"All striving to adorne their houses with costly peeces"

Two Case Studies of Paintings in Wealthy Interiors

Eric Jan Sluijter

The great majority of the innumerable Dutch seventeenth-century paintings now hanging in museums all over the world were originally meant to decorate the homes of Dutch burghers. The paintings were made as commodities to embellish the environment in which these people lived their daily lives. It was certainly not a matter of course that burghers in cities like Amsterdam, Haarlem, Leiden, and Delft displayed high numbers of paintings on their walls. Not until the nineteenth century did this happen on a comparable scale in other European countries, even though pictorial production in Italy, Flanders, and France had been vigorous since the fifteenth century. In those cultures middle-class citizens also bought paintings for their homes, but art had more significant public and religious functions, and the church and nobility remained important patrons. In the Dutch Republic, the role of these traditional patrons of the visual arts was much diminished. The primary political and economic power resided with the prosperous middle-class citizens who governed the cities. 

The political prominence of the stadhouders (city keepers), a nobleman who served as the highest military and diplomatic official in the land, was held in check by the States General, the official body of representatives of the cities and provinces of the Republic. The dominant Calvinist church, which aligned itself with the stadhouders, agitated against the use of religious images in worship and thus effectively curtailed the production of religious art.

From the estate inventories of prosperous Dutch burghers, it appears that as of the beginning of the seventeenth century the number of people who owned paintings—as well as the quantities of paintings they assembled—increased rapidly. This phenomenon corresponds with the explosive growth of the number of painters active in Dutch cities. The production of paintings kept expanding until well after the middle of the seventeenth century, to decrease dramatically only toward 1700. In this essay I will briefly consider the development of a taste for paintings among the Dutch middle class and then present two case studies of wealthy burghers who assembled huge numbers of paintings in their homes. 

A detailed look at the paintings mentioned in the inventories of their possessions begins to suggest why specific individuals sought particular kinds of pictures.

A Taste for Paintings

In the sixteenth century the southern Netherlands city of Antwerp had been the primary European center for the production of reasonably priced paintings for private homes. From the middle of the century, this market was supplied by growing numbers of painters who began to specialize in secular genres like landscape or the depiction of peasant life. The religious strife that tore apart the Netherlands from the 1560s interrupted this development. In the decade following the definitive separation of the northern and the southern Netherlands in 1585, many merchants and craftsmen fled to the north for religious and economic reasons. There, the southern immigrants soon prospered, and they must have stimulated the fashion to decorate homes with paintings. From 1610 onwards the production of secular subjects developed at an incredibly rapid pace in the Dutch cities, where
commissions from churches and monasteries had come to a virtual standstill. Among the many young men who now chose landscape, genre, or still-life painting as their profession, the number of immigrants' children was disproportionately high.8

In his treatise on painting of 1658, Samuel van Hoogstraten remarked that the fashion for paintings had taken on a feverish character soon after 1600:

In the beginning of the century the walls in Holland were not as densely hung with paintings as they are now. But this custom gained ground daily, which emboldened some painters to habituate themselves to painting fast, even to make a painting a day, whether small or large.7

Van Hoogstraten's claim that painters increased their production is borne out by painters such as Jan Porcellis and Jan van Goyen, who indeed developed rapid painting techniques.9

About 1630, the famous poet and art lover Constantijn Huygens, secretary to the stadtholder, linked the omnipresence of paintings to the necessity to know something about them. Huygens wrote that his father, having heard many well-educated persons make stupid remarks about paintings, had wanted his sons to become knowledgeable about pictures because they "are to be found everywhere nowadays."10 Foreign visitors were astonished to observe how the Dutch filled their houses with paintings. On the basis of a trip he took in 1640, Peter Mundy wrote:

As for the Art of Painting and the affection off the people to Pictures, I thinke none other goe beyonde them.... All in generall striving to adorn their houses, especially the outer or street roome, with costly pieces, Butchers and bakers, not much interior in their shops, which are Fairly set Forth, yea many tyme Blacksmithes, Cobblers, ets., will have some picture or other by their Forge and in their stalle: Such is the generall Notion, enclamation and delight that these Countrie Natives have to Paintings.11

He went on to say that the Dutch harbored splendid and costly furnishings within houses with unremarkable façades. Mundy and other foreign observers were astonished by the great number of paintings and rich interior appointments in Dutch burgher homes, and they marveled at the contrast between interior opulence and exterior simplicity. These observations became stereotypes in travel descriptions of Holland,12 and in them the wide social range of Dutch owners of paintings, presumably from peasants to princes, tended to be exaggerated.

Considering the high number of paintings circulating on the Dutch market at mid-century, the amazement of visitors to Holland appears justified. Around 1640, about two-thirds of the population of Delft lived in households with paintings, with an average of eleven paintings per household.13 The poorest segment of the population did not own paintings, but day laborers had the odd inexpensive picture and the inventories of modest artisans quite often list a few paintings (fig. 142).14 These works, whose authors are almost never identified in inventories, must have been produced and sold as cheap commodities without painters' names attached to them. The master-painters whose names have come down to us made their works for the homes of the more affluent citizens who eagerly sought their works. This segment of the art market comprised a broad spectrum of buyers, however, from successful shopkeepers, artisans, and innkeepers to the urban elite of rich merchants, entrepreneurs, and regents.15 The variety of works produced was correspondingly wide, ranging from postcard-size panels to canvases more than six feet across, from ambitious historical scenes to simple still-life pictures, from trifles priced at a few guilders to paintings worth over a thousand, a substantial annual wage.16 In prosperous households we often find astonishing numbers of paintings, sometimes over a hundred — holdings that are exceptional today outside museums.17

Hendrick Bugge van Ring and Franciscus de le Boe Sylvius were two seventeenth-century burghers of Leiden who lived in interiors richly endowed with pictures.18 Compared with more typical legal records of household goods, the inventories of these two wealthy men are exceptionally informative because they list the paintings by their location in the house, mention the subjects of nearly all the paintings, and frequently specify their makers. Reading these inventories, we get a uniquely clear picture of the possessions of these two burghers. The extraordinarily high number of paintings they owned allows us to
commissions from churches and monasteries had come to a virtual standstill. Among the many young men who now chose landscape, genre, or still-life painting as their profession, the number of immigrants’ children was disproportionately high.4

In his treatise on painting of 1678, Samuel van Hoogstraten remarked that the fashion for paintings had taken on a feverish character after 1600:

In the beginning of the century the walls in Holland were not as densely hung with paintings as they are now. But this custom gained ground daily, which emboldened some painters to habituate themselves to painting fast, even to make a painting a day, whether small or large.7

Van Hoogstraten’s claim that painters increased their production is borne out by painters such as Jan Porcellis and Jan van Goyen, who indeed developed rapid painting techniques.8

About 1630 the famous poet and art lover Constantijn Huygens, secretary to the stadhouder, linked the omnipresence of paintings to the necessity to know something about them. Huygens wrote that his father, having beard many well-educated persons make stupid remarks about paintings, had wanted his sons to become knowledgeable about pictures because they “are to be found everywhere nowadays.”9 Foreign visitors were astonished to observe how the Dutch filled their houses with paintings. On the basis of a trip he took in 1640, Peter Mundy wrote:

As for the Art of Painting and the affectio of the people to Pictures, I thinke none other goe beyonde them. All in generall striving to adorn their houses, especially the outer or street room, with costly pieces, Butchers and bakers, not much interiour in their shops, which are Fairly set forth, yea many tymes blacksmithe, Coblars, etcs., will have some picture or other by their Forse and in their stalle. Such is the generall Notion, enclination and delight that these Countrie Natives have to Paintings.10

He went on to say that the Dutch harbored splendid and costly furnishings within houses with unremarkable façades. Mundy and other foreign observers were astonished by the great number of paintings and rich interior appointments in Dutch burgner homes, and they marveled at the contrast between interior opulence and exterior simplicity. These observations became stereotypes in travel descriptions of Holland,11 and in them the wide social range of Dutch owners of paintings, presumably from peasants to princes, tended to be exaggerated.

Considering the high number of paintings circulating on the Dutch market at mid-century, the amazement of visitors to Holland appears justified. Around 1640 about two-thirds of the population of Delft lived in households with paintings, with an average of eleven paintings per household. The poorest segment of the population did not own paintings, but day laborers had the odd inexpensive picture and the inventories of modest artisans quite often list a few paintings (fig. 142).12 These works, whose authors are almost never identified in inventories, must have been produced and sold as cheap commodities without painters’ names attached to them. The master-painters whose names have come down to us made their works for the homes of the more affluent citizens who eagerly sought their works. This segment of the art market comprised a broad spectrum of buyers, however, from successful shopkeepers, artisans, and innkeepers to the urban elite of rich merchants, entrepreneurs, and regents.13 The variety of works produced was correspondingly wide, ranging from postcard-size panels to canvases more than six feet across, from ambitious historical scenes to simple still-life pictures, from trifles priced at a few guilders to paintings worth over a thousand, a substantial annual wage.14 In prosperous households we often find astonishing numbers of paintings, sometimes over a hundred – holdings that are exceptional today outside museums.15

Hendrick Bugge van Ring and Franciscus de le Boe Sylvius were two seventeenth-century burgurers of Leiden who lived in interiors richly endowed with pictures.16 Compared with more typical legal records of household goods, the inventories of these two wealthy men are exceptionally informative because they list the paintings by their location in the house, mention the subjects of nearly all the paintings, and frequently specify their makers. Reading these inventories, we get a uniquely clear picture of the possessions of these two burgurers. The extraordinarily high number of paintings they owned allows us to discern distinct patterns of preference in their acquisition of paintings. Since both Bugge van Ring and Sylvius assembled their holdings during the second and third quarters of the seventeenth century, when the production of paintings in Holland reached its peak, their inventories lead us to ponder how the kinds of paintings now most often seen in museums helped shape the domestic environment of well-to-do burgurers with a taste for art. The distinctive contents of their inventories also allow plausible speculation about factors that may have motivated the acquisition of certain (types of) paintings, and they indicate that such fanatical art lovers must have stimulated the high quality and innovative character of Dutch painting in this period.

Franciscus de le Boe Sylvius, Cosmopolitan Professor of Medicine

The house that Franciscus de le Boe Sylvius (fig. 143), an internationally famous professor of medicine, had built for himself on Leiden’s Rapenburg canal is still extant (fig. 144). Although its interior has been much changed over the centuries, it has retained its essential layout and striking façade with Sylvius’s coat of arms at the top. The façade, inspired by houses being built in Amsterdam at the time and probably designed by the city architect Willem van der Helm, remains a showpiece.17 The surviving building specifications allow a
rather precise reconstruction of the original plan (fig. 145). The house is 25 feet wide on the street side and 42 1/2 feet at the rear. There is a small courtyard between the front house and the back house, and the entire building spans 106 1/2 feet from front to rear. Sylvius commissioned the house in 1664, at the zenith of his career. The new house, perhaps conceived at the prospect of his second marriage in January 1667, needed to have space for his laboratory experiments, teaching activities, library, and paintings. When he died in 1672 the house was exceptionally well appointed, with 172 paintings (many costly) among the other furnishings. He appears to have bought these himself, some in Amsterdam before his move but most during his residence in Leiden.

