

# Samuel van Hoogstraten as Rembrandt's teaching assistant

Jochem van Eijsden, Bader Fellow, The Rembrandt House Museum

**How to cite:** Jochem van Eijsden (2024). Samuel van Hoogstraten as Rembrandt's teaching assistant. *Kroniek van het Rembrandthuis* 2024/25, 7-21, <https://doi.org/10.48296/KvhR2024.02>

## Introduction: "When I was still a disciple"

In his *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst* (1678), Samuel van Hoogstraten calls himself a "*discipel*" (pupil), when referring to his time with Rembrandt,<sup>1</sup> between circa 1642 and 1647. For a long time, this was seen as the sole extent of his role during this period. Later art historians (Werner Sumowski, Jonathan Bikker and David de Witt) opted for another dimension: that of Rembrandt's teaching assistant, during the last four years of his stay.<sup>2</sup> In the context of the recent exhibition and research project on Van Hoogstraten (Kunsthistorisches Museum Vienna, Rembrandt House Museum, and RKD),<sup>3</sup> the notion of an assistantship following his pupilship has become commonplace.<sup>4</sup> However, there are no documented *assistenten* (assistants) in painters workshops in seventeenth-century Holland.<sup>5</sup> *Leerlingen* (pupils) and *gezellen* (journeymen) though, are well attested. All three roles imply a subordinate position,<sup>6</sup> and an assistant role could still be assumed by Van Hoogstraten in his capacity as a pupil, but the idea of an assistant may equally connote remuneration and professional skill. This suggests that he may have served as a journeyman, a capacity not yet considered. This article examines how Van Hoogstraten's possible role, articulated in the literature as a "teaching assistant", in Rembrandt's workshop should be understood, based on guild regulations, dictionary entries, archival documents, and artworks.

### 1.1 The rules

In order to clarify Van Hoogstraten's proposed assistant role, it is helpful to examine the implications of the use of the term "assistant" for his probable *de jure* role (pupil or journeyman) in the context of a seventeenth-century Amsterdam painter's workshop. The most formal reference point for understanding Van Hoogstraten's position with Rembrandt is the ordinances of the Amsterdam Guild of Saint Luke.<sup>7</sup> An eighteenth-century ordinance book states that Amsterdam-based pupils (called "*leerjongens*") had to be registered with the guild and serve a pupilship for the minimum of two years.<sup>8</sup> Journeymen (called "*(werk)gesellen*" and "*knechts*" - servants or hands),<sup>9</sup> are described simply as working: no minimum term or registration requirement is mentioned.<sup>10</sup> Both pupils and journeymen had to appear with a master at the guild office upon arrival in the city and pay a fee of ten stivers.<sup>11</sup> Journeymen who failed to find employment received reimbursement for travel and lodging expenses.<sup>12</sup> This was effectively a refund of the ten stivers.

The guild ordinances, however, do not further define the terms pupils and journeyman. The Dutch-Latin dictionary *Etymologicum Teutonicae Linguae* (1599), offers some clarification through contemporary synonyms. The term "*leerlinck*" is translated as "*discipulus*", which is also the Latin translation given for "*leerkind*", "*leer-ionghe*", "*leerknecht*", and "*discipel*".<sup>13</sup> The phrase "*gheselle van een ampt*" (journeyman in a trade) is translated in Latin as "*collega*" (colleague),<sup>14</sup> while "*knecht*" - synonym for "*dienaer*" (servant) - is translated as "*servus*", "*famulus*", "*minister*", and "*puer*".<sup>15</sup> In correspondence with the regulations in the guild ordinances, a journeyman painter was a trained practitioner working in someone else's

employ. This fits with the profile of a documented example: Louis du Prêt. In 1624, at around the age of thirty-five, this painter was described as a “*knecht*” of portraitist Cornelis van der Voort.<sup>16</sup> Among his colleagues however, Du Prêt was an esteemed connoisseur of Italian painting.<sup>17</sup>

## 1.2 The practice

Moreover, the guild ordinances do not clearly specify the distinct roles or tasks of pupils and journeymen. As Ronald de Jager (1990) has shown, surviving contracts between master painters and young aspiring ones also rarely distinguish between these functions.<sup>18</sup> Broadly speaking, all young men in a master painter’s studio were expected to be diligent and obedient, to paint, to prepare materials, and to act only with permission.<sup>19</sup> While a distinction between pupil and journeyman evidently existed, the official period of pupilship appears to have been prolonged in seventeenth-century Amsterdam, as we will see. De Jager already notes that artistic training was generally lengthy and often consisted of an initial phase of about four years, followed by a second, concluding phase of approximately two.<sup>20</sup> Despite the diversity of contracts, a rough trajectory from novice pupil to experienced journeyman in Amsterdam can be discerned, comparable to a line emerging from a scatter plot. This will help to estimate Van Hoogstraten’s formal role in Rembrandt’s workshop.

The starting point is the 1626 agreement in which fourteen-year-old Gerrit Willemsz Horst began a six-year pupilship with Anthony Lust.<sup>21</sup> In the contract, the term “*dienaer*” is consistently crossed out and replaced by “*leerknecht*”.<sup>22</sup> Horst’s age, title and (remarkably long) contract mark him as a typical novice. A next step in pupilship is found in the 1635 contract of Adriaen Carman, who at seventeen became Isaac Isaacsz’ “*leerknecht*” for two years. Though also described as a “*dienaer*”, Carman was taught painting and related skills, prepared canvases, and ground pigments.<sup>23</sup> No tuition or wage was paid; instead, Carman’s father annually gifted Isaacsz a small barrel of herring or stockfish, worth about twelve guilders,<sup>24</sup> modest compared to common fees.<sup>25</sup> He thus appears to have occupied a position virtually between pupil and journeyman. Notably, Carman was permitted to create his own work: one painting per year on a *daelder* (Dutch silver thaler) size canvas or panel (c. 123 × 92 cm).<sup>26</sup>

## 1.3 Learning on the job

A typical journeyman was Markus Waltusz. Although this twenty-one-year-old entered into service with Bartholomeus van der Helst as a “*discipel*” in 1652, he did so for a daily wage of ten and a half stivers. His duties included painting, keeping shop, and following orders. Van der Helst was to instruct him.<sup>27</sup> While not explicitly referred to as a journeyman, Waltusz effectively functioned as one: he got paid,<sup>28</sup> was hired for only a year (shorter than permitted for pupils), and had already been described as a painter six months earlier at the time of his marriage.<sup>29</sup> A final example, at the endpoint of the progression from pupil to journeyman, is the 1649 contract between Gerardus van Berleborch and Lambertus Jansz de Hue,<sup>30</sup> both referred to as “*schilder*” (painter). Van Berleborch entered De Hue’s service for one year at fifteen stivers per day, with restrictions on painting for himself or others except on Sundays and during the time of one free month.<sup>31</sup>

The case of Waltusz (and to some extent Carman) illustrates that in Amsterdam, one could functionally be a journeyman while remaining contractually a pupil. Masters and guilds appear to have prolonged pupil status as much as possible. This seems to reflect a broader development from the late sixteenth to the early eighteenth century.<sup>32</sup> A 1766 publication compiling all known Amsterdam guild regulations shows that in 1553, masters were limited to two pupils,<sup>33</sup> and by 1579, journeymen were required to pay a weekly fee of one half or one stiver, depending on their wages.<sup>34</sup> Such distinctions between pupils and journeymen

are absent in the abovementioned ordinance book.<sup>35</sup> This practice of gradually blurring the boundaries between pupils and journeyman, and extending the pupilship period, makes it convincing that Van Hoogstraten formally remained a pupil throughout his time with Rembrandt, even if he may already have taken on responsibilities more typical of a journeyman, or even a master.

