



Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy (1588-1650/56) and Portraiture in Amsterdam around 1620-45

BY DAVID BURMEISTER KAARING

When Rembrandt (1606-69) went to Amsterdam in 1631 in order to work for the art dealer Hendrik Uylenburgh (1584/89-1661), the pre-eminent portrait painter in town was Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy. Nowadays, Rembrandt is famous across the entire globe whereas only a few know Pickenoy; art history tends to mainly mention him in connection with Rembrandt in order to show how the younger artist's lifelike portraits left those of Pickenoy and his generation dated and obsolete.¹ For those who take this position, the fact that Pickenoy kept painting in the old manner is regarded as a sign that he was unable to change with the times, to adjust to the demands stipulated by the new vein of portraiture: that a portrait should go behind outer appearances to capture the inner essence of the person portrayed.² Taking Pickenoy's four portraits at Statens Museum for Kunst as my point of departure, I will examine his style of portraiture in some detail and then proceed to attempt to understand the paintings on their own terms. I will do so by examining a selection of Pickenoy's clients with a view to finding parallels between their expectations and Pickenoy's portrait idiom.

Pickenoy's pendant portraits

The knee-length portraits painted by Nicolaes Pickenoy constituted a variation on a type of portrait popular in Amsterdam and originally developed by his teacher Cornelis van der Voort (c. 1576-1624). In these paintings, the person portrayed is depicted life-sized in a static, three-quarters turned pose in front of a neutral background. Besides gloves and perhaps a hat, typically held in the hands, no objects in the paintings draw attention away from the person portrayed. It could be said that this form of portraiture is quite a curious one; on the one hand the knee-length portrait does not have the clear spatial structures of the full-length portrait, and on the other hand the only real feature differentiating it from half-length figures is the fact that we see more leg, prompting a greater sense of distance to the person portrayed. Thus, the knee-length portrait offers no real additions to the expressive devices of the half-length figures, but the distance between the observer and the person portrayed creates a corresponding sense of mental distance: the person portrayed is perceived as less approachable, more formal than the half-length figure.³

A central aspect of these portraits is their

level of abstraction: nothing distracts our attention from the person depicted. He or she is imbued with a stately air by virtue of their pose and, especially, the sense of distance. This – and the cool, descriptive style of painting – can seem impersonal to modern-day audiences, but at the time of their creation they were not perceived that way – as is demonstrated by their popularity: Within Northern Netherlandish portraiture, knee-length portraits are far more commonplace than busts and half-length portraits even though the latter were significantly cheaper.

Portrait of a Man, aged 35 and Portrait of a 26-Year-Old Lady from 1621

The two pendant portraits *Portrait of a Man, aged 35* and *Portrait of a 26-Year-Old Lady* from 1621 (figs. 1 and 2) are some of the earliest pendant portraits we know from Pickenoy's hand. The two figures are depicted in passive poses, turned three-quarters towards each other. In both pictures the arm closest to the observer hangs down the side in a relaxed pose, reinforcing the sensation that the two figures mirror each other. This mirroring and the fact that both spouses observe the observer is the only kind of meeting that ever arises between the pair, and in a sense this is enough; one is never left in any doubt that this is a married couple. It also means that the portraits require a third party – the observer – to link up the companion pieces and create a single whole out of the two pictures, for there is no direct contact between the married couple, no gesture, movement or eye contact that might give rise to an inner coherence. The couple's seemingly cool relationship and expressionless faces give the portraits a very formal and matter-of-fact quality that modern-day observers might find awkward in light of the fact that they are, after all, portraits of a married couple. Some have even held that the awkwardness they perceived was caused by Pickenoy's shortcomings; that his skill was insufficient to express the personality of the persons depicted.⁴ Pickenoy's manner of portraiture did not, however, worry his clients, so such readings call forth some reservations.

The two portraits are typical of Pickenoy's style of portraiture insofar as the figures are clearly delineated against a neutral (olive) background. The contours also close in around the figures, reinforcing the perception of the models as introvert and aloof.⁵ Also

characteristic of Pickenoy are the very well modelled faces, created by means of light hues that nevertheless take on a warm quality because they vary between blushing reds and almost white highlights. Shadows are soft and created using light tones of grey. All these traits are reminiscent of Pickenoy's teacher Van der Voort,⁶ but a comparison between the female portrait from 1621 and *Portrait of a Lady, aged 22* from 1622 and attributed to Van der Voort (fig. 3) does, however, reveal differences between the two. Both paint with great attention to detail, but Van der Voort typically handles his paints with slightly more freedom, and his skin tones have a matt, velvety finish. Pickenoy accentuates the colours of the face more than Van der Voort, but his very precise demarcation of collars, faces and hands also give his portraits a slightly harder appearance than those of his master. Another significant difference between Pickenoy and his teacher concerns their creative approach to portraiture: whereas Van der Voort was an innovator, Pickenoy was a champion of tradition first and last.

The thematics of the clothes and portraits

The clothes worn by the two models have been executed with a precision and attention to detail that invites audiences to dwell on the luxurious fabrics, lace, and jewellery, and in this way Pickenoy's technical execution of the paintings can be said to play an important role for the overall impact of the paintings: the detailed rendition is a response to the challenge raised by the knee-length format and its increased focus on the clothes.⁷ The couple are presented in luxurious garments: the woman wears a silk gown and a gold-embroidered brocade bodice, and both she and her husband sport splendid lace cuffs and collars. Together with the plentiful jewellery, these trimmings indicate that the couple have dressed for a special occasion; hence the black outfits, the appropriate formal-wear choice for people of rank at the time.⁸

The female portrait lets us know exactly what this occasion was. In her right hand she holds a pair of wedding gloves decorated with motifs that strike up themes such as fertility (the apple), love (the rose) and chastity (the violet). She also wears a total of three rings on her fingers, one of which is undoubtedly a wedding ring. We cannot, however, say exactly which of the three is the wedding

band; the rings are worn on the index and ring fingers, and at the time wedding rings could be worn on either.⁹ The man's ring is unlikely to be a wedding ring, for men rarely wore them at the time; his most significant attributes are the gloves and the hat. Both signify his high status, but a less formal tone is struck by the fact that he carries them loosely in his hand.

Some may wonder at the fact that the couple chose to celebrate their marriage with two such formal portraits, but it should be borne in mind that marriage and wedding portraits were viewed differently in the 17th century. Back then portraits often served a dynastic purpose, and conversely the distinctions between the couple's roles as husband and wife, members of a family, and as public figures were more blurred than that they would be today.¹⁰ Wedding portraits of the kind painted by Pickenoy were to some degree images for public display. They would typically hang in the reception rooms of residences unless they were on display in galleries with other family portraits located further back in the house.¹¹ This certainly held true for the political elite, who were, as will be outlined below, among the primary customers for knee-length portraits.

Facial expressions

One of the first things one notices about the two portraits is how the faces have been rendered in a relaxed state; facial expressions are kept to a minimum, thereby reinforcing the sense of stasis. Art history, which has traditionally applied the lively images painted by Rembrandt and Frans Hals (1582/83-1666) as the standard for Dutch portraits, has until recently regarded Pickenoy's faces as expressionless. It was assumed that this lack of expression was caused by an inability on the part of Pickenoy and his peers to properly express the inner lives of their sitters. Thus, their portraits have been characterised as both "unimaginative but fully descriptive" and as "more a ceremonial façade than a psychological artifice".¹² Such criticism misses the point, for closer inspection of a painting such as *Portrait of a Man, age 35* reveals that the physical passivity conceals an alert awareness, subtly suggested by a modest contraction of the forehead in the shaded right side, and by the tightened muscles of the eye area which give the eyes an alert, observing look.¹³ Seeing that Pickenoy was able to conjure up such

expressions, I see no reason why his portraits should be viewed as unintentionally expressionless. Rather, Pickenoy and his clients wished to create this exact effect – for reasons which I shall later return to.

