



The Hidden Youth of Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw: A Portrait by Govert Flinck Revealed

• MARGRIET VAN EIKEMA HOMMES, RUUD LAMBOUR,
BIANCA M. DU MORTIER, MARIEKE DE WINKEL, GWEN TAUBER,
MATTHIAS ALFELD, KOEN JANSSENS AND JORIS DIK* •

The earliest signed and dated painting by Govert Flinck (1615-1660) is a full-length portrait of his cousin Dirck Leeuw (Amsterdam 1614/15-after May 1664 and before 1671) he made in 1636 (fig. 1).¹ Dirck was the youngest son of the prominent Mennonite merchant Jacob Leeuw (?-1635), Flinck's mother's brother.² The portrait has been the property of the United Mennonite Congregation of Amsterdam since 1837, and from 1899 to 1953 was on loan to the Rijksmuseum, where it originally hung in one of the side rooms of the Gallery of Honour. It has been on loan to the Rembrandt House Museum since 2006, and is on show in the *Sydelcaemer* – the anteroom in which Rembrandt had his art dealership. Studies of Govert Flinck mention Dirck's portrait only in passing – and yet behind this seemingly unremarkable painting lies an extraordinary story. Recent scientific research and technical examination of the canvas made a sensational discovery: under the present portrait was the likeness of a man in a different pose, wearing fashionable, colourful clothes.³ As we demonstrate in this article, the underlying portrait, taken in conjunction with the final likeness of Dirck Leeuw, sheds surprising new light on Mennonite dress conventions in the seventeenth century.

Fig. 1
GOVERT FLINCK,
*Portrait of Dirck
Jacobsz Leeuw*
(1614/15-after May
1664), signed and
dated *g. flinck. f 1636*.
Canvas, 64.4 x 47.2 cm.
Amsterdam,
Rembrandt
House Museum,
inv. no. L80072;
on loan from the
United Mennonite
Congregation,
Amsterdam.
Photo: Rijksmuseum.

Until now relatively little has been known about the clothing customs of the Mennonites at that time. Contemporary writings present a contradictory picture. True, their authors assume that Mennonites advocated a modest style of dress, but at the same time they reproach them for maintaining only the semblance of plainness and restraint.⁴ This unfamiliarity comes about because until quite recently Mennonite probate inventories have only been researched to a very limited extent, and no distinction has been made between Mennonites from different towns and cities and from different factions.⁵ Detailed research into the probate inventories of the Amsterdam Mennonites has been undertaken with a view to interpreting the clothes Dirck Leeuw wears in his portrait and those worn in the likeness hidden beneath it.⁶ The results of the research into the materials and techniques used played a major role in our study since they not only led to the discovery of the overpainted portrait but also made it possible to precisely determine the clothes worn by the hidden man and establish his identity. Portraits of other Amsterdam Mennonites provided important comparative material for our study. A series of Mennonite sermons not previously consulted for publications on the history of art and

the history of costume also provided considerable insight.

The Identity of the Subject

The identification of Dirck Leeuw is based on the provenance, taken in conjunction with a name attached to the portrait in the past and the date. The portrait came from the estate of Veronica van de Rijp Centen (1740-1832). She had inherited the usufruct of it, along with eight other family portraits, from her uncle Jan van de Rijp Centen (1712-1764), who had founded the Rijpenhofje almshouses with her father Job van de Rijp Centen in 1737. Jan van de Rijp Centen, in turn, had inherited these paintings from his mother Maria van de Rijp (1675/76-1763), on condition that he should leave them to her granddaughter Veronica.⁷ In Jan's will they were to be given a place, after Veronica's death, in a second almshouse that was still to be built. In due course it was to be handed over to the Mennonite congregation.⁸ However, the capital he left, of which Veronica had the use during her lifetime, proved insufficient after her death. The governors of the Rijpenhofje, which had a governors' chamber added at the beginning of 1837, consequently decided to hang all nine portraits there. They are specified one by one in the minutes, and as number 4 we find a 'Portrait of Dom[inu]s Jacob Leeuwen Dirksz by G. Flinck'.⁹ This is the first record of the portrait, and there is no mention of its date.¹⁰

In 1899 the Mennonite congregation gave the painting to the Rijksmuseum on loan, but corrupted the name to read 'Jonas Jacob Leeuwen Dirksz'.¹¹ The further provenance proves that it is in fact Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw (b. 1614/15).¹² Veronica's grandmother, Maria van de Rijp, was the heir to her brother Arent van de Rijp (1664/65-1729), who died childless.¹³ Under the terms of their will, he in turn had inherited all the contents, including the paintings, in the house of his deceased

wife Eva Baltus (1656/57-1720).¹⁴ Eva, lastly, had previously been married to the merchant Jacob Dirksz Leeuw (1639-1703), the only son of Dirck Leeuw (see appendix, II.c.1). Although his name does not appear on the portrait, the provenance points very compellingly in his direction. Taking this together with the dating of the portrait in 1636 and Dirck Leeuw's age then, we may safely assume that the portrait Flinck painted was of his first cousin.

Dirck Leeuw and his Family

Dirck's father, Jacob Leeuw, was the son of a Mennonite painter and lay preacher (teacher) in Cologne. We do not know when Jacob settled in Amsterdam; he is not registered as a citizen. From 1593 on he was living on Niezel and in the summer of 1625 he bought a house on Fluwelenburgwal, where he ran a successful business selling *kamerijksdoek* or cambric (a fine white linen).¹⁵ After Jacob's death in 1635 the business was continued by Dirck's half-brother Ameldonck (II.a), his widow and their son David (III.a).¹⁶

Jacob Leeuw's family, most of whose members were part of the Waterlander Mennonite Congregation 'bij de Toren', maintained close contacts with the Amsterdam painter and art dealer Hendrick Uylenburgh (1584/98-1661), who belonged to the same congregation. Jacob's widow was actually one of the eighteen people who lent him money to support his art business in 1640.¹⁷ There is no known inventory for Jacob and his widow, but from that of Jacob's oldest son, Ameldonck, we learn that the Leeuw family owned several paintings by Hendrick Uylenburgh and his son Gerrit, as well as many other works that were probably acquired through Uylenburgh. The family also had no fewer than nine paintings by Govert Flinck, who started to paint for Hendrick Uylenburgh's art dealership in 1635.¹⁸ These included a number of portraits of members of the Leeuw family.

After Dirck's sister Grietje (I.7) married Jan Claesz Anso in 1637, Dirck married Anso's sister Maria (II.c) in 1639. Her grandfather Claes Claesz Anso the Elder (1555-1632) had been a deacon of 'bij de Toren' since 1615.¹⁹ Her father Claes Claesz Anso the Younger (1586-1636) was also a member there.²⁰ After his death, Maria was made a ward of, among others, her uncle Cornelis Claesz Anso (1590/91-1646), a minister of the congregation. Rembrandt made a portrait etching of him in 1641 (fig. 2) and painted him in a monumental double portrait with his wife Aeltje Gerrits Schouten (1589/90-1657) in the same year.²¹ The poet

Reyer Anso (1626-1669), of whom Flinck made a drawing, was Dirck's wife's first cousin. He was baptized at the Waterlanders in 1646, but converted to Roman Catholicism in 1649.²² Dirck and his wife, however, were baptized in the Amsterdam Remonstrant Church in 1639.²³ They had their only son Jacob Leeuw Dircksz (1639-1703; II.c) baptized as a Remonstrant as soon as he was born.

In 1643 Dirck paid 17,100 guilders for a substantial house on Lauriergracht, now number 80.²⁴ By way of comparison, the annual wage of a skilled labourer averaged 300 guilders.²⁵ A year later Govert Flinck

Fig. 2
REMBRANDT,
*Portrait of the
Minister Cornelis
Claesz Anso
(1590/91-1646)*, 1641.
Etching and drypoint,
183 x 156 mm.
Amsterdam,
Rijksmuseum,
inv. no. RP-P-OB-524.



bought two adjoining properties (now numbers 76 and 78), thus becoming Dirck's next-door neighbour.²⁶ Together they bought the back house to numbers 76-78 in 1651.²⁷ Flink must have had a close relationship with Dirck and with his half-brother Ameldonck, for the two cousins acted as witnesses of his marriage settlement with the Remonstrant Ingetje Thoveling (c. 1620-1651) in 1645.²⁸

Until now, one 'Dirck Lewen', whose body was carried out from the Molenstraat and buried in the Oude Kerk in 1652, has been taken to be 'our' Dirck.²⁹ This is incorrect, for 'our' Dirck proves to have been a witness in the town of Weesp in 1664 to the marriage contract between Elisabeth Schouten, daughter of his sister Elisabeth Leeuw (1.2), who lived in the town, and the Weesp-born brewer Jacob Dell (fig. 3).³⁰ His sisters



Fig. 3
Dirck Leeuw's signature in 1664 as a witness to the marriage contract between Jacob Dell and Elisabeth Schouten, daughter of his sister Elisabeth Leeuw, living in Weesp. Photo: Ruud Lambour.

Fig. 4a
REMBRANDT, *Portrait of Marten Soolmans (1613-1641)*, signed and dated 1634. Canvas, 207 x 132.5 cm. Joint purchase of the French and the Dutch government, collection of the Rijksmuseum, 2016. Photo: © Josso/Scala, Florence.

Fig. 4b
REMBRANDT, *Portrait of Oopjen Coppit (1611-1689)*, 1634. Canvas, 207 x 132 cm. Joint purchase of the French and the Dutch government, collection of Musée du Louvre, 2016. Photo: © Josso/Scala, Florence.





Barbara (1.3) and Aeltgen (1.5) also lived in Weesp, as did his brother Jacob (11.b), who was burgomaster there on several occasions. The families by marriage Anslo, Block, De Flines, Rutgers and Schouten were strongly represented in both the wholesale trade and the production of silk cloth in Amsterdam. How this network affected Dirck's life and the date of his death are unknown. His widow married the Remonstrant minister Isaac Pontanus in 1672, at which time she was still living in the Lauriergracht house.³¹

The Portrait of Dirck Leeuw

Govert Flinck pictured his cousin full length. This style of portraiture was quite popular at the time. Emulating the nobility, the wealthiest and most distinguished citizens often chose to have life-size portraits made. They were frequently pendants of married couples, such as Rembrandt's

portraits of Marten Soolmans (1613-1641) and Oopjen Coppit (1611-1689) (figs. 4a, b), but eminent gentlemen also had individual portraits made to show off their status; one such was Andries de Graeff (1611-1678), likewise painted by Rembrandt (fig. 5).³² There is also a tradition of full-length portraits of more modest dimensions, and at 64 x 47 centimetres it is in this category that Dirck Leeuw's portrait belongs. In Amsterdam Thomas de Keyser (1596-1667), for instance, made small portraits (individual, double and group) with the sitters usually shown in an interior, but on occasion outdoors (fig. 6).³³ Herman Doncker (before 1620-after 1656) concentrated almost exclusively on small portraits of gentlemen, couples and families full length against the background of a landscape (fig. 7).³⁴ Flinck, too, painted his cousin in a landscape, and chose the same setting for three small full-length portraits he made in



Fig. 5
REMBRANDT, *Portrait of Andries de Graeff* (1611-1678), signed and dated 1639. Canvas, 200 x 125 cm. Kassel, Staatliche Museen Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, inv. no. GK 239.

Fig. 6
THOMAS DE KEYSER, *Portrait of Frederick van Velthuysen (?-1658) and his Wife Josina Schonevelt (?-1636)*, 1636. Panel, 114.9 x 80.5 cm. Melbourne, National Gallery of Victoria, inv. no. E1-1987; presented through The Art Foundation of Victoria in memory of their parents Eric and Marian Morgan by Lynton and Nigel Morgan, Founder Benefactors, 1987.



Fig. 7

HERMAN DONCKER,
*Portrait of an
Unknown Family*,
signed 1645.
Panel, 85 x 111 cm.
Private collection.
Photo: RKD,
Netherlands Institute
for Art History,
The Hague,
1800108067.

Fig. 8

GOVERT FLINCK,
Portrait of a Boy,
possibly David Leeuw
(1631/32-1703), signed
and dated 1640.
Canvas,
129,5 x 102,5 cm.
Birmingham, Barber
Institute of Fine Arts,
inv. no. 40.8.



subsequent years – a 1640 portrait of a boy, possibly Dirck's nephew David Leeuw (fig. 8), an undated portrait of an elderly man (fig. 9) and a portrait dated 1646 of a couple who may be Dirck Graswinckel (1600-1666) and his wife Geertruyt van Loon (1600-1675) (fig. 10).³⁵

Whereas Flinck portrayed these subjects in the landscape in repose, he pictured his cousin Dirck with his left leg forward and the heel of his right foot slightly lifted, creating the impression that he is walking towards



Fig. 9

GOVERT FLINCK,
*Portrait of an Elderly
 Man, possibly
 Mennonite*, c. 1640.
 Panel, 92 x 69 cm.
 Warsaw, Muzeum
 Narodowe,
 inv. no. M.Ob.2584.



Fig. 10

GOVERT FLINCK, *Portrait of a Couple in
 a Landscape (possibly Dirck Graswinckel
 (1600-1666) and Geertruyt van Loon
 (1600-1675))*, signed and dated 1646.
 Canvas, 107.5 x 91 cm.
 Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans
 Van Beuningen, inv. no. 1207 (OK).
 Photo: Studio Tromp, Rotterdam.

us out of the shade of the trees in the background. Rembrandt, too, frequently made his subjects appear to be moving, as he did in his *Portrait of Shipbuilder Jan Rijcksen and his Wife Griet Jans* (1633).³⁶ In a number of small full-length likenesses painted in the 1620s and 1630s Thomas de Keyser likewise showed his subjects in motion.³⁷

Dirck is dressed all in black. As his change of clothes are crucial to our understanding of his portrait, a full description is called for. He wears a doublet and breeches that end below the knee. The wide cloak hangs over his left shoulder and is draped under his left arm and around his waist.³⁸ He has a flat collar of fine white linen, fastened at the throat with two thin

cords, or bandstrings, ending in *tassels* (ornamental knots tied in the ends of the cords) (fig. 11).³⁹ There is a striking concentration of small white dots on his chest, probably representing the glint of beads, perhaps jet, on a ribbon



Fig. 11

Detail of the tassels and highlights of the jet beads in the *Portrait of Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw* (fig. 1).
 Photo: Rijksmuseum.

trim along the front edges of the doublet, as in Flinck's portrait of an anonymous man which can be dated to around 1636 on the basis of what he is wearing (fig. 12). Around his wrists Dirck wears turned-back cuffs or *poignets* that match his collar. He holds his left glove in his gloved right hand. His black stockings are held up by black garters tied in loops below the knee. Dirck's black shoes have a low heel and are fastened with a

Fig. 12

GOVERT FLINCK,
*Portrait of a Young
Man*, c. 1636.
Panel, 68 x 52.6 cm.
Dublin, National
Gallery of Ireland,
inv. no. NGI.319.



Fig. 13

uv photograph of
the *Portrait of Dirck
Jacobsz Leeuw* (fig. 1).
Photo: Rijksmuseum.
The retouches applied
during the restoration
in 2006 show up as
dark against the
fluorescing layer of
varnish.

ribbon over the instep. The small rivets attaching the upper to the thick sole catch the light. He clasps a round object firmly in his left hand. Given the surface texture, suggested with tiny peaks of yellow paint, it is probably an orange.⁴⁰ We do not know why Dirck Leeuw chose to have himself immortalized holding this fruit.⁴¹

The portrait was restored in 2006.⁴² The paint layer, which was badly abraded in many places, as a result of

cleaning procedures in the past, was considerably retouched, particularly in Dirck's clothes, hat and hair, and in the sky and the landscape to the right of his leg (fig. 13). The wear to the paint layer hampered the interpretation of some accessories, as can be seen in a photograph taken during the restoration after old overpaintings had been removed and before any retouching had been done (fig. 14). Abrasion rendered the ends of the left garter

Fig. 14

Photograph taken during the restoration in 2006 of the *Portrait of Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw* (fig. 1) after removal of overpaintings, before retouching. Photo: Alkmaar, Bijl Schilderijenrestauratie.

The paint layer is seriously abraded by cleaning procedures in the past. The light grey ground shows through the paint layer in many places, for instance just above Dirck's left arm. To the right of Dirck's head the abraded paint of the sky allows the black paint of the broad brim of an overpainted hat to show through. Above Dirck's head are scant remnants of later brownish-black paint used for overpainting, painted over the sky to create the hat Dirck wore before the restoration in 2006. To the right of Dirck's left leg, the paint of the overpainted man's red-stockinged leg shows through.



transparent, so that the underlying paint of the landscape shows through in places. This gives the impression that the ends were edged with lace, but it is not clear whether Flinck intended to create this effect.⁴³

Dirck's present hat is a reconstruction made during the last restoration to replace the curious model he wore prior to this treatment, which had a high, narrow crown positioned illogically off-centre on his head and a brim

that was much narrower on the right than on the left (fig. 15).⁴⁴ Earlier authors have rightly remarked that this hat, which Dirck certainly had on his head in 1948, as a description tells us, is a later overpainting.⁴⁵ The photograph taken during the restoration after this overpainting had largely been removed (there are only remnants of the brownish-black paint above Dirck's head) shows, however, that Dirck's original hat was extremely difficult to



Fig. 15
The Portrait of
Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw
(fig. 1) before the
restoration in 2006.
Photo: Rijksmuseum.

reconstruct from the scant remains of the original black paint. It can be seen that a broad black hat brim to the right of his head has been painted out with paint for the sky, about which more later. The fine grey line with small white dots at the bottom of the crown of the hat is original. They represent the hatband of gold or silver thread with which hats could be decorated.

