

ABSTRACT

Title of Document: AMALIA VAN SOLMS AND THE
FORMATION OF THE STADHOUDER'S
ART COLLECTION, 1625-1675

Virginia C. Treanor, Doctor of Philosophy,
2012

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

This dissertation examines the role of Amalia van Solms (1602-1675), wife of Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange and Stadhouder of the United Provinces of the Netherlands (1584-1647), in the formation of the couple's art collection. Amalia and Frederik Hendrik's collection of fine and decorative arts was modeled after foreign, royal courts and they cultivated it to rival those of other great European treasure houses. While some scholars have recognized isolated instances of Amalia's involvement with artistic projects at the Stadhouder's court, this dissertation presents a more comprehensive account of these activities by highlighting specific examples of Amalia's patronage and collecting practices.

Through an examination of gifts of art, portraits of Amalia and her porcelain collection, this study considers the ways in which Amalia contributed to the formation of the Stadhouder's art collection. This dissertation seeks to provide a greater knowledge not only of Amalia's activities as a patron and collector, but also a

more thorough understanding of the genesis and function of the collection as a whole, which reflected the power and glory of the House of Orange during the Dutch Golden Age.

AMALIA VAN SOLMS AND THE FORMATION OF THE STADHOUDER'S
ART COLLECTION, 1625-1675

By

Virginia Clare Treanor

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
2012

Advisory Committee:

Professor Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., Chair

Professor H. Perry Chapman

Professor Anthony Colantuono

Professor Jay Robert Dorfman

Professor Meredith Gill

© Copyright by
Virginia Clare Treanor
2012

Disclaimer

The thesis or 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.

Acknowledgements

My greatest debt of gratitude goes to my advisor, Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr. for his generosity of time, encouragement and salient comments, all of which helped bring this dissertation to fruition. Research for this project was aided by the the American Friends of the Mauritshuis Fellowship in 2007, which allowed me to visit the Koninklijke Bibliotheek, the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie and the Koninklijk Huisarchief in The Hague as well as the Archiv Schloss Braunfels in Braunfels, Germany. A rare visit to the Huis ten Bosch to see the Oranjezaal was made possible by the Attingham Trust whose study trip to the Netherlands I was able to attend in the spring of 2010 thanks to the generous support of Judith Hernstadt and an educational grant from the Netherland-American Foundation. In the fall of 2010, I received the Ann G. Wylie Dissertation Fellowship from the Graduate School at the University of Maryland, allowing me to devote all of my time to writing at a crucial stage in the dissertation process.

I would also like to extend my thanks to the faculty and staff in the Department of Art History and Archaeology, all of whom have made my time at the University of Maryland both enlightening and enjoyable. I have also found wonderful support from my fellow graduate students with whom I have shared stimulating conversations, art historical and otherwise. For their translation help, my particular thanks goes to my good friend Laura Sheldon and Dr. Henriette de Bruyn Kops. Finally, I would like to thank my parents, my husband and my son for their support and patience.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Figures	vii
Introduction.....	1
Stadhouderly Patronage	1
Approach and Objectives	3
Amalia in the Literature	6
Women as Patrons.....	10
Chapter 1: Amalia van Solms, An Art-Historical Biography	12
Introduction.....	12
Part I - Elizabeth Stuart.....	16
Heidelberg.....	16
Prague	19
The Hague.....	21
Part II - Frederik Hendrik	27
Art Patronage and the House of Orange-Nassau	27
Courtship and Marriage	30
The Court of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia van Solms.....	34
Paintings in the Stadhouder's Quarters, 1632.....	38
Part III - Constantijn Huygens	45
Honselaarsdijk.....	47
Huis ten Bosch	51
The François Dieussart Commission	54
Part IV - Marie de Medici.....	55
Conclusion	58
Chapter 2: The Utrecht Gift	62
Introduction.....	62
Gift Theory.....	63
A Gift of Paintings	68
Utrecht Politics 1618-1627	74
The Motive.....	78
Conclusion	81
Chapter 3: The Allegorical Amalia.....	83
Introduction.....	83
Imagery of Power.....	85
Flora/Charity	88
Diana.....	93
Widowhood.....	100
Artemisia.....	102
Amalia's last commissions	118
Conclusion	129

Chapter 4: <i>'Une abondance extra ordinaire'</i> The Porcelain Collection of Amalia van Solms.....	131
Introduction.....	131
Brief History of Porcelain in Europe	135
Amalia's Collection	143
Porcelain in the Oude Hof.....	143
Porcelain in the Stadhouders' Quarters.....	146
Later Inventories	148
Inspiration	154
Porcelain as Symbol of Dutch and Orange Power	159
Conclusion	163
Conclusion	165
Bibliography	169

List of Figures

- 1.1 Anthony van Dyck, *Portrait of Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange*, 1632, oil on canvas, 110 cm x 95 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid. Inv. no. P01482.
- 1.2 Anthony van Dyck, *Portrait of Amalia van Solms-Braunfels*, 1632, oil on canvas, 105 cm x 91 cm. Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid. Inv. no. P01483.
- 1.3 *Braunfels Castle*, 13th-19th century, Lahn-Dill-Kreis, Hesse, Germany.
- 1.4 *Ottheinrichsbau*, 1556-1560, Heidelberg Castle, Heidelberg, Germany.
- 1.5 Salomon de Caus, *View of the Hortus Palatinus*, print from *Hortus Palatinus*, published 1620.
- 1.6 Gerard van Honthorst, *Seladon and Astrea*, 1629, oil on canvas, 304 x 480 cm. Collection of Prince Ernst August of Hannover, Castle Marienburg.
- 1.7 Gerard van Honthorst, *Portrait of the Princess Palatinate Elizabeth II As Diana Together with Her Brothers Karl Ludwig, Rupert and Moritz*, 1631, oil on canvas, 167.8 x 210.8 cm. Collection of Queen Elizabeth II, Hampton Court. Inv. no. 1453.
- 1.8 Gerard van Honthorst, *Portrait of Amalia van Solms as Flora/Charity*, c. 1629-1630, oil on canvas. Gotisches Haus, Wörlitz. Inv. no. 1119.
- 1.9 Gerard van Honthorst, *Portrait of Amalia van Solms as Esther*, 1633, oil on panel, 74.7 x 59.1 cm. Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton. Inv. no. 1966:14.
- 1.10 Gerard van Honthorst, *Portrait of Elizabeth Stuart as Esther*, c. 1633, oil on canvas, 73.7 x 59 cm. Sale 5944, Christie's of London, April 24, 1998.
- 1.11 Gerard van Honthorst, *Frederick V, King of Bohemia, in Profile*, c. 1632-1633. Whereabouts unknown.
- 1.12 Gerard van Honthorst, *Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, in Profile*, 1632, oil on panel, 50 x 39 cm. Stichting Historische Verzamelingen van het Huis Oranje-Nassau, The Hague.
- 1.13 Gerard van Honthorst, *Profile Portrait of Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange*, 1631, oil on canvas, 77 x 61 cm. Stichting Historische Verzamelingen van het Huis Oranje-Nassau, The Hague. Inv. no. 71.

- 1.14 Gerard van Honthorst, *Profile Portrait of Amalia van Solms, Princess of Orange*, c. 1631-1632, oil on panel, 73 x 55 cm, Stichting Historische Verzamelingen van het Huis Oranje-Nassau, The Hague.
- 1.15 Rembrandt van Rijn, *Profile Portrait of Amalia van Solms, Princess of Orange*, 1632, oil on canvas, 69.5 x 54.5 cm. Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris. Inv. no. 423.
- 1.16 Anonymous, *Portrait of Amalia van Solms*, 1625, oil on panel, 77 x 66.5 cm. Olsztyn Museum, Poland.
- 1.17 Adriaen van de Venne, *Game of Billiards*, c.1625, Watercolour with bodycolour, over black chalk, heightened with and gold, 96 mm x 151 mm. British Museum, London. Inv. no. 1978,0624.42.28.
- 1.18 Cornelis van Poelenburch, *Amaryllis Crowning Mirtillo*, c. 1635, oil on canvas, 116.5 x 148.3 cm. Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. Inv. no. 956.
- 1.19 Dirck van der Lisse, *Blind Man's Bluff*, c. 1635, oil on canvas, 117.3 x 142.5 cm. Jagdschloss Grunewald, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten, Berlin. Inv. no. GK I 5295.
- 1.20 Herman Saftleven and Hendrick Bloemaert, *Silvio and Dorina*, 1635, oil on canvas, 118 x 141.7 cm. Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. Inv. no. 958.
- 1.21 Abraham Bloemaert, *The Marriage of Amaryllis and Mirtillo*, c. 1635, oil on canvas, 115.3 x 140.4 cm. Jagdschloss Grunewald, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten, Berlin. Inv. no. GK I 5295.
- 1.22 Dirck van der Lisse, *Landscape with Dancing Herdsmen*, c. 1635, oil on panel, 52.5 x 171 cm. Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. Inv. no. II.467.
- 1.23 Gijsbert Gillisz d'Hondecoeter, *Hilly Landscape with Hunters*, oil on panel, 52 x 170.5 cm. Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. Inv. no. 985.
- 1.24 Adam Willaerts, *Beach Scene*, c. 1635, oil on panel, 52.4 x 161.9 cm. Jagdschloss Grunewald, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten, Berlin. Inv. no. GK I 10014.
- 1.25 *Plan of the apartments of the Stadhouder's Quarters in the Binnenhof*, c. 1632. Drawing by Prof. K. Ottenheym, 1993.

- 1.26 Jan Brueghel the Elder and Peter Paul Rubens, *Flora and Zephyr*, c. 1617, oil on panel, 53 9/16 x 42 15/16 in. Kulturstiftung Dessau-Wörlitz, Schloss Mosigkau. Inv. no. Mos. 129.
- 1.27 Peter Paul Rubens (workshop?), *Annunciation*, 1614, oil on panel, 186 x 153.9 cm. National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin. Inv. no. NGI 60.
- 1.28 Anthony van Dyck, *Amaryllis and Mirtillo*, c. 1632, oil on canvas, 123 x 137 cm. Collection of Graf von Schönborn, Pommersfelden. Inv. no. 44.
- 1.29 Gerard van Honthorst, *Diana at the Hunt*, 1627, oil on canvas, 190 x 132 cm. Formerly Castle Grunewald, Berlin. Lost in WWII.
- 1.30 Gerard van Honthorst, *Three Oldest Children of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia van Solms*, 1629, oil on panel, 102.9 x 124.5 cm. Paleis Het Loo, Nationaal Museum, Apeldoorn.
- 1.31 Daniel Seghers and Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert, *Garland of Flowers with the Virgin Mary*, 1645, oil on panel, 151 x 122.7 cm. Mauritshuis, The Royal Picture Gallery, The Hague. Inv. no. 256.
- 1.32 Balthasar van der Ast, *Basket of Flowers*, c.1622, oil on panel, 18.4 x 24.4 cm. The National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C. Collection of Mrs. Paul Mellon, inv. no. 1992.51.2.
- 1.33 Balthasar van der Ast, *Basket of Fruits*, c.1622, oil on panel, 18.8 x 23.5 cm. The National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C. Collection of Mrs. Paul Mellon, inv. no. 1992.51.1.
- 1.34 Plan of Huis ten Bosch, Ground Floor, c. 1650. From *De Sael van Oranje* by Pieter Post, published 1650.
- 1.35 *The Oranjezaal*, general view. Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 1.36 Francois Dieussart, *Willem I, Maurtis, Frederik Hendrik, Willem II*, 1646-1647, marble, dimensions unknown. Formerly in Potsdam Palace, destroyed in WWII.
- 1.37 Wenceslaus Hollar, *Procession of Marie de Medici, Queen of France and Amalia van Solms on Their Way to the Reception in Amsterdam*, 1638, engraving. Koninklijk Huisarchief, The Hague.
- 1.38 Wenceslaus Hollar, *Portrait of Frederik Hendrik*, engraving, in *Histoire de l'entrée de la reyne mere du roy tres-chrestien dans les Provinces Unies des Pays-Bas* [sic], by Sr. de la Serre, published 1639, London.

- 1.39 Wenceslaus Hollar, *Portrait of Amalia van Solms*, engraving, in *Histoire de l'entrée de la reyne mere du roy tres-chrestien dans les Provinces Unies des Pays-Bas* [sic], by Sr. de la Serre, published 1639, London.
- 1.40 Jan van Vianen, *The Cabinet of the Médiateur in Huis ter Nieuburg*, Rijswijk, 1697. Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam.
- 2.1 Paulus Moreelse, *Shepherd*, 1627, oil on Panel, 71.5 x 55.2 cm, Staatliches Museum, Kunstsammlungen Schlösser und Gärten, Schwerin. inv. no. 330.
- 2.2 Cornelis Poelenburch, *Banquet of the Gods*, n.d., oil on panel, 39 x 69 cm. Anhaltische Gemäldegalerie Schloss Georgium, Dessau. inv. no. 801
- 2.3 Roelandt Savery, *Garden of Eden*, 1626, oil on panel, 80.5 x 137.6 cm. Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Inv. no. 710.
- 2.4 Paulus Moreelse, *Portrait of Sophia Hedwig, Countess of Nassau-Dietz, as Charity with her Children*, 1621, oil on canvas, 136.5 x 119.5 cm. Paleis Het Loo Nationaal Museum, Apeldoorn.
- 2.5 Joost Corneliz. Droochsloot (1586 Utrecht – 1666 Utrecht), *The Disbading of the 'Waargelders' by Prince Maurits in Utrecht, 31 July 1618*, 1625, Oil on Canvas, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Inv. no. SK-A-606.
- 3.1 Jacob Gerritsz. Cuyp, *Allegorical Representation with Frederik Hendrik After the Victory at 's-Hertogenbosch*, 1630, oil on panel, 138 x 216 cm. Noordbrabants Museum, 's-Hertogenbosch. Inv. no. 11785.004
- 3.2 Peter Paul Rubens, *The Felicity of the Regency of Marie de Medici*, 1625, oil on canvas, 394 x 295 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris.
- 3.3 Peter Paul Rubens, *The Queen Triumphant*, 1623-1625, oil on canvas, 276 x 149 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris.
- 3.4 Detail of FIGURE 2.4.
- 3.5 Cesare Ripa, *Carita*, from *Iconologia*, published 1613.
- 3.6 Rembrandt van Rijn, *Flora*, 1635, oil on canvas, 123.5 x 97.5 cm. The National Gallery, London. Inv. no. NG4930.
- 3.7 Franciscus Hoeius after Frans Bruns, *Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms and Their Children after the Seige and Victory at Grol*, 1627, engraving. Haags Gemeentearchief, The Hague. Inv. no. gr.B 1261.

- 3.8 Willem Outgersz. Akersloot after Adriaen van de Venne, *Amalia van Solms with Her Children*, 1628, engraving. Royal Collection, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 3.9 Claes Jansz. Visscher, *'The Famed Family of Orange-Nassau,'* c. 1628, from *Atlas van Stolk*, Historisch Museum, Rotterdam.
- 3.10 Gerard van Honthorst, *Diana Resting with Two Shepherdesses and Two Greyhounds*, 1627-1632, oil on canvas, 97 x 160 cm.
- 3.11 Gerard van Honthorst, *Amalia van Solms, Half-Length, as Diana*, 1632, oil on panel, 74 x 57 cm. Gotisches Haus, Wörlitz.
- 3.12 Gerard van Honthorst, *Louise Christina van Solms as Diana*, n.d, oil on canvas, 73.7 x 61 cm. Whereabouts unknown.
- 3.13 Gerard van Honthorst, *Louise Hollandine, Princess Palatinate, Full-Length, as Diana*, 1643, oil on canvas, 207.3 x 141 cm. Centraal Museum, Utrecht. Inv. no. 2492.
- 3.14 Gerard van Honthorst, *Elizabeth, Princess Palatinate, Half-Length, as Diana*, c. 1632, oil on panel, 76 x 60 cm.. Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich. Inv. no. 7827.
- 3.15 Crispijn van de Passe the Younger, *Orania P. O.*, from *Les Vrais Pourtraits de Quelques Unes des Plus Grandes Dames de la Chrestienté, Desguisée en Bergères*, 1640.
- 3.16 Adriaen van de Venne, *The King and Queen of Bohemia seen riding near The Hague with their hounds, followed by Frederik Hendrik and Amalia van Solms*, c.1625, Watercolour with bodycolour, over black chalk, heightened with and gold, 96 mm x 151 mm. British Museum, London. Inv. no. 1978,0624.42.12.
- 3.17 Peter Paul Rubens and Frans Snyders, *The Crowning of Diana*, c. 1625, oil on canvas, 165.5 x 187 cm. Bildergalerie Potsdam-Sanssouci, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg. Inv. no. GK I 6293.
- 3.18 Gerard van Honthorst, *Amalia van Solms and Charlotte de la Trémouille as Diana and a Nymph*, 1633, oil on canvas, 120.9 x 167.6 cm. Collection of Duke and Duchess Fitzwilliam, Castle Milton, England.
- 3.19 Charles Percier after Ambroise Dubois, *Marie de Medici as Diana*, from the *Galerie de Diane* at Fontainebleau, c.1600.

- 3.20 Pieter de Grebber (attributed), *The 'Surrounding Gallery' in the Great Hall at Honselaarsdijk*, c. 1637, detail, ten drawings, 20.9 x 580 cm, Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam. Inv. no. RP-T-00369/378.
- 3.21 Detail of FIGURE 1.18.
- 3.22 Peter Paul Rubens, *Artemisia*, before 1625, oil on panel, 97 x 105 cm. Bildergalerie Potsdam-Sanssouci, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg. Inv. no. 7596.
- 3.23 Gerard van Honthorst, *Artemisia*, c. 1635, oil on canvas, 170 x 150 cm. Princeton University Art Museum, Princeton. Inv. no. 1968-117.
- 3.24 Antoine Caron, *Les Victimaire conduisant trois taureaux blancs*, c. 1562, . ms. fr. 306, book 1, chapter 6. Cabinet des Estampes, Bibliotheque National, Paris.
- 3.25 Gerard van Honthorst, *Allegory of the Marriage of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia van Solms*, 1650, oil on canvas, 321 x 746 cm. Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 3.26 Gerard van Honthorst, *Allegory of the Marriage of Prince Willem II to Mary Stuart*, c. 1650, oil on canvas, 322 x 207 cm. Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 3.27 Gerard van Honthorst, *Allegory of Louise Henriette of Orange Leading the Elector of Brandenburg to Their Royal Highnesses*, 1649, oil on canvas, 319 x 202 cm. Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 3.28 Gerard van Honthorst, *Allegory of Amalia van Solms and Her Four Daughters*, 1650, oil on canvas, 382 x 200 cm. Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 3.29 Jacob Jordaens, *Triumph of Frederik Hendrik*, 1652, oil on canvas. Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 3.30 Gerard van Honthorst, *Allegorical Portrait of Amalia van Solms in Mourning and Holding a Portrait of Frederik Hendrik*, c. 1651-1652, oil on panel, 85 x 83 cm. Gemäldegalerie der Staatlichen Museen, Berlin.
- 3.31 Deatil of FIGURE 3.29.
- 3.32 Cesar van Everdingen, *Allegory of the Birth of Frederik Hendrik*, c. 1650, oil on canvas, 373 x 243 cm. Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.

- 3.33 Jacob Jordaens, *Allegory of Time*, 1652, oil on canvas, 383 x 205 cm. Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 3.34 Peter Paul Rubens, *A Roman Triumph*, c. 1630, oil on canvas on panel, 86.8 x 163.9 cm. National Gallery, London. Inv. no. NG 278.
- 3.35 Pieter de Grebber, *Procession with Sacrificial Oxen*, c. 1650, oil on canvas, 380 x 246 cm. Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 3.36 Theodoor van Thulden, *Procession with Elephants and Paintings*, c. 1650, oil on canvas, 315 x 242 cm. Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 3.37 Govert Flinck, *Allegory of the Memory of Frederik Hendrik, with a Portrait of his Wife, Amalia van Solms*, 1654, oil on canvas, 307 x 189 cm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Inv. no. A 869.
- 3.38 *Reconstruction of wall hanging with valence from Amalia's bedchamber at Huis ten Bosch*, reconstruction by Marya Gasille, 1984. Paleis Het Loo, Nationaal Museum, Apeldoorn.
- 3.39 Theodoor van Thulden, *Allegory of Amalia van Solms as Founder of the Dynasty*, c.1660, pen and wash drawing in sepia, 17 x 22.5 cm. Musée Municipal, Bergues. Inv. no. 265.
- 3.40 Theodoor van Thulden, *Allegory of Willem III as Inheritor of Dynasty*, c. 1660, pen and black pencil wash drawing in sepia, 17.6 x 21.6 cm. Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna. Inv. no. 8245.
- 3.41 Theodoor van Thulden, *The Empowerment of Solomon*, c. 1660, pen and wash drawing in sepia, 14.5 x 17.5 cm. Musée Municipal, Bergues. Inv. no. 815.
- 3.42 Theodoor van Thulden, *Allegory of William III taking His Leave of His Grandmother, Amalia van Solms*, c.1661, black chalk, pen and pencil wash drawing in sepia, 16.5 x 20.7 cm. Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna. Inv. no. 8244.
- 3.43 Theodoor van Thulden, *The Apotheosis of Augustus*, c. 1660, black chalk, pen and pencil wash drawing in sepia, 22 x 15.7 cm, Collection Marcel Puech, Avignon.
- 3.44 Gerard van Honthorst, *Frederik Hendrik, Amalia van Solms and Their Three Youngest Daughters*, 1647, oil on canvas, 263.5 x 347.5 cm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Inv. no. A 874.
- 3.45 Gerard van Honthorst, *Willem II and Mary Stuart*, 1647, oil on canvas, 300.5 x 193.5 cm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Inv. no. A 871.

- 3.46 Gerard van Honthorst, *Friedrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg and Louise Henriette*, 1647, oil on canvas, 301 x 192 cm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Inv. no. A 873.
- 3.47 Reconstruction of the hanging of portraits by Honthorst in the large closet in the western apartments at Huis ten Bosch. By Th. Lunsingh-Scheurleer in “De woonvertrekken in Huis in het Bosch,” *Oud Holland* 84, no. 1/4 (January 1, 1969): 29-66.
- 4.1 Jacob van Campen, *Goods From the East and West Indies*, c.1648-49, oil on canvas, 380 x 205 cm. Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.
- 4.2 Jan Brueghel the Elder and Peter Paul Rubens, *Allegory of Sight*, detail, 1617, oil on panel, 64.7 x 109.5 cm. Museo del Prado, Madrid. Inv. no. P01394
- 4.3 Giovanni Bellini and Titian, *The Feast of the Gods*, detail, 1514/1529, oil on canvas, 170.2 x 188 cm. The National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. Inv. no. 1942.9.1.
- 4.4 Bowl from the wreckage of the *Witte Leeuw*, before 1613. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Inv. no. NG-1977-163-W.
- 4.5 Fruit bowl from the wreckage of the *Witte Leeuw*, before 1613. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Inv. no. NG-1977-155-W.
- 4.6 Anonymous, *Family in Prayer Before Mealtimes*, 1627, oil on panel, Het Catharijneconvent, Utrecht.
- 4.7 Daniel Marot, *View of a ‘China Closet’*, c.1690, possibly for one of Mary Stuart’s rooms at Het Loo. From *Das Ornamentwerk des Daniel Marot: in 264 Lichtdrucken nachgebildet*, 1892, Berlin.
- 4.8 *Transition ware Rolwagen*, porcelain, China, 1636-1645. Groninger Museum, Groningen. Inv. no. 1985.0377.
- 4.9 *Guanyin, the Goddess of Mercy*, porcelain (blanc de chine), China, 1700-1725. Groninger Museum, Groningen. Inv. no. 1960-51.
- 4.10 Nicolaes Maes, *Interior with a Dordrecht Family*, 1656, oil on canvas, 112.4 x 121.0 cm. The Norton Simon Foundation, Pasadena. Inv. no. F.1972.15.2.P.
- 4.11 Pieter Post, *Design for a mantelpiece for Frederik Hendrik’s ‘raadzaal’ in the Stadhouder’s Quarters*, c. 1640.

4.12 Jan Davidsz. De Heem, *Still Life in a Niche*, c. 1660-1670, oil on canvas, 63 x 49 cm. Paleis Het Loo, Apledoorn.

Introduction

Stadhouderly Patronage

To speak of personal ‘taste’ in relation to the patronage and collecting of art in the seventeenth century is somewhat misleading. ‘Motivation,’ perhaps, would be a better term to describe the choices that patrons and collectors made, particularly those among Europe’s nobility. Kings and princes, known as much for their art collections as their military victories, surrounded themselves with art that reflected their erudition, humanism and, above all, status. Frederik Hendrik (1584-1647) and Amalia van Solms (1602-1675), the Prince and Princess of Orange were no exception. Eager to be recognized as the peers of their monarchical counterparts in France, Spain, England and elsewhere, the Prince and Princess modeled their collection after royal courts and cultivated it to rival those of other great European treasure houses.¹

Amalia and Frederik Hendrik’s desire to fashion their own collection on foreign courts explains why the art, particularly paintings, they preferred differed so greatly from what was found in the home of the Dutch urban elite. The late nineteenth-century ‘rediscovery’ of Dutch painting concentrated on portraits, genre pieces and landscapes that reflected urban elite tastes. Only relatively recently have art historians come to appreciate the wide-ranging subjects and styles that existed

¹ When considering this collection and, indeed, any early modern collection, it is important to keep in mind that the various elements of which it was comprised need to be considered together as they operated, not independently, but as a whole, designed to impress and overwhelm. Thus, while the majority of artworks examined in this study are paintings, sculpture and decorative arts are also considered.

alongside paintings of the Dutch landscape, domestic interiors and portraits of wealthy burghers.² Indeed, what many modern-day viewers consider to be characteristic of Dutch art bears little resemblance to the classicizing and pastoral-inspired paintings collected by the House of Orange.

While Charles I, King of England and Philip IV, King of Spain collected paintings executed by the Flemish masters Peter Paul Rubens and Anthony van Dyck and, in the case of Charles I, by the Dutch artist Gerard van Honthorst, they also collected numerous works by Italian masters of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Amalia and Frederik Hendrik, on the other hand, collected works exclusively by contemporary Dutch and Flemish artists. They preferred, however, those artists like Van Dyck, Rubens and Honthorst who had been influenced by Italian art. This proclivity of the princely couple for northern artists can be seen as an expression of strong nationalistic pride. Although Frederik Hendrik and Amalia could have afforded paintings by Raphael and Titian, whose work was so sought after by monarchs of the time, and although they modeled their collection on those of foreign courts, they aspired to create their collection within a specifically northern paradigm.

Fueling Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's drive to compete with the royal courts of Europe was the couple's unique political position. Their titles, the Prince and Princess of Orange, were hereditary ones that designated them as the rulers of the tiny principality of Orange in southern France but gave them no similar jurisdiction in the

² See especially, Joaneath A Spicer et al., *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht During the Golden Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); Blankert, Albert, et al. *Dutch Classicism in Seventeenth-Century Painting* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1999); Alison McNeil Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia: Pastoral Art and Its Audience in the Golden Age* (Totowa, N.J.: Allanheld and Schram, 1983); Albert Blankert et al., *Gods, Saints and Heroes: Dutch Painting in the Age of Rembrandt* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1980).

United Provinces in the Netherlands where they lived. Theirs was an anomalous political position in seventeenth-century Europe as the United Provinces was, at this time, a republic. Frederik Hendrik held the position of stadhouder, an office dating back to the Middle Ages originally designated to represent the authority of the feudal lord in his absence. Willem I (1533-1584), Frederik Hendrik's father, held the post for the Habsburgs in the Spanish Netherlands until he led the revolt against Spanish control in 1581. Despite the subsequent independence of the United Provinces, the position of stadhouder was maintained and inherited by Prince Maurits (1557-1625) upon his father, Willem I's, death. Frederik Hendrik also inherited the title, along with those of Captain General of the Army and Admiral of the Navy, when his half-brother Prince Maurits died in 1625. Even though Frederik Hendrik was the titular head of state, he served at the pleasure of the States General, a representative body that was the official governing entity of the Dutch Republic. As wife to the Stadhouder, Amalia's role was even less well-defined although, as will be seen, she took every opportunity to use her position and influence to her family's, and her own, political advantage.

Approach and Objectives

This dissertation addresses Amalia's role in the formation of the couple's collection of paintings and decorative art in order to more fully understand her activities as a patron and collector as well as the genesis and function of the collection as a whole. The exact relationship between Frederik Hendrik's activities as a patron and those of Amalia is not easily determined. Because the lives of women were less

thoroughly chronicled than those of men in the seventeenth century, a dearth of primary source documentation concerning Amalia's activities exist while Frederik Hendrik's activities have been extensively detailed.³ Subsequently, the current understanding of the genesis and formation of the couple's collection is unbalanced. Presented in this study are instances where Amalia's patronage is either documented or can be inferred from the extant evidence, primarily the works themselves. In constructing this portrait of Amalia's artistic endeavors, I have drawn on both primary and secondary sources. I have sought to examine the archival and visual evidence within the cultural and political context of the day to better understand Amalia's motivations as a patron and collector and to present an account of those activities over her lifetime.

This dissertation consists of four chapters. Chapter 1 provides a biographical background against which the other chapters are set. Like any individual, Amalia's life was shaped and influenced by those around her. As this study on Amalia is centered on her artistic patronage and collecting, the biography likewise concentrates on these areas and those individuals who most influenced these interests. Divided into four parts addressing those individuals and their relationship with Amalia, this biography covers the span of Amalia's lifetime and highlights specific arts-related projects in which she was involved.

³ For Frederik Hendrik as patron see especially, Ferrand Hudig, *Frederik Hendrik en de kunst van zijn tijd: rede uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het ambt van buitengewoon hoogleraar in de kunstgeschiedenis der middeleeuwen en van den nieuweren tijd aan de* (Amsterdam: M. Hertzberger, 1928); (Hague, Netherlands) Mauritshuis, *Princely Patrons: The Collection of Frederick Henry of Orange and Amalia of Solms in The Hague* (The Hague: Mauritshuis, 1997); Historisch Museum Haags, *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia Van Solms* (Hague: Historical Museum, 1997); D Slothouwer, *De paleizen van Frederik Hendrik* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1945); Rebecca Joslyn Tucker, "The Art of Living Nobly: The Patronage of Prince Fredrik Hendrik (1584--1647) At the Palace of Honselaarsdijk During the Dutch Republic" (United States -- New York: New York University, 2002).

Chapter 2 focuses on the so-called, ‘Utrecht Gift,’ a gift of four paintings given to Amalia by the Deputed States of Utrecht in 1627. This chapter examines the possible motivation behind the gift within the context of contemporary gift-giving practices and the political situation in Utrecht at the time of the gift. Chapter 3 concerns portraits of Amalia in which she appears in the guise of a mythological, allegorical or historical figure. Sometimes referred to as ‘historiated portraits’ or *portraits historié*, these images served to invest sitters with the qualities of the figures as whom they were portrayed and/or with whom they were associated. This chapter presents instances of such portraiture of Amalia, which indicate that Amalia was aware, throughout her lifetime, of the potential of such portraiture to create and maintain a powerful social and political persona.

Chapter 4 examines Amalia’s collection of decorative art, specifically porcelain. Amalia’s collection of porcelain offers a unique paradigm with which to more fully understand her role as a collector as it was an interest that Frederik Hendrik did not share. Finally, the conclusion re-evaluates the impact that Amalia had on the patronage and collecting practices of the House of Orange.

This dissertation both relies on and responds to earlier studies on Amalia as a patron and collector. In each chapter, I have sought to give an account of the existing scholarship pertaining to the subject at hand. Where this scholarship is extensive, for example, that which concerns the Oranjezaal project, I have not recapitulated it fully in the text. Instead, I have chosen to focus on, and discuss in greater detail, those areas that have been less fully studied in order to present a wider-ranging account of Amalia’s activities.

Amalia in the Literature

The earliest modern study exclusively devoted to Amalia is Arthur Kleinschmidt's *Amalie von Oranien, geborene Gräfin zu Solms-Braunfels: ein Lebensbild (Amalia of Orange, Born Countess of Solms-Braunfels: A Portrait of a Life)*, written in 1905. Kleinschmidt, as he tells the reader in his introduction, undertook the task of writing Amalia's biography at the request of Prince Albert of Solms-Braunfels (d.1901).⁴ However, instead of a pandering account of the most famous member of the Solms-Braunfels family, Kleinschmidt's biographical account is carefully considered and thorough. The author makes use of the archives available to him in Germany and presents his book in a series of excerpts from these primary sources. However, he deals less thoroughly with Amalia's cultural and political impact. While Kleinschmidt's chapter, 'Art and Culture under Frederik Hendrik,' begins with the promising, if flowery statement, "...under the gaze of [Amalia's] dark eyes, the intellectual life of the Netherlands bloomed and the Muses liked to be seen next to their great friend," he only summarily describes the Oranjezaal, the large cycle of paintings that is Amalia's most recognized and ambitious commission, and hardly mentions Amalia's involvement with the project.⁵ Similarly, although Kleinschmidt calls Amalia "...an eminent politician of manly intellect..." his chapter

⁴ Arthur Kleinschmidt, *Amalie von Oranien, geborene Gräfin zu Solms-Braunfels: ein Lebensbild* (Berlin: Råde, 1905), iv.

⁵ Kleinschmidt, *Amalie von Oranien, geborene Gräfin zu Solms-Braunfels*, 98–103.

on this topic reads more as a general history of the Thirty Years' War than of Amalia's particular role within in it.⁶

It is precisely this vagueness for which Titia Geest lambasts Kleinschmidt in the introduction to her 1909 political biography, *Amalia van Solms en de Nederlandsche politiek van 1625 tot 1648: Bijdrage tot de kennis van het tijdvak van Frederik Hendrik (Amalia of Solms and Dutch Politics from 1625 to 1648: Contribution to the Knowledge of the Period of Frederik Hendrik)*.⁷ Geest seeks to clarify the role of Amalia in seventeenth-century politics and identifies Amalia's 'life's mission and purpose' as the promotion of the House of Orange, an aspect of her life that Kleinschmidt missed altogether.⁸ Geest offers an intelligent and balanced interpretation of Amalia's involvement in politics. While she acknowledges Amalia's role in the political machinations that led to the Treaty of Münster in 1648, Geest is overly cautious in recognizing the extent of the Princess of Orange's political influence, especially during the early years of her marriage to Frederik Hendrik.

More than thirty years after these works, Anna Hallema published her full-length biography *Amalia van Solms: Een Lang Leven in Dienst van Haar Natie (Amalia of Solms: A Long Life in Service to Her Nation)* in 1941.⁹ Hallema outlines Amalia's involvement in significant political events such as Marie de Medici's 1638

⁶ "...einer eminenten Politikerin von männlichen Verstande..." Kleinschmidt, *Amalie von Oranien, geborene Gräfin zu Solms-Braunfels*, v.

⁷ Titia Geest, *Amalia van Solms en de Nederlandshe politiek van 1625 tot 1648. Bijdrage tot de kennis van het tijdvak van Frederik Hendrik*. (Baarn 1909., 1909), i–viii.

⁸ Geest, *Amalia van Solms en de Nederlandshe politiek van 1625 tot 1648*, iii.

⁹ A Hallema, *Amalia van Solms een lang leven in dienst van haar natie*, (Amsterdam: J.M. Meulenhoff, 1941).

tour of the United Provinces, the marriage negotiations between the House of Orange and the Stuarts of England, and the guardianship and education of Willem III.

The first scholar to address Amalia's involvement with artistic projects was Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurleer in his 1969 article, "De Woonvertrekken in Amalia's Huis in het Bosch," ("The Living Quarters in Amalia's House in the Woods").¹⁰ Lunsingh Scheurleer reconstructs what Amalia's quarters in the Huis ten Bosch looked like during her lifetime and acknowledges her influence in the choice of interior decoration, including paintings, textiles and furniture. Together with S.W. A. Drossaers, Lusingh Scheurleer also transcribed and published the inventories of residences of the House of Orange from 1567-1795, a work that has been of invaluable assistance to the present study.¹¹

Amalia's role as patron and collector was highlighted in the simultaneous exhibitions, *Princely Patrons: The Collection of Frederick Henry of Orange and Amalia of Solms* and *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms*, held in 1997 at the Mauritshuis Royal Picture Gallery and The Hague Historical Museum respectively.¹² The catalogues for these shows were the first publications to acknowledge Amalia's role in the formation of the Stadhouder's art collection. However, with the exception of the essay by C. Willemijn Fock, "The Apartments of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia of Solms: Princely Splendour and the Triumph of Porcelain," the exhibitions did not assess her specific contributions to the

¹⁰ Th Lunsingh Scheurleer, "De woonvertrekken in Huis in het Bosch," *Oud Holland* 84, no. 1/4 (January 1, 1969): 29-66.

¹¹ D/LS, *Inventarissen van de inboedels in de yerblijven van de oranjes an daarmede gelijk te stellen stukken, 1567-179.*, vol. 1 ('s-Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, 1976).

¹² See note 2.

formation of the collection. In her essay, Fock addresses Amalia's collection of porcelain as well as her innovative use of lacquer to cover the walls of her small *cabinet* (closet) in the Huis ten Bosch. Fock expanded her account of Amalia's influence on interior décor at the Stadhouder's court in her 2005 article, "Interieuropvattingen van Amalia van Solms: Een Frans getint hof in de Republiek (ca. 1625-1675)," ("Interior Views of Amalia van Solms: A French-tinted Court in the Republic (c.1625-1675)").¹³

Barbara Gaehtgens has also explored Amalia's role as a patron of the arts, particularly painting. In her essay, "Amalia van Solms und die oranische Kunstpolitik," ("Amalia van Solms and Orange Political Art") for the 1999 exhibition catalogue, *Onder den Oranje Boom: Dynastie in der Republik : das Haus Oranien-Nassau als Vermittler Niederländischer Kultur in Deutschen Territorien im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (*Under the Orange Tree: Dynasty in the Republic: The House of Orange-Nassau as a Mediator of Dutch Culture in the German Territories in the 17th and 18 Century*), Gaehtgens traces Amalia's use of art as political propaganda throughout her life.¹⁴

The recent consideration of Amalia as a patron and collector in her own right has done much to disprove the early twentieth-century architectural historian D.F. Slothower's assertion in 1945 that, "The Princess never held herself out to be a patroness of the arts, nor indeed had she the chance of doing so, for the Prince always

¹³ C. Fock, "Interieuropvattingen van Amalia van Solms," *Gentse Bijdragen tot de Interieurgeschiedenis* 34 (2005): 25-45.

¹⁴ Barbara Gaehtgens, "Amalia van Solms und die oranische Kunstpolitik," in *Onder Den Oranje Boom: Niederländische Kunst Und Kultur Im 17. Und 18. Jahrhundert an Deutschen Fürstenhöfen* (München: Hirmer, 1999).

took the lead in everything.”¹⁵ She is now considered by most scholars to have been a partner in many of Frederik Hendrik’s artistic endeavours and, after his death, a patron in her own right.

Women as Patrons

The activities of female patrons and collectors have received much less consideration in art-historical scholarship than those of their male counterparts. While much has been done on female patronage in recent years, especially in the field of Italian Renaissance art, the absence of any in-depth discussion on this topic in the seventeenth-century Netherlands is a significant lacuna.¹⁶

The role of women in Dutch art as both subjects and artists has been explored, most notably by Alison McNeil Kettering, Frima Fox Hofrichter, Nanette Salomon, Martha Moffitt Peacock and Wayne Franits.¹⁷ However, aside from the small number

¹⁵ Slothouwer, *De paleizen van Frederik Hendrik*, 379.

¹⁶ Some notable publications on early modern female patronage are, Dagmar Eichberger and Yvonne Bleyerveld et al., *Women of Distinction: Margaret of York: Margaret of Austria* (Leuven: Davidsfonds, 2005); Sheryl Reiss, *Beyond Isabella: Secular Women Patrons of Art in Renaissance Italy* (Kirksville Mo.: Truman State University Press, 2001); Sheila ffolliott, “Casting a Rival into the Shade: Catherine de’ Medici and Diane de Poitiers,” *Art Journal* 48, no. 2 (1989): 138; Deborah Marrow, *The Art Patronage of Maria de’ Medici* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982); Catherine King, *Renaissance Women Patrons: Wives and Widows in Italy c. 1300-c. 1550* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998); Cynthia Lawrence, *Women and Art in Early Modern Europe: Patrons, Collectors, and Connoisseurs* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).

¹⁷ Alison McNeil Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia: Pastoral Art and Its Audience in the Golden Age* (Totowa, N.J.: Allanheld and Schram, 1983); Kettering “Gender Issues in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Portraiture: A New Look,” in Roland Fleischer, *Rembrandt, Rubens, and the Art of Their Time: Recent Perspectives* (University Park Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University, 1997), 147; Frima Hofrichter, *Judith Leyster: A Woman Painter in Holland’s Golden Age* (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1989); Julia Lloyd Williams, *Rembrandt’s Women* (Edinburgh: National Gallery of Scotland in collaboration with the Royal Academy of Arts London, 2001); Eric Sluijter, *Rembrandt and the Female Nude* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006); Anat Gilboa, *Images of the Feminine in Rembrandt’s Work* (Delft: Eburon, 2003); *Judith Leyster: A Dutch Master and Her World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993); Nanette Salomon, *Shifting Priorities: Gender and Genre in*

of articles written about Amalia van Solms, few studies examine the patronage of seventeenth-century Dutch women.¹⁸ Thus, this study seeks to expand the discourse of early modern female patronage in the Dutch Republic.

Seventeenth-century Dutch Painting (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004); Martha Moffitt Peacock, "Early Modern Dutch Women and the City: The Imaging of Economic Agency and Power," in *Urban Space in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 667-712.