Sylvius was one of many non-native burghers of the Dutch Republic. His Flemish parents were of prominent family, but they had lost their possessions and emigrated to Hanau, near Frankfurt am Main, where Francisculus was born in 1614. He received a cosmopolitan education, studying in Sèvres (northern France), Leiden, Wittenberg and Jena (Germany), Chur (Switzerland), and Basel, where he received his doctorate in 1637. He also lived in Paris and probably traveled to Italy, but about 1658 he left for Leiden, where he immediately attracted numerous medical students. He soon moved to Amsterdam, however, and maintained a highly successful practice there for eighteen years. In 1658 a high salary offer and ardent efforts from the University of Leiden brought Sylvius back to the city, where he began his tenure with a speech emphasizing the primacy of knowledge based on firsthand observation and experience. Sylvius became a well-known representative of the new experimental school that rejected the once infallible authority of the physicians of classical antiquity. Many students from neighboring countries came to study with him because of his famous anatomical dissections, clinical teaching, and chemical theories.

Sylvius’s Calvinism is evident from his library, which contained books by Calvin, Protestant martyrologies, and other theological texts. His first marriage to Anna de Ligne of Amsterdam was consecrated in 1649 in the Walloon church; Anna died eight years later, shortly before Sylvius’s departure for Leiden. There Sylvius rented a house on the Rapenburg for several years before commissioning the new house to which he moved in 1667 with his new bride, Magdalena Lucretia Schützer. Sylvius must have been deeply affected by the
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143 Corneil van Dalen, Portrait of Franciscus de le Boe Sylvius, 1659. Engraving, 12 1/2 x 9 in. (31.5 x 23 cm). Gemeente Archief, Leiden.
rather precise reconstruction of the original plan (fig. 143). The house is 25 feet wide on the street side and 42 1/4 feet at the rear. There is a small courtyard between the front house and the back house, and the entire building spans 106 3/4 feet from front to rear. Sylvia commissioned the house in 1664, at the zenith of his career. The new house, perhaps conceived at the prospect of his second marriage in January 1667, needed to have space for his laboratory experiments, teaching activities, library, and paintings. When he died in 1672 the house was exceptionally well appointed, with 172 paintings (many costly) among the other furnishings. He appears to have bought these himself, some in Amsterdam before his move but most during his residence in Leiden.

Sylvius was one of many non-native burghers of the Dutch Republic. His Flemish parents were of prominent family, but they had ost their possessions and emigrated to Hanau, near Frankfurt am Main, where Franciscus was born in 1614. He received a cosmopolitan education, studying in Sédan (northern France), Leiden, Wittenberg and Jena (Germany), Chur (Switzerland), and Basel, where he received his doctorate in 1657. He also lived in Paris and probably traveled to Italy, but about 1658 he left for Leiden, where he immediately attracted numerous medical students. He soon moved to Amsterdam, however, and maintained a highly successful practice there for eighteen years. In 1658 a high salary offer and ardent efforts from the University of Leiden brought Sylvius back to the city, where he began his tenure with a speech emphasizing the primacy of knowledge based on firsthand observation and experience. Sylvius became a well-known representative of the new experimental school that rejected the once infallible authority of the physicians of classical antiquity. Many students from neighboring countries came to study with him because of his famous anatomical dissections, clinical teaching, and chemical theories.

Sylvius's Calvinism is evident from his library, which contained books by Calvin, Protestant martyrologies, and other theological texts. His first marriage to Anna de Ligne of Amsterdam was consecrated in 1649 in the Wallen church; Anna died eight years later, shortly before Sylvius's departure for Leiden. There Sylvius rented a house on the Rapenburg for several years before commissioning the new house to which he moved in 1667 with his new bride, Magdalena Lucetia Schlechter. Sylvius must have been deeply affected by the death of Magdalena Lucetia only two years later, a month after the birth of their daughter, who survived her mother by only seven months. Of his daughter he wrote that "she already showed her mother's virtues in the most miraculous fashion," and he described his brief second marriage as "very happy for both partners because of a harmony of souls." After his wife's death he commissioned the famous Frans van Mieris to commemorate this happy marriage in a painting that represents Magdalena Lucetia tuning a lute—a well-known visual representation of the harmony of love—while Sylvius casts her a loving look (fig. 144, cat. 83). Sylvius himself died in November 1672, just eight months after the completion of this picture, which hung in the room that must have been his bedroom.

The first painting one would have noticed on entering Sylvius's vorhuis (front hall), which had an Italian marble floor, was a Quack Doctor by Adriaen Brouwer, the famous painter of peasant themes (fig. 145). The prominent display of quackery in the home of a celebrated physician tells us something about Sylvius's sense of humor. As so often in the vorhuis, most of the paintings were landscapes, including, among others, one by Jacob van Ruisdael, a characteristic night scene by Aert van der Neer, and a seascape by Jan Beerstraten. The coat of arms of the Sylvius family here reappeared, possibly above the stone archway that led from the vorhuis to the extensive corridor.

The finest room in the house, the groot sal (grand salon) where guests would be received, immediately announced to visitors Sylvius's admiration for the so-called fijnhouders (fine painters) of Leiden: Gerrit Dou and Frans van Mieris, who in this period were the most internationally famous and best-paid Dutch artists. This room measured 26 × 18 feet and featured two tall windows onto the courtyard. It had a large chimneypiece of layered marble set on marbled columns, and the wood ceiling was probably painted in the manner still visible in a neighboring house (fig. 148). The furniture included a large draw-leaf table covered by a Turkish carpet, twelve side chairs and two armchairs, a cabinet veneered with tropical woods, and a large mirror. Most conspicuously, the walls were hung with thirty-three paintings. Four were important works by Dou, three by Van Mieris. Sylvius's holdings by these artists alone must have been worth a fortune. Joachim von Sandrart, a German painter, wrote a few years later that Sylvius's brother (who lived in Hamburg) had inherited paintings by Dou and Van Mieris of which even the smallest might fetch six hundred to one thousand guilders—prices for which a craftsman might buy a comfortable house.

Altogether, Sylvius owned dozen works by Dou, six were sheltered in cases, five of which had painted doors. This type of case for genre paintings seems to have been one of
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146 Adriaen Brouwer, Quack Doctor and His Audience, c. 1635. Oil on panel, 17 1/2 × 24 1/2 in. (45 × 62.8 cm). Staatliche Kunsthalle, Karlsruhe.
Doû's specialties. Unfortunately, none of these paintings still has its original case. The form, which must have recalled devotional paintings of the late Middle Ages, emphasized the preciousness of Doû's paintings, meant to be "revealed" for the enjoyment of knowledgeable viewers. Four of these costly pieces hung in the great salôt, among them the Woman at Her Toilette, dated 1667, now in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen (fig. 21). In this painting a young beauty making her toilette regards herself in the mirror. At the same time her reflection addresses the viewer, who is thus invited to enter the wondrous world crafted by the fine painter. At almost 30 x 23 inches, the picture is one of Doû's rare large works. In the same room, the inventory also mentions "a capital large piece with painted doors," which presumably was even larger. Although the subject is not listed, it is tempting to assume that this masterpiece may have been Doû's largest and most ambitious painting. Quack Doctor and His Audience, which now also hangs in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen (fig. 147). This speculation gains plausibility from the presence of Brouwer's more modest Quack in the roof-huts.
Dou's specialties. Unfortunately, none of these paintings still has its original case. The form, which must have recalled devotional paintings of the late Middle Ages, emphasized the preciousness of Dou's paintings, meant to be “revealed” for the enjoyment of knowledgeable viewers. Four of these costly pieces hung in the great saloon, among them the Woman at Her Toilette, dated 1667, now in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen (fig. 21). In this painting a young beauty making her toilette regards herself in the mirror. At the same time her reflection addresses the viewer, who is thus invited to enter the wondrous world crafted by the fine painter. At almost 30 x 23 inches, the picture is one of Dou’s rare large works. In the same room, the inventory also mentions “a caparol large piece with painted doors,” which presumably was even larger. Although the subject is not listed, it is tempting to assume that this masterpiece may have been Dou’s largest and most ambitious painting, Quack Doctor and His Audience, which now also hangs in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen (fig. 147). This speculation gains plausibility from the presence of Brouwer’s more modest Quack in the rear. 

Especially appropriate for the salon of a clever professor of medicine, Dou’s is the sort of painting that would prompt the owner and his guests to witty conversation. Dou’s quack, who exploits the credulity of the poor and the gullible to his profit, is the comic antipode to Sylvius, one of the great experimenters and reformers of medical science, who was known to treat all patients equally, without regard for their ability to pay. Next to the Quack, Dou painted his own portrait, leaning out of the window with a palette in his hand and smiling directly at us. Thus, the painter suggests a comparison between his profession and that of the quack, for he, too, sells illusions, amusing deceits, as paintings were considered to be in the seventeenth century. Far from luring simpletons into parting with their money, however, the painter instead charges distinguished connoisseurs like Sylvius exorbitant prices for his fabulous deceits. Contradictions and correspondences between doctor, quack, and painter must have formed a rich topic of discussion for contemporary viewers.

Sylvius and Dou are likely to have enjoyed a friendly relationship. Dou’s own face also appears as a portrait on the chintzepiece in his Woman at Her Toilette (fig. 21). This self-portrait, now almost invisible, seems to be a larger version of the one that survives in Kansas City (fig. 146). The latter painting may have hung in Sylvius’s great saloon as well, possibly next to the Quack. Its shutters were apparently painted with the image of a lit candle. Both the Quack and the self-portrait include a specific city gate of Leiden, which received the new roof and steeple seen in the paintings in 1667. The same year Sylvius moved into his new house. It is conceivable that Sylvius bough: the three paintings by Dou in order to decorate the main reception room with the finest and costliest pictures then available. The fourth painting by Dou in the room was a candlelight scene with Mary Magdalene—a subject repeatedly painted by Dou. At first glance it seems odd that Sylvius, who owned almost no religious paintings, would have selected this saint. Of course, a painting by Dou of a beautiful, 

140. Gerrit Dou, Self Portrait, 1665 (some parts changed between 1667 and 1675). Oil on panel, 21 1/2 x 15 1/2 in. (54.7 x 39.4 cm). Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, Missouri.

141. Frans van Mieris, Portrait of the Painter’s Wife, Carena van der Civck, c. 1667-68. Oil on panel, 4 1/8 x 3 1/8 in. (11.3 x 8.2 cm). The National Gallery, London.
scantily dressed woman would be a desirable object in any circumstance, but the Magdalene may have been particularly appealing to Sylvius because his beloved second wife was her namesake.