#### **1.4 Early signs**

The fact that Carman, as a pupil, and Van Berleborch, as a journeyman, were allowed to produce independent work invites addressing a complicating aspect of Van Hoogstraten's time in Rembrandt's workshop: between 1644 and 1647, Van Hoogstraten made and signed paintings, one or two works per year.<sup>36</sup> It has previously been argued that only master painters were entitled to sign their work, as a mark of completed training.<sup>37</sup> This view is primarily based on guild regulations from The Hague and Utrecht dating to the 1650s,<sup>38</sup> the only known ordinances of their kind. No such rule appears to have existed in Amsterdam. There, both pupils and journeymen (with their master's consent) could produce independent work. Moreover, some Amsterdam contracts specify who owned the work produced by pupils,<sup>39</sup> suggesting such arrangements were negotiable. Clearly, attitudes in Amsterdam differed from those in The Hague and Utrecht.

Although Carman's is the only known pupil with such an production arrangement, among the scarce surviving pupil-master contracts from Amsterdam, it is possible that Van Hoogstraten – who as a pupil produced around two small-format paintings per year (ranging from 54 × 45 cm to 74 × 48 cm, *grote stooter* (groat) to *tien stuiver* (ten stivers) size),<sup>40</sup> but roughly adding up to a *daelder* size – had had a similar opportunity as Carman. De Witt and Leonore van Sloten have already noted that Van Hoogstraten's early works display a distinctly personal character,<sup>41</sup> suggesting they may not have been intended for open-market sale, or made on commission. So even if Amsterdam guild practice held that only masters sell signed work, such production might have gone unnoticed by the guild. In any case, Van Hoogstraten's early signed and dated paintings offer little indication that he was a master; he probably created them while still a pupil.

#### **2.1 A teaching pupil**

In the literature, the idea of Van Hoogstraten as Rembrandt's teaching assistant has largely relied on the suggestion that he gave painting instructions to Drost while still working in Rembrandt's studio. Although this notion is convincing of itself – based on the proposed stylistic similarities between the two artists' works – it remains just one example.<sup>42</sup> However, recent research by the author into the life and work of Barent Fabritius now provides further support for the notion of Van Hoogstraten as a teaching pupil within Rembrandt's workshop, this time in the domain of drawing. Fabritius is likely to have spent some years of his training in Rembrandt's studio, approximately between 1645 and 1647, just as his elder brother Carel a few years before. This is primarily based on the evidence of Barent Fabritius's early drawings, which also reveal a striking affinity with works by Van Hoogstraten from the latter half of the 1640s.<sup>43</sup>

Although Barent Fabritius is generally not considered a pupil of Rembrandt in the most recent literature on him,<sup>44</sup> several of his early drawings do suggest his presence in Rembrandt's workshop. The most important of these is a copy after Rembrandt's painting *Susanna and the Elders*. Fabritius reproduced the painting faithfully (figs. 1 and 2). There are some differences between the copy and the original, and technical examination of the painting indicates that the drawing must have been made after an intermediate stage in the painting's creation, in 1646 or 1647.<sup>45</sup> At that moment it was a direct copy. In fact, it was so precise, it shows that Rembrandt was still at work on the painting: he was in the process of

correcting the position of Susanna's left foot.<sup>46</sup> The painting must therefore have been present in the studio at the time the drawing was made – when Van Hoogstraten was also



Fig 1. Attributed to Barent Fabritius, *Susanna and the Elders*, c. 1646-1647. Pen and brown ink, washed with red and grey, on paper, 178 x 238 mm. Budapest, Szépművészeti Múzeum, inv. no. 1737.

Fig 2. Rembrandt, *Susanna and the Elders*, 1647. Oil on panel, 76.6 x 92.8 cm. Berlin, Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 828D.

active here.

## 2.2 Drawing inspiration

The Susanna drawing thus originated in Rembrandt's studio, yet notably, Fabritius did not adopt Rembrandt's drawing style. The drawings currently attributed to Rembrandt from the second half of the 1650's are characterized by a more sketchily approach, in solely black ink and chalk.<sup>47</sup> Fabritius appears to have been inspired instead by Van Hoogstraten. Several of Fabritius's drawings were at one point even attributed to him.<sup>48</sup> Shared characteristics include doll-like figures, a pictorial rendering in a full tonal range, and use of varied materials (fig. 3 and fig 4). In the early part of the second half of the 1640s, both artists employed



Fig 3. Attributed to Barent Fabritius, *The Departure of the Prodigal Son*, c. 1650. Chalk, red chalk, pen in black ink, brush in black and red, 198 x 320 mm. Städel Museum, Frankfurt am Main, inv. no. 817 Z.

Fig 4. Samuel van Hoogstraten, *Balaam blesses the Israelites*, c. 1646. Pen in grey, brush in grey, red chalk, grey wash, heightened with white, 174 x 309 mm. London, The British Museum, inv. no. 1895,0915.1175.

multiple media, especially red chalk. Van Hoogstraten though used it more prominently, primarily in the initial layout and contours of the figures. Barent applied it more sparingly, mainly for accentuation and detailing. There are also differences in how each artist created hounding in their drawings.<sup>49</sup> Fabritius typically developed the background in chalk, leaving it more indistinct in order to achieve a convincing atmospheric perspective.<sup>50</sup> Van Hoogstraten tended to work more sketchily with a fine pen in the backgrounds, while rendering the foreground with greater precision.

