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Abstract

In the seventeenth century, the proliferation of Dutch family portraits among the broad middle class was a distinctive facet of artistic production. Within this visual trend, the vast majority of such paintings present the sitters in outdoor environs rather than the domestic sphere. This dissertation focuses on such images and adopts the term “family-landscape portrait” to highlight the hybrid nature of the images that commemorate a particular family within a specific locale. I consider the particularities of seventeenth-century Dutch family-landscape portraiture as a separate pictorial genre and attend to the ways in which these images construct identity and generate meaning, including through the blending of portraiture and landscape conventions.

In order to investigate the complex meanings of family-landscape portraits, this dissertation will consider the images from the perspective of the biographical circumstances of the sitters’ lives; contemporary cultural, socioeconomic and political issues that inflect the choice of symbols or locale; and the pictorial traditions from which the images stem. Chapters divided by commonalities in locale reveal that mercantile or professional identities and values resonated strongly with families pictured along a coast. Kin groups portrayed near urban landmarks tended to highlight communal memory and political or civic values as facets of familial ideals. Groups adjacent to ruins displayed a concern with history, familial memory and cultural sophistication. Families depicted on their country estates highlighted communal and professional identities, earned leisure and hospitality as integral to familial identity.
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Introduction

In the seventeenth century, the proliferation of Dutch family portraits among the broad middle class was a distinctive facet of artistic production. Within this visual trend, the vast majority of such paintings present the sitters in outdoor environs rather than the domestic sphere.¹ This dissertation focuses on such images and adopts the term “family-landscape portrait” to highlight the hybrid nature of the images that commemorate a particular family within a specific locale. I propose that family-landscape portraiture can be considered a separate category of portraiture, yet it is one that has not been studied as a distinct visual phenomenon. This dissertation will consider the particularities of seventeenth-century Dutch family-landscape portraiture and attend to the ways in which these images construct identity and generate meaning, including through the blending of portraiture and landscape conventions.

Analyzing Family Portraits

Since the 1980s, scholarly attention has focused upon the profusion and cultural significance of the various types of portraits from the Dutch Golden Age, yet those that depict families have received significantly less critical notice than individual, pendant and non-family group portraits.² This oversight resulted in part from Alois Riegl’s dismissal of family


portraiture as “essentially nothing more than an elaboration of the individual portrait.”

He argued that “a husband and wife are, so to speak, two sides of the same coin, their children of the same stamp, and all of them are naturally the same mintage. This family resemblance leads to a natural unity in a work of art that precludes the need for any special tricks of pictorial conception or composition.”

Riegel’s underestimation of the genre, however, has been re-evaluated by some scholars. Art historians have recognized that such portraits could provide meaningful insights into the status and identity of the sitters and the cultural values of both the artist and sitters.

In his study, *Masks of Wedlock: Seventeenth-Century Dutch Marriage Portraiture*, David Smith attended to the form and content of pendants and double portraits, and a few family portraits. He argued that sitters perform social roles through such images. According to Smith, these portraits present idealized images of the sitters’ values and attitudes towards marriage as conveyed through dress, accessories, setting, rhetorical devices of pose and gesture, and symbolic motifs. Simply stated, portraits are performances and presentations of social identity.

---


4 Rieg, *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, 62. Rieg’s dismissal of family portraits has been re-evaluated by a number of scholars including Frauke Laarmann. Laarmann elaborates on the characteristics and development of family portraits in the first half of the seventeenth century in her dissertation. See, Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederlands Familieportret.”

In *Portretten van Echt en Trouw: Huwelijk en Gezin in de Nederlandse Kunst van de Zeventiende Eeuw*, Eddy de Jongh charted new territory into iconographic analysis of marriage and family portraits and argued for their symbolic, moral or didactic content. De Jongh also analyzed marriage and family portraits in light of contemporary attitudes regarding gender, wedlock and social status. In recent decades, without abandoning iconography and socioeconomic and cultural history, the scope of heuristic inquiries expanded to include a broader consideration of the functions of various categories of portraiture.

This dissertation draws upon formal and iconographic analysis, and socioeconomic and cultural history to answer a variety of questions about family-landscape portraits. What are the pictorial conventions of family-landscape portraits? What meanings are generated through the integration of family in landscape? How are these meanings complemented by associations assumed by other visual motifs and details? Do family-landscape portraits speak to cultural perceptions of other social institutions besides the family and wedlock?

**Dutch Families in the Seventeenth Century**

At the core of family portraits is the family unit. As such, art historical investigations of these images have focused on cultural perceptions of the family. Most scholars consider family

---


portraits as manifesting attitudes toward children, concern for their upbringing and the parents’ responsibility in that arena. 

In the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic, families were usually small close-knit groups with an average of three to four children. The nuclear family lived at the same residence and children usually did not leave home until the time of their own marriage when they were in their mid-twenties. Although both Catholic and Protestant doctrine espoused the idea that the primary, if not sole, purpose of marital intercourse was the propagation of children, religious concern valued companionate marriage even more. Protestant theology emphasized the importance of companionship, procreation and the avoidance of fornication in marriage. Protestantism contrasted with Catholic doctrine in so far as the latter also promoted marriage as a sacrament to ensure salvation. In family-landscape portraits, the formal arrangement of figures, gestures and symbolic motifs do seem to embody pervasive perceptions of marriage, the family and its constituent members. Many of the images discussed in this dissertation depict a nuptial gesture where man and wife clasped right hands that was part of the ritual of taking

---


10 Early modern theologians believed that sex for any other reason than procreation in marriage was sinful. Wayne E. Franits, Paragons of Virtue: Women and Domesticity in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 67; Schama, Embarrassment of Riches, 421.

11 Manon van der Heijden states that, “Marital love became the most important object of marriage. Love and companionship were to be the bond that kept men and women together.” Manon van der Heijden, “Secular and Ecclesiastical Marriage Control: Rotterdam, 1550–1700,” in Private Domain, Public Inquiry: Families and Life-Styles in the Netherlands and Europe, 1550 to the Present, eds. Anton Schuurman and Pieter Spierenburg (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1996), 42. See also, Smith, Masks of Wedlock, 26. Westermann, “Making Home,” 48.
marriage vows, which reinforces the value placed on the marital union as a companionate one. The very inclusion of children in such images highlights other aspects of marriage as a vehicle for sexual virtue and procreation.

In addition to picturing facets of the marriage relationship, family-landscape portraits engage attitudes toward reciprocal obligations between parents and children. The primary role of middle- and upper-class wife and mother was to honor her husband, maintain the home and servants, set good examples of modest demeanor, and nurture and discipline her children. Until the children’s age of seven, the mother held greatest responsibility for child rearing. The father then took over moral and social responsibility for the education of his progeny. His duties included financial support of his family, instruction in the fear of God and training in virtues, and preparation of his children to be useful citizens who could support themselves. In a pedagogical treatise of 1621, Middleburg schoolmaster Johannes de Swaef wrote, “Here this has to be heeded / for it is the duty of the male sex to serve in all important positions, in the Republic as well as in the Community / as well as such duties that benefit the family. On the other hand, the female sex is charged with a more general calling, namely the supervision of their children and their household / to see that the children are well taken care of / and that everything in the

12 Erwin Panofsky identified this gesture as the dextrarum iunctio. This term is repeated in much of the twentieth-century scholarship on Dutch art that depicts marriage portraits and betrothed couples in portraits. According to Edwin Hall, “the Western matrimonial joining of right hands was not a survival, or even a revival, of the dextrarum iunctio as has generally been assumed since the nineteenth century…the linking of right hands was in fact a new symbolic gesture that arise in transalpine Europe during the final stage of development of the marriage ritual ‘in the face of the church.’” Edwin Hall, The Arnolfini Betrothal: Medieval Marriage and the Enigma of Van Eyck’s Double Portrait (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 37; Edwin Panofsky, “Jan van Eyck’s Arnolfini Portrait,” Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs 64, no. 372 (1934): 123; Franits, Paragons of Virtue, 76; Smith, Masks of Wedlock, 59.

house goes properly.”14 Children, in turn, were to be submissive and obedient. In the opinion of Johan van Beverwijck, “Republics that set most store by their good citizens give most attention to the upbringing of their children,” because failure to raise upright children could have dire consequences for the nation.15 The repeated appearance of motifs such as dogs, goats and kolf sticks alludes to parental roles in proper upbringing and children’s absorption of taught lessons.16

Site Specificity: Combining Landscape and Portrait

The particularized landscape settings in which sitters appear include dunes, shores, panoramic vistas and mountainous backdrops. The settings give attention to recognizable environments that were part of the lives of the urban citizens depicted. Unlike the relative dearth of art historical studies on family portraits, there are numerous scholarly publications that address painted and printed Dutch landscapes, albeit not as a hybrid aspect of family portraits.

A perplexing trend within art historical scholarship on family portraits has been the tendency to ignore or dismiss depicted settings unless the family appears within a domestic space. Landscapes in family-landscape portraits receive attention only in so far as the environs

14 “Hier op moet ghelet zyn / wat het is het mannelyck gheslachte belast alle aensienelycke beroepinghen beyde inde Rebuplycke [sic] ende de Gemeente te betrachten / oock soodanige daer hy zyn huysgesin mede kan voorstaen. Daer en tegen den vrouwelycken geslachte is dit generael beroep opgeleydt / van op haer kinderen en huyshouden gade te slain / dat de kinderen haer ghemack hebben / ende alles in het huyshouden ordentelyck toegae.” Translations from the Dutch are my own unless otherwise noted. Translation in Frantits, Paragons of Virtue, 130 and note 79.

15 Johan van Beverwijck, Schat der Gesontheyd, vol. 2 (Dordrecht: Hendrick van Esch, 1640-42), 192; Schama, Embarrassment of Riches, 495.

16 Kolf was a two or four person game that required a wooden-handled stick with a lead head and a leather or wooden ball. The game required strength, precision, skill in judging speed and distance, and the ability to cooperate with teammates and grace in either winning or losing. The kolf stick is not merely a sport accessory, but an attribute of self-discipline, sound judgment and cooperation. These ideas are explained in Chapter 1. Annemarieke Willemse. “Out of Children’s Hands: Surviving Toys and Attributes,” in Pride and Joy, 299; Amy Orrock, “Play and Learning in Pieter Bruegel’s Children’s Games” (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2010), 29; Bram Stoffele, “Cristiaan Huygens, A Family Affair: Fashioning a family in Early-Modern Court Culture” (M.A. Thesis: Utrecht University, 2006), 61.
show where the families lived or if the locales have some tie to the professional activities of the patriarchs. I propose a more complex interpretative relationship existed between sitters and settings. Since family-landscape portraits show those portrayed outside the walls of their urban homes, this dissertation considers the landscape environment a significant iconographic element and thus integral to the interpretation of the family-landscape portraits. The limited types of portrayed landscapes suggest that the selectivity of topographies or environs is as meaningful as other details, such as gesture, costume and symbolic motifs. I look to scholarship on landscape imagery, which examines connections to social, political, cultural and economic events to discern the significance of the locales for the depicted families. The purposeful combination of family portrait and landscape setting is integral to identities the sitters wished to project and how they wished to be perceived by viewers.

Structure of the Dissertation

In order to investigate the complex meanings of family-landscape portraits, this dissertation will consider the images from the perspective of the biographical circumstances of the sitters’ lives, contemporary cultural issues that inflect the choice of symbols or locale, and the pictorial traditions from which the images stem. Among the many variables and varieties of

---

family-landscape portraits, one prominent organizing principle emerges for this study: the type of landscape or salient landscape feature that they depict. Thus, the dissertation will be organized by type of landscape setting.

Chapter 1, “Coasts and Kin,” examines nine portraits that depict families along a coast, port or canal. The chapter argues that families who elected to have themselves portrayed beside an aqueous locale did so to highlight the foundation of their status and identity in nautical enterprises or activities. Within a chronological framework, this chapter elucidates the formal and iconographic similarities and differences between the nine paintings. A consideration of artist and sitter biographies, pictorial contexts, symbolic gestures and motifs, and socio-historical contexts reveals a number of cultural perceptions projected by both the families and their maritime activities. These cultural perceptions structure the formal characteristics and iconographic content of the images, which visualize identity at the intersection of familial and mercantile values. Among the nine coastal-family-landscape portraits, the ideals of honor, self-restraint or discipline, industriousness and conformity to expected social norms manifest themselves not only in the representation of individual family members, but also through the coastal environments in which they appear.

Chapter 2, “Panoramas and Progeny,” discusses a group of eleven panoramic-family-landscape portraits that portray sitters in the foreground of the image with a view to a landscape backdrop, which contains an important city landmark or a city profile on the horizon.18 The chapter begins with an exploration of aspects of the socio-historical contexts and visual and literary culture that frame the appearance of panoramic-family-landscape portraits, and proceeds

---

18 Landmarks include the Grote Kerk (also known as the Cathedral of St. Bavo) in Haarlem, a city gate of Leiden, the tower of St. Janskerk in The Hague, the tower of the Dom (Cathedral of St. Martin) in Utrecht, Kasteel Duurstede near Utrecht, and the Koningshuis and tower of the Cunerakerk in Rhenen.
with a chronological discussion of individual images, grouped by the depicted city with which the family may be linked. Like most family portraits, the images in this chapter visualize the roles of kin and their reciprocal obligations to each other, and highlight the virtues of husbands, wives and children. But this subset of portraits contextualizes familial virtues and ideals as also civic in resonance and as tied to an urban locale. Iconographic interpretations of various motifs in such family portraits reveal similar themes of honor and illustriousness of citizenry, wealth, unity, civic pride and cultural memory that appear in city descriptions, maps and poems.

Chapter 3, “Ruins and Relations,” focuses on nine family-landscape portraits, discussed in chronological order, that show the family before ruins which allude to decayed structures in Rome with commemorative significance as embodiments of the ideas of virtue and glory. The settings and pictorial details are meaningful for the interpretation and understanding of familial and individual identity because they depict the families transported beyond the shores of their homeland. As iconographic elements, ruins in such paintings can embody memento mori associations of decay and death while also promoting the importance of family history and past family members, that is, the foundation of the prestige of successive generations.


20 “Italianate” as a descriptor of paintings by Dutch artists applies to landscapes or genre scenes with classical ruins or mountainous terrain pervaded by a golden cast of light. Albert Blankert, Nederlandse 17e Eeuwse Italianiserende Landschapschilders = Dutch 17th Century Italianate Landscape Painters (Soest: Davaco, 1978), 7. See also, Frederik J. Duparc and Linda L. Graif, Italian Recollections: Dutch Painters of the Golden Age (Montreal: Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, 1990), 13–45.
Simultaneously, ruins transcend time and hint at the eternal commemoration of the pictured family. The combination of ruins and certain other symbolic motifs allows the pictured family members to present themselves as honorable and worthy of remembrance. In addition, ruins enable the sitters to project an identity of elevated social status and sophistication, which the evocation of the *groote tour* (Grand Tour) to various Italian cities implies. Such portraits with an Italianate coastal setting and Dutch ships can also allude to the naval or commercial activities of the patriarchs and the introduction of sons into their professional endeavors. The chapter will discuss the family-landscape portraits within the contexts of the ideas of remembrance, cultural sophistication and commercialism.

Chapter 4, “Domains and Dynasties,” takes as its subject images that portray families on their country estates, or *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits. Six portraits for which the sitters’ names are known show the families within the grounds of their estates, usually with a partial or complete view of the houses themselves. The owners of country houses discussed in this chapter were investors and merchants, regents and military men. Such burghers commissioned portrayals of *buitenplaatsen* (country estates) primarily as a means of expressing the patrons’ elevated social status and membership in an elite segment of society.\(^\text{21}\) The *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits similarly speak to the social status of the depicted families. Images express pride in accomplishment and affirm membership in wealthy middle-class and regent spheres. The *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits also affirm marital and familial roles and obligations, and they evince familial values of honor, obedience, discipline and the leisure afforded by industriousness in a professional or political sphere. In comparison to other family-landscape portraits, the images discussed in this chapter place greater emphasis on

leisure and reveal hospitality as a significant component of familial identity through their inclusion of country houses.

Family portraits, especially those with landscape settings, make grand statements about the station of the family and its individual members. The hybrid nature and visual intricacies of family-landscape portraiture enrich the study of the display, performance and construction of identity that is central to any examination of seventeenth-century Dutch portraiture. Family-landscape portraits are an assemblage of individual and collective identities that must be understood as distinct, but nonetheless tied to larger social entities, such as mercantile activity, political organizations, civic affiliations and cultural or social institutions. These address expectations for behavior and gender roles within the family, local communities and Dutch society at large.
Chapter 1: Coasts and Kin

Introduction

Much of the nascent seventeenth-century Dutch Republic’s unforeseen economic and political success derived from its engagement with the sea through navigation, trade, fishing or investment. Dutchmen celebrated their varied relationship to the sea in diverse media and contexts, including family portraits where the sitters are pictured along a coast, port or canal. This chapter investigates the phenomenon of family-landscape portraits that locate sitters in environs comprised of duned beaches, ports, ships, fish and fishermen, and seashells (figs. 1–9).

Paintings by Hendrick Avercamp, Adam Willaerts, Cornelis Adamsz. Willaerts, Jan Daemen Cool, Isaack Luttichuys, Dirck Dircksz. Santvoort, Herman Meindertsz. Doncker, Abraham Willaerts and Nicolaes Maes constitute a small yet distinct subset of family-landscape portraiture that emerges during the 1630s and all but disappears by the end of the 1650s. The brief, concentrated appearance of family portraits in proximity to a body of water during roughly the second quarter of the century may be explained by several factors: the proven success of private and commercial fishing and trading enterprises begun earlier in the century that had come to fruition by the end of the 1620s; the dense, interconnected web of industries affiliated with

---

22 This chapter is not intended to be an exhaustive survey of families pictured along coasts; several examples have been excluded from the discussion for various reasons. Pieter Codde’s Portrait of Sebastiaan Francken and His Family on the Beach of Scheveningen 1638–39 (Unknown Location) is unlike others in this chapter because the image does not constructing a mercantile identity for the family, probably because Sebastiaan Francken was not a merchant. Francken held various governmental offices in Dordrecht and The Hague. Jan Molenaer’s Portrait of Jacob Mathijszoon Oosterlingh, 1682 (Edams Museum), shows Jacob with his daughter and son-in-law at the Edams shipyard with every ship he built during his lifetime; the majority of these ships are fluyts. This example places significantly greater emphasis on Jacob’s professional achievements and does not include obvious symbols that would suggest the interstices of mercantile and familial values evident in other coastal-family-landscape portraits. Ludolph Bakhuizen painted his family sitting around a table on the banks of the Ij, with Amsterdam warehouses in the background in 1702 (Amsterdam Museum). This painting does not have a place in this chapter because it appears almost fifty years after Maes painted the Cuyter portrait. It is a complicated blend of family along a coast and family around a laden table. The driving force of familial identity was the patriarch and as an artist, Bakhuizen would not have projected a mercantile identity or values in the manner of other coastal-family-landscape portraits.
fishing and nautical trade; the prevalence of leisure activities connected with the water (from games to shell collecting); and the established strength of the admiralties.\textsuperscript{23} Most of the coastal-family-landscape portraits invoke some aspect of trade or fishing, often in combination with leisure pursuits, while only one makes explicit reference to the navy.

Eight of the nine families pictured in these portraits resided in the maritime provinces of Holland or Zeeland, two regions where a large percentage of the population could attribute their wealth and concomitant social standing to their business ventures in fishing, shipping and related investments.\textsuperscript{24} The occupation of the patriarch in coastal-family-landscape portraits ranged from captain to trader, and investor to innkeeper. Despite the considerable number of Hollanders and Zeelanders active in the breadth of maritime industries, only a small number chose to have themselves depicted in a watery environment that explicitly connects familial and mercantile identity. The purposeful, and somewhat unusual, compendium of family portrait and marine view is, therefore, significant to the expression of identity and status in coastal-family-landscape portraits.

Families that did elect to have themselves portrayed as a social unit in an aqueous locale did so to highlight the foundation of their status and identity in nautical enterprises or activities. The notion that artists used the setting to communicate aspects of the patriarch’s professional identity has not entirely escaped the notice of other scholars; however, this chapter posits a rather more complex visual and interpretive relationship between sitters and setting. Within a chronological framework, this chapter elucidates the formal and iconographic similarities and


\textsuperscript{24} By 1680 50,000 people were active in maritime trade and even more in related support industries. Jeroen Giltaij and Jan Kelch, eds., \textit{Praise of Ships and the Sea: The Dutch Marine Painters of the 17th Century} (Rotterdam: Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Berlin: Staatliche Museum zu Berlin, 1996), 43.
differences between the nine paintings. A consideration of artist and sitter biographies, pictorial contexts, symbolic gestures and motifs and socio-historical contexts reveals a number of cultural perceptions of both the families and maritime activities. These cultural perceptions structure the formal characteristics and iconographic content of the images, which visualize identity at the intersection of familial and mercantile values. Among the nine coastal-family-landscape portraits, the ideals of honor, self-restraint or discipline, industriousness and conformity to expected social norms manifest themselves not only in the portrayal of individual family members, but also through the coastal environment in which they appear.25

An Early Example from the 1610s

Hendrick Avercamp’s Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait, c.1608-15 and 1620, the earliest of the coastal-family-landscape portraits, depicts a family group in the bottom left corner silhouetted against a vast icy winter landscape with an inn and a panoply of figures engaged in pleasurable, seasonal activities (fig. 1). While the frozen water is a significant visual element and the activities pictured upon it help to fashion familial identity in the painting, on the whole the image is quite unlike the other coastal-family-landscape portraits. Avercamp’s Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait gives more emphasis to the setting, where the ice becomes a stage for leisure activities, and there is only a minimal indication of the family’s commercial pursuits. Despite the dearth of overt mercantile references, Avercamp’s

coastal-family-landscape portrait, nonetheless, visualizes familial ideals through the interplay of figure and environment.

Avercamp’s *Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait* portrays two families, or eight portraits in total in the foreground: the two husbands in the center with their wives and children placed to their right and left, and a maid who holds the youngest child of the group. They are the same diminutive scale as the other figures in the scene and they seem distanced from the viewer because Avercamp portrays the sitters and their environment from an elevated, panoramic vantage point. Although the subjects appear in the left foreground and engage the viewer by looking out at them, the sitters are not given visual prominence. This is an unusual feature of Avercamp’s image both within the broad category of family-landscape portraits and the smaller subset of coastal-family-landscape portraits.²⁶ Adam Willaerts’ *Portrait of a Family at the Maasmond near Den Briel* is the only other image in this chapter in which the manipulation of scale and space distances the sitters from the viewer (fig. 2).²⁷

The icy scene, filled with a cross section of society engaged in a variety of seasonal activities, is typical of an Avercamp winter landscape. Since his time in Amsterdam in 1607, the artist had had been specializing in wintry outdoor scenes, derived from Flemish artists he either knew personally (David Vinckboons and Gillis van Coninxloo) or through printed reproductions

---

²⁶ In her analysis of family portraits from the first half of the seventeenth century, Frauke Laarmann identifies Avercamp’s image as belonging to a distinct category of family portrait where the sitters are subordinate to the landscape. In such portraits she argues that the image should be understood in terms of its value as a collector’s item, as an object whose value lies in the name of the artist who painted it and an appreciation for the artist’s pictorial specialization. Frauke K. Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederlands Familieportret in de Eerste Helft van de Zeventiende Eeuw: Beeldtraditie en Betekenis” (PhD diss., Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2002), 118.

²⁷ One explanation for the distance and diminutive presentation of the families in Avercamp’s painting may be its composite manufacture. Avercamp painted the frozen landscape between 1608 and 1615 and then appended the families to the scene after 1620. Avercamp’s attempt to integrate the families into an already finished composition resulted in the small, tightly clustered grouping of the sitters separate from the bustling activity behind them. Pieter Roelofs, “The Paintings: The Dutch on Ice,” in *Hendrick Avercamp: Master of the Ice Scene*, eds. Roelofs et al. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, Nieuw Amsterdam Publishers, 2009), 45.
(Pieter Bruegel and Hans Bol). He continued to paint such scenes after he returned to his hometown of Kampen in the inland province of Overijssel sometime after 1613. Kampen may be visible in the atmospheric cityscape on the horizon of his coastal-family-landscape portrait. A number of iconographic details pictured upon the stilled water of Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait elucidate the connection between familial and mercantile values also suggested by symbolic motifs and gestures within the family groups.

Skating is the most frequently occurring activity in Avercamp’s coastal-family-landscape portrait; figures glide along in gleeful abandon, stumble clumsily on the slippery surface or play the popular game of kolf. Scholars usually explain these oft-repeated activities in Avercamp’s landscapes in relation to several historical, social or literary contexts. Historians label the period between the mid-sixteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries the little ice age because there were many years of especially harsh winters. In Kampen, municipal accounts record expenses associated with “hard winters with heavy ice drifts” (harde winter met swaere ijsgangh) in the years 1610, 1614, 1621 and 1634. If one can believe images such as Avercamp’s landscapes and poems

---

28 These stylistic features and the overall lighthearted tone of Avercamp’s winter landscape appealed to many buyers during the celebratory atmosphere of the Twelve Years Truce (1609–21), some of whom included other artists, the municipal secretary and then burgomaster Wouter Valckenier, and wealthy businessmen Hans Loon. Roelofs, “The Dutch on Ice,” 45.


such as Jan Six van Chandelier’s ‘s Amstedommers Winter (Amsterdam, 1650), people took pleasure in the leisure activities afforded by frozen canals and waterways.\textsuperscript{32}

While most people in Winter Landscape with Skaters and Family Portrait certainly seem to be enjoying themselves, several in the middle distance have fallen (fig. 10). Contemporary moralists frequently compared the precariousness of the ice to the slipperiness of life or the dangers of sin. Johannes Galle’s seventeenth-century re-issue of an engraving of Pieter Bruegel’s Skaters by St. George’s Gate in Antwerp contains an inscription that encapsulates this sentiment (fig. 11):

\begin{center}
\begin{quote}
See how they skate on the ice in Antwerp, outside the city,  
One this way, the other that, watched from every side.  
One stumbles, another falls, that one stands proud and tall.  
Oh learn from this scene how we proceed through the world,  
Slithering as we go, one foolish, the other wise  
On this impermanence, far brittle than ice.\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}
\end{center}

The pitfalls of skating and life may never have been far from people’s minds, however, metaphorical allusions with skating were not solely negative. Roemer Visscher is somewhat more even-handed in his articulation of symbolic associations with skaters and skating. In Sinnepoppen (1614) he includes one emblem of a fallen skater with the motto “Het mist een meester wel,” or it lacks a master (fig. 12). This emblem is balanced by another of an upright skater with the motto, “Gheoeffent derf,” or practice makes perfect (fig. 13). The accompanying text expounds on this idea, reiterating that confidence in certain matters may be gained through practice, which brings mastery.\textsuperscript{34} An emphasis on the connections between skating and

\textsuperscript{32} ‘s Amstedommers Winter describes in words the many kinds of activities to be seen in Avercamp’s paintings. Jan Six van Chandeliers, Maria A. Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen and Hans Luijten, ‘s Amstedommers Winter (Utrecht: HES, 1988).

\textsuperscript{33} Van Suchtelen et al., Holland Frozen in Time, 16; Nadine M. Ortsein, Pieter Brueghel the Elder: Drawings and Prints (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2001), 176.
education and discipline carries greater weight for Avercamp’s *Winter Landscape with Skaters and Family Portrait*, not least of all because there are more upright than fallen skaters.

Although the family groups in *Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait* stand apart from the cavorting figures behind them, Avercamp makes an explicit connection between the sitters and the ice skaters through the figure of the boy who holds a pair of ice skates, so that skaters and skating become a comment on the familial value of discipline achieved through proper education (fig. 14). The pedagogical connotation of ice skates and skaters relates to contemporary ideas about the parental duty to mold offspring into moral and productive members of society, and leisure as a facet of learning. Avercamp’s image makes it clear that individuals not only ascribed to these ideas, but also took pains to present themselves as embodying social norms and ideals.

The heightened emphasis on obedience and discipline as familial values may be traced to numerous medical, didactic and educational texts that attest to the role of the parents in the physical, intellectual and moral development of their children. For example, Otto Brunfels’ *On Disciplining and Instructing Children* (1519 Latin edition, 1525 German edition), Erasmus’ *Behavior Befitting Well-Bred Youth* (1530 Latin edition, 1531 German edition), and Erasmus’ *On Good Manners for Boys* (1530) stress the need to learn discipline and self-restraint. Most

---


35 The identification of the item as skates may be deduced through a comparison to a similar bundle of skates in *Winter Landscape with Skaters* c.1608 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

36 *On Good Manners for Boys*, the best selling book of the sixteenth century, was translated into twenty-two languages. Jonathan Leece, “An Unexpected Audience: Manner Manuals in Renaissance Europe,” *The Forum: Cal Poly’s Journal of History* 3, iss.1 (2011): 44; Orrock, “Play and Learning in Pieter Bruegel’s Children’s Games,” 149. For sixteenth-century humanists and reformers the content of these books was geared to developing internal and external controls necessary to preserve and enlarge a newly won religious freedom. In the seventeenth century the need for training in self-restraint, discipline and industriousness might be understood as a concern for achieving and then preserving independence from Spain. In Steven Ozment’s summarization, “The common goal of parents and tutors, to which all lesser exercise in self-control were aimed, was the fashioning of a person who could
sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers relied on Plutarch’s *De liberis educandis*, which had been printed and translated many times since the fifteenth century. Plutarch argued that natural aptitude (*natura*) could be improved by learnable rules (*ars*), which needed to be practiced (*exercitatio*). The combination of *natura*, *ars* and *exercitatio* all but guaranteed the transformation of children into successful, productive adults.37 Many writers from Visscher to fellow seventeenth-century writer Jacob Cats subscribed to Plutarch’s ideas and articulated them in pithier form. Visscher wrote, “practice makes perfect,” and Cats opined, tucht baert vrucht, or “discipline bears fruit.”38 In holding the ice skates, the boy in the family group appears to demonstrate his discipline and the willingness to practice, so the skates become an attribute of those virtues.

The development of discipline, self-restraint and other virtuous habits came through education at home and at school. In both spheres, play (in the form of a variety of leisure activities) was an integral feature of intellectual and physical development. The didactic texts by Erasmus and Plutarch and medical texts by noted Dordrecht physician Johan van Beverwijck promoted activities requiring physical exertion and the honing of motor skills for youths. Some Protestants viewed play with a measure of suspicion; however, Beverwijck argued that it was useful as exercise for the body and respite from work and learning.39

______________________________


In a print series contemporaneous to Avercamp’s coastal-family-landscape portrait, etched by Cornelis Bloemaert after the designs of his father Abraham, these aspects of leisure, or *otium*, find another voice.\(^{40}\) The series of sixteen engravings on the theme of leisure and pleasure (*Otia delectant*) begins with an image of a shepherd resting on a large boulder upon which text has been inscribed (fig. 15). The Latin text reiterates Beverwijck’s positive valuation of the concept of recreation, but makes more explicit reference to leisure through the use of the Latin *otium* (leisure). The text describes *otium* as that which “restores tired limbs with new strength and provides delight and makes us fit for work,” and warns against “lazy rest [that] weakens the body with sluggishness and dulls the mind.”\(^{41}\) Pictorial and literary contexts for leisure demonstrate the widespread currency and positive connotations of that concept. Time spent at rest or play could be productive; or, in other words, one could be industrious outside of work. In Avercamp’s painting then, ice skates and skaters are a means for visualizing discipline and industriousness as facets of familial values and identity.

Other iconographic details in Avercamp’s *Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait* reinforce familial roles and virtues. Within the horizontal grouping, the couples demonstrate their marital unity, affection toward each other and fulfillment of expected roles with the social unit of the family. In the left side family, the mother places her right hand on her son’s shoulder, while her daughter extends her arm to grasp her skirt. And, in the right side family, the husband gestures toward his wife. The artist evokes affective closeness with couples

\(^{40}\) The series was published between 1620 and 1625. Walter Gibson, *Pleasant Places: The Rustic Landscape from Bruegel to Ruisdael* (Berkley: University of California Press, 2000), 133.

who gesture toward their spouse, parents who hold the hands of their children, or through
siblings that do the same. Both gesture and figural arrangement reflect the prevailing Protestant
attitude toward wedlock in the Dutch Republic, which held marriage as a social institution that
allowed individuals to avoid the sin of fornication, facilitated the procreation of children and – in
a more decisive shift away from Catholic notions of matrimony – provided companionship. The jurist Hugo Grotius stated, rather more baldly, “matrimony is made not merely by coitus but
by the affection of marriage,” and these ideas appeared in various types of printed texts,
including nuptial sermons and treatises. When Dutch politician Hendrick Tuyll van
Serooskerken and his wife Jacobmina van Wijngaerden drew up their last will and testament in
1625, the stated purpose of the document was, “for the benefit of each of us to the other, and also
for the benefit of our children that we leave behind, which possessions we distribute here in good
conscience and also through the dutiful love and natural affection which we bear for one another
as well as for our children.” The very presence of children makes it obvious that the couples
have fulfilled the first two functions of marriage. The physical proximity between each husband
and wife and the way one man motions towards his wife suggests the companionate, if not
sentimental, aspect of the couples’ union.

42 Wayne E. Franits, Paragons of Virtue: Women and Domesticity in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art (New
York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 67; Simon Schama, The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of
Dutch Culture in the Golden Age (New York: Knopf, 1987), 421; Manon van der Heijden, “Secular and
Ecclesiastical Marriage Control: Rotterdam, 1550–1700,” in Private Domain, Public Inquiry: Families and Life-
Styles in the Netherlands and Europe, 1550 to the Present, eds. Anton Schuurman and Pieter Spierenburg
(Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1996), 40–42.

43 “Non enim coitus matrimonium fecit sed maritalis affection.” Translation in Schama, Embarrassment of
Riches, 421. Schama states that a greater interest in the affective bonds of marriage can be tied to humanist thought
and is not completely anathema to Catholic belief. See also, Merry E. Wiesner “Nuns, Wives, and Mothers: Women
and the Reformation in Germany,” in Women in Reformation and Counter-Reformation Europe, ed. Sherrin

Press, 1987), 15, 73.
The inclusion and positioning of the children around the parents indicates more than simply a fulfillment of nuptial roles; through gesture and other symbolic details, they evince familial roles and virtues. The symbolic character of gestures and motifs is doubly important in communicating maternal roles and virtues since the family is not in a domestic space that would otherwise suggest the expected role of the wife and mother in raising children and maintaining the household.\textsuperscript{45} Popular thinking held the mother responsible for raising children from birth to age seven. During this period, it was incumbent upon her to provide nourishment and moral or practical instruction for her children. The fulfillment of these duties is most obvious with the woman in the right side family group. A \textit{sleutelreex} (keychain), which held the keys to the household cupboards, hangs from her waistband.\textsuperscript{46} The \textit{sleutelreex} becomes a symbolic indication of the woman’s ability to care for the home and her children since it is not practically necessary in an outdoor setting. Her husband participates in successful household management in the way he gestures towards his wife. In addition, this right side group includes a maid who holds the youngest child -- the only child who is in fact under the age of seven, and therefore, still under the care of her mother. The maid may be a wet nurse -- sometimes viewed with suspicion since they reflected poorly on the mother’s ability to provide nourishment for her children.\textsuperscript{47} It seems unlikely, however, that the maid should be seen in this way in an image that otherwise celebrates familial values. Rather, she is a sign of the family’s wealth and like the \textit{sleutelreex}, denotes the virtue of the mother through proper household management. The rattle

\textsuperscript{45} Franits, \textit{Paragons of Virtue}, 69. The pictorial emphasis on husbandly or wifely duty reflects the contractual structure of marriage and the clearly defined place of each partner in the relationship. David R. Smith, \textit{Masks of Wedlock: Seventeenth-Century Dutch Marriage Portraiture} (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982), 43.

\textsuperscript{46} Bianca du Mortier suggests that the head of household or perhaps simply the more socially senior female figure is the woman who wears the \textit{sleutelreex} from her waist. Bianca M. du Mortier, “Aspects of Costume. A Showcase of Early Seventeenth-Century Dress” in \textit{Hendrick Avercamp, Master of the Ice Scene}, eds. Pieter Roelofs et al. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, Nieuw Amsterdam Publishers, 2009), 158.

in the hand of the child held by the maid functioned in much the same way. The precious silver object, which parents usually gave as a baptismal gift (*pillegift*), could be a source of entertainment for the child or used as a teething ring to soothe the infant.48 Rattles indicated a family’s material wealth and a signaled parental affection. They were also evidence of parental honor and investment in the future of the child. In situations where the death of parents left a child orphaned, rattles might be sold for cash to support the child and could thus fulfill the honor-bound duty of parents to provide for the pecuniary welfare of their children.49

The father is not left out of the presentation of fulfilled familial roles and duties. All but one child appears to be over the age of seven, at which time the father took over moral and social responsibility for the edification of his progeny. The father’s duties included financial support of his family, instruction in the fear of God, training in virtues, and preparation of his children to be useful citizens who could support themselves. Children, in turn, were to be submissive and obedient.50 The father’s hand in raising disciplined and obedient children is more obvious in the left side family group, where the symbolic motif of the dog illustrates this idea. Dogs were the most common visual metaphor of discipline in portraits of children and families.51 The canine in Avercamp’s image certainly may have been a family pet and plaything for the children, but it


49 Willemsen, “Images of Toys,” 64–65.

50 Sixteenth-century customary laws enumerate this relationship. “The children of Husband and Wife stand under the authority of their Father, as long as they are underage. Goods which the said underage children receive by inheritance, gifts, legal acts, or other means, remain in full possession of the said children, without their Father receiving any legal right to the said possessions….And thus when the children come of age or come to marry, so that they are free of the authority and trusteeship of their said Father, they may administer their goods themselves, and enter into contracts, and stand before the law…as if they had no Father.” Marshall, *The Dutch Gentry*, 14; Pieter J. J. van Thiel, ”’Poor Parents, Rich Children’ and ’Family Saying Grace’: Two Related Aspects of the Iconography of Late Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Dutch Domestic Morality,” *Simiolus* 17, no. 2/3 (1987): 94.

metaphorically refers to the proper education of children, for dogs, like children, must be trained.⁵²

Jan Baptist Bedaux traces this meaning of canines to Plutarch’s frequently repeated parable of two dogs, one of which the Spartan king Lycurgus raised properly to become a good hunter, while the other became greedy through neglect. Bedaux argues that seventeenth-century pictorial convention for portraiture reduced the parable to the single motif of the dog, which exemplifies the notion that the behavior of adults depends on discipline learned as a child.⁵³ The dog in Avercamp’s coastal-family-landscape portrait demonstrates that children have absorbed lessons in discipline and self-restraint, which they learned from their parents. Additionally, the inclusion of the ice skates reinforces this notion and the skaters highlight the practice of learned rules and ideals. In a complementary manner, the left side group reflects the expectation for proper education, whereas the right side family presents the parental obligation to provide a financially stable, secure home environment.

The appearance and connotations of details such as the dog, sleutelreex, rattle and skaters impart the idea that parents have upheld their duty to mold their offspring into moral and productive members of society. In addition to speaking to the virtues of children, the pictorial insistence on well-bred children through symbolic motifs enabled mothers and fathers to claim praise and honor for themselves, since Dutch society held them directly responsible for the

⁵² Jan Baptist Bedaux and Rudolph E.O. Ekkart, eds., Pride and Joy, 118.

⁵³ Bedaux gives a more complete synopsis of the parable as it appears in De liberis educandis: “Lycurgus [...] took two puppies of the same litter, and reared them in quite different ways, so that from the one he produced a mischievous and greedy cur, and from the other a dog able to follow a scent and to hunt. And then at a time when the Spartans were gathered together he said, ‘Men of Sparta, of a truth habit and training and teaching and guidance in living are a great influence toward engendering excellence, and I will make this evident to you at once.’ Thereupon producing the two dogs, he let them loose, putting down directly in front of them a dish of food and a hare. The one dog rushed after the hare, and the other made for the dish. While the Spartans were as yet unable to make out what import he gave to this, and with what intent he was exhibiting the dogs, he said, ‘These dogs are both of the same sitter, but they have received a different bringing-up, with the result that the one has turned out a glutton and the other a hunter.’” Bedaux, Reality of Symbols, 112–13.
behavior of children until they reached the age of legal maturity at fifteen. Cats, again, speaks to this idea. He says, “If the young lack virtue, / Blame not the children, / But punish the father / For failing to teach them better.”

One other aspect of familial honor held parents, but especially fathers, responsible for the pecuniary welfare of their children. A father secured the family’s financial security through his professional endeavors, yet the means by which the patriarchs in Avercamp’s coastal-family-landscape portrait provided for their kin cannot be positively known. Because the names of the families remain unknown, it is only possible to speculate that they were involved in some aspect of that type of business associated with innkeeping since the artist has placed the sitters in front of a slightly dilapidated inn. The koekenzopie (food stall) placed on the ice, marked with flags, augments this connection, as these make-shift constructions that sold refreshments to the revelers functioned as an extension of inn hospitality.

If the families in Avercamp’s Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait were innkeepers they may have been invested in any number of industries: brewing, fishing, the Baltic trade in livestock, wine and grain or some combination of these. Innkeepers were a kind of merchant that had their hand in a number of business ventures. Ruben Schalk finds evidence of this in his discussion of Enkhuizen’s credit market. He mentions that Frederik and Pieter

---


57 The icy landscape setting does not locate the sitters unquestionably in Kampen. There is a faint city profile on the horizon, but it is not detailed enough in its geographical accuracy to make a location determination. Considering the fact that Avercamp painted the family after his return to Kampen in 1613 and there is no evidence to suggest he left the city thereafter, the sitters probably resided in that city as well.
Tatinghof, father-son merchants and innkeepers, were in an advantageous position to profit from various trades because inns were convenient locations for buyers and sellers to congregate. Innkeepers could easily act as intermediaries between parties of consumers and vendors because they made it their business to be familiar with local markets and as middle-men their professional endeavors were necessarily cooperative.\(^{58}\)

The inclusion of the two families and the horizontal arrangement of figures within the two groups succinctly mirrors the collaborative facet of inn keeping. For the most part, the subjects stand side by side and this linear configuration of the families conveniently echoes the horizontal character of business networks. The double presentation of the families also reflects the tendency among merchants to form initial business relationships among kin, since they had already established trust, cooperation and loyalty.\(^{59}\) The paired patriarchs at the center of Avercamp’s family group may reflect this aspect of commerce. The position of the boy and girl as they appear in profile turned toward each other, suggests a dialogue between the two families. In arranging them thusly, Avercamp highlights the potential for, if not actuality of, a familial and/or professional relationship between the two groups. The placement of the families in front of an inn and the gestural inclusiveness between the figures suggests an established or perhaps newly formed business relationship. The slight movement of the girl and boy toward each other even hints at a possible future marriage to solidify and continue the professional ties between the families.


Avercamp’s *Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait* celebrates family identity as it is tied to common perceptions of familial roles and the values of discipline, honor and self-restraint. Aspects of familial roles and values appear in iconographic details linked to a frozen body of water, however, unlike other coastal-family-landscape portraits, it lacks an explicit visualization of the mercantile foundation of a family’s wealth and celebration of values and identity associated with a source of income tied specifically to the sea. This may be due to the fact that the artist, and likely his patrons, lived in the inland province of Overijssel (where Kampen is located). Merchants and innkeepers in Overijssel did have some hand in the transport and exchange of goods along the Ijssel, which connected the Rhine to the Zuiderzee, but a significantly greater preponderance of businessmen invested in sea-related industries and trade in the maritime provinces of Zeeland and Holland. Beginning in the decade after the appearance of Avercamp’s painting, and lasting until the 1650s, many of the coastal-family-landscape portraits emphasize the nautical basis of a family’s fortune and connect mercantile and familial identity through the interplay between figure and setting.

**Shifts in Meanings and Visual Conventions during the 1630s and 1640s**

Adam Willaerts and his son Cornelis painted coastal-family-landscape portraits early in the 1630s. In the examples of Adam Willaerts’ *Portrait of a Family on the Maasmond at Den Briel*, 1633, and Cornelis Adamsz. Willaerts’ *Portrait of an Unknown Family*, c.1635–55, the profession of the patriarch certainly forms one basis for the content and significance of the setting (figs. 2–3). In both instances the *pater familias* is probably an innkeeper who may have also been involved in the transport and sale of fresh and saltwater fish, as made evident by the placement of the family next to an inn, the types of ships depicted along the water and fish
resting at the feet of the family groups. Similar to Avercamp’s coastal-family-landscape portrait (and indeed most family portraits), Willaerts, father and son, constructed images that exemplify contemporary perceptions of the family. Unlike Avercamp’s earlier example, those by Adam and Cornelis Willaerts more obviously show the intersection of self-restraint, discipline, cooperation and obedience to social norms as familial and mercantile values.

Adam Willaerts’ Portrait of a Family on the Maasmond at Den Briel displays an array of figures and ships within a panoramic vista of the city of Den Briel (fig. 2). The artist has placed the sitters in a tight cluster on the bottom left corner of the image, and includes two sets of families who appear distanced from the viewer through an elevated viewpoint. The families appear before the Maasmond, the estuary of the Maas River, or one of the points at which the North Sea feeds into the Maas within the province of Zeeland. The city profile on the horizon, visible in the left third of the image, clearly features the recognizable landmark of the Sint Catharijnekerk with its square tower. The painting locates the sitters next to an inn or tavern on the perimeter of Den Briel and by doing so, presents the city as important to familial and mercantile identity. Willaerts highlights the importance of place through the greater visual

---

60 Adam Willaerts (1577–1664) was born and baptized in London and is documented in the Dutch Republic from 1602 when he and Salomon Vredeman de Vries were commissioned to paint organ shutters for Utrecht cathedral. By 1605 he had received the right of citizenship and from this point on he became a major figure in Utrecht artistic circles. His professional importance within Utrecht can be gauged by the fact that he helped to found the painter’s guild and held the position of dean in the guild for several years (1620–22, 1624–31, 1636–37) and through the commissions he received from Utrecht burgomasters. Willaerts garnered esteem outside of his city of residence on a national and international level, not only with his View of Dordrecht commissioned by the Dordrecht Camere van Justice (Board of Justice) but also through a commission for a series of paintings for the Castle von Kronborg from the Danish king Christian IV. L. O. Nelemans, "Adam Willaerts (1577–1664): zee-en kustschilder en twee bijbelse voorstellingen te Utrecht," Jaarboek Oud-Utrecht (2001): 21, 27. E. K. Altes and W. De Ridder, “De ondertekening van Adam Willaerts’" Schepen voor een rotsachtige kust,” Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum 54, no. 4 (2006): 385.