The three paintings by Van Mieris in the great salé were described as two trompetjes (small faces) and a “portrait of the wife of Van Mieris.” It is significant that the makers of Sylvius’s inventory thought it important to record that the portrait represented the artist’s wife (fig. 130). Since she was not the relative of Sylvius’s or a celebrity, but merely the model for a trompe – a type of single-figure painting that was usually marketed as a sample of artistic virtuosity – the identification seems intended to emphasize the truthfulness of the representation. At the same time, it suggests that the viewer’s knowledge of the model’s personal relation to the renowned artist added value to the picture. Sylvius indeed had a special friendship with Van Mieris, as the painter’s posthumous portrait of Magdalena implies. In his biography of Van Mieris, Arnold Houbraken (who probably received his information from Van Mieris’s son) wrote that Sylvius had frequently asked the painter for the first right of refusal and was willing to match any offer for one of his paintings. Houbraken also noted that Sylvius recommended Van Mieris to the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, who subsequently paid one thousand guilders for the painter’s well-known Cleth Slup (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum).

Several other masterpieces in the great salé competed for the visitor’s attention. The Dead Adonis by Hendrick Goltzius (fig. 151), wrongly identified in the inventory as “a dead Abel,” was both large and expensive. One can imagine that Sylvius would have relished Goltzius’s anatomical and perspectival tour de force, which he would have judged with the professional expertise of a doctor whose dissections were famous and for whom the representation of the dead body must have been especially meaningful. Other treasures that must have been costly included two pendant paintings of horses by Paulus Potter (fig. 152).
scantily dressed woman would be a desirable object in any circumstance, but the Magdalene may have been particularly appealing to Sylvius because his beloved second wife was her namesake.

The three paintings by Van Mieris in the groot salier were described as two *trompetjes* (small faces) and a "portrait of the wife of Van Mieris." It is significant that the makers of Sylvius’s inventory thought it important to record that the portrait represented the artist’s wife (fig. 150). Since she was neither a relative of Sylvius’s nor a celebrity, but merely the model for a *trompete*—a type of single-figure painting that was usually marketed as a sample of artistic virtuosity—the identification seems intended to emphasize the truthfulness of the representation. At the same time, it suggests that the viewer’s knowledge of the model’s personal relation to the renowned artist added value to the picture. Sylvius indeed had a special friendship with Van Mieris, as the painter’s posthumous portrait of Magdalena implies. In his biography of Van Mieris, Arnold Houbraken (who probably received his information from Van Mieris’s son) wrote that Sylvius had frequently asked the painter for the first right of refusal and was willing to match any offer for one of his paintings. Houbraken also noted that Sylvius recommended Van Mieris to the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, who subsequently paid one thousand guilders for the painter’s well-known Cloth Shop (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum).

Several other masterpieces in the groot salier competed for the visitor’s attention. The Dead Adam by Hendrick Goltzius (fig. 151), wrongly identified in the inventory as "a dead Abel," was both large and expensive. One can imagine that Sylvius would have relished Goltzius’s anatomical and perspectival tour de force, which he would have judged with the professional expertise of a doctor whose dissections were famous and for whom the representation of the dead body must have been especially meaningful. Other treasures that must have been costly included two pendant paintings of horses by Paulus Potter (fig. 152).
Antwerp. One of the two paintings represented Christ preaching, the other the self-sacrifice of Marcus Curtius, who saved the Roman people by jumping into a ravine on horseback. Sylvius may have bought this painted exemplar of virtue and courage from the estate of Hendrick Bugge van Ring, whose holdings we will examine next. In Bugge’s inventory the picture had been attributed, no doubt correctly, to Isaac van Swanenburg, the leading painter of Leiden around 1600. The attribution of it in the Sylvius inventory to a painter of Brabant would be quite understandable since Van Swanenburg had been trained in the workshop of Frans Floris in Anwerp.30

A room measuring almost 20 × 15 feet at the end of the corridor on the garden end of the house was designated as the dining room. Reserving a large room for this purpose was a new fashion. The paintings, however, had few thematic connections to dining. There were landscapes, flower still lifes, a portrait of Martin Luther and his wife, and another precious painting by Dou in a case, representing a candlelight scene.31 Only a still life with fish by Pieter de Putter and pendant paintings by Simulation Huyson of a roemer glass with an orange and a roemer with a lemon (fig. 154) were surely chosen for their appropriateness in this setting. Five octagonal pieces by Jan Miense Molenaer representing the five senses were undoubtedly humorous and pleasant, and in their crude reference to sensual pleasures would have been considered a somber contrast to the sophisticated indulging of the senses by the occupants of this room. One of the most striking objects in the room was a birdcage with an exotic parrot.

Surprisingly, the very large room adjacent to the garden on the other side of the corridor contained only two paintings (one a portrait of Sylvius) and one print (again representing Sylvius, fig. 143). There was ample wall space for pictures in this room, which measured about 18 × 25 feet (a walnut chest, a small cabinet with some small sculptures, and a bed left plenty of wall), but it is quite possible that the room featured fine textile wall coverings that may even have been painted with landscapes. The emergence of this decorating fashion left art critics of a few decades later complaining that it had drastically reduced the wall space for easel paintings.32

The greatest number of paintings in one room—no fewer than forty-two—was found in the large front room on the second floor. The walls must have been virtually invisible, for this luxuriously appointed room had three large windows onto the Rapenburg, two large mirrors on the walls, two beds (one with purple curtains lined with yellow silk), and a walnut cabinet containing a vast quantity of porcelain. The chimney piece, too, was richly decorated with porcelain. The room was jam-packed with fine furniture: ten chairs covered
Antwerp. One of the two paintings represented Christ preaching, the other the self-sacrifice of Marcus Curtius, who saved the Roman people by jumping into a ravine on horseback. Sylvius may have bought this painted exemplar of virtue and courage from the estate of Hendrick Bugge van Ring, whose holdings we will examine next. In Bugge’s inventory the painting had been attributed, no doubt correctly, to Isaac van Swanenburg, the leading painter of Leiden around 1600. The attribution of it in the Sylvius inventory to a painter of Brabant would be quite understandable since van Swanenburg had been trained in the workshop of Frans Floris in Antwerp.

A room measuring almost 20 × 15 feet at the end of the corridor on the garden end of the house was designated as the dining room. Reserving a large room for this purpose was a new fashion. The paintings, however, had few thematic connections to dining. There were landscapes, flower still lifes, a portrait of Martin Luther and his wife, and another precious painting by Dou in a case, representing a candlelight scene. Only a still life with fish by Pieter de Putter and pendant paintings by Simon Luttichuys of a naker glass with an orange and a naker with a lemon (fig. 154) were surely chosen for their appropriateness in this setting. Five octagonal pieces by Jan Miere Vollenbergh representing the five senses were undoubtedly humorous and peasantlike, and in their crude reference to sensual pleasures would have been considered a comic contrast to the sophisticated indulgences of the senses by the occupants of this room. One of the most striking objects in the room was a birdcage with an exotic parrot.

Surprisingly, the very large room adjacent to the garden on the other side of the corridor contained only two paintings (one a portrait of Sylvius) and one print (again representing Sylvius, fig. 143). There was ample wall space for pictures in this room, which measured about 18 × 25 feet (a walnut chest, a small cabinet with some small sculptures, and a bed left plenty of wall), but it is quite possible that the room featured fine textile wall coverings that may even have been painted with landscapes. The emergence of this decorating fashion left art critics of a few decades later complaining that it had drastically reduced the wall space for easel paintings.

The greatest number of paintings in one room—no fewer than forty-two—was found in the large front room on the second floor. The walls must have been virtually invisible, for this luxuriously appointed room had three large windows onto the Rapenburg, two large mirrors on the walls, two beds (one with purple curtains lined with yellow silk), and a walnut cabinet containing a vast quantity of porcelain. The chimney piece, too, was richly decorated with porcelains. The room was jam-packed with fine furniture: ten chairs covered in velvet, two armchairs, lacquer chests and boxes, ivory and mother-of-pearl curios, all sorts of natural marvels, and two albums of prints. A cradle, its covers lined with yellow silk, stood as sad mementoes of Sylvius’s wife and daughter. Van Mieris’s poignant portrait of Sylvius and his wife tuning the lute (fig. 141, cat. 81) also hung in this room, which must have served as primary bedroom. As so often in such rooms, this one featured other family portraits, including a drawing of Sylvius and his wife.22 (Sylvius’s face appeared six times in his own house, not counting mirrors.) Sylvius’s favorite fijnhewiders were well represented: three additional paintings by Van Mieris (see fig. 155).23 three by Dou,23 and a Diana and Actaeon by Dou’s pupil Ary de Vos24 that can still be identified today (fig. 156).

Such rooms crammed full of pictures typically mixed all manner of paintings. Although Sylvius’s fashionable taste clearly ran to small, smoothly and meticulously painted works, there was considerable variation within it. Apart from the Leiden “fine” painters mentioned above, this room contained detailed flower paintings by Abraham Mignon and Bartholomeus van der Ast, a landscape by Cornelis van Poelenburgh, horses by Weenix, a fruit piece by Jan Davidsz de Heem, a small picture by Adam Elsheimer, and two pieces by Margaretha de Heer, which must have been detailed paintings of insects against a smooth white ground. A seascape by the beloved Porce lies was surely small and well painted, but certainly not in a highly finished technique (fig. 157); a small piece by Brouwer must have shared these characteristics. Anthony Van Dyck’s portrait of Charles I must have been a very good work, for it was later evaluated at two hundred guilders in the inventory of Sylvius’s nephew Rouyer. A Bathsheba by Pieter Lastman (fig. 159) hung here as well; like Van Dyck’s sizable portrait it must have been conspicuously different from the many small and meticulously detailed pictures in the room. This painting is exceptional, too, because it was the only painting in Sylvius’s holdings with a female nude in the leading role. Unlike many orthodox Protestants, he seems to have had no problem with nudity in paintings, but it is telling that the picture was kept in the most private room of the house.
156. Arvy de Vos, Actaeon with Diana and Nymphs. Oil on panel, 10 7/8 x 17 in. (27 x 43 cm). National Museum, Warsaw.

157. Jan Porcellis, Ship with Ships, c. 1629. Oil on panel, 16 3/4 x 24 3/4 in. (41.5 x 61.7 cm). Mr. and Mrs. E. W. Carter, Los Angeles.

