FAME, CONVENTION AND INSIGHT: ON THE RELEVANCE OF FORNENBERGH AND GERBIER

Two seventeenth century texts form the subject of this paper. The first has occasionally been referred to by historians of sixteenth and seventeenth century Flemish painting; but has never been adequately analyzed; while the second, although it contains sixty-three lines on Rubens, has been almost entirely overlooked by scholarship on him. This latter text is also of considerable interest for the study of Dutch art in the first quarter of the seventeenth century; and yet it has scarcely been acknowledged since it was first presented by Hirschmann over sixty years ago. There is no obvious connection between the two texts; but since concern with issues raised by the first led to a re-examination of the second, both will be discussed in some detail.

Alexander van Fornenbergh’s Life of Quinten Matsijs was published in 1658 under the unwieldy title of: “The Antwerp Proteus or the Cyclopean Apelles, that is, the Life and Artistic Deeds of the outstanding and highly-famed Quinten Matsijs, van Grof-Smidt in Fijn-Schilder verandert.” (An English translation of the last part of the title would run ‘transformed from blacksmith into painter’; but that loses the antithetical word-play of the Flemish phrase, which succinctly brings to the fore the transition from coarse manual labour - grof-smidt - to the more refined pursuit of easel-painter - fijn-schilder). But Fornenbergh’s text has more claim to our attention than the mere fact that it is the second of two lives of Quinten Matsijs published in Antwerp shortly after Rubens’ death, and that it thus counts as one of the progenitors of both a distinguished and a tiresome art-historical genre: the monographic treatment of a single painter. Nor is it significant simply because of the useful source material it provides for sixteenth and seventeenth century painting and collecting, nor only because, with satisfying aptness, it suggests a possible link between Julius Held, the Ringling Museum, and the Courtauld Institute.

The starting point for this paper was a certain puzzlement at the comparative thinness of contemporary literary and theoretical references to Rubens. There are two striking aspects both of contemporary testimonia and of his immediate Nachruhm: while Rubens’ correspondents occasionally have something genuinely perceptive to say about his art, the literary and theoretical material before Bellori in 1672 and Roger de Piles in 1677 seems extraordinarily feeble, and largely lacking in any real insight into his art. It is as if all the writers were so stupefied by his overwhelming talents that they could barely rise above those tired and even then familiar encomiastic phrases referring to the Belgian Apelles, the Progeny of the Muses, or the reborn Zeuxis. I do not believe that to ask why this was so is somehow akin to asking why there were no landscape paintings in the catacombs. For a start, one does occasionally find a poem or other form of tribute which rises above the cliches, but these, perhaps not surprisingly, are almost wholly North Netherlandish. Indeed, it is to Gaspar
Scioppius in 1607, and the Leiden Professors Daniel Heinsius and Dominicus Baudius between 1609 and 1616 that we must turn for some of the best early appreciations of Rubens, and then to Vondel in 1640 (the dedication of the Gebroeders) and 1650 (the poem on the Leander) for something a little more substantial than the standard rhetoric of encomium. But it may be oversimplified to attribute the Southern Netherlands lacunae wholly to the meagerness of literary talent south of the Maas.

It seems pertinent to begin by posing this question: what texts are available to determine the criteria of artistic appreciation in the Southern Netherlands in the decades immediately following Rubens' death? Fornenbergh's little book on Matsys then appears as a major source, and provides a significant means of gaining access to the modes and standards of thinking and writing about art in Antwerp during this period. Now it has occasionally been observed, and with some justice, that the artistic resonance of Rubens in the years following his death was not as substantial as one might have expected - even, perhaps, when compared with the resonance of Van Dyck. But what was the basis for the appreciation of Matsis, and what, apart from civic pride, does it reveal about the problems just raised? The harvest is richer than has generally been assumed.

Fornenbergh's book has usually been considered in the same breath as the even smaller booklet on Matsys published by Franchoys Fickaert ten years earlier. But while Fickaert's work undoubtedly provided the inspiration for the later biography - and may just conceivably be an earlier attempt by Fornenbergh himself - it is very thin indeed. It does little more than recount the well-worn story of Matsjs's illness, marriage, and subsequent transformation from blacksmith to painter, recall the old puzzle of the precise number of horses on the right wing of the Lamentation triptych in Antwerp, and summarize the chequered history of that work during the troubled times between 1566 and 1581. Fornenbergh's book, on the other hand, adds considerably more to these anecdotes and greatly enhances our knowledge of the elements of taste and art historical retrospection in Antwerp in the first half of the century. It is a curious mixture of ingenious charm and critical acuity. A thoroughgoing analysis cannot be provided here, but the following seem to be the main points of interest.

