'Hand resting provocatively on his hip, Mick Jagger leads the press conference like a pied piper teasing a pack of rats.'

J. Hunter, 'Satisfaction', Report on Business Magazine

Renaissance Man may have been a creature of many parts, but it has generally been his rational 'speaking hands' which have attracted the attention of historians. I am, however, more fascinated by Jagger's swaggering ancestors and will concern myself with Renaissance Man's more emotive and increasingly assertive (but hitherto neglected) elbow. Written references to gestures associated with the elbow in the period under consideration – the late fifteenth to seventeenth centuries – are largely limited to admonitions to restrain them, and thus they fit more easily under the controversial heading of 'natural' as opposed to 'taught' (though whether they still might be said to be 'learned' remains to be resolved). They are for that no less expressive of 'the motions of the mind', nor no less rewarding to decode than those long identified from the canon of ritual or rhetoric – as fingers resting lightly on the chest – which, as Fritz Graf shows (see p. 50), Quintilian had already suggested be used to indicate sincerity.
Portraits of any period are obviously not candid photographs; they are as composed as any narrative scene. The decorum of ritual and daily life provides the background code of comportment upon which portraitists drew: for example, the self-abasing body language of the devotional portrait versus the often prideful assertion or nonchalance of the secular. All this is hard to do well. As Leonardo succinctly put it, 'the intention of the mind' is difficult to paint because it 'has to be represented through gestures and movements of the limbs.' This is echoed in the writings of others of the period, some like the later Dutch theorist and painter Karel van Mander further emphasizing the decorum or appropriateness of gesture and comportment: for example, that men act like men, and women like women.' The introduction of purposeful gestures will usually represent a distillation of generally accepted societal codes which rise out of collective experience – otherwise they wouldn't be recognized – and which convey an impression which the sitter is content to give off, seen through the prism of the individual artist's aesthetic sensibilities. In ordinary life we are usually not directly conscious of the way our body language colours our spoken word, adapts it for our relation with the audience at hand. However, an artist sensitive, perhaps unconsciously, to the nuances of non-verbal communication will be able to adapt this for a pictorial system that can be applied as well, to permit a sitter, whether himself or another, to give off a desired impression. Though this is certainly a manifestation of the 'presentation of the self' the analysis of which can benefit greatly from the insights of sociology, we must be careful to remember the distinction between the distillation and that from which it has been distilled.

The following essay is a kind of work-in-progress report with as many holes and uncertainties as there are proposals. As a true follower of Bacon rather than Descartes I have devoted myself first to gathering primary material and have not got far enough in my research to pay Descartes his due. This essay will chronicle, in a fashion more skeletal and suggestive than truly descriptive, the presumed first appearance, rise and apogee of the male elbow in gestures indicative essentially of boldness or control – and therefore of the self-defined masculine role, at once protective and controlling, in contemporary society and in the microcosm of the family – in painting, primarily portraits, from about 1500 to 1650.
My examples begin in Germany and Italy but are soon concentrated in Holland, where for reasons that surely have to do with a collective perception of social ties and duties rather than pure artistic invention, the elbow in its most perfectly evolved form – the arms akimbo – will come close to achieving the status of a national attribute as an integral aspect of the imagery of the alert, on guard, proud regent class who managed so successfully to inform the values of seventeenth-century Holland. This connection of 'gesture and culture' may be seen in another way as an essay in defining the meaning of one or two related 'words' in a vocabulary and syntax that are as yet little understood.

Before proceeding we may reflect on some general observations. At the close of the fifteenth century in the major artistic centres of western Europe, natural movement observed from life was increasingly playing a role in lending vitality to artistic interpretation of traditional themes in a way that had been rejected since antiquity. In the wider context of narrative from which portraiture takes many of its cues, the arm akimbo is found widely, but not randomly: typically a male military figure registering self-possession and control, either the assertion of success or defiance. The most frequent appearance of the gesture in fifteenth-century Florence is probably in sculptural interpretations of David triumphing over the head of Goliath. Around 1500, especially in German art and more especially in the work of Albrecht Dürer, the real movements of daily life were increasingly absorbed into the expressive canon. The dominance of idealizing tendencies in Italian and Italianate art would limit developments in narrative interpretation of gesture before the shift to an acceptance of comportment of real life in the early seventeenth century especially in the work of Caravaggio and artists in the Dutch Republic, which experienced an explosion of male elbows.

The body language of self-possession, which in most pictorially treated narratives is associated with authority, will colour our perception of the figure: he is typically a leader (or one who comports himself as one) giving a command with the one arm outstretched sometimes holding a sceptre, baton or whip, the other arm akimbo, his weight on one leg in a hip-shot pose with the other leg casually extended. The effect may be heightened by the subordinate body language of others. The High Priest in scenes of
Figure 5.1 Pieter Gartner (attr.), Calvary, 1537.
(Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore.)
Calvary, as in this example of 1537 attributed to Pieter Gartner\(^4\) (see figure 5.1) commonly asserts himself so; another negative type of power is provided by the chief executioner in Albrecht Durer's *Martyrdom of Ten Thousand*\(^5\) of 1508. Positive imagery includes such scenes as Rembrandt's *Scene of Clemency from Ancient History*\(^6\) of 1626 or the many renderings of the *Magnanimity of Scipio* in Dutch art.\(^7\) If a leader's chosen posture is statesmanlike restraint, then one of his men representing the power of the 'state' takes up this aggressive, self-possessive display.\(^8\) When striding – or rather swaggering – the effect is rather like a cock ruffling his feathers for greater effect which is in keeping with patterns of threat display throughout the animal kingdom. Samson with jaw bone in one triumphant fist may take this pose; likewise Hercules. He may be hero or brutal executioner; there is no moral distinction. Though often defiant, this gesture is incompatible with humiliation or humility and only by the greatest exception is it a gesture of Christ's.\(^9\) In the same vein it is characteristic of Old Testament heroes but not of New Testament apostles or of philosophers and learned men whether ancient or contemporary. On the other hand in scenes of low life such as by Pieter Brueghel or Jan Steen, whether peasant or urban, this and other assertive gestures are more casually encountered, even among women.

