

ABSTRACT

Title of Document: HOE SCHILDER HOE WILDER:
DISSOLUTE SELF-PORTRAITS
IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY
DUTCH AND FLEMISH ART

Ingrid A. Cartwright, Ph.D., 2007

Directed By: Professor Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr.,
Department of Art History and Archaeology

In the seventeenth century, Dutch and Flemish artists presented a strange new face to the public in their self-portraits. Rather than assuming the traditional guise of the learned gentleman artist that was fostered by Renaissance *topoi*, many painters presented themselves in a more unseemly light. Dropping the noble robes of the *pictor doctus*, they smoked, drank, and chased women. Dutch and Flemish artists explored a new mode of self-expression in dissolute self-portraits, embracing the many behaviors that art theorists and the culture at large disparaged.

Dissolute self-portraits stand apart from what was expected of a conventional self-portrait, yet they were nonetheless appreciated and valued in Dutch culture and in the art market. This dissertation explores the ways in which these untraditional self-portraits functioned in art and culture in the seventeenth century. Specifically, this study focuses on how these unruly expressions were ultimately positive statements concerning theories of artistic talent and natural inclination.

Dissolute self-portraits also reflect and respond to a larger trend regarding artistic identity in the seventeenth century, notably, the stereotype “*hoe schilder hoe wilder*” that posited Dutch and Flemish artists as intrinsically unruly characters prone to prodigality and dissolution. Artists embraced this special identity, which in turn granted them certain freedoms from social norms and a license to misbehave. In self-portraits, artists emphasized their dissolute nature by associating themselves with themes like the Five Senses and the Prodigal Son in the tavern. These playful, inventive and sometimes challenging self-expressions present a unique vision that broadens our perception of what it meant to be an artist in the Dutch Golden Age.

HOE SCHILDER HOE WILDER:
DISSOLUTE SELF-PORTRAITS IN
SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY DUTCH AND FLEMISH ART

By

Ingrid A. Cartwright

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2007

Advisory Committee:
Professor Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., Chair
Professor Renée Ater
Professor Anthony Colantuono
Professor Meredith J. Gill
Professor Norbert Hornstein

© Copyright by
Ingrid A. Cartwright
2007

Acknowledgements

My greatest thanks and appreciation go to my advisor, Arthur Wheelock, for his unfailing kindness and true patience in seeing this dissertation completed! I am indebted greatly to his wisdom and support, both of which have shaped and deepened my appreciation and love for Dutch art. I offer my gratitude to the Department of Art History and Archaeology at Maryland for the opportunity to study with such knowledgeable faculty. I would also like to express my appreciation to my faculty committee for their time, energy and interest in my topic.

The dissertation document that follows has had referenced material removed in respect for the owner's copyright. A complete version of this document, which includes said referenced material, resides in the University of Maryland, College Park's library collection.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	iv
List of Illustrations	vi
Chapter 1: The Problem of the Dissolute Self-Portrait	1
Introduction to the Problem	1
Defining the Parameters: Methodology	7
Existing Interpretations of Dissolute Self-Portraits	12
Dissolute Self-Portraits and the Art Market.....	20
The Spirit of Satire.....	24
This Dissertation: Goals and Perspective	29
Chapter 2: How to Behave: Positive Modes of Artistic Conduct, Character and Self- Portrayal in the Renaissance and Baroque Periods	32
The Artist’s Status in the Classical and Medieval Eras	36
An Artist’s Renaissance: Refiguring a Role	40
1. The New Artist: Intellectual.....	45
The Intellectual Artist in the Renaissance	45
The Intellectual Artist in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art	49
2. The New Artist: Divine Genius, Melancholic Mind.....	54
Genius and Melancholy in the Renaissance.....	54
Natural Inclination in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art	59
<i>Verscheydenheden</i>	61
<i>Zoo de man was, was zyn werk</i>	63
Non-Conformity in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art.....	68
3. The New Artist: Gentleman of Renown	77
Renaissance Gentlemen	77
<i>Uomini Illustri</i> and the Role of Biographers.....	80
Becoming a Gentleman.....	89
The Famed, Gentleman Artist in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art.....	95
Famous Gentlemen: Artists’ Portraits in Demand and in Print	102
Chapter 3: How Not to Behave: Dissolute Conduct and the Dutch Artist.....	112
Good Advice, Bad Artists	112
1. How Not to Behave: Smoking	115
2. How Not to Behave: Drinking	120
Dutch Drinking	122
Artists Characterized as Heavy Drinkers	127
The Power of Drink	136
Bacchanalia and the <i>Schildersbent</i>	139
3. How Not to Behave: Prodigality.....	145
The Prodigal Son in Holland.....	149

Chapter 4: Dissolute Self-Portraits	155
The Five Senses	157
Artists and the Five Senses	161
Group 1: Single-Figured Self-Portraits with Pipe.....	162
Smoking, the Senses, and Artistic Inspiration	164
The Nature of Smoke, the Nature of Art.....	167
Group 2: Single-Figured Self-Portraits with Drink	170
Low-Life Drinker: Van Craesbeeck.....	175
Wine and the Gentleman Artist.....	177
Group 3: Self-Portraits within Multi-Figured Compositions with Smoking, Drinking, Carousing and Other Unruly Behaviors	179
Rembrandt and Metsu’s Prodigal Selves	180
Role Reversal: Leyster, Schalcken and Molenaer	185
The Party Guests That Never Leave: Steen and Van Mieris	193
Peasant Prodigals: Brouwer and His Circle	202
Pictor Gryllorum	205
Conclusion	212
Bibliography.....	215

List of Illustrations

1. Rembrandt, *Satire on Art Criticism*. 1644, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
2. Rembrandt, *Self-Portrait*. 1658. Frick Collection, New York.
3. Rembrandt, *Self-Portrait*. 1629. Alte Pinakothek, Munich.
4. Adriaen Brouwer, *The Smokers*. ca. 1636, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
5. Godfried Schalcken, *Vrouwtje kom ten Hoof* ('Lady, Come into the Garden') ca. 1675-80. Royal Collection, England.
6. Jacob Ochtervelt, *Peasant Smoking*. Hamburger Kunsthalle, Hamburg.
7. Rembrandt, *Self-Portrait with Saskia*, ca.1635. Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden.
8. Gerrit Dou, *Self-Portrait of the Artist in His Studio*. 1647. Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden.
9. Jan Steen, *The Idlers*. Ca. 1660. Hermitage, St. Petersburg.
10. Pieter van Laer, *Artist's Tavern*. Ca. 1630. Pen and wash drawing. Kupfersstichkabinett, Berlin.
11. Jan Miense Molenaer, *Self-Portrait in Studio*. Private collection, London.
12. Frans van Mieris, *Self-Portrait*. 1670. Rhode Island School of Design, Providence.
13. Frans van Mieris, *Self-Portrait as a Painter*. 1676. Uffizi, Florence.
14. Frans van Mieris, *Self-Portrait of the Artist Holding a Small Painting*. 1677. Uffizi, Florence.
15. Frans van Mieris, *The Oyster Meal*. 1661. Mauritshuis, The Hague.
16. Frans van Mieris, *Teasing the Pet*. 1660. Mauritshuis, The Hague.
17. Frans van Mieris, *The Song Interrupted*. 1671. Petit Palais, Paris.

18. Giuseppe Zocchi, *Allegory of the Arts*. Fresco. Ca. 1740. Palazzo Gerini, Florence.
19. Rembrandt, *Self-Portrait as a Young Man*. Ca. 1639. Uffizi, Florence.
20. Matthew Paris, *Virgin and Child with the Author's Portrait*. Illuminated page from the *Historia Anglorum*, 1250-59. British Library MS Royal 14 c vii, fol. 232.
21. *German Psalter from Augsburg*. Late twelfth century. Walters Art Museum, Baltimore.
22. Antonis Mor, *Self-Portrait*. 1558. Uffizi, Florence.
23. *Portrait of Jan Cornelisz Vermeyen*. Engraving from Domenicus Lampsonius' *Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae inferioris effigies*, no. 15.
24. *Portrait of Lambert Lombard*. Engraving from Domenicus Lampsonius' *Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae inferioris effigies*, no. 18.
25. Willem Joseph Laqui after Gerrit Dou, *Triptych (Night School; the Lying-In Room; Man Sharpening a Quill)*. Ca. 1763-1771. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
26. Dirk Helmbreker, *Self-Portrait*. Red chalk. Unknown date. National Gallery of Art, Washington.
27. Bennozo Gozzoli, *Journey of the Magi to Bethlehem* (detail, self-portrait). Ca. 1459. Fresco. Palazzo Medici-Riccardi, Florence.
28. *Self-Portrait Gallery in the Uffizi, Florence; Entrance to the Corridor with Portraits of Painters from the Northern European School*. Pen drawing. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.
29. Michiel van Musscher, *Self-Portrait*. 1692. Uffizi, Florence.
30. Raphael, *Portrait of Baldassare Castiglione*. Ca. 1514-5. Louvre, Paris.
31. Rembrandt, *Copy after Raphael's Portrait of Baldassare Castiglione*. 1639. Pen and brown ink drawing with white body color. Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna.
32. Titian, *Portrait of a Man*. Ca. 1512. National Gallery, London.
33. Rembrandt, *Self-Portrait at the Age of 34*. 1640. National Gallery, London.

34. Hendrick van Steenwijk the Elder, *Art Lovers Welcomed by Fama*. Ca. 1590. J.O. Leegenhoek Collection, Paris.
35. *Portrait of Joos van Cleve*. Engraving from Domenicus Lampsonius' *Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae inferioris effigies*, no. 12.
36. *Portrait of Frans Floris*. Engraving from Domenicus Lampsonius' *Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae inferioris effigies*, no. 22.
37. *Portrait of Adriaen de Vries*. Engraving from Hondius.
38. Rembrandt, *Self-Portrait in Sixteenth-Century Attire*. Etching. 1638. Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
39. *Portrait of Jan Gossaert*. Engraving from Domenicus Lampsonius' *Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae inferioris effigies*, no. 7.
40. *Portrait of Daniel Mytens*. Engraving from Van Dyck's *Iconography*, no. 56.
41. *Title Page of Petrus Scriverius' Vasten-avont*.
42. Jan Steen, *As the Old Sing, So Pipe the Young*. Ca.1663-5. Mauritshuis, The Hague.
43. Nicolaes de Bruyn, *Merry Company*. Engraving. Ca. 1625. Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
44. Ignatius Josephus van Regermorter, *Jan Steen and Frans van Mieris*. 1828. Historical Museum, Amsterdam.
45. *Portrait of Jan Steen and Frans van Mieris* from Houbraken's *Groote Schouburgh*.
46. *Portrait of Adriaen Brouwer, Juriaan Ovens, and Cornelis Bega* from Houbraken's *Groote Schouburgh*.
47. Jan Miense Molenaer, *Allegory of Fidelity in Marriage*. 1633. Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond.
48. Jan Steen, *Self-Portrait as Lutenist*. ca. 1663-65. Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum, Madrid.
49. David Teniers, *The Prodigal Son*. Ca. 1640. Oil on copper. Minneapolis Institute of Arts, Minneapolis.
50. Illustration from Hadrianus Junius, *Medici Emblemata*. 1565.

51. Maerten van Heemskerck, *St. Luke Painting the Madonna*. 1532. Frans Hals Museum, Haarlem.
52. Domenicus van Wijnen, *The Roman Schilder-Bent*. Ca. 1690. Engraving.
53. Roeland van Laer, *Merry Company*. Museo di Roma, Rome.
54. Domenicus van Wijnen, *Bentveughels in a Tavern*. Ca. 1685. Engraving.
55. Jacob Matham, *Amorous Couple* engraving from *The Consequences of Drunkenness*. Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
56. Title page from W.D. Hooft's *Heden-daeghsche verlooren soon*. Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague.
57. *Portrait of David Teniers* from Meysen's *True Effigies of the Most Eminent Painters*.
58. Jan Saenredam after Hendrick Goltzius, *Taste*. Engraving. Ca. 1595.
59. Cornelis van Kittensteyn after Dirck Hals, *The Five Senses: Gustus*. Engraving. Ca. 1630. Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
60. Molenaer, *The Five Senses: Taste*. 1637. Mauritshuis, The Hague.
61. Gonzales Coques, *The Five Senses: Taste*. Ca. 1660. Koninklijk Museum, Antwerp.
62. Joos van Craesbeeck, *Painter's Studio (The Five Senses)*. Ca. 1640-50. Institut Néerlandais, Paris.
63. Barent Fabritius, *The Five Senses: Smell*. 1665-6. Suermondt-Ludwig Museum, Aachen.
64. Cornelis Saftleven, *Self-Portrait*. 1629. Louvre, Paris.
65. Pieter Codde, *Self-Portrait*. Ca. 1630s. Museum Boijmans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam.
66. Jan Davidsz de Heem, *Self-Portrait*. 1636. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
67. Anthonie Palamedesz, *Self-Portrait*. 1634. Prinsenhof, Delft.
68. Pieter Codde, *Portrait of Palamedes Palamedesz*. Ca. 1630s. Philadelphia, P.A.B. Widener Collection.

69. Rembrandt, *The Painter in His Studio*. 1629. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
70. Cornelis Saftleven, *Self-Portrait*. 1626. Institut Néerlandais, Paris.
71. Jan van Mieris, *Painter Smoking a Pipe in his Studio*. 1688. Kunsthalle, Hamburg.
72. Job Berckheyde, *Self-Portrait*. 1675. Uffizi, Florence.
73. Michiel van Musscher, *Self-Portrait*. Ca. 1665. Bass Museum of Art, Miami.
74. Cornelis de Bisschop, *The Artist in His Studio*. Ca 1665-70. Detroit Institute of Arts.
75. Gerrit Dou, *Painter with a Pipe*. Ca. 1645. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
76. Gerrit Dou, *Self-Portrait*. 1658. Uffizi, Florence.
77. Lucas Vorsterman after Jan Davidsz de Heem, *Portrait of the Painter as Taste*. Engraving.
78. David Teniers the Younger, *The Five Senses: Taste*. Ca. 1640s. David Zoester Gallery.
79. Frans Hals, *The Merry Drinker*. 1627. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
80. Jacob Backer, *Self-Portrait as Taste*. ca. 1630-40. Staatliche Museen, Berlin.
81. Judith Leyster, *The Last Drop (The Gay Cavalier)*. Ca. 1639. Philadelphia Museum of Art.
82. Frans van Mieris, *Self-Portrait Holding a Large Glass*. 1668. Private Collection, United States.
83. Willem van Mieris, *Self-Portrait*. 1688. Private Collection, United States.
84. *Portrait of Tobias Verhaecht from Meysens, True Effigies of the Most Eminent Painters*.
85. David Teniers the Younger, *The Five Senses: Taste*. Ca. 1640s. Harold Samuel Collection, London.
86. Pieter van Roestraeten, *Self-Portrait Drinking*. Ca. 1660s. Private collection.

87. Joos van Craesbeeck, *Self-Portrait as Drinker*. Ca. 1630. Newbattle Abbey and Crailing House, Midlothian, Scotland.
88. Joos van Craesbeeck, *Self-Portrait as a Grinning Drinker with an Eyepatch*. Ca. 1630. Current location unknown.
89. Anthonie Palamedesz (?), *Portrait of an Artist with Wineglass*. 1624. Landesgalerie, Hannover.
90. Gerard de Lairesse, diagram from *Het groot Schilderboeck*.
91. Rembrandt, *The Raising of the Cross*. Ca. 1633. Alte Pinakothek, Munich.
92. Gabriel Metsu, *The Artist and His Wife in a Tavern*. 1661. Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden.
93. Judith Leyster, *Carousing Couple*. 1630. Louvre, Paris.
94. Sofonisba Anguissola, *Self-Portrait with Book*. 1554. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.
95. Jacob Goltzius after Hendrick Goltzius, *Young Man Refusing an Old Woman's Money*. Engraving. Ca. 1595. Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
96. Jan Miense Molenaer, *The Artist in his Studio*. 1631. Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin.
97. Jan Miense Molenaer, *The Painter at Work*. Ca. 1632. Museum Bredius, The Hague.
98. Jan Steen, *Interior of an Inn (the Broken Eggs)*. Ca. 1664-8. National Gallery, London.
99. Jan Steen, *Easy Come, Easy Go*. 1661. Museum Boijmans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam.
100. Henrick Bary after Frans van Mieris, *Wine is a Mocker*. 1690. Engraving after a lost drawing. Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge.
101. Jan Steen, *The Dissolute Household*. 1673-5. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
102. Frans van Mieris, *Inn Scene*. Ca. 1658-9. Mauritshuis, The Hague.
103. Godfried Schalcken, *Self-Portrait*. Ca. 1695. Uffizi, Florence.

104. Joos van Craesbeeck, *The Smoker*. Ca. 1635-6. Louvre, Paris.
105. Joos van Craesbeeck, *Flirting Pair*. ca. 1630s. Location unknown.
106. David Teniers the Younger, *Self-Portrait in a Tavern*. 1646. Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden.
107. Simon de Vos, *A Gathering of Smokers and Drinkers*. 1626. Louvre, Paris.

Chapter 1: The Problem of the Dissolute Self-Portrait

Introduction to the Problem

Around 1644, Rembrandt made a quick drawing of a scene he surely knew well. In the sketch, a group of men lean in around a painting while listening intently to a man before them. Their eyes are fixed not on the painting before them but on the gentleman speaking, a cocky figure sitting proudly on a barrel with one hand on his hip and the other gesturing confidently to the painting with his pipe. It could easily be a scene from daily life in Rembrandt's studio, the master in mid-lesson with his students. The seemingly commonplace scenario is transformed into something else entirely with the addition of a simple element to the central male figure, namely, donkey ears. Rembrandt added the huge ears to the seated man with bold strokes. So large and dark, they grow through his hat and protrude grandly like foolish antennae. Yet the gathered men, listening with respectful concentration, appear too enrapt to notice.

Apparently the meaning of donkey ears has not changed much since the seventeenth century, for Rembrandt clearly wanted to make the man appear an ass. The drawing is likely a biting parody of the foolishness of art critics. Today, it is entitled *Satire on Art Criticism* (Figure 1) and the self-assured yet donkey-eared man represents Rembrandt's art critic. If the brazenly drawn ears were not enough to seal our impression of the critic, surely Rembrandt's depiction of himself in the scene

speaks clearly. Crouched behind the painting in discussion, Rembrandt supports the frame with one hand while simultaneously defecating in front of the whole group. All the while, Rembrandt looks out at the viewer with a knowing glance. If his figure could speak, it would cackle. The way Rembrandt reveals his disdain is shocking, even scandalous, and even to our twenty-first century eyes. If Rembrandt had painted a coarse peasant in his place, a beggar or even a child, perhaps our sensibilities might not be as offended by such crassness. But instead, we find ourselves eye to eye with the most prolific self-portraitist in history, his hackles up, his pants down.

In this drawing, Rembrandt presents by far the lowliest persona of all his numerous self-incarnations (and possibly the only self-portrait in art history to reveal an artist's bottom). Its scatological nature stands out in his great oeuvre because it goes against not only traditional conventions of self-portraiture, but contemporary conventional traditions of morality as well. Thus, the drawing leaves one conflicted: who is *this* Rembrandt? It is certainly not the gentleman Rembrandt wearing veils of nobility and honor (Figure 2), or the introspective Rembrandt, intimately exposed yet masked by shadow (Figure 3). Rather, we see a peeved artist who dips generously into the well of scat and satire.

Rembrandt had a point to make, and his visual vocabulary, while shocking, is apropos. The drawing could potentially amount to an angry stab at one specific art collector, Andries de Graeff, whose likeness, some propose, bears the brunt of the joke as well as the ass-ears.¹ Specifics aside, the overall sentiment easily applies to

¹ Simon Schama, *Rembrandt's Eyes* (New York: Knopf, 1999) 513-515. Schama takes a leap in suggesting that the "critic" is Andries de Graeff, a wealthy patron who was apparently reluctant to pay five hundred guilders for a portrait he was unsatisfied with in 1642. J.A. Emmens (*Rembrandt en de Regels van de Kunst*. Utrecht: Haentjens, Dekker & Gumbert, 1968. Pp. 150-154; 201.) rather feels

the sort of art critics Rembrandt despised: the “conceited and pedantic connoisseurs” who “praise what deserves only contempt” solely as a means of gaining profit.² The artist’s message of contempt is clear, yet it is still difficult to reconcile such a crude persona with his preponderantly introspective missives of self-expression.³ This particular drawing by Rembrandt may be a footnote in his oeuvre, but it is not an anomaly. Other Dutch artists of the Golden Age chose to tread in the same murky

that “there may be an attack on Franciscus Junius [classicist critic who published *De Pictura Veterum* (Amsterdam, 1637; Dutch version 1641) extolling the virtue of the ancients] built into the drawing” (201), even naming Junius the “*protagonist van deze satire*,” whose likeness “*met zijn puntbaardje*” in a portrait by Van Dyck appears similar to the “art critic” seen in Rembrandt’s drawing (153). There is also suggestion that the figure could represent art lover and Secretary to the Stadholder, Constantijn Huygens.

Also under debate is the drawing’s inscription that to this point has defied definite legibility. J.A. Emmens [*Rembrandt en de regels van de kunst* (Utrecht: Haentjens, Dekker & Gumbert, 1986) p. 152, note 271] reads it as “*Dees quack van de kunst /is Jockich gunst*,” though Walter L. Strauss and Marjon van der Meulen [*The Rembrandt Documents* (Abaris, New York: 1979)] find it largely illegible (p. 609). Rembrandt may have also been recalling the classical tale of the Calumny of Apelles wherein the famed Apelles, painter to Alexander the Great, takes out his rage at a fellow painter who had wrongly accused him of conspiracy. Apelles retaliated by painting the supposed object of his conspiring, the Egyptian king Ptomeley, with great ass ears, “twitching as they listened to the lies concocted by Envy, Ignorance, and Sloth.” (Schama 1999, 513)

² Samuel van Hoogstraten, *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst, konstschilders en schilderessen* (Rotterdam, 1678) 197-198. “*Zeeker, ’t is een belachelijke zaek, de waenwijze konstkeners somtijts over eenige Schilderiy haar oordeelte hooren: want zy bedriegen niet alleen d’onkundige liefhebbers, met voddige kopyen voor oprechte prinsipaelen te verkoopen, en dat quansuys goe koop en voor een gerige prijs, maer zy bedriegen ook zich zelfs, vermaek neemende met zich, in steede van de deugden, de slimste fouten en gebreeken als wonderen voor oogen te stellen, en dategene te prijzen, dat alle verachtige verdient, tot kleynmaeking van den meesters des prinsipaels, die zich van die dingen, die zy ’t volk voor ongemeens aenprijzen, geschaemt zou hebben.*”

“Certainly, it is a ridiculous matter to hear the judgment conceited or pedantic connoisseurs sometimes give about a painting: for they do not only deceive art lovers by selling ragged copies for true originals and this seemingly cheaply and for a low price, they also deceive themselves, being pleased when putting the worst faults and shortcomings, instead of the virtues, as miracles before their eyes, and to praise what only deserves contempt, thus belittling the master of the original, who would have been ashamed by the things they recommend to the common people as something extraordinary.” Translation Ernst van der Wetering, “Rembrandt’s *Satire on Art Criticism* Reconsidered,” in *Shop Talk: Studies in Honor of Seymour Slive on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Eds. Cynthia P. Schneider, William W. Robinson et al. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Art Museums, 1995) 266.

³ It should be emphasized that this work, a drawing, was not necessarily intended for public view.

waters, publicly displaying their image in self-portraits with various unsavory guises or illicit behaviors most would prefer kept behind closed doors.

In his most famous self-portrait set deep in a tavern (Figure 4), Adriaen Brouwer (1605/6-1638) turns away from his table of bar mates only to acknowledge the viewer by blowing a cloud of smoke our way. Brouwer's comrades are equally offensive, and mock with lewd gestures.⁴ Dordrecht native, and Gerrit Dou (1613-1675) protégé, Godfried Schalcken (1643-1706) painted himself sprawled on the floor in only his underclothes in *Vrouwetje kom ten Hoof* ('Lady, Come into the Garden') (Figure 5). Surrounded by a gaggle of women, his proper clothes in a pile beside him on the floor, the artist does not seem to mind being the loser in a licentious party game.⁵ Rotterdam artist Jacob Ochtervelt (1634-1682) created only two paintings solely composed of peasants in his career, yet one of them is a self-portrait in a poor man's clothes with smoke from his pipe pouring through his lips (Figure 6).⁶ And perhaps most famously, and certainly most prolifically, Jan Steen (1625/6-

⁴ Gerard Knuttel, *Adriaen Brouwer: The Master and His Work* (The Hague: L.J.C. Boucher, 1962), 95-7.

⁵ Little is known about the game today, though Arnold Houbraken [*De groote schouburgh der Nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen*, 3 vols. (Amsterdam, 1718-21; The Hague, 1753), III: 175-6) mentions the game, which he says was popular among youths in Dordrecht. Apparently it involved a group of women removing one man's clothes. Houbraken specifically identifies this as a self-portrait, as is the agreement among most art historians. Two scholars disagree: Cornelis Hofstede de Groot [*A Catalogue Raisonné of the Works of the Most Eminent Dutch Painters of the Seventeenth Century*. Trans. Edward G. Hawke. 8 vols. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1908-27). See vol. 5 p. 391, no. 280] and Franits 2004 (246). Otto Nauman's catalog entry for the painting in *Masters of Seventeenth Century Dutch Genre Painting* (exh. Cat. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1984) mentions (301) the positive likeness of the central figure to Schalcken's self-portrait in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge of the artist at the same approximate age. The likeness is clear not only in that it is a self-portrait, but also from the engraved portrait in Houbraken (vol. 3, opposite p. 176) as well as in the artist's self-portraits in Hans-Joachim Raupp's *Untersuchungen zu Künstlerbildnis und Künstlerdarstellung in den Niederlanden im 17. Jahrhunderts* (Hildesheim, Zurich and New York, 1984) (see figs. 120-122).

⁶ Susan D. Kuretsky, *The Paintings of Jacob Ochtervelt (1634-1682)* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1979) 32. Kuretsky writes that Ochtervelt painted only one other peasant painting, *Peasant Spinners in an*

1679) portrayed himself in his compositions again and again in poses ranging from provocative (seducing young women) to downright corruptive (teaching children to smoke). In the history of self-portraiture, these selves are a rowdy bunch. Even Rembrandt's pose with his wife Saskia (Figure 7) would have been shocking to some eyes: a contemporary of Rembrandt's was charged and jailed for indecency after being seen in a tavern with a woman on his lap.⁷ However, this seemingly deviant mode of self-portrayal occurs often enough to be considered something of a minor phenomenon in seventeenth-century Dutch art.

The dissolute self-portraits of Rembrandt, Brouwer, Steen and their various other comrades in this self-imaginative endeavor stand miles apart from what was traditionally expected of a self-portrait—not to mention the honorable conduct desired of artists and advised by contemporary art theorists. Biographer Arnold Houbraken (1660-1719) warned artists against leading a “lascivious life,” and painter and theorist Karel Van Mander (1548-1606) exhorted painters to follow the “moral example that art and honorable living should always go together.”⁸ In addition to

Interior (formerly in Leipzig Museum der bildenden Künste, destroyed World War II). She adds that Ochtervelt did incorporate peasant types in his “entrance hall” genre paintings and in one other genre scene depicting a fish market.

⁷ Christopher Brown, “The Strange Case of Jan Torrentius,” in *Rembrandt, Reubens and the Art of Their Time: Recent Perspectives*. Eds. Ronald E. Fleischer and Susan C. Scott (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, 1997), 227. Jan Torrentius (aka Jan Simonsz. van der Beeck, 1589-1644) was put on trial, sentenced and eventually put to death for his deviant religious beliefs. His heretical views were exacerbated by accusations of immorality, which were fueled by many eyewitness accounts of Torrentius' public carousing, various situations involving prostitutes and young girls and his own erotic paintings. Many of his works were destroyed, yet the one that survives is an allegorical still life of Temperance (*Emblematic Still Life with Flagon, Glass, Jug and Bridle*. 1614, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

⁸ Karel van Mander, *Der Grondt der edel vry schilder-const* (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker and Gumbert, 1973), 82. “...*exempel [voor de moraal] dat de kunst en de welevenheid altijd bij de kunstenaar behoren samen te gaan.*”

being contrary to models of conduct proscribed by theorists, historically speaking, this type of self-portraiture is a complete inversion of conventional depictions of artist as learned, sophisticated, and worthy of respect, not derision.

So the question naturally emerges: what caused this apparent rash of self-portraits in negative guise in seventeenth-century Dutch art? What impulse caused artists to veer visibly from the artistic canon and envision themselves as new characters? The lewd, often comic nature of self-presentation runs contrary to conventions of self-portraiture established in the Renaissance: the artist as a serious sort, well dressed, rarely smiling, but rather with the furrowed brow of diligent concentration.⁹ The *topos* of the *pictor doctus*, or learned painter, was epitomized both by sophisticated artist-gentlemen like Peter Paul Rubens (1585-1640) and Anthony van Dyck (1599-1641) and diligent artist-scholars like Gerrit Dou, whose self-portraits continually emphasize and honor the process of *studium* (Figure 8).¹⁰ In addition, these portraits appear to defy what the few surviving art historical treatises from seventeenth-century Holland proscribed as appropriate behavior and subject matter for artists.

Dissolute self-portraits present an intriguing opportunity to investigate not only how Dutch artists conceived of themselves (as well notions of individualism and

⁹ Ernst van de Wetering, "The Multiple Functions of Rembrandt's Self Portraits," *Rembrandt By Himself*. Exh. Cat. Christopher White and Quentin Buvelot, Eds. (London and The Hague: National Gallery Publications & Royal Cabinet of Paintings Mauritshuis, 1999), 16.

Raupp 1984 (115-123) posits that the furrowed brow can be interpreted as an "'attribute' of the emancipated artist," symbolizing the artist's intellectual capabilities.

¹⁰ In an inventory of 1722, Dou's painting was referred to as "*Counterfait sitzt als ein Philosophus*." See *De Leidse Feinschilders uit Dresden*, Exh. Cat. (Dresden & Leiden: Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen & Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal, 2001), 27.

“self” in general), but also how the negative guise functioned in the culture, specifically, in the seventeenth century. Despite the frequent admonitions by art theorists warning against the specific behaviors (drinking, smoking, carousing) these artists display, dissolute self-portrayal appears to have been accepted and understood by seventeenth-century viewers. It also appears not to have been such an inside joke: not only did at least twenty-four artists paint their self-portraits in dissolute guises, but several artists incorporated likenesses of their peers into works in similar roles. Brouwer, for example, recruited a number of friends for *The Smokers* (Figure 4): Jan Lievens (1604-1674), Joos van Craesbeeck (1605?-54/61), Jan Cossiers (1600-1671) and Jan Davidsz. de Heem (1606-1683/4).¹¹

Defining the Parameters: Methodology

This dissertation is not intended to be a catalogue raisonné of self-portraiture in negative guise, but an investigation of how and why these types of paintings functioned and flourished in seventeenth-century Dutch art. It is likely that many more dissolute self-portraits of artists exist within larger compositions and have gone unrecognized for centuries, as they appear so different from traditional self-

¹¹ See Karolien de Clippel, *Joos van Craesbeeck (1605/06-ca. 1660): Een Brabants Genreschilder*. 2 vols. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 47-8.

For this new identification, see de Clippel, “Brouwer and Portraiture. Some New Identifications and an Iconographical Novelty,” *Simiolus* 30 (2004): 196-216.

portrayals. To date in the literature of the history of art, Dutch self-portraits in dissolute guise have not been studied uniquely.¹²

I selected the self-portraits based on several criteria. First, an identifiable artist's self-portrait had to be either the entire focus of the work or be featured prominently within a larger composition. The artist's image had to be recognizable by some means: either having been identified by biographers or in inventories and sales descriptions, or when compared to existing self-portraits or portraits of the artist by other hands. The ability for the viewer to identify the artist has significant ramifications as to the interpretation (and value) of the work, mostly in terms of the educated collectors who actively purchased artists' self-portraits. Moreover, artists had to depict their likenesses as engaged and active participants in bad behavior, not merely spectators to the truancy of others.¹³ I focused on three particular activities—

¹² This is not to imply that the topic has not been broached at all. However, no author has assembled self-portraits of artists in negative guises in any sort of comprehensive format. The closest precedent would be Raupp, who classifies Dutch self-portraiture into various categories. Most pertinent to my classifications would be Part 2, Chapter 2 “*Der Künstler als moralische Instanz*” (pp. 242-348). His discussion of the artists' self-portraits representing the five senses (311-329) is perhaps closest to my model, but by no means inclusive of all the paintings I will be addressing. Erin Griffey [*The Artist's Roles: Searching for Self-Portraiture in the Seventeenth-Century Netherlands* (Ph.D. diss, University of London, 2001)] addresses some of these themes in chapters 3 (“Act I: The Artist as Merry-Maker”; pp. 100-136) and 4 (“Act II: The Artist as Lover, Husband and Family Man”; pp. 137-187) of her dissertation.

¹³ The role of the artist as spectator was quite common and derived from the tradition of patrons (and later artists) appearing amid religious or historical scenes as important or pious witnesses. Some artists like Dou (*The Quack*, 1652. Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Rotterdam), Van Mieris (*The Charlatan*, Ca. 1650-55. Uffizi, Florence) and possibly Vermeer (*The Procuress*, 1656. Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden) painted themselves amid scenes of potential moral corruption, but placed themselves along the sidelines or in the shadows, functioning perhaps at times as moral commentators on the action. Dou clearly positions himself (actually physically higher, as well) as a judge of the suspicious character of the charlatan, and while the possible self-portrait of Vermeer may hint that the artist is participating in the scene unfolding around him (he holds a drink in this hand), there is no visual basis for comparison (other than the traditional marker of a self-portrait, which positioned the artist looking out to the viewer) to definitively confirm his identity. It may, however, relate to the tradition of images of the Prodigal Son among whores. For more on the possible self-portrait of Vermeer, see Arthur K. Wheelock, *Vermeer* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1981) 25 and John Michael Montias, *Vermeer and His Milieu* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991) 147-8.

smoking, drinking and carousing—that appear to have been the most popular forms of dissolute conduct in self-portraits. These are also the three predominant behaviors that theorists disparaged in art literature and beseeched artists to avoid, lest both their art and reputation suffer.¹⁴

Aside from bad behavior, many of the artists in this group often appear poverty-stricken and poorly groomed. Their clothes are disheveled (Figure 5), their hair unkempt (Figure 4). But what is additionally interesting about dissolute self-portraits as a group is how the artists embrace these profligate roles so proudly, often dramatically. These were not intended to be hidden self-portraits, as it is quite easy to point a finger at the interlopers. They do not seem to mind, for most often they smile back at us, quite gladly--like Steen does in *The Idlers* (Figure 9), toasting us happily while his wife slumps next to him, clearly feeling the effects of one too many.

There is little consistency as to the frequency in which artists painted themselves as dissolute characters. Artists like Steen and Frans van Mieris were happy to dwell with the likes of irreverence again and again, pointing to the notion that their likenesses helped enhance and promote the type of comic genre in which they specialized. Steen, for example, included his own image within genre compositions countless times, including occasionally multiple times within a single

¹⁴ I focused on these three behaviors as they are the predominant forms of dissolute conduct portrayed in self-portraits and in art literature, but also as a means of narrowing the focus of this topic, particularly in regards to Steen's prolific disobedient incarnations in his paintings, which merit a dissertation (or more) unto themselves. However, I encountered many other examples of unconventional self-portraiture in my research, from Christiaan van Couwenburgh's self-portrait as "Mussel-Man," (present location unknown) to Pieter van Laer's *Self-Portrait as an Alchemist* (late 1630s. private collection, on loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).

scene.¹⁵ Frans van Mieris rivaled Steen for the sheer number of cameo appearances in his scenes, though not far behind the two is the Joos van Craesbeeck; the Brouwer colleague painted himself as a coarse peasant, smoking, drinking and carousing at least five times.¹⁶

In contrast, other artists like Rembrandt, Jacob Ochtervelt and Judith Leyster (1609-1660) only depicted themselves in such a manner on a single occasion. Moreover, artists that portrayed themselves in self-portraits of this type run the gamut from the internationally esteemed (the famed Rembrandt) to the unassuming (the lesser known Pieter van Roerstraten [ca. 1630-1700]). Statistically speaking, there does not appear to be a pattern involving a certain geographic area or an exceedingly specific time period. The artists in question worked in different areas: Leiden, Amsterdam, Haarlem, Rotterdam, Delft, and Antwerp. Their self-portraits date from throughout the era, with one painted as early as 1627 and another as late as 1701. However, the trend appears to have been most popular during two periods: first in the 1630s and again, later in the century, ca. 1660-1680.¹⁷

¹⁵ See for example, *The Marriage of Tobias and Sarah* (ca. 1673, M.H. Young Memorial Museum) in which Steen paints his likeness three times: as servant, notary and groom.

¹⁶ Otto Naumann [*Frans Van Mieris*. 2 vols. (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1981), 126] writes that “if one counts the many self-images included in his genre paintings, it is safe to say Van Mieris is second only to Rembrandt in the number of self-portraits produced in seventeenth-century Holland. In total the artist depicted himself a maximum of thirty-one times in one hundred and twenty-one surviving paintings.” However, not all of these appearances are accepted as self-portraits. Of the 31 images Naumann mentions, seven are certain, seven are “proposed,” and an additional seventeen have been recognized in his genre paintings.

¹⁷ The second period during which this type of self-portraiture flourished is possibly due to Steen and Van Mieris, whose frequent use of their own comic guises in paintings certainly accounts for the large number of occurrences at this time. It is also possible that Steen may have prompted a renewed interest in this manner of self-portrayal.

Moreover, the artists in question were not altogether the degenerates or wastrels that their undignified self-portraits might imply, even though some were labeled as miscreants by later authors.¹⁸ The public and painted personae of the many artists who painted dissolute self-portraits are contradictory. There are certainly no anecdotes of Rembrandt ever dropping his pants before an irascible art critic. Of Rembrandt's astonishing output of over seventy-five images of his likeness in many varied guises, only his *Self-Portrait with Saskia* (Figure 7) can truly be construed as a painted depiction of himself caught in a moment of lewd conduct. By all accounts Jacob Ochtervelt led a quiet and successful life, even serving as the guardian to several orphans.¹⁹ And despite the oft-cited proto-bohemian antics trailing Brouwer's legacy, his works were sought after by the most informed collectors of his time including the world-renowned Rubens.²⁰

¹⁸ Steen, Van Mieris and Brouwer were portrayed somewhat ignobly by later biographers, which will be discussed in chapter three. However, recent research into Steen in particular, [see Mariët Westermann, *The Amusements of Jan Steen: Comic Painting in the Seventeenth Century* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997) and *Jan Steen: Painter and Storyteller*. Exh. Cat. (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1996)] interprets him as a stable, professional artist and family man.

¹⁹ Kuretsky, 4-5. Kuretsky reports that Ochtervelt's large oeuvre of over one hundred paintings, as well as the substantial sales prices of the homes he lived in are evidence of his success. Ochtervelt served as guardian to his brother's orphaned children as well as contributing support to an orphaned child of another family member.

²⁰ Jean Denucé, *Inventare von Kunstsammlungen zu Antwerpen im 16. um. 17. Jahrhundert* (Antwerp: Verlag "de Sikkel," 1932) lists seventeen works by Brouwer in 1640 inventory of Rubens' possessions (68). In *Adriaen Brouwer; David Teniers the Younger: A Loan Exhibition of Paintings*. Exh. cat. (New York: Noortman & Brod, 1982) catalog author Margaret Klinge (11) also points out that Brouwer's works were already being readily copied and imitated in his lifetime.

Existing Interpretations of Dissolute Self-Portraits

These dissolute self-portraits form a most unique and interesting group. They have proved, however, somewhat problematic and since the eighteenth century, authors have stumbled over them. They are a group that has been gently pushed to the status of an “aside” or into the footnotes for lack of a cogent categorization. How does one explain why the normally respectable Jacob Ochtervelt, for example, produced a single self-portrait of himself posed as peasant, smoking? Does one simply explain Godfried Schalcken’s afternoon romp (Figure 5) as an anomaly? Why would any professional artists, whose livelihoods were intertwined with public personae, choose to “portray themselves in the very manner Van Mander warned artists to avoid”?²¹

Jan Steen is by far the best-known artist to have inserted his own image into his comic compositions, as he made cameo appearances in dissolute households, inn scenes and a myriad of other merry scenes from daily life. His friend (and infamous drinking partner) Frans van Mieris was also renowned for the practice, often giving equal billing to his wife Cunera who proved to be a versatile partner, playing many roles from the lovesick patient in his *Doctor’s Visit* (1657. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) to a lustful maid offering wine (*Inn Scene*. 1658. Mauritshuis, The

²¹ *Judith Leyster: A Dutch Master and Her World*. Exh. Cat. (Worcester: Worcester Art Museum and Haarlem: Franshalsmuseum, 1993), 147. James A. Welu, who wrote the catalog entry for Leyster’s *Carousing Couple* (cat. 4, pp. 142-149) poses this question about the dichotomy between Leyster’s apparent self-portrait in the work and the bawdiness of the character, offering her companion wine and a lustful leer. Welu does not offer any theories as to possible motivation for this portrayal, yet he notes there was a trend of this type of negative self-portraiture in seventeenth-century Dutch art and offers Rembrandt’s Dresden portrait and a Gabriel Metsu (1661, also in Dresden) self-portrait in the guise of the prodigal son as examples.

Hague). As viewers, we have come to look for, and even expect, Steen and Van Mieris' (and perhaps Cunera's) familiar faces in their paintings. The search for artists' hidden portraits is "a game played since Vasari," whose identifications of artists' likenesses within larger compositions helped promote the status of the artist and the market for artists' portraits in the Renaissance.²²

It should be noted that the term "self-portrait" did not come into use until the nineteenth century, nor did the word "autobiography."²³ Rather, seventeenth-century works were described as pictures or likenesses "done of the artist by the artist."²⁴ A self-portrait of Rembrandt, for instance, is described as follows in a sale from 1658: "*een schilderij sijnde een tronye door/Rembrandt nae hem selven geschildert*" (a painting of a head (tronie) by Rembrandt, picturing himself).²⁵ The 1722 inventory of the grand collection of Maria Justina Kraij lists a self-portrait by Van Mieris as "*Frans Mires sijn eigen portrait int kleijn door hem selfs geschildert*" (Frans van

²² Naumann, I: 129.

²³ Rudolf M. Dekker, Ed. *Egodocuments and History: Autobiographical Writing in its Social Context Since the Middle Ages* (Erasmus University: Rotterdam, 2002), 13.

²⁴ Ernst van der Wetering, ["The Multiple Functions of Rembrandt's Self-Portraits," *Rembrandt By Himself* exh. cat. Eds. Christopher White & Quentin Buvelot. (London: National Gallery Publications, 1999), 17] makes note of several self-portraits of Rembrandt that are referred to in this way in the seventeenth century, including one in the 1639 inventory of the collection of Charles I of England referred to as "his owne picture & done by himself."

Van der Wetering cites the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* for the appearance of the term "self-portrait."

Griffey (27-8, note 40) remarks that "'self-portrait' appears regularly only from the early nineteenth century in English sales catalogues."

²⁵ Walter L. Strauss and Marjon van der Meulen, *The Rembrandt Documents* (New York: Abrams, 1979), 1658/22. In the Amsterdam records of the notary J. de Hue from 1 December 1658, an excerpt from a bill of sale from Dirck van Cattenburgh to his sisters Joanna and Margarita van Cattenburgh for a group of paintings and curios, a Rembrandt self-portrait is described as follows: "*een schilderij sijnde een tronye door/Rembrant nae hem selven geschildert.*" (a painting of a head (tronie) by Rembrandt, picturing himself.)

Mieris, his own small portrait painted by himself).²⁶ Portraits and self-portraits were referred to alternately as *conterfeytsels* or *portrets*, regardless of authorship.²⁷ It appears, based on the extensive number of collections of artists' images in the sixteenth century through the eighteenth centuries, that both portraits of artists and self-portraits by the artists were equally desirable.

Art literature has concerned itself mostly with the function of the self-portraits of Steen and Van Mieris in negative guise, likely because they were so prolific in number, but also, because the appearance of these artists within both a comic and dissolute framework fits so easily into the character of their painted oeuvres and historically-crafted personae, the legacy of Arnold Houbraken's admiration and anecdotes. While Steen, Van Mieris, and Brouwer have come through history as believable drinkers, lovers and louts, the other artists in the group I have assembled, have not. It appears that minus the shadow of the artist's comic persona, viewers are often at a loss as how to perceive otherwise respectable artists' seemingly disreputable antics. A review of a 1993 catalog and exhibition of the works of Judith Leyster offers a pointed example of how difficult it is to reconcile a single dissolute self-portrayal in an otherwise traditional oeuvre. This scene unfolded when art

²⁶ Pieter Biesboer, *Collections of Paintings in Haarlem: 1572-1745*. Ed. Carol Togneri (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2001) 344 (108:0053), inventory of 30 August 1722.

²⁷ For a discussion of the language of seventeenth century art, see Lydia de Pauw de Veen, *De Begrippen "schilder," "schilderij" en "schilderen" in de zeventiende eeuw* (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1969).

Griffey (31) writes that *conterfeytsel* was more widely used in sixteenth and earlier seventeenth century art literature and documents, and *portret* came into use around 1640, largely replacing the use of *conterfeytsel* by the end of the century.

historians encountered a self-portrait by Jan Miense Molenaer in an untraditional guise: seated at his easel next to an old procuress with a lapful of coins (Figure 10):

Several art historians gathered before an intriguing self-portrait by Molenaer. The elaborately dressed artist sits at his easel surrounded by the accoutrements of his craft, beaming with cheerful arrogance at the viewer, while an old woman, her lap full of coins, importunes him by grabbing his wrist and holding out her other hand. What is going on here? Is she offering more money or demanding it? Why? The museum label alluded to the traditional pairing of a young man and old woman (with money) as unequal lovers, but seemed imprecise, unsatisfying. The scholars, their training and senses sharpened after a good lunch, spontaneously began to offer half a dozen possible interpretations of the picture: the old woman is a procuress, the artist's mother, his landlady, a symbol of commerce versus high art, and so on. Nobody regarded any gloss as the comprehensive account, and shrugging in good-natured resignation, they moved onto other pictures.²⁸

These paintings often leave scholars with more questions than answers. Many authors have posited that for an artist to portray himself engaged in behaviors that were culturally disparaged, there had to be an ironic or humorous element of expression. Eddy de Jongh feels Frans van Mieris' may have been mocking himself foremost, and that his self-portrayals as drinker reflect "his keen sense of humor and irony."²⁹ Quentin Buvelot reads Van Mieris' witty self-inclusions as "a kind of insider joke."³⁰ Similarly, David Levine writes of Pieter van Laer's (ca. 1592-1642) image of a wine-infused revel (Figure 11), that the artist "seems to be lauding

²⁸ Martha Hollander, "Review of *Paragons of Virtue: Women and Domesticity in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art* by Wayne E. Franits, and *Judith Leyster: A Dutch Master and Her World* by James A. Welu and Pieter Biesboer," *Art Bulletin* 76 (1994): 543.

²⁹ Eddy de Jongh, "Frans van Mieris: Questions of Understanding," in *Frans van Mieris: 1635-1681* Exh. Cat. Quentin Buvelot (The Hague and Washington: Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis and National Gallery of Art, 2005), 61.

³⁰ The Hague and Washington, 126.

reprehensible moral qualities in himself and in his friends,” which was “surely meant ironically.”³¹

Scholarly opinions regarding dissolute self-portraits follow three general approaches. The first group interprets the work of comic painters (predominantly Steen, though Van Mieris and Brouwer are included as well) as expressions of farcical personae. Regarding Steen, authors including Lyckle de Vries, Mariët Westermann, H. Perry Chapman and Sturla Gudlaugsson, have focused on how the artist’s works reflect constructs of comedy and theater that were prevalent in the seventeenth century. Steen’s self-inclusions, Chapman argues, were an innovative strategy that “would have distinguished him from his fellow artists and presented a unique commodity to those viewers and collectors sophisticated enough to know his oeuvre and appreciate the witty challenge of spotting the artist.”³²

Chapman feels that Steen’s multiple insertions of himself into his genre paintings amount to a fairly consistent comic persona. Furthermore, his conflation of real and imagined roles made Steen all the more confounding and ultimately compelling as well.³³ Mariët Westermann, who has written extensively on Steen’s

³¹ David Levine, *The Art of the Bamboccianti* (Ph.D., Princeton University, 1984), 249-50.

³² Chapman, “Jan Steen as a Family Man: Self-Portrayal as an Experiential Mode of Painting,” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 46: 371. For more from Chapman on Steen, see “Jan Steen: Player in His Own Paintings” in Washington 1996 (11-24) as well as “Jan Steen’s Household Revisited.” *Simiolus* 20 (1990-1): 183-196; “Persona and Myth in Houbraken’s Life of Jan Steen,” (135-150). Also see Sturla Gudlaugsson, *The Comedians in the Work of Jan Steen and His Contemporaries* (Soest: Davaco, 1995).

Chapman’s thesis that Steen’s rampant self-portrayal is related to “self-promotion” has been dismissed by both Horn (I: 655-7), and de Jongh (“Jan Steen, So Near and Yet So Far” in Washington 1996, 43) who writes that seventeenth-century collectors “might not have recognized the face.”

³³ Chapman in Washington 1996, 12-21. Chapman maintains that Steen’s sophisticated clientele (16) would have “delighted in the challenge [Steen’s art] presented.” Other scholars, including Lyckle de Vries (“Tronies and Other Single Figured Netherlandish Paintings,” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch*

relationship to comic strategies, writes that “numerous seventeenth-century authors, actors, and artists forged analogous comic identities, drawing attention to their comic voices, eliding the borders between their actual and represented lives or creating tensions between the two.”³⁴ Karolien de Clippel echoes this idea in regards to Brouwer, who by inserting his presence into the indecorous realm of low-life tavern genre, he confounded real and painted worlds, to make his works “extremely graphic, and even gave it a fresh boost.”³⁵

The second interpretation of these self-portraits regards them as a reflection of theatrical, staged “roles.” Erin Griffey’s dissertation, titled *The Artist’s Roles: Searching for Self-Portraiture in the Seventeenth-Century Netherlands*, is one of the few sources dealing directly with self-portraiture in which the artists portray themselves in negative guises. Echoing David Smith’s idea that portraiture reflected theatrical “masks” and acted identities, Griffey theorizes that artists including Steen, Dou, Metsu and Frans van Mieris conceived of themselves much like “actors” playing the roles that are reflected in the artistic literature of the time.³⁶ While she establishes that the majority of biographers and theorists railed against profligate behavior in artists, Griffey interprets the “leisure roles” that depict bad behavior of artists, namely drinking and smoking, as metaphors for creativity and as

Jaarboek 8 (1990):185-202) argue that Steen (as well as other artists, including Rembrandt) used his own likeness so often merely because he was his own most convenient model. Also see Mariët Westermann, “Jan Steen, Frans Hals, and the Edges of Portraiture,” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 46 (1995): 299-301.

³⁴ Westermann 1997, 94.

³⁵ De Clippel 2003, 212.

³⁶ David Smith, “Irony and Civility: Notes on the Convergence of Genre and Portraiture in the Seventeenth Century,” *Art Bulletin* 69 (1987): 407-430.

“perhaps...role-models of sorts for painters aspiring to an alternative to the artist-gentleman [self-portrait role].”³⁷

By far the most comprehensive study of seventeenth-century Dutch self-portraiture in any guise is Hans-Joachim Raupp’s 1984 *Untersuchungen zu Künstlerbildnis und Künstlerdarstellung in den Niederlanden im 17. Jahrhundert*.³⁸

While Raupp does not focus on artist’s roles as they relate to theater, his encompassing survey was the first to consider self-portraiture as falling under a range of fairly fixed categories that relate to a variety of cultural and art historical impulses. Raupp views self-portraiture of this era as less of a personal expression, than a reflection of Christian, medieval and humanistic factors. His study investigates how self-portraits in dissolute guises reflect Northern visual traditions, particularly the themes of the Five Senses and the Prodigal Son.

The most prevalent theory concerning these self-portraits in negative guise is that they represented an alternative to the conventional mode of self-representation in the seventeenth century, the learned-gentleman artist or *pictor doctus*, the artistic ideal promoted during the Renaissance. Art historians have pointed to its classical foil: the model of the *pictor (or poeta) vulgaris*, the so-called “vulgar painter.” Both the *pictor doctus* and *pictor vulgaris* derive from Horace’s *Ars Poetica* of 18 B.C. as positive and negative ideals within the creative life--the Learned Poet and Vulgar Poet. The idea of striking a balance between these models of *studium* (learned poet)

³⁷ Griffey, 109. Pages 100-136 deal with the artist’s roles as “merry maker”: drinker, smoker and music-maker.

³⁸ Hans-Joachim Raupp, *Untersuchungen zu Künstlerbildnis und Künstlerdarstellung in den Niederlanden im 17. Jahrhundert* (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1984).

and *ingenium* (vulgar poet) circulated in the seventeenth century in the work of poet Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679)'s *Aenleiding ter Nederduitse Dichtkunst* (1650), "but it isn't certain that the theory of inspiration in poetry was applied to the painter in Holland."³⁹ In fact, it was only mentioned in a single passage in Franciscus Junius' 1637 classicist treatise, *De pictura veterum*.⁴⁰

Rensselaer Lee was the first to apply the concept of the *poeta doctus* to artists, while Jan Emmens addressed the *pictor vulgaris* in his *Rembrandt en de regels van de kunst* in regards to the perceived lack of "decorum" in Rembrandt's style.⁴¹ Chapman also invoked the concept in her discussion of Rembrandt's *Self-Portrait with Saskia* (Figure 7), writing that "especially during the 1620s and 1630s the vogue for moralizing self-portraits in the role of the *pictor vulgaris*, showing the artists engaged in various vices, sometimes as personifications of the senses, provided an alternative to the refined virtuoso self-portrait type."⁴²

The concept of *pictor vulgaris*, though apt in its ability to capture the tone of this type of self-portraiture, is one idea that was largely silent in the artistic dialogue of the seventeenth century. Even more difficult than the lack of contemporary consensus regarding these works is the relative paucity of seventeenth-century

³⁹ Jan A. Emmens, *Rembrandt en de regels van de kunst* (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1968), 181. Also see Ivan Gaskell "Gerrit Dou, His Patrons and the Art of Painting," *Oxford Art Journal* 5 (1982): 22. Vondel translated Horace's *Ars Poetica* (1653, Amsterdam), dedicating the work to the members of the guild of St. Luke in Amsterdam.

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 195.

⁴¹ Rensselaer W. Lee, "Ut Pictura Poesis," *Art Bulletin* 22 (1940): 235-242. Lee (235) however, maintains that the *pictor doctus* is an idealized construct, "a highly theoretical personage who, if he cannot be called an actual figment of the imagination, has never had more than a partial basis in reality; and much of the time he has had no basis there at all." Emmens 1968 (28-54; 180-6) discusses both the *pictor doctus* and *pictor vulgaris* in regards to the critical reception of Rembrandt.

⁴² Chapman 1990, 118.

writings on ways the culture viewed art and perceived its artists, as well as how the artists regarded their roles. Seymour Slive, in his groundbreaking work on seventeenth-century attitudes toward Rembrandt, aptly refers to the “silence” both in the tone of works in popular Dutch artistic genres like still life and landscape, but also in regards the relative reticence of the huge number of art lovers and artists to verbalize the means and meaning of their art.⁴³

Dissolute Self-Portraits and the Art Market

Dissolute self-portraits are far from “silent” and today we understand these artists to have been far from “vulgar.” When these self-portraits are mentioned in seventeenth-century art literature, sales records and inventories, hardly a bad word is said about them. These paintings were clearly understood by the public and were widely praised and collected, and the artists who painted them were greatly esteemed.

