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Cuyt (Albert)

Op Doek, hoog 46, breed 66 duim.

Een zeer capitaal Stuk, verbeeldende een ruim Landschap in den vroegen Morgenstond; by een aangenaam Zonligt, zeit ter linkerzyde een Herder by een staande en leggende Koe, deezen Meester.

van een ongemeene schoone uitwerking, en een der beste van waar by een Man die te paard komt aanrennen; verder ziet men een Rivier met Schepen gestoffeerd, en in't verschiet Een zeer capitaal Stuk, verbeeldende een ruim Landschap in de region in 1651-1652.

(Trustee of the British Museum and of the National Gallery).

1839.

tions were auctioned at Christie's, London, May 1854-1857 Waagen, 2 (1854): 110.


1942.9.15 (611)

Lady and Gentleman on Horseback

c. 1655, reworked 1660/1665 Oil on canvas, 123 x 172 (48 1/4 x 67 3/4) Widener Collection

Inscriptions

At lower left: A.Cuijp.

Technical Notes: The original support, a fairly coarse fabric, has been lined with the vertical tacking margins trimmed. Cusping is visible along all edges. At the top and bottom tacking margins have been unfolded and incorporated into the picture plane. Tears are found near the top edge, left of center, and right edge, near the lower right corner. A coarsely pigmented red ground was applied overall followed by a gray preparatory layer under the landscape and a white layer in the sky.
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Paint is applied in thin opaque layers. Numerous artist’s changes are visible as pentimenti and in infrared reflectography and x-radiography. The man had shorter hair and wore a brimmed hat, a decorated tunic, and an embroidered cape tied under his plain collar. The woman, whose proper right arm was raised to hold the reins, wore a large brimmed hat pushed back on her head, a cape, and an ornate dress that fell over the horse’s right side. The white horse’s decorated marlingale was slung lower. The boy in the middle ground was running, accompanied by five greyhounds. Contour changes were made in the seated rider at the far left and in the lower left landscape.

Old discolored overpaint covers many of the pentimenti. Scattered small and moderately sized losses have been retouched, often without prior filling, and all edges have been overpainted, extending well into the picture. A thick coating of discolored natural resin varnish is present, along with remnants of aged coatings from prior selective cleanings.

The lining canvas was in place when the painting was treated privately in 1942, and records indicate at least two generations of retouching were present. Prior to acquisition, discolored varnish and earlier retouching were removed, and a surface coating of mastic applied. No conservation work has been carried out since acquisition.


This extraordinary double portrait of a couple on horseback in an extensive landscape is unique in Dutch art. Unfortunately neither the identity of the sitters nor the circumstances surrounding the commission of this large work is known. Elegantly dressed—the woman wears a black cap decorated with ostrich feathers, pearl necklace, and elaborate blue dress with split sleeves, and the man has on a brown jacket with a gold-trimmed sash across his chest—the couple appear to be participating in a hunt. Three hounds accompany them and sniff the bushes and ground in the lower left, apparently trying to track the scent of game. Two other hunting dogs that resemble greyhounds are held on a leash by an attendant who carries a stick for flushing out the quarry. In the middle distance two gentlemen on horseback journey through the countryside. Beyond them rises a large stone building with turrets and a rectangular tower, which overlooks a broad, low river valley.

The hunt became a popular pastime for the aristocracy in the second half of the seventeenth century, and numerous representations of the sport exist. In the paintings of Meindert Hobbema, for example, hunters can be seen walking through wooded landscapes (see A Village near a Pool, 1642.9.32). Philips Wouwerman (1619–1668) often focused on activities surrounding the hunt itself, and still-life painters like Willem van Aelst represented the trophies of the hunt (see Still Life with Dead Game, 1982.36.1). Cuyp is one of the few Dutch painters who used this theme as a point of departure for portraits of the huntsmen, in works such as The Huntsmen Halted (Barber Institute of Fine Arts, Birmingham) and The Three Huntsmen (formerly in the collection of Thomas Fee, Oklahoma City).\(^2\)

The Washington painting differs from other examples by Cuyp not only in that a woman rider is present, but also in that the main figures seem disconnected from the hunt. They and their mounts are much larger than the accompanying figures and ride past the hounds, oblivious to their presence. Although, to judge from Wouwerman’s paintings, it seems that women occasionally participated in the hunt, in this instance the hunt theme merely served as a pretext for the unusual portraits. Indeed, no prior tradition existed in Dutch art for portraits of a
couple on horseback. While double portraits frequently have rural, outdoor settings, on the grounds of country houses, as, for example, in Bartholomeus van der Helst's *Portrait of Abraham Delcourt and His Wife Maria de Keerssegieter*, 1654 (fig. 1), or evocative, pastoral landscapes, most of these figures are shown seated, standing, or walking. ³

