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Visual Arts M/F

In 1632, the vastly wealthy Magdalena Stockmans received a letter from her older sister Elisabeth, who was living in Amsterdam at the time. Magdalena was in Antwerp on her way to Amsterdam. She had travelled from Naples, where she had lived with her husband and children who had all passed away by then. Now alone, Magdalena was returning to Amsterdam. There she would move into a house and decorate the interior with, among many other things, paintings, as was expected of someone of her high standing. Her sister wrote her the following about the availability of paintings in Amsterdam: 'Here too one can obtain paintings in abundance. [We] have the best masters living here at present'.[[1]](#footnote-1) Elisabeth was comparing the Amsterdam art market with that of Antwerp, where her sister was at the time. Not long before, Antwerp had been the artistic center of Northern Europe. After the Fall of Antwerp in 1585 and the subsequent immigration to the Republic, the consumption and production of the visual arts in the Northern Netherlands grew explosively.[[2]](#footnote-2) In 1632, according to Elisabeth, paintings were also available in Amsterdam 'in abundance' and 'the best masters' were living there. There were still international connections between Amsterdam, what is now Europe and, to a lesser degree, the rest of the world: many painters were immigrants, foreign art was also sold in the Republic, and locally produced art was shipped abroad. Seen from an international perspective, however, the production of paintings in Northern Netherlands had caught up with pre-existing artistic centers such as Antwerp. Today, the seventeenth century still stands as a remarkable chapter in the history of Dutch visual arts.

The visual arts produced in the Republic were exceptional in some respects, but comparable to the situation in others elsewhere in Europe. Comparable, because, for example, the court in The Hague played an important role in the art market, even though the young Republic was not a monarchy. Also comparable were the relatively wide range of Biblical images and the unabated popularity of classicism, in its many forms (see also Chapter 18).[[3]](#footnote-3) The art market was remarkable because new subjects first came on the market in the Republic in the seventeenth century: landscapes, interior scenes, still lifes. These were mainly bought by urban citizens (burghers) to decorate their homes. The private individual as a buyer of art and the household as a place of consumption amazed foreign visitors to Dutch cities. They noticed a preference for painting among the local population, although printmaking, silversmithing, and sculpture were also flourishing at the time. This essay describes the visual arts, especially painting, as part of household consumption, and interprets its significance in a social context. By considering art as part of the household, women like the Stockmans sisters step into the light for the first time. They were the ones running the household and were responsible for both household consumption and decorating private interiors. Nevertheless, the Dutch art market of the seventeenth century has always been considered a man's world in which art was made by and for men. This essay demonstrates that women - one-third of persons named in this chapter - offer a new perspective into a phenomenon that has caused astonishment since the seventeenth century: the strong desire of wealthy citizens to decorate their homes with paintings.

Household Consumption

Uniquely, a significant part of Dutch art production was intended for domestic consumption. Almost all paintings made in the Republic were intended for the homes of citizens and not just for churches or palaces. Elsewhere in Europe and previously in the Northern Netherlands, the church and court had been the dominant players in the art market. Individual Catholics, the stadholder court, and the Dutch nobility also commissioned art, but they were not the only art buyers of importance in the Republic. An example is the imposing tomb sculpture of noblewoman Anna van Ewsum and her first husband Carel Hieronymus van In- and Kniphuisen in Midwolde (Fig. [7.2](https://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Praalgraf_van_Van_In-_en_Kniphuisen#/media/Bestand:Interieur,_overzicht_marmeren_grafmonument_van_In-_en_Kniphuisen_-_Midwolde_-_20372345_-_RCE.jpg)). A unique role was reserved for citizens - men and women like the Stockmans sisters. They commissioned works of art, but also purchased paintings from stock on a partly 'open market'. Scholars have always paid ample attention to private people as art buyers in the Dutch Republic, but in this discussion, women have been systematically overlooked. Art made for public buildings, such as the stadholder residences, the Amsterdam Town Hall, and the district water control boards (*hoogheemraadschappen*), has received considerable attention only since the 1980s. The effort to catch up was necessary because decorative programs in public spaces usually adhered to international standards and do not, as a result, look particularly 'Dutch', which clashed with the laudatory nature of already existing art historical literature about the seventeenth century. Although scholarship now represents a more diverse image of the art production in the Dutch Republic, women as consumers and the household as the main destination of art production have been left out of the picture.

