



1984

Torrentius and His Camera

Erik Barnouw

Recommended Citation

Barnouw, E. (1984). Torrentius and His Camera. *10* (3), 22-29. Retrieved from <https://repository.upenn.edu/svc/vol10/iss3/3>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/svc/vol10/iss3/3>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Torrentius and His Camera

Torrentius and His Camera

Erik Barnouw

The known facts about Johannes Torrentius can be briefly stated.

Born in Holland in 1589, he was a painter in the greatest age of Dutch art. A contemporary of Hals and Rembrandt, Torrentius produced works that were hailed as among the most brilliant. They were bought by collectors far and wide, including King Charles I of England.¹

His work came in two sharply contrasting styles. He sometimes painted nudes, tending toward the scatological and irreverent. Many people considered them not only offensive but very crudely painted. His still lifes, on the other hand, won ecstatic praise from connoisseurs. The Swedish ambassador in The Hague, planning Dutch art purchases, sought advice from a leading engraver, Michel le Blon, who urged him to buy Torrentius still lifes. Le Blon wrote to the ambassador:

I know of nothing in the world that can compare with these works, which are believed by some of the principal masters, and not without reason, to be the work of magic. . . . One sees nowhere any crust of paint, neither beginning nor end to the entire work. It seems to have been poured or blown upon the panel rather than painted.²

Constantijn Huygens, cosmopolitan littérateur and private secretary to the Prince of Orange, wrote memoirs in which he commented discerningly on the artists of his time. About Torrentius he wrote:

As to his art, I find it difficult to restrain my use of words in asserting that he is, in my opinion, a miracle-worker in the depiction of lifeless objects, and that no one is likely to equal him in portraying accurately and beautifully glasses, things of pewter, earthenware, and iron so that, through the power of his art, they seem almost transparent, in a way that would have been thought impossible until now . . . Torrentius exasperates skeptics as they look in vain for any clue as to how he uses, in some bold manner, colors, oil, and if the gods desire it, his brushes.

Erik Barnouw, Professor Emeritus of Dramatic Arts at Columbia University, was born in The Hague, Netherlands, and lived there for eleven years. He has written eight books of media history including a 3-volume History of Broadcasting in the United States; the condensation Tube of Plenty: The Evolution of American Television; Documentary: A History of the Non-fiction Film; and The Magician and the Cinema. From 1978 to 1981 he served as Chief of the newly formed Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division of the Library of Congress. He is now Editor of the International Encyclopedia of Communications to be published in 1988 by The Annenberg School of Communications and Oxford University Press. © 1983 by Erik Barnouw.

According to Huygens, Torrentius had been heard to say that his gift had come to him suddenly by divine inspiration. Huygens expressed puzzlement that this inspiration should have fallen so far short in his painting of living people.

. . . for he is so disgracefully incapable of painting human beings and other living creatures that leading connoisseurs consider their attention wasted on that part of his work . . .³

Torrentius did everything in bravura style. His real name was Johan van der Beeck, meaning "of the brook." In latinizing it, he gave himself an aura of distinction and also transformed the brook into a torrent. The added intensity seemed to fit him. He dressed with dash and was followed everywhere by admirers (see Figure 1). When he visited his barber, they were said to go along to help bring water, towels, comb, and curling tongs. He delighted his entourage with ribald and anticlerical jests. He was said to have proposed a toast to the devil. He had married early, but his marriage soon broke up, and he subsequently lived a life that was described as dissolute. He was said to have boasted, on one occasion, that all the loose women of Holland paid him tribute. Asked how he painted his extraordinary still lifes, he gave cryptic, provocative answers. He did not paint these as other men painted, he said. Neither easel nor brush were used. He said that his panels lay flat on the floor and that as he worked, a musical sound would emerge from the panel, like that of a swarm of bees. He was once quoted as saying: "It isn't I who paint; I have another method for that." Once, at a party, he said he had to rush back to his studio, or there might be an explosion. He said he did not have to lock his studio, as the pungent odors kept people away.