As in the case of Fickaert's booklet, two of the greatest Antwerp patrons feature prominently - Cornelis van der Geest and Peeter Stevens. Central to both works are, on the one hand, Cornelis van der Geest's role in the reinterment of Matsis's remains on the centenary of his death in 1629 and his composition of a suitable epitaph inscription for him; and on the other, the dedication to Peeter Stevens. It was Peeter Stevens, rich and pious linen merchant and for many years almoner of the city, who succeeded Cornelis van der Geest as the most important collector in town. It was he who acquired many of the gems of van der Geest's collection, who sold a number of major works to the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm in 1648, and whose inventory of 1668 provides us with insight into one of the most extraordinary rich collections of the time. His importance has always been recognized, but it was only with Jan Briels's
recent publication of the inventory and Stevens's own annotations in his personal copy of van Mander that this importance can be fully appreciated. Amongst much else, the annotations, dating from 1625 to just before Stevens's death in 1668, testify to an astonishingly deep interest in 16th and 17th century Flemish painting. Everywhere Stevens noted the contemporary locations of important works from that period, and considerably added to the range of van Mander's material. This interest is in turn abundantly corroborated by the evidence of his inventory, with its ten Bruegels (at one time he owned as many as twelve), the three most famous Matsijses in private hands, and, above all, the renowned Bath by Jan van Eyck which he acquired from Cornelis van der Geest. From the van Mander annotations we know that he also owned Jan van Eyck's portrait of the Cardinal of Santa Croce, thus finally confirming the identification of the sitter as Cardinal Albergati, and enabling Briels to make the plausible suggestion that the Cabinet d'Amateur formerly in the Seilern Collection and now in the Courtauld Institute Galleries is in fact that of Peeter Stevens, at an early stage in its creation (Fig. 1). It is in this climate of appreciation that we must situate Fornenbergh's book on Matsijs, the painter who, above all, provides the artistic link between the past and the future of Flemish painting, between the fifteenth century and the sixteenth, between the minutely observed excellence of the Eyckian heritage and the kind of pictorial flair, the bold feats of the brush, that were to lead to the achievements of Rubens himself. As Fornenbergh reminds us, it was Peeter Stevens who inherited from van der Geest Matsijs's most famous adaptation of an early Netherlandish painting, the Money-changer and his Wife, and Rubens himself copied at least one of the other works by Matsijs which hang in the Constanmer of Cornelis van der Geest represented in the well-known painting by Willem van Haecht (Fig. 2). Such then are the works which connoisseurs sought in the middle of the century; and it is perhaps striking that amongst such riches, only one work by Rubens himself features in Stevens's inventory. It is in fact the first item, The Flight of Lot and his Wife from Sodom, La fuite de Loth avec sa femme & ses filles hors de la Ville de Sodoma. Could it be that this is precisely the painting of which a copy hangs in the Ringling Museum and whose provenance has so far been traced back to the collection of the Antwerp painter Jacob de Wit (Fig. 3) or is it the version in the Louvre acquired by Louis XV in 1742?

It is perhaps not surprising - although it is occasionally forgotten or denied - that the constant model for much art historical and theoretical writing was Carol van Mander; and so in the Eer-Dicht, the encomium to van Fornenbergh prefacing the work, we find lines like these: 'Van Mander heeft weleer 't Groot Schildey beschreven/En Fornenbergh beeldt ons een kleynen uyt naer 't leven' - 'Van Mander once wrote a large book on painting; And now Fornenbergh makes a small one, after the life.' And after attempting a brave comparison with Vondel, the poem concludes with these irresistible lines: '.../Dit Boecksten tuyght oock med': waer vondt men onder ander/Twee, soo ghelijck van Gheest, als Fornenbergh en Mander?' 'Where could one find, amongst others, Two so alike in spirit, as Fornenbergh and Mander?'.
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Such doggerel is not particularly persuasive, but Fornenbergh's own comments are by no means banal. After the usual tales of the artist's humble beginnings, he proceeds to his analysis of what was commonly regarded as the greatest of Matsijs's works, the famous Lamentation altarpiece in the chapel of the Circumcision in Antwerp Cathedral and now in the Museum there (Fig. 4). He methodically deals with the skill of the composition and then remarks on the remarkable outward rendering of inner emotion, that is, of the Affection; he comments on the drapery, the subtle juxtaposition of deep, glowing shadows and clear lights, and the moving representation of Christ's body. In this case, incidentally, there is no question that the use of the verb beweergh refers to the spectator's emotion, and not to the mobility of Christ's body. Finally, Fornenbergh invokes what was still a very modern authority, Philips Angel's Lof Rede to the Leyden Painters' Guild in 1642. The painting, he suggests, conforms to Angel's criteria of 'confident and assured drawing, a fluent composition, and a decorously elaborated richness ('een vloeyende Gheest der Ordonnantie, een cierelyke Rijkelijkeheyt') fitting juxtapositions of lights and shadows; a personal observation of Nature; the representation of mental states on the faces; deep consideration of the story; a thorough understanding of anatomy; a fleshy colouring; and a clear differentiation of all the textiles. Above all, adds Fornenbergh, it displays an exuberant but well-handled use of the brush from near it might seem somewhat rough and idiosyncratic in places, with considerable impastos, especially on the side panels; but the handling of paint is so masterful that from below it gives the impression of exceeding competence and justness. This last observation is interesting in itself, as well as for the fact that it invokes criteria that, instead of being derived directly from the now slightly old-fashioned van Mander, come from the nearly contemporary Philips Angel.

A few further instances may serve to demonstrate Fornenbergh's sensitivity and the quality of his perceptiveness, restricted in scope though it may be. When it comes to the Holy Kinship altar then in St. Peter's in Louvain, he confesses that his account may be defective, as he has not seen it for several years, 'sonder verrevenwinghe des gesichts' without renewing his impressions - surely an admirable example of art historical candour. He revels in his description of one of Matsijs's most famous easel paintings, the Madonna and Child with the Cherries, also acquired by Peeter Stevens from Cornelis van der Geest, and of which a beautiful copy exists in the Ringling Museum (Fig. 5); he notes the smallest details of the Money-changer and his Wife and comments on its monogram and date; in a manner that puts one in mind of the later processes of art history, he observes the similarity between heads in two of the compositions; and he ruefully reflects, in some detail, on the blistering and flaking of a smaller picture and the further damage wrought upon it by an incompetent restorer. There is explicit evidence of archival perusal; much on the ownership and provenance of other works; more on the swift and broad but nevertheless pure handling of the brush; and a careful distinction between the original and the repainted or damaged parts of the wall-paintings surviving in Matsijs's own house.
As a critic, then, Fornenbergh should more than repay further attention; but the evidence of his abilities as a poet is rightly forgotten. At the end of the book, simply, it would seem, in order to fill the remaining pages - "tot vullinge- edes overschietende papiers" he disarmingly states - he appends encomia of Otto van Veen, Rubens and Van Dyck. The one on Rubens is perhaps the worst. It begins: "O progeny of Thespis, you nine holy Muses, come down from Olympus to the earth below; conclude your oracles on Cytheron's peak; abandon for a moment the top of Helicon; leave your Aganippe and come to the shores of the Scheld; redouble your song and retune your strings", and so on and so forth. For one in search of revealing testimonia to Rubens, this all comes as a sore anticlimax; here we will find nothing that is even remotely revealing about him. For insight we have to turn to the pages on Matsijs.

