Professor I.Q. van Regteren Altena (1899-1980), professor in art history at the University of Amsterdam, in those days still called the Gemeente-lijke Universiteit, and director of the Rijksprenten-kabinet from 1948 to 1962, put together a collection of drawings. This sizeable collection, mainly acquired in the nineteen-twenties and thirties, reveals wide-ranging interests and a taste that was often unconventional for its time. Altena collected works from the fifteenth to the twentieth century; they are predominantly Dutch, Flemish and Italian, but there are French and German drawings in his collection too.

On many occasions Van Regteren Altena made generous gifts to the Rijksmuseum; the earliest, an intriguing sixteenth-century drawing which at the time was attributed to Cornelis Ketel, dates back to 1928. In 1971 he donated Raphael’s impressive study of the head of a woman, and on his death in 1980 it was revealed that he had bequeathed no fewer than sixty-six Italian drawings to the Rijksmuseum, including Barocci’s fabulous Adoration of the Magi.

After the death of the collector’s widow, in lieu of inheritance tax the heirs gifted an exquisite group of drawings to the State for placement in the Rijksmuseum. This selection from the collection, which came about after close consultation with the keeper and the curators of the Prenten-kabinet, consists of drawings that are all – for various reasons – of great art-historical or cultural interest.

Eleven drawings by Northern and Southern Netherlandish artists from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that form part of the donation are presented below. Each and every one of them is a work that fills a gap in the existing collection in the best way imaginable. As part of the gift there is also a rare terracotta figure by Nicholas Stone, Hendrick de Keyser’s pupil, employee and son-in-law. It is a work that proves to be perfectly at home in this outstanding assembly.

We hope to devote attention to other aspects of the Van Regteren Altena gift in subsequent issues of the Rijksmuseum Bulletin.

I MAARTEN VAN HEEMSKERCK
(Heemskerk 1498 – 1574 Haarlem)
Study sheet with Roman ruins on both sides
Pen and brown ink, outlines partially indented for transfer, 187 x 282 mm
Verso, an illegible inscription top left
Maarten van Heemskerck spent the years 1532 to 1536 in Rome. Van Mander makes a point of telling us that he did not waste his time being idle and carousing with other Dutch artists, but that he diligently recorded the relics of antique art and the countless ruins of the Eternal City in his drawings. Certainly a considerable number of Heemskerck’s drawings of Rome have survived; the bulk of them are to be found in two albums in Berlin compiled in the eighteenth century that are usually designated as the Römische Skizzenbücher. The Rijksmuseum already owned a couple of drawings from Heemskerck’s time in Rome, but they are sketches of details of antique – and also later – works of art. Until now the collection lacked a good view of the ruins in Rome. The
newly-acquired drawing eloquently illustrates the economical use Heemskerck made of his paper. After he had drawn a number of overgrown ruins – possibly on the Palatine – he gave his sheet a half turn and almost completely filled the paper with even more studies of the decayed glory of Ancient Rome. The huge complex on the right may well also have been on the Palatine; the tall structure on the left in the foreground is a relic of the Septizodium or Septizonium built by Emperor Septimius Severus at the beginning of the third century AD on the same hill. The verso is also filled with a study of an unspecified ruin and a view of the city wall of Rome. The sketch sheet is a fine example of the crisp, stenographic drawing style with short strokes, horizontal parallel hatching lines and – in the shadow passages – cross-hatching lines, which Heemskerck employed in his time in Rome.

Closer examination reveals that parts of the outlines of the ruins depicted, both on the front and the back, have been indented with a sharp stylus. This way the composition could be transferred on to a copper plate or a new sheet of paper. However we do not know of any print by or after Maarten van Heemskerck in which these ruins occur, nor has a second drawing of the same architecture so far come to light.

LITERATURE:
- exh. cat. Kabinet van tekeningen: 16e en 17e eeuwse Hollandse en Vlaamse tekeningen uit een Amsterdamse verzameling, Rotterdam (Museum Boymans-van Beuningen), Paris (Institut Neerlandais), Brussels (Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I), 1976-1977, pp. 40-41, no. 72, ill. Pl. 7 (with reference to older literature);

PROVENANCE:

2 LODEWYK TOEPUT
Lodovico Pozzoserrato)
Mechelen 1550-1605 Treviso)
St John the Evangelist on Patmos
Pen and brush and brown ink, 217 x 308 mm

No matter how magnificent and extensive a collection may be, there is always something to be desired. Amsterdam is no exception. The lack of a characteristic work by Lodewijk Toeput in the collection of early Netherlandish drawings has long been considered a deficiency. In the last few decades there have been two attempts to fill this gap, but on both occasions they were unsuccessful. The acquisition of Toeput’s St John the Evangelist on Patmos has finally put paid to this undesirable situation.