Hands

Hands play an important part in the composition of the portraits; the white collars and the cuffs establish much-needed contrast in the dark images. More than this, the hands are used as important tools that break up and invigorate the stately poses and overall stasis. It is true that the hands are depicted as relatively passive, but at the same time they include several small suggestions of the sitters' individual personalities that offset the formal atmosphere. For this very reason Pickenoy was always careful to paint his hands in individualised positions and to model the hands as convincingly as possible.¹⁴

In *Portrait of a Man, age 35* the little finger of the right hand is the only finger to be placed below the brim of the hat, suggesting that he is fidgeting with it. At the same time, the immensely long middle finger crosses the ring finger slightly; a gesture which Pickenoy was particularly fond of and one which he developed further in his later portraits. The left hand is depicted in the same manner: here, the index finger has a nonchalant grip on the gloves, and the little finger is brought forward to lend greater prominence to the ring. The visual devices used in *A 26-Year-Old Lady* are more subdued; undoubtedly such restraint was deemed suitable for a female portrait. The way she holds the index finger of her left hand is the key element introducing a certain individuality to the portrait, but the gesture also serves to demonstrate her elegant manners. David Smith has suggested that specific meanings may have been associated with such a gesture; this is undoubtedly true in cases where a couple hold each other's right hand (a sign of entering the state of matrimony), or where a person places one hand on their chest. I have greater reservations when it comes to regarding the modest variations as gestures imbued with specific meaning, but the possibility cannot be completely ruled out.¹⁵

Portrait of a Man and Portrait of a Woman from 1635

Keeping the 1621 portraits in mind, we will now turn our attention to the two companion

portraits of an unidentified couple painted by Pickenoy at the peak of his career, in 1635 (figs. 4 and 5). His late portraits have a greater freshness than his earlier work; the depiction of the young woman is particularly charming, but the man's fashionable half-length hair also helps to give the portraits greater vitality and contribute to a fresher, yet still elegant appearance.¹⁶ The backgrounds are darker than those of the two earlier portraits, the colour scheme used for the figures is warmer, and the contrasts between light and shadow are more pronounced, creating a more dramatic atmosphere. Here Pickenoy reveals how he was influenced by Frans Hals during the early 1630s; Pickenoy presumably became acquainted with Hals' manner of painting through his apprentice (?) Bartholomeus van der Helst (1613-70). Frans Hals' influence on Pickenoy can first be discerned in a civic guard piece from 1632, but it is most clearly seen in *Company of Captain Dirck Theuling* from 1639, a work whose composition is borrowed from Hals, and one in which Pickenoy quotes the magnificent standard bearer from Hals' and Pieter Codde's (1599-1678) *Company of Captain Reynier Reael, known as the Meagre Company*.¹⁷

The difference in style between the early and late portraits is, however, relatively marginal compared to the many stylistic and compositional similarities between them. Thus, the 1635 portraits display all the traits we found in the early paintings: the internal coherence is subordinated to the external, the sitters appear distanced from the observers, their faces and one of their arms are relaxed, their poses are static, and the overall atmosphere is very formal. The paintings also show their kinship in their details. When we compare the two pairs, we see that Pickenoy used the same formula to depict the loosely depicted arms, and this basic formula appears in almost every portrait from his hand.¹⁸ This use of basic formulae is characteristic of Pickenoy and can also be identified in his renditions of poses and hands. The male portrait from 1635 repeats the middle finger of the 1621 male portrait, albeit in a more developed version where the finger crosses the ring finger entirely. This hand pose is among the most frequently seen among Pickenoy's production. The female portrait from 1635 contains a similar repetition of basic formulae: the way she holds her arms and the

way she points discreetly to her wedding ring are repetitions of a composition he had used on at least two previous occasions: in *Portrait of a Young Woman* at the Getty Museum and in *Geertruid Overlander (1608-34)* at the Scheepvaartmuseum in Amsterdam (from 1632 and 1633, respectively).¹⁹

Why did Pickenoy take this approach to portraiture? The most obvious explanation is that sticking to tried-and-tested approaches let him rest reasonably assured that the final result would be acceptable to the client. As we shall see in what follows, very precisely defined expectations applied to knee-length portraits, so it is highly likely that the conventional form was perceived as something to be desired, or alternatively as something one played up against and expressed one's difference from through the small deviations found in each portrait.

A Pickenoy drawing at the Department of Prints and Drawings?

The Royal Collection of Prints and Drawings owns a drawn chest-length portrait of an unnamed woman with an old attribution: "Nicolaes Elias?" (fig. 6). The drawing undoubtedly dates back to Pickenoy's active years, but unfortunately its condition is less than optimal. The white chalk used for the headdress and collar is barely visible in one half of the drawing, and the shaded areas of the headdress have been made over by another hand, one that applied the chalk in a rather heavy-handed manner. The black satin garment has also been re-traced in an attempt at rendering the transition from bodice to sleeve clearer, but once again the chalk has been applied with excessive force. The face itself, however, is quite well-preserved, displaying shading around the chin and bridge of the nose that is far more delicate than the shading applied by the later artist.

Apart from Rembrandt, none of the portrait painters of the day were known as prolific draughtsmen. Indeed, no known drawings can be conclusively attributed to Pickenoy.²⁰ Thus, we can only link the present chalk drawing to Pickenoy by comparing it to his painted portraits, an approach fraught with considerable uncertainty.²¹ The undertaking is further complicated by the fact that in Pickenoy's day, portrait painters used relatively schematic formulae for their renditions of different areas of the face, meaning that we

cannot make any definite conclusions about the attribution of the drawing solely on the background of the overall similarities between the drawing and Pickenoy's portraits.

We need to take a closer look at the stylistic issues, at the nature of the artist's interpretation of the common practices of the day. In this regard, we find some similarities between Pickenoy's portraits and the enigmatic drawing. Both paintings use a light tone in the shaded areas of the face, and the tones, highlights, and shaded areas of the drawing are as varied as those we found in the paintings. The way in which the white chalk suggests a highlight falling across the forehead, bridge of the nose, and chin is particularly reminiscent of Pickenoy's painted portraits, and the accurate modelling of the faces, the tendency towards narrow eyes, and the strong accentuation of the lower edge of the eye by means of a white chalk outline also have a kinship with what we find in the paintings. Based on the facts available to us, the drawing might, however, also be a copy after one of his paintings or a piece drawn by an artist from his circle. Uncertainties notwithstanding, it makes sense to maintain some sort of link between this drawing and Pickenoy's name.

Summing up

The four painted portraits show how Pickenoy remained loyal to a type of portrait which many present-day observers might find stiff and uninvolved in its characterisation of the sitters; a kind of portrait which even inscribes the persons portrayed within predefined basic formulae instead of taking the individual sitter as its point of departure. At this point, however, it is clear that Pickenoy's portraits were not only logical, but also full of meaning to those who bought them. Thus, we shall now proceed to take a closer look of how the portraits were perceived at the time.

Pickenoy's clientele and their portraits

The following account is based on studies of 23 portraits by (or attributed to) Pickenoy where the identity of the sitter is known with some degree of certainty. This leaves more than 50 other portraits of unidentified persons which merit a few, brief initial remarks. We can assume that most of Pickenoy's clients came from Amsterdam and that they were quite affluent;²² otherwise they would not have been able to afford a

portrait of the quality he supplied. This assumption is confirmed by the fact that all of Pickenoy's known Amsterdam customers are recorded in a 1631 taxation list comprising the wealthiest 15% of the city's inhabitants; their amassed wealth spanned from the lower limit of 1000f (the lowest amount to attract taxation) to a staggering 270,000f.²³

The information available about identified clients does not allow us to arrive at definite conclusions about Pickenoy's clients in general; after all, a portrait of a prominent figure is more likely to remain identifiable than a portrait of an average citizen. This is partly due to the fact that the persons depicted were often quite famous and/or belonged to families whose names were also of interest to posterity. Also, many of the regent families kept their collections intact through generations, making the task of identifying the family portraits relatively straightforward. Even though the regent class is probably overrepresented among the identified sitters, one can still assume that Pickenoy's paintings exercised a great degree of attraction on this particular part of society. Although our knowledge about all artists is affected by the same bias, we can nevertheless conclude that members of the regent class appear far more frequently in portraits by Pickenoy and Van der Voort than in portraits by artists who mainly painted in other styles (e.g. De Keyser and Rembrandt). In the following I wish to analyse Pickenoy's relationship with the regent class by examining how and by whom his clients and their families let themselves be portrayed during the period from circa 1615-45. Such an analysis might yield some indication of what the ruling classes found attractive in Pickenoy's works. The analysis should be regarded as preliminary in nature, being almost exclusively constructed on the basis of the information on families available in Johan Elias' seminal work *De Vroedschap van Amsterdam*.²⁴

Pickenoy and his in-laws, the Graaflands

In an article from 1985 S.A.C. Dudok van Heel mentions that Pickenoy was presumably receiving commissions from the regent classes because of his marriage, entered into in 1621, to Levina Bouwens (1599-after 1656), who came from the periphery of the regent class.²⁵ As it was common practice at

the time to use artists with whom one had some form of contact, the suggestion seems quite plausible,²⁶ but even so I have only succeeded in linking up two of the buyers identified to Pickenoy's in-laws. Pickenoy portrayed *Dieuwer Harencarspel* (1569-1645) and *Laurens Joosten Baack* (1570-1642) in 1629, and a few decades later(!) their son was in business with Mrs Levina's stepbrother Cornelis Graafland (1619-77).²⁷ In-depth scrutiny of the Graafland family might unearth further connections that I have missed, but even so I think it unlikely that Pickenoy's marriage had a significant impact on his artistic career. I base this view on two separate facts: his breakthrough on the art scene took place *before* he was married, and Pickenoy was unable to attract the custom of the ruling class while Van der Voort was still alive. Far more important than family ties were Pickenoy's inherent ability as a portrait painter and the fact that Van der Voort's death in 1624 created a vacuum which Pickenoy was able to fill.

Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Sebastiaen Egbertsz. de Vrij (1563-1621), 1619

Van der Voort presumably also played a more active role in Pickenoy's earliest career. The painting that established Pickenoy as a portrait painter of significance was the guild portrait *Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Egbertsz. de Vrij*, which he painted in 1619, i.e. two years prior to his marriage.²⁸ At that time Van der Voort was the first choice for group portraits among the Amsterdam institutions, and he worked on several group portraits during the final years of the 1610s. If Van der Voort did not have the time to take on yet another commission, it is likely that he exercised some influence when the Guild of Surgeons ended up giving the commission to the as-yet relatively unknown Pickenoy rather than to the more obvious choice, Werner van den Valckert (circa 1585 – after 1635).

Be that as it may, this group portrait saw Pickenoy establish himself as one of the city's pre-eminent painters of group portraits, and at the same time his contact with the Guild of Surgeons gave him access to the persons who would become his most important clients. Dr Egbertsz himself was a former mayor and was married into a family who would often let themselves be portrayed by Van der Voort and later by Pickenoy. To begin with, however, especially the guild members appreciated Pickenoy's skill, and in

1626 they asked him to paint another group portrait, *Dr. Johan Fonteijn's (1574-1628) Anatomy Lesson*, but unfortunately this piece was severely damaged in a fire in 1723.²⁹ In 1632, however, the guild dispensed with Pickenoy's services and let Rembrandt paint the famous *The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp (1593-1674)*,³⁰ but even that prominent doctor appreciated Pickenoy's work: He asked him to do two family portraits, one in 1624/26 and one in 1636, as well as a chest-length portrait of the doctor himself in 1634.³¹ On an earlier occasion Dr. Tulp had also been portrayed by Van der Voort, who also used the chest-length format.

From Sebastiaen Egbertsz to the Hasselaer family

Through his marriage to Agnieta Benningh (1561 – before 1606), Dr. Egbertsz was related to the prominent Hasselaer family who also belonged among Cornelis van der Voort's regular clientele. After his death Pickenoy received several commissions from members of that family; the earliest of these portraits are from 1628 and depict two remoter connections of the Hasselaers, *Andries Rijckaert (1569-1639)* and *Susanne Merchijs (1581-1633)*, 1628. Shortly after that time he painted two half-length portraits depicting *Margriet Benningh (1565-1641)*, the widow after Pieter Dircksz Hasselaer (1554-1616).³² The half-length portrait was one of the family's favourite formats – in addition to Pickenoy's two portraits, another two half-length portraits from the hand of Frans Hals survive until today: the presumably posthumous *Nicolaes Hasselaer (1593-1635)* and its pendant *Sara Wolphaerts van Diemen (1594-1667)* from around 1635.³³ Here, the portrayal of Sara has a static quality very similar to that of Pickenoy's works, but the portrait of Nicolaes goes against the grain by making a complete break with the principles of the static portrait: His torso may be turned three-quarters towards Sara, but the portrait is given a hitherto unseen dynamic quality through his pose – one elbow points towards us – and the face, which is turned away from both Sara and us. Hals' unique style of painting reinforces this dynamic quality.

These portraits set a precedent among the family members. Nicolaes Hasselaer's children Geertruid (1624-96) and Gerard (1621-73) and the latter's wife Agatha

Hasselaer (1624-58) also opted for the half-length figure when they were portrayed by Jacob Backer (1608-51) in the 1640, as did the children's cousin Aeghje (1617-64) and her husband, Hendrick Hooft (1617-78).³⁴ The sheer impact of Hals' portraits is evident in Michiel van Mierevelt's (1567-1641) portraits of the latter two. Van Mierevelt clearly tried to emulate Hals, but had some difficulty in reconciling that idiom with the static representations of the figures. The final result is interesting and very telling, but the paintings are not entirely successful: Van Mierevelt solved his challenge by retaining a static depiction of the figures and giving the male portrait greater vitality by means of a ray of light which lights up the space behind Hendrick's head, creating expectations of a drama which the portraits do not, in the final analysis, deliver. His attempt foundered on the fact that Van Mierevelt was unwilling to deviate from the central dogmas applying to portraits of a regent.

The Hasselaers' purchases of portraits throughout the 1620s and 1630s reveal a shift away from the traditional, Van der Voortian knee-length format in favour of half-length figures represented in more elegant poses and with arms positioned in a more nonchalant manner. It is, however, important to note that even in later portraits such as the above-mentioned Van Mierevelt pieces it is easy to recognise the contours of the traditional manner of representation. We see, then, that even though the family bought portraits in a slightly different style and format than those typically employed by Pickenoy – and even though the family was quick to respond to the late 1630s new approaches within portraiture – the family portraits still reveal that the principles behind Pickenoy's style remained very valid after 1640.

Hooft, De Graeff and full-length life-sized portraits, 1618-39

From the Hasselaer family we can move on to the Hooft and De Graeff families. These three families were not only connected by numerous marriages; they also belonged to the same political wing of the Amsterdam city council, the *vroedschap*. This wing, known as the Libertines, was sympathetic towards the Remonstrant vein of Calvinism and, particularly, with its belief that the State should have greater power than the church on all matters mundane. In 1618 their

position caused the Libertines to be barred from the centres of power: This was the year the Stadtholder Maurits (1567-1625) removed all those with Remonstrant sympathies from the Dutch city councils. The ranks of persons to lose their seats in the Amsterdam *Vroedschap* included Dr. Egbertsz and Jacob de Graeff (1571-1638), whereas the *pater familias* of the Hooft family, Cornelis Pietersz (1546-1626), had already been put out to pasture at an earlier stage. The Libertines did not remain marginalised, however – in 1628 they succeeded in obtaining the most powerful positions for themselves, and this time they stayed in power for more than 30 years.³⁵ All this is to say that these families belonged among the political heavyweights, and the list of Pickenoy's clients includes both former and future mayors.

Pickenoy would only portray one person bearing the Hooft name, but he did, however, also paint portraits of more remote relatives of the clan, the undated *Renske Fotuyn* (1588-1658) and *Jacob Hop* (1588-1633).³⁶ The most remarkable feature of the portraits associated with the Hooft and De Graeff families is the fact that around 1620 it became popular in those circles to line the walls of one's newly built town houses with life-sized full-length portraits.³⁷ Traditionally this type of portraits had been the special province of the European aristocracy, and this presented something of a delicate issue: During the first half of the century, the ruling classes of the Dutch Republic still had to step carefully in order not to be too closely associated with the aristocracy.

Once again, portraits such as *Laurens Reael* (1583-1637) and *Arnoldus van der Hem* (1586-1656) saw Cornelis van der Voort introducing a new type of portrait to Amsterdam audiences.³⁸ Laurens Reael was a former governor of some of the republic's overseas colonies, while Arnoldus van der Hem had acquired a title shortly before sitting for the artist. Facts such as these may have helped prompt the artist to choose a portrait format with an aristocratic feel – although the self-image held by the sitters and the norms they shared with their peers undoubtedly also helps explain why full-length portrayals become popular among this small circle.

