TRIBUTES TO
DAVID FREEDBERG

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

TRIBUTES TO

David Freedberg

Image and Insight

EDITED BY
CLAUDIA SWAN

HARVEY MILLER PUBLISHERS

HARVEY MILLER PUBLISHERS
An Imprint of Brepols Publishers
London / Turnhout

Publication is made possible in part by a gift from Elizabeth Warnock
to the Department of Art History at Northwestern University.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library
ISBN 978-1-909400-70-2
D/2019/0095/146

© 2019, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by
any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or
otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

Contents

Acknowledgments 1

Introduction
Claudia Swan 3

The North

Florilegium: The Origins of the Flower Still Life in the Early Modern Netherlands
Marisa Anne Bass 11

Poussin's Idolatrous Dances
Emily A. Beeny 27

Rembrandt's So-Called *'Faust'* as Self-Portrait of the Artist-Kabbalist in the Studio
Benjamin Binstock 45

Rubens and the Gallery of Beauties
Adam Eaker 61

Rubens and the Twelve Years' Truce:
Reconsidering the *Adoration of the Magi* for the Antwerp Town Hall
Robert Fucci 75

Kitchen Scenes and Performance at the Antwerp Dinner Party
Claudia Goldstein 89

Something's Missing:
A Note on the Historiography of Rubens's *Rockox Triptych*
Koenraad Jonckheere 101

The Lemon's Lure
Mariët Westermann 115

Forging Rubens: Antwerp and the Vaenius Studio
Anne T. Woollett 131

Print Matters

Capitals between Rome and Nuremberg:
Creating and Transferring Style *c.* 1470-75
Renzo Baldasso 149

'Imitation and its Discontents': Hercules Segers's Window
Catherine Levesque 165

Vorsterman, Van Dyck, and Rubens's Printmaking Enterprise
Victoria Sancho Lobis 175

What Price Innovation? The Cost of Printing the Paris Polyglot Bible
Peter N. Miller 187

Hans van Luyck and the Byways of Flemish Landscape Prints
Alexandra Onuf 203

Rembrandt's *Christ Presented to the People* (1655):
A Report on the Crowd
Peter Parshall 219

'Various Rare Paintings and Printed Artworks for Art Lovers':
Jan Pietersz Berendrecht and the Origins of the Dutch Painter-Etcher Tradition
Elizabeth Wyckoff 233

The Powers of Images

Venus, Slashed: Objectification and Artistic Agency
Carolin Behrmann 251

The *Bios* of the Image: Living Thanks to Fiction
Chiara Cappelletto 261

Image, sensation, disproportion
Georges Didi-Huberman 269

Stoning the Doge:
Popular Aggression and Political 'Iconoclasm' in Early Modern Venice
Maartje van Gelder 279

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

The Anthropomorphic Drive: Similitude, Simulation, Empathy
Andrea Pinotti 291

Emotions in Art from Giambattista della Porta to David Freedberg
Gary Schwartz 301

Images of Power: Dinglinger's Dresden Miniatures
Larry Silver 313

Inhabited Sculptures, Lethal Weapons
Carolyn Yerkes 327

Italian Subjects

Angles and Demons:
Considerations on the Aesthetics of Ground Plan Drawings in the Renaissance
Francesco Benelli 343

The Black Page: The Ottoman Connection
David Bindman 359

Le Cacce dei Papi
Giovanna Alberta Campitelli 367

Guido Reni, Antonio Bruni, and a Poetics of Response
Jonathan Unglaub 381

Drawings from the Gennari Inventory of 1719
Veronica Maria White 401

The Artist

The Minotaur in the Drawings of Peter Vos: An *Alter Ego*?
Jan Piet Filedt Kok 417

'Divine' or Not? Poetic Responses to the Art of Michelangelo
Diletta Gamberini 431

William Kentridge: Renaissance Man of Johannesburg
Margaret K. Koerner 443

Theory; Connoisseurship

Erwin Panofskys Habilitation und die Rhythmik des Films
Horst Bredekamp 455

Mise en abyme: A Reframing
Carlo Ginzburg 465

Connoisseurship Revisited: The Case of *Saul and David*
Emilie E.S. Gordenker 481

'Rubens Only Whispers':
The Reception of the Cambridge *Bozzetti* for the *Triumph of the Eucharist* Tapestry Series
Meredith M. Hale 491

The Style and Substance of Ancient Coins:
Louis Savot, Numismatics, and Connoisseurship in the Age of the Paper Museum
William Stenhouse 505

List of Publications by David Freedberg 515

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

Florilegium: *The Origins of the Flower Still Life in the Early Modern Netherlands*

Marisa Anne Bass

A flower still life is never so static as it first appears. The blooms still tremble from the touch of the hand that gathered the bouquet together. And each flower still fights to maintain the generative force with which nature endowed it, to resist the inevitable fading wrought by the cut of its stem. The tension between the ephemerality of flora and their enlivenment through painterly artifice had become such a commonplace by the early seventeenth century that Karel van Mander (1548–1606), at the conclusion of his *Schilder-boeck* (1604), contrasted nature's transient blooms with the painter's ultimate aim: to strive for eternity through art.[1]

The burgeoning of horticultural pursuits and influx of exotic flowers to the early modern Low Countries provided one stimulus for the beginnings of the still-life genre.[2] Informed viewers surely took pleasure in the collection of diverse specimens within a given painting, in noting the rarity and relative value of each individual bloom. Yet following Norman Bryson's claim that 'still life is not a *taxonomic* category', I want to consider the flower piece not merely as the sum of these cultural accretions, but instead as a kind of picture that works its effect on the viewer as an enlivened whole.[3] In his seminal 1991 article 'Science, Commerce, and Art', David Freedberg pointed to a way forward when he wrote of the natural objects that populate so many Dutch paintings:

> They are not just or only the tokens of the divine Other. They are much more than that, whether in still life or any other form of Dutch picture making. They are tokens of real and material value […] We linger over them with our eyes because we need to use them, handle them, and exchange them for other rarer, stranger, and more valuable objects […] Touch too becomes a criterion for representation.[4]

* In writing this essay, I am grateful for advice and suggestions from Frank Fehrenbach, Denise Gill, Rhodri Lewis, Paul Taylor, and especially Claudia Swan.

