Something more than four hundred years ago, Govert Flinck (1615-1660) was born in Cleves and Ferdinand Bol (1616-1680) was born in Dordrecht – they were contemporaries. When their initial schooling as painters, which they were about fifteen, the two talented artists attended Rembrandt’s workshop, where they were training under Rembrandt, who at that time ran the biggest art studio in Amsterdam, and even surpassed Rembrandt in that regard; they remained in their famous teacher’s shadow in the centuries that followed. To honour Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol, the Rembrandt House Museum and the Amsterdam Museum came together to produce a major double exhibition and this book, in which the two artists are portrayed and compared.

As advanced students, they took part in the production process in the workshop and in so doing mastered Rembrandt’s style. After they had set themselves up as artists in their own right, Flinck and Bol still worked in Rembrandt’s style for some years, before adopting a different, more classicist approach. Flinck emerged as a true virtuoso who worked in different painting styles, depending on the commission. Bol, moreover, was the only one of Rembrandt’s pupils to produce a substantial graphic oeuvre, amounting to twenty or so skilfully etched prints.

This book chronicles the latest insights into Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol, including some surprising evidence from the palaeographic inscriptions on the paintings and etchings. The essays explore the essential artistic values and challenges for Rembrandt and his pupils, and the family connections and social networks that were crucial to their success. Bol and Flinck were awarded prestigious commissions – from private individuals and rulers, and from city institutions including the civic guard and the town hall. Fifteen paintings by Bol and Flinck were restored especially for the exhibition. Words and images combine to make this book a valuable addition to art lovers’ libraries.
Something over four hundred years ago, Govert Flinck (1615-1660) was born in Cleves and Ferdinand Bol (1616-1680) was born in Dordrecht – they were contemporaries. After their initial schooling as painters, when they were about twenty, the two talented artists moved to Amsterdam, where they finished their training under Rembrandt, who at that time was at the height of his fame. From though Flinck and Bol were commissioned almost the same work as Rembrandt, and so experienced Rembrandt in that regard, they retained in their famous teacher’s shadow in the centuries that followed. To honour Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol, the Rembrandt House Museum and the Amsterdam Museum came together to produce a major double exhibition and this book, in which the two artists are portrayed and compared.

As advanced students, they took part in the production process in the workshop and in so doing mastered Rembrandt’s style. After they had set themselves up as artists in their own right, Flinck and Bol still worked in Rembrandt’s style for some years, before adopting a different, more classicist approach. Flinck emerged as a true virtuoso who worked in different painting styles, depending on the commission. Bol, moreover, was the only one of Rembrandt’s pupils to produce a substantial graphic oeuvre, amounting to twenty or so skilfully etched prints. This book chronicles the latest insights into Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol, setting out to recreate the complex context of their lives, their times, and their work. From their coming into Rembrandt’s inner circle to their later commissions, the book explores the influence of their master and of his contemporaries, as well as the development of their artistic styles. The essays feature a wealth of color illustrations, including newly commissioned drawings and new perspectives. The book offers an intensive study of the artists’ lives and work, focusing on their influences and their development, their contributions, and their legacies. It is an essential companion for researchers and students of art history, as well as for those interested in the art and culture of the period.
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124. GOVERT FLINCK  Allegory of the Death of Frederick Henry and the Continuation of the Orange Dynasty, 1654. Oil on canvas, 307 x 189 cm. The Hague, William V Gallery, inv. no. 1116 (on loan from the Rijksmuseum Amsterdam)
From Immersion in Rembrandt’s Manner to a Style of Their Own

Evidence that you had been a pupil of the most famous master would have guaranteed a good start. For great talents like Flinck and Bol, who had both already been fully trained, this was an important reason to study with Rembrandt. Houbraken, basing his assertion on information from artists who had been around at the time, was quite explicit: ‘Rembrandt’s art was generally appreciated as something wholly new, so artists were obliged to master his manner of painting if they wanted their work to do well in the market ... the reason why Gouver Flinck ... and others went to study with Rembrandt.’ At the same time, though, while following the style of such a famous artist might well be lucrative, an ambitious young painter who wanted to make a name
for himself also had to be distinctive. This was the task both Flinck and Bol set themselves. They must also have been aware of the age-old advice, repeated by Samuel van Hoogstraten, another of Rembrandt’s pupils, that artists should discover as soon as possible what best suited their own characters.6

Both broke with Rembrandt’s style in the mid-fourties. They immediately seized on the potential of a new trend – commissions for large-scale history paintings (overmantel and overdoor paintings and wall panels) to occupy permanent positions in the panelling of prestigious spaces, both public and private, such as the reception rooms of the upper echelons of society.7 Gaining a place in a network of wealthy patrons was essential and they, unlike their teacher, were perfectly cut out for this (pp. 58-79).8 But their skill in manoeuvring themselves into elite networks was not all that enabled them to make the transition to a new type of painting; proceeding from the specific characteristics that began to emerge in their earliest works they were able to create a style that this elite recognized as perfectly suited to their needs. Rembrandt’s priorities were completely different: his position as a great artist was always at the forefront of his mind. He decided what he made – masterpieces for the connoisseur-collector – and his paintings were sold predominantly through the art trade or from his workshop.9

**Ferdinand Bol**

By copying the master’s spectacularly innovative paintings while he was in Rembrandt’s studio, Bol spent much longer than Flinck training with Rembrandt and consequently internalized his style more thoroughly. The young Bol likewise made copies and variations of Rembrandt’s compositions (p. 46, fig. 46 and p. 48, fig. 51). From his earliest independent works, however, we see that Bol sought a certain elegance and muted emotion, using warm colours and nuanced transitions from light to dark to create a typical sort of ‘soft focus’ (figs. 125 and p. 51, fig. 55).10 Picturing powerful movements and feelings was not in his nature. Even
in a subject that is anything but tranquil, *The Sacrifice of Isaac*, an immense painting made in 1646 that would immediately have reminded everyone in Amsterdam of Rembrandt’s 1635 work, Bol went to great lengths to avoid his teacher’s gruesome directness and his focus on stirring up powerful emotions (p. 101, fig. 121 and p. 25, fig. 11).16

Flinck’s ability to deploy stylistic means that were very different from those he had learnt with Rembrandt is already evident in his earliest independent works. In the pastoral pendants he painted in 1636 (p. 28, figs. 17 and 18), for example, the figure of the shepherd (who has Rembrandt’s features) has notably little in common with Rembrandt’s style. The palette and the design in distinct areas of colour derive from those of his first teacher, Lambert Jacobsz. A shepherdess Flinck painted a few years later (fig. 126), which would also have had a pendant of a young shepherd, shows the virtuosity with which he could blend different elements in the early sixteen-forties. The round face with its rosy cheeks, the pale, almost translucent skin and the flaxen curls immediately call to mind a group of paintings of a young blonde woman that Rembrandt made in the early thirties.17 But the broad, flowing movement with which Flinck painted the costume with dark strokes and dabs and seemingly swiftly applied highlights over a light brown ground that shows through, is similar to the painting technique used for the tronies of children and young people by Jacob Backer, Flinck’s friend, seven years his senior, who studied with him under Lambert Jacobsz. The young model even seems to be the same girl Backer painted, probably a little earlier.18 The carefulness of Flinck’s modelling is very different from Backer’s rather showy pursuit of effect. A surprising aspect is the unusual colouring of
the light background that suggests a cloudy sky against which the graceful contours of the girl’s figure stand out. Initially this little painting, which was originally oval, then changed into an octagon (and only later made rectangular), had the quite dark, brownish background one would expect; it was probably Flinck himself who overpainted it with light blue and grey.19

Around the mid-forties, Flinck abandoned the outward characteristics of Rembrandt’s style in most of his works, although if desired – as in The Crucifixion of 1647 – he could still apply the essential elements of that style, in which ‘the forceful control of the lights and shadows’ was fundamental (fig. 127).20 A Christ Holding the Cross of 1649 shows just how flexible he was at around this time (fig. 128). Whereas the Crucifixion was painted for an art-loving member of his Mennonite family, his cousin Ameldonck Leeuw,21 the Christ Holding the Cross was probably made as a devotional work for a Catholic client. The idealized Christ type is unmistakably Anthony van Dyck’s, as are the pathos of his expression and the delicacy with which he holds the Cross.22 Then, as now, every connoisseur must have thought of Van Dyck when he saw this picture, and that would have been the intention. Wealthy Catholics would certainly have been familiar with replicas and copies of Antwerp devotional paintings like this.

It was a few years earlier, with his civic guard portrait of 1645, the Company of Captain Albert Bas for the Arquebusiers’ Guild, that Flinck emphatically broke with Rembrandt’s example (p. 136, fig. 169). This is not a history painting, true, but it should be discussed
here because Flinck made ingenious use of the structure of a history work (see p. 133). 23

Face with this new and difficult challenge – a large group of twelve life-sized figures in a
tall, narrow space – he looked for assistance in his composition to a Rubens altarpiece that
he knew from a print (p. 136, fig. 170). This enabled him to arrange the group of life-sized
figures within a clearly constructed space such that they fill the whole of the picture plane
from top to bottom. Flinck carefully modelled each figure individually and gave them clear
outlines, but he was also able to use the ‘houding’ he had learnt from Rembrandt: nuances in
colour, tone and shading create a convincing space between the figures, something lacking,
for instance, in the militia portraits by Backer and Sandrart in the same room.24

This monumental work must have brought him considerable acclaim among the Amsterdam
elite. His growing prestige would also have been given a significant boost by the patronage
of the Grand Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick William, and his wife, Louise Henriëtte (the
oldest daughter of Frederick Henry and Amalia of Solms-Braunfels).25 The commission he
received from them must have been prompted by the fact that Frederick William also ruled
Flinck’s birthplace, the Duchy of Cleves. The allegory of the birth of the electoral couple’s
first son was a type of composition that Flinck had never painted before. It was, moreover,
a subject for which there was no existing iconographic tradition on which he could call (fig.
129). Again, he made ingenious use of the compositional scheme of another subject, the
adoration of Christ. He used traditional motifs like the Virgin ‘revealing’ the infant Christ by
lifting a blanket, a kneeling figure and a standing figure on either side of the new-born baby, and an opening heaven populated by cherubs. The Virgin and the worshipping shepherds were replaced with the guardian goddesses Venus, Minerva and Juno, accompanied by the figure of Abundance who takes Joseph’s place right at the back. In the background Flinck pictured Schwanenburg Castle in Cleves, where Prince Wilhelm Heinrich was born in 1648. When the prince died in 1649, the menacing skeleton holding an arrow was added, half concealed behind Juno and Abundance (see also p. 222-225). The recollection of a print after Abraham Bloemaert’s Adoration of the Shepherds (fig. 130) probably aided Flinck in creating this composition, but he skilfully transformed it into something wholly contemporary.26 The group of figures, with a lot of bright red and very light flesh tones, is carefully lit so that it stands out against the many shades of grey in the background. The deft ‘koppeling’ of the figures shows that Flinck could use with aplomb a lesson learnt from Rubens in constructing a composition in which divine and mortal figures are linked in a sweeping curve through space.27

The success of Flinck’s commission for her daughter and son-in-law must have prompted Amalia to order another allegory from him, this one to be much larger. In 1654 she got him to paint an Allegory of the Death of Frederick Henry and the Continuation of the Orange Dynasty for her ‘large cabinet’ in Huis ten Bosch (fig. 124). An Annunciation by Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert had been hanging on the opposite wall since 1649 (fig. 131).28 This Brabant-born artist, who worked in Antwerp and was one of the most successful followers of Van Dyck, had been a favourite at the court in The Hague for some time. This gave Flinck an opportunity
to present himself as the equal of or – better yet – superior to the best Antwerp artists of the day. Flinck made a composition that subtly reflected that of Willeboirts’s *Annunciation* facing it across the room (in its current form an 85-centimetre strip is missing from the top of that work). As the Archangel Gabriel appears to the Virgin in Willeboirts’s painting while she reads the Bible, so an angel appears to Amalia as she sits with an open book on her lap. Flinck combined the pictorial schemes of two types of traditional Annunciation iconography (merged by Willeboirts) – the type with the descending angel and that with the angel kneeling before the Virgin. Here, the latter became the personification of Hope. In both works a monumental, imaginary classical architecture (in Flinck’s case a huge tomb of Frederick Henry) is shown, and a ray of divine light breaks through dark grey-blue clouds. In the flowing outlines and gleaming surfaces, Flinck appropriated characteristics of a Van Dyckian manner, but the compactness of the modelling and the considered tonality of the many nuances, black, green, grey-green, blue-grey, greyish orange, reddish brown and yellow, with which the figures are subtly placed in the space relative to one another, show that his work was rooted in a different artistic tradition. His style appears to be in deliberate competition with the more superficial handling and relative lack of depth in Willeboirts’s canvas.

From the same year, 1654, comes a pastoral painting that was probably commissioned as an overmantel (fig. 132). In the second and third decades of the seventeenth century Pieter Lastman was the first artist to make paintings of amorous pastoral couples with decidedly erotic overtones that do not allude to a specific story (fig. 133); these are more at home in the tradition of light-hearted pastoral ballads in the popular Amsterdam song books than in the pastoral literature for the stage. Rembrandt had reflected this in 1642 with an etching that gave an entirely new twist to the amorous pastoral: an uncouth rustic voyeur, flute at the ready, looks up the skirt of an innocent-seeming shepherdess who sits weaving a garland of flowers (fig. 134). Rembrandt’s little scene must have been at the back of Flinck’s mind, but his shepherd and shepherdess are beautiful young urbanites with contemporary hairstyles, wearing loosely draped pastoral costumes made of expensively gleaming fabrics. Erotic humour is still evident in the position of flute and flower garland, while the couple
eye one another with arch smiles. Rembrandt’s almost alarming contrast between raw lust and naïve innocence is transformed into a playful game between two elegantly posed young people. And Rembrandt’s restless jostling rams and billy-goats, age-old symbols of lust, have become quietly grazing sheep. Flinck painstakingly observed all the rules of grace and decorum that Rembrandt had broken (and which Lastman largely ignored, too).

Flinck’s effort to restore ‘welstand’ (which implied grace, beauty and decorum both of an individual figure and of a composition as a whole) to a central role is nicely expressed in his life studies (pp.196-199, figs. 271, 272 and 276). Styling in body and pose was anathema to Rembrandt, and that included life drawing, whereas Flinck specifically accentuates conventional, ‘welstandige’ poses in arranging and depicting a nude model. Flinck’s painting of the semi-nude *Bathsheba with the Letter from King David* done in 1659, the last year of his life, must have been painted as a riposte to Rembrandt’s incomparable masterpiece of 1654, probably as a commission (figs. 135 and 136). Flinck was undoubtedly aware that he could never equal the way Rembrandt evokes powerful emotional involvement in the viewer. The suggestion of physical proximity and the insistence with which Rembrandt compels the viewer to think about the inner conflict in this woman, faced as she is with an impossible dilemma, would have struck many in the upper ranks of Amsterdam society as unsuited to their prestigious reception rooms. Well-painted, attractive physical beauty was a prerequisite, of course, for Bathsheba ignited the fire of love in those who beheld her nakedness; Flinck wholly satisfied this requirement. His nude moreover followed the rules of grace and decorum, which created some distance from the viewer.
Ferdinand Bol went through a similar process of development. As early as 1644, Bol had painted a *Vertumnus and Pomona* in which his style appears to have undergone a radical change (fig. 137), but the contrast with earlier work is mainly evident in the composition, based on Jacob Backer’s work, the bright colours and the gleaming fabrics. It is no coincidence that this move towards a lighter and more colourful palette occurred when he painted a work with a mythological subject. Throughout his career, Bol differentiated between classical or pastoral themes, for which he used light, bright colours, and biblical subjects painted with more muted colours and heavier shadows. The change that began in 1644 was fully developed by 1650, as we see, for instance, in his *The Crowning of Mirtillo* (fig. 138). This theme, taken from the pastoral tragicomedy *Il Pastor Fido*, was a favourite with Jacob Backer, who had painted a number of pastoral subjects based on Renaissance literature in the sixteen-forties. At the same time, Flinck and Bol’s contemporary Jacob van Loo, who had trained in The Hague, made his first works with such subjects, such as his *The Crowning of Mirtillo* of around 1649. There was certainly an interaction between these painters, but unlike Backer and Van Loo, Bol continued to create the effect of three-dimensional space entirely by means of colour, light and shadow.