Jan Pietersz Hooft's (1543-1602) family in particular embraced the full-length format. Both he, his wife, and four of the couple's

children and their spouses let themselves be portrayed in full-length portraits. We cannot, however, identify the artists behind all of them. For example, the artist behind the married couple *Pieter Jansz Hooft* and *Geertruyd Overlander* (1577-1653) remains unidentified, but Dudok van Heel has persuasively argued that it is unlikely to be the work of an Amsterdam artist.³⁹ Nor can we conclusively identify the artist behind the full-length portraits of Pieter's sister and brother-in-law *Geertruyd Jansdr* (1578-1636) and *Volckert Overlander* (1571-1630), c. 1630, or those of his daughter and son-in-law *Maria Overlander* (1603-78) and *Frans Banning Cocq* (1605-55). Having said that, however, there can be no doubt that the latter two portraits were painted by a workshop that also painted full-length portraits of two other people from the circle around the same time, *Dirck de Graeff* (1601-37) and *Eva Bicker* (1609-65). Despite their stylistic differences, all of these portraits are painted according to exactly the same principles we found in Pickenoy's knee-length portraits. In fact, if one regards the figures alone, the full-length portraits could be regarded as knee-length pieces that have been continued all the way to the ground.⁴⁰

We now come to the most prominent of all of Pickenoy's clients. In 1633 he painted two knee-length portraits of *Cornelis de Graeff* (1599-1664) and Volckert Overlander's daughter, *Geertruid Overlander* (1608-35); portraits that can be directly compared to the two 1635 portraits owned by Statens Museum for Kunst.⁴¹ Sadly, Geertruid died soon after the wedding and Cornelis remarried in 1635, this time to the daughter of Pieter Jansz Hooft, Catharina Hooft (1618-91). Once again the bride and groom had Pickenoy do a portrait of them, this time in full-length versions (fig. 9).⁴² Here we find them placed within a sumptuous setting: A lavishly decorated hall featuring a marble floor and a colossal column (symbolising that the people portrayed were pillars of the community), and in the corner of the portrait of Catharina a carpet extends across the foreground. Such passages once again demonstrate that Pickenoy was very loyal to the conventions of the format; every one of them is culled directly from Van der Voort's seminal full-length figures.

Pickenoy was not, however, the only artist to let himself be controlled by convention. Rembrandt too adapted to convention when

portraying Cornelis' brother *Andries de Graeff* (1611-78) in 1639.⁴³ The compositional basis for the painting was Pickenoy's full-length portrait of Cornelis, and Rembrandt used this formula to create a painting that was very closely related to the brother's image in terms of both architectural structure and overall portrayal (pose, facial expressions and gestures). Thus, we find that all full-length portraits created of members of these families evince exactly the same formula as Pickenoy's knee-length portraits.

Characteristics of the portraits bought by the client network 1615-45

The analysis of Pickenoy's portraits of the regent families and how those families had themselves portrayed by other artists has revealed some clear trends. Firstly, it enables us to make some comments on Pickenoy's artistic career. Until Van der Voort's death in 1624 Pickenoy had difficulties breaking through to the regent classes, and his golden years began with the death of the older artist and lasted until the second half of the 1630s. Pinpointing the exact time his artistic star began to fade is a matter of some discussion. The most widespread position states that his popularity waned around 1640, prompting the theory that the reason behind this reduced activity was that Pickenoy was unable to adapt his style to the new tastes emerging precisely around this time.⁴⁴

Such a conclusion is, however, fraught with problems. First of all, he was asked to paint no less than three civic guard portraits during the years 1639-45, a fact testifying to considerable artistic acclaim.⁴⁵ Secondly, the conventional knee-length portrait cannot be said to have fallen out of fashion after 1640. Dirck van Santvoort (1610/11-1680), for example, painted several knee-length portraits in a "pickenoyan" style, including some from the ruling class. Most importantly, Pickenoy's own dated portraits suggest that the decline in his productivity should be pushed back a few years to after 1636.⁴⁶ At this point in time the younger generation had not yet become fully established in Amsterdam, and so the explanation for the changes in Pickenoy's activities should be found elsewhere.

Here I wish to call attention to just two main points. First of all, Pickenoy's diminished activity coincides chronologically with a corresponding decline for De Keyser

and with Rembrandt's episodic break from the art of portraiture. The latter can be explained by pointing out how Rembrandt left Uylenburgh's workshop at the time, but even there portraits did not play an important part after 1635. Thus, we see that the three most important portrait workshops of the early 1630s reduced their levels of activity around the same time – an interesting phenomenon that has not yet been elucidated. We can, however, discern certain indications of stagnating demand and increased supply.⁴⁷

My second point is that if Pickenoy's lower level of activity can be set to occur shortly after 1636, this would coincide precisely with his purchase of the elegant corner house on Sint Anthonisbreestraat. This was the house previously occupied by Van der Voort and Uylenburgh, so the address acted as a focal point for portraiture for several decades.⁴⁸ Not only did Pickenoy move into a house equipped with an ideal artist's studio; he also obtained a very respectable address, meaning that the house may have appealed to both Pickenoy the artist and Pickenoy the man of renown. Be that as it may, the house would no longer play a prominent part within the Amsterdam portrait scene, but I do not find it unthinkable that Pickenoy quite voluntarily and deliberately cut down on his activities at a time where his finances (presumably) allowed him to do so. Such behaviour was not uncommon among artists who rose in social standing, e.g. Aelbert Cuyp (1620-91) and Ferdinand Bol (1616-80).⁴⁹ The most interesting thing is, however, that Rembrandt acted in a similar manner after becoming Pickenoy's neighbour in 1639. From that time onwards his art and his general behaviour shows that he began to identify himself with the elite, e.g. by establishing a cabinet of curiosities.⁵⁰

The hegemony of the static portrait

The second and most important tendency indicated by the analysis is that the members of the ruling class were highly conservative in their preferences and continued to let themselves be portrayed according to the types and formats introduced by Van der Voort. At first, Pickenoy was the most important artist to fill the void created by Van der Voort's death in 1624, but Michiel van Mierevelt from Delft was another artist who frequently painted for the Amsterdam

regents. The typological kinship between the typical portraits created by the two artists is obvious, but it should be noted that their manners of painting are also closely related. This is borne out by the fact that the two Pickenoy portraits from 1621 (figs. 1 and 2) owned by Statens Museum for Kunst were previously attributed to Van Mierevelt. Finally, we saw that around 1630 static full-length figures were painted in a workshop which, according to Dudok van Heel, might be that of Hendrick Uylenburgh. This would connect this third prominent figure within the portrait market to the Van der Voort tradition too – not only because the portraits were painted in accordance with that particular tradition, but also because Uylenburgh clearly sought to take over Van der Voort's position. He rented the house formerly occupied by Van der Voort, using it to set up a business offering almost the same kind of commodity.⁵¹ In this manner Rembrandt, too, came into immediate contract with tradition. Having said that, however, he had only very few opportunities to grapple actively with this tradition, for the regent class was largely absent among Rembrandt's known clients during the years prior to 1639. When he *did* paint portraits of figures belonging to the elite, e.g. the aforementioned knee-length portrait of *Andries de Graeff* and the full-length portraits of *Marten Soolmans (1613-41)* and *Oopjen Coppit (1611-89)* from 1634,⁵² his choices of composition, pose, and facial expression are remarkably like those of Pickenoy and Van der Voorts.

The fact that many members of the ruling class let themselves be portrayed in static knee-length portrait has, of course, been noted before now, but now it has been specifically proven with the analysis of Pickenoy's clients. The way they let themselves be portrayed not only confirms that static types such as the knee-length portraits were a favourite format among the families who purchased works by Pickenoy; it also shows that this was virtually the *only* way a member of the political elite wished to be portrayed. We find only very few exceptions from this trend – I mentioned Frans Hals' *Nicolaes Hasselaer* – but such exceptions aside it is difficult to find single or pendant portraits of the ruling class which make use of informal poses or prosaic idioms such as interaction or inter-dynamics

between the persons portrayed.

This is an important point: The members of the regent class examined here turned their backs on the new, dynamic modes of portraiture that emerged during the 1620s and the first half of the 1630s.⁵³ Even when the regent families were portrayed by artists who did in fact master the dynamic portrait, they would still typically order static knee-length portraits. Rembrandt's portraits of the regent class are relatively conventional, at least up until 1639, and we find the same tendency in the works of Thomas de Keyser, who have depicted the cartographer *Willem Blaeu (1571-1638)* in a small chest-length painting, but aside from that he was forced to grapple with the knee-length format when painting the portraits of prominent citizens.⁵⁴ By contrast, almost all of their (identified) dynamic portraits depict either merchants or other tradespeople without any direct political influence; there can be no doubt that the dynamic portraits' suggestions of a link between the identity and deeds of the person portrayed were more popular in those circles than among the regent class.⁵⁵

Regardless of the exact artist and format involved, we can conclude that during the period from circa 1620 to 1640 the regent class preferred to be depicted in portraits of the kind mastered by Pickenoy. Even in Pickenoy's last active years, 1637-45, this basic type was not abandoned but at this point it did find new expression in the form of more nonchalant poses, more colourful garb, and a more colouristic, Van Dyck-like manner of painting. Thus, the changes in the portraits of the regent class that took place in the late 1630s can be regarded as developments based on the familiar basic type. It was the resulting new variant, rather than the dynamic portraits, that gave the ruling classes an alternative to portraits of the Van der Voort/Pickenoy type. This also serves to explain why Rembrandt's portraits did not have a more marked impact on Pickenoy.

