

## The Ownership of Paintings: From the Stadholder to a Fishwife

*Eric Jan Sluijter*

If foreigners visiting Holland in the seventeenth century had been asked who actually bought the huge numbers of paintings being produced there, they probably would have answered “everyone.” These foreign travelers, who were usually aristocrats or at least very affluent, were astonished by the art to be seen in Dutch cities, for to their mind there were paintings hanging everywhere. The English, French and Italians were accustomed to seeing paintings in their own countries in churches and convents, or at the homes of the aristocracy or the very rich; in Holland, however, they got the impression that paintings were omnipresent, for one reason because they often hung in the front room, and the tall windows made them easily visible from the street. The English merchant Peter Mundy described this phenomenon in his travel account: “All in generall striving to adorne their houses, especially the outer or street roome, with costly peeces, Butchers and bakers not much inferiour in their shoppes, which are Fairely sett Forth, yea many tymes blacksmithes, Cobblers, ettc. will have some picture or other by their Forge and in their stalle. Such is the generall Notion, enclination and delight that these Countrie Natives have to Paintings” (Peter Mundy, 1640).<sup>1</sup>

This descriptive passage, written in 1640, was probably not much of an exaggeration. John Michael Montias calculated in his pioneering study of 1982 that in Delft, around 1646, two-thirds of the population had paintings in their homes, with an average of eleven pictures per household. The poorest, of course, did not own such luxuries. Nevertheless, Montias found the occasional painting even among the few possessions of day laborers, and several small paintings were often listed in the inventories of simple artisans,<sup>2</sup> though never very many: Montias estimated that half of all Amsterdam households had a couple of paintings (two or less).<sup>3</sup> These were not the paintings now hanging in museums, however, for such higher quality work must be sought primarily among the *grote burgerij* (the upper middle class: rich merchants, wealthy shipowners, large landowners, senior government officials, professors, barristers, physicians and the clergymen in the larger cities) and to a somewhat

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter Mundy, *The Travels of Peter Mundy in Europe and Asia, 1608-1667*, vol. 4, *Travels in Europe, 1639-47*, ed. R. Carnac Temple (London: Hakluyt Society, 1925), 70.

<sup>2</sup> John Michael Montias, *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 220.

<sup>3</sup> John Michael Montias, “Works of Art in Random Samples of Amsterdam Inventories,” in *Economic History and the Arts*, ed. Michael North (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1996), 80.

lesser extent among the *brede burgerij* (broad middle classes: small businessmen, established shopkeepers, successful artisans, urban public servants).<sup>4</sup>

But was the ownership of the work of certain artists or paintings of certain subjects a distinguishing factor between different socio-economic groups? There is no straightforward answer to that question, nor is it possible to ascertain whether the affluent and more highly placed members of society owned the most expensive and highest quality paintings. There were huge differences in quality, subject, format and price; the choice was therefore immense – a particular type of painting for each social group, one might think. Yet most inventories listing a number of paintings contain a bit of everything, and it is difficult to detect any patterns in collecting behavior. For example, it can seldom be stated categorically that certain subjects were to be found mainly in the households of certain social groups. The mere fact that every subject was available in a wide variety of formats and prices – ranging from a small panel the size of a postcard to a canvas of more than two meters, and costing anywhere from four or five guilders to over a thousand – makes it extremely difficult to establish connections between collector and subject matter. With regard to style, too, cheap imitations and copies were made of almost every kind of painting.

Of course costly paintings by masters with a solid reputation were found almost exclusively in the possession of wealthy individuals. It would be wrong, however, to assume that the rich owned only high-quality paintings, for their estate inventories nearly always contain many inexpensive, anonymous works. One would expect a gentleman-dealer such as Johannes de Renialme to have sold only expensive pictures to the very rich, considering that at his death in 1657 he owned 586 paintings, forty of which were valued at between 200 and 500 guilders, which was the high end of the art market (one extremely valuable Rembrandt was even estimated to be worth 1,500 guilders). Yet his stock also included 246 paintings worth between ten and forty guilders, and no fewer than 122 pieces valued at between one and eight guilders.<sup>5</sup> Did he sell those inexpensive pictures by second- and third-rate masters to the same wealthy individuals who bought expensive paintings, or were they intended for buyers

---

<sup>4</sup> Paul Knevel, “Een kwestie van overleven. De kunst van het samenleven,” in *De Geschiedenis van Holland*, vol. II, 1572 tot 1795, eds. Thimo de Nijs and Eelco Beukers (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2002), 220-21.

<sup>5</sup> The valuations were analyzed by Bram de Blécourt, *Johannes de Renialme. Een Amsterdamse kunsthandelaar uit de zeventiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Master’s thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2012). De Renialme is always presented as an art dealer at the upper end of the market, though no one has previously taken a good look at his inventory as a whole; Bredius reproduced only a part of it: A. Bredius, *Künstlerinventare: Urkunden zur Geschichte der holländischen Kunst des XVIIten. XVIIten und XVIIIten Jahrhunderts* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1915-22), vol. 1, 230-39. The complete inventory appears in the Montias Database, no. 180. He also had 154 paintings valued at between fifty and 190 guilders.

with smaller purses? The former seems the most likely.<sup>6</sup> There were also art dealers who sold only very cheap things, such as Cornelis Doeck, whose 576 paintings were valued in 1667 at about four guilders apiece.<sup>7</sup> A number of the painters named in Doeck's inventory – such as Leendert de Laeff, by whom sixty-four works were to be found in the shop – must have been employed by art dealers and probably specialized in painting pictures for people with modest incomes. This cannot be verified, however, since the names of such painters occur only in dealers' inventories, and their works are untraceable among the countless anonymous pieces in private estates.<sup>8</sup> The majority of the paintings in Doeck's stock depicted biblical subjects, mainly from the Old Testament, which presumably indicates the preference of his clientele.<sup>9</sup>

To get an impression of the ownership of paintings among the various social groups – I confine myself here to estate inventories from the second and third quarter of the seventeenth century<sup>10</sup> – we will begin by examining the top of the social pyramid in the Dutch Republic: the stadholder's court and the nobility. By no means does it appear to have been customary for the nobility to own many landscapes, still lifes, genre pieces or history paintings. Their houses were chiefly filled with portraits – large numbers of them. On the basis of the inventories of nobles living in The Hague – the only city in Holland where many noble families settled, having been attracted by the stadholder's court – Thera Wijssenbeek calculated that the nobility owned more than three times as many portraits as wealthy magistrates did, whereas the latter group possessed twice as many paintings of other categories. Even shopkeepers and craftsmen owned, considerably more than the nobility, all kinds of subjects other than portraits (of which they had almost none).<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> In 1650 De Renialme tried to sell the Great Elector Friedrich Wilhelm, the husband of a daughter of Frederik Hendrik, a number of very expensive paintings, as well as a huge number of small, cheap paintings. Altogether they numbered 500 works: 112 bore names; the other 388 were anonymous (De Blécourt, *Johannes de Renialme*, 24-27).

<sup>7</sup> Angela Jager is writing a dissertation on these cheap, mass-produced paintings; the information here was taken from her findings. The contents of Doeck's shop were valued at 2,562 guilders, meaning an average of 4.5 guilders per picture. This included a large number of books, however, so the average painting could not have been worth more than four guilders. An analysis of his stock appears in Angela Jager, "Everywhere Illustrious Histories that ar a Dime a Dozen.' The Mass Market for History paintings in Seventeenth Century Amsterdam," *Journal of the Historians of Netherlandish Art*, 7:1 (2015), <http://www.jhna.org/index.php/past-issues/vol-7-1-2015/303-angela-jager>. Doeck's inventory (incomplete) appears in Bredius, *Kunstlerinventare*, vol. 1, 102-10.

<sup>8</sup> Doeck's inventory names fifty painters, but a large number of them do not occur in any other inventories and we know only a few of their paintings (and in some cases none).

<sup>9</sup> The same holds true for the stock of Jan Fransz Dameroen (1646) and Hendrick Meyeringh (1687), the art dealers' inventories that form the basis of Angela Jager's research.

<sup>10</sup> This is the period in which paintings in estate inventories are best described. Here I used Amsterdam inventories from the Montias Database, Haarlem inventories compiled by Pieter Biesboer that appear in the Getty Provenance Index, a number of Hague inventories gathered by Thera Wijssenbeek-Olthuis, Leiden inventories collected by Willemijn Fock for the Rapenburg project, and several inventories published here and there.

<sup>11</sup> Thera Wijssenbeek-Olthuis, "Magistraten, edelen en buurtverenigingen," in *Het Lange Voorhout. Monumenten, mensen en macht*, ed. Th. Wijssenbeek-Olthuis (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 1998), 92 and n. 195. She calculated this on the basis of the inventories of twenty nobles, twenty of the richest magistrates and twenty tradesmen in The Hague. Among the nobility she encountered an average of twenty-five portraits and seventeen paintings of other types; among the tradesmen she found

The walls of noble homes had always been hung with costly tapestries, and this tradition continued throughout most of the seventeenth century. Tapestries were easy to take along – noble families were accustomed to moving house frequently – and lent the interior a luxurious and prestigious character.<sup>12</sup> Among the bourgeoisie we see tapestries only in the homes of the most affluent, where they usually attest to their owners' aristocratic aspirations. This trend is exemplified by the burgomaster Joan Huydecoper, who bought costly tapestries for the reception room of his new house, one of the first grand canal-side mansions

by the renowned architect Philips Vingboons, which was completed in Amsterdam in 1641.<sup>13</sup> The fact that Constantijn Huygens had his portrait painted in front of a tapestry displaying his coat of arms therefore tells us a great deal about his social ambitions (cat. 00). In such a room there would not have been much space left for paintings, apart from an overmantel. Jan Steen's tapestry-covered interior in this exhibition – which illustrates the custom of hanging tapestries in front of the door and pushing them to the side (see cat. 00) – is exceptional, both in his oeuvre and in those of contemporary genre painters, and shows what Steen thought an aristocratic interior looked like. In the course of the century, the nobility began increasingly to decorate the rooms that lacked tapestries with wall-coverings of satin or damask, either embroidered or with floral or striped patterns; wealthy burghers did not follow suit until late in the seventeenth century. Gilt leather was another pricey wall-covering found in the homes of the nobility, but it soon became fashionable among the well-to-do bourgeoisie as well. (See, for example, the room in the background in cat. 00 [notary Job Berckheyde]).<sup>14</sup>

An interior of Holland's upper nobility is well represented by the 1646 inventory of Batenburg House at Vianen, which belonged to Johan Wolfert van Brederode, the husband of Louise Christina van Solms Braunfels, Amalia van Solms' sister.<sup>15</sup> The most important rooms of this house were decorated with tapestries depicting the stories of historical or mythological figures – such as Hercules, Cadmus and Joseph – whereas several of the smaller rooms were

---

an average of three portraits and twenty-nine paintings of other kinds; the rich magistrates owned an average of thirty-three "ordinary" paintings and eight portraits.

Shortly before her death, Thera Wijssenbeek donated photocopies of the Hague inventories she had collected to the project "Artistic Exchange and Cultural Transmission in the Low Countries during the Seventeenth Century" (supervisor: Filip Vermeylen; co-supervisors: Karolien de Clippel and Eric Jan Sluijter), which enabled me to make use of this material.

<sup>12</sup> C. Willemijn Fock, *Het Nederlandse interieur in beeld 1600-1900* (Zwolle: Waanders Uitgeverij, 2001), 36.

<sup>13</sup> Fock, *Nederlandse interieur*, 39. K. Ottenheim, *Philips Vingboons (1600-1678), architect* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 1989), 247, n. 97. Huydecoper paid a total of 3,280 guilders for the tapestry and the overmantel by Joachim von Sandrart; according to Ottenheim, the tapestry alone cost 3,000 guilders.

<sup>14</sup> Fock, *Nederlandse interieur*, 37. On gilt leather in the Netherlands, see E. Koldewey, *Gouldleer in de Republiek der Zeven Provinciën* (Leiden: Ph.D. Diss. Leiden University, 1998).