Only Cuyp and the Amsterdam portrait painter Thomas de Keyser (1596/1597—1667) portrayed couples on horseback. De Keyser began painting his small-scale equestrian portraits around 1660. ⁴ Since Cuyp worked in Dordrecht and De Keyser in Amsterdam and since their styles were so completely different, it seems unlikely that one artist influenced the other. In any event, De Keyser almost certainly did not influence Cuyp, who began painting subjects on horseback by the early 1650s, particularly for the Dordrecht family of Pompe van Meerdervoort. In *Two Young Horsemen with Their Tutor* (fig. 2) ⁵ the young riders, Cornelis and Michiel Pompe van Meerdervoort, are situated in the foreground while behind them the hunt is in full chase. Such equestrian portraiture, which must have helped satisfy the family's aristocratic inclinations, was particularly suited to Cuyp's dual interest in portraiture and in depictions of domestic animals. The equestrian double portrait in Washington, thus, was a direct outgrowth of Cuyp’s own innovations in this genre.

Interestingly, in the Washington picture Cuyp did not follow the traditional portrait convention that the woman should be to the left or sinister side of the man. ⁶ Indeed, the woman, resplendent in her gorgeous blue dress and mounted on a white horse with a brilliant red and gold saddlecloth, is given great prominence in the composition. Her position may reflect her high social or economic status, or it may be an expression of pastoral, courtly love.

Cuyp arrived at his compositional arrangement for *Lady and Gentleman on Horseback* with a great deal of effort. Close observation of the surface of the work and of the x-radiographs (fig. 3) reveal that he overpainted and changed major portions of the painting. Both figures have been extensively modified. The man originally wore a hat and had shorter hair. His collar lay flat on his shoulders. He also wore a military-style tunic-and-cape combination, resplendent with braids and buttons (presumably gold), and it seems that the overall color of his costume was brilliant red, rather than its current brown. The costume was in many respects not unlike that worn by Jan Six in Rembrandt’s famous portrait of 1654 in the Six Collection, Amsterdam (see p. 258, fig. 2).
Aelbert Cuyp, *Lady and Gentleman on Horseback*, 1942.9.15
The woman’s costume was also substantially changed. She wore a different shaped hat with feathers that sat back on her head rather than over her forehead. Her dress fit more loosely and seems to have fallen over the right flank of her horse. In place of the fairly low, elegantly gathered neckline in the final version, Cuyp originally painted a plain flat collar that covered her shoulders. The costume was comparable to that seen in Van der Heist’s work of 1654 (fig. 1). From the evidence of these two costumes one can thus conclude that the original version is datable to about 1654–1655.

Aside from the changes in costume, Cuyp also substantially modified the mood of the painting through changes in the arrangement of figures and landscape. The woman, for example, originally assumed a less demure pose and extended her right arm, presumably to hold the reins tightly. This gesture would have suggested more movement than is evident in the final version. The background also had more activity. Instead of the two greyhounds and the young attendant walking behind the riders, Cuyp originally included five running greyhounds and a somewhat larger young man in red socks running with them. The juxtaposition of the portraits and the background figures would thus have been similar to that seen in the painting in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 2). Finally, the landscape also sloped in from the left, and Cuyp may also have made changes to the building.

The couple probably represents a husband and wife, although the suggestion has been made that the woman, because of her younger appearance, may be the man’s daughter. The distinctive crescent and star brass on the bridle of the man’s horse, which might be thought a means of identifying the sitter, was a standard form of horse brass and is unrelated to family crests. One possible clue to the identity of the sitters may be the two letters, JH, embroidered on the woman’s saddle cloth, but these initials have not yet been connected with any name.

A more promising clue to their identity may well be a bust-length portrait, based on the male rider in this painting, that has been traditionally identified as Adriaen Stevens. Snouck (c. 1634–73). Alan Chong, who discovered the resemblance between the two heads, notes that Snouck, originally from Rotterdam, lived in The Hague until his marriage to Erkenraad Berck Matthisdr. (1638–1712) in 1654. This marriage would have brought Snouck into contact with Cuyp because Erkenraad was the daughter of Matthijs Berck, Raad-Pensionaris of Dordrecht, and an important patron of the artist. This theory may well account for the prominence of the woman in this painting. Since the date of the wedding accords rather well with the style of costume seen in the underlying image, one could also hypothesize that the initial commission was to commemorate that event.