II

But if the poetic element in Fornenbergh has little to tell us about Rubens, and represents the nadir of the many cliché-ridden attempts to praise Rubens' art from 1609 onwards, there is at least one poem in Dutch dating from Rubens' own lifetime which is by no means as slight. It is Balthazar Gerbier's Lament on the Death of Hendrick Goltzius. This 46 page poem, written in 1618 but only published in The Hague in 1620, entitled 'Eer ende Clagh Dicht: Ter Eure van den l converteden constrijcken ende Gheleerden Henricus Goltius' contains 63 lines on Rubens - thus constituting the longest literary tribute to Rubens written in his lifetime. Its importance can hardly be over-estimated, coming as it does from the youthful pen of one of his closest lifelong associates, seven years before they are first supposed to have met in 1625. But the literature on Rubens has almost wholly passed it by. Although it escaped Rooses-Ruelens, Gerbier's work formed the subject of an article by Hirsch- mann in 1920, who even transcribed the long passage on Rubens in full; but there is no reference to it either in Prosper Arents's massive Rubens bibliography of 1940, or even in Lieven Rens's useful discussion of the early literature on Rubens published in 1977. The only part of the work which has received attention from Rubens scholars, including Jan van Gelder's 'Rubens in Holland in de 17de Eeuw', has been the brief marginalium later on in the book, referring to a trip by Rubens, Jan Brueghel and Hendrick van Balen to Holland, when they met Goltzius and other Haarlem artists - a trip, incidentally, which has recently been dated with some certainty to June 1612. But apart from this, silence. Yet Gerbier's poem has not only a quite different character to the many Latin tributes decorated with more or less standard phrases and compliments from classical authors, it was also written at a time when Rubens was himself worrying about the status of his works in Holland - as is clear from the well-known correspondence of 1619 with Pieter van Veen about the copyrighting thereof of prints after his own compositions.

When Hirschmann wrote in 1920, and when Reznicek made his surprisingly slight reference to Gerbier's poem in his monograph on Goltzius of 1961 - surprisingly slight given its even greater relevance for the study of Goltzius and his circle - only one copy of the work was known, in the Stadsbibliotheek in
Haarlem (although another copy is reported to have belonged to that great
print scholar, Francken). There is, however, another copy in the Print Room
of the British Museum bound in the middle of four other works, namely
Bidloo’s poem on the Konstkamer of Philips de Flines, Philips Angel’s Lof der
Schilderkonst, the very rare Dialogue concerning Architecture and Painting
by Jacques de Ville published in Gouda in 1628, and Fickaert’s 1648 booklet
on Matsijs. This copy belonged to the late seventeenth century Haarlem
engraver and bookseller, Isaack Vinentsz van der Vinne, whose manuscript
notes at the beginning of this collection are of some interest, but which I hope
to publish in another context, as they are not directly relevant here.

Gerbier’s poem is dedicated to Noel de Caron, the Dutch Ambassador
with whom Gerbier first went to London in 1616 - the second major move in a
turbulent life that saw him vilified for his association with Buckingham,
damned for his sale of English state secrets to the Archduchess Isabella,
obliged to free his daughter from a Parisian nunnery to which she had been
forcibly removed, impelled to undertake a hazardous entrepreneurial expedi-
tion to Dutch Guinea, and then finally restlessly flitting in increasing
poverty and obscurity between London and The Hague, before dying in 1667 at the age
of some seventy-six odd years. The poem is the first literary attempt of a
young man whose literary and rhetorical talents were to receive expression in
that failed effort to found an Academy for young men in his home in Bethnal
Green in 1648, in connection with which he published a number of works on
science, literature and rhetoric. Walpole says of one of these tracts that it is a
most trifling superficial rhapsody, a condemnation which the Dictionary of
National Biography cannot resist extending to the rest of his oeuvre. But it
would be wrong so to dismiss our poem. It is admittedly very expansive indeed,
the main subject, as Isaack van der Vinne commented in his manuscript note,
smothered by Multifold additions. But is ingenious composition, sometimes
affecting and sometimes witty, a little obsessed, prophetically perhaps,
by suspicion of the teeth of envy, but above all a remarkably full and acute
assessment of the artistic situation in the province of Holland in the second
decade of the century.

The poem begins with a magnificent funeral procession for Goltzius. At its
head, of course, is the sorrowing Goddess of Drawing, accompanied by Fama and
followed by many maidens. The first carries in her hands the black chalk
with which Goltzius drew - for, as we shall see, Gerbier here chooses to cele-
brate Goltzius the draughtsman and engraver, not Goltzius the painter - the
second has the swans’ quills, the third the graver’s burin, the fourth, ink,
compasses and parchment. Everyone comes down from Parnassus to accom-
pany the Goddess of Drawing, who in turn is surrounded by a crowd of patrons
and connoisseurs, ‘die men liefhebbers noemt’. Nature, the Fates and the
Three Graces are there too, but suddenly Gerbier realizes that there must be
someone to organize so complex a procession; and who should he choose to do so
but Wenzel Coebergher! The modern reader might be surprised by such a
choice, but it is worth remembering the role this now almost forgotten painter,
engineer and architect played in the artistic milieu of the Netherlands around
the turn of the century. In architectural terms at least he was, without doubt, the first major mediator of Italian modes to the Netherlands.82 He stayed in Italy from 1579/80 to 1603/4, by which time he had already received the important commission for the St. Sebastian of the Antwerp Crossbowmen’s guild (1599) which still survives as testimony to his early abilities as a painter;83 for the remaining thirty years of his life he was attached to the court of the Archdukes as artistic adviser and architect of major commissions like the Augustinian Church in Antwerp, the Church of the Discalced Carmelite Nuns in Brussels (for which Rubens was to paint the High Altar), and above all the Basilica at Scherpenheuvel, for which he - Coebergher - also painted the High Altar. As engineer and architect-general he supervised the works at the palaces of Tervuren and Mariemont, drained marshes, and oversaw the development of the Southern Netherlandish Monti di Pieta.84 In the light of such diverse talents it is not after all surprising that Gerbier should have chosen Coebergher as the marshal of his imaginary procession of the artists who walked beside the denizens of Olympus in this remarkably conceived demonstration of homage to Goltzius.

