

35 See publications by Eddy de Jongh, in particular those of the late 1960s and early to mid-1970s, such as De Jongh 1967, De Jongh 1968–9 and Amsterdam 1976.

36 The only exception is *Woman with a Water Pitcher* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Liedtke 2008, pp. 98–100, no. 13, ill.), which has a subject – a pensive female figure holding a basin with one hand, while holding onto a window frame with the other – that no other contemporary painter represented. The subject does echo pictorial trends of women washing their hands in a basin, as initiated by Ter Borch in *Woman Washing her Hands* (here, CAT. 8.1; see this catalogue, p. 157) and figures being distracted by their own thoughts in Ter Borch’s paintings, such as *Lady at her Toilet* (CAT. 7.2). Even Vermeer’s lost *Gentleman Washing His Hands*, recorded only at an auction in Amsterdam in 1696, was in all likelihood a variation of Ter Borch’s *Woman Washing her Hands* (here, CAT. 8.1); for more on this painting, see Waiboer 2011.

37 The exceptions are the musician on the left in Vermeer’s *Procuress* (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden; Liedtke 2008, pp. 62–5, no. 3, ill.) and the artist at his easel in *The Art of Painting* (here, FIG. 20).

38 For more on this, see, for instance, Sutton 1984, pp. xiv–xv.

39 Much has been published about the apparent realism in Dutch art and in that of genre painting in particular. Some of the most important contributions include De Jongh 1971, Alpers 1983 and Franits et al. 1997 (includes essays by different authors).

40 Sutton 1984, pp. xxvi–xxviii.

41 Valentiner 1932, pp. 317–18.

42 R. Klessmann in Braunschweig 1978, p. 165, seems to have been the first to notice the relationship between Van Mieris and Vermeer’s paintings. See also Naumann 1981, vol. 1, pp. 61, 64.

43 Gudlaugsson 1968, p. 30.

44 Schavemaker 2010, p. 39.

45 Lasius 1992, p. 51.

46 Franits 2011, pp. 134–5.

47 Q. Buvelot in The Hague–Washington 2005–6, pp. 189–91.

48 Liedtke 2009, p. 17, summed it up aptly: ‘Vermeer had an extraordinary ability to combine and revise artistic sources, so that one scarcely recognizes the connection between his invention and its prototypes.’

49 Junius 1641, p. 29; Weststeijn 2005, p. 263; Weststeijn 2008, pp. 162–4. See also Eric Jan Sluijter’s essay in this catalogue, p. 43.

50 During a study day held in conjunction with the exhibition *Gabriël Metsu: een meester herontdekt* at the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, on 23 February 2011, the present author gave a lecture entitled *Gabriel Metsu and the Mutual Relationships between Dutch Genre Painters*. During the question-and-answer session at the end of the day, it appeared that several art historians suggested that prints were among the most likely sources that allowed genre painters to learn about each other’s works.

51 See Hollstein 1949–2010.

52 The primary source of literature on graphic productions during the second half of the seventeenth century is Wuestman 1998, in particular pp. 41, 44–6, 110–14, 127–9, 167–70. I am grateful to Wuestman for expanding and contextualising my knowledge on graphic reproductions after genre paintings.

53 The research database compiled in preparation for the present exhibition includes merely thirty copies after works by one of the eighteen principal genre paintings recorded during their lifetime or within twenty years after their deaths (Netscher: 14; Dou: 4; Ter Borch: 3; Schalcken: 3; Van Mieris: 2; Steen: 3; De Hooch: 1). This amounts to 2.37 per cent of the total number of works by or after these artists known through inventories, auction and literary sources of the same period.

54 Aono 2015, pp. 45–70; Sluijter 1988, p. 34, drew attention to the fact that an inventory of Abraham de Pape dating to 1656, included fourteen copies after works by Dou, his presumed teacher. He suggested that De Pape made these as part of his artistic training.

55 Van der Neer made a partial copy after a painting by Metsu (present location unknown; Schavemaker 2010, pp. 39, 453, no. 9, ill.). He apparently also borrowed a picture from Van Mieris in order to replicate it (Gaehtgens 1987, p. 433–4; Schavemaker 2010, pp. 51, 59, 198–200). Ter Borch is known to have made copies after his own works, probably with the help of his workshop (see A. M. Kettering in Washington–Detroit 2004–5, pp. 114–16; A. K. Wheelock in *ibid.*, pp. 149–53; and M. E. Wieseman in *ibid.*, pp. 171–2). Johan van Haensbergen, a landscape and portrait painter, owned more than fifty copies after contemporary masters, among them Ter Borch, Van Mieris and Netscher. Whether these replicas were by Van Haensbergen’s own hand or by other artists is unknown (Bredius 1915–22, vol. 6, pp. 2074–7; see also Bredius 1911).

