

Preface.

In the British Museum's Department of Prints and Drawings there is a small book containing, among other texts, a copy of Balthazar Gerbier's *Eer Ende Claght-dicht Ter Eeren van den lofweerdighen Constrijken ende Gheleerden Henricus Goltius*¹; his tribute in verse, with a prose afterword, to the painter, engraver and draughtsman Hendrick Goltzius. This modest volume, bound in seventeenth century marbled paper, is a rarity. There are perhaps only two other copies surviving from the edition published in The Hague in 1620, and never reprinted. And while it seems to be accepted that Gerbier's short work has some significance in the context of art-historical writing, its inaccessibility has meant that few scholars have had the chance to consider it in detail. The well known articles by Otto Hirschmann² and David Freedberg³ are among the very few accounts to result from a direct perusal of it.

My long-term objective is to offer a re-evaluation of Gerbier's long and diverse life in the various fields in which he took an active role. This will include looking at the substantial body of written work that he left, both in print and manuscript. Much of his published work is available through Early English Books Online, and I decided to make a transcript of the *Eer Ende Claght-dicht* so that this work is also accessible via the Internet, and I hope it will prove of interest to people working in such fields as Dutch art and literature. I am very grateful to the staff of the Study Room of the British Museum's Department of Prints and Drawings, who have so kindly given me access to the original, and to Martin Royalton-Kisch for approving the idea of making a transcript of the text available online.

This *is* a transcript; *not* a new edition. I am not an art historian, and my Dutch is too limited for me to think of producing a modern translation, or providing a detailed scholarly critique. Should anyone wish to undertake one, I shall be delighted – I suspect that there is much more to be inferred from it about Gerbier himself than I have been able to extract, and I would welcome any additional information! But it seems sensible to clarify a few points, and briefly address one or two questions about the work.

The Transcript.

I have not attempted to produce a *facsimile* of the original: a modern typeface has been used for clarity, and the proportions of the page have had to accommodate the constraints of 21st century software. For example, Gerbier's marginal notes

appear in my text as numbered footnotes. Otherwise, the content of the book is laid out as closely as possible to the original: the words on each of Gerbier's pages correspond to those on mine, and I have numbered the pages as he did. Roman and Italic typefaces are employed just as in the 1620 printing and I have tried to maintain the relative font sizes used by Gerbier's publisher/printer, Aert Meuris. I have not been able to include the various printers' ornaments used in the original, and while I have used 'drop' capitals where he did, these are plain, whereas some of those in the original were decorated. Where appropriate, I have modernised 'V' to 'U', and I have used the modern 's' throughout.

The Errata listed in the original, and thus acknowledged by the author, have been corrected in the text, but other errors have been left as they appear in the book. (For example, on page 44 there are two missing letters in a three-letter word.) While such corrections might seem simple to make, I preferred to take a cautious approach, and avoid possible mistakes. The British Museum copy has, perhaps in the process of the later 17th century rebinding, had its page edges trimmed. A few letters in some of the marginal notes have been lost, but here I have inserted the uncontroversial missing letters in brackets. (For example, on page 44.) I should like to thank Dale Carr for answering several queries, and for suggestions regarding Gerbier's anagrams, though of course any errors that remain are entirely mine. Or, of course, Gerbier's!

The printer abbreviated many words in the original, both in the marginal notes, and at the ends of lines. This usually takes the form of omitting a letter 'n' and inserting a sign over the preceding vowel to indicate its absence. Aert Meuris variously used the signs '˘', '˘' or '˘' and I have tried to reproduce these as in the original. In the prose section of the work, the typesetter scattered decorative 'W's throughout the text, and I have used a plain, lower-case letter, other than in contexts such as the start of a sentence, where a capital is obviously appropriate. I regret having been unable to imitate the layout of the original more exactly.

Lastly, it should be noted that the title page and dedication both spell Gerbier's forename as *Balthasar*, not *Balthazar*. Since the majority of his published and manuscript writings – including autograph sources in which he provides his full name (rather than just 'B Gerbier') have a 'z', I have decided to use the spelling 'Balthazar Gerbier' when referring to him. (He became *Sir* Balthazar in October 1638.)

The British Museum Copy.

This is the copy referred to by David Freedberg. Hirschmann refers to the copy in the Haarlem Stadsbibliotheek⁴, and the online catalogue of the University of Gent⁵ confirms that there is also a copy there. Hirschmann refers to one in the possession of ‘D Franken’, and it is possible that others survive in private collections. The provenance of the British Museum copy is not complete, but while it is not possible to identify the first owner, the book seems to have spent much of its existence in Haarlem. Owned by the engraver Isaack van der Vinne, (1665-1740) it was acquired at the sale that followed his death by Johannes Enschede (1708-1780). Undoubtedly the British Museum acquired it through the Enschede collection sale in 1867, or shortly afterwards – the volume appears in the sale catalogue as Lot 2928.