158. Pieter Xavery, Bagpipe Player, 1673. Terracotta, 12 7/8 x 11 7/8 x 6 in. (32.9 x 28.4 x 15 cm). Museum Willet Holdtuyzen, Amsterdam.
Quite a few paintings hung in other rooms on the second floor, among them more “pen paintings” of seascapes by Stieler. In one of the rooms stood a painter’s easel, undoubtedly used for viewing paintings that were taken down from the wall. Most remarkable is the collection of small genre figurines in the room at the back of the house. Their subjects—a woman with goat’s feet, a woman and child, a peasant couple, a hurdy-gurdy player, a goblin, a bagpiper, a rommelganger (another folk musician)—recall the small terracotta figures (fig. 158) that were the specialty of Pieter Xavery of Antwerp, who settled in Leiden in 1670 and was registered in the university. All his dated works are from 1670-74, and this suggests that Sylvius may have bought them fresh from the studio. A modeled portrait bust of Sylvius also stood in the room: it is as if he immediately seized the opportunity afforded by the sudden presence of a good sculptor in Leiden.\(^\text{19}\) Above the second floor were Sylvius’s working chambers, of which only the study contained some unremarkable paintings. A classroom was fitted with benches, and a distillery chamber and two labs were filled with kettles, mortars, and nineteen stoves and burners for chemical experiments.\(^\text{18}\)

Sylvius apparently bought all his paintings himself, rather than inheriting them. The role of his wives in the acquisition of paintings cannot be ascertained, but I suspect that he was the driving force, as Houbraken’s account of his special relationship with Van Mieris implies. His taste was entirely up-to-date. Like his Leiden peers and the two generations of Leiden art lovers before him, he opted for paintings by (often younger) contemporaries, but in his case this preference is more pronounced. Sylvius had no interest in the somewhat older painters of the quickly painted “toral” Dutch landscapes that had been so popular in Leiden during the 1630s and 1640s.\(^\text{18}\) Only the much-admired seascape painter Pieter van de Velde, Pieter de Molijn, or Pieter de Neyn, whose works we find so often in other Leiden
inventories. Even the famous Leiden native and absolute top scorer Jan van Goyen was absent. Sylvius’s taste became quite typical for wealthy connoisseurs in the third quarter of the seventeenth century, and it prefigures the eighteenth-century canon among his contemporaries, Dou, Van Mieris, Potter, Wouwerman, De Heem, Mignon, Van Poelenburgh and other Italianate landscape painters; of the older generation, the meticulous Savery and Elsheimer would remain favorites in the eighteenth century as well.

Although he must have bought his considerable holdings of pictures by Luttichuys and Sillennans in Amsterdam, he did not buy Flemish and Italian paintings on that most international of Dutch art markets; price cannot have been an obstacle, for the Leiden “fine” painters he patronized produced the most expensive art available in Holland.62 The cheaper variants of “fine” painting by local artists such as Quirijn van Brekelenkam or Jacob Toorenvliet were of no interest to him. Mignon, born in Frankfurt am Main and a fellow member of the Walloon church, is likely to have had a personal relationship with Sylvius, for his work is not otherwise found in Leiden holdings. As in the case of the Swansenburgh picture of Marcus Curtius, Sylvius may occasionally have bought paintings from Leiden estates; works by painters rarely seen in Leiden – among them Hendrick van Vliet of Delft, Paulus Potter of The Hague, and Wouwerman of Haarlem – were probably bought from dealers.

In its small proportion of religious paintings (only four have a biblical theme) Sylvius’s collection is an extreme instance of a tendency among the Protestant elite to favor landscapes and seascapes over history paintings.63 Given that Sylvius had no ties with maritime enterprise, his interest in seascapes is striking. Besides the pictures by Beerstraten, Porcellis, and Sillennans, he owned marine paintings by Pieter Mulier and Hendrick Staets, as well as unidentified painters. Sylvius’s preferences contrast strongly with those of Hendrick Bugge van Ring, who lived a few hundred yards away on the Steenschuur, an extension of the Rapenburg. Although they were alike in age (Bugge was perhaps ten years older),64 wealth, and a passion for paintings, their holdings of paintings were remarkably dissimilar. Religious difference appears to account for much of this disparity.

Hendrick Bugge van Ring, Prosperous Catholic
The wealthy Bugge van Ring must have been a devout Catholic, as the private chapel in his attic indicates. His grandfather and father had been brewers in Delft,65 but Bugge entered Leiden society by his marriage in 1658 to Aeltgen Hendrickxdr van Swieten, who came from a prominent Catholic family of wealthy brewers.66 In 1667, six months after her death, Bugge ordered an inventory of his possessions, probably because he intended to remarry (as he did that same year).67 Unlike Sylvius’s inventory, Bugge’s was made in his presence, and his expertise is evident in the resulting document.

Bugge owned an enormous amount of property: many houses in Leiden, lots of land near the city, a country estate near Leiderdorp, and a very rich inventory in his house on the Steenschuur and in the country house.68 His inventory confirms the impression that Catholics within the urban elite often distinguished themselves from Protestant regents by a more aristocratically tinged mode of life. Protestants confirmed their status primarily by assuming prominent positions in city government and charitable organizations open to the Catholic elite. For wealthy Catholics, an elegant lifestyle, extensive real estate holdings, and luxurious furnishings offered alternative ways of displaying social distinction.69

Bugge’s inventory defies belief, especially in the vast number of paintings he owned. The front room upstairs accommodated sixty-four pictures, several of which were designated “large,” that is, well over three feet wide.70 It is difficult to imagine how they could have been jammed into a room that would have measured at most 17 x 26 feet and contained six bookcases! Every square inch of wall space must have been covered with paintings – though such an arrangement is never seen in contemporary depictions of Dutch interiors. Painters typically represented limited numbers of paintings in strict symmetry to give their interiors a calm and balanced appearance (fig. 160).71 Even when the walls are fairly full, as in some-what earlier interior paintings by, for example, Pieter Codde (fig. 161), the paintings are never stacked in more than two rows.72 Only in the eighteenth century do we begin to see paintings of galleries or cabinets where the walls are hung floor-to-ceiling with paintings.73
inventories. Even the famous Leiden native and absolute top scorer Jan van Goyen was absent. Sylvius's taste became quite typical for wealthy connoisseurs in the third quarter of the seventeenth century, and it prefigures the eighteenth-century canon among his contemporaries; Dou, Van Mieris, Potter, Wouwerman, De Heem, Mignon, Van Poelenburch and other Italianate landscape painters of the older generation, the meticulous Savery and Elsheimer would remain favorites in the eighteenth century as well.

Although he must have bought his considerable holdings of pictures by Lutichius and Siliensens in Amsterdam, he did not buy Flemish and Italian paintings on that most international of Dutch art markets; price cannot have been an obstacle. For the Leiden "fine" painters he patronized produced the most expensive art available in Holland. The cheaper variants of "fine" painting by local artists such as Quirijn van Brekelenkam or Jacob Toorenvliet were of no interest to him. Mignon, born in Frankfurt am Main and a fellow member of the Walloon church, is likely to have had a personal relationship with Sylvius, for his work is not otherwise found in Leiden holdings. As in the case of the Pieter van Loan painting of Marcus Curtius, Sylvius may occasionally have bought paintings from Leiden estates; works by masters rarely seen in Leiden—among them Hendrick van Vliet of Delft, Paulus Potter of The Hague, and Wouwerman of Haarlem—were probably bought from dealers.

In its small proportion of religious paintings (only four have a biblical theme) Sylvius's collection is an extreme instance of a tendency among the Protestant elite to favor landscapes and seascapes over history paintings. Given that Sylvius had no ties with maritime enterprise, his interest in seascapes is striking. Besides the pictures by Beerstraten, Horenbout, and Siliensens, he owned marine paintings by Peter Muylder and Hendrick Staets, as well as unidentified painters. Sylvius's preferences contrast strongly with those of Hendrick-Bugge van Ring, who lived a few hundred yards away on the Steenschuur, an extension of the Raphenburgh. Although they were alike in age (Bugge was perhaps ten years older), wealth, and a passion for paintings, their holdings of paintings were remarkably dissimilar. Religious difference appears to account for much of this disparity.

Hendrick Bugge van Ring, Prosperous Catholic

The wealthy Bugge van Ring must have been a devout Catholic, as the private chapel in his attic indicates. His grandfather and father had been brewers in Delft, but Bugge entered Leiden society by his marriage in 1638 to Aeltgen Hendricksd. van Swieten, who came from a prominent Catholic family of wealthy brewers. In 1667, six months after her death, Bugge ordered an inventory of his possessions, probably because he intended to remarry (as he did that same year). Unlike Sylvius's inventory, Bugge's was made in his presence, and his expertise is evident in the resulting document.

Bugge owned an enormous amount of property: many houses in Leiden, lots of land near the city, a country estate near Leiderdorp, and a very rich inventory in his house on the Steenschuur and in the country house. His inventory confirms the impression that Catholics within the urban elite often distinguished themselves from Protestant regents by a more aristocratically tinged mode of life. Protestants confirmed their status primarily by assuming prominent positions in city government and charitable organizations not open to the Catholic elite. For wealthy Catholics, an elegant lifestyle, extensive real estate holdings, and luxurious furnishings offered alternative ways of displaying social distinction.

Bugge's inventory defies belief, especially in the vast number of paintings he owned. The front room upstairs accommodated sixty-four pictures, several of which were designated "large," that is, over three feet wide. It is difficult to imagine how they could have been jammed into a room that would have measured at most 17 x 26 feet and contained six bookcases! Every square inch of wall space must have been covered with paintings—though such an arrangement is never seen in contemporary depictions of Dutch interiors. Painters typically represented limited numbers of paintings in strict symmetry to give their interiors a calm and balanced appearance (fig. 161). Even when the walls are fairly full, as in somewhat earlier interior paintings by, for example, Pieter Codde (fig. 161), the paintings are never stacked in more than two rows. Only in the eighteenth century do we begin to see paintings of galleries or cabinets where the walls are hung floor-to-ceiling with paintings.
Seventeenth-century Antwerp paintings of picture galleries purporting to represent local, often aristocratic art cabinets do represent walls completely filled with paintings in a jigsaw-puzzle arrangement (fig. 162), but those enormously tall, mostly fictional cabinets have little in common with Bugge’s front room on the Steerschuur. Nevertheless, we have to imagine this sort of density for Bugge’s room. This high concentration of paintings was not limited to this one chamber; paintings were everywhere, varying in number from twelve to twenty-three in the other rooms.

Unlike the great Antwerp collectors (real and imaginary), Bugge owned no Italian paintings and few of southern Netherlandish origin. That he had more Flemish paintings than usual in Leiden may well be explained by the often close contacts between the Dutch Catholic elite and their southern fellow Catholics. We do find in Leiden inventories the odd sixteenth-century Flemish picture, in particular from the ateliers of Josse van Cleve and Frans Floris, and now and then a landscape by, for instance, the popular Joos de Momper. Bugge’s holdings fit that pattern. More exceptionally, Bugge owned several works by contemporary Antwerp masters: two paintings of smoking men by David Teniers (fig. 163), a copy of a Teniers peasant woman asleep, a seascape by Bonaventura Peeters, and twelve landscapes by Lodewijk de Valder representing the months of the year—all works conspicuously closer to those of Dutch painters than to those of Rubens, Van Dyck, and Jacob Jordaens, who in Holland seem to have been favored almost exclusively at the court in The Hague. From that school Bugge owned only “a tronie of St. Paul by Rubens on paper”
Seventeenth-century Antwerp paintings of picture galleries purporting to represent local, often aristocratic art cabinets do represent walls completely filled with paintings in a jigsaw-puzzle arrangement (fig. 162), but these enormously tall, mostly fictional cabinets have little in common with Bugge’s front room on the Steenschuur. Nevertheless, we have to imagine this sort of density for Bugge’s room. This high concentration of paintings was not limited to this one chamber; paintings were everywhere, varying in number from twelve to twenty-three in the other rooms.