In the past Dirck's clothes have been regarded as evidence 'of the typical simplicity and respectability of dress among Mennonites, who did not follow fashion'.⁴⁶ At first sight, with his black outfit and flat, unadorned collar, Dirck does indeed appear to be a pattern of Mennonite propriety. The soberness of his garments appears to contrast with the attire in which other well-to-do gentlemen chose to have themselves captured for posterity (figs. 4a, 5, 6). It will become clear, however, that by no means all the items in Dirck's costume can be described as 'plain' or 'simple' and that we fail to do him justice when we suggest that he was not a follower of fashion.

The Hidden Portrait

As we saw in the introduction, Dirck's portrait was painted over another likeness. A study of the canvas with infrared reflectography and X-rays revealed under the current portrait the likeness of a man wearing different clothes and in a different pose (figs. 16, 17). Since these two forms of imaging analysis techniques give only a fragmented picture of the hidden figure, the painting was also analyzed with the macro X-ray fluorescence spectrometry scanner, or macro-XRF scanner for short. This technique involves scanning the painting by means of series of point measurements with X-ray fluorescence spectrometry. This shows the chemical composition and distribution of elements over the whole of the paint surface. The distribution is given for each element in the form of a contrast image, known as an element distribu-

tion map. The local intensity of a specific element is shown by means of grey tones: a high concentration is rendered in white, the zones without the element in question in black, and the intensities in between in shades of grey.

The underlying portrait can be seen clearly in the XRF distribution map for lead, which shows the distribution of lead white (fig. 18a).⁴⁷ The hidden man's legs were not in the same position as Dirck's, but more to the right: the right, supporting leg is planted firmly on the ground and the left is slightly bent. We can also see on the lead map that instead of Dirck's plain, flat collar the subject wears a much larger one that sits rather higher around the neck. This collar lay over the full width of the shoulders and was trimmed with a scalloped lace edging. The relief of the pastose lead white paint used for this shows up under the present clothes in raking light (fig. 19).

This wide collar explains why the white points that represent the jet beads on the braid only start half way down Dirck's chest, whereas in reality the braid trim should continue to the top of his doublet (fig. 11). The level at which these dots begin proves to correspond precisely with the level at which the initial wide collar ended, from which it appears that this braid actually belongs to the costume of the underlying man and not to the clothes in the finished portrait. When Flinck replaced the wide collar with a narrow version, he added the present tasselled bandstrings and painted over the white points with black paint. Abrasion of this black paint revealed the dots again and they now form an unintended part of Dirck's outfit.

Dirck Leeuw and the man underlying his portrait were wearing the same doublet (except that Dirck's was not trimmed with jet-beaded braid) and the same cloak and gloves. In the original portrait, however, the cuffs were also quite a lot wider and, so it seems, trimmed with a scalloped lace

p. 16

Fig. 16

X-radiograph of the *Portrait of Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw* (fig. 1). The X-radiograph shows the overpainted leg and clothing less clearly because the X-radiograph of this painting was seriously hindered by the craquelure of the paint and the impression of the canvas weave in the lead-containing ground.
Photo: Rijksmuseum.

p. 17

Fig. 17

Infrared reflectograph of the *Portrait of Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw* (fig. 1).
Photo: Rijksmuseum.







Fig. 18a
XRF element map for lead (L-shell). Photos: Matthias Alfeld.



Fig. 18b
XRF element map for copper (K-shell).



Fig. 18c
XRF element map for mercury (L-shell).



Fig. 18d
XRF element map for iron (Kb-shell).



Fig. 18e
XRF element map for calcium (Kb-shell).



Fig. 18f
XRF element map for manganese (K-shell).



Fig. 18g
XRF element map for titanium (K-shell).



Fig. 18h
XRF element map for barium (L-shell).



edging similar to that of the collar (figs. 15, 16, 18a). Parts of these cuffs that were visible during the restoration, in conjunction with the X-radiograph, suggest that the lace trim was slightly curled over at the edge. Flinck may have got the idea for this from Rembrandt, who was fond of using curled-up cuffs in portraits, like that in *Oopjen Coppit* (fig. 4b).⁴⁸

We can also identify on the lead map the hat whose broad brim, as we have said, was painted over with paint for the sky. This version had a low, round crown and was placed at a slight angle on the head. The outlines of this hat can likewise be seen in the infrared reflectograph (figs. 17, 20); it is also possible to make out yet another model with a tapering crown with a virtually flat top, and a narrower brim. This hat was similarly placed at an angle on the head. Altogether no fewer than four hats have been painted one over the other in this portrait, the last being the one that replaced the peculiar

version – the result of overpainting – in 2006, with beneath it two tilted hats, each with a different crown and brim.

The XRF distribution map for copper (fig. 18b) yields important information about these two earliest hats. It shows the copper-containing pigments (which may have been azurite, malachite or green or blue verditer) that were used in this painting only in the sky and the landscape. This copper-containing paint precisely follows the silhouette of the first figure: we can see the more upstanding collar and the different position of the legs on which, as the clearly visible outlines show, there were also stockings with garters tied in looped bows. The outlines of the tilted hat with low crown and broad brim also stand out against the surrounding copper-containing paint used for the sky (fig. 18b), which indicates that this hat was painted first and then replaced with the version with the tapering crown (fig. 20).⁴⁹

Fig. 19
Photograph of the collar in the *Portrait of Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw* (fig. 1) taken in raking light.
Photo: Rijksmuseum.

Fig. 21
Detail of the *Portrait of Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw* (fig. 1). In the landscape, to the right of Dirck's left leg, there are small areas of bright red from the overpainted stocking.



Fig. 20

Infrared reflectograph, overexposed, showing the various hats.

- red dotted line: hat with low crown and broad brim.
- green dotted line: hat with angular, tapering crown and a somewhat smaller brim than the hat as indicated with the red dotted line.
- purple dotted line: overpainting, hat with tall, narrow crown and brim of irregular width.
- yellow dotted line: the hat added during the 2006 restoration.



The IRR image reveals that the original shoes had open quarters, and had a ribbon tied in a bow over the instep (fig. 17). The original stockings show up light on the XRF distribution map for mercury, which tells us that they were painted with vermilion. These stockings were red: small areas of the colour show through the paint layer of the present landscape (fig. 21). During restoration the stocking on the right was particularly evident with above it part of the original breeches, which were not black, like Dirck's present pair, but dark grey (fig. 14).

The light brown soles and heels of Dirck's current shoes show up strongly on the XRF maps for mercury and iron, indicating that they were painted with a mixture of vermilion and ochre. This colour was also used for the soles and heels of the original shoes (figs. 18c, d). The brown tree stump on the right was also painted with this mixture, as were the tree roots in the foreground that were painted out for Dirck's portrait.



Fig. 22
Signature of Govert
Flinck, on the *Portrait
of Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw*
(fig. 1).

The XRF mercury map reveals that a significant quantity of vermilion was mixed with the black in the part of the cloak at the level of Dirck's hip. It is possible to see from the paint surface, with some difficulty, that the black of the cloak here was more reddish than the cooler black of the other clothes.⁵⁰

It can be deduced from the XRF map for copper (fig. 18b) that when the pose and dress were altered, the foliage of the trees and the plants on the ground were already worked out in detail, including in the passages that would subsequently be covered by the eventual legs. It follows from this that work on the landscape was far advanced, in fact probably complete, when the clothes and the position of the legs were changed. The details that had been added to the overpainted garments confirm that the first version was already nearly or completely finished. The brushwork in the original parts of the landscape corresponds to that in the landscape added for Dirck's present portrait.⁵¹ Likewise, the handling of the brush for the cloak, doublet

and gloves that were 'reused' in Dirck's portrait corresponds with that of the altered clothes, showing that the underlying likeness was also painted by Flinck.

An examination of the paint surface with the stereo microscope reveals that the present signature *g. flinck. f 1636* was added in two stages (fig. 22). The name *g. flinck* was initially painted with thin, yellowish-brown ochre paint. The 'k' was then wholly and the 'n' and 'c' partly painted over with an opaque beige paint. On top of this Flinck painted the date 1636, the letter, 'f' for fecit and the 'k' in his name in greyish-brown. Using the same paint he also accentuated the upper part of the 'c' in his name and he also added to this letter a yellowish-brown brushstroke. The reason for this is not clear. It may well have had to do with creating a painterly effect by integrating the signature into a shadow in the landscape. Rembrandt also sometimes painted his signature in more than one colour.⁵² Or did Flinck paint over an earlier date that related to the underlying portrait of a man?⁵³ If so, the

date could only have been 1635. When he first arrived in Amsterdam Flinck worked under Rembrandt's wing, and in his capacity as assistant would not have signed his own name.⁵⁴ The earliest he could have started to do this was 1635, when he began to work for Uylenburgh as an independent artist.

The pose adopted by the overpainted man, with the supporting leg firmly placed and the other leg slightly bent, was quite popular in the Republic at the time. Life-size or small format, eminent citizens had their portraits painted in this *contrapposto* pose derived from Classical Antiquity, as we see in Rembrandt's portrait of Marten Soolmans (1634) and Thomas de Keyser's *Portrait of Frederick van Velthuysen (?-1658) and his Wife Josina Schonevelt (?-1636)* (1636) (figs. 4a, 6).⁵⁵ In these and countless other portraits of men painted in this period we see the garments worn by the man underneath Dirck's likeness. The wide flat collar, standing up slightly around the neck and trimmed with an edging of scalloped lace, has already been discussed. Like the man in the underlying likeness, the anonymous man in Flinck's

portrait in Dublin wears this type of collar (although with deeper scalloping in the lace pattern) combined with a doublet with jet-beaded braid and a broad-brimmed hat with a round crown worn at a jaunty angle (fig. 12). In many men's portraits we also see deep cuffs trimmed with scalloped lace, garters tied in looped bows and shoes with open quarters fastened with a bow (fig. 6). The hidden portrait, in short, is of a man with a certain air, elegantly dressed in the latest fashion.

The man's red stockings were also the height of fashion. Along with pairs in other bright colours, they are found specifically in the probate inventories of unmarried young men.⁵⁶ Paintings show the same link: coloured stockings are virtually always the preserve of youths or unmarried young men.⁵⁷ They consequently appear in the colourful outfits of the partying young people in *Merry Company* paintings like the ones by Willem Buytewech (1591/92-1624) and Dirck Hals (1591-1656; fig. 23). Fashionable young men actually did wear costumes like this in real life.⁵⁸ Colourful attire was regarded at the time as eminently suited to carefree

Fig. 23
DIRCK HALS, *The Fête Champêtre*, signed and dated D HALS 1627. Panel, 77.6 x 135.7 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-A-1796.



youth.⁵⁹ Once a man married or started to play a serious role in public life, he would usually present himself in decent black, so married men generally wear black clothes in portraits from this period. Grey, brown and red garments are worn chiefly by bachelors.⁶⁰ The red hose and grey breeches worn by the man in the underlying likeness consequently indicate that he was young and unmarried when Flinck painted his portrait.

The Unknown Man Unveiled

How can we explain the underlying portrait? Houbraken describes how when Govert Flinck arrived in Amsterdam, 'since he had very prosperous blood relations living there, he was given the initial opportunity to show proof of his art'.⁶¹ Indeed Flinck, who, as we know, came from a Mennonite family, was given work by his Mennonite relatives. The commissions from the Leeuw family are examples of this.⁶² And all the known sitters in his earliest portraits are of that denomination. The hidden portrait would appear to be an exception. It seems difficult to reconcile the colourful, opulent outfit with what we know about Mennonite dress customs. Did Flinck paint his cousin in 1636 over the portrait of a fashionable man who was not a member of the Mennonite community? Someone who, for one reason or another, had rejected his likeness?

Closer examination of Dirck's face, taken in conjunction with the data in the XRF element distribution maps, reveals that this was not, however, the case. The XRF maps for lead, mercury, calcium and iron (figs. 18a, c, d, e) show that Dirck's face was painted with flesh-toned paint mixed from lead white, vermilion, chalk and ochre.⁶³ The distribution of the elements in these XRF maps corresponds exactly with what we may expect on the paint surface on the basis of Dirck's eventual likeness. Nothing points to a change in the facial features: the lead white

distribution in the XRF map accurately follows the modelling, with more lead white in the illuminated passages of the face and less in the areas in shadow. The distribution of ochre and chalk also ties in with what we can expect with the present modelling, with a relatively higher proportion of both pigments in the shadowed flesh tones.⁶⁴ The distribution of mercury shows that the bright vermilion is present in the greatest quantity in Dirck's mouth and pink cheeks. We can rule out any idea that an earlier face was painted out with an opaque layer of lead white that would block the signals from the pigments underneath. A layer of lead white of this kind would have shown up as a white patch on the X-radiograph and in the lead distribution map. There is no indication whatsoever that a face painted earlier has been scraped off, nor does the hairstyle appear to have been changed. All this suggests that the man in the underlying likeness must have been Dirck Leeuw himself.

This is supported by the orange Dirck holds in his left hand. The XRF distribution maps indicate that it was also clasped by the man in the first portrait (figs. 18a, c, d, e). There are no signs that the object was ever altered.⁶⁵ Oranges do appear in portraits from time to time, but they were certainly not standard attributes.⁶⁶ It therefore seems most unlikely that Dirck had himself immortalized holding the orange solely because it was already on the canvas. Had he not wished it to be there, it could simply have been replaced with another object. We may therefore safely conclude that we are seeing the same young man – Dirck Leeuw – in both portraits.

This means that in 1636 (and perhaps even in 1635) Dirck Leeuw decided to have his portrait painted by his cousin and contemporary Govert Flinck. He chose a fashionable costume and an elegant pose (fig. 24). He subsequently had his pose changed and his clothes

Fig. 24
Digital impression of the final version of Govert Flinck's *Portrait of Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw* (fig. 1), showing the hat with a tapering crown, a virtually flat top and a relatively narrow brim. The effect of the abrasion of the black paint in the costume has been corrected so the garters are no longer transparent and the jet-bead braid edging of Dirck's original doublet is no longer visible. The darkening of the landscape and the black paint of Dirck's costume have been corrected, making the folds and the reddish hue of the black cloak at hip level visible. Digital manipulation: Lara de Moor.





< Fig. 25

Digital impression of the original version of Govert Flinck's *Portrait of Dirck Jacobsz Leeuw* (fig. 1). Digital manipulation: Lara de Moor.



Fig. 26

ALBERT CUYP, *Lady and Gentleman on Horseback*, c. 1655, reworked 1660-65. Canvas, 123 x 172 cm. Washington, National Gallery of Art, Widener Collection, inv. no. 1942.9.15.

altered: his red stockings turned black, his cuffs and collar were made smaller and less flamboyant, his hat was given a tapering crown and a somewhat narrower brim, his shoes with open quarters were replaced with closed ones, and the jet-bead braid edging his doublet was painted out and replaced with tasselled bandstrings (fig. 25).

Dirck Leeuw was not unique in having his clothes changed. We know of several other sitters who did the same. One such was the unknown couple in Aelbert Cuyp's *Lady and Gentleman on Horseback* (fig. 26).⁶⁷ There the man originally wore a hat and a military-style doublet and cloak combination, with braids and buttons, and the woman had a different hat and a plain flat collar that covered her shoulders. Govert Flinck actually seems to have modified the costumes worn by the sitters in his portraits with some frequency. The recent restoration of the 1640 *Portrait of a Boy* (fig. 8) revealed a wider collar with picot edging under the present small one trimmed with a narrow lace border.⁶⁸ The X-radiograph of Flinck's *Portrait of a Couple in a Landscape* of 1646 (fig. 10)

shows that the garments of both husband and wife have been considerably altered.⁶⁹ The woman originally wore a wider, lace-trimmed collar, she had a heart-shaped lace cap, her cuffs were decorated and the cut of her bodice was different. The man also originally wore a larger, lace-edged collar.

We do not know the identity of any of these sitters with certainty.⁷⁰ We do know, however, who Dirck Leeuw was. This gives us the opportunity to study the decisions he took about his clothes in more detail. What led him, a youth of Mennonite origins, to wear such flamboyant attire and adopt such a dashing stance for his portrait? And why, then, did he have his costume and pose altered? To answer these questions we need to compare Dirck's clothes with the dress code and the actual dress customs in his Mennonite environment.