<sup>15</sup> P. van Meurs, "Kunst in de archieven van Vianen," *Oud Holland* 26 (1908): 277-303, esp. 179-85. I confine myself here to the inventory of 1646. Unfortunately, no inventories are known of the Brederode's possessions in their Hague houses.

hung with damask and gilt leather. Some of the rooms boasted overwhelming numbers of portraits: in the Counts' Room, twenty-one portraits of noble family members; in the room of Brederode's wife, twenty-four portraits of the Nassaus; in the office, thirty-eight unnamed portraits; in the saloon, three of "His Excellency" and his wife; in the large gallery, another fifty-two unnamed "portraits big and small"; and here and there some portraits "of the old gentlemen" and "of old captains". Unfortunately, this inventory did not mention the painters by name, but there seems to be little chance of finding masterpieces among the Dutch nobility. The unknown Jan van Rossum must have been something of a court painter to Johan Wolfert.<sup>16</sup> Compared with these approximately 150 portraits, other paintings make a poor showing. In addition to depictions of medieval castles belonging to the Brederode family,<sup>17</sup> there were overmantels by Jan van Bijlert, Jacob van Campen (probably monumental works, but the subjects are not mentioned), paintings by Cornelis Saftleven, Roelant Savery and Ambrosius Bosschaert, and a couple of small, anonymous pieces. Finally, the large hall contained a series of twelve portraits of Roman emperors, apparently a must-have among the nobility and burghers with aristocratic aspirations.<sup>18</sup>

A similar series of Twelve Emperors also occurs in the inventory of the Van Boetzelaer family (1663), who lived on the Lange Voorhout in The Hague.<sup>19</sup> This is one of the few Hague inventories to provide reasonable descriptions of a noble family's possessions, and shows that nobles of slightly lower rank than the Brederodes conformed to this pattern. At the Van Boetzelaers' residence, two reception rooms and the master bedroom contained tapestries that were family heirlooms, while other rooms were decorated with gilt leather and costly fabrics. There were some thirty-five family portraits and two old paintings of the gentlemen of the Order of the Golden Fleece, a portrait of the prince of Orange and three views of places to which the family had ties.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, there were only two small

---

<sup>16</sup> The family portraits must have included works by Jan Anthonisz van Ravestejn. On the small number of extant portraits of the Brederodes, see M. E. Spliethoff, "Familiereünie in Vianen. Portretten van Johan Wolfert van Brederode en zijn gezin herenigd," in *Johan Wolfert van Brederode. Een Hollands edelman tussen Nassau en Oranje*, eds. A. J. M. Koenheim et al. (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 1999), 75-83.

<sup>17</sup> An overmantel from Brederode Castle and a view of Huis ter Kleef (both in the vicinity of Haarlem and already ruins in those days, having been reduced to rubble by the Spanish).

<sup>18</sup> This must have begun with the series of Twelve Emperors that Titian produced for Federigo Gonzaga, of which there were many copies, including a series owned by Emperor Ferdinand II that was engraved by Aegidius Sadeler II. See Jasper Hillegers in Jasper Hillegers et al., *Salomon Lilian. Old Masters 2013* (Amsterdam and Geneva: Lilian 2013), 80-83, with additional references.

<sup>19</sup> More specifically, this is the inventory of Geneveva Maria van der Noot, Lady (*vrijvrouwe*) of Beek, widow of Philip Jacob van Boetzelaer, Lord (*heer*) of Asperen, 20 May 1663; Haags Gemeentearchief, notary Thomas van Swieten, 309 (1140). Thera Wijssenbeek also encountered the Twelve Emperors in inventories of other nobles of The Hague: Martin Snouckaert van Schauburgh, Francois van Aerssen, Freule van Uytenhove and Du Tour (Wijssenbeek-Olthuis, "Magistraten, edelen," 94). She incorrectly states that Frederik Hendrik commissioned Rubens to paint such a series, a notion based on a publication by Marieke Tiethoff-Spliethoff (see n. 22 below).

<sup>20</sup> The places in question are Hoochwou and the abbeys of Rijnsburg and Leeuwenhorst.

landscape paintings, three still lifes, one of which must have been very beautiful – “a beautiful painting with a flowerpot” – a picture of peasants having a meal, five paintings of biblical subjects, one mythological scene (The Rape of Europa) and some unspecified works.<sup>21</sup>

The Twelve Emperors were also to be found at the stadholder’s court, but as an extraordinary variant: a series produced by twelve famous painters, including Peter Paul Rubens, Paulus Moreelse, Michiel van Mierevelt, Gerard van Honthorst, Abraham Bloemaert, Hendrick Goltzius and Hendrick ter Brugghen. Prince Maurits probably commissioned this series between ca. 1616 and 1626,<sup>22</sup> but it was Frederik Hendrik and Amalia van Solms who eventually amassed a truly splendid collection. Indeed, their holdings displayed in magnified form a number of characteristics of an aristocratic collection. There were tapestries in abundance: the 1632 inventory of Noordeinde Palace listed – in storage – twelve sets of figurative tapestries, each consisting of between six and ten pieces, which could be used on all kinds of occasions.<sup>23</sup> The 1632 inventory of the Stadholder’s Quarters records that the twelve grandest rooms were hung with tapestries, including various series depicting the stories of Hercules, Julius Caesar, Perseus, Vertumnus and Pomona (twice), Alexander and Phaeton,<sup>24</sup> as well as twenty-eight gilt- and silver-leather wall-coverings.<sup>25</sup> However, Amalia increasingly chose – and in this she was a trendsetter – to decorate the walls to a large extent with costly silk damask, satin or velvet. This fashion, which had come to the Dutch Republic

---

<sup>21</sup> Among these were six “French paintings” and two small paintings that had been “bought in Brussels.”

<sup>22</sup> Potsdam, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg, now in Schloss Caputh, Brandenburg (they hung for a long time in Berlin, Schloss Grunewald). The other painters were Abraham Janssens, Gerard Seghers, Dirck van Baburen, Werner van den Valckert and Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem. The provenance of the series is uncertain, since it does not occur in the stadholder’s inventory of 1632. Maurits or Frederik Hendrik almost certainly commissioned it, however; the series probably came into the possession of the Electoral Princes of Brandenburg via Louisa Henrietta, who might have been given it as a wedding present when she married the Great Elector Friedrich Wilhelm. For an enlightening summary of the vicissitudes of this series, with further references, see Wayne Franits, *Dirck van Baburen, ca. 1592/93-1624* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins Publishers, 2013), 137-40. Marieke Tiethoff-Spliethoff incorrectly states that Frederik Hendrik commissioned Rubens to paint this series; see Marieke Tiethoff-Spliethoff, “Representatie en rollenspel. De portrekunst aan het hof van Frederik Hendrik en Amalia,” in *Vorstelijk Vertoon. Aan het hof van Fredrik Hendrik en Amalia*, eds. Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, exh. cat. (The Hague: Haags Historisch Museum; Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 1997), 174.

<sup>23</sup> See S. W. A. Drossaers and Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurleer, *Inventarissen van de inboedel in de verblijven van de Oranjes* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974), vol. 1, 211-12, nos. 717-33. Altogether there were 100 tapestries. Peter van der Ploeg and Carola Vermeeren, “‘Uijt de penningen vande zeeprinsen’. De Stadhoudelijke schilderijenverzameling,” in *Vorstelijk Verzameld. De kunstcollectie van Frederik Hendrik en Amalia*, eds. P. van der Ploeg and C. Vermeeren, exh. cat. (The Hague: Mauritshuis; Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 1998), 39-40, names 136 tapestries, but this includes non-figurative tapestries; see also Wijssenbeek-Olthuis, “Magistraten, edelen,” 1998, 83, which mentions as many as 158 (including other textile wall-coverings). Some of these wall-coverings were probably intended for the palaces under renovation: Honselaersdijk and Huis te Nieuburg.

<sup>24</sup> Drossaers and Scheurleer, *Inventarissen ... Oranjes*, 182 (24), 186 (118), 187 (128), 188 (148), 189 (188), 196 (353), 197 (361).

<sup>25</sup> C. Willemijn Fock, “Frederik Hendrik en Amalia’s appartementen. Vorstelijk vertoon naast de triomf van het porselein,” in *Vorstelijk Verzameld. De kunstcollectie van Frederik Hendrik en Amalia*, eds. P. van der Ploeg and C. Vermeeren, exh. cat. (The Hague, Mauritshuis; Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 1998), 77.

from the French court, called for alternating light and cheerful summery fabrics with darker, wintry materials.<sup>26</sup>

Half of the paintings in Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's extensive collection were portraits: likenesses of members of the Houses of Orange and Nassau, and of countless foreign princes and nobles. In 1632 Noordeinde Palace alone contained 169 portraits, the majority depicting princes and noblemen from all of Europe.<sup>27</sup> Honselaarsdijk Palace had a large room with 103 portraits of princes, artists, scholars and military commanders, a veritable *Galerie des Illustres*, as well as a gallery of European royals. Huis te Nieuburg likewise prided itself on a gallery filled with princely portraits.<sup>28</sup> This contrasts with the couple's rooms in the Stadholder's Quarters: according to the inventory of 1632, Frederik Hendrik had in his own rooms only portraits of his father, mother, wife and Elizabeth of Bohemia, whereas Amalia had twenty-five portraits in her private quarters, including twelve small likenesses of French nobles.<sup>29</sup> The inventory seldom mentions the painters' names, and when it does, they are invariably Van Mierevelt (portraits of members of the House of Orange from the first decades of the century [cat. 00]), Honthorst (countless later portraits of family and in-laws [cat. 00]), Van Dyck (a number of portraits; see cat. 00) and Rembrandt (one portrait, a profile of Amalia).<sup>30</sup>

By as early as 1632, however, the stadholderly couple had also amassed a true collection of art, as befitted a princely court. Their collection was housed primarily in special galleries in the Stadholder's Quarters – a gallery each on their respective floors. The collection was rather unusual, however. Unlike other European rulers of the time (and in contrast to several of the most important collections in Holland assembled by connoisseurs), they did not collect Italian paintings.<sup>31</sup> And even though French fashions in interior decoration were followed at their court, they did not purchase French paintings either. Italian paintings were certainly to be had in Holland, and the Oranges were extremely wealthy – they imported from France and Italy many costly fabrics for wall-coverings, which were usually

---

<sup>26</sup> Fock, *Nederlandse interieur*, 37-38.

<sup>27</sup> Van de Ploeg and Vermeeren, "Stadhouderlijke schilderijenverzameling," 39, n. 31. On the portraits, see also Marieke Tiethoff-Splithoff, "Representatie en rollenspel," 162-99.

<sup>28</sup> Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "Stadhouderlijke schilderijenverzameling," 40, 42, 45.

<sup>29</sup> Drossaers and Scheurleer, *Inventarissen ... Oranjes*, I, 183 (45-48) and 192 (245).

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem*; for Mierevelt, see nos. 976, 978, 979, 980, 981, 984 and 985; Honthorst, nos. 186 and 611, but mainly in Amalia's inventory of 1654, nos. 1176, 1177, 1192, 1193, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1208, 1244, 1245 and 1248. Van Dyck, no. 19, and in Amalia's inventory of 1654, nos. 1189 and 1246. The portrait of Amalia by Rembrandt is on p. 191, no. 219, and occurs again in Amalia's inventory of 1654, p. 283, no. 1209. Van Dyck's portraits of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia (ca. 1631), both now in Madrid, Prado (cat. 00) and of Willem II in Dessau, Schloss Mosigkau, are not listed in the inventory of 1632; they might have been at Honselaarsdijk at that time.

<sup>31</sup> The only Italian painting in the collection was by the Florentine artist Franciabigio.

much more expensive than paintings – so collecting only Netherlandish paintings must have been a deliberate choice.<sup>32</sup>

Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's choice of art seems to have been guided by an ambition to enhance the reputation of Netherlandish painting. Huygens's account of painters – written in 1631, as part of the autobiography of his youth – shows that this was by no means a strange notion. After all, he discusses only painters of the Low Countries (which in Huygens's view included both the Northern and the Southern Netherlands), and considers the level of Netherlandish art to be unsurpassed.<sup>33</sup> At the same time, however, the stadholder's inventories reveal that the paintings in their collection, although of Netherlandish origin, nevertheless represent international courtly tastes. The painters they esteemed most highly had all spent a long time in Italy and had already enjoyed great success among Italian princes and aristocrats. First among them were the Antwerp artists Peter Paul Rubens and Anthony van Dyck, at this time the most famous painters of the Low Countries. These artists were considered the best representatives of the Italian style in the Netherlands; a number of their history paintings served as overmantels and others hung as showpieces in the galleries.<sup>34</sup> Other overmantels had been supplied by Gerard van Honthorst, whereas Cornelis van Poelenburch was the painter by whom they owned the greatest number of works. Both artists had spent years working for the Roman – and in Poelenburch's case, also the Florentine – nobility. Poelenburch's refined Southern landscapes with staffage representing mythological or biblical subjects decorated Frederik Hendrik's and Amalia's rooms.<sup>35</sup> Rembrandt and Lievens, still very young at the time, were well represented by works from their Leiden period as early as 1632; the commission granted to Rembrandt to paint seven Passion scenes (five between 1633 and 1639 and two in 1646), for which he was paid the fabulous sum of 5,400 guilders, was still to come. Even though Rembrandt and Lievens never travelled to Italy, they were considered, as Huygens explains at length, to be young painters who had surpassed the Italians and even the artists of antiquity.<sup>36</sup> That the subject matter was often of secondary

---

<sup>32</sup> See, for example, the Italian damask and satin among the interior decorations that had just been purchased to furnish the new rooms in the Stadholder's Quarters, Honselaarsdijk Palace and Huis te Nieuburg; Drossaers and Scheurleer, *Inventarissen ...Oranjes*, I, 230; the following pages also contain the occasional mention of Italian damask, and a bedstead with "velvet curtains that came from France" ("fluweele behangsels uyt Vranckrijck gekomen").