Unlike the great Antwerp collectors (real and imaginary), Bugge owned no Italian paintings and few of southern Netherlandish origin. That he had more Flemish paintings than usual in Leiden may well be explained by the often close contacts between the Dutch Catholic elite and their southern fellow Catholics. We do find in Leiden inventories the odd sixteenth-century Flemish picture, in particular from the ateliers of Josse van Cleve and Frans Floris, and now and then a landscape by, for instance, the popular Joos de Momper. Bugge’s holdings fit that pattern. More exceptionally, Bugge owned several works by contemporary Antwerp masters: two paintings of smoking men by David Teniers (fig. 163), a copy of a Teniers peasant woman asleep, a seascape by Bonaventura Peeters, and twelve landscapes by Lodewijk de Vadder representing the months of the year—all works conspicuously closer to those of Dutch painters than to those of Rubens, Van Dyck, and Jacob Jordaens, who in Holland seemed to have been favored almost exclusively at the court in The Hague. From that school Bugge owned only “a front of St. Paul by Rubens on paper” and a Mary, Joseph, and Child that was scrupulously attributed to a “disciple of Jordaeus.”

Like Sylvius, Bugge vastly preferred paintings by Dutch contemporaries, particularly by Leiden painters.

The unusual details in the inventory are the measure of Bugge’s connoisseurship. Of the 237 paintings he owned, he could not name the maker for just twenty-four, and those were primarily old family portraits or sixteenth-century religious paintings that he may have inherited. The 213 remaining paintings were attributed to ninety-eight different artists, an astounding number of names to be able to recall. Eight paintings were recorded as copies— with the copyist identified for two of these, one by Isaac van Swanenburg after his master Frans Floris, and one by Gerrit van Ee of a bagpiper by Van Ostade. Tellingly, Bugge could even identify a work after the little-known Delft painter Willem van Vliet as a copy. The voice of the honest connoisseur echoes in Bugge’s doubts about attributions: when unsure about paintings attributed to the Utrecht painter Abraham Bloemaert or the Flemish artists Pieter Aertsen, Brouwer, and Josse van Cleve, he used the qualifier “as they say.” Bugge’s occasional specification of the particular period in an artist’s career is exceptional at this time. Works by Dou and Steen are identified as having been made “in his youth.”

Two landscapes, one by Van Goyen and one by Esaias van den Velde, are listed with their precise dates, 1652 and 1658, respectively. The identification of periods and years may have constituted a criterion for the value of the works. As Sylvius’s preferences have already indicated, Van Goyen’s quickly painted tonal works of the 1650s were losing currency in the 1660s. Thus, in the case of Van Goyen, the relatively early date may have been specified because it implied a more colorful and detailed painting of his first period.

Bugge’s active Catholicism emerges from the contents of a room in the front attic. It housed an altar with liturgical silver, a crucifix, and nineteen religious paintings that apparently had a devotional function: images of the Virgin Mary and other saints and scenes from the New Testament, with emphasis on the Passion of Christ. Some were sixteenth-century pictures from the southern Netherlands, but several were by contemporary Dutch artists such as Quirijn van Breke enam of Leiden, Adriaen van den Venne of The Hague, and Thomas de Keijser and Barend Fabritius of Amsterdam. The room clearly functioned as a richly appointed private chapel, to which Bugge may have invited other
164  Adriaen van de Venne, Christ Carrying the Cross. Oil on canvas, 26 7/8 x 37 1/8 in. (67 x 80 cm). Gemäldegalerie, Dessau.

165  Jacob Isaacksz van Swanenburgh, Some of Hell with Charon's Ship. Oil on canvas, 38 3/4 x 57 1/4 in. (97 x 145 cm). National Museum, Gdansk.
166 Jan van Goyen, Landscape with a View of Leiden, 1650. Oil on canvas, 26 1/4 x 38 1/4 in. (66.9 x 97.3 cm). Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden.

Catholics for the Mass, which was publicly forbidden. Religious paintings appeared throughout the house, for a total of forty-six works, and it is especially in this respect that Bugge’s inventory deviates from what was usual in Dutch households, with many paintings. However, these paintings rarely hung in the more public spaces such as the voornhuis, corridor, and salon.

The voornhuis was distinguished instead by the pronounced moral character of the most prominent paintings. Besides the pictures customarily found in the entry hall, such as landscapes, a map of the local Rijnland area, and innocuous genre pictures, Bugge displayed four large paintings of nonreligious subjects with a moral stamp. Van Swanenburggh’s depiction of Marcus Curtius’s self-sacrifice, probably owned later by Sylvius, hung here, as did two large grisaille paintings by the famous Utrecht painter Gerard van Honthorst on the invention and abuses of wine. The group was rounded out with a painting by the now unknown Claes de Groot, representing Heraclitus and Democritus, the Greek philosophers who respectively wept and laughed over the follies of the world. The corridor leading back from the voornhuis had a similar mix of secular paintings, chief among them a battle scene and a painting of the classical underworld with Charon’s ship by Jacob van Swanenburggh, the son of Isaac and the first teacher of Rembrandt (fig. 165). A small scene of tic-tac players by Steven (the one done “in his youth”) and two modest genre paintings by Van Brekelenkam must have formed a particularly curious contrast with Jan van de Velde’s four small paintings of Prince Frederick Henry and his retinue riding on horseback to Scheveningen. Portraits of the House of Orange are more typically found in the voornhuis and corridors of Orange-minded Protestants in the first half of the seventeenth century. As a Roman Catholic, Bugge surely did not display this painting to show his fervent support of the traditional first family of the Dutch Republic, but he would have enjoyed the aristocratic image of a princely cavalcade.
Buggs's finest reception room, the saler, still had a bed in it, unlike its more fashionable counterpart in Sylvia's home. The relatively modest number of paintings in the room, fifteen, even so, competed with a large teak and ebony chest decorated with columns and a large table carpet with a design of a unicorn and a woman (compare fig. 56; cat. 31). This motif was repeated in the upholstery of six walnut chairs (compare fig. 57; cat. 48). The masterpiece among the saler's fifteen paintings must have been a large *Adoration of the Shepherds* attributed to Aertsen. A still life by Willem Claesz Heda and a view of Leiden by Van Goyen (fig. 166) were probably also sizable, and the considerable quality of these and other paintings in the saler must have been particularly evident because the room was less crowded with pictures than others.35

But the room on the second floor was a true connoisseur's cabinet that would be the pride of any museum today. The room must also have functioned as study. Six bookcases and two desks with additional bookshelves housed a substantial library,36 an office chest stored documents. There were twelve chairs, a large draw-leaf table, a tall mirror, and a large brass chandelier with eight arms, a costly object that was rare in seventeenth-century homes.37 The impact of sixty-four paintings in this densely furnished room must have been overpowering. All manner of paintings were on view. Historical scenes (biblical and mythological),38 genre paintings, and landscapes were about evenly distributed; still lifes
Bugge’s finest reception room, the sallet, still had a bed in it, unlike its more fashionable counterpart in Sylvius’s home. The relatively modest number of paintings in the room, fifteen, even so, competed with a large desk and ebony chest decorated with columns and a large table carpet with a design of a unicorn and a woman (compare fig. 36/cat. 31). This motif was repeated in the upholstery of six walnut chairs (compare fig. 35/cat. 98). The masterpiece among the salon’s fifteen paintings must have been a large Adoration of the Shepherds attributed to Aertsen. A still life by Willem Claesz Heda and a view of Leiden by Van Goyen (fig. 166) were probably also sizable, and the considerable quality of these and other paintings in the sallet must have been particularly evident because the room was less crowded with pictures than others.55

But the front room on the second floor was a true connoisseur’s cabinet that would be the pride of any museum today. The room must also have functioned as study. Six bookcases and two desks with additional bookshelves housed a substantial library, an office chest stored documents. There were twelve chairs, a large drawer table, a tall mirror, and a large brass chandelier with eight arms, a costly object that was rare in seventeenth-century homes.56 The impact of sixty-four paintings in this densely furnished room must have been overpowering. All manner of paintings were on view. Historical scenes (biblical and mythological),57 genre paintings, and landscapes were about evenly distributed; still lifes were in the minority. There was no discernible organization by subject or painter, and it is likely that shape and size determined the arrangement. The comparatively high number of genre paintings is conspicuous, and the artists represented ranged from the young Leiden masters Pieter van Slingelandt (fig. 167) and Jacob Toorenvliet to more established figures such as Dou (two), Steen, and Van Bredaelen. Peasant paintings included a sixteenth-century work by Cornelis Molenaar but also very recent work by Cornelis Bega of Haarlem.58 Bugge’s taste in landscapes was more conservative. He must have cherished the Van Goyen from 1627, for its setting and stiffage were described in especially great detail.59 Most of the landscapes in the upstairs front room were by excellent masters, from those who painted their best works early in the seventeenth century (Savery and Paulus Bril) to the younger Esais van de Velde, Van Goyen, Molijn and De Vadder. The more recently fashionable Wouwerman was also included, as well as a seascape by the perennially popular Porecillis (fig. 157). The finest still life, surely a recent and costly acquisition, was a flower garland by Adriaen van der Spelt, for which Van Mieris painted a stunningly illusionistic curtain that partly covers the flowers (fig. 168).60 Several other rooms displayed a similar variety of genre paintings and landscapes, mixed with a few biblical scenes and still-life pictures. In one of these rooms, directly above the cellar, the inventory mentions two harpsichords, which show that, like so many households, the family counted music among its cultural pursuits (compare figs. 168, 189).

Bugge owned numerous family portraits, most of which came from his wife’s family. As usual, such paintings hung primarily in rooms of pronounced private character and thus were not meant to impress the visitor with the family’s genealogy. In Dutch middle-class circles portraits were cherished rather because they allowed “descendants to maintain contact with their ancestors,” as Constantijn Huygens wrote.61 Bugge hung the majority in a small room upstairs, displaying older works along with a recent portrait of his wife by Abraham de Pape, who was probably a friend.62 De Pape was Dou’s pupil and a well-to-do merchant who apparently paired for pleasure.

Sylvius’s inventory did not list paintings in the kitchen, a room that earlier in the century usually contained a relatively large number of paintings.63 Bugge, by contrast, did display some paintings in his “large rear inner kitchen,” a so-called best kitchen used for dining and enlivened by two canaries in a birdcage. Kitchens often did not have the kinds of pictures on view that we might expect. The quite popular kitchen scenes, for instance, are rarely mentioned as hanging in a kitchen.64 However, along with the usual landscapes and
small devotional paintings, Bugge hung some thematically appropriate works there: the probably large kitchen piece after Aertsen, a cat with an eel by Pieter van Noort, and a painting of haddock and crab by Abraham van Beyeren.