As will be discussed in chapter two, it is clear a keen market for portraits of artists existed in the seventeenth century, attested by the substantial number of self-portrait collections and engraved portraits of artists that circulated in print. Both of those outlets were associated with self-portraits of artists in the conventional guise of the *pictor doctus*, reflecting the artist’s elevated status, education and skill. Yet it is clear that collectors sought portraits of artists, regardless of the guise the artist assumed. Otto Naumann posits that there was a “brisk market” for self-portraits of artists in different roles, which could explain the proliferation of various self-portrait

⁴³ Seymour Slive, *Rembrandt and His Critics: 1630-1730* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1953), 2.

guises from historically-derived to dissolute. Furthermore, they served a dual function, as “in such a guise the picture could be sold either as a portrait of the artist or as an anonymous character in fanciful costume.”⁴⁴

Cosimo III de’ Medici (1617-1675) sought a self-portrait by Van Mieris for his collection, but does not appear to have been too concerned as to how the artist was portrayed. When Cosimo visited the artist in his studio on a trip to the Netherlands in June 1669, he was intending to purchase a small self-portrait of the artist holding a glass of wine (Figure 12) that he had admired six years earlier. The work, however, was not available, so the Duke eventually received another Van Mieris self-portrait, this one showing the artist in antique clothing holding a palette (Figure 13). Cosimo does not seem to have been at all dismayed by the substitution, but did request an additional self-portrait of the artist either in the process of painting or holding a small work (Figure 14).⁴⁵

Sales and provenance records indicate that artists were readily identified in dissolute guise, even though the mode varied from self-portrait conventions. Steen’s likeness was certainly known to the public in his day. Houbraken picked up on the trick fairly early: in 1721, he noted Steen’s presence in a disorderly household scene, holding a wineglass. Houbraken thought the scene portrayed Steen’s own home and

⁴⁴ Naumann, I: 126.

⁴⁵ Naumann, I; 26-8 and II: 117, cat. no. 110. Cosimo III de’ Medici visited the studio of Van Mieris (22 June 1669) while touring through Northern Europe in 1667-9 to purchase works of art for his Florentine collection to see the artist’s progress on paintings the duke had ordered. Cosimo had apparently seen a small self-portrait by Van Mieris six years earlier and wanted to buy it. The picture is described in a letter from Cosimo’s secretary in Florence, Apollonio Bassetti, to his Amsterdam agent, Giovacchino Guasconi, referring to the self-portrait as a small, pocket-size work on copper of the artist wearing a beret and holding a glass in one hand. There is no precise record of the painting today, though it may have been similar to his 1670 *Self-Portrait* in Providence (Figure 12). See I: 184 for the letter (Archivio di Stato Firenze, Mediceo del Principeato, 4262, fol. 430).

noted that the artist included his likeness “as a joke.”⁴⁶ Early sales records also reveal that buyers were aware that certain compositions contained Steen’s self-portraits, and perhaps even mentioned them as selling points. In 1708, a sales catalogue lists a portrait of “*Jan Steen en zijn slapende vrouwje, door hem zelfs geschildert*” (Jan Steen and his sleeping wife, painted by himself), a work that may well describe *The Idlers* (Figure 9), which sold for a respectable 101 guilders at auction. A painting purchased by burgomaster Johan van der Hulk of Dordrecht in 1720 cites “*Een S. Nicolaes, verbeeldende de heele Familie van Jan Steen aerdig van hem geordonneert en geestig geschildert*” (A St. Nicholas depicting the whole family of Jan Steen, nicely composed and merrily painted) sold for 400 guilders.⁴⁷ Another description of a Steen painting ambitiously found Rembrandt within the scene as well, and notably—“Rembrandt” is smoking: “Twelfth-night, with Himself and his Friends chusing King and Queen, amongst which is Rembrandt’s portrait smoaking.”⁴⁸

In sales descriptions of many of these dissolute self-portraits, while the artist’s presence is noted, cataloguers paid little notice in the dissolute nature of self-portrayal. Instead, descriptors generally refer to the tone of the painting or the quality of execution. For instance, a (now-presumed) copy after Van Mieris’ *Oyster Meal* (Figure 15) sold in 1727 is mentioned as “*een Cabinetstukje van de oude Frans van*

⁴⁶ Houbraken, III: 15. “*T eerste dat hy maakte was een zinnebeeld van zyn bedorven huishouwen. ‘T vertrek lag buiten orde overhoop, de Hont slobbered uit den Pot, de Kat liep met Spek heen, de Kinderen buitelden ongehavent over de Vloer, Moer zat gemakkelyk in een zetel en zag dit werk aan, en om de klucht had hy zig zeld daar by afgemaalt, met en roemer in de hand, en een Aap op de schoorsteen die dit alles met een langen bek begluurde.*”

⁴⁷ Westermann, 81, n. 133. The work of 12 September 1708 was an anonymous sale.

⁴⁸ Chapman, 1990-1, 183. Chapman cites the source of these records as the Hofstede de Groot fiches in the Netherlands Institute for Art History (RKD) in The Hague.

Mieris, verbeeldend zig zelfs aan een vrouwtje oesters presenteerende in een zilvere schaal, zeer schoon... (“A cabinetpiece by Frans van Mieris the Elder, painted himself presenting a woman oysters in a silver dish, very beautiful...”).⁴⁹ Coenraad Baron Droeste, the first owner of Van Mieris’ *Teasing the Pet* (Figure 16), published a poem about the painting in 1717 briefly mentioning the presence of the artist and his wife in the composition. However, Droeste was more enchanted with the artist’s ability to depict the different substances and textures in the work, particularly noting the brilliant *Turks tapyt* (Turkish rug), which he said was painted with multiple, velvety colors.⁵⁰ Similarly, in *The Song Interrupted*, in which Van Mieris painted himself in offering wine to his wife (an act often equated with an offer of love) (Figure 17), the description from 1798 stresses how beautifully the artist portrayed the objects in the scene: “*Mieris offrant un verre de vin à sa femme; elle est assise devant lui, vêtue en velours et satin;...un tableau précieux et riche de composition ne laisse rien à désirer.*” (“Mieris offering a glass of wine to his wife; she is seated next to him, dressed in velvet and satin; a precious work and compositionally rich leaving nothing to be desired”).⁵¹

When Rembrandt’s *Self-Portrait with Saskia* (Figure 7) entered the collection of the Elector of Saxony in 1749, it was noted both for the presence of the artist and his wife, as well as the large size of the painting itself. Yet interestingly, an inventory

⁴⁹ Naumann, II: 45, cat. 36f. The description comes from a sale from the collection of Valerius Roever of Delft to Verschurring from Roever in 1727.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, II: 41. Cat. 35. The poem was published in *De Harderkouten en andere Dichten* (Rotterdam, 1717).

⁵¹ *Ibid*, II: 100, cat. 88. The description comes from a 1798 sale in Paris (Constantin; C.P. Boileau), 23.III.1801).

of the same collection from 1754 does not acknowledge Rembrandt's presence, though the work is described in much greater detail. In the later inventory, the painting's subject is discussed with more attention to the actions of the main characters: "*Ein Officier sitzend, welcher ein Frauenzimmer caressiret, in der Hand ein Glasz mit Bier haltend...*" ("Seated officer, caressing a woman, holding a glass of beer.")⁵²

The Spirit of Satire

One of the reasons dissolute portraits of artists were not perceived as outrageous affronts to decorum is that they reflected the spirit and structure of satire. In 1658, for instance, a Parisian art dealer wrote of Brouwer's *Smokers* (Figure 4) that it was "among the most beautiful [paintings] he made."⁵³ To most eyes, Brouwer's painting is neither conventionally nor aesthetically beautiful. In truth, the artist took pains to emphasize the crude, unsophisticated, even ugly qualities of this dirty corner in a shabby tavern. Brouwer's dark palette of muddy browns colors the composition with a humble character, while the lewd expressions and gestures of the artists crowded around the table cloud the scene with smoke and vulgarity. Brouwer arranged the figures tightly in this composition, using the broom as cropping device while including minimal foreground space between the viewer and the faces of the

⁵² *Corpus*, III: 147, no. A 111.

⁵³ De Clippel 2003,196. De Clippel cites J. Denucé, *Na Peter Pauwel Rubens: documenten uit de kunsthandel te Antwerpen in de XVIIe eeuw van Matthijs Musson* (Antwerp & The Hague, 1949), 180.

artists. As a result, the mocking expressions of Brouwer and his compatriots confront the viewer with an instant, almost contemptuous wit that is simultaneously engaging and uncomfortably direct.

The Smokers, much like Rembrandt's opinionated drawing (Figure 1), uses satire as a narrative strategy and a means to sharpen its pictorial bite. Brouwer's painting satirizes not only the artificial constructs of society by revealing the ugly commonality that resides in all men, but also the academic conventions of comportment and decorum expected of artists.⁵⁴ By the seventeenth century, satire was a well-established construct in both Netherlandish literary and artistic traditions. Brouwer's work, like many other self-portraits in this discussion, would have been understood and appreciated in this context.

To northern minds, satire was an effective means of conveying both Christian and humanistic concepts. Satire exposed the follies of the world through inversion, paradox, and comedy; its goal, as Horace wrote, was "*ridentem dicere verum*," or to speak the truth with a smile.⁵⁵ The ancient writers Cicero and Quintilian discussed the important effects of laughter on the body and the mind in passages that were widely read in the sixteenth-century Netherlands.⁵⁶ As a method, satire aimed to convey believable arguments, ideas or philosophies through accessible, direct means

⁵⁴ Hans-Joachim Raupp, "Adriaen Brouwer als Satiriker," in Henning Bock and Thomas W. Gaehtgens, eds. *Hollandische Genremalerei im 17. Jahrhundert Symposium Berlin 1984* (Berlin: G. Mann), 239.

⁵⁵ Horace, *Satires*. Trans. Edward P. Morris (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Co., 1909) I. i. 24 (p.28). The line reads: "*quamquam ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?*" (What prevents me from speaking the truth with a smile?).

⁵⁶ Erasmus' character of Folly in *Praise of Folly* decried Quintilian's chapter on laughter in his *De institutio oratoria* as "longer than the whole Iliad" [Desiderus Erasmus, *The Praise of Folly*. Trans. Clarence H. Miller (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), 82]. Cicero devoted a chapter to laughter in his *De oratore*.

that would be easily understood by all. As Cicero voiced it, the intent of satire was to place “philosophy on a popular level by dealing with serious subjects in a light and witty fashion.”⁵⁷ Therefore, satire embraced the ordinary, vernacular, even the vulgar, to convey meaning.⁵⁸ This concept parallels the Christian consideration of the paradoxical and illusory nature of exterior appearances, which, like the statue of Silenus in Desiderus Erasmus’ (1466-1536) *Sileni Alcibiadis* (1515), “in spite of its absurd outer casting, discloses a divine beauty when opened.”⁵⁹

While ancient satires were readily reproduced in the Netherlands in the fifteenth through seventeenth centuries, the genre was suited to the didactic aims of Northern reformers, most famously Erasmus.⁶⁰ His *Praise of Folly* (*Moriae encomium*) written in 1509 uses the character of Stultitia, or Folly herself, to criticize the abuses of Christian doctrine and the corrupt areas of the Catholic Church. Written as a mock encomium, Stultitia praises the ridiculous: “the curses of mankind she boasts of as her gifts; the frailties and failings of humanity she extols as desired achievements; and she lovingly contemplates the vices of her companions as though

⁵⁷ Cicero, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Academica* II. 8, ed. J.S. Reid (London: Macmillan and Co., 1885) 98-100.

⁵⁸ Raupp 1984b, 237-8. Raupp (242) compares Brouwer’s vivid coarseness to the ancient Cynical philosophical notion that one must often be shocking in order to bring about recognition of human error. Humor softens the reception of the initial vulgarity. Raupp likens the experience to honey sweetening the taste of a bitter medicine and suggests that Brouwer alluded to such a medical metaphors in his *Back Operation* and *Bitter Draught* (both ca. 1635, Frankfurt, Städtisches Kunstinstitut).

⁵⁹ Walter M. Gordon, *Humanist Play and Belief: the Seriocomic Art of Desiderus Erasmus* (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Buffalo Press, 1990), 73.

⁶⁰ Margaret A. Sullivan, *Bruegel’s Peasants: Art and Audience in the Northern Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 37. Among the classical satires reproduced in the Northern Renaissance were Petronius’ *Satyricon* (Antwerp, 1565) and Horace’s *Satires* (Antwerp, 1564). Sullivan reports that satires were even used as school text, such as Persius’ *Satyræ sex* (Paris, 1549) (see note 173).

they were virtues.”⁶¹ Stultitia’s ironic dialogue is ultimately an effective tool in exposing worldly vice, as what is satirically presented as praise is ultimately censured as folly. Other northern works like Sebastian Brant’s (1457-1521) *Ship of Fools* (*Das Narrenschiff*, 1494) and Rabelais’ (ca.1495-1553) five-book series *Garagantua and Pantagruel* (1532-1564) employed similar satiric strategies for critical means.

Erasmus’ *Praise of Folly* was exceptionally popular and influential in northern culture. It laid the framework for both written and painted expressions of satire in the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when mocking farces (*kluchten*) were rife in literature and on the stage. Poet Jeremias de Decker’s (1610-1666) *Praise of Avarice* (*Lof der geldzucht*), for instance, followed Erasmus’ model closely. Gerbrand Adriaensz. Bredero’s (1585-1618) *Spanish Brabanter* (*Spaanschen Brabander*), a farcical play first performed in Amsterdam in 1617, comically satirized the pretentious airs of a noble, but now impoverished, Flemish immigrant to the Dutch Republic. Bredero’s popular production commented on the social tensions spurred by the influx of Flemish immigrants to Amsterdam in the 1570s. Works like Adriaen van de Venne’s *Tafereel van de belaachende werelt* (*Pictures of the Laughable World*; The Hague 1635) and Jan van Duisberg’s (before 1655-1700) *The Satirical Tapeworm Mirror* (*Den schimpigen bollworm-spiegel*, 1671) ridiculed the foibles of mankind by “holding a mirror to show people their ‘strange habits, activities and the great variety of natures and properties.’”⁶²

⁶¹ Walter Kaiser, *Praisers of Folly: Erasmus, Rabelais, Shakespeare* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963), 51.

⁶² Rudolf M. Dekker, *Humour in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age* (Hampshire and New York: Palgrave, 2001), 31. The author does not provide a citation for his quote from this source.

Artists also embraced wit, mockery and satirical inversion as a means of dealing with the folly and madness of the world. Pieter Bruegel the Elder's (ca. 1525/30-1569) scenes of peasants helped establish a Northern precedent for visual satire.⁶³ Seventeenth-century artists also used farcical techniques in painting, most famously Steen, whose fantastically dissolute households scenes (Figure 101) relate to the sixteenth-century theme of the topsy-turvy world, "constructed on the conceit of stating what is, or what should be, by what is not."⁶⁴

A popular theme in seventeenth-century Dutch art was that of the pre-Socratic philosopher Democritus and his foil Heraclitus, who together represented man's choices in the way he approached the follies of the world: to laugh or to weep. A sixteenth-century booklet on fashion with engravings by Philips Galle (1537-1612) bears the more precise epithet: "Democritus regards everything he sees and hears in this futile world as vain and ridiculous."⁶⁵ While Heraclitus is often depicted downcast with his hand supporting his head, Democritus is shown smiling broadly, often with a partially open mouth suggesting the figure may be mid-laugh, as in Hendrick ter Brugghen's (1588-1629) *Democritus* of 1628 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). Biographer Jacob Campo Weyerman referred to Brouwer as "*dien*

⁶³ Sullivan (5-46) discusses Bruegel's audience, which she estimates to have been a fairly distinct circle of Christian humanists in Antwerp (she approximates [7] a group eighty men consisting of artists, writers, and publishers) who would have appreciated Bruegel's works as satiric allegories of human folly.

⁶⁴ Nanette Salomon, "Jan Steen's Formulation of the Dissolute Household, Sources and Meanings," in Bock and Gaehtgens, 315.

⁶⁵ Ger Luijten, "Frills and Furbellows: Satires on Fashion and Pride around 1600," *Simiolus* 65 (1996): 140.

The book is titled *Variae comarum et barbarum formae, una eademque in regione et urbem uno eodemque loco et tempore observatae* (Various fashions of dressing the hair and beard, observed in one and the same region and city at one and the same place and time).

Demokriet der Schilders” (the Democritus of painters), an artist who approached the world’s follies satirically, as he does with a mocking puff of smoke in lieu of a fiery diatribe in *The Smokers* (Figure 4).⁶⁶

This Dissertation: Goals and Perspective

Satire is just one of the strategies at work in dissolute self-portraits. Moreover, these unconventional self-expressions function within the dialogue surrounding the status and character of artists in the seventeenth-century. My dissertation will center on this idea: that despite their seemingly deviant appearance, dissolute self-portraits express positive statements concerning fame, talent and the artistic identity of Dutch and Flemish artists. They are, therefore, not as greatly at odds with artistic dialogues centered on elevating the status of the artist as they might appear.

In addition to the spirit of satire, dissolute self-portraits reflect three oft-discussed concepts in seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish art: (1) the idea of artistic specialization and inclination, (*verscheydenheden*); (2) the notion that one’s art was a reflection of one’s character (“*zoo de man was, was zyn werk*”); and (3) the stereotype that the Dutch painter was prone to prodigality (“*hoe schilder hoe wilder*”). Prodigality appears to have replaced the prevalent sixteenth-century artistic “affliction,” melancholia, as an identifying characteristic of artists in seventeenth-century Holland. I will explore how these concepts functioned in relation to both

⁶⁶ Jacob Campo Weyerman, *De levensbescreyvingen der Nederlansche konst-schilders en konst-schilderessen*, 4 vols. (The Hague, 1729-69), II: 63.

positive and negative modes of artistic conduct and self-portrayal, as well as how these inventive self-portraits reflect a new model of artistic identity unique to seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish art.

Chapter two examines precedents for canons of self-portraiture as they were fostered by the humanist climate of the Renaissance and how those *topoi* persisted in seventeenth-century Dutch art, especially as seen through the perspective of contemporary art literature and biographers. This chapter focuses on how Renaissance cultural and artistic modes established a foundation for the public perception of artists and the means of their depiction in self-portraits, as well as how Dutch artistic conventions of the seventeenth-century followed prodigiously in these footsteps—the norm from which the self-portraits of artists as smokers, drinkers and revelers differentiated.

Chapter three investigates the negative *exempla* exhibited in dissolute self-portraits in light of the moralizing culture and art community that warned against behaviors like drinking, smoking, carousing and other vices. This chapter also looks at artists that were particularly characterized as heavy drinkers and wild characters; a stereotype that appears to have had a solid basis in reality. Biographers and theorists throughout the century bemoaned a rollicking tide of dipsomania that plagued Dutch artists, particularly characterized by the *Bentveughels*, a group of Dutch artists working in Rome. As early as 1604, Van Mander complained about the dissolute and drunken artist in his *Schilder-Boeck*, referring to the *spreekwoord*—or common saying: “*Hoe schilder hoe wilder*” (the more of a painter, the wilder he is), a reference that reappears throughout the century, both in print and in paint.

Chapter four analyzes dissolute self-portraits of artists as smokers, drinkers, and carousers. Artists assumed self-portrait guises particularly related to two pictorial traditions: the Five Senses and Prodigal Son. Both themes provided artists with an opportunity to visually align themselves with the wild behaviors theorists and biographers ascribed to Dutch and Flemish artists. This chapter also investigates how the positive theoretical constructs of *verscheydenheyden* and “*zoo de man was, was zyn werk*” complemented the new image of the *wilder schilder* in Dutch art. Together, these three major forces fostered, promoted and legitimized the image of the dissolute artist in seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish self-portraiture.

Chapter 2: How to Behave: Positive Modes of Artistic Conduct, Character and Self-Portrayal in the Renaissance and Baroque Periods

In Giuseppe Zocchi's (1711-1767) *Allegory of the Arts* (Figure 18), a mid-eighteenth century fresco in the Palazzo Gerini in Florence, a statuesque female figure personifying Painting holds court amid an ideal landscape. Various tools of the trade are strewn around the scene, including physical muses and traditional implements of artistic instruction. Yet the marble busts topple sideways and the sketchbook sheets of classical profiles lay discarded on the ground, unheeded. The figure of Painting herself has turned her attention away from a work in progress, palette in hand, as something even more important has caught her attention. Her intent gaze, like that of the viewer, is directed at the centerpiece of Zocchi's fresco and the key to his allegory on art. Contained in a large book so grand that two chubby cherub types do their best to brace it open for display, is a page that bears a figure instantly recognizable as a self-portrait by Rembrandt in beret and gorget.⁶⁷

Zocchi's composition could well be called an "Allegory of the Artists" as it speaks to Rembrandt's far-reaching fame as well as the changing nature of the status of the artist and the impact of self-portraiture in history.⁶⁸ Traditionally, an allegory of the arts included elements symbolizing elements crucial for artistic creation: manual (easels, brushes, maulsticks), intellectual foundation (books, classical statues)

⁶⁷ Volker Manuth, "Rembrandt and the Artist's Self Portrait: Tradition and Reception," *Rembrandt By Himself*, Ed. Christopher White and Quentin Buvelot. Exh. Cat, (London: National Gallery Publications and The Hague: Royal Cabinet of Paintings, Mauritshuis, 1999) 50.

and divine inspiration (muses, models).⁶⁹ Zocchi, however, offers up a new twist. By placing Rembrandt's image in the seat of honor, he positions a self-portrait among the implements of artistic creation--in this case, the one that has inspired the cause of Painting more than any other. Though it is Rembrandt's fame being celebrated, the vehicle for that fame—his self-portrait—is consciously honored as well.

Zocchi likely included the self-portrait because the painting it was based upon belonged to his patrons, the Marchese Carlo Gerini and his brother.⁷⁰ The large book in the fresco being admired by Painting represents the illustrated catalog of the family's art collection that was produced in 1759. The Rembrandt self-portrait that is showcased here was clearly a source of great pride, reflecting the depth and stature of their collection. Though the authorship of the painting and the identity of the sitter are now in question (Figure 19), the work was considered an authentic Rembrandt self-portrait in the eighteenth century and was exhibited as such in the Accademia del Disegno in 1724.⁷¹

Rembrandt's cameo in Zocchi's fresco bookmarks the painter's place in history almost one hundred years after his death. It is proof of the painter's persistent fame and a testament to the lasting value of his work as a precious commodity. While

⁶⁹ For example, see Bernardo Strozzi's (1581-1644) *Allegory of the Arts* of ca. 1640 in the Hermitage. Strozzi's version contains three female figures and a marble bust of Homer that could ostensibly serve as both a physical model for an artist to copy, as well as a symbol for the classical theoretical precedent *ut pictura poesis*, that painting should mimic poetry.

⁷⁰ Karla Langedijk, *Die Selbstbildnisse der Holländische und Flämische Künstler in der Galleria degli Autoritatti der Uffizien in Florenz* (Florence: Edizioni Medicea, 1992), 140-143.

⁷¹ Manuth, 50. At time the fresco was painted, the work was considered to be an authentic self-portrait and was exhibited as such at the Accademia del Disegno in Florence in 1724. Today, there is uncertainty surrounding the work, which is believed to be an unfinished work by Rembrandt that was possibly finished by another artist (London and The Hague 1999, cat. 52, p. 169). It is alternately titled, "'Tronie' of a Young Man with Gorget and Beret."

it is clear the work was included because it was the prize of the Gerini collection, it is also telling that the subject of the work in question is a self-portrait, and not, for example, a mystical *Flight Into Egypt* or vibrant *Annunciation*. History painting, after all, had been since the Renaissance traditionally the most valued genre of painting, as its complex narratives and intellectual conceits echoed the precepts of Christian humanism.⁷² As an artistic genre, self-portraiture had been relatively recently been revived in the Renaissance.

Rembrandt's self-portrait memorialized in Zocchi's fresco later entered the famous self-portrait collection of Cardinal Leopoldo de' Medici in the Uffizi, the largest of many such sixteenth and seventeenth century collections devoted exclusively to artists' self-portraits.⁷³ The dignified bearing of the artist in the self-portrait combined with his elegant dress, which while martial in appearance would have held associations with the wisdom of Minerva and respectable character of artists, reflects both the elevation of the status of the artist and new, formal conventions of self-portrayal developed in the Renaissance.⁷⁴ In contrast,

⁷² That notion was echoed as late as the last quarter of the seventeenth century in the writings of Rembrandt pupil Samuel van Hoogstraten, who remarked in his *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst* (Introduction to the Lofty School of Painting) that history painting (including biblical and mythological subjects) was the most superior genre. The discussion of the importance and triumph of history painting occupies about half of Gerard de Lairese's *Het groot Schilderboek, waar in de schilderkonst in al haar delen grondig werd onderweezen, ook door redeneeringen en prentverbeeldingen verklaard* (Amsterdam, 1707).

⁷³ Langedijk, 142. Around 1818, the portrait entered the Galleria degli Autorittati in the Uffizi in Florence where it remains today. A 1669 self-portrait by Rembrandt also still in the Uffizi and appears in the inventory of the Medici collection made in 1663-1671 (London and The Hague 1999, cat 85, p. 226-7). *Corpus* vol. IV no. 25.

⁷⁴ Chapman 1990, 43-4. Military attributes, in this case the gorget, would have held identifications with Minerva, the goddess of war and wisdom, who by the late-sixteenth century replaced St. Luke as the protector of painters. Minerva also would have been equated with the learned painter, as she "stood for his moral fortitude when she defended the Art of Painting from its enemies, Ignorance and Envy." The word *schilder* was often invoked in a pun on the word *schild*, or shield, Minerva's attribute.

Rembrandt's more exuberant self—the imbibing reveler he plays in *Self-Portrait with Saskia* (Figure 7), was also in a prominent collection by the mid-eighteenth century, though the identification of Rembrandt's own portrait and that of his wife faded quickly and was rechristened with anonymity as “seated officer, caressing a female and holding a glass of beer.”⁷⁵

Classicist canons of self-portrayal and comportment championed the ideal of the learned, gentleman painter—the *pictor doctus*—and were so pervasive throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the image of Rembrandt's prodigal self seems virtually unrecognizable as an image of an esteemed artist, as indeed it was a little over a hundred years after it was painted. The development of the artist as *pictor doctus* reflects a long and circuitous campaign by artists and theorists alike to retrieve the fame, glory and honor of the artistic profession enjoyed by the ancients. The fulfillment of this promise was only achieved through the construction of a new artistic self, a model that promoted the artist as intellectual, divine genius and gentleman of renown. It is clear in both the artistic literature of the seventeenth century, as well as the public personae crafted for and by Netherlandish artists that

An example of Minerva's role as not only the protector but learned advocate of painting is seen an engraving after a painting by Hans van Aachen (1552-1615), *Minerva Introducing Painting to the Liberal Arts* [Ger Luijten and Robert Zijlma, eds. *The New Hollstein: German Engravings, Etchings and Woodcuts 1400-1700*, Hans van Aachen (Rotterdam: Sound & Vision Interactive, 1996), cat. 57, pp. 134-5.]

For more on the history of Minerva's association with painters, see E. de Jongh, “Minerva's Secret: An Allegory of Drawing by Jan de Lairese,” *Simiolus* 13 (1983): 201-17.

The beret was associated with painters, ironically due to Rembrandt's popularization of the old-fashioned hat. See Marieke de Winkel, “Costume in Rembrandt's Self-Portraits” in *London and The Hague 1999*, 68.

⁷⁵ *Corpus*, vol. III, no. A 111., p. 147. The painting was in the collection of the Elector Palatine of Saxony by 1754 with that description: “Ein Officier sittzend, welcher ein Frauenzimmer caressiret, in der einen Hand ein Glasz mit Bier haltend...”

the Dutch Golden Age was deeply indebted to these Renaissance precedents and actively promoted those paradigms. These distinct conventions of behavior and self-portrayal mark the ideal from which seventeenth-century Dutch self-portraits in negative guise deviate, or just as often, reflect the complete inverse.

The Artist's Status in the Classical and Medieval Eras

Key to the place of the artist in society was the perception of his profession in history. Ancient Greek philosophy, particularly the ideas of the Stoics, esteemed artistic skill and individual achievement and as early as the sixth century B.C. artists began to be celebrated in culture, individualized and differentiated from manual craftsmen.⁷⁶ It is apparent that ancient Greek artists understood their work held potential as a vehicle for fame. By the fourth century B.C., artists incorporated their own likenesses into works. The self-portrait served as a prominent and sophisticated signature for artists like Phidias (who, for example, included his image in the guise of a warrior on the massive cult statue of Athena in the Parthenon. Even Plutarch,

⁷⁶ Rudolf and Margot Wittkower, *Born Under Saturn: The Character and Conduct of Artists, A Documented History from Antiquity to the French Revolution* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1963) 1-4. One of the reasons ancient Greek artists would have desired to be differentiated from the realm of craftsmen was that slaves generally executed most manual labors. Therefore, the issue had larger social ramifications regarding “the contrast between slave and freeman.” [1] Additionally, they point to records of an early bronze self-portrait by the mid-sixth century architect and sculptor Theodoros of Samos as evidence of the trend of individualization of artists [2]. Despite this “emancipation” of artists, the fine arts were still grouped among the manual arts in ancient Greece. Wittkower (1-7) discusses both the elevation of the status of the artist and his appreciation as an individual as well as the ways in which the fine arts appear to have been valued less than intellectual (especially poetry) or physical endeavors.

Also see Joanna Woods-Marsden, *Renaissance Self-Portraiture: The Visual Construction of Identity and the Social Status of the Artist* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1998) 3.

writing on the most distinguished names in Greek history in his *Lives*, notes Phidias' great fame and how his works "brought envy."⁷⁷

Perhaps appropriately, these classical artists are best known in myth. The tales about the fame and prestige that artists from antiquity enjoyed in their day had a direct impact on how Renaissance and Baroque artists modeled their own careers and public images. The stories of riches (Parrhasios signed his paintings as "One who lived in luxury"), celebrity (Zeuxis wove his name into his garments with gold) and good fortune (Alexander the Great bestowed his favorite courtesan, Campaspe, upon Apelles) created an irresistible aura of splendor. Especially influential to later artists were Pliny's descriptions of Alexander the Great's relationship with Apelles.

Alexander's visits to the artist's studio became a popular subject imagined in later centuries, as it visualized an ideal of patronage.⁷⁸ Famous anecdotes about

⁷⁷Plutarch discusses Phidias' self-portrait in the section on the life of Pericles in *Lives* [Trans. B. Perrin. (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1982) 91 (31.4)]: "But the reputation of his works was what brought envy upon Phidias, especially that where he represents the fight of the Amazons upon the goddess's shield, he had introduced a likeness of himself as a bald old man holding up a great stone with both hands, and had put in a very fine representation of Pericles fighting with an Amazon. And the position of the hand which holds out the spear in front of the face, was ingeniously contrived to conceal in some degree the likeness, which meantime showed itself on either side." It is also mentioned by Cicero in *Tusculan Disputations*. Trans. J.E. King (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), 40-41 (1.15.34).

⁷⁸Pliny's account (*Natural History* XXXV. 36) reveals the two important aspects of the patronage relationship between Alexander and Apelles that signaled the importance of the artist: respect and generosity. Pliny contrasts Alexander's curiosity and ignorance about art with Apelles' skill and knowledge ["On one occasion, however, when the prince was in his studio, talking a great deal about painting without knowing anything about it, Apelles quietly begged that he would quit the subject, telling him that he would get laughed at by the boys who were there grinding the colours: so great was the influence which he rightfully possessed over a monarch, who was otherwise of an irascible temperament."] Additionally, Pliny emphasizes Apelles' unique bond with the king, apparently a tie that Alexander esteemed more than that with his mistress ["Alexander conferred upon him a very signal mark of the high estimation in which he held him; for having, in his admiration of her extraordinary beauty, engaged Apelles to paint Pancaste undraped, the most beloved of all his concubines, the artist while so engaged, fell in love with her; upon which, Alexander, perceiving this to be the case, made him a present of her...not only did he sacrifice his passions in favour of the artist, but even his affections as well..."] .The theme of Alexander visiting the studio of Apelles was especially popular in the eighteenth-century. For example, the subject was painted by Giovanni Battista Tiepolo (ca. 1725-6, Museum of Fine Arts, Montreal).

competitions between the ancients over artistic ability or zealous perfectionism are bandied about throughout art history like old war stories. Yet who could match with the perfect lines of Apelles, the startling naturalism of Parrhasios or the passion of Apollodorus?⁷⁹ Naturally, no one quite could, though many aspired. Yet classical artists were held up as ideal models of artistic skill, production and patronage for centuries to come.

As the classical era dissolved into the Middle Ages, so did the professional prestige of making art. Though art and artist did not disappear during the medieval era, aesthetic values were rearranged. Christian learning usurped classical humanism and the visual arts thrived mostly as they were “applied” to religious, not secular purposes.⁸⁰ Consequently, the artistic product was glorified, not the artist. During these centuries the professional and social status of the artist regressed to that of anonymous craftsman. In addition, the collective structure of the late medieval guild

⁷⁹ Rudolf Wittkower, “Individualism in Art and Artists: A Renaissance Problem,” *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 22 (1961): 291-302. Wittkower (292) recounts the story from Pliny of Apollodorus acquiring the nickname of the “madman” because he “often broke up a finished statue being unable to reach the ideal he aimed at...” The famous story of Apelles mini-competition with Protogenes also appears in Pliny (*Natural History*, XXXV, 81-82. Trans. H. Rackham. London [1961] p. 321). In this tale, Apelles went to Rhodes and visited Protogenes home, but found he was away. As a calling card that he had visited, Apelles drew one single line; wherein a competition ensued as to which artist could execute a finer line (the victor: Apelles).

Artists throughout history recall these tales both in words and in paint as artistic ideals, as for example Vasari’s story of “Giotto’s ‘O’s” and Rembrandt’s *Self-Portrait with Two Circles* (ca. 1665-9, London, English Heritage, Kenwood House) recall in word and in image the legacy of Apelles and Protogenes. See Giorgio Vasari, *The Lives of the Artists* Trans. Julia Connaway Bondanella & Peter Bondanella (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1991) 23. Also see Ben P.J. Broos, “The ‘O’ of Rembrandt” *Simiolus* 4 (1971): 150-84.

See Alastair Smith, [“Dürer and Bellini, Apelles and Protogenes,” *Burlington Magazine* 114 (1972): 326-329] for the comparison of the relationship of Dürer and Bellini to their antique forbears.

⁸⁰ Johan Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1954) 244. Huizinga argues that all art of the Middle Ages was “applied” and “subservient to some practical use.”

system, while designed to protect and regulate artists and craftsmen, essentially devalued the idea of artist as an empowered individual creator.

In sharp contrast to the plethora of artists' names that come out of ancient Greece and Rome, relatively few emerge prominently in the medieval era. Artists appear to have been rarely seen or heard, at least to any extent that merited great interest or permanent record. It is not until the eleventh century that a fair number of artists' names entered public discourse. Towards the later Middle Ages there are instances of self portraiture, though almost always as a small part within a larger composition.⁸¹

Medieval self-portraits reflected both piety and pride, but certainly not the high status of the artist. The self-portrait of thirteenth-century illuminator Matthew Paris (ca. 1200-1259) is a notable inclusion on a page with the Virgin and Child from the *Historia Anglorum* if simply for the relatively large scale of the artist in comparison to the sacred figures (Figure 20). Yet Paris depicts himself overridingly as a pious devotee, crouching submissively prostrate beneath the Virgin's throne like a living footnote. Another medieval artist who literally plays a supportive role is Claricia, a late-twelfth century German nun and artist who incorporated her own tiny full-length likeness into a psalter page as the swooping tail of the letter "Q" (Figure 21).⁸² Delightfully weightless, she dangles from the elaborate orb of the letter with her arms propped upward to support the great, imagined weight of it, like a miniature Atlas. The artist obviously took pride in her work enough to include her likeness as a

⁸¹ Wittkower 1963, 8. It should also be noted that by the medieval period the names of famous Greek and Roman artists were unknown to the uneducated public and of little interest to the Christian clergy.

⁸² Whitney Chadwick, *Women, Art and Society* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991) 45.

visual signature and inscribed her own name as well. The tiny letters “CLA” and “RICIA” are inscribed on the small crescents formed between her shoulders and big circle of the letter, creating the illusion of a banner unrolling as if announcing a great proclamation or proud news.

An Artist’s Renaissance: Refiguring a Role

Artists from the late fourteenth through seventeenth centuries were cognizant, often to a keen extent, of the winding and sometimes tenuous path their profession had taken in history. The diminished status of the artist during the medieval period was one of the driving forces behind the development of the genre of self-portraiture. The advent of the Renaissance and its guiding impulse, humanism, provided the main impetus for a change in the status in the artist in society. A renewed interest in classical philosophy promoted and celebrated the individual’s critical thoughts and independent actions.⁸³ The humanist curriculum -- a *studia humanitatis* as Cicero called it-- included the liberal arts of grammar, rhetoric, and logic (the trivium) and geometry, arithmetic, music, and astronomy (the quadrivium). Its course of study centered on human achievement and not the abstract realms of metaphysics, astronomy and theology.

⁸³ Swiss historian Jacob Burckhardt [*The Civilization of Renaissance in Italy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958; first edition 1860) was the first to theorize that the discovery and liberation of the individual were hallmarks of the Renaissance. Though this idea has prevailed for the most part (particularly by medieval scholars that place the rise of individualism in that era), Burckhardt’s conception of the Renaissance has been criticized for the narrowness of his vision, specifically his omission of economic factors as well the problem of a Northern Renaissance. See Paul Oskar Kristeller, “Changing Views of the Intellectual History of the Renaissance since Jacob Burckhardt,” in *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters II* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1985).

Consequently this intellectual shift, which began to stir as early as the late thirteenth century, fostered the investigations of individual experiences, analyses and celebrations of self that were richly commemorated in Renaissance portraiture and self-portraiture. In writing, the advent of biography and autobiography as prominent literary forms provides parallel evidence of burgeoning self-analysis and individual awareness as early as the fourteenth century. Works like Dante Alighieri's (1265-1321) *Commedia* and Francesco Petrarca's (1304-1374) *Letter to Posterity* of 1368 and the *Secretum* reflect a sense of respect for and deepening examination of one's individual thoughts and experiences. By the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, written explorations of self compounded exponentially and the introspective voices are notably more self-assured. For example, Benvenuto Cellini (1500-71), a goldsmith and sculptor, recounts detailed episodes of his adventures with a healthy dose of egotism. Cellini promoted the act of autobiography and the value of self-importance, beginning his own story stating that "all men of whatsoever quality they be, who have done anything of excellence, ought, if they are persons of truth and honesty, to describe their lives with their own hand..."⁸⁴ Michel de Montaigne (1533-92)'s *Essais* was perhaps the most revolutionary investigation of self of the era. The 1580 book was conceived of as a literary self-portrait, a continuous discourse about the author arranged in a collection of chapters each addressing only one or two aspects of self.

⁸⁴ Benvenuto Cellini, *The Autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini*. Trans. John Addington Symonds (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1948) 3. Cellini adds that one ought to not consider undertaking such an enterprise as autobiography until "they have passed the age of forty." Cellini's book was drafted in 1558 though not published until 1728. Interestingly, Cellini dictated his memoir while under house arrest for the crime of sodomy. Patricia L. Rubin [*Giorgio Vasari: Art and History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) 24] interprets Cellini's autobiography as an attempt to "redeem his unfortunate present by recounting a heroic past."

The rise of portraiture as an independent genre paralleled the rise in individualism in the Renaissance. The earliest independent portraits were profile views, popular because the pose consciously intended to link the sitter to the tradition of classical medals and coins that were issued to commemorate victory and perpetuate fame. As the portraiture developed, so did interest in the sitter's persona, both superficially and psychologically. Portraits of artists started to appear in quattrocento Florence as evidenced, for example, by the *Portrait of Giotto, Uccello, Donatello, Manetti and Brunelleschi* (Florentine, fifteenth century. Louvre, Paris.)⁸⁵ Artists' portraits (and self-portraits) became a valuable commodity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the artist gained fame and credence as a subject worth both painting and collecting.

Renaissance humanism called artists' attention back to antiquity in ways that were both nostalgic and inspirational. Firstly, the renewed interest in classical history provided an attractive model for artists as they struggled against limits of the late medieval guild structure.⁸⁶ The guilds' tight regulations over artist's lives railed against newfound ideals of individual achievement. Pliny's tales of famous artists and Plutarch's biographies of famous men were a vivid reminder of the value once placed

⁸⁵ Brown, 39, The likenesses in this unsigned group portrait were probably taken from other works of art such as frescoes and assembled here.

⁸⁶ Wittkower 1963, 9-10. The appearance of the medieval guild system coincided with the growth of cities. The first craft guilds appeared in Italy in the late thirteenth (Venice, Perugia) and early fourteenth centuries (Florence, Verona and Siena). Northern European guilds were established a bit later (Ghent in 1338, Frankfurt in 1410). Guilds provided training, support and protection to artists, but also imposed many constrictions upon their lives and careers. The authors cite restrictions ranging from a fifteenth-century London guild prohibiting profanity to a painter's guild in Cremona reserving the right to destroy works it deemed indecent (as well as punishing the work's creator). See Gervase Rosser ("Crafts, Guilds and the Negotiation of Work in the Medieval Town," *Past and Present*, No. 154. (Feb., 1997), pp. 3-31) for a discussion of the socio-economic ramifications of guilds in medieval society.

on artistic ingenuity and skill, as well as the respected and charmed lives that a number of Greek and Roman artists enjoyed. Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528), for instance, the artist most credited for bringing the ideas surrounding Italian Renaissance art to Northern Europe, noted artists in antiquity were esteemed by kings in various drafts of his *Lehrbuch der Malerei*.⁸⁷

Above all, the status of the artist in society changed in the Renaissance because art itself was perceived differently. While art was admired and esteemed in antiquity, it was still regarded as predominantly a manual craft. The visual arts were never recognized among the elite seven liberal arts, the classifications of knowledge and study that represented an ideal standard of intellectual achievement and practice.⁸⁸ Other arts, however, like poetry and music, were acknowledged differently. Poetry was considered equivalent to a liberal art because of its close ties to rhetoric, and music was similarly esteemed because it ranked alongside astronomy and mathematics in the medieval Quadrivium. In contrast, in the Middle Ages, the visual arts were situated among the seven “mechanical” arts.⁸⁹ These distinctions factored substantially in the position of the artist in society as, in both the classical and medieval ages, one’s occupation was “always evaluated socially on the basis of

⁸⁷ Joseph Leo Koerner, *The Moment of Self-Portraiture in German Renaissance Art* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1993) 138.

⁸⁸ Emile Mâle, *The Gothic Image: Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958) 76. The liberal arts were considered the summa of all material knowledge, reigned over only by philosophy, “the mother of them all.” Mâle refers to Christian humanist Augustine of Hippo’s (354-430) theory that the combination of philosophy and the liberal arts contained “all the knowledge possible for man to acquire apart from revelation.” Also see Wittkower 1963, 1-9, for a discussion of the evolution of the liberal arts in the late medieval and Renaissance periods.

⁸⁹ Woods-Marsden, 19. The medieval scholastic tradition emphasized the divisions of the Trivium and Quadrivium among the liberal arts. For further discussion of the Trivium and Quadrivium, and its artistic representation in the medieval period, see Mâle, 75-94.

its proximity to, or distance from, physical labor.”⁹⁰ Manual work, historically, had been associated with slavery in antiquity.⁹¹ Though early Renaissance artists were not considered slaves, it was enough to be aligned with mechanical labor to cement their social ranking firmly on the minor side of a major cultural divide.

From about 1400, one sees distinct historical, sociological and visual evidence of the artist’s attempt to elevate his status in society. The solution, for Renaissance artists, was to realign creatively not just themselves, but the entire profession of artistic creation. The loose “strategy,” as adopted by artists and writers throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, was to disassociate gradually the visual arts from its mechanical classification and reinvent the profession as a liberal art. This effort was carried out in three major ways, each of which had a direct bearing on later modes of self-portraiture: (1) by stressing the intellectual components in art and its production; (2) emphasizing the natural inclination or genius inherent in artist himself; and (3) by fashioning the artist as part of the social and artistic nobility, both as a gentleman and part of the “reflected glory” of famous artists in history.⁹² These Renaissance ideals became standard models of self-representation throughout Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including the artists of the Dutch Golden Age. These ideals of conduct and comport, of self-representation and self-reference were precisely those that Dutch artists contradicted when they painted themselves in dissolute guise.

⁹⁰ *ibid*, 3. Naturally, other factors like one’s family status and ancestors, marital connections, etc. also contributed to social standing.

⁹¹ The term “liberal arts” derives from the Latin *liber* meaning free, because its purpose was to train and educate the free man.

⁹² Anthony Blunt, *Artistic Theory in Italy, 1450-1600* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), 49.

1. The New Artist: Intellectual

The Intellectual Artist in the Renaissance

The production of art is a physical task, but Renaissance artists and writers refashioned the process as being primarily intellectual. Perceptible advances in the creation of art, like linear perspective, smacked of the rationality of geometry and mathematics, the latter of which was an admitted liberal art. Many authors, including Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) and sculptor Lorenzo Ghiberti (1378-1455), emphasized the scientific aspects of the production of art in their theoretical treatises. Alberti was the first to suggest that the visual arts could rise above their mechanical heritage by linking them firmly to practical liberal arts of the Quadrivium. His book on painting, *della pittura* of 1435, which was deliberately structured after Horace's *Ars poetica*, presented for the first time a systematic formula for linear perspective.⁹³ Alberti's approach to painting relied largely on a combination of the scientific study of mathematics and vision, yet he also addressed the intellectual education of the artist, claiming that one "could not aspire to individual artistic accomplishment without a highly educated self."⁹⁴ Ghiberti's *Comentarii* of 1450 included three approaches—biography, autobiography and art theory—to make the case for the

⁹³ Carroll W. Westfall, "Painting and the Liberal Arts: Alberti's View," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 30 (Oct.-Dec. 1969): 492. Alberti divided his work into three books (mathematics, painting and the "painter") using the same structure Horace did in devising his practical treatise on poetry. Alberti published a Latin version of *della pittura* in 1435 and an Italian translation in 1436 (487).

⁹⁴ Woods-Marsden, 15.

elevation of the status of the artist. After discussing the greatness of the ancient artists and their heirs (himself and his Florentine contemporaries), Ghiberti addressed theoretical concerns in art from a scientific perspective, including optics. Like Alberti, Ghiberti asserted the great importance of the education of the artist, and that, like the Renaissance ideal ‘*uomo universale*’, he should be trained in all the liberal arts.⁹⁵

Leonardo da Vinci regarded painting as a “mental discourse” and his extensive theoretical and practical writings place it firmly in the domain of science.⁹⁶ Moreover, Leonardo importantly positioned creativity as a rational sequence: “first in the mind [*mente*], then with the hands [*mani*].”⁹⁷ This view represented a new theory of art as the product of two distinct processes, intellectual and manual— though at this juncture the scales tipped the balance towards intellect. Writers like Leonardo, Alberti and artist and biographer Giorgio Vasari (1511-1576) repeatedly emphasized the role played by the mind in the creation of a work of art. Alberti, for example, purported that the artist’s “hand was understood to be an *extension* of the mind.”⁹⁸ Similarly, Michelangelo famously purported that the hand must be “obedient to the mind” for it to uncover the latent potential within a block of marble.⁹⁹ Furthermore,

⁹⁵ Andrew Martindale, *The Rise of the Artist in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), 101. Ghiberti felt that the finest artists should be educated in all areas including Grammar, Geometry, Philosophy, Medicine, Astrology, History, Anatomy and Arithmetic.

⁹⁶ Martin Kemp, ed. *Leonardo on Painting* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989), 13-22.

⁹⁷ Woods-Marsden, 4.

⁹⁸ *ibid.*

⁹⁹ Creighton Gilbert, trans. *The Complete Poems and Selected Letters of Michelangelo* (New York: Random House, 1963) 100. Blunt (73) translates the same sonnet’s verses: “*Non ha l’ottimo artista alcun concetto, / Ch’un marmo solo in sè non circoscriva / Col suo soverchio, e solo a quello arriva /*

Renaissance theorists contended that the hand articulating those motions of the artist's mind had to be trained or 'learned' as well.

The concept of the *pictor doctus*, or learned painter, also appears in the Renaissance amid dialogues concerning exactly how educated an artist should be and precisely in what areas. Arising from the cinquecento discussion surrounding the similarities between the sister arts of painting and poetry, *ut pictura poesis*, the concept of the *pictor doctus* derives from Horace's vision of the *poeta doctus*, the learned poet, in the *Ars Poetica*. Like the *poeta doctus* and the ideal orator from antiquity, the ideal learned painter needed a comprehensive base of knowledge to be able to successfully express any subject he was depicting, necessitating an encyclopedic understanding of everything from scripture to architecture to costume. Ludovico Dolce (1508-1568) in his *Dialogo della pittura* (1557, Venice) felt that the artist needed to be able to express accurately not just linear narratives, but all "nations, customs, places and epochs."¹⁰⁰

However, Rensselaer Lee, in his investigation on the development of the concept of *ut pictura poesis*, stresses that the construct of the *pictor doctus* was actually a "highly theoretical personage" that never "had more than approximation in fact." The idea of an artist possessing knowledge of everything under the sun was an truly an ideal, an "uncommon erudition."¹⁰¹ Yet concomitant to the idea of the *pictor doctus* and *ut pictura poesis* (and also derived from the *Ars Poetica*) is the notion that

La man, che ubbidisce all' intelletto" as "The greatest artist has no conception which a single block of marble does not potentially contain within its mass, but only a hand obedient to the mind can penetrate the image."

¹⁰⁰ Ludovico Dolce, *Dialogo della pittura initiolato l' Aretino* (Venice, 1557) 154.

¹⁰¹ Lee, 235-240.

painting, like poetry, had a didactic value should be designed “to instruct and to delight,” or *docere et delectare*. It implied that the artist was responsible to a degree for the educational value of the work of art, and essentially, was beholden to inspire virtue or at least offer moral instruction.

Artists aspired to this intellectual ideal and often depicted their intellectual prowess in self-portraits. Antonis Mor’s (ca. 1517-1577) self-portrait of 1558 (Figure 22), highlights the artist’s superior skill, intellect and education quite literally. In his portrait, the impeccably dressed artist sits before a blank panel, ostensibly ready to paint. Upon the panel Mor has illusionistically painted a sheet of paper tacked on with a golden pin. The paper bears a poem written in Greek by his friend the humanist Domenicus Lampsonius (1532-1599), praising Mor and ranking him higher than the legendary Apelles and Zeuxis.¹⁰² By placing the sheet in the spot usually reserved for a narrative or portrait, Mor shows the viewer that his fame, his education (including a knowledge of classical language and history) and intellect are as worthy as—or perhaps more than—the physical result of the manual act of painting. Though Mor shows himself as a painter holding the working implements of art (a palette, brushes, maulstick and even a rag), he clearly emphasizes that what is *behind* the paint—the intellectual presence that exists before a bit of oil paint is whisked into form. The panel within Mor’s self-portrait is blank except for the pinned poem, highlighting the theory that the motions of the mind, rather than those of the hand, are in fact the true work of art.

¹⁰² Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990) 154, 216-7. The ledge of the easel bears the inscription in Latin: “Antonis Mor, painter to Philip, King of Spain, painted by his own hand in the year 1558.”

The Intellectual Artist in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art

The emphasis on the artist's learning and intellect is a prominent element in Dutch self-portraiture of the seventeenth century. Praise for the educated artist appears throughout the literature of seventeenth-century Dutch art, particularly in treatises with a classicist bent. Hans-Joachim Raupp suggests that the appearance of a furrowed brow in a self-portrait was a symbol of *contemplatio* and a deliberate association with the intellect, and therefore should be considered a sign of the emancipated artist.¹⁰³ Almost every artist in Domenicus Lampsonius' (1532-1599) *Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae inferioris effigies* (*Celebrated Artists of the Low Countries*; 1572) appears to a certain degree with a furrowed brow (with some quite extreme, as in the portrait of Jan Cornelisz Vermeyen, 1500-ca. 1559 (Figure 23)).¹⁰⁴ For those artists not depicted with furrowed brow in Lampsonius, engraver Hieronymus Cock still placed a visual emphasis on the head, accentuating horizontal wrinkles of artists' foreheads and even, in the case of Lambert Lombard, a bulging vein on the temple that appears almost like a lightning bolt (Figure 24). In the seventeenth century, painter and printmaker Philips Angel encouraged artists to

¹⁰³ Raupp 1984, 120-123.

¹⁰⁴ Domenicus Lampsonius, *Da van Eyck a Brueghel: Scritti sulle arti di Domenico Lampsonio* Trans. Maria Teresa Sciolla (Utet: Torino, 2001). Almost every one of the twenty-three artists in the 1572 edition of Lampsonius-Cock appears with furrowed brow with the exception of only four: Quentin Metsys [(83) who appears in profile, although the profile portrait of Pieter Bruegel (103) does depict a furrowed brow even portrayed from the side], Dirk Bouts (75), Jan Gossaert (79) and Joachim Patinir (81). A few artists are borderline: Rogier van der Weyden (73), Lucas van Leyden (85).

explore their intellectual capacities, stating: “A little furrowing of the brows/ Will bring you a great name, immortalize your art.”¹⁰⁵

Practically speaking, an artist had to be educated to execute his job well. Both Renaissance and Baroque writers insisted on the need for artists to understand the literary sources of their narratives in order to express the theme correctly, emphasizing the proper themes and details. Franciscus Junius (1589/91-1677) expounded at length in his *De Pictura Veterum* on the need for the artist to be educated in all aspects of the liberal arts and to “...take in hand the writings of morall and naturall Philosophers, of Poets, of Historians, of Mathematicians.” Junius acknowledged that these studies “cannot make him a Painter,” however “these Sciences [will] make him a more absolute Painter.”¹⁰⁶ Angel’s treatise “*Lof der schilderkonst*” (“Praise of Painting”), first delivered as a speech in Leiden in 1641 and published as a small book the following year, presented the author’s high expectations of an artist’s training when he spoke of the fundamental qualities a proper artist should possess:

He has a sound judgment, as sure and reliable hand for drawing, a rich talent in the natural arrangement of objects, an ingenious invention of pleasing abundance, the proper arrangement of the lights and shades, with a good observation of distinctive natural things, a well-versed understanding of perspective, and equal experience in the knowledge of histories accompanied by profound and essential reflections based upon wide reading and study. He would also have some grasp of mathematical principles. This painter would also possess a thorough understanding of anatomy...¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ Angel-Hoyle, 231.

¹⁰⁶ Franciscus Junius, *The Literature of Classical Art: I: The Painting of the Ancients (De Pictura Veterum) II: A Lexicon of Artists and their Works (Catalogus)* (originally published London, 1638) 2 vols. Reprint Eds. Keith Aldrich, Phillip Fehl and Raina Fehl (University of California: Berkeley, 1991) 208 [III.i. 9]

¹⁰⁷ Angel-Hoyle, 242.

One of the artists Angel most admired was Leiden painter Gerrit Dou, whom Angel found to be “perfect and excellent.”¹⁰⁸ A Rembrandt pupil, Dou was an enthusiastic proponent of *studium* as a vital part of the artistic education. In his now lost *Triptych* (Figure 25), one of a series of school scenes Dou painted in the 1660s, Dou positioned three related scenes to read as an allegory of learning based on Aristotlean theory, which circulated prominently in seventeenth-century Holland.¹⁰⁹ Jan Emmens was the first to interpret the scene with that theory in mind, viewing the central scene of mother and child as representing nature (*natura*), the school lesson in the left panel reflecting training (*ars*) and the right panel containing a man sharpening his quill as practice (*exercitio*).¹¹⁰ The cutting of the quill in Dou’s painting relates the notion that a raw material, like an artist, must be honed (here, literally) to become useful and productive. The tripartite theory of understanding and practice displayed in the work was voiced not only by Dou but by several seventeenth-century Dutch art

¹⁰⁸ *ibid.*, 238.