1. Karel van Mander, *The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters*, ed. by Hessel Miedema, 6 vols (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1994), I, pp. 460–61, fol. 300v. For wide-ranging and insightful discussion of this theme, see Karin Leonhard, *Bildfelder: Stilleben und Naturstücke des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2013), and also Frank Fehrenbach, 'Cut Flowers', *Nuncius,* 32 (2017), 583–614.

2. See Onno Wijnands, 'Commercium Botancium: The Diffusion of Plants in the 16th Century', in *The Authentic Garden: A Symposium on Gardens*, ed. by Leslie Tjon Sie Fat and Erik de Jong (Leiden: Clusius Foundation, 1991), pp. 75–82; Paul Taylor, *Dutch Flower Painting, 1600–1720* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), pp. 1–27; Elizabeth Alice Honig, 'Making Sense of Things: On the Motives of Dutch Still Life', *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, 34 (1998), 166–83 (pp. 180–82); Claudia Swan, 'From Blowfish to Flower Still Life Paintings: Classification and Its Images, circa 1600', in *Merchants and Marvels: Commerce, Science, and Art in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Pamela H. Smith and Paula Findlen (New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 109–36 (pp. 128–31); Anne Goldgar, *Tulipmania: Money, Honor, and Knowledge in the Dutch Golden Age* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997); and Florike Egmond, *The World of Carolus Clusius: Natural History in the Making, 1550–1610* (London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 11–44.

3. Norman Bryson, *Looking at the Overlooked: Four Essays on Still Life Painting* (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), p. 10.

4. David Freedberg, 'Science, Commerce, and Art: Neglected Topics at the Junction of History and Art History', in *Art in History, History in Art: Studies in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Culture*, ed. by David Freedberg and Jan de Vries (Santa Monica, CA: Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1991), pp. 377–427 (p. 404).

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

This essay takes up touch and intimacy as the criteria most fundamental to the design and intended impact of flower paintings. My contention is twofold. Firstly, the flower still life as a picture intimates a gesture of reciprocal exchange between itself and the viewer. Not only does touch guide the experience of these paintings; the elusiveness of the tactile sense also endows them with their particular allure.[5] So it was for the seventeenth-century Englishman Samuel Pepys (1633–1703), who wrote of the water droplets brilliantly depicted in a flower painting by Simon Pietersz Verelst (1644–1721): 'I was forced again and again to put my finger on it to feel whether my eyes were deceived or no'.[6]

My second and related contention is that the flower still life originated in dialogue with the early modern culture of friendship. When the humanist Juan Luis Vives (1493–1540) described the communion between touch and sight as 'a kind of friendship'—or when Leon Battista Alberti (1404–72) proclaimed painting, like friendship, to possess the ability to make the absent present and the dead seem still alive—both drew on a Ciceronian discourse that was common currency in the Renaissance.[7] The friendship metaphor employed by Vives and Alberti aligns with the practices of early modern *amicitia*, a concept that encompassed ties of kinship and collegial enterprise.[8] Letter-writing, gift-giving, and the keeping of friendship albums (*alba amicorum*) in turn informed the ways that the still-life genre first took shape. To paraphrase Vives and Alberti, early flower paintings functioned as living monuments, designed to perpetuate a tangible bond between the painting as giver and the viewer as recipient.

The intimate visual tactics evident in early exemplars of the genre likewise reflect the historical context of their making. The flower piece first emerged in and around Antwerp, the major metropolis and art market of the southern Netherlands, during the latter half of the sixteenth century. During these same years, the political and economic discord of the Dutch Revolt sent fissures through the collegial networks that had long fostered Antwerp's cultural and commercial growth. Faced with the violence of the Spanish invasion and the threat of the Inquisition, many members of the Netherlandish artistic and intellectual community fled to the northern Netherlands or even farther afield across Europe.

War and emigration not only increased the desire for private modes of exchange between friends dispersed across distance; it also shifted focus to the natural world, and to the garden in particular, as sites of friendship and refuge during troubled times. From the 1576 botanical treatise of Matthias de l'Obel (1538–1616) to the

5. See David Summers, *The Judgment of Sense: Renaissance Naturalism and the Rise of Aesthetics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 78–88; Daniel Heller-Roazen, *The Inner Touch: Archaeology of a Sensation* (New York: Zone Books, 2007); Niklaus Largier, 'The Plasticity of the Soul: Mystical Darkness, Touch, and Aesthetic Experience', *MLN*, 125 (2010), 536–51; Joe Moshenska, *Feeling Pleasures: The Sense of Touch in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 143–74; Frederique de Vignemont and Olivier Massin, 'Touch', in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Perception*, ed. Mohan Matthen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 295–313, and Elizabeth A. Honig, *Jan Brueghel and the Senses of Scale* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2016), pp. 37–77.

6. Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. by Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970–83), IX, pp. 514–15.

7. Juan Luis Vives, *De anima et vita libri tres* (Basel: in officina Roberti Winter, 1538), p. 30 (Bk. I, Ch. 9): 'magnam habent visus et tactus communionem, quasique amicitiam'; Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting and Sculpture*, ed. and trans. by Cecil Grayson (London: Phaidon Press, 1972), II. 25, pp. 60–61: 'ut quod de amicitia dicunt, absentes pictura praesentes esse faciat, verum etiam defunctos longa post saecula viventibus exhibeat'. Alberti's phrasing is adapted directly from Cicero, *De Amicitia*, 7. 23. See also Kathy Eden, *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Intimacy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012); and Daniel T. Lochman and Maritere López, 'Introduction: The Emergence of Discourses: Early Modern Friendship', in *Discourses and Representations of Friendship in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1700*, ed. by Daniel T. Lochman, Maritere López, and Lorna Hutson (Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 1–26 (pp. 3–9).