Bol’s *Venus and Adonis* in the Rijksmuseum (c. 1655-58) must have been made in competition with a work by Backer (figs. 139 and 140). Bol painted the same restrained movement by a rather hesitantly departing Adonis, who looks lovingly at the anxious Venus. This is an unusual interpretation of the subject, which we know only from a number of paintings by Backer, Bol and Van Loo. Rather than emphasizing the dramatic action of Adonis’s departure, they focus on the loving relationship between the two, which Bol accentuated by placing two turtle doves lower right. Strikingly, we see in Bol’s painting the same type of female nude as in Backer’s (and in some of Van Loo’s works, too). It is based on drawings of one particular female model.
that Backer, Flinck, Bol and Van Loo made at the same time: small, high breasts, a rather broad midriff, almost no waist, and markedly long, thin lower legs. Although stylized in pose and outline, the type definitely does not conform to classical proportions and anatomy; the ‘from life’ suggestion is admittedly less pronounced than in Rembrandt, but it is greater than in most Flemish or Italian nudes. Where Bol’s painting differs significantly from Backer’s, however, is in the powerful modelling with which Bol’s figures advance out of a convincing space; this is achieved entirely by careful modulations of colour and tone. In comparison, Backer’s figures look quite flat and rather insecurely placed on a narrow strip against a background that lacks depth. Bol’s robust shadows and the lively palette create a potent relief that gives the figures a strong presence.

These latter qualities are also immediately evident in a rather large painting of The Virgin and Child with St John the Baptist and the Archangel Gabriel of 1659 (fig. 141). A Catholic client must
have had a specific reason for commissioning Bol to make a work with this rare iconography. The combination of the Virgin and Child, the infant John the Baptist and the Archangel Gabriel is highly unusual and I am aware of only a few early Renaissance paintings of this subject by Botticelli and his circle. As Flinck did earlier, Bol also looked to Anthony van Dyck when he was commissioned to make a devotional work of this kind. In the graceful movement with which Mary bends over the child as he lies on his back and raises one arm, Bol is making a variant of a composition he would have known from an engraving after Van Dyck. Bol continues the flowing movement into the space in the Christ child’s gesture as he grasps the lily Gabriel holds out to him. All the forms are fluidly connected from the lower right foreground to the upper left background and supported by the figure of John with his lamb. The robust forms and the colouring in the foreground so typical of Bol – a combination of rust red, strong yellow and very light flesh tones – set the brightly lit Virgin and Child off powerfully against the greyish dun and beige-brown shades in which the subsidiary figures are painted. None of this is at all reminiscent of Van Dyck or any other Flemish painter.

Flinck and Bol in the Town Hall

When the burgomasters of Amsterdam decided to award contracts for the decorations in the town hall, they commissioned Flinck and Bol to make the paintings in the most prestigious rooms. For the Burgomasters’ Cabinet they had to decorate the very large chimney breasts that faced each other across the room, with Manius Curius Dentatus Rejects the Bribes of the Samnites and Gaius Fabricius Luscinus in Pyrrhus’s Army Camp respectively (pp. 134-135, figs. 167 and 168): a direct confrontation that inevitably invited comparison. It would soon have been
realized that Flinck’s approach – with well-defined forms linked by fluid movement, a more clearly constructed setting and more even lighting – is better suited to such huge paintings hanging high above the viewer’s head (see further pp. 132-141).

Flinck confirmed his abilities on a truly grand scale with Solomon’s Prayer for Wisdom for the City Council Chamber, completed in 1658, in which he achieved a high point of Rubenesque movement (fig. 142). At the same time, however, Flinck’s roots in the Amsterdam history painting of an older generation remained very evident: in types, poses and gestures, the figures are reminiscent of the work of Pieter Lastman and even Claes Moyaert, but more stylized and painted with greater grace. In 1662, in other words after Flinck’s death, Bol painted Moses Descends from Mount Sinai with the Ten Commandments, for the Magistrates’ Chamber (fig. 144). The tall, relatively narrow format made this a difficult job and one that was clearly beyond Bol’s power. Although he, too, sought assistance from compositions by Rubens (fig. 143), he failed to convincingly connect the crux of the scene – Moses coming down from the mountain – with figures in the foreground. In a preliminary drawing for this composition the figures either side of the too dominant figure seen from behind, which he borrowed from Rubens, had slightly more room (p. 201, fig. 281) – by clustering them more closely together in the painting he weakened the movement towards Moses. Bol was still working here with ‘the forceful control of the lights and shadows’ but he was unable to create spatial unity.48
In 1659 the burgomasters of Amsterdam gave Flinck the largest public commission ever awarded to a Dutch painter: the Batavian Cycle for the lunettes, the semi-circular fields on the walls of the great gallery in the town hall. In September 1659, as a sort of preview, Flinck produced within a few days four large watercolour paintings on canvas as a one-off festive decoration for Amalia of Solms’s visit to Amsterdam. After this virtuoso performance, Flinck was awarded the definitive commission in November 1659. He had to paint eight huge canvases (c. 550 x 550 cm.), plus four crescent-shaped scenes of biblical heroes above the arched entrances to the Citizens’ Hall, and was given six years to do it. But Flinck died suddenly two months later, and two drawings are all that we have left of his plans (fig. 145, and p. 200, figs. 278-279). It is evident from the palette Flinck chose for the two large overmantel paintings he had previously made for the town hall that he would have painted these lunettes in much brighter colours than those we see today; the rather dark palettes of Jordaens and Lievens were unsuited to these extremely poorly lit locations (and the works have become even darker over time). The ‘bright’ style Flinck developed especially for decorative commissions would without doubt have been much more appropriate.
It is ironic, however, that the only work by Flinck that is still hanging there is the darkest of all. This canvas, *The Conspiracy of Claudius Civilis*, which now looks really unsightly, was originally one of the temporary festive decorations Flinck had painted with watercolour on fine linen, unprimed, in shades of brown with beige highlights and black outlines in charcoal (fig. 146). In 1662 this huge watercolour was hauled out again as a stopgap to fill the space left when Rembrandt’s work was removed, and the composition was quickly touched up by Jürgen Ovens with heavy brushstrokes, lines and highlights in oil paint. However, the temporary solution proved permanent; from the eighteenth century until the nineteen-sixties, Flinck’s original decoration continued to deteriorate, suffering the ravages of ageing and injudicious treatments. In consequence, despite the recent restoration, virtually nothing is left of his large watercolour sketch. A surviving drawing that Flinck most probably made for the final version of *The Conspiracy of Claudius Civilis* (fig. 145) shows that he meanwhile had a very different composition in mind. He has now significantly increased the scale of the figures in the foreground. Once he saw his temporary canvases *in situ*, he must have realized that the figures were too small for the great distance from which they would be seen – a mistake his successors would repeat. There can be almost no doubt that if Flinck had lived to complete these works the gallery would have been considerably more impressive than it is now – albeit that then Rembrandt’s removed (and drastically cut down) masterpiece would never have been painted.

There is an oil sketch by Bol for *The Peace Negotiations between Claudius Civilis and Quintus Petillius Cerealis* (fig. 147). In view of the subject, it would appear to be a study for one of the lunettes in the Batavian series for the town hall. Was there a competition for which artists could submit designs? Did Bol, hoping for a commission, make one – or more – designs off
his own bat? And was this during the first round, or when new commissions awarded after Flinck’s death? The tall, rectangular shape is totally different from that of the lunettes, so we may also wonder whether this was a commission from a member of Amsterdam’s ruling elite who wanted this scene – or perhaps all of them – on a small scale for his own house. As Flinck had done in his watercolour decoration, Bol stayed very close to the composition of Antonio Tempesta’s etching of this subject (fig. 148); all the artists who worked on the Batavian scenes took his set of prints as their point of departure. Bol, though, brought the principal figures standing either side of a broken bridge much closer and added an allegorical figure holding wreaths and a palm above the heroes’ heads. What is clear is that Bol’s composition would have been much more attractive in this place than the flat, confused heap of countless figures, notable for their marked inconsistency of scale, that the elderly Jordaens supplied (fig. 149).
Ferdinand Bol in the Sixteen-Sixties

Bol’s ambition to give his life-size figures a strong ‘presence’ culminated in a spectacular room decoration for a house in Utrecht, which he made in the early sixties (figs. 150 and 151). The suite of five paintings that covered the four-metre-high walls of a room all round from floor to ceiling – there was not even a wainscot – must have been something wholly new. Without wainscotting it was possible to create the illusion that the figures stood on the same plane as the viewers and, as it were, shared their space. The Renaissance endeavour to achieve ‘rilievo’, life-size ‘presence’, as advocated by Alberti and Vasari, came to a head in Caravaggio’s altarpieces. Rembrandt even surpassed this in his few history paintings with life-size protagonists, like those in The Sacrifice of Isaac (p. 25, fig. 11) and Bathsheba (fig. 136), ‘advancing strongly’, as Sandrart put it. Bol had learnt Rembrandt’s lessons well and knew how to make figures come forward powerfully. The effect was helped by relatively deep shadows – which Bol continued to use much more than Flinck. Unlike Rembrandt, however, Bol did it with bright colours and more idealized forms, and he did not follow Rembrandt’s technique of varying relief in the paint.

In Elisha Refusing Naaman’s Gifts (fig. 152), the commission for the Leper Hospital painted in 1661, we see, as we did in the town hall, that the regents, possibly with help from poets or humanists, came up with an unusual subject that aptly expressed their moral task (see
The painting is a good example of the way Bol very skilfully amalgamated the sources on which he chiefly drew during his training as a history painter – Rembrandt, Lastman and Rubens – into a painting with a highly recognizable individual style and a coherent narrative. The figure of Naaman and his position relative to the doorway of a house with a woman looking out of a window are a direct borrowing from Rembrandt’s 1637 etching of *Abraham Casting out Hagar and Ishmael* (fig. 153). For Naaman he reused, with a few small adjustments to the torso, the Rubenesque figure of Fabricius (p. 135, fig. 168). From a print after Rubens dated 1636 (p. 137, fig. 171), which he must have studied very closely, he took – even more literally than Flinck had done before him – the naked, kneeling servant laying down valuable gifts and the figure behind him bearing a heavy load on his shoulder (p. 134, fig. 167). The arrangement – a rising pyramid with figures and animals that stand out against the sky at the top (with or without a parasol), where the story clearly unfolds from left to right – is a construction typical of Lastman. Rembrandt must have taught all his pupils to analyse Lastman’s history paintings thoroughly. We still see a great deal of Rembrandt’s example in the landscape background and the way the groups are lit, but the distinctive palette makes Bol’s composition a comprehensible whole with a character all its own.

Bol’s practice of using warmer and more subdued colours for biblical subjects than in his works with stories from classical history or mythology (or allegories with mythological figures) is also evident in *Neptune Enters the Amsterdam Admiralty’s Service* (fig. 154). Bright green, blue, yellow, pink and white satin fabrics create accents in this joyous composition. Bol painted this work for the Amsterdam Admiralty between 1661 and 1663; it was to hang in
the saloon of the governors’ yacht. It is easy to imagine that the gentlemen were delighted. The composition is of a type often used in Amsterdam since Lastman: a figure placed higher both literally and metaphorically, flanked by standing figures regarding someone on a slightly lower level, who is surrounded by others lower still. Bol used it effectively and brought vitality to the scene by way of Neptune, who, with a graceful movement, cleverly links the group on the left to the sea-horses pulling his chariot towards us. This last was a motif Bol took (in mirror image) from an engraving based on a performance during the Joyous Entry of Marie de’ Medici in Amsterdam in 1642, in which Neptune drives across the waves (fig. 155). The atmospheric view of ships in the distance immediately brings to mind the background – probably painted by Willem van de Velde the Younger – to Bol’s portrait of Admiral de Ruyter of 1667 (p. 162, fig. 210). Here too, a few years earlier, Bol appears to have called upon Van de Velde’s help. With such a significant commission – Bol was paid the very considerable sum of 2,000 gilders for the four paintings he made for the Admiralty – it is quite conceivable that a specialist was hired to paint this passage.

The other paintings for the Admiralty were destined for the governors’ boardroom. Again, the clients had chosen original subjects with a fitting moral message: *Aeneas at the Court of Latinus* and *Consul Titus Manlius Torquatus Orders the Beheading of his Son* (figs. 156 and 157). The more attractive of the two is the scene of Aeneas at the court of Latinus presenting prizes after a sailing race, but it is illustrative of Bol’s increasing habit of repeating motifs he had used before. Many elements of this composition appear in the sketch for *Jethro Advising Moses* of around 1655-56 (fig. 158), a painting that was never made: the bowing man climbing the steps, the priest seated beside Aeneas/Moses, the boy with the dog lower right and, of course, the overall structure with the steps, the column and the heavy draperies. Aeneas looks...
very like the figure of Fabricius we know from another painting with a similar composition, *Consul Gaius Fabricius Refuses To Be Bribed with Gifts* (fig. 159). What chiefly sets *Aeneas at the Court of Latinus* apart from these other works is the background of masts with sails lowered. Strikingly, in the oil sketch for the painting (fig. 160) these are exotic ships (galleys with a single sail), whereas in the final version all but one have been changed into the masts of modern vessels, establishing a clear relationship with the current age.

In these late years of his career Bol felt less of a need to think up something new. The last history work of his that we know, *The Persian King Cyrus Returns the Treasure Looted from the Temple in Jerusalem* (fig. 161), is actually a repetition in mirror image and a smaller size of one of the large canvases that decorated the room in the house in Utrecht (see fig. 150). The overall composition of the two is very similar to the paintings discussed above, particularly *Consul Gaius Fabricius Refuses To Be Bribed with Gifts* (fig. 159), and some figures in earlier works return quite literally. There has been an ongoing debate about the subject of the two paintings. For the last few decades they went under the title *Bringing Gifts for Solomon's Temple*, but it was recently convincingly argued that this is the story of the Persian king, Cyrus, who returns treasure looted from the temple in Jerusalem to the people of Israel. In this work the treasures are not being brought, they are being carried away to be used in the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem. This rare subject, which had a special significance for orthodox Calvinists, was painted for the meeting room of the churchwardens of Amsterdam’s Zuiderkerk – with which Bol and his family had personal ties (see p. 79).
A comparison with the overmantel work Nicolaes van Helt Stockade painted in 1656 for the Treasury Extraordinary in the town hall (fig. 162) shows that even an uninspired work like this was still superior to what many a capable Amsterdam artist who used a ‘bright’ style could produce. Stockade’s Joseph Distributing Corn is a rather uninteresting update of a type of composition also used by Bol, which had been introduced by Lastman. Here, though, the outlines are hard, the colours are strident and depth is suggested only by overlapping outlines and a pronounced perspective. No attempt has been made to create harmony in colour and
tone; the contrast with Bol’s technique is very marked. Bol binds elements together with sophisticated transitions of light and shade, colour and tone, creating a cogent suggestion of three-dimensional space; he convincingly conveys the texture of materials and skilfully organizes the composition by means of groups that are picked out by light or left in shadow.

Bol’s *Venus and the Sleeping Mars*, a masterpiece dating from around 1661 (fig. 163), and the 1663 *Allegory of Education* (fig. 164), which was made to go on a chimney breast in the Trip House, prove that in the first half of the sixties Bol could far transcend this level in large paintings with a few figures in a tranquil situation. The latter work is a *portrait historié*
of Margaretha Trip as Minerva, teaching her younger sister Anna Maria Trip (see also p. 160). Every educated viewer would immediately have recognized the allusion to traditional personifications of Grammar, the first image in series of the Liberal Arts (fig. 165). An important difference, however, is that it is Minerva herself, the goddess of wisdom and the mother of all the arts, who is teaching the young girl, as Rubens had pictured it in The Education of Marie de’ Medici in his famous Medici cycle in the Luxembourg Palace. There were no prints of these paintings, but there must have been descriptions in circulation; this respectable example will doubtless have been a factor in Bol’s conception of this work.