<sup>33</sup> Constantijn Huygens, *Mijn Jeugd*, translated and with an introduction by C. L. Heesakkers (Amsterdam: Querido Uitgeverij, 1987), 72, 74, 77-90.

<sup>34</sup> Drossaers and Scheurleer, *Inventarissen ... Oranjes*, I; for Rubens, see nos. 94, 208 (overmantel), 218 (or Van Dyck), 230 (with Brueghel), 516 (overmantel), 620 (overmantel); Van Dyck: 11 (overmantel), 25 (overmantel), 95, 190 (overmantel); in Amalia's inventory of 1654: nos. 1178 and 1239.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibidem*; for Honthorst, see nos. 44 (overmantel), 50, 51, 66 101 (overmantel), 102, 611. Poelenburch: nos. 59, 67, 69, 74, 75, 79, 232, 233, 234 (2), 81 (twice with Alexander Keirinx), 241 (with Roelant Savery), 1246 (with Kerinx); in Amalia's inventory of 1654: 1195, 1196, 1201.

<sup>36</sup> See, for instance, *Vorstelijk verzameld*, eds. Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, 38, 184-97.

importance to Frederik Hendrik and Amalia, certainly where famous painters were concerned, is nicely expressed by the only stipulation placed by Frederik Hendrik on a commission to Rubens: Rubens was allowed to come up with a subject of his own choosing, but the composition had to include three or at most four figures, “in which the beauty of women should be elaborated with love, studiousness and diligence”!<sup>37</sup>

The preference for Poelenburch shows that delicately painted landscapes, often containing historical scenes – such as those by Hendrick van Balen, Jan Brueghel the Elder and Roelant Savery, by whom they also owned paintings – were an obvious favorite.<sup>38</sup> Mythological subject matter, usually very sparse elsewhere in Dutch collections, was well represented here, mostly by generally known, slightly erotic subjects in compositions by Van Dyck, Van Balen, Rembrandt and the Utrecht artists Poelenburch, Honthorst and Moreelse.<sup>39</sup> A number of then uncommon subjects from post-classical literature – paintings by Van Dyck, among others – likewise depicted amorous episodes.<sup>40</sup> This trend soon culminated in the monumental *Pastor Fido* series, painted for one of Amalia’s rooms at Honselaarsdijk by the Utrecht artists Abraham Bloemaert, Herman Saftleven, Cornelis van Poelenburch and Poelenburch’s Hague pupil Dirck van der Lisse.<sup>41</sup>

In contrast to most Reformed burghers, Frederik Hendrik and Amalia owned very few paintings of Old Testament subjects, but New Testament themes were relatively well represented in their collection.<sup>42</sup> These religious works, which were all hanging in Frederik

---

<sup>37</sup> “que la beauté des femmes y fust élabourée con amore, studio e diligenza”: cited, among other places, in Inge Broekman, *Constantijn Huygens, de kunst en het hof* (Amsterdam: Ph.D. diss. University of Amsterdam, 2010), 92. The painting was never executed, because Rubens died shortly after receiving the commission.

<sup>38</sup> Drossaers and Scheurleer, *Inventarissen ... Oranjes*; for Van Balen, see nos. 61, 65, 72, 110, 239, 240; Jan Brueghel, nos. 230 (with Rubens), 243 (three small landscapes); Roelant Savery, nos. 57, 236, 237, 241 (with Poelenburch); in Amalia’s inventory of 1654, nos. 1216, 1217. Paul Brill and Johann Rottenhammer (a German active in Italy, the only non-Netherlander) were also represented by several small landscapes: Brill, nos. 62, 63; Rottenhammer, no. 73.

<sup>39</sup> For example, *Diana and her Nymphs* and *Venus and Ceres with Satyrs* by Honthorst; *Banquet of the Gods* (twice), *Flora with Putti*, *Neptune with Venus and Cupid* by Poelenburch; *Diana and Actaeon*, “the story of Venus,” and a *Banquet of the Gods* by Van Balen; *Venus and Cupid* and *Venus and Adonis* by Moreelse (Drossaers and Scheurleer, *Inventarissen ... Oranjes*, I, 182-93. There were also a few pieces with shepherds and shepherdesses that heralded the incipient pastoral mode: an overmantel “with shepherdesses” (“met harderinneken”) by Honthorst (no. 223), “two nymphs with Coridon” (“twee nimfen met Coridon”) by Moreelse (no. 231) and two “shepherdesses” (“harderinnen”) by Jan van Bijlert (no. 52).

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem*: Van Dyck: *The Kissing Contest of Amaryllis and Mirtillo* from Guarini’s *Pastor Fido* and *Rinaldo and Armida* from Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata*; Bloemaert: *Theagenes and Chariclea* from the *Historiae Aethiopicæ* by Heliodorus; Jan Lievens: a fortune-telling scene from Cervantes’s *La Gitanella de Madrid*. On Lievens’s painting, see *Jan Lievens: A Dutch Master Rediscovered*, ed. Arthur Wheelock, exh. cat. (Washington: National Gallery; New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 132-33. For the other paintings, see, among others, *Vorstelijk verzameld*, ed. Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, 67, 100-07, 114-17. Classical history was represented almost exclusively by Rubens: *Alexander and Roxane*, *Artemisia* and the *Flight of Cloelia*. See, among others, *Vorstelijk Verzameld*, eds. Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, 37, 66, 198-99.

<sup>41</sup> Regarding the *Pastor Fido* series, see, among others, *Het gedroomde land. Pastorale schilderkunst in de Gouden Eeuw*, ed. Peter van den Brink, exh. cat. (Utrecht: Centraal Museum; Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 1993), 115-19, 100-203, 245-47, 254-58 and *Vorstelijk Verzameld*, eds. Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, 216-25.

<sup>42</sup> Drossaers and Scheurleer, *Inventarissen ... Oranjes*, vol. I; Old Testament scenes: “A Moses striking water from the rock by Lastman” (no. 53), a *Samson and Delilah* by Rembrandt (no. 87, as Lievens), and an anonymous piece depicting *Judith and Holofernes* (no. 166).

Hendrik's rooms, displayed a remarkable number of themes encountered mainly in a Catholic milieu, and in fact these paintings had been produced by Catholic artists, such as Rubens, Poelenburch, Honthorst and Van Balen.<sup>43</sup> There were also a couple of seascapes and several architectural perspectives (church or palace interiors), but still lifes were scarce, contrary to what one would expect of this decorative genre.<sup>44</sup> Frederik Hendrik and Amalia did not own genre pieces – depictions of scenes from everyday life – apart from a painting of tric-trac players and a portrayal of music-making courtesans by Honthorst. The stadholderly couple's later acquisitions, which are not under consideration here, do not change the picture.<sup>45</sup> Suffice it to say that in her own palace – the Huis ten Bosch (cat. 00), completed after Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647 – Amalia van Solms surrounded herself with a very select group of works by her favorite artists: Van Dyck, Honthorst and now, too, Govert Flinck, the only Amsterdammer who managed to gain acceptance from the stadholder's family. The costly wall-coverings left little room for paintings, which hung mainly above the beautifully hewn mantelpieces.<sup>46</sup> The use of painting in these palaces to produce monumental scenes intended to glorify the prince – which reached its apex in the decorative program of the Oranjezaal – is beyond the scope of this essay.<sup>47</sup>

To what extent Constantijn Huygens provided advice and guidance in the purchase and commissioning of the works in their collection – a role he is supposed to have fulfilled – is unclear.<sup>48</sup> It is likely that Frederik Hendrik and Amalia were themselves actively involved

---

<sup>43</sup> A “crucifixion” is mentioned twice (nos. 108 and 109), both in Frederik Hendrik's cabinet, which also featured an *Adoration of the Shepherds* by Honthorst (101) and the same subject rendered by Van Balen (110), as well as *Simeon with the Christ Child in the Temple* by Rembrandt (111). An *Annunciation* by Rubens hung in Frederik Hendrik's gallery (no. 94), where there was also a *Magdalen* by Goltzius (no. 85), a *Mary and Joseph*, a *Landscape with the Virgin and Child* and a *Saint Martin* by Poelenburch (nos. 65, 67, 79), a *Virgin and Child* and a *Virgin* by Van Balen (the last two – nos. 65 and 110 – were both made in collaboration with Brueghel), an anonymous *Virgin and Child* – “very beautifully done” – and an anonymous *Circumcision of Christ*.

<sup>44</sup> They owned only a few, very refined flower pieces by such painters as Jan Brueghel, Bartholomeus van der Ast and Ambrosius Bosschaert. In the 1640s and early 1650s they also bought spectacular flower “cartouches” by Father Daniël Seghers, which were coveted by all the rulers of Europe. See Amalia's inventory of 1654, nos. 1179 and 1247; see also a number of later inventories of, for example, Honselaarsdijk (1707). On Frederik Hendrik and Seghers, see, among others, *Vorstelijk verzameld*, eds. Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, 208-11 and 246-49 (on the golden palette with golden maulstick and brushes that Frederik Hendrik gave Seghers).

<sup>45</sup> See Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, “Stadhouderlijke schilderijenverzameling,” 40-47. On Honselaarsdijk Palace, see Rebecca Tucker, *The Art of Living Nobly: The Patronage of Prince Frederik Hendrik (1584-1647) at the Palace of Honselaarsdijk during the Dutch Republic* (Ann Arbor, UMI: PhD Dissertation, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University 2002). On the commissions and part played in them by Huygens, see Broekman, *Constantijn Huygens*, 129-54.

<sup>46</sup> The works by Van Dyck were two portraits of her son and daughter-in-law Mary Stuart and another portrait of the latter; Honthorst's works were portraits of her husband, daughters, son, daughter-in-law and son-in-law (the Great Elector); Drossaers and Scheurleer, *Inventarissen ... Oranjes*, I, 281-82. On Flinck's work and its installation as an overmantel in the large cabinet, together with works by Willeboirts Bosschaert and Seghers, see Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, “Stadhouderlijke schilderijenverzameling,” 128-31.

<sup>47</sup> On the Oranjezaal, see Margriet van Eikema Hommes and Elmer Kolfin, *De Oranjezaal in Huis ten Bosch. Een zaal uit loutere liefde* (Zwolle: Waanders Uitgevers, 2013).

<sup>48</sup> Broekman, *Constantijn Huygens*, 125-29 (e.g. Hudig, Fock, Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, Hofman et al.), 171 (Van Gelder, Westermann), 173 (Jardine). Inge Broekman argues convincingly that there is not one document which points to this, whereas it can be demonstrated that Frederik Hendrik and Amalia were directly involved in such matters.

in choosing artists and granting commissions, and that Huygens, as secretary, was primarily responsible for the correspondence and the business arrangements.<sup>49</sup> It has always been assumed that Huygens owned an important collection of artworks himself, but that, too, is unsubstantiated.<sup>50</sup> He was undoubtedly very knowledgeable about the painters of his day, but he did not spend much money on art. In various poems Huygens refers to art as a waste of money and airs his opinion that one is so inured to the art in one's own home that one walks past beautiful paintings without noticing them; one would do better to enjoy art – free of charge – in the collections of friends.<sup>51</sup> It is not as though Huygens had no paintings at all, but the ones he did own were – again – portraits, which he valued mainly because of the sitters and not because of their artistic quality. Many of those portraits were copies after likenesses – both of princely persons and illustrious individuals he esteemed – which he had seen in other people's collections and had subsequently commissioned a copy or been given the portrait as a gift.<sup>52</sup> He collected, in particular, portraits of women whose beauty or talent he admired – not just queens, princesses and noblewomen, but also singers – and did not hesitate to ask for such portraits from the sitters themselves. He also had a weakness for female painters – Jeanne van Aerssen, Louise Hollandine and Geertje Pieters, the painting maidservant of the painter Maria van Oisterwijk<sup>53</sup> – whose work he sought to acquire, but preferably as a gift. Huygens also owned a large number of family portraits, which he had inherited, not to mention numerous portraits of himself by such painters as Jan Lievens, Thomas de Keyser (cat. 00), Michiel van Mierevelt, Adriaen Hanneman (with his children, Jacob van Campen (with Susanne van Baerle), Caspar Netscher and Anthony van Dyck (for the *Iconographie* – probably an oil sketch, engraved by Paulus Pontius). It would be difficult to find another seventeenth-century personage who had his portrait painted so often.