The Significance of the "Expressionless" faces

It follows, then, that if we wish to understand Pickenoy's artistic activities, it is necessary to take a closer look at the meanings and significance that the ruling classes attributed to the static portrait. A pivotal point is the interpretation of the static element, including the "expressionless" faces that we have seen

to be deliberately conjured up by Pickenoy. Ann Jensen Adams has pointed out that the faces are far from “expressionless”; rather, they express a precisely defined ideal: The sitter is to appear physically unruffled, illustrating that he or she was in complete control of their feelings. The ideal has its wellspring in neo-Stoicism; Adams describes it as *tranquillitas*, tranquillity or self-restraint, a highly valued quality in the Dutch Republic.⁵⁶ To illustrate how widespread the idea was she quotes a number of examples, one of which springs from one of the families who bought Pickenoy's portraits – specifically the poet Pieter Cornelisz Hooft (1581-1647). In a letter written shortly after the death of his wife he described how he lost his ability to master his feelings when his beloved died: “How can he, who has always picked up pins and nails to fix what he loved securely to his heart, when it is ripped from there, be left with anything but unbearable rifts?”⁵⁷ In this quotation P.C. Hooft reveals that he has lived his whole life adhering to an ideal of keeping one's feelings in check; the very essence of *tranquillitas* – and what the knee-length portraits seek to visualise. By depicting the person portrayed as physically unmoved, Pickenoy's portraits present a precisely defined aspect of the sitter's personality; the aspect that the sitters chose as their *persona*, the face they wanted to show the world.⁵⁸

Adams sees the fact that the regent classes preferred to demonstrate *tranquillitas* as a consequence of the cultural undertones associated with the neo-Stoic ideal. She argues that the portraits play on two different aspects of *tranquillitas*. First of all, self-control was a personal quality that everyone could, in principle, master. At the same time, however, the concept also held potent political undertones, particularly for male members of the ruling class: Control over one's own feelings was regarded as necessary for the ability to act rationally, a necessity if one was to lead others.⁵⁹ In this sense the knee-length portraits served a dual function. They demanded a *deference* and a *mirroring*: “On the one hand, the viewer would have to acknowledge the legitimacy of the political power by any regent portrayed. At the same time, these portraits suggest that the viewer actually ‘ruled him or herself’: Any authority claimed by pictured members of the regent class could be viewed as merely a material formality.”⁶⁰ In this way, the *tranquillitas* portraits could validate the social pre-

eminence of the regent class by expressing that the social precedence was founded on common values.

Back to Pickenoy

The analysis of Pickenoy's clientele, the way they let themselves be portrayed, and the connotations of the static mode of portraiture revealed several interesting aspects of Amsterdam portrait painting, aspects that have a bearing on the four portraits at Statens Museum for Kunst. My studies of Pickenoy's clientele confirm Adams' point about how the static portrait held specific meanings that were useful to the regent class; a confirmation contingent on our conclusion that the static portrait was not just *one* way of having one's portrait painted among many, but that around 1620-45 it was virtually the *only* way that members of the regent class wished to see themselves portrayed. Having said that, however, we should immediately add that non-regents would also often have their portraits painted in the knee-length format, so the format of the four paintings does not in itself allow us to make any definite conclusions about the social rank of the unidentified clients depicted. What we *can* say with some degree of confidence is that the two married couples shared the values inherent in the *tranquillitas* concept and that they used a type of portrait which had, for male members of the regent class, a public and political significance because they mirrored themselves in the portraits' claims of personal, moral superiority. According to Adams, the paintings' fusion of political and personal significance may have been instrumental to the sense of social coherence in what was quite a heterogenic society because the portraits embodies the common values shared by the elite.⁶¹

We have seen how Pickenoy remained faithful to the same mode of portraiture throughout his entire career. Viewed in light of the information unearthed by the study of his clients, it would seem that such conservatism can be explained as a sensible response to market conditions: As long as Pickenoy wanted to fill the position vacated with the death of Van der Voort he could not stray significantly from the path of established conventions.

How the Portraits describe the Patrons

The discoveries we have made in the above make it easier to understand many of the

peculiar features of the four portraits we began by taking a look at. The fact that the figures are represented in static poses and depicted by means of closed contours that give them a closed-up quality helps create a sense of *tranquillitas* in the portraits. Nowhere is the self-control more directly expressed than in the limply dangling arm; it almost becomes a physical manifestation of restraint. This makes it entirely understandable that Pickenoy repeated the relaxed arm in most of his portraits; indeed, once you have noticed it and its connotations, you discover it in the works of many different artists. De Keyser made use of the device, and it also makes an appearance in Rembrandt's aforementioned *Andries de Graeff*.

We also saw that the portrayals could be perceived as stiff and impersonal, and that the relationship between married couples could be perceived as awkward because contact to the observer was given greater weight than their contact with each other. When we investigated the portraits purchased by the clientele we saw that these conditions were not unique to Pickenoy; they appear in all the pendant portraits commissioned by this group. Their preference for such depictions is rooted in the fact that any indication of emotion and affect in the portraits could potentially undermine the observers' perception of the emotional and physical self-control of the persons portrayed. The issue can be illustrated by reference to Rembrandt's *Marten Soolmans (1613-41)* and *Oopjen Coppit (1611-89)*, 1634 (figs. 7 and 8). Here, he sought to create an internal coherence in a pair of *tranquillitas* portraits by adding narrative references to the couple's love.

In many ways the portraits are in line with the Pickenoyan formula: The poses are predominantly static, the faces are relaxed, and Oopjen has been depicted with one arm hanging limply down the side, although the pose has been reinterpreted slightly by letting the hand lift the dress up a little. The gesture exposes Oopjen's feet, which seem to be moving towards her husband. The most significant difference from Pickenoy's portraits is the fact that whereas married couples in Pickenoy's pendants connect only with the observer, Rembrandt added an emotional connection between the couple by having Marten offer up a glove to Oopjen as a symbol of his love for her. The gesture does, however, create some problems in the composition, for

Marten does not follow up his movement by looking in his wife's direction – and were it not for Oopjen's feet and lifted dress we would not think that she took any notice of his offer; neither her gaze nor her torso suggest the slightest movement towards the husband. Rembrandt's problem was that he had to adhere to the established conventions applying to static portraits while also creating a sense of an emotional connection between the couple. The latter would require that he let one figure look away from the observer towards the spouse, or that he incorporate prosaic elements which would unavoidably break down the sense of stasis, thereby interfering with *tranquillitas*. Rembrandt chose the latter option, meaning that to avoid a complete break away from the static portrait he cut the Gordian knot in another way: He combined the frontal images of the static portrait with a single, prominent dynamic gesture which is not integrated into the overall body stance. Briefly put, the prosaic act was transformed into a rhetorical reference to a familiar theme.⁶²

How the Manner of Painting affects the Portraits

Portraiture in Amsterdam experienced dramatic changes during Pickenoy's active career as an artist. The choice of formats was expanded from a relatively limited selection to a point where genre-like single and double portraits as well as landscape portraits became popular during the 1620s. This was also the time when Thomas de Keyser began to paint small-scale dynamic full-length portraits, (figs. 10 and 11), and after 1631 patrons at Hendrick Uylenburgh's workshop could have their portrait painted by Rembrandt – or at least in the manner of Rembrandt. All this had little or no effect on Pickenoy.

The very limited changes to Pickenoy's style were undoubtedly the result of the fact that his client expected their portraits to be done in the very style practiced by Pickenoy. My analysis showed that Pickenoy was not the only artist to paint knee-length and full-length portraits in this style; the other masters of Amsterdam did exactly the same. The direct link between the style of painting and portrait format is particularly evident in De Keyser's production. Besides his small, fresh, genre-like portraits he also painted traditional knee-length portraits – and in those pieces his idiom would usually closely

approximate that of Pickenoy.⁶³ The same is true of Rembrandt, whose knee-length and full-length figures are usually done in a more descriptive style than that adopted for his chest portraits. Thus, we can assume that when Amsterdam patrons commissioned a knee-length portrait in the 1620s or 1630s, they expected to receive a detailed, smoothly painted portrait.

The relationship between the knee-length portrait and the descriptive manner of painting is an expression of what Jan Bialostocki has termed the "problem of mode in visual art", i.e. the tendency to link certain themes to specific modes of expression.⁶⁴ During the 17th century the problem of mode was particularly explicitly expressed within literary and music theory, but it also existed – albeit in a less formalised form – within art theory. Here, a rough, realistic manner was deemed suitable for low themes, whereas a smooth, idealised manner should be used for more lofty themes.⁶⁵ Pickenoy's lifelong dedication to the same style of portraiture reflects how this style was regarded as the most suitable for a stately portrait.