Although no specific symbolism relating to marriage exists in the painting, the hunt as a theme was metaphorically linked with the game of love. The large burdock leaves in the foreground were also frequently associated with love. Although the burdock leaf can be symbolic either of virtue and fidelity or vice and lust, the context of the scene clearly points toward the first alternative. Cuyp had a special fondness for this plant. He made three drawings of burdocks (two in the British Museum, London, and one in the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, Rotterdam) and included this plant in the foreground of a number of his paintings (see Horsemen and Herdsmen with Cattle, 1942.9.16). In most of these works the symbolic associations of the burdock leaf seem irrelevant to the meaning of the painting, but in this instance, with the dog calling attention to
its presence, Cuyp may have intended to convey its symbolic associations. 54

The remarkable revisions in the painting indicate that the patrons must have been dissatisfied with the original composition. One may speculate that the activity of the hunt was too predominant an element in the scene and distracted from the character of the double portrait. The substantial modifications in costume, however, also reflect the radical change in the style of clothing that occurred in Dordrecht in the 1660s, and suggest that the sitters wanted to update their image. Particularly revealing in this respect are the changes in the male figure. The dignified brown jacket crossed by a sash and the long wavy hair worn to fall over the shoulders came into vogue around 1660.

The style also differs from that of Cuyp’s earlier portraiture. Indeed, the careful modeling and psychological penetration in these figures is far greater than that which he achieved in portraits such as those in the New York painting (fig. 2). Cuyp’s new style reflects that of Nicolaes Maes (1632–1693), who, after arriving in Dordrecht in the mid-1650s, initiated a new vogue of portraiture in Dordrecht by the end of that decade. Maes captured the elegant, aristocratic aspirations of a Dordrecht society that had begun to follow French styles of dress and decorum, and Cuyp clearly learned from his example.

Notes
1. The 20 June 1894 auction of paintings from the “Adriaen Hope Collection,” which was formed in the eighteenth century, included works acquired by descendants of Hope. At the time of this auction, Lord Henry Francis Pelham-Clinton-Hope had acquired the collection.
2. For reproductions of these paintings, see Reiss 1975, nos. 122 and 123.
3. An example of the rural type of portraiture is: Adriaen van de Velde, Family Group in a Landscape (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, inv. no. C.248). Typical of the “grounds of the country house” category is the Van der Helst reproduced here and Frans Hals’ portrait of Isaak Masa and Beatrice van der Laen (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, inv. no. A.133) or Cornelis Holsteyn’s Reiter Paarz and His Family at Westwijk (private collection; reproduced in Robinson 1979, 493, fig. 6), all works in which the country house itself can be seen in the background.
4. See Equestrian Portrait of Pieter Schout, dated 1660 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, inv. no. A.677), A Lady and Gentleman Riding Through a Wood (Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, Buckingham Palace; London 1982, cat. no. 95); Two Horsemens (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden, inv. no. 1543).
6. While this convention was not absolutely rigid (see, for example, Anthony van Dyck’s companion portraits of Pieter Steven, 1627, and Anna Wake, 1628, in the Mauritshuis, The Hague, inv. nos. 239, 240), most Dutch artists placed the male to the right of the female.
7. In the original concept a fur-trimmed cape may also have hung over her shoulders.
8. Another connection with this painting is the architecture of the building, which, though not identical, is similar in character to that in the Washington painting. This structure has not been identified and is probably a fanciful evocation of an ancient fortified château such as Cuyp may have seen on his trip along the Rhine (see also Horsesmen and Herdsmen with the Cattle, 1642–9.16).
9. This suggestion was made in a number of catalogues of the Widener Collection.
10. Reiss 1975, 165, says that the gentleman “may be a member of the Pompe [van Meerdervoort] family, perhaps Cornelis Pompe (1639–1680), younger of the two boys seen in the New York picture” (fig. 2), but this conclusion rests on the assumption that the horse brass in the Washington picture contains, like that in the New York picture, a star. Alan Chung letter, 25 February 1984, in NGG curatorial files, at one point suggested that the device in the NGA picture’s horse brass is similar to the stylized five-pointed oak leaf that appears in the Berck family crest. According to the archivist of the Municipal Archives in Dordrecht, however, these horse brasses were standard decorative elements of Turkish origin and cannot be connected with family crests. Indeed, exactly the same motifs occur on the horse brass on Paulus Potter’s 1653 life-size equestrian portrait of Dirck Tulp, in the Six Collection, Amsterdam.
11. The painting is housed in the Zeeuws Genootschap van Kunst en Wetenschap, Middelburg. This information was kindly provided by Alan Chung in a letter, 5 February 1990, in NGG curatorial files.
12. Eddy de Jongh writes: “The hunt is synonymous with the game of love and it... was a current and naturally obvious metaphor.” De Jongh 1968–1969, 34.
14. Another example in which symbolism seems intended is Landscape with Cattle and Figures in the National Gallery, London (inv. no. 53; Reiss 1975, no. 183; HdG 1907–1927, 2: no. 426). There the scene of a horseman talking to a shepherdress has clear romantic implications. Cuyp included in the foreground not only burdocks, but also a goat (a traditional symbol of lust), and two dogs frolicking. Reiss 1975, 188, no. 143, quite wrongly rejects the attribution to Cuyp himself, believing it to be by an unknown follower. For a further discussion of the attribution see Brown/MacLaren 1992, 87–88.
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Gerard Dou
1613–1675

