

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

CAT. 2

PEN TO PAPER

pages 122–7

- P. C. Sutton in Dublin–Greenwich 2003–4, p. 92. The Dutch text reads: ‘De Liefd wild dat ik schrijf.’
- For De Renialme’s collection, see Getty Provenance Index (http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/provenance/).
- Copies of Ter Borch’s paintings, for example, are found in the inventories of two important Amsterdam painters, Eglon van der Neer and Michael van Musscher. See Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 2, pp. 289–90.
- See P. C. Sutton in Dublin–Greenwich 2003–4, p. 134.
- See *ibid.*, p. 133.
- See Waiboer 2010–11, p. 36
- Although Vermeer’s painting is not dated, the woman’s elegant yellow jacket reappears in *Woman with a Lute* (CAT. 5.2) and *Woman with a Pearl Necklace* (CAT. 6.4), both of which date to about 1664.

CAT. 3

MUSICAL DUOS

pages 128–34

- For examples of prints and paintings from the earlier period, see Kolfin 2005.
- See also Naumann 1981, pp. 52–4, who pointed out similarities with Ter Borch’s *Two Women Making Music, with a Page* and Jan Miense Molenaar’s *Woman Playing a Virginal* (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; Raleigh–Columbus–Manchester 2002–3, pp. 133–5, no. 23, ill.). Closest, however, is *Merry Company with a Woman Standing at the Virginal* of about 1630 by Pieter Codde (private collection; https://rkd.nl/explore/images/190695).
- See Naumann 1981, p. 53, for connections with Delft painters and works by Quiringh van Brekelenkam. Nicolaes Maes’s work, however, seems to me to have been more important to Van Mieris.
- For a large number of examples, see Van Dijk and Koopman 1983.
- Other paintings by Steen, notably *Young Woman with a Letter* (*‘Bathsheba with King David’s Letter’*) (CAT. 6.2), demonstrate that he also knew Ter Borch’s *Young Woman at her Toilet with a Maid* (CAT. 6.1). See this catalogue, pp. 147–9.
- Steen depicted many other women standing or sitting at the harpsichord, for example, Braun 1980, p. 109, no. 169, ill.; p. 116, no. 210, ill.; p. 120, no. 247, ill.; p. 132, no. 315, ill.; p. 170, no. B110, ill.
- In general, the nobility had significantly fewer paintings in their interiors than wealthy burghers, but they traditionally had tapestries covering their walls – quite a rarity in rich burgher interiors. See Sluijter 2015–16, pp. 90–91.
- A harpsichord by Andreas Rückers the Younger with this text still exists and is dated 1654 (Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, inv. nr. MINE85; http://objektkatalog.gnm.de/objekt/MINE85). One of

Steen’s Leiden acquaintances must have owned such an instrument.

- Waiboer 2012, pp. 254–5, no. A-115, ill.; pp. 262–3, no. A-122, ill.; pp. 263–4, no. A-123, ill.; pp. 268–9, no. A-129, ill.
- See Waiboer 2012, pp. 33–144 (chapters 3–5). In regard to the women at the harpsichord, for example, it is clear that *Woman at the Virginal and a Man Offering her a Drink* (Ranger’s House (English Heritage), Blackheath, London; *ibid.*, pp. 268–9, no. A-129, ill.) confirms his knowledge of Ter Borch’s *Refused Letter* (Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Alte Pinakothek, Munich; Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, p. 283, pl. 124; vol. 2, pp. 137–8, no. 124). Metsu’s *Man and a Woman at a Virginal* (The National Gallery, London; Waiboer 2012, pp. 254–5, no. A-115, ill.) and *Woman at a Virginal with a Dog* (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam; Waiboer 2012, pp. 263–4, no. A-123, ill.) demonstrate that the artist had studied Vermeer’s *Woman at the Virginal with a Gentleman* (*‘The Music Lesson’*) (here, FIG. 68) and Emanuel de Witte’s *Woman at the Virginal* (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam; The Hague–Antwerp 1994, pp. 316–20, no. 45, ill.).
- The State Hermitage Museum of Art, St Petersburg; Naumann 1981, vol. 2, p. 30, no. 27, pl. 27.
- This work probably dates from the time Netscher was a pupil in Ter Borch’s studio between approximately 1654–5 and 1658–60. See Wieseman 2002, pp. 24–5, about his presence there.
- Some of Ter Borch’s women turn their faces towards the viewer (for example, CAT. 7.2) but, as Adriaan Waiboer pointed out to me, always look past the painting’s beholder rather than address him/her directly, as is the case with many women by Dou, Van Mieris and Metsu, and a few by Vermeer as well.
- It is not clear what is represented here. The left one (relief or grisaille) is certainly an amorous scene, and in the centre the standing figure in armour might be Minerva. At the right is a seated couple with a child in their lap. See Wieseman 2002, p. 65.
- One wonders whether some connoisseurs would have assessed the different parts of Netscher’s painting as too recognisably borrowed and not transformed into something sufficiently different and new. This composition calls to mind the words of Franciscus Junius when he scornfully rejected works that are like ‘bits and pieces . . . shamelessly scraped together and subsequently combined unartfully and infelicitously’, but contemporaries may have judged it differently. Junius 1641. p. 309. See Eric Jan Sluijter’s essay in this catalogue, p. 43. This applies even more to several paintings by Jacob Ochtervelt with ladies at a keyboard instrument. See Kuretsky 1979, p. 78, no. 58, FIG. 57; pp. 86–7, no. 78, FIG. 90; pp. 92–3, no. 94, FIG. 105; p. 93, no. 95, FIG. 107; p. 93, no. 96, FIG. 108; p. 94, no. 97, FIG. 109.
- In contrast, an animated relation between the protagonists and a variety of surface textures is precisely what Metsu emphasised in his response to Vermeer’s painting (The National Gallery, London; Waiboer 2012, pp. 254–4, no. A-115, ill.). Vermeer challenges the viewer to look and contemplate. Metsu, in contrast, invites the viewer to enjoy his virtuosity in imitating all kinds of surfaces and to engage in the amorous narrative and lively interaction. See *ibid.*, pp. 119–21.

