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115  Jinsei no mon  1 March 1978  Relief karen print
116  Airan no koi  8 November 1978  Gold foil stencil
117  Rui to Kanna  8 October 1978  Pyroboard printing
118  Sode no shita  20 January 1979  Self-carved woodblock karen print
119  Erihanâme to chô  1 March 1979  Arumina Porcelain (photolithography on ceramic)
120  Hanatsu to tanuki  1 April 1979  Three-colour relief printing
121  Shûfû Mangorô  15 May 1979  Two-colour relief printing
122  Chinchikurin no mikoto  23 June 1979  Two-colour relief printing
123  Bangasa kidan  15 August 1979  Pyroboard printing
124  Kalei to sukô  20 September 1979  Two-colour relief printing
125  Shin no mabû  20 October 1979  Self-carved woodblock karen print
126  Berabô monogatari  25 June 1980  Heat embossing
127  Kâto Kiyoumâsâ  10 October 1980  Three-colour relief printing
128  Kidara no senmin  1 March 1981  Monochrome relief print
129  Rejo nesai  12 December 1980  Self-carved woodblock karen print
130  Tsukâ kara kita ko  30 March 1981  Intaglio gold line printing
131  Senju Kannon  5 May 1981  Unspecified (letterpress)
132  Tôkârâshûrû no tsuna  3 November 1981  Self-carved woodblock karen print
133  Fujin to raîjin  10 March 1982  Bullrush-leaf paper, relief print
134  Kagûyâhime gojîtsuden  10 October 1982  Three-colour relief printing
135  Tsuribane ibun  25 June 1982  Colour cloud paper, relief printing
136  Ionagâki  15 August 1982  All stamping
137  ABC Yowa  3 November 1982  Self-carved woodblock karen print
138  Toritsukai no otome  11 February 1983  Laser cut
139  Tenjiku no tori  20 April 1983  Indian paper, two-colour relief printing

---

**Shorter Notices**

**Rembrandt’s *Reclining Nude* Reconsidered**

Elmer Kolfin

‘Un effet de sa bizarrerie ordinaire’ was how Pierre Jean Mariette interpreted the darkness in Rembrandt’s print commonly known as *Negress Lying Down* (Bartsch 205; fig. 36, inv. RP-P-OB 428). The title was first noted by Adam van Bartsch in 1797.¹ Ever since, there has been doubt as to the woman’s racial identity, a matter that gained some urgency with the growing interest in blacks in art since the 1970s.² Mariette and others

---

¹ I would like to thank Paul Kaplan and Erik Hinterding for their useful suggestions.


before Bartsch saw a white women in the shade. The new title was given in a period with much artistic interest in blacks. The abolitionist movement had just discovered the power of the printed image. One year before Bartsch’s catalogue was published, William Blake’s prints of slaves appeared in John Gabriel Stedman’s soon-to-be famous *Narrative of a Five Years’ Expedition Against the Revolted Negroes of Surinam*. Blacks were also becoming popular subjects in painting. Quite possibly this interest inspired the new interpretation of the woman in Rembrandt’s print as African.

In 1731, 1735 and 1755 the print was called *The Sleeping Woman*, *Sleeping Women* [sic] and *A Nude Sleeping Woman with Naked Buttocks*. In 1679 the plate, now at the British Museum, was identified as *Sleeping Nude Woman*. As a rule, descriptions in seventeenth-century probate inventories drew attention to what was regarded as the most characteristic feature of the image. When blacks were the single subject of an image, it would usually be described as ‘a moor’ or ‘a black’. For example, in Rembrandt’s own inventory of 1656, his painting of two Africans was listed as *Two Moors*.


7. Sale catalogue De Burgh, 1755, nos. 550–55 (different states and variations); sale catalogue Van Huls, 1735, no. 1008; inventory of Valerius Rover, 1731; all quoted in Hinterding, op. cit., p. 375, notes 1 and 2.
Therefore it is significant that his *Reclining Woman* was not called *Black Woman Lying Down* but *Sleeping Nude Woman*. Evidently in 1679 the woman was not seen as black.

*Reclining Nude* is dated 1658 and it is useful to look at Rembrandt’s other prints of the time. The print shows a woman lying on a mattress; the dark background suggests a confined space like the bed in *Woman with the Arrow*, of 1661, or *Antiope and Jupiter* from 1659 (Bartsch 202 and 203). If we add to this little series his *Woman at a Brook* (Bartsch 200) from 1658 it becomes clear that Rembrandt was experimenting with nude white women and shadow in narrowly confined spaces. *Woman at the Stove* and *Woman with the Hat*, both from 1658, show the same interest (Bartsch 197 and 199). In every print the artist situates the woman differently vis-à-vis the shadow and light. In *Woman at a Brook* she is placed in front of a dark background, her right side in a soft shadow. *Antiope and Jupiter* shows a more bold play of light and an extremely velvety shadow on legs, hips and belly. In *Woman with the Arrow* she is on the verge of light and shade; half shadows define her back while a strong light throws the side of her body into sharp silhouette. Chronologically, *Reclining Nude* falls between *Woman at a Brook* and *Jupiter and Antiope*, between the refined print and the more daring experiment. In this context it does not seem illogical to see the woman as a white model in a situation that seems straightforward, but that is extremely difficult to depict because the subject is fully in the


---

37. Anonymous artist, *Reclining Nude Seen from Behind*, 1658, black and white chalk on blue paper, 234 x 315 mm (formerly Amsterdam, Paul Brandt).
shadow. Had she been a black model, Rembrandt would have created a completely new situation.

