The emergence on the art market in 1992 of a new kunstкамер painting related to the work of Jan Bruegel the Elder and Frans Francken the Younger was the occasion for an article in Tableau on the contribution of those prominent Antwerp artists to the fascinating genre of painted galleries. The present article is inspired by the continued non-emergence of two kunstкамер paintings by their younger colleague Guillam (also known as Willem or Guillaume) van Haecht. (See Note on a Name.)
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A
though the two works to which I allude have been referred to in passing in the art-historical literature, one of them has never been reproduced before, and the other only once, in a 1936 Berlin auction catalogue. This is all the more amazing considering the high and growing estimation enjoyed by van Haecht. In her book of 1957, Les peintres flamands de cabinets d'amateur, S. Speth-Holthoff wrote of him: 'il est sans conteste le meilleur des peintres de Cabinets d'Amateurs et, après plus de trois cents ans, ses œuvres n'ont rien perdu de leur attrait ni de leur éclat.' Yet, discussion of van Haecht has been concentrated entirely on two of his paintings: The kunstкамер of Cornelis van der Geest in the Rubens House, Antwerp, and The studio of Apelles in the Mauritshuis, The Hague. The time has come to publish all five known kunstкамер paintings by van Haecht, albeit in summary and preliminary form. The importance of studying the entire group will become plain below. Only in this way does it emerge that all five share a common theme, which I have dubbed 'love in the kunstкамер' and that all or nearly all conspicuously feature paintings that were famously fit for royalty.

The genre of kunstкамер painting came into being in Antwerp in the first decade of the seventeenth century. The word kunstкамер refers both to the display rooms of art and antiquities for which Antwerp was famous, and to the paintings which evoke collections of that type, even those which are partly or completely invented. In the hands of its first and most frequent practitioner, Frans Francken the Younger (1581-1642), it was devoted mainly to the noble purpose of reconciling modern science and philosophy with Catholic faith. In spaces hung with paintings and filled with collectors' objects of all kinds, students of cosmology debate the mysteries of creation. In several of these paintings, by way of contrast, figures with asses' heads destroy works of art and scientific instruments. The message seems clear: art is honored by serious people of high moral and intellectual calibre, while those who are antagonistic to it or engage in iconoclasm are morons. Francken sometimes goes further in elevating the status of art. In a painting entitled Pictura Sancta, Christ himself stands model to a woman personifying the art of sacred painting.

In the second half of the 1610s the genre originated by Francken was picked up by an older painter of higher social standing than the craftsmanlike Francken, Jan Bruegel (1568-1625), son of the great Pieter Bruegel. Bruegel was a favorite of Archduchess Isabella, who with her husband Albert of Austria ruled the Southern Netherlands from their court in Brussels. In 1617 and 1618 he adopted the idiom of the kunstкамер painting in a series of the Five Senses painted, in collaboration with Pieter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), for Albert and Isabella. Like Francken, Bruegel too assigned positive and negative Christian moral messages to the combinations of objects in the kunstкамер. The allegorical figure of Sight, for example, is shown studying an edifying painting of Christ curing the blind, while behind her is an admonishing image of the blind leading the blind.

There is however one new departure by Francken which is worth noting. In 1626-27, van Haecht repainted the Altar of St. Gummarus, Lier, St. Gummaruskerk. The insides of the wings were repainted by Guillam van Haecht in 1626-27. (Photo: Alb. Bequet, Lier)

1. Altar of St. Gummarus, Lier, St. Gummaruskerk. The insides of the wings were repainted by Guillam van Haecht in 1626-27. (Photo: Alb. Bequet, Lier)
2. Title page of J. David, S.J., Orbed probitatis, in Veridicus Christianus, Antwerp 1603. The imitation of Christ is expressed through the activity of painting. (Photo: David Freedberg, New York)
The paintings within his paintings were mainly included on account of their motif, and in most cases were invented by the artist to suit the occasion. The paintings in Bruegel’s series — especially in The sense of Sight (Madrid, Prado) — refer to existing works of art, mainly by Rubens. Since a view of the archducal palace in Brussels is built into the scene, and since several of the objects are definitely known to have belonged to the archdukes, Marcel De Maeyer concluded quite reasonably that the painting as a whole is an evocation and glorification of the collection of the archdukes.