All his still lifes were small. A painting owned by Charles I of England was described as follows in the catalog of the royal collection:

Item in a black ebony frame two Rhenish wine glasses, wherein the reflexion of the steeple of Haarlem is observed, given to the king by Torrentius by the deceased Lord Dorchester's means. 7½ × 6 inches.⁴

Torrentius infuriated some of his rivals; some charged him with using magic or sorcery. Even more he aroused the suspicion and anger of Holland's Calvinist elders. In 1623 they instigated an investigation of him. They charged heinous crimes against God and religion, and hinted at collaboration with demonic forces. A campaign was launched to discredit him and to warn others not to associate with him, on the ground of his alleged dealings with the devil. In 1627 he was arrested by authorities of the city of Haarlem, where he lived and worked. Some of his paintings were seized—from Torrentius himself and



Figure 1 Johannes Torrentius.

from others—and apparently destroyed. Descriptions of some of these remain:

- A woman sitting somewhat oddly with her hand under her leg.
- A woman pissing in a man's ear.⁵

Brought to trial, Torrentius heard testimony on curious and cryptic remarks he had made over the years, all solemnly quoted as proof that he trafficked with the devil. He was convicted. The prosecution demanded that he be burned alive at the stake. In prison he was repeatedly tortured to force a confession of sorcery. Depositions by several torturers—four worked in relays—remain extant, and make clear that he confessed to nothing and gave no information beyond what he had said in court. The defense was not allowed a final statement, on the ground that it would be unseemly for the public to hear a defense of one so infamously guilty. He was sentenced to twenty

years in prison, probably the equivalent of a death sentence. The trial caused wide agitation. A committee of three painters, one of them Frans Hals, was allowed to visit him in jail; it reportedly found him in woeful condition from his torture. The Prince of Orange urged the city of Haarlem to release him so that he might go to some other city or country to pursue his art; Haarlem authorities declined. Then a letter—in French—came from King Charles I of England to Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange:

Dear Cousin,

Having heard that one Torrentius, painter by profession, has for some years been in prison in Haarlem, sentenced by a court of justice in that city for some profanation or scandal committed against the name of religion . . . be assured that I do not seek to favor him as a challenge to the rigor of that sentence . . . which we trust was justly imposed for so enormous a crime; yet nevertheless, in view of the reputation he has won for his artistic talent, which it would be tragic to allow to be lost or to perish in prison, we are moved by the pleasure we have taken in the rare quality of his work to beg you . . . to pardon him and to send him to us . . . where we shall take care to keep him within the bounds of the duty he owes to religion . . . that we may employ him at this court in the exercise of his art.

At our Westminster Palace, 6 May 1630, w.g. Charles R.⁶

The Prince forwarded the letter to authorities in Haarlem. When they still declined to act, the Prince took matters into his own hands, sending an order direct to the Haarlem jailer to release Torrentius to the custody of the English ambassador, Sir Dudley Carleton. This was done, and Torrentius was quickly escorted to England. At Sir Dudley's suggestion, he took with him one of his early still lifes.

Thus Torrentius became in 1630 a court painter in the service of Charles I. Physically he seems to have been in bad shape. There appears to be no record of any work done in England. He never again produced any of the miraculous works that had made him famous. An English account speaks of him giving "more scandal than satisfaction."⁷ In 1642 he returned to Holland, where he died two years later.

These facts about Torrentius, with detailed documentation from surviving judicial and other records, were assembled in 1909 by the Netherlands art historian A. Bredius, long associated with Amsterdam's Rijksmuseum and a specialist on the Age of Rembrandt. He published the assembled information in a booklet titled *Johannes Torrentius, Schilder* (Johannes Torrentius, Painter). A thought-provoking revelation was that Bredius had been unable to find, anywhere in Europe, a work by Torrentius. Various obscene and irreverent works had apparently been destroyed at the time of the trial. But the still lifes too had vanished, a disappearance that seemed extraor-

dinary in view of their celebrity and the high prices paid for them. Bredius expressed hope that some might turn up.

Far from closing the book on a mystery, the scholarly Bredius account proved only the beginning. Stimulating new research, the account set off speculations and inquiries of various kinds—technical, aesthetic, religious, political. The Torrentius story turned into a complex saga, a lens through which to view a turbulent age.