In addition to the portraits of himself, the only fairly expensive painting that Huygens commissioned was a large double portrait by Honthorst of his patron and patroness, Frederik Hendrik and Amalia (a replica of a work made for the princely couple, so it was probably not

---

<sup>49</sup> *Ibidem*, chapter 3, *passim*. With regard to commissions for Honselaarsdijk Palace, see also Tucker, *The Art of Living Nobly*, 344. Jacob van Campen – in consultation with the princely couple, and later with Amalia alone – must have been responsible for the iconography, compositions and commissioning of the paintings in the palace. Like present-day art historians, painters in those days also thought that Huygens played a much more important role. A number of them even wrote to him in hopes of obtaining a court commission; none of these painters ever succeeded in selling anything to Frederik Hendrik or Amalia.

<sup>50</sup> Broekman, *Constantijn Huygens*, chapter 2, *passim*. For examples of this assumption, see *Ibidem*, 75-77. Inge Broekman compiled all the information on paintings mentioned in Huygens's correspondence and poetry, and compared it to information gleaned from the inventories of Huygens's descendants.

<sup>51</sup> Given the paintings in Huygens's possession, this seems to have been a more serious matter than just a literary joke. See Broekman, *Constantijn Huygens*, 31-33.

<sup>52</sup> He owned, for example, portraits of Erasmus, Petrarch (and Laura), Janus Secundus and Marnix of St. Aldegonde.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibidem*, 97-120.

so expensive after all).<sup>54</sup> It hung in the stairwell of his house on the Plein as a way of emphasizing his close ties to the stadholderly couple and his high position in the Dutch Republic. The other paintings he owned were mainly gifts – some by painters who tried, through him, to gain access to the court (though not one of them succeeded), such as Adriaen van de Venne, Laurens Craen and Pieter Saenredam – or had been given to him as a token of gratitude for his mediation at court, such as the painting he received from Daniël Seghers.<sup>55</sup> Rembrandt, too, wished to present Huygens with a large painting, probably as a means of furthering his career among the Hague elite, but Huygens was disinclined to accept such a costly piece, and, after all the bickering about the delivery and payment of the Passion series, he certainly had no desire to be of further assistance to this troublemaker.<sup>56</sup> The only works that Huygens is known to have purchased were two apostle *tronies* by Van Dyck and two landscapes by Cornelis Vroom.<sup>57</sup> He did not, therefore, have an important collection of art. If he had indeed owned other works by famous masters, they would no doubt be traceable, either in the countless letters and poems penned by the vain Huygens, or in the letters and diaries of visitors to his home.<sup>58</sup> Even though he was a true connoisseur, Huygens spent little money on art, with the exception of portraits of himself and copies after portraits of men and women he admired – although he preferred to receive them as presents.

As secretary to the stadholder, Huygens was constantly in touch with courtiers and noble diplomats, which meant that he occupied a special place within the burgher elite. In the Seven Provinces the true “nobility” among the burgher elite consisted of the families that supplied the burgomasters of the large cities, particularly Amsterdam. Andries de Graeff – who served many times as burgomaster of Amsterdam and had his portrait painted by Rembrandt in 1639, at the age of twenty-eight (cat. 00) – and his brother Cornelis were for a long time among the most powerful (and wealthiest) men in the country.<sup>59</sup> Their grandfather had been a

<sup>54</sup> *Ibidem*, 94. The painting is now in the possession of the Mauritshuis in The Hague.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibidem*, 82-92.

<sup>56</sup> Eric Jan Sluijter, “Determining Value on the Art Market in the Golden Age: An Introduction,” in *Art Market and Connoisseurship. A Closer Look at Paintings by Rembrandt, Rubens and their Contemporaries*, eds. Anna Tummers and Koenraad Jonckheere (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2008), 14; Michael Zell, “Rembrandt’s Gifts: A Case Study of Actor-Network-Theory,” *Journal of the Historians of Netherlandish Art* 3, no. 2 (2011), <http://www.jhna.org/index.php/past-issues/volume-3-issue-2/143-zell-rembrandts-gifts>; Broekman, *Constantijn Huygens*, 85-86.

<sup>57</sup> Broekman, *Constantijn Huygens*, 83-84, 98-99.

<sup>58</sup> In this regard the diary entry written by Balthasar de Monconys has always been misunderstood; see Broekman, *Constantijn Huygens*, 119.

<sup>59</sup> On the De Graeffs, see, among others, J. E. Elias, *De vroedschap van Amsterdam, 1578-1795* (Amsterdam: Loosjes, 1903), 422-23 (Cornelis) and 520-21 (Andries); P. J. Blok and P. C. Molhuysen, *Nieuw Nederlands Biografisch Woordenboek* (Leiden: Sijthoff, 1912), vol. 2, 490-97; Kees Zandvliet, *De 250 rijksten van de Gouden Eeuw* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum and Nieuw Amsterdam Uitgevers, 2006), 77-79 (Andries).

burgomaster, and in 1610 their father had bought the manor of Zuid-Polsbroek, after which he took to calling himself Lord of Polsbroek. The De Graeffs, too, apparently considered an exceptional collection of paintings less important than a portrait gallery. In their case, however, the portraits were not of princes, aristocrats or luminaries; instead, almost all of them were monumental portraits of themselves and their families. Whereas the quality of the portraits seemed to be of little importance to noble families such as the Brederodes and the Van Boetzelaers, the portraits owned by families like the De Graeffs were usually commissioned from the very best painters. And unlike the painters who worked for the court, these select artists did not come from Antwerp, Utrecht or The Hague/Delft, but from Amsterdam, where intense competition propelled the quality of portraiture to unprecedented heights.<sup>60</sup>

Cornelis de Graeff and his wife, Catharina Hooft, had their portraits painted twice by Nicolaes Elias Pickenoy, after which they had themselves portrayed by Jacob Backer, Bartholomeus van der Helst and Govert Flinck in succession, and had marble portrait medallions made of both of them by Artus Quellinus and a *portrait historié* by Jan Victors. Catharina Hooft, moreover, had been painted as a small child in the arms of her wet nurse by Frans Hals, now one of the most famous portraits of the seventeenth century. Just imagine having such portraits of oneself on the wall! Around 1660 De Graeff commissioned Thomas de Keyser and Jacob van Ruisdael to portray himself and his family riding in a coach (and his two sons on horseback) in front of Soestdijk, their country estate.<sup>61</sup> Cornelis also commissioned a copy – to which his two sons were added – after Jacob Backer’s civic militia painting of his Klovenierscompagnie.<sup>62</sup> Cornelis’s brother Andries was portrayed not only by Rembrandt but also by Bartholomeus van der Helst, Govert Flinck, Jan Lievens and, with his entire family, by Jurriaan Ovens, who also painted the children separately, and finally, in

---

<sup>60</sup> The following passage on the De Graeffs is based on information taken from a chapter of Elmer Kolfin’s forthcoming study of Jordaens, the De Graeffs and the Amsterdam town hall, in which he examines the De Graeff brothers’ knowledge and taste in the field of painting.

<sup>61</sup> On the portraits by Pickenoy, see S. A. C. Dudok van Heel, *De jonge Rembrandt onder tijdgenoten* (Ph. D. diss. Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, 2006), 46-64 and *Hollanders in beeld. Portretten uit de Gouden Eeuw*, eds. Rudi Ekkart and Quentin Buvelot, exh. cat. (The Hague: Mauritshuis; Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2007), 176-80. The portrait by Jacob Backer was sold at auction in Zürich (Koller), 17 September 2010, lot 3062 (reference supplied by Peter van den Brink). The pendants by Van der Helst are no longer known, but are listed in an eighteenth-century inventory; see Judith van Gent, *Bartholomeus van der Helst. Een studie naar zijn leven en werk* (Zwolle: W Books, 2011), 368, nos. S112 and S113 (it is not known if the sitter is Cornelis or Andries). On the portraits by Flinck, see J. G. von Moltke, *Govaert Flinck, 1615-1660* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1965), 154-55, nos. 424-25. The painting by Victors depicts Jacob and his family taking leave of Laban (dated 1652); for a reproduction, see W. Sumowski, *Gemälde der Rembrandt-Schüler* (Landau/Pfalz: Edition PVA, 1983), vol. 4, 2654, no. 1755. A great deal has been written about De Keyser and Ruisdael’s painting in the National Gallery of Ireland by, among others, Seymour Slive, *Jacob van Ruisdael: A Complete Catalogue of Paintings, Drawings and Etchings* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 106-08. On Quellinus, see F. Scholten, “Quellinus’s burgomasters: a portrait gallery of Amsterdam republicanism,” *Simiolus* 32 (2006): 101-02.

<sup>62</sup> *Jacob Backer (1608/9-1651)*, eds. Peter van der Brink, Jaap van der Veen, exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Museum het Rembrandthuis; Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2008), 236, A 92.

1673, by Gerard ter Borch in a small refined portrait.<sup>63</sup> So it was not just one “court painter”; rather, the De Graeffs had themselves portrayed by a whole series of painters who were favorites among the Amsterdam elite. Their likenesses – along with those of members of the families of Overlander, Bicker, Hooft, Banninck Cock, and De Wit – all ended up in the possession of Pieter de Graeff, Cornelis’s son, who was thus able to install a spectacular Gallery of Ancestors at Ilpenstein Castle.<sup>64</sup>

Rembrandt’s 1639 likeness of Andries was the last in a series of full-length, life-size portraits, a format previously reserved for princes and the high nobility and apparently inspired primarily by portraits of English aristocrats.<sup>65</sup> In 1615 Volckert Overlander and Geertruyt Hooft – the parents of Cornelis de Graeff’s first wife, and the uncle and aunt of his second wife, Catharina Hooft – had themselves portrayed in this way. In 1612 Volckert had acquired the manor of Purmerland and Ilpendam from the count of Egmond, and in 1620 he had become a knight of the British Empire; the aristocratic aspirations of the Amsterdam elite thus manifested themselves early in the seventeenth century.<sup>66</sup> Dirck de Graeff (brother of Cornelis and Andries) and his wife, Eva Bicker, had their portraits painted full-length, as did a number of other family members; this type would culminate in the previously mentioned portraits painted by Pickenoy of Cornelis de Graeff and Catharina Hooft in 1636 (fig. 00) and Rembrandt’s portrait of Andries of 1639 (cat. 00).<sup>67</sup> The sitters’ pretensions are as plain as day, but this is hardly surprising, since they belonged to families that were among the most powerful in the Republic, and could parley on an equal footing with noble diplomats from other countries.

Pickenoy portrayed them with the detached, impassive stateliness common to the rulers and high nobility of all countries. Rembrandt, on the other hand, experimented with the latest fashion – which, since its introduction by Van Dyck, had recently become the rage at the English court – by portraying Andries with an elegantly draped cloak and a somewhat nonchalant *contrapposto*, leaning against a pedestal, a pose employed by Van Dyck several years earlier in his portrait of Prince Rupert, a son of the Winter King.<sup>68</sup> Elegance of this kind

---

<sup>63</sup> See Von Moltke, *Govaert Flinck*, 107, no. 205; H. Schneider and R. E. O. Ekkart, *Jan Lievens. Sein Leben und seine Werke* (Amsterdam: B. M. Israël, 1973), 146 and Norbert Middelkoop, *Kopstukken. Amsterdammers geportretteerd 1600-1800*, exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Amsterdams Historisch Museum; Bussum: Uitgeverij Toth, 2002), 134-36.

<sup>64</sup> On this subject, see Dudok van Heel, *De jonge Rembrandt*, 315-71, esp. 347-49.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibidem*, 320-21.