¹⁰⁹ *Gerrit Dou 1613-1675: Master Painter in the Age of Rembrandt*. Exh. Cat. Ed. Arthur K. Wheelock (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2000), 120. Christopher Brown [*Images of a Golden Past: Dutch Genre painting of the 17th Century* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1984) 152]] notes the great fame of Dou’s ca. 1661 *Triptych* in the seventeenth century. It was the highlight of the esteemed collection of Gerrit Braamcamp in Amsterdam (it is often referred to as the Braamcamp or Braamkamp triptych), but then the work was lost in a November 1771 shipwreck at Oostee on its way to Russia after having been purchased by the Empress Catherine the Great. There is some confusion as to whether there may have been another version aside from the Willem Joseph Laqui (or Laquy) (1738-1798) work, in the Six van Vromade collection in Amsterdam. See Horn, II: 806-807, note 10-7 for a discussion of the literature and provenance regarding the works.

Aristotle’s theory of learning was available in at least three translations in seventeenth-century Holland, as “*natuur, onderwijzing en oefening*” (*Tot lering en vermaak: Betekenissen van Hollandse genrevoorstellingen uit de zeventiende eeuw*. Exh. Cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1976), 91-93.

Also see Amy Golahny, *Rembrandt’s Reading: The Artist’s Bookshelf of Ancient Poetry and History* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2003), 45.

¹¹⁰ Jan A Emmens, “A Seventeenth-Century Theory of Art: Nature and Practice,” *Delta* 12 (1969): 30-39. Also see Emmens 1979, 42.

theorists, including Angel, Samuel van Hoogstraten and Gerard de Lairesse. Houbraken praised Cornelis de Bisschop (1630-1674) as well for his “natural inclination and tireless effort” and then held up Aristotle’s advice as an example: “*To become an outstanding man in any practice, whatever it may be, three things must come together, Nature, Diligence [sic] and Practice.*”¹¹¹ Cornelis de Bie and another writer on art, the poet Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679), author of the influential *Aenleidinge ter nederduitsche dichtkunst* of 1650, recommended a balance between the inventiveness (*ingenium*) and discipline (*studium*) that Horace proscribed for the poet.¹¹²

Dou’s self-portraits portrayed him as equal parts scholar and artist, emphasizing the value of the liberal arts and the due diligence and practiced study to the artist.¹¹³ In a handful of self-portraits, Dou presents himself in the studio, though with books as prominent compositional elements along with traditional implements of artistic creation like brushes, palettes and easels.¹¹⁴ In his Dresden *Self-Portrait* (Figure 8), Dou hardly bears the appearance of an artist at all. Though all of the props surrounding him have associations with artistic creation, Dou has hidden all but one tool—the palette—related to the manual production of art. However, as Ivan Gaskell

¹¹¹ Arnold Houbraken, *De groote schouburgh der Nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen* 3 vols. Amsterdam, 1718-21. II: 222-223. Incidentally, Houbraken, though he mentioned the Aristotelian triad on several occasions, failed to make the connection with the theme of Dou’s *Night School* triptych.

¹¹² Emmens 1979, 32, 181. See note 35.

¹¹³ Annagret Laabs [Dresden & Leiden, 2001] 29) for one, notes an antiquated quality to Dou’s artistic statement, stating that it aligns more closely with the “maatschappelijke ambities van de geleerde in de *arts liberales* over te brengen, dan om de artistieke doelstellingen van een schilder te later zien.”

¹¹⁴ See Dou’s *Artist in His Studio* (ca. 1630-2, Colnaghi, London), *Painter with Pipe and Book* (ca. 1645, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) and his ca. 1665 *Self-Portrait* (private collection, Boston).

has noted, Dou also obscures the palette by placing it almost entirely in shadow.¹¹⁵ Hanging high on the wall near the window curtain, Dou literally overshadows the palette with a large sculpture of Hercules slaying Cacus, a full-bodied lute and a terrestrial globe.¹¹⁶ Dou portrays himself as such a scholar that he has two books open for study: the one in which he appears to be copying and the other a music book atop the violin.¹¹⁷

Peter Paul Rubens (1585-1640) was perhaps a greater “student of study” than even Dou, whose self-portraits are rarely without a book or a cast of classical sculpture. In his short essay on art theory, *De Imitatione Statuarum*, Rubens argued that an artist must have a “profound” knowledge of classical sculpture and the critical judgment to see the best works and not merely copy slavishly. Rubens echoed Renaissance theories of imitation and the ideas of Quintilian (who called for the “selective and analytical” culling of artistic models) and advised the artist to work from both diligent study and inspiration. In that same vein, Rubens’ personal emblem was an allegorical tribute to artistic genius and intellect: a winged figure representing

¹¹⁵ Ivan Gaskell, “Gerrit Dou, His Patrons and the Art of Painting,” *Oxford Art Journal* 5 (1982): 16.

¹¹⁶ Van Mander helped to revive the image of Hercules as a literally powerful protector of the arts (along with Minerva and Mercury) in seventeenth-century Dutch art. Hercules was most often used as a personification of virtue in the arts. Therefore, Dou’s inclusion of the subject from Livy, Hercules and Cacus, relates to the triumph of virtue over envy (and thievery). Eddy de Jongh [“Realism and Seeming Realism in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting” in *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*. Ed. Wayne Franits. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 35-38] suggests that the theme often referred “to disputes between ‘academic’ painters and guild members, or between artists or lesser craftsmen.”

Musical instruments, like the violin and the lute in this instance, often referred to the figurative harmonies achieved by the artist. The terrestrial globe was associated with the worldliness. MORE

¹¹⁷ *Ibid*, 16-18.

Ingenium binds together a caduceus (representing “eloquent practice”), a lyre (Theory) and a mirror with a snake (Prudence).¹¹⁸

2. The New Artist: Divine Genius, Melancholic Mind

Genius and Melancholy in the Renaissance

Art theorists, artists and writers in Renaissance Italy also focused on the nature of artistic talent, associating the artist’s creativity with two most eminent gifts: divine power and genius. Naturally, being bestowed with either quality effectively assigned artists a higher stature in society, as both represent a preternatural gift; esteemed pre-selections by a much higher order than any one bound to earthly codes. Alberti was one of the first to voice the concept of the *divino artista*, writing in the opening of book two of his highly influential *della pittura* that “painting possesses a truly divine power.”¹¹⁹ Alberti went on to purport that the painter could consider himself like a god.¹²⁰ Albrecht Dürer, a key figure in the dissemination of the humanistic ideals of the Renaissance in northern Europe, felt artists were quasi-divine, because “...the most understanding artists are similar to God.” Dürer was also

¹¹⁸ For a discussion of Rubens’ emblem, see Jeffrey Muller, *Rubens: The Artist as Collector* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989) 9. Brown (82-83) details the history of the allegory of prudence in painting, noting that the snake or serpent originally represented the virtue, as taken literally from Matthew (10:16): “Be ye wise (*prudentes*) like serpents.”

¹¹⁹ Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting*. Trans. Cecil Grayson (New York and London: Penguin, 1991) 60.

¹²⁰ Wittkower 1963, 98. The authors state that the Renaissance concept of the divine artist is likely derived from a combination of Plato’s theory of “poetical enthusiasm” and “the medieval idea of God the Father as artist: as architect of the universe.”

the first to assert the artist had a God-like creative ability to invent “something new” beyond what existed in the natural world.¹²¹ Vasari, too, likened Raphael (1483-1520) to a “mortal god” and when writing about Michelangelo (1475-1564), he described the artist being “sent” to earth to edify, enhance and bring the mortal lot closer to God:

...the most benevolent Ruler of Heaven mercifully turned His eyes toward earth, and witnessing the hopeless quantity of such labours, the most fervid but fruitless studies, and the presumptuous opinion of men who were further from the truth than shadows of light, He decided, in order to rid us of so many errors, to send to earth a spirit who, working alone, was able to demonstrate in every art and every profession the meaning of perfection in the art of design...Moreover, He wanted to join to this spirit true moral philosophy and the gift of sweet poetry, so that the world would admire and prefer him for the wholly singular example of his life, his work, the holiness of his habits, and all his undertaking, and so that we would call him something divine rather than mortal.¹²²

It is hard to imagine a more eminent social assignment than the one Vasari saw as Michelangelo’s birthright. No artist ranked higher according to the author, though in Vasari’s mind many artists were bestowed with gifts from divine benefactors, which were alternately referred to as God, Nature or other “celestial forces.” When referring to artists in his biographies, Vasari does not use the contemporary Italian term for artist (*artista*) or artisan (*artigiano*), instead he employs the term *artefice* (‘artificier’). The word comes from the Latin *artifex*, a term often used for God the Creator in theological literature of the time.¹²³ Creativity in general was associated with divine inspiration, and like claims of divine selection, it both

¹²¹ Koerner, 138.

¹²² Vasari, 414. The mention of Raphael being one of those individuals who are “not as simple mortals but...mortal gods,” can be found on pp. 305-6.

¹²³ T.S.R. Boase, *Giorgio Vasari: The Man and the Book* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979) 119-128.

promoted an artist's rank in society and simultaneously removed him from its codes. Since the classical era, extreme creativity had been regarded as a more amiable cousin of true madness—an intelligent “insanity,” though one not subjected to the same traditional cultural biases as were held towards mental illness. Rather, artistic temperament was considered to convey with it innate behavioral traits that transcended normal social codes and permitted non-conformity. By calling attention to melancholic or saturnine traits, authors stressed the qualities inherent in artists that differentiated them from the majority of the population, yet celebrated this distinction as a creative gift.

In the Renaissance, by far the most common quality of temperament cited in reference to artists was melancholia. Aristotle was the first to make a positive connection between a melancholic disposition (assumed to be due to the kidney's over-production of black bile—the *atra bilis*—which “contained” the physical substance of melancholy, one of the four physiological humours which, at least through the Renaissance, was thought to determine personality) and artistic talent. Florentine philosopher Marsilio Ficino (1433-99) renewed this classical notion in his *De vita triplici* (1482-89) with the aid of astrology, revealing melancholy as a divine gift bestowed on those born under the sign of the planet Saturn.¹²⁴

¹²⁴ *ibid*, 98-103. The association of artists and madness was not a new concept. Plato was the first to differentiate between clinical and “creative” insanity, the latter being “that inspired madness of which seers and poets are possessed.” David Levine [article] writes that the idea is seen in Plato's *Phaedrus*, in which he credits the Muses with bestowing mortals with “divine madness” to create poetry. Levine also feels the idea relates to Dionysus, the god of wine associated with poetic inspiration, who had a “mythic ability to induce madness among his devotees during religious rituals.”

Ficino updated Plato's ideas in the mid-fifteenth century writing that “divine madness” was caused by the inspiration and excitement incurred after encounters with “divine beauty and harmony.”

Scholars traditionally define melancholia as inward emotional and psychic states: depression, brooding, volatility, reclusive tendencies and secrecy, and could even be diagnosed by having “fearful and terrible dreams.”¹²⁵ So potent was the bile that it could even cause the illusion of a darkening of the skin, giving the appearance of a *facies nigra*. Joseph Leo Koerner remarked upon the irony of how the medieval mind “moralized [black bile] excess as the deadly sin of acedia,” while the Renaissance thinker “abstracted inwardness as an inherent quality of creative genius and valorized its effects in the originality of the artist.”¹²⁶ Melancholy was viewed as a reflection of a high level of intellectual activity of many types, not just creative but also analytical thought. Vasari, for instance, found Paolo Uccello’s (1397-1475) overly keen (in Vasari’s opinion) interest in perspective a reason for his melancholic behavior. Of Uccello’s fanatical interest in these difficult problems of geometry, Vasari wrote that “such a person frequently becomes solitary, eccentric, melancholy, and impoverished like Paolo Uccello who, endowed by Nature with a meticulous and subtle mind, took pleasure only in the problems of perspective which were difficult or impossible, and which, however original or vexing, nevertheless hindered him so much in painting figures, that as he grew older, he grew even worse.”¹²⁷

Infamous for his melancholic temperament, Michelangelo embraced his character, even writing in a sonnet: “melancholy is my joy.”¹²⁸ German humanist and

¹²⁵ *Ibid*, 105. The authors quote Timothy Bright whose 1586 book, *On Melancholy*, was considered at the time to contain a “generally accepted definition of *melancholicus*.”

¹²⁶ Koerner, 26.

¹²⁷ Vasari, 74.

¹²⁸ Wittkower 1961, 294. Michelangelo was known so known for his melancholic temperament that in the *School of Athens* fresco in the Vatican (ca. 1510-1512, Stanza della Segnatura), Raphael depicted

Reformer Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560) cited Dürer (one of whose engraved *meisterstücke* is the psychic incarnation of Melancholia) as melancholic.¹²⁹ Others artists, like Hugo van der Goes of Bruges (ca. 1440-1482), exhibited more serious symptoms of mental illness. Hugo suffered from incapacitating depressions that prevented him from painting, as well as delusional episodes thought to be caused by “a great frenzy of the brain” or an evil spirit.¹³⁰ (Rudolf and Margot) Wittkower characterized melancholia as a fashionable plague that seemed to beset Renaissance artists, so pervasive in that era when it came to “the great masters . . . melancholy was a forgone conclusion.”¹³¹

Many artists’ idiosyncratic behaviors and oddities fell under the topos of *melancholicus*, yet various sorts of non-conformities were accepted as reflections of an artistic temperament. Writers from the second half of the fifteenth century onward made frequent mentions of artist’s eccentricities, foibles and oddities; whether proof of the gift of too much bile or of having been born with correct astral alignment—either way, it signified nonconformity, individuality, and creative superiority. Little biographical reports of personal oddities also humanized artists to the public, allowing viewers to conceive of the personalities residing behind the brushstrokes.

Michelangelo in the pose associated with the allegorical personification of Melancholy: a brooding and solitary seated figure with his head resting against one hand.

¹²⁹ Koerner, 27. Melanchthon refers to Dürer’s “most noble and magnanimous” melancholy in his 1540 *De anima* (cited by Koerner as folio 82r). It is also quoted in Aby Warburg, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1932), 529. Dürer engraved Melanchthon’s portrait in 1526.

¹³⁰ Wittkower 1963, 108-113. Hugo van der Goes appears to have been suffering from serious mental illness. He had well-documented delusions in the mid-1470s and a severe depression in 1481. He was, however, apparently able to recover enough to resume painting, completing the *Death of the Virgin* (ca. 1481-2, Musée Communal, Bruges).

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 104.

Piero di Cosimo (1462-1521?) had little patience for anything that distracted him from his art and took to eating only the simplest of meals: boiled eggs, which he expedited by cooking in boiling glue.¹³² Flemish artist Joos van Cleve (ca. 1485-1540), called “Crazy Cleve,” was known as an excellent colorist, but vain to the point of insanity. Van Cleve quarreled violently about the value of his works over those by other artists and later tried to destroy his own paintings.¹³³ Tales of the reclusive artist working in seclusion and were a common refrain in biographies of Renaissance artists’ lives and piqued the curiosity of both readers and viewers. Michelangelo famously guarded his privacy and that of his art “to avoid having to reveal his work, and, as a result, everyone’s desire to see it grew greater every day.”¹³⁴

Natural Inclination in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art

The Dutch artistic literature of the seventeenth century was rife with interesting, often comical and telling anecdotes about artists’ personal lives and working methods, yet it is largely devoid of mentions of artists affected by melancholia or influenced by Saturn.¹³⁵ Additionally, one finds fewer allusions to the

¹³² Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Artists*. Trans. Julia Connaway Bondanella & Peter Bondanella (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1991)

¹³³ Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, fol. 226v. Van Cleve argued with Antonis Mor, court painter to Philip II of Spain, after his paintings were not purchased for the royal collection. Van Cleve saw his works as far superior to the Italian paintings Philip purchased on Mor’s advice. He quarreled shamefully with Mor, calling him a “conceited madman,” unable to appreciate masterpieces.”

¹³⁴ Vasari, 440.

¹³⁵ Wittkower 1963 (106) reports of that the “melancholic artist had gone out of fashion in the seventeenth-century.” Horn (347) writes, “not a single actor in [Houbraken’s] *The Great Theatre* is said to have been born under Saturn.”

idea of genius as a divine gift as it was conceived in the Italian Renaissance, though innate artistic talent was a common topic of discussion in the seventeenth century. Contemporary Dutch literature expressed the concepts of nature and nurture (as previously mentioned in the discussion of the Dutch assimilation of the Aristotelian triad) in relation to an artist's success just as frequently as the idea that natural talent was a supernatural gift bestowed by a divinity.¹³⁶

There are intermittent references to artists' talents being derived from lofty or ethereal sources, but not with the frequency and profound emphasis as noted by Renaissance writers like Vasari. Houbraken, for example, frequently used the term "natural inclination" as well as "Fortune" to explain the abilities and path of an artist's career in his *Groote schouburgh der Nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen* (*The Great Theater of Netherlandish Painters and Paintresses*). Van Mander often writes about artists as if they were lucky lottery winners, hand-picked by a swift turn of Nature's discriminating hand and swept under her tutelage for special guidance. He often refers to the affinity for art as a special *gaef* (gift) and a necessity before pursuing an artistic career. "Nature is marvellous [sic] in her achievements," wrote Van Mander in the opening lines of his biography of Hendrick Goltzuis (1558-1617), "when she has wished a youth to become an artist, she acts

¹³⁶ Emmens (1968) assigns two categories to the contemporary literature of Dutch art: pre-classicist (pre-1670) and classicist (post-1670). 1670, incidentally, marks the publication of Jan de Bisschop's *Paradigmata*, (especially the dedication to Jan Six, which criticized Dutch artists for imitating nature without distinguishing between beautiful and ugly) or what Emmens calls "the first occurrence in Holland of hard-core classicism" (187). He sees the "great event" in seventeenth-century art criticism as the shift in how authors approached the idea of whether artistic talent was inborn or learned. For the large part of the seventeenth century, Emmens regards the approach to art as "a system stressing natural inclination and intensive practice" (193), while the later classicists emphasized theoretical implications of art and the need for academic foundations.

with dynamic force.”¹³⁷ Of Hans van Aachen (1552-1615), Van Mander noted that “bountiful mother Nature...had chosen the boy from his youth, imprinting and impressing in his memory and mind the nobility and most pleasant essence of the art of painting...”¹³⁸ Writing at the beginning of the eighteenth century, Houbraken claimed the “spry genius” of Adriaen van der Werff (1659-1722) was due to the fact that the “Goddess of Art favoured him,” however it was his own “natural zeal” that “served him as schoolmistress.”¹³⁹

Junius referred to natural talent as “wit.” His did not intend the reference to carry comedic overtones, but rather associated it with the tendencies or sensibilities that contribute to success in a given field—traits such as intelligence, ambition or inventiveness in artists. Painting and sculpture were “wittie Arts” and eloquence in the arts was something that “also doth demand wit; not an ordinary one, but a high and profound wit.”¹⁴⁰

Verscheydenheden

Van Mander advised Dutch artists to specialize in and promote the specific type of painting to which they were naturally inclined. In *Den Grondt der edel vry*

¹³⁷ Van Mander, *Lives*, 281v. The following lines read: “She lets the seed she has sown in his bosom ripen very early. It becomes visible soon, as, generously, she gives the seed vitality and fertility.” Vasari also referred to anthropomorphized Nature (in addition to divine forces) as the giver of creativity. See for example, Vasari, 210.

¹³⁸ Van Mander, 289r.

¹³⁹ As quoted in Horn, I: 350. No reference for the original citation given.

¹⁴⁰ Junius-Fehl, I:104.

schilder-const, the first book of his influential *Het Schilder-Boeck* of 1604, Van Mander discussed the concept of *verscheydenheden* (literally “varieties”), particular areas of expertise like landscape, animals, buildings, night scenes, portraits that an artist should strive to perfect, should he show particular talent or dispensation to “*één speciaal onderdeel*” —one special part.¹⁴¹ Van Mander pointed out that the ancients had their particular strengths:

For it does not occur daily, that one alone can possess, learn, or apprehend everything, becoming excellent in all things. And so one finds that among those who pursued our art in old or ancient times, some were better at one thing and others at another, just as you shall see in their lives. For Apollodorus applied himself especially to beauty. Zeuxis fashioned over-large heads, but was a good painter of fruit. Eumarus accustomed himself to working after life. Protogenes could paint small ships at first. Apelles was graceful at all things...Pausias, exceptional at children and flowers. Asclepiodorus, good at measure and proportion. Amphion at composition. Serapio worked exceptionally well on a large scale. Pyreicus, at a small scale.”¹⁴²

Van Mander based his theory on arguments in the third book of Alberti’s *De pictura*, which similarly listed an inventory of Greek and Roman masters. Alberti praised some of the same artists as Van Mander, but introduced the specializations “as corollaries rather than alternatives to history [painting], ‘the painter’s surpassing

¹⁴¹ Van Mander-Miedema, *Grondt*, fol. *5 v.

For the concept of *verscheydenheden*, see Walter S. Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon: Karel van Mander’s Schilder-Boeck* (University of Chicago: Chicago and London, 1991), 5-9.

Houbraken echoed this idea, eschewing versatility for the sake of the mastery of one area of expertise. See Horn, I: 396.

¹⁴² Van Mander-Miedema, *Grondt*, *5v-ivr.. “*Zo vindt men dat het in onze kunst sedert de oude of antieke tijd is toegegaan: dat de een voor het ene en de ander voor het andere meer aanleg had en daarin een beter meester is geweest, zoals men in hun levensbeschrijvingen zal vinden. Want Apollodorus legde zich in het bijzonder toe op de schoonheid; Zeuxis maakte erg grote hoofden maar was een goed fruitschilder; Eumarus gewende zich om alles naar het leven te doen; Protogenes kon eerst alleen maar scheepjes schilderen; Apelles was in alles bevallig...Pausias bekwaam in kinderen en bloemen. Asclepiodorus goed in maat of proportie, Amphyon in compositie, Serapio bekwaam in groot formaat, Pyreicus in klein...*” Translation Melion, 28.

work.’”¹⁴³ But Van Mander instructed the painter to follow his inclination towards the most particular of genres, be it “animal pictures, kitchen pieces, fruit still lives, flower pictures, landscapes, architecture pictures, perspective pieces, cartouches, grotesques, night pieces, fires, portraits after life, sea- or ship scenes, or anything else on the earth to paint.”¹⁴⁴ Houbraken too, posited that art was best served when a painter respected his talents and did not try to master everything under the sun:

One must (goes the saying) not attempt to jump farther than one’s pole can reach. It is the wise who know their abilities and attempt nothing too elevated. Many who have attempted to pursue everything have realized their folly too late, when they discovered they knew something of everything and nothing well. On the contrary, one sees that those who have focused on this or another part of art and attempted to excel above other in it, have reached their goal and imperishable fame.¹⁴⁵

Zoo de man was, was zyn werk

A parallel construct to *verscheydenheden* in seventeenth-century Dutch art theory is the idea that an artist’s character is mirrored in his work. Houbraken noted this concept repeatedly in his biography of Steen, whom he imagined to be a penniless and haphazard drunk, writing: “In general, I must say, that his paintings are

¹⁴³ Melion, 29.

¹⁴⁴ Van Mander-Miedema, *Grondt*, * vi. “*Is het niet de perfectie in figuren en historiestukken dank an het zijn: dierstukken, keukenstukken, fruitsstillevens, bloemstukken, landschappen, architectuurstukken, perspectiefstukken, cartouches, grotesken, nachtstukken, branden, afbeeldingen naar het leven, zee- en scheepstukken, or iets anders van dien aard te schilderen.*”

¹⁴⁵ Houbraken, II: 217-8. From the biography of still life painter Willem Kalf (ca. 1622-1693): “*Men moet (zeit de spreuk) niet wider tragten te springen als zyn stok kan reiken. ‘T zyn verstan standigen die hun vermogen kennen, en niets dat te hoog is ondernemen. Vele die alle hebben willen nastreven, hebben hunne dwaasheid te laat beproest, wanneer zy bevonden van alles watt e weten, en geen een ding welt e verstaan. In tegendeel zietman dat zulke die’t een of’t ander deel van de Konst tot hun doel hebben bereikt, en een onverwelkelyken roem behaald.*” Translation Horn, I: 451.

like his lifestyle and his lifestyle like his paintings.”¹⁴⁶ Consequently, Houbraken tells some wonderful tales about Steen’s life that appear to have been taken straight from his paintings: when the beer runs out at his brewery Steen puts ducks in the vat to make things lively; the brewery folds when Steen spends the money for malt on wine for himself.¹⁴⁷ Houbraken did not intend this statement to be a negative reflection of Steen, whose work he admired, and he applies the same interpretation to the works of other farcical artists like Van Mieris, Brouwer and Pieter van Laer based on the coarse character of their paintings.¹⁴⁸

According to theorists, following one’s natural inclination and character was the path to honor and fame. In 1649, biographer Jan Meyskens (1612-1670) wrote about Brouwer that “he seldom work’d but in a Tavern, where in the heat of Wine he invented things that gave a true Character of the wildness and frolicksomeness of his Temper; yet with such curiousness and art, that caused admiration to the gravest and most judicious Painters.”¹⁴⁹ Meyskens was correct—those qualities did make Brouwer famous. An early owner of Brouwer’s *Smokers* (Figure 4) provides one of the few

¹⁴⁶ Houbraken, III: 12-13. “*In ’t algemeen moet ik zeggen, dat zyn schildereyen zyn als zyn levenswyze, en zyn levenswyze also zyne schildereyen.*”

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, III: 7; 14-15. “*Is het nou niet levendig in de Brouwery?*” (Now isn’t it lively in the brewery?) Steen asked his wife after bringing in the ducks. Also see Chapman 1996, 13.

¹⁴⁸ Mariët Westermann, *The Amusements of Jan Steen: Comic Painting in the Seventeenth Century* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997), 94.

H. Perry Chapman [“Persona and Myth in Houbraken’s Life of Jan Steen,” *Art Bulletin* 75 (1993) 135] notes that the fact that Steen leased a brewery and later owned an inn were central to Houbraken’s characterization of Steen as a drunk, though he attaches “no particular significance in light of other Sutch artists with similar second trades.” For Steen’s critical fortune see Westermann 1997, 24-31.

¹⁴⁹ Jan Meyskens, *Images de divers homes d’esprit sublime...*(Antwerp, 1649) (republished London, 1705 as *The True Effigies of the Most Eminent Painters and other Famous Artists that have Flourished in Europe: Curiously Engraven on Copper-Plates: Together with an Account of the Time when They Lived, the Most Remarkable Passages of their Lives, and Most Considerable Works*), 18.

descriptions that refers to the dissolute character of the artist's self-portrait. In 1662, the catalogue of the collection of Louis Henri de Loménie, comte de Brienne, describes the work as: "*Braurus seipsum cum sociis combibonibus inter periferos tabaci odors exhibet*" ("Brouwer shows himself with his drinking companions amidst the pestiferous stench of tobacco").¹⁵⁰ Even Brouwer's sure opposite, Rubens, admired his work and owned sixteen of his paintings.¹⁵¹

The idea that "every painter paints himself" circulated in the Renaissance not only as a common proverb ('*ogni dipintore dipinge se*') but also as a Neoplatonic theory of art. It is attributed to various figures including Michelangelo and Savonarola, but the idea echoed as close as the Nuremburg of Albrecht Dürer.¹⁵² In the Renaissance, the phrase alternately referred to the artist transferring his own

¹⁵⁰ De Clippel 2003, 196. See *La catalogue de Brienne (1662) annoté par Edmond Bannaffé* (Paris, 1837), p. 37.

¹⁵¹ See Knüttel, 179 (Appendix B) for a list of the works in Rubens collection.

¹⁵² Katherine T. Brown, *Self-Portraiture in Renaissance Venice: 1458-1625* (Florence, Leo S. Olschki, 2000) 69-70. Vasari attributes the saying to Michelangelo. It was also attributed to Cosimo de' Medici and Angelo Poliziano. Dürer, who visited Italy twice (in 1494 and again in 1505/6), made a similar statement: "Many painters paint figures resembling themselves." [A. Dürer, *The Writings of Albrecht Dürer* Ed. W.M. Conway (New York: Philosophical Library, 1958) 180.]

¹⁵² In the Renaissance, the concept (also known as automimesis) circulated as well, generally as a similar positive expression of inborn talent. Vasari refers to the concept, "*ogni pittore dipinge se*" in his life of Michelangelo as does Filippo Baldinucci in his biography of Caravaggio. Both writers emphasized "that artists have their own way and that even eccentric features of an artist's character which can be found in his works of art should be accepted" {Frank Zöllner, "'Ogni pittore dipinge se.' Leonardo da Vinci and 'automimesis,'" [originally published in *Der Künstler über sich in sienem Werk* (Weinheim: Acta Humania, 1992), pp. 137-60] "Archive of the Library of Ruprecht-Karls-Universität, Heidelberg." http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/artdok/volltexte/2006/161/pdf/Zoellner_Kuesisw_92.pdf [accessed 10 June 2007]}. However, the concept also circulated in a literal sense, disdained by Leonardo who regarded it as a compulsion in one's character, as involuntary self-portraiture. As the idea functions in seventeenth-century Dutch art dialogue, it appears to be an entirely positive statement about the artist's natural abilities. Also see Philip Sohm, "Caravaggio's Deaths," *Art Bulletin* 84 (2002): 459-68; Martin Kemp, "Ogni Dipintore Dipinge Se': A Neoplatonic Echo in Leonardo's Art Theory," *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oscar Kristeller*, Ed. C.H. Clough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976): 311-323.

physical likeness onto his figures or to the idea that he infused works with a distinct, personal spirit.¹⁵³ Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528) may well have taken the saying quite literally, as his portrait of Emperor Maximilian I is said to bear the artist's superimposed features.¹⁵⁴

The *topos* “*zoo de man was, was zyn werk*” found refrain in the writings of other leading biographers and theorists including Karel Van Mander and Cornelis de Bie.¹⁵⁵ Draughtsman and engraver Jan de Bisschop (1628-1671) echoed the idea when he stated that “each man often times paints his own manners and activities.”¹⁵⁶ Likewise, art lover and secretary to three stadholders Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687) wrote that a portrait was “a summary of the whole man, of his body as well as his spirit.”¹⁵⁷ The concept was even applied to the brushstrokes used to create portraits, something that poet Jan Vos (1610-1667) noted when he wrote of one painter: “But to my distress, as loose as your painting are you.”¹⁵⁸ Similarly,

¹⁵³ Griffey, 46.

¹⁵⁴ Campbell, 14-16.

¹⁵⁵ Houbraken, I: 363. “As the man was, was his work.” De Bie (93) mentions the same *topos* in regards to Brouwer: “*En soo hy was in't wreck, soo droegh hy hem in 't leven.*”

¹⁵⁶ “*Veelmaels yder sijn eygen seden en bedrijf sal afmalen.*” See Emmens 1968, 60.

¹⁵⁷ Constantijn Huygens, *De Jeugd van Constantijn Huyghens*. Trans. A.H. Kan (Rotterdam, 1946) quoted in Chapman 1990, 80.

¹⁵⁸ Mariët Westermann, “Steen's Comic Fictions,” in *Jan Steen: Painter and Storyteller* Exh. Cat. (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1996), 61. Westermann quotes Jan Vos, *Alle de gedichten 2 vols.* (Amsterdam, 1726) I: 515. Houbraken (I: 335) also cites this conceit in the biography of Joos van Craesbeeck, a Brouwer protégé who painted in an even coarser style than his teacher: “*Ik min dit Beeld; want 't is heel los gemaakt: maar gy, Dat haat ik, zyt zoo los als uwe schildery.*”

Houbraken (1660-1719) advised artists to imitate Frans Hals' (ca. 1582-1666) bold and rough style of painting, but not similarly rough *levenswyze*.¹⁵⁹

When applied to an artist, the *topos* was certainly meant as praise. It implied that the artist had an inborn talent or character that predisposed him to a particular type of art, and if he listened to nature and followed his inclination, that artist could achieve brilliance. Houbraken offers the example of Brouwer:

...there is nothing that stimulates pleasure more than the following of natural inclination; nor are the bodily member [ever] more ready (with respect to some action or effect), because the work is gratifying in itself. The life of ADRIAAN BROUWER will demonstrate this saying as if in a mirror. He, following his inclination, which leaned to peasant subjects, did not have any other aim than to paint the same with the brush in the most natural manner (in which he succeeded above others) and in this way received the honorable name of a great master.¹⁶⁰

In the seventeenth century, the theory “*zoo was de man, was zyn werk*” legitimized dissolute self-portrayal, at least for painters whose works focused on depictions of the unruly realm.¹⁶¹ The particular genre of painting an artist pursued, or self-portrait guise he assumed was incidental in light to whether or not the artist followed the talent he was given.¹⁶² Houbraken could not emphasize this quality

¹⁵⁹ Arnold Houbraken, *De groote schoubrugh der nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen* (1718-21) Facsimile version (Amsterdam: B.V. Israël, 1976), I: 93. “*Zyn brave Konst en stoute wyze van penceelbehandeling, maar niet zyne levenswyze moet de schilderjeugt zig ten voorbeeld...*”

¹⁶⁰ Houbraken, I: 318. “...*zoo is ‘er niets dat meer het genoegen streelt, als het opvolgen van de natuurlyke geneigtheid; nog zyn de lichamelyke werktuigen (in opzigt van eenige behandeling of uitwerkinge) gereeder, om dat het werk van zelfs zig vlyd. Het levensbedryf van ADRIAAN BROUWER zal ons gezegde als in een Spiegel doen zien. Deze zyne genegenheid opvolgende, die tot boerterye helde, heft niet anders beoogt als de zelve op het natuurlykst door ‘t penceel af te malen, (‘t geen hem boven anderen gelukt is) en daar door den eernaam van een groot meester bekomen.*”

¹⁶² For instance, in the life of Salomon de Bray (1597-1664), Houbraken (I: 177) writes “*Hadden de menschen eenen zin (zeit het spreekwoord), zy zouden eenen weg loopen, maar wy zien dat yder al van de bijzondere drift aangevoert en gedreven word. De Schilderkonst heft hare bijzondere deelen, en by gevolge keurs genoeg tot voldoening van yders lust, en verschillige geneigtheid.*” (Horn translation, I:

enough his *Groote Schouburgh*, and seemed genuinely amused, rather than disgusted by the drunken antics of Steen and company, encouraged by how heartily they embraced this role in art and life. Other theorists including Van Mander, De Bie, Weyerman and Meyskens all echoed the same sentiment regarding an artist's natural inclination, heaping praise on those who embraced their character. It may well have provoked some of these artists to depict themselves in guises that reflected both their character and their art.

Non-Conformity in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art

While Dutch and Flemish artists were encouraged to follow their innate characteristics, often these tendencies were quite different from their Renaissance forebears. In contrast to Renaissance notions of melancholia and social non-conformity, Dutch art theorists and biographers noted that the best artists were talented because they were productive, hard-working members of society rather than temperamental, cloistered geniuses. In the Dutch Golden Age, expressions of melancholia were less common than in the Renaissance and many classicist art theorists stressed practical educations and business-like productivity and habits.¹⁶³ Among recent historians, H. Perry Chapman relies heavily on the influence of melancholy in her study of Rembrandt's self-portraits, citing expressions of melancholy in English literature and seeing their emotional fruition in "Rembrandt's

444: "If men were of one mind (the proverb goes) they would walk one road, but we see that everyone is motivated and driven by a specific passion. The Art of Painting has her separate parts, and as a consequence, enough to satisfy everyone's taste, and differing inclination."

shadowy countenance.”¹⁶⁴ In regards to artistic biographies, fewer expressions of the melancholic temperament are cited and fewer artistic expressions of it are found in self-portraits of the Dutch Golden Age, although a self-portrait by Flemish artist Michiel Sweerts (ca. 1618-1664) (*Portrait of a Young Man [Self-Portrait]* 1656, Hermitage, St. Petersburg) and a self-portrait drawing by Haarlem artist Dirck Helmbreker (1633-1699) (Figure 26) recall the prototypical pose of the allegorical figure of Melancholy: a forlorn expression paired with the head cradled by one hand.¹⁶⁵ Raupp posits that the type of melancholy affecting Netherlandish artists of the seventeenth century was of a different strain than the one that consumed Renaissance artists. He characterizes the melancholic images of artists in Netherlandish art as “melancholische *pensierosi*,” thinkers caught in a moment of pause in contrast to the depressive state inspired by the *furor poeticus*, which caused the “*melancholia imaginativa*” that beset artists like Michelangelo.¹⁶⁶

Even in the sixteenth-century, Netherlandish sources bemoan the squandered opportunities of artists who suffered from mental instability. The Latin inscription accompanying the portrait of Joos van Cleve (ca. 1480-1540/1) in Lampsonius-Cock’s book of celebrated artists from Van Eyck to Bruegel notes that Joos could have enjoyed greater fame and fortune had he not exhibited “eccentricity and insanity”:

¹⁶⁴ Chapman 1990, 26-33.

¹⁶⁵ Raupp, 230 and 450. Helmbreker’s drawing is the National Gallery of Art, Washington. Also see the self-portrait of Cornelis de Bisschop (ca. 1670-4, private collection, Hamburg), 451, no. 136.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 226-233. Raupp also characterizes an intermediary expression of melancholia, one that he sees as a fusion of the image of the artist as thinker and the informal portrait type popularized by Frans Hals and his circle, often sharing the motif of the sitter holding a cocked arm over the back of a chair. See, for example, the ca. 1638 self-portrait of Jan Lievens in the National Gallery, London.

See, among the great artists of the Netherlands
Our Muse shall surely not remain silent about you, Joos
Who is no small jewel of the elevated art of painting.
Your's and you son's art would have brought you good fortune
If you, poor man, had remained but sound of mind.¹⁶⁷

Similarly, in the biography of Jan Gossaert (Jan de Mabuse (1478-1532), Van Mander specifically relates that an unstable or volatile mental state is not suited to the profession of painting:

The art of painting, which first arises through inner imaginations of the spirit or the mind before it can be further developed and brought to perfection with the hand, requires, one might say, to be practised by those whose behaviour is suitably tranquil and who lead a regulated life, since without disruption of the senses or internal disturbances of the mind, they would therefore be better suited to occupy their spirit with or devote it to such a very ingenious art...¹⁶⁸

Nevertheless, although comparable anecdotes and discussions of artists' lives are found among Dutch authors from Van Mander to Houbraken, yet decidedly less emphasis was placed on their emotional instabilities and social dysfunctions. Northern artists, especially seventeenth-century Golden Age, were noted despite rather than *because* of their non-conformity. And of the artists that broached the boundaries of mental instability, few seemed to have raised many literary eyebrows.

¹⁶⁷ Lampsonius-Sciolla, 88-9. The English translation by Miedema is found in Van Mander (fol. 227r) who quotes Lampsonius in his life of Joos van Cleve. Van Mander (fol. 226v) blames his insanity on his "proud or haughty spirit" that caused excessive arrogance and "deceived him so that he thought that his works should be valued above the works of all others."

Van Cleve's nickname was "Zotten van Cleve", or Van Cleve the Mad. For more on the insanity of Van Cleve, see Lionel Cust and F. Jos. Van den Branden, "Notes on the Pictures in the Royal Collections XXX: Paintings by Joots and Cornelis van Cleve - No. 1," *Burlington Magazine* 26 (1915): 170-1.

¹⁶⁸ Van Mander, fol. 225r. Van Mander goes on to discuss how despite living a "most disorderly and irregular life," Mabuse was able to overcome this tendency to become "just as measured, pure, neat and patient" in the creation of art as a rational artist should be. He developed this skill only through persistence and hard work. (fol. 225r-225v).

For instance, biographer Van Mander did not discuss Dürer's melancholy in his biography of the artist in his *Schilder-boeck* (as Melanchthon had a century earlier), rather, he pointed out the artist's "very elevated and great spirit, and intelligence and judgement [sic] that outshone all others."¹⁶⁹ Houbraken, in his regaling account of the farcical acts of Pieter van Laer (or Il Bamboccio) one of the most flamboyant and non-conforming Dutch artists of the era, only briefly made a "connection of sorts between [Van Laer's] self-mocking performances and the later depression and death by suicide."¹⁷⁰ Finally, Jacob Campo Weyerman (1677-1747) called Cornelis Visscher (1629? -ca. 1658) "een goed Schilder," but noted in passing that he "by een halve Gek was."¹⁷¹

In comparison to the plethora of melancholic references and self-fashioning that appears in Renaissance art and literature, the artistic discourse of the seventeenth century, particularly Dutch, appears to be "ambivalent" about melancholia—or perhaps more specifically, felt this way about the *type* of melancholia that beset Italian artists of previous era. As melancholia can be characterized by both creative and destructive behaviors, it could be said that Dutch artists yielded to the latter forces. Gerlinde Lütke Notarp, echoing Joseph Leo Koerner, posits that the dual nature of the melancholic condition lent itself to not only positive outcomes—such as inspiring creativity-- but also held adverse possibilities including predilections

¹⁶⁹ Van Mander, fol. 209v.

¹⁷⁰ Horn, I: 207. The name "Bamboccio" means "grotesque or ill-formed baby" and refers to the artist's hunchback.

¹⁷¹ Ton J. Broos, *Tussen Zwart en Ultramarijn: De levens van schilders beschreven door Jacob Campo Weyerman (1677-1747)* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodolphi, 1990) 160.

towards exhaustion, sorrow and idleness, which were often confounded with the deadly sin of sloth or acedia.¹⁷²

Where Renaissance artists fell prone to the melancholic humours of creative temperament already circulating within their bloodstream, Dutch artists appear to have been more susceptible to external influences that they themselves placed into their bodies, often cited as means to induce creativity. Prevalent in Dutch art literature of the seventeenth century is the image of the profligate artist, a non-conformist type, but one more touched by the bottle than by the divine.¹⁷³ Rudolf and Margot Wittkower, in their seminal text on the character of the artist from the antiquity through the eighteenth century, point to a seventeenth-century “pattern of prodigality in the low countries.”¹⁷⁴ The prodigal type of artist the Wittkowers describe shares several of the behaviors (propensity to drink, to wander, to behave raucously, to squander money) that could have been ascribed to a melancholic temperament in the sixteenth century, yet the seventeenth-century conception of the dissolute artist lacks the same sense of connection to the concepts of genius or melancholy. Rather, the

¹⁷² In the medieval era, the sin of Acedia referred to spiritual inactivity and the disregard of religious duties. [Siegfried Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth in Medieval Thought and Literature* (University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1967), 182-186.]

Gerlinde Lütke Notarp, “Jacques de Gheyn II’s *Man Resting in a Field*: An Essay on the Iconography of Melancholy,” *Simiolus* 24 (1996): 311. Notarp’s article describes how the Jacques de Gheyn II drawing *Man Resting in a Field* (ca. 1602-4, Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett) reflects an understanding of melancholy that combined classical concepts and medieval spiritual beliefs. It is an overwhelmingly negative presentation of melancholia—as both a spiritual and social failure---and de Gheyn’s inscription confirms this: “Almighty God gave me a melancholy nature, cold and dry like the earth, with blackened skin and a clumsy body; [I am] sullen, ugly, greedy and angry, childish, false, lazy and stupid; I have no honor and no respect for women; Saturn and autumn are at fault.” (quoted from Notarp, 316).

¹⁷⁴ Wittkower 1963, 215-221.

behaviors associated with prodigality were seen as negative traits, vices or even immoralities.

The prodigality of artists in seventeenth-century Holland was, however, the subject of real discussion among art theorists, playwrights, poets and even clergy. From the literature of art to moralizing poems and plays, the subject of artists and their socially and profligate tendencies was a popular theme. However, the theme was an undercurrent to the theoretical discourse that still clung to the inherited ideal of the artist as an educated gentleman. Philips Angel, for example, clucked his tongue ruefully at artists in the opening verses of his encomium on painting, telling the “liquor-loving tosspots” to put down the wine glasses and “devote your useful time to the service of painting.”¹⁷⁵ However, it is but a short, sharp warning in Angel’s long speech, the rest of which sings the glories of the profession.

The image of the dissolute artist in Dutch art and literature reveals artists were associated with their mortal shortcomings to a greater extent than with divine gifts as their Renaissance predecessors had been. The Renaissance melancholic artist, so overwhelmed with the workings of his mind that he became depressed, withdrawn and peculiar, was absent in much of the discourse of seventeenth-century literature concerning art. If there were vestiges of this condition in the image of the seventeenth-century Dutch artist, it manifest itself in destructive outward behaviors that, unlike the unique creative abilities that accompanied the melancholia, were largely disdained in Dutch culture. While there were strong arguments for the

¹⁷⁵ Angel-Hoyle, 230-1.

inspirational powers of both drinking and smoking, the profligate artist ultimately stood as a model of how not to behave, which is the subject of the following chapter.

One of the most interesting cases concerning the bounds of social conformity and Dutch artists is that of Johannes Symoonis van der Beeck (1589-1644), better known as Torrentius. As an artist, Torrentius was praised for his still lifes by such high sources as the secretary to the prince of Orange, Constantijn Huygens, and was singled out by Samuel Ampzing in his history of Haarlem. He was especially famed for his ability to create startlingly believable *trompe l'oeil* effects thought to have been created by use of the camera obscura.¹⁷⁶ But Torrentius was also a controversial figure and was publicly shamed and tormented for his unconventional behavior and beliefs.¹⁷⁷ As an artist, as well, Torrentius stirred up scandal after he was notoriously accused of pornography—for “bawdye [sic] pictures such as his friends saye [sic] he intended should never be seen...”¹⁷⁸ Only one painting from Torrentius’ survives

¹⁷⁶ Philip Steadman, *Vermeer’s Camera: Uncovering the Truth Behind the Masterpieces* (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 2002) 19-21. Torrentius was thought by many to have employed the camera obscura, though he feigned ignorance of it.

Also see A.J. Rehorst, *Torrentius* (W.L. & J. Brusse N.V.: Rotterdam, 1939) 203.

¹⁷⁷ Christopher Brown, “The Strange Case of Jan Torrentius,” in *Rembrandt, Rubens and the Art of Their Time: Recent Perspectives*. Eds. Ronald E. Fleischer and Susan C. Scott (1997), 227. Huygens had at least three well-known patrons including Isaac Massa, a trader whose portrait was painted by Frans Hals.

¹⁷⁸ From a list of works said to be in a friend of Torrentius’ house in Lisse, near Leiden, according to “State Papers” in the Public Record Office in London. This is quoted by A. Bredius, *Torrentius: Schilder, 1589-1644* (‘S-Gravenhage: Martinus-Nijhoff, 1909) 9. The “bawdy” subject matter is listed as follows: “One is an Adam and Eve, his flesshe [sic] very ruddy, theye [sic] show there [sic] syde [sic] faces./ The other is a woman pissing in a mans [sic] eare [sic]. The nest of those 3 is a young (woman) sitting somewhat [sic] odly [sic] with her hand under her legg [sic].” Steadman (19) summarizes Torrentius’ oeuvre as falling into the following categories: “...on the one hand rather poorly painted nudes and figure compositions, some pornographic or scatological in character, and on the other miraculously realistic and smoothly rendered miniature still lifes.”

Bredius notes that in the same group of papers is a letter (26 January 1628) from Lord Dorchester, British ambassador in The Hague to his nephew Lord Dudley Carleton who was a royal agent of

today as the rest of his oeuvre was publicly burned after being condemned as pornographic.

These accusations, in combination with Torrentius' outsider religious beliefs, provoked a public outcry. The artist was accused of every sort of cultural taboo, including immorality for having a young woman sit on his knees.¹⁷⁹ Later in the century, Houbraken held the artist's "exasperatingly lascivious life" up as a "mirror for revulsion."¹⁸⁰ While the precise nature of his religious position is still unknown, it was enough to cause a sensational fury in Calvinist Holland. Torrentius was tried by the municipal government of Haarlem, convicted and sentenced (barely escaping a death sentence) to twenty years imprisonment for his atheism, blasphemy and "shocking and harmful heresy."¹⁸¹

Though his outsider religious beliefs and colorful personality caused him to be ostracized, Torrentius' artistic ability did, in fact, save him from a life in prison. When envoys of Charles I keenly alerted the English king to Torrentius' lot, Charles intervened and helped the artist secure a pardon. While Charles and his ambassador in The Hague, Lord Dorchester, were prepared to overlook the "*scandale par lui commis contre l'honneur de la Religion,*" for the sake of "*la reputation qu'il a*

Charles I in United Provinces at the time of Torrentius' trial. Their interest in Torrentius' works brought the artist to the attention of Charles I and precipitated his pardon.

¹⁷⁹ See footnote 7.

¹⁸⁰ Houbraken, II: 121-122.

¹⁸¹ Even Theodorus Schrevelius wrote about the trial in his *Harlemias* (1645). Though historically, Torrentius' religious "crime" has been thought to be Rosicrucianism, Brown (227-8) asserts that the question of whether the artist was a Rosicrucian was "thoroughly muddled" by Rehorst, one of the major sources in the discussion of Torrentius. Brown argues that the words "Rosa Crucis" appear only once in the lengthy transcripts of the entire trial and "it may be that they were employed as a generic term for heretical belief."

d'exceller en la faculté de son art.” In his letter to Frederick Hendrick petitioning for Torrentius’ release, Charles wrote that he would keep the artist sufficiently contained for his offenses—“*dans les bornes du debvoir*”—yet moderately enough so that Torrentius would still be allowed to continue “*l’exercise de c’est Art.*”¹⁸²

Though Torrentius was released at the mercy of King Charles I, a similar sympathetic attitude toward Torrentius was not shared in the artist’s native country. The tale of Torrentius shows us that the cultural climate of mid-seventeenth-century Holland did not accommodate extreme deviant beliefs and behaviors, nor did they offer a measure of leeway or latitude to accommodate such a degree of eccentricity from the artist.¹⁸³ Torrentius was tried and convicted for his religious beliefs in Haarlem in 1628, which at the time was one of the largest artistic centers in the United Provinces and home to artists like Frans Hals, Molenaer, Leyster and Brouwer. While Torrentius’ story is certainly an extreme case of the unconventional lifestyle of an artist, it does illuminate the boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable limits of behavior and conduct afforded to artists.

¹⁸² Bredius (61) quotes the letter from Charles I to the Prince of Orange dated 30 May 1630. The letter continues: “

¹⁸³ Interestingly, Brown (228) writes that once Torrentius landed in England “we lose sight of him altogether.” There were few mentions of him in the literature, no evidence of works from this period, but a mention in Henry Walpole’s *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (1762-71) states that Torrentius gave so much “scandal” during his tenure in England that he returned to Amsterdam in the early 1640s. One has to wonder if perhaps an irony exists that Torrentius’ sensational reputation, which drew Charles to his attention, in the end became what repelled him from his service.

3. The New Artist: Gentleman of Renown

Renaissance Gentlemen

Two more conformist and outwardly public trends in the re-fashioning of artists in the Renaissance era and beyond were the elevation of artists' social and professional standing through deliberate associations with the most respected men from past and present. The most direct way for artists to align themselves with famous men or important histories was quite literal: they painted themselves in. The participant self-portrait, or artist's inclusion of his own likeness within a larger narrative, is sometimes referred to as a "crypto-portrait" due to its hidden nature, though this should not imply that artists did not wish to be seen.¹⁸⁴ Certainly, a driving impetus of self-portraiture was self-commemoration and fame, and thus the presence of the artist's own visage within a painted narrative acted as an additional "physical" signature.

It was a convention seen in Florence as early 1425 when Masaccio inserted his image into one of the frescoes he painted for the Brancacci Chapel and was utilized by other Italian Renaissance artists, including Sandro Botticelli (ca. 1445-1510), Domenico Ghirlandaio (1449-1494) and Fra Filippo Lippi (1406-1469).¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁴ Natasja Peeters, "Brothers in Art; Hieronymus and Frans Francken I and their Family: Portraits and Crypto-Portraits in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century," *Dutch Crossing* 23 (1999): 82. The term is also discussed in Campbell and John Pope-Hennessy, *The Portrait in the Renaissance* (New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1966).

¹⁸⁵ Brown, 117. Botticelli's self-portrait is included in the right edge of the *Adoration of the Magi* (after 1482, Uffizi, Florence); Ghirlandaio appears in two frescoes [the *Miracle of the Spini Child* (ca. 1483-6, Sassetti Chapel, Santa Trinità, Florence) and the *Expulsion of Joachim from the Temple* (ca. 1480-90, Capella Maggiore, Santa Maria Novella, Florence)]; Fra Filippo Lippi painted his self-portrait in the *Dormition, Assumption and Coronation of the Virgin* in the duomo of Spoleto Cathedral (1469).

The tradition was an extension of the devotional practice of depicting pious donors amid religious scenes or on the wings of an altarpiece.¹⁸⁶ Appearing amid a scene of religious importance assumed the artist's presence was important enough to have been requested to witness history or even participate in its unfolding. Bennozo Gozzoli, for example, not only assured his piety by placing himself at the scene of the rider back to Bethlehem in his *Journey of the Magi to Bethlehem* (Figure 27) but he happened to show himself (easily identified by the signature on his cap) riding back in some impressive company: with the procession of the Medici family's entourage.¹⁸⁷ Even Raphael painted himself in exquisite company. Vasari recognized the artist in a black cap in the right foreground of his *School of Athens*, rubbing elbows with the greatest philosophers, mathematicians, astronomers and poets from antiquity and conversing with Zoroaster and Ptolemy.¹⁸⁸

Artists used this particular format to showcase their talent, but occasionally their wit as well. One variation of the participant self-portrait was to cleverly "conceal" one's likeness within a work, such as Andrea Mantegna's visage that peers out from the decorative foliage on a pilaster in *Meeting Scene* (1465-74. Fresco in Camera dipinta, Palazzo Ducale, Mantua). Mantegna's conceit was intended as a jest, a *facetiae* for his patrons of the Gonzaga court. Mantegna was known for his wit, though apparently history did not get the joke, as: "From the approximate date of the painting to...the early 1970s, Mantegna's self-portrait in this site went unmentioned in the literature, that is, it was, for all practical, 'lost.'"

¹⁸⁶Katlijne van der Stighelen, "Das Porträt zwischen 1550 und 1650. Die Emanzipation eines Genres," in E. Mai and Hans Vlieghe, *Von Bruegel bis Rubens, Das goldene Jahrhundert der flämischen Malerei*. Exh. Cat. (Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Kunsthistorischen Museums: Cologne, Antwerp & Vienna, 1993) 171

¹⁸⁷ Brown, 117.

¹⁸⁸ Vasari, 313. Vasari describes Raphael's self-portrait in this work as having "a youthful head and a very modest appearance coupled with a pleasant and gentle grace..." Paul Barolsky ["Art History as Fiction," *Artibus et Historiae* 17 (1996) 11] questions many of the self-portraits said to appear in Raphael's work. Notably, Raphael salutes a contemporary legend—Michelangelo—in a widely accepted portrait of that artist as Heraclitus. Barolsky doubts this attribution, asking "how likely is it...that Raphael would himself have paid homage in this way to his hated rival at the Vatican?" Barolsky also disputes the claim of a self-portrait by Raphael "helping support the papal litter" in a fresco in a neighboring room, the *Expulsion of Heliodorus*. Also see Woods-Marden, 123.

