Goltzius, Painting and Flesh; or, Why Goltzius Began to Paint in 1600

For many visitors to the spectacular Goltzius exhibition held in 2003 in Amsterdam, New York and Toledo,¹ the paintings would have come as a surprise. After admiring around 175 more or less chronologically arranged drawings, engravings and penworks, delicate virtuoso performances in the handling of line, one suddenly came to a group of eleven large and colourful paintings with rather naturalistic life-size figures, that seemed far removed from Goltzius' work as a draftsman and engraver. Visitors may have wondered why Goltzius started to paint so suddenly and why so late in his career? Apart from that, many of them may have reacted in the same way as journalists who reviewed the exhibition in Dutch and American newspapers: 'acres of erotic flesh', 'a lot of fleshy nudity', or 'all the paintings are about one thing: flesh, its texture, its colour, its chemistry'. Willem de Kooning once said that oil paint was made for depicting flesh: Goltzius would probably have agreed.² In fact, Karel van Mander already noted how ‘miraculously fleshily’ Goltzius’ painted nudes were, after having described his transformation into a painter as – indeed – a sudden occurrence: as if it were some kind of miracle.³ But how to explain this abrupt metamorphosis into a painter of life-like human flesh, if we do not believe in miracles?

That was the question that urged itself upon me too, after having seen this exhibition. Several reasons have been given for Goltzius’ decision to start painting, often crediting Van Mander as being the prime influence. It has been argued repeatedly that Goltzius’ move to painting was theoretically inspired and followed Van Mander’s ideals.⁴ Indeed, Van Mander called drawing the body and painting the soul of art.⁵ Several authors cited the lines from Van Mander’s biography of Jacques de Gheyn, a pupil of Goltzius, in which he writes how De Gheyn moved from draftsman and engraver to painter. De Gheyn was of the opinion that his career as engraver had been a waste,⁶ because ‘oil painting, working with colour, was the highest endeavour in art and by far the best means to come as close as possible to nature in all her aspects by way of representation’.⁷ One might indeed assume that Van Mander saw in Goltzius’ career a justification for his own theoretical position, but that does not mean that Goltzius obediently followed Van Mander’s ideas and theories; in many instances it might even have been the other way round. I do not think that ‘it is warranted to presume that Van Mander’s ideas were indeed a significant factor in Goltzius’ decision to become a painter’, as is stated in the catalogue.⁸ If that were the case, why did Goltzius – who seems to have been highly ambitious and anxious to be praised as a great artist – wait until 1600, when he was already 42 years old, before he started to paint? After all, Van Mander had been his friend since 1583.

Let us first consider how Van Mander informs us about Goltzius’ transition to the art of painting. Before he embarks on Goltzius’ career as a painter, Van Mander concludes his extensive discussion of Goltzius’ engravings and drawings with the words: ‘I do not believe that anyone else is so sure and quick at drawing a figure and even an entire history offhand without making a sketch, completed with the pen in one go so perfectly and precisely and with such great livelihood. With this we allow his artful pen to rest – in the art of which he will always remain the king – so that we now can tell about his paintings.’⁹ Thus, this part ends with the statement that Goltzius has achieved the highest in the art of drawing (engraving was discussed by Van Mander as part of this art);¹⁰ Goltzius had surpassed everybody and would remain the one who reigns in this field.

Having said this, Van Mander begins the paragraphs about Goltzius’ paintings by relating what happened when Goltzius came back from Italy in 1591, nine years before he started to paint: ‘When Goltzius returned from Italy he had impressed the beautiful Italian paintings as firmly in his memory as in a mirror, so that wherever he went he still saw them continuously before him: now it was the sweet grace of Raphael that he enjoyed, then the natural appearance of the flesh of Correggio, then the advancing highlights and recessive fleeting depths [i.e. shadows] of Titian, or the beautiful silken material and well-painted things of Veronese and others in Venice – so that the works from his native land could no longer entirely satisfy him. For painters it was stimulating and instructive to hear him talk on this subject, for he spoke all about glowing flesh parts, glowing shadows and such unfamiliar and little heard expressions. When he drew something, then the flesh parts in particular had to be coloured with crayons: and thus he eventually proceeded to brushes and oil paint only two years after he was cured or weaned from sucking the breast, when he was no less than 42 years of age, in 1600.’¹¹