At the same time I find that Pickenoy's manner of painting perfectly complemented the type of portrait he mastered. When Ernst van de Wetering compared Pickenoy's and Rembrandt's chest-length paintings of *Margriet Benningh* and *Haesje van Cleyburg* (1583-1641), 1634, he concluded that even though the two masters used identical formulae to depict the faces, our perceptions of their paintings are very different in kind. Pickenoy paid attention to every detail, modelling his image clearly and sharply, whereas Rembrandt used rapid, fleeting brushstrokes and avoided sharp contours and modelling.⁶⁶ Thus, as first glance Pickenoy's modelling appears more convincing, but at the same time his portraits seem stiff and frozen whereas Rembrandt's casual, yet confident technique bring his portraits to life. In this analysis Van de Wetering provides a precise description of the effect of Pickenoy's style: It adds a sense of objectiveness to the depiction, making the images a little abstract and distant, whereas Rembrandt's chiaroscuro and vivid renditions communicate a sense of immediacy, giving us the sense that we stand face to face with the person portrayed.

Even though the latter position may seem the most appealing, it is important to be aware that the more life-like manner of

painting did not serve all types of portraits equally well. In knee-length portraits – and particularly in full-length figures – there was a risk that a sense of immediacy and direct contact to the person portrayed might clash with the imposing format, thereby disrupting one's overall experience of the painting. The issue can be demonstrated by once again returning to Rembrandt's *Marten Soolmans* (fig. 7) to compare it with Pickenoy's portrait of *Cornelis de Graeff* (fig. 9). Art history has typically characterised Marten Soolmans as a vain, self-conscious parvenu with a predilection for boastful garb, a man who affected elegance for his portrait.⁶⁷ Such accusations have never been levelled against Cornelis de Graeff even though all the features that may appear boastful and vain about Marten are also present in this portrait of Cornelis: Both men are depicted within a stately room, they wear almost identical (wedding) clothes made from extremely luxurious materials, including very remarkable rosettes on their shoes, and finally they both possess a nonchalant elegance in their gestures and poses.

Thus, the crucial difference to our perception of the two images cannot be said to reside in the architecture, the lavish costumes, nor any other of the things usually interpreted as signs of Marten Soolmans' dandyism. Rather, the different perceptions spring from Marten's gestures because they communicate the feeling of immediacy that we sense in the portrait because of Rembrandt's unique manner of painting. His chiaroscuro and brushwork give the image the sense of immediacy addressed in the above. And because Marten is depicted with all the accoutrements of rank *and* meets the observer directly as dictated by convention he appears to be striking a pose, affecting his purely symbolic gesture right before our eyes and primarily for our sake. Correspondingly, the less pompous impression left by *Cornelis de Graeff* is the result of the fact that he is not gesturing and of Pickenoy's descriptive manner of painting which records the garments, the shape of the face and the body's posture while retaining a sense of detachment. As a result, we do not get as close to Cornelis as we did to Marten, and this makes it easier for us to reconcile ourselves with Cornelis' self-staging and the painting's rather explicit aristocratic pretensions.

Conclusion

In the preceding pages I have argued that there are distinct and direct links between Pickenoy's particular manner of painting and the expectations that his primary clientele held in relation to portraiture. The most important issue to note in this context is *tranquillitas*, because this concept provides a

relevant perspective on most of the conspicuous characteristics of the portraits. Other noteworthy issues include the synergy between the manner of painting and the portrait format chosen as well as the striking correlation between the commissioners' social status and their choice of portrait format. If we start by considering Pickenoy's

ability to unite convincing portrayals with the client's expectations and perceptions of portraiture, we will not only be able to enjoy Pickenoy's consummate technical skill; we will also be able to appreciate the art of the static portrait in its own right.

- 1 The most significant treatment of Pickenoy's career is dr. Jan Six: "Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy", *Oud Holland IV*, 1886, p. 81-108; S.A.C. Dudok van Heel: "De schilder Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy (1588-1650/56) en zijn familie. Een geslacht van wapensteensnijders, goud- en zilversmeden te Amsterdam" in (u.f.), *Liber Americum Jhr. Mr. C.C. Van Valkenburg*, Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie, s'Gravenhage 1985, 152-53; David Smith: *Masks of Wedlock. Seventeenth-Century Dutch Marriage Portraiture*, Ann Arbor, Michigan 1982, particularly p. 13-23; P. Dirkse: "Een Luthers Bijbelstuk door Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy", *Antiek XVIII*, 1983, p. 233-239 and Rudolf E.O. Ekkart: "Pickenoy, Nicolaes Eliasz.", in Jane Turner (ed.): *The Dictionary of Art XXIV*, Willard, Ohio 1996, p. 734f.
- 2 Ann Jensen Adams: "The Three-Quarter Length Life-Sized Portrait in Seventeenth-Century Holland", in Wayne Franits (ed.): *Dutch Seventeenth-Century Painting, Realism Reconsidered*, Cambridge 1997, p. 163-165.
- 3 Smith, 1982, 55 (see note 1).
- 4 E.g. Jakob Rosenberg, Seymour Slive and E.H. Ter Kuile: *Dutch Art and Architecture, 1600-1800*, New Haven 1993, p. 88, 317, see also note 12 below.
- 5 Smith, 1982, p. 15 (see note 1).
- 6 Six, 1886, p. 84 (see note 1).
- 7 The care taken by Pickenoy to accurately reproduce reality is evident when we compare to painted bridal gloves in his *Johanna le Maire*, 1622, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-A-4957 (oil on wood, 105.2 x 77.7 cm) to the original gloves, which are still in existence, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. R.B.K.-1978-48-A/B, depicted in Norbert Middelkoop (ed.): *Kopstukken. Amsterdammers geportretteerd 1600-1800*, Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam 2002, cat. 3b and 3c
- 8 Irene Groeneweg: "Regenten in het zwart: vroom en deftig?", in Reindert Falkenburg (ed.): *Beeld en zelfbeeld in de nederlandse kunst, 1550-1750*, *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek XXXVI* (1995), p. 237.
- 9 Eddy de Jongh: *Portretten van echt en trouw. Huwelijk en gezin in de Nederlandse kunst van de zeventiende eeuw*, Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem 1986, p. 138-140.
