartsch 108, as by Rembrandt; Clausnin 1824, no. 19, as by Bol; Rovinski Éléves, col. 21, no. 18, as by Bol; Hind 4110, as not by Rembrandt; Hollstein, III, 18, as by Bol.

EXHIBITED

EX COLL.
William Esdaile (Lugs 2617).

FERDINAND BOL (1616–1680)

103 Man in a Plumed Cap

1645
Etching, 5½ x 4½ in. (13.7 x 11.3 cm)
Second state of two
Signed and dated upper left: f. Bol 1645
The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1957
57.585.12

Ferdinand Bol, Govert Flinck (1651–1660), and other Rembrandt associates acquired their master’s well-known penchant for exotic paraphernalia. In engravings and paintings they employed a colorful assortment of helmets, textiles, weapons, and old-fashioned costumes to transform models—and themselves—into characters suggestive of the historical past. This print by Bol presents a long-haired gentleman who leans his gloved hands on a sword hilt and wears a gleaming steel gorget around his neck. These details give the costume a military flavor but do not neces-
sarily identify the subject as a portrait of an officer.1 This cavalier type recalls similar swashbuckling figures found in the paintings of Caravaggio and other Italian artists as well as on the Amsterdam stage. Its most immediate antecedent is seen in works by Rembrandt such as his etched self-portrait of 1638 (fig. 121). Here Bol may have further emulated Rembrandt by casting himself as the dashing protagonist.2

This print shows Bol’s technical debt to his master’s etching style, especially in the irregular patterns of hatching that describe the textures of velvet, steel, and curly hair and that enliven the background space. The first two states of the work are distinguished only by the addition of cross-hatching beside the head, a finicky adjustment that also mirrors Rembrandt’s approach. However, comparison with Rembrandt’s self-portrait reveals that Bol’s linear handling is more open and nervous. In the mid-eighteenth
century this etching was attributed to Rembrandt by Gersaint, but soon thereafter Bartsch recognized it as the work of the younger artist.  

1. Gersaint (1751, no. 309, "Un Portrait d’Officier... fort rare") gave this print its traditional title, Portrait of an Officer (see Hollstein, III, 12).

2. Bol adopted a similar conceit for painted self-portraits (see, for example, Museum of Fine Arts, Springfield, Massachusetts; London, art market, 1979 [Blankert 1982, nos. 64, 65]). See also Albach 1979; Chapman 1990, pp. 40–45; Dickey 1994, pp. 117–18, 140–44.

3. For the rusticated background, compare Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait in Soft Hat and Embroidered Cloak of 1631–33 (Bartsch 7), eighth state (ill. in Hollstein, XIX, B 7/VIII).

Literature
Gersaint 1751, no. 309, as by Rembrandt; Bartsch 11, as by Bol; Rovinski Élèves, col. 20, no. 13; Hollstein, III, 12.

Fig. 121. Rembrandt. Self-Portrait in a Velvet Cap with Plume, 1638. Etching, 5 7/8 x 4 in. (13.4 x 10.3 cm).
Second state of two. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Julia H. Manges, in memory of her husband, Dr. Morris Manges, 1960 60.598.66
104 Holy Family in an Interior

1643
Etching, drypoint, and engraving. 7¼ x 8½ in. (18.2 x 21.6 cm)
Only state
Signed and dated right center: f. bol f. 1643
The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1995
1995.100

This etching was produced shortly after Bol left Rembrandt’s studio to establish himself as an independent master.¹ The artist prepared his composition with a careful drawing, then traced the design onto the copperplate, a painstaking method also used occasionally by Rembrandt.² Once on the plate, the intimate domestic scene was elaborated with a varied play of tonalities, ranging from the deeply shadowed interior of the curtained bed to the glare of sunlight from the window falling on the placid forms of nursing mother and child.

