If we ask ourselves what aspect of the art of Paul van Vianen (Utrecht c. 1570–Prague 1613) had the most impact on Dutch silversmiths, we should realize that this artist was appreciated in the seventeenth century for a reason different from ours today. Paul van Vianen became famous for exploring and pushing the boundaries of his discipline, defining silversmithing as a free art form equal to painting and sculpture, but with different possibilities. Van Vianen was a learned artist; he studied the stories of Antiquity in depth in order to visualise abstract themes, gave full scope to his imagination in form and decoration and was outstanding in his technical virtuosity. Van Vianen celebrated his triumphs at the imperial court of Rudolph II in Prague; in the Netherlands his ideas were disseminated from his hometown of Utrecht by his brother Adam van Vianen (Utrecht 1568–1627).

We know that Paul van Vianen also had admirers in Amsterdam quite early on – certainly among his fellow craftsmen. In 1614 the syndics of the Amsterdam goldsmiths’ guild commissioned Adam van Vianen to make an work of art that was widely admired at the time – a ewer that can be regarded as an ode to the free art of silversmithing. The guild used the object in different ways; as a monument in silver to the memory of Paul van Vianen and as a ceremonial drinking vessel for the syndics. Through this commission, they showed themselves as the artist’s spiritual heir.

We know the names of those involved; several of them were members of a prominent Amsterdam/Utrecht family of silversmiths. In 1613-14 the chairman, Andries Fredericks (Amsterdam 1566-1627), awarded the commission to Adam van Vianen; Fredericks’s uncle, Symen Symens Valckenaer (Amsterdam c. 1550-1629), was one of the group of former syndics the guild consulted when making important decisions. Fredericks and Valckenaer would both have known Paul and his slightly older brother Adam well; not only were they contemporaries, they were also related by marriage to the Van Vianens’ masters in Utrecht: Bruyn Ellerts (Utrecht c. 1530-1604) and Cornelis Ellerts van Leijenbergh (Utrecht c. 1531-1591). Symen Symens was even an associate in the atelier of the Van Leijenberghs when the Van Vianens worked here as pupils. No surviving work can be attributed or linked to any of these Amsterdam and Utrecht silversmiths. If and how their admiration for Paul van Vianen was translated into their work must therefore remain an open question. However, the impact of Paul’s ideas can be traced in the work of a young
silversmith from the same family: Sijmon Andries Valckenaer (Amsterdam 1609-1672). Together with his surviving oeuvre, his portrait (fig. 1), painted in 1630 by Thomas de Keyser (Amsterdam c. 1596-1667), provides essential information.7

Sijmon Andries Valckenaer
Sijmon Andries Valckenaer was the oldest son of Andries Fredericks, the silversmith who in 1614 had been instrumental in awarding the commission to Adam van Vianen. Since his name was engraved and his maker’s mark struck on the surviving fragment

Fig. 2
Detail of the salt in Portrait (fig. 1).

of the Amsterdam insculpation plate in 1630, we know for certain that Valckenaer joined the guild as a fully-trained silversmith in that year.8 At least from the sixteen-fifties onwards the workshop was combined with a kashouderij; a type of shop dealing in gold and silver, specific to the Netherlands. Kashouders were important intermediaries; they supplied gold and silver to the masters in the form of objects, coins or bars and sold the finished products in their shops. In the province of Holland this early division of labour encouraged specialization; the workshops concentrated on specific categories of gold and silver which by this method could be made cheaper and to a higher standard as well. As a result, kashouders like Valckenaer could offer their clients a much more comprehensive range of goods.9 Exceptionally, the identities of the gold- and silversmiths who collaborated with Valckenaer are known; in one case his role can even be specified. The concept, the texts and the preparatory design of the medal commemorating the opening of the new Amsterdam town hall in 1655 were developed by Valckenaer. The final design and the die for the medal were made by a specialist, the Polish die cutter and chaser Jurriaan (George) Pool (Świdnica c. 1618-Amsterdam 1669), who signed the medal with his initials. Valckenaer’s contribution to the project is known thanks to a ruling by the Amsterdam court. They decided that the invention was Valckenaer’s and therefore granted him the exclusive rights to sell the medals.10 In 1638 he had joined the syndics of the guild, as his father, uncle and great-uncle had done before. Valckenaer was the only new syndic that year, and was added to the group portrait his brother-in-law Thomas de Keyser had painted ten years earlier, commissioned by the then present and former syndics together.11
**Painted Silver**