¹⁸ To my knowledge, the only other Dutch female patrons of the seventeenth-century who have been discussed, if only summarily, are Maria Boot van Wesel (d.1654) and Agnes (Agneta) Block (1629-1704). Boot van Wesel, a widow from Dordrecht, had a painting collection of about fifty works and a 'little rarity room' that contained 'many beautiful rarities.' See John Loughman and John Michael Montias, *Public and Private Spaces: Works of Art in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Houses* (Zwolle: Waanders, 2000), 84-87. Block was the wealthy owner of a botanical garden and menagerie who commissioned artists like Alida Withoos, Maria Sibylla Merian and Pieter Holsteyn the Younger to paint and draw her collection. See Arthur K. Wheelock Jr., *From Botany to Bouquet: Flowers in Northern Art* (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1999), 57.

Chapter 1: Amalia van Solms, An Art-Historical Biography

Introduction

Anthony van Dyck (1599-1641) painted pendant portraits of Amalia van Solms and her husband, Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange in 1632 [**FIGURES 1.1 and 1.2**].¹⁹ While both portraits are half-length, Frederik Hendrik stands in full armor adorned with a lace collar while Amalia is seated on a red velvet chair and wears a voluminous black dress trimmed with white ruffles at the wrists and a wide, starched lace collar. Where the rigidity of Frederik Hendrik's stance is reinforced by the stone pillar seen behind his right shoulder, the softness of the ochre curtain behind Amalia compliments that of her dress, hair and face. Orange is a featured color in both images. The orange plume of his helmet on a table to his left identifies Frederik Hendrik as the Prince of Orange and as the Captain and Admiral General of the young Dutch Republic. Likewise, the orange festoons on Amalia's dress associate her with the House of Orange. Amalia's gaze is firmly focused on the viewer and the slightest hint of a smile plays at the corners of her mouth. In her expression as well as her stance, Van Dyck captured the pride and self-satisfaction that Amalia felt at the age of thirty. She had, by this time, gone from a lady-in-waiting to the wife of the effective ruler of the United Provinces, inherited a noble title and borne five children, including a boy, thereby securing the family line of Orange.

¹⁹ There are two versions of each of these paintings; one pair is in the Museo del Prado while the other pair has been separated. The portrait of Frederik Hendrik, in the Baltimore Museum of Art, and that of Amalia van Solms is in a private collection. Both sets are by Van Dyck. See, *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings* (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2004), cats. III.112 and III.113.

By 1632, Amalia had fulfilled all the roles prescribed by early modern society for women and had reason to be proud. She had advanced her status, as well as that of the Solms-Braunfels family, through her marriage to Frederik Hendrik and would become a key figure in Dutch history. The Solms-Braunfels family was an old, noble German family, albeit not an exceedingly wealthy one. The family seat was, and still is, Braunfels castle, a fairy-tale-like structure that hovers over the equally picturesque German village of the same name [FIGURE 1.3]. Amalia was born in this castle on August 31, 1602 and was named for Amalia von Neuenahr (1539-1602), the recently deceased Electress Palatinate. Amalia's father, Johan Albert I (1563-1623) was the Prince of Solms-Braunfels, a region just north of Frankfurt am Main. Her mother, Agnes van Sayn Wittgenstein (1568-1617), died when Amalia was fifteen years old.

Johan Albert I was the 'Hofmeister' to the Elector Palatinate Frederick IV and, in the summer that Amalia was born, he was elevated to the position of 'Grosshofmeister' and 'Staatsminister.'²⁰ These political positions were generally reserved for members of the highest nobility.²¹ As such, Johan Albert I was the most important statesman after the Elector.²² Johan Albert's new post took him to Heidelberg, the seat of the Electorate and 170 kilometers away from Braunfels. It is likely that Amalia's mother stayed behind in Braunfels due to her advanced

²⁰ Hauptline Solms-Braunfels, Tafel II.

²¹ L.J. van der Klooster, 'Johan Albert graaf van Solms', *De Nederlandsche Leeuw* 111 (1996) 224-226.

²² Van der Klooster, 'Johan Albert graaf van Solms,' 225.

pregnancy. By 1605 at the latest, the family was reunited in Heidelberg where an infant son, Frederik, was buried in the Church of the Holy Ghost.²³

The Solms-Braunfels family was closely connected to the House of Orange. Amalia's paternal grandmother was Elisabeth of Nassau (1542-1603), sister to Willem I, leader of the Dutch revolt and Frederik Hendrik's father. Amalia had two older sisters, Elizabeth (1593-1636) and Ursula (1594-1657), two older brothers, Konrad Ludwig (1595-1635) and Johan Albert II (1599-1648), and one younger sister, Louise Christina (1606 – 1669). In Heidelberg, the family resided in a house on the Hauptstrasse between Karlsplatz and Kisselgasse and across from Leyergasse.²⁴ In 1617 two years after the death of his first wife Agnes, Amalia's father Johan Albert I married Juliana van Nassau-Dillenburg (1565-1630). Elizabeth was married in the same year to Wolfgang Friedrich, Rheingraf zu Dhaun. In 1620 Ursula married Christoph, Burgraf zu Dohna, and, Louise Christina married Joan Wolfert van Brederode in 1638. All of the sisters made highly desirable matches with men from prominent and distinguished German and Dutch families.

The extent of Amalia's education is not known, but having been raised in the Palatinate, a Protestant state in Germany, as well as being a member of the upper class, she most likely had a better education than her female contemporaries in other parts of Europe. One of the fundamental tenets of the Reformation was the right of everyone, including women, to read scripture. Martin Luther (who visited Heidelberg in 1518), encouraged the education of girls as well as boys: "Even a girl

²³ Van der Klooster, 'Johan Albert graaf van Solms,' 224.

²⁴ Van der Klooster, 'Johan Albert graaf van Solms,' 225.

has enough time that she can go to school for an hour a day and still perform her household tasks.”²⁵ In Württemberg, a system of state controlled schools was established in 1559 in which children, boys and girls, were taught reading, writing and memorizing.²⁶ Girls would also have learned household management from their mothers. Amalia and her sisters would have most likely been responsible for the smooth operating of the household after their mother died. Women of Amalia’s status, that is to say, upper class nobility, would also have been instructed in dancing and singing and perhaps even riding. If Amalia did not learn these things at her own home in Heidelberg, she certainly was introduced to them in 1613, when she became a lady-in-waiting for Elizabeth Stuart (1596-1662), Electress of the Palatinate.

While piety is not a characteristic that is attributed to Amalia by any source, she appears to have been somewhat more fundamental in her approach to the Protestant faith than her husband, Frederik Hendrik.²⁷ Although raised a Calvinist, Frederik Hendrik was worldlier than Amalia, having visited the courts of London and Paris in his youth. During Amalia’s youth, Heidelberg was still a bastion of Protestantism, which was reinforced in 1613 with the arrival of the new Electress, Elizabeth Stuart, who was the daughter of King James I of England.

²⁵ Phyllis Stock, *Better Than Rubies: A History of Women’s Education* (New York: Putnam, 1978), 62.

²⁶ Stock, *Better Than Rubies*, 64.

²⁷ Jan Poelhekke, *Frederik Hendrik: Prins van Oranje: Een Biografisch Drieluik.* (Zutphen: De Walburg pers, 1978), 350. Poelhekke also notes that, during the early years of her marriage, Amalia kept company with André Rivet, a staunch Calvinist and Huguenot minister.

Part I - Elizabeth Stuart

Heidelberg

The long relationship between Amalia and Elizabeth Stuart began when the two women were quite young. Amalia entered Elizabeth's service at the age of eleven as a lady-in-waiting when the English princess arrived in Heidelberg in June of 1613. On Valentine's Day the very same year, the sixteen year-old Elizabeth had married the Elector Palatinate Frederick V (1596-1632) in a lavish ceremony in London. Their union afforded each of these Protestant nations an ally against the German Catholic League and Spanish crown.²⁸

English decorum and protocol, as well as local German customs, influenced protocol at the court in Heidelberg. As the daughter of a reigning king of England, Elizabeth had precedence over all local nobles.²⁹ This situation undoubtedly caused some ruffled feathers in Heidelberg and matters were not helped when English protocol clashed with German etiquette. For instance, Elizabeth's English serving staff would not allow members of the Palatinate aristocracy, which included the Solms family, to hand the Electress her cup at meals, as was the local custom.³⁰

Amalia experienced her first taste of true luxury at Frederick and Elizabeth's court in Heidelberg. As a Princess, Elizabeth's apartments were lavishly appointed to reflect her status. In her 1938 biography, Carola Oman records that floors were

²⁸ For a complete biography of Elizabeth Stuart see, Josephine Ross, *The Winter Queen: The Story of Elizabeth Stuart* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979); Carola Oman, *Elizabeth of Bohemia* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938).and Mary Green, *Elizabeth, Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia*, (London: Methuen & Co., 1909).

²⁹ Oman, *Elizabeth of Bohemia*, 128.

³⁰ Oman, *Elizabeth of Bohemia*,129.

covered with Turkish carpets and that the walls, which were hung with red and brown gilded leather, were decorated by two paintings by Rubens.³¹ Unfortunately, Oman does not indicate her sources for this information and her account may not be entirely accurate. For example, only two paintings by Rubens are known to have been in Elizabeth's possession, neither of which she owned when she lived in Heidelberg.³² Sir Dudley Carleton, English ambassador to The Hague (1615-1625) gave Elizabeth Rubens's painting *Abraham and Hagar* (date unknown) in 1619, the year she and the Elector left Heidelberg for Prague. The second work, Rubens's *Venus and Adonis* (date unknown), hung in Elizabeth's small closet at her palace in Rhenen in 1633 although it is not known when it entered the collection.³³

Even if Rubens's paintings were not in Heidelberg, the couple seems to have acquired a collection of paintings, that was comparable in quality to that of their first-rate tapestry and book collections.³⁴ Among the many tapestries the couple owned were Karel van Mander II's ten-piece set of the *Deeds of Scipio* that the Dutch States-General gave to Elizabeth as a wedding present and a six-piece set representing the story of Diana.³⁵ Tapestries were the pre-eminent symbol of wealth and power, and

³¹ Oman, *Elizabeth of Bohemia*, 120.

³² Hans Hubach in *Tapestry in the Baroque: New Aspects of Production and Patronage* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010), 123, n. 13.

³³ Willem Jan Hoogsteder, "De Schilderijen van Frederik en Elizabeth, Koning en Koninginn van Bohemen." Ph.D. Diss., Kunsthistorisch Instituut der Rijks Universiteit te Utrecht, 1984., Inv. pg. 4, no. R 40; Neither of these paintings are extant. For more see, Michael Henker, *Der Winterkönig: Friedrich V, der Letzte Kurfürst aus der Oberen Pfalz. [Kurzführer zur Bayerischen Landesausstellung 2003]*, Amberg - Heidelberg - Prag - Den Haag (Augsburg: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 2003), 200.

³⁴ Hoogsteder, *De Schilderijen Van Frederik en Elizabeth, Koning en Koninginn van Bohemen*, 41.

³⁵ Hubach, *Tapestry in the Baroque*, 113. Diana was an especially relevant theme for Elizabeth Stuart as she was known as an avid huntress.

they decorated palaces of nobles throughout Europe.³⁶ Frederick and Elizabeth continued to expand their tapestry collection throughout their marriage, even when they could no longer afford to do so.

The collection of books that Frederick and Elizabeth inherited was equally impressive. The *Bibliotheca Palatina*, the most important collection of books and manuscripts to be found in early modern Northern Europe, was housed in Heidelberg in the libraries of the castle, the Church of the Holy Ghost and the University.³⁷ The library, which was established by Elector Otto Henry (1502–1559) in the mid-sixteenth century, was comprised of all the books that he and subsequent Electors had owned. Otto Henry transformed Heidelberg, particularly the castle, into a showcase for new architecture during his short reign as Elector from 1556 until his death in 1559. He brought in the architect Alexander Colin (c.1526-1612) from Mechelin to construct a new wing for the castle, known as the Ottheinrichbau, of which only the façade remains today [FIGURE 1.4].³⁸ This building's façade is comprised of paired windows, between which stand sculptures of Old Testament heroes as well as Roman gods and goddesses.

The expansion of the palace continued under Frederick V, who, in anticipation of the arrival of his English bride, built the Englischer Bau in 1612. He also commissioned the Frenchman Salomon de Caus (1576-1626) to design and build the *Hortus Palatinus*, an immense L-shaped garden located adjacent to the castle

³⁶ Hubach, *Tapestry in the Baroque*, 106.

³⁷ Oman, *Elizabeth of Bohemia*, 120-121.

³⁸ Elizabeth Godfrey, *Heidelberg: Its Princes and its Palaces* (Dutton, 1906), 131.

[FIGURE 1.5]. This garden was a masterpiece of landscape architecture and included grottoes, fountains and statuary. Its topoi were the *paragone* of art and nature as well as the union of Frederick and Elizabeth, who were represented in the garden as Vertumnus and Pomona.³⁹

The atmosphere at the court in Heidelberg was one of refinement and erudition. Amalia lived in this environment from the ages of eleven to seventeen and it was here that she learned the courtly arts of dancing and singing as well as how to carry herself as a lady of rank. In all of this, Elizabeth Stuart, Princess of England and Electress of the Palatinate, was her instructor and guide.

Prague

In 1619, the fate of the entire Palatinate household changed drastically when Frederick V accepted the proffered crown of Bohemia and moved his court to Hradčany Castle in Prague. A year earlier, the Protestant Diet of Bohemia had rebelled against the rule of the Holy Roman Emperor Matthias. When Matthias died in 1619, his successor Ferdinand II technically inherited the kingdom of Bohemia but the Protestant Diet deposed him and offered the crown to Frederick V, thereby setting off a chain of events that would evolve into the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648). Frederick and Elizabeth left Heidelberg for Prague on September 27, 1619 along with

³⁹ Luke Morgan, *Nature as model: Salomon de Caus and Early Seventeenth-century Landscape Design* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 197.

their household and a baggage train of 153 wagons.⁴⁰ The couple entered Prague on October 21 to extraordinary fanfare that began a full half-mile outside of the city.

One of the first things the royal couple did in Prague was inspect the legendary collections of Holy Roman Emperor, Rudolf II (1552-1612). The largest collection of its kind, Rudolf's *Kunst* or *Wunderkammer* was an unparalleled assortment of priceless treasures.⁴¹ In addition to painted masterpieces by Raphael, Correggio, Hendrik Goltzius, Roelandt Savery, and all members of the Brueghel family, the collection contained examples of rarities from the East like porcelain, as well as exotic specimens from the natural world.⁴² Seven years had passed between Rudolf's death and the reign of Frederick V, and, in the interim, parts of the collection had been inherited by Rudolf's brothers. However, most of the collection was still intact in 1619 when Frederick and Elizabeth arrived.⁴³ During Rudolf's lifetime, his *Kunstammer* was a jealously guarded space into which the Emperor allowed only the most privileged guests. As one courtier pointed out to Elizabeth upon her inspection of these treasures, she and Frederick were now the owners of the collection and, as such, had complete and unfettered access to it.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ Josephine Ross, *The Winter Queen: The Story of Elizabeth Stuart* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979), 70-72.

⁴¹ For a good account of what was contained in Rudolf's collection, see Beket Bukovinska in *Rudolf II and Prague: The Court and the City* (Prague: Prague Castle Administration, 1997), 199-207.

⁴² Heinrich Zimmerman, "Das Inventar der Prager Schatz- und Kunstammer vom 6. Dezember 1621," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 24 (1905): XIII-LI.

⁴³ See Eliška Fučíková in, *1648, War and Peace in Europe* (Münster: Verlag Westfälischer Friede, 1998), 173-179.

⁴⁴ Oman, *Elizabeth of Bohemia*, 191.

Rudolf's *Kunstkammer* is of particular importance in regards to Amalia's own collection of decorative arts later in life. Amalia had her own version of a *Kunstkammer* in her apartments in the Stadhouders' Quarters and the Oude Hof, albeit on a much smaller scale than the one in Prague.⁴⁵ Examples of porcelain, silver and goldwork, gems, automatons and various other rare and curious specimens inhabited the shelves and drawers of Rudolf's *Kunstkammer* and similar objects appear in inventories of Amalia's collections. Aside from the example of porcelain discussed in Chapter 4, which Amalia collected in great quantity, objects like cups and dishes made of rhinoceros horn and the European ceramic, *terra sigillata*, which were believed to have curative properties, appear in both Rudolf and Amalia's collections.

Amalia was exposed to a magnificent array of artistic and architectural treasures during her formative years in Heidelberg and Prague. The refined court culture under Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart and their sumptuous surroundings must have made a lasting impression on her. One can well imagine Amalia competing with the memories of the splendor of Heidelberg and Prague when she set about shaping the appearance of her own residences as Princess of Orange.

The Hague

The reign of the new Protestant King and Queen of Bohemia did not last long. It ended disastrously on November 8, 1620 at the Battle of the White Mountain where the superior forces of Count Tilly, commander of the Catholic League in Bavaria,

⁴⁵ See Chapter 4.

routed Frederick's meager army. After his defeat, Frederick and his wife were forced to flee Prague. The Winter King and Queen, as they were now derisively known, having ruled for only one winter, wandered the German countryside seeking asylum. They were unable to return to Heidelberg as it was now occupied by Ambrogio Spinola's troops. They were ultimately taken in by Frederik Hendrik's elder half-brother Prince Maurits of Orange (1567-1625), Stadhouder of the United Provinces, who was a maternal uncle to Frederick V. Upon their arrival in The Hague, Frederick and Elizabeth, along with their retinue, established themselves in the Wassenaerhof, a large house on the west end of the Lange Voorhout in The Hague, not far from the Binnenhof that housed the Stadhouder's Quarters. Thoughtfully decorated for Frederick and Elizabeth by their landlords, the States General, it was here that the exiled royal couple held court.⁴⁶ Amalia, too, lived here as part of the Winter Queen's retinue, along with the rest of the Solms-Braunfels family. Amalia remained in the Wassenaerhof until her marriage to Frederik Hendrik in 1625, four years after her arrival in The Hague.

As Jacqueline Doorn notes in her article on the relationship between Elizabeth Stuart and Amalia van Solms, their rapport is best gauged through the letters of the Queen.⁴⁷ According to Doorn, the relationship between the two women was somewhere between the 'jealous rivalry' described by Arthur Kleinschmidt and the 'strong bond of friendship formed through shared adversity,' touted by Anna

⁴⁶ Ross, *The Winter Queen*, 88; Oman, *Elizabeth of Bohemia*, 248.

⁴⁷ Jacqueline Doorn, "De Winterkoningin, vriendin of rivale van Amalia van Solms", *Spiegel der Historie* 1 (1966) 81-86.

Hallema.⁴⁸ At the time of Amalia's marriage to Frederik Hendrik, a match Elizabeth herself championed, Elizabeth told her former lady in waiting, "My misfortune is your fortune, my lady!"⁴⁹ By marrying the Prince of Orange, Frederick V's maternal uncle, Amalia became part of Elizabeth's family and the Queen affectionately dubbed her *la petite tante*, a nickname that implied their difference in status as well as age.

Over time, however, the relationship between Amalia and Elizabeth grew distinctly frosty. As early as 1628, Sir Dudley Carlton, British Ambassador to The Hague, remarked that the Prince and Princess of Orange seldom visited Frederick and Elizabeth and even when they did, their visits were very short.⁵⁰ Matters of precedence often caused friction between the two women. As a Queen, Elizabeth out-ranked Amalia, whose official title was Princess of Orange, and Elizabeth was always given prominence of place at official functions, such as the 1638 wedding of Amalia's sister, Louise Christine to the Duke of Brederode.⁵¹ As was her right as the highest-ranking woman in the country, Elizabeth also laid the cornerstone to important building projects including Amalia's own Huis ten Bosch.⁵²

Such perceived indignities surely rankled Amalia who, perhaps as a result, was often supercilious in her demeanor. In 1647, her future son-in-law Willem Frederik van Nassau-Dietz (1613-1664) wrote of Amalia, "She is a vain woman...she

⁴⁸ Doorn, "De Winterkoningin," 81.

⁴⁹ Hallema, *Amalia van Solms een lang leven in dienst van haar natie*, 19.

⁵⁰ *Princely Display*, 51.

⁵¹ *Princely Display*, 50.

⁵² Marten Loonstra, *Het Huijs int Bosch: Het Koninklijk Paleis Huis ten Bosch Historisch Gezien/ The Royal Palace Huis ten Bosch in a Historical View* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 1985), 19.

respects no one...now we [Willem Frederik] are beginning to know her properly, and all her qualities...are fewer than those who do not know her think.”⁵³ Such a close relation is perhaps not the best source for an unbiased opinion of Amalia’s character, but there are other indications that she was preoccupied with her status and the protocol she felt it merited. From Hugo de Groot, the celebrated Dutch statesman, we learn that Amalia solicited the French King Louis XIII to bestow the titular honor of ‘Altesse’ on her and her husband. In 1637, De Groot wrote, “I understand that the king [of France] has given the title of ‘Altesse’ to my lord the Prince of Orange, knowing that the Princess wished it.”⁵⁴ Amalia also decorated her apartments in her various palaces to convey a sense of majesty using elements like balustrades and canopies to demarcate privileged spaces in rooms she used to receive visitors.⁵⁵

The rivalry between Amalia and Elizabeth Stuart, which vacillated between jealous and friendly, generated concurrent commissions given to the same artists, particularly Gerard van Honthorst (1590-1656). Honthorst, a native of Utrecht who had studied in Italy, eventually became the pre-eminent painter at both courts in The Hague. Elizabeth was the first to commission Honthorst upon his return to the Netherlands from England where he painted for her brother, King Charles I.⁵⁶

Portraits of the King and Queen of England disguised as a shepherd and shepherdess

⁵³ *Princely Patrons*, 30.

⁵⁴ Poelhekke, *Frederik Hendrik*, 479. ‘Ick verstaet hier dat den coning den tytel van Altesse heeft gegeven aen mijnheer den prins van Orangie, wetende dat de prinsesse selve wenschte.’ Translation mine.

⁵⁵ Amalia had balustrades in her bedchamber in the Stadhouder’s quarters and, later, at Huis ten Bosch. Fock suggests that she borrowed the use of such a device from Lousie de Coligny who probably had one in her chambers in the Oude Hof. Frederik Hendrik did not use a balustrade in his bedchamber in the Stadhouder’s Quarters. See Fock in *Princely Patrons*, 78.

⁵⁶ J. Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656* (Doornspijk The Netherlands: Davaco, 1999), 28.

painted by Honthorst were sent back with the artist as gifts for Elizabeth, who subsequently asked Honthorst to paint herself and her husband in a similarly pastoral manner [FIGURE 1.6]. This painting, *Seladon and Astrea*, (1629) portrays the Bohemian royal family as characters from the popular pastoral romance of the same name.⁵⁷ These works were among the first examples of pastoral portraits in the Netherlands and commissions for similar images soon came from the Stadhouder's court.⁵⁸ Amalia in particular liked to have her portrait painted in the pastoral mode but, apparently, Frederik Hendrik did not for none exist.⁵⁹ The earliest of Honthorst's pastoral portraits of Amalia is *Flora/Charity* (c.1630) [FIGURE 1.8].⁶⁰

The closeness in dates between *Seladon and Astrea* and the portrait of Amalia as *Flora/Charity* suggests that the Stadhouder and his wife were eager to keep up with the artistic fashion for pastoral-inspired portraits at the Bohemian court. Amalia and Elizabeth, in particular, often had their portraits painted in a similar manner. For instance, Honthorst's 1633 half-length portrait of Amalia as the Biblical Queen Esther, now in the Smith College Museum of Art, is strikingly akin to that of Elizabeth who likewise holds a scepter in her right hand [FIGURES 1.9 and 1.10].⁶¹

⁵⁷ For the influence of theatrical performances on Dutch pastoral painting see, Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, 12.

⁵⁸ Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, 67.

⁵⁹ Kettering notes that it was mainly women who were represented in this way. Kettering, "Gender Issues in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Portraiture: A New Look," 147.

⁶⁰ As is discussed in chapter 3, this image is the earliest, still-extant pastoral portrait done for the Stadhouder's court. Although Honthorst worked for Frederik Hendrik and Amalia prior to his London sojourn in 1628, he had not previously painted pastoral portrait but had made decorative genre paintings such as *The Concert*, which he painted in 1624 for the Oude Hof.

⁶¹ Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656*, cat. no. 339, fig. 228. Unfortunately, the whereabouts of Elizabeth's portrait is unknown and Judson offers no date.

Both women are garbed in pseudo-historical costumes with capes attached to their left shoulders and wear a crown of some sort atop their heads. The figure of Esther, a Jewish exile in Persia who became a queen, was an appropriate figure for Amalia and Elizabeth to be compared with as they, too, were exiles in a foreign land.⁶²

Many of the portraits Honthorst executed for the two women look so alike that it is oftentimes hard to identify the sitter. In 1631, Honthorst made pendant profile portraits of the King and Queen of Bohemia and shortly thereafter, similar portraits for Frederik Hendrik and Amalia [FIGURES 1.11, 1.12, 1.13 and 1.14]. The portrait of Amalia (that Horst Gerson mistakenly identified as the Winter Queen), is similar to Rembrandt's profile portrait of her, which was executed at slightly earlier date than Honthorst's image [FIGURE 1.15]. Rembrandt's portrait of Amalia is now accepted by most scholars as the true pendant to Honthorst's portrait of Frederik Hendrik as both were executed c. 1631-32 and both are on canvas while Honthorst's portrait of Amalia is on panel.⁶³ However, the fact that Honthorst received the commission to depict Amalia *after* Rembrandt executed his profile portrait, speaks to a certain dissatisfaction the patron had with the earlier work. Compared with Honthorst's profile portrait of Amalia, Rembrandt's seems somewhat plain and underwhelming

⁶² Amalia, in addition to being portrayed as the Biblical queen, was also hailed as a 'second Esther' by the clergyman Frejus in his sermon during her wedding ceremony at the Kloosterkerk and Hugo Beyerus in his sermon at Willem II's baptism. See, Paul Boer, *Het huijs int Noorteynde: het Koninklijk Paleis Noordeinde Historisch Gezien/ The Royal Palace Noordeinde in an Historical View* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 1986) and L.J. van der Klooster, "Amalia van Solms als Esther," *Jaarboek Oranje-Nassau Museum*, 1997, 7-9.

⁶³ For the sequence of events surrounding these portraits see, Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656*, 31-32; J Bruyn et al., *A Corpus of Rembrandt paintings* (The Hague: M. Nijhoff Publishers, 1982), 250-255. For Gerson's misidentification see, Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst*, cat. no. 308. Curiously, the portrait of Frederik Hendrik by Honthorst and the portrait of Amalia by Rembrandt did not hang in the same room in 1632, although they were both located in Amalia's apartments. For the portraits listed in the 1632 inventory of the Stadhouder's Quarters see, D/LS, vol. 1:191, no. 219 and 189, no. 186.

and most likely did not flatter Amalia enough, who had a very high opinion of herself.

Given the similarities between Honthorst's portraits of Elizabeth and Amalia, it appears that Amalia was eager to have her likeness similarly captured by the same artist. Both women wear low-cut bodices trimmed with gauzy white fabric gathered at the center of the chest and again at the shoulders. Chokers of large pearls encircle their necks and a rope of smaller ones are worn in their hair to which, in both portraits, is attached a flowing scarf that is blown out behind them, as if by a breeze. In both portraits, this scarf is attached again, at the other end, to the bodice at the shoulder.

Amalia's early years were heavily influenced by the example of noble living that Elizabeth Stuart set. In many ways, Amalia's efforts to create an equally impressive court of her own can be seen as an attempt to compete with Elizabeth's court. Despite the cooled relations between the two women, the commissions Amalia and Elizabeth gave to Honthorst continued to parallel each other throughout their lifetimes. Frequently portrayed in similar fashions, stances and guises in portraiture, these images bear witness to the close yet competitive relationship between the two women.

Part II - Frederik Hendrik

Art Patronage and the House of Orange-Nassau

Amalia's courtly education began in the courts at Heidelberg and Prague, but it was refined and perfected in The Hague under the guidance of her husband,

Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange (1584-1647). While Frederik Hendrik was certainly the most active patron within the House of Orange-Nassau, he was not the only one. The first Count of Nassau, Henry III (1483-1538), had formed an impressive collection that included expensive tapestries and paintings by the Northern masters of the day such as Hugo van de Goes, Jan Gossaert and Lucas Cranach the Elder. Hieronymous Bosch's painting *The Garden of Earthly Delights* had been in the Count's collection since 1517.⁶⁴ Frederik Hendrik's father Willem I, Prince of Orange (1533-1584) inherited this collection and housed it, along with other treasures, in his residences at Brussels and Breda. When Willem I refused to sign the oath of allegiance to the Spanish King Philip II, he fled to Dillenburg, leaving many possessions behind, including Bosch's *Garden of Earthly Delights*, which fell into the hands of the Spanish.⁶⁵ Today it is a great treasure of the Museo del Prado in Madrid.

The financial and psychological pressures of waging a rebellion necessarily put a damper on further collecting by Willem I as was the case for Prince Maurits (1567-1625), who in 1585 inherited the fight for independence upon his succession to the Stadholdership. Maurits did, however, find time to make improvements to the Stadhouder's Quarters in the Binnenhof adding the 'Mauritstoren' between 1592 and 1598 and in 1621, a wing that would later become Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's quarters. In 1610, Maurits also commissioned Jacques de Gheyn to design a walled

⁶⁴ *Princely Patrons*, 12.

⁶⁵ *Princely Patrons*, 13, n. 5.

garden, called *Prinsentuin* (Prince's Garden), on the southwestern side of the Binnenhof.⁶⁶

Frederik Hendrik was a much more avid and knowledgeable patron of the arts than his predecessor and half-brother Maurits and he reintroduced to the House of Orange-Nassau an interest in patronage and collecting after he became stadhouder in 1625.⁶⁷ Frederik Hendrik was a well-traveled man with an impressive family lineage. His parents were Willem I of Orange, leader of the Dutch Revolt and his fourth wife Louise de Coligny (1555-1620), daughter of the French Huguenot leader Gaspard de Coligny, whose assassination triggered the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre in 1572. Only a month after Frederik Hendrik's baptism, Willem I was assassinated in Delft in 1584. His mother wished to return to France with her son but was prevented from doing so by the States General who feared the influence of the French court on the young prince.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, it granted Louise permission to take her son to the French court in 1598 where Frederik Hendrik's godfather, Henri IV, King of France, took a great interest in him. His experience at the French court (discussed below), as well as the influence of his tutor, the liberal Calvinist Johannes Uytenbogaert (1557-1644), shaped the man Frederik Hendrik would become and the court culture he would establish in The Hague.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ *Princely Patrons*, 14; Hudig, *Frederik Hendrik en de kunst van zijn tijd*, 8.

⁶⁷ For the most recent study on the artistic activities of Maurits, see T. Magreta, "The Development of Orange-Nassau Princely Artistic Activity, 1618--1632" Ph.D. Diss., City University of New York, 2008.

⁶⁸ *Princely Patrons*, 18.

⁶⁹ For Frederik Hendrik's role as patron and collector, see, *Princely Patrons* and *Princely Display* as well as Hudig, *Frederik Hendrik en de Kunst van Zijn Tijd*.

Frederik Hendrik was, and has been recognized as, a driving force behind the unprecedented expansion of the stately art collection of the House of Orange.⁷⁰

Highly educated and a savvy politician, Frederik Hendrik not only realized the importance of such a collection on a political level, but also had a genuine interest in art and architecture.

Courtship and Marriage

Art played an important role in Amalia and Frederik Hendrik's relationship from the beginning. In 1624, the year before they married, Frederik Hendrik wrote to a friend that he had recently made changes to his picture gallery to include a portrait of Amalia [FIGURE 1.16].⁷¹ Now identified as the portrait of Amalia from in the Museum Warmii in Poland this image depicts the sitter in half-length, dressed in a low-cut floral gown with her hair flowing loose over her shoulders.⁷² Frederik Hendrik also displayed a portrait of the Queen of Bohemia in his picture gallery. In his letter, Frederik Hendrik cautions his correspondent not to read too much into the fact that he owns a portrait of Amalia, pointing out that he has paintings of the Queen and the Countess van Salm-Dhaun as well. He goes on to say, "...all the additional allusions [about Amalia] over which you write are not true...although I should be

⁷⁰ Hudig, *Frederik Hendrik en de kunst van zijn tijd*; Mauritshuis, *Princely Patrons*; Haags, *Princely Display*; Slothouwer, *De paleizen van Frederik Hendrik*; Tucker, "The Art of Living Nobly."

⁷¹ *Princely Display*, 164.

⁷² Marieke Spliethoff, in her essay on portrait painting at the Stadhouder's court, links this image with other, similar portraits of Elizabeth Stuart, Elisabeth van Salm-Dhaun and others to an unknown painter who worked in the style of the English miniaturist, Isaac Oliver. All of the sitters have long, loose hair; an indication, not of their marital status, but of their close relationship with Frederik Hendrik. See Spliethoff in *Princely Display*, 165.

delighted if all were true which you write of these ladies' favors, such as dining late with them and so forth...⁷³

Frederik Hendrik's possession of these portraits, especially that of Amalia, indicated a close relationship with the sitters and, as may be inferred from his letter, elicited much speculation, even from Constantijn Huygens and Sir Dudley Carleton.⁷⁴ Both of these men wrote about the amorous relationship between the prince and Amalia van Solms prior to Frederik Hendrik's own letter to the contrary. In fact, Amalia told her son-in-law Willem Frederik years later in 1647 that she and Frederik Hendrik had a three year courtship before their marriage in 1625.⁷⁵ In the face of such evidence that such a relationship existed between them, it is unclear why Frederik Hendrik denied it. It was, perhaps, his wish to keep any potential scandal from tainting Amalia's reputation. It is also possible that the birth of his illegitimate son Frederik, to Margaretha Catharina Bruyns in 1624, put a strain on Frederik Hendrik's relationship with Amalia at that time.⁷⁶ Amalia's own words to her son-in-law in 1647 about the 'unwholesome gossiping,' surrounding her courtship with Frederik Hendrik imply that this period was not without its tribulations.

Prince Maurits, Frederik Hendrik's elder half-brother, took over the Stadholdership in 1584 upon the assassination of their father, Willem I. By the

⁷³ *Princely Display*, 164.

⁷⁴ *Princely Display*, 164.

⁷⁵ J. Willem Frederik, *Gloria parenti: Dagboeken van Willem Frederik, Stadhouder van Friesland, Groningen en Drenthe, 1643-1654* (Amsterdam: Nederlands Historisch Genootschap, 1995), 400.

⁷⁶ Frederik van Nassau-Zuylestein, 1624-1672, married the Englishwoman Mary Killigrew in 1648 and in 1659 became the governor of the household for his nephew, Willem III. Troost, *William III the Stadholder-king: A Political Biography*, 37-38.

beginning of 1625 it was clear to Maurits that his health was failing. He had no legitimate heir, yet stipulated that Frederik Hendrik would only succeed him as Prince of Orange if the latter married. If not, the inheritance would pass to the Stadhouder of Friesland from the Nassau branch of the family.⁷⁷ Evidently this mandate had the desired effect and Frederik Hendrik and Amalia wed quickly and quietly on April 4, 1625. The wedding took place in the Kloosterkerk in The Hague, but there were no attendant festivities out of respect for the current Stadhouder who lay on his deathbed. Maurits died on April 23, just weeks after Frederik Hendrik and Amalia married.

By all accounts, Amalia and Frederik Hendrik's life together was a happy one and a union not made exclusively out of political necessity.⁷⁸ The couple had a total of nine children of whom five lived to adulthood. Beginning the year after her marriage in 1625, Amalia had a child every one to two years, her last one born in 1642 when she was forty years old. Despite the birth of Frederik Hendrik's bastard a year before he wed Amalia, there is no inkling that the Prince of Orange was ever unfaithful to his wife.⁷⁹ They kept each other's counsel and it appears that Frederik Hendrik truly valued and appreciated Amalia's input in all manner of things. It was well known at court that one should first approach Amalia when requesting an audience with the Stadhouder and that she had a certain amount of influence on him.⁸⁰ Frederik Hendrik gave Amalia's brother, Johan Albrecht II, a choice military

⁷⁷ *Princely Patrons*, 21.

⁷⁸ Gesst, *Amalia van Solms en de Nederlandshe Politiek van 1625 tot 1648*, 6.

⁷⁹ Poelhekke, *Frederik Hendrik*, 54–55. Poelhekke notes there is only one account of such an indiscretion mentioned by an 'unreliable' Spanish source in 1645.

⁸⁰ *Princely Patrons*, 29.

command upon her request, although he later rejected her choice for lieutenant of the cavalry, Willem Frederik of Friesland and appointed Johan Maurits of Nassau instead.⁸¹

Although she had no official political function, Amalia was involved in matters of state throughout her lifetime. As Martin Royalton-Kisch has demonstrated, Adriaen van de Venne's illustration of *The Game of Billiards* in the 1626 album that the King of Bohemia gave to Frederik Hendrik, allegorically demonstrates the roles Amalia and Elizabeth Stuart played in aiding their husbands to make prudent political decisions [FIGURE 1.17].⁸² In the image, two women and a man stand around a billiards table. The woman on the left is Elizabeth Stuart and at the other end of the table is Amalia. Frederik Hendrik stands next to Amalia and prepares to hit a ball through the hoop gestured to by Elizabeth. Amalia points to another object on the table, a post called 'the king,' that Frederik Hendrik must avoid hitting lest he lose the game. Royalton-Kisch interprets this scene to mean that the Orange court and the Bohemian court share the same political objectives and that the Stadhouder must take care not to topple 'the king' in achieving his own goals.⁸³ In the 'game,' both men are assisted and guided by their wives. Amalia stands at her husband's side, pointing out potential obstacles and reminding him of his duty to his

⁸¹ *Princely Patrons*, 29.

⁸² Martin Royalton-Kisch, *Adriaen van de Venne's album in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum* (London: Published for the Trustees of the British Museum by British Museum Publications, 1988), 97.

⁸³ Royalton-Kisch, *Adriaen van de Venne's album in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, 97.

nephew, the King of Bohemia. Van de Venne's image provides the earliest evidence of Amalia's role as Frederik Hendrik's supporter and advisor.

Amalia had an important position in Dutch society. As the wife of the effective head of state, her role in assuring the continuation of the Orange line was of utmost importance to the family and, from an Orangist point of view, to the newly formed Dutch Republic. Amalia was constantly kept abreast of military developments while her husband was out on campaign during the early years of their marriage by the faithful Constantijn Huygens. For example, in the space of one day, September 11, 1633, Huygens wrote to Amalia three separate times about the movement of troops and the outcomes of various battles.⁸⁴ She was known to inspect the troops, and that, "...Her Highness knows everything that goes on here, just as if she was with the army herself."⁸⁵ Amalia's forceful personality was not suited to a life of behind the scenes. Instead, she craved the limelight and often occupied center stage of the social and political arena.

The Court of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia van Solms

The court that Frederik Hendrik and Amalia kept was unlike anything the citizens of the Dutch Republic had ever seen. Predominantly inspired by French fashions, the Stadhouder's court had an undeniable international flavor, intentionally constructed by Frederik Hendrik and Amalia along the model of other European

⁸⁴ J. Worp, *Constantijn Huygens* (Baarn: Hollandia, 1914), nos. 817-819. It is unclear as to whether Amalia specifically requested that Huygens keep her so well-informed.

⁸⁵ *Princely Patrons*, 29.

courts. The earliest direct conduit for the transmission of contemporary French artistic and architectural trends was most likely Louise de Coligny, Frederik Hendrik's mother and widow of Willem I. After the assassination of her husband in 1584 in Delft, Louise de Coligny took up residence at the Oude Hof in The Hague until her death in 1620.⁸⁶ Here, the suite of rooms she occupied was based on the French *appartement* system (discussed below) and it is likely that it was Louise, who was a frequent visitor to Fontainebleau where the *appartement* system was employed, introduced this French architectural element to her residence at the Oude Hof.⁸⁷ Despite the lack of any documentation from Louise's residency in the Oude Hof, the 1632 inventory of the palace gives the impression that her quarters had remained very much as she left them upon her death. In the inventory, the heading, 'the rooms where Madame the Princess of exalted memory stayed,' precedes the description of their contents.⁸⁸

Frederik Hendrik's own experiences at the court of the King of France, Henri IV, had a lasting impact on the young prince and influenced the way he used art and architecture to reflect his noble status. In addition to his 1598 trip to France with his mother, Frederik Hendrik returned to that country in 1610 on a diplomatic mission and again in 1611 to act as godfather to the son of his sister Elisabeth, the Duchess of

⁸⁶ This palace was a gift from the States to Frederik Hendrik and his mother. See Boer, *Het huijs int Noorteynde*, 15-23.

⁸⁷ Boer states that between 1610 and 1620 the so-called 'new hall' was constructed. Other than this, nothing is known about renovations to the Oude Hof during Louise's residency. See Boer, *Het huijs int Noorteynde*, 23.

⁸⁸ 'De camer daer mevrouw de prinsesse hoochl. mem. plach te logeren.' D/LS, vol. 1:202.

Bouillon.⁸⁹ His last trip was in 1619 to Orange in southern France in order to facilitate the transition of the principality to Maurits's control after the death of their half-brother Philips Willem.⁹⁰

F.W. Hudig, in his study on Frederik Hendrik and the art of his day, points particularly to the architecture of Paris and its environs, including the Palais du Luxembourg, as greatly impacting the prince.⁹¹ During his second trip to Paris, Frederik Hendrik would have seen the new gallery of the Louvre that connected it to the Tuileries. In France, Frederik Hendrik witnessed how architecture, and the art within it proclaimed the magnificence of the king. Frederik Hendrik's passion for French architecture and his desire to replicate it in the Netherlands was aided by Jacques Androuet I Ducerceau's architectural treatise, *Les Plus Excellents Bastiments de France* (2 volumes, 1576 and 1579).⁹² During the course of the expansion and renovation of Honselaarsdijk palace (c.1621-c.1647), Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's country hunting lodge, the Stadhouder employed the Frenchman Simon de la Vallée (c. 1590-1642), whose father Martin de la Vallée was one of the architects of the Palais du Luxembourg.⁹³

The couple's official residence, the Stadhouder's Quarters in the Binnenhof, was renovated and designed to incorporate the French *appartement* system

⁸⁹ Poelhekke, *Frederik Hendrik*, 42.