The binding is presumably the work of van der Vinne and the spine bears the simple title of ‘Schilderkunst’. Inside the front cover is an inscription by Enschede, recording the circumstances of the acquisition. Folded, and glued to the flyleaf, is a piece of paper illustrating some basic shapes of three-dimensional geometry - a cube, a cone etc. - neatly drawn in ink. The two pages that follow contain handwritten comments on each of the works bound into this little volume, preceded by the words: *‘In dit bandje zijn by een gebonde verscheyde stukjes wegens de Schilderkunst’*.

The works bound together are:

1. Govaert Bidloo: (1649-1713) *Aan den Herr Philips de Flines op Zyn Kunstkammer.*(Amsterdam 1681. 12pp)
2. Philips Angel: *Lof der Schilder-Konst.* (Leyden 1642. 58pp.)
3. Balthasar Gerbier: *Eer ende Claght-dicht ter eerenHenricus Goltius....*(The Hague 1620. 46pp.)
4. J(acques) de Ville: *T’Samen-spreekinghe Betreffende de Architecture end Schilder-konst.* (Gouda 1628. 16pp.)
5. François Fickaert: *Metamorphosis end Leven van den vermaerden Mr Quinten Matsijs.* (Antwerp 1648. 22pp.) Fickaert’s text is followed by verses on Matsijs by Thomas More, in both Latin and Dutch, and a short verse signed ‘VGB’:

Tot de Schilders.

Comt ghy Schilders, comt ghy Gheesten,
 Comt den minsten met den meesten,
 Comt, becroont die weerdigh belt,
 Dat soo in ons sinnen spelt:
 Wilt het hoofd met Lauwers gorden,
 Die van Smit ginck Schilder worden:
 Wenscht hem om sijn goet beleyt,
 Vrede, rust en Saligheyt.

The book has been in the British Museum since at least 1883, when a rubber stamp on the flyleaf notes that it was transferred (from the Library?) to the Department of Prints and Drawings as a ‘duplicate’.

The owner of the book commented on Gerbier’s publication in these words:

3. Eer en klagt-digt, ter eeren H:Goltzius, door Balthazar Gerbier, is een seer poëtisch dog gaen sagt vloeyend Gedigt; het is al te breed-weydende, het voornaame onderwerp versmoort onder de menigvuldige bijvragingen, (“bijvrag” replaces several letters that have been crossed out.) voorders wat den Auteur tot Lof van Goltzius styl gaet by mij niet te hoog; hij stelt hem voor de Grootste plaatsnijder en taekenaer met de pen die de wereld tot die tijd toe gehad heeft; en ik voeg’er by, die de wereld tot nu nog toe gehad heeft en soo als Goltzius in’t plaatsnijden was, soo stel ik R de Hooge (meede te Haerlem woonende) de grootste meester in ’t plaat-Etsen te zijn, van alle die de wereld tot nog toe gehad heeft, daer Zyn ’er wel die in sommige studien en eenige bijzondere stükken, soo veel of meer der Konst betoont hebb, als hy in sommige heeft gedaen, maer in soo veelarlijke niet.

Gerbier’s tribute to Goltzius.

There has been something of a mystery surrounding the circumstances in which Gerbier came to write his first major published work. This is complicated by the fact that we know relatively of his life between about 1598, when his father died, and around 1614, when his talents as miniaturist and calligrapher led to his employment by Prins Maurits in The Hague. More research is needed in this area: he may well have been at least partly educated in one of the French Academies. He certainly had family in Amsterdam, and his detailed familiarity with the artists of both the Northern and Southern Netherlands suggest that he was by 1618 very

much in contact with many of the men and women he depicts in verse, taking part in an imaginary funeral procession for Goltzius.

There is no evidence that Gerbier was ever a pupil of Goltzius, and in view of his vigorously expressed admiration for his subject, it seems probable that he would have mentioned it elsewhere, had this been the case. But he appears to feel strongly about the way he alleges Goltzius has been treated since his death, and says in his afterword that he has written his tribute in order to remind the people of Haarlem of their failure to accord Goltzius the respect due to him. Who prompted him to put quill to paper? Hirschmann suggested that someone known to Gerbier in The Hague – perhaps Jacques de Gheyn – influenced him, but it seems equally likely that it was Cornelis Drebbel who in London encouraged his young compatriot to put his talents to use in the production of an elegy for Drebbel's brother-in-law.⁶ Drebbel is, after all, given more lines than anyone but Rubens. Gerbier had already written poetry; a set of printed verses complimenting Prins Maurits had probably appeared before their author left The Hague for London.⁷ Throughout his life, Gerbier was to produce quantities of verse in Dutch, French and English, and this early effort, like the *Eer ende Claght-dicht*, concludes with the words *Mon heur est en Gerbe*. This sounds like the assertion of a young man confident of his talent and potential: it is also of course a writer's *Zinspreuk* - the kind of anagram popular among writers at the time - and can be deciphered as either '*Het noemen Gerberus*' or even '*nomen heet Gerberus*'. Either way, the name is Gerbier, and he uses it also to sign his early verse tribute to Prins Maurits!

There is no doubt that Gerbier was impressed by the inventions of Drebbel. He may also have known Thomas Tymme's *A Dialogue Philosophicall* of 1612, which describes Drebbel's *Perpetuum Mobile*, and uses the Biblical figure of Bezaleel to personify his ingenuity.⁸ Gerbier likewise refers to Bezaleel and Ahaliab in a marginal note on the first page of the *Eer ende Claght-dicht*, and provides the Old Testament reference.⁹

Influences?

