Young Man and Woman Studying a Statue of Venus, by Lamplight
Godefridus Schalcken
(Made 1643 – 1706 The Hague)

ca. 1688–92
oil on canvas
43.8 x 34.9 cm
signed faintly lower right on the base of the statue: “G. Schalcken”
GS-103
In this engaging and atmospheric picture, a young man is shown wearing a painter’s beret and holding a drawing in his left hand that displays the contours of the plaster or marble statue of a kneeling nude woman in front of him. He points to this statue with his right hand while looking up at the young woman standing next to him, to whom he apparently explains the drawing and the statue. A copper oil lamp illuminates the scene, which is closed off on the right by a green curtain. Discernible in the right foreground is the plaster cast of the head of an antique female figure, probably the so-called Juno Cesi. Godefridus Schalcken might have been familiar with the actual antique statue of the kneeling Venus (or Aphrodite), or he might have owned a plaster cast of it. He could also have known of this fragment through an engraving by Jan de Bisschop (1628–1671), which De Bisschop based on a drawing by the Roman artist Francesco Salviati (1510–63). Bisschop published this drawing in his Signorum veterum icones of 1671 (fig 1).

Because of its subject—the viewing of art—the painting has previously been interpreted mainly in the context of art theory. Young painters, who had to study antique sculptures before progressing to drawing from a live model, were advised to draw such sculptures by artificial light; this approach caused the contours of the sculptures to emerge more clearly and allowed the artist to practice rendering objects in relief. This academic practice has fused perfectly here with Schalcken’s artistic strength: rendering nocturnal scenes illuminated by artificial light. The glowing flame of the oil lamp both models the smooth surface of the sculpture and gently illuminates the young painters, drawing them together through the subdued reddish tonalities of their faces. Indeed, the atmospheric effects created by the flow of light and color across this image—from the flame’s white heat to the sculpture’s muted ivory-colored surface and the softly-lit figures—are beautifully rendered and quite evocative.
The presence of lamplight may also allude to studious diligence and dedication—a figurative illumination, or enlightenment, resulting from the true artist’s rigorous training. Schnackenburg, a strong proponent of this view, considers the entire painting to be exemplary of a new stylistic and thematic direction in Schalcken’s art, in which he examines Bisschop’s ideas and ponders classicist thought.[4] Crucial to this interpretation is the identification of the young man in the painting as Schalcken himself.[5] Schnackenburg also attaches great importance to the presence of the statue of Venus, which in her eyes refers to the rivalry between painting and sculpture.[6]

The presence of the statue of Venus is clearly significant, but it has less to do with the many art-theoretical notions attached to the figure than to her role as the goddess of love for the ancient Greeks and Romans alike. Here the subject chiefly involves the love presumed to exist between the young man and the young woman, for which the magnificently spotlighted statue of Venus serves as a catalyst. The amorous context depicted here fits in perfectly with the main themes found in Schalcken’s oeuvre, which is filled with references to the kindling of love between two people. The multiple layers of meaning that can be found in this composition make it clear that Schalcken gave great thought to his subjects, an observation previously made by Hecht.[7]

Beherman dated this small work to between 1680 and 1685, owing to his identification of the protagonists as the painter and his young wife, Françoisia van Diemen, who married in 1679. The dating of Schalcken’s genre and history paintings is often problematic because we know only a handful of dated genre scenes and half a dozen dated history paintings, which mainly stem from his later years (see GS-112).[8] Nevertheless, Beherman’s dating of Young Man and Woman Studying a Statue of Venus, by Lamplight neglects the fact that the work—in Schalcken’s most frequently used format of approximately 44 by 34.9 cm—is painted on canvas. At that stage in his career he would have been more likely to execute paintings of this size on panel, or occasionally on copper (see, for example, GS-102). Moreover, the dry, thin manner of painting and the use of pastel hues, evident here in the figures’ pink lips, also differ from the works painted around 1680.

Stylistically, Young Man and Woman Studying a Statue of Venus, by Lamplight is closely related to Schalcken’s Allegory of the Treaty of Nijmegen (fig 2).[9] Beherman dated this latter painting, of a size rather
large for Schalcken, to around 1676–77, largely because the French painter Henri Gascard (1635–1701) produced a thematically similar work depicting The Signing of the Treaty of Nijmegen between France and Spain on 17 September 1678, which is preserved in the Museum Het Valkhof in Nijmegen.\textsuperscript{[10]} It is more likely, however, that Schalcken’s Allegory of the Treaty of Nijmegen, with its thin application of paint and somewhat divergent, tempered use of color, originated around 1688–92, toward the end of the artist’s activities in Dordrecht. This stylistic dating can be underpinned in yet another way. For this unusual composition, Schalcken appears to have made use of a French engraving published in Paris by François de Poilly (1623–93) in 1684 (fig 3).\textsuperscript{[11]} Young Man and Woman Studying a Statue of Venus, by Lamplight should, therefore, be dated to the same period, from around 1688 to 1692. This later dating immediately calls into question the identification of the young artist and his pupil as Schalcken and his wife. Moreover, a small, recently discovered portrait of Françoisia reveals that in these years, having given birth to eight children, she no longer looked as she did in the first year of her marriage (fig 4).\textsuperscript{[12]}