Van Mander underlines in this passage that it was his visit to Italy that made Goltzius think and talk incessantly about painting; and the things he thought and talked about entirely concerned the Venetian and North Italian art of colorito – using terms that tried to describe its specific qualities. The only Tuscan/Roman artist mentioned is Raphael, and then it was the sweet grace that had enchanted him; for the rest it was natural appearance of flesh, advancing
highlights and deep shadows, glowing flesh, glowing shadows, beautiful textiles and other well-painted things. There is one other passage in which Van Mander explicitly tells us something about Goltzius’ admiration of certain paintings in Italy. In the life of Correggio he writes about the Mystical Marriage of St. Catherine: ‘Just as the sun outshines all other celestial bodies in clearness, so does this painting by its outstanding excellence. Goltzius, who has a good judgement and saw this painting when he was in Rome, told me that immediately his art loving eyes were drawn to it with great delight and pleasure, being truly amazed by the very beautiful manner of rendering and the lovely glow of the colouring.’

The fact that Van Mander informs us that Goltzius extensively told other painters about this and could not appreciate any longer what the painters in his own country were doing, adding that Goltzius himself now felt the need to colour the flesh of the nudes in his drawings with coloured crayon, makes one wonder even more why he did not start painting right away. If all this had become so obsessively important for him, why did he wait for another nine years? The simplest answer seems to be: because he could not paint.

Van Mander’s account is an extraordinary event that Goltzius started to paint in 1600. As of that time Goltzius was immediately making highly accomplished works for which collectors were willing to pay huge prices. Van Mander describes it as if Goltzius was born anew – which even more separates his activities as a painter from that of the draftsman. The rebirth is announced with precise date and underlined with a jest: it was only two years after he was weaned from the breast. This refers to information Van Mander gave two pages earlier, where he tells that Goltzius had to suckle a woman’s breast as a cure for his dangerous disease – his friend thought he was going to die. Van Mander tells – and this disease was diagnosed by Van Mander as a very serious case of melancholy. But now Goltzius was reborn and, moreover, he appeared to be a child prodigy. He could suddenly paint, only two years after he was given the breast. The expression ‘sucking the breast’ was also used metaphorically by Van Mander in the Grottendie and the Lives, meaning ‘getting instruction’; at the same time it recalls the image of Picture as a nurturing mother with which Van Mander opens his book. Thus, the implication seems to be that Goltzius was reborn after having sucked from Picture’s breast, while this cured him from his terrible illness as well. What may all this mean?

Van Mander described Goltzius as the king in the art of the pen and burin. This would have concurred with Goltzius’ own self-image: he was the greatest master in the art of drawing, the teckkenkunst – as exemplified by his spectacular oeuvre of drawings and engravings. He had proved that by practicing those arts one could become one of the truly famous artists of Europe. As long as the most prestigious conception of art was based on the disegno ideal – the ideal of the line as the expression of the invention originating in the mind – he did not have to be a painter to achieve this. Besides, as Walter Melion extensively argued, Goltzius’ conception of teckkenkunst was essentially that of an art of imitation, in particular of imitating handelingen (methods/manners of rendering) of the great artists of past and present. This was the way in which he competed with all of them. As Van Mander tells us, he was the ‘rechste Proteus of Vertumnum in the art’, the Protean artist, who could transform himself in all shapes – taking on different handelingen during the first half of his career he set out with miraculous skill to imitate the various manners of Maarten van Heemskerck, Frans Floris, Anthonie Blocklandt, Federigo Zuccaro and finally Bartholomeus Spranger. and later in his career he did so in optima forma with the styles of Albrecht Dürer and Lucas van Leyden in several prints and print series. These were all handelingen that were based in the first place on line. As long as the art as he knew it – and which he imitated and emulated as no one else had done – was in essence based on line (and up to his Italian sojourn his knowledge of contemporary Italian painters almost exclusively would have been based on reproductive engravings), he could see himself as the supreme master, surpassing northern masters as well as Italians by way of his specific conception of teckkenkunst.