Van Hoogstraten's role as his drawing instructor becomes apparent in Fabritius's *Rest on the Flight into Egypt* (fig. 5).<sup>51</sup> The drawing's chaotic character stems from the variety of materials, linework, and especially the coexistence of different drawing styles. It appears to have been corrected - there are even two Josephs - confirmed by handwritten suggestions on the verso, strikingly rare among Rembrandt and his pupils.<sup>52</sup> In the corrections, the angular black pen lines in Joseph's face are particularly telling, echoing Van Hoogstraten's figural stylizations, such as the sharp nasal bridge and long, slightly arched eyebrows seen in his drawings from around 1647 (Table 1).<sup>53</sup> The "second", more sketch-like Joseph is faint, but resembles Van Hoogstraten's looser sketched works of the period: the lobed coiffure and broken, scratchy contour of the left shoulder recall those of Joseph in his *Adoration of the Shepherds* (c. 1647), while the facial features echo the peering Zechariah in Van Hoogstraten's *Visitation* (1646/1648). That the drawing at the basis of the Dresden sheet is in fact by Fabritius, is evident from, among other things, the dark grey washes and broad zigzag hatching in the shadow areas.<sup>54</sup> These features closely resemble those found in Barent's *Susanna and the Elders*. In addition, the restrained use of red chalk - in the Dresden drawing for instance applied on the donkey, is comparable in its seemingly arbitrary application for emphasis and detail in the two drawings. The text on the back is possible too by Barent's hand.<sup>55</sup>



Fig 5. (Here) attributed to Barent Fabritius and Samuel van Hoogstraten, *The Rest on the Flight into Egypt*, c. 1646-1647. Black chalk, pen in brown and grey ink, grey wash, red chalk, and white heightening, 195 × 223 mm. Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kupferstich-Kabinett, inv. no. c 1443r.



Table 1.

**u.l.:** detail from fig 5.

**u.ctr.:** detail from fig 4.

**l.l.:** detail from fig 5.

**l.ctr.:** Samuel van Hoogstraten, *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, c. 1646-1647. Black chalk, pen in brown, red chalk, brown wash, brush in brown, heightened with white, 153 × 204 mm. Hamburg, Hamburger Kunsthalle, inv. no. 22050.

**l.r.:** Samuel van Hoogstraten, *The Visitation*, c. 1646-1648. Pen in brown, red chalk, brown wash, brush in brown, 72 × 88 mm. Amsterdam, Amsterdam Museum, inv. no. TA 10153.

### 2.3 Dual master

Taking a step back, it is striking that three key elements in the two drawings by Fabritius discussed here are echoed in Van Hoogstraten's discussion of drawing in his *Inleyding*: the value of copying paintings as a means of sharpening perception and understanding composition;<sup>56</sup> the didactic function of corrections in the drawing itself;<sup>57</sup> and the painterly quality of red chalk drawing.<sup>58</sup> Combined with stylistic affinities and the presence of corrections by Van Hoogstraten in one of Fabritius's sheets, this suggests a pedagogical relationship between them, likely dating to 1645-1647. Additionally, these principles appear to have been situated within the context of Rembrandt's workshop. Fabritius's Dresden drawing is closely related to an undated sketch by Rembrandt in Berlin with the same subject, and the annotations on Fabritius's sheet are in turn visualized by Rembrandt himself (fig. 6).<sup>59</sup> While Van Hoogstraten's role in Fabritius's training seems more direct, Rembrandt, too, appears to have contributed to his artistic development.



Fig 6. Attributed to Rembrandt, *The Rest on the Flight into Egypt*, c. 1647. Pen and brown ink on paper, 126 × 203 mm. Berlin, Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. no. KdZ 5262.

The three-way artistic relationship between Fabritius, Rembrandt and Van Hoogstraten is likewise revealed in Fabritius's drawing of *The Adoration of the Shepherds* in Leiden (fig. 7) The drawing closely relates to Van Hoogstraten's painting of the same subject from 1647, almost certainly created in Amsterdam (fig. 8).<sup>60</sup>



Fig 7. Attributed to Barent Fabritius, *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, c. 1647. Black and red chalk, pen in brown, brown wash heightened with white, 193 × 248 mm. Leiden, Leiden University, inv. no. PK-T-AW-274.



Fig 8. Samuel van Hoogstraten, *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, 1647. Oil on panel, 58.2 × 70.8 cm. Dordrechts Museum, Dordrecht, inv. no. DM/980/567.

Striking similarities include a figure lifting the cloth in the manger like a crumpled rag, the half-height wooden partition on the right, and the wide-brimmed hat. The shepherd seen from the back is derived from the figure of Saint John the Evangelist in Van Hoogstraten's drawing *The Crucifixion* (fig. 9).<sup>61</sup> At the same time, Fabritius seems to have drawn inspiration from Rembrandt's *Tobit and Anna with the Kid* from 1645–46 (fig. 10), echoing the lighting from the left, the slanted shanty roof in the upper right, and the seated figure right of center. Thematically and compositionally, the drawing also resonates with Rembrandt's *The Dream of Joseph* (fig. 11).



Fig 9. Attributed to Samuel van Hoogstraten, *The Crucifixion*, c. 1649, Pen in brown, brown wash, brush in brown, heightened with white, 155 × 150 mm. Bremen, Kunsthalle Bremen, 1951/385.



Fig 10. Rembrandt, *The Wife of Tobias with the Goat*, 1645. Oil on panel, 21.5 × 16.5 cm. Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 828F.



Fig 11. Rembrandt, *The Dream of Joseph*, 1645. Oil on panel, 52 × 41 cm. Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 828E.

## 2.4 Primus inter pares

In the context of the idea that Van Hoogstraten remained a pupil throughout his time with Rembrandt, it is worth pointing to evidence that he was still in training between 1644 and 1647. In 1646, he made a drawing of *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, after a painting Rembrandt made for the Passion series, commissioned by Stadtholder Frederik Hendrik.<sup>62</sup> Several comparable drawings by other Rembrandt pupils from around 1646 survive.<sup>63</sup> Fabritius's *Susanna and the Elders* is not unique in this regard. During this same period, figure drawing from nude models also took place in Rembrandt's workshop. Three such drawings by pupils and an etching by the master himself, *The Walking Trainer* (B 194), attest to this practice.<sup>64</sup> One of the pupil drawings has long been attributed to Van Hoogstraten (fig. 12); another, long unattributed (fig. 13),<sup>65</sup> appears to be by Barent Fabritius.<sup>66</sup> Around 1646, Van Hoogstraten thus participated in group training exercises alongside Fabritius – at a similar level, even while giving him drawing instruction.



Fig 12. Attributed to Samuel van Hoogstraten, *Standing Nude Man*, c. 1646. Pen in brown, brown wash, white gouache, 247 x 155 mm. Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. RF 4713 recto.



Fig 13. (Here) attributed to Barent Fabritius, *Standing Nude Man*, c. 1646. Pen in brown, brown wash, white gouache, 252 x 193 mm. London, The British Museum, inv. no. Oo.9.94.