<sup>66</sup> The portrait of Volckert Overlander is anonymous and known only from late nineteenth-century reproductions. Dudok van Heel attributes it with reservations to Cornelis van der Voort (*Ibidem*, 347-49).

<sup>67</sup> *Ibidem*, 317-49.

<sup>68</sup> Reference is usually made to Van Dyck’s portrait of Cesare Alessandro Scaglia (*Ibidem*, 340 with references), but the portrait of Prince Rupert (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum) that Van Dyck painted for Frederick V of Bohemia and his wife (the Winter King and Queen) in The Hague (where Rembrandt might have seen it) is closer with regard to the pose; on

remained, for the time being, a one-off experiment, so it is highly questionable if such a nonchalant courtly pose actually pleased the Amsterdam elite; only at the end of the 1640s did they finally accept a somewhat watered-down version of Van Dyck's style, chiefly as practiced by Flinck.<sup>69</sup> The quarrel that arose over Rembrandt's painting probably had to do with its payment: at any rate, Andries ended up paying all of 500 guilders for it.<sup>70</sup> An equally spectacular and undoubtedly much more expensive portrait, which Andries commissioned much later, was a marble bust by Artus Quellinus, produced in 1661; this was, after all, the ultimate way for a potentate to have himself portrayed – the reference to a famous Roman portrait bust of Brutus must have appealed to Andries.<sup>71</sup>

Unfortunately there are no inventories of the estates of Andries and Cornelis, but inasmuch as can be ascertained from early eighteenth-century inventories of their heirs, their collection of paintings was impressive mainly because of its size, which was considerably boosted by all those portraits.<sup>72</sup> The approximately 100 paintings that Catharina Hooft had in her house on the Herengracht at the time of her death in 1692 (unfortunately, her inventory does not name the painters) had a total value of 1,300 guilders – an average of ten guilders a painting – a rather unimpressive showing. Although Andries and Cornelis were instrumental in Amsterdam in granting important civic commissions to prominent history painters for such projects as the decoration of the town hall, they seemingly had no need – and in this they resembled Huygens and most aristocrats – to surround themselves with paintings other than portraits. It was not as if their collections were entirely bereft of good pieces, however. Late in his career Andries commissioned Gerard de Lairesse to make a magnificent allegorical ceiling painting in his new house on the Herengracht, while the chief reception room is said to have boasted an overmantel by Rembrandt.<sup>73</sup> It is likely that Andries also owned an important

---

this painting, see, among others, *Van Dyck 1599-1641*, eds. Christopher Brown and Hans Vlieghe, exh. cat. (Antwerp: Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten; London, Royal Academy, Royal Academy Publications, 1999), 236-37.

<sup>69</sup> On the relationship of Flinck's portraits to Van Dyck, see Hilbert Lootsma, "Tracing a pose: Govert Flinck and the emergence of the van Dyckian mode of portraiture in Amsterdam," *Simiolus* 33 (2007/8): 221-36.

<sup>70</sup> With regard to this quarrel, see Paul Crenshaw, *Rembrandt's Bankruptcy. The Artist, His Patrons and the Art Market in Seventeenth-Century Netherlands* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 111-20.

<sup>71</sup> On the works of Quellinus, see Scholten, "Quellinus's burgomasters," 101-05.

<sup>72</sup> There exists an inventory drawn up in 1691 of the possessions of Catharina Hooft at Ilpenstein Castle and a 1692 inventory of her possessions in the house on the Herengracht (Getty Provenance Index, N-183

[<http://piprod.getty.edu/starweb/pi/servlet.starweb>]). Both inventories contain short descriptions of the paintings but do not name the painters. The most detailed inventory is the one drawn up in 1709 of the possessions of Pieter de Graeff, who inherited a great deal from both Cornelis and Andries; this inventory does name painters, but disappointingly few; some of the listings include appraisals (GPI N-470). There also exist inventories of Alida de Graeff of 1733 and Gerrit de Graeff of 1753. All of these inventories, most of them kept in the De Graeff family archive in the Amsterdam City Archives, were studied by Elmer Kolfin. See also Dudok van Heel, "Het maecenaat van de Graeff en Rembrandt," *Maandblad Amstelodamum* 56 (1969): 150-55 and 249-83.

<sup>73</sup> See Dudok van Heel, "Maecenaat de Graeff," 150. Manuth and De Winkel suggested that the Minerva which Vos praised at Andries's house, though without mentioning the name of the painter (Jan Vos, *Alle de Werken* [Amsterdam: Lescaillje, 1662], 561), could have been Rembrandt's large *Minerva* of 1635 (Volker Manuth and Marieke de Winkel, *Rembrandt's Minerva in her Study of 1635: The Splendor and Wisdom of a Goddess* [New York: Otto Naumann, 2002], 15); one may well

work by Pieter Saenredam, which left his collection to become part of the “Dutch Gift” to the king of England; it is difficult to determine what other paintings he owned, but it seems, given the appraisals in the inventories of his heirs, that his collection of paintings was not very special.<sup>74</sup> The majority of Cornelis and Catharina’s artworks had probably been inherited or purchased at the beginning of his career, because the few painters who are mentioned by name are mostly Haarlem and Amsterdam artists of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century.<sup>75</sup>

If we take a look at another regent, Frederick Alewijn – who did not rise as high as the De Graeffs, though he was a close relative of theirs and also lived on the Herengracht<sup>76</sup> – we are struck once again by the great number of family portraits in his inventory of 1665: a total of twenty-five, mainly of the Alewijn family, but also a few De Graeffs and Bickers.<sup>77</sup> These were not hanging in the chief reception room, however, but in the back room and the upstairs front room, suggesting that they were there for the family’s own enjoyment, rather than to enhance their prestige. Only the *pater familias*, Dirck Alewijn, had his portrait hanging in the chief reception room, which also contained the best pieces, such as two large paintings of *The Crowning with Thorns* by Hendrick ter Brugghen and a *Cain and Abel* by Frans Floris, *Laborers in the Hayfield* by Abraham Bloemaert, two tronies by Rembrandt, a landscape by Alexander Keirincx, five grisailles by Aegidius Sadeler and a large seascape that served as an overmantel. The paintings in other rooms included a *Pedilavium* by Pieter Aertsen, a nude by Pieter de Grebber, a grisaille by Bartholomeus Spranger and a Marcus Curtius by Cornelis Holsteyn. The rest of the ninety-four paintings were unnamed and were probably of no great value: some marine paintings, a couple of landscapes, peasant scenes, the Four Evangelists, a Proserpine, a banquet still life, birds, tulips and a single genre piece, depicting a young woman playing the lute: in short, a miscellany of paintings, comprising not so much a choice

---

ask if this was actually the overmantel in question, installed by Andries after his move. With regard to Lairese’s work, the most spectacular of all his ceiling paintings, a forthcoming publication by Tatjana van Run examines the information provided by new research into, and the restoration of, these paintings (now in the Vredespaleis in The Hague).

<sup>74</sup> One of the most interesting is a copy after Jordaens of an *Adam and Eve* in an inventory of the possessions of his daughter Alida, which appears to have been purchased or received as a gift in the period when Jordaens was working for the town hall. On Saenredam’s interior of St. Bavo’s and the “Dutch Gift” to Charles II, see G. Schwartz and M. J. Bok, *Pieter Saenredam: The Painter and His Time* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1990), 261, cat. 58. Now in Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland. On the “Dutch Gift,” see, among others, Friso Lammertse and Jaap van der Veen, *Uylenburgh & Zoon. Kunst en commercie van Rembrandt tot De Lairese*, exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Museum het Rembrandthuis; Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2006), 64-70.

<sup>75</sup> For example, Maarten van Heemskerck, Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem and Pieter de Molijn (all from Haarlem) and Pieter Aertsen, Dirck Barendsz, Cornelis Ketel, Jan Pynas, David Vinckboons, Roelant Savery and David Colijns (all from Amsterdam). The only Southern Netherlandish artist mentioned is Frans Floris, and the only Utrecht artist Abraham Bloemaert. Only two much younger painters are named: the Italianate landscape painter Jan Asselijn with an “Evening Hour” and Anthonie Beerstraten with a view of “old Amsterdam.” This information comes from Elmer Kolfin, who combined information from various inventories and was able to connect a number of descriptions with names from later inventories.

<sup>76</sup> His wife, Eva Bicker, was the widow of Dirck de Graeff (younger brother of Cornelis and Andries), who died young.

<sup>77</sup> *Montias Database*, inv. no. 400 (<http://research.frick.org/montias/browserecord.php?-action=browse&-recid=1585>).

collection as an assortment of fashionable pictures for the reception room and some decoration for the other rooms. Apparently he did not own any very expensive paintings or works by foreign masters, which was probably the norm among regents.

Beautiful collections with Italian paintings must be sought among a few true art lovers who were also collectors: wealthy merchants who had many trading contacts with Italy and had also lived there, such as Jan and Gerrit Reynst, Balthasar Coymans and his sons, and Lucas van Uffelen. Indeed, Van Uffelen was the only one who could pride himself on having had his own portrait painted – not once, but twice – by Van Dyck. His collection was sold at auction in 1639 for the staggering sum of 50,456 guilders.<sup>78</sup> With the exception of the Reynst brothers, all of these collectors were natives of the Southern Netherlands and had not yet climbed to the top of Amsterdam's ruling elite, although the following generation of the Coymans and Reynst families would succeed in doing so. Somewhat later in the century, connoisseurs such as Jan Six, the son of a wealthy merchant who married into the regents' class, and the rich silk trader Philips de Flines, would join their ranks as collectors of important Italian paintings. Like Coymans and Van Uffelen, they, too, came from families who had fled the Southern Netherlands (in their case present-day North France) and settled in Amsterdam in the 1580s. The extremely wealthy Coymans family, originally from Antwerp, was among the first to build, as early as 1624, a classicist mansion of truly monumental proportions on an Amsterdam canal, "full of wonderfully large rooms, with costly paintings and other decorations."<sup>79</sup> In this impressive house (designed by Jacob van Campen, the same architect who later worked on the Oranges' palaces and the Amsterdam town hall), they had a large number of works by contemporary Italian painters – purchased in Italy by Balthasar I and his son Joan, and highly praised by Joachim von Sandrart – but they must also have owned work by Rembrandt and Flinck, the most famous Amsterdam masters. Unfortunately, no inventory of their possessions has been preserved.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> On collections containing Italian art, see in particular Bert W. Meijer, "Italian Paintings in 17th Century Holland: Art Market, Art Works and Art Collections," in *Europa e l'arte Italiana. Per I cento anni dalla fondazione del Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz*, eds. M. Sidel and B. Brenk (Venice: Atti del Convegno internazionale Florence 1997, 2000), 377-417.

<sup>79</sup> Regarding the house, see K. Ottenheim, "Architectuur," in *Jacob van Campen, Het klassieke ideaal in de Gouden Eeuw*, eds. J. Huisken, K. Ottenheim and G. Schwartz (Amsterdam: Architectura & Natura Pers, 1995), 158-61. The quotation was taken from Luuc Kooijmans, *Vriendschap en de kunst van het overleven in de zeventiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Bert Bakker, 1997), 122, without source: "vol heerlijke groote zalen, met kostelijke schilderijen en andere vercierselen." [J. F. F. L.] De Balbian Verster, "Het huis van Coymans," *Maandblad Amstelodamum* 16 (1929), 31, mentions Melchior Fokkens as his source, without further reference.