CAT. 4

INVITING DUETS

pages 135–9

- Joseph Taylor, visiting Rotterdam on 7–10 September 1707; cited in Van Strien 1998, pp. 326–7. Compare also Jan Vos’s comments on the unique intimacy of Metsu’s *Visit to the Nursery* (here, FIG. 49); see also Dublin–Amsterdam–Washington 2010–11, p. 191).
- The idea that Dou’s painting was a model for Vermeer has been proposed by numerous authors; perhaps the first to observe the relationship was Boström 1949, p. 24.
- For Dirck van Baburen’s *Procuress* (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), see Franits 2013, pp. 125–30, no. A23, ill. This painting (or a version of it) was owned by Vermeer’s mother-in-law, Maria Thins. On the virginal painting, see Weber 1994.
- This may be why Vermeer (or a later hand) covered the woman’s bodice (which X-rays have shown originally resembled that in *Young Woman Seated at a Virginal*) with the broad swathe of ‘timeless’ yellow drapery that now envelops her upper body. The technical aspects of this painting are discussed in Sheldon and Costeras 2006.

CAT. 5

STRINGS ATTACHED

pages 140–44

- This entry is a partial adaptation of Waiboer 2017.
- Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 64, mentioned that Van Mieris’s *Woman with a Theorbo-Lute* ‘probably served as the basis for Steen’s and Vermeer’s excursions into the subject’ without further elaborating this point. See also Waiboer 2017.
- Although the direction of influence is undocumented, it is highly unlikely that Vermeer’s painting preceded Van Mieris’s work, considering his strong reliance on the work of the Leiden painter in the first half of the 1660s (see Waiboer 2017). While Van Mieris’s painting is inscribed 1663, Vermeer’s is variably dated to c. 1664 (Wheelock 1981, p. 112), 1662–3 (Liedtke 2008, p. 101), c. 1662–5 (Franits 2015, p. 141).
- Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 67, argued: ‘Also close to Van Mieris’s *Woman Playing the Lute* is Vermeer’s late guitar player in Kenwood House, which exhibits similar concerns for smooth surface and polish finish.’
- This is at odds with what can be found in the two most recent catalogues raisonnées of Vermeer’s work (Liedtke 2008, pp. 195, 198; Schütz 2015, pp. 226, 238–9), which assume that the seventeenth-century provenance of *Woman with a Lute* is unknown and that *The Guitar-Player* from Kenwood House appeared at the posthumous auction of Jacob Dissius in Amsterdam on 16 May 1696 as ‘A young lady playing the guitar’ (Hoet 1752, vol. 1, p. 34). As the vast majority of Dissius’s works probably originated from his father-in-law, Pieter Claesz van Ruijven, it is assumed that the latter owned *The Guitar-Player*. However, it is more likely that Van Ruijven had in his possession *Woman with a Lute*, even though the description in the 1696 sales catalogue identified the painting as a guitar.