61 There has been some debate among scholars over whether the residence of the families is Utrecht, where the artist worked, or the pictured Den Briel. One argument for the families’ Utrecht residence comes from it being the artist’s place of residence and because the painting first came on the market in the nineteenth century in Utrecht. In addition, portrait subjects usually contracted an artist in the city where the lived, and there are no extant documents to suggest that Willaerts lived in Den Briel. There is more circumstantial evidence, however, to suggest
primacy given to profile of Den Briel and the ships that traverse the canal lock of the Maasmond in comparison to the diminutive figures.\textsuperscript{62}

Willaerts’ \textit{Portrait of a Family on the Maasmond at Den Briel} generally captures the spirit of urban life as it revolved around fishing and sea trade and the image advertises the families’ role in those industries along the Maas through the types of boats, the activities of figures in the water, the fish still life detail in the foreground, their proximity to an inn, and their clothing. The thirteen family members stand close to the water’s edge with various types of ships that coast along or bring goods to shore. These ships and their function shed light on the mercantile identity and values of the families. The ships on the right side of the composition are frigates or merchantmen.\textsuperscript{63} Several types of frigates existed in the seventeenth century, but those pictured here by Willaerts were lightly armed merchant vessels. These were outfitted with guns to protect crew and goods against pirates and warships of other countries.\textsuperscript{64} In the center of the

---

\textsuperscript{62} The painting is closest in size, format and composition to Willaerts’ slightly earlier \textit{View of Dordrecht} 1629 (Dordrechts Museum) and as such the hand of the artist is easily recognizable. While there is no evidence to suggest the families in Willaerts’ coastal-family-landscape portrait had seen his \textit{View of Dordrecht}, the artist had become renowned for his marine views well before 1633.

\textsuperscript{63} The term frigate and merchantman are used interchangeably in scholarly discussions of seventeenth-century Dutch marine paintings and the history of shipbuilding. The term “merchantman” refers to the use of these ships in trade, although occasionally they were appropriated by the navy. Louis Siching, “Naval Power in the Netherlands before the Dutch Revolt,” in \textit{War at Sea in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance}, eds. John B. Hattendorf and Richard W. Unger (Suffolk, England: The Boydell Press, 2003), 199–216.

\textsuperscript{64} The Dutch preferred multi-purpose vessels that could be used to trade and defend against hostilities. Robert Gardiner and Richard W. Unger, \textit{Cogs, Caravels and Galleons: The Sailing Ship 1000–1650} (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1994), 111. The use of frigates as protective chaperones for smaller fishing boats was necessary even before the outbreak of hostilities at sea between the Dutch and British during the Anglo-Dutch Wars (1652–54, 1665–67, 1672–74). Frigates were important in safeguarding investment against the privateers that
middle ground, to the left of the frigate on the right is a buss. These were designed for herring fishing at sea. The pinks and _smalschips_ on the left side of the composition were also connected to fishing. These boats were smaller single- and double-sailed fishing boats that had narrow sterns for greater maneuverability in shallow waters and flat bottoms that made them easy to ground ashore.\(^{65}\) These design features meant they were used frequently to transport goods through inland waterways and to transfer cargo from larger trading vessels.\(^{66}\) Willaerts pictures the typical use of these different vessels. The frigates demonstrate their protective role with the display of guns, and passing vessels salute one another with a single burst of cannon fire. The pinks and _smalschips_ directly behind the family group approach the water’s edge and men offload cargo from those that have already landed. The looming frigates and ships offer clues as to the mercantile identity of the families; it is possible that the families held some ownership in the pictured ships and their cargo. The Maas featured prominently in the exchange of grain and Rhenish wine, and the export of herring since it flowed through France, the Spanish Netherlands and the Dutch Republic.\(^{67}\) It is probable that the families engaged in the investment in ships and their cargo of fish, wine or grain.

Willaerts actively links the ships to the mercantile identity of the family groups through the gesture of one of the boys and the placement of fish between the two boys and at the feet of one of the fathers. While most of the sitters stand close together and are connected by touch or

---

\(^{65}\) The term _smalschip_ translated as small ship in the seventeenth century. In modern Dutch _smal_ translates as narrow.

\(^{66}\) Giltaij and Kelch, _Praise of Ships and Sea_, 21, 33.

\(^{67}\) Wine was one of the most important trade goods in terms of volume and value. It was one of the products the Dutch bought in exchange for grain. Hochstrasser, _Still Life and Trade_, 89–90; Richard W. Unger, _Shipping in the Northern Sea and Atlantic_, 1400–1800 (Brookfield: Aldershot, 1997). 9.
gesture, two boys stand slightly apart. In almost the direct center of the foreground, a boy in grey attire with a red hat points backwards to the ships at sea and figures among the waves (fig. 16). His gesture initiates a diagonal link from the sea to the family. Just in front of him to the left lies a basket of saltwater fish (rays and plaice). A second boy in grey with a red plume in his hat leads a dog from the space of the fish still-life towards the rest of the family group (fig. 17).  

The combination of these details creates an intersection of family and aqueous locale to communicate the family’s pecuniary endeavors.

The proximity of the other members of the family to an inn and gesture of the patriarch reinforce identification of the families as entrepreneurs and possibly innkeepers. Eleven members of the families stand amidst a crowd of figures close to an inn with a white swan on the signboard. Text inscribed on the beam from which the signboard hangs reads, “there’s water for geese, wine for the gentry, ale for peasants, tobacco for lechers and whores.” Given their proximity to the inn, it is possible that they owned it and may have engaged in the import of (Rhenish) wine served at such inns, as did other merchants who lived in Den Briel or along the Maas. The father figure who points to a still-life cluster of fish at the edge of the foreground strengthens the likelihood that the families invested in ships carrying various kinds of fish.  

---

68 The boys who are slightly apart from the rest of the family groups are dressed in a similar manner to the other figures. They are distinctly better attired than the other beach-goers, highlighting their connection to the families.

69 “In de witte swaen, water voor de ganse, wijn voor de Hansen, bier voor de boeren, toeback voor bocken en hoeren.” J.C. Ebbinga Wubben, Catalogus schilderijen na 1800 (Rotterdam: Museum Boymans-Van Beuningen, 1963), 154.

70 There are two male heads of household pictured, but the figure on the left side of the group seems to hold greater prominence and command authority in the way he points to the pile of fish at his feet. Willaerts draws the viewer’s attention to this figure though that demonstrative gesture, whereas the other male is not wholly visible as he stands behind his wife and daughter. Willem Ormea may have painted the fish still-life. He was known to collaborate with Adam, Cornelis and Abraham Willaerts. Nelemans, “Adam Willaerts,” 18; Adriaan van der Willigen and Fred G. Meijer, A Dictionary of Dutch and Flemish Still-Life Painters Working in Oils, 1525–1725 (Leiden: Primavera Press in cooperation with The Netherlands Institute for Art History, 2003), 42.
general clamor of figures around the families would seem to indicate the success of the Den Briel families’ various commercial endeavors and the angled trajectory from fish to father to boys to the sea visualizes the intrinsic importance of water to these ventures.

Aspects of costume augment the suggestion that the families in Willaerts’ *Portrait of a Family on the Maasmond at Den Briel* profited from activities connected to sea trade and transport. In the busy scene with a cross-section of society, the artist draws the viewer’s attention to the cluster of thirteen portraits at the bottom left through their brightly colored clothing and the heads of the men and women are silhouetted against the background by the hats they wear. The hats worn by the women are a somewhat unusual aspect of their attire and these accessories hint at the families’ relationship to England. Typically, Dutch women did not cover their heads with broad brimmed hats; instead they wore small caps or veils. In her discussion of Rembrandt’s *Portrait of Maria Bockenolle*, 1634, Marieke de Winkel convincingly argues that the kind of hat worn by the sitter was a trend in English attire, especially among the wives of British merchants who wore “mannish” broad brimmed hats (fig. 18). Dutch women whose husbands held professional ties to England adopted this trend to demonstrate their families’ British mercantile connections.\(^7\)

The similarity of the hats worn by the women in Willaerts’ portrait to English fashion offers the possibility to interpret the families either as English themselves or having strong connections to England. Den Briel and other towns in Zeeland along the river Maas had

---

\(^7\) Maria Bockenolle’s husband was a Dutch Reformed minister stationed at that church in Norwich, England and her broad rimmed hat refers to the couple’s relationship with England. Marieke de Winkel, *Fashion and Fancy: Dress and Meaning in Rembrandt’s Paintings* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 55–60. The Middleburg portraitist Salomon Mesdach painted several female members of the Bourdaen-Courten family in similar broad rimmed hats. They were a Flemish merchant family who fled to London during Alba reign of terror (1567–1573) and established profitable trade contacts with the Dutch Republic. Even after most of the Bourdaen-Courten family immigrated to the Dutch Republic during the first decades of the seventeenth century, portraits of the females in the family demonstrate their British mercantile connections through fashion accessories. Jonathan Bikker, Yvette Bruijnen and Gerdina Eleonora Wuestman, *Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century in the Rijksmuseum Amsterdam* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum and Yale University Press, 2007), 249–55.
longstanding trading relations with England. These associations strengthened between 1585 and 1617, the years when the English crown held the city as a cautionary town, or garrison, in exchange for British provision of troops for defense against Spain. During this time, the English and Scottish population of immigrants in Den Briel became more numerous. Regardless of nationality, the Den Briel families advertises their role in fishing and sea trade first through the still life at their feet and then through the White Swan inn.

The various compositional and iconographic details that bind the sitters to the sea not only speak to the identity of the families, but also communicate aspects of familial and mercantile values, and situate these values as all but inseparable from each other. As discussed with Avercamp’s coastal-family-landscape portrait, the gestural inclusiveness of adults who point to children or hold their hands suggests a spirit of harmony and cooperation that echoes the familial bonds that characterize the initial formation of many commercial ventures. In addition, Willaerts has organized the composition to show that the pater familias accessed multiple commercial venues to secure the future financial welfare of his kin and thus demonstrates the familial virtue of honor. Parents lead children along a similar path of honor, and in doing so uphold their obligation to mold offspring into productive members of society. The very appearance of the boys in the image, and the way they are interwoven among products of investment involved them in the family business. Male children are allowed to partake in their parents’ pursuits because they have absorbed lessons in education and demonstrate self-restraint

72 The most important exports in towns in Zeeland along the Maas were herring and coal. The latter was a bulk good in trade with England and Scotland. Unger, Shipping in the Northern Sea and Atlantic, 9.

73 With the Treaty of Nonesuch of 1585, the queen committed 5,000 foot soldiers and 1,000 cavalry. These were given on the condition that the Republic turn the towns of Vlissingen and Brielle over to the English to be used as garrisons. Lita-Rose Betcherman, Court Lady and Country Wife: Two Noble Sisters in Seventeenth-Century England (New York: William Morrow, 2005), 35; Keith Sprunger, Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 6–7, 35. If the family was from or traded with London, Willaerts may have received the commission through his own familial ties to that city.
and discipline. Willaerts indicates the two boys’ fulfillment of these duties and embodiment of familial values specifically in the attribute of the dog. As explained above, dogs typically function as a metaphor for discipline and obedience in portraits of families and children. Just as the hound dutifully follows the boy with a red-plumed hat towards the rest of the family, so too are the sons led by their fathers.

The commercial success achieved by the patriarch, such that it could be inherited by sons, would not have been possible had he not already established his reliability, trustworthiness and honor in a commercial sphere. As probable innkeepers and ship owners, the Den Briel families needed to establish and maintain an intricate web of business contacts based on a foundation of reliability and cooperation. As discussed with Avercamp’s Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait, merchants required collaboration based on trust, reliability and honor, and collaboration came to be seen as a value for merchants who were innkeepers. This was even more the case with merchants who were ship owners. A single person could have owned the smaller, single-manned smalschips, but mid and large sized vessels (pinks, busses, frigates) required the shared resources of several individuals. The cooperative purchase of ships depended on an investment strategy called partenrederijen (partnerships or managed partnerships), where individuals pooled capital when embarking on high risk or high cost business ventures. The practice of partenrederij was necessary to own, build, buy, or freight a ship and its cargo, because ships were the single largest item bought and sold in early modern Europe.\(^\text{74}\) In the words of an anonymous 1644 source, “There is hardly a fishing-buss, a hulk, or a boat which is fitted out or put forth from this land without this being done by several persons in

conjunction." Partnership could be shared between eight, sixteen, or thirty-two, but Jonathan Israel has found examples of equity split into as little as 1/64. Division of ownership meant greater affordability; it spread out investments and reduced the chance for bankruptcy, and also meant that a significant proportion of the population had connections to each other through some aspect of maritime trade.

The success and longevity of partenrederij depended on teamwork, trustworthiness and dependability amongst business partners. Honor and investment were inextricably linked in early modern commerce; one of the worst insults was to accuse someone of cheating. A merchant needed to demonstrate integrity to obtain credit, and without credit they could not claim to have honor. A merchant could demonstrate honor through reliability, and in a reciprocal manner, general manuals on how to write letters and conduct business stress the importance of reliability and friendship in forming and maintaining commercial ventures. Heyman Jacobi’s Gemeene Send-brieven (Common Send-Letters, 1597) offers this advice to merchants:

> There are several points which a good merchant should maintain well, to do with all piety his merchandise, one of the principal things of which is, that he keeps to his word as well as he can, to establish faith and reliability, and to keep it, for if a merchant is not true to his word,

---


76 As a case in point, Israel mentions the 1610 inventory of an Amsterdam entrepreneur who had shares in 22 ships: he had 1/16 shares in 13 vessels, 1/30 shares in 7 vessels, 1/17 share in 1 vessel and 1/28 share in 1 vessel. Israel, *Dutch Primacy in World Trade*, 21–22. Gelderblom, “The Golden Age of the Dutch Republic,” 165.


he loses reliability, without which one has to do traffic or business with much difficulty. Also, a merchant has to be attentive with his pen, write down his affairs well, and keep a good account, as often much evil can be prevented this way. Also, a merchant should keep in mind not to conduct business with people of light means.\(^79\)

Merchants, especially those separated by long distances, preferred to interact with familiar or familial businessmen since they had already established trust, cooperation and loyalty.\(^80\) As seen in Avercamp’s *Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait*, the horizontal arrangement of figures mirrors *partenrederij*, highlights the mercantile and familial values of cooperation, reliability and honor, and emphasizes lineage and the continuity of the families’ wealth and honor.

Cornelis Adamsz. Willaerts’ *Portrait of an Unknown Family*, 1635–55, reiterates the confluence of familial and mercantile values as seen in the earlier examples by Avercamp and Adam Willaerts (fig. 3). Cornelis seems to have adopted outright some of the compositional features, and their attendant meanings, from his father’s depiction of the Den Briel family.\(^81\) The family stands in a row along a beach in front on an inn marked with a swan on the signboard. The beach, with a fish still life in the foreground, gives way to an open waterway with frigates,

\(^79\) “Er zijn sommige puncten die een goet koopman wel behoort te onderhouden, om met alle vroomheit sijn koopmanschap te doen, van welke een van de principaelste is, dat hy schikt zijn woort te houden soo veel als’t hem mogelijk is, om in geloof en reputatie te komen, en te blijven, want als een koopman zijn woort niet en hout, soo raekt hy uit het geloof, sonder welk men qualijk trafi que of koopmanschap doen magh. Ook moet een koopman wakker by de pen wesen, om sijn affairen wel op te schryven, en geode verkeninge daer af te houden, daer dikwils veel quaett mede magh verhoet worden. Ook sal een koopman wel voor hem sien dat hy met lichte lieden geen sware koopmanschap en doe.” Translation in Zijlstra, “Long Distance Correspondence of Merchants,” 117–18 and 119.

\(^80\) Zijlstra, “Long Distance Correspondence of Merchants,” 118. For example, Lambert Massa, a Muscovy merchant from Haarlem who lived in Amsterdam, served as an agent for his brother Isaac (painted by Frans Hals) and invested with his brother Christiaen in voyages to Archangel, Russia. Goldgar, *Tulipmania*, 148.

\(^81\) It is possible that Cornelis (1600–60) had seen his father’s coastal-family-landscape portrait from preparatory drawings or in its completed form, although little is known of his training and life. Laurens Johannes Bol, *Die Holländische Marinemalerei des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Braunschweig: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1973), 63–80.
smalschips and pinks as fishermen bring their catch to shore. The sitters appear to be located just beyond the borders of a town, visible around the bend in the shoreline in the middle distance.

The family seems to be close-knit and harmonious through the example set by the married couple, who stand near each other with arms touching. Through their arrangement the man and woman maintain the conventional heraldic positioning in portraiture, whereby the male appears on the privileged left side and the woman on the right.\(^8^2\) This arrangement affirms their places in the social and marital hierarchy. Two girls stand to the right of their mother, as the younger grasps the skirt of her sister. A maid holds another child, probably a boy, in her lap.

There are few overt indications that the children have learned the traits of industriousness, obedience, discipline and honor, but some motifs do help visualize parental fulfillment of expected roles and duties. As the products of a virtuous couple, the progeny share in their parents’ virtues. The youngest child wears a white garment that contrasts with the strands of coral beads he wears across his torso. Children customarily wore coral necklaces because coral had talismanic properties in protecting children against disease and death, according to popular belief.\(^8^3\) In its connection to death, coral also had vanitas associations and may have prompted the elder children to contemplate their own mortality. The gifting of a coral necklace to the youngest child demonstrates the parents’ physical care for their offspring, a notion affirmed by the rattle held in the boy’s right hand. The line of red created by the coral necklace draws the viewer’s attention to the rattle, another object that signaled affection and

\(^8^2\) In portraits of betrothed couples, the positions of the man and woman on right and left are often reversed. Smith, *Masks of Wedlock*, 47–48.

physical care. As explained in the discussion of Avercamp’s coastal-family-landscape portrait, the rattle could be converted into money if necessary and as such, it gives evidence of parental honor in providing for the financial security of children.

The ships (frigate, herring buss and boyer or *kraag*), fishermen and fish (plaice, cod, rays) provide additional witness to paternal fiscal capability and honor and may reference commercial endeavors. Much like the one in Adam Willaerts’ coastal-family-landscape portrait, this family appears framed between an inn on one side and an active sea on the other. This compositional strategy visually links familial and mercantile values; however, the result is not as seamless in Cornelis’ slightly later image. The variation in scale between the family, fish, fishermen and boats is a perplexing feature of Cornelis Willaerts’ *Portrait of an Unknown Family*. Art historians have not proposed that this is a result of different hands, which makes it difficult to determine the significance of such compositional elements. Willaerts may have shrunk the fishermen and their boats to maintain the focal emphasis on the family; he may have enlarged the scale of the fish to indicate products that secured familial wealth; and there may be other possibilities.

---

84 Boyers were coastal freighters and herring busses were designed for herring fishing at sea. *Kraags* were a variant of the boyer used mainly on inland waterways. Giltaij and Kelch, *Praise of Ships and Sea*, 23–24. Susan Koslow has argued that there were political dimensions to the large fish still-lifes and market scenes of Frans Snyders, which he began to paint at the start of the Twelve Years Truce (1609–21). In this context, Antwerp fishermen regained access to the sea via the Scheldt in a period of renewed prosperity for the struggling city. Koslow suggests that Synder’s paintings, and those like it, reflect the flourishing fishing industry throughout the Southern and Northern Netherlands and asserted the confidence of fishermen in their ability to continue to provide sufficient products for the market. The fish still-lifes in Adam and Cornelis Willaerts’ coastal-family-landscape portraits may similarly indicate the patriarch’s ability to provide nourishment for his family. Susan Koslow, *Frans Snyders: Stilleven- en Dierenschilder 1579–1657* (Antwerp: Mercator fonds Paribas, 1995), 141–44.

85 There is, in fact, no scholarship on this particular painting and the auction house through which it was sold in 1983 only lists Cornelis Willaerts as the painter. In one discussion of Adam Willaerts’ *Portrait of a Family on the Maasmond at Den Briel*, the two coastal-family-landscape portraits by Cornelis are referenced but not illustrated, described or analyzed. Wubben, *Catalogus schilderijen na 1800*, 154.
Problems of scale aside, the visual trend established by the other coastal-family-landscape portraits in this chapter would indicate that the *pater familias* probably was a ship owner, an innkeeper and investor. The father in Cornelis’ image likely participated in *partenredertij* to maintain his businesses and secure his wealth. As with Adam Willaerts’ *Portrait of a Family on the Maasmond at Den Briel*, the linear arrangement of the family mimics the horizontal character of mercantile networks and the prosperity conveyed by landscape details speak to the wealth, honor, trust and reliability of the patriarch.

The visual parallel offered between mercantilism and virtue in Willaerts’ *Portrait of an Unknown Family* is a facet of a larger cultural discourse on the same topic. The connection between financial success and honor was an important one in the seventeenth-century. Commerce and entrepreneurship could be viewed with distrust, especially the manner of earning money through speculation and not through physical labor. Merchants distinguished between the honest gain of wealth through careful calculation and the rapid acquisition of money through gambling or dubious speculation. Negative opinions of mercantile activities, especially profit making, were enough of a concern, that individuals like politician Dirck Coornhert, intellectual Caspar Barleus, and minister Godfried Udemans contributed to contemporary discourse that defended mercantile pursuit of fortune. Barleus identified and described what he termed the *mercator sapiens* (wise merchant) in his lecture at the opening of the Amsterdam “Athenaeum Illustre” on January 9, 1632. The wise merchant was, in Arthur Weststeijn’s summary of Barleus’ ideas, “the successful entrepreneur who engages in self-interested trade yet, reaping the

---

seeds of a humanist education, proceeds rationally and honestly in public affairs.”

Barleus emphasizes the value of individual commercial activity for society at large and claimed that the pursuit of profit was honorable if it did not produce greed and ostentation. Udemans, likewise, undertook a defense of merchants and profit in ‘t Geestelyck roer van ‘t coopmans schip (The spiritual helm of the merchant’s ship, 1638), a text dedicated to the directors of the Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie (United East India Company or VOC) and West Indische Compagnie (West India Company or WIC) that went through three editions between 1638 and 1655. In it, Udemans argued that the merchant’s calling is not unlawful or ignoble but in keeping with Christian precepts. Furthermore, overseas trade provided the opportunity for missionary outreach and it was an outlet for surplus capital and labor. He wrote, “Commerce is an honest activity, as long as it is pursued in the justice and fear of the Lord.”

Udemans encouraged merchants to seek righteousness and honor above wealth, “Let a merchant take this for his maxim: honor above gold, for it is better to be a poor man than a liar…For an honorable man is and will always remain a burgher even if he be poor, but if he outlives his honor, that is a living death.” The family and the setting work together to make the claim that the father, and by extension his family, have achieved their fortune honorably.

---

88 Weststeijn, Commercial Republicanism, 184.

89 The lecture was published in a collection of Barleus’ speeches and circulated independently in a Dutch translation. Weststeijn, Commercial Republicanism, 188.

90 “dat de Koopmanschap, is eene eerlijcke handelinge, als die maer gedreven wordt in de gerechtigheydt, ende vreese des Heeren.” Translation in Weststeijn, Commercial Republicanism, 189. See also, Boxer, The Dutch Seaborne Empire, 127. The example of bankers is a case in point for the moral and theological wariness towards certain professions. The synods disapproved of bankers and in an ordinance of 1581, bankers were banned from taking communion. Wives and relations of bankers could take communion only if they publically renounced the banker’s profession. This decision was only reversed in 1658. Schama, Embarrassment of Riches, 330.

91 Schama, Embarrassment of Riches, 330–31. Pieter Saenredam’s engraved portrait of Hans von Aachen (after Pieter Isaacszoon) contains the inscription vivit post funera virtus or “virtue lives on after death,” which expresses the same sentiment. Sixteenth-century merchants buried in Antwerp cathedral have gravestones that carry the description coopman, negotiator or Mercator preceded by the epithet den eersaemen (honorable) or insignis.
The patriarch in Jan Daemen Cool’s *Portrait of the Arckenbout Family*, 1633, had an equal interest in uniting virtue, honor and wealth, but in this instance familial identity is tied to the admiralty as opposed to fishing (fig. 4). The image adopts some of the familiar visual language seen in other coastal-family-landscape portraits: the heraldic positioning of the couple and the gestural inclusiveness between mother and children to indicate conformity to expected roles and familial accord, and seascape view that pictures the source of wealth, status and honor. Cool deviates from the other images discussed in this chapter in the way he places the nautical view in the center of the composition, between the sitters at left and right. Two boys stand on the left edge of the image and the parents and two daughters appear in front of a large tree at the right edge. In her research on family portraits from the first half of the seventeenth century, Frauke Laarmann has shown that this is a compositional innovation that originated with Cool. The artist’s inventive figural arrangement creates a greater visual balance between figure

---

92 Jan Daemen Cool (1589–1660) was born in Rotterdam and while little is known of his early life, he is recorded among the members of the St. Luke’s guild in Delft in 1614 and may have studied with renowned portrait painter Michiel Jansz. van Mierevelt while in Delft. The artist returned to Rotterdam in 1618 and spent his career painting portraits of notable Rotterdam citizens. This is one of four family portraits the artist painted between 1631 and 1637. Cool had several clients who were prominent in aspects of the Dutch seaborne empire, among them: Piet Heyn, a naval officer and vice-admiral of the West India Company, Michiel van den Broeck, a member of the Raad of Amsterdam and Advocaat-Fiscal of the Admiralty in Rotterdam, Jaspar Cock, a brewer and ship owner.

93 In family portraits, it is not unusual for one or both of the parents to be sitting while the children are standing. In Cool’s portrait, where the father stands and the mother sits, Marianne Giesen has suggested that the pose relates to the sacred position of the mother in Dutch culture, but Laarmann believes that it has more to do with the woman’s role in the family. The sitting pose puts the woman in a passive position in relation to the more active stance of her husband and it also positions her as the hub of the family. Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederlands Familieportret,” 76. As Westermann states, “Family portraits, which became ever more popular and varied over the century, increasingly registered a cultural commitment to the nuclear family and its hierarchical relationships,” Westermann, “Making Home,” 55.

94 The artist would continue to use this arrangement for other types family portraits and it was adopted later by the Cuyp in Dordrecht. Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederlands Familieportret,” 118.
and setting, eliminating the need for gestures to direct the viewer’s attention to the seascape, although the man’s right arm akimbo does just that nonetheless.

The family has been identified as Cornelis Arckenbout (1593–1640), Maria Welhouck (d. 1643) and their children Lodewijk, Nicolaes, Maria and Cornelia. Cornelis Arckenbout was born in Den Briel, where he first made a living as a brewer. After moving to Rotterdam, Cornelis gained entry into the vroedschap (town council) by 1636 and also held the position of schepen (magistrate). Cornelis’ membership in the vroedschap and position as schepen meant he had gained acceptance by regents and admittance into the upper political echelons of Rotterdam society. Custom stipulated that individuals who held such positions had to be men of good quality and ancestry, had to prove their worthiness by upholding codes of behavior, had to be willing to serve their country in official posts and had to possess sufficient wealth. Financial security functioned as a safeguard against the abuse of public office, since only those who were free from material want could devote themselves wholeheartedly to the common good. Arckenbout must have acquired significant fortune as a brewer in Den Briel before he moved to Rotterdam to be so quickly elected to the vroedschap. Furthermore, the manner in which he

95 He died in 1640, not long after Cool painted his family portrait. “Jan Daemen Cool,” last modified September 1, 2013, http://ib.rkd.nl/showobject.mhtml?ib=86580. The family portrait exists as two fragments; the panel of the couple was separated from the two boys, the latter of which was also cropped extensively. The fragment of the couple was inscribed with the date 1633 and the ages of some of the figures in the original picture; the man and wife are both forty, the boys sixteen and thirteen, and the older girl is ten. “Jan Daemen Cool, A Dutch Family Group,” https://www.nationalgalleries.org/art-and-artists/4800/dutch-family-group-portrait-man-woman-and-two-girls. See also, Ekkart, “De Rotterdamse portretti vrouwe Jan Daemen Cool,” 204.


97 J.L. Price, Holland and the Dutch Republic: The Politics of Particularism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 218–19. Arckenbout would have been considered an immigrant to Rotterdam since he was born in Den Briel. To qualify for election to the vroedschap, one had to be a burgher or citizen of their city of residence. To obtain citizenship one could inherit from his parents, marry a citizen, purchase citizenship or receive it as a gift. Immigrants, such as Arckenbout, who bought or married into citizenship still had to wait a period of time to be
gained his fortune needed to be honorable or free from suspicion, for a man without virtue could not have entered smoothly into public office.

While it is not known if Arckenbout continued to act as a brewer in Rotterdam, the seascape backdrop in his family portrait suggests that he had connections to the most profitable corporate and civic institutions. The nautical view at the center of the composition contains a *smalschip* visible beyond the elbow of Cornelis, a sloop with figures rowing to shore, and a frigate in the background. Rotterdam was a center for ship building, and housed chambers of the Admiralty and VOC. The admiralties had much capital and many jobs at their disposal since they were responsible for the collection of export duties and customs, licenses and convoys. The considerable income generated by the admiralties meant they were also accountable for the maintenance of the navy. The frigate in the middle ground of Cool’s *Portrait of the Arckenbout Family* may have been owned by the navy, as evidenced by the red flag on its stern. Red flags were typically flown during skirmishes as a signal of aggression, and only the navy or the VOC would have cause to deploy ships for attack. The connection between the Arckenbout family and the Rotterdam admiralty established by the presence of the

---

98 The largest central ship is somewhat small for a frigate or East Indiaman. It could be confused with the shape of the fluyt, a widely used trading vessel. The pictured ship cannot be a fluyt because they were not armed with defense weaponry and cannons visibly project from the hull of this ship.


100 The admiralties were managed by boards of councilors (*raden*), had facilities for the building and repair of ships, and responsible for the administration of their section of the fleet. Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic*, 218–19.

101 The flag is not the city flag of Rotterdam, which is comprised of green and white stripes. It is unlikely that Arckenbout captained any of the depicted ships because he does not wear a sword.
frigate is reiterated by the man in the sloop who stands to herald the family on the shore. As part of the vroedschap, perhaps Cornelis hired the men in the sloop as ship builders, captains, or tax collectors. Whatever the particular role, he exhibits reliability, trustworthiness, honor and industrious since the navy’s fleet can demonstrably defend the interests of the city and the Republic.

The ships in the central seascape view picture the source of wealth and professional trajectory Cornelis Arckenbout expected for his sons in the admiralties or some other form of civic office. Cool’s image seems to act as a means to introduce Lodewijk and Nicolaes, aged sixteen and thirteen respectively, into the public sphere of their father. The training of his sons to follow in his footsteps was a matter of honor for Cornelis and their readiness to do so reflected on the education and acquired virtues of Lodewijk and Nicolaes. The way the boys stand with one foot forward and the proffered hand of Nicolaes places them in a more active pose as if confirming their determination to follow the path of their father.

Cool’s Portrait of the Arckenbout Family lacks the kinds of symbols that might allude to the virtues and moral upbringing of offspring as seen in the previous examples of coastal-family-landscape portraits; however, in this instance, the setting integrates nautical metaphors that speak to the role of parents and their instillation of virtues in children. Many contemporary writers offered seafaring comparisons of the role of the father in guiding his children through life.

---

102 Ultimately, Lodewijk would not have the opportunity to do so since he died the year after the date of the painting in 1634. “Jan Daemen Cool, Portret van Een Familie aan het Water,” last modified December 17, 2013, http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/51037.

103 Ostensibly, they had almost finished French and Latin school, which was typical of regents and wealthy merchants’ children. Children of wealthy families went to the expensive French schools between the ages of 6 and 10. There they learned to read and write Dutch and French, had lessons in history, and developed proper conduct. Boys and girls differed in some areas of education. Boys were taught math and bookkeeping and girls instead learned music, dancing and needlework. After age 10, boys continued their education at the Latin school, where they acquired knowledge in Latin grammar, literature, rhetoric, ancient history, logic, ethics, geography, physics, and the history of religion. Muizelaar and Phillips, Picturing Men and Women, 16.
Father Poirters, a Jesuit priest who was the Flemish counterpart to Jacob Cats in the Southern Netherlands wrote, “The father is to his household what the admiral is to the fleet sailing under his command, for wherever he sails, be it East or West, the other ships follow his course.”

And, in the 1644 Dutch version of Cesaer Ripa’s *Iconologia*, the personification of *Oeconomia* (Household Management) is a woman crowned with olive branches, who stands next to a rudder, holds a pair of compasses in her left hand and a stick in her right hand (fig. 19). The accompanying text explains that the rudder represents “the Care a Father ought to have over his Children,” so that, “in the ocean of childish playfulness, they do not deviate from the course of virtue, along which they ought to be steered with the greatest diligence.” In light of popular adages and aphorisms, the ships and the coastal locale refer to the navigation of children towards discipline and the path of virtue. Many of fathers in coastal-family-landscape portraits point toward the setting and in doing so indicate the path to righteousness.

**Isaack Luttichuys** more overtly encapsulates these ideas in his *Portrait of an Unknown Family*, 1642, as the family holds hands and promenades along the Zandvoort beach (fig. 5).

---


106 It is possible that the depicted family resided in Amsterdam, since that is where Isaack Luttichuys worked and he is documented being in the city from the 1630s and acquired property in 1642. At one time, scholars thought the image might depict the Santvoort family, perhaps even that of the artists Dirck Dircksz. Santvoort, his brother Pieter Dircksz. Santvoort or his father Dirck Pietersz. Bontepaert, but Rudi Ekkart has shown that this cannot be the case. It is likely that the sitters were from the same elite, intellectual circle as Luttichuys’ other patrons. The artist’s other known patrons were merchants, doctors and high-ranking militiamen who were originally from Germany. These include Jan Hendrik Lestevenon (broker), Cornelis Graafland (merchant, director of the Swedish trading post), Jacob van Merken (tobacco merchant), Pieter Adriaensz. de Lang (doctor), Paulus Timmerman (director of the WIC), and Martinus Gaertz (fur trader in Poland, Sweden, Russia). Bernd Elbert, *Simon
The couple and their two children are grouped on the right side of the composition as they walk in a slight diagonal direction towards the space of the viewer. The younger boy pulls a wagon of shells as a small poodle leaps in front of him. The shell-strewn beach opens up to a view of the coastline of Zandvoort, where pinks, herring busses, and boyers (coastal freighters used to trade in the North Sea and Baltic) bring cargo to shore and fishermen unload their catch. The specificity of place can be determined through the square lighthouse and church spire on the left side of the horizon, and the inscription at the top edge of the painting that reads “het ghaet al na Sandtvoort” (walk to Zandvoort).

This coastal-family-landscape portrait blends familial and mercantile values through various iconographic details, including the grouping of the couple, their hand gestures, the activity of the boy, the dog and the fishermen with their boats. As they walk across the sand, the husband grasps his wife’s right hand with his left. David Smith has shown that the gesture frequently appears in pendant and marriage portraits and had come to signify marital accord from the fifteenth century onward. The couple presents a harmonious unit through clasped hands.

The husband appears to the left of his wife, which maintains the conventional heraldic and privileged position of the male in portraiture. The adjustment of the motif allows the mother to hold the hand of her daughter, and lets the father point towards the left side of the composition as he holds a pair of gloves in his hand. The clasped hands variously indicate marital harmony, the

---


wife’s obedience to the guiding hand of her husband, the daughter’s submission to the authority of her mother, and thus the sitters’ embodiment of obedience and self-restraint.\footnote{Note the coral necklace worn by the girl on the right. This necklace has the same connotations here as described for Cornelis Willaerts’ \textit{Portrait of an Unknown Family}.}

The pointing hand and forward walking motion of the patriarch, in combination with clasped hands, suggests that the husband has brought his wife and family into his corporate world of fishing-related endeavors that occur along the coastline. While the anonymity of the sitters makes it impossible to know whether the wife was involved in her husband’s financial affairs, a significant percentage of seventeenth-century Dutch merchants’ wives were and widows could even inherit and run their late husband’s businesses.\footnote{Danielle van den Heuvel, \textit{Women and Enterpreneurship: Female Traders in the Northern Netherlands, c. 1580–1815} (Amsterdam: Askan, 2007), 51.} Wives of ship owners, ship captains and fishermen were more prone to take an active role in the commercial lives of their husbands, who would often be away from home for periods of time. If the \textit{pater familias} did entrust some aspects of his financial affairs to his spouse, she would have to exemplify the same ideals of reliability, trustworthiness, loyalty and honor expected of all merchants operating within the \textit{partenrederij} system.

Luttichuys sets the projected familial and mercantile virtues of \textit{Portrait of an Unknown Family} within the framework of an outing to Zandvoort. The identification of the scene as a daytrip to a fishing village near Amsterdam adds the theme of leisure to the constructed identity of the subjects. Zandvoort was, indeed, a popular recreational destination for residents of the neighboring cities of Amsterdam and Haarlem. The conception of the village as a retreat from urban life first took visual form in Claes Jansz. Visscher’s series \textit{Plaisante Plaetsen} (1611–12). The series shaped the perception of the sites depicted therein as pleasurable excursions for city
dwellers. Visscher pictures the square lighthouse of Zandvoort on the second title page of *Plaisante Plaetsen* that lists the images to follow (fig. 20). Zandvoort appears again in *Plaisante Plaetsen*, and in the second iteration, the Oude Kerk is given more prominence (fig. 21). Visscher’s portrayal of Zandvoort was followed by numerous other printed and painted examples. In almost all of these, the artist marks the site with its square lighthouse, spire of the Oude Kerk and rolling dunes.

Zandvoort initially rose to prominence as a place where fishermen harvested plaice, cod, haddock and herring. Fishing remained an important local industry up until the mid-sixteenth century when Zandvoort ceded prominence to other cities in North Holland. The village experienced a brief economic resurgence with the founding of the North Whaling Company in 1614, but for much of the seventeenth century it began to cultivate an identity as a resort locale, or as a site of leisure. Image and text confirm this view. Samuel Ampzing describes how residents of Haarlem would take excursions to the seaside and partake of pleasurable beach activities, such as swimming, courting, and shell collecting. Songs and songbooks such as *Liedeken te singhen op de spel-waghen nae Santvoort* (Song to be Sung in the Coach to Zandvoort) reiterated similar sentiments.

\[\text{111 This series is often celebrated as the earliest topographical depictions of the Dutch landscape and the series stated purpose on the title page is to offer printed views of Haarlem and its environs as a means of vicarious travel and enjoyment. Catherine Levesque, *Journey Through Landscape: The Haarlem Print Series and Dutch Identity* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994); Huigen Leeflang, “Dutch Landscape: The Urban View, Haarlem and its Environments in Literature and Art, 15\textsuperscript{th}–17\textsuperscript{th} Century,” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 48 (1997): 69–70.}\]

\[\text{112 Jan van de Velde II produced an engraving of Zandvoort, and Hendrick Cornelisz Vroom, Nicolaes Molenaer, Philips Wouwerman and Jacob Esselns produced paintings of the village. Sabine E Giepmans, Anton Kos and Reinier van ’t Zelfde, *Hollandse stranden in de Gouden Eeuw* (Katwijk: Katwijk’s Museum, 2004), 11–14.}\]

\[\text{113 Its use as a site of leisure for urban Amsterdam and Haarlem residents was on the rise, although it would not be fully established as a resort town until the eighteenth century. Jan Hein Furnée, “A Dutch Idyll? Scheveningen as a Seaside Resort, Fishing Village and Port,” in *Resorts and Ports: European Seaside Towns since 1700*, eds. Peter Borsay and John K Walton (Buffalo: Channel View Publications, 2011), 39.}\]
The unfettered frivolity of Zandvoort day-trippers in some seventeenth-century paintings and songs does not appear in Luttichuys’ *Portrait of an Unknown Family*. The promenading figures are decorously restrained in their physical comportment and the patriarch’s gesture toward ships and fishermen suggests that their recreation is a restorative respite from work. It is the kind of *otium* (leisure) advocated in Avercamp’s coastal-family-landscape portrait and by Abraham Bloemaert’s *Otia delectant*; images and texts tied relaxation to productivity, not as a contrast but as a complement. The active collecting of shells by the young son helps to present leisure as a productive and equally virtuous counterpart to commercial industriousness. The shells and the activity of collecting them give an aspect of utility to *otium*. In this instance, shell collecting links personal to mercantile interests. They are opportunity for the display of status, wealth and erudition, and provide the chance to appreciate the bounty of God’s creation.\(^{115}\)

Shells were highly collectible objects during the seventeenth century, especially after the establishment of the VOC and WIC. It was through these trading companies that shells were able to circulate within the boundaries of the Dutch Republic, thus shells may be evidence of the patriarch’s investments in intercontinental trade.\(^{116}\) Additionally, in having the son pull a wagon

---

\(^{114}\) Leeflang, “Haarlem and its Environ,” 90.


\(^{116}\) Marsely L. Kehoe, "Dutching at Home and Abroad: Dutch Trade and Manufacture of Foreign Materials and Landscapes of the Golden Age" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2012), 83. As Anne Goldgar writes, “Collections were naturally intended to incite wonder at the creation of God and the ingenuity of man, but they also involved the thrill of possession, the search for social status, and the wish to be known and remembered.” Goldgar, *Tulipmania*, 70–90. Luttichuys’ coastal-family-landscape portrait is unusual in its combined emphasis on
of shells, Luttichuys may be drawing a parallel between the preciousness of offspring and that of shells. In other words, children are an investment, as are shells.\footnote{Fruitfulness of investment portrayed by Luttichuys contradicts the negative light Roemer Visscher casts on shells in an emblem from Sinnepoppen. The emblem depicts a pile of shells with the motto “It is sickening how a fool spends his money.” (Tis misselijck waer een geck zijn gelt aen leiit). The subscriptio continues, “it is surprising that there are people who spend large sums of money on shells and mussels, whose only beauty is their rarity. They do it because they notice that great potentates, even Emperors and Kings, commission people to look for them and pay them well. Oh, you monkeys (= imitators), you do not understand the ins and outs of the game. King Louis IX of France ordered rare animals from neighboring kingdoms to make people believe that he still had a great appetite for life, though actually he was already physically very weak. I do not mean to condemn the people who earn their living from this: they are cunning enough to see profit in this game.” Segal and Jordan, Prosperous Past, 77–78.}

Collecting was a communal activity, much like business, based on networks of social and financial systems of exchange, patronage, gifting and commerce.\footnote{Mark A. Meadow, “Hans Jacob Fugger and the Origins of the Wunderkammer,” in Merchants and Marvels: Commerce and the Representation of Nature, eds. Pamela H. Smith and Paula Findlen (New York: Routledge, 2002), 184.} The conditions for gaining entry into the community of liefhebbers (art lovers) was different than the mercantile cooperation of partenrederij, but each community required industriousness and discipline. A merchant might collect shells to cultivate gentlemanly collector’s status, but it was not enough to simply acquire a variety of examples. One also had to be able to talk about one’s collection; conversing on and discriminating between types of shells was a prerequisite for liefhebbers.\footnote{Goldgar, Tulipmania, 120.} The way the boy holds the shell up for inspection may indicate that he intends to acquire the requisite knowledge (through industriousness and discipline) to gain a place among liefhebbers.\footnote{It is fairly improbable that he already has such knowledge; he wears the type of dress worn by boys (and girls) up until the age of seven, so he had not yet entered school. Saskia Kuus, “Children’s Costumes in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century,” in Pride and Joy, 78–80.} The connection between education and shell collecting is reinforced by the presence of the dog, which symbolizes obedience, discipline and self-restraint in portraits of children. The boy may seem to thwart social expectations by leading instead of following, but he nonetheless typifies the mercantilism and collecting. It does not quite fit within either the tradition of kunstkammer paintings or portraits of individual collectors with their collections.
familial values of obedience, discipline and industriousness that have their counterpart in these same mercantile values in the father.

Dirck Dircksz. Santvoort depicted a family along the Zandvoort coast, but in his Portrait of Otto van Vollenhoven and his Family, 1644, leisure is not as a significant facet of familial and mercantile values and identity (fig.7). In this coastal-family-landscape portrait the familiar features of Zandvoort’s square lighthouse and church steeple are visible beyond the shoulders of Maria van Vollenhoven, who stands on the right side of the composition with the family coat of arms above her head. The coat of arms are that of Otto van Vollenhoven and his wife Apollonia Boogaert, residents of Amsterdam. Otto and his wife Apollonia Boogaert stand united next to their daughter. Santvoort creates a visible link between the professional activities of the patriarch and his family through the position of his left elbow akimbo and this outstretched arm that rests upon a walking stick and points to the ship De Geweldige in the middle distance.

The artist gives greater emphasis to Zandvoort’s role in shipping and fishing through De Geweldige in the middle ground, the sloop of men who row to shore and the windschips that approach the edge of the beach. These ships do indeed refer to Otto’s profession, since he was captain of De Geweldige for the Amsterdam admiralty. As captain, van Vollenhoven likely invested shares in the ship and its cargo and thus participated in partenrederij. Similar to other coastal-family-landscape portraits, the linear arrangement of the family and the staggered placement of frigate, sloop and windschip echo the horizontal, interconnected character of partenrederij. Santvoort’s Portrait of Otto van Vollenhoven and His Family communicates that

---

Otto van Vollenhoven embraces the mercantile virtues of industriousness, honor, and trustworthiness through the presence of these ships and through the sword he wears on his left hip. The sword makes direct reference to Otto’s role as captain and signals his wealth and status. Portraits of rulers and military leaders often show these figures with swords to indicate their right to rule. In the Dutch Republic, various types of naval figures used this attribute to acknowledge their authority at sea. In addition, both the aristocracy and upwardly mobile members of the affluent middle class began wearing swords as a sign of wealth and cultivation from the sixteenth century onwards. It is not clear whether Otto van Vollenhoven navigated De Geweldige through any skirmishes, but the sword does establish his successful command of his ship and family. The command implied in the sword is reinforced by the pose of his left elbow akimbo. Joaneath Spicer has shown that this gesture carried authoritative, military connotations from the sixteenth century onwards. As Otto points his elbow towards his wife Apollonia, he seems to suggest that he steers his wife and daughter on the same righteous path he charted for himself.