56 They concern Dou receiving Joachim von Sandrart and Pieter van Laer in his studio to reveal some of his painstaking working methods (Sandrart 1675–79, vol. 2, book 3 (*niederl. u. dt. Künstler*), p. 321); the Flemish painter Louis Cousin being part of a group of men visiting Vermeer’s workshop (Monconys 1665–6, vol. 2, pp. 148–9, who referred to Cousin as ‘M. de Gentillo Lieutenant Colonel’). Montias 1997, p. 198, identified ‘Gentillo’ as Cousin, who was also known as Luigi Gentile; see also Liedtke 2001, pp. 12–13; and Cornelis Brouwer, a Rembrandt pupil from Rotterdam, who frequently came to see Van der Neer (Gaehtgens 1987, pp. 433–4; Schavemaker 2010, pp. 23, 200; on Brouwer, see Rotterdam 1994–5, p. 273, and Sumowski 1983–[94], vol. 1, pp. 457–9).

57 The date on Van Musscher’s painting (private collection) has long been misread as 1690 (see https://rkd.nl/explore/images/115408). Van Gelder 1958, p. 8, first published the relationship between Van Musscher and Vermeer’s painting. On Vermeer’s possession of *The Art of Painting* until his death, see Montias 1989, pp. 201, 350, docs 379, 380.

58 Steen’s *Young Woman Playing a Harpsichord to a Young Man* (CAT. 3.3), inscribed 1659, for instance, is a response to Van Mieris’s *Duet* (CAT. 3.2), which is dated 1658 (Arthur K. Wheelock in Washington–Amsterdam 1996–7, p. 129–31); see also this catalogue, p. 128; Van der Neer painted a partial copy after Metsu’s *Woman Tuning her Cittern, Approached by a Man* of 1659–62 (Museumslandschaft Hessen Kassel, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister; Waiboer 2012, pp. 223–3, no. A-81, ill.), which dates to 1660–62 (present location unknown; Schavemaker 2010, p. 453, no. 9, ill.).

59 To illustrate this point, Lugt 1938–87, vol. 1, [s.p.], listed merely three auctions that took place in Dutch cities before 1675, although his list was incomplete. Only three other public sales from this period (none

of which are mentioned by Lugt) included works by any of the genre painters under discussion. One of them was that of the collection of Abraham van Waesbergen (see also Piet Bakker’s essay in this catalogue, p. 93), held in Rotterdam on 2 October 1670, which included one work by Dou, one by Van Hoogstraten and twenty-seven paintings by Ludolf de Jongh (see Abraham Bredius’s Oud Hollandsche Kunstinventarissen, preserved at the RKD, The Hague). The other auctions included paintings by Ter Borch (Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 2, p. 71) and Steen (Braun 1980, p. 161, no. A-743).

60 On Vermeer’s activities as an art dealer, see Montias 1989, pp. 185, 219, 351, no. 383; on Netscher’s, see Wieseman 2002, pp. 31–2. Other artists may have traded in paintings as well. The present author suggested that Metsu may have acted as an agent for Ter Borch’s works in Amsterdam, given that the former seems to have known most of the latter’s genre scenes of the second half of the 1650s and first half of the 1660s (Waiboer 2012, p. 156).

61 De Renialme owned at his death three paintings by Ter Borch, five by Dou, one by Steen, one by Vermeer and four by Van Zijl (Bredius 1915–22, vol. 1, p. 228–39). Uylenburgh’s posthumous inventory lists one painting by Dou, two by Metsu, one by Van Mieris, five by Netscher, one by Bega and one by Van Zijl (London–Amsterdam 2006, pp. 297–8; see also Lammertse 2006, pp. 245–52). Herald Appelboom from The Hague bought four paintings by Steen on behalf of the Swedish field marshal Karl Gustav Wrangel (Braun 1980, pp. 11, 145). Abraham de Cooge from Delft acquired a painting by Dou in Utrecht (Bakker 2017a) and Johan van Rhenen from Utrecht sent a picture by Steen to Denmark in order to sell it there (Braun 1980, p. 11). Additionally, we know that the dealer Anthony de Vos from Amsterdam and Claude Habert from Brussels were in personal contact with Van der Neer (Schavemaker 2010, pp. 22, 24, 188, doc. 71). The Amsterdam dealer Jan van der Bruggen had ties with Schalcken (Jansen 2015–16, p. 22).

62 Jaap van der Veen argues that there is no evidence that collectors made use of dealers acting as intermediaries and buying paintings on their behalf (personal communication).

63 As appeared from the research database compiled in preparation for the present exhibition.

64 A good example of such a close relationship between a patron and an artist is that between Constantijn Huygens and Jan Lievens. During a meeting in Leiden, the former invited the latter to stay with him in The Hague. Excited to paint Huygens, Lievens came to The Hague a few days later to portray the renowned diplomat (Huygens 1994, pp. 85–8).