Mennonite Dress Codes

There were various Mennonite congregations in seventeenth-century Amsterdam.⁷¹ Dirck's parents, as we have seen, were members of the Waterlander Mennonite congregation

'bij de Toren', so called because they attended a hidden church on Singel in the close vicinity of the Jan Rodenpoortstoren tower. They did not impose discipline as strictly as the Young Flemings, Young Frisians and High Germans. In 1639 these three merged to form the moderately orthodox United Flemish-Frisian-High German (commonly known as the Flemish) congregation 'bij 't Lam', which was almost twice the size of 'bij de Toren'. The most orthodox Mennonite factions in Amsterdam were the Old Flemings, Old Frisians and Jan Jacobs' People, who in terms of numbers were no more than splinter groups in the city.⁷²

Menno Simonsz (1496-1561), the founder of the Mennonite movement, believed that following Christ was incompatible with opulence and excess in anything, including dress.⁷³ Very little seems to have been put down in writing about the practical application of this principle, however.⁷⁴ It is possible that its self-regulating character – it was seldom necessary to enforce discipline – made written rules unnecessary in this faith group. This virtual absence of rules most likely, though, points to general compliance with these principles. The most widely-used surviving source about their sober style of dress therefore comes not from within their own circles but from a Reformed quarter: the satirical poem *Menniste Vryagie* (Mennonite Courtship) written in 1623 by the poet Jan Jansz Starter (1593-1626).⁷⁵ For the time being it seemed that only one primary Mennonite source had survived: the rules of the Groningen Old Flemings (1659), an ultra-orthodox group who had split off from the Flemings, mainly in the northeast of the Netherlands, in 1628, but never had their own congregation in Amsterdam. Although these rules never applied to most Mennonites, and certainly not to those in Amsterdam, for want of anything better they

have always received a great deal of attention in art-historical publications. They contain, for instance, prohibitions on all finery, the adornment of clothes and the person, fashionable cut, buttons, crimson or other colours, satin-weave fabrics, whaleboned bodices, wide skirts with padding at the waist or ornamented with trimmings, ironed collars and shirts (the use of an iron or smoothing stone was not permitted), shoes with open quarters, high heels and white stitching between sole and upper; all were absolutely forbidden. The women were not allowed to wear chains in their hair, nor strings or plaits, and they could not wear ear irons under their cap. The men could not grow their hair long, but at the same time they were not permitted to shave off their beards.⁷⁶

The Groningen Old Flemings may have forsworn every form of worldly adornment, but many among the much more moderate Waterlander Mennonites seem to have been 'exquisitely' dressed early on. This, at least, was the conclusion reached by their Alkmaar teacher Hans de Ries in 1615: 'Simplicity has turned into pomp and circumstance. Goods are enriched, but the soul is impoverished. The clothes have become exquisite but the inner jewel has perished.'⁷⁷ As for Dirck Leeuw, it was specifically the standards in the Waterlander Mennonite congregation 'bij de Toren' that were relevant. And it is of precisely this congregation that some primary sources have survived; however, to date they have received virtually no attention in broader art-historical and costume research.⁷⁸ They are three sermons written in 1651 by Jacob Cornelisz (van Dalen) (1608-1664), surgeon by profession and twelve years teacher of this congregation.⁷⁹ Unlike the Groningen Old Flemings, whose leaders must have reached agreement about explicit instructions, Jacob Cornelisz spoke only in a personal capacity about

ostentatious habits that he himself found unbiblical. He saw it as his duty to call attention to them:

Because I have observed from time to time, with heartfelt sorrow, and still daily ... notice that the ostentation of the Mennonites ... in general, in houses, furnishings, weddings, meals and clothes, is increasing to such an extent that they follow hard on the heels of those who serve the world, and the elegance of their manners is very similar: such that one can see little if any difference between them and the others (the good excepted).⁸⁰

In order to return to evangelical conduct in their lives, women had to lay aside their pearls and gold jewellery:

Oh look at yourself from top to toe, your attire, your ornaments, your gold rings on your fingers, your gold ear irons, your pearls in your ears, your gold bodkins in your hair are living testimony that you do not heed the words of St Paul, or that you do not fear God.⁸¹

He also condemns 'showy' fabrics, colours and cut with which women appear to be better than they are. He rejects expensive and costly looking materials, particularly shiny fabrics like silk and *felp* [a long-pile velvet], as well as embroidery, silver and gold lace, and ornaments of all kinds such as 'laces, edgings, pomets etc.'⁸² In so far as people were ashamed to wear expensive fabrics openly, he complained, these materials were used as linings or for undergarments, with the intention of showing them 'accidentally'. Tellingly, he even finds it necessary to condemn unequivocally the fashion of the low décolleté popular among non-Mennonite women and to warn forcefully against following it.

In the first instance Jacob Cornelisz was addressing the women in his congregation; once he had converted them, he reasoned, the 'effeminate men who

do not differ by a hair's breadth from the women when it comes to ostentation' would automatically have to follow.⁸³ He roundly denounced what he saw as the ludicrous male fashions in the outside world; he would not, of course, have had to do so if no one in the congregation had been guilty of following them:

Who should not be ashamed to disclose the whole altar of dishonest and frivolous dress: both men and women whom one daily sees sweeping past one's gaze such that they have to bedeck themselves with bows and adornments before their dress is fine enough to cover their paltry limbs? Who should not be ashamed when one sees all the unnecessary fripperies that are in themselves ridiculous?⁸⁴

It seems that Cornelisz's strict standards were not shared by the whole church council. The very fact that he published his thoughts in his private capacity points in this direction. We are moreover aware of only a few documented cases where members of 'bij de Toren' were called to account by the church council because of their inappropriate dress. In 1657, for instance, Cornelis Vincent (1633-after 1683), paper merchant on Nieuwendijk and a member for two years, was summoned because of his lifestyle.

He promised to reform his ways and to 'moderate the opulence of his clothes'.⁸⁵ In the same year Jacob Venkel (1635-1680), apothecary in Sint Antoniesbreestraat, who had been a member of the congregation for five years, was summoned to appear before the church council 'because his dress was so conspicuous'.⁸⁶ It is interesting to note that the church council found that Venkel had a degree of innocence in the way he dressed because his wife was a member of the Reformed Church. Evidently this was regarded as a mitigating circumstance.

With his frankness, Jacob Cornelisz put his finger squarely on a sore spot: for decades the Mennonites had been accused by the Reformed Church of hypocrisy in their appearance. Jan Jansz Starter's *Menniste Vryagie* is the best-known example of this. Their dress was seemingly simple and restrained, but they used expensive materials and hidden luxury. As early as 1618 the Reformed minister Jacobus Trigland attacked the Mennonites for using cheap-looking fabrics that were actually of fine quality, and so in fact quite costly.⁸⁷ Not all the criticism was unfounded: the black garments worn by Mennonites in wealthy families were sometimes anything but cheap.

As an example, a cloak of black cloth belonging to the Waterlander Mennonite Amsterdam merchant and deacon Reyer Claesz was valued at forty guilders in 1638, a sum for which a skilled worker would have to work for six weeks.⁸⁸ At that time black was in any case one of the most expensive colours, because dyeing it was a labour-intensive process in which the imported dyestuff indigo was an important ingredient.⁸⁹

Dirck's Final Outfit According to the Mennonite 'Yardstick'

If we compare Jacob Cornelisz's sermons in retrospect with Dirck's 'new' outfit in his 1636 dated portrait,

Fig. 27
GOVERT FLINCK,
Portrait of a Man,
Known as Gozen
Centen (1611/12-1677),
1639-40.
Panel, 65,5 x 51 cm.
Amsterdam,
Rijksmuseum,
inv. no. SK-A-4166;
purchased with
the support of
the Stichting tot
Bevordering van
de Belangen van
het Rijksmuseum.





we can conclude that the strict Mennonite teacher would have had nothing to complain about when it came to the suit itself. Dirck's doublet, breeches and cloak are not a striking colour, but black, nor is the fabric satin-weave, and there are no trimmings of lace, jet beads or other ornaments. His stockings, shoes and hat are likewise black and he wears a plain collar. Nevertheless, there are dress elements that were condemned from the pulpit. Dirck has long hair that actually falls over the edge of his collar. His cuffs, tasselled bandstrings and leather gloves, the loops on his garters and the bows on his shoes would most probably have been regarded as 'unnecessary fripperies'. However, the sermons are not enough to give us a clear picture of what went on in daily life. Mennonite probate inventories, on the other hand, can provide clarity in this respect and illustrate what was customary and what was exceptional. The inventories of the Waterlander

Mennonites are obviously the most relevant for Dirck's outfit, but those of the stricter congregations also prove to be very enlightening.

It is immediately clear from these inventories that Dirck's wardrobe – plain black cloak, doublet, breeches, stockings, shoes and hat – was the choice of by far the majority of Mennonite men.⁹⁰ As was the un-adorned flat collar. The probate inventories of the 1625 to 1670 period list both *kragen* and *beffen* – ruffs and flat collars respectively.⁹¹ Almost all of them are without lace or any other ornamentation. In portraits of Mennonites we see that they virtually all wear plain collars, like an unknown young man whose oft-mentioned identification as Gozen Centen (1611/12-1677) is not certain, but whose Mennonite background is unarguable (fig. 27).⁹² Another example is the ruff in the portrait of the Flemish-Mennonite Laurens Joosten Baeck (1567/68-1642), a successful sugar refiner (fig. 28a).⁹³

Fig. 28a
Attributed to
NICOLAES ELIASZ
PICKENOY, *Portrait of
Laurens Joosten Baeck
(1567/68-1642)*, with
the inscription *Aetatis
suae 62. Ano 1629.*
Panel, 121 x 89 cm.
Johannesburg,
Johannesburg
Art Gallery,
inv. no. 1991.7.5.
Photo: Johannesburg
Art Gallery.

Fig. 28b
Attributed to
NICOLAES ELIASZ
PICKENOY, *Portrait of
Dieuwer Jacobs van
Harencarspel
(1567/68-1645)*, with
the inscription *Aetatis
suae 62. Ano 1629.*
Panel, 121 x 89 cm.
Johannesburg,
Johannesburg
Art Gallery, inv. no. 204.
Photo: Johannesburg
Art Gallery.



Fig. 29

THEODOR MATHAM
after a painting by
Simon de Vlieger,
*Portrait of Jacob
Aertsz Colom (1599-
1673)*, c. 1640-60.
Engraving, 253 x 284 mm.
Amsterdam,
Rijksmuseum,
inv. no. RP-P-OB-23.195.

It is also striking that the probate inventories seldom mention the things Jacob Cornelisz campaigned against. It would seem that most members conformed to the required austerity. Nevertheless, plain and embroidered bandstrings, velvet and lace edgings, satin piping, satin *pomet* and even silver and gold braid on men's and women's clothes do appear.⁹⁴ A certain luxury was certainly not unique in Mennonite circles. Dirck's accessories, however, prove to be a rarity.

This is true, first and foremost, of his cuffs or *poignets*. It was recently established that cuffs are not found in Mennonite estates.⁹⁵ The inventory research in Amsterdam, however, revealed that ten of the two hundred inventories (5%) listing men's and/or women's garments in the 1625-70 period do contain *poignets* – only a small percentage. In each case, moreover, there are very few of them, suggesting that they were not worn every day.⁹⁶ In later inventories we do occasionally come across larger numbers; the Waterlander

Mennonite Jacob Aertsz Colom (1599-1673), a successful publisher, for instance, had forty-five pairs.⁹⁷ He had his portrait done by Simon de Vlieger (c. 1601-1653), before 1653, after which Theodoor Matham (1605/06-1676) made an engraving (fig. 29). Other portraits of Mennonites in which they do not wear cuffs lead us to suspect that he was an exception. The white edges we often see at sitters' wrists prove on closer examination to be the wristbands of a shirt or shift, sometimes finished with a zigzag edge (described in estate inventories as *muizentandjes* – 'mouse teeth'), as in Nicolaes Elias Pickenoy's (1588-before 1657) portrait (1629) of the Flemish Mennonite Dieuwer Jacobs van Harencarspel (1567/68-1645) (fig. 28b),⁹⁸ and in Rembrandt's portrait (1632) of the Old Flemish Mennonite Marten Looten (1585/86-1649) (fig. 30),⁹⁹ and Frans Hals's (1582/83-1666) portrait (1635) of Feyntje van Steenkiste (1603/04-1640) (fig. 31).¹⁰⁰

Fig. 30

REMBRANDT, *Portrait of Marten Looten (1585/86-1649)*, 1632. Panel, 92.8 x 74.9 cm. Los Angeles, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, inv. no. M53.50.3; gift of J. Paul Getty.





< Fig. 31

FRANS HALS,
*Portrait of Feyntje
 van Steenkiste*
 (1603/04-1640),
 dated *Aetat suae*
 31 An^o 1635.
 Canvas, 123 x 93 cm.
 Amsterdam,
 Rijksmuseum,
 inv. no. SK-C-557;
 on loan from the
 City of Amsterdam.

Fig. 32

ABRAHAM
 VAN DEN TEMPEL,
*Portrait of David
 Leeuw (1631/32-1703)
 and his Family*,
 signed and dated
A. van d. Tempel 1671.
 Canvas, 190 x 200 cm.
 Amsterdam,
 Rijksmuseum,
 inv. no. SK-A-1972;
 gift of J.H. Willink
 van Bennebroek,
 Oegstgeest.

Leather gloves like Dirck's are also recorded in only ten of the two hundred (5%) Mennonite inventories between 1625 and 1670 and only in those of the wealthiest.¹⁰¹ The tasselled bandstrings are even rarer, but here again Dirck Leeuw was not unique.¹⁰² Many Waterlander Mennonites among the wealthy citizenry wore them in their portraits, such as Jacob Aertsz Colom (fig. 29) and David Leeuw with his family (fig. 32). While tasselled bandstrings appear to be absent from portraits of Flemish Mennonite men, women of this denomination are portrayed with tassels on the corners of their neckerchiefs.



Garters are extremely rare in Mennonite inventories.¹⁰³ On all four occasions we find them they are made of silk: in 1636 and 1637 in the inventories of two Flemish Mennonites, in 1641 and 1649 in those of two Waterlander Mennonites, one pair edged with lace.¹⁰⁴ Admittedly this is a negligible number out of 123 inventories that list men's garments in the 1625-70 period, but it nonetheless proves that the more opulent version of this indispensable accessory was worn now and again. Ribbons on shoes, however, are not found in any of the Mennonite inventories that have been consulted.

We have already concluded that Jacob Cornelisz would not have approved of Dirck's hairstyle. Similar criticism was also voiced in other denominations. During the 1640s the Dutch Reformed church councils in a number of large towns and cities spoke out against what they saw as the unkempt long hair worn by fashionable young men. This was occasioned by the fact that a number of young Reformed ordinands had recently appeared in the pulpit with flowing locks. When the Reformed Dordrecht minister Jacobus Borstius (1612-1680), his fellow townsman the physician Johan van Beverwijk (1594-1647), the Reformed Zierikzee minister Godefridus Udemans (c. 1580-1649) and lastly the Leiden professor Marcus Zuërius Boxhorn (1612-1653) all waded into the debate, the *Hairige Questie* – the 'Hairy Quarrel' – was born.¹⁰⁵ Although the controversy did not culminate in a war of pamphlets until 1640, long hair on men had been contested before, among members of the Reformed Church and Mennonites alike. For instance, the Waterlander Mennonite silk-mercator Isaack Vlaming (1585-1668) stipulated in the contracts for apprentices who came to learn the trade with him in 1636 that they had to get their hair cut as soon as it grew over their ears.¹⁰⁶ It can be deduced that short hair was indeed the norm for Mennonite men

from a disparaging comment in a pamphlet published in 1644 by Florentius Schuyl (1619-1669), professor at the Atheneum Illustre in Den Bosch.¹⁰⁷

In sum, we see that in his final portrait Dirck Leeuw chose an outfit in which the most important elements were in accordance with Mennonite dress conventions, but he also had many accessories that clearly departed from them in the degree of opulence. All the same, with the exception of the ribbon bows on his shoes, Dirck was not the only man who wore them; time and again other gentlemen in the well-to-do Waterlander Mennonite community prove to have owned these accessories. There is, though, a significant difference between them and Dirck. None of these gentlemen ever had all these items in his inventory at the same time; in their case it was always one or at most a few 'controversial' accessories. Nobody else had his portrait painted wearing all these accessories at once. It would seem that in his choice of clothes Dirck was balancing on the precarious bounds of the acceptable, by Mennonite standards, if not actually overstepping them.

Dirck's Former Costume According to the 'Mennonite Yardstick'

He was certainly overstepping the bounds when it came to the clothes in his underlying portrait (fig. 25). To start with, the flat collar trimmed with lace. Just how exceptional this was for Mennonites is evident from the Mennonite estate inventories in Amsterdam. The ruffs recorded there are always without lace.¹⁰⁸ In the case of flat collars [*beffen*] lace occurs very seldom – in just three of the sixty-eight inventories that include men's collars in the 1625-70 period.¹⁰⁹ As far as we know to date, adult Mennonites in the seventeenth century never had their portraits painted wearing lace collars.¹¹⁰

Dirck originally also wore wide cuffs edged with scalloped lace. As we have already seen, Mennonites seldom had cuffs of any kind and no embellished ones at all are mentioned in any of the inventories.¹¹¹ One also looks there in vain for doublets trimmed with jet-bead braid.¹¹² Bright red or otherwise brightly coloured stockings likewise do not appear: men's hose is almost exclusively white or black.¹¹³ There are a couple of exceptions: there are dark 'tenette' [tawny] stockings and two inventories include 'coloured' stockings.¹¹⁴ Although the colour is not specified, they were probably brown or grey.¹¹⁵ Only the Waterlander Mennonite cloth merchant Jan Pietersz Bruijningh had, as well as a pair of grey and a pair of black 'saijette' [twisted woollen knitting yarn] stockings, a pair of 'dark crimson ditto'.¹¹⁶ Crimson was used to signify a very deep red, tending towards purple.¹¹⁷ The adjective 'dark' tells us that Bruijningh's stockings were not bright crimson, but a darker, more muted colour.