Bugge owned a conspicuously high number of paintings by the Leiden artist Quirijn van Brekelenkam, with whom he appears to have had a personal relationship. Although Van Brekelenkam painted subjects closely related to Dou's, his manner of painting was much less detailed and refined. Most of the eighteen Van Brekelenkam paintings owned by Bugge were the kind of genre scenes for which the painter is well known (fig. 169), but others were probably commissioned – images of saints, two portraits, and even copies of old family portraits. Eleven of Van Brekelenkam's paintings were distributed through the house on the Steenschuur, but two hung in the saloon of Bugge's country house, Achthoven, and five, including a portrait of Bugge and his son, were placed together in a small room of this retreat. In the same room Bugge also kept his sole picture by Rembrandt, a "doctor with his books," surely a painting from the artist's first years in Leiden.

With six paintings, Jan Steen was also especially well represented in Bugge's holdings. The most important picture by Steen, a "Twelfth Night merriment" described as "large," can probably be identified with a painting dated 1662 now in Boston (fig. 170). This painting of a prosperous interior is remarkably thorough in its representation of all the folkloric details of this feast, in which normal behavioral codes and lines of authority were upended for the day. We see the star singers serenading in the street, the child-king drinking, children
small devotional paintings, Bugge hung some thematically appropriate works there: the probably large kitchen piece after Aertsen, a cat with an eel by Pieter van Noort, and a painting of haddock and crabs by Abraham van Beyeren.

Bugge owned a conspicuously high number of paintings by the Leiden artist Quirijn van Breukelen, with whom he appears to have had a personal relationship. Although Van Breukelen’s paintings closely related to Dou’s, his manner of painting was much less detailed and refined. Most of the eighteenth-century Van Breukelen’s paintings owned by Bugge were the kind of genre scenes for which the painter is well known (fig. 164), but others were probably commissioned – images of saints, two portraits, and even copies of old family portraits. Of the eleven Van Breukelen’s paintings were distributed through the house on the Steenschuur, but two hung in the salae of Bugge’s country house, Achthoven, and five, including a portrait of Bugge and his son, were placed together in a small room of the retreat. In the same room Bugge also kept his sole picture by Rembrandt, a “doctor with his books,” surely a painting from the artist’s first years in Leiden. 116

With six paintings, Jan Steen was also especially well represented in Bugge’s holdings. The most important picture by Steen, a “Twelfth Night merriment” described as “large,” can probably be identified with a painting dated 1662 now in Boston (fig. 170). 117 This painting of a prosperous interior is remarkably thorough in its representation of all the folkloric details of this feast, in which normal behavioral codes and lines of authority were upended for the day. We see the star singers serenading in the street, the child-king drinking, children jumping over candles, and the fool making an obscene joke, but the scene has not degenerated into the debauchery typical of so many paintings of the feast. 118 Twelfth Night continued to be celebrated in the seventeenth century, apparently more eagerly by Catholics than by Protestants, the strictest of whom condemned such ritual revelry as “Popish.” 119 Steen’s gentle rendering of the feast as condonable, harmless pleasure may have suited a Catholic disposition very well.

Bugge also seems to have had a special preference for Jan van Goyen, who is represented in the inventory with six paintings. The two characteristics shared by Van Breukelen, Steen, and Van Goyen – very different painters all – are their Leiden origins and their Catholicism. Although most of their works do not qualify as particularly Catholic, it seems likely that Bugge liked to patronize local fellow Catholics.

Bugge must have been fond of genre paintings, and especially those of the comic, boorish kind by artists such as Van de Venne, Jan Miere Molenaer, Cornelis Dordtschoot, Teniers, Van Ostade, Bega, and the young Steen. The percentage of genre scenes, in particular of these lowly themes, far exceeded the average, as comparison with contemporary Leiden inventories proves. 120 Similar comparisons show that the proportion of history paintings in his possession was also uncommonly high and that he owned relatively few still lifes and a smaller percentage of landscapes than was usual. The exceptional number of Bugge’s religious paintings has already been noted, but he also owned quite a few mythological scenes,
including works by masters like Moyzes van Uyttenbroeck (fig. 171), François Verwilt, and Daniël Vertangen, who filled their landscapes with goddesses, nymphs, and their lovers. He had no objections to nudes; he owned "a large picture of the sleeping Venus" by "a good Brabant painter," and he even owned several paintings of female nudes that apparently lacked an extenuating context, including a small "naked woman" by Van Brekelenkam and "a piece with six or seven naked women" by a member of the Van Someren family of artists.

Like Sylvius, Bugge bought works from contemporaries. Most of the sixteenth-century paintings he owned were probably inherited. At first glance it seems to have been more conservative than Sylvius. The painters he preferred were mostly of his own generation or somewhat older, and many of them specialized in the tonal, local Dutch landscape, comic genre, and still life spurned by the more fashionable Sylvius: Van Goyen, Esaias van de Velde, Pieter Molijn, Dusch Hek, Jan Mierev Molenaer, Antoine Palamedesz, and Willem Claesz Heda. Looking more closely, however, it is striking how many paintings he owned by artists who were at least one generation younger than he. He particularly liked younger genre painters, including, besides Van Brekelenkam (b. 1590) and Steen (b. 1626), Hendrick van der Burch (b. 1627) and Cornelis Bega (b. 1632). Jacob Toorenvliet and Pieter van Slingelandt (both b. 1640) were only in their twenties when the aging Bugge had his inventory made. Van der Speelt and Van Mieris, makers of the exceptional collaborative still life, were still youthful, too.

Individually, Bugge's pictures were rarely as valuable as Sylvius's. The still life with curtain by Van der Speelt and Van Mieris, Steen's "Twelfth Night", Van Slingelandt's "Nursing Mother" (surely very Dou-like), certain seventeenth-century religious paintings, and some sixteenth-century works must have been the most expensive. Van Brekelenkam's works, which numerically accounted or one-thirteenth of Bugge's holdings, were cheap, fetching about one-tenth to one-fiftieth of the prices Dou and Van Mieris could command.

Religious affiliation seems to account for the major difference between the artistic preferences of Sylvius and Bugge van Ring. Rarely is the contrast as sharp as in their case, however, since many Protestant inventories, too, featured paintings that might strike us as Catholic devotional images, from pictures of Mary to themes from the Passion. These were often inherited and kept for their sentimental or artistic value. Nevertheless, some recently observed trends in differences between Catholic and Protestant inventories of paintings seem to be magnified in the holdings of Sylvius and Bugge.
including works by masters like Moyseys van Uytenbroeck (fig. 171), François Verwilt, and Daniël Vertangen, who filled their landscapes with goddesses, nymphs, and their lovers. He had no objections to nudes: he owned “a large picture of the sleeping Venus” by “a good Brabant painter,” and he even owned several paintings of female nudes that apparently lacked an eternally ennobling context, including a small “naked woman” by Van Breukelenam and “a piece with six or seven naked women” by a member of the Van Someren family of artists.

Like Sylvius, Bugge bought works from contemporaries. Most of the sixteenth-century paintings he owned were probably inherited. At first glance he seems to have been more conservative than Sylvius. The painters he preferred were mostly of his own generation or “somewhat older, and many of them specialized in the tonal, local Dutch landscape, comic genre, and still life spurned by the more fashionable Sylvius: Van Goyen, Esaias van den Velde, Pieter Molijn, Dirck Hals, Jan Miense Molenaer, Antonie Palamedesz, and Willem Claesz Heda. Looking more closely, however, it is striking how many paintings he owned by artists who were at least one generation younger than he. He particularly liked younger genre painters, including, besides Van Breukelenam (b. 1560) and Steen (b. 1586), Hendrick van der Burch (b. 1627) and Cornelis Bega (b. 1632). Jacob Toorenvliet and Pieter van Slingelandt (both b. 1640) were only in their twenties when the aging Bugge had his inventory made. Van der Spelt and Van Mieris, makers of the exceptional collaborative still life, were still youthful, too.

Individually, Bugge’s pictures were rarely as valuable as Sylvius’s. The still life with curtain by Van der Spelt and Van Mieris, Steen’s Twelfth Night, Van Slingelandt’s Nursing Mother (surely very Dou-like), certain seventeenth-century religious paintings, and some sixteenth-century works must have been the most expensive. Van Breukelenam’s works, which numerically accounted for one-thirteenth of Bugge’s holdings, were cheap, fetching about one-tenth to one-fiftieth of the prices Dou and Van Mieris could command. Religious affiliation seems to account for the major difference between the artistic preferences of Sylvius and Bugge. Rarely is the contrast as sharp as in their case, however, since many Protestant inventories, too, featured paintings that might strike us as Catholic devotional images, from pictures of Mary to themes from the Passion. These were often inherited and kept for their sentimental or artistic value. Nevertheless, some recently observed trends in differences between Catholic and Protestant inventories of paintings seem to be magnified in the holdings of Sylvius and Bugge.
between one and ten guilders, not only the anonymous paintings that were sometimes valued at even less than one guilder, but also works by well-known masters. See, for instance, Montias, Artists and Artisans, 258-84; Goosens, chap. 9; and Loughman, 50-53. Vatulations above a hundred guilders are exceptional. For such sums for Leiden “fine paintings,” see E.J. Shuiter, “Schilders van clemsyne, subtile ende curiosae dingen”: Leidse fijnschilders in contemporene broonen,” in E.J. Shuiter et al., eds., Leidse fijnschilders: Van Gerrit Dou tot Frans van Mieris de Jonge (Leiden and Zwolle, 1988), 24-28, 38-39. For an extreme case, see the 1664 inventory of Hieronymus van Straten of Goes, who had extraordinarily costly paintings and recorded the prices he paid, the most expensive being works by Rembrandt (eight hundred guilders), De Hooge (one thousand guilders), Van Ploegem (twelve hundred guilders) and Ebbeim (eighteen hundred guilders). H. Uil, “Het huis de Oillphaet te Goes,” Historisch Jaarboek voor Zuid- en Noord-Bestand 4 (1978) 95-116. See also below, notes 62 and 46.


14 Their holdings of paintings are among the largest we know of in Leiden. C. Williemijn Fock wrote a brilliant survey of the ownership of paintings in Leiden in the seventeenth century based on a selection of 120 of the most interesting examples with paintings that she found over the years in the Leiden archives (Fock, “Kunstbezit,” 3-36).

15 For the Amsterdam influence, compare the houses designed by Phillips Vingboons, especially Singel 46 of 1662 (Luningsch Schureluer, Fock, and Van Dessel, Rijnpburg, 3[1990]:22-28).

16 The original building specifications written up by the contractor Willem Wymoth – an unusual document to have survived – are published in Luningsch Schureluer, Fock, and Van Dessel, Rijnpburg, 3[1990]:22-28.

17 On the basis of this, a reconstruction of the plan and elevation were drawn up by H.J. Zantkuil (Luningsch Schureluer, Fock, and Van Dessel, Rijnpburg, 3[1990]:22-28). The property bought by Wymoth consisted of a much wider house that was subsequently split in two. Of this earlier house, the part on the Rupenburg was torn down and completely rebuilt as two houses (Rijnpburg 31 and 32), and only parts of the war houses were left intact and incorporated into the two new houses (Luningsch Schureluer, Fock, and Van Dessel, Rijnpburg, 3[1990]:22-28).

18 According to the building specifications, the commission was given in 1662, but the official transfer of the house to the new owner took place only in January 1667 (Luningsch Schureluer, Fock, and Van Dessel, Rijnpburg, 3[1990]:220).