Born in Mechelen, Lodewijk Toeput moved to Italy in the sixteenth-seventies and found his second home there. He never returned to the north. Toeput’s contemporaries particularly admired his frescos and paintings of landscapes. Forty years after Toeput’s death, his biographer Ridolfi was still praising his virtuosity in the depiction of all kinds of weather conditions, particularly rain showers and storms. Toeput generally painted landscapes filled with tiny biblical figures; for example Ridolfi described a work with ‘a bridge with two arches, ravaged by time, under which sails a boat containing the Virgin Mary on the flight into Egypt’ (Le Maraviglie dell’ Arte Ovvero le Vite degli Illustri Pittori Veneti e dello Stato Descritte da Carlo Ridolfi Herausgegeben von Detlev Freiherr von Hadeln, Berlin 1914, Vol. II, p. 93). A large part of Toeput’s drawn oeuvre is similarly made up of landscapes seen from a high vantage point, sometimes enlivened with tiny figures from biblical stories, myths or fables.

St John the Evangelist on Patmos displays Toeput’s characteristic, almost naive exuberance of landscape motifs, coupled with an extremely refined drawing style. In Toeput’s view the Greek island of Patmos, where St John was said to have written his Revelation, is no more than a rock overgrown with trees and shrubs rising from an inlet. On the left, in an open space, we can see the tiny figure of the evangelist accompanied by his eagle, which is spreading its wings. John gazes towards the heavens where, high in the clouds, the vision of a woman appears, clothed with the sun, the moon beneath her feet and a crown of five stars on her head (Revelation 12:1). It seems as if all the light in the scene originates from the vision: this gives the artist the opportunity to show up the landscape against dramatic backlighting. Toeput tested his mettle on the theme of St John on Patmos more than once. There is a drawing of the same subject by the artist in the Pierpont Morgan
Library in New York, almost the same size as the version in Amsterdam (Felice Stample, with the assistance of Roth S. Kraemer and Jane Shoaf Turner, Netherlandish Drawings of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries and Flemish Drawings of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York / Princeton 1991, p. 60, no. 102, ill.). In the version in New York we can see the seated figure of the evangelist writing his Revelation. The eagle is far less prominent than in the Amsterdam drawing; the bird is almost lost against the background and its presence can only be discovered after some searching. The vision of the woman crowned with stars is absent, and with it the heavenly source of light that makes the Amsterdam version such a visionary spectacle. The drawing in New York appears somewhat pale in comparison to the one in Amsterdam.

PROVENANCE:
I.Q. van Regteren Altena, Amsterdam; Heirs of I.Q. van Regteren Altena; Gift 2008 (inv. no. RP-T-2008-98).

3 KAREL VAN MANDER
(Meulebeke 1548-1606 Amsterdam)
Peasant Fair
Pen and grey ink, outlines indented for transfer, 284 x 406 mm
Verso: sketch of a head, pen and brown ink
Signed and dated bottom left: KvMander 1592
(the first three letters in monogram)
Below the scene two quatrains: Siet hier de boeren, in haar magesteyt coen / De kermis vieren, met gieter en gapen / Zij houden wel vele, van goet bescheyt doen / maer weinich bescheyt, cammen daer betrapen / Deen singt dander springht de derde wil slapen / Of den papegaei schieten, voor slechten: buyt / Daer de verkens commen de pijlen rapen / Dan comt het noch dicwijls op een vechten: uit.

In his biography of his much younger fellow countryman, Karel van Mander praised David Vinckboons’s Peasant Fair, which he described as ‘also very full of subtle and lively postures’ (‘ook heel vol aerdige en eluchtige bootsen’). Van Mander knew what he was talking about: peas-
ant scenes also recur with some regularity in his own painted and drawn oeuvre. Of the scenes of partying peasants by Karel van Mander that we know of to date, this drawing, with its ambitious composition, spiky drawing style and visual jokes, is definitely the most attractive.

As is usual in scenes of peasant celebrations, weddings and annual fairs from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the image painted of the peasant is not particularly flattering. Here Van Mander expresses the opinion of the bourgeoisie: peasants are coarse, boorish and intemperate folk. The town-dweller is also included in the scene. In the right foreground stand a distinguished lady and gentleman, who are obviously well-to-do citizens, dressed in the latest fashion. We see the woman from the back. She, like us, the audience, watches the scene and comments: the peasants celebrating at the fair are overindulging in food, drink, dancing and other idle entertainment, and ten to one the fun will end in a punch-up. The man, whose face is partially visible, seems to have turned away from events in disgust. It cannot be denied, things are pretty rough at this fair. People are dancing, on their own, in couples and in a circle, to the music of a bagpipe player. In the foreground on the left a couple are kissing and cuddling with total abandon. On the right a group of people are sitting at a table stuffing themselves with food and knocking back the liquor. It has become too much for one of the merrymakers; everything has had to come up. Two pigs are benefiting from the man’s vomit. The genteel lady was right. In the background we can see that the festivities have degenerated into an ugly brawl. One of the combatants is lying on the ground and it does not look too good for him: his opponent has drawn a huge knife. A third man raises a stick above his head to hit the other two. His wife tries to stop him getting involved in the fight.