In the background of Gerbier's verses is the inevitable shadow of van Mander. The verse form, the roll-call of Netherlandish artists and their patrons, and the author's own references to *Het Schilderboek* combine to confirm that the young Gerbier knew the book well, even if his objectives were rather different. (He may also have known the *De Kerck der Deught*, dedicated to Cornelis Ketel.) With the *Eer ende Claght-dicht* he was celebrating the spectacular work of Goltzius the

‘*Supermagister*’ of the pen and burin, rather than providing a biography. He cannot be said to have ‘updated’ van Mander, but holds forth pessimistically in his prose afterword on the way in which van Mander has been ‘*mishandelt*’, and on the arguments and professional jealousies that his book has provoked among contemporary artists.

As well as reminding his Haarlem contemporaries of the honour due to Goltzius, Gerbier may well have had more personal ambitions. As well as his obvious enthusiasm for the visual arts, Gerbier had links with contemporary writers, and it is in Dutch literary circles that we find a connection that appears to have played a part in motivating him to write the *Eer ende Claght-dicht*. Gerbier notes in his *Généalogie de Messire Balthazar Gerbier* that his mother Radegonde died in Amsterdam in 1619¹⁰. She appears to have lived there with her eldest son, Israel, whose mercantile career seems to have taken him there. By 1620, his family lived in a house in the newly built Rosengracht¹¹, and the Montias database shows him purchasing pictures at auction in the 1620s. His wife, née Catharina Kieff, was the sister of Cornelia Kieff, the wife of a painter, Jan Basse. Another sister, Anna, was married to Pieter Rodenburgh, the brother of Theodoor (or Dirk) Rodenburgh, one of Amsterdam’s leading writers, who wrote for the *Wit Lavendel* and later the *Egelantier* Rederijkerskamers. His colleagues included Abraham de Coninck and Heinsius – both are referred to in the *Eer ende Claght-dicht* - and his family connection with the young Balthazar Gerbier does not seem to have been previously considered.

Like Balthazar Gerbier, Theodoor Rodenburgh was a traveller: he had been to Spain, and in 1610 had undertaken a trip to the Guinea Coast, of which Gerbier later made a map that hinted at sources of gold and silver. He settled in Amsterdam in 1615, and in 1618 published a play entitled *Melibea*, which appeared under the auspices of the *Egelantier* and has an intriguing parallel with the *Eer ende Claght-dicht*.¹² The two works were essentially written in the same year, so that there may even have been a mutual influence. *Melibea* will be familiar to many in the context of Rodenburgh’s praise of several Amsterdam painters, as noted for example in Marten Jan Bok and Sebastien Dudok van Heel’s article on Govert Janszn. Poelenburgh.¹³ The play’s *Voor-spel*, stylistically reminiscent of Gerbier’s verse, includes lines referring to a number of Amsterdam artists, linked variously by kinship, training, marriage, neighbourhood and patronage.

“Roemt van uw’ LANGHE PIER, roemt van uw waerde KETEL,

UW DIERYCK BARENTS lof. Men achtent noyt vermetel,
 Dat ghy uw heldens faem op uw baeckx-toppe viert,
 En uw verleden tijdt met gloryen lauriert.
 En die ghy hebt als noch PINAS, uw LASMANS wercken,
 UW PIETER YSACX, die u roofden Denemercken.
 TENGNAGEL. BADENS. VINCK, verciereu't Amstellandt,
 UW POELENBURGH. NIEU-LAND. MOEYERT. En VAN NANT.
 UW ZAV'RY. VINCKEBOONS, uw waerden vander VOORDEN,
 't Levanten ghy verciert door uw kunst'rijke Noorden."

In his poem, Gerbier introduces artists from various centres of activity in the Netherlands. On pages 8- 9, we find a remarkably similar Amsterdam group, though less concisely presented:

"Een lofweerdighe schaer d'eer d'Amstels rijcken oever,
 Die hier met een *Pinas* zijn t'saem ghecomen over,

Hier *Badens* berst eerst uyt, reeu dwingt my hem te noemen,
 De vrienden in den rouw voor vreemden binnen comen:
 Hy was sijn liefsten vriendt, noyt d'Amstel hy betrat
 Oft *Badens* d'eerst van al hem yv'righ wil'com bat.