**The single portrait**

With this brief indication of the narrative patterns in mind we may turn to our portrait theme. Around 1500 we encounter not only cool, admirably restrained, disembodied descendants of Roman busts and coins as Giovanni Bellini’s *Doge Leonardo Loredano*\(^10\) of about 1503, but the increasingly frequent encroachment of hands claiming pictorial space as their own, especially in Flemish and also German portraiture. As far as I am aware, however, it is first in self-portraits by Albrecht Durer, most clearly developed in that of 1498 (see figure 5.2) and slightly later by Perugino c.1503,\(^11\) that the lower arm and elbow are used aggressively, seemingly as space markers on the parapet separating the sitter from the viewer. The admonition found already in a fourteenth-century etiquette book\(^12\) to keep one's elbows off the communal eating table is clear
acknowledgement of the perceived possessive intrusiveness of this
gesture. If Dürer’s Self-Portrait is indeed the first experiment with
this form, such an 'invention' would be consistent with the
prideful posturing which comes through in his writings and artistic

Figure 5.2 Albrecht Dürer, Self-Portrait, 1495.
(The Prado, Madrid.)
self-imaging and indeed with the larger trends in intellectual self-assertion of the Renaissance as a whole. The effectiveness of this self-possessive assertion of territoriality by such a boundary marker is strengthened by the direct eye contact Durer establishes with us and the alignment of the lower arm parallel to the picture plane, thus a barrier over which we are challenged to leap in order to enter the space behind. A typically more subtle modification is found in Titian's Portrait of a Man of c.1510, now thought possibly to be a self-portrait, where brashness is replaced by the hauteur of this elegantly attired man who without condescending to look at us subtly controls the barrier dividing our space from his. Later portraits of artists, including self-portraits, from Parmigianino and Lorenzo Lotto to Gabriel Metsu, Van Dyck, or Rembrandt will show a marked preference for an assertive body language which, as we will see, would normally be associated with military power or social position of a kind rarely enjoyed by painters.

Durer's Paumgartner brothers (see figure 5.3) of c.1498 from the Paumgartner Altarpiece provide an early example of the Renaissance elbow in a second form that will carry on throughout the period under discussion: the military posture with arm akimbo attributed to the portraits of the brothers in the guise of their name saints, the knights George and Eustace. As they each carry a banner, their appearance takes on the body language of the contemporary mercenary flag- or standard-bearer. Indeed it can now be seen that this gesture—whether with the hand on the hip or even more provocatively resting on the pommel of a dagger or sword as a rather obvious aspect of threat display—was an accepted gesture, even attribute, of the standard-bearer already in such German woodcuts and engravings from the end of the fifteenth century on as by Albrecht Durer c.1502 or Hans Sebald Beham’s dashing Landsknecht of 1526 (see figure 5.4). He was, as John Hale has succinctly described him,
Figure 5.4 Hans Sebald Beham, *Standard-bearer*, c.1526, engraving.
advantage of his swirl of cloth, but also an emotional charge. Seldom shown wearing armour, he was expected to die with the standard wrapped around him so that it would not be borne away as a trophy by the enemy.\(^{17}\)

While on the march one might imagine that the standard-bearer might well walk with one hand at his waist simply to brace himself, as may St Christopher when he carries the 'weight of the whole world' or Samson carrying the doors of the gate at Gaza or a peasant woman carrying a load on her head, but most representations of the standard-bearer show him at ease.

In the sixteenth century in the Netherlands, central Europe, Italy, and Spain there is a steady increase in the use of more expressive, frequently bolder, body language especially in male portraiture of the more powerful segments of society. Often this means vaguely or explicitly military associations – to convey the manly virtues – through both attributes and body language, such as the arm akimbo, most frequently showing one hand on the hip by a sword or rapier, or, if a commander, with a baton.\(^{17}\)

Pontormo’s c.1537 Duke Cosimo I de Medici as a Halberdier\(^ {19}\) (see figure 5.5) depicts Cosimo at age eighteen in the guise of a German or Swiss Landsknecht, in which the effrontery and virile coarseness of the mercenary whose elbow grazes the picture plane – a militarily tough but socially despised ‘front’ Cosimo is said to have enjoyed affecting apparently even after personally assuming command of his forces in 1537 – constitutes a slap at decorum and just the sort of association to which youths in regulated roles are often attracted. That this is balanced by a striking, ambiguous grace and refinement that suggests a noble in lowlife disguise contributes to its fascination. A duke or king, as in Holbein's famous portrait of Henry VIII c.1539/40,\(^ {20}\) may comport himself as expansively as a lowly mercenary, though for different reasons. In any case, this is not the humble, dignified, ideal courtier of Baldassare Castiglione's 1528 treatise on court life Il Cortegiano!

With this reference I would like to turn briefly to the subject of books on etiquette or comportment in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. The majority, like F Cortegiano, are largely aimed at those at court or on the fringes of court life and are concerned first with ingratiating comportment in the presence of one’s betters,\(^ {16}\)
Figure 5.5 Jacopo Carucci, called Pontormo, *Duke Cosimo I de’Medici as a Halberdier*, c.1537.
(J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu.)
The Renaissance elbow

not exactly an issue for Cosimo or Henry. The importance of honesty (humility) and modesty underline most advice. After the earlier texts largely aimed at table manners, Erasmus in his influential 1532 treatise on comportment *De civilitate morum puerilium* appears to have the honour of being the first to comment on the arm akimbo, referring with disapprobation to those who (in an English edition of 1540) 'stand or sit and set [the] one hand on [the] side which maner to some semeth comly like a warrior but it is not forthwith honest'. This is a confirmation of the military associations we have already proposed on the basis of the visual evidence. In like manner, Giovanni della Casa, in his widely influential book on gentlemanly comportment *Il Galateo* first published in 1558, condemns the pride and boldness of those who would 'set their hands to their sides and go up and down like a Pecock'. Other references in texts on comportment either repeat the admonition to keep the elbows off the table or just to restrain their movement. Bonifacio's *L'arte de' cenni* of 1616, the one text from the period devoted to an analysis of gesture, devotes a fascinating section to the elbow and the arm akimbo, which he describes as giving the impression of strength, as those who use them to push their way through crowds. He goes on to cite passages from various authors which imply criticism of men always with their hands on their hips, as a quotation from Plautus deriding those who go around with hands on hips whom he calls 'handle men'.