<sup>80</sup> Joachim von Sandrart, *Teutsche Academie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlery Künste*, Nürnberg 1675/1679/1680 (eds. Thomas Kirchner et al. 2009-2012: <http://ta.sandrart.net>), II, Book 2, 188 (<http://ta.sandrart.net/-text-401>) and II, Book 2, 190 (<http://ta.sandrart.net/-text-404>). For the announcement of the sale of the Coymans collection in 1709 (in which a number of names are mentioned), see S. A. C. Dudok van Heel, "Honderdvijftig advertenties van kunstverkopingen uit veertig jaargangen van de Amsterdamsche Courant, 1672-1711," *Jaarboek Amstelodamum* 67 (1975), 170-71, n. 24 and Jonathan Bikker, "Balthasar Coymans's Italian paintings and Annibale Carracci's Melancholy," in *Collected Opinions: Essays on*

Less wealthy than the Coymanses, but still one of the richest men in Haarlem, was the cloth merchant Willem Heythuysen, another native of the Southern Netherlands, who, like so many other Southern Netherlandish merchants, had moved first to Cologne and then to Frankfurt before emigrating to Haarlem, where he settled around 1613.<sup>81</sup> The inventory – drawn up at his death in 1650 – of his plentiful and splendid possessions includes, among his approximately 100 paintings, “the effigy or likeness of Willem Heythuysen with a length of black cloth over it” in the “large reception room” – a large full-length portrait that was apparently covered as a sign of mourning for Van Heythuysen’s death (cat. 00).<sup>82</sup> Visitors entering the reception room would no doubt have been taken aback to see the master of the house, portrayed large as life, leaning on a huge silver-decorated sword and standing in front of a red drapery, as though he were the king of England. Never before had a Dutchman had himself portrayed so pretentiously. A few Amsterdam regents had themselves portrayed full-length, but not in such an imposing view from below, and certainly not leaning on a sword (which cannot be a reference to an important position in the civic militia, because Willem was not a member). Similar views from below in full-length portraits are known before this time only from several portraits by Van Dyck of Genoese nobles such as the Spinolas. What moved Heythuysen to have Frans Hals paint his portrait in such a way? The garden of love in the left background and the roses on the ground, which contrast so sharply with his regal bearing and his position in front of the heavy curtain, almost make one think that both painter and sitter are mocking the full-length portraits of courtiers and the few Amsterdam regents who had not only dared to have themselves portrayed in this way but had spent great sums of money to acquire foreign titles of nobility, as Laurens Reael and Volckert Overlander had done.<sup>83</sup> Ten years later Van Heythuysen had himself portrayed by Hals in an equally unusual way, but that small portrait exudes an informal nonchalance seen in no one else’s likeness; only Hals’s portrait of Isaac Massa (cat. 00), another prosperous merchant in Haarlem with roots in the Southern Netherlands, approaches its lively immediacy.<sup>84</sup>

Unfortunately, the listings of Heythuysen’s rich holdings do not include the artists’ names, nor is there much information about the subjects of his paintings; the inventory was

---

*Netherlandish Art in Honour of Alfred Bader*, eds. Volker Manuth and Axel Rüger (London: Paul Holberton Publishing, 2004), 26–33.

<sup>81</sup> He was born in Weert around 1586/87. Weert is now in the Dutch province of Limburg, but in the seventeenth century it belonged to the Spanish (and later Austrian) part of the Netherlands. For biographical information, see Pieter Biesboer, *Collections of Paintings in Haarlem 1572-1745* (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2001), 115-16.

<sup>82</sup> For the inventory, see Biesboer, *Collections of Paintings*, 117-19 (see also the Getty Provenance Index, inv. no. N-3650). For the painting, see, among others, Rudi Ekkart and Quentin Buvelot, *Hollanders in beeld*, no. 18, with further references.

<sup>83</sup> Overlander became a knight of the British Empire in 1620 and Laurens Reael received a knighthood in 1625 (Dudok van Heel, *De jonge Rembrandt*, 326 and 348).

<sup>84</sup> For this small portrait of Heythuysen, see *Ibidem*, no. 20, with further references.

obviously the work of an incompetent clerk, or at least one with no knowledge of painting. One gets the impression that the house was decorated with notable pictures, most of them in ebony or gilt frames. Many of them are described as large, one even as “a very large painting consisting of many large figures in a gilt frame.” The inventory lists, moreover, a remarkable number of nudes: “a large scene consisting of various nudes,” “three nudes on the ground” – perhaps Ceres, Bacchus and Venus seated on the ground – “a large scene with nude figures in a gilt frame,” and a Susanna as an overmantel. Did he collect the work of Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem and Hendrick Goltzius? Those are the names that such descriptions immediately call to mind. Goltzius is also suggested by the listing of “a large scene with two personages and some fruit,” which may well have been a Vertumnus and Pomona, a subject Goltzius painted a few times in large format.<sup>85</sup> Heythuysen also owned merry companies – “music-singers,” “young people” – kitchen pieces, banquet still lifes and peasant scenes, all of which are highly reminiscent of Haarlem artists (Dirck Hals, Pieter Claesz, Adriaen Brouwer, Jan Miense Molenaer?). And “a personage with a skull in an ebony frame” instantly recalls, given Heythuysen’s connection to Frans Hals, the latter’s phenomenal painting in the National Gallery in London. Heythuysen also owned landscapes, some quite large, and his country house, just outside the city walls, boasted what was probably a scantily clad “Lucretia Romana in front of the mantelpiece” and, once again, “the twelve Roman emperors painted, in gilt frames,” which we have already encountered several times among the nobility. (One wonders, for that matter, where all those emperors ended up.) He did not own many religious paintings, and evidently he was not particularly interested in owning portraits of sitters other than himself.

It is among such members of the elite – residing in one of the large cities of Holland, very well-off but not belonging to the highest regents’ circles, often merchants, sometimes intellectuals, quite often of Southern Netherlandish origin – that one can find huge quantities of paintings produced by contemporary Dutch painters whose works still fill our museums. Good examples include the well-to-do Leiden professor Franciscus de le Boë Sylvius and Hendrick Bugge van Ring, a descendant of a rich family of brewers: two Leiden contemporaries from whom we have detailed inventories.<sup>86</sup> These men were true art lovers

---

<sup>85</sup> For mythological nudes by Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem and Hendrick Goltzius, see Pieter J. J. van Thiel, *Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem 1562-1638: A Monograph and Catalogue Raisonné* (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1999), cat. nos. 113-95 and Lawrence W. Nichols, *The Paintings of Hendrick Goltzius (1568-1617)* (Doornspijk: Davaco, 2013), cat. nos. A 29-48 and biblical nudes: A1, 2, 5, 9, 10.

<sup>86</sup> On these collections, see Eric Jan Sluijter, “‘All striving to adorne their houses with costly peeeces.’ Two Case Studies of Paintings in Wealthy Interiors,” in *Art & Home: Dutch Interiors in the Golden Age*, ed. M. Westermann, exh. cat. (Denver: The Denver Art Museum; Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2001), 102-27.

who did not buy paintings simply to decorate the walls.<sup>87</sup> Professor Sylvius – born near Frankfurt but of Southern Netherlandish descent, and renowned in all of Europe as a progressive physician – had at the time of his death in 1672 a staggering collection of 172 paintings in his house on Leiden’s Rapenburg, which must have been filled to the brim with art.<sup>88</sup> The upstairs front room, for example – approximately twenty-five by twenty feet, with large windows at the front, and containing two beds, ten chairs, two armchairs, a walnut cabinet and a cradle – had forty-two paintings hanging on the wall, as well as two large mirrors. Almost all of these paintings had been made by contemporary Northern Netherlandish painters and purchased by Sylvius himself. Unfortunately, they were not appraised, but his collection must have been worth a fortune, because it included eleven paintings by Gerrit Dou (six of them precious enough to be kept in a small display case with doors) and nine by Frans van Mieris the Elder, the most famous and most highly priced painters of their time. Among these artworks were a number of first-rate pieces, which had certainly cost more than 1,000 guilders apiece. Nearly all of Sylvius’s paintings were signed by artists whose names are still well known: Adriaen Brouwer, Jan Porcellis, Paulus Potter, Philips Wouwerman, Jan Davidz de Heem, Abraham Mignon, Balthasar van der Ast, Cornelis van Poelenburch – nearly all of them masters known for their detailed and delicately painted works. The only nude and one of the few biblical representations that Sylvius owned – his library indicates that he was a strict Calvinist – was a Bathsheba by Pieter Lastman. One of the few family portraits was a costly piece painted by Frans van Mieris that portrayed Sylvius and his late wife tuning her lute.

The Catholic Hendrick Bugge van Ring, who came from a rich family of brewers, had an even larger collection. The 1667 inventory of his 213 paintings lists the names of no fewer than 93 painters! This document was drawn up in the presence of Bugge, who must have been a true connoisseur with a good memory to boot. In cramming his house full of paintings, he went even farther than Sylvius: in the upstairs front room – probably comparable in size to the above-mentioned room in Sylvius’s house – Bugge had as many as sixty-four paintings, plus six bookcases. His collection was entirely different from Sylvius’s, however. He did not own

---

<sup>87</sup> In a seventeenth-century context it is difficult to distinguish between extensive holdings of paintings and collections of paintings (assembled by an owner who can be called a collector). I do not go into this subject, but the problem is examined in Jaap van der Veen, “Delftse verzamelingen in de zeventiende en eerste helft van de achttiende eeuw,” in *Schatten in Delft. Burgers verzamelen 1600-1750*, eds. E. Bergvelt et al., exh. cat. (Delft: Stedelijk Museum Het Prinsenhof; Zwolle: Waanders, 2002), 47-54.

<sup>88</sup> For the complete inventory, see Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurleer, C. Willemijn Fock and A. J. van Dissel, *Het Rapenburg. Geschiedenis van een Leidse gracht* (Leiden: Universiteit Leiden, 1988), vol. IIIa, 335-42. For a inventories-based study of painting ownership in Leiden, see C. Willemijn Fock, “Kunstbezit in Leiden in de 17de eeuw,” in *Ibidem*, vol. Va (1990), 3-36.

the work of foreign masters either, but he had a good many family portraits and plenty of religious paintings, mostly depicting subjects from the New Testament, including a large number of scenes from the Passion of Christ; an attic room, which was furnished as a private chapel, contained devotional pieces, a small altar and liturgical silver. A salient feature of his enormous collection was the large number of paintings by Jan van Goyen, Jan Steen and Quirijn van Brekelenkam, at first glance three quite different painters. What they had in common, however, is the fact that they all came from Leiden and, like Bugge, were Catholic – he was probably personally acquainted with all of them. Bugge’s paintings – and he truly owned every conceivable genre that was to be had in his lifetime – generally seem a bit less expensive and less refined than those in Sylvius’s collection, even though he undoubtedly paid a great deal of money for a spectacular flower garland by Adriaen van der Spelt with a curtain painted by Frans van Mieris. Such extensive and beautiful collections were exceptional, however.

Decidedly modest in comparison were the paintings owned by the Mennonite printer and bookseller Abraham van Casteleijn, portrayed with his wife, Margareta van Bancken, with such dignity by Jan de Bray (cat. 00).<sup>89</sup> In Casteleijn’s inventory – cursorily drawn up but including appraisals – the most valuable paintings are by the hand of “Casteleijn,” probably his elder brother, Vincent Casteleijn (one work valued at forty-four guilders and two at twenty guilders), a not very talented painter by whom hardly any work is known.<sup>90</sup> Other works that received rather high appraisals were by various minor masters of Haarlem: Abraham Begeijn (eighteen guilders), Thomas Wijck (fifteen guilders) and Cornelis Decker (fourteen guilders). A Frans Hals (without a description) was valued at ten guilders, as was “a copy after Steen”; the rest, including several works by Van Goyen, received even lower valuations. The majority of his seventy paintings – a surprisingly high number – were worth only between fifteen stuivers and five guilders. They had probably all been purchased in Haarlem for no purpose other than to decorate the walls of his house. The rather sober character of this assemblage of paintings was not necessarily due to the fact that Casteleijn

---

<sup>89</sup> On Abraham Casteleijn, see Biesboer, *Collections of Paintings*, 291. A Mennonite preference cannot be discerned in this concise inventory. But unlike the collections belonging to Catholics, Mennonite collections do not generally show a partiality for specific subjects (inasmuch as this can be ascertained). See Gabriël C. Pastoor, “Biblische Historienbilder im goldenen Zeitalter in Privatbesitz,” in ed. C. Tümpel, *Im Lichte Rembrandts. Das Alte Testament im Goldenen Zeitalter der niederländischen Kunst* (Munich/Berlin: Klinkhardt und Biermann, 1994), 124; S. A. C. Dudok van Heel, “Doopsgezinden en schilderkunst in de 17e eeuw – Leerlingen, opdrachtgevers en verzamelaars van Rembrandt,” *Doopsgezinde bijdragen*, nieuwe reeks 6 (1980), 105-23. Several articles that attempt to discover a connection between Mennonites and painting were published in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* 16 (1990), 113-54.