Lastman, d'eer d'Amstels voet, die wil ick hier aen voeghen,
 Op wiens Const 'tweeld'rigst ooggh moet sterren met genoegē
 Liefhebbers sit vry neer, en met aendacht eens siet
 Oft niet der Consten mergh *Pictura* u daer biet.
 Nieuwlandt yv'righ verschijnt, sijn gonst hier wil bewijsen,
 G'lijck Const sijn Gheest verrijckt en sijnen Naem doet rijsen,
 Hebt ghy uyt 'sHollandts Thuyn vrucht-baerders uyt ghewijt
 'tNieuwlandt schoon vruchten uyt, *Atropos* u ten spijt.
 Warnarts hoogh' neersticheyt, sijn lust, en sijne gaven,
 Die tot de Const-Goddin soo yv'righ hem doen draven,
 Dat Faem den last versoet, en heft sijn Naem int licht,
 Die toont hem hier oock by, in yver hy niet swicht.
 Musa schorst dijn verhael, wint Tijt, Faem dees' schenct Cranssen,
 Venant en Vinckeboons, Tingh-Nagel, Govert Iansz.
 Savrey die spijt Hyems, de Velden bloeyen doet,
 Soo schoon dat Natuer roemt hem t'hebben opghevoet.
 Hier volghet Abraham Vinck, dies waert sijn Const doet blijckē,
 Cornelis vander Voort de Statie comt verrijcken."

Gerbier confirms the identity of Govert Jansz. as Rodenburgh's 'Poelenburgh'. He omits the deceased Aertsen, Barents and Ketel. The latter – also a member of the *Egelantier* - had died in August 1616, and the *Eer ende Claght-dicht* includes only artists alive as Gerbier was writing, with the exception of Isaac Oliver, who apparently died while the book was being written, and who gets a footnote referring to his death.

A comparison of the two lists of artists suggests their similarities are not coincidental:

	Gerbier	Rodenburgh
1		Langhe Pier (Pieter Aertsen) d. 1575
2		(Cornelis) Ketel d.1616
3		Dieryck Barents d. 1592
4	(Jan) Pinas	(Jan) Pinas
5	(Frans) Badens	Badens
6	Pieter Lastman	Lasmans
7	Adriaen van Nieulandt	Nieu-land
8	Warnarts. (Werner van den Valkert)	
9		(Nicolaes) /Claes Cornelisz Moeyert
10	(Frans) Venant	Van Nant
11	David Vinckeboons	Vinckeboons
12	Tingh-Nagel	Tengnagel
13	Govert Ianszoon (Poelenburg)	Poelenburg
14	Roelandt Savery	Zav'ry
15	Abraham Vinck	Vinck
16	Cornelis van der Voort	Vander Voorden

As far as the artists alive in 1618 are concerned, except for Gerbier's inclusion of Werner van den Valkert¹⁴, (-whom he may have known as a poet as well as a pupil of Goltzius -) and Rodenburgh's mention of Moeyert, (- a fellow Rederijker -) the two groups are effectively the same. Gerbier's opening words '*Denckt niet 'tPhantasos zy...*' echo the first line of the *Voorspel to Melibea*: '*Denckt niet gy Heeren, Helden...*' This looks like a tribute, rather than a coincidence. Did the two writers discuss their work together? Was Rodenburgh a literary mentor to Gerbier? At present it is impossible to say, but the fact that Gerbier focuses on the Amsterdam artists so early in his book suggests that this milieu was central to his project, and that he may have spent a considerable time in Amsterdam, prior to his first visit to England. With several members of his family living and working there, this is not unlikely, while the circle of his Moucheron relatives may also have introduced him to men like Michel le Blon and Daniel Nijs, who were later to play significant parts in his career. The presence of drawings by Gerbier in the

collections of Amsterdam notables is also highly suggestive, and these connections will be considered separately.

Balthazar's connection with Theodoor Rodenburgh appears significant, but Rodenburgh is not the only contemporary writer whose influence is discernible. Gerbier refers on page 15 to Abraham de Coninck:

“De *Coninck* kent mijn Lier, die haer sanck niet wil laken,
En sal in dijn vierschaer mijn yver niet versaken,”

These lines can be interpreted in more than one way, but there is an implication that de Coninck, who contributed verses to Rodenburgh's *Melibea*, a prominent art dealer as well as playwright, himself busy in 1618 publishing his play *Jephthah*, is to be seen as a critic of Gerbier's writing, whose approval mattered to him - another link with Amsterdam's Chambers of Rhetoric.

There is another, more direct link with the Netherlandish literati, in the shape of the poetry of Daniel Heinsius. Described by the admiring Gerbier as “Heynsius den Nederlantschen Apollo” (page 35. Note 62), Heinsius had published his *Nederduytsche Poemata*¹⁵ in 1616, at around the time of Balthazar's departure for his first visit to England. This collection of verse includes the *Hymnus oft Lofsanck van Bacchus*, in which one finds elements of Greek mythology that Gerbier uses in the *Eer ende Claght-dicht*. At line 135 we read:

“Maer, Vader, die maer eens den schoonen hemel siet,
En woont by Phlegethon noch by Cocytus niet.”

- which Gerbier echoes on page 1:

“kDacht van *Cocytus* vloet en *Phlegetontis* Stroomen”

And at line 539 in the *Lofsanck*:

“In een geleende vreucht, met Ikelos zijn maet,
En Phantasos zijn soon, die dick wils met u gaet.”