8. For the flexibility of the early modern notion of friendship, see Peter Burke, 'Humanism and Friendship in Sixteenth-Century Europe' in *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Julian Haseldine (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), pp. 262–74.

famous treatise *On Constancy* that Justus Lipsius (1547–1606) penned in 1584, humanist writing during the Revolt figured the cultivation of flora and communion among friends as tandem antidotes to the war's destructive forces.[9] L'Obel even equates the calamities of the Revolt with the inhospitable northern climes that compelled his countrymen to band together in their horticultural endeavor.[10] This discourse inspired the three artists whose work I consider below—Ludger tom Ring the Younger (1522–84), Joris Hoefnagel (1542–1600), and Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder (1573–1621)—in developing their foundational approaches to the flower still-life genre.

The Bonds of Friendship

Ludger tom Ring the Younger's *Flowers in an Earthenware Vase* (*c.* 1565) appears remarkably unassuming compared to later seventeenth-century flower paintings and their superabundant cascades of exotic blooms (Fig. 1).[11] The vase is simple, and the flowers and herbs are all locally grown. However, Ludger's bouquet exhibits a curious feature, which is found to my knowledge in no other artist's work within the genre, and which is crucial to reconstructing the intentionality behind the picture itself.

Just visible above the lip of the vase is a delicate string wound tightly seven times around the stems. The taut string functions within the logic of the picture to hold the bouquet upright, but it also points to the imagined hand of the individual who selected each specimen, arranged them just so, bound them together, and placed them before us for display. The additional loose blooms scattered across the tabletop are the refuse of this working process, which either fell off or were plucked from the final composition.

And all of this is ruse, because the flowers that Ludger represents bloom variously in the spring or summer and could not have been picked at the same time. In another flowerpot by Ludger now in the Mauritshuis, the same exact assemblage of daffodils surmounts the bouquet, which is also tied with a string and situated in a pitcher inscribed with the artist's name.[12] *Flowers in an Earthenware Vase* is thus a composite of preliminary studies, some of which Ludger employed more than once across different paintings.[13] That Ludger signed on the Mauritshuis vase attests that his invention comprised the creation of a convincing whole out of disparate component parts. The vase as an object implies precisely this process of selection and composition. In arranging a bouquet of flowers, the size and shape of the vessel dictate the length to which the individual blooms should be cut, the way they should be situated, and how many specimens can be reasonably collected together.

In short, the string tied around the bouquet is a pictorial conceit in excess of what is necessary to emphasize Ludger's artistry. It consolidates instead the implied gesture of the painting itself. It creates the sense that the bouquet is being presented and offered to the world beyond the frame. Like so many later manifestations of the flower still life, Ludger's vase of blooms is set against a

9. Matthias de l'Obel, *Plantarum, sive stirpium historia* (Antwerp: ex officina Christophori Plantini, 1576); Justus Lipsius, *De Constantia, libri duo* (Antwerp: apud Christophorum Plantinum, 1584). See also Mark Morford, 'The Stoic Garden', *Journal of Garden History*, 7 (1987), 151–75, and for the diversity of participants in early modern exchanges of natural history, see Florike Egmond, 'Observing Nature: The Correspondence Network of Carolus Clusius (1526–1609)', in *Communicating Observations in Early Modern Letters (1500–1675): Epistolography and Epistemology in the Age of the Scientific Revolution*, ed. by Dirk van Miert (London: The Warburg Institute, 2013), pp. 43–72.

10. L'Obel, *Plantarum*, p. 3.

11. Angelika Lorenz, ed., *Die Maler tom Ring*, 2 vols (Münster: Westfälisches Landesmuseum, 1996), II, pp. 394–95, no. 78, and p. 616, no. 150, with prior literature.

12. Mauritshuis, The Hague, inv. no. 1212.

13. On Ludger's studies, preserved today in the Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Vienna (Cod. min. 42), see Sam Segal, 'Blumen, Tiere und Stilleben von Ludger tom Ring d.J.', in Lorenz, *Die Maler tom Ring*, I, pp. 109–49 (pp. 117–19).

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

Fig. 1. Ludger tom Ring the Younger, *Flowers in an Earthenware Vase*, *c.* 1565. Oil on panel, 382 × 283 mm. Westfälisches Landesmuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte, Münster.

Fig. 2. Ludger tom Ring the Younger, *Portrait of Reinhard Reiners and his Wife Gese Reiners, born Meier*, 1569. Oil on panel, 845 × 533 mm and 855 × 580 mm. Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig.

dark background that pushes it forward into the viewer's perceptual field; the bouquet is not just seen but palpably felt as a site of connection.

In both family portraits and marriage portraits from this period, the presence of bouquets served to embody the union between the depicted individuals, suggesting that although their lives were as ephemeral as cut flowers, their commitment to each other would endure through their painted likeness.[14] In 1569, Ludger produced a double portrait of the Braunschweig goldsmith Reinhard Reiners and his wife that employs a flower bouquet in this manner (Fig. 2).[15] Reinhard holds in his right hand a jeweled object of his own crafting, and in his left a pair of gloves signaling his prominent social status. The cloud of white fluff near his right hand, which must have been used for polishing the jewel, rhymes (so to speak) with

14. For examples, see Adriaen Thomasz. Key, *Portrait of a Man and Woman*, 1580 (Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels, inv. nos 3621 and 2609), and Maarten de Vos, *Portrait of Antonius Anselmus, his wife Joanna Hooftmans, and their children Gillis and Joanna*, 1577 (Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels, inv. no. 3689). The bouquet of flowers in Key's *Portrait of a Woman* has been attributed to Ludger himself, for which see Lorenz, *Die Maler tom Ring*, II, pp. 482–83, no. 124.

15. Lorenz, *Die Maler tom Ring*, II, pp. 620–21, nos 155–56, and Angelika Lorenz, 'Die Porträts: Inzenierungen zwischen Abbild und Bild', in ibid., pp. 89–107 (pp. 102–04).

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

the stray white rose further forward on the tabletop.[16] Both scattered objects suggest a working process that has led to the finished products on display, a process that is now suspended so that Reiners might pose for this portrait. Meanwhile, the vase of flowers is the only still-life element that might just breach the otherwise empty side of the table occupied by Reiners' wife. Standing between the couple on the table, the bouquet—bound again several times by a fine string—embodies the bond between them that is otherwise not depicted through any gesture or physical contact. It is this same kind of relationship that Ludger's independent flower paintings create between the bouquet and the external viewer.