However, this self image may have fallen apart during his stay in Italy. There he was confronted with great art he was not prepared for and he could not compete with: the art that made such a devastating impression on Goltzius was essentially an art of paint and colour and the artists mentioned were precisely the ones canonized by Ludovico Dolci as the masters of colouring. Ludovico Dolci, the great advocate of colorito, argued in his L’Arte di 1557, basically a response to Vasari’s subordination of Venetian masters to the Florentine disegno-ideal, that by colorito the painter should persuade and captivate the viewer by deceiving his eyes pleasurably, rendering the appearance and variety of natural things, especially of the most important and the most difficult: the color and texture, the hue and the softness, of human flesh. The objective of Titian’s style was described by Dolci as: ‘Titian […] moves in step with nature, so that every one of his figures has life, movement and flesh that palpitates. He has shown in his works no empty gracefulness, but a palette which is properly appropriate: no artificiality in ornament, but a masterly concreteness: no crudity, but the mellowness and softness of nature. And the highlights and shadows in his creations always contend and interplay with one another, and fade out and decrease in the very same way as nature itself has them done.’ That must have been precisely what captivated Goltzius: this was an entirely different conception of art, and one he could only compete with if he were a painter – but he wasn’t.

Shortly after he came home, Goltzius made the Meisterstücke, introduced by Van Mander as ‘[…] six pieces, which he did after he returned from Italy: since he remembered what handelingen he had seen everywhere, he demonstrated with one and the same hand the various handelingen following his own invention […]’ Thus, apart from the two prints in the style of Dürer and Lucas van Leyden, he appropriated in the other four prints the manners of several contemporary Italian
masters. However, he could only do so by way of making his versions look like beautiful reproductive engravings after paintings of such artists, capturing pictorial manners by linear means – which he did masterfully, for instance with his ‘Bassano’ Adoration of the Shepherds (fig. 1). In drawings he often coloured the flesh of his nudes with crayon, as Van Mander tells us, and in engravings he brilliantly suggested with the burin the ‘appearance of flesh that is palpable (pulpy) and tenera (tender) and that invites the tender caress of the eyes’, as Walter Melion argued in his discussion of Goltzius’ Pymatius print of 1593, pointing out that he achieved effects associated with painting, such as sfumato (blurring), nebroidezze (softness) and zaghezza (charm) (fig. 2). These drawings and prints were great achievements, but one wonders if such endeavours were not frustrating in the end and even may have aggravated his melancholy! Towards 1600 he also devised the brilliant invention that I discussed extensively elsewhere: his Vies print, an Allegory of Sight, that shows in its centre the nude Venus as the subject of a painter sitting before his easel (fig. 3). In this complex invention Vies and Pictura are merged in the figure of the nude Venus, paragon of beauty and seductress of the senses. It deals with the relation between Venus, Vies and Pictura: the depiction of (nude) female beauty, the sense of sight and the art of painting, affirming the power that painting has over the sense of sight: offering sensual delight and eliciting desire. It underlines emphatically Goltzius’ preoccupation with such matters at this point in time. The only way to compete with the great masters in this newly discovered art was to become a painter himself; and at last he became one – but not before 1600.

Now we should ask the question: how did Goltzius learn to paint? To become the accomplished painter that he immediately seemed to be, takes a long time. To acquire all the knowledge and tricks of the techniques of oil painting is not something one learns overnight. Moreover, there was nobody in Holland he could turn to. As a famous master he could hardly go to Cornelis van Haarlem or Van Mander and mingle with their pupils. Besides, no one in Haarlem could have taught him the ‘Venetian’ manner of painting that had such an impact on him. So the question is: who could teach him precisely the techniques to paint the glowing flesh and glowing colours he was so crazy about and which he did learn after all? The obvious answer seems to be: the young Frans (also François or Francesco) Badens.