In technique Bol followed Rembrandt’s lead in creating tonal effects by means of dense, irregular hatching enhanced with drypoint and burin. Rembrandt’s Saint Jerome in a Dark Chamber of 1642 (fig. 119) may have provided a direct model, but comparison of the two prints reveals the older artist’s greater subtlety in modulating form and chiaroscuro.³ Bol’s Holy Family depends on Rembrandt thematically as well as technically, notably on his etched and painted domestic scenes in which the setting evokes a humble Dutch home and the poses and old-fashioned clothing mark the cozy family group of mother, father, and baby as Mary, Joseph, and the infant Jesus.⁴

¹. Date (in oval windowpane) read as 1649 by Rovinski Élèves, col. 18, no. 4, who cites a comment by Gersaint that this etching was often ascribed to Rembrandt by connoisseurs who could not decipher the faintly etched signature and date, 1643 by Hollstein, III, 4, and Lawrence, New Haven, Austin 1983–84, no. 10, but as 1643 by Köhne 1932, p. 26; Tsurutani 1974, no. 4; Boston, Saint Louis 1980–81, no. 100; and Corpus, III (1989), p. 564, under no. C 87. Bol’s first known signed painting dates from 1642 (Blankert 1982, p. 17).
2. Bol's preparatory drawing in black and red chalk with pen and ink and brown wash is in the British Museum, London (Sumowski 1979–1, I, no. 95, ill.). Rembrandt prepared the etched Cornelis Claesz Ansel (Bartsch 271) with a preparatory drawing in red chalk (British Museum, London [Benesch 758], intended for transfer) in 1640–41, while Bol was working in his studio. Also related is Bol's sketch of a mother nursing her child in the Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris (Sumowski 1979–1, I, no. 96, ill.). See also Corpus, III (1989), pp. 563–64, under no. C 87.


4. See especially Rembrandt's etching Holy Family of about 1632 (Bartsch 62) and painting of the same subject of about 1634 in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (Corpus, II [1986], no. A 88). The painting of 1640 in the Musée du Louvre, Paris, often cited as a prototype (see, for example, Boston, Saint Louis 1980–81, p. 155; Lawrence, New Haven, Austin 1983–84, p. 70) is now attributed to a pupil, possibly Bol himself (Corpus, III [1989], no. C 87).
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JAN LIEVENS (1607–1674)

105 Saint Jerome

Ca. 1630–31
Etching, 12⅞ x 10⅞ in. (32.3 x 27.6 cm)
First state of five
Signed center left: IL
Watermark: Grapes
The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1956
56.510.4

The close collaboration between Jan Lievens and Rembrandt during their years in Leiden, characterized by mutual esteem and competition, is reflected in their frequent treatment of the same subject. Lievens painted and then etched this Saint Jerome about the time that Rembrandt attempted a large etching of the subject (see no. 107) as well as a painted variation.1 In Lievens's
vigorously yet subtle handling of the theme, the penitent saint is more introspective than either of Rembrandt’s figures; Bible set to one side, he gazes down in thought rather than at the crucifix in his hands.

Lievens’s etching style, though related to Rembrandt’s, is quite individual. His tonal hatchings may derive from the master’s, yet his use of stippling as light shading and the wispsiness of his uniformly etched lines are unique. Saint Jerome has been cited as exemplifying Lievens’s debt to Rembrandt, a debt apparent in his work from 1629 on. This print, however, is much more successful than any of Rembrandt’s earlier large etchings and certainly much bolder than any of the older artist’s prints produced up to 1630. It is also notable that Rembrandt had hired van Vliet to produce sizable etchings after his paintings in 1631, whereas Lievens was generating such reproductive prints independently at this time.

The present etching was probably redrawn over a first unsuccessful biting of the plate. In the lower left corner a considerable area of etched tone can be perceived under the lines and along Jerome’s right leg, and in the halo strokes have been burnished away. We associate such reworking of a plate with Rembrandt, particularly in his later work. Whether he was inspired by Rembrandt or took the lead, Lievens appears also to have approached etching as a medium that allows repeated rethinking and revising.

1. Lievens’s painting, a grisaille on paper on panel, is in the Stedelijk Museum “De Lakenhal,” Leiden (Sumowski 1983–94, III, no. 1242); the present etching is generally faithful to the painting, but some details have been changed. Rembrandt’s etching is Saint Jerome Kneeling; Large Plate (Bartsch 106). Rembrandt also prepared prints from such grisaille studies (see no. 99 here).
2. Schatborn 1991–92, pp. 71–72. About 1629 Rembrandt etched three large plates, all of which appear to have suffered while being bitten by the acid: Saint Paul in Meditation (Bartsch 149); Peter and John at the Gate of the Temple (Bartsch 95); Saint Jerome cited in n. 1 above.
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JAN LIEVENS (1607–1674) ☼