The pose and costume of Apollonia Boogaert and Maria van Vollenhoven affirm their participation in Otto’s honor and virtue through pose and costume. Apollonia conforms to the gendered presentation of couples in portraiture and thus also adheres to socially expected roles within the marriage. She demonstrates her affectionate and procreative role through the appearance of her daughter and through the gloves she holds in her right hand. David Smith has suggested that gloves and fans held by women in pendant or marriage portraits denote sexual or


123 Capwell, Noble Art of the Sword, 17, 29–31, 83.

marital love. Marieke de Winkel disagrees with this assessment of the fan, arguing instead that it more simply refers to wealth and thus status.\textsuperscript{125} In the context of Santvoort’s coastal-family-landscape portrait, Apollonia’s gloves may do both in their reference to the companionate and procreative nature of the relationship with her husband and their acquired wealth and station in Dutch society. Maria’s fan, too, may be interpreted as a sign of wealth and marital love or sexuality; Santvoort completed the image in the same year she married Dirck van der Waeyen on February 28.\textsuperscript{126} The contemporaneous marriage of Maria and the inclusion of the fan in the image attest to the fact that Otto properly guided his daughter toward the virtuous path of obedience, self-restraint and industriousness.

Herman Meindertsz. Doncker’s \textit{Portrait of an Unknown Family}, 1645, contains familiar iconographic details as seen in other coastal-family-landscape portraits which speak to familial and mercantile identity and values (fig. 6). Like Otto van Vollenhoven, the patriarch was likely a captain or ship owner and he stands to the heraldic left of his wife. The couple appears on a quay, flanked by their children on either side. In the left background of the painting a lighthouse rises from the dunes and on the right the view gives way to a frigate and sloop upon the sea. Two boys doff their hats in deference and respect for their father, while a deceased child (shown as if alive) sits upon the ground between father and brother.

\textsuperscript{125} In this instance where the sitter holds a fan in the outdoors, it serves the additional purpose of shielding her face from the sun. Maria Vollenhoven holds a folded fan, which replaced the feather fan in popularity after the 1630s. Winkel, \textit{Fashion and Fancy}, 80–81, 88.

\textsuperscript{126} Dirck van der Waeyen was a kerkmeester (lay church administrator) for the Oostkerk in Amsterdam. This position was a kind of public service performed by the upper echelons of a city’s citizens. Jan Wagenaar, \textit{Wagenaar’s Beschryving van Amsterdam Gevolgd, in eene Geregelde Aanwyzing van de Sieraaden der Publieke Gebouwen Dier stad: Zeer Dienstig voor alle Liefhebbers der Bouw-, Beeldhouw- en Schilderkunst} (Amsterdam: J.B. Elwe, 1790), 125. According to Frauke Laarmann, Maria van Vollenhoven’s costume was repainted to reflect the fashions of the 1660s. She does not make clear whether Santvoort would have made these changes, although this seems unlikely, since the artist had stopped painting before 1657. Maria may have commissioned the changes herself shortly before her death on December 30, 1666. Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederlands Familieportret,” 83.
Doncker’s presentation of the children on either side of their parents is similar to the compositional strategy employed in the portraits by Isaack Luttichuys, and in a general way, by Jan Daemen Cool. The figures also demonstrate a gestural inclusiveness indicative of familial roles and accord. Doncker uses the patriarch’s right outstretched arm and hand resting on a walking stick to form a visual connection to the deceased child and eldest boy. This boy, at the left edge of the composition, mimics the crooked left arm and extended right arm of his father. The boy’s imitative character, in terms of dress and attitude, strongly suggests that the father performed his duty to instill his offspring with the proper values and that the son has absorbed lessons and morals. The younger boy on the right edge of the quay does not as clearly ape the actions of his father, but he does create a visual link between the family and the ships upon the water.

The presence of the dead child gives greater immediacy to the parental concern for the proper raising of offspring. The research of Frauke Laarmann has shown that the youngest child dressed in a loose white garment with a wreath of flowers on his or her head, who sits on the ground between brother and father is deceased. She makes this identification based on a comparison to other portraits where a departed child appears in a similar manner, especially with regard to the white garment and bare feet. Doncker and his patrons seemed to have preferred this alternative to the portrayal of dead children as putti or angels (which Maes preferred), since a dead child in white dress sits next to his or her parents in at least one other family portrait by the artist, Portrait of a Family in an Arcadian Landscape (fig. 22). Dead children frequently

127 Other examples include Cornelis and Herman Saffléven’s Portrait of Godard van Reede van Nederhorst and his Family, 1635 (Slot Zuylen, Oud-Zuilen), and the Portrait the Children of Jacobus Pietersz. Costerus and Cornelia Jans Coenraadsdochter (The Dordrecht Triplets), 1621 (Dordrecht Museum). In the former, a child in white stands on a bier next to his/her dead mother, and in the latter, one of the Dordrecht quadruplets who died shortly after birth lies on a pillow wearing a white shift. Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederlands Familieportret,” 150. For an illustration of Godard van Reede van Nederhorst’s family-landscape portrait, see fig. 3 in the chapter, “Ruins and Relations” and for an illustration of the Dordrecht quadruplets see Pride and Joy, 130–31.
appear in individual and family portraits because they were considered part of the family in death, as in life.

The high rate of infant mortality during the early modern period meant that parents began to instill virtues and values in their offspring at an early age.\textsuperscript{128} It was not enough that couples united to procreate, they also had to mold their offspring into moral and productive members of society. In the opinion of Johan van Beverwijck, “Republics that set most store by their good citizens give most attention to the upbringing of their children,” because failure to raise upright children could have dire consequences for the nation.\textsuperscript{129} Beverwijck continues, “The depravity of republics proceeds from the inattention and oversight of their [children’s] good upbringing.”\textsuperscript{130} This view is based on the seventeenth-century conception of the family as a microcosm of the church and state; that is, the social unit of the family was considered the cornerstone of society. Jacob Cats, statesman and prolific Dordrecht moralist, speaks to this concept in describing wedlock as, “a smithy of men, a foundation of cities, and a nursery of high government” and “the groundstone of towns.”\textsuperscript{131} Beverwijck wrote “the first community is that of marriage itself; thereafter in a family household with children, in which all things are common.”\textsuperscript{132} In this outlook, parental success in raising children would have significant consequences for the moral, economic, political future of the Republic.

\textsuperscript{128} More than half of all children did not reach adulthood and up to 85 percent of children died before age 5. Bedaux, “Introduction,” 24.

\textsuperscript{129} Schama, \textit{Embarrassment of Riches}, 495.


\textsuperscript{131} “… de staet des huwelicx is een smisse van menschen, een grontsteen van steden, en een queeckerye van hooge regeeringe.” Translation in Weststeijn, \textit{Commercial Republicanism}, 161.

\textsuperscript{132} In his 1639 treatise \textit{Van de Winementheyt des Vrouwelicken Geslachts} (On the Excellence of the Female Sex), Beverwijck calls the family the “fountain and source” of social authority. Translation in Schama,
Social pressures encouraged the instillation of values in children at ever younger ages because an increasingly widespread train of thought perceived children as blank slates, or in more medical terms, they had moist, soft and malleable brains that were susceptible to impression.133 These ideas first appeared in the sixteenth century in the writings of the humanist Erasmus and started to gain wider acceptance in the writing of Jacob Cats. As Cats writes, “A child is like a sheet of white paper, / So take good care of that innocent beast; / For as soon as someone prints evil theron, / That noble white will be sullied.”134 The presence of the departed child served as a reminder to the parents of the need to impart values to their children early on and the white garment highlights the importance of resisting evil. Although there are no educational symbols, such as a dog or kolf stick, Doncker’s coastal-family-landscape portrait suggests that the boys have learned the self-discipline, industriousness, restraint and honor required to operate successfully in communal and commercial spheres. The poses of the boys, in emulation of their father, evince their embodiment of these familial virtues that find their counterpart in the economic and political realm.

The professional sphere within which the pater familias in Doncker’s Portrait of an Unknown Family operated was that of nautical ventures. The coastal-family-landscape portrait makes the connection to the sea explicit through the way the arm of the boy on the right points to

---

133 Bedaux, “Introduction,” 22; Bedaux and Ekkart, Pride and Joy, 149.

134 “Een kint is al seen wit papier/Dus let op dit onnoosel dier:/Want soo daer yemant quaet in prent/Soo is date del wit geschennt.” Translation in Jeroen Dekker, Leendert Groendijk and Johan Verberckmoes. “Proudly Raising Vulnerable Youngsters,” 49 and note 35. Jacob Cats was one of the most popular seventeenth-century Dutch writers who was so esteemed that he earned the sobriquet “Father Cats” in his lifetime. His book on marriage, Huwelyck went through several editions, and according to his publisher, 300,000 copies circulated in the seventeenth century alone. Benjamin B. Roberts and Leendert F. Groenendijk, “‘Wearing Out a Pair of Fool’s Shoes’: Sexual Advice for Youths in Holland’s Golden Age,” Journal of the History of Sexuality 13, no. 2 (2004): 141.
the sloop and frigate. It is possible that the patriarch captained and owned shares in the frigate since he wears a sword in a manner similar to that of Otto van Vollenhoven, who was also a captain. The absence of smaller freighters, such as smalchips or pinks, increases the likelihood that the father had a military connection to the admiralty and/or was involved in international trade with the VOC. The family probably heralded from Enkhuizen, since the image dates to the period when Doncker worked in that city. If the family did reside in Enkhuizen, the father may have had ties to the admiralty or chamber of the VOC based there. The Enkhuizen VOC chamber had its own warehouse on the Oosterhaven and shipyard on the Wierdijk, where 21 ships were built between 1602 and 1649. The frigate on the right is probably an East Indiaman, so called because it was a kind of ship used by the VOC in long-distance trade and heavily armed with cannons. Due to their armaments, they were deployed as escorts for smaller boats to protect cargo from plunder by pirates and appropriated by the admiralty for small-scale

---

135 Doncker was probably born before 1600 and had become a master painter in Haarlem by 1634, at which time he was listed in as a member of the St. Luke’s guild in that city. His early works consist of genre scenes that display some stylistic and iconographic similarities to Dirck Hals, but like Jan Daemon Cool, Doncker was an artist who specialized in family portraits. During the time Doncker lived in Enkhuizen he turned from genre scenes of merry companies to painting stories from Ovid’s Metamorphoses and scenes from Il Pastor Fido. This shift in the choice of subject Doncker chose to depict may be connected to his desire to appeal to the market for these types of history subjects among the elite. There are twelve known family portraits in his oeuvre and the earliest of these date to the 1630s, however, most of them have been dated to the time he spent in Enkhuizen from 1635–41 and then 1642–50. This image is typical of Doncker’s family portraits on the whole in that they situate the sitters in a landscape and the low, deep horizon makes the subjects appear large in the otherwise small format paintings. Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederland Familieportret,” 131–33,140–41, 145, 148–49.

136 Herring was the other important maritime related industry in Enkhuizen. Between 1570 and 1650, Enkhuizen had grown from a small fishing town into a large city and the impetus for the city’s prosperity was the herring industry. The peak of herring fishery was between 1630–60 when the total herring fleet consisted of approximately 500 busses; more than half of these came from Enkhuizen. In Meynert Semeys’ 1649 history of the herring trade Corte Beschryvinge over de Haring Vischerye in Hollandt, he made the grand claim, “The Dutch catch more herrings and prepare them better than any other nation ever will; and the Lord has, through the instrument of the herring, made Holland an exchange and staple-market for the whole of Europe. The herring keeps Dutch trade going, and the Dutch trade sets the world afloat.” Schalk, “Credit Market of Enkhuizen,” 7–9, 13; Hochstrasser, Still Life and Trade, 36–38; Virginia W. Lunsford, Piracy and Privateering in the Golden Age Netherlands (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 70.

naval skirmishes. The *pater familias* had a comparable protective role for his family and those who sailed with him. The presence of the frigate and the team of men on the sloop attest to his fulfillment of duties within the family and embodiment of mercantile values. Wife and children share in the patriarch’s fortune and virtues through pose and proximity to these details.

In Abraham Willaerts’ *Portrait of a Shipbuilder and His Family*, 1650, there is a return to fishing-related commerce and a more active demonstration of virtue on the part of the children through the inclusion of symbolic motifs (fig. 8). Willaerts’ coastal-family-landscape portrait pictures husband, wife and two sons on the left side of the image with houses marking the edge of a village behind them. A view to the water dotted with small freighters and the profile of a larger city is visible in the right half of the scene. Abraham Willaerts completed this coastal-family-landscape portrait while he resided in Amersfoort between 1644 and 1659, so it is possible that the urban profile is that of Amersfoort and the family resided there.

Willaerts’ *Portrait of a Shipbuilder and His Family* repeats pictorial conventions from earlier examples of coastal-family-landscape portraits: children on either side of the parents, the marital couple posed according to gendered or heraldic expectations, parents gesturing to their children. As with other images in this chapter, the gestural inclusiveness among sitters is a

---

138 The use of the ship by the VOC is further suggested by the large red flag on the stern, as red flags were raised by ships as a signal of attack. Giltaij and Kelch, *Praise of Ships and Sea*, 24, 26, 84.

139 Abraham was mainly a marine painter in the manner of his father Adam, but he also painted several other family portraits and several admirals. Willaerts, like his father, was based in Utrecht for the early part of his career. He produced this coastal-family-landscape portrait probably in Amersfoort between his return from Brazil in 1644 and his departure for Italy in 1659. Abraham had been in away in Brazil as part of the team Johan van Maurits took with him from 1637–1644. To follow Frauke Laarman’s line of reasoning, Willaerts may have sought this commission as a way to build a client base in Utrecht after a prolonged absence. Margarita Russell, *Visions of the Sea: Hendrick C. Vroom and the Origins of Dutch Marine Painting* (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 1983), 179, 182; Bol, *Die Holländische Marinemalerei*, 63–80.

140 Although the architecture of the homes is fairly generic, the structures do appear to be similar to those along the Eem in Joan Blaeu’s map of Amersfoort. Joan Blaeu, *Toneel der Steden van Veernighde Nederlanden met hare beschrijvingen* (Amsterdam: J. Blaeu, 1652).
means of demonstrating parental affection and fulfilled duty to procreate within marriage. In addition, the parents signal the inculcation of proper virtues and values in their children with the symbolic motifs of the dog and kolf stick. These are a way to demonstrate the parental duty to raise moral citizens of the Republic and so they also reflect the honor of the couple. The dog and kolf stick in turn become attributes through which children evince their successful education and embodiment of familial virtues.

Both boys are dressed in gowns that children of both genders wore before the age of seven. The young age indicated by their costume suggests that they are still being taught and cared for at home. Several details indicate that the mother in Willaerts’ coastal-family-landscape portrait succeeds in this role as caregiver for the physical and moral welfare of her children. She holds a fan in her right hand and uses this object, a sign of nuptial love, to point to the child. In her left hand she holds the leading strings of his garment. Leading strings were long bands that hung from the shoulders of the upper garment that an adult could use to rein in children; they were a harness of sorts used to assist with children who were learning to walk or to keep them safe from environmental dangers. The leading strings are a fashion counterpart to the rudder that guides ships in Ripa’s personification of Household Economy. The mother propels her children along the path of virtue and steers them clear of the road to evil.

The boy appears to have heeded the teachings of his mother. In his left hand he holds the paw of a spaniel, which sits on his hind legs in a begging pose. As in the previous discussion of Avercamp’s Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait, the dog is a metaphor for

---

141 Kuus, “Children’s Costume,” 77.
142 Kuus, “Children’s Costume,” 77.
143 Ludolph de Jongh painted an individual portrait of a boy with a dog in quite a similar pose 1661 (Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond).
the proper education of children in lessons of self-restraint, discipline and obedience. This motif alludes to the idea that the child is indeed disciplined, obedient and honorable and it also is a way for the mother to claim honor in raising virtuous children.

The father partakes of familial honor in raising morally upright offspring, as in the son who stands to his left. This boy holds a *kolf* stick in his left hand and this object of play suggests that the development of self-restraint, discipline and other virtuous habits come through education. *Kolf* was a two or four person game that required a *kolf* stick with a wooden handle, lead head and a leather or wooden ball. The goal of the game was either to get the ball from one end of a set course to the other in as few strokes as possible or to hit the ball the farthest in an agreed upon number of strokes.\textsuperscript{144} The game required strength, precision, skill in judging speed and distance, and the ability to cooperate with teammates and grace in either winning or losing.\textsuperscript{145}

Play was an integral feature of intellectual and physical development at home and at school. Educators and physicians recommended this kind of game to build skills and character, for in the words of Erasmus, “boys’ characters are nowhere more apparent than in a game,” and “nothing is learned better than what is learned as a game.”\textsuperscript{146} Johan van Beverwijck takes a more pointed defense of games, which could be viewed with suspicion, especially those involving gambling.\textsuperscript{147} Beverwijck argued that games are useful as exercise for the body and respite from work and learning. In *Schat der Gesondheyt* (*Treasury of Health*, 1651), a book

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{145} The equation of *kolf* with these skills meant that it was viewed with less suspicion than other childhood games, especially those involving betting.
\item \textsuperscript{146} Orrock, “Play and Learning in Pieter Bruegel’s *Children’s Games*,” 149, 186.
\item \textsuperscript{147} Schama, *Embarrassment of Riches*. 499; Roberts and Groenendijk, “Sexual Advice for Youths,” 142.
\end{itemize}
written to teach people how to live in good health, Beverwijck states, “Let them [children] freely
play and let school use play for their maturing…otherwise they will be against learning before
they know what learning is.”148 Beverwijck explores children’s games as metaphors for time ill
or well spent and suggests that leisure activities are useful because they rejuvenate the mind and
body for greater productivity in learning.149

In the portraits by Avercamp and Willaerts, play is referenced but not actually performed
by any of the sitters. In both images, the child holding the kolf stick does not actually appear to
be playing the game and in all likelihood each was too young to be able to play the game with
any modicum of success. The kolf stick is not merely a sport accessory, but an attribute of self-
discipline, sound judgment and cooperation.150 It symbolizes the expectation that the child will
learn these virtues and it represents the kind of man he will become.151 The kolf stick is a
physical manifestation of parental investment in the future of one’s child and the inculcation of
behaviors, morals and gender identities through play.152

The setting of ships and water in Willaerts’ Portrait of a Shipbuilder and His Family
suggests that if the children follow the professional path of their father, they would be involved

148 Schama, Embarrassment of Riches, 557. See also, Dekker, Childhood, Memory and Autobiography in Holland, 75; Kolfin, The Young Gentry at Play, 221.


150 Bedaux explains that realistic items such as toys or objects from the child’s everyday world could also have symbolic meaning that often functioned as a metaphor for effective upbringing. Bedaux, “Introduction,” 19. Emblem literature also connects toys to the necessity of education and exercise. Ozment, When Fathers Ruled, 132; Willemsen. “Images of Toys,” 66; Willemsen, “Surviving Toys and Attributes,” 299.

151 According to Annemarieke Willemsen, the kolf stick only appears in portraits of children (or family portraits with children), which solidifies its connotation with learning. It may also be a specifically male attribute. Willemsen argues that because more boys than girls hold kolf sticks in portraits, the stick is gendered male. “The colf stick was clearly intended to add a sporty and masculine character to the portrait of this ‘little man,’” who would balance his time between learning and play. Willemsen, “Images of Toys,” 66; Kuus. “Children’s Costume,” 81.

in some aspect of fishing or shipping. The bustling waterway is filled with pinks and smalschips carrying passengers and wares to the coastline. The disproportionately small fishermen who trudge to shore reiterate the cooperative nature of nautical enterprises, which involve networks of people to reap financial reward.\textsuperscript{153} Affluence is communicated by features of the sitters’ clothing (fan) and children’s toys (kolf stick); these are objects that speak to the mercantile success of the family, a success dependent on the realization of familial and mercantile virtues of trust, honor, self-restraint, discipline and obedience.

\textbf{Culminations in the 1650s}

The latest dated coastal-family-landscape portrait, Nicolaes Maes’ \textit{Portrait of the Cuyter Family}, 1659, forms a culmination of the issues and ideas discussed in relation to the other images in this chapter (fig. 9). Maes depicts the Cuyter family grouped in the foreground on the left side of the composition. The horizontal/linear arrangement of figures allows the viewer to see each individually, yet they interact with gestures to indicate familial, affectionate bonds between them. On the far left, Cornelis (age 16) holds a nautical chart and stands next to his brother Johannes (age 10), who grasps a garland of fruit slung over his shoulder. At their feet, the youngest child Arien (age 1) reclines in a wagon. The parents, Job and Dingetje stand with their hands clasped, while Pieter (age 7) clutches a piece of bread in one hand and his mother’s skirt in the other. Two daughters, Treintje (age 15) and Leendert (age 4), sit to the right of Job at the edge of a quay. Maes has clearly located the family just beyond the urban limits of Dordrecht, as they stand on the landing of the Melkpoortje; behind the outstretched left hand of

\textsuperscript{153} Abraham’s coastal-family-landscape portrait contains similar, perplexing discrepancies in scale between the sitters and the boats and fishermen as his brother Cornelis’.
Job, the Groothoofdspoort town gate with its distinctive bell tower is visible. Job’s demonstrative gesticulation to the right side of the composition draws the viewer’s attention to a waterway dotted with both occupied and unoccupied boats. Maes balances the family cluster on the left with angels at the top right, who represent deceased children floating overhead.

Job and Dingetje Cuyter married in 1646 and the companionate nature of their union is partly visualized through their joined right hands. Dingetje’s slight twist away from the viewer and toward her husband conveys modesty and deference, and visualizes her intention to follow his example. The suggestion of virtues appropriate to her station in the marriage and in life is important in eliminating any sense of usurped or subversive authority, which might be construed from her position to the left of Job. Dingetje’s raised left hand, which rests lightly over her heart, reinforces her acceptance if not submission to patriarchal authority, as it is a sign of fidelity and avowal. The significance of Dingetje’s gestures and pose becomes doubly important in communicating her fulfillment of wifely duties and values since the family is not in a domestic space that would otherwise suggest the expected role of the wife and mother in maintaining the household. The appearance of clasped hands suggesting unity and accord indicates that the family thought it important to present the marriage and family as a close-knit and harmonious group.

The portrayed familial harmony is based on the fulfillment of expected roles by parents and progeny. In the case of the Cuyter family, the number of children attests to Job and

---


155 Smith, *Masks of Wedlock*, 72.
Dingetje’s realization of their conjugal duty to procreate. By contemporary standards, the Cuyters were a fairly large family. The average family typically was comprised of the couple and two or three children, as was true for the van Vollenhoven family and the family depicted by Abraham Willaerts. The two sets of families in Avercamp’s coastal-family-landscape portraits also fall within this average size. The Cuyter couple’s union was certainly fruitful, a point made more explicit through the garland carried by Johannes and in the cherries held by Trientje and Leendert. Cherries can also signify more specifically the soul because they were considered the fruits of paradise and the food of children who died prematurely. To take Jacob Cats’ maxim “discipline bears fruit” literally, as discussed previously with regard to with Avercamp’s Winter Landscape with Skaters and a Family Portrait, the fruit may indicate that the children have realized the virtues of self-restraint and discipline.

That these details have metaphorical meaning is made obvious by their incongruity in a maritime setting. Foodstuffs’ function as a referent to good behavior is further evident in the bread held by Pieter. The type of rectangular loaf the child holds out toward the viewer appears in Jan Steen’s Feast of St. Nicholas, 1665, and during this Christmas festival, children were given comestibles, even more than toys, as reward for virtuous behavior (fig. 23). In Cornelis

156 The marriage was the second for Job and the third for Dingetje. Dingetje was the widow of Pieter Oudebotter and then Jan Willems van Albas. Job married Willemintje Otten. Husband and wife had been fruitful in their previous marriages; the oldest son Cornelis (far left) was the product of Dingetje’s second marriage, and the eldest daughter Trientje (far right) was from Job’s first marriage. The other children, Johannes, Pieter, Leendert and Arien were all offspring from Job and Dingetje’s union. The couple commissioned a family portrait from Maes as part of a contract whereby the portrait was completed as part of a payment for a house. Staring, “Vier Familiegroepen van Nicolaes Maes,” 171–72; Laarman, “Het Noord-Nederlands Familieportret,” 66, 71.

157 Although fruit is one of the most commonly recurring items in both children’s and family portraits as it alludes to fertility, artists typically naturalize the motif as part of a meal or verdant setting. The difficult of achieving this in a seaside locale is perhaps why none of the other coastal-family-landscape portraits include fruit. Bedaux, The Reality of Symbols, 103.

Dusart’s series on the four ages of man, *Infancy* depicts a woman who seems to have confiscated the same kind of bread as punishment for bad behavior (fig. 24).

The *memento mori* allusion of the cherries held by the two girls complements the angels above them, who represent deceased children. Dingetje and Job had lost two children by the time Maes painted their portrait. In the example previously discussed by Doncker, the artist provided an alternate pictorial device for representing deceased children in the child who wears a garland, and sits upon the ground with bare feet peeking through the bottom of the white garment he or she wears. In some respects, Maes’ more traditional convention of depicting dead children suggests that the children have been saved and received into heaven. His conception of the children is a slightly problematic idea, since the Protestant belief in predestination meant that parents could not know whether a dead child had indeed been received into God’s grace. This uncertainty does not seem like an aspect of faith that most people were wont to accept as a matter of course because the Synod of Dordrecht (1618) instead affirmed the idea that children were among the elect when God took them in their infancy. The poet Joost van den Vondel


161 Dingetje Cuyter bore six children with Job between 1647 and 1660, but the portrait depicts only four (the two eldest being from earlier marriages). Frick photographic file. The garland held by the angels in the Maes family portrait may be made of rosemary. Often, the deceased were given branches of rosemary because they kept their fragrance for a long time, and were thus associated with eternity. Rosemary was used as an herbal, medicinal remedy and was thought to strengthen the memory, so if the angels are indeed holding a rosemary garland this motif augments the commemorative associations of the angels themselves. Segal and Jordan, *Prosperous Past*, 68.

162 Laarmann-Westdijk, “‘Engeltje van t’hemelijk’” 227–33.
certainly believed that his young son had entered heaven upon his premature death as the poem composed in his honor would indicate:

Constantine, blessed child benign
Cherub mine, sees from on high
Pomp and show in man below,
Therefore laughs with twinkling eye.
‘Mother’, said, ‘Lo, wherefore fret so
Why regret so by my corpse?
I’m alive here, I survive here
Angel-child in heav’ly courts:
Brightly gleaming, sprightly cleaning
All the bounteous Giver showers
And unfolds on myriads souls,
Wanton with such lavish dowers.
Turn your face then and so hasten
To this place thence from the mess
Made on earth, of little worth.
Moments yield to endlessness.\textsuperscript{164}

The presence of the deceased as angels reaffirmed their continued presence among the living family members, and they reminded the parents of their duty to begin educating their children at a young age.

The educational aims directed the sons in particular to Job’s profession as an owner and seller of ships. Cuyter is documented as “a bachelor and assistant skipper” in the wedding bans for his marriage to his first wife Willemeintje Otten and he is again called skipper in the

\textsuperscript{163} Chapter 1, article 17 of the Synod of Dordrecht states, “We must judge God’s will from his words, which testify that the children of the faithful are holy, not by nature, but by the power of the covenant of grace, in which they and their parents are included: God-fearing parents ought not, therefore, to doubt the election and salvation of their children, whom God has taken from this life in their infancy.” Bedaux, “Introduction,” 24; Bedaux and Ekkart, \textit{Pride and Joy}, 278.

surviving contract for the Maes family portrait. The term skipper was used to describe a captain of a merchant vessel, but often captains were co-owners of the ships they steered. Cuyter seems to have been both owner and seller of ships since he is listed as co-owner of a boyer in a deed of 1658 and in another documents his name appears as a seller of ships. The nautical context of the image clearly speaks to this aspect of the sitter’s identity, as Cuyter raises his walking stick to draw the viewer’s attention to the figures in a sloop making their way from a frigate in the right middle distance to the quay of the Melkepoortje. The appearance of frigates, and smalschips on the Maas, suggests that Job Cuyter was invested in the major areas of sea trade based in Dordrecht.

Dordrecht was the oldest of the five major towns in Holland and it sat along the trade routes between the German Rhineland and valley of the Mass River and the provinces of Flanders, Brabant, Holland and the North Sea coast. The Counts of Holland granted the city staple rights in the thirteenth century and made it a center of their toll system, meaning it was a compulsory port of call for ships entering the Maas estuary from open sea. By the seventeenth century, Dordrecht had lost some of its staple rights to Amsterdam and Rotterdam, but it was still a center for the east-west transport of goods. Many entrepreneurs in Dordrecht were involved in the grain trade with the Baltic, the transport of wine from Germany and France, and the import of

---

165 Nicolaes Maes was born in Dordrecht in 1634, and went to Amsterdam at age twelve to apprentice with Rembrandt. Maes began his career in Amsterdam painting genre scenes and he continued to paint these types of images even after he returned to Dordrecht in 1653. Maes began painting portraits shortly before he returned to Amsterdam around 1660, whereupon the artist painted the portraits of Amsterdam’s elite until his death in 1693. Slive, “A Family Portrait by Nicolaes Maes,” 32–34. Maes painted the Cuyter family shortly before returned to Amsterdam. The painting was part of a sale contract for a house on the Steegoversloot in Dordrecht. In a contract signed March 1659, Maes agreed to pay £2650 and paint a portrait of living and future members of the family. Robinson, “Early Career of Nicolaes Maes,” 6, 183–85; William H. Wilson, Dutch Seventeenth-Century Portraiture: The Golden Age (Sarasota: John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, 1980), not paginated; Staring, “Vier familiegroepen van Nicolaes Maes,” 171–72.

166 Robinson, Early Career of Nicolaes Maes, 6, 282.

167 Giltiaj and Kelch, Praise of Ship and Sea, 23.
wood and cattle from Germany and Eastern Europe.\textsuperscript{168} The bread held by Pieter seems to indicate some involvement with the Baltic grain trade and it is possible that Cuyter owned shares in the pictured frigate, along with the smalschip, around the bend of the port in the left background. The figures in the sloop, which heads toward the Melkpoortje quay in Cuyter’s family portrait, appear to be business contacts, if not employees, and their inclusion seems to indicate that Job, in true partenrederij form, has established and maintained professional relationships through cooperation, reliability, trust and honor.

The eldest child, Cornelis, would seem to have also assimilated the virtues of discipline, self-restraint, industriousness and honor, since he is poised to engage with Job’s mercantile pursuits. The map held by Cornelis depicts the mouth of the Rhine on the North Sea and confirms that he and perhaps his brothers will follow in Job’s wake.\textsuperscript{169} By the age of sixteen, the eldest son would have already completed a good portion of the training necessary to be a merchant. Accordingly, Cornelis appears poised to enter into commercial ventures.\textsuperscript{170} The portrait symbolically facilitates his initial introduction into Dordrecht trade, establishing


\textsuperscript{169} The younger brother Pieter may have some future role to play in the family business, which can be deduced through his garment and the bread he holds. The bread may refer to the Baltic grain trade and his garment could signal contact with Hungary or Poland. The garment appears to be a simplified version of a Hungarian dolman, a tight fitting coat cut straight to the waist, fastened down the front to the waist, flared at the sides to form a full skirt that reached halfway down the thigh. This may simply be a prop from Maes’ or Rembrandt’s studio (Maes trained with Rembrandt) as Robinson suggests, but it could also be a professionally referential item. Wilson, 	extit{Dutch Seventeenth-Century Portraiture}; Emilie E. S. Gordenker, “Cuyp’s Horsemen: What do Costumes Tell Us?,” in 	extit{Aelbert Cuyp}, ed. Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr. (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2001), 53–54.

\textsuperscript{170} Merchants’ sons trained to be their fathers’ successors through education at the Latin schools with instruction in math (multiplication and division), calculating interest and exchange rates, and foreign languages. They might apprentice with another merchant, often a friend of the family or relative. Josiah Child, writing at the end of the century, confirms these ideas: “the education of their Children, as well as Daughters as Sons; all of which, they be of never so great quality or estate, they always take care to bring up to write perfect good hands, and to have the full knowledge and use of Arithmetick and Merchants-Accounts.” Quoted in Van den Heuvel, 	extit{Women and Entrepreneurship}, 48, 51.
familiarity, the first step in forming mercantile relationships and networks. The family portrait also grants trust and reliability to Cornelis through association with his father.\textsuperscript{171} Job would have introduced Cornelis to his corporate world in actuality because he was honor bound to provide for the present and future pecuniary welfare of his family. Job’s success as a skipper enabled his provision for the monetary, intellectual and moral well-being of his family, and, as Udemans and Barleus would have advocated, his pursuit of gold was not absent honor.

Conclusion

The consistent message of coastal-family-landscape portraits is reciprocity between familial and mercantile values and the interdependency of social institutions. Maes’ \textit{Portrait of Job Cuyter and His Family} is the culminating example in which the combination of setting, expressive groupings and symbolic motifs convey the idea that honor, self-restraint, industriousness, and obedience were at the core of both commerce and kin. By 1659, alternate visual modes had begun to replace those of the short-lived pictorial trend of coastal-family-landscape portraits; the locale was no longer used to situate the families at the nexus of mercantile and familial values.

\footnote{Andries van der Meulen’s wife told their son, “I beg you, Andries, once again...be aware that it is time to do something, like others, to go through life honourably. God has given you the means, please take advantage of the opportunity...don’t give people a chance to discredit you, because that would hurt me very much...Always remember what kind of man your father was, so that you will not only bear his name but also follow his deeds...that would be the greatest pleasure I could have in this world, that I may see that you will do your best to be a man, by whom the memory of your good father will be revived.” Kooijmans, “On the Mentality of Merchants,” 30–31.}
Chapter 2: Panoramas and Progeny

Introduction

One of the distinctive features of the Dutch polity during the seventeenth century was the decentralized governmental control and the greater power exercised by local government in the lives of its citizens. For much of the populace, a person first identified with his family, his neighborhood and his city; affiliation of self with a province or the seven United Provinces as a whole did not have the same daily resonance. As Willem Frijhoff and Marieke Spies explain, “the city was always a corporation of burghers who had gained the right of citizenship through birth, as a gift, or through purchase, which meant that they could be expected to identify with the city and its welfare.” Many different kinds of images and texts produced in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic reflect the importance of communal, civic identity. But this chapter takes as its subject the combination of familial and civic identity represented in the panoramic-family-landscape portrait (figs. 1–12).

A group of twelve panoramic-family-landscape portraits depict sitters from a number of cities in the provinces of Holland and Utrecht. In most examples, the sitters appear in the
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174 Several panoramic-family-landscape-portraits are not discussed due to the poor quality of available reproductions. These include Nicolaes van Helt Stockade’s Portrait of the Artist with His Family, n.d. (Muzeum Narodowe, Warsaw); Roelof Koets’ Portrait of Hendrik Nilant and His Family, c. 1695 (Private Collection); Claes Bellekin’s Portrait of a Family with Kampen in the Background, c.1645–1660 (Stedelijk Museum, Zwolle); and another family group attributed to Claes Bellekin dated to the third quarter of the century in a private collection. For
foreground of the image with a view to a landscape backdrop, which contains an important city landmark or a city profile on the horizon. Families can be seen in proximity to sites such as the Grote Kerk (also known as the Cathedral of St. Bavo) in Haarlem, a city gate of Leiden, the tower of St. Janskerk in The Hague, the tower of the Dom (Cathedral of St. Martin) of Utrecht, Kasteel Duurstede near Utrecht and the Koningshuis and tower of the Cunerakerk in Rhenen. In paintings by Bartholomeus van der Helst, and Jan Bijlert and Bernardus Swaerdecroon in which the names of the sitters are known, the choice of landmark or locale can be linked directly to the family’s primary city of residence. In other examples by Willem Claesz. Heda, Godaert Kamper, Sybrand van Beest, Christiaen van Colenberg, Cornelis Adamsz. Willaerts, Jacob Gerritsz. and Aelbert Cuyp, a similar inference may be made since the artists lived in and/or worked for other patrons in the depicted cities.

Further excluded from this chapter are several family-landscape-portraits where there are minimal clues to deduce the specificity of setting. For example, Gerard Donck’s Portrait of Jan Hensbeeck with His Wife and Child c. 1636 (National Gallery, London) places the sitters near a village or country estate with a cityscape visible on the left background of the image. The dearth of information on the artist or the sitters hinders conclusions regarding the depicted city. “G. Donck Portrait of Jan van Hensbeeck, His Wife and a Child,” http://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/g.-donck-portrait-of-jan-van-hensbeeck-his-wife-and-a-child. A family group formerly attributed to both Bartholomeus van der Helst and Aelbert Cuyp shows a family walking along a river or canal with a village in the background. The buildings may be those of a village near Amsterdam, but they are fairly generic in their architecture. For an illustration see, Judith van Gent, *Bartholomeus van der Helst (ca. 1613–1670): Een studie naar zijn leven en werk* (Zwolle: WBooks, 2011), 259. Also excluded from this chapter are Barent Fabritius’ Portrait of Willem van der Helm and His Family 1656 (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum) in which the sitters are located within their home with a view of buildings in Leiden visible through a window, and Cornelis de Man’s Portrait of Reyer van der Burch and His Family c.1673 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) in which the sitters are shown in an interior space with a view to the armory in Delft because they belong to a slightly different visual mode that pictures the sitters within their home with a view to the urban sphere beyond that space. Pieter de Hooch’s Portrait of a Family in a Courtyard in Delft c.1657–60 (Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der bildenden Künste, Vienna) and Jan Steen’s Portrait of Adolf and Catharina Croeser on the Oude Delft 1655 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) have also been excluded from this chapter because they have been written about at length by other scholars and they are outliers in terms of the pictorial conventions displayed by the images included within this chapter. Hendrick Martensz. Sorgh’s Portrait of a Family with a Polder Landscape in the Background 1662 (Private Collection) is a fairly unusual hybrid of landscape (which cannot be clearly identified, although it may be in the vicinity of The Hague where Sorgh worked for the entirety of his career) and family pictured on a terrace. For an illustration see, “Hendrick Martensz. Sorgh, Portrait of a Family on a Terrace,” last updated September 6, 2014, http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/64035.
The logical choice of setting based on where members of the family lived and worked only partially explains the phenomenon of panoramic-family-landscape-portraiture. This chapter begins with an exploration of aspects of the socio-historical contexts and visual and literary culture that frame the appearance of panoramic-family-landscape-portraits, and proceeds with a chronological discussion of individual images, grouped by the cities with which the families may be linked. Like most family portraits, the images in this chapter visualize the roles of kin and their reciprocal obligations to each other, and highlight the virtues of husbands, wives and children. But this subset of portraits contextualizes familial virtues and ideals as also civic in resonance and as tied to an urban locale. Iconographic interpretations of various motifs in such family portraits reveal similar themes of honor or illustriousness of citizenry, wealth, unity, civic pride and cultural memory that appear in city descriptions, maps and poems.

In the 1620s, artists began to paint family portraits that place the sitter in distinctly Dutch landscapes, but it was not until the 1640s and 1650s that such images, which included identifiable landmarks with any regularity, could be interpreted as a distinct visual trend. The cluster of images around midcentury may be related to the shifting political circumstances of the Dutch Republic at that time. With the Treaty of Münster in 1648, the seven United Provinces concluded their protracted struggle for autonomy from Spanish rule and achieved official recognition of sovereignty. This event halted dissent in one sphere, but political unrest hardly ceased. At the same time, Princes Frederik Hendrik and William II of Orange sought to confer greater political authority onto the stadholderate through control of the army. Regents, especially in Holland, interpreted this as an attempt to turn the stadholderate, a position traditionally held by previous members of the House of Orange, into a monarchy and as a threat

---

to their local power. When William II died suddenly in 1650, the General Assembly of the United Provinces convened in 1651 and elected not to replace the position of stadholder. This action ushered in the first stadholderless period (1650–1672), as each province affirmed its individual autonomy and agreed to maintain its own military force. As Joanna Woodall has remarked, “Taken together, these events meant not only that the sovereignty of the Dutch polity was formally secured, but also that this sovereignty was explicitly centered on the citizen elite, rather than the hereditary nobility.”

The production of panoramic-family-landscape-portraits seems to be one manifestation of the abstract conception of increased civic sovereignty and autonomy in the wake of the Eighty Years War and the beginning of the first stadholderless period. Just when discourse on local authority took center stage across the Republic, settings of localized significance began to proliferate in portraits. Johan van Clarenbeek (1640s), a Haarlem regent, and Jochem van Aras (1654), an Amsterdam baker, for example, had their families portrayed in landscapes punctuated by silhouettes of Haarlem churches (figs. 1, 3).

The mid-century discourse on authority and sovereignty may have opened up the possibility for alternative modes of representation in portraiture, particularly one that included the incorporation of distinctly Dutch local landscape features. The incorporation of topography and sites particular to the United Provinces in panoramic-family-landscape-portraits follows the pictorial conventions established in independent landscapes of the 1620s and 1630s. In these works...


178 Joanna Woodall, “Sovereign Bodies: The Reality of Status in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Portraiture,” in *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*, ed. Joanna Woodall (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997), 93–94. Woodall argued that there is a continuity between portraiture and concepts of nobility not only for the aristocracy, but among burghers as well. She posited that artists and sitters espoused traditional concepts of portraiture that highlighted the noble ideals of birth, virtue (or service to the state) and skill, but adapted these concepts to *burgerselijk* forms of self-presentation.
decades, artists began painting views of the land that showed dunes, windmills, dikes, canals, churches and fortifications. Simon Schama has suggested that such landscape paintings constituted a “kind of generalized patriotic geography,” because selection of native landmarks and landscape features conferred importance on the local and communal. Schama linked the shift in landscape conventions and their political associations to the period during and just after the conclusion of the Twelve Years Truce (1609–1621). The key feature of Schama’s analysis is the heightened importance of the local and communal in landscape painting, and these same concepts shape the meaning of setting in panoramic-family-landscape-portraits.

While family-landscape-portraits began to incorporate specifically Dutch sites and landmarks several decades after independent landscapes had done so, the views in portraits may find their basis in a similar ideological construct to that of landscapes in other pictorial contexts and media. Through their site specificity, panoramic-family-landscape-portraits seem to partake of the general impulse connecting the individual or family to the communal through visual representation. In a study focused on explaining why Haarlem first emerged as a subject of representation and the resident city of artists making images of Dutch locales, Huigen Leeflang proposed that landscapes were part of the process of shaping a local cultural memory. The appeal of and meanings ascribed to visual representations of Dutch sites and terrain aided in the construction of a shared identity. Similarly, Elisabeth de Bièvre has argued that paintings, sculpture and architecture from the cities of Leiden and Delft reflected an “urban subconscious,”
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180 Simon Schama, “Culture as Foreground,” in Masters of 17th-Century Dutch Landscape Painting, 73.

or “a sense of priorities shared by all inhabitants of one town.” De Bièvre explained that, “This urban subconscious is formed by the sum of physical circumstances, both natural and man-made, and historical events, experienced collectively by a group of people living for several generations in the same environment,” and can be observed in the products of visual culture.

This chapter examines panoramic-family-landscape-portraits as a previously unexplored expression of an urban subconscious; they were a means of visualizing a collective identity that was familial and civic, that is, one that declared familial ideals as facets of civic values.

In the way they encompass ideas about urban self-consciousness, mutual priorities and collective identity or memory, the images discussed in this chapter share these traits with city histories, a genre consulted by de Bièvre in her explication of the Delft and Leiden urban subconscious. Panoramic-family-landscape-portraits and stadsbeschrijvingen (city histories) are both chorographic documents that shape collective identity and present individual citizens as representative examples of virtue and moral excellence.

Stadsbeschrijvingen, in their structure and thematic components, construct a unified image of a specific place and its people. In his analysis of these documents, Eddy Verbaan argues that city histories present a “frame of reference shared by a group” in keeping with the notion of collective memory expressed on a local level. These chorographic documents describe the origins and geographic location of the
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183 de Bièvre, “Urban Subconscious,” 222.
184 Chorographies map a specific region or place. Edward S. Casey, Representing Place: Landscape Painting & Maps (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), 154–70.
185 Stadsbeschrijvingen first appeared in the Dutch Republic in 1611 with Johannes Pontanus’ publication of Rerum et urbis Amstelodamensium about the city of Amsterdam. In successive decades many other Dutch cities would follow suit in publishing their own city histories. Verbaan, “City Histories in Historical Perspective,” 289. According to Raingard Esser, “Between the late sixteenth and the middle of the seventeenth century more than 50 historiographical and topographical descriptions of Dutch towns were printed, which made this literary form by far
city, its buildings and institutions, explain the structure of civic administration, list the magistrates and give biographies of famous men who lived in the city, discuss urban trade and industry, and recount battles fought by the city.\textsuperscript{186} The emphasis on geography and civic buildings highlights the city’s material superiority; the stress on civic administration and laws accentuates legal autonomy; and the elaboration on the lives of citizens evokes moral respect.\textsuperscript{187}

While the ultimate purpose of city histories was self-aggrandizement, as argued by Verbaan, they also created a folklore and shared identity for residents of a city. \textit{Stadsbeschrijvingen} certainly highlight the uniqueness of place and character of its citizenry; however, most city histories also highlighted the idea that moral and virtuous citizens who worked collectively for the common good of the city formed the basis of communal identity. The biographies of important men within \textit{stadsbeschrijvingen} provided exempla of successful efforts in the endeavor to achieve civic accord and moral excellence, which they attained through the \textit{vita activa} or \textit{vita contemplativa}.\textsuperscript{188} Simon Stevin, a mathematician, engineer and military
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\textsuperscript{186} E. H. Mulier, “‘The Image of Amsterdam in Seventeenth-Century Descriptions,’” in \textit{Rome, Amsterdam: Two Growing Cities in Seventeenth-Century Europe}, eds. Peter van Kessel and Elisja Schulte van Kessel (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1997), 13–14. Examples such as Lodovico Guicciardini’s \textit{Beschryvinghe van alle de Nederlanden} (1612 Dutch translation), Constantijn Huygens’ \textit{Stede-stemmen en dorpen} (1624) and Caspar Barleus’ \textit{Urbium praecipuarum encomia. Respublica Hollandiae et urbes} (1630) are fairly standardized in their content. They explain the importance of a city’s location, discuss the etymology of the city’s name as a way to discuss the city’s heritage and history, describe its political, economic and cultural strengths and list notable figures who brought the city fame. Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., “‘Worthy to Behold’: The Dutch City and Its Image in the Seventeenth Century,” in \textit{Dutch Cityscapes of the Golden Age}, eds. Adriane van Suchtelen and Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr. (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2009), 18–19.