Van Mander informs us that Frans Badens travelled together with Goltzius’ stepson Jacob Matham to Italy, where they stayed for four years; they must have left in 1593 and returned in 1597. Badens would have been one of the young painters who loved to listen to Goltzius’ account about painting in Italy and Goltzius would have been able to tell this friend of his stepson where to go, what to look at and what to learn. Van Mander introduces Badens as a painter who played an important role in the recent changes in the art of the Netherlands, ‘especially in relation to colouring, flesh colours and shadows’, with the result that

---

FIG. 1 – Hendrick Goltzius, Adoration of the Shepherds, 1594, engraving, 461 x 350 mm
Fig. 2 - Hendrick Goltzius, *Pigmalion and the Ivory Statuette*, 1593, engraving, 315 x 214 mm

Fig. 3 - Jan Saenredam after Hendrick Goltzius, *Allegory of Virtus and the Art of Painting*, c. 1598-1601, engraving, 244 x 182 mm
Fig. 4 - Frans Badens, The Lovemaking of Venus and Adonis, 1596, black chalk, with brown and gray washes and some touches of oil paint, 227 x 181 mm, London Courtauld Institute Galleries.

Fig. 5 - Attributed to Frans Badens, St. John the Baptist in the Wilderness, panel, 113 x 68.5 cm, Salzburg, Residenz Galerie (on loan from the Schönborn Bachheim collection).
the usual 'stony greyness, or a pale, fish-like, chilly colour' disappeared and was replaced by a 'glow in the flesh colour and flesh-coloured shading'. Van Mander then tells that, after returning home, Frans Badens was called 'the Italian painter' because he was the first in Amsterdam to bring the newest Italian manner to this country: 'for he has a very beautiful, flowing and glowing method of rendering, being an excellent master, whether painting histories, faces or portraits.' Badens seems to have done precisely what Goltzius needed.27 And now he was the one that could teach him — which, if I am right, must have happened between 1595 and 1600.

We know that there were many contacts between the two artists: Badens, for instance, owned two of Goltzius' penworks, one of which he sold to the Emperor - the work now in Philadelphia. More important is that Balthasar Gerbier, in his lament on the death of Goltzius, names Badens as Goltzius' best friend: 'He was his most beloved friend, never did Goltzius come to the Amstel/Or Badens was the first to welcome him.' However, although Badens was considered an important painter by contemporaries, we do not know any paintings that can be attributed to him with certainty. Only two signed coloured chalk drawings made in Italy are known; these are close to Goltzius' coloured drawings from this period, showing nude figures in a soft modelling with hardly any lines (fig. 4). As we learn from Van Mander and from contemporary inventories, Badens must have favoured large paintings with nudes in biblical or mythological subjects, for instance Bathsheba Bathing, Judith with the Head of Holofernes, Lot and his Daughters, Baptism of Christ, Lucretia, Venus, Rape of Ganymede, Bacchus and Ceres; it reads like a list of works by Goltzius. A painting attributed to Badens, St. John the Baptist in Salzburg (fig. 5), looks like the kind of work that one might expect of him, although this is impossible to prove. According to Paul Taylor, the painting shows in the depiction of flesh the same technique that Goltzius used, which can indeed be described as 'glowing': in the shadows we see greyish scumbles over a red underpainting that shines through and creates the warm, glowing depths. The red underpainting, in which red ochre, organic red or vermillion are mixed, constitutes a second layer over a cool grey ground. The third layer also contains some red, but consisted mainly of lead white. As Paul Taylor argued convincingly, this must have been Goltzius', and probably also Badens', technical solution to suggest this 'glowing fleshiness'.

Hence, I suggest that now that Goltzius had learned from the young Badens how to paint, he was cured from his melancholy and could conquer the world again. He was already the king of teekenkonst, now he could truly compete in the art of colorito as well. Using this 'newest beautiful manner' he would immediately outshine his most direct rivals in the Netherlands, painters like Cornelis van Haarlem and Abraham Bloemaert.

But one question remains: why did he inaugurate his career as a painter with two small works that refer to northern styles of the early 16th century and are painted...
on copper plates in a refined and detailed technique (fig. 6). The use of copper plates, in particular for small, smooth, highly detailed and expensive paintings, was developed in northern Italy and immediately taken up by northern masters in particular, especially Germans working or having worked in Italy, like Johann Rottenhammer, Adam Elsheimer and Hans von Achen. For his first public venture in painting, Goltzius started with small religious paintings with devotional subjects, Christ on the Cross and Christ on the Cold Stone, using a style most fitting for such subjects and particularly suited to elicit an emotional response. Demonstrating that also as a painter – in the field of precious devotional pictures for which altramontani had been famous – he could compete with the northern masters of the past, seems to have been his first step (as an engraver he had done something similar in his Meisterstiche), matching himself in particular against the greatest of all, Albrecht Dürer, but infusing this archaic style with his newly learned ‘glowing’ fleshtones. With those paintings he catered to the tastes of Roman Catholic art lovers, among them Rudolph II, who was willing to pay fantastic prices for such works.