There is no evidence that around 1645 other Rembrandt pupils were correcting each other's work. It is therefore justified to assume that peer correction was not standard practice in the studio, and that Van Hoogstraten acted as *primus inter pares* - a pupil with teaching responsibilities. This raises the question whether his role was unique in the history of Rembrandt's studio, or if there were predecessors or successors. A possible predecessor may have been Van Hoogstraten's fellow Dordrecht native Ferdinand Bol.<sup>67</sup> Although Bol already referred to himself as a painter in Dordrecht as early as 1635, he worked in Rembrandt's studio in the late 1630s, which is usually considered a pupilship.<sup>68</sup> Only from 1642 onward does he seem to produce works typical of a master painter.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, Bol appears to have influenced later Rembrandt pupils, such as Carel Fabritius.<sup>70</sup> So, while no direct evidence has been found, Bol may have served as a functional forerunner to Van Hoogstraten.<sup>71</sup> At a later stage in his career, Van Hoogstraten appears to have implemented a similar system in his own studio. Arnold Houbraken was, according to himself, the eldest pupil among Van Hoogstraten's disciples and had a room of his own.<sup>72</sup>

### **Conclusion: Once a disciple, always a disciple**

Recent scholarship has argued that Samuel van Hoogstraten, after starting a pupilship with Rembrandt in 1642, became an "assistant" in the studio from 1644, until 1647, entrusted with teaching pupils and producing his own work. While this may imply the status of a journeyman, it is unlikely that Van Hoogstraten attained that position. In the course of the seventeenth century, extended pupilship (with some privileges) appeared to be favored over journeymanship in Amsterdam. Van Hoogstraten thus likely remained, in formal terms, a pupil under Rembrandt. The idea of Van Hoogstraten being a teaching assistant instructing his peers, as a *primus inter pares*, is further substantiated by evidence that he provided drawing instruction to Barent Fabritius. His early drawn works reveal corrections by Van Hoogstraten, but also stylistic affinities with him, and pedagogical principles later articulated by him in his *Inleyding*. The close parallels between Fabritius's drawings and Rembrandt's

works further underscore that this happened under the supervision of Rembrandt. Van Hoogstraten thus emerges as a key figure mediating Rembrandt's pedagogy within the workshop, in the capacity of a pupil. Whether other pupils before or after him adopted comparable roles remains an open question, meriting further research.

---

I would like to thank David de Witt for his help, advice and expertise.

<sup>1</sup> Samuel van Hoogstraten, *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst: anders de zichtbaere werelt*, Rotterdam 1678, p. 18. Van Hoogstraten here refers to the period when he was "still a disciple", during which, as part of a "we", he and others discussed a particular question, to which a certain "Fabritius" responded with an answer. It is generally assumed that this refers to Carel Fabritius, who is assumed to have studied with Rembrandt between approximately 1641 and 1643.

<sup>2</sup> Werner Sumowski described Van Hoogstraten as "*pädagogisch begabt, Assistent Rembrandts gewesen*" (Werner Sumowski, *Gemälde der Rembrandt-Schüler II*, Landau/Pfalz 1984, p. 1286). As supporting evidence, Sumowski argued that Van Hoogstraten corrected drawings by Constantijn Daniël van Renesse (; p. 1290, nt. 2). When discussing one of these drawings (*Moses and Reuel's Daughters at the Well*, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-T-1893-A-2782) Sumowski suggested the possibility that "Samuel van Hoogstraten acted as assistant to the master on occasional trips even at a later date". (Werner Sumowski, *Drawings of the Rembrandt School IX*, New York 1985, no. 2159\*). Building on this, Jonathan Bikker suggested in his monograph on Willem Drost that Van Hoogstraten "might have supervised Drost during his early days in Rembrandt's studio" (Jonathan Bikker, *Willem Drost, A Rembrandt Pupil in Amsterdam and Venice*, New Haven/London 2005, p. 11). David de Witt later observed, in his Abraham van Dijck monograph, concerning Van Hoogstraten: "by 1646 his training would have been complete, but he appears to have stayed on as a tutor or head pupil for several years" (David De Witt, *Life and Work of Late Rembrandt Pupil Abraham van Dijck, c. 1635-1680*, Amsterdam 2020, p. 11).

<sup>3</sup> Sabine Pénot, *Rembrandt - Hoogstraten. Colour and Illusion*, exh. cat. Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, 2024; Nathalie Macieszka, Epcó Runia, *Samuel van Hoogstraten. De Illusionist*, exh. cat. Amsterdam: Rembrandt House Museum, 2025; Sabine van Beek, Leonore van Sloten, David de Witt et al., *Samuel van Hoogstraten: Catalogue Raisonné*, The Hague 2025.

<sup>4</sup> The catalogue of the Vienna exhibition assumes a position for Van Hoogstraten as an assistant for approximately three to four years (Angelina Illes, in: exh. cat. Vienna 2024 (see note 3), p. 29; Jonathan Bikker, in: exh. cat. Vienna 2024 (see note 3), p. 93), though it makes no mention of any teaching responsibilities. These are, however, included in the publication accompanying the exhibition at the Rembrandt House Museum (Michiel Roscam Abbing, in: exh. cat. Amsterdam 2025 (see note 3), p. 19; David De Witt, in: exh. cat. Amsterdam 2025 (see note 3), p. 131), and in the online Van Hoogstraten catalogue raisonné by the RKD (Michiel Roscam Abbing, in: The Hague 2025 (see note 3), "With Rembrandt in Amsterdam". <https://vanhoogstraten.rkd.nl/samuel-van-hoogstraten-the-ingenious-and-poetic-painter/with-rembrandt-in-amsterdam/>, 26 May 2025).

<sup>5</sup> The term "assistant" was used in Holland in the 17th century, albeit in other contexts, see: *Woordenboek Nederlandse taal*, s.v. assistent, <https://gtb.ivdnt.org/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=WNT&id=M004535&lemma=assistent&domein=0&conc=true>, 11 July 2025.

<sup>6</sup> "Een min of meer ondergeschikte helper", a more or less subordinate helper (see note 5); "A person who helps or supports somebody, usually in their job": *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. assistant, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/12041>, 11 July 2025.

<sup>7</sup> The guild archive has been lost. For a comprehensive account of the Amsterdam Guild of Saint Luke and its ordinances, see: Isabella H. van Eeghen, "Schilders of Sint Lucasgilde", in: Isabella H. van Eeghen (ed.), *Inventarissen der archieven van de gilden en van het brouwerscollege*, Amsterdam 1951, *passim.*; Isabella H. van Eeghen (Jasper Hillegers, translator), "The Amsterdam Guild of Saint Luke in the 17th Century", *Journal of Historians for Netherlandish Art* 4.2 (2012), *passim.*, DOI:10.5092/jhna.2012.4.2.4, 11 July 2025. The current article relies exclusively on the guild regulations of the Amsterdam

---

painters' guild. It is often assumed that the regulations of painters' guilds in different Dutch towns did not differ substantially in content. On that assumption, gaps in the regulations of one town might be filled by those of another. However, the discussion later in this article regarding whether apprentices were permitted to produce their own work shows that crucial differences did in fact exist. For that reason, guild regulations from other cities are not used here to fill the gaps in the surviving Amsterdam regulations.

<sup>8</sup> *Extract van de willekeuren en ordonnantien den gilde van St. Lucas verleent*, Amsterdam 1720, p. 11.

<sup>9</sup> *Extract* (see note 8), p. 11; This is also the case in the chapter title and margin of the 1766 publication of all known guild charters: *Ordonnantien en willekeuren van het Lucas-gilde binnen Amsterdam*, Amsterdam 1766, p. 64, 68. It is noteworthy that the dean and headmen of the guild employed a *gilde knecht* (*Extract* (see note 8), pp. 26-27. This was not a pupilship, and the tasks meet the definition of an assistant in the *Oxford English Dictionary* and the *Woordenboek Nederlandse Taal* (see note 6).