In 1630 De Keyser painted Valckenaer at the start of his career. The nineteen-year-old completed his training that year and set himself up as a free master silversmith in Amsterdam. In so doing, he breathed new life into his late father’s workshop; according to the rules of the guild a silversmith’s widow was allowed to continue to run her husband’s shop, but not his workshop. Now the son had fulfilled all the conditions, the business could resume active production.\(^{12}\)

The objects in the portrait project an image of the business’s present and past, and emphasize its continuity. The drawings on the table and the roll of paper in the sitter’s left hand underscore the intellectual and creative aspect of the craft. The geometric shape and engraved decoration of the hexagonal salt in his other hand can be linked to the Amsterdam output around 1600,\(^{13}\) when his father Andries started his career. Like the contemporary Baroque salt in the background, those, too, were not necessarily just functional objects, but could have been intellectual and creative exercises as well.

The monumental salt in the background is depicted on such a large scale and rendered in such detail that the elements of the composition can be studied (fig. 2). Together the sculptural elements convey an abstract thought; they visualize the armed peace. The militiaman at rest on top is prepared for battle. On the pedestal below, the war rages on; the tormented positions of the bodies of the young men show their reactions to the ongoing violence. Ambition is also expressed in the choice of the models for the youngsters; Valckenaer based his designs on undisputed Italian highlights. Direct parallels can be drawn with *Young Slave*, a work by Michelangelo (Caprese 1475-Rome 1564) dating from 1519-34, in the position of the bodies and the way they sink into the background as well.\(^{14}\) In the first decades of the seventeenth century, silversmiths also used famous sixteenth-century sculptural models as sources of inspiration. Variations were created around 1616-18 by Christoph Jamnitzer (Nuremberg 1563-1618) in Nuremberg, variants and direct quotes used around 1620 by Adam van Vianen in Utrecht.\(^{15}\)

Whether the monumental salt was actually made is an open question. Perhaps it should rather be regarded as a form of self-promotion, aimed at a specific audience. Both Valckenaer and his uncle Loef Vredericx (Amsterdam 1590-Utrecht 1668) were active members of the Amsterdam civic guard; the latter had himself proudly portrayed as an ensign by De Keyser in 1626.\(^{16}\) Five years later, in 1632, De Keyser was chosen by the Arquebusiers to paint a group portrait. If the same institutions also ordered virtuoso silver is not known, let alone if they patronized Valckenaer.\(^{17}\)
What was important to Valckenaer is revealed when other works of art are taken into account. His funeral shields for the Amsterdam Guild of St Victor have a specific purpose; form and representation were ruled by conventions. Within that framework the silversmith emphasized the pictorial element; placing St Victor three-quarters turned in the plane suggested space and perspective, and a logical place could also be assigned to the patron saint’s attribute, his sword (fig. 3). The restrained role of the folded and pleated auricular ornament, which is gathered together at the top by a double mask, is revealing. Valckenaer opted for a tight transition, so that the decoration is emphatically presented as a frame. For him the art of ornament was a subject of the second plane.

**Nautilus Cup**

All kinds of solutions incorporated in the painted salt, like the positioning of the sculptural elements on the base and the flat interpretation of the restrained auricular decoration, return in a nautilus cup (figs. 4-6), which can be linked to Valckenaer on that basis. Around 1679 the artwork was depicted in the painted inventory of the highlights of the collection of the British courtier Robert Paston (1631-1681, fig. 7). When the painted representation is compared in detail with the surviving object, it is clear that the nautilus cup has been changed at some moment in its history. The inside of the cap of the original shell featured the Paston family’s incised coat of arms, as used by his father William (1610-1663). Around 1640 William was one of the most important clients of an Anglo-Dutch dynasty of sculptors around Hendrik de Keyser (Utrecht 1565-Amsterdam 1621); it would have been no coincidence that Paston also patronized silversmiths from the same extended family.