<sup>90</sup> Inventory of Margareta van Bancken, 1694, in *Ibidem*, 291-93.

was a Mennonite, for there were also well-to-do Mennonites with splendid collections of great value.<sup>91</sup>

The research carried out into the ownership of paintings in Amsterdam, Delft, Leiden and Haarlem has not been systematically examined with an eye to specific economic and social groups.<sup>92</sup> It therefore seems almost impossible to detect trends in the ownership of paintings by various social and/or economic groups.<sup>93</sup> Only a few general remarks can be made: Montias concluded that the number of paintings owned by the burghers of both Delft and Amsterdam not only increased along with disposable income but showed a proportionately greater increase than their ownership of other movable goods.<sup>94</sup> Moreover, Montias's research into Amsterdam inventories showed – and this was confirmed by Marion Goosens's study of Haarlem estates – that the ubiquitous increase in the number of landscape paintings was especially pronounced among the more prosperous estates.<sup>95</sup> The more extensive the inventories and the greater the number of attributed paintings – which is clearly connected to the richness and value of the estate – the greater the number of landscapes and seascapes in their samples.<sup>96</sup> The landscape paintings by masters known to us, even though they were not usually in the most expensive category, were to be found mainly in the inventories of more highly placed individuals who took a great interest in paintings; even the many anonymous

---

<sup>91</sup> See Dudok van Heel, "Doopsgezinden en schilderkunst," 117-20, the inventories of Cornelis Rutgers, Jan Pietersz Bruyningh and Ameldonck Leeuw, among others, all of whom owned a work (or works) by Rembrandt.

<sup>92</sup> Amsterdam: John Michael Montias, "Works of Art in Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam: An Analysis of Subjects and Attribution," in *Art in History – History in Art: Studies in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Culture*, eds. David Freedberg and Jan de Vries (Santa Monica, The Getty Center, 1991), 331-72 and John Michael Montias, "Works ... in Random Samples," 67-88. Leiden: Fock, "Kunstbezit in Leiden," 3-36; Delft: Montias, *Artists and Artisans*, 220-71; Haarlem: Biesboer, *Collections of Paintings*, passim; Marion Goosens, *Schilders en de markt. Haarlem 1605-1663* (Leiden: Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden University, 2001), 325-99. Montias's article "Works of Art" is based on a selection of inventories listing at least one attributed work; only when he analyzed the subjects did he include inventories without attributed works and make a distinction between inventories with and without attributions; Marion Goosens makes a distinction between large (more than twenty paintings) and small inventories. In both cases they reveal something of the nature and costliness of the holdings, thereby giving an indication of the owner's financial circumstances. Goosens includes the owners' professions in her discussion; unfortunately, she does not go further than estates up to 1650. Fock's sample consists of the twelve most interesting Leiden inventories per decade (i.e. those with the greatest number of attributed works). The various points of departure and differing nature of the inventories make comparison extremely difficult.

<sup>93</sup> My observations are based on the available Hague (see n. 00 above), Leiden, Haarlem and Amsterdam estates, particularly the last-mentioned (compiled in the *Montias Database*), of which I studied all the inventories from the years 1645, 1655 and 1665 with a view to forming a picture of the lower groups. I make no claims whatsoever to representativeness; the following merely presents examples that illustrate my argument.

<sup>94</sup> Montias, "Works ... in Random Samples," 76.

<sup>95</sup> Goosens, *Schilders en markt*, 356-57, Montias, "Works of Art," 334 (based on the division of the inventories into two groups, those with attributed works and those with unattributed works; the inventories in the first group proved to be worth, on average, twice as much as those in the second group; the first group even contained fifty percent more landscapes). This conclusion is confirmed by Montias's research as presented in "Works ... in Random Samples," 81-82, in which he makes no such division: these random samples – which contain greater numbers of modest inventories than his earlier research did – point to the same trend by virtue of the fact that landscapes show less of an increase and religious subjects less of a decrease.

<sup>96</sup> The fact that Fock observed a far greater increase in landscapes accords with this, because her findings are based on a selection of inventories with the greatest possible number of attributed works, meaning estates of much higher value (Fock, "Kunstbezit Leiden," 18-23 (from three percent in the first decade of the century to forty percent in the 1670s!).

landscapes are relatively more numerous in somewhat more affluent estates. It was just the opposite with biblical history paintings, which decreased proportionally in the better estates, whereas they continued to be present in relatively large numbers in the modest households of artisans and tradesmen.<sup>97</sup> Particularly in the case of biblical scenes, for which attributions were generally lacking, there was a market for small, inexpensive paintings whose attraction was their subject matter and not their artistic merit. This is in keeping with the previously mentioned fact that the inventories of art dealers who catered to the low end of the market reveal that their stock in trade displayed a preponderance of biblical paintings, mostly scenes from the Old Testament.

As we saw in the case of Bugge (though this also holds true for modest inventories), the owner's religious persuasion is often easy to determine in the case of Catholics, whose collections nearly always contain a much greater proportion of religious paintings, and above all many more subjects from the New Testament, such as scenes with the Virgin Mary and episodes from the Passion of Christ.<sup>98</sup> As one would expect, subjects from classical mythology occur mainly in the richer holdings, but, remarkably enough, it seems to have been chiefly Catholics who often owned such paintings.<sup>99</sup> Flower still lifes and fruit still lifes ("fruytagies") are found in the entire range of inventories; in this case it was the quality of the painter that made the difference, because in this genre, just as in history painting, the appraisals could vary from less than one guilder to over 1,000 (for an ornate still life by Jan Davidz de Heem, for instance). The small still life hanging in the interior inhabited by Brekelenkam's tailor (cat. 00) would not have cost more than a couple of guilders. Banquet still lifes – such as those produced by Pieter Claesz and Willem Heda, and above all the countless imitations of such work – are encountered with surprising frequency in the more modest estates. Genre pieces, on the other hand, almost never occur in humble inventories. Works by the genre painters known to us – and certainly those by such masters as Dou, Metsu, Ter Borch and Vermeer – were, in those days too, destined for wealthy collectors, and this was also true of the peasant scenes by successful painters such as Adriaen Brouwer and Adriaen van Ostade, which are encountered mainly in the estates of the upper crust.<sup>100</sup> In the

---

<sup>97</sup> Goosens, *Schilders en markt*, 356-57 and 235-36; Montias, "Works of Art," 334 and Montias, "Works ... Random Samples," 81-82. Here, too, we see in Fock's inventories the most dramatic decline; see Fock, "Schilderijenbezit in Leiden," 18-20.

<sup>98</sup> Montias, "Works of Art," 338-40; Goosens, *Schilders en de markt*, 371-75 and the table on p. 378.

<sup>99</sup> Goosens, *Schilders en de markt*, 373. This was also my experience when examining Leiden and Amsterdam estates. On the objections of strict Protestants to the use of mythology in art and literature, see Eric Jan Sluijter, *De 'heydensche fabulen' in de schilderkunst van de Gouden Eeuw* (Leiden: Primavera Pers, 2000), 191-92.

<sup>100</sup> Goosens, *Schilders en de markt*, 389-90, found that this was clearly the case with regard to the work of Adriaen van Ostade.

case of works by Jan Miense Molenaer we find greater variation<sup>101</sup> – just as there are great differences in quality among the paintings produced in his studio – yet his work does not appear in truly humble estates either. Compared with other types of painting, inexpensive genre pieces must have been produced in very small numbers, and the few that were made were peasant scenes.

Particularly when the rich upper crust is disregarded, it makes more sense to form an idea of painting ownership by studying a number of individual inventories than by attempting to make general pronouncements.<sup>102</sup> From the inventories I examined of the *smalle burgerij* (burghers of slender means, such as small shopkeepers and humble craftsmen), it is apparent that there is seldom a link between the owner's profession and a certain type of representation. Seascapes, for example, were encountered among all groups; sailors and ship captains occasionally owned a greater-than-average number, but there were also skippers without a single seascape or painting with ships.<sup>103</sup> A “barber-surgeon's shop” in the estate of a surgeon, Dirck Thomasz Molengraeff (cf. cat. 00), seems not to be a coincidence, however, nor is his ownership of what are possibly two series of the Five Senses (including one by Dirck Hals).<sup>104</sup> It also stands to reason that an innkeeper would own such mouth-watering paintings as a kitchen piece, a butchered pig and “a large fatted ox.”<sup>105</sup> But it is particularly surprising to learn that one of this innkeeper's twenty-seven paintings was “a cook in the kitchen with raw meat, portraying the gentleman *comparant*” (i.e. Joost Joosten, the gentleman whose inventory was being drawn up), which was valued at seventy guilders: a very special portrait of himself, therefore, which far surpassed his other paintings in value. Innkeepers probably often owned paintings that they intended to sell to their customers;<sup>106</sup> this seems to have been the case with Joost's other small paintings, most of them worth between five and twenty guilders.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> *Ibidem*, 391.

<sup>102</sup> The following observations are based on inventories in the Montias Database from the years 1645, 1655 and 1665.

<sup>103</sup> Goosens, *Schilders en de markt*, 364. I also observed this phenomenon in Amsterdam inventories. Examples of ship captains who owned no seascapes at all are Jasper Hendriksz, 1655 (*Montias Database*, no. 341) and Herman Hermansz Muller, 1665 (*Montias Database*, no. 191). With regard to the ownership in Amsterdam of marine views and paintings of ships at sea, see also Remmelt Daalder, *Van de Velde & Zoon, zeeschilders. Het bedrijf van Willem van de Velde de Oude en Willem van de Velde de Jonge, 1640-1707* (Amsterdam: Ph.D. diss. University of Amsterdam, 2013), 70-72.

<sup>104</sup> Montias Database, no. 317 (1654).

<sup>105</sup> Montias Database, no. 505 (1645). These works were valued at twelve, fifteen and twenty guilders, respectively.

<sup>106</sup> Goosens, *Schilders en de markt*, 364 and Fock, *Kunstbezit Leiden*, 7.

<sup>107</sup> This Joost Joosten owned, among other things, a number of peasant scenes by Jan van Buesum in the category of four to twelve guilders, seascapes by Hendrick Vroom and Hendrick van Anthonissen (ten guilders and six guilders), an Esaias van de Velde (the only landscape, valued at ten guilders), a Ganymede by Jan Pynas (nineteen guilders) and a “scene of sorcery” by Cornelis Saftleven (twenty guilders), as well as two tronies by Isaac Isaacs and some anonymous works, including a Pyramus and Thisbe, a Lucretia, an Annunciation, a Nativity, a skull and a robbery, all valued at between sixteen and eight guilders, plus two dogs worth five guilders and the King and Queen of Bohemia, valued at thirty guilders.

Grietje Tijmans, a Catholic fishwife (cf. cat. 00), is recorded as actually owning “a small painting of a fish,” which was valued, together with three other small panels (of unknown subject), at one guilder.<sup>108</sup> Both Grietje and her husband, a ship’s carpenter, were illiterate. Her most valuable painting was a Rebecca and Eliezer estimated to be worth ten guilders; the other biblical representations (two pictures of Mary and Joseph, Christ and the Samaritan Woman, Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane, The Nativity of Christ and a Homecoming of Tobias) were all valued at between one and five guilders. Altogether she owned eighteen paintings, including a kitchen piece, a winter scene and three *tronies*, as well as a portrait of the duke of Brunswick, valued at one guilder and fifteen stuivers. Her family possibly came from that area, since many seventeenth-century residents of Amsterdam had roots in the German-speaking regions. The portraits found in the inventories of such simple folk are almost always likenesses of princes, mainly the princes of Orange.<sup>109</sup>

Thus the cloth finisher Watse Leurens, who possessed twenty-nine paintings, must have been a fervent Orangist, considering that he owned portraits of Prince Willem of Orange, Prince Maurits, and Frederik Hendrik and Amalia.<sup>110</sup> He was obviously a Calvinist and had a *prentbord* (a print affixed to a panel) of Moses’ Tables of the Law and a number of Old Testament pieces (Abraham’s Sacrifice, Rebecca and Eliezer, Daniel in the Lions’ Den, Susanna, a Sacrifice to Baal and even two paintings of Jacob and Rachel), as well as a Conversion of Saul.<sup>111</sup> All of these paintings – together with a Christ Healing the Blind Man, a Caritas, a Saint Jerome, some small landscapes, a banquet still life, a flower painting and a portrait of his two children – were hanging in the living/dining room (*binnenhaard*) of his house on the Goudsbloemstraat. The same princely portraits – of Willem, Maurits, Frederik Hendrik and Amalia – and a small, damaged painting of the prince on horseback (as well as a picture of an unnamed king) occur in the inventory of Albert Jansz, the skipper of a *veerkaag* (a sailing ferry-boat), who also owned a number of scenes from the Old Testament (featuring Samson, Hagar and Moses), as well as a Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane, two prints of clergymen, and a few small landscapes and banquet still lifes: thirty-one paintings altogether, nearly all of them in the “front room” (*voorhuis*).<sup>112</sup>

<sup>108</sup> Montias Database, no. 431 (1645).