In the seventeenth century the domestic domain included the house and its interior, including all things and people that belonged to it. Everything inside the home of a married couple was run by the lady of the house. Real-estate was not part of her domain, based on seventeenth-century ledgers in which people recorded household spending.[[4]](#footnote-4) For instance, while a wife would hire and oversee a craftsman repairing a gutter, her husband would have the exclusive legal right to sign a deed to purchase a house or a piece of land or enter an agreement to rent a home. Most wealthy, married couples divided household duties along these lines, leaving the wife to manage all personnel: servants with a permanent position, but also people who held temporary positions, such as wet nurses and cleaning women who would be hired several days a year, often in springtime. Raising the children, managing multiple wardrobes, and overseeing the daily cooking and cleaning all belonged to the domestic domain and were part of a married woman's responsibilities. Logically, household consumption related to a woman's duties was extensive and included the purchase of all household goods, such as clothes, but also art and other luxury products. The domestic domain was long considered female and its public counterpart male, but recent scholarship has shown that the public and the private overlapped and that semi-gendered worlds were connected in various ways. Furthermore, single men and unmarried or widowed women ran households independently.

Intact domestic interiors from the seventeenth century no longer exist. Those who want to know what domestic interiors originally looked like are mainly dependent on painted interior scenes and a dozen surviving doll's houses.[[5]](#footnote-5) The doll's house compiled by Petronella Oortmans, for example, shows that there were richly decorated rooms where guests were received and that the attic was used by workers to press laundry, for example (Fig. [9.5](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/BK-NM-1010)). In addition to paintings, there were all kinds of luxury goods, some of which had come to Amsterdam on ships, as discussed below. Only one seventeenth-century furnished interior is still fully intact: the regents' room of the Deutzenhofje, named after its founder, Agneta Deutz (Fig. [1.3](https://www.amsterdam.nl/publish/pages/950230/af_20200806regentenkamerrce_10.png)). In her many wills, Deutz laid down her heavily detailed plans, including which objects from her personal household were to be used to furnish the regent's room after her death.[[6]](#footnote-6) No heating or electricity was ever installed in the room, and even the glasses are still in the cupboard; nothing may be altered because Deutz decreed it so. Only a set of candelabras is missing from the unique room: it is on display in the Rijksmuseum (Fig. [15.1](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/BK-NM-13268-C)). The space shows how the multitude of materials and types of objects - gold leather wallpaper, silver and porcelain, embroidered chairs, mirrors with ebony frames, and of course paintings - create a new whole, rich in textures and layering. Based on the many probate inventories that survive in Dutch archives, many wealthy merchant's homes in the seventeenth century were as well-stocked as the regent's room furnished by Deutz.

Sometimes an (international) move was the reason for redecorating a house, as in the case of Magdalena Stockmans. More often the reason would have been marriage. Many newlywed couples in the Republic moved into their own house, which had to be furnished with all kinds of things. Much of this had to be purchased new, although wealthy couples also inherited household goods, such as household linens and silver or porcelain kitchenware. As argued by Jan de Vries, this was unique in the European context and the reason why the Republic can be and has been considered the cradle of today's consumer society.[[7]](#footnote-7) The seventeenth-century perspective on this theory and the purchase of household goods by newlyweds is provided by Hieronymus Sweerts. In his satirical novel *De Tien Vermakelijkheden des Huwelijk* (1670), he prepared the groom for what 'entertainments' awaited him, including his wife going out shopping almost immediately after the wedding night:

‘Because your Sweetheart is talking about purchasing large Venetian mirrors, Indian egg-shell porcelain [Indisch Kraakporselein], velvet chairs, Turkish tapestries, Amsterdam Gold Leather Wall Hangings, expensive paintings, silver service, a wooden cabinet [een Sakkerdaanhouten Kast], an ebony table, another cabinet and a diaper cabinet, various sets of napkins and table linens, fine and coarse linens, expensive lace and a thousand other things and hodgepodge [spullen en prullen], [a list] too long to relay… And this, at the very least, we must have, so says the wife, before an honorable person is allowed in our home.’[[8]](#footnote-8)

This passage, which is illustrated with a print, contains a long list of household objects that are reminiscent of the wide variety of materials that were used in Deutz's regent room and Oortmans' dollhouse (Fig. [15.2](https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/swee002tien01_01/swee002tien01ill0006.gif)). Here, too, it is striking that the origin of many of these objects is diverse and explicitly stated: the mirrors are Venetian, the porcelain is Indian, the carpets are from Turkey, etc. Only the gold leather wall hangings are described as a local Amsterdam product. The domestic domain thus had an international character: local products were part of a whole that could only be brought together thanks to world trade.

The male reader was advised by Sweerts not to interfere with the shopping spree of his new wife. He would not even have to formulate an opinion about which painting would hang over the chimney piece - he most prominent and status-rich spot to hang a picture. Even if his wife would not know what to do, her girlfriends would: 'Oh, they have the right style so precisely in their heads that you don't even have to argue with your Sweetheart whether a painting should be hung above the chimney or not!'[[9]](#footnote-9) Which realities underlie Sweerts' satirical exaggerations is difficult to gage, but the division of gendered roles is clear: the husband had to provide sufficient income and it was his wife's responsibility to furnish the house and to buy everything she thought necessary for it. Only after the long list of household and luxury goods, including capital paintings, had been purchased, Sweerts wrote, would the lady of the house let in an honorable person.[[10]](#footnote-10) Filling the house with 'opulence and treasure[s]', to borrow the words of the Dutch poet Joost van den Vondel, was clearly a matter of honor and reputation.[[11]](#footnote-11) One might even argue that interior decoration was a way for women to raise the social and professional status of their family.