The series was such a success that in 1618 the city government of Antwerp decided to do it over again lightly, with yet another added twist. Jan Bruegel was commissioned to create a two-painting series of the five senses to present to the archdukes, in which the paintings within Sight and Smell would be painted by twelve different Antwerp masters! The association of kunstkamer painting with the artists of Antwerp and with the archdukes was confirmed once more around 1619 with a collaboration between Jan Bruegel and Frans Francken celebrating the Antwerp guild of St. Luke and making use of paintings from the archducal collection. By 1620, then, the genre of kunstkamer painting had become a prominent Antwerp specialty, with far more specific overtones than most genres. The medium had a message. Kunstkamer paintings tended to convey the notion that the arts — especially painting — were an eminently praiseworthy pursuit, morally and intellectually as well as aesthetically; that Antwerp artists were suited as none others to satisfy the desires of discriminating patrons and collectors; and that both of these truths were demonstrated by the patronage bestowed on Antwerp painters by Archduke Albert and Isabella, who were famous throughout Europe for their uncompromising piety.

Like Frans Francken and Jan Bruegel, Guillam van Haecht too was born into the kind of Antwerp dynasty of artists to whom such a message would have particular appeal. His great-grandfather Godevaard van Haecht, who moved to Antwerp from the village of Nijlen in 1510 or 1511, was a cabinetmaker. Godevaard’s descendants climbed higher up the hierarchy of the arts, practicing sculpture, painting and poetry. The family married into other Antwerp clans in the related fields of printmaking and publishing, the Liesaerts and Grapheuses, while several van Haechts and their in-laws also dealt in art. A notable distinction of the van Haechts is that, in the words of the Antwerp archivist who has reconstructed their history, the family was ‘contaminated’ with the Lutheran form of Protestantism. (This does not seem to be true of Guillam.)

The peak of artistic success in the family was reached by Guillam’s father Tobias van Haecht (1561-1631; also known, from his own time on, as Verhaecht). With his wild mountain landscapes and paintings of the tower of Babel he became one of the more recognizable and respected artists in Antwerp after iconoclasm. As the first teacher of Rubens, to whom he was related by his first marriage, he shared
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tentation in the Temple (fig. 1) to van der Geest. The outsides of the wings, depicting the Miracle of the Living Tree, were entrusted for 108 guilders

Tobias and Guiliam Verhaecht. in this period van Haecht was in or re-

cently returned from Paris. According to an unidentified source consulted by

the largely reliable nine-teenth-cen-

tury archivist F. Jos. van den Branden. van Haecht left Antwerp for Paris on August 24, 1615. The family contacts there were extensive and old. In the 1620s Tobias's cousin Hans van Haecht and his wife Antoinette Wiael had paintings worth more than 6,000 guilders out on consignment with no fewer than ten Paris dealers. Guiliam returned sometime before 1619, when, once more according to van den Branden, he departed for Italy, where