There are quite a lot of children running round the fairground. Two little girls almost in the centre concentrate hard on the dance they are doing. In the left foreground a little boy on a hobby-horse looks open-mouthed at the wild antics of a dancer. The boy seen from the back with his wild hair sticking up in all directions is wonderfully characterized. The lad is the companion of an old, hunchbacked beggar in a long, much-patched...
coat. Most appealing of all are the two children in the foreground on the right, near the two burghers. The little boy is shy so close to these wealthy townsfolk, and looks bashfully at the ground. The girl, on the other hand, is totally unimpressed by all this stateliness and regards the beautifully turned-out lady from the city with undisguised curiosity. It is as if by including this little girl Van Mander wants to put his own moral message into perspective: although these merry-making peasants are no paragons of virtue, the visitors from the town with their exaggerated attention to chic trappings and refined manners may not be the measure of all things either.

Nicolaes Jansz. Clock engraved a print dated 1593 after the example of Van Mander’s drawing. (Leesberg 1999, pp. 132-133, no. 118 (ill.)) Clock’s engraving has an inscription in Latin hexameters by a poet calling himself Franco Estius (van Est). In tone – somewhat ironical and slightly moralizing – the text is not all that different from the one under the drawing. There is also a much smaller reversed copy after Clock’s print by an unknown engraver (Leesberg 1999, p. xlvi, fig. 17).

The Rijksmuseum already owned a drawing by Van Mander dated 1588 of two drunken fairgoers. Although this merry pair is sometimes described in literature as a peasant couple, they are certainly not rustics returning home from the fair the worse for wear; they are in fact a soldier and his sweetheart. The acquisition of the drawing from the Van Regteren Altena Collection means that the peasant genre, certainly not an insignificant part of Van Mander’s oeuvre, is now represented in the collection in the best conceivable way.

LITERATURE:

PROVENANCE:
HANS MONT
(Ghent c. 1545-c. 1590 Constantinople?)
Five Figures Standing and Walking
Brush and brown and white inks, over a sketch in black chalk, on blue paper,
165 x 156 mm
Signed or old annotation bottom right:
Hans Montes | van ghent
We are quite well informed about the life of Hans Mont thanks to Karel van Mander, who must have known him personally. Van Mander relates how Emperor Maximilian, in search of two gifted young artists, a painter and a sculptor who would be suitable to serve him on great works and buildings, consulted the great sculptor Giovanni da Bologna. Giambologna recommended Spranger, with whom he had worked a great deal on the papal palace, as the painter, and as the sculptor ‘someone also in Rome at the time, his pupil, the most excellent strikingly art-full young man Hans
Mont, sculptor, born in Ghent in Flanders and one of the most subtly gifted in the world, who particularly caused Spranger to agree to move there, because one thing is certain, he would never have left Rome without Hans Mont for he planned and had every intention of devoting himself to study, eventually, before leaving’ (‘... die oock te Room was, en zijn Discipel, den seer uytmnemenden, seldsamen constighen Jongman, Hans Mont, Beeldhouwer, gheboren te Ghent in Vlaender, een van de alderbeste edel ghedesten der Weerelt, den welcken den sonderlinghen oorsaker was, dat Sprangerh bewilichhde daer henen te trecken: want dat is een gewis dingen, dat sonder Hans Mont, hy noyt van Room waer vertrokken, meenende en vast voor ghenenom hebbende eenmael hem tot studeren te begheven, eer hy vertreken soude ...’) (Karel van Mander, The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, With an Introduction and Translation, edited by Hessel Miedema, Vol. 1, Doornsijp 1994, pp. 344-349; Vol. v. Doornsijp 1998, pp. 99-105). The two friends left for Vienna and arrived there in 1575. Emperor Maximilian died in the following year. When his successor, Rudolph II, finally arrived in Vienna he commanded Spranger to remain there, while Mont was ordered to travel to Prague in the emperor’s retinue. After several months in which no commissions were forthcoming, Mont, believing that the emperor was keeping him on a string, decided to leave Prague. As Van Mander put it, he saw himself ‘led by the nose as one does with buffaloes’ (‘gheleydt, gelijck als by de neuse, soo men de buffels doet’). So ends Van Mander’s account; the only other thing he could tell us is that he understood that Mont may have settled in Turkey. We know from another source that when Mont was watching a ball game in Prague in 1584 he was hit in the left eye by a ball, and as a result became blind in that eye and had to abandon his career as a sculptor. All in all, his life story seems to be the tragic tale of the declining career of a highly talented man.