Constructing the work as a balanced equilateral triangle, Bol avoided dullness by introducing a slight twist in the bodies of the two protagonists, and by the movement in space of the figures on either side of Minerva: the two putti walking towards Minerva and the pretty Anna Maria, who connects the viewer’s space – her skirt seems to come out of the picture – with her sister Margaretha, who is placed further back. But what makes the painting surpass those of his fellow artists in Amsterdam (Rembrandt always excepted, of course) is the extraordinarily rich colouring: the sheen of the gold, pink, white and blue fabrics, the gleaming golds and silvers, the skin tones ranging from almost chalky white to warm rose, everything carefully attuned and painted in many tonal nuances with superb control of shadows and highlights. A painting like this explains why Bol must have been a significant
model for Gerard de Lairesse, the most important history painter of the next generation, when he arrived in Amsterdam in 1665. During the first five years of his Amsterdam career, De Lairesse adapted his style somewhat to what the Amsterdam elite was used to, and enhanced the strictly classicist manner he had learnt in Liège with elements like Bol’s warm colouring and his careful use of ‘houding’. It seems highly likely that Bol and the young De Lairesse were in contact during that time. One can well imagine that his work would be a guide to successful integration into the Amsterdam tradition for this ambitious young man.74

In Conclusion
Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol deliberately developed a style that was ideally suited to history paintings with a prestigious function, designed for specific places – both overmantel paintings in the reception rooms of the houses of the elite and decorations in public spaces and palaces.73 A style like this was intended to convey a message reflecting the status of the client or the function of the space in a public building. After the mid-sixteen-forties, their works were first and foremost ‘commission art’ and not, as Rembrandt’s were, conceived as objects to be collected – and these commissions came from a carefully built-up network.76
161 (cat.no. 95). **FERDINAND BOL**  *The Persian King Cyrus Returns the Treasure Looted from the Temple*, 1669.

Oil on canvas, 157 x 171 cm. Amsterdam, Nieuwe Kerk (on loan from the Protestantse Kerk Amsterdam)
To achieve an appropriate, ‘bright’ style in which ‘welstand’ (grace and decorum) was a crucial concept, they turned away from Rembrandt’s radical innovations and harked back to a more conventional representation of gestures, poses and lighting.

Flinck evolved a style in which figures act with clear ‘legibility’ in a well-constructed space with limited contrasts of light and shade. He sought grace and the selection of the beautiful in nature in accordance with the traditional rules of decorum, with fluid outlines and elegant movement in the composition as a whole. Prints after Rubens that he had already learnt to study with Lambert Jacobsz were an important guide in his change of style. He supplemented his knowledge on a trip to Antwerp, where painters like Van Dyck and Willeboirts Bosschaert must have made an impression on him. He could also have studied paintings by all these artists in palaces in The Hague. Aided by the knowledge of working with ‘houding’ he had acquired with Rembrandt, he created a wholly individual ‘bright’ style that brought him great success with the upper echelons of Amsterdam society and at the courts in Berlin, Cleves and The Hague.

Bol stayed closer to what he had learnt from Rembrandt; he never abandoned the use of strong shadows to bring his figures powerfully to the fore. In terms of colour and technique he was Flinck’s superior, but he did not have Flinck’s natural ease and ingenuity in constructing multi-figure narrative compositions. In the sixteen-sixties, after Flinck’s death,
FERDINAND BOL. Allegory of Education (portrait historié of Margaretha Trip as Minerva Teaching Anna Trip), 1663. Oil on canvas, 208 x 179 cm. Amsterdam, The Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Trippenhuis (on loan from the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, inv. no. SK-A-46)
he was indisputably the painter who got the most important commissions where prestigious works for the salon or for public spaces were wanted. Rembrandt, to be sure, was still seen as the greatest artist of the age, as De Lairesse was later to leave in no doubt in his *Groot Schilderboek*, but his work was not suited to official commissions, aside from the fact that he was not prepared to comply with others’ wishes. To Rembrandt, every painting was a new experiment; he only wanted to follow his own drives as an artist. Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol were very different: they modelled themselves on Apelles and Raphael, who were always cited in the art literature as shining examples of painters who were successful in part because of their pleasant nature and polite dealings with clients. For such artists, the status of their art depended in the first place on their relations with the ruling elite and the reputations they had established. Unlike any other artists of the age, they were able to achieve this status – to a degree through their networking skills but above all by developing an individual, distinctive style that this elite recognized as wholly appropriate for the dignified art they wanted.
The commission Ferdinand Bol and Govert Flinck were awarded by the city council to supply paintings for the two monumental chimney breasts that faced one another across the Burgomasters’ Cabinet was an unprecedented challenge in these painters’ careers.1 The sheer size of the chimney breasts, the white marble, the supporting double columns with Corinthian capitals and the lavish ornamentation were designed to convey the fact that this chamber had the highest status of all the rooms in the town hall (figs. 166).2 It was the administrative epicentre of Europe’s largest and most monumental town hall, the meeting place of the four governing burgomasters and the former burgomasters. It was the task of the paintings, nigh on five metres high, to express this prestige in images that underlined the moral leadership of the burgomasters and validated their position. Both Bol and Flinck must have regarded the job of producing a huge, multi-figured history painting for this room as a daunting but extraordinarily prestigious one. The works measured 485 x 350 cm and 485 x 377 cm respectively (see figs. 167 and 168), and no painter in Amsterdam had ever made history paintings of this magnitude before. The job was made even harder by the fact that the very unusual subjects had no tradition on which an artist could draw. They were consequently faced with a number of problems that were new to them and for which they had to find satisfactory solutions. At the same time, it meant a trial of strength between the two painters who at that time were enjoying the greatest success among the Amsterdam elite – it was obvious, after all, that everyone would compare the two paintings.

The subject Govert Flinck was commissioned to paint, *Manius Curius Dentatus Rejecting the Bribes of the Samnites*, had to show how the frugal, incorruptible Roman consul was not tempted by the riches he was offered and that he was a man happy with a simple meal of turnips. As far as we know, the episode had never been depicted in Holland before. The Amsterdam burgomasters
wanted to use this estimable historical parallel to convince viewers of the virtues that they, as powerful ‘republican’ governors, possessed (‘consul’ was also translated as ‘burgomaster’ at that time). The subject had been depicted in a town hall once before: in Basel by the famous Hans Holbein the Younger.3 One of the men involved in the Amsterdam project probably had a drawn copy of it, because Flinck was evidently aware of this composition, as appears from the open gallery, columns and arches and a view of trees beyond, and the extraordinary stiff pleated skirts worn by the two pages. In devising the composition for this enormous canvas, Flinck resourcefully adapted a scheme he had used before. Eleven years previously he had had to make a large work in an upright format with many figures – the civic guard portrait of the Company of Albert Bas (fig. 169) Although not a history painting, it had likewise been a new challenge; not only was it uncommonly large for a militia work, the vertical orientation was unusual too. Flinck moreover had to find a response to the powerful movement and huge vitality of Rembrandt’s Night Watch, beside which his work was going to hang (p. 170, fig. 219). But Flinck wanted every figure to be clearly visible, something Rembrandt had failed to do in his radical pursuit of a unity of movement in the composition as a whole.

Where did an ambitious painter look for a model for such a huge, vertical, multi-figure painting? Almost inevitably he would have turned to the altarpieces by the great Antwerp master Peter Paul Rubens. It was an ingenious idea to use the layout of his Adoration of the Magi in Tournai. Flinck knew the composition from an engraving (fig. 170) in which he could see how Rubens had built up a monumental, yet vibrant composition with life-sized, clearly-defined figures that filled the canvas. Like Rubens, Flinck placed men at the top of a staircase, standing behind a balustrade or leaning over it, others descending the stairs and the most important figures sitting and standing at the bottom.

Eleven years later, the success of this civic guard work prompted him to use the same framework for the much larger painting for the Burgomasters’ Cabinet. Here, Rubens’s composition was also

166. Amsterdam, Royal Palace, Burgomasters’ Cabinet seen from the south
167. GOVERT FLINCK  *Manius Curius Dentatus Rejecting the Bribe of the Samnites*, 1656. Oil on canvas, 485 x 377 cm. Amsterdam, Royal Palace, Burgomasters’ Cabinet
FERDINAND BOL
Gaius Fabricius Luscinus in Pyrrhus's Army Camp, 1656. Oil on canvas, 485 x 350 cm. Amsterdam, Royal Palace, Burgomasters’ Cabinet
fitting in terms of content: in both scenes a group arrives to offer a “revered” person gifts. Flinck reversed the composition. He made the architecture more monumental and less cluttered so that he could place the figures in the space even more convincingly, and exploited the dynamic movement of Rubens’s figures more than he had in the militia work; there is a sinuous curve that flows down towards us and comes to a halt just before the edge of the picture space. The men in the foreground of the militia work appear to be standing on the same level as the viewer; this time, however, Flinck took into account the height at which the painting would hang by introducing a step across the full width at the viewer’s eye level. And, so it seems, the brown and white dog on the left is trotting up the steps from our own space. Flinck was able to lift this plinth from another print after a composition by Rubens, an engraving of his *Abraham and Melchizedek* (fig. 171). Flinck skilfully added the motif of the kneeling slave who sets down gifts and behind him the bearded, gesturing Samnite, variations of figures in the same print.

There is no evidence at all, however, of a Rubenesque manner of painting. Although Flinck may have seen Rubens’s 1615 altarpiece on a trip to the South after Peter Paul Rubens, *The Adoration of the Magi*, c. 1620-30. Engraving, 616 x 454 mm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-P-1887-A-12010

169. **GOVERT FLINCK**  *The Company of Captain Albert Bas and Lieutenant Lucas Conijn*, 1645. Oil on canvas, 347 x 244 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (on loan from the City of Amsterdam), inv. no. SK-C-371

thern Netherlands and had certainly encountered other works by the Antwerp master, it was none-theless primarily ‘Rubens in print’ that would have served as his example, and his style of painting remained completely different. The types of figures are also quite different. The sober Dentatus and his servant on the left, for example, are reminiscent of the Bible figures of Lambert Jacobsz, Flinck’s first teacher, and the naked torso of the kneeling man has little in common with Rubens’s bruiser, and much more with the muscular figures in Lambert Jacobsz’s painting of the Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard.4

It made sense for Flinck to study the print of Abraham and Melchizedek closely. It too, after all, told a story in which one general presents gifts to another. It enabled him to interweave two Rubens compositions in which a group of men and their retinue offer riches. Flinck was highly inventive in the way he constructed a monumental, legible composition that puts the story across convincingly. The meticulous spacing of the figures relative to one another and their connection to one another with clear shapes, calm gestures and gazes, and carefully thought through transitions of colour and tone, make it a painting that is perfectly suited to this place.

Ferdinand Bol had also made a sketch of this subject (fig. 172). The position of Dentatus in front of the high, bare chimney breast, turning to the group behind him, suggests that Bol, too, knew the drawing after Holbein’s painting in Basel. Did the two painters, having been shown this example by the

---

172 (cat.no. 144). FERDINAND BOL. Manius Curius Dentatus Rejecting the Bribes of the Samnites, 1655. Pen and brown ink, brown and grey wash, black chalk, 388 x 328 mm. Vienna, Albertina, inv. no. 9504

171. HANS WITDOECK. after Peter Paul Rubens, Abraham and Melchizedek, 1636. Engraving, 409 x 450 mm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-P-OB-61.121
burgomasters, submit designs? We do not know. Bol made a sketch of about the same size and in the same technique (pen and ink, wash and black chalk) for *Gaius Fabricius Luscinus in Pyrrhus’s Army Camp* (fig. 173), the subject he was commissioned to make and which came to hang opposite Flinck’s *Dentatus*. In this scene, the incorruptible consul Fabricius is entirely unmoved by the sudden appearance of a blaring elephant from behind a curtain, a trick played on him by his opponent King Pyrrhus.

The scale of the figures in Bol’s two sketches is different, however, which makes it unlikely that they were done at the same time. The light comes from the left in both drawings, so at that time Bol had yet to take into account the fact that the paintings were to hang facing each other with the window wall on one side. In the final paintings, however, the light was consistent with the position of the windows: in Bol’s it came from the right and in Flinck’s from the left. In Bol’s first sketch the figures are placed in a high, rather ill-defined space with drapes. The protagonists wear Rembrandtesque clothes, which are actually more in keeping with a work on a biblical subject. Bol probably soon saw that such a composition was unsuited to the large size – it would mean that more than two and a half metres of canvas at the top would have to be filled with dim architecture, curtains or sky.

In Bol’s next design for his painting of Fabricius and Pyrrhus the main figures were placed on a high platform with a flight of steps leading from it, down which frightened children tumble (fig. 174). Soldiers in Roman dress stand unmoved on each side in the foreground and a man who has escaped from Rembrandt’s *Hundred Guilder Print* looks on. Bol, too, began to use monumental, multi-level architecture in order to place the figures at

---

**173 (cat.no. 107). FERDINAND BOL Gaius Fabricius Luscinus in Pyrrhus’s Army Camp, 1655. Black chalk, pen and brown ink, brown and grey wash, 394 x 332 mm. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, inv. no. 1749**

**174. FERDINAND BOL Gaius Fabricius Luscinus in Pyrrhus’s Army Camp, 1656. Black chalk, pen and washes in grey, 61.7 x 46.1 cm. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, inv. 1748**
different heights in the space, and unmistakably drew on an engraving of Rubens’s *Miracles of St Ignatius of Loyola* (fig. 175) for the basic structure. The semi-circular architectural space that can be seen in the background of a subsequent oil sketch shows that he still had that composition in mind (fig. 176). This time the scene is reversed, probably because by now Bol had realized that the situation in the room meant that the light had to come from the right. By eliminating the high platform, Bol brought the main characters closer and was able to depict them on a somewhat larger scale. He also emphasized the unflappably chatting Fabricius and accentuated the terror of the bystanders by adding a soldier fleeing towards us, after an example of a terrified man in a *Resurrection of Christ* by Pieter Lastman.5

In a following oil sketch Bol tried a different composition (fig. 177): the main characters have been brought to the foreground and the staircase has disappeared; only a step parallel to the picture plane remains and a large arch closes off the top. Rubens’s *Abraham and Melchizedek* composition, which Bol must also have known well, seems to resonate in it (fig. 171). The elephant has been moved back to the other side, although the light continues – somewhat illogically – to come from the right. Of the figures in the foreground only a dog slinking away and the fleeing soldier, moved to the right, remain to convey fear. The protagonists are now not only much bigger, they also have far sturdier figures and their proportions, poses and costumes have made them more ‘classical’. Such figure types are based more on Rubens than on Northern Netherlandish examples. Fabricius, for example, has typical ‘Rubens legs’ (broad knees, bowed shins), like the armoured Abraham in the engraving.

At this point, Bol must have realized that while this was indeed a legible composition, at full size there would still be two metres of empty space at the top, which would in no way be consistent with Flinck’s composition opposite. In the end Bol reversed the two robust protagonists in his last composition (fig. 178) and, while retaining the larger scale, fitted them into the earlier design. In comparison to the figures in the foreground they have now actually become too large. Admittedly they instantly capture the viewer’s attention, but it makes the suggestion of depth less convincing. Bol added a terrified soldier seen from the back, quoting in mirror image a similarly frightened figure, likewise placed in the foreground, which he had seen in a print of Rubens’s *Assumption of the Virgin* (p. 117, fig. 143). Some years later he would use this figure again in *Moses Descends from Mount Sinai with the Ten Commandments* for the Magistrates’ Chamber (p. 117, fig. 144).

Conveying the sort of strong reactions and powerful movements needed for this subject was not Bol’s strong suit. Nonetheless for the composition as a whole he found a consistent solution that
could compete with Flinck’s work at the other end of the room. With the warmer palette, the carefully painted effects of lustrous and gleaming materials, and the skilful way in which the figures are powerfully lit against the dark greys of the background, Bol showed his entirely individual style, completely different from Flinck’s. The organization of the space is not entirely successful, however, and the composition is not as solidly put together as Flinck’s. We do not know the burgomasters’ opinion about this trial of strength, but we can imagine that they thought Flinck’s style – a more clearly constructed space, more even illumination, and clearly-defined forms linked by supple movement – more appropriate for such huge paintings placed high above viewers’ heads. Although Flinck’s good contacts among the governing burgomasters probably clinched it, it is hardly surprising that in 1658 it was he who was commissioned to paint a very large work in the almost as prestigious City Council Chamber (Solomon’s Prayer for Wisdom, p. 116, fig. 142), and finally, in 1659, he was awarded the large commission to paint twelve enormous canvases, the whole Batavian series and four Bible scenes, for the lunettes in the town hall gallery. Bol was also commissioned to make one other large work for one of the most impressive rooms, the Moses Descends from Mount Sinai with the Ten Commandments for the Magistrates’ Chamber (p. 117, fig. 144). But this commission came in 1662, after Flinck had died. In 1658 Bol had probably hoped to get a commission for the overmantel.