Ludger was born in the town of Münster, but he produced his flower pieces during the several years that he spent in Antwerp, between approximately 1553 and 1568, where he came into contact not only with a range of new pictorial genres but also with an intellectual circle invested in the nascent study of natural history.[17] At the center of that circle was the Antwerp cartographer Abraham Ortelius (1527–98), whom we know that Ludger counted among his friends. In a 1570 letter to Ortelius, the Protestant antiquarian Hubert Goltzius (1526–83) writes of his visit to the German town of Braunschweig, where Ludger had by then taken up residence. Ludger's choice of Braunschweig was prompted by his own conversion to Protestantism. It could only have been the arrival of the Spanish general the Duke of Alva (1507–82) and his troops in August 1567—whose presence fomented the onset of the Revolt—that induced Ludger to flee Antwerp for greater peace and opportunities back in his native land.

Goltzius's letter makes clear that Ludger was concerned to perpetuate his relationship with Ortelius even from a distance. 'I went to Braunschweig', Goltzius writes, 'and there I found Ludger of Münster residing, and Ludger beseeched me on my next occasion of writing to send his friendly greetings to you'.[18] The artist's request to Goltzius shows his awareness of Ortelius's vast network of correspondents and its role in maintaining ties of friendship. There is no evidence that Ludger ever produced a flower piece for Ortelius; we know nothing about the original owners of any of his still-life works. However, as we will see below, Ortelius had an appreciation for the genre, and a shared interest in the study of nature may have motivated their initial acquaintance.[19]

But if we want to understand the intimacy that underlies Ludger's approach to image-making, a still more resonant piece of evidence is his last will and testament. In the document, the artist bequeathed to his two brothers—both fellow artists—a collection of his own works:

> To Hermann and Herbort tom Ring, my dear brothers, I give and bequeath my art in a chest in Münster (as they already know) so that the art shall stay together and not be dispersed, except as they want to use it and as they see

16. In modern Dutch, the word *bloempot* ('flowerpot') can also refer to a setting of various gathered jewels of the kind that Reiners holds. See F. Leviticus, *Geïllustreerde Encyclopaedie der Diamantnijverheid* (Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn, 1908), p. 70.

17. See Jochen Luckhardt, 'Das "Küchenstück" von Ludger tom Ring d.J. (1562): Kunst in Antwerpen zwischen Münster und Braunschweig', in *Westfalen: Hefte für Geschichte, Kunst und Volkskunde,* 92 (2014), 123–63 (pp. 143–44). For Ortelius as a central figure in the study of natural history in Antwerp, see Marrigje Rikken, 'Abraham Ortelius as Intermediary for the Antwerp Animal Trailblazers', *Jahrbuch für Europäische Wissenschaftskultur,* 6 (2011), 95–128.

18. Abraham Ortelius and others, *Abrahami Ortelii (geographi Antverpiensis) et virorum eruditorum ad eundem et ad Jacobum Colium Ortelianum (Abrahami Ortelii sororis filium) epistulae*, edited by Joannes Henricus Hessels (Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1969), pp. 64–68 (p. 67), no. 28 (Leipzig, 2 March 1570): 'Ghinck ick te Brunsweick daer ick Mr Lutgert van Munster, wonhaftich vant […] unnd heeft Mr Lugert [*sic*] mij ghebeden in mijn eerste schrijven synen vriendelicken grut an U L. te doen'.

19. A surviving portrait of an unidentified man by Ludger's hand has plausibly been identified as the earliest likeness of Ortelius, for which see Luckhardt, 'Das "Küchenstück"', pp. 156–58, fig. 39.

fit according to our friendship [*unser Freundschaft*].[20]

Ludger's concern that his art remain in familial hands, that it not be sold and dispersed after his death, points to the personal nature of his creative enterprise. He does not specify the contents of the chest itself, presumably because his brothers already knew. Rather, he chooses to emphasize that friendship should be their guide in determining its future. Love and fraternity, so he implies—whether in the bestowal of his painterly legacy or the representation of a carefully assembled bouquet—inspired his pursuit of art. Whoever had the pleasure of owning one of Ludger's flower pieces entered into a familiar exchange, every time they looked upon the painting, with the giver whose imagined and amicable hand so thoughtfully arranged its blooms.

The Refreshment of Flowers

Another early innovator of the flower still life was the Antwerp-born polymath Joris Hoefnagel, who began his career as a merchant.[21] In his youth, he pursued a university education, mastered Latin, and cultivated his natural talent for art, which he applied to the nascent fields of cartography and natural history. Through these activities, he participated in a local intellectual circle that included Abraham Ortelius as well as several other scholars, merchants and artists.

As van Mander tells us, the turning point in Hoefnagel's life came with the Spanish Fury of 1576, when his hometown of Antwerp was plundered by mutinous Spanish soldiers and his family fortune confiscated.[22] Compelled to flee abroad, Hoefnagel set off for Italy in the company of Ortelius, hoping to find commercial opportunities farther south. Yet when the two men stopped to sojourn at the court of Munich, the Duke of Bavaria Albrecht V (1528–79) expressed an interest in Hoefnagel's artistic endeavors. So impressed was Albrecht upon seeing 'a small piece of parchment with little animals and trees in gouache' that the duke not only asked if he might purchase the miniature but also invited Hoefnagel to remain in Munich as his court artist.[23] Thus began Hoefnagel's productive second career producing splendid painted illuminations for the Dukes of Bavaria; Ferdinand II, Archduke of Austria (1529–95); and eventually for the Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II (1552–1612).[24]

Hoefnagel's surviving flower pieces all postdate his departure from Antwerp, and the majority of them were made and sent from abroad as gifts to specific friends and family members. Among the most charming is a miniature titled 'A Monument of Love to his Dearest Mother' (*amoris monumentum matri charissimae*), which he produced in 1589 and sent to the elderly Elisabeth Hoefnagel, who had fled their hometown after the fall of Antwerp in 1585 and eventually settled in the northern Netherlands.[25] However, the flower pieces that Hoefnagel produced for his mercantile

20. Heinrich Mack, 'Das Testament Ludgers tom Ring d.J. 1584 Januar 8', *Niedersächsisches Jahrbuch,* 1 (1924), 220–22 (p. 221): 'Harmen und Hervorde von Ringen, meinen lieben Brudern, gebe und vermache ich meine Kunste zu Munster in einer Kisten, wie sie wissen, also, das die Kunste sollen zusamen pleiben und nicht getheilet werden, sonderen sie sollen derselben gebrauchen und beisamen bei unser Freundschaft bleiben'. See also Luckhardt, 'Das "Küchenstuck"', pp. 129–33.