The mention rated by this gesture in John Bulwer's *Chironomia* of 1644, the first example I know of in a text on rhetoric, is again highly critical: 'to set the arms agambo or aprank, and to rest the turned-in back of the hand upon the side is an action of pride and ostentation, unbeseeming the hand of an orator'. In part because of the continuing pressure of the war with Spain, by 1600 military portraiture was an important aspect of public and also private art in the northern Netherlands as it was not in Italy. Of course if you subtracted the portraiture of the Dutch regent class and compared only the portraiture of the blood aristocracy, the only class outside the Church really commissioning portraits in Italy, the differences would be minimalized. A characteristic type is the individual portrait of the *Standard-bearer* of a militia company (see figure 5.6) by Evert van der Maes of 1617 of the
Figure 5.6 Evert van der Maes, *Standard-bearer*, 1617
(Collection Haags Gemeentemuseum, The Hague.)
The Renaissance elbow

Orange Company of the St. Sebastian Guild in The Hague, typically richly dressed in yellow or red and posed in a calculatedly casual hip-shot stance with his hand on his hip—just oozing macho assertion. The standard-bearer in a Dutch militia company was the third ranking officer, was normally from the social elite, and was required to be single and affluent, contributing to his symbolic role proclaiming the potency of the company. Instead of facing the viewer, he insolently looks down his elbow at us, jabbing it at the viewer in a way that would be incredibly rude in actual life. Other depictions of standard-bearers, whether in inn-scenes or as portrait types as Rembrandt's 1636 Standard-bearer as a Landsknecht carry on the use of this pose as an expressive attribute. The brash insolence of this gesture, now touching the picture plane, is widely followed in other military portraits as in the Smiling Cavalier (see figure 5.7) of 1624 by Frans Hals or in civilian portraits such as Hals's Jaspar Schade, of c.1645, by contemporary reports a man not only wealthy but very vain. In like manner a 1670 emblem by Cornelis de Bie of 'impudence and stupidity' is represented by an ass sauntering along with one hand on his hip and the other carrying a bag of money.

To the extent that single portraits of men depicted with this gesture can be identified, the overwhelming percentage are socially powerful or associated with the military, or both. Such men when on horseback, if they don't have their hands full, may take this posture as Pauwels van Hillegaert's Prince Frederik Hendrik on Horseback. Individual proclivities of artists are blended with the self-consciousness of the sitter, his class. Indeed men depicted with the arm akimbo are more likely to be identifiable than those depicted without specific gestures (or in bust length), and there is a clear correlation with regent class. This gesture expressive of social assurance is often correlated with a view into the distance (of a house or battle), the use of an elegant curtain, pillars, or garden sculpture and of course with armour or a baton as in Jan Lievens, Maerten Harpertsz. Tromp, Vice-Admiral, or a walking stick serving as a baton-surrogate for a non-military 'commander' as Samuel van Hoogstraten's Mattheus van den Broucke, Governor of the East Indies (see figure 5.8). Among the artists who used it the most often would figure Hals and his follower C. Verspock in Haarlem. In Amsterdam the usage was more widespread, continuing
into the eighteenth century with C. Troost; but no one could rival Bartholomeus van der Helst in his adaptation of the arm akimbo in conveying the sense of self of his prominent patrons from such patrician Amsterdam families as Bicker, Coymans, or De Geer – for example his 1642 portrait of Andries Bicker. In Van der Helst’s 1665 Egbert Meeuws Kortenaar, Admiral of Holland his
Figure 5.8 Samuel van Hoogstraten, *Mattheus mat. den Broucke, Governor of the East Indies.*
(© Rijksmuseum-Stichting, Amsterdam.)
subject stands in three-quarter view behind a parapet facing us, right arm akimbo, the left holding a baton braced against his abdomen. The strategically placed cannon just below the parapet aimed out into our space strengthens the assertive potency of the stance. Boys might be depicted in similar poses as well, as Ferdinand Bol's, *Otto van der Waejen as a Polish Officer* which features the left arm akimbo, the right grasping a ceremonial war hammer braced against the thigh, other weapons strewn behind. However, almost every single depiction of an Easterner was likely to display this mark of pride. Both hands on the hips – Plautus' 'handle man' – is potentially such a strong statement of self-possession, normally identified in art with anger or defiance, that it almost never appears in portraits, exceptions being a full-length portrait of a pugnacious, very short *Unidentified Man* by Pieter Quast in 1631 and Rembrandt's three-quarter-length *Self-Portrait* in Vienna of 1652. The artist is dressed in studio attire, thumbs in his belt, obviously looking intently at himself in a mirror; his brow is furrowed in thought. In the recent literature the 'aggressive informality' of this 'proud, confrontational worker's stance' has been astutely noted, but in the context of this present study the unique choice of this posture in Rembrandt's paintings of himself takes on more significance. As a self-portrait, this takes on the character of profound, personal stocktaking.

As for the weaker, perforce humbler sex, the arm akimbo might characterize a woman of princely status such as Queen Elizabeth I of England, or a female warrior such as Juno or Athena, but it was not an appropriate gesture for middle-class women of good standing, though there were some exceptions for women from powerful or noble families. Standards of female comportment called for restraint on the part of the 'morally weaker' sex, containment, the avoidance of anything suggestive of personal pride or self-possession. It would lack propriety to be so bold; and the gesture is otherwise rarely encountered except in allegories of Pride or Vanity such as cautionary images of Lady World or depictions of light company.
The function of the brandished male elbow takes on further connotations in Dutch group portraiture, a kind of societal self-imaging hardly found outside the Republic with the exception of marriage portraits. The issue of body language as an aspect of the group dynamics of 'men in groups' has not been really addressed in the recent literature on Dutch corporate imagery and I can make only an exploratory foray into the material here. For example, in Rembrandt's 1642 *Nightwatch* or Militia Company of Captain Frans Banning Cocq (see figure 5.9) which has been eloquently termed 'a living allegory of the soldier's calling', a 'role portrait of the militant citizen' framed around the narrative motif of the company preparing to move out. As E. Haverkamp Begemann has put it, 'Banning Cocq's company, strong and ready to act, was a visual metaphor for the might of Amsterdam and its willingness to protect its rights.' There are two proud figures each with arm akimbo, the vividly dressed lieutenant Willem van Ruytenburgh and, once again, the standard-bearer or ensign Jan Cornilsz. Visscher, the second and third ranking officers within the company. In a surprising percentage of Dutch militia company pieces, especially of Amsterdam companies by the whole gamut of painters, this proud, assertive gesture characterizes the standard-bearer, as in Pieter Isaacsz., Officers of the Amsterdam Company of Captain Jacob Gerritsz. Hoing, 1596 (see figure 5.10) and frequently the lieutenant or the captain (as in Rembrandt's only militia company piece or Joachim von Sandrart's Company of Captain Cornelis Bicker c.1642), sometimes joined by another officer on the outer edge of the group, protective of the group in the face of outsiders (viewers). Most often the captain comports himself as the statesman who gives the orders while the next ranking officers suggest the aggressive potential. That the higher ranking officers were usually of a higher social class may contribute to their easy posturing. The centrality of the standard-bearer, whose individual characterization we have already treated, is obvious in the Dutch and German vocabulary, as it is not in English: the words for 'company', 'flag', and 'flag-bearer' all have the same root, thus more encompassing than the English 'ensign'
signifying the flag, the flag-bearer (formerly) but not the company itself. In Dutch, each militia company (vendel) had its own flag (vaan, vaandel) which was carried by the flag or standard-bearer (vaandragcr, vaandrig). The macho imagery of these militia companies, to which we will return, is especially interesting given the decline in their military significance in consequence of the rise in the effectiveness of the standing army.