Women and men wanting to decorate their homes with paintings had to enter an overcrowded art market. That art market had grown strongly not only because of immigration, but also because more and more people had a surplus of income to spend on luxury products (see also Chapter 14).[[12]](#footnote-12) Despite the unprecedentedly high demand for paintings, it was still a buyers' market: supply surpassed demand because artists immigrated to the Northern Netherlands in large numbers as well, especially from the Southern Netherlands. With a high demand and an even higher supply, a mass market for paintings emerged and it was, like most mass markets, subject to product and process innovation.[[13]](#footnote-13) Under pressure, artists were forced to innovate, for example, by developing a new product or applying a new technique that made the production process cheaper without reducing the perceived value of the product. The latter market phenomenon is called process innovation, a well-known example of which is the landscape painting of Jan van Goyen. He developed a new technique called wet-in-wet that allowed him to work more quickly: visible to the naked eye is how Van Goyen painted details using still wet paint layers he had applied before (Fig. [2.3](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-A-3249)). An example of product innovation are the nightcaps that were printed by the engraver Magdalena van de Passe with political scenes and newsworthy events, such as the Battle of Leipzig and the defeat of the Spanish fleet in 1631. In 1630, Van de Passe obtained the exclusive right to produce her unique and politically charged caps. She had created a niche in the art market, and anyone who trespassed on her territory would have to pay her a fine by order of the States General. Thanks in part to the creative innovations of artists such as Van Goyen and Van de Passe, the visual arts on offer in the artistic centers of the Republic were extremely diverse.

During the seventeenth century, the percentage of landscape painting in Dutch probate inventories increased, mostly at the cost of Biblical and classical narratives. By 1650, the largest category in probate inventories was landscape painting. In the Southern Netherlands in the sixteenth century, landscapes had served only as backgrounds for Biblical and other representations. With the shift of the artistic center to the Northern Netherlands in the seventeenth century, the landscape developed into an autonomous subject. The same happened with still life painting and representations of everyday life, although the latter category still appeared only in limited numbers in estate inventories at the end of the seventeenth century. Such profane, 'neutral' subjects would more easily find a wider audience on the open market than subjects conceived with a particular religious group in mind, as would have been the case with some Biblical themes (also see Chapter 13). Within the popular category of landscape painting the range was diverse, varying from local to so-called Italianate landscapes, from seascapes to dune landscapes, and from winter landscapes to landscapes by night (Figs. [2.1](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-A-5030), [2.2](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/RP-P-OB-80.778), [2.3](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-A-3249), [2.4](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-C-1705)). The range of landscapes also varied in terms of price level. In probate inventories, inexpensive, often small-scale landscapes appeared in increasing numbers.[[14]](#footnote-14) At the other, so high-end of the spectrum, masters such as Jacob Isaacksz van Ruisdael worked on commission for exorbitant prices. Van Ruisdael elevated the local landscape to new artistic heights by depicting, for example, a windmill from below and setting it against a dramatic cloudscape (Fig. [15.3](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-C-211)). Navigating the abundant supply in the art market could be an overwhelming challenge, to which art dealers and brokers skillfully responded. Elisabeth, for example, reassured her sister that she, Elisabeth, knew someone who could help Magdalena with the many paintings she was about to purchase for her new Amsterdam home.

More internationally oriented movements in painting, such as history painting, *portraits historiés*, and so-called Italianate landscapes, were also in demand. Stories from the Bible, mythology, and contemporary literature were depicted in a variety of ways in the seventeenth century: Mannerist, Caravaggist, classicist, or academic. Many of these modes of painting were developed by artists who were looking at art production outside the Republic. Some painters were mobile and traveled to Italy, for example, like Pieter Lastman. His history paintings depict Biblical and mythological stories as clearly and accurately as possible. His depiction of Bathsheba, for example, exactly describes the narrative: the bathing beauty is in the foreground, she is holding the letter she had received from King David, and the king himself is visible in the upper left background (Fig. [15.4](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/c/c8/Lastman_-_The_Toilet_of_Bathsheba_-_Hermitage.jpg/800px-Lastman_-_The_Toilet_of_Bathsheba_-_Hermitage.jpg?20180709083021)). Typically, Lastman's pupil Rembrandt overthrew pictorial conventions with his almost cinematic spectacles of light and dark (Fig. [15.5](https://collections.louvre.fr/en/ark:/53355/cl010060453)). His goal was to make the central emotion in a story recognizable and lifelike, and therefore almost palpable to the viewer. His Bathsheba therefore zooms in on the emotion of the naked woman who wonders whether her loyalty should lie with her sovereign or her husband.[[15]](#footnote-15) King David himself is nowhere to be seen. Incompleteness did not bother Rembrandt at all. Classicists or academists, discussed in detail in Chapter 18, responded in turn to the counter-conventional Rembrandt (Fig. [15.6](https://collections.louvre.fr/en/ark:/53355/cl010064626)). Like the pre-Rembrandtists, they believed that a story should be rendered accurately, recognizably and with due regard for decorum.[[16]](#footnote-16) At the time, this was also referred to as 'welstand' (the art of standing or living well), which in Jacob van Loo's hands translated into a depiction of Bathsheba characterized by her graceful posture and the smooth treatment of her naked skin. Also in history painting, artistic competition and innovation led to uncanny versatility in the visual arts.