Participant self-portraits, however, did not originate in the Renaissance. They existed in antiquity as we know thanks to Pliny, who in his *Natural History* mentions that antique painters' and sculptors' included self-portraits within narrative scenes. Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574), who likely contributed to the proliferation of this practice, enthusiastically identified these cameo appearances in his *Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors and Architects* (first published in 1550), pointing out ninety-two portraits and self-portraits of artists in his second edition.¹⁸⁹

The practice continued in the seventeenth century. Just about a year or two before he painted the Dresden self-portrait with Saskia (Figure 7), Rembrandt included his likeness in the biblical composition *The Raising of the Cross* (Figure 91) as the executioner positioned next to the cross. The work was one of five paintings of scenes from the Passion of Christ that were commissioned by Stadholder Frederick Hendrick.¹⁹⁰

Though earlier in his career, Rembrandt had included his likeness as a participant in larger history paintings, for the first time in *The Raising of the Cross* he was assuming a role other than passive bystander, here posing in the guise of a main character and an antagonist.¹⁹¹ But in addition, Rembrandt also posed as an artist: positioned in the exact center of the painting wearing, at the naked and crucified feet

¹⁸⁹ Woods-Marsden, 43.

¹⁹⁰ Chapman 1990, 109. It appears as if three of the five were commissioned by the Stadholder and two, including *The Raising of the Cross* were already in Frederick Hendrick's collection. It has also been suggested that Rembrandt incorporated his likeness into the pendant, *The Descent from the Cross*, though not in the same antagonistic role.

¹⁹¹ Rembrandt had included his likeness in *The Stoning of St. Stephen* (1625. Lyon, Musée des Beaux-Arts) and *Historical Scene* (1626. On loan to Stedelijk Museum 'de Lakenhal' from Rijksdienst Beeldende Kunst, The Hague).

of Christ, a painter's beret and antique garment with a low-cut neck and slashed sleeves.¹⁹² He has only partially assumed the role as executioner, though his body curls around the cross and heaves it upwards, he also turns to the viewer in sixteenth-century dress, identifying himself as both the executioner and the painting's executor. Rembrandt's role has also been interpreted as a spiritual statement, a confessional expression of the sinfulness of all men, with whom he shares a collective identity.¹⁹³

***Uomini Illustri* and the Role of Biographers**

To create visual parallels to classical heroes of the past, a number of artists from the fifteenth and mid-sixteenth centuries created commemorative cast bronze medals from the fifteenth and mid-sixteenth centuries including Alberti who used this medium for his profile self-portrait. Popularized by sculptor Leone Leoni (1509-1590), medals depicting likenesses of Gentile and Giovanni Bellini as well as Titian recall the profile pose reserved for heroes in antiquity and "show a conscious effort on the part of artists to emulate ancient coinage and circulate images of themselves for the perpetuation of their fame."¹⁹⁴ But the most prevalent means of summoning reflected fame was in the literary and visual references to illustrious men from the

¹⁹² Rembrandt is wearing sixteenth-century dress, which is a hallmark of his self-portraits and in one sense a manifestation of his respect for his Northern artistic forebears, whom he emulated and wished to be associated. Marieke de Winkel has written extensively on Rembrandt's dress, see de Winkel in *The Hague and London 1999* 67-72 and "Rembrandt's Clothes—Dress and Meaning in his Self-Portraits," in *Corpus* Vol. IV, 45-87, especially pages 68-9 for remarks on the beret (or bonnet) as it was known, and popularized by Rembrandt in the seventeenth century.

¹⁹³ Chapman 1990, 108-114. Also see Schama 1999, 293-4.

¹⁹⁴ Brown, 96-7. Brown notes that the medal was particularly appealing as an art form as it could circulate easily and be duplicated.

history, *uomini famosi*, as well in ties to the most respected gentlemen of their own era.

The artistic community in the Renaissance developed the tradition of grouping cycles of famous men, called *uomini famosi* or *uomini illustri*, to strengthen ties to a vaunted classical legacy. Such groupings were made in two ways: in both literary panegyrics by biographers and art theorists, and in painted cycles of artists' portraits (and later, self-portraits). With *De Viris Illustribus (On Famous Men)*, Petrarch (1304-1374) reinitiated for Renaissance culture "the notion of citing illustrious citizens for the glory they relinquished to a city (Rome, for example) in order to inspire imitation of their excellence in contemporary society."¹⁹⁵ Many Renaissance biographers adopted Petrarch's model of moralizing biographies of heroes to detail the lives and habits of illustrious contemporaries. For the most part, literary works of this type, like Filippo Villani's *Lives of Famous Florentines*, celebrated personalities from political and intellectual life, known as *uomini illustri* or *famosi*.¹⁹⁶

The status of the artistic profession was further elevated as artists were incorporated into the literary tradition of *uomini illustri*. Within the writings of Alberti and Ghiberti are early Renaissance examples of the encomium of artists, as both authors created special sections in their artistic treatises for accounts of the lives of the artists. By far the most influential Renaissance biographer of artists was Vasari,

¹⁹⁵ Christiane L. Joost-Gaugier, "The Early Beginnings of the Notion of 'Uomini Famosi' and 'De Viris Illustribus' in Greco-Roman Literary Tradition," *Artibus et Historiae* 3 (1982) 100. Petrarch included only historical contemporary in his study, as he was "grimly and sarcastically realistic in his evaluation of contemporary leaders." [Benjamin G. Kohl, "Petrarch's Prefaces to de Viris Illustribus" *History and Theory* 13 (1974): 136.]

¹⁹⁶ Filippo's work, which included the biography of Giotto, was a continuation of his father Giovanni's chronicles of the city of Florence begun in early fourteenth century.

a Tuscan painter and architect whose *Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors and Architects* centers on the “story of the triumph of Florentine art,” with each section “marked by a great Florentine: Giotto, Brunelleschi, and ultimately Michelangelo, the only living, active artist included in Vasari’s text.”¹⁹⁷

In these biographies, many of the strategies aimed at elevating the status of the artist crystallized. Vasari’s biographies emphasized the innate, divinely inspired talent of artists and their idiosyncratic personal histories, both aspects implying that the artist’s destiny was in large part a passive assumption of nature and divine destiny. However, Vasari also noted artists’ aspirations towards fame, which suggests artists were also driven and affected by their own worldly ambitions. For example, in his biography of Pietro Perugino (ca. 1450-1523), Vasari writes that a “powerful motivation is a thirst for glory and honour which that air generates in men of every profession and which will not permit men of bold spirit to remain equal, let alone lag behind those they judge to be men like themselves, even though they acknowledge them as their masters.” He adds that the quest for fame could also elicit less favorable qualities, as “this thirst often compels them to desire their own greatness to such an extent that, if they are not kind or wise by nature, they turn out to be malicious, ungrateful, and unappreciative of the benefits they received.”¹⁹⁸

Another means by which Renaissance writers helped confer fame to artists was by association with famous historical figures. Surprisingly, Vasari does this

¹⁹⁷ Lisa Pon, “Michelangelo’s Lives: Sixteenth-Century Books by Vasari, Condivi, and Others,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27 (1996): 1017. Actually, Pon notes that there was indeed one other living artist included—Benedotto da Rovezzano—who was blind.

¹⁹⁸ Vasari, 257-8.

relatively infrequently in his *Lives*, and it is perhaps most apparent in formal verses he quotes such as the epitaph of Andrea Mantegna (ca. 1431-1506) proclaiming the artist as “Apelles’ peer” or in the final lines of Leonardo’s story, quoting Giovanbatista Strozzi’s noble stanza that reads: “Alone [Leonardo] vanquished/ All others; he vanquished Phidias and Apelles,/and all their victorious band.”¹⁹⁹ Vasari also alluded to stories from famous artists in history; the well-known story of Giotto and his perfect “O”’s is a recasting of the tale of Apelles’ perfect lines first made famous by Pliny.²⁰⁰ Interestingly, the artist Vasari most deeply imbeds in a web of reflected fame was a woman, the Bolognese sculptor Properzia de’ Rossi (ca. 1490-1530). Vasari indulges in a brief history of illustrious women in all fields, from Hippolyta to Hortensia and Sappho to the Signora of letters of his time. He links Properzia not with simply artistic fame but rather a different history, measuring her fame among all outstanding women.²⁰¹

The second and more famous edition of Vasari (1568) contained 144 woodcuts after artists’ self-portraits. The likenesses were set within an oval architectural framework and surrounded by attributes and personifications symbolizing each artist’s specialty. Vasari’s illustrated edition helped to stimulate an interest in collections of artists’ portraits and self-portraits. His work, within the tradition of *uomini illustri* had a lasting impact on not only the status of artists in the

¹⁹⁹ Vasari, 248; 298.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 22-23. In quoting the story from Pliny, Vasari was also consciously placing himself within the classical tradition of artistic encomium.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 339-344. Vasari manages to include a brief biography of another woman artist in Properzia’s story. Near the end of the chapter, Vasari discusses the life and skill of Sophonisba Anguissola (1532-1625).

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but also in shaping the artist's public persona. Collectors literally built on Vasari's idea, giving depth and physical shape to the idea of the famed artist with elaborate collections of artists' portraits

In the early sixteenth century, painted and engraved galleries of illustrious faces were the visual equivalent of Petrarch's literary form, and primary among them was Paolo Giovio's (1483-1552) portrait collection, which was "the prime mover in the sixteenth century cult of *uomini illustri*."²⁰² Giovio, a humanist, philosophy professor, the Bishop of Nocera and a friend of Vasari, was one of the motivating forces behind the inception of Vasari's *Lives*. He was also the first individual to amass a large-scale collection of portraits of famous men, a crucial step in the dissemination of images of famous individuals, which would help establish a pattern of collecting that included artists' self-portraits in both the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He may have been inspired by two earlier, smaller collections of images of *uomini illustri*: one, a series of famous men and women painted by Justus of Ghent (1430-1476) for Federico da Montefelto, Duke of Urbino, or another, the ca. 1450 group of *uomini illustri* by Andrea Castagno (ca. 1421-1457) for the Villa Carducci at Legnaia near Florence.²⁰³

Giovio's amassed collection of 400 works was installed in his *Musaeum*, a villa he built on the shore of Lake Como, and was visited by admirers and copyists seeking to duplicate his efforts.²⁰⁴ The collection of contemporary *uomini illustri*

²⁰² Barnes, 81.

²⁰³ Brown, 40. Castagno's fresco series portrayed full-length likenesses of nine famous men and women, contemporary and historical, including military figures, philosophers, poets and politicians.

²⁰⁴ Giovio moved to Florence in 1534 and added about a hundred more portraits to his collection during his lifetime.

consisted of two large groups of portraits of statesmen and generals, as well as a few portraits of poets and philosophers and smaller groups in which a few artists appear. Giovio included a short biographical description with each portrait, though he had intended a greater literary accompaniment to the images. He intended volumes of eulogies to his heroes to be published with prints made after the portraits.²⁰⁵ Though this project was never realized, Giovio probably suggested the same idea to Vasari, who in turn added illustrations to the second edition of the *Lives*.

Though Giovio's portrait collection contained a small number of artists' portraits, it established another means of offering artists an entrée into "the web of individuals to whom one was, or wished to be, linked."²⁰⁶ It also made credible and tangible the artist's presence in the pantheon of famous individuals in history and contemporary life. Giovio's collection and Vasari's imbedded portraits created templates for other collectors to emulate and opened the door for collections of portraits of artists and their self-portraits to emerge.

Vasari, for instance, had a hand in the formulation of the plan for the Accademia del Disegno in Florence and intended to incorporate artists' portraits into the design. Though this project was not fully realized, Vasari had recommended that the walls of the grand assembly hall be covered with images of Tuscany's most

²⁰⁵ Lisa Klinger, *The Portrait Collection of Paolo Giovio*, (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1991) 202 Giovio did publish a volume celebrating famous poets and philosophers in 1546 (*Elogia vens clarorum virorum imaginibus apposite quae in Musaeo comi spectantur*, Venice) and another (*Elogia virorum bellica virtute illustrium supposita quae apud Musaeum spectantur*, Florence, 1551) honoring great warriors, though neither contained accompanying portraits with the text. The volumes were quite popular, with thirty-two editions appearing within fifty years and translations in French, German and Italian. The books were "the primary means by which knowledge of the collection was disseminated."

²⁰⁶ *Ibid*, 107.

famous artists. The first president of the Accademia di San Luca in Rome, Federico Zuccari (1540/1-1609), did incorporate artists' likenesses into the plan for the interior of the building. Zuccari, who established the artists' academy not as craftsman's guild but as an "institution that would foster and defend the intellectual foundations and the nobility of painting," first donated his own self-portrait to hang on the academy's walls, supplemented by copies of self-portraits by other famous artists.²⁰⁷ Eventually, portraits and self-portraits of all the academy members graced the walls.

Collections of portraits of *uomini illustri* appeared in great number in the next century, the grandest of which was Cardinal Leopoldo de' Medici's (1617-1675) enormous group of paintings (700), including eighty artists' self-portraits. The self-portrait collection, amassed between 1664 and 1675, was the Cardinal's pride. Leopoldo directly commissioned some of the paintings, including self-portraits by Guercino (1591-1666) and Pietro da Cortona (1596-1669). Forming the basis of the collection, a number of the works of the most famous artists of the Renaissance including Michelangelo, Brunelleschi, Alberti, Titian, Leonardo and Dürer were already in place at the Palazzo Vecchio, part of the collection of *uomini illustri* put together by Cosimo I de' Medici (1519-1574) at the urging of Vasari.²⁰⁸

Leopoldo's collection of self-portraits was enlarged to epic proportions under the hands of his nephew Cosimo III de' Medici (1642-1723) who inherited the works. Cosimo, the grand duke of Tuscany since 1670, created an emphasis on artists' portraits the artists within the larger collection of portraits of *uomini illustri*. Cosimo

²⁰⁷ Barnes, 87. Also see Manuth, 42.

²⁰⁸ Brown, 40.

built a new room (started in 1682, completed 1709), the Galleria degli autoritratti, (Figure 28) in the west wing of the Uffizi to house the self-portraits and enlisted the help of Filippo Baldinucci (1625-1696) to create the first comprehensive inventory of artists' self-portraits.

So sought after was Cosimo's collection that one envious royal resorted to trickery to stay abreast of the grand duke's tastes. In the late seventeenth century the heir to the Prince-bishop of Salzburg, Leopold Anton (died 1744), formally requested to make copies of the portraits in Cosimo III's Galleria degli autoritratti and was denied. Intent and determined to have the duplicate self-portraits, Leopold boldly sent a team of copyists to paint the works in secret, eventually smuggling off with ninety copies before being discovered. Leopold did eventually outsource his rivals: by 1783, his nephew and heir inherited the largest group of paintings in northern Europe based at the Schloss Leopoldskron outside of Salzburg. The collection held a group of 248 portraits by 240 different artists and a gallery dedicated to artists' portraits, including 304 of the most famous artists from past and present, trumping Cosimo in that category.²⁰⁹

The painted persona of choice among self-portraits in collections of *uomini illustri* was that of the elegant gentleman. In contrast to the topos of the melancholic, introspective artist, the artist's adoption of the role of gentleman represented a very public face that embraced, rather than eschewed, social conformity. Artists most

²⁰⁹ Manuth, 50. The request to copy the works was made as early as 1690 (Manuth cites S. Meloni Truklja, "La collezione Pazzi (autoritratti per gli Uffizi): Un'operazione sospetta, un documento malevolo." *Paragone* 29 (1978): 254, no. 1647/1). The collection of Laktanz, Count Firmian (1712-1783), the nephew and heir to Leopold's paintings, was known for the variety of schools it represented. Dutch artists were particularly visible with works from Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Goltzius Brouwer, Gerrit Honthorst and Rembrandt. The collection remained intact until 1822.

often portrayed themselves seated, within an interior, thus distancing themselves from the slightest hint of the physical or manual aspects of their profession. The tradition continued in the Netherlands in the seventeenth-century, as with Michiel van Musscher (1645-1705) (Figure 29), who depicted himself sober and dignified, dressed in the somber, formal colors of a gentleman's attire, with a sample of his talent painted within the picture, in this instances a cameo.

In her study of Renaissance self-portraiture, Joanna Woods-Marsden sees the rise of the self-portraiture in part as “visual witness to [the artist's] struggle for social acceptance.” She argues that before the later sixteenth-century artists suppressed “visual evidence of professional identity,” eschewing practical props like easels and palettes in their self-portraits and “taking on such ennobling signs of elevated rank as swords, gloves, fine clothes and architectural elements.”²¹⁰

In descriptions about details of scale and composition of self-portraits collections, we find evidence that patrons preferred a homogenous appearance to them. In his self-portrait collection, Cosimo III subjected each work to actual physical manipulation: paintings were reduced to a standard size and their frames were also edited to create a sense of uniformity. But more importantly, actual compositions were changed, in some cases adding extra bits of artists' bodies and in “some of the smaller pictures that portrayed only the head, shoulders or hands holding a palette

²¹⁰Woods-Marsden,5. By the mid-seventeenth century in France, an artist's “tools of the trade” were actually a mark of status. Manuth (42) discusses the academic *portrait d'apparat*—“an elaborately staged, imposing image, with various props and details serving to underline the sitter's distinguished status”—something candidates for the Académie Royale de la Peinture et Sculpture (founded 1648) required for admission. He writes: “Academic painters adopted tis form, originally reserved for the nobility, but including the tools of their profession. Hence, their portraits became an expression of their own ‘noble’ status and the importance of art: the artist as aristocrat.”

were added.”²¹¹ For paintings Cosimo commissioned or wished to add to his collection, he proscribed the dimensions of the work and the type of portrait he desired from the artist. Despite what appear to be rigid qualifications, Cosimo was indeed interested in not only the artist’s likeness, but also personality. Therefore he requested that artists use a common device of self-portraiture, creating a painting within a painting depicting the genre of their specialty.²¹²

Becoming a Gentleman

This more outward and genteel incarnation of the Renaissance artist was fostered both in literature and in practice: Rudolf and Margot Wittkower make a connection between the rise of artists’ academies as professional institutions in the mid-sixteenth century and the role of the artist as gentleman.²¹³ Alberti (echoing Pliny) was the first to promulgate the idea of the gentleman artist in his *della Pittura*, but it was Baldassare Castiglione’s (1478-1529) *Il Cortegiano*, or *The Book of the Courtier* (published 1528 in Venice) that circulated the ideal throughout Europe.

²¹¹ Brown, 43-44.

²¹² Langedijk, xviii.

The collecting of artists’ portraits in both galleries and in print continued into the next century. In northern Europe, Charles Perrault (1628-1793) included a number of French painters in *Les homes illustres qui ont paru en France pendant ce Siècle* (Paris, 1696-1700), which followed in the tradition of *uomini illustri*. Samuel Pepsys (1633-1703) collected 118 portraits of painters, sculptors and architects in his print collection that totaled 1800 images of the “world and its most important protagonists.” (Manuth, 51-2)

In southern Europe, Ottavio Leoni (ca. 1578-1630) and Giovanni Battista Marino (1569-1625) both featured artist’s portraits prominently in their printed series of *virtuosi*.

²¹³ Wittkower 1963, 95.

Castiglione wrote his influential fictionalized view of court life during his service as a diplomat to two dukes of Urbino, Guidobaldo Montefeltro and his successor Francesco Maria della Rovere.

In a series of imaginary discourses between members of the court of Urbino, Castiglione formulated a model of an ideal courtier that possessed “eloquent speech, elegant demeanor, ready wit, scholarly attainment, and political acumen.”²¹⁴ He conceived of the courtier as operating much like an actor, staging his behavior to suit the situation and company at hand. A unique quality, special to the courtier was *sprezzatura*, a graceful carelessness (the contemporary equivalent would be “cool”), which would help convey a sense of noble confidence and perhaps disguise any overt wrinkles in the public façade or bearing of the courtier-in-training. The unstudied nonchalance of *sprezzatura* was notably ironic, almost riddle-like:

It will vanish if a man takes too much pains to attain it, or if he shows any effort in his actions. Nothing but complete ease can produce it. And the only effort which should be expended in attaining it is an effort to conceal the skill on which it is based; and it is from *sprezzatura*...that grace springs.²¹⁵

Castiglione’s *Courtier* contains only a few pages specifically addressing art, yet it was tremendously influential as a model of manners for artists to emulate. His advice to “take great care to make a good impression” was a precept that artists followed in the formation of their public personae in self-portraits.²¹⁶ For the most part, Castiglione’s artistic dialogue centered on a discussion of the *paragone*, and was

²¹⁴ Woods-Marsden, 15. Castiglione’s theatrical self-fashioning was aided by technique used by performers to control one’s behavior known as *sprezzatura*.

²¹⁵ Blunt 97-8.

²¹⁶ Castiglione, 111.

a key disseminator of the “main points of the ritual disputation” of the comparative merits of the arts in the sixteenth century.²¹⁷ The parallels between Castiglione’s courtier and the station of Renaissance artists were vital. Each were strategically aspiring to a station beyond their own, and as such, Castiglione’s ideas about manners, decorum and social positioning apply just as easily to the ambitious courtier as to the Renaissance artist. Vasari, for one, transferred the author’s concepts to aesthetic concerns. In particular, Vasari was influenced by Castiglione’s concept of *sprezzatura*, and was the first to apply this “cultivated aestheticism” as a concept of grace to painting and the artist, as he does in his biography of Uccello:

There is no doubt that anyone who does violence to his nature with fanatical study may well sharpen one corner of his mind, but nothing that he creates will ever appear to have been done with the natural ease and grace of those who place each brush-stroke in its proper place and, with moderation, considerable intelligence, and good judgement [sic], avoid certain subtleties which soon encumber their works with an overworked, difficult, arid, and ill-conceived style which more readily moves those who observe them to compassion than to wonder.²¹⁸

The Book of the Courtier was an influential voice of the *paragone* and an important model of self-fashioning, one that viewed the “formation of self as an artful, conscious process.”²¹⁹ Castiglione relied heavily on precedents found in classical literature to shape his view and esteem for art’s role in society. Importantly, the book made clear that art was a suitably elevated topic for discussion for refined gentlemen as well as respectable leisure activity—one passage even suggests that the

²¹⁷ Klein and Zerner, 17.

²¹⁸ Vasari, 74.

²¹⁹ Chapman 1990, 73.

courtier should know how to draw.²²⁰ By the middle of the sixteenth century, Castiglione's ideas found refrain in the writings of Benedetto Varchi, Paolo Pino and Lodovico Dolce.²²¹ Even well into the seventeenth century, Castiglione was cited as a principal authority on the praise of painting in Jan de Brune de Jonge's (1616/18-1649) preface to the 1641 Dutch translation of Junius' *De pictura veterum*. Junius in turn, stressed the concept of *sprezzatura*, which he voiced as ease or "facilitie."²²²

Castiglione was a great friend of the artist Raphael, who painted the author around 1515 (Figure 30). The portrait gained fame as the personification of a gentlemanly ideal, "a fusion of the ideal and the natural."²²³ In it, Castiglione wears the same "grave and sober" colors of dress and sophisticated style proscribed in his book.²²⁴ Castiglione's posture conveys an air of serene dignity, yet his direct gaze speaks to the sense of intimacy between artist and author. The pose, the portrait and the notion of art as a cultivated gentleman's domain as conveyed in both literary and visual form impacted the canons of portraiture and self-portraiture throughout Europe and well into the seventeenth-century.

²²⁰ Martindale, 103.

²²¹ Susan J. Barnes, "The *Uomini Illustri*, Humanist Culture, and the Development of a Portrait Tradition in Early Seventeenth-Century Italy," *Studies in the History of Art (Cultural Differentiation and Cultural Identity in the Visual Arts)*, eds. Susan J. Barnes and Walter S. Melion) 27 (1989): 86. Varchi, Pino and Dolce all wrote and spoke publicly about art in the mid-Cinquecento.

²²² Junius-Fehl, I:xxxiv-xxxv; see footnote 23. See I: 383 for the concept of grace in Junius.

²²³ Lynn M. Loudon, "Sprezzatura in Raphael and Castiglione," *Art Journal* 28 (1968): 49.

²²⁴ Baldassare Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier* Trans. Leonard Eckstein Opydycke (Mineola: Dover, 2003), 101. Castiglione felt that reserved colors of dress conveyed a sense of noble gravitas that reflected positively on the character of those who wore it: "I always like them to tend a little towards the grave and sober rather than the gay. Thus I think black is more suitable for garments than any other colour is; and if it is not black, let it at least be somewhat dark...I would have our Courtier's dress display that sobriety which the Spanish nation greatly affect, for things external often bear witness to the things within."

Rembrandt, for one, was so impressed by Raphael's portrait when he saw the work at auction in Amsterdam in 1639 that he made a sketch of it including a special note of the high price it fetched, the only known instance in which he recorded the sale of a work by another artist (Figure 31).²²⁵ It also may have served as inspiration, along with Titian's *Portrait of a Man* (Figure 32) for his *Self-Portrait at the Age of 34* (Figure 33) in which the artist paints himself as the epitome of confident sophistication. Framed by an elegant pool of darkness formed by his clothes, luxurious fur trailing the line of his collar, Rembrandt's dignified pose conveys both a sense of gravitas and an air of refinement. Moreover, his self-possessed and slightly down-turned gaze suggests the ennobled attitude of the *Courtier*, its potent influence evident even though the work had yet to be translated into Dutch.²²⁶

²²⁵ Chapman 1990, 72-3. Chapman notes the visual discrepancies between Rembrandt's sketch and Raphael's portrait, most notably being the shape of the hat, raising of the brow and thickening of the face, contribute to the notion that Rembrandt drawing was done not at the sale, but later, from memory. Chapman suggests that Rembrandt "copied the *Castiglione* not only to record its sale but also because he saw it as an idea for a self-portrait (73)."

Also see *Rembrandt: A Genius and His Impact*. Exh. Cat. Ed., Albert Blankert (Melbourne: National Gallery of Victoria, 1997), 127. Rembrandt saw Raphael's portrait on 9 April 1639 at the auction of the Lucas van Uffelen collection where it was purchased by the collector and agent of Cardinal Richelieu stationed in Amsterdam Alphonso Lopez (1572-1649). The painting sold for the high price of 3,500 guilders. Rembrandt must have been also impressed by the high price of the entire sale, as he noted that figure (59, 456 guilders) on his sketch as well, the entire inscription reads: "The count/Baldassare Castiglione/by Raphael sold/for 3500 guilders the entire estate for Luke van Nuffelen/fetched f 59456.- . Anno 1639." (Strauss and van der Meulen, 1639). Rembrandt's strong impression of the work is furthered by the idea that he may have sketched the copy of Raphael's portrait. Interestingly, the losing bidder on the work was the German artist and classicist author Joachim von Sandrart (1608-1688) at 3,400 guilders.

²²⁶ Chapman 1990, 75-6. Rembrandt also saw Titian's *Portrait of a Man* in the Lopez collection in Amsterdam. In the seventeenth century, Titian's work was thought to represent the Renaissance poet Ludovico Ariosto (1474-1533). Chapman notes that Ariosto was even more well known than Castiglione in the Dutch Republic at the time, as his *Orlando Furioso* was translated into Dutch in 1615. Additionally, Van Mander had quoted from it several times and made special mention of the relationship between Ariosto and Titian. Castiglione's book, though not translated into Dutch until 1662 (this edition was dedicated to Jan Six), was well-known in the Netherlands. Chapman notes that the engraving by Renier van Persijn of Raphael's portrait, made around the same time Rembrandt made his sketch, is accompanied by verses suggesting the fame of Castiglione's work was part of the Dutch consciousness. The resulting 1640 self-portrait by Rembrandt incorporates elements from both

Castiglione was among the first voices to address the topic of the *paragone*, a theoretical debate over the relative merits of different arts that arose in the Italian Renaissance that contributed to the elevation of the status of the artist as well as the artist's image as a sophisticated virtuoso. Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), for one, was a vocal contributor in the theoretical discussion regarding the comparison of painting to poetry, as was famously characterized by Horace's idiom "*ut pictura poesis*." The concept proved to be persistent refrain beyond the Renaissance, as it appears in both Italian and Dutch art theory from the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries. Alberti was the first to revive and reinvent the idea of the mirror-like relationship of the "sister arts" again in the early Renaissance, when the similarity of the mechanical art of painting to the liberal art of poetry added fuel to the movement to elevate the visual arts to an intellectual and "noble rank."²²⁷ Among the tenets accompanying this theory of art was the idea that painting, like poetry, should "instruct as well as teach," a notion that presumed the painter was an accomplished and learned individual.²²⁸

In *Trattato della Pittura*, Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) enters into the *paragone* debate by making the practice of painting sound compellingly regal. "The

Raphael's and Titian's portraits, and notably a pentimento shows the collar was changed to be turned up resembling the portrait of Castiglione (see Melbourne 1997, 127). Also see E. de Jongh, "The Spur of Wit: Rembrandt's Response to an Italian Challenge," *Delta* 12 (1969): 49-67.

²²⁷ Rensselaer W. Lee, "Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting" *Art Bulletin* 22 (1940) 199-201. Lee points out that the Renaissance and Baroque conception of *ut pictura poesis* was theoretically distant from the concepts voiced by Horace in *Ars poetica* and Aristotle in *Poetics*. While the two classical authors had made a few statements regarding the similarities one experienced viewing painting and poetry, later writers instead usurped antique theories of poetry "making them apply in a more or less Procrustean manner to the art of painting for which they were never intended." (201)

²²⁸ *ibid*, 197-296. Lee cites imitation, invention and expression as the three central means in which painting was believed to imitate the practice, structure and experience of poetry.

well-dressed painter,” he purports, “sits at great ease in front of his work” while contemplating the many technical aspects of his composition like volume, outline and motion. Additionally, the painter’s home “is full of fine paintings and is clean and often filled with music, or the sound of beautiful works being read...” The foil to Leonardo’s gentleman-painter is the sculptor, who is an easy target based on the sheer challenges of housekeeping alone! The sculptor toils in a hammer-driven, noisy house “filled with chips and the dust of stones” and yet has “fewer (scientific or technical) matters to consider” than the painter, so consequently must be much less fatigued.²²⁹ Leonardo emphasized the contrasting physicality of the two visual arts by highlighting the mechanical (and arduous) nature of sculpture and the physically effortless, intellectual character of painting. In doing so, he further equated the painter’s profession and lifestyle to that of a gentlemanly realm, but did so at the expense of the art of the sculptor.

The Famed, Gentleman Artist in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art

Similar themes and anecdotes surrounding the discussion of the *paragone* appear often in the Dutch artistic literature. The gentle character and “cleanliness” of painting factored into a romantic triangle described by Van Mander. He tells the anecdote of Quentin Metys (1465/6-1530) who gave up his trade as a blacksmith to become a painter to win the affections of a girl, as she “was not pleased by his dirty

²²⁹ Leonardo da Vinci, *Leonardo on Painting: an Anthology of Writings by Leonardo da Vinci with a Selection of Documents Relating to his Career as an Artist* Ed. Martin Kemp (New Haven and London: Yale, 1989) 38-46, especially p. 39.

trade.”²³⁰ Van Mander mentions that Lampsonius recounted the story as well in a poem under Metsys’ engraved portrait.²³¹ Neither author mentions if in fact Metsys won the girl, but each implies the superiority of the art of painting for which Metsys laid down his hammer and anvil.

The poet Jacob Cats tells an almost identical story in his *Trou-ringh (Wedding Ring)* of 1637 in the story of Rhodope, “*De beschryving van de op-komste van Rhodopis*” (“Description of the Rise of Rhodope”). Instead of just two suitors, the beautiful Rhodope was wooed by no less than a poet, a painter, a military officer, a counselor, a merchant and an embroiderer! Despite Cats’ lengthy descriptions of the virtues of each profession, in the end, he shows how the painter is superior to them all, narrowly nosing out the poet because of both the physically permanent and tangible effects of his art, “for more than just delight, it brings profit in its train.” For, much to the dismay of poets everywhere, “one cannot keep a courtly maid, nor yet a comely woman/From honor or from praise, nor yet from poetry.”²³²

²³⁰ Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, 215v. Van Mander writes that Metsys’ romantic rival for the affections of the girl was a painter.

²³¹ *Ibid*, 215v.

The poem reads:
“Quintijn Messijs, painter from Antwerp speaks:
A rough Cyclopean smith I was before,
But when a painter fervently courted my sweetheart,
And that clever girl reproachfully let me know that
She rejected the fierce thunderclaps on the anvil
Far more than the silent action of the brushes,
The power of love made me soon become a painter.
That this is true is indicated by a small anvil,
A select trademark on my paintings.
Just as formerly Cypris obtained the weapons
From Mulciber for you, her son, the greatest poet—
So too you made a clever painter from a rugged smith.”

²³² Angel-Hoyle, 240. Also see Eric Jan Sluijter, *Seductress of Sight: Studies in Dutch Art of the Golden Age* (Waanders: Zwolle, 2000), 213-214. Cats tells the tale in *Proef-steen van den trou-ringh*

Cats' story figured prominently in art lover and painter Philips Angel's classicist encomium, "Praise of Painting," which was delivered as a speech in Leiden in 1641 to promote the dignity of the profession and the need for a local St. Luke's guild. Angel reproduced the lengthy verse from Cats in the middle of his speech to highlight how "painting is of far greater profit and use than poetry for sustaining the body." As the title would suggest, Angel's speech was designed to celebrate the art of painting, and his lengthy discussion unabashedly promoted it above all others as a vastly superior art, historically and intellectually. Angel's words were echoed in the writings of Cornelis de Bie as well. In his 1661 *Het Gulden Cabinet van de Edel Vry Schilderconst*, De Bie writes of two separate "competitions": one, a debate between Pictura and Sculptura and another a contest between Pictura and Pallas, in which the gods who are judging rule firmly in favor of Pictura."²³³

Angel, like Cats, mentioned the material rewards of painting, an aspect of the profession that was frequently flaunted in the Dutch Golden Age. In the seventeenth-century, an artist's desire to attain both fame and wealth was not just accepted, but encouraged. In his biography of Antonis Mor (ca.1517/20-1576/7), Van Mander wrote "it is generally for two reasons that people feel urged to follow an artistic

in *Alle de werken*. For a discussion of the importance of the story in the debate over the *paragone* in seventeenth-century Dutch art literature, see Eric Jan Sluijter, "Didactic and Disguised Meanings? Several Seventeenth-Century Texts of Painting and the Iconological Approach to Northern Dutch Paintings of this Period," in *Art in History, History in Art: Studies in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Culture* Eds. David Freedberg and Jan de Vries (Getty Center for the History of Art and Humanities: Santa Monica, 1991) 175-207, and especially pages 177-179. Sluijter mentions (196, note 13) that the original story has its roots in the work of second-century Greek military writer Aelianus.

²³³ Cornelis de Bie, *Het gulden cabinet van de edel vry schilderconst* (Davaco: Soest, 1971) 22-23 and 467-472. In the preface to the contemporary edition, G. Lemmens writes (13) that in the contest between Pictura and Pallas "there painting, silent poetry, wins because it can represent more on a flat surface than sculpture in three-dimensions." But, in the debate between Pictura and Sculptura, "de Bie had lost some of his earlier assurance, and now he find something to say for both sides, leaving the issue unresolved in the end."

career: One is for the sake of honor; the other for the sake of profit.”²³⁴ However, it was possible to achieve both simultaneously: Van Mander mentioned the reward of the gold chain bestowed by rulers upon several artists as a literal shining example of “the greatest favour and honour.”²³⁵ Apparently, the notion that art was an endeavor geared for profit was even commonly known among the general public, as the concept circulated in the Dutch saying “art is about bread.”²³⁶

The desire for financial success was regarded as admirable and went hand-in-hand with the notion of the gentleman painter. It also underscored the idea of the artist as a respectable professional, with enough outward signs of success to be respected, if not envied. A few pages of Angel’s *Praise of Painting* are devoted to examples of the great goods and monies artists received for their works—and Angel lists some mouthwateringly tangible rewards. In addition to examples from antiquity, Angel reveals that Francisco Monsignor received a farm with 200 acres from the Marquis de Mantua, Rosso Fiorentino (1494-1540) got an additional 400 gold crowns

²³⁴ Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, Fol. 230v.

In his biography of Goltzius, Van Mander also remarks upon restraint rather than financial ambition and notes that the artist has “‘Honour above Gold’ as his motto, an in practice he shows plentifully that he strives not so much for money as for honour; adopting modesty rather than opulence...” (fol. 286r, 286v.)

²³⁵ Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, Fol. 273v. Van Mander mentions the both Bartholomeus Spranger (1546-1611) and Antonis Mor receiving gold chains.

Other authors, like Samuel van Hoogstraten, saw the gold chain as more than a monetary honor, but a link to the “victory” of painters of the past. Celeste Brusati, *Artifice and Illusion: The Art and Writing of Samuel van Hoogstraten* (University of Chicago: Chicago and London, 1995) 147-9.

²³⁶ Pieter Jacob Harrebomée, *Spreekwoordenboek der nederlandsche taal, of Verzameling van nederlandsche spreekwoorden en spreekwoordelijke uitdrukkingen von vroegeren en lateren tijd* 3 vols. (Utrecht: Kemink en zoon, 1858-70) I: 94.

beyond his wages from the Francis I of France, and Dou received 500 guilders each year, just so an eager patron could have the right to choose first from his works.²³⁷

It has been posited that Dutch painters “were generally thought to have come from the lower social classes,” and that based on the status of the professions of their fathers, artists’ backgrounds were “solidly middle class.”²³⁸ While few artists became rich from painting, John Michael Montias, in his study on the economic life of seventeenth-century Delft artists, estimated that an artist’s average net earnings would have been substantially higher than other craftsmen.²³⁹ The exception—and subsequent shining example—to the rule was always Rubens, who had Tacitus read to him as he painted.²⁴⁰ His great wealth, gentlemanly bearing and noble status made him the model for artistic success in the eyes of many a biographer. Houbraken, in fact, may have harbored a slice of jealousy towards what he saw as Rubens’ ostentation. He recounts the artist’s lifestyle with the literary equivalent of a tightly clenched jaw:

He built for a house for himself in Antwerp that must have cost him sixty thousand guilders, and in it a room along the lines of the *Rotonde* [the Pantheon] in Rome...He hung this room with Italian, French and Dutch Masterpieces, and among these some by his own hand, which Cabinet was renowned everywhere, so that the Duke of *Buckingham*, who also wanted to decorate his palace with Art, ordered Mister Michiel le Blon, lover and good connoisseur of Art, to buy 60000 guilders

²³⁷ Angel-Hoyle, 238.

²³⁸ Michael North, *Art and Commerce in the Dutch Golden Age* Trans. Catherine Hill (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1997) 63.

²³⁹ John Michael Montias, *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1982).

²⁴⁰ Emile Michel, *Rubens: His Life, His Work, and His Time*. 2 vols. Trans. Elizabeth Lee (London & New York: W. Heinemann & C. Scribner's Sons, 1899) I: 6-7. Michel tells of the Danish physician Otto Sperling’s visit to Rubens’ studio in 1621 who was taken aback to find Rubens not only working at his easel, listening to Tacitus, but simultaneously dictating a letter. Sperling noted that Rubens even graciously spoke to his visitor at the same time, “as if to give us a proof of his extra-ordinary powers.”

worth of Art from there, which happened. Which certainly made *RUBBENS* feel good, *as his knife*, as the saying goes, *cut both ways*, and he knew the road to making money on all sides. Thus he piled up an enormous treasure; and the whole world had to know...²⁴¹

In addition to their discussion of the *paragone* and the admirable, honorable and tangible merits of the life of the painter, authors (including both De Bie and Angel) also expounded on notions of artistic fame and noble character and bearing of artists both of which were crucial themes that Dutch artists embraced in their self-portraits throughout the seventeenth century. Vasari's *Lives* proved to be a model for what was the standard for other biographers of artists to follow, including the "Dutch Vasari," Karel van Mander, in his *Schilder-Boeck* of 1604. Though not content to follow southern footsteps from the previous century, Van Mander laid claim to a greater lineage. His intent was to show that "it is the Netherlanders, not the Italians, who recover the pursuits of Greek and Roman art."²⁴² Van Mander, unlike Vasari, made frequent allusions between artists and the legendary artists of antiquity. With each reference to a famous ancient name or story he drops into the tale of a contemporary Dutch artist—Parrhasius into Hans Vredeman de Vries (1527-after 1604), Apelles into Goltzius, Protogenes into Maerten van Heemskerk (1498-1574)-- Van Mander strengthens not just the credibility of Dutch artists and their techniques, but also allots them a share of the respect and fame of the ancients.²⁴³

²⁴¹ Houbraken, I: 71-72; translation Horn, I: 374.

²⁴² Melion, 25.

²⁴³ Melion, 25-37; Van Mander, fol. 247r. By the seventeenth century, the use of the name Apelles was practically a synonym for successful artist.

Franciscus Junius was by far the greatest contributor to the classical dialogue of the seventeenth century. His *De pictura veterum libri tres* (1637, Amsterdam) chronicled the painting of ancient artists and stood as a comprehensive reference of the artists of antiquity and the literary sources of classical art.²⁴⁴ First dedicated to Charles I, Junius' tome is divided into three books including one consisting of classical texts with commentary and another with quotations from the lives of ancient artists. The text was conceived of as a compendium with the *Catalogus*, a dictionary of artists in antiquity.²⁴⁵ Both works were very influential with the *Catalogus* remaining as a primary source of information on ancient art through the mid-eighteenth century.²⁴⁶ Rubens wrote an expressive letter to Junius in Latin (that appeared as a testimonial in a later edition) calling Junius' book an "immense treasure" and stating that artists can now truly respond to the *exempla* of the artists of antiquity. The only thing Rubens would have wished differently from Junius was a similar book on the paintings of the Italians.²⁴⁷

De Bie also emphasized the artistic pantheon in his writing with abundant references to painters of antiquity as models for the painters of his day, particularly the patronage relationship between Apelles and Alexander. He especially noted the

²⁴⁴ *De pictura veterum* was first published in Latin. Junius published a revised edition in an English translation in 1638 and another edition with more revisions in Dutch translation in 1641.

²⁴⁵ The work was not published until 1694, fourteen years after his death.

²⁴⁶ Junius' work was overshadowed by Johann Winckelmann's *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (Dresden, 1764).

²⁴⁷ Philipp P. Fehl, "Touchstones of Art and Art Criticism: Rubens and the Work of Franciscus Junius," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 30 (1996): 11-12. Rubens letter actually begins in Dutch and finishes in Latin, as Fehl suggests Rubens' Latin was "not up to it." The letter is reproduced in Junius-Fehl, Appendix II, I: 326-330.

Van Dyck also wrote a letter to Junius expressing his gratitude for the book.

artists that had received special favors from kings and rulers, suggesting a tradition of “ancestral honors” artists could aspire to follow. De Bie made the case for recent heroes—contemporary famous names like Titian, Rubens and Van Dyck as well as “lesser personalities like Deodatus de Mont, *noble domestiq du Duc de Nieuborg*, and David Beck of Delft, painter and *valet de chamber* to Queen Christina.”²⁴⁸ Angel also presented an image of an ideal, genteel artist who, aside from having a “sound judgment, a sure and reliable hand for drawing...and profound and essential reflections based on wide reading and study,” would represent an assimilation the best parts of artists from history:

And if he can combine all these qualities with the sweet-tongued eloquence of Apelles and the chastity of Michelangelo, and also have the desire and diligence of Domenico Ghirlandaio, it may be justly said that this person deserves the tribute of an eternal, memorable crown of honor.²⁴⁹

Famous Gentlemen: Artists’ Portraits in Demand and in Print

Renaissance paradigms of fame extended into the artistic discourse of seventeenth-century Dutch art. John Michael Montias documents an increase in the attachment of Dutch artists’ names to works of art in probate records over the course of the seventeenth century. Montias considers this a great leap in the conceptual transition from craft to art and from unknown artisan to celebrated artist.²⁵⁰ Though it is clear that the concept of the fame was tied to the artist in the seventeenth century

²⁴⁸ Faith Paulette Dreher, “David Teniers II Again,” *Art Bulletin* 59 (1977): 110.

²⁴⁹ Angel-Hoyle, 242.

²⁵⁰ Montias, 227.

from the large presence of self-described art-lovers or *liefhebbers der schilderyen* (lovers of paintings) that were cultivated collectors, patrons and educated, but amateur promoters of the arts. Van Mander lists twenty-three art lovers in his *Schilder-Boeck*, a testament to their important role in the arts.

Art lovers aspired to be knowledgeable about the arts--particularly painting--and educated themselves about it in part by a group of literature created for them, like Roger de Piles' *Conversations sur la connaissance de la peinture*.²⁵¹ Moreover, the artists themselves were the objects of art lovers' esteem as much as the paintings that hung in their *kunstkamers*. Art lovers showed their reverence by compiling lists of famous artists and making notes about their status.²⁵² Manuals like that of De Piles' encouraged art lovers to go directly to the source, the artist, to learn as much as possible about art. A small painting on copper by Antwerp artist Hendrick van Steenwijk the Elder (1550-1603) (Figure 34) satirizes the overly worshipful nature of art lovers, as the allegorical figure of Fama opens the door to an artist's studio while a crowd of elegantly dressed gentlemen in tall hats and gallant capes push through the threshold. Some *liefhebbers* were interested only in the fame of the artist, and not his art. Rembrandt pupil and art theorist Samuel van Hoogstraten (1627-1678) disparaged

²⁵¹ Additionally, Ernst van der Wetering ["The Miracle of Our Age: Rembrandt Through the Eyes of His Contemporaries," in *Rembrandt: A Genius and His Impact* Exh. Cat. Albert Blankert (Melbourne: National Gallery of Victoria, 1997)58-60; 68] lists Guilio Mancini's *Considerazione sulla pittura* (ca. 1621) and Abraham Bosse's *Sentimens sur la distinction des divers manières de peinture, desseins & graveure, & des originaux d'avec leurs copies* (1649).

For more on the literature of art lovers, see Carol Gibson-Wood, *Studies in the Theory of Connoisseurship from Vasari to Morelli* (New York: Garland, 1982).

²⁵² Van der Wetering 1997, 58-60. Van der Wetering discusses the major list-keepers of seventeenth-century Dutch artists including German clergyman Gabriel Bucelinus (1599-1681) in 1664 (the author who addresses Rembrandt as "*nostrae aetatis miraculum*," or "the miracle of our age"); Amsterdam physician Jan Symus and secretary to the stadholders, Constantijn Huygens, to name a few.

the “*naem koopers*” (name buyers) in his 1678 *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst* (Introduction to the Art of Painting) or those who purchased art simply because of the status of the artist, the result of uneducated art devotees and a consequence of the spread of individual fame and name recognition of Dutch artists.²⁵³

One way that collectors and art lovers would have known about an artist’s fame was through the tradition of *uomini illustri* or *famosi*. The collection and dissemination of artists’ portraits and self-portraits thrived in the seventeenth century, particularly in regards to Northern artists. Cosimo III’s Galleria degli autoritratti in the Uffizi contained thirty self-portraits by Dutch and Flemish artists from the renowned (Rubens) to the less prominent (Lieven Mehus, 1630-1691). Cosimo twice visited the Netherlands (1667-8 and 1669) on behalf of his uncle Cardinal Leopoldo de’ Medici with the intention of purchasing self-portraits by Dutch artists, whom he regarded as the ‘*più eccellenti maestri*’ (finest masters). On the first trip he visited the workshop of several artists including Rembrandt, who is listed as “*pittore famoso*” (famous painter) in the journal kept by Cosimo’s traveling companion, Filippo Corsini.²⁵⁴ Likewise, Charles I’s self-portrait collection contained several works by contemporary northern artists including Rembrandt, Rubens and Anthony

²⁵³ Samuel van Hoogstraten, *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst anders de zichtbaere werelt* orig. pub. Rotterdam, 1678 (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1969) See for example, p. 76 where the author bemoans the “*verwaende liefhebbers*” (conceited art lovers) who only care about having the artist’s name on the work. Also see van der Wetering 1995, 266-7.

²⁵⁴ London and The Hague 1999, 226. On the trip, Cosimo likely purchased the ca. 1669 Rembrandt self-portrait that now hangs in the Uffizi.

For more on Cosimo’s two trips to the Netherlands, see G.J. Hoogewerff, *De twee reizen van Cosimo de’ Medici Prins van Toscane door de Nederlanden (1667-1669): Journalen en Documenten* (Amsterdam: J. Müller, 1919)

van Dyck (1599-1641). Artist's portraits, however, gained fame in the seventeenth century largely because of three published books that circulated their images.

Ironically, Van Dyck (though not his paintings per se) was one of the most influential artists in disseminating the image of the sophisticated gentleman artist seventeenth century. Van Dyck's *Iconography*, which was composed of a group of 80 etched and engraved portraits of famous contemporaries that was first published in Antwerp by Maerten van den Enden between 1632 and 1641. Van Dyck embarked on the ambitious project after returning from Italy, where he had undoubtedly seen the portrait medals of *uomini illustri* popularized by Leoni.²⁵⁵ While Van Dyck's group of illustrious men ranged from princes to scholars, he devoted a large section to artists giving them prominence among his subjects. By the time of his death in 1641, Van Dyck's series comprised of eighty portraits, fifty-two of which were artists and the remainder scholars and princes.²⁵⁶

Van Dyck's most important precedent was a popular series of engraved portraits of contemporary artists published by the humanist Domenicus Lampsonius (1532-99), in his sixteenth-century *Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae effigies* was. It was reissued four times before 1600 alone. Originally published in Antwerp in 1572, Lampsonius' book contained verses below the twenty-two artist's portraits engraved by Hieronymus Cock (ca. 1510-70), Cornelis Cort (1533-78) and Jan (1549-

²⁵⁵ Barnes, 92. Van Dyck spent several months in Rome in 1622-3 and may well have met Leoni.

²⁵⁶ Raupp, 49. The *Iconography* is divided into three sections: the first group contains sixteen portraits of political and military leaders, the second group contains twelve portraits of scholars and diplomats, and the third group, the largest, contains fifty-two portraits of artists and art lovers.

ca. 1618) and Hieronymus Wierix (1553-1619).²⁵⁷ In 1610, Hendrick Hondius (1573-1619), an engraver and publisher active in The Hague, expanded on Lampsonius' 1572 version in his *Pictorum aliquot celebrium, præcipuè Germaniæ Inferiõris, effigies* and increased the number of portraits to 68, as well as adding detailed backgrounds to the previously neutral backgrounds.

The Lampsonius-Cock series was crucial in the formation and dissemination of the ideal of the gentleman-artist in the Northern and Southern Netherlands, circulating a formula of self-representation that shaped the way Dutch and Flemish artists portrayed a public face in regards to pose, bearing and dress. In terms of the artist's proper attire, the Dutch edition of Cesar Ripa's *Iconologia* clearly put voice to what was pictured in these editions: "He should be dressed artfully and nobly, because art is by itself noble, which men can also call second nature."²⁵⁸

All twenty-two portraits in the 1572 Lampsonius-Cock edition portray bust-length figures of artists with prominently featured hands engraved against a neutral background (Figure 35).²⁵⁹ Each portrait is underscored by a laudatory verse in Latin, glorifying the artist and commending their fame. All of the artists are dressed luxuriously in antique costume with various accoutrements including velvet robes, fur

²⁵⁷ Barnes, 82. Cock had actually had a similar idea independent of Lampsonius, and started a set of portraits of contemporary European leaders by 1556, which was even earlier than Vasari's illustrated edition, but he work was not completed before he died in 1570.

²⁵⁸ Cesare Ripa, *Iconologia of uytbeeldinghe des verstands*. Facsimile of 1644 edition (Soest: Davaco, 1971) 259. "Konstigh en eedel worth y gekleet, om dat de konst door haer selven eedel is, die men oock de tweede Natuyre kan heeten." This text relates to the personification of "Artificio of Konststuck."

²⁵⁹ Raupp (20) notes that the half-length portrait with hands was a standard from the early sixteenth-century on.

collars and scholarly vestments, even gloves.²⁶⁰ A few artists are depicted with their brushes and palettes in hand, though the painters nonetheless appear as respectably spotless as the *paragone* implied they should (Figure 36).

Hondius' reworking of Lampsonius-Cock's earlier edition expanded on the theme of the artist as gentleman both literally and figuratively. Hondius' artists, almost tripled in number, are presented amid richly textured and detailed backgrounds that add depth to the composition and dimension to the sitter's personality. In contrast from the earlier version, Hondius' artists are more frequently portrayed at work or with artistic implements. Nonetheless, their finely-fitted attire with elegant collars speak of their elevated status, while the palettes, brushes and examples of their work make it clear what their profession was no longer simply manual craft, but worthy of the fame befitting a noble gentleman. For example, Hondius' portrait of Adriaen de Vries (ca. 1546-1626) (Figure 37) conveys the extensive augmentation of detail from the straightforward presentation of a lone figure against a spare background in Lampsonius-Cock. Hardly a patch of De Vries' portrait space is devoid of elaboration--from the pulsing pattern of the artist's tightly constructed vestment to the beckoning view into the fanciful piazza behind him. De Vries appears caught in the tightly constructed spot Hondius has created for him. The artist stands stiffly in his formal clothes between a twisting column to his right and the classical facades

²⁶⁰ The portrait of Bernard van Orley holds a slimly folded pair of gloves in his hand. Additionally, a number of artists [Orley, Lucas van Leyden, Joos van Cleve, Pieter Bruegel, Matthys and Hieronymus Cock (the engraver's own likeness), William Key, Lucas Gassel] all wear berets. Marieke de Winkel ["Costume in Rembrandt's Self-Portraits," in London & The Hague 1999, pp. 67-72) discusses the similarities in dress in Rembrandt's self-portrait (Figure 32) to elements of Lucas van Leyden's portraits in both Lampsonius and Hondius. De Winkel writes that the beret (or bonnet, as it was then called) Rembrandt wears would have been unfashionable for the time, but would have held associations with art, becoming a "general attribute" of artists in the seventeenth century. De Winkel notes that Rembrandt was the first artist to portray himself in this way.

extending into the distance. With his hand wound around a statuette of *Pictura*, the artist is framed into a respectable position by the literal trappings of his profession.

The portraits in both editions were crucial to the development of the elevated status of the artist in the seventeenth century on many levels. Not only did the visual specifics of dress, pose and bearing unequivocally link artists to the tradition of the ennobled artist borne in the Renaissance, but the grouping of Northern artists into format of *uomini illustri* also lent itself “to champion a specifically Northern artistic tradition.”²⁶¹ The Lampsonius-Cock edition included on its first pages portraits of Jan (active 1422; died 1441) and Hubert van Eyck (ca. 1385/90-1426), creating for the art lover, reader or student of art a visual starting point to a native history, a position of reference and reverence for names and faces to follow. It also provided for northern artists a parallel and nearly independent equivalent to the Italian tradition of *uomini illustri*. Rembrandt, for one, showed his homage to his northern forebears in a self-portrait (Figure 38) that recalls a variety of elements from Lampsonius-Cock. Volker Manuth likens Rembrandt’s pose and costume to that of Jan Gossaert (Figure 39), though the turn of the head and the quite specific motion of placing his hand under his jacket and on his chest is more directly reminiscent of the *Portrait of Lambert Lombard* (Figure 24). Rembrandt’s adoption of sixteenth-century dress is a figurative tip of the hat to his artistic ancestors, claiming an affiliation with the earlier Netherlandish painters as if he were literally trying to step in their shoes.²⁶²

²⁶¹ Manuth, 43.

²⁶² Manuth, 43. Raupp, 23-31.

De Winkel (70) theorizes that Rembrandt was not attempting to mimic the role of gentleman-artist in these emulative self-portraits, as rather “he can be seen as an artist modelling himself on his illustrious Northern predecessors rather than on an aristocratic *gentilhumano* or poet.”