At the head of the procession of artists, Coebergher places Rubens, a shining Phoebus, who rightly claims the lead of all artists on this side of the Alps; time cannot diminish either his art or spirit.85 Gerbier now imagines a series of paintings which Rubens does in homage to the Haarlem artist. He paints an Emblemata full of allegorical figures, on a large canvas;86 his brush moves so quickly that he produces a whole host of paintings87 - and in this comment on Rubens’ speed we have the literary antecedent both of Vondel’s comment (in the dedication of the Gebroeders) on the hand that does not rest till it has finished the work,88 and even perhaps of Bellori’s furia del pennello.89 Here Rubens paints Parnassus, with the contest between Apollo and Pan; there the Nine Muses; here Andromeda tied to the rock;90 and many more mythological subjects.91 Then he turns to subjects from sacred scripture, and above all the Passion, all in honour of the deceased.92 But the most beautiful are six very large works, which challenge all envy, and pull the mask off Momus’s face.93 The first of these Gerbier describes in some detail, prefacing his description with lines like ‘a little softly now, pen and chalk, let brush now flow - Grief must now grow from this soil; these are the shores where Cypresses abound, where there is no longer place for laurel’.94 Here Charon appears with his ragged boat, then Cerberus with his back all bent from the passage through Acheron. Sweat pours from Charon’s torso, as he struggles to get his soul-swallowing boat through the torrent. But however inexorably he proceeds, he finds no booty here; he has no chance against Goltzius95 - despite all the efforts of his detractors, as Gerbier comments in the marginal annotation.96 All this is brilliantly represented by Rubens; with a few swift strokes and touches of the brush he shows Charon’s muscles and his misshapen brow.97 There is no one who so captures the very essence of the art by means of which each lively figure plays its appropriate role.88 ‘But as I write’, Gerbier concludes, ‘my pen slows down, my eyes lift to the scene, Rubens concludes his work, and Charon picks up his rags, in this place meeting no one who will so much as yield to
him: "ontmoetend op dit pas niemand die voor hem swicht".\textsuperscript{39}

But why should Gerbier have chosen this subject at all? As far as we know, Rubens never painted this kind of underworld scene (except, of course, in some of the eschatological subjects of just these years); and yet the description of the Charon paintings is more substantial than that of any of the others in this poem. Could it be that Gerbier had in mind an implicit parallel with Michelangelo, whose Charon appears so tellingly at the bottom of the fresco of the Last Judgment in the Sistine Chapel? We may wonder at what Rubens himself would have thought of both the content and the context of Gerbier’s tribute; but what better compliment than to suggest that he too was capable of a grand conception of the subject, and of thus emulating one of the greatest achievements of art? Not even the Belgian Apelles would have demurred at such expectations.

Now these lines may all seem a little breathless, but there can be no doubt of the graphic and colourful plausibility of the paintings by Rubens Gerbier has imagined. Hirschmann thought that these were descriptions of real paintings which had since been lost;\textsuperscript{100} but this is surely wrong, however much we may be tempted to see in the brief allusion to an Andromeda tied to a rock a reference to an existing or recorded painting;\textsuperscript{101} and even though the three paintings mentioned by Baudius in his poem of 1616 - a Venus and Adonis, a Ganymede, and a Prometheus - may just conceivably be identifiable.\textsuperscript{102} The pictures mentioned by Gerbier are plainly imaginary,\textsuperscript{103} just as in the case of the elaborate painting described by Vondel in the dedication of the Gebroeders twenty years later;\textsuperscript{104} but even so we are left with the impression of a writer, however uncouth and overwritten some of his lines may be, who has managed to capture in words something of the spirit and breadth of Rubens’s art, at a time when this seemed to be quite beyond the capabilities of better educated and more refined talents. It is hard to avoid reflecting on the irony of what must be the longest contemporary poetic tribute to the Antwerp painter appearing in a lament for Haarlem’s greatest draughtsman.

A whole procession of artists follow Rubens in this cortège. To each of their names Gerbier appends a few illuminating lines or marginalia. First comes Hendrik van Balen, then Bloemaert, then Cornelis van Haarlem, Hendrik Vroom, Cornelis Claes van Wieringen, Esaias van de Velde, Floris van Dyck, Jan Pynas, Frans Badens, Pieter Lastman (especially highly praised), Adriaen van Nieulandt, Werner van der Valckert, Franquish Venant, Jan Tengnagel, David Vinckboons, Govert Jansz., Roelandt Savery, Abraham Vinck, Adam van Vianen, Cornelis van der Voort, Joachim Uytewael, Cornelis Boissens,\textsuperscript{105} and then two artists of special importance for the funeral procession: Hendrick de Keyser, who sculpts the tomb from white marble;\textsuperscript{106} and Abraham van Doort, already then in the service of the English court, but now reimported to make the life-like wax image of Goltzius.\textsuperscript{107} After this key pair comes Goltzius’s brother-in-law, the then renowned scientist and naturalist, Cornelis Drebble.\textsuperscript{108} Drebble is allotted more lines than anyone else in the poem besides Rubens, and when we come upon his name, we half expect to find that Gerbier will assign him the task of automating the wax image made by van Doort, in
the manner of those automata that were to be popular in Amsterdam later on in the century. But this is expecting too much, even though Gerbier speaks of Drebble's experiments that would make man swim like fish, fly, rise to the moon, explore the depths of the sea, and sail without the aid of sails, rudders or oars. "Come here, Archimedes; come everyone to learn at this source". What Drebble does provide for Goltzius's tomb, however, is a perpetuum mobile, to symbolize the perpetual immortality of Goltzius's soul. Then the procession resumes, with Hendrik van Steenwyck, Jan Brueghel, Jacob de Gheyn, Simon Frisius, the recently deceased Isaac Oliver, Miereveld, Ravesteyn, Daniel Mytens, Abraham Blyenbergh, Dirck Boijsens and several others from London, The Hague, and Amsterdam bringing up the rear; and finally Jacob Matham arrives, with fresh impressions of prints straight from the press. It is quite an assortment, but a most instructive one; and this is only the first of the three books.