176 (cat.no. 75). FERDINAND BOL. Gaius Fabricius Luscinus in Pyrrhus’s Army Camp, 1655-56. Oil on canvas, 71 x 54.5 cm. Amsterdam Museum, inv. no. SA 35807

177 (cat.no. 76). FERDINAND BOL. Gaius Fabricius Luscinus in Pyrrhus’s Army Camp, 1655-56. Oil on canvas, 80 x 65 cm. Amsterdam Museum, inv. no. SA 25383
painting opposite Flinck’s *Solomon’s Prayer for Wisdom* in the City Council Chamber (p. 116, fig. 142), an equally large picture of *Moses and Jethro*, because he had made an oil sketch for it (p. 126, fig. 158). However, this commission was awarded to Jan Gerritsz van Bronckhorst (fig. 179). We do not know why; perhaps it was simply to save money: Van Bronckhorst was paid a lot less than Flinck for an overmantel of the same size. Bol would not have worked for less than Flinck – remuneration and reputation were closely linked.

Flinck and Bol were each paid 1,500 guilders for their works in the Burgomasters’ Cabinet, and Flinck actually received 2,500 guilders for the even larger painting for the Magistrates’ Chamber (Van Bronckhorst only got 1,000 guilders for the similar sized painting opposite it). These were incredible sums of money, among the highest prices paid for works of art in the seventeenth century. But then, they were also the largest commissions in the seventeenth century, both in size and prestige, and they were made by painters with exceptional reputations.

178. **FERDINAND BOL**  
*Gaius Fabricius Luscinus in Pyrrhus’s Army Camp*, 1655-56. Oil on canvas, 81 x 65 cm. Brunswick, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, inv. no. 248

179. **JAN GERRITSZ VAN BRONCKHORST**  
*Moses and Jethro*, 1659. Oil on canvas, 465 x 450 cm. Amsterdam, Royal Palace, City Council Chamber
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33 1638, panel, 46.5 x 66 cm., Krakau, Muzeum Narodowe, Czartoryski-collectie, inv. no. V.105; Ibid., vol. 6, pp. 561-62, no. 159.


35 Flinck may have already been aware of the change in format, from landscape to portrait, by a hand other than Rembrandt’s – possibly Flinck’s? – and used it in his own version.


38 Baldinucci 1681-1728, vol. 5, p. 484.

39 Van de Wetering, in Corpus 1982-2015, vol. 6 (2015), p. 535, at no. 113, makes a connection between this etching and the Balustrade (fig. 27) as part of the same project.

40 Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 2, p. 1020, no. 615; see also Sluijter 2015a, pp. 70-71, with a reference to Franciscus Junius’s De pictura veterum, published in 1637. The book was translated into Dutch in 1639. Flinck could have read it after it was published in 1641.


42 Baldinucci 1681-1728, vol. 5, p. 484, claimed that Flinck worked for the dealer for ‘many years’, even ‘the whole of his youth’, which suggests that his employment may have continued until Flinck bought his own house on Lauriergracht in 1644, in other words ten years or so. NB: Erna Kok (see p. 243, note 12) sees the payment by Uylenburgh in 1639 as an indication that Flinck had started his own workshop by then. I regard it as part of their work agreements, which would have applied from the start of Flinck’s time in the workshop as had probably also been the case between Uylenburgh and Rembrandt before that.


45 Van Eck 1987, p. 44, no. 2, p. 48, note 54.

46 See Raupp 1984, pp. 120-23.

47 The same is true of the Self-Portrait of around 1640, panel, 66 x 51.4 cm., Glasgow, Glasgow Museums, inv. no. 44; Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 2, p. 1033, no. 669, sees a number of elements borrowed from Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait of 1640.

48 Sumowski – curiously enough – links this work stylistically with Flinck’s Self-Portraits in London (fig. 34) and Glasgow (see previous note) but sticks to a date of around 1639: Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 2, p. 1033, nos. 667 and 669.

49 This painting has also been interpreted as an allegory of youth, because the earliest reference in a sale catalogue of 1762: sale Dr J. P. Wierman, Amsterdam, 18 August 1762, lot 118, mentions a ‘young man’, immediately after the description of an Old Man by Flinck; see De Bruyn Kops 1965, p. 29. The owner may have regarded the paintings as two independent tronies, without knowing the identity of the sitter in this painting.

50 Self-Portrait, 1643, oil on panel, 73.1 x 53.5 cm, New York, The Leiden Collection, inv. no. GF-103; Man with Plumed Cap and Chain by a Balustrade, 1641, oil on canvas, 65.5 x 52 cm., Pommersfelden, Graf von Schönborn Collection; Man in a Red Coat and Cap by a Balustrade, c. 1640, oil on canvas, 60.5 x 52 cm., sale, Vienna (Dorotheum), 15 October 1996, no. 283 (attribution supported in a letter from Werner Sumowski, with the photograph in the Rembrandt Information Centre, Rembrandt House Museum).

51 These characteristics are noticeable for the first time in Boy with a Soap Bubble (‘Homo Bulla’), 1640, oil on canvas, sale, New York (Sotheby’s), 22 January 2004, no. 47; Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 2, p.1028, no. 644.

52 Remarked on for the first time by Tom van der Molen during the conference ‘New Light on Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol: Rising Stars in Rembrandt’s Amsterdam’, Herstmonceux Castle, Bader International Study Centre, 16 July 2015.


54 Exh. cat. Munich / Amsterdam 2001-02, pp. 210-12, no. 54. E.J. Sluijter, in exh. cat. Cleves 2015-16, p. 66, proposes another source: Jacob Backer’s Granida and Dafílo in the Hermitage (c. 1637). While the composition of Rembrandt’s drawing is the same, the similarity of the placement and the expressions of the main figures is striking and also points to Backer’s influence.

55 This is not without controversy; many authors still stand by the date of 1638, which was reported on the painting in Beschrijving der schilderijen van het Rijksmuseum te Amsterdam, met historische aantekeningen en fascimiles der naamtekens, The Hague 1880, pp. 94-95, no. 87, with the facsimile of the signature and date. On the other hand, this was never mentioned anywhere before this and, moreover, it completely disappeared during a restoration between 1960 and 1965, which suggests that it was not authentic; Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 2, p. 1019; exh. cat. Cleves 2015-16, p. 17.

56 His Expulsion of Hagar (c. 1638), now lost, was already showing smooth brushwork and...


Ferdinand Bol: Rembrandt’s Disciple - David de Witt and Leonore van Sloten

1 Blankert 1982, p. 16.
2 Houbraken 1718-21, vol. 1, p. 301. Houbraken admits that he was poorly informed as he was not able to give a year of birth.
4 Rembrandt, Susanna and the Elders, red chalk, Berlin Kupferstichkabinett, inv. no. KdZ 5296; Coll. cat. Berlin 2006, pp. 82-85 (cat. 18); The inscription reads: Verkocht syn vaendrager synde 15. – . – . een floora verhandelt 4. 6. – . Ferdinandus van syn werck verhandelt Aen ander werck van syn voorneemen Den Abraeham een floorae Leenderts floorae is verhandelt tegen Sg
5 Ibid.
6 Albert Blankert attributed a Vertumnus after a painting by Abraham Bloemaert’s son, Hendrick, to Bol on the basis of the signature. The work subsequently surfaced at a sale (Christie’s Amsterdam, 21 November 2001, lot 54), and further study by Willem van de Watering revealed that the signature should be read as Ferdinandus West. West was active in Utrecht, where Bloemaert also lived. See Blankert 1982, p. 16, RKD - Netherlands Institute for Art History, object no. 44550, and Kok 2011, p. 311.
8 For the Cuyp, see Schoon 1993. For the Bol see Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 1, p. 291, no. 78. Benjamin painted this subject regularly and the similarity to the subject in Bol’s work has been commented on before. No one has ever commented, however, on the strong similarities and borrowings which support the suggestion that there was a teacher-pupil relationship between Benjamin Cuyp and Ferdinand Bol.
9 See the discussion in the essay by Peter Schatborn, p. 185, note 13.
10 No drawings by Benjamin Cuyp have survived, so comparisons with his hand are not possible.
15 Ernst van de Wetering shared these observations during a session in 2007 in which the partial copy in the Rembrandt House was examined. He published his findings in Corpus 1982-2015, vol. 5 (2011), pp. 276-82 and note 1.
16 See Blankert 1982, pp. 76-78, no. 22 in the inventory of Bol’s possessions, which were part of the marriage contract with Anna van Erckel, dated 8 October 1669.
18 Judges VI, 20-23.

Tronies in the werk of Flinck and Bol - Franziska Gottwald

2 Gottwald 2011, pp. 11-14.
7 Rembrandt, Self-Portrait, 1633. Panel (oval), 70.4 x 54 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. 1745.
9 In this case Flinck could have taken his inspiration from a painting by Rembrandt, Jeremiah Lamenting the Destruction of Jerusalem, 1630. Panel, 58.3 x 46.6 cm., Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-A-3276.
10 The same model appears in other tronies by Flinck, reduced to head and shoulders format, such as the Bearded Man with a Velvet Cap, 1645. Panel, 60.3 x 52.4 cm, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, inv. no. 25.110.27.

Govert Flinck, Ferdinand Bol and their network of influential clients - Erna E. Kok

1 Scheltema 1856, pp. 92 and 138; Van Eikema
Amsterdam 2011b.

der Zwaag and R. Cohen Tervaert in exh. cat.

Hommes / Froment 2011, pp. 141-70; M. van

Van der Veen 2008, p. 18. It is highly likely that

this manner of painting [Rembrandt’s style] with great difficulty and labour, seeing that the world’s eyes had already been opened before Rembrandt’s death on the introduction of Italian brushwork by true connoisseurs of art, when bright painting came back into fashion. [My italics E.K.] (‘Hy [Flinck] heeft die wyze van schilderen [Rembrandts stijl] naderhand met veele moeite en arbeid weer afgewen; naardien de Waereld voor ‘t overlyden van Rembrandt, de oogen al geopent wierden, op ‘t invoeren der Italiaansche penceelkonst, door waren Konstekenners, wanneer het helder schilderijen weer op de baan kwam.’) On these two alternative painting styles in Amsterdam see Sluijter 2006, pp. 195-219, and Sluijter 2015, p. 88.

Von Moltke 1965, p. 19. Van Eck 1987, p. 44, quotes a 1741 inventory of the Catholic church ‘De Tol’ in Gouda: ‘A painting depicting Samson’s parents’ sacrifice, by G. Flinck anno 1640’ (‘Een schilderij verbeelt de offerhande van de ouders van Samson, door G. Flinck anno 1640’). Van Eck, ibid., p. 48, note 54, suggests that this is Flinck’s Manoah of 1640; De Witt 2008, pp. 132-33, no. 76, hypothesizes that the unusual format relates to its position in the architecture of the church. This would imply that the painting was commissioned by the Catholic church.

Von Moltke 1965, no. 466. The date is the subject of debate. Flinck supposedly commenced work on the painting in 1640 and overpainted, signed and dated it in 1646. See Jansen and Giltaij in coll. cat. Rotterdam 1988, pp. 38-40, no. 8, and Lamertse in exh. cat. Amsterdam 2002-03, no. 78. Ibid., for the identification, which has not been conclusively established.

Coll. cat. Raleigh 2009, pp. 74-77, nos. 17 and 18; Dennis P. Weller raises this identification following a suggestion done by Jaap van der Veen.

Elia 1903-05, vol. 1, pp. 260-61 and Zandvliet 2006, p. 240. For the identification as Augustijn Wittenbogaert see Dudok van Heel 1978, pp. 156-58; Bikker 2006, p. 195, however, suggests that this could also be a portrait.
of cousin Pieter Wttenbogaert. Von Moltke 1965, nos. 236, 237 and 238, includes three portraits as Johan Wttenbogaert, but given his age in 1643 (thirty-five) that is unlikely.

22 Van Hoorn was painted by Flinck according to a poem by Jan Vos, ‘Den Eed. Heer Symon van Hoorn, Burgermeester en Raad t’Amsterdam, &c. Door Govert Flink geschildert’, see Vos 1662, p. 180; Von Moltke 1965, no. 206. For Van Hoorn, see Elias 1903-05, vol. 1, p. 447.

23 Von Moltke 1965, nos. 426 and 427, as Joan Huydecoper and Maria Coymans, but with a note that F. van Kretschmar convincingly suggested that it was Appelman and his wife. That is a plausible identification based on a comparison with three portraits of Appelman: on the left in the civic guard portrait with Joan Huydecoper (fig. 79); in Bol’s governors’ portrait of 1648 on the far right (fig. 227), see Bikker 2011, pp. 127-34; Blankert 1982, no. 179, in a print by Jacob Houbraken after Flinck’s militia work; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet. inv. no. RP-OB-48.814, (with inscription: G. Flinck pinxit J. Houbraken Sculptor). For Appelman see Elias 1903-05, vol. 2, p. 538.

24 Von Moltke 1965, cat. no. 477. Von Moltke identified this civic guard portrait as marking Flinck’s switch to the bright style and did not regard his subsequent success as an artistic feat, observing disapprovingly: ‘we notice with regrets how connections with the right type of people can be more important than a genuine achievement.’; ibid., p. 28.


26 Only the prints after Flinck’s portraits are known (fig. 80 and 81); Huttenus’s portrait is undated, but since he was a minister in Amsterdam in 1643 and in Nijmegen from 1649 to 1649, his portrait must have been made between 1643 and 1649.

27 Flinck remarried in 1656. His second wife was the Remonstrant Sophia van der Houwe (? - 1669), daughter of a brewer in Gouda; see Dudok van Heel 2008, p. 462.

28 Von Moltke 1965, nos. 201, 207, 204, 420 and 421. Elias 1903-05, vol. 2, pp. 450-51; ibid., p. 536. In 1654 Flinck also received a commission from outside Amsterdam; he painted the portraits of the burgomaster of Vlissingen, Johannes Schorer (1620-1697), and his wife; see Von Moltke, nos. 430-31.


30 Von Moltke 1965, nos. 113 and 30.


32 For the meaning of exchanging gifts in friendship see Kooijmans 1997/2016 and Kok 2016, pp. 27-29.

33 For the identification see Van der Molen 2016, pp. 157-58. I rule out Blankert 1982, no. 61, as a self-portrait.

34 For the development of the Van Dyckian portrait type in Amsterdam see Lootsma 2007/08, pp. 221-26; Ekkart 2007, pp. 34-36; Judith van Gent in exh. cat. Amsterdam 2002-03, p.117.

35 Von Moltke 1965, nos. 120 and replica nos. 121, 198, 214.

36 Ibid., nos. 118 and 119. The last work was lost when the forger Van Meegeren used it to paint a Last Supper in the style of Vermeer over the top; see Coremans 1950, pp. 199-203.

37 Crenshaw 2006.

38 This is evidenced by a notarial declaration in which he acted as a witness for Rembrandt at the end of August 1640; see Blankert 1982, p. 71.


40 Kok 2016, pp. 48-56.

41 For the identification and a comprehensive discussion of Bol’s self-portraits see Kok 2016, pp. 61-67; Blankert 1982, nos. 60-65,103 and 151. I rule out Blankert 1982, no. 61, as a self-portrait.

42 The gentiluomo portrait type alludes to the ideal a nobleman had to meet in the Renaissance. He excelled in self-evident qualities and scholarship, but was distinguished chiefly by his exemplary character, courtly grace and conduct.

43 Blankert 1982, nos. 62, 63, 64 and 65; Blankert, ibid., pp. 57-58, in my view incorrectly, sees these four not as strict self-portraits, but as the prototype of the artist; see Kok 2016, pp. 61-62 and Bruyn 1983, p. 216, note 7.


45 Blankert 1982, no. 152. The Self-Portrait with Palette and the pendant portrait of his first wife, Elisabeth Dell, are mentioned in Bol’s 1669 marriage contract with his second wife, Anna van Eckel. Both paintings and the Self-Portrait with Cupid are listed in Bol’s son Elbert’s estate (1709-10).

46 Bol made at least 125 portraits (and tronies) during his career, more than twice as many as the fifty-five known history paintings by him.

47 Blankert 1982, cat. nos. 145 and 146.

48 Ibid., p. 23.

49 Ibid., no. 138.

50 For the underpinning of the identification and the relationship with the Dell and Spiegel family network see Grijzenhout/Kok 2017.

51 According to Blankert 1982, p. 72, on 2 October 1653.


53 Elias 1903-05, vol. 1, no. 130, pp. 399-401.

54 Three of these are still extant, see ibid., nos. 56, 58 and 59.

55 Blankert, ibid., nos. 76-87, lists 24 works, of which only nos. 76-79 and 82Add and 83 are signed and dated by Bol. Research into this group is needed to distinguish the copies from the originals.