Although Van Mander spoke highly of Mont’s qualities as a sculptor, nowadays we do not know of a single statue that can be credited to him with certainty. The situation with regard to his art on paper is better, but not that much: only a handful of drawings can be attributed to him. In the Uffizi in Florence there is an intriguing mythological scene, probably Jupiter and Antiope, which bears an old inscription – not a signature: G°Mo[n]t Fiammingo. (Arjan de Koomen in: Wouter Kloek and Bert W. Meijer (eds.), Fiamminghi e Olandesi a Firenze Disegni dalle collezioni degli Uffizi, Florence 2008, pp. 48-51, no. 27, ill.). The drawing style with angular outlines, bold parallel hatching lines and a strong chiaroscuro effect is reminiscent of the work of Hans Speckaert. A St Sebastian monogrammed HM is somewhat akin to the drawing in Florence (sale Amsterdam (Sotheby’s), 2 November 1987, no. 25, ill. See also An Zollo in Oud Holland 106 (1992), p. 43, ill. Pl. 15). The only drawing to date that might perhaps be termed as ‘signed’ is the sketch of five standing and walking figures from the Van Regteren Altena Collection. The inscription in the right bottom corner appears to have been written in the same ink as that used for drawing the composition. In technical and stylistic respects there is little similarity to be found between this work and the two drawings referred to above. A pen was not used here: the composition was set down with a brush alone, with quick strokes and broad areas; the blue of the paper acts as a mid tone, the brown denotes the shadows and the white suggests the highlights. The effect is not dissimilar to that of Italian chiaroscuro woodcuts from the first half of the sixteenth century, and the drawing can therefore be linked to a passage from Van Mander’s Leerdicht, in which he advises young artists to practise drawing by copying such woodcuts.

On the grounds of similarities in technique and style to the Five Figures Standing and Walking there are two drawings attributed to Hans Mont: a Sacrificial Scene in the Szépmivészeti Múzeum in Budapest (exh. cat. Vienna 1988, pp. 373-374, no. 233, ill.) and a Triumphal Procession which was sold in Paris some years ago (sale Paris (Piasa) 19 June 2003, no. 48, ill.).

**Literature:**


**Provenance:**

Jan Nagel is another of those artists, like Hans Mont, who seem to have left only a handful of surviving works. We know almost nothing about his life. In Van Mander's biography of the Antwerp landscape painter Cornelis Molenar, nicknamed Schele Neel, he refers to him briefly: 'There was one who succeeded him in landscape, but who never became as good, though he surpassed him in figures: Jan Naghel, from Haarlem or Alkmaar, who died in The Hague in 1602'. ('Daer is gheweest een, die hem (Molenar) naevolghde in 't Landschap, doch noyt achterhaelde, dan wel in beelden voor quam, Jan Naghel, van Haerlem oft Alckmaer, ghestorven den Haegh, Anno 1602.') We will have to make do with this: this Jan Nagel, who was born in Haarlem or Alkmaar, never equalled his master in painting landscapes, but he surpassed him in the portrayal of the human figure. Older literature states that he died in 1616, but that must have been another artist of the same name; nowadays it is accepted that Van Mander was well informed about the year of Nagel's death (Karel van Mander, The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, With an Introduction and Translation, edited by Hessel Miedema, Vol. 1, Doornspijk 1994, pp. 284-287; see also Irene van Tiel Stroman in: Paintings in Haarlem 1500-1850 The Collection of the Frans Hals Museum, Ghent / Haarlem 2006, pp. 255-256). One of his rare paintings is a Mary Magdalen Reading dated 1592 or 1597 in the Frans Hals Museum in Haarlem (Paintings in Haarlem 1500-1850 The Collection of the Frans Hals Museum, Ghent / Haarlem 2006, pp. 561-562, ill.)
The drawing may have served as the first sketchy design for a painting.

**LITERATURE:**
exh. cat. Rotterdam / Brussels / Paris 1976-1977, p. 54, no. 92, ill. (with reference to older literature)

**PROVENANCE:**
L.Q. van Regteren Altena, Amsterdam; Heirs of L.Q. van Regteren Altena; Gift 2008
(ibv. no. RP-T-2008-100).

---

Paulus van Vianen
(Utrecht c. 1570-1613 Prague)
A Wooden Bridge to a House built half over a Town Canal
Verso: Rocky Landscape with Trees
Pen and black ink, brush and grey and pink inks, 120 x 192 mm
Verso: pen and black ink, brush and brown and grey inks
In 1603 the renowned silversmith Paulus van Vianen went to work for Emperor Rudolph II in Prague, where he would remain until his death in 1613. In Prague he became acquainted with
Roelant Savery and it is probably safe to assume that from time to time the two artists went on sketching outings together. At any rate their landscape drawings are strikingly similar in the choice of subjects. Van Vianen never seems to have risked the extremely large sizes that Savery sometimes produced; in general his landscapes are far more modest in size. Van Vianen used chalk only infrequently in his nature studies. Most of his landscapes were drawn with a gossamer-thin pen and then washed with a brush and brown or grey ink, sometimes with a small addition of less common colours like soft pink and blue-green. Beside Savery’s down-to-earth, loosely-drawn landscapes, Paulus van Vianen’s look like ethereal visions.