This can be compared with Gerbier – also on page 1:

“Denckt niet 'tPhantasos zy, oft Ikelos zijn maet
Die droomen setten uyt als Morpheus opslaet”

Gerbier appends the marginal note “*Phantasos ende Ikelos zijn bedieders der droomen.*”

This shared imagery could be mere coincidence; its usage simply an example of literary convention. However, I suspect that Gerbier was very familiar with contemporary Dutch literature, and that this familiarity related to his sense of himself as a writer. Throughout his life he felt himself to be in his ‘element’ when putting pen to paper. Whether it was a matter of setting down a diplomatic report, a treatise on languages or military architecture, verses for his children, or a prayer for his wife, he was at home with the act of writing. The catalogue of his printed and manuscript works reveals an extensive body of work, and I strongly suspect that at the time of writing the *Eer ende Claght-dicht*, Balthazar saw himself as a writer –perhaps more than an artist - and was trying to attract the attention of Amsterdam’s literary elite, to further that ambition. He may have aspired to join the *Egelantier*, or the *Wit Lavendel* and to prove his competence, took the opportunity to address a subject that meant something to him: the draughtsmanship of Goltzius. The artist was already the subject of tributes by van Mander and Cornelis Ketel, and Gerbier was demonstrating both his connoisseurship in relation to the visual arts, and his ability to compose a skilfully sustained piece of verse. He was writing within the conventions of his day, utilising the techniques and imagery common to educated artists and writers, the *Liefhebbers* and *Virtuosi* who often profited from the pedagogical influence of the Rederijerskamers.

It is well known that many of the artists referred to in the *Eer ende Claght-dicht* were multi-talented men, who combined a professional life as painters, engravers or dealers with membership of a Rederijerskamer, for which they wrote plays and verse. Between 1610 and 1620, Haarlem’s ‘*Wijngaertrancken*’ had a particularly illustrious membership, that included Frans and Dirk Hals, Esias van de Velde and Salomon de Bray. Van Mander and Goltzius himself also had connections with the *Kamers*, and in view of this it is surprising to find Gerbier claiming in the *Eer ende Claght-dicht* that Haarlem had ignored the death of Goltzius. In fact, before Gerbier published his own tribute to Goltzius, there had been at least one publication that sought to honour Haarlem’s late Master. As Lawrence Nichols revealed in his 1993 article ‘*Hendrick Goltzius – Documents and Printed literature Concerning His Life*’, Gerbier’s elegy was preceded by a shorter, anonymous work, composed by a member of the *Wijngaertrancken*. This *Elegia ofte Klagh Dichtse Twee-Spraek over de Doot des Alder-konst-rijcksten Heer Henricus Goltzius, in sijn leven Kloeck Schilder, Teeckenaer, ende Konstigh Plaet-snijder*’, was published by Adriaen Roomen, and sold by Daniel de Keyser

in 1617. It must therefore have been composed immediately after the death of Goltzius.

The anonymous poet, whose nom de plume of ‘*Luyck geen Deucht*’ (or *Deught*) appears in connection with a number of *Eerdichten* attached to plays published in these years – for example Govert van der Eembd’s ‘*Sophonisba*’ – is identified by Arjan van Dixhoorn as Lucas Gijsbertsz.¹⁶ This first Elegy is very likely to have been known to Gerbier, (perhaps via Drebbel) and could well have played a part in his decision to compose his own work on the subject. Whether or not he had already written some of the verses, he must have begun his own elegy to Goltzius soon after the artist’s death, composing much of it before the death of Isaac Oliver (October 1617) and finishing before the death of Frans Badens. (November 1618.) And although he does not refer specifically to this anonymous Haarlem work, Gerbier may well have seen it as a challenge to be met by an Amsterdam writer.

A further contemporary source that needs to be considered here is the rare first edition of the ‘*Den Lof van Haerlem*’, published in 1616. Published anonymously, but attributed to Ampzing on the basis of his authorship of later editions, it has elements of style and layout reminiscent of Gerbier’s elegy, and I think it very likely that Gerbier knew the work. Ampzing’s catalogue of distinguished Haarlemers includes Goltzius, who is hailed in the words:

“*O Phoenix onser eeuw O Goltzy die de Berghen
De Alpen overvlieght en gaet het Romen terghen.*”

This is highly reminiscent of Gerbier’s:

“*O Phoenix sonder paer! Hoe sal ick van u schrijven?*”,
and many mythological names, such as *Phoebus*, *Apollo*, *Musae*, and *Neptunus*, appear in the vocabulary of both works. ‘*Phoenix*,’ for example, is a term used 13 times by Gerbier to refer to Goltzius.

There was clearly some connection between Gerbier and Ampzing. The 1621 edition of *Den Lof van Haerlem* contains a rewritten section on Goltzius, giving the date of his death as December 29th 1617 – the date Gerbier gives in the *Eer Ende Claght-Dicht*. It is generally accepted that this date is wrong: according to the records of the Groote Kerk, and the memories of Goltzius’ family, he died on Sunday January 1st, 1617. His grave was prepared on the 2nd, and his burial took place on January 3rd. Gerbier’s error is a strange one: by December 29th 1617 he had written much of the work, and it may be that he confused the dates because

he was in London, where old style dating still prevailed. Or perhaps the error was the printer's, and Gerbier missed it, or did not have the title page, when he checked the proofs. (Someone appears to have checked the text, to judge from the errata page at the beginning of the book.) It is quite possible that Ampzing or Scriverius had access to a copy of Gerbier's book, and took the incorrect date from this. A correction was made in the 1628 edition.