⁹⁰ Poelhekke, *Frederik Hendrik*, 68. See also, Peter Thornton and Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art Paul, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France, and Holland* (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1978), 39-40.

⁹¹ Hudig, *Frederik Hendrik en de Kunst van Zijn Tijd*, 4-5.

⁹² Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France, and Holland*, 27.

⁹³ *Princely Display*, 108; D. Slothouwer, *De paleizen van Frederik Hendrik* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1945), 366-367.

constituting a connected suite of rooms. In the apartment system, each successive room was more private in nature than the preceding room and one's intimacy with the occupant was gauged on the basis of the rooms into which they were allowed to enter.⁹⁴ The basic arrangement was an *antichambre*, or receiving room that led into the *chambre*, the bedroom of the regent and the principal room in the suite. The resident formally received esteemed visitors in the bedroom, which was sometimes divided by a balustrade placed in front of the bed, behind which only the most intimate members of the court were allowed.⁹⁵ Beyond the bedchamber were the most private rooms: the *cabinet* and the *garderobe*. These spaces were the most intimate of the apartment and were often decorated to reflect the personal taste of the owner.⁹⁶

French influence was also manifest in the interior decoration of most of the couple's residences. The 1632 inventory of the Stadhouder's Quarters records luxurious *en suite* textiles used as wall hangings as well as bed and window curtains that were color coordinated to create a unified look within the room in which they were hung, a fashion that began in Paris.⁹⁷ The walls of Amalia's cabinets in the palaces of Huis ter Nieuberg at Rijswijk and Honselaarsdijk Palace were covered with

⁹⁴ Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France, and Holland*, 57.

⁹⁵ Louise de Coligny had such a balustrade in her bedroom in the Oude Hof. Amalia, too, had one in her bedroom in the Stadholder's Quarters, apparently in imitation of her French mother-in-law. No such device is recorded in any of Frederik Hendrik's apartments. D/LS, vol. 1:220, no. 917 and 196, no. 352.

⁹⁶ Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France, and Holland*, 296.

⁹⁷ *Princely Patrons*, 77.

painted, wooden paneling in a technique known as *lambris à la française*.⁹⁸ Amalia's cabinet in Honselaarsdijk, dated to about 1635, was lined with paneling into which were incorporated four paintings based the pastoral romance, *Il Pastor Fido* [FIGURES 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, and 1.21].⁹⁹ Below each of these works hung a horizontal landscape painting that corresponded with the scene above [FIGURES 1.22, 1.23 and 1.24].¹⁰⁰ In her study on Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's living spaces, Willemijn Fock suggests that this kind of decoration, unknown in the Netherlands before this time, was likely introduced by the French architect, Simon de la Vallée, who worked for the Stadhouder between 1633 and 1637.¹⁰¹

Paintings in the Stadhouder's Quarters, 1632

In 1632, the Stadhouder's Quarters in the Binnenhof were renovated and expanded to accommodate Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's growing court and collection. The completion of these renovations prompted an inventory of the couple's possessions.¹⁰² This inventory provides an invaluable snapshot into the environment in which Frederik Hendrik and Amalia lived and worked and helps gauge their artistic preferences at that time. The renovations included two new galleries, one in Frederik Hendrik's apartments and one in Amalia's, to house their

⁹⁸ *Princely Patrons*, 78.

⁹⁹ These paintings are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

¹⁰⁰ Only three of these paintings are still extant.

¹⁰¹ *Princely Patrons*, 79; Fock, "Interieuropvattingen van Amalia van Solms," 26.

¹⁰² D/LS, vol. 1:179.

expanding collection of paintings.¹⁰³ These galleries were in addition to the ones that already existed in each apartment prior to 1632, which extended the length of the west side of the building. The apartments of Frederik Hendrik were on the second floor while Amalia's, which had the same floor plan, were on the third and uppermost floor. Visitors entered the main gallery along the west side of the building from the staircase in the southeast corner of the Binnenhof. Each gallery was about thirty meters long and had seven windows along the west side and one on the north wall. Two doors on the east side lead into the apartments [FIGURE 1.25].¹⁰⁴

Of the one hundred and thirty-four paintings recorded in Stadhouder's Quarters in 1632, the majority hung in these galleries: fifty-five in Frederik Hendrik's and forty-six in Amalia's. The Prince and Princess shared a taste for Italianate and classicizing paintings, a preference evident throughout their residences and one that continued throughout their lifetimes. In addition to portraits of family members and other European nobility, both galleries, as well as the apartments, housed history paintings, pastoral/mythological paintings, landscapes and seascapes. No genre paintings, or scenes of everyday life, are cited in any of the extant inventories.

Notwithstanding the couple's taste for classicizing and Italianate paintings, only two Italian paintings hung in the Stadhouder's Quarters in 1632. In Frederik Hendrik's large audience hall, a painting by the Florentine Franciabigio (1482-1525)

¹⁰³ These rooms were empty at the time of the inventory, which might indicate that the spaces had not yet been decorated, but the vacancy of the new galleries could also point towards an intention on the part of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia to continue building their already impressive painting collection.

¹⁰⁴ Robert Jan Pelt and M. E. Tiethoff-Splithoff, *Het Binnenhof: van grafelijke residentie tot regeringscentrum* (Bataafsche Leeuw, 1984), 63; *Princely Display*, 109.

hung over the mantle, which was fashioned out of Italian marble.¹⁰⁵ The second, a scene from the *Commedia dell'Arte* by an unidentified painter, hung over the mantle in an antechamber belonging to Amalia's sister, Louise Christine.¹⁰⁶ With the exception of a series of twelve portraits of the 'queens and grandees of France' by an anonymous French painter that hung in Amalia's gallery, the couple also did not collect French or German paintings.¹⁰⁷

Frederik Hendrik and Amalia prized the work of Peter Paul Rubens and Anthony van Dyck above all other artists. Van Dyck himself visited the court in The Hague in the winter of 1631-1632 when he painted the pendant portraits of the Prince and Princess as well as a portrait of the young Willem II. Both galleries included a painting by Rubens: in Amalia's gallery hung a *Flora and Zephyr* (c. 1617) and in Frederik Hendrik's an *Annunciation* (1614) [FIGURES 1.26 and 1.27].¹⁰⁸ Van Dyck's *Rinaldo and Armida* (a scene from Tasso's epic poem, *La Gerusalemme liberate*), hung in Frederik Hendrik's gallery and *Achilles Discovered Amongst the Daughters of Lycomedes* (c. 1632) hung in the Prince's 'new' bedroom, also over the mantle.¹⁰⁹ Van Dyck's *Amaryllis and Mirtillo* (c. 1632) hung over the mantle in the Prince's *garderobe* and was the first painted representation from Guarini's pastoral romance, *Il Pastor Fido* in the Netherlands. As such, it served as

¹⁰⁵ D/LS, vol. 1:186, no. 120.

¹⁰⁶ D/LS, vol. 1:210, no. 670; Pelt and Tiethoff-Spliethoff, *Het Binnenhof*, 63.

¹⁰⁷ D/LS, vol. 1:192, no. 245.

¹⁰⁸ D/LS, vol. 1:192, no. 230 and 185, no. 94. Rubens was only responsible for the figures in *Flora and Zephyr*. Jan Breughel the Elder painted the background. The provenance for the *Annunciation*, now in Dublin, is not certain but Drossaers and Lunsingh Scheurleer advance it as a possibility. Frederik Hendrik purchased the *Annunciation* from the widow of one of his councilors.

¹⁰⁹ *Princely Patrons*, 114, no. 5.

inspiration for the artists commissioned to paint similar scenes for Amalia's closet at Honselaarsdijk just a few years later [FIGURE 1.28]. A painting by Van Dyck also hung in Amalia's apartments. This work, perhaps also of Rinaldo and Armida, was displayed over the mantle in the Princess' 'new' bedroom.¹¹⁰ The romantic subject of both *Rinaldo and Armida* and *Amaryllis and Mirtillio* must have appealed to Amalia and Frederik Hendrik, who had earlier commissioned Cornelis van Poelenburch to paint *Theagenes Receives the Palm of Honor from Charicleia*, a similarly romantic story, to commemorate their wedding.¹¹¹

Paintings by Gerard van Honthorst also hung over the fireplace mantles in both Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's galleries. A painting of Diana at the hunt hung in Frederik Hendrik's gallery, while in Amalia's was an image of shepherdesses [FIGURE 1.29].¹¹² Unfortunately, these are the only paintings with recorded locations within the galleries. While it is not known how other paintings were hung, a sense of the overwhelming effect the galleries would have had is evident from the number and the caliber of paintings contained in them. The coordination of artists and subject matter between Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's new bedchambers speaks to the extent to which they harmonized the decoration of their new chambers.

¹¹⁰ D/LS, vol. 1:190, no. 190. In 1629, Van Dyck gave King Charles I of England a painting of Rinaldo and Armida, now in the Baltimore Museum of Art.

¹¹¹ This painting is not listed in the 1632 inventory of the Stadhouder's Quarters, thus was probably housed in another palace, most likely Honselaarsdijk. See *Princely Patrons*, 100.

¹¹² D/LS, *Inventarissen van de inboedels in de yerblijven van de oranjes an daarmede gelijk te stellen stukken, 1567-1795*, 1:183, no.44 and 191, no.223. Lost in WWII. The description of the Van Honthorst painting in Amalia's gallery reads, "...een stuck schilderie verciert met harderinneken, door Honthorst gemaect." See Chapter 3 for a discussion of Diana imagery.

Notable differences, however, did exist in the paintings found in Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's apartments. One of the most marked differences is the preponderance of portraits in the latter. For example, nineteen of the forty-six paintings in Amalia's gallery were portraits while only four portraits out of a total of fifty-five paintings were found in the gallery of Frederik Hendrik. These included portraits of his son Prince Willem II, his mother Louise de Coligny, Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, and the portrait of Amalia with 'loose' hair [FIGURE 1.16].¹¹³ The large number of portraits in Amalia's gallery was bolstered by the series of twelve French portraits mentioned above. Among the portraits of courtiers, European nobles and others was a recently rediscovered portrait by Honthorst of Amalia's three children Willem II, Louise Henriette and Henriette Amalia [FIGURE 1.30]. One of Amalia's two cabinets contained six more portraits, including her own profile portrait by Rembrandt while Honthorst's profile portrait of Frederik Hendrik was the only portrait that hung in her 'small garderobe'.¹¹⁴

Frederik Hendrik's gallery and cabinet contained no fewer than nineteen religiously-themed works. These included a *Finding of Moses* by Pieter Lastman, a *Magdalen* by Hendrik Goltzius, *Samson and Delilah* by Jan Lievens, and Rembrandt's *Simeon's Hymn of Praise*, as well as two crucifixions.¹¹⁵ Although not listed in the 1632 inventory, as they were not yet finished, the seven paintings by

¹¹³ D/LS, vol. 1:183, nos. 45-48. The artists are not recorded.

¹¹⁴ Although these portraits did not hang together in 1632, they were listed next to one another in the 1667 inventory of Amalia's possessions. See D/LS, vol. 1: 283, nos. 1209 and 1210. See also, Bruyn et al., *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings*, 254. Honthorst's profile portrait of Amalia does not appear in the 1632 inventory suggesting that it was not yet completed.

¹¹⁵ D/LS, vol. 1:183, no. 53; 184, no. 85; 185, no. 87; 186, nos. 108, 109, 111. The significance of these subjects for Frederik Hendrik is not clear and merits further investigation.

Rembrandt of scenes from Christ's life are the most famous religious works that Frederik Hendrik would come to own. In 1633, Frederik Hendrik purchased the first two paintings of this series, *Elevation of the Cross* and *Descent from the Cross* in 1633 on the recommendation of Huygens.¹¹⁶ Subsequently, the Stadhouder commissioned five other scenes of the life of Christ from Rembrandt. Rembrandt's letter to Huygens in 1636 about his progress (or lack thereof) on the series, the artist mentions in a postscript that his latest painting, the *Ascension*, would be best displayed in the Stadhouder's gallery.¹¹⁷

Amalia, conversely, had but one religious painting in her gallery in 1632: *The Finding of Moses* by Daniel Cletcher (active in The Hague c.1626-1632).¹¹⁸ The disparity between the number of religious paintings found in Frederik Hendrik versus Amalia's gallery is interesting. Although the Prince and the Princess were both Protestant, perhaps Frederik Hendrik's early exposure to the French, Catholic court made him more comfortable with religious imagery. Amalia, raised in a staunchly Protestant area of Germany, may have been adverse to overt religiously-themed paintings. Judging from works that she owned later in life, however, it appears that Amalia grew more comfortable with religious scenes, perhaps because of her husband's admiration for them. After Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647,

¹¹⁶ *Princely Patrons*, 192.

¹¹⁷ *Princely Patrons*, 193. The gallery to which Rembrandt refers may be Frederik Hendrik's 'new' gallery that was not yet furnished in the 1632 inventory. It is therefore possible that these commissions were intended specifically for this space.

¹¹⁸ D/LS, vol. 1:193 no. 251. Also see The Hague 1997a, cats. 4a and 4b. Two Cletcher paintings hung in Frederik Hendrik's gallery and were battle scenes of the sieges of Groenlo (1627) and Bois-le-Duc (1629). The three works listed in the inventory of the Stadhouder's Quarters constitute the majority of the artist's oeuvre.

Rembrandt's seven paintings of Christ's life hung in Amalia's quarters in the Oude Hof.¹¹⁹ Shortly thereafter, Amalia commissioned two paintings by the Antwerp Jesuit painter, Daniel Seghers. After the death of her son Willem II in 1650, Amalia commissioned Seghers to paint *Garland of Flowers with Pietà*, (lost in WWII) to 'match her mood of sadness.'¹²⁰ Another painting by Seghers, *Garland of Flowers with the Virgin Mary*, hung over the mantle of the large east cabinet in Huis ten Bosch [FIGURE 1.31].¹²¹

While Frederik Hendrik and Amalia had a penchant for large-scale, classicizing paintings, the couple also owned small landscapes, some with mythological or religious subjects, by artists such as Joos de Momper (1564-1635), Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568-1625), Denis van Alsloot (c.1570-c.1626), Hendrik van Balen (1575-1632), Rolaendt Savery (1576-1639) and Cornelis van Poelenburch (1594/5-1667). Frederik Hendrik displayed ten such landscapes in his gallery and Amalia thirteen, with two more in her cabinet.¹²² In addition, four small still-lives hung in the Stadhouder's Quarters. A vase of flowers with shells by Jan Brueghel the Elder hung in Frederik Hendrik's gallery, while a similar painting by Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder (1573 – 1621) hung in Amalia's gallery.¹²³ Two still lifes by

¹¹⁹ D/LS, *Inventarissen van de inboedels in de yerblijven van de oranjes an daarmede gelijk te stellen stukken, 1567-1795*, 1:285, no. 1240; *Princely Patrons*, 62.

¹²⁰ *Princely Patrons*, 208, no. 27.

¹²¹ D/LS, vol. 1, 281, no. 1179; The garland was painted by Seghers while the figures of the Virgin and Child were done by Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert.

¹²² D/LS, vol. 1:183, no. 57; 184, nos. 62–64, 68, 70, 84, 86; 185, no. 93; 191, nos. 215 and 221; 192, nos. 232, 233, 236–243; 193, no. 253. Those paintings with religious subjects, mentioned above (n. 109), are not included in this total.

¹²³ D/LS, vol. 1:183, no. 60 and 193, no. 252.

Balthasar van der Ast (1593/4-1657), now in the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., hung in one of Amalia's cabinets [FIGURES 1.32 and 1.33].¹²⁴

Despite differences in the types of paintings on display in the apartments of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia in 1632, the overwhelming impression is one of unison and similarity in taste. As Rebecca Tucker notes in her study on Frederik Hendrik's patronage at Honselaarsdijk, the continuity in painted decoration as well as architectural styles between the Prince's palaces and Amalia's own widow's residence, Huis ten Bosch, points, not only to shared aesthetic tastes, but also to using artistic patronage to express the nobility and grandeur of the House of Orange.¹²⁵

Part III - Constantijn Huygens

Constantijn Huygens looms large in the scholarship surrounding the court in The Hague. Aptly and invariably labeled a 'Renaissance man,' the hand of Huygens is detected in the politics, music, art and literature of the day. Although not noble, his father, Christiaan, held a position as one of the four secretaries to Willem I. This position afforded the elder Huygens the ability to give his children an aristocratic education that included music, dancing and etiquette. Constantijn Huygens also traveled extensively in his younger years. In 1618, Huygens accompanied Sir Dudley Carleton, the English ambassador to The Hague to London, a city to which Huygens

¹²⁴ D/LS, vol. 1:191, no. 217.

¹²⁵ Tucker, "The Art of Living Nobly," 358.

would return three more times between 1621 and 1624. In 1620, Huygens went to Venice to serve as the secretary to the Dutch ambassador, François van Aerssen.¹²⁶

Huygens's courtier's education paid off well. In 1625 he was awarded the position of Secretary to the Prince of Orange, a position that encompassed various duties but was primarily taking care of Frederik Hendrik's official correspondence. In this capacity, Huygens accompanied the Prince on campaign, sending important dispatches to garrison commanders as well as to Amalia, keeping her abreast of military developments as well as the health of her husband. Huygens's official duties kept him very busy; all in all he wrote between 100 and 120 letters every month.¹²⁷

The role Huygens played at court, however, went far beyond his secretarial duties. An accomplished poet, musician and composer in his own right, Huygens kept a finger on the artistic pulse of the Netherlands during the seventeenth century. It was Huygens who brought the young Rembrandt and Lievens to the attention of the court in The Hague where they each received commissions. He was also involved in the major building projects that the Prince and Princess undertook, such as Honselaarsdijk Palace and Huis ten Bosch. He served as a kind of 'artistic advisor' to the couple both in their collection of paintings and their architectural projects. Painters and writers who sought the patronage of the court often approached Huygens first, as was the case with P.C. Hooft who wanted to dedicate his *Nederlandsche Historiën* (1642) to Frederik Hendrik.¹²⁸ Additionally, Huygens was the conduit for

¹²⁶ Inge Broekman, *De rol van de schilderkunst in het leven van Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687)* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2005), 23.

¹²⁷ *Princely Patrons*, 31.

¹²⁸ Irma Thoen, *Strategic Affection?: Gift Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Holland* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007), 180.

remitting payment to artists as he did for Daniel Seghers who received from Amalia, via the secretary, a golden mahlstick in gratitude for the painting, *Garland of Flowers with Pieta* [FIGURE 1.31].¹²⁹

Inge Broekman, in her study of Huygens's interest in painting, argues rightly that the secretary influenced the formation of the painting collection in the Stadhouders' Quarters as it stood in 1632.¹³⁰ Broekman notes that Huygens wrote an essay on painting between the years 1625 and 1632, a time frame bracketed by the beginning of his employment for Frederik Hendrik and the completion of the renovations of the Stadhouders' Quarters. In addition, Broekman points out that, in his memoir, *Mijn jeugd*, Huygens praises ten of the fifteen artists represented in the collection at the Stadhouders' Quarters.¹³¹ The inclusion of paintings by Rembrandt and Lievens in the Stadhouders' Quarters also attests to the fact that the Prince and Princess valued Huygens's artistic opinions enough to purchase works by two such relatively unknown painters.

Honselaarsdijk

The rebuilding of the old castle at Honselaarsdijk, purchased by Frederik Hendrik from the Count of Aremberg in 1612, provides an example of the working relationship between Frederik Hendrik, Amalia and Huygens. Begun in 1621 and continuously expanded and renovated until Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647, the

¹²⁹ *Princely Patrons*, 246.

¹³⁰ Broekman, *De rol van de schilderkunst in het leven van Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687)*, 71.

¹³¹ Broekman, *De rol van de schilderkunst in het leven van Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687)*, 71.

demolition of the older structure and the construction of the new palace of Honselaarsdijk was a project in which the Stadhouders and, after 1625, his wife were intimately involved.¹³² This lodge, in reality a palace replete with formal gardens, a grand staircase and luxurious furnishings, was Frederik Hendrik's most cherished building project.

In her study on Honselaarsdijk, Rebecca Tucker demonstrates that Amalia was left in charge of overseeing the project during Frederik Hendrik's frequent and prolonged absences on military campaigns.¹³³ Huygens served as a conduit for communication between the Prince and Princess and the vast workforce they employed at Honselaarsdijk. Tucker calls Huygens's role at Honselaarsdijk ancillary while she characterizes Amalia's role as 'active and hands-on.'¹³⁴ She administered payments, mediated disputes with contractors and influenced design decisions. For example, Frederik Hendrik sent a message to Amalia (via Huygens), indicating that she was the best judge of what was suitable for the palace's new east garden at Honselaarsdijk. The ultimate design of swirling colored turf and rocks closely resembled the molding and gilded sculptural decoration on the walls of Amalia's cabinet and demonstrates the Princess' involvement with the palace's interior and exterior decoration.¹³⁵

Huygens's artistic influence can be detected in at least one room at Honselaarsdijk. Amalia's cabinet at the palace contained a series of paintings based

¹³² Tucker, "The Art of Living Nobly," 19; *Princely Display*, 111.

¹³³ Tucker, "The Art of Living Nobly," 351.

¹³⁴ Tucker, "The Art of Living Nobly," 351.

¹³⁵ Tucker, "The Art of Living Nobly," 352.

on the pastoral play, *Il Pastor Fido*. This choice of subject betrays the secretary's hand, who earlier suggested the subject for Van Dyck's *Amaryllis and Mirtillo* that hung in the Stadhouder's Quarters.¹³⁶ The subject is taken from a play written in the early 1580s by the Italian poet Giovanni Battista Guarini (1538-1612). The play is set in Arcadia and concerns the romance between the shepherd Mirtillo and the nymph Amaryllis. In 1623 Huygens, whose many talents included writing pastoral poetry, translated the popular play, which he called, 'this sweetest of poetical works.'¹³⁷

The central love story of Mirtillo and Amaryllis and its pastoral setting was fitting decoration for the palace of Honselaarsdijk, which was situated in the Dutch countryside. The decision to illustrate scenes from *Il Pastor Fido*, a literary work highly popular among the European elite, also indicates an awareness of international courtly culture, particularly French, and an attempt to infuse Honselaarsdijk with it. A series of ten paintings executed between 1620 and 1630, also based on *Il Pastor Fido*, hung in a small room in the castle of Ancy-le-Franc in Burgundy and may have served as inspiration for the decoration of Amalia's cabinet although it is not clear how these ideas would have been transmitted.¹³⁸

The four paintings in Amalia's cabinet based on scenes from *Il Pastor Fido* were: *Amaryllis Crowning Mirtillo*, by Cornelis van Poelenburch; *Blind Man's Bluff*

¹³⁶ See pg. 37-38. A painting by Van Dyck of a scene from *Il Pastor Fido* is listed in the 1632 inventory of the Stadhouder's Quarters in Frederik Hendrik's dressing room. See, *Princely Patrons*, 222, n.8. Next to Peter Paul Rubens whom he called, 'the Apelles of our day,' Huygens admired Van Dyck the most and *Amaryllis and Mirtillo* was most likely purchased or commissioned from the artist by the Stadhouder on the advice of Huygens. Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, 12.

¹³⁷ A Dutch version of the story appeared in 1617 under a different title and in 1618, Govert van der Eembed translated the original text.

¹³⁸ For an image of the cabinet at Ancy-le-Franc see, *Princely Patrons*, 223, fig. 1.

by Dirck van der Lisse; *Silvio and Dorinda* by Herman Saftleven and Hendrick Bloemaert; and *The Marriage of Amaryllis and Mirtillo* by Abraham Bloemaert [FIGURES 1.18-1.21]. Each of these had a corresponding horizontal landscape painting that hung beneath the narrative scenes [FIGURES 1.22-1.24].¹³⁹ All of the works were executed c. 1635 by painters from Utrecht, two of whom, Poelenburch and Abraham Bloemaert, were already represented in the princely collection. Bloemaert had executed three paintings for Frederik Hendrik in 1625-1626 and thirteen works by Poelenburch were listed in the couple's collection in the 1632 inventory, including a painting given to Amalia in 1627 by the Deputed States of Utrecht.¹⁴⁰ Given Amalia's involvement in the Honselaarsdijk project, it is likely that she, with the assistance of Huygens, played a large role in the decoration of her own cabinet and thus may have commissioned this series.

These paintings were incorporated directly into the wall paneling in a technique known as *lambris à la française*.¹⁴¹ Despite the fact that different artists were involved in this series of paintings, which convey the pleasures of pastoral life, the paintings have a shared aesthetic. All artists set their classically-garbed figures in

¹³⁹ *Princely Patrons*, 224. It is not known with certainty which of these landscape paintings were paired with which narrative scene. Alison McNeil Kettering proposes the Van der Lisse's landscape with shepherds dancing hung below his *Blindman's Bluff*, a *Forest Landscape* by Gillis d'Honecoeter hung below Saftleven and H. Bloemaert's *Silvio and Dorinda*, a seascape by Adam Willaert hung below either A. Bloemaert's *Marriage of Amaryllis and Mirtillo* or Poelenburch's *Amaryllis Crowning Mirtillo*. The fourth landscape is no longer extant. See Kettering 1983, 112. There were also thirteen other paintings in the room with no apparent correlation to the *Il Pastor Fido* series. See *Princely Patrons*, 222.

¹⁴⁰ The work by Poelenburch, *Banquet of the Gods*, was part of a gift of four paintings from the Deputed States of Utrecht. This gift is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

¹⁴¹ *Princely Patrons*, 78.

a sunny Arcadian landscape above which large white clouds float by.¹⁴² The challenge of having different artists work on a series of paintings intended to be hung together is similar to what Huygens and the artist and architect Jacob van Campen (1596-1657) faced when conceiving the Oranjezaal in the Huis ten Bosch.

Huis ten Bosch

The relationship between Amalia and Huygens appears to have been agreeable, if more professional than friendly.¹⁴³ Huygens remained loyal to Amalia after Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647, when he became secretary to their son, Willem II, and he served as her artistic advisor, along with Jacob van Campen, for the Oranjezaal project at Huis ten Bosch.¹⁴⁴ Huygens devised the complex iconographic framework for the cycle of paintings Amalia commissioned for the central hall, the Oranjezaal, and he also functioned as the manager of the project, corresponding with artists keeping Amalia apprised of their progress.¹⁴⁵

Huis ten Bosch (The House in the Woods), was Amalia's own private residence. Intended as a summer palace, a parcel of land on which to build it was granted to Amalia just outside The Hague in 1645 by the Chamber Accounts of Holland. It is the only building in the Netherlands that owes its existence to the wife

¹⁴² *Princely Patrons*, 222. It is suggested here that the woman in profile in Poelenburch's *Amaryllis Crowning Mirtillo* may be a representation of Amalia.

¹⁴³ L. Strengholt, *Constanter het leven van Constantijn Huygens* (Amsterdam: Querido, 1987), 83.

¹⁴⁴ He was one of her only allies in the nasty dispute she had with her daughter-in-law Mary Stuart over the guardianship of Willem III after the premature death of his father in 1650. See, Strengholt, *Constanter het leven van Constantijn Huygens*, 83.

¹⁴⁵ For the iconographical program see, B Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, "Notities betreffende de decoratie van de Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch," *Oud Holland* 96, no. 3 (January 1, 1982): 133-185.

of a governing Prince of Orange.¹⁴⁶ The building was almost certainly intended as a home for Amalia once she became a widow, as was anticipated because of the eighteen year difference in age between her and her husband.¹⁴⁷ Designed by Pieter Post (1608-1669), the Huis ten Bosch is a centrally-planned building whose symmetrical wings radiate out from a cruciform central hall [FIGURE 1.34]. Unlike Honselaarsdijk that was based on French models, Huis ten Bosch was influenced by Italian architecture such as the Villa Rotonda by Andrea Palladio (1508-1580) that likewise radiate from a central hall.¹⁴⁸

Construction began in 1645 while Frederik Hendrik was still alive, but plans for the interior, particularly the central hall, the Oranjezaal, changed radically after his death in 1647 when Amalia designated Huygens and Van Campen to create a memorial to honor the memory of her husband. Inspired by the Medici cycle that Peter Paul Rubens painted in the 1620s for the Queen of France, Marie de Medici (1575-1642), Amalia commissioned eleven artists from both the southern and northern Netherlands to create a cycle of paintings in the Oranjezaal consisting of over thirty large works on canvas for the walls and four paintings executed directly on the wood paneling of the vault.¹⁴⁹ The completed cycle celebrates the life and military achievements of Frederik Hendrik [FIGURE 1.35]. Van Campen supplied participating artists with instructions and sketches and also executed paintings himself and his oversight unifies the paintings despite the stylistic differences of the artists

¹⁴⁶ Loonstra, *Het Huijs int Bosch*, 14–15.

¹⁴⁷ Mauritshuis, *Princely Patrons*, 47; Loonstra, *Het Huijs int Bosch*, 15.

¹⁴⁸ Loonstra, *Het Huijs int Bosch*, 27.

¹⁴⁹ The influence of the Medici cycle on the Oranjezaal is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

involved. Huygens devised the complex, iconographic program program that he based on classical rhetorical rules for eulogies.¹⁵⁰

Amalia kept close tabs on the progression of Huis ten Bosch and the Oranjezaal projects. She received updates about the construction of the building from Pieter Post and reviewed preliminary sketches for paintings.¹⁵¹ Jacob Jordaens, who executed the largest and most iconographically detailed painting in the series, *The Triumph of Frederik Hendrik*, wrote to Amalia to explain the nuances of his composition.¹⁵² Huygens, as with earlier projects, served as the main conduit of information. In 1649, he informed her that one of the artists initially selected, Gaspar de Crayer, declined the commission and suggested the painter Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert as an acceptable alternate.¹⁵³ In another letter, he informed Amalia of his latest conversations with Honthorst and Van Campen about the Oranjezaal.¹⁵⁴ And, at the completion of the project in 1651, Huygens wrote Amalia on behalf of Van Campen to ask her to release the latter from her service.¹⁵⁵ These missives not only

¹⁵⁰ As the complexities of the iconographic program have been adequately explicated in this text and elsewhere, they will not be addressed here apart from Huygens's particular role in the Oranjezaal project. See Chapter 3 as well as Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij 1980. The artists who worked on the Oranjezaal project are: Salomon de Bray, Christiaan van Couwenburgh, Theodoor van Thulden, Willeboirts Bosschaert, Gerard van Honthorst, Caesar van Everdingen, Pieter de Grebber, Pieter Soutman, Jacob Jordaens, Jacob van Campen.

¹⁵¹ J. Terwen, *Pieter Post (1608-1669) architect* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 1993), 59; Worp, *Constantijn Huygens*, nos. 5132, 5190.

¹⁵² Max Rooses, *Jacob Jordaens: His Life and Work*. (J. M. Dent & Co. London; printed in Holland, 1908), 166-167.

¹⁵³ Worp, *Constantijn Huygens*, no. 4969.

¹⁵⁴ Worp, *Constantijn Huygens*, no. 4997.

¹⁵⁵ Worp, *Constantijn Huygens*, no. 5193.

indicate Amalia's interest in the project, but also the extent to which she exercised control over it.

The François Dieussart Commission

In 1646, just prior to the Oranjezaal project, Amalia commissioned the Flemish sculptor François Dieussart (c.1600/01- 1661) to create four life-size marble statues of the Princes of Orange who had served as stadhouders: Willem I, Maurits, Frederik Hendrik and Willem II [FIGURE 1.36]. By 1650, these statues were completed and subsequently displayed in the vestibule of the Huis ten Bosch just outside the entrance to the Oranjezaal.¹⁵⁶ Huygens had introduced Dieussart to the Stadhouder and his wife, having himself been introduced to the sculptor via a letter from Gerard van Honthorst.¹⁵⁷ Dieussart had arrived in The Hague in 1641 from London where he had executed the portrait busts of King Charles I and Charles Louis, Prince of the Palatinate. Dieussart's first commission in The Hague came from Elizabeth Stuart.¹⁵⁸ As with the paintings that the Stadhouder and the Bohemian court commissioned from Honthorst, the Dieussart commissions indicate the parallel artistic patronage of the two courts.

¹⁵⁶ Lunsingh Scheurleer, "De woonvertrekken in Huis in het Bosch," 31. Destroyed in World War II, these statues are considered to be at the core of Dieussart's oeuvre. Charles Avery, "François Dieussart (c. 1600—1661 portrait sculptor to the courts of northern Europe", *Victoria and Albert Museum Yearbook* 4 1974:221-222. Avery notes that these four statues constitute the first example of a dynastic set of statues of the Princes of Orange and may have been inspired by Habsburg prototypes.

¹⁵⁷ *Princely Patrons*, 232.

¹⁵⁸ Avery, "François Dieussart (c. 1600—1661 portrait sculptor to the courts of northern Europe", 212-213.

Huygens wrote to Frederik Hendrik on April 16, 1646, to inform the Stadholder that Dieussart had sent him four clay models of ‘Madame’s statues.’¹⁵⁹ This letter is important because it is the only concrete evidence that Amalia expressly commissioned artworks in her own right while Frederik Hendrik was alive. It also reveals the nexus between Frederik Hendrik, Amalia and Huygens regarding artistic matters. Not only did Huygens keep Amalia apprised of her husband’s activities when he was away from The Hague, but he also kept the Stadhouder informed about the Princess’ projects.

Part IV - Marie de Medici

Forced into exile in 1631 by her son, Louis XIII, the French Queen, Marie de Medici traveled through Flanders, the United Provinces, England and, finally, Germany, where she died in Cologne in 1642. During her stay in the United Provinces in 1638, Marie was the guest of the States General and was escorted in her travels by the Princess of Orange [FIGURE 1.37]. Marie’s train of some eighty coaches was welcomed in each city in the United Provinces, where she traveled with much pomp and ceremony.¹⁶⁰ A travelogue of these journeys was published by Sr. de la Serre in 1639. This publication was dedicated to the Prince and Princess of Orange whose portraits, by Wenceslaus Hollar, appear at the beginning of the volume

¹⁵⁹ “*Le statuaire Francisco [Dieussart] me donnera quatre petits modèles de terre pour les statues de Madame Mercredy au soir.*” Worp, *Constantijn Huygens*, 4313.

¹⁶⁰ Suzette Zuylen van Nyevelt, *Court life in the Dutch Republic, 1638-1689*, (London;New York: J.M. Dent & Co.; E.P. Dutton & Co., 1906), 5.

[FIGURES 1.38 and 1.39].¹⁶¹ During the period of her visit, Frederik Hendrik was away on military campaign, specifically at Kallo in the southern Netherlands, thus the responsibility of escorting the royal guest fell to Amalia.¹⁶² Marie was housed lavishly at both Honselaarsdijk and the Oude Hof and even had Honthorst paint her portrait during the visit. During this trip Amalia and the French Queen hatched the initial plan for the marriage between Amalia's son Willem II and Marie's granddaughter, Mary Stuart.¹⁶³

The French Queen's commission for Rubens's famed Medici Cycle is often cited as an inspiration for the creation of the Oranjezaal.¹⁶⁴ Although neither Amalia nor her learned advisor, Constantijn Huygens, ever saw the cycle in person before the Oranjezaal was completed, its influence is apparent in the way in which allegory and near-contemporary events are blended together in the paintings.¹⁶⁵ Huygens, who greatly admired Rubens, certainly had second-hand knowledge of the cycle of paintings that the Flemish master executed for the French Queen. Direct transmission of the ideas underlying Rubens's series, however, could also have come from Marie

¹⁶¹ Sr. de la Serre, *Histoire de l'entree de la reyne mere du roy tres-chrestien, dans la Grande-Bretaigne*. (A Londre: Par J. Raworth pour G. Thomason & O. Pullen, 1970). For Hollar's portraits see, Richard Pennington, *A descriptive catalogue of the etched work of Wenceslaus Hollar, 1607-1677* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 68, no. 463 and 284, no. 1687.

¹⁶² Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 536.

¹⁶³ Geest, *Amalia van Solnis en de Nederlandshe politiek van 1625 tot 1648*, 18; Hallema, *Amalia van Solms een lang leven in dienst van haar natie*, 76.

¹⁶⁴ See Hanna Peter-Raupp, *Die Ikonographie Des Oranjezaal*, Studien zur Kunstgeschichte Bd. 11 (New York: G. Olms, 1980), 193; Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, "Notities betreffende de decoratie van de Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch"; Mauritshuis, *Princely Patrons*, 55.

¹⁶⁵ Amalia never traveled to France and Huygens did not do so until 1661. Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, "Notities betreffende de decoratie van de Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch," 170.

herself during this visit. The fact that Amalia and Marie spent considerable time together and that Marie could have shared details of her commission with Amalia is not adequately acknowledged in the literature.

Evidence that Marie and Amalia exchanged aesthetic ideas is found in renovations made in Amalia's closet at Huis ter Nieuburg at Rijswijk. The wooden floor of Amalia's cabinet had been finished by 1638, the year of Marie's visit. However, just two years later, in 1640, a carpenter was paid 200 guilders to remodel the floor.¹⁶⁶ This floor, seen in a print from 1697, was similar to the floor in Marie de Medici's closet at the Palais du Luxembourg and was one of the earliest parquet floors outside of France **[FIGURE 1.40]**.¹⁶⁷ Given Amalia's decision to have the floor redone so soon after Marie's visit, it seems highly likely that the French Queen shared with Amalia the details of her own closet floor at the Palais du Luxembourg.

As will be discussed in Chapter 3, after Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647, Amalia looked to the iconographic precedents set by Marie de Medici to express her identity as a widow. Marie had incorporated imagery of Artemisia, the ancient Queen of Caria and widow of Mausolus, into the 'vast iconography' associated with her own widowhood.¹⁶⁸ After becoming a widow, Amalia, too, incorporated Artemisian imagery into the Oranjezaal as well as her apartments at Huis ten Bosch. Likewise, a series of drawings that Amalia commissioned from Theodoore van Thulden (1606-1669) that emphasize her role as matriarch of the House of Orange and guardian of

¹⁶⁶ *Princely Patrons*, 79.

¹⁶⁷ *Princely Patrons*, 79.

¹⁶⁸ Barbara Gaehtgens, "L'Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine," *Revue de l'Art* 109, no. 1 (1995): 17.

Willem III attests to Amalia's desire to immortalize herself in much the same way Marie was commemorated in Rubens's cycle.¹⁶⁹

Conclusion

As a widow, Amalia devoted her life to preserving her husband's memory as well as securing a place for the House of Orange among the European courts. When her son Willem II died unexpectedly in 1650 and when, in 1651, his own infant son, Willem III, was barred from inheriting the title of stadhouder in the Act of Seclusion, Amalia turned her efforts towards reestablishing the Stadholdership for her grandson and restoring the House of Orange to its position of power. Along with Mary Stuart and the Elector of Brandenburg, Willem III's paternal uncle, the Court of Holland in 1651 appointed Amalia co-guardian of her grandson.¹⁷⁰ Although Amalia lived to see the repeal of the Act of Seclusion and the appointment of Willem III as Captain-General and Stadhouder in 1672, she died before she could see her grandson marry Mary Stuart II in 1677, a marriage through which he eventually became King of England in 1689.

Amalia amended her will for the last time on September 4, 1674, almost exactly one year before her death on September 8, 1675. She left the majority of her valuables, including jewels, gold and silverware, porcelain, textiles and furniture to her three surviving daughters, Albtertina Agnes, Henrietta Catherine and Maria.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁹ See Chapter 3.

¹⁷⁰ Wouter Troost, *William III the Stadholder-King: A Political Biography* (Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2005), 27.

¹⁷¹ D/LS, vol. 1:325.

Amalia's eldest daughter, Louise Henriette, predeceased her mother in 1667 and her share of the estate was divided between her sons, Frederick III (1657-1713) and Louis (1666-1687). Upon Frederik Hendrik's death, Amalia inherited many of her husband's paintings including, famously, Rembrandt's series of the life of Christ. These paintings, added to her own already inimitable holdings, meant that Amalia was poised to leave an enduring legacy to her children. Although Rembrandt's paintings do not appear in the division of Amalia's estate, they were probably passed on to Amalia's youngest daughter Maria along with other paintings, including Cornelis van Poelenburch's *Banquet of the Gods* [FIGURE 2.2].¹⁷² Among the paintings Amalia left to her daughter Albertina Agnes were a *Shepherd* and *Shepherdess* by Paulus Moreelse that, together with Poelenburch's painting, formed part of a gift of four paintings given to Amalia by the Deputed States of Utrecht in 1627.¹⁷³ Henrietta Catherine received, among other paintings, the pendant portraits of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia by Anthony van Dyck [FIGURES 1.1 and 1.2].¹⁷⁴

Amalia's extensive collection of porcelain, which will be discussed in Chapter 4, was also divided between her daughters and two grandsons. Henrietta Catherine received a large amount of white porcelain, otherwise known as *blanc de chine*, which often took the form of figurines [FIGURE 4.9].¹⁷⁵ For Albertine Agnes, Maria

¹⁷² D/LS, vol. 1:369, no. 1406.

¹⁷³ This gift is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

¹⁷⁴ D/LS, vol. 1:372, no. 1495. These paintings were not listed in the 1632 inventory of the Stadhouder's Quarters and must therefore have hung in one of the couple's other residences. See *Princely Patrons*, 121, n. 2.

¹⁷⁵ D/LS, vol. 1:353.

and the young Princes of Brandenburg, Frederick and Louis, Amalia left copious amounts of porcelain flower pots, teapots, cups and saucers. The sheer number of porcelain items listed in the division of Amalia's estate is an indication of the impressive collection she had formed by the end of her life.