106 Bust of an Oriental Man

Ca. 1631
Etching, 6½ x 5¼ in. (16.1 x 14.6 cm)
Second state of four
Signed lower right: IL; publisher’s address lower right:
P de Balliu exc.
The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1993
1993.1048

A prolific portraitist, Jan Lievens produced a printed oeuvre composed primarily of heads of real or imagined figures. This Bust of an Oriental Man belongs to a group of so-called Oriental heads that Lievens etched about 1631, during the period he and Rembrandt regularly shared styles, motifs, and models. The aged man with a peculiar hat made of cloth tied around the base of a fur cap is a type found in Rembrandt’s etchings of about a year earlier. The person depicted here modeled for both Lievens and Rembrandt during the early 1630s; he appears in another of Lievens’s Oriental heads from this group as well as in the artist’s drawing Bust of a Man with Mustache and Goatee.

Fig. 122. Rembrandt. Second Oriental Head, ca. 1635. Etching, 6 x 4¼ in. (15.1 x 12.5 cm). Only state. The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.
(Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna).  

The era of mutual influence continued for some time after 1632, when Rembrandt and Lievens left Leiden for Amsterdam and London, respectively. In 1635 Rembrandt etched copies in reverse of this print (see fig. 122) and of three other Oriental heads by Lievens. Although Rembrandt closely followed Lievens’s work in general, he did not imitate such stylistic details as the stippled shadows on the man’s face and the tapered lines of the fur cloak. Three of the four examples bear the word *genetuckert* (retouched) following Rembrandt’s signature. This inscription led scholars to believe that these studies were etched by a Rembrandt pupil and retouched by Rembrandt. More recently, however, the word has been interpreted as an indication that Rembrandt traced the outlines of Lievens’s print onto the plate and then elaborated the rest himself.  

2. For Lievens’s etching, see Bartsch 18; for his drawing, see Sumowski 1979–82, VII, no. 1591, ill. An impression of the present print in reverse also exists and is thought to have been an earlier version of this work. It is possible that all three prints were derived from the drawing, which may depict the same model Rembrandt etched in Bartsch 292, 304, and 321.  
3. Bartsch (287) reproduces the Bust of an Oriental Man; Bartsch 286, 288, and 289 copy the other Lievens heads.  
4. The reference in Hollstein (XVIII, B 287) states that it was probably done by a pupil and retouched by Rembrandt; Amsterdam 1988–89, nos. 28–31.
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107 Saint Jerome

1631
Etching, 14¾ x 11⅞ in. (35.8 x 28.8 cm)
First state of two
Signed and dated lower right: RHL. v. Rijn jr. JG.v.vliet fec. 1631
Rogers Fund, 1969
69.514.7

In 1631 Jan van Vliet produced five etchings based on paintings by Rembrandt. The printmaking workshop that Rubens assembled in Antwerp several decades earlier to turn out engravings after his paintings must have inspired the young Rembrandt to hire van Vliet for this purpose.

Among the etchings van Vliet made, his Saint Jerome is one of the most accomplished; it is thought to reproduce a lost painting by the master, the only remaining evidence of which is Rembrandt’s study for the kneeling figure. These prints have unintentionally proven to be valuable records of Rembrandt’s missing work.

The technical mastery van Vliet achieved here was never equaled in the Rembrandt-influenced etchings he produced subsequently (see no. 108). Van Vliet attempted meticulously to simulate Rembrandt’s subtle painted chiaroscuro by varying the thickness and number of his etched lines—heavy where the image fades into darkness, differentiated where the saint’s robe displays the delicate modulations of light on cloth. A distinct stylistic contrast
exists between the finely etched central figure and the rather coarsely delineated attributes that surround Jerome; the still life with an immense rosary at left, for example, is awkwardly drawn and too large for the saint. Such inconsistency suggests that the still life may have been van Vliet's own invention, not a feature copied from the original painting.

Van Vliet took liberties in translating Rembrandt’s other paintings into print, most of them slight. However, in *A Young Man in a Gorget and Cap*, he departed further from his prototypes, reproducing no particular Rembrandt painting but compiling motifs from several. Although the exact nature of the agreement between Rembrandt and his printmaker remains unknown, the arrangement appears to have allowed van Vliet some freedom with Rembrandt’s inventions, the results of which nevertheless continued to bear the master’s name.