In the *Eer ende Claght-dicht*, Gerbier demonstrates the ability to construct and maintain quite a complex, multi-layered allegory, incorporating classical mythology and Biblical references, in which he situates dozens of contemporary artists, and other figures from the artistic milieu in which he lived. The procession of painters, engravers, writers and patrons he assembles to provide Goltzius with an appropriate entourage, contains the elements of a *Joyeuse Entrée*, with Rubens contributing a whole series of canvases, and other figures bringing a collection of paintings, models, prints and tableaux. It is a typically *Rederijker* combination of dramatic performance and civic pageantry, attended by Goddesses and Graces, at once original and familiar to the seventeenth century reader.

Throughout his life, his writings reflect a fondness for emblems, allegories and proverbs, and he clearly knew some of the popular emblem books. Consider the epigraph on his title page:

*“Uyt Floras soete schoot de Bie haer heunich gaet,
Waer uyt de Spin oock treck haer gift en boosen aert.”*

It is taken from Emblem XXXIII of Hadrianus Junius's *Emblemata* of 1565, presumably in the Dutch translation by Gillis van Diest.¹⁷ The emblem, '*Boni Adulterium*', (originally dedicated to the Haarlem printer Jan van Suren) bears the image of a rose bush, on which both the bee and the spider have alighted, the former gathering honey, while the latter extracts poison. Junius provides a gloss, on the theme of a single origin for both unity and discord; positive and negative.¹⁸

Gerbier's comments in the prose postscript, addressed to contemporary 'Constighe Gheesten', suggest a certain pessimism. Later in his career, Gerbier appears highly sensitive to the perceived (and in some cases actual) hostility of others, but in this case his acceptance of anticipated criticism may be more a matter of literary convention. Yet his mindset, conditioned by the upheavals of his early life and his Calvinist upbringing, remained a sober blend of Lipsian

Constancy and Old Testament fortitude. In this Stoicism originates his attitude to Envy: he may have known Boissard's Emblem book¹⁹, which contains such emblems as '*Vir bonus invidiae securus*', or '*L'homme de bien se moque de l'envie*'. (Years later he wrote that '*La plus grande finesso est d'estre homme de bien*'.) The moral security of the '*homme de bien*' – the blend of integrity, patience and personal culture that defined the Christian Gentleman of his time – remained his ideal, even if his life suggests it was not always realised.

The Personae of the Eer ende Claght-dicht.

I do not intend to discuss at length here the many artists given a part in the allegorical procession depicted in the book. David Freedberg has drawn attention to the art-historical importance of the section relating to Rubens,²⁰ and Hirschmann noted the significance of Gerbier's comment on Rubens's journey to the United Provinces – an event in which Gerbier may have been involved. But one figure who should perhaps be mentioned here is Wenzel Coebergher, whose managerial role in Goltzius's poetic funeral procession implies that the author may well have known him, more than a decade before Gerbier began his posting as Charles I's resident in Brussels. Further research is required here, but since Coebergher may well have influenced Gerbier both as an architect, and in his attempt in the 1640s to establish the *Monts de Piété* in France, it seems possible that he had already spent time in Coebergher's circle. Nor can we rule out the idea that Gerbier had some kind of acquaintance with Rubens by 1618 – he seems particularly well-informed about his work, whether or not the pictures he attributes to the Antwerp painter in the *Eer ende Claght-dicht* are imaginary.

It is noteworthy that in the first six pages of a work that declares itself a tribute to Goltzius, Coebergher and Rubens are the only people mentioned: not until page seven does Gerbier begin the catalogue of his contemporaries, including only 4 from the southern Netherlands. Goltzius himself, other than in a footnote on page 6, does not really make an appearance until page 18. This seems to me to be possible evidence that Gerbier began the work as a Rederijker text, only later adapting it as an elegy for Goltzius.

Here are the participants, listed by the places with which he associates them:

Brussels/Antwerp: (4)

Rubens

Coebergher

Hendrick van Balen

Jan Brueghel

Amsterdam: (18)

Jan Pinas
Frans Badens
Pieter Lastman
Adriaen van Nieulandt
Werner van den Valkert
François Venant
David Vinckeboons
Jan Tegnagel
Govert Jansz. Poelenburg
Abraham Vinck
Cornelis van der Voort
Hendrick de Keyser
Abraham de Coninck
Dirick van Os
Roeland Savery
Johan Muller
Pieter Serwouters
Anna Roemersdr. Visscher
Maria Tesselschade Visscher

London: (8)

Abraham van Dorch (Dort)
Cornelis Drebbel
Hendrick van Steenwyck
Isaac Oliver
Pauwel van Somer
Abraham Blyden-Bergh
Daniel Mytens
Dirick Boissens

Haarlem (7)

Hendrick Goltzius
Cornelis van Haarlem
Jacob Rauwart (d. 1597) (or possibly his son Claes)
Hendrick Vroom
Cornelis Claesz. Van Wieringen
Esias van de Welde
Jacob Matham

Utrecht: (7)