he remained until 1626. Our first record of van Haecht after his definitive return to Antwerp finds him engaged in the restoration of an altarpiece from the church of St. Gummarus in Lier, a town about eight miles southeast of Antwerp. The altar, dedicated to St. Gummarus himself, had been destroyed by iconoclasts in 1580, and the altarpiece, a triptych, badly damaged. After a cheap (four guilders) and unsuccessful attempt at restoration ("as if it were new," said the painter) in 1594-95, in 1620 the altarpiece was painted over while a new altar was being carved by Hans van Mildert. On August 17, 1626 the altarpiece was loaded onto a barge to be shipped to Antwerp for repair and enlargement in the house of Cornelis van der Geest. The outsides of the wings, depicting the Miracle of the Living Tree, were entrusted for 108 guilders to Frans Francken II and the insides - an Adoration of Christ and a Presentation in the Temple (fig. 1) to van Haecht, who was paid 168 guilders. On June 24, 1627, the wings were returned to Lier for installation. Out of thanks to Cornelis van der Geest, the "inventor" of the operation (he had also been instrumental in the commission for the new marble altar), the burgomasters of Lier presented him with half an "ame" of Rhine wine. Frans Francken had inserted a portrait of van der Geest among the bystanders at the miracle. Van der Geest's sponsorship of the restoration of a sixteenth-century monument of Netherlandish art was not an isolated incident. Whereas most patrons of the arts prefer to attach their names to new commissions, van der Geest was equally open to the less glamorous need to repair and maintain older structures and objects. His most striking deed of this kind was his rescue of the mortal remains and tomb of Quentin Matsys. When during the enlargement of the Kla-
rissenkerk the artist's burial place was uncovered, van der Geest had the bones and stones salvaged and brought to his house. On the one-hundredth anniversary of the artist's death, December 17, 1629, he had the skeleton re-in-
terred at the foot of the tower of Antwerp Cathedral. The tombstone was mounted on the tower, together with a new plaque and portrait com-
missioned by van der Geest. This act of conspicuous commemoration was an early instance of genius-worship in Netherlandish art as well as a stimulus for cultural tourism. It had a lasting impact, contributing greatly toward the apotheosis of Matsys as the guid-
ing spirit of the Antwerp School. In this role he was honored with two monographs - by Franchyos Fickaert in 1648 and Alexander van Fornenbergh in 1658 - which were incunabula of the historiography of art. Temporarily, Guiliam van Haecht was comfortable with this secondary and adulatory relation to artistic creation. He may have been the first painter to concentrate nearly exclu-
Van Haecht found at once the form that was to be his own contribution to the history of art. It sounds so simple as to be nearly syllogistic. In 1626 he was working in the house with the famous kunstkamer of Cornelis van der Geest on the fronts of panels whose backs were being restored by Frans Francken, the artist who had coined the kunstkamer painting. By 1628 van Haecht had painted a kunstkamer painting of the van der Geest kunstkamer, on the general model pioneered by Francken and Jan Bruegel. Like the earlier examples by these masters, van Haecht’s Kunstkamer of Cornelis van der Geest (fig. 3) is imbued with Catholic humanist morals, glorifies collecting and patronage, and honors Archdukes Albert and Isabella as well as the cultural elite of Antwerp. The innovation introduced by van Haecht is to combine these features with a startling degree of specificity. Not only are the figures portraits, and is the gallery presented as if it could be a private collection, but the painting refers to a particular event that occurred on August 23, 1615, the day before Guillam left Antwerp (fig. 4). The story is told by the biographers of Matsys mentioned above, for it was the second great instance of Cornelis van der Geest’s love of that artist and a credit both to him and to Matsys.

‘A certain Madonna and child by Matsys’, wrote van Fornenbergh, ‘once had as its owner the great art-lover Signor Cornelis van der Gheest and when in the year 1615, on the 23rd of August, their Illustrious Highnesses Albertus and Isabella were in Antwerp and came to see the “Kunst-kamer” of the above-mentioned van der Gheest as well as a mock battle that was to take place on the Scheldt behind his house, the archduke so fell in love with this picture of Mary that he used all the means of the suitor to acquire the same. But since two minds with but a single thought were opposed to each other, the owner’s and the archduke’s, his Highness was rejected with the most respectful courtesy and [the owner’s] own love [or self-conceit; “eyghen Liefde”] prevailed above the favor of the prince.’

This rich anecdote, in which a prince and a patrician compete in love of sacred art, provides the central motif for van Haecht’s painting. In the picture over which they are struggling,
the love between Mary and Jesus is expressed in a particularly physical form - a kiss on the lips (fig. 5) - which adds to the poignancy of van Fornenbergh's metaphor. The imagery of romantic love is used by Fichaert as well, who writes of Albert's "silent, major, semi-public wooing" of van der Geest. The archduchess too is smitten by love for art. A page holds up a Cupid aiming an arrow at her while in her lap she fondles a flower piece by her favorite painter, Jan Bruegel.