\textsuperscript{187} In Elisabeth de Bièvre’s summarization of Samuel Ampzing’s 1628 \textit{Beschrijvinghe der stadt Haerlem}, she states, “Ampzings book concentrates on three themes, each making a different claim. The first enumerates the earlier ruling families and the laws and privileges acquired in the past, thus stressing a legal autonomy. The second describes the most splendid religious and civic buildings inside the walls and the many attractions immediately outside, thus emphasizing a material superiority. The third part elaborates the lives of individual citizens, honored for spiritual, intellectual or physical excellence and thus evoking moral respect.” Elisabeth de Bièvre, “Violence and Virtue: History and Art in the City of Haarlem,” \textit{Art History} 11, no.3 (1988): 310.
advisor to Prince Maurits, articulated a similar idea that he called *burgherlickheyt* in *Vita politica. Het burgherlick leven* (Civic Life), published in 1590. Burgherlickheyt meant acting in a manner that befitted the whole community, or “A man who so behaves himself in it [civic conduct] that the greatest stability and welfare of the community results from it in this life is called a civic person (*burgherlick persoon/poiticus*). And such proper practice is called a civic life (*burgherlick leven/vita politica*).”190 Panoramic-family-landscape-portraits share a similar interest in presenting or promoting moral, *burgherlick* individuals as the foundation of civic identity. These images paint familial virtue as a facet of civic identity and virtue, which is symbolized through various iconographic details.

**Families in and around Haarlem**

Several of the earliest panoramic-family-landscape-portraits to locate the sitters within a specific and identifiable landscape come from Haarlem (figs. 1–3). This is perhaps not surprising considering prior art historical scholarship has established that the city of Haarlem provided a fruitful environment for the emergence of the local landscape as an independent pictorial genre in the Dutch Republic early in the seventeenth century.191 The *Portrait of Johan Eddy Verbaan*, De woonplaats van de faam: Grondslagen van de stadsbeschrijving in de zeventiende-eeuwse republic (Hilversum: Verloren 2011), 9–43.

188 Eddy Verbaan, De woonplaats van de faam: Grondslagen van de stadsbeschrijving in de zeventiende-eeuwse republic (Hilversum: Verloren 2011), 9–43.


van Clarenbeek and His Family, c. 1640s, by an unknown artist is the first of this group to picture the sitters in a Haarlem environ (fig. 1). The image depicts the family in the foreground; Johan (1601–1642) stands on the left and his wife, Glaudina de Glarges, sits on the far right. Johan van Clarenbeek and Glaudina de Glarges married in December of 1626, and any children they might have had would be no more than fifteen years old at the time of the portrait’s commission. Early scholarly speculation posited that the image shows two generations of the same family, or that of another couple with their small children who stand between the elder couple. The former proposition seems unlikely because the offspring of Johan and Glaudina were too young to be already married and procreating at the time the artist painted the portrait. In all probability, the four sitters in between Johan and Glaudina were the couple’s progeny. The two twin children in the center of the figural group draw the most attention, as their white garments contrast with the arboreal backdrop and two of the other figures point in their direction. The curiosity usually attached to multiple births makes it possible that Van Clarenbeek commissioned the portrait in celebration of the procreative success of his marital union. The children also attest to the fulfillment of expected roles within marriage and the family for both father and mother. The gestures of deference offered by the two eldest children demonstrate the reciprocal role of progeny, as explained in the chapter on coastal-family-landscape-portraits.
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193 The curiosity and local celebrity attached to multiple births is documented with the children of Jocabus Pietersz. Costerus, also known as “the Dordrecht quadruplets.” They were mentioned in Mattheij Balen’s Beschryvinge der stad Dordrecht (1677). Jan Baptist Bedaux and Rudoph E. O. Ekkart, eds. Pride and Joy: Children’s Portraits in the Netherlands 1500–1700 (Amsterdam: Ludion Press Ghent, 2001),130–31.
Johan van Clarenbeek (1601–1642) appears as the epitome of social sophistication and civic authority in his family portrait, and these facets of his identity are conferred upon his lineage through this image. Van Clarenbeek was a notable figure in the civic administration of Haarlem. He served as a lieutenant of the cavaliermen’s civic guard in 1633 and captain in 1639; he was a member of the vroedschap (town council) by 1638 and elected schepen (alderman) in 1639–40; and became regent of St. Elizabeth Hospital in 1641, for which he acted as secretary.\(^{194}\)

Although his parentage remains unknown, Van Clarenbeek likely came from a prominent family because he married into the De Glarges family. Glaudina’s father, Gilles de Glarges was a pensionary of Haarlem and an outspoken advocate for the Counter-Remonstrant cause during the religious and political debates between that group and the Remonstrants earlier in the century.\(^{195}\)

If Johan’s own father had not been influential in facilitating his son’s political career, it is possible that his father-in-law was. Johan’s elevated position within the social and political fabric of Haarlem by the time of his death in 1642 meant that he had proven himself an honorable and virtuous individual, for it was commonly held that political office holders had to be men of respectability and good ancestry.\(^{196}\)

Through costume accessories, the image of Johan van Clarenbeek and his family references Johan’s civic positions. The hilt of a sword Van Clarenbeek wears on his left hip is visible beneath his left arm akimbo. Both the sword and placement of his arm connote military and leadership associations and specifically reference his role as lieutenant and then captain.

---


within the civic guard.\textsuperscript{197} The sword clearly indicates his elevated social status and authority in leadership.\textsuperscript{198} His positions within the civic guard likely paved the way for his governance with the St. Elisabeth Hospital. As secretary he belonged to a group of individuals responsible for managing the finances and grounds of the hospital so that the poor could receive care.\textsuperscript{199} In early modern ideology, Johan’s obligation to care for those in residence at the St. Elisabeth Hospital echoed his duty to care for his family.\textsuperscript{200} As Henk van Nierop has written, “Historians have described urban communities as ‘quasi kin groups,’ whose members were bound to assist, aid and protect one another. Its members had mutual claims and obligations to assistance and protection.”\textsuperscript{201} The image seems to claim that Johan’s competency as a secretary was analogous to his capability in caring for his family.

The setting also may allude to Van Clarenbeek’s civic affiliations and connects civic virtue to familial virtue. The image does not explicitly reference the St. Elisabeth Hospital, but the church along the horizon beyond Johan’s right shoulder evokes the urban center of Haarlem. Within the city center, buildings such as the town hall, the cavaliermen’s \textit{doelen} and the Elisabeth Hospital clustered around the Grote Kerk. The artist could not include all these buildings and remain topographically accurate in his rendering of the city from a distance, so the


\textsuperscript{199} Biesboer, \textit{Collections in Haarlem}, 487.


\textsuperscript{201} Van Nierop, “A Tale of Two Brothers: Corporate Identity and the Revolt of the Towns of Holland,” 56.
church may act as a metonymic reference for these other sites, which were important to Van Clarenbeek and other Haarlem residents. The landscape seems to be that of Haarlem, but this identification is complicated by the fact that the church in the distance deviates from the more typical pictorial rendering of the Grote Kerk, as seen in Willem Heda’s *Portrait of an Unknown Family*, Bartholomeus van der Helst’s *Portrait of Jochem Aras and His Family* or Jacob van Ruisdael’s many views of Haarlem (figs. 2–3, 13). Van Ruisdael and others typically painted a view of Haarlem from the north, so that the tower of the church appears to rise from the center of the nave. In Johan van Clarenbeek’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait, the church tower emerges from one end of the building, leading some scholars to conclude that this is not the Grote Kerk of Haarlem. There are, in fact, two church spires visible in this image and the landscape may show a view to the Nieuwe Kerk (St. Annakerk), with the Grote Kerk visible just beyond.

The buildings connect Van Clarenbeek and his family to the environs around Haarlem, and also allude to the family’s virtue and morality. The painted churches generally link the family to others who pledged allegiance to the Reformed Church in order to hold political office and they function as a means for Van Clarenbeek to demonstrate his devotion to the common good of Haarlem. The visualization of the patriarch’s dedication to civic virtue in this image aligns with his actions in life and shows that he embodies *burgherlickheyt*. The panoramic-family-landscape-portrait also complements the desire to promote the prosperity of the town and protect the interests of its citizens evident in two other group portraits that include the visage of Johan van Clarenbeek: Pieter Soutman’s *Officers and Sub-alterns of the St. George Civic Guard*,


1642, and Frans Hals’ *Regents of the St. Elizabeth Hospital*, 1641 (fig. 14). In these images, also painted in the year before his death, the artists have inserted Van Clarenbeek among a group of other illustrious men of Haarlem in a comparable manner to the listing of esteemed men in city histories.  

Much like the *Portrait of Johan van Clarenbeek and His Family*, Willem Claesz. Heda’s *Portrait of an Unknown Family*, 1647, pairs familial virtue with civic identity, but the latter portrait elucidates familial values more through symbolic details (fig. 2). The father and mother stand in the traditional heraldic positions on the left side of the composition, while two boys appear on the right with a view to the Grote Kerk of Haarlem between the two figural groupings. The parents seem to fulfill expected social roles in the provision of children and in the mother’s indication of modest deference to the authority of her husband through the tilt of her head. The boys embody youthful vigor in their more animated poses, as the younger child straddles a goat that he holds by the reins and the elder holds the animal in place by his horns. The inclusion of the goat is a symbolic detail that has a similar didactic purpose to that of the dog, as described in the chapter on coastal-family-landscape-portraits.

The goat functions as a visual device to signal leisured life as a complement to the industriousness of urban existence and as a symbol to communicate filial roles and virtues. Artists began depicting children with goats and in carts in portraits and genre scenes from the 1620s and 1630s, for example Frans Hals’ *Portrait of the Van Campen Family in a Landscape* (fig. 22). Goats may allude to pastoral imagery that developed as a new genre in the 1620s, but


205 Like some other examples of family-landscape-portraits, the image may be a result of the collaborative effort between Heda and Salomon van Ruysdael, who may have painted the landscape. Rudolph E.O. Ekkart, Quentin Buvelot, eds., *Dutch Portraits: The Age of Rembrandt and Frans Hals*, trans. Beverly Jackson (The Hague: Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, London: National Gallery Co., Zwolle: Waanders, 2007), 231, note 16.
Heda’s family cannot be said to conform to the pastoral portrait type since the sitters do not wear pastoral dress.\textsuperscript{206} In genre and mythological images, goats alluded to lust because they often appear in bacchanal scenes pulling the cart of Bacchus. In portraits of children, goats do not comment on the lustful nature of children, but rather they indicate the pedagogical emphasis on learning to control one’s passions or appetites at an early age. In Heda’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait, the way the boys interact with the animal reinforces the symbolism of the goat as restraint in temperament and passion. They exert physical control over untamed nature by grasping the horns, and the bridle acts as an additional restraint.\textsuperscript{207}

The idea of restraint and control as a familial virtue is apparent in numerous family portraits and the bridled, restrained goat in Heda’s \textit{Portrait of an Unknown Family} is an iteration of this notion.\textsuperscript{208} This idea stems from Plutarch’s \textit{De liberis educandis}, in which the author makes reference to a bridle when he states that teachers and parents should not loosen the reins on their children: “one should, with great care and vigilance, bridle the vicious lusts of children, as their youth makes them highly susceptible to stimuli and easily inclined to indulge in all sorts

\textsuperscript{206} Joaneath Spicer calls this image a “country life portrait” because people shown at leisure in country settings with allusions to pastoral themes celebrate country life. Joaneath Spicer, “Introduction to Painting in Utrecht,” in \textit{Masters of Light, Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age}, Joaneath Spicer, et al. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 36.


\textsuperscript{208} The \textit{Portrait of an Unknown Family} possibly painted by Bartholomeus van der Helst sometime after mid-century employs the device of the bridled goat in a manner similar to that in Heda’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait. For an illustration see, Van Gent, \textit{Bartholomeus van der Helst}, 359.
of carnal desire.” Jacob Cats and Johan van Beverwijck repeat Plutarch’s ideas when they promote moderation as the foundation of all education. Restraint as a virtue in Heda’s Portrait of an Unknown Family takes on broader civic resonance through its visualization in a Haarlem setting. The Grote Kerk filters through the atmospheric haze in the center background of the image, locating the sitters in the environs around Haarlem. The church is clearly recognizable from a typical view from the north with the tower rising from the center of the nave. As with the churches in the image of Johan van Clarenbeek’s family, the Grote Kerk generally connotes morality and virtue. Additionally, the cruciform shape of the Grote Kerk’s profile on the horizon and its similarly shaped footprint may have called to mind the cross on the city’s emblem, a cross which symbolized the virtue of the citizens.

The family in Heda’s portrait seems to share the virtue ascribed to other illustrious residents of Haarlem, including Johan van Clarenbeek, who contributed to the honor of the town through the taming of passions. The virtue of restraint held great significance to Haarlem citizens. The town hall, adjacent to the Grote Kerk, contains several visual examples on the theme of good government resulting from restraint and tranquilitas. Regents cultivated tranquilitas and communicated this trait through stiff posture, passive expression and rigid

---

209 Bedaux and Ekkart, Pride and Joy, 218.

210 Cats’ Houwelick and Beverwijck’s Schat der gesontheyt reiterate these ideas in Dutch in the seventeenth century. Bedaux and Ekkart, Pride and Joy, 218.

211 The church was a site that garnered much praise in encomiastic texts, including Samuel Ampzing’s Besrijvinghe der stadt Haerlem of 1628. In a poem that accompanied the etched profile of the city by Pieter Saenredam, Ampzing exclaims, “See here an old town born a thousand years ago./...How many beautiful churches! How many high towers! / How many noble Houses!” Wheelock, “Worthy to Behold,” 19.

212 de Bièvre, ”Violence and Virtue, 319.

demeanor in portraiture, as argued by Ann Jensen Adams.\(^{214}\) The couple in Heda’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait displays these pictorial features of restrained emotion and in doing so, the parents act as exempla for their children and align themselves with members of Haarlem’s elite who shared this trait.

The family may be virtuous through self-discipline, but the image also brings to the fore the idea of leisure as a complement to civic life through the inclusion of the goat and in the way Heda has located the sitters beyond the city walls of Haarlem. References to leisure or recreation are, in fact, a component of most family-landscape-portraits. One reason for this may be found in the frontispiece to Abraham Bloemaert’s print series *Otia*, “Leisure gives pleasure and prepares you for great efforts. It strengthens weary limbs… but idle laziness weakens the body with lethargy and numbs the spirit, and prevents you from being virtuous.”\(^{215}\) Recreational activities, such as promenades outside the city walls, were popular among Haarlem residents, as described by the writer of Haarlem’s city history, Samuel Ampzing. Such pursuits not only provided respite from the worries of urban life and facilitated the cultivation of virtue, but walking was a group activity that created shared experiences and contributed to a collective identity. In the examples of panoramic-family-landscape-portraits, the references to collective identity manifest a variation of what Stevin called *burgherlickheyt*, in which virtuous individuals fulfill familial roles and thus uphold the honor of their city.

Even more than Heda’s family group, Bartholomeus van der Helst’s *Portrait of Jochem van Aras and His Family*, 1654, emphasizes leisure in a Haarlem landscape as a component of

---


individual and familial identity (fig. 3).\textsuperscript{216} Van der Helst evokes the leisured lifestyle of Jochem van Aras (d. 1662), his wife, Elisabeth Claes Loenen (c.1616–73) and daughter Maria van Aras through setting, clothing and other pictorial motifs.\textsuperscript{217} The family appears in a landscape with a view of the Grote Kerk of Haarlem in the background. The vista may be one familiar to the family from their estate near Overveen, a village located in the vicinity of Haarlem, according to Judith van Gent. Jochem lived and worked in Amsterdam as a baker and merchant, but in a practice typical of other affluent burghers, he purchased an estate near Haarlem. When he bought the estate in 1648, a contemporary document described it as a “large, beautiful and pleasant manor called Tetro’s Bosch, situated in well-cultivated surroundings (\textit{grote, schooner, plaijsante ende wel beplante vermaeckelijcke hoffstedete Tetro’s Bosch})” and Van Gent has identified the house with a small tower visible in the middle distance as the family’s country estate.\textsuperscript{218}

Jochem van Aras’ motivation for purchasing a country estate near Haarlem and having van der Helst paint a view of that landscape in his family portrait may be the result of the patriarch’s desire to project ideas of leisure and nobility as facets of familial and communal

\textsuperscript{216} There may be other family-landscape-portraits that evoke the Haarlem countryside. Frans Hals, an artist who painted some of the earliest examples of family groups in landscapes, may situate his sitters in Haarlem environs, although he does not include particular architectural references that would allow for secure determination of setting. Frans Hals’ family-landscape-portraits include \textit{Family Group in a Landscape}, c.1648 (National Gallery, London), \textit{Family Group in a Landscape}, c.1648 (Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum, Madrid), \textit{Portrait of Gijsbert Claesz. van Campen and His Family in a Landscape}, early 1620s (Toledo Museum of Art and Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique in Brussels). For illustrations see Slive, \textit{Frans Hals}.

\textsuperscript{217} The daughter Maria, the couple’s only child to survive to adulthood, was 10 years old in the portrait. The painting was bequeathed to Elizabeth Claes Loenen and in an inventory of 1665 it was described as, “in the big hall: a large piece with three full-length portraits of Jochem van Aras, his wife and their daughter in a gilt carved frame by Van der Helst (int groot sallet Een groot stuk begrijpende drie contrefeytsels int geheel van Jochem van Aras met sijn huysvrouw en dochter met een vergulde, gesneden lijst, gedaen van der Elst).” Judith van Gent, “A New Identification for Bartholomeus van der Helst’s Family Portrait in the Wallace Collection,” \textit{Burlington Magazine} 101 (2004): 165–67.

\textsuperscript{218} Judith van Gent provided the English translation. Van Gent, “A New Identification for Bartholomeus van der Helst’s Family Portrait in the Wallace Collection,” 165.
identity. Samuel Ampzing describes the predilection of wealthy urbanites to purchase country estates near Haarlem and attributes it to the city’s *locus amoenus* (pleasant situation), that is, the superior quality of the woods, dunes and pleasant atmosphere of the Haarlem countryside. By the 1630s, the major themes of visual and verbal descriptions of Haarlem’s dunes and woods focused on the pastoral ideal, the fecundity and prosperity of the land, noble and spiritual connections, wealth and the leisure time afforded by it, and the country as a retreat from city life. The view in Van der Helst’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait evokes these associations as well.

The trees directly behind the family allude to the famous and frequently praised Haarlemmeershout (Haarlem woods) and connect the family to the noble foundations of the city and its environs. The Haarlemmeershout provided the very reason for the establishment of Haarlem. The Counts of Holland favored the site as a hunting ground, and they built a permanent hunting lodge nearby that later became the Haarlem town hall. The 1573 siege of Haarlem destroyed the woods, but the city replanted the Haarlemmerhout in 1583 with 10,000 trees brought from Amersfoort. These aspects of the Haarlemmerhout’s past carried enduring associations with nobility, grandeur and civic pride for many of Haarlem’s citizens throughout the seventeenth century. The presence of the trees within Van der Helst’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait links familial identity to these same ideas.

Jochem and his family did not go so far as to claim noble status outright through their panoramic-family-landscape-portrait, but he, like other wealthy burghers around mid-century, began adopting noble affectations. Ownership of a country estate and hunting became typical of
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this practice. In the family portrait, Jochem certainly presents himself as a hunter: he wears a riding jacket and boots, his hunting dogs rest obediently by his side, the barrel of his rifle visible just beyond his right shoulder, and Elisabeth holds up a dead hare.\textsuperscript{221} Until the early seventeenth century, hunting had been the privilege of the nobility and was regulated by strict protocols. Regulations stipulated that one had to be a member of the nobility, an \textit{ambachtsheer} (owner of an estate) or citizen with an income of more than 100 florins per year to hunt legally.\textsuperscript{222} The restrictions on hunting began to erode when prosperous merchants like Jochem accumulated wealth, estates with titles, and hunting rights, although as a member of the affluent middle class, he could only hunt smaller game, such as the hare held by his wife.\textsuperscript{223} When Jochem van Aras acquired Tetro’s Bosch on a long-term lease from the Lords of Brederode, the purchase agreement probably also included hunting rights, as Judith van Gent explains in her discussion of the portrait.\textsuperscript{224} The image of Jochem as a hunter shapes his identity as leisured, sophisticated and as prestigious as the illustrious burghers extolled in Ampzing’s city history of Haarlem.

It is significant that the artist highlights these features of Jochem’s identity and not his specific professional endeavors. The image emphasizes fruits of his marriage, wealth and social standing. The view of Haarlem from Tetro’s Bosch, and the silk dresses and pearl earrings worn

\begin{itemize}
\item 221 Marieke de Winkel, \textit{Fashion and Fancy: Dress and Meaning in Rembrandt’s Paintings} (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 102–3. Only those entitled to hunt were allowed one hare or two rabbits per week from September 15 to February 2. Scott A. Sullivan, \textit{The Dutch Gamepiece} (New Jersey: Rowman & Allanheld Publishers, 1984), 34. Western cities of the Dutch Republic with dunes and waterlands had a greater population of rabbits, hares, pheasants, grouse, duck, and other fowl. The eastern and northern territories had more forests that were better for hunting deer and larger game. Donna R. Barnes and Ruud Spruit, \textit{Food for Thought} (Midwoud: Peter Sasburg, 2010), 93.
\end{itemize}
by Elisabeth and Maria, presuppose a level of wealth that indicate that Van Aras had established himself professionally as a successful baker and merchant in Amsterdam. Bakers could acquire a significant amount of wealth since all classes ate bread at every meal. The provision of a necessary food staple also meant that bakers contributed to the health of the community. Jochem did indeed provide for the health of his family and Elisabeth also participates in this role. She holds a rabbit caught by her husband that could be consumed or sold to innkeepers, pastry chefs or merchants, who then sold the items to the public at markets.

The fertile nature of the couple’s union and Jochem’s business endeavors find a parallel in the fruit held by Maria. The apples gathered in her arms allude to Maria as the product of Jochem and Elisabeth’s union and, by extension, the couple’s fulfilled duties in marriage. Procreativity lay at the center of a wife’s primary duties in matrimony, as explained in the chapter on coastal-family-landscape-portraits. In other family-landscape-portraits, fruit often appears in portraits of children and it often has symbolic import.

Maria and the apples she holds reflect the Protestant conception of marriage, in which fruit embodied cultivated offspring. The juxtaposition of figures and landscape suggests that the status, lineage and prosperity of the family depended on the moral and civic fortitude of the parents and children, just as the city of Haarlem linked its prestige to its environs, including the dunes and woods.

---


226 Barnes and Spruit, *Food for Thought*, 93.

227 Contemporary dietary prescriptions often discouraged eating fruit, although foreign travellers to the Dutch Republic noted that people ate fruit at meals during the appropriate seasons. Johan van Beverwijck wrote in his 1636 medical treatise, *Schat der Gesontheyt* (Treasury of Health), “not only apples, but all soft-skinned tree-fruit…tend to have juices that spoil very easily. For that reason, Galen of Pergamum forbids its use by those who wish to live healthily.” Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy*, 240. Yet, Thomas Scott, who visited the Dutch Republic during 1672, notes that in season fruit was eaten at almost every meal. Kees van Strien, *Touring the Low Countries: Accounts of British Travellers, 1660–1720* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998), 370. As influential as Van Beverwijck was, it may be that opinions had started to change towards the end of the century regarding the consumption of fruit and the pervasive presence of fruit in portraits was a positive commentary on children.
Family at the Gates of Leiden

Like panoramic-family-landscape-portraits with views of Haarlem, Godaert Kamper’s Portrait of an Unknown Family, 1643, brings to the fore ideas about burgherlickheyt, and the notion of familial and communal identity as founded on civic virtue. Kamper’s image pictures a family of six on the left side of the composition before a copse (fig. 4). The family stands along the bank of a river or canal with a pair of swans, which approach a bridge and city gate.\textsuperscript{228} We currently have no information about the names and residence of the sitters in Kamper’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait to support the identification of locale; however, the city gate may be one of Leiden’s since the artist lived and worked there during the time he painted the image. Kamper was born in Dusseldorf in 1613/14, but spent a long stretch of his professional life in Leiden, that is, from 1633–59.\textsuperscript{229} I tentatively suggest that the city gate in Kamper’s Portrait of an Unknown Family is that of the Oude Wittepoort or Haagspoort (built in 1419 and demolished in 1650), alternatively called the former due to its location on the Witte canal and the latter because it led to The Hague (figs. 15, 16).

If the identification of the city gate as a Leiden landmark proves to be correct, its presence may refer to the fact that the depicted patriarch held an administrative position in some

\textsuperscript{228} Another example of a family pictured near a city gate is the Portrait of an Unknown Family by Monogrammist M.D.W., 1634 (Private Collection). According to Frauke Laarmann, this image is one of the earliest family portraits to place the sitters in a landscape setting. Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederlands familieportret,” 111. The structure on the right side of the composition is similar in form to many fortified town gates. The presence of figures and animals wandering or resting in front of the city gate in this image is also reminiscent of the activities depicted just outside of city limits in urban panoramas. Dirck Santvoort’s Portrait of an Unknown Family, 1625–49 (Unknown Location) is another example, which may show the sitters near the Montelbaanstoren on the Oudeschans in Amsterdam. The Montelbaanstoren was not part of a city gate per se, but it did mark a defensive point at the edge of the city in a similar manner to the function of city gates. For an illustration see “Attributed to Dirck Dircksz. Santvoort,” last updated December 30, 2012, http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/141218.

way connected to the boundaries of that city. Gates visually marked the edges of a city’s protective and commercial reach, although the power of civic authorities extended approximately seven-and-a-half kilometres beyond the physical borders.\textsuperscript{230} The male head of family in Kamper’s \textit{Portrait of an Unknown Family} may have been a regent of Leiden, as holds true in three other examples within the group of panoramic-family-landscape portraits. Regents had a greater vested interest in and responsibility for the protection of the city’s borders than did otherburghers. If the father had not been a regent, the inclusion of the city gate may indicate that he was a \textit{boomsluiter} (gate keeper). This civic administrative position aided the regents in their charge to protect the city’s residents, since gate keepers supervised access to the city.\textsuperscript{231} In addition to the setting’s evocations of such professional activities, the placement of the family outside the city gate in Kamper’s \textit{Portrait of an Unknown Family} alludes to leisure. The family appears in the liminal area just beyond the city gate, a space that allowed the sitters to remain within the protective embrace of the city, but outside the immediate cares of daily life.

The setting of Kamper’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait speaks not only to leisure, but also to civic pride as a facet of familial identity. The relational group stands along the edge of a canal, which may obliquely reference the source of Leiden’s economic success, the textile industry. The city’s fiscal vitality relied on the woolen textile industry, and it, in turn, depended


\textsuperscript{231} As regents took on greater power with the advent of the stadholderless period and the steady rise in urban population, they began delegating some of their duties regarding the monitoring of urban infrastructure. From 1582 to 1675, Leiden’s population grew from 11,000 to c. 65,000. Price, \textit{Dutch Society}, 89; de Bièvre, “The Urban Subconscious: Art of Delft and Leiden,” 229. As a lesser administrative position than those held by regents, the job usually provided a secondary income to families and was frequently used as a stepping stone to positions of higher authority and prestige. Arie van Steensel, “The Emergence of an Administrative Apparatus in the Dutch Towns of Haarlem and Leiden During the Late Medieval and Early Modern Periods, circa 1430–1570,” in \textit{Serving the Community: The Rise of Public Facilities in the Low Countries}, ed. Manon van der Heijden (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009), 49–54.
on the river water supplied by its location on the Rhine. The canal adjacent to the city gate may allude to this aspect of Leiden’s urban identity, which Jan Orlers lauded in his *Description of the Town of Leyden* (1614). Orlers praised Leiden in terms of its *ex utilitae*, or economic success. While the author did not claim the same *locus amoenus* for Leiden as Ampzing had done for Haarlem, Orlers did praise sites within the city, including protective ramparts such as the Haagsepoort. It would seem that the group in Kamper’s *Portrait of an Unknown Family* shared Orlers’ sentiment of pride for Leiden’s urban landmarks as the family members stand before the city gate.

Taken together with other redolent elements in the image, the landscape in *Portrait of an Unknown Family* has even stronger thematic connections to the ideas of respite and protection than to economic success. As noted earlier, the presence of the city gate and the location of the family on the edge of the city’s protected boundaries may have brought to mind notions of safeguarding and civic duty, evoking *burgherlickheyt* as a facet of familial and civic identity. These features of the image may have resonated with memories of Leiden’s role in the Eighty Years War as well. During the early years of the United Provinces’ fight with Spain, the city suffered a year of invasion and deprivation at the hands of Spanish forces. When the city emerged victorious from the siege of 1574, the regents cultivated an identity characterized by stoic endurance and a preoccupation with the passage of time, as argued by Elisabeth de Bièvre. She comes to this conclusion through an analysis of the town’s history, its coat of arms, and sculpted decoration on the façade and paintings within the city hall. Kamper’s panoramic
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family portrait seems similarly concerned with protection and longevity as evidenced by the presence of the city gate.

The interactions between family members and the objects they hold reinforce the importance of protection and endurance in Kamper’s *Portrait of an Unknown Family*. The husband stands to the viewer’s left with his right elbow akimbo and gloves grasped in hand. With his elbow akimbo, the husband indicates his authority and the couple’s clasped hands reflect the companionate nature of their union. The only male son stands to his father’s left and mimics his authoritative gesture, while he displays appropriate deference and submissiveness with his doffed hat. The mother points and draws attention to her eldest daughter, who embodies the fulfillment of her procreative role within the family. The eldest daughter in turn demonstrates an awareness of her role as a future wife in the way she protects her youngest sister by holding onto the leading strings of her dress with her right hand. The second youngest girl displays similar affection and protection in the way she holds the hand of the youngest sibling.

The three girls each hold additional objects that reflect a preoccupation with the transience of life and an interest in safeguarding the lives of offspring. The eldest girl holds carnations, the younger cherries and the youngest a rattle. Carnations often connoted divine love, resurrection and hope of eternal life, and were thought to ward off evil spirits. The rattle was a precious object indicative of the family’s material wealth and affection for the child, and like carnations, rattles demonstrated parental concern for children. Both motifs signal an acknowledgment of the preciousness of life and the hope for the mortal and spiritual well being.

---


236 This point was discussed in greater detail in the chapter “Coasts and Kin.”
of children, in addition to alluding to the fertility of the couple in producing offspring.\textsuperscript{237} These facets of Kamper’s *Portrait of an Unknown Family* link the dual concerns for familial and urban safety. Protection of the family emanates from the father, just as it derives from regents in a civic context.

**Families near The Hague**

Two families painted by Johannes Mijtens and Sybrand van Beest chose to have themselves depicted near The Hague (figs. 5, 6). These panoramic-family-landscape-portraits display several features already seen in Bartholomeus van der Helst’s *Portrait of Jochem van Aras and His Family* and Kamper’s *Portrait of an Unknown Family*, especially in their presentation of familial identity as a combination of leisure and civic pride. Similar to the panoramic-family-landscape-portraits discussed above, those painted by Mijtens and Van Beest draw on the characterizations of the depicted city already pervasive in various media.\textsuperscript{238} During the seventeenth century, citizens tied The Hague’s urban identity to the presence of the States General and the court of the House of Orange.\textsuperscript{239} The town had an international, cosmopolitan, aristocratic air based on the residence of the many diplomats and extended family or guests of the Princes of Orange. Some of these features of The Hague appear in the panoramic-family-landscape-portraits by Johannes Mijtens and Sybrand van Beest.\textsuperscript{240}

\textsuperscript{237} In addition, Leiden had only recently recovered from an outbreak of the plague in 1635. De Bièvre, “The Urban Subconscious: Art of Delft and Leiden,” 233, 235.

\textsuperscript{238} I call The Hague a city for the sake of consistency, although it was not legally granted rights as a city until the eighteenth century. G. de Cretser’s *Beschryvinge van ’s-Gravenhage* was published only in 1711 and reissued in 1729. Christine B. Weightman, *A Short History of The Hague* (The Hague: Kruseman, 1978), 53.

\textsuperscript{239} Weightman, *A Short History of The Hague*, 71.

\textsuperscript{240} Jacob van der Merck and Jan van Goyen’s *Portrait of an Unknown Family*, 1645–56 (Unknown Location) is another image that could be discussed in this section; however, I have been unable to find clear
Johannes Mijtens’ *Portrait of Rogier van Slijp(e) and His Family*, 1647, appears to align the sitters with ideals of leisure and sophistication evoked through specificity of setting and pastoral motifs, but this interpretation is complicated by the fact that there are no extant documents indicate that the family ever resided in The Hague (fig. 5).\(^{241}\) Traditionally, scholars have identified the sitters as Rogier Adriaensz. Slijpe (d. 1663), Beatrix van Lennep and their two sons Isaac and Rogier. The figures gather before a city profile of The Hague, marked by the tower of the St. Jacobskerk on the right side of the composition. Rogier held the position of *hopman* (captain) of the company of G. van Challancy in Friesland from 1604–24. Rogier having died in 1634, Mijtens’ image visualizes the posthumous nature of the patriarch’s portrait through the inclusion of the putti who circle above his head. Rogier married Beatrix van Lennep (1600–1672) in August 1622 and the couple had five children together: Abraham, Isaac, Rogier, Maria, and Elisabeth. Beatrix came from a prestigious German merchant family, who settled in Amsterdam by the seventeenth century. They were Mennonite silk merchants, who traded with the Levant and married into other wealthy and prestigious Amsterdam Mennonite families.\(^{242}\)

Rogier and Beatrix sit at the center of the familial cluster that is both animated and made intimate through the use of gesture. While the setting can be identified as The Hague, the family had no known obvious connection to that city. The location may indicate political affiliations with the House of Orange or social aspirations, since Isaac would later become burgomaster of reproductions to study. "Jacob van der Merck and Jan van Goyen, Portrait of a Family in a Landscape,” last updated February 18, 2014 [http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/51040](http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/51040).

\(^{241}\) Johannes Mijtens made a significant contribution to the genre of family portraits; his name is all but synonymous with images of families in a landscape setting during the second half of the seventeenth century. Most of the families Mijtens painted lived in The Hague, along with the artist, although this seems not to be the case with the Slijpe family. Alexandra Nina Bauer, *Jan Mijtens (1613/14–1670): Leben und Werk* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2006), 52–59.

\(^{242}\) Bauer, *Jan Mijtens*, 245.
Additionally, the hunting rifle and dogs that accompany Isaac on the far left side of the image may reflect the family’s aristocratic aspirations. The man’s hunting activities and loose tunic evoke the kinds of pastoral images and ideals popular among collectors in The Hague. \(^\text{244}\)

*Portrait of an Unknown Family*, 1650–74, by Sybrand van Beest, who was active in The Hague from 1629–66, also locates the figures within a view of the St. Jacobskerk; however, in this image, familial identity is linked to different facets of The Hague than seen in Johannes Mijtens’ panoramic-family-landscape-portrait (fig. 6). The mounds of vegetables and garden beside husband and wife and northwesterly view of the church relate the patriarch’s provision for the welfare of his family with the city’s responsibility to care for its citizens. The image further evokes notions of civic pride through its formal and iconographic similarity to market scenes in which the artist specialized (fig. 17). This panoramic-family-landscape-portrait incorporates elements of his specialization in other genres, but uncharacteristically features the location of the sitters outside the city instead of within the urban fabric. \(^\text{245}\) The collection of foodstuffs in a family portrait is more typical of families grouped around a table in an interior, or outdoor genre portraits, such as those by Jan Steen and Emanuel de Witte. \(^\text{246}\) Jan Steen’s *Portrait of Arend Bauer*, 243; “Johannes Mijtens, Portrait of a Person named Rogier van Slipj(e),” last updated September 6, 2013, [http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/169329](http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/169329).


\(^\text{245}\) The visual placement of the sitters beyond The Hague, with a view to civic landmarks may have some connection to other depictions of the town in paintings and maps that picture the countryside as an important auxiliary of the town. Charles Dumas argued this point for painted views by Jacob van der Croos and a map by Cornelis Elands. Charles Dumas, *Haagse stadsgezichten 1500–1800: Topografische schilderijen van het Haags historisch museum*, (Zwolle: Waanders, 1991), 224, 226.

\(^\text{246}\) Heemskerck is probably responsible for the earliest Dutch example of this type of family portrait from the sixteenth century. Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederlands familieportret,” 98; Victoria B. Greep, *Een beeld van het gezin: Functie en betekenis van het vroegmoderne gezinportret in de Nederlanden* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1996). Other examples are included in Pieter J. J. van Thiel, “‘Poor Parents, Rich Children’ and ‘Family Saying Grace’:
Oostwaert and His Wife, 1658, and Emmanuel de Witte’s Portrait of Adriana van Heusden and Her Daughter, 1662, for example, both contain an element of commerce since the Leiden baker Oostwaert appears in front of his wares and Adriana van Heusden stands before a fishmarket in Amsterdam (figs. 18, 19). These and similar market scenes have been connected to civic pride, especially those that depict markets in Leiden, Amsterdam and Haarlem. Although the market element is more subtle in Van Beest’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait, this image may also encompass the idea of civic pride.

Van Beest’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait is less about blending a family portrait with a market scene; instead it emphasizes the cultivation of foodstuffs, the cultivation of the family and offspring, and the provision for the health of both the family and city. The view of the church tower in Van Beest’s Portrait of an Unknown Family places them near the southwest corner of The Hague, where, according to Johan Blaeu’s 1649 aerial map of The Hague, a number of gardens existed (fig. 20). In the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic, people cultivated two types of gardens: domestic and market. The size of the garden behind the sitters and the type of vegetables suggest that the depicted garden was a market rather than domestic garden. Market gardens served the purpose of larger scale cultivation and were located on the periphery or just outside the city walls. Often, these gardens depended on familial cooperation


People grew aromatic herbs, medicinal herbs, some root vegetables and some leafy vegetables in domestic gardens. These were typically small in size, since they needed to satisfy the needs of only one family. Anton C. Zeven. “On the History of the Vegetable Garden in North-west Europe,” Botanical Journal of Scotland 46, no. 4 (1993): 606; Anton C. Zeven, “Vegetables and Vegetable Gardens in North-West Europe. Their History as Shown by 15th to 18th Century Paintings,” Pact 42, no. 15 (1991): 142–43; Erik de Jong “For Profit and Ornament: The Function and Meaning of Dutch Garden Art in the Period of William and Mary 1650–1702” in The Dutch
because families planted and harvested crops during different seasons. The volume of gourds, squash, nuts, pears, apples and melons in Van Beest’s image implies that the garden behind the sitters supplied the markets within The Hague. The presence of the church tower near the urban location of many of the fruit, vegetable, meat and fish markets signals the destination of the produce near the family. The dress and attitude of repose of the husband and wife indicate, however, that they are not farmers, but may have been landowners or investors in one of the gardens that supplied the citizens of The Hague with food. This would be in keeping with the fact that the economy of The Hague geared itself toward local consumption, rather than being dependent on major industries or trade. The garden and its produce would seem to equate the familial duty to provide for the health and well-being of family members with a


251 Weightman, A Short History of The Hague, 33.  

252 The garden may also have brought to mind life on a country estate, since many people had gardens. While the image does not include a view of a country house, it contains many features typical of the grounds of an estate, particularly those near The Hague. Gardens on country house estates were enclosed with hedges of elm, as is the garden in van Beest’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait. The inclusion of vegetables possibly grown on a country estate might signal a desire for or achievement of higher status. De Jong “For Profit and Ornament,” 16.  

concern for the welfare of the broader community. As the Calvinist Reverend Petrus Wittewrongel, who preached at the Oude Kerk in Amsterdam, advocated in *Oeconomia christiana* (1655), “Plant gardens and eat what they produce. Marry and have sons and daughters; find wives for your sons and give your daughters in marriage, so that they too have sons and daughters.”

The fruit and vegetables take on additional symbolic import within the context of the daughter’s gesture. She walks toward her parents with her right arm outstretched and a bundle of foodstuffs held by her left arm and hand. Much like the dog leaping at her feet, her actions connote filial obedience and discipline. Children offering or exchanging flowers or fruit with siblings or parents evoked filial obedience and the assumption that good children will always return the fruit to the giver when asked. This metaphorical trope appears in a number of family-landscape-portraits, including several examples by Frans Hals (figs. 21). Van Beest modifies this metaphor in his panoramic-family-landscape-portrait where the daughter proffers vegetables to her parents with her outstretched hand. The forward motion of her body reiterates the notion of exchange and thus obedience.

**Families near Utrecht**

No significant differences appear in the conventions of panoramic-family-landscape-portraits set in the cities of the maritime province of Holland and the inland province of Utrecht. In the images of families near the cities of Utrecht, the sitters find themselves paired with the locale’s most prominent and praised landmarks, which also appear in text and other images.

---


These images further exemplify the pairing of familial and civic virtue, and reinforce the notion that collective leisure activity, such as walking, provides one basis for the formation of collective identity.

In Jan van Bijlert and Bernardus Swaerdecroon’s *Portrait of Lambert van Kuijk and His Family*, c.1650s, the sitters appear in a landscape with a view of the Dom tower of Utrecht (fig. 7). The painting shows tobacco retailer Lambert van Kuijk (1623–89), his wife Maria Laurensdr. Rampens (d. 1676), and daughters Anna, Cornelia and Antonia. This composition is similar to that in the portrait of Johan van Clarenbeek (fig. 1). A panoramic view appears beyond the shoulder of Lambert van Kuijk and the rest of the family, who are juxtaposed against a wooded backdrop to his right. Similar to Clarenbeek, Lambert stands in a pose of command and authority with his right elbow akimbo and a walking stick in the opposite hand. While the life and circumstances of Van Kuijk remains unknown, his ability to commission a family portrait from Jan van Bijlert, a highly sought-after painter, whose work was also collected by the aristocracy in Utrecht and The Hague, indicates that he and his family lived in comfort and

---

256 This image is signed by both artists; it is one instance of Van Bijlert’s collaborations with other artists, such as Gijsbert de Hondecoeter and Cornelis Willaerts. In these instances, each artist worked in their specialty. The collaboration with Zwaerdecroon is slightly strange because they were both figure painters and portraitists, so it is most likely that Van Bijlert was asked to finish a painting begun by Zwaerdecroon. Evidence for this is based in the fact that the youngest daughter was born in 1656, two years after Zwaerdecroon’s death. Paul Huys Janssen, *Jan van Bijlert, 1597/98–1671. Catalogue Raisonné* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1998), 176; Albert Blankert, *Dutch Classicism in Seventeenth-Century Painting* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1999), 112; Marten Jan Bok, et al, *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*, 374.

257 Tobacco was grown in the Dutch Republic by 1615 and its common use can be gauged by the institution of a tax by the States Holland in 1623. Ingrid A. Cartwright, “Hoe Schilder Hoe Wilder: Dissolute Self-Portraits in Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Art,” (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 2007), 115. Between 1610 and 1620 the Dutch began commercial production of tobacco, first in Amsterdam and then in other towns in eastern and central parts of the Netherlands. The cultivation in eastern and central areas, especially Utrecht and Gelderland, prospered due to the increase in population that supported the labor-intensive process of cultivation. Smaller farms could sustain the demand because work could be done by women and children and it did not require a substantial financial output at the outset. Julie Berger Hochstrasser, *Still-Life and Trade in the Dutch Golden Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 180.
Lambert van Kuijk and his wife Maria appear to have fulfilled their procreative and protective roles within marriage, as three daughters appear grouped near their mother. Maria holds the hand of Cornelia in her left hand and cherries in her right. Anna, Cornelia and Antonia display sisterly affection through gesture and pose. The combination of cherries held by Maria and fruit held by the youngest, Antonia, indicate a concern for the spiritual and moral well-being of the children. The cupid with a bow and arrow hovering above the mother and sisters reiterates the symbolic message of the fruit motifs. The cupid also stands in for the couple’s son, Laurens, who died shortly after he was baptized in 1651.

The emphasis on fertility, protection and concern for spiritual well-being evident in the depiction of the family finds a counterpart in the landscape view. The determination of the setting as Utrecht derives from the appearance of the Dom tower in the far distance of Van Bijlert and Swaerdecroon’s Portrait of Lambert van Kuijk and His Family. The Dom tower attracted acclaim throughout the Dutch Republic partly because it was the tallest structure in all of the United Provinces. It stood at almost 110 meters (370 ft.) high, dwarfing the thirty-six other church towers in the city. Like the Grote Kerk of Haarlem and St. Jacobskerk of The Hague, this architectural landmark appeared in many cityscapes and frequently received praise in text. In 1663, when William, Lord Fitzwilliam visited Utrecht he wrote, “Within the town we saw the cathedral church, called the Dom, which is a great and rare building and of very great

258 Van Bijlert was patronized by important noble families from Utrecht and his work was collected by Frederik Hendrik and the Winter king and queen of Bohemia. “Jan van Bijlert,” last updated July 16, 2013, http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/artists/8324.

259 Janssen, Jan van Bijlert, 176; de Meyere, Utrecht op schilderijen, 195–96.

260 There is at least one other family-landscape-portrait that depicts the sitters near Utrecht. In Christiaen van Colenberg’s Family Portrait in a Landscape, c. 1660–1665 (Centraal Museum, Utrecht), the patriarch points to the Dom tower in the far background. The Dom tower appears in several fifteenth-century devotional images or altarpieces, including Jan van Eyck’s Altar of the Lamb and the Virgin and Child with Chancellor Rolin. It also appears in a portrait of a man from 1480. Jos de Meyere, Utrecht op schilderijen: Zes eeuwen topografische voorstellingen van de stad (Utrecht: Kwadraat Utrecht, 1989), 175–81.
revenues...The steeple of this church is four hundred and fifty stairs high; from it you may see on a clear day Amsterdam.”

Praise for the landmark in image and text stemmed from feelings of civic pride, because initially the building of the cathedral was a communal, municipal undertaking. The structure became an immense source of civic pride for Utrecht burghers because tax revenues collected annually paid for the tower’s upkeep. The tower of the cathedral evoked Utrecht’s glorious past as the Catholic spiritual center of the Low Countries, but once ownership of religious sites and landholdings transferred to urban administrators after the Reformation, it became indicative of communal wealth, power and unity. The juxtaposition of the Van Kuijk family with the Dom tower suggests that the family contributes to the prestige of Utrecht just as the tower does. Prior citizens brought honor to the city through their efforts and sacrifice in building the cathedral and so too does Lambert van Kuijk through his successful mercantile activities.