Though images of the Amsterdam civic guard from the middle of the sixteenth century with their insistently speaking hands, direct gazes and straight backs exude stalwart firmness, the earliest possible example I have found of this more pugnacious comportment centred on a standard-bearer with 'elbow drawn' is a sketch attributed to Cornelius Ketel, presumably for a lost Company of Captain Herman Rodenburg dated 1581, though other more certainly dated works follow in quick succession.
Figure 5.10 Pieter Isaacs, Officers of the Amsterdam Company of Captain Jacob Gerritsz Hoing, 1596. (Amsterdam Historisch Museum on loan from City of Amsterdam.)
This was in fact a pivotal time in the military history of Holland. In 1579 the provinces rebelling against Spain had signed the Union of Utrecht. In 1580 the Prince of Orange, as leader of the rebellion, came to Amsterdam to garner support; apparently as a consequence of this in September of that year a reorganization of the Amsterdam militia was initiated with the aim of producing a more efficient force. It is thus very likely that there is a causal relationship between these events, capped by the declaration of the Republic in 1581, and the appearance of what seems to be a new mentality expressed in the new pride, self-assertion and more aggressive posturing in the imagery of the militia companies. The paintings themselves also became much larger and frequently full-length. That there is a relationship between mentality and the impression these men were comfortable in giving off is further suggested by depictions of Amsterdam militia companies celebrating the Peace of Munster in 1648 by Flinck and Van der Helst which are far more relaxed and open in their body language; besides such overt signs as figures shaking hands, they are both almost entirely ‘de-elbowed’.

If we now return briefly to Rembrandt’s Nightwatch, it should be clear that the arm akimbo of the highlighted standard-bearer and lieutenant play an integral role, subtly blending symbolism and narrative in expressing ‘the might of Amsterdam and its willingness to protect its rights’.

The pattern appears to be far less consistent for group portraits of Haarlem militia companies. Though Hals’s 1616 Officers of the St George Company (see figure 5.11) fairly bristles with elbows and self-satisfied but good natured bravado – all fascinating examples of upper middle class masculine posturing – the bold flag bearer at the right edge is more the exception than the rule and he is not at the centre. The pattern of response envisioned by Hals is consistent with the impression given off by tightly bonded groups of men (or men with women) today when facing an outsider (viewer), as in the similar pattern of posturing of the male rock group the Sha Na Na (figure 5.12): again it is the figures on the front line of contact with the outsider-spectator who raise their weapons.

Depictions of the regent class sitting as the board of a charity or civic body normally involve less aggressive posturing, as one
Figure 5.11 Frans Hals, Officers of the St George Company, Haarlem, 1616. (Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum.)
would expect. However, by the middle of the seventeenth century – the high point of such corporate imagery – of the members shown seated around their meeting table, there will commonly be one man (not the chairman) who is seated next to the space at the table visually left open for the approach of the intruder-viewer (and thus either at the right or left edge or in front) and who turns in his chair to look either at us or at an intruder within the scene (as an orphan) and assumes this 'on guard' or 'ready' posture, for example in Ferdinand Bol's *Regents of the Nieuwezijds Huiszittenhuis, Amsterdam 1657* (see figure 5.13). The assistant in Rembrandt's *Anatomy Lesson of Dr Deyman* plays a similar part. This role offers parallels to that played by the second- and third-ranking officers in the military groups. As might now be anticipated, in portraits of all female boards the body language of the group as a whole and certainly of the mediating figures tends to be either neutral or more open and welcoming.

Figure 5.12 Press photograph of the Sha Na Na. (Source unknown.)
The evolution of certain strands of marriage and family portraits runs parallel though the dynamics are different. A variety of pictorial conventions were called upon by Renaissance artists to evoke a sense of marital bonds; some clearly evince a sense of territoriality, turf to be defended.

Raphael's splendid companion portraits of *Angelo and Magdalena Doni* (see figure 5.14) of c.1505 convey the message of a marital unit with Angelo at the head, an early example of complementary assertive–passive body language. Where he is all angles pressing up to the picture plane, she is all curves flowing back, the potentially strong line of her left arm delicately broken by the overlapping counterpoint of her other hand as it is in portraits of women by other artists, such as Leonardo's *Mona Lisa*. While she looks away, he confronts the viewer with a direct gaze. He sits forward with his right arm nudging the picture plane, the highlighted elbow slightly forward, accentuating the structural L of this position which is further strengthened by the rectangle of the 'window frame' itself and anchoring the composition for the left to right visual scan characteristic of so much sixteenth- and seventeenth-century art. His gesture serves to mark the boundary signalling his territory. It is not so different from the modern male party-goer who possessively rests his arm on the back of his wife's or girlfriend's seat. Such male posturing is normally aimed at other males. Analogous uses of body language (though not the elbow) to express dominance are found in fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Flemish and German painting, as in Jan van Eyck's *Arnolfini Wedding* of 1434 and Jan Gossaert's *Double Portrait of a Couple* from roughly a century later.

A more overtly assertive expression of the husband's prerogatives and duties, focusing on the man with (right) hand on his hip or pommel of a sword in a boldly casual hip-shot pose, was used by Dürer for the *Betrothal of Archduke Maximilian and Mary of Burgundy*, one of the vignettes designed by him for the woodcut *Triumphal Arch of Maximilian* of 1512–18. Whether or not this is the first use in portraiture, the gesture seems to have already become a commonplace in depictions of couples in German painting.
Figure 5.14 Raphael Sanzio, *Angelo and Magdalena Doni*, c.1505.
(Palazzo Pitti, Florence.)
allegories or scenes of domestic life, as in the work of Israel van Meeckenem and the Master ES.65

The issues are more clearly drawn in a Family Group66 by an anonymous artist of the northern Netherlands dated 1559 (see figure 5.15). The militant gesture of the husband will reappear in Netherlandish and German marriage portraiture (but most especially in Netherlandish) and this piece exemplifies the allegorical origins of many conventions that eventually become commonplaces – so well understood that the apparatus of interpretation could be jettisoned. The painting is discussed by E. de Jongh in his stimulating study of marriage and family portraiture in seventeenth-century Holland. He comments on the emblematic toys of the two children and the scene visible through the window to the rear – of Eve offering the apple to Adam – as underlining the harmony of marriage, based on the necessary hierarchy of the sexes resulting from female weakness. Though elsewhere De Jongh briefly refers to the 'generally greater freedom of movement' on the part of husbands in marriage and family portraits, he does not take the issue further. However, I would suggest that the husband's bold 'on guard' gesture of right arm akimbo coupled with his left hand resting possessively on his wife's shoulder while she looks down, and he at her, make the hierarchy and their respective roles in it palpably clear. His virtues reside in steadfast leadership. Hers lie in passive obedience. The codes that De Jongh has been so important in uncovering in terms of the emblematic sources for many objects are more obviously susceptible to decipherment with the aid of contemporary emblem books, but the kind of gestural vocabulary analysed here offers further important clues to interpretation without which our understanding is unnecessarily limited.