The booklet prompted an immediate anonymous letter in a Dutch newspaper, suggesting that Torrentius must have used the camera obscura. Perhaps he had even, long before others, found a way to preserve its image—i.e., had invented photography. The disappearance of his works might simply mean that he had failed to fix them permanently. They may have gradually blurred and been discarded. The small size of the pictures, and the choice of subject matter, seemed to support the photography idea. Torrentius must have needed long exposure periods, ruling out living subjects. With still lifes he could also keep his methods secret. And he obviously pursued chemical experiments.⁸

This letter was quickly followed by an article in a German periodical, *Photographische Korrespondenz*, by one A. P. H. Trivelli of Scheveningen, Holland, which made a surprising contribution. He pointed out that the Constantijn Huygens memoir that had been cited by Bredius, relative to the rare quality of the Torrentius still lifes, included a further passage about Torrentius that Bredius had not noted, a passage of unusual significance.⁹

In 1621 Huygens had visited England, and made the acquaintance of an ingenious Holland-born experimenter, Cornelis Drebbel, who lived and worked in England and whose experiments were financed by funds supplied by King Charles. His experiments apparently ranged from optics to alchemy, and he was said to have invented a perpetual motion machine. Huygens' father warned his son against Drebbel, suggesting that Drebbel probably had dealings with the devil. But Constantijn Huygens passed off this warning and became fascinated with Drebbel. In Drebbel's workshop he had his first glimpse of a camera obscura. It was portable, box-shaped. It showed its images upside down but the images enchanted Huygens, and he took such an instrument back to Holland from Drebbel's workshop.¹⁰

In Holland, as Huygens recounts in his memoir, he demonstrated the device at a gathering in his father's house, to the delight of all. Among those present was Torrentius. And it seemed to Huygens that Torrentius was so exaggerated in his expressions of amazement that Huygens concluded that Torrentius already knew the device and had acquired "especially by this means . . . that certain quality in his paintings which

the general run of people ascribe to divine inspiration." Huygens mentioned an "astounding resemblance of Torrentius's pictures to these images. . . ."¹¹

If Torrentius already knew and used the device, he may have been the first Dutch painter to do so. It had evolved from observations of much earlier times. Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519) mentioned in his notebooks that if, on a bright day, a pinhole is made in one wall of a very dark room—*camera obscura*—images of the outside world will appear on an opposing surface in the room. The images would "present themselves in a reversed position, owing to the intersection of the rays." Giovanni Battista della Porta, in a 1558 edition of his encyclopedic *Natural Magic*, uses similar language, with the picturesque detail that "people passing in the street will have their feet in the air." In an edition published some thirty years later he speaks vaguely of the use of lenses and mirrors to improve the image, and asks: "Would you like to see this apparition set upright? This is very difficult, often attempted, but nobody has succeeded." By the seventeenth century this playful use of a darkened room had evolved into something quite different: a portable room that could be taken into the field and set up at any chosen site, for observation or study. A painter could enter the room—resembling a tent, but opaque—and copy or trace the received image. In 1611 the astronomer Kepler was described as having such a portable, tentlike room. There are also references to portable rooms constructed like sedan chairs.¹²

Such devices could help a painter solve problems of perspective, but were hardly convenient. Eventually a more truly portable "camera" came into existence in the form of a box with a translucent screen in one side, allowing the observer to study the image from outside instead of inside the "camera." It was such a device that Huygens found in Drebbel's workshop in 1621, and that Torrentius may have acquired even earlier.

But could Torrentius possibly, as some were suggesting in response to the Bredius booklet of 1909, have taken a further step, a chemical step, preserving the image? Among those who speculated, few believed this possible. Most assumed that he had focused the camera obscura image on a panel flat on the floor and applied paint mixtures—some formula of his own—over the image to reproduce as closely as possible its shapes and qualities. They assumed his mixtures had not stood the test of time.

These speculations were thrown into some confusion by an astonishing event of 1913. A Torrentius still life turned up (Figure 2). It was found in a Dutch grocery store, used as the lid for a vat of currants. Torrentius had signed and dated the work—1614. Details of the painting revealed it to be the picture that Torrentius had taken to England in 1630 to

present to King Charles. The stamp of Charles I on the back of the panel identified it as a part of the royal collection. How it had made its way back to Holland, and to a grocery store, no one could explain. But its authenticity was accepted. It hangs in the Rijksmuseum, the one extant work considered by authorities the creation of Johannes Torrentius. Why had it—and it alone—survived?¹³

The resurrected still life now provided a focus for inquiry. Brush markings were not in evidence. The subtlety of the shadows and reflections caused considerable amazement. It was noted that the reflections in the wine glass showed clearly—though the scale was minute—that the studio had leaded pane windows. The words of the song occasioned surprise. Instead of an ode to Bacchus, it was a warning against excesses.