21. On Hoefnagel, see Marisa Anne Bass, *Insect Artifice: Nature and Art in the Dutch Revolt* (Princeton Princeton University Press, 2019), and Thea Vignau-Wilberg, *Joris and Jacob Hoefnagel: Art and Science around 1600* (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2017).

22. Van Mander, *The Lives*, I, pp. 308–09, fol. 262v.

23. Ibid.: 'Een stucxken met beestgens en boomkens, van Verlichterije, op pergamijn'. The miniature that Hoefnagel showed Albrecht was almost certainly derived from his manuscripts now known as the *Four Elements* (National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, inv. nos 1987.20.5–1987.20.8) on which he had begun work while still in Antwerp.

24. For an overview of Hoefnagel's tenure at these courts, see Vignau-Wilberg, *Joris and Jacob Hoefnagel*, pp. 34–41.

25. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. no. 2008.110. See Thea Vignau-Wilberg, 'Flowers for his Mother: An Unknown Cabinet Miniature by Joris Hoefnagel', *Master Drawings*, 45 (2007), 522–26; and Stijn Alsteens, Nadine Orenstein, and Perrin Stein, 'Recent Acquisitions, A Selection: 2007–2008', *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, 66 (2008), 18.

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

and humanist colleagues are the most relevant here for their close relation to a new manuscript genre that emerged in the Low Countries during the latter half of the sixteenth century: the *album amicorum*, or friendship album.

Alongside letter-writing, the keeping of friendship albums became a powerful means of personal exchange that soon spread from its original university milieu to become a larger cultural phenomenon.[27] These collections of inscriptions and images, dedicated to an individual by their friends and colleagues, grew out of the practice of keeping commonplace books and *florilegia*.[28] The latter word, which translates as 'a gathering of flowers', refers figuratively to a collection of choice literary texts culled from diverse sources.[29] Friendship albums were small manuscripts that fit between two hands and were easily passed from one friend to the next. Their gatherings of inscriptions and memories coalesced organically over time—sometimes over decades—mirroring the travels, ever-growing social networks, and personal histories of their owners.

What mattered in an album inscription was as much the personalization of the content as the trace of presence, the way than an individual's distinctive script and gestural marks attested that they were—however briefly—in tangible contact with the manuscript itself. Once that moment of contact was cut, their memory remained alive in the hands of the owner and every successive viewer of the album, re-enlivened by the touch and turning of its pages. The friendship album was a living entity that endured even after the individuals who inscribed it had moved on or passed away. Hence the standard habit of concluding album inscriptions with the phrase 'a monument of friendship' (*amicitiae monumentum*), which implies the creation of something that would outlast the ephemeral moment of exchange itself.

Hoefnagel's familiarity with the *album amicorum* genre is evinced both by the surviving inscriptions he penned in the albums of friends and by the fact that he kept an album himself. Indeed, his flower pieces are best understood as visual *florilegia*, which extend the genre's dedicatory practices and intimate mode of exchange from the manuscript to the independent miniature.[30] Executed in watercolour, gouache, and gold, these small works were meant to be touched and held rather than hung on a wall. Hoefnagel even experimented with pasting them on panels of wood so that they might be more easily handled, and so that their delicate parchment surfaces might be better preserved.

A 1589 flower miniature that Hoefnagel sent as a gift to his friend and fellow Antwerp merchant Johannes Radermacher (1538–1617) is one of the earliest examples from his oeuvre (Fig. 3).[31] Hoefnagel's close relationship with Radermacher was fostered throughout their lives through the

26. For a useful overview and analysis of the album genre, see Kees Thomassen and others, *Alba amicorum: Vijf eeuwen vriendschap op papier gezet: het album amicorum en het poëziealbum in de Nederlanden*, exh. cat. (The Hague: Rijksmuseum Meermanno-Westreenianum, 1990); June Schlueter, *The* album amicorum *and the London of Shakespeare's Time* (London: The British Library, 2011), pp. 8–28; and Bronwen Wilson, 'Social Networking: The 'album amicorum' in Early Modern Public Making', in *Beyond the Public Sphere: Opinions, Publics, Spaces in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Massimo Rospocher (Bologna: Società editrice il Mulino, 2012), pp. 205–23.

27. See Earle Havens, *Commonplace Books: A History of Manuscripts and Printed Books from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century* (New Haven: Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, 2001); and Ann M. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), passim.

28. 'florilegium, n.'. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/71895 (accessed 10 October 2017). The etymology of the word derives from the Latin noun *flos* ('flower') and the verb *legere*, which means most literally 'to gather' but also 'to read', from which follows the Dutch equivalent of *bloemlezing*, or 'a reading of flowers'.

29. For Hoefnagel's surviving album dedications, see Abraham Ortelius, *Album amicorum Abraham Ortelius*, ed. by Jean Puraye (Amsterdam: A. L. van Gendt & Co, 1969), pp. 16–17, fol. 6^{v}; and H. C. Rogge, 'Het album van Emanuel van Meteren', *Oud Holland*, 15 (1897), 159–92 (p. 166, fols 5^{v}–6^{r}).

30. Zeeuws Museums, Middelburg, inv. no. M98–072-01. See Thea Wilberg-Vignau, 'Freundschaft für die Ewigkeit: Joris Hoefnagels unbekannte Miniatur für Johannes Radermacher', in *Libellus amicorum Beket Bukovinská*, ed. by Lubomír Slavíček (Prague: Artefactum, 2013), pp. 113–25.