Since lace-trimmed cuffs and brightly-coloured stockings are absent from Mennonite inventories and collars with lace occur only very rarely, we may conclude that these items were very seldom, if ever, worn. The appearance of these elements in Dirck's previous costume would therefore have been deemed utterly inappropriate for a Mennonite, condemned from the pulpit and shunned in everyday practice. Dirck, moreover, wore all three accessories at the same time, which would only have increased the odium of impropriety. His worldly pose, borrowed from elegant, wealthy patricians, must also have come across as presumptuous. This gives rise to the question as to why Dirck had himself portrayed in this way.

The Two Portraits Explained

The answer to this question lies in an identifying feature of Mennonite faith. Mennonites differ from other

reformist movements in their rejection of infant baptism. They practise adult baptism following a confession of faith. In seventeenth-century Amsterdam the baptism of the faithful could take place from the age of seventeen onwards, but many people waited until after marriage, some of them even until they were on their deathbed. No one in the Leeuw family was in any hurry. When Dirck's half-brother Ameldonck and his wife were baptized as Mennonites in 1632, followed by Dirck's sisters Elisabeth, Barbara and Aeltje in 1634, 1636 and 1637 respectively, they were an average of twenty-five years old.¹¹⁸ Dirck was the same age when on 7 September 1639 he and his wife Maria chose baptism as a sign of confession – not in a Mennonite congregation, however, but in the Remonstrant congregation that had had its own hidden church on Keizersgracht since 1630.¹¹⁹ The Remonstrant Church recognized Reformed infant baptism and also accepted Mennonite adult baptism as valid. Baptized Mennonites were therefore accepted by the Remonstrants on confession of faith, without rebaptism. Since Dirck had not been baptized a Mennonite, his confession was not enough and he had to be baptized by a Remonstrant minister. Dirck's sister Grietje and his brother Jacob Leeuw followed his example in 1640 and 1642, and Govert Flinck, who until then had not been a member of any church, took the same step in 1651.¹²⁰

The fact that Dirck had not been baptized a Mennonite when Flinck painted him is crucial to the interpretation of the underlying flamboyant portrait. To Mennonites, baptism was the outward sign that the person receiving baptism was prepared to renounce sinful desires and to live henceforth according to God's will. It was only after this baptism following confession that someone became subject, as a member, to the ecclesias-

tical discipline with which the congregation purified itself of errors in life and doctrine. However, at the time his portrait was painted, Dirck was unbaptized and therefore immune to this discipline. Pressure from Mennonite family members aside, he was at complete liberty to follow his own conscience in matters of dress.

The church council minutes reveal that some aspiring candidates for baptism did not take sufficient account of the dress rules imposed on members. A request to be baptized could be refused as long as the person concerned did not wear more decent clothes. An application to this effect made in 1616 by a couple who had married in 1614 was only granted after husband and wife 'had promised to reduce and discontinue the outlandishness of their dress'.¹²¹ Unbaptized members of Mennonite families – even those who wanted to join the Mennonite congregation – thus sometimes wore clothes that the rules did not permit. These garments were evidently tolerated by those in their Mennonite milieu as long as their wearers were not baptized, but they had to be changed if they wanted to be accepted as members of the congregation.

The minutes do not specify precisely what constituted the 'outlandishness' of these clothes, but some inventories provide an answer. In the corpus that has been researched there are two inventories of men from Mennonite families who were not baptized when their probate inventory was drawn up. These are the inventories of Michiel Adriaensz van Zevenbergen (1626-c. 1659) and his younger brother Nicolaes Adriaensz van Zevenbergen (1629-1653), which were compiled in 1657 and 1653 respectively.¹²² The brothers, both bachelors, were the sons of the Waterlander Mennonite couple Adriaen Claesz van Zevenbergen and Hester de Flines, whom we have encountered before. Of their eight children, four were baptized into the

same congregation, but Nicolaes died unbaptized in Northern Italy in 1653. Michiel was likewise unbaptized when he had his inventory drawn up in 1657.

Both inventories list fashionable items of clothing and accessories, similar to Dirck's. Sometimes we find precisely the same pieces in Michiel's inventory, among them 'a pair of red stockings' and 'bows on the shoes'. But Michiel dressed much more flamboyantly than Dirck Leeuw: he had 'a pair of small lace garters', 'a cloth-of-silver doublet with black lace', 'pink silk breeches with black lace', 'a cloth-of-gold doublet with a pair of silk sleeves', 'a Japanese gown' and various coloured garments and items with gold and silver buttons. As well as the obligatory black, his brother Nicolaes also had all sorts of coloured clothes. Some were adorned with gold buttons, lace or gold braid. There were also gold and silver 'hatbands'.

We do not know whether these two inventories are representative of the dress habits of unbaptized men in Mennonite families. Both examples, however, show just how flashy some of them were.¹²³ We may therefore assume that Dirck's original outfit was not unique; in Amsterdam other unbaptized men from Mennonite families also dressed in this showy way – and sometimes even more flamboyantly. The clothes in which Dirck chose to have his portrait painted may not have been permissible for a Mennonite or an aspiring candidate for baptism, but a blind eye was apparently turned when it came to unbaptized members of Mennonite households. This would appear to have solved the riddle of the clothes in Dirck's earlier portrait.

This leaves us with one major question: why were Dirck's suit and pose so drastically altered? In answering this it is crucial to establish when these changes were made. As we have pointed out, the signature added in two phases raised the possibility that there

might be an earlier date concealed under the present 1636. Might this possible change of date coincide with the alteration of dress and pose? If so, it can have had nothing to do with Dirck's baptism, which did not take place until 1639 and then not with the Mennonites but in the Remonstrant congregation. In 1636, however, one could well imagine that Dirck's black suit and simple collar could be mourning, since his father died in early November 1635. At that time the death of a parent, like the death of a spouse, ushered in a period of mourning during which people wore black clothes and linen without lace for a year, eschewing gleaming materials like silk and gold.¹²⁴ These mourning clothes were expected to be plain; any form of showiness had to be avoided.¹²⁵ Might Dirck have wished not to cause offence with the portrait after his father's death and is this why he had it changed?

In fact this seems unlikely. True, some of the clothes Dirck is wearing conform to conventional mourning dress, but this is most definitely not true of his gloves made of glossy tan leather and his hatband of gold or silver thread. Moreover – and this settles the matter – closer examination reveals that various elements of Dirck's costume suggest a date some ten years later. This later date emerges from the combination of a number of smaller elements and is certainly not obvious at first glance. The small, flat unadorned collar was already being worn by some Mennonites in the early 1630s, such as Marten Looten in his 1632 portrait (fig. 30). At that time this modest little collar stood in stark contrast to the prevailing fashion which called, on the contrary, for wide collars trimmed with lace (figs. 4a, 12). From around 1645 to 1655, however, the wide model of collar made way for a much smaller type known as a *bef* or falling bands.¹²⁶ The bandstrings of the *bef* and the decorative tassels hanging

from them became an increasingly prominent fashion element. In these years the previously popular flat lace tassels (fig. 6) also made way for tassels made of small knots or white beads, as we see in Dirck's final outfit.¹²⁷ The final version of the hat with the more tapering crown (fig. 24) and relatively narrow brim is also more in tune with the fashions of the 1640s.¹²⁸

All in all, the black suit that was painted over Dirck Leeuw's initial flamboyant costume can be dated to around 1647. This means that the date 1636 (whether it was altered or not) belongs to Dirck in his first colourful outfit and was not altered when the clothes were revised. The clothes in the *Group Portrait of The Hague Magistrates* painted in 1647 by Cornelis Jonson van Ceulen (1593-1661) (fig. 33) are a good comparison with Dirck's eventual outfit. Without exception the black-clad gentlemen sported the then generally-worn small collar (with or without a narrow lace edging) and matching, unpretentious cuffs. The bandstrings with tassels either hang loose on the chest (like Dirck Leeuw's) or are tied at the throat.

The radical change to Dirck Leeuw's costume would therefore seem to have been more in the nature of an update. The reason could have been the (almost universal) feeling that, ten years later, the once so fashionable attire in which one had been portrayed looks ugly and eccentric. This effect is aggravated when the clothes concerned are extravagant, youthful fads. The relatively extreme fashion of the 1630s with its wide collars, lavish lace trim and ornamentation was certainly in great contrast to that of the 1640s and 1650s, when a much more restrained style of dress came into fashion. This period also saw the end of the extremely wide shoe quarters that had been popular in the 1620s and 1630s. Dirck's original shoes with strikingly large quarters must therefore have been replaced by a closed model in the final

Fig. 33
CORNELIS JONSON
VAN CEULEN,
*Group Portrait
of The Hague
Magistrates*, signed
and dated 1647.
Canvas,
283.5 × 373.5 cm.
Den Haag, Haags
Historisch Museum,
inv. no. 251.
Photo: Reprorek.





version. It is possible that in 1647 Dirck felt that his earlier showy style of dress as a young bachelor was no longer seemly for his present status in life. By then he was a grown-up married man with responsibilities to his family, and a member of the Remonstrant Church.

The change in Dirck's pose also gave his portrait a contemporary look. The portraits that Flinck's exemplar Rembrandt was painting in the 1630s already had a suggestion of movement, but this was chiefly lateral, as we see in the portrait of Marten Soolmans (fig. 4a). It was not until 1641 that Rembrandt started to use an explicitly forward motion in order to achieve a strong spatial effect.¹²⁹ The change from Dirck's first static stance to a pose in which he walks towards the viewer seems to have been prompted by this style innovation.

Dirck does not appear to have been the only person to have his portrait modernized by replacing what was seen as an outmoded costume with garments more in line with current fashions. The same might well have been the case for the couple on horseback portrayed by Cuyp (fig. 26). Their clothes as we see them now can be dated to around 1663/65 and, as the X-radiograph shows, have been painted over a fashionable costume from around 1655.¹³⁰ The changes to Flinck's portraits of a boy and a couple in a landscape also appear to be the result of a fashion update. The boy's original wide collar with picot edging was in fashion around 1640, which tallies with the date on the portrait, whereas the eventual small collar with a narrow lace border that has almost no indentations only became the vogue after 1645. As in Dirck Leeuw's case, Flinck did not regard a costume overhaul in this boy's portrait as any reason to alter the date on it. The same is true of the modifications to the costumes of the couple in the landscape, whose current clothes reflect

the fashions of the 1650s, whereas Flinck dated the canvas 1646. In Dirck's case and, it would seem, in those of the boy and the couple, Flinck himself made the changes. The painter was evidently happy to accommodate his clients by reworking an old portrait in accordance with their wishes. Where Dirck Leeuw was concerned, the change was in any event easy to accomplish, since by 1647 the cousins had been neighbours on Lauriergracht for several years.

Conclusion

Research into materials and techniques revealed the unusual genesis of Govert Flinck's earliest known signed and dated painting, a portrait of his cousin Dirck Leeuw. It appeared that Flinck had originally painted his cousin in a fashionable, colourful costume and a different pose, and had replaced this version with the present picture in which Dirck is dressed predominantly in black and walks towards the viewer.

Combining data from surviving Mennonite teachings and from a great many Amsterdam Mennonite probate inventories, in conjunction with an analysis of the clothes in Mennonite portraits, made it possible to determine with a fair degree of accuracy how people in Mennonite circles would have perceived the clothes in the two versions of the portrait and whether they would have considered them as acceptable. It emerged that Mennonite dress conventions were anything but straightforward, even within one and the same congregation. For although sermons were preached against specific items of clothing and accessories, and a great many Mennonites did indeed refrain from wearing them, there were always some members, as their inventories tell us, who nevertheless owned the articles in question. This shows how speculative it is, in the case of anonymous portraits, to make pronouncements about the sitters' Mennonite denomination or back-

ground – or otherwise – solely on the basis of what they are wearing.

Particular caution is called for because our analysis brought to light an important aspect of Mennonite mores, one that has been entirely neglected in art and costume history research: as long as people had not been baptized, the ‘objectionable’ garments and accessories were permitted or at least overlooked. It was this that proved to be the explanation of Dirck’s ostentatious costume in the first version of the portrait. However, the change to a predominantly black outfit and a different pose made by Flinck was not, however, prompted by Dirck’s baptism. More detailed examination of this costume reveals that we should date it not in 1636 but ten years later, around 1647. By this time a more restrained style of dress, one that differed from the relatively ostentatious fashion of the 1630s, had become the mode. Dirck’s personal circumstances – he had meanwhile grown up, married, become a father and a member of the Remonstrant congregation – may have contributed to his desire to reconcile his portrait as a young bachelor with his present situation in life.

Govert Flinck’s portrait of Dirck Leeuw tells the unusual and personal story of a young man from a Mennonite family, his search for his place in society and the way his cousin the painter was at his service. As neighbours, Govert Flinck and Dirck Leeuw must certainly have seen Dirck’s portrait together on countless occasions and perhaps recalled the now hidden youthful portrait: a family secret to which we – almost four centuries later – are now also privy.



APPENDIX

Edited Genealogy of the Leeuw Family

1. Jacob Leeuw I, b. Cologne, member of 'bij de Toren', merchant in kamerijksdoek [cambric], resided in Amsterdam: Niezel (1593-1625), Oudezijds Voorburgwal now no. 113 (1625-†); in 1631 assessed in the register of the 200th penny for taxable capital (real estate) of 30,000 guilders, s. of Ameldonck Leeuw (painter and teacher of the Mennonites in Cologne) and N.N., buried Amsterdam (Oude Kerk) 3-11-1635, m. (1) 1604 Barbara Pieters de Bosch (Goch 1581-1605 Amsterdam), d. of Pieter Jansz de Bosch and Jenneken Hendriks; m. (2) 1609 Geertge Jacobs Melcknap, b. Hoorn, member of 'bij de Toren', resided Fluwelenburgwal, buried Amsterdam (Oude Kerk) 20-4-1641.

From the first marriage:
 1. Ameldonck Leeuw, follows II.a
 From the second marriage:
 2. Elisabeth Leeuw (Amsterdam 1609-1678 Weesp), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 19-2-1634, resided in Weesp, there: governor of the orphanage 1650-62, 1667-68, governor of the hospital 1662, m. 1630 Matthijs Schouten (Weesp 1607/08-1641), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 19-2-1634, s. of Lambert Cornelisz Schouten (member of 'bij de Toren' and burgo-master of Weesp on several occasions 1612-44) and Christina Meyninga Matthijsdr.
 3. Barbara Leeuw (Amsterdam 1610-1671 Weesp), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 11-5-1636, m. 1634 Cornelis Schouten (Amsterdam 1606/07-1659 Weesp), brewer in Weesp, burgomaster there 1645, 1649, 1651, s. of Lambert Cornelisz Schouten (see under 2) and Christina Meyninga Matthijsdr.
 4. Jacob Leeuw II, follows II.b
 5. Aeltgen Leeuw (Amsterdam c. 1613-1678 Weesp), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 1-3-1637, by confession member of the Remonstrant congregation in Amsterdam 23-2-1645, unmarried.
 6. Dirck Leeuw, follows II.c
 7. Grietgen Leeuw (Amsterdam 1615/16-1666), bapt. Amsterdam (Remonstrant Church) 14-2-1640, m. 1637 Jan Claesz Anslø (Amsterdam 1609/10-1668), bapt. Amsterdam (Remonstrant Church) 14-2-1640, grocer, s. of Claes Claesz Anslø the Younger

and Maritge Jans (de Vogel)
the Younger.

- II.a Ameldonck Leeuw, b. Amsterdam Nov. 1604, bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 12-12-1632, citizen 30-5-1640, cambric merchant, art collector, had a house built on Rokin now no. 95 by Philips Vingboons in 1646, buried Amsterdam (Oude Kerk) 19-6-1647, m. 5-3-1628 Maria Rutgers, b. Haarlem 1603/04, bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 12-12-1632, d. of David Rutgers and Josina Lamberts, buried Amsterdam (Oude Kerk) 7-10-1652; she remarried: 1650 Jan le Pla, member of 'bij de Toren' Dec. 1650 (with attestation from Leiden), widower of Piroentje Hennebo.