As Sandrart tells us, Savery collected motifs in order to use them later in his paintings, and Van Vianen’s drawings similarly served the art that brought him his greatest fame: chasing silver. Paulus van Vianen possessed the well-nigh inconceivable ability to convert his landscape drawings into embossed work in silver without its losing the tiniest nuance. For instance, the house with the rather shaky-looking bridge on the recto of the drawing described here found its way on to the base of a drinking bowl dated 1607 in the Rijksmuseum (T. M. Duyvené de Wit-Klinkhamer, ‘Een drinkschaal van Paulus van Vianen’, Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum 2 (1954), p. 83, fig. 7). The motif of the delicate trees on the tor can be found in the background of a silver plaque of Pan and Syrinx of 1603, likewise in the Rijksmuseum (exh. cat. Zeldzaam Zilver uit de Gouden Eeuw: De Utrechtse edelsmeden Van Vianen, Utrecht (Centraal Museum) 1984-1985, p. 38, no. 10, ill.). This tells us that Van Vianen’s drawing could not have been made later than 1603.

**LITERATURE:**

**PROVENANCE:**
I.Q. van Regteren Altena, Amsterdam; Heirs of I.Q. van Regteren Altena; Gift 2008
(inv. no. RP-T-2008-95).

---

7 **PAULUS VAN VIANEN**
(Utrecht c. 1570-1613 Prague)
*A Tree-Trunk as a Bridge over a River*
Verso: *Study of a Gnarled Tree*
Pen and black ink, brush and grey, pink and blue-green inks, 120 x 102 mm
Verso: pen and black ink, brush and brown ink
This sheet is the same size as the drawing described above; in all probability both sheets came from the same sketchbook. This drawing also provided subject matter for embossing in silver. The felled – or fallen – tree that serves as a primitive bridge over a brook, both banks of the brook, the wooden fence to the right and the stooping man standing more than knee-deep in the water all return in one of the three landscapes on the cover under the lugs of the drinking bowl of 1607 (Duyvené de Wit-Klinkhamer 1954, p. 81, fig. 6).

**LITERATURE:**

**PROVENANCE:**
I.Q. van Regteren Altena, Amsterdam; Heirs of I.Q. van Regteren Altena; Gift 2008
(inv. no. RP-T-2008-94).

---

8 **ROELANT SAVERY**
(Courtrai 1576-1639 Utrecht)
*Study of Gnarled Trees*
In linseed oil-saturated charcoal, black chalk, brush and red and blue-green watercolour on light brown paper, 482 x 370 mm
Eben so grosse Erfahrung liess er auch merken in Steinfelsen, Klippen Rotzen Bergen und Wasserfällen, daeho Kayser Rudolphus bewogen, ihn in Tyrol verschickt, um darinne der Natur seltsame Wunder mehr zu erkundigen: also zeichnete er alle schönste und verwunderlichste Gebürge und Thäler dieses Landes aufs fleißigste mit der Feder, die grosse Bäume mit Kohle, die weit-aussehende Werke aber mit Wasserfarben, in zweyen Jahren, in ein grosses Buch, das ihm hernach in seinen Landschaften sehr wohl zu Nutzen kam... (Joachim von Sandrart auf Stockau, l’Academia Todescha della Architettura,

Sandrart’s description of the drawings, and in particular the materials used, is so detailed that we get the impression that he had seen Savery’s Tyrolean landscapes with his own eyes. And that is quite possible. Sandrart lived in Amsterdam from 1637 to 1645, and he numbered scores of artists, including Rembrandt, among his acquaintances. As we know from the inventory of his estate, Rembrandt had in his collection Een dito boeck, groot, met teekeninge in ’t tirol van Roelant Savrij nae ’t leven geteeckt, (a ditto book of drawings drawn from life in the Tyrol by Roelant Savery) (Walter L. Strauss and Marjon van der Meulen, The Rembrandt Documents, New York 1979, pp. 376-377). So Sandrart could very well have seen Savery’s drawings at Rembrandt’s studio. Be that as it may, in Sandrart’s text about die grosse Bäume – the large trees – which Savery drew mit Kohle – in charcoal – we automatically think of the drawing in the Van Regteren Altena Collection. There the artist made lavish use of charcoal saturated in linseed oil, a material that gives a powerful, deep brownish-black line. The linseed oil acts as a fixative; once a line has been drawn it cannot be erased. Only a handful of large tree studies like these have survived. A somewhat smaller drawing of an uprooted tree-stump which was acquired by the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York around ten years ago is similar in the combination of materials (Michiel C. Plomp in: ‘Recent Acquisitions, a Selection: 1999-2000’, The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin 58, No. 2 (Fall 2000), p. 31, ill.). A tree study in Berlin is if anything even more ghostly than our drawing (Justus Müller-Hofstede in Kunstchronik 29 (19760, p. 32, ill. P. 43). Of the same calibre, but more traditional in the use of colour – the linseed oil-saturated charcoal which gives such an unusual effect is lacking here – is a study of a lopsided hollow tree in the Atlas van der Hem in de Nationlabibliothek in Vienna (Peter van der Krogt and Erland de Groot, The Atlas Blaeu-van der Hem of the Austrian National Library, Vol. v., Westreenen 2005, p. 592, no. 46:05, ill.) What these drawings have in common is the malicious glee with which the artist has reproduced the terrifying grotesqueness of nature. The question remains as to whether huge drawings like these were made on the spot. Since 1975 the Prentenkabinet has owned a small tree study by Savery, which is very similar in composition to the abovementioned drawing in Vienna (Marijn Schapelhouman, Nederlandse tekeningen omstreeks 1600 / Netherlands Drawings circa 1600 (Catalogue of the Dutch and Flemish Drawings in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, Vol. iii, The Hague 1987, pp. 128-129, ill.) The small study shows traces of a network of squares which would have been used as an aid in scaling the composition up to a larger size. It is not out of the question that the large, detailed drawings were created in the studio on the basis of small studies from nature. Sandrart wrote that Savery’s book of landscape drawings came in very useful afterwards (’sehr wohl zu Nutzen kame…’) for paintings; indeed Savery seems to have considered his landscape drawings principally as a treasure trove of motifs on which he could draw when painting. The tree-stump with its fanciful roots in our drawing can be found in a little painting of a Deer Hunt dated 1610 (Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, L’École de Praque La Peinture à la Cour de Rodolphe II, Paris 1985, p. 280, no. 19-44, ill.).