- 10 Joanna Woodall: "Sovereign Bodies: The Reality of Status in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Portraiture", in Joanna Woodall (ed.): *Portraiture. Facing the Subject*, Manchester and New York 1997, p. 82-86.
- 11 One interesting example is the portrait gallery of the De Graeff family at Huis Ilpenstein, see: S.A.C. Dudok van Heel "Toen hingen er burgers als vorsten aan de muur", in Norbert Middelkoop (ed.): *Kopstukken*, Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam 2002 p. 54-57.
- 12 Jakob Rosenberg: *Rembrandt. Life and Work*, Cambridge Mass. 1948, p. 59-60; Smith, 1982, p. 19 (see note 1)
- 13 Indeed, recent works present more positive interpretations of Pickenoy's works, e.g. Bob Haak: *Das Goldene Zeitalter der Holländischen Malerei*, Cologne 1984, p. 275-276 and Jan Briels: *Vlaamse schilders en de dageraad in Hollands Gouden eeuw*, Antwerp 1997, p. 41-42.
- 14 E.g. the portraits of *Jochem Swartenhont*, 1627, and *Pieter van Son*, 1622, both Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-A-705 (oil on wood, 118.3 x 90.4 cm) and SK-A-4956 (oil on wood, 105.5 x 79.3 cm).
- 15 Smith, 1982, p. 72ff. (see note 1). The rhetoric of the 17th century had a very well-developed tradition for gestures which the portraits may have appropriated. I am grateful to Hanne Kolind Poulsen and Eva de la Fuente Pedersen for pointing out this fact.
- 16 Briels 1997, p. 41-42 (see note 13).
- 17 Amsterdams Historisch Museum, inv. SK-A-7313 and SK-A-7314 (oil on canvas, 198 x 531 cm and 202 x 340.5 cm, respectively) and Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-C-374 (oil on canvas, 209 x 429cm). See: Six, 1886, p. 94 (see note 1), Alois Riegl: *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, Los Angeles 1999 (first published 1902), p. 239-241 and Albert Blankert: *Schilderijen daterend van voor 1800*, Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam 1975/1979, nos. 142-143.
- 18 The arm is repeated in numerous portraits of both men and women, e.g. these male portraits: *Portrait of a Man*, 1628, private collection (oil on wood, 122 x 91 cm) (reproduced in Haak, 1984, p. 275 fig. 580 (see note 13)), *Man Holding a Celestial Globe*, 1624, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv.1976.100.22 (oil on wood, 104.8 x 76.2 cm), *Gerard Hinlopen*, 1631, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum inv. SK-A-1319 [as Renier Hinlopen, the attribution is a matter of dispute] (oil on wood, 123 x 91 cm), *Cornelis de Graeff*, 1636, Berlin, Gemäldegalerie inv. 753a (oil on wood, 185.2 x 105 cm), and particularly *Portrait of a Man*, 1632, Malibu, Getty Museum, inv. 94.PB.1 (oil on wood, 121,9 x 85 cm).
- 19 Malibu, Getty Museum, inv. 54.PB.3 (oil on wood, 118.7 x 90.2 cm); Amsterdam, Scheepvaartmuseum, inv. 1994.6803 (oil on wood, 119 x 88 cm). George p. Keyes has also noted that there are certain correlations between the jewellery depicted by Pickenoy in different paintings, e.g. in the 1635 portrait and *Portrait of a Woman*, c. 1630, Detroit Institut of Arts, inv.21.214 (oil on wood, 123.5 x 91.4 cm), see: George p. Keyes, *Masters of Dutch Painting: The Detroit Institute of Arts*, Detroit 2004, cat. 65.
- 20 Besides the drawing owned by the Department of Prints and Drawings at the SMK, only one other drawing has been tentatively attributed to Pickenoy. It is housed at the photo collection of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Dokumentaties (RKD).
- 21 Another possibility is to compare the drawing with the underdrawing that presumably lies hidden underneath the painted portraits. I am not aware of any such studies having been published.
- 22 In a few cases he also painted the portraits of people who were not residents of Amsterdam, e.g. *Trijntje van Nooy* and *Renier Hinloopen*, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-A 1319 and SK-A 1312 (oil on wood, 123 x 90/91 cm), who lived in Hoorn.
- 23 J.G. Frederiks and P.J. Frederiks: *Kohier van den tweehonderdsten penning voor Amsterdam en onderhoorige plaatsen over 1631*, Amsterdam 1890, 5vo-49 (Dr. Tulp); 51-5 (Benningh) 95vo-166 (Van Son/Le Maire); 11-32 (Rijckert/Merchijns); 142-41 (Van Hoek/Keysers); 184vo-79 (Fortuyn/Hop [spelled "Hol"]); 211-71 (Swartenhont); 248-214 (Baack/Harencarspel); 259-156: (Rey/Swartenhont), whereas others are represented via their parents: 1vo-2 (De Graeff); 2-8 (Hooft) and 66vo-198 (Overlander).
- 24 The primary source regarding the family relations of the regent class is Johan Elias: *De vroedschap van Amsterdam*, Amsterdam 1963 (originally printed in Haarlem 1903-05). This approach is inspired by Gary Schwartz, *Rembrandt, His Life, His Paintings*, London 1985 p. 136-137, in which a considerable quantity of the persons mentioned are also part of Pickenoy's clientele. My identification of portraits from the period has been aided by RKDImage (www.rkd.nl); Ann Jensen Adams: *The Paintings of Thomas de Keyser (1596-1667): A Study of Portraiture in Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam*, (unpubl.) PhD thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1985; Kurt Bauch: *Jacob Adriaensz Backer*, Berlin 1926; Blankert, 1975/1979 (see note 17); Albert Blankert: *Ferdinand Bol (1616-1680). Rembrandt's Pupil*, Doornspijk 1982; Joos Bruyn et al.: *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings*, vols. II-III, Dordrecht, Boston and Lancaster 1986-89; Dudok van Heel, 2002 (see note 11); Rudolf E.O. Ekkart: "A portrait historié with Venus, Paris and Cupid: Ferdinand Bol and the Patronage of the Spiegel Family", *Simiolus XXIX*, 2002, p. 14-41; J.J. de Gelder: *Bartholomeus van der Helst*, Rotterdam 1921; Christian Klemm: *Joachim van Sandrart: Kunst Werke und Lebens Lauf*, Berlin 1986; Jhr. F.G.L.O. van Kretschmar: "Aantekeningen vij de portretten Hooft", *Jaarboek van het Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie XXXV*, 1981, p. 109-124; E.W. Moes: *Iconographia Batava*, vols. I-II, Amsterdam 1897-1905; J.W. van Moltke: *Govaert Flink (1615-1669)*, Amsterdam 1965; Pieter J.J. van Thiel (ed.): *All the Paintings of the Rijksmuseum*, Maarssen 1976; Christopher Wright: *Paintings in Dutch Museums*, Bath 1980; and, as regards Pickenoy, the photo collection at Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Dokumentaties.
- 25 Dudok van Heel, 1985, p. 152 (see note 1). I disregard Dirkse's suggestion that Pickenoy had contacts to the Lutheran church, Dirkse, 1983, p. 238f (see note 1). His theory primarily applies to historical paintings, whereas he only knew the the two portraits addressed, *Lambert van Tweenhuyzen* and *Janneken Camperbeke*, 1617, Munich, Schloss Schleissheim, inv. 1284 and 1285, from two poor photographs at the RKD. The paintings cannot be attributed to Pickenoy (Schloss Schleissheim states that the portraits were painted by an "anonymous Haarlem master", RKD attributes them to the "Circle of Van der Voort or Pickenoy"). Thus, the question of links to the Lutheran church is less relevant in connection with his portraits.
- 26 De Keyser received many commissions from his fellow