The painted version also reveals another change, small but essential for the meaning of the nautilus cup.
The seated figure’s wrist was originally chained to the bottom of the shell, which means she can be unequivocally identified as Andromeda. According to the myth, she was an Aethiopian princess whose mother had incurred the wrath of the Nereids by boasting that her daughter was far more beautiful than the sea goddesses. Egged on by their parents Nereus and Doris, Poseidon sent the sea monster Cetus to ravage the Aethiopian coast as divine punishment. To sate the monster, Andromeda was then chained to a rock as a sacrifice, but was saved from a certain death by the hero Perseus. He slayed the monster, and married the princess. Around the base we can see the Nereids; the straps are designed as trophies made out of fish and other creatures of the sea, held by a merman and a mermaid respectively, possibly Nereus and Doris. This representation of the myth is almost unique in the visual tradition of this subject; we only know of one other example in which Andromeda is deliberately isolated. That version was painted by Rembrandt van Rijn (Leiden 1606–Amsterdam 1669) around 1630; because the fight between Perseus and the monster has been omitted, the painter shifted the focus to the innocent victim’s uncertainty about her fate. Valckenær’s representation of the myth is not a copy of a composition conceived in a different material, but a work of art in its own right. A three-dimensional...
object such as a nautilus cup allows the artist to present different perspectives to the story at the same time. By including the Nereids and their parents in his composition, Valckenaer contrasted the expectations of the innocent victim and the indignant perpetrators, and heightened the tension. At the same time Valckenaer touches on an ongoing debate within the arts at that time. The torso of his Andromeda refers to the 'Venus Pudica', one of the most important classical relics known in the seventeenth century. Valckenaer shows himself here as a classicist, as opposed to Rembrandt, who saw nature as the ultimate example. In the debate between naturalists and classicists Valckenaer sided with Peter Paul Rubens (Antwerp 1577-1640). For his representation of the myth, Rubens chose the same ‘Venus Pudica’ as his source of inspiration.

The references to developments in international painting and sculpture are important because they portray Valckenaer as a well-grounded artist. The way he used them to convey a thought or story through a silver object identifies him as an artist in silver, in accordance with the ideas Paul van Vianen had developed in Prague. Viewed from that starting point, it becomes apparent that many more silversmiths were inspired by Paul’s ability to tell stories in silver than by his inventions in the art of ornament. Joachim von Sandrart had already come to that conclusion in his Teutsche Akademie in 1675, in which he lauded Paul van Vianen as the preeminent source of inspiration for artists in this discipline. The fact that their names have now largely been forgotten says more about the current state of research than about the reputation they enjoyed in their own time.
NOTES

1 Since the mid-nineteenth century Paul van Vianen has been associated above all with the ‘invention’ of what has since been termed the auricular style, and his influence has been exclusively linked to the development of that form of decoration. Cf. R. J. Baarsen et al., Kwab: Dutch Design in the Age of Rembrandt, exh. cat. Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum) 2018. As I have argued here and elsewhere, this limited perspective distorts our image and obscures our view of the significance of the artist in his own time.


5 Sijmon Valckenaer, born Amsterdam 1609, x 1642 Utrecht to Geertje Verriet (?-Amsterdam 1681) [NL-asdSAA, no. 337 (list of names)]. In that same year he moved to Utrecht; in 1583 he returned to Amsterdam, where he became a free master goldsmith and money changer in 1587. Syndic Amsterdam 1577 and 1583-1606 [NL-asdSAA 366, inv. no. 366 (registration of hallmarks)]; NL-asdSAA 366, inv. no. 337 (list of names); Wolleswinkel 2001 (note 4), p. 321; Van den Bergh-Hoogterp (note 4), vol. 11, no. 227.