65 See note 63.

66 As many as thirty-six of the thirty-seven works listed in the table ‘Genre painters’ hypothetical visits to collectors’ (p. 260), were part of collections that did not, as far as we know, include any of the work by those artists that visited them. They concern visits made by Ter Borch to Spiering; Van Brekelenkam to De Bye and Van Ruijven; De Hooch to Van Ruijven, Hinlopen and Spiering; Maes to Spiering; De Man to Paedts and Van Ruijven; Metsu to De Bye, Lois and Van Ruijven; Van Mieris to Lois; Van Musscher to Van Ruijven and Vermeer; Van der Neer to De la Court, Hinlopen, Paedts and Uylenburgh; Netscher to Van Ruijven; Ochtervelt to Agges, De Bye, Paedts and Van Ruijven; Schalcken to Uylenburgh; Steen to Van Ruijven; and, Vermeer to De Bye and Lois.

67 Some caution is called for when making such hypotheses, as the sources we rely on pinpoint to a specific moment when an individual owned a certain painting – usually shortly after his or her death. They do not disclose how long the individual in question had owned the picture for, nor whether he or she had purchased it directly from the artist.

68 Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 2, p. 126, no. 114.

69 See also Schavemaker 2010, p. 22, who hypothesised that Van der Neer was in personal contact with Lois.

70 Relatively few drawings by the artists included in the exhibition have come down to us anyway. See, for instance, Schapelhouman 2010–11, pp. 181–2.

71 Naumann 2014. I am thankful to Otto Naumann for providing me with a copy of his unpublished article. The recto of Van Mieris’s drawing depicts a woman standing in front of a mirror assisted by a maid. The latter’s pose is so similar to that of the servant in Ter Borch’s *Lady at her Toilet* (CAT. 7.2) that it is safe to assume the Leiden artist had seen this painting.

72 On Van Goyer’s drawing practice, see Buijsen 1996–7, pp. 32–5.

ESSAY 2

ERUDITION AND ARTISTRY

The Enduring Appeal of Dutch Genre Painting

pages 21–35

- I would like to thank Jennifer Henel and Henriette Rahusen for their commentary and feedback on this essay.
- Brown 1984, p. 63.
- Washington–Detroit 2004–5, p. 189. For a discussion of this letter see Kettering 2004–5, p. 20.
- Ibid.*, p. 20.
- Kettering 1988, pp. 1, 20.
- Angel 1996, p. 243. See also Sluijter 2000.
- Angel 1996, p. 248.
- Angel 1996, p. 248.
- Ibid.*, p. 242.
- For Van Hoogstraten, see Brusati 1995, and Weststeijn 2008.
- Hoogstraten 1678, p. 25.
- Ibid.*, p. 274.
- Huygens 1994, p. 83. For further discussion of this issue, see Wheelock 2002–3, pp. 82–3.
- Hoogstraten 1678, p. 274.
- Ibid.*, p. 168.
- Ibid.*, p. 79.
- Ibid.*, p. 109: ‘Als eerstelijck, om de waere en rechte driften der gemoederen . . .’
- The following discussion on De Lairese is largely based on Kemmer 1998. For De Lairese, see also De Vries 1998.
- To emphasise these distinctions, De Lairese imagined differences in the tenor of conversations between Adriaen Brouwer and Pieter van Laer that would focus on the vulgar and mean (‘op het allergeringste’), Rembrandt and Jacob Jordaens that would dwell on a citizen’s daily life (‘op het burgerlyke’), and Anthony van Dyck and Peter Paul Rubens, who would consider sublime and lofty thoughts about art (‘op het verheevne der konst vester’). See Kemmer 1998, p. 92.
- Ibid.*, p. 98.
- Ibid.*, pp. 97–9.

22 Angel 1996, p. 246. For Rembrandt’s *Samson’s Wedding Feast* (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden), see Bruyn et al. 1982–2014, vol. 3, pp. 248 57, A 123, ill.

23 Vergara 1998, p. 254, note 34; Franits 2004, p. 222.

24 For Ter Borch’s artistic career and stylistic evolution, see Washington–Detroit 2004–5.

25 For an excellent assessment of Ter Borch and the ‘modern’ manner, see Kettering 2004–5.

26 Kettering 1988.

27 *Ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 435–6, 510 (291).

28 One of her favourite authors was Jan Hermansz Krul. See Krul 1634.

29 For Johannes Renialme, see Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 2, p. 25. Eighteen paintings by Ter Borch are listed in Amsterdam inventories during the artist’s lifetime or within twenty years after his death (see table ‘Geographical distribution of paintings’ (p. 267)).

30 It is not clear how Ter Borch established a market for his paintings outside of Deventer, but his fame undoubtedly owed much to his travels, his contacts among the urban elite and his international reputation.

31 Joachim von Sandrart, a German artist and art theorist who had visited Dou’s studio around 1640, provides a fascinating account of the master’s working process. See Baer 2000–2001, p. 34.

32 Van Mieris sired a daughter in 1657 and soon thereafter married the mother, Cunera van der Cock. He was sociable and counted among his friends a drinking buddy, Jan Steen. See Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 3, p. 7.

33 Van Mieris also studied with the portrait and allegorical painter, Abraham van den Tempel, and it is likely that the latter’s remarkable ability to paint satins also had a strong impact on the flowing character of Van Mieris’s fabrics, where brushstrokes almost become invisible.