Interestingly, there exists an anonymous drawing depicting a Reclining Nude Seen from Behind that has not been related to Rembrandt’s Reclining Nude, but seems to be connected to it (fig. 37). It is alternatively attributed to Rembrandt’s pupils Ferdinand Bol and Govert Flinck. Jacob Backer was also recently suggested.10 The woman in the drawing is posed slightly more diagonally, she is more curvaceous, we see her ear and hair, but not her right foot. She is in full light, which falls in from the left. Reclining Nude Seen from Behind is generally seen as the result of a session of life drawing on 27 July 1658 that included both Bol and Flinck, in the same year that Rembrandt dated his Reclining Nude print.11 If he was indeed present, the white girl in fig. 37 might actually be the same model as in the print. A situation comes to mind like the one depicted in Constantijn Daniel van Renesse’s drawing Rembrandt and his Pupils Drawing from a Nude Model of c. 1650 (fig. 38), except that the 1658 session would have involved Rembrandt and ex-pupils who by then had gone their own way and whose style differed from that of the master. Possibly the relationship between Rembrandt’s Reclining Nude and the anonymous Reclining Nude Seen from Behind is comparable to that between the etching of Male Nudes, Seated and Standing – the Walking Trainer (Bartsch 194) and drawings by Carel Fabritius, Samuel van Hoogstraten and an unknown pupil of circa 1646.12 A similar example dates from 1661, with Rembrandt creating his Woman with the Arrow (Bartsch 202) and Johannes Raven making a drawing of a seated female nude.13 In all cases the pupils were working on paper, while Rembrandt was drawing directly on a copperplate; he introduced new features at a later stage: the background with the walking trainer in Bartsch 194, the face of Cupid in Bartsch 202 and the strong shadow on the woman’s body in Bartsch 205.

Only one impression of the first state of Rembrandt’s Reclining Nude exists. It was poorly inked and has the appearance of a proof, even though it was printed on Japanese paper.14 If Rembrandt indeed worked on the plate in front of a live model this print may be the result of that session. The image is not very appealing, for it lacks ‘force’, a seventeenth-century term that denoted a strong relief resulting from a play of light and shadow and situating the figure firmly in space. Her back is still too flat, the anatomy of the right hip is awkward and she is lying rather squarely in front of the shadow rather than being enveloped by it. This is not what Rembrandt would have been after.

Rembrandt finally achieved the desired effect of a body lying in shadow through etching and drypoint, with a dense pattern of delicate hatching and cross-hatching. Dark areas were given extra ‘force’ with the burin. In the final blend, the different techniques are almost impossible to distinguish. This in itself already signals workmanship of the highest quality. But the true magic comes with the inking, wiping and printing of the plate.15 Rembrandt did not wipe the plate clean overall, but left thin films of ink in places that show up in the final print as subtle tonal fields of light grey, almost as a translucent wash applied with the brush. He also used varying types of paper and different effects. As a result, each print is unique. Very dark copies exist, but also relatively light ones.

Caps of the kind the woman is wearing were bright white, as they appear in other etchings by Rembrandt from this time, such as the Sitting Nude Beside a Chair with a Hat, of 1658 (Bartsch 199). In Reclining Nude the cap is not rendered white, so the head must be in the shadow. The tonality of the cap is comparable to that of the woman’s side. If the cap is white, it seems reasonable to assume the body is white and also in the shadow. The wider spaced cross-hatching makes the cap slightly lighter in places, suggesting its texture and intense whiteness.

Also revealing is the woman’s face, of which we see a small part at the temple. In most copies this spot was not inked, so that it would print white. Its function is to

10. W. Sumowski, Drawings of the Rembrandt School, New York, 1979, I, p. 262, admits the style is more reminiscent of Flinck, but attributes it to Bol because of a similar figure in Bol’s painting Canon and Epiphonia, formerly in Bremen, Kunsthalle (lost in World War II). The attribution to Backer in P. van den Brink, Jacob Backer (1608/09–1673), Zwolle, 2008, p. 79.
separate the dark hair or the shadow in the neck from the slightly hunched shoulder and the background. This entire part would be blurred if Rembrandt had made this little spot dark too, which he would have had to do if he intended the woman to be black.

Rembrandt made seven prints with black people, all dating between 1630 and 1652. In most of these he did not indicate the darkness of the skin, but rather relied on the physiognomy to suggest the figures’ African identity. Only the soldier in Ecce Homo from 1636 and the servant in the Beheading of John the Baptist from 1640 have a light hatching that suggests a brown tone (Bartsch 77 and 92). Rembrandt stubbornly adhered to the convention of depicting telling physical features to indicate African heritage that went back to Albrecht Dürer, Lucas van Leyden and Hendrick Goltzius. His contemporaries, like Lucas Vorsterman and Wenceslaus Hollar, were at the same time looking for ways to depict dark skin convincingly in print, with careful, often dense patterns of hatching and cross-hatching. In this context a reclining black woman would certainly be a late, unexpected and unique response. A reclining white nude in the semi-dark, however, fits neatly with Rembrandt’s experiments with the effect of shadow in the 1650s that resulted in so many extraordinary prints.

16. Bust of a Black Woman, c. 1630 (Bartsch 357), Ecce Homo, 1636 (Bartsch 77); The Decapitation of St John the Baptist, 1640 (Bartsch 92); The Baptism of the Eunuch, 1641 (Bartsch 98); The Large Lion Hunt, 1641 (Bartsch 114); The Preaching of Christ, c. 1639–49 (Bartsch 74) and Christ among the Doctors, 1652 (Bartsch 63).


38. Constantijn Daniël van Renesse, Rembrandt and his Pupils Drawing from a Nude Model, c. 1650, black chalk, brush and brown wash heightened with white, 180 x 266 mm (Darmstadt, Hessisches Landesmuseum).