We need not dwell on the second book, for it continues in much the same vein, with a few more artists mentioned, and further reflections on envy, death and immortality. The third book brings down more figures from the mythological Pantheon, and the tone grows loftier still. But it also contains an interesting variation on the theme of Rome and the Netherlands. In much the same manner as Lucas d'Heere's 1565 Inevitable Against a Certain Painter, Gerbier reflects on the craze for visiting Rome, not much use for lesser talents, since 'he who goes there a donkey does not easily return as a horse; many live there amidst cares and woes, simply in order to make their art more skillful and ingenious. O Goltzius you too were there, but now it is plain to all that the real Antique is not at Rome'. And then, very much in the spirit of Hendrik Spiegel and the other writers who extol the attractions and virtues of the Netherlands over Rome or some mythical Arcadia, he exords Athena to remain in the Nederlandish Garden, whose pious citizenry adorn her with wreaths and will comfort her for her loss. This land is worth as much as the Rome she - Athena - nourishes so well. Finally bringing up the rear comes a constellation of seven stars who will ensure the fame of Goltzius' drawing: the engravers Jacob Matham, Jacob de Gheyn, Jan Muller, Pieter Serwouters, Hendrick Goudt and Crispin van de Passe; and at the very end Three Graces to console the Goddess of Drawing: the lovely Anna and Maria Tesselschade, Roemer Visscher's daughters, and Magdalena van de Passe.

Gerbier concludes his work with a seven-page postscript in prose. In it he apologizes for the deficiencies of his literary abilities - but justifies his efforts on the ground that Haarlem had not given Goltzius his due. It is perhaps not surprising that Gerbier could find no publisher in Haarlem, and that Aert Meurs in the Hague kept his manuscript for two years before finally taking the decision to go ahead with it; but it is true that Goltzius was not immediately accorded a gravestone and epitaph, possibly because of the damage his personal reputation suffered in his last years; and so Gerbier's poignant tribute in the form of an imaginary cortege is in this sense wholly justified. Again, however, he gives way to his obsession with the carplings of the envious, and here his reflections have the ring of truth about them. "It has come to such
a pass these days, that no one seems able to speak well of another". He comments. He worries at length about the fact that there will be some who will be upset, even direct their venom at him, either for making them part of the procession when they would have preferred Goltzius's name to be buried; or for leaving them out; or for having devoted more lines to some artists than to others. He admits that he could not have included everyone in such a small space although some 50 artists are included - and he was, after all, not trying to emulate Van Mander.

As Gerbier’s further comments were written in the very year that van Mander was to be reprinted, it may be worth considering them for a moment. Every day one sees van Mander being misused, he says; the Schälder-Boeck is turned inside out and upside down, by some to see if they have been sufficiently highly rated, by others to note who stands in front or at the rear, and by others yet who say that van Mander had better have remained silent. “I realize,” Gerbier seems to be saying, “that for the same reasons my few lines in honour of Hendrik Goltzius will also be vilified.” What a vivid and easily understandable picture of the petty jealousies and rivalries that must have characterized the artistic climate in Haarlem at the time! Occasionally art historians have attempted to diminish the impact of Van Mander on contemporary art and artists, but a passage like this gives the lie to such a view.

We have come some way from Rubens, and I may have been carried away by the obvious interest of the poem for students of Dutch, rather than Flemish, art. But even if Gerbier had devoted fewer lines to Rubens, even if they had been of the same order of cliché and fulsome hyperbole that we find in the conventional tributes of the time, we would still be left with this first testimony of a relationship that was to become quite close and in which art and politics were soon to become inextricably linked. In 1627 Rubens and Gerbier spent a week together in Delft, supposedly treating for peace between England and Spain, but taking the opportunity now to visit the leading painters of Holland - including in Utrecht Bloemaert, Moreelse, Terbruggghen, Poelenburgh and Honthorst. Their diplomatic efforts were wholly thwarted by the powers that be, when unbeknownst to them and to their mutual distress, Legaños and Olivares concluded a separate treaty with Richelieu. But despite Gerbier’s apparently dubious character, their relationship, alternately affectionate and guarded, lasted until Rubens’ very last days. What bound them together was not only political exigency but a common commitment to art; what more auspicious beginning could it have had than Gerbier’s touching inclusion of Rubens at the head of his imaginary tribute to the draughtsmanship of Goltzius? If there was one thing that Rubens desired as keenly as anything else, it was the reunion of the Northern and Southern Netherlands: we can be sure that nothing would have given him greater pleasure than to give symbolic expression to that ideal by taking his place amongst the artists of Holland in their joint homage to Goltzius, among so many whose careers had been disrupted by the very rift that Rubens spent his life vainly trying to heal. The new art of the North was to take wholly different course to that represented both by Goltzius and Rubens, but in 1620 there was still only one artist who could take the place at its head; and that artist was Rubens.
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Muller discusses the fictive canvas of Perseus and Andromeda shown overlapping the
loggia of Rubens's House in Antwerp in Haarwelin's engraving of 1629; and briefly, in his
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The best summary of all these activities of Coebergher is to be found in De Maeyer, op. cit., pp. 198-213, with extensive archival and bibliographic references.

Appendix, lines 1-6.

It seems clear that in his use of this phrase, Gerbier meant to suggest a painting with allegorical figures. Cf. Abraham van der Doort’s description of the painting of Peace and War (National Gallery, London) which Rubens presented to Charles I as an “Emblen wherein the difference and ensuenices between peace and warrs is Shewed” (O. Millar, ed., “Abraham van der Doort’s Catalogue of the Collection of Charles I”, Walpole Society, XXXVII, 1956-60, p. 000).