But in the meantime he was working on the painting which should position him in the forefront of contemporary art: the Danaë, his first life-size female nude, finished in 1603 – now still the high point of his career as a painter (fig. 7). As I have argued before, the choice of Danaë was certainly not an accidental one. I am convinced that the painting may even be considered as a kind of manifesto. After all, it was Titian’s Danaë that elicited the first emphatic exposition about the contrast between the Venetian colorito and the Tuscan disegno, supposedly from the mouth of Michelangelo, written down by Vasari and in extenso repeated by Karel van Mander. Ever since, painters could take sides, choosing for the one or the other, or trying to combine the two. The last was obviously Goltzius’ goal and Van Mander makes that clear in the way he describes the Danaë: ‘This nude is painted miraculously fleshily and plastically and displays great study of contours and structure’; ‘miraculously fleshily and plastically’ being obviously terms referring to the ‘Venetian’ manner – Goltzius used the new methods to make the flesh as glowing and palpable as he could and he did so within the framework of the Venetian Venus type, but he took pains that it showed at the same time ‘great study in contours and structure’, that is, precisely drawn contours, and well structured anatomy – ideals of disegno – even incorporating the pose of Michelangelo’s Danaë.

Moreover, Danaë was a subject that gave painters the opportunity to compete with a legendary painting from antiquity that was said to have provoked a young man to rape a girl, a story often referred to in the sixteenth century as proof of the power of images over the senses, particularly in the provocative effect of erotic paintings. Because of this it became in the sixteenth century the

FIG. 7 – Hendrick Goltzius, Danaë, 1603, canvas, 173.5 x 100 cm, Los Angeles, Los Angeles County Museum of Art

FIG. 8 – Hendrick Goltzius, Vertumnus in the Gaze of an Old Woman with Pomona, 1613, canvas 84.5 x 146.5 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum
prototype of a portrait which aimed at arousing the senses of the viewer and a subject par excellence for painters to compete in making the nude as lifelike and as sensual as possible, especially by depicting skin and flesh, resulting in some of the most sensual nudes in the history of art: the Danaë by Titian, Correggio, and Rembrandt, and, we may add, by Goltzius. Thus, Goltzius tried to position himself between the great painters of the nude, just as Rembrandt would do 35 years later with his first life-size nude. Goltzius would indeed have agreed with De Kooning: oil paint was made for depicting flesh. He had finally reached his goal: now he was a true Vertumnus in his love for the beautiful, enticing, but virtually unattainable Pomona: in his last guise, that of a painter, he went to great lengths to achieve the ultimate in the depiction of beauty that awakens love (fig. 8): love for what is seen—that is, love for his works of art.