Fig. 3. Joris Hoefnagel, *Flower Still Life for Johannes Radermacher*, 1589. Watercolour and gold on parchment, with wooden support, 118 × 163 mm. Zeeuws Museum, Middelburg.

exchange of images; one of Hoefnagel's first major works was an album of drawings and poems concerning the impact of the Revolt on their native Antwerp, which he created for Radermacher in 1569 while both men had fled abroad to London.[31] Their experience as Netherlandish émigrés was as foundational to their friendship as their shared mercantile and humanist pursuits.[32]

Hoefnagel crowds Radermacher's miniature with flowers, fruit and insects. The pink rose contrasts in its softness with the vibrant blue vase on which a fritillary has come to rest. Carnations and columbines radiate from behind the rose, leading the eye towards the magnificent pear nearby and the slinking snail making its way down the left edge of the painted frame. The snail's body is an inverted analogue to the pear both in its shape and colouring, just as the two butterflies depicted in profile—a clouded yellow just below the snail, and the small tortoiseshell climbing

31. See Marisa Bass, 'Patience Grows: The First Roots of Joris Hoefnagel's Emblematic Art', in *The Anthropomorphic Lens: Anthropomorphism, Microcosmism and Analogy in Early Modern Though and Visual Arts*, ed. by Walter S. Melion, Breth Rothstein, and Michel Weemans (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 145–78, with prior literature. See also Hoefnagel's later painting *Allegory on the Friendship between the Artist and Johannes Radermacher* (Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Rotterdam, inv. no. 1308).

32. For Radermacher's biography, see Karel Bostoen, *Bonis in bonum: Johan Radermacher de Oude (1538–1617): humanist en koopman* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1998).

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

down the succulent fruit—mirror each other across the horizontal page. Together with the ichneumon wasp at rest on the budding carnation, the creeping caterpillar of a spurge hawk moth at the far right, the stretch spider just below, and the stag beetle lurking in the lower left, all Hoefnagel's insects are depicted remarkably true to life.[33]

Yet the accuracy with which Hoefnagel portrays his individual specimens is secondary to the significance of their careful arrangement and material treatment on the page. The pictorial field is so shallow that the creatures and objects set back into space seem to abut those perching on the illusory frame. Take the crisscrossing of the vase's handle with the mandibles of the stag beetle, or the leaf of the rose that seems to caress the pear. These points of contact close the distance between the viewer and Hoefnagel's depicted subjects. The gesture of the miniature is one of opening up rather the receding away, a gesture articulated most forcefully by the frontal rose and the open-winged fritillary at its center. Hoefnagel further heightens the invitation to touch by enhancing the butterfly wings with a layer of gum arabic (and gilding, in the case of the central fritillary), which give them a luminous sheen and tantalizing dimensionality. When holding the miniature in your hands, the temptation to caress the wings and test whether they are real or fictive is overwhelming.[34] Indeed, the only disruption to this immersive experience is one that was never intended: the dark hole in the upper left corner left by a worm that burrowed itself through the lime-wood onto which Hoefnagel originally pasted it.

The benevolent unfolding of the composition—and its many tactile encounters both depicted and implied—echo the dedication that Hoefnagel inscribed to Radermacher along the lower border, which itself recalls the dedicatory formulae used in friendship albums: 'Joris Hoefnagel gave this gift as a pledge of love to his friend Johannes Radermacher'.[35] Hoefnagel's pledge of love, as he makes clear through the inscription at the miniature's summit, is not comprised of the actual blooms and insects but by their unification and preservation through the painting. In declaring that 'friends should not be treated like flowers, only beloved so long as they are new', Hoefnagel suggests that the image alone endures as a monument of their friendship.[36]

Hoefnagel expands on this theme in a letter that he sent to Abraham Ortelius from Frankfurt in September 1593, with which he enclosed two miniatures as gifts for his friend back in Antwerp. One of the miniatures, inscribed explicitly with the phrase *amicitiae monumentum*, embodies their shared pursuit of the arts and is preserved today on its original wooden support.[37] The other was a flower still life that does not survive, which Hoefnagel denotes with the word *blompotteken*, or 'little flowerpot', suggesting (quite precociously) that he already understood the work to belong to

33. I am grateful to Jefferson Graves, Grant Brown, and David Shuker at the University of St Andrews for their assistance in identifying Hoefnagel's insects. The stag beetle in Radermacher's miniature derives from a folio of Hoefnagel's *Four Elements* (Washington, DC, National Gallery of Art, inv. no. 1987.20.5.6), which is in turn adapted from Albrecht Dürer's *Stag Beetle*, *c.* 1505 (Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, inv. no. 83.GC.214). The central rose, the wasp, and the spider also appear in the *Four Elements* in essentially identical form (Washington, DC, National Gallery of Art, inv. nos 1987.20.5.24, 1987.20.5.33, and 1987.20.5.38 respectively).

34. On this point, see also Bernhard Siegert, *Cultural Techniques: Grids, Filters, Doors and Other Articulations of the Real* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015), pp. 164–91. Hoefnagel did in some cases paste real insect wings to his miniatures. The best known examples are in the *Ignis* volume of the *Four Elements*, but there are likely others that have not yet been detected.

35. 'D[omino] Ioanni Rademacherio suo / Georgius Hoefnaglius pignus amoris d[ono] d[edit] a[nn]o [15]89'.

36. 'Amicitiis no[n] est utendum ut flosculis, tamdiu gratis quamdiu recentibus'. This inscription is also found in Hoefnagel's *Ignis* volume from the *Four Elements* (National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, inv. no. 1987.20.5.63).