Is it coincidental that the visit of Albert and Isabella to van der Geest's kunstkamer is depicted and described in terms of love? I think not. Three of van Haecht's four other kunstkamer paintings also contain a narrative subject, and all of them deal with love. Two show the well-known story from Phily about how the painter Apelles fell in love with the favorite concubine of Alexander the Great while painting her portrait for the ruler (figs. 6-7). Alexander's generous and universally admired response was to give the girl to the painter. Van Haecht's visualization of the scene follows that of Frans Francken in a painting dated 1617 now in Chatsworth (fig. 8, for the artist and the old lady), while the figure of Campaspe is related to a painting on the upper right of The kunstkamer of Cornelis van der Geest (fig. 9). The choice of this subject illuminates the meaning to van Haecht of Matsys's Madonna. Both are examples of the desire to possess, excited by the sense of sight. Once we have noticed this, we are struck by the high frequency of the motif among the paintings in the large Alexander and Apelles in the Mauritshuis. The timely Blufshaling of Amor which Venus is performing in the large painting by Titian would have averted the unfortunately uncontrolled desires of Samson (to be blinded for his weakness), the elders spying on Susanna, and Jupiter uncovering Antiope. Apollo would not be chasing Daphne. Paris would have chosen more wisely than he did in awarding the golden apple, Mars would not have been captured in bed with Venus, Holôfernes might have kept his head. Two paintings of couples in the foreground contain mirrors in which we can look for our own reflection (fig. 10). Do we find it in the mirror held by Palma Vecchio's Venetian courtesan with her customer, or in that on the table of the pious goldweigher and his wife by ... Quinten Matsys?

We are on a descending scale. The desire to possess is a dangerous passion. It cost Cornelis van der Geest, as pure as his heart may have been, the high favor of the archdukes. It could have cost Apelles his life, were it not for the extraordinary graciousness of his lord Alexander. In the fourth kunstkamer to which we turn our attention, desire has run riot (fig. 11). The wife of the high Egyptian officer Potiphar has let her lust for Joseph get the better of her. In this painting, apparently identical to the painting of Joseph and the wife of Putifar, being a small kunstkamer painting, mentioned in van Haecht's testament, alarm signals are flashing all over. Above the two figures are paintings of Jupiter's successful abduction of Europa and Apollo's frustrated pursuit of Daphne. On the table are bronze of Nessus raping Dejanira and a satyr lustfully feasting his eye on a sleeping nymph. There is only one 'mirror' painting in this scene: the Venetian courtesan we have already met in the Alexander and Apelles, a composition which the German artist Lucas Furtencgele revised as a portrait of Hans Burgkmair and his wife with skulls in the reflection. But instead of heeding the warning in these representations, Potiphar's wife allows them to excite her still further. Love of art is not an innocent occupation.

The fifth known kunstkamer painting by van Haecht, here illustrated for the first time, is the only one lacking a central narrative (fig. 12). Like so many kunstkamer paintings, it is composed of modules and clusters that recur in other works, which here are not subordinated to a dominant motif. The company is divided into Frans Francken-like groups of scholars and cognoscenti, none of which is elevated in importance above the others. In the adjoining room another Franscenesque scene is taking place which is not found elsewhere in the work of van Haecht: two men with asses' heads are breaking a statue and a painting. The subject of that painting is Lot and his daughters, of which the two girls, fearing that the destruction of Sodom left them and their old father the last people on earth, ply the old man with drink to get him to impregnate them. In the hands of many a Netherlandish artist, the story is interpreted not as a tragic attempt by frightened disaster victims to save humanity but as a Lewd seduction, all the more arousing for its incestuousness. In the corresponding space in the large Alexander and Apelles, the same painting, possibly a composition by Frans Floris, is being held up for deflection. On the table...
in the main room of the new panel, near the archway, is a painting of a Gothic church in which a monumental golden statue is being worshipped. Iconoclasm, van Haecht seems to be saying, is stupid but not necessarily unprovoked.