Van Bijnert and Zwaerdecroon’s celebration of familial procreativity in their Portrait of Lambert van Kuijk and His Family also seems to echo praise for the fecundity of the Utrecht landscape. In Joost van den Vondel’s 1665 poem about the city he wrote:

This flourishing city, capital of the province of Utrecht, Lies in a blessed, fertile bosom of clay soil. Here swell the ears of corn, there the udders, filled with cream. Here lies the herdmen in the shadow of the tree. Here the rivers Vecht and Mare flow through orchards and gardens And the estates. Here woodland scenes attract The turtledoves and cattle. There sucks the honeybee. There sing the nightingale and the lark happily A sweet song that is never inclement to the ear.

---

261 Van Strien, Touring the Low Countries, 332.

How does one call Utrecht, then? A cornucopian paradise.\textsuperscript{263} The equation of the fertility of the land with procreativity in marriage resonated as an especially powerful metaphor in agrarian provinces, such as Utrecht. Additionally, this metaphor likely had personal significance for Van Kuijk, who traded in tobacco, an agricultural product grown in Utrecht.

In Christiaen van Colenberg’s \textit{Portrait of a Family with Kasteel Duurstede in the Background}, c.1665, the notion that leisure and civic pride formed the basis of familial identity, as seen in Van Bijlert and Zwaerdecroon’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait, again comes to the fore (fig. 8). Similar to Mijtens’ \textit{Portrait of Rogier Slijp(e) and His Family}, van Colenberg’s image seems to reference the family’s political affiliations. A family of five stands and sits in the foreground, with a view of Kasteel Duurstede visible on the right side of the composition and a vista to a duned landscape on the left. The mother sits on the right, with her youngest child in her lap, while the elder daughter, father and son stand in the middle of the composition. The figures have taken a carriage to their locale, as indicated by the horse-drawn transport behind the resting mother.

Van Colenberg’s \textit{Portrait of a Family with Kasteel Duurstede} includes a number of motifs and details that express ideas regarding procreativity, filial obedience, and leisure similar to those discussed elsewhere in this chapter. The mother clearly fulfills her duties as wife and parent to bear, protect and educate her children. The way she cradles her daughter and the pile of fruit in the child’s lap convey these ideas. Filial obedience can be seen in the fruit held in the

\textsuperscript{263} “Dees stadt, de hoofstadt van het Sticht, in top gestegen / Leght in een vruchtbren schoot van klaygront, ryk van zegen. / Hier zwelt de korenaer, daer d’uier vol met room / Hier rust de herder in de schaduw van de boom. / Hier vloeiien Vecht en Mare door boomgaert en prieelen, / En heerenslooten heen, hier trekken boschtooneelen / De tortels en het vee, daer zuigt de honinghby. / Daer zingt de nachtegaal en leeurik even bly / Een liefeluk gezang, dat noit het oorverveelde. Hoe noemt men Utrecht dan? Een Paradys vol weelde.” Translation in Verbaan, “Recent city histories in historical perspective,” 281–82.
outstretched hand of the elder daughter and also by the small dog that looks back toward the son. The boy’s pose echoes that of his father, reinforcing the idea that he has absorbed lessons in obedience and pursues a path to virtue in emulation of his father. Leisure and respite from daily cares form a major component of this family’s identity. Van Colenberg communicates these ideas through several details: the empty carriage behind the mother and the walking sticks held by the father and son in their left hands. The carriage and the servant who tends to the horses further indicate the wealth and prestige of the family, who may have required such transport if they lived a short distance away in Utrecht or one of the many villages, such as Wijk bij Duurstede, near the landmark of Kasteel Duurstede.

Kasteel Duurstede stood as a significant historical site connected with strength and nobility in the province of Utrecht. Zweder van Zuilen built the castle in the thirteenth century and it later became the residence of the Burgundian bishop David, bastard son of Philip the Good, in the fifteenth century. David erected the tallest visible tower in Van Colenberg’s image. He lavishly decorated Duurstede with the aid of artists like Jan Gossaert and turned it into a humanist center of learning. Subsequent bishops of Utrecht retained ownership, although Charles V, Hapsburg king of Spain and Holy Roman Emperor, had possession of the castle briefly. In 1577, at the outset of the Eighty Years War, the States of Utrecht seized ownership. Utrecht did not have the funds to maintain the castle and it quickly fell into disrepair;

---

264 The castle fell into Burgundian hands only after Jacob van Gaesbeek, Lord of Abcoude and descendent of Zweder van Zuilen (also called Zweder I van Abcoude), was forced to hand over the site due to a conflict with the bishop. Fred Gaasbeek, Marinus Kooiman and Ben Olde Meierink, Wijk bij Duurstede: Geschiedenis en architectuur (Zeist: Kerckebosch, 1991), 33–34, 73, 129.

however, it remained a popular attraction within the province. Van Colenberg does not show the parts of the structure that had begun to crumble, but these features are visible in Thomas Doesburgh’s later etching *View of Wijk by Duurstede*, 1692–1714 (fig. 23). The painted view of the castle privileges the fifteenth-century Burgundian tower and thus seems to emphasize the nobility and cultured sophistication, as well as the fortified power of the site. Through the juxtaposition of the pictured family with Duurstede, the sitters appear to partake of the prestige and noble aura associated with previous owners.

Van Colenberg’s *Portrait of a Family with Kasteel Duurstede in the Background* may be part of a broader trend of pairing seventeenth-century families with Medieval or Renaissance castles in order to allude to elevated social aspirations, political or civic connections and the family’s honor or nobility. Although the specific castles are not identified, Jan Daemon Cool’s portrait of *Eeuwout Prins and His Family*, c. 1635, and Jacques van der Wijen’s *Wooded Landscape with a Family*, c. 1631, seem to function similarly to Van Colenberg’s family-landscape portrait (figs. 11, 12).

---

266 The castle no longer exists; it was one of the many sites destroyed by the French during the rampjaar of 1672. A. A. Vorsterman van Oijen, *Het kasteel Duurstede* (‘s Gravenhage, 1882), 1–11.

267 Jan van Goyen’s *View of the Castle of Wijk at Duurstede*, 1649 (The Getty Center, Los Angeles), shows a slightly different view of the castle.

268 Tower elements were representative of fortification and strength, but they were not put to practical use since Kasteel Duurstede functioned mostly as a residence and not as a defensive position in any skirmishes. Hans L. Janssen, “Tussen Wonig en Versterking: Het Kasteel in de Middeleeuwen,” in *1000 Jaar Kasteel en Nederland: Functie en Voorm Door de Eeuwen Heen*, eds., H.L. Janssen, J.M.M. Kylstra-Wielinga and B. Olde Meiering (Utrecht: Matrijs, 1996), 67.

269 There are also a number of children’s portraits that portray the sitter in front of a Dutch castle. These images, too, may allude to the political affiliations of the parental couple. See for example, Jacob Gerritsz., *Portrait of an Unknown Child with Egmond Castle in the Background*, c. 1625–49 (Unknown Location, RKD IB 00103232) and Jacob Gerritsz. and Aelbert Cuyp’s *Portrait of a Young Boy and Girl in a Landscape with the Ruin of Egmond Castle Beyond*, c. 1650 (Dordrechts Museum, Dordrecht).
Jan Daemon Cool’s portrait of Eeuwout Prins and His Family, c. 1635, portrays the family within a densely forested area with a view of a castle in the background (figs. 11). Eeuwout Prins (1590–1636) and his wife Catharina Keyser (1597–1665) sit on the right side of the composition in front of a copse. A view to a castle in the distant background separates the parents from their three children, Anna, Adriaen and Eeuwout Eeuwoutsz. on the left side of the image. The patriarch Eeuwout was a merchant and owner of a brewery called Het Lam (the lamb), and medeoprichter (co-founder) of the V.O.C. chamber in Rotterdam. In 1618, Eeuwout married Catharina Keyser, whose father was a member of the Rotterdam vroedschap and had served as burgomaster. These political connections gained through marriage proved beneficial for Eeuwout the younger and Adriaen. Eewout Eeuwoutsz. would later be elected schepen of Rotterdam (1649–1650) and Heilige Geestmeester (regent of a charitable institution) from 1654 until his death in 1662. Adriaen served as schepen (1654–55), lid van de vroedschap (head of the town council) (1661–68), weesmeester (government administrator of orphans’

---

270 A portrait of an anonymous family, possibly by David Vinckboons or Thomas de Keyser, pictures the sitters before a structure that seems to have similar architectural features as the building in Cool’s family-landscape portrait. Whether the building behind the unknown family is a civic landmark or country estate is unclear because the structure is largely obscured by foliage. Laarmann, “‘Het Noord-Nederlands familieportret,’” 111.

271 Catharina bore seven children, but only three survived to adulthood. One child was stillborn and three others died in infancy. Rudolph E. O. Ekkart, “De Rotterdamse portrettist Jan Daemen Cool (ca.1589–1660)” Oud-Holland 111, no.4 (1997): 228. The grouping of the figures on either side of the image with a landscape view between them was a compositional device that probably originated with Cool. He deploys a similar formal arrangement in his portrait of the Arckenbout family discussed in the “Coasts and Kin” chapter.

272 Rudolph E.O. Ekkart, “Rotterdamse Portrettisten in de Zeventiende Eeuw,” in Rotterdam Meesters uit de Gouden Eeuw, ed. Nora Schadee (Zwolle: Waanders, 1994), 229; Lisbeth van der Zeeuw, Oog in Oog: Portretten van Rotterdammers (Rotterdam: Koppell Uitgeverij, 2003), 347–48. One of Cool’s other clients was Cornelis Arckenbout, who made his wealth as a brewer in Den Briel before moving to Rotterdam. In Rotterdam, Arckenbout was elected schepen and served on the vroedschap. The trajectory from merchant to regent is typified in the Arckenbout and Prins families. The fact that both originated as brewer families is indicative of the power of merchants to elevate their social station through wealth, as well as marriage, and of the importance of the brewing industry to the Dutch economy. “Jan Daemen Cool, A Dutch Family Group,” https://www.nationalgalleries.org/collection/artists-a-z/c/artist/jan-daemen-cool/object/a-dutch-family-group-portrait-of-a-man-woman-and-two-girls-ng-2259; Ekkart, “De Rotterdamse portrettist Jan Daemen Cool,” 204.
estates) (1661-63, 1666), *bewindvoerder* (administrator) of the V.O.C. (1663–1664) and burgomaster (1667–1668).\(^{273}\)

As with many family-landscape portraits, details of pose and gesture suggest the companionate nature of the marital couple’s union. Eeuwout and Catharina sit in close proximity and display the traditional heraldic positioning of husband and wife in portraiture. The artist suggests an affective relationship between the two in the intimate grouping of the figures, the slight twisting of Eeuwout’s torso and face toward his wife, and the intimate placement of Catharina’s hand on her husband’s lap.

The three siblings stand in three-quarter profile, turned towards each other as a self-contained unit, while looking out toward the viewer. The group is visually connected to their parents through the brocaded natural motifs on their clothing.\(^{274}\) The image lacks many of the motifs seen in other family-landscape portraits that communicate the familial values of obedience, industriousness, fulfillment of expected social roles and honor. Instead there is a focus on earned leisure; there is a display of wealth and accessories that communicate industriousness and honor in a commercial or political sphere that would have made possible the leisure activities of walking and visiting castle sites outside of town. In addition to the sumptuously detailed brocaded details on the garments of Anna, Eeuwout and Catharina, mother and daughter wear jewels, Anna holds a fan by her side, and Eeuwout Eeuwoutsz. and his

---

\(^{273}\) Ekkart, “De Rotterdamse portrettist Jan Daemen Cool,” 228, 230. The younger Eeuwout commissioned a family portrait of his own painted by Hendrick Sorgh. In this image, the group appears in an interior domestic space. Adriaen probably appears in a second family portrait, as well. He may be included in Bartholomeus van der Helst’s *Portrait of a Family (Possibly Willem Visch, Eva Bisschop, Laurentia Visch, Adrien Prins and Willem Prins* c. 1652 (Hermitage, St. Petersburg). This image likely portrays Adriaen and his wife Laurentia Visch with their son Willem, and his in-laws, Willem Visch and Eva Bisschop.

\(^{274}\) In the death inventory of Anna the family portrait was listed as, ”oock de groote schilderij daer mijn vader en moeder met haer kinderen staen” (a large painting of my father and mother with their children). Ekkart, “De Rotterdamse portrettist Jan Daemen Cool (ca.1589–1660),” 230; “Jan Daemon Cool,” last updated August 25, 2014, [https://rkd.nl/explore/images/11430](https://rkd.nl/explore/images/11430).
namesake hold gloves. The two brothers Adriaen and Eeuwout Eeuwoutsz. also display features of a leisured lifestyle earned by industriousness in their hunting accouterments. Adriaen holds a hunting rifle while Eeuwout Eeuwoutsz.’s right arm and hand, as they hang by his side, draw the viewer’s attention to the hound resting at his feet, which holds a duck in its mouth. The fowl could have been captured from along the edges of the water in front of the castle at the center of the composition.275

The castle in the image and its surrounding moat reflect an older fifteenth- and sixteenth-century architectural style of country seat that was fortified with rounded towers and turrets, and frequently surrounded by a body of water, similar to some of the features of Kasteel Duurstede.276 Castles in this style typically remained in aristocratic families for centuries, but if the owners were ousted by religious or political upheaval, the ruling authorities in the nearest large city in the province could seize control of the site. As with the example of Kasteel Duurstede, such locations that were controlled by regent bodies could become sites of civic importance even if they fell into disrepair. On occasion, however, regents and wealthy burghers bought such estates as noble families fell on hard times or their lines died out. When rich burghers and the ruling elite did buy kasteelen, frequently they kept some vestiges of the older architectural style, but incorporated some of the more popular classicizing features of newer built buitenplaatsen (country estates). This can be seen in Johannes Mijtens’s portrait of Michiel Pauw, Anna Maria Fassin and Their Children, 1654, which will be discussed in greater detail in the chapter, “Domains and Dynasties.” Even when kasteelen remained in noble hands, the

275 Although Adriaen carries a rifle, it is unlikely the boys used that weapon to kill their prey. More often dogs were used to catch smaller game and fowl. See above note 49 in the discussion of Bartholomeus van der Helst’s Portrait of Jochem van Aras and His Family.

owners often modernized the façade, as was the case with Johan van Wassenaer van Duivenvoorde at Kasteel Duivenvoorde.277

The Prins family almost certainly did not own the castle seen in their family-landscape portrait. There is no evidence the family held any property or residences outside the walls of Rotterdam.278 Eddy de Jongh suggests that in light of this knowledge, the site functioned as a status symbol, indicating changes in fortune or social standing of the family.279 This proposal fits with Eeuwout’s opportune marriage to the daughter of a regent, and the elite connections he would have gained through this relationship. Although Eeuwout could not know the high level of political success his sons would achieve after his death, the inclusion of the castle in the family portrait may indicate the patriarch’s hopes for his progeny to circulate within the sphere of civic authorities who might have had control over the castle, and thus was also an expression of civic pride. At the very least, the pictured castle alludes to the idea that the honor and nobility of historic sites parallels the similar familial virtues.

While details regarding the biography of the sitters, and the castle and wooded locale in Jacques van der Wijen’s Wooded Landscape with a Family, c. 1631, are lacking, this image may also have communicated notions of civic pride, honor and virtue for the sitters (fig. 12).280 The

---


278 Luuc Kooijmans, “Patriciën en aristocratisering in Holland tijdens de zeventiende en achttiende Eeuw,” in Der Blom der Natie: Adel en Patriciën in de Noordelijke Nederlanden, eds. J. Aalbers and Maarten Prak (Amsterdam: Boom Meppel, 1987), 100; Johannes Hendrikus Scheffer, Genealogie van het geslacht Prins (Rotterdam: Van Hengel & Eeltjes, 1878), 6, 12–14.

279 De Jongh also proposes that the trees and water might have had pietistic overtones through their allusion to Psalms 1: 3, which states “And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.” De Jongh, Portretten van Echt en Trouw, 221–24.
oblong composition shows a family in the foreground on a wooded lane that appears to lead to a castle in the distance on the left side of the composition. The structure again adopts many features of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century castles. The aerial perspective displays the densely forested terrain and clearly indicates the site’s remove from urban cares. Van der Wijen also includes several pastoral elements to suggest an aspect of leisure. The field that leads to a body of water around the castle contains riders on horseback, clothes drying, grazing animals and a resting peasant pair. The *pater familias*, as he stands on the far left in the heraldic position next to his wife in the lane, draws the viewer’s attention to this space through gesture. Two older sons stand next to their mother turned in three-quarter profile to the right side of the composition. The woman in the center, who appears to be the eldest daughter, holds a broad-brimmed walking hat in her hands. The hat may be an attribute to reinforce the country atmosphere since the winged coif on her head provides some measure of protection against the elements. The youngest boy standing right of center shows deference to his elder brothers and father in his manner of doffing his hat. The cluster of three girls on the right engage with each other and the other family members through gesture. The two standing girls point to their brother, while the younger of the two places her hand in the lap of her seated sister. The seated girl holds a garland in her hand and another broad-brimmed hat lies on the ground beside her.\footnote{Without biographical information, it is only possible to speculate, but pictured children might be the product of multiple marriages of the husband and wife since four of the siblings appear close in age. It is possible that one of the girls was a maid to the family, but in examples where a maid appears in a family-landscape portrait, she is usually pictured in profile, at the edge of the family group or behind the row of family members. For example, as mentioned in the chapter, “Panoramas and Progeny,” the woman on the right holding the leading strings of the youngest child in Cornelis Adansz. Willaerts’ *Portrait of a Family with Rhenen in the Background*, c. 1630–50 (Castello Sforza, Milan) and the woman at the right edge of the family group in Frans Hals’ *Family Group in a Landscape*, c. 1647–50 (National Gallery, London) are likely maids.}

\footnote{The same may be said about *Family in a Landscape* by an unknown artist, c. 1625 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), however the anonymity of the sitters and artist make it difficult to speculate with any reasonable sense of confidence. For an illustration see, “Portret van een echtpaar met vier kinderen,” http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.COLLECT.4692.}
Absent specific information about the sitters or the site, it is only possible to conjecture on the significance of the estate for the identity of the family. The idea that the castle may have held broad political or civic significance is strengthened by the existence of another almost identical composition, Jacques van Wijen’s *Wooded Landscape with a Couple*, c. 1630–1638 (fig. 24). The two highly similar images may be interpreted in several ways. The castle may be a generalized status symbol indicating social aspirations; it may connote civic pride in an historical site possibly with political overtones; and/or the images may demonstrate the appeal of a certain style of landscape among collectors. An appreciation of the distinctive rendering of the landscape and its contents likely formed reasons for the commissioning or collecting of both images. While Dutch artists tended to be repetitive in terms of style and content, they usually inserted greater variety in their compositions than is evident in the two images under discussion here. Perhaps the owners valued the landscape backdrops for their stylistic distinctiveness and possibly civic or personal connections attached to the castle view.

**Families of Rhenen**

Cornelis Willaerts’ *Portrait of an Unknown Family with Rhenen in the Background*, 1630–50, expresses familial values and virtues in a manner akin to that of other family-

---


283 Jacques van der Wijen (1604–38) lived and worked in Amsterdam. He trained under Gillis van Coninxloo, whose landscapes were popular among Amsterdam collectors. The artist was from a Flemish immigrant family, so perhaps the sitters were as well. The sitters’ patronage of Van der Wijen also may communicate the idea that the family has a vested interest in their new country of residence. The castle may suggest that they have established roots, permanence and longevity. “Gillis van Coninxloo and his Disciples,” 36; “Jacques van der Wijen,” last updated July 1, 2013, [https://rkd.nl/explore/artists/85818](https://rkd.nl/explore/artists/85818).

284 Frauke Laarmann argues that some family portraits can be understood in terms of its value as a collector’s item, as an object whose value lies in the name of the artist who painted it and an appreciation for the artist’s pictorial specialization. Laarmann makes this assertion for Hendrick Avercamp’s *Winterlandscape with Skaters and Family Portrait* and Adam Willaerts’ *Portrait of a Family on the Maasmond at Den Briel*. See figures 1 and 2 from the chapter “Coasts and Kin.” Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederlands familieportret,” 118.
landscape-portraits (fig. 9). The parental couple stands on the left side of the composition with children arranged horizontally to their right. The couple appears in the traditional, heraldic arrangement and they grasp hands. These features demonstrate the companionate nature of their relationship and their faithfulness to each other. They thus fulfill the expected roles within the marriage. The thistle and ivy that the *pater familias* points to in the foreground highlight the overall emphasis on faithfulness, since these plants were traditionally associated with marital fidelity. The couple’s union has produced five children in whom they have inculcated the values of obedience and discipline. The two older girls hold gloves, a sign of the family’s wealth and the girls’ modesty. In this instance none of the sisters hold carnations or fruit, but they demonstrate an interest in caring for each other in the way the two girls in the center of the composition clasp hands and in the way the eldest daughter holds the leading strings of the youngest sister in her left hand.

Within the horizontal arrangement of figures, Willaerts has paired off four of the sitters, which works to convey a sense of unity and accord. Peaceful co-existence lay at the core of both familial and civic values. In their description of virtuous and illustrious residents, most *stadbeschrijvingen* promulgated the idea that a municipality’s prosperity rested upon cooperation and harmony among its leading citizens. Although no city history existed for Rhenen during the seventeenth century, it would seem that peaceful co-existence was at the core of both familial and civic values in that city as well. The group in this panoramic-family-landscape-portrait seems to acknowledge these ideals in the way it presents the family as embodying those values.

---


The landscape view behind the sitters reaffirms the virtues of cooperation and connects the family to the political, civic and spiritual associations of the site. The view behind the sitters consists of grazing and resting animals and the newly built Koningshuis with the tower of the St. Cunerakerk, which appears to rise from the center of the building. The gothic tower of St. Cunerakerk, although not quite as famous as Utrecht’s Dom tower, is the distinguishing feature of Rhenen’s city profile. Like church landmarks in the panoramic-family-landscape-portraits that include views of Haarlem and Utrecht, the tower alludes to the morality, virtue and devotion to the common good in Willaerts’ *Portrait of an Unknown Family with Rhenen in the Background*.

Complementary meaning may be found in the buildings and grounds of the Koningshuis as they appear in this panoramic-family-landscape-portrait. Frederik V, Elector of Palatine and cousin to the Princes of Orange, and his wife Elisabeth Stuart, commissioned Dirck van Bassen to remodel the St. Agnes Convent that previously stood on the site of the Koningshuis. Although Frederik V and Elisabeth spent a significant amount of time in The Hague with the rest of the Orangist court, they chose Rhenen for a country retreat because they had stayed there on previous occasions when accompanying the stadholder as they passed through the area. When

287 Although less populous than neighboring Utrecht, Rhenen had served as a strategic defensive post for the protection of Utrecht during the Middle Ages and it had been a pilgrimage site until the Reformation. Rhenen began to emerge as a popular subject for paintings and drawings in the decade of the 1620s, when Dutch artists turned to portraying distinctly local landscapes. Hercules Seghers painted one of the earliest views of Rhenen in 1625 and Jan van Goyen sketched or painted the city and its environs no less than 28 times between 1636 and 1655. Other artists who painted views of Rhenen include Salomon van Ruysdael, Philips Koninck, Pieter Saenredam, Abraham de Verwer, Jan de Bisschop, Rembrandt, Lambert Doomer, Gerbrand van den Eeckhout, Jacob van Ruysdael, Johannes Ruyscher, Aelbert Cuyp, Daniel Schellinks and Anthonie Waterloo. Adriane van Suchtelen and Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., eds., *Dutch Cityscapes of the Golden Age* (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2009), 224, note 10; Audrey M. Lambert, *The Making of the Dutch Landscape: An Historical Geography of the Netherlands* (New York: Seminar Press, 1971), 329.

288 The deposed Bohemian king was cousin to the Dutch stadholder Frederik Hendrik, a prince of Orange, and he was welcomed to the Dutch Republic because he was perceived as a defender of Protestant freedoms. Frederik V, King of Bohemia, married to Elisabeth Stuart, assumed the Bohemian crown in 1619 but was forced to relinquish the throne in 1620 after being defeated by Hapsburg adversaries at the Battle of the White Mountain in
Frederik V died in 1632, Elisabeth used the Koningshuis as a summer palace and occasionally invited other aristocrats and dignitaries to Rhenen. The Koningshuis certainly was a source of civic pride for the residents of Rhenen, including the family in Willaerts’ panoramic-family-landscape-portrait. One reason for commemorative views of the landmark in this and other images stems from the fact that the citizens of Rhenen agreed to pay one third of the cost of transforming the St. Agnes Convent buildings and grounds. The group in Willaerts’ *Portrait of a Family with Rhenen in the Background* and other like-minded burghers may have been motivated to invest their own money in this endeavor because they realized it would spur the local economy and bring the city fame and prestige.

Similar to families who stand before the landmarks of the Grote Kerk of Haarlem and the Dom tower of Utrecht in other panoramic-family-landscape portraits, this group has chosen to identify itself with a site of communal significance and in doing so, the family members tie themselves to the broader fortunes and virtues of the urban community and perhaps the political affiliations of the House of Orange.

Jacob Gerritz. and Aelbert Cuyp’s *Portrait of an Unknown Family with Rhenen in the Background*, 1641, shares a Rhenen backdrop with that of Willaerts’ *Portrait of an Unknown Family with Rhenen in the Background*; however, some of the meanings that may be ascribed to the image are different (fig. 10). The panoramic-family-landscape-portrait by Cuyp father and

---


291 This image was one of a type initiated by Jacob Gerritz Cuyp, Willem Heda and Frans Hals in the 1640s. During this decade Jacob and Aelbert often collaborated on paintings combining pastoral figures (and
son does not show the Koningshuis, so it probably does not have the same political overtones as found in Cornelis Willaerts’ portrait. Both images, however, picture the family against the backdrop of Rhenen’s Cunerakerk tower, and thus share the idea that the spiritual fortitude suggested by the church tower echoes the moral fortitude of the family.

In the foreground of the Cuyp’s painting, details of gesture and symbolic motifs reinforce the connection between familial and civic virtues. Jacob Gerritsz. and Aelbert Cuyp depict the parental couple seated near the trunk of a cut tree. A dog eats from the hand of the patriarch and a lamb feeds from the hand of the matriarch. Their child, probably a son, grasps the lamb’s rear and seems to guide the animal toward his mother. The symbolic import of the dog has been explained in reference to other family portraits as a sign of proper upbringing, or the instillation and absorption of the values of obedience and discipline. The lamb has a similar meaning in signaling the docility and obedience of the child, which are values he learned from his parents.

In addition, lambs, like the goats discussed in Heda’s panoramic-family-landscape-portrait, act as a visual device to celebrate leisured life as a complement to the industriousness of urban existence.

Conclusion

Throughout the seventeenth century, families living in cities across the Dutch Republic commissioned portraits of themselves within landscape backdrops, which included important civic landmarks. In most instances, such buildings were the tallest structures within each city, so


293 Bedaux, Reality of Symbols, 119.
they could be viewed from a distance. These landmarks indicate specific places, represent
community and history, and help convey the message that familial virtues parallel urban values
in panoramic-family-landscape-portraits. This message can also be gleaned from texts, such as
*stadsbeschrijvingen*, that praised famous citizens and a city’s buildings or topography as an
extension of urban pride and values. Through elements of setting and additional pictorial motifs,
the depicted families in panoramic-family-landscape portraits seem to embody *burgherlickheyt*
and the kind of praise lavished upon cities and their illustrious citizens in *stadsbeschrijvingen*.
Chapter 3: Ruins and Relations

Introduction

The seventeenth century was a time of urban expansion and building booms for many cities within the Dutch Republic, yet, its citizens remained fascinated with ruin and decay amidst the construction of the new. The ruins of buildings appear in many prints, maps, painted landscapes and family portraits (figs. 1–9). The notable difference between family portraits and other pictorial genres that depict ruins is that the crumbling structures in the former almost never represent sites indigenous to the Dutch Republic. The ruins in nine family-landscape portraits discussed in this chapter capture the ambience of Italy and specifically ancient Rome, but for the most part, they do not depict identifiable monuments. Rather, they allude to decayed structures in Rome with commemorative significance, such as the columns of the Temple of Saturn and Vespasian in the Forum, the sculptural group of the Discouri, the pyramid

---

294 I do not discuss Johannes Mijtens’ Portrait of the Lannoy Family, 1647 (Unknown Location), and Nicolaes Maes’ Family Portrait in a Landscape, c. 1650 (Unknown Location), because of the poor quality of available reproductions. Maes’ family-landscape portrait with ruins is problematic because it is known primarily through a truncated copy of the image, currently attributed to Cornelis Bisschop. It may be that the family appears outside their country estate in a Dutch locale with a Dutch ruin because there are few stylistic details that would suggest an Italianate setting; however, this cannot be substantiated due to the way the copy has been cropped. Susan Donahue Kuretsky, ed., Time and Transformation in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art (Poughkeepsie: Frances Lehman Loeb Art Center, Vassar College; Seattle: Distributed by the University of Washington Press, 2005), 272–73.

295 The well-known Dutch landmarks of Kasteel Ubbergen, Kasteel Brederode, Huis ter Kleef, and Huis te Merwede appeared on maps, and in painted or printed landscapes throughout the seventeenth century, but in no known family-landscape portrait. Several of these sites were ravaged during the Eighty Years War, so their pictorial depiction was associated with the Dutch struggle for independence. Catherine Levesque, “Landscape, Politics, and the Prosperous Peace” Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 48 (1997): 222–57; Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., Aelbert Cuyp (Washington: National Gallery of Art; London: Thames & Hudson, 2001), 154.

296 Within the context of genre imagery, Christine Skeeles Schloss calls the fictive, yet plausibly realistic Italianate harbor views capricci. I avoid this term because there is little evidence to suggest that an equivalent term existed in seventeenth-century Dutch. Christine Skeeles, Schloss, Travel, Trade and Temptation: The Dutch Italianate Harbor Scene, 1640–1680. Studies in Baroque Art History, Vol. 3 (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982), xv. Description of paintings with ruins in inventories compiled by J. Michael Montias either refer to a specific building or site, or as ”een ruintje,” or some variation of the spelling of “ruintje.” Montias Database of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art Inventories, hosted by the Frick Collection and Frick Art Reference Library.
of Cestius, the Temple of the Sybils at Tivoli and the sculpture of the lion attacking a horse on the Capitoline.²⁹⁷ Sixteenth-century Flemish humanist Justus Lipsius argued that such ruins connoted history and splendor. In *De Amphitheatro* (1584), a text describing the Colosseum in Rome, Lipsius states that, “In reality, these broken and crumbled constructions are still pervaded with the spirit of antique Rome.”²⁹⁸ The spirit of Rome, described by Lipsius in greater detail in *Admiranda sive de Magnitudine Romana Libri IV* (1598), was one of virtue and glory and its monuments stood as a symbol of growth and decay governed by divine Providence.²⁹⁹ One can assume that the more generalized ruins and buildings in family-landscape portraits were similarly redolent with symbolic meaning.

The choice of Italianate settings and ruins, and their significance to the families pictured in the images discussed in this chapter have remained largely unexplored in any depth by art historians. Yet the settings and pictorial details are meaningful for the interpretation and understanding of familial and individual identity because they depict the families transported...
beyond the shores of their homeland. In historiated family portraits, in which the sitters adopt the guise of real or fictional persons from antiquity, the inclusion of ruins complements the antiquated costume and helps define the family’s adopted personae. Yet, the reasons for ruins in family-landscape portraits are not quite as self-evident. The juxtaposition of contemporary clothing and ancient setting in the family-landscape portraits gives them a sense of vacillating between past and present.

As iconographic elements, ruins in such paintings can embody memento mori associations of decay and death while also promoting the importance of family history and past family members, that is, the foundation of the prestige of successive generations. Simultaneously, ruins hint at the eternal commemoration of the pictured family. The combination of ruins and certain other symbolic motifs allows the pictured family members to present themselves as honorable and worthy of remembrance. In addition, ruins enable the sitters to project an identity of elevated social status and sophistication, which the evocation of the groote tour (Grand Tour) to various Italian cities implies. Such portraits with an Italianate coastal setting and Dutch ships can also allude to the naval or commercial activities of the patriarchs and the introduction of sons into their professional endeavors. This chapter will
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300 “Italianate” as a descriptor of paintings by Dutch artists applies to landscapes or genres scenes pervaded by a golden cast of light upon classical ruins or mountainous terrain. Albert Blankert, Nederlandse 17e Eeuwse Italianiserende Landschapschilders = Dutch 17th Century Italianate Landscape Painters (Soest: Davaco, 1978), 7. See also, Frederik J. Duparc and Linda L. Graif, Italian Recollections: Dutch Painters of the Golden Age (Montreal: Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, 1990), 13–45.

301 Often, historiated portraits depicted the sitters as biblical figures because Roman ruins and Italian landscapes could evoke the Holy Land. Examples of historiated family portraits with ruins are: Pieter Hermansz. Verelst’s Unknown Family, 1643 (Unknown Location), Cornelis van Poelenburgh’s Portrait of Adolf van Nassau-Dillenburg and His Family (?) as Eliezer and Rebeccaah, c. 1625–49 (Unknown Location), Jan Victors’ Portrait of a Family in Exotic Dress, 1670 (Unknown Location), and Herman Doncker’s Unknown Family as Cornelia, Mother of the Gracchi, c. 1645–50 (Unknown Location). According to Ann Jensen Adams there are almost thirty examples of historiated family portraits. Ann Jensen Adams, “The Performative Portrait Historie,” in Pokerfaced: Flemish and Dutch Baroque Faces Unveiled, eds. Katiljne Van der Stighelen, Hannelore Magnus and Bert Watteuw (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 193; Peter C. Sutton, et al. Masters of 17th-Century Dutch Landscape Painting (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1988), 284.
discuss the family-landscape portraits within the contexts of the ideas of remembrance, cultural sophistication and commercialism.

**Remembrance, Memento Mori and Familial Legacy**

Crumbling relics of past glory may have found their way into family-landscape portraits for several reasons, but perhaps the most pervasive was their connotations of remembrance and *memento mori*. In an era that was fraught with outbreaks of the plague, war, treacherous travel for overseas trade and high levels of infant mortality, Dutchmen experienced death as a part of everyday life. Ruins’ presence of decay beside or behind the families evokes a sense of remembrance and their persistence throughout time confers a similar immortality to the families. Their association with death and memory is especially evident in Christiaan Coevershoff’s *Portrait of the Kluppel Family* (?), c.1645; the anonymous portrait of *Gijsbert van Hemert and His Family*, c. 1650–60; Cornelis and Herman Saftleven’s *Portrait of Godard van Reede van Nederhorst, Emerentia Oem van Wijngaarden, Catharina van Utenhove and their Children*, 1634; Herman Meindertsz. Doncker’s *Portrait of a Couple and Their Child in a Landscape*, c.1620–1656 and Doncker’s *Portrait of a Family in a Landscape*, 1644 (figs.1–5). The composition of the family, aspects of gesture and the combination of ruins with other symbolic motifs communicate ideas about social prestige, noble foundations and the importance of the success of present generations for successive ones.

---

The *Portrait of the Kluppel Family (?)* by Christiaan Coevershoff contains three generations of the same family, who likely resided in Enkhuizen. The elders on the left may be cloth maker Wessel Albertz. Kluppel (d. 1653) and his wife Gried Joriaensdr. The younger man and woman on the right possibly are their son, bookseller and printer Albert Wesselsz. Kluppel (1608–1653), and his wife Geert Heyns (d. 1669). In the middle is the three-year-old son of Albert and Geert, Hendrik Albertsz. Kluppel (1643–1702), who also became a bookseller, printer and later city secretary. The elder woman and younger man point to the landscape visible behind the child. Within the landscape appears a four-column colonnade silhouetted against mountainous terrain.

As seen in many other family-landscape portraits, the younger couple displays the affective and companionate nature of their marriage by grasping hands. Thus, the couple successfully manifests the social obligations in marriage. They further demonstrate their honor and virtue by caring for their son. The artist visualizes this concept through the rattle affixed to the chain that crosses the boy’s torso. As explained in the chapter, “Coasts and Kin,” this *pillegift* could symbolize the parental obligation to ensure the physical and long-term financial well-being of one’s offspring. Albert Wesselsz. Kluppel and Geert Heyns embody familial virtue, and by extension, so do Albert’s parents, Wessel Albertz. Kluppel and Gried Joriaensdr. Aelbert Wesselsz. and Geert could only claim to be virtuous and honorable if their parents had those qualities themselves and had successfully instilled them in their progeny.

Although the two couples loom large within the painting, Coevershoff also draws the viewer’s attention to the boy and the landscape background through compositional arrangement...
and gesture. The inclusion of three generations of the same family, and the emphasis on the young boy and the ruins through gesture and figural arrangement communicate the importance of legacy and longevity for this group. As Pieter Bietenholz explains, “The descent, pretend or real, from illustrious ancestors was seen to promise fame and popularity. It also invited the visual representation of such ancestors.”

In the broader tradition of family portraits in general, the appearance of multiple generations within a single image invoked *memento mori* associations and served as a kind of pictorial writing of family history. For example, an image like Dirck Dircksz. Santvoort’s *The Family of Dirck Bas Jacobsz., Burgomaster of Amsterdam*, c. 1635, places the elder couple in the center of the group while also drawing the viewer’s attention through gesture to the young boy on the left (fig. 10). Another example, Jan Miense Molenaer’s *Self-Portrait with Family Members*, c. 1635, makes history and memory explicit by including deceased grandparents as paintings on the wall behind the other sitters (fig. 11). Families who displayed images of departed relatives also continued to live with a reminder of their own mortality.

Willem Godschalck van Focquenbroch, a seventeenth-century Dutch poet and doctor, articulates this notion in *Gedachten op mijn kamer* (Thoughts in my room):

> And when a sidelong glance I cast  
> At pictures of my blood relations  
> I think: death claims us all at last.  
> Though on my walls hang imitations  
> The models perished in the past.  
> The fate that death turns each to dust,  
> All servants, serfs and lords see beckon;  
> Both poor and rich men always must  
> With their return to ashes reckon;

---


Death equalizes all, I trust.\textsuperscript{307} The ruins in the landscape settings in family portraits by Coevershoff and others discussed in this chapter similarly take on the function to remind one of death and communicate the importance of legacy.

Portraits generally and ruins in portraits specifically prompt viewers to contemplate those who lived before them. Dutch statesman Constantijn Huygens articulates the way portraits, and especially those with ruins, allude to mortality and immortality concurrently, noting that portraits “perform a noble work, that more than any other is necessary for our human needs, that through them we in a true sense do not die; furthermore as descendants we can speak intimately with our most distant ancestor.”\textsuperscript{308} In an emblem from Jan Luyken’s \textit{De bykorf des gemoeds} (The Beehive of the Mind) published in 1711, a couple contemplates those who preceded them as they look at ruins. The motto above the emblem reads, “Het Oud Gebow. Zy zynder gewest” (The old building. They have been there) (fig. 12).\textsuperscript{309} The coexistent nature of ruins’ persistence and

\textsuperscript{307} “Of sie ick van ter zijden aen / De Beelden van mijn Bloet-verwanten; / So segh ‘k: wie kan de doot weer staen? / Want schoon ‘t Copy hanght aen dees wanten / Het Principael is langh vergaen. / So maect de doot elck een tot slijck, / En spaert geen slaef, noch knight, noch Heeren / Want idermoet ‘t z yarn, of rijck, / In ‘t geen hy eertijts was, verkeeren; / So maect de doot elck een gelijck.” Translation in Maria A. Schenkeveld van der Dussen, \textit{Dutch Literature in the Age of Rembrandt Themes and Ideas} (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1991), 170–73.


decay parallels attitudes towards the picturing of ancestors in portraits. This message had even
greater poignant resonance in multi-generational family portraits.

Ruins were an index of history and time and their appearance in family-landscape
portraits reminded the viewer of the inevitability of decay and death. This notion is less explicit
in the portrait of the Kluppel family than in that of Gijsbert van Hemert and his family (fig. 2).
Gijsbert van Hemert (1590–1656), a burgomaster of Deventer and Lord of Slingelandt, is
pictured with his second wife Johanna Reiniera van Coeverden, whom he married in 1635. The
family-landscape portrait depicts the nine children from both of Gijsbert van Hemert’s
marriages. Six accompany their parents and the angels with palm fronds above Gijsbert’s head
represent three deceased children. Similar to Albert Wesselsz. Kluppel and Geert Heyns,
Gijsbert and Johanna clasp hands in nuptial affection. The couple demonstrates their fulfilled
roles in marriage and society in the fruitfulness of their large family as well as in their
embodiment of familial virtue. The family portrait of Gijsbert and Johanna indicate that they
have raised obedient, submissive children through the doffed hat held by the child on the far left,
the dog held in the lap of the boy sitting in the foreground center, and the large bird held by the
boy on the far right. As explained in earlier chapters, both animals could be trained, which
reflected on the good training of children. The bird may also allude to Van Hemert’s elevated
social status as Lord of Slingelandt for which he likely had hunting rights as part of the
privileges of the estate. The couple and six children stand within a landscape, which includes

---

310 Van Hemert’s first wife was Alegonda Scherff, whom he married in 1615. His nine children were:
Geertruid Christina, Johan van Laer, Johan, twins Harmanna and Geertruyd, Johannes, Reiniera Aleida, Johanna
Nederlandschen Adel met genealogische en heraldische aanteekeningen Deel 1 (Groningen: Wolters, 1883), 176–77.
remnants of an arched building beyond the shoulder of the eldest daughter. The *memento mori* associations of the ruins are magnified in the context of the angels who represent deceased children, and the presence of Van Hemert who also survived his first wife.

Although the images within this chapter form one of the smaller subsets of family-landscape portraits, a fairly long-lived visual tradition of ruins in family portraits as *memento mori* motifs precedes them. An early example is Monogrammist van Valenciennes’ *Family of Ivo Fritema*, c.1530 (fig. 13). The painting alludes to death, immortality and scholarly learning through ruins, as well as through the book and shrouded, deceased child in the foreground. The background shows the pyramid of Caius Cestius and the obelisk of Caesar. Both ancient Roman monuments evoked associations of honor, fame, death and immortality. The pyramid of Caius Cestius functioned as the tomb for a Roman magistrate and obelisks had been associated with funerary monuments since the end of the fifteenth century. While the pyramid and obelisk convey impermanence, they are also structures that embody the honor and fame of Caius Cestius and Caesar, rulers in ancient Rome, whose memory lived on through such edifices. The deceased child at the edge of the picture plane heightens the *memento mori* symbolism of the pyramid and obelisk.

---


313 Raphael’s design for the Chigi chapel and mausoleum at Santa Maria del Popolo in Rome included an obelisk shaped pyramid. In general, pyramids and obelisks were interchangeable in funerary monuments and as symbols of death and/or immortality during the Renaissance and later. De Jongh, *Portretten van Echt en Trouw*, 202.

314 The artist of this painting might have been aware of these monuments and their associations through the art of Jan van Scorel, who spent time in Rome as conservator of the Vatican collections. De Jongh, *Portretten van Echt en Trouw*, 202.
Gijsbert van Hemert may have requested the depiction of ruins in his family portrait not only to evoke the memory of deceased ancestors who might serve as exempla to subsequent generations, but also to indicate the noble or honorable foundations of his lineage. Van Hemert’s roles as burgomaster of Deventer and Lord of Slingelandt are certainly in keeping with elevated social aspirations. The inclusion of ruins asserts that the Van Hemert family could claim honor and fame by virtue of their juxtaposition with the commemorated and worthy ancient monuments.

Sixteenth-century artist Maerten van Heemskerck provides evidence of the lasting nature of this idea in the frontispiece to the 1569 print series *Clades Judacae Gentis*, which states that ruins embody “instructive examples for the future, from the past” (fig. 14). In their persistence through time, ruins allow the sitters to make claims about the immortality of their own worthiness. These claims are strengthened through the appearance of motifs symbolic of individual and familial virtue.

Cornelis and Herman Saftleven’s *Portrait of Godard van Reede van Nederhorst*, *Emerentia Oem van Wijngaarden, Catharina van Utenhove and their Children*, 1634, contains many similarities to the family-landscape portrait of Van Hemert and his family with regard to iconography and message (fig. 3). This family-landscape portrait shows several generations of the family and the symbolic motifs impart the image’s theme of *memento mori*. Godard van Reede van Nederhorst (1588–1648), a member of the Utrecht nobility and delegate for the States General, stands with one hand placed on a skull and the other on the head of his son. The skull rests on a tablet that reads, “Anhelo Superstes et Spero” (I breathe, survive, and remain hopeful). He looks toward his deceased first wife Emerentia Oen van Wijngaarden (died 1632), who lies

---

beneath a canopy with a small child standing at her side.\textsuperscript{316} As Frauke Laarmann-Westdijk has shown, the child’s white garment and proximity to his deceased mother indicates that the child is dead as well.\textsuperscript{317} Inscribed in the decorative detail of the carpet below the deceased mother and child is the text, “Extincta Prole Quieso” (My child is dead and I am at rest). Sandrina and Mechteld, the two eldest daughters, stand on the other side of Godard. Second wife Catharina Elisabeth van Utenhove sits in front of that pair and holds a basket of flowers as siblings Gerard, Hendrina and Margaretha stand around her. At the front edge of the painting, son Frederik Hendrik sits on an overflowing cornucopia as daughter Maria kneels next to him.\textsuperscript{318}

The two inscriptions very clearly indicate that the portrait is concerned with the presence of death in life, and several other pictorial motifs support this interpretation. The extinguished candle at the bottom right edge of the composition and the putti with garlands at the top left of the image have metaphorical associations with death. In contrast, the basket of fruit and flowers held by Catharina and the cornucopia that Frederik Hendrik sit upon allude to the fecundity and prosperity in life.