37. *Allegory for Abraham Ortelius*, 1593 (Plantin-Moretus Museum, Antwerp, inv. no. OT 535).

a distinctive genre of picture.[38] As he explains to Ortelius:

> I am sending you a piece by my hand that I hope will not displease you, and also the little flower-pot that I made in your honour a while ago, which came into my hands again. Because lord Oykens asked me to make him another one that is fresher, and since the one that I dedicated to you is for you alone and nobody else, I send and present it once again, adorned with many insertions and restored and refreshed. It became yellowed because its ebony frame was oiled and the oil was absorbed into the parchment. You should have another frame made for it from a non-oily wood otherwise it will be entirely spoiled. I put no price on the new piece. Rather than money, I would prefer in return to have something from our arts and speculation that would serve my study. Likewise, for this little flower-pot, I desire nothing except art for art.[39]

Hoefnagel affirms not only that his flower miniatures were created in honour of specific friends but also that they truly could belong to nobody except their intended recipient. In describing one painted flower-pot as 'fresher' (*verscher*) than another—and in explaining that he has 'refreshed' (*ververst*) an old work with new additions—he extends a quality by which flowers themselves are often described to his painted miniature. Hoefnagel suggests once again that friendship should not be treated like a flower but instead like a work of art, which must be carefully preserved and continually restored.

Yet most significant is Hoefnagel's emphasis on what he desires in return for his gift. Playing upon the language of his own mercantile origins, Hoefnagel asks Ortelius for some reciprocal token of their shared 'arts and speculation' (*consten ende speculatie*). By 'speculation' he means their dialogue over intellectual questions, but the word *speculatie* in Dutch—as in English—can refer to the contemplation of ideas and commercial transactions alike. Hoefnagel thus consciously evokes, and then distinguishes his flower-pot from, the realm of public consumption. Hoefnagel's miniature monument traversed physical distance to refresh and restore to Ortelius's mind their mutual love. In exchanges between true friends, only art changes hands.

The Angelic Hand

The flower paintings of Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder (1573–1621) bridge the gap between the genre's intimate sixteenth-century origins and its explosion and expansion on the seventeenth-century art market.[40] Bosschaert's family came from Antwerp but fled in 1587 for Middelburg to avoid religious persecution and to seek out better prospects in the northern Netherlands, at

38. Hoefnagel's letter is the earliest instance I have found of the word used in this manner. A few years later, 'bloem-potten' are defined as 'horti imaginarii' in Cornelius Kiliaan, *Etymologicum teutonicae linguae* (Antwerp: ex officina Plantiniana, 1599), p. 59. By the early seventeenth century, Van Mander refers to 'Bloem-potten' painted by Lodewijck Jan van den Bos, in *The Lives*, I, p. 127, fol. 217r, and the term begins to surface in inventories like that of the collector Melchior Wijntgis from 1618. See further discussion of Wijngtis below, and Hymans, 'Melchior Wyntgis', *De Dietsche warande*, 2 (1889), 152–58, 268–77 (pp. 271, 273, 275, and 276).

39. Ortelius, *Epistulae*, pp. 566–67, no. 239 (Frankfurt, 20 September 1593): 'Sende ick u […] een stuxken van mijnder handt, hope tselve en sal u. l. nijet misvallen, ende alsoe mij wederom in handen is commen het blompotteken dat ick u l. over langen tydt hebbe vereert, hebbende mij D. Oijkens begert hem to willen daer voer een ander maken dat verscher is, terwijl het aen u. l. is gededicert ende alsoe nijemant anders en dient, sendet u. l. ende presentert u noch eens, vermeerdert van vele inserta ende over al gerenovert ende ververst […] het is gheel gewoerden doer het ebben lijstken dat geolit is woerden ende soe is die olie int perkement getrocken […] ende soe u. l. een ander laet maken datter gheen olie aen en comme ende het schelken van anderen houte sij ongeloit oft sal gansch verderven. Prijs van gelde en wil met u. l. nijet maken voer het nieu stuxken, stellet al in u ende liever ijet van onse consten ende speculatie daervoer dan gelt tot mijn studie dienende; ommers voer het blompotteken en beghere nijet anders dan const tegen conste'.

40. See especially L. J. Bol, *The Bosschaert Dynasty: Painters of Flowers and Fruit* (Leigh-on-Sea: F. Lewis, 1960), pp. 14–33; Taylor, *Dutch Flower Painting*, pp. 128, 138–39; and Meghan Siobhan Wilson Pennisi, 'The Flower Still-Life Painting of Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder in Middelburg, ca. 1600–1620' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 2007).

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

Fig. 4. Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder, Dedication by Melchior Wijngtis in the *Album Amicorum of Samuel Radermacher*, 1609. Leiden University Library, BPL 2185.

remove from the turmoil of the Revolt. As still-life painter and art dealer, Bosschaert benefited from Middelburg's thriving garden culture and international trade.[41]

Nonetheless, Bosschaert came to the flower still-life genre as much through the practices of friendship as through the commercial and horticultural endeavors surrounding him. Bosschaert's only known drawings survive in a friendship album that reveals his participation in Middelburg's intellectual milieu. The album belonged to Samuel Radermacher, the son of Johannes Radermacher, whom we already encountered as the recipient of Hoefnagel's 1589 flower miniature. By 1599, the Radermachers had returned from England to settle in Middelburg, attracted—like the Bosschaert family—by the city's tolerant religious climate.[42]

The three drawings enshrined in Samuel's *album amicorum* all date from 1609. One folio inscribed with Bosschaert's initials constitutes the artist's own dedication of friendship.[43] The other double-page opening, although not signed by the artist,

41. Karolien De Clippel and David van der Linden, 'The Genesis of the Netherlandish Flower Piece: Jan Brueghel, Ambrosius Bosschaert and Middelburg', *Simiolus*, 38 (2015–16), 73–86, and Goldgar, *Tulipmania*, pp. 26–28.