6 Van den Bergh-Hoogterp (note 4), vol. 11, nos. 203, 204.


8 Sijmon Valckenaer, born Amsterdam 1609, x 1642 Utrecht to Geertje Verriet (?-Amsterdam 1681) [NL-asdSAA, no. 337 (list of names)]. In that same year he moved to Utrecht; in 1583 he returned to Amsterdam, where he became a free master goldsmith and money changer in 1587. Syndic Amsterdam 1577 and 1583-1606 [NL-asdSAA, no. 337 (list of names)]. In that same year he moved to Utrecht; in 1583 he returned to Amsterdam, where he became a free master goldsmith and money changer in 1587. Syndic Amsterdam 1577 and 1583-1606 [NL-asdSAA, no. 337 (list of names)]; Wolleswinkel 2001 (note 4), p. 321; Van den Bergh-Hoogterp (note 4), vol. 11, no. 227.

9 There are several indications that Sijmon Andries Valckenaer was primarily active as a kashouder from the sixteen-fifties onwards; in 1663, Jeronimus Schut, Pieter Tillier, Luykas Draef and Warnaer Andriesz complained about the quality of the silver they had had to process for ten years on his instructions (NL-asdSAA, Archief van Amsterdam Notaries (accession number 5075), inv. no. 3100 Protocols H. Rosa, deed 147, 1 March 1663).
The first versions of this medal have Valckenaer's maker's mark (for this medal, see Jan Pelsdonk, 'Van Pool tot Valckenaer: De stadhuispenning van 1655', De Beeldenaar 37 (2013), pp. 111-18; for Pool, see Anna C. Koldeweij, 'Stempelsnijder en zilversmid Juriaan Pool (ca. 1618-1669): Een Poolse immigrant in een Amsterdam zilversmedennetwerk', Jaarboek voor Munt- en Penningkunde 101 (2014), pp. 124-91. The idea put forward in the literature that Pool was a silversmith is incorrect. The register, drawn up in 1663 by order of the city council, included not only fully-qualified free master gold- and silversmiths, but also those who were closely connected to the trade, like die cutters, cashiers and shopkeepers (NL-AoDAAA, 366 Guild archives, inv. no. 340, copy of a register held by the chief officer 1663-1677). The rules of the guild stated that they should be registered at the guild, and pay half as much as a free master should do. As a die cutter and chaser, Pool was obliged to do so. He had not the same rights as a free master, could not register a maker's mark, and was not allowed to open a workshop. That Pool was not a free master silversmith is confirmed by the list of tools, described in his inventory in 1669 (Koldeweij 2014 (note 10), p. 131).

Between 1638 and 1670 Valckenaer went on to serve as syndic of the guild fifteen times (Amsterdam 2003 (note 8), pp. 476-77).

In a private will, his father had stipulated that Valckenaer would inherit the tools and that he could take over the models from the estate for the price of the silver. His mother established this in 1627 formally in a new will (Amsterdam 2003 (note 8), p. 476-77).

The most important Amsterdam example in the Rijksmuseum is a 1608 silver ewer and basin, made for the town of Flushing in Zeeland (see Jan Rudolf de Lorm and Dirk Jan Biemond, Amsterdam Goud en Zilver, coll. cat. Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum) 2001, no. 4); the Amsterdam example with the most complex iconography is a 1606 silver-gilt bowl with cover in the Royal Collection Trust (see Jan Piet Fiedelt Kok et al., Kunst voor de Beeldenstorm: Noordnederlandse kunst 1525-1580, exh. cat. Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum) 1986, no. 98).

For the different contemporary interpretations of Michelangelo's 'Slaves' see E. Motzin, 'Michelangelo's Slaves in the Louvre', Gazette des Beaux Arts 120 (1992), pp. 207-28; the best overview of the project of which they were part is still Erwin Panofsky, 'The First Two Projects of Michelangelo's Tomb of Julius II', The Art Bulletin 19 (1937), no. 4, pp. 565-79.