NOTES
3 Karel van Mander, Het Leven der Doelenstichtte Nederlande en Huggeleytse Schiæders, in: Het Schilder-Boek, Haarlem 1604, fol. 286v and 287v respectively. Van Mander describes Goltzius first nude, his Danaë of 1603 as being 'miraculously fleshly' ('wonder vleeschachtigh'). See below (notes 6-7) about Van Mander's account of Goltzius' transition to the art of painting.
Other reasons that have been proposed: poor health and a failing sight (especially Reznick 1960, pp. 30-31), which seems unlikely considering the very many detailed drawings Goltzius still made after 1600 (see for instance, as late as 1614, Reznick, Ziebungen [see note 4], vol. 2, folios 442 and 443, drawn in the technique of engraving). Nichols points especially to the 'career-long penchant for creating works of art in a total mode, quite often in actual color'. This, however, does not explain his abrupt move to painting late in his career; in that case one would have expected Goltzius to have done this many years earlier. Nichols also sees the penworks as a kind of transition to the paintings. However, these are made at the same time as his early paintings, and the use of colour in those works is restricted to a few touches of red and yellow in the Philadelphia penwork only (cat. no. 99).
5 Van Mander, Den grondt (see note 4), fol. 88v.
6 Van Mander, Leven (see note 3), 1947 (Leven, vol. 1, pp. 431-432): '…by Plaat snijden en Druckerij verleent, beelooghe zijne verloopen tij, wederen hem docht t'onnoytigh daer in dowe de hebben gehobraet'. ('[...] abandoning engraving and painting, he lamented the time he had wasted, which he felt he had spent senselessly in those techniques').
7 Van Mander, Leven (see note 3), 1947 (Leven, vol. 1, pp. 433-435): '[...] den beoelden Pinceel, met verwen te werkelen en te schilderen, als wesende het opperste der Const, en den alder bequaemsten middel, om de Nature in allen deelen met vryebeeldheden ten alder ghedenken nae te komen'.
9 Van Mander, Leven (see note 3), 1947 (Leven, vol. 1, pp. 430-431): 'Ik acht niets, dat ynen soost vast en veeldig is, een hecht, yae een gantsche Historie, uyt der hand, sonder yet te booten, te trecken ten eersten met de Pen, met salckhen volcomentalh, en syrvulichck te voldoen, en met so grooten gheest. Hiermede laten wy zijn voynige Pen herueren, en den Monarch in haer te handelen blijven, en moghen van zyn schilderen verhaelen'.
Van Mander discussed the penworks also in the context of the art of drawing, before he starts his account on Goltzius as a painter. In the catalogue of the Goltzius-exhibition the penworks were treated as part of Goltzius' painted production, in ch. X 'Brushes and oil paint', instead of ch. IX 'Pen Works, Sketches, Chalk Drawings 1587-1614' (in the installation in the Rijksmuseum they rightly got their own room; in the Metropolitan Museum, however, they were exhibited between the paintings). This seems to me fundamentally wrong. Also see above, note 4.
10 Van Mander, Leven (see note 3), 1947 (Leven, vol. 1, pp. 407-408): 'Goltzius comende yit Italien, hadde de frayed Italsche schilderijen als yn een spieghel soo vast in zyn ghedacht gehdrukt, dat hyse wyer hy was noch altyne gestadt saghe: dan vermaekte hem de soete graezelichheyt van Raphael, dan de eygen vleeschachhtigheyt van Correggio, dan de ouytsende hooghebelen, en afwijkende verdreven diespelen van Tizian, de schoon silekens en wel ghescildere deynghen van Veronese, en ander van de Venetius, dat hem de Inlandische dynghen soo heel volomen niet meer condon voldoen. Het was den Schilders eenen lust en voedel, hem hier van te hoeren spoeken: want zyn woorden waren al gelyende carnation, gelyende diespelen, en dergelijckhe ongewoon oft weyningh meer gheboerde verhalinghen. Teyckende hye yet, de naeckten sonderlingh mosten met de cryons hin verwen hebben: soo dat hy eyndelijk tot den Pinceel en Oly-verwe hem heeft behoeven, doe hy maer twee Juer van de styghen ooit horend oft gespeent was, doch zyns onderdons 42 Juer, No.1664.'
11 Van Mander, Leven (see note 3), 1947 (Leven, vol. 1, pp. 407-408): 'Maaer gelijck als de Son ander hemelich schilderijen poevert in clairyckh: also optuymante ende excellente gait dit de ander te boeven: by dat ikc ynt den mond des goet oorpranden Goltzius hebben verslaen, die dit te Room wesende te zien quam, alwaer straes zijn Const-berende oogen nae toe gestoken waren, met grooten lust en vermenken, hem seer ver-wonderende in die seer frey handelinghe, en de schoon gelyscomthet des colorerens.'
12 See the letter from Johann Tillmanns to Count Simon IV zu Lippe, concerning the acquisition of a painting by Goltzius for Rudolph II as early as 1603. Tillmanns wrote that 400 Kaiser's guilders have already been offered for one of Goltzius' first paintings, the Christ on the Cold Stone, that was in the possession of Jacob Matham (who seems to have taken care that the prices were being pushed up by showing