Appendix, lines 1-6.

Vondel, Gebroeders (1640), Dedication to Vossius: “Hy (Rubens) valt aen het tekenen, ordineeren, en schilderen, noote zijn wakkere geest rust eer het werckstuk voltoit zy”.


On the possibility of identifying these works — the Andromeda in particular — see p. 000 above and notes 101 and 103 below.

“En dyusent dinghen meer, ghehaelt uit d’Heydens boeck”, Appendix, line 19.

Appendix, lines 22-23.

Appendix, lines 24-25.

Appendix, lines 22-25.

Appendix, lines 38-48.

“Hoe den Poeticinen Heydenschen Caron aen Goltius gheen cans en heeft, waer van zijn eynde ende godtsalich sterven een goet bewijs van gheweest is, dienende tot wederlegginghe aen de quade gerucht-makers ende faen-roovers”, Gerbier, p. 6.

Appendix, lines 50-54. Here I have abbreviated Gerbier’s description of the imaginary Chiron in these lines, and have omitted to translate the passages on his bare head, his wrinkled skin, and the rumbling noises he utters as he proceeds.

Appendix, lines 58-59.

Appendix, lines 60-63.

Hirschmann, p. 109.

Hirschmann, p. 109, suggested that the Andromeda mentioned here might be identifiable either with the painting of Persoon and Andromeda in Leningrad, No. 461 (K.d.K., p. 224) or with that in Berlin, No. 785 (K.d.K., p. 225). But the possibility of either of these identifications is undermined by the fact that both paintings almost certainly date from just after 1620, by which time Gerbier had already finished writing his poem. Professor J. Muller, however, in the article cited in note 55 above, notes that the enormous fictive canvas tacked to a wooden stretcher showing Persoon and Andromeda in Harrewijn’s engraving of 1692 is identical with the composition now in Leningrad. Now although it is just possible that some knowledge — probably secondhand — of the decoration of Rubens’ House may have been at the back of Gerbier’s mind when he wrote his poem, the vagueness of each description, the odd juxtaposition of a variety of subjects, and the constant tailing-off into thoughts provoked by each subject which are more or less inappropriate to the general theme, suggests a process of somewhat undisciplined literary invention rather than the consistent reflection of a sequence of real paintings — but see the hypothesis outlined in note 103 below. There is neither any reason nor any need for descriptions of real paintings here: the whole point of the enigma which Rubens heads is that it is an imaginary one. In honour of an artist to whom the homage is purely literary. As for the proposed Andromeda identification, it may in any case be noted that the description “d’onheyl’ghe rots dae
Andromeda claechden" suggests the kind of composition where Andromeda is shown tied mournfully to rock, and not one in which she is in the process of being freed by Perseus: indeed, in both the Leningrad and the Berlin pictures the expression on her face reflects anything but the emotion suggested by Gerbier's lines. The largest part of the poem, moreover, is devoted to the complex description of Charon ferrying souls across the Styx: this is certainly an odd subject for a painting or series of paintings, even when they relate to a dead hero; who is to know the extent to which the name of the dedicatee of the poem, Noel de Caron, may, paronomastically, have inspired these lines? One has only to notice Gerbier's fondness for expansive plays on proper nouns — cf. for example the play on the first syllable of Abraham Bloemaert's surname cited in note 106 below. And how can one take the references to "a thousand things more, taken from pagan books" (Appendix, line 19), and the consequent need to include subjects from the Passion too, in any terms other than those of a profuse literary inventiveness, restricted only by the vague possibility that these are all subjects Rubens could well have treated? But see again note 103 below.

102. For the possible — but unlikely — identifications of the Venus and Adonis with the painting in Dusseldorf (K.d.K., p. 29), the Ganymede with that in the collection of Erbpriinz Karl zu Schwarzenberg in Vienna (K.d.K., p. 39) and the Prometheus with that in Philadelphia (reproduced in van Gelder, p. 127, plate 18; but see also J.S. Held, "Rubens' Prometheus Bound", Philadelphia Museum of Art Bulletin, LIX, 1963, pp. 17-32), see Rooses-Ruelens, p. 58, van Gelder, pp. 122-128, and Rens, pp. 332-334. Rens rightly points out the discrepancy between Baudius' descriptions and all of these paintings; cf. also W. Prohaska, in (Cat. Exhib.), Peter Paul Rubens 1577-1640, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, 1977, No. 8, pp. 58-60. On the other hand, it is by no means impossible that Baudius may have recalled paintings of these subjects. In any case, he is likely to have been as familiar as Rubens was with the ekphrastic passages in Achilles Tatius on both a Prometheus and a Perseus and Andromeda subject. For the connection between Rubens' Philadelphia painting and Achilles Tatius, see C. Dempsey, "Eunathes Redivivus: Rubens' Prometheus Bouma", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXX, 1967, pp. 420-425.

103. Indeed, it seems by no means impossible that Gerbier was thinking of works by Goltzius when he composed these lines on Rubens. When he described a Combat between Apollo and Pan, followed by a reference to the Nine Muses, might he not have had in mind Goltzius's engraving of the Judgment of Midas (where the Nine Muses are actually present)? Might Goltzius's Andromeda engraving then have occurred to him, and then finally his Passion series (the generic description "De Passy" in line 22 of the Appendix may well suggest a series rather than an individual subject)? Given the general difficulty in assessing the early stages of any creative conception, this seems nonetheless a plausible account — oddly ironic though it may now seem to be; and I am grateful to Elizabeth McGrath for suggesting it to me. The engravings concerned are catalogued in O. Hirschmann, Verzeichnis des Grischinen Werks von Hendrick Goltzius, 1558-1617, Leipzig, 1921, Nos. 132, 157 and 21-32 respectively.