While Lampsonius-Cock and Hondius presented formulas for noble self-presentation of artists they were mere predecessors for Van Dyck's *Iconography*, the most influential series of artist's portraits and the one that printed into the era's psyche the ideal image of the artist as an aristocratic gentleman.²⁶³ Van Dyck's series featured mostly artists hailing from the southern Netherlands, as he concentrated mostly on figures of his own time and own town—Antwerp. Van Dyck, however, presented artists alongside other members of the social and professional elite, including scholars and princes.²⁶⁴ Visually, the artists fit seamlessly amid the noble fray. Moreover, including them within this respectable assemblage assigned artists a higher moral standing, binding the group with “the aristocratic notion of *virtù*: the belief in a fundamental link between the virtuous way of life and intellectual or artistic activity.”²⁶⁵

The artists in Van Dyck's *Iconography* are seldom presented with any props of their work but rather shown as serious-minded virtuosi, dressed to the pinnacle of elegance and sophistication with only perhaps a pair of gloves in hand or at times a book.²⁶⁶ Though in different variations of contemporary and antique dress, all the *Iconography's* artists share a timeless fashion: they are dashing. Van Dyck adds dynamism and diversity to the portraits by animating the drapery folds with vibrant

²⁶⁵ Manuth, 45.

²⁶⁶ Marie Mauquoy-Hendrickx, *L'Iconographie d'Antoine Van Dyck: Catalogue Raisonné* (Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1956). For instance, the portraits of Hendrick van Balen (42/1) and Andreas Colyns de Nole (34/II) contain sculpted heads, though the majority of portraits are absent of any props. Simon Vouet (74/IV) is shown with his hand on Alberti's *Trattato della nobilita della pittura* (Rome, 1585). Michiel van Miereveld (26/II) holds a pair of gentleman's gloves; his cane rests nearby.

light and shadow. The portrait of Daniel Mytens (ca. 1590-ca. 1648) (Figure 40), for instance, reveals no evidence of Mytens's profession, but shows him as a stylish ideal in a splendid billowing coat with the satiny sheen of his jacket peering from underneath.

The *Iconography*'s sophisticated method for portrayal was a model for Dutch artists in both portraiture and self-portraiture. Jan Lievens (1607-1674), for instance, imitated Van Dyck's work so closely that when he embarked on a series of portrait prints of artists in 1635 he not only followed Van Dyck's formula of size, style and format, but even used the same printmaker.²⁶⁷ The legacy of the *Iconography* continued through the seventeenth century as Van Dyck's work was re-issued after his death in an enlarged edition of one hundred prints in 1645.²⁶⁸ Joannes Meyssens (1612-1670), an Antwerp artist and publisher who sought to compose an illustrated collection of artists' lives in the same vein as Van Mander, imitated this format as well. Meyssens' engraved artists portraits took prominence over text, accompanied only by brief biographies giving only the artist's vital information and a brief description of his oeuvre.²⁶⁹ Subsequent biographies of artists in the later seventeenth

²⁶⁷ Lloyd DeWitt, "Evolution and Ambition in the Career of Jan Lievens (1607-1674)," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 2006), 187. Upon Lievens' return to Antwerp from London, he produced portrait prints of artists à la Van Dyck, including Brouwer, Daniel Seghers, Jan Davidsz. De Heem, Lucas Vorsterman and Paulus Pontius.

For more on the influence of Van Dyck's *Iconography*, see Raupp 154- 60.

²⁶⁸ Strauss and Van der Meulen, 1656/12, no. 228 (p. 371). Gillis Hendricksz created the engravings in this edition.

It appears that Rembrandt owned a copy of this edition. Listed in the inventory of 1656 is '*Een boek, vol contrefijtsels soo van van Dijck, Rubens en verscheijde andere oude meesters.*' (A book full of portraits of by Van Dyck, Rubens and various other old masters.)

²⁶⁹ Joannes Meyssens, *Image de divers homes d'esprit sublime qui par leur art et science debvroyent vivre eternellement et des quells la louange et renommé faict estonner le monde* (Anvers, 1649).

and eighteenth centuries were also illustrated, including De Bie in 1661, Houbraken in 1718-21 and Joachim Sandrart's *Teutsche Academie* (1768 edition).

In Giuseppe Zocchi's fresco in the Palazzo Gerini (Figure 18), it is not precisely Rembrandt that is celebrated with sounding trumpets and gathered putti, but rather, Rembrandt's self-portrait.²⁷⁰ The portrait reflects how self-portraits functioned as vehicles of artistic fame and also how that fame spread in the seventeenth-century: in a book and as part of a collection. In addition, Zocchi's fresco is an example of the highly desirable nature of self-portraits and the way these images circulated widely in print, making formal canons of representation accessible to a wide audience. What Zocchi presents to us is Rembrandt, three times removed: from his painted self-portrait, reproduced in a book (the collection catalogue) and then as part of a fresco decoration. It represents not only Rembrandt's personal artistic success, but also the fulfillment of Renaissance revisionism of the artist's status and the depth of that echo as it resonated through paint—paper—plaster.

²⁷⁰ See footnote 85 regarding the debate over authenticity of the portrait.

Chapter 3: How Not to Behave: Dissolute Conduct and the Dutch Artist

Good Advice, Bad Artists

Lovers of the brew, you who love to drain
And trumpet the praise of brimming glasses.
Liquor-loving tosspots, who would rather sit and ca-
rouse
Than busy yourselves before the easel,
Whose favorite haunt is where the tankards clink,
Repairing there swiftly to refill them to the brim,
Who pour beer by the tankard-full down your dry
throats
And are never sated, however much you drink...

--Philips Angel, "Praise of Painting"²⁷¹

On St. Luke's Day in Leiden, 1641, art lover and painter Philips Angel stood before a crowd of banqueters to deliver a speech on painting. After a grateful dedication and a few laudatory verses glorifying the honor of art beginning with the words "O happy painter," Angel's tone suddenly turned. In a long poem, Angel delivered a mild diatribe against the drunkenness of painters. Angel did not single out any one artist in particular (as he would do throughout the rest of the speech in praise), but his admonitory poem has a "you-know-who-you-are" tone to it. With pointed references to those artists who over-imbibe on the feast-day celebrating St. Luke, one imagines there may well have been a few red-faced and tipsy painters in

²⁷¹ Angel-Hoyle, 230-1.

the room that very day.²⁷² With the admonition aside, Angel regained his composure and went on to deliver a speech that included an encyclopedic history of famous artists in history, a discussion of the *paragone* and practical strategies for the painter to imitate the natural world.

Despite the many literary and visual *topoi* designed to elevate the status of the artist in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Dutch artists of the Golden Age were all too often reported as misbehaving. Instead of emulating the noble *exempla* offered by the model of the *pictor doctus*, Dutch painters drank (Steen) and reveled in public (Van Laer), could not pay their bills (Van Mieris) and eschewed conventions of dress and gentlemanly comportment (Brouwer). Angel complained in his speech that drinking and carousing derailed artists from articulating the Renaissance *topoi* of the artist as an intellectual, famed, respectable gentleman. He emphasized the ideas that drinking made artists inelegant (“you walk with splayed legs”), indolent (“devote your useful time/To the service of painting, not squander it uselessly”), dim-witted (“[you] celebrate...until the brainpan knows neither rule nor law”) and unworthy of fame (“This would give you great honor, now you have great shame”). Instead of “brutish carousing,” Angel encouraged artists to “perfect the praise of painting with your scholarly writings.”

It was not just a matter of artists failing to live up to an unmatched ideal of professional perfection, there was also a moral concern, as these behaviors marked not just deviations from artistic models of behavior, but from cultural ones as well.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, 231. Apparently, drinking was a traditional part of celebrating the day, as Angel continues: “That your limbs refuse to carry you home,/ Who believe that St. Luke’s Day can only be celebrated/By getting as drunk as lords on guzzled wine...”

While the art literature argued against dissolute conduct for the ways it sabotaged and sullied the public image and honor of the noble profession, preachers and moralists in the culture at large condemned the same behaviors for their capacity to spread vice and sin.

The loudest complaint from art theorists and biographers was that artists drank too much, though drinking was as much of a problem unto itself as it was part of a larger pattern of profligacy among artists. The particular behaviors depicted in dissolute self-portraits directly parallel the contentious conducts cited in literature. Artists depicted themselves engaged in three principal behaviors (from the least to the most offensive): (1) smoking, (2) drinking, and (3) prodigal conduct, especially carousing with women.

Drinking and smoking, while largely condemned, also could have held inspirational benefits for artists, an aspect that is present in some of the self-portraits discussed in detail in chapter four. However, all of these behaviors contrast sharply with the codes of conduct and deportment outlined in chapter two, and present us with a very different type of artist than what was promoted by the contemporary art literature. While the smoking, drunken, dissolute artist was not a model that was emulated by theorists, nonetheless it appears to have been an actual phenomenon, and one that adds to the definition of what it meant to be a Dutch artist in the seventeenth century.

1. How Not to Behave: Smoking

Smoking was the most common of vices, and it appears frequently in dissolute self-portraits, as well as in still life and genre scenes. On the one hand, tobacco could be an artist's friend. It appears to perhaps have held stronger associations with artistic inspiration than drinking, based purely on the greater number of artists' self-portraits in which pipes or smoking appear as beneficial aids to solemn concentration or creative focus. Oddly, however, there is very little mention of smoking in artistic literature, perhaps conveying that the practice was condoned or at least accepted.

Tobacco was brand new in the Netherlands at the beginning of the seventeenth century, arriving only when ship's crews brought it in from western ports in the 1580s. By 1615 it was being grown in the Netherlands and as attested by a tobacco tax instituted by the States of Holland in 1623, its use was widespread. Throughout the seventeenth century, smoking was known as a medical treatment, though attitudes towards its recreational use varied widely. The first book on tobacco use in the United Provinces appeared in 1622: *Tabacologica* by philosopher and physician Johann Neander (ca. 1596-ca. 1630). It was subtitled: "The Science of Tobacco, that is, a medico-surgico-pharmaceutical description of Tobacco, or Nicotiana, especially its preparation and use in all the ailments of the human body..."²⁷³ Neander was opposed to tobacco used recreationally, but advocated its use as a treatment for a myriad of diseases and supported his stance with the authority of Aristotle, Galen and

²⁷³ George Arents and Jerome E. Brooks, *Tobacco, Its History Illustrated by the Books, Manuscripts and Engravings in the Library of George Arents, Jr.* 5 vols. (New York: The Rosenbach Company, 1937), II: 85, no. 543.

Hippocrates, a common refrain of respectability summoned by its proponents.²⁷⁴ Claims were made left and right as to the panorama of conditions tobacco cured, including rheumatism, asthma, goiter, and venereal diseases—even coughing fits. It was used in love potions and tonics “for the preservation of eternal youth” and alchemists even claimed they could extract gold from the plant (“provided it was treated in the right way”).²⁷⁵ One of Adriaen van de Venne’s short comic stories on the theme of tobacco praised smoking for clarifying poor eyesight, expelling lice and its power to drive away wives.²⁷⁶

Tobacco’s use as a stimulant spread quickly, but so did critical opinions of its use. Like alcohol, tobacco was described as being sipped or “*gedroncken*” (drunk) and its stupetory effects were compared to drunkenness. Throughout the early seventeenth century, it was progressively associated with alcohol’s socially undesirable aspects. Tobacco was the cheapest of habits, which allowed for prolific consumption particularly among lower classes. It was seen as “common to smoke four or five pipes one after the other” in locations as varied as shops, inns, stagecoaches, even in churches at times.²⁷⁷ Tobacco inns were just another incarnation of a tavern environment; its patrons came from the lower classes and “were progressively incapacitating themselves and that such behaviour, though fit for

²⁷⁴ Ivan Gaskell, “Tobacco and Social Deviance” in Bock and Gaetgens, 119-120.

²⁷⁵ Georg A. Brongers, *Nicotiana Tabacum: The History of Tobacco and Tobacco Smoking in the Netherlands* (Groningen: Theodorus Niemeyer, 1964), 26-9.

²⁷⁶ Gaskell, 123.

²⁷⁷ Zumthor, 179.

the lower classes...certainly should not affect the respectable element of society for whom physical integrity was an unspoken ideal.”²⁷⁸

Moral diatribes against “*Roock-drinckers*” (smoke-drinkers) mirrored the public condemnations against excessive drinking, and appeared in both religious and satiric forms. The most bone-rattling invectives came from scholar Petrus Scriverius (1576-1660) whose 1628 poem translated from Latin by Samuel Ampzing begged his readers to “deliver us from this poison and plague.” His warnings were published in Haarlem (1630) as *Vasten-avond*, the title page of which overflows with vanitas warnings: in the center is a skull with two crossed, smoking pipes in its mouth, a winged-hourglass atop the skull and a burning candle adjacent to it (Figure 41).²⁷⁹ Ampzing’s 1633 *Mirror of the Unrestrainedness of Our Age*, mentioned above in the context of drinking, held equal censure for the “filthy, black stench.” The inscription under an image of a man holding a glass of wine reads, sarcastically: “I don’t begrudge you your smoke and black sucking and your glass of beer, you fetid wretch. Stink all you like and rinse your mouth out with beer; I’ll stick to wine...”²⁸⁰

²⁷⁸ Gaskell, 122.

²⁷⁹ Niemeyer (140) does not offer a source but quote the (translated) poem as:

“Tobacco is such a disease that it ruins the body,
And as a medicine, it avails little against death.
It does more evil than good. Whoever you are,
I beg of you: deliver us from this poison and this plague.”

“*Taback is sulken siekt die ‘t lichaem doet verderven,
En haere medicijn baet weynig tegens ‘t sterven.
Het is meer quaad, dan goed, ‘K verlag dan wie hy sij,
Die ons van dit vergift en dese pest bevrij.*”

Also see Amsterdam 1976, 55.

²⁸⁰ Van Thiel, 185. The original poem (numbered “12”) reads:
“*Ik wild y dyne rook, en suygeren
Met dyne flap met bier, o stinker! Miet benyen,*

In popular culture, too, smoking was condemned or mocked as a fleeting pleasure. An emblem of a smoker published in 1614 by Claesz. Jansz Visscher (1587-1652) is accompanied by the phrase: “*Veeltijds wat nieuws, selden wat goets*” (often something new, rarely anything good), an allusion to the suspicious sentiment the public held towards the new substance at the beginning of the century. Even Bredero poked fun at tobacco in his farce *Molenaer*, specifically its reputation for causing impotence. One of the female characters blames her lack of fertility on her husband’s new habit of smoking, bemoaning that he that he was once “a man with the best of them,” but no more.²⁸¹

These cultural admonishments, however, do not appear to have deterred the use of tobacco. Few listened. The inscription accompanying a print after a work by Brouwer of three peasants smoking in an interior explains the lure of tobacco for the common man:

Vainly do you brand and condemn tobacco,
 Without which none of us can live, as causing the wasting disease.
 Fill your gullet with wine, your belly with partridge,
 The water-pipe and its clouds of smoke give us pleasure.²⁸²

*Stinkt wat gy stinke[n] meugt, en spoelt den mond met bier
 Ik hou met den wyn. Een yder syn playsier.”*

²⁸¹ G.A. Bredero, *Werken van G. A. Bredero*. 3 vols. Introduction by J. A. N. Knuttel. (Amsterdam : A. Hahn, 1921) I: 239. Also see *The Hoogsteder Exhibition of Music and Painting in the Golden Age*. Exh. Cat. Edwin Buijsen & Louis Peter Grijp (The Hague: Hoogsteder & Hoogsteder, 1994), 182-3.

²⁸² Amsterdam 1997, 311. The work after Brouwer is an etching and engraving, and was done by Jonas Syderhoef (ca. 1613-1686) The Latin inscription reads:

*“Tabificum frustra clamas, damnasque tabacum,
 Quo sine nostrorum vivere nemo potest.
 Ingluuiem vino, ventrem perdicibus expel;
 Nos tubus, inque tubo nubile nata iuvant.”*

Smoking appears to have been popular among painters, though there is little evidence as to attitudes concerning their use of tobacco—positive or negative—that can be gleaned from contemporary art literature. Houbraken mentions in passing that the brothers Job (1630-1693) and Gerrit Berckheyde (1638-1698) had little talks about art while smoking a pipe.²⁸³ However, a 1665 poem by Karel van Mander III (1610-1670), grandson of the author of the *Schilder-boeck*, offers some evidence that smoking may have held special sanction for artists. The poem, titled “*Lauwererants: Voor alle Liefhebbers der Loffwaerden/SNUYFFTOE-/BACKS/als oock/Haer Gheboort, en hooghe Hercomst*” (Laurel Wreath for all friends of the commendable snuff-tobacco as well as [an account of] its origin and high lineage”), praises the powers of tobacco, specifically snuff.²⁸⁴ Van Mander III portrays snuff as a friend of the Muses and traces its origin to Vulcan, who smoked tobacco to relieve fatigue and then introduced it to North America. Pallas, also a champion of tobacco, pulverized its leaves to create snuff. Notably, Van Mander III calls tobacco “the brother of all arts” and he goes on to characterize it as something socially acceptable for use by artists. One passage describes Vulcan’s dismissal by the other gods because of the offensive odor of his tobacco smoke. Pallas interceded for him, defending his use of it, “saying that he was an artist, not a mannered courtier.”²⁸⁵

²⁸³ Griffey (125) cites this reference in Houbraken, III: 195. “*Wy somwyl een vermaelyk praatje van de Kunst, onder een pypje.*”

²⁸⁴ Zumthor (179) writes that snuff was even more common than smoking and even beggars had their own snuff-boxes by the end of the century, “and dipped their fingers into it before extending their hand for an offering.”

²⁸⁵ A detailed description of the poem appears in Arents and Brooks, II: 377-8, no. 294.

2. How Not to Behave: Drinking

Were Dutch artists drunks? Angel, in his St. Luke's day speech, was not the only voice to chime in on shortcomings of Dutch artists, as many theorists on Dutch art in the seventeenth century pointed at the dissolute artist, most often about the negative effects of excessive alcohol consumption. And according to biographers, those fingers were justly raised as there indeed was a Dutch propensity towards drinking among artists in the Golden Age. Compared to Renaissance artists, Dutch seventeenth-century painters had a significant reputation for drinking. Ebrietas, the weakness for drink, replaced Renaissance *melancholicus* as the most commonly cited "affliction" of artists in seventeenth-century Holland. However, unlike melancholy, excessive drinking was largely condemned by Dutch society from art critic to clergy. In the Renaissance, excessive drinking among artists does not appear to have registered many complaints among theorists and its mention is virtually non-existent in artistic biographies of the era. In Vasari's *Lives*, for example, mentions of drunkenness appear in the context of paintings, not artists, as in the descriptions of Michelangelo's or Paolo Uccello's versions of the *Drunkenness of Noah* or in the leaden limbs of Donatello's wine-drunk Holofernes.²⁸⁶

Houbraken claimed that "excessive swilling of wine" was the rage among painters in the seventeenth century. Writing with the omniscience of eighteenth-century eyes, he also noted that "it has been diminishing for some time, so that one can say to the credit of Artists: that there is now almost no one of name to be counted

²⁸⁶ Vasari, 79; 152; 446.

among the Painters who is a drunkard.”²⁸⁷ Van Mander, too, bemoaned the “customary Netherlandish malaise of dipsomania,” so by the publication of his *Schilder-boeck* in 1604, drinking among artists must have already become a problem. He wrote vividly on the subject of alcohol in his *Schilder-boeck*, with an attitude that was alternately stern and forlornly resigned to artists’ relationship with a substance he saw as a “detriment” to art.²⁸⁸ Even the role of the painter Otie Dickmuyl, in Bredero’s *Spanish Brabanter* (1617), is characterized as a stereotypical drunkard. He is even ribbed about it by his companions as Jasper, a goldsmith, asks, “It’s always drinking time, say Otie, is it true?”²⁸⁹

Excessive drinking was seen as a common, but cardinal sin of artists in that it was not simply the drunkenness that was so troubling, but the way alcohol had the potential to open a gateway to so many other sins and riotous living. Drinking commonly went hand-in-hand with smoking, which had a predominantly negative reception in the Dutch Republic though at times paintings allude to its ability to rouse creativity. Alcohol, too, was sometimes regarded for its powers of Bacchic

²⁸⁷ Houbraken, *Groote Schouburg, III*, 248. This quote appears in the biography of Josef Mulder (1659/60-ca. 1718): “*Ik heb opgemerkt dat in dien tyd en vroeger het plegen van onvoeglyke bedryven, en inzonderheit ‘t overdadig wynzwellen, onder de Konstschilders byster in zwang ging, en gelyk al seen mode ingekropen was: maar he book opgemerkt dat het zedert allengs heft afgenoomen, zoo datmen thans tot roem van Konstenaren zeggen kan: dat ‘er nu byna geen onder de Konstschilders van naam getelt kan werden die een dronkaart is.*” (translation Horn, 317) This passage is indexed in Houbraken’s book III (unpaginated index) under the heading “*Dronkenschap onder de Schilders*” (Drunkenness among painters), suggesting it was a pronounced enough trend and topic to merit discussion and dedicated reference.

²⁸⁸ Van Mander, *Schilder-boeck*, fol. 240r. Van Mander includes this passage in the biography of Frans Floris.

²⁸⁹ G.A. Bredero, *The Spanish Brabanter*. Trans. H. David Brumble III (Binghamton, N.Y.: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1982.) 115. Also see Griffey, 105-6. The name of the drunk painter’s character is Otie Diekmuyt. Before becoming a playwright, Bredero was a painter.

inspiration, but the dangers far outweighed its potential benefits. In both the literature and the art of the era, it was clear that the Dutch viewed drinking as a latent peril. If misused, an innocent drink was just a step away from opening a Pandora's box of immoral behaviors including the deadly sins of lust (*luxuria*), sloth (*acedia*), gluttony (*gula*) and even anger (*ira*), not to mention contributing to gambling and poverty.²⁹⁰ Leiden humanist Dirck Volkertsz Coornhert (1522-1590) cited from Proverbs 23:21 the *summa* of possible sins: "For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty, drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags, and slothfulness casteth into a deep sleep and an idle soul shall suffer hunger."²⁹¹

Dutch Drinking

For the Dutch, excessive drinking was a moral concern in a culture of notorious imbibers. Wine and drink were everywhere in Dutch culture of the Golden Age so much so that at times it seems difficult to find a painting by Steen *without* a wineglass in it, at times being replenished mid-stream (Figure 42).²⁹² Drinking appears to have been a strong part of both the celebratory and communal culture of the Dutch: one guild of surgeons forbade indecent drunkenness at its banquets, but ordered colleagues to carry home anyone who happened to fall under the table.²⁹³

²⁹¹ Salomon, 333. Salomon cites Coornhert's *Recht Gebruyck ende Misbruyck van tydelycke have* (Leiden, 1585), no. V.

²⁹² Also see the ca. 1665 version in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

²⁹³ Paul Zumthor, *Daily Life in Rembrandt's Holland*. Trans. Simon Watson Taylor (New York: Macmillan, 1963), 170-3.

Banquets, taverns, festivals and kermises were sites of conviviality and community, and drinking was a central activity.

By the early seventeenth century, the Dutch were already renowned for their beer brewing and by the close of the century, gin distillation abounded. They were the largest wine traders of the period, as their plum geographic position allowed for importing wine both from Bordeaux and the Rhine valley, exporting to as far as Russia and Spain. Dutch traders were also responsible for promoting the taste for strong wine and spirits throughout Europe: by adding syrup, spirits (particularly brandy) or stronger wines to poor white wines imported from the south of France, they were able to make a popular commodity of a previously unpalatable drink.²⁹⁴

As for consumption, drinking was not reserved for celebrations but was a staple of daily life in Holland from a breakfast beer to an end of day drink at the tavern. In 1600, customers of Haarlem taverns drank five and a half million gallons of beer.²⁹⁵ The nobility and wealthier members of the population consumed wine daily, and brandy and genever were enjoyed by the lower classes in society.²⁹⁶ But beer was ubiquitous, not only because the plethora of Dutch breweries, but also

²⁹⁴ Gregory A. Austin, *Alcohol in Western Society from Antiquity to 1800: A Chronological History* (Santa Barbara, Denver and Oxford: Clio, 1985) 191 & 205. Wine trade in the Baltic expanded after 1580, growing especially 1623-1657. Most of the wine traded originated in Charente. The addition of syrup and spirits to wine also helped it travel better. The Dutch were the first to reach this solution to a previously difficult problem in transport.

For more on the Dutch alcohol industries, see Richard W. Unger, *A History of Brewing in Holland, 900-1900: Economy, Technology, and the State* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2001).

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.* Schama (192) reports that in the 1570s there were 50 operating breweries in Haarlem and by 1620 there were more than twice that number.

²⁹⁶ Dirck Pietersz. Pers, *Suypp-stad of dronckaerts leven*. Facsimilie of 1628 edition. Forward by J.E. Verlaan & E.K. Grootes (Culembourg: Tjeenk Willink/Noorduijn, 1978): 24-33.

because it served as a replacement for the lack of good drinking water.²⁹⁷ There were plenty of opportunities to partake publicly: in 1613 there were 518 alehouses in Amsterdam alone.²⁹⁸

Perhaps it was in their blood: Tacitus noted heavy drinking as a characteristic of the ancestors of the Dutch, the Batavians, in his *Germania* (98 A.D.). “To pass an entire day and night in drinking disgraces no one,” he wrote.²⁹⁹ Many contemporary travelers to the Netherlands reported residents’ prodigious intake as well. Sixteenth-century Italian visitor Ludovico Guicciardini (1521-1589) also noted the Dutch love of wine on his trip through the Low Countries, as did an agent of Cosimo III de’ Medici in Amsterdam, who pointed out that drunkenness was “the sickness one often sees in these parts.”³⁰⁰ On a trip through Holland in 1661-2, the British Lord Maynard and his servants found their stay “as if every day had been a wedding; all sorts of wine but especially Rhenish as plenty as water.” John Evelyn, another

²⁹⁷ Amsterdam 1997, 168. See Dirck Pietersz. Pers, *Suyp-stad of Dronckaerts leven* Eds. J.E. Verlaan & E.K. Grootes. Orig. pub. 1628 (Culemborg: Tjeenk Willink, 1978), 24, 54-55.

²⁹⁸ Schama, 191. Amsterdam had approximately 100,000 inhabitants in 1613.

²⁹⁹ Tacitus, *The Agricola and Germania*. Medieval Source Book. <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/tacitus1.html> (accessed 1 June 2007)

From the site: “The first half of this etext [is] from Tacitus, *The Agricola and Germania*, A. J. Church and W. J. Brodribb, trans., (London: Macmillan, 1877), pp. 87ff. The second part, in which Tacitus gives a geographical account of the locations of the main German tribes is from the 18th-century translation by Thomas Gordon.”

The drinking did lead to intoxicated fighting, which Tacitus noted “are seldom fought out with mere abuse, but commonly with wounds and bloodshed.”

³⁰⁰ Ilja M Veldman, “Elements of Continuity: A Finger Raised in Warning” *Simiolus* 20 (1990-1): 134.

Sullivan (100-1) quotes Guicciardini as noting the way the Dutch drank both day and night, incurring “grievous maladies of mind and body.”

Naumann I: 178, letter of 23 February 1674 (ASF, Mediceo, 4261, fol. 360) from Giovacchio Guasconi to Apollonio Bassetti, Cosimo’s secretary.

visiting young Briton at the tail end of the seventeenth century, remarked he was served “more wine than was needful.”³⁰¹ The main character of Jerolimo Rodrigo in Bredero’s *Spanish Brabanter* put it more crudely: “These Hollanders, *par die*, they drink like moffs, like very poops...”³⁰²

While alcohol may have flowed freely in the northern Netherlands, it came with a moral antidote. There were frequent attacks about the dangers of drinking in seventeenth-century sermons and warnings in popular literature and in art, on what many saw not only a moral, but mortal peril. “One can therefore say that drunkenness,” wrote Gijsbertus Voetius in *De Ebrietate* (1636), “is the devil’s principle means of drawing us towards him.”³⁰³ Other literature on drunkenness included Daniël Souterius’ (1571-1634) *Den nuchteren Loth* (1623) [The Sober Lot]. The Haarlem pastor must have spoken regularly about the evils of drink as 28 of his sermons on the topic appear in the book. Souterius’ friend and colleague, Reformed Haarlem preacher Samuel Ampzing’s (1590-1632) *Mirror of the Unrestrainedness of Our Age* (1633) expressed in both text and image the moral dangers facing Dutch culture. Ten of Ampzing’s seventeen short poems accompanying the engraved illustrations by Jan van de Velde II (1593-1641) address the ugly results of too much drinking. In Ampzing’s vision, drinking leads directly to moral degradation and social

³⁰¹ Cornelis Daniël van Strien, *British Travellers to Holland During the Stuart Period: Edward Browne and John Locke as Tourists in the United Provinces* (Leiden and New York: E.J. Brill, 1993) 93; 38. From the account of Lord Maynard’s servant, Robert Moody, *The Travels of the Honourable Banister Maynard thought the Chief Countreys of Europe, Performed in the Years 1661 and 1662* (1661-2).

³⁰² Bredero-Brumble, 54.

³⁰³ Verlaan and Grootes in Pers, 42. The authors quote Voetius and cite fol. 13v.

“*Men conde daerom vande dronckenschap segghen...dat he teen vande principaelste middelen is die de Duyvel gebruyckt om ons tot hem te trecken...*”

ill: gambling, cheating, begging, idleness, fighting—even murder. “I’ve got beer in my blood and murder in my heart,” reads the verse accompanying the image of an irate man with a knife.³⁰⁴ However, Ampzing’s most consistent complaint seems to be that alcohol drained both the pocketbook and the conscience. “It’s all been drunk, all gone, all clinked away,” bemoans the verse below the picture of an elderly backgammon player.³⁰⁵ A vomiting man is admonished for spending “all you have on beer,” and an elderly man holding a money box will “soon run through [his savings] by guzzling and boozing.”³⁰⁶

Wine was particularly, almost interchangeably, associated with amorous behavior. Many sayings in Erasmus’ *Adages* highlight the Dutch awareness of the

³⁰⁴ F.W.H. Hollstein, *Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, ca. 1450-1700* (Amsterdam: M. Hertzberger, 1949-), vols. 33 and 34, no. 117. The engraving is numbered “10” in the series.

The four-line poem reads:

*De kop die state my kroes. ‘Kheb al myn geld versopen:
Nu wil ik aen de man, al most ik’t selfs bekopen.
De drank die maekt my dol. Het bier is in het lyf,
Ed’t hert is vol van moord, van wreak, en van gekyff.*

³⁰⁵ Hollstein, vols. 33 and 34, no. 115.

The poem (number “8” in the series) reads:

*Is’t nu niet moy gemaekt? ‘Tis altemael verdronke[n]
‘Tis al ‘tis verspeeld, verticktackt en verkeerd
Al vechten wy te met, ik dien wel afgesmeerd.*

³⁰⁶ Hollstein, vols. 33 and 34, no. 116

The poem, number “9” in the series reads:

*Verscheurde bedelaer! Gy kont dyn naekte leden
Met dyne flarsen nau bedecken, en bekleden,
Noch moet het wat gy hebt aen bier, aen overdaed.
Maer varken die den balg tot spuwen overlaed.*

Hollstein, vols. 33 and 34, no. 124

The poem, number “17” in the series, reads:

*Ik lope met de klap om daglykx geld te garen,
De spaer-pot inde hand: maer’tis n[iet] om te sparen:
Ik maek het my soo haest in overdaet weer quyt
Ik steel de luyden ‘tgeld, my siel, en eer, en tyd.*

erotic powers of wine, including the classical adage—“without Ceres and Bacchus, Venus grows cold” (desire fails without food and drink)—a theme that was popular among Dutch Mannerists.³⁰⁷ Erasmus called wine the ‘*lac Veneris*’ (the milk of Venus), but also advised that too much of it could make a even a virile man like Alexander the Great “sexually so ineffective.”³⁰⁸ Drink also held the potential to corrupt innocence: an engraving by Nicolaes de Bruyn (ca. 1571-1652) (Figure 43) depicting men seated at a table with elegant courtesans and a full glass of wine bears the inscription “*Et Venere et Baccho bona Decoquit omina natus*” (Sex and drink ruin youth).³⁰⁹

Artists Characterized as Heavy Drinkers

Regardless of the moral implications of drinking and the public admonishments against its abuse, it is clear from the number of mentions of artists and alcohol in contemporary artistic literature, particularly biographies, that many Dutch artists drank heavily, frequently. Theoretically, contemporary art literature held

³⁰⁷ Another popular theme at the turn of the seventeenth century was that of Venus and Mars surprised by Vulcan. A painting on copper by Utrecht artist Joachim Wtewael (1566-1638) shows Venus turning toward her lover in an embrace, all the while properly balancing a full glass of wine without spilling a drop (*Mars, Venus, and Cupid*. Ca. 1610. Amsterdam, Stichting Collectie P.en N. de Boer). The image is reproduced in Baltimore and San Francisco 1997, p. 278.

³⁰⁸ Desiderus Erasmus, *The Adages of Erasmus*. (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2001) 178-9. Erasmus saw both the benefits and potential drawbacks of wine. While he saw it as the ultimate truth serum (“There is truth in wine,” p. 101) with potential to encourage desire, he noted that even Aristotle noted wine’s ability to “make a man unfit for coiton” by “[diluting] the strength of his semen.”

Impotence was also thought of as a potential side effect of tobacco use. In Bredero’s play *Molenaer*, a woman says of her husband: “I do not believe that my husband’s sap is potent anymore, as he drinks too much tobacco, and that (they say) dries you up. Once, he was a man with the best of them but now he is too limp.”

³⁰⁹ Worcester 1993, 146.

artists to the same standards in regards to drinking as the culture at large. Writers not only advised artists against drinking in general, but they also pointed out relevant examples for others to avoid in biographies. Dutch artists classified as particularly heavy drinkers include Jan Gossaert (1462/70-1533/41), Hercules Seghers (ca. 1590-1638), Emmanuel de Witte (1617-1691), Willen van Aelst (1627-ca. 1683), Hals, Brouwer, Steen, Frans van Mieris, painter and classicist art critic Gerard de Lairese (1640-1711), as well as the artists of the *Schildersbent* working in Rome.³¹⁰ Almost without exception, biographers and theorists approached artist's alcohol use with derision; placing an emphasis on the ways alcohol interfered with artists' careers and respectable public images. Yet despite being heavy drinkers, these artists are among the most productive and prominent of the Golden Age. Ironically, the warnings and admonitions by theorists and biographers intended as negative *exempla* likely publicized and unintentionally promoted the idea of the drunken artist, creating a literature and a dialogue for the dissemination of the image of the (productive) prodigal painter.

Hals, for example, is characterized as a heavy drinker when several biographers, including Houbraken and Weyerman, place him at the tavern as often as in the studio. Weyerman, in his *Levensbeschrijvingen*, tells the story of when Anthony van Dyck, on behalf of Charles I of England, came to see Hals, only to find him not at home, but rather drinking in a tavern. Weyerman noted that this tavern

³¹⁰Wittkower 1963, 215-20.

Seghers appears to have killed himself while taking a fall down a set of stairs while drunk. See Houbraken II: 136-9.

For Lairese, see Joachim von Sandrart (*Teutsche Academie des edlen Bau-Bild und Mahlerey Kunste* [Nuremberg, 1675-9; ed. A.R. Pelzer, Munich, 1925] no. 37.

was a common place for painters to hide as they tried to evade creditors.³¹¹

Houbraken also recalls how Hals' students took turns retrieving the artist from the tavern at night, carefully maneuvering him home and into bed.³¹² Hals' one-time protégé, Brouwer, was even worse, wrote Houbraken, as he "did not have the strength in himself, whenever he had money, to keep himself from drinking, swilling and carousing."³¹³

Van Mander mentions the drinking habits of artists frequently in his *Lives*, with commentary, such as in the case of Cornelis of Gouda (1510-1550). Cornelis was so prolific in his consumption that "even great drinkers were in awe of him," but Van Mander quickly qualified the statement with a moral lesson: "thus he fell completely into decline and became a bungler; therefore youth must avoid following such examples."³¹⁴ However, Van Mander's penultimate example of a drunken artist is Frans Floris (ca. 1516-1570), whom he considered a great artist and champion drinker, though Floris' love of drink appears to have won out over his artistic productivity:

³¹¹ Weyerman, I: 353-4. Houbraken (I: 90-1) tells the same story about Hals as well. Hals also struggled with debt throughout his life and was once in arrears for the small amount of his guild membership fee (four guilders). See Wittkower 1963, 215.

Van Mieris, too, was chronically indebted, a theme that reappears throughout tales of his life. See Naumann, I: 33.

³¹² Houbraken, I: 93.

³¹³ *Ibid*, I: 325. "Op deze wyze leefde hy doorgans, en zig niet magtig, al shy geld had, van drinken, zwelgen en Berteryen te onthouden." Translation Horn I: 319.

³¹⁴ Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, fol. 227v. Van Mander's anecdote goes on to describe a formidable drinking contest between Floris and some bass players from Brussels who had heard of his legendary drinking abilities. Van Mander details Floris' drinking almost proudly, or perhaps, in astonishment ("he drank sixty times to their two") [fol. 241r].

...[Floris] now has nothing but great debts, which, with his painting he could after all easily have paid off but (it seems) he was too far gone in his habits and could not easily leave his drink-loving hangers-on or send them away; for all servants of Bacchus inclined to excessive drinking delighted to be in his company. Since his immunity to alcohol was famous, some great boozers or drinkers were envious of his great celebrity...³¹⁵

Houbraken bemoaned the inclination of drinking among artists, though he also believed the *topos* “as his art, so his life” and felt that painters of farcical genre carried an innate propensity to such behavior, which at once both propelled and inhibited the progression of their talents.³¹⁶ As such, he dwelled on dissolute characteristics such as drinking and told anecdotes about the ways alcohol affected the lives of the “always thirsty” Steen, Brouwer and Frans van Mieris in particular. Houbraken’s colorful stories frequently found to Steen partaking in drink, remarking that he was “always thirsty” and became merry after drinking wine.³¹⁷ Steen famously owned a brewery in Delft that Houbraken claims was lost because the artist spent his money on wine instead of on malt for making beer, thus prompting the saying, “*De Waard in de drie Masten, is eer dronken als zyn Gasten.*”³¹⁸ Later, after the brewery folded, Steen opened an inn in Leiden and received a license to serve alcohol out of his house. Jacob Campo Weyerman reported in his *Levensbeschrijvingen* that many local artists frequented the inn, including Frans van

³¹⁵ Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, fol. 240v.

³¹⁶ Houbraken, III: 13. It is in the life of Steen that Houbraken writes “*In’t algemeen moet ik zeggen, dat zyn schildereyen zyn also zyn levenswyze, en zyn levenswyze als zyne schildereyen.*” (In general I must say, that his paintings were like his way of life, and his way of life like his paintings.)

See Westermann 1997 (16-45) for a discussion of Steen’s critical fortune, focusing on his reception in Houbraken. Westermann (24) suggests that Houbraken formulated many of the anecdotes in his biography of Steen from the artist’s own paintings as well as stock elements of comic texts, including jest books and comic plays.

³¹⁸ Houbraken, III: 7; 14-16. “The landlord of the Three Masts, is drunker than his guests.”

Mieris, Arie de Vois (ca. 1632-1680), Quiringh van Brekelenkam (ca.1622-1670) and Jan Lievens.³¹⁹ Houbraken happily writes of Steen's bad influence on his friend

Frans van Mieris:

[Van Mieris] was a particularly good friend of Jan Steen, and loved his peasant antics so much that he was captivated by his company and often visited him; but as Jan Steen sank ever more into drinking (*he who handles tar says the old Dutch proverb, will be stained by it*) it sometimes transpired that our MIERIS erred in the measure of his drinking. *Who, says Seneca, is equally wise at all times?*³²⁰

Houbraken's anecdote goes on to emphasize the serious consequences of Steen's and alcohol's influence, telling of Van Mieris' literal fall into the gutter one night when drunk.³²¹ The stories about Van Mieris' drunkenness are not without a likely basis in reality. It appears that the artist did have an inclination to drink way too much, perhaps even had a serious addiction, which at times did interfere with his business. A letter from Cosimo de' Medici III's Amsterdam agent Giovacchio

³¹⁹ Weyerman, II: 353. Weyerman classifies these artists as "*geldelooze*"—penniless.

³²⁰ Houbraken, III: 7. "*Hy was een byzonder goed vrient van Jan Steen, en beminde zyne boertereyen zoodanig d thy op zyn gezelschap verzet was, en dikmaals by hem kwam; maar alzoo Jan Steen meer en meer tot den drank verviel (die met pek omgaat zeit het oude Hollandsche spreekwort, wort 'er door besmet) gebeurde 'took somtyds wel eens, dat onze MIERIS zig in de maat van drinken vergistel. Wie, zeit Seneca, is 't aller uuren even wys?'*" Translation Horn, I:189.

³²¹ *Ibid.*, III: 8-9. The rest of the story recounts the encounter of a kind shoemaker and his wife who heard Van Mieris' cries and found him in the muck, rescuing him and cleaning him up (and incidentally, the couple gave the artist *more* brandy "as he was quite upset"). Later, Van Mieris returned to their house and gave them a painting to show his gratitude. The wife did not recognize him and Van Mieris did not identify himself, "Truly an example of a grateful and noble spirit," Houbraken thought (9) ("*Waarlyk een staal van en danknaaren en edelmoedigen geest*"). Also see Horn (189-90) who interprets this story and its happy ending as something new in Houbraken, rather than "a sermon against reprehensible alcoholism" and a reflection of the author's great respect for Van Mieris' paintings.

Grieffy (111) notes that Van Mander uses the same example of drunkenness (a "drunkard [who] stumbles into muddy gutters") in his *Grondt* section of the *Schilder-boeck* (I: 77), suggesting that Van Mander's image was perhaps a literal example of drunkenness for Houbraken.

For more on the subject of Frans van Mieris and drunkenness, see Naumann, I: 31-3.

Guasconi to Cosimo's secretary Apollonio Bassetti in 1674 reveals that the artist was completely drunk when Van Mieris arrived to deliver a painting, *The Old Lover* (Florence, Uffizi), one that had been requested for some time. Not only was Van Mieris sick from drink when he met Guasconi, but it was soon discovered that the artist did not even have the painting in his possession—he had left it in an inn.³²² Van Mieris was also apparently not a good money manager, which may or may not have been related to his drinking habits. A later letter concerning the same painting relates that Guasconi was approached by Van Mieris' wife Cunera van der Cock, who asked to be paid some of the money for the work to care for the household. She requested this be done without her husband's knowledge as money in his hands "goes out like unstopped acid from an etching plate."³²³

Both Steen and Van Mieris were characterized as drunks in later art literature based on the personae developed by Houbraken, which proved to be a long-lived *topos*. A nineteenth-century painting proves that the tales of their relationship were still fascinating to viewers centuries later, imagining the two artists outside an inn, one lifting a pitcher to fill the other's glass (Figure 44).³²⁴ The two painters were also linked in posterity in the accompanying engravings of the artists' portraits that accompanied Houbraken's edition, (Figure 45) where Steen's and Van Mieris' portraits not only share a page, but illusionistically—almost intimately—overlap.

³²² Naumann I: 178. The letter is dated 23 February 1674 (ASF, Mediceo, 4261, fol 360). The painting is referred to as a "*Bridero*" and in a second letter dated 25 March 1675 (Naumann I: 183; ASF, Mediceo, 4262, fol. 423) Guasconi writes how Bassetti to see how much he should pay for the 'picture of Bredero.'

³²³ *Ibid*, I: 183; ASF, Mediceo, 4262, fol. 423.

³²⁴ Another painting by the same artist is titled *Jan Steen Sending his Son out to Trade Paintings for Beer and Wine* (1828. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

Next to Steen and Van Mieris' portraits in the engraving of the two kindred artists is an interesting addition: a monkey holding a palette. The traditional interpretation of the monkey in this context, as Westermann suggests, would be as a symbol of imitation—a reference to the painter as an “ape of nature.”³²⁵ It may have also hinted at the witty character of both artists (it appeared as an attribute of *Commedia* in Ripa's *Iconologia*) as monkeys appear as active participants and symbols of foolishness in many of Steen's paintings of dissolute households and also in works by “Geestige Willem” Buytewech and David Teniers the Younger (1610-1690).³²⁶ However, monkeys also held two other associations that could well be related to the art of Steen and Van Mieris, and dissolute artists in general. Monkeys were traditionally linked to the sanguine humour, a temperament that is characterized by an overabundance of blood and that resulted in both a witty character as well as a propensity towards sensuality.³²⁷ Houbraken also includes a monkey next to his

³²⁵ Westermann 1997, 23.

³²⁶ *Ibid*, 229. Westermann notes that Steen often places the role of the monkeys in his scenes as “complete alter egos” to the artist, as in the painting *In Luxury Beware* (1663, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), they pull up the clock weights to suspend time and watch the scene from above.”

Ripa, 77-78 & 452-3.

E. Haverkamp Begemann, *Willem Buytewech* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1959) 59-60. Buytewech is referred to as “Geestige” for the first time in a document of 1656 (Orlers [I. Orlers, *Beschrijvinge der Stadt Leyden*, 1641] announced that Lievens had copied after “Geestighe Willem”), but geestig also “had a wide range of meaning: from *ingenious* to *witty* with *inventive* as its central meaning.”

³²⁷ Janson, 241-4. Janson suggests that the original concept of the four temperaments or humours had an association with the drunkenness of Noah, which also accounts for the association of the monkey, the sanguine temperament and wine. He quotes the mid-fourteenth century *Gesta Romanorum* in which Noah discovers a wild grapevine and to sweeten the bitter taste of the grapes, he mixed the blood of four animals—a lion, lamb, pig and an ape—with some earth to create a fertilizer. The resulting wine caused Noah's drunkenness. Noah then told his son “that he had applied the blood of the aforesaid beasts (to the vine) in order to instruct mankind.” The story was “supplemented by a ‘moralisation’ which explains that wine has the peculiar effect of evoking the character traits of the four animals in men: ‘Some drinkers become irate like lions, some resemble lambs *per verecundiam*, and others

engraved portrait of Adriaen Brouwer as well (Figure 46). Though Brouwer shares the page with two other artists, the monkey sits specifically adjacent to Brouwer, staring ruefully at the artist's otherwise elegant incarnation.³²⁸ Of both a witty and unconventional character, Brouwer was also known as a great drinker, who reportedly died at the young age of thirty-two because he was “overwhelm'd with his Intemperance.”³²⁹

Monkeys were often shown fettered in chains, such as the monkey in Moleaner's *Allegory of Fidelity in Marriage* (Figure 47), showing that “the sanguine creature stands for the prisoner of bodily pleasures.”³³⁰ The sanguine temperament was particularly exposed by drink: “the more he drinks the gayer he becomes and pursues that ladies.”³³¹ Weyerman, in his *Levensbeschrijvingen*, refers to Steen's “*bloedryke gesteltnis*,” (sanguine constitution) as well as his merry humor, perhaps suggesting, like Houbraken, that the artist was not only a cheerful sort, but predisposed to a weakness towards alcohol and worldly pleasures.³³² Houbraken did make specific mention that Steen's nature was “*geneigt...tot klucht*” (inclined to farce), moreso than the “*droefgeestige*” (melancholic) artist.³³³ Houbraken describes

develop the curiosity and inept gaiety of the ape.” The association of these animals with Noah is replaced by their appearance with Bacchus in a ca. 1400 mythological treatise, *Libellus de imaginibus*.

³²⁸ The image can be found in Houbraken I: opposite p. 326.

³²⁹ Meysens, 18.

³³⁰ P.J.J. van Thiel, “Marriage Symbolism in a Musical Party by Jan Miense Molenaer,” *Simiolus* 2 (1967): 98.

³³¹ Janson (248) cites the *Calendrier des Bergers*, published in 1493 by Guyot Marchand (Morgan Library, New York, M565, f. 2r).

³³² Weyerman, *Levensbeschrijvingen* II: 347. “Sanguine (blood-rich) constitution”

³³³ Houbraken III: 12.

Schilderbent artist Pieter van Laer the same way before launching into an anecdote about how the artist, for a joke, dressed up as a monkey and sat in front of a store window, giving passersby a good laugh.³³⁴ Ripa personified the sanguine temperament as a lute-playing gentleman [a model that Steen may have intentionally adopted in his *Self-Portrait as a Lutenist* (Figure 48)], and described those ruled by the humour as “the liveliest, sharpest wits of the day, from whom laughter and merriment come forth...”³³⁵

Monkeys were also traditionally related to the images of the Five Senses, specifically the sense of Taste, as they were considered the animal that had an even keener sense of taste than man. The derivation of the symbol comes from the monkey or ape’s legendary taste for apples, which naturally also held associations with the Fall of Man, the ultimate symbol of the flawed human nature.³³⁶ While other animals connected with the senses (vultures with smell, lynx with vision, boars with hearing, spiders with touch) were transformed through time, the symbol of the monkey was constant. As early as the twelfth century, artists included a monkey to symbolize the Taste in series of the senses.³³⁷ The association persisted, as Jan Bruegel’s (1568-

³³⁴ *Ibid.*, I: 360. “*Daar benevens was hy van een vrolyken potsemakenden aart...*” (He had a merry and farcical disposition.)

³³⁵ Ripa, 75-6. “...*daer uyt komen de suyvere levendige en scherpsinnige geesten vvoor den dagh...*” (translation Washington and The Hague 1996, 182). Ripa also includes a goat (the astrological symbol for Capricorn, which corresponded to the sanguine temperament) holding a bunch of grapes in its mouth, an allusion to wine. Also see Chapman 1990-1, 375-6.

³³⁶ H.W. Janson, *Apes and Ape Lore in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1952) 240.

³³⁷ Chu-tsing Li, *The Five Senses in Art: An Analysis of Its Development in Northern Europe*. (Ph.D. dissertation: State University of Iowa, 1955) 25. Li cites Thomas of Cantimpré’s twelfth-century animal cycle of the Five Senses with a boar for Hearing, a lynx for Sight, a vulture for Smell and a spider for Touch.

1625) famous 1618 series of the Five Senses in the Prado shows a woman eating at a large table with a monkey standing on the back of her chair. The symbol thrived in Dutch seventeenth-century art: Hendrick Goltzius includes a monkey eating fruit in his version of the Five Senses and a later engraving of Taste by Cornelis van Kittensteyn (ca. 1600-after 1638) after Dirk Hals shows an elegant couple drinking wine in a courtyard with a monkey behind them.³³⁸ The monkey appears as a symbol of Taste and carnal vice in other genre scenes as well, such as in Molenaer's *Allegory of the Fidelity of Marriage* (Figure 47) or David Teniers' *Prodigal Son* (Figure 49).³³⁹ The use of symbol would have been relevant to Steen, van Mieris and Brouwer given their reputations and as a reflection of their character.

The Power of Drink

Dutch artists did, in fact, have a reasonable explanation (some might say excuse) for drinking. Moral perils aside, since classical times, alcohol—specifically wine—had been attributed with the power to alight creativity. The idea derives from classical sources, most importantly the writings of Horace (and later Ovid), who promoted the idea in his *Epistles* that wine could induce a type of frenzy much like a “divine madness” inspiring artistic creation. Consequently, the god of wine, Dionysus (in Greek myth) or Bacchus (in Roman), was worshipped as the source of this

³³⁸ Hollstein Goltzius was engraved by Jan Saenredam. Hollstein, 10 (Kittensteyn).

power.³⁴⁰ Virgil also explored the inspirational power of drinking on the poet in the character of Silenus, the drunken god who was also prophetic. The Bacchic celebration featuring the fat and drunken Silenus was a popular theme, particularly in Flemish art.³⁴¹

The idea of Bacchic inspiration reemerged in Italy during the Renaissance, an adjunct to the idea of artist as creative genius, and one was evident in northern art and literature by the middle of the sixteenth century. The powers of wine are celebrated in emblems such as Hadrianus Junius' 1565 *Medici Emblemata* showing a winged figure of Bacchus cupping a wineglass and a bunch of grapes, gazing admiringly out across an idyllic view. (Figure 50). While the inscription "VINEM INGENIJ FOMES" expresses the classical idea of inspirational power of wine, the scene is distinctly Netherlandish with a windmill sited prominently in the landscape's middle distance.³⁴² Similarly, a passage under the heading of "Genius" in the 1644 Dutch edition of Ripa's *Iconologia* reads: "*En Ceres als oock Bacchus wijn, /Doet's menschen Geest vol levens zijn.*" (In Ceres and also Bacchus' wine, /Man's spirits live fully).³⁴³

³⁴⁰ David A. Levine, "Pieter van Laer's *Artists' Tavern*: An Ironic Commentary on Art," in Bock and Gaeghtgens, 177. Plato's *Phaedrus* was the first source to credit the muses with bestowing a "divine madness" upon mortals that inspired poetry.

³⁴¹ Rubens (*The Drunken Silenus*. 1616-7. Alte Pinakothek, Munich), Van Dyck (*Drunken Silenus Supported by Satyrs*. Ca. 1620. National Gallery, London) and Jordaens (*The Revel of Bacchus and Silenus*. Sold 5 July 2007, Christie's London) all painted the subject.

³⁴² *Ibid*, 190. Levine notes that a similar emblem appears in F. Schoonhovius, *Emblemata partim moralia partim etiam civilia* (Gouda, 1618) with an accompanying motto that reads VINUM ACUIT INGENIUM.

Junius' treatise was published in Antwerp.

³⁴³Ripa, 138.

The positive powers of wine also appear in the writings of art theorists and biographers. In some matters, it was simply a matter of not drinking too much, like “Leiden’s prince” Frans van Mieris, who “drowned in the liquid of Bacchus.”³⁴⁴ Samuel van Hoogstraten, who joined the artists of the *Schildersbent* in Bacchic revel in Rome, cited the “*gebruik van wijn*” by artists for inspiration in his 1678 *Inleyding*, though he did not condone its use.³⁴⁵ Van Mander referred to wine’s power to summon creativity in the biography of Frans Floris (ca. 1516-1570) noting that “often when he returned home, half-drunk or worse, he put his hand on his brushes and still did a great pile of work; it seemed as if he had even more spirit then...”³⁴⁶ Adriaen Brouwer, though known for his bohemian antics, is referred to as using wine and the tavern environment to benefit his art. The artist famously painted in a tavern, where according to Meysens, “in the heat of Wine he invented things that gave a true Character of the wildness and frolicksomeness of his Temper, that caused admiration to gravest and most judicious Painters.”³⁴⁷

Maerten van Heemskerck (1498-1574) alluded to inspirational effects of wine in his depiction of the patron saint of painters in *St. Luke Painting the Madonna* (Figure 51). David Levine identifies the “bearded and wreathed” figure standing behind St. Luke in the painting as “a personification of *furor poeticus*.” Levine bases

³⁴⁴Naumann I: 192 cites a 1697 poem by David van Hoogstraten: “*Wie volge Leidens voersteling/Die, schoon in Bacchus vocht verzopen...*” Also see Hofstede de Groot, X: 194-5.

³⁴⁵ Van Hoogstraten, 200-1.

³⁴⁶ Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, fol. 242r. “*Oock dickwils t’huys comende half oft meer beschoncken wesende/ stoegh handt aen de Pinceelen en maeckte noch grooten hoop wercks/ schijnende dan meer gheestigh...*”

³⁴⁷Meysens, 18, (XXI).

the identification on the fact that the male figure's wreath is "composed entirely on Bacchic ivy, [as] it alludes specifically to the god of wine."³⁴⁸ Van Mander identified this figure behind St. Luke as a possible self-portrait of Van Heemskerck, noting the artist's unusual choice of putting his own features on an allegorical figure rather than on his profession's patron saint ("whose face was a portrait of a baker).³⁴⁹ Van Heemskerck painted this work upon his departure from Haarlem to Rome, where, according to Vasari, he publicly exhibited such Bacchic inspiration working on the decoration of the arch of San Marco he and his assistants were "constantly drunk and inflamed with the heat of wine, and their facility in execution, they achieved wonders."³⁵⁰

Bacchanalia and the Schildersbent

The most notorious proponents of Bacchic inspiration were the artists of the Schildersbent, a fraternity of Dutch artists living and working in Rome. Also known as the Bamboccianti after the artist Pieter van Laer (called Bamboccio or "little puppet" due to his physical abnormalities), the group was founded in 1623 both for camaraderie and to protect the rights of expatriate Netherlandish artists working and studying in Rome. The brotherhood of artists remained active through the end of the

³⁴⁸ Levine 1984b, 178-9. Levine (190, note 36) points out that Heemskerck was a friend of Hadrianus Junius, the author of the treatise containing the emblem (Figure 50) citing the presence Bacchic inspiration in the Netherlands.