From this point we will concentrate on the Dutch husband and father whose sterner image and projected sense of duty more easily express themselves in such insistent gestures of prerogative and protection. While there are relatively few marriage portraits in Italian sixteenth-century painting, it is interesting to note how often they are infused with a degree of tenderness and absence of assertion.

While there are many ways through gesture and objects such as harmonizing musical instruments to illustrate the complementary roles of husband and wife, this one will evolve into one of the most
Figure 5.15 Northern Netherlands painter, *Family Group*, 1559. (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp.)
common formulas for seventeenth-century Dutch companion portraits of married couples. The man will normally be on our left (on the right before marriage, as De Jongh has shown) with hand resolutely on hip, often thrusting his elbow boldly in our direction, as in Frans Hals's companion portraits of an unidentified couple in Cincinnati (see figure 5.16) or, less frequently but more discreetly, angled away as in the portraits of an unidentified couple of c.1650 in Washington.

Variations on this particularly resonant expression of male and female relations are found in the work of nearly every Dutch portraitist and many of the Flemish. In Anthony van Dyck's companion portraits of the small son and daughter of the Marchesa Cattaneo of 1623, four and half year old Filippo is shown in the same protective pose as the adult males with their wives or families. As De Jongh has pointed out, the marriage portraiture of royalty was often overtly concerned with conveying political messages; within that context body language often expressed a similar gloss on the relationship as found in those of lesser mortals: for example *The Archduke Albert and Archduchess Isabella Visiting a Collector's Cabinet* (see figure 5.17) presently attributed to Jan Breughel and Frans Francken II. On the wall to the rear can be seen a typical pair of marriage portraits from c.1570/80 featuring the husband as a guardian figure. A variation on this relation between the sexes may be found in genre scenes such as Johannes Vermeer's Soldier and Laughing Girls where this outwardly protective gesture has been turned around to the more erotic overtones of sexual threat display.

Images of women exhibiting this gesture of self-possession become more plentiful around 1650 for women of powerful families in the Netherlands as in Van der Helst's companion portraits of Samuel de Marez and Margaretha Trip.

A reflection of subconscious associations contemporaries made with such marital images must be behind intriguing alterations made in the depiction of paired, full-length portraits of Willem Prince of Orange and his son Maurits seen hanging together in the Leiden University library in an engraving by Willem Swanenburgh after Jan C. Woudanus in 1610 (see figure 5.18) for a series of views of the university. In the first, unfinished state, Maurits, the brilliant military leader and stadhouder in 1610, stands at the left in
Figure 5.16 Frans Hals, *Unidentified Husband and Wife*, c. 1650.
(The Taft Museum, Cincinnati, Ohio; bequest of Mr and Mrs Charles Phelps Taft.)
Figure 5.17 Jan Brueghel and Frans Francken II (?) The Archduke Albert and Archduchess Isabella Visiting a Collector's Cabinet, c.1620.
(The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore.)
a classic military posture with right hand on his hip, the left bracing a baton against that hip, his weight on the right leg with left extended, next to a table upon which rests a helmet. To the right his father Willem, the founder of the university in 1575, here more in the guise of a statesman in a long robe, stands partially turned towards his son, his arms stretched out with palms up (a gesture traditionally recognized by rhetoricians as indicating 'openness' or appeal) – thus, in the context of this pairing and contemporary portrait modes, visually playing an inappropriately subordinant 'wifely' role. That this must have struck the printmaker, or the sponsor of the series, is suggested by the changes in the final state. Now Willem has been moved to the place of honour and dominance on the left, his right hand on his hip while his left hand rests on a table balancing off that in Maurits’s portrait which has now been moved, in reverse, to the right. In the actual portraits presented to the university by Maurits in 1598 upon which these were presumably based, Maurits lightly rests one hand on the pommel of his sword and the other on a table while Willem stands next to a table with his hands stuffed into the pockets of his robe! Both portraits were adapted in differing degrees to a more heroic, assertive mode as joint protectors of the university and, particularly since the more 'manly' figure is at the right, neither is left to play the wife.

While portraits of whole families are found from the middle of the sixteenth century, I have not been successful in finding examples exhibiting this same kind of threat display until well into the seventeenth century, at which point they abound. As in Gabriel Metsu’s Family of Burgomaster Dr Gillis Valkenier of about 1657 (see figure 5.19) they will often centre on a proud paterfamilias shown seated or standing, sometimes in exaggerated ease, with his hand on hip casually conveying seigneurial territoriality and warning off encroachment on his preserve – a 'pictogram' of middle-class virtue. In Peter de Hooch’s contemporary Family in a Courtyard with three adult males and two females, the two eldest males respectively sit and stand with arm akimbo at the right and left edges, 'bracketing' the group while their spouses offer them fruit – a common reference to fruitfulness in marriage imagery. A further variation on this theme focuses on a son or sons who instead take this watching, protective masculine
Figure 5.18 Jan C. Woudanus (after), *Leiden University Library, 1610*, engraved by W. Swanenburgh (details of the first and second states showing the portraits of Prince Willem of Orange and his son Maurits).
stance vis-à-vis the outside world as in works by Frans Hals, Cuyp, or in a stern Family Group by an anonymous northern Holland artist where all the sons 'have their elbows out' while the girls, except for the baby, all wear pearls and carry flowers or fruit, symbols of chastity and hoped-for fruitfulness. This convention finds a parallel expression at the English court in Anthony van Dyck's Portrait of Philip 4th Earl of Pembroke and his Family where the richly dressed two eldest sons and son-in-law play out this role while the soberly dressed father wearing the Order of the Garter takes the role of statesman. This role is again curiously comparable to that of the standard-bearer or lieutenant in militia.