<sup>10</sup> *Extract* (see note 8), pp. 12-13.

<sup>11</sup> *Extract* (see note 8), pp. 11-12.

<sup>12</sup> *Extract* (see note 8), p. 12.

<sup>13</sup> Cornelis Kiliaen (ed. Frans Claes), *Etymologicum teutonicae linguae*, Antwerp 1599 (The Hague 1972), p. 278, s.v. leer-ionghe; leer-kind; leer-knecht; leerlinck; p. 703, s.v. discipel. In the regulations of the Haarlem Guild of St. Luke from 1634 (NHA, 1105, Ambachtsgilden te Haarlem (Gilden Haarlem), no. 219), the terms "*leerling*", "*leerjongen*", and "*discipel*" are used. This might suggest that a distinction existed between them, but they are actually used interchangeably. The same applies to the terms "*(werk)gezel*", "*knecht*", and – a new term – "*gast*". The latter is synonymous with journeyman or servant: "*Knecht van een ambachtsman of fabrikant; gezel, werkknecht*"; servant of a tradesman or manufacturer; journeyman, workshop hand: *Woordenboek Nederlandse taal*, s.v. gast, <https://gtb.ivdnt.org/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=WNT&id=M017355.re.35&lemma=werkgast&domein=0&conc=true>, 16 oktober 2025.

<sup>14</sup> Kiliaen, *Etymologicum* (see note 13), p. 139, s.v. ghe-selle van een ampt. The Latin word "*collega*" is likewise a translation for "*ambtgenoot*", "*maet*", and "*vennoot*" (Kiliaen, *Etymologicum* (see note 13), p. 18, s.v. ampt-ghenoot; p. 302, s.v. maet, med-maet, maetken; p. 579, s.v. veyn-out, veyn-noot, ven-noot, vennoot, veyn-gnoot).

<sup>15</sup> Kiliaen, *Etymologicum* (see note 13), p. 244, s.v. knecht, dienaer.

<sup>16</sup> Nicolaas de Roever, "Drie Amsterdamsche Schilders (Pieter Isaaksz, Abraham Vinck, Cornelis van der Voort)", *Oud Holland* 3 (1885), p. 198.

<sup>17</sup> In 1619, he was asked together with several artists who had traveled to Italy, including Pieter Lastman, Adriaen van Nieulandt, and Barent van Someren, to assess the authenticity of a Caravaggio painting from the collection of the late Louis Finson. Abraham Bredius, Nicolaas de Roever, "Pieter Lastman en François Venant", *Oud Holland* 4 (1886), pp. 7-8.

<sup>18</sup> Ronald de Jager "Meester, leerjongen, leertijd. Een analyse van Zeventiende-eeuwse Noord-Nederlandse leerlingcontracten van kunstschilders, goud- en zilversmeden", *Oud Holland* 104 (1990), p. 96, nt. 107. The title of "*gezel*" is, in fact, never mentioned in the known Amsterdam contracts.

<sup>19</sup> De Jager, "Meester" (see note 18), pp. 73-75.

<sup>20</sup> De Jager, "Meester" (see note 18), p. 71.

<sup>21</sup> Stadsarchief Amsterdam (hereafter SAA), 5075, 393A, nots. Jacob Jacobs and Nicolaes Jacobs, ff. 59r-59v, 20-07-1626; Abraham Bredius, "Gerrit Willemsz. Horst", *Oud Holland* 50 (1933), pp. 5-6; De Jager, "Meester" (see note 18), p. 98, no. 7.

<sup>22</sup> This underscores a clear distinction: as was also evidenced by the entries in Kiliaen, *Etymologicum* (see note 13), *dienaer* was a synonym for *knecht*, not for *leerknecht* (see note 15).

<sup>23</sup> Abraham Bredius, *Künstlerinventare. Urkunden zur Geschichte der holländischen Kunst des XVIten, XVIIten und XVIIIten Jahrhunderts V*, The Hague 191, pp. 1482-1483; De Jager, "Meester" (see note 18), p. 98, no. 10.

<sup>24</sup> The value of a barrel of herring in Amsterdam in 1635 was approximately 120 grams of silver (Bo Poulsen, *Dutch Herring. An Environmental History, c. 1600-1860*, Amsterdam 2008, p. 93, table 6.9); in the seventeenth century, ten grams of silver corresponded to the value of roughly one guilder.

<sup>25</sup> The tuition fees in Holland for a two-year contract averaged 61.5 guilders per year (De Jager, "Meester" (see note 18), p. 75).

---

<sup>26</sup> Josua Bruyn, "Een onderzoek naar 17<sup>de</sup>-eeuwse schilderijformaten, voornamelijk in Noord-Nederland", *Oud Holland* 93 (1979), p. 113.

<sup>27</sup> Abraham Bredius, *Kunstlerinventare. Urkunden zur Geschichte der holländischen Kunst des XVten, XVIIten und XVIIIten Jahrhunderts II*, The Hague 1916, pp. 400-401; De Jager, "Meester" (see note 18), p. 98

<sup>28</sup> As a journeyman painter Waltusz earned less than half the daily wage of peers in other trades. In 1652, journeymen carpenters and bricklayers in Amsterdam earned approximately 26 to 27 stivers per summer day (although there are no exact figures for 1651, data is available for 1633, 27 and 25 stivers respectively, and for 1667, 28 and 27 stivers respectively). This disparity between painter's journeymen and their peers in other trades mirrors the situation in 1579. The guild regulations (*gildebrief*) of the St. Luke's Guild from that year mention journeymen earning 4 stivers and others earning 10 stivers per day (*Ordonnantien* (see note 9), p. 17, art. 11). Taking the average of 7 stivers, these were notably low wages – practically half – when compared to the 14 and 12 stivers earned by carpenters and bricklayers, respectively, in that same year. For the wages of the workers mentioned here, see: Hubert Nutseling, *Welvaart en werkgelegenheid in Amsterdam 1540-1860*, Amsterdam/Dieren 1985, p. 252, appendix 5.1, table A.

<sup>29</sup> SAA, DTB 5001, 469, p. 241, 30-09-1651; Judith van Gent, *Bartholomeus van der Helst (circa 1613-1670): een studie naar zijn leven en zijn werk*, Utrecht (Utrecht University), p. 41.

<sup>30</sup> Virtually nothing is known about Gerardus van Berleborch (Bernard Renckens, "G. van Berkborch", *Oud Holland* 84 (1967), no. 4, passim). He or his father was likely from the region around Bad Berleburg in Germany. He appears to have been present in Leiden in 1665, when he is recorded as a witness ("Gerrit van Berleberg") at the baptism of a child of the painter Jacobus Geutkien (Erfgoed Leiden en Omstreken (hereafter ELO), DTB 1004, 237, fol. 236v, 3-12-1665).