Some other landscape features may also relate to the painting’s theme of remembrance. In the background, a castle appears perched atop a mountain and in the ravine below, fragments of a building stand beside a river. The castle cannot be identified with any certainty as one of Van Reede van Nederhorst’s residences, but it might be understood as a motif that refers to


\textsuperscript{318} De Jongh, \textit{Portretten van Echt en Trouw}, 218–20; Warner, “Remembering the Mother, Presenting the Stepmother: Portraits of the Early Modern Family,” 141.
persistence and continuity, ideas articulated more explicitly in the inscription on the tablet: “Anhelo Superstes et Spero.” Areas of the stone surface of the building vary from lighter to darker browns, suggesting that the walls and tower may have suffered damage and then were rebuilt. If this were the case, the castle may symbolize the survival of the family dynasty. It is not clear if the setting refers to an Italian locale; however, the ruins may have nonetheless evoked ideas of decay and the past noble foundation of the family. This would be especially apt for Godard van Reede van Nederhorst since he was certainly a member of the nobility.

The two unknown families painted by Herman Meindertsz. Doncker in a landscape setting with ruins might also be seen as crafting familial identity as enduring, noble and honorable (figs. 4–5). In the first of the two, Portrait of a Couple and Their Child in a Landscape, c. 1620–56, Doncker groups the family unit closely together in the foreground (fig. 4). Little is known about the identity of the sitters, but it is likely they resided in Enkhuizen, since the artist was working in that city during the time the painting was completed.\(^{319}\) The couple does not clasp hands, but they do stand in the traditional heraldic position of the wife’s dutiful submission to her husband in marriage. The child holds a carnation in one hand and cherries in the other. The flower and fruit were symbolic of the couple’s marital fertility. As explained in the chapter, “Coasts and Kin,” the cherries could also signify the soul because they were considered the fruits of paradise and the food of children who died prematurely. The depicted parental unit may have been especially concerned with infant death since the child also wears a three-strand coral necklace. Children customarily wore such necklaces because coral was thought to have talismanic properties in protecting them against disease and death.\(^{320}\)

Although there is no clear visual indication that the child was deceased at the time of the painting’s execution, the combination of cherries and coral necklace do suggest parental concern for the well-being of their offspring.

The group stands in an Italianate landscape setting reminiscent of the administrative heart of ancient Rome. The ruins do not clearly identify a specific site, but they are evocative of the vestiges of the imperial palace complex on the Palatine Hill. The sketchily painted pastoral figures who congregate around a fountain serve to reinforce the Italianate setting. The ruins are a more dominant visual component in this family-landscape portrait than in those discussed previously. The lack of other symbolic details and information regarding the biographies of the sitters only allows speculation as to the meaning of the ruins for the identity of the family. The pervasive *memento mori* associations of ruins may be evoked by this image as well, which would complement the similar meanings of the cherries and coral necklace. Additionally, the ruins may signal that the family claims honor and the noble foundation of their lineage. The ruins may also indicate a mercantile connection to Italy, since Enkhuizen was a major port for trade and transport with that country.

The idea that the depicted family may have had commercial interests in the Mediterranean finds support by comparison with single or double portraits painted by Doncker during his time in Enkhuizen that also contain ruins and an Italianate landscape setting: *Portrait of an Unknown Man*, n.d.; *Portrait of a Man (Possibly Laurens Jansz. van Loosen)*, c. 1645; and *Portrait of a Wine Merchant and Possibly His Son*, c. 1645–50 (figs. 15–17). The first image depicts an ensign, perhaps associated with the admiralty located in Enkhuizen (fig. 15).

---

coastal setting and presence of frigates suggest that Dutch trading interests in Italy were important to this individual. In a second single portrait, Doncker’s painting of Laurens Jansz. van Loosen shows a man who may have been employed by the VOC as opperkoopman (chief merchant responsible for cargo and trade), and died in 1646 in Indonesia (fig. 16). The ruins in Van Loosen’s portrait are most similar to those in the image of the anonymous family in the Rijksmuseum collection so the sitters may have been acquaintances with similar business interests (fig. 4). The Portrait of a Wine Merchant and Possibly His Son most strongly indicates the sitter’s professional ties to Italy through the transport and trade in wine (fig. 17). A man, who holds up a glass of wine to another figure, perhaps his son, stands in front of a pile of kegs, while a youthful boy kneels in front of a tapped keg. The mountainous terrain and silhouette of a fragmented colonnade and tower in the background suggest an Italianate setting for the wine merchant, although the Dutch imported and transported higher quantities of wine from France and Germany. This concentration of family and individual portraits by a single Enkhuizer artist suggests that Doncker specialized in such portraits, which were in particular demand in that region of the Dutch Republic.

---

321 Ekkart, Portret van Enkhuizen in de gouden eeuw, 24.


323 Two other images may be added to this group: Portrait of an Unknown Man, 1656 (Unknown Location), attributed to Doncker, and Portrait of a Mother with Her Daughter and Two Sons, c. 1640–45 (Unknown Location), by an anonymous artist. In the former, a man stands in mountainous terrain with ruins. As he looks out at the viewer, he gestures with his right hand to a ledge that holds a skull and vase with two carnations. Inscribed on the stone surface is the phrase huc tendimus omnes (all things tend this way). The combination of skull and inscription heighten the memento mori associations of the ruins. In the latter, the woman wears an outdated mode of attire specific to areas of Northern Holland, such as Hoorn and Enkhuizen. This family portrait lacks a father and the memento mori evocations of the ruins in the right background may indicate that he was no longer among the living. If more were known about the biographies of the sitters, these paintings by Doncker might be evidence of a network of acquaintance among the artist’s patrons and collectors. Ann Jensen Adams, “The Paintings of Thomas de Keyser (1596/7–1667): A Study of Portraiture in Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1985), 436–38; Rudolf E. O. Ekkart and Quentin Buvelot, eds., Dutch Portraits: The Age of Rembrandt and Frans Hals,
Doncker’s Portrait of a Family in a Landscape, 1644, repeats some of the memento mori allusions already discussed in regard to his Rijksmuseum family-landscape portrait (fig. 5). The parental couple displays their affective bonds through clasped hands although they do not adopt the heraldic pose seen in other images. Instead, the father points to his son and the landscape beyond. The dog sitting at the wife’s feet indicates filial obedience; the rattle draped across the boy on the far right demonstrates parental care and the cherries held by the same child may invoke memento mori associations, similar to those alluded to by the ruins in the background.324

The ruins in this family-landscape portrait represent Doncker’s most elaborate iteration of crumbling structures. Several edifices perched atop a rocky outcropping lead to remnants of a bridge that spans a body of water. These ruins cannot be identified with any certainty, but they are reminiscent of those depicted by Jan van Heyden in his View on the Tiber River, Rome, n.d. (fig. 18).325 The ruins in Doncker’s painting may have held a variety of associations, including an allusion to the honor and noble foundation of the family and the suggestion that the current sitters stood as moral exempla for successive generations.

The connection to antiquity signaled by the ruins in the backgrounds of Doncker’s and other artists’ family-landscape portraits was an important part of communicating the social standing of the sitters. As historian Judith Pollmann explains, “For families who had any claim to status, it became increasingly important to document antiquity using, for instance, the ever

---

324 This child’s gender is most likely male since he stands next to his father, who gestures toward him, while the girls stand next to their mother. The segregation of children around their parents by gender was common in family portraits. See Laarmann, “Het Noord-Nederland Familieportret,” 97–117.

325 Susan Kuretsky posits that the ruins in Doncker’s painting are fragments of the Temple of the Sibyl at Tivoli, a section of the Colosseum and a bridge over the Tiber. Kuretsky, Time and Transformation, 274.
more popular genealogies and heraldic devices.” Ruins in family-landscape portraits should be considered part of the phenomena of such documentation of antiquity in text and image. The fact that most of the family-landscape portraits with ruins picture the nuclear family (the Kluppel family is the sole exception) and omit grandparents and other relatives suggests that the ruins mark elevated social standing in the present, as a record for future generations. At the same time, decaying structures also demonstrate an awareness of the precariousness of one’s status; the dishonor of one generation could undo the esteem of previous ones.

**Cultural Sophistication and the Grand Tour**

Family-landscape portraits with ruins in an Italianate setting express families’ interest in the Mediterranean, ancient cultures and travel, and were an aspect of chronicling one’s journeys. Many individuals from the upper echelons of society used text and image to capture their experiences abroad. For example, the Van Bolhuis family, regents from Groningen, kept travel journals for three generations spanning the years 1680 to 1740, and the Van Dussen brothers, sons of a Dordrecht burgomaster, also kept journals. Generally, youths wrote to account for their time to their parents; most adults wrote for posterity or so that they could remember the trip later in life. In the words of eighteenth-century Rotterdam painter Gerard van Nijmegen:

> I write for myself and for my worthy wife and travel companion, in order that when we are old and the only place we can travel to together is heaven, we can sit in our armchair in a corner by the fireplace and in the intervals between bouts of coughing, gout, rheumatism or all these at once read once again or have read to us everything we saw, heard and did on our journeys and for that reason I will even give attention to trifles.

---


In a comparable vein, Pieter Verhoek’s praise of Adam Pynacker’s cycle of large Italianate paintings for Cornelis Backer’s house on the Herengracht comments on the appeal of such paintings for contemporary viewers:

And green woods, on which shines a morning sun,
Which brilliantly dawns from the horizon
And creates the day so anyone who understands Art stands enraptured
And fancies that he beholds Italy with his own eyes […]
Receding for miles as far as where the pale azure
Of the mountains is painted with the gleam of the sun’s fire. […]
Here can Lord Backer, when the trees are devoid of leaves
And the barren field is overwhelmed with dunes
Of drifting snow, contemplate these leafy crowns,
The green of the foliage, a Summer for the eye.
Here, worn out by the cares of State, he can unstring
His bow, revelling in this contemplation. 329

Similarly, family-landscape portraits set among Italianate ruins may have recorded travels for posterity and evoked treasured memories.

Ruins could also evince knowledge of history and antiquarian interests, and in doing so spoke to another facet of elite social status, that is, education and the completion of a *groote tour* (Grand Tour). The very opportunity to travel abroad for an extended period of time marked an individual as possessing extensive education, wealth and social prestige. The price of travel was exorbitant because one needed to cover expenses at a minimum for transportation, inns and foot guides. Joan Huydecoper, a member of the regent family in Amsterdam, spent ten guilders per

---

328 “Ik schrijf voor mijzelve en voor mijn waardige echt- en reisgenote, om, als wij oud zijn geworden, als wij tezamen niet meer kunnen reizen dan naar de Hemel, om dan in ’t hoekje van den haard, in onze armstoel gezeten, in tussenpozingen van hoest, jicht, rumatique pijnen, of van alle tegelijk … dan nog eens te kunnen lezen, of horen lezen, hetgeen wij op onze reizen gezien, gehoord, en gedaan hebben en daarom wil ik zelfs over beuzelingen bijzonder zijn.” Translation in Dekker, “Dutch Travel Journals from the Sixteenth to Early Nineteenth Centuries,” 278–82, 287.

day traveling during the winter of 1648–49. The extensive fortunes of his father made this trip affordable, yet the pater familias encouraged his son to be thriftier. Dutchmen visited France more frequently than the Mediterranean on their groote tour; however, images suggest that Italy was more popular in the imagination of travellers. A person journeying to Italy would have paid particular attention to classical sites and objects because they were the bearers of tradition and their antiquity made them rare and curious.

The groote tour was part of the drive to raise one’s prestige since it comprised one facet of education. A person, especially a member of the regents and very wealthy burghers, could elevate his social position through marriage, wealth, the purchase of land and titles, and education. In her in-depth study of the topic, Anna Frank-van Westrienen consistently refers to the groote tour as an educatiereis (education trip) based on the fact that Justus Lipsius and others stressed the edifying import of the Grand Tour. In a letter to Philippe de Lannoy of 1578, Lipsius advocated, “So to profite, and inrich themselves with experience, and true wisedome, and especially to benefite their owne proper, and natural countrie, they traversed over; and travelled into other countries. For this, (right honourable Lord) this must be the end of your

---


travelling. “These ideas were reiterated in the diary of a late sixteenth-century citizen of Utrecht who took several journeys. His diary begins with several mottoes from Lipsius and other humanists on the importance of travel for broadening the mind and expanding knowledge, especially as it related to learning foreign languages. Such peregrinations provided an opportunity to learn the rules of civility, cultivate honor, govern passions, understand the demands and obligations of service, learn languages, make contacts and find an occupation. Mastering languages was certainly a required skill set for merchants, but the elite or even those who wished to better their social position also sought to acquire proficiency at languages. Travel enriched one’s insight, knowledge and character because it brought one into contact with different people who had varied rites, manners and customs. Family-landscape portraits with ruins in an Italianate environ may position the sitters within the realm of experiences gleaned from a groote tour.

Like Doncker’s two family-landscape portraits, the Unknown Family, c. 1650–1674, possibly painted by Johannes Mijtens indicates the sitters’ interest in demonstrating or elevating the family’s status by referencing sites one typically visited on a groote tour (fig. 6). The


337 Frank-van Westrienen, De groote tour, 341; Cook, Matters of Exchange, 48.


339 Cook, Matters of Exchange, 48.

married couple sits before an architectural backdrop with the man’s arm resting on a parapet that opens to a view of an Italianate countryside marked by temple fragments and a triumphal arch. The artist conveys the tight-knit character of the unit through pose and gesture. The woman rests her hand on the arm of her husband, who in turn lays his hand on her lap. The child stands between mother and father and holds a piece of fruit. As elucidated by earlier discussion of other family-landscape portraits, the piece of fruit might refer to the conjugal fertility and fulfillment of marital roles or it may symbolize the child’s filial obedience.

While the Portrait of an Unknown Family promotes the status of the sitters through erudition, and perhaps even a *groote tour*, several of the details also reference leisure activities popular specifically among the Dutch elite. For instance, a dead hare, shotgun and hound rest beside the patriarch. As explained in the chapter, “Panoramas and Progeny,” hunting was a leisure activity once the sole purview of the nobility, but as the seventeenth century progressed, hunting became more and more popular with the urban elite. The restrictions on hunting began to erode when regents and the urban elite accumulated wealth, estates with titles, and hunting rights, although as members of the affluent middle class, they could only hunt smaller game, such as the hare resting by the patriarch’s site. Like other signs of leisure, whether they be children’s toys, or recreational activities such as walking, hunting should be viewed as productive. Leisure could occur only because a person had demonstrated industriousness and diligence in another sphere.

The majority of Mijtens’ patrons resided in The Hague, as did the artist, and it is likely that the sitters in Portrait of an Unknown Family lived in that city as well.\(^\text{341}\) Given that so many residents of The Hague participated in court and political life during the seventeenth century, the

patriarch in the portrait of the unknown family may have used the ruins in his family portrait to convey the fact that he had indeed absorbed the lessons of travel, and acquired the necessary virtues to be an honorable representative of government. Or, the portrait may suggest his inclination to send his offspring on a *groote tour* as part of the inculcation process for political roles.  

The inclusion of symbols that communicate the moral uprightness of progeny aligns with one of the main purposes of the *groote tour*, that is the need to govern the passions. 

According to Lipsius and others, acquiring *prudentia* (prudence) was a prime aim of the Grand Tour because this quality was required of administrators and civil servants. 

The actions of *raadpensionaris* (Grand Pensionary) Johan van Oldenbarnevelt confirm the importance of the Grand Tour for success in governmental posts. In his will of 1592, he outlines provisions for his sons’ education, which included directions for their undertaking a Grand Tour. 

My proposal that the *pater familias* in the *Unknown Family* portrait sent his child abroad as a means of paving the way for a political career could be equally applicable to Van Hemert’s family-landscape

---


343 Frank-van Westrienen, *De groote tour*, 338.

344 Oldenbarnevelt indicated that his sons should be 18 to 20 years old and they would travel for almost five years. The first two years should be spent in various cities in France and the subsequent three years should be spent in Venice, Rome, Naples, Florence and Milan in Italy, and then onto Germany and Switzerland. Frank-van Westrienen. *De groote tour*, 340. Constantijn Huygens’ *groote tour* was typical of those who had political aspirations. He went on supervised diplomatic missions to the court of James I in England between 1621 and 1624. Huygens then sent his son, Constantijn, Jr. on a *groote tour* to Italy and France in 1649. The younger Huygens almost succumbed to temptations feared by parents who could not supervise their children’s activities from long distances. As he passed through Berchem, near Antwerp, his travel companion took him to a prostitute, but he “was not able to copulate.” Fornication among unsupervised youth was a concern because it could result in unwanted pregnancies. Paternity suits were embarrassing and damaging to the honor of the family and could result in a son being forced to marry below his rank or station. Stoffele, “Christiaan Huygens,” 11; Dekker, *Family, Culture and Society in the Diary of Constantijn Huygens, Jr.*, 8; Rudolf M. Dekker, “Sexuality, Elites and Court Life in the Late Seventeenth Century: The Diaries of Constantijn Huygens, Jr.,” *Eighteenth-Century Life* 23, no. 3 (1999): 94–97; Benjamin B. Roberts and Leendert F. Groenendijk, “Moral Panic and Holland’s Libertine Youth of the 1650s and 1660s,” *Journal of Family History* 30, no. 4 (2005): 335; Benjamin B. Roberts and Leendert F. Groenendijk, “‘Wearing Out a Pair of Fool’s Shoes’: Sexual Advice for Youths in Holland’s Golden Age” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 13, no. 2 (2004): 145.
portrait (fig. 2). It is likely that he wished his progeny to embark on a parallel professional path. The ruins in the image could indicate that his sons would have the necessary skills and virtues for civic office.

**Profession and Commerce**

Family-landscape portraits by Jan Baptist Weenix and his son, Jan Weenix, may combine naval or mercantile associations with the meanings of ruins discussed previously in this chapter. Jan Baptist Weenix’s *Family in a Mediterranean Port*, c. 1650s; Jan Weenix’s *Family Portrait in the Grounds of a Villa*, c.1670; and *Family Group in a Southern Harbor*, c. 1670, evoke views of the Mediterranean that include ships and active secondary figures (figs. 7–9). Whether the male heads of household in any of the three paintings discussed in this section were involved in the navy in some way, or were merchants or investors, it is likely their professional pursuits were tied to the Mediterranean, and thus the Dutch *straatvaart* (trade route from the Straight of Gibraltar to various Mediterranean ports). The presence of the large, armed frigates in the paintings might reference the navy or admiralties as a facet of the family’s identity. Frigates accompanied the smaller merchant vessels that transported goods. They acted as protection against piracy from the Spanish in the years before the Treaty of Münster and from England during the second half of the seventeenth century. Perhaps the portrayed patriarchs were

---

345 Inventories called Weenix’s Italianate harbor genre scenes *Italiaanse zeehaven* (Italian seaports) and the failure to specify a particular seaport would suggest that topographical accuracy was not important to audiences. Roelofs, “Italianate Harbour Views in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting,” 43, 46, 51.

346 Initially commercial exchange was more of a shipping service where Italian merchants purchased goods that would be shipped from warehouses in Amsterdam, Enkhuizen, Hoorn, Middleburg or Rotterdam. On the return trip, such ships carried silk, cotton, wine, fur, fruit and marble for the Dutch market. The Dutch also shipped goods from Spanish controlled territories within Italy, especially Sicily and Puglia, to Northern Italian ports. Wilson, *The Dutch Republic*, 78–79; Jonathan Israel, “The Phases of the Dutch Straatvaart 1590–1713: A Chapter in the Economic History of the Mediterranean,” *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 99 (1986): 3–11. In evoking trade along a coastline, these three paintings have themes in common with those images discussed in the “Coasts and Kin” chapter; however, the images in that chapter depict settings that are almost certainly local to the Dutch Republic.
captains of one of these vessels or directors in one of the managing offices of the *straatvaart* charged with protecting Dutch trade interests along this route.\(^{347}\)

The *Family in a Mediterranean Port* by Jan Baptist Weenix shows five figures before a bustling harbor scene (fig. 7). The parental couple stands in the center in the traditional heraldic position, and on the other side of the patriarch one daughter holds a small dog in her arms. Similar to other family-landscape portraits, the position of husband and wife suggests fulfillment of marital roles. On the other side of the mother, a hound leaps in front of a boy and girl who look toward the lively animal. The interaction of the three children with their dogs again conveys filial obedience. The group stands in front of a large plinth atop which rests the Hellenistic sculpture group of a lion devouring a horse. The vista on the right side of the composition depicts frigates and freighters along the shore punctuated by the three remaining columns of the Temple of Castor and Pollux.\(^ {348}\) Other figures ride on horses, hoist and lift goods, and wander in the background.

Previously, this image has been labeled a self-portrait of the artist and his family. However, Rebecca Ginnings has shown that this identification is unlikely because Weenix had two sons and no daughters.\(^ {349}\) Weenix painted the image after he returned to Utrecht from a four-year sojourn in Italy, so it is likely the depicted family also resided in that city.\(^ {350}\) Ginnings

---

\(^{347}\) To support the *straatvaart*, an organization of directors of trade to the Levant formed by 1625 based in Amsterdam. The directors expanded their offices to Hoorn, Rotterdam and Middelburg as trade increased. One of the more important aspects of the directors’ job was to organize convoys to protect trading ships from attack from pirates and rival privateers. Israel, “The Phases of the Dutch *Straatvaart* 1590–1713,” 3-11; Schloss, *The Dutch Italianate Harbor Scene*, 44.

\(^{348}\) The grouping of columns has been alternatively identified by Christine Skeeles Schloss as those remnants from the Temple of Saturn and Vespasian. Rebecca Ginnings, “The Art of Jan Baptist Weenix and Jan Weenix” (PhD diss., University of Delaware, 1970), 148; Schloss, *The Dutch Italianate Harbor Scene*, 9, 197.

suggests that the placement of the family in a port context indicates that the patriarch held a naval position. A comparison between Weenix’s family-landscape portrait and another by Zacharias Webber that specifically depicts the family of a naval officer in a similar setting may strengthen Ginnings’ assertion that the father in the former image had naval connections. Webber’s portrait of *Hans Hartwijk, Anna Schut, and Two Children*, 1681, depicts Hans Hartwijk, Kaptein ter Zee from 1678, and his family on the edge of an estate on a Mediterranean coastline with frigates (fig. 19). The port or coastline, the Italianate setting and classical architectural references in both Weenix’s and Webber’s portraits may allude to a seafaring profession south of the Alps.

In contrast to Ginnings’ interpretation of the patriarch’s occupational identity in Weenix’s portrait, Christine Skeeles Schloss suggests that the *pater familias* was a merchant or official involved in Mediterranean trade. Schloss bases her interpretation on the presence of a man weighing and recording boxes on a scale on the left and the piles of bales and barrels in the left middle ground, which were all typical activities and accoutrements for merchants who traded or transported goods. The merchant vessels and piles of goods in Weenix’s family-landscape portrait do suggest an involvement with the transport of goods from Amsterdam warehouses to

---

350 Of all the artists discussed in this chapter, Jan Baptist Weenix is the only one known to have traveled to Italy. He resided in Italy sometime after October 30, 1642, and stayed for four years. He spent some time in Rome and received commissions from illustrious patrons such as Cardinal Pamphili. Upon his return to the Dutch Republic, Weenix began to specialize in Italianate harbor and genre scenes. Ginnings, “The Art of Jan Baptist Weenix and Jan Weenix,” 148; Duparc and Graif, *Italian Recollections*, 191.


353 Schloss notes Gerard de Lairesse lists a barrel of goods, a pair of scales and a yard measure as the appropriate symbols of a merchant in his *Groot Schilderboek* of 1707. In his words, “van een Koopman, een baal, weegschall, en elle.” Schloss, *The Dutch Italianate Harbor Scene*, 11; Gerard de Lairesse, *Groot Schilderboek* (Haarlem: Johannes Marshoorn, 1740).
Italian ports or transport from cities in Southern Italy to Northern Italy, which were the primary functions of Dutch ships along the *straatvaart* during the first half of the century.  

While the setting in Weenix’s *Family in a Mediterranean Port* evokes Dutch trading activities in the Mediterranean through the many active figures and ships along the shore, the family itself is not engaged in labor of any kind. Schloss suggests that even in images that contain figures laboring along the shore, Italianate harbor scenes are fundamentally about Europeans at leisure. Her claim seems essentially accurate for family-landscape portraits as well, however, this assertion may be nuanced. In the seventeenth century, leisure was a fundamental counterpart to work. The success and wealth of a patriarch afforded his family a leisure lifestyle. A lesson about their value may be communicated to the children in the image.

Additionally, the setting of the *Family in a Mediterranean Port* may serve a similar function as those in the family-landscape portraits discussed earlier. It may provide the sons with a visual introduction to the milieu of the father’s professional network and the presence of the ruins may allude to the *pater familias’* steadfastness, honor or nobility. The longevity of the ruins allows the family to claim reliability in their business dealings, which was an integral trait to a commercial system that relied heavily on personal networks. In counterpoint, the crumbling decay of ruins also reminds the sitters or viewers of the precariousness of fortunes; shipping and trade were lucrative, but also risky.

Jan Weenix painted two family-landscape portraits that have similarities to the painting by the elder Weenix. This is not surprising considering the younger Weenix borrowed

---


compositional formulas and motifs from his father’s paintings in his early genre scenes as well. The two family portraits date to the early years of the younger Weenix’s career when he was still looking to his father for artistic inspiration. The sitters in *Family Portrait in the Grounds of a Villa*, c.1670, and *Family Group in a Southern Harbor*, c. 1670, were painted when Jan was working in Amsterdam. As a result, these families likely resided in that city as well (figs. 8–9). The paintings do not have the same barrels of goods as seen in the elder Weenix’s *Family in a Mediterranean Port*, but they do include figures working along the shore in the background who are perhaps meant to allude to mercantilism and the *straatvaart*.

Jan Weenix’s *Family Portrait in the Grounds of a Villa* c. 1670 places the seven family members in an Italianate harbor setting defined by classical architecture on the right and ships on the left in the far distance (fig. 8). The husband and wife stand in front of a plinth topped by a sculpted urn with a bacchanal scene. The wife gestures to her husband, as does the daughter who stands between them. The father appears to drop carnations onto the two daughters who sit at his feet. The elder daughter dressed in green extends a bunch of flowers towards the sister who stands between the parents. These flowers may connote fertility in marriage or filial obedience in a manner similar to flora in other family-landscape portraits discussed in this chapter. Another daughter sits on the left edge of the picture with a small spaniel dog in her lap. The only male sibling walks toward the rest of the group from the right side of the image, carrying a rifle and two hares he has hunted. Although the Dutch elite hunted hares in the dunes along the coasts of

---


beach villages like Zantvoort and Scheveningen, it is not clear if hunting also occurred at the edges of Mediterranean ports.³⁵⁹

The importance of business ventures to the family’s identity is less obvious in this image than it was to the family painted by Jan Baptist Weenix. The greater visual distance between ships in the background and leisure activities in the foreground, and the bacchanal scene on the sculpted urn contribute to the spirit of relaxation. As with the portrait of the unknown family possibly painted by Johannes Mijtens (fig. 6), however, this family could not have earned the privilege of hunting if they had not achieved a certain amount of wealth, elevated social status and demonstrated diligence and honor through industriousness. While the crumbling edges of the stone plinth in this image exhibit less of a ruined state than seen in other family-landscape portraits, their aging disrepair and the classicizing style of the architecture and urn may have nonetheless communicated the honorable foundations of the family, who could serve as exempla to future generations.

In one of the last dated family-landscape portraits to include ruins discussed here, Weenix’s Family Group in a Southern Harbor c. 1670 presents three figures before a structure inspired by classical architectural forms (fig. 9). A possible villa setting is implied by the fountain sculpture beyond the left shoulder of the patriarch. Along the vista on the horizon, the four remaining columns of the Temple of Saturn and Vespasian are visible, as are trading ships. Despite the specificity of the ruins, the younger Weenix does not change significantly the symbolic motifs from those seen in his other family-landscape portrait. A platter of fruit rests beside the mother who holds flowers in her hands. The daughter stands between her sitting

mother and father as she reaches for the walking stick held by her father. A dog adopts an obedient mien beside the father.

Considering the commemorative function of temples, the ruins of identifiable temple fragments in the portrait convey the notion that the current generation of the family is honorable and worthy of remembrance. The patriarch may have also hoped that the ruins indicate their elevated social status and convey important family history to future marriage prospects for his daughter, since it seems he had no son to carry on the dynastic line.

Political and Sacred Ruins

In the previously discussed examples of family-landscape portraits, ruins set in Italy allude to remembrance and memento mori, the groote tour, naval roles and/or mercantilism. Two rare exceptions to these thematic interpretive trends in such portraits are Christiaen van Colenberg’s *Portrait of a Family with Kasteel Duurstede in the Background* c.1665 (Private Collection) and Gerrit Pietersz. de Jong’s *Portrait of a Family Before the Ruins of the Chapel of Onze-Lieve-Vrouw ter Nood (Our Lady of Solace) of Heiloo* 1630 (Museum Catharinjeconvent, Utrecht) (fig. 20), which include Netherlandish ruins. Van Colenberg’s image, as discussed in the chapter “Panoramas and Progeny,” includes the ruins of Kasteel Duurstede to highlight the family’s political affiliations with a particular city. De Jong’s image, on the other hand, incorporates ruins to emphasize the family’s sanctity.

Gerrit Pietersz. de Jong’s *Portrait of a Family Before the Ruins of the Chapel of Onze-Lieve-Vrouw ter Nood (Our Lady of Solace) of Heiloo* depicts the ruins of a chapel near Alkmaar where a miraculous appearance of the Virgin and Christ child occurred. The locale may have had some civic or political associations since it was partially damaged in the 1573 siege of
Alkmaar, but the site also had Catholic religious significance and was an important pilgrimage destination in the seventeenth century. De Jong’s painting was one of many pictorial representations of the chapel with pilgrims, but it is the only one that includes a family portrait. More than simply a souvenir of an excursion, the painting functions as an expression of the sitters’ piety. Several details affirm the family’s Catholic identity. The patriarch holds an open prayer book, his wife has a prayer book, rosary beads and basket of fruit attached to her sleutelreex, and the elderly woman on the right holds rosary beads and a prayer book. Other figures behind the family kneel and prostrate themselves before the shrine and one man approaches the family group also with prayer book in hand. De Jong alludes to the miraculous appearance of the Virgin through the faint apparition of Mary holding a child in the open space in the middle of the ruins. These details affirm the primarily religious significance of the site for the family; however, the destruction of the chapel in 1637, during the family’s lifetime, may have resulted in memento mori associations with the site as well.

Conclusion

In a period of unprecedented economic and population growth, Dutch citizens embraced the inevitable cycle of death and regeneration. The ruins in family-landscape portraits suggest that the themes of remembrance and memento mori, family history and the foundation of the prestige for successive generations were of primary importance to the sitters who elected to have

---


361 Elissa Anderson Auerbach, “Re-Forming Mary in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Prints” (PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2009), 149.

themselves depicted with crumbling antique structures. The combination of ruins and certain other symbolic motifs allow the pictured families to present themselves as honorable and worthy of remembrance, to project an identity of elevated social status and sophistication, and to allude to the professional activities of the patriarch.

Visions of Rome were never far from the daily lives of many Dutch citizens, whether they had intimate familiarity with Italy through travel, or not. The town halls of Enkhuizen, Goes, Haarlem and Rotterdam contained inscriptions that adapted the saying “Senatus Populus Que Romanus” (SPQR, the Senate and People of Rome) in reference to the Republican foundation of Dutch governmental structure. Not only did town hall chambers contain painted episodes from Roman history, but also funerary monuments of burgomasters and other members of the vroedschap (town council) contained inscriptions related to Roman senators or consuls.

Furthermore, Amsterdam’s new town hall, and recently built country houses on the Vecht river and Beemster polder adopted classical forms that reminded the Dutch populace of the ancient Roman past. In light of such frequent evocations of ancient Rome by Dutch civic governments, it would not be surprising if the fathers depicted in the images discussed in this chapter proved to be regents or closely connected to regents. The Italianate ruins in family-

363 Within the more exclusive domain of the burgomasters’ chambers, the town halls of Amsterdam, Enkhuizen and Middelburg pictured an episode of Roman history when Quintus Fabius Maximus, an ex-consul and military general, was required to bow before his son, the current consul. The son’s demand might seem to reverse the typical structure of filial obedience and allegiance; however, the message of this encounter between father and son demonstrated that civic obligations should take precedence over obligations of birth. In other words, civic authority was made not born. Joop de Jong, “Visible Power? Town Halls and Political Values,” in Power and the City in the Netherlandic World, eds. Wayne te Brake and Wim Klooster (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 159–60; Peter Burke, Venice and Amsterdam: A Study of Seventeenth-Century Elites (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994), 101.

364 Burke, Venice and Amsterdam, 101.

landscape portraits could have evoked compelling connections between honorable leaders of the past and present.
Chapter 4
Domains and Dynasties

Introduction

Within much of the Dutch Republic there were fewer than thirteen miles between cities, yet country life and ideals were celebrated widely in image and text. Some of the most common means of celebrating country life were *hofdichten* (country house poems), images of *buitenplaatsen* (country estates), *portrait historiae* of shepherds and shepherdesses and landscape images. This chapter takes as its subject paintings that portray families on their country estates, or *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits. Six such portraits for which the

---


368 This chapter focuses on *buitenplaatsen* located within the territories of the United Provinces. There are several *buitenplaats* family-landscape portraits that possibly portray a family in regions outside the Dutch Republic, but their paucity in number makes it difficult to draw conclusions regarding issues of identity, status and symbolism. Two known examples of family-landscape portraits that perhaps show the sitters in foreign locales are Jan Baptist Weenix’s *Christina de Lepper and Her Daughters*, c. 1665 (Private Collection); and Follower of Jan Baptist Weenix or Johannes van Wijckersloot’s *Family Portrait (Possibly Cornelis van Wijckersloot, Maria Dibbout and Their Children with a Self-Portrait of the Artist*, 1650–60 (Centraal Museum, Utrecht). In the art historical scholarship on the image of Christina de Lepper with her three daughters, the setting is usually called “Italianate” because the landscape includes cypress trees and the *hofstede* visible in the background has a pediment. The supposition that De Lepper and her children appear in an Italian clime is problematic, however, because there is no documentary evidence that she or her deceased husband owned property outside the Dutch Republic, the cypress trees might have been imported (as Russian trees were), and classicizing features such as pediments were common to *hofsteden* within the Republic. The *Portrait of a Family* by a follower of Weenix or Wijckersloot was previously thought to depict Aernout van Wijckersloot, a wine merchant who resided in Nantes with his family. Current scholarship posits the identity of the patriarch as Cornelis van Wijckersloot, who was a merchant who owned a brewery in Utrecht. This change in identification makes it less likely that the pictured house and countryside show France since Cornelis was not known to have owned property outside the Dutch Republic. The landscape probably depicts the part of the site of Cornelis’ brewery, De Witte Lelie, on the Oudegracht of Utrecht. Jan Baptist Bedaux and Rudolf E. O. Ekkart eds., *Pride and Joy: Children's Portraits in The Netherlands 1500–1700* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2000), 224–25; Joaneath Spicer, “Introduction to Painting in Utrecht,” in *Masters of Light, Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*, Joaneath Spicer, et al. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 37; Frederik J. Duparc, *Golden: Dutch and Flemish Masterworks from the Rose-Marie and Eijk van Otterloo Collection* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 312–15; William H. Wilson, *Dutch Seventeenth-Century Portraiture: The Golden Age* (Sarasota, FL: John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, 1980), not paginated; Henriette de Bruyn Kops, *A Spirited Exchange: The Wine and Brandy Trade Between France and the Dutch Republic, 1600–1650*
sitters’ names are known portray the families within the grounds of their estates, usually with partial or complete views of the hofsteden (country houses) themselves (figs. 1–6). 369

The ownership of country estates as secondary and temporary residences by wealthy middle-class individuals was a phenomenon unique to the Dutch Republic. 370 The owners of country houses discussed in this chapter were investors and merchants, regents and military men. Such burghers purchased buitenplaatsen primarily as a means of expressing elevated social status and membership in an elite segment of society. 371 As Erik de Jong observed, “These

369 Dirck Santvoort’s Portrait of a Family, c. 1625–49 (Private Collection) may portray the family on the grounds of their estate, however, it is unclear if they are before a buitenplaats or a civic landmark because the structure is obscured by foliage. “Attributed to Dirck Dircksz. Santvoort,” last updated, November 3, 2013, https://rkd.nl/explore/images/132396. There are numerous family portraits by Johannes Mijtens that place the sitters in a landscape punctuated by structures that may be buitenplaatsen, however, due to the indeterminacy of the buildings in these landscapes, I have chosen not discuss them either within the context of this chapter, nor within the Chapter “Panoramas and Progeny.” For illustrations see, Alexandra Nina Bauer, Jan Mijtens (1613/14–1670): Leben und Werk (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlang, 2006), 52–77. I have also included Jacob van Ruisdael and Thomas de Keyser’s Portrait of Cornelis de Graeff and Members of His Family at Soestdijk, 1658 (The National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin), Barent Graat’s Portrait of the Five Deutz Brothers, 1658 (Private Collection) and G. Donck’s Portrait of a Burgomaster’s Family, c. 1640 (Honolulu Academy of Arts). These three images lie beyond the scope of this chapter because the first two picture the family along with Willem Schrijver, Pieter Trip and Andries de Graeff, and the later includes siblings without their parents. These family portraits highlight the cooperative nature of familial relations with regard to politics and mercantilism in ways that are different from the images discussed in this chapter. Ann Jensen Adams, Public Faces and Private Identities in Seventeenth-Century Holland: Portraiture and the Production of Community (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Benjamin Bikker, “The Deutz Brothers, Italian Paintings and Michiel Sweerts: New Information from Elisabeth Coymans’s ‘Journael,’” Simiolus 26, no. 4 (1998). Other images excluded from this chapter are those with families in a setting that contains statues or fountains without any obvious architectural references to a country house. For example, Herman Meindertsz. Doncker’s Portrait of a Family in a Garden, c. 1650 (National Trust, The Lake District); Johanne Ducq’s Portrait of a Family, Possibly the Loth Family, 1660 (Private Collection); Barend Graat’s Portrait of a Mother and Three Children in a Park, 1657 (Musée des Beaux-Arts de Carcassonne, Carcassonne), Unknown Family, c. 1650–74 (Private Collection), A Family Group, 1658 (Buckingham Palace, London), and Unknown Family, 1675–99 (Private Collection); Nicolaes Maes’ Portrait of a Family in a Park Setting, c. 1675–80 (Private Collection); Monogrammist MDW’s Unknown Family, 1624 (Private Collection); Michiel van Musscher’s Unknown Family, 1670 (Unknown Location), Portrait of a Family, 1681 (Mauritshuis, The Hague).

370 Family portraits that depict the sitters near or on an estate appear in the oeuvres of Flemish artists Gilles Tilborch and Gonzales Coques; however, these images are not discussed in this chapter for several reasons. Many of their family portraits date to the second half of the seventeenth century, when the social, political and economic conditions of the Southern Netherlands were quite different from those of the Dutch Republic, thus such family-landscape portraits likely had different resonances than those examined in this chapter.
country estates, which we should understand to mean a unit consisting of a house, a garden, and in many instances lands belonging thereto, were a monetary enterprise, meant as an investment in agricultural lands or intended for hunting purposes, but always confirming a desired higher status.”372 Buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits similarly speak to the social status of the families. These images express pride in accomplishment and affirm membership in wealthy middle-class and regent spheres. As with other types of family-landscape portraits, buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits attest to marital and familial roles and obligations, and they evince familial values of honor, obedience, discipline and the leisure afforded by industriousness in a professional or political sphere. The images discussed in this chapter, however, place greater emphasis on leisure and reveal hospitality as a significant component of familial identity through their very portrayal of country houses. Prior to the discussion of individual buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits, the chapter will outline several of the socio-economic, visual and literary contexts that account for the popularity of buitenplaatsen and country life among regents and wealthy merchants. Within the analysis of each buitenplaats-family-landscape portrait, additional paintings for which the sitters remain anonymous will be introduced to demonstrate the pervasiveness of visual trends and meanings.

Country House Architecture and Garden Design

There are three main types of buitenplaatsen depicted in the family-landscape portraits discussed in this chapter: those that were renovated and transformed from older boerderijen


(farmsteads) often located along major canals; those that were newly built, frequently on reclaimed polderlands; and those adapted from late medieval castles. Some of the earliest dated buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits are examples of the first type of country estate. These include Adam Camerarius’ portrait of Daniel Hendrick Lestevenon, Anna Margaretha Venturin and Their Family, c. 1625–49, and Jacob van Loo’s The Meerbeeck-Cruywagen Family, 1642 (figs. 1–2). Many of the converted boerderijen were located in Holland on the edges of polderlands around Amsterdam and Haarlem, especially the Beemster, Schermer and Purmer.

As polders were drained early in the century they were divided into narrow plots unsuitable for farming (figs. 7–9). Instead they were sold to regents and rich merchants who used the land to build hofsteden. Several families documented their newly built buitenplaats in their family portraits, such as Pieter van Anraedt’s portrait of Jeremias van Collen, Susanna van Uffelen and Their Twelve Children, 1655–57, and Cornelis Holsteyn’s Portrait of a Family (Possibly Reinier Pauw and Adriana Jonckheyn and Their Children), 1637 (figs. 3–4).

Less common than the first two types of country houses were those repurposed from medieval castles. Examples of the third type include Johannes Mijtens’ portrait of Michiel Pauw, Anna Maria Fassin and Their Children, 1654, and perhaps Nicolaes Maes’ Portrait of the Van den Brandelaer Family, 1672 (figs. 5–6).

Before the draining of the Beemster (1612), Purmer (1622) and Schermer (1635) polders, country houses were built on farms that were purchased as investments. Gradually, these land holdings developed into country estates that still retained some of their agricultural function.

---

373 Families might also lease parcels of land or residences from the nobility, which they would use as a summer escape from the city. One example of this trend discussed in this dissertation is Jochem van Aras’ lease of Tetro’s Bosch from the Lords of Brederode. See fig. 3 in the chapter, “Panoramas and Progeny.”
The transition from farm to *buitenplaats* started in the sixteenth century when landowners began building small “Sunday houses” on their farms. These structures had the characteristics of a homestead. They were small, with only a few rooms reserved for the owner during the summer or hunting season and the garden façade usually did not have any windows with views to the gardens or grazing fields. Over the course of the sixteenth and into the seventeenth centuries, the farmstead was expanded and the house evolved into a large structure with classical architectural elements.

An example of this shift from *boerderij* to *hofstede* can be seen in paintings by Jan van der Heyden of Jan Jacobsz. Huydecoper’s country home named Goudestein (figs. 10–11). Huydecoper, a wealthy merchant from Amsterdam, acquired large tracts of land in the village of Maarsseveen along the Vecht River in the province of Utrecht early in the century (fig. 12). Much of this land was later parceled into plots and sold, but Jan Jacobsz. retained Goudestein for his personal use. Huydecoper began converting the farmhouse and land into a country estate and upon his death in 1624 the land and buildings passed to his son Joan. The younger Huydecoper engaged in more extensive renovations to Goudestein and he consulted with renowned architect Jacob van Campen for the redesign. The resulting structure retained some features of the old farmhouse with new wings that adopted classical forms.

---


376 Kuyper, *Dutch Classicist Architecture*, 126.

377 He owned fourteen estates along the Vecht River, one of these was Goudestein. In 1629 Goudestein was the only *hofstede* on the Vecht. Between 1637 and 1657 Jan Jacobsz. and then his son Joan sold some of the other estates. Schwartz, “Jan van der Heyden and the Huydecopers,” 204; De Jong, “For Profit and Ornament,” 32; Frijhoff and Spies, *A Hard Won Unity*, 485.
Both the old and new elements of Goudestein can be seen in Jan van der Heyden’s depiction of the structure (fig. 10). This painting of the buitenplaats depicts the site from its entrance gate on the Vecht. The older part of the house can be seen on the right side of the central structure. The large main part of Goudestein incorporates a cupola, pediment and symmetrical balance of architectonic elements typical of classicizing country houses. Not visible in Van der Heyden’s painting are the flower and vegetable beds with a sundial and a garden pavilion that was also part of the estate.

Many buitenplaatsen could be found on farmlands in the seventeenth century, but even more arose on polderlands. As land reclamation efforts concluded in the polders, the increased landmass of the Dutch Republic meant that many new country estates could be built on these sites as well. Usually these were not large tracts of land that could be farmed and thus the conception of a country estate shifted from an investment in arable land with an eye to profit, to that of a summer retreat from the city with a focus on gardens. Essentially, the raising of livestock almost completely disappeared, while horticulture and the growing of plants, flowers

---

378 In the years around 1670, Van der Heyden painted numerous depictions of buitenplaatsen, including at least fourteen views in Maarsseveen, four of Herteveld, two of Huis ten Bosch and six of Goudestein. The many painted and printed views of Maarsseveen and poems written by Joos van den Vondel and Caspar Barleus were part of an active marketing campaign by Huydecoper to encourage the purchase and development of plots on his lands in Utrecht. Additionally, because landownership at Maarsseveen included seigneurial rights, the numerous portrayals of this territory may have been an expression of the owner’s political and social reach. Gary Schwartz, “Jan van der Heyden and the Huydecopers,” 215; Peter C. Sutton, Jan van der Heyden (1637–1712) (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 53–54.

379 Kuyper, Dutch Classicist Architecture, 156, 290.

380 Taken together with the drainage of the Wieringerwaard (1617), Wijde Wormer (1626), Heerhugowaard (1631) polders, land reclamation efforts resulted in increasing the size of Holland by more than thirty percent. Hans Goedkoop and Kees Zandvliet, The Dutch Golden Age: Gateway to Our Modern World (Zuitheten: Walburg Pers, 2012), 94.

and herbs in gardens continued uninterrupted, albeit on a scale appropriate for the consumption of produce by a single family, rather than to sell at one of the larger, nearby city markets.

As maps of the various polders show, buitenplaatsen featured a tight organization of space with long vistas due to the division of plots into narrow tracts of land. The houses were often encompassed by a canal or separated from the surrounding landscape by a moat or avenue of trees, with vegetable gardens and orchards nearby. Gardens were designed on a rectangular pattern and divided into small, distinct square and rectangular areas.\(^{382}\) Until the second half of the seventeenth century, the axis of the garden usually was not related to the building or to an overall plan. Any underlying geometry evident in these types of gardens derived from the regular, ordered layout of the polders upon which they had been built.\(^{383}\) Owners planted trees and high hedge walls to protect houses and gardens from high winds and perimeter or axial canals helped to maintain drainage levels.\(^{384}\) The placement of trees meant the gardens and grounds of the estate generally had a confined atmosphere.\(^{385}\) Trees had a functional purpose, but they could also enhance the beauty of an enclosed garden and communicate the wealth and prestige of the owner. When Sir Francis Child from England toured the Dutch Republic in the late seventeenth century he remarked on the grounds of Clingendael near The Hague.