In the absence of a narrative motif, how shall we name this important new addition to the small œuvre of Guillam van Haecht? My proposal is to descend to the second level of main identifiers, which in the case of van Haecht are the individual paintings within the painting. The featured item in the Kunstkamer of Cornelis van der Geest is of course the Matsys Madonna.

In large Alexander and Apelles it is the market scene by Joachim Beuckelaer, in the small one Rubens's Achilles among the women and in Joseph and the wife of Potiphar Rubens's Reconciliation of Jacob and Esau. By this standard, the new painting should be called Kunstkamer with van Dyck's Mystic marriage of St. Catherine, a work that is pushed up to front center of the composition, in front of the Beuckelaer and flush with the picture plane (figs. 13-14). This title brings the painting into thematic line with the other four, depicting a movingly appropriate subject for love in a Catholic Kunstkamer.

The legend surrounding the Mystic Marriage is that before Catherine was baptized she had a dream in which she saw the Virgin Mary holding the Christ Child in her arms. When the Virgin asked the child to allow Catherine to serve him, he averted his head and said that she was not beautiful enough, even though she was rewon for her beauty. Then, tormented about what she should do to make herself beautiful enough for him, Christ himself used a materialistic, aesthetic metaphor for the spiritual state of a human being. This was as good a precedent as one could wish for the dedication of art to religion - and of excellent art at that, beautiful enough to be pleasing in the demanding eyes of Christ the connoisseur.

Guillam van Haecht himself is prudent in his passion for art. He makes as strong a case as he can for the joys of collecting while taking care to show that he is aware of its dangers and those of visual seduction in general. To affirm the morality of art in a post-iconoclastic environment required deliberate judgment. That kind of judgment is manifested in van Haecht's Kunstkamer paintings. Repairing the damage of iconoclasm - the activity in which we first make the acquaintance of Guillam van Haecht and Cornelis van der Geest - is a fitting metaphor for the kunstkamer paintings on which they collaborated as patron and painter. The love engendered in the kunstkamer can be divine love, but not exclusively. The sensual mechanism which triggers love for God borders, in the creatures of flesh and blood we are, on the realms of the libido and the desire of the collector to possess. The wise apologist for art does well to acknowledge rather than deny this.

On a more mundane level which nonetheless underscores this message, the same paintings also exemplify royal patronage of the arts. Not only is this plain in the main action of the Kunstkamer of Cornelis van der Geest and the two paintings of Alexander and Apelles, it is also implicit in the choice of many of the paintings singled out for special display. The most striking proof of this concerns a famous episode in Rubens's life, in which the greatest Antwerper of the day was honored as an artist and a diplomat. On August 13, 1628 - the year of the Kunstkamer of Cornelis van der Geest - Rubens was summoned to Madrid. The real reason was to involve him, forty years after the defeat of the Armada, in a confidential Spanish attempt to re-establish ties with Britain. The pretext was the delivery of eight paintings that had been ordered from the artist some years previously by the Spanish court. He left Antwerp with the paintings on August 29th and by June 26, 1629 they had been paid for, framed in gilded frames and hung by order of Philip IV in the New Room of the Alcázar, the most prominent display venue in the palace. The compositions of two of these paintings as well as a third which was already in Spain are recreated by van Haecht in three different paintings of his own. The reconciliation of Jacob and Esau of ca. 1625-27 is the showpiece of Joseph and the wife of Potiphar. Mucius Scaccovi before Lars Porsena (figs. 15-17) occupies a place of honor in the Kunstkamer with van Dyck's Mystic marriage of St. Catherine; and Achilles discovered by Odysseus among the daughters of Lycomedes adorns the mantelpiece of the small Alexander and Apelles. To these paintings by Rubens in the collection of the Spanish king can possibly be added a gift offered to the English crown, the Mystic marriage of St. Catherine by van Dyck. By all appearances, the painting in thevan Haecht seems to be the 'very beautiful Virgin and St. Catherine ... one of the best pictures Van Dyck has executed,' that in December 1631 was sent to England 'to present either to the King or the Queen as a new year's gift' by Bal-thazar Gerbier, resident of Charles I at the court of the Infanta Isabella in Brussels. According to Gerbier, the painting in question
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had been hung by Isabella 'in the chapel of the Queen Mother [Maria de' Medici] when she was at her Court' in Brussels in the summer of 1631.26