---

**JAN VAN VLIET (ACTIVE 1628–37)**

**108 Woman Carrying a Basket**

1632

Etching, 2 ⅝ x 2 ⅛ in. (6.4 x 5.6 cm)

First state of two

The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1960

60.634.23(3)

This small etching belongs to a series of prints depicting an assortment of single figures ranging from peasants to noblemen. The series is one of two signed groups of prints created by van Vliet in 1632. During that year the artist began to produce etchings of his own invention rather than works based on Rembrandt’s designs. However, the prints van Vliet produced beginning in 1632 bear a marked stylistic relationship to those by Rembrandt—the vestige of their collaboration during the previous years in Leiden. In contrast to the meticulously worked figures and settings in van Vliet’s etchings after Rembrandt’s paintings (see no. 107), the beggars in the series to which *Woman Carrying a Basket* belongs are set against spare backgrounds and drawn with a minimum of lines and shadows that are loosely, even somewhat frantically, hatched. For these sketches van Vliet looked back in particular to Rembrandt’s etchings and drawings of peasants and beggars from his Leiden years.

Unlike other prints for which an attribution to either Rembrandt or van Vliet remains debatable (see nos. 98, 99), *Woman Carrying a Basket* could never be mistaken for a work by Rembrandt—for van Vliet’s slightly coarse and

---

1. In addition to *Saint Jerome*, these are *Lot and His Daughters* (Bartsch 1); *The Baptism of the Eunuch* (Bartsch 12); *Old Woman Reading* (Bartsch 18); *A Young Man in a Gorget and Cap* (Bartsch 26).

2. Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris (Benesch 18).

3. The paintings of Bartsch 1, Bartsch 12, and *Saint Jerome* have all been lost.

4. On van Vliet’s later prints, see Bober 1981.

5. Fredericksen (in Santa Barbara, Malibu 1977–78, p. 35, no. 50) considered for stylistic reasons that van Vliet based the print on the drawing and invented the rest; Scallen (1990, p. 53) indicated that the prominent Catholic devotional objects in the print, the rosary and the crucifix, would have been unusual for Rembrandt to include at this time.

6. Nevertheless, the etching’s inscription, RHLV RL in, indicates Rembrandt as the originator of the design (*Corpus*, I [1982], p. 41). See also Bruyn’s comments on Bartsch 1 and 12 in *Corpus*, I (1982), pp. 36–38.

**LITERATURE**

Bartsch 13; Rovinski Élèves, col. 44, no. 13; Hollstein, XLI, 13.
spiky etching style is quite personal here. Indeed, his portrayals of beggars in general are more comical than those of Rembrandt, and they lack the air of naturalism that infuses even the master’s most farcical depictions of peasants (see fig. 123).

**ATTRIBUTED TO JAN VAN VLIET (ACTIVE 1628–37)**

**109 Head of an Old Woman**

Ca. 1631
Etching, 2 1/2 x 2 1/4 in. (6.3 x 7.3 cm)
Only state
Inscribed upper right: RHL [monogram]
Gift of Felix M. Warburg and his family, 1941
41.1.62

This print, once attributed to Bartsch to Rembrandt, is now generally considered to be the work of another artist that entirely covers an etching begun by Rembrandt. In recent literature, this reworking has been more or less tentatively ascribed to Jan van Vliet. A comparison with van Vliet’s signed prints, such as Woman Carrying a Basket (no. 108), affirms this attribution. The same kind of short, sharp hatching that here defines the fur on the woman’s shoulder appears in the shading of the ground in the Woman Carrying a Basket, and the fine, more fluid lines that delineate the turban and the woman’s cheek in the present work are similar to the outlines of the other woman’s skirt and shoe.

The Head of an Old Woman is one of a number of thumbnail etchings signed with a Rembrandt monogram and dated to about 1631 that are currently accepted as plates revised by a hand other than the master’s. Assignments of these prints to van Vliet have frequently been proposed in a negative light: he is said to have obtained Rembrandt’s unfinished plates and reworked them for himself, with or without the artist’s permission. One recent theory casts van Vliet in a more positive role, as a professional hired by the young Rembrandt to instruct him in the finer points of etching as he learned the new medium. Plates such as Head of an Old Woman can thus be seen as van Vliet’s demonstrations of proper etching technique executed on top of some of Rembrandt’s unsuccessful etching attempts. In any event, Rembrandt quickly surpassed van Vliet, and it was Rembrandt’s influence that soon became apparent in van Vliet’s prints (see no. 108).