LITERATURE:

PROVENANCE:
C. Hofstede de Groot; I.Q. van Regteren Altena, Amsterdam; Heirs of I.Q. van Regteren Altena; Gift 2008

(inv. no. RP-T-2008-96).

9 JACOB DE GHEYN II
(antwerp 1565-1629 the Hague)
The design for the last print in the series Omnium rerum vicissitudo est
Pen and brown ink, brush and grey ink, outlines indented for transfer, 229 x 160 mm Annotated in the cartouche at the bottom in the centre: Omnium rerum vicissitudo est (pen and brown ink, all but illegible)
In the sizeable group of De Gheyn drawings in the Rijksmuseum – apart from the drawings for a number of figures in the Wapenhandelinghe – designs for prints are few and far between. The artist’s early work, in which he clearly reflects the Mannerism of Hendrick Goltzius, is likewise barely represented in the collection. The arrival of the design for the last engraving in the Omnium rerum vicissitudo est series, which must date from 1596-1597, is therefore a very welcome addition.

The title of the series, which comprises nine prints, is taken from a line in a comedy by Terence that can be freely translated as ‘all things follow from one another’. Existence proceeds in a fixed order, and when the cycle has been completed it begins all over again. The first eight prints in the series are portrayals of allegorical figures, each representing one phase in the cycle. The series begins with Good Fortune which is the result of Peace. Good Fortune brings Wealth, Wealth creates Pride, Pride causes Envy which results in War. War brings Poverty, which leads to Godliness, and Godliness brings Peace. This completes the circle. The entire series is summed up in the last print. The composition is described here on the basis of the drawing; the engraving is in mirror image. The personification of Peace sits atop a globe; Good Fortune stands beside her on the left and then Wealth, Pride, Envy, War, Poverty and Godliness follow anti-clockwise until we come back to Peace. In this last design De Gheyn did not take the easy option of simply ‘pasting’ the allegorical figures from the first eight prints on to the globe. The eight individual allegorical figures create a rather static effect because they are all portrayed standing. In the last drawing De Gheyn placed his little figures in many more varied poses, standing, sitting and kneeling, so that his personifications achieve their full dramatic potential. So, in spite of the modest scale of the figures, it is perhaps in this drawing that De Gheyn comes closest to the Haarlem mannerism of his master Goltzius, and does so in a most convincing way.

All the designs for the series have survived. The drawing for Good Fortune was sold at Sotheby’s in London on 4 July 1994 and has since disappeared from view. The other drawings are in the Print Room of the University of Leiden (Wealth, Pride, War, Poverty and Peace), the Kunsthalle in Hamburg (Envy) and the P. and N. de Boer Foundation in Amsterdam (Godliness). (Van Regteren Altena 1983, 11, pp. 48-49, nos. 177-184, II, pp. 47-49, figs. 26-32).