- Montias 1989, p. 260, note 54, argued that ‘one would have expected the contemporaries of Vermeer to know the difference between a cittern and a lute’. I am afraid that Montias had too much faith in the musical knowledge of Dutch auctioneers. Musical instruments were frequently wrongly identified in early sources, as exemplified by Hoet 1752, vol. 2, p. 442, who described the instrument held by the woman in Ter Borch’s *Woman Playing the Theorbo-Lute and a Cavalier* (Liedtke 2007, vol. 1, pp. 70–4, no. 15, ill.) as a ‘guitar’. A legal clerk described the instrument in Metsu’s *Woman Tuning her Cittern, Approached by a Man in 1752* as a ‘viola da gamba’ (Waiboer 2012, p. 223, no. A-81). Be that as it may, *The Guitar-Player* remained in all likelihood unsold in Vermeer’s studio and came into the possession of master baker Hendrick van Buyten (Montias 1989, pp. 217, 260). Assuming that Vermeer did not paint any other musicians with plucked string instruments, the Kenwood painting is probably identical with ‘a figure playing the cittern’, which Vermeer’s widow gave to Van Buyten on 27 January 1676 together with *Lady Writing a Letter, with her Maid* to cover an outstanding debt (*ibid.*, p. 338, doc. no. 361). Given that *The Guitar-Player* dates to the last few year of Vermeer’s career and the artist’s widow admitted in April 1676 that her husband had earned ‘very little or hardly anything at all’ since the French invasion in 1672, it is likely that this was the picture that was still in the couple’s possession (*ibid.*, pp. 344–5, doc. 367). If Van Ruijven indeed owned *Woman with a Lute*, several artists who presumably visited his collection, including Ter Borch, Steen, Metsu, Ochtervelt, Netscher and Van Brekelenkam, had an opportunity to study it (Waiboer 2010, p. 59). Van Buyten’s collection was easily accessible as well, given that Balthasar de Monconys saw it in August 1663 without having made a prior appointment (Monconys 1665–6, vol. 2, p. 124).
- 6 Naumann 1981, vol. 1, p. 67. For Van der Neer’s paintings, see Schavemaker 2010, p. 466, no. 39, ill. (present location unknown); p. 468–9, no. 46, ill. (Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum, Aachen); p. 470, no. 51, ill. (present location unknown); p. 477, no. 63, colour pl. XXI (private collection, New York); p. 481, no. 73, ill. (Staatliche Kunsthalle, Karlsruhe); p. 485–6, no. 83, colour pl. XXVII (Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Alte Pinakothek, Munich); for Netscher’s, see Wieseman 2002, p. 227, no. 84, ill. (Wallace Collection, London); p. 252, no. 119, ill. (present location unknown); for Verschuring’s, Van der Werff’s and Van Dijk’s, see Aono 2015, pp. 28–30, FIG. 5 (Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart); FIG. 6 (Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague); FIG. 7 (private collection).

CAT. 6

PRIVATE VANITY

pages 145–51

- For further discussion of Ter Borch’s relationship with Gesina, see Arthur Wheelock’s essay in this catalogue, p. 21.
- For further discussion of this painting, see A. K. Wheelock in Washington–Amsterdam 1996–7, 132–4, no. 11, and P. C. Sutton in Dublin–Greenwich 2003–4, pp. 162–6, no. 31.

- For a differing interpretation of Vermeer’s painting, see Liedtke 2008, pp. 115–17, no. 18. For the relationship of Van Mieris’s painting to that of Vermeer, see The Hague–Washington 2005–6, pp. 157–9, no. 31.

CAT. 7

REFLECTIONS

pages 152–6

- Hoogstraten 1678, p. 263, emphasised that reflections should be painted in subdued tones to make them appear realistic.
- Van Veen 1611, pp. 116–17. In an emblem entitled *Out of sight out of mynde*, Cupid gazes at his own reflection in a mirror. The accompanying text provides the moral: ‘The glasse doth shew the face whyle thereon one doth look,/ But gon, it doth another in lyke manner shew./ Once beeing turnd away forgotten is the view,/ So absence hath bin cause the louer loue forsook.’
- According to Cesare Ripa’s *Iconologia* (1644), a mirror is one of the attributes of Prudence; with it she achieves self-knowledge (Ripa 1644, p. 622). It is also an attribute of Truth; just as a mirror accurately reflects reality, so does man achieve understanding when he comprehends the true character of the physical world. Otto van Veen related the elements of truth and love to a mirror’s reflection in his emblem ‘Clear and pure’. For a discussion of these issues, see A. K. Wheelock in Washington–The Hague 1995–6, p. 142.
- For a discussion of the mirror reflection in Vermeer’s paintings, see Wheelock 1995, p. 89–90.
- Washington–London–The Hague 2000–2001, pp. 128, 143 (under CAT. 32), note 1. The existence of the doors is noted in an inventory of 1678, where it is written: ‘Being a little woman being coiffed, with a door opening outward on which is a sucking woman by candlelight’ (*sijnde een vrouwtje dat gekapt wordt, met openslaende deur en daerop een suygent vrouwtje bij de lamp*). It is not clear what iconographical relationship might have existed between the image on the doors and the painting of *Lady at her Toilet*.
- To reinforce this central compositional and iconographic focus, Dou placed the vanishing point of his perspective system just behind the woman’s neck.