57 Blankert 1982, no. 34; Ekkart 2002, pp. 14-41. Elisabeth Spiegel (1628-1707) was the daughter of the lawyer Elbert Spiegel (1600-1674) from his first marriage. In 1651 she married WigboldSLicher (1627-1718), the son born to the first marriage of Elisabeth van Vlaming Outshoorn, who by then was Elbert Spiegel’s second wife.

58 Blankert 1982, no. 34. For the identification see Grijzenhout 2009/10, pp. 42-43. Helena van Heuvel (1638-1698) was a niece of...
Hendrick Dircxsz Spiegel (1598-1667), Bol’s wife’s uncle.

59 Blankert 1982, nos. 138, 139, 141 and 142.

Otto van der Waeyen (1648-1686) was the grandson of Geertruijt Dircxs Spiegel (1601-1661), Bol’s wife Elisabeth Dell’s aunt. Petronella Elias (1648-1667) was the daughter of Rebecca Spiegel (1626-1651), Elisabeth Dell’s first cousin; see Ekkart 2002, pp. 25-29. Joost van den Bempden (1659) was the nephew of Frederick Sluijksen (1644-1710).


61 Blankert 1982, no. 12, pl. 58. Called here Solomon Brings Gifts to the Temple. Van Eikema Hommes identified the subject as the story of King Cyrus, see Van Eikema Hommes 2012, pp. 121-29.

Flinck and Bol’s Companions in Art - Tom van der Molen

1 ‘Hier is de beurs, en ’t geld, en liefde tot de Kunst.’ Asselijn and Vondel 1654.

2 See Van der Molen 2013 for a fuller discussion of this meeting and the one held the following year.

3 A month later, on 27 November 1653, Vondel wrote a foreword to his translation of Horace’s Poetics dedicated to the ‘companions in art of St Luke in Amsterdam: painters, sculptors, draughtsmen and their patrons’ (‘de kunstgenoooten van Sint Lukas ’t Amsterdam: Schilders, Beelthouwers, Tekenaers, en hunne begunstigers’). In the foreword he cites the same quotation from Plutarch and asserts that ‘everyone is saying it now’ (‘elck [die] nu in den mont [heeft]’). Asselyn and Vondel 1654, foreword.

4 Vos 1662, pp. 140-41.

5 On the relationship between Huydecoper and Vos, see Geerdink 2012.

6 Emmens 1981.

7 Brandt 1658, pp. 121-22; Van der Molen 2012, pp. 319-24.

8 Op d’afbeelding van Rozemond, Door den beroemde schilder G. Flink De geest van Flink vliegt boven zyn penseel, Nu Rozemond beschaduwd zyn taafreel En hy van ver die schoone schaduw maalt, Een schaduw daar een zoon van glans uit straalt. Hij maalt een zon, myn zielzon die my brant, Die my vertreert en licht. Hy maalt die hant, Die schoone hant die my in boeien slaat, Dat voorhoof, dat de schoone dageraat Zo ver beschamen kan als d’uchtentstont den nacht.

Hier ziet men nu de kunst en schoonheit in haar kracht. De diamant, die op haar blanke boezem flonkert, Wort hier verdoofd, en door haar lieflyk oog verdonkert:

Dat is dat oog dat my verwinnen kan, Dat niemand ziet of hy ontsteekt ’er van Kupido straal vry water uit zyn schicht, Want al zyn vier verschuilt in haar gezicht. Hy heeft voor my geen vier als in haar oog. Wat schildert Flink, hoe vliegt zyn kunst om hoog? Ik zie een hof, en wat de lente geeft, En al wat blos, en kleur, en geuren heeft: Haar schone slinkerhant vertoont hier bloem op bloem, Ik zie hier nu by een, ô lente, uw schoonste roem, Maar ’t is al dof en doof by zulke morgenroozen, Die om haar zoeten mont en op haar kaken blazen.

Dus maalde Flink myn blonde morgenzon. Hier ging zyn kunst zo ver die reiken kon, En geen Apel noch groote Titiaan Heeft groter kracht met zyn penseel gedaan. Maar echter (dat Flink my dit woord vergeef) Hoe zeer zyn kracht de schoonste verf verdreef, Wat hoogsels en wat diepsels dat hy gaf, ’t Is al vergeefs, hy maakt dit werk niet af, Het blyft, wat dat hy doet, maar stukwerk half gedaan, Hy raakt de schets van ’t best, en ’t binnenst niet eens aan.

Dit volmaken wilt maal dan alleen geen leden

Geen lichaam, maar haar ziel, haar deugden en haar zeden.

9 Op Mejoffer Margriete Tulp, Huisvrouwe van Joan Six.

Door Govert Flinck geschildert.

Animum pictura pascit inani.

Margrite zag haer’ sijn in haere beeck, Gelyck een perle in ’t klaere water, leven, Zoo heeft de kunst haer nu met verwe en streeck

Den ommetreck natuurelyck gegeven. Toen Six dit zaggh, ontvonckte ’t hart van min. Hy zagh bekoort de schaduwu aen voor ’t wezen Van zyne Tulp, en liëe Zanggodin.

Het bloet ontstack, en al zyne aders rezen. Hy kuste ’t beelt, en had het weër gekust, De schildery had zelf dien gloet geblust.

Vondel 1660, p. 147.

10 Zoo vat de beitel van Quellyn in louter marmer Naer ’t leven wat ons oogh in Huidekooper ziet, Den burgervader en trouwhartigen beschermer Der koopstadt, daer de Nyt haer pylen op verschiet. Christina heeft dien helt het ridderzaert gegeven. De Keurvorst welkomt hem, als stads Gezant in ’t hof. Zyn raet stut Indiën, zoo wyt ons zeilen zween, En Maerseveen draeft hoogh en groeit op ’s ridder lof.


11 Hier is van Maarseveen uit marmersteen gehouwen, Om dat hy als een zuil van marmer staat voor ’t Y.

Op zulk een burgerburg kan d’Amstel zich betrouwen.
Een ongekreukte moet gedoopt geen
dwinglanty.
’t Gezantschap naar Berlyn, en Ridderschap
Van Zweeden,
Verbreien hem gelyk zyn zorg voor d’ooster-
kust.
Hy waakt, door raadt en moedt, tot heil van
volk en steeden.
Door zulk een wakkerheidt bevindt zich elk
gedoch.
Hier hoeft geen beeldt van steen, hy leeft by
wonder; dit is een buuren.
Zoo brult de Leeuw van moedt, en
bruist deur alle zeen. De koopmansschap
gedoopt geen roovers op de taaren. De
Tritons blaazen; wijk: de zee is elk gemeen.
Het hart is anders dan het aanzicht dat hier
draait.
Nu durf geen zeegedroght op zee de vinnen
zijn snaaren,
G. Flink geschildert Neptunus gaat in zee tot schrik
van ’t roofgedrocht. Het recht der vrijheid
tljijt geen afgepaalde vloedten. Hij wordt
door Herkules en Pallas Scheep gebrocht. De
Staat is best door Kracht en Wijshheid te
behoeden. Zoo brult de Leeuw van moedt, en
bruist deur alle zeen. De koopmansschap
gedoopt geen roovers op de taaren. De
’T Welvaaren van het Landt bestaat in veilig
vaaren.’ Voel 1662, p. 654.
14 ‘Zinnebeeldt in ’t jacht van haare Eed.
Mog. de Zeeraadet t’Amsterdam, door F. Bol
geschildert Neptunus gaat in zee tot schrik
van ’t roofgedrocht. Het recht der vrijheid
lijdt geen afgepaalde vloedten. Hij wordt
van Herkules en Pallas Scheep gebrocht. De
Staat is best door Kracht en Wijshheid te
behoeden. Zoo brult de Leeuw van moedt, en
bruist deur alle zeen. De koopmansschap
gedoopt geen roovers op de taaren. De
’T Welvaaren van het Landt bestaat in veilig
vaaren.’ Voel 1662, p. 654.
15 Fabricius houdt stant, in Pyrrhus leger-
tenten.
Het gout verzet hem niet, door schandelijcke
zucht,
Nooch elfants gebriesch, en felle dreigementen.
Zoo zwicht geen man van Staet voor gaven,
noch gerucht.
Deeze Christus zou vervloekt van
Christus spreken.
Het hart is anders dan het aanzicht dat hier
straalt.
Vraagt gy waarom? dit beeldt is naar een
Joodt gemaalt.
Daer Demokrit om lacht daer Heraklit om
schreit.
Nu zocht voor ’s lants vrede en
welvaart veiligh,
En zegene deen bou en koopvaeryd der steen.
Dees zeehelt om dieven last groothartigh uit
to voeren,
Neemt Sterckheid, Wijshheid, en Voorzichtig-
heit te haet.
Nu durf geen zeegedroght op zee de vinnen
roeren.
Dus groeit de handel aen, ten wasdom van
den staet.
Vondel 1682, vol. 2, p. 330 (differs slightly
from the original text).
16 ‘Op ’s Burgermeesters wacht magh Rome
veiligh slaepen,
En prickeltze tot vreught, of slaet ons zoete
wonden:
Het bootst de weereldt na: het kittelt ziel en lijf:
Het ziet in klein begrijp al ’s menschen
ydelheid
En Amirael der zee, in haeren dienst getreen,
Dat hy de zeevaert voor ’s lants vrede en
welvaart veiligh’,
En zegene deen bou en koopvaeryd der steen.
Dees zeehelt om dieven last groothartigh uit
to voeren,
Neemt Sterckheid, Wijshheid, en Voorzichtig-
heit te haet.
Nu durf geen zeegedroght op zee de vinnen
roeren.
By Venus om een pees. wilt gy, o Mingodt!
wis In ’t schieten zijn, zoo haal slechts een
van Lauraas hairen,
En spanz’ op uwe boog; zoo schiet gy nimmer
mis:
Want Lauraas hair heeft kracht om harten
saam te hechten.
Geen taazer peezoen voor de Min dan schoone
vlechten.
Vos 1662, p. 560
19 Christus, voor Joris de Wyze, door Govert
Flink, naar een Joodt, geschildert
Hier ziet men vel en vleesch; ja bloedt door
d’aadren zweeven.
De Schepper schijnt hier, door zijn schepsel,
weer te leeven.
De Teelzucht haat de kunst om zulk een
grote vondt.
Hier eischt niet meer dan spraak; maar Flink
heeft deezemond
Niet oopen willen doen, schoon hem de Wijse
quam smeeken:
Want deeze Christus zou vervloekt van
Christus spreken.
Het hart is anders dan het aanzicht dat hier
straalt.
Vraagt gy waarom? dit beeldt is naar een
Joodt gemaakt.
Vos 1662, p. 531
20 Tooneeslauw quan in ’t licht, tot leerzaem
tijdverdrijf;
Het wijkziet geen ander spel, noch Koningklj-
c eve konden.
Het boost de weereclt na het kindeltziel en lijf:
En prakeltze tot vreught, of slaet ons zoete
wonden:
Het toont in klein begrijp al ’s menschen
ydelheid
Daer Demokrit om lacht daer Heraklit om
schreit
De Winkel 2006, pp. 191 ff., with references
to other authors on the subject.
23 Salomon Savery, The Boxes in the New
Theatre, 1658, 513 x 721 mm. Impression in
the Rijksmuseum Print Room, inv. no. RP-P-
OB-70.099
24 ‘The sale of Joseph came to mind because of the painting by Jan Pinas hanging with other skilful works by Peter Lastman in the house of the scholarly and knowledgeable Doctor Robbert Verhoeven; in the blood-stained coat is shown to the father: and so, in the same way in making this work I attempted as nearly as I could to imitate in words the painter’s colours, drawings and passions.’

(‘Iosephs verkoopinge schoot ons in den zin, door het tafereel van lan Pinas, hangende, neffens meer kunstige stucken van Peter Lastman, ten huise van den hooghgeleerden en ervaren Dokter Robbert Verhoeven; daer de bloedige rock den Vader vertoont wort: gelijck wy in ’t sluiten van dit werck, ten naesten hy, met woorden des schilders verwen, teickeningen, en hartstoghten, pooghden na te volgen.’) Vondel 1640, dedication to Joachim van Wickevort.

25 Nicolaes van Helt Stockade, Joseph Telling His Dreams, 1655, canvas, 112 x 88 cm, private collection, Sweden; Govert Flinck, Joseph’s Bloodstained Coat Shown to Jacob, 1656, canvas, 112 x 89 cm, Sinebrychoff Art Museum, Finnish National Gallery, Helsinki; Rembrandt, Joseph and Potiphar, 1655, canvas, 110.5 x 90 cm, Barber Institute of Arts, Birmingham; Salomon de Bray, Joseph Interprets the Pharaoh’s Dreams, 1655, canvas, 112.3 x 89.6 cm, Staatliche Museen, Schwerin; Bartholomeus Breenbergh, Joseph’s Bloodstained Coat Shown to Jacob, 1655, canvas, 113.5 x 90 cm, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin; Salomon Koninck, Joseph Receives his Father and Brothers in Egypt, 1656, canvas, 112 x 89 cm, private collection, Sweden.

26 Van der Molen 2013.

27 Van der Molen 2017.

28 Amsterdam City Archives (ACA), accession number 5075, Notarisen ter Standplaats Amsterdam, Gilles Borselaer, Minuutakten, no. 1474, 27 July 1658.


30 Strijcker was certainly in Rome between 1626 and 1628; see Renckens 1952, pp. 116-22. Van Helt Stockade was probably there around 1634 to 1637; see Van Velden 1993.


32 Asselijn 1654.

33 Bredius 1915-21, vol. IV, p. 1244.

34 Bredius 1915-21, vol. IV, p. 1243.


37 Schwartz 2012.

38 ACA, 5033; Archief van de Burgemeesters: poorterboeken, no. 2, Registers van gekochte poorters, E, 24 to 30 January 1652, f. 253-253v.

39 Jager 2012.

40 Scholten 2010.

41 On G. Flink’s Cabinet of Sculptures. This is no sculpture cabinet: I find myself here at the peak of the double Parnassus. The water, at the ‘Tritons’ command, has receded again From the world, all drowned, One sees here, now that it ebbs, How Deucalion created people from stones, To build the earth again. It seems he had a heart of stone cut from the breast What! Does my eye miss the fire? It I see how Flink dares challenge death and noble nature With his paints: For he breathes life into his paint and shields it from death. Art will be eternal. These are the creatures that the gifted Quellijn Created with his chisel. Deucalion created nothing but unsawn statues: Had he shaped them so, Heaven would not have unleashed the fury of a storm upon the earth. Come, help honour this creator. A skilful statue can overcome the woes of the centuries Op de Beeldkas van G. Flink.

Ik vindt my hier op ‘t hoogst’ van ‘t dubbele Parnas.

De wereldt, heel verdronken,

Is ‘t water, door ‘t gebodt der Tritons, weer ontsgonnen.

Men ziet hier, nu het ebt,

Hoe dat Deukalion den mensch van steenen schept,

Om ‘t aardtrijk weêr te bouwen.

Het schijnt dat hy de borst een hart van steen laat houwen.

Hoe! mist mijn oog het vuur?

Ik staa daar Flink de Doodt en d’eedele Natuur

Durf tarten, door zijn verven:

Want hy bezelit zijn verf en hoedtze voor het sterven.

De kunst wil eeuwigh zijn.

Dit zijn de schepsels die de geestige Quellijn Door zijne beitl teelden.

Deukalion schiep niet dan onversaagde beelden:

Hadt hy ze dus gevormt,

De hemel wierdt zoo dol van ‘t aardtrijk niet bestormt.

Op, help deee’ schepper eeren.

Een kunstig beeldt kan ‘t woên der eeuwen overheeren.

Vos 1662, vol. 1, p. 524.

42 ‘modellen van ‘t Stathuysse’; Bredius 1910, p. 285.

43 There are two versions of both Flinck’s painting and Quellinus’s little figure. In Flinck’s case, there is one dated 1652 (Potsdam, Stiftung Preußische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg, inv. no. GK I 50916) and an unsigned and undated version in the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore (inv. no. 71.399) and an unsigned and undated version in the Rijksmuseum (BK-2002-19-1). Scholten 2010, p. 8; Van der Mark 2003.