According to Van Mander it was the same disease from which he suffered before his travels to Italy. Van Mander, Lecce (see note 3), fol. 284a (Lecce, vol. 1, p. 394-395): '[...] ganschi uytrroughe, soo dat by ellicie Jaren Gay ten-melck heeft ghedroncken, en heeft moe teynugh Vrouwen borsten, ...' [...] became completely dehydrated so that he had to drink goat's milk for several years and had to suckle women's breasts,' and earher: fol. 282v. (Lecce, vol. 1, p. 388-389): '[...] he got such a waterness that, in addition to the other sicknesses he had, he had to suck women's breasts. [...] the doctors did their best to help him, but it was in vain because this sickness was too deeply rooted in him.'

In the life of the brothers Van Eyck the metaphor is used to state that Italy has now to send her picture to Flanders to suckle from new breasts (Van Mander, Lecce, fol. 198r. Lecce, vol. 1, pp. 352-353); in the first chapter of the Grondt, pupils have to suckle the breast of the virgin Minerva, the virtuous goddess of wisdom and intellect and as such patron of the arts (Grondt, fol. 37 [I, 40]); and he ends the first chapter by saying that he himself has sucked from many different breasts (Grondt, fol. 7r [I, 84]; see also Miedema, Grondt, vol. 2, pp. 422-23). In the life of Dirck Buecker, this painter is introduced as an example of the artist who sucked from the full and overflowing breast of the most perfect instruction', because he was taught by Van Mander and worked in the studio of his master (van Lecce, fol. 153a [II, 10]; p. 294-295). Since Van Mander mentions twice Golzius' sucking women's breasts, he appears to have been fascinated by this cure and he seems to relate the sexual implications to the image of Pictura as a beautiful, seductive woman, an image with which he begins the Grondt (Grondt, fol. 1r-v [I, 3-4]; fol. 27r [I, 1]), as well as that of Pictura as a nurturing mother, with which he opens the Preface (Grondt, Voorrede), fol. 'niur, the first sentence.'


Van Mander, Lecce (see note 3), fol. 284v (Lecce, vol. 1, pp. 396-397): '... se sucken, die hy uit Italien gemaakt een seer dode: want bedenkende wat hy over al voor handelingen hadde gheseen, heeft niet eenige heen verscheen handelingen van zijn inventie ghetoont [...].'

See about this series: Leeflang in: Leeflang en Luijten, Golzius (see note 1), pp. 210-215. Also see Melion, 'Defining the Paradigm' (see note 16).

Van Mander, Lecce (see note 1), p. 181.


Van Mander, Lecce (see note 3), fol. 298v: 'Onse Const hebben wy cortsijt in onze Nederlanden gesee in this geheestenissen toenemen en veranderen, besonder in de coloreringhe, carnarion, en dieselen, meer en meer zijn geworden afgeschreyden van een scheemachtige grauwschijte, oft bleeksche Visschachijte, eindelijk in deze verse, want de glowynghet in lyp-verse ende lypoachtigh diep- seen zijn heen seer in ghedruyc gesee. Hier doe heeft ook geen eene behulp gehad Francoise Badess.'

Van Mander, idem, fol. 298v (Lecce, vol. 1, pp. 412-413): 'Thys gesee, also by t'Amsterdam was by seer eerste, die de jongste schoon maniere hier in 't Landt bracht, des noomen hem de jonge Schilders des Italianischen Schilders: want hy een seer schoon vloeyende en glowynghet maniere heeft, weesende een soortmelckhe Meester, beyden in te seyden Historien, tromen, en Contrafteries.'

B. van der Woude, 'Van Mander's pictorial work: see Nichols in Leeflang and Luijten, Golzius (see note 1), pp. 275-77. One could even imagine that this magnificent work, made around 1600, was given to Badess as an expression of gratitude for teaching him the art of painting.

For the complete text see Nichols, 'Documents' (see note 13), pp. 113-114 and O. Hirschmann, 'Balthasar Gerards ende eyde clagh-dig de eer en Henricus Golzius', Oud Holland 38 (1920), 1164-122. The passage concerned: 'Hy war syn lieven vreugt, neen d'Amstel hy beurt / Oor Badesen d'eer van al hem synne wilcom kon.'