34 Kemmer 1998, p. 98.

35 The most significant of these paintings is Dirck van Barbaren’s *The Procuress* (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Franits 2013, pp. 125–30, no. A23, ill.), which is shown hanging on the back wall in Vermeer’s *The Concert* (Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston; Liedtke 2008, pp. 14, 108–11, no. 16, ill.) and *Lady Seated at a Virginal* (here, CAT. 4.2).

36 For Vermeer’s *Christ in the House of Mary and Martha* (National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh), see Washington–The Hague 1995–6, pp. 90–95, no. 2, ill.

37 Wheelock 1995, pp. 39–47.

38 In creating this image Vermeer looked to genre paintings by his contemporaries, including Nicolaes Maes, who had already used interior settings effectively in his narrative genre scenes. See *ibid.*, pp. 39–47.

39 Unfortunately, the circumstances that brought Ter Borch to Delft are not entirely certain, but this document does indicate that these two artists, who were in quite different stages of their respective careers, knew each other. Quite possibly their acquaintance came through an art dealer, either Willem de Langue, who was present at the signing of the document, or Johannes Renialme, an Amsterdam dealer who handled paintings by both masters. See Montias 1989, p. 102.

40 See A. K. Wheelock in Washington–The Hague 1995–6, pp. 152–5.

41 Washington–The Hague 1995–6, pp. 152–5.

42 The only contemporary comment on his work comes from a distinguished visitor from The Hague, Pieter

Teding van Berckhout, who, in 1669, remarked on the artist’s superb perspectives. See Broos 2005–6, pp. 49–50.

43 Significantly, Vermeer kept this masterpiece in his possession until he died in 1675. Then, even though Vermeer left his family in dire financial straits, his widow refused to sell it. Instead, she transferred its ownership to her mother to keep it out of the hands of creditors. See Montias 1989, pp. 228–30, 350, doc. 379.

ESSAY 3

EMULATIVE IMITATION AMONG HIGH-LIFE GENRE PAINTERS

pages 36–49

1 For such efficient methods of production, see Kolfin 2005, pp. 145–77 (chapters 4 and 5).

2 For an excellent study of the recurrence of motifs distinctive to individual painters, see Angela Ho’s doctoral dissertation (Ho 2007).

3 I prefer the term ‘emulative imitation’ to the oft-employed ‘emulation’, as the imitation of motifs within a spirit of rivalry is inherent to the concept. Emulation does not necessarily imply imitating or borrowing elements from other artists. The relation between imitation and emulation remained vague throughout the seventeenth century; see Sluijter 2005, and Sluijter 2006, pp. 251–65 (chapter 9). In her important study on the subject, Elizabeth Cropper favoured ‘creative imitation’ and used less frequently ‘emulative imitation’ (Cropper 2005).

4 Similar conclusions can be found in Ho 2007, pp. 172–217 (chapter 6).

5 Important studies on the subject of imitation and emulation in painting include the pioneering texts by Gombrich 1966, Muller 1982 and Pochat 1987. More recent are Loh 2004, and Cropper 2005, pp. 99–127 (chapter 3). On aspects of such concepts in the northern Netherlands, see Emmens 1979, pp. 131–7, Broos 1986, Sluijter 2005, Sluijter 2006, pp. 251–65 (chapter 9), Weststeijn 2005a, Weststeijn 2008, pp. 123–67 (chapter 3) and Bracken 2015.

6 My earlier studies on this subject (Sluijter 2005, and Sluijter 2006, pp. 251–65 (chapter 9)) were focused on history painting in order to better understand Rembrandt’s treatment of such notions. For this essay, I have reconsidered these concepts and have allowed some of my conclusions to diverge from earlier insights.

7 For the classic passage against the use of the term ‘influence’, see Baxandall 1985, pp. 58–62; see also Cropper 2005, pp. 193–207 and Sluijter 2006, pp. 18–19, 251–3.

8 See also Sluijter 2015, pp. 3–4.

9 Sluijter 2006, pp. 256–61.

10 Sluijter 2005 and Sluijter 2006, pp. 251–65 (chapter 9).

11 Jansen 2005, with further references.

12 Classic studies on imitation in early modern literature are Pigman 1980 and Reckermann 1993; for the Netherlands, see Warners 1956–7 and Jansen 2005.

13 For an extensive discussion of the Senecan simile (and its relation to what Bracken calls ‘creative invention’ in the work of Rembrandt), see Bracken 2015, chapter 3, with references to the relevant literature.