Surviving children from this marriage:

1. Barbara Leeuw (Amsterdam 1629-1682), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 17-3-1647, m. 1646 Anthony Block (Emmerik 1619/20-1681 Amsterdam), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 17-3-1647, s. of Arent Dircksz Block and Ida Rutgers.
 2. Angenieta Leeuw (Amsterdam 1630-1694), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 13-12-1648, m. 1648 Dirck Block (Emmerik c. 1616-1664), member of 'bij 't Lam' 12-7-1642 (with attestation from Emmerik), s. of Arent Dircksz Block and Ida Rutgers.
 3. David Leeuw, follows III.a
 4. Jacob Leeuw III, follows III.b.
- II.b Jacob Leeuw II, b. Amsterdam c. 1611, bapt. Amsterdam (Remonstrant Church) 17-8-1642, resided in Weesp, there: governor of the orphanage 1654, 1657, commissioner for marital matters 1652, sheriff 1644, 1649, 1651, 1655, city

council 1658-71, burgomaster 1658, 1662, 1670-71, buried Weesp 5-9-1671, m. Weesp after 17-8-1642 Lysbeth Schouten, adult bapt. Amsterdam (Remonstrant Church) 7-4-1667, resided in Weesp, governor of the orphanage in Weesp 1663, d. of the de Mennonites Lambert Cornelisz Schouten (burgomaster of Weesp on several occasions between 1612 and 1644) and Christina Matthijs Meyninga (governor of the orphanage in Weesp 1632-33), buried Weesp 9-10-1677.

From this marriage (sequence uncertain):

1. Lambert Leeuw, adult bapt. Amsterdam (Remonstrant Church) 7-4-1667, resided in Weesp, there: commissioner for marital matters 1686-91, 1696, church warden 1692-93, 1698, 1700, 1707-10, orphanage master 1701-02, 1705, 1711, polder master 1705, treasurer 1705, receiver 1708, sheriff Bijlmer 1692, 1694, 1698, sheriff Weesp 1695, 1697, 1699, 1701, 1708, burgomaster 1702, city council 1699-†1715, unmarried.
2. Jacob Leeuw III, adult bapt. Amsterdam (Remonstrant Church) 7-4-1667, resided in Weesp, there: treasurer 1675, 1677, sheriff 1679, polder master 1686-92, 1699, unmarried.
3. Geertruid Leeuw, † Weesp 1667, m. Weesp, Claes Huybertsz Dell, brewer in Weesp, there also: sheriff 1642, commissioner for marital matters 1670, s. of Huybert Claesz Dell (burgomaster of Weesp on several occasions between 1636 and 1653) and Hilleetje Jacobs, buried Weesp 28-4-1673.
4. Christina Leeuw, † Amsterdam 1732, adult bapt. Amster-

dam (Remonstrant Church)
7-4-1667, m. Weesp 1671
Johannes Uylenbergh
(Amsterdam 1642-1709),
sheriff Weesperkarspel 1692,
s. of Pieter Pietersz Uylen-
bergh and Griet Jans Alma.

- II.c Dirck Leeuw, b. Amsterdam
1614/15, bapt. Amsterdam
(Remonstrant Church) 7-9-1639,
living 18-5-1664, m. 20-3-1639
Maria Anslo (Amsterdam 1619/
20-1702), bapt. Amsterdam
(Remonstrant Church) 7-9-1639,
d. of Claes Claesz Anslo the
Younger and Marritje Jans
(de Vogel) the Younger; she
remarried: Amsterdam 1672
Isaac Pontanus (Den Briel?
c. 1625-1710 Amsterdam), wid-
ower of Elisabeth Gouwenaar.

From this marriage:

1. Jacob Leeuw Dircksz (Amster-
dam 1639-1703), bapt. Amster-
dam (Remonstrant Church)
27-9-1639, merchant and
translator from English and
Italian, m. 1683 Eva Baltus
(Alkmaar 1657-1720 Amster-
dam), member of the Remon-
strant congregation Amster-
dam 3-3-1677, d. of Dirck
Baltus and Niesje Keijsers.
They had their infant daughter
Maria Jacoba (1685-1700)
baptized as a Remonstrant;
Eva Baltus remarried:
Abcoude 1705 Arent van de
Rijp (Amsterdam 1664/65-
1729), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij 't
Lam & de Toren') 9-12-1691,
governor Collegianten
Weeshuis De Oranjeappel
1710-15, 1717-29.

- III.a David Leeuw (Amsterdam
1631/32-1703), bapt. Amsterdam
(‘bij de Toren’) 25-2-1652, in 1671
painted as head of the family in
the family by Abraham van den

Tempel (fig. 26); cambric mer-
chant, deacon of the United
Mennonite Congregation ‘bij
't Lam & de Toren' 1673-76,
m. Weesp 1651 Cornelia Hooft
(Amsterdam 1631-1708), bapt.
Amsterdam (‘bij de Toren’)
25-2-1652, d. of Pieter Gerritsz
Hooft (governor of Weesp
orphanage 1649, member of
the committee responsible for
the upkeep of the polder Gein
1649-56, hospital master Weesp
1650-56) and Weijntje Schouten.

From this marriage:

1. Maria Leeuw (Amsterdam
1652-1721), bapt. Amsterdam
(‘bij 't Lam & de Toren’)
6-12-1671, m. 1674 Ameldonck
Block (Amsterdam 1651/52-
1702), bapt. Amsterdam
(‘bij 't Lam & de Toren’)
10-11-1672, s. of Dirck
Arentsz Block and Angenieta
Leeuw (II.a.3).
2. Pieter Leeuw (Amsterdam
1656/57-1677).
3. Weijntje Leeuw (Amsterdam
1659-1728), bapt. Amsterdam
(‘bij 't Lam & de Toren’)
5-12-1677, m. 1682 Aernout
van Lennep (Amsterdam
1658-1728), bapt. Amsterdam
(‘bij 't Lam & de Toren’)
9-2-1687, s. of Jacob van Len-
nep and Anna van der Meersch.
4. Cornelia Leeuw (Amsterdam
1662-1716), bapt. Amsterdam
(‘bij 't Lam & de Toren’)
18-11-1685, unmarried.
5. Susanna Leeuw (Amsterdam
1669-1726), bapt. Amsterdam
(‘bij 't Lam & de Toren’)
14-2-1694, m. 1692 Dirck van
Lennep (Amsterdam 1665-
1720), bapt. Amsterdam (‘bij
't Lam & de Toren’) 14-2-1694,
s. of Jacob van Lennep and
Anna van der Meersch. From
them descends the Leeuw van
Lennep family.

III.b Jacob Leeuw IV (Amsterdam 1636-1704), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 26-2-1662, paint merchant, m. 1666 Christina de Flines (Amsterdam 1647-1725), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij de Toren') 26-2-1668, d. of Gilbert Philipsz de Flines and Rebecca de Wolff.

From this marriage:

1. Christina Leeuw (Amsterdam 1668-1731), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij 't Lam & de Toren') 18-11-1703, m. 1702 Jan van der Heyden the Younger (Amsterdam 1662-1726), bapt. Amsterdam ('bij 't Lam & de Toren') 18-11-1703, s. of Jan van der Heyden and Sara ter Hiel.
2. Jacob Leeuw V (Amsterdam 1669-1711).
3. Rebecca Leeuw (Amsterdam 1671-1747), bapt. Amsterdam ('De Zon') 28-2-1700, m. 1704 David van Heyst (Amsterdam 1675-1746), bapt. Amsterdam ('De Zon') 24-2-1697, minister 'De Zon' 1701-16, s. of Hendrik van Heyst and Maria Hooft.
4. Maria Leeuw (Amsterdam 1673-1718).
5. Gilbert Leeuw (Amsterdam 1679-1732 IJsselstein).
6. David Leeuw (Amsterdam 1682-1755).
7. Ameldonck Leeuw (Amsterdam 1683-1761 Weesp).
8. Jan Leeuw (Amsterdam 1684-1724).
9. Agneta Leeuw (Amsterdam 1686-1755), godparent on many occasions in the 'bij 't Lam & de Toren' congregation.
10. Dirck Anthony Leeuw (Amsterdam 1690-1767). The Amsterdam branch of the Leeuw family died out with him. Another branch of the Leeuw family, still Mennonite in the seventeenth century, had settled in Haarlem and Nijmegen.



NOTES

- * The authors would like to thank Gregor J.M. Weber (Rijksmuseum) and Piet Visser (formerly VU University Amsterdam) for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this article.
- 1 E.W. Moes, *Iconographia Batava. Beredeneerde lijst van geschilderde en gebeeldhouwde portretten van Noord-Nederlanders in vorige eeuwen*, 2 vols., Amsterdam 1897 and 1905, vol. 2 (1905), p. 10, no. 4394; A. von Wurzbach, *Niederländisches Künstler-Lexikon: auf Grund archivalischer Forschungen bearbeitet*, 3 vols., Vienna/Leipzig 1906-11, vol. 1 (1906), p. 538; S.J. Gudlaugsson, 'De datering van de schilderijen van Gerard ter Borch', *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 2 (1948-49), pp. 235-67, esp. p. 238; P. van Eeghen, 'Abraham van den Tempel's familiegroep in het Rijksmuseum', *Oud Holland* 68 (1953), pp. 170-74; I.H. van Eeghen, 'Ongrijpbare jeugd. Bij een portret door Govert Flinck', *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum* 25 (1977), no. 2, pp. 55-59; J.W. von Moltke, *Govaert Flinck 1615-1660*, Amsterdam 1965, pp. 108-09, cat. no. 211; W. Sumowski, *Gemälde der Rembrandt-Schüler*, 6 vols., Landau 1979-83, vol. 2 (1983), pp. 1037, 1117, no. 658; S.A.C. Dudok van Heel, 'Mennonites en schilderkunst in de 17e eeuw. Leerlingen, opdrachtgevers en verzamelaars van Rembrandt', *Doopsgezinde bijdragen, nieuwe reeks* 6 (1980), pp. 105-23, esp. pp. 119-20; S.A.C. Dudok van Heel, 'Het "schilderhuis" van Govert Flinck en de kunsthandel van Uylenburgh aan de Lauriergracht te Amsterdam', *Jaarboek Amstelodamum* 74 (1982), pp. 70-90, esp. p. 70; F. Lammertse and J. van der Veen, *Uylenburgh & Zoon: Art and Commerce from Rembrandt to De Lairese 1625-1675*, Zwolle/Amsterdam 2006, pp. 168 (fig. 118), 169, 174, 190; E. Kok, 'Zonder vrienden geen carrière. De succesvolle loopbanen van de zeventiende-eeuwse kunstenaars Govert Flinck en Ferdinand Bol', *De Zeventiende Eeuw* 27 (2011), no. 2, pp. 300-36, esp. pp. 314-15; M. Goverde, *Imitation & Ambition: The Relation between Dutch Adult and Child Portraiture 1620-1650*, Utrecht 2011 (MA thesis University of Utrecht), esp. p. 26; A. Ziemia, 'Modus rusticus portretu holenderskiego jako model tozsamosciowy obywateli Republiki Niderlandzkiej: obraz Govaerta Flicka w Muzeum Narodowym w Warszawie' / 'Modus Rusticus as a Model of Dutch Social Identity in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Portrait Painting: A Painting by Govaert Flinck in the National Museum in Warsaw', *Rocznik Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie | Journal of the National Museum in Warsaw New Series* 37 (2012), pp. 189-211 (Polish text), pp. 212-26 (English text); E. Kok, *Culturele ondernemers in de Gouden Eeuw. De artistieke en sociaal-economische strategieën van Jacob Backer, Govert Flinck, Ferdinand Bol en Joachim von Sandrart*, Amsterdam 2013 (dissertation University of Amsterdam), p. 51 (fig. 7); T. van der Molen and V. Vlastic (eds.), *Govert Flinck: Reflecting History*, exh. cat. Kleve (Museum Kurhaus Kleve) 2015, pp. 13, 24.
- 2 Lammertse and Van der Veen, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 174, 188, 191. See also the appendix, I.6 and II.c.
- 3 This research into the materials and techniques used was carried out in 2011 and 2012 under the direction of Margriet van Eikema Hommes. Research by Gwen Tauber, Arie Wallert, Joana Vaz Pedroso, Ige Verslype of the Rijksmuseum, Margriet van Eikema Hommes and Zeph Benders of the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands, and Matthias Alfeld of the University of Antwerp. The surface of the paint was studied in daylight and under UV light with the naked eye and through a microscope. Two paint cross-sections taken from the edge of the canvas were examined using a light microscope and with Energy-Dispersive X-Ray Analysis Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM-EDX). An X-radiograph was made with an ERESO 280 MF (settings: 40 Kv, 4.6 mA, 100 cm distance, 15 secs. on Structurix D4 DW film, no. 1931, 1-10, on 26 November 2011). Infrared examination took place firstly with the Sony DSC-F828 camera with an infrared filter (B+W 93) and secondly with the Osiris scanning InGaAs camera with a 16 x 16 tile system of 512 x 512 focal plane array, with a range to just beyond 1700 nm. Visible light was filtered through an 875 nm infrared filter. The XRF element distribution maps were prepared with the Bruker M6 Jetstream. The maps were obtained in 3.5 hours and have a resolution of 1300 x 900 pixels with a place resolution of 0.5 mm and a measuring time of 10 ms per measurement point. A detailed description of the equipment and the measurement conditions used for this painting was published previously in M. Alfeld et al., 'A Mobile Instrument for In Situ Scanning Macro-XRF Investigation of Historical Paintings', *Journal of Analytical*

Atomic Spectrometry 28 (2013), no. 5, pp. 760-67.

- 4 I. Groeneweg, 'Regenten in het zwart. Vroom en deftig?', in R. Falkenburg et al. (eds.), *Beeld en zelfbeeld in de Nederlandse kunst 1550-1750*, Zwolle 1995 (*Nederlands kunst-historisch jaarboek* 46), pp. 199-251, esp. pp. 205-08; B.M. du Mortier, 'Features of Fashion in the Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century', in J. Pietsch and A. Jolly (eds.), *Netherlandish Fashion in the Seventeenth Century*, Riggisberg 2012 (*Riggisberger Berichte* 19), pp. 17-41, esp. pp. 34-35; B.M. du Mortier, "'Black is Black": or is it?', *Journal of Design History* (forthcoming).
- 5 On the dress of Mennonites in the seventeenth century see J.H. der Kinderen-Besier, *Speelvaart der mode. De kledij onzer voorouders in de zeventiende eeuw*, Amsterdam 1950, pp. 131-32; B.M. du Mortier, 'Het kostuum bij Frans Hals', in S. Slive (ed.), *Frans Hals*, exh. cat. Washington (National Gallery of Art) and elsewhere 1989-90, pp. 45-60, esp. pp. 49-50; Groeneweg, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 207-08; M. de Winkel, *Fashion and Fancy: Dress and Meaning in Rembrandt's Paintings*, Amsterdam 2006, pp. 15-16, 47, 76-77, 82, 90, 287 (note 104).
- 6 Ruud Lambour studied seven hundred inventories of Amsterdam Mennonites from the 1614 to 1725 period. The Mennonite church sources dating from before 1614 are too scarce to permit any definite conclusions to be drawn from them and identify someone with certainty as Mennonite. After 1725 there was a period of economic decline and the Golden Age had been consigned to the past. Lambour is preparing a publication containing detailed analyses of the source material. In the years relevant to Dirck – 1625 to 1670 – there are 123 inventories describing the clothes of men of around the same age.
- 7 Amsterdam City Archive (hereafter: ACA), archive 5075, Notarial Archives 1578-1915 (hereafter: NA, followed by the inventory number), 12856, deed no. 254, notary H. van Heel, 28 March 1764, inventory of Maria van de Rijp, widow of Gosewijn Centen, p. 27: 'Goods bequeathed by the deceased to Jan van de Rijp Centen: ... eight family portraits, ... two family portraits' ('Door de overledene aan Jan van de Rijp Centen gelegateerde goederen: ... acht stuks familie pourtraiten, ... twee familie pourtraiten'). See also ACA, NA 12858, deed no. 827, notary H. van Heel, 27 September 1764, division of the estate, in which there is a reference to a private codicil by Maria van de Rijp, according to which Jan van de Rijp Centen was to receive the (unspecified) 'family portraits', which had to go to Veronica if he died childless.
- 8 ACA, NA 12858, deed no. 583, notary H. van Heel, 25 July 1764, will of Jan van de Rijp Centen: 'And in respect of the portrait paintings of the testator's family, it is his wish that they should not be sold, but will be placed in the Hofje and that therefore Miss Veronica van de Rijp Centen, if she is alive at the time of the testator's death, will have sole keeping of them and that they must be passed over to the governors of the Hof after her death.' ('En ten aansien van de pourtrait schilderijen van des testateurs familie is sijn begeeren, dat die niet verkocht, maar op het Hofje geplaatst sullen werden en dat mitsdien sijn Juffrouw Veronica van de Rijp Centen, indien sijn op des testateurs afsterven leeft, gedurende haar leeven daarvan alleen sal hebben de bewaaring en naa haar afsterven aan de bestierders van het Hof moeten werden overgelevert.')
- 9 ACA, archive 1120, United Mennonite Congregation of Amsterdam (hereafter UMCA), no. 2537 (Rijpenhofje minutes 1837-75), p. 6: list of nine paintings hung in the new Governors' Chamber, of which mention is made in the representatives' report of the bequest of Van de Rijp Centen to deacons on 29 December 1836, under no. 4: 'Portrait van Dom[inu]s Jacob Leeuwen Dirksz door G. Flinck'. It would appear that one of the ten portraits had vanished between 1764 and 1837.
- 10 The date is also missing in the catalogue of the *Historische Tentoonstelling van Amsterdam ... van 1876*, an exhibition at which all nine family portraits from the Rijpenhofje were displayed: see p. 21 of this catalogue, nos. †1970*-†1970**, esp. no. †1970*3: 'Portrait of Jacob Leeuwen Dircksz. Painting by Govaert Finck, 17th century' ('Portret van Jacob Leeuwen Dircksz. Schilderij door Govaert Flinck, 17e eeuw'). A.D. de Vries Az, 'De schilderkunst op de Historische Tentoonstelling te Amsterdam', *De Gids* 40 (1876), no. 3, pp. 533-60, esp. pp. 550-51, pointed to the importance of the dating.
- 11 No such person ever existed. The old title *Dominus*, meaning cleric, was also incorrect in itself. There were no clergymen in this family after the Cologne progenitor Ameldonck Leeuw. For the loan see the Noord-Hollands Archief at Haarlem, archive 476, Rijksmuseum Amsterdam, no. 2075 (loan UMCA, 1899-1953): letter no. 238/1899, 27 November 1899, from the Board of Deacons of the UMCA to General Director