Amalia's will virtually excluded her son Willem II's only heir, her grandson, Willem III.¹⁷⁶ This omission suggests that Amalia realized the power and status valuable objects, particularly paintings, would bequeath on their subsequent owners and in this way she sought to protect her daughters' patrimony, since they, unlike Willem III, would not inherit any of the territorial holdings of the House of Orange. Supporting this theory is the fact that Amalia successfully persuaded Frederik Hendrik to amend his will in 1644 to stipulate that should his heir, Willem II, die an untimely death without issue of his own, his inheritance would pass to his sisters, rather than to his closest male relative (Willem Frederik van Nassau, Stadhouder of Friesland), as traditionally had been done.¹⁷⁷ Amalia's bequests to her daughters ultimately led to the dispersal of the Orange collection throughout Germany, the adopted homeland of three of Amalia's four daughters.¹⁷⁸ Today, many paintings whose provenance can be traced to Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's collection remain in museums and private collections in Germany.

Throughout her lifetime, Amalia enjoyed, collected and used art objects, particularly paintings and decorative objects. Influenced by those around her, Amalia

¹⁷⁶ Willem III only received a handful of valuables from his grandmother. See, D/LS, vol. 1:333, nos. 153-163.

¹⁷⁷ *Princely Patrons*, 62.

¹⁷⁸ For the fate of specific paintings, see Helmut Börsch-Supan, *Die Gemälde aus dem Vermächtnis der Amalie von Solms und aus der Oranischen Erbschaft in den brandenburgisch-preussischen Schlössern: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der hohenzollernschen* (München: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1967).

grew into a discerning collector and shrewd propagandist, using art to further her own dynastic ambitions. Although recently acknowledged as Frederik Hendrik's able and willing partner in the formation of the Stadhouder's collection, Amalia was also an innovative collector and patron in her own right, the evidence for which is presented in the following pages.

Chapter 2: The Utrecht Gift

Introduction

In early April of 1627, Amalia van Solms received a gift of four paintings from the Deputed States of Utrecht (*Gedeputeerd Staten van Utrecht*). These paintings are: a *Shepherd* and a *Shepherdess* (no longer extant) by Paulus Moreelse; a *Banquet of the Gods* by Cornelis van Poelenburch; and a *Garden of Eden* by Roelant Savery [FIGURES 2.1, 2. 2, 2.3].¹⁷⁹ In 1632, all four were hanging in Amalia's gallery in the Stadhouder's Quarters in the Binnenhof.¹⁸⁰ The Prince and Princess of Orange were no strangers to receiving costly gifts from all manner of contributors even at this early date. Along with their own purchases, commissions and inheritance, gifts were an important channel through which Frederik Hendrik and Amalia formed their collection of treasures.¹⁸¹ While items that came into the collection through the couple's choosing (or an advisor's, like Contantijn Huygens) give insight into how the Prince and Princess of Orange fashioned their identity, gifts reveal more about how the recipient was perceived through the eyes of the giver.

The circumstances that occasioned the Utrecht gift have long been a matter of speculation and disagreement among scholars.¹⁸² Various theories have been

¹⁷⁹ Moreelse's *Shepherd*, 1627, is now in Schwerin, Staatliches Museum, Kunstsammlungen Schlösser und Gärten, inv. no. 330; Poelenburch's *Banquet of the Gods*, n.d., is in Dessau, Anhaltische Gemäldegalerie Schloss Georgium, inv. no. 801; and Savery's *Garden of Eden*, 1626, is in the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 710.

¹⁸⁰ D/LS, vol. 1:192. nos. 231, 232 and 236.

¹⁸¹ *Princely Patrons*, 36.

¹⁸² Abraham Bredius, "Over Schilderijen te Ludwigslust en Sewerin," in *Nederland Spectator*, (1879), 351-353; C.H. de Jonge, *Paulus Moreelse : Portret- en Genreschilder te Utrecht, 1571-1638*. (Assen:

advanced but none of them take into account the intricacies of early modern gift-giving practices. In early modern societies, gift-giving functioned as a form of political and social exchange, particularly in regards to the upper class and it is through this lens that the gift of four paintings given to Amalia will be considered.

Gift Theory

The relationship between persons of higher status and those in their service or otherwise dependent on their munificence is described, in modern terminology, as a patron/client relationship. First theorized by Marcel Mauss at the beginning of the twentieth century, historians, anthropologists and sociologists have thoroughly examined the study of gift-giving in various cultures throughout history.¹⁸³ One premise that runs throughout the majority of these studies is the anticipated reciprocity of the initial gift. As the seventeenth-century Dutch emblemist Johan de Brune succinctly stated, “The first gift is the womb of the second.”¹⁸⁴ In other words, a gift would not be given without the expectation of receiving something in return. As cynical as this practice might sound to present-day ears, in early modern Europe it was accepted and expected. In her study on seventeenth-century Dutch gift-giving

1938), 5; D/LS, vol. 1:192; Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, 1; Jos de Meyre in, *Het gedroomde land pastorale schilderkunst in de Gouden Eeuw* (Zwolle: Waanders/Centraal Museum, 1993), 23. Joneath Spicer in Spicer et al., *Masters of Light*, 294; and Paul Huys Janssen, *Jan Van Bijlert, 1597/98-1671*. (Amsterdam: 1998), 51.

¹⁸³ Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies* (London: Routledge, 1990); Thoen, *Strategic Affection?*; Geert H Janssen, *Princely Power in the Dutch Republic: Patronage and William Frederick of Nassau (1613-64)* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2008); Lamot, *Women of Distinction*; Harry Liebersohn, *The Return of the Gift: European History of a Global Idea* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Natalie Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000).

¹⁸⁴ Thoen, *Strategic Affection?*, 227.

customs, Irma Thoen notes that while this principal of reciprocity permeated all classes of society, it was particularly codified in the court circles of the Stadhouder.

Tohen writes,

This [stadhouderly] system of patronage was widespread in seventeenth-century Holland. It worked both ways: patrons could commission works of art and reward their clients with a gift afterwards, and clients could spontaneously offer works of art to possible patrons in the expectation that they would eventually be rewarded for it.¹⁸⁵

Tohen goes on to state that when the Stadhouder was the intended recipient, permission to give the unsolicited gift needed to be secured in advance through an intermediary.¹⁸⁶ The seventeenth-century historian P.C. Hooft proceeded in this manner when he wanted to dedicate his *Nederlandsche Historiën* (1642) to Frederik Hendrik. Hooft approached the Prince's secretary, Constantijn Huygens, with his request. Permission was granted and in return, also via Huygens, Hooft received a silver ewer and wash basin.¹⁸⁷ Those who sent unsolicited gifts were best served by appealing to the known preferences of the patron. Hooft surely knew that Frederik Hendrik was something of a history lover and would, therefore, be sure to accept Hooft's gesture of dedicating his work to him. Hooft followed the appropriate etiquette for making such a gift and, as a result, was rewarded handsomely. Hooft subsequently wrote the prescribed letter of thanks to the Stadhouder, thereby cementing the patron/client relationship. In the end, both men got something out of the exchange: Frederik Hendrik's name was immortalized in the dedication of a major

¹⁸⁵ Thoen, *Strategic Affection?*, 180.

¹⁸⁶ Thoen, *Strategic Affection?*, 180.

¹⁸⁷ Thoen, *Strategic Affection?*, 180.

piece of historical literature and Hooft was guaranteed the Prince's favor, which translated into both social and monetary support.

Power is a fundamental component in gift reciprocity and the act of gift-giving tells us much about the perceptions surrounding the power of the recipient. When a client makes a gesture of a gift, he/she is, in essence, acknowledging that the patron has influence, whether it is political, social or monetary and is in a position to help the client. Amalia wielded a considerable amount of influence at the Stadhouder's court and thus gifts given to her must be considered in relation to contemporary gift-giving practices.

Amalia was a strong-willed woman and had influence on both her husband and the politics of the day. Primary sources, such as the memoirs of Amalia's nephew, Count Frederic of Dohna (1619-1688), and the diary of her son-in-law, Willem Frederik, Stadhouder of Friesland (1613-1664), form the basis for much of this portrait. Dohna records how army officers, members of the States General and foreign ministers always consulted the 'oracle' that was Amalia before approaching her husband. To the 'great relief of her husband [as it] freed him from much importunity,' she often addressed their concerns herself.¹⁸⁸ The Princess was, indeed, an unfailing source of support for her husband and often accompanied him to the beginning of each new campaign, inspecting the troops herself. Often, Amalia used the influence she had on her husband to gain positions for those she favored, like her

¹⁸⁸ Friedrich Dohna, *Les mémoires du Burgrave et Comte Frédéric de Dohna ... 1621-1688*. (Königsberg i. Pr., 1898), 27.

brother Johan Albrecht II whom Frederik Hendrik first appointed to the army and eventually made general of the artillery.¹⁸⁹

Frederik Hendrik, however, did not always bend to his wife's will, much to her chagrin. An example of this tension is demonstrated in Amalia's vehement comments regarding the installment of Johan Maurits of Nassau as the lieutenant general of the cavalry in 1644 over Amalia's choice, Willem Frederik. Amalia found Johan Maurits 'unsuitable' because of his 'delicate constitution' and his 'fond[ness] of ease.'¹⁹⁰ For the most part, however, Frederik Hendrik did have faith in his wife's capabilities. This confidence is most vividly seen in the instructions he gave to the States General in 1646 when he was in failing health. Frederik Hendrik told the States General that the body should address itself directly to Amalia, whom he authorized to act in his stead.¹⁹¹

Amalia came into her own, politically speaking, early on in her union with Frederik Hendrik. In 1632, the Venetian ambassador, Vincenzo Gussoni, acknowledged that the best way to reach the Prince of Orange was through his wife.¹⁹² This perceived influence led many, including nobles, merchants, various states and provinces, to offer her luxury gifts from Chinese lacquer work to porcelain to valuable gems and jewels.¹⁹³ Whether or not Amalia did, in fact, consistently let such gifts influence her, it is clear that this perception existed among perspective

¹⁸⁹ *Princely Patrons*, 29.

¹⁹⁰ *Princely Patrons*, 29.

¹⁹¹ *Princely Patrons*, 28.

¹⁹² *Princely Patrons*, 29.

¹⁹³ Geest, *Amalia van Solnis en de Nederlandshe politiek van 1625 tot 1648*, 11-12.

supplicants.¹⁹⁴ Although Titia Geest, in her study on Amalia's political role at court, was inclined to believe that the Princess of Orange regarded these gifts as homage due to her rather than as attempts at bribery (as we would label such 'gifts' today), it seems that Amalia was inclined to favor those who lavished her with presents.

During Marie de Medici's 1638 visit to the United Provinces, the French Queen's archenemy, Cardinal Richelieu sent Amalia a pair of earrings on behalf of Marie's estranged son, Louis XIII, King of France.¹⁹⁵ Along with these earrings, Richelieu sent a letter in which he told Amalia that the King chose these earrings as a reminder that she should not listen to anything that their 'ennemis communs [sic]' might say to her.¹⁹⁶ In her letter of thanks to the Cardinal, Amalia does indeed promise to 'close her ears to hostile whispers' against the interests of France.¹⁹⁷ Amalia's promise to Richelieu was probably more of a conciliatory gesture rather than one of collusion, and reflects her political savvy as well as her perceived influence. Clearly, Richelieu believed, as did his successor Mazarin who also sent Amalia gifts of jewelry, that the Princess of Orange was in a position to influence matters of state, particularly in regards to diplomatic relations between the two countries. If a friend could be found in Amalia, one would find a powerful ally at the court in The Hague.

¹⁹⁴ *Princely Patrons*, 29. The authors of the catalogue state, "All manner of sources give the impression...that generous gifts had great influence on her."

¹⁹⁵ For a first-hand account of this visit, see La Serre, *Histoire de l'entree de la reine mere du roy tres-chrestien, dans la Grande-Bretagne*, 1639. See also Chapter 1.

¹⁹⁶ Marie de Medici is the 'enemy' implied here. Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives ou correspondance inédite de la Maison d'Orange-Nassau*. (Leide: S. et J. Luchtmans, 1859), 125.

¹⁹⁷ Geest, *Amalia van Solnis en de Nederlandshe Politiek van 1625 tot 1648*, 17; *Princely Patrons*, 29.

Gifts, then, functioned as much more than obsequious gestures. As Jonathan Israel notes in his seminal work on the Dutch Republic, “The...political system, under Frederik Hendrik, was shaped by clientage, favors, courtly connections, and noble status, and characterized by a minimum of open debate.”¹⁹⁸ It was within this atmosphere of strategically constructed relationships and power brokerage that the Deputed States of Utrecht gave their gift to Amalia.

A Gift of Paintings

The first issue to be resolved surrounding the Utrecht gift is to whom, exactly, the paintings were given. The text of the surviving document, the Resolutions of the Deputed States of Utrecht dated April 6, 1627, records the specifics of the gift:

Mr. Cornelis van Poelenburch was summoned and appeared and business was transacted with him over the purchase of a certain piece...And also it was found that other paintings, in addition, one representing all the beasts of the air and earth, made by Mr. Savré [sic.], also two of a shepherded and shepherdess, made by Mr. Paulus Moreelss [sic], so also a courteous letter, delivered to Her Royal Grace, the Princess of Orange, etc., shall be sent to The Hague to decorate Her Royal Grace’s Cabinet. In addition, it has been approved that it will be requested that the well-born lady Dowager of Brederode etc., will be asked to please take the trouble to present the aforementioned paintings to Her Royal Grace, the Princess of Orange etc., according to the previously discussed manner and to make sure that they are handed over properly.¹⁹⁹

Although the resolution states clearly that Amalia was the recipient and that the paintings were intended for ‘Her Royal Grace’s Cabinet,’ this fact has been obscured

¹⁹⁸ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 526.

¹⁹⁹ Rijksarchief Utrecht (RAU), Resolutions of the Deputed States of Utrecht April 6, 1627 (33, inv. no. 264-32). Translation until, ‘...to Her Royal Grace’s Cabinet,’ is taken from Kettering 1983, 1, note 1. For the second half, beginning from, ‘In addition...’ I would like to thank Dr. Henriette de Bruyn-Kops for her assistance with translating the text found in C.H. de Jonge, *Paulus Moreelse : portret- en genreschilder te Utrecht, 1571-1638*. Assen: 1938, 120.

in the art-historical literature relating to the discussion of these paintings. Invariably, scholars state that the gift was given to Amalia *and* Frederik Hendrik, but there is no reference at all to Frederik Hendrik in the resolution.²⁰⁰ This misreading has obfuscated the singular role that Amalia played in the transaction and neglects to recognize her as the sole recipient of the gift.

The character of the paintings, particularly those by Moreelse also indicate that this gift was conceived with Amalia in mind. Although the pastoral subjects of the paintings by Moreelse, Savery and Poelenburch, which thematically relate to the harmony between gods, man and nature, appealed to both the Prince and Princess of Orange, as is evident from the presence of similarly-themed paintings in the 1632 inventory of the Stadhouder's Quarters, Amalia seems to have been especially fond of them. For example, inspired by Moreelse's portrait of *Sophia Hedwig, Countess of Nassau Dietz as Charity with Three of Her Children*, she had her own portrait painted by Honthorst in a similar manner [FIGURES 2.4, 1.8].²⁰¹ Of the five paintings by Moreelse that hung in the Stadhouder's Quarters in 1632, four of them were in Amalia's gallery.²⁰² Three paintings by Savery, an artist whose work she would have seen in Rudolf II's collection in Prague, were also in Amalia's gallery compared with just one in Frederik Hendrik's.²⁰³ Of the three Utrecht artists included in the gift from

²⁰⁰ See those listed in note 177.

²⁰¹ This painting is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

²⁰² D/LS, vol. 1:192, no. 231.

²⁰³ D/LS, vol. 1:183, no. 57 and 192, nos. 236, 237 and 241.

the Deputed States, only Poelenburch's work was represented in greater number in Frederik Hendrik's gallery than in Amalia's gallery.²⁰⁴

A long held theory is that the Deputed States of Utrecht gave the four paintings to Amalia as a present in honor of her marriage to Frederik Hendrik, which was celebrated on April 4, 1625.²⁰⁵ In 1993, Jos de Meyere rejected this theory on the grounds that Frederik Hendrik and Amalia were married in the spring of 1625 while the gift from Utrecht was not presented until two years later.²⁰⁶ Instead, De Meyere suggested that the gift marked the occasion of Amalia's 25th birthday. However, this proposition also poses chronological problems: Amalia's birthday, August 31, was four months *after* the gift was received. Another problematic hypothesis is that the gift was presented to Amalia on the occasion of either the birth (May 27, 1626) or baptism (June 1, 1626) of Willem II.²⁰⁷ Aside from the fact that the

²⁰⁴ Frederik Hendrik's gallery also included a *Banquet of the Gods* by Poelenburch. D/LS, vol. 1:184, no. 71.

²⁰⁵ Abraham Bredius first espoused this theory at the end of the nineteenth century and it was again reiterated by later scholars. *Holländische Malerei in Neuem Licht: Hendrick Ter Brugghen Und Seine Zeitgenossen* (Braunschweig: Utrecht: Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum; Centraal Museum, 1986), 26; Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, 1. Drossaers and Lunsingh Scheurleer note that the paintings were given as a wedding present by the States of Utrecht to Frederik Hendrik and Amalia. D/LS, vol. 1:192, note 231 and 236. Curiously, the distinction is made by Drossaers and Lunsingh Scheurleer that the *Shepherd* and *Shepherdess* by Moreelse and *Banquet of the Gods* by Poelenburch were given to Frederik Hendrik while *The Garden of Eden* by Savery was given to Amalia, even though the aforementioned passage from the Deputed States of Utrecht clearly state that all the paintings were presented to Amalia. D/LS, vol. 1:192, note 231: 'Twee (de Herder en Herderin) van deze stukken werden in 1627 door de Staten van Utrecht aan Frederik Hendrik aangeboden als huwelijksgechenken.' Ibid, note 236: 'Gedateerd 1626 en waarschijnlijk in at jaar door de stad Utrecht aan Amalia van Solms geschonken.' Furthermore, all four paintings are located in Amalia's gallery in the 1632 inventory.

²⁰⁶ De Meyere in Brink et al., *Het gedroomde land pastorale schilderkunst in de Gouden Eeuw*, 23, note 1. Given the nearness in date between Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's wedding anniversary and the Utrecht Gift, I would not rule out the possibility that it was given as an anniversary present. I have not, however, been able to find any indication that gifts were given on that particular occasion.

²⁰⁷ Christiann Kramm as cited in De Meyere in Brink et al., *Het gedroomde land pastorale schilderkunst in de Gouden Eeuw*, 225, note 7.

gift would have been over a year late, all evidence indicates that gifts given on these occasions were made directly to the child and not to the parents.²⁰⁸

Apart from marking a specific occasion, it has also been suggested that the gift was given as a means to engender interest and promote future commissions for Utrecht artists. In her study on Frederik Hendrik's patronage of Honselaarsdijk, Rebecca Tucker hypothesized that the gift functioned as an advertisement of sorts for Utrecht painters.²⁰⁹ However, by 1627, the Prince and Princess of Orange were already active collectors of Utrecht artists. From the inventory done of the couple's possessions in 1632, it is known that Frederik Hendrik's gallery in the Stadhouders' Quarters included a pair of paintings, signed and dated 1624 by Honthorst, that depicted young women playing instruments.²¹⁰ The inventory also lists a painting of a shepherdess by Moreelse that may have already been in Amalia's possession at the time of the Utrecht gift.²¹¹ In addition, in 1625 Frederik Hendrik commissioned Abraham Bloemaert, the pre-eminent Utrecht painter, to paint *Theagenes and Charicleia in the Midst of Murdered Pirates*, a in the following year, *Theagenes*

²⁰⁸ A christening gift or, *pillegift*, would be given by the godparents to the child on the day of the baptism. In a time when infant mortality rates were high, an exception to this custom was the pledge of a gift to be given when it was determined that the child would survive infancy. See Irma Thoen, *Strategic Affection?*, 118. While this could conceivably explain the lag time between Willem II's baptism and the Utrecht gift, the fact remains that the States of Utrecht were not named as godparents for the future Prince of Orange. This honor belonged to the States General who gave the child a pension of 8,000 franks, the States of Holland who gave 5,000 franks, the City of Delft who gave 600 franks and Frederick V, King of Bohemia. See Kleinschmidt 1905, 16. The States of Utrecht did act as godparents to Maria, the last born of Amalia's children. They gave her an annual stipend of 1500 guilders. See Hallema *Amalia van Solms: een lang leven in dienst van haar natie*, 46.

²⁰⁹ Tucker, *The Art of Living Nobly*, 357.

²¹⁰ D/LS, vol. 1:183, nos. 50-51. See also *Princely Patrons*, 143. Though only one painting is signed and dated the authors of the catalogue note this was not unusual in the case of pendants. See p. 143, note 8.

²¹¹ D/LS, vol. 1:192, no.231. See also *Princely Patrons*, 177.

Receives the Palm of Honor from Charicleia.²¹² Other paintings by Moreelse, Savery and Poelenburch listed in the 1632 inventory hung in both Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's galleries, although it is difficult to say when they entered the collection.²¹³ Thus, given the preponderance of Utrecht painters represented in the couple's collection, many of which were certainly already in their possession by 1627, the Utrecht gift should not be viewed as an advertisement for Utrecht artists, but rather as a calculated gift designed to please collectors whose artistic preferences were already known.²¹⁴

Eric Domela Nieuwenhuis believes that the Utrecht gift was presented to Amalia upon the appointment of her husband as Stadhouder of Utrecht.²¹⁵ This hypothesis is the most likely scenario, as Frederik Hendrik was not officially installed as Stadhouder of Utrecht until 1626, precisely when the gift was being organized.²¹⁶ It does not, however, take into account the underlying intent of the gift. As demonstrated above, in a society where gifts were part and parcel of codified

²¹² *Princely Patrons*. cat. Nos. 3 and 2, respectively. *Theagenes and Charicleia in the Midst of Murdered Pirates* is now in the Stiftung Preussische Schlosser und Garten Berlin-Brandenburg, Bildergalerie Potsdam-Sansouci, inv. No. GK I 2531 and *Theagenes Receiving the Palm of Honor from Charicleia* is in The Mauritshuis, The Hague, inv. No. 16. A third painting based on the story of Theagenes and Charicleia, *Theagenes and Charicleia at the Pythian Games* was also commissioned from Bloemaert in 1628. See *Princely Patrons*, 107. One of these three paintings hung over the chimney in Amalia's 'galerije van 't voors. Quartier' although it is impossible to say which one it was. D/LS, vol. 1:209, no. 667. It is equally unclear as to where the other two paintings hung and if they were intended for a specific residence.

²¹³ D/LS, vol. 1: nos. 57, 59, 67, 69, 71, 74, 75, 79, 83, 231, 233, 234, 237, and 241.

²¹⁴ Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, 13.

²¹⁵ Domela Nieuwenhuis in Spicer et al., *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht During the Golden Age* (Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery, 1997), 325. I have not been able to find any indication of similar gifts given by other provinces to either Frederik Hendrik or Amalia.

²¹⁶ Domela Nieuwenhuis in Spicer et al., *Masters of Light*, 431, note 3.

behavior and operated on a system of reciprocity, the Utrecht gift did not come without expectations of a reciprocal act of generosity.²¹⁷

The Deputed States of Utrecht followed the proscribed protocol of gift-giving by offering it through an intermediary, the Dowager Brederode, through whom it also presumably secured permission for the gift.²¹⁸ One of the oldest noble Dutch families, the Brederodes were among the highest-ranking courtiers and, as such, would have enjoyed the company of the Prince and Princess of Orange. The dowager referred to in the Resolution was most likely Margaretha van Daun, Countess of Broek and Valkenstein, widow of Walraven IV van Brederode (d.1620). The Dowager Brederode's role was to present the paintings, along with a 'courteous letter' (*een beleeffde missive*) to Amalia, and to make sure that they were "handed over properly."²¹⁹ That Amalia ultimately accepted the gift is known not only through the presence of the paintings in the 1632 inventory of her gallery, but also because she sent the States of Utrecht a letter of thanks.²²⁰ Thus, the carefully-followed protocol of gift-giving demonstrates that the Deputed States was operating within the contemporary codified system of gift exchange.

²¹⁷ Domela Nieuwenhuis notes that preparations for the gift began in the fall of 1626. Domela Nieuwenhuis in Spicer et al., *Masters of Light*, 431, n. 3.

²¹⁸ RAU, Resolutions of the Deputed States of Utrecht, April 6, 1627 (33, inv. no. 264-32) as reprinted in De Jonge 1938, 120. The identity of the 'dowager of Brederode' is not certain. She may have been Gulielma van Haefen, wife of Walraven III van Brederode (d.1614) or, more likely, Margaretha van Daun, gravin van Broek and Valkestein, wife of Walraven IV (nephew and successor to Walraven III) van Brederode (d.1620). Further biographical information on these women is not readily available. De Meyere mistakenly identifies Margaretha as the widow of Johan Wolferts, Walraven IV's brother. However, Johan Wolferts did not die until 1655. De Meyere in Brink et al., *Het gedroomde land pastorale schilderkunst in de Gouden Eeuw*, 225, note 4.

²¹⁹ RAU, Resolutions of the Deputed States of Utrecht, April 6, 1627 (33, inv. no. 264-32) as reprinted in De Jonge 1938, 120.

²²⁰ Domela Nieuwenhuis in Spicer et al., *Masters of Light*, 225.

Utrecht Politics 1618-1627

But what was the Deputed States of Utrecht hoping to gain from the transaction? To answer that question, it is necessary to understand the composition and the function of this political body. The Deputed States of Utrecht was the executive branch of the provincial government and was responsible for the administration of the province, including the publishing and enforcing of decrees made by the States of Utrecht, controlling finances, and provisioning and oversight of military requirements.²²¹ To further discern the composition of this group as it stood in 1627, it necessary to understand a dispute from 1618 that led to a radical socio-religious and political shift in Utrecht. This event had to do with the autonomous power of the provinces in relation to that of the States General and the stadhouder, specifically, the right of the provinces to maintain *waargelders* (hired soldiers) for their own use.

The roots of this dispute were grounded in an escalating religious conflict between the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants. This ideological battle between the more liberal-minded Remonstrants (also known as Arminians after Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609), the Dutch theologian who rejected the Calvinist tenet

²²¹ *Princely Patrons*, 177, n. 3. Israel 1995, 282. Jonathan Israel uses the term ‘delegated’ in lieu of ‘deputed.’ See Israel 1995, 282, 448 and 814. Also see, George Edmundson, *History of Holland* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1922), 114. “The ordinary executive and administrative work of Provincial government was carried out in Holland by a body known as the Commissioned-Councilors—*Gecommitteerde-Raden*; in the other provinces by Deputed-Estates—*Gedeputeerde-Statens*. The Commissioned-Councilors were to the Estates of Holland what the Council of State was to the States-General. They enjoyed considerable independence, for they were not appointed by the Estates but directly by the nobles and cities according to a fixed system of rotation, and they sat continuously, whereas the Estates only met for short sessions. Their duty was to see that all provincial edicts and ordinances decreed by the Estates were published and enforced, to control the finances and to undertake the provision and oversight of all military requirements; and to them it belonged to summon the meetings of the Estates. The Deputed-Estates in the other provinces had similar but generally less extensive and authoritative functions.”

of Predestination) and the strict Calvinist Counter-Remonstrants was, in reality, a fight for political power. Since 1610 Utrecht had been firmly in Remonstrant hands. In 1617, the Remonstrant *raad*, or council, of Utrecht hired 600 *waargelders* and used them to drive Counter-Remonstrants out of the city militia.²²² Prince Maurits, who had been Stadhouder of Utrecht from 1590 and sympathetic to the Counter-Remonstrant cause, mandated that Utrecht must disband its *waargelders*.²²³ To this end, he entered the city on July 31, 1618 with troops and supervised their disbandment [FIGURE 2.5]. With this act, Utrecht was purged of its Remonstrant leaders all of whom were replaced with Counter-Remonstrants loyal to Maurits.²²⁴ One of the Counter-Remonstrants Maurits installed in the *ridderschap* was Walraven IV van Brederode, late husband of Margaretha van Daun, the Countess of Broek and Valkenstein who presented the gift of paintings to Amalia.²²⁵

Upon Maurits's death in 1625, each province had to elect a new stadhouder. In Utrecht this election provoked discussion about whether to accept Frederik Hendrik under the terms of Maurits's initial 'instructions' of 1590 that maintained provincial authority, or the revised version of 1618, which enhanced the stadhouder's power to regulate city council elections as well as to manipulate the noble and clerical

²²² Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 442.

²²³ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 447.

²²⁴ Maurits removed all Remonstrant members from the Deputed States and installed seven new Counter-Remonstrant members in the *ridderschap*, the estate of the nobility. Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 448; For the three estates in Utrecht see, Spicer et al., *Masters of Light*, 53 and 73–74.

²²⁵ Abraham Aa, *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlande: Bevattende levensbeschrijvingen van zoodanige personen, die zich op eenigerlei wijze in ons vaderland hebben vermaard gemaakt*. (Haarlem: Brederode, 1852), vol. 2-2, 1264.

chambers.²²⁶ The Counter-Remonstrant-dominated city favored the 1618 regulations giving Frederik Hendrik more control in the province while retaining the rights of the *burgemeesters* to call upon the services of the *waargelders*.²²⁷ The majority of the nobles, wanting to maintain control over city council elections, favored the regulations of 1590 that reduced that power of the stadhouder.²²⁸ In the end, the terms agreed upon favored the city's stance more than that of the nobles. Frederik Hendrik took his oath as Stadhouder of Utrecht in his army camp at Waalwijk on June 9, 1625, but was not officially sworn in until November 10, 1626.²²⁹

In 1625, the year of Maurits's death and Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's wedding, the city of Utrecht was still firmly in Counter-Remonstrant control. However, Frederik Hendrik, who in his youth had been tutored by the outspoken Remonstrant Johannes Uttenbogaert, did not share Maurits's support of Counter-Remonstrantism.²³⁰ In early 1626, Frederik Hendrik mandated that the Utrecht city magistrates would no longer be able to call upon the *waargelders* quartered in the city for their own purposes, in this case dispersing Remonstrant gatherings.²³¹ In addition, the British ambassador to The Hague, Sir Dudley Carleton, wrote in December 1626

²²⁶ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 489–490.

²²⁷ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 490; Jonathan Israel, *Empires and Entrepôts: the Dutch, the Spanish monarchy, and the Jews, 1585-1713* (Continuum International Publishing Group, 1990), 79.

²²⁸ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 490.

²²⁹ Poelhekke, *Frederik Hendrik*, 95–96.

²³⁰ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 489.

²³¹ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 492. Frederik Hendrik made this clear the following year when he disallowed the use of troops to such ends in Schoonhoven in April 1627.

that Frederik Hendrik had elected Arminians into the ‘magistracie’ of Utrecht.²³² Carleton was most likely referring to the Remonstrant Jan Florissen Nieuwpoort whom Frederik Hendrik installed as one of two *burgemeesters*, as was his prerogative as stadhouder.²³³ Nieuwpoort thus served as a balance to the other *burgemeester*, Johan van Weede, a staunch Counter-Remonstrant. From 1626-1629 these two men were joint *burgemeesters* of Utrecht and, by rights, also members of the Deputed States.²³⁴ Van Weede, however, had a strong personality and wielded great power over the city and the Deputed States. Israel writes of the situation, “During the fierce religious disputes of 1627-28 in the States of Utrecht, while the Arminian [Remonstrant] cause was backed by the *ridderschap* [nobility].... Johan van Weede rallied the Utrecht, Rhenen and Montfoort *vroedschappen* together with the clergy in support of a hard-line orthodox stand.”²³⁵

Frederik Hendrik’s prohibition on the use of *waargelders* by the Utrecht magistrates to disperse Remonstrant gatherings and his installment of Nieuwpoort as *burgemeester* in 1626, made it clear to Van Weede and his fellow Counter-Remonstrants that the new Stadhouder of Utrecht was more and more inclined towards siding with the Remonstrants and their political counterparts, the Arminians. For the Counter-Remonstrant faction, which had argued for Frederik Hendrik’s

²³² Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 493.

²³³ For the stadhouder’s right to influence *vroedschap* elections see, Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 459.

²³⁴ Poelhekke, *Frederik Hendrik*, 92; Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, 13-14; Sherrin Marshall, *The Dutch Gentry, 1500-1650: Family, Faith, and Fortune* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 157.

²³⁵ Israel, *Empires and Entrepôts*, 81.

appointment to stadhouder under terms that gave him this right, his actions were both insulting and worrisome.²³⁶

The Motive

One reason that Frederik Hendrik had decided to throw his weight behind the Remonstrants and Arminians was probably financial: the Remonstrant/Arminian strongholds generally supported Frederik Hendrik's request for funding military campaigns, while the Counter-Remonstrant provinces, preferring the cheaper option of maintaining a purely defensive stance against the Spanish, invariably rejected his requests.²³⁷ Frederik Hendrik could not accommodate the Counter-Remonstrants without offending his allies whose financial support he needed to continue the war against Spain.²³⁸ However, by appealing to Amalia, the Deputed States avoided putting Frederik Hendrik in an awkward political position while still making its petition heard.

In 1627, feeling its control over Utrecht wane, the Counter-Remonstrant-dominated Deputed States decided to make an overture to the court on the occasion of Frederik Hendrik's official installation as Stadhouder of Utrecht in the hopes of

²³⁶ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 493. The Counter Remonstrants of Utrecht had cause for further alarm in early 1627 when the Stadhouder restored Arminians to positions of power at Nijmegen.

²³⁷ Israel, *Empires and Entrepôts*, 13-14.

²³⁸ The acclaimed poet and playwright, Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679) found himself in a similar situation as the Deputed States, due to his outspokenness on political issues. He wrote countless laudatory poems about Frederik Hendrik and many plays that the Stadhouder enjoyed, yet was never recompensed or officially recognized for his work by Frederik Hendrik. Because Vondel was so unpopular among many strict Calvinists, the Prince of Orange could not risk their displeasure by favoring the poet. See Thoen, *Strategic Affection?*, 181.

retaining some of its influence.²³⁹ The fact that the Deputed States presented Amalia, and not Frederik Hendrik, with the gift of four paintings, indicates that it felt she would be more receptive to the gesture than would be her husband. There are indications that Amalia was somewhat more rigid in her approach to the Protestant faith than Frederik Hendrik at this time in her life. As was discussed in Chapter 1, Amalia kept company with the staunch Counter-Remonstrant minister, André Rivet, and seems to have been, at least early in her life, less comfortable with the overt religious imagery Frederik Hendrik displayed in his gallery in the Stadhouders' Quarters.²⁴⁰ By presenting its gift to the Princess via the widow of one of the staunchest Counter-Remonstrant members of the *ridderschap*, Walraven IV van Brederode, the Deputed States ensured that the pro-Counter-Remonstrant spirit of the gift was understood.

The argument for a Counter-Remonstrant tenor to the gift is also reinforced by the fact that two of the four paintings were by Paulus Moreelse, a well-known Counter-Remonstrant member of the city council (*vroedschappen*). Moreelse was given his life-long seat on the council by Prince Maurits in 1618 for his help in the coup that resulted in the ousting of the more liberal Remonstrant members.²⁴¹ Many of Utrecht's artists were involved in the politics of the day. Joachim Wtewael, for

²³⁹ Frederik Hendrik certainly received other gifts to mark this occasion. The five collegiate churches of Utrecht, under the control of aristocratic and patrician families and thus aligned with the Remonstrant/Arminian cause, gave Frederik Hendrik a work of silver by Adam van Vianen. See Mauritshuis, *Princely Patrons*, 236. Interestingly, the piece by Adam van Vianen was a figure of Maurits on horseback. In the 1632 inventory of the Stadhouders' Quarters, it is listed in Amalia's closet, along with other rare and precious items, which raises the possibility that it was also, in fact, presented to her. See D/LS 1974-1976, vol. 1:194, no. 279.

²⁴⁰ Poelhekke, *Frederik Hendrik*, 350–351. Also see Chapter 1, page 41.

²⁴¹ Moreelse's son, Hendrick later occupied the same post. See De Vries in Spicer et al., *Masters of Light*, 386.

example, also took part in the 1618 coup alongside Moreelse. He and his brother, Johan Wtewael, were likewise rewarded by Maurits with lifetime appointments to the *vroedschaap*.²⁴² Neither of the other two artists involved in the Utrecht Gift - Poelenburch, who was Catholic, nor Roelandt Savery who was probably Calvinist - had such direct links to the political majority. However, Savery's nephew, Hans, who lived with his uncle, was a Calvinist and it is known that Moreelse was a frequent visitor at the Savery household, as was Balthasar van der Ast, another Calvinist painter represented in Amalia's gallery in the Stadhouder's Quarters.²⁴³

Given the strong Counter-Remonstrant associations with the gift, it seems probable that the Deputed States hoped to gain a sympathetic ear to its cause. The Deputed States offered Amalia a gift designed to appeal to her aesthetic taste in the hopes that she would, in return, exert her influence on her husband. Although it is unclear whether Amalia did intercede with Frederik Hendrik on behalf of the Utrecht Counter-Remonstrants, the city council continued to be dominated by Counter-Remonstrants throughout the middle of the century. Johan Wtewael, brother to the painter Joachim and Counter-Remonstrant member of the *vroedschaap*, became *burgemeester* in 1628, replacing the more liberal Nieuwenpoort, and served jointly

²⁴² Spicer et al., *Masters of Light*, 393. As the brothers were not allowed to serve on the council at the same time, Joachim had to wait until his brother's death in 1630 to take up his seat. No paintings by Joachim Wtewael are recorded in any of the inventories from Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's lifetime probably due to the fact that his artistic output was minimal. By 1604, Wtewael abandoned attempts to become a full-time painter and instead turned his energy to trading flax. See Spicer et al., *Masters of Light*, 392.

²⁴³ Spicer et al., *Masters of Light*, 390. The two small still lifes by Balthasar van der Ast are located in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Collection of Mrs. Paul Mellon, 1992.51.1 and 1992.51.2. See figs. 1.32 and 1.33.

with Van Weede.²⁴⁴ Morelsee's son, Hendrik, became a regent, likewise continuing the family tradition of involvement in Utrecht politics.²⁴⁵ Whether or not Amalia played a role in maintaining the political power of the Counter-Remonstrants is not known, but it is evident that she was perceived by the Deputed States of Utrecht as someone who had the capacity to aid it in its power struggle with opposing factions.

Conclusion

Amalia's influential role at the court in The Hague was widely recognized and remarked upon by her contemporaries. The Utrecht Gift of 1627 provides the earliest date for evidence of Amalia's perceived influence at court. The extent to which Frederik Hendrik took her opinions into consideration is not easy to determine, but the perception existed among courtiers and foreign dignitaries that she was in a position to influence matters of state. They eagerly sought to predispose her to their own agendas through lavish gifts worthy of her status and her discerning tastes, since the prescribed mode of gift-giving in the seventeenth-century always anticipated the reciprocation of favors. After Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647, Amalia assumed an even more prominent political role in national and international politics. Gifts continued to be the currency with which her partiality was courted. In his memoirs, Amalia's nephew, Frederic Dohna, writes that after the death of her husband and son, ambassadors from France, Spain, England and Scandinavia could be seen pacing Amalia's antechamber, waiting to be admitted into her presence and all of them

²⁴⁴ Utrechts Archief,
<http://www.hetutrechtsarchief.nl/thema/stadsbestuurders/zoeken/?n=&f=&j=1628&p=>

²⁴⁵ Spicer et al., *Masters of Light*, 58.

bearing gifts which she received, "...openly and in good grace, without meanness or in secret."²⁴⁶

²⁴⁶ Dohna, *Les mémoires du Burgrave et Comte Frédéric de Dohna.*, 28.

Chapter 3: The Allegorical Amalia

Introduction

Sometime between the end of 1629 and the summer of 1630, Amalia sat for a portrait with her two children, Willem II (b. 1626) and Louise Henriette (b. 1627) [FIGURE 1.8]. A third figure, a *putto*, hovers over Amalia's head preparing to crown her with a wreath of flowers. Amalia is seated on a stone bench surrounded by a multitude of blossoms, one of which, a rose, she holds in her left hand. The scene takes place on a fauna-filled terrace overlooking the Stadhouder's Quarters of the Binnenhof, visible in the background. Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's cherished first-born son, Willem II, enters the scene from the left, struggling under the weight of a basket laden with various fruits. Mother and son look directly out at the viewer while Louise Henriette, leaning against Amalia's right knee, looks to her brother as she proffers him the branch of an orange tree. The awkward little cherub who hovers in the sky above Amalia's head most likely symbolizes the unfortunate Henrietta Amalia who was born in October of 1628 and died in December of the same year.

This group portrait was executed by the Gerard van Honthorst, who was the preferred painter at the Stadhouder's court as well as at the exiled Bohemian court in The Hague during the 1630s and 1640s. This allegorical image depicts Amalia simultaneously as a personification of Flora, the goddess of spring and fertility, and Charity, one of three Christian theological virtues.²⁴⁷ The painting is the earliest

²⁴⁷ Marieke Spliethoff has identified this portrait as both Flora as well as Charity. See, *Princely Display* 168 and "De drie oudste kinderen van stadhouder Frederik Hendrik en Amalia van Solms," *Vereniging Rembrandt* (2010): 25.

extant, allegorical image of Amalia, the first in a long line of such images she used to construct, reinforce and otherwise bolster her identity as Princess of Orange.