Zacharias Dolendo made engravings after De Gheyn’s drawings, all of which have Latin couplets by Hugo de Groot (The New Hollstein, Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts 1450-1700: The De Gheyn Family, Part 1, compiled by Jan Piet Filedt Kok and Marjolein Leesberg, edited by Ger Luijten, Rotterdam 2000, pp. 174-184, nos. 114-122, ill.). Aet. XIII was added to Grotius’s signature on the first print from the series, which means the poet was thirteen years old when he wrote those lines. This makes it possible to date the series reasonably accurately: it must have been created in 1596 or in early 1597. The prints are numbered from 1 to 9. The engraving after the newly-acquired drawing is number 9 and, although it looks like a title page, it was designed as the conclusion of the series.
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Supposedly anonymous sale (H. de Winter, B. Tiedeman zin en J. Yver) 11 February 1776 and following days, Album A, no. 114: Een Zinnebeeldige Quarto Titel, in de manier als de voorgaande, door denzelven (J. de Gyn); sale De Gruyter, Berlin (Sachse’s Kunst-Auktion) 2 February 1885, no. 24; sale R.P. Goldschmidt, Frankfurt am Main (Prestel) 4-5 October 1937, no. 224, fig. Pl. 37; W.A. Engelbrecht, Rotterdam; his sons; L.Q. van Regteren Altena, Amsterdam; Heirs of L.Q. van Regteren Altena; Gift 2008 (inv. no. RP-T-2008-97).
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10 PIETER VAN MELDERT
(active in Middelburg around 1625)

*Allegory on Farming*

Pen and brown ink, brush and grey ink, 181 x 125 mm

Signed at the bottom to the left of centre: Meldert; monogrammed and dated below, right of centre: pvm 1614

The collection policy of the Rijksmuseum’s department of prints and drawings, the Prentenkabinet, has always aimed at being able to present the broadest possible overview of Dutch drawing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This means not only that the work of the great masters – Goltzius, De Gheyn, Rembrandt – is welcome in the collection, but that rather less exalted artists
should be represented too. A collection that consists of nothing but artistic highlights eventually becomes tedious. To make a musical comparison: no symphony orchestra can be without its second violins.

A drawing such as the Allegory on Farming is therefore entirely in its place in the Rijksmuseum. To date it is the only known signed work by Pieter van Meldert, an artist about whom we know precious little. Van Meldert had poetic aspirations: he is the author of the ode to Zealand poets, Eer-Liedt Tot de Zeeusche Poëten, which was printed in the De Zeeusche Nachtegaël anthology in 1623. The poem is signed with Van Meldert’s initials and his motto: Doende leerlmen (One learns by doing).

An optimistic motto, but Van Meldert became no more than an undeniably minor poet. Poetry must only have been a leisure activity; by occupation Van Meldert was a ‘glass writer’: a designer – and possibly also a maker – of stained glass. In 1625 he supplied windows decorated with coats of arms for the Kloveniersdoelen, the new militia headquarters in Goes, but none of this glass has survived. Only the Allegory on Farming remains to testify to Van Meldert’s artistic merits. Judging by the layout, with a wide mullion and two narrower horizontal bars, the drawing is a design for a stained-glass pane.

The farmer and his wife both have all sorts of farming tools as attributes: he has a flail and a scythe; she has a sickle and a hoe. Implements depicted below the man refer to arable farming – a harness, a wagon wheel, a pitchfork and a basket – while those to the side of the woman refer to dairy work: a churn, a cheese mould, a milk jug and a yoke.

The drawing has echoes of Haarlem Mannerism – in the styling of a hand, the way in which a foot was designed – mixed with a dash of Bystewech and Adriaen van de Venne. Van de Venne must have known Van Meldert: he lived in Middelburg until 1624 and once dedicated a poem to Van Meldert.

LITERATURE:

PROVENANCE:

II. JAN COSSIERS
(Antwerp 1600-1671)
Portrait of Cornelis Cossiers
Black, red and yellow chalk, pen and brown ink, 267 x 185 mm
Annotated and dated above right: Cornelis
cossiers / 1658; numbered at the top on the left; 32