<sup>31</sup> SAA, 5075, 875, not. Jacob van Zwieteren, pp. 638-640, 16-10-1649; Johannes G. van Dillen, *Bronnen tot de geschiedenis van het bedrijfsleven en het gildewezen van Amsterdam 1510-1672 III*, p. 540, no. 1057.

<sup>32</sup> A possible reason for this may be that young painters attained the status of master more quickly. This benefited the guild financially, as it earned income only from masters and pupils, not from journeymen.

<sup>33</sup> *Ordonnantien* (see note 9), p. 10, art. 3

<sup>34</sup> *Ordonnantien* (see note 9), p. 17, art. 11.

<sup>35</sup> Joachim von Sandrart's famous anecdote about Rembrandt's studio being filled with "countless elite children", pupils who each paid an annual tuition fee of 100 guilders suggests that the legal limit on the number of pupils was, in practice, a dead letter (Joachim von Sandrart, *Teutsche Academie*, Nuremberg 1675, p. 326; Van Eeghen, "Guild" (see note 7), p. 6).

<sup>36</sup> *Young Man Reading with a Vanitas Still Life*, 1644, oil on panel, 58 x 74 cm, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. no. 1386; *Self-portrait*, 1644, oil on panel, 63 x 48 cm, The Hague, Museum Bredius, inv. no. 056-1946; *Self-portrait*, 1645, oil on panel, 54.1 x 44.8 cm, Liechtenstein, The Princely Collections, Vaduz-Vienna, inv. no. GE 107; *Portrait of a Child*, 1645, oil on panel, 68.6 x 57.8 cm, private collection; *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, 1647, oil on canvas, 58.2 x 70.8 cm, Dordrecht, Dordrechts Museum, inv. no. DM/980/567.

<sup>37</sup> Godefridus J. Hoogewerff, *De geschiedenis van de St. Lucasgilden in Nederland*, Amsterdam 1947, p. 24; Ernst van de Wetering "Problems of Pupilship and Studio Practice" in: Josua Bruyn et al., *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings II: 1631-1634*, Amsterdam 1986, p. 57; Bikker, *Drost* (see note 2), p. 11; Angelina Illes, in: exh. cat. Vienna 2024 (see note 3), p. 29.

<sup>38</sup> Samuel Muller Fz., *Schilders-vereenigingen te Utrecht. Bescheiden uit het Gemeentearchief*, Utrecht 1880, p. 76; Frederik D.O. Obreen, *Archief voor Nederlandsche Kunstgeschiedenis IV*, Rotterdam 1881/1882, p. 51. The very fact that such a regulation had to be instituted in these cities already indicates that works were being signed by non-masters.

<sup>39</sup> De Jager, "Meester" (see note 18), pp. 77-79.

<sup>40</sup> Bruyn, "Onderzoek", (see note 26), p. 113.

<sup>41</sup> David de Witt, Leonore van Sloten, in: The Hague 2025 (see note 3), "Rembrandt's Impact", <https://vanhoogstraten.rkdstudies.nl/catalogus-schilderijen/rembrandts-impact/>, 3 June 2025.

<sup>42</sup> Almost exclusively, reference is made to Bikker, *Drost* (see note 2), p. 11. Also in the exhibition catalogue of the Van Hoogstraten exhibition in Amsterdam, *Drost* is cited as an example of an early student of Van Hoogstraten (David de Witt, in: exh. cat. Amsterdam 2025 (see note 3), p. 131.

<sup>43</sup> Since Daniël Pont's monograph on Barent Fabritius, (Daniël Pont, *Barent Fabritius 1624-1673*, The Hague, 1958) and Sumowski's *Drawings of the Rembrandt School* (see note 2), no subsequent scholarly efforts have systematically

---

reconstructed his drawn oeuvre or analyzed the development of his distinctive style. The author's forthcoming dissertation addresses this lacuna, and catalogues drawings by Barent Fabritius.

<sup>44</sup> Pont was among the first to suggest he may not have been a direct pupil of Rembrandt, but instead only came into contact with Rembrandt's work indirectly, through his brother Carel (Pont, *Barent* (see note 43), p. 96). In the literature, uncertainty on this matter appears to have become the norm, with scholars consistently noting – or implicitly dealing with – the lack of evidence for a formal pupilship with Rembrandt (see: Paul Huys Jansen, Werner Sumowski, *The Hoogsteder Exhibition of Rembrandt's Academy*, exh. cat. The Hague: Hoogsteder & Hoogsteder, 1992, p. 139; Walter A. Liedtke in: Hubert von Sonneburg, *Rembrandt/Not Rembrandt in the Metropolitan Museum of Art I*, exh. cat. New York City: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1995, cat. 48, pp. 145-146; Peter C. Sutton in: Albert Blankert, *Rembrandt. A Genius and his impact*, exh. cat. Melbourne: National Gallery of Victoria; Canberra: National Gallery of Australia, 1997, p. 283; Jan Blanc, *Dans l'atelier de Rembrandt. Le maître et ses élèves*, Paris 2006, p. 140.

<sup>45</sup> Holm Bevers, "Das Susanna-Thema im Werkstattzusammenhang: Zeichnungen", in: Holm Bevers, Katja Kleinert, Claudia Laurenze-Landsberg, *Rembrandts Berliner Susanna und die beiden Alten. Die Schaffung eines meisterwerks*, exh. cat. Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett; Gemäldegalerie, 2015, pp. 49-50.

<sup>46</sup> Katja Kleinert, Claudia Laurenze-Landsberg, "Wandlungen eines Gemäldes. Rembrandts Berliner *Susanna und die beiden Alten*", in: exh. cat. Berlin 2015 (see note 45), p. 19, 32.

<sup>47</sup> See for instance Rembrandt's *Holy Family in the Carpenter's workshop* or his *Star of the Kings* (London, The British Museum, inv. nos. 1900,0824.144, 1910,0212.189).

<sup>48</sup> The drawing of a male model (here attributed to Barent Fabritius) has been described as stylistically very close to Van Hoogstraten (Martin Royalton-Kisch in: *Catalogue of Drawings by Rembrandt and his School*, London: The British Museum, 2010, cat. 71). The *Departure of the Prodigal Son*, a drawing already earlier attributed to Fabritius, is still considered a work by Van Hoogstraten (Frankfurt am Main, Städel Museum, inv. no. 817).

<sup>49</sup> A convincing spatial representation of the scene, achieved through a successful use of proportion, perspective, light, and color. For an elaboration on this definition, including references, see: Leonore van Sloten, "Regels voor de kunst", in: David de Witt, Leonore van Sloten, Jaap van der Veen, *Rembrandts late leerlingen. In de leer bij een genie*, exh. cat. Amsterdam: Rembrandt House Museum, 2015, p. 73, note 31.