All of this information fits admirably into our initial sketch of kunstkamer painting as a means of advertising Antwerp as a premier source for high art, with archducal patronage serving as a testimonial. The works by Rubens and van Dyck in van Haecht's kunstkamer paintings were destined for even more exalted courts than that of Brussels. Antwerp was clearly indispensable for the realization of the cultural ambitions of Spanish and English royalty as well. Obversely, the kunstkammers of the city from which this art emerges are virtual Alcázars on the Schelde.

This reading of van Haecht as a repairer of the moral and material damage of iconoclasm and a procraimer of Antwerp artistic hegemony by no means exhausts the meanings of his kunstkamer paintings. Van Haecht well deserved his epithet, in a priam of 1630 dedicated to him by Guillaume Panneels: 'pictor artificiosissimi Antuerpiensis': supremely sophisticated painter of Antwerp. Every student of his work comes up with different sets of significances in his overloaded compositions, of which the glorification of art and collecting are only the most obvious. In the present context I wish to call attention to one more of these: the ethics of patronage as exemplified in the large Alexander and Apelles.

Several of the paintings on the wall of honor and foreground of that composition were well known for the relationship they typified between a patron and a painter. Two contemporary Antwerp examples are heartwarmingly positive: The Battle of the Amazons was painted by Rubens for Cornelis van der Geest in thanks for brokering the commission of The elevation of the Cross; and Diana departing for the hunt by Rubens and Jan Bruegel, which immortalizes the hounds and other beloved animals owned by the Infanta Isabella, was a token of the trust between her and the painters. The triumph of the nymphs above them, by way of contrast, was the object of a notoriously unedifying act of high patronage. The original painting by Domenichino (of which van Haecht apparently owned a copy) had been commissioned by Cardinal Pietro Al-}

12. Guillam van Haecht, Kunstkamer with van Dyck's Mystic marriage of St. Catherine. Panel, 73 x 104 cm. Unsigned, undated, undocumented. Private collection. In the left middleground, studying a manuscript by the light from the window, is the occult scientist Paracelsus (1493-1541). His presence here, as in other guises in figs. 3 and 7, suggests that van Haecht was interested in hermetic philosophy.
that also had to be in it, for he always brought something novel to be portrayed, that it was impossible for him to earn his bread and cheese with it, so full was the piece with fowl, fish, meat, fruit and vegetables."

The relation between Guillam van Haecht and Cornelis van der Geest could not have been more different. The pay van Haecht received as resident keeper of the van der Geest collection was generous enough to enable him to leave an impressive estate upon his death. The description of his goods begins with '130 paintings, including panels, canvases as well as painted [copper] plates, further specified in the booklet written in his own hand by 5r. van der Geest.' (The booklet is unfortunately lost. It would have told us whether, as I tend to believe, some of the paintings in the pictures other than The kunskamer of Cornelis van der Geest came from the collection not of the patron but of the painter.) Nor was van Haecht required, as in other such arrangements of which we know, to relinquish his production to his patron. He retained ownership of various works by himself: paintings, drawings and no doubt several of the fourteenetching plates in the estate. The provisions of the will, which appoints Cornelis van der Geest as main executor and bequeathes to him the best individual items, speak of a close and trusting relationship between the two men and between van Haecht and his own family. Among the beneficiaries are uncles, uncles and cousins, as well as his two half-siblings by his father's second marriage. Nor was the Jesuit sodality of sewed young men forgotten.

Love of God, love of art, self-conceit, love between the sexes: Guillam van Haecht found them all in the kunskamer.