Figure 5.19 Gabriel Metsu, Family of Burgomaster Dr Gillis Valkenier, c.1657.
(Gemaldegalerie. Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.)
pieces. In a double portrait of two brothers, it may be the elder whose arm akimbo expresses the message of his protective feeling toward his sibling.\(^\text{83}\)

Beyond basic distinctions in societal roles, individual artists made greater or lesser use of different patterns of body language: for example Rembrandt's use of body language in portraiture is subtle but more frequently turned to the conveyance of contemplative values and less to aggressive posturing than in the portraits of Hals, Van der Helst, or Van Dyck. Surely this reflects a blending of his own sensitivities with the social sense of his Amsterdam patrons,\(^\text{84}\) who indeed were generally not from the same very powerful regent circles as those of Van der Helst.

Did men of the regent, mercantile, portrait-commissioning class in the Netherlands posture more assertively than the more aristocratic or clerical patrons in Italy? How reflective are these portraits of actual mores? While much was made in contemporary travellers' tales of the almost proverbial gesticulating Italian observed in the marketplace, these gesticulators were, by and large, not from the class that commissioned portraiture. The ambience of the courts, so important elsewhere in Europe as the focal points for standards of comportment, with an emphasis always on restraint and the elimination of large movements away from the body, was not such a socially formative factor in the northern Netherlands, and indeed there is a dearth of new etiquette books after Erasmus's until adaptations of Antoine de Courtin's French manual at the end of the seventeenth century.\(^\text{85}\) It is possible that the greater social and gender equality of Netherlandish society might have bred the urge in those holding power to accentuate the symbols of their hegemony and the respect due to their guardianship? How does one correlate this with the similar self-possessive body language lent(?) by Van Dyck to his noble English and Italian sitters?

Finally, were seventeenth-century Dutch burghers more aggressive in their manners than Netherlanders 100 years previously? While it may well be so for the specific case of military imagery, I can hardly think that it was so for Dutch husbands. Here the changes in the artistic prism may be the operative factor.

In this connection we cannot conclude without momentarily considering the limits of our pictorial evidence, a significant aspect of which is the historical shifts in the aesthetic predispositions
which inform visual imagery at any given period, and how these influence our perception of the mores we take to be reflected in the seeming naturalism of these paintings, more exactly what would appear to be the increasing level of aggression in male gestures. Important here are the shifts in the perception of pictorial illusion, of the function of the picture plane in contributing to the sense of a spatial continuum between the viewer and the man or narrative portrayed. In a simple representative contrast of the Nativity from the Paumgartner Altarpiece by Diirer (figure 5.3) of about 1503 and Caravaggio's Supper at Emmaus (see figure 5.20) of roughly 100 years later we are aware of dramatic differences in the perception of space. In the earlier composition the viewer is involved by being drawn into the rational illusionistic space back beyond the 'window' (in contemporary parlance) of the picture plane. While by the time of Pontormo's Cosimo the taste for more complicated rhythms would accommodate the effrontery of the ducal elbow, it is only in early seventeenth-century painting, so often characterized by thrusting rhythms challenging the picture plane, that the male elbow could reach its provocative apogee. Typically in Caravaggio's melodramatic, even alarming compositions the spatial continuum extends, even bursts out, into our space involving us in the emotive experience whether we want to be or not. The coarse figures shock with their gaggle of elbows rudely thrust upon us as Caravaggio surely intended. Whether conceived by Dürer, Pontormo, or Hals, the evolving interpretation of body language remains wedded to the evolution of contemporary aesthetic tastes.

A part of the fascination of expressive elbows is that such natural gestures, as opposed to more ritualistic ones, remain just as integrally a part of our own repertory – though not of our conscious conventions – and therefore are intriguing to decipher. While we today are not critical of men or 'even' women who habitually put their hands to their hips and make no associations with the military, the urge to make the gesture and to react intuitively to it goes unabated.
NOTES

An initial interpretation of some of this material was first given at the Toronto Renaissance and Reformation Colloquium, *The Language of Gesture in the Renaissance* in 1983 but was not published with the proceedings. Bibliographic references have been kept to a minimum. Myriad sources including the photographic archives of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistoriche Documentatie in the Hague have been important in establishing a repertory of examples of the various gestural types. However, to make it easier for readers who are not art historians, as many as possible of the works cited in the notes below are illustrated in Bob Haak, *The Golden Age of Dutch Painting* (New York, 1984; hereafter 'Haak'). So many paintings cited belong to the Rijksmuseum or the Historisch Museum in Amsterdam that such locations are given as ARM and AHM, respectively.

3 Erving Goffman's *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (New York, 1959) remains a useful prompt, though the caveats are important. Beginning with his *Masks of Wedlock: Seventeenth Century Dutch Marriage Portraiture* (Ann Arbor, 1982), David Smith has frequently introduced the approaches of sociologists such as Goffman into his interpretations of portraiture. While his interpretations are not always persuasive, his initial premise, that such an approach can offer salient insights, is.
4 Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery.
5 Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.
6 Leiden, Museum De Lakenhal; Haak 577.
7 As those by G van den Eeckhout of 1669 (Lille, Musée des Beaux-Arts; Werner Surnowski, *Gemälde der Rembrandt–Schüler* (5 vols, Landau, 1983), vol. II, 474 (hereafter 'Sumowski')) or an earlier one (The Hague, Dienst voor Verspreide Rijkscollecties; Sumowski 411) or that by F. Bol (The Hague, Gebouw van de Eerste Kamer; Sumowski 93). Cf. Jan Lievens, *Brinio Promoted to General*, 1661 (Former Amsterdam Town Hall, now Royal Palace; Haak 46); F. Bol, *Aeneas Distributing Prizes* c.1662 (Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, on loan from the Dienst voor Verspreide Rijkscollecties; Haak 50); F. Bol, *Three Marys at the Tomb*, 1644 (Copenhagen, Statens Museum; Haak 609).
8 For example the soldiers standing by in Albrecht Dürer's woodcut of *Christ Presented to the People* 1498/9; Claes van der Heck's *The Judgment of Count Willem III of Holland*, 1618 (Alkmaar, Stedelijk Museum; Haak 109); or Adrian van de Venne's *Adoration of the Magi*, 1644 (Stockholm, Nationalmuseum; Haak 705).

9 Occasionally seen in the *Raising of Lazarus*, as that by Carel Fabritius, c.1643 (Warsaw, Muzeum Narodowe; Haak 635) when Christ commands Lazarus to come forth from the grave.

10 London, National Gallery.

11 Florence, the Uffizi.

12 Bouc van seden in *Denkmäler altniederländischer Sprache und Literatur*, ed. E. Kausler (Tiibingen, 1844), lines 660–2.