The influence of Schalcken’s teacher Gerrit Dou (1613–75) is still present to a remarkable degree in this late painting. Dou painted a large number of works portraying an artist, mostly himself, sometimes working in his studio but always wearing a painter’s cap.\textsuperscript{[13]} Occasionally the artist is shown drawing a statue by the light of an oil lamp, as in An Artist Drawing in Brussels (fig 5), which is the work most closely related in subject to Young Man and Woman Studying a Statue of Venus, by Lamplight.\textsuperscript{[14]}

- Guido Jansen
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8. For the dated genre pieces, see Thierry Beherman, Godfried Schalcken (Paris, 1988), nos. 143 (1667), 151 (1669), 160 (1682), and 168 (1690). To these we should perhaps add the small painting of 1692 in Toronto; see entry GS-112, fig. 1. The history paintings date from 1690, 1691 and 1700; see Thierry Beherman, Godfried Schalcken (Paris, 1988), nos. 10, 19, 34, 37, and 40–41.


10. The canvas of 161 x 274.5 cm was painted in 1679; Gerard Lemmens and Peter B. M. Sliepenbeek, De Vrede van Nijmegen (1678–1978) (Nijmegen, 1978), 59–64 with illustrations.

11. The exceptional engraving contains the thesis with which Louis-Nicolas and Louis-Francis Le Tellier obtained their doctorates on 28 July 1684 at the Collège d’Harcourt in Paris; José Lothe, L’oeuvre gravé de François et Nicolas de Poilly d’Abbeville, graveurs parisiens du XVIIe siècle (Paris, 1994), 236–37, no. 371 with illustration. In all likelihood Schalcken knew this unique print through the Flemish engraver and art dealer Jan van der Bruggen.
(1649–ca. 1699), who was living in Paris in those years. Schalcken’s Recognition of Constance (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin) was taken to Paris by Van der Bruggen, who never paid for it. This gave rise to a number of legal entanglements that occurred between 1688 and 1691; Peter Hecht, De Hollandse fijnchilders: Van Gerard Dou tot Adriaen van der Werff (Exh. cat. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum) (Maarssen and The Hague, 1989), 190–93. Van der Bruggen and the engraver François de Poilly were next-door neighbors on Rue Saint-Jacques; José Lothe, L’oeuvre gravé de François et Nicolas de Poilly d’Abbeville, graveurs parisiens du XVIIe siècle (Paris, 1994), 373.

12. This is a small oval portrait of Françoisia, which, given its dark blue background, must be dated to Schalcken’s London years, 1692–96. It was sold as the portrait of an anonymous lady by someone in the “Circle of Schalcken” at Christie’s in Amsterdam on 22 September 2009, lot 132 with color illustration. However, the portrait bears Schalcken’s monogram at the lower left center. Dr. Eddy Schavemaker and the present author identified the sitter as the wife of the painter on the basis of her portrait of 1706; Thierry Beherman, Godfried Schalcken (Paris, 1988), no. 59 with color illustration. In fact, Françoisia’s ninth child, Godefrius, was baptized on 3 February 1697 in The Hague, which suggests that Schalcken and his family had already left England by the end of 1696, since it stands to reason that he would not have exposed his heavily pregnant wife to the dangers of such a journey.


14. Henri Pauwels et al., Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Departement Oude Kunst, inventariscatalogus van de oude schilderkunst (Brussels, 1984), 92, inv. no. 86.
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**Technical Summary**

The support, a single piece of coarse, plain-weave fabric, has been lined. All four tacking margins have been almost entirely removed, and narrow remnants of primed fabric remain. Cusping along the upper edge only suggests the support has been cut from a larger primed fabric. There is one paper label but no wax collection seals, stencils, or import stamps along the lining or stretcher.

The fabric has been pre-primed with a gray ground followed by a light red ground applied below the composition area. The paint is applied with thin layers of transparent glazes that refine the effects of light and the transitions into shadow, and with broader scumbles along the folds of the artist’s proper right sleeve.

No carbon-based underdrawing or compositional changes are readily apparent in infrared images captured at 900–1700 nanometers or in the X-radiograph.[1]

A faint signature located in the lower right corner is visible in the X-radiograph but not under normal light conditions or in infrared images.[2]

The painting was cleaned and restored in 2008 and remains in a good state of preservation despite areas of thinness and fine drying cracks through the background.[3]

- Annette Rupprecht