³⁴⁹ Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, fol. 245r. "Behind St. Luke stands a sort of poet, his head crowned with ivy or leaves of the pea-plant and it rather looks as if it could be a portrait of Marten himself at that time."

³⁵⁰ Vasari,

century.³⁵¹ Over two hundred artists claimed association with the group at one point or another, including many prominent names such as the Italianate landscapist Cornelis Poelenburgh (ca. 1586-1667), Utrecht Caravaggist Dirck van Baburen (1595-1624) and Rembrandt pupil Samuel van Hoogstraten (1627-1678). Stylistically, the Bamboccianti, or “Bent” artists, were generally known for their small scenes of life depicting the city’s lower classes and for the cues they took from Caravaggio’s realism. They were, however, even more famous for their ritualistic drunken revelry.³⁵²

Their group affiliation (Schildersbent translates as “painter’s clique”) was based largely on the rites and rituals they held, including elaborate initiation ceremonies and feasts that all featured elements of Bacchic worship, but moreover, bacchanalian excess.³⁵³ Every time a new member arrived from the North, the group held indulgent, often multi-day initiations called “baptisms.” Images of the actual induction ceremony (Figure 52) depict the newcomer crowned with ivy and stripped down to a loincloth to resemble Bacchus. Quite often, the initiate is shown sitting astride a wine barrel while other members gather around in drunken revelry. The new members were given “Bent” nicknames like “Biervliech” (meaning “beer fly,” Baburen), “Batavier” (van Hoogstraten) and “Satyr” (Poelenburgh). The ceremony was officiated by a Bent “priest,” though the implied mocking of holy sacrament was

³⁵¹ Levine, 4. Van Laer had a hunchback as well as a disproportionately short chest.

³⁵² See Levine (12) for a summary of the opinions regarding the influence of Caravaggio on the art of the Bamboccianti. Hoogewerff 1952 (131-146) lists 222 artists affiliated with the Bentveughels.

³⁵³ Levine 1984b, 181. A drawing (Anonymous, Museum van Boijmans-Van Beuningen, Rotterdam) and painting (by Domenicus van Wijnen, known today in a ca. 1690 engraving by M. Pool) after a Bentveughel initiation ceremony shows a group of men surrounding a plump figure of Bacchus straddling a barrel and supplying everyone with wine.

deemed so blasphemous by Roman society that it was condemned in 1669 and eventually banned by papal decree in 1720.³⁵⁴

Equally as infamous was the gluttony of the feasts. Of Van Laer's initiation, seventeenth-century biographer Giambattista Passeri wrote that the "celebration lasted continuously for at least twenty-four hours without [the participants] ever leaving the table, to which entire barrels of wine were brought..."³⁵⁵ After the banquet, the ceremony continued with a (now drunken) procession to the church of Santa Costanza, just outside the walls of Rome. The church housed a sarcophagus that at the time was believed to be the grave of Bacchus, and the place where Bentveughels prayed to their patron saint.³⁵⁶

The artists of the Schildersbent embraced a raucous public persona, but they were able to sanction their behavior through association with the classical god. Aside from the elaborate initiation ceremonies, the group convened often in taverns where they "enjoyed regular drunken sprees."³⁵⁷ Throughout the long duration of the fraternity, Bent artists fostered and promoted their association with wine and wild

³⁵⁴ Hoogewerff 1952, 131; 147; 141. See page 147 for a list of all "*bentnamen*." See p. 122 for the decree by Pope Clemens XI.

³⁵⁵ Giambattista Passeri, *Vite de' pittori, scultori ed architetti che hanno lavorato in Roma*. Reprint. Originally published Rome: N. Barbiellini, 1772. (Milan: A Forni, 1976) 76. "*Questa ricreazione durava il meno 24 hore continue, senza mai levarsi da tavola, nella quail facevano portar' il vino a barili intieri.*" Translation Kren, 69.

³⁵⁶ Hoogewerff, 103-105. It is now thought to be the grave of Constantina, the daughter of Constantine the Great. The sarcophagus is now in the Vatican Museum.

Thomas Kren, "Chi non vuol Baccho: Roeland van Laer's Burlesque Painting about Dutch Artist in Rome," *Simiolus* 11 (1980): 69-70. The church of Santa Costanza was outside the city walls and during the procession "members of the Bent scrawled their names on the walls of the church, thus providing an informal register of inductees, including their names, their dates of induction, and the nicknames awarded on that occasion." See Kren (69-73) for a description of the *tableaux vivants* honoring Bacchus that accompanied initiation ceremonies.

³⁵⁷ Levine, 3-4.

living in drawings and paintings depicting group meetings. A painting by Roeland van Laer (d. 1640) (Figure 53), thought to depict part of the Bent initiation ceremony, depicts a riotous scene where the guests are literally climbing the walls (on a ladder to the right). The figures form a drunken pyramid, topped by a woman, likely a prostitute, triumphantly (but precariously) balancing a wine jug atop her head as she stands on the shoulders of two men. The rest of the tavern pulses with action-- we see figures guzzle wine and smoke, throw their arms in the air in celebration and even one who lays exhausted under the table. The scene likely depicts a *tableau vivant*, an activity that was popular at Bent ceremonies. Biographer Joachim von Sandrart describes one that recreated Parnassus, the mountain of the gods, in a similar structure as seen in the painting.³⁵⁸

A few scenes by members of the Schildersbent hint at a connection between drinking and artistic creation, though both emphasize revelry over productivity. A drawing by Roeland's younger brother, Pieter, (Figure 10) appears to depict a more casual gathering of *Bentveughels*, though the scene is no less raucous. The drawing shows a group of artists sitting around a table drinking, smoking, and playing board games. Another figure stands with his hands against a wall that is covered in drawings and a thick scrawl in broad letters that reads: "BAMBOO[TS]," an allusion to the artist's nickname Bamboccio, or Bamboots.³⁵⁹ The large, haphazard drawings do not suggest studied practice, but rather imply an impulsive "frenzy to create" that

³⁵⁸ Kren (73) identifies the woman as a prostitute based on the inscription that appears next to her on the wall: "*Chi non vuol Baccho Venere nō puo/Chaudier.*"

³⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 68.

may have been associated with Bacchic inspiration.³⁶⁰ However, aside from the man who places his hands to the wall, none of the other figures show any interest in the drawings, or seem to feel compelled in any way to create.

An engraving after a work by Domenicus van Wijnen (Figure 54) similarly depicts tavern walls covered with drawings including the outline of a male figure and a quickly drawn portrait. The scene bustles with energy, and the artists are busy at work, not drawing, but drinking. We see snippets of reckless debauchery—a wineglass soaring in mid-air, and another one about to spill onto the floor. There are hints of prodigality as well: a peacock pie (a traditional part of the iconography of the parable of the Prodigal Son) is being delivered to the waiting table of artists. The scene allies artists and artistic creation with the dissolute realm—a place where drinking, smoking, writing on walls, and falling under tables are all part of rites and rules of what it means to be an artist.

David Levine has interpreted Pieter van Laer's *Artist's Tavern* drawing as an ironic commentary on academic training, and one that “lays bare the pretentious assumptions of the elevated tradition to which it refers, namely that artists should be dignified, learned gentlemen, and that art can be taught by following a standard set of rules.”³⁶¹ The *Bentveughels*, with their unruly conduct, riotous ceremonies and naturalistic scenes of peasants and low-life subjects, were held in contempt by much of the academic community of Rome. Initial disputes arose in the 1620s and 1630s when the *Bent* artists refused to pay voluntary alms (and later a mandatory levy) to

³⁶⁰ Levine, 254.

³⁶¹ Levine 1984b, 183.

the *Accademia di San Luca* in Rome.³⁶² Salvator Rosa (1615-1673), in his satire on painting called *Pittura*, pointed to the Bamboccianti as one of the reasons for what he saw as the decline of art, scorning their depictions of “foul activities set in vulgar places” as well as their own immoral conduct.³⁶³ Rosa went so far as to classify the artists as “beasts” that were insignificant in comparison to the great masters.³⁶⁴

For the artists of the Schildersbent, identifications with classical inspiration through the worship of Bacchus did little to ingratiate the group into the graces of the academic realm. Their Bacchic revelry appears to have functioned less as a conduit for artistic inspiration, and more as a means for artists to celebrate a shared group identity. David Levine posits the artists’ connection to Bacchus was “a mock-serious effort to invoke the god’s power to inspire creativity.”³⁶⁵ Their love of wine did, however, help to promote the connection between Dutch artists and drinking outside of their homeland, fostering the image of the dissolute artist—for good and for bad—as a particularly Dutch construct.

³⁶² Hoogewerff, 162-3. The first refusal of alms payment occurred in 1624-5. In 1633, Pope Urban VIII issued a papal brief that replaced the voluntary alms with a compulsory levy. The academy could not prevent the Bentveughels from selling their popular paintings, and after the death of Urban VIII in 1644, the artists were legally permitted to sell small secular paintings.

³⁶³ Wendy Wassyng Roworth, “A Date for Salvator Rosa’s Satire on Painting and the Bamboccianti in Rome,” *Art Bulletin* 63 (1981) 611.

³⁶⁴ Levine, 7.

³⁶⁵ Levine, 259.

3. How Not to Behave: Prodigality

Wine alighted Bentvueghel celebrations like a flame. The various images of group initiations and tavern meetings concentrate on the electric energy of the artists when under the influence of alcohol. Whether in a standing-room-only tavern or in the midst of an initiation rite, the scenes of drinking Bentvueghels teem with animated life. In Dutch culture, alcohol was viewed as a conduit that could ignite a fuse towards dissolution. Literature discussing sensual pleasures often conveyed the idea that behaviors like drinking and smoking “had a natural tendency to progress from one form of concupiscence to another—overeating and drinking to immodesty, lustfulness and lechery, to gaming, idleness, and excessive sleep.”³⁶⁶ A series of four prints by Jacob Matham (1571-1631) entitled *The Consequences of Drunkenness* clearly illustrates the results of overindulgence and the accompanying text in both Latin and Dutch makes the message even clearer. Like Jan van de Velde II’s prints for Ampzing, Matham’s quartet shows that the sins of lust, greed and ire reside in a Pandora’s box of even more vices, looming just a few drops away for those who choose to open their throats. “Excessive drinking leads above all, to every form of dishonorable and dissolute behavior,” reads the inscription on Matham’s *Amorous Couple* engraving (Figure 55) of a well-dressed couple groping each other on a bed with a procuress figure behind them.³⁶⁷

³⁶⁶ Christine Megan Armstrong, *The Moralizing Prints of Cornelis Anthonisz* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990) 21.

³⁶⁷ Amsterdam 1997, p. 165. The engraving titled *Amorous Couple* is inscribed with the saying in both Latin (“*Crebrior inprimis potandi procreat usus/Omne inhonestatis luxuriaque genus.*”) and Dutch

In addition to diatribes against excessive swilling, seventeenth-century Dutch art literature also spoke out against other compromising actions of artists, particularly their prodigality, which was seen as often initiated or exacerbated by drink. Cornelis de Bie, for example, was very concerned that artists should exude good morals and warned in particular against sloth.³⁶⁸ Houbraken reported that the parents of Govaert Flinck (1615-1660) had a bad opinion of artists because of their reputedly dissolute habits.³⁶⁹

Van Mander berated artists not just for excessive drinking, but for general dissolute conduct, noting unbridled, riotous and “gek” (crazy) behavior and bemoaning how poorly it reflected upon the profession giving it a “bad reputation.” Van Mander was also concerned about artists squandering their money on so many sensual delights. He frequently equated artistic fame with wealth, and bemoaned what he saw as artist’s potential for fame pour out of their pockets and into a wineglass. Van Mander invoked a popular proverb about artists, wishing for “mildness” instead of “wildness.” In fact, in *Den grondt der edel vry schilderconst*,

(“*Onmaticheijt des dranckx eerst can verwecken snel/Oncuijsheyt al vol stanckx des siels bevlecken fel.*”).

The series has a precedent in a similarly titled group of prints of Bacchic gluttony made in 1551 after Maerten van Heemskerck that pictures the inevitable downfall of alcohol allegorically rather than using scenes from everyday life. Van Heemskerck’s four designs feature heroic nudes and Bacchus as the personification of wine literally engaged in physically forceful behavior and inciting vices such as lust (*Bacchus Prepares the Way for Lust*, which shows Bacchus literally pulling out the heart of a drunken man to give to Venus) or *Bacchus Causes the Loss of the Senses and Memory* (showing drunken fighting). In another, Bacchus grabs the legs of a drinking man to symbolize the instability of drunkenness. See Veldman, pp. 134-5 and Sullivan, 31-2.

³⁶⁸ Cornelis de Bie, *Het gulden cabinet van de edel vry schilderconst*, (Antwerp, 1661) facsimile ed., (Soest: Davaco, 1971), 206-7.

³⁶⁹ Houbraken II: 19. He worries that his son will follow in the “*ongebonden leven*” (unbridled living) of artists.

he mentions the saying twice, addressing his readers as young “painting promotion officers”:

Dus, leerlustige geesten, ontloop wijselijk de dronkenschap mar haar kwade gevolgen, waarvan het vermelden te lang zou duren en te onnut zou zijn, opdat de slechte reputatie van de kunst eens in de afgrond van de Styx mag dalen, zoals, een schilder [is] een gek”, en [opdat} ook het populaire volkspreekwoord „Hoe schilder hoe wilder” ontoepasselijk mag worden en vertrekken in „Hoe schilder hoe rustiger.”

[So, souls eager to learn, be so wise to avoid drunkenness with all its evil results (to list them all here would take far too long and thus serves no purpose) so that the bad reputation of art now and forever can fall into the ravine of Styx and thus the saying that "the artist is crazy" and the popular expression "the more of a painter, the wilder he is" no longer apply and can be changed to "the more of a painter, the calmer he is.]³⁷⁰

Jacob Campo Weyerman voiced similar concerns about “*het karakter van losheit*,” (the character of looseness) as well as the “*Zotheid en Armoede*” (folly and poverty) of the “*rampzalige Konstchilders*” (miserable painters).³⁷¹ Weyerman was concerned not only about the wild living of artists, but also about their moral character. Speaking of Hamburg artist Filip Tideman, he offers a contrast of virtue:

Moreover (besides) he was a pious, sincere and honest man, three qualities which are so rare under the majority of painters, such as the valuable golden coins are rare under the poets, and of which Venus is usually their patroness and Bacchus usually their patron.³⁷²

³⁷⁰ Van Mander-Miedema, *Grondt*, p. 78, strophe 23. The phrase, “painting promotion officers” is untranslated. Oddly, Van Mander included those words in English.

Van Mander mentions the same saying again on page 82, strophe 35, slightly altered as “hoe schilder hoe stiller.”

³⁷¹ Jacob Campo Weyerman, *De levensbeschrijvingen der Nederlandsche konst-schilders en konst-schilderessen*, 4 vols. (The Hague, 1729-69) IV: 375, “the character of looseness; IV: 199, “foolishness and poverty,” “disastrous painters.”

³⁷² Weyerman, III: 348. “*Daarboven was hy een vroom oprecht en eerlyk man, drie eyenschappen dewelke zo raar zijn onder het gros der Schilders, also de Vierdubbelde goude pistoolen raar zijn onde de Poeeten, zijnde Venus doorgans hun Patrones en Bacchus hun Beschermyelig.*”

Drinking and women went hand in hand in the minds of the Dutch; “*van Wijntje naar Trijntje*,” they often joked.³⁷³ Lust, brought on by alcohol, was a dangerous condition—a sin in any state—that could ostensibly be controlled through moral discipline, as illustrated quite literally by a print by Dirck Volkertsz. Coorhert entitled *Through Faith One Turn’s One’s Back on Improper Desires*, showing the figure of Faith beating a small Cupid to death!³⁷⁴ Despite man’s best efforts to stay on the path of virtue and fortitude, an uncontrollable factor proved to be the women themselves. Van Mander proclaimed “amorous desire” a blockage “whose aim is usually to obstruct youth from the path of virtue.” He also warned of the mortal dangers of lust, such befell the son of Marten van Cleef, Jooris, who “had an excellent start...but because he took too much pleasure in prostitutes he died young.”³⁷⁵ Women, however, abetted this downfall, and Van Mander warned of their potentially dangerous influence in his biography of Venlo painter Hubert Goltz (1525-1583):

Eventually he married a second time with a woman who did not have one of the best reputations, to the sorrow of his children and relations and to his own distraction, detriment and disgrace, as has happened to other wise and sensible

³⁷³ F.A. Stoett (1923-5), *Nederlandsche Spreekwoorden, spreekwijzen, uitdrukkingen en gezegen*. Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren website http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/stoe002nede01_01/stoe002nede01_01_2701.htm (date retrieved 1 September 2007)

“From Wine to Trijn” is the translation, as Trijn or Trijntje, was a common name for a prostitute.

Emmens 1968 (167) refers to the *Wijntje* and *Trijntje* as symbolic of the senses of Taste and Touch.

³⁷⁴ Veldman, 130-1. The engraving by Coorhert is after a design by Adriaan de Weert (Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett). The work is illustrated in Veldman, p. 130, fig. 8.

³⁷⁵ Van Mander, *Grondt*, 90, strophe 61. “*Vermijd, om niet je eleven lang een knoieier te blijven, de dartele wellusteling Cupido, de lust om te vrijen, wiens bedoelingen veelal de jeugd de toegang tot deugd beletten.*”

Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, fol. 230v.

Pieter van Laer was another artist whose death was blamed on loose living with women. See Passeri, 34

men who have put too much trust in the inconstancy of some women, intending to moderate them with reason or through education, to soften or lead onto better paths their hardened, bad habits.³⁷⁶

The Prodigal Son in Holland

This drunk, lustful and unruly artist that biographers and theorists disparaged was the converse of the prevailing seventeenth-century image of the artist as a gentleman of learning. Drinking and raucous behavior represented a loss of control of the intellect, which had been crucial in the elevation of the status of the artist. Like the preachers who warned of drink's potential for sin, art theorists warned how it could render the artist sloppy, unproductive, penniless, graceless, witless—all the things that defied the precepts of the *paragone*—even like animals, wrote Van Mander, *varkens* (pigs).³⁷⁷

It may not have been such a casual reference. The pig was a common symbol for not only gluttony in Dutch art, but of drunkenness in particular. The title page of Ampzing's *Mirror of the Vanity and Unrestrainedness of Our Age* is designed to create the illusion that the text is inscribed upon pig's skin. Engraver Jan van de Velde II included a curly pig's tail along the irregular edge of the bottom of the page, a hint at the character of the vices explored within the book. Pieter van Thiel

³⁷⁶ Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, fol. 248v.

³⁷⁷ *Ibid*, p. 77, strophe 20-21. “*De dronkaard valt in de slijkige gotten en moet, berooid, veel ongemak verdragen. En wat zijn er uit dronkenschap al [geen] schandelijke en gruwlijke handelingen voortgekomen die in nuchtere toestand zeer te betreuren zijn...*”

Van Mander quotes Goltzius, a teetotaler, making a similar comment about drinking when offered a drink by German noblemen: “Why, gentlemen, do you wish (he said) that I should have so much to drink? After all, I am not an animal. And if I did, what then could I achieve, or how could I be of service to you?” (*Lives*, fol. 286v)

interprets the pig's tail as a visual metaphor for "the symbol of Gula since time immemorial, and particularly of the craving for drink."³⁷⁸

Van Mander's comparison of artists to pigs may have also called to mind the parable of the prodigal son to seventeenth-century Dutch minds, a theme that represented the epitome of unruly and self-destructive behavior. Artists, however, appear to have associated with this biblical guise, as a fair of artists depicted themselves as the prodigal son himself. The parable, from Luke 15: 11-32, tells the story of a man with two sons, one of whom leaves home with a share of his father's goods and wealth only to squander it on "riotous living." Penniless and hungry, the son is forced to feed among swine before he returns to his father in shame, yet he is welcomed with forgiving arms.

Van Mander's reference could well have been quite pointed as he himself had made a design of the subject of the prodigal son among swine, engraved in 1592 by the same Jacob Matham who would later depict the effects of drunkenness in a series of prints (Figure 55). In his *Schilder-boeck*, Van Mander also identified a self-portrait by Dürer in the guise of the prodigal son, noting the artist's presence "where he kneels by the pigs, gazing up."³⁷⁹ In the tale of the prodigal son, the pig represented

³⁷⁸ Pieter J.J. van Thiel "For Instruction and Betterment: Samuel Ampzing's 'Mirror of the Vanity and Unrestrainedness of Our Age'" *Simiolus* 24 (1996): 191

The pig held various meanings in the seventeenth century, including associations with the sin of sloth. See Susan Koslow, "Frans Hals' Fisherboys: Exemplars of Idleness," *Art Bulletin* 57 (1975): 426.

³⁷⁹ Van Mander also made a design for the *Prodigal Son Squandering His Inheritance by Riotous Living*, which was engraved by Jaques de Gheyn II in 1596. See Worcester 1993, 146.

Van Mander-Miedma, *Lives*, fol. 209v. The full text reads: "His portrait can also be seen in one of his prints, that is to say the face of the prodigal son where he kneels by the pigs, gazing up."

not only the depravity of prodigal son's ways, but also the sin of gluttony that echoed the nature of his "riotous" living.

The subject of the prodigal son was particularly popular in Dutch Republic throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in many artistic contexts, first seen in ca. 1520 woodcut by Lucas van Leyden, and was also particularly popular in the theatre.³⁸⁰ The theme was clearly understood by another seventeenth-century art theorist, Cornelis de Bie, who composed a play about the prodigal son, *Den verlorene sone Osias oft bekeerden sondae*, first performed in 1678.³⁸¹ Gulielmus Gnapheus' comedy *Acolastus* was the most influential of the sixteenth-century plays and was printed 47 times between its 1529 debut in The Hague and 1585.³⁸² Willem Dirck Hooft's play *Heden-daegsche verlooren soon* (Present-Day Prodigal Son) debuted in Amsterdam in 1630, just a few years before Rembrandt painted his self-portrait with Saskia (Figure 7), what is now considered to represent a version of the prodigal son theme. The subject was present in both numerous prints (Claes Jansz Visscher after David Vinckboons) and in paintings (Honthorst, Flinck, Metsu, Molenaer, Teniers, et

³⁸⁰ Lucas van Leyden, *Young Man Cheated in an Inn* (Cabinet des Estampes, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris). The scene shows a young man embracing a woman as she simultaneously picks his pocket. A figure of a fool proclaims "Acht, hoet varen sal" (watch the way the wind blows). See Christopher Brown, *Scenes of Everyday Life: Dutch Genre Painting of the Seventeenth Century* (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1984) 182-3.

³⁸¹The play was published in Antwerp, 1689.

³⁸² Barbara Haegar, "The Prodigal Son in Sixteenth-Century and Seventeenth-Century Netherlandish Art: Depictions of the Parable and the Evolution of a Catholic Image," *Simiolus* 16 (1986): 129. Haegar credits the popularity of this theme in both the southern and northern Netherlands of the sixteenth century to the unique ability of the story to cater to Catholic or Protestant messages, with "Protestants regarding renditions of the subject [confirming] their belief that works played no part in the process of justification and that man is completely dependent on God's grace." Catholics "would have assumed that the prodigal son cooperated with God's grace and decided of his own free will to return home, thereby contributing to his own salvation." (133)

Also see Gulielmus Gnapheus, *Acolastus: a Latin Play of the Sixteenth-Century by Gulielmus Gnapheus* trans. W.E.D. Atkinson (London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario, 1964).

al.) that predominantly imagined scenes from the parable of what “riotous living” entailed.³⁸³ The parable itself was intended to illustrate the gift of repentance, and to serve as a moral exemplar as well as an assurance of God’s grace.

However, a popular depiction of the prodigal son in seventeenth-century Dutch art focused on one part of the parable: the prodigal son wasting his inheritance among whores, which is precisely the role artists embraced in dissolute self-portraits. The parable of the prodigal son itself gave few specifics regarding the “riotous living” that Dutch artists loved to imagine, aside from a remark made in verse 30 by the loyal son declaring his prodigal brother had “devoured his substance with harlots.” The scene is situated almost exclusively in a tavern with plentiful drink (often with a scorecard marking the number of drinks consumed), one or more women and an allusion to the peacock, the symbol for excessive pride, also known as the sin of Superbia. The cover of Hooft’s play (Figure 56) depicted this scene replete with a woman making marks on a scoreboard to the right, a peacock pie on the table, a seated, reveling prodigal toasting his drink, with a prostitute to his right and an old procuress with her hand in his pocket to the left.

Earlier representations of the parable gave equal attention to other episodes from the story, as an influential series of tondi by Leiden artist Pieter Cornelisz Kunst

³⁸³ For more on the Visscher-Vinckboons 1608 print, see Amsterdam 1997, pp. 188-123. Honthorst (1623, Staatsgalerie, Schleissheim); Flinck (ca. 1640, North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh); Metsu (1640s, State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg); David Teniers the Younger (ca. 1640, Minneapolis Institute of Arts). Rembrandt also depicted the theme in an etching (1636) and in a late painting (ca. 1669, State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg).

The prodigal son theme appears to have enjoyed more popularity in prints in the sixteenth-century rather than the seventeenth, with a version of the subject depicted by, for example, Crispijn van de Passe after Maerten de Vos’ series of eight engravings, Cornelis Bos after Maerten van Heemskerck (1543, etching and engraving) and Lucas van Leyden’s *Inn Scene (The Prodigal Son)* (ca. 1517, woodcut).

(1484-1560) depicts eleven scenes from the life of the prodigal son, from his birth, to wealth, to poverty, to homecoming.³⁸⁴ By the middle of the sixteenth century, the carnal parts of the story were emphasized, especially the folly and vanity of *Luxuria*.³⁸⁵ The increasing secularization of the theme eliminated references to other episodes from the parable, though the subject would have still functioned as a moral exemplar of the perils of luxury, intemperance and lust, among other sins, even without the biblical contextualization. The subject is similar to the northern tradition of Sorgheloos, or Careless, the anonymous profligate who wandered through sixteenth-century Northern art and literature, as well as the theme of the merry company, though there has been some debate as to the related development of these themes.³⁸⁶

The visual boundaries of the riotous prodigal son theme were somewhat fluid, and at times the iconography overlaps with other themes, particularly the theme of the five senses. A version of the prodigal son by David Teniers the Younger (Figure 49) includes the image of a monkey (here chained) eating an apple, which as previously discussed, was the traditional symbol for Taste, the sense most associated with artists.³⁸⁷ Hanging on the wall from a fat nail is a portrait that appears to depict the

³⁸⁴ *Ibid*, 20. There were likely twelve scenes originally.

³⁸⁵ Wages, 184.

³⁸⁶ Armstrong, 19-36. For a discussion of how these three themes interrelate, see Sara M. Wages, "Remarks on Love, Woman, and the Garden in Netherlandish Art: A Study on the Iconology of the Garden," *Rembrandt, Rubens, and the Art of their Time: Recent Perspectives* Eds. Ronald E. Fleischer and Susan Clare Scott (University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University, 1997) 184-5. Luijten (122) in Amsterdam 1997 agrees with Konrad Renger [*Lockere Gesellschaft: Zur Ikonographie des Verlorenen Sohnes und von Wirtshausszenen in der niederländischen Malerei* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1970)] that the themes "coexisted in the sixteenth century, and continued to do so [in the seventeenth century]."

³⁸⁷ The painting also includes musicians behind the table of the prodigal son feasting, who could represent the sense of Hearing. However, Teniers does not appear to have included the other senses.

artist, as the pose, dress and hair are very similar to the self-portrait of Teniers that appears in Jan Meyssen's illustrated biography *True Effigies of the Most Eminent Painters* (Figure 57). Though Teniers does not implicate himself in the story, he nonetheless associates himself with the theme, taking part in an animated artistic conversation about the artist's relationship to prodigality in life and art.

Chapter 4: Dissolute Self-Portraits

The great irony, of course, is that artists chose to portray themselves in self-portraits engaged in the very acts—like smoking, drinking, and often other lewd and dissolute behaviors—that were condemned as negative *exempla* of how a respectable artist or citizen should not to behave. Moreover, few of these dissolute self-portraits allude to any sort of moralization, which would have been a warranted justification for assuming such a negative role. The persistent refrain in the literature of Dutch art was that artists were predisposed to prodigal behaviors, but with applied discipline, they could rise above these innate tendencies. Yet, these innate tendencies are precisely what artists embraced and celebrated in these unruly self-portraits. By aligning themselves with symbols of prodigality and dissolution, artists actively portrayed themselves as “*wilder schilders*,” a construct that granted them a certain freedom from social norms, and a license to misbehave.

Of the self-portraits I have identified of artists engaged in stereotypically negative behaviors, nearly all prominently feature alcohol and smoking. The self-portraits can be divided into three major groups that correspond to the same behaviors that were condemned by art theorists and moralists. The paintings fall into these categories: (1) single-figured self-portraits of artists with pipes; (2) single-figured self-portraits with drink; and (3) self-portraits within multi-figured compositions portraying a combination of prodigal behaviors including drinking, smoking or carousing, et al.

The first group of self-portraits appears to be the most traditional, often showing the artist seated in his studio, or near his easel. By situating smoking in the studio, the artists associate the act of smoking with the creation of art, and promote it as a symbol of the artist. In these scenes, artists use tobacco for creative inspiration and to reflect their artistic natures, but yet the scenes are also related to the theme of the Five Senses, particularly the senses of Smell or Taste. The self-portraits of the second group largely allude to the sense of taste, yet the artists portray themselves generally away from the studio, with large (or alternately enormous) glasses of wine. Lastly, in the largest group of self-portraits, artists are truly unruly. They present a combination of bad behaviors: artists drink and smoke, fondle women and make crude gestures. Many works in this group are directly related to images of the prodigal son and are situated in taverns, or tavern-like interiors, recalling the most corrupt moments in the parable. Others, like the works of Steen and Van Mieris, take place in typical interior genre settings, yet refer to the same dissolute themes. Low-life painters Brouwer, Teniers and Van Craesbeeck situate themselves appropriately in the peasant realm.

The negative guises adopted by Dutch artists in these dissolute self-portraits (of the third group in particular) appear to represent the complete inversion of the *topoi* involved in the Renaissance conception of the *pictor doctus*: the artist as intellectual, melancholy genius and renowned gentleman, conventions that were actively promoted in the dialogue of Dutch art and circulated in publications like Hieronymus-Cock and Van Dyck's *Iconography*. The intellectual artist's *vita contemplativa* is replaced by the excesses of the *vita voluptuosa*, trading erudition and

diligence for a vernacular vocabulary and low-life, scatological references and a focus on the delights of the sensual realm. Artists in these paintings are inspired not by divinity, but by the delights of drink, and often appear to be moved not to create but to commit a host of sins of the flesh. The famous gentlemen-artists, cousins of Castiglione celebrated in galleries of *uomini illustri*, are replaced by a line-up of men of infamy: Steen, Van Mieris, Brouwer, Rembrandt, Ochtervelt, the faces of coarse jokers, boozers and brawlers and poverty-stricken wasters. Most essentially, the visual contrast between these self-portraits and conventional ones resides in the juxtaposition of expressions of sensual versus intellectual experience.

Yet when we examine these works more closely, it becomes clear that these self-portraits are not straightforward expressions of vice, nor are they completely contrary to the aims of Renaissance doctrine; rather, they embrace vice to convey positive artistic statements. These dissolute self-portraits express creative inspiration, function as displays of the artist's special talents, and lastly, associate the painters with the prodigality that had become symbolic of Dutch artists, much in the same way Renaissance melancholia had functioned as a positive and unique identifying factor of artists.

The Five Senses

The first two groups of paintings share strong associations with the theme of the Five Senses, especially that of Taste as represented by the drinking painter, or Smell as represented by the smoking painter. The Five Senses was a popular theme in

both the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but it was intended as an allusion to the perils and easy pleasures of the sensual world. But artists clearly embraced the role, identifying with it by repeatedly employing it as a self-portrait guise.

The idea of the Five Senses originated in Aristotle's *De Anima* (Of the Soul), a text that was reprinted with 46 new commentaries in the sixteenth century alone.³⁸⁸

The classical concept was applied to Christian doctrine in the Middle Ages under the belief that the senses were illusory and sinful and should be regarded as a false truth.³⁸⁹ In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the idea persisted that the senses were portals for vice and sin to find entry, touchstones that human frailty made all too accessible. Therefore, one was to be especially mindful, as “should the senses be used improperly, the soul was irrevocably poisoned.” The senses were not regarded as trustworthy sources of experience, rather misleading and unreliable informants. The senses, like the arts, also followed a hierarchy with a distinction made between the “superior” senses of Sight and Hearing, and the “inferior” senses of Taste, Smell and Touch.³⁹⁰ Artists appear to have identified closely with the latter three, and most often with Taste.³⁹¹

Praise of the senses, not just warnings about them, was also to be found in the Dutch Republic. Two mid-century poems by Joost van den Vondel stress the importance of the senses and their benefits to a pleasurable life. Vondel begins “*Op*

³⁸⁸ Chapman 1990, 26

³⁸⁹ Li, 14-22.

³⁹⁰ De Jongh 1997, 25.

³⁹¹ Given the nature of art, it would seem more apt for artists to have associated with the sense of Sight. Goltzius emphasized the link between Sight and the painter. See the chapter titled “Venus, Visus and Pictura” in Sluijter 2000 (86-159).

de Vyf Zinnen” (1644) with the admonition that the misuse of the senses will result in pain. He devotes a stanza to each sense, bemoaning the missed pleasures if one were to malfunction, as for example without Taste “*daar kan niet[s] leckers sijn*” (there can not be delicious things).³⁹² The later poem by Vondel (1658) refers to the senses like muses, the “five sisters” who animate the soul.³⁹³

The Five Senses proved to be a popular theme in Netherlandish art not only for all of the rich visual possibilities associated with the theme, but also for their justifiable by moralizing overtones.³⁹⁴ An engraved series of prints by Cornelis Cort after Frans Floris popularized the theme in the southern Netherlands when it was published in 1561. It was soon followed by numerous other series, including one by Hendrick Goltzius, who published a series of the Five Senses in 1578. Goltzius’ series was particularly influential in that he was the first artist to combine all five senses into a single image and also the first to contemporize the theme (it had been previously portrayed by single allegorical figures), depicting the senses as contemporary amorous couples.³⁹⁵ Each of Goltzius’ images of the senses depicts a

³⁹² Joost van den Vondel, *De Werken van Vondel, Deel 4. 1640-1645* (Amsterdam: Maatschappij voor Goede en Goedkoope Lectuur, 1930) 600. “*Want waar de Smaek ontbreekt, daar kan niet[s] leckers sijn.*”

The edition can also be found online:

http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/vond001dewe04_01/index.htm
(p. 600: http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/vond001dewe04_01/vond001dewe04_01_0117.htm)

³⁹³ Louise Vinge, *The Five Senses: Studies in a Literary Tradition* (Lund: LiberLäromedel, 1975) 133-4.

³⁹⁴ De Jongh 1997 (25) suggests that the theme was particularly popular in the Netherlands because it satisfied a preference for fixed series of themes, subjects and ideas, that had “existed since the Middle Ages for anything that could somehow be united in a series, a phenomenon which—once again under the influence of science—received new impetus during the Renaissance.” He suggest similar series were present as the temperaments or humours, the seasons, times of day, ages of man, elements, etc.

³⁹⁵ Sluijter 2000, 91-6.

slightly different coupling, with the image of Taste shown as a woman feeding a man a piece of fruit (with a chained monkey in the background) (Figure 58). A series engraved by Cornelis van Kittensteijn after Dirck Hals shows the influence of Goltzius, as all five images depict different vignettes of an elegantly dressed couple with different incarnations of the senses. Hals, however, symbolized the sense of Taste not with fruit, but with a wineglass and pipe (Figure 59).

Traditionally, images of the sense of Taste included by bunches of fruits, a monkey (as previously discussed), or, as with Jan Bruegel, a feast or banquet table laden with food. The image of the drinker representing Taste became predominant in Dutch art in the early seventeenth century, when scenes of the Five Senses grew increasingly less allegorical and took more of the character of a genre scene. Brouwer appears to have painted a series of the senses in low-life style using peasants instead of the elegant gentleman and ladies of Goltzius and Dirck Hals.³⁹⁶ Molenaer, too, painted a lively genre version using a *kannekijker* (one who peers into a tankard to see is anything is left) in the traditional pose of *Gula*, to represent Taste (Figure 60).³⁹⁷

Ger Luijten contends that as a medium for portraiture, the theme of Taste was problematic as “few people allowed themselves to be portrayed with a glass in their hands” because of the moral implications surrounding drinking in Dutch culture, but

³⁹⁶ Hearing, Touch, Taste and Smell, are the only extant ones, though it is unclear whether a fifth work was painted or not. See Knuttel, 134-140. Brouwer’s *Taste* appears to be represented by a trio of pipe smokers (Kurfürstlicher Galerie, Munich).

³⁹⁷ Van Thiel 1996 (194 note 44) suggests that this panel may actually represent Visus or Sight “because the act of looking is depicted twice, one by the boy looking into the jug and again by his companion peering over his shoulder.” There is another *kannekijker* in Molenaer’s series, thought to represent Sight, who sits at a table and forlornly peers into an empty jug.

“when they presented themselves as the personification of taste...it was in the context of typecasting that was so popular in the seventeenth century.”³⁹⁸ Taste was a dangerous sense to be linked to; it could all too easily lead one to the sin of gluttony as the inscription below the Dirck Hals’ image of Taste indicates:

Smell is followed by Taste, the sense by which the tongue perceives flavors of every kind. Strive for moderation in Taste! Indeed, sickness, together with [painful] distress is caused by excessive amounts of drink and food.³⁹⁹

Artists and the Five Senses

The theme of Five Senses appears to have held special meaning for artists, as so many painted self-portraits in the guise of one of the senses. In these two groups of self-portraits (with pipe and with wineglass), artists utilized the themes of Taste and Smell to show how alcohol and tobacco could be stimuli for creative inspiration, and also to associate themselves with the image of the drinking, dissolute, anti-intellectual artist that pervades Dutch art of the seventeenth century. Five Senses self-portrait imagery occurred so often it is possible that the artists themselves *became* symbols of the senses. In an interesting twist, the artist has become his own iconography.

Antwerp painter Gonzales Coques painted a series of separate single-figured images of the Five Senses with each sense represented by a different recognizable

³⁹⁸ Amsterdam 1997, 265-7.

³⁹⁹ Worcester and Haarlem 1993, 332.

*Olfctum sequitur Gustus quo senus saporos
Percipet omnigenos, à curvo adiuta pallata
Sit modus in Gustu, ne morbos, atque Dolores
Afferat immodicus Gustus potusque cibique*

Also see *Jan Miense Molenaer: Painter of the Dutch Golden Age* Exh. Cat. Dennis P. Weller (North Carolina Museum of Art: Raleigh, 2002) 145-7.

figure, each one a different artist. Coques represented himself as Taste (Figure 61) holding a large roemer of wine and looks out, half-smiling, at the viewer.⁴⁰⁰ Several works depicting artists in their studio contain depictions of the Five Senses, implying that the artist found inspiration in the sensual world.

Joos van Craesbeeck (ca. 1605/6-1660), a Brouwer protégé who painted himself four times in rough, low-life guises reflecting the sense of Taste, included references to all five senses in his delicately quiet *Painter's Studio* (Figure 62). Craesbeeck painted a *tableau vivant* showing group of figures symbolizing the Five Senses seated around a table as the artist worked at his easel. Each figure in the group corresponds to one of the senses: a lute-player (Hearing), a man holding a wineglass (Taste), a man with a pipe (Smell), an intimate couple (Touch) and a woman reading (Sight).⁴⁰¹

Group 1: Single-Figured Self-Portraits with Pipe

The single-figured self-portraits with pipe refer to the theme of the Five Senses and also to two other themes related to the tobacco's use: smoking as a

⁴⁰⁰ Raupp, 322-3. In addition to Coques, Artus Quellinus I represents Sight, flower painter Jan Phillips van Thielen is Sight, Lucas Faydherbe represents Smell, and Pieter Meert is Touch.

⁴⁰¹ De Clippel 2006, I: 165. De Clippel feels that, instead of the reading woman, the artist would have represented Sight. Also see Raupp, 326-7.

Raupp (323) reports that the painter Robert van den Hoecke (1637-1668) made a sketch of the Five Senses in which artists are used as personifications. He mentions that Jan Philips van Thielen was shown as a lute player representing Hearing, Coques held a wineglass for Taste, and a possible identification of Lucas Faydherbe is shown with a pipe, and another unidentified figure (presumably an artist) is shown being bled to represent the sense of Touch.

stimulus for creativity and as an allusion to the brevity of life. Additionally, in Dutch art, smoke was a virtuoso effect for painters to showcase their talent, as the painted image of smoke billowing from the mouth also worked to effectively visualize respiration, enhancing the keen sense that the sitter was living, breathing.⁴⁰² Tobacco may have also hinted that the artist was of a sanguine disposition, prone to heat and dampness, as smoking was a remedy for “ridding the head of all moisture and phlegm... [and] promote dessication.”⁴⁰³ Tobacco could have been combined with hemp to bring about a narcotic stupor, or trance-like ecstasy, which some of these portraits appear to portray. The combination was forbidden by law, however, and only smoked in secret.⁴⁰⁴

This group of seven self-portraits and two portraits of artists with pipes—by Pieter Codde, Dou, Barent Fabritius, De Heem, Jan van Mieris, Jacob Ochtervelt, Anthonie Palamedsz and Cornelis Saftleven—all depict artists using solely tobacco in a studio or interior setting. Aside from Ochtervelt’s self-portrait, an easel is prominently featured in every work. The artists are well dressed and groomed, and they are clearly working (or at the very least, thinking about working) pictured with, or near, works in progress. Overall, these self-portraits have a serious tone as the artists exude an air of contemplation, which the act of smoking accentuates.

⁴⁰² Conversation with Arthur Wheelock, 19 October 2007.

⁴⁰³ Brongers, 25. The author does not provide citations, but quotes Jan van Beverwijk (1594-1647), “first parish doctor and professor at Utrecht’.” Excessive drinking was also related to the phlegmatic temperament, which also lent itself to moisture and phlegm.

⁴⁰⁴ Knüttel, 26, n. 1 and 2. Hemp was commonly grown in Flanders, and its use was subject to “severe penalties.”

Smoking, the Senses, and Artistic Inspiration

The self-portraits of artists with pipes working at their easels by Codde, Fabritius, De Heem, Palamedesz and Saftleven are strikingly similar in composition. In each, the artist sits near an easel that clearly holds a work-in-progress. Many of the artists also hold their palettes (Fabritius, De Heem, Saftleven), further identifying themselves as painters. Reinforcing the sense that these works were related to the sense of Smell is the fact that Barent Fabritius' self-portrait in this guise is one of five individual panels of the Five Senses (Figure 63).⁴⁰⁵ This image is the only painting in the series that is signed and dated, supporting the identification of the work as a self-portrait.⁴⁰⁶ Fabritius holds his palette near his chest so that the viewer is sure to see it, and in the background an easel is visible holding a finished work of what appears to be a landscape, suggesting that smoking has not enveloped the artist in a paralyzing stupor, but may have served the cause of art.⁴⁰⁷

In these self-portraits (and portraits) of painters with pipes, artists convey the idea that smoking was an aid to producing art, not by driving the artists into a creative frenzy, but by bringing about an air of pensive consideration. Many of the artists

⁴⁰⁵Tobacco smoking could also represent Taste, as the act of smoking (“drinking tobacco”) was considered akin to the act of drinking. Brouwer’s likely image of Taste in his series of senses is portrayed by three smokers, each in different degrees of stupefaction brought on by tobacco. See footnote 383.

⁴⁰⁶ Walter A. Liedke, “The Three ‘Parables’ by Barent Fabritius with a Chronological List of his Paintings Dating from 1660 Onward,” *Burlington Magazine* 119 (1977): 326.

Raupp (318) suggests that the works by Codde, de Heem and Palamedesz were intended to represent the sense of Smell.

Barent Fabritius painted an earlier self-portrait with pipe (ca. 1645. Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, Mass.). See Hall, 97; 637:1.

⁴⁰⁷Daniël Pont, *Barent Fabritius: 1624-1673* (‘S Gravenhage: N.V. Drukkerij Trio, 1958), 65-7.

depict themselves not at work, but in a quiet pause. We see it in the self-portrait of Cornelis Saftleven (ca. 1607-1681) (Figure 64) where the artist, seated by his easel with palette in hand, turns away from his work-in-progress to smoke his pipe. Other artists, including Pieter Codde (1599-1678) (Figure 65) and Jan Davidz de Heem (1606-1683/4) (Figure 66) also show the artists turned away from their work. Only Anthonie Palamedesz (1601-1673) (Figure 67) portrays himself actually looking at the work on his easel with pipe in hand. With no other props at hand like palettes, easels and maulsticks, the reflective poses suggest the artist gains inspiration from smoking.⁴⁰⁸

This pause in work also implies that the difficult mental task of creating art is relieved by smoking. In Pieter Codde's *Portrait of Palamedes Palamedesz* (Figure 68), a composition comparable to his own self-portrait smoking a pipe in Rotterdam, the artist's splayed posture speaks not of necessarily of relaxation, but of intensity and engagement: Palamedesz appears to have one eye on his canvas and the other on us. The stretched canvas looms large, as an imposing presence, much as in Rembrandt's self-portrait in his studio (Figure 69), emphasizing the mental efforts of the artist as he contemplates the work he is about to create.

Codde, Saftleven, and Jan Davidsz. De Heem (Figure 66) emphasized the stupetory effects of smoking. Saftleven's painted himself twice with a pipe, once as a gentleman rather than an artist (Figure 70). In this latter work he portrayed himself

⁴⁰⁸ Artists portrayed themselves in similar poses with musical instruments instead of pipes, such as Johannes van Swieten's *Lute-Playing Painter* (1650s, Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal, Leiden). Griffey (129-134) writes that "the *topos* of the artist-musician appears throughout biographies of artists, from Vasari through Houbraken and Weyerman, where music-making is accorded a positive role in artists' lives as a vehicle of inspiration and relaxation..."

Raupp (239-40) suggests that their poses reflect not only melancholy contemplation, but indolence, and reads these self-portraits to have a moralizing tone.

seated, holding a pipem in a hunched pose reminiscent of the traditional pose of Melancholy, with his arm resting crooked on a table and with a glassy-eyed expression connoting that he is deep in thought. Raupp characterizes this self-presentation as pensive melancholic—*pensieroso*—a contemplative state enhanced here by smoking.⁴⁰⁹

In his self-portrait at the easel, Saftleven presents himself with a palette in one hand and a pipe in the other, gently blowing smoke out of his mouth. Codde's self-portrait shows an almost identical moment as smoke billows outward from his face, its haze suggestive of the narcotic's effect on the mind.⁴¹⁰ De Heem's self-portrait similarly captures the sense of stupefaction. Sitting in front of a painting on an easel, De Heem fingers his pipe as smoke clouds around his head forming a smoky barrier that echoes his inward mental state. He painted the work in 1636, the same year as Brouwer's *Smokers*, in which he made a cameo appearance as a smoker.

Jan van Mieris (Figure 71) portrays an artist similarly, in a contemplative trance amid the tools of his trade.⁴¹¹ Dressed in a luxurious robe and velvet beret, the artist does not focus on the unfinished sketch before him, but rather appears fixed in thought. In fact, the artist ignores all the tools of artistic instruction that surround him, including plaster casts and a book. Instead, he weaves his fingers around the long clay pipe, allowing smoking to inspire him instead.

⁴⁰⁹ Raupp, 232.

⁴¹⁰ Van Mander-Miedema, *Lives*, fol. 295r. Van Mander notes several times artists who were talented at reproducing the effects of smoke, as for example he praised Otto van Veen for his ability to depict cannon smoke "very truthfully with the soldiers enveloped by it and hazily visible."

⁴¹¹ This may be a self-portrait. See Washington and The Hague 2005, 24.

Almost all images of smoking painters share an intensely pensive, almost trance-like state. Even Ochtervelt, dressed as a peasant, appears spellbound as he watches the smoke fall from his mouth (Figure 6). Ochtervelt's painting, which is believed to have a pendant, is likely part of a larger series of the senses. Additionally, given Ochtervelt's attire of poor peasant's clothes, as well as the cropped, half-length composition, his self-portrait as a peasant fits into the iconographic tradition of representations of the Five Senses. By the late seventeenth-century, the Five Senses were often symbolized by half-length low-life figures.⁴¹²

The Nature of Smoke, the Nature of Art

Smoking was an aid to artistic creation, but moreover in Dutch art it was also a symbol of the precise opposite: the fleeting measure of life itself. Juxtaposed, the themes could allude to the triumph of art (eternal life) over the inevitable decay of the natural world (fleeting life). Job Berckheyde (1630-1693) (Figure 72) includes pipes (as well as a modest glass of wine) among his implements of artistic creation. The *Self-Portrait* by Michiel van Musscher (Figure 73) for instance, depicts smoking as one of the tools of artistic creation, though it is not the artist who smokes. Rather, in the center of a table amid brushes, papers, books and plaster casts sits the small,

⁴¹² Kuretsky, 21; 65-6. Though Ochtervelt painted only other one peasant painting, the theme of the peasant was not too far removed from his oeuvre of traditional genre scenes. Kuretsky (21) speculates that he may have been experimenting with the peasant genre. Ochtervelt also used himself as a model in four paintings of single musicians (Kuretsky cats. 25, 30, 33-35). With his mouth open as if singing while playing the violin in all four works, these works reflect other similar images of the sense of Hearing.

Ochtervelt certainly would have known Saftleven, whom he lost a St. Luke's guild election to in Rotterdam a year or so after he painted the self-portrait

sculpted figure of a *putto* smoking a tiny pipe. Musscher positioned the sculpture facing towards him, cupping his hand around the back of it. From the pose and position, it appears as if the *putto* were blowing smoke right at the artist. A self-portrait attributed to Cornelis Bisschop (1630-1674) (Figure 74) contains a similar statue of *putto* holding a pipe.⁴¹³ The small sculpture stands alone in the far right foreground and is juxtaposed to a variety of *vanitas* still-life elements (skull, globe, snuffed out candle, curling and torn papers). The artist stands between the two groups and motions to each, though the hand holding his palette and brushes is the one that points towards the *putto* with pipe, suggesting again the triumph of art (sculpture) over transient life (pipe).

Similarly, a possible self-portrait, or portrait of an artist by Dou in the guise of a smoking painter (Figure 75) infuses the theme of intense concentration or inspiration brought on by smoking with suggestions of *vanitas*. From Dou's other self-portraits, for example Figure 8, we know that he consistently crafted the image of the artist to suggest the *pictor doctus*. He surrounded his own image with props and accoutrements to reflect that diligent study and erudition were key components to the creation of his art and public persona. It is likely that the artist had a similar focus in mind with this portrait, as Dou includes several elements that point to the theme of the nobility of painting. He clearly alludes to the classical story of Zeuxis and Parrhasius with the inclusion of the *trompe-l'oeil* curtain, suggesting his kinship (or rivalry?) with the famous Greek painter whose phenomenal naturalism could fool the birds and bees. Additionally, Dou also includes several *vanitas* elements, like the

⁴¹³ Raupp, 275-6; 471, no. 168 attributes this work to Frans van Mieris. See Naumann I: cat. C31.

curling cartellino on the front of the stone niche, an allusion to the triumph of painting over the passage of time—*ars longa, vita brevis*.

Dou often included pipes in his compositions that regularly functioned as *vanitas* symbols, allusions to the fleeting nature of life insinuating that life was a momentary pleasure not unlike a puff of smoke.⁴¹⁴ The symbol recurs throughout Dutch art and also in literature and song: “Are not actually/All things here on earth like smoke?” asks an early eighteenth-century song called “Tobacco” (“*De Tabak*”).⁴¹⁵

Dou included similar symbols in other self-portraits that seem to confirm the *vanitas* reading of the pipe. His *Self-Portrait* in the Uffizi (Figure 76) shows the artist in an almost identical stone niche, his hand resting on a skull instead of holding a pipe, while his other hand motions to an hourglass. In the Uffizi self-portrait, an easel is also visible through the parted curtains in the background.⁴¹⁶ In other works, Dou

⁴¹⁴ See, for example, Dou’s *Old Man Lighting a Pipe* (ca. 1635, private collection, England).

The pipe also functioned as a *vanitas* symbol in the proverb “As the Old Sing, So Pipe the Young,” a theme made famous by Jan Steen, though the theme appears frequently in Dutch art in images of young children smoking (see, for example, Moleanaer’s *Three Children at a Table* [ca. 1628-9, private collection; see Raleigh 2002, 66-68, cat. No. 2] and debates the issue of nature versus nurture. See Washington and Amsterdam 1996, pp. 172-5.

An inscription of the lid of an eighteenth century tobacco box (made after a seventeenth-century print) depicting two smokers reads: “Vita est Fumas” (Life is Smoke). See Niemeyer, 61.

⁴¹⁵ Niemeyer, 149-50. The author quotes the song from an 1816 collection compiled by students of Gronigen University that “were so fond of tobacco, that they formed a smoking-club with the device: ‘NULLA SALUTIFERO PRAESTANTOR HERBA TABACO.’” (“no herb is more excellent than the salutary tobacco”)

⁴¹⁶ Like the Amsterdam self-portrait, the Uffizi painting is quite dark now and the easel in the background is difficult to see. See Langedijk (19) for a painted replica of the work in which the easel and the hourglass are clearly visible, brightly illuminated from the light of the window.

Dou’s *Violin Painter* (1653. Princely Collections, Vaduz Castle, Lichtenstein) has a similar composition as the Amsterdam self-portrait, but with a violinist perched in the stone niche. He looks behind him into an artist’s studio, where one figure grinds pigments while another seated male figure

linked the pipe with the intellectual realm, placing, for example, a pipe on a table among other elements of learning (a globe, a book, musical instruments) in his *Interior with Young Violinist* (1637, National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh). In this sense, we can assume Dou's use of tobacco in the self-portrait or portrait of an artist in Amsterdam was a positive intellectual association that alluded to the triumph of painting over time, as well as the artist's power to manipulate time and nature. It is a power he holds in his hand—like a pipe.

Group 2: Single-Figured Self-Portraits with Drink

Lucas Vorsterman refashioned De Heem's self-portrait with pipe (Figure 66), entranced by smoke, in an engraving (Figure 77). The print retains De Heem's basic composition (even retaining vestiges of the cloud of smoke), but changes one key element: the pipe has been turned into a glass of wine. Vorsterman rechristened the self-portrait as a symbol of the sense of Taste. Below the title "Gustus" is inscribed:

O sweet Bacchus, merriest of men,
O holy god, they can justly honor you.
But you can also be severe and cruel,
And visit suffering on he who abuses you.⁴¹⁷

smoking a pipe. The violinist likely refers to "music's power to inspire the painter's creative faculties," a theme that may be echoed in the pipe-smoker. See Washington and The Hague 2000, cat. 20, p. 104.

⁴¹⁷ Amsterdam 1997, 267.

*"O soete Bachi Volvreugdich man,
O heylich godt, die u recht eeren kan
Maer daerentegen: weer strafen vreet
Die u misbruykt die doet ghy leet."*

The admonishment reflects a common sentiment held in the Dutch Republic towards overindulgence, which ironically suits the image as De Heem's heavy-lidded state from smoking could also be read as drunkenness. As is apparent from the quick change of De Heem's pipe into a wine glass, the boundaries between these themes were fluid. Nonetheless, the second group of self-portraits in this discussion, which focuses upon portraits of artists with wine, have a much different tone from the previous group. The quiet air of contemplation fostered by smoking is often replaced by a buoyant immediacy, suggesting the sanguine state brought on by wine. Few, if any direct references exist to the production of art. Instead many of these works take place out of doors, often with a pastoral landscape extending into the background.

Jacob Backer, Gonzales Coques (1614/5-1684), Joos van Craesbeeck (1605?-1654/61), Frans van Mieris and his son Jan (1660-1690) painted their self-portraits with wine. Anthonie Palamedsz painted a similar work, although it is probably the portrait of another artist. The single-figured format of these works matches other representations of Taste from series of the Five Senses, as in David Teniers the Younger's image of a simple woman drinking from a wineglass representing Taste (Figure 78). They also relate to single-figured images of drinkers and jolly toppers in Dutch art, such as Frans Hals' *Merry Drinker* (Figure 79).

Backer and Coques clearly depicted themselves as the sense of Taste. Coques' self-portrait, as previously mentioned, was part of a series of senses, with each panel depicted by a different artist. Rembrandt pupil Jacob Backer's (1608-1651) *Self-Portrait as Taste* (Figure 80), also one of a series of five panels, shows the artist in a

pastoral garment, holding a wine glass.⁴¹⁸ Backer holds the glass from its bottom and turns it upside down, revealing that the glass is empty and needs refilling. The gesture is related to the theme of the empty glass and the image of the *kannekijker*—the tippler who peers into a jug to see if there is anything left (there is not). Both motifs relate to images of the sin of *Gula* or gluttony and recur in countless genre scenes from Molenaer to Van Mieris.⁴¹⁹ Judith Leyster's *The Last Drop (The Gay Cavalier)* (Figure 81) depicts a jaunty young reveler making a similar gesture with his tankard. He and his still guzzling companion are flanked by a grinning skeleton, a walking *vanitas* by itself, but the skeleton also holds a candle, as well as another skull in one hand and raises an hourglass with the other as if, like a wineglass, to toast. Backer's pose in *Taste* would have held similar *vanitas* implications, either related to

⁴¹⁸ Backer painted two self-portraits in pastoral guise: one of 1635-40 (Friesisches Museum, Leeuwarden) and ca. 1645 (Mauritshuis, The Hague). See Raupp, 427, 446; figs. 89 & 127.

Kurt Bauch [*Jakob Adriaensz Backer: Ein Rembrandtschüler aus Friesland* (Berlin: G. Grote'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926), 82; cat. 72] identifies the sitter as Rembrandt, an attribution that has since been changed.

⁴¹⁹ Worcester 1993, 157-9. The pose of the guzzling man on the left (head back, bottle to mouth) also mirrors the traditional representation of *Gula*, as evidenced, for instance, in Hieronymus Bosch's *Tabletop of the Seven Deadly Sins* (ca. 1485-1500. Prado, Madrid)

See for example, the empty glass gesture in Molenaer's *Breakfast Scene* (1629. Freiherr von Heijl zu Herrensheim Collection, Worms) and Frans van Mieris' *The Empty Glass* (ca. 1674. Uffizi, Florence).

The word *kannekijker* literally means "tankard-looker." It was synonymous with a drunkard and also with rederijkers who were known for their drinking. The phrase "Rederijker, kannekijker," was a popular mocking expression. See Krel, 73. For more on the subject see van Thiel 1967, 93-4 and Worcester 1993, 242-3.

The *kannekijker* was often pictured as the stock comic figure *Peeckelhaering* (Pickle-herring), a stock, comic figure in farces. Frans Hals, for instance, painted a version of *Peeckelhaering* holding open a tankard (ca. 1628-30. Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel) though he does not look in it, he holds it out for the viewer to take a peek.

overindulgence in worldly pleasures, or in fleeting nature of life, like an empty glass, is so swiftly drained.⁴²⁰

Van Mieris portrayed himself in at least two self-portraits with large glasses of wine (Figure 82) (Figure 12).⁴²¹ His son Willem van Mieris (Figure 83) conceived of an almost identical self-portrait in composition and theme, though he also holds a pipe. All three of these works appear to relate to the sense of Taste.⁴²²

In Frans van Mieris's earlier work, the artist leans against a balustrade, holding wine in one hand while pressing the other hand to his chest. This gesture of drawing one's hand to the chest appears frequently in self-portraits of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, particularly in series of self-portrait prints, as for example

⁴²⁰ Amsterdam 1997. Ger Luijten likens this latter notion to the overturned glasses in Dutch still lifes as in Willem Claesz Heda's *Banquet Piece with Mince Pie* (1635. National Gallery, Washington).

Jan Lievens painted a friend of his in this same guise. The painting is not extant, nor is the name of the friend known, but the image was reproduced in an engraving by Anthony van der Does (see Amsterdam 1997, cat. 53, pp. 264-7). Lieven's sitter holds an empty glass upside-down, while looking out to the viewer, grinning broadly. Below, an inscription suggests a *vanitas* reading of the gesture:

*Cur poculum dextra teneat pictoris amator,
Ebrius, irridet quae peritura videt
Cur vacuo monstret mundane simillima vitro
In promptu causa est non peritura cupit.*

(Why does the painter's drunken friend hold a goblet in his right hand? He is laughing at the things he knows will pass. Why does he present worldly matters as most closely resembling an empty glass? The reason is plain: he desires that which does not pass.)

⁴²¹ Another proposed self-portrait, *A Man Holding a Roemer* (1664. Museum der bildenden Künste, Leipzig) depicts a similar figure holding a roemer.

Another possible self-portrait drinking (though Naumann assigns it to the section of "problematic attributions") in Staatliche Museum in Schwerin, *Portrait of the Artist* (1662), depicts a man with a glass of wine. Raupp (318) suggests that together with the pendant to this portrait, a woman (his wife?) holding a rose, would have represented Taste and Smell. See Naumann II: 136, cat. B24 and B25 and images CB24 and CB25.

The dress Van Mieris wears in both portraits has been associated with the costumes of the *commedia dell'arte*. See Langedijk, 90-3.

⁴²² Both Van Mieris' 1668 self-portrait and the self-portrait by Willem also contain food, which adds to the notion of the sense of taste. Willem sits with a bunch of grapes upon his lap, while his father's work contains what appears to be a piece of bread on the balustrade.

the portrait of Tobias Verhaecht (1561-1631) in Meyssens' *True Effigies* (Figure 84).⁴²³ Raupp interprets this action as a self-conscious gesture, an expression of both self-knowledge and confession.⁴²⁴ Juxtaposed to the wineglass, Van Mieris' hand on his chest strengthens the idea that he personally identifies his character with the role of the drinker.

Both of the glasses in Van Mieris' self-portraits are exceptionally large. Particularly in his 1668 self-portrait, the glass of wine appears almost disproportionate; its wide body measures almost as large as the artist's torso. The extra-large glass may well have been an attribute of the sense of Taste, as an equally immense (and freshly-filled) roemer appears as well in the image of Taste from a series by David Teniers the Younger (Figure 85).

While both Van Mieris' substantially oversized roemers make it clear they held importance in the composition and to the theme, there is perhaps no larger wineglass in Dutch art than the one in the Pieter van Roestraeten's (ca. 1630-1700) *Self-Portrait, Drinking* (Figure 86). The glass is larger than the artist's head, so massive, in fact, that he needs two hands to support it. In the other hand, Van Roestraeten holds a pipe, probably unlit, as it is turned backwards in his hand. Despite the gargantuan proportions of his drinking glass, Van Roestraeten does not appear terribly gluttonous. He looks out to the viewer, unsmiling and unironic despite the glass's almost comic scale. Van Roestraeten is dressed in a rustic, almost arcadian garment, rather than the antique finery of Van Mieris; he is not a rogue, but a pseudo-Bacchic descendant. Van Roestraeten's self-portrait is undoubtedly an

⁴²³ Meyssens 70. The portrait may have been engraved after a design by Rubens.

⁴²⁴ Raupp, 108.

image of Taste, and appears to confirm the correlation between the inflated scale of glasses in other self-portraits and the theme of Taste.⁴²⁵

Low-Life Drinker: Van Craesbeeck

Joos van Craesbeeck painted himself in indecorous guises many times, four of which likely relate to the Five Senses, all of which serve to reflect and enhance his artistic identity. De Bie, who called van Craesbeeck the “*tweedden Brouwers*” (second Brouwer), identified these four images as self-portraits. While they are not identified as symbols of the Five Senses, compositionally, they relate to self-portraits of other artists as Taste.⁴²⁶ They could be almost be considered tronies—head or facial studies that investigate varieties of expression—but their exaggerated effects also mimic the expressive nature of single-figured images of the Five Senses, which rely on facial expressions to help convey the character of a physical sense. In each of these works, Van Craesbeeck places his face close to the picture plane, creating a sense of both

⁴²⁵ Lindsey Bridget Shaw, “Pieter van Roestraeten and the English ‘vanitas’,” *Burlington Magazine* 132 (1990): 402-4. Van Roestraeten appears to have missed Brouwer’s stay in the studio by a few years. Houbraken tells an anecdote about Brouwer baby-sitting for Hals, and the child was van Roestraeten’s future wife. See Peter Hecht, “Browsing in Houbraken: Developing a Fancy for an Underestimated Author,” *Simiolus* 24 (1996): 264.

Van Roestraeten was best known as a still-life painter in England, though he was born in Haarlem and apprenticed to Frans Hals; he even married Hals’ daughter. The artist entered Hals’ studio and the Haarlem guild in 1646. Van Roestraeten moved to England in the 1660s and was famed for his virtuoso and trompe l’oeil self-inclusions in at least nine of his still-lives, the tiny figure of the artist at his easel reflected in a suspended glass ball. He also painted at least one well-known genre scene of a prodigal nature called *De liefdesverklaring* (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem). The work combines both elements of the prodigal son (carousing with loose women and wine) as well as the senses (chained monkey). See Amsterdam 1976 pp. 214-7.

⁴²⁶ De Bie, 109.

immediacy and confrontation. He smiles brightly, proud to show off his glasses of beer, his grizzled complexion and worn clothing.

Van Craesbeeck wears a hint of a grin in his *Self-Portrait as Drinker* (Figure 87), but aside from that his countenance is rough as sandpaper. His eyes bulge, his hair is untamed and he is dressed in peasant's clothes. He wraps a thick hand around a thin glass of wine, filled almost to the top. In another of his works, *Self-Portrait as Grinning Drinker with Eyepatch* (Figure 88), Van Craesbeeck looks even cruder. He holds a beer glass up like a trophy and smiles forthrightly out at the viewer, though he appears to be missing a tooth. His hair and dress are equally unkempt, and what is more, he is wearing a crudely fashioned eye patch, though it does not seem to have dampened his spirits; he is happy to drink.

Van Craesbeeck fashioned himself the epitome of the low-life drunkard or merry reveler, assuming the character and guise that epitomizes the style of his work. His animated and thick brushstrokes, vibrant tone and sense of crackling immediacy speak to the influence of Hals' portrait innovations, which Van Craesbeeck may well have learned in Brouwer's studio. His work also reflects the strong influence of his teacher Brouwer, whose low-life peasant guise he has assumed. Cornelis de Bie characterized van Craesbeeck as a fearless proponent of the peasant realm, joining their ranks willingly for the sake of his art:

...he did not flatter himself with beauty but painted himself uglier than he really was, being painted now yawning then spewing or pulling faces and grimacing by biting his tongue from the aniseed, on another occasion with a plaster on one eye.⁴²⁷

⁴²⁷ De Bie, 109. "...sijn selven niet en flateert met schoonheydt maer meer mismaeckt schilderde al shy in sijn selven was, sijnde somwijk gheschildert gapende, andermael spowende oft maeckende eenighe grillen en treckinghen in 't aensicht door het tongh-bijten vanden annijs, op eenen anderen tijt met een plaster op de een ooghe."

De Bie's characterization testifies to Van Craesbeeck's ability to know his subject matter, as the *topos* "*zoo de man was, was zyn werk*" proscribed. The rough style of his self-portraits reflects the peasant vernacular of that genre, and his animated, unrefined expressions attest to his innate understanding of the peasant character. His association with drink, of which he seems quite proud, strengthens his ties to this realm.

Wine and the Gentleman Artist

The jovial countenance of the drinker, smiling contentedly (or in Van Craesbeeck's case, grinning toothlessly) reflects the effects of alcohol on the artist's temperament. Much like the meditative haze cast by smoking, artists clearly portrayed the physical results of drink in their single-figured self-portraits, focusing for the most part on the ways it enhanced their sanguine character. A portrait of an artist with wineglass (Figure 90) by Anthonie Palamedesz portrays a different disposition: a serious drinker. The work combines two (seemingly incongruous) self-portrait formulas, blending the picture of the artist as drinker with the image of the artist as sober, sophisticated gentleman.⁴²⁸ It is an interesting portrait of an artist, not

⁴²⁸ Raupp (317) mentions this work as a self-portrait. H. van Hall [*Portretten van de Nederlandse beeldende kunstenaars* (Amsterdam: Swets en Zeitlinger, 1963) 244, 1604:10 also calls this a self-portrait, along with the 1634 work in Delft. However, the features of the sitter in the Hannover portrait differ substantially from the slightly bulging eyes, dark curling hair and moustache of the sitter in his Delft self-portrait, which appears to be the only other extant self-portrait.

I would suspect that the sitter is not Palamedesz himself, but almost certainly the portrait of another painter. The work is signed and dated on the palette "Aeta: 23 1624." It does not appear to represent

for its unconventionality, but precisely because of how its traditional nature intersects with the *topos* of the wine-drinking artist.

Palamedesz, who also depicted himself smoking at the easel (Figure 67) here paints the artist very much a gentleman with his arm akimbo, starched lace collar and stylish hat resting on his hip. He is polished enough to appear among the artists of the *Iconography* and even exhibits the furrowed brow that was characteristic of the *pictor doctus*. Behind him on the wall hangs a palette, a common motif that would identify the sitter as an artist.⁴²⁹ Yet in the artist's hand, rather than a book or a plaster cast as one might expect in an image of a learned artist, is the base of a wineglass. According to a diagram created by Gerard de Lairesse in *Het groot Schilderboek* (Figure 90), the way he holds the glass—almost balancing upon the top of his fingers as if it were a pedestal—reflected refinement and the idea that he was among the “people of fashion.”⁴³⁰ Notably, Palamedesz painted the wineglass directly underneath the palette on the wall, creating a visual parallel and possibly a symbolic one as well.

Palamedesz presents an interesting blend of iconography with the refined appearance of the sitter, the palette and the wineglass. Each of these symbols appear in Dutch art to reflect different aspects of the artist—as gentleman, as creator and as merry maker—though we are usually loath to see them pictured together. But

his brother Palamedes, whose portrait in Van Dyck's *Iconography* (no. 58) is distinctly different in appearance. That self-portrait shares more of a likeness with the Delft self-portrait of Anthonie, perhaps suggesting a family resemblance. The Delft self-portrait was copied in a 1737 drawing by Taco Hajo Jelgersma (1702-1795), which bears the inscription “Anthonie Palemedes ipse se pinx: 1634” (Anthony Palamedesz painted himself in 1634). See *The Public and Private in the Age of Vermeer*. Exh. Cat. Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr. (Osaka: Osaka Municipal Museum of Art, 2000), 116-7; fig. 2. Also see note 9 in regards to the literature regarding the Hannover portrait.

⁴²⁹ Griffey (191) notes a palette hanging on the wall in the portrait of Leiden painter Cornelis Engelbert in Hondius' *Pictorum aliquot celebrium*.

⁴³⁰ Franits 2004, 133-4.

Palamedesz combines all three to give us an image of a painter that reflects both the influence of the *pictor doctus* as well as the artist as drinker, suggesting that the two conceptions of the artist were not altogether incompatible. Both personae sought to free the artist from normal social codes. While the *pictor doctus* elevated the image of the artist to level of gentleman, the figure of the dissolute, drinking artist fostered a unique creative identity that afforded artists special social dispensation as well. By celebrating *hoe wilder* they were, artists distinguished themselves as separate and distinct from normal codes of conduct.

Group 3: Self-Portraits within Multi-Figured Compositions with Smoking, Drinking, Carousing and Other Unruly Behaviors

The story of the prodigal son among whores contained all the elements of artists' most notorious weaknesses: drinking, smoking and carousing. As such, it provided an effective thematic vehicle in which to indulge and celebrate their dissolute nature. In his study on satire, Ronald Paulson characterized the satirist as "by definition concerned with the middle of an action, when conditions are at their worst, rather than with the beginning and the end..."⁴³¹ In depicting of the theme of the prodigal son among whores, artists tread in this messy middle-ground, which represents both the height of the parable's drama as well as the depth of the prodigal son's depravity. Artists embraced satirical conventions by including their own likenesses in roles exemplifying folly, ironically commenting on the well-known

⁴³¹ Ron Paulson, *The Fictions of Satire* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1967), 57.

wildness of their profession, as well as satirizing self-portrait conventions concerning propriety and decorum. The prodigal son theme and its related variants also provided a stage for some genre painters like Molenaer, Steen, Van Mieris and others to showcase themselves within products of their specialties, a reflection of their mastery of *verscheydenheden*.⁴³²

Rembrandt and Metsu's Prodigal Selves

Rembrandt and Metsu both painted themselves as the prodigal son, using specific iconography that situated their self-portraits (and the portraits of their wives) in the context of the parable. The artists both placed themselves in taverns, with drink in hand, a scoreboard on the wall and women by their side. Rembrandt also included a peacock, which along with the scoreboard, would have been the most conventional markers of the prodigal son theme.

Rembrandt's image (Figure 7) is probably the most debated of all the self-portraits in this discussion, as scholars throughout the last two centuries have investigated every plausible reason that the prolific self-portraitist would depict himself in such a bawdy incarnation. As such, the painting and subject matter have

⁴³² Chapman 1990 (118) notes that Utrecht painter Jan van Bijlert also portrayed himself in the role of the prodigal son. See G.J. Hoogewerff, "Jan van Bijlert, schilder van Utrecht (1598-1671)," *Oud Holland* 80 (1965): 19, fig 19.

Interestingly, it appear that artists frequently presented themselves with their spouses in these dissolute participant self-portraits. Both Rembrandt and Metsu's wives have been identified in their self-portraits as prodigal son, while Steen and Van Mieris incorporated their wives in scenes often. It has also been suggested that Vermeer's wife may appear alongside his possible self-portrait in *The Procuress* (see note 13). The male figure in Leyster's *Procuress* also bears a resemblance to her husband Molenaer. Including one's spouse may have been a means of tempering the dissolute character of the self-portrayal.

been closely scrutinized in regards to the personal details of Rembrandt's life, in an effort to discern his motivation for such a self-portrayal. Two events were seen as possible motives: the just-married Rembrandt and Saskia were enjoying the early fruits of the artist's fame in Amsterdam around the time the work was painted and it was complicated by a lawsuit filed in 1638 over the squandering of Saskia's inheritance.⁴³³ Among the myriad of art historical interpretations, Bode (1899) suggested it represented the happy marriage of Rembrandt and Saskia; Rosenburg (1964) said it reflected the social disparity between "Rembrandt's lowly origin" and Saskia's "finer breeding," though he condemned Saskia for encouraging "this life of prodigality and ostentation."⁴³⁴ Others have viewed this work as a satirical statement, such as Otto Naumann who wrote he was sure Rembrandt intended this work as an "ironical comment."⁴³⁵

In 1630, about five years before he painted the work, Hooft's play had appeared in Amsterdam, raising the oft-cited notion that Rembrandt was reacting to the staged drama and issuing himself the role of "Modern-Day Prodigal Son." Rembrandt, according to Ingmar Bergström, was the first to transform the pictorial theme by incorporating his image in this guise, though Raupp and Chapman both note a 1575 self-portrait by Hans van Aachen, laughing with a woman playing a lute, as a

⁴³³ Strauss and Van der Meulen, 152-55. See 1638/7: "Rembrandt's Suit for Libel in Leeuwarden." The lawsuit charged Saskia.

⁴³⁴ Wilhelm von Bode, *The Complete Work of Rembrandt: History, Description and Heliographic Reproduction of all the Master's Pictures, with a Study of his Life and his Art*. 8 vols. (Paris: C. Sedelmeyer, 1897-1906) III: 7-8.

Jakob Rosenburg, *Rembrandt, Life and Work* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989; first published 1948) 23.

⁴³⁵ Philadelphia 1984, 301.

possible early incarnation of an artist depicting himself in a prodigal theme.⁴³⁶ Bergström's key identifications of the scoreboard locating the tavern environment and the peacock symbolizing *Superbia* or pride, transformed what had previously been identified as a true portrait of the artist and his wife into a representation of the biblical parable, with Rembrandt assuming the guise of the prodigal son.⁴³⁷ X-rays have revealed that a female figure playing a lute once stood above the figures of Rembrandt and Saskia, a discovery that places the painting in the context of two drawings Rembrandt made of the prodigal son with a female lute player, a familiar motif of the prodigal scene.⁴³⁸

Rembrandt was equally interested in various episodes from the parable of the prodigal son throughout his life, especially the scene at the resolution of the story when the son returns home, which he painted around 1662 (*The Return of the Prodigal Son*. Hermitage, St. Petersburg). He also made an etching of that same moment of forgiveness about the same time as he painted the Dresden self-portrait

⁴³⁶ Raupp, 315. Chapman 1990, 118. The painting's location is unknown. See Fucikova, 123, fig. 82. Raupp (315) also identifies a 1657 version of the theme in Berlin by van Couwenburgh that includes a self-portrait.

⁴³⁷ Bergström, 163-4. He notes that the scoreboard may have also been stressed "the dissipation of the patrimony." Kahr (257) suggest that the presence of the accounts would also serve as a warning "that sinners will be brought to judgment" and that the "account-board alone may suffice to serve notice that each sin is chalked up as a debit in the life record of the sinner."

Bergström was not the first to link the painting with the prodigal son theme, W.R. Valentiner did in 1925 (see note 31).

The painting has been cut down from its original size, and it appears that more of the scoreboard would have been visible, see *Corpus* III: 145.

⁴³⁸ Bruyn *et al*, 140-2. See A. Mayer-Meinstchel, "Rembrandt und Saskia im Gleichnis vom Verlorenen Sohn," *Staatliche Kunstmuseen Dresden* (1970-1): 39-57. In addition to the drawings mentioned by Bruyn and Mayer-Meinstchel, Rembrandt made a drawing of the departure of the prodigal son (ca. 16323. Kupferskabinett, Dresden). See Bergström, 148, fig. 2. Hi

with Saskia.⁴³⁹ But what has been problematic to interpret is Rembrandt's decision to paint himself as the epitome of dissolution in this case, an anomaly in his prolific oeuvre of self-portraits.

In the *Self-Portrait with Saskia*, Rembrandt does not atone for his sins, but revels in his momentary fortune. Flashing a toothy smile, he turns to toast the viewer with one hand, while the other holds Saskia on his lap. Rembrandt's vision of the prodigal son's riotous time among whores is quite sumptuous, accentuated by the rich palette of reds and golds. Both he and Saskia are dressed in resplendent antique clothing, with his bright white, feathered beret angled rakishly across his face. The room is swathed in a velvet curtain and the table before them is decked with a heavy oriental carpet and topped with a peacock pie. Perhaps the only hints that this may be a low-life situation are the scoreboards and the beer Rembrandt holds in the *fluit*, which was, as we have seen, a common and less valued beverage than wine. Though it is the least redemptive moment in the story, Rembrandt portrayed both himself and his wife not virtuously—but in a virtuoso manner. Of all the incarnations of the theme, Rembrandt's decadent affair appears the most noble, the grandest, the most elevated—an image of Pride but a source of it as well.

Gabriel Metsu painted his self-portrait (Figure 92) in the guise of the prodigal son, like Rembrandt including a portrait of his wife in the composition.⁴⁴⁰ The scene takes place here in a rustic tavern with bare wood floors, but the tavernmaid keeping score of the drinks on the board associates the scene in the contemporary iconography

⁴³⁹ The etching *The Return of the Prodigal Son* is dated 1636 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

⁴⁴⁰ See note 433.

of the prodigal son theme. But Metsu, in contrast to Rembrandt, pictured his wife, Isabella de Wolff, quite differently. Metsu incorporated the same central grouping as Rembrandt, with one figure posed above the other on a chair, but here his wife is seated as Metsu cheerfully cavorts above her. Metsu also makes it very clear she is no harlot: her regal fur-trimmed dress with intricately bound corsetry makes her appear the picture of modesty and temperance. Additionally, Metsu's wife is delicately holding a bunch of grapes by the stem, a gesture that mirrors an emblem by moralist Jacob Cats subtitled "*Eer is teer*" (Honor is fragile), which, as Eddy de Jongh purports, more specifically refers to the purity of carnal love (the grapes) when it is sanctioned or "supported" by marriage (the vine or stem that she holds).⁴⁴¹ Above the pair, a birdcage hovers. Closed, as it appears here, the birdcage could symbolize sexual purity or the idea of staying at home and the virtue of domesticity, the latter idea is echoed in another emblem by Cats chastizing women who wander to gossip. Metsu used similar iconography in other works.⁴⁴²

Metsu's prodigal son incarnation appears more like a portrait than a biblical painting. Despite the genre-like character of the setting with moralizing symbols like the birdcage, the picture of both he and his wife is exceedingly pleasant and modest, even with the tavern setting and dissolute theme. The subject of the prodigal son seems incongruous, or inapt in light of the moral symbolism he has applied to the

⁴⁴¹ Eddy de Jongh, "Grape Symbolism in Paintings of the 16th and 17th Centuries," *Simiolus* 4 (1974): 166-191, especially page 174.

⁴⁴² Franits 2004, 183. Metsu used an identical birdcage in *Lady Seated in a Window* (ca. 1661. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), a virtuous image of a woman peeling apples with a book. A open birdcage could also refer to a woman's chastity, more specifically, departed innocence. For more on the subject see E. de Jongh, "Erotica in vogelperspectief. De dubbelzinnigheid van een reeks 17de eeuwse genrevoorstellingen (Double Entendre in Some 17th-Century Genre Subjects)," *Simiolus* 3 (1968): 22-74.

portraits of himself and his wife. Metsu's prodigal son self-portraits hints at the idea that he is adopting a template for self-portrayal—the artist as prodigal son—as many other artists had. Metsu eschews the moral lesson of the parable, redemption after riotousness, in favor of iconography emphasizing personal morality. The figures act out their roles happily, yet there is no sense of unruliness: it is a quiet day in the tavern.⁴⁴³

Role Reversal: Leyster, Schalcken and Molenaer

Judith Leyster's self-portrait in *Carousing Couple* (Figure 93), presents an interesting intersection of culture and art, for Leyster portrays herself in a scene related to the story of the prodigal son among whores, and depicts the artist making an offer of love via an offer of wine. Leyster associates herself not with the redeemed prodigal, however, but with the prostitutes he visited in the tavern. Leyster's role also mirrors that of the ubiquitous courtesans or elegantly dressed prostitutes that recur in Dutch genre paintings of both merry companies (Figure 43) and also in deceptively quiet interiors (Gerard ter Borch, *Gallant Military Man*. Ca. 1662-3, Louvre Paris). The female figure, ogling and leaning in towards the male violin player, has been generally identified as Leyster based on the physiognomic similarities to her self-portrait in Washington (ca. 1630, National Gallery of Art, Washington).⁴⁴⁴ In the latter self-portrait, Leyster portrays herself at the easel with brush in hand, pausing as

⁴⁴³Metsu painted his self-portrait and that of his wife in another quiet tavern-like interior, known through a copy (Metropolitan Museum, New York). See Götz Eckardt, *Selbstbildnisse niederländischer Maler des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1971) 197. Eckardt mentions that Metsu's wife was the sister of Haarlem artist Pieter de Grebber.

⁴⁴⁴The same features also appear in Leyster's *Concert* (Wallace and Wilhelmina Holladay Collection).

she appears to be putting some finishing touches on the painting of a single-figured picture of a musician, a type of composition that was her specialty.⁴⁴⁵

Carousing Couple represents an interesting convergence of issues not only because the artist included her self-portrait within a image that ostensibly was intended as a moral reminder of the erotic potential of alcohol, but also because Leyster, a woman artist, has depicted herself as the aggressor in the scene. Flush-faced and grinning, Leyster holds up a glass of wine for her male companion who does not even appear to notice as he carries on playing his violin, looking out toward the viewer. Though the demure dress covered by a white cape and her prim, starched linen cap makes Leyster's role appear ambiguous, it is clear that she has adopted the sexual positioning of the instigator in the relationship.⁴⁴⁶ While the role of a woman as drinker would not have been unusual in Dutch culture, as women were known to drink as much as men, her conduct as an instigator of romance would have been considered inappropriate behavior from a respectable woman. Only women from the lower classes were known to frequent taverns regularly, the place where carousing is often situated in Dutch art.⁴⁴⁷

⁴⁴⁵ Infrared photographs of the painting reveal that Leyster originally painted the portrait of a woman in place of the violin-player. Arthur Wheelock [*Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century* (National Gallery of Art: Washington, 1995), 158-9] believes that the female figure probably was likely another self-portrait of Leyster herself, following in the iconographic tradition of another woman artist, Catharina van Hemessen (1528-1587), who depicted herself painting her self-portrait in a work of 1548 (Basel, Öffentliche Kunstsammlungen). Raupp (37) notes that Hemessen's painting is one of the first instances of a Netherlandish artist depicted in the process of painting.

⁴⁴⁶ Cynthia Kortenhorst-von Bogendorf Rupprath [in Worcester 1993 (145-6)] notes similarly dressed women appearing in the role of courtesan in works by Molenaer and Hendrick Pot. An almost identical arrangement (a woman dressed with a white cape and bonnet, offering a glass of wine to a violin player) appears in a work by Dirck Hals (*Merry Company*, formerly Sotheby's London [1981]).

⁴⁴⁷ Zumthor, 173-5.

Dutch culture at large—in literature, sermons and emblems—promoted virtues for women that stressed chastity, monogamy and honor. Crispin de Passe the Elder’s series of nine engravings of famous women in history (likely made as a counterpart to his male *Nine Worthies*), for example, praised women like Lucretia, who chose death over dishonor.⁴⁴⁸ Jacob Cats’ *Houwelijck* (1625), a book of emblems on marriage and one of the most popular books in the seventeenth-century Netherlands, echoes that concept, praising “A wife who’d rather suffer pain/Than cry or utter a vile name.”⁴⁴⁹ A didactic poem in a songbook from 1629 by Haarlem author Gilles Jacobsz Quintijn would have been exactly contemporary to Leyster’s *Carousing Couple*, advises against the very behavior she depicts in the painting:

Ye mothers in this land, if you would be called
Honorable,
Shall know from my pen, to your daughters’
Advantage,
That they, I believe, cannot be honorable
Who sit with young men, at night, by the wine.⁴⁵⁰

Until Leyster painted *Carousing Couple*, women artists had depicted themselves in guises and postures that emphasized culturally-promoted female virtues, as evidenced by the self-portraits of Renaissance artists Sofonisba Anguissola (ca. 1532-1626) and Lavinia Fontana (1552-1614), both of whom painted themselves

⁴⁴⁸ Ilja M. Veldman, “Lessons for Ladies: a Selection of Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Dutch Prints,” *Simiolus* 16 (1986): 121. The print series (1601-2) also includes images of Virginia, Veturia, and Cleopatra among others. For Lucretia, see fig. 15.

⁴⁴⁹ Jacob Cats, *Alle de Wercken* (Amsterdam/Utrecht, 1700) I: 284. This is cited in Schama 1987, 398.

⁴⁵⁰ Gilles Jacobsz Quintijn, *De Hollandsche Liis met de Brabandsche Bely: Poetischer wyse voorgesteld en gedicht* (’s Gravenhage, 1629) 68-70. Translation Els Kloek, Worcester 1993, 56. “Gy, moeders in het landt, die hier wilt Eerbaer heten, Sult, tot u dochters baet, nu door mijn penne weten, Dat sy, na dat ick meyn, niet kunnen Eerbaer sijn Die, met de jonge-maets, ‘s nachts sitten by de wijn.”

playing the keyboard, which would have suggested their musical talents, harmonious character as well as their creative potential.⁴⁵¹ Another Anguissola self-portrait of 1554 (Figure 94) shows the artist modestly dressed and holding a small book bearing a signatory that promotes her chastity. It reads: “*Sofonisba Anguissola Virgo Seipsam fecit 1554*” (Sofonisba Anguissola virgin made this in 1554).

A number of Dutch women were valued for their learning and talents, such as the daughters of author Roemer Visscher, Anna and Tesselschade, who were celebrated for their wit and skills in poetry and music by literati from Bredero to Vondel to Huygens.⁴⁵² Leyster herself was praised in Samuel Ampzing’s *Beschrijvinge ende Lof der stad Haerlem in Holland* (1628) for being an artist “who paints with a good, keen sense.”⁴⁵³ Given the character of Ampzing’s other publications, including his *Mirror of the Unrestrainedness of Our Age*, which laid a strict moral framework to combat vices like drinking, smoking and carousing, it seems unlikely the author would have praised Leyster were her individual character truly reflected by her art.

However, Leyster’s self-portrait in *Carousing Couple* poses an interesting question. Because as a woman she would have been held to different, more sexually

⁴⁵¹ See Brown, 98. Anguissola plays the spinet in her self-portrait dated 1561 (Earl Spencer, Althorp, Northampton). Fontana’s self-portrait is from 1577 (Accademia Nazionale di San Luca, Rome) and can be viewed here: http://www.csupomona.edu/~plin/women/images/fontana_big.jpg

⁴⁵² Schama 1988, 408.

⁴⁵³ Ampzing as quoted in Ellen Broersen, “‘Judita Leystar’: A Painter of ‘Good, Keen Sense,’” in Worcester 1993, 19.

In addition, in his 1647-8 book praising Haarlem [*Harlemias, Ofte, om beter te seggen, De eerste stichting der Stadt Haerlem*], Thoedorus Schrevelius referred to Leyster as a “leading star,” a comment that not only reflected the artist’s fame, but also was a pun on her name, which meant leading or pole star. See Frima Fox Hofrichter, “The Eclipse of a Leading Star,” in Worcester 1993, 115-6.

modest standards than male artists, did she intend for her personal identity to inhabit this work? If so, a simple-seeming genre scene could take on a very different meaning, holding references to the aggressiveness of women, a popular theme since the fifteenth century when an oft-quoted Latin proverb claimed that such a woman was “three times worse than the devil.”⁴⁵⁴ Various themes regarding contests and role reversal between the sexes are found in Dutch culture, including the “battle of the trousers,” a satiric struggle between man and woman for authority and to determine, literally, who wore the pants in the family.⁴⁵⁵ The inscription accompanying a famous sixteenth-century engraving by titled *Upper Hand (Overhand): Battle for the Trousers* warns of the consequences of women on top:

A woman either loves or hates, she is said to have no third alternative,
Unless it is a crazed lust for domination
Which causes her to force her husband to knuckle under
While she, wearing the trousers, stokes the fires of conflict.⁴⁵⁶

Godfried Schalcken painted his self-portrait in a scene (Figure 5) in which he appears to be on the losing end of a playful game related to “battle of the trousers.” In *Vrouwtje kom ‘ten hoof*, or “Lady, Come into the Garden (or Courtyard),” Schalcken sits half-dressed on the floor amid a gaggle of amused appearing ladies. Though he is in his underclothing, of which the shirt is unbuttoned to his navel and his pants gape

⁴⁵⁴ Keith Moxey, *Peasants, Warriors and Wives: Popular Imagery in the Reformation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 105. See Moxey 105-126 for the history of this subject in Northern art.

⁴⁵⁵ Another subject related to this theme was the legend of Phyllis and Aristotle, picture often in medieval art, showing the philosopher humiliated as he was forced to carry around the object of this desire on his back.

⁴⁵⁶ The design was engraved by Hieronymous Cock and is inscribed “*Boscher excu*” in the upper right. The original inscription is in Latin, see Walter S. Gibson, “Some Flemish Popular Prints from Hieronymous Cock and his Contemporaries,” *Art Bulletin* 60 (1978) 677. See note 23 and figure 5.

open precariously, the artist looks out to the viewer and shrugs. Houbraken singles out this painting in his biography of Schalcken, though he tells us little about the precise nature of the game, only that “*de Jonge luden te Dordrecht in dien tyd gewoon waren te spelen*” (only the young people of Dordrecht were playing it). He does specify that Schalcken painted himself “*zittende ontkleed tot zyn hemd en onderbroeck aan den schoot van een Juffrouw*” (sitting undressed to his underclothes on the lap of a young lady).⁴⁵⁷ However, Houbraken makes no comment or moralization regarding the compromising position of the artist. Instead he notes the great care and time (one month) he took painting the carpet that drapes across the right foreground. Houbraken also reveals that the other figures are portraits too, “*en waren in dien tyd van elk bekennt*” (and were known by everyone in their time).⁴⁵⁸

⁴⁵⁷ Houbraken, III: 176. The features of the young man in the painting appear very similar to the engraved portrait of Schalcken in Houbraken.

Naumann (writing in Philadelphia 1984, 301-2) suggests that *Vrouwje kom ten Hoof* may not have been such an innocent game, and that the name “may well have conveyed a lascivious meaning in the seventeenth century.” As evidence, he cites the modern Dutch idiom “*Iemand het hof maken*”, which he writes “connotes amorous pursuit or aggressive courtship, and an old Dutch proverb uses the word *hof* as a metaphor for whore.” See note 5.

Weyerman (III: 12) notes the same as Houbraken, though adding that Schalcken not only portrayed his own face, but also his *gestalte*: “*Op dat stuk heeft hy zijn eygen konterfijtsel en gestalte geschildert, gezeten op zijn knien voor een jonge Juffer, en ontkleed tot op zijn hemd en onderbroek. Ook zijn alle de andere beeldjes en konterfijtsels by uytneemendheyt konstiglijk en uytvoeriglijk geschildert, en inzonderheyt een tapytekleedje, waar over hy zo het zeggen waar is een geheele maand heeft gepenceelt.*”

Griffey (32) writes that the word *gestalt* “is used specifically in reference to the body in seventeenth-century descriptions, while *lichaam* is used more generally to denote one’s whole ‘being.’”

⁴⁵⁸Houbraken III: 176.

Philadelphia 1984, 301. Naumann writes that the other “prominent figure” is Schalcken’s sister Maria, though he does not specify whether he is referring to the seated woman, or the standing female figure to the left who holds her hand up refusing to participate in the game.

The name Schalcken translates as “rogue” in Dutch. The punning of artists’ names appears frequently in art and art literature, so it is possible that Schalcken was playing with the meaning of his name by portraying himself as a rogue. Houbraken (III: 26) made a pun with Steen’s name (that means “stone”),

Molenaer also painted himself as the object of a woman's advances in his *Self-Portrait in Studio with an Old Woman* (Figure 11). The woman leans in towards the artist, who is seated in front of a work-in-progress, grasps his arm and beckons with an outstretched open hand. The gold coins filling her lap make clear she is a procuress. The artist, however, palette and brush in hand, does not appear to acknowledge the old woman's advances. Rather, Molenaer swings around in his chair and looks towards the viewer, offering a somewhat bemused expression.

Given the positioning of the seated figures beside the easel, it appears that the woman is the model for the work on which he is working. Yet, on the canvas is a vanitas still life, showing a skull, an unlit lamp, an overturned glass and a helmet.⁴⁵⁹ Hanging neatly on the wall behind the duo are a violin and recorders—symbols of both harmony and transience—as well as a framed picture of a landscape. At the left is another figure busily grinding pigments.

Molenaer's painting combines several pictorial strategies and themes. On one level, the juxtaposition of the young artist and old woman calls to mind the theme of unequal love, which more often pictured an old man begging the affections of a young woman. Goltzius made a design for an engraving of a similar arrangement, *Young Man Refusing an Old Woman's Money* (Figure 95).⁴⁶⁰ In the larger context of

noted in his epitaph: "*Deze Steen dekt Jan Steen...*" (this stone covers Jan Steen) (see page 213). Steen himself often punned on his own name, carving it into stone ledges and lintels (See Westermann 1996, 61-2). Leyster played with the meaning of her name as "leading star" by creating a monogram of an interconnected "J" and "L" with a star shooting out to the right (Hofrichter, 115-6).

⁴⁵⁹ Cynthia von Bogendorff Rupprath, "Molenaer in His Studio: Props, Models, and Motifs," in Raleigh 2002, 28. The author contends that the helmet may represent "fleeting earthly power."

⁴⁶⁰ Von Bogendorff Rupprath 1993 (303) suggests that Molenaer and Leyster were both focusing on the theme of unequal lovers at the same time. She notes that Leyster's *Man Offering a Woman Money*

the iconographical associations the other elements throughout the composition, the central group of Molenaer and old woman does not appear to be the primary subject of the work. Instead, Molenaer's composition focuses more on the nature of painting than on the relationship of the artist to the procuress.

Molenaer painted two other studio scenes that relate thematically to his *Self-Portrait in Studio with and Old Woman*. In *The Artist at Work in his Studio* (Figure 96), Molenaer works in a studio with four diverse models, from a dwarf dancing with a dog to an old man. The group is effectively a *tableau vivant*, as they are the living subjects of the framed work on the easel.

In *The Painter at Work* (Figure 97), Molenaer depicts an artist at work in his studio painting a still life based on a mountain of vanitas objects piled on the table before him: skulls, musical instruments, a tumbled, empty glass, the nub of a burned candle, worn books. Interestingly, Molenaer includes seven skulls in this scene, a departure from the standard iconographic representation of one single human skull to stand for the brevity of life. He depicts skulls from a variety of species, from the large skull of what appears to be a horse resting on the floor, to a tiny specimen next to the human skull that may be from a monkey. Molenaer emphasizes the ability of art to transcend mortality and the role of the artist as a scientific observer of nature, as the skulls serve as both vanitas elements and instruments of empirical experience.

The procuress figure in Molenaer's *Self-Portrait in Studio* (Figure 11) is thematically related to the other studio scenes (Figures 96 and 97). The old woman sits before the artist as a subject of his work, just as the table full of vanitas elements

(1631. Mauritshuis, The Hague) is related to the pendant of Goltzius' engraving, one titled *Seamstress Resisting the Caresses of an Old Man*.

or the dancing dog and dwarf appeared before him and as painted subjects on the easels in his other paintings. In this work, however, the old woman sits in the location where the vanitas still life props should appear: she becomes the *memento mori*, the reminder of death and the insignificance of earthly pleasures—as is pictured by the coins on her lap, her aging body, and her role as procurer of carnal pleasure.⁴⁶¹

Molenaer highlights his ability to layer compositions with thematic complexity, and also showcases the particular subjects that represent his artistic strengths, or *verscheydenheden*.

The Party Guests That Never Leave: Steen and Van Mieris

Steen and Van Mieris employed the dissolute self-portrait more than any other Dutch artists, to the degree that the viewer has come to expect, rather than be surprised by their presence within compositions. Chapman cites Houbraken's early eighteenth-century mentions of Steen in his works as evidence that his contemporaries were playing the same game.⁴⁶² Otto Naumann counts Van Mieris' likeness in about a quarter of his paintings, which Ernst van der Wetering has noted was “proportionately greater than Rembrandt's” seemingly prolific output of self-portraits.⁴⁶³

⁴⁶¹ On another level, the procuress is also an example of one of the subjects Molenaer, as an artist, was capable of producing. In this scene, he shows us he is a painter of still life (on the easel), landscapes (on the wall), musical instruments (also on the wall), procuresses, and portraits (himself).

⁴⁶² Chapman 1990-1,183.

⁴⁶³ Naumann I: 126. Naumann writes that Van Mieris included his own image a maximum of thirty-one times in 121 surviving paintings. Also see Van der Wetering 1999, 30.

Steen's dissolute self-portraits obviously function differently than those by the other artists in this discussion, whose one or two self-portraits in unruly guise celebrated prodigality as one aspect of his (or her) artistic persona. Even Steen's good friend Van Mieris' indecorous self-portraits within more *burgerlijk* settings lent themselves to a more restrained humor or irony, but it is perhaps also telling that Van Mieris' self-portraits still side with prodigality within such elegant interiors. Steen truly exploited the possibilities inherent in playing the rogue, and took it on as a much larger part of his artistic persona than any Dutch artist of the era. Both Chapman and Westermann refer to Steen's deliberate strategy of developing and promoting this comic self in his art as "a pictorial device designed to confuse the line between art and life and as a professional stance through which he defined his own identity."⁴⁶⁴ Chapman also theorizes that Steen's self-inclusion would have related to classical notions of comedy present in the seventeenth century that regarded it as a "mirror of everyday life," for which one's first-hand experience was essential in creating a truthful reflection, much like the tavern scene in *Interior of an Inn (The Broken Eggs)* (Figure 98), which would have related directly to Steen's role as innkeeper and brewer.⁴⁶⁵

Steen's dissolute painted persona was in perpetual conversation with his identity as an artist, constantly begging the question: did his unruly character inform his art or did his art shape his persona? It was likely both. And both the comic bent of Steen's art and his innate temperament contributed greatly to his fame, as did his

⁴⁶⁴ Chapman 1996, 17.

⁴⁶⁵ Chapman 1995, 377.

ubiquitous roguish self-inclusions. Steen never tired of the role, though his wife did: Weyerman reports she complained of being portrayed so often, so indiscreetly, like an “indecent object.”⁴⁶⁶

In paintings like *Easy Come, Easy Go* (Figure 99), Steen emphasizes his role as both actor and director, profligate participant and consequent moralizing artist. The painting has been called *The Prodigal Son* in the past, because it appears to represent the wayward son living the high life, not in a tavern, but in a well-appointed interior, replete with tapestries, fine works of art and attentive servants.⁴⁶⁷ Here, amid the flurry of wine pouring and oyster shucking sits an elegantly dressed Steen at a table, smiling broadly at the women who offer him these delicacies. Yet, at the same time, Steen appears too happy—he bubbles with glee, obviously smitten by his fortune, a sign that perhaps this state was a novelty to him, the result of a windfall. The title certainly suggests this idea, and Steen clearly intended as such, as he tells us by inscribing “*Soo gewonne Soo verteert*” (Easy come, Easy go) next to his signature on the mantelpiece.

While Steen’s works celebrate his identity a prodigal character, they also function much like a traditional genre paintings in that he generally provides a clear

⁴⁶⁶ Weyerman II: 362-3. “...haar dikmaals konterfyte doch altos als een onzedig voorwerp.”

Both Steen and Van Mieris used their likeness in so many of their genre scenes, however, for this study, I will focus on the scenes by Van Mieris and Steen in which the artists’ most clearly depict themselves as active participants in (or avid abettors of) prodigal behaviors like drinking, smoking or carousing, rather than as witnesses to others’ transgressions. For example, I have omitted works like Steen’s *Twelfth Night* (1668. Staatliche Museen, Kassel) in which the artist sits in the center of a raucous celebration replete with a nun helping a child drink wine, a drunken woman stretched out in her chair and broken eggs strewn about the floor. However, Steen and his wife simply sit quietly at the table and watch the scene unfold around them, looking toward the figure of a fool playing a rommelpot.

⁴⁶⁷ Chapman 1996, 19.

moral lesson amid the madness. In this painting, Steen illuminates the perils of easily won pleasure and its consequences. The women that flank him in the painting, for instance, may not necessarily be such helpful servers as they appear. The coupling of an old woman with a young beautiful one, especially when presenting or offering something to a man, would have held associations with procuress imagery, and indeed the stuffs that they are offering—wine and oysters—were famous romantic stimuli. Steen adds salt to his oysters, an act that would have been associated, both literally and figuratively, with adding spice to a meal, or situation.⁴⁶⁸ But mostly with this image, Steen wanted to reiterate the perils of indulgence and the fickleness of fortune, which like the game of tric-trac played in the antechamber, is quickly won and lost again. He places a personification of Fortune above the fireplace, her nude figure heroically, and precariously, balancing entirely on one foot that rests upon a die, which in turn sits on an unstable orb. The young boy in the foreground fills the wine jug with water, a symbol of temperance and moderation.⁴⁶⁹

Steen makes it clear that we are looking at two realities. Steen, as an actor in this scene, is clearly unaware of, or ignoring the folly of his circumstances. Rather, he revels in his momentary pleasures. However, Steen, as the work's maker, is cognizant of the scene's moral lesson, indicated by his prominent signature and the painting's title inscribed on the mantelpiece. By attaching his name on this illusionistic stone

⁴⁶⁸ Washington 1996, 126. Steen used the same gesture in *Girl Offering Oysters* (ca. 1658-60. Mauritshuis, The Hague). Chapman, in the catalogue entry for this painting in Washington 1996 (146) suggests that the young woman's gesture of placing her hand to her chest "would have seemed an exaggerated way of offering herself."

⁴⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 148. Naumann (I: 129) writes that Sir Joshua Reynolds observed "'old Mieris, standing with his hands behind him'" in Steen's painting.

cartellino, Steen signs his name as painter but also, in this more permanent fashion, as moral teacher.

In other works, while Steen embraces the role of the profligate, we also feel his presence as painter and moralist. In *The Idlers* (Figure 9), for instance, Steen sits in a dingy room, a pipe in one hand and a drink in the other, but again, but seemingly untroubled or incapacitated by these stimulants, he gives us a hearty smile. Sharing his table, however, is a woman who is clearly feeling the effects of a few too many, as she slumps over the table in an inelegant heap. The woman is the picture of sloth, literally a textbook model of the deadly sin of acedia, as it was popularly represented in the seventeenth century.⁴⁷⁰

An oft-cited adage, “wine is a mocker, strong drink is a brawler/and whomever is led astray by it is unwise,” accompanies this same pose in Frans van

⁴⁷⁰De Jongh 2005, 61. De Jongh suggests that women were more frequently shown in a drunken sleep as artistic convention “had long dictated that women be used as personifications [of drunkenness].” Chapman (Washington 1996, 224) writes that in the seventeenth century, women were thought of “as being weaker by nature and more prone to sloth and drunkenness.” In addition to being female, quite often, the drunken figure of sloth is also a maid. See Worcester 1993, 142-3.

Alcohol-induced sleep was depicted by many artists including Vermeer, [*A Woman Asleep* (ca. 1657, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York)] Dou [*Woman Asleep* (ca. 1660-65, private collection, Switzerland)], Metsu [*Two Men with a Sleeping Woman* (ca. 1655-60, National Gallery, London)], Jacob Duck (ca. 1600-1667) [*Sleeping Woman and a Cavalier* (ca. 1640-45, Vienna, Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der bildenden Künste) and *Sleeping Woman* (1650s, Collection of Peter Eliot)]. When picturing the theme, artists focused on the potential perils that could befall a person who was unconscious due to drunkenness. Women were at risk of falling victim to uninvited sexual advances—frequently maids, traditional paragons of industry and diligence—are depicted passed out with wineglasses at arm’s length and amorous men looming even closer. When men (frequently officers) fall prey to the lure of alcohol, such as the soldier in Steen’s *Robbery in a Brothel* (ca. 1665-8, Louvre, Paris), different sorts of misfortunes follow, typically the type that empties one’s pockets. In the latter painting, for instance, it is the women—here two well-dressed prostitutes and an older procuress—who use the power of wine to incapacitate the target of their thievery as they happily pick the man’s pocket-watch. For more on the theme of the drunkenness, women and maids see Albert Blankert “Vermeer’s Modern Themes and Their Tradition” in *Johannes Vermeer*. Exh. Cat. (Washington and The Hague: National Gallery & Royal Cabinet of Paintings, Mauritshuis, 1995), 35-6, and Seymour Slive, “Een drokende slapende meyd aan een tafel by Jan Vermeer,” in Ulrich Middeldorf, *Festschrift Ulrich Middeldorf* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1968), 452-59. In addition, see Amsterdam 1997, pp. 368-372. For more on the subject of depictions of drunken sleep see Nanette Salomon, “Dreamers, Idlers, and Other Dozers: Aspects of Sleep in Dutch Art” (Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1984).

Mieris' *Wine is a Mocker* (Figure 100), which circulated widely as an engraving, showing the embarrassing effects of wine-induced slumber: one becomes an easy target for humiliation.⁴⁷¹ In Van Mieris' composition, a sleeping woman lies unconscious, unaware that she is being taunted by a fool who holding a chamberpot over her head.⁴⁷² The inscription below by Christoffel Pierson makes the moralizing message explicit: "Whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise."⁴⁷³

Though Steen has a pipe in one hand and guards a wineglass with the other, in *The Idlers* he nonetheless functions as a moral guide. Chapman reads Steen's role as being akin to a "fool-like commentator" derived from sixteenth-century rederijker plays and imagery, which "constituted the play's moral voice, providing commentary on its action, mocking and rebuking its characters and explaining its moral."⁴⁷⁴ In this scene, Steen looks straight out towards the viewer (an identifying marker of the participant self-portrait), flashing a knowing grin that lets us know he is privy to both the comedy of the situation as well as its larger meaning. Steen, the artist, has focused our attention on the moral message, and to emphasize this point he turns the woman's lost shoe towards her like a beacon, drawing our attention to her transgression.

Steen does the same thing in a domestic scene, *The Dissolute Household* (Figure 101), eyeing the viewer coyly from his helm at the center of the painting, as

⁴⁷¹ The saying originates in Proverbs 20:1.

⁴⁷² *Mirror of Everyday Life: Genreprints in the Netherlands 1550-1700* Exh. Cat. Eddy de Jongh & Ger Lijten (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, 1997) 337-40. The owl, a symbol of both wisdom and folly, perches above the woman and her spilled wineglass. Its wide eyes are a sharp contrast to the woman's shuttered eyelids and its attentive pose makes the owl a vigilant foil to the deceptive (and sleep-inducing) powers of alcohol.

⁴⁷³ De Jongh 2005, 61.

⁴⁷⁴ Chapman 1990-1, 190.

he links hands with the maid who in turn keeps the lady of the house's glass endlessly replenished. While Steen paints himself as a transgressor, he subtly reminds the viewer that he understands, and in fact, controls the situation. In *The Dissolute Household*, Steen sets off a chain reaction—his hand to the maid's, the maid's pitcher to the wife's glass—with the implication being that the completion of this circle will put Steen together with his now tipsy wife. He has let us in on his sneaky plan, though no one else in the composition seems to realize he is pulling the strings. He joins his hand to the maid's as if he were switching a lever to initiate the action in the scene. Steen's dissolution is partial and his judgment mild, likely two things that made him all the more likeable.

Van Mieris, in contrast to Steen, appears a subtle gentleman in his self-portraits in dissolute guise. In fact, his three self-inclusions as a romantic carouser appear more polite than dissolute, yet his intentions, as he paints them, are no nobler than Steen's—it is only that the finer manners and *fijnschilder* style of his more genteel genre interiors gild the licentious themes. *Teasing the Pet* (Figure 16), for example, a pendant to *The Oyster Meal* (Figure 15), reflects the most restrained of erotic themes, in which Van Mieris reaches to pet the dog seated on the lap of a woman (his wife Cunera van der Coecke), only to be rebuffed not only by her, but by a second barking dog. The lute on the table hints at the theme of love, as the simple overture likely symbolizes a less subtle play at romance. An emblem by Jacob Cats that Van Mieris appears to have referred to in other works helps explain the dogs presence, reading “*Gelijck de Juffer is, soo is haer hondeke*” (Like mistress, like

dog).⁴⁷⁵ Van Mieris used dogs in his *Inn Scene* (Figure 102) to underscore the theme of physical love between the flirting soldier and maid; in that painting, the dogs are copulating.⁴⁷⁶

The Oyster Meal, a pendant to *Teasing the Pet*, also revels in erotic overtones. Here, Van Mieris is clad the sober attire of a gentleman, and leans towards a woman (again, his wife) offering a tray of oysters with a grin and a polite hand to his chest. This time, she appears to accept his advance, holding a glass of wine in one hand and taking an oyster with the other. Not only was the oyster known as an aphrodisiac, but it also held references to female genitalia.⁴⁷⁷ Additionally, the woman's fur-trimmed jacket has been untied, revealing the woman's bodice, as well as her cleavage. The sweeping, blue curtain of bed behind the couple certainly adds to the implication that this is an offer of love.

Van Mieris' gesture—one hand held to his chest—is worth noting, as it functions two ways in the composition. Firstly, it contributes to the narrative as a gesture of a polite offer, of both oysters and love. Moreover, it is precisely the same, self-conscious gesture that Van Mieris makes in his *Self-Portrait, Holding a Large Glass* (Figure 82) even in the precise way in which his third and fourth fingers cling together. It was a gesture used in many seventeenth-century self-portraits to assert the

⁴⁷⁵ The emblem is from Cats' *Spiegel van den ouden ende nieuwen tijd* (The Hague, 1632) vol. II: 12. See The Hague and Washington 2005, 126 & 132; Brown 1984b, 183. Van Mieris also alludes to this emblem in *The Little Dog* (ca. 1660. Hermitage, St. Petersburg).

⁴⁷⁶ The work is alternately titled *Brothel Scene*. Van Mieris has been tentatively identified as the man romancing a woman in the doorway, though the features are very indistinct. The dog behind was overpainted and only revealed when the painting was restored in 1949. See The Hague and Washington 2005, 126 and Naumann I: 104.

⁴⁷⁷ Brown 1984b, 183. Brown mentions Johan van Dans as an author who used this symbolism.

artist's presence and authorship, and appears to reflect the domain of the *pictor doctus*, rather than the dissolute artist.

In a self-portrait commissioned by Cosimo III de' Medici in the Uffizi (Figure 103), Godfried Schalcken presents himself in the elegant finery of a Van Dyckian *virtuosi*, and places his hand to his chest in a similar gesture to that of Van Mieris. The scene is a nocturne, illuminated by candlelight, a specialty for which the artist was internationally renowned. In the self-portrait, Schalcken also holds a mezzotint (a print medium that was the commonly used for night scenes), a copy after his *Penitent Magdalene*, which he had sent to Cosimo along with the self-portrait as a gift for his patron.⁴⁷⁸ When Cosimo instructed his agent Thomas Platt to contact Schalcken in regards to the commission, Schalcken is said to have told Platt that "he was skilled in both day and night pieces, but that he would recommend the Duke ordering a self-portrait by candlelight."⁴⁷⁹ The artist has in effect given Cosimo samples of both types of scenes by including the mezzotint within the night scene. The gesture of his hand to his chest emphasizes Schalcken's declaration of his authorship of this virtuoso display of his many special talents.

Similarly, Van Mieris' self-portrait in *The Oyster Meal* reflects the artist's particular talent in the area of his specialty: *burgherlijk* genre scenes and love conceits. Self-portraits, too, could be added to that list, as Van Mieris was clearly engaged in the dialogue of self-portrayal. In essence, *The Oyster Meal* functions

⁴⁷⁸ The print was by the English mezzotint maker, John Smith, whose work was listed in Schalcken's possession at the time of his death in 1706. Schalcken became enamored of the mezzotint while living in England, 1697-8. See Gardien Wuestman, "The Mezzotint in Holland: 'Easily Learned, Neat and Convenient'," *Simiolus* 23 (1995): 78-9. Also see Raupp 1984, 217-9; and Langedijk, 165-71.

⁴⁷⁹ Peter Hecht, "Candlelight and Dirty Fingers, or Royal Virtue in Disguise: Some Thoughts on Weyerman and Godfried Schalcken," *Simiolus* 11 (1980): 31.

much like the type of self-portrait in which an artist portrayed himself holding (or in the midst of creating) a product of his talents. Van Mieris painted just such a scene for Cosimo III de' Medici (Figure 14), which shows the artist holding a scene of a music lesson, another subject that was often also just a lightly veiled love theme. In *The Oyster Meal*, Van Mieris paints himself within a scene that was a product of his talents, in effect eliminating the “painting within a painting” composition by incorporating his self-portrait as one of the characters. Van Mieris wears the reserved, dark robe of a gentleman, which would have been the same dress proscribed of the noble painter. His gesture, too, could well reflect the conventions of the learned painter, signaling his role as proud creator (as well as participant) of the scene. Though Van Mieris could not have known it at the time he painted the work, *The Oyster Meal* would become a famous testament to his talents: it was one of his most popular works, copied more than thirty times.⁴⁸⁰

Peasant Prodigals: Brouwer and His Circle

There are few more dissolute self-portraits than those by Brouwer and his circle, and fewer still that more clearly illuminate and promote the cultural connection between artists and prodigality. Though Brouwer, Teniers and Van Craesbeeck were technically Flemish, their work closely reflects ideas, both theoretical and pictorial, that circulated in Dutch art. Brouwer moved to Haarlem in the early 1620s, where legend places him in the studio of Hals; he then moved between that city and Amsterdam before returning to Antwerp in 1631-2 (dying just six years later in 1638).

⁴⁸⁰ Naumann I: 63. *Teasing the Pet* was copied seven times.

Both Teniers and van Craesbeeck were subsequently influenced by Brouwer's style upon his return to Antwerp.

Brouwer was crucial in helping to formulate the persona of the dissolute artist, as he made a strong connection between not only his own character and prodigality, but implicated other artists, his friends, in *The Smokers* (Figure 4). Brouwer's painting was well known as a group portrait during the seventeenth century.

Weyerman, writing in 1729, identified the figures:

The celebrated knight Carel de Moor has gladly told us that this Adriaen Brouwer once painted a history piece, consisting of the portraits of Jan David de Heem, Jan Cossiers and his own portrait, the gentlemen sitting smoking and drinking a glass. The aforementioned knight, who J.D. de Heem saw in Antwerp said that his portrait was wonderfully done.⁴⁸¹

The central figure, turning in his chair to blow smoke at the viewer, is Brouwer. It is a crude gesture, in any context, but Brouwer makes the act appear like an insult. He paints himself in the middle of a sharp outward breath as smoke ring emerges from the round cavern of his mouth, deliberately aimed at the viewer. Brouwer's eyes bulge open and his facial muscles flex, heightening the sense that the artist is pushing the smoke out with force, to mock and repel us. The other figures, too, create a tension between the viewer's interest in the scene and the sense that we are being ridiculed for disturbing this unruly table in the corner of the tavern. To Brouwer's left, a figure that has been identified as Jan Lievens confronts us with his gaze and pushes his index finger against his nose, causing smoke to pour out of the

⁴⁸¹ Weyerman, II: 69. "Den beruchten Ridder Karel de Moor heeft ons gelieven te verhaalen, dat dien Adriaan Brouwer eens een historiestukje schilderde, bestaande in de Konterfytzels van Jan David de Heem, Jan Koessiers, en in zijn eygen portret, zittende die Heeren te rooken en een glaasje te drinken. Den voornoemden Ridder, die J. D. de Heem heeft gezien tot Antwerpen, zegt dat deszelfs konterfytzel wonderlijk wel was getroffen."

opposite nostril. It is a repulsive gesture, compounded by his ragged peasant's clothes and hunched appearance.

Each figure shows a slightly different moment in the act of smoking tobacco. Next to Lievens, a figure that Karolien de Clippel has identified as Joos Van Craesbeeck blows smoke from his lips, looking upward at the gray cloud he has created. Jan Cossiers sits next to Van Craesbeeck. He appears to have smoke in his mouth, tasting it, preparing to exhale. Between Cossiers and Brouwer sits Jan Davidsz de Heem, giving the viewer a sly grin as he packs his pipe with tobacco.⁴⁸² From de Heem's figure, moving counter-clockwise, Brouwer has painted a veritable chronology of smoking, from preparation the pipe to elaborate ways to blow smoke, with each figure becoming cruder and more unruly as our eyes move around the table, culminating with Brouwer's confrontational pose and gesture.

⁴⁸² De Clippel 2003, 198-201. The identification of Brouwer and de Heem have been accepted since Hans Schneider ("Bildnisse des Adriaen Brouwer," in *Festschrift für Max J. Friedländer zum 60. Geburtstag*. Leipzig, 1927, pp. 148-55) identified them in 1927. However, the identities of the other figures have been disputed. De Clippel's reidentification of the figure on the left as Lievens replaces Walter Liedke's assumption [*Flemish Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. 2 vols. (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1984) I: 6] that it may represent Jan Cossiers. De Clippel bases this identification on the likeness of Lieven's portrait in Van Dyck's *Iconography*, which depicts Lievens in a similar position. She also places Lievens near the scene of the crime: he was in Antwerp in the spring of 1635, remaining there until ca. 1639-40, registering in the guild the year that he arrived. He was also known to have been in contact with Brouwer and de Heem, as they signed as witnesses on a contract regarding a student's apprenticeship with Lievens. De Clippel identifies Brouwer's former pupil, van Craesbeeck based on the likeness to his self-portraits, the same argument she makes for Cossiers' identification. Additionally, she feels (203) that this scene may have been painted to commemorate the entry of Brouwer and de Heem into the professional associations in 1635 (de Heem entered the Antwerp guild as a master that year, and Brouwer was admitted to the Violieren chamber of rhetoric with the guild as a *liefhebber*). She bases this idea partially on the fact that Brouwer and de Heem appear to be dressed in finer clothes than the other figures. De Clippel also notes (209, n53) that de Heem may also appear in Brouwer's *Back Operation* (Stadelsches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt) as the patient.

The act of packing a pipe with one's finger, as de Heem is doing here, was considered an obscene gesture. See Naumann II: 24, cat. 21.

To our eyes, *The Smokers* may appear first a genre scene, but to contemporary viewers, it was noted primarily as a portrait, more specifically a portrait of artists. Furthermore, despite the low-life setting and crude gestures, it was not viewed with derision.⁴⁸³ In 1658, for example, Parisian Estienne Perruchot wrote to an Antwerp art dealer about what was likely Brouwer's work, noting that it was "among the most beautiful he made. It depicts the portrait of Monsieur de Heem and of three other painters whom I do not know."⁴⁸⁴ Despite Perruchot's ignorance of the three remaining sitters' identities, he still notes that they were painters. He is not shocked at all by their coarse appearance or impolite gestures, rather, like Weyerman, notes the skill of the painting's execution. Perruchot's comment may also suggest that artists were well associated with the dissolute persona, and that it was an appropriate role for them to assume in society.

Pictor Gryllorum

By the time *The Smokers* was painted, Brouwer was admired already for his skills as a painter of peasants. Later biographers praised the likeness of his art and his character. The *topos* that "the man was like his art," is mentioned repeatedly in

⁴⁸³ Horn (I: 662) notes that "although the three cronies are hamming it up with a vengeance, they do not look remotely as crude or dim as Brouwer's usual subjects." Knüttel (26) also mentions that Brouwer, though appearing doped from the smoking, could have painted himself "more depraved than was the actual case."

⁴⁸⁴ De Clippel 2003 (196) cites Jean Denucé, *Na Peter Pauwel Rubens: documenten uit de kunsthandel te Antwerpen in de XVIIe eeuw van Matthijs Mussan* (Antwerp and The Hague: De Sikkel, 1949) 180. "J'ay recouvert deux tableaux de Mr Braor don't l'un de un des plus beaux qu'il aye faict. Il represente le portrait de Me de Hem et de trios autres peintre que je ne cognoy pas."

In the early twentieth century, it was believed that the figure of de Heem was Frans Hals. See Knüttel, 97, n.1.

regards to Brouwer, as De Bie writes: “how he was in work, so also did he carry himself in life”—a high compliment suggesting Brouwer was suited to his profession and specialty.⁴⁸⁵ In art literature, Brouwer was characterized as a high-spirited and jovial artist, a theatrical prankster whose jokes mocked the rules of genteel society; “a prankster in his drawing, a prankster in his life,” wrote Houbraken.⁴⁸⁶

The numerous stories about Brouwer’s life by biographers leave us with the picture of an unconventional character that creatively eschewed social airs and embraced the dank atmosphere of the tavern. Several anecdotes regarding Brouwer emphasize how the artist did not conform to outward social norms. One incident places Brouwer at a wedding, where he donned a fancy velvet suit upon which the other guests commented favorably, complimenting him for his rich apparel. This angered Brouwer; he argued that apparently only his suit was invited as a guest to the festivities, as it was so well received. In response, Brouwer smeared the suit with grease and threw it into the fire. After the incident, the artist ambled away “to his usual place of resort, to smook his Pipe, and drink his Brandy, which he was much addicted to.”⁴⁸⁷

Anecdotes of this nature posit Brouwer as a proto-bohemian artist, drinker, squanderer and satirizer—all of which were perfectly in keeping with what was seen as the character of his art. Others contemporary sources approached the subject of Brouwer as a more elevated construct. The engraving of Brouwer in Van Dyck’s

⁴⁸⁵ De Bie, 93. “*En soo hy was in’t werck, soo droegh hy hem in ‘t leven.*”

⁴⁸⁶ Houbraken, I: 318. “*Potsig was zyn penceelkonst, potsig zyn leven.*”

⁴⁸⁷ Meyskens, 18.

Iconography (Figure 46) envisions Brouwer as a noble artist, pushing his hand into a well-fitted glove rather than pushing smoke rings out of his mouth. Below Van Dyck's image, the Latin inscription reads: "Adrianus Brouwer, Gryllorum pictor Antverpiae" (Adriaen Brouwer, Antwerp painter of Caprices). Ancient authors like Pliny used the term "gryllorum" to describe humorous works of art and the Dutch word *grollitje*, meaning joke or witticism, derives from the term. Van Dyck's portrait and accompanying inscription acknowledges Brouwer's talent and natural inclination for farce, though pictures him as a noble artist, buttoned in up to his chin in civilized finery.

Raupp contends that biographers actively fashioned Brouwer's persona as a modern-day Diogenes, the cynical Greek philosopher who needed no possessions and was praised in the emblematic literature of the seventeenth century as a judge of morality.⁴⁸⁸ Joachim von Sandrart made a direct connection between the two, noting that "because of his merry nature, which was inclined to buffoonery and humourous stories in the style of Cynical Diogenes, [Brouwer] was liked by almost everyone."⁴⁸⁹ Raupp claims that the emphasis on Brouwer's ascetic and satiric nature elevated his art in the eyes of biographers like Houbraken, de Bie and Sandrart, imbuing it with an additional ethical component that surpassed aesthetics.⁴⁹⁰ According to de Bie,

⁴⁸⁸Raupp 1984b, 235.

⁴⁸⁹Joachim von Sandrart, *Teutsche Academie des edlen Bau-Bild und Mahlerey Künste*. 3 vols. (Nuremberg, 1675-80) (ed. Nördlingen: Verlag A. Uhl, 1994) I: 305. Translation from *The Age of Rubens*. Exh. Cat. (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1993-4) 416, n. 7.

⁴⁹⁰ Raupp 1984b, *passim*.

Brouwer knew how to “present the absurd folly of this world to one and all under the guise of mocking words and manners.”⁴⁹¹

The coarse style that Brouwer used to convey his message—also mentioned as a mirror of the artist’s rough character—was interpreted similarly: as a reflection of the character of the peasants he painted.⁴⁹² By using a low-life vernacular, Brouwer could impart a realistic message to his art, using a directness that came from first-hand knowledge. It was a technique also used by sixteenth and seventeenth-century authors like Bredero and the poet P.C. Hooft, who emulated the example set forth by the poetry of the Pléiade, embracing a native realism. Bredero, in the preface of his *Groot liedboek* (Great Songbook) of 1622 praised this manner of close imitation of nature: “I have followed the saying, common among painters: Those who come closest to real life are the best painters...as much as possible I have expressed the pleasantries in the most appealing peasant vernacular.”⁴⁹³

⁴⁹¹ De Bie, 91. “...onder den deckmantel van spots-ghewijse/redenen en manieren/ de sotte dulheydt des wereldts...aen ieder te ontdekken.” Translation by Eddy de Jongh in Amsterdam 1997, 313.

⁴⁹² Houbraken (I: 335) also cites this conceit in the biography of Joos van Craesbeeck: “*Ik min dit Beeld; want ’t is heel los gemaakt; maar gy, Dat haat ik, zyt zoo los als uwe schildery.*”

One seventeenth-century art theorist who opposed this practice was classicist critic Gerard de Lairese, who found it vulgar and incompatible with the dignity of art, despite the classical references to Diogenes. See Raupp 1984b, 233. Also see Emmens 1968, 124ff.

⁴⁹³ G.A. Bredero, *Groot lied-boeck* (edition G. Stuiveling, 1975) (originally published Amsterdam, 1622) http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/bred001groo01_01/bred001groo01_01_0005.htm (date retrieved: 1 August 2007)

“*Wat my belangt, ick heb anders geen Boeck geleert als het Boeck des gebruycx, so ick dan door onwetenheydt der uylandscher spraken, wetenschappen, en konsten hebben gedoolt: ver- 46 schoont my ongeleerde Leke-broeder, en geeft den Duytsche wat toe: ant ick heb als een schilder, de schilder-achtige spreucke ghevolcht, die daer seyt: Het zijn de beste Schilders die ’t leven naast komen...Ick hebbe soo veel als ick vermocht de boerterijen met de soetste Boere-wóórdén uyt gedruckt.*” Translation Franits 2004, 37. Bredero’s preface is also reproduced in Alpers 1975-6, 140-3.

Brouwer's *Smokers* reflects these qualities—the use of a coarse vernacular to speak forthrightly, the expression of the likeness of one's character to the nature of one's art (“*zoo de man was, was zyn werk*”), and an emphasis on the artist's special talents in an area of specialization (*verscheydenheyden*)—to convey a positive statement about Brouwer as both a man and an artist. The painting shows him in his element, not just literally in the tavern where he was said to work after life, but as the drinker, smoker and direct and unapologetic spokesman of the low-life realm and the leader at this table of dissolute artists. It is no surprise that the “*tweeden Brouwers*,” seated directly behind his mentor in the painting, also employed the dissolute self-portrait to a great extent. Van Craesbeeck portrayed himself as a lively, but coarse drinker no less than five times, as a prodigal figure (Figure 104), and as a smoker (Figure 103), two-times coarser than his mentor.

David Teniers also painted himself at home in a low-life tavern (Figure 105). Teniers is dressed in the same fashion as Brouwer in his *Smokers*, respectably but humbly, and very much at home amid the rustic atmosphere of the tavern. A coarser group of peasants is visible through the doorway, and though Teniers does not join them, he comfortably co-exists within their realm. Rather, he sits next to a wine barrel that has been turned into a makeshift table, and with one hand on a jug and other holding a glass of wine. Teniers raises his glass as if to toast us kindly, as so many other have done in their self-portraits of artists with drink. Like Brouwer and Van Craesbeeck, Teniers embraces the role of a prodigal peasant as a testament to his innate capacity to understand, with great verism, the essential nature of his subject.

Not all of the artists that Brouwer depicts in *The Smokers* were low-life specialists, though the artist seems to have recruited them into that realm for this special occasion. Lievens was a prominent history painter, De Heem, a flower specialist, and Cossiers was known for his Caravaggesque genre scenes. Yet here, the artists are united by friendship and a like-minded temperament that is at home with tankards of beer and a shared round of tobacco. Cossiers appears in another group portrait of artists by the Flemish painter Simon de Vos (1603- 1676) (Figure 106) that depicts three artist friends (de Vos, Cossiers and Johan Geerlof, a landscape painter from Zeeland) sitting around a table, sharing camaraderie, a glass of wine and a smoke.⁴⁹⁴

Whether Brouwer knew de Vos' earlier portrait is unknown, but it is likely no coincidence that both painters prominently featured alcohol and tobacco alongside portraits of artists. Given the presence of pipes and wine in so many other self-portraits, it is clear that artists identified with these substances as symbols of artistic identity, either as creative stimuli or symbols of the dissolute lifestyle that was synonymous with the image of the painter in Dutch society.

As early as the opening decade of the seventeenth century, Van Mander informs us that the artist was so intrinsically associated with an unruly character that it had entered the general realm of adages, known publicly in the widespread saying "*hoe schilder hoe wilder.*" The artists sitting at Brouwer's table in *The Smokers*, as well as the other artists in this discussion—from Rembrandt to van Roestraeten—aligned themselves with this artistic construct by painting themselves both according

⁴⁹⁴ See de Clippel 2003, 200-1. Cossiers studied with de Vos.

to their artistic inclination as well as in dissolute guise. Wildness, as evidenced by smoking, drinking and carousing, had become, as the adage suggests, an attribute of the Dutch artist. As we can clearly see from these self-portraits, it was something about which to be proud.

Conclusion

These alternately coarse, wild, drunken, lustful, stupefied, riotous, and rebellious portraits of artists stand out among seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish self-portraits for a variety of reasons. Visually, they are hard to ignore, and also fun to look at. Artists actively called attention to their dissolute behaviors by employing a range of eye-catching devices: great plumes of smoke pouring from open mouths, wine glasses raised in mid-toast, and harlots caught mid-prowl. With unprecedented bravado, these self-portraits challenged visual and social conventions by adopting the very postures and behaviors that contemporary art theorists and moralists condemned.

Despite their coarse exterior, at their heart, dissolute self-portraits shared some of the same theoretical constructs that served to elevate the status of the artist. In particular, they reflect two concepts: *verscheydenheden*, and “*zoo de man, zoo was zyn werk.*” Both were positive statements that emphasized artists’ inborn talent or special gifts, promoting the idea that artists were graced with abilities distinct from the rest of society.

The idea of *verscheydenheden*, cited by theorists from Van Mander to Houbraken, asserted that artists should specialize in and promote the specific type of painting to which they were naturally inclined. In regards to dissolute self-portraiture, artists expressed *verscheydenheden* by painting self-portraits that incorporated the particular themes and subjects that reflected their specialty. In *The Oyster Meal* (Figure 15), for instance, Van Mieris emphasized his artistic strengths by depicting

himself in the type of elevated genre interior for which he was famed. In addition, Van Mieris painted himself in a genteel, but erotically-charged romantic encounter, a subject that was one of his favorites.

“*Zoo de man, zoo was zyn werk,*” the theory that an artist’s character is mirrored in his work, was a parallel construct to *verscheydenheden*. This *topos* was invoked repeatedly in the art literature of the seventeenth century, especially in regards to artists like Steen and Brouwer. By painting themselves in self-portrait guises reflective of the spirit or tenor of their work, artists promoted the notion that they were especially predisposed to a particular type of art. Who was better suited to paint a low-life peasant scene than a coarse character like Van Craesbeeck (Figure 103) who looked as if he knew the realm intimately? Certainly, no artist appeared more inclined to paint the upside-down world of the dissolution than Steen, whose self-portraits reveled in chaos (Figure 101) and embraced the unruly (Figure 98). Even Steen’s epitaph (or perhaps Houbraken’s version of it) fused his art and painted persona:

This stone covers Jan Steen,
Among Artists none,
In painting as wittily wise;
His famous art of the Brush
Shows, how people, with loss
Of Discipline, grow even wilder.⁴⁹⁵

Steen was not alone in his wildness. The stereotype that the Dutch painter was prone to prodigality—“*hoe schilder hoe wilder*”—appears to have been a real phenomenon. Theorists and biographers refer to the trend of artists drinking heavily, as well as their reckless antics, throughout the era (1604, 1641, 1708-21). Prodigality

⁴⁹⁵Houbraken III: 26.

appears to have replaced the prevalent sixteenth-century artistic affliction, melancholia, as an identifying characteristic of artists in the seventeenth-century Netherlands. Dutch and Flemish artists embraced the role of the “*wilder schilder*” by consistently fashioning themselves as drinkers, rogues and profligates. In particular, artists gravitated towards two pictorial traditions for their dissolute self-portraits, the Five Senses and the Prodigal Son in the tavern, both of which provided ample visual possibilities for unruly expression.

I would suspect that these dissolute self-portrayals were nationalistic as well. It appears that Dutch artists grew even wilder away from home, as the Bentveughels certainly did their share in publicizing the cause of Dutch dissolution. In addition, the particular roles that artists adopted in these self-portraits (namely the Five Senses and the Prodigal Son) derive from Northern artistic traditions. By assuming these pictorial guises, artists aligned themselves with a distinctly Netherlandish art history.

Artists embraced dissolute self-expression for these many reasons. Aided by the spirit of satire and wit, these self-portraits provided artists with a unique pictorial alternative to the conventional image of the artist as *pictor doctus*. Moreover, the dissolute self-portrait celebrated the identity of Dutch and Flemish artists as both wild and talented. Whether proclaiming their artistic talent, expressing natural inclination or associating themselves with the phenomenon of the *wilder schilder*, it is clear that artists were happy to play along with these dissolute roles in both art and life.

Bibliography

- Alpers, Svetlana. "Realism as a Comic Mode: Low-Life Painting Seen through Bredero's Eyes." *Simiolus* 8 (1975-6): 115-44.
- Armstrong, Christine Megan. *The Moralizing Prints of Cornelis Anthonisz.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Baer, Ronni, et al. *Gerrit Dou 1613-1675: Master Painter in the Age of Rembrandt.* Exhibition Catalogue. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2000.
- Barnes, Susan J. "The *Uomini Illustri*, Humanist Culture, and the Development of a Portrait Tradition in Early Seventeenth-Century Italy." *Studies in the History of Art (Cultural Differentiation and Cultural Identity in the Visual Arts)* 27 (1989): 81-94.
- Barolsky, Paul. "Art History as Fiction." *Artibus et Historiae* 17 (1996): 9-17.
- Bauch, Kurt. *Jakob Adriaensz Backer: Ein Rembrandtschüler aus Friesland.* Berlin: G. Grottesche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926.
- Begemann, Egbert Haverkamp. *Willem Buytewech.* Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1959.
- Bie, Cornelis de. *Het gulden cabinet van de edel vry schilderconst.* Antwerp, 1661. Facsimile edition, Davaco: Soest, 1971.
- Biesboer, Pieter. *Collections of Paintings in Haarlem: 1572-1745.* Edited by Carol Togneri. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2001.
- Blankert, Albert. "Vermeer's Modern Themes and Their Tradition." In *Johannes Vermeer*, 31-45. Exhibition Catalogue. Washington & The Hague: National Gallery & Royal Cabinet of Paintings Mauritshuis, 1995.
- . "What Is Dutch Seventeenth Century Genre Painting? A Definition and Its Limitations." In *Holländische Genremalerei im 17. Jahrhundert Symposium Berlin 1984*, edited by Henning Bock and Thomas W. Gaehtgens, 9-33. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1987.
- . "Heraclitus en Democritus in het bijzonder in de Nederlands kunst van de zeventiende eeuw." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 18 (1967): 31-124.
- Blunt, Anthony. *Artistic Theory in Italy: 1450-1600.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

- Bock, Henning and Thomas W. Gaechtgens. *Holländische Genremalerei Im 17. Jahrhundert Symposium Berlin 1984*. Berlin: G. Mann, 1987.
- Bode, Wilhelm von. *The Complete Work of Rembrandt: History, Description and Heliographic Reproduction of All the Master's Pictures, with a Study of His Life and His Art*. 8 vols. Paris: C. Sedelmeyer, 1897-1906.
- Bredero, G.A. *The Spanish Brabanter*. Translated by H. David Brumble III. Binghamton, N.Y. : Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1982.
- . *Werken van G.A. Bredero*. Edited by J.A.N. Knuttel. 3 vols. Amsterdam: A. Hahn, 1921.
- . *Groot lied-boeck*. Amsterdam, 1622.
http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/bred001groo01_01/bred001groo01_01_0005.htm
 [date retrieved: 1 August 2007].
- Bredius, A. *Johannes Torrentius: Schilder, 1589-1644*. S'Gravenhage: Martinus-Nijhoff, 1909.
- Brongers, Georg A. *Nicotiana Tabacum: The History of Tobacco and Tobacco Smoking in the Netherlands*. Groningen: Theodorus Niemeyer, 1964.
- Broos, Ben P.J. "The 'O' of Rembrandt." *Simiolus* 4 (1971): 150-84.
- Broos, Ton J. *Tussen zwart en ultramarijn: de levens van schilders beschreven door Jacob Campo Weyerman (1677-1747)*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1990.
- Brown, Christopher. *Images of a Golden Past: Dutch Genre Painting of the 17th Century*. New York: Abbeville Press, 1984.
- . *Scenes of Everyday Life: Dutch Genre Painting of the Seventeenth Century*. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1984.
- Brown, Katherine T. *Self-Portraiture in Renaissance Venice: 1458-1625*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2000.
- Brusati, Celeste. *Artifice and Illusion: The Art and Writing of Samuel Van Hoogstraten*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1995.
- Buijsen, Edwin, and Louis Peter Grijp. *Music and Painting in the Golden Age*. Zwolle: Waanders, 1994.

- Buvelot, Quentin, ed. *Frans Van Mieris: 1635-1681*. Exhibition Catalogue. The Hague & Washington: Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis & National Gallery of Art, 2005.
- Campbell, Lorne. *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Castiglione, Baldassare. *The Book of the Courtier*. Translated by Leonard Eckstein Opydycke. Mineola: Dover, 2003.
- Chadwick, Whitney. *Women, Art and Society*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1991.
- Chapman, H. Perry. "A Hollandse Pictura: Observations on the Title Page of Philip Angel's 'Lof Der Schilder-Konst'." *Simiolus* 16 (1986): 233-48.
- . *Rembrandt's Self-Portraits: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- . "Jan Steen's Household Revisited." *Simiolus* 20 (1990-1): 183-96.
- . "Persona and Myth in Houbraken's Life of Jan Steen." *Art Bulletin* 75 (1993): 135-50.
- . "Jan Steen as a Family Man. Self-Portrayal as an Experiential Mode of Painting." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 46 (1995): 368-93.
- . "Jan Steen: Player in His Own Paintings." In *Jan Steen: Player in His Own Paintings*, edited by Guido M. C. Jansen, 11-24. Exhibition Catalogue. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1996.
- Cicero, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Academica* II. 8. Edited by J.S. Reid. London: Macmillan and Co., 1885.
- Clippel, Karolien de. *Joos Van Craesbeeck (1605/06-Ca 1660): Een Brabants Genreschilder*. 2 vols. Tunhout: Brepols, 2006.
- . "Adriaen Brouwer, Portrait Painter: New Identifications and an Iconographic Novelty." *Simiolus* 30 (2003): 196-216.
- Cornelis, Bart. "A Reassessment of Arnold Houbraken's 'Groote Schouburgh'." *Simiolus* 23 (1995): 163-80.
- Cranston, Jodi. *The Poetics of Portraiture in the Italian Renaissance*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

- Cust, Lionel, and F. Jos van den Branden. "Notes on Pictures in the Royal Collections Xxx: Paintings by Joost and Cornelis Van Cleve - No. 1." *Burlington Magazine* 26 (1915): 169-73; 76.
- Dekker, Rudolf M. *Humour in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave, 2001
- ., ed. *Egodocuments and History: Autobiographical Writing in Its Social Context since the Middle Ages*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University, 2002.
- Denucé, Jean. *Inventare Von Kunstsammlungen Zu Antwerpen Im 16. Um. 17. Jahrhundert*. Antwerp: Verlag "de Sikkel", 1932.
- DeWitt, Lloyd. "Evolution and Ambition in the Career of Jan Lievens (1607-1674)." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 2006.
- Dreher, Faith Paulette. "David Teniers II Again." *Art Bulletin* 59 (1977): 108-10.
- Eckardt, Götz. *Selbstbildnisse Niederländischer Maler des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1971.
- Emmens, J.A. "A Seventeenth-Century Theory of Art: Nature and Practice." *Delta* 12 (1969): 30-39.
- . *Rembrandt en de regels van de kunst*. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1968.
- Erasmus, Desiderus. *The Praise of Folly*. Trans. Clarence H. Miller. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- . *The Adages of Erasmus*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2001.
- Fehl, Philipp P. "Touchstones of Art and Art Criticism: Rubens and the Work of Franciscus Junius." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 30 (1996): 5-24.
- Franits, Wayne, ed. *Looking at Seventeenth Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- ., *Dutch Seventeenth-Century Genre Painting: Its Stylistic and Thematic Evolution*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Fucikova, Eliska. "'Quae Praestat Iuvenis Vix Potuere Viri': Hans Von Aachen's Selbstbildnis in Köln." *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 33 (1971): 115-24.
- Gaskell, Ivan. "Gerrit Dou, His Patrons and the Art of Painting." *Oxford Art Journal* 5 (1982): 15-23.

- . "Tobacco, Social Deviance and Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century." In *Hollandische Genremalerei Im 17. Jahrhundert Symposium Berlin 1984*, edited by Henning Bock and Thomas W. Gaehtgens, 117-37. Berlin: G. Mann, 1987.
- Gibson, Walter S. "Some Flemish Popular Prints by Hieronymous Cock and His Contemporaries." *Art Bulletin* 60 (1978): 673-81.
- Golahny, Amy. *Rembrandt's Reading: The Artist's Bookshelf of Ancient Poetry and History*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2003.
- Gordon, Walter M., *Humanist Play and Belief: the Seriocomic Art of Desiderus Erasmus*. Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Buffalo Press, 1990.
- Griffey, Erin. "The Artist's Roles: Searching for Self-Portraiture in the Seventeenth-Century Netherlands." Ph.D. dissertation, University of London, 2001.
- Groot, Cornelis Hofstede de. *A Catalogue Raisonné of the Works of the Most Eminent Dutch Painters of the Seventeenth Century*. Translated by Edward G. Hawke. 8 vols. London: Macmillan & Co. , 1908-27.
- Gudlaugsson, Sturla. *The Comedians in the Work of Jan Steen and his Contemporaries*. Soest: Davaco, 1995.
- Haegar, Barbara. "The Prodigal Son in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Netherlandish Art: Depictions of the Parable and the Evolution of a Catholic Image." *Simiolus* 16 (1986): 128-38.
- Hall, H. van. *Portretten van Nederlandse Beeldende Kunstenaars*. Amsterdam: Swets en Zeitlinger, 1963.
- Harrebomée, Pieter Jacob. *Spreekwoordenboek der Nederlandsche taal, of verzameling van Nederlandsche spreekwoorden en spreekwoordelijke uitdrukkingen von vroegeren en lateren tijd*. 3 Vols. Utrecht: Kemink en Zoon, 1858-70.
- Haskell, Francis. *Patrons and Painters: A Study in the Relations between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Hecht, Peter. "Candlelight and Dirty Fingers, or Royal Virtue in Disguise: Some Thoughts on Weyerman and Godfried Schalcken." *Simiolus* 11 (1980): 23-38.
- , ed. *De Hollandse Fijnschilders: Gerard Dou Tot Adriaen Van Der Werff*. Exhibition Catalogue. Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1989.

- . "Browsing in Houbraken: Developing a Fancy for an Underestimated Author." *Simiolus* 24 (1996): 259-74.
- Hofrichter, Frima Fox. "The Eclipse of a Leading Star." In *Judith Leyster: A Dutch Master and Her World*, edited by James A. Welu & Pieter Biesboer, 115-122. Exhibition Catalogue. *Judith Leyster: A Dutch Master and Her World*. Exhibition Catalogue. Worcester: Worcester Art Museum 1993.
- Hofstede, Justus Müller. "Der Künstler im Humilitas-Gestus. Altniederländische Selbstporträts und ihre Signifikanz im Bildkontext: Jan Van Eyck, Dirck Bouts, Hans Memling, Joos Van Cleve." In *Autobiographie Und Selbstportait in Der Renaissance*, edited by Gunter Schweikhart, 38-68. Köln: König, 1998.
- Hollander, Martha. "Review of Paragons of Virtue: Women and Domesticity in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art by Wayne E. Franits, and Judith Leyster: A Dutch Master and Her World by James A. Welu and Pieter Biesboer." *Art Bulletin* 76 (1994): 541-44.
- Hollstein, F.W.H. *Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, Ca. 1450-1700*. 58 Vols. Amsterdam: M. Hertzberger, 1949-.
- Hoogewerff, G.J. *De twee reizen van Cosimo de' Medici Prins van Toscane door de Nederlanden (1667-1669): journalen en documenten*. Amsterdam: J. Müller, 1919.
- . *De Bentveughels*. 'S-Gravenahge: Martinus Nijhoff, 1952.
- Hoogstraten, Samuel van. *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst; anders de zichtbaere werelt*. Rotterdam, 1678. Reprint, Doornspijk: Davaco, 1969.
- Horace, *Satires*. Translated by Edward P. Morris. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Co, 1909.
- Horn, Hendrick J. *The Golden Age Revisited: Arnold Houbraken's Great Theatre of Netherlandish Painters and Paintresses*. 2 vols. Doornspijk: Davaco, 2000.
- Houbraken, Arnold. *De groote schouburgh der Nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen*. 3 vols. Amsterdam; The Hague, 1718-21; 1753. Reprint, facsimile edition, Amsterdam: B.V. Israël, 1976.
- Huizinga, Johan. *The Waning of the Middle Ages*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1954.
- Jansen, D. "Jan Van Eyck's Selbstbildnis-der 'Mann mit dem rotem Turban' und der sogenannte 'Tymotheos' der Londoner National Gallery." *Pantheon* 47

(1989): 36-48.

Jansen, Guido M. C., ed. *Jan Steen: Painter and Storyteller*. Exhibition Catalogue. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1996.

Jongh, Eddy de & Ger Luijten, eds. *Mirror of Everyday Life: Genreprints in the Netherlands 1550-1700*. Exhibition Catalogue. Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1997.

Jongh, Eddy de. "Realisme en schijnrealisme in de Hollandse schilderkunst van de zeventiende eeuw." In *Rembrandt en zijn tijd*, edited by Jan van Lerberghe, 143-194. Exhibition Catalogue. Brussels: Paleis voor Schone Kunsten, 1971.

———. "Grape Symbolism in Paintings of the 16th and 17th Centuries." *Simiolus* 4 (1974): 166-91.

———et al, ed. *Tot lering en vermaak: Betekenissen van Hollandse genrevoorstellingen uit de zeventiende eeuw*. Exhibition Catalogue. Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1976.

———. "Minerva's Secret: An Allegory of Drawing by Jan de Laïresse." *Simiolus* 13 (1983): 201-17.

———. "Jan Steen, So Near and Yet So Far." In *Jan Steen: Painter and Storyteller*. Edited by Guido M. C. Jansen, 39-52. Exhibition Catalogue. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1996.

———. "Realism and Seeming Realism in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting." In *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*, edited by Wayne Franits, 21-56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

———. "Frans Van Mieris: Questions of Understanding," in *Frans Van Mieris: 1635-1681*, edited by Quentin Buvelot, 44-61. Exhibition Catalogue. The Hague & Washington: Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis & National Gallery of Art, 2005.

Junius, Franciscus. *The Literature of Classical Art: I: The Painting of the Ancients (De Pictura Veterum), II: A Lexicon of Artists and Their Works (Catalogus)*. Edited by Keith Aldrich, Philipp Fehl and Raina Fehl. 2 vols. London, 1638.

Kahr, Madlyn. "Rembrandt and Delilah." *Art Bulletin* 55 (1973): 240-59.

Kaiser, Walter. *Praisers of Folly: Erasmus, Rabelais, Shakespeare*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Kemp, Martin, "Ogni Dipintore Dipinge Se': A Neoplatonic Echo in Leonardo's Art

- Theory," in *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oscar Kristeller*, edited by C.H. Clough, 311-323. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976.
- Kirschenbaum, Baruch D. *The Religious and Historical Paintings of Jan Steen*. New York & Montclair: Allanheld & Schram, 1977.
- Klinge, Margaret. *Adriaen Brouwer; David Teniers the Younger: A Loan Exhibition of Paintings*. New York: Noortman & Brod, 1982.
- Klinger, Lisa. "The Portrait Collection of Paolo Giovio." Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1991.
- Knuttel, Gerard. *Adriaen Brouwer: The Master and His Work* The Hague: L.J.C. Boucher, 1962.
- Koslow, Susan. "Frans Hals' Fisherboys: Exemplars of Idleness." *Art Bulletin* 57 (1975): 418-32.
- Kren, Thomas. "Chi Non Vuol Baccho: Roeland Van Laer's Burlesque Painting about Dutch Artists in Rome." *Simiolus* 11 (1980): 63-80.
- Kris, Ernst, and Otto Kurz. *Legend, Myth, and Magic in the Image of the Artist: A Historical Experiment*. Translated by Alastair Laing. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Kuretsky, Susan D. *The Paintings of Jacob Ochtervelt (1634-1682)*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1979.
- Laabs, Annegret et al, eds. *De Leidse Fijnschilders uit Dresden*. Exhibition Catalogue. Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen: Dresden, 2001.
- Lairesse, Gerard de. *Het groot Schilderboek, waar in de schilderkonst in al haar delen grondig werd onderweezen, ook door redeneeringen en prentverbeeldingen verklaard*. Amsterdam, 1707.
- Lampsonius, Domenicus. *Da Van Eyck a Brueghel: Scritti Sulle Arti di Domenico Lampsonio*. Translated by Maria Teresa Sciolla. Torino: Utet, 2001.
- Langedijk, Karla. *Die Selbstbildnisse der holländische und flämischen Künstler in der Galleria Degli Autoritatti der Uffizien in Florenz*. Florence: Edizioni Medicea, 1992.
- Lee, Rensselaer W. "Ut Pictura Poesis: A Humanistic Theory of Painting." *Art Bulletin* 22 (1940): 197-269.

- Levine, David A. "The Art of the Bamboccianti." Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1984.
- Levine 1984b, "Pieter Van Laer's Artists' Tavern: An Ironic Commentary on Art." In *Hollandische Genremalerei Im 17. Jahrhundert Symposium Berlin 1984*, edited by Henning Bock and Thomas W. Gaeghtgens, 169-191. Berlin: G. Mann, 1987.
- Li, Chu-tsing. "The Five Senses in Art: An Analysis of Its Development in Northern Europe." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1955.
- Liedke, Walter A. "The Three 'Parables' by Barent Fabritius with a Chronological List of his Paintings Dating from 1660 Onward." *Burlington Magazine* 119 (1977): 316, 19-27.
- . *Flemish Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. 2 vols. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1984.
- Louden, Lynn M. "Sprezzatura in Raphael and Castiglione." *Art Journal* 28 (1968): 43-9; 53.
- Luijten, Ger. "Frills and Furbellows: Satires on Fashion and Pride around 1600." *Simiolus* 65 (1996): 140-60.
- Luijten, Ger, and Robert Zijlma, eds. *The New Hollstein: German Engravings, Etchings and Woodcuts 1400-1700*. Rotterdam: Sound & Vision Interactive, 1996.
- Mander, Karel van. *The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, from the First Edition of the Schilder-Boeck (1603-1604)*. Translated by Hessel Miedema. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1994.
- . *Den grondt der edel vry schilder-const*. Translated by Hessel Miedema. Utrecht: Haentjens, Dekker and Gumbert, 1973.
- Mauquoy-Hendrickx, Marie. *L'Iconographie D'Antoine van Dyck: Catalogue Raisonné*. Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1956.
- Melion, Walter S. *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon: Karel Van Mander's Schilder-Boeck*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1991.
- Meysens, Jan. *Images de divers homes d'esprit sublime qui par leur art et science deburoyent vivre eternellement et des quells la loyange et renommée faict le monde*. Antwerp, 1649. Republished as *The True Effigies of the Most Eminent Painters and other Famous Artists that have Flourished in Europe*:

Curiously Engraven on Copper-Plates: Together with an Account of the Time when They Lived, the Most Remarkable Passages of their Lives, and Most Considerable Works. London, 1705.

- Michel, Emile. *Rubens: His Life, His Work, and His Time.* Translated by Elizabeth Lee. 2 vols. London and New York: W. Heinemann & C. Scribner's Sons, 1899.
- Montias, John Michael. *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Moxey, Keith. *Peasants, Warriors, and Wives.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Muller, Jeffrey M. "Rubens's Theory and Practice of the Imitation of Art." *Art Bulletin* 64 (1982): 229-42.
- . *Rubens: The Artist as Collector.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Naumann, Otto. *Frans Van Mieris.* 2 vols. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1981.
- North, Michael. *Art and Commerce in the Dutch Golden Age.* Translated by Catherine Hill. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Notarp, Gerlinde Lütke. "Jacques De Gheyn II's "'Man Resting in a Field': An Essay on the Iconography of Melancholy." *Simiolus* 24 (1996): 311-19.
- Passeri, Giambattista. *Vite de' Pittori, Scultori ed Architetti Che Hanno Lavorato in Roma.* Milan: A. Forni, 1976.
- Paulson, Ronald. *The Fictions of Satire.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1967.
- Peeters, Natasja. "Brothers in Art; Hieronymus and Frans Francken I and Their Family: Portraits and Crypto-Portraits in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century." *Dutch Crossing* 23 (1999): 80-102.
- Pers, Dirck Pietersz. *Suyp-Stad of Dronckaerts Leven.* Edited by J.E. Verlaan and E.K. Grootes. Facsimilie, 1628 edition. Culembourg: Tjeenk Willink/Noorduijn, 1978.
- Pont, Daniël. *Barent Fabritius: 1624-1673.* 'S Gravenhage: N.V. Drukkerij Trio, 1958.
- Pope-Hennessy, John. *The Portrait in the Renaissance.* New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1966.

- Quintijn, Gilles Jacobsz. *De Hollandsche liis met de Brabandsche bely: poeetischer wyse voorgesteld en gedicht*. 's Gravenhage, 1629.
- Raupp, Hans-Joachim. *Untersuchungen zu Künstlerbildnis und Künstlerdarstellung in den Niederlanden im 17. Jahrhunderts*. Hildesheim, Zurich and New York: Olms, 1984.
- . "Adriaen Brouwer als Satiriker." In *Holländische Genremalerei im 17. Jahrhundert Symposium Berlin 1984*, edited by Henning Bock and Thomas W. Gaetgens, 225-252. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1987.
- Rehorst, A. J. *Torrentius*. Rotterdam: W.L. & J. Brusse N.V., 1939.
- Ripa, Cesar. *Iconologia of uytbeeldinghe des verstands*. Soest: Davaco, 1644. Reprint, 1971.
- Rosenburg, Jakob. *Rembrandt, Life and Work*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- . *Rembrandt: Life and Work*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1948.
- Roworth, Wendy Wassying. "A Date for Salvator Rosa's Satire on Painting and the Bamboccianti in Rome." *Art Bulletin* 63 (1981): 611-17.
- Rupprath, Cynthia von Bogendorf. "Molenaer in the Studio: Props, Models, and Motifs." In *Jan Miense Molenaer: Painter of the Dutch Golden Age*, edited by Dennis P. Weller, 27-42. Exhibition Catalogue. Raleigh: North Carolina Museum of Art, 2002.
- Salomon, Nanette. "Jan Steen's Dissolute Household, Sources and Meanings." In *Hollandische Genremalerei Im 17. Jahrhundert Symposium Berlin 1984*, edited by Henning Bock and Thomas W. Gaetgens, 315-344. Berlin: G. Mann, 1987.
- . "Dreamers, Idlers, and Other Dozers: Aspects of Sleep in Dutch Art." New York University, 1984.
- Sandart, Joachim von. *Teutsche Academie der edlen Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste*. 3 vols. Nuremberg, 1675-80. Nördlingen: Verlag A. Uhl, 1994.
- Schama, Simon. *Rembrandt's Eyes*. New York: Knopf, 1999.
- Schweikhart, Gunter, ed. *Autobiographie und Selbstportrait in der Renaissance*. Cologne: König, 1998.
- Shaw, Lindsey Bridget. "Pieter Van Roestraten and the English 'Vanitas'."

- Burlington Magazine* 132 (1990): 402-6.
- Slive, Seymour. *Rembrandt and His Critics: 1630-1730*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1953.
- Sluiter, Eric Jan. *Seductress of Sight: Studies in Dutch Art of the Golden Age*. Zwolle: Waanders, 2000.
- . "Didactic or Disguised Meanings? Several Seventeenth-Century Texts of Painting and the Iconological Approach to Northern Dutch Paintings of This Period." In *Art in History, History in Art: Studies in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Culture*, edited by David Freedberg and Jan de Vries, 175-201. Santa Monica: Getty Center for the History of Art and Humanities, 1991.
- Smith, David. "Irony and Civility: Notes on the Convergence of Genre and Portraiture in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting." *Art Bulletin* 69 (1987): 407-30.
- Sohm, Philip. "Caravaggio's Deaths." *Art Bulletin* 84 (2002): 449-68.
- Spicer, Joneath, ed. *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht During the Golden Age*. Exhibition Catalogue. Walters Art Gallery & Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco: Baltimore and San Francisco, 1997.
- Steadman, Philip. *Vermeer's Camera: Uncovering the Truth Behind the Masterpieces*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Stoett, F.A. "Nederlandsche Spreekwoorden, Spreekwijzen, Uitdrukkingen En Gezegden." http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/stoe002nede01_01/stoe002nede01_01_2701.htm [accessed 1 September 2007].
- Strien, Cornelis Daniël van. *British Travellers to Holland During the Stuart Period: Edward Browne and John Locke as Tourists in the United Provinces*. Leiden and New York: E.J. Brill, 1993.
- Sullivan, Margaret A. *Bruegel's Peasants: Art and Audience in the Northern Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Sutton, Peter C. *Masters of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Genre Painting*. Exhibition Catalogue. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1984.
- Tacitus, "The Agricola and Germania." Trans. A.J. Church and W.J. Brodribb. London: MacMillan, 1877.
- The Hague. *The Hoogsteder Exhibition of Music and Painting in the Golden Age*. Edited by Edwin Buijsen and Louis Peter Grijp. Exhibition Catalogue. The

- Hague: Hoogsteder & Hoogsteder, 1994.
- Thiel, Pieter J.J., "Frans Hals' portret van de Leidse Rederijkersnar Pieter Cornelisz. Van Der Morsch, alias Piero (1543-1628)." *Oud Holland* 34 (1961): 153-72.
- . "Marriage Symbolism in a Musical Party by Jan Miense Molenaer." *Simiolus* 2 (1967): 90-99.
- . "For Instruction and Betterment: Samuel Ampzing's 'Mirror of the Vanity and Unrestrainedness of Our Age.'" *Simiolus* 24 (1996): 182-200.
- Trulja, S. Meloni. *La Collezione Pazzi (Autoritratti Per Gli Uffizi): Un' Operazione Sospetta, Un Documento Malevelo.* *Paragone* 29 (1978): 79-123.
- Vasari, Giorgio. *The Lives of the Artists*. Translated by Julia Conaway Bondanella and Peter Bondanella. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Veldman, Ilja M. "Lessons for Ladies: A Selection of Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Prints." *Simiolus* 16 (1986): 113-27.
- . "Elements of Continuity: A Finger Raised in Warning." *Simiolus* 20 (1990-91): 124-41.
- Vinge, Louise. *The Five Senses: Studies in a Literary Tradition*. Lund: LiberLäromedel, 1975.
- Vondel, Joost van den. *De Werken Van Joost Van Den Vondel, Deel 4. 1610-1645*. 10 vols. Amsterdam: Maatschappij voor Goede en Goedekoope Lectuur, 1930.
- Vries, Lyckle de. "Tronies and Other Single Figured Netherlandish Paintings." *Nederlandse Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 8 (1990): 185-202.
- . "The Changing Face of Realism." In *Art in History, History in Art: Studies in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Culture*. Edited by Jan de Vries & David Freedberg, 209-248. Santa Monica: Getty Center for Art and Humanities, 1999.
- Wages, Sara M. "Remarks on Love, Woman, and the Garden in Netherlandish Art: A Study on the Iconology of the Garden." In *Rembrandt, Rubens, and the Art of Their Time: Recent Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald E. Fleischer and Susan Clare Scott, 176-223. University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University, 1997.
- Warburg, Aby. *Gesammelte Schriften*. 2 vols. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1932.
- Weller, Dennis P., ed. *Jan Miense Molenaer: Painter of the Dutch Golden Age*.

- Exhibition Catalogue. Raleigh: North Carolina Museum of Art, 2002.
- Welu, James A. & Pieter Biesboer, eds. *Judith Leyster: A Dutch Master and Her World*. Exhibition Catalogue. Worcester: Worcester Art Museum 1993.
- Wenzel, Siegfried. *The Sin of Sloth in Medieval Thought and Literature*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1967.
- Westermann, Mariët. "Jan Steen, Frans Hals, and the Edges of Portraiture." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 46 (1995): 299-301.
- . "Steen's Comic Fictions." In *Jan Steen: Painter and Storyteller*. Edited by Guido M.C. Jansen, 53-68. Exhibition Catalogue. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1996.
- . *The Amusements of Jan Steen: Comic Painting in the Seventeenth Century*. Zwolle: Waanders, 1997.
- Westfall, Carroll W. "Painting and the Liberal Arts: Alberti's View." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 30 (1969): 487-506.
- Wetering, Ernst van de. "Rembrandt's 'Satire on Art Criticism' Reconsidered." In *Shop Talk: Studies in Honor of Seymour Slive, Presented on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, 264-270. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Art Museums, 1995.
- . "The Miracle of Our Age: Rembrandt through the Eyes of his Contemporaries." In *Rembrandt: A Genius and His Impact*. Exh. Cat. Edited by Albert Blankert. Melbourne: National Gallery of Victoria, 1997. 58-68.
- . "The Multiple Functions of Rembrandt's Self Portraits." In *Rembrandt by Himself*. Edited by Christopher White and Quentin Buvelot, 8-37. Exhibition Catalogue. London and The Hague: National Gallery Publications & Royal Cabinet of Paintings Mauritshuis, 1999.
- Weyerman, Jacob Campo. *De levensbeschrijvingen der Nederlandsche konst-schilders en konst-schilderessen*. 4 vols. The Hague, 1729-69.
- Wheelock, Arthur K. *Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century*. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1995.
- . "Rembrandt Inventing Himself." In *Rembrandt Creates Rembrandt: Art and Ambition in Leiden, 1625-1631*. Edited by Alan Chong, 13-24. Exhibition Catalogue. Boston: Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, 2000.
- , et al. *The Public and Private in the Age of Vermeer*. Exhibition Catalogue. Osaka: Osaka Municipal Museum, 2000.

- Winkel, Marieke de. "Costume in Rembrandt's Self-Portraits." In *Rembrandt by Himself*. Edited by Alan Chong, 58-74. Exhibition Catalogue. London & The Hague: National Gallery & Mauritshuis, 1999.
- . "Rembrandt's Clothes--Dress and Meaning in his Self-Portraits." In *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings*. Edited by Ernst van der Wetering, 45-87. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Wittkower, Rudolf. "Individualism in Art and Artists: A Renaissance Problem." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 22 (1961): 291-302.
- Wittkower, Rudolf and Margot. *Born under Saturn: The Character and Conduct of Artists, a Documented History from Antiquity to the French Revolution*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1963.
- Woods-Marsden, Joanna. *Renaissance Self-Portraiture: The Visual Construction of Identity and the Social Status of the Artist*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Worcester. *Judith Leyster: A Dutch Master and Her World*. Edited by James A. Welu and Pieter Biesboer. Exhibition Catalogue. Worcester: Worcester Art Museum, 1993.
- Wuestman, Gerdien. "The Mezzotint in Holland: 'Easily Learned, Neat and Convenient'." *Simiolus* 23 (1995): 63-89.
- Zöllner, Frank. "'Ogni Pittore Dipinge Sè.' Leonardo Da Vinci and 'Automimesis'." http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/artdok/volltexte/2006/161/pdf/Zoellner_Kuesisw_92.pdf [accessed 10 June 2007].
- Zumthor, Paul. *Daily Life in Rembrandt's Holland*. Translated by Simon Watson Taylor. New York: Macmillan, 1965.