13 London, National Gallery.

14 Munich, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen. For other military saints similarly characterized in German art: Stefan Lochner, *Altarpiece of the Patron Saints of Cologne*, c.1440 (Cologne, Cathedral); Grienewald, *The Meeting of Sts Erasmus and Maurice*, c.1520 (Munich, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen).


17 John R. Hale 'The soldier in Germanic graphic art of the Renaissance', in *Art and History: Images and their Meaning*, eds R.I. Rotberg and Th.K. Rabb (Cambridge, 1986), p. 87. Though Hale notes the standard-bearer's typical 'strutting' and notes his importance as one whose role signalled him out for artistic attention in military imagery of the first decades of the sixteenth century, lie does not further comment on the possible attributive function of gestures. More recently Keith Mosey, in his *Peasants, Warriors and Wives*, pp. 69–72, comments instructively on ways in which the standard-bearer in sixteenth-century German prints of military mercenary life, as Erhard Schön's *A Column of Mercenaries*, may serve as the symbol of the virility of the company and therefore of the cause it serves. Mosey's concerns do not encompass such sign systems of body language as are here discussed.

18 As Christopher Amberger, *Christoph Baumgärtner*, 1543 (Vienna,
Kunsthistorisches Museum) or various portraits of the Duke of Alva, e.g. by an unidentified artist in the AHM.

19 Malibu, the J. Paul Getty Museum. See most recently the discussion of the pose as a 'Landsknecht' in the separate catalogue of its sale by Christie's, New York, 31 May 1989.

20 Rome, Galleria Nazionale.

21 The most specifically applicable secondary text consulted on manners was Pieter Spierenburg, Elites and Etiquette: Mentality and Social Structure in the Early Modern Northern Netherlands (Rotterdam, 1981) which takes as its point of departure Norbert Elias's influential work Über den Prozess der Zivilisation: Soziogenetische und psycho-genetische Untersuchungen (2 vols, Basel, 1939).

22 From the 1540 English translation A Lytell Booke of Good Maners for Chyldeyn by Robert Whitinton. The majority of uses from c.1400 on of the term 'arm akimbo' (source obscure) cited by the Oxford English Dictionary imply dominance or defiance; as English seems to be unique in having such a specific word, tracing the occasions of the gesture in other literature has thus far proved unfruitful.


24 Some of the quotations are taken out of context and do not, in the original text, appear to imply criticism.

25 John Bulwer, Chirologia: or the Naturall Language of the Hand... Whereunto is added Chironomia: or the Art of Manuall Rhetoricke (2 vols, London 1644), chapter on 'Certain prevarications against the rule of rhetorical decorum...', section 9.

26 The Hague, Gerneentemuseum; Haak 459.

27 Paris, private collection; Rembrandt Research Project (hereafter 'RRP'), A Corpus of Paintings by Rembrandt, vol. III (Dordrecht, 1989), cat. A120, with references to early seventeenth century portraits of standard-bearers. However it should be noted that the man is wearing a gorget, which a 'Landsknecht' standard-bearer would not have worn. Rembrandt may not have known this; alternatively, he knew exactly what he was doing and delighted in the historical mixing of past and present. More generic imagery: G. van den Eeckhout, Two Soldiers in an Inn, 1673 (Amsterdam, private collection; Sumowski 518) or G. Dou, Officer with a Flag and Weapons (Budapest, Szepműveszet Muzeum; Sumowski 268). The flag-bearer is hardly the only officer to sport this gesture in scenes of military life.
28 London, Wallace Collection; Haak 477.
29 Prague, Narodni Galerie; Seymour Slive, Frans Hals (Washington, 1989) (hereafter, 'Hals'), 62.
31 ARM. Cf. his *Cornelis Pompe* van Meerdevoort (*The Netherlands, Private collection; Sumowski* 872).
32 ARM; Haak 914.
33 ARM; Haak 475.
34 ARM. Compare Van der Helst's *Michiel Adriaensz. de Ruyter, Vice Admiral of Zeeland, Holland and West-Friesland* from 1667 commemorating his defeat of the English (ARM; Haak 48); F. Bol's portrait of de Ruyter, 1668 (Copenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst; Sumowski 177).
35 Rotterdam, the Boymans van Beuningen Museum: Sumowski 146.
36 For example the depiction of the General Pyrrhus in F. Bol's *Intrepidity of Gaius Fabricius Lucinus in Pyrrhus' Camp* (Amsterdam, Former Town Hall and now Royal Palace; Haak 760).
37 Amsterdam, private collection.
39 Anonymous artist (Hatfield House).
41 E. van de Velde, *Garden Party 1615* (ARM; Haak 380); Pieter Quast, *Merry Company* (Hamburg, Kunsthalle; Haak 707).
42 A review of the theories on why this should be so would carry me far beyond the purposes of this essay.
43 Most recently: M. Carasso-Kok and J. Levy-van Halm (eds), *Schutters in Holland, kracht en zenuwen van de stad* (cat. Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem, 1988; hereafter *Schutters*) with bibliography, and Hals.
46 AHM. Representative sampling of Amsterdam militia pieces focusing similarly on the flag-bearer: Nicolaes Eliasz., *Company of Capt. Jan van Vlooswijk, 1642* (ARM; Haak 625); F. Hals, *Company of Capt. Reynier Reael*, completed by Pieter Codde (ARM; Haak 482); A. van Nieulandt and Claes Lastman, Capt. *Abraham Boom with a
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**detachment** sent in 1622 to defend Zwolle, 1623 (AHM; Haak 62); P. Mooreelse, *Officers of the Amsterdam Company of Capt. Jacob Hoynck*, 1616 (ARM); G. Flinck, *Company of Capt. Albert Bas*, 1645 (ARM; Haak 623).

47 ARM; Haak 621.

48 For example: C. Anthonisz., *Banquet of Amsterdam Civic Guard*, 1533 (AHM; Haak 185); Dirck Jacobsz, *17 Members of the Amsterdam Civic Guard*, 1529 (ARM; Haak 183). See also Schutters.


52 Christian Tumpel, ‘De Amsterdamse schuttersstukken’ in Schutters, especially pp. 87–101, on the evolution of the companies from 1575 and also of the compositional format of the portraits. Tümpel’s fine observations on the visual language of these pieces do not extend to the questions raised here.

53 Flinck (AHM; Sumowski II, 717), Van der Helst (ARM; Haak 190).

54 H. Pot, *Officers of the St. Adrian Company, Haarlem*, c.1630 (FHM; Haak 376).

55 Thomas de Keyser’s *The Four Burgermasters of Amsterdam* (AHM) is interesting because of the gestural jockeying for dominance between four men equal in power.