<sup>50</sup> In drawings by Barent Fabritius from the second half of the 1640s, his preparatory chalk underdrawing is generally careful and precise but not detailed, with clear, exact contours rendered in continuous, rounded lines. The somewhat squat figures possess a doll-like, slightly caricatural character. When using pen to trace or fill in the figures, particularly those in the foreground, the style becomes sketchier and more angular. Fabritius's hatching lines become more carefully placed as they grow finer, laid loosely side by side with only occasional thin-pen scratching, while thicker lines, including contours, are rendered in a zigzag, looser manner, often applied to foreground elements such as a *repoussoir*. Groups of hatching in shadowed, complex motifs (e.g., figures or foreground foliage) are neither intertwined nor uniformly oriented, and though the balance of light and shadow varies between drawings, it remains consistent within each composition; early mastery is evident in his wash applications, where loosely brushed transitions in shadows lend a painterly quality, enhancing figural plasticity and atmospheric depth, as seen in drawings with dramatic chiaroscuro effects.

<sup>51</sup> Although it has been argued by Holm Bevers that this drawing is by Constantijn Daniël van Renesse and dates from between 1650 and 1652 (Holm Bevers, "Ausstellungen zu Rembrandt in Rückblick", *Kunstchronik*, 58 (2005), p. 480; Holm Bevers, in: *Rembrandt. Die Zeichnungen im Berliner Kupferstichkabinett*, exh. cat. Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, 2006, cat. no. 45, p. 158, nt. 12; Holm Bevers in: Holm Bevers et al., *Drawings by Rembrandt and his Pupils. Telling the Difference*, exh. cat. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2009, cat. no. 31.2, pp. 190-191), a number of features are so uncharacteristic of Van Renesse that the attribution cannot be sustained. This applies in particular to elements such as the heavy, coarse scratches in the shadow areas and the sketch-like rendering of the faces of Joseph and Mary. Van Renesse typically keeps shadow areas and light transitions in brush clear and even. Also characteristic is his meticulous penwork, marked by fine, short strokes in the contours and hatching lines (see for instance: *The Judgment of Salomon*, New York City (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Robert Lehman Collection, inv. no. 1975.1.806; *Daniel in the Lion's Den*, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. no. MB 200). Generally, it shows the boldness of Barent much more than the careful restraint of Renesse.

---

<sup>52</sup> "Beeter waer 't dat [om de veranderin[g]] een eesel van achteren was, dan dat al de hoofden iuist wt het stuck sien. Dat oock omtrent de boom wat meerder groente was. | 1 Iosep heft af te swaer en te onbesuist | 2 Maria most het kindeken wat meerder vieren, want een teeder kint magh sulck duwen niet ver[dragen]. | Iosep al te kort en dick, sijn hoofd wast hem wt de [borst?]. Sijn hebben alle beide al te groote koppen". Transcript from: Leonore van Sloten, in: exh. cat. Amsterdam 2015 (see note 49), p. 73, nt. 27. "It would be better that [for the alteration] there were a donkey from the back, than that all the heads are looking straight out of the work. That there were also somewhat more greenery around the tree. | 1 Joseph lifts too heavily and too inconsiderately. | 2 Mary ought to ease the little child somewhat more, for a tender infant cannot [endure] such pushing. | Joseph is all too short and stout, his head grows out of the [chest?]. They both have all too large heads". These instructions are also partly articulated within the drawing itself. Joseph is indeed shown tugging firmly at Mary's arm, whereas in the more sketch-like version, he supports her more gently at the back. The small patch of greenery in the lower corner may also be a later addition, in correspondence with the suggestion.

<sup>53</sup> The face does not appear to be a correction in the technical sense, but rather an example of a foreshortened face viewed from below - a challenging principle of perspective.

<sup>54</sup> An attribution proposed Christian Dittrich (Christian Dittrich in: Christian Dittrich, Thomas Ketelsen, *Rembrandt. Die Dresdener Zeichnungen 2004*, exh. cat. Dresden: Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, 2004, cat. no. 14, pp. 80-81).

<sup>55</sup> Brusati implied the possibility that the text was written partly by Rembrandt and partly by Van Hoogstraten (Celeste Brusati, *Artifice & Illusion. The Art and Writing of Samuel van Hoogstraten*, Chicago/London 1995, pp. 31, 275, note 40). Rembrandt was excluded as the author of the instructions by Bevers, while Van Hoogstraten as author remained an option. Van Renesse was likewise ruled out by Bevers, based on a comparison with the handwriting on his *Daniel in the Lions' Den* drawing and *The Judgment of Solomon* drawing (see note 51); Holm Bevers, in: exh. cat. Los Angeles 2009 (see note 51), cat. 31.1-31.2, p. 190; 191, note 3). To this may be added that the handwriting also closely resembles that of Barent Fabritius. Although little comparative material survives, the compact, small script of Fabritius's name beneath the death inventory of his sister-in-law Aeltje, dated 24 April 1643 (SAA, 5075, 1628a, not. David de l'Hommel, p. 399), shows a strong resemblance to the instructions on the Dresden sheet.

<sup>56</sup> "Once you have mastered your handling and your eye is somewhat clarified, it will no longer trouble you to translate many naturalistic paintings into a naturalistic drawing". "Wanneer gy uwe handeling nu machtich zijt, en uw oog wat verklaert is, zoo zal 't u ook niet verscheelen veel verwige Schilderyen in een verwige teykeningen na te klaren" (Van Hoogstraten, *Inleyding* (see note 1), p. 27).

<sup>57</sup> "I advise masters, when they review the drawings of their pupils, to improve them by making sketches of the same subject themselves. This is an excellent exercise and has greatly assisted many in the art of composition". "De meesters raed ik, als ze de Teykeningen haerer discipelen overzien, datze de zelve, met schetsses op 't zelve voorwerp te maeken, verbeeteren. Dit oeffent ongemeen, en heeft veelen geweldich in de schikkunst geholpen" (Van Hoogstraten, *Inleyding* (see note 1), p. 192).

<sup>58</sup> "And certainly, this manner of drawing with pen and brush is likewise the most suitable for completing a masterly work in its full force. For one can also, whenever it proves convenient, work into it with red chalk and crayons, as though one were almost painting with colours". "En zeker deeze wijze van met pen en pinseel te teykenen, is ook allerbequaemst om een meesterlijk werk in zijn volle kracht te voleinden. Dewijl men'er ook, als't pas geeft, met rood krijt en kryons in kan speelen, als of men byna met verwen schilderde" (Van Hoogstraten, *Inleyding* (see note 1), p. 31).

<sup>59</sup> On stylistic grounds, this Rembrandt drawing has been placed among a group of history drawings dating to around 1650 (Otto Benesch, *The Drawings of Rembrandt V*, New York 1957, no. 902). Among other arguments, this dating led Bevers to attribute the Dresden drawing to Constantijn van Renesse, rather than Barent Fabritius (Holm Bevers, in: exh. cat. Berlin 2006 (see note 51), cat. no. 45, p. 157, 158, nt. 12) However, it remains questionable whether the Rembrandt drawing in Berlin should be understood within that context. Unlike the other history drawings, this work is not an autonomous composition but rather a sketched response to the Dresden sheet. It is plausible that the sketch was already made around 1647. In terms of linework, it is not far removed from the portrait sketch of Jan Six, dating from in or before 1647 (Amsterdam, Six Collection). It is drawn in a similarly free style, applied in a sketch, comparable to other drawings from the second half of the 1640's (see note 47). Rembrandt's Berlin drawing could thus have been made quite soon after Fabritius's corrected drawing.