Faggini, 'Badess' (see note 24), pp. 130-142, attributed several paintings to Badess. Some of them seem to be plausible attributions, but nothing can be proved. For good reproductions of five attributed paintings, see: J. Briels, Vlaamse schilders in de Noordelijke Nederlanden in het begin van de Gouden Eeuw, Antwerpen 1967, 1968. 70-72 and J. Briels, Vlaamse schilders en de dagverf van Holands Gouden Eeuw, Antwerpen 1997, 1998, 77 and 78. I myself added the attribution of a large painting of the lifesize Venus and Adonis, in 2002 in the possession of the art dealer Albrecht Neuhaus in Würzburg, reproduced in the catalogue of The European Fine Art Fair Maastricht 2003, p. 186, with the mention of an expertise by Albert Blankert (which was based on my information); this is the kind of painting, very close to the paintings by Golzius, that one would imagine as a work of Badess on the basis of Van Mander's information, the types of works mentioned in other sources and the known drawings.

Faggini, 'Badess' (see note 24), p. 138; Apelier Painting Campaign, dated 'roma 1496' (black and red chalk with brown and grey washes and some touches of oil paint), and 'Venus and Adonis', signed and dated 'roma 1496' (black and red chalk with brown wash and white highlights on coloured paper), both reproduced in: P. Taylor, 'The Glow in late Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Dutch Paint-
ings', in: E. Hermens (ed.), Looking through Paintings. The Study of Painting Techniques and Materials in Support of Art Historical Research, Leiden 1998 (Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek XI), pp. 160-161, fig. 2 and plate 1. Fagg mentions a third drawing with dancing nude men, in the Albertina in Vienna; it is not signed, but has an old attribution to Badens (see p. 151 in Fagg's article). Apart from the drawings, there is a print by Egbert van Panderen after a painting by Badens, representing S. Mercur. (Fagg, p. 153).

42 Van Mander, sive (see note 3), fol. 198v (Lives, vol. 1, pp. 52/53), describes a Balthasar Balthasar portraits, 'Many masquarades and banquets by night' and a painting with 'two lovers in the Italian style'. Faggins, 'Badens' (see note 25) mentions no less than eighteen descriptions of paintings by Badens in 17th-century sources. Apart from the ones mentioned in the text, also s. Andreae, Nudity, Sacrifice of Marcus Curtius, Banquet of the Gods, Saturn and Apoll. Venus, Jupiter and Juno, Head of a Woman, Amurin Cupid and two Merry Company.

43 Taylor, 'Glow' (see note 31), pp. 162-165. Taylor demonstrates convincingly what must have been meant by the 'glowing' flesh colours, showing that the technique of Badens and Goltrζς were probably similar and must have been introduced by Badens; however, even Taylor does not ask the question who taught Goltrζς the art of oil painting.

44 Taylor, idem, passim. Taylor shows that Rubens used a similar technique directly after his return from Italy, for instance in his Samson and Delilah of 1609 (National Gallery); whether this was due to direct influence, indirect influence or common influence is not clear (from the paintings we know, Goltrζς' 'Dance in Los Angeles seems to be the earliest example showing this technique of depicting 'glowing' flesh fully developed). Taylor also points out that, remarkably, no similar technique with a red underlayer seems to be have been used by Italian artists. Titian, Veronese, Correggio, 'All painted with brown shadows, which would certainly have seemed striking to northern eyes', as Taylor says. He considers this technique as 'one of those creative misunderstandings in the history of art. In their attempts to capture the warmth of the Italian style, Badens and Goltrζς went too far, and so created a new manner.' (Taylor, 'Glow' (see note 31), p. 169).

45 See for these two paintings, 'Devout the Cross with Mary, St John and the Magdalen, ca. 1600, and 'Devout on the Cold Shore with Two Angels, 1602: Nichols in Leeflang and Luifjer, Goltrζς (see note 11), pp. 180-183; for the second painting also Reenick, 'Het begin' (see note 41), pp. 32-33.


47 See above, note 13.


49 See Sluijter, 'Emulating' (see note 38), pp. 25-26 with further references.


52 Sluijter, idem, pp. 14-18.

53 Sluijter, idem, passim.