Most paintings ended up in residential houses, where they were part of an interior decoration, consisting of furniture, wall coverings, colorful curtains, and floors, and a multitude of decorative and utilitarian objects, such as porcelain, textile, wood, pewter, and silverware. As elsewhere in Europe, some residents owned specialized art collections or so-called cabinets of curiosities, which were filled with rare objects such as shells, gemstones, ivory objects, stuffed birds, and other animals. Foreign visitors remarked that such collections in the Republic were primarily owned by citizens, not aristocrats. In these collections, Dutch people in the seventeenth century often valued objects that were traded by the Dutch. For example, the artist, scientist, and entrepreneur Maria Sybilla Merian sold prepared insects and animals on spirits, and she published large, richly illustrated books about the natural world. Some of the goods she sold came from Suriname, where she herself had traveled to conduct research and from where she had native plants and animals shipped to Amsterdam, amongst others by her daughter Johanna Helena. Merian's Amsterdam workshop, staffed primarily by women, also offered a service in high-quality coloring of botanical prints and publications (Fig. 20.3). The 'exotic' and rare collectibles from afar - shells, taxidermy animals, and books on such subjects - often ended up in so-called cabinets of curiosities. The dollhouse of collector Petronella de la Court, on display in the Centraal Museum in Utrecht, has such a cabinet in it, but in miniature: in the art room stands a miniature cabinet with porcelain and pottery inside, and below it a drawer full of shells. De la Court's collection of 'sea horns' (*zeehoorntjes*) was extremely rare; the botanist Georg Eberhard Rumphius, studied her shells firsthand, included them in his famous *Amboinsche Rariteitkamer* (1705), mentioned De la Court by name in his book, and praised her as a collector (Fig. 20.2). Based on the auction catalog of her possessions, it appears that after the death of her husband, with whom she had begun collecting, she continued independently. For instance, she commissioned artists such as Willem van Mieris and Francis van Bossuit after her husband's death. De la Court thus owned several collections: her doll's house, her cabinet(s) of curiosities, and her art collection, the best of which was presented in a special art room. Art and curiosity collections varied widely in size and nature; in fact, cabinets and collections could take as many forms as there were collectors. The constant factor, however, was the domestic domain in which visual art was brought together with all kinds of other household and luxury objects.

Working at Home

Not only was the home the predominant destination for art in the seventeenth century; paintings were also produced and sold in workshops and shops that were often literally attached to residential houses. Visitors to Rembrandt's workshop, for example, had to pass through private rooms to reach the master's studio on the second floor. Because of the connection of the workshop to the house, the whole family could be involved in the painting business. However, not everyone's participation was documented in the archives. As such, their work and participation in the workshop often remains (partly) invisible. The painter's profession was often passed on from generation to generation. Apprentices were trained at home, as was the custom among craftsmen in early modern Europe. In the seventeenth century, the artist's social status grew, which caused even more parents to wish for their children to aspire to a career as a painter. These children, especially boys, but to a limited extent girls as will also be discussed below, had to be apprenticed to a master, as elsewhere in Europe (Fig. [15.8](https://www.getty.edu/art/collection/object/103RFR)); schools or art academies were few and far between. An apprenticeship as a painter typically lasted four years, and already during this time the apprentice was expected to contribute to the production of the workshop. What an apprenticeship looked like is here illustrated by the best documented and most researched workshop of the seventeenth century: that of Rembrandt.