3. The print in this series closest to Rembrandt is Man Relieving Himself (Hollstein, XLI, 88), which treats the same subject as Rembrandt’s A Man Making Water (Bartsch 190), dated 1631.

**LITERATURE**
Bartsch 85; Hollstein, XLI, 85.

---

1. This etching is stylistically related to the second state of the Bust of an Old Woman in a Furred Cloak and Heavy Headress (Bartsch 355). The lightly etched first state of this work, attributed to Rembrandt (ill. in Hollstein, XIX, B 355/1), was completely redrawn in the second state so that little of the original is visible; this may be the case with this print as well, though an early state is not known. The Museum’s impression, which according to Warburg (memorandum) came from Rovinsky’s collection, is much larger than the measurements in Hollstein indicate (XVIII, p. 175, B 360); the image is actually surrounded by wide margins. Thanks are due to Jo Saxton for pointing out the larger measurements.

2. In Rovinsky Élèves (col. 56, atlas no. 334) as by van Vliet; Hind (†365) as by van Vliet rejected; Münz (1952, no. 292) as by van Vliet; Hollstein, XVIII, p. 175, B 360; as probably reworked by van Vliet. Dickey has recognized the monogram as one that appears on a number of Rembrandt prints that were reworked by another hand, possibly that of van Vliet (to be discussed in her forthcoming Commentary volume on Rembrandt for The Illustrated Bartsch publications).

3. Münz 1952, p. 18, n. 8. White (1969, p. 21) suggests that Rembrandt “impatiently discarded the plates and allowed someone else to finish them.”
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ANONYMOUS, AFTER REMBRANDT

110 Head of a Rat Catcher

1630s
Etching, 1¼ x 1¼ in. (3.6 x 3.0 cm)
Only state
Inscribed upper right: R 163[6]
Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1947
47.100.544

Rembrandt's etching The Rat Catcher, dated 1632 (fig. 124), is the master's most imitated print.1 It shows a peddler of rat poison offering his wares to a man in a doorway.2 Dead rats hang from his cage, which contains either live rats or ferrets, and another creature sits on his shoulder. The present stamp-size etching, one of eleven recorded copies of Rembrandt's original, is a reverse detail of the rat catcher's head, the animal on his back, and the cage.3

It is not clear whether such signed copies were produced in Rembrandt's studio. The author of this work must have been quite familiar with Rembrandt’s etchings of the 1630s: he was able to transform a detail from the elaborate composition of The Rat Catcher into a small sketch of a peddler's head, a print that is very different from its model but closely resembles another characteristic type of etching Rembrandt produced at the time. The anonymous artist successfully picked up many of Rembrandt's trademarks, among them the border line traced through the etching at the bottom and the ink spots at either side left by a sloppily bitten plate. Numerous copies of and variations on these quick sketches were produced during Rembrandt's lifetime, and they have generated a good deal of scholarship regarding their attribution.4

Although Rovinski assigned this print to Jan van Vliet, the rather rectilinear quality of the hatched lines and of those that define the shoulder argue against that attribution. Van Vliet did produce his own etched variation on Rembrandt's Rat Catcher in 1632.5

Fig. 124. Rembrandt. The Rat Catcher, 1632. Etching, 5½ x 4½ in. (14 x 12.5 cm). Second state of three. The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York

1. Bartsch 121.
3. Most of these copies appear to have been created in the seventeenth century, although several were etched by British admirers of Rembrandt's work in the eighteenth century. In addition, in the seventeenth century a number of prints with images of rat catchers were made with Rembrandt's work in mind, such as Cornelis Visscher's engraving of 1655 (Hollstein, XL, 50).
4. Some of these, such as Peasant with His Hands behind His Back, were accepted by Bartsch (135) and Hind (69), given by Münz (1952, no. 290) to Jan van Vliet, and reattributed by White and Boon (in Hollstein, XVIII, B 135) to Rembrandt. The Head of a Rat Catcher has never been ascribed to Rembrandt.
5. Hollstein, XII, 80.
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