Abraham Bloemaert

Adam van Vianen
 Iochen Uyt de Wael (Joachim Wtewael)
 Pauwel Mereelsen
 Hendrick Goudt
 Crispin van den Pas
 Madaleen van den Pas

The Hague: (5)

Floris van Dijck
 Jacques de Gheyn I
 Jacques de Gheyn II
 Simon Frisius
 (Jan van) Ravesteyn

Leyden: (2)

Cornelis Boissens
 Daniel Heinsius

Delft (1)

Michiel Jansz. Mirevelt

Gerbier introduces a total of 52 of his contemporaries: painters, engravers, goldsmiths, *fijnschrijvers*, writers, patrons, sculptors and architects. The gathering is certainly Gerbier's own, and may be as remarkable for the figures excluded as for those whom he deems worthy of taking part in Goltzius' funeral procession. His time in London is reflected in his choice. Even here we find only people of Netherlandish origin, confirming that Balthazar is primarily writing for a market in the Low Countries, and the preponderance of Amsterdam based artists and writers strongly suggests that this is where he expected to find an audience. Conversely, he refers to only two men associated with Leyden, and one of these, Heinsius, he seems to have known from works published in Amsterdam.

The Dedication.

The *Eer ende Claght-dicht* is dedicated to Noel de Caron, the philanthropic, Anglophile Dutch ambassador for whom Gerbier is believed to have worked during his first visit to London. There is no obvious connection between Caron and Goltzius, and the author predictably stresses simply the Ambassador's support for the visual arts as the motive for the dedication. Perhaps Noel de Caron contributed to the costs of producing the book: Gerbier explicitly informs

us that it took him two years to get it published, and it may be that the financial support of the dedicatee played a vital part in its appearance.²¹

I am not really in a position to judge the literary qualities of Gerbier's book, or to know how it might read to a present-day Dutch speaker. Reznicek²² dismisses it as a '*bombastische Klageode*', full of '*kränkliche Phantasie*', while Enschede (above) is rather kinder. Gerbier's text typifies the Netherlandish tradition of using verse as a medium for commentary on the visual arts. Just as pictorial images were used to illustrate verse - as in the emblem books - so poetry seemed a natural means of celebrating artists and their works. Gerbier is part of the tradition that embraced van Mander and Cornelis de Bie, who included Gerbier in *Het Gulden Cabinet*²³. But Gerbier's aim is not biographical, and although he provides notes to confirm the home town of each artist, and the type of work they produce, he obviously expects the artists he includes to be generally familiar to his readers.

In his lifetime and in the centuries that followed, Gerbier seems to have been more kindly - and perhaps more objectively - treated in his original homeland than in his adopted one. The hostility and contempt he evoked in the writings of Sanderson and Walpole contrast with the respect shown by de Bie and Enschede. The literary form that Gerbier's book exemplifies did not die out for some time: Lambert Bidloo's *Panpoëticon Batavum, Kabinet der voornaamste Nederlandsche Digteren*, published in 1720, uses a similar format to applaud the achievements of Dutch writers, among them van Mander and Rodenburgh. In it one finds references to the same mythological figures that populated Gerbier's verses. Lambert Bidloo - the brother of Govert, whose account of the *Kunstkammer* of Philips de Flines is bound with the *Eer ende Claght-dicht* - would no doubt have recognised Gerbier as part of the same tradition.

Sources and References:

Primary Sources:

Balthazar Gerbier: *Eer ende Claght-dicht Ter Eeren van den lofweerdighen Constrijken ende Gheleerden Henricus Goltius, Constrijken Schilder, Plaetsnijder, ende Meester van der Penne*. The Hague. Aert Meuris. 1620.

Theodoor Rodenburgh: *Melibea*. Amsterdam 1618.

Thomas Tymme: *A Dialogue Philosophicall*. London 1612.

Salomon de Bray: *Architectura Moderna ofte bouwinge van onsen tyt*. 1631. Edited by Ed. Taverne. Soest 1971.

Daniel Heinsius: *Nederduytsche Poemata*. Amsterdam 1618.

Secondary Sources:

The main published articles focussing on the *Eer ende Claght-dicht* remain those of Otto Hirschmann and David Freedberg,

J.H Astington: *Buckingham's Patronage and the Gypsies Metamorphosed*. Theatre Survey (2002), vol 43. pp 133-147.

Marten Jan Bok and Sebastien Dudok van Heel: *The Mysterious Landscape Painter Govert Janszn called Mijnheer*, in *In His milieu. Essays on Netherlandish Art in Memory of John Michael Montias*. Eds. A Golahny, M M Mochizuki, L Vergara. Amsterdam 2006.

David Freedberg: *Fame convention and Insight: On the Relevance of Fornenberg and Gerbier*. Ringling Museum of Art Journal. 1983 pp.236-259.

Otto Hirschman: *Balthasar Gerbier's Eer ende Claght-dicht Ter Eeren van den lofweerdighen Constrijken ende Gheleerden Henricus Goltius*. *Oud Holland* 1920.

Jeffrey M. Muller: *The Perseus and Andromeda on Rubens's House*. In *Simiolus. Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art*, Vol. 12, No. 2/3 1981/1982, pp. 131-146.