What goes beyond restraint
Soon turns to unrestraint.

The arrangement of objects in a circular setting caused speculation. It seemed to some observers to represent Rosicrucian symbolism. The Rosicrucians were obsessed with circles, which could represent the heavens, perfection, eternity, wholeness, or inner unity. But what did Torrentius mean by his assemblage?¹⁴

The Rosicrucian connection gradually became the center of interest. For the secret, mysterious Rosicrucian brotherhood, a storm center in early seventeenth-century Europe, was said to have been especially strong in Holland, and Torrentius was considered its leading figure. Curiously, this was never mentioned in the trial. But accumulating evidence has suggested that this was indeed the key element in the decision of church authorities to move against him with crushing force. There were reasons for the trial that never appeared in the trial.

Until recently, the elusive Rosicrucians have been considered beneath the attention of serious scholars. But recent investigations, such as the 1972 study by Frances Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment*, have changed this. And it has helped provide a new focus for the Torrentius story.¹⁵

The Rosicrucians burst on the consciousness of Europe with dramatic suddenness in 1614. That year saw the publication in Germany of a manifesto whose title page read:

Universal and General Reformation of the whole wide world; together with the *Fama Fraternitas* of the Laudable Brotherhood of the Rose Cross, addressed to all the learned men and rulers of Europe; also a short statement contributed by Herr Haselmayer, for which he was seized by the Jesuits and put in irons on a Galley. Now put forth in print and communicated to all true hearts. Printed at Cassel by Wilhelm Wessel, 1614.¹⁶

This Rosicrucian proclamation, or *Fama*, had circulated in manuscript, but this was the first time anything about the Rosicrucians had appeared in print. The *Fama* was followed by a second manifesto, known as the *Confessio*. Both were promptly translated from German into other languages and caused excitement throughout Europe—according to Frances Yates, “a frenzied interest . . . a river of printed words.” Scores of pamphlets were published during the following half-dozen years, in several languages, praising the ideas of the brotherhood and expressing interest in joining their wondrous work. Some of the authors said they had not yet succeeded in making contact with the brothers, but hoped to do so. The brothers seemed to be elusive.¹⁷

The manifestos ascribed the origin of the Rosicrucian movement to one Christian Rosenkreutz, whose name incorporates the linked Rosicrucian symbols of the rose and the cross. Today he is considered a mythical figure, since no historic evidence of his existence has turned up; but the account of him in the manifestos was accepted at the time they were published. According to that account, he was born in the fourteenth century of a noble but impoverished German family, and raised in a convent. At sixteen he embarked on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. But during the journey, in Damascus and elsewhere, he became aware of the scientific knowledge and age-old wisdom of the Arabs, which gave his life a new direction. He traveled throughout the Arab world, all the way to Fez, and was impressed by the way its sages shared their knowledge and findings with each other. Returning via Spain to the European world, he wanted to win its savants to a similar sharing. They tended to hoard their secrets. In view of the rapidly accumulating knowledge about the world and the mysteries of nature, Rosenkreutz proclaimed that a sharing of knowledge would soon bring mankind to a more glorious life on earth. This apocalyptic sense of being on the verge of great changes in the condition of man apparently communicated itself to many readers, who must have included a spectrum of scientists/alchemists, astronomers/astrologers, physicians/quacks, and diverse scholars and mystics. Some rulers also took notice.

In Rosicrucian symbolism the cross apparently represented a pious dedication to the envisioned earthly salvation—not to religious hierarchies that had become an obstacle to research. The rose represented the unfolding of the secrets of nature.

Rosenkreutz was said to have enjoined his followers not to wear distinguishing dress. Wherever they went, they were to dress like others in that place. They were to use their knowledge everywhere to heal the sick, always gratis. The movement was to maintain secrecy for a hundred years.¹⁸



Figure 2 Only known surviving work by Torrentius. It was once owned by Charles I of England and was rediscovered in 1911.