CAT. 8

PURITY AND INTRUSION

pages 157–63

- For Netscher’s apprenticeship with Ter Borch, see Wieseman 2002, pp. 24–5.
- For more on Netscher’s painting, see *ibid.*, p. 54.
- State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg; Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, p. 269, pl. 111; vol. 2, pp. 120–1, no. 111.
- For more on Van der Neer’s painting, see Schavemaker 2010, p. 43. The similarities between Netscher’s and Van der Neer’s paintings are intriguing, but in all likelihood coincidental.
- For more on this painting, see Lasius 1992, pp. 49, 139, no. 204, pl. 66.

- The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Sutton 1980, p. 100, no. 79, pl. 82. For more on De Hooch’s painting, see Liedtke 2007, vol. 1, pp. 366–9, no. 88, ill.
- The woman’s pensive expression, as if distracted from her mundane activity by her own thoughts, probably originates from other paintings by Ter Borch, such as *Lady at her Toilet* (CAT. 7.2). For more on Vermeer’s painting, see *ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 877–83, no. 203, ill.
- Hoet 1752, vol. 1, p. 34, no. 5; Waiboer 2011.
- Waiboer 2012, pp. 136–8.
- Ibid.*, pp. 90–91.
- Schavemaker 2010, p. 39.

CAT. 9

THE FOOD OF LOVE

pages 164–9

- Naumann 1981, vol. 2, p. 30, no. 27, ill.; P. van der Ploeg in The Hague–Washington 2005–6, pp. 129–31, no. 20, ill..
- A much earlier painting by Ter Borch, *Young Woman Preventing a Man from Pouring Wine into her Glass*, usually dated to 1648, also displays some general similarities to Van Mieris’s composition (private collection; Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, p. 230, pl. 68; vol. 2, p. 89, no. 68).
- See, for instance, Waiboer 2012, p. 85. Of the artists mentioned, only Van Mieris dated most of his genre paintings.
- Ibid.*, p. 222, no. A-80, ill., dated Metsu’s *Gentleman Offering Oysters to a Woman* to c. 1659–62.
- Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 3, p. 7.
- Washington–Amsterdam 1996–7, pp. 126–8, no. 9, ill.; Van Suchtelen 2011, pp. 32–4, ill.
- In 2012, the Mauritshuis embarked on an ambitious research project to improve our understanding of Steen’s technical and artistic development. The art-historical study is based on the analysis of paint samples. *Interior with a Man Offering an Oyster to a Woman* (CAT. 9.3) has been dated variously to c. 1659–63 and c. 1662–6 (Braun 1980, p. 110, no. 172).
- Ibid.*, p. 110, no. 173, ill.; MacLaren and Brown 1991, vol. 1, pp. 428–9, no. 2559, vol. 2, pl. 354.
- See, for instance, Q. Buvelot in Bevelot et al. 1998, pp. 192–5, no. 52, FIG. 52a, pp. 196–9, no. 53, FIG. 53b.
- Naumann 1981, vol. 2, pp. 44–7, FIGS. C 36a, C 36b, C 36c, C 36m, C 36u. A watercolour of 1784 by Jacobus Buys after a variant (*ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 46–7, no. 36u) has since been sold (sale, Amsterdam (Sotheby’s), 10 November 1998, no. 117).
- During restoration of this painting, the inscription *F.v. Mieris Ft Ao 1675* was found, but it does not appear to be autograph. If the date is correct, however, this version might be one of the earliest copies after the painting in The Hague.
- For more on this painting, now in the Harold Samuel Collection, London, see Kuretsky 1979, pp. 62–3, no. 23, FIG. 33; Sutton 1992, pp. 134–6, no. 46, ill.
- Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam; Kuretsky 1979, pp. 67–8, no. 36, FIG. 40; Lammertst et al. 1998, pp. 123–5, no. 40, ill.
- Schavemaker 2010, pp. 23, 199.
- Ibid.*, pp. 52–3.
- See Franits 2015, p. 126; Waiboer 2016, p. 132.