L. Nichols: *The 'Pen Works' of Hendrick Goltzius*. Bulletin of the Philadelphia Museum of Art 88. 1992. pp 1-58. See also 'Hendrick Goltzius – Documents and Printed Literature Concerning His Life' in *Goltzius Studies. Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 1991-2*. Waanders Uitgevers, Zwolle, 1993.

E.K.J Reznicek: *Die Zeichnungen von Hendrick Goltzius*. Utrecht.1961.

Christian T. Seifert: *Pieter Lastman, constrijken history schilder tot Amsterdam – kunstreicher Historienmaler zu Amsterdam*. In ed. M Sitt: *Pieter Lastman: In Rembrandt's Schatten?* (Exhibition Catalogue Kunsthalle, Hamburg.) Munich 2006.

Eric Jan Sluijter: *Rembrandt and the Female Nude*. Amsterdam 2006.

Eric Jan Sluijter: *Goltzius, Painting and Flesh; or, Why Goltzius Began to Paint in 1600*. In *The Learned Eye. Regarding Art, Theory, and the Artist's Reputation*. Eds. M van den Doel, N van Eck, et al. Amsterdam 2005.

Notes:

¹ British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings Shelfmark 157.a.35

² Hirschmann, O: *Balthasar Gerbiers Eer Ende Claght-Dicht ter Eeren van Henricus Goltzius*. Oud Holland 1920.

³ Freedberg, D: *Fame, Convention and Insight: On the Relevance of Fornenbergh and Gerbier*. Ringling Museum of Art Journal. The Ringling Museum, Sarasota. 1983. P236-259.

⁴ Shelfmark 76 B 23. I am grateful to Dr. Anneke van den Bergh for confirming that the book is in the Stadsbibliotheek's collection.

⁵ Accessed 27 July 2009 The catalogue records the book as in 4^o, suggesting that the British Museum copy has been substantially trimmed, but Hirschmann refers to the copy he consulted as octavo.

⁶ Gerrit Tierie suggests there was "an intimate relation between Gerbier, Goltzius and Drebbel", in his *Cornelis Drebbel*, Amsterdam. 1932. P.26.

⁷ *Den Thuyn van de Prins van Orangien spreeckt tot sijn Excelltie*.

⁸ Thomas Tymme: *A Dialogue Philosophicall*. 1612. P.60.

⁹ Exodus XXXV.30. In his 1971 edition of Salomon de Bray's '*Architectura Moderna*', Ed Taverne draws attention to de Bray's use of Gerbier's imagery. As a friend of Goltzius and van Mander, it is credible that de Bray would have read the *Eer ende Claght-dicht*. It may also be that de Bray influenced Gerbier in his *Three Principles of Magnificent Building*, thirty years later.

¹⁰ The burial records of the Waalse Kerk show her death as having occurred in 1621.

¹¹ Further details about Israel and his family appear in the burial records of Amsterdam's Waalse Kerk.

¹² The dedication of *Melibea* is dated '*den lesten December 1617*' and the title page is dated New Year 1618. Gerbier wrote the verse section of the *Eer ende Claght-dicht* during 1617, and perhaps early 1618. Hirschmann refers to Melibea, but doubts that Gerbier knew it. The parallels were first noted by N de Roever. (Oud Holland. 1903)

¹³ Marten Jan Bok and Sebastien Dudok van Heel: *The Mysterious Landscape Painter Govert Janszn called Mijnheer*, in *In His milieu. Essays on Netherlandish Art in Memory of John Michael Montias*. Amsterdam 2006. P 77. In the years 1610-1612, Govert Janszn Poelenburgh was a neighbour of Israel Gerbier, who at that time lived in the Warmoesstraat.

¹⁴ Van den Valkert was himself the author of a '*Lofdicht ter eeren St Lucas het Schilders Patroon*' in 1618, as well as being responsible for the title page of the second edition of *Het Schilderboek*.

¹⁵ Published by Willem Janssen, Amsterdam. 1616.

¹⁶ Arjan van Dixhoorn: *Lustige geesten. Rederijkers in de Noordelijke Nederlanden(1480-1650)* Amsterdam UP. 2009.

¹⁷ It corresponds to both the Latin version of Junius, and the French translation (1567) of Jacques Grévin, but I have not had access to the Dutch version. If the Dutch is not that of Gillis, then it is likely to be Gerbier's.

¹⁸ A similar emblem '*De Douceur Amertume*' appears as no.13 in Heinsius's *Emblemata Amatoria*, printed in 1616 with the *Nederduytsche Poemata*.

¹⁹ Boissard, J-J: *Emblemes...nouvellement mis de latin en françois par Pierre Joly*. (Metz 1595)

²⁰ Freedberg. Ibid. P.242.

²¹ Aert Meuris worked for the States General, as well as printing some of Huygens's early works.

²² Reznicek, E: *Die Zeichnungen von Hendrik Goltzius*. 1961. P.29.

²³ Cornelis de Bie: *Het Gulden Cabinet*. 1662. P248. But it should be noted that some of his information is questionable.