104. Reference in note 10 above. Vondel expansively describes a supposed painting of David's Judgment of the Sons of Saul in the Presence of the Gibeonites (2 Samuel 21 — although the subject of the Gebroeders is taken from a variety of passages concerning the Sons of Saul in both the first and second books of Samuel).

105. Gerbier, pp. 7-10. This initial list thus combines artists representing a surprisingly wide range of tendencies in Dutch art around 1617-18. The following are the artists who receive more than obvious attention: Abraham Bloemaert (although the lines about him are largely devoted to a play on the first syllable — Bloem for flower — of his name), Cornelis van Haarlem, Esaias van de Velde ("Breng d'Aerd' veel oncruyt voort, dat niemand deugd en doet/ Siet hoe Velden noch goc Vrucht draagt, en veel voet/ Des Velds scotten borst" — a significant early reference), Frans Badens (probably because Goltzius was "sijn liefste vriend"), Pieter Lastman ("Lastman, d'eer d'Amstels voet, die wil iek hier aan voeghen/ Op wiens Const't veeld'rigst oogh moet sterren met genoeg") but most of the lines on individual artists here are in fact more worthy of attention than transpires from the meagre attention accorded to them in the literature.


108. On Drebbel, see G. Tertie, Cornelis Drebbel (1572-1633), Amsterdam, 1932. For Rubens' comments on Drebbel — whom he met in 1629 — see Rooses-Ruelens, V, No. DCXV, p. 153.
They are unusually cool for the time.


110. Gerbier, p. 11, lines 11-24 (lines 17-18; “Comt Archimedes hier, comt alle hier (ter Schoolen/ Comt suyght uyt desen Boom ...”). The reference to exploring the depths of the sea is, of course, an allusion to Drebels’s various attempts — some apparently successful, at least later on — at making a submarine.


112. Gerbier, p. 11, line 25 - p. 18, line 14. In this listing, both Abraham Vinck and Cornelis van der Voort are mentioned for a second time.


114. Gerbier, pp. 15-23; see especially pp. 19-20 for the further reflections on Golzheimer, fame, envy and immortality. Note too the insistently breathless tone of lines like “Prijst prijst/ Italia u Raepht et Angoels;/ Duyts-Lant: Albert Durer pugt Vnrenkrijck van Bel-Angoels;/ Ghy Neerlandt die nu voet soo meniggh gheest vernaemt;/ Roemt vry soo veel ghy wilt, ghy, mijn Dicht is niet vervaert;/ Te meerder dat ghy pocht, te meer mijn Pen wil schrijven;/ Te meer “tvoorvry ontvliegt, te meer den niet wil drijven” (Gerbier, pp. 16-17).

115. Gerbier, pp. 23-28. At the beginning of this section, for example, Gerbier again invokes the Fates, Minerva, Fauns, Pans, Ceres and Diana; and Persseus and Andromeda yet again (“En ghy Persseus cloock ghy cost doot ‘t minnen-uyer/Andromeda de Maeght verlossen van/ het Dier: Cost ghy hem niet in noot oock cloockck komen helpen?” (Gerbier, p. 24, lines 19-21).


117. “Doch die een Ezel gaat niet licht weer keeret een peert;/ Met commer en ellendt en sorghae/ daar veel leven; Om eenen cloocken aert een hare handt te gheven;/ Ghylij ghwaert ook daer, daer nu merckt ghgy gheswe,/ Als dat de recht Antic, te Romen niet en is”, Gerbier, p. 26, lines 24-28. Cf. the marginal comment on this page warning of the moral dangers of Rome: not only do those who go there as donkeys return as donkeys: they go there as Christians but return with as much evil as art, having been transformed by a pagan metamorphosis into Epicureans and deuykerheeten (Gerbier, p. 26 in margin).

118. On these writers, with a variety of examples, see D. Freedberg, *Dutch Landscape Prints of the Seventeenth Century*, London, 1980, pp. 12-15.

119. Cf. Gerbier, p. 31, lines 15-18: “Blijft op der consten oort, blijft in dij Neeheits Tuyyn./ Wiegen vroome Hurtherij met Cransen ciert u criyn/ Daer zijn die, wien lick u tot dij troost/ sal vertoonen/ Niet vol van const, als weerdich uwe croonen”.


121. Gerbier, pp. 32-34.


125. See Reznick, op. cit. (as in note 62 above), pp. 29-30, as well as Gerbier, pp. 22-23.

spouwen, gheeft my daervan macht ende vryheydt: voor mijn deel ick en vil de stormen die my de sotte nydige clapsachtighe tougheen hebben aengehieden, hier nieten toon setten, want het mijn wit niet en is alleene trachte mijn GOLTIVS voor te staen". Cf. the passage (shortly following this one) in the next note. All the pages of the postscript similarly - and sometimes even more heatedly - reflect Gerbier's obsessiveness about the venom of the envious.

127. "... ick achte daer sommighe wel soo opgeheblazen sullen zijn, die het tot een cleyn achtigninge sulle trecken, dat ick haer achter den by Goltius oft tot Eere der Teecken Const in zijn eer Dicht begrepen hebbe, die denck ick alsoo lief hadden dat Goltius naem ook begreaven waer, also dat men haer naam alleen een gantsch boeck vullen soude", Gerbier, p. 42.

128. "... ende al ist saecche dat ick van den eenen somtijds breuher verhiael als van den anderen... Willende ook menighe andere cloeckhe Baesen die daer niet is verhait en zijn ghebeden hebben, dat sy het hun niet aan en trecken dat ick haer schijne voor bij togaen, ende haer laten dese reden ghenoeghen, dat het stack in dese woynighe blaeuren begrepen hun allen niet by-een en verheyste; ook dat ick gheeen "Carol van Manderen" en ghedacht naer te booten... ", Gerbier, p. 43.

129. Carel van Mander, Hol Schilder-Boeck... Hier is op nieuw by-ghevoecht het leven des Antheurs, Amsterdam (Jacob Pietersz Wachter), 1618.