Ferdinand Bol in Italy - Tom van der Molen and Norbert Middelhoop

1 See Jacobsen 1896 and Moes 1908.
2 The identification appears to be based on the mention of the painting in the Mansi Collection in 1920; see Krempel 2000, p. 310, no. A 140.
3 Three other children were baptized in the Roman Catholic clandestine church ‘t Boompje: Wilhelma (1 May 1648), Wilhelmina (9 September 1650) and Jacobus (10 April 1654); SAA, DTB, no. 316, Baptismal Registers R.C. Church ‘t Boompje, 1628-1680, f. 35, 39 and 48, respectively. Anna Maria, a record of whose baptism has not been found, but who gave her age as twenty-five in the notice of her marriage in 1675, was therefore probably born in 1649.
4 ACA, DTB, no. 678, Marriage Registers of the PUI, 1678, f. 198, 4 May 1646.
7 ACA, DTB, no. 690, ‘Marriage Registers of the puy, 1674-1677’, f. 97, 15 August 1675.
9 Romain de Hooghe, Print on the Occasion of the Marriage of Francesco Mollo and Anna Maria Ooms. Etching and engraving, 470 x 383 mm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-P-1903-A-23614; ACA, DTB, no. 689, ‘Marriage Registers of the puy, 1672-1674’, f. 250, 30 August 1674.
12 Ibid, f. 155, 22 May 1679.
13 ACA, DTB, no. 1056, ‘Burial Registers Nieuwe Kerk and English Church, 1669-1687’, f. 235, 5 June 1682; ibid., f. 277, 8 November 1684; ibid., f. 333, 4 November 1687; ibid., no. 1057, ‘Burial Registers Nieuwe Kerk and English Church, 1688-1713’, 4 November 1687; f. 11vo, 28 July 1689.
14 The information about the members of the Parensi family in Lucca comes from the records of the Museo Nazionale di Palazzo Mansi. A family tree dated 1695 mentions another Paolo and a Gisberto, presumably sons who died early.
16 In a record of 1730 in the Archivio di Stato of Lucca (derived from the documentation of the Museo Nazionale di Palazzo Mansi) of a payment by Parensi to portraitist Domenico Brugieri for four portraits, a portrait of ‘Gaspar Van Diemen, Zio Maderno’ (maternal uncle) is mentioned, probably the oval portrait in the Museo di Palazzo Mansi (inv. no. A 140). Although the description suggests that this is a brother of Anna Maria van Diemen, the only reference in the Amsterdam archives is to a son of that name, born in 1677. If the surname is correct, on the basis of the man’s clothes and the style of the portrait it could be a copy of an unknown portrait of her father, Gisbert van Diemen, dating from around 1655.

Out of Rembrandt’s Shadow: Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol as History Painters - Eric Jan Sluijter

1 See Sluijter 2015a, passim (summary pp. 385-400). The most important painters to come from elsewhere were Rembrandt (Leiden 1606 - Amsterdam 1669), Jacob Backer (Harlingen 1608/09 - Amsterdam 1651), Govert Flinck (Cleves 1614 - Amsterdam 1666), Ferdinand Bol (Dordrecht 1616 - Amsterdam 1680), Joachim von Sandrart (Frankfurt a.M. 1606 - Nuremberg 1688). Already working in Amsterdam were Adriaen van Nieulandt (Antwerpen c. 1586 - Amsterdam 1658), Claes Moyaert (Durgerdam c. 1591 - Amsterdam 1655), Isaac Isaacsz (Amsterdam 1598 - Amsterdam 1649). From around 1640 there were Salomon Koninck (Amsterdam 1609 - Amsterdam 1656), Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (Amsterdam 1621 - Amsterdam 1674), Jan Victors (Amsterdam 1619 - Indonesia after 1676). Around the mid-forties they were joined by Jan Lievens (Leiden 1607 - Amsterdam 1674), Jan Gerritsz van Bronckhorst (Utrecht c. 1603 - Amsterdam before December 1661), Jacob van Loo (Sluis 1614 - Paris 1670), Cornelis Holsteyn (Haarlem 1618 - Amsterdam 1638), Nicolaes van Helt Stockade (Nijmegen 1614 - Amsterdam 1669).
2 Van Mander 1603-04, Leven, fol. 190v: ‘eenen genuechlijcken strijdt’ and ‘eenen brandenden ijver’
3 Sluijter 2015a, pp. 52-59; see also Sluijter 2008, pp. 13-16.
4 Carlo Cesare Malvasia wrote of Guido Reni’s pupils (1678): ‘The fact that they had had such a famous teacher was enough in itself to give Reni’s pupils a great advantage.’ Quoted by Spear 1997, p. 225. The same would have applied to Rembrandt’s pupils.
5 Houbraken 1718-21, vol. 3, p. 206 (in the biography of Aert de Gelder): ‘De Konst van Rembrandt had als wat nieuws in haar tyd een algemeene goedkeuring; zoo dat de konstoeffenaren (wilden zy hunne werken gangbaar doen zyn) genoodzaakt waren zig tot de school van Rembrandt begeven.’ See also Flinck’s biography (Houbraken 1718-21, vol. 2, p. 21).
6 Van Hoogstraten 1678, p. 175, with reference to Horace and Cicero. See also Junius 1641, p. 29.
7 Sluijter 2017.
8 See Erna Kok in this catalogue and Kok 2013, pp. 59-79.
9 See among others Crenshaw 2006, esp. pp. 29-40. Renowned art dealers known to have
handled works by Rembrandt include Claude Vignon (Paris), Hendrick Uylevburgh, Johannes de Rennaime, Gerrit Uylevburgh and Lodewijk van Ludick. We find none of Bol’s and Flinck’s work with art dealers, except from Flinck’s early period. See Sluijter 2017. 10 Van Hoogstraten 1678, pp. 175-76. Van Hoogstraten uses this word when he contrasts different painting styles, esp. Rembrandt’s manner as against what we would now call classicism. On this passage see Sluijter 2015a, pp. 88, 387 and 407 (note 86) and below, note 20. On Joachim von Sandrart’s term 2015a, pp. 88, 387 and 407 (note 86) and now call classicism. On this passage see Sluijter 2015a, pp. 336-43. 21 Dudok van Heel 1980, pp. 119-21, and Van der Veen 2006, p. 174. 22 For this type see for example Van Dyck’s Tribute Money in Genoa, Palazzo Bianco (c. 1623-24). For versions of Christ Holding the Cross: Genoa, Palazzo Rosso, c. 1619, and Aschaffenburg, Staatsgalerie, c. 1613-14. 23 On the civic guard portraits for the Arquebusers’ Guild by Sandrart, Rembrandt and Flinck see Sluijter 2015a, pp. 90-99. 24 Ibid., pp. 91-92. 25 Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 2, p. 1024, no. 631. 26 Roethlisberger 1993, vol. 2, fig. 336, cat. no. 222 (vol. 2, p. 190). 27 The term ‘koppeling’ (the linking of figures and objects in space) comes from Van Hoogstraten (Van Hoogstraten 1678, p. 193: ‘de zwier van koppeling en spring’). Engravings of different versions of The Assumption of the Virgin (by Paulus Pontius and Hans Witdoeck, for instance) would have served as examples; see Van Hout (ed.) 2004-05, figs. 44 and 45. 28 On Flinck’s painting see Lunsingh Scheurleer 1969, pp. 53-54, and Blankert in Blankert et al.1999, pp. 168-71. For the work of Willeboirts Bosschaert see Heinrich 2003, vol. 1, pp. 202-06, cat. no. A 36. 29 Ibid., vol. 1, p. 203. 30 The angel gestures towards the divine light with one hand and with the other to Phoenix rising from its burning nest, which is placed atop a tomb in the background with a recumbent figure in armour, undoubtedly William II. 31 The iconography of the room must have been very carefully thought out. Pieter Verelst painted the Cardinal Virtues on the six doors (three of them false doors): the seventh, Hope, was missing. She was given her place in Flinck’s painting (with her attributes of an anchor and orange blossom). See Lunsingh Scheurleer 1969, p. 52. 32 See Sluijter 1993, passim (English translation Sluijter 2000b, pp. 161-97). This is a Dutch tradition that began with Goltzius. 33 On Rembrandt’s etching and the pastoral tradition see McNeil Kettering 1977, passim. 34 Cf. an illustration for a pastoral play written by Harmen Krul in 1639: McNeil Kettering 1977, p. 35, fig. 20. On Krul’s (very virtuous) pastoral plays see Smits-Veldt and Luijten 1993, pp. 72-73. 35 See McNeil Kettering 1977, pp. 41-42. 36 On the group with whom Flinck drew at life drawing sessions see Manuth 2001, pp. 50-53 and Sluijter 2006, pp. 322-24. This group, described by Dirk Bleker as a ‘society of painters’ (‘collegie van schilders’), was active in 1648 (the date on a drawing Flinck did at one of these sessions) and probably began a few years earlier. 37 See Sluijter 2006, pp. 292-309 and Noorman 2016, passim. 38 For my interpretation of Rembrandt’s Bathsheba in the context of countless other depictions of Bathsheba, see Sluijter 2006, pp. 333-68, esp. the work of Flinck on pp. 365-66. Willem Drost’s Bathsheba (1654) also played a role in Flinck’s conception of this work. They all show a Bathsheba contemplating the letter, aware that she is observed. 39 Sluijter 2015a, pp. 343-45; on images of Vertumnus and Pomona from this period see Sluijter 2000a, pp. 69-75 and 152-53. 40 Ibid., pp. 116-22. Cf. esp. Backer’s large painting in Sibiu, dated 1641 (ibid., fig. II-44; Van den Brink and Van der Veen 2008, cat. no. 81 and fig. 5). On scenes from the Pastor Fido, see McNeil Kettering 1983, pp. 107-13 and Van den Brink (ed.) 1993, pp. 18-21. 41 On Van Loo’s rather mysterious early training see Sluijter 2015a, pp. 374-79. 42 Sluijter 2000a, pp. 75-78 and p. 141. 43 For drawings, see e.g. Noorman and De Witt 2016, cat. nos. 25, 26, 28-32, Blankert et al. 1999, p. 162, fig. 25a; for paintings: Blankert 1982, cat. no. 29 (the Bol), Blankert in Blan-
kert et al. 1999, pp. 160-62, cat. no. 25 (Backer) and Mandrell 2011, cat. nos. P. 52, 55, 56 (Van Loo); no known painting by Flinck. Cf. esp. the paintings of Venus and Adonis by Backer and Bol and Van Loo’s Cimon and Iphigenia (ibid., P. 56); these all appear to be based on the same life drawing session.

A later Venus and Adonis by Bol dated 1661, with Venus in virtually the same pose (reversed), is a much more classical type, with broader shoulders, full, round breasts, a defined waist and sturdier legs (Miami Beach, Bass Museum); Blankert 1982, cat. no. 31). Van Loo used both this type and a more classical type of nude, as Judith Noorman argued in her unpublished MA thesis (University of Amsterdam, 2006).

See e.g. a Virgin and Child with the Archangel Gabriel and John the Baptist by Sandro Botticelli (c. 1470) in Naples, Museo di Capodimonte.

Hendrick Snayers after Anthony van Dyck, engraving, after c. 1642-44 (the grisaille after which the engraving was made is in an English private collection; this is a variant of the painting in the Royal Collection in Buckingham Palace). The position of Bol’s infant Christ bears a remarkable resemblance to Van Dyck’s famous Madonna and Child with Two Donors in the Louvre, Paris, of which drawings or copies undoubtedly existed. A year earlier, Bol had painted a Charity (Moscow, Pushkin Museum) in which he almost literally repeated a composition by Van Dyck that was in Amalia of Solms-Braunfeld’s collection (see Blankert 2011, pp. 284-86, figs. 8 and 9).

For the commissions for all the decorations in the town hall see Van de Waal 1952, pp. 215-19, with further references. For the works by Bol and Flinck in the town hall see Blankert 1975 (English translation Blankert 2004).

For this term, see above, notes 10 and 20. The coherence within the composition is also upset because the light on the dominant foreground figure comes from the right to give it high relief (as in the print after Rubens in reverse), whereas the rest of the scene is lit and held together by the divine light from above.

The true circumstances were only recently reconstructed by Margriet van Eikema Hommes and Emile Froment during the restoration in 2007-09; see Van Eikema Hommes and Froment 2011a.

Flinck was to deliver two a year at 1,000 guilders each; see Van de Waal 1952, p. 222.

On the problematic situation with the lighting see Van Eikema Hommes and Froment 2011b, pp. 50-52. They rightly suggest that had Van Campen still been in charge, the decorations would have been much better geared to this situation. They also note the irony of the fact that Rembrandt, whose work was removed, was the only one who did take the lighting into account.

On the technique of the watercolour decoration see ibid., pp. 149-53.

On Ovens’s intervention see ibid., pp. 153-56.

Ibid., pp. 156-58.

It has always been assumed that Flinck made these drawings first, but in view of, among other things, the fact that Flinck’s watercolour decoration is much closer to the composition of Tempesta’s print, I am convinced that Flinck made them as designs for the later, final versions.

1661-62, oil on canvas, 196 x 309 cm., Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, on loan from the Royal Academy of Sciences.

See Van de Waal 1952, pp. 229-34.

In the eventual painting by Jacob Jordaens we likewise see a personification of Peace between them (fig. 149). This suggests either that the motif was specified in the commission or that Bol made his work after Jacob Jordaens’s painting had already been installed.

Elmer Kolfin is preparing a study on the Batavian series and Jordaens’s role in particular.

On this series see Van Eikema Hommes’s masterly study 2012, passim.


Sandartz 1678, vol. 2, book 3, p. 328 (in the biography of Rembrandt): ‘he could effectively depict the artlessness of nature... by using colour with natural strength, advancing forcefully’ (‘der Natur Einfalt ... mit natürlichen Kräften in Colorten und starken Erheben zu zieren gewuist’).

On ‘henlijkheid’, as Van Hoogstraten called this, another means of bringing things forward strongly, see Van de Wetering 1997, pp. 179-90.


Bol appears to have used a print in the anatomy book for artists by Jacob van der Gracht (Van der Gracht 1634, plate 1) for Neptune’s pose, or, more probably, made a drawing of a model in the pose of the anatomical example in the well-known book. The pose of the figure of Adonis in the Rijksmuseum’s Venus and Adonis, like the one in the Bass Museum, Miami Beach (note 44 above), is virtually identical.

The engraving by Pieter Nolpe is based on an oil sketch that I believe has to be attributed to Jan Baptist Weenix (Sluijter 2015a, pp. 162-65, figs. II-30, 31). Sea-horses like these also appear on Artus Quellinus’s tympanum for the town hall (see fig. 120 in this book), but the print seems to be a more direct source. Needless to say, this motif is part of a long tradition stretching back into antiquity.

Similar groups of ships lying at anchor in calm weather occur in a type of painting that Van de Velde developed at precisely this time; the vessels do not appear to have been copied from a particular work. Van de Velde expert Remmelt Daalder confirmed that this area could have been painted in by Willem van de Velde the Younger, because of the expertise with which the becalmed ships are painted.

On the painting in the Utrecht set and the work for the Zuiderkerk see Van Eikema Hommes 2012, pp. 121-29.

Blankert described the subject as Solomon Bringing Gifts to the Temple (Blankert 1982, pp. 250).
Hommes convincingly identified the subject as the story of King Cyrus.

See ibid., p. 123-25 and 164. The subject was previously pictured in a church window for the same church to a design by Pieter Lastman, given by the goldsmiths in 1611.

See Middelkoop 1999, pp. 184-87, who at the same time convincingly links Minerva to the Trip family’s arms dealings. However, the peacock as a symbol of vanity, as Middelkoop suggests, seems to me out of place here. To my mind, it functions as an attribute of Juno, along with the dolphin, an attribute of Venus, and Minerva herself. Together the three goddesses represent all the good qualities of a woman (as we find in marriage poems, e.g. Vondel: ‘Drye godthéén smilten in dit eenigh schoon in een’; see Sluijter 2000a, p. 128), essentially, therefore, comparable to the Three Graces in Rubens’s painting of the *Education of Marie de’ Medici* (See note 73).

In devising the composition, Bol probably had in mind an etching of *Grammatica* by Rubens’s Antwerp-born pupil Cornelis Schut; see Diels 2009, pp. 50-51, fig. 13.

C. 1622-25. Oil on canvas, 394 x 295 cm., Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. 1771.

See E.J. Sluijter in exh. cat. Enschede 2016-17, pp. 36-46, esp. 41-42. It is very probable that they knew one another personally; both were in touch with the poet and playwright Andries Pels. Iona van Tuinen will publish on this in the context of Bol’s painting of the *Death of Dido*, a work that has to be dated to 1668-69.


See note 8 above.

Both Houbraken 1718-21, vol. 2, pp. 23-24, and Baldinucci 1681-1721 (ed. 1974-75), vol. 5, p. 322, mention this trip. We do not know when it took place, but the early sixteen-forties seems the most likely.


See among others Crenshaw 2006, esp. chap. 6. See also Sluijter 2015a, pp. 56-57.