56 ARM. Other examples: Pieter van Anradt’s *Regents of the Oude Zijds Huiszittenhuis*, 1675 (ARM Haak 864); Jan de Bray *Regents of the Children’s Charity Home*, 1663 (FHM; Haak 801). Other examples: Van der Helst, *Regents of the Walloon Orphanage*, 1637 (Amsterdam, Maison Descartes; Haak 617); Hals, *Regents of the Old Men’s Almshouse, Haarlem*, 1664, (FHM; Haak 798, Hals 85); Jan de Baen, *Directors of the United East India Company, Hoorn*, (Hoorn, Westfries Museum; Haak 1001); F. Bol, *Regents of the Leper Asylum, Amsterdam*, 1649 (AHM; Haak 197); J. Backer, *Regents of the Nieuwe Zijds Huiszittenhuis, Amsterdam*, c.1650 (ARM; Haak 607). One of the most self-assertive of these is Van der Helst’s *Governors of the Archers’ Guild*, 1657 (ARM; Haak 198).

57 ARM; Haak 206. A much later example: Cornelius Troost’s *Inspectors of the Collegium Medicum* 1724 (ARM).

58 The subjects of G. ter Borch’s *Magistracy of Deventer*, 1667 (Town
Hall, Deventer; Haak 47) are, on the other hand, very restrained, as their office would lead one to hope.

59 For example Jacob Backer, *Regentesses of the Burgber Orphanage, Amsterdam*, c.1633 (AHM; Haak 196) or Adriaen Backer’s 1683 portrait of the same body (AHM).


61 Florence, *Palazzo Pitti*.


64 See Lucas Cranach’s companion portraits of *Duke Henry the Pious and Duchess Catherine of Saxony*, 1514 (Dresden, Gemäldegalerie, Staatlich Kunstmuseum).

65 For example: Meccckenem’s engraved series *Couples in Scenes of Daily Life*, c.1495–1503 (Lehrs IX.389.499 and 395.508); Master of the Lake Constance Region, * Allegory of Life and Death*, c.1480 (Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum); Master ES’s engravings: *The Small Garden of Love* (Lehrs 207), *The Garden of Love with Chess Players*, c.1460–5 (Lehrs 214), for which see *Meister E.S.* (Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, 1987; catalogue by Holm Bevers) including in comparison as test ill. 40 a page from a North Italian *Tacuinum sanitatis* (Handbook of health) showing a maiden playing a lyre and a young man seated listening with arm akimbo and hand on upper thigh. There is no comment on the gestures. The configuration of these couples is curiously similar to Master ES’s *Arms of the Passion* (Lehrs 188) in which the shield is supported by Christ at the left with his right hand to his side holding open his wound and the Virgin at the right (Lehrs 188).

66 Antwerp, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten.

67 De Jongh, *Portretten van echten trouw*, p. 46.

68 Cincinnati, The Taft Museum; *Hals*, cat. 63, 64.

69 Washington, National Gallery; *Hals*, cat. 71, 72.

70 Washington, National Gallery.
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Hague, Mauritshuis; De Jongh, Portretten van echt en trouw, fig. 27a; Haak 681). In his portrait of Princess Maria Steward and Prince Willem II, 1647 (ARM; De Jongh, Portretten van echt en trouw, fig. 27b), the royal status of the husband is lower and he is at the right but in spite, or perhaps because of this he is particularly militantly presented with half-armour, left arm akimbo (away from his bride) and with his right, gloved hand smartly bracing his commander's baton against his upper right thigh.

72 New York, Frick collection, c.1658.
73 Private collection; Haak 785, 786.
75 Leidse Universiteit, C5, and C6.
76 This perspective offers intriguing insights into the aggressive–passive body language of Hans Holbein's double portrait of Jean de Dinteville and Georges de Selve, 1533 (London, The National Gallery).
77 Berlin, (Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz), Gemäldegalerie.
78 Selected examples: P. Soutman (attr.) Berestyn Family, c.1630–1 (Paris, Louvre; Haak 175); A. van Ostade, Family Group, 1654 (Paris, Louvre; Haak 179); Caspar Netscher, Family Group, 1667 (Rotterdam, Museum Boymans–Van Beuningen; De Jongh, Portretten van echt en trouw, cat. 59); Henrick ten Oever, Family Group, 1669 (Zwolle, Overijssels Museum; De Jongh, Portretten van echt en trouw, cat. 60; Haak 866); Jan Mijns Molenær, Music-making Family (Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum; De Jongh, Portretten van echt en trouw, cat. 69); Abraham van den Tempel, Family Group (Leiden, prentenkabinet der Rijksuniversiteit; De Jongh, Portretten van echt en trouw, fig. 11).

The formula is frequently encountered in the following centuries in American and English painting influenced by Netherlandish types, for example John Singleton Copley's Sir William Pepperrell and his Family, 1778 (Raleigh, North Carolina Museum of Art).
79 Vienna, Akademie der bildenden Künste (De Jongh, Portretten van echt en trouw, fig. 37f). On fruit, see De Jongh Portretten van echt en trouw, under cat. 37.
80 Jacob Cuyp, Family Portrait, 1631 (Lille, Musée des Beaux Arts; Haak 727); Frans Hals, Family Group in a Landscape, c.1648 (Castagnola-Lugano, Thyssen-Bornemisza; Hals cat. 67); Jan Mijtens, Mr. Willem van den Kerckhoven en zijn gezin, 1652 (The Hague, Gemeentemuseum; De Jongh, Portretten van echt en trouw, cat. 52); Herman Doncker, Family in a Dune Landscape (location unknown; De Jongh, Portretten van echt en trouw, fig. 30a); Wybrand de Geest,
The Verspreck Family of Leeuwarden 1621 (Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie; Haak 465).

81 Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery; discussed in Spicer, 'Jaunty soldiers and good husbands'.

82 Wilton House, Wiltshire, collection of the Earl of Pembroke.

83 Herman Doncker, Two Brothers in a Landscape (Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery; Spicer, 'Jaunty soldiers and good husbands'); Rubens, Albert and Nicolaas Rubens (Vaduz, Prince of Liechtenstein) in which Albert has his right hand on his hip, and his left arm around his brother.

84 On Rembrandt's patrons see G. Schwartz, Rembrandt His Life, His Paintings (New York, 1985) and S. Alpers, Rembrandt's Enterprise (Chicago 1988); for Haarlem see Pieter Biesboer, 'The burghers of Haarlem and their portrait painters' in Hals.