- 14 Van Mander 1603–4, *Grondt*, fol. 5r (l. 46). Emmens 1979, pp. 131–7, did not recognise that Van Mander was explicitly addressing pupils and made the mistake of considering this attitude as a pre-classicist practice among established painters. Van Mander/Miedema 1973, vol. 2, pp. 388–9, rightly pointed out that this passage functioned as an exhortation to young pupils and was not meant for accomplished painters.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 We find a similarly untroubled attitude in Vasari, for whom Raphael was the great example of imitating elements from others to develop a style that was entirely his own (Cropper 2005, pp. 105–8).
- 17 See especially Willner 2016 on Van Mander's lives of Italian artists (*Het leven der Moderne . . . Italiaensche schilders*). She underlines that Van Mander meant his lives as instructive examples in a progressive history of painting and demonstrates that he emphasised the importance of artistic rivalry and the role of patrons.
- 18 See Cropper 2005, pp. 99–127 (chapter 3); Goldthwaite 2010; and Sluijter 2015, pp. 20–21.
- 19 Willner 2016; see above, note 17.
- 20 Cropper 2005, pp. 99–127 (chapter 3); Muller 1982; Sluijter 2006, *passim*; Sluijter 2015, pp. 25–95 (chapter 2, part A); and Bracken 2015, chapter 1.
- 21 Cropper 2005, pp. 120–23. The classic case remains Lanfranco's accusing Domenichino of theft, an act that divided Roman artists and connoisseurs into advocates and opponents. Elizabeth Cropper has admirably analysed the case.
- 22 On the character of Angel's speech and its relation to the art of Dou, see Sluijter 2000, pp. 199–263.
- 23 Angel 1642, pp. 36–7.
- 24 All English translations of Angel's *Lof der schilder-konst* are my own.
- 25 On Dou's practice, see, for example, Sluijter 2000, pp. 224–33.
- 26 Gerard ter Borch the Elder advised his son in a letter of 1635 to work on 'ordonantsij van modern' (literally: 'modern compositions'). For the letter and an English translation, see Washington–Detroit 2004–5, pp. 188–9. On this phrase and the meaning of term 'modern', see Kettering 2004–5, p. 20, with further references. See also this catalogue, p. 22.
- 27 Van Mander 1603–4, *Grondt, Voorrede*, *5v, and more extensively Van Hoogstraten 1678, pp. 69–75. Interestingly, Van Hoogstraten 1678, pp. 256–7, mentioned Dou and Van Mieris among the painters who chose to depict the 'noblest inventions'. On subject matter and genre in the seventeenth century, see De Vries 2011.
- 28 De Lairese 1707, book 3, chapter 2 is called *Aanwyzinge om het burgerlyk of ciertyke Modern wel uit te beelden* (Directions to depict well the civic or graceful modern subjects). On De Lairese's discussion of this type of painting, see Kemmer 1998.
- 29 See also Ho 2007, pp. 201–7, about the attitude towards a new canon in the 1660s and 1670s, and Aono 2015, pp. 19–42 (chapter 1), for the period beginning with the 1680s, when it had become a solidly established canon. About connoisseurship in relation to the establishment of a canon of desirable masters in Antwerp, see Honig 1995.
- 30 Orlers 1641, p. 378. See Sluijter 1988, p. 26, and 2000, p. 204.
- 31 Angel 1642, p. 23. See Sluijter 1988, p. 26, and Sluijter 2000, p. 216.
- 32 See Sluijter 2008, pp. 18–23, and Sluijter 2015, pp. 19–22.

- 33 Van Hoogstraten 1678, p. 310.
- 34 See the tables 'Prices of paintings' (p. 268) and 'Most expensive documented paintings' (p. 269); see also Piet Bakker's essay, p. 87.
- 35 Junius 1638, p. 170; Weststeijn 2015, p. 240. On Junius and connoisseurship, see Tummers 2011, pp. 176–80.
- 36 Sluijter 2008, pp. 18–23; Sluijter 2015, pp. 19–22. The table 'Prices of paintings' in this catalogue (p. 268) seems to reflect such ranking. However, we should be cautious about comparing the few prices we know, because prices paid by the first owner to the artist or to an art dealer are barely known, and the numbers, dates and contexts of the known prices of works by different artists, mostly appraisals in inventories, diverge greatly.
- 37 See Sluijter 2008. As a comparison, 80 per cent of the population had an annual income of less than 600 guilders. The working class earned 300 to 350 guilders, craftsmen and shopkeepers 350 to 600 (De Vries and Van der Woude 1997, pp. 561–7).
- 38 On connoisseurship and the judgement of quality, see Tummers 2011, pp. 181–234 (chapter 6).
- 39 Monconys 1665–6, vol. 2, pp. 128–83 (Delft on pp. 148–9; Leiden on pp. 152–3, 156–7). See also Blaise Ducos's essay in this book.
- 40 For Teding van Berckhout, see Fock 2012, pp. 443–4, and Piet Bakker's essay in this catalogue (p. 97). Even the schoolmaster David Beck from The Hague, who used to read Van Mander and discuss art with other middle-class people when travelling by towing barge, went to see a collector without an appointment when he visited Delft for a day (Beck 1624, p. 217).
- 41 Van Hoogstraten 1678, pp. 73, 192, 215–16; Sluijter 2005, pp. 285–6; Sluijter 2006, p. 262.
- 42 The discussions by Huygens, Schrevelius and Orlers of, respectively, Netherlandish, Haarlem and Leiden artists were entirely couched in terms of one artist surpassing the other. See Sluijter 2002, pp. 14–17, and Sluijter 2006, p. 261. On Rembrandt and the Leiden circle of humanists, see Van de Wetering 2001, pp. 27–32, and Sluijter 2015, pp. 25–6.
- 43 It was published in Latin, English and Dutch in 1637, 1638 and 1641 respectively.
- 44 Weststeijn 2015, p. 117.
- 45 Thijs Weststeijn recently admirably analysed this vocabulary. Junius's Dutch text (written in his mother tongue) is 65 per cent longer than the Latin one. In the Dutch version Junius's own comments are sometimes twice as long as in his English ones. Weststeijn 2015, pp. 121, 125.
- 46 Weststeijn 2015, esp. pp. 103–48 (chapter 2).
- 47 Ibid., p. 104.
- 48 Weststeijn 2015, p. 104, mentioned that Van Voerst travelled between Vossius in Amsterdam and Junius in London to report on the publishing progress of *The Painting of the Ancients*.
- 49 See Weststeijn 2008.
- 50 See Van Hoogstraten 1678, pp. 192–5; Sluijter 2006, pp. 255, 259–60, 262–3.
- 51 Junius 1641, p. 309.
- 52 Ibid., pp. 72, 94: 'Aemulatie (Aldus wordt den naer-ijver ofte naevaolghens-lust gemeynlick gheheeten) ... 'Naer-ijver' means both jealousy and rivalry.
- 53 Ibid., pp. 28–30. This passage is found only in the Dutch version of 1641 (Weststeijn 2015, p. 359).
- 54 Remarkable is the ample attention Junius pays in his Dutch text to the suggestion of space through tone, colour and contour, which confirms that