Throughout her marriage and subsequently during her widowhood, Amalia had her portrait painted numerous times. Honthorst, who was appointed court painter to the House of Orange in 1637, was the most prolific of Amalia's portrait painters. Portraits that he and his workshop made were copied and dispersed as gifts to courtiers and heads of state and functioned as diplomatic currency. Many of these portraits were bust-length, a size that allowed the painting to be hung alongside others of a similar format in *galleries des illustres*, portrait galleries of famous ancient and contemporary men, and sometimes women, that existed in many aristocratic residences.²⁴⁸

This chapter focuses on portraits of Amalia that represent her in the guise of mythological, allegorical and historical figures. While some scholars have considered these paintings individually, they have never been viewed in relation to one another or within the context of Amalia's changing roles: wife, mother and widow. This chapter proposes that Amalia, in consultation with advisors such as Constantijn Huygens and Jacob van Campen, fashioned her social and political identity through the use of mythological, allegorical and historiated portraits. These portraits will be considered in relation to Amalia's (synonymous) marital and political status. They will also be discussed in relation to portraits of contemporary and near-contemporary women in power to gain a better understanding of the way these images functioned in seventeenth-century courtly society.

²⁴⁸ One, still extant example is the *Galerie des Illustres* in Château de Beaurégarde in France. For an illustration see, *Princely Patrons*, 44, fig. 13.

Imagery of Power

The association of a political figure with a historical character was a frequent trope that the European nobility used throughout the seventeenth century.

Renaissance humanists like Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459) espoused the practice of *imitatio* in the visual arts whereby a ruler was compared with ancient *uomini*

famosi.²⁴⁹ These portraits historié or ‘identification portraits,’ are defined by Friedrich

Polleross as, “...the combination of two spheres of reality: that of the past, which is sacral or mythical, and that of the present, which is real and existent.”²⁵⁰ Polleross

goes on to add:

The methodical basis for relating historical and contemporary persons or events is usually analogy, ideally involving a direct, profane typological relationship. Formally, this is most often illustrated by drawing a parallel, in other words by combining the historical and the contemporary figure.²⁵¹

In the United Provinces numerous images linked the Dutch struggle against Catholic Spain with the oppression of the Israelites by the Egyptians. Many Dutch heroes were compared to biblical figures as for example when the Dutch poet Vondel compared Willem I to Moses. Vondel also cast Philip II of Spain in the role of Pharaoh.²⁵² Frederik Hendrik, who was also seen through this biblical lens, was portrayed as David after his victory in the decisive battle of Grol in 1629 [FIGURE

²⁴⁹ See, Christiane L. Joost-Gaugier, “Poggio and Visual Tradition: “Uomini Famosi” in Classical Literary Description,” *Artibus et Historiae* 6, no. 12 (January 1, 1985): 57-74.

²⁵⁰ Friedrich Polleross, “Between Typology and Psychology: The Role of the Identification Portrait in Updating Old Testament Representations,” *Artibus et Historiae* 12, no. 24 (1991): 77.

²⁵¹ Polleross, “Between Typology and Psychology,” 77.

²⁵² James A. Parente, *Religious Drama and the Humanist Tradition: Christian Theater in Germany and in the Netherlands, 1500-1680* (Brill, 1987), 107.

3.1].²⁵³ Analogies with mythological and allegorical figures imbued human sitters with godlike powers and impeccable virtues. For example, Frederik Hendrik's godfather, Henri IV of France, was repeatedly cast in the role of Hercules, Jupiter and Mars, among others.²⁵⁴

Sources on which to base imagery for women were at once more and less complicated than for men. For women, allegorical associations were relatively predictable, in part because Cesare Ripa (c.1560-c.1622) codified the personifications of virtues as feminine in his *Iconologia* (first edition published in 1593). Ripa's book served artists as a kind of manual from which they took attributes associated with a specific allegory and transferred them onto the portrait of a female sitter. Marie de Medici, for example, was portrayed in allegorical guises like Justice, Peace and Minerva throughout her reign, most famously by Peter Paul Rubens **[FIGURES 3.2 and 3.3].**²⁵⁵

Slightly more complicated were the examples of historical women, because while most feminine personifications were above repute, the lives of actual women were often less than perfect. Helpfully, Giovanni Boccaccio (1313-1375) published *De mulieribus claris* (c.1361-62), a collection of biographies of 106 women from classical antiquity and the Bible, which separated virtuous women from wicked ones. Additionally, Christine de Pizan's (1363-c.1430) *Le Livre de la Cité des Dames* of 1406 built upon Boccaccio's examples of virtuous women. In the visual arts, Crispijn

²⁵³ This is the only representation of Frederik Hendrik in an historiated portrait during his lifetime.

²⁵⁴ Françoise Bardon, *Le Portrait Mythologique À La Cour De France Sous Henri IV Et Louis XIII: Mythologie Et Politique* (Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1974), figs. 2a, 8a, 23a, 28a and 48.

²⁵⁵ Bardon, *Le Portrait Mythologique À La Cour De France Sous Henri IV Et Louis XIII*, figs. 34a, 44a and b. Justice and Peace are abstract qualities personified unlike Minerva who is a goddess with allegorical associations.

van de Passe the Elder (c.1564-1637), executed a series of prints in the early seventeenth-century of nine women, the female counterparts to the ‘nine worthies,’ historical and mythological kings and princes.²⁵⁶ These examples of virtuous women provided acceptable models to which contemporary women could be compared. Contemporary women were not usually compared through historiated portraits with an historical woman as was the case with many allegorical portraits. Rather, the qualities a contemporary woman shared with the historical woman were *implied* through visual and textual association. An example of this approach, which will be discussed in greater detail below, is the exemplary widow Artemisia, ancient Queen of Caria, whose dedication to the memory of her husband Mausolus served as a model for other widows. Widowed queens like Catherine and Marie de Medici were compared to the ancient queen in the art and literature of the day, but never portrayed outright as Artemisia.

Whatever forms such feminine imagery took, they operated within a framework of acceptable female roles and the virtues associated with them, as a woman’s position was usually viewed through her relationship to a man: maiden, wife, mother and widow. In the seventeenth-century Netherlands these categories and the virtues associated with them (maiden = chastity, wife = devotion, mother = nurture and widow = piety), were reinforced by Jacob Cats’s publication, *Houwelick (Marriage)*, which codified female behavior for each of these categories for generations of Dutch women. Published in 1625, the same year as Amalia’s marriage

²⁵⁶ The female counterparts to the ‘nine worthies’ were supplied in the fifteenth century by the Frenchman Eustace Deschamps. See, Johan Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (Courier Dover Publications, 1999), 61; Ilja M. Veldman, “Lessons for Ladies: A Selection of Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Dutch Prints,” *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 16, no. 2/3 (January 1, 1986): figs. 13-15.

to Frederik Hendrik, it is not surprising that the allegorical and historicized portraits of Amalia fall into Cats's last three categories.

Flora/Charity

Honthorst's portrait of Amalia as Flora/Charity symbolizes two traits that were desirable in a wife and mother: fertility and altruistic or maternal love.²⁵⁷ The personifications of Flora and Charity are two sides of the iconographical coin: Flora, and her associations with new life, emphasizes fertility while Charity, surrounded by the fruits of her fertility, emphasizes altruistic love. Rather than negating each other, these ideas reinforce one another to present an allegory/personification of all of the qualities associated with each. Both of these readings are applicable to Honthorst's portrait of Amalia and her children. Seen as Charity, Amalia embodies the virtues of motherhood while as Flora she represents the promise of continued fertility, a highly important characteristic in a family set upon maintaining a political dynasty.

Honthorst was influenced in this allegorical portrait by the one Paulus Moreelse (1571-1638) had executed in 1621 [FIGURE 2.4]. Moreelse's portrait of *Sophia Hedwig, wife of Ernst Casimir van Nassau-Dietz, Stadhouder of Friesland, Groningen and Drenthe as Charity*, depicts Sophia Hedwig (1594-1642) seated next to a table surrounded by three of her children while another, younger child is seen in the background in the arms of a nursemaid, both of whom are dressed in

²⁵⁷ The figure of Flora can be interpreted as either *Flora Meretrix*, who is associated with courtesans and sexuality or *Flora Genetrix*, who is associated with fertility and motherhood. The latter is represented in Honthorst's portrait of Amalia. See Julius Held, "Flora, Goddess and Courtesan," in Millard Meiss et al., *Essays in honor of Erwin Panofsky* (New York: New York University Press, 1961), 201-217.

contemporary clothing [FIGURE 3.4].²⁵⁸ Sophia Hedwig wears a kind of quasi-Oriental headdress while the two oldest children next to her are dressed *all' antica*, wearing Roman-inspired cuirasses.²⁵⁹ Sophia Hedwig's right breast is bared and she presses against it with the fingers of her left hand. This seemingly incongruous element in a family portrait of a prominent Dutch family indicates that this is no ordinary portrait, but an allegorical one.²⁶⁰ One bared breast was an established iconographic cue to indicate that the figure is allegorically associated with Charity, who is usually also portrayed as a woman surrounded by two or more children, and the type of altruistic love that Charity embodied [FIGURE 3.5].

While Honthorst's portrait of Amalia does not use a bared breast as an iconographic indicator of allegory, it does make use of a pseudo-historicized costume to set the protagonists apart from everyday life. Outmoded, classical, Oriental or otherwise fantastical costume was a device used by artists to distance the sitter from the quotidian world and transform a recognizable visage into an allegorical image.²⁶¹ Like Sophia Hedwig and her children who wear exotic and classical-inspired clothing, Amalia wears a gown with an old-fashioned, sixteenth-century bodice with slashed sleeves, indicating the 'timelessness' of the image.²⁶²

²⁵⁸ A no longer extant portrait of Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia as Flora by Honthorst is also a possible precedent. See, Alison McNeil Kettering, "Rembrandt's 'Flute Player': A Unique Treatment of Pastoral," *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 9, no. 1 (January 1, 1977): 26, n. 29.

²⁵⁹ For more on the costumes in this portrait see, Emilie E. S. Gordenker, "The Rhetoric of Dress in Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Portraiture," *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 57 (January 1, 1999): 91.

²⁶⁰ Gordenker, "The Rhetoric of Dress in Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Portraiture."

²⁶¹ Marieke Winkel, *Fashion and Fancy: Dress and Meaning in Rembrandt's Paintings* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 194.

²⁶² Winkel, *Fashion and Fancy*, 218-219.

Additionally, the costume of Willem II is toga-like while that of Louise Henriette is similarly antique-looking.

The iconographic ambiguity of Amalia's covered torso allows the image to be simultaneously interpreted as Flora, the ancient goddess of spring and fertility. Most famously depicted in seventeenth-century Dutch art by Rembrandt during the 1630s, Flora is usually portrayed with an abundance of flowers that signify her association with fertility and the season of spring [FIGURE 3.6]. Alison McNeil Kettering's description of what defines Rembrandt's paintings specifically as representations of Flora rather than an anonymous shepherdess, can likewise be applied to Honthorst's portrait of Amalia:

Rather than alluding to the goddess by just a flower or two, Rembrandt has showered the figures with an elegant profusion of blossoms and surrounded them with a luxuriant garden.²⁶³

The fertility of Flora, as symbolized by the abundance of flowers in Honthorst's portrait, and the association of Amalia with the goddess is an important element in this painting. Not only is Amalia's proven fertility, represented by the presence of her children, emphasized in this image but her *continued* fertility is also alluded to by associating her with the goddess Flora. As Barbara Gaehtgens has observed, Amalia's ability to ensure the Orange succession was of prime importance to her role as the wife of the Stadhouder.²⁶⁴ Honthorst most likely painted this image towards the end of 1629 or early 1630. Willem II, born in 1627, looks closer to three years of age than to two and certainly older than he appears in the 1629 portrait that

²⁶³ Kettering, "Rembrandt's 'Flute Player'," 26; Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, 58–62.

²⁶⁴ Barbara Gaehtgens, "Amalia van Solms und die oranische Kunstpolitik," in *Onder Den Oranje Boom: Niederländische Kunst Und Kultur Im 17. Und 18. Jahrhundert an Deutschen Fürstenthöfen* (München: Hirmer, 1999), 272.

Honthorst painted of him and his sisters [FIGURE 1.30]. Louise Henriette, too, looks older in the portrait with her mother while Henrietta Amalia, just two months-old at the time of her death, appears about the same age in each painting, forever immortalized as a cherubic memory. Amalia's fourth child, Elisabeth, was born in August of 1630 and it is possible that the Princess of Orange might have been expecting when this portrait was painted.²⁶⁵ The realized or expected promise of new (hopefully male) life after the tragic loss of Henrietta Amalia meant joy not only for the parents, but also for the nation as the Orange dynasty was, potentially, further secured.

Contemporary elements in Honthorst's allegorical portrait anchor the figures in the real world, much as the presence of the nursemaid dressed in contemporary clothing does in Moreelse's portrait of Sophia Hedwig. In Amalia's portrait, one sees the west wing of the Binnenhof and the Mauritstoren that formed the Stadhouder's Quarters.²⁶⁶ As official residence of the Stadhouder and the seat of the States General, the Binnenhof was at the political heart of the Dutch Republic. Thus, despite being 'disguised' in allegorical fashion, the identity of the sitters is made explicit through their juxtaposition with the Binnenhof.

Amalia is frequently depicted in conjunction with the west wing of the Binnenhof and Mauritstoren in prints of the late 1620s [FIGURES 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9].

As Gaetgens has noted, Amalia's appearance in these political prints can be

²⁶⁵ Unfortunately, Elisabeth died the very same day she was born but Amalia would go on to have five more children, three of whom, all daughters, lived to adulthood.

²⁶⁶ Despite its inaccurate representation in the painting (the Mauritstoren does not, in reality, extend beyond the façade of the west wing), there can be no doubt that the building pictured is meant to portray the Mauritstoren, crowned with the distinctive balustrade that is still evident today.

explained by her importance to the survival of the Orange line.²⁶⁷ However, the juxtaposition of Amalia with the building that housed both the Stadhouder's Quarters and the States General in these images also signifies her authoritative position as head of the court while the Stadhouder was absent from The Hague.²⁶⁸ As discussed in Chapter 2, even though Amalia had no official political authority, she nevertheless wielded significant power and influence. The association of architecture with socio-political power was made explicit elsewhere in the couple's collection. In a series of portraits that hung first at Huis ter Nieuwberg at Rijswijk and, later, at Honselaarsdijk, images of palaces such as Fontainebleau, the Escorial and Windsor Castle hung directly beneath the portraits of their respective owners.²⁶⁹

Honthorst's portrait of Amalia as Flora/Charity operates on various iconographic levels, woven together to celebrate her faceted role as Princess of Orange. Not only does the portrait allude to her role as mother, it also serves to highlight Amalia's social and political function. As such, this portrait stands as one of the earliest pieces of visual evidence of Amalia's association with the political realm, an association that grew stronger throughout her marriage and widowhood.

²⁶⁷ Gaehtgens, "Amalia van Solms und die oranische Kunstpolitik," 272. Gaehtgens also notes the importance of the entirety of the family shown in these prints, which was in direct opposition to 'bourgeois representations of republican officials' where the family of the official played no role.

²⁶⁸ Hallema, *Amalia van Solms: Een Lang Leven in Dienst van Haar Natie*, 16–17. Tucker, "The Art of Living Nobly," 207. Frederik Hendrik gave Amalia the use of his mother's rooms in the Oude Hof in which to hold court while he was away. Interestingly, it is not the Oude Hof, the private residence of the couple that is depicted in the prints and Honthorst's painting but the Binnenhof, the official residence of the Prince and Princess. This suggests a political implication to the pairing of Amalia and the building, rather than a purely social one.

²⁶⁹ Tucker, "The Art of Living Nobly," 206–208; D/LS, vol. 1:470, nos. 422 and 423; Slothouwer, *De paleizen van Frederik Hendrik*, 79. Slothouwer notes that these paintings were executed by Frans Post. See also, H. H. Heldring, 'De Portretten gallerijen op het huis Ter Nieuburch te Rijswijk,' *Jaaboek Die Haghe* 1967, 66-71.

Diana

Images of Diana, most of which Honthorst and his studio painted, were popular both at the Stadhouder's court and the Bohemian court in The Hague. In 1627, Frederik Hendrik commissioned Honthorst to paint two images of Diana for mantelpieces at Honselaarsdijk.²⁷⁰ Around the same time, Honthorst executed *Diana Resting with Shepherdesses and Two Greyhounds* (c. 1627- 1632) for the mantle in Frederik Hendrik's gallery in the Stadhouder's Quarters [FIGURE 3.10].²⁷¹ Having one's portrait painted as Diana was fashionable among the women at court and sitters depicted in this guise included Amalia, her sister Louise Christine and the Princess Palatinate, Louise Hollandine [FIGURES 3.11, 3.12 and 3.13].²⁷² The King and Queen of Bohemia also employed Honthorst to paint imagery of Diana that incorporated portraits of their children. For example, Honthorst depicted the young Elizabeth as the goddess in a half-length portrait as well as in a group portrait with her brothers [FIGURES 3.14 and 1.7].

Diana imagery was a subset of the larger genre of pastoral painting that, as Alison McNeil Kettering has demonstrated, carried associations of the aristocratic

²⁷⁰ Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656*, 114–115, cats. 108 and 109. Both of these paintings are lost although a photograph of *Diana on the Hunt* (cat. 109) survives. The latter painting has, not entirely convincingly, been interpreted as a portrait of Amalia. See, E. De Jongh, *Portretten van echt en trouw* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1986), 77. See also, Sarah Crawford-Parker, *Refashioning Female Identity: Women's Roles in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Historiated Portraits*, 2006, 50.

²⁷¹ The portrait-like quality of the faces in this painting raises the possibility that the figures depicted specific women of the court. While it is tempting to see Amalia portrayed here as Diana, comparisons of this image with known portraits of the Princess do not support this conclusion. Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656*, 113–114, cat. 107.

²⁷² Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656*, cats. 310, 365 and 456; For more on Dutch women portrayed as Diana see, Rose Wishnevsky, *Studien zum "portrait historié" in den Niederlanden* (Bamberg: Rodenbusch, 1967).

and noble lifestyle in the seventeenth-century Netherlands.²⁷³ Pastoral portraiture, whereby a sitter was portrayed as a shepherd/shepherdess or as a character from one of the pastoral plays popular at the time, intimated that the upper-class associations of love and leisure applied directly to the sitter. Often portrayed in half-length, the sitter is usually dressed in a straw hat and/or holds a shepherdesses crook. This type of pastoral portraiture is reflected in Crispijn van de Passe the Younger's 1640 publication *Les Vrais Pourtraits de Quelques Unes des Plus Grandes Dames de la Chrestienté, Desguisée en Bergères* [sic]. This book, a collection of prints of female portraits showing the subjects dressed as shepherdesses, not only reflected the popularity of this type of imagery but did much to contribute to it.²⁷⁴ Three categories of women are represented: queens and princesses, noble women and bourgeois women. Amalia, represented in the first category alongside other nobles such as Elisabeth Stuart, is depicted in half-length wearing a crown and a diaphanous veil and holding a shepherdess' crook in her left hand and a branch of an orange tree in her right [FIGURE 3.15].

Like these more generalized pastoral portraits, portraits of women as Diana imbued the sitter with the goddess' qualities of nobility and chastity. Diana was an appropriate subject for noble women, who actively participated in hunting. Amalia, like her former mistress Elisabeth Stuart, often participated in the hunt with male members of the court.²⁷⁵ Pictorial evidence of this activity is captured in an image

²⁷³ Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, 69-70.

²⁷⁴ Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, 75.

²⁷⁵ *Princely Display*, 44.

from Adriaen van de Vennne's album of drawings given to Frederik Hendrik by the King of Bohemia [FIGURE 3.16]. Amalia's portrayal as Diana in the half-length portrait in Dessau-Wörlitz [FIGURE 3.11], as well as in a now-lost double portrait with her sister, Louise Christine, not only reflects her engagement with the sport but also imbues her with the goddess' qualities.

Amalia's association with Diana was a recurring one in contrast to her isolated representation as Flora/Charity. She was frequently associated with the goddess, particularly at the palace at Honselaarsdijk. This palace was the 'hunting-lodge' of the Prince and Princess of Orange. As was fitting, the painted decoration of the interior reflected the function of the building that was dedicated to the pleasures of country living and that most noble of leisurely activities, the hunt. Hunting was a pastime that was reserved for the nobility, much as it was in the rest of Europe, and as stadhouder, Frederik Hendrik held the titles Master of the Hunt, Lord High Falconer, and Great Forester of Holland.²⁷⁶ At Honselaarsdijk, imagery of Diana, Queen of the Hunt, reigned supreme.²⁷⁷ This imagery functioned not only to reflect the purpose of the palace as a hunting-lodge but also to impress upon visitors the noble status of its owners, particularly Amalia.

Influenced by the French architecture he had seen during his 1597-1599 trip to France, Frederik Hendrik had Honselaarsdijk built with a main wing at the front and two lateral wings connected by a gallery at the back, which were erected between

²⁷⁶ *Princely Display*, 45.

²⁷⁷ For Diana portraits related to the theme of the hunt, see Friedrich Polleross, "Erogetzliche Lust der Diana; Jagd, Maskerade, und Portrait," *Wolfenbuttel Arbeiten zur Barockforschung* 28, (1997): 795-820.

1621 and 1631.²⁷⁸ The interior décor, particularly in the Great Hall where numerous paintings of Diana hung, was likewise influenced by French noble residences, specifically the palace at Fontainebleau. Frederik Hendrik knew Fontainebleau first-hand and appears to have been particularly influenced by the imagery displayed in the *Galerie de Diane* (c.1600-1610) where allegorical representations of King Henri IV and Queen Marie de Medici as Apollo and Diana adorned the walls. While Frederik Hendrik did employ the French architect Simon de la Vallée at Honselaarsdijk from 1633-1637, and who was most likely responsible for the construction of the Great Hall, the Dutch painter and architect Jacob van Campen was responsible for the decoration of the hall beginning in 1635.²⁷⁹

The Great Hall was the most important and most public space in the building and was used for official banquets and receptions. Over the mantle hung *The Crowning of Diana* (c.1625) by Rubens and Frans Snyders (1579-1657) [FIGURE 3.17].²⁸⁰ Another large painting of Diana by Van Campen hung at the opposite end of the hall and the theme was rounded out by a painting of Diana and her nymphs hunting by Christiaan van Couwenburgh as well as one of Diana ‘falconing,’ by Paulus Bor, each flanking the main entrance to the hall.²⁸¹

²⁷⁸ Slothouwer, *De Paleizen van Frederik Hendrik*, 366-377; *Princely Patrons*, 40.

²⁷⁹ *Princely Display*, 113; Tucker, “The Art of Living Nobly,” 175. Simon’s father, Martin, had worked on the Palais Luxembourg in Paris for Marie de Medici. Slothouwer, *De Paleizen van Frederik Hendrik*, 366-377.

²⁸⁰ D/LS, vol. 1:525, no. 82. This painting may have been in the Stadhouder’s possession long before it hung in Honselaarsdijk’s Great Hall.

²⁸¹ None of these paintings survive nor are their precise dates known but Van Couwenbergh and Bor were paid for their work in 1638. D/LS, vol. 1:525, nos. 85, 83 and 84, respectively.

The association with the imagery in the Great Hall is, at first glance, not obviously connected with Amalia. Elsewhere in the palace, however, there existed a double portrait of Amalia and her sister Louise Christina, Countess of Brederode as Diana and her nymph done *naer 't leven* (after life) by Honthorst.²⁸² It hung in the place of honor over the mantle in a room that was later the audience chamber of Mary Stuart II (1662-1694), wife of Willem III. As it is recorded being done ‘after life’ by Honthorst, it can be inferred that this portrait was executed during Amalia’s lifetime, most likely in the early 1630s and probably resembled another double portrait by Honthorst of *Amalia van Solms and Charlotte de la Tremoille* executed in 1633 [FIGURE 3.18].

Barbara Gaehtgens convincingly argues that the image of Amalia and her sister as the goddess and a nymph ‘personalized’ the Diana theme throughout Honselaarsdijk and visitors would have subsequently connected other images of Diana in the palace with Amalia.²⁸³ This hypothesis is strengthened when one considers that the subject of Paulus Bor’s painting of Diana falconing may have been chosen to reflect Amalia’s participation in this specific form of hunting.²⁸⁴ However, it is not the hunt itself that is the focus of the imagery in the Great Hall at Honselaarsdijk but rather the associations of nobility that it carried. Gaehtgens links

²⁸² D/LS, vol. 1:Vol. 2, 512, no. 216. “Voor de schoorsteen eerstelijk verthoont de gravinne Amalia van Solms (gemalin van prins Fred. Hendr.) in de gedaente der jaghtgodinne Diana, benevens hare zuster de gravinne van Brederode in de gedaente eener jaghtnimph te rusten, vergeselt door liefdewighjes welke allerley smakelijke vrugten ter verkwikking aanprezen-teeren, konstig geschildert na ‘t leven door G. Hondhorst [sic].”

²⁸³ Gaehtgens, "Amalia van Solms und die oranische Kunstpolitik," 277; Also see Spliethoff in *Princely Display*, 171; and Buvelot in *Jacob van Campen*, 127.

²⁸⁴ In his memoirs, Willem Frederik records hunting herons with Amalia using falcons. As cited in, *Princely Display*, 45.

this imagery with the *mythologie de la royauté*, the conflation of a ruler's image or persona with a god or goddess. In her study on myth and royalty during the reigns of Henri IV and Louis XIII, Françoise Bardon defines the resulting images as, "...le rapport dialectique de l'événement, de l'idéologie et de la représentation."²⁸⁵ The artistic expression of this concept reached its apogee at Fontainebleau, particularly in the *Galerie de Diane* where imagery of Diana and Apollo was equated with the reign of Henri IV and Marie de Medici.²⁸⁶ Since this imagery was associated with the king and queen, it seems likely that the imagery at Honselaarsdijk was similarly associated with Frederik Hendrik and Amalia.

In the *Galerie de Diane*, Marie de Medici was represented as Diana in a painting that hung over one of the two chimney pieces. While Bardon cautions against reading too much into an image that no longer exists, first-hand descriptions leave no doubt as to the composition, which has been preserved in a contemporary drawing [FIGURE 3.19].²⁸⁷ Bardon interprets this image of Marie as the beginning of a new kind of imagery, one in which the mythological figure becomes a sign of royal power. Gaetgens applies this interpretation to *The Crowning of Diana* by Rubens and Snyders at Honselaarsdijk, saying that this image, "...could have no other purpose than to crown the influential lady of the house and powerful companion at the Stadhouder's side with the Olympic goddess's distinction."²⁸⁸ While not a

²⁸⁵ Bardon, *Le Portrait Mythologique À La Cour De France Sous Henri IV Et Louis XIII*, 217.

²⁸⁶ Bardon, *Le Portrait Mythologique À La Cour De France Sous Henri IV Et Louis XIII*, 74-77.

²⁸⁷ Bardon, *Le Portrait Mythologique À La Cour De France Sous Henri IV Et Louis XIII*, 76.

²⁸⁸ Gaetgens, "Amalia van Solms und die oranische Kunstpolitik," 277. My thanks to Laura Sheldon for her help in translating this article.

specific portrait of Amalia as Diana, viewers would have associated this imagery with Amalia, particularly as she was represented as Diana in Honthorst's double portrait of her and Charlotte de la Tremoille.

The Great Hall should not, however, be seen as a space that promoted Amalia above her husband. As Rebecca Tucker has argued in her study of Honselaarsdijk, the frieze-like painting by Pieter de Grebber and Paulus Bor that ran around the perimeter of the ceiling in the Great Hall, addresses issues of status and noble behavior.²⁸⁹ Known today only through the preparatory drawings for the painting, the composition consists of a *trompe l'oeil* balustrade behind which stand figures from all corners of the globe. Often described as a banqueting scene, Tucker points to the lack of food and drink in this scene and convincingly demonstrates that the figures on the west and east walls form processions that head in the direction of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's apartments, respectively. Interpreting the woman seen in profile on the east wall as representative of Amalia [FIGURE 3.20] and the swashbuckler on the west wall as Frederik Hendrik's alter-ego, Tucker states:

In the midst of the merry making above, then, we find a complex narrative celebrating not only Diana's rule and the pleasures of nature and the hunt, but emphasizing the noble stature and respect paid to the Prince, and the harmonious relationship of the husband and the wife of the house.²⁹⁰

Although it is not possible to determine the extent of Amalia's involvement in the decoration of the Great Hall, Amalia certainly had input in the decoration of her own apartments at Honselaarsdijk, where the series of paintings of c. 1635 based on

²⁸⁹ Tucker, "The art of living nobly," 183.

²⁹⁰ Tucker, "The art of living nobly," 184.

the popular pastoral play *Il Pastor Fido* adorned the walls, a subject suggested to her by Constantijn Huygens.²⁹¹ The theme of love and romance set in Arcadia depicted in these images serve to underscore the harmonious relationship between husband and wife that was similarly expressed in De Grebber and Bor's painting in the Great Hall. Personalizing this theme even more is the presence of Amalia herself in one of the paintings from the *Pastor Fido* Series. In Cornelis van Poelenburch's painting, *Amaryllis Crowning Mirtillo*, Amalia appears in profile as a witness to the crowning of the hero of the story [FIGURE 3.21].²⁹²

The Diana imagery found at Honselaarsdijk in the mid-1630s reinforced the nobility of Amalia's public persona as wife of the Prince of Orange much the same way her social and political roles were visualized in her portrait as Flora/Charity by Honthorst as well as in prints of the late 1620s. Amalia's use of visual rhetoric to claim and maintain her position not only within the House of Orange, but also more broadly within the European political power elite, reached its peak after the death of her husband in 1647 when she commissioned her most ambitious project, the Oranjezaal in the Huis ten Bosch.

Widowhood

After the death of Frederik Hendrik in 1647, Willem II succeeded his father as Stadhouder and Prince of Orange. Amalia slipped quickly into her new role as Princess Dowager and redecoreated her living spaces at the Oude Hof and the Huis ten

²⁹¹ See Chapter 1, Part III.

²⁹² *Princely Patrons*, 223.

Bosch in the colors of mourning. Amalia's new role, as she saw it, was to preserve the memory of her husband and to this end she commissioned the decorative program of paintings in the Oranjezaal. The relationship between Amalia and her son was rife with conflict as was her relationship with her daughter-in-law, Mary Stuart. Willem II, yearning for glory on the battlefield, wanted to resume the war with Spain and this desire put him at odds with Amalia who favored ending the conflict at the Peace of Münster in 1648.²⁹³ Mary, daughter of King Charles I of England, who considered her marriage to Willem II beneath her rank, had a particularly difficult relationship with her mother-in-law in part because Amalia had once been in the employ of her aunt, Elizabeth Stuart.²⁹⁴

The political situation in the Netherlands changed radically in 1650 when Willem II died unexpectedly from smallpox. His son, Willem III, was born just a week later. As discussed below, Amalia and Mary quarreled fiercely over which one of them would be the infant's guardian. Amalia undoubtedly viewed guardianship of Willem III as a way to reinsert herself into the political arena as well as an opportunity to control the future of the House of Orange. Both Amalia and Mary, however, were to be thwarted when in 1654 the Grand Pensionary, Johan de Witt, persuaded the States of Holland to sign the Act of Seclusion, effectively barring Willem III from the Stadhoudership. Amalia's last artistic commissions must be viewed against the backdrop of these events.

²⁹³ Troost, *William III the Stadholder-king*, 12.

²⁹⁴ Troost, *William III the Stadholder-king*, 13.

Artemisia

The association of widowed queens of Europe with the conflated story of two ancient queens named Artemisia was thoroughly entrenched by the time Amalia entered into her own widowhood. The stories of the two Artemisias (I, c. 480 BCE; II d. 350 BCE), both Queens of Caria, were first fused together in the fourteenth century by Giovanni Boccaccio in his *De mulieribus claris* and formed a popular visual topos for widowed rulers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.²⁹⁵ As Barbara Gaetgens and Shelia ffolliott have demonstrated, the history and deeds of Artemisia were appropriated by sixteenth and seventeenth-century queens and princesses like Catherine de' Medici, Marie de' Medici, Anne of Austria and Amalia van Solms to associate their own virtuous widowhoods with the ancient queens.²⁹⁶ The story most often associated with Artemisia was that of Artemisia II, wife and sister of Mausolus, the fourth-century B.C. satrap of Caria, who was admired for her dedication to her husband's memory after his death. She erected a monument in his honor, the eponymous Mausoleum, and imbibed his ashes in order that her own body might serve as a living shrine to the memory of her husband. The story of Artemisia I, who, according to Herodotus, served as regent for her young son Lygdamis, also resonated with Catherine and Marie de Medici, Anne of Austria and Amalia van Solms since they were all guardians for young princes.²⁹⁷

²⁹⁵ Giovanni Boccaccio and Virginia Brown, *Famous women* (Harvard University Press, 2003).

²⁹⁶ Gaetgens, "L'Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine," 16; ffolliott, "Casting a Rival into the Shade," 138.

²⁹⁷ Herodotus and Alfred Denis Godley, *Herodotus* (Harvard University Press, 1922), 401.

Amalia was not the first widow in The Hague to align herself with Artemisia. Both Louise de Coligny and Elizabeth Stuart owned scenes of Artemisia preparing to drink the ashes of her husband. Louise de Coligny's painting of Artemisia preparing to drink the ashes of her deceased husband, which Peter Paul Rubens executed in 1612, hung over the mantelpiece in her cabinet in the Oude Hof [FIGURE 3.22].²⁹⁸ Given that Louise was a frequent visitor to Fontainebleau, where a cycle of tapestries based on the conflated histories of Artemisia hung in Marie de Medici's apartments, she would have been familiar with the use of this subject to extol the virtuous widow.²⁹⁹

Elizabeth Stuart also owned a painting, by Gerard van Honthorst, depicting the same moment in the story of Artemisia [FIGURE 3.23]. Executed in the mid 1630s, this painting eventually ended up in Amalia's possession and hung in the apartments of the Huis ten Bosch. Despite the absence of documentary evidence, Barbara Gaehtgens has convincingly argued that Elizabeth Stuart most likely commissioned this painting of the exemplary widow Artemisia after her husband Frederick IV died in 1632.³⁰⁰ Although listed as a chimneypiece in the 1654-1668 inventory of the Huis ten Bosch, the style of the painting dates it to around 1630-35, well before the construction of the palace and Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647.³⁰¹ Subsequently, upon the death of the Stadhouder in 1647, Elizabeth gifted the painting

²⁹⁸ D/LS, vol. 1: 203, no. 516. "Een schilderije staende voor de schoorsteen, d'istorij van Artemise, door Rubbens van Antwerpen gedaen."

²⁹⁹ It is not clear where the painting was hung during Amalia's lifetime as it does not appear again in the inventories until the 1712 inventory of Het Loo. See, *Princely Patrons*, 198.

³⁰⁰ Gaehtgens, "L'Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine." 18.

³⁰¹ Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656*, 192, no. 97.

to Amalia in a gesture of consolation. Amalia, in turn, specified that the measurements of the mantelpiece in the audience chamber of the western apartment of the Huis ten Bosch accommodate this work.³⁰²

The conflated story of the two ancient Queens of Caria into one exemplum of a widow and regent was first used as a model for a contemporary queen in the late sixteenth century. In 1562, the Frenchman Nicolas Houel wrote *L'histoire de la Royne Arthémise* for Catherine de Medici. Widowed in 1559 and regent for the ten year-old Charles IX, Catherine's life held many parallels with the mythologized Artemisia.³⁰³ To accompany his text, Houel commissioned the artist Antoine Caron (1521-1599) to illustrate the history of Artemisia and suggested that Catherine use the drawings for tapestry cartoons.³⁰⁴ It appears that the Queen never followed Houel's advice since no such tapestries were ever made during her lifetime.³⁰⁵ However, upon Henri IV's ascension to the French throne in 1589, he used Caron's drawings to create a series of tapestries about Artemisia. Henri IV did not have the entire cycle woven but rather chose specific scenes to convey those portions of the Artemisia

³⁰² The measurements of the both the painting and the mantelpiece are exactly the same. *Princely Patrons*, 152; Gaehtgens, "L'Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine," 22. Gaehtgens notes further that the image probably did not resonate anymore with Elizabeth Stuart whose son had by this time, reclaimed part of his rightful inheritance.

³⁰³ In referring from this point on to 'Artemisia' I mean to imply the history of both ancient Queens as it was understood as one story in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

³⁰⁴ For Caron's drawings see, Jean Ehrmann, *Antoine Caron : peintre des fêtes et des massacres* (Paris: Flammarion, 1986); *Women in Power: Caterina and Maria De' Medici: The Return to Florence of Two Queens of France* (Firenze: Mandragora, 2008).

³⁰⁵ Margaret Ferguson, *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 231.

story that he wished to emphasize, namely the education of the young prince as well as allusions to regal power.³⁰⁶

Henri IV commissioned the Artemisia scenes for his wife, Marie de Medici, from his newly created Parisian tapestry workshops and they hung in ‘la chambre de la reine’ at Fontainebleau.³⁰⁷ The tapestries included horizontal scenes representing the education of Artemisia’s son, Lygdamis, as well as vertical *entre-fenêtres* depicting a procession, scenes inspired by Caron’s drawings of Mausolus’s funerary procession [FIGURE 3.24].³⁰⁸ After the death of Henri IV, Marie continued her late husband’s patronage of this series. As a widow these scenes took on an added meaning for her, and she incorporated the story of Artemisia into the ‘vast iconography’ associated with her own widowhood.³⁰⁹ That the theme of the virtuous widow was re-associated with these tapestries during Marie’s regency is corroborated by the fact that both her daughter, Henriette Maria (widowed 1649), and her daughter-in-law, Anne of Austria (Regent of France 1643-1651), were also visually associated with Artemisia during their own widowhoods and regencies thus promulgating the comparison between contemporary female queens and their ancient predecessors.³¹⁰

³⁰⁶ *Women in Power*, 103.

³⁰⁷ Bardon, *Le Portrait Mythologique À La Cour De France Sous Henri IV Et Louis XIII*, 72.

³⁰⁸ For a detailed discussion of Caron’s influence on the later tapestries see, *Women in Power*, 140.

³⁰⁹ Gaehtgens, “L’Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine,” 17.

³¹⁰ Henrietta Maria had seven tapestries from the Artemisia cycle at her ‘widow’s palace’ in Paris and Anne of Austria inherited the tapestries made for Marie. Anne’s portrait was also the frontispiece for a book of *Femmes Fortes* which included Artemisia. Gaehtgens, “L’Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine,” 17; *Die Galerie der starken Frauen = La Galerie des Femmes Fortes: die Heldin in der französischen und italienischen Kunst des 17. Jahrhunderts* (München: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1995), 170, fig. 55.

Amalia consciously tapped into these examples when she created the iconography of her own widowhood, probably in consultation with Constantijn Huygens.³¹¹ A concerted effort to portray Amalia as ‘another Artemisia’ is evidenced not only by Huygens’s own words but also by the architect of the Huis ten Bosch, Pieter Post, and at least one of the painters involved in the Oranjezaal decorative ensemble, Jacob Jordaens. In 1655, Huygens alluded to Amalia as Artemisia when he called the Oranjezaal, “...this mausoleum that, I believe, surpasses many other illustrious projects encountered in the grandest courts in Christendom.”³¹² The other ‘illustrious projects’ that Huygens had in mind were probably Rubens’s Medici cycle (1622-1625) for the Luxembourg palace and the Flemish master’s painted ceiling at the Banqueting Hall in Whitehall (1635-1636). Pieter Post made a similar allusion in his dedication to the 1655 edition of *De Sael van Oranje*, a collection of 22 prints of the Huis ten Bosch, when he writes to Amalia’s daughter, Louise Henriette, that her mother was ‘een andere Artemisia,’ (‘another Artemisia’).³¹³

The idea of the Oranjezaal as a mausoleum was fundamental to its character from the moment the space was reconceptualized as a memorial to the memory of Frederik Hendrik after his death. In 1651, during the ongoing decoration of the Oranjezaal, Jacob Jordaens wrote to Constantijn Huygens, “...this is a great piece of

³¹¹ Gaehtgens, “L’Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine,” 21.

³¹² Gaehtgens, “L’Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine,” 21. Translation mine. Gaehtgens further states, “This allusion to the Mausoleum seems to equate, not without pride, the Oranjezaal to a new wonder of the world.” Translation mine.

³¹³ Th.H. Lunsingh Scheurleer, “De Woonvertrekken in Amalia’s Huis in het Bosch,” *Oud Holland*, 84, 1969. 29 and 58. This was first noted by Peter Raupp 1980.

work that Her Highness has fashioned into a second Mausoleum.”³¹⁴ Jordaens’s letter expressly intimates that Amalia helped conceive of the Oranjezaal as a mausoleum. The references made by Post, Huygens and Jordaens, all of whom were intimately involved in the Huis ten Bosch project, underlie the pervasive theme that the Oranjezaal was to be a new mausoleum erected to honor the memory of their very own Mausolus. This agenda necessarily and purposefully cast Amalia in the role of Artemisia as keeper and defender of her husband’s memory. Thus, Amalia and her advisors consciously adapted the Artemisia iconography employed by widowed European queens and consorts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³¹⁵

Amalia’s position as a widow is a dominant theme in the Oranjezaal. Repeatedly hailed in contemporary accounts as well as modern scholarship as a monument to the memory of Frederik Hendrik, the reality is that Amalia’s presence is almost as predominant as that of her husband.³¹⁶ Entering the Oranjezaal from the main entrance on the north wall, one is immediately confronted with Gerard van Honthorst’s large painting, *Allegory on the Marriage of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia* [FIGURE 3.25]. The viewer’s eye is immediately drawn to the figure of Amalia, who is dressed in shimmering ivory skirt and lemon-yellow top replete with an

³¹⁴ “Want dit sijnde een treffelijk stuck werekx, bij Haere Hoocheijdt als een tweede Mausolea bij de hand genomen...”Worp, *Constantijn Huygens*, Vol. 5, 85. My thanks to Dr. Henriette De Bruyn-Kops for her assistance with translating this passage.

³¹⁵ Catherine de Medici, like Amalia, was referred to as 'a new Artemisia,; in 1560. See, Martin Gosman, Alasdair A. MacDonald, and Arie Johan Vanderjagt, *Princes and Princely Culture, 1450-1650* (Brill, 2003).