- B.W.F. van Riemsdijk: '(among others) *Jonas Jacob Leeuwen Dircksz door G. Flink*'; no. 1454, Verslagen van 's Rijks verzamelingen 1899-1900, report on 1898, pp. 20-21 (received loans from the UMCA): 'cat. no. 634. Govert Flinck, Portret van *Jonas Jacob Leeuwen Dircksz*. h 65 x b 47.5 cm. Doek. Gemerkt: G. Flinck f.' For the withdrawal of the loan see no. 2075, receipt dated 28 November 1952 by T. Bakker, sexton, on behalf of the Board of Deacons.
- 12 While Von Moltke, op. cit. (note 1) followed the 1934 Rijksmuseum catalogue in identifying the subject as 'Jonas Jacob Leeuwen Dircksz', Van Eeghen, op. cit. (note 1) provided a substantiated identification of the sitter as Dirck Leeuw for the first time.
- 13 ACA, archive 5046, Collateral Succession, no. 21, fol. 944: tax return 15 December 1729 for the houses and effects in the estate of Arent van de Rijp, died 2 October 1729 by Gozewijn Centen, husband of Maria van de Rijp, 'who is her brother Arent van de Rijp's heir'.
- 14 ACA, NA 4647, pp. 1231-39, notary J. Backer, 3 June 1707: will of Arent van de Rijp and Eva Baltus.
- 15 His occupation is recorded in the transfer of 17 June 1625 of the house on Fluwelenburgwal, now 113 Oudezijds Voorburgwal: ACA, archive 5062, transfer register no. 32, fol. 102. As a merchant, like so many shopkeepers, he had a shop at the front of the house, but sold larger stocks of cambric from the store in his attic. The earlier address, 'Niezal', probably Lange Niezal between Warmoesstraat and Oudezijds Voorburgwal, is given in the notice of his marriage to Dirck's mother Geertge Jacobs (Melcknap) of 20 December 1608, with a note that this had been his address for fifteen years: ACA, archive 5001, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials (hereafter the Dutch abbreviation DTB, followed by the inventory no.), 762A, p. 268.
- 16 See the codicil of Ameldonck Leeuw and Maria Rutgers dated 27 April 1647 in ACA, archive 88, Brants family archive, no. 805, in which they undertake to one another that the survivor will do his or her absolute best to establish David Leeuw in the '*kamerijksdoekhandel*' – the cambric trade – if he conducts himself well in all things and marries with the approval of the survivor and the guardians. Unlike them and other merchants of any standing, Dirck himself did not have an account at the Wisselbank, the Amsterdam exchange bank: ACA, archive 5077, Wisselbank, nos. 696-727 (indexes to the ledgers of 1641-70). The occupation he pursued is unknown.
- 17 Lammertse and Van der Veen, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 174-75, 188, 191-92. For background on the Waterlanders, see P. Visser, *Broeders in de geest. De doopsgezinde bijdragen van Dierick en Jan Philipsz. Schabaelje tot de Nederlandse stichtelijke literatuur in de zeventiende eeuw*, 2 vols., Deventer 1988 (diss. University of Amsterdam), vol. 1, pp. 96-118.
- 18 Kok, op. cit. (note 1), p. 46; Lammertse and Van der Veen, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 160-69, also take 1635 as the most likely date when Flinck came to work for Uylenburgh independently.
- 19 He founded the almshouse for indigent old women in Egelantiersstraat that bears his name in 1616, see I.H. van Eeghen, 'De restauratie van het voormalige Anslohofje', *Maandblad Amstelodamum* 56 (1969), pp. 199-205, esp. pp. 200-01; G. Brinkgreve (ed.), *Stichting Claes Claesz Hoffje 30 jaar*, Amsterdam 1995.
- 20 As a widower in 1631 he married Niesje Pancras (c. 1590-1636), whose mother Anna Quintingh (1568-1642) had been baptized, as a widow, in the 'bij de Toren' congregation in 1623. Niesje's brother Gerbrand Claesz Pancras (1591-1646) belonged to the Dutch Reformed Church, married a woman of the same denomination and pursued a career as a governor. In the early years of the Republic, family ties between Mennonites and the governing class of patricians were not unusual, see M.S. Sprunger, 'Iemand burgemeester maken. Doopsgezinden en regentengeslachten in de Gouden Eeuw te Amsterdam', *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen, nieuwe reeks* 32 (2006), pp. 75-121, esp. p. 116.
- 21 Rembrandt, *Portrait of Cornelis Claesz Anslo (1590/91-1646)*, etching and drypoint, 183 x 156 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-P-OB-524; Rembrandt, *Double Portrait of Cornelis Claesz Anslo (1590/91-1646) and Aeltje Gerrits Schouten (1589/90-1657)*, canvas, 176 x 210 cm, Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, inv. no. 828L. The years of birth of Anslo and his wife can be deduced from their notice of marriage of 21 December 1610; he states his age as nineteen and hers as twenty: ACA, DTB 666, p. 261.
- 22 This drawing is known only from a print for the collected edition of Anslo's *Poezy*, Rotterdam, 1713; Jacob Folkema (1692-1767), etching and engraving, 140 x 87 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-P-OB-52.096, with an inscription by Joan de Haas (1685-1723) and Flinck's name as the artist: 'G. Flinck delinea'it'.

- 23 ACA, DTB 301, p. 19, 7 September 1639. Maria's younger brother Cornelis Anslø (1616/17-1639) had been baptized as a Remonstrant on 6 May 1638: ACA, DTB 301, p. 15. Dirck's younger sister Aaltje had become a member of the Remonstrant congregation as early as 1634, see appendix 1.5.
- 24 Dudok van Heel 1982, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 70, 87, note 13. It emerges from the Remonstrant church's communicant book that this was also where he lived: ACA, archive 612, Remonstrant Congregation, no. 295, p. 164, 23 February 1645, together with no. 301: 'Marritjen Claes Anslø h[uysvrouw] van Dirck Leuwen op de Lauriersg[racht]'.
- 25 For the annual wage (275 working days), based on a day wage of twenty-two stivers for masons and carpenters in Amsterdam at that time, see H. Nusteling, *Welvaart en werkgelegenheid in Amsterdam*, Amsterdam/Dieren 1985, p. 123.
- 26 Dudok van Heel 1982, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 70-71.
- 27 ACA, archive 5062, transfer registers no. 44, fol. 203v, 19 May 1651. Purchased for 1,150 guilders.
- 28 Dudok van Heel 1982, op. cit. (note 1), p. 110. For the contract of 2 June 1645 executed by notary J. van Loosdrecht referred to in it, see ACA, NA 1971, fols. 18v-19.
- 29 Publications about Dirck Leeuw (see note 1) always give the year of his death as 1652.
- 30 Regional Historical Centre Vecht and Venen, location Weesp, archive GAW138 (notaries at Weesp, 1609-1842), no. 5200, fols. 332-33v, notary J. van Leijden, 18 May 1664: marriage contract of Jacob Dell, supported by his mother Hillegont Dell [Hillegond Jacobs, widow of burgomaster Huybert Claesz Dell], and by his brother-in-law Johannes Snoeck [brewer of Weesp], and Elisabeth Schouten, supported by her mother Elisabeth Leeuw [widow of Matthijs Schouten], and by Jacob Leeuw her uncle (11.b), Dirck Leeuw and Gilbert de Flines. With thanks to Jaap van der Veen, The Rembrandt House Museum. Gilbert de Flines (1614-1669) was married to Heijltje Lamberts Schouten, daughter of an earlier burgomaster of Weesp, and at that time was himself a resident of Weesp. For the magistrates' posts in Weesp see H. Brood, *Officianten-register van Weesp 1550-1795*, Weesp 1977, in which all the official posts of the members of the Leeuw family living in Weesp referred to hereafter can also be found.
- 31 For her address in her notice of marriage of 3 March 1672, see ACA, DTB 688, p. 322.
- For Isaac Pontanus see G. van der Ham, 'The Clergyman and his Grandson: The Story of a Family', *The Rijksmuseum Bulletin* 58 (2010), no. 4, pp. 366-89.
- 32 On the identification of the man as Andries de Graeff see M. de Winkel in R.E.O. Ekkart and Q. Buvelot (eds.), *Dutch Portraits: The Age of Rembrandt and Frans Hals*, exh. cat. The Hague (Mauritshuis)/London (National Gallery) 2007, p. 198, cat. no. 56. On full-length portraits see S.A.C. Dudok van Heel, 'Toen hingen er burgers als vorsten aan de muur', in N. Middelkoop (ed.), *Kopstukken. Amsterdammers geportretteerd 1600-1800*, exh. cat. Amsterdam (Amsterdams Historisch Museum) 2002-03, pp. 46-63; S.A.C. Dudok van Heel, *De jonge Rembrandt onder tijdgenoten. Godsdiens en schilderkunst in Leiden en Amsterdam*, Nijmegen 2006 (*Nijmeegse Kunsthistorische Studies* 14), pp. 315-71; R.E.O. Ekkart, 'Het portret in de Gouden Eeuw', in R.E.O. Ekkart and Q. Buvelot (eds.), *Dutch Portraits: The Age of Rembrandt and Frans Hals*, exh. cat. The Hague (Mauritshuis)/London (National Gallery) 2007, pp. 17-47, esp. p. 28, figs. 16-17, cat. nos. 47-48.
- 33 On this portrait and some other portraits by De Keyser see A. Jensen Adams, 'Aemulatio of Taste: Thomas de Keyser and the New Classicism of the 1630s', in A.W.A. Boschloo et al. (ed.), *Aemulatio. Imitation, Emulation and Invention in Netherlandish Art from 1500 to 1800: Essays in Honor of Eric Jan Sluijter*, Zwolle 2011, pp. 167-81.
- 34 F. Laarmann, 'Herman Meindertsz. Doncker: Ein origineller Künstler zweiten Ranges', *Oud Holland* 114 (2000), pp. 7-52. Numerous other painters made small full-length portraits, such as Harmen Willems Wieringa (c. 1590-1650) and Pieter Codde (1599-1678).
- 35 The identity of Flinck's *Portrait of a Boy*, signed and dated 1640, canvas, 129.5 x 102.5 cm, Birmingham, Barber Institute of Fine Arts, is not certain, see Goverde, op. cit. (note 1), p. 23; R. Wenley et al., *Flinck in Focus: A Question of Identity in 17th-Century Dutch Portraiture*, exh. cat. Birmingham (The Barber Institute of Fine Arts, University of Birmingham) 2015-16. The identity of the subject of Govert Flinck's *Portrait of an Elderly Mennonite Man*, c. 1640-45, panel, 92 x 69 cm, Warsaw, Muzeum Narodowe, is likewise unknown. On this portrait see Ziemba, op. cit. (note 1) and I.M. Stefanska, 'Konserwacja Mezczyzny w ciemnym stroju Govaerta Flincka w Muzeum narodowym w Warszawie' / 'Conservation of a Portrait of a Man in a Dark Costume by Govert Flinck

- in the National Museum in Warsaw', *Rocznik Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie | Journal of the National Museum in Warsaw New Series* 1/37 (2012), pp. 227-38 (Polish text), pp. 239-43 (English text). The couple in a landscape, signed and dated 1646, canvas, 107.5 x 91 cm, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, is usually identified in the literature as *Dirck Graswinckel and Geertruyt van Loon*. This identification was called into question by F. Lammertse in exh. cat. Amsterdam 2002-03 (note 32), p. 214. The identification is based solely on the supposed resemblance to a man described as Dirck Graswinckel in a print that Theodoor Matham (1605/06-1676) made after a much earlier painting (1636) by Michiel van Mierevelt, see Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. R-PB-OB-23.207. An argument against this identification is that in the 1646 painting the subject is not wearing the insignia of Knight in the Order of San Marco, to which Graswinckel was elevated in 1645.
- 36 Lammertse and Van der Veen, op. cit. (note 1), p. 169. On movement in Rembrandt's portraits see J.B. Bedaux, 'Portretten in beweging. Rembrandt als portrettist', in Middelkoop, op. cit. (note 32), pp. 64-81.
- 37 In, among others, his *Portrait of Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687)*, signed 1627, panel, 92.4 x 69.3 cm, London, National Gallery, and his *Group Portrait with Cornelis Davelaer Announcing the Arrival of Marie de' Medici to Four Waiting Amsterdam Burgomasters*, dated 1638, panel, 28.5 x 38 cm, Amsterdam, Amsterdam Museum.
- 38 In the first decades of the seventeenth century there were countless ways of draping cloaks.
- 39 On the genesis and production of tassels see K. Johansen, 'A Netherlandish Contribution to Seventeenth-Century Danish Fashions', in Pietsch and Jolly, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 107-17.
- 40 The tiny peaks of paint are Flinck's original paint: information kindly provided by Martin Bijl, Schilderijenrestauratie, Alkmaar, who restored the canvas in 2006. We are indebted to Martin Bijl for his willingness to share his information for this article. Such upstanding highlights were part of the standard formula for expressing the surface texture of oranges and lemons at this time: A. Wallert (ed.), *Still Lifes, Techniques and Style: The Examination of Paintings from the Rijksmuseum*, Zwolle 1999.
- 41 A symbolic meaning of support for the House of Orange is unlikely. Since 1633 the stadholder had sought and found the mainstay for his position of power in the Republic among Contra-Remonstrants, so that he had ceased to be the figurehead of tolerance politics.
- 42 By Martin Bijl, *Bijl Schilderijenrestauratie*, Alkmaar. There is no information about any previous restorations. There is nothing about it in the Rijksmuseum documentation, however the canvas was definitely restored before 2006 since it has been lined and attached to a stretcher.
- 43 The left garter has a transparent 'lace-like' appearance, but this effect is not seen in the right garter.
- 44 For this previous hat see also Moltke, op. cit. (note 1), pl. 39; Van Eeghen, op. cit. (note 1), p. 59; Dudok van Heel 1980, op. cit. (note 1), unpaginated, unnumbered, fig; Gudlaugsson, op. cit. (note 1), p. 238, note 1, discusses this hat.
- 45 Gudlaugsson, op. cit. (note 1), p. 238, note 1; Dudok van Heel 1980, op. cit. (note 1), p. 109. Conservator Martin Bijl noted during the removal of old overpaintings and layers of varnish that most of the brownish-black paint of this hat dissolved very easily. The XRF maps for barytes, titanium and zinc show that the brownish-black paint residue of this overpainting does not include any modern pigments containing titanium or zinc or barium sulphate; it might therefore be an eighteenth- or nineteenth-century overpainting. Barytes and titanium are present in quantity in the passages that were retouched in 2006.
- 46 Dudok van Heel 1980, op. cit. (note 1), p. 109.
- 47 Map for lead of the L-shell, which shows the distribution of lead throughout the whole structure of the paint, in other words also in the preparation layer and in the paint layers that have been overpainted. This lead L-map differs from the lead map for the M-shell, which shows chiefly the lead at the surface of the paint so that its distribution corresponds largely with that of the visible representation. The lead in this painting comes from the pigment lead white. Lead tin yellow was not found. The costume shows up clearly in the lead L-map because the lead in the preparation layer is readily visible through the black paint that was used for the actual costume. The preparation layer in this painting is built up of two layers: first a red layer of clay, some iron oxide and a little lead white, on top of which is a light grey layer which contains primarily lead white, some carbon black and a little red earth.
- 48 Rembrandt also used the effect, for instance, in his *Portrait of a Woman in an Armchair*, signed and dated 1633, canvas, 125.7 x 101.0 cm, New York, The Metro-