After his own training as a painter in the Leiden studio of Jacob van Swanenburg and in the Amsterdam studio of Pieter Lastman, Rembrandt started out on his own in Leiden. In the early 1630s, he moved to Amsterdam, where he worked for several years in the workshop or shop ('winkel') of the art dealer Hendrick Uylenburg. He later opened his own workshop in his lavish house on the Sint Anthonisbreestraat--today's Rembrandt House Museum. The pupils who trained there with Rembrandt between 1639 and 1657 all had to start by drawing. Artist and Art Theorist Karel van Mander wrote that the art of drawing was 'The Father of Painting' and Willem Goeree baptized it the 'Womb and Nourisher of all Arts and Sciences'.[[17]](#footnote-17) They advised pupils to draw zealously; 'feel free to besmirch a great deal of paper', Van Mander wrote. Although such advice must have indirectly produced an abundance of sketches, virtually all drawings made by aspiring painters have been lost. Rembrandt's workshop is the sole exception, albeit an important one. The surviving sheets made by him and his pupils illustrate which stages pupils had to go through, as also described by Van Mander, Goeree, and other writing painters. It was key to copy all kinds of examples, whereby the degree of difficulty was continuously increased: pupils began with copying ears, eyes, and noses; and ended with copying and varying on whole compositions. Workshops such as Rembrandt's would have had entire libraries of images, example books, and series of engravings depicting all parts of the human body, which were all meant to be copied by the youngsters. Only after the copying stage did pupils learn how to draw three-dimensional models - often sculpture - and finally 'from life' (*naer 't leven*).

Finally, the pupil was expected to be able to draw from the imagination ('uyt de geest'), that is, to come up with ideas by themselves and, in so doing, create original inventions. Working towards acquiring this skill, Ferdinand Bol was given an assignment to devise an alternative composition to a history scene drawn by the master himself. Comparing the two drawings of the same subject (Christ appearing to Mary Magdalene), Bol's rendition of Mary Magdalen's reaction to Christ's sudden appearance is less convincing than his Rembrandt's lifelike portrayal of her shock (Figs. [11.3](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/RP-T-1961-80/catalogue-entry) and [11.4](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/RP-T-1930-29)). Likely, Rembrandt's reprimand will not have been gentle: Samuel van Hoogstraten, another pupil of Rembrandt, confessed later in his life that he was sometimes 'saddened by master's teaching,' although he also realized that his apprenticeship had been the best possible learning experience.[[18]](#footnote-18) After the drawing stages, the learning process was repeated in paint: Rembrandt's pupils had to make partial copies and were instructed to vary on Rembrandt's compositions. Eventually, they were able to devise and paint original inventions entirely on their own. The apprentice was now ready to work independently and start his own workshop. In addition to apprentices, some workshops had assistants and/or servants who contributed in yet another way to the studio production. Often the completion of an apprenticeship meant that the young, now independent master had to find a new home; normally, it seems, apprentices lived with the master.

As elsewhere in Europe, a career as a painter was not equally accessible to everyone. To begin with, an apprenticeship cost money. Quite a lot, in fact. On May 1, 1630, Rembrandt stated that he had received 50 guilders to instruct Isaak Jouderville in the art of painting for six months. That amount probably included board and lodging. Eighty percent of the urban population in the Republic had an annual income of less than 600 guilders and artisans had to make ends meet with an income of circa 300-350 guilders.[[19]](#footnote-19) Clearly, not everyone had the means to become a painter. Women who wanted to learn how to paint would encounter even more limitations. Most painters known by name came from an artistic family and were trained by a relative. Very few women artists found an apprenticeship outside the family. A well-known example is the Haarlem painter Judith Leyster whose father was a weaver and later owned a brewery, albeit briefly (Fig. [14.4](https://www.nga.gov/collection/highlights/leyster-self-portrait.html)). Maria van Oosterwijck was also apprenticed to a man who was not her father. According to Houbraken, Jan Davidsz de Heem was her master (Fig. [3.2](https://www.pubhist.com/w6453)). Rachel Ruysch learned the profession from Willem van Aelst (Fig. [15.9](Rachel%20Ruysch,%20Still-life%20with%20Flowers,%201700,%20Den%20Haag,%20Mauritshuis)). Most artists, men and women, were trained by their fathers, mothers, or other family members. Gesina ter Borch and Maria Schalcken were, for instance, able to hitch a ride on the training of their brothers (Fig. [12.3](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/BI-1890-1952-46)). Finally, while a career as a painter may have seemed promising to many, it was unthinkable that a scion from a wealthy, high-ranking family would become a professional painter. Aristocrats, regents, and other members of the elite may have aspired to a profession as an artist, but for them painting could never be more than a hobby or an element of their humanistic education, as was the case with the privileged Catharina Backer. Therefore, most painters of the seventeenth-century Republic were male and well-to-do middle class. Only to them, an apprenticeship was affordable and a career as a painter offered a promising prospect.