³¹⁶ This is also noted by Gaehtgens. Gaehtgens, “L'Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine,.” 22.

ermine-trimmed cape. She stands out from the background and is a foil to the figure of Frederik Hendrik, who is clad in darker clothing.³¹⁷

This large canvas is flanked by paintings by Honthorst that depict the advantageous marriages of Willem II to Mary Stuart and Louise Henriette to Elector of Brandenburg, both of which Amalia played an instrumental role in arranging [FIGURES 3.26 and 3.27]. Amalia is thus positioned as the central figure to the ensured continuation of the Orange dynasty, a sentiment Pieter Post expressed in the forward to his 1655 publication on Huis ten Bosch. In this dedication, the same one in which he tells Louise Henriette that her mother was ‘een andere Artemisia,’ Post hails Amalia’s share in the establishment of the House of Orange.³¹⁸

Amalia is portrayed a second time in a vertical panel on the east wall, again painted by Honthorst [FIGURE 3.28]. This work, *Allegory with Amalia van Solms and Her Four Daughters* is adjacent to the enormous *pièce de résistance* of the room, Jacob Jordaens’ *Triumph of Frederik Hendrik* of 1652 [FIGURE 3.29].³¹⁹ Dressed in a golden, ermine trimmed dress in Honthorst’s painting, Amalia sits among her four daughters and looks toward the scene of Frederik Hendrik’s triumph, the thematic

³¹⁷ Framed between two seemingly incongruous palm trees, the couple clasp hands in the recognizable gesture of *dextrarum junctio*, an important part of ancient marriage rites co-opted by seventeenth century artists such as Rubens and Honthorst. The palm trees also refer to the union of the couple as ancient writers saw the tendency of the trees to lean together as a sign of companionship. Peter-Raupp, *Die Ikonographie Des Oranjezaal*, 112–113. This idea was picked up by Jacob Cats and was illustrated in his *Emblemata moralia et aeconomica* of 1627.

³¹⁸ Lunsingh Scheurleer, “De woonvertrekken in Huis in het Bosch,” 58. “...Post's opdracht van zijn prenten van het Huis ten Bosch aan Amalia's dochter, de keurvorstin, waarin hij wijst op het aandeel van haar moeder bij het tot stand komen van het huis...”

³¹⁹ This large canvas also served as a door through which Amalia could access the Oranjezaal directly from her apartments. Amalia’s direct access to the room *through her own image* certainly augments the supposition, advanced here, that she was just as much the central subject of the Oranjezaal as Frederik Hendrik.

climax of the Oranjezaal. Painted in 1652 after the death of Willem II, who appears at the lower right of Jordaens' painting, Honthorst's painting underscores the importance of the female line of the family in the continuation and preservation of the House of Orange. An element of mourning is evident in the painting in the form of a veiled figure who hovers in the upper left of the composition. Even though she is not dressed in mourning, this allegorical figure refers to Amalia's status as a widow.

Amalia's widowhood is explicitly depicted in the hexagonal portrait that was situated at the center of the cupola [FIGURE 3.30].³²⁰ The strong verticality of the Oranjezaal's architecture, which leads the viewer's eye ever upwards, culminates in this three-quarter length portrait of Amalia holding a portrait of Frederik Hendrik. This image is surrounded by an inscription painted on the wood panelling of the ceiling, penned by Huygens himself: "To her incomparable consort Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange, his disconsolate widow Amalia van Solms erected a memorial in token of her sorrow and undying love, a memorial that, being peerless, is therefore worthy of him."³²¹ The image, together with the text, puts Amalia not only literally, but figuratively, at the crux of the Oranjezaal's iconographic program. In fact, only through understanding the importance of Amalia's role as a widow, a role that carried

³²⁰ B. Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, "Notities betreffende de decoratie van de Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch," *Oud Holland* 96, no. 3 (January 1, 1982): 187. This image was placed over another bust-length portrait of Amalia that was painted directly on the panelling of the ceiling. There is yet a third hexagonal image of Amalia that also appears to have been intended for this spot in which she holds a miniature bust-length portrait of Frederik Hendrik. Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij proposes that this third painting, by Honthorst, was painted too minutely to be seen from such a great distance and may have never even hung in the cupola where the second, more broadly painted portrait, now resides. However, Judson believes that the portrait of Amalia holding the portrait of Frederik Hendrik had been installed after the death of the latter. Judson also states that the painting of Amalia holding a skull is an eighteenth-century work. See Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst*, cat. 178.

³²¹ *Princely Patrons*, 52. "Voor haar onvergelykbare gemaal Frederik Hendrik Prins van Oranje heeft zijn ontroostbare weduwe Amalia van Solms als uiting van haar rouw en onvergankelijke liefde een gedenkteken opgericht, dat op zichzelf zonder weerga is en daarom juist hem waarding."

concrete associations with Artemisia, is a complete understanding of the iconographic program of the Oranjezaal possible.

Jacob van Campen supplied the thematic directives to the artists involved in the Oranjezaal. In close consultation with Constantijn Huygens, Van Campen laid out precise instructions for all of the artists involved in the project. These ‘memories’ were very detailed and not always to the artists’ liking. Jacob Jordaens took particular exception to the presence of the figure of Death, represented by a skeleton, in the *Triumph of Frederik Hendrik* saying, ‘...[it is] quite the contrary of what one wishes to eternalize and hence quite contrary to a triumph.’³²² However, in this opinion he was overruled by Huygens and Campen and, probably, Amalia herself. Clearly, this figure had importance in the overall theme of the room and its presence may be explained when the so-called ‘triumphal procession’ that occupies the bottom third register of the Oranjezaal is viewed within a funerary context.

B. Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij has shed much light on the complex program behind the cycle of paintings in the Oranjezaal. Her argument that the cycle of paintings in the Oranjezaal is based on the ancient rules of rhetoric, specifically those pertaining to funerary orations, is widely accepted. Pointing out that Constantijn Huygens had earlier applied these same rules to the monument of Willem I in the Nieuwe Kerk in Delft, she ably demonstrates that each element of such rhetoric is displayed visually in the cycle of paintings: *exordium* (introduction), *laus* (praise), *luctus* (mourning), *consolatio* (consolation), and *amplificatio/ornatus* (amplification/

³²² *Princely Patrons*, 156.

embellishment).³²³ For Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, the element of mourning is kept to a minimum according to the rules of *decorum* and only evident in the inscription and portrait in the cupola as well as the shadowy figure in the portrait of Amalia with her daughters. However, as Peter van der Ploeg and Carola Vermeeren have noted, references to mourning are also evident in Caesar van Everdingen's scene of the birth of Frederik Hendrik, the skeleton in the *Triumph* and the *Allegory of Time*, also by Jordaens [FIGURES 3.31, 3.32 and 3.33].³²⁴

Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij ascribes the role of the 'triumphal procession' to *laus* or praise, one of the components of ancient eulogistic rhetoric.³²⁵ Culminating in the *Triumph of Frederik Hendrik*, this procession possesses an air of joy. The triumph celebrated in the Oranjezaal is the Treaty of Münster that ended the Eighty Years' War, as made evident by the banderole held aloft by putti in Jordaens' *Triumph*, that reads: "Ultimus ante omnes de parte pace triumphus," ("The most important triumph one can have is the triumph of peace"). However, ancient triumphal processions, on which the procession in the Oranjezaal is undoubtedly based, often had the double function of serving as a funerary procession, as Seneca

³²³ Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, "Notities betreffende de decoratie van de Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch," 188.

³²⁴ *Princely Patrons*, 52.

³²⁵ Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, "Notities betreffende de decoratie van de Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch," 159. She says only that when viewed within the context of funerary eulogies, the procession serves to reinforce the idea of Frederik Hendrik as the arbiter of the Peace of Munster: "De laus die achteraf wordt toekend is uitgedrukt in de negen scènes van de Triomf. De 'trionf om de verworven vrede' (het schilderij van Jordaens) gaat ervan uit dat Frederik Hendrik de bewerkstelliger van deze vrede was, ondanks het feit dat hij in 1647 overleed en de vrede pas in 1648 gesloten werd. Binnen de context van het funeraire gedicht of de lijkrede krijgt deze bewering echter zijn juiste perspectief het nagelicht beschouwt Frederik Hendrik als de bewerkstelliger van deze vrede."

and Plutarch recount.³²⁶ If a victorious hero was vanquished in battle, his funeral procession also served as his triumph. Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647, while not a result of battle, preceded the official ratification of the Treaty of Münster by one year. Thus, recognition for his role in the peace process had to be celebrated posthumously.

The heralding of Frederik Hendrik as champion of the Treaty of Münster in Jordaens's canvas deviates significantly from historical fact. Frederik Hendrik was far from supportive of peace with Spain. Having fought the Spanish for most of his life and being intent on re-capturing Antwerp, Frederik Hendrik was loathe to cease and desist. This attitude put him in opposition with the States General, dominated by the States of Holland, who were in favor of peace with Spain in order to reduce spending and to keep the Spanish Netherlands as a 'buffer zone' between the United Provinces and France.³²⁷ Amalia was also in favor of peace, a stance that T.J. Geest attributes to her concern for the rapidly deteriorating health of the Prince and Amalia's desire to keep him from the battlefield.³²⁸ For her efforts in mediating negotiations between Frederik Hendrik and Spain, the Spanish King, Philip IV, thanked Amalia by gifting her the estates of Zevenbergen and Turnhout in the Southern Netherlands.³²⁹

Viewed against the backdrop of historical realities, Jordaens portrayal of Frederik Hendrik as advocate for the Treaty of Münster can be seen as a reflection of

³²⁶ Mary Beard, *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 286.

³²⁷ Troost, *William III the Stadholder-king*, 11.

³²⁸ Geest, *Amalia van Solms en de Nederlandshe politiek van 1625 tot 1648*, 58.

³²⁹ D/LS, vol. 1:276; Geest, *Amalia van Solms en de Nederlandshe politiek van 1625 tot 1645*, 75–76.

the effort of Amalia, and her advisors, to cast Frederik Hendrik in a role he reluctantly played at the end of his life. Firm in her belief that peace was the best course for her family and, by extension, the country, Amalia ensured that Frederik Hendrik's memory would be forever associated with the Treaty of Münster and the prosperity it ensured for the United Provinces.³³⁰ Thus, Jordaens' large painting, as well as the procession that surrounds it, can be seen as both a posthumous triumph and as a funerary procession in keeping with the rules of the eulogistic rhetoric concept proposed by Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij. This funereal reading of the procession is supported by a heretofore unidentified iconographic source, which is discussed below.

Although the blending of myth, allegory and contemporary events in the Oranjezaal are often compared to the approach Rubens took in the Marie de Medici cycle, the procession that runs along its bottom perimeter has no parallel in Rubens's cycle. One of the pictorial sources frequently cited as an inspiration for this portion of the Oranjezaal is Mantegna's series of paintings, *Triumphs of Caesar* of c. 1486-1505. This series had been obtained by Charles I in 1629 and placed in Hampton Court Palace where it has remained ever since. This series influenced Rubens to paint his own version of a Roman triumph around 1630 [FIGURE 3.34].³³¹ Rubens's small painting had a large impact on the conception of the Oranjezaal procession, particularly the paintings by Theodoor van Thulden (1606-1669) and Pieter de

³³⁰ Rooses, *Jacob Jordaens*, 167.

³³¹ Rubens was most likely already back in Flanders when Mantegna's series arrived in London but he certainly knew the compositions from woodcuts after the paintings. Allan Braham, *Rubens* (London: National Gallery, 1972), 25.

Grebber (c.1600-1652/3) whose scenes quote from Rubens's image directly [FIGURES 3.35 and 3.36].³³² De Grebber's image borrows the motif of the half-nude man grasping the horns of the white bull as well as the woman dressed in yellow and white, who lifts a basket of fruit above her head. The transmission of these visual elements may have come to The Hague via prints of Rubens's work or from someone who was familiar with the painting firsthand.³³³ Van Thulden, who worked with Rubens in Antwerp in 1634, would have seen the *Roman Triumph* in person. From Rubens's composition, Van Thulden borrowed the figure of the woman balancing a basket of flowers on her head as well as the angry elephant.³³⁴

Aside from its dependence on Mantegna's series, Rubens's *Roman Triumph* also shares similarities with Antoine Caron's drawings of lavish funerary procession of Mausolus that he made for Houel's text on Artemisia. Houel based his description of Mausolus's funeral procession on ancient accounts, among them, Valerius Maximus, Pliny the Elder, Diodorus and Strabo. Caron incorporated triumphal elements these writers described, such as the parade of captives, sacrificial white oxen, and captured booty in his drawing, *Les Victimaire conduisant trios taureaux blancs* [FIGURE 3.24].³³⁵

³³² Peter-Raup, *Die Ikonographie Des Oranjezaal*, 102.

³³³ I have been unable to discover, as of yet, whether Rubens's *Roman Triumph* was reproduced in print during the seventeenth century.

³³⁴ Van Thulden worked in Paris in 1631-1633 where he copied Mannerist paintings at the palace of Fontainebleau. Thus, there is a possibility that he may also have seen Caron's drawings.

³³⁵ Ehrmann, *Antoine Caron*, 53. Barbara Gaehtgens has related one of Caron's drawings to Honthorst's *Artemisia* of the mid-1630s. In her discussion of this painting, she notes compositional similarities between it and two scenes from the Artemisia series, and proposes that Honthorst was also aware of these images. Gaehtgens, "L'Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine," 19.

The character of Rubens's *Roman Triumph* suggests that he was familiar with the French compositions. While most of Rubens's figures, like Mantegna's, are placed close to the picture plane and packed together, the extended background he includes provides them more space to occupy. The way the figures wind their way to domed temple in the distance is similar, although reversed, to Caron's procession of figures in *Les Victimaires conduisant trios taureaux blancs*. The train of classically-dressed women in Rubens's image also bear striking resemblance to those in Caron's drawing. Of particular note is Rubens's depiction of the woman in yellow and white whose back is turned to the viewer and who balances a basket on top of her head. Two women, similarly garbed, are seen in the upper left in Caron's image.

Rubens, who worked for Marie de Medici in the 1620s, may very well have had access to the drawings by Caron, and possibly the tapestries, during his time in Paris.³³⁶ Marie de Medici may have been another conduit through which these themes reached the Netherlands.³³⁷ As has been noted, during the exiled Queen's visit to the Netherlands in 1638, she and Amalia spent much time together and probably spoke concretely about artistic projects. In any event, given the eulogistic rhetorical rules on which the imagery of the Oranjezaal is based, as well as the over-

³³⁶ Maurice Fenaille and Fernand Calmettes, *État général des tapisseries de la manufacture des Gobelins depuis son origine jusqu'à nos jours, 1600-1900. 1 / publié par M. Maurice Fenaille...* (Hachette (Paris), 1903), 133, <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k55296953>. While working on the Marie de Medici cycle, Rubens was also designing a series of tapestries based on the life of Contantine, to be woven in Paris. His interest in designing tapestries may have led him to view Caron's drawings while in Paris. See Belkin, *Rubens*, 190. Interestingly, Brenninkmeyer De-Rooij has noted a connection between tapestries and how the paintings of the Oranjezaal are arranged. Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, "Notities betreffende de decoratie van de Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch," 159.

³³⁷ Another avenue for transmission may have been a written description of the tapestries similar to Mathieu de Morgues's known description of the Medici cycle, which was certainly in circulation by the time of Marie's visit to the Netherlands. See, Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, "Notities betreffende de decoratie van de Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch," 171–172.

arching theme of exemplary widowhood embodied by Artemisia/Amalia, Caron's images, particularly those pertaining to Mausolus's funeral procession, are a likely thematic and iconographic source for the Oranjezaal procession.

The thematic association of Amalia and Artemisia is essential for understanding the complexity of the Oranjezaal and, as well, the broader visual program of the Huis ten Bosch. Amalia was implicitly associated with Artemisia in Honthorst's painting that hung in the audience chamber of the western apartment [FIGURE 3.23], and explicitly portrayed as a mourning widow in Govaert Flinck's 1654 *Allegory on the Memory of Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange, with a Portrait of his Wife, Amalia van Solms*, [FIGURE 3.37] which hung in the large cabinet of Amalia's apartments on the eastern side of the building.³³⁸

The year that Amalia commissioned Flinck to paint this work is important in understanding its imagery.³³⁹ After the death of her son, Willem II, in 1650 and the Act of Seclusion of May 4, 1654, barring his son Willem III from inheriting the position of stadhouder, Amalia's trepidation about the future must have reached a nadir. However, a ray of hope came in October of 1654 when the States of Overijssel elected the young Willem III to be their stadhouder. Accordingly, in Flinck's painting of that year, a phoenix rises from the tomb of Willem II in the background while ominous clouds above begin to disperse.³⁴⁰ Flinck undoubtedly painted the work to reinforce the message contained in Honthorst's compositionally similar image. In

³³⁸ Gaehtgens, "L'Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine," 23. The measurements of Flinck's painting indicate that Amalia commissioned it specifically for this space.

³³⁹ *Princely Patrons*, 128.

³⁴⁰ This motif may have been taken from the 1610 print, *Allegory of the Death of Henri IV*. Bibliothèque nationale, Cabinet des estampes.

both paintings, the widows, seated in the lower right corner wearing black veils, serve as custodians of their husbands' memories. Honthorst's Artemisia prepares to drink the ashes of her husband from a golden chalice, thereby transforming her body into a living shrine. In Flinck's painting, the widow Amalia sits before the effigies of her husband and son holding the book of history in which their deeds are recorded thereby becoming the guardian of that history. Together, these paintings, so similar in theme and content, functioned to centralize the theme of mourning that pervaded the apartments of Huis ten Bosch.

The theme of mourning was continued in the black-upholstered furniture in the large cabinet where Flinck's painting hung.³⁴¹ Likewise, Amalia's bedchamber was lined with black-trimmed wall hangings, an expression of mourning also used by Louise de Coligny at the Oude Hof after the death of Willem I [FIGURE 3.38].³⁴² There were no paintings in Amalia's bedchamber but the bed hangings, like the walls, were edged with black damask and the furniture was covered in black velvet. Marten Loonstra has noted that such manifestations of mourning were all the more important when a familial line, like the House of Orange, had not been long established. By keeping her mourning, "conspicuously in view," the widow thereby kept the memory of her husband alive.³⁴³

³⁴¹ Loonstra, *Het Huijs int Bosch*, 41.

³⁴² Lunsingh Scheurleer, "De woonvertrekken in Huis in het Bosch," 48; Loonstra, *Het Huijs int Bosch*, 41.

³⁴³ Loonstra, *Het Huijs int Bosch*, 41.

Amalia's last commissions

If Gerard van Honthorst was the preferred painter of the House of Orange in the 1630s and 1640s, then Theodoor van Thulden held the honor in the 1650s and 1660s. Van Thulden was from 's-Hertogenbosch and prior to working in The Hague, had worked in Paris (1631-1633) and then in Antwerp (1634-1635) alongside Peter Paul Rubens.³⁴⁴ Having painted under the Flemish master Rubens, Van Thulden was a natural choice for princely patronage in The Hague and he most likely received his commissions on the recommendation of Huygens, who was a friend of the artist's great-uncle.³⁴⁵ After Van Thulden executed important commissions at Honselaarsdijk and the Oranjezaal in the early 1650s, he continued to receive commissions for more work from Amalia in the 1660s. These commissions resulted in preparatory drawings intended for large-scale paintings that, except for one, were probably never executed.

Between 1660 and 1661, Van Thulden made five drawings as part of a series depicting the conference of power to Willem III and survival of the Orange lineage. This series also featured Amalia's central role as matriarch of the House of Orange and *de facto* head of that dynasty as Willem III's guardian.³⁴⁶ These drawings are: *Allegory of Amalia van Solms as Founder of the Dynasty* (c.1660) [FIGURE 3.39], *Allegory of Willem III as Inheritor of Dynasty* (c. 1660) [FIGURE 3.40], *The Empowerment of Solomon* (c. 1660) [FIGURE 3.41], *The Apotheosis of Augustus* (c.

³⁴⁴ Van Thulden also worked on the Torre de la Parada in Madrid in 1637.

³⁴⁵ Alain Roy et al., *Theodoor van Thulden: Een Zuidnederlandse Barokschilder: 's-Hertogenbosch, 1606-1669 - Un Peintre Baroque du Cercle de Rubens: Bois-le-Duc, 1606-1669* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1991), 38.

³⁴⁶ *Theodoor van Thulden*, 86-87. Vermet builds upon observations made by R.A. d'Hulst in "Enkele tekeningen van Theodoor van Thulden," *Album Amicorum J.G. van Gelder* (1973).

1660) [FIGURE 3.43] and *Allegory of William III taking His Leave of His Grandmother, Amalia van Solms* (c.1661) [FIGURE 3.42].³⁴⁷ It is uncertain whether any of these compositions, with the exception of *The Apotheosis of Augustus*, were ever fully realized. Nevertheless, these drawings as well as Van Thulden's notes on them, shed light on Amalia's role in the ever-changing political situation during the 1650s and 1660s.

With the responsibility of at least partial guardianship of her grandson, Amalia found herself in the 1650s in a political position similar to that of other contemporary female regents. Like Catherine and Marie de Medici as well as Henriette Maria and Anne of Austria, Amalia was now an acting custodian of a prince who was a minor. However, while these queens associated themselves with the history of Artemisia, who acted as regent for her son, Lygdamis, Amalia chose to be cast in the guise of other historical and allegorical figures to represent her role as guardian. Van Thulden's sketches for these late commissions illustrate Amalia's evolving awareness of the political climate of the day, particularly as it pertained to the role of Willem III and the position of the House of Orange in the Netherlands.

The tussle over Willem III's guardianship after the death of Willem II stemmed from Amalia and Mary's intense dislike for one another, which had begun

³⁴⁷ Alain Roy and Bernard Vermet, propose that of Van Thulden's drawings that are stylistically similar also share thematic parallels. These are: *Allegory of Amalia van Solms as Founder of the Dynasty Allegory of Willem III as Inheritor of Dynasty The Empowerment of Solomon and William III taking His Leave of His Grandmother, Amalia van Solms Theodoor van Thulden*, cat. nos. 68, 69, 70 and 71. *The Apotheosis of Augustus* is included here as part of this series based on thematic similarities to the other drawings. Roy also tentatively links this to the other four drawings. *Theodoor van Thulden*, cat. no. 67. Yet another drawing, *Allegory of Willem III and 's-Hertogenbosch*, dated c. 1666 is linked by Roy to the earlier series but will not be discussed here as the date of the drawing and the apparent age of Willem III in the composition (16 years) make its relationship to the earlier series unclear. See Roy, *Theodoor van Thulden*, cat. no. 73. Similarly, an oil sketch titled, *Allegory of Willem III Taking Leave of His Grandmother Amalia van Solms to Enter the Service of the State*, c. 1661 is also considered by Roy to be part of the series but is also not discussed here. See note 370.

even before the Prince's birth. With his birth, however, the animosity between the two women escalated. Even the question of what to call the child turned into an ugly battle between mother and grandmother. Mary, ever the Stuart loyalist, wanted to name her son Charles in honor of her brother, the King of England. Amalia, determined that the child should have the name of his celebrated grandfather, Willem I, eventually prevailed to the extreme chagrin of Mary who, as a result, refused to attend her son's baptism.³⁴⁸ Mary also demanded sole guardianship of her son but, again, Amalia resisted and the matter was eventually settled by the Court of Holland and the High Council who, in 1651, designated both women, along with Willem III's paternal uncle, the Elector of Brandenburg, as co-guardians.³⁴⁹

The Act of Seclusion of May 4, 1654 suspended the office of stadhouder and barred Willem III from inheriting this position. However, as mentioned above in relation to Flinck's painting, *Allegory on the Memory of Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange, with a Portrait of his Wife, Amalia van Solms*, later the same year, the States of Overijssel decided to re-instate the office of stadhouder in that province and elected Willem III to the post. For Amalia, this act inspired a new hope for the future and induced her to commission Flinck's painting.

Amalia was similarly inspired by events in 1660 to commission a series of works from Van Thulden. The first event was the restoration of the Charles II Stuart to the throne of England in 1660, which meant that the House of Orange now had a powerful ally in its efforts to appoint Willem III, Charles' nephew, to the office of

³⁴⁸ Nesca A Robb, *William of Orange, a Personal Portrait* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963), 60.

³⁴⁹ Troost, *William III the Stadholder-king*, 27.

stadhouder.³⁵⁰ The Act of Seclusion was also repealed in 1660 and the States of Holland soon undertook the education of the prince to prepare him, ‘...to discharge the high offices and employments formerly held by his forefathers....’³⁵¹ For Amalia, each of these events meant that her grandson, Willem III, would likely be installed as stadhouder as his father and grandfather had been before him.³⁵²

The blending of allegory with contemporary figures evident in Van Thulden’s drawings is strongly reminiscent of Rubens’s Medici Cycle. Van Thulden was familiar with the Medici cycle from his time in Paris from 1631-1633. He had earlier taken inspiration from Rubens’s *Apotheosis of Henri IV* for his own painting, *Frederik Hendrik Being Offered the High Command of the Army and Navy*, which he painted for the Oranjezaal.³⁵³ The strong stylistic similarities that Van Thulden shared with Rubens are evident in his drawing, *The Apotheosis of Augustus*, which until recently, was attributed to Rubens [FIGURE 3.43]. This drawing is believed to be a preparatory sketch for a chimney painting of the same subject that he executed for Amalia and that hung in her apartments in the Oude Hof.³⁵⁴ The painting (current whereabouts unknown) eventually entered the collection of Oranienstein, Albertina Agnes’ palace in Diez, and is described in the 1726 inventory of that collection as:

³⁵⁰ Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic, 748–751*.

³⁵¹ Troost, *William III the Stadholder-king*, 43.

³⁵² Willem III would not be officially appointed Stadhouder until 1672.

³⁵³ *Theodoor van Thulden*, 18.

³⁵⁴ D/LS, vol. 1:283, no. 1197.

“The Apotheosis of Augustus by Van Thulden that represents the portrait of Amalia van Solms, wife of the Prince of Orange.”³⁵⁵

The drawing, dated c. 1660, is a vertically-oriented scene that depicts a woman seated on a throne surrounded by five other figures. Van Thulden has helpfully labeled the central female figure as Livia and the man standing behind her to the right as Tiberius. Two unnamed female figures stand to her right, the one at the far right holding aloft a palm branch and the other an open book. A third unidentified figure kneels to the left of Livia and presents her with another open book. A man dressed in a Roman military costume ascends the dais on which Livia and Tiberius are placed. This figure, identified by Alain Roy as Germanicus, Tiberius’ adopted son, gestures upwards to the scene of Augustus’ apotheosis. Augustus is welcomed into the arms of an attendant angel. A canopy extends from the left edge of the image, visually separating the terrestrial and celestial events.

Livia (58 BCE – 29 CE) was the widow of the Roman Emperor Augustus and mother of Tiberius who became Emperor in 14 CE after his step-father’s death. Having herself portrayed as Livia was a bold and potentially risky move for Amalia, as Livia was a polemical figure in her day and often described unflatteringly by contemporary Roman historians, particularly Tacitus.³⁵⁶ However, the lives of the two women held certain parallels. Both were widows of powerful leaders and both sought to hold onto the power conferred by their married status after their husbands’ deaths. Intriguingly, each woman also had tumultuous relationships with her son,

³⁵⁵ *Theodoor van Thulden*, 90; D/LS, vol.1:373, no. 373.

³⁵⁶ Anthony A. Barrett, *Livia: First Lady of Imperial Rome* (Yale University Press, 2004); Matthew Dennison, *Livia, Empress of Rome: A Biography*, 1st ed. (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2011).

both of whom were heirs to the offices held by their fathers (step-father, in the case of Tiberius and Augustus). The parallels between the ancient Roman family and the House of Orange also make for a fitting analogy. Bernard Vermet interprets the figure of Augustus, appropriately, as representing Frederik Hendrik.³⁵⁷ This identification, along with Amalia as Livia, as noted in the Oranienstein inventory, makes it likely that the figures of Tiberius and Germanicus represent Willem II and Willem III respectively.

Amalia's motivation for the analogy becomes clearer when considered within the context of Livia's political role after her husband's death. In his will, Augustus bequeathed his widow the title 'Augusta,' to recognize her outstanding services to the state and carried implications of formal political power.³⁵⁸ Whether or not Livia had an official political function after the death of her husband is a matter of some debate. Nevertheless, it is widely accepted that Livia was the driving force behind Tiberius' ascension to power and that she remained a powerful figure during his reign.³⁵⁹ Likewise, Livia was an important presence in Germanicus' life, and served him in a supportive role.³⁶⁰ Thus, Van Thulden's pairing of Amalia with Willem II and Willem III analogizes their relationship to the one that existed between Livia, Tiberius and Germanicus.

The importance of Amalia's position within the House of Orange is explicitly illustrated in Van Thulden's drawing, *Allegory of Amalia van Solms as Founder of*

³⁵⁷ Theodoor van Thulden, 90.

³⁵⁸ Dennison, *Livia, Empress of Rome*, 241.

³⁵⁹ Dennison, *Livia, Empress of Rome*, 246.

³⁶⁰ Barrett, *Livia*, 78–79.

the Dynasty [FIGURE 3.39]. Amalia is enthroned in the center of the composition in the guise of *Unio* (Unity) surrounded by her daughter-in-law and daughters. Helpfully labeled by the artist, these figures are, from left to right: Mary Stuart, Amalia's daughter-in-law; and her daughters, Albertina Agnes, Henriette Catherine, Louise Henriette and, in the lower right corner, Maria. This image is not only an explicit reference to the importance of Amalia in the creation, and maintenance, of the Orange dynasty, but also of the particular role that these women played within that framework. Van Thulden's image echoes the words of Pieter Post in the dedication of his 1655 book of prints to Louise Henriette in which he hails Amalia's central role in the House of Orange.³⁶¹

Amalia was proud of the advantageous marriages that all of her children made, marriages that she had a hand in orchestrating. The succession of the Orange-Nassau dynasty was secured by Willem II's marriage to Mary Stuart, and her daughters' marriages into noble German and Dutch houses ensured that the House of Orange would live on in those dynasties as well. Willem III's absence from this image is explained both by his presence in each of the other drawings of the proposed series.

An emphasis on the role of women in the Orange dynasty had long been evident in paintings at the court of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia as in Gerard van Honthorst's portrait of Amalia as Flora/Charity. Another portrait, also by Honthorst and executed shortly after Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647, portrays Amalia as the center of the family [FIGURE 3.44]. Dressed in widow's black, Amalia is shown surrounded by her three youngest, unmarried daughters. Amalia's youngest daughter,

³⁶¹ See page 103.

Maria (b.1642), stands beside her and caresses the orange blossom that she holds in her left hand while Albertina Agnes (b.1634) and Henriette Catharina (b.1637) stand to the right. Frederik Hendrik, represented posthumously and dressed in a suit of armor, appears rather stiffly to the left while two putti descend to crown him with a wreath of laurels. Frederik Hendrik has, through death, been moved off center stage, replaced in his role as the nucleus of the family by his wife.

This painting is one of a trio of works that Honthorst executed in the late 1640s. The other two canvases represent Willem II with his wife Mary Stuart, and Louise Henriette with her husband, Frederick William Duke of Brandenburg [FIGURES 3.45 and 3.46]. All three paintings hung in the large closet of the western apartments of Huis ten Bosch [FIGURE 3.47].³⁶² The portraits of Willem II and Louise Henriette with their respective spouses hung on the west wall to either side of the window while the larger, horizontal painting of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia with their three youngest children hung directly across the room on the east wall. These paintings operated as a unified cycle within the room, of which the figure of Amalia occupies the central position.

The importance of the Orange women to the dynasty is also stressed in the portrait of Amalia and her four daughters in the Oranjezaal [FIGURE 3.28]. This image was described in Van Campen's 1649 list of subjects for the Oranjezaal as, "Her Highness, with three young princesses, Destiny shows her changes in all things."³⁶³ This painting, signed and dated by the artist, *GHonthorst 1650*, includes

³⁶² Lunsingh Scheurleer, "De woonvertrekken in Huis in het Bosch," 60.

³⁶³ Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656*, 149, cat. 172.

four, not three, princesses. Judson supposes that only the three unmarried daughters were mentioned in the 1649 description although he does not venture to explain why.³⁶⁴ It is proposed here that the inclusion of the eldest princess, Louise Henriette, who had married the Duke of Brandenburg in 1646, may reflect a fundamental change that took place in the family after the death of her brother, Willem II in 1650.

After the untimely death of Willem II, the only son of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia, his sisters became important for the continuation of the Orange lineage. Willem II left behind an infant son, Willem III, who was born posthumously, but it was not clear in 1650 that the infant, who was often sickly, would survive to adulthood.³⁶⁵ The hopes for the future of the House of Orange lay largely with Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's four daughters, who, in the potential absence of a direct male heir, assumed the responsibility of perpetuating the bloodline.³⁶⁶ In 1660, when Van Thulden made his drawings, *Allegory of Willem III as Inheritor of Dynasty* and *Allegory of William III taking His Leave of His Grandmother, Amalia van Solms*, Willem III was ten years old and past the dangers of infant mortality. These drawings relate directly to Willem III taking his rightful place within the Orange dynasty. Mary Stuart is conspicuously absent from both of these images and may indicate that they were executed after her death in December 1660.

³⁶⁴ Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656*, 149, cat. 172.

³⁶⁵ Robb, *William of Orange, a Personal Portrait*, 59. For the first four months of his life, Willem III was often sickly and wracked by convulsions and his health, in general, was not good during his first two years.

³⁶⁶ Interestingly, Mary Stuart is not represented in this earlier visualization of the female side of the family but is included in Van Thulden's later drawing. Executed ten years after the Oranjezaal painting, this drawing reflects the role that Mary Stuart was eventually, and probably grudgingly on Amalia's part, accorded in the continuance of the Orange dynasty.

The central motif in Van Thulden's, *Allegory of Willem III as Inheritor of the Dynasty* is an orange tree that springs from a crown on the ground. Above, Providence, identifiable by its third eye, unfurls a phylactery on which are inscribed words taken from Virgil's *Aeneid*, "Uno avulso non deficit alter [aureus]," ("When one branch is torn away, a golden one grows in its place.") The young Willem III, dressed in armor, is pushed forward from the right by personifications of Time and Selene-Lucina, goddess of birth. At the extreme lower right is the sketchy figure of Atropos, god of destiny, who holds the branch of an orange tree. At left, two female figures representing the lines of Orange and Nassau mourn for Willem II.³⁶⁷

The theme of fate, hope and lineage is explicit in *Allegory of Willem III as Inheritor of Dynasty*, and is the only image in which Amalia does not appear. However, given the drawing's dynastic theme, evident in the personifications of Orange and Nassau as well as the figure of Providence and the orange tree, it seems probable that this work was a pendant to *Allegory of Amalia van Solms as Founder of the Dynasty*.

Amalia reappears in *Willem III Taking Leave of His Grandmother, Amalia van Solms*. Van Thulden recorded the specifics of this composition on its verso in his own hand. Willem III, seen in the center, takes the hand of his grandmother and bids her farewell, as Minerva invites him to follow the examples of his ancestors, who can be seen through the archway behind her.³⁶⁸ Amalia stands upon a dais to the left

³⁶⁷ This same subject appears in an earlier drawing by Van Thulden. The most notable difference is that in this drawing dated to c. 1655, Willem III is still dressed in the gown worn by all children under the age of seven, regardless of gender. This earlier drawing was made into an oil sketch whose location is not presently known. For image see, *Theodoor van Thulden*, fig. 60.

³⁶⁸ *Theodoor van Thulden*, 246.

while two women hover behind the throne from which she has just risen. These figures are presumably personifications of Orange and Nassau that also appear in both versions of *Allegory of Willem III as Inheritor of the Dynasty*. Out of Amalia's mouth spring the words, "liceat superesse nepotem" ("Let me save my grandson"). These words, from Virgil's *Aeneid*, belong to a longer phrase in which the goddess Venus implores Jupiter to spare her grandson, Ascanius.³⁶⁹ This phrase is both touching and telling for it implies that Amalia is the person upon whom Willem III's fate rests. This scene most likely refers to Willem III's 1660 departure for the University of Leiden where he was to be educated.³⁷⁰

The last drawing in this series is *Allegory of the Empowerment of Solomon* [FIGURE 3.41]. Roy and Vermet argue that this image is part of the series because it relates stylistically to the other drawings. They also believe that it can be interpreted as an allegory of Amalia and Willem III, just like the figures of Livia and Germanicus in *The Apotheosis of Augustus*.³⁷¹ In this drawing, Solomon is seated on a throne while his mother, Bathsheba, stands directly to his left. An unidentified bearded man gestures to Peace, Justice and Victory hovering in the sky above. Bathsheba, like Livia, would have been an appropriate model for Amalia. As the widow of King

³⁶⁹ *Theodoor van Thulden*, 246.

³⁷⁰ Both the themes and the compositions of the three drawings, *Allegory of Willem III as Inheritor of the Dynasty* (c. 1655 and c. 1660) and *Willem III Taking Leave of His Grandmother, Amalia van Solms*, are combined in an oil sketch, now in the Rijksmuseum, *Allegory of Willem III Taking Leave of His Grandmother Amalia van Solms to Enter the Service of the State*, and also dated to c. 1661. See *Theodoor van Thulden*, 247. It is telling that it is only Amalia from whom Willem III takes his leave even though his mother was still alive when he left for Leiden. However, at the time this drawing was executed in 1661, Mary had died. Given the animosity that existed between Amalia and her daughter-in-law, it is not surprising that Van Thulden's composition omits Mary Stuart.

³⁷¹ Amalia was also portrayed in at least one other portrait historié, as the biblical heroine Esther. *Amalia van Solms, with Crown and Scepter, as Esther* by Gerard Honthorst, 1633, Smith College Museum of Art, inv. no. 1966:14. See fig. 1.9.

David and mother to his successor, Solomon, Bathsheba gave a Biblical precedent for a powerful widow and mother.

Van Thulden's explicit imagery and historical associations of Amalia's role in the Orange dynasty and as guardian to Willem III do not accurately reflect historical reality. Amalia was not the sole guardian of Willem III. Even though Willem III's mother died in 1661, Amalia still shared guardianship with the Elector of Brandenburg as well as Charles II, whom Mary Stuart had appointed as co-guardian in her will. Amalia did not, however, occupy any official political function after the death of Frederik Hendrik.³⁷² Van Thulden's drawings emphasize Amalia's role as the guardian of Willem III and are a clear indication that Amalia continued to use the visual arts to construct and define her identity as the matriarch of the House of Orange during the last years of her life.

Conclusion

Amalia van Solms recognized the power of art to create her public persona and to preserve her memory. In close consultation with advisors like Constantijn Huygens and Jacob van Campen, she fashioned herself as exemplary wife, mother, widow and guardian of the House of Orange. Amalia's understanding of the role art played in creating her public persona began in the early years of her marriage and

³⁷² Despite the promising outlook for Willem III's future in 1660, there were setbacks along the way to his eventual installment as Stadhouder in 1672. The States of Holland renounced its share in the Prince's education in late 1661 because Amalia and Charles II did not agree that the States would become Willem III's supreme guardians. See, Troost, *William III the Stadholder-king*, 44. Ultimately, however, Amalia realized that Willem III would need the support of the States to become Stadhouder and reluctantly agreed to relinquish her guardianship of the Prince and in 1666, Willem III became a Child of the State. See, Troost, *William III the Stadholder-king*, 49. Johan de Witt, the anti-Orange Grand Pensionary of the States of Holland headed the committee responsible for the Prince's education and removed all pro-English members from Willem III's household.

continued unabated throughout her lifetime. Her association with Diana at Honselaarsdijk served to reinforce Amalia's noble status along with that of her husband, Frederik Hendrik. As her circumstances and those of the House of Orange changed, art, particularly painting, was constantly used to re-evaluate, re-shape and re-present Amalia's changing role, not only in relation to her husband, but also within the House of Orange. She looked to the visual vocabulary of contemporary female counterparts, especially Marie de Medici. Amalia participated in a tradition of powerful female iconography by equating herself with figures like Artemisia, whom other female rulers and regents had likewise used to define their widowhoods. Her status as a widow and as a guardian to Willem III defined the last years of Amalia's life and is reflected in the works she commissioned during this time.

Amalia's use of art to suit her own agenda of promoting the status of the House of Orange and her central role within it, grew steadily stronger over the years, culminating in the Oranjezaal and continuing with Van Thulden's series. Although it is not known whether Amalia's last commissions were ever fully realized, Van Thulden's drawings indicate her intention to create a cycle of paintings, much like the Medici cycle, in which she figured as the main protagonist.

Chapter 4: ‘Une abondance extra ordinaire’ The Porcelain Collection of Amalia van Solms

Introduction

Within the Oranjezaal is a series of scenes that form a procession, running along the perimeter of the room. One of these images, painted by Jacob van Campen (1596-1657), the designer of the Oranjezaal program, features a tangle of figures and objects festooned with garlands of flowers bursting out of a *trompe l’oeil* archway in full Baroque vigor [FIGURE 4.1]. In this painting, *Goods From the East and West Indies*, eight white European-looking figures are joined by one African woman in a white garment holding a parrot. Crouching in the lower right corner is an American Indian, identifiable by his dark skin and the feathers in his hair. Surrounding these figures are exotic foods including lemons, pineapples and corn, as well as shells from far-away seas. Other foreign objects like baskets, porcelain, feathered shields and Japanese armor are located in the upper half of the composition.

This image, like the other processional scenes in the Oranjezaal, celebrates the Dutch ‘Golden Age’ and specifically the global power of the Dutch maritime empire. The commercial maritime successes of the Republic, however, were achieved under the auspices of the East and West India Companies, autonomous organizations in which the Stadholder had little direct power. The inclusion of this scene in the Oranjezaal, then, effectively serves to subsume these economic successes under the aegis of Frederik Hendrik’s legacy.