- politan Museum of Art, and after that in his *Portrait of Agatha Bas (1611-1658)*, signed and dated 1641, canvas, 105.4 x 83.9 cm, London, The Royal Collection, HM Queen Elizabeth II, Buckingham Palace.
- 49 This is also clear from the photograph taken during restoration after the removal of later retouches (fig. 14). It is possible to see how Flinck partially painted out the broad brim of the first hat with grey from the sky in order to create the narrower brim of the second hat with the tapering crown.
- 50 To obtain black wool, dyers started with a dye bath of woad (indigo from the 1590s onwards) to get a blue colour, followed by a bath of crimson madder. Most black clothes consequently had a slightly reddish sheen. The seventeenth-century Low Countries were famed for the many shades of black their dyers could create: J.H. Hofenk de Graaff, *The Colourful Past: Origins, Chemistry and Identification of Natural Dyestuffs*, London 2004, pp. 292-93, 313-19, 329-30.
- 51 This can be seen in the passage where landscape was added to paint out the original man's right leg. The landscape where his left leg had been was very seriously abraded as a result of over-cleaning.
- 52 An example of this is *Portrait of a 41-Year-Old Man, Probably Pieter Sijen (1591/92-1652)*, signed and dated 1633, panel, 69.5 x 54.7 cm, Pasadena, California, Norton Simon Art Foundation.
- 53 The fact that a possible earlier date cannot be made visible with current imaging techniques (IRR, X-radiographs and macro-XRF spectrometry) is not necessarily surprising. That date would, after all, have been painted with the same thin, fluid yellow ochre paint as Flinck's name, and therefore cannot be revealed under the covering opaque paint, which contains lead white, with these techniques.
- 54 There is some confusion about exactly when Flinck came to Amsterdam. Lammertse and Van der Veen, op. cit. (note 1), p. 160, say 'around 1635'. For the time being, however, there seems to be no reason to doubt Houbraken's information (see note 61) that Flinck came to Amsterdam with Jacob Backer. This must have been before May 1633 since Backer was living in Amsterdam then, as argued by Kok, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 46, 89. The shape of the collar of the man in the underlying portrait, where the fabric extends slightly beyond the shoulder, and the shallow scallops of the lace did not come into fashion until 1635.
- 55 Anthony van Dyck (1599-1642) also used this pose in his portraits of the English aristocracy, see for example, *James Stuart, Duke of Richmond and Lennox*, 1633-34, canvas, 215.9 x 127.6 cm, and *Robert Rich, Second Earl of Warwick*, c. 1634, canvas, 208 x 128 cm, both New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- 56 Like those of Michiel Adriaensz van Zevenbergen (1626-c. 1659) and his younger brother Nicolaes Adriaensz van Zevenbergen (1629-1653), which were drawn up in 1657 and 1653 respectively (see note 122).
- 57 Examples include Harmen Wieringa, *Portrait of a Young Man*, 1636, panel, 42 x 32.6 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-A-2221 and Thomas de Keyser, *Portrait of an Unknown Family*, c. 1625-30, panel, 59 x 70 cm, Gotha, Schlossmuseum. We do, though, often see brightly coloured hose worn by adults and married men in civic guard group portraits. Evidently these were customary in the festive setting of a militia gathering. Pink, yellow and green stockings can be seen in Bartholomeus van der Helst's *Banquet at the Crossbowmen's Guild in Celebration of the Treaty of Münster*, 1648, canvas, 232 x 547 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-C-2.
- 58 E. Kolfin, *The Young Gentry at Play: Northern Netherlandish Scenes of Merry Companies, 1610-1645*, Leiden 2005, p. 112.
- 59 Der Kinderen-Besier, op. cit. (note 5), p. 84; Groeneweg, op. cit. (note 4), p. 230; B.B. Roberts, *Sex and Drugs before Rock 'n' Roll: Youth Culture and Masculinity during Holland's Golden Age*, Amsterdam 2012, pp. 61-64.
- 60 The bachelor Jan Six (1618-1700), for instance, wears colourful clothes in his 1654 portrait by Rembrandt (canvas, 112 x 102 cm, Amsterdam, Six Collection). See De Winkel, op. cit. (note 5), p. 100.
- 61 'wijl hy daar zeer welvarende Bloedvrienden had wonen, ten eersten gelegentheid vond om proeven van zyn Konst te geven.' A. Houbraken, *De groote schouburgh der Nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen*, 3 vols., Amsterdam 1718-21, vol. 2 (1719), pp. 20-21; see also Kok, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 300-36, fig. 5.
- 62 Moltke, op. cit. (note 1); Dudok van Heel 1980, op. cit. (note 1).
- 63 The lead that can be seen in the XRF distribution map comes from the lead white. Lead tin yellow was not found, see note 47.
- 64 This also corresponds to the way Flinck used these pigments in the faces of his *Isaac Blessing Jacob*, c. 1638, canvas, 117 x 141 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-A-110. The XRF maps for calcium and iron here

- show that chalk and ochre were also used chiefly in the shadows in the skin tones. With thanks to Matthias Alfeld, University of Antwerp, Arie Wallert and Joana Vaz Pedroso, Rijksmuseum.
- 65 The hand and the black drapery around it contain numerous retouches.
- 66 This can be concluded after an analysis of the portraits from the Republic in the 1600-50 period using the RKD website. Usually sitters hold the orange elegantly between thumb and index finger or by a stalk, so that it is clearly recognizable, but there are also a few examples in which the fruit is grasped firmly in the hand, for instance in the 1635 family portrait by Frans Hals in the Cincinnati Art Museum.
- 67 A.K. Wheelock Jr, *Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century: The Collections of the National Gallery of Art Systematic Catalogue*, coll. cat. Washington 1995, pp. 50-56.
- 68 Wenley et al., op. cit. (note 35), pp. 17-18. Picots (French) are small loops of twisted thread.
- 69 Middelkoop, op. cit. (note 32), p. 214, cat. no. 78.
- 70 See notes 67 and 35.
- 71 R. Lambour, 'Doopsgezinde gemeenten te Amsterdam in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw', *Maandblad Amstelodamum* 100 (2013), no. 1, pp. 24-38. Estimates vary as to the number of Waterlander Mennonites in Amsterdam in the seventeenth century, see W.J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis van de doopsgezinden in Nederland 1600-1735*, Haarlem 1940, p. 66 (750 to 1,000 in 1615); M.S. Sprunger, *Rich Mennonites, Poor Mennonites: Economics and Theology in the Amsterdam Waterlander Congregation During the Golden Age*, Illinois 1993 (diss. University of Illinois), Urbana-Champaign 1993, p. 36 (1,000 to 1,200).
- 72 The 'bij 't Lam' congregation met in the church hidden behind the façade of 452 Singel, the present-day Mennonite Singel Church. In 1668 this congregation merged with 'bij de Toren' to form the United Flemish-Waterlander Congregation 'bij 't Lam & de Toren'. For the meeting places of the Old Flemings, Old Frisians and Jan Jacobs' People in Amsterdam see Lambour, op. cit. (note 71), pp. 33-35.
- 73 M. Simons in H.W. Meihuizen (ed.), *Dat Fundament des Christelycken Leers*, The Hague 1967, p. 148: 'Het dient waerlick niet, dat een oetmoedich man met costelijcke vercierde clederen voele [veel] proncken unde praelen sal, unde die cuys unde sober is voele [veel] inden herbergen met den oneerlycke wiven spreken, sigen unde dansen sal. Wast dat hi alsulckes dede, so was emmers syn licht niet dan duysternisse, unde wie solde seggen dat syn leven den evangelio Christi gelyck was?'
- 74 The only document in which this was attempted was the *Concept van Keulen*, a draft creed of the High German and Dutch Mennonites agreed in 1591; one of the signatories was Dirck's grandfather Ameldonck Leeuw as the teacher of the congregation in Cologne. It recommends wearing only 'simple' clothes and not adorning oneself in a 'worldly' manner. Discipline had to be maintained through brotherly admonition, 'and that with a paternal heart, so that the admonition is all the more pleasant ('en dat met een vaderlijck herte [hart], op dat de vermaninghe des te aenghenamer zy'). This *Concept* is printed in *De Algemeene Belydenissen der Vereenigde Vlaemsche, Vriesche en Hoogduytsche Doopsgezinde Gemeente Gods*, Amsterdam 1665, pp. 2-7, esp. p. 5.
- 75 Slive, op. cit. (note 5), p. 264; Groeneweg, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 205-07; Der Kinderen-Besier, op. cit. (note 5), p. 132. Starter's poem appeared for the first time in the second edition (1623) of his *Friesche Lusthof* (1621). See also M. de Baar, 'The Stereotype of the Sanctimonious "Menniste Zusje" (Mennonite Sister) Reconsidered', in M. van Veen et al. (eds.), *Sisters: Myth and Reality of Anabaptist, Mennonite and Doopsgezind Women ca. 1525-1900*, Leiden 2014 (*Brill's Series in Church History and Religious Culture* 65), pp. 149-68.
- 76 P. Visser, 'Een achttiende-eeuws afschrift van een verordening uit 1659 voor uiterlijk, kleding en huisinrichting bij de Groninger Oude Vlamingen', *Doopsgezinde bijdragen, nieuwe reeks* 27 (2001), pp. 229-38, esp. pp. 235-36. The quote is taken from rules 1, 3-7, 9, 16-17. For an older transcript, present whereabouts unknown, see S. Blaupot ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Mennonites in Friesland. Van derzelve ontstaan tot dezen tijd, uit oorspronkelijke stukken en echte berigten opgemaakt*, Leeuwarden 1839, pp. 307-08.
- 77 'De slechticheyt [eenvoud] is in pracht ende prael verandert. De goederen zijn verrijct, maar de ziel is verarmt. De kleederen zijn kostelijck geworden maer het inwendich cieraet is vergaen.' Kühler, op. cit. (note 71), p. 104.
- 78 M. de Winkel was the first to use these sermons in an art-historical context in a paper (unpublished) presented at the international conference 'Mythe en werkelijkheid over de doperse vrouw op het Europese

- continent van 1525 tot 1900' (Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit, 31 August-1 September 2007). See also C.N. Wybrands, 'Het Menniste Zusje', in J. Six, *Koninklijk Oudheidkundig Genootschap te Amsterdam. Jaarverslag in de vijf-en-vijftigste Algemeene Vergadering op 23 juni 1913*, Amsterdam 1913, pp. 29-107, esp. pp. 59-60.
- 79 J. Cornelisz, *Onciersel en cieraet van de Godtsalige Vrouwen* (The Un-Adornment and Adornment of the Godly Women), Amsterdam 1652 (second ed.), fols. A3-A3v, pp. 1, 3, 10, 15-18, 24, 30, 32, 40-41, 47, 49, 56, 58, 60-62, 92, 95 and 107. In 1649 Jacob Pietersz van de Koogh, Flemish Mennonite teacher in Koog and Zaandam-West, had expressed similar criticism of showy excess, among other things in women's dress: *Inleydinge om te komen tot een recht gebruyck van de tijdelicke goederen*, Wormerveer 1649, pp. 55-56 (costly fabrics), 57 ('frivolous' colours), 58 (bandstrings, trimmings, unnecessary buttons), 59 (plaiting the hair, 'unusual' caps, coloured hood linings and ribbons that can be seen through the outer hood), 60 (trimming with lace; starching collars and falling bands).
- 80 'om dat ick van tijt tot tijt met herten-leet aenschout hebbe, ende noch dagelick ... bemercke, dat de Doopsghesinde ... in 't gemeyn [algemeen], in het stuck van de pronckerije, soo in Huysen, Huysraet, Bruyloften, Maelyden ende Kleederen, soo seer toe neemt, dat se diegene, die de Werelt dienen, seer op de hielen na volgen, ende de swier van hare manieren seer gelijk zijn: sulcx dat men tusschen haar ende de andere (de goede uytgesondert) weynigh ofte geen onderscheydt mercken kan.'
- 81 'Ay besiet u selven van boven tot beneden, u kleedt, u verciersel, u goude ringen aan u vingeren, u goude oorsers, u peerlen aen u ooren, uwe goude naelden in 't hayr, geven levendighe getuygenisse of dat ghy op de woorden Pauli niet en acht, of dat ghy nae Godt niet en vraecht.'
- 82 Pomets (French: pommettes) are linen trimmings with small fluffy round balls (like apples, hence the name): Antoine Furetière, *Dictionnaire Universel*, The Hague/Rotterdam 1690, vol. 3, *in voce*.
- 83 'verwyfde mannen die de vrouwen in 't stuck van de pronckerije niet een voet breed wijcken'.
- 84 'Wie moet hem niet schamen het geheele autaer van de oneerlijke ende lichtvaerdighe drachten te ontdekken: beyde van Vroulieden ende mans Persoonen die men dagelijcks voorby de ooghen siet swieren alsoo [zodanig] dat se met wie weet al voor stricken ende quicken [opschik] moeten behanghen zijn al eer haer kleet bequaem [mooi genoeg] is om hun schamele leden te bedecken? Wie moet hem niet schamen als men aensiet al het onnodigh getoysel dat in hem selven belachelijk is?'
- 85 'de pracht sijner klederen te verminderen': ACA, archive 1120, UMCA, no. 116, Daybook B, 23 August 1657. As well as modifying his dress, Cornelis Vincent also promised not to visit any taverns.
- 86 'omdat hij ook soo wat uytstack in kleding': ACA, archive 1120, UMCA, no. 116, Daybook B, 13 December 1657. There was also another case in 1662 involving Goris Snoeck, of the same nature as Vincent's. There were also similar cases in 1670, 1676-77 and 1680, but these came under the authority of the United Congregation 'bij 't Lam & de Toren'. We do not know how the stricter Flemish congregation 'bij 't Lam' dealt with cases of flamboyant clothes in practice because their church council minutes dating from before 1662 have not survived.
- 87 Groeneweg, op. cit. (note 4), p. 207. Trigland refers specifically to Mennonite cloth and Mennonite velvet. Mennonite caffa (figured or flowered silk velvet) appears regularly in the estate inventories of Mennonites and non-Mennonites alike in the early decades of the seventeenth century.
- 88 ACA, NA 840, notary J.C. Hoogeboom, 10-11 December 1638: the inventory of his estate. He is described in this document as a broker, but his name has not been found in the archives of the brokers' guild. For Reyer Claesz as a merchant in Danzig and Amsterdam, see Lammertse and Van der Veen, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 40-41.
- 89 Du Mortier 2012, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 32-39.
- 90 Even so, 'coloured' cloaks appeared in thirty-one of the 123 inventories of the 1625-70 period listing the clothes of Mennonite men. For this description see note 115.
- 91 J. Scharp, *Oudheidkundige- en Geschiedkundige Verhandelung over de Beffen of Halskragen, inzonderheid der Kerkelijken ...*, Rotterdam 1806.
- 92 This portrait was one of the paintings belonging to the Mennonite Van de Rijp Centen family that was hung in the Rijpenhofje in 1837: see note 9.
- 93 Attributed to Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy, *Portrait of Laurens Joosten Baeck*, with the inscription 'Aetatis suae 62. Ano 1629', panel, 121 x 89 cm, Johannesburg (South Africa), Johannesburg Art Gallery, inv. no. 1991.7.5., RKD illustration no. 214014. See R.E.O. Ekkart,