- Junius 'observed a key point in contemporary studio practice', as Weststeijn 2015, pp. 129–40, wrote. The word *houding* (suggestion of space through differentiation of tone and colour) is used here for the first time, and Junius writes acutely about *verdrifven* (blurring of contours), *verschieten* (gradual fading, diminution of colours) and *omronden* (gradually rounding away with fine brushes), all aspects that are important in the work of the painters discussed here.
- 55 For more on Ter Borch's painting, see Liedtke 2007, vol. 1, pp. 63–6. On this 'Ter Borchian' type, see Kettering 1993.
- 56 Angel 1642, p. 37.
- 57 This is not only true for genre painting but also for history painting. See Sluijter 2006, pp. 208–9.
- 58 We know several drawings by the young Moses ter Borch after Goltzius and Bloemaert, as well as decidedly 'mannerist' compositions of his own (Kettering 1988, vol. 1, pp. 312, 322, 344–6, nos. M 48, 49, 70, 113–20, ill.). There is one drawing by Gerard the Younger after Goltzius (ibid., p. 92, no. Gjr 2, ill.). Gerard ter Borch the Elder, whose drawings of histories show strong mannerist traits, clearly had his children draw after Goltzius.
- 59 Many variations of this pose can be seen in Goltzius's famous print after Bartholomeus Spranger, *The Wedding of Amor and Psyche* of 1587, the fountainhead of the late-mannerist 'Sprangerian' style. For this print, see Amsterdam–New York–Toledo 2003–4, pp. 87–9, no. 28, ill.
- 60 We see, for example, the exact profile pose of Ter Borch's woman in the figure of Minerva standing in the background. The attitude of the maidservant (who looks like a variation of the many young male servants with gilded wine pitchers that we find in prints of banquets of the gods or the prodigal son) is close to that of the left figure of the group of the three Muses behind Apollo.
- 61 See, for example, Sluijter 1988a. Hieronymus Bosch had already depicted a woman in contemporary dress before a mirror as *Pride*. She became familiar through many sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century prints of *Visus, Pride* and *Vanitas*. Paulus Moreelse and Jan Miense Molenaer had depicted her as a rare subject in genre painting in the 1620s and 1630s. Both artists emphasised the *vanitas* context.
- 62 Logan 1979, p. 147–9. The print after the painting (attributed to Jeremias Falck or Theodor Matham) was certainly owned by the Ter Borch family, because Moses made a drawn copy after it. However, the prints after the Reynst paintings were probably commissioned around 1655 (Logan 1979, p. 38), which means that Gerard cannot have used this print for the painting, as has been assumed (Kettering 1988, vol. 1, p. 326, no. M75, ill.; Washington–Detroit 2004–5, p. 81).
- 63 Rubens's painting has been in the Liechtenstein collection, Vaduz, since the early eighteenth century. Many old copies after Rubens's composition are known.
- 64 Naumann 1981, vol. 1, pp. 52–4.
- 65 In fact, we see the same pose (in reverse) and proportions in the figure of a woman at the left of *The Wedding of Amor and Psyche* by Goltzius after Spranger (see note 59).
- 66 This remarkable characteristic of Dou's technique, 'neatness' combined with 'looseness' as Angel described it, was already noted in his time. See Angel 1642, pp. 55–6; also Van Gool 1750–51, vol. 2, p. 4 (Sluijter 2000, pp. 245–6).