It has long been assumed that after 1600 silversmiths in the South German centres copied sculptors' models, with a preference for models by Giambologna (Douai 1529-Florence 1608) and Adriaen de Vries (The Hague c. 1550-Prague 1626) (see Hans R. Weihrauch, 'Italienische Bronzen als Vorbilder deutscher Goldschmiedekunst', in Studien zur Geschichte der europäischen Plastik, Munich 1965, pp. 263-80, esp. pp. 264, 273). This has still not been researched in detail; analyses of silver sculptures by Christoph Jamnitzer show that he devised his own creations as well as developing variations of famous models by others (see Lorenz Seelig, 'Ein Wilkomme in der Form eines Mohrenkopfs von Silber getriebene Arbeit: Der wiederentdeckte Mohrenkopfpokal Christoph Jamnitzers aus dem späten 16. Jahrhundert', in Renate Eikelmann et al., Der Mohrenkopfpokal von Christoph Jamnitzer, exh. cat. Munich (Bayerisches Nationalmuseum) 2002, pp. 19-124, esp. pp. 47-49). We know of variants on Italian examples by Adam van Vianen from around 1620, but also direct quotes (Salt, silver, monogrammed and dated Adam van Vianen 1621; the stem is a quote of the bagpipe player by Giovanni da Bologna (Ter Molen 1984 (note 7), vol. 11, no. 419).

In 1650 Loeff Fredericks was the lieutenant of District VII, Sijmon Andries in 1652 (see J.A. Jochems, Amsterdam Oude Burgervendels (schutterij) 1580-1795, Amsterdam 1888, p. 47). For the portrait as an ensign by Thomas de Keyser, 1626, see the most recent Wolleswinkel 2001 (note 4), k.309 and fig. no. 1.

The Arquebusiers did possess modern silver, part of which is depicted on a portrait of the aldermen of 1653 (cf. Barend J. van Benthem, 'Vroeg Amsterdams zilver op het schilderij “De overlieden van de Handboogdoelen” van Bartholomeus van der Helst uit 1653', Jaarboek de Stavelij 2018, pp. 34-46). The seventeenth-century records of the Arquebusiers do not survive, it is therefore impossible to find out if they also owned any modern virtuoso work in silver, nor whom they patronized in this framework of time.

The four shields are each marked with the Amsterdam town mark, the date letter O = 1645, and the maker's mark, a falcon in a shield (Voet 1921 (note 8), no. 31; Citroen...
1975 (note 4), no. 999). The maker’s mark was discovered on the shields for the first time in 2003 and identified as Valckenier’s (Amsterdam 2003 (note 8), no. 26).

19 For the painting, see the most recent Andrew Moore, Nathan Flis and Francesca Vanke (eds.), The Paston Treasure: Microcosm of the Known World, exh. cat. New Haven (Yale Center of British Art)/Norwich (Norwich Castle Museum) 2018. For the nautilus cup, then linked to Christiaan van Vianen, see Theresia Margarethu Duyvené de Wit-Klinkhamer, ‘Zilver uif de verzameling Dreesmann’, Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum 8 (1960), no. 3, pp. 85-95, and Ter Molen 1984 (note 7), vol. ii, no. 626.


21 As far as we know the original shell, depicted in the Paston portrait, had already been replaced by the current modern example before the work entered the Dreesmann Collection. The chain link to the shell was not restored at that time; evidently people no longer knew which story was depicted here, see Duyvené de Wit-Klinkhamer 1960 (note 18).


23 The ‘Venus pudica’ was a sculpture already famous in Antiquity; it is now thought that the lost original was made in the fourth century BCE by Praxiteles in Athens. What it looked like can be reconstructed by comparing the some fifty copies and variations still extant. Around 1640 the most famous version was the ‘Medici Venus’ (Guido Mansuelli, Galleria degli Uffizi: Le Sculture, vol. 1 (1958), vol. 11 (1961), coll. cat. Florence, vol. 1, pp. 71-73). Rubens knew the work without the head, arms and right leg; several of his drawings of the fragment have been identified recently (Sluijter 2009 (note 21), p. 85, fig. 26). The sculpture in its current manifestation is the result of an extensive eighteenth-century restoration.

24 Biemond 2019 (note 2).