<sup>60</sup> Josua Bruyn, "Gemälde der Rembrandt-Schüler II by Werner Sumowski Review", *Oud Holland* 101 (1987) no. 3, p. 229.

---

<sup>61</sup> <https://rkd.nl/images/313061>, 17 July 2025. In terms of drawing style, this work is not far removed from Van Hoogstraten's drawing *The Sacrifice of Manóah* of 1649 (Braunschweig, Herzog Anton Ulrich Museum, inv. no. Z 335; <https://rkd.nl/images/71286>, 17 July 2025). We may even assume that *The Crucifixion* predates it; the departing angel in the Braunschweig drawing – also seen from the back – appears to be a more developed and refined treatment of the motif of a figure seen from behind.

<sup>62</sup> Samuel van Hoogstraten, *The Adoration of the Shepherds*. London, The British Museum, inv. no. 1895,0915.1203; <https://rkd.nl/images/313552>, 17 July 2025. A drawing of *The Circumcision*, likewise painted as a part of the Passion series in 1646, has been attributed to Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (Brussels, Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten België, inv. no. 4060/1212). There are also two copies after Rembrandt's *Holy Family with a Curtain* from 1646 (London, The British Museum, inv. no. 1895,0915.1200; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, inv. no. WA1986.56).

<sup>63</sup> Josua Bruyn in: Josua Bruyn et al., *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings III: 1635-1642*, Amsterdam 1989 pp. 13-16.

<sup>64</sup> Martin Royalton-Kisch, *Drawings by Rembrandt and his Circle in the British Museum*, London: The British Museum, 1992, cat. no. 87, pp. 180-182; Holm Bevers, "Drawings in Rembrandt's Workshop", in: exh. cat. Los Angeles 2009 (see note 51), pp. 13-17; David de Witt, "Leren van het leven: tekeningen van Rembrandts leerlingen" in: Judith Noorman, David de Witt, *Rembrandts Naakte Waarheid. Tekenen naar naaktmodellen in de Gouden Eeuw*, exh. cat. Amsterdam: Rembrandt House Museum, 2015, pp. 117-120.

<sup>65</sup> Initially, this drawing was attributed to Rembrandt, but as early as 1908, this attribution was already being questioned (Martin Conway, "Some Rembrandt Drawings", *Burlington Magazine* 14 (1908/1909), p.37).

<sup>66</sup> This sheet has previously been judged the weakest of the three (David de Witt, in: exh. cat. Amsterdam 2015 (see note 64), p. 118), and it has even been suggested that Rembrandt may have corrected it. (Martin Royalton-Kisch, in: col. cat. London 2010 (see note 48), cat. 71). The fine parallel pen strokes in the boy's torso are comparable to those in the body of Susanna in the Budapest drawing. The somewhat arbitrary use of red chalk (in the model's right armpit area, on the reverse side of the cushion, and in the upper left corner) also stands out in both sheets. The type of loose, heavy pen lines used for the cushion corresponds to those found in the cloak of the old man in the *Susanna* drawing.

<sup>67</sup> For a first suggestion of Bol being the assistant of Rembrandt, see: Albert Blanckert, *Ferdinand Bol (1616-1680). Rembrandt's Pupil*, Doornspijk 1982, pp. 17-18.

<sup>68</sup> Blanckert, *Bol* (see note 67), pp. 17-18; David de Witt, "Ferdinand Bol, discipel van Rembrandt", in: Norbert Middelkoop, *Ferdinand Bol en Govert Flinck. Rembrandts meesterleerlingen*, Amsterdam (Rembrandt House Museum/Amsterdam Museum) 2017, pp. 44-45.

<sup>69</sup> *Portrait of a Lady*, 1642. Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 809. However, there are paintings by Bol, or attributed to him, of an earlier date or dating. *The Liberation of St Peter* (private collection), dated around 1636, may be, given its strong connection to the work of Benjamin Cuyp (David de Witt, in: exh. cat. Amsterdam 2017 (see note 68), pp. 42-43), made before Bol's departure to Amsterdam. *Gideon's Sacrifice* of 1640, signed by Bol (Utrecht, Museum Catharijneconvent, inv. no. RMCC s24), is typical in subject matter and composition of his later work from the 1640s, and may be made under conditions comparable to those proposed in this article for the paintings by Van Hoogstraten, dating from between 1644 and 1647. Other works attributed to Bol prior to 1642 are often copies or adaptations of compositions by Rembrandt.

<sup>70</sup> Christopher Brown, *Carel Fabritius*, Oxford 1981, p. 47; Gero Seelig in: Frederik J. Duparc, *Carel Fabritius 1622-1654*, exh. cat. The Hague: Mauritshuis; Schwerin: Staatliches Museum, 2004-2005, cat. no. 4, p. 97.

<sup>71</sup> Erna Kok erroneously states that Bol is mentioned as Rembrandt's "werckgesel" in a document of 30 August 1640 (Erna Kok, "Govert Flinck en Ferdinand Bol en hun netwerken van opdrachtgevers," in: exh. cat. Amsterdam 2017 (see note 68), p. 71, p. 244, n. 37). Bol's exact role during his time in Rembrandt's workshop is never documented. It is striking that the drawn copies after three of Rembrandt's paintings from around 1636 are attributed to Ferdinand Bol (Peter Schatborn, "Tekeningen van Govert Flinck en Ferdinand Bol", in: exh. cat. Amsterdam 2017 (see note 68), p.185). Apart from these sheets and those datable around 1646 by later pupils, there are few, if any, known drawings by Rembrandt's pupils that are direct copies after his history or figure paintings. It is possible that Bol played an important role in introducing this method into the studio, and that it was later adopted by Van Hoogstraten. Van Hoogstraten is likely to have been in contact with Bol while in Amsterdam. After Bol established himself as an independent master, around 1642, he too began to draw in red chalk. He did so,

---

however, almost exclusively in preparatory studies for (mainly) paintings – see, for instance, *Joseph brings his Father before Pharaoh* (Dresden, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 1605), and its preliminary drawing (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-T-1883-A-276). Van Hoogstraten may well have adopted this practice from him. This suggests that, even as an official pupil of Rembrandt, Van Hoogstraten felt the freedom to look to the work of other contemporaries as well. Van Sloten has argued that Bol continued to visit Rembrandt during the first half of the 1640s (Leonore van Sloten, “Ferdinand Bol, de etsers”, in: exh. cat. Amsterdam 2017 (see note 68), pp. 218-221). Bol’s use of red chalk for preparatory studies may therefore have been the source of Van Hoogstraten’s conception that the use of red chalk contributes to the painterly quality of a drawing.

<sup>72</sup> Arnold Houbraken, *De groote schouburgh der Nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen*, Amsterdam, 1976, p. 165.