- 67 Naumann 1981, pp. 52–3, already pointed out the relation with this painting.
- 68 For Van Mieris's innovative depiction of the space and its relation to developments in Dordrecht and Delft, see Naumann 1981, pp. 52–4. Blankert 1975, p. 60, already stressed the novelty of this painting.
- 69 The change of subject when using elements of someone else's composition recalls Junius's and, more extensively, Van Hoogstraten's advice. See Junius 1641, pp. 28–9, and Van Hoogstraten 1678, pp. 192–3. The latter links the change of subject (making 'a different tune on the same song') specifically if one should want to use an admired example of *koppeling and sprong*, the arrangement of elements as imagined in space (Sluijter 2006, pp. 259–60). This is precisely what happens here.
- 70 Among the best known are, for example, Jan Saenredam after Hendrick Goltzius (c. 1598), and David Vinckboons's title print of Michiel Vlack's songbook *Den Nieuwen Lust-hof* (Amsterdam 1602) (Van Dijck and Koopman 1983, [s.p], nos. 43, 64, ill.). Closest to Van Mieris's painting is Pieter Codde's *Merry Company with a Woman Standing at a Virginal* from about 1630 (private collection; photograph at the RKD, The Hague). For 150 sixteenth- and seventeenth-century prints and paintings with women at keyboard instruments, see ibid.
- 71 Dou not only responded to Van Mieris, but also to Steen's emulative imitation of Van Mieris. The type of the seated woman recalls Steen's painting of 1659 (CAT. 3.3). Dou probably consciously referred to both paintings. For more about Steer's painting, see the catalogue entry *Musical Duos* (pp. 128–30).
- 72 Martin 1901, pp. 72, 171–3; Sluijter 1988, pp. 36–8; Baer 2000–2001, pp. 30, 124.
- 73 On the 'flatness' of light and shadow, see Taylor 2008, esp. p. 168.
- 74 Junius 1641, p. 177, used this word. Many variations exist in seventeenth-century art literature to indicate connoisseurs, as we would now call them.

ESSAY 4

ACQUISITION OR INHERITANCE? *Material Goods in Paintings by Vermeer and his Contemporaries*

pages 50–63

- See Kolfin 2005, esp. pp. 117–18.
- On the question of marble floors in seventeenth-century Dutch houses, see Fock 1998, pp. 193–208; and Fock 2001–2, pp. 86–8; more recently, Groeneveld [2010] has questioned some of Fock's earlier findings.
- Groeneveld [2010], pp. 361–2.
- Groeneveld [2010], pp. 349, 350.
- Fock 1998, pp. 208–9, FIG. 21, and Fock 2001–2, p. 91, fig. 127, illustrate a mathematical manuscript from the mid-seventeenth century that contains some twenty drawings demonstrating how to render floor patterns in perspective.
- The sole exception is Ter Borch's *Concert* (FIG. 34) of about 1675, although the patterned floor is virtually hidden and does not create a perspectival effect. Additionally, Fock 2001–2, p. 90, has noted that contemporary family portraits set in interiors, arguably a more reliable representation of domestic surroundings, nearly always show wooden floors.

- On the development of chimneypieces, see Fock 2001, pp. 94–5.
- Simpler and less 'modern' fireplaces continued to appear in scenes set in kitchens or other less ostentatious areas of the home, as for example in De Hooch's *Woman Nursing an Infant with a Child and a Dog* (CAT. 16.2) of c. 1658–60.
- Fock 2001–2, p. 94.
- See Sutton 1997, pp. 26–7; also Rotterdam 1991, *passim*.
- Ter Borch's *Curiosity* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, p. 314, pl. 164; vol. 2, pp. 168–9, no. 164) features a nearly identical chimneypiece. For the identification, see Haverkamp-Begemann 1965, p. 40; Dubbe 1982, p. 54, FIG. 23, illustrates the chimneypiece made by Derck Daniels for the Nieuwe Kamer in the Deventer town hall in 1652–3.
- Waiboer 2012, p. 73, noted that Metsu was the first artist to make reference to the Amsterdam Town Hall interior in Dutch painting. The chimneypiece (as well as the black and white tiled floor) in Metsu's *Visit to the Nursery* (FIG. 49), dated 1661, is derived from those features in the Vroedschapskamer (burgomaster's council chamber), as are the chimneypieces in numerous other paintings, all dated to Metsu's middle Amsterdam period (c. 1659–62); see Waiboer 2012, pp. 222–9, CATS A-80, A-81, A-82, A-85, A-86, ill. At least four paintings by De Hooch from the early 1660s depict interiors copied or adapted from rooms in the Town Hall; see Sutton 1980, pp. 96–8, CATS 65–68, ill., and Sutton 1997, pp. 68–77. Schavemaker 2010, p. 41, noted the impact of the Amsterdam Town Hall on Eglon van der Neer's interior scenes; whether the inspiration was direct or mediated by other artists, it takes the form of individual motifs modified and freely recombined rather than direct quotations.
- Blankert 1991, p. 199.
- Steen's *Oyster Meal* of 1660 (private collection; Braun 1980, p. 100, no. 114, ill.) and '*Easy Come, Easy Go*' of 1661 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam; ibid. 1980, p. 105, no. 143, ill.). Lunsingh Scheurleer 1935, pp. 262–3, also wondered whether Steen was inspired directly by the print or by an example seen in a private residence.
- With respect to genre paintings that included features of Amsterdam's Town Hall, see Franits 2010–11, p. 70; see also Franits 1993, pp. 112, 227, note 11; and Chapman 2001–2, pp. 133, 143, who notes that 'the intentional use of a governmental building as the setting for a domestic scene might possibly allude to the concept of the family as a microcosm of the state'.
- Koldewey 1998, esp. vol. 1, pp. 226–43.
- Fokkens 1662, p. 69; Parival 1651, p. 33; Von Zesen 1664, p. 358 (all cited in Fock 2001, p. 101). A study of sixty-five residences of mixed social classes on the Rapenburg in Leiden found more than sixty rooms hung with gilt leather, about two-thirds of which dated to the seventeenth century; see Fock 2001, p. 489, note 155.
- Fock 2001, pp. 102–3. Although Amalia van Solms opted for textiles, Willem III seems to have reverted to a preference for gilt leather.
- www.pepydiary.com/indepth/2011/09/23/at-home/ (accessed 15 February 2016).
- Fock 2001, p. 103.
- See Scholten and Koldewey 1989, p. 165.
- The posthumous inventory of Vermeer's estate made in 1676 lists 'about seven ells [4.7 metres] of