---

\(^{382}\) Few estates had deliberately planned parks until after 1650 and formal gardens in the French or Italian style did not appear in large numbers until the 1680s. Van der Wijck, “Country Houses in the Northern Netherlands,” 409.


\(^{384}\) These oak, poplar and elm lined avenues were sometimes referred to as windsingels when they served the additional function of protecting the house and grounds from winds. Tromp, Private Country Houses in The Netherlands, 8; De Jong, Nature and Art, 24.

“Returning from thence I went to see the much admired gardens of Monsieur St. Annaland, who has a neat dwelling on the side of this wood, about a mile from The Hague. His house [Clingendael] is small but very neat, the gardens are large and very well kept, but the beauty of them consists most in the walks and hedges, whereof there are some Dutch elm, the highest in the country as of twenty foot high.”

Trees could also reflect the wealth of the owner since some were imported from as far away as Russia and they were also items that might be gifted. For instance, Constantijn Huygens, the Dutch secretary of state, was given trees by the stadholder from the latter’s woods near Breda.

Construction and upkeep of the grounds and gardens usually resulted from collaborative efforts among patron, land surveyor and gardener. Within a geometrically divided whole, gardens contained a combination of native and exotic plants and statuary. Sculptures might depict mythical deities or be thematically related, as in the four seasons. This trend in garden design for buitenplaatsen can be seen in the terrain of Elswout, an estate near Haarlem that had a Neptune fountain in the inner court of the house; classical statues in the parterres, including a Diana Chasseresse copy; stairs inspired by Bramante’s steps in the Cortile del Belvedere at the Vatican; and classical temples. Many of these details can be seen in Jan van der Heyden’s depiction of Elswout (fig. 13). Similar features are visible in the anonymous painting of

---


388 Usually, statues were made of lead and painted to look like stone. Walter Liedtke, *Dutch Paintings in The Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 335. Initially, Jacob Cats owned Zorgvliet and began to layout the grounds in the 1640s. The Bentinck family bought the estate from Cats’ heirs and expanded the area of cultivated land from 30 to 80 acres between 1674 and 1819. Vanessa Bezemer-Sellers, “The Bentinck Garden at Zorgvliet,” in Dixon Hunt, *The Dutch Garden in the Seventeenth Century*, 100–6.
Vlietzorg and Zorgvliet, estates also located near Haarlem (fig. 14). The views of Elswout, Vlietzorg and Zorgvliet also demonstrate how buitenplaatsen took the surrounding topography into consideration for the placement of the house and layout of the grounds. Country homes were situated so that those along rivers had an entrance platform on the bank of the waterway, as exemplified by those at Goudestein, Vlietzorg and Zorgvliet.

The development of country estates on the polders was especially popular among regent families, who lived in proximity to one another in the city as well as the country. Various members of the Trip family, for example, owned at least eleven country estates on the Beemster by the end of the century. The families Huydecoper, Cromhout, Valkenier, Pauw, Bakx, Schaap and Ranst were neighbors of each other on plots of land in Maarsseveen. Part of the appeal of building a country house on these reclaimed lands can be gleaned from the characterization of polderlands as earthly paradises by the famous Dutch poet Joost van Vondel. In 1640 he wrote in praise of Den Beemster:

The Beemster a fair lea, as lake drained into the ocean.
Surprised, the sun beheld how waves of brackish clay
Which it then dried and decked with a fair emerald sheet
With flowers stitched, with crops and fruits in rich array,
And garlanding her hair, strewed it with perfume sweet.
A cream and butter-well sprang from her ample bust,
The fishmeat turned into flesh, a virgin yet intact,
The towers round her brow showed a cloud-piercing thrust
As opulence and height each other will attract.
Here, hounds chase after game, here carriages promenade,
Here’s dancing, banqueting, here wealthy merchants landed.
Here smiles the Golden Age in arbors offering shade.

389 De Jong, “For Profit and Ornament,” 32.
391 “Den Beemster tot een beemt, en loosed ’t meir in zee. / De zon verwondert, zagh de klay noch brack van baren, / En droghdese af, en schonkse een groenen statsikeurs, / Vol bloemen geborduurt, vol lovren, ooft en
In addition to the greater availability of land provided by polders and the appealing outdoor atmosphere of these sites, buitenplaatsen depicted in images convey meanings ancillary to the country estates. Land was tied to the nobility’s claims of dynastic power and continuity, and provided proof of their stature due to the titles attached to land holdings. This perception of land and residence is evident in the anonymous painting *Genealogy of Elbert van Isendoorn of Blois and Maria Hadewig of Essen with Cannenburch on the Left and Swanenburg on the Right in the Background* (*Kwartierstaat van Elbert van Isendoorn à Blois en Maria Hadewig van Essen, op de achtergrond links de Cannenburch en rechts de Swanenburg*), 1645 (fig. 15). The image depicts the heraldic devices of successive generations as fruits of a tree and in the background on left and right are the country residences of each branch of the family. By the end of the Golden Age, regents and merchants may have held similar views to that of nobility, but initially their attitudes toward acquired land were different. For the urban, elite middle- and upper-middle class, country houses and the surrounding estates functioned as social capital, which provided evidence of their status and wealth in the present.

Once regents and merchants amassed a significant amount of wealth through commerce, they began to procure additional businesses and properties. In *Samen-Spraeck tusschen Waermondt ende Gaergoedt* (*Dialogues between Waermondt and Gaergoedt*), 1637, a text satirizing the tulip trade of the 1630s, the fictional weaver Gaergoedt writes, “We will buy a...”

---


country house, or one of the best houses in the city, and live as rentiers.” Individuals invested their surplus wealth in land as much as in trade or other financial ventures. Most of the middle- to upper-middle- class families, especially those who made their fortune in commerce, were likely first generation landowners. Unlike older noble or gentry families, the principal means of self-identification for the middle- and upper-middle class was not land. They may have hoped that the fortunes of future generations would tie their individual and familial identity to property, but the concept was new to regents and the urban elite. For them, *hofsteden* and *buitenplaatsen* constituted secondary residences, not ancestral homes. In image and text, the merchants and regents of the Dutch Republic chronicled their summer retreats as an extension of their urban power and authority, not as the foundation of their prestige, as nobility did. The locus of middle- and upper-middle-class political and economic power remained concentrated in the city, not in the land.

---

394 “ofte soo ick mijn Drouws sin wilde doen sullen een hofstede koopen / ofte een van de beste hunsen van de stadt en leven als renteniers.” Translation in Anne Goldgar, *Tulipmania: Money, Honor and Knowledge in the Dutch Golden Age* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2007), 277; Adriaen Roman, *Samen-Spraeck Tusschen Waermondt ende Gaergoedt, Nopende de Opkomste ende Ondergangh van Flora* (Haarlem: Adriaen Roman, 1637), 7. The notion that owning *buitenplaatsen* might be tied to a process of aristocraticization among the Dutch urban elite cannot be gauged by most of the images discussed in this chapter. Representations of the Pauw family by Holsteyn and Mijtens are possibly an exception to this generalization. Interestingly, most regents and merchants who did acquire land and houses with titles they then incorporated as part of their own name did not commission *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits.


397 Agnes Block and her house, Vredenburgh on the Vecht in Utrecht is an exception. She spent the majority of her time on the estate rather than in any of the residences inherited from her husband in Amsterdam.

**Hofdichten and Country Life**

In addition to the newly available plots on the reclaimed polders, motivation for the regents and merchants to acquire or build *buitenplaatsen* included the popularity of the country life ideal as expressed in *hofdichten* (country house poems). These texts lauded country life (*laus ruris*), the house owners and their estates. The poems may have informed the kinds of identities communicated by *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits, which pictorially describe country houses and grounds.

Approximately 125 hofdichten were written between 1611 and 1803, although many of them date to the second half of the seventeenth century. Notable examples include Philibert van Borsselen’s *Den Binckhorst; ofte het lof des geluk-salighen ende gerust-moedighen Landlevens* (Den Binckhorst; or in praise of happiness-blessed, tranquil-encouraging country life), 1611; Petrus Hondius’ *Dapes Inemptae, of de Mouffe-schans, dat is, de soeticheydt des buytenlevens vergheselschap met de boeken* (Unpurchased meal; or de Mouffe-schans, that is the sweetness of country life accompanied with books), 1621; Constantijn Huygens’ *Vitaulium, Hofwyc. Hofsteede van den Heere van Zuylichem Onder Voorburgh* (Vital Hofwijck, country house of lord of Zuylichem under Voorburgh), 1653; Jacob Westerbaen’s *Arcota Tempe Ockenburgh* (Arcadian temple Ockenburgh), 1653; and Jacob Cats’ *Ouderdom Buytenleven en Hofgedachten op Sorghvliet* (Age-old country life and country house poem on Sorghvliet), 1655.399 These poems derived from ancient, classical pastoral poems, particularly Virgil’s *Georgics* and Horace’s *Beatus Ille*. Such poets established a dichotomy between country and city, in which the peaceful

---

simplicity of country life stood in contrast to the greed and corruption of urban existence. According to Virgil and Horace, country folk and gentlemen farmers could know relatively greater happiness because they were not subsumed by the urbanite’s greedy pursuit of wealth. Horace wrote, “Happy is the man who far from schemes of business, like the early generations of mankind, ploughs and ploughs again his ancestral land with oxen of his own breeding, with no yoke of usury on his neck.” In other words, country life was idealized as a retreat from city life.

Dutch audiences first became aware of this view of country life through Karel van Mander’s translations of Virgil and Horace in his Bucolica en Georgica: dat is, Ossen-stal en Landt-werck, 1597. The availability of such texts in the vernacular prompted the writing of hofdichten from 1610 onward. In the Dutch tradition, however, country house poems described estates for different ends than had their classical precedents.

 Hofdichten reserved praise not for a tenant farmer or shepherd, but for the owner of a house and tract of land outside a city’s walls. Also in contrast with the earlier poetry by Virgil and Horace, seventeenth-century hofdichten minimized the tension between city and country. Dutch poets legitimized retreat into the country as a facet of earned leisure. As summarized by Maria Schenkeveld-van der Dussen, “The urban owners of a country house used it [hofdichten] to portray an ideal image of themselves. Although professing a great love for the simple rural life, they did not pose as real farmers. Their model was the cultured gentleman farmer who

---


401 Carel van Mander, Bucolica en Georgica, dat is, Ossen-stal en Landt-werck (Amsterdam: Zacharias Heyns) 1597.

402 Freedberg, Dutch Landscape Prints, 14.
could leave the hard and monotonous labor to servants, occupying himself with more attractive pursuits like grafting and the care of the flower and kitchen gardens.”

The reconceived tradition of *laus ruris* included retreat to a residence outside city walls, contemplation of God’s creation, pursuit of knowledge through empirical observation of nature, and affirmation of the wealth and status that afforded the pursuit of country living. Dutch country house poems do not simply praise country life in an abstract sense; they are specific to one estate and the life it affords.

Most *hofdichten* were written either by the owner of an estate or by a friend of the owner. Petrus Hondius, for example, wrote *Dapes Inemptae, of de Mouffe-schans*, 1621, about the estate of Johan Serlippens, a burgomaster of Neuzen. Serlippens had invited Hondius to stay at his residence and it was likely during this visit that the author compiled observations about the site, which appeared in the poem. The final text lauds the physical features of the *buitenplaats* as poet and owner traverse the grounds.

Hondius’ poem described De Mouse-schans’ gardens, parks, sculptures, fountains, plants and vistas throughout the seasons, but not the house itself. *Dapes Inemptae, of de Mouffe-schans*, similar to other *hofdichten*, focused on the grounds and gardens of *buitenplaatsen* because of the symbolic import of the natural world, in general, and of gardens, in particular, as sites of productivity, which could speak to the values and moral integrity of owners.

Willem Sluiter, a Dutch preacher and poet, for example, wrote in his 1660 *Buiten-leven* (Country Life):

There’s scarce a thing here, that we see,  
That cannot a fair symbol be  
Of something of a nobler kind.

---


405 Freedberg, *Dutch Landscape Prints*, 14.
This pleases and improves man’s mind.
One may from birds, beasts, herbs and trees,
Even from gnats, from ants and bees
Draw lessons that are, in all parts,
Sweet and instructive to our hearts.\footnote{406}

Jacob Cats reiterated this notion in Sorghvliet in Ouderdom buyten-leven, 1655, a poem about his own country house, when he wrote that men had, “gone through the countryside—just as they went through books—to investigate the nature of all things, and to see God therein…. Now I will cherish neither stream, mountain, nor forest nor fountain; not even a goddess of the fields; but only you, O unnameable God, father of all things.”\footnote{407} Constantijn Huygens, also writing about his own buitenplaats, offers an additional view of nature as revelatory of scientific or empirical truths in Vitaulium, Hofwyck, 1653.\footnote{408} Simply put, authors described country life as replete with religious, scientific and social lessons.

In keeping with the laudatory and simultaneously didactic function of hofdichten, writers frequently embellished the actual appearance of the referenced topography. Authors speak of trees, orchards or gardens as fully blossomed when, in many cases, they had only been recently planted. The purpose of such exaggeration lay in the desire to convey that well-ordered grounds

\footnote{406} “Al wat by na hier komt voor d’oogen, / Kan haest een Sinne-beelt vertogen / Van d’een of d’ander goed saek, / Te saem tot stichting en vermaek. / Men mag uit boomen, kruiden, dieren, / Ja self suit muggen, mieren, sieren, / Veel lessen trekken, die hel soet / En leersaem zijn voor elks gemoet.” Translation in Schenkeveld-van der Dussen, Dutch Literature, 97; Willem Sluiter, Buiten-leven, ed. F. C. Kok (Zwolle: W. E. J. Tjeenk Willink, 1958), 93.


were a reflection of God’s hand in nature as much as a reflection of a productive and fruitful landowner.\textsuperscript{409}

It is in this last aggrandizing function that one finds the greatest correlation between hofdichten and buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits. The inclusion of the estate grounds in the paintings speaks to qualities valued by the pictured families: they are productive, virtuous and disciplined members of their cultural milieu. The visualization of tamed and ordered nature in the portraits, as seen in the hofdichten, may have also indicated that the depicted owners embodied the virtue of tranquilitas, that is, the restraint of passions,\textsuperscript{410} an especially important trait for regents and other members of the urban patriciate.\textsuperscript{411}

Additionally, the praise and justification of country life in seventeenth-century poetry hinged on the idea that the house owners embodied the value of hospitality. As much as buitenplaatsen and hofdichten assumed a removal from densely populated cities, they depended on the shared social experience between house owner and visitor, who was led through the country house gardens and arbors, as well as between poet and reader, who was guided through embellished descriptions of them. In a practical sense, the demonstration by buitenplaats owners of their earned leisure through industry, and their elevated social status or cultural sophistication depended on their hosting of visitors on their estates. Many country house poems also mention that such visits with friends could include a shared meal that featured food grown or livestock raised on the estate. In Hondius’ praise of the country house De Mouse-schans, for example, the

\textsuperscript{409} Cearfoss Mankin, “Dutch Seventeenth-Century Images,” 8.


\textsuperscript{411} De Vries, Wandeling en Verhandeling, 289.
author noted the warmth with which Serlippens, the owner, greeted and treated his visitors, and made his kitchen available to them. Buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits may have similarly communicated the depicted owners’ valuation of hospitality by placing the sitters in the composition before the garden façade of their residence; through sitters’ gestures that acknowledge the presence of the viewer; and/or by picturing modes of transport that facilitated access to buitenplaatsen.

The symbiotic relationship between work and relaxation constituted another feature integral to the picture of country life and estates presented in hofdichten as well as buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits. One could be industrious outside of work, that is, time spent at rest or play could be productive. The escape from the city afforded by buitenplaatsen rewarded industry that resulted from the economic and political success of townsfolk. Leisure activities could demonstrate and augment one’s social skills and they could provide respite necessary for the better performance of one’s professional/political obligations.

As seen in previous chapters of this dissertation, other types of family-landscape portraits also manifested that relationship. Support for the visual expression of otia (leisure, rest) and negotium (work) as two sides of the same coin can be found in the sixteen-print series Otia delectant, etched by Cornelis Bloemaert after designs of his father Abraham, and published

---


413 Schenkeveld-van der Dussen, *Dutch Literature*, 100–1.

The first print depicts a shepherd resting on a large boulder. The text inscribed on the rock describes *otium* as that which “restores tired limbs with new strength and provides delight and makes us fit for work.” The wording also warns against “lazy rest [that] weakens the body with sluggishness and dulls the mind.”

The series’ images affirm the value of leisure.

In a comparison, however, between *hofdichten* and *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits, an important question remains: why do many of the paintings picture the sitters’ residential structure on their country estate when *hofdichten* barely mention them? Both compositional and symbolic considerations may answer the question. Whereas the surrounding grounds of a country house received significant attention in poetry, a comparable description of the expansive grounds in a family portrait would have required aerial perspective, resulting in a relatively diminished scale for the depicted sitters. As a result, the *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits discussed in this chapter place visual emphasis on the portrayed figures and the country house, coupled with a truncated view of the natural surroundings. These formal choices meant that the inclusion of a recognizable house linked the depicted domain with the dynasty of the sitters. Based solely on an aerial view of the grounds, the country estate might not have been as readily identifiable. The inclusion of country houses in the family portraits also manifested the

---

415 This print series of sixteen images was introduced in the chapter, “Coasts and Kin.” Gibson, *Pleasant Places*, 133.

respective owner’s wealth. Classicizing elements in some of the structures demonstrated the family’s cultural sophistication.\footnote{417}

The following discussion groups six buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits by house type within a loosely chronological framework. Families had themselves pictured before converted boerderijen, hofsteden on polderlands or repurposed medieval castles. The chronological discussion of the paintings reveals the longevity of family values of honor, obedience, discipline and the leisure afforded by industriousness in a professional or political sphere. Study of the paintings also illuminates the significance of hospitality as a key element of country-house life. Within the analysis of each buitenplaats-family-landscape portrait, additional paintings for which the sitters remain anonymous will be introduced to demonstrate the pervasiveness of visual trends and meanings.

Converted Boerderijen: The family-landscape portraits of Adam Camerarius and Jacob van Loo

Adam Camerarius’ Portrait of Daniel Hendrick Lestevenon, Anna Margaretha Venturin and Their Family, c. 1625–49

Adam Camerarius’ painting Daniel Hendrick Lestevenon, Anna Margaretha Venturin and Their Family, c. 1625–49, which depicts twelve members, exemplifies a buitenplaats-family-landscape portrait that dates to the earlier phase of country-estate ownership (fig. 1).\footnote{418}

Although the pater familias Daniel Hendrick Lestevenon (1600–61) stands in the middle ground close to the canal, and grasps the porch trellis on the façade of the house, most of the family

\footnote{417} CeaRFoss Mankin, “Dutch Seventeenth-Century Images,” 10, 123–24, 139.

\footnote{418} Until very recently, this painting had been attributed Camerarius; however, Fred Meijer has recently changed the painting’s authorship to Gijsbert Jansz. Sibilla on the Rijksbureau voor Kunstgeschiedenis website. This dissertation maintains the previous attribution of Camerarius in referring to the author of the portrait of Daniel Lestevenon and his family because no published documentation currently exists to substantiate the change in attribution. “Gijsbert Jansz. Sibilla,” last updated April 11, 2017, https://rkd.nl/explore/images/144320.
stands or sits in the foreground in a horizontal row. Anna Margaretha (1600–79), wife and mother, sits in the rowboat with the two youngest daughters Barbara and Esther. Beside the mother, a maid holds a child who wears a rattle, which hangs from her waist, and a bird perches in one hand. In the center, Anna, the eldest daughter, stands between her two oldest brothers, Daniel and Jean. On the right side of the composition sit four daughters, Anna Maria, Marij, Geertruijde and Elisabeth, while three putti float overhead.

In a deviation from pictorial trends established by other types of family-landscape portraits, Camerarius separated the husband from his wife by a significant compositional distance. Nevertheless, the image of the family clearly extols the fertile union of the couple and, thus, their fulfillment of roles within wedlock. Married in 1620, Daniel Hendrick and Anna Margaretha had eleven children. Although Camerarius’ portrait depicts only nine children, the absent two are included and commemorated through the putti who appear together in the sky.419

Through motif and gesture, the children in Camerarius’ portrait also exhibit familial roles and values in a fashion typical of most family-landscape portraits of all types. On the right, Anna Maria and Marij exchange flowers that can signify filial obedience in addition to the fecundity of a nuptial union.420 Jan Baptist Bedaux suggested that fruit and flowers “show the subjects not only as the product of a fruitful marriage, but also as a well bred person.”421

419 Frauke Laarmann-Westdijk has argued that each angel that appears in portraits need not correspond to exactly one deceased person. In some instances, angels could symbolize the being that ushered the deceased into the afterlife. Frauke Laarmann-Westdijk, “‘Engeltje van t’hemelijn.’ Overledenen op weg naar de hemel,” in Face Book: Studies on Dutch and Flemish Portraiture of the 16th–18th Centuries: Liber Amicorum Presented to Rudolf E.O. Ekkart on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday, eds., Edwin Buijsen, Charles Dumas and Volker Manuth (Leiden: Primavera Pers, The Hague: Netherlands Institute for Art History, 2012), 227–33.

420 Also see the discussion of these associations in previous chapters of this dissertation. Mariët Westermann, “Frans Hals, Jan Steen and the Edges of Portraiture,” Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 46 (1995): 55.

Moralist and politician Jacob Cats promoted the same interpretation of natural elements as reflective of well-bred children, although he drew a parallel between the cultivation of upright children and straight trees. In a collection of emblems, he made this point on the upbringing of children with the motto, “You can bend young growth, but not old trees.” The accompanying emblematic image depicts a man who stands on a ladder and attempts to straighten the crooked trunk of an older tree by affixing a piece of rope around a pole. A second man looks on and points out his folly. In the background, rows of pliable saplings stand straight with the guiding aid of poles and rope (fig. 16).

Contemporary textual sources highlighted similar didactic lessons to be learned from nature for the rearing of children. Specifically, the equation of the education of children with the cultivation of trees had longstanding currency in popular Netherlandish thinking. In the Album amicorum, 1574–96, of Antwerp cartographer Abraham Ortelius, preacher Justus Menius wrote, “The diligent rearing of children is the greatest service to the world, both in spiritual and temporal affairs, both for the present life and for posterity. Just as one turns young calves into strong cows and oxen, rears young colts to be brave stallions, and nurtures small tender shoots into great fruit-bearing trees, so must we bring up our children to be knowing and courageous adults, who serve both land and people and help both to prosper.”

---


423 Steven Ozment, When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 132. The comparison between youth and trees appears as a trope not only in emblem books and moralizing tracts, but in letters and diaries as well. The parents of Willem van Irhoven van Dam (1760–1802) signed a contract with his uncle who was a tradesman in Amsterdam to take him on as office clerk for 9 years without pay. Willem writes of this occurrence later in life, “very early, then, although with the best intentions, my parents decided my future, without asking me about my own wishes. Hardly twelve years of age, I was planted out
Camerarius’ portrait appears to incorporate such parallels between the education of children and the cultivation of trees. Beyond the head of Anna Margaretha, an orchard is visible through an arched gateway and other trees edge the right side of the house along the bend in the Vecht. The resulting fruits of the orchards and farmlands parallel the successful education and training of the Lestevenon children. Familial and parental honor are displayed and upheld through the motifs of the trees, which convey that children have absorbed moral instruction to lead disciplined and virtuous lives.

Cultivation of the family and its parallel in nature may also be suggested in the depicted animals that traverse the pavement on the left side of the house behind the head of Anna Margaretha Venturini. The animals in Camerarius’ family-landscape portrait highlight the agricultural function of country estates early in the century. The inclusion of birds and livestock, however, is somewhat unusual compared with other buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits, which do not include beasts. The turkey and cattle visible in Camerarius’ portrait may have been solely raised for the family’s consumption, but they may also have been sold at markets in Amsterdam. The depicted fowl and livestock, coupled with the orchards, reference the duty of a head of household to provide for the health and well-being of family members, with a related concern for the welfare of the broader community.424 These details, thus, highlight the productivity of the land, the utility of such buitenplaatsen not only for the family, but possibly for the larger community, and they communicate virtues of industriousness and diligence.


424 The chapter, “Panoramas and Progeny” argues a similar point for Sybrand van Beest’s Portrait of an Unknown Family 1650–74 (Private Collection). The image possibly alludes to the farms just outside the city that provided sustenance to residents of The Hague.
In addition to celebrating familial values and virtues, Camerarius’ portrait demonstrates the wealth and status of the family members through their placement before a hofstede, which Daniel Hendrick Lestevon purchased as a result of the wealth he acquired as a makelaar (broker) and caffatier (coffee trader) in Amsterdam.\(^\text{425}\) The Lestevenon country house and estate lay on the Weespvaart between Diemen and Muiden, although it is unclear which specific town is visible on the right side of the painting.\(^\text{426}\) Built by 1639, the Weespvaart was part of the trekvaarten (public transportation by barge) route that traveled along the Vecht and Amstel rivers from Weesp to Amsterdam four times daily.\(^\text{427}\) Convenience and ease of travel heightened the desirability of owning a country house in this particular location for a family and any hosted guests with whom they shared the locus amoenus of their buitenplaats.

The prominence of the small rowboat depicted in Camerarius’s portrait that holds the mother, maid and three of the children probably references the common mode of transport from city to country. However, the craft does not specifically represent a large trekschuit (tow barge used in trekvaarten), which could have contained all the pictured family members at one time.\(^\text{428}\)


\(^{426}\) The architecture cannot be described as classicizing, unlike that seen in many other buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits, although I am unsure what to make of this deviation. It is clear that Lestevenon did not have any sort of disdain for classicism in architecture. When he bought a house in 1661 at Herengracht 257, it was a residence in the classicizing style designed by Justus Vingboons. This house, known as Het Huis met den Witten Gevel (house with the white façade) on Amsterdam’s newer built canal that was home to its wealthiest and most politically powerful residents had classical features of Doric pilasters, Ionic pilasters, Corinthian pilasters on the first, second, third stories in imitation of the design of the Colosseum in Rome. “Huis met de Witten Gevel,” *Amstelodamum* 29 (1942): 41–43.

\(^{427}\) The Weespvaart was one of the main passenger barge lines from Amsterdam to Utrecht on the Vecht. Aukje Zonerdjpgeld-Hamer, *De geschiedenis van Weesp: van prehistorie tot de modern tijd* (Weesp: Huereka, 1990), 1–192; Schwartz, “Jan van der Heyden and the Huydecopers of Maarsseveen,” 204.

\(^{428}\) Trekvaart barges were larger flat bottom boats that were pulled by horses between pre-determined stops. Jan de Vries, “Barges and Capitalism: Passenger Transport in the Dutch Economy, 1632–1839,” *HES studia historica*, 4 (Utrecht: HES Publishers, 1981), 93.
The rowboat may have provided the means by which the family travelled from a *trekvaart* stop nearby the canal entrance to their *buitenplaats*. As he appears to lead her into the boat, Jean grasps the hand of his sister Anna, which suggests such a function for the craft. The position of the father Daniel Hendrick on the opposite bank and immediately in front of the house heightens the sense of the rowboat’s arrival. The depicted vessel also highlights the valued retreat from city life and the stress of commercial activity, a pervasive theme of country-house poems. In its function to transport persons from one destination to another, the small boat also implies the transient nature of visits to *buitenplaatsen*.

Like other wealthy merchants whose social behavior echoed that of regents, although without the same kind of political clout, Daniel Hendrick Lestevon spent many summer days with his family members at his *buitenplaats* along the Vecht. In Camerarius’ portrait, the other houses that line the curve of the canal as it approaches the background of the composition probably belonged to other wealthy merchants and regents. During the later years of the seventeenth century, such country-house construction increasingly occurred in the area between Weesp and Amsterdam.

The status and aspirations embodied in Daniel Hendrick Lestevon’s purchase of a country estate and its commemoration in his *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portrait helped to pave the way for his progeny’s own social mobility. In Camerius’ portrait, Lestevon’s son Daniel appears to be in his mid-teens by which time his father would have taken responsibility for his education.
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429 When situated directly along a river or canal, it was common for *buitenplaatsen* to have a platform leading from the water to the closest façade of the house. For instance, Constantijn Huygens’ Hofwijck had a platform on the Vliet. Kuyper, *Dutch Classicist Architecture*, 154.

430 The Weespvaart between Muiden and Diemen was in a region called Het Gooi, which was particularly popular among Amsterdammers because of its accessibility by boat. In the part of Het Gooi near Hilversum, nobleman Godard van Reede van Nederhorst, and regents Pieter Cornelisz. Hooft, Andries Bicker and Reynier Pauw owned adjacent plots of land upon which they built country houses. Audrey M. Lambert, *The Making of the Dutch Landscape: An Historical Geography of the Netherlands* (New York: Seminar Press, 1971), 197, 203–4; Tromp and Six, *Buitenplaatsen van ’s-Graveland*, 19–22.
and training for a future professional or political career. The father was duty and honor bound to
do so. Eventually the younger Daniel, a merchant with Spain, served between 1662 and 1666 as
a regent of the Burgerweeshuis (orphanage for citizens) for which he helped manage the finances
and care of orphans.\footnote{Johannes Hendrikus Scheffer, Genealogie van het geslacht Lestevenon (Rotterdam: Van Hengel &
Eeltjes, 1878), 15–16; Coene, “Het Geportretteerde Huis,” 104, 107. The Burgerweeshuis was a more privileged
institution that cared exclusively for orphans of citizens, as opposed to orphanages that cared for foundlings or the
poor. Daniel is pictured in Jurgen Ovens’s Regents of the Amsterdam Burgerweeshuis, 1663 (Amsterdam Museum,
Amsterdam).

In such professional roles, the younger Daniel enjoyed equal status with regents who held moderate political power.

\textit{Jacob van Loo’s Portrait The Meebeeck-Cruywagen Family, 1642}

Like Camerarius’ portrait of the Lestevon family, Jacob van Loo’s \textit{buitenplaats}-family-landscape portrait \textit{The Meebeeck-Cruywagen Family}, 1642, similarly communicates that the depicted merchant family rose to prestigious socio-economic heights (fig. 2).\footnote{Adriaen van de Velde’s \textit{Portrait of a Couple with Two Children and a Nursemaid in a Landscape}, 1667
(Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) also shows a family that has traversed the countryside via horse-drawn carriage,
however, in the absence of biographical information about the sitters, it cannot be positively determined that the
central plan stone structure and low lying wooden buildings in the right background are their country residence. If it
were their \textit{buitenplaats}, it appears to be in the older style that was more common for the late sixteenth and early
seventeenth centuries than the late 1660s. The inclusion of roaming livestock also highlights a use of land that was
less common for owners of country estates during the second half of the seventeenth century. The reclining
shepherd figure with a flute highlights the \textit{otium} of the \textit{buitenplaats} lifestyle adopted by many burghers, but it is a
somewhat unusual motif in comparison to the other family-landscape portraits discussed in this chapter. For an
illustration see, “Adriaen van de Velde,” last updated September 30, 2016, \url{https://rkd.nl/explore/images/142996}.

The painting shows three generations of the Meebeeck-Cruywagen family on their estate outside Amsterdam,
along the Uitweg between Ringsloot and the Sloterdijkermeer. Figures stand and sit around a
horse-drawn cart in front of a stone gate with one side of the country residence visible beyond
the family group. Standing before a stone gate on the right side of the composition, Hendrick
Jansz. Meebeeck-Cruywagen (1598–1659) holds hands with his wife Barbara Jansz.
Mastenbroek (d. 1650), whom he married in 1623. The portrait also pictures the couple’s six
sons, who survived to adulthood, out of a total of twelve children. The youngest child Ryckert
holds a rattle and stands in front of the clasped hands of his parents. Jacob stands in front of his maternal grandmother Niesje Clasedr. Next to her, Jan sits on a goat that Pieter helps to restrain with reins and a whip. Claas sits in a horse-drawn carriage while the eldest son Cornelis places his right hand on the horse’s reins and holds a whip in the other.\footnote{Hendrick adopted the surname Cruywagen after the name of his residence. Isabella H. van Eeghen, “De Familie Meebeeck Cruywagen,” \textit{Amstelodamum} 19 (1962): 79–84; “Attributed to Jacob van Loo,” last updated January 20, 2015, \url{https://rkd.nl/explore/images/10630}.}

As seen in other family-landscape portraits, Van Loo’s painting of the Meebeeck-Cruywagen family emphasizes their familial values. Husband and wife display unity and the companionate nature of their marriage through clasped hands and their close proximity to each other. The father Hendrick Jansz. nonetheless affirms his position of authority through the pose of his left elbow akimbo.\footnote{The authoritative and often military associations of this pose are elaborated upon in earlier chapters. Joneath A. Spicer, “The Renaissance Elbow,” in \textit{A Cultural History of Gesture}, eds. Jan N. Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992): 84–128.} The couple demonstrates their devotion to the welfare of their children and the importance of instilling virtues of obedience, discipline and \textit{tranquilitas}.\footnote{\textit{Tranquilitas} is discussed as a facet of familial and civic values in the chapter, “Panoramas and Progeny.”} The poses or accessories held by the children manifest the cultural importance of parental education of children and the instillation of familial values in them. In addition to speaking to the virtues of children, the pictorial insistence on well-bred children through symbolic motifs enabled mothers and fathers to claim praise and honor for themselves. Dutch society held parents directly responsible for the behavior of children until they reached the age of legal maturity at fifteen.\footnote{Rudolf Dekker, \textit{Childhood, Memory and Autobiography in Holland: From the Golden Age to Romanticism} (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000), 105–6.}

Cornelis’ placement of his right hand on the horse’s reins and the whip held in his left hand reinforce the ideas of discipline and \textit{tranquilitas}. In the words of Johan van Beverwijck, a
contemporary Dutch physician, “As with horses (as Plutarch says), which if not tamed and properly trained at an early age and always kept reined in, [they] will no longer take heed when given their head, so it is with children, if one gives them their head and allows them to grow up wild.”

Jan’s position atop a goat and Pieter’s restraint of the animal through the reins and whip also allude to the boys’ embodiment of discipline and tranquilitas. In family portraits and portraits of children, the depiction of goats frequently signaled leisured country life and alluded to the pedagogical emphasis on controlling one’s passion at an early age. Jan and Pieter exert physical control over untamed nature in the form of the goat and thus demonstrate their acquisition of these values.

The rattle held by Ryckert, the youngest son, manifests the family’s material wealth and also signals parental affection for the health and happiness of offspring. Typically made of gold or silver, such an object was often received as a baptismal gift (pillegift). A rattle entertained a small child and could be used as a teething ring.

In addition to communicating familial roles and values, the Meebeeck-Cruywagen family portrait manifests the wealth and high standing of the sitters in a number of ways. The industriousness and accumulated wealth of the patriarch enabled the view of a leisured familial visit to their country house, and respite from civic, commercial concerns indicated by the urban

---


438 See also the chapter “Panoramas and Progeny” in this dissertation, which discusses the depiction of goats in family-landscape portraits.

profile on the horizon. In its commemoration of a country locale, earned leisure and escape from urban concerns, the portrait has parallels with *hofdichten*.

Those pressures resulted from Hendrick Jansz.’s professional success as a *zeilenmaker* (sail maker), an investor in shares of ships (*scheepsparten*), and as captain of his neighborhood watch on the Nieuwedijk. A 1662 posthumous inventory of his possessions declared his total wealth of 87,324.17 florins. Hendrick Jansz.’s impressive net worth was based in part on his ownership of many properties, including a house on the Singel in Amsterdam called het Gulden Kruiwagen, from which Hendrick Jansz. adopted his surname, and some land on the Uitweg with a *boerenhuis* (farmhouse) and orchard.\footnote{Hendrick also owned part of a house by de Sparendammerbrug, an inn called de Rode Haan on the north side of the Brouwersgracht, four houses on the Vinkenstraat or Middelstraat. Van Eeghen, “De Familie Meebeeck Cruywagen,” 81; Coene, “Het Geportretteerde Huis,” 107; “Attributed to Jacob van Loo,” last updated January 20, 2015, https://rkd.nl/explore/images/10630.}

In Van Loo’s portrait of the Meebeeck-Cruywagen family, the viewer sees only a small part of the farmhouse visible between two copses, which may represent the orchard referenced in the 1662 inventory of Hendrick Jansz.’s assets. As previously seen in the portrait of the Lestevenon family, the trees depicted in the Van Loo painting may also allude to the productivity of the marital union and the training of their moral and upright children. However, it is unclear why the trees obfuscate so much of the depicted *boerenhuis* given the significance of the site, which remained within the possession of the Meebeeck-Cruywagen lineage after Hendrick’s death. In the inventory, the appellation of *boerenhuis* rather than *buitenplaats* might indicate that the structure retained the older and somewhat outmoded features of farmhouses, instead of the classicizing elements of newer country houses designed by the architect Philips Vingboons and others. Hendrick Jansz. may have been in the process of transforming the *boerenhuis* from a more modest farmhouse to the elaborate estates of mid and late century.
Regardless, even the cropped depiction of the house in the Meebeeck-Cruywagen portrait signals that Hendrick Jansz.’s wealth and status allowed him to acquire possessions comparable to those of his esteemed peers. The horse-drawn wagon, which also references the family’s wealth, could have been their means of conveyance from town to country. Tremendously expensive to own and maintain, a carriage or wagon, carriage house, horse and coachman represented luxurious wealth.441 The wagon’s golden-colored wooden frame and seats may also allude to the Meebeeck-Cruywagen surname and the name of their house, het Gulden Kruiwagen, in Amsterdam.

The earned leisure evident in Hendrick Jansz.’s buitenplaats-family-landscape portrait manifests his industriousness in professional and political spheres that also paved the way for his sons’ eventual status through their own achievements. As adults, their professional positions reflected their success: Claas served as ontvanger (tax receiver and registrar of public debt) in Amsterdam; Jan worked as ontvanger van de Krijgsraad te Amsterdam (tax receiver and registrar of public debt of the highest military branch in Amsterdam); Jacob served as ontvanger van de graafelijkheidstol te Weesp (tax receiver of a toll in Weesp); and in 1662, Pieter was tax collector, presumably for the WIC, on the coast of Guinea where he resided.442

Variations on Jacob van Loo: Bartholomeus van der Helst’s Portrait of Jan Jacobsz. Hinlopen and Lucia Wijbrants, 1666

441 The average price of a horse could range from 130 to 690 guilders and it cost approximately 200 guilders per year to stable a single horse. B. P. J. Broos, “Rembrandt’s Portrait of a Pole and his Horse,” Simiolus 7, no. 4 (1974): 202; Marieke de Winkel, Fashion and Fancy: Dress and Meaning in Rembrandt's Paintings (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 112.

Although not a family portrait in the same vein as other paintings discussed in this chapter, Bartholomeus van der Helst’s *Portrait of Jan Jacobsz. Hinlopen and Lucia Wijbrants*, 1666, pictures a childless couple, but has several noteworthy pictorial elements in common with Jacob van Loo’s portrait *The Meebeeck-Cruywagen Family* (fig. 17). Van der Helst, for example, truncated the view of the sitters’ country house. The couple appears to be on the grounds of their estate with a distant cityscape appearing through the atmosphere on the horizon.

Van der Helst’s double portrait depicts Amsterdam regent Jan Jacobsz. Hinlopen (1626–66) and his second wife Lucia Wijbrants (1638–1719). In the foreground, the couple sits slightly off center. On the right, a balustrade leads to a stone façade with ivy. On the left, gloves and a hat rest on a table. Jan Jacobsz. and Lucia are dressed in all their finery as they grasp hands in marital accord. With his right-handed gesture toward the table, Hinlopen draws the viewer’s attention to signifiers of his wealth: gloves, his hat and the two hunting dogs which stand in front of the table. In the middle ground beyond Hinlopen’s outstretched hand, a woman holds a child; a dog walks alongside them; three girls cavort along the edge of a body of water; two swans paddle by; and a four horse-drawn carriage comes down the lane.

*A schepen* or lieutenant in the civic guard, Hinlopen made his fortune as a cloth merchant. Through his first marriage to Lenora Huydecooper and through his own endeavors, he was well connected in the political sphere. Lenora’s father Joan Huydecooper I played a significant role in the history of country house architecture and land development in the

---

443 While the painting does seem to allude to Hinlopen’s first wife and children in the background, they cannot be said to be portraits since their faces are indistinct. Van der Helst’s portrait has some similarities to Louis Vallée’s *Portrait of a Couple with Their Son*, 1649 (Private Collection). Based on the inclusion of statuary on the cornices of the building behind the sitter and the row of tall trees along the left side of the composition, the family may be shown in front of their *buitenplaats*. This image has not been included in this chapter because the woman appears significantly older than the man and she wears the peaked cap of widows, suggesting she is a grandmother rather than mother to the pictured child. “Louis Vallée,” last updated, January 14, 2016, [https://rkd.nl/explore/images/242100](https://rkd.nl/explore/images/242100).
Maarseveen area. He also played a prominent role in Amsterdam’s political fortunes. In addition to his own professional and political achievements, Hinlopen owned a country estate that would have kept him on equal standing with his former father-in-law Huydecoper I and other regents. After their mother’s death in 1652, Jan Jacobsz. Hinlopen and his brother Jacob inherited the Pijnenburg estate near Soest, which had been designed and built in 1647 by Philips Vingboons.444

Like other buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits, Van der Helst’s Portrait of Jan Jacobsz. Hinlopen and Lucia Wijbrants emphasizes elevated status, leisure and hospitality through setting and other visual elements, but does not highlight familial values in a comparable way. The artist may have actually pictured Jan Jacobsz. and Lucia on the grounds of Pijnenburg because the setting’s features resemble those of other known seventeenth-century buitenplaatsen: a verdant landscape; a canal or pool; a straight tree-lined avenue within view of the partially visible residence; a horse-drawn carriage, which travels down the lane towards the figures at the edge of the water, and presumably toward Jan Jacobsz. and Lucia in the foreground. The depicted carriage that could accommodate travel by the sitters and their guests from the city to the country estate references the Hinlopens’ status and wealth, their leisured lifestyle in the country, as well as their hospitality. As presumable visitors to Pijnenburg, the woman and four children on the estate’s manicured grounds also heighten a sense of welcome and hospitality.

444 Judith van Gent, “Portretten van Jan Jacobsz van Hinlopen en zijn familie door Gabriel Metsu en Bartholomeus van der Helst” Oud Holland 112, no. 2/3 (1998): 129–32; Norbert Middelkoop and Jan Baptist Bedaux, Kopstukken: Amsterdammers Geportretteerd, 1600–1800 (Bussum: Toth; Amsterdam: Amsterdams Historisch Museum, 2002), 218. Certainly, owning a buitenplaats would have kept Hinlopen on equal standing with his father-in-law, Joan Huydecoper, who first bought property at Maarseveen and expanded and embellished the estate on that property.
Alternatively, the middle-ground figures may represent a posthumous depiction of Hinlopen’s first wife Lenora Huydecoper with their still-living son and three daughters.\(^{445}\) Such commonplace commemoration of deceased family members appears in other family-landscape portraiture, including Herman and Cornelis Saftleven’s *Portrait of Godard van Reede van Nederhorst, Emerentia Oem van Wijngaarden, Catharina van Uitenhove and Their Children*, 1634 (Slot Zuylen, Oud-Zuilen); and Johannes Mijtens’ *Portrait of Johan van Wassenaer van Duivenvoorde, Maria van Voerst and Clara de Hinojosa*, 1643 (fig. 18). The latter portrait depicts Johan with his deceased first wife Maria and his living second wife Clara.\(^{446}\) Whether the middle-ground figures in Van der Helst’s portrait of the Hinlopen couple represent actual or fictional individuals, they embody the spirit of welcome, hospitality and enjoyment of the natural world embedded in *hofdichten* themes.

Noteworthy here, some themes that characterize another painting by Batholomeus van der Helst, *Portrait of Jochem Aras and His Family*, 1654,\(^{447}\) discussed in an earlier chapter of this study, converge with those of *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits. Most likely, the artist depicted Jochem van Aras, his wife and their daughter on the grounds of their estate Tetro’s Bosch outside of Haarlem. The setting communicates the worthiness of Van Aras and his family among the most esteemed citizens of Haarlem. The portrait’s setting and the family’s depicted participation in leisure activities, such as hunting, signals their elevated status.

---

\(^{445}\) Lenora died in 1663; daughter Geertruid died in the same year; and their son Jacob died in 1664. Two daughters, Johanna Maria and Sara outlived both parents. Jan remarried two years later in 1665. It is possible that the two living daughters were not included in Van der Helst’s double portrait because Hinlopen wanted a marriage rather than family portrait. Van Gent, “Portretten van Jan Jacobsz. Hinlopen en zijn familie,” 127–38.

\(^{446}\) Johan van Wassenaer van Duivenvoorde also commissioned Mijtens to paint him again with living second wife and sister, along with deceased first wife and parents. See fig. 3 in the chapter, “Ruins and Relations” and “Johannes Mijtens,” last updated March 7, 2016, [http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/14019](http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/14019).

\(^{447}\) See fig. 3 in the chapter, “Panoramas and Progeny.”
Hofsteden on Polderlands: Pieter van Anraedt’s Portrait of Jeremias van Collen, His Wife and Their Twelve Children, c. 1655–57

Unlike the buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits discussed above, Pieter van Anraedt’s Portrait of Jeremias van Collen, His Wife and Their Twelve Children, c. 1655–57, pictures a full view of the family’s country house as well as a significant portion of the estate’s grounds (fig. 3). The portrait presents the family unit as embodying traditional familial values and communicates the worthiness of the family’s association with the most politically and economically powerful families in the province of Holland. The painting depicts Jeremias van Collen (1608–76), his wife Susanna van Uffelen (1622–74), whom he married in 1640 in Amsterdam, and their twelve children. The figures stand on a grand tiled terrace with a view in the center background of their family’s country house Velserbeek. From left to right, the depicted children are Catharina, Susanna, Jacomo, Constantia, Caspar, Jan Pieter, Jan Petro, Elias, Abigail, Ferdinand, Jeremias and Anna Jacoba. Jan Pieter, who stands in the center dressed in white garments and points toward his father and brother, assumed the name of his recently deceased brother Jan Petro, who appears posthumously standing closest to his father. The exceptional size of the family alone would have been worthy of documentation and

---


celebration in the portrait. The Van Collen family fulfilled their procreative duties and, in fact, had far exceeded the average family size for this period in the Dutch Republic.