42. Bostoen, *Bonis in bonum*, p. 16.

43. Leiden University Library, BPL 2185, fol. 62^{r}. For discussion and illustration of Bosschaert's album entry, see Ger Luijten and others, *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art, 1580–1620* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1993), pp. 630–31, no. 302.

also belongs to his hand (Fig. 4).[44] It comprises a monument of friendship dedicated to Samuel by another Middelburg resident named Melchior Wijntgis (?-before 1626), the local master of the mint and an ardent collector, who was so prodigal in his art-buying that he eventually went into debt and was briefly imprisoned.[45] Wijntgis must have commissioned the young artist to make the drawings for him and then added his own signatory inscriptions—a practice not uncommon for album images. Wijntgis's friendship with Bosschaert only grew in the years following their collaboration in Radermacher's album. Bosschaert was witness to the baptism of Wijntgis's child in 1609 and, in his activity as an art dealer, helped him to acquire costly works for his collection.[46]

Wijntgis's elaborate double-page opening is remarkable among dedications found within friendship albums, even acknowledging the great diversity of the genre. On the recto, a female personification of Concord cradles a cornucopia under one arm while she delicately pours a goblet of wine—a clever play on Wijntgis's name (*wijn* for 'wine' in Dutch) and a simultaneous allusion to the virtue of Temperance. The titular inscription 'concord in modest wealth' (*parvo concordia dives*) seems ironic given Wijntgis's own penchant for overspending but is fitting for a master of coin, as both the title and the figure of Concord recall the iconography of the Netherlandish ducat.[47] Wijntgis conveys a similar message in the inscription that he scrawled below, having clearly given Bosschaert very specific instructions to ensure a unity of text and image.[48]

On the opposite verso, a unicorn modeled in fine thin lines bends down to drink from a stream and casts a reflection on the water's wavering surface. 'Leave nothing unexplored' (*nihil inexplorato*) reads the inscription above, while below, Wijntgis pays homage to Radermacher by signing off: 'your friend, at your command' (*tuus tuo imperio amicus*). In contemporary emblem books, the unicorn and the accompanying motto employed in Bosschaert's image refer to the pursuit of pure intellectual endeavor.[49] Perhaps Wijntgis meant to suggest that he shared a desire for true understanding with both Samuel and the contributors to the latter's album at large. The landscape in the background of the unicorn—despite the fanciful rocky cliff—recalls the setting of Middelburg and the surrounding province of Zeeland that Radermacher, Wijntgis, and Bosschaert all called home. Landscapes that appear through windows in the background of Bosschaert's later flower paintings evoke the watery topography of Zeeland as a flourishing *locus amoenus* of commerce, horticulture, and intellectual exchange—a longstanding trope in local humanist discourse.[50]

The micro-ecosystems of Bosschaert's flower paintings likewise constitute a fertile space of interaction. Bosschaert certainly appealed to buyers in embracing the representation of rare and costly blooms, but many of his paintings adhere in their immediacy and small scale to the strategies of his predecessors like Ludger and Hoefnagel. One of Bosschaert's very last flower pieces, signed and dated to 1621, intimates tactility in its every detail: the momentary insect

44. As first recognized by Pennisi, 'The Flower Still-Life Painting', pp. 155–57.

45. See Hymans, 'Melchior Wyntgis', pp. 152–58.

46. See Bol, *The Bosschaert Dynasty*, pp. 18, 26.

47. Adapted from the line 'concordia parvae res crescunt', in Sallust, *Bellum Iugurthinum*, 10.6.

48. 'Una fides pondus, mensura, moneta sit / una, / et status illaesus totius orbis erit'. Derived from Renerus Budelius, *De monetis et re numaria, libri duo* (Cologne: apud Joannem Gymnicum, 1591), fol. 6r (unpaginated front matter).

49. See Frederick John Stopp, *The Emblems of the Altdorf Academy: Medals and Medal Orations, 1577–1626* (London: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 1974), pp. 36, 118, no. 14; and Joachim Camerarius, *Symbolorum et emblematum ex animalibus quadrupedibus desumtorum centuria altera collecta* (Nuremberg: excudebat Paulus Kaufmann, 1595), no. 12.

50. See, for example, Bosschaert's *c.* 1618 painting *Vase of Flowers in a Window* (Mauritshuis, The Hague, inv. no. 679). For the notion of Zeeland as a *locus amoenus*, see Marisa Anne Bass, *Jan Gossart and the Invention of Netherlandish Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), pp. 36, 68–69, 140.

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.

wayfarers, the cut stems visible through the glass vase, and the water droplets on the leaves of the violet overhanging the foreground ledge, which one can readily imagine Samuel Pepys wanting to touch (Fig. 5). Bosschaert has arranged the flowers from dark to light such that they seem to emerge from the sensual gloaming of the background, and to encroach on the viewer's space.[51]

This painting may be the work for which Bosschaert famously received 1000 guilders in payment from Frederick van Schurman (1564–1623), steward to the Prince of Orange.[52] According to a surviving account written by his daughter, Bosschaert died at van Schurman's home in the Hague after falling ill on his journey to deliver the finished product.[53] As such, it is fitting that a plaque with an inscription dedicated to Bosschaert appears on the ledge at the composition's base. The plaque was ruled in Bosschaert's own underdrawing and serves to memorialize his creative legacy: 'This is the angelic hand of the great painter of flora, Ambrosius, renowned even to the banks of the River Moré'.[54] The inscription alludes to the etymological affinity between Bosschaert's name and the Greek word *ambrotos* for 'immortal' and suggests—by referencing the Moré River along the Gold Coast of Africa—the vast distances that the artist's rare subjects traveled before they came to reside in this precious picture. At the same time, the metonymic association between the painting and Bosschaert's hand suggests that the still life preserves the trace of his presence even after he has gone. We do not know who composed this florid dedication, but whoever did understood the painting as a living monument, which the artist—in an angelic gesture—had dedicated and offered to all his viewers thereafter.

51. For discussion of this technique, see Paul Taylor, 'The Concept of *houding* in Dutch Art Theory', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 55 (1992), 210–32 (pp. 229–30); and Taylor, *Dutch Flower Painting*, pp. 183–84.

52. Arthur K. Wheelock Jr., 'Ambrosius Bosschaert/*Bouquet of Flowers in a Glass Vase*/1621', *Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century*, NGA Online Editions, https://purl.org/nga/collection/artobject/94743 (accessed 25 November 2018).

53. Abraham Bredius, 'De bloemschilders Bosschaert', *Oud Holland*, 31 (1913), 137–40 (esp. p. 138).

54. 'C'est l'angelicq[ue] main du gra[n]d peinctre de flore / Ambroise, renommé jusqu'au Rivage Moré'.

Fig. 5. Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder, *Bouquet of Flowers in a Glass Vase*, 1621. Oil on copper, 316 × 216 mm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC.

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.