That positive prospect changed around the 1660s. By then the art market had suffered heavy blows from, among other things, the First Anglo-Dutch War. Afterwards, a career as a painter probably involved considerable risks. Fewer young men and women joined the profession, as shown by the flattening of the curve in Diagram 14.1. Fashions also gradually changed: women like De la Court had entire rooms painted, from floor to ceiling, often with depictions of landscapes. Her doll's house, which was furnished to approach reality and according to the latest fashion, contains such painted rooms. Such households needed scarcely any easel paintings. Moreover, there were already many paintings on the market, which had been produced *en masse* in the preceding decades. As a result of these changed circumstances, the demand for new paintings declined dramatically. The final blow to the art market came in 1672, which has gone down in history as the Disaster Year, when wars, both a political and economic crisis, decimated the demand for paintings. Successful artists moved abroad. Very few painters managed to survive on what was left of the recently flourishing art market, among whom was the exceptionally productive painter Rachel Ruysch (Fig. [15.9](Rachel%20Ruysch,%20Still-life%20with%20Flowers,%201700,%20Den%20Haag,%20Mauritshuis)).

Function, Status, and Meaning

In the 1560s, an iconoclastic movement had ripped through the Northern Netherlands, leaving many churches damaged or altered forever. In the seventeenth century, when Protestant services often took place in buildings that had been Catholic prior to the Revolt, people were still often reminded of the religious violence. When the architectural painter Pieter Saenredam painted the interior of the Catharijnekerk in Utrecht, the space was devoid of the many Catholic treasures that had once been here and looked austere (Figs. [11.1](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/4/4a/Pieter_Saenredam_-_The_Interior_of_the_Church_of_St_Catherine%2C_Utrecht_NTII_UPH_446733.jpg)). Back at home, Protestant churchgoers - the wealthier ones - were often surrounded by many images and representations, of a religious nature, but also landscapes, portraits, and still lifes. The seemingly paradoxical, post iconoclastic contrast between the visual austerity of public churches and the visual abundance at home can be explained from the social functions of paintings, the visual arts, and other luxury goods. In the very young Republic, the nouveaux riches were in control, both politically and culturally. Clearly, they were not struggling morally with their wealth, putting their riches on display, but it mattered to their social status that they would distinguish themselves from others who were less fortunate and did not belong to an elite few.[[20]](#footnote-20) To demonstrate their social superiority and the legitimacy of their political power, they used fashion, manners, and richly furnished (country) houses. Many aspects of the new manners, codes of conduct, and ostentatious display were based on those of the aristocracy, but the position of that group was hereditary and therefore in a sense unimpeachable. No matter their abundance of political power, non-aristocratic citizens had to work hard to demonstrate the legitimacy of their position. In fact, the only difference from the 'other' was that they could afford the art of living well ('welstand').

Portraitists cleverly capitalized on the social and political ambitions of wealthy citizens. In the first half of the seventeenth century, Frans Hals in Haarlem and Rembrandt in Amsterdam changed the pictorial conventions of portraiture forever by expressing urban pride and the living standard of the urban rich, regents, and merchants, as discussed elsewhere in this book (Figs. [1.1](https://www.franshalsmuseum.nl/en/art/banquet-of-the-officers-of-the-st-george-civic-guard/), [6.8](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-C-5), [12.2](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-C-6), [15.13](https://www.franshalsmuseum.nl/en/art/regentesses-of-the-old-mens-alms-house/), [20.4](https://www.mauritshuis.nl/en/our-collection/artworks/146-the-anatomy-lesson-of-dr-nicolaes-tulp/)). Later still, other portraitists invented new types of portraits, merging virtues held high by the urban elite and a semi-aristocratic appearance. In 1712, Gerard de Lairesse listed the names of portraitists who, according to him, excelled in this: 'I speak of so great and illustrious Masters, such as Van Dyk, Lely, Van Loo, Bakker senior and junior, and others who were so accomplished in the Art [of Painting], that, I say, they added what was noble to what was civil'.[[21]](#footnote-21) De Lairesse is referring here to a specific type of portrait that had been developed by Anthony van Dyck for the international nobility and was adopted by painters who portrayed courtiers in The Hague, such as Gerard van Honthorst and later Jan Mijtens; they, like Van Dyck, enriched portraits with architectural elements and used landscapes as backgrounds (Fig. [3.1](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-A-285)). When in 1648 the Peace of Münster was signed and Spain recognized the Republic as a nation, and two years later the first stadtholderless period began, Amsterdam regents were for the first time on the same political level as the aristocracy.[[22]](#footnote-22) This perceived equality found expression in Amsterdam's portraiture, in which Van Dyckian pictorial elements started to appear. Around 1650, Amsterdam portraitists such as Bartholomeus van der Helst incorporated graceful hand gestures, bright colors, and the suggestion of movement in clothing (Fig. [7.1](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-C-2)). Furthermore, types of portraits that had been previously reserved for monarchs and aristocrats such as the Oranges were also now appropriated by welathy citizens (Fig. [5.1](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-A-255)). For example, the Antwerp sculptor Artus Quellinus I immortalized the Amsterdam mayor Andries de Graeff in marble (Fig. [15.10](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/BK-18305)). By having themselves portrayed as equal or superior to monarch and nobility, regents showed that their social and political ambitions had become reality. The message was clear: the regent class was inferior to nobody.