That it should be secret, and given to cryptic communication, was perhaps inevitable at a time when heretical experimenters and thinkers were being imprisoned or burned at the stake in substantial numbers. At the same time, the secrecy and mystery fed rumor and suspicion, eventually providing the basis for counterattack.

Much about the Rosicrucian movement remains an impenetrable mystery. Were the manifestos that started the hubbub a description of an organization in actual existence? So almost everyone assumed. Or were they perhaps, as Frances Yates had suggested, intended as a call to form an organization? Whatever the truth, Yates feels that the resulting ferment did stimulate communication and meetings among scholars and experimenters "in the Rosicrucian spirit."

Perhaps the manifestos actually created, almost overnight, a Rosicrucian movement. If so, this seems to have happened with intensity in Holland.¹⁹

"There is no country in the world," wrote a French writer of the time, Sorbière, "more suitable than Holland for the Brotherhood of the Rose Cross, and where those who have the secret of the great work have more freedom."²⁰ All this seems to have unnerved the Dutch Calvinist hierarchy, as it did religious establishments elsewhere. The Rosicrucians seemed to have forgotten about heaven and hell.

Wide religious counterattacks on the Rosicrucians commenced in Paris in 1623 in a publication titled *Horrible Pacts Made Between the Devil and the Pretended Invisible Ones*. In this their secrecy was pictured as a sharing of diabolical secrets. The rule against distinguishing dress was pictured as a sinister infiltration tactic. The piety of the movement was described as devil worship. Similar attacks erupted in Holland, where a 1624 publication asserted that "they conclude abominable pacts with Satan; they are instantly transported from one place to another; they make themselves invisible; they read plants, and can tell the secrets of human thoughts."²¹

The Calvinists were meanwhile urging an official investigation of the Rosicrucians. They enlisted the aid of the theological faculty of Leyden University, which concurred that the sect was "greatly in error and heretical, harmful to the Republic, rebellious, and full of deceit." Pressure was brought on the city of Haarlem for legal action. A memorandum presented to Haarlem authorities stated:

As we have learned . . . certain persons who call themselves the Brothers of the Rose-Cross and who have had their residence in the city of Paris have now come also into these provinces, and are engaged in activities very harmful to the interests of the State . . .

The memorandum said that meetings of the sect were found to have been held in various cities including Haarlem. It then mentioned "a certain Torrentius who is said to be one of the foremost of this sect." It was this memorandum that launched the campaign against Torrentius.²²

If the Rosicrucian connection was never mentioned in the trial, or in the prosecutor's final summation, there was a reason. The Rosicrucians apparently had support among intellectuals and well-to-do patricians. One document in the prosecution file suggests that there were meetings of Rosicrucian members in the palace of the Prince of Orange himself. The Calvinist leaders dared not attack this elite directly and chose to move against the sect obliquely by discrediting the individual most prominently mentioned in connection with it, a man whose mysterious activities and pronouncements made him a ready target for the charge of sorcery. His trial became, in effect, a historic show trial, comparable to other such trials. The real target was neither Torrentius nor his method of painting, but a heretical movement.

Holland's judicial procedure did not at this time call for testimony and cross-examination in court. Instead, both prosecution and defense arranged for witnesses to appear before magistrates in their places of abode and give testimony there. This was all written down. Those mentioned might be called and questioned, for further information or corroboration. The resulting depositions could be used selectively in the trial for

arguments pro and con. The voluminous depositions in the Torrentius case, a case that became a *cause célèbre* accompanied by wild public excitement and alarm, have been preserved in the Haarlem archives and were extensively quoted by Bredius and by later commentators.