Notes
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11. Fickert, p. 15.
13. Broos, pp. 165-66, fig. 3.
14. "Iem een Sr Joris van Mockershoven een schilderij van Joseph ende huysevrouw van Patuer, wensende een kunskamerwerk." Speth-Holterhoff, p. 201. Van Mockershoven was the second executor of the will. To the first, Cornelis van der Geest, van Haecht left his greatest kunskamer, which corresponded closely to that of the illustration. The further history of Joseph and the wife of Patuer is unknown. It has been recorded only once. On June 11-12, 1536, it was auctioned in Berlin at Lepke as lot 183, with the poor illustration reproduced here for the first time since.
15. Karel E. Biset. Van Haecht's authorship was correctly recognized by S. Speth-Holterhoff (p. 111), who however does not illustrate the painting. The support is panel, like the other known works by van Haecht; the dimensions given in the catalogue are 51 x 70 cm. The ratio corresponds closely to that of the illustration.
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26. Panel, 73 x 104 cm. The painting was exhibited as a Frans Franscjen the Elder in Bethnal Green Museum in London in 1883 and never since. To my knowledge, it has subsequently been mentioned as a work by van Haecht, without being discussed or illustrated, by Kurt Zoega von Manteuffel in Thieme-Becker, vol. 15 (1922) and Speth-Holterhoff (1957), pp. 212-13, note 138. In connection with van Dyck it is mentioned in passing by Oliver Millar in The Tudor, Stuart and early Georgian pictures in the collection of Her Majesty the Queen, London 1963, cat. nr. 162 and Wheelock, p. 226. In all these references, the owner is identified as the Marquis of Bute.
29. Stoichita.
31. For the identification of the three Rubens compositions with works that hung in the Alcázar, see Volk, wood, Oros and references there. Van Haecht's depiction of Achiilles and the daughters of Lycomedes corresponds not to the painting in Madrid, now in the Prado, but to a very close version in Aschaffenburg. The comm-
15. Detail of fig. 12. The three paintings in this group - Mucius Scavena before Lars Porsenna, Salome receiving the head of John the Baptist and Church interior with golden idol do not occur in any other paintings by van Haecht.


The Book of Psalms, in use through the eighteenth century, and was thus identified publicly and emphatically as a Lutheran. This was no light matter in Antwerp in the period following the bloody re-establishment of the
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Catholic faith there. By calling our artist Willem van Haecht II, we obliterate a distinction that was a determining factor in the biographies of those concerned. The use of the form Willem van Haecht has been known to cause serious errors even in standard reference works. The entry on the artist in Thieme-Becker’s Künstler-Lexikon by Kurt Zöge von Manteuffel says that he was not inscribed in the Antwerp guild of St. Luke, an error due entirely to the uncritical acceptance of the form Willem van Haecht. At the close of the entry in Manteuffel expresses wonderment that the prints are signed “G.V. Haecht” and not inscribed in the Antwerp guild of St. Luke.


No. 20.

GUILLAM VAN HAECHT.

For description of the picture see an article by Mr. Edward Dillen, "Antwerp", January 1977, pp. 3-10 and Catalogue of a Loan D’OR Exhibition, Brussels, 1977. Several well-known pictures are represented on the wall, the most interesting of which is a link Van Eyck representing a Lady at her toilet. Among others easily recognisable are the “Battle of the Amazons” by Rubens, now at Madrid; the portrait of Tintoretto by Meyers, known through the copy by Rubens at Brussels; the portrait of Inigo Perez de Figueroa, at Frick, and the Madonna at Amsterdam by the same artist; and the Cena and Stella by Elsheimer at Madrid. The figures are all portrait pictures.

The picture records a visit by the Archdiocese Albert and the Isabella Almshouse in Cornesil Van der Geest, whose portrait by Van Dyck is in the National Gallery, London. The picture on the floor of Danube is signed G. V. Haecht, 1626.