- Remonstrants, Rembrandt portrayed many of the Mennonite comrades of his partner, Hendrik Uylenburgh, and Ferdinand Bol's marriage brought him into contact with the top echelons of the Amsterdam admiralty, which subsequently commissioned several historical paintings from Bol. Adams, 1985, p. 78-87 (see note 24); Schwartz, 1985, p. 139-142, 146-148 (see note 24); Ekkart, 2002, p. 14-41 (see note 24).
- 27 Johannesburg, Art Gallery, inv. 204 and 1991.7.5. (oil on wood, 122 x 89.5 cm). Pickenoy's brother-in-law, Cornelis Graafland, can be linked to several of the families represented in the network: His brother-in-law on his sister's side, Nicolaes Kloppe, was married to Margaretha a Gouche and though this marriage also related to Zacharias Alewijn, son of Martinus Alewijn. Nicolaes Kloppe's daughters, Wendela and Jacoba, were married to Nicolaas Calcoen (formerly married to Agatha van Loon) and to Jacobus Trip, who in turn was related to the Trip, Six and Hop families, all of whom had links to Pickenoy's clientele. This indicates that Graafland had ties to other families surrounding the network identified in this essay, but all marriages resulting from such ties are later than 1697 and so have no bearing on Pickenoy's clientele. Elias, 1963, nos. 108, 180, 206, 263, 308, 320 and 321 (see note 24)
- 28 Amsterdams Historisch Museum, inv. A-7352. Dudok van Heel did not consider the painting for the simple reason that it was not attributed to Pickenoy until 1993. For a discussion of this attribution, see: Adams, 1985, cat. 1 (see note 24); Pieter J.J. van Thiel: "Werner Jacobsz. van den Valckert", *Oud Holland* XCVII, 1983, p. 169-71 and Wouter Kloek (ed.): *Dawn of the Golden Age. Northern Netherlandish Art, 1580-1620*", Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam 1993, cat. 268.
- 29 Amsterdams Historisch Museum, inv. SA-2048 (fragment, oil on canvas, 100 x 200 cm).
- 30 s'Gravenhage, Mauritshuis, inv. 146 (oil on canvas, 169 x 216 cm). Rembrandt's anatomy lesson can also be viewed as a continuation of *Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Egbertsz. de Vrij* in terms of the devices used to ensure internal and external coherence, see Riegl, 1999, p. 239-41, 254-59 (see note 17).
- 31 Amsterdam, private collection, *Portrait of Geritghen van Poelenburgh and her Grandchildren*, 1624/26, (dimensions unknown), *The Tulp Family*, 1636 (oil on canvas, 137 x 207 cm) and *Dr. Tulp* (oil on wood, 39 x 30 cm). The attribution of the family portrait from 1624/26 is a matter of contention, Frauke Laarman, *Het Noord-Nederlands familieportret in de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw*, Amsterdam 2004 p. 126 cat. C5.
- 32 Muiden, Rijksmuseum Muiderslot, inv. M.1958-7 (oil on wood, 71 x 65 cm); Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-A-1245, (oil on wood, 56 x 46 cm); the portraits of Merchijs/Rijckaert are in private ownership (oil on wood, 121 x 89 cm). Rijckaert/Merchijs' ties to the Hasselaer family are charted in Elias, 1963, nos. 21 and 126 (see note 24).
- 33 Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-A-1246 and SK-A-1247 (oil on canvas, 79.5 x 66.5 cm). Norbert Middelkoop: "Hollandse meesters voor Australië; onderzoek naar zeven schilderijen voor de tentoonstelling *The Golden Age of Dutch Art*", *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum* XXXVII, 1999, p. 179-181, reproduced in Middelkoop (ed.), 2002, cat 25a-b (see note 7).
- 34 Zeist, Gemeentehuis (oil on canvas, 96 x 75 cm); s'Gravenhage, Hoogsteder en Hoogsteder (oil on canvas, 75.2 x 96,9 cm); Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-A-1250 and SK-A-1251 (oil on wood, 69 x 59 cm and 70 x 68.5 cm), reproduced in Middelkoop (ed.), 2002, cat. 27a-b (see note 7).
- 35 Elias, 1963, lii-lvi, lix-lxxx (see note 24); Adams, 1985, p. 84 n31 (see note 24).
- 36 S'Gravenhage, private collection (media and dimensions unknown to me).
- 37 Dudok van Heel, 2002 (see note 11).
- 38 Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, circa 1620, inv. SK-A-3741 (oil on canvas, 223 x 127 cm); formerly Münster, Kunsthandel Freye und Sohn.
- 39 Dudok van Heel, 2002, p. 53-54 (see note 11). For information about the works and reproductions of those and the paintings listed below, see this essay.
- 40 Two paintings – the full-length portraits of Volckert Overlander and Geertruyd Hooft – were, in fact, expanded copies after two older knee-length portraits. Dudok van Heel, 2002, p. 49f, 57 (see note 11).
- 41 Amsterdam, Scheepvaartmuseum, 1633, inv. 1991.0205 and 1994.6803 (oil on wood, 119 x 88 cm). As was mentioned above, the composition of the female portrait from 1633 is repeated in the female portrait from 1635, the only difference being that the gloves are held in the other hand.
- 42 Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, 1636, inv. 753a and b, (oil on canvas, 185.2 x 105 cm and 185.2 x 105.4 cm).
- 43 Kassel, Gemäldegalerie, inv. GK239, (oil on canvas, 199 x 122.5 cm).
- 44 This interpretation can be found in e.g. Ekkart, 1996, p. 735 (see note 1). In her studies of the similar career of Thomas de Keyser, Ann Jensen Adams has concluded that his diminished production was the result of fiercer competition within the portrait market and by a general economic lull during the period. Adams, 1985, p. 416ff (see note 24).
- 45 Amsterdams Historisch Museum: *Company of Captain Dirck Theuling*, 1639, inv. A-7314 (oil on canvas, 202 x 340.5 cm [fragment]); *Company of Captain Jan van Vlooswijk*, 1642, inv. A-7311 (oil on canvas, 340 x 527 cm); and *Company of Jacob Rogh*, 1645, inv. A7315 (oil on canvas, 243 x 581 cm).
- 46 Relevant portraits by Santvoort include *Margaretha de Vlaming (1593-1674)*, 1645, Amsterdam, private collection (oil on canvas, 207 x 137 cm) and *Agatha Geelvinck (1617-1638)*, circa 1640, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-A-1318 (oil on wood, 72 x 61 cm). Among the individual portraits attributed to Pickenoy with varying degrees of credibility we find the following five dated 1637 or later: *Portrait of an Admiral*, 1640 Munich, Alte Pinakothek, inv. 183 (oil on wood, 112 x 85 cm); *Self-Portrait*, 1641, S'Gravenhage, De Suter (auction), 15 June 1937; *Portrait of a 49-year-old Woman*, 1639, Roma, Collezione Spiridon (oil on wood, 69 x 55 cm); *Portrait of a Woman*, auction Pavillon Royal, Neuilly-sur-Seine 22 November 1992 (oil on wood, 64 x 52 cm); and finally *Bust of a Man*, 1649, Sevastopol, Kunstmuseum (oil on wood, 66 x 61.5 cm). Rudolf E.O. Ekkart does not believe that there are any known individual portraits later than 1640, Ekkart, 1996, p. 734f.
- 47 Adams, 1985, p. 416-418 (see note 24); Marten Jan Bok: *Vraag en Aanbod op de nederlandse kunstmarkt, 1570-1700*, (unpublished), thesis, Utrecht Universiteit 1994, appendix 4.1; Marten Jan Bok: "Fluctuations in the Production of Portraits made by Painters in the Northern Netherlands, 1550-1800" in p. Cavaciocchi (ed.): *Economia e Arte Secc. XIII-XVIII*, Prato 2002; David Burmeister Kaaring; *Rembrandt, Handelsmand i Amsterdam*, (unpublished), thesis, Cph University, 2004, p. 64-71.
- 48 Dudok van Heel, 2002, p. 52f (see note 11).
- 49 Blankert, 1982, p. 22f (see note 24); Alan Chong: *Aelbert Cuyper and the Meanings of Landscape*, (unpublished) PhD thesis, New York University 1992, p. 94-96.
- 50 Simon Schama: *Rembrandt's Eyes*, London 2000, p. 470;
- Schwartz, 1985, p. 202 (see note 24). See also R. W. Scheller "Rembrandt en de encyclopedische kunstkamer", *Oud Holland*, vol. 84 (1969), p. 81-147 and Michael Zell, "A Leisure and Virtuous Pursuit", *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, vol. 54 (2003), p. 357ff.
- 51 Dudok van Heel, 2002, p. 50-53 (see note 11), Schwartz, 1985, 139-142 (see note 24).
- 52 Kassel, Gemäldegalerie, inv. GK235, (oil on canvas, 128.5 x 100,5 cm) and Paris, private collection, (oil on canvas, 209.8 x 134.8 cm and 209.4 x 134.3 cm, respectively). Krul did not belong to a regent family but had several acquaintances within regent circles, and the painting may have been a part-public commission. Schwartz, 1985, p. 156 (see note 24).
- 53 There are, of course, exceptions, e.g. Frans Hals' aforementioned *Nicolaes Hasselaer*. Of particular note are Hendrick Pot's (1580/81-1657) *Petronella Witsen (1602-76)* and *Jacob van der Merck (1599-1653)*, London, Sotheby's, 7 May 1995, lot 48, because they are static full-length portraits executed on a very modest scale (42 x 32 cm). See also Werner van den Valckert's portraits of the patrician *Michiel Poppen at his Desk*, circa 1620, Tilburg, private collection (oil on wood, 116 x 88 cm). The iconography of this portrait, however, comes from another "official" type of portrait, the regent pieces of charitable institutions.
- 54 Unknown ownership, before 1638?, (oil on copper, 32.4 x 20.9 cm). Besides this piece, all of his identified portraits of prominent persons are painted as *tranquillitas* knee-length portraits, see: Adams, 1985, cat. 11-12, 40-41 and 73-75. See also the problematic portrait of the De Graeff family, cat. D-2.
- 55 Adams, 1985, p. 218 (see note 24).
- 56 *ibid.*, p. 310ff; Adams, 1997, p. 158-74 (see note 2).
- 57 Quoted from: Adams, 1997, p. 169 (see note 2) ("*How can he, who has always picked up pins and nails to fix what he loved securely to his heart, when it is ripped from there, be left with anything but unbearable rifts?*"). Statens Museum for Kunst owns a portrait of P.C. Hooft, painted in 1638 by Van Mierevelt, inv. KMS380 (oil on wood, 59.5 x 46.5 cm)
- 58 Smith, 1982, p. 10f, 16-19 (see note 1); David Smith: "Rhetoric and Prose in Dutch Portraiture" in *Dutch Crossing* XLI, 1990, p. 74.
- 59 Adams, 1997, p. 167, 171 (see note 2).
- 60 *ibid.*, p. 173. ["On the one hand, the viewer would have to acknowledge the legitimacy of the political power by any regent portrayed. At the same time, these portraits suggest that the viewer actually 'ruled him or herself': Any authority claimed by pictured members of the regent class could be viewed as merely a material formality."]
- 61 *ibid.*, p. 173-174. This is essentially true regardless of whether the person commissioning the portrait was aware of the underlying significance of the type or whether they simply chose it because it was the accepted standard for portraits.
- 62 Smith, 1982, p. 57ff (see note 1); Smith, 1990, pp. 72-74 (see note 58).
- 63 Adams, 1985, p. 298 (see note 24).
- 64 Jan Bialostocki: *Stil und Ikonographie*, Dresden 1966, p. 9-35.
- 65 See e.g. Ernst van de Wetering: "Rembrandt's Self-Portraits: Problems of Authenticity and Functions" in Ernst van de Wetering (ed.): *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings* vol. IV, Dordrecht 2005, p. 166-71
- 66 Ernst van de Wetering: *Rembrandt. The Painter at Work*, Amsterdam 1997, p. 171f.
- 67 Smith, 1982, p. 54 (see note 1); Harry Berger Jr.: *Fictions of the Pose, Rembrandt against the Italian Renaissance*, Stanford 2000, pp. 278-280.