**Ferdinand Bol and Govert Flinck in the Burgomasters’ Cabinet - Eric Jan Sluijter**

1. For the commission, subject matter, meaning and composition of the works by Flinck and Bol see A. Blankert in exh. cat. Amsterdam 1975, pp. 11-23 and Blankert 1975/2004, pp. 49-64; for Bol, see also N. Middelkoop in coll. cat. Amsterdam 2008, pp. 116-17; for Flinck, see also Sluijter 2015a, pp. 96-99.


3. All that remains of this mural, apart from a few fragments, is a nineteenth-century watercolour drawing: Heinrich Hess, copy after Hans Holbein the Younger, *Manius Curtius Refuses the Gifts of the Samnites*, 1817, Basel, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung. This drawing has already been noted by Blankert; see exh. cat. Amsterdam 1975, fig. 10, and Blankert (1975) 2004, p. 45.

4. See, for example, his Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard, c. 1629, oil on canvas, 158 x 174 cm., Rouen, Musée des Beaux-Arts, inv. no. 1999.4.1.

5. C. 1610, oil on panel, 80 x 57 cm., Budapest, Szépművészeti Múzeum, inv. no. 92.3

**Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol: The Portraits - Rudi Ekkart**

1. For an overview of Amsterdam portraiture in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries see R. Ekkart in exh. cat. Amsterdam 2002-03, pp. 28-45.


3. For the identification as a self-portrait see De Bruyn Kops 1965, pp. 20-29.

4. Previously described as a portrait of Jonas Jacob Leeuwen. The correct identification was published by Dudok van Heel 1980, pp. 105-23.


8. The sitter has also been identified as Augustijn Wttenbogaert on the grounds of the likeness to the governor in Bol’s painting of governors (fig. 221). For the identification see Dudok van Heel 1978, p. 146 and Bikker 2006, pp. 190-95, esp. 194.


11. Ibid., p. 137, no. 120 (c. 1644); Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 1, p. 310 no. 158 (c. 1642-44).

12. Oil on canvas, 115 x 90.5 cm, Bruxelles, Royal Museum of Fine Arts Bruxelles, inv. no. 155. Two copies of Rembrandt’s portraits of Bambeeck and his wife Agatha Bas dated 1641 are attributed to Bol; cf. Amsterdam (Sotheby’s) 15 November 2005, no. 74; Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 5, p. 3086, nos. 2019-20.

13. See also Blankert 1982, nos. 101, 104, 123, 133, 149, 150, 151 and 152.


16. Exh. cat. Cleves 2015-16, p. 17, figs. 6 and 7, as possibly Jan van Hellemont and Margaretha van Raephorst.

17. Blankert 1982, nos. 149 and 150.

18. For the identification by Frans Grijsenhout and Erna Kok see Dickey (red.) 2017, chapter 6.


22. See also the portraits of Davidt de Wildt and Elisabeth van der Voorde dating from
1667; the last set of pendants by Bol that we know of. Oil on canvas, both 122 x 102 cm, Amsterdam, Amsterdam Museum, inv. nos. SA 23614 and 23615; Blankert 1982, nos. 165 and 166.

23 For the identification of the deathbed portrait see exh. cat. Haarlem 1998.


25 For the identification of this portrait see Ekkert 2002.


27 Snoep 1983, pp. 205-06.

28 Van Gendt 2011, cat. nos. 93 (with pendant 94), 119, 131, 150 and 151 (with pendant no. 152).


30 See also exh. cat. Amsterdam 1984, pp. 219-20, no. 54 and Van Thiël and De Bruyn Kops 1995, pp. 265-66, no. 54. Some of the variants also have carved frames; see Blankert 1982, nos. 82, 82Add and 86.

31 Ibid., nos. 76-82Add.

32 The existence of the painting was noted by Prud’homme van Reine 2001, pp. 335 and 446, note 42. Our thanks to Johan Bosch van Rosenthal, who put the exhibition curators in touch with the owner of the painting.

33 This is a map of the southern North Sea area by Pieter Goos; see Koeman 1970, vol. 4, pp. 196-97, as Goos 18 No. 6. My thanks to Willem van Kinschot and Kees Zandvliet for their identification of the map.

Flinck and Bol: The Group Portraits - Norbert Middelkoop

1 This essay arises out of my doctoral resea-arch into the Amsterdam group portraits, concluded in 2017.


3 The men in the painting served together in this position from 1636 onwards, so it makes sense to conclude that it was they who initiated the decoration campaign; see Schaep 1653, f. 51r., whose list of governors before 1636 is very incomplete.

4 The Governors of St Elisabeth’s Hospital, 1641. Canvas, 153 x 252 cm. Haarlem, Frans Hals Museum, inv. no. OS 1-114; For the Governors by Flinck and the preliminary drawing, see my entry in exh. cat. Perth / Adelaide / Brisbane 1997-98, pp. 83-85, no. 29.

5 See Elias 1903-05, vol. 1, p. 527 no. 106 (Burgh), p. 420 no. 141 (Willekens) and p. 422 no. 131 (Van Vlooswyck).

6 This horn, made in 1547 and attributed to Arent Jansz Coster, survived and is in the Rijksmuseum (inv. no. BK-AM-12, on loan from the City of Amsterdam). We do not know how the ceremonial toasts were made but the governors may have ratified the decisions they made by taking a draught from the horn after the content of flute on the table had been poured into it.

7 Dudok van Heel 2008, vol. 1, pp. 290-91 and Hell / Van Gent 2013, p. 299-300. He is shown as an ordinary militiaman in Cornelis van der Voort’s Civic guardsmen of the Company of Cornelis Zilven and Lieutenant Voltcker Overlander, c. 1610-12 (Amsterdam Museum, inv. no. SA 7433).


9 Sluijter 2015a, pp. 96-99.

10 Bikker/Tauuber 2015/16, pp. 263-64.

11 Ibid., p. 263. See further Elias 1903-05, vol. 1, p. 414, no. 137 (Bas) and p. 510 no. 185 (Reael).

12 The Governors of the Nieuwezijds Almshouse, c. 1650/51. Canvas, 272 x 312 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (on loan from the City of Amsterdam), inv. no. SK-C-442.

13 With regard to Van der Helst, Van Gent 2011, p. 199, mentions an eighteenth-century drawn copy with ‘voltrocken 1650’ (completed 1650) on the back. The painting by Flinck is dated ‘1650’ in Schaep 1653.

14 For the Oetgens Van Waveren brothers, see Elias 1903-05, vol. 1, p. 332.


16 Vos 1662, pp. 540-41: ‘Hier trekt van Maar-sevene de eerst’ in d’eeuwge vred / Zoo trok zijn vaader d’eerst’ in ’t oorlog voor de Staat / Vernuut en Dapperheid, de kracht der vrye steede’ / Verwerpen d’oude wrok, in plaats van ’t krijgsgewaedt / Zoo waakt men aan het Y na moorden en verwoesten / De wijzen lauten ’t zwaardt wel rusten, maar niet roes-ten’. (Here Van Maarseven leads in eternal peace / As did his father lead in the war for the sake of the State / Wit and bravery, the strength of free cities / Reject the old resentment, instead of the armour. This is how they keep watch at the IJ after murder and ruin / The wise let the sword rest, but not rust.)

17 Schaep 1630-53, nos. 24 and 25.

18 The commission may have been prompted by the extension of the Leper Hospital in 1640, completed under the watchful eyes of the men portrayed by Bol; see Wagenaar 1760-68, vol. 2 (1765), p. 312.

19 See in brief Blankert 1982, pp. 155-56, no. 177.

20 A 1769 engraving after the painting by Reinier Vinckles shows an extended composition on all sides (Hollstein 1949-2010, vol. 2 (1954), p. 35, no. 30), as if the painting had originally been larger, however, the present edges of the canvas do not appear to indicate a reduction in size.

21 He was preceded by the physicians Marten Jansz Coster, Sebastiaen Egbertsz and Nicolaes Tulp; see Dudok van Heel 1998, pp. 55-57, about the practice of appointing doctors medicinae to the city council.

22 Bikker 2006, p. 194.

23 See Middelkoop 2013b for an illustrated overview.

24 Information about the social functions can be derived from NN, Lijsten van de heeren van regeeringe der stad Gouda (...) [1600-1794], Gouda 1705. As well as being a lieutenant (1649-51) and captain (1652, 1653, 1657, 1664,
1665), Jan Jansz van Immerseel (?-1671?) was a governor of the House of Correction from 1643 to 1671; Adriaen van Groenendijk (?-1704?) was a lieutenant (1651-52) and captain (1653, 1654, 1657, 1658, 1661, 1662) and governor of the Leper Hospital from 1649 to 1704 and secretary from 1666 to 1704; Hendrick Herberts (?-?) was a lieutenant (1641-42, 1649, 1650-51) and captain (1652-53, 1656-57) and governor of the hospital from 1648 to 1652 and from 1656 to 1658. Johan Herberts (?-1704?) was a lieutenant (1651-52) and captain (1652-53, 1656-57) and governor of the hospital from 1648 to 1652 and from 1656 to 1658. Johan Herberts (?-?) is only named as a captain in 1648 and 1649; evidently Dirck Cant (?-1670?) was a governor of the House of Correction, 1660-64†). Gijsbert Pietersz van Wieringen (1607-1664, in office 1656-57, 1661) and Willem Pietersz van der Molen (1603-1666, in office 1655-66†) and Gerrit van Ruytenburgh (1603-1686, in office 1667-68). In 1765 Wagenaar, vol. 2, no. 14254 and 14255). In 1765, separated from the accompanying painting.

29 He is named as head of the Confrérie in 1629, 1630, 1633, 1634 and 1638; this can be deduced from the annual accounts signed by the governors in SAA 366/52, Archief van de Gilden en het Brouwerscollege, Wijnkopersgilde, no. 1645, ‘Kasboek 1621-1659’ (incomplete), passim; Blankert 1982, pp. 20, 21 and 157, no. 180 (without mention of source), states that he served as head in 1629, 1631, 1635 and 1639. The names of five governors who could have been portrayed by Bol appear in the annual accounts for 1659: Christoffel Croesen (Utrecht 1590/91-?), Hendrick Kreijvanger (1607/08-?), Willem Simonsz Moons (Amsterdam 1603/04-?), Tijmon Cornelisz Pondt (Amsterdam-?) and Marijn Harmansz Faber (?-?); See SAA 366/52, no. 1645 (see previous note), f. 60.

Flinck and Bol: The Black Presence - Imara Limon

1 Blakely 1993, p. 103.
2 The catalogue of the same name (Kolfin and Schreuder 2008) includes a bibliography of research into themes relating to the black presence in Dutch art and society.
3 Already remarked upon by N. Middelkoop in mus. cat. Amsterdam 2008, p. 117.
4 See Otte 1987.
5 Geeraardt Brandt’s ‘Leven en bedryf van den heere Michiel de Ruiter, Amsterdam 1687, includes a portrait print of De Ruyter based on a combination of two portrait types by Bol, one with a black page; my thanks to Tom van der Molen for this observation.
6 Cf. also Flinck’s A Young Archer of c. 1639-40 in London, The Wallace Collection, oil on
Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol: Drawings – Peter Schatborn

1 Special thanks to Holm Bevers and Marleen Ram for their comments.
2 Bredius 1917, vol. 4, p. 1255; exh. cat. Amsterdam 2014, under no. 54.
6 New Hollstein 2013, no. 159.
9 C. 1638. Red chalk, heightened with white, 247 x 137 mm., Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty museum, inv. no. 81.GB.27; Benesch 1973, no. 157; exh. cat. Los Angeles 2009-10, no. 3.1.
10 C. 1638. Black and white chalk, 198 x 234 mm., Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, inv. no. 33/1956; Benesch 1973, no. 193A; Stockholm 1992, no. 132; Schatborn 2010, pp. 7-8, fig. 4; previously attributed to Flinck by Von Moltke 1965, no. D 215, where the attribution by Frits Lugt is also mentioned.
12 Black chalk, 121 x 105 mm., Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Koenigs/Van Beuningen Collection, inv. no. R 81; Benesch 1973, no. 376; Giltaij 1988, no. 12; exh. cat. Rotterdam 2005-06, no. 10; Schatborn 2010a, p. 10, fig. 6.
13 For the view that Rembrandt only began on this later, see exh. cat. Amsterdam 2016.
15 Benesch 1973, no. 79, as Rembrandt; Plomp 1997, no. 322, as Rembrandt; exh. cat. Los Angeles 2009-10, no. 41 and fig. 4C; Schatborn 2010a, p. 25, fig. 14.
16 Benesch 1973, no. 70; Schatborn 2010a, p. 15, fig. 16; Coll. cat. London 2010, Flinck no. 7.
18 C. 1638. Pen and brown ink and black chalk, on blue paper, 245 x 181 mm., Melbourne, National Gallery of Victoria, Felton Bequest, 1923, inv. no. 1278.12.2-3; Sumowski 1979-92, vol. 4 (1981), no. 948; Schatborn 2010a, p. 13, fig. 11.
19 ‘Godefredo Flinck de Cleves, scolaro di Rembrandt in Amsterdam; nella facilitat[à] del dipingere oltrepass[à] il Maestro Orlandi’ (Godefredo Flinck of Cleves, pupil of Rembrandt in Amsterdam; he surpassed Master Orlando in his skill as a painter). Giovanni Orlando worked in Rome and Naples from 1590 to 1640.
31 There is a drawing of a flute-playing shepherd that is somewhat similar to the shepherd in the painting in the Maida and George Abrams Collection in Boston; exh. cat. Amsterdam 2014, under no. 21, fig. 21a.
32 For an overview of preliminary studies for paintings, see Blankert 1982, pp. 198-204. David on his Deathbed, 1643, pen and brown ink, brown wash, 158 x 217 mm., Besançon, Musée des Beaux-Arts, inv. no. D. 2756; Sumowski 1979-92, vol. 5, no. 1277, as Gerrit Willemsz Horst, can be added to it; it is a preliminary study for Bol’s painting in Dublin, National Gallery of Ireland, inv. no. 47; oil on canvas, 79 x 101 cm., signed F. Bol fecit 1643; Coll. cat.