This sentiment also translated into lavish displays within the domestic realm. The meaning of paintings hung in private homes could best be interpreted in the context of the social status and ambition of its residents. To illustrate, a striking number of still lifes contain objects and commodities in which the residents traded or invested.[[23]](#footnote-23) The showpiece painted by Jan Davidsz de Heem around 1655 includes a nautilus shell from the West Indies, a Brazilian macaw, and a gray parrot from Africa; oranges, plums, figs, and melons were also imported goods (Fig. [3.2](https://www.pubhist.com/w6453)). Other objects often seen in still lifes were brought in large numbers by *Vereenigde Oostindische Compangnie* (VOC) ships from Asia (Fig. 10.1). It is estimated that by 1650 the VOC had shipped over three million pieces of porcelain to Europe. A rare and beautiful example is the Chinese porcelain from the Ming dynasty in a still life by Willem Kalf: the colorful figures are almost completely detached from the base on which they are attached - a true tour de force in color and ceramics (Fig. [15.11](https://www.artsalonholland.nl/uploads/illustraties-groot/82936518-c31a-43f5-9f79-883bfbaf808d/3046560999/KALF%2C%20WILLEM%2C%20Stilleven%20met%20nautilusbeker%2C%201660%2C%20ASH.jpg)). Some traders in the Republic also owed their wealth to the trade in pepper from Borneo, Persian and Taiwanese silk, Japanese copper, shells from the Indonesian island of Ambon, and many other products. By hanging paintings of these foreign goods in their homes, they referred to the source of their prosperity and their share in world trade, be it consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly. The Black boy in the portrait of Margaretha van Raephorst, painted by Jan Mijtens, must also be seen in this way (Fig. [3.1](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-A-285)). Now we recognize the boy, among others, as an involuntary immigrant (see Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion), but at the time his presence in the portrait would have signified a status symbol.

The domestic interior was not only considered a new status symbol among wealthy citizens, but also became an autonomous subject in painting for the first time in the seventeenth century. Flemish painters such as David Vinckboons had brought scenes of everyday life, such as country fairs, with them to the Republic, where the subject matter was adapted to the wishes of local art buyers (Fig. [16.4](https://www.mauritshuis.nl/en/our-collection/artworks/542-country-fair/)). In the hands of Johannes Vermeer, Gabriel Metsu, and other specialists who would later be called genre painters, the interior scene became the iconic image of the seventeenth century (Figs. [16.9](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/0/03/Johannes_Vermeer_-_The_lacemaker_(c.1669-1671).jpg/523px-Johannes_Vermeer_-_The_lacemaker_(c.1669-1671).jpg), [9.3](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/7/72/Metsu_LeMarchéAuxHerbesDAmsterdam.jpg)). At the time, such scenes of daily life were called 'modern pictures', because they showed figures in contemporary interiors and dress. Geertruydt Roghman was the first artist to produce interior pieces in print, a series she had invented herself (Fig. [9.2](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/RP-P-OB-4232)). With no written sources about how interior pieces were intended or interpreted at the time, seemingly lifelike representations such as these have left important question unanswered: why was the interior depicted so often and what exactly do scenes like this mean? Wayne Franits writes about questions of meaning in detail in Chapter 16. What is clear is that interior pieces depict the domain of women. Pieter de Hooch, for example, often filled his interiors with women with varying roles in the household: from the working servant to the lady of the house and daughter learning from her mother (in this painting, the mother feeds an infant, while the daughter cradles a cat in her arms) (Fig. 16.3). Even when interpreting the meaning of rural fairs, the depicted perspective is always that of the affluent, art-buying urbanite. People living in rural areas, like those depicted in Adriaen van Ostade's paintings, would not have bought his paintings; if the painter incorporated a message into his paintings at all, that message was probably only intended to entertain his buying audience (Figs. 16.6 and 16.7). After all, the audience considered themselves both morally and socially superior to the less privileged people depicted in the painting.