19 Announcement of the marriage of Sylvia and his second wife was legally posted on 14 December 1666, so they probably married at the end of December or beginning of January.

20 The complete inventory of paintings, furniture, porcelain, and silver was published in Luningsch Schureluer, Fock, and Van Dessel, Rijnpburg, 3[1990]:220-24. For a full description of the furnishing of the interior, ibid., 224-24.

21 That Sylvia felt strongly about his new homeland appears from the testimony of a friend. Writing shortly after Sylvia’s death in 1672, the so-called remon (year of disaster), he speculated that Sylvia had been assaulted by a fatal illness because “he must have been weakened by grief about what was happening to his fatherland, or by exhaustion caused by a journey to The Hague” (E.D. Baumann, François de le Roe Sylviae (Leiden, 1940), 43).

22 For Sylvia’s life, see Baumann, chap. 1. The families of both his mother (Anne de le Vignette) and his father (Bas de le Roe) came from southern Flanders (new French Flanders). His grandfather François de le Roe led to Frankfurt am Main and settled there as a merchant.


24 Building is the present Rijnpburg 31 (about this house, see Luningsh Schureluer, Fock, and Van Dessel, Rijnpburg, 3[1990]:220-24). It was built around 1666 by the same contractor, Willem Wymoth, who built Sylvia’s House at Rijnpburg 31. In the building specifications for Rijnpburg 31, the contractor refers several times to the example of this house, for instance in the case of the arched way of natural stone leading from the room to the corridor, which is still present in Rijnpburg 43 (ibid., fig. 9).

25 She was born in Kleve, and her father came from Frankfurt am Main, the same city where Sylvia’s family had settled in the late sixteenth century; his sister continued to reside in Hanau near Frankfurt.


27 For this familiar metaphor of harmonious love, see F. de Jongh, Portretten van echt en trouw: Huwelijken in de gramin de Nederlanden komt van de zeventiende eeuw (Haarlem and Zwolle, 1986) 40-45. Otto Naumann first identified the painting in Dresden as a portrait of Sylvia and his wife – with a question mark – on the basis of the man’s likeness to the portrait of Sylvia engraved by Cornelis van Dalem (fig. 143 in this essay) and an item in Sylvia’s inventory: “the deceased with his last wife by Mieris” (Frans van Mieris the Elder 1623-1681) (Doorink, 1981), 2101, cat. 89). The convincing likeness was confirmed by the description of the same painting in the inventory of his nephew Joan Roussey (1678): “the portrait of professor Sylvia and his wife playing the lyre” (Gemeente Archief Amsterdam, Desolate Boedelskamer, no. 182). Unlike Naumann, I have no doubt that the woman is Magdalena Lucia Scheltelet her unrealistic dress and veil are very appropriate for the portrait of a deceased wife.

28 In my opinion, the other portrait that Naumann thinks might be Sylvia definitely represents a different loco (Naumann, 278, cat. 63).

29 The picture bears an unusually precise date: 1 March 1673.

30 In this first painting mentioned in the inventory, which starts with the contents of the southern. Assuming that the listing of paintings started clockwise from the entrance and went around the room, this must have been the first painting one saw.

31 Maritl Westermann reproduces a poem from 1676 by the Amsterdam poet and painter Willem Schellinks about a Quack by Brouwer (The Amusements of Jan Staen: Comic Painting in the Seventeenth Century [Zwolle, 1998], 46). The poem shows that this type of picture was typically admired for its comical realism, and since it is a rare subject in Brouwer’s oeuvre it may well have concerned the same painting. Sylvia may have bought this painting in Amsterdam, possibly along with the Street Singer about which Schellinks also wrote a poem (Sylvia owned two paintings by Brouwer, but unfortunately no subject is mentioned for the second). It is possible that Brouwer’s Quack now in the Staatliche Kunsthalle, Karlsruhe (fig. 140 in this essay), the only painting I know by Brouwer of a quack selling his wares, came from Sylvia’s inventory. See on 273. Amsterdam inventories, Montias calculated the typical distribution of works of art and types of paintings among the rooms in the house (Loughman and Montias, 57-63). He found that the zoom, the most public of domestic spaces, generally contained a

Notes to Pages 104-107
visit to Leiden, Cosimo surely must also have met Sylvius, who, as a fellow art lover, may well have introduced the grand duke to the astonishing virtuosity of Van Mieris.

It is not entirely certain that this is the same painting as the Adonis now in the Rijksmuseum. If it is the same painting, the makers of the inventory would have missed the obvious attributes of Adonis — the spear, the anemone, the wound in the groin, and the tiny figure of Venus in the clouds — but the expertise of inventory takers varied widely. We find the same painting, which Sylvius must have acquired only a few years before his death, again described as an "Abel" in an inventory taken in 1669 of the possessions of the Leiden bookseller Jan Jansz. van Rhijn, who owned 172 paintings. The painting is also mentioned in 1674 in an inventory in Deilt of Willem van Assendelft, again as "an Abel foreshortened" (Montias, Artists and Artisans, 232).

One of them is described as "a piebald horse." This might be the painting now in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles (fig. 152 in this essay), or the one in the Staatliches Museum in Schwerin.

On hunting and Dutch society, see Scott A. Sullivan, The Dutch Grisaille (Totowa and Montclair: New Jersey, 1983), chap. 4. Hunting, especially the pursuit of larger game, traditionally a prestigious aristocratic pastime, was by and large still the privilege of the nobility. In the course of the seventeenth century, however, hunting privileges were also obtained by wealthy men who bought country estates and hunted on their own land.

in the old cricket and by tavern "a piece with animals." An Italianate landscape is carefully attributed to "a disciple" of Cornelis van Poelenburgh; in other words, the painting was recognized as an original by an anonymous pupil rather than a copy after the famous Van Poelenburgh.

In the inventory of Sylvius’s nephew Jean Rouyer this painting is attributed to Frans Badens, once a quite famous painter from Amsterdam, to whom nowadays no paintings can be attributed with certainty. An attribution to Badens, who was born in Antwerp, traveled to Italy and was of the same generation as Van Swanenburg, is an understandable mistake. Sylvius probably also bought a Balthasar Balthasar by Pieter Lastman (fig. 159 in this essay) from the estate of Bugge van Ring. A painting with this title and attribution is described in both inventories, and given the scarcity of history paintings in Sylvius’s inventory it would be highly coincidental for them to own different versions of such a subject by the same artist.

Described as "a nightpiece in a cave." This is probably the painting listed in the inventory of Sylvius’s nephew Jean Rouyer as "a painting that can be opened in which a personخفیت a candle." Here it seems that the case was meant to be painted and did not consist of two doors.

Van Gool, 1:338. This is one of the reasons why eighteenth-century collectors concentrated on their paintings in a scheldekaapen, a room reserved for pictures.

About the custom of placing family portraits in private rooms, see Fock, "Kunstbezit", 276, and Loughman and Montias, 67-69.

One of them, a "half-length by Nieris with a roemer in the hand," might be Naumann, 2:24, 59, 72, or 77. "A gentleman with a young lady" might be The Oyster Meal, which was in the collection of Johann Wilhelm, Elector: Palatine, and is now in the Mauritshuis, The Hague (Naumann, 2:24, 36). This would mean that it was not intended as a companion piece to Naumann, 2:24, 35 (Closing the Pot).

Two of them are described as candlelight scenes without cases, the third as "a storm by Gerrit Dou in a case." In the Rouyer inventory this painting was described as "a painting being a hermit with casement door on which a lamp is painted."

Described in Sylvius’s inventory as "an Apollo hunting by Ad. de Buis" (the notary’s clerk surely misunderstood the name). The reason that it can be identified with certainty is that De Vos deviated from the pictorial tradition of Diana and Actaeon by placing in the foreground the hunter Actaeon, rather than the naked Diana and her bathing nymphs. This idiosyncrasy understandably caused the painting to be identified as a hunting Apollo. The same painting was described in the Rouyer inventory of 1678 as "a landscape in which a hunter" and in the 1912 Rouyer inventory correctly as "a bath of Diana and her nymphs" with Actaeon by De Vos (the 1701 Rouyer inventory was published in A. Bredius, Künstler- Inventaren [The Hague, 1915-21], 41:99-102; about both inventories, see also Lunsingh Scheurleer, Fock, and Van Dissel, Rijksb., 3:190-197).

About the sometimes fierce criticism of nudes, see E. J. Sluijter, De 'heerlijke fabriek' in de scheldekaap von de Gouden Era (Leiden, 2000), 157-67; and Sluijter, Selctaress of Sight, 118-23. Nevertheless, paintings with nudes can even be found in inventories of Calvinist preachers (Loughman and Montias, 49).

Good sculptors were thin on the ground in Holland because most sculpture had traditionally been commissioned for purposes of worship. As public Catholic worship was no longer allowed in the Republic, demand for sculpture had dwindled drastically. For a survey of sculpture in the northern Netherlands, see E. Noutenburg, De zeventiende-eeuwse beeldhouwkunst in de noordelijke Nederlanden (Amsterdam, 1948), about Pieter Xavery, ibid., 224-26.

Lunsingh Scheurleer, Fock, and Van Dissel, Rijksb., 3:190-197. It seems likely that his students used these in chemical experiments.

Unaware of the abundance of stones and burners in Sylvius’s house, Van Siprosen notes (330) that only Johannes Hartmann in Marburg might have taught chemical research to students and that this form of teaching was not adopted until the nineteenth century.

Nor did he have works by popular genre painters of the same generation, such as Dekk Haar or Pieter Codde.

Forrester’s special standing is evident in the list of favorite painters drawn up in the 1710s by Arnold Houbraken: of the entire "totaal" generation of landscape and genre painters, only Forrester is mentioned (2130).

See for instance the 1657 inventory of a Johann de Renialde, an art dealer of Amsterdam who worked for the top level of the art market. He owned primarily good and quite expensive Dutch paintings, but he also had works by Jacob Palma, Padovano, Bassano, Tintoretto, Ribera, and Titian. The estimates for the paintings of those masters were very high, between one hundred and five hundred guilders. The most expensive, however, were a Rembrandt valued at fifteen hundred guilders and a Dou at six hundred. For his inventory, see Bredius, 1230-39. Montias concluded that in a sample of 372 Amsterdam inventories with paintings the number of Italian works was almost negligible ("Works of Art," 324): the same is true for Leiden (Fock, "Kunstbezit", 237; and Goossen found no Italian paintings at all in Haarlem inventories before 1650 (301, 340). About the few collectors of Italian masters, see H. Th. van Veen, "Uitzonderlijke verzamelingen: Italiaanse kunst en klassieke sculptuur in Nederland," in E. Bergveld and R. Kustemaker, eds., De wereld binnens handbereik: Nederlandse kunst- en rariteiten- verzamelingen, 1587-1751 (Amsterdam and Zwolle, 1992), 102-16.