(panel, 66.2 x 50.8 cm., inv. no. P338.
7 My thanks to Norbert Middelkoop for this suggestion.)
This is also evidenced by a copy with the original composition in Providence, Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design; Benesch 1973, under no. 492, with ill.
46 Ferdinand Bol, attributed, Joseph Interprets the Dreams of the Baker and Cagbeaer in Prison, c. 1640. Oil on canvas, 165 x 212 cm. Schwerin, Staatliches Museum, inv. no. 65. The attribution of this work to Bol has been called into question, although various characteristic elements of early paintings by Bol occur in it.
48 See e.g. Rembrandt’s preliminary study for a print dated to c. 1639, Artist Drawing from Life; Benesch 1973, no. 423; Coll. cat. London 2010, no. 24.
49 Cf. e.g. Rembrandt’s drawing Joseph Interprets the Dreams of the Baker and Butler in Prison, (verso of the sheet referred to in the previous note) and Bol’s study of a Standing Virgin for the 1644 painting. Pen and brown ink, 157 x 115 mm., Wroclaw, Ossolineum, inv. no. 8721; Sumowski 1979-92, vol. 1 (1979), no. 98.
50 Benesch 1973, no. 475; Sumowski 1979, vol. 1, no. 93.
54 Blankert 1982, p. 77, no. 42.
58 Ibid., vol. 1, no. 261*.
59 Ibid., vol. 1, no. 211*.
62 See also the Scholar at a Table with a Globe and Books, late 1640s, oil on canvas, 122 x 98 cm., St Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum, inv. no. cat. 1958, no. 767; Blankert 1982, no. 69; Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 1, no. 124.
64 Ibid., no. 109; Blankert 1982, under cat. 26, p. 201, fig. B; the painting is in the building of the Upper House of the Dutch parliament in The Hague (on loan from the Cultural Agency of the Netherlands). For two versions of the same composition (in pen and ink), see Benesch 1973, no. C 43. In a lecture presented at the conference Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol: Rising Stars in Rembrandt’s Amsterdam, Queen’s University, Bader International Study Centre, Herstmonceux Castle, United Kingdom, 16-19 July 2015, Jan Leja attributed previously – to Rembrandt (not published).
66 C. 1655. Pen and brown ink, brown and grey wash, 308 x 401 mm., Vienna, Albertina, inv. no. 25113; Sumowski 1979-92, vol. 1 (1979), no. 118.
67 C. 1655. Oil on canvas 115.5 x 133 cm., Graz, Alte Galerie am Landesmuseum Joanneum, inv. no. 151; Blankert 1982, no. 30; Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 1, no. 91.
69 Sumowski 1979-92, vol. 1 (1979), no. 899 (Flinck) and ibid., vol. 1, no. 54* (Backer); exh. cat. Amsterdam / Aachen 2008/09, cat. nos. 54A and B.
70 Dudok van Heel 1982, p. 71 and pp. 74-75.
71 Two nudes included by Sumowski, vol. 1, nos. 119 and 155*, under ‘Bol’ are now attributed to Jacob van Loo and Flinck respectively, see exh. cat. Amsterdam 2014, nos. 54 and 20.
72 Bredius 1917, vol. 4, p. 1255.
73 C. 1655. Black and white chalk on blue paper, 373 x 244 mm., Amsterdam, Private collection; exh. cat. Amsterdam 2014, no. 54.
80 See note 40.
83 C. 1654-55. Pen and brown ink, brush in grey, black chalk, 605 x 452 mm., Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, inv. no. 1744; Blankert 1975, p. 24, fig. 21; Sumowski 1979-92, vol. 1 (1979), no. 114; exh. cat. Munich / Amsterdam 2001-02, no. 44.
84 1655. Black chalk, pen and brown ink, brown and grey wash, 675 x 467 mm., Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, inv. no. 1741; Sumowski 1979, 1, no. 113; exh. cat. Munich / Amsterdam 2001-02, no. 45.
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88 Pen and brown ink, 12 x 95 mm., Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. 23,008; Lugt 1933, no. 1300; Sumowski 1979-92, vol. 1 (1979), no. 107.
96 Etching, 250 x 204 mm.; New Hollstein 2013, no. 172.
97 See note 38.
101 Blankert 1982, p. 77, nos. 60-64.
102 Elias 1903-05, vol. 1, p. 401; with thanks to S.A.C. Dudok van Heel.
103 Portrait of a Man, 1647, pen and brown ink, brown wash, red chalk, heightened in white, 116 x 82 mm., Wrocław, Ossolineum, inv. no. 1072; Sumowski 1979-92, vol. 1 (1979), no. 101; cf. Portrait of a Man, 1647, oil on canvas, 88.2 x 76.5 cm., Schwerin, Staatliches Museum, inv. no. 2433; Blankert 1982, cat. 99; Sumowski 1983-94, vol. 1, no. 163; Woman Playing a Lute, Allegory of Hearing, c. 1654, pen and brown ink, brown and grey wash, 109 x 68 mm. Mettingen, Libera Collection, inv. no. D 35; Sumowski 1972-92, vol. 1 (1979), no. 272; cf. Woman Playing a Lute, Allegory of Hearing, 1654, oil on canvas, 100 x 82 cm., Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, inv. no. 1430; Blankert, 1982, no. 132; Sumowski 1983-94, I, no. 128; P. Schatborn in Mettingen 2012-13, fig. 107; Woman in a Window, c. 1642, pen and brown ink, 100 x 80 mm., Besançon, Musée des Beaux-arts, inv. no. D 573; Blankert 1982, under no. 144. Sumowski 1979-92, vol. 1 (1979), no. 185; the painting after this drawing is not known.
107 Sale Huquier, Amsterdam, 14 September 1761, no. 1581; Schatborn 2010, no. 79, note 11.
109 Sumowski 1979-92, vol. 1 (1979), no. 278; Royalton-Kisch 2003, p. 140ff. Royalton-Kisch sees a link with a River Landscape from the 16528, black chalk, pen and brown ink and watercolour, heightened with white, 144 x 198 mm., New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, inv. no. I 176; Turner 2006, no. 36.
110 See note 67.
113 Blankert 1982, pp. 32-33.
115 Rembrandt, Landscape near Bloemendaal with Haarlem in the Distance, 1651. Etching, 12 x 31.9 cm.; New Hollstein 2013, no. 257.
117 Lugt 1933, no. 1200; Beneesch 1973, no. 848; for the attribution to Bol see Royalton-Kisch 1992, pp. 131-32.
118 Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-A-1935; Corpus 1982-2015, vol. 6 (2015), no. 165. The pen-and-ink technique is meanwhile similar in the Landscape with a Bridge, but worked up more extensively and rather irregularly with a brush.
119 The attribution to Bol of the Landscape with a Lift Bridge, sixteen-forties, pen and brown ink, brown wash, 156 x 286 mm. Vienna, Albertina, inv. no. I 174; Beneesch 1973, no. 851; Royalton-Kisch, 1992, pp. 132-33, fig. 39, seems less secure; the sheet and several other drawings fit better in the oeuvre of Carel Fabritius because the handling of line is more powerful and more uniform than Bol’s; cf. Fabritius’s Tobias with the Angel and the Fish, c. 1642-45, pen and brown ink, brown wash, 15 x 288 mm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. 2010/03; Beneesch 1973, no. 496; Royalton-Kisch 1992, p. 127, fig. 30; exh. cat. Amsterdam / Paris, 2015-16, no. 44; and St Jerome in a Landscape, c. 1642-45, pen and brown ink, brown wash, 170 x 161 mm., Brno, Moravská Galerie, inv.
Ferdinand Bol, The Etcher - Leonore van Sloten

* ‘I should like to express my gratitude to my mentor, Bob van den Boogert, who among other things played a crucial part in the advancement of my knowledge on this specific subject. My thanks also go to Norbert Middelkoop and Erik Hinterding for their critical reading of this essay.’

1 See Hollstein 1949-2010, vol. 3 (Bol) and exh. cat. Amsterdam 2000. In The Illustrated Bartsch, vol. 51, which is being published in the summer of 2017 by Abaris, George C. Kenney sets out his findings about Bol’s graphic oeuvre (hereafter referred to as Kenney 2017). In this essay, the references to the states of Bol’s prints follow Kenney 2017 (abbreviation for references to specific prints: K.). With thanks to the author and publisher for providing a preprint.

2 Of all the students trained by Rembrandt over a period of four decades, we currently know around forty of them by name.

3 Flick must have known Rembrandt’s prints extremely well, but he appears to have had no interest in practising the art of etching. In cases where prints can be linked to Flick’s oeuvre they are primarily reproductive prints that were produced from copper plates made after Flick’s painted works by professional engravers.

4 The students who etched were Gerrit Dou, Gerbrand van den Eeckhout, Ferdinand Bol, Samuel van Hoogstraten, Willem Drost, Constantijn van Renesse, Johannes Leupenius, Philips Koninck, Salomon Koninck, Johannes Ruyscher, Pieter de With and Karel van der Pluym. For an overview of their graphic oeuvres see the various volumes of Hollstein 1949-2010.

5 It should be noted that Van Rennesse was not a professional artist but he took drawing lessons from Rembrandt in (at least) 1649 and 1651. Ruyscher (c. 1625-after 1675) must have been apprenticed to Rembrandt in the mid-1640s. Interestingly his drawings are Rembrandtian in style, whereas his prints were very strongly inspired by the work of Hercules Segers – to such a degree that he had already earned the nickname of ‘the young Hercules’ in the seventeenth century and his work was long mistaken for Segers’s. See exh. cat. Amsterdam 2014, pp. 125-27 and exh. cat. Amsterdam 2016-17, pp. 36-41.

6 Willem Drost, Self-Portrait, Drawing, 1652. Etching, only state, 64 x 50 mm; Hollstein 1949-2010, dl. 6 (Drost); Constantijn van Rennesse, Self-Portrait, Drawing, 1651. Etching and drypoint, only state, 80 x 70 mm.; Ibid., vol. 20 (Renesse).

7 See exh. cat. Amsterdam 2015, pp. 25-29 for an overview. The drawn self-portraits were by Nicolas Maes, Samuel van Hoogstraten, Heyman Dullaert and Arent de Gelder. There may also have been similar drawn portraits by other students, but they have been lost. Since we know of other etchings by Van Rennesse dating from 1653 they also could have been made during his time with Rembrandt.


9 New Hollstein 2013, text I, Introduction.


11 ‘Hy had ook een eige wyze van zyne geëste platen naderhand te bewerken en op te maken: ’t geen hy by zyne Leerlingen nooit liet zien; ’t is ook niet te bedenken op wat wyze ’t zelve gedaan is; dus is die vinding ... met den uitvinder ten grave gedaalt.’ Houbraken 1718-21, vol. 1, p. 271.

12 ‘mit fast unzählbaren fürnehmen Kinder zur Instruction und Lehre erfüllt [war], deren jeder ihm jährlich in die 100. Gulden bezahlt, ohne den Nutzen welchen er aus dieser seiner Lehrlinge Mahlwerken und Kupferstucken erhalten der sich auch in die 2 bis 2500 Gulden baares Gelds belauffen, samt dem, was er durch seine eigne Hand-Arbeit erworben.’ Von Sandrart 1675, vol. 2, book 3, p. 326.


14 Kenney 2017, K22.

15 The second state has ‘F Bol f’ in the left foreground in angular letters that may have been inscribed with a drypoint; this could explain the character of the letters.


17 In 1646 Bol completed a large painting of the same subject (p. 101, afb. 121), which he based amongst others on another painted version of The Sacrifice of Isaac (Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. R. F. 920).

18 This was a reason for Blankert to doubt the attribution; see Blankert 1982, p. 14, note 4 and p. 91, cat. 4. Rovinski, Bartsch, Hollstein and Kenney, however, include the print as autograph in their overviews of the oeuvre.

19 Exh. cat. Amsterdam 2011, p. 175.

20 Munich, Alte Pinakothek, inv. no. 395. Bol’s etching hand shows similar – albeit more skilful and more refined – ways of depicting particular pictorial elements. He would have known the prints by Van Vliet and studied them to hone his etching skills. We know that Rembrandt had examples of the prints in his collection from his estate inventory of 1666: ‘A box of prints by Van Vliet after paintings by Rembrandt’ (‘Een kas met printen van Van Vliet naer schilderije van Rembrandt’). Amsterdam City Archives, archive no. 5072, inv. no. 364, fol. 36, no. 277.

21 Rembrand, Susanna and the Elders, red chalk, Berlin Kupferstichkabinett, inv. no.
KdZ 5296; Cat. coll. Berlin 2006, pp. 82-85, no. 18; The inscription reads:
Verkoft syn vaendrager synde 15. – – –
een floora verhandelt 4. 6. – .
Fardynandus van syn werck verhandelt
Aen ander werck van syn voornemen
Den Abrueham een floorae
Leenderts floorae is verhandelt tegen 5 g

22 The drawing on the recto is dated to 1636, because the sketch of Lastman’s composition of Susanna and the Elders served Rembrandt as the example for his 1636 painting of Susanna, now in the Mauritshuis (inv. no. 147). Cat. coll. Berlin 2006, pp. 82-85 (cat. 18).

23 The impression of the first state in the Rijksmuseum’s collection (inv. no. RP-BI-1984) bears a watermark of a multi-rayed sun (observation Erik Hinterding, communication by email on 2 May 2017). This watermark appears similar to the watermarks that have been found in impressions of prints by Rembrandt dating from 1633 and 1639 (Hinterding 2006, vol. 2, p. 181). Unfortunately, these marks were not photographed, and in the case of the Rembrandt prints do not relate to first states. Yet it is not out of the question that paper with a similar watermark dates from the 1630s, which makes a dating of the print by Bol in that period one of the possibilities.


25 Borrowing parts of a composition from work by an admired predecessor was common practice. Artists also entered into artistic competition with one another by taking each other’s inventions and improving them (emulation). See for example exh. cat. Amsterdam 2013-14.


30 Around 1652 when Rembrandt adapted Hercules Segers’s etching plate of Tobias and the Angel, he replaced the figures with a fleeing Joseph and Mary. While Segers, interestingly, had based his composition on a print of Tobias and the Angel by Hendrick Goudt after Adam Elsheimer, Rembrandt likewise based his adaptation of Segers’s etching plate on Goudt, but on the engraving that Goudt made of Elsheimer’s Flight into Egypt in 1613.


32 Jan Lievens played an important role in Rembrandt’s earliest development as a printmaker. He had an aptitude for the technique and encouraged the young Rembrandt to take up the etching needle; Lievens based his etching of St Jerome on an oil sketch (Leiden, Museum De Lakenhal). See exh. cat. Amsterdam / Washington 2008-09, pp. 126-27.

33 Amsterdam City Archives, archive no. 5072, inv. no. 364, fol. 36: ‘(274) Noch een gesneeden boeck met printen sijnde de werc-ken van Jan Lievensz. en Ferdinando Bol’.

34 Krul 1644, p. 11.


36 Jan Six’s tragedy Medea was published in 1648. Rembrandt etched an illustration of the wedding of Jason and Creusa (New Hollstein, 241) for this publication. In 1655 Rembrandt supplied four small etched illustrations for the mystical treatise Piedra Gloriosa o de la Estatua de Nebuchadnessar by Menasseh den Israel on the coming of the Messiah (New Holstein, 288).

37 For the iconographic interpretation of this print see exh. cat. Amsterdam 2015-16, p. 79, no. 53. For more window works see Blankert 1982, p. 140-141, nos. 131-136.

38 Prague, Národní Galerie, inv. no. DO-4288.


41 The impression with inventory number RP-P-2008-83 has a foolscap with seven points and the monogram MG.


43 Inv. no. RP-P-BI-1990. Observation of the paper also reveals that it looks somewhat thinner than the gampi Rembrandt usually used (Erik Hinterding, oral communication on 22 March 2017).

44 Observation by Erik Hinterding, oral communication on 22 March 2017.

45 In addition to the print in the Rijksmuseum there is also an impression on Japanese paper in the British Museum, inv. no. F6.175.

46 There may also be an impression on Japanese paper of Rembrandt’s etching St Jerome in a Study of 1642, which Bol took as an example for his print. Rembrandt may have reprinted his own plate when he had the exotic paper at his disposal. See Hollstein 2013, New Hollstein, 212, text section p. 106, state II, Florence (Uffizi) (6085 ST SC), where there is a question mark because the circumstances in which the paper had to be assessed were difficult. The identification of the support as Japanese paper could therefore not be made with certainty.

47 Rembrandt, Portrait of Jan Six Leaning on a Window Ledge, 1647. Etching, drypoint and burin, 245 x 191 mm, New Hollstein 2013, no. 238.


49 Rembrandt, Christ Preaching (The Hundred Guilder Print), c. 1648. Etching, drypoint and burin, 278 x 388 mm, New Hollstein 2013, no. 239.
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Amsterdam Museum wordt structureel ondersteund door de gemeente Amsterdam
Something over four hundred years ago, Govert Flinck (1615-1660) was born in the Netherlands and Ferdinand Bol (1616-1680) in Dordrecht. They were contemporaries. When they first studied as painters, they were about twenty. They both worked under the guidance of Sir Rembrandt van Rijn, who was then at the height of his fame. Even though Flinck and Bol soon stopped being the most successful painters in Amsterdam, and no one expected Rembrandt in that regard, they remained in his famous teacher’s shadow throughout their careers. To celebrate Flinck and Ferdinand Bol, the Rembrandt House Museum and the Amsterdam Museum joined forces to produce a major double exhibition and this book, in which the two artists are portrayed and compared.

As advanced students, they took part in the production process in the workshop and in so doing mastered Rembrandt’s style. After they had set themselves up as artists in their own right, Flinck and Bol still worked in Rembrandt’s style for some years, before adopting a different, more classicist approach. Flinck emerged as a true virtuoso who worked in different painting styles, depending on the commission. Bol, moreover, was the only one of Rembrandt’s pupils to produce a substantial graphic oeuvre, amounting to twenty or so skilfully etched prints.

This book chronicles the latest insights into Govert Flinck and Ferdinand Bol, adding a more personal dimension to the theme. It brings together the life and work of these two Rembrandt pupils, showing how they worked in different painting styles and graphic mediums. The book explores the international artistic and cultural context in which Rembrandt and his pupils flourished, and how they influenced each other. Bol and Flinck were awarded prestigious commissions – from private individuals and rulers, and from city institutions including the civic guard and the town hall. Fifteen paintings by Bol and Flinck were restored especially for the exhibition. Words and images combine to make this book a valuable addition to art lovers’ libraries.

REMBRANDT’S MASTER PUPILS

Ferdinand Bol

Govert Flinck

Govert Flinck

Self-Portrait, c. 1640. Panel, 59 x 47 cm.
Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum & Fondation Corboud (loan private collection)

Ferdinand Bol

Self-Portrait Leaning on a Balustrade, c. 1647. Canvas, 93 x 83.5 cm.
Private collection USA
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