Burghers did not just flaunt their status and power in their canal houses. In the middle of Amsterdam's public space, construction began in 1648 on a new city hall: the current palace on Dam Square. At the top of the façade, in the triangular pediment, sits a personification of the city of Amsterdam as a now implausible symbol of innocence and purity (Fig. 0.4, the pediment is also discussed in the introduction to this book). References to world trade, prosperity, and superiority are ubiquitous in the decorative program of the Stadhuis, both outside and inside. In the semi-public buildings of guilds and militias hung group portraits painted by portraitists such as Frans Hals, Rembrandt, and Van der Helst (Figs. [1.1](https://www.franshalsmuseum.nl/en/art/banquet-of-the-officers-of-the-st-george-civic-guard/), [12.2](https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/SK-C-6), 20.4). In militia paintings and other group portraits, individual status and urban pride go hand in hand, albeit in widely ranging compositions. Male and female regents of the many charitable institutions that existed in the Republic also liked to be portrayed in their administrative roles; for example, visitors to the regents' room of the Oudemannenhuis in Haarlem came face to face with the 'governesses', painted by Hals, who were responsible for the daily and domestic affairs of the charitable institution (Fig. [15.13](https://www.franshalsmuseum.nl/en/art/regentesses-of-the-old-mens-alms-house/)). Clearly, in addition to holding administrative positions, regents were expected to uphold a certain lifestyle. In the second half of the seventeenth century, living well increasingly meant that one had to own a country home. For example, the widow Magdalena Poulle, together with her intended heir, had herself portrayed with the ground plan of Gunterstein, a knightly manor that she had had built along the river Vecht; she lived there from 1680 onwards (Fig. [15.14](https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_jaa030200101_01/_jaa030200101ill0036.gif)). Thanks to the accompanying gardens and the nonindiginous plants she collected herself, she acquired an international reputation among collectors and botanists. She and her portraitist made sure that her independently acquired status would escape nobody, hence the map and her heir in the portrait. In that respect, Poulle is representative of the way in which her contemporaries deployed painting for their social aspirations, both in the home and in the (semi)public space, within and outside the city.

Conclusion

The seventeenth century can be described as a period in which the production of painting, more than other visual arts, was unprecedented in both quantitative and qualitative terms, and it would never reach such heights again. It was a time when private citizens played a decisive role as consumers in the art market. Moreover, visual art played an important social role: it was a way for the very rich to show who they were, how they related to the (international) aristocracy, and what they considered 'lower' classes of society. A pompous household meant that you belonged to a select group who was also in charge politically, and that you were a 'person of honor'. What is and is not exceptional about the situation in the Dutch Republic is best understood when viewed in the international context.

In 1718 the biographer Arnold Houbraken looked back on the seventeenth century as a bygone era in which the visual arts flourished: 'Then was the Golden Age of the Arts, and the golden apples (now only attainable through unpleasant ways and sweat) dripped routinely into artists' mouths.'[[24]](#footnote-24) It was hard work to be an artist at the beginning of the eighteenth century, if we are to believe Houbraken. According to him, artists had it easy not long before. In reality, however, that was not the case: many artists in the seventeenth century had to work hard to survive. Nowadays, the term 'the Golden Age' has become problematic because it glosses over the darker sides of history. For art history, this is certainly true: almost all art buyers of the seventeenth century were rich or privileged in one way or another.

There are still aspects of art production and consumption in the seventeenth century that have remained underexposed and need scholarly attention. All too often, for instance, women rarely appear in art historical overviews of the era, and when they are mentioned, it is usually in a short, separate segment, creating the impression that these apparently noteworthy women were exceptions to the rule that the art market of the time was a man's world. In the meantime, recent research has shown that women played a more important role in the art market, both as painters and as consumers, than was previously assumed.[[25]](#footnote-25) Therefore, this chapter is illustrated as much as possible, but only where relevant, with examples of women artists, sitters, and buyers. The result is, above all, a more historically accurate picture of the paintings that were produced and consumed in the seventeenth-century Republic. Moreover, the female perspective, in addition to the male, provides a better picture of the everyday practices and domestic realm in which art was purchased, viewed, and preserved for future generations. Finally, the female perspective sheds new light on some of the most characterizing aspects of art production: the burgher as an art buyer of paintings and the private home as a destination for consumption.

Reflecting on the past, Houbraken must also have thought about women. For him it was probably more obvious than for us that women belonged in the art market: not only did he include many women artists in his lexicon of artists' biographies and speak highly of them, Houbraken also published a book with the Dutch poet Gesine Brit. She wrote poems to accompany prints that Houbraken had made. The publication is in both their names.[[26]](#footnote-26) Houbraken also trained not only his son as an artist, but his two daughters as well. No works of art are known from the hand of these daughters, but we are well-informed about his granddaughter: Christina Maria Elliger. In 1751, the painter and author Johan Gool praised her for her 'artistic ability', likening portraits, and drawings 'from life (*naer 't leven*).[[27]](#footnote-27) At seventeen, Christina was in the spring of her career, Van Gool wrote and he hoped that her 'summer' would be fruitful and her 'autumn' rich, thinking in terms of flowering and decay, just as Christina's grandfather Houbraken had done when he looked back at the seventeenth century and sang its praises.
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Diagram 14.1: Estimate of the number of artists and publishers active in the Republic, 1580-1700.
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