Notes
1. For the baptismal name see baptismal registry Onze Lieve Vrouw 5 in the Antwerp municipal archives. The will is in vol. 2280 of the notarial files there [Th. Ketgen, 1636-37, fol. 312r]. The books of the guild of St. Luke are kept in the Rekeningen der dekens van St. Lucas en der Violieren, register nr. 7, nr. 200, p. 425. With thanks to Jan Lempo and Arnout Balis for checking the latter on my behalf.


LIEFDE IN DE KUNSTKAMER

H et “kunstkamer” schilderij is ontstaan in het zeventiende-eeuwse Antwerpen. Frans Francken de Jongere en Jan Bruegel waren de eerste die dit fascinerende genre van geschilderde galerijen beoefenden. Rond 1620 was het “kunstkamer” schilderij een gevestigde Antwerps-specialiteit geworden. Het had een duidelijke boodschap: beoefening en bevordering van de kunsten - vooral de schilderkunst - vormen uitnemende bezigheden en Antwerpse kunstenaars zijn daarbij uitstekend bedreven in. Dat werd nog versterkt door het mecenaat van de in Brussel zetelende aartshertog Albert en Isabella.

Guillaume van Haecht, de schilder die centraal staat in dit artikel, stamde uit een Antwerps kunstenaarsgeslacht, en een dergelijke boodschap zou hem bijzonder aangesproken hebben. In opdracht van zijn patroon Cornelis van der Geest heeft hij onder meer meegewerkt aan de restauratie van een door beeldendenermen vernield zestiende-eeuws altaarstuk. Als restaurator, schilder van kunstmasterschilderijen, en reproduktei-"eber is Van Haecht wellicht de eerste kunstenaar geweest die zich bijna uitsluitend bezighield met het creatief recyclen van anderzijds werk. Hij bleef gedurende zijn hele (korte) leven bij Van der Geest wonen, en nam diens collectie onder zijn hoede. Uit zijn “Kunstkamer Cornelis van der Geest” (afb. 3) blijkt zijn vernieuwende bijdrage aan de kunstgeschiedenis. Het werk verwijst naar een specifieke gebeurtenis, de figuren erop zijn portretten en de galerij wordt gepresenteerd als een privécollectie. Afgebeeld is een twintussen aartshertog Albert en Van der Geest om een ‘Madonna met Kind’ van de schilder Matsys, dat Albert wilde hebben maar Van der Geest niet van de hand wilde doen. Het is geen toeval dat het bezoek van Albert en Isabella aan Van der Geests kunstkamer geschilderd is in termen van liefde. Drie van Van Haechts andere ‘kunstkamer’ schilderijen gaan ook over de liefde. Twee werken verwijzen naar de schilder Apelles die verliefd werd op Campaspe, de favoriete concubine van Alexander de Grote (afb. 6 en 7). Liefde en verlangen in alle mogelijke vormen komen voor op de andere schilderijen op deze werken. Van Haechts terugkerend thema is het verlangen om te bezitten, zoals dit door het oog wordt aangewakkerd. Maar hij wijst ook op de gevaren die er aan verbonden zijn. Het kostte Van der Geest de achtig van de Aarshertog. Het had Apelles zijn leven kunnen kosten. Bij de vierde kunstkamer (afb. 11) van Van Haecht, ‘Jozef en de vrouw van Potifar’ is het verlangen op hol geslagen en verwijst het hoofdmoedig en vele afgebeelde kunstwerken naar een onontembare lust. Het vijfde ‘kunstkamer’ schilderij van Van Haecht, hier voor het eerst afgebeeld (afb. 12) is het enige werk zonder een duidelijk thema. Maar prominent aanwezig is hier Van Dijck’s ‘Mystiek huwelijk van de H. Catharina’, een werk dat ook gaat over de liefde.

In zijn hartstochtoor voor de kunsten is Guillaume van Haecht voorzichtig. Hij toont de lusten van het verzamelen maar wijst tegelijkertijd ook op de gevaren, met name die van de visuele verleiding. Liefde voor God, liefde voor de kunst, ‘eigenliefde’, liefde tussen de seksen - dit alles en nog veel meer vindt men terug in de ‘kunstkammers’ van Guillaume van Haecht.