130. "... men siet noch dagheliex hoe van Manderen missandelt wert ende voor loshinghe van iijhen arbeyt, het finij van quade ghemoeend moet voelen, hoe hy om ende wederom ghetoomelt wert, den eenen om te sien oft hy daer hoog naechen in uytgheeset is, den anderen om te sien wie voor oft achter staet, den andere scyt van Manderen mocht beter ghewegehen hebben, het welcke denke ick op dese regheelen ter eeren Henrici Goltii geschreven is, ook ghhepoghen sal werden", Gerbier, p. 43. See also the Clinic- and Lof-Dichter - especially the one by F. Bor - that preface both editions of van Mander’s Schilder-Boeck for conventional accolades of fame and envy.


133. See, for example, the remarkable series of letters to Gerbier from 1627 right March, 1640: Magurn, Nos. 100, 105, 109, 117, 121, 124-126, 225, 227, 228, 231, 246, 249 provide revealing insights into Rubens’ relations with him.

Appendix

Balthasar Gerbier

Eer ende/CLAGHT-DICHT/ Tor Eeren van den lofteurderighen Constrijcken/ ende Gheleerden/ HENRICVS GOLTIVS/ Constrijcken Schilder, Plaetsnijder, ende/ Meester van de PENNE/.
Overleden tot HAERLEM, den 29. December/ ANNO 1617) Door BALTHASAR GERBIER.

In 's GRAVENHAGE/ Ghedruckt, By AERT MEURS, Boeckvercooper, woonende/ inde Pape-straet, inden Bybel, Anno 1620. Pp. 5-6.

1. Hier stelt hy (Coebergher) boven een *Phoebus vol van stralen,
   Hier is een cloeckhe Gheest dien ick niet kan afmalen,
   Ilyr staet een, 'eers' van al, die vol Const' voorhoof gezigt
   Aen allen die hier zijn, aen dees' zijd van't Gheberght.

5. Die toont zich als een heldt, die niet en heeft te dencken
   Dat cortheyt van den Tijt hem Const oft gheest sou erecken,
   Biedt hier zijn rappe handt, en beeld daar af seer cloeck
   Een Emblema vol eins, op eenen grooten doeck.
   Daer swierdt zijn snel ghesicht! den borstel wil hier baren,
Niet een beeldt twee of dry, maer in een stondt veel scharen,
't En is het Pinceel niet, het is zijn rijpen Gheest.
Die noyt geen vorm en slaet van ander lieden leest.
Hier maelt hy af den Berch waer Apollo zijn snaren,
Laet drillen in den strijdt, daar Pan cryptt uyt zijn blaren,
Met zijn Satyr's heet daer't oordeel is ghegaen,
Wie dat van beyden heeft het alderbest ghedaen.
Hier beeld hy Constich by te neghen wije Maegbden
Daer toe d'onheyl'gie Rots daer Andromeda claechden,
En duysent dinghen meer, ghehaelt uit d'Heydens boeck.
Daer naer neemt hy zijn vlucht naer 't Hemels hey'te wegen,
En stelt veel sinnen voor in 't heylisch woord beschreven
Zoo werd tot d'hoochste eer des overleden loff
De Passy afschemaelt, vol merzh. vol constich stoff.
Doch 't geen hier 't schoonst verschijnt zijn zes seer groote stucken
Die Nijlcheyt't hoofd bieen, en Mornus't Morn afrucken,
Wett daer u Tanden op ghy broeders in de Can.
Ghy Coppen vol van wint, stom' hecken voor de Man.
Dit is het eerste deel, waar in men licht an mercken
Dat haere schors' omvaet de uytegekinste wercken,
Dien hy voort heeft ghebracht, en die hier zijn gesteldt
Op dat soo wel mijn Dicht, als Pama, daer van meldt.
Maer soochoch wat, spalt, oft swart, daer dit pinceel nu vloegen,
't Schijnt oft drootheyt moet zijn dat op dees' groot sal groeuen,
Cipres, Atropos cruikt, woelt hier op dese Strandt.
't En zien den Lanweer niet hier spruyten uyt dit Landt.
Het is een teghendeel, hier wilt Charon verschijnen
Met zijn ghelapte Boot, wie sou schier connen pijnen,
Te schrijven van den hont, daer comt hy aenghstoeyet.
Crom-ruggghich door het nat van Acheron ghegroeyet;
Daer loopt hem 't sweet van 't lijff, daer siet den bui eens hijgen,
Om zijn Ziel-slokchig schip door dese vloet te criijgen.
Versenckt vry onderweegh, naeckt hier noyt met u schuurt,
Maer smoorret in de Stiex, hier is voor u gheen buyt.
Noch drijft by dapper aen, wat baet ghy sult doch 'wenden,
Want dien waer ghy naer tracht is vry van u ellenden,
Ghevaren door de Loech, en rust, in vreedom vreught.
De Heerlickheyt besigt by 't Centrum van de Docht.
Ee siet den calen oop, hoe slecht dat hy sal wijcken,
Hoort hoe ij brullen wil als ledich hy moet strijcken,
Sijn leden zijn ghreecht, vol cronskeln is zijn huyt,
't Is Rubens cloecken Gheest die dit al beeldt uyt.
Charon gheen spiren heeft, gheen soo mismaekte fronszen
Oft sijn handt plant het recht met een vegghe of twee gossen,
Soo dat wie zijn werk niet denckt stracken dat het al leeft,
Wat dat sijn Gheest, sijn handt, en sijn Pinceel ons gheeft.
Met recht soo heeft de Faom hem in dit stuck verkoren
Dewijl de Const met hem schijnet te zijn heeboren,
En dat daer niemant is die 't wesen soo uybeelt,
Weer door elke Figuer haer rechte rol speelt.
Maer terwijl ick verhael, hij is my al ontvloogh
dacht, Mijn Pen die cryptt vast voort en volght hem met de ooghen,
Hy eyndicht nu dit werk, Charon sijn lappen licht,
Ontmoetend op dit pas niemant die voor hem swight.
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