- gold-tooled leather on the wall' of a room described as an 'interior kitchen'; see Liedtke 2008, p. 19, and Montias 1989, p. 340, doc. 364; and also Vermeer's *Love Letter* (CAT. 21.3).
- 23 Examples of striped fabric wall hangings can be seen in De Hooch's *Woman and Child with a Serving Maid*, c. 1663–5 (Kunsthistorisch Museum, Vienna; Sutton 1980, p. 92, no. 54, pl. XIII) and Jan Verkolje's *Man and Woman Making Music in an Interior* of 1674 (private collection; Rome 2012, pp. 198–9, no. 44, ill.).
- 24 Fock 1998, pp. 220–26; Fock 2001–2, pp. 95–6. Just five chandeliers are mentioned in Leiden household inventories of the seventeenth century, one in The Hague and none in Amsterdam.
- 25 See Baart et al. 1990.
- 26 Recent research has suggested that white faience was made at least on a small scale in Haarlem from about 1640, and on a larger scale in Delft by 1660. See Jaspers 2007, pp. 10–14.
- 27 One of the earliest instances is Vermeer's *Woman Asleep* of c. 1656–7 (FIG. 3); see also CATS 9.1, 9.2, 16.3. A recent study of Dutch white faience is Vester 2010; my thanks to Adriaan Waiboer for bringing this to my attention. Previously, Baart et al. 1990, p. 14, had concluded that the jugs painted by Vermeer between 1658 and 1662 'must still be Italian' to judge from their shape, but that the lobed dishes in paintings by Maes and Ter Borch were 'undoubtedly Dutch'.
- 28 One exception may be a painting by Dirck Hals, dated 1626 (The National Gallery, London; MacLaren and Brown 1991, vol. 1, p. 153, no. 1074; vol. 2, pl. 134), which depicts several white *plooishotels* above a doorway.
- 29 Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 61.
- 30 See Van Dam 2004, and Roelofs 2015–16, pp. 235–6. On the display of blue and white porcelain in seventeenth-century interiors, see Van Campen 2014; and on Delftware's ability to convincingly imitate Chinese porcelain, Lambooy 2014, esp. pp. 233–5.
- 31 Gawronski et al. 2010, pp. 9–10; and Hudig 1923, pp. 45–55.
- 32 On the concept of 'new luxury' in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic, which has been defined by the economic historian Jan de Vries as a focus on the production of goods and services for the comfort and enjoyment of a broad segment of the population with discretionary income, see Franits 2010–11, esp. p. 57, and the further references cited there.
- 33 On musical culture in the Netherlands, see London 2013, pp. 10–17, and Buijsen 1996; on musical themes in painting, The Hague–Antwerp 1994.
- 34 As one example, in 1648 Constantijn Huygens purchased a virginal for about 180 guilders, equivalent to several months' salary for a skilled worker; see Legène 1994, p. 85; and Buijsen 1996, pp. 112–19.
- 35 Buijsen 1996, p. 106. In addition to keyboard instruments, lutes and bass viols were nearly ubiquitous in genre paintings; citterns, cellos and guitars were also common. Wind instruments are rarely depicted in high-life genre scenes.
- 36 There are, of course, exceptions: some paintings by Jan Miense Molenaer from the mid-1630s (both genre scenes and portraits) have a keyboard instrument as the centrepiece of the composition; see Bogendorf Rupprath 2002–3, pp. 31–2; and Raleigh–Columbus–Manchester 2002–3, pp. 100–02, CAT. 12, ill., pp. 133–5, CAT. 23, ill.