These were the Magelberge by Dou, the Bartheleby by Lastman, and the Preaching of Christ and "story of Joseph" by a master from Brabant.
The noticeable preference for landscapes and seascapes among the Protestant elite can be deduced from the fact that six out of four hundred landscapes and seascapes is significantly higher among Protestants, as well as in "rich" inventories (see esp. Montias, "Works of Art," 357; 1992). Mozart workforce, having seen his first marriage in 1768, his second marriage in 1769, and his death in 1791. I assume that he was born sometime between 1700 and 1710.

60: "Fock, Kunsthistoriker.

67: Her great-grandfather and gout-great-grandfather were Leiden magistrates; her father and grandfather were wealthy brewers. On the Van Swieten family, see R.C.J. van Maanen, "De Leidse van Swieten", Groot Nieuws (1973): 96-112; and 33 (1978) 343-347.

68: The name of his bride was Jennette Mullens, born in Lingen (Germany). One wonders if she was a domestic servant, many of whom came from the eastern provinces of the Netherlands or from just across the border. Bugge died two years later.

69: His house is no longer extant. The house on the Steenwijkstraat was destroyed in 1897 by the infamous explosion of a ship with gunpowder lying in the canal of the Steenwijkse, which ruined a whole neighborhood. Bugge's house once stood within the precincts of what is now the Van der Welf park; the house was the third from the intersection with the Doucresstrat (then Kopenhagsestraat). The houses to either side were also owned by Bugge.


71: Montias found one Amsterdam inventory (1661) in which sizes are recorded, sometimes with the description "large" or "small." (Loughman and Montias, 114). A landscape described as "large" was 53 inches wide, a "large" painting with aMr. Masonplane approximately 66 inches, a "small" landscape about 19 inches, and a "small" vertical about 12 inches. Is there any correlation between the "large" and the "small" in these descriptions? Further research is necessary to determine the extent to which painters distorted elements of interior decoration in their efforts to present a balanced room. Also see Loughman and Montias, 106-13.

72: Montias gives an inventory that gives detailed information about the location of pictures on the wall and shows that the paintings

were hung in two tiers. It concerns a quite modest inventory of 1654, however, with thirteen paintings distributed over four rooms (Loughman and Montias, 41-42, 139-40)

73: For, see, for example, Loughman and Montias, fig. 10 (Adriaen de Lelie, Art Gallery / Im Gildemuseum) and Grijpstra and Van Heem, fig. 8 (Johannes Jensen, Paulus van Vlijt 1692-1706)

74: The Anwerp genre known as "piet" gallery paintings," which usually show imaginary collections, developed in self-conscious environment of collectors and artists interested in rating the intellectual and social standing of the visual arts (see Zrinka Zasenica Filipcic, Painting Art in Antwerp [Ypsilanti, 1987], esp. chap. 7.

75: Amsterdam inventories, for example, often included paintings by Joos de Momper, which was represented in Bugge's inventory along with the other late-sixteenth-century landscape painters Gillis Mostaert and Cornelis Moreel. Montias, " Works of Art," 343, 343-346.

76: For the collection of the stoutboded Frederik Hendrik, see P. van der Ploeg and C. Vermeeren, Verzameling van: De kunstcollectie van Frederik Hendrik en Amalia (The Hague and Zvolle, 1997). For the complete inventories, see S.W. van der Haar and Th. H. L. Lichtenstein, Inventarissen van de inboedel in de verblijven van de Oranje en daarmede pelijk te stellen stukken (The Hague, 1974), vol. 1.

77: In two cases paintings were described as 'by a good master of Brabant.' Bugge recognized the origin and quality of these works but did not know enough to be able to identify the master.

78: This identification confirms Bugge's intimate knowledge: he names the copyist as "the young Heda," that is, Gerrit, to distinguish him from his more famous father, Willem Claesz Heda. The Van Oetade could be either the Haarlem painter Adriaen or his brother Isaac. Given the subject, Adriaen is a bit more likely.

79: This painting is described as "a man counting money by candlelight." The only copies were after Teniers (already mentioned), after the sixteenth-century painter Pieter Aertsen (a well-known ceramic painter and Merten van Heemskerck, "Christ with the Cross").

80: For instance: a large piece being a Christmas night as they say by Tall Peter (Linge Pier - Peter Aertsen) and "a commode [loud instrument] player by Brouwer as you say."

81: For the Seem, below, note 16: the Dou, note 11.


83: These were S. Gregory by Anthonie Blocklandt, the already mentioned Corrigan of the Cross copied after Van Heemskerck, a Nelt Meentjes and a Discant from the Cono by Lucas Cornelisz Kornet, and a painting by Jan Gossaert, also known as Mabuse.

84: The subjects were: St. Boniface, St. Clare, St. Francis, and the Jesuit Francisco Borgia (who were canonized in the seventeenth century), all by Van Brekelenkam; the Coronning of the Cross (Van de Venen); an Annunciation (De Keijser); and "Our Lady in a lily" (Fabritius). Also, among other paintings, a Magdalene by Willem Stricker, a "dying Xavere" by Cornelis van Rijnsburg, and a "large piece with the freeing of Joseph by Master Claes." For examples of comparable situations, see G.M.C. Pastor, "Bijbelse historiënsten in particulier bezit," in C. Timpel et al., Het Oude Testament in het huishouden van de zeventiende eeuw (Amsterdam, Jerusalem, and Zvolle, 1991), 123-29; and Loughman, 54-55.

85: Bugge's portraits had a landscape by Elias van den Velde, a landscape with Venus and Adonis by Meyron van der Haar, and a portrait of the picture of the generous benefactor Peckelinge by Frans Hals. Maps were frequent decorative elements in the rococo house, see cat. 46, 46 and the essay in this catalog by C. Willenbroeck. For a very good discussion of the term "rococo," see cat. 9-10.

86: Like many writers after him, Bugge clearly was confused about the first names of the burgomaster painter Isaac Claesz van Swansbech and his son Jacob Isaaco van Swansbech, the first master of Rembrandt. In Bugge's inventory the first is called "bougmaster Swansbech" (the Good Samaritan) or "burgmester Claesz Swansbech" (the Marcus Curtius and the copy after Frans Floris); two paintings with subjects that can only be identified as being by Isaac van Swansbech ("a large piece of hell & the ship of Charon" [fig. 165] and "a large oblong piece being a battle.") See R.E. O. Ekkart, Isaac Claesz, Zuideruniversiteit, 357-164. H. Slotemaker van Swansbech (Zwolle, 1995), 26.

87: The inventory lists "Aristotelus and Democritus," but given the current currency of the subject of Heraclitus and Democritus in
seventeenth-century Dutch painting we may assume that Bugge misprinted or that he was misread by the inventory scribe. On this subject in Dutch painting, see Albert Blankert, "Hersenen en Democritus, in het bijzonder in de Nederlandse kunst van de 17de eeuw," Nederlands Kunstgeschied. Jaart. 19 (1969) 31-124.

93 For the description, see abare note 87.

94 Described as "four small pieces with horsemen and horses riding with his majesty prince Frederick to Scheveningen by Master Jan van de Velde." Loughman and Montias, 46-47; Fock concluded that the number of portraits of the House of Orange dropped dramatically in Leiden inventories after 1660 (Fock, "Kunstbezit," 38).

95 The attributions for the other paintings in this room are very promising: a Pan and Syrinx by Mosey van Uyterbroeck; various landscapes by the excellent Dutch and Flemish masters Pieter Molijn, Bartholomeus Breenbergh, David Vinckboons, and Joos de Momper; genre paintings by Jan Miense Molenaer and van Brekelenkam; and still-life pictures by the somewhat less well-known Pieter de Ring and Cornelis Liesenbergh.

96 The inventory of the library lists no specific books, but it does group the works in categories (theology, jurisprudence, and literature).

97 See the essay by Willemijn Fock in this catalog.

98 Religious paintings were by Lastman, Jan Pytius (two), De Keijzer, Van Uyterbroeck, and Josse van Cleve, among others. For the mythological paintings, see below, note 110.

99 Nowadays no works can be attributed with certainty to the sixteenth-century landscape painter Cornelis van Miere, always called by his nickname, "cross-eyed Noel" (Schade Noel), about whom Van Mander speaks with admiration. We often come across his works, mostly landscapes, in inventories from the seventeenth century; in 1657 the art dealer Johannes de R зависимe (see note 64 above), like Bugge, had "a paasant kerms," which was estimated at the amazingly high sum of four hundred guilders (by way of comparison, works of his seventeenth-century nameake Jan Miense Molenaer, who was represented in Bugge's holdings by these peasant paintings, were generally estimated between ten and twenty-five guilders; see Goughen, 286).

100 A large landscape by Jan van Goijen being an inn with a coach and hunters done in the year 1627. To my regret, I do not know of a Van Goyen of 1627 that fits this description.

101 A piece with flowers by van der Spelt and a little curtain with it by Miere. In 1648, I identified this painting as the Flower Garland with Cartuvin signed only by van der Spelt in the Art Institute of Chicago; the spectacular curtain on this work is without any doubt from the hand of Frans van Mieris (Sluijters et al., 40 and fig. 11).

102 Vuygenra (ed., Haassakkers), 81.

103 Among the older works were family portraits by De Grebber and Bloemaert (which are not specified, but it should be noted that both the De Grebber and the Bloemaert families were Catholic). A portrait by De Pape of Bugge's brother-in-law, the lawyer Cornelis van Swieten, hung in the inner kitchen. The upstairs room with family portraits also contained two small peasant paintings by Steen and a nursing mother by Van Brekelenkam.


105 In Amsterdam inventories, Montias found only one out of the seventy-two kitchen pieces mentioned hanging in kitchens (Loughman and Montias, 43). In Leiden and Haarlem this does occur quite often, however, especially in the first half of the century (Fock, "Kunstbezit," 26-27; and Goughen, 356).

106 Among them "a lady giving money to the maid" (fig. 164 in this essay), "two women," "a young man and a young woman," "a reading woman," "a nursing woman," "a female seller of apples and pears," "a man cleaning fish," "a miser by candlelight," "an astrologer," and "a harridan.

107 There were also "a naked woman," several saints (see above, notes 83 and 84), a portrait of Bugge and his son, a portrait of Wijtten Ctewens (a grandfather of Bugge's wife), and "two copies of counterfeits of the old Bugge and his wife," undoubtedly Bugge's parents.

108 No authentic paintings of a schole in his study by Rembrandt are known today. Since we know several works with this subject from his studio (see A. Bredius, Rembrandt: Th Compleet Edition of the Paintings, rev. H. Gerson, London 1962), nos. 427-29, 430-33 and since his first pupil, Gerrit Dou, painted it quite often early in his career, early Rembrandt works with this theme undoubtedly existed. The closest is his 1627 candlelight scene with an old miser (Parable of the Old Fool?) surrounded by pupils books (Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie).

109 Of Steen's paintings of Twelfth Night, the one in Boston dated 1662 is the only one of large size that was painted before 1667 (Westermann, 64). The other paintings were: "two of peasants playing," "a piece being tric-trac players by Jan Steen in his youth," "a tavern," "a peasant kerms with a strumpet and an old man playing tric-trac."