The archives make clear the determination of religious and civil authorities to blacken and convict Torrentius. In the city of Delft an innkeeper and his wife, at whose place Torrentius had sometimes stayed, were called for testimony. When questioned they spoke of a particular evening, several years earlier, when Torrentius in the company of other guests had ridiculed various stories in the Bible, spoken countless blasphemies, and even scoffed at the story of the Passion, until the innkeeper put a stop to it, telling Torrentius: "Shame on you! If this were Spain they would burn you alive at the stake!" Asked to mention others present, they mentioned the names of two other guests. When these were later summoned to testify, they remembered an evening when Torrentius had twitted the innkeeper on various matters, but they recalled no mention whatever of the Bible. The innkeeper and his wife were called back and questioned further, and finally confessed that their statements had been false. They had merely tried to be helpful to the authorities. They said the Haarlem prosecutor and another official, along with two Calvinist ministers, had visited them at the inn and explained how dangerous Torrentius was. They had given her a paper on which was written the sort of testimony that was needed. The wife had memorized it.²³

To support the charge that Torrentius was in league with the devil, the prosecution relied heavily on the testimony of one Dr. Jacob Hogenheim. He and Torrentius had on several occasions taken walks together; Torrentius apparently enjoyed mystifying the doctor. On one walk they passed a boy, who greeted Torrentius effusively but ignored the doctor. The doctor commented on this. Torrentius replied: "That boy has an evil spirit."

The doctor found this remark thought-provoking. How could Torrentius know that someone was possessed of an evil spirit unless he himself dealt with evil spirits? Besides, Torrentius had used the same phrase on several occasions.

On one walk they came to a farm, where a man spoke to Torrentius: "You want a hen, don't you? I know you need them!" Hogenheim was puzzled. "How would that fellow know you needed a hen?" Torrentius said: "That man is possessed of an evil spirit."²⁴

When Torrentius, after his arrest, was confronted with the doctor's testimony, he explained about his need for hens. He said that he sometimes mixed his colors in an empty eggshell, resealed it, and had a hen sit on it for as long as three weeks, to keep the

mixture at a steady warmth until it was just right. The explanation suggests a sophisticated technician. Torrentius apparently explained nothing further about his techniques.²⁵

As a show trial, the action against Torrentius appears to have been an unqualified success. It virtually snuffed out the Rosicrucian movement in the Netherlands and helped to weaken it elsewhere. There is little evidence of a Dutch Rosicrucian movement in the following years. Copies of the Dutch translation of the *Fama* disappeared. Apparently no copy now remains in existence. After the trial, Prince Frederik Hendrik seems to have given his protection to the Freemasons rather than the Brothers of the Rose Cross. Here and in England, a strengthened Freemason movement seemed to rise from the Rosicrucian crisis. In France, too, the movement seemed to vanish. Descartes, who had been rumored to be a Rosicrucian, made a point of denying that he had ever been a member of the brotherhood. To make clear he was not one of the *invisibles*, he made himself widely visible in Paris.

In many ways, the world of Johannes Torrentius had been a microcosm of the era. Microcosm—a favorite word of the Rosicrucians. To them, every human being was *microcosmus*.

The role of Torrentius as a Rosicrucian, member of a knowledge-sharing brotherhood, may help to explain his early acquisition of the camera obscura. Whatever his use of the camera, it also touched a central theme of Renaissance art. It was a time when painters became obsessed with perspective, and with that kind of realism we can now call photographic—an obsession unquestionably aided and abetted by the evolving camera obscura.

Its evolution was also a story of science, a field still hedged by perils. In the public mind it was still so closely linked to necromancy that probes into the nature of things were risky, bringing some to prison, others to the stake.

The role of Charles I in the Torrentius case raises interesting questions. He had a sister, the Princess Elizabeth, who in 1613 married a German prince from the Palatinate, named Frederick. This couple became, for a brief season, 1619–1620, King and Queen of Bohemia, reigning from Prague. There they were said to be among the crowned heads who were receptive to Rosicrucian ideas. When they were overthrown, with the king defeated in battle by Counter-Reformation forces, they fled to Holland. The young couple became popular among its social elite. They are mentioned here and there in the journal of Constantijn Huygens. For many years Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia in exile, held court in The Hague.²⁶

Was King Charles I's rescue of Johannes Torrentius in any way related to Elizabeth's espousal of the Rosicrucian brotherhood? There is no evidence of it. Yet it is possible, perhaps even likely.