<sup>109</sup> When considering the percentages of portraits in inventories we must always take into account that many of them were portraits of this kind; these were certainly not commissioned works, but were in fact counted as such by Marten Jan Bok and Gary Schwartz, “Schilderen in opdracht in Holland in de 17e eeuw,” *Holland* 23 [1991]: 183-95, 191-92.

<sup>110</sup> Montias Database, no. 199 (1645).

<sup>111</sup> “The woman at the well” (“Het vrouwtje bij de put”) could be either Rebecca and Eliezer or Christ and the Samaritan Woman.

<sup>112</sup> Montias Database, no. 535 (1665).

The beer seller Christoffel Barendsz had the same members of the House of Orange on the wall – Maurits, Frederik Hendrik and Amalia – as well as a “prince in armor” and a print of Willem of Orange.<sup>113</sup> He also owned a seascape, a kitchen piece, a female *tronie* and a landscape that served as an overmantel, but no biblical scenes are listed among his eighteen paintings. A fellow beer seller, Jan Bruynsen, was obviously Catholic and therefore had, instead of portraits of the princes of Orange, a portrait of a priest (valued at three guilders), a series of six prints of priests (together worth one guilder and ten stuivers), two Annunciations to the Virgin, a Virgin, a Crucifixion, a Deposition, two likenesses of Saint Francis, the Four Evangelists and a Moses; the appraisals of these range from three guilders (the Deposition) to twenty guilders (one of the Annunciations).<sup>114</sup> Even though there were no landscapes or still lifes among his eighteen paintings, he did own, remarkably enough, “a large painting portraying the entire family,” valued at forty guilders. A work of this kind was seldom encountered in humble households. Family portraits were not often found in the households of simple shopkeepers and artisans (unless they happened to have a painter in the family), and, as mentioned earlier, they tended to own few landscapes and almost no genre pieces. Not all simple craftsmen owned biblical pictures, however. The master tailor Wouter Luijsinck had seven paintings, not one of which depicted a religious scene.<sup>115</sup> Just like the tailor in Brekelenkam’s painting, he owned a still life (cat. 00), as well as a piece with satyrs, a landscape, three small paintings of birds by Elias Vonck, and even a portrait of himself.

Painters are rarely named in such estate inventories. Sometimes a single painting is mentioned, such as that in the possession of the “rough camlet worker” Jan Jacobsz Gouda, whose paintings included one by the easily identifiable Rombout van Troyen, which was probably the best piece. He also had two paintings of the prince, a Jephtha and a Joseph, but oddly enough, also a portrait of the “Pope of Rome.” Other surprising pictures included an Andromeda and “a dead child.” Altogether he had twenty-six paintings, including a Burning of Troy, a number of landscapes and a banquet still life.<sup>116</sup>

Bakers were often among the more well-to-do shopkeepers (cat. 00). The confectioner Cornelis Dircksz Wittenoom on the Anjeliensgracht owned, according to his 1665 inventory, no fewer than six portraits of himself: two small portraits were among the eleven paintings in the entrance hall, and in the best room there were even three: a portrait of Wittenoom with

---

<sup>113</sup> *Ibidem*, no. 1104 (1645).

<sup>114</sup> *Ibidem*, no. 221 (1665).

<sup>115</sup> *Ibidem*, no. 448 (1669).

<sup>116</sup> *Ibidem*, no. 220 (1665).

two of his children by Philips Koninck and two more small portraits by Barent Graat.<sup>117</sup> He also owned landscapes by Jan van Goyen, David Vinckboons and the completely unknown Barend Veris (Wittenoom's uncle), as well as some anonymous biblical paintings. Another baker, Gerrit Jansz Kock, had only ten paintings, which were mostly religious works: Jephtha, Abraham's Sacrifice, Abraham and the Three Angels, and the Four Evangelists; the last two were described as "bad," meaning in poor condition.<sup>118</sup> There was also a portrait of the king of England, a smoker, two candlelit *tronies* and a hunting scene – all of which make his holdings look more like the collection of a simple craftsman.

Paintings could be acquired in all sorts of ways. Painters often used their work as a means of payment, so some of the paintings owned by shopkeepers, innkeepers and landlords may well have been acquired in this way. It is striking, for example, to find works by the above-mentioned Rombout van Troyen mainly in the inventories of people who lived near him, and the owner of the house he rented also had quite a few.<sup>119</sup> Of course this might also mean that those who wanted paintings simply went around the corner to the painter's (work)shop; painters often dealt in the work of fellow painters, so that such a shop would have a large assortment, not just work by the painter in residence.<sup>120</sup> As mentioned above, moreover, there were art dealers who specialized in very inexpensive paintings; their shops were often located in the same neighborhood, and therefore easy to find.<sup>121</sup> In addition, many people no doubt bought paintings at the market, particularly the annual markets and fairs, where art dealers erected huge stalls and filled them with paintings.<sup>122</sup> It was also possible to acquire paintings at bargain prices at the estate sales of deceased or bankrupt individuals. Finally, paintings served as lottery prizes.<sup>123</sup> There were practically no barriers to buying paintings in seventeenth-century Holland, even for people with little money to spend.

---

<sup>117</sup> *Ibidem*, no. 474 (1665).

<sup>118</sup> *Ibidem*, no. 343 (1646).

<sup>119</sup> This was demonstrated by Anne Lenders in a paper (University of Amsterdam, 2012) in which she used Amsterdam inventories to point out clusters of owners around the various places where Van Troyen lived. Piet Bakker found an inventory with eleven paintings by Van Troyen that were originally in the possession of the owner of the house on the Prinsengracht that Van Troyen rented (I am grateful to Piet Bakker for this information).

<sup>120</sup> On the art trade (with further references), see Marion Boers, *De Noord-Nederlandse kunsthandel in de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2012).

<sup>121</sup> In Amsterdam such shops were to be found near the Nieuwmarkt, mostly at the beginning of Kloveniersburgwal and Koestraat (I am grateful to Angela Jager, see n. 00 above).

<sup>122</sup> There exists a document in which five Rotterdam art dealers commission a carpenter to make them a huge stand for the fair, measuring between fifty and seventy-five meters long and four meters high, with an awning extending for two meters on either side (N. Alting Mees, "Schilderijen op de Rotterdamse kermis," *Oud Holland* 33 [1915]: 63). This would have been large enough to exhibit many hundreds of paintings.

<sup>123</sup> On the sale of paintings at annual markets, fairs, auctions and lotteries, see (with further references) Boers, *Noord-Nederlandse Kunsthandel*, 70-106 and Marten Jan Bok, "'Schilderijen te koop.' Nieuwe marketingtechnieken op de Nederlandse kunstmarkt van de Gouden Eeuw," in *Thuis in de Gouden Eeuw*, eds. M. Gosselink and J. De Goede, exh. cat. (Rotterdam: Kunsthal; Zwolle: Waanders Publishers 2008), 9-29.

The well-to-do who bought pictures of good quality would sometimes commission a painter to make an overmantel for the best room and, of course, portraits, but they probably purchased most of their paintings at the shop of a painter with a good name or from a reputable art dealer. Even so, their estates often included many inexpensive pieces bought at auctions, markets or fairs – we know that even the Winter King and Queen bought paintings at a fair in Scheveningen.<sup>124</sup> And, as mentioned earlier, established art dealers also had inexpensive paintings as part of their stock in trade.<sup>125</sup> The paintings owned by Hieronimus van Straaten provide a nice, albeit extreme, example of someone who collected paintings of both types. This burgomaster of Goes, who undoubtedly bought his paintings in The Hague, Amsterdam and Utrecht, was a true collector who drew up an inventory of his holdings himself,<sup>126</sup> which he divided into “the beautiful paintings” – sixty-three extremely valuable works – and fifty-one other paintings, many of them anonymous, which decorated various walls of his house. For the works in the first group he also recorded prices, which probably reflect what he had paid for them, with a total value of 18,800 guilders (including a Rembrandt valued at 800 guilders, a Jan Davidsz de Heem worth 1,000 guilders, a Poelenburch estimated to be worth 1,200 guilders and even an Elsheimer valued at 1,800 guilders!). Apparently he did not think it worthwhile to list prices next to the paintings in the second group.

We must bear in mind that throughout this discussion we have been talking about the large cities in the provinces of Holland and Utrecht, the cities that make up the urbanized area now known as the Randstad.<sup>127</sup> More than anywhere else in Europe, paintings were ubiquitous in these cities, where one could find countless works of very high quality, just as we can still see

---

<sup>124</sup> Recorded in the diary of the schoolmaster David Beck, *Spiegel van mijn leven. Haags dagboek 1624*, with an introduction and annotations by S. E. Veldhuijzen (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1991), 88. A nice example is the rich aristocratic collector baron Willem Vincent van Wytttenhorst, who bought, among other things, two copies by Cornelis Mahu after David Teniers the Elder at a yearly market for fourteen guilders and twenty stuivers (see Marion E. W. Boer, “De schilderijen verzameling van baron Willem Vincent van Wytttenhoirst,” *Oud Holland* 117 (2004): 225; fol. 27, no. 96; see also fol. 32, no. 68.

<sup>125</sup> See n. 00 above, on De Renialme.

<sup>126</sup> J. Uijl, ‘Het huis de Oliphant te Goes,’ *Historisch Jaarboek van Zuid- en Noord-Beveland* 4(1978): 95-115; the inventory is on pp. 106-15. This Hieronimus van Straten was burgomaster of the city of Goes in the province of Zeeland, as well as a member of the Gecommitteerde Raden (Executive Committee) of the States of Zeeland (the provincial assembly), in which capacity he probably made frequent visits to the large cities of Holland, where he purchased works of art.

<sup>127</sup> For examples of holdings of paintings in the provinces, see Hester Dibbits, *Vertrouwd bezit. Materiële cultuur in Doesburg en Maassluis, 1650-1800* (Nijmegen: Uitgeverij SUN, 2001), 285-302. For Leeuwarden – an exceptional provincial city, owing to the court of the stadholders of Nassau-Dietz – see the extremely informative dissertation by Piet Bakker, *Gezicht op Leeuwarden. Schilders in Friesland en de markt voor schilderijen in de Gouden Eeuw* (Amsterdam: Ph.D. diss. University of Amsterdam, 2008), 125-67. Bakker is the only one to distinguish between economic groups, which he was able to do because of the many estates in Leeuwarden that had been appraised. On the paintings owned by the Frisian nobility, see also Piet Bakker, “De Friese adel en de schilderkunst in de Gouden Eeuw: een verkenning,” *Virtus. Jaarboek voor Adelsgeschiedenis* 15 (2008): 71.

in our museums (and at this exhibition). Many people must have had expert knowledge of paintings, because their prices varied greatly, depending on the reputation of the artist and the quality of the work. Evidence of the fact that talking about the art of painting was a popular pastime among people from many walks of life can be gleaned from the now-famous 1624 diary of the Hague schoolmaster David Beck, who sometimes read a bit of Van Mander's *Schilder-Boeck* before going to bed or discussed this book with his neighbor, an apothecary, and one spring day wrote that he had chatted for quite some time about art with a cabinetmaker on the passenger barge to Delft.<sup>128</sup> Even members of the lower classes apparently could not avoid talking about the subject – at least if we are to believe the image created at the time. In the comic satire *Tafereel van de Belacchende Werelt* (Tableau of the Laughable World), the painter and poet Adriaen van de Venne has the farm hand Tamme Lubbert and his beloved Feitje Goris visit the annual fair held on the Buitenhof in The Hague,<sup>129</sup> where they decide to stroll through the sale exhibition of “beautiful paintings” in the large hall in the Binnenhof. Naturally Tamme Lubbert admits that he knows nothing about paintings and would therefore do best not to buy anything. But how times have changed: nowadays no comedy writer would dream of letting a pair of country bumpkins casually wander into one of the many art galleries nearby when attending the annual fair (still held every year at the same place by the Hofvijver!

---

<sup>128</sup> Beck, *Spiegel van mijn leven*, 54, 82, 128.

<sup>129</sup> Adriaen van de Venne, *Tafereel van de Belacchende Werelt* (The Hague: Van de Venne, 1635), 58; facsimile edition in M. van Vaeck, *Adriaen van de Vennes Tafereel van de Belacchende Werelt*, vol. 2 (Ghent: Koninklijke Academie voor Taal- en Letterkunde, 1994), 374.