- 'Uit de collecties van het Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie. De portretten van Laurens Baeck en zijn echtgenote', *De Nederlandsche Leeuw* 127 (2010), pp. 83-85. Baeck and his wife left large sums to their congregation, see ACA, NA 424, fols. 152-53v, notary J. Jacobs, 17 April 1642; and ACA, archive 1120, UMCA, no. 36 ('bij 't Lam' debt and poor book), fol. 36: 'the late Laurens Joosten Baeck has bequeathed to the poor of our congregation ... f600. N.B. Dieuwertgen Jacobs the widow of ... Baeck has in the same year 44 ... bequeathed to the poor of our congregation which has received after her death f500. And added to this by the children f100. (Total) f1,200.' ('wijlen Laurens Joosten Baeck heeft den armen onser gemeente besproeken [gelegateerd] ... f600. N.B. Dieuwertgen Jacobs de weduwe van ... Baeck heeft zelve anno 44 ... den armen onser gemeente gelegateert, noch na haer doot 'ontf[angen] f500. Noch bij [door] de kinderen daertoe ghedaen f100. (Totaal) f1200.')
- 94 With the Waterlander Mennonites, see Hester de Flines, widow of Adriaen Claesz van Zevenbergen, ACA, NA 1067, fols. 145-58, notary J. van de Ven, 2-21 July 1643: all the above-mentioned items; Anna Michiels van Vaerlaer, widow of Tijmen Jacobsz Hinlopen, ACA, NA 569, pp. 959-74, esp. p. 969, notary L. Lamberti, 9 April 1644: bandstrings, embroidery, satin *pomet* on women's garments; Jan Pietersz Bruijningh, ACA, archive 5073, Board of Orphans, no. 973, deed no. 4, fol. 13, 30 January 1647: satin piping on men's garments; Hester Joris Cool, widow of Harmen Gerritsz van Eyck, ACA, NA 3101, pp. 775-88, notary H. Rosa, 7 February-12 March 1664: satin piping and velvet laces on men's and women's garments. With the Flemish Mennonites: Jacob Pietersz Ringh, ACA, NA 911, notary P.L. Eijloff, 16 March-19 July 1633: French and embroidered laces on women's garments; Jacquemijntje Teijaerts, widow of Abraham Ostens, ACA, NA 714, fols. 100-07v, notary P. Carelsz, 12 February 1637: (embroidered, satin) laces and velvet trimmings on women's garments and trimmings on men's garments; Samuel van de Geer, ACA, NA 840, notary J.C. Hoogeboom, 20 April 1651: satin piping and *pomet* on men's garments.
- 95 De Winkel, op. cit. (note 5), p. 79.
- 96 Listed: one pair (1x), five pairs (3x), six pairs (2x), eleven pairs (1x, in the inventory of a Waterlander Mennonite physician) and 'some' (3x).
- 97 ACA, NA 4416, pp. 380-422, esp. p. 418, notary M. Bockx, 28 April 1674.
- 98 Attributed to Nicolaes Eliasz Pickenoy, *Portrait of Dieuwer Jacobs van Harencarspel*, with the inscription 'Aetatis suae 62. Ano 1629', panel, 121 x 89 cm, Johannesburg, Johannesburg Art Gallery, inv. no. 204. RKD illustration nos. 91278 and 119896.
- 99 His denomination can be identified from the following. Two of the four witnesses who declared both the couple's fathers' written consents to be authentic on the occasion of his giving notice of his marriage to Cecilia Lups in the town hall on 7 October 1617 were teachers of the Old Flemings: his brother-in-law Nicolaas Gijsbertsz de Veer and Hendrick van Wesel (ACA, DTB 668, p. 121). Conversely, on 10 February 1629 Looten himself had to declare his consent to the notice of marriage between Cornelis van Amersfoort and Aeltje Cornelis Versteet, daughter of Cornelis Jansz Versteet, a teacher of the Old Flemings (ACA, DTB 671, p. 123). Looten may have belonged to the section of the Old Flemings who moved to the Flemish congregation 'bij 't Lam' in 1632 without rebaptism: Lambour, op. cit. (note 71), pp. 27-28. His business partner Jacob van Hummel (1604-1665, baptized 9 February 1630) already belonged to this congregation. His son Govert Looten was likewise baptized there on 21 October 1657. The brothers Govert and Marten Looten Jr married the sisters Anna and Christina Rutgers, both members of 'bij 't Lam'.
- 100 Du Mortier, op. cit. (note 5), pp. 49-50. The most fashionable element of her clothes are the countless tiny buttons down the centre front of her bodice and on the *bragoenen* [shoulder wings]. These buttons are solely decorative and serve no purpose. The vertical band – a woven or embroidered ribbon – down the front of the skirt is also striking. The pattern is typically Dutch and can be found from the 1620s onwards.
- 101 Of the two hundred inventories that include clothing, thirty-six mention gloves, ten specified as leather and eight as cloth. Seven inventories list knitted gloves, and two (Waterlander Mennonite) embroidered ones. The type of material is not usually given; for mittens (ten inventories) it is mentioned only once (cloth). The first mention of leather gloves occurs in the 1626 inventory of an Old Flemish Mennonite. After 1670 there are entries for thread-work, linen, velvet and silk gloves.
- 102 In the 1625-70 period they are only found in the inventory of the Flemish Mennonite

- Jacquemijntje Teijaerts, widow of Abraham Ostens (note 94), fol. 101: 'a paper with Cadenet lace and tassels' ('een papiertje met kamberet kant en akertjes'), and that of the Waterlander Mennonite Cornelis Arisz Snoeck, see ACA, NA 2483, pp. 170-207, esp. p. 176, notary Jac. Hellerus, 11 February 1669: 'three pairs of tassels' ('drie paer aeckers').
- 103 Garters made of a simple fabric would have had no value after repeated use. The selvedge of a length of fabric could also serve as a garter. See I. van den Berg, *Het gestoffeerde winkel en luyfen banquet, dienstig voor alle winkeliers ...*, Amsterdam 1693, p. 35: 'Here they sell patches and soles/ to mend tears and holes:/ And also all sorts of selvedges/ that are used for garters.' ('Hier verkoopt men Lappen en Solen/ om te stoppen gaten en hopen:/ Ook alderhande Sellefkant/ Dat men gebruykt voor Kousen-band.')
- 104 The two Flemish Mennonites are Daniel Tielemans, see ACA, NA 918, fols. 155v-67, esp. fol. 166v, notary B.J. Verbeeck, 31 May 1636: 'two pairs of silk garters' ('twee paer sije kousebanden'), and Jacquemijntje Teijaerts, widow of Abraham Ostens (note 94), fol. 100: 'a pair of green silk ribbon garters' ('een paar groene sijde linte koussebanden'); the two Waterlander Mennonites are the merchant Goris de Weert, see ACA, NA 840 (unpag.), notary J.C. Hogeboom, 1, 2 and 7 March-5 April 1641: 'two silk garters with lace' ('twee sijden cousebanden met canten'), and the physician Dr Dirck Berckman, see ACA, NA 908 (unpag.), notary J. van Zwieten, 9 September 1649: 'four pairs of silk garters' ('vier paer sijde coussebanden'). After the death of his Waterlander Mennonite wife Maycke van de Wouwer, Goris de Weert married Tietje Korver, who was a member of the Dutch Reformed Church. The fact that he was never called to account by the church council for wearing lace may have been out of consideration for his mixed marriage.
- 105 On this 'Hairige Questie' see M.M. Toth-Ubbens, 'Kaalkop of ruighoofd. Historisch verzet tegen het lange haar', *Antiek* 6 (1972), pp. 371-85. See also G.D.J. Schotel, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der kerkelijke en wereldlijke kleding*, The Hague 1854, pp. 22-23, 26; G. de Vries, 'Zeventiende-eeuwse haar-kloverijen', *Holland* 4 (1973), pp. 165-80; Du Mortier, op. cit. (note 5), pp. 55-56.
- 106 ACA, NA 1044, fols. 402-07, esp. fol. 403v; NA 1045, fols. 209-12, esp. fol. 209v, both notary J. van de Ven, 24 June 1636 with Jeronimus Spengler (22) and 8 September 1636 with Heinrich Haach (18).
- 107 F. Schuyll, *Raedt voor de scheer-siecke hair-cloovers* (Advice to Shaving-Mad Hair-Splitters), Den Bosch 1644, vol. 2, p. 34: 'those who like a Mennonite adhere to these words of the Apostle' ('die gene, die alsoo als een Mennist aen dese woorden des Apostels hanght'). The reference is to 1 Cor. 11:14 ('does not even nature itself teach you that if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?'), on which opponents of long hair based their objections.
- 108 When textiles are trimmed with lace this is always specified in the inventories. If something does not have lace, it is only mentioned if the same item on the preceding or following line is listed as having lace.
- 109 In that of the Waterlander Mennonite Isack Nitters (ACA, NA 1996B, pp. 380-83, esp. p. 382, notary J. van Loosdrecht, 24 June 1645): '5 cambric falling bands with lace' ('5 camerdoexe beffen met cant') (valued together at 15 guilders) and '4 linen falling bands with lace' ('4 linne beffen met cant') (6 guilders). In those of two Flemish Mennonites: Jacquemijntje Teijaerts, widow of Abraham Ostens (note 94): '39 linen and cambric men's falling bands with and without lace' ('39 linnen en kamerdoexe mans-beffen met en sonder kant'), and Jacques van de Gaver (ACA, NA 3188, fols. 26-31, esp. fol. 29, notary H. Outgers, 14 January 1665): '16 old cambric and linen falling bands with and without lace' ('16 oude kamerdoeckse ende linnen beffen met ende sonder kant'). In the inventory of Hester de Flines, widow of Adriaen Claesz van Zevenbergen (note 94), it is not clear whether the 'two cambric falling bands with large flat lace' ('twee camerixdoeckse beffen met groote platwerckse canten') belonged to her or to her husband, who had died shortly before and whose clothes were also listed.
- 110 We do, though, find a collar or sleeve edged with a modest lace border in a few portraits of children from Mennonite families. In the portrait of David Leeuw and his family (fig. 32), Weijntje playing the harpsichord and Maria standing beside it both wear sleeves edged with a modest lace border, see Ekkart and Buvelot, op. cit. (note 32), p. 51. The ruff worn by the Haarlem Flemish Mennonite merchant Lucas de Clercq in the portrait Frans Hals painted around 1635 is erroneously described as lace in P. Visser, *Sporen van Menno. Het veranderende beeld van Menno Simons en de Nederlandse mennisten*, Krommenie 1996, p. 144. This ruff, which was also worn by non-Mennonite men, consists of a very long strip of linen, finely pleated and

- attached to a collar. Visser also mistakenly described De Clerq's wife's large ruff as lace. See also Slive, op. cit. (note 5), pp. 266-67.
- 111 The sole exception is the Waterlander Mennonite notary Hendrik Venkel, whose 1684 inventory includes a pair of *poignets* with lace; they may however have belonged to his Remonstrant wife Geertruyd de Latfeur, who had died shortly before and whose wardrobe was inventoried together with his, see ACA, NA 5474, pp. 88-106, esp. p. 94, notary C. van Leeuwaarden, 19 February 1684.
- 112 Doublets are described in sixty-seven of the 123 inventories that include men's garments in the 1625-70 period. In three of them (see note 94) we find other trimming on the doublet: threaded with lace in that of Hester de Flines, widow of Adriaen Claesz van Zevenbergen; satin cord in that of Jacquemijntje Teijaerts, widow of Abraham Ostens; satin piping in that of Jan Pietersz Bruijningh.
- 113 Red women's stockings are mentioned in only two inventories: in the division of the estate of Isaac Vlaming and Maria Wijnants, in which the household goods and only the woman's clothes are listed, see ACA, NA 3017, pp. 617-60, notary H. Venkel, 4-6 April 1668, p. 635: 'a pair of red stockings' ('een paer roode kaussens'); in the inventory of Gilbert de Flines and Heijltje Lamberts Schouten, which lists the household goods and 'a grosgrain innocent' ('een grofgreijne innocent') belonging to the man and otherwise only women's garments, see ACA, NA 2483, pp. 590-603, esp. p. 598, notary Jac. Hellerus, 30 January-14 March 1670: 'a pair of red stockings' ('een paer rode kousen').
- 114 In the inventory of the Waterlander Mennonite physician Dr Dirck Berckman (note 104), unpag.: 'a pair of coloured stockings' ('een paer gecoleurde coussen'), and in that of the Flemish Mennonite cabinetmaker Jacob Jacobsz Bouman in ACA, NA 2089, pp. 182-91, notary Joh. Hellerus, 27 December 1656, p. 187: 'a pair of coloured silk stockings' ('een paer gecoleurde zijde kousen').
- 115 Inventory research reveals that brightly coloured garments are specifically described as such, and that the description 'coloured' is used to refer to clothes of a subdued or indeterminate shade.
- 116 'doncker carmosijen ditto'; for his inventory see note 94.
- 117 For the dye recipe and the nomenclature of shades of red, including crimson: Hofenk de Graaff, op. cit. (note 50), pp. 43-163, esp. pp. 64-85.
- 118 See the appendix under 11.a (Ameldonck and his wife), 1.2 (Elisabeth), 1.3 (Barbara) and 1.5 (Aeltgen).
- 119 ACA, DTB 301, p. 19, 7 September 1639.
- 120 R. Lambour, 'Het doopsgezind milieu van Michiel van Musscher (1645-1705) en van andere schilders in zeventiende-eeuws Amsterdam. Een revisie en ontdekking', *Oud Holland* 125 (2012), no. 4, pp. 193-214, esp. pp. 197-98.
- 121 'inde wtheemsheden der cledinghe haer beloofd hadden te willen verminderen ende affbreecken': ACA, archive 1120, UMCA, no. 116, Daybook B, 6 and 10 March 1616. They were the eminent merchant Bartholomeus Munter (1569-?) and Aeltje Jacobs Hinlopen (1584-1620). Munter's parents were Mennonite citizens in Harlingen. Bartholomeus could have sought advice from his brother Jan Munter (1570-1617), a leading member of 'bij de Toren'. His son Jan Munter (1611-1685) adopted the Reformed faith and was burgo-master of Amsterdam seven times. Aeltje could have consulted her mother, Lynken Jacobs (?-1612), who was also a member of 'bij de Toren'. Aeltje's brother Jacob Jacobsz Hinlopen (1582-1629) adopted the Reformed faith and became a member of Amsterdam City Council as a sheriff in 1617, see Sprunger, op. cit. (note 20), pp. 75-121, esp. pp. 111-16.
- 122 ACA, NA 1996B, pp. 745-49, notary J. van Loosdrecht, 28 August-23 October 1657 and *ibid.*, pp. 487-91, notary J. van Loosdrecht, 3 November 1653. Both were living in the house of their brother-in-law Jan van Alderwerelt (1614-1682) on Keizersgracht; he was a member of 'bij de Toren'.
- 123 'een paar roije kouse' en 'stricke op de schoen'; 'een paar cleen cante cousebanden', 'een silver lakes wambes met swarte kant', 'een incarnate sije broeck met swarte kant', 'een gout lakes wambes met een paar sije mouwe', 'een japonse rock'. Michiel's style of dress would probably have been showier than that of other unbaptized people. His inventory reveals that he had no plans to join the Mennonite congregation: with his four pistols, after all, he was violating one of the most important principles of Mennonism, that of pacifism. This also implied a taboo on the Dutch East India Company (VOC), an offensive extension of the government. The following year Michiel did indeed make a radical break with his parents' faith by joining the VOC and setting sail for the East Indies: ACA, NA 1972, fol. 448, notary

- J. van Loosdrecht, 31 December 1658: 'Michiel Adriaensz, young man of age, on the point of his departure for a trip to the East Indies in the service of the lord directors of the Dutch East India Company, appoint as his heirs: for one half his brother Jan Adriaensz, and for the other half the children of his brother-in-law Jan van Alderwerelt together for equal shares.' ('Michiel Adriaensz, bejaard jongman, staande op zijn vertrek om een reis naar Oost-Indië te doen in dienst van de heren bewindhebbers van de Oost-Indische Compagnie, benoemt tot erfgenamen: voor de ene helft zijn broer Jan Adriaensz, en voor de andere helft de kinderen van zijn zwager Jan van Alderwerelt tezamen voor gelijke porties.') His brother Nicolaes proved less ill-disposed towards 'bij de Toren'. In his will he left 600 guilders to the poor of the congregation: ACA, NA 1977, fol. 92, notary J. van Loosdrecht, 1 April 1653.
- 124 De Winkel, op. cit. (note 5), p. 70. At funerals people wore special long black cloth mourning cloaks, and in the house mirrors and other items were covered with lengths of black cloth. Almost every man wore such mourning cloaks, which could be hired. The use of black cloth, which could also be hired, to cover the coffin and hang up in the house was widespread: A. Schmidt, *Overleven na de dood. Weduwen in Leiden in de Gouden Eeuw*, Amsterdam 2001, pp. 23-28, 44; B.M. du Mortier, 'De Zwarte Dood en andere rouwverhalen', in K. Debo et al. (eds.), *Zwart. Meesterlijk zwart in mode & kostuum*, Antwerp 2010, pp. 145-53.
- 125 In his *Houwelick* (Marriage) 1625, p. 51, for instance, Jacob Cats warned that mourning should not be 'showy' ('opzigtig uyt te rusten') and in his *Friesche Lust-hof* (1621), Jan Jansz Starter called upon his readers: 'in sorrow and lamenting/ reject all your adornments/ and wear solemn mourning clothes/ instead of showy garments' ('treurd en klaegd/ Verwerpt al u cieraaden/ En droeve rou-kle'en draeght/ In Plaets van pronck-ghewaden.') J. Cats, *Houwelick ...*, Middelburg 1625, p. 51; J.J. Starter in J.H. Brouwer (ed.), *Friesche Lust-hof*, Zwolle 1966, p. 177. These sources are treated in Du Mortier, op. cit. (note 124).
- 126 Cf. Der Kinderen-Besier, op. cit. (note 5), p. 136; F.W.S. van Thienen, *Studien zur Kostümgeschichte der Blütezeit Hollands*, Utrecht 1929 (PhD thesis Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht), p. 83.
- 127 This type was also known as pearled tassels as we see in the 1680 inventory of the painter Jan van de Capelle (1626-1679) which lists, as well as ten pairs of *bef* tassels, '16 fine pearled tassels' ('16 moye parelakers'): De Winkel, op. cit. (note 5), Appendix Q, pp. 348-49.
- 128 Der Kinderen-Besier, op. cit. (note 5), figs. 108, 111a, 114b-c.
- 129 E. van de Wetering, 'Rembrandt as a Searching Artist', in E. van de Wetering, *Rembrandt: Quest of a Genius*, exh. cat. Amsterdam (Rembrandt House Museum)/ Berlin (Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin) 2006, pp. 79-124. Examples are the forward-pointing gestures of Banningh Cock in the *Militia Company of District II under the Command of Captain Frans Banninck Cocq, known as 'The Night Watch'*, signed 1642, canvas, 379.5 x 453.5 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-C-5 and of Anslø in the *Double Portrait of Cornelis Claesz Anslø and Aeltje Gerrits Schouten*, signed 1641 (see note 21).
- 130 The type of sleeve worn by the woman did not come into fashion until 1663. Wheelock dates the costume to the 1660-65 period: see Wheelock Jr, op. cit. (note 67).