Jan Cossiers is not one of the true greats of Flemish baroque painting. A pupil of Cornelis de Vos and later an assistant of Rubens, after Rubens’s death he met the demand for large religious paintings for South Netherlandish churches. Notwithstanding the overloaded compositions and the often garish colours, his large paintings leave a somewhat lifeless impression. Cossiers’ portraits and genre scenes are more attractive. The artist’s known drawn oeuvre is very small and consists exclusively of portraits. The heart of it – and the point of departure for further attributions – is made up of the survivors of a series of portraits of the sons from his second marriage, which Cossiers must have drawn in 1658. The Fondation Custodia in Paris has the portrait of the eldest son, Jan Frans (exh. cat. Flemish Drawings of the Seventeenth Century from the Collection of Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais Paris, London (Victoria and Albert Museum), Paris (Institut Néerlandais), Bern (Kunstmuseum) and Brussels (Royal Library of Belgium) 1972, pp. 26-28, no. 20, ill. Pl. 74). This is also the only portrait which gives the sitter’s age; Jan Frans was sixteen when his father drew his portrait. The British Museum has the likeness of the second boy, Jacobus (A.M. Hind, Catalogue of Drawings by Dutch and Flemish Artists Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum, Vol. ii: Drawings by Rubens, Van Dyck and other Artists of the Flemish School of the xvii Century, London 1923, p. 98, no. 1, ill. Pl. XLIX). The next, probably, is the lad portrayed in our drawing, Cornelis. In the 1980s the portrait of his somewhat younger brother Gerard was in the British art trade (cat. An Exhibition of Old Master Drawings, Richard Day Ltd, New York / London 1987, no. 35, ill.) and the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York has the portrait of the boy who is clearly the youngest of the five, Wilhelms or, as his father called him in the inscription on the drawing: Guiliellemus (Felice Stampfle, with the assistance of Roth S. Kraemer and Jane Shoaf Turner, Netherlandish Drawings of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries and Flemish Drawings of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Cen-
turies in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York / Princeton 1991, p. 118, ill.), Cossiers’ second wife bore him six sons. We know of no portrait of the sixth child. The portrait may not have survived, or at any rate was not drawn in 1658 because the child was too young. The sixth son may not even have been born in 1658. Aside from the fact that they are all dated 1658 and bear the name of the subject, each drawing has a number: 31 (Jan Frans), 25 (Jacobus), 32 (Cornelis), 27 (Gerard) and 21 (Guilielmus). As yet we have not been able to discover any logic in the sequence. The high numbers suggest that the drawings belonged to a much larger series, but what this series might have looked like we can only guess. The only drawing which may help to give us a hint is a boy’s portrait that has been in the J. Paul Getty Museum in Los Angeles since 1998 (Nicholas Turner, European Drawings 4 Catalogue of the Collections, Los Angeles 2001, pp. 123-125, no. 43, ill.) It is true that this drawing is somewhat smaller than the other portraits discussed here and it does not bear the date of 1658 either, but like the other five it does have a number, in this case 36. Moreover it would appear that the same boy is portrayed in the drawing in Los Angeles and in the Rijksmuseum’s new acquisition. The long, rather untidy, slightly wavy hair, the tip-tilted nose, the large eyes and the pronounced upper lip display an unmistakable likeness to the features of the boy in the drawing in Amsterdam. In the Amsterdam drawing Cornelis is looking at the observer in a friendly manner, with the beginning of a smile, his mouth a little open as if he wants to say something. In the drawing in Los Angeles he is clearly in a less composed frame of mind and he looks more as if he is shocked or outraged. The conclusion may be somewhat premature, but it could be that the series originally consisted of studies in which Cossiers used his sons as models expressing different emotions.
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PROVENANCE:
I.Q. van Regteren Altena, Amsterdam; Heirs of I.Q. van Regteren Altena; Gift 2008
(inv. no. RP-T-2008-103).

12 NICOLAS STONE
(Devon 1586/87-1647 London)
Young Woman Standing
Amsterdam, c. 1610-1613
Terracotta
Height 74 cm
In 1948 Elisabeth Neurdenburg attributed this exceptional terracotta statue to the English sculptor Nicholas Stone, who worked in Amsterdam as an assistant to Hendrick de Keyser between 1607 and 1613. The son of a Devon quarryman, Stone was taken to the Netherlands by De Keyser after his visit to London in 1607. In 1613 Stone married his master’s eldest daughter and settled with her in Long Acre in London. He became the most important English tomb sculptor of his time, initially working in the late mannerism that he had learned from De Keyser, but later more and more emphatically in an early classicist style (Elisabeth Neurdenburg, De zeventiende eeuwsche beeldhouwkunst in de Noordelijke Nederlanden, Amsterdam 1948, pp. 93-109; Margaret Whinney, Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830, Harmondsworth 1988, pp. 67-80). We know of only a few works by Stone from his time with De Keyser, which he executed more or less independently, among them the epitaph for the Delft burgomaster Jacob van der Dussen and the tomb of Elisabeth Morgan, née Marnix van Sint Aldegonde, both in the Oudekerk in Delft. The three personifications of virtue on the Van der Dussen epitaph have the same elongated physique, the characteristic attenuated features and the exaggeratedly long neck that characterize this terracotta.

Stone must have taken Venetian examples of female nudes from the second half of the sixteenth century as his models for this type of statue. They were probably available in the Netherlands in the form of plaster casts. Some bronzes by Campagna and Vittoria in particular display surprising similarities in pose and physique to his young woman in terracotta. In contrast to the Italian examples, Stone’s statue portrays not a classical goddess or a personification of virtue but an anonymous Dutch girl in contemporary dress. At the same time Stone was inspired by the Dutch art of around 1600. The oval face with a short chin, a long nose and long neck is also found in the work of artists such as Goltzius, Wtewael, Bloemaert and De Gheyn, contemporaries and kindred spirits of Stone’s teacher De Keyser.
The meaning of this statue is unclear; the lack of attributes or of pronounced individual features seem to rule out an allegorical figure or portrait. Perhaps it was a model for a statue that was intended as a decoration for a facade, possibly an old women’s home, a courtyard or another public or semi-public institution.

Nicholas Stone’s confidently modelled young woman is a rare example of his early Dutch work; it is also among the earliest known Dutch sculptures in fired clay, a medium that originated in Italy and was little used by sculptors in the Netherlands prior to 1600.
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