Jeremias van Collen’s professional successes afforded him the large sum of 7,500 gulden for the 1639 purchase of his country house Velserbeek, located in Velsen, north of the province of Holland. The family used the buitenplaats primarily during the temperate spring and summer months. The estate consisted of a gardener’s house; stable for six horses; carriage house; plantation; orchard; flower and vegetable garden; ornamental gardens laid out in symmetrical, geometrical shapes and decorated with statuary; and a butterfly garden. As a merchant with trade interests in Italy, Spain and the Caribbean, Jeremias and his family also lived in Amsterdam on the Herengracht near the Reguliersgracht in the midst of the wealthiest and most powerful of the citizens. In 1672 upon Van Collen’s death, his brother Ferdinand inherited Velserbeek, although he was forced to sell the estate in 1688 after he went bankrupt.

Van Anraedt’s portrait suggests harmony among all family members in the ways in which the parents and siblings gesture towards or touch one another. These actions also lend dynamism to the composition and draw the viewer’s attention, in turn, to each individual. The portrait depicts the union of Jeremias and Susanna as conforming with expected social roles and obligations. Jeremias stands in a pose of authority and strength and his left hand rests on Susanna’s chair, which suggests their marital accord. Susanna demonstrates care for the well-being and upbringing of her children through her physical support of the youngest, Elias, and in the way Abigail and Ferdinand cluster around her. The fruit on the ledge beside this group references the fertility of the married couple.

---


The *Portrait of Jeremias van Collen, His Wife and Their Twelve Children* includes many of the symbolic motifs that indicate filial obedience, chastity or purity, which appear in other family-landscape portraits also concerned with the moral fortitude of offspring. On the left, Catharina holds a basket of flowers and points to a fountain, perhaps alluding to virtues of purity and chastity. The garland motif carved on the base of the fountain, the fruit exchanged between Susanna and Jacomo, and the verdant backdrop may reference the fecund nature of the union between the parents, Jeremias and Susanna. In the foreground, the two docile dogs likely refer to the importance of raising obedient children. As in Camerarius’ portrait of the Lestevenon family (fig. 1), the erect appearance of the trees may also reference ideal familial discipline.

While some compositional features in *Portrait of Jeremias van Collen, His Wife and Their Twelve Children* draw the viewer’s attention to each of the family members in the foreground, they also link the sitters to Velserbeek in the background. The geometric pattern of the terrace tiles and the orthogonals created by the placement of the trees along the edges of the gardens draw the viewer’s attention to the distant residence, a place where Jeremias might have entertained friends and colleagues. In the center foreground, the implied movement of Jan Petro and a dog walking up the terrace stairs near the child’s father also helps to bridge the distance between the near raised terrace with sitters, and the distant *hofstede* with gardens. The suggested movement of the young boy and the dog on the terrace stairs also links the *buitenplaats*-family-

---

452 The clothing of the children is typical of mid-century styles with the exception of the garments worn by Jacomo. He wears the costume of a page, such as that worn by genre figures in the paintings of Gerard ter Borch. It is difficult to determine the significance of this deviation from then-current modes of fashion. The combination of attire associated with pages in genre paintings and the orange Jacomo extends to Susanna might indicate that Van Collen wished to cultivate some sort of relationship with the Princes of Orange or members of their court through the service of his children. This can only be speculation since Jacomo’s activities as a youth or adult are unknown. For an image of Ter Borch’s page genre figures see, See Alison McNeil Kettering, “Ter Borch’s Ladies in Satin,” *Art History* 16, no. 1 (1993): 97.

453 For a discussion of other family-landscape portraits with dogs, see the chapters “Coasts and Kin” and “Panoramas and Progeny” of this study.
landscape portrait with the actual promenade and contemplation of a country estate’s natural environment, which many *hofdichten* described.

Other details within the *Portrait of Jeremias van Collen, His Wife and Their Twelve Children* communicate valued cultural sophistication among the urban elite. A *buitenplaats* typically had a terrace that provided estate owners and visitors a pleasing vista of the surrounding landscape. Velserbeek may or may not have actually had a terrace on the estate’s grounds. However, a terrace appears often enough in family-landscape portraits and other imagery that its depiction in Van Anraedt’s portrait suggests that a terrace actually existed on the Van Collen estate. Similar terraces, for example, can be seen among the more elaborate and meticulously designed gardens at Elswout and Zorgvliet (figs. 13–14).

Although the terrace and family in *Portrait of Jeremias van Collen, His Wife and Their Twelve Children* appear at a remove from Velserbeek in the background, the statues and fountains on the terrace connect this space to the classicizing style of the country home. The classicizing design of Velserbeek, which conformed with that of newly built country houses from mid-century and later, includes a central block with symmetrical and ordered placement of windows. The preferred classicizing style of many newly built *buitenplaatsen* attested to the owners’ cultivated knowledge; their aspirations for greater economic, social and/or political prestige; and their political affinity with those in power, especially regents who also built houses in this style.

**Variations of Jeremias van Collen’s Family-Landscape Portrait: Frans Hals, Barend Graat,**

Eglon van der Neer and Jan Verkolje

---

Frans Hals’ *Family Portrait*, c. 1635

Several other buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits also include the compositional feature of a terrace with sitters and a background view of a landscape surrounding a country house. Such paintings include Frans Hals’ *Family Portrait*, c. 1635; Barend Graat’s *Portrait of a Family by an Estate*, c. 1643–1709; Eglon van der Neer’s *Portrait of a Family*, 1671; Jan Verkolje’s *Portrait of a Family on a Terrace*, 1680, and *Self-Portrait with the Artist’s Wife on a Terrace*, 1675 (figs. 19–23). In the earliest of these images, Frans Hals’ *Family Portrait*, c. 1635, presents a group of four figures before a partially draped architectural structure and a view of a country estate in the right background (fig. 19). The house displays typical classicizing features with its central block form, symmetrical placement of windows and rooftop statuary. The intervening space between the sitters and the house includes cypress trees, which suggests an Italianate setting. Originally, the setting in Hals’ portrait consisted of a domestic interior, replaced by the view of a country estate at a later date. Since the identity of the family remains unknown, it is only possible to speculate on the sitters’ motivations for requesting this compositional change. Perhaps the patron wanted to see himself and his family as part of a lifestyle to which he aspired. Alternatively, the patriarch may have subsequently acquired a fortune, purchased a country house, and wished to reflect his new success with an altered setting in the family portrait.

Barend Graat’s *Portrait of a Family by an Estate*, c. 1643–1709

---

455 Hals painted several other family portraits that place the sitter in a landscape setting. For example, Frans Hals, *Family Group in a Landscape*, c. 1645–48 (Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid); Frans Hals, *Family Group in a Landscape*, c. 1647–50 (National Gallery, London); Frans Hals, *Van Campen Family Portrait in a Landscape*, c. early 1620s (Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo).


457 There is no evidence to suggest anyone other than Frans Hals painted over the original background. Cincinnati Art Museum curatorial file.
Like Hals’ *Family Portrait*, Barend Graat’s *Portrait of a Family by an Estate*, c. 1643–1709, also pairs the sitters with a classicizing *buitenplaats* (fig. 20). The *hofstede* in Graat’s painting appears to share some features in common with Velserbeek in Van Anraedt’s *Portrait of Jeremias van Collen, His Wife and Their Twelve Children* (fig. 3), such as the central block form and urn atop the roof. However, Graat depicted more elaborate estate grounds in his *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portrait than seen in other examples discussed above. In the background of Graat’s painting, a figure walks within an ordered garden with evenly spaced statuary. Perhaps the family invited an acquaintance to share the pleasures of country life in which they also partake. A boat on the moat or canal, which separates the foreground family group from the distant house and orchards or gardens, may provide transport and access for family members and visitors akin to that seen in Camerarius’ *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portrait (fig. 1). As such, the oared conveyance might reference hospitality, which country house life highly valued.

Although the family depicted in Graat’s portrait has not been identified, the sitters likely hailed from Amsterdam where the artist completed many portrait commissions received from wealthy merchants. The portrayed patriarch may either have been a regent or affiliated with

---

458 Barend Graat’s *Family Group*, 1659 (Buckingham Palace, London) is similar to the artist’s other family-landscape portrait in that it shows family members seated around a table possibly next to a portico entrance to their country house or a pavilion on the estate. The truncated depiction of the architecture does not lend itself to positive identification of the site as a *buitenplaats*. Furthermore, the surrounding landscape appears more untamed and less ordered than is typical of the grounds of other country estates discussed in this chapter. For an illustration see, Desmond Shawne-Taylor, *The Conversation Piece: Scenes of Fashionable Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 44–45.

such city leaders. Perhaps he intended to signal to viewers his steadfastness, wisdom, endurance, peace of mind and virtue in a general sense, which regents professed to possess. The motif of a sphere on a balustrade, such as the one adjacent to the *pater familias* in Graat’s portrait, symbolized just such traits.  

Eglon van der Neer’s *Portrait of a Family*, 1671

A family on a terrace next to a classicizing country house also appears in Eglon van der Neer’s *Portrait of a Family*, 1671, which likely depicts sitters from Rotterdam where the artist worked at the time he completed the painting (fig. 21). Van der Neer’s *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portrait displays many of the typical themes also seen in similar images, discussed above. His painting, however, stands out for its clearer emphasis on hospitality, as well as an unusual undertone of *memento mori*. The family appears before an imposing façade delineated by columns and arched openings. In the middle ground, a couple—perhaps they are visitors to the estate—stands within one of these spaces, as if contemplating a walk within the parterre.

---

460 Eddy de Jongh, “Peace of Mind by the Balustrade. The Implications of an Architectonic Motif in Seventeenth-Century Portraiture,” in *Questions of Meaning: Theme and Motif in Dutch Seventeenth-Century Painting*, trans. Michael Hoyle (Leiden: Primavera Pers, 2000), 220, 230. The chain and medal worn by the child sitting on the table may also allude to the family’s political affiliations. Although it is not possible to discern if there is an image or text on the medal, these types of medals worn often by children in portraits typically express the political inclinations of the family. Claxton, “Medals in Portraits,” 12–23.

461 Previously this image had been identified as a self-portrait of the artist with his family. This identification is unlikely, however, because Van der Neer and his wife Maria had 16 children and only five are pictured. Furthermore, if the image were a self-portrait of the artist and his family it would be doubly unusual in the artist’s oeuvre. Van der Neer only painted one other known self-portrait and this was commissioned by Cosimo I, Duke of Tuscany. Additionally, this family portrait is one of the only group portraits by the artist. Typically he painted individual or pendant portraits. *Sotheby’s Old Master Paintings* (Amsterdam: Sotheby’s, November 14, 1995), 56–57; Yvonne Prins, “Een familie van kunstenaars en belastingpachters. De kunstschilders Aert en Eglon van der Neer en hun verwanten” *Jaarboek van het Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie* 54 (2000): 189–253; Eddy Schavemaker, *Eglon van der Neer (1635/36–1703): His Life and Work* (Doornspijk: Davaco Publishers, 2010), 20–25; “Eglon van der Neer,” last updated March 31, 2017, [https://rkd.nl/explore/artists/59048](https://rkd.nl/explore/artists/59048); “Portrait of a Family,” last updated February 25, 2016, [https://rkd.nl/explore/images/104798](https://rkd.nl/explore/images/104798).
gardens in front of the *hofstede*. Their presence highlights the practice among country house owners of hosting visitors, acquaintances or other family members, as described in *hofdichten*.\(^\text{462}\)

Van der Neer’s *Portrait of a Family* also differs from other *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits in its somewhat somber tone. Even those portraits that include putti to reference the deceased emphasize pleasure experienced in the landscape through leisure activities and the security provided by wealth. Van der Neer’s family group does not contain putti, but the portrait highlights the transience of life and the decay of the natural world in two ways. A broken sculpture appears in the bottom right corner of the foreground and another sculpture of a bereft child stands on the balustrade. These two details that appear in close proximity to the depicted mother may indicate that she has passed.\(^\text{463}\)

Jan Verkolje’s *Self-Portrait with the Artist’s Wife on a Terrace, 1675, and Portrait of a Family on a Terrace, 1680*

In Jan Verkolje’s *Self-Portrait with the Artist’s Wife on a Terrace, c. 1675, and Portrait of a Family on a Terrace, c. 1680*, a family again appears in each painting on a terrace with a country house in the background (figs. 22–23). The artist incorporated almost the same exact setting in the two separate pictures.\(^\text{464}\) The compositions bear a strong resemblance to Hals’ c.

---


\(^\text{464}\) It is unclear which painting was completed first. Verkolje may have painted his self-portrait with his wife prior to the other family portrait, but if this is the case, it begs the question as to why the artist did not include
1635 buitenplaats-family landscape portrait in several ways (fig. 19). The family appears in the left foreground before an architectural structure adorned with drapery and separated from the view of a country estate in the right background. In Verkolje’s paintings, however, the terraced space occupied by the family is slightly more elaborate. The tiled, patterned floor resembles more the terrace seen in Anraedt’s portrait of the Van Collen family (fig. 3), although the comparable area in Verkolje’s paintings is not higher than the house and gardens in the background.

In Verkolje’s two buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits, the sitters engage with each other by sharing a meal, perhaps with the implication that they would offer such hospitality to visitors to their estate. Hondius praised Johan Serlippens’ comparable generosity in sharing the produce of his gardens with invited guests, as discussed above. Similarly, an anonymous London merchant travelling through Dordrecht in 1695 noted the hospitality he enjoyed on country estates. “On Thursday the 8th [September] I went by water [from Rotterdam] to Dordt to settle my son there at school…. After five days’ stay here, in which time Mr. Irish continually attended me in showing me the town, in settling my son with the rector of the Latin school, one Mr. Metzler (very much to my content), he carried us in his yacht to his country house and supplied us with all sorts of good fruit from his gardens as my sister did likewise from hers.”

The sitters who dine on the terrace in two other buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits may also convey the virtue of hospitality. In Barend Graat’s Portrait of a Family by an Estate, the family gathers around a table somewhat incongruously placed outside the hofstede (fig. 20).

---


465 Van Strien, Touring Holland, 130.
In Abraham van den Tempel’s *Portrait of a Family*, 1672, the mother and daughter share fruit (fig. 24).

In several other *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits that position the figures on a terraced space with a view to a garden in the background, the sitters hold musical instruments and/or songbooks, which symbolize familial harmony. Such portraits include those by Jan Weenix, Abraham van den Tempel, Michiel van Musscher and Johannes Vollevenus (figs. 25–29). Instruments and sheet music also convey the themes of social refinement, leisure and wealth. In Abraham van den Tempel’s *David Leeuw and His Family*, 1671, the inscription on the harpsichord states, “acta virum probant (actions prove the man)” and makes explicit the connection between music and cultural sophistication (fig. 26).

*Hofsteden on Polderlands: Cornelis Holsteyn’s Portrait of a Family (Possibly Reynier Pauw and Adriana Jonckheyn and Their Children), 1637*

Although most portraits included only a glimpse of the family *hofstede*, Cornelis Holsteyn’s *Portrait of a Family (Possibly Reynier Pauw and Adriana Jonckheyn and Their Children)*, 1637, presents a full view of the house’s garden façade (fig. 4). Similarly, the *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits by Camerarius and Anraedt, discussed above, also depict a full side of the country house of each of the portrayed families. Holsteyn’s family-landscape

---


portrait depicts the parental couple on the left, two older boys on the right and the youngest two siblings in between them. The placement of the parents and the elder boys creates a framing device that focuses the viewer’s attention on the country house in the background.

The building bears a strong resemblance to the depiction of Westwijk, a country house located on the Purmerend, which Philips Vingboons designed and illustrated. The plans for the country house appear in the publication of Vingboons’ architectural designs, *Afbeeldels der Voornaemste Gebouwen uyt alle die Philips Vingboons geordineert heeft* (Images of Primary Buildings that Philips Vingboons had Dedicated) (Amsterdam: Joan Blaeu, 1648). Plates 28–29 of *Afbeeldels der Voornaemste Gebouwen* illustrate the residence, which was built in 1637. The accompanying text states that beginning in 1644, Reynier Pauw, Lord of Nieuwerkerck owned the estate. However, it remains undetermined whether Holsteyn’s portrait depicts the Pauw family.469

By the time Holsteyn’s portrait was completed in 1637, Reynier Pauw (1612–52) had married his wife Adriana Jonchkeyn (1615–56) in 1632 and the couple had three children: Anna, Anna Albertina and Adriaan. However, at the time of the portrait’s execution, neither the makeup of Reynier’s family nor the ages of all three of his children, who were under five years old, correlate to the family depicted in the painting.470 Furthermore, Holsteyn completed the family portrait before Reynier Pauw purchased the buitenplaats in 1644 from the previous owner, Dirck Tholinx.471

---


470 All three children were born between 1633 and 1637. The artist signed and dated the painting and thus far there has been no reason to doubt the authenticity or accuracy of the signature. [https://rkd.nl/explore/images/125201](https://rkd.nl/explore/images/125201); Cearfoss Mankin, “Dutch Seventeenth-Century Images,” 88, 155, 160.

471 It is unlikely that the family-landscape portrait depicts the Tholinx and his family. Dirck’s children were much older than the offspring who appear in Holsteyn’s buitenplaats-family-landscape portrait. And, the
Aside from the difficulty in identifying the sitters in Holsteyn’s family portrait, the depicted site was clearly meaningful to the portrayed family since the painting also commemorates the Westwijk estate. Through their placement in front of the country house designed by Philips Vingboons, the architect of houses for the wealthiest and most powerful in society, the family in Holsteyn’s painting sought to align themselves with these same groups.

Vingboons’ classically inspired, modern architectural style reinforced a kind of cultural sophistication. He designed Westwijk and at least twelve other buitenplaatsen in Maarsseveen, the Purmer, the Beemster and in areas around Weesp. The areas offered highly desirable locations for building or purchasing country houses. For the wealthy merchant and regent Hinlopen family, Vingboons designed Pijnenburg, visible in Bartholomeus van der Helst’s Portrait of Jan Jacobsz. Hinlopen and Lucia Wijbrants, discussed above (fig. 17). In addition to catering to a burgher clientele, Vingboons also received commissions from the gentry in Gelderland, North Groningen and Overijssel. The buitenplaats-family-landscape portrait reinforces the appeal of such places for leisure and respite from city life, and emphasizes the owners’ interconnected social circles.

The visage of the patriarch in Holsteyn’s painting bears little resemblance to Tholinx as he was depicted in a schutterij group portrait of 1639. [https://rkd.nl/explore/images/10398].


473 Frijhoff and Spies, A Hard Won Unity, 485.

474 Joris van der Haagen and Adriaen van de Velde’s Family Portrait in Front of an Estate on the Purmerend, c. 1651–69 (Musée J. P. Pescatore, Luxembourg), portrays another country estate on the Purmerend. The figures were likely painted by Van de Velde and the landscape by Van der Haagen. Both artists frequently collaborated with other painters in making landscape or genre images throughout their careers. Additionally, collaboration between two artists on a family portrait was not unusual. See, for example, Bartholomeus van der Helst and Jan Baptist Weenix’s Helst’s Portrait of Jochem Aras and His Family and Jan van Bijlert and Bernardus Swaardecroon’s Portrait of Lambert van Kuijk and His Family in the chapter, “Panoramas and Progeny.” Peter C. Sutton, Masters of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Genre Painting (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1984), 492–96; Jan Briels, Vlaamse schilders en de dageraad van Hollands Gouden Eeuw, 1585–1630: met biografieën als bijlage (Antwerp: Mercatorfonds, 1997), 333; Edwin Buijsen, ed., Haagse schilders in de Gouden Eeuw: het
The family in Cornelis Holsteyn’s *Portrait of a Family (Possibly Reynier Pauw and Adriana Jonckheyn and Their Children)* fully partakes of the lifestyle espoused by landowners and idealized in *hofdichten* (fig. 4). On the left side of the composition, husband and wife clasp hands and walk toward their children in the middle and left foreground. The walking stick held by the patriarch alludes to the practice of promenading the grounds of one’s country estate in contemplation of the natural world and its spiritual or scientific revelations. The youngest child sits in a goat-pulled cart close to the parental couple. As in the portrait of the Meebeek-Cruywagen family (fig. 2), the goat demonstrates the importance of *tranquilitas* as a familial virtue that the patriarch possesses and instills in his children. In a similar vein, the dogs communicate the virtue of obedience as a familial value.

The two boys on the right have returned from the hunt. One holds a dead hare and a rifle while a hunting dog stands at attention by the other. In the center, a daughter, who stands between parents and siblings, carries a basket filled with flowers. Hunting, growing and gathering flowers were activities typical of time spent at one’s country retreat. In the family portrait, the goat and hunting motifs signal leisured life as a complement to the industriousness of urban existence. Their presence implies that the participants conduct themselves industriously in other spheres and thus have earned the respite of leisure activities. The virtues modeled by the children reflect favorably on the parents, who have fulfilled their duty to raise honorable offspring. The straight, ordered row of trees that borders the property may also reference the integrity of the children.

Among the *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portraits discussed in this chapter, only Holsteyn’s painting with a view of Westwijk shows the kind of ordered, symmetrical garden

typical of much later *buitenplaats* gardens for which Vingboons advocated. In this style, an axis of symmetry divided a rectangular garden in two equal parts to either side of the center of the house. Subdivisions of the total area of the garden resulted in separate square gardens, parterres and beds of flowers. The regular placement of trees at the edges of Westwijck contributed to the overall geometry that structured the grounds of the estate. The entire rectangular garden was enclosed by tree-lined canals, as was common in polder landscapes.\(^475\)

**Renovated Medieval Kasteelen: Johannes Mijtens’ Portrait of Michiel Pauw, Anna Maria Fassin and Their Children, 1654 and Nicolaes Maes’ Portrait of the Van den Brandelaer Family, 1672**

Johannes Mijtens’ *Portrait of Michiel Pauw, Anna Maria Fassin and Their Children*, 1654, demonstrates the pervasiveness of owning country estates, especially among extended members of the same family lineage and typifies a third type of *buitenplaats*-family-landscape portrait in which the sitters appear before a renovated medieval castle.\(^476\) This image possibly depicts Michiel Pauw (1617–58), Lord of Hoogersmilde and Oosterwijk, his wife Anna Maria Fassin (1628–65) and their two children Adriana (1652–1713) and Johan (1653–86).\(^477\) The family group sits ensconced in fruitful nature near Huis te Heemstede. Through symbols, pose and gestures their portrait conveys many of the many of the same familial virtues and values as those images discussed above.

---


\(^{476}\) Mijtens received commissions from several members of the Pauw family: Reinier Pauw; Adriaan Pauw, nephew and stepson of Reinier; and Gerard Pauw, brother of Adriaan. Bauer, *Jan Mijtens*, 254, 335, 347.

\(^{477}\) By 1625 the Pauws and other notable Amsterdam families had begun to acquire land in the Drente region because of its rich farming soil and flourishing forests. Michiel inherited the title Lord of Hoogersmilde after his father’s death. Michiel’s son Johan would also inherit the title Heer van Hoogersmilde. Previously, the sitters had been identified as the family of Gerard Pauw (1615–76) or that of Adriaen Pauw (1622–97), his wife Cornelia and their children. Bauer, *Jan Mijtens*, 63, 414. “Johannes Mijtens,” last updated June 25, 2015, [https://rkd.nl/explore/images/124435](https://rkd.nl/explore/images/124435).
Michiel Pauw and Anna Maria Fassin married in 1652 and their family-landscape portrait depicts the companionate and procreative nature of their union through the couple’s close physical proximity as they sit in the fertile grounds of Huis te Heemstede with their two children. Adriana stands in between her mother and father and appears to exchange flowers with Anna Maria as she looks toward her brother Johan, who stands between the legs of his father. Johan looks out toward the viewer as he holds fruit in his left arm as the outstretched positioning of his right hand, which holds another piece of fruit, draws attention to the dog leaning on the skirts of Anna Maria. The fruit and flowers held by offspring demonstrate the fulfillment of procreative roles in marriage. As in Sybrand van Beest’s *Portrait of an Unknown Family*, 1650–74, children offering or exchanging flowers or fruit with siblings or parents evoked filial obedience and the assumption that good children will always return the fruit to the giver when asked. The appearance of two dogs within Mijtens’ *Portrait of Michiel Pauw, Anna Maria Fassin and Their Children* also suggests that parents have fulfilled their obligation to teach their children the important virtue of obedience and that children embody that value.

Mijtens’ depiction of Michiel and Anna Maria transposes the usual heraldic positioning of husband on the left and wife on the right. This may be so that Michiel could be in closer visual proximity to Huis te Heemstede, a site which had social and political significance for the Pauw family. The buitenplaats had contained a residence from the thirteenth century and the *Portrait of Michiel Pauw, Anna Maria Fassin and Their Children* pictures the building’s remaining vestiges of its noble, medieval foundation in the two prominent towers. Michiel’s father Adriaan Pauw (1585–1653) acquired the lands and sixteenth-century buildings in 1620 to utilize as a country retreat. Evidence of this use and the value of hospitality often connected to

---

hofsteden can be gleaned by the Elector of Palatine Frederik V and Marie de’Medici’s visit in 1638, followed by that of Henrietta Maria, wife of Charles I in 1642.479

While the house retained some of its medieval character, Adriaan undertook renovations at Huis te Heemstede that highlight his bureaucratic achievements and connections to the highest political realms. The elder Pauw, raadpensionaris (grand pensionary) of Holland and West-Friesland (1631–36 and 1651–53) played a role in facilitating the Treaty of Münster, which he commemorated in the bridge, called Pons Pacis, he built in 1648.480 The bridge is visible in the buitenplaats-family-landscape portrait as it extends from the building to the right edge of the composition. Upon Adriaan Pauw’s death his elder son Gerard inherited Huis te Heemstede, although the site held personal significance for Michiel, Anna Maria and their children since they are buried there.

Nicolaes Maes’ Portrait of the Van den Brandelaer Family, 1672

Nicolaes Maes’ Portrait of the Van den Brandelaer Family, 1672, may convey political affiliations through the pairing of sitters and a country-estate setting (fig. 6). The family portrait depicts father, mother and three children in the foreground, with a view of the hofstede Huis te Eemr in Breda in the background. The painting likely depicts François van den Brandelaer (1623–76), his wife Margaretha Crillaerts (1625–72) and three of their children: Johan, Maria

479 See the discussion of Cornelis Willaerts’ Portrait of an Unknown Family with Rhenen in the Background, 1630–50, in the chapter “Panoramas and Progeny” for a brief biography of Frederik V.

François and Margaretha married in 1656 and lived with their children in Dordrecht, where François was a captain in the civic guard. The putti in clouds above Margaretha probably reference the couple’s deceased child, although they also may indicate a posthumous portrayal of Margaretha. While putti in family portraits typically acknowledge deceased children, they may also allude to departed adults.482

As with most family-landscape portraits, Maes’ painting highlights several facets of familial values and virtues. Through the exchange of fruit between husband and wife, the couple signals conjugal love and the fulfillment of their procreative duty. The fruit—an orange—held between François and Margaretha may also refer to Van den Brandelaer’s military and political support of the House of Orange. In his role as captain of the civic guard, François and his company were sent in the rampjaar of 1672 to the front lines to fight Louis XIV’s troops when the French army invaded the United Provinces. The orange likely alludes to Van den Brandelaer’s support of Willem III from the House of Orange in his desire to reinstate the position of stadholder in his fight against the French. The orange swath of cloth draped across the arm of Margaretha complements the possible meanings of the fruit.483

---

481 Adolph Staring suggests it could be either Jacob or Francois van den Brandelaer. Jacob was the older brother of Francois and had lived at Huis te Emer as his primary residence, along with his wife Johanna Crillaerts and children, since he inherited the property from his father in 1644. Jacob had a stronger connection to the locale and to Maes, as well. Maes served as lieutenant under the captaincy of Jacob in the civic guard of Dordrecht. Evidence mitigating the identification of the family as that of Jacob, Johanna and their children is the fact that the couple had five living children at the time the painting was completed in 1672 and technical examination of the painting, such as radiography, has revealed an inscription that suggests rather the sitter was Francois. Frédéric Elsig, L’art et ses marchés: La peinture flamande et hollandaise (XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles) au Musée d’art et d’histoire de Genève (Genève: Somogy éditions d’art, 2009), 79; Adolph Staring, “Vier Familiegroepen van Nicolaes Maes” Oud Holland 80, no. 3 (1965): 172–75.


Margaretha shows care and affection for her youngest daughter, whom she holds in her lap. The eldest child Maria stands in front of her father and points to a fountain, which may refer to the virtue of chastity. The strand of pearls that lies on the edge of the fountain’s basin connotes purity and thereby strengthens the fountain’s allusion to chastity.\textsuperscript{484}

On the left, the Van den Brandelaers’ son Johan wears classicizing or pseudo-antique attire. He stands with a bow and arrow, which may reference the hunt, a facet of leisure practiced by the wealthy on their estates. In both costume and accessories Johan deviates from contemporary modes of dress, whereas the other family members do not. In some sense, his garb resembles that of children in pastoral portraits or pastoral genre scenes.\textsuperscript{485} Johan’s pseudo-antique garb also carried associations with the military might of ancient Rome. In that context, his attire may allude to his father’s intention to train his son for leadership positions and/or a military career.

The Van den Brandelaer hofstede Huis te Emer in Breda held longstanding connections to the House of Orange. Since the sixteenth century, various Van den Brandelaer ancestors were regents of the gasthuis and burgomasters of that city from which the family hailed. The ruling bodies of Breda had always supported the Princes of Orange and the Van den Brandelaer family members, in their administrative political roles within the municipality, also likely supported them.


\textsuperscript{485} See for example, Gerard van Honhorst’s Hieronymus and Frederik Adolf van Tuyll van Serooskerken, 1641 (M. A. O. C. Gravin van Bylandt Stichting, The Hague); and Pieter Nason’s Boy as Hunter, c. 1689 (Musée J. P. Pescatore, Luxembourg). Jan Baptist Bedaux and Rudoph E. O. Ekkart, eds., Pride and Joy, 172, 271.}
Roelof, François van den Brandelaer’s father, owned property in Breda in the vicinity of Huis te Emer and in 1629 acquired the latter abode as a summer residence. Located thirty minutes outside of the city, Huis te Emer included a brewhouse, coach house, stalls, fishing ponds and an arboretum.\textsuperscript{486} Upon Roelof’s death, the estate passed in 1658 to François’ elder brother Jacob, who used it as his primary residence. Jacob may have resided at the estate, but François probably visited his brother at his country house.

In 1672, Maes completed the image of François and his family in front of the view of Huis te Emer in Breda, a city significant to current political events, rather than in front of their own residence in Dordrecht. The selection of the setting on the basis of possible political resonance for François van den Brandelaer and his family has commonalities with the setting depicted in Christiaen van Colenberg’s \textit{Portrait of a Family with Kasteel Duurstede in the Background}, c. 1665 (Private Collection), as an expression of civic pride.\textsuperscript{487}

\textbf{Conclusion}

The large number of images discussed in this chapter stands as a testament to the popularity of \textit{buitenplaats}-family-landscape portraits that present country property as a symbol of wealth, social prestige and leisure earned through industry and diligence. The portraits depict regents and merchants who appropriated the individual- and family-held ideals of country life as expressed in \textit{hofdichten}, such as honor, leisure earned through industriousness, and hospitality. Additionally, \textit{buitenplaats}-family-landscape portraits functioned as a means of displaying the


\textsuperscript{487} See fig. 8 in the chapter, “Panoramas and Progeny. The Van den Brandelaer family-landscape portrait may also embody ideas in common with Jan Daemon Cool’s portrait of \textit{Eeuwout Prins and His Family}, c. 1635 (Historisch Museum, Rotterdam), and Jacques van der Wijen’s \textit{Wooded Landscape with a Family}, c. 1631 (Private Collection). The settings of the latter two paintings, however, do not definitively have political significance in the same way as the settings of Breda or Kasteel Duurstede.
sitters’ accumulated wealth, elevated social status, cultural sophistication, and affinity with the elite in various cities throughout the Dutch Republic.
Conclusion

The sheer volume of family portraits produced in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic make the genre a rich area of study. This dissertation explored the hybrid family-landscape portrait and ways in which the setting is a significant iconographic element in the construction and representation of familial identity. Landscape settings featuring coasts, urban landmarks, ruins or country houses, as examined in their various historical contexts, could have symbolic meaning that complement the representation of familial identity through gesture, costume and other pictorial motifs. Patrons of family-landscape portraits mostly consisted of wealthy, *burgers* (middle-class) mercantile and political families who embraced shared values and ideals of honor, industriousness, obedience, discipline, earned leisure and remembrance, which artists then signaled through various pictorial details, including the setting.

Chapters divided by commonalities in locale reveal that mercantile or professional identities and values resonated strongly with families pictured along a coast. Kin groups portrayed near urban landmarks tended to highlight communal memory and political or civic values as facets of familial ideals. Such groups adjacent to ruins displayed a concern with history, familial memory and cultural sophistication. Families depicted on their country estates highlighted wealth, communal and professional identities, earned leisure, as well as hospitality, as integral to familial identity.

Chapter 1: “Coasts and Kin” argued that the consistent message of coastal-family-landscape portraits is reciprocity between familial and mercantile values and the interdependency of marital and commercial institutions. The combination of setting, expressive groupings and symbolic motifs convey the idea that honor, self-restraint, industriousness and obedience were at the core of both commerce and kin structures. This chapter expanded the discourse on familial
identity through a consideration of mercantile concepts, such as *partenrederijen* (partnerships or managed partnerships), which are not typically brought to bear in the interpretation of portraits.

Chapter 2: “Panoramas and Progeny” examined images of families living in cities across the Dutch Republic who commissioned portraits of themselves within landscape backdrops, which included important civic landmarks. In most instances, such buildings were the tallest structure within each city, so they could be viewed from a distance. The landmarks indicate specific places, represent community and history, and help convey the message that familial virtues parallel civic values in panoramic-family-landscape-portraits. The chapter suggests that these notions are encapsulated in Simon Stevin’s concept of *burgherlijkheyt*, which has not been addressed previously in art historical scholarship on portraiture. *Burgherlijkheyt* meant acting in a manner that befitted the whole community. Stevin’s praise of individuals who contribute to the esteem of their locality through honorable actions can also be gleaned from texts, such as *stadsbeschrijvingen*, that praised famous citizens and a city’s buildings or topography as an extension of urban pride and values. Through elements of setting and additional pictorial motifs, the depicted families in panoramic-family-landscape portraits seem to embody *burgherlijkheyt* and the kind of praise lavished upon cities and their illustrious citizens in *stadsbeschrijvingen* (city histories).

Chapter 3: “Ruins and Relations” posits that family-landscape portraits manifest the tendency of Dutch citizens to embrace the inevitable cycle of death and regeneration in a period of unprecedented economic and population growth. The appearance of ruins in family-landscape portraits suggests that the themes of remembrance, *memento mori* and family history were of primary importance to the sitters who elected to have themselves depicted in front of crumbling antique structures. The combination of ruins and certain other symbolic motifs allow the
pictured families to present themselves as honorable and worthy of remembrance, to project an identity of elevated social status and sophistication, and to allude to the professional activities of the patriarch.

Chapter 4: “Domains and Dynasties” focuses on images of families on the grounds of their country estates with partial or entire views of their houses and gardens. The buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits allude to the wealth and social prestige of the families in the portrayal of secondary residences that were sites of leisure and hospitality. Such estates could provide opportunities for moral contemplation of nature and the acquisition of knowledge through empirical observation of the natural world. The juxtaposition of site, sitters and symbolic motifs express pride in accomplishment and affirm elevated social status, marital and familial roles, and obligations. They attest to familial values of honor, obedience, discipline and the leisure afforded by industriousness in a professional or political sphere. Additionally, this chapter argues that buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits reveal the value of hospitality as a component of familial and social ideals that has received little attention by art historians in their examinations of such images.

Areas for Future Research

Research in the area of Dutch family-landscape portraits is hindered by two major and important lacuna: a lack of biographical data or identification of the sitters and knowledge of the whereabouts and provenance of paintings currently only reproduced in black and white images. A more comprehensive and nuanced picture of patronage demographics and the interrelationship between site specificity and familial identity in images might be gained if more extensive information on sitter biography and provenance were known. Additionally, such information
might reveal notarial documents that could uncover patterns of placement and display of family portraits within specific rooms in the home.\textsuperscript{488}

To construct further a more comprehensive overview of Dutch family-landscape portraits, additional research might consider paintings of incomplete or blended familial units. For example, portraits in which siblings are pictured without one parent, or with grandparent(s) instead of parents, and/or family portraits that include step-parents and step-children. Such studies might examine if and how pictorial conventions differ in the portrayal of single parents, grandparents or step-parents and step-children. Two examples of a blended type of family unit considered in this dissertation include Nicolaes Maes’ \textit{Portrait of the Cuyter Family} and Cornelis and Herman Saftleven’s \textit{Portrait of Godard van Reede van Nederhorst, Emerentia Oem van Wijngaarden, Catharina van Utenhove and their Children}. In these images, the specific placement of children in proximity to the parental couple seems to have been affected by whether the children were the offspring from a previous marriage or the current union.\textsuperscript{489} Analysis might also examine the early modern conception of father and/or mother as both a biological \textit{and} social relationship, and step-parents as a social relationship. Additionally, family-landscape portraits that only depict siblings, especially when those siblings are adults living independent lives, as seen in the example of Barend Graat’s \textit{Portrait of the Five Deutz Brothers},

\textsuperscript{488} John Loughman, J. Michael Montias, and Frauke Laarmann have shown that multi-figure, larger scale family portraits were frequently displayed in rooms with public access, while portraits of deceased family members could be found in more restricted spaces in a the form of an \textit{Ahnengalerie} (family portrait gallery). Confirmation of these patterns of display through additional primary sources would strengthen the presumed notion of this dissertation that seventeenth-century Dutchmen were concerned with external, outward displays of persona or identity through images for viewers who did not reside at their abodes. John Loughman and J. Michael Montias, \textit{Public and Private Spaces: Works of Art in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Houses}, Studies in Netherlandish Art and Cultural History (Zwolle: Waanders Uitgevers, 2000), 42–46; Frauke Laarmann, \textit{Families in beeld: De ontwikkeling van het Noord-Nederlandse familieportret in de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw} (Hilversum: Verloren, 2002), 48.

1658, might be studied for the interconnectedness between biological and social or commercial networks.490

There are three other subsets of family portraits that might also be included with the family-landscape portraits grouping: those that depict families within an interior space with a view outside to a specific building, street or neighborhood within a city; families who appear in a park setting that does not appear connected to a buitenplaats; and families portrayed within forested environs. The first group of urban-family-landscape portraits includes at least four examples: Cornelis de Man’s Reyer Reyersz. van der Burch, Geertruid Graswinckel and Their Children c. 1673 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Barent Fabritius’ Willem van der Helm, Belytgen Cornelisdr. van der Schel and Their Son 1656 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Nicolaes Maes’ Interior with a Dordrecht Family 1656 (Norton Simon Museum, Pasadena); and Pieter de Hooch’s Family in a Courtyard, Delft c. 1658 (Gemäldegalerie Akademie der Bildenden Künsten, Vienna). These paintings could be compared to the panoramic-family landscape portraits examined this dissertation because they have potentially similar elements of civic pride and values intertwined with familial values. The second group of park-family-landscape portraits would analyze numerous examples by Caspar Netscher, Jan van Noordt, Michiel van Musscher, Nicolaes Maes, Johannes Mijtens and Jan Weenix.491 Such images appear related to

---


491 For example: Herman Meindertsz. Doncker’s Portrait of a Family in a Garden, c. 1650 (National Trust, The Lake District); Johan le Ducq’s Portrait of a Family, Possibly the Loth Family, 1660 (Private Collection); Barend Graat’s Portrait of a Mother and Three Children in a Park, 1657 (Musée des Beaux-Arts de Carcassonne, Carcassonne), Unknown Family, c.1650–74 Private Collection), A Family Group, 1658 (Buckingham Palace, London), Unknown Family, 1675–99 (Private Collection), and Merry Company in a Garden, 1662 (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum); Daniël Haringh’s Portrait of a Family in a Park, c. 1641–1713 (Private Collection); Nicolaes Maes’s Portrait of a Family in a Park Setting, c. 1675–80 (Private Collection); Monogrammist MDW’s Unknown Family, 1624 (Private Collection); Michiel van Musscher’s Unknown Family, 1670 (Unknown Location RKD IB00090807), and Portrait of a Family, 1681 (Mauritshuis, The Hague and Caspar Netscher’s Portrait of a Family, 1667 (Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Rotterdam).
buitenplaats-family-landscape portraits, but they do not contain architecture that would indicate the nearby presence of a country house. They may show an alternate form of park space. Further inquiries into park-family-landscape portraits might indicate that public park spaces did exist and were similar to the newly popular mazes in Amsterdam. The largest group of family-landscape portraits not examined in this dissertation are those that portrayed families near arboreal environs. This group is distinctive for its lack of site specificity. Generalized copses


493 A non-exhaustive list of forested-family-landscape portraits include: Anonymous, Family Portrait (Evansville Museum of Art, Evansville); Anonymous, Portrait of a Family in a Landscape, c. 1655–75 (Jan Roelofs Antiquairs, Amsterdam); Anonymous, Unknown Family, c. 1650–99 (Private Collection); Anonymous, Unknown Family, c. 1650–74 (Unknown Location); Anonymous, Unknown Family, c. 1650–1674 (Unknown Location); Anonymous, Unknown Family, c. 1650–74 (Unknown Location); Pieter van Anraedt’s The Family of Hendrick de Sandra, c. 1649 (Fraylemborg, Slochteren); Gerrit Claesz. Bleker’s Portrait of Jacob Dircksz. de Roy, Marrítge Bonte and Their Sons Jan and Dirck, 1641 (Ons’ Lieve Heer op Solder, Amsterdam); Cornelis Bisschop’s Unknown Family, 1661 (Musée des Beaux-Arts de Quimper, Quimper); Christiaen van Colenberg’s Portrait of Silvester Herremans and His Family (?)(Private Collection), Group Portrait of a Family in a Landscape, c. 1660–65 (Centraal Museum, Utrecht); Jacob Gerritsz. Cuyp’s Family Portrait, 1631 (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille); Jacob Gerritsz. Cuyp and Aelbert Cuyp’s Family in a Landscape 1641 (The Israel Museum, Jerusalem); Follower of Gerard ter Borch’s Family Portrait in a Landscape, c. 1650–99 (Unknown Location); Barend Graat’s A Family Portrait in a Garden Setting (Private Collection), Unknown Family, 1677 (Unknown Location, RKD IB00109438), Unknown Family (Unknown Location, RKD IB00091419), Unknown Family, c. 1650–60 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, SK-A-1911); Frans Hals’ Family Group in a Landscape, c. 1645-1648 (Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid), Family Group in a Landscape, c. 1647–50 (National Gallery, London), Van Campen Family Portrait in a Landscape, c. early 1620s (Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo), Three Children with a Goat Cart (Van Campen Family) c. early 1620s (Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Brussels); Daniel Eliasz. Haringh’s Unknow Family, 1684 (Private Collection); Bartholomeus van der Helst’s The Reemaker Family, 1669 (Musée du Louvre, Paris); Isaack Jacobsz. Hoorn’s Portrait of a Family in a Landscape, c. 1640–52 (Private Collection); Philips Koninck’s Portrait of a Couple with Two Children in a Landscape, c. 1634–88 (Unknown Location); Jacob van Loo’s Portrait of the Family of Rutger van Weert and Maria Beels, 1644 (Johnny van Haeften, London), and Portrait of a Family in a Landscape, c. 1650–60 (Unknown Location); Pieter Merckelbach’s Portrait of a Family at the Edge of a Forest, c. 1648–73 (Museum aan het Vrijhof, Maastricht); Johannes Mijtens’ Portrait of Govert van Slingselandt, Christina van Beveren and Their Two Sons, 1657 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), Portrait of The Van der Graeff Family, 1654 (Birmingham Museum of Art, Birmingham), Family Portrait of Willem van Kerckhoven, His Wife and Their Fifteen Children (Haags Historische Museum, Den Haag), Portrait of Willem van der Does and His Family, 1650 (Museum Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerpen), Portrait of Two Generations of the Van Wassenaer of Duivenvoorde Family 1643 (Kasteel Duivenvoorde, Voorschoten), Portrait of the Family of Matthijs Pompe, c. 1654 (National Museum Stockholm, Stockholm); Johannes Mijtens’ Portrait of Pieter Stalpert van der Wiele and His Family, 1645 (Haags Historisch Museum, Den Haag), Portrait of Laurens Ravens, Maria van Groenesteijn and Their Children in a Landscape 1651 (Institut Collectie Nederland, Amsterdam), Portrait of a Family, Possibly Adriaan and Cornelia Pauw, 1653 (Arp Museum, Remagen), The Martini Family, 1647 (New Orleans Museum of Art, New Orleans), Unknown Family, c. 1650–74 (Unknown Location, RKD IB00093982), A Family Group, 1661 (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin, RKD IB00082230); A. Molenaer’s Unknown Family, 1652 (Unknown Location); Jan van Noordt’s Unknown Family (Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Brussels); Fernandus West’s Alexander van der Capellen and His Family, 1653 (Unknown Location); Matthias Withloos and...
and hills that might be found in numerous sites within the western or eastern Netherlandish provinces are the major landscape features. The appearance of forests in so many family-landscape portraits confounds one because, with the exception of hunting and leisure forests, such as the Haarlemmerhout (Haarlem woods) and Haagse bos (The Hague woods), the provinces of the Dutch Republic had been largely deforested by the end of the Middle Ages. It is possible that forest-family-landscape portraits nonetheless evoke the prestigious and venerable sites of the Haarlem and Hague woods, but additional scholarship may reveal other connotations. These other instances of family-landscape portraits affirm the legitimacy of considering family-landscape portraiture as a distinct genre or category of imagery and demonstrate the need to consider the myriad pictorial and contextual complexity of hybrid portrait types.

Steven van Duyven’s Cornelis Kaiser and His Family, 1676 (Stadhuis Hoorn, Hoorn); Gerard ter Borch and Pieter Molijn’s Family Portrait, Possibly Danielsz. de Marez, Elisabeth de Schilder and Their Family, c. 1645 (Provinciehuis Overijssel, Zwolle).
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