Even more interesting questions revolve around Constantijn Huygens. Was he among those involved in Rosicrucian gatherings in the palace of the Prince of Orange himself? Again, no answer is available. But the story of the Huygens family reflects dramatically the seventeenth-century transition in scientific research. The father of Constantijn Huygens, Christiaan Huygens the elder, feared that his son's scientific inquisitiveness would lead to involvement with the devil. Constantijn passed off these fears but witnessed the destruction of Torrentius amid similar terrors. No such fears would hound the career of Christiaan Huygens the younger (1629–1695), son of Constantijn. Born during the time Torrentius was experiencing prison and torture, this Christiaan Huygens would do his work in another kind of age. He would perfect his lenses and his telescope, freely probe the heavens, unravel planetary mysteries, and contribute to knowledge on earth with the magic lantern, the pendulum clock, the spiral watchspring, and other wonders. So science made its transition.

Amid the transition lived the hapless, brilliant, flamboyant Torrentius. It was a violent and devil-haunted time—a time when, as Frances Yates put it, "the Renaissance disappears into convulsions of witch-hunting and wars, to emerge in the years to come—when these horrors were overcome—as enlightenment."²⁷

Notes

Translations from non-English sources are by the author unless otherwise indicated.

- 1 Our summary is based mainly on Abraham Bredius, *Johannes Torrentius, Schilder, 1589–1644* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1909). In Dutch. Other sources as noted.
- 2 *Ibid.*, pp. 6–7.
- 3 Huygens wrote his memoirs in Latin. They did not see publication until the late nineteenth century, when fragments of the text along with Dutch translations appeared in the bimonthly periodical *Oud-Holland*, IX, 1891. Bredius quoted from this source. A major compilation of passages from the memoirs, with annotations by A. H. Kan, was published under the title *De Jeugd van Constantijn Huygens: door hemzelf beschreven* (The Youth of Constantijn Huygens, described by himself; Rotterdam and Antwerp: Donker, 1946). The book contains a valuable appendix on Torrentius.
- 4 Bredius, *op. cit.*, p. 10, quoted from Public Records Office, London.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- 6 The French text can be found in Bredius, pp. 60–61; or in A. J. Rehorst, *Torrentius* (Rotterdam: Brusse, 1939), pp. 226–227.
- 7 Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, vol. 2 (London, 1828), p. 242.
- 8 *Het Vaderland*, Oct. 31, 1909. In Dutch.
- 9 A. P. H. Trivelli, "Johannes Torrentius 1589–1644," in *Photographische Korrespondenz*, No. 47, 1910, pp. 1–8. In German.
- 10 Rosalie L. Colie, "Some Thankfulness to Constantine": a study of English influence upon the early works of Constantijn Huygens (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1956), includes a valuable passage on Cornelius Drebbel and Huygens's fascination with him. See pp. 92–110.
- 11 A. H. Kan, ed., *op. cit.*, pp. 86–87.
- 12 Quotations are from Georges Potoniée, *The History of the Discovery of Photography*, translation from the French by Edward Epstean (New York: Arno, 1973), pp. 8, 11. For the evolving forms of the portable camera obscura see also Helmut Gernsheim, with Alison Gernsheim, *The History of Photography* (New York: Oxford, 1955).
- 13 Abraham Bredius, "Johannes Symonsz. Torrentius: een nalezing," in *Oud-Holland*, 1917, pp. 219–223.
- 14 Rehorst, *op. cit.*, provides the most massive compilation of Torrentius documents, with emphasis on the Rosicrucian connection. Some far-fetched inferences.
- 15 Frances A. Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972).
- 16 English translations of the Rosicrucian manifestos and related documents appear in Arthur E. Wait, *The Real History of the Rosicrucians* (London, 1887), and Yates, *op. cit.*
- 17 Yates, *op. cit.*, pp. 48–49.
- 18 For a history of the movement see especially Frans Wittemans, *A New and Authentic History of the Rosicrucians*, translated from the Dutch by Francis Graem Davis (Chicago: Aries, 1938).
- 19 Yates, *op. cit.*, pp. 91–102.
- 20 Wittemans, *op. cit.*, pp. 50–54.
- 21 *Ibid.*, p. 38, quoted from *Wassenaers Historisch Verhaal*, 1624.
- 22 Rehorst, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–19.
- 23 *Ibid.*, pp. 31–36.
- 24 *Ibid.*, pp. 25–28.
- 25 *Ibid.*, p. 41.
- 26 A detailed account of the "winter King and Queen of Bohemia" is in Yates, *op. cit.*, pp. 1–29.
- 27 *Ibid.*, p. 224.