Gerard Dou, considered the founder of the Dutch school of fijnschilderij, or fine painting, was born in Leiden on 7 April 1613, the son of the glassmaker and engraver Douwe Jansz. and Marytje Jansdr. van Rosenberg. According to Orlers, Dou received his first artistic instruction, in the art of glass engraving, from his father. He was an apprentice with the copper engraver Bartholomeus Dolen-do (c. 1571–active 1629) for a year and a half, beginning in 1622 at the astonishingly young age of nine, and then trained with the glass painter Pieter Couwenhorn for two years. As he was a member of the glaziers’ guild from 1625 to 1627, it is tempting to make a connection between this youthful career and the smooth, shiny surface effects characteristic of his later panel paintings.

On 14 February 1628 Dou began his apprenticeship with Rembrandt van Rijn (q.v.), which seems to have lasted until the master moved to Amsterdam some three or four years later. At the time he entered Rembrandt’s workshop Dou was not quite fifteen years old and Rembrandt was only twenty-one. Although there are no dated works by Dou from this period, a number of his pictures are so close in style to those of his teacher that they must have been painted at this time. Indeed, early works by Dou have at times been attributed to Rembrandt himself, a confusion in part due to the fact that Dou and Rembrandt shared subjects and models during these years.

After Rembrandt went to Amsterdam, Dou produced ever more finely wrought, highly finished compositions with increasingly smooth, enamel-like surfaces. He also began to employ a range of cooler, paler colors in preference to the warm, darkish browns of his earlier works.

Dou painted a wide range of subjects, including genre scenes, history paintings, still lifes, portraits, and—unusual for a seventeenth-century Dutch painter—nudes. He also began painting candlelit scenes during the 1650s. His fame quite rightly rests, however, on the meticulously painted, small genre scenes that make up a large portion of his oeuvre. These typically depict one or two figures engaging in some kind of domestic activity, either in an interior or else looking out over a windowsill—a compositional device that Dou was chiefly responsible for popularizing. Many of these works are also open to a considerable degree of symbolic interpretation, containing numerous, if sometimes ambiguous, visual references to well-known contemporary proverbs or emblems.

Dou had remarkable success. From his own lifetime until late in the nineteenth century, his work was considered one of the crowning achievements of Dutch art, and his pictures consistently fetched higher prices than those of Rembrandt. By 1648, when he is recorded as one of the founder-members of the Leiden Guild of Saint Luke, his pictures commanded some of the highest prices of their day, and he had already gained a remarkable international reputation. Pieter Spiering, the agent in The Hague of Queen Christina of Sweden, apparently paid 1,000 guilders per year to secure for his queen first refusal of whatever Dou produced. In 1660 the States General of the Netherlands included several paintings by Dou amongst their gifts to Charles II of England on the occasion of his restoration to the throne. He subsequently invited Dou to travel to England and work at the royal court, an invitation the artist did not accept.

Indeed, it seems that Dou hardly ever left his native Leiden, where his work was as appreciated as it was in the royal courts of Europe. In 1641 the mayor of Leiden, J. J. Orlers, wrote admiringly of Dou’s technique in his general description of the city, Beschrijvinge der Stadt Leyden, and in 1665 a local collector, Johan de Bye, rented a room in which he
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