In addition to functioning as visual rhetoric, Van Campen’s painting also depicts the kinds of goods that came from the East and West Indies. Many of the

items featured in the image, such as the suit of Japanese armor and the large porcelain vase adorned with flowers, were probably owned by Amalia and Frederik Hendrik.³⁷³ Another porcelain dish, filled with shells from exotic seas, is balanced on the head of a half-nude figure in the lower left. These porcelain objects, in addition to serving as symbols of international trade, also refer to Amalia's actual collection of porcelain, much of which was housed in the Huis ten Bosch. In her apartments, which were located just behind Van Campen's painting, she had assembled no fewer than 441 porcelain objects by 1673. [see **FIGURE 1.34**].³⁷⁴

Frederik of Dohna, nephew to Amalia van Solms, wrote of his illustrious aunt, "...she possessed in short time a prodigious amount of solid gold dishes for all uses of life, pompous furniture of all kinds, paneled cabinets of Chinese lacquer, [and] porcelain vases of extra-ordinary grandeur and abundance..."³⁷⁵ Amalia, indeed, had amassed an impressive collection of porcelain from China and Japan by her death in 1675.³⁷⁶ Unlike the paintings that she and Frederik Hendrik owned, which reflects the couple's shared taste in Italianate, classicist styles and subjects and presents a unified aesthetic taste, porcelain was Amalia's own interest and it appeared only in

³⁷³ Prince Maurits was given at least one suit of Japanese armor by the Shogun Tokugawa Hidetada and it may be this suit that is represented in Van Campen's painting. See K. Zandvliet and (Netherlands) Rijksmuseum, *The Dutch Encounter with Asia, 1600-1950* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 2002), 101-106. My thanks to Karina Corrigan for bringing this to my attention.

³⁷⁴ D/LS, vol. 1:310.

³⁷⁵ Dohna, *Les mémoires du Burgrave et Comte Frédéric de Dohna*, 28. "...elle possédait en peu de temps une prodigieuse quantité de vaisselle d'or massif pour tous les usages de la vie, des meubles pompeux de toutes sortes, des cabinets lambrissés de laque de la Chine, des vases de porcelaine d'une grandeur d'une forme et d'une abondance extra ordinaire..."

³⁷⁶ Amalia also owned pieces of Delftware, imitation porcelain made in Holland, after mid-century. I use the term 'collection' here as a designator for all the pieces of porcelain that Amalia possessed. I do not mean to imply that it was physically concentrated in one specific location. Rather, like her collection of paintings, the porcelain was housed in many of Amalia's various residences.

her apartments. Because only Amalia collected porcelain, it is a useful paradigm with which to differentiate her activities as a collector from those of her husband. An evaluation of her porcelain collection also allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the role played by decorative art within the context of the couple's collecting interests and the extent to which Amalia shaped that role. Just as Van Campen's scene is a part of the cycle of paintings in the Oranjezaal, Amalia's porcelain collection is a component of the larger whole of the couple's collection and part of her overall agenda to emphasize the central position of the House of Orange in Dutch society.

Through inventories of Amalia's possessions, it is possible to trace the development of her collection from an already exceptional assortment of porcelain early in her marriage to a surfeit of hundreds of pieces by her death in 1675. During this period, Asian porcelain in Europe went through a series of transformations, from being a curio in collector's cabinets, to requisite garniture consisting of many pieces assembled *en masse* displayed in specially-designed rooms. Amalia helped effect these changes and her innovative use of porcelain as a decorative element in interior spaces was an important source for the 'porcelain-mania' of the early eighteenth century.³⁷⁷

Amalia's collection of eastern treasures was an expression of the global reach of the House of Orange. As a whole, Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's collection of objects was modeled on those of the great European monarchies, but it had its own

³⁷⁷ *Princely Patrons*, 80–86; Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France, and Holland*, 250. Within a wider scope, Amalia could also be seen as one of the progenitors of *Chinoiserie* in Europe as manifest in fashionable interiors of the wealthy, a style ultimately associated with the Rococo period.

distinctive character. For example, as noted earlier, the paintings owned by Frederik Hendrik and Amalia were almost entirely by Dutch and Flemish artists.³⁷⁸ While the paintings the couple owned emphasized the indigenous art of the Netherlands, Amalia's collection of porcelain and lacquer work emphasized the extent of the Dutch maritime empire.³⁷⁹ Although the Stadhouder played no direct role in the Dutch East India Company, [the VOC (*Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie*)], he was the admiral and commander-in-chief of the Dutch fleet and entitled to ten percent of the value of any enemy ship captured by the company.³⁸⁰ The princely couple's piggy-backing onto the company's successes did not seem to trouble the *Heeren XVII*, the executive board of the VOC. In fact, they actively sought the good graces of the Stadhouder and his wife by giving them gifts, most famously the lacquered balustrade that was installed in Amalia's bed chamber in Huis ten Bosch.³⁸¹

I have chosen to highlight porcelain in this chapter as the breadth of Amalia's influence can be clearly traced via this commodity. A study of Amalia's porcelain collection (what today would be labeled, 'decorative arts'), is necessary to understand the full scope of her collecting practices as well as her use of art for political ends.

C.W. Fock has asserted that Amalia was one of the earliest, if not the earliest,

³⁷⁸ See Introduction.

³⁷⁹ For a similar argument pertaining to the Empress Maria Theresa's collection of lacquer, see Michael E. Yonan, "Veneers of Authority: Chinese Lacquers in Maria Theresa's Vienna," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37, no. 4 (Summer 2004): 652-672.

³⁸⁰ *Princely Patrons*, 34. The VOC, although in essence a separate entity from the navy, owed its existence to a charter from the States General and agreed to aid the government, when asked, with military assistance. See Kristof Glamann, *Dutch-Asiatic Trade: 1620-1740*. Ph.D. Diss., Kobenhavns Universitet, 1958. 6-7.

³⁸¹ Stefan van Raaij, *Imitation and Inspiration: Japanese Influence on Dutch Art* (Amsterdam: Art Unlimited Books, 1989), 66.

innovator of using porcelain as an integrated decorative element.³⁸² Indeed, Amalia's contemporaries noted her love of and copious collection of porcelain because of its uniqueness.³⁸³ Although Amalia and Frederik Hendrik were highly influenced by French interior fashions, Amalia, in particular, had her own ideas about decorating. But where did such ideas come from? Was Amalia as influenced by her own youth in Heidelberg and Prague, as Frederik Hendrik was by his in Paris? Or, was this a unique conceit driven by the unprecedented quantities of porcelain available in the first half of the seventeenth century?³⁸⁴ It is crucial to understand the context in which Amalia's porcelain collection existed in order to answer these questions.

Brief History of Porcelain in Europe

To place Amalia's collection in context, it is necessary to understand the history of the early porcelain trade in Europe. The quantity of porcelain that a single collector could amass in the sixteenth to early seventeenth century was small. The relative dearth of porcelain coming into Europe meant that it was valued for its rareness and the prices fetched for such objects remained financially prohibitive for most people. Initially regarded as a *curio*, the sort of object to appear in a collector's cabinet (*Kunst* or *Wunderkammer*), porcelain was displayed alongside "elephants'

³⁸² *Princely Patrons*, 81. Fock points out that this practice was not recorded in England until the 1640s. See also, C. W. Fock 'Interieuropvattingen van Amalia van Solms: Een Frans Getint Hof in de Republiek (ca. 1625-1675),' *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten*. 34 (2005); pp. 25-45.

³⁸³ D/LS, vol. 1:239.

³⁸⁴ Fock offers this as a possible explanation. See, *Princely Patrons*, 84. .

teeth and coconuts” and other rare and exotic objects.³⁸⁵ These objects were often put into silver or gold European-style mounts both to increase their functionality and/or denote their importance.³⁸⁶ Paintings such as *Allegory of Sight* by Jan Brueghel the Elder and Peter Paul Rubens give an impression, albeit idealized, of the various objects that constituted these collections [FIGURE 4.2].

The vicissitude of porcelain’s value throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was due primarily to its availability, and not necessarily its quality. The only porcelain available in Europe during the first half of the seventeenth century was from China. It was made specifically for export and was lower in quality than domestic wares.³⁸⁷ Even so, porcelain’s combination of delicacy and strength mystified Europeans who tried in vain, until 1708, to discover the technique by which it was made.³⁸⁸ Its status as a rarity prized by the wealthy is attested to in Bellini and Titian’s *Feast of the Gods* (1514/1529), where the deities dine from blue and white porcelain bowls, so rare and priceless that only the gods may use them [FIGURE 4.3].

The importation of porcelain into Europe dates to 1498 when Vasco da Gama brought back specimens to Portugal via India. The porcelain trade began in earnest in the early sixteenth century after the Portuguese cemented relationships with the

³⁸⁵ Hugh Honour, *Chinoiserie; the Vision of Cathay* (New York: Dutton, 1962), 42.

³⁸⁶ Linda Levy Peck, *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 49.

³⁸⁷ C. J. A Jörg, *Fine & Curious: Japanese Export Porcelain in Dutch Collections* (Amsterdam: Hotei, 2003), 9.

³⁸⁸ In 1708, what became known as ‘Meissen’ porcelain after the city in which it was first produced, Ehrenfried Walther von Tschirnhaus developed the first European hard-paste porcelain for the Elector of Saxony, Augustus the Strong.

Chinese in 1517, but porcelain was of secondary value to the most prized cargoes of pepper and other spices.³⁸⁹ In 1595, when Philip II of Spain (I of Portugal) closed Lisbon to Dutch ships, the Dutch merchants were forced to compete directly with the Portuguese in Asia to obtain their goods rather than using them as a wholesaler. This circumstance spurred the formation of the Dutch East India Company, or the VOC. While the VOC was not allowed to trade directly with mainland China, as the Portuguese had done, it garnered its porcelain cargo by establishing trading posts in Java (Bantam and Batavia), and Japan (Hirado) where there was an active market for Chinese porcelain.³⁹⁰

The first trove of porcelain to reach the Netherlands did not come directly from Asia via a Dutch ship, but rather from a captured Portuguese carrack (one possible source for the term *kraak* porcelain in Dutch³⁹¹), the *San Jago*, captured by the VOC off of the island of St. Helena in 1602.³⁹² Taken to Middleburg, the contents of the ship were divided amongst the town, which received twenty-eight

³⁸⁹ Maura Rinaldi, *Kraak Porcelain: A Moment in the History of Trade* (London: Bamboo Pub., 1989), 34. The evidence for porcelain's presence in sixteenth-century Portugal is ample, from the celebrated collection of Asian goods amassed by Catherine of Austria (1507-1578), wife of King Jouseph I of Portugal, to first-hand accounts that mention at least six shops selling porcelain on the Rua Nova in Lisbon by 1580. None of the English-language studies (Honour 1962; Jarry 1981), mention Queen Catherine as an early collector of porcelain but it certainly bears further exploration. For a complete history of porcelain consumption in Portugal at this time see, João Calvão and Fundação Oriente, *Caminhos da porcelana : dinastias Ming e Qing*, 2nd ed. (Lisboa: Fundação Oriente, 1999).

³⁹⁰ For a more complete history of asian export porcelain in Europe, see: John Ayers, *Porcelain for Palaces: The Fashion for Japan in Europe, 1650-1750* (London: Oriental Ceramic Society, 1990); Honour, *Chinoiserie; the Vision of Cathay*; C. J. A Jörg, *Porcelain and the Dutch China Trade* (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1982). See also the chapter on ceramics in Rosamund Mack, *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art, 1300-1600* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

³⁹¹ For other possible etymological origins of the word, see: *The Ceramic Load of the "Witte Leeuw" (1613)* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1982), 46.

³⁹² Thijs Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company, as Recorded in the Dagh-Registers of Batavia Castle, Those of Hirado and Deshima, and Other Contemporary Papers, 1602-1682*, Mededelingen van het Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, Leiden no. 11 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1954), 22.

‘packages’ of porcelain dishes and fourteen ‘packages’ of small bowls; city dignitaries; and the crews of the Dutch ships that had captured the carrack.³⁹³ The crews received the bulk of the captured cargo and sold it at auction.³⁹⁴ An even greater windfall came two years later with the capture of yet another carrack, the *Catharina*, taken off Patani (southern Thailand). Thijs Volker has estimated that this ship was laden with no less than 100,000 pieces of porcelain.³⁹⁵ Auctioned at Amsterdam beginning on August 15, 1604, the sale of these goods attracted prestigious buyers (via intermediaries) including King Henri IV of France and King James I of England.³⁹⁶

The first ‘wave’ of porcelain imports to the Netherlands is referred to as Wanli, after the Chinese Emperor Wanli (1573-1620). It is also known by the Dutch term, *kraak* porcelain and is classified by four main object types: dishes, *klapmutsen* (for its resemblance to a Dutch hat of the same name), bowls and closed forms.³⁹⁷ Beginning in the mid-sixteenth century, this type of export porcelain was produced in massive quantities by the Chinese.³⁹⁸ In 1976, the excavation of the wreckage of the Dutch cargo ship the *Witte Leeuw*, which sank in 1613 off the coast of the island of St. Helena, revealed much about the porcelain being shipped to the Netherlands

³⁹³ Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, 22. Volker does not define how many pieces of porcelain constituted a ‘package.’

³⁹⁴ Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, 22.

³⁹⁵ Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, 22.

³⁹⁶ Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, 22; H Gelder, *Gegevens omtrent den porceleinhandel der O.I. Compagnie* ([S.l.], 1924), 166.

³⁹⁷ Rinaldi, *Kraak Porcelain*, 11.

³⁹⁸ C. J. A Jörg, *Fine & Curious: Japanese Export Porcelain in Dutch Collections* (Amsterdam: Hotei, 2003), 9; Rinaldi, *Kraak Porcelain*, 60.

during the first quarter of the seventeenth century.³⁹⁹ Nearly all of the porcelain found in the wreckage of the *Witte Leeuw* was western in shape including butter dishes, fruit dishes, and mustard pots [FIGURES 4.4 and 4.5].⁴⁰⁰ This material evidence corresponds with contemporary records. In 1614, the directors of the VOC in Amsterdam placed an order for, “a great quantity of various porcelain, mostly flatware like butter dishes, fruit dishes, other dishes...also a lot of beer and bread cups of all kind, none white, but all painted blue work.”⁴⁰¹ These orders were often accompanied by wooden models of the objects to be made, a tactic that the Portuguese had also used in the sixteenth century.

Volker has calculated the worth of various loads. For example, in 1633 the *Middelburgh* carried 25,345 pieces of porcelain with a cost-price of 7749 florins, with the prices per piece ranging from 2.6 florins for a large dish and 0.03 florins for a brandy-cup.⁴⁰² Considering that the annual income for the lower middle class was between 350 and 600 florins, these prices were not exorbitant and a few choice pieces could certainly have been acquired for special occasions. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that these were whole-sale prices that the VOC paid and not market prices, which would have been significantly higher.⁴⁰³ Although one Dutch historian remarked in 1614 that, “...[porcelain] has come to be with us in nearly daily use with

³⁹⁹ *The Ceramic Load of the “Witte Leeuw” (1613).*

⁴⁰⁰ Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, 22–23. This type of porcelain is also known as *Chine de Commande*. Jörg, *Porcelain and the Dutch China Trade*, 11.

⁴⁰¹ Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, 26.

⁴⁰² Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, 28.

⁴⁰³ For information on contemporary economics see, John Loughman, *Public and Private Spaces: Works of Art in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Houses* (Zwolle: Waanders, 2000), 21.

the common people,” visual evidence indicates that middle classes families generally owned only a small number of pieces.⁴⁰⁴ In these limited amounts, porcelain maintained its air of preciousness.

Porcelain often appears in still-lives and portraiture of the period, a clear indication that owners took pride in possessing these goods from the Orient. For example, an early seventeenth-century family portrait depicts a family sitting around the table before their meal [FIGURE 4.6]. Among the dishes of silver and pewter on the table, on which sit humble loaves of bread, is a small porcelain dish (like the one found in the *Witte Leeuw* wreckage), containing berries, the most expensive food on the table. While the middle class had to content themselves with one or two prized pieces, aristocrats and nobles could indulge in multiple items.⁴⁰⁵ By the end of the century, ‘porcelain-mania’ had blossomed in Europe and in its most lavish form ensembles of porcelain, consisting of many pieces assembled *en masse*, were displayed in specially-designed rooms, such as those designed by Daniel Marot (1661-1752) [FIGURE 4.7]. Amalia played an important role in the evolution of this decorative style as she was one of the first in Europe, if not the first, to use large amounts of porcelain towards such a decorative end.⁴⁰⁶

After the death of the Emperor Wanli in 1620, there was much political unrest in China as the Ming and Qing dynasties fought for supremacy. The porcelain from

⁴⁰⁴ Potanus as quoted in Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, 23.

⁴⁰⁵ Stacey Pierson, *Collectors, Collections and Museums: The Field of Chinese Ceramics in Britain, 1560-1960* (Oxford: P. Lang, 2007), 29-31. Pierson notes that at Wardour Castle, Robert Cecil kept his collection of porcelain in a 'Possylen House' (154 items) and a 'Cabonnett' (81 items) and while she sees this as an extension of a *wunderkammer* mentality of collecting, Pierson nevertheless points out that it is noteworthy that the porcelain was kept in separate, architecturally defined spaces.

⁴⁰⁶ Fock, "Interieuropvattingen van Amalia van Solms," 35.

this period, known as Transition ware, is characterized by a wider range of pictorial subjects. While the decoration of the export Wanli porcelain was comprised of ‘universally translatable motifs,’ such as plants and animals, porcelain of the Transition period portrayed landscapes, sometimes inhabited by characters from Chinese folklore and history [FIGURE 4.8].⁴⁰⁷ In 1644, Manchu invaders founded the Qing dynasty in China, which resulted in near-constant rebellion and upheaval.⁴⁰⁸ As the political situation made trade difficult, the VOC turned to Japan to fulfill the Dutch demand for porcelain. The early examples of Japanese porcelain, the type that would have been available in the Netherlands during Amalia’s lifetime, were copies of earlier Chinese *kraak* porcelain.⁴⁰⁹

The VOC continued to dominate maritime trade with Asia throughout the seventeenth century. Thus, the majority of the porcelain destined for the European market came through Amsterdam. Eventually, the Dutch came to be equated with porcelain, particularly blue and white objects, an association that was only strengthened by the emergence of factories in mid-century Delft that began making a ‘home-grown’ variety of blue and white ceramics, an association that still exists today.⁴¹⁰ The increasing difficulty in procuring porcelain after 1620 prompted Dutch

⁴⁰⁷ Rosalind Fischell, *Blue & White China: Origins/Western Influences*, 1st ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1987), 25.

⁴⁰⁸ Jörg, *Fine & Curious*, 10.

⁴⁰⁹ Jörg, *Fine & Curious*, 10. Later, after Amalia’s death in 1675, other types of Japanese porcelain like Kakiemon and Imari ware became popular.

⁴¹⁰ Alan Caiger-Smith, *Tin-Glaze Pottery in Europe and the Islamic World; the Tradition of 1000 Years in Maiolica, Faience & Delftware* (London: Faber, 1973), 127-131. Delft was the location of one of the VOC’s import offices.

pottery to fill the void left by the severed trade relationship with China.⁴¹¹ Although not porcelain in the modern sense of the word, that is to say hard-paste (high-fired) kaolin and petunste, the Dutch, nevertheless, achieved a remarkable likeness to it through the use of transparent glazes. The huge gunpowder explosion in Delft in 1654 gave another boost to the industry as the potteries destroyed in the blast eventually found new homes in larger buildings once occupied by breweries, which were by this time in decline.⁴¹² Initially, the potters in Delft and other Dutch cities copied the decoration seen on *kraak* porcelain, but they soon began to portray native landscapes, figures and religious scenes among other themes.⁴¹³ Decorative pottery painting flourished in Delft, while other cities produced a more utilitarian and, often, unpainted product.⁴¹⁴

Although the origin of such items may have changed, the overall aesthetic remained the same. The proximity of Delft to The Hague should not be overlooked when examining the ascendancy of native ‘porcelain.’ It seems likely that this proximity to the court and the residence of both Amalia and, later, Mary Stuart II, both of whom had extensive porcelain collections, helped spur the growth of the

⁴¹¹ Fischell, *Blue & White China*, 110.

⁴¹² Caiger-Smith, *Tin-Glaze Pottery in Europe and the Islamic World; the Tradition of 1000 Years in Maiolica, Faience & Delftware*, 131.

⁴¹³ Fischell, *Blue & White China*, 110.

⁴¹⁴ Caiger-Smith, *Tin-Glaze Pottery in Europe and the Islamic World; the Tradition of 1000 Years in Maiolica, Faience & Delftware*, 131.

industry in Delft whose potters were eager to fill the demands of the House of Orange in the void left by interrupted Asian trade.⁴¹⁵

Amalia's Collection

Porcelain in the Oude Hof

Porcelain was not unknown to the House of Orange before Amalia married into the family in 1625. As early as 1567, Willem the Silent had two 'coupes' of porcelain, one white and one blue, both with European silver-gilt mounts, at his castle in Breda.⁴¹⁶ Both the small quantity and precious metal mounts point to the rarity of these pieces of porcelain. In the 1619 inventory of Breda castle 65 pieces of porcelain were located in the cabinet of Eleonore de Bourbon, wife of Philips Willem, son of Willem the Silent.⁴¹⁷ As in Amalia's later cabinet at the Stadholder's Quarters, Eleonore housed other items variously labeled as 'Indiaenisch' or 'Oostindiaens' and it is possible that some, if not all of these items, found their way into Amalia's collection.

Amalia's porcelain was spread throughout her various residences and, as is evident from the inventories, her collection kept expanding. From the 1632 inventory, which records the location of porcelain objects, it is evident that Amalia considered porcelain to be an integral part of the overall decoration of a room.

⁴¹⁵ I would like to thank Dr. Frima Fox Hofrichter for suggesting this possibility to me. The eventual association of Delftware with the Royal Family of the Netherlands, which exists to this day, also lends weight to this supposition.

⁴¹⁶ These appear in the 1567 inventory of the castle at Breda. D/LS, vol. 1:17. nos.245, 246.

⁴¹⁷ D/LS, vol. 1:161, nos. 805-838.

Unfortunately, the inventories made after 1632 do not describe how Amalia's porcelain was arranged but it can be inferred from other sources that she continued the trend of massed porcelain displays. For example, between 1648 and 1649 she had an entire room, a 'large china closet,' ('*groote porceleyn cabinet*'), added to the Oude Hof that was dedicated to the display of over 500 pieces of porcelain.⁴¹⁸ Later inventories record porcelain in other palaces, such as Huis ter Nieuwbergh at Rijswijk or Huis ten Bosch outside of The Hague, although neither specify in which rooms the porcelain was housed nor how it was arranged. By 1673, the time of the last inventory of Amalia's possessions, her collection of porcelain numbered over 1,200 pieces.

The 1632 inventory of the Oude Hof, the former residence of Louise de Coligny (1555-1620), Frederik Hendrik's mother, records the arrangement of the porcelain objects in the cabinet, or closet, of her apartment.⁴¹⁹ In this closet there were 283 porcelain objects along with pottery from Avon in France (27 items), *terra sigilata*, Roman pottery (89 items), and one cup made from a rhinoceros horn. In addition, there were boxes and chests of various shapes and sizes designated as being 'Indiaensch,' a generalized term used during the period to describe objects of Eastern origin. The relative diversity of the objects in this room calls to mind a *Kunstkammer*, particularly the presence of the rhinoceros horn, which was a *curio par excellence*.⁴²⁰ The arrangement of these items makes this 'collection' unique. In

⁴¹⁸ *Princely Patrons*, 81.

⁴¹⁹ See Chapter One for a discussion of the French *appartement* system in the Stadhouder's residences.

⁴²⁰ Interestingly, there were 'magical' properties, mainly curative, associated with many of these objects: the rhino horn, the terra sigilatta and the porcelain.

addition to one large porcelain pot with a lid with a golden knob on top situated in the fireplace, clearly serving a decorative purpose, the other items were located on shelves above and next to the fireplace above which hung Rubens's *Artemisia*.⁴²¹

Professor C. W. Fock points out that the mere fact that these shelves are mentioned in the inventory points to their novelty and the innovation of the arrangement.⁴²² Fock goes on to argue that this decorative arrangement of the objects could only be attributed to Amalia's initiative. She writes, "...Amalia's mother-in-law died in 1620 and one can scarcely imagine porcelain displayed this way during her lifetime."⁴²³ Amalia probably incorporated her decorative aesthetic in the Oude Hof, which served as the couple's residence in 1625 during the first year of their marriage while the Stadhouders' Quarters in the Binnenhof were being renovated and where she held court while Frederik Hendrik was on military campaign. Multiple sources indicate that Frederik Hendrik expressly gave Amalia the use of his *mother's quarter's* to receive important visitors.⁴²⁴

⁴²¹ D/LS 1974-76, vol. 1:204-206. It is not clear whether these shelves, three-high, bordered the entire fireplace or were located only above it and along one side. Fock identifies the arrangement as, "...two rows of three shelves or 'richels', one above the other..." *Princely Patrons*, 80. Thirteen other paintings hung in this closet, all of them portraits of European aristocrats.

⁴²² Fock, "Interieuropvattingen van Amalia van Solms," 38.

⁴²³ *Princely Patrons*, 80.

⁴²⁴ Hallema, *Amalia van Solms: Een Lang Leven in Dienst van Haar Natie*, 16–17. Fock restates this assertion in, "Interieuropvattingen van Amalia van Solms," 38. The inventory, however, still labels these rooms as the former quarters of Louise de Coligny (*De camer daer mevrouw de prinsesse hoochl. Mem. Plach te logeren*), still identified as such, whereas the apartments Amalia are designated by the term, *Haere Excellentie*.

Porcelain in the Stadhouder's Quarters

The decorative arrangement of porcelain and other ceramic *objets* in Amalia's apartments in the Stadholder's Quarters can be firmly attributed to her invention. These quarters within the Binnenhof served as the official residence of the couple from 1626 until Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647, at which time Amalia moved her household back to the Oude Hof. Like the Oude Hof, the residence in the Stadholder's Quarters was modeled after the French system of *appartements*, or series of rooms. Upon entering either Frederik Hendrik or Amalia's quarters (the Prince's on the first floor, the Princess' on the second), visitors would find themselves in a long gallery [see **FIGURE 1.25**].⁴²⁵ A fireplace, located on the eastern wall somewhere between the two doorways, probably shared a chimney with a fireplace in one of the rooms of the *appartements*, most likely the one in the cabinet/closet.⁴²⁶

Porcelain appears in Amalia's apartments and nowhere else within the Stadholder's Quarters. Amalia's closet, located next to the fireplace in the gallery ('*Het cabinet beneffens de schoorsteen van de galderije*'), contained three porcelain cups of the 'highest quality'.⁴²⁷ This closet, like the one at the Oude Hof, housed other objects aside from porcelain and should also be seen as a *Kunstammer*.⁴²⁸ Here, Amalia kept a collection of various exotic and costly objects such as Japanese

⁴²⁵ *Princely Patrons*, 37. The exact layout of the apartments is not clear although Jansen offers a possible scenario. He states that the visitor would enter the apartments from the gallery, through a door leading in to the antichambre. See Jansen in Pelt and Tiethoff-Spliethoff, *Het Binnenhof*. 63.

⁴²⁶ Indeed, in the inventory the cabinet is described as being 'beneffens,' or beside/conjoined with the fireplace of the gallery.

⁴²⁷ D/LS, vol. 1:193 and 195, no. 312.

⁴²⁸ *Princely Patrons*, 85.

lacquer boxes, silver objects by Adam van Vianen and objects made from rock crystal.⁴²⁹ A Japanese cabinet which stood on a table (or stand, of European manufacture), inlaid with mother-of-pearl and gilded foliage is listed as were several other, smaller Japanese boxes and chests similarly gilded and/or inlaid.⁴³⁰ In addition, a three-shelved *kasse in de meur*, or wall cupboard, included objects commonly found in *Kunstkammers* such as, silver, gold, crystal (quartz), serpentine and amber objects. In this context, the three porcelain cups would have functioned as prized curiosities from exotic lands.

A set of shelves specifically for the display of porcelain was recorded in a 1634 addendum to the 1632 inventory: “*Een partije plancken met drye bancken, alle root geschildert ende vergult, dienende op de gaelderije van Haere Ex^{cie} om tde porseleynen op te setten [sic].*” (‘A set of shelves with three tiers, painted red and gilded, upon which to place porcelain, intended for Her Excellency’s gallery.’)⁴³¹ These shelves were most likely intended for Amalia’s new gallery, part of the 1632 renovation of the Stadhouder’s Quarters, which were empty at the time of the inventory.⁴³² The mantel in the new gallery, similarly painted red and gilded, matched the decoration of the shelves.⁴³³

⁴²⁹ D/LS, vol. 1:194.

⁴³⁰ D/LS, vol. 1:193-194. It is important to note that there is a distinction made in the inventory between those cabinets and boxes labeled ‘Jappaens’ and those labeled as having been made in Amsterdam or The Hague (nos. 266 and 270) where there was already an active cabinet-making industry, suggesting that the former were in fact from East Asia.

⁴³¹ D/LS, vol. 1:233, no. 1192. The items listed here come under the heading, “List of furniture that was made and bought in 1634...” (*Memorie van de meubilen in den jaere 1634 gemaect ende aengecocht...*).

⁴³² *Princely Patrons*, 81.

⁴³³ D/LS, vol. 1:190, no. 201.

The next entry on the addendum records two wooden stands, also painted red and gilded, on which large porcelain pots could be placed; "*Twee houtte voeten van gelijcke geschildert ende vergult, dienende om twee groote porseleynen potten op te setten*" (Two wooden stands similarly painted and gilded, on which to sit two large porcelain pots).⁴³⁴ The presence of these shelves and stands is an indication that Amalia was either planning to move the porcelain collection from the Oude Hof into this new gallery, or that she planned to acquire more porcelain for her collection. These shelves and stands point to a new way of thinking about the display of porcelain. Unlike the closets in the Oude Hof and the Stadhouder's Quarters, Amalia no longer viewed porcelain as a curiosity to be displayed alongside other rare objects but valued it as a decorative element in its own right.

Later Inventories

Later inventories and dispensations, compiled after Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647, do not indicate where or how Amalia's growing assortment of porcelain was displayed within specific residences. What can be gleaned from these documents, however, is the ever-increasing number of objects Amalia owned. The next extant inventory (1654-1668), first mentions porcelain following the heading: '*Volgen voorts allerley frayicheden hare hoogheyt toebehorende*, (The following lists all the decorative things that her highness owns).'⁴³⁵ This list comes immediately after the

⁴³⁴ D/LS, vol. 1:233. "Twee houtte voeten van gelijcke geschildert ende vergult, dienende om twee groote porseleynen potten op te setten."

⁴³⁵ D/LS, vol. 1:250-253. nos. 240-382.

listing of Amalia's gems, gold and silver possessions, an indicator of the value placed upon the porcelain.⁴³⁶ Items are listed in groups according to their similarity. They include objects such as flower pots, pitchers with and without handles, double-gourd bottles, *kendi* (a drinking vessel often in the shape of an animal), mustard pots, plates, cups and figurines. Although the location of these 519 objects is not indicated, these pieces may have been housed in Amalia's porcelain cabinet in the Oude Hof.⁴³⁷

After Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647, Amalia relinquished her apartments in the Stadhouders' Quarters to her daughter-in-law, Mary Stuart, and moved back into the Oude Hof. In 1648-49 the room above the loggia in Amalia's apartments there was renovated and divided in two, creating a large and a small porcelain closet. The cupboard maker Anthony Urbanus of The Hague made a porcelain cupboard/cabinet for the Oude Hof in the same years, presumably to display porcelain within the newly constructed closets.⁴³⁸

The 1654-68 inventory also includes a frustratingly brief mention of 398 pieces of porcelain at the Huis ten Bosch and 558 at the Huis ter Nieuwbergh, both 'retreat' residences outside The Hague that Amalia would frequently visit.⁴³⁹ These objects are not itemized, but it is possible to gain an impression of what kinds of objects were represented. Amalia's 1673 *Dispositieboek*, an inventory of all of her possessions, lists more than 500 porcelain objects, presumably from the Oude Hof,

⁴³⁶ *Princely Patrons*, 80.

⁴³⁷ *Princely Patrons*, 81.

⁴³⁸ *Princely Patrons*, 81.

⁴³⁹ D/LS, vol. 1:253. nos. 383-385.

including ‘wit porcelain,’ or, *blanche de Chine* objects, usually figurines [FIGURE 4.9].⁴⁴⁰ Also listed in the *Dispositieboek*, are 441 items at Huis ten Bosch, an addition of more than forty objects since the 1654-68 inventory of that residence. These additions indicate that Amalia continued to collect porcelain throughout her later years.⁴⁴¹ These items were almost certainly kept in Amalia’s apartments in the Huis ten Bosch and probably occupied one of the two closets. The walls of the smaller closet were lined with lacquer, probably taken from small, decorative boxes covered with mother-of-pearl and an installation of porcelain would have completed the oriental theme of the room, which was one of the earliest types of such décor.⁴⁴²

Objects similar to those appearing in the earlier inventories are listed at Rijswijk (butter dishes, fruit dishes, etc...), along with cups specifically designated for drinking an exotic new treat – chocolate. Although the arrangement and function of these objects in the inventory of 1654-68 and the 1673 *Dispositieboek* is not noted, it may be surmised that Amalia displayed these porcelain objects as a massed display in a room, much as she had in 1632 at the Stadholder’s Quarters and the Oude Hof.

From these sources, it appears that Amalia’s porcelain was most often housed in a closet, which was one of the most intimate rooms in an apartment. Given the public life that members of a court led, particularly the regents, the emergence of such private spaces is not surprising and the partitioning of rooms in the apartment system

⁴⁴⁰ *Princely Patrons*, 83. Fock notes that 1673 is a very early date for the mention of this type of porcelain. The Oude Hof was Amalia’s main residence at the end of her life and the *Dispositieboek* contains separate listings for Huis ten Bosch and Rijswijk, thereby making it the most likely location for these objects.

⁴⁴¹ Fock also makes this observation. *Princely Patrons*, 83.

⁴⁴² *Princely Patrons*, 84.

allowed the resident to control access to them. The further one was admitted into the apartment, the higher his or her favor with the occupant.⁴⁴³ The decoration of these rooms reflected the private and personal taste of the inhabitant, hence it was here that innovative approaches to decoration, like Amalia's arrangements of porcelain, were first attempted.⁴⁴⁴ The decorative schemes of these spaces were, nevertheless, influential. Visitors to such spaces were often impressed by the uniqueness of what they saw and went on to emulate the décor themselves, thereby spreading the fashion throughout Europe.⁴⁴⁵

The sheer amount of porcelain that Amalia owned can be fully appreciated when compared to middle-class 'collections.' For example, in a family portrait by Nicolaes Maes of 1657 only three pieces of porcelain are on display in the otherwise austere interior [FIGURE 4.10]. It is obvious that the owners took pride in these pieces: aside from the basket of fruit the children hold, they are essentially the only objects portrayed. Not even the painting hanging above the porcelain makes it fully into the picture! The porcelain is *kraak* ware, evident from the separate panels around the rims of the dishes.⁴⁴⁶ Wealthier individuals often owned more pieces than did this family. The 1653 inventory of a silversmith's widow lists 352 objects, while

⁴⁴³ Jean Guillaume, *Architecture Et Vie Sociale: L'organisation Intérieure Des Grandes Demeures À La Fin Du Moyen Age Et À La Renaissance: Actes Du Colloque Tenu À Tours Du 6 Au 10 Juin 1988* (Paris: Picard, 1994), 76-77.

⁴⁴⁴ Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France, and Holland*, 296.

⁴⁴⁵ Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France, and Holland*, 297.

⁴⁴⁶ However, as the view out of the window tells us, this family lived in Dordrecht which, along with Delft, had become one of the seats of Delftware manufacturing by this time. Thus, the objects displayed in this painting could very well be Dutch copies of original *Kraak* porcelain. See, John Carswell, *Blue and White: Chinese Porcelain and Its Impact on the Western World* (Chicago: The Gallery, 1985), 40.

the 1689 estate of a certain Christina de Ridder contained 680 pieces.⁴⁴⁷ While these are impressive numbers, they do not come close to the scale of Amalia's collection.

The question of how exactly Amalia came by her magnificent trove is difficult to answer. Auctions of porcelain and other Asian goods were held in Amsterdam throughout the seventeenth century. Amalia probably did not attend these auctions in person and most likely had an agent go for her. In 1639, her 'Indian' folding screen was purchased for 400 guilders from a merchant in Amsterdam.⁴⁴⁸ Most of these items were probably offered to Amalia as gifts, as was, for example, an 'Indiaensche' screen that had been given to Amalia by an unidentified person or group, which is listed in the 1634 addendum to the 1632 inventory.⁴⁴⁹ In 1639 the Directors of the VOC in Amsterdam asked the Zeeland chapter of the company of to 'set apart some of the finest and most curious porcelains of various assortments to be presented to "Her Highness the Princess of Orange."⁴⁵⁰ Also, as mentioned earlier, in 1641, the VOC gave Amalia a lacquered balustrade, which was later installed in her bedchamber at the Huis ten Bosch.⁴⁵¹ These gifts belong to the tradition of gift-

⁴⁴⁷ Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, 20. Unfortunately, Volker does not reveal if the location of these objects indicated in the estate. Volker, who uses this example to demonstrate the market price of such goods, points out that this number might be a little higher as there are other items in the inventory that are not designated as porcelain, but most likely were.

⁴⁴⁸ *Princely Patrons*, 83. Fock believes that this was most likely a lacquered screen.

⁴⁴⁹ D/LS, vol. 1:237, no.1307. 'Een Indiaensche scherm van...bladen aen Haere Excie. vereert.'

⁴⁵⁰ Volker, *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, 15.

⁴⁵¹ Raaij, *Imitation and Inspiration*, 66.

giving that began by 1627 when the States of Utrecht presented Amalia was with a gift of four paintings.⁴⁵²

The name most often associated with massed displays of porcelain of the late seventeenth century is Daniel Marot (1661-1752). Marot, a French Huguenot who fled to the Netherlands in 1684, designed fantastic displays of porcelain for Mary Stuart II, wife of Willem III, both in Holland and England. Unfortunately, no documents indicate that Amalia similarly worked with a particular designer/architect in relation to her porcelain displays. It is, however, probable that she did collaborate with one of the many talented architects and designers that were employed at court. Given the French-inspired system of the apartments in the Oude Hof and Stadholder's Quarters, it seems likely that the architect responsible for these hailed from that country and perhaps came to The Hague in the service of Louise de Coligny.⁴⁵³ Simon de la Vallée (c. 1590-1642), worked for Frederik Hendrik from 1633 until his departure for Sweden in 1637. De la Vallée, a French Huguenot, was the son of Martin de la Vallée, architect to Marie de Medici. He worked at Luxembourg Palace and was influenced by the work of the master architect there, Salomon de Brosse. Under Frederik Hendrik, De la Vallée worked at Honselaarsdijk where he implemented the latest international architectural concepts.⁴⁵⁴ However, since De la Vallée's arrival in the

⁴⁵² See Chapter 2 for implications of gift-giving.

⁴⁵³ The architect responsible for the layout of the Oude Hof as it existed prior to the renovation by Jacob van Campen and Pieter Post in 1639 is not known. The name of the architect responsible for the renovations of the Stadhouder's Quarters in 1632 is also unknown. See, *Princely Display*, 108-109.

⁴⁵⁴ It is not known whether there were any porcelain installations at Honselaarsdijk during Amalia's lifetime but there certainly were by the time of Mary Stuart II's occupancy, which are listed in the 1694-1702 inventory of the palace. See, D/LS, vol. 1: 466-467. See also, A. Erkelens, "*Delffs porcelijn*" van Koningin Mary II: *ceramiek op Het Loo uit de tijd van Willem III en Mary II/ Queen*

Netherlands did not occur until a year after the inventory of the Oude Hof and Stadholder's Quarters was completed, connections between him and the décor of these residences seems improbable.⁴⁵⁵

The architects most closely aligned with the court in The Hague, during the 1630s, 1640s and 1650s were Jacob van Campen and Pieter Post. Post is known to have designed at least three fireplaces in the Stadhouder's Quarters [FIGURE 4.11] and Van Campen served as architect and designer of interior decorations for Frederik Hendrik, beginning in 1635.⁴⁵⁶ Van Campen was also responsible for the renovations of the Oude Hof in 1639 as well as the chief architect and designer for Huis ten Bosch. Either of these architects could have worked with Amalia on matters of interior design, although Post appears to be the most likely candidate of the two. Post did much more interior work than did Van Campen and favored using architectural elements on which to place decoration like plaster garlands. Such pilasters served no functional purpose, only decorative – something that would have been anathema to a true Classicist like Van Campen.

Inspiration

The inspiration for Amalia's porcelain displays is not immediately clear. The vogue for Asian goods was just beginning to gain a foothold among European

Mary's "Delft porcelain": Ceramics at Het Loo From the Time of William and Mary (Zwolle: Waanders, 1992), 27.

⁴⁵⁵ Pelt and Tiethoff-Spliethoff, *Het Binnenhof*, 83.

⁴⁵⁶ Blankert et al., *Dutch Classicism in Seventeenth-Century Painting* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1999), 41.

aristocrats at the end of the sixteenth century. Although the French did not establish the *Compagnie des Indes* until 1664 and the famous *Trianon de porcelaine*, Louis XIV's opulent tea-house, was not erected until 1670, Marie de Medici's early twentieth-century biographer, Lois Battifol, claims that the French Queen employed Etienne Sager to produce imitations of Japanese lacquered furniture and housed a vendor of 'Chinese goods' at the Louvre at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Documentary evidence to support this claim has not been found.⁴⁵⁷ Louise de Coligny, who was in France between 1598 and 1603, may have played a role in creating a decorative ensemble of porcelain in the Netherlands, had she seen such an example in France at the time. Unfortunately, without further evidence, this supposition is not possible to prove.

While the English East India Company was established in 1600, two years before the VOC, it was excluded from trading directly from mainland China. Nevertheless, some early English collections of porcelain were formed, most notably that of Robert Cecil, First Earl of Salisbury (1563-1612).⁴⁵⁸ The porcelain available in England during the early seventeenth century came via VOC auctions in Amsterdam or by private trade through members of the English East India Company.⁴⁵⁹ A 1612 inventory of Salisbury's London homes records eighty-one

⁴⁵⁷ Louis Battifol and Henry William Carless Davis, *Marie de Médicis and the French court in the XVIIth century* (Chatto & Windus, 1908), 250. This claim is restated, almost verbatim, in Honour 1961, 44. There are no sources listed. Battifol also claims Marie kept 'rare porcelains' in one of Sager's cabinets along with other valuables. See, Battifol, *Marie de Médicis and the French court in the XVIIth century*, 39.

⁴⁵⁸ Pierson, *Collectors, Collections and Museums*, 29. Susan Bracken, "'Chyna in England Before 1614,' *Oriental Art* 2001, vol. XLVII, no. 2. 8.

⁴⁵⁹ Pierson, *Collectors, Collections and Museums*, 28-29.

pieces of porcelain kept in a room described as a ‘Cabonnett’.⁴⁶⁰ Likewise, Thomas, Lord Arundell of Wardour (1560-1639), a relation of Salisbury’s, had 154 porcelain items that were kept in a ‘Possylen House,’ along with other ceramics and glass objects in the early seventeenth century.⁴⁶¹ These two examples, however, are the exception rather than the rule and such exotic items were still a rarity in England at the turn of the century.⁴⁶²

It is possible that Elizabeth Stuart, Amalia’s former mistress, had knowledge of these two collections although she does not seem to have had a particular penchant for Asian decorative objects. Only one such item, a cabinet of ‘China worke,’ probably lacquer, is known to have been in her possession. Given to her in 1613 upon the occasion of her wedding by her father, James I, and valued at the astonishing price of £10,000 this gift must have awed those who saw it. This object was possibly similar to the later examples noted in Amalia’s inventories.⁴⁶³ The direct imports of lacquer-ware from Japan to England did not begin until the following year, 1614, thus this example might have been taken from the spoils of a captured Portuguese vessel or obtained by merchants via Lisbon or Antwerp.⁴⁶⁴ This

⁴⁶⁰ Pierson, *Collectors, Collections and Museums*, 29.

⁴⁶¹ Bracken, “‘Chyna in England Before 1614,’ 10. Bracken speculates that the ‘Possylen House’ was a banqueting hall. It is not known if ‘Possylen’ is etymologically related to ‘porcelain.’

⁴⁶² Pierson, *Collectors, Collections and Museums*, 29. Interestingly, Lord Arundell had been in the service of Rudolf II (for whom he fought the Ottoman Turks) in Prague in 1596 and was possibly inspired by the collection of objects he saw in the Emperor’s *Kunstammer* Bracken, “‘Chyna in England Before 1614,’ 10.

⁴⁶³ Honour, *Chinoiserie; the Vision of Cathay*, 43–44. No specifications for the ‘cabinet’ are given, thus it is impossible to say how large it was. For an example of the kind of lacquer objects in Amalia’s collection, see Mauritshuis, *Princely Patrons*, 83, fig. 10.

⁴⁶⁴ John Irwin, “A Jacobean Vogue for Oriental Lacquer-Ware,” *The Burlington Magazine* 95, no. 603 (June 1953): 193.

cabinet likely travelled with Elizabeth to Heidelberg, and Prague and, eventually, to The Hague.⁴⁶⁵ Unfortunately no inventories exist from Elizabeth's residences at Heidelberg or The Hague (1613-1661). In the 1633 inventory of the castle at Rhenen, the country home of Frederick and Elizabeth, no Eastern, or Eastern-inspired goods are listed and none appear in Elizabeth's testament of 1661.⁴⁶⁶

The most probable influence on Amalia's collecting and display of porcelain is Rudolf II's legendary *Kunstkammer* in Prague, which she would have seen in 1619, when she traveled to Prague as part of Elizabeth's retinue. After Rudolf's death in 1612, the collection in Hradčany castle began to be dispersed among his brothers, although they agreed that the most important pieces should remain together as part of the official Habsburg patrimony.⁴⁶⁷ Thus, even though the character of the collection was somewhat altered from what it had been during Rudolf's lifetime, many treasures remained within the walls of Hradčany when Frederik V and Elizabeth Stuart arrived in Prague in 1619.

An inventory of the collection, compiled on December 6, 1621, provides an idea of what the collection looked like, both in terms of content and display, when

⁴⁶⁵ There is a tantalizing mention of a red-lacquered box (*een langhwerpige doos, root*) in Amalia's possession in 1673, bearing a monogram that could be that of ES. D/LS, vol. 1:316, no. 684.

⁴⁶⁶ For the Rhenen inventory see, Willem Jan Hoogsteder, "De Schilderijen van Frederik en Elizabeth, Koning en Koninginn van Bohemen." Ph.D. Diss., Kunsthistorisch Instituut der Rijks Universiteit te Utrecht, 1984, Inv. p. 4; For Elizabeth's testament, see *Briefe der Elisabeth Stuart, Königin von Böhmen, an ihren Sohn, den Kurfürsten Carl Ludwig von der Pfalz: 1650-1662* (Litterarischer Verein in Stuttgart, 1902), 215.

⁴⁶⁷ For the fate of Rudolf's collection, see Elišká Fučíková in, 1648, *War and Peace in Europe*, 173–180.

Amalia was there.⁴⁶⁸ In addition to paintings, marvelous objects of all shapes and sizes were displayed in cabinets and on tables. Most of these objects seem to have been located in the overflowing *Kunstkammer*, but unfortunately it is not possible to be certain how items were actually arranged.⁴⁶⁹ The inventories, however, do indicate that there were twenty cases/cabinets in the main room of the *Kunstkammer*. Cases number 18 and 19 contained a total of 683 pieces of porcelain.⁴⁷⁰ While it is not clear specifically what is meant by ‘porcelain,’ it probably indicates that the pieces originated in Asia since European wares, like maiolica, are identified as such in the inventory.⁴⁷¹

Rudolf’s *Kunstkammer* contained types of objects that appear in Amalia’s collections, such as Japanese lacquer pieces, and an ‘indianisch schreibtischlein,’ a kind of writing table that appears frequently in the Orange inventories.⁴⁷² The European ceramic *terra sigillata*, and cups made out of Rhinoceros horn, both credited with curative power, also appear in both collections. Such parallels in the character

⁴⁶⁸Inventory published by Zimerman in *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*. 1905. Vol. 25. This inventory was ordered by Karl von Liechtenstein to whom Maximilian of Bavaria had entrusted the administration of Boude Hofemia after Frederick V’s defeat at the Battle of the White Mountain. He himself an art lover, Liechtenstein delayed having an inventory made of the collection probably so that he could easily remove items to his own castle at Aussee. See *1648, War and Peace in Europe*, 175. After defeating Frederick V at the Battle of the White Mountain on November 8, 1620, Maximilian of Bavaria stayed in Prague only until the 20th. However, upon his departure, he took with him no less than 1500 wagons full of goods of various nature. Additionally, Karl von Liechtenstein, Maximilian’s administrator of Boude Hofemia, ‘borrowed’ a number of paintings and tapestries. *1648, War and Peace in Europe*, 175.

⁴⁶⁹ *Rudolf II and Prague*, 199–208.

⁴⁷⁰ Heinrich Zimerman, *Das Inventar der Prager Schatz- und Kunstkammer vom 6. Dezember 1621. Nach Akten des k. u. k. Reichfinanzarchivs in Wien herausgegeben von Heinrich Zimmermann*. (1905., 1905), XXVI-XXVII, nos. 305-325.

⁴⁷¹ Zimerman, *Das Inventar der Prager Schatz- und Kunstkammer vom 6. Dezember 1621*.no. 302.

⁴⁷² *Rudolf II and Prague*, 205.

of their collections indicate that Amalia was familiar with Rudolf's *Kunstammer* and probably spent time admiring it during her time in Prague.

Porcelain as Symbol of Dutch and Orange Power

Amalia's collection of porcelain grew out of the *Kunstammer* framework, which has its philosophical roots in the Renaissance *studioli* of Francesco I, Grand Duke of Tuscany (1541-1587) and Isabella d'Este, Marchesa of Mantua (1474-1539). Samuel von Quiccheberg's (1529-1567) *Inscriptiones vel tituli theatric amplissimi* of 1565, espoused the concept of *Kunstammer* as *theatrum mundi* (theater of the world), where objects labeled as *naturalia* and *artificialia* were systematically categorized by type and seen as a microcosm of all of God's and man's creations.⁴⁷³ This treatise became the *de facto* manual for sixteenth and seventeenth-century collectors, guiding them in what to acquire and how to display it. *Exotica* is a sub-category that is integral to the universality of the *Kunstammer*.⁴⁷⁴ The German art historian Horst Bredekamp has observed that the exotic is a theme prevalent throughout Quiccheberg's prescribed categories of *naturalia* and *artificialia* even though the sixteenth-century author does not address it directly. Bredekamp explains the impetus for collecting exotic objects as, "...a desire to understand the earth in its

⁴⁷³ Arthur K Wheelock, *A Collector's Cabinet* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1998), 19-20.

⁴⁷⁴ Horst Bredekamp, *The Lure of Antiquity and the Cult of the Machine: The Kunstammer and the Evolution of Nature, Art, and Technology*, American ed. (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1995), 34-35.

horizontal, spatial entirety.”⁴⁷⁵ Thus, *exotica*, which represented *naturalia* as well as man-made goods, was essential to the universality of the *Kunstammer*.

Rudolf II’s extensive *Kunstammer* followed Quiccheberg’s model. In his work on Rudolf’s collection, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann writes, “Rudolf II’s *Kunstammer*, like much of the art and public ceremony of his reign, was a form of *representatio*, or imperial self-representation.”⁴⁷⁶ Kaufmann argues that the *Kunstammer* functioned not only as a microcosm of the wonders of God’s power, but also a reflection of the ruler’s magnificence and political power.⁴⁷⁷ Thus, the collection of such varied and exotic goods reflected not only the owner’s ability to procure these items, but also his/her control over the objects and, by extension, the lands from which they came. This idea is exemplified in Jacob van Campen’s painting *Goods from East and West* in the Oranjezaal where the natural *exotica* is represented by fruits and flowers (and people) and the artificial *exotica* by the feathered shields, Japanese armor and, porcelain [FIGURE 4.1]. In the conclusion to her study on the representation of material goods in seventeenth-century Dutch culture, Julie Hochstrasser uses this painting as an exemplar of the control exerted

⁴⁷⁵ Bredekamp, *The Lure of Antiquity and the Cult of the Machine*, 36.

⁴⁷⁶ Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, “Remarks on the Collections of Rudolf II: The *Kunstammer* as a Form of *Representatio*,” *Art Journal* 38, no. 1 (Autumn 1978): 22. Kaufmann notes that Quiccheberg’s theories are based in large part on those of Giulio Camillo whose ideas of the ‘memory theater’ emphasized magical links between the micro and macrocosms; i.e. that objects could possess talismanic powers which could be harnessed by the owner. Kaufmann, “Remarks,” 25.

⁴⁷⁷ Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Variations on the Imperial Theme in the Age of Maximilian II and Rudolf II*, Outstanding dissertations in the fine arts (New York: Garland Pub, 1978), 123.

over such exotic items by the West saying, "...goods are representative of control, synonymous with power."⁴⁷⁸

As discussed in Chapter 3, Amalia and her advisors conceived the cycle of paintings in the Oranjezaal to link Frederik Hendrik's name with the glory of the Dutch Golden Age. Similarly, Van Campen's painting co-opts the successes of the Dutch East and West India Companies to glorify the House of Orange. Amalia's collection of porcelain, the one item of *exotica* that had become inextricably linked with the Dutch by the middle of the seventeenth century, also allied the House of Orange with the VOC's maritime domination. The association of the Dutch with porcelain, particularly blue and white objects, was only strengthened by the emergence of factories in Delft. By collecting such a large amount of porcelain, Amalia not only demonstrated the wealth of the House of Orange, but simultaneously linked her family to the Dutch dominance of maritime trade.

Seventeenth and eighteenth-century collections of porcelain, including those of Amalia, are the inheritors of the humanist principles that defined the *Kunstkamer* - a point that has been obfuscated almost from the beginning. Not long after Amalia's death, massed decorative displays of porcelain were labeled as grossly inelegant. In the early eighteenth century, Daniel Defoe famously decried the influence of Mary Stuart II's (Amalia's granddaughter-in-law) collection on the lower classes saying that they, "...piled their China upon the tops of cabinets, structures, and every chimney-piece, to the tops of ceilings, and even setting up shelves for their China-ware....till it became a grievance in the expense of it and even injurious to their

⁴⁷⁸ Julie Hochstrasser, *Still Life and Trade in the Dutch Golden Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 274.

families and estates.”⁴⁷⁹ Although some modern historians recognize Amalia’s collection as one of the earliest examples of the decorative displays of porcelain, it has also been trivialized when it comes to considering any deeper meaning. For example, the noted decorative art historian Peter Thornton writes of such displays:

It is curious to note that the fashion for dressing rooms in this way [i.e. with lacquer and massed porcelain displays] was espoused by the women of the House of Orange [he does not mention any of them by name]. . . . Such formally organized art-treasures - for porcelain and lacquerwork were expensive and highly prized - followed those of Renaissance princes and their successors but the emphasis now was on playfulness and light-hearted make-believe (Let’s go to my China Closet and drink tea and pretend we are Chinamen!) rather than on serious collecting.⁴⁸⁰

Thornton thus implies that serious collecting was done by men within a humanist framework while the decorative arts, often associated with the ‘feminine,’ do not have the capacity to function in a similar fashion. In trivializing such an important moment in the history of the decorative arts, Thornton denies the ideological connection between porcelain collections and their *Kustkammer* predecessors. Instead of being divorced from the humanist principles that guided the formation of a *Kunstkammer*, these porcelain rooms should be seen as the direct inheritors of these principles.

⁴⁷⁹ As quoted in Joan Wilson, “A Phenomenon of Taste: The China Ware of Queen Mary II,” *Apollo*, 96, no. 126 (1972): 122.

⁴⁸⁰ Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France, and Holland*, 250. Thornton was more generous in his earlier estimation of Amalia’s role in the phenomenon. See Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France, and Holland*, 250.

Conclusion

To what extent porcelain became identified with the House of Orange towards the end of Amalia's life, is evident in a still life painting executed around 1667 by Jan Davidsz. de Heem [FIGURE 4.12]. Although the patron of this work is unknown, De Heem painted it for someone who understood the centrality of porcelain to Amalia's efforts to intertwine the success of the Dutch Republic and the glory of the House of Orange. Aside from the explicit symbolism of the oranges, as well as the inscription 'Vivat Oraenge' on the cartouche at the bottom, the painting has other associations that celebrate the House of Orange. A laurel wreath above the orange pronounces the glory of the House and the olive branch to the right, its dedication to peace. Sensuous oysters, wine and spices symbolize the bounty enjoyed by the country, literally and figuratively, under the leadership of the House of Orange. At the center of the painting, is a half-peeled orange cradled by a blue and white porcelain dish. In an image so calculated to evoke the glory of the House of Orange, it is surely no accident that porcelain holds the eponymous fruit.

Just as Amalia used painting to promote and glorify the House of Orange, so she used her collection of porcelain in much the same way. The confluence of Amalia's own experience of Rudolf II's *Kunstkammer* and the unprecedented availability of porcelain in the Dutch Republic led her to create new ways of displaying her collection. What began as a small *Kunstkammer* in her closet in the Stadhouder's Quarters, evolved throughout her lifetime into something much more specifically identifiable with the Dutch mercantile empire. Amalia artfully marshaled the resources she had at her disposal to create a powerful statement of wealth, power

and luxury. At the same time she played a pivotal role in the creation of a novel form of interior decoration that was to reverberate throughout centuries.

Conclusion

Amalia is variously described in both contemporary and modern sources as vain, ambitious, proud, determined, petty, jealous, scheming and petulant. Nearly all of the qualities ascribed to her are pejorative, with enough evidence to support at least some of them. However, in a scholarly study, these modifiers distract both researchers and readers from objectively assessing Amalia's contributions to the formation of the Stadhouder's art collection.

Women are all too often marginalized by such characterizations and, consequently, less likely to receive serious scholarly consideration from historians and art historians. Thus, while Amalia has had the benefit of some scholarly attention, it pales in comparison to the literature surrounding her husband, Frederik Hendrik. Most of the scholarship on the Princess of Orange and her artistic patronage has centered on the Oranjezaal project, which she undertook after the death of Frederik Hendrik. The trend in the scholarship to focus on Amalia's role as a patron after the death of her husband is not surprising as it is much easier to parse out the actions of a widow who no longer operates under the aegis of her husband. This narrow focus gives the false impression that Amalia was an active patron only after her husband's death.

This study demonstrates that Amalia was an active and engaged patron and collector of paintings and decorative arts throughout her marriage to Frederik Hendrik as well as in her subsequent widowhood. This dissertation, thus, contributes to the growing literature on early modern female patronage. Hopefully, this study will

engender further exploration into the role Dutch women played as patrons and collectors.

The four chapters of this study present specific instances of Amalia's involvement with artistic projects and collections over the course of her lifetime. The biography of Amalia presented in the first chapter considers her early life at the court of the Elector Palatinate, Frederick V and his wife, Elizabeth Stuart, in Heidelberg and Prague where she spent her formative years. Additionally, I explore Amalia's relationships with Frederik Hendrik and Constantijn Huygens in order to more fully understand how these individuals shaped and guided her artistic choices. The figure of Marie de Medici is also considered as a powerful and immediate example of a woman who used art to foster her own political agenda.

By viewing the gift of four paintings given to Amalia in 1627 through the lens of contemporary gift-giving practices, the second chapter demonstrates that Amalia's political influence was a recognized fact from the early years of her marriage. The third chapter likewise examines the power of Amalia's historiated portraiture, which was imbued with iconographic imagery appropriated from contemporary female rulers and regents to project a strong public persona. Finally, an account of Amalia's porcelain collection in the fourth chapter provides evidence of her own interests as a collector, apart from those of her husband. Amalia's greatest legacy as a collector was the passion for porcelain that she instilled in her daughters, and in her granddaughter-in-law Mary Stuart II. The elaborate displays of porcelain showcased by these women in their various palaces in Germany, the Netherlands and the United

Kingdom are directly related to Amalia's earlier 'china closets' in her various residences.

As with any research project, it has been impossible to investigate every avenue of potentially interesting information that presented itself along the way. The relationship between Amalia and Elizabeth Stuart is one such avenue that merits much closer attention. It may not only reveal important information regarding the success of Gerard van Honthorst as a portrait painter in The Hague but also the popularity of pastoral portraits among the upper and middle classes. Further consideration of gifts of artwork, as was discussed in Chapter 2, is another fruitful topic that could yield a more nuanced understanding of the role art played in the upper echelons of Dutch society. Also ripe for further exploration are the other 'exotic' contents of Amalia's decorative art collection, such as laquerware. A better understanding of what these objects were used for, how they were displayed and how Amalia procured them could contribute greatly to the literature on Asian goods in early modern Europe. Lastly, further exploration of the stylistic and iconographic connections between Theodoor van Thudlen's drawings of the 1660s for Amalia and Peter Paul Rubens's Medici cycle would, I believe, strengthen the argument made in this study that Amalia was consciously modeling her widowhood after the example of Marie de Medici.

Amalia's role as a patron and collector was a facet of her identity that was present during the entirety of her reign as the Princess of Orange. The capacity of this role necessarily evolved throughout her lifetime as her circumstances changed. Influenced by those around her as well as her experiences early in life, Amalia

successfully marshalled the artistic resources at her disposal to fashion her social and political persona as well as to promote the legacy of the House of Orange. In considering the ways in which she contributed to the formation of the Stadhouder's art collection, this dissertation provides a more complete picture of Amalia's role as a patron and collector, which, in turn, allows for a more nuanced understanding of the genesis and function of the collection as a whole.

Bibliography

Aa, Abraham, ed. *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden: Bevattende levensbeschrijvingen van zoodanige personen, die zich op eenigerlei wijze in ons vaderland hebben vermaard gemaakt* (Haarlem: Brederode, 1852).

Ayers, John, Oliver Impey, and J.V.G. Mallet. *Porcelain for Palaces: The Fashion for Japan in Europe, 1650-1750* (London: Oriental Ceramic Society, 1990).

Bardon, Françoise. *Le Portrait Mythologique À La Cour De France Sous Henri IV Et Louis XIII: Mythologie Et Politique* (Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1974).

Barnes, Susan J. *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings* (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2004).

Barrett, Anthony A. *Livia: First Lady of Imperial Rome* (Yale University Press, 2004).

Batiffol, Louis. *Marie de Médicis and the French Court in the XVIIth Century*. Translated by Mary King. (Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, 1970).

Baumgärtel, Bettina and Sylvia Neysters, eds. *Die Galerie der starken Frauen/ La galerie des femmes fortes: die Heldin in der französischen und italienischen Kunst des 17. Jahrhunderts* (München: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1995).

Beard, Mary. *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007).

Blankert, Albert and Leonard J. Slatkes, eds. *Holländische Malerei in Neuem Licht: Hendrick Ter Brugghen Und Seine Zeitgenossen* (Braunschweig and Utrecht: Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum and Utrechts Centraal Museum, 1986).

Blankert, Albert, et al. *Dutch Classicism in Seventeenth-Century Painting* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1999.).

Boccaccio, Giovanni. *Famous Women*. Edited and translated by Virginia Brown. (Harvard University Press, 2003).

Boer, Paul. *Het huijs int Noorteynde: Het Koninklijk Paleis Noordeinde historisch gezien/ The Royal Palace Noordeinde in an Historical View* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 1986).

Börsch-Supan, Helmut. "Die Gemälde aus dem Vermächtnis der Amalie von Solms und aus der Oranischen Erbschaft in den brandenburgish-preussischen Schlössern:

ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der hohenzollernschen,” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 30, no. 2/3. (1967): 143-198.

Bracken, Susan. “‘Chyna’ in England before 1614,” *Oriental Art*. 47, no. 2 (2001): 8-10.

Bredekamp, Horst. *The Lure of Antiquity and the Cult of the Machine: The Kunstammer and the Evolution of Nature, Art, and Technology*, American ed. (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1995).

Brenninkmeyer-De Rooij, B. “Notities betreffende de decoratie van de Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch,” *Oud Holland* 96, no. 3 (January 1, 1982): 133-185.

Brink, Peter, ed. *Het gedroomde land pastorale schilderkunst in de Gouden Eeuw* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1993).

Broekman, Inge. *De rol van de schilderkunst in het leven van Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687)* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2005).

Bruyn, J., et al. *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings*. 4 vols. (The Hague, Boston and London: M. Nijhoff Publishers, 1982-).

Bussman, Klaus and Heinz Schilling, eds. *1648, War and Peace in Europe* (Münster: Verlagsgesellschaft 350 Jahre Westfälischer Friede, 1998).

Caiger-Smith, Alan. *Tin-Glaze Pottery in Europe and the Islamic World; the Tradition of 1000 Years in Maiolica, Faience & Delftware* (London: Faber, 1973).

Calvão, João. *Caminhos da porcelana: dinastias Ming e Qing*, 2nd ed. (Lisboa: Fundação Oriente, 1999).

Campbell, Thomas, P., ed. *Tapestry in the Baroque: New Aspects of Production and Patronage* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010).

Carswell, John, et al. *Blue and White: Chinese Porcelain and Its Impact on the Western World* (Chicago: The David and Alfred Smart Gallery, University of Chicago, 1985).

Cassidy-Geiger, Maureen, et. Al. *Fragile Diplomacy: Meissen Porcelain for European Courts Ca. 1710-63* (New Haven: Published for The Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, Design, and Culture, New York, by Yale University Press, 2007).

Coolhaas, W. P. and J.E. Schooneveld-Oesterling. *Generale missiven van gouverneurs-generaal en raden aan Heren XVII der Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie*. ('s-Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, 1960-1997).

Corbeiller, Clare Le, and Alice Cooney Frelinghuysen, "Chinese Export Porcelain," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 60, no. 3, New Series (Winter 2003): 1-60.

Crawford-Parker, Sarah. "Refashioning Female Identity: Women's Roles in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Historiated Portraits." Ph.D. Diss., The University of Kansas, 2006.

D/LS, (S.W.A. Drossaers and Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurleer) *Inventarissen van de inboedels in de yerblijven van de oranjes an daarmede gelijk te stellen stukken, 1567-1712.* vol. 1 ('s-Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, 1976).

Davillier, Jean Charles. *Les origines de la porcelaine en Europe : les fabriques italiennes du XVe au XVIIe siècle, avec une étude spéciale sur les porcelaines des Médicis.* (Paris : Librairie de l'art, 1882).

Delaborde, Jules. *Louise de Coligny: princesse d'Orange* (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970).

Dennison, Matthew. *Livia, Empress of Rome: A Biography*, 1st ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2011).

Dohna, Friedrich. *Les mémoires du Burgrave et Comte Frédéric de Dohna ... 1621-1688.* Edited by H. Borkowski. (Königsberg: B. Teichert, 1898).

Edmundson, George. *History of Holland* (Cambridge: The University press, 1922).

Ehrmann, Jean. *Antoine Caron: peintre des fêtes et des massacres* (Paris: Flammarion, 1986).

Eichberger, Dagmar and Yvonne Bleyerveld, et. al. *Women of Distinction: Margaret of York: Margaret of Austria* (Leuven: Davidsfonds, 2005).

Elzinga, D.J. *The Dutch Constitutional Monarchy in a Changing Europe* (Kluwer, 2007).

Erkelens, A. "Delffs porcelijn" van Koningin Mary II: ceramiek op Het Loo uit de tijd van Willem III en Mary II/ Queen Mary's "Delft porcelain": *Ceramics at Het Loo From the Time of William and Mary* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1992).

Fenaille, Maurice and Fernand Calmettes, *État général des tapisseries de la manufacture des Gobelins depuis son origine jusqu'à nos jours, 1600-1900.* (Paris: Hachette, 1903),

Ferguson, Margaret, ed. *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

ffolliott, Sheila . “Casting a Rival into the Shade: Catherine de’ Medici and Diane de Poitiers,” *Art Journal* 48, no. 2 (1989): 138.

Fischell, Rosalind. *Blue & White China: Origins/Western Influences*, 1st ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1987).

Fleischer, Roland. *Rembrandt, Rubens, and the Art of Their Time: Recent Perspectives* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1997).

Flower, Harriet. *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Fock, C.W., “Interieuropvattingen van Amalia van Solms,” *Gentse Bijdragen tot de Interieugeschiedenis* 34 (2005): 25-45.

Fuchs Ronald W. *Made in China: Export Porcelain from the Leo and Doris Hodroff Collection at Winterthur* (Winterthur: Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, 2005).

Fučíková, Eliška, et al. *Rudolf II and Prague: The Court and the City* (Prague: Prague Castle Administration, 1997).

Gahtgens, Barbara. “L’Artémise de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine,” *Revue de l’Art* 109, no. 1 (1995): 13-25.

Gahtgens, Barbara. “Amalia van Solms und oranische Kunstpolitik,” in Horst Lademacher, ed. *Onder Den Oranje Boom: Niederländische Kunst Und Kultur Im 17. Und 18. Jahrhundert an Deutschen Fürstenhöfen* (München: Hirmer, 1999).

Geest, Titia. *Amalia van Solms en de Nederlandshe politiek van 1625 tot 1648. Bijdrage tot de kennis van het tijdvak van Frederik Hendrik.* (Baarn: J.M. Meulenhoff te Amsterdam, 1909).

Gelder, H.E. van. *Gegevens omtrent den porceleinhandel der O.I. Compagnie.* (’s-Gravenhage, M. Nijhoff, 1924).

Godfrey, Elizabeth. *Heidelberg: Its Princes and Its Palaces* (New York: Dutton, 1906).

Gordenker, Emilie S. “The Rhetoric of Dress in Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Portraiture,” *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 57 (January 1, 1999): 87-104.

Gosman, Martin, Alasdair A. MacDonald, and Arie Johan Vanderjagt. *Princes and Princely Culture, 1450-1650* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003).

- Green, Mary. *Elizabeth, Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia*, (London: Methuen & Co., 1909).
- Groen van Prinsterer, Guillaume. *Archives ou correspondance inédite de la Maison d'Orange-Nassau*. (Leiden: S. et J. Luchtmans, 1859).
- Guillaume, Jean. *Architecture Et Vie Sociale: L'organisation Intérieure des Grandes Demeures à la Fin Du Moyen Age et à La Renaissance: Actes du Colloque Tenu à Tours du 6 au 10 Juin 1988* (Paris: Picard, 1994).
- Hallema, A. *Amalia van Solms: een lang leven in dienst van haar natie*, (Amsterdam: J.M. Meulenhoff, 1941).
- Henker, Michael, et. al. *Der Winterkönig: Friedrich V., der letzte Kurfürst aus der Oberen Pfalz*. (Augsburg: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 2003).
- Godley, Alfred Denis. *Herodotus* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922).
- Hochstrasser, Julie. *Still Life and Trade in the Dutch Golden Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007).
- Hodson, Simon. "The Power of Female Dynastic Networks: A Brief Study of Louise de Coligny, Princess of Orange, and Her Stepdaughters," *Women's History Review*. 16, no. 3 (2007): 335.
- Hofrichter, Frima. *Judith Leyster: A Woman Painter in Holland's Golden Age* (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1989).
- Honour, Hugh. *Chinoiserie; the Vision of Cathay* (New York: Dutton, 1962).
- Hoogsteder, Willem Jan. "De Schilderijen van Frederik en Elizabeth, Koning en Koninginn van Bohemen." Ph.D. Diss., Kunsthistorisch Instituut der Rijks Universiteit te Utrecht, 1984.
- Hudig, Ferrand. *Frederik Hendrik en de kunst van zijn tijd*. (Amsterdam: M. Hertzberger, 1928).
- Huisken, Jacobine, ed. *Jacob van Campen: Het klassieke ideaal in de Gouden Eeuw* (Amsterdam: Architectura & Natura Pers; Stichting Koninklijk Paleis te Amsterdam, 1995).
- Huizinga, Johan. *Nederlands beschaving in de zeventiende eeuw: een schets*. (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Contact, 1998).
- Innocenti, Clarice, et. al. *Women in Power: Caterina and Maria De' Medici: The Return to Florence of Two Queens of France* (Firenze: Mandragora, 2008).

- Irwin, John. "A Jacobean Vogue for Oriental Lacquer-Ware," *The Burlington Magazine* 95, no. 603 (June 1953): 193-195.
- Israel, Jonathan. *Empires and Entrepôts : the Dutch, the Spanish Monarchy, and the Jews, 1585-1713*. (London and Roncevert: Hambledon Press, 1990).
- Israel, Jonathan. *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).
- Janssen, Geert H. *Princely Power in the Dutch Republic: Patronage and William Frederick of Nassau (1613-64)*. (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2008).
- Jarry, Madeleine. *Chinoiserie: Chinese Influence on European Decorative Art 17th and 18th Centuries* (New York: Vendome Press, 1981).
- Jongh, E. de. *Portretten Van Echt En Trouw: Huwelijk En Gezin in De Nederlandse Kunst Van De Zeventiende Eeuw* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1986).
- Joost-Gaugier, Christiane L. "Poggio and Visual Tradition: 'Uomini Famosi' in Classical Literary Description," *Artibus et Historiae* 6, no. 12 (January 1, 1985): 57-74.
- Jörg, C. J. A. *Porcelain and the Dutch China Trade* (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1982).
- Judson, J. *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656* (Doornspijk The Netherlands: Davaco, 1999).
- Kaufmann, Thomas DaCosta. "Remarks on the Collections of Rudolf II: The Kunstkammer as a Form of *Representatio*," *Art Journal* 38, no. 1 (Autumn 1978): 22-28.
- Kaufmann, Thomas DaCosta. *The School of Prague: Painting at the Cour of Rudolf II*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).
- Keblusek, Marika, Jori Zijlmans, et. al. *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia Van Solms* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997).
- Kettering, Alison McNeil. "Rembrandt's 'Flute Player': A Unique Treatment of Pastoral," *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 9, no. 1 (January 1, 1977): 19-44.
- Kettering, Alison McNeil. *The Dutch Arcadia: Pastoral Art and Its Audience in the Golden Age* (Totowa, N.J: Allanheld and Schram, 1983).

King, Catherine. *Renaissance Women Patrons: Wives and Widows in Italy c. 1300-c. 1550* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998).

Kleinschmidt, Arthur. *Amalie von Oranien, geborene Gräfin zu Solms-Braunfels: ein Lebensbild* (Berlin: Rade, 1905).

Lawrence, Cynthia, et al. *Women and art in early modern Europe: patrons, collectors, and connoisseurs* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).

Liebersohn, Harry. *The return of the Gift: European History of a Global Idea* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Lightbown, R. W. "Oriental Art and the Orient in Late Renaissance and Baroque Italy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 32 (1969): 228-279.

Lion-Goldschmidt, Daisy. "Les Porcelaines chinoises du palais de Santos," *Arts Asiatiques*, 39, no. 1 (1984): 5-72.

Loonstra, Marten. *Het Huijs int Bosch: het Koninklijk Paleis Huis ten Bosch historisch gezien/ The Royal Palace Huis ten Bosch in an Historical View* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 1985).

Loughman, John and John Michael Montias. *Public and Private Spaces: Works of Art in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Houses* (Zwolle: Waanders, 2000).

Lunsingh Scheurleer, Th. "De woonvertrekken in Huis in het Bosch," *Oud Holland* 84, no. 1/4 (January 1, 1969): 29-66.

Mack, Rosamond E. *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art, 1300-1600* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

Magreta, T. "The development of Orange-Nassau princely artistic activity, 1618--1632" Ph.D. Diss., City University of New York, 2008.

Marrow, Deborah. *The Art Patronage of Maria de' Medici*. (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982).

Marshall, Sherrin. *The Dutch Gentry, 1500-1650: Family, Faith, and Fortune* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987).

Ploeg, Peter van der, Carola Vermeeren et al., *Princely Patrons: The Collection of Frederick Henry of Orange and Amalia of Solms in The Hague* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997).

Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies* (London: Routledge, 1990).

Montias, John Michael. *Art at Auction in 17th Century Amsterdam* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2002).

Morgan, Luke. *Nature as model: Salomon de Caus and Early Seventeenth-Century landscape Design*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

Nochlin, Linda. *Women, Art, and Power: And Other Essays*, 1st ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1988).

Oman, Carola. *Elizabeth of Bohemia* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938).

Parente, James A. *Religious drama and the humanist tradition: Christian theater in Germany and in the Netherlands, 1500-1680*. (Leiden: Brill, 1987).

Peacock, Martha Moffitt. "Early Modern Dutch Women and the City: The Imaging of Economic Agency and Power," in *Urban Space in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 667-712.

Peck, Linda Levy. *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Pelt Robert Jan, and M. E. Tiethoff-Spliethoff. *Het Binnenhof: van grafelijke residentie tot regeringscentrum* (Bataafsche Leeuw, 1984).

Pennington, Richard. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Etched Work of Wenceslaus Hollar, 1607-1677*. (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

Peter-Raupp, Hanna. *Die Ikonographie Des Oranjezaal*. (Hildesheim and New York: G. Olms, 1980).

Platt, John. *Reformed Thought and Scholasticism: The Arguments for the Existence of God in Dutch Theology, 1575-1650*. (Leiden, Brill, 1982).

Pierson, Stacey. *Collectors, Collections and Museums: The Field of Chinese Ceramics in Britain, 1560-1960*. (Oxford: P. Lang, 2007).

Pijl-Ketel, C.L. van der. *The Ceramic Load of the "Witte Leeuw" (1613)*. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1982).

Poelhekke, Jan. *Frederik Hendrik: Prins van Oranje: een biografisch drieluik door J.J. Poelhekke*. (Zutphen: De Walburg pers, 1978).

- Polleross, Friedrich. "Between Typology and Psychology: The Role of the Identification Portrait in Updating Old Testament Representations," *Artibus et Historiae* 12, no. 24 (1991): 75-117.
- Polleross, Friedrich. "Ergotzliche Lust der Diana: Jagd, Maskerade und Porträt," *Wolfenbitteler Arbeiten zur Barockforschung*, 28 (1997): 795-820.
- Raaij, Stefan van. *Imitation and Inspiration: Japanese Influence on Dutch Art* (Amsterdam: Art Unlimited Books, 1989).
- Reidemeister, L. "Die Porzellankabinette der brandenburgisch-preussischen Schlösser," *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen Berlin*, 55 (1933): 262-272.
- Reiss, Sheryl and David G. Wilkins, et al. *Beyond Isabella: Secular Women Patrons of Art in Renaissance Italy* (Kirkville: Truman State University Press, 2001).
- Rinaldi, Maura. *Kraak Porcelain: A Moment in the History of Trade*. (London: Bamboo Pub., 1989).
- Robb, Nesca A. *William of Orange, a Personal Portrait* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963).
- Rooses, Max. *Jacob Jordaens: His Life and Work*. Translated by Elisabeth C. Broers. (London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1908).
- Ross, Josephine. *The Winter Queen: The Story of Elizabeth Stuart* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979).
- Royalton-Kisch, Martin. *Adriaen van de Venne's album in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum* (London: Published for the Trustees of the British Museum by British Museum Publications, 1988).
- Serre, Sr. de la. *Histoire de l'entree de la reyne mere du roy tres-chrestien, dans la Grande-Bretagne*. (London: J. Raworth for G. Thomason & O. Pullen, 1639.).
- Slothouwer, D. *De paleizen van Frederik Hendrik* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1945).
- Spallanzani, Marco. "Medici Porcelain in the Collection of the Last Grand-Duke," *The Burlington Magazine* 132, no. 1046 (May 1990): 316-320.
- Spicer, Joaneath A et al., *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht During the Golden Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).

- Spliethoff, Marieke. *Oranje in de wieg: over geboorte en doop van vorstenkinderen*. (Apeldoorn: Paleis Het Loo Nationaal Museum, 2004).
- Spliethoff, Marieke. "De drie oudste kinderen van stadhouder Frederik Hendrik en Amalia van Solms," *Vereniging Rembrandt* (2010): 23-27.
- Stock, Phyllis. *Better Than Rubies: A History of Women's Education*. (New York: Putnam, 1978).
- Strengholt, L. *Constanter het leven van Constantijn Huygens* (Amsterdam: Querido, 1987).
- Terwen, J. *Pieter Post (1608-1669): Architect*. (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 1993).
- Toen, Irma. *Strategic Affection?: Gift Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Holland* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007).
- Thornton, Peter. *Form & Decoration: Innovation in the Decorative Arts, 1470-1870* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1998).
- Roy, Alain, et al. *Theodoor van Thulden: een zuidnederlandse barokschilder: 's-Hertogenbosch, 1606-1669/ Un peintre baroque du cercle de Rubens: Bois-le-Duc, 1606-1669* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1991).
- Troost, Wouter. *William III the Stadholder-king: a political biography* (Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2005).
- Rebecca Joslyn Tucker, "The Art of Living Nobly: The Patronage of Prince Fredrik Hendrik (1584--1647) at the Palace of Honselaarsdijk During the Dutch Republic" Ph. D. Diss., New York: New York University, 2002.
- Veldman, Ilja M. "Lessons for Ladies: A Selection of Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Dutch Prints," *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 16, no. 2/3 (January 1, 1986): 113-127.
- Volker, T. *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company, as Recorded in the Dag-Registers of Batavia Castle, Those of Hirado and Deshima, and Other Contemporary Papers, 1602-1682*. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1954).
- Watson, William. "Lacquerwork in Asia and Beyond," *Colloquies on Art & Archaeology in Asia*, 11 (1982).
- Wendland, Anna, ed. *Briefe der Elisabeth Stuart, Königin von Böhmen, an ihren Sohn, den Kurfürsten Carl Ludwig von der Pfalz: 1650-1662* (Litterarischer Verein in Stuttgart, 1902).

- Wheelock, Arthur K., Jr. *Flemish Paintings of the Seventeenth Century: The Collections of the National Gallery of Art Systematic Catalogue* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2005).
- Willem Frederik, *Gloria parendi: dagboeken van Willem Frederik, stadhouder van Friesland, Groningen en Drenthe, 1643-1654*. Edited by J. Visser and G.N. van der Plaats. (Amsterdam: Nederlands Historisch Genootschap, 1995).
- Wilson, Joan. "A Phenomenon of Taste: The China Ware of Queen Mary II," *Apollo*, 96, no. 126 (1972): 1116-123.
- Winkel, Marieke. *Fashion and Fancy: Dress and Meaning in Rembrandt's Paintings* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006).
- Wishnevsky, Rose. *Studien zum "portrait historié" in den Niederlanden*. (Bamberg: Rodenbusch, 1967).
- Worp, J. *Constantijn Huygens* (Baarn: Hollandia, 1914).
- Yates, Frances Amelia. *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London: Routledge, 1996).
- Yonan, Michael E. "Veneers of Authority: Chinese Lacquers in Maria Theresa's Vienna," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37, no. 4 (Summer 2004): 652-672.
- Zandvliet K. and Leonard Blussé, et al. *The Dutch Encounter with Asia, 1600-1950*. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 2002).
- Zimmerman, Heinrich. "Das Inventar der Prager Schatz- und Kunstkammer vom 6. Dezember 1621," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 24 (1905): XIII-LI.
- Zuylen van Nyevelt, Suzette. *Court life in the Dutch republic, 1638-1689*. (London and New York: J.M. Dent